1. Introduction

In many ergative languages, only the nominative/absolutive DP can undergo movement.

Tagalog ergative alignment

(1) a. D<um>ating ang babae. (Intransitive)
   <INTR.PRV>arrive NOM/ABS woman
   ‘The woman arrived.’

b. B<in>ili ng babae ang isda. (Transitive)
   <TR.PRV>buy GEN/ERG woman NOM/ABS fish
   ‘The woman bought the fish.’

NOM/ABS extraction

(2) a. isda-ng b<in>ili ng babae (Transitive object: OK)
    fish-LK <TR.PRV>buy GEN woman
    ‘fish that the woman bought’

b. *babae-ng b<in>ili ang isda (Transitive subject: *)
   woman-ng <TR.PRV>buy NOM fish
   ‘woman who bought the fish’

c. babae-ng D<um>ating (Intransitive subject: OK)
   woman-LK <INTR.PRV>-arrive
   ‘woman who arrived’

Proposal: Correlate extraction with structural case licensing.¹

(3) Extraction Competition
    NOM valued by C. Only the NOM DP can occupy [Spec, CP].

¹ This proposal builds on the widely held views that absolutive case is equivalent to nominative (Bok-Bennema 1991; Murasugi 1992; Campana 1992; Bittner 1994; Bittner & Hale 1996a, b; Manning 1996; Ura 2000) and that nominative case assignment is related to the extraction asymmetry in Austronesian and/or syntactically ergative languages (Schachter & Otanes 1972, Bell 1983, Campana 1992, Guilfoyle et al. 1992, Kroeger 1993, Coon et al. 2014 and others). See also Keenan & Comrie (1977) for the observation that only one grammatical function in a language can undergo relativization, it must be the subject. See also Deal (2016) for a different approach to tying extraction privilege to a particular type of case. In this analysis, probes on C are sensitive to the type of case valued on a DP, with “unmarked case” (in the sense of Marantz 1991, Bobaljik 2008) being the most accessible.
2. Extraction-Competition in Ergative Languages

2.1. Theoretical background

Chomsky (2008 and subsequent work) C-T Inheritance:
1. All uninterpretable features on T are inherited from C.
2. C passes $[u\phi]$ to T. $[u\phi]$ case licenses the subject and forces it to move to [Spec, TP].
3. C retains other features like $[uWH]$ to allow wh-movement over the subject.

(4) a. What did you buy?

\[ 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP}_{[WH, ACC]} \\
\text{CP}
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{C'} \\
\text{TP}
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{what} \\
\text{did}
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{C}_{[uWH]} \\
\text{TP}
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP}_{[NOM]} \\
\text{you}
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{T'} \\
\text{vP}
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{<DP}_{[WH, ACC]} > \\
\text{v'}
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP}_{[NOM]} \\
\text{v'}
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{vP}
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{<DP}_{[WH, ACC]} >
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{buy}
\end{array}
\]

C-T Inheritance is not universal (Ouali 2006; Gallego 2014; Legate 2014; Martinović 2015; van Urk 2015; Erlewine 2016; Aldridge 2017)

(5) Condition on C-T Inheritance
Uninterpretable features are inherited.\(^2\)

WH > SUBJECT order in English:

⇒ $[u\phi]$ must be inherited by T, leaving [Spec, CP] available for other movements.

\[^2\text{This proposal follows Richards (2007, 2012), but see also den Dikken (2014) for arguments against the need for uninterpretable features to be inherited. He (2014: 44) proposes instead that the EPP property of a phase head must be satisfied within the domain of that phase head. This is also very similar to what I propose if we understand an “EPP property” to be satisfied by movement to check a probe at the landing site, i.e. movement driven by a strong feature (in the sense of Chomsky 1995). For me, the difference between whether inheritance takes place is not in whether movement takes place but in whether movement is motivated by a probe on the phase head or takes place agnostically to value a feature on the moving constituent.}\]
Languages with extraction competition
No subject/verb agreement: Subject movement is not driven by \[\mu\] (Saito 2016).

