
INSTITUT FÜR SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT
UNIVERSITÄT ZU KÖLN

ARBEITSPAPIER Nr. 15 (Neue Folge)

THE PHILIPPINE CHALLENGE TO UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR

Nikolaus P. Himmelmann

Oktober 1991

Herausgeber der Reihe: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft
der Universität zu Köln
D-5000 Köln 41

(c) bei den Autoren

Acknowledgements

This paper is based on my unpublished MA thesis (München 1983) and my PhD thesis, written in 1985 and published in 1987. I owe very special thanks to John Wolff who commented at length on the published version of the dissertation and encouraged me to proceed along the lines developed there. I also thank Hans-Jürgen Sasse and Fritz Serzisko for the pertinent and helpful comments on this paper. Last, but not least I have to thank Chris Searls and Victor Fusilero for brushing up my English.

Comments on this working paper version are highly welcome!

Contents

	PAGE
1. Introduction	1
2. Tagalog clause structure	6
2.1. Preliminaries	6
2.2. <i>ang</i> and the problem of subjecthood	8
2.3. The function of <i>ang</i>	15
3. Syntactic categories	16
4. Orientation	25
4.1. The nature of orientation marking	27
4.2. The semantics of the orientation affixes	34
4.3. Aspect/mood inflection and inherent orientation	36
4.4. Derivation and prediction	41
5. Syntactic categories and the grammaticalization of argument structure	43
6. The equational hypothesis and the order of constituents	49
7. Conclusion	52
Abbreviations	55
References	56

1. Introduction

Grammatical relations - in particular the relation 'subject of' - and voice are of central concern to any theory of universal grammar. With respect to these phenomena the analysis of Tagalog (and the Philippine languages in general) has turned out to be particularly difficult and continues to be a matter of debate. What traditionally has been called passive voice in these languages (for example by Blake (1925), Bloomfield (1917) and Wolfenden (1961)) appears to be so different from voice phenomena in the more familiar Indo-European languages that the term 'focus' was introduced in the late 1950s to underscore its 'exceptional' nature (cf. Llamzon (1973:168), Matsuda French (1988a)). This term, however, is a misnomer since in general linguistics 'focus' is used to refer to the pragmatic phenomenon of highlighting new or contrastive information and, as most researchers today agree, the 'focus' affixes in Philippine languages do not have such a highlighting function.¹ It is also quite generally accepted that the Philippine 'focus' can not be analyzed as passive (cf. Shibatani (1988:89-96), DeWolf (1988:150-160), Foley (1991)). The current debate concerns the issue of whether the Philippine languages should be considered ergative languages (whereby the construction traditionally called active is to be analysed as antipassive). This proposal has been made within the respective frameworks of relational (Gerds 1988) and lexicase grammar (de Guzman (1978, 1988), Starosta (1986, 1991)), as well as from a discourse-functional perspective (cf. Payne (1982), Cooreman et al. (1984, 1988)).² The ergative analysis is refuted by Shibatani (1988:96-115), DeWolf (1988:158-160) and Foley (1991) with basically the same arguments that may be adduced against the passive analysis. The major point is this: whereas the active and the ergative construction can be shown to be the unmarked constructions in accusative and ergative languages,

1 For lack of a convenient alternative, however, most authors continue to use the term *focus*. Exceptions are Cumming (1986) and Schachter (1987:949ff) who use the term *trigger* instead.

2 Blake (1988) makes a primarily morphological argument for ergativity in Tagalog. This will be commented upon in sect. 4.3.

respectively (both in terms of morphosyntactic properties and discourse function³), this is not possible for the Philippine 'active' and 'passive' constructions (see sect. 4).

Furthermore, as also pointed out by Shibatani (1988:114) and DeWolf (1988:156f), an inflationary use has been made of the term 'ergative' in the last decade; it can thus no longer be assumed that it has an unequivocal and specific meaning in typologizing languages, apart from the technical definition it might be given within a particular framework.⁴ But if the Philippine 'focus' constructions are neither passive nor ergative, how else can they be analysed? Shibatani (1988) and DeWolf (1988), who both refute the passive as well as the ergative analysis, do not offer an alternative proposal. In this paper a case will be made for the claim that 'focus' marking should be analysed in terms of *orientation*⁵, a concept used by Lehmann (1984:151f) for capturing the difference between English (and, more generally, Indo-European) orientated nominalisations such as *employ-er* or *employ-ee*, and unorientated nominalisations such as *employ-ing*. This approach

3 For Tagalog, the figures concerning the discourse distribution of 'active' and 'passive' (or 'ergative' and 'antipassive') constructions vary according to the theoretical position of the authors, see Shibatani (1988:95f, 111ff).

4 The problem was already pointed out in 1981 by van Valin. I prefer defining 'ergative' as a nominal case-form, i.e. the case-form of the agent in a transitive event. There is no ergative case-form in Philippine languages (as opposed to other Austronesian languages such as Samoan or Tongan) and thus, in my view, the issue of ergativity does not arise for these languages. This issue is further discussed with respect to the so-called ergative languages of Central and South Sulawesi in Himmelmann (1991).

5 The German term used by Lehmann is 'Ausrichtung'. To my knowledge, 'orientation' is not a technical term in the English literature, although it occasionally appears in discussions of voice and ergativity (cf., for example, Comrie (1981:69 *passim*) and DeLancey (1982:167)). It is, however, a technical term in the UNITYP model (cf. *inter alia* Seiler (1986) and Seiler & Premper (1991)) where it is used as a cover term for all phenomena related to the orientation or directedness of event expressions (Serzisko 1991), including inherent orientation (accusative vs. ergative languages) and mechanisms of reorientation (passive, antipassive, inverse inflexion, etc.). Although Philippine 'focus' marking is also covered by the UNITYP usage of *orientation*, note that this term is used here in more specific sense, i.e. it refers to a derivational process that is applicable to all kinds of expressions, not just event expressions (see sect. 4.1).

implies that 'focus' marking is derivational rather than inflectional as often presumed in the literature. This is to say that what is typologically conspicuous in Tagalog is not the 'focus' phenomenon per se, since this is very similar to orientated nominalisations in many other languages, but rather the very prominent use of orientated formations (i.e., derivational morphology) in basic clause structure.

Before presenting the analysis of orientation affixes in Tagalog we will briefly sketch Tagalog clause structure in section 2 where it will be discussed whether there is a grammatical relation 'subject of' in Tagalog or not. The controversy regarding this topic has developed along lines similar to those concerning the phenomenon of 'voice' in Philippine languages. Bloomfield (1917) and Blake (1925) use the term 'subject' without further discussion. The same reasoning which led to the replacement of the concept of 'voice' by the concept of 'focus' also led to replacing 'subject' by 'topic'.⁶ The current controversy was initiated by Schachter (1976), who argues that there is no subject in Tagalog since the properties usually attributed to subjects (as spelled out in Keenan (1976)) are shared between two participants (the 'topic' and the agent).⁷ Foley & van Valin

6 See McKaughan (1973), who in this article explicitly revises his position and returns to the use of 'subject' again.

7 Shibatani (1988:115-130) basically follows Schachter's analysis, but draws a different conclusion since he operates with a prototype approach to subjects. For him, actor-topics are prototypical subjects (exhibiting all of the subject properties), while non-topic actors and non-actor topics are non-prototypical subjects (exhibiting only a part of the subject properties). As a consequence of this view he is forced to analyse some clauses as containing two (non-prototypical) subjects (1988:126ff). This, in my view, rests on a serious misunderstanding of the concept of subject, which was intended to capture the fact that in many languages there is one participant which is more central to the expression of a given state of affairs than others and the primacy of which is reflected both in morphological marking and morphosyntactic behaviour (traditionally, 'subject' has been defined as 'what the sentence is about' or, more precisely, that 'which undergoes a predication'; for details, see Sasse 1982, Foley & van Valin (1984:108ff)). By definition, there can be no two primary participants; i.e. if there are two participants that partially exhibit properties of morphosyntactic centrality, neither of them is *the* primary or central participant, though both of them may be more central than other participants and thus be core participants (Foley & van Valin

(1984:134ff) consider the *ang*-phrase (see sect. 2) to be the pragmatic pivot of a Tagalog clause. Later on (p143) this is further characterised as 'clause internal topic'. Hoekstra (1986) and McGinn (1988) - working within a GB framework - both consider the *ang*-phrase to be the subject; Carrier-Duncan (1985) and Gerdts (1988), however, treat the agent as the subject in all instances without presenting an explicit argument for their analysis. In this paper I principally follow the arguments presented by DeWolf (1979:67-86, 1988:144-150) that a subject relation indeed exists in Tagalog. The major problem, though, does not seem to me to be the definition and identification of the subject relation in Tagalog, but the recognition of the fact that Tagalog clause structure is essentially equational as argued by Naylor (1980) and DeWolf (loc. cit.). In Indo-European languages verbal predicates exhibit inherent morphosyntactic relationality. As a result there exist two aspects to the subject relation: subject as opposed to object (subject₁ in terms of Matthews (1981:104ff)) and subject as opposed to predicate (subject₂). In Tagalog, however, all predicates (both 'verbal' and 'nominal') are morphosyntactically non-relational; thus only one aspect of the subject relation is present in Tagalog (that is, the opposition between subject and predicate). Indeed, the essentially equational nature of clause structure in Tagalog has repercussions for many aspects of clause grammar: of course, no object relation exists in Tagalog. It is correlated with the prominence of orientated formations which - in a sense to be explained in sections 3 and 4 - are the functional equivalent of argument structure in Tagalog.⁸ Furthermore, it is

(1984:77ff); see Durie (1987) for an analysis of Acehnese along these lines). This is not meant to imply that the prototype approach may not be usefully applied to subjects. A subject like *it* in *it rains* is certainly a less prototypical subject than *the boy* in *the boy shot his grandpa*, but it still exhibits important properties of English subjects such as preverbal position and triggering agreement on the predicate. To be a useful concept, however, even a non-prototypical subject has to be more subject-like than anything else in a given clause.

⁸ That argument structure in Tagalog requires a distinctly different treatment is also pointed out by Foley (1991) who offers a proposal for dealing with this within the framework of a lexically-based functional

correlated with the fact that the syntactic categories noun and verb are difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish in Tagalog (see sect. 3).

The nature of the distinction between nouns and verbs will thus be of major concern in this paper. It is important to keep in mind that this distinction pertains to at least two levels: it pertains, on the one hand, to lexical semantic classes (words denoting entities vs. words denoting events), and on the other, to major syntactic categories, i.e. classes of words exhibiting common morphosyntactic properties.⁹ In this paper the terms *noun* and *verb* will be reserved for the latter, while lexical semantic classes are referred to by terms such as *entity* or *event*. *Entity* is used to embrace lexical semantic classes that are typically expressed by nouns such as persons, things, institutions, etc., whereas *event* is used for typically verbal denotata such as states, processes, and actions. In Tagalog it is difficult to find a morphosyntactically relevant difference between event expressions and entity expressions. Thus, there is no need to make a distinction between the syntactic categories noun and verb. This, however, does not mean that formal differences do not exist at all. Indeed, the most pervasive difference consists in the different stress patterns¹⁰ found in certain derived formations, a quite unusual phenomenon when seen from a typological point of view.

unification grammar. We briefly comment on this in sect. 4.1.

9 As Croft (1991:37ff) points out, the former can be regarded as the ontological basis for the latter and is thus used by him as one of the external parameters in his supposedly universal definition of the major syntactic categories (chapters 2 and 3 in Croft 1991).

10 Stress in Tagalog is unmarked in standard orthography. Its analysis is highly controversial since some authors (e.g., Schachter & Otanes 1972:15-18) consider vowel length the primary phenomenon, while others consider vowel length an epiphenomenon of stress (cf. Bloomfield 1917:141f; Matsuda French 1988b:63f). In this paper, both stress and vowel length are indicated, but, since stress assignment in Tagalog is not fully understood, all remarks pertaining to this phenomenon must be regarded with caution. Note that much of the literature on Tagalog ignores stress altogether. Stress is phonemic in Tagalog; compare *búkas* 'tomorrow' and *bukás* 'open', and plays an important rôle in affixation. Primary stress on the penultima will remain unmarked (thus *bukas* for 'tomorrow'), elsewhere it will be marked by the acute accent. The grave accent marks vowel length (a long vowel, of course, is also clearly stressed).

2. Tagalog clause structure

2.1. Preliminaries

In discussing Tagalog clause structure it is useful to make a distinction between full words and function words (or particles; cf. Bloomfield 1917:146). Function words may not be inflected; they mark morphosyntactic slots or appear in clitic positions. Full words may be extensively affixed and occur in the limited set of morphosyntactic slots provided by the function words. There are six morphosyntactic slots for full words in a Tagalog clause, four of which can be illustrated by the following example:

- (1a) *i-ni-abót* *ng mang-ga-gamot*
UG_T-REAL(UG)-within reach GEN IRR.ACT-RDP₂-medicine
sa sundalo ang itlóg, (Bl 30/13)¹¹
LOC soldier REF egg
'The physician handed the egg to the soldier'

Except for the first word, all full words in this clause are preceded by function words (the function markers *ang*, *ng*, and *sa*). The clause initial position is the predicate position, which is unmarked unless another constituent precedes. In this case, the predicate constituent is marked by the predicate marker (PM) *ay*, as in

- (1b) *at ang pare at siyá ay nag-hintáy*
and REF priest and 3.SG PM REAL.ACT-wait
ng sà-sabih-in ng sundalo. (loc.cit.)
GEN RDP₁-say-UG GEN soldier
'and the priest and he waited for what the soldier would say.'

Full words in pre-predicate position, the fifth morphosyntactic

11 Most Tagalog examples in this paper are from Bloomfield's collection of texts (=Bl). For these examples, the page and line numbers in Bloomfield (1917) are given. Although the Bloomfield texts are over 70 years old and although they have been produced by a single native speaker, they still represent an adequate and reliable data base for contemporary standard Tagalog (for an appreciation, see Wolff (1987)). As for the other examples, example (20) is from Schachter & Otanes (1972:163), examples (24) and (29) are from Tagalog letters to the author, and the remaining examples have been elicited.

slot, may be unmarked or they may be marked by the function markers *ang* or *sa*. Full words in post-predicate position are always preceded by one of the function markers. These markers have the following functions:

sa is a general locative preposition (LOC) marking all kinds of oblique participants. It is the final constituent of all of the more specific prepositions in Tagalog, such as *hanggang sa* 'until' or *para sa* 'for'.

ng [naŋ] marks genitive attributes (GEN). In the literature it is common to differentiate between a *ng* marking non-topic agents (e.g. *ng manggagamot* in (1a)), one marking patients and themes, another one for instruments, a different one for manner adverbials, and still another one for possessors, etc. But, as convincingly argued by Naylor (1980:37-42), *ng* itself marks nothing but the attributive relation. This does not mean, of course, that the semantic roles mentioned cannot be distinguished in each case (the lexical semantic class of the participant and the orientation affix of the predicate expression are the most important clues in this respect). The claim is simply that *ng* is not a multi-functional case marker, and the fact that needs to be explained is why participants may be constructed as genitive attributes in Tagalog irrespective of their semantic role.

