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Abstract
In the literature of Philippine linguistics, Goal-Focus (GF) constructions in Tagalog have been generally considered as transitive, both syntactically and semantically; however, whether Actor-Focus (AF) constructions should be analyzed as syntactically transitive or intransitive is controversial. This paper addresses the question of the syntactic transitivity of Tagalog AF constructions from a new perspective. We argue two points in this paper. First, AF constructions do not form a homogenous construction type but rather consist of both syntactically and semantically varying construction types: ambient, agentive, patientive, reflexive, and antipassive types. Moreover, AF construction types other than antipassive are clearly intransitive. This means that only antipassive AF constructions should be examined in a discussion of the syntactic transitivity of AF constructions. Second, it is argued that antipassive AF constructions are syntactically intransitive; specifically, in this construction type, nominative agent NPs behave like grammatical arguments of GF constructions, but genitive patient NPs do not. It is concluded that Tagalog AF constructions are best analyzed as syntactically intransitive.*
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1. Introduction
The aim of this paper is to explore one of the most controversial and arguably the most important issues in the morphosyntax of Tagalog, namely, the syntactic transitivity of Actor-Focus constructions. Actor Focus (AF) is one of four morphological categories distinguished by what is referred to as focus morphology in Philippine linguistics: Actor Focus <um>, m-; Patient Focus -in; Locative Focus -an; and Circumstantial Focus -i. AF constructions are those verb-predicate clauses whose predicate contains an AF marker. To illustrate, consider an AF construction in (1).¹

* An earlier version of this paper was presented in the 132nd meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan, held at the University of Tokyo at Komaba on June 17–18, 2006 (Nagaya 2006b). Some supporting data and analyses are also provided from Nagaya (2006a). The research presented here was supported by the JSPS grant #24-9187.

¹ The following abbreviations are used in this paper: AF actor focus; CAUS causative; CF circumstantial focus; EXC exclusive; GEN genitive; GF goal focus; INC inclusive; IPFV imperfective aspect; LF locative focus; LK linker; LOC locative; NEG negation; NOM nominative; P personal name and kinship term; PF patient focus; PFV perfective aspect; PL plural; PROS prospective aspect; SG singular; 1 first person; 2 second person; 3 third person; “<>” infixed; “==” cliticization; and “~” reduplication. The diagraph ng represents a velar nasal. In the orthography, the genitive marker nang and the plural marker manga are spelled as “ng” and “mga”, respectively.
(1) **AF construction:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{K<um>ain} & \quad \text{ang=} \quad \text{bata} \quad \text{nang=} \quad \text{tinapay}. \\
\text{AF:eat} & \quad \text{nom=} \quad \text{child} \quad \text{gen=} \quad \text{bread} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘The child ate some bread.’

In (1), the verbal predicate in the clause-initial position is marked by the AF infix \(<um>\), indicating that the argument in the nominative case bears the actor role (see Section 2 for ‘actor’). In Schachter and Otanes’ (1972: 69) words, “FOCUS is the feature of a verbal predicate that determines the semantic relationship between a predicate verb and its topic [NN-nominative argument]”.

This AF construction is contrasted with a PF construction in (2), an LF construction in (3), and a CF construction in (4), which are collectively referred to as **Goal Focus (GF) constructions** (Schachter and Otanes 1972; also see Section 2).

(2) **PF construction:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ka~kain-in} & \quad \text{nang=} \quad \text{bata} \quad \text{ang=} \quad \text{tinapay}. \\
\text{pf:pros:eat} & \quad \text{gen=} \quad \text{child} \quad \text{nom=} \quad \text{bread} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘The child will eat the bread.’

(3) **LF construction:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{K<in>ain-an} & \quad \text{nang=} \quad \text{bata} \quad \text{ang=} \quad \text{pinggan na} \quad \text{iyon}. \\
\text{lf:pfv:eat} & \quad \text{gen=} \quad \text{child} \quad \text{nom=} \quad \text{plate} \quad \text{lk that.nom} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘The child ate off of that plate.’

(4) **CF construction:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I-k<in>ain} & \quad \text{nang=} \quad \text{bata} \quad \text{ang=} \quad \text{kapatid} =\text{niya}. \\
\text{cf:pfv:eat} & \quad \text{gen=} \quad \text{child} \quad \text{nom=} \quad \text{sibling} =\text{3sg.gen} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘The child ate on behalf of his/her sibling.’

As the AF marker \(-um\) in (1) specifies the role of the nominative argument as actor, the PF marker \(-in\) in (2), the LF marker \(-an\) in (3), and the CF marker \(i\)- in (4) indicate that the nominative argument bears patient, locative, and benefactive roles, respectively, in each sentence. In other words, different focus affixes indicate different semantic roles borne by the nominative argument.

This paper is mainly concerned with the syntactic transitivity of AF constructions. To be more precise, it addresses the question of whether AF constructions are syntactically transitive or intransitive. To elaborate on this question, let us consider an AF construction in (5) and a GF (specifically, PF) construction in (6).

(5) **AF construction:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{P<um>atay} & \quad \text{ang=} \quad \text{lalaki} \quad \text{nang=} \quad \text{aso}. \\
\text{af:kill} & \quad \text{nom=} \quad \text{man} \quad \text{gen=} \quad \text{dog} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘The man killed a dog/made a dog-killing.’

(6) **GF construction:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{P<in>atay-ø} & \quad \text{nang=} \quad \text{lalaki} \quad \text{ang=} \quad \text{aso}. \\
\text{pf:pfv:kill} & \quad \text{gen=} \quad \text{man} \quad \text{nom=} \quad \text{dog} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘The man killed the dog.’

² Schachter and Otanes (1972: 70): “Any verb that does not focus upon the actor may be called a GOAL-FOCUS verb”.

In almost all recent studies of Tagalog, it has been agreed that GF constructions such as (6) are syntactically transitive (but see Ross 2002). In contrast, AF constructions such as (5) are analyzed in two different ways: the transitive and the intransitive analyses. In the transitive analysis of AF constructions, both AF and GF constructions are considered as transitive. Evidence mainly comes from semantics and morphology: both AF and GF constructions have much the same meaning and contain agent and patient participants being marked by the same set of case markers. For example, AF construction (5) and GF construction (6) describe the fact that the man made a/the dog dead and both agent and patient participants appear as lexical nouns marked by the nominative marker *ang* and the genitive marker *nang*. See Kroeger (1993), Foley (1998), Ross (2002), and Himmelmann (2002, 2005a, b).

In the intransitive analysis of AF constructions, in contrast, AF constructions are analyzed as syntactically intransitive, although they may be semantically transitive. Since the early 1980s, linguists have realized that GF constructions are more transitive than AF constructions in the sense of Hopper and Thompson (1980), showing typical properties of the active voice (Wouk 1986; Nolasco 2003, 2005, 2006; Nolasco and Saclot 2005; Saclot 2006). Some put forward an analysis that AF constructions are actually equivalent to intransitive or antipassive constructions in ergative languages (Cena 1977; Payne 1982; De Guzman 1988; Liao 2004; Reid and Liao 2004).

One of the pieces of evidence for the intransitive analysis of AF constructions is, among others, that AF constructions cannot take a patient NP with a definite interpretation. For example, compare AF construction (5) and GF construction (6) again. The patient NP *aso* ‘dog’ only has an indefinite interpretation in (5) but can have a definite reading in (6). This fact was already pointed out by Schachter and Otanes (1972), Schachter (1976, 1977), and McFarland (1978), but was adopted as evidence for the intransitive analysis by Payne (1982) and De Guzman (1988, 1992) and for the low transitivity of AF constructions by Hopper and Thompson (1980), Wouk (1986), and Nolasco (2003, 2005, 2006).

As a result of this definiteness constraint, AF constructions cannot express individuated transitive events. For example, it is necessary to choose a GF construction over an AF construction in order to express events where a specific individual is affected. Compare (7) and (8).

(7) **AF construction:**
*P<um>* atay  ang= lalaki nang= aso  =ng iyon.
*AF:kill  NOM= man GEN= dog  =lk that.NOM
Intended for ‘The man killed that dog.’

(8) **GF construction:**
P<in>* atay-ø nang= lalaki ang= aso  =ng iyon.
P*F:PFV:kill GEN= man NOM= dog  =lk that.NOM
‘The man killed that dog.’

In other words, AF constructions cannot express prototypical transitive constructions in Hopper and Thompson’s (1980) sense. A case in point is an ungrammatical AF construction in (9).

(9) **AF construction:**
*S<um>* ira =ako  nang= kotse ni= Ally.
*AF:break  =1sg.NOM GEN= car  P.GEN= Ally
Intended for ‘I broke Ally’s car.’
In (9), the typical transitive verb *sira* 'break' takes an AF form, but the resulting sentence is ungrammatical, whether the patient NP *kotse* 'car' is interpreted as definite or indefinite. Instead, a GF construction like (10) is used in order to express such a prototypical transitive clause.

(10) **GF construction:**

\[
\text{S<in>ira-ø} =_{ko} \text{ang=} \text{kotse} \text{ ni=} \text{Ally.}
\]

\[
fPitch\text{:pitchv:break} =_{1sg\text{.gen}} \text{NOM= car} \text{ P.GEN= Ally}
\]

'I broke Ally’s car. ’

There are at least two reasons why the question of the syntactic transitivity of AF constructions is so important in Tagalog. For one thing, Tagalog’s position in the alignment typology hinges upon the analysis of AF constructions (see also Ross 2002). When one adopts the intransitive analysis of AF constructions, the alignment pattern of Tagalog is of the ergative-absolutive type, where S and O are coded alike and differently from A. See (11).

(11) **Alignment pattern in the intransitive analysis of AF constructions:**

a. **Intransitive AF construction (cf. Section 3.2):**

\[
P<um>unta \text{ ang=} \text{lalaki (S) sa=} \text{Makati.}
\]

\[
A\text{F:go} \text{NOM= man loc=} \text{Makati}
\]

‘The man (S) went to Makati.’

b. **AF construction (= intransitive):**

\[
P<um>atay \text{ ang=} \text{lalaki (S) nang=} \text{aso.}
\]

‘The man (S) killed a dog.’

c. **GF construction (= transitive):**

\[
P<in>atay-ø \text{ nang=} \text{lalaki (A)} \text{ ang=} \text{aso (O).}
\]

‘The man killed the dog (O).’

In contrast, the transitive analysis of AF constructions implies that Tagalog has two competing transitive constructions, making it difficult to determine whether the Tagalog alignment pattern is of the ergative-absolutive type or of the nominative-accusative type (see Shibatani 1988; Kroeger 1993; Katagiri 2005). See (12).

(12) **Alignment pattern in the transitive analysis of AF constructions:**

a. **Intransitive AF construction (cf. Section 3.2):**

\[
P<um>unta \text{ ang=} \text{lalaki (S) sa=} \text{Makati.}
\]

‘The man (S) went to Makati.’

b. **AF construction (= transitive):**

\[
P<um>atay \text{ ang=} \text{lalaki (A) nang=} \text{aso (O).}
\]

‘The man (A) killed a dog (O).’

c. **GF construction (= transitive):**

\[
P<in>atay-ø \text{ nang=} \text{lalaki (A) ang=} \text{aso (O).}
\]

‘The man killed the dog (O).’

In addition, the analysis of the syntactic transitivity of AF constructions also determines how to understand voice phenomena in Tagalog. If one takes the transitive analysis of AF constructions, it means that Tagalog has more than one basic transitive/active construction type (Kroeger 1993, for example). In contrast, under the intransitive hypothesis, only GF constructions are
transitive/active constructions; AF constructions represent intransitive-related voice phenomena such as antipassive. This is the position taken by Payne (1982) and De Guzman (1988, 1992).

From our perspective, there are two problems in the existing approaches to the syntactic transitivity of Tagalog AF constructions. First, it has been mistakenly assumed that AF constructions constitute a semantically and syntactically homogeneous construction type. As discussed later in Section 3, AF constructions include different kinds of constructions that differ in many ways: some look like transitive while others are obviously intransitive. Thus, it is necessary to spell out the anatomy of AF constructions, discussing each type one by one, for a better understanding of the syntactic transitivity of these constructions.

Second, from our perspective, the previous studies have been mixing morphological, syntactic, and semantic evidence in their discussion of the transitivity of AF constructions. In particular, the intransitive hypothesis of AF constructions has been based on morphological and/or semantic grounds but not syntactic. In this paper, thus, we focus only upon syntactic characteristics of AF constructions. As demonstrated in Section 4, the most substantial evidence for the intransitive analysis of AF constructions comes from the syntactic comparison of GF constructions with antipassive AF constructions.

In this paper, we address the above-mentioned problems and argue that AF constructions should be analyzed as syntactically intransitive rather than transitive. This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses the terminological issues of the focus system, necessary for understanding Tagalog AF constructions. In Section 3, a typology of AF constructions is provided with special reference to the semantic role of nominative NPs. This typology of AF constructions shows the need to look at the syntactic transitivity of antipassive AF constructions. Section 4 examines various syntactic phenomena and demonstrates that antipassive AF constructions are syntactically intransitive. This paper is concluded in Section 5.

2. Preliminary: More on the Tagalog focus system

Any serious discussions on the syntactic transitivity of Tagalog Actor-Focus constructions cannot go without spelling out the functions of the focus system and terminological issues surrounding it. In this section, preliminary notes on the focus system are offered so as to clarify the nature of the problem this paper aims to address: major functions of the focus system (Section 2.1), the relation between the focus system and case-marking (Section 2.2) and the terminological issues (Section 2.3).

2.1 Major functions of the focus system

To begin with, let us overview two major functions of the focus system: nominalization and voice. First, when used as part of referential expressions, focus morphology marks argument nominalization (Schachter and Otanes 1972; see also Starosta, Pawley, and Reid 1982 and Kaufman 2009): AF for actor nominalization, PF for patient nominalization, LF for locative nominalization, and CF for benefactive and other peripheral nominalization. For example, the AF marker \(-um-\) in (13) indicates that the nominalization with this marker is actor nominalization.

(13) L<um>ingon =ako   sa=  [<um>upo sa= kalye].
    AF:look.back   =1sg.nom  loc=  [AF:sit  loc= street]
  ‘I looked back at [the one who sat on the street].’
In contrast, the LF marker -an in (14) means that the expression it heads is locative nominalization.

(14) \(\text{L\textless um\textgreater ingon =ako sa= [\text{<in\textgreater upu-an ni=} \text{Aldrin}].}\)  
\(\text{AF:look.back =1sg.nom loc=} [\text{LF:PFV:sit p.gen=} \text{Aldrin}].\)  
‘I looked back at [the place where Aldrin sat].’

Notice that the nominalized expression with -um- in (13) refers to the agent of sitting on the street, while that with -an in (14) designates the place where Aldrin sat. Through these examples, different focus affixes are used for different types of argument nominalization.

Second, when employed as part of predicates, the focus system makes voice distinctions. On the basis of Shibatani’s (2006) conceptual framework for voice phenomena, Nagaya (2007b, 2009) makes the following generalization over the form-function correspondence between focus categories and voice distinctions in Tagalog: the formal contrast between AF and GF corresponds to the voice opposition between middle/antipassive and active. In other words, AF constructions represent either middle or antipassive situation types, while GF constructions express active situation types. To illustrate, consider an AF middle construction in (15) and a GF active construction in (16).

(15) \(\text{AF middle:}\)  
\(\text{Nag-bihis si=} \text{Mike.}\)  
\(\text{AF:PFV:dress p.nom=} \text{Mike}\)  
‘Mike dressed (up).’

(16) \(\text{GF active:}\)  
\(\text{B\textless in\textgreater his-an ni=} \text{Mike ang=} \text{child =3sg.gen}\)  
\(\text{lf:PFV:dress p.gen=} \text{Mike nom=} \text{child =3sg.gen}\)  
‘Mike dressed his child (up).’

The same lexical root bishis ‘dress’ is used in both (15) and (16), but the AF construction in (15) and the LF construction in (16) have different voice interpretations. On the one hand, the AF construction in (15) represents a middle situation type, where the development of an action is confined within the agent’s personal sphere so that the action’s effect accrues back on the agent itself (Shibatani 2006: 234). In other words, this sentence means that the actor himself was affected by his own action. In contrast, the LF counterpart in (16) designates an active situation type, where an action extends beyond the agent’s personal sphere and achieves its effect on a distinct patient (Shibatani 2006: 234). To put it differently, this sentence indicates that the actor acted upon the goal and that the goal was affected.

Another related voice contrast is observed between an AF antipassive construction in (17) and a GF active construction in (18).

(17) \(\text{AF antipassive:}\)  
\(\text{K\textless um\textgreater ain ang=} \text{bata nang=} \text{mansanas.}\)  
\(\text{AF:eat nom=} \text{child gen=} \text{apple}\)  
‘The child ate some apple.’
(18) **GF active:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{K}<\text{in}>\text{a} = \text{m} & \text{ nang=} \text{ bata} \text{ ang=} \text{ mansanas}. \\
\text{PF:PFV:eat} & \text{ GEN=} \text{ child} \text{ NOM=} \text{ apple} \\
\text{‘The child ate the apple (completely).’}
\end{align*}
\]

An AF construction in (17) corresponds to an **antipassive situation type**, in which an action extends beyond the agent’s personal sphere but does not develop to its full extent and fails to achieve its intended effect on a patient (Shibatani 2006: 239) (see also Heath 1976; Comrie 1978; Cooreman 1994; Dixon 1994; and Polinsky 2008). The AF construction in (17) implies that the goal element *mansanas* ‘apple’ is only partially affected or that it is not specified in the discourse. In contrast, similar to the GF construction in (16), the GF construction in (18) indicates an active situation. This sentence does not have a partitive or indefinite reading of the goal element but means that the specific goal element was completely consumed.

Before closing this section, two final remarks are due regarding the functions of the focus system. First, it should be added that, whether as part of referential expressions or predicates, the focus system constitutes a complex aspect-marking system together with other verbal morphology to the extent that it is difficult to gloss focus morphology separately from aspect morphology. To illustrate, observe the paradigm of the PF verb *kain-in* ‘eat’ in (19) through (22) differentiated in terms of aspect.

(19) **Basic form:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Kain-} & \text{in} = \text{mo} \text{ iyan!} \\
\text{PF:eat} & = \text{2SG.GEN that.NOM} \\
\text{‘(You) eat that!’}
\end{align*}
\]

(20) **Perfective form:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{K}<\text{in}>\text{a} = \text{k} & \text{o iyan.} \\
\text{PF:PFV:eat} & = \text{1SG.GEN that.NOM} \\
\text{‘I ate that.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(21) **Prospective form:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ka-kain-in} & = \text{k} \text{o iyan.} \\
\text{PF:PROS:eat} & = \text{1SG.GEN that.NOM} \\
\text{‘I will eat that.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(22) **Imperfective form:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{K}<\text{in}>\text{a-k} & \text{in} = \text{k} \text{o iyan.} \\
\text{PF:IPFV:eat} & = \text{1SG.GEN that.NOM} \\
\text{‘I am eating that.’}
\end{align*}
\]

As seen in (19) through (22), aspectual distinctions are made by the existence or absence of the PF marker *-in* in combination with prefixal reduplication and the infix <in>. Notice in particular that the PF marker *-in* is not overtly realized in perfective aspect, as in (20). Similar examples are found in the rest of this paper.

Second, diachronically speaking, the voice function of the focus system was derived from its nominalization function (Starosta, Pawley & Reid 1982; Kaufman 2009). Synchronically, however, the two functions should be clearly distinguished. For one thing, in modern Tagalog, the voice contrasts made by the focus system are neutralized in the context of nominalization
(Nagaya 2009: 180ff). For example, the middle reading in (15) and the antipassive reading in (17) are not necessarily obtained when the AF verbs are nominalized. In addition, there are some types of AF constructions that only appear in nominalization (Schachter and Otanes 1972: 296, 299–300; Schachter 1976: 517).

2.2 Focus category and case-marking

As introduced in Section 1, four morphological categories are distinguished in the focus system: Actor Focus, Patient Focus, Locative Focus, and Circumstantial Focus. Non-Actor Focus types are collectively referred to as Goal Focus. These contrasts are morphological distinctions, but each category is given its name according to the semantic role of an argument it “focuses upon”. See Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus category</th>
<th>AFFIX</th>
<th>Focused semantic role(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actor Focus (AF)</td>
<td>m-, um-</td>
<td>agent, patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient Focus (PF)</td>
<td>-in</td>
<td>patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative Focus (LF)</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>goal, location, source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumstantial Focus (CF)</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>other semantic roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our terminology, ‘actor’ and ‘goal’ are macro-roles: the actor refers to the initiator of the evolution of an event, while the goal pertains to the endpoint of the evolution of an event. ‘Locative’ is a cover term for goal, location, and source roles, which, for example, in English, are marked by prepositions to, in/at, and from, respectively. ‘Circumstantial’ is a garbage-can category, to which various peripheral semantic roles go, such as benefactive, instrumental, and reason roles. Let us look at examples in (23) through (27) for illustration.

(23) **AF construction:**
Nag-bukas ang= pinto.
AF:PFV:open NOM= door.
‘The door (actor: patient) opened.’

(24) **AF construction (Schachter 1976: 494):**
Mag-a~alis ang= babae nang= bigas sa= sako para sa= bata.
AF:PROS:take.out NOM= woman GEN= rice LOC= sack for LOC= child
‘The woman (actor: agent) will take some rice out of a/the sack for a/the child.’

(25) **PF construction (Schachter 1976: 495):**
A~alis-in nang= babae ang= bigas sa= sako para sa= bata.
PF:PROS:take.out GEN= woman NOM= rice LOC= sack for LOC= child
‘A/The woman will take the rice (patient) out of a/the sack for a/the child.’

(26) **LF construction (Schachter 1976: 495):**
A~alis-an nang= babae nang= bigas ang= sako para sa= bata.
LF:PROS:take.out GEN= woman GEN= rice NOM= sack for LOC= child
‘A/The woman will take some rice out of the sack (locative: source) for a/the child.’
\begin{align*}
(27) & \quad \text{CF construction (Schachter 1976: 495):} \\
& \quad \text{I-pag-a-alis nang= babae nang= bigas sa= sako ang= bata.} \\
& \quad \text{cf:pros:take.out gen= woman gen= rice loc= sack nom= child} \\
& \quad \text{‘A/The woman will take some rice out of a/the sack for the child (circumstantial: beneficiary).’}
\end{align*}

As demonstrated in (23) through (27), different arguments appear in the nominative case in different focus categories. In Actor Focus constructions, the actor or the initiator of an event is marked in the nominative case, whether it is an agent or patient. Likewise, a patient participant receives such a marking in Patient Focus constructions, a locative participant in Locative Focus constructions, and a peripheral participant in Circumstantial Focus constructions. Consider Table 2 for a summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus category</th>
<th>Agent</th>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Peripherals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AF constructions</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>——</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF constructions</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF constructions</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF constructions</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>NOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 also illustrates the basic case-marking pattern in Tagalog. The focal NP, whose semantic role is indicated by a focus marker, is marked in the nominative case, while other non-focal NPs receive their default case marking. For example, an agent NP appears in the nominative case when focused but in the genitive case when not focused. Likewise, a benefactive NP is realized in the nominative case if focused; otherwise, it is introduced to the sentence by a preposition.

There are several reasons for grouping PF, LF, and CF as GF. First, all three types of verbs take the infix \textit{-in-} for realis mood (Himmelmann 2006). Second, all of them can go with the potenti
tive prefix \textit{ma-} (Himmelmann 2006). Lastly, GF constructions share the same case-marking pattern: an agent NP is realized in the genitive case and a non-agent focal NP in the nominative case (see Table 2). As discussed in Section 3, in contrast, no unified case-marking pattern is observed in AF constructions. Different types of AF constructions have different case-marking patterns.

2.3 Terminological notes: ‘Focus’, ‘topic’, ‘pivot’, and ‘voice’

Three terminological notes on the focus system are in order. First, this paper refers to the language-specific morphological paradigm in question as ‘focus system’ rather than ‘voice system’, partially because it appears that this term is one of the most prevalent terms used for this morphological system in the literature (French 1987/1988) and partially because the term ‘focus’ cov-
ers the different kinds of functions it carries out: nominalization and voice. Although the term ‘focus’ has several different meanings in linguistic analysis including pragmatic focus (as opposed to topic), the term ‘focus’ is used only in the sense defined above in this paper.

In most recent studies of Philippine languages, the term ‘voice’ is chosen over ‘focus’ to refer to the morphological system with which this paper is concerned (Kroeger 1993, for example). This position is not taken in this paper for two reasons. On the one hand, the function of making voice distinctions is only one of the major functions of the focus system, and there is no reason for calling it ‘voice’, neglecting the other functions. Second, we want to use ‘focus’ for formal/morphological categories, keeping ‘voice’ for functional/semantic categories.

Second, in recent studies of Tagalog voice systems, the term ‘undergoer’ is often used to refer to non-actor focus constructions, namely, our GF constructions. We avoid this term because the actor-undergoer contrast does not really match the constructional distinction between Actor and Non-Actor Focus constructions. In its original sense used by Foley and Van Valin (1984), undergoer covers patient NPs in intransitive clauses in addition to those in transitive clauses. However, as discussed in Section 3 and exemplified here by AF construction (28), an “undergoer subject” of intransitive clauses is typically marked in Tagalog by Actor Focus.

\begin{equation}
L<\text{um}>ubog\ ang=\ araw\ sa=\ kanluran.
\end{equation}

\text{AF:}set\ \text{nom}=\ \text{sun}\ \text{loc}=\ \text{west}

‘The sun set in the west.’

Lastly, we refer to NPs marked by \textit{ang} as ‘nominative’ instead of ‘topic’: there is no bi-unique relationship between \textit{ang}-marking and pragmatic topic status. \textit{Ang}-marked NPs are not always interpreted as pragmatic topic (Kaufman 2005; Nagaya 2007a). Similarly, the term ‘pivot’ is not used to stand for \textit{ang}-marked NPs because they do not always serve as syntactic pivots (Section 4).

3. Typology of Actor-Focus constructions

AF constructions are those verb-predicate clauses where the verb is marked by an AF affix. In terms of syntax and semantics, they include different kinds of constructions. In this section, we provide a typology of AF constructions with regard to the existence or absence of agent and patient participants and the structural coding of each participant. For ease of reference, the discussion of this section can be summarized in advance as in Table 3.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Type of AF} & \textbf{Agent} & \textbf{Patient} & \textbf{S-transitivity} & \textbf{GF counterparts} \\
\hline
Ambient & ø & ø & Atransitive & N/A \\
\hline
Agentive & NOM & ø & Intransitive & Applicative \\
\hline
Patientive & ø & NOM & Intransitive & Active \\
\hline
Reflexive & NOM & ø & Intransitive & Active \\
\hline
Antipassive & NOM & GEN & (see Section 4) & Active; applicative \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Typology of AF constructions (cf. Table 2)}
\end{table}

Ambient AF constructions do not contain either an agent or a patient participant. Agentive
AF constructions only have an agent participant; patientive ones contain a patient participant. In reflexive AF constructions, a single argument bears the dual role of agent and patient. Lastly, antipassive AF constructions contain both agent and patient participants, realized in the nominative case and in the genitive case, respectively.

By presenting this typology of AF constructions, this section aims to show that most AF construction types are clearly intransitive and that it is antipassive AF constructions whose syntactic transitivity needs to be carefully examined.

3.1 Ambient Actor-Focus constructions
In ambient Actor-Focus constructions, there is no participant in a clause, and thus, no focus alternation is observed. For example, consider (29) and (30).

(29)  Mag-te-ten =na.
      AF:PROS:ten.o'clock =PFV
‘It is about to be 10 o'clock.’
(30)  G<um>a~gabi =na.
      AF:IPFV:become.night =PFV
‘It is becoming night.’

An AF construction in (29) states that it is about to be 10 o'clock without mentioning a specific individual entity. Likewise, one in (30) indicates that it is getting darker and darker outside. No specific individual is expressed here, either.

3.2 Agentive Actor-Focus constructions
Agentive AF constructions express situation types where a volitional agent carries out a self-contained action. In this type of AF constructions, only one argument bearing an agent semantic role appears in the nominative case. There is no patient participant, and thus this construction type is intransitive. Examples of agentive AF constructions are given in (31) through (33).

(31)  Activity:
      S<um>ayaw ang= manga bata sa= kwarto.
      AF:dance nom= pl child loc= room
‘The children danced in the room.’
(32)  Path of motion:
      <Um>akyat ang= bata sa= Mt. Mayon.
      AF:climb nom= child loc= Mt. Mayon
‘The child climbed Mt. Mayon.’
(33)  Manner of motion:
      Nag-lakad si= Paul sa= Luneta Park.
      AF:PFV:walk p.nom= Paul loc= Luneta Park
‘Paul walked inside Luneta Park.’

Much the same meanings can also be expressed by the GF constructions corresponding to agentive AF constructions, but the emphasis is on the fact that non-agent participants, such as location or path of motion, are somehow affected by the agent’s action, resulting in an applicative interpretation (see Shibatani 2006: 240 for the conceptual definition of applicatives). Compare
(34), (35), and (36) with (31), (32), and (33), respectively.

3.4 Activity:
\[
\begin{align*}
S<\text{ayaw-an} & \text{ ni=} \text{ Ria ang=} \text{ kwarto.} \\
\text{LF:PFV:dance p.gen=} & \text{ Ria nom=} \text{ room} \\
\text{‘Ria danced in the room.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(35) Path of motion:
\[
\begin{align*}
<\text{In}>\text{akyat-ø} & \text{ ni=} \text{ Farah ang=} \text{ Mt. Mayon.} \\
\text{PF:PFV:climb p.gen=} & \text{ Farah nom=} \text{ Mt. Mayon} \\
\text{‘Farah climbed Mt. Mayon (and conquered it).’}
\end{align*}
\]

(36) Manner of motion:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ni-lakar-an} & \text{ ni=} \text{ Paul ang=} \text{ Luneta Park.} \\
\text{LF:PFV:walk p.gen=} & \text{ Paul nom=} \text{ Luneta Park} \\
\text{‘Paul walked in Luneta Park (completely).’}
\end{align*}
\]

In this type of focus alternation, both AF and GF constructions have much the same meaning, but the former are intransitive, while the latter are transitive. The agent participant of AF intransitive constructions corresponds to the agent participant of GF transitive constructions.

3.3 Patientive Actor-Focus constructions
Patientive AF constructions represent situation types where a non-volitional patient undergoes a change of state or location. Consider (37), (38), and (39), for instance. Again, these constructions are obviously intransitive.

(37) Change of state (1):
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Nag-bukas} & \text{ ang=} \text{ pinto.} \\
\text{AF:PFV:open nom=} & \text{ door} \\
\text{‘The door opened.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(38) Change of state (2):
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{G<um>anda} & \text{ ang=} \text{ presentation ni=} \text{ Ian.} \\
\text{AF:become.beautiful nom=} & \text{ presentation p.gen=} \text{ Ian} \\
\text{‘Ian’s presentation became beautiful.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(39) Change of location:
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{G<um>ulong} & \text{ ang=} \text{ bola sa=} \text{ kalsada.} \\
\text{AF:roll nom=} & \text{ ball loc=} \text{ street} \\
\text{‘The ball rolled on the street.’}
\end{align*}
\]

GF counterparts of patientive AF constructions indicate events that cause such a change of state or location to take place. Namely, they express causative situation types. Compare (40), (41), and (42) with (37), (38), and (39), respectively.

(40) Direct causative (1):
\[
\begin{align*}
B<\text{in>uks-an} & \text{ ni=} \text{ Tuting ang=} \text{ pinto.} \\
\text{LF:PFV:open p.gen=} & \text{ Tuting nom=} \text{ door} \\
\text{‘Tuting opened the door.’}
\end{align*}
\]
(41) **Direct causative (2):**

\[
\text{G\textless in\textgreater andah-an ni= Ian ang= presentation =niya.} \\
\text{lf:pfv:make.beautiful p.gen= Ian nom= presentation =3sg.gen}
\]

‘Ian made his presentation beautiful.’

(42) **Caused motion:**

\[
\text{G\textless in\textgreater ulong-ø ni= Jay ang= bola sa= kalsada.} \\
\text{pf:pfv:roll p.gen= Jay nom= ball loc= street}
\]

‘Jay rolled the ball on the street.’

In this type of focus alternation, the patient participant of intransitive AF constructions corresponds to the patient participant of transitive GF constructions (cf. *causative alternations*).

### 3.4 Reflexive Actor-Focus constructions

In reflexive AF constructions, a single argument bears two semantic roles, agent and patient simultaneously: a volitional agent carries out some action, but at the same time the agent him- or herself is the patient that undergoes some change of state or location due to his or her own action (see Kemmer 1988, 1993, 1994 for middle situation types). See (43), (44), and (45), for example. These constructions can be analyzed as intransitive, because they contain only one argument.

(43) **Grooming:**

\[
\text{Nag-bihis si= Ricky.} \\
\text{af:pfv:dress p.nom= Ricky}
\]

‘Ricky dressed.’

(44) **Change in body posture:**

\[
\text{T\textless um\textgreater ayo si= Lucy.} \\
\text{af:stand.up p.nom= Lucy}
\]

‘Lucy stood up.’

(45) **Non-translational motion:**

\[
\text{Nag-unat si= Marfeal.} \\
\text{af:pfv:stretch p.nom= Marfeal}
\]

‘Marfeal stretched.’

Like patientive AF constructions, GF counterparts of reflexive AF constructions represent active situation types, where an actor acts on a goal and the goal is affected by the action. See (46), (47), and (48).

(46) **Grooming:**

\[
\text{B\textless in\textgreater ihis-an ni= Ricky ang= apo =niya.} \\
\text{lf:pfv:dress p.gen= Ricky nom= grandchild =3sg.gen}
\]

‘Ricky dressed his grandchild.’

(47) **Change in body posture:**

\[
\text{I-t\textless in\textgreater ayo ni= Lucy ang= manika.} \\
\text{cf:pfv:stand p.gen= Lucy nom= doll}
\]

‘Lucy stood the doll up.’
(48) **Non-translational motion:**

\[
\text{<In>unat-ø ni= Marfeal ang= kamay nang= lola.}
\]

\[
\text{pf:pfv:stretch p.gen= Marfeal nom= hand gen= grandmother}
\]

‘Marfeal stretched the grandmother’s hand.’

Another important case belonging to this category is morphological causative. Tagalog morphological causative constructions are formed with the causative prefix *pa-* and have different meanings for AF and GF constructions (Nagaya 2011). AF causative constructions obtain the reflexive causative reading that a causer (= actor) causes a causee to act on the causer him- or herself, while GF causative constructions display an indirect causative reading, where a causer asks a causee to do some action not necessarily directed at the causer. To illustrate, compare an AF morphological causative sentence in (49) and a GF morphological causative sentence in (50).

(49) **Causative reflexive:**

\[
\text{Nag-pa-gupit =ako kay= Resty.}
\]

\[
\text{af:caus:pfv:cut.hair =1sg.nom p.loc= Resty}
\]

‘I had my hair cut by Resty.’ (The causer was affected.)

(50) **Indirect causative:**

\[
\text{P<in>a-gupit-an =ko si= Resty.}
\]

\[
\text{lf:caus:pfv:cut.hair =1sg.gen p.nom= Resty}
\]

‘I had Resty cut his hair.’ (The causee was affected.)

AF causative reflexive constructions play an important role in clause-linking constructions (see Section 4.3), because they carry out the same functional end that passive constructions do in other languages (“causative reflexive” in Lyons 1968: 374).

3.5 **Antipassive Actor-Focus constructions**

The last and equally important AF construction type is an antipassive AF construction, which we have already introduced in Section 2.1. Antipassive AF constructions indicate “that the action is carried out less completely, less successfully, less conclusively, etc., or that the object is less completely, less directly, less permanently, etc. affected by the action” (Anderson 1976: 22). For example, see (51), (52), and (53).

(51) **Verbs of killing:**

\[
\text{P<um>atay ang= manga lalaki nang= aso.}
\]

\[
\text{af:kill nom= pl man gen= dog}
\]

‘The men killed a dog.’

(52) **Verbs of hitting:**

\[
\text{S<um>ampal ang= babae nang= lalaki.}
\]

\[
\text{af:slap nom= woman gen= man}
\]

‘The woman slapped a man.’

(53) **Verbs of consumption:**

\[
\text{K<um>ain ang= babae nang= pakwan.}
\]

\[
\text{af:eat nom= woman gen= watermelon}
\]

‘The woman ate some watermelon/part of the watermelon.’
In antipassive AF constructions, a patient NP has either an indefinite or a partitive reading. In (51) and (52), the patient NPs aso 'dog' and lalaki 'man' are interpreted as indefinite; in (53), pakwan 'watermelon' receives a partitive reading, meaning that it was incompletely affected by the actor’s action of eating.

In contrast, GF counterparts of antipassive AF constructions represent active situation types. See (54), (55), and (56).

(54) **Verbs of killing:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{P<in>atay-ø} & \text{ nang= lalaki} & \text{ ang= aso.} \\
\text{pf:pfv:kill} & \text{ gen= man} & \text{ nom= dog} \\
\text{‘The man killed the dog.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(55) **Verbs of hitting:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{S<in>ampal-ø} & \text{ nang= babae} & \text{ ang= lalaki.} \\
\text{pf:pfv:slap} & \text{ gen= woman} & \text{ nom= man} \\
\text{‘The woman slapped the man.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(56) **Verbs of consumption:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{K<in>ain-ø} & \text{ nang= babae} & \text{ ang= pakwan.} \\
\text{pf:pfv:eat} & \text{ gen= woman} & \text{ nom= watermelon} \\
\text{‘The woman ate the watermelon.’}
\end{align*}
\]

In (54) and (55), the patient NP has a definite reference, which means that it is more directly and completely affected than in (51) and (52). In addition, the patient NP in (56) does not have a partitive reading, either. It is construed that the patient pakwan 'watermelon' is more completely consumed in (56) than in (53). In other words, (54), (55), and (56) represent individuated transitive events. See Nagaya (2009: 166ff) for more on antipassive AF constructions.

Another interesting characteristic of antipassive AF constructions is that in most cases, they have more than one corresponding GF construction, usually active and applicative ones. See (57) and (58).

(57) **Verbs of loading:**

a. **AF construction:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Nag-karga =ako nang= dayami sa= trak.} \\
\text{af:pfv:load =1sg.nom gen= hay loc= truck} \\
\text{‘I loaded some hay onto the truck.’}
\end{align*}
\]

b. **CF construction:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I-k<in>arga =ko ang= dayami sa= trak.} \\
\text{cf:pfv:load =1sg.gen nom= hay loc= truck} \\
\text{‘I loaded the hay onto the truck.’}
\end{align*}
\]

c. **LF construction:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{K<in>argah-an =ko nang= dayami ang= trak.} \\
\text{lf:pfv:load =1sg.gen gen= hay nom= truck} \\
\text{‘I loaded the truck with hay.’}
\end{align*}
\]

(58) **Verbs of removal:**

a. **AF construction:**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mag-tanggal =ka nang= putik sa= salamin.} \\
\text{af:remove =2sg.nom gen= mud loc= glass} \\
\text{‘Remove mud from the glass!’}
\end{align*}
\]
b. **PF construction:**

\[
\text{Tanggal-in} = \text{mo} \quad \text{ang=} \quad \text{putik} \quad \text{sa=} \quad \text{salamin}. \\
\text{PF:} \text{remove} \quad =2\text{sg.gen nom=} \quad \text{mud} \quad \text{loc=} \quad \text{glass}
\]

‘Remove the mud from the glass!’

c. **LF construction:**

\[
\text{Tanggal-an} = \text{mo} \quad \text{nang=} \quad \text{putik} \quad \text{ang=} \quad \text{salamin}. \\
\text{LF:} \text{remove} \quad =2\text{sg.gen gen=} \quad \text{mud} \quad \text{nom=} \quad \text{glass}
\]

‘Remove the mud from the glass!’

### 3.6 Summary

In this section, we presented a typology of AF constructions. AF constructions are not as syntactically or semantically homogenous as has been assumed in the literature but include various kinds of constructions that are both formally and functionally differentiated. They have more than one case frame (Table 3) and correspond to GF constructions in various ways. The semantic role of an actor NP also differs from one type to another. It can be an agent, a patient, or both.

One of the important consequences of this typology is that most AF constructions, namely, agentive, patientive, and reflexive ones are uncontroversially intransitive. They only have a single argument in the nominative case. In contrast, antipassive AF constructions have both agent and patient NPs and look transitive at first glance. To put it differently, what is really at issue in the discussion of the syntactic transitivity of AF constructions in Tagalog is the antipassive AF construction. Therefore, the following section concentrates on antipassive AF constructions in comparison to GF constructions.

Before closing this section, one final remark is made regarding the typology of AF constructions. This typology pertains to the syntax and semantics of AF constructions and is not designed for classifying lexical roots. Indeed, a single lexical root may appear in more than one AF construction type. Let us use the lexical root *pasok* ‘enter’ for illustration. On the one hand, this lexical root can appear in an agentive AF construction as in (59), expressing a volitional agent’s motion, and thus also in an applicative GF construction as in (60).

(59) **Path of motion (agentive AF construction):**

\[
P<\text{um}>\text{asok ang=} \quad \text{bata} \quad \text{sa=} \quad \text{kwarto}. \\
\text{AF:} \text{enter} \quad \text{nom=} \quad \text{child} \quad \text{loc=} \quad \text{room}
\]

‘The child entered the room’

(60) **Path of motion (applicative GF construction):**

\[
P<\text{in}>\text{asuk-an nang=} \quad \text{bata} \quad \text{ang=} \quad \text{kwarto}. \\
\text{LF:PFV:} \text{enter} \quad \text{gen=} \quad \text{child} \quad \text{nom=} \quad \text{room}
\]

‘The child entered the room (and the room was affected).’

On the other hand, the lexical root *pasok* can be used in a patientive AF construction as in (61), meaning a non-volitional movement of an inanimate entity, and also in a caused motion construction as in (62).