⇒ C-T inheritance does not take place.
⇒ Nominative is valued by C, perhaps as interpretable tense or finiteness (Pesetsky and Torrego 2001, 2006).
⇒ DPs move agnostically to value case (Boščović 2007).

Generally: DPs surface in positions where they are licensed.
Caveat: DPs can surface in lower positions if they are overtly marked.

König’s (2008) Generalization: “No Case Before the Verb”
⇒ Postverbal subjects in African languages are overtly marked.
⇒ Preverbal subjects are bare.

(6) a. bume haŋae ŋakogine. (Chai; König 2008: 248)
   Bume.ACC chase.PRV.3PL.3SG.OBJ Ngakogine.ACC
   ‘The Bume chased Ngakogine.’

b. ŋakogine haŋae bume-o.
   Ngakogine.ACC chase.PRV.3PL.3SG.OBJ Bume-NOM
   ‘The Bume chased Ngakogine.’

2.2. Analysis of Tagalog

(7) Tagalog case assignment
[Spec, v]\textsubscript{Tr}]:\ GEN\textsuperscript{3}
[Spec, C\textsubscript{Fin}]:\ NOM
[Compl, V]:\ OBL (default, assigned as last resort)

NOM is bare when DP occupies [Spec, CP].
⇒ Bare DPs in Tagalog are non-referential, function as heads of relative clauses.
NOM is overtly marked when DP is spelled out in the clause.
⇒ NOM-marked DPs in Tagalog have presuppositional interpretations.

Transitive clause
IA with NOM; IA can extract.
If EA tries to move, IA is not licensed.

(8) a. B<in>ili ng babae ang isda. (Declarative)
   <TR.PRV>buy GEN woman NOM fish
   ‘The woman bought the fish.’

b. isda-ng b<in>ili ng babae (NOM object extraction)
   fish-LK <TR.PRV>buy GEN woman
   ‘fish that the woman bought’

c. *babae-ng b<in>ili ang isda  (*GEN subject extraction) 
    woman-ng <TR.PRV>buy NOM fish 
    ‘woman who bought the fish’

d.    
    CP 
    DP[NOM] C’ 
        C AspP 
            V+v+Asp vP 
                <DP[uCASE]> v’ (EA gets GEN from TRANS v.) 
                    DP[GEN] 
                        <V+v> VP 
                            <V> <DP[uCASE]> (IA needs case.)

Intransitive clause
EA with NOM; EA can extract.
If IA tries to move, EA is not licensed.

(9)  
    a. B<um>ili ang babae ng isda. (Declarative antipassive) 
        <INTR.PRV>buy NOM woman GEN fish 
        ‘The woman bought a fish.’ 
    b. babae-ng b<um>ili ng isda (Intransitive subject: OK) 
        woman-LK <INTR.PRV>buy GEN fish 
        ‘woman who bought a/the fish’ 
    c. *isda-ng b<um>ili ang babae (AP object: *) 
        fish-LK <INTR.PRV>buy NOM woman 
        ‘fish that the woman bought’

d.    
    CP 
    DP[NOM] C’ 
        C AspP 
            V+v+Asp vP (No GEN from INTR v; EA needs case) 
                <DP[uCASE]> v’ 
                    <V+v> VP 

**Extraction:** Only the DP with an unvalued case feature can move to [Spec, CP]. => This will be the NOM DP; only the NOM DP can undergo movement.

