INSTITUT FÜR SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT
UNIVERSITÄT ZU KÖLN

ARBEITSPAPIER NR. 19 (Neue Folge)

The Systematization of Tagalog Morphosyntax

Werner Drossard

Juli 1994

Abbreviations

AF	agent focus
AFF	affective focus
BF	benefactive focus
CeeF	causee focus
CF	cause focus
CRCF	causative reciprocal focus
CRF	cause reciprocal focus
DF	directional focus
ECF	experiencer cause focus
EF	experiencer focus
EFO	experiencer focus with a local complement
GF	goal focus
IF	instrumental focus
impf	imperfective
INV.ACF	involuntary actor focus
FIN	final (conjunction)
LF	locative focus
LK	linking particle
non-T	non-topic
OF	object focus
PA	personal article
perf	perfective
RCF	reciprocal focus
stat	stative
TOP	topic

1. Introductory Remarks

In the last two decades Philippine languages, and of these especially Tagalog, have acquired a prominent place in linguistic theory. A central role in this discussion was played by two papers written by Schachter (1976 and 1977), who was inspired by Keenan's article on the subject from 1976. The most recent contributions on this topic have been from de Wolff (1988) and Shibatani (1988), both of which were published in a collection of essays, edited by Shibatani, with the title *Passive and Voice*. These works, and several works in-between, deal with the focus system specific to Philippine languages. The main discussion centers around the fact that Philippine languages contain a basic set of 5 to 7 affix focus forms. Their exact number varies not only in the secondary literature, but in the primary sources, i.e. Tagalog grammars, as well, where considerable differences in the number of affix focus forms can be found. All of these works, however, do agree on one point: the Philippine focus system basically consists of agent, patient (=goal or object), benefactive, locative, and instrumental affix forms. Schachter/Otanes (1972) list a number of further forms, and in Drossard (1983 and 1984) we tried to show (in an attempt similar to those of Sapir 1917 and Klimov 1977) that the main criterion for a systematization of the Philippine focus system consists in the difference between the active and stative domains, an attempt which in our opinion was largely misunderstood (cf. the brief remarks in Shibatani (1988) and de Wolff (1988)). The present paper is thus, on the one hand, an attempt to repeat and clarify our earlier position, and on the other, a further step towards such a systematization. A first step in this direction was an article on resultativity in Tagalog from 1991. In the present paper this approach will be extended to reciprocity. In the process we will show that it is valid to make a distinction between an active (=controlled action) vs. a stative (=limited controlled action) domain. First, however, we will take a brief look at what makes up the active and stative voice systems.

2. Two voice systems: active vs. stative

In the following we will use the term active to denote controlled actions, i.e. those actions which are performed by the actor on purpose or under his or her conscious control. As opposed to this we will employ the term stative for:

a) those actions in which the conscious/purposeful control of the actor is limited

b) certain roles which by means of their marking are already coded as "non-actional" (e.g. EXPeriencer)

2.1 The active voice system

As described above Philippine languages are often said to have a minimal focus system consisting of agent, patient, benefactive, locative, and instrumental affix forms. This minimal system corresponds to the active voice system which by means of minor additions can be expanded and, depending on the source, may be subject to terminological differences. Thus, a good deal of variation exists in the quantity and quality of the focus forms found in the individual grammars.

In the following we will start from the assumption that the active focus system is made up of the following three basic agent affixes: *mag-*, *-um-*, and *mang-*. On the basis of these three forms, a series of "affix correspondence classes", as proposed by Schachter/Otanes (1972: 293ff), can be established, differentiated according to whether they are two or three place verbs. In this case we find that — depending on the verb class involved — patient focus forms (or, as Schachter/Otanes call them, object focus forms) have a relatively wide semantic range. They may add: 1) an *-an* suffix (e.g. to *anyaya* "to invite", *laba* "to wash", *walis* "to sweep"); 2) an *i-* prefix (to *handa* "to prepare", *luto* "to cook"); 3) the suffix *-in*, the latter probably being the most commonly used patient affix (to *hiwa* "to cut", *dala* "to pull"). In addition, we also occasionally find the prefix *ipag-*, an affix which is normally used to express benefactive focus (e.g. with *kanulo* "to deceive"), as well as *pag-...-an* (with *tiis* "to endure"). Semantic criteria, of course, determine the exact choice of the affix form used. In general grammatical summaries, only *one* verb form is usually given, i.e. one belonging to a particular verb class and thus to a particular focus form. This is not normally, however, misleading, since in most cases it is an attempt to demonstrate the morphosyntactic mechanisms of the language. In all of the above examples, i.e. with *-in*, *-an*, etc., focusing the object does not change the overall active character of the sentence. The focus system is a pragmatic-discourse regulated system that shifts the topic (or, as Foley/van Valin (1977) call it, the prominent peak) of the sentence to an object in order to move the emphasis from the peak of a no longer focused but still existing controlling agent to the object affected by it (cf. Drossard 1984). Thus, a sentence with benefactive focus maintains its active character. Putting it simply: who would be the beneficiary of an action if there was no "benefitter" (=agent)? Benefactive focus affix forms are generally listed as having an *i-* prefix (corresponding to verbs with an *-um-* stem) or an *ipag-* prefix (for *mag-* verbs). Considering the fact that these verbs have a triple valency (=three slots), we may also view the third slot as an indirect object (in the broadest sense). This grammatical relation of indirect object also applies to the directional focus of Schachter/Otanes and the locative focus of Ramos (1971,1974), respectively. These latter forms also differ in affixation: *-an* (for *abot* "to give something"), *-in* (for *alok* "to offer something"), *pag-...-an* (for *mag-bili* "to sell"). Instrumental focus can only be expressed by means of one affix: *ipang-*.

