

On the Syntactic Transitivity of Tagalog Actor-Focus Constructions

journal or publication title	NINJAL Research Papers
number	4
page range	49-76
year	2012-11
URL	http://doi.org/10.15084/00000498

On the Syntactic Transitivity of Tagalog Actor-Focus Constructions

NAGAYA Naonori

JSPS Research Fellow (SPD) / Postdoctoral Research Fellow, Department of Crosslinguistic Studies,
National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics [-2012.03]

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.*

Key words: Tagalog, transitivity, voice, ergativity, Philippine-type

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; “<>” infix; “=” 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:**

K<um>ain ang= bata nang= tinapay.

AF:eat NOM= child GEN= bread

‘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 Otnes’ (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 Otnes 1972; also see Section 2).²

(2) **PF construction:**

Ka~kain-in nang= bata ang= tinapay.

PF:PROS:eat GEN= child NOM= bread

‘The child will eat the bread.’

(3) **LF construction:**

K<in>ain-an nang= bata ang= pinggan na iyon.

LF:PFV:eat GEN= child NOM= plate LK that.NOM

‘The child ate off of that plate.’

(4) **CF construction:**

I-k<in>ain nang= bata ang= kapatid =niya.

CF:PFV:eat GEN= child NOM= sibling =3SG.GEN

‘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:**

P<um>atay ang= lalaki nang= aso.

AF:kill NOM= man GEN= dog

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

(6) **GF construction:**

P<in>atay-∅ nang= lalaki ang= aso.

PF:PFV:kill GEN= man NOM= dog

‘The man killed the dog.’

² Schachter and Otnes (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 Otnes (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.
 PF: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:**

S<in>ira- \emptyset =ko ang= kotse ni= Ally.
 PF:PFV:break =1SG.GEN NOM= car 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 ang= **lalaki (S)** sa= Makati.
 AF:go NOM= **man** LOC= Makati
 ‘**The man (S)** went to Makati.’

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

P<um>atay ang= **lalaki (S)** nang= aso.
 ‘**The man (S)** killed a dog.’

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

P<in>atay- \emptyset nang= lalaki (A) ang= **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 ang= **lalaki (S)** sa= Makati.
 ‘**The man (S)** went to Makati.’

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

P<um>atay ang= **lalaki (A)** nang= aso (O).
 ‘**The man (A)** killed a dog (O).’

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

P<in>atay- \emptyset nang= lalaki (A) ang= **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) L<um>ingon =ako sa= [**<in>upu-an ni= Aldrin**].
 AF:look.back =1SG.NOM LOC= [LF:PFV:sit P.GEN= 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) **AF middle:**

Nag-bihis si= Mike.
 AF:PFV:dress P.NOM= Mike
 ‘Mike dressed (up).’

(16) **GF active:**

B<in>ihis-an ni= Mike ang= anak =niya.
 LF:PFV:dress P.GEN= Mike NOM= child =3SG.GEN
 ‘Mike dressed his child (up).’

The same lexical root *bihis* ‘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) **AF antipassive:**

K<um>ain ang= bata nang= mansanas.
 AF:eat NOM= child GEN= apple
 ‘The child ate some apple.’

(18) **GF active:**

K<in>ain-∅ nang= bata ang= mansanas.
 PF:PFV:eat GEN= child NOM= apple
 ‘The child ate the apple (completely).’

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:**

Kain-in =mo iyan!
 PF:eat =2SG.GEN that.NOM
 ‘(You) eat that!’

(20) **Perfective form:**

K<in>ain-∅ =ko iyan.
 PF:PFV:eat =1SG.GEN that.NOM
 ‘I ate that.’

(21) **Prospective form:**

Ka~kain-in =ko iyan.
 PF:PROS:eat =1SG.GEN that.NOM
 ‘I will eat that.’

(22) **Imperfective form:**

K<in>a~kain-∅ =ko iyan.
 PF:IPFV:eat =1SG.GEN that.NOM
 ‘I am eating that.’