Before discussing *ang* in the next section, let us briefly look at the sixth morphosyntactic slot, not shown in example (1). It is constituted by the linker (or ligature) *na/-ng*.¹² This function marker 'links' the elements of a modifying construction such as *ulól na unggó'* 'foolish monkey' but also occurs in compounds such as *puno-ng-saging* 'tree-LK-banana' and in complement clauses (see Gonzales 1971). The order of modifying constructions is not fixed in Tagalog; thus *unggó' na ulól* is equally possible. The difference between *ng* and the linker pertains to referentiality, i.e. *ng* is a combination of *ang*, marking referentiality (see sect. 2.3), and *na* (the

¹² *-ng*, a simple velar nasal, is the allomorph of the linker after words ending in a vowel. It is not to be confused with the genitive marker [naŋ] which is conventionally spelled *ng*.

linker), marking attribution; compare the following 'minimal pair':

- (2) a) bata-ng dalaga
child-LK young woman
'girl'
- b) bata' ng dalaga
child GEN young woman
'child of the young woman'

Corresponding to the markers *ang*, *ng* and *sa* there is a special set of function markers for proper nouns, i.e. *si*, *ni* and *kay*, respectively. Similarly, there are *ang-*, *ng-* and *sa-* forms of the personal and the deictic pronouns (cf. Schachter & Otanes (1972:88ff)).

2.2. *ang* and the problem of subjecthood

ang is generally called a topic (or subject) marker in the literature. As briefly mentioned in sect. 1, the discussion has mainly been concerned with the fact that a non-agent *ang*-phrase such as *ang itlóg* in (1a) exhibits only part of the subject properties displayed by subjects in Indo-European languages. This is no surprise given the fact that the prototypical subject in modern¹³ Indo-European languages is a combination of the pragmatic role topic and the semantic role agent. There is no doubt about the fact that the *ang*-phrase exhibits most of the topic-related properties of subjects. The facts have been widely discussed in the literature and need not be repeated here (see the references in sect. 1). Of particular importance in the present context is the fact that the orientational affix on the predicate (*i-* in (1a)) signals the semantic role of the participant denoted by the *ang*-phrase. This means that there is a special relation, a *predicative relation*, between the *ang*-phrase and the predicate (as distinct from *ng-* and *sa-*phrases). In other words, the *ang*-phrase denotes the participant 'the sentence is about', which is the traditional definition for subjects (but also for topics, which is a major cause for the

13 See Sasse (1982) for a sketch of the development of the subject relation in Indo-European languages.

confusion surrounding these terms). More precisely, this definition characterizes subjects as opposed to predicates (subject₂ in the terminology of Matthews 1981:104-113). I propose to use the term *predication base* to denote this aspect of subjecthood since *topic*, which has also been used in the same way, has so many other different meanings. Thus we may say that there is a subject relation in Tagalog in the sense that the *ang*-phrase represents the predication base in clauses such as (1a).

The interrelation between topics and predication bases is highly complex and cannot be spelled out here. Clause-level¹⁴ topics represent presupposed information and basically have a scene-setting function. This scene-setting function may be further subdivided into the scene-setting function proper (*On a lovely morning in April 1965 Claire set out to ...*), the explicit representation of what is under discussion (*as for topics, I do not believe that we will ever be able to come up with a satisfactory definition*), and the representation of the discourse topic (usually by pronominalisation or zero anaphora). Although topics in the latter two senses often coincide with predication bases (see for example *ang manggagamot at siyá* in (1b)), this is not necessarily the case (for a Tagalog example, see (9) below). Indeed, topics and predication bases are related insofar as predication bases are grammaticalized topics (of discussion), which is also the reason why identical definitions have been proposed for both of them. In other words, predication bases are topics which have been tightly integrated into core-level clause structure (as evidenced by the well-known subject properties such as agreement, obligatoriness, etc.), and in the process they have lost the pragmatic function of scene-setting to varying degrees. To exemplify the loss of the pragmatic function note that it would be nonsense to attribute the function of setting

14 I have nothing to say here about discourse-topicality as defined in Givón (1983). As shown by Cooreman et al. (1984) *ang*-phrases in Tagalog do not represent discourse topics. Foley & van Valin (1984:143ff) consider relative-clause constructions 'the crucial nexus' in the interrelation between topic and predication base (= *pivot* in their terminology).

the scene or providing the topic of discussion to the most grammaticalized predication bases, i.e. dummy subjects such as *it* in *it rains*. In Tagalog the need to differentiate between topics and predication bases is related to the fact that both may co-occur in the same clause (see below).

In the preceding discussion we have indiscriminately dealt with the *ang*-phrase as a predication base, thereby implying that *ang* marks predication bases. This, however, is not correct. The fact that *ang* by itself marks neither predication bases nor topics is evident from clauses containing two *ang*-phrases:

- (3) *ang mga buhók lamang ang p-in-ù-putol ng patalím*
REF PL hair only REF RDP₁-REAL(UG)-cut GEN blade
'only the hair was cut by the blade' (Bl 58/36)

In fact, one of the two *ang*-phrases appearing in this clause has to be the predicate. Since Tagalog predicates are usually in clause initial position and since no evidence can be presented to the contrary, *ang mga buhók lamang* must be analysed as the predicate expression in this clause. A more literal translation would be 'that being cut by the blade (was) only the hair'. Thus, predicate and predication base must be defined configurationally in Tagalog: the predicate expression appears in clause initial position (or immediately following *ay*), whereas the predication base is the *ang*-phrase following the predicate expression. Topics are also defined by position, i.e. they appear in pre-predicate position, separated from the predicate by *ay*. Topics may be of varied semantic and formal make-up: we find, for example, unmarked temporal expressions (4), *sa*-phrases in differing functions (5), *ang*-phrases (1b), complex conjunctions (6), gerundial constructions (7) and complete clauses (8):

- (4) *isá-ng katanghali'an ay ma-tahimik ang bayan*
one-LK noon PM IRR.STAT-quiet REF town
'One noon the town was quiet.' (Bl 120/37)

- (5) sa loób ng bao ng niyóg ay
LOC inside GEN shell GEN coconut PM

i-ni-là-lagáy ang isa-ng pirasu-ng lamán
UG_T-REAL(UG)-RDP₁-position REF one-LK piece-LK meat

ng niyóg (Bl 120/108)
GEN coconut
'Inside the coconut shell is placed a piece of the meat of
the coconut, ...'
- (6) dahil dito ay t-in-awag niyá ang pare'
cause DEM.LOC PM REAL(UG)-call 3.SG.GEN REF priest
'Therefore he called the priest ...' (Bl 64/25)
- (7) pag-ka-wika' niyá nitó ay b-um-alík siyá
GER-??-language 3.SG.GEN DEM.GEN PM REAL.ACT-return 3.SG
'Having said this he went back ...' (Bl 20/40)
- (8) nang d-um-ating silá sa isa-ng gubat ay
when REAL.ACT-arrive 3.PL LOC one-LK forest PM

in-iwan silá ng kanilá-ng magulang (Bl 32/25)
REAL(UG)-abandon 3.PL GEN 3.PL.DAT-LK parent
'When they came to a jungle, their parents left them, ...'

Thus, topics are neither limited to *ang*-phrases nor is the presence of *ang* sufficient to identify the predication base. That topic and predication base must be distinguished in Tagalog and that neither is solely identified by *ang* is shown by the following clause:

- (9) kanyá ang mga buntís na babaye sa bayang yaón ay
therefore REF PL pregnant LK woman LOC town:LK DEM PM

lalo-ng ma-lakí ang takot (Bl 36/16)
surpassing-LK IRR.STAT-big REF fear
'Therefore the pregnant women in the town had great fear.'

Here, the first *ang*-phrase in pre-predicate position (*ang mga buntís na babaye sa bayang yaón*) denotes the topic, the second *ang*-phrase (*ang takot*), which follows the predicate, functions as the predication base. A more literal translation of this clause is 'therefore, the pregnant women in the town, very great (was) the fear'.

Given this state of affairs the question arises as to how clauses such as (1b), where an *ang*-phrase occurs in topic position and no *ang*-phrase follows the predicate expression,

should be analysed. Is *ang manggagamot at siyá* the topic, the inverted predication base (as it is commonly assumed in the literature, viz. the term *ay-inversion* (Schachter & Otnes (1972:485ff)), or both? There are two facts which strongly suggest that it is simply the topic: First, in clauses such as (6) and (8) an inversion analysis would be highly artificial since the corresponding non-inverted constructions do not occur. In (4) and (7) the non-inverted constructions are possible although extremely rare. This strongly suggests that the topic position should be considered an optional constituent of basic clause structure in Tagalog rather than the output of some sort of movement rule. Second, the predication base is not an obligatory part of a Tagalog clause but may remain unexpressed if it is recoverable from the context:¹⁵

(10) *d-um-atíng ang aswáng, um-akyát sa isa*
REAL.ACT-arrive REF vampire REAL.ACT-climb LOC one

puno-ng-suha', at nà-riníg niyá-ng
tree-LK-grapefruit and REAL.STAT-hear 3.SG.GEN-LK

p-um-itás ng marami-ng bunga (Bl 36/34)
REAL.ACT-pick GEN many-LK fruit
'the vampire came and climbed on a grape-fruit tree, and
he [i.e., a policeman] heard it picking many fruits.'

Here, both the predicates *umakyát* and *pumitás* (more precisely, this is a complex predicate *nàriníg na pumitás* 'be heard picking') lack the expression of a predication base. The vampire (*ang aswáng*), which is the 'subject' of these predications, is not anaphorically referred to by a pronoun in these clauses. Another example, involving an entity expression as a predicate, is:

¹⁵ Of course, there are clause types in Tagalog which never involve predication bases, for example, existential clauses such as *may-roon díng íla-ng bahay na tablá* 'there were also some frame houses' (Bl 34/37). Here we are only concerned with clauses where a predication can be expected.

(11) ang hitsura ng kulam ay hindi' parè-pareho. Kung
REF appearance GEN PM NEG RDP₃-same if

minsán ay isa-ng bató o isa-ng manika (Bl 40/13)
once PM one-LK stone or one-LK doll
'The appearance of the *kulam* is not always the same.
Sometimes (it) is a stone or a small doll ...'

This kind of zero anaphora is quite common in Tagalog texts and provides independent evidence for the claim that the predication base in a Tagalog clause may optionally remain unexpressed. Given this fact and the fact that topics should not be analysed as inverted or extracted constituents, the most simple and economical analysis of clauses such as (1b) lies in assuming that they contain a topic constituent and that the co-referential predication base remains unexpressed.¹⁶

Let us summarize:

- there are both topics and predication bases in Tagalog clauses. Both have to be configurationally defined (in terms of ordering before and after the predicate).
- neither topics nor predication bases are obligatorily expressed in every clause.
- there is no one-to-one correspondence between morphosyntactic function and morphological marking. Though predication bases are obligatorily marked by *ang*, *ang*-phrases may also function as topics (1b, 9) and predicates (3).

The analysis may be illustrated more schematically with the help of the following formulas.¹⁷ Optional constituents are given in parentheses:

¹⁶ McGinn (1988:278) proposes a somewhat similar analysis within the GB framework which also involves ellipsis. In his analysis, however, the functions are assigned exactly opposite to the way it is done here (and has been done in most preceding analyses). *ang*-phrases preceding the predicate are considered properly governed subjects (*ay* being the governor), and *ang*-phrases following the predicate are considered inverted subjects. As far as I can see, examples involving two *ang*-phrases (such as (9)) cannot be adequately dealt with in this analysis.

¹⁷ These formulas are not to be misunderstood as a proposal concerning the formalization of Tagalog clause structure!

I. Tagalog clause structure

(TOPIC ay) PREDICATE (PREDICATION BASE) (OBLIQUE)

The internal structure of each of these constituents is basically the same. In most cases there is an obligatory function marker, followed by a full word¹⁸ which may be modified further by non-referential modifiers (which are linked), genitives and/or obliques.

II. Tagalog phrase structure

FUNCTION MARKER FULL WORD (MODIFIER(S)) (GENITIVE(S)) (OBLIQUE(S))

This structure of the phrase, of course, also applies to genitives and obliques. Example (1a) thus consists of a predicate phrase and a predication base. The predicate phrase in turn consists of a full word (the event expression *iniabót*), a genitive (*ng manggagamot*) and an oblique (*sa sundalo*). There is no function marker for this predicate phrase. The predication base consists of an obligatory function marker (*ang*) and a full word (*itlóg*).

The following correspondences hold between morphosyntactic functions and function markers (in the case several markers may be used in a given morphosyntactic function, they are listed in the order of their relative frequency):

III. Morphosyntactic functions and function markers:

TOPIC:	sa, ang, (Ø)
PREDICATE:	Ø, ang, sa
PREDICATION BASE:	ang
OBLIQUE:	sa
GENITIVE:	ng
MODIFIER:	na/-ng

18 The identification and definition of phrasal heads is extremely difficult in modifying (linked) constructions. Since I do not want to enter into a lengthy discussion of this issue at this point, I refrain from identifying a phrasal head in this formula. In the present analysis, there is no need for a distinction between noun phrases and verb phrases in Tagalog which is the reason the term *full word* is used in the formula rather than the more common terms *noun* or *verb*.

2.3. The function of *ang*

The following table lists the functions of the *ang*-phrases in the Bloomfield texts:

IV. Functions of *ang*-phrases in Bloomfield texts

TOPIC	458
PREDICATION BASE	693
PREDICATE	31
REST ¹⁹	37
TOTAL	1219

These numbers clearly support the claim made above that *ang* does not mark a morphosyntactic function. Given this fact, the question arises as to what the function of *ang* is. In the literature it is often claimed that *ang*-phrases are necessarily definite. This, however, is not true, as shown by the following example:

- (12) a) doón ay nà-kita nilá ang isa-ng
 DEM.LOC PM REAL.STAT-see 3.PL.GEN REF one-LK
 ma-lakí-ng higante (B1 32/31)
 IRR.STAT-big-LK giant
 'There they saw a great giant ...'

In fact, *ang*-phrases are always referential, but they may involve all kinds of referentiality (definite, indefinite, generic: for details see Adams & Manaster-Ramer 1988). Thus, not definiteness but referentiality is the relevant parameter here. This claim can be further supported by looking back to example (3) where an *ang*-phrase functions as the predicate. If *ang* marks referentiality, this clause should involve two referential expressions, and the predication should be a case of an identificational²⁰ predication (the *the-murderer-is-the-*

19 This includes cases where *ang*-phrases appear in titles (21 times) which may be considered a special case of the topic function. Furthermore, it includes the use of *ang* in terms of address such as *ang iyo po-ng kamáhalan* 'Your Majesty' (B1 26/23) and a few more complex constructions, cf., for example, B1 28/10 or 56/19 and B1 46/37.

