Tagalog Clitic Placement, p. 1

Clitic placement is a phonological operation constrained by syntactic structure. This means that the position in which the clitic is pronounced does not reflect the actual syntactic position that it occupies.

In Tagalog: a clitic follows the first constituent of the lowest phrase that contains it. For possessor clitics, this lowest phrase is the NP. What about the sentence?

Basic sentence structure in Tagalog:

```
IP
SPEC I
  I ⊙
    … SUBJ
```

The smallest constituent containing the SUBJ is the one labeled ⊙. If this constituent were a VP, it would be the lowest phrase containing the SUBJ, and a SUBJ clitic would be pronounced in second position within ⊙.

BUT . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

the empirical evidence shows that the domain for clitic placement is IP! In an unmarked sentence, clitics immediately follow the verb, which is in I position.

```
IP
SPEC I
  I ⊙
    verb … NP
      ako
        ‘I.NOM’
```

Marked constructions also show that ⊙ is not the domain for clitic placement, and, under Kroeger’s analysis, that IP is.
If ♦ is not a domain for clitic placement, it cannot have the status of a phrase, i.e. an XP, an X maximal projection. This means that it is not a VP. It must be the non-X category S.

Clitic placement thus confirms the IP-over-S analysis of Tagalog sentences. Such an analysis has also been proposed for languages like Irish and Warlpiri.

Further evidence shows that Tagalog, unlike Irish, doesn’t have a VP constituent within the S either. If there was a VP, it would be the domain for the placement of object clitics, and it isn’t.

By hypothesis, there is no such thing as a VP-internal subject. All cases of ostensible VP-internal subjects are really cases of IP-over-S. This allows us to discard the problematic sentence-as-$V^{\text{max}}$ analysis, and retain sentence-as-S and sentence-as-IP.