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Abstract

This dissertation presents an analysis of Tagalog within the framework of Lexical-Functional Grammar. Tagalog is a non-configurational language in which the grammatical subject does not occupy a unique structural position. Nevertheless, the grammar of Tagalog makes crucial reference to the notion of grammatical subjecthood. This fact shows that grammatical subjecthood cannot be defined in terms of a specified position in surface phrase structure. More generally, the Tagalog data shows that grammatical relations must be defined independently of phrase structure, semantic structure and pragmatic functions, strongly supporting a conception of linguistic structure in which these various kinds of information are modeled as independent subsystems of the grammar.

A large number of syntactic tests are presented which uniquely identify the nominative argument as the grammatical subject. It is argued that the apparent ambiguity of subjecthood properties in Tagalog is due to the Actor’s semantic and pragmatic prominence, together with the fact that non-subject Actors are always terms (non-oblique arguments) in Tagalog, unlike passive agents in English. Evidence is presented which shows that the nominative argument does not have the properties of a “topic”, as it is frequently analyzed, whether this concept is defined in terms of discourse continuity or pragmatic function.

Crucial evidence for the non-configurationality of Tagalog comes from rules governing the co-reference of personal pronouns and the position of clitic elements. An analysis of Tagalog phrase structure is developed using a modified version of the X-bar theory of Chomsky (1986). The analysis is shown to provide an account for the structural properties of Clause Reduction, a construction similar in many ways to “restructuring” in Romance languages, in which two verbs appear in a single monoclausal structure. Finally, it is argued that long-distance dependencies (“Wh-movement”) in Tagalog are best described in terms of grammatical relations, rather than phrase structure configuration.
Unless the Lord builds the house, its builders labor in vain.

Unless the Lord watches over the city, the watchmen stand guard in vain.

In vain you rise early and stay up late, toiling for food to eat —

for he grants sleep to those he loves.

(Psalms 127:1-2)
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1. Overview

This dissertation has two main goals. First, I will demonstrate that grammatical relations, in particular the SUBJECT relation, play an important role in the grammar of Tagalog. Second, I will show how other types of information—phrase structure, semantic structure and pragmatic or discourse structure—interact with information about grammatical relations in various syntactic constructions. I hope to show that an optimal analysis of Tagalog is greatly facilitated by recognizing these various kinds of information as independent subsystems of the grammar.

To those who have never studied Austronesian languages, the first of these goals may seem superfluous. Yet over the last 20 years or so, most of the work on the syntax of Philippine languages has been focused on the question of whether or not these languages can be said to have grammatical subjects, and if so which argument of a basic transitive clause should be analyzed as being the subject. The answers most commonly proposed can be roughly classified into the following categories:

a. nominative case (ang) marks the grammatical subject (Bloomfield, 1917; Blake, 1925; Bell, 1976)
b. Tagalog has no subject; nominative case marks the Topic (Schachter, 1976, 1977)
c. the Actor is always the subject, and
   1. nominative case marks the Topic (Carrier-Duncan, 1985)
   2. nominative case marks the absolutive argument (Gerdts, 1988; Payne, 1982)

(Each of these analytical positions will be discussed in more detail in chapter 2.) My basic assumption is that grammatical relations such as subject and object are syntactic notions, and must be identified on the basis of syntactic properties, rather than by semantic roles or discourse functions. I will show that a large number of syntactic processes in Tagalog uniquely select the argument which bears nominative case. On the other hand, the data which has been cited as showing ambiguity of subjecthood, or indicating that the Actor is always the subject, is best analyzed in terms of semantic rather than syntactic constraints. I will argue that these facts
support an analysis along the lines of (a) above, taking the nominative argument to be the subject.

In addition to reviewing the history of the subjecthood debate and identifying various syntactic properties of subjects, chapter 2 discusses a few tests which distinguish terms (direct arguments, i.e. subjects and objects) from non-terms. I will argue, first, that the results of these tests provide strong evidence against an “ergative” analysis of Tagalog along the lines proposed by Gerdts (1988). Second, this evidence shows clearly that non-subject Actors are always terms in Tagalog, unlike passive agents in English. This fact is responsible for much of the controversy and confusion over the identity of the subject.