20 The terminology for clauses involving nominal or adjectival predicates (e.g., *John is a teacher*, *The wall is green*) is quite varied and thus highly confusing (see Declerck (1988:1ff) for a brief survey). Following Schachter & Otnes' (1972:61) usage for Tagalog, I will use *equational clause* (rather than *copular* or *nominal clause*) as a cover term. One major subgroup of equational clauses are clauses asserting the identity between

gardener type). Furthermore, it should be possible to drop the *ang* of the predicate expression, and the resulting clause should involve a characterizational predication (*the gardener is a murderer*). This is, in fact, the case: *mga buhók lamang ang pinúputol ng patalím* means 'that being cut by the blade (was) only hair'. While in (3) *ang mga buhók* refers to the specific hair of one of the protagonists of the story, *mga buhók* in the preceding clause specifies the kind of object that is being cut. All instances of *ang*-phrases functioning as predicates known to me can be explained with the help of this analysis (for further discussion, see de Guzman 1982). To sum up, we may state that the function of *ang* is basically similar to that of an article (as assumed by traditional grammar, cf. Blake 1925:205f). This is also shown by the fact that *ang* may be missing from phrases in which the *ang*-form of one of the demonstrative pronouns precedes other full words as in:

- (12) b) kung iyo-ng dà-dalh-in ito-ng supot ko
if 2.SG.DAT-LK RDP₁-carry-UG DEM-LK bag 1.SG.GEN

ng kuwaltá sa aking asawa (Bl 34/4)
GEN money LOC 1.SG.DAT:LK spouse
'If you will carry this bag of money of mine to my
wife'

Strictly speaking, however, it is not a definite article, but, more generally, a reference marker (REF). As opposed to *ng* and *sa*, *ang* then is not a case marker.

3. Syntactic categories

It has long been recognised that the distinction of major syntactic categories (or parts of speech) in Philippine languages is different from that found in other languages. The major concern has been with the distinction between nouns and

two referential expressions. These are called *identificational* clauses (de Guzman 1982 and Starosta et al. 1982:150 use the same term, Declerck uses *specificational*). The other major subgroup of equational clauses in which the referent of the subject expression is further characterized by the predicate expression (by ascribing some property to it or specifying its class membership) are called *characterizational* (Starosta et al.'s *descriptive*, Declerck's *predicational*) clauses. Clauses involving verbal predicates (called *narrational* by Schachter & Otones (loc. cit.)) are simply termed *verbal clauses*.

verbs,²¹ and the claim has often been made that Philippine verbs are actually nouns. Traditionally, this claim has been restricted to undergoer-orientated event expressions (the various 'passives'). The major evidence adduced was the fact that in these constructions the expression for the agent is identical to that of a possessor (i.e. it appears in a *ng*-phrase, see examples (1a), (6), (8)).²² Schachter & Otnes (1972:62) claim that 'Tagalog verbs and verb phrases are ... much more noun-like than their English counterparts'. This claim refers to all kinds of 'verbs' and is based on distributional evidence: 'there is virtually no context in which a noun occurs in which it cannot be replaced by a verb or verb phrase'. They nevertheless distinguish between nouns and verbs in their Tagalog grammar, primarily because, in their view, verbs are inflected for aspect (1972:65). Starosta et al. (1982:146f) briefly discuss and refute some of the arguments against the supposedly nominal character of Philippine 'verbs'. In their view, Philippine 'verbs' historically were nouns which were later reinterpreted as verbs but which retained a strong nominal character (1982:158ff). The main evidence for such a reinterpretation is the position of the subject (predication base) - we will say more about this in sect. 6. The most radical stand in this debate is taken by Lemaréchal (1982) who claims that no distinction of major syntactic categories in Tagalog is possible (and necessary); there are just full words (which he calls *superpartie du discours*). Again, his evidence is distributional, i.e. every full word can occur in every major morphosyntactic function.

21 In this paper we will be concerned with the distinction between only nouns and verbs. But regarding the other major syntactic category, adjectives (and adverbs), the same claim can be made and substantiated: the evidence for such a category is marginal, there is no need to make use of it in analyzing Tagalog morphosyntax.

22 The most elaborate account of this claim is Capell (1964) where the earlier literature is briefly reviewed. Note that the claim has a long tradition in Austronesian studies, particularly in early Dutch work on Western Austronesian languages. For a brief discussion and references, see Milner (1980).

There is no need to review all of Lemaréchal's evidence here. The following observations may suffice to support his (and, somewhat more cautiously phrased, Schachter & Otnes') claim with respect to the distribution of full words. In the preceding sections, six basic morphosyntactic functions in a Tagalog clause were identified. In section 2.2 the functions predicate, predication base, and topic were defined. In section 2.1 it was briefly mentioned that there are three further basic functions: genitive (or referential) attributes (marked by *ng*), non-referential modifiers (marked by the linker *na/-ng*), and oblique complements (marked by *sa* and various more complex prepositions all of which involve *sa*). The fact that entity expressions - words which potentially may be classified as nouns - occur (without further derivation) in all six functions is evident from the examples presented thus far (example (2) involves the linker, (11) exemplifies the predicate function). The fact that there is no copula in Tagalog is of major importance in this regard since the presence of a copula distinguishes verbal from nominal predicates in many languages.²³ In reviewing the evidence for event expressions we will limit the discussion to the supposedly hardest case, that is, aspectually inflected forms appearing in presumably nominal functions (for example, as oblique complements; recall that aspectual inflection has been proposed as a defining feature for verbs by Schachter & Otnes). With Schachter & Otnes' (1972:66f) aspect terminology in mind, note that in (3) an IMPERFECTIVE form (*pinùputol*) appears as the predication base; in (1b) a contemplated form (*sàsabihin*) appears as a genitive attribute. In the following example we find an IMPERFECTIVE form (*pinatùtunguhan*) as a locative complement:

23 Note that there is also no distinction with regard to negation, as can be found, for example, in Indonesian where *bukan* may serve to distinguish nominal from verbal (and adjectival) predicates (negated by *tidak*).

- (13) na-kà-tanaw siyá ng bahay na ma-ilaw
REAL.STAT-??-visible 3.SG GEN house LK IRR.STAT-light

sa p-in-a-tù-tunguh-an ng kalabáw
LOC CAUS-REAL(UG)-RDP₁-go towards-UG; GEN water buffalo
'he saw a lighted house in the direction toward which the
caribou was going.' (Bl 72/6)

Although examples such as (13) are rare, aspectually inflected forms in *ang*-phrases (functioning as predication bases or as topics) and, to a lesser extent, *ng*-phrases are very common.

In the literature it is often implied that the function markers *ang*, *ng*, and *sa* have a nominalising function in the examples involving (inflected) event expressions (cf., for example, Schachter & Otnes (1972:150ff)). But this is an ad hoc explanation for which no evidence can be adduced. There is no difference between *ang*-, *ng*- or *sa*-phrases containing (uninflected) entity expressions and those containing event expressions. Rather, the distributional facts just mentioned suggest the following interpretation: the cross-linguistically well-supported observation that entity expressions in the unmarked case have a referential function while event expressions in the unmarked case are used as predicates does not hold in Tagalog.²⁴ Full words do not differ in markedness with respect to morphosyntactic function. Every full word that serves a referential function has to be marked by one of the prepositive markers *ang*, *ng* or *sa*. Thus, these three function markers have, not a nominalising, but a referentializing function; in turn every Tagalog full word, including entity expressions, must be marked by one of these three markers in order to serve as referential expressions. Similarly, every full word may be used without further marking as a (characterizational) predicate. Therefore, Tagalog full words are neither truly nouns nor truly verbs. They seem to be precategorial, as claimed by Foley (1991:5f). He limits this

24 The present argument is phrased in the framework and terminology of Croft (1991 chapters 2 and 3, cf. especially p#62ff; note that instead of *entity* and *event* he uses *object* and *action*); the argument does not, however, depend on this framework but may be expressed within any framework that proposes a cross-linguistic definition of nouns and verbs.

claim, however, to base forms, while here the claim is made for all full words, including orientated ones. Note that this phrasing is more precise and less prone to misinterpretations than such sweeping statements as 'all verbs in language X are actually nouns'. As pointed out by Walter (1981) and Hopper & Thompson (1984), noun and verb are correlative concepts; the degree to which they are distinguished as such may be plotted on a continuum ranging from pre- (or a-) categoriality to fully implemented noun/verbhood. To put it differently, where there are no nouns there can also be no verbs. To talk about the 'nominal' character of verbs in a given language is a potentially misleading shortcut to saying that expressions that are semantically similar to verbs in Indo-European languages display morphosyntactic properties common to Indo-European nouns. What is necessary in this situation is not the impressionistic label 'nominal character' but a careful investigation of categoriality.

What, then, is implied by the claim that Tagalog full words are pre-categorial? Basically, there are two properties of nouns and verbs which Tagalog full words lack: on the one hand, they lack the inherent referentiality characteristic of nouns, hence the pervasive use of markers for referentiality which is a major characteristic of Tagalog clauses. On the other hand, they lack a property inherent to verbs, one however which is somewhat more difficult to determine. The major function of verbs is to predicate (cf. Croft loc. cit.). Tagalog full words may be used in this function without requiring further function-marking morphology ((characterizational) predicates in Tagalog are unmarked); thus it may be hypothesized that Tagalog full words are inherently predicative. They are unlike verbal predicates, however, in that they seem to lack morphosyntactic relationality (or valency). Thus, Tagalog full words, including event expressions, do not have an inherent argument structure (see again Foley (loc.cit)). This hypothesis is supported by the following facts:

- 'arguments' may be freely omitted in Tagalog.²⁵ Any Tagalog text will provide numerous examples for this claim.
- assuming Tagalog event expressions were inherently relational, it would be difficult to explain why they may occur unaltered in referential function. English verbal predicates such as *cuts*, *is/was being cut*, etc. may not be used as nominals (**a/the is being cut*) while this is perfectly possible with the corresponding Tagalog expressions (cf. (3) above).
- Foley (1991:8f) notes that the Tagalog orientation morphology does not allow differentiation of arguments from non-arguments. Instead, orientation may take place with regard to practically any argument role. If arguments cannot be distinguished from non-arguments, the assumption of an inherent argument structure makes no sense.
- this hypothesis provides a natural explanation for the fact that all arguments of a Tagalog event expression (apart from the predication base) are marked as either genitive attributes (*ng*) or oblique complements (*sa*). In this regard they resemble certain English nominalisations (viz. *the giving of an apple to Mary by Peter in my backyard*).

Note that the hypothesis that Tagalog event expressions lack inherent morphosyntactic relationality does not mean that they are not semantically relational. Of course, a lexeme such as *bigáy* 'give' semantically evokes a frame which possibly includes an agent who does the giving, the thing given, the person to whom something is given, the place where the giving happens, the instrument with which something is given, etc. - just as its English equivalent. But the English equivalent is different in that some of the arguments are not merely semantically evoked; rather the slots for agent, theme and goal are part of the inherent argument structure of the English lexeme, which is evident from the fact that in the unmarked

25 cf. McGinn (1988:276) who also points out that in this respect, Tagalog resembles Japanese rather than a pro-drop language of the Italian type (p291, endnote 1).

case they are obligatorily expressed and that they are expressed as core arguments (subject, direct and indirect object). The difference between inherent morphosyntactic relationality and semantic relationality may also be illustrated by English nominalisations: As opposed to the verb 'give' the action nominalisation 'giving' does not obligatorily require the expression of an argument though, of course, it is possible to express them. If they are expressed, they are expressed in the form of adnominal modifiers (genitives) or prepositional complements (*Peter's giving of an apple to Mary*).²⁶ Thus, the frame which is semantically evoked by the verb 'give' and the nominalisation 'giving' is the same, but the way in which the semantically evoked arguments are realized morphosyntactically is distinctly different. Nominalisation is, of course, a complex issue (see Comrie & Thompson (1985) for a cross-linguistic review of the phenomena and Spencer (1991 chapters 6-8) for a review of the theoretical issues involved). Note in particular that we are not concerned here with the intricacies of argument inheritance. What is of interest here is only the fact that the morphosyntactic status of the arguments of verbs is different from the morphosyntactic status of the 'arguments' of nominalisations, and that Tagalog full words more closely resemble the latter than the former in this regard.

Since the distinction between inherent morphosyntactic relationality and semantic relationality²⁷ will be important throughout this paper let us introduce the following

26 For the sake of our argument we will abstract from the fact that English gerund formations also allow for a 'verbal way' of expressing the arguments (*Peter giving an apple to Mary*).

27 This distinction is similar to the distinction between argument structure and lexical semantic (or conceptual) structure proposed in various generative frameworks (cf., among others, Jackendoff (1990), Grimshaw (1990), Lefebvre (1991:44f), Spencer (1991:342f)). However, the conceptual structures in these frameworks are fairly close to argument structure and they involve compositional representations of the meanings denoted by an event expression. *Semantic relationality* here is to be understood in a broader sense, i.e. as the event frame or scene evoked by an event expression which includes not only those participants a compositional representation provides slots for, but instead includes any imaginable participant and the place where an event happens.

terminological conventions: The term *argument* will be limited to arguments that fill slots provided by a morphosyntactically relational expression (i.e. that are governed by a verb/are part of the inherent argument structure). 'Arguments' that are merely evoked semantically are called *participants*. The concept of *semantic evocation* needs to be further refined, since, as will be seen below, not all participants in Tagalog display exactly the same morphosyntactic properties. That is, the expression of participants as genitive attributes or obliques is not arbitrary but is linked to the semantic roles they play in the event expressed (the same holds for participants in action nominalisations). As a consequence of this, it is possible in Tagalog to differentiate between central and peripheral (or core and non-core) participants. This in turn means that the distinction between morphosyntactic and semantic relationality referred to in the preceding paragraphs is not absolute and that there is no such thing as pure semantic relationality. Put differently, the difference between an English verb and a Tagalog event expression is, strictly speaking, not the fact that the former is morphosyntactically relational and the latter not; rather, argument structure is grammaticalized in English to a higher degree than in Tagalog. We will return to this point in sections 5 and 6. For the time being, however, we will continue to refer to the oversimplified two-way distinction morphosyntactic vs. semantic relationality.

To sum up: Tagalog full words are inherently predicative, but unlike verbal predicates they lack an inherent argument structure. Thus they most closely resemble (characterizational) nominal predicates (*is a stone/a thing being cut*), which are both non-referential and predicative but morphosyntactically non-relational. This characterization holds for both entity and event expressions (and, though not discussed here, property expressions) since they share the same distributional properties.

Several points have to be added to this discussion of categoriality in Tagalog:

First, note that it is not claimed that further morphosyntactic subclassification of Tagalog full words is impossible; rather it is claimed that a classification into major syntactic categories is impossible. A low-level classification is both necessary and possible. Two examples may suffice as illustrations. One example are proper nouns which obviously form a subclass of their own since they require a different set of prepositive markers (*si, ni, kay* instead of *ang, ng, sa*) and allow for a plural formation that is unique both formally and semantically (see Schachter & Otnes (1972:93f, 113). Another example is the group of auxiliaries or pseudo-verbs meaning 'like', 'want', 'can', etc., whose distribution and morphology clearly set them apart from all other full words, even though they may also appear in the six major slots discussed above (cf. Schachter & Otnes (1972:261ff)).

