Sabbagh (2008) makes an empirical argument concerning the derivation of right node raising (RNR) sentences in Tagalog. He notes that all and only the syntactic constituents that can undergo typical leftward wh-movement can serve as the shared element, or target, of a RNR sentence. Therefore, he argues, a movement analysis would be the most plausible for Tagalog RNR. However, when investigated further, the parallelism does not hold. A greater variety of elements can serve as the RNR target than can be wh-moved, contrary to what Sabbagh claims. The fact that elements that cannot undergo A\(\bar{}\)-movement can still act as RNR targets suggests that RNR in Tagalog is not derived via A\(\bar{}\)-movement. The instances where RNR is not allowed can be explained by the interplay between morphologically realized specificity marking of Tagalog arguments and crosslinguistic information structure requirements of RNR sentences. The position immediately prior to the gaps in RNR must represent discourse-salient new information (as in Hartmann 2000, Ha 2007). The illicit RNR sentences that Sabbagh produces fail to be acceptable because the constituents in this position are marked with a ‘‘specific’’ determiner (Schachter and Otanes 1972, Kroeger 1993), which, being specific, requires a ‘‘previously established discourse referent’’ (Enc 1991:8). That is, the pregap expressions must simultaneously represent new information and refer to an established referent, a difficult feat. Discourse-initially this is not possible for obvious reasons, and it is correctly predicted that RNR sentences with pregap, specific-marked expressions are judged unacceptable. However, in particular contexts, the otherwise unacceptable sentences are judged acceptable.

1 Sabbagh’s Argument

Sabbagh (2008) (among others, including Chung (1998), Rackowski (2002), and Rackowski and Richards (2005)) notes that in Tagalog only ‘‘subjects’’ and oblique arguments can undergo A\(\bar{}\)-extraction (in addition to adverbs).\(^1\) A ‘‘subject’’ in Tagalog is determined by agreement morphology on the verb and is independent of thematic roles. In (1a) (from Sabbagh 2008:503, along with (1b)), *si Juan* is the subject and agrees with the (active voice) verb; and in (1b), *ang aklat* ‘book’ is the subject despite being the theme of the sentence and agrees with

---
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Abbreviations: \(S\) = subject, \(NS\) = nonsubject, \(L\) = linker, \(PASS\) = passive, \(ACT\) = active.

\(^1\) Using the term *subject* here is controversial, but I will retain Sabbagh’s usage for the sake of continuity. See Richards 2000 for a good summary of the issue.
the (passive voice) verb. Extraction of nonsubjects and nonoblique arguments is prohibited. In (2b), *ang kotse mo* 'your car' is the subject of the sentence, and the sentence is unacceptable because a nonsubject has been *wh*-extracted. This contrasts with (2a), in which *ng kotse mo* is not the subject. Rather, the verb agrees with the *wh*-extracted agent *sino* 'who'.

(1) a. *Humahawak ng aklat si Juan.*
   \[\text{act.}\, \text{hold} \quad \text{NS book} \; \text{s} \; \text{Juan} \]
   *Juan is holding a book.*
   
   b. *Hinahawakan ni Juan ang aklat.*
   \[\text{pass.}\, \text{hold} \quad \text{NS Juan s} \; \text{book} \]
   *The book is being held by Juan.*

(2) a. *Sino ang nagnakaw ng kotse mo?*
   \[\text{who} \; \text{s} \; \text{act.}\, \text{stole} \quad \text{NS car you(NS)} \]
   *Who stole your car?*
   
   b. *Sino ang ninakaw ang kotse mo?*
   \[\text{who} \; \text{s} \; \text{pass.}\, \text{stole} \; \text{s} \; \text{car you(NS)} \]
   *(‘Who stole your car?’)*

This restriction closely parallels restrictions found in RNR sentences. In (3)–(4) (from Sabbagh 2008:506), the RNR element can be the subject but it cannot be the object. Sabbagh claims that this parallelism shows that RNR is derived via movement in the same way as *Å*-extraction. That is, there is a certain type of element that can *wh*-move in Tagalog and since this type of element is also the only type that can serve as the shared RNR element, *wh*-movement and RNR are the same sort of process in Tagalog.