Chapter 3 addresses the question of whether the nominative argument in Tagalog can be analyzed as a “Topic”, rather than the grammatical subject, as in approaches (b) and (c1) above. This claim cannot constitute an analysis of the data in the absence of some prior notion of what a topic is. Thus, in order to evaluate the hypothesis, we must ask what is meant by the term “Topic”. I will consider two notions of topicality which make empirically testable predictions: first, the notion of discourse topic, defined in terms of continuity or predictability; and second, topic as a pragmatic function or information type, which contrasts with pragmatic focus. I will show that the nominative argument does not have the properties of a topic under either of these definitions.

One of the strongest arguments which has been raised against analyzing the nominative argument as grammatical subject has been based on the behaviour of Equi constructions in Tagalog. The controllee (or target) of the Equi construction is normally the Actor, rather than the nominative NP. This fact seems to pose a major problem for my analysis, since cross-linguistically controllees are almost always subjects. In chapter 4 I will examine the Tagalog pattern in detail. I will show how the observed facts follow from universal semantic constraints on Equi constructions and the interaction of these constraints with certain language-specific syntactic properties, in particular the termhood of non-subject Actors.

In English grammar, there is a strong alignment between the grammatical notion of subject, the semantic notion of Actor, and the pragmatic notion of Topic. This pattern is often taken to be the canonical or universally unmarked alignment. But the Tagalog facts force us to recognize these three notions as being fully independent, since in basic transitive clauses the subject is neither the Actor nor a topic. Data from Tagalog and other typologically similar languages thus
provide unique opportunities to investigate the defining properties of and interrelationships among these three concepts.

Chapter 5 presents an analysis of Tagalog phrase structure. The most important conclusion of the analysis is that the grammatical subject does not have a unique structural position. In other words, grammatical subjecthood cannot be defined in terms of a specified position in surface phrase structure. This is an important result, since many approaches to syntax (notably the Government-Binding framework) assume that grammatical relations are defined in terms of surface phrase structure configurations.

I will argue that Tagalog is a non-configurational language in the sense that there is no VP constituent which excludes the subject in the phrase structure of the clause. Crucial evidence to support this claim will come from the rules governing coreference (antecedence) of personal pronouns and the position of clitic elements. In frameworks which equate grammatical relations with surface phrase structure positions, non-configurationality should imply the lack of any grammatical relations, in particular the absence of any subject-object asymmetries. Thus the fact that the grammar of a non-configurational language makes crucial reference to the notion of grammatical subjecthood shows that grammatical relations must be defined independently of phrase structure.

In chapter 6 I present an analysis of Clause Reduction, a construction similar in many ways to “restructuring” in Romance languages. I will use the behaviour of Tagalog modal verbs, and in particular certain exceptions to the normal constraints on modals, to motivate the analysis. But Clause Reduction is not limited to modals; it can also be triggered by Equi predicates of the type discussed in chapter 4. The analysis of Clause Reduction does not require us to posit any new structural configurations; the phrase structure and grammatical relations involved are the same as those independently attested in Tagalog auxiliary and complex predicate constructions, discussed in chapter 5. I will suggest that Clause Reduction is the result of a merger of the argument structures of two verbs.

Chapter 7 discusses long-distance dependencies (sometimes referred to as “Wh-movement”) in Tagalog. I will argue that these constructions are best described in terms of grammatical relations, rather than phrase structure configuration. I will show how such an analysis, based on the notion of Functional Uncertainty proposed by Kaplan and Zaenen (1989),
allows one to give a unified account for the two main constraints on these dependencies in Tagalog, both of which can be captured in a single, very simple rule.

2. Theoretical framework

Since the major claim of this dissertation is that grammatical relations cannot be defined in terms of surface phrase structure positions, discourse/pragmatic functions or semantic roles, I must adopt a theoretical framework which makes it possible to treat these different types of information as being truly distinct. I will be working within the basic conceptual framework of Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG), as described in Kaplan and Bresnan (1982) and various later work. This approach assumes that grammatical information about an expression is factored into three independent systems of constraints: PHRASE STRUCTURE (or c-structure, for “constituent structure”), which encodes information about linear precedence and constituency; FUNCTIONAL STRUCTURE (f-structure), which encodes information about grammatical relations; and ARGUMENT STRUCTURE (arg-structure), which is a projection of the semantic roles assigned by the verb.