We thus arrive at a classical five-part system which, with the help of artificially constructed sentences, can be depicted in various ways, all of which confirm the system's basic premises. Let us cite a few examples from Schacher/Otanes (1972):

Example: *bigay* "to give"

1a)

AF: Nag-bigay siya sa akin   ng sulat
     AF-give   3sg   LOK 1sg   LK letter
     perf   TOP
     "He gave me a letter"

1b)

OF: B-in-igay   niya   sa akin   ang sulat
     OF-give   3sg   LOK 1 sg   TOP letter
     perf   nonT
     "He gave me the letter"

1c)

DF: B-in-igy-an niya   ako ng sulat
     DF-give   3sg   1sg LK letter
     perf   nonT   TOP
     "He gave me a/the letter."

For Schacher/Otanes the last example demonstrates how "directional focus" focuses the addressee of an action. Furthermore, in these examples we find the three basic constituents of a Tagalog sentence: a) the topic with *ang* for common nouns (*si* for personal names and the corresponding *"ang"* pronouns for 1sg, 2sg, etc., i.e. *ako* for 1sg), b) the *ng* slot which as the second most important syntactic position introduces, *inter alia*, a non-focused object (and like *ang* has special forms for the personal article and pronouns), and finally c) the *sa* complement (with its own special forms for the personal article and pronouns) on the basis of which further syntactic positions may be created such as *para sa* for benefactives or *dahil sa* for causal relations.

Thus, the active domain may be systematized as follows (with OF=PF, DF=LF):

AF: *mag, -um-, mang-*
PF: *-in, -an, i-*
BF   *i-, ipag-*
LF: *-an, -in-*
IF   *ipang-*

As mentioned above it must be remembered that, statistically, the majority of object focus forms are expressed by means of *-in* affixes, whereas the majority of locative focus

forms use *-an*. This latter fact is of particular importance for establishing corresponden-
ces in the stative voice system.

2.2 The stative voice system

2.2.1 Fixed stative marking

With the idea of fixed stative marking we mean that there are a considerable number of
verbs which only take stative coding, i.e. a *ma-* affix. This group is especially made up of
those verbs which express uncontrolled actions or feelings (INV-AG or EXP). Thus,
whereas it is theoretically possible to stativize every active verb (i.e. those containing an
-um-, *mag-*, or *mang-* affix), there are a certain number of verbs, which do not allow for
-um-, *mag-* or *mang-* affixation, i.e. are restricted to their inherently stative *ma-* form.
Since such verbs have generally been neglected, if not to say ignored, in the scientific lite-
rature, the following should only be taken as a representative sample:

MA-

-awa "to pity, have pity on", *-bakla'* "to become worried about", *-bako* "to fall into a
hole, to have a disappointment", *-bahala'* "to be worried", *-bahaw* "to heal, to be
healed", *-baliw* "to be crazy", *-bigala* "to be surprised, astounded", *-bugnot* "to lose
one's temper", *-habag* "to pity", *-hilo* "to become dizzy", etc.

A quick glance tells us that this list contains one and two place verbs. As our
"experience" with the active voice system shows, two or more place verbs are characte-
rized by focus variation. This means: if *-um-* or *mag-* affixes are the basis of certain ben-
efactive, locative, or instrumental forms and these regularities can be related to "affix cor-
respondence classes", then the *ma-* base may serve as the starting point for further vari-
ants, which, together with *ma-*, themselves constitute "affix correspondence classes". If
we assume that *ma-* in the context of two-place verbal relations always focuses a limited
affixed object then the variants are in every case — in the sense of Foley/van Valin
(1984) — modifications of an ACTOR role.

The first major correspondence is between *ma-* and *maka-*.

2.2.1.1 "EXPeriencer" focus (=EF)

The standard example is the verb for "to see". If the thing being perceived is focused, the affix *ma-* is used:

2a) Na-kita mo   ba ang aksidente?
     OF-see   2sg Q TOP accident
     perf/stat   nonT
     "Did you see the accident?"