(3) *Hindi nagluto’ ng bigas at hindi kumain ng isda*
   \[\text{not cooked} \quad \text{NS rice and not ate} \quad \text{NS fish} \]
   [ang pareho-ng babae].
   \[\text{s} \; \text{same-L} \; \text{woman} \]
   *‘The same woman did not cook rice and did not eat fish.’*

(4) *Nagsara si Juan at nagbukas si Pedro [ng pintuan].*
   \[\text{closed} \; \text{s} \; \text{Juan and opened} \; \text{s} \; \text{Pedro NS door} \]
   *(‘Juan closed, and Pedro opened—a door.’)*

---

2 The subject marker *ang* is used to introduce inanimate arguments and *si* is used for animate ones, but they are syntactically identical (Schachter and Otanes 1972).

3 See Richards 1998, Paul 2000, 2001, Pearson 2001, Aldridge 2002, Massam 2003, Potsdam 2004, 2006, and Law 2005, 2007, among others, for arguments that *wh*-questions in Austronesian involve clefting. The *ang* immediately following the *wh*-word is taken to be the head of the subject of the predicate nominal and as such is predicted to show up as a subject marker. That there is apparent movement out of a relative clause does not militate against movement analyses per se. Sabbagh (2007) offers an analysis of RNR that predicts its island insensitivity.

4 In this squib, I will enclose the RNR target in square brackets irrespective of constituency.
2 Specificity in Tagalog and Focus in Right Node Raising

The subject/nonsubject distinction that Sabbagh (2008) believes determines extractability in RNR also correlates with morphologically realized specificity in Tagalog. The element I have been glossing as S(subject), ang, is used to mark specific DPs (Rackowski 2002). By specific, I intend at least the requirement noted by Encç (1991), that the specific argument must have a preestablished referent in the discourse. This requirement seems to be met by ang, as Schachter and Otanes (1972:61) report that the ang-marked expression must “have been mentioned in the immediately preceding context [or] . . . have been implied, rather than mentioned, in the preceding context . . .”

Note that all of Sabbagh’s unacceptable sentences have the specific, ang-marked argument immediately to the left of the gaps in RNR ((4), repeated here as (5)).

(5) *Nagsara si Juan ___ at nagbukas si Pedro ___
closed s Juan and opened s Pedro
[ng pintuan].
NS door
(‘Juan closed, and Pedro opened—a door (= the same door).’)

Hartmann (2000:109) argues that in RNR sentences there is “focus on the last element preceding the target.” Using an example like (6), she argues that a definitive aspect of being focused is representing discourse-related new information. In the RNR sentence in (6), the verbs bought and sold directly precede the gaps. This is a licit answer only to questions concerning what happened to the object being

---

5 This is by no means an uncontroversial position to take, and the argument presented here crucially relies on its being correct. However, it has also been suggested that the ang marker expresses “old” information (Bowen 1965, Richards 2000). But as a reviewer points out, this view of ang does not stand up in light of facts like (i), noted by Kroeger (1993). Here (crucially not discourse-initially), the ang-marked expression represents new information, not old. I therefore follow Rackowski and Richards (2005) among many others in taking ang to be specific and, as such, able to express new information. That the ang-marked expression can represent new information in the form of an answer to a question will prove important in section 4, where it will be licensed in the pregap position of RNR.

(i) Q: Ano ang kinain mo?
what s ate you(NS)
‘What did you eat?’
A: Kinain ko ang isda?
ate I(NS) s fish
‘I ate the fish.’

6 Hartmann’s (2000) use of target is a notational variant of the more agnostic gap used here.

7 Hartmann (2000) uses a question-answer pair like that in (i) to illustrate the point.
bought and sold: questions in which these verbs would convey new information.

(6) Q: What did they do with the books?
   A: Hans bought, and (then) Maria sold, the books.

The declaration in (6) would not be a licit answer to the question *Who bought and who sold the books?* as the verbs would no longer convey new information.

There is a clash between the focus requirements of RNR sentences and the morphosemantics of the pregap elements in Sabbagh’s unacceptable sentences. The constituents to the immediate left of the RNR gaps in Sabbagh’s examples account for the unacceptability of the sentences. As specific arguments, they must refer to preestablished referents in the discourse. As pregap constituents in an RNR sentence, they must refer to new information. The logic here is that the pregap position must contain content that has not previously entered the discourse or context, yet specific expressions necessarily pick out entities in the discourse or context. That is, pregap *ang*-marked phrases must pick out discourse-salient entities whose content does not yet exist in the discourse, a seeming contradiction (though see section 4). Sentences like (4) are unacceptable because of this conflict, and sentences like (3) are fine because there is no conflict. In the next section, I will show that if this clash is avoided, the ostensibly disallowed RNR target arguments can indeed serve as RNR targets.