None of these three structures is derived from the others. All three are simultaneously present (i.e., the three sets of constraints apply simultaneously). They are related to each other by regular correspondence rules, such as “linking” rules which define the mapping of argument structure into functional structure. Almost nothing in this dissertation depends on a particular formalization of these concepts, and I have made every effort to present the data in such a way that my analysis could be readily translated into other formal frameworks.

2.1 Phrase structure

In my analysis of Tagalog phrase structure I will adopt a version of the X-bar theory of Chomsky (1986). However, some of the assumptions mentioned above (e.g. the non-derivational nature of the mapping between levels of representation) and certain others to be discussed below (including a lexicalist approach to morphology and an avoidance of empty categories) will constrain the ways in which the X-bar theory is interpreted. But it is important to note that a particular theory of phrase structure, or any other part of the grammar, can be adopted within a variety of conceptual frameworks.
The core intuition of the X-bar theory is that phrases are projected from their heads in a uniform way, which can be extended even to non-lexical categories (clauses and sentential complements). The general schema for a phrase of category X (an XP) is given in (1):

(1) \[ \text{XP} \rightarrow \text{YP} \quad \text{X'} \]
\[ \text{X'} \rightarrow \text{X}^0 \quad \text{YP}^* \]

For the moment let us assume that X is a lexical category (noun, verb, adjective or preposition). This schema states that a lexical item projects a phrase of its own category. Its first projection, X', consists of the lexical head and zero or more complements, i.e. maximal projections (YP’s)\(^1\) which are sisters of X\(^0\). The maximal projection, XP, consists of the X' constituent and a specifier, i.e. a maximal projection which is the sister of X'. For example, in a noun phrase like “Caesar’s conquest of Gaul”, X=N. The complement would be a PP, “of Gaul”, and the specifier would be a possessive NP, “Caesar’s”. The head noun (X\(^0\)) is the lexical item “conquest”. The structure of the phrase would be the following:

(2)

In addition to the lexical categories (N, V, A and P), Chomsky assumes two functional categories, I (for INFL, corresponding to the AUX position in the framework of Chomsky (1965)) and C (for COMP). Both of these categories can be projected according to the same schema. The maximal projection of INFL, IP, is a sentence. The maximal projection of COMP, CP, corresponds to S’. In English, the subject is assumed to occupy the specifier position in IP, abbreviated [SPEC, IP]. The verb phrase (VP) is assumed to occupy the complement position in I’, while objects and other arguments of the verb are complements of V. Thus the structure of a simple transitive sentence would be as shown in (3):

\(^1\)Note that Y here is intended to range over any category. I do not intend the notation YP* to be restricted to multiple occurrences of the same category.
Chomsky assumes that specifiers are optional, complement positions are determined by the argument structure of the head, and heads are obligatory. However, I will try to maintain a “transparent” theory of phrase structure which does not allow for empty categories or unfilled phrase structure positions. (My phrase structure representations will therefore be comparable to the level of “surface structure” (or PF) in GB.) This implies that even heads can be optional, as in English expressions like “I’ll take three” or Tagalog headless relative clauses. The missing head in such constructions will often correspond to a functional structure element which is unrealized in phrase structure.

The non-derivational nature of the framework assumed here implies that there can be no movement rules, i.e. that all elements in the phrase structure must be base-generated in the proper position. However, the placement of second-position clitics will require special treatment, for reasons which will be discussed in chapter 5. It is difficult to see how a purely syntactic treatment of Tagalog clitics could be given, whether in terms of base-generated positions in phrase structure or movement rules of any normal type. Nevertheless, it is possible to say quite a bit about the constraints on where these elements must appear. In fact, the position of second-position clitics will provide crucial evidence for the phrase structure analysis proposed in that chapter. It may be possible to define the position of these elements in terms of prosodic structure, along the lines suggested by Zec and Inkelas (1991) and others. For now, I will not attempt to formalize the rule of clitic placement, and will informally represent it as a movement process.