**Case:** Inherent GEN for transitive EA
Bare NOM on DP in [Spec, CP]; Overt NOM on lower copy
OBL as last resort for complement of V

3. Old Japanese (OJ; 8th C. CE)

Basic word order and alignment:

(10) a. 烏梅能波奈 伊麻佐可利 奈理 (MYS 820)
    [Ume=no pana] ima sakari-nar-i
    plum=GEN flower.NOM now open-be-ss
    ‘The plums are now in bloom.’

b. 我期大王 国所知良之 (MYS 933)
    [Wa-ga opo-kimi] kuni sirasu ras-i.
    1SG-GEN great-lord.NOM country.OBL rule seem-ss
    ‘My great lord rules seems to rule the land.’

(11) | Case | Form | Context |
    |------|------|---------|
    | NOM  | NULL | Subject in [Spec, CP] |
    | NOM  | TOP  | On lower subject copy |
    | ACC  | wo   | Specific object, dislocated |
    | GEN  | ga   | High animacy DP in nominalized [Spec, vP] |
    | GEN  | no   | Low animacy DP in nominalized [Spec, vP] |
    | OBL  | NULL | Non-specific DP, sister to V |

3.1. Extraction restriction

NOM extracted:

(12) 後心乎 知人 (MYS 222)
    [noti=no kokoro=wo sir-u] pito
    after=GEN heart=ACC know-RT person
    ‘a person who knows how he will feel afterward’

GEN subject in object relative clause:

(13) a. 隠口乃 泊瀨越女我 手二纒在 玉 (MYS 424)
    [komoriku=no patuse wotomye=ga te=ni mak-ye-ru] tama
    secluded=GEN Patuse girl=GEN hand=DAT wind-PAST-RT bead
    ‘the beads that the maiden of the secluded Patuse wound around her wrist’
b. 白雲乃棚引山 (MYS 287)
   [sira kumwo=no tanabik-u] yama
   white cloud=GEN hang-RT4 mountain
   ‘the mountain that white clouds hang over’

3.2. NOM in [Spec, CP]

Focus Concord Constructions (kakari-musubi 係り結び):
   ⇒ Focused constituent with focus particle
   ⇒ Main verb with adnominal (RTadnominal 连体 or IZ 已然 realis inflection)
   ⇒ Subject often surfaces with GEN case.
   ⇒ Focused constituent moves out of vP.

   FOC > GEN subject

(14) a. 由布佐禮婆 比具良之 伎奈久 伊故麻山 古延弓曽 安我 久流
   Yupu sar-e-ba pigurasi ki-naku ikomayama (MYS 3589)
evening go-IZ-COND cicada come-cry Mt. Ikoma
kwoe-te=so a-ga ku-ru
cross-COND=SO I-GEN come-RT
   ‘It is climbing over Mt. Ikoma, where the cicadas come to sing in the evening, that I come.’

b. 何物 鴨 御狩 人之 折而 将捲頭
   Nani=wo ka=mo mi-kari=no pito=no wori-te kazasa-mu?
what=ACC KA=FOC HON-hike=GEN person=GEN pick-CONJ wear.MOD.RT
   ‘What should the hikers pick and wear (on their hair)?’ (MYS 1974)

Yanagida (2006), Yanagida and Whitman (2009), and Yanagida (2012):
   ⇒ GEN as inherent case assigned to the subject in [Spec, vP]5
   ⇒ WO-marked object moves to outer spec of vP.
   ⇒ FOC must be even higher.

(15) a. 佐欲比賣能故何 比列布利斯 夜麻 (Manyoshu 868)
   [vP Sayopimye=no kwo=ga [vP pire puri]-si] yama
Sayohime=GEN child=GEN scarf wave-PAST.RT hill
   ‘the hill where the girl Sayohime waved her scarf’

b. 蜻野叫 人之懸者 (Manyoshu 1405)
   [vP Akidu nwo=wo [vP pito=no [vP to_obj kakure-ba]]]
Akizu field=ACC man=GEN speak.of-COND
   ‘When a man speaks of the moorland of Akizu…’