If the EXPeriencer is focused we get:

2b) Naka-kita ka   ba ng aksidente?
     EF-see   2sg   Q LK accident
     perf/stat   TOP
     "Did you see an accident?"

To this *ma-* : *maka-* correspondence belong *dinig* "to hear", *halata, pansin* "to notice, become aware of".

2.2.1.2 CAUSE (or natural force) focus (=CF)

Here we find a correspondence between *ma-* : *ika-*. *ma-* again focuses the object, whereas with *ika-* it is the cause (or natural force):

3a) Na-sira¹   ng bugso   ang dampa
     OF-destroy   LK storm   TOP hut
     perf/stat
     "A storm destroyed the hut"

3b) I-k-in-a-sira¹   ng dampa ang bugso
     CF-destroy   LK hut   TOP storm
     perf/stat
     "The storm destroyed a/the hut"

It should be noted that *sira¹* — if used with an agent in complete control of the situation — is always an *-um-* verb. Thus, the opposition *s-um-ira¹* vs. *ika-sira¹* (human causer vs. non-human causer) serves once more as a means of showing the fine line that separates the coding of the active and stative voice systems.

2.2.1.3 "EXP-CAUSE" focus (=ECF)

A correspondence exists between *ma-* and *ka-...-an* affix forms. In the first example a *sa* complement is added to an EXP verb in order to express the "object" that feelings are being shown for. With a *ka-...-an* affix, the *sa* complement advances to topic position and becomes part of an "EXP-CAUSE" construction:

4a) Na-awa sila   sa pulubi
     EF-pity 3pl   LOK beggar
     perf/stat TOP
     "They felt pity towards a/the beggar"

4b) K-in-a-awa-an nila   ang pulubi
     ECF-pity   3pl   TOP beggar
     perf/stat   nonT
     "They pitied the beggar" or "The beggar caused them to feel pity"

Schachter/Otanes (ibid:314 ff) list the *ka-...-an* affix within the framework of a more general AF-LF (agent focus vs. locative focus) correspondence, i.e. as part of the same affix correspondence which includes *um-* : *pag-...-an* or *mag-* : *pag-...-an*.

Our distinction, however, between an active and a stative domain provides us with a more plausible solution. Since the *ka-* affix is often used in order to express actor relations (as, for example, in cause focus constructions, but also in EXP focus constructions), *ka-...-an* forms should be seen as expressing EXP- CAUSE focus, i.e. an actor role instead of the locative role proposed by Schachter/Otanes.

Verbs which behave similarly to *awa* are *gulat* "to be surprised", *inis* "to be annoyed", *galit* "to become angry", *tuwa* "to be happy about sth."

2.2.2 "Shifting" from active to stative

A fundamental and characteristic feature of Tagalog (and other Philippine languages) is the fact that it differentiates between purposefully and non-purposefully performed actions, on the one hand, and between spontaneously performed actions and those accomplished "with effort" on the other. From a morphological point of view, active codings are "shifted" to stative codings. Since in many cases we are dealing with two-place verbs, the following correspondences arise.

2.2.2.1 The INV-ACTOR focus (=INV.ACF)

Here again a *ma-* affix form is the basis upon which an object affected by an agent with limited control is focused, while a *maka* prefix — identical to the one used for EXP focus — focuses an INV.ACTOR:

5a) Na-bagsak ng bata'   ang patalim
     OF-drop   LK child   TOP knife
     perf/stat
     "The child accidentally dropped the knife"

5b) Naka-bagsak   ng patalim   ang bata'
     INV.ACF-drop   LK knife   TOP child
     perf/stat
     "The child dropped the/a knife by accident"

The agent of a purposefully performed action would be focused by using an *-um-* affix form, i.e. *b-um-agsak*.

We should now consider how this shift from active to stative forms part of a larger system. Theoretically, every role in a sentence which is in some way connected to an agent can be put in the context of stativity.

2.2.2.2 Stativized benefactive focus

Schachter/Otanes (ibid: 330 ff) list no further affix forms for expressing "ability" or "involuntary action" other than object (=patient) focus. Bloomfield (1917: 287), on the other hand, provides us with a good example of stativized benefactive focus (which he, however, lists under "instrumental focus"):

6a,1)   Ang pagkatawag ng kura sa mga pulis ay hindi niya ikanabute,
          sapagkat sila (a)y kaunti lamang upang maipagtanggol siya sa mga magnanakaw

          "The priest's having called in the police did him no good,
           for they were too few to defend him from the thieves"

Here we find the form *ma-ipag-tanggol* in the *upang* clause:

6a,2)   upang   ma-ipag-tanggol   siya   sa mga magnanakaw
        FIN   stat-BF-defend   3sg   LOK pl thief
                                TOP
        "... in order to be able to defend <u>him</u> from the thieves"

tanggol is "normally" a *mag-* verb (thus the *ipag-* form for expressing benefactive focus). The stative variant of this verb, formed by adding a *ma-* prefix, has an "ability" connotation. Theoretically, we could shift the focus in 6a,2) from the benefactive to the object and get:

6b)   upang   ma-tanggol ang mga magnanakaw   para sa kaniya
       FIN   OF-defend   TOP pl thief   for   3sg
             stat
       "...in order to keep <u>the thieves</u> away from him"

(We have translated *tanggol* with a different lexeme in order to better emphasize the focusing of thieves.)