Chomsky assumes that tense and agreement features are base-generated in the INFL position. In English sentences which lack an auxiliary element, these features are assumed to lower on to the verb through a process of “affix lowering”, analogous to the “affix hopping”

An exception is [SPEC, IP], the position of the subject in languages like English, which is required by the Extended Projection Principle.
transformation of Chomsky (1965). In many other languages, the verb is assumed to raise into INFL position in order to get its inflectional features. However, I am assuming a lexicalist theory of morphology which would prevent bare affixes or disembodied morphological features from being independently generated in phrase structure (though both affix and stem may contribute syntactic information at f-structure). I interpret INFL as being the position of the inflected verb or auxiliary, rather than the position of an inflectional affix or abstract inflectional features. In languages in which the finite verb appears in INFL, the head of the VP must be optional.

I take the core intuition behind the notion that INFL as the head of IP to be that the finite verbal element occupies a unique position in the sentence and functions as its head. The finite element has a specified position in a large number of languages, such as the verb-second Germanic and Kru languages, and even Warlpiri, in which every other element of the sentence is freely ordered. In Tagalog, too, the finite element seems to be the fixed point around which the other elements are arranged. In some languages any finite verb can appear in this position, while in others only a certain subset of such verbs can appear there. In English, for example, only auxiliaries and modals can appear in the INFL position; this is what makes it necessary to assume an “affix lowering” operation for main verbs in the standard GB analysis.

Even under the assumption that finite elements which appear in INFL must be base generated there, it is possible to give a non-movement analysis within the LFG framework which is exactly analogous to the standard GB treatment of V movement to INFL.³ Essentially, we only need to assume the existence of two optional positions for the head of the clause which are unified in functional structure. This allows us to give a non-transformational account for the kinds of facts which have often been cited as evidence for Head-to-Head movement. We must postpone the discussion of how precisely this is done until we have considered the rules for mapping functional structure onto phrase structure, in the next section.

My most radical departure from the X-bar theory of Chomsky (1986) concerns the category symbol S, which I will use to designate a “small-clause” constituent containing the subject and its non-finite or non-verbal predicate. In other words, I claim that for some languages (of which Tagalog is one) it is necessary to distinguish IP (the clause) from S.

³Many of the ideas relating to this point were suggested by Joan Bresnan in an advanced syntax seminar at Stanford, spring quarter, 1991.
Following Bresnan (1982), S is assumed to be the only exocentric category, in the sense that its syntactic category is not determined by (or identical to) that of its head. The basic clause structure which I will propose for Tagalog is similar to that proposed by Chung and McCloskey (1987) for Irish, in which INFL takes a small-clause (S) sister. (Chung and McCloskey did not distinguish between S and IP.) However, the internal structure of S in Tagalog will be shown to be different in certain respects from that of Irish.

(4) **Irish** (cf. Chung and McCloskey, 1987)

```
      IP
     /\    
    /   \  
   I     S
  /\     /\ 
 NP  (SUBJ) XP  (PRED)
```

As mentioned above, the finite verb in Tagalog seems to be the fixed point around which the other elements in a sentence are arranged. Any elements that precede the verb must occur in specific positions, which are neatly predicted by the IP-CP structure. This contrasts sharply with the order of elements following the verb (internal to S), which is extremely free. Preverbal elements are those which appear as specifiers of functional categories, that is, in [SPEC, IP] or [SPEC, CP] positions. Elements in these positions always bear a pragmatic function, either Topic or Focus, in Tagalog. The [SPEC, CP] position seems to be pragmatically marked in most, and perhaps all, languages, but this is not the case for [SPEC, IP]. In English, for example, subjects appearing in [SPEC, IP] do not necessarily bear a marked pragmatic function.

The remarks in the preceding paragraphs suggest that, if the X-bar theory of phrase structure is to be adopted as part of a theory of universal grammar, at least four parameters of cross-linguistic variation must be recognized. First, languages vary as to what elements may appear in INFL. English restricts this position to auxiliaries and modals, while in Irish and Yiddish any finite verb may occupy this position. Second, languages may place different restrictions on the [SPEC, IP] position. In English, this position is reserved for subjects. In Yiddish, under Diesing’s (1990) analysis, it is a Topic position. In Warlpiri, following Hale (1983) and Simpson and Bresnan (1983), any string which can be construed as a constituent may
occupy this position. Third, the [SPEC, IP] position may be obligatory (as in English and
Yiddish), optional (as in Tagalog and Chamorro\(^4\)) or completely lacking (as in Irish).