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 1 Focus system

FOCUS CATEGORY		AFFIX	FOCUSED SEMNATIC ROLE(S)
Actor Focus (AF)		<i>m-</i> , <i>-um-</i>	agent, patient
Goal Focus (GF)	Patient Focus (PF)	<i>-in</i>	patient
	Locative Focus (LF)	<i>-an</i>	goal, location, source
	Circumstantial Focus (CF)	<i>i-</i>	other semantic roles

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.’

(27) **CF construction (Schachter 1976: 495):**

I-pag-a~alis nang= babae nang= bigas sa= sako ang= bata.

CF:PROS:take.out GEN= woman GEN= rice LOC= sack NOM= child

‘A/The woman will take some rice out of a/the sack **for the child (circumstantial: beneficiary).**’

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 2 Focus construction and case-marking (cf. Table 3)

FOCUS CATEGORY	AGENT	PATIENT	LOCATION	PERIPHERALS
AF constructions	—	—	LOC	Preposition
	NOM	—	LOC	Preposition
	NOM		LOC	Preposition
	NOM	GEN	LOC	Preposition
	—	NOM	LOC	Preposition
PF constructions	GEN	NOM	LOC	Preposition
LF constructions	GEN	GEN	NOM	Preposition
CF constructions	GEN	GEN	LOC	NOM

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 *-in-* for realis mood (Himmelmann 2006). Second, all of them can go with the potentiative prefix *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.

(28) **AF construction with a “focused” undergoer:**

L<um>ubog ang= araw sa= kanluran.

AF:set NOM= sun LOC= west

‘The sun set in the west.’

Lastly, we refer to NPs marked by *ang* as ‘nominative’ instead of ‘topic’: there is no bi-unique relationship between *ang*-marking and pragmatic topic status. *Ang*-marked NPs are not always interpreted as pragmatic topic (Kaufman 2005; Nagaya 2007a). Similarly, the term ‘pivot’ is not used to stand for *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.

Table 3 Typology of AF constructions (cf. Table 2)

TYPE OF AF	AGENT	PATIENT	S-TRANSITIVITY	GF COUNTERPARTS
Ambient	∅	∅	Atransitive	N/A
Agentive	NOM	∅	Intransitive	Applicative
Patientive	∅	NOM	Intransitive	Active
Reflexive	NOM		Intransitive	Active
Antipassive	NOM	GEN	(see Section 4)	Active; applicative

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.

(34) **Activity:**

S<in>ayaw-an ni= Ria ang= kwarto.
 LF:PFV:dance P.GEN= Ria NOM= room
 ‘Ria danced in the room.’

(35) **Path of motion:**

<In>akyat-ø ni= Farah ang= Mt. Mayon.
 PF:PFV:climb P.GEN= Farah NOM= Mt. Mayon
 ‘Farah climbed Mt. Mayon (and conquered it).’

(36) **Manner of motion:**

Ni-lakar-an ni= Paul ang= Luneta Park.
 LF:PFV:walk P.GEN= Paul NOM= Luneta Park
 ‘Paul walked in Luneta Park (completely).’

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):**

Nag-bukas ang= pinto.
 AF:PFV:open NOM= door
 ‘The door opened.’

(38) **Change of state (2):**

G<um>anda ang= presentation ni= Ian.
 AF:become.beautiful NOM= presentation P.GEN= Ian
 ‘Ian’s presentation became beautiful.’

(39) **Change of location:**

G<um>ulong ang= bola sa= kalsada.
 AF:roll NOM= ball LOC= street
 ‘The ball rolled on the street.’

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):**

B<in>uks-an ni= Tuting ang= pinto.
 LF:PFV:open P.GEN= Tuting NOM= door
 ‘Tuting opened the door.’

(41) **Direct causative (2):**

G<in>andah-an ni= Ian ang= presentation =niya.
 LF:PFV:make.beautiful P.GEN= Ian NOM= presentation =3SG.GEN
 ‘Ian made his presentation beautiful.’

(42) **Caused motion:**

G<in>ulong-ø ni= Jay ang= bola sa= kalsada.
 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:**

Nag-bihis si= Ricky.
 AF:PFV:dress P.NOM= Ricky
 ‘Ricky dressed.’

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

T<um>ayo si= Lucy.
 AF:stand.up P.NOM= Lucy
 ‘Lucy stood up.’

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

Nag-unat si= Marfeal.
 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:**

B<in>ihis-an ni= Ricky ang= apo =niya.
 LF:PFV:dress P.GEN= Ricky NOM= grandchild =3SG.GEN
 ‘Ricky dressed his grandchild.’

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

I-t<in>ayo ni= Lucy ang= manika.
 CF:PFV:stand P.GEN= Lucy NOM= doll
 ‘Lucy stood the doll up.’

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

<In>unat-ø ni= Marfeal ang= kamay nang= lola.
 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:**

Nag-pa-gupit =ako kay= Resty.
 AF:CAUS:PFV:cut.hair =1SG.NOM P.LOC= Resty
 ‘I had my hair cut by Resty.’ (The causer was affected.)

(50) **Indirect causative:**

P<in>a-gupit-an =ko si= Resty.
 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:**

P<um>atay ang= manga lalaki nang= aso.
 AF:kill NOM= PL man GEN= dog
 ‘The men killed a dog.’

(52) **Verbs of hitting:**

S<um>ampal ang= babae nang= lalaki.
 AF:slap NOM= woman GEN= man
 ‘The woman slapped a man.’

(53) **Verbs of consumption:**

K<um>ain ang= babae nang= pakwan.
 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:**

P<in>atay- \emptyset nang= lalaki ang= aso.
 PF:PFV:kill GEN= man NOM= dog
 ‘The man killed the dog.’

(55) **Verbs of hitting:**

S<in>ampal- \emptyset nang= babae ang= lalaki.
 PF:PFV:slap GEN= woman NOM= man
 ‘The woman slapped the man.’

(56) **Verbs of consumption:**

K<in>ain- \emptyset nang= babae ang= pakwan.
 PF:PFV:eat GEN= woman NOM= watermelon
 ‘The woman ate the watermelon.’

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:**

Nag-karga =ako nang= dayami sa= trak.
 AF:PFV:load =1SG.NOM GEN= hay LOC= truck
 ‘I loaded some hay onto the truck.’

b. **CF construction:**

I-k<in>arga =ko ang= dayami sa= trak.
 CF:PFV:load =1SG.GEN NOM= hay LOC= truck
 ‘I loaded the hay onto the truck.’

c. **LF construction:**

K<in>argah-an =ko nang= dayami ang= trak.
 LF:PFV:load =1SG.GEN GEN= hay NOM= truck
 ‘I loaded the truck with hay.’

(58) **Verbs of removal:**

a. **AF construction:**

Mag-tanggal =ka nang= putik sa= salamin.
 AF:remove =2SG.NOM GEN= mud LOC= glass
 ‘Remove mud from the glass!’

b. **PF construction:**

Tanggal-in =mo ang= putik sa= salamin.
 PF:remove =2SG.GEN NOM= mud LOC= glass
 ‘Remove the mud from the glass!’

c. **LF construction:**

Tanggal-an =mo nang= putik ang= salamin.
 LF:remove =2SG.GEN GEN= mud NOM= 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<um>asok ang= bata sa= kwarto.
 AF:enter NOM= child LOC= room
 ‘The child entered the room’

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

P<in>asuk-an nang= bata ang= kwarto.
 LF:PFV:enter GEN= child NOM= 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<um>asok ang= bola sa= kwarto.
 AF:PFV:enter GEN= ball LOC= room
 ‘The ball entered the room.’

(62) **Caused motion (active GF construction):**

I-p<in>asok nang= bata ang= bola sa= kwarto.
 CF:PFV:move.into GEN= child NOM= ball LOC= room
 ‘The child moved the ball into 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<in>ain-∅ nang= bata ang= mangga.
 PF:PFV:eat GEN= child NOM= mango
 GEN agent NOM patient
 ‘The child ate the mango.’

(64) **Antipassive AF construction:**

K<um>ain ang= bata nang= mangga.
 AF:eat NOM= child GEN= mango
 NOM agent GEN patient
 ‘The child ate some mango.’

GF construction (63) contains the genitive agent NP *nang bata* ‘the child’ and the nominative patient NP *ang mangga* ‘the mango’, while AF construction (64) includes the nominative agent NP *ang bata* ‘the child’ and the genitive patient NP *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- \emptyset ni= Bill si= Juan.
 PF:PFV:kill P.GEN= Bill P.NOM= Juan
 ‘Bill killed Juan.’

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

P<in>atay- \emptyset =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.

(77) **Genitive agent (GF) pivot:**

Nag-ipon =siya para [bilih-in ___GEN ang= iPod].
 AF:PFV:save.money =3SG.NOM for PF:buy NOM= iPod
 ‘S/he saved money in order to buy the iPod.’

(78) **Nominative patient (GF) pivot:**

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

(79) **Nominative agent (AF) pivot:**

Nag-ipon =siya para [b<um>ili ___NOM nang= iPod].
 AF:PFV:save.money =3SG.NOM for AF:buy GEN= 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.

(80) **Genitive patient (AF) pivot:**

*I-ni-lagay =ko ang= pakwan sa= ref
 CF:PFV:put =1SG.GEN NOM= watermelon LOC= refrigerator
 para [k<um>ain ___GEN mamaya].
 for AF:eat 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).

(81) **Genitive agent (GF) controller:**

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

(82) **Nominative patient (GF) controller:**

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

(83) **Nominative agent (AF) controller:**

K<um>uha =ako nang= pera para [b<um>ili ___NOM nang= isda].
 AF:get =1SG.NOM GEN= money for AF:buy GEN= fish
 ‘I got some money to buy some fish.’

(84) **Genitive patient (AF) controller:**

*Mag-lagay =ka =nito sa= ref
 AF:put =2SG.NOM =this.GEN LOC= 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:**

P<in>a~plano-ø ni= Roni na [p<um>unta ____{NOM} sa= Japan].
PF:IPFV:plan P.GEN= Roni LK AF:go LOC= Japan
'Roni is planning to go to Japan.'

(91) **Nominative agent (AF) controller:**

Nag-pa~plano si= Roni na [p<um>unta ____{NOM} sa= Japan].
AF:IPFV:plan P.NOM= Roni LK AF:go LOC= Japan
'Roni is planning to go to Japan.'

(92) **Nominative patient (GF) controller:**

P<in>ilit-ø ni= Chiara ang= manga lalaki
PF:PFV:force P.GEN= Chiara NOM= PL man
na [<um>alis ____{NOM} agad].
LK AF:leave immediately
'Chiara forced the men to leave immediately.'

(93) **Genitive patient (AF) controller:**

P<um>ilit si= Chiara nang= manga lalaki
AF:force P.NOM= Chiara GEN= PL man
na [<um>alis ____{NOM} agad].
LK AF:leave immediately
'Chiara forced some men to leave immediately.'

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:**

Nakabubad na k<in>ain-ø ni= Jem ang= isda.
naked LK PF:PFV:eat P.GEN= Jem NOM= fish
'Jem ate the fish *naked*.'

(95) **Nominative patient (GF) controller:**

Hilaw na k<in>ain-ø ni= Jem ang= isda.
 raw LK PF:PFV:eat P.GEN= Jem NOM= fish
 ‘Jem ate the fish *raw*.’

(96) **Nominative agent (AF) controller:**

Nakabubad na k<um>ain si= Jem nang= isda.
 naked LK AF:eat P.NOM= Jem GEN= fish
 ‘Jem ate some fish *naked*.’

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

(97) **Genitive patient (AF) controller:**

**Hilaw* na k<um>ain si= Jem nang= isda.
 raw LK AF:eat P.NOM= Jem GEN= fish
 Intended for ‘Jem ate some fish *raw*.’

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

4.5 Floating quantifiers

The quantifier *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).

(98) **NP-internal quantifier:**

S<um>u~sulat ang= lahat nang= manga bata nang= manga liham.
 AF:IPFV:write NOM= all GEN= PL child GEN= PL letter
 ‘All the children are writing the letters.’

(99) **Floating quantifier:**

S<um>u~sulat lahat ang= manga bata nang= manga liham.
 AF:IPFV:write all NOM= PL child GEN= PL letter
 ‘All the children are writing the letters.’

Crucially, the quantifier *lahat* ‘all’ cannot float out of any kind of NP. Let us first confirm that *lahat* 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.

(100) **Genitive agent (GF):**

B<in>ili-ø *lahat* nang= manga bata ang= libro ni= Bob Ong.
 PF:PFV:buy all GEN= PL child NOM= book P.GEN= Bob Ong
 ‘All the children bought Bob Ong’s book.’

(101) **Nominative patient (GF):**

B<in>ili- \emptyset *labat* nang= lalaki ang= manga libro.
 PF:PFV:buy all GEN= man NOM= PL book
 ‘The man bought *all the books*.’

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

B<um>ili *labat* ang= manga bata nang= libro ni= Bob Ong.
 AF:PFV:buy all NOM= PL child GEN= book P.GEN= Bob Ong
 ‘*All the children* bought Bob Ong’s book.’

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

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

*B<um>ili *labat* ang= lalaki nang= manga libro.
 AF:PFV:buy all NOM= man GEN= PL book
 Intended for ‘The man bought *all the books*.’

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):**

Si= Flori, s<in>ampal- \emptyset _____ si= Weng.
 P.NOM= Flori PF:PFV:slap _____ P.NOM= Weng
 ‘As for Flori, (she) slapped Weng.’

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

Si= Weng, s<in>ampal- \emptyset ni= Flori _____
 P.NOM= Weng PF:PFV:slap P.GEN= Flori _____
 ‘As for Weng, Flori slapped (her).’

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

Si= Ria, k<um>ain _____ nang= mangga.
 P.NOM= Ria AF:eat _____ GEN= mango
 ‘As for Ria, (she) ate some mango.’

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):**

*Ang= mangga, k<um>ain si= Ria _____
 NOM= mango AF:eat P.NOM= Ria _____
 Intended for ‘As for the mango, Ria ate (it).’

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):**

Ang= isa=ng lalaki, k<in>ain-∅ ___GEN ang= mangga.
 NOM= one=LK man PF:PFV:eat NOM= mango
 ‘As for a man, (he) ate the mango.’

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

Ang= isa=ng mangga, k<in>ain-∅ nang= lalaki ___NOM.
 NOM= one=LK mango PF:PFV:eat GEN= man
 ‘As for a mango, the man ate (one).’

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

Ang= isa=ng lalaki, k<um>ain ___NOM nang= mangga.
 NOM= one=LK man AF:eat GEN= mango
 ‘As for a man, (he) ate a mango.’

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

*Ang= isa=ng mangga, k<um>ain ang= lalaki ___GEN.
 NOM= one=LK mango AF:eat NOM= man
 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 4 Syntactic transitivity

Focus category	GF	GF	AF	AF
NP	GEN agent	NOM patient	NOM agent	GEN patient
Pronominal encoding	ok	ok	ok	*
Personal name NP	ok	ok	ok	*
Pivot in purpose constructions	ok	ok	ok	*
Controller in purpose constructions	ok	ok	ok	*
Depictive secondary predicate	ok	ok	ok	*
Floating quantifier	ok	ok	ok	*
Left dislocation	ok	ok	ok	*

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.

References

- Adelaar, Alexander and Nikolaus P. Himmelman (eds.) (2005) *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London: Routledge.
- Anderson, Stephen R. (1976) On the notion of subject in ergative languages. In: Charles N. Li (ed.), 1–23.
- Cena, Resty M. (1977) Patient primacy in Tagalog. Presented at the LSA Annual Meeting, Chicago.
- Cena, Resty M. (1995) Surviving without relations. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 26: 1–32.
- Comrie, Bernard (1978) Ergativity. In: Winfred P. Lehmann (ed.) *Syntactic typology*, 329–394. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Cooreman, Ann (1994) A functional typology of antipassive. In: Barbara A. Fox and Paul J. Hopper (eds.), 49–88.
- De Guzman, Videia P. (1988) Ergative analysis for Philippine languages: An analysis. In: Richard McGinn (ed.) *Studies in Austronesian linguistics*, 323–345. Athens: Center for Southeast Asia Studies, Center for International Studies, Ohio University.
- De Guzman, Videia P. (1992) Morphological evidence for primacy of patient as subject in Tagalog. In: Malcolm D. Ross (ed.), *Papers in Austronesian linguistics* 2: 87–96. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Dixon, R.M.W. (1994) *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foley, William A. (1998) Symmetrical voice systems and precategoriality in Philippine languages. Presented at the Workshop on Voice and Grammatical Functions in Austronesian Languages, 1998 International Lexical Functional Grammar Conference, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, July 1, 1998.
- Foley, William A. and Robert D. Van Valin Jr. (1984) *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox, Barbara A. and Paul J. Hopper (eds.) (1994) *Voice: Form and function*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- French, Koleen Matsuda (1987/1988) The focus system in Philippine languages: An historical overview. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 18/19: 1–27.
- Heath, Jeffrey (1976) Antipassivization: A functional typology. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 2: 202–211.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. (2002) Voice in western Austronesian: An update. In: Fay Wouk and Malcolm D. Ross (eds.), 7–16.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. (2005a) The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar: Typological characteristics. In: Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelman (eds.), 110–181.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. (2005b) Tagalog. In: Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelman (eds.), 350–376.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. (2006) How to miss a paradigm or two: Multifunctional *ma-* in Tagalog. In: Felix Ameka, Alan Dench and Nicholas Evans (eds) *Catching language: The standing challenge of grammar writing*, 487–526. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson (1980) Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56: 251–299.
- Katagiri, Masumi (2005) Topicality, ergativity, and transitivity in Tagalog: Implications for the Philippine-

- type system. Presented at the Taiwan-Japan Joint Workshop on Austronesian Languages, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan, June 23–24, 2005.
- Kaufman, Daniel (2005) Aspects of pragmatic focus in Tagalog. In: I Wayan Arka and Malcolm D. Ross (eds.) *The many faces of Austronesian voice systems: Some new empirical studies*, 175–196. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Kaufman, Daniel (2009) Austronesian nominalism and its consequences: A Tagalog case study. *Theoretical Linguistics* 35: 1–49.
- Kemmer, Suzanne (1988) The middle voice: A typological and diachronic study. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.
- Kemmer, Suzanne (1993) *The middle voice*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kemmer, Suzanne (1994) Middle voice, transitivity, and the elaboration of events. In: Barbara A. Fox and Paul J. Hopper (eds.), 179–230.
- Kroeger, Paul (1993) *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Li, Charles N. (ed.) (1976) *Subject and topic*. New York: Academic Press.
- Liao, Hsiu-chuan (2004) Transitivity and ergativity in Formosan and Philippine languages. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawai'i.
- Lyons, John (1968) *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mithun, Marianne (1994) The implications of ergativity for a Philippine voice system. In: Barbara A. Fox and Paul J. Hopper (eds.), 247–277.
- McFarland, Curtis D. (1978) Definite objects and subject selection in Philippine languages. In: Casilda Edrial-Luzares and Austin Hale (eds.) *Studies in Philippine linguistics* Volume II, 139–182. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Nagaya, Naonori (2004) Depictive construction and grammatical relations in Tagalog. *Tokyo University Linguistic Papers* 23: 119–150.
- Nagaya, Naonori (2006a) Grammatical relations and reference-tracking in Tagalog. MLitt thesis, The University of Tokyo.
- Nagaya, Naonori (2006b) Tagarogugo-no jitakoutai [Transitivity alternations in Tagalog]. *Handbook of the 132nd meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan*, 129–134.
- Nagaya, Naonori (2007a) Information structure and constituent order in Tagalog. *Language and Linguistics* 8: 343–372.
- Nagaya, Naonori (2007b) The middle voice in Tagalog. Presented at the 17th annual conference of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society (SEALS), The University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland, August 31–September 2, 2007.
- Nagaya, Naonori (2009) The middle voice in Tagalog. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistic Society* 1: 159–188.
- Nagaya, Naonori (2011) Tagarogugo-no *pa*-siekikoubun to sekinin [Tagalog *pa*-causative constructions and responsibility]. *Handbook of the 143rd meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan*, 392–397.
- Nolasco, Ricardo Ma. Duran (2003) Ang pagkatransitibo at ikinaergatibo ng mga wikang Pilipino: Isang pagsusuri sa sistemang boses [Transitivity and ergativity in Philippine languages: An analysis of voice systems]. Ph.D. dissertation, University of the Philippines Diliman.
- Nolasco, Ricardo Ma. Duran (2005) What ergativity in Philippine languages really means? Presented at the Taiwan-Japan Joint Workshop on Austronesian Languages, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan, June 23–24, 2005.
- Nolasco, Ricardo Ma. Duran (2006) Ano ang S, A, at O sa mga wika ng Pilipinas? [What are S, A, and O in languages of the Philippines?] Presented at the 9th Philippine Linguistics Congress, University of the Philippines Diliman, Quezon, Philippines, January 25–27, 2006.
- Nolasco, Ricardo Ma. Duran and Maureen Joy Saclot (2005) M- and S-transitivity in Philippine type languages. Presented at the 2005 International Course and Conference on Role and Reference Grammar, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan, June 26–30, 2005.
- Payne, Thomas E. (1982) Role and reference related subject properties and ergativity in Yup'ik Eskimo and Tagalog. *Studies in Language* 6: 75–106.
- Polinsky, Maria (2008) Antipassive constructions. In: Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil

- and Bernard Comrie (eds.) *The world atlas of language structures online*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library, chapter 108. Available online at <http://wals.info/feature/108>. Accessed on 2008-12-31.
- Reid, Lawrence A. and Hsiu-chuan Liao (2004) A brief syntactic typology of Philippine languages. *Language and Linguistics* 5: 433–490.
- Ross, Malcolm D. (2002) The history and transitivity of western Austronesian voice and voice-marking. In: Fay Wouk and Malcolm D. Ross (eds.), 17–62.
- Saclot, Maureen Joy (2006) On the transitivity of the actor focus and patient focus constructions in Tagalog. Presented at the tenth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Palawan, Philippines, January 17–20, 2006.
- Schachter, Paul (1976) The subject in Philippine languages: Topic, actor, actor-topic, or none of the above. In: Charles N. Li (ed.), 491–518.
- Schachter, Paul (1977) Reference-related and role-related properties of subjects. In: Peter Cole and Jerrold M. Sadock (eds.) *Syntax and semantics* Volume 8, *Grammatical relations*, 279–306. New York: Academic Press.
- Schachter, Paul and Fe T. Otones (1972) *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi (1988) Voice in Philippine languages. In: Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.) *Passive and voice*, 85–142. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi (2006) On the conceptual framework for voice phenomena. *Linguistics* 44: 217–269.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi (2009) Elements of complex structures, where recursion isn't: The case of relativization. In: T. Givón and Masayoshi Shibatani (eds.) *Syntactic complexity: Diachrony, acquisition, neuro-cognition, evolution*, 163–198. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Starosta, Stanley, Andrew K. Pawley and Lawrence A. Reid (1982) The evolution of focus in Austronesian. In: A. Halim, L. Carrington and S.A. Wurm (eds.) *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics* 1, 145–170. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Wouk, Fay (1986) Transitivity in Batak and Tagalog. *Studies in Language* 10: 391–424.
- Wouk, Fay and Malcolm D. Ross (eds.) (2002) *The history and typology of western Austronesian voice systems*. Canberra: Australian National University.

タガログ語における行為者焦点動詞構文の統語的他動性について

長屋 尚典

日本学術振興会 特別研究員 (SPD) / 国立国語研究所 言語対照研究系 プロジェクト研究員 [-2012.03]

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く、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節であり、本当にその統語的他動性を精査しなければならぬのは逆受動タイプの行為者焦点動詞構文のみである。二つ目は、逆受動タイプの行為者焦点動詞構文が自動詞節である統語的証拠がいくつも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節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。

キーワード: タガログ語, 他動性, ヴォイス, 能格性, フィリピン=タイプ