3 Unexpected Targets

To test whether it is indeed the pregap argument that is responsible for the unacceptability and not the RNR target, one can construct sentences where the target remains constant and the pregap constituent is not specific. One way to avoid having the *ang*-marked subjects adjacent to the RNR gaps is to *wh*-front them. In the sentences below,

(i) Q: What did Hans do to the squash?
   A: Hans sliced, and Hans fried, the squash.

Contrast this with the infelicitous dialogue in (ii).

(ii) Q: Who sliced and who fried the squash?
   A: *Hans sliced, and Mary fried, the squash.

The use of obligatorily transitive verbs is important to ensure an RNR interpretation here. Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for questions that clarified this point.

8 Pregap positions will necessarily be at the right edge of each conjunct. This follows from the Right Edge Restriction (Sabbagh 2007, Wilder 2008, Bachrach and Katzir 2009), which requires the gaps to be the rightmost element in each conjunct.
the subject has been extracted to the front of the sentence and the RNR target is a nonsubject, previously taken to be illicit in that position.\footnote{A reviewer notes that a similar test could be constructed with the wh-words in situ. Despite claims to the contrary, Law and Gärtnert (2005) and Law (2006) show that wh-words can remain in situ in Tagalog and related languages.}

\begin{equation}
\text{(7) Sino ang nanghuhuli _____ at sino ang nagtitinda _____}
\begin{align*}
&\text{who s catches} & \text{and who s sells} \\
&\text{[ng isda]?
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
&\text{NS fish} \\
&\text{‘Who catches, and who sells, fish?’}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

Another way to remove the ang-phrase from the pregap position is to apply the transformation of ay-inversion, which fronts the ang-phrase to a sentence-initial topic position, as shown in (8)–(9).

\begin{equation}
\text{(8) Nanghuhuli ng isda si Juan.}
\begin{align*}
&\text{catches NS fish s Juan} \\
&\text{‘Juan catches fish.’}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{(9) Ay-inverted sentence}
\begin{align*}
&\text{Si Juan ay nanghuhuli ng isda.} \\
&\text{s Juan AY catches NS fish} \\
&\text{‘Juan catches fish.’}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

This same transformation, when applied to RNR sentences, results in acceptable sentences even though Sabbagh’s prohibited element is the shared element.

\begin{equation}
\text{(10) Si Juan ay nanghuhuli _____ at si Maria ay}
\begin{align*}
&\text{s Juan AY catches} & \text{and s Maria AY} \\
&\text{nagtitinda _____ [ng isda].} & \text{sells NS fish} \\
&\text{‘Juan catches, and Maria sells, fish.’}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

One further way to separate the specific argument from the pregap position is to insert an adverbial between the two. In (11), a time adverbial is inserted into each conjunct (‘on Monday’ and ‘on Saturday’, respectively). The sentence is acceptable, as predicted.

\begin{equation}
\text{(11) Nanghuhuli ang amo ko sa lunes _____ at}
\begin{align*}
&\text{catches s father I(NS) on Monday and} \\
&\text{nagtitinda ang ina ko sa sabado _____ [ng isda].} & \text{sells s mother I(NS) on Saturday NS fish} \\
&\text{‘On Monday my father catches, and on Saturday my mother} & \text{‘On Monday my father catches, and on Saturday my mother} \\
&\text{sells, fish.’}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

This acceptability is due to the fact that there is no specific, ang-marked argument, requiring a discourse referent, where RNR requires new information. The ang-marked phrase can also be shifted into the RNR target to get acceptable sentences with ostensibly illicit targets. In (12), the RNR target contains the nonsubject niya and remains acceptable. The difference stems from there not being an ang-marked phrase to the left of the gaps.
(12) Iniisip ni Juan na kinain pero iniisip ni Maria
thinks that Juan that ate but thinks Maria
na hinugasan [niya ang isda].
that washed he(NS) s fish
‘Juan thinks that he ate the fish but Maria thinks that he
washed the fish.’