2.2.2.3 Locative focus forms

Analogous to what was said in the foregoing sections about stativization, it is also an obvious fact that the stativization of -an yields ma-...-an. A cursory glance at the literature shows that this affix is normally treated as a special form, e.g. in Ramos (1974), where it is called affective focus (cf. Drossard 1984). In Schachter/Otanes we find several differing interpretations of ma-...-an, and Bloomfield lists at least two forms distinguishable on the basis of accent opposition which he labels "local passive".

One of these latter forms mentioned by Bloomfield (ibid. 297), i.e. the má- ...-an affix combination (with accent), corresponds to an "ability" variant of an originally active affix form and, in some cases, may even have a "happen to" connotation. Compare:

7) Ná-putul-an   ko   ng tahid   ang kat(i)yaw
   LF-cut from   1sg   LK spur   TOP rooster
   perf/stat   nonT
   "I managed to cut off the rooster's spur"

In this example, the special active form of putul-an "to cut from", prefixed by má-, has an "ability" reading.

On the other hand, Bloomfield's non-accented form of ma-...-an corresponds to the affective focus construction described by Ramos. In this case we are dealing with a focus correspondence within the stative system itself (i.e. not one caused "by crossing the boundary" between active >>> stative).

8a) Na-matay ni Hwan   ang tatay
     OF-die   PA John   TOP father
     perf/stat nonT
     "The father of John died"

8b) Na-matay-an   ng tatay   si Hwan
     AFF-die   LK father   TOP John
     perf/stat
     "John was affected by his father's death"

More detailed studies of this latter variant of the ma-...-an form show that numerous examples can be given in which the "affectedness" of an object having a local shade of meaning (whether animate or inanimate) is expressed. In some cases it is even possible to distinguish between two different forms, i.e. an accented "happen to" and a simple AFF variant:

9a) ma-hangin-an   "to be exposed to the wind"

9b) má-hangin-an   "to happen to be exposed to the wind"

Nevertheless, the accented form does not always have to have a "happen to" reading:

má-ambag-an	"to get donations"
má-halik-an	"to get a kiss"
má-tulung-an	"to get help"
má-putik-an	"to be covered with mud"

As these examples show, the accented variant does not always transmit the idea of an adversative situation (as often claimed for examples such as 8b).

Finally, we may list a third occurrence of the *ma-...-an* form (in addition to the above "ability" and AFF variants), i.e. an object affix, listed by Schachter/Otanes under EXP focus, which focuses an object by adding *-an* to an EXP verb (which we call EFO). Schachter/Otanes list this form in connection with the affix correspondence: *ma-* : *ma-...-an* .

10a) Na-tu-tuto   siya   noon
      EF-learn   3sg/   DEM/
      impf/stat   TOP   nonT
      "<u>He</u> is learning some of that"

10b) Na-tu-tutu-han   niya   iyon
       EFO-learn   3sg/   DEM/
       impf/stat   nonT   TOP
       "He is learning <u>that</u>"

The above discussion of the *ma-...-an* affix shows that *ma-* forms, especially when used together with a second affix, do not always induce a "shift" to the stative domain, but have their own inherent semantic connotations within this system. Thus, any general attempt to systematize affix forms in Tagalog will have to vary in its choice between regularities and idiosyncracies. Nevertheless, "shifting" from active to stative does remain a regular feature of such a systematization.

2.3 Active affixes and their stativized correspondences

Correspondences between active and stative affixes may be established according to varying criteria: 1) the degree of control; 2) purposeful vs. accidental actions; 3) the idea of "factual" vs. "ability":

	Active	Stative
Agent	*-um-, mag-*	*maka-*
Object	*-in-*	*ma-*
Benefactive	*i-/ipag-*	*ma-i-, ma-ipag-*
Locative	*-an*	*ma-...-an*
Instrumental	*ipang-*	*ma-ipang*

In addition to these possible "shifts" from active to stative (e.g. *-um-*, *mag-* : *maka-* ... *ipang-* : *ma-ipang*) we also have the "fixed" form for EF mentioned above (*maka-*). As for the latter form, a cross-language comparison is enough to show how close EXP and INV.AC really are. Compare, for example, the following case marking in German:

11a) Mir   ist   aufgefallen,   daß   er   ziemlich   blaß   ist.
      1sg:DAT   be:3sg   notice: PP   that   3sg   rather   pale   be:3sg   (DAT for EXP)

11b) Mir   ist   plötzlich   das   ganze   Geschirr   hingefallen.
      1sg:DAT   be:3sg   suddenly   ART   whole   dishes   fall:PP   (DAT for INV. AC)