Second, we have discussed categoriality only with respect to morphosyntactic function (as reflected in distribution). Thus there is still the possibility that Tagalog full words may be classified into major subclasses on purely morphological grounds (the result being morphological categories rather than syntactic ones, though the labels would be the same (noun, verb, etc.)). This is not the place to pursue this point further (see Himmelmann (1987:78ff) for more details), though it seems reasonably safe to predict that the result would be similar to that obtained here. The major parameter is compatibility with the orientational affixes (to which the aspectual inflection is inherently linked, see below). As can be easily gleaned from the major grammars (Bloomfield 1917, Blake 1925, Schachter & Otnes 1972) and dictionaries (Panganiban (1972), Santos (1983)), there is no orientational affix which is compatible with all event expressions. As for entity expressions, there are only very few which are incompatible with orientational affixes. The orientational possibilities of expressions for animate and human beings are the most limited, though even here we find formations such as *langgam-in* 'infested with ants' (< *langgam* 'ant') or *mà-lalakih-an* 'subjugated by someone's vigorous manliness' or *mag-*

lalaki 'act like a man' (< *lalaki* 'man, male').

Third, we have not claimed that Tagalog full words may not be semantically classified into major lexical semantic classes (using, for example, the criteria proposed by Croft (1991:62ff)). Given the appropriate qualifications, these might also be labeled *noun*, *verb*, etc., though in this paper the labels *entity*, *event*, etc. are preferred in order to underscore the semantic nature of the classification. There is no doubt that event and entity expressions are semantically distinct in Tagalog: *bató* clearly denotes the object 'stone', while *lakad* clearly denotes the action of walking. More importantly, the distinction between these two kinds of expressions is often formally marked (by stress), i.e. it is grammatically relevant. As an example note that *manggagamot* 'doctor' in (1a) is segmentally identical to *manggàgamot* 'will heal, heal habitually'. Both are derived from the base *gamot* 'medicine' and both are semantically closely related (a doctor is obviously one who habitually heals). The semantic difference expressed by the different stress patterns shows that the former unambiguously denotes an object (a person) while the latter denotes an action. This and various other similar patterns are highly productive in Tagalog. The problem of categoriality in Tagalog is therefore somewhat more complex than has been presented in the preceding paragraphs. The distinction between event and entity expressions is not a purely semantic one but has some formal (suprasegmental) correlates. Note, however, that it is still valid to claim that the distinction is not relevant morphosyntactically.

4. Orientation

Tagalog event expressions usually display an affix that indicates the semantic role of one of the participants involved in the state of affairs denoted by the event expression. Using the terms for semantic macro-roles introduced by Foley & van Valin (1984:27-32), these affixes are glossed as ACTOR (ACT) or UNDERGOER (UG, plus subscripts which are explained below) in the present paper. The following examples illustrate the basic four

affixes:

- (14) t-um-angó' ang unggó' (Bl 16/6)
 ACT-nod REF monkey
 'the monkey nodded in assent'
- (15) dikdik-in siyá sa lusóng (Bl 16/27)
 crush-UG 3.SG LOC mortar
 '(that) he (i.e. the turtle) be crushed in a mortar'
- (16) hulug-an mo akó! (Bl 16/17)
 drop-UG_i 2.SG.GEN 1.SG
 'drop me (some)!'
- (17) kung i-tà-tanim niyá ang kaniyá-ng ka-parté
 if UG_T-RDP₁-plant 3.SG.GEN REF 3.SG.DAT-LK ASSOC-part
 'if he would plant his part (for him)' (Bl 16/6)

In these examples, the affixes indicate the semantic role of the referent which appears in the *ang*-phrase (*siyá* in (14) and *akó* in (15) are *ang*-forms of the pronoun). Thus, the infix *-um-* in (14) indicates that it is the monkey who does the nodding, and in (15) the suffix *-in* indicates that the turtle is to be the UNDERGOER of the crushing (rather than the ACTOR).

As already indicated in section 1, the grammar of these affixes is highly controversial. Apart from the central point whether orientation marking is a voice phenomenon or not, the following interrelated problems are involved:

- the nature of the relation between the predication base and the orientation affixes is unclear. Most analyses, however, agree in assuming a special relation between the predication base and the orientation affix (see 4.1).
- are orientation affixes inflectional affixes or derivational ones? Although we agree with Bybee (1985 chapt. 4) that there is no clear and absolute border between inflection and derivation, it is nevertheless important for the understanding of a given affixation process whether it is located closer to one or the other end of the continuum. The issue has hardly ever been explicitly discussed with respect to Tagalog orientation affixes. A notable exception is de Guzman (1978, see also 1991), who was the first to question the traditional

inflectional treatment and to propose a clear distinction between what is inflectional and what is derivational in orientation marking. The present account radicalises her position by claiming that *all* orientation marking is derivational rather than inflectional (for a similar position, see Starosta 1986 and endnote 4 in de Guzman (1991:46)²⁸, Foley 1991).

- the number of affixes or distinctly-coded semantic roles varies substantially: The traditional approach recognized four basic formations (one active and three passives, cf. Blake 1906 and 1925:38ff; Bloomfield (1917:154); Scheerer (1924); Lopez (1937:46-48); Llamzon (1973:169; 1976:89). Wolfenden (1961:14-16), Ramos (1971:21-23, 56-69), and Foley (1976:105-113) claim that there are five basic formations; McFarland (1976:16-24) proposes seven, de Guzman (1978 Ch. III) and Ramos (1974:19-40) eight, Schachter & Otanes (1972:344) eleven, and finally Drossard (1983:87f, 1984:86) twelve.

4.1. The nature of orientation marking

The way our examples (14-17) have been presented suggests that a major relation exists between orientational affixes and the predication base. Many proposals have been offered as to the nature of this relation: that the orientational affix highlights or focuses on the predication base, that it determines the semantic relationship between predicate and predication base, that it expresses the case of the predication base, etc. Thus, most approaches attribute some kind of relational quality to the orientational affixes. That these approaches all head in the wrong direction is evident from the following fact: Although orientated words occur most commonly in predicative function, they are not at all restricted to this function but occur instead in all the functions available to full words in Tagalog (see section 3). In examples such as the following it is impossible to identify a predication base for

28 I agree with de Guzman's point that aspect in Tagalog should be considered an inflectional category.

nagsàsabuy:

(18) at hulih-in ang nag-sà-sabuy sa kanyá
and catch-UG REF REAL.ACT:GER-RDP₁-spatter LOC 3.SG.DAT
ng buhangin (Bl 68/8)
GEN sand
'and catch the one who was throwing sand on him ...'

In this example, there are two orientated event expressions (*hulihin* and *nagsàsabuy*), but there is a predication base for only one (*hulihin*). Note that this is not a case of ellipsis; in principle, it is impossible to introduce a predication base for *nagsàsabuy*. Instead, *nagsàsabuy* is part of the definite description that functions as predication base for *hulihin*. Let us emphasize once more that this kind of construction is quite common in Tagalog texts; it is *not* a marginal and highly marked construction. Therefore, any attempt to give a relational analysis of orientation marking, i.e. one that refers to the predication base, is doomed to fail. In examples such as (14-17) there is no special relation between the predication base and the orientation affix. There is only the predicative relation between predication base and predicate that holds in any Tagalog clause. This predicative relation is not dependent on the orientation affix but pertains to structural positions in Tagalog (see section 2.2). Thus, it seems more promising to investigate orientation marking in more local terms, i.e. in relation to the bases to which the affixes are applied.

It has been suggested that orientation affixes are functionally similar to nominalising affixes in other languages (cf. - among many others - Starosta et al. (1982:147f)). To call them nominalising affixes, however, is not very revealing as long as it remains unexplained why in a language such as Tagalog the overwhelming majority of predicates appears in a 'nominalised' form. Furthermore, it is necessary to delimit more precisely the derivational process involved since many different nominalisation strategies are found in the languages of the world. In particular, it is necessary to distinguish between the morphosyntactic and the semantic aspects involved

in nominalisations (see sect. 3 above).

As for morphosyntax, the term nominalisation implies a change with regard to the part of speech of a given item: A verb is turned into a noun and this means that the morphosyntactic properties of the word (its distribution, affixation, etc.) change. In section 3 it was shown that there is no morphosyntactically relevant distinction between nouns and verbs in Tagalog. Thus, to call orientation affixes nominalising affixes seems misleading since it can not be shown that there are any verbs to begin with.

There is, however, a similarity to the semantic side of certain nominalising strategies. Orientation affixes change the orientation of a given word in such a way that it may be used to refer to one of the participants involved in the state of affairs denoted by the base-form of the word. For example, *-um-* is an ACT-orientating infix which is used to derive from a root such as *tangó'* 'nod, nodding in assent' the expression *tumangó'* 'one who nods, nodder'. This expression no longer denotes the action of nodding, but rather the participant who nods.

In this regard the orientation affixes are functionally similar to those affixes in other languages (including Indo-European) which are used to form agentive nouns (*nomina agentis*), objective nouns (*nomina acti (patientis)*), locative nouns (*nomina loci*), instrumental nouns (*nomina instrumenti*), etc. Lehmann (1984:151f), who introduced the term orientation ('Ausrichtung') for this process, characterizes it in the following way: There are two major types of nominalisation strategies in many languages of the world.²⁹ In one of these types, resulting in action nominals (*nomina actionis*), the core

²⁹ Comrie & Thompson (1985:349ff) propose the same distinction between nominalisations that result in the name of the activity denoted by the verb and those that represent one of the arguments of the underlying verb. Note again that the following discussion of nominalisation is extremely brief and surface-oriented. Its purpose is to point out the similarity between nominalisation in English and orientation marking in Tagalog. Although the Tagalog data, if analysed the way it has been done here, are of considerable importance for the lively debate concerning the nature of nominalisation and, consequently, the interface between syntax and morphology, it is not the purpose of this paper to support or advance any particular theory in this regard.

arguments of the former verb may still be added as adnominal modifiers, as in *Peter's employing of my brother*. Here the nominalised verb (*employing*) simply denotes a state of affairs and implies no orientation. In the other nominalisation strategy orientation is involved: the expression for the state of affairs actually denotes one of the participants involved in the process of employing, e.g. *employer* which involves orientation towards the ACTOR (nomen agentis). As a result, the ACTOR-argument of the verb *employ* can no longer be added as an adnominal modifier, i.e. *Peter's employer* cannot mean that Peter was the agent of the employing. In order to express this (with the nominalised form), one would have to use an equational construction such as *Peter is the employer of my brother*. Note that the same construction is impossible with nomina actionis (**Peter is the employing of my brother*). Thus, the two nominalisation strategies differ in the way they deal with the argument slots of the underlying verb. The former basically leaves them untouched, while the latter allows one of the argument slots to be filled by the orientation affix and no longer by an adnominal expression.³⁰ Note that this difference pertains to the semantic relationality of the items involved; morphosyntactically - and this pertains to both strategies - the nominalised forms no longer have argument slots that have to be filled obligatorily. *Baking is not one of my favorite activities* is a well-formed expression, while *bakes that banana cake* is, as it stands, incomplete.

In Tagalog we find two derivational strategies which display exactly the same properties:

- 1) Orientation affixes are used to derive orientated expressions from a given base. The participant towards which the expression is orientated cannot be expressed as a genitive

30 One of the many more formal ways to express this is Di Sciullo and Williams' (1987:40f) notion of 'control of an argument by an affix'. The concept of orientation may be related to semantically based accounts of nominalisations such the one by Booij (see Spencer 1991:342f) who argues that orientated derivations involve the binding of variables in lexico-conceptual structure rather than operations on the predicate-argument structure of a given verb.

or oblique complement. Thus, in (16) the pronoun *mo* (2.SG.GEN) can never refer to the UNDERGOER of the dropping since *hulugan* is an UNDERGOER-orientated expression. The only possible morphosyntactic relation between the orientated expression and an expression for the participant towards which it is orientated is that of an equational predication. A more literal translation of (16) would thus be 'I (be) the place of your dropping/your droppery'. Similarly, (14) is 'nodd-er in assent (was) the monkey', (15) 'he (be) crush-ee in the mortar', and (17) 'if his plant-ee (would be) his part' (cf. DeWolf 1988:157f). This supports our claim proposed above that there is no special morphosyntactic relation between an orientation affix and the predication base. All Tagalog predications which involve a predication base are simply equational, irrespective of whether the predicate expression is orientated or not.

2) Another very productive derivation, commonly called gerund formation (prefix *pag-*, for details see Schachter & Otnes (1972:159ff)), is used to derive event expressions which are not orientated. As in the English case, all participants may be expressed as genitive and oblique complements:

- (19) at pag-kà-sabi niyá nitó (B1 80/1)
 and GER-??-say 3.SG.GEN DEM.GEN
 'and when he had said this ...'

Gerunds generally may not be predicated about a predication base, thus **pagkàsabi siya nitó* or **pagkàsabi niya itó* are ungrammatical. Gerunds may function as equational predicates only in the following kind of construction:

- (20) pag-lu-luto' ng pagkain ang trabaho niya.
 GER-RDP₂-cook GEN food REF work 3.SG.GEN
 'His/her job is cooking food.'

Tagalog orientation marking and gerund formation thus show considerable similarity to the two nominalisation strategies considered above.

Of course, many differences exist between nominalising affixes in, for example, Indo-European languages and Tagalog orientation affixes with regard to their productivity and

semantics. Orientation affixes may be applied to bases denoting actions as well as to those denoting: things (e.g., *bató* 'stone' -> *batuh-ín* 'throw stones at (x)'), masses (e.g., *tubig* 'water' -> *tubig-an* 'add water to (x)' or 'rice paddy'), states (e.g., *bago* 'new' -> *baguh-in* 'change (x)' or *i-bago* 'move (x) to another position'), or animate beings (e.g., *baboy* 'pig' -> *babuy-in* 'make (x) dirty'). Orientation is thus a much more prevalent process in Tagalog than orientated nominalisations in Indo-European languages. But apart from the fundamental difference that Tagalog orientation affixes are not nominalising in terms of morphosyntax, the overall similarity in the function of these affixes is conspicuous.

Incidentally, the derivational possibilities just mentioned show that instead of calling the orientation affixes nominalising, a case could be made to analyse them as verbalising affixes. This is in fact Foley's (1991) approach, which is to some extent a reversal of the nominalisation analysis. According to his approach the base forms are precategoryal, and orientation marking is used to derive verbs from these bases. In this process the verbs receive their argument structure and at the same time the 'topic' function (predication base) is assigned to one of these arguments. This analysis is clearly preferable to most other analyses that have been proposed to date. Our point of contention should be obvious from the preceding discussion (see also sect. 3): Where is the evidence for a syntactic category verb and, consequently, for argument structure?