4 Discourse Modulations of Acceptability

Two established variables play a role in Tagalog RNR. First, there
is the requirement that ang-marked arguments be specific and have
preestablished discourse referents. Second, the pregap position in RNR
sentences must present information new to the discourse. To show
that these are the crucial elements for Tagalog RNR acceptability (and
not that these are simply the elements that can be Å-extracted), it
should be possible to manipulate Sabbagh’s (2008) examples along
the above parameters so that they are acceptable. Example (13b) is
ungrammatical as Sabbagh presents it, that is, discourse-initially. I
propose that it is judged as such because the ang-phrases need to
convey new information and at the same time have a discourse referent.
If this sentence were an answer to a question concerning the catcher
and the seller, then not only would the particular answer (‘my father’
and ‘my mother’) convey new information, it would also have a dis-
course referent in the form of the restricted set of possible referents
presented by the wh-word (Erteschik-Shir 1997:105). As an answer
to question (13a), the sentence is fine.

(13) a. Sino ang nanghuhuli ____ at sino ang
who s catches and who s
nagtitinda ____ [ng isda]?
sells NS fish
‘Who catches, and who sells, fish?’

b. Nanghuhuli ang ama ko ____ at nagtitinda
catches s father I(NS) and sells
ang ina ko ____ [ng isda].
s mother I(NS) NS fish
‘My father catches, and my mother sells, fish.’

The same alternation in acceptability can be made in the opposite
direction. Sentence (14b) is judged acceptable discourse-initially.
When preceded by a question that enters Juan and Maria into the
discourse, though, the otherwise acceptable sentence becomes unac-
cetable. Juan and Maria, no longer conveying new information, can-
not occur in the pregap position of the RNR sentence.

(14) a. Ano ang hinuhuli ni Juan at (ano ang) tinitinda
what s caught NS Juan and (what s) sold
ni Maria?
NS Maria
‘What did Juan catch and (what did) Maria sell?’
5 Conclusion

In this squib, I have argued that the limitations on wh-movement in Tagalog do not carry over straightforwardly to right node raising. Contrary to Sabbagh (2008), I argue that what determines acceptability is not the type of constituent in the RNR target, but the type of constituent that is on the left edge of the RNR gaps. It is not merely subjects and oblique arguments that can serve as the RNR target; rather, it is just about any sort of element in the rightmost position of a conjunct so long as there is no conflict between the focus requirements of the pregap position and the specificity of the argument in that position. When this conflict is avoided, the targets that Sabbagh claims are always unacceptable turn out to be fine. I have shown that failure to avoid this conflict is a more accurate determinant of unacceptability. Previous analyses have attempted to unify RNR with Á-movement, but the facts reviewed here challenge that unification. In fact, Sabbagh’s argument can be reversed: the fact that elements that cannot Á-move can still serve as the RNR target suggests that RNR in Tagalog is in fact not derived via Á-movement.
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Perceptually Grounded Faithfulness in Harmonic Serialism

John J. McCarthy
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

1 Statement of the Problem

Steriade (2008) argues that faithfulness constraints in Optimality Theory are perceptually grounded: the faithfulness of a phonological mapping is directly proportional to the perceptual similarity between the input and the output of that mapping. For example, when a phonological process like place assimilation, voice assimilation, or deletion affects a medial consonant cluster /VC₁C₂V/, it usually targets C₁ rather than C₂.¹ The explanation is that changing C₁ is less of a change perceptually than changing C₂, because C₂’s prevocalic position gives it stronger perceptual cues than C₁. Formally, this difference in strength of perceptual cues is reflected in the ranking of faithfulness constraints: processes affecting C₁ violate lower-ranking faithfulness constraints than processes affecting C₂.

A mapping has an input and an output, and faithfulness constraints require an input and an output to compare. In the standard parallel version of Optimality Theory, referred to here as P-OT, the input to every mapping is the underlying representation and the output is the surface representation (Prince and Smolensky 1993/2004).

When this property of P-OT is combined with perceptually grounded faithfulness, a problem arises (Blumenfeld 2006, Flemming 2006, 2008a,b, Gallagher 2006, Jun 2002, McCarthy 2008b, Wilson 2001): underlying representations lack information that is important for perception. For example, the release of a stop consonant contains important perceptual cues for its place of articulation. In most if not all languages, the distribution of release is determined by the grammar, not the lexicon: stops are released prevocally, but they may be unreleased (depending on the language) preconsonantally. If important perceptual cues like release are not already determined in underlying representation, how can faithfulness be perceptually grounded?²
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² Specifying underlying representations for release will not solve this problem because the distribution of release is decided by the grammar, not the lexicon. See McCarthy 2008a:88–95 on richness of the base in OT.