The fourth parameter of variation is related to the second and concerns the position of the
subject. For languages like English, in which the subject must appear in [SPEC, IP], I will
assume that INFL takes a VP constituent as its sister. I will refer to these languages as “external
subject languages”. “Internal subject languages”, on the other hand, are those in which INFL
takes an S constituent as its sister. I assume that a VP (maximally) consists of a verb and all of
its arguments except the subject. A constituent which contains both a verb and its subject must
be an S, rather than a VP.

The settings of these parameters for some representative languages are suggested in the
following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Sister to INFL</th>
<th>[SPEC, IP]</th>
<th>INFL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>obligatory / subject</td>
<td>Aux only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>any finite V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiddish</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>obligatory / Topic</td>
<td>any finite V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamorro</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>optional / Topic</td>
<td>any finite V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlpiri</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>obligatory / any XP</td>
<td>any finite V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>optional / Focus or Topic</td>
<td>(insufficient evidence)(^5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2 Functional structure

For the most part, it makes no difference to my analysis whether grammatical relations such as
subject and object are adopted as primitive notions, as in Relational Grammar, or are derived
from some more basic set of concepts. Neither the precise inventory nor the formal
representation of these grammatical relations is crucial for my purposes, only the fact (which I
hope to demonstrate) that they must be independent of phrase structure and argument structure.

There are two important distinctions which will be made: (1) between subjects and non-
subjects, and (2) between terms (direct arguments, i.e. subjects and objects) and non-terms.
Various syntactic tests which enable us to make these distinctions will be presented in chapter 2.
I will refer to all non-subject terms as “objects”. I will occasionally distinguish between obliques

---

\(^4\)The analysis of Chamorro assumed here is based on my own preliminary investigation, drawing heavily on the work of Chung
and Cooreman cited in the bibliography. The analysis is in many ways similar to that proposed for Tagalog in chapter 5.

\(^5\)I will suggest in chapter 5 that finite verbs, as well as auxiliary elements, appear in INFL in Tagalog. But since the INFL
position is adjacent in linear order to the predicate position inside S, it is difficult to find overt evidence one way or the other as to
which position the finite verb occupies.
(non-term arguments) and adjuncts (non-arguments). In discussing clausal complements, I will
distinguish between “closed complements”, which are full sentences, and “open complements”
(abbreviated XCOMP), in which the subject is controlled by an argument of a higher clause.
Finally, LFG makes use of two pragmatic functions, Topic and Focus, which will be discussed in
chapter 3. As mentioned in the previous section, elements occurring in the [SPEC, IP] or [SPEC,
CP] positions in Tagalog always bear one of these pragmatic functions.

LFG shares with GPSG and HPSG the basic intuition that many grammatical features of a
phrase (including its syntactic category, gender, number, etc.) are determined by the features of
its head (cf. the Head Feature Principle of Pollard and Sag (1987)). In LFG this principle is
expressed by requiring that the phrase and its head be mapped onto the same f-structure. These
f-structures, which contain various sorts of grammatical information, are represented as sets of
ordered pairs. The first element in each pair, called the attribute, may be a grammatical feature
(e.g. CASE, NUMBER, etc.), a grammatical relation (e.g. SUBJ, OBJ, etc.), or the PRED
function. The second element in each pair is called the value.

Each attribute must be paired with a unique value of the appropriate type. (This
uniqueness requirement is what makes the f-structures “functions” in the mathematical sense.)
The CASE feature takes as its value one of the possible case categories of the languages (NOM,
ACC, etc.). The PRED attribute takes as its value a lexical form, which specifies the
grammatical relations which the lexical item assigns. Well-formedness constraints require that
the f-structure must contain exactly one instance of each grammatical relation specified by its
PRED. The values for grammatical relation attributes are themselves f-structures.