The analysis proposed here has several advantages as well as repercussions for many areas of Tagalog grammar. To mention just two: First and foremost, the ability of orientated expressions to function as referential expressions (cf. (1b), (3), (13), (18)) is accounted for naturally. Second, another oddity of Tagalog grammar is easily resolved. A brief look at the list of affixes in Schachter & Otnes for nouns (1972:97-106), adjectives (1972:198f; 216-229), and verbs (1972:344-355) immediately reveals that basically the same affixes are involved (both formally and semantically). The

differences that do exist only pertain to stress and, in correlation with stress, to the way a concept is denoted (as event, entity, or property). The analysis proposed here allows for considerable simplification in stating the regularities of affixation since these only have to be stated once. The differences that exist between entity and event expressions are stated with reference to the linguistic level to which they pertain, i.e. stress assignment. To give just two examples of formations where so-called nominal and verbal derivations clearly overlap: 1) *mag-* (plus unstressed reduplication) occurs in formations denoting professionals; thus from *nakaw* 'steal' *mag-na-nakaw* 'thief' may be derived. This form differs only with respect to stress from the action denoting formation *mag-nà-nakaw* 'will steal' (cf. sect. 3 and Bloomfield 1917:242f; Schachter & Otanes 1972:103). Both formations are clearly ACTOR-orientated. There is no evidence to support the distinction between *mag-* as a nominalising affix and *mag-* as a verbal affix. 2) The suffix *-in* may denote the entities undergoing the action denoted by the root, e.g., *aral* 'study' -> *aralín* 'lesson'. Again, it is the stress that (often) differentiates action and thing, cf. *aralin* 'study (x)'. Other examples are *kumpuní* 'repair' -> *kumpunihin* 'things to repair' vs. *kumpunihín* 'repair (x)'; *kain* 'eat' -> *kanin* 'boiled rice' or 'eat (x)' (no difference whatsoever, compare also *kakanín* 'sweets'); *inóm* 'drink' -> *inumín* 'drinking water' or 'drink (x)', cf. also *inumín* 'beverage' (see Bloomfield 1917:247; Schachter & Otanes 1972:99f). Again, all these formations are UNDERGOER-orientated expressions. The distinction between event and entity, if it is formally expressed at all, pertains to stress and not to the suffix.³¹

31 In formations involving the suffix *-an* stress also (often) distinguishes an event and an entity expression. But with this suffix the matter is further complicated by the fact that a third meaning may be distinguished, i.e. collective action (cf. Bloomfield 1917:250-262). There are no formations with *-um-* or *i-* which may denote entities.

4.2. The semantics of the orientation affixes

The discussion in the preceding section showed that orientation affixes are to be considered neither as some kind of inflectional marker nor as markers of a change in syntactic category. Instead, the results of the preceding section strongly suggest a derivational approach to these affixes and, more specifically, a derivational approach based on compositional semantics. Therefore, the hypothesis will be advanced here that orientational affixation may be analysed with the help of derivational rules, ones which refer both to the semantics of the root and the semantics of the affixes. The semantics of the base will be discussed in the next section. In this section, we will briefly present our view on the semantics of the affixes.

In our view, both the formal and the semantic evidence strongly supports the traditional claim that there are basically four orientations in Tagalog: one towards the ACTOR, and three kinds of UNDERGOER-orientation. The unification of the latter three orientations under the heading of UNDERGOER-orientation is supported by the fact that they display the same modal inflection (the REALIS infix *-in-*, see 4.3). In fact, the existence of an aspectual/modal inflectional paradigm for all four of the basic orientations is the major formal evidence for combining four otherwise formally very different formations under the heading of orientation. That is, apart from the fact that orientated forms allow for the same aspectual/modal inflections, they are far from uniform, neither semantically nor formally.

ACTOR-orientation is marked by an infix (*-um-*) and is relatively strongly grammaticalized to the extent that it denotes not only ACTORS that control an action (as in (14)) but also participants involved in a process, as in *p-um-ulá* 'become red' or *l-um-ù-lutang* 'be floating'. Furthermore, it occurs in expressions for natural events such as *um-ulán* 'rain' or *l-um-indól* 'earthquake'. This infix is not the only way to signal ACT-orientation. The prefix *mag-* (REALIS *nag-*) also indicates this orientation, cf. examples (1b) and (18).

Following de Guzman (1978 Chapt. 3), this prefix is analysed here as consisting of the prefix *pag-* used in gerund formation (see above), ACTOR-orientation (and mood) being signalled by consonant alternation.³² The difference between these formations pertains to the kind of action denoted and is further commented on in Himmelmann (1987:178ff).

UNDERGOER-orientation is expressed by two suffixes and one prefix:

- *-in* indicates a directly affected UG, such as the turtle in (15), that which is being cut (in example (3)), the person to be caught (in example (18)), or *itó* in *inum-in mo itó* 'drink this'. It is the unmarked and the most strongly grammaticalized member of the three UNDERGOER-orientations since there is no suffix in the REALIS mood (see 4.3) and since it is used in all cases which do not clearly pertain to the other two UNDERGOER-orientations (for more discussion, see Himmelmann (1987:107ff)).
- *-an* indicates the location towards which an action is orientated, such as the 1.SG in (16) (called *directional focus* in the literature) or the location where an action takes place (the so-called *locative focus*), e.g.:

(21) ni-lakar-an ko ang ma-bató-ng kalye
REAL(UG)-walk-UG_i 1.SG.GEN REF IRR.STAT-stone-LK street
'I walked on a stony road'

I prefer the term INDIRECT UNDERGOER (UG_i) because of examples such as *buks-án mo ang pintó* 'open the door', where the participant denoted is neither locative nor

32 The argument for this analysis, as presented by de Guzman, may be summarized as follows: A number of prefixes display regular alternation of the initial consonant: the /p/-initial form is the basic form (used as gerund or imperative), /m/ marks IRREALIS and /n/ REALIS, compare *pag-/mag-/nag-*, *pang-/mang-/nang-*, *paki-/maki-/naki-*. The alternation between the two nasal forms also occurs with the STATIVE prefix (*ma-/na-*), although for these no /p/-initial basic form exists. Furthermore, a small number of /p/-initial roots (containing a fossilized prefix) exhibits this alternation, e.g. *pakiníg makiníg nakiníg* 'listen', *panoód manoód nanoód* 'watch'. This alternation probably developed from infixed formations, with loss of the first syllable. Thus, *mag-* < **pumag-* and *nag-* < **pinag-* (note, however, that *pinag-* is a productive formation, i.e., REALIS(UG) of *pag-* derived bases).

directional but, more generally, an indirectly affected undergoer. Furthermore, there is a clear opposition between *-in* and *-an* pertaining to directness, which is evident from many contrastive pairs (compare, for example, *inum-in mo itó* above with *inum-án mo itó* 'drink from/some of this').

i- indicates an UG that is moved (thematic UG (UG_T), cf. Kroeger (1988:231-33) who uses the term 'translative focus'), such as the egg in (1a) or the half of the tree in (17). The analysis of this prefix is somewhat more controversial. It is often analysed as a marker for the instrumental role because of examples such as

- (22) ang iták ay i-p-in-utol ko ng saging
REF bolo PM UG_T-REAL(UG)-cut 1.SG.GEN GEN banana
'I cut bananas with the bolo.'

This usage, however, is less prominent and may easily be accounted for as UG_T (cf. Himmelmann (1987:139f)). But *i-* is also used to indicate the beneficiary of an action with a few roots, as in *i-bilí* 'buy for (x)', which is difficult to account for under any analysis proposed so far.³³ Note that *i-* is not only semantically outstanding but is also formally highly conspicuous since it is the only prefix among the orientational affixes as well as the most irregular of the Tagalog prefixes (unlike other prefixes, it is never stressed nor reduplicated).

4.3. Aspect/mood inflection and inherent orientation

One of the most conspicuous characteristics of orientation marking in Tagalog is the fact that the base-forms do not seem to have an inherent orientation; both ACT- as well as UG-orientation involve morphological marking while, for example, in English only UG-orientation (passive) is explicitly marked.

³³ One possibility is to analyse this as a case of homophony, i.e., there are two UNDERGOER prefixes, a thematic one and a benefactive one (which would imply that there are five basic orientations in Tagalog). The major argument against this approach is the fact that benefactive participants may also be indicated by *-an*, that is, as INDIRECT UNDERGOERS (which makes more sense semantically). Furthermore, benefactive *i-* is marginal both in terms of type and token frequency (see Himmelmann (1987:141f)).

The question whether there is any evidence for orientation inherent to the base forms has, to my knowledge, never been posed before. The issue is quite complex and only some preliminary remarks are possible here. We will start by pointing out two asymmetries in the aspect/mood paradigm which may be used in formulating a hypothesis.

For orientated forms Tagalog distinguishes between two aspects (PERFECTIVE and IMPERFECTIVE) and two moods (REALIS and IRREALIS).³⁴ IMPERFECTIVE aspect is indicated by stressed reduplication (RDP₁); PERFECTIVE aspect is unmarked. REALIS mood is indicated by the infix *-in-* or consonant alternation (/m/ -> /n/, cf. fn32), IRREALIS again being unmarked. In interaction with orientation marking, the following paradigms can be established for the root *bilí* 'buy', one of the few roots which is compatible with all orientational affixes:

	ACT	ACT
	'buy'	'sell'
IRR/PRF	b-um-ilí	mag-bilí
IRR/IMPF	bìbilí	mag-bìbilí
REAL/PRF	b-in-ilí	nag-bilí
REAL/IMPF	b-in-ìbilí	nag-bìbilí
	UG	UG _i
IRR/PRF	bilh-ín	bilh-án
IRR/IMPF	bìbilh-ín	bìbilh-án
REAL/PRF	b-in-ilí	b-in-ilh-án
REAL/IMPF	b-in-ìbilí	b-in-ìbilh-án
	UG _T	
IRR/PRF	i-bilí	
IRR/IMPF	i-bìbilí	
REAL/PRF	i-b-in-ilí	
REAL/IMPF	i-b-in-ìbilí	

As may be immediately observable there are two asymmetries in these paradigms (see the IRR of the *um*-infix forms and the

34 This is the analysis proposed by Bloomfield, who, however, uses an overly idiosyncratic terminology (1917:217). Schachter & Otanes (1972:66ff, 361ff) propose a somewhat different analysis involving a basic form (=IRR/IMPF) and three basic aspects: CONTEMPLATED (= IRR/PRF), PERFECTIVE (REAL/PRF), and IMPERFECTIVE (REAL/IMPF). The formal evidence supports Bloomfield's analysis. Furthermore, there is another aspectual formation, Recent PERFECTIVE (with prefix *ka-*), which is not orientated. This will not be considered further here.

REAL of the UG-forms). Nevertheless, it seems justified to establish these paradigmatic arrangements and to speak of aspectual and modal inflection, since these formations are highly regular (they exist for every orientated form and are also possible for other affix combinations, e.g. *maki-*, *makiki-*, *naki-*, *nakiki-*) and the contexts they are used in are also identical. Thus, IRR/PRF is used in hypothetical and complement clauses and in commands (cf. (15) and (16)); IRR/IMPF is used for future events (cf. (17)), whereas REAL/PRF and REAL/IMPF are used for past and present events.

The asymmetries are relevant in discussing the inherent orientation of Tagalog roots. Strictly speaking, REALIS UG-orientated forms do not have a marker for orientation. Similarly, there is also no marker for ACT-orientation in the IRR/IMPF of the *um*-paradigm. This may be interpreted as evidence for the claim that base forms of event expressions have, not an inherent orientation, but rather a default orientation (which remains segmentally unexpressed) depending on the context in which an event expression is used. In IRR/IMPF contexts the default orientation is towards the ACTOR; in REALIS contexts (both PERFECTIVE and IMPERFECTIVE) it is towards the UNDERGOER. Such a correlation is not uncommon cross-linguistically (note the various case marking splits based on tense/aspect splits (Tsunoda 1981, Mallinson & Blake 1981:59ff)). Blake (1988:79f) even takes the asymmetries as evidence for the claim that Tagalog is a morphologically ergative language, more precisely, a split ergative language. The problem with his argument (and all of the other ergative proposals mentioned in sect. 1) is the fact that Blake is forced to claim that ACTOR-orientation is a kind of antipassive, i.e. ACTOR-orientated constructions are claimed to be intransitive (loc. cit. 81). This claim, however, is impossible to support since ACTOR-orientated predications are possible with more than one participant:

- (23) nag-dà-dalá silá ng sarile nilá-ng
REAL.ACT-RDP₁-bring 3.PL GEN own 3.SG.GEN-LK

banda ng músika (Bl 48/33)
band GEN music
'they bring their own band'

The matter is complicated by the fact that there is a certain prominence of UNDERGOER-orientation in Tagalog: Whenever a clause involves a definite undergoer this is usually made the predication base. This is taken by some authors as evidence for the intransitive status of ACTOR-orientated constructions since in many languages events involving non-specific and specific-indefinite undergoers are expressed by intransitive clauses (cf. Hopper & Thompson 1980). As for Tagalog, however, the data concerning this phenomenon are misrepresented in the literature. It is often assumed that instead of being a very general tendency the prominent use of UNDERGOER-orientation is a syntactic rule of Tagalog, which it is not, as shown by example (23).³⁵ Furthermore, this tendency is not sufficient to prove the intransitive status of ACTOR-orientated expressions, and I cannot see how this can be done. On the contrary, if the analysis presented here so far is basically correct, the whole approach seems to rest on the wrong assumption that transitive and intransitive verbs may be distinguished in Tagalog; this cannot be the case, however, since there is no syntactic category verb to begin with. Further, where there is no transitivity distinction with respect to verbs, no ergativity is possible.

Returning to the asymmetries which exist in the aspect/mood paradigm of Tagalog orientated expressions, note that there is further evidence for the claim proposed here that bases lack an inherent orientation. Although this is hardly ever acknowledged

35 See Adams & Manaster-Ramer (1988) for more discussion of the issues involved, but note that though their account is probably the most detailed and considerate account available to date it still has some flaws. In accordance with all of the relevant literature they claim (1988:92ff) that apart from possessed undergoers as in (23) - which in their analysis are not (!) definite - definite undergoers may never occur as genitives in Tagalog. This is not true; compare example (19) where a definite undergoer is marked as genitive (*nitó*).

in the literature (the major exception being Bloomfield (1917:218ff), it is possible to use unaffixed roots denoting events in predicate position which are UG-orientated in a REALIS context (often with a resultative connotation):

- (24) antáy ko ang sagót mo
wait 1.SG.GEN REF answer 2.SG.GEN
'I wait for/expect your answer'

ACTOR-orientation with unaffixed roots in REALIS contexts is impossible:

- (25) a) *uwí' siyá sa bahay
return 3.SG LOC house
'He returned home.'
- b) *dalá ng manók ang kuya ko
bring GEN chicken REF older brother 1.SG.GEN
*'my brother brought a chicken'
?'the chicken brought my brother'

The informants claimed that (25b) was acceptable in the sense of 'the chicken brought my brother' (though this is, of course, peculiar pragmatically). But unaffixed roots may occur with ACT-orientation in imperatives (i.e., in IRREALIS contexts), e.g., *hintáy ka* 'you wait!'. Furthermore, they may be used to denote an event without orientation (and thus resemble the gerund formations mentioned above) in basically the same contexts in which UNDERGOER-orientation is possible:

- (26) iyák ang sagót niyá sa akin
cry REF answer 3.SG.GEN LOC 1.SG.DAT
'His answer to me was crying/to cry'

The conditions applicable to the use of unaffixed forms and the nature of possible semantic differences between affixed and unaffixed forms are still unclear (for more discussion, see Himmelmann 1987:157ff). The data investigated so far, however, support the hypothesis that event expressions which lack orientation affixes also lack an inherent orientation (and are thus neither accusative nor ergative).

4.4. Derivation and prediction

Our analysis of the orientation affixes ultimately depends on the hypothesis that orientation marking is a derivational process rather than an inflectional one, as is often assumed in the literature. In this section we will present some further observations to support the claim that orientation marking in Tagalog is derivational or, at least, more derivational than inflectional.