---

4 As is true for several OJ verb classes, the rentai adnominal and shuushi conclusive forms for this verb are syncretic. In the interest of clarity, I gloss these inflections according to their functions in the given examples.
5 Specifically, this is for ga genitive case, while they allow no to be assigned/valued higher.
⇒ No island boundary between the particle and the verb showing concord with it.\(^6\)

(16) a. 福何有人香黒髪之
[DP [Sakipapi=no ika na-ru] pito]=ka kurwo kami=no
fortunate=GEN how be-RT person=KA black hair=GEN
白成左右妻之音乎聞 (MYS 1411)
sirwo-ku na-ru made imwo=no kowe=wo kik-u?
white-ADV be-RT until wife=GEN voice=ACC hear-RT
‘A man whose fortune is how (good) will hear his wife’s voice until his black hair has turned white?’

b. 雁之翅乃覆羽之何処漏香
[CP [[Kari=no tubasa=no opopi-pa]=no iduku mori-te]]=ka
goose=GEN wing=GEN great-wing=GEN where leak-CONJ=KA
霜之零異牟 (MYS 2238)
shimo=no furi-kye-MOD
‘The frost has fallen, because what part of the great wings of the wild goose is leaking?’

⇒ Focus (or wh-) movement to a position above vP

NOM > FOC
⇒ Focus feature inherited by T
⇒ Subject moves to [Spec, CP] for licensing

(17) a. 保等登藝須奈尓加伎奈可奴 (MYS 4053)
Pototogisu nani=ka ki-naka-un?
cuckoo.NOM what=KA come-cry-NEG,RT
‘Why does the cuckoo not come and sing?’

b. 志藝誰田尓加須牟 (MYS 4141)
… sigi [ta-ga ta=ni]=ka sum-u?
snake who-GEN field=DAT=KA live-RT
‘In whose field lives the snake who …?’

\(^6\) See also Gair (1983, 1998), Kishimoto (1992, 2005), Cable (2010), Slade (2011), and others on the locality restriction in similar constructions in other languages, specifically Sinhala and Tlingit.
But: Focus can precede subject if subject not bare:
⇒ Subject marked as topic

(18) a. 三嶋江之 入江之薦乎 荊爾社 吾乎婆公者 念有来 (2766)
          Misimae=no irie=no komo=wo kari=ni=koso
Misima=GEN estuary=GEN straw=ACC cut-CONJ=DAT=KOSO
    ware=wo=ba kimi=pa omopi-tari-kyer-e.
    me=ACC=TOP you=TOP think-PRV-PAST-IZ
    ‘It was when you went to the Misima estuary to cut straw that you were you thinking
    of me.’

b. 時自久曽人飲云 (MYS 3260)
    Toki-ji-ku=so pito=pa nomu to ip-u.
    time-NEG-CONJ=SO person=TOP drink C say-RT
    ‘(They) say that people drink at the wrong times.’

3.3. More on extraction

One bare DP can be licensed in [Spec, CP].

Bare subjects can be preceded by adjuncts.

(19) a. 情無 此渚埼未尒 多津鳴倍思哉
          [Kokoro na-ku] [kono susakimi=ni] tadu nak-u bes-i ya?
feeling lack-ADV this sandbar=LOC crane cry-SS MOD-SS Q
    ‘Should a crane be crying without feeling on the sandbar?’

b. 我屋<戶>前乃 花橘尒 霍公鳥 今社鳴米 (MYS 1481)
    [Wa-ga yadwo=no pana tatipana]=ni
    1SG-GEN house=GEN flower orange=LOC
    pototogisu ima=koso ki-naka-me.
cuckoo now=KOSO come-cry-MOD.IZ
    ‘The cuckoo will now come to sing at the flowering orange blossoms of my home.’