(61) **Change of location (patientive AF construction):**

\[
P<\text{um}>\text{asok ang=} \quad \text{bola} \quad \text{sa=} \quad \text{kwarto}. \\
\text{AF:PFV:} \text{enter} \quad \text{gen=} \quad \text{ball} \quad \text{loc=} \quad \text{room}
\]

‘The ball entered the room.’
4. Intransitive analysis of antipassive Actor-Focus constructions

The discussion in Section 3 shows that, in order to examine the syntactic transitivity of AF constructions, we only have to compare antipassive AF constructions with GF constructions. To be more precise, it is necessary to look into argumenthood of agent and patient NPs in each construction, namely, genitive agent and nominative patient NPs in GF constructions and nominative agent and genitive patient NPs in AF constructions. To illustrate this point, consider a GF construction in (63) and an AF construction in (64).

(63) **Active GF construction:**

\[
K<\text{in}>ain-ø nang= bata ang= mangga. \\
f:\text{PFV}:\text{eat} \quad \text{GEN} = \text{child} \quad \text{NOM} = \text{mango} \\
\text{GEN agent} \quad \text{NOM patient} \\
\text{‘The child ate the mango.’}
\]

(64) **Antipassive AF construction:**

\[
K<\text{um}>ain ang= bata nang= mangga. \\
\text{AF:eat} \quad \text{NOM} = \text{child} \quad \text{GEN} = \text{mango} \\
\text{NOM agent} \quad \text{GEN patient} \\
\text{‘The child ate some mango.’}
\]

GF construction (63) contains the genitive agent NP \textit{nang bata} ‘the child’ and the nominative patient NP \textit{ang mangga} ‘the mango’, while AF construction (64) includes the nominative agent NP \textit{ang bata} ‘the child’ and the genitive patient NP \textit{nang mangga} ‘some mango’. The question to ask is, do these NPs behave alike or differently?

To answer this question, this paper investigates the following syntactic phenomena: personal pronouns (Section 4.1), personal name NPs (Section 4.2), purpose constructions (Section 4.3), depictive secondary predicates (Section 4.4), floating quantifiers (Section 4.5), and left-dislocation (Section 4.6). The result of these tests is summarized in Section 4.7, where we conclude that antipassive AF constructions should be analyzed as syntactically intransitive.

Most of these syntactic tests are discussed in Schachter’s (1976, 1977) arguments against positing the subject relation in Philippine languages (see also Kroeger 1993; Cena 1995). But there are some morphosyntactic phenomena that Schachter (1976, 1977) examines that we do not: imperative and cohortative constructions, reflexive and reciprocal constructions, and relativization. Imperative and cohortative constructions and reflexive and reciprocal constructions cannot be good evidence for argumenthood, because they are mainly related to agentivity rather than argumenthood (Kroeger 1993). In addition, in recent studies of Tagalog and other Philippine languages (Kaufman 2009; Shibatani 2009, for example), relative clauses are analyzed as one of the uses of nominalization. For this reason, we do not deal with such phenomena.

Before turning to analyses of antipassive AF constructions, we show that, although both agent NPs in GF constructions and patient NPs in AF constructions receive the genitive marking, this has nothing to do with their argumenthood (Ross 2002). This is because adjuncts such...
as adverbials are also marked by the same marker. See (65) and (66).

(65) **Genitive-marked adverbial:**

T<um>akbo si= Ria nang= mabilis.

*AF:run P.NOM= Ria GEN= fast*

‘Ria ran fast.’

(66) **Genitive-marked instrumental:**

S<in>aksak-ø =ko =siya nang= kutsilyo.

*PF:PFV:stab =1SG. GEN =3SG. NOM GEN= knife*

‘I stabbed him/her with a knife.’

As in (65) and (66), the genitive case marker *nang* can introduce an adverbial element, as well as an instrumental phrase, among others. This means that morphological markings are useless in determining if a particular NP serves as a syntactic argument; and consequently, it is necessary to examine its syntactic behaviors.

4.1 **Personal pronouns**

Genitive agent and nominative patient NPs in GF constructions and nominative agent NPs in AF constructions can be realized by personal pronouns, as in (67), (68), and (69), respectively.

(67) **Genitive agent (GF):**

P<in>atay-ø =ko si= Juan.

*PF:PFV:kill =1SG. GEN P.NOM= Juan*

‘I killed Juan.’

(68) **Nominative patient (GF):**

P<in>atay-ø =ko =siya.

*PF:PFV:kill =1SG. GEN =3SG. NOM*

‘I killed him/her.’

(69) **Nominative agent (AF):**

P<um>atay =ako nang= tao.

*AF:kill =1SG. NOM GEN= person*

‘I killed a man.’

However, genitive patient NPs in AF constructions cannot appear as personal pronouns, as in (70).

(70) **Genitive patient (AF):**

*P<um>atay =ako =niya.

*AF:kill =1SG. NOM =3SG. GEN*

Intended for ‘I killed him/her.’

Another related phenomenon is the use of the pronoun *kita* ‘1sg + 2sg’, which is the single portmanteau form in the Tagalog pronominal system. This portmanteau pronoun can be used in GF constructions but not in AF constructions. Compare (71) and (72).
(71) **GF construction:**

Ya-\_yakap-in =kita (< ko ka).

**Pf:pros:hug =1sg.gen/2sg.nom**

1sg.gen 2sg.nom

‘I will hug you.’

(72) **AF construction:**

*Ya-\_yakap =kita.

**Af:pros:hug =1sg.gen/2sg.nom**

Intended for ‘I will hug you.’

As shown in (71) and (72), the portmanteau pronoun *kita* is for a combination of genitive agent and nominative patient NPs in GF constructions, but not nominative agent and genitive patient NPs in AF constructions. See also Mithun’s (1994: 248–249) discussion of portmanteau forms of Kapampangan pronominal enclitics.

### 4.2 Personal name NPs

Genitive agent and nominative patient NPs in GF constructions and nominative agent NPs in AF constructions can be realized by personal name NPs, as in (73), (74), and (75), respectively.

(73) **Genitive agent (GF):**

P<in>atay-ø ni= Bill si= Juan.

**Pf:pfv:kill p.gen= Bill p.nom= Juan**

‘Bill killed Juan.’

(74) **Nominative patient (GF):**

P<in>atay-ø =ko si= Juan.

**Pf:pfv:kill =1sg.gen p.nom= Juan**

‘I killed Juan.’

(75) **Nominative agent (AF):**

P<um>atay si= Bill nang= tao.

**Af:kill p.nom= Bill gen= person**

‘Bill killed a man.’

However, genitive patient NPs in AF constructions cannot be personal name NPs, as in (76).

(76) **Genitive patient (AF):**

*P<um>atay =ako ni= Juan.

**Af:kill =1sg.nom p.gen= Juan**

Intended for ‘I killed Juan.’

### 4.3 Purpose constructions

Purpose constructions in Tagalog are formed with the preposition *para* ‘for’, which introduces a purpose clause expressing the purpose of an action designated by the main clause. To begin with, observe in (77), (78), and (79) that genitive agent and nominative patient NPs in GF constructions and nominative agent NPs in AF constructions can serve as pivots in purpose clauses. In the following examples, a pivot is indicated by “__” with its case, while a controller is underlined. See Foley and Van Valin (1984) for pivots and controllers.
Genitive agent (GF) pivot:

(77) 
\[
\text{Nag-} \text{ipon} \quad = \text{siva} \quad \text{para} \ [\text{bilih-in} \quad \text{GEN} \quad \text{ang=} \quad \text{iPod}].
\]
\[
\text{AF:PFV:save.money} \quad = \text{3SG.NOM} \quad \text{for} \quad \text{PF:buy} \quad \text{NOM=} \quad \text{iPod}
\]
‘S/he saved money in order to buy the iPod.’

Nominative patient (GF) pivot:

(78) 
\[
\text{I-} \text{ni-lagay} \quad = \text{ko} \quad \text{ang=} \quad \text{pakwan} \quad \text{sa=} \quad \text{ref}
\]
\[
\text{CF:PFV:put} \quad = \text{1SG.GEN} \quad \text{NOM=} \quad \text{watermelon} \quad \text{LOC=} \quad \text{refrigerator}
\]
\[
\text{para} \ [\text{kain-in} \quad \text{GEN} \quad \text{mamaya}].
\]
\[
\text{for} \quad \text{PF:eat} \quad \text{later}
\]
‘I put the watermelon in the refrigerator in order to eat (it) later.’

Nominative agent (AF) pivot:

(79) 
\[
\text{Nag-} \text{ipon} \quad = \text{siva} \quad \text{para} \ [\text{b<um>ili} \quad \text{GEN} \quad \text{nang=} \quad \text{iPod}].
\]
\[
\text{AF:PFV:save.money} \quad = \text{3SG.NOM} \quad \text{for} \quad \text{AF:buy} \quad \text{GEN=} \quad \text{iPod}
\]
‘S/he saved money in order to buy an iPod.’

Importantly, genitive patient NPs in AF constructions cannot be pivots for this construction. Consider (80), for example.

Genitive patient (AF) pivot:

(80) 
\[
*\text{I-} \text{ni-lagay} \quad = \text{ko} \quad \text{ang=} \quad \text{pakwan} \quad \text{sa=} \quad \text{ref}
\]
\[
\text{CF:PFV:put} \quad = \text{1SG.GEN} \quad \text{NOM=} \quad \text{watermelon} \quad \text{LOC=} \quad \text{refrigerator}
\]
\[
\text{para} \ [\text{k<um>ain} \quad \text{GEN} \quad \text{mamaya}].
\]
\[
\text{for} \quad \text{AF:eat} \quad \text{later}
\]
Intended for ‘I put the watermelon in the refrigerator in order to eat (it) later.’

In addition, genitive patient NPs in AF constructions cannot work as controllers for purpose constructions, either, while other NPs can count as such. Consider examples in (81) through (84).

Genitive agent (GF) controller:

(81) 
\[
\text{K<in>uha-ø} \quad = \text{ko} \quad \text{ang=} \quad \text{pera} \quad \text{para} \ [\text{b<um>ili} \quad \text{GEN} \quad \text{nang=} \quad \text{isda}].
\]
\[
\text{PF:PFV:get} \quad = \text{1SG.GEN} \quad \text{NOM=} \quad \text{money} \quad \text{for} \quad \text{AF:buy} \quad \text{GEN=} \quad \text{fish}
\]
‘I got the money to buy some fish.’

Nominative patient (GF) controller:

(82) 
\[
\text{I-lagay} \quad = \text{mo} \quad = \text{ito} \quad \text{sa=} \quad \text{ref}
\]
\[
\text{CF:put} \quad = \text{2SG.GEN} \quad \text{=this.NOM} \quad \text{LOC=} \quad \text{refrigerator}
\]
\[
\text{para} \ [\text{l<um>amig} \quad \text{GEN} \quad \text{mamaya}].
\]
\[
\text{for} \quad \text{AF:become.cold}
\]
‘Put this in the refrigerator in order for it to become cold!’

Nominative agent (AF) controller:

(83) 
\[
\text{K<um>uha} \quad = \text{ako} \quad \text{nang=} \quad \text{pera} \quad \text{para} \ [\text{b<um>ili} \quad \text{GEN} \quad \text{nang=} \quad \text{isda}.]
\]
\[
\text{AF:get} \quad = \text{1SG.NOM} \quad \text{GEN=} \quad \text{money} \quad \text{for} \quad \text{AF:buy} \quad \text{GEN=} \quad \text{fish}
\]
‘I got some money to buy some fish.’

Genitive patient (AF) controller:

(84) 
\[
*\text{Mag-lagay} \quad = \text{ka} \quad = \text{nito} \quad \text{sa=} \quad \text{ref}
\]
\[
\text{AF:put} \quad = \text{2SG.NOM} \quad \text{=this.GEN} \quad \text{LOC=} \quad \text{refrigerator}
\]
para [l<um>amig ___ nom].
for AF:become.cold
Intended for ‘Put this in the refrigerator in order for it to become cold!’

In contrast to purpose constructions, agentivity matters in control constructions, also known as equi-NP constructions (Schachter 1976, 1977). In this construction type, only agent NPs, either genitive or nominative, can serve as pivots. To be more precise, only agent NPs downstairs can be interpreted as coreferential with their controller upstairs. See (85) and (86), for instance.

(85) Genitive agent (GF) pivot:
<In>utus-an =ko si=_______ Farah na
LF:PFV:order =1SG.GEN P.NOM= Farah LK
[kain-in ___ gen ang= mangga].
PF:eat nom= mango
‘I ordered Farah to eat the mango.’

(86) Nominative agent (AF) pivot:
<In>utus-an =ko si=_______ Farah na
LF:PFV:order =1SG.GEN P.NOM= Farah LK
[k<um>ain __ nom nang= mangga].
af:eat gen= mango
‘I ordered Farah to eat some mango.’

On the contrary, patient NPs cannot work as pivots in control constructions, either in the nominative or in the genitive case. See (87) and (88).

(87) Nominative patient (GF) pivot:
*<In>utus-an =ko si=_______ Farah na
LF:PFV:order =1SG.GEN P.NOM= Farah LK
[sipa-in nang= bata ___ nom].
pf:kick gen= child
Intended for ‘I ordered Farah to be kicked by the child.’

(88) Genitive patient (AF) pivot:
*<In>utus-an =ko si=_______ Farah na
LF:PFV:order =1SG.GEN P.NOM= Farah LK
[s<um>ipa ang= bata ___ gen].
af:kick nom= child
Intended for ‘I ordered Farah to be kicked by the child.’

In order for a patient NP to be controlled, it is necessary to employ causative reflexive AF constructions (Section 3.4), as in (89).

(89) Causative reflexive:
<In>utus-an =ko si=_______ Farah na
LF:PFV:order =1SG.GEN P.NOM= Farah LK
[mag-pa-sipa ___ nom sa= bata].
af:caus:kick loc= child
'I ordered Farah to be kicked by the child.'
(lit. 'I ordered Farah to allow the child to kick her.')

Interestingly, any kind of NP can be a controller in control constructions, as long as it can be interpreted as an agent of the action described by an embedded clause. Compare examples in (90) through (93).

(90) **Genitive agent (GF) controller:**
\[
Pf:ipfv:plan \ p.gen= \ Roni \ lk \ af:go \ loc= Japan.
\]
'\text{Roni is planning to go to Japan.}'

(91) **Nominative agent (AF) controller:**
\[
Nag-pa-plan \ si= \ Roni \ na \ [p<um>unta \ __\ nom \ sa= Japan].
\]
'\text{Roni is planning to go to Japan.}'

(92) **Nominative patient (GF) controller:**
\[
Pf:pfv:force \ p.gen= \ Chiara \ nom= \ pl \ man \ na \ [<um>alis \ __\ nom \ agad].
\]
'\text{Chiara forced the men to leave immediately.}'

(93) **Genitive patient (AF) controller:**
\[
Nakahubad \ na \ k<in>ain-ø \ ni= \ Jem \ ang= \ manga \ lalaki.
\]
'Them ate the fish.'

4.4 Depictive secondary predicates

Secondary predicates are those predicates that are used in addition to a primary predicate in a clause and ascribe some property to one of the arguments of the primary predicate. There are two major types of secondary predicates, depictive and resultative secondary predicates, and only the former are relevant to our discussion here.

In the Tagalog depictive secondary predicate construction, a depictive secondary predicate is used to describe a temporal state of an argument of the main predicate while the action designated by the main predicate is being carried out. Syntactically, a depictive predicate appears in the clause-initial position, being attached to the main predicate by means of a linker (see Cena 1995 and Nagaya 2004 for more on this construction in Tagalog). For example, the clause-initial depictive predicate is ascribed to a genitive agent NP (GF) in (94), a nominative patient NP (GF) in (95), and a nominative agent NP (AF) in (96).

(94) **Genitive agent (GF) controller:**
\[
Nakahubad \ na \ k<in>ain-ø \ ni= \ Jem \ ang= \ isda.
\]
'naked'
Nominative patient (GF) controller:

\[ \text{Hilaw na k<in>ain-ø ni=} \text{Jem ang=} \text{isda.} \]
\[ \text{raw lk pf:pfv:eat p.gen=} \text{Jem nom=} \text{fish} \]

‘Jem ate \text{the fish raw.}’

Nominative agent (AF) controller:

\[ \text{Nakahubad na k<um>ain si=} \text{Jem n ang=} \text{isda.} \]
\[ \text{naked lk af:eat p.nom=} \text{Jem gen=} \text{fish} \]

‘Jem ate \text{some fish naked.}’

Importantly, genitive patient NPs in AF constructions cannot serve as controllers for such a depictive secondary predicate. See (97).

Genitive patient (AF) controller:

*\[ \text{Hilaw na k<um>ain si=} \text{Jem n ang=} \text{isda.} \]
\[ \text{raw lk af:eat p.nom=} \text{Jem gen=} \text{fish} \]

Intended for ‘Jem ate \text{some fish raw.}’

The depictive secondary construction in (97) is ungrammatical in the sense that the depictive \text{hilaw} cannot be predicated of the genitive patient NP \text{isda ‘fish’}. From a purely syntactic perspective, the nominative agent NP \text{si Jem ‘Jem’} can be a controller for this depictive predicate, but this leads to pragmatically implausible meanings.

4.5 Floating quantifiers

The quantifier \text{lahat ‘all’} appears inside an NP in most cases but may also occur outside an NP and right after a verb predicate (Schachter 1976, 1977). This phenomenon is called quantifier floating. To illustrate, compare an NP-internal quantifier in (98) and a floating quantifier in (99) (adapted from Schachter 1976: 501).

NP-internal quantifier:

\[ \text{S<um>u~sulat ang=} \text{lahat nang=} \text{manga bata nang=} \text{manga liham.} \]
\[ \text{af:ipfv:write nom=} \text{all gen=} \text{pl child gen=} \text{pl letter} \]

‘All the children are writing the letters.’

Floating quantifier:

\[ \text{S<um>u~sulat labat ang=} \text{manga bata nang=} \text{manga liham.} \]
\[ \text{af:ipfv:write all nom=} \text{pl child gen=} \text{pl letter} \]

‘All the children are writing the letters.’

Crucially, the quantifier \text{labat ‘all’} cannot float out of any kind of NP. Let us first confirm that \text{labat} can be located outside genitive agent and nominative patient NPs in GF constructions and nominative agent NPs in AF constructions. See (100), (101), and (102), respectively.

Genitive agent (GF):

\[ \text{B<in>ili-ø labat nang=} \text{manga bata ang=} \text{libro ni=} \text{Bob Ong.} \]
\[ \text{pf:pfv:buy all gen=} \text{pl child nom=} \text{book p.gen=} \text{Bob Ong} \]

‘\text{All the children bought Bob Ong’s book.}’
(101) **Nominative patient (GF):**

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{B<in>ili-ø labat nang= lalaki ang= manga libro.} \\
&\text{pf:pfv:buy all gen= man nom= pl book} \\
&\text{The man bought all the books.}
\end{align*}
\]

(102) **Nominative agent (AF):**

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{B<um>ili labat ang= manga bata nang= libro ni= Bob Ong.} \\
&\text{af:pfv:buy all nom= pl child gen= book p.gen= Bob Ong} \\
&\text{All the children bought Bob Ong's book.}
\end{align*}
\]

However, as in (103), the quantifier lahat cannot float out of genitive patient NPs in AF constructions.

(103) **Genitive patient (AF):**

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{B<um>ili labat nang= lalaki nang= manga libro.} \\
&\text{af:pfv:buy all nom= man gen= pl book} \\
&\text{Intended for 'The man bought all the books.'}
\end{align*}
\]

4.6 **Left-dislocation**

In the Tagalog left-dislocation construction, the dislocated NP appears in the nominative case in the sentence-initial position, leaving either a gap or a resumptive pronoun in the original position (Nagaya 2007a). In either case, genitive agent and nominative patient NPs in GF constructions and nominative agent NPs in AF constructions can be coreferential with a left-dislocated NP. To illustrate, consider examples in (104), (105), and (106).

(104) **Genitive agent (GF):**

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Si=}\text{ Flori, s<in>ampal-ø }\_\_{gen} \text{ si=}\text{ Weng.} \\
&\text{p.nom=}\text{ Flori pf:pfv:slap p.nom=}\text{ Weng} \\
&\text{As for Flori, (she) slapped Weng.'}
\end{align*}
\]

(105) **Nominative patient (GF):**

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Si=}\text{ Weng, s<in>ampal-ø ni=}\text{ Flori }\_\_{nom}. \\
&\text{p.nom=}\text{ Weng pf:pfv:slap p.gen=}\text{ Flori} \\
&\text{As for Weng, Flori slapped (her).'}
\end{align*}
\]

(106) **Nominative agent (AF):**

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Si=}\text{ Ria, k<um>ain }\_\_{nom} \text{ nang= mangga.} \\
&\text{p.nom=}\text{ Ria af:eat gen= mango} \\
&\text{As for Ria, (she) ate some mango.'}
\end{align*}
\]

However, genitive patient NPs in AF constructions cannot serve as pivots for the Tagalog left-dislocation construction, as in (107). In this example, the dislocated NP ang mangga 'the mango' cannot be interpreted as coreferential with the gapped genitive patient NP.

(107) **Genitive patient (AF):**

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{*Ang=}\text{ mangga, k<um>ain si=}\text{ Ria }\_\_{gen}. \\
&\text{nom=}\text{ mango af:eat p.nom=}\text{ Ria} \\
&\text{Intended for 'As for the mango, Ria ate (it).'}
\end{align*}
\]

One might argue that this contrast in grammaticality can be accounted for by the definiteness constraint in antipassive AF constructions: to be more precise, in antipassive AF construc-
tions, genitive patient NPs cannot have a definite interpretation (Section 3.5) and thus do not allow left dislocation. However, this is not the case. The same result is obtained even when the dislocated NP contains the numeral *isa* ‘one’ and has an indefinite reference. Consider examples in (108) through (111).

(108) **Genitive agent (GF):**

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Ang= isa=ng } \text{lalaki, k<in>ain-ø } \text{ang= mangga.} \\
\text{NOM= one=LK } \text{man pf:pfv:eat } \text{nom= mango}
\end{array}
\]

‘As for a man, (he) ate the mango.’

(109) **Nominative patient (GF):**

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Ang= isa=ng } \text{mangga, k<in>ain-ø } \text{nang= lalaki } \text{__nom}^* \\
\text{NOM= one=LK } \text{mango pf:pfv:eat } \text{gen= man}
\end{array}
\]

‘As for a mango, the man ate (one).’

(110) **Nominative agent (AF):**

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Ang= isa=ng } \text{lalaki, k<um>ain } \text{__nom } \text{nang= mangga.} \\
\text{NOM= one=LK } \text{man af:eat } \text{gen= mango}
\end{array}
\]

‘As for a man, (he) ate a mango.’

(111) **Genitive patient (AF):**

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{*Ang= isa=ng } \text{mangga, k<um>ain ang= lalaki } \text{__gen}^* \\
\text{NOM= one=LK } \text{mango af:eat } \text{nom= man}
\end{array}
\]

Intended for ‘As for a mango, the man ate (one).’

In summary, genitive agent and nominative patient NPs in GF constructions and nominative agent NPs in AF constructions can be left-dislocated either with or without a resumptive pronoun, while genitive patient NPs in AF constructions cannot.

4.7 Summary

The discussion of this section can be summarized as in Table 4. This table clearly demonstrates that nominative agent NPs in AF constructions behave like genitive agent and nominative patient NPs in GF constructions, but genitive patient NPs in AF constructions do not. Therefore, agent and patient NPs in GF constructions and agent NPs in AF constructions are syntactic arguments, while patient NPs in AF constructions are not. To put it differently, GF constructions are syntactically transitive, whereas antipassive AF constructions are syntactically intransitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus category</th>
<th>GF GEN agent</th>
<th>GF NOM patient</th>
<th>AF NOM agent</th>
<th>AF GEN patient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronominal encoding</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal name NP</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pivot in purpose constructions</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller in purpose constructions</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depictive secondary predicate</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating quantifier</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left dislocation</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Conclusions

In this paper, we explored one of the most controversial issues in Philippine linguistics, namely, the syntactic transitivity of AF constructions. There are two claims we have argued in this paper. First, AF constructions do not form a homogenous construction type but rather consist of both syntactically and semantically varying construction types. In particular, most AF construction types are clearly intransitive and only antipassive AF constructions should be taken into consideration when we discuss the syntactic transitivity of AF constructions.

Second, this paper has provided several pieces of evidence that antipassive AF constructions are syntactically intransitive: nominative agent NPs in this construction type behave like agent and patient NPs in GF constructions, but genitive patient NPs do not. Taken together, it is concluded that Tagalog AF constructions are best analyzed as syntactically intransitive.
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要旨
本稿は、フィリピン言語学においてもっとも難しい問題の一つといえる、タガログ語の行為者焦点動詞構文の統語的他動性について考察する。この問題については、それが統語的に他動詞なのか自動詞なのか、長らく議論されている。この論文では次の二つの主張を行う。一つ目は、タガログ語の行為者焦点動詞構文は単一の均質なカテゴリーを形成するわけではない。統語的にも意味的にも相異なる複数の構文からなっているということである。本稿が明らかにするように、ほとんどの行為者焦点動詞構文は自動詞であり、本当にその統語的他動性を精査しなければならないのは逆動態タイプの行為者焦点動詞構文のみである。二つ目は、逆動態タイプの行為者焦点動詞構文が自動詞である統語的証拠がいくつかあるということである。このタイプの構文の主格動作者名詞句が非行為者焦点動詞構文の動作者名詞句や被動者名詞句と同じように振る舞うのに対して、属格被動者名詞句はそうではない。こうして、二つの観察をあわせて、タガログ語の行為者焦点動詞構文は統語的に自動詞であると分析するのが一番よいと結論づけることができる。
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