But now back to the diagram given above. One look at the literature on Tagalog affixes shows that Ramos (1971) — even when not expressly distinguishing between active and stative voice systems — is the one who most clearly demonstrates the interdependencies which exist between focus affixes in Tagalog. In section 3.1 ("Major affixes used in verbal formation") she lists the individual focus forms and provides an additional "distributive", "sociative", "causative", and *"aptative"* variant for each form ("Aptative" is the terminological equivalent of Schachter/Otanes' "ability" focus.). In this way, Ramos is able to systematically provide "aptative" variants of benefactive and instrumental focus forms, as for example in the following stativized instrumental variant of a "normally" active *-um-* verb (*b-um-asa*):

12)   Na-ipang-basa   niya   ng diyaryo   ang aking salamin
      BF-read   3sg/   LK paper   TOP 1sg/   glasses
      perf/stat   nonT   POSS
      "He was able to read the newspaper <u>with my glasses</u>"

3. Causativity

As suggested in the foregoing section in connection with Ramos 1971, every focus affix form has a causative variant. And again Ramos is the only source where one immedi-

ately recognizes that for every active causative form there must be — in keeping with the system we are proposing here — a stative causative variant. But first a few words about causativity in the active domain.

3.1 Causativity in the active domain

Since this subject has already been dealt with extensively in the literature a schematic overview of the pertinent active forms will suffice:

	Active	Stative
Agent	*-um-, mag-*	*mag-pa*
Object	*-in-*	*i-pa*
Benefactive	*i-/ipag-*	*ipag-pa*
Locative	*-an*	*pa-...-an*
Instrumental	*ipang-*	*ipang-pa*

The following may serve as a representative example:

13) Pa-bil-han   mo   ng tinapay   ang tindahan nila!
     LF-buy   2sg   LK bread   TOP store   3pl
     caus   nonT
     "Have (someone) buy bread <u>from their store</u>!"

3.2 Causativity in the stative domain

As Ramos has correctly shown, the "shift" from controlled actions to less controlled actions (together with the "shift" from active to stative coding) is not only limited to non-causative contexts. Within the stative domain itself various "ability" (or, as Ramos calls them, "aptative") affix forms exist for expressing causativity.

14) AF/apt

     Naka-pa-gawa   ako   ng bahay
     AF-caus-build   1sg   LK house
     perf/stat   TOP
     "<u>I</u> was able to have a house built"

15) GF (=OF or PF)/apt

     Na-pa-gawa   ko   ang bahay
     GF-caus-build   1sg   TOP house
     perf/stat   nonT
     "I was able to have <u>the house</u> built."

16) BF/apt

```
Na-i-pa-gawa        ko      siya    ng bahay
BF-caus-build       1sg     3sg     LK house
perf/stat           nonT    TOP
```
"I was able to have a house built <u>for her/him</u>"

17) LF/apt

```
Na-pa-gawa-an       ko      ng bahay    ang lupa ko
LF-caus-build       1sg     LK house    TOP lot 1sg/poss
perf/stat           nonT
```
"I was able to have a house built <u>on my lot</u>"

18) IF/apt

```
Na-ipang-pa-gawa    ko      ng bahay    ang na-ipon     ko-ng   pera
IF-caus-build       1sg     LK house    TOP PF-find     1sg-LK  money
perf/stat           nonT                    perf/stat
```
"I was able to have a house built <u>with the money I saved</u>"

As could be seen in section 2.2.2 above (esp. 2.2.2.3 on the locative), some affix forms may establish — "independently" of any system of affix correspondences — their own individual shades of meaning. This is especially true of the *ma-pa* form found in 15). Whereas in 15) it is the object which is focused in a causative context having an "ability" shade of meaning, in 19a) it is a causee that has been compelled to react by an outside circumstance:

19a)
```
Na-pa-balik         ang babae       dahil sa pagkakasakit   ng bata'
CeeF-caus-return    TOP mother      because of illness       LK child
perf
```
"<u>Mother</u> was forced to return because of the child's illness"

In such an example it is also possible to focus the cause. In this case we get the stative cause (*ika-*) focus which appeared in 3b):

19b)
```
I-k-in-a-balik      ng babae        ang pagkakasakit    ng bata'
CF-return           LK mother       TOP illness          LK child
perf/stat
```
"<u>The child's illness</u> caused mother to return"

The form given in 19a) can be explained on the basis of its own inherent logic: The *ma-* element focuses an object which is at the same time both 1) the goal of an action performed by a non-controlling actor and 2) a "causee" requiring causative morphology (-*pa*-).

The *ma-pa* form can therefore be said to have a double interpretation similar to that of *ma-...-an* (cf. sect. 2.2.2.3 above).

4. Reciprocity

One look at the scientific literature on Tagalog reveals that reciprocity — *per se* — has not yet received systematic treatment. A detailed discussion of this subject is valuable in that it allows us to further develop the systematization of Tagalog forms presented in the foregoing sections. This means that active reciprocal forms can be distinguished from their stative counterparts in both causative and non-causative contexts.