… or a scrambled object with accusative WO-marking:
(20)  a. 許乃久能 之氣伎乎乃倍乎 保等登藝須 奈伎弓 故由奈利
[Ko=no kure=no sige-ki wo=no pe]=wo
tree=GEN darkness=GEN dense-RT ridge=GEN over=ACC
pototogisu naki-te kwoy-u nar-i.
cuckoo cry-CONJ cross-SS be-SS
‘The cuckoo seems to cry as it passes over the ridge draped in the darkness of the trees.’

b. … 我振袖乎妹見都良武 (MYS 132)
[... wa-ga pur-u sode]=wo imwo mi-tu-ramu=ka?
1SG-GEN wave-RT sleave-ACC wife see-PRV-MOD=Q
‘Did my dear wife see the sleave I waved?’

But: Bare objects can front only in the absence of NOM subject.

(21)  a. 梅柳誰與共可吾縵可牟 (MYS 4238)
Ume yanagi tare=to tomo=ni=ka wa-ga kaduraka-mu?
plum willow who=with together=DAT=KA 1SG-GEN adorn.hair-MOD.RT
‘With whom shall I adorn my hair with plums and willows?’

b. … 心何所可将寄 (MYS 480)
… kokoro iduku=ka yos-e-mu?
heart where=KA send-MZ-MOD.RT
‘Where shall I send my heart?’

Point: An object can move over the subject if the subject is already licensed.
⇒ Just like ergative languages: ERG case on subject enables object extraction.

3.4. Oblique case

OBL = last resort case for DP complement of V

Non-specific direct object

(22) 我期大王 國所知良之 (MYS 933)
[Wa-ga opo-kimi] kuni sirasu ras-i.
1SG-GEN great-lord.NOM country.OBL rule seem-SS
‘My great lord rules seems to rule the land.’

Unaccusative subject in focus concord construction

(23)  a. 志藝誰田尔加須牟 (MYS 4141)
… sigi [ta-ga ta=ni]=ka sum-u? (Bare NOM in [Spec, CP])
snipe who-GEN field=DAT=KA live-RT
‘In whose field lives the snipe who … ?’

b. 時自久曽人者飲云 (MYS 3260)
Toki-ji-ku=so pito=pa nomu to ip-u. (TOP NOM lower copy)
time-NEG-CONJ=SO person=TOP drink C say-RT
‘(They) say that people drink at the wrong times.’
3.5. OJ summary

**Extraction:** One bare DP can be licensed in [Spec, CP].
⇒ This is usually the subject. But a lower DP can move if higher DPs have inherent case.

**Case:** Bare NOM on DP in [Spec, CP]; Overt NOM on lower copy
Inherent GEN from nominalized v
Bare OBL as last resort to V complement

4. Rukai

(25) Tagalog Old Japanese
NOM extraction restriction NOM extraction restriction
GEN to transitive subject GEN to subject in nominalization
⇒ Allows OBJ movement ⇒ Allows OBJ movement

Why should ergative Tagalog be so similar to accusative OJ?
⇒ Austronesian ergativity is the result of the reanalysis of embedded nominalizations in an accusative language with Extraction Competition.

---

7 As is true for several OJ verb classes, the *rentai* adnominal and *shuushi* conclusive forms for this verb are syncretic.
In the interest of clarity, I gloss these inflections according to their functions in the given examples.
(26) Austronesian (Accusative alignment) (Subgrouping by Aldridge 2015, 2016)\(^8\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Rukai}\textsuperscript{9} & \quad \text{Ergative An (Irrealis > ergative)} & \text{Tsou} & \quad \text{Puyuma} & \quad \text{Nuclear An (Nominalization > ergative)}
\end{align*}
\]

Rukai alignment: Accusative

\textit{Tanan Rukai}

(27) a. sina-sinay \textit{ka} Lulay
   \textit{RED-sing NOM.CN child}
   ‘The child is singing.’

   b. ku\textit{ð}aa daru’u sa aru’un \textit{ka} tama-tama
   yesterday make OBL.CN chair NOM.CN man
   ‘The man made a chair yesterday.’

4.1. Extraction restriction

Past and future tense markers in finite clauses:

\textit{Tanan Rukai verbal tense}

(28) a. aw-\textit{kila} nakua ku\textit{Da} Lulay
   \textit{PAST-come 1SG.OBL that child}
   ‘That child came to me.’

   b. lu\textit{ð}aa \textit{ay-kila} ku tina=li
   tomorrow \textit{FUT-come NOM.PN mother=1.SG.GEN}
   ‘My mom will come tomorrow.’

Subject relatives can contain tense morphemes.

\textit{TananRukai tense in subject RC}

(29) a. [ku\textit{Da} w-\textit{aga}] ka sakacikili-li
   \textit{DEM PAST-cook NOM.CN spouse-1.SG.GEN}
   ‘The one who cooked is my spouse.’

   b. [kua\textit{Da} ay-suwasuwaw] ka mukabarbarua
   \textit{DEM FUT-clean NOM.CN girl}
   ‘The one who will clean is the girl.’

---

\(^8\) This is a revision of Ross’s (2009, 2012) subgrouping proposal in which he reconstructs PAn with ergative alignment. See Aldridge (2015, 2016) for arguments that PAn should be reconstructed as accusative.

\(^9\) This proposal is in agreement with Starosta’s (1995, 2001) claims that Rukai is a primary subgroup of PAn, though there are significant differences between the bases for the two claims.
c.  

```
CP
  DP_[NOM] C'
    C
      TP
        T
          vP
            <DP_[uCase]>
              v'
                v
                  VP
                    V
                      DP_OBJ
```

But object relatives are nominalized: contain aspect, but not tense

**TananRukai**

(30) a. [kayvay **kani-kani**=nay kay kaang] ka ma’alili
    this RED-eat=1.PL.EXCL this fish NOM.CN bitter
    ‘The fish we are eating is bitter.’

b. w-agas=sa sa aga
    PAST-cook=2.SG OBL.CN food
    [a-kani-ani=ta ki maum]
    OBL.CN IMPRV-eat=NMLZ=1.PL.INC this night
    ‘Did you cook dinner (the food that we will eat tonight)?’

c. [kuani **tuwu-ani**-su kuða] ka manima
    that cook=NMLZ-2.SG yesterday NOM.CN what
    ‘What is it that you cooked yesterday?’

Subject in object relatives must be genitive:

**TananRukai**

(31) a. kuani langay-**li** kuani sidusia ka maDaw
    this buy-1SG.GEN this car NOM.CN big
    ‘This car that I bought is big.’

b. kuani a-bath-ani-**li** kuani kiʔiŋi ka sawalai
    this IMPRV-give-NMLZ-1SG.GEN this clothes NOM.CM male
    ‘These clothes that I am giving are men’s (clothes).’

Contrast with nominative subject in finite clause:

**Tanan Rukai**

(32) a. uduri=**aku** sa bilbil
    plant=1SG.NOM INDEF banana
    ‘I plant bananas.’
b. labuwal=aku kila
   walk=1SG.NOM come
   ‘I come walking.’

Object extraction:
⇒ -ani heads the nominalized relative clause nP
⇒ GEN assigned to subject; object can move over it

(33) 
```
DP
   OP -- D'
       D -- Asp'
       Asp -- vP
       OP -- v'
       <DP_{GEN}> v'
       v
       ani
       VP
       <OP>...
```

Starosta et al. (1982), Ross (2009, 2012): Transitive ergative clauses in Nuclear Austronesian languages were reanalyzed from nominalizations in cleft constructions.

4.2. High NOM position

Extraction Competition is accounted for if NOM is located on C and not on T. But what other evidence can be found in verb-initial languages like Rukai and Tagalog?

Wh-questions:
Rukai: Subject as cleft predicate; non-subject can be in-situ

Tanan Rukai

(34) a. ania kuaDa aw-bay sa valu na Lulay
   who NOM.DEM PAST-give ACC.INDEF treat ACC.DEF child
   ‘Who is the one who give the child a treat?’

    b. kuani tALagi-su ka bay sa manima inia Lulay?
       DEM friend-2SG GEN NOM give ACC.INDEF what DEM child
       What did your friend give the child?

    c. kuani tALagi-ini ka bay sa valu ki ania?
       DEM friend-3SG GEN NOM give ACC.INDEF treat DAT who
       ‘Who did his friend give a treat to?’
Tagalog (Law 2006)\textsuperscript{10} 
Nominative must be cleft predicate:

Tagalog
(35) a. Sino ang [\text{CP OP b<um>ili \text{top} ng tela sa Maynila}]?
who NOM <\text{INTR.PRV}buy GEN cloth in Manila
‘Who bought (some) cloth in Manila?’
b. Ano ang [\text{CP OP b<in>ili=mo \text{top} sa Maynila}]?
what NOM <\text{TR.PRV}buy=2SG.GEN in Manila
‘What did you buy in Manila?’
c. *B<in>ili=mo ang ano sa Maynila?
<\text{TR.PRV}buy=2SG.GEN NOM what in Manila
‘What did you buy in Manila?’

In-situ OK for non-nominative:

Tagalog
(36) a. B<um>ili=ka ng ano ]?
<\text{INTR.PRV}buy=2SG.NOM GEN what
‘What did you buy?’
b. B<in>ili \text{nino} ang libro-ng ito]?
<\text{TR.PRV}buy who.GEN NOM book-LK this
‘Who bought this book?’

Analysis:

(37) Condition on C-T Inheritance
Uninterpretable features are inherited.

$\Rightarrow$ Focus position (or position for unselective binder) is lower than C.
$\Rightarrow$ NOM DP must move higher, out of the scope of OP.

(38)
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Non-DPs can undergo focus fronting in Tagalog but not DPs.

Tagalog

(39) a. I-b<in>igay ng babae ang kendi sa bata.
    APPL-TR.GV give GEN woman NOM candy to child
    ‘The woman gave the candy to the child.’

b. Sa bata i-b<in>igay ng babae ang kendi.
    to child APPL-TR.GV give GEN woman NOM candy
    ‘To the child, the woman gave the candy.’

c. Kanino i-b<in>igay ng babae ang kendi.
    to whom APPL-TR.GV give GEN woman NOM candy
    ‘Who did the woman gave the candy to?’

Old Japanese bare subjects precede focused constituents:

(40) a. Pototogisu nani=ka ki-naka-nu?
    cuckoo.NOM what=KA come-NEG
    ‘Why does the cuckoo not come and sing?’

b. CP
    DP[NOM] C’
       TP C
       XP[FOC] T’
          vP T
                 RT

Bare objects precede focused subjects.
⇒ Subject is licensed by the focus particle, so object can move over it to [Spec, CP].\(^\text{11}\)

(41) a. Ume=no pana tare=ka ukabe-si?
    plum=GEN flower.NOM who=KA float-PAST
    ‘Who floated the plum blossom?’

b. … aki-sari koromo tare=ka tori-mi-mu?
    … autumn kimono.NOM who=KA take-see-MOD
    ‘Who will pick up and look at the autumn kimono that …?’

\(^\text{11}\) It has been claimed that this type of KM construction derives historically from a cleft (Quinn 1997, Whitman 1997, Shinzato 1998, Serafim & Shinzato 2005), and the focus particle might have been a copula.
5. Conclusion

Empirical generalization:
⇒ Extraction Competition occurs in languages where nominative case is valued in [Spec, CP].

Proposals:
1. Uninterpretable features are inherited.
2. There is no probe at C valuing NOM in languages with Extraction Competition.

Consequences
⇒ C-T inheritance does not take place; nominative is valued by C.
⇒ Only the nominative DP undergoes extraction.
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