Synchronically, the derivational character of orientation marking is evident from the fact that there is no basic orientated form from which other formations may be predicted. That is, if one knows, for example, that a given root allows for the infix *-um-* there is no way to predict which other orientations are possible. McFarland, who has investigated the orientational possibilities for 332 roots in texts, concludes:

'The focus inflections in Tagalog are subject to a great amount of idiosyncratic behavior. The degree of predictability from one focus form to another is very low.' (1976:32)

This is particularly noteworthy because of the fact that other formations in Tagalog are much more regular and can be predicted on the basis of basic forms. McFarland writes:

'Aside from the focus inflections, the verbal inflectional system exhibits a high degree of regularity. The formation of gerunds, aptative forms, causative forms, etc. follow highly predictable patterns.' (loc. cit.)

Furthermore, there have been several attempts to deal with the idiosyncratic behaviour of Tagalog orientation marking in terms of verb classes: Blake (1925:38f) postulated 17 classes; Schachter & Otnes (1972:295ff) operate with 43 classes; Cruz (1975) recognizes 38 classes; McFarland (1976:101ff) has 53 classes; Ramos (1974, 1975) postulates 15 classes; and de Guzman (1978) recognizes 7 main classes with 48 subclasses for 'primary verb stems' and 14 main classes with 32 subclasses for 'secondary verb stems'. Although the differences among these authors are in part due to differences in their respective frameworks, this enormous range of proposed classes, in my

opinion, supports the claim that an approach in terms of inflectional classes is simply inappropriate. The derivational approach proposed here predicts that various idiosyncracies will occur in orientation marking and thus seems to be clearly preferable (for a preliminary sketch of such a derivational approach, see Himmelmann 1987:129ff).

In the preceding discussion the heterogeneity of the orientation marking affixes was already pointed out several times. Although this in itself does not prove that these affixations are derivational, it is clear that such a variety of formal expressions for one category seldom arises in inflectional paradigms. The heterogeneity clearly shows that we are dealing with formations which have developed from quite different historical sources and are probably of a varied historical age. It is basically the aspectual/modal inflection common to all orientation affixes which allows us to unite this rather heterogeneous set of affixes under the label *orientation*. The 'holes' in the aspectual/modal paradigm pointed out in the preceding section suggest that we are dealing with a language where at a certain stage the derivational morphology 'has gone wild'. That is, at an earlier stage event expressions probably were inflected only for aspect (reduplication) and mood (infix *-in-*).³⁶ Later on, the use of orientated forms - which were formerly used in a similar way as orientated nominalisations were in Indo-European languages - was generalized and, as a consequence, the equational pattern became the dominant pattern in Tagalog clause structure. In this line of events, orientated forms also acquired regular aspect/mood-inflection. Only the most common formations 'survived', namely reduplication for ACTOR-orientated IRREALIS/IMPERFECTIVE and *-in-* infigation for UNDERGOER-orientated

36 The present distribution of the REALIS infix (it occurs only in UNDERGOER-orientation) clearly is a recent development. Older sources on Tagalog such as Müller (1882:140) and Blake (1906 and 1925:41) adduce the following REALIS-allomorph for the *-um-* infix: *-ungm-*, e.g., *s-ungm-ulat* 'wrote' and *s-ungm-u-sulat* 'is/was writing'. Furthermore, in several Philippine-type languages the ACTOR-orientating *-um-* is still compatible with the RELAIS-infix (see, for example, Tondano (Sneddon 1975:211)).

REALIS. Their distribution which probably used to be restricted to the predicative function changed in such a way that the earlier morphosyntactic distinction between nouns and verbs became obsolete. This was due to their interaction with the (formerly nominal) orientated forms. What we then synchronically analyse as aspect/mood paradigm for Tagalog event expressions historically consists of nominalized and verbal forms. I shall not go into this diachronic scenario in detail.³⁷ It may suffice, however, to indicate that it is possible to sketch a plausible diachronic scenario as to how the Tagalog state of affairs might have arisen. Note that within the Austronesian family only Tagalog (and, to varying degrees the other Philippine-type languages) have evolved the peculiar morphosyntax we are investigating here.

5. Syntactic categories and the grammaticalization of argument structure

The preceding discussion was based on the hypothesis that there is no distinction between the syntactic categories noun and verb in Tagalog. The related distinction between event and entity expressions, however, does exist and is (sometimes) formally marked by stress. Thus one of the traditional definitions for distinguishing between nouns and verbs, that nouns and verbs are different ways of denoting concepts (*modus significandi*), is applicable to Tagalog full words. Furthermore, there can be no doubt that Tagalog event expressions are semantically relational, as opposed to (most) entity expressions. The major reason for the hypothesised lack of a distinction of syntactic categories was the fact that the difference in semantic relationality between entity and event expressions is not clearly reflected in their morphosyntax. In other words, both entity and event expressions allow for the same kind of complements (genitive attributes or obliques), and neither obligatorily demands the expression of a complement.

37 The major evidence is provided by Formosan languages where nouns and verbs are more clearly distinguished than in Tagalog and the fact that in PAN there were probably two affixes (*-i and *-aken) which could be used only with verbs (for some discussion, see Starosta et al. (1982)).

Therefore, the hypothesis has been put forward that all Tagalog full words lack inherent morphosyntactic relationality (and inherent referentiality as well, see sect. 3). This hypothesis allows for a consistent, surface-oriented and relatively simple statement of the core of Tagalog morphosyntax. The following characteristics are thus easily accounted for:

- the distribution of full words
- the use of the major function markers *ang*, *ng*, and *sa*
- the basic equational character of the Tagalog clause
- the very existence and pervasiveness of orientation marking

The purpose of this section is to test further and refine the hypothesis that Tagalog full words lack inherent morphosyntactic relationality. It is not the case that there are no morphosyntactic differences at all between event expressions and entity expressions in Tagalog; rather, the hypothesis proposed here is that the differences that do exist are distinct from those encountered in other languages to such a degree that an analysis in terms of syntactic categories (nouns and verbs) is inappropriate. Put differently, syntactic categories are but weakly grammaticalized in Tagalog. Let us illustrate this with an example:

- (27) a) mang-ga-gamot siyá
 IRR.ACT-RDP₂-medicine 3.SG
 'He is a doctor.'
- b) mang-gà-gamot siyá
 IRR.ACT-RDP₁-medicine 3.SG
 'He will heal.'

manggagamot in (27a) clearly denotes a person, while *manggàgamot* in (27b) clearly denotes an action. One pertinent difference between the two is that the latter does allow for aspectual/modal inflection (*manggagamot*, *nanggàgamot*, *nanggagamot*) while the former does not. This has often been used as the major criterion to distinguish nouns and verbs in Tagalog, but since the inflected forms may appear in all morphosyntactic environments (functions), I do not consider this evidence for a

distinction in syntactic category (see sect. 3). Unlike their English equivalents, the Tagalog entity expression (*manggagamot*) may function as predicate without further morphosyntactic function marking. Furthermore, complements may be added in the same way: *mang-ga-gamot ng bata' siyá* means 'he is a doctor of (for) children', *mang-gà-gamot ng bata' siyá* is 'he will heal children'. In fact, the pervasive use of the genitive (*ng*-phrase) in Tagalog is the major factor in the lack of a morphosyntactic distinction between nouns and verbs. The two cases available in Tagalog, genitive and oblique, are cases which, viewed from cross-linguistic perspective, are generally used for either adnominal complements or peripheral participants. The fact that complements of event expressions have to be expressed in this way in Tagalog deprives them of the central morphosyntactic feature of verbhood, the governing of core arguments. Put differently, oblique complements are equally possible with both nouns and verbs, whereas genitive complements are typical for nouns in most, if not all languages. Tagalog event expressions thus lack the expression of complements typical for verbs; instead they exhibit a 'nominal' character since participants are expressed as genitives and obliques.

This, however, is not the whole story since there are various complexities pertaining to definite undergoers. In example (27a) it is possible to add a definite complement marked as genitive:

(28) a) *siyá ay ang mang-ga-gamot ng mga bata-ng ito*
3.SG PM REF IRR.ACT-RDP₂-medicine GEN PL child-LK DEM
'he is the one who is the doctor of these children'.

This is not possible in (27b). Instead, the definite undergoer has to be expressed as an oblique:

(28) b) *siyá ay ang mang-gà-gamot sa mga bata-ng ito*
3.SG PM REF IRR.ACT-RDP₁-medicine LOC PL child-LK DEM
'he is the one who will heal these children'.

Here the complement of an entity expression and the undergoer of an event expression are clearly marked in a different way;

the difference in semantic relationality between entity and event expressions is reflected in the morphosyntax. This, in fact, may be interpreted as evidence that at least a minor difference in syntactic category between event and entity expressions exists in Tagalog.

As hinted at above (sect. 3), the distinction between semantic and morphosyntactic relationality is not an absolute one. Instead, morphosyntactic relationality is the result of the grammaticalization of semantic relationality: certain aspects of the frame evoked by a relational concept are reflected in its morphosyntactic expression. The major factor in the gradual formation of the syntactic categories noun and verb is the fact that the way in which the participants evoked by a semantically relational expression are morphosyntactically linked to this expression differs at least in some detail from the way attributes are linked to non-relational expressions (i.e. the majority of the entity expressions). As is well known, the major morphosyntactic reflections of semantic relationality are agreement and government (cf., for example, Lehmann 1982, 1985), and although there is no clear evidence for either in Tagalog, some evidence for the grammaticalization of semantic relationality can be discerned. That definite undergoers of event expressions must be marked as obliques is a case in point. Further facts pointing in the same direction include the following:

Participant roles are mapped onto either the genitive or the oblique functions in a non-arbitrary way. We may note the following regularities (these regularities are to be understood as including the qualification that any participant may also be chosen as predication base): agents and experiencers are always expressed as genitives; instruments either as genitives or marked with a complex preposition, but never with simple *sa*; locatives always as obliques; patients, themes and goals either as genitives or as obliques. As for goals, these are generally marked as obliques, but occasionally a genitive construction also occurs. Compare:

- (29) b-um-alík na ulí' akó ng probinsya
REAL.ACT-return LK again 1.SG GEN province
'I have returned once more to the province.'

The regularities for patients and themes are quite complex and interact with the factors involved in choosing a particular orientation. The most important parameter in this regard is the specificity of undergoers; that is, specific, especially definite, undergoers are usually made the predication base. Otherwise, specific undergoers are generally marked as obliques (but see fn35) and non-specific undergoers as genitives (for more discussion see Naylor 1975 and 1986, Adams & Manaster-Ramer 1988). As already hinted at in the discussion of example (23) above, the facts are more complex than this simplified statement suggests. But these will not be further investigated here. In the present discussion the following observation is of particular interest: the morphosyntactic coding of participant roles in part allows for the distinction of more central from less central participants. For example, agents are clearly central participants because they are always marked as genitives; locatives are more peripheral, for they are always marked as obliques. The distinction between central and less central participants is obviously a necessary stage in the grammaticalization of argument structure. Note that the evidence regarding the centrality of the undergoer roles is not decisive.

The asymmetries in the aspectual/modal paradigms of orientated forms pointed out in sect. 4.3 could be adduced as evidence for the claim that actor and direct undergoer (basically patient) are the most central participants in Tagalog event expressions, since the orientation does not have to be expressed segmentally in some contexts (REALIS for undergoers, IRREALIS/IMPERFECTIVE for actors).

With regard to some event expressions the derivational morphology may also be used to determine the centrality of a given participant role in that the orientation towards one participant role is morphologically more complex than that for others. For example, there is a group of roots which allows

ACT-orientation only with *mag-* (that is, first a gerund has to be derived by prefixing *pag-* which in turn is orientated by consonant alternation, cf. fn32), while UG-orientation is possible without a prior derivation. From *luto* 'cook' one may not derive **lumuto* but rather only *magluto*', while the UG-orientated form is simply *iluto*' or *lutu'in*. Other roots belonging to this group, which does not exhibit a common semantic denominator, are *dasál* 'prayer', *hugas* 'wash', *punas* 'wipe off', *libíng* 'burial', *bayad* 'payment', *kahoy* 'wood', *hubád* 'naked', etc. (cf. Himmelmann 1987:179f). Thus for these roots the claim could be made that the undergoers are more central participants than the actor since orientation towards them requires less morphological marking.

Furthermore, there is one morphosyntactic context in which only entity expressions, but not event expressions, may occur: unaffixed roots may be used as imperatives only if they denote events (see 4.3). There is no **lalaki ka!* 'be a man!' or **bató ka sa kaniyá!* 'throw stones at him!' That is, at least in this somewhat marginal context there is a morphosyntactic difference between event and entity expression which could be adduced as evidence for a distinction of the syntactic categories noun and verb in Tagalog. But then this fact may easily and naturally be stated in terms of lexical semantic classes and thus, in my view does not constitute compelling evidence to alter the analysis of syntactic categories proposed above in sect. 3.

All of the facts mentioned in the preceding paragraphs doubtlessly constitute evidence for the grammaticalization of syntactic categories and argument structure in Tagalog. However, they do not provide decisive, compelling evidence for establishing syntactic categories and argument structure. From the point of view of grammaticalization taken here, they may be interpreted in two ways: either they are considered to represent remnants of an earlier stage in the history of Tagalog (as hinted at in sect. 4.4) where syntactic categories and argument structure were more fully grammaticalized, or they may be seen as evidence of an incipient stage of the grammaticalization of syntactic categories and argument

structure. At least the asymmetries in the aspectual/modal paradigms and the possibility to use unaffixed event-roots as imperatives seem to me to be remnants since they clearly constitute irregularities in the present system which cannot have evolved from a regular system without other factors, e.g., phonological change, interfering for which there is no evidence in these cases. In the following section we will turn to a phenomenon which in fact may be plausibly interpreted as incipient grammaticalization of argument structure.

6. The equational hypothesis and the order of constituents

The claim that Tagalog clause structure is basically equational clearly predicts the order of the constituents: participants coded as genitive attributes are considered part of the predicate constituent and therefore should precede the predication base (see the end of sect. 2.2 above). Obliques can occur in any of the following three positions: 1) as topics before the predicate, 2) as part of the predicate constituent, i.e., following the genitive attributes, but preceding the predication base, or 3) after the predication base (in clause final position). When obliques occur as topics or in clause final position they should function as clausal modifiers, whereas when they occur as parts of the predicate constituent they are expected to express either complements or modifiers of the predicate. This prediction is basically correct. The counterclaim often found in the literature that word order is basically free in Tagalog thus requires further comments. It is common practice to use (made-up) example clauses in which the predication base immediately follows the predicate as in:

(30) b-um-ili ang babae ng tinapay sa tindahan
 REAL.ACT-buy REF woman GEN bread LOC store

para sa bata'
for LOC child

'The woman bought some bread at the store for the child.'

Clauses such as these are highly unnatural for two reasons: First, in Tagalog, as probably in most languages, clauses containing more than one full NP are extremely rare (see DuBois

1987, Serzisko 1992). Second, and more importantly, the predication base generally follows genitive attributes (and some obliques) in 'real' Tagalog. Of all the 1219 *ang*-phrases in the Bloomfield texts (see sect. 2), for example, there is not a single *ang*-phrase preceding a *ng*-phrase which expresses a participant in the event denoted by the predicate. Bautista (1983:42) points out that when the predication base precedes a *ng*-phrase an ambiguity results since the *ng*-phrase may be either a modifier of the immediately preceding word or the expression of a further participant in the event denoted by the predicate. To reproduce her example:

- (31) p-in-à-pa-ligu-an ang aso ng bata'
RDP₁-REAL(UG)-CAUS-bath-UG_i REF dog GEN child
'the child's dog is being bathed' or:
'the child is bathing the dog'

Such an ambiguity, however, is pure fiction since it occurs only in made-up example clauses. Note that the function of the *ng*-phrase in (30) is unambiguous because of the semantics of *tinapay* 'bread' ('woman of the bread' makes no sense). The veracity in the claim that the order of the predication base and the genitive-marked participant is not fixed rests on the fact that this ordering is not completely impossible; this is the reason that informants are willing to accept this ordering in decontextualized examples. But it is so rare in actual texts (or conversations) that it should be considered an exceptional positioning of the predication base. All the examples of which I am aware involve proper nouns which are marked by the function marker *si* rather than by *ang* as in the following example:

- (32) nag-pa-sundó' si Andrés ng isa-ng pare'
REAL.ACT-CAUS-fetch PN GEN one-LK priest
'... Andrés sent for a priest ...' (Bl 92/23)

Bloomfield calls this ordering *enclitic* positioning (1917:153) since in this example the proper noun occupies the clitic position that is usually occupied by pronominal predication bases (for example, 3.SG *siyá*). In all examples which involve a

si-marked proper noun and a further, genitive marked participant in Bloomfield's texts³⁸ the proper noun is in such an enclitic position. We may thus hypothesize that this is in fact the regular position for predication bases denoting proper nouns and that native speakers who accept made-up examples such as (30) probably do this in analogy to examples such as (32).

Starosta et al. (1982:162) claim that the enclitic positioning of the *ang*-phrase is evidence that a former nominal predicate has been reanalysed as verbal predicate. In the present approach this claim may be rephrased: A former precategory event expression is being grammaticalized as a verb and begins to acquire some morphosyntactic properties characteristic for verbs, such as inherent argument structure. I basically agree with this claim but would underscore the fact that these are only the very beginnings of a grammaticalization process. I would predict that the full grammaticalization of argument structure in Tagalog requires that the use of *ng* is restricted to marking one central participant role (say actor) and that another function marker (either *sa* or a newly 'coined'³⁹ one) is used to mark other central participant roles (theme, patient, goal). This, in fact, is the case for proper nouns for which, due to the specificity constraint (see above sect. 5), the genitive *ni* may be used for actors/possessors only; for all other participants (including undergoers which in the case of proper nouns are always specific) the oblique *kay* has to be used. From this and the preceding paragraph it is obvious that the morphosyntax of proper nouns is of utmost importance to this grammaticalization process.

Evidence for the claims made in this and the preceding section concerning the development of the Tagalog state of affairs obviously can not be found in Tagalog alone. To corroborate them a detailed study of the related Philippine and other Austronesian languages would be necessary. But this is no

38 See B1 58/22, 72/13, 88/32, 92/26, 94/29, 100/15, 102/39, 104/25.

39 This is intended to mean that another element is being grammaticalized as marker of undergoer roles. The most plausible scenario in fact is that *sa* becomes such a marker and that oblique roles are expressed by complex prepositons (involving *sa* as one constituent).

longer the task of the present paper. That such a study most probably will be very revealing is suggested by the following observation: There are hardly two Philippine languages in which the form and function of the morphosyntactic function markers are identical; in addition, several languages exist where the distribution of the function markers allows for a much clearer morphosyntactic distinction of participants than it is the case in Tagalog. For example, in Ivatan (Reid 1966:85), we find the following markers:

(33) IVATAN	qo	PREDICATION BASE
	so	UNDERGOER, MANNER
	no	POSSESSOR, ACTOR, INSTRUMENT
	do	LOCATIVE, TEMPORAL

However, there still is variation with regard to the marking of undergoers since they may also be marked by *no* or *do* (see Reid (1966:25,28)).

7. Conclusion

Tagalog facts have been notoriously difficult to accommodate in both formal and functional approaches to universal grammar. In the present paper an alternative view of the Tagalog facts is advanced. It includes the following interrelated claims:

- Tagalog clause structure is basically equational (rather than verbal).
- A distinction between the syntactic categories noun and verb is only weakly grammaticalized, but the lexical semantic classes, event expressions and entity expressions, clearly exist as shown by the fact that they are sometimes formally (suprasegmentally) marked.
- There is no grammaticalized argument structure due to the weak grammaticalization of the syntactic category 'verb'. That is, full words lack inherent morphosyntactic relationality. There is, therefore, neither agreement nor government.
- The lack of argument structure (and government) is compensated in Tagalog by the frequent and elaborate use of orientation marking (in other words, orientation marking is

the functional equivalent of argument structure in Tagalog). Orientation marking is the derivational process that allows one to derive from a given base-form a form that denotes one of the participants involved in the state of affairs denoted by the base-form. Orientation marking is a common process in many other languages, but it is usually restricted to nominalisations. In Tagalog, nearly all full words allow for orientated formations, although many differences exist as to the productivity and frequency of these formations with regard to particular items.

- Orientation marking is inherently limited to one participant per clause (no expression can be orientated at the same time towards the actor and the goal!). This participant, if expressed, must appear as the predication base. Other participants may be introduced either as genitives or as obliques.
- Evidence exists that suggests that current Tagalog morphosyntax evolved from an earlier stage where syntactic categories and argument structure were more strongly grammaticalized than they are now. There are also some indications that a new grammaticalization of syntactic categories and argument structure may take place.

The purpose of the present analysis is to provide a more precise and adequate understanding and statement of the peculiarities of Tagalog morphosyntax from the point of view of universal grammar. It attempts to make Tagalog look less peculiar than in most analyses proposed so far: it exhibits functionally similar constructions in more familiar languages and hints at a possible diachronic scenario of the developments that have led to the present state of the language.

The present analysis, however, does not suggest exactly how one should accommodate the Tagalog facts in a theory of universal grammar. Instead, it points to some fundamental assumptions common to most approaches to universal grammar which require modification in order to accommodate the Tagalog facts (if the present analysis is valid). In particular, most

approaches assume that the major clause type in all languages is the verbal clause. That is, clause structure is modelled on some kind of action model as exemplified by highly transitive verbs such as *kill* or *hit*.⁴⁰ Such an assumption is basically correct and works perfectly well in many languages. The Tagalog case, however, shows that the equational clause type may become the predominant clause type as well. Therefore, theories of universal grammar must provide for this possibility and for a way to capture those features just listed which are inherently correlated with the equational clause type (in particular, the weak grammaticalization of syntactic categories and argument structure, and the elaborate use of orientation marking). Note that if the diachronic scenario hinted at above is correct, the verbal and the equational clause types (and their respective correlates) are not of equal standing. The predominance of the latter in a given language may instead be considered as an unusual yet possible case within a theory of universal grammar based in essence on the former. This implies the prediction that morphosyntactic constellations as evidenced by Tagalog are inherently unstable. Evidence from other Philippine languages (not dealt with in this paper) supports this view: in the closely related language Kapampangan, for example, a system of person agreement marking has evolved (see Mirikitani 1972).

40 See Croft (1991 Chapt. 4) for a very recent example of a functional approach of this kind. Generally, all dependency based models of grammar are clearly based on such an action model (see Matthews (1981:124) for a brief illustration). But also all modern varieties of phrase structure grammars invoke such a model, insofar as they incorporate argument structure.

Abbreviations

ACT	ACTOR
ASSOC	ASSOCIATIVE
DAT	DATIVE
CAUS	CAUSATIVE
DEM	DEMONSTRATIVE
GEN	GENITIVE
IPRF	IMPERFECTIVE
GER	GERUND
IRR	IRREALIS
LK	LINKER
LOC	LOCATIVE
NEG	NEGATION
PL	PLURAL
PM	PREDICATE MARKER
PN	PROPER NOUN
PRF	PERFECTIVE
RDP	REDUPLICATION
REAL	REALIS
REF	REFERENTIAL (PHRASE)
SG	SINGULAR
STAT	STATIVE
UG	UNDERGOER
i	indirect
t	thematic

References

- Adams, Karen L. & Manaster-Ramer, Alexis, 1988, "Some Questions of Topic/Focus Choice in Tagalog", in: *Oceanic Linguistics* XXVII: 79-101
- Bautista, Maria Lourdes S., 1983, "Word Order in Tagalog Child Language", in: *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 14/1:25-44
- Blake, Barry J., 1988, "Tagalog and the Manila-Mt Isa Axis", in: *La Trobe Working Papers in Linguistics* No.1, Melbourne: La Trobe University, 77-90
- Blake, Frank R., 1906, "Expression of case by the verb in Tagalog", in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 27:183-189
- Blake, Frank R., 1925, *A Grammar of the Tagalog Language*, New Haven: American Oriental Society (= American Oriental Series 1)
- Bloomfield, Leonard, 1917, *Tagalog Texts with Grammatical Analysis*, Urbana: The Univ. of Illinois (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature Vol.III 2-4)
- Bybee, Joan L., 1985, *Morphology*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins
- Capell, Arthur, 1964, "Verbal systems in Philippine languages", in: *Philippine Journal of Science*, 93:231-249
- Carrier-Duncan, Jill, 1985, "Linking of Thematic Roles in Derivational Word Formation", in: *Linguistic Inquiry* 16:1-34
- Comrie, Bernard, 1981, "Aspect and Voice: Some Reflections on Perfect and Passive", in: Tedeschi & Zaenen (eds.), 65-78
- Comrie, Bernard (ed.), 1987, *The World's Major Languages*. London/Sydney: Croom Helm
- Comrie, Bernard & Thompson, Sandra A., 1985, "Lexical nominalization", in: Shopen (ed.) Vol. III:349-398
- Cooreman, Ann, Fox, Barbara & Givón, Talmy, 1984, "The discourse definition of ergativity", in: *Studies in Language* 8:1-34
- Cooreman, Ann, Fox, Barbara & Givón, Talmy, 1988, "The discourse definition of ergativity: A study in Chamarro and Tagalog Texts", in: McGinn (ed.), 387-425
- Croft, William, 1991, *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations*, Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press
- Cruz, Emilita L., 1975, *A Subcategorization of Tagalog Verbs*, Quezon City: University of the Philippines (= The Archive Spec.Mono.No.2)
- Cumming, Susanna, 1986, "Word Order Change in Malay", in: Geraghty et. al. (eds.), 97-111
- Declerck, Renaat, 1988, *Studies on Copular Sentences, Clefts and Pseudo-Clefts*, Leuven University Press and Dordrecht: Foris
- DeLancey, Scott, 1982, "Aspect, transitivity and viewpoint", in: Hopper (ed.), 167-184
- DeWolf, Charles M., 1979, *Sentential Predicates: A Cross-Linguistic Analysis*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii dissertation

- DeWolf, Charles M., 1988, "Voice in Austronesian languages of Philippine type: passive, ergative, or neither?", in: Shibatani (ed.), 143-193
- Di Sciullo, Anna-Maria & Williams, Edwin, 1987, *On the Definition of Word*, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press
- Drossard, Werner, 1983, "Kasusrollen im Tagalog: ein intrasprachliches Kontinuum der Kontrolle", in: *akup 53*, Beiträge zum Problembereich Skalen und Kontinua, Köln, 67-98
- Drossard, Werner, 1984, *Das Tagalog als Repräsentant des aktivistischen Sprachbaus*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr
- DuBois, John W., 1987, "The discourse basis of ergativity", in: *Language* 63:805-955
- Durie, Mark, 1987, "Grammatical Relations in Acehnese", in: *Studies in Language* 11:365-399
- Foley, William A., 1976, *Comparative Syntax in Austronesian*, UMI Michigan
- Foley, William A., 1991, "The lexical basis of argument structure in Western Austronesian languages", paper presented at 6ICAL, Honolulu
- Foley, William A. & van Valin, Robert D., 1984, *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*, Cambridge etc.: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Geraghty, Paul, Carrington, Lois & Wurm, Stephen A. (eds.), 1986, *FOCAL: papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, Canberra (PL C-94)
- Gerdts, Donna B., 1988, "Antipassive and Causative in Ilokano: Evidence for an Ergative Analysis", in: McGinn (ed.), 295-321
- Gonzales, Andrew B., 1971, "The Tagalog Nasal Ligature: A Reinterpretation", in: *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 2/1:28-43
- Gonzales, Andrew B. (ed.), 1973, *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez*, Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines
- Grimshaw, Jane, 1990, *Argument Structure*, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press (= Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 18)
- Guzman, Videia P. de, 1978, *Syntactic Derivation of Tagalog Verbs*, Honolulu: Univ. Press of Hawaii (= Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication 16)
- Guzman, Videia P. de, 1982, "The focus constituent as subject of identificational sentences", *Calgary Working Papers in Linguistics* 8
- Guzman, Videia P. de, 1988, "Ergative Analysis for Philippine Languages: An Analysis", in: McGinn (ed.), 323-345
- Guzman, Videia P. de, 1991, "Inflectional Morphology in the Lexicon: Evidence from Tagalog", in: *Oceanic Linguistics* XXX:33-56
- Halim, Amran, Carrington, Lois & Wurm, Stephen A. (eds.), 1982, *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, Vol. 1-4, Canberra (PL C-74-78)
- Heinz, Sieglinde & Wandruszka, Ulrich (eds.), 1982, *Fakten und Theorien. Beiträge zur romanischen und allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft* (=FS Stimm), Tübingen: Narr

- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P., 1987, *Morphosyntax und Morphologie - Die Ausrichtungsaffixe im Tagalog*, München: Fink (Studien zur Theoretischen Linguistik Bd. 8)
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P., 1991, "Person Marking and Grammatical Relations in Sulwaesi", to appear in: Steinhauer, H. (ed.), *Papers in Western Austronesian Linguistics No. 5*, Canberra: Pacific Linguistics
- Hoekstra, Eric, 1986, "On the structural position in Tagalog", in: *Lingua* 70:41-56
- Hopper, Paul (ed.), 1982, *Tense and Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins
- Hopper, Paul & Thompson, Sandra A., 1980, "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse", in: *Language* 56:251-299
- Hopper, Paul & Thompson, Sandra A., 1984, "The Discourse Basis for Lexical Categories in Universal Grammar", in: *Language* 60:703-752
- Jackendoff, Ray, 1990, *Semantic Structures*, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press (= Current Studies in Linguistics 18)
- Keenan, Edward L., 1976, "Towards a Universal Definition of 'Subject'", in: Li (ed.), 305-333
- Kroeger, Paul R., 1988, "Verbal Focus in Kimaragang", in: Steinhauer, Hein (ed.), *Papers in Western Austronesian Linguistics No.3*, Canberra: Pacific Linguistics (Series A-78), 217-240
- Lefebvre, Claire, 1991, "Take serial Verb Constructions in Fon", in: Lefebvre (ed.) 37-78
- Lefebvre, Claire (ed.), 1991, *Serial Verbs: Grammatical, Comparative and Cognitive Approaches*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins (=SSLS 8)
- Lehmann, Christian, 1982, "Universal and typological aspects of agreement", in: Seiler, H. & F.J. Stachowiak (eds.), 201-267
- Lehmann, Christian, 1984, *Der Relativsatz*, Tübingen
- Lehmann, Christian, 1985, "On Grammatical Relationality", in: *Folia Linguistica* XIX/1-2:67-109
- Lemaréchal, Alain, 1982, "Sémantisme des parties du discours et sémantisme des relations". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 77/1, 1-39
- Li, Charles N. (ed.), 1976, *Subject and Topic*, New York etc.: Academic Press
- Llamzon, Teodoro A., 1973, "The four focus transformations of Tagalog", in: Gonzales (ed.), 168-183
- Llamzon, Teodoro A., 1976, *Modern Tagalog: A Functional-Structural Description*, The Hague/Paris: Mouton (= *Janua Linguarum, Series Practica* 122)
- Lopez, Cecilio, 1937, "Preliminary Study of the Affixes in Tagalog", in: Lopez 1977:28-104
- Lopez, Cecilio, 1977, *Selected Writings in Philippine Linguistics*, E.Constantino (ed.), Quezon City
- Mallinson, Graham & Blake, Barry J., 1981, *Language Typology. Crosslinguistic studies in syntax*, Amsterdam: North-Holland Public. Comp.
- Matsuda French, KOLEEN, 1988a, "The focus system in Philippine languages: A historical overview", in: *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 18/19:1-29

- Matsuda French, Koleen, 1988b, *Insights into Tagalog. Reduplication, Infixation, and Stress from Nonlinear Phonology*, Dallas: The Summer Institute of Linguistics and The University of Texas at Arlington (= Publications in Linguistics No. 84)
- Matthews, Peter H., 1981, *Syntax*, Cambridge etc.: Cambridge Univ. Press
- McFarland, Curtis D., 1976, *A Provisional Classification of Tagalog Verbs*, Tokio <Study of Lang.&Cult. of Asia&Africa MS No.8>
- McGinn, Richard, 1988, "Government and Case in Tagalog", in: McGinn (ed.), 275-293
- McGinn, Richard (ed.), 1988, *Studies in Austronesian linguistics*, Athens, Ohio: Center for International Studies (= Ohio University Monographs in International Studies, Southeast Asia Series 76)
- McKaughan, Howard P., 1973, "Subject versus Topic", in: Gonzales (ed.), 206-213
- Milner, George B., 1980, "On the centrality of Austronesian syntax", in: Naylor (ed.), 1-17
- Mirikitani, Leatrice T., 1972, *Kapampangan Syntax*, Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii (= Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 10)
- Müller, Friedrich, 1882, *Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft. II. Band II. Abt. Die Sprachen der Schlichthaarigen Rassen*, Wien: Alfred Hölder
- Naylor, Paz B., 1975, "Topic, focus, and emphasis in the Tagalog verbal clause", in: *Oceanic Linguistics* 14:12-79
- Naylor, Paz B., 1980, "Linking, Relation-Marking, and Tagalog Syntax", in: Naylor (ed.), 33-49
- Naylor, Paz B., 1986, "On the pragmatics of focus", in: Geraghty et al. (eds.) *Focal I*:43-57
- Naylor, Paz B. (ed.), 1980, *Austronesian Syntax. Papers from the Second Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages [Ann Arbor 1976]*. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies (= Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia No. 15),
- Panganiban, José V., 1972, *Diksyunario-Tesouro Pilipino-Ingles*, Quezon City
- Payne, Thomas E., 1982, "Role and reference related subject properties and ergativity in Yup'ik Eskimo and Tagalog", in: *Studies in Language* 6:75-106
- Ramos, Teresita V., 1971, *Tagalog Structures*, Honolulu: Univ. Press of Hawaii
- Ramos, Teresita V., 1974, *The Case system of Tagalog verbs*, Canberra: Pacific Linguistics (Series B-27)
- Ramos, Teresita V., 1975, "The Role of Verbal Features in the Subcategorization of Tagalog Verbs", in: *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 6/1:1-24
- Reid, Lawrence A., 1966, *An Ivatan Syntax*, Honolulu: Pacific and Asian Linguistics Institute (= Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 2)
- Santos, Vito C., 1983, *Pilipino-English Dictionary*, 2.rev.edit., Metro Manila

- Sasse, Hans-Jürgen, 1982, "Subjektprominenz", in: Heinz & Wandruszka (eds.), 267-286
- Schachter, Paul, 1976, "The Subject in Philippine Languages, Topic, Actor, Actor-Topic or None of the Above", in: Li (ed.), 491-518.
- Schachter, Paul, 1987, "Tagalog", in: Comrie (ed.), 936-958
- Schachter, Paul & Otnes, Fe T., 1972, *Tagalog Reference Grammar*, Berkeley etc.: Univ. of California Press
- Scheerer, Otto, 1924, "On the Essential Difference Between the Verbs of the European and the Philippine Languages", in: *Philippine Journal of Education* 7:1-10
- Seiler, Hansjakob, 1986, *Language, Object and Order. The Universal Dimension of Apprehension*, Tübingen (= LUS 1/III)
- Seiler, Hansjakob & Stachowiak, Franz-Joseph (eds.), 1982, *Apprehension. Das sprachliche Erfassen von Gegenständen*, Teil II.: Die Techniken und ihr Zusammenhang in Einzelsprachen, Tübingen (= LUS 1/II)
- Seiler, Hansjakob & Premper, Waldfried (eds.), 1991, *Partizipation. Das sprachliche Erfassen von Sachverhalten*, Tübingen (= LUS 6)
- Serzisko, Fritz, 1991, "Orientierung", in: Seiler & Premper (eds.), 273-308
- Serzisko, Fritz, 1992, *Sprechhandlung und Pause*, to appear in *Linguistische Arbeiten*, Tübingen: Niemeyer
- Shibatani, Masayoshi, 1988, "Voice in Philippine languages", in: Shibatani (ed.), 85-142
- Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.), 1988, *Passive and Voice*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins (= Typological Studies in Language 16)
- Shopen, Timothy (ed.), 1985, *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, III Vols., Cambridge UP
- Sneddon, James, 1975, *Tondano Phonology and Grammar*, Canberra (= PL B-38)
- Spencer, Andrew, 1991, *Morphological Theory*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Starosta, Stanley, 1986, "Focus as Recentralisation", in: Geraghty et al. (eds.), 73-95
- Starosta, Stanley, 1991, "Ergativity, transitivity, and clitic coreference in four Western Austronesian languages", paper presented at 6ICAL, Honolulu
- Starosta, Stanley, Pawley, Andrew K. & Reid, Lawrence A., 1982, "The evolution of focus in Austronesian", in: Halim et al. (eds.) *TICAL* 2:145-170
- Tedeschi, Philip J. & Zaenen, Annie (eds.), 1981, *Tense and Aspect*, New York et al.: Academic Press (= Syntax and Semantics 14)
- Tsunoda, Tasaku, 1981, "Split case-marking patterns in verb types and tense-aspect-mood", in: *Linguistics* 19:389-438
- van Valin, Robert D., 1981, "Grammatical Relations in Ergative Languages", in: *Studies in Language* 5:361-394
- Walter, Heribert, 1981, *Studien zur Nomen-Verb-Distinktion aus typologischer Sicht*, München: Fink
- Wolfenden, Elmer, 1961, *A Re-statement of Tagalog Grammar*, Manila: SIL and Institute of National Language
- Wolff, John U., 1987, "Bloomfield as an Austronesianist", in: *Historiographica Linguistica* XIV:173-178

Von 1968 an erschienen die von Prof. Dr. Hansjakob Seiler herausgegebenen Arbeitspapiere des Instituts für Sprachwissenschaft. Nach der Emeritierung von Prof. Dr. Seiler im März 1986 wurde eine neue Folge mit neuer Zählung und dem Zusatz "Neue Folge" (N.F.) begonnen. Herausgeber ist das Institut für Sprachwissenschaft. Die in beiden Folgen erschienenen Titel werden jeweils am Schluß der Publikationen aufgeführt. Die mit einem Stern bezeichneten Arbeitspapiere sind noch vorrätig.

1. Seiler, H. (1968): Grundzüge der Allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft. Erster Teil: Generative Grammatik. Ausarbeitung der Vorlesung SS 1967
2. (1969): Zur Gestaltung eines Studienführers für Studenten der Sprachwissenschaft unter Berücksichtigung einer sprachwissenschaftlichen Grundausbildung für Studenten benachbarter Disziplinen
3. Seiler, H. & Scheffczyk, A. (1969): Die Sprechsituation in Linguistik und Kommunikationswissenschaft. Referat einer Diskussion
4. Katičić, R. & Blümel, W. (1969): Die sprachliche Zeit
- *5. Brettschneider, G. (1969): Das Aufstellen einer morphophonematischen Kartei (illustriert an der Morphophonematik des japanischen Verbs)
6. Penčev, J. (1969): Einige semantische Besonderheiten der bulgarischen Geschmacksadjektive
7. Seiler, H. (1969): Zur Problematik des Verbalaspekts
8. Gottwald, K. (1970): Auswahlbibliographie zur kontrastiven Linguistik
9. Ibañez, R. (1970): Emphase und der Bereich der Negation Satz- vs. Satzgliednegation
10. Penčev, J. (1970): Die reflexiven, medialen und passiven Sätze im Bulgarischen
11. Untermann, J. (1970): Protokoll eines Kolloquiums über die Situation des Faches Indogermanistik, veranstaltet auf Einladung des Instituts für Sprachwissenschaft, Köln am 30.01.1970, 11:15 - 13:00 Uhr
12. Seiler, H. (1970): Abstract Structures for Moods in Greek
13. Bäcker, J. (1970): Untersuchungen zum Phonemsystem und zur Nominalflexion im Litauischen (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Akzentwechsels in der Nominalflexion)
14. Rosenkranz, B. (1970): Georg von der Gabelentz und die junggrammatische Schule
15. Samuelsdorff, P. (1971): Problems of English-German Automatic Translation
16. Rosenkranz, B. (1971): Zur Entstehung der indogermanischen Verbalflexion
17. Babinotis, G. (1971): Phonologische Betrachtungen zum Wandel a zu e im Ionisch-Attischen
18. Seiler, H. (1971): Possessivität und Universalien. Zwei Vorträge gehalten im Dezember 1971: I. Zum Problem der Possessivität im Cahuilla (Uto-Aztekisch, Südkalifornien), II. Possessivität und Universalien
19. Maas, U. (1972): Semantik für Sprechakte
20. Seiler, H. (1972): Zum Problem der sprachlichen Possessivität
21. Leys, O. (1972): Nicht-referentielle Nominalphrasen
22. Pisarkowa, K. (1973): Possessivität als Bestandteil des polnischen Sprachsystems
- *23. Brettschneider, G. & Lehmann, Ch. (1974): Der Schlagwortkatalog des Instituts für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Köln
24. Wiesemann, U. (1974): Time Distinctions in Kaingang
25. Untermann, J. (1975): Etymologie und Wortgeschichte
- *26. Seiler, H. u.a. (1975): Deskriptive und etikettierende Benennung; Relativkonstruktionen (Becker, Katz, Walter, Habel, Schwendy, Kirsch, Clasen, Seip)
27. Lehmann, Ch. (1975): Sprache und Musik in einem Schumann/Heine-Lied
28. Stephany, U. (1975): Linguistic and Extralinguistic Factors in the Interpretation of Children's Early Utterances
29. van den Boom, H. & Samuelsdorff, P. (1976): "Aspects"-Kommentar. Protokolle eines Seminars aus dem WS 1975/76
30. Walter, H. (1976): Gapping, Wortstellung und Direktionalitätshypothese
31. Ojo, V. (1976): Linguistische und soziolinguistische Aspekte der Entlehnung
32. (1976): Diskussion von Roman Jakobson mit Professoren und Studenten der Uni Köln

33. Samuelsdorff, P. (1977): On Describing Determination in a Montague Grammar
34. Auer, P. & Kuhn, W. (1977): Implikative Universalien, linguistische Prinzipien und Sprachtypologie
35. Lehmann, Ch. (1978): Der Relativsatz im Persischen und Deutschen; ein funktional-kontrastiver Vergleich
- *36. Stephany, U. (1978): The Modality Constituent: A Neglected Area in the Study of First Language Acquisition
- *37. Lehmann, Ch. (1980): Guidelines for Interlinear Morphemic Translation. A proposal for a standardization
38. Biermann, A. (1980): Nominalinkorporation
39. Kukuczka, E. (1982): Verwandtschaft, Körperteile und Besitz. Zur Possession im Tamil
40. Paul, W. (1982): Die Koverben im Chinesischen (with an English summary)
- *41. Schlögel, S. (1983): Zum Passiv im Türkischen
- *42. Breidbach, W. (1983): Zur Possession im Samoanischen
- *43. Stephany, U. (1983): The development of modality in language acquisition
- *44. Seiler, H. Die Indianersprachen Nordamerikas. Ausarbeitung der Vorlesung SS 1980
- *45. Kukuczka, E. (1984): Lokalrelationen und Postpositionen im Tamil
46. Simons, B. (1984): Sprachliche Strukturen der Lokalität im Dakota
- *47. Pustet, R. (1985): Possession im Dakota
- *48. Schlögel, S. (1985): Die Kausativierung im Türkischen
- *49. Premper, W. (1986): Kollektion im Arabischen
- *50. Fachner, Regine (1986): Der Relativsatz im Bambara
- *51. Pustet, Regina (1986): Zur Frage der Universalität des "Subjekts": Das Ayacucho-Quechua
- *52. Reichert, Christoph (1986): Verteilung und Leistung der Personalaffixe im Ungarischen

Neue Folge:

1. Hofmann, Gudrun (1986): Zum Verständnis epistemischer Modalausdrücke des Deutschen im Kindergartenalter
- *2. Breidbach, Winfried (1986): Die Verben mit der Bedeutung 'weggehen' im Althochdeutschen
- *3. Haspelmath, Martin (1987): Verbal nouns or verbal adjectives? The case of the Latin gerundive and gerund
4. Mosel, Ulrike (1987): Inhalt und Aufbau deskriptiver Grammatiken (How to write a grammar)
5. Haspelmath, Martin (1987): Transitivity alternations of the anticausative type
- *6. Breidbach, Winfried (1988): Die Schiffsbezeichnungen des Alt- und Mittelhochdeutschen. Ein onomasiologisches und etymologisches Glossar
7. Haase, Martin (1988): Der baskische Relativsatz auf dem Kontinuum der Nominalisierung
- *8. Thomadaki, Evangelia (1988): Neugriechische Wortbildung
- *9. Sasse, Hans-Jürgen (1988): Der irokesische Sprachtyp
- *10. Haase, Martin (1989): Komposition und Derivation: Ein Kontinuum der Grammatikalisierung
- *11. Baumann, Monika (1989): Die Integration englischer Lehnwörter in die samoanische Sprache. Das Verhalten der englischen Konsonantenphoneme
- *12. Sasse, Hans-Jürgen (1990): Theory of Language Death; Language Decay and Contact-Induced Change: Similarities and Differences
- *13. Schulze-Berndt, Eva (1991): Phonetische Substanz und phonologische Theorie. Eine Fallstudie zum Erstspracherwerb des Deutschen.
- *14. Sasse, Hans-Jürgen (Hg.) (1991): Aspektsysteme.