In a <u>non-causative</u> context active *mag-...-an* forms can be distinguished from stative *mag-ka-* forms.

mag-...-an (active)	denotes the reciprocity or sociativity of individuals acting with complete control
mag-ka (stative)	denotes reciprocity or sociativity

   a) between EXPeriencers

   b) between partners or entities in the same situation/position

   c) between inanimate actors

   d) between individuals acting unintentionally ("happen to") or with limited control

This general summary already suggests that the "shift" from active to stative coding is also relevant to reciprocal contexts (cf. especially variant d)).

4.1 *mag-...-an*

This active form denotes reciprocity when the inherent semantics of the word stem are "bilateral" or sociativity when they are more "monovalent" (which results in a "together" connotation):

Reciprocal:	*mag-purik-an*	"to praise each other"
	mag-tulung-an	"to help each other"
	mag-kamay-an	"to shake hands with each other"
Sociative:	*mag-alis-an*	"to leave together"
	mag-labas-an	"to go out together"
	mag-pitas-an	"to pick fruit together"

Here a simple example of the above distinction:

20a) reciprocal

Nag-halik-an   si Pedro   at   si Maria
RCF-kiss   PA P.   and   PA M.
perf   TOP   TOP
"Pedro and Maria kissed each other"

20b) sociative

Nag-iyak-an   si Pedro   at   si Maria
RCF-cry   PA P.   and   PA M.
perf   TOP   TOP
"Pedro and Maria cried together"

The form *mag-...-an* represents a special variant of agent focus in which the "collectivizing" suffix *-an* occurs. Schachter/Otanes (1972: 99) call it: "Reciprocal or joint performance", Bloomfield (1917: 257) calls it an "action of two or more actors". It is important to note here that simple suffixation of the stem with *-an* normally results in a nominal form:

um-away >>> *away-an*   "to fight" >>> "fighting together"
s-um-ulat >>> *sulat-an*   "to write" >>> "writing each other"

Adding *mag-* thus verbalizes, so to speak, this latter nominal expression.

We may now ask how focus may vary in a reciprocal context, similar to what we have described above for the non-reciprocal domain. In doing so the following questions arise:

a) What is the reciprocal focus variant of a benefactive relation?

b) What is the reciprocal focus variant of an instrumental relation?

Informants have difficulties translating a sentence such as:

"Maria and I gave each other presents"

since no special benefactive focus form exists in Tagalog for expressing a reciprocal relation. Instead, Tagalog speakers must code "iconically", i. e. the actions must be "split up":

21) I-b-in-ili ko   ng regalo si Maria at   i-b-in-ili ako   ni Maria ng regalo
     BF-buy   1sg LK present PA M.   and BF-buy   1sg/ PA M.   LK present
     perf   nonT   TOP   perf   TOP   nonT
     "I bought a present <u>for Maria</u> and Maria bought a present <u>for me</u>"

Whereas, on the one hand, Tagalog possesses no special reciprocal forms for benefactive or instrumental focusing, it is, on the other hand, able to focus causal phrases in senten-

ces which contain lexical reciprocals. But first, a relatively simple form with agent focus and a non-focused *dahil sa* phrase:

22a) Nag-away   si Ben   at   si Eddie dahil   sa   laruan
     AF-fight   PA B.   and PA E.   because of toy
     perf   TOP   TOP
     "Ben and Eddie fought because of the toy"

Focusing the *dahil sa* constituent requires either an *ika-* affix (cf. 2.2.1.2 above) or *ipag-*:

22b) I-p-in-ag-away   ni Ben   at   ni Eddie   ang laruan
     CF-fight   PA B.   and PA E.   TOP toy
     perf   nonT   nonT
     "The toy made Ben and Eddie fight"

4.2 *mag-ka*

The existence of a stative reciprocal domain can be shown by the fact that:

a) a *ma-* verb always takes an additional *ka-* affix in order to express a reciprocal or so–ciative connotation

b) actions performed with limited control, and therefore stative, also take a *mag-ka* affix

In the first case, a), there are not many *ma-* verbs which can be used in reciprocal constructions. In reciprocal EXPeriencer contexts, however, *mag-ka* forms are used:

input: *ma-galit*   "to be angry"   >>>   *mag-ka-galit*   "to quarrel with each other"
input: *ma-inggit* "to be envious" >>>   *mag-ka-inggit* "to envy each other"

A simple example:

23)   Nag-ka-galit   si Pedro   at   si Ben
     RCF-be angry   PA P.   and PA B.
     perf/stat   TOP   TOP
     "Pedro and Ben were angry at each other"

For the second argument b) we could also give an example with inanimate actors and a sociative connotation. We must however remember that, analogous to the active form with *mag-an*, the *-an* suffix is carried over to the stative domain:

24)   Sa loob   ng isa-ng ora   nag-ka-dating-an   ang apat na tren   sa estasion
     LOK inner   LK one-LK hour   RCF-arrive   TOP four LK train   LOK station
                                    perf/stat
     "Within one hour four trains arrived one after the other at the station"

Things, however, get complicated with *mag-ka* forms when there is an accent opposition. Analogous to what was said in section 2.2.2.3 above, the active *mag-yakap-an* "to embrace each other" can, by accentual means, be "shifted" to the stative domain (cf. the d) variant of *mag-ka* above):

a) *mag-ká-yakap*   "to happen to embrace each other"
        (It sometimes happens that at large events with a mass audience euphoric
        people who do not know each other will fall into each other's arms)

And, as a non-accented correspondence of this form, we get

b) *mag-ka-yakap*

which expresses the idea of "to be in an embracing position" (i.e. the b) variant of *mag-ka*).

A closer look at Santos' dictionary from 1990 confirms that there are about 90 verb pairs of this sort.

In principle, all accented as well as non-accented *mag-ka* forms belong to the group of *mag-ka* variants expressing limited control. Sometimes, however, we do not find a symmetric distribution of accent oppositions and their corresponding shades of meaning. This could be due to the fact that, if non-binary relations are involved (i.e. forms which do not belong to the 90 examples mentioned above), a simple form without accent is used, which itself can also be considered an example of limited control. An example for this is given by Bloomfield (ibid: 268).

25a) Nag-ka-ka-lipon ang mga langgam   dahil   sa   puto
     RCF-crowd   TOP PL ant   because of   cake
     impf/stat
     "The ants ran together because of the cake"

This example clearly has a "sociative" reading. Since *lipon* also possesses an active version in the form of a lexical reciprocal, *mag-lipon*, the *mag-ka* form must be interpreted as a stative nuance. This agrees with the fact that: a) we are dealing with animals (and not human beings) b) the ants are seen as being "unconsciously" drawn to the cake. This becomes even clearer when the "causer" of their running together, i.e. the cake, is focused. Then we get the following construction:

25b) I-p-in-ag-ka-ka-lipon   ng mga langgam   ang puto
     CRF-crowd   LK PL ant   TOP cake
     impf/stat
     "The cake made the ants run together"

4.3 Reciprocity in causative context

4.3.1 Inanimate causers

By comparing the active examples 22a) and 22b) with the forms that occur here in examples 25a) and 25b) we obtain the following symmetry:

reciprocal active		reciprocal stative	
causer	causee (+control)	causer	causee (–control)
–TOP *dahil sa*	+TOP *mag-an + ang*	–TOP *dahil sa*	+TOP *mag-ka + ang*
+TOP *ipag + ang*	–TOP *ng* phrase	+TOP *ipag-ka*	–TOP *ng* phrase

In each of the above columns the "causer" is inanimate.

4.3.2 Animate causers

Normally, there are only a few cases of a combined causative-reciprocal morphology with an animate causer. We must at the same time distinguish between active reciprocal and stative reciprocal actants. The former are expressed by means of a lexical reciprocal, e.g. *akap* "to embrace each other":

26) P-in-a-pag-akap   ni Ben si Maria   at   si Eddie
     CRCF-embrace   PA B.   PA M.   and PA E.
     perf   nonT   TOP   TOP
     "Ben made <u>Maria and Eddie</u> embrace each other"

In this example it is only possible to express the focused causee, i.e. it is impossible to focus the causer (by means of *mag-pa*).

Stative reciprocal actants, on the other hand, can also occasionally be found in a causative context. By causativizing a *mag-ka* form to *pa-pag-ka...-in* (lit. *pinapagka*) we get:

27) P-in-a-pag-ka-galit ni Pedro si Juan at   si Maria
     CRCF-quarrel   PA P.   PA J.   and PA M.
     perf/stat   nonT   TOP   TOP
     "Pedro made <u>Juan and Maria</u> quarrel with each other"

4.3.3 Causative reciprocals — a brief summary

Such examples in which causativity and reciprocity are simultaneously morphologized on the verb, as in examples 25) – 27) above, are comparatively rare, but do in the end allow us to establish the following correspondences. These correspondences are of central importance to understanding the underlying principles of Tagalog morphology:

Causative Reciprocals			
Animate Causers		Inanimate Causers	
Active Causee *p-in-a-pag-*	Stative Causee *p-in-a-pag-ka-*	Active Causee *ipag-*	Stative Causee *ipag-ka-*

Bibliography

Bloomfield, L., 1917. "Tagalog texts with grammatical analysis" in: *University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature* 3. Pp. 2–4.

de Wolff, C. M., 1988. "Voice in Austronesian languages of the Philippine type: passive, ergative, or neither?" in: Shibatani, M. (ed.). *Passive and Voice.* (=TSL 16). Amsterdam/Philadelphia. Pp. 143–194.

Drossard, W., 1983. "Tagalog case roles: An intralanguage continuum of control" in: Seiler/Brettschneider (eds.). *Language Invariants and Mental Operations.* International Conference held at Gummersbach/Cologne 1983. Tübingen. Pp. 25–30.

Drossard, W., 1984. *Das Tagalog als Repräsentant des aktivischen Sprachbaus.* (=CONTINUUM 3). Tübingen.

Drossard, W., 1991. "Resultativity in Tagalog (with concluding remarks on resultativity in general)" in: *akup* (Arbeitspapiere des Kölner Universalienprojektes) Nr. 83. Pp. 93–110. Köln.

Foley, W. A. & R. D. van Valin, 1977. "On the viabililty of the notion of 'subject' in universal grammar". *BLS* 3 . Pp. 293–320.

Foley, W. A. & R. D. van Valin, 1984. *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar.* (=Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 38). Cambridge.

Himmelmann, N., 1987. *Morphosyntax und Morphologie — Die Ausrichtungsaffixe im Tagalog.* (=Studien zur Linguistik 8). München.

Himmelmann, N., 1991. "The Philippine Challenge to Universal Grammar". (Arbeitspapier des Institutes für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität zu Köln Nr. 16, Neue Folge). Köln.

Keenan, E., 1976. "Towards a universal definition of 'subject'" in: Li, Ch. (ed.). *Subject and Topic*. New York. Pp. 303–333.

Klimov, G., 1977. *Tipologia jazykov aktivnogo stroja*. Moskau.

Ramos, T. V., 1971. *Tagalog Structures*. (pali Language Texts: Philipines). Honolulu.

Ramos, T. V., 1974. *The case system of Tagalog verbs*. (=Pacific Linguistics. Series B, No. 27). Canberra.

Santos, V. L., 1983. *Vicassan's Pilipino-English Dictionary*. Manila.

Sapir, E., 1917. "Review of Uhlenbeck 1916" in: Het Identificeerend Karakter de Possessieve Flexie in Talen van Noord-America. *IJAL* 1. Pp. 86–90.

Schachter, P., 1976. "The subject in Philippine languages: Topic, Actor, Actor-Topic or None of the Above" in: Li, Ch. (ed.). *Subject and Topic*. New York. Pp. 491–518.

Schachter, P., 1977. "Reference related and role related properties of subjects" in: Cole, P. & M. Sadock (eds.). *Syntax and Semantics* 8. Pp. 279–306.

Schachter, P./Otanes, F., 1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley.

Shibatani, M., 1988. "Voice in Philippine Languages" in: Shibatani, M. (ed.). *Passive and Voice*. (=TSL 16). Amsterdam/Philadelphia. Pp. 85–142.

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.

Arbeitspapiere Köln (Liste noch vorrätiger Arbeitspapiere)

2.   1969. Zur Gestaltung eines Studienführers für Studenten der Sprachwissenschaft unter Berücksichtigung einer sprachwissenschaftlichen Grundausbildung für Studenten benachbarter Disziplinen.

3.   SEILER, H. & Scheffcyk, 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 morphophonemischen Kartei (illustriert an der Morphophonemik des japanischen Verbs).

6.   PENČEV, J. 1969. Einige semantische Besonderheiten der bulgarischen Geschmacksadjektive.

14.   ROSENKRANZ, B. 1970. Georg von der Gabelentz und die Junggrammatische Schule.

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.

23.   BRETTSCHNEIDER, G. & Lehmann, Ch. 1974. Der Schlagwortkatalog des Institutes für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Köln.

24.   WIESEMANN, U. 1974. Time Distinctions in Kaingang.

26.   SEILER, H. u.a. 1975. Deskriptive und etikettierende Benennung; Relativkonstruktionen, (Becker, Katz, Walter, Habel, Schwendy, Kirsch, Clasen, Seip).

29.   VAN DEN BOOM, H. & Samuelsdorff,P. 1976. "Aspects"-Kommentar. Protokolle eines Seminars aus dem WS 1975/76.

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.

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.   KUKUČZKA, E. 1984. Lokalrelationen und Postpositionen im Tamil.

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 (Die fettgedruckten Nummern der Arbeitspapiere sind vorrätig.)

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.

15. HIMMELMANN, Nikolaus P. 1991. The Philippine Challenge to Universal Grammar.

16. HIMMELMANN, Nikolaus P. 1992. Grammar and Grammaticalization.

17. COMPES, Isabel & KUTSCHER, Silvia & RUDORF, Carmen. 1993. Pfade der Grammatikalisierung: Ein systematisierter Überblick.

18. COMPES, Isabel & OTTO, Barbara. 1994. Nicht-morphologische Nominalinkorporation - etwas ganz anderes?

19. DROSSARD, Werner 1994. The Systematization of Tagalog Morphosyntax.

20. ÁGEL, Vilmos 1994. Valenzrealisierung, Grammatik und Valenz.