The mapping between phrase structure and functional structure can be represented by
annotations on the phrase structure rules. Rather than using the metavariables “↑” and “↓”
deefined by Kaplan and Bresnan (1982), I will for simplicity use a numerical subscript to refer to
the f-structure which each constituent in phrase structure is mapped onto. The general X-bar
schema in (1) would be annotated as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
(6) & \quad \text{XP}_i \rightarrow \text{YP} \quad \text{X}_i' \\
& \quad \text{X}_i' \rightarrow \text{X}_0 \quad \text{YP}^* \\
\end{align*}
\]
This schema shows that each maximal projection is in general mapped onto a distinct f-structure, and that the head of the phrase (as well as its X’ projection) is mapped onto the same f-structure. Only maximal projections (the YP categories in the specifier and complement positions) can be assigned grammatical relations. The specific grammatical relations licensed in each phrase will be determined by the lexical form of its head, which will appear as the value of the PRED attribute. Additional constraints must be added to the mapping procedure, e.g. that clausal complements should map onto VP, IP or CP, terms (SUBJ and OBJ) map onto NP (and perhaps CP), etc. But I will not deal with these constraints here.

To show how this mapping would work, let us consider a familiar analysis of the English auxiliaries as raising verbs. In English, the expansion rule for IP must specify that the [SPEC, IP] position gets mapped onto the subject position in the f-structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(7)} & \quad \text{IP} & \rightarrow & \text{NP} & \text{I'}[i] \\
& \quad \text{I'}[i] & \rightarrow & \text{I}^0[i] & \text{YP^* (GR)}
\end{align*}
\]

This rule, together with the general schema in (6), would license the following mapping between phrase structure and functional structure (I will suppress all non-essential features for clarity):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(8a) Phrase Structure}
\end{align*}
\]
To illustrate how a V-movement analysis could be duplicated in this framework, let us consider the following Welsh example from Sproat (1985):

(9) Gwelodd Sion ddraig.
saw-3.SG.PST John dragon

John saw a dragon.

Assuming essentially the same analysis proposed for Irish by Chung and McCloskey (1987), in which the VSO order is the result of V-to-INFL movement, we would say that Welsh has an internal subject position (i.e., the sister of INFL is S), and the finite verb appears in INFL when there is no auxiliary. What makes “verb movement” possible in certain languages is that in these languages, functional categories can be doubly-headed. That is, in languages like Welsh both the INFL position and its sister (S) are mapped onto the same f-structure as the IP. The phrase-structure rules for Welsh would include something like the following (assuming that Welsh, like Irish, lacks the [SPEC, IP] position):

(10) \[\begin{align*}
    \text{IP}_{[i]} & \rightarrow \text{I}^0_{[i]}, \ S_{[i]} \\
    \text{S}_{[i]} & \rightarrow \text{NP} (\text{SUBJ}) \quad \text{VP}_{[i]} \\
    \text{VP}_{[i]} & \rightarrow (V^0)_{[i]} \quad \text{NP} (\text{OBJ})
\end{align*}\]

Note that both INFL and S are marked as heads of IP, VP is the head of S and V is the head of VP, so all of these categories will share the same functional information, since they will all be mapped into a single f-structure. When there is no auxiliary, as in the example in (9), the finite verb appears in the INFL position and the optional V position in VP is omitted. The resulting structure is shown below:  

![Diagram of the f-structure of the example sentence in Welsh](image-url)
3. Some essential aspects of Tagalog morphology

3.1 Modifiers, linkers etc.

Noun phrases in Tagalog consist of a preposed case marker followed by the head noun and its modifiers. The case markers are clitics in the sense that they are not phonologically independent, i.e. they do not bear stress and never appear in isolation. But in standard Tagalog orthography, the case markers are written as separate words. I will use the symbol “=”, indicating the presence of a clitic boundary, to join the case marker to the noun or adjective which follows it.

The head noun and its modifiers may occur in any linear order relative to each other, but non-pronominal genitive possessor phrases occur in phrase-final position. Each modifier phrase is linked to the head noun by the linking particle *na*. This same linker also appears between a verb and its adverbial modifiers, and is used as a complementizer to introduce clausal complements. Following a final vowel, glottal, /-h/ or /-n/, the linker is realized by an allomorph consisting of a velar nasal *-ng*, which attaches to the preceding word. The *na* allomorph is written orthographically as a separate word, while the *-ng* allomorph is written as a part of the preceding word. I will again use the “=” sign in the latter case.

There is a distinct linker, *-ng*, which is realized by a zero allomorph following consonants other than /-h/, glottal or /-n/. (The two linkers are phonologically distinct only following the consonants which trigger the *na* and Ø allomorphs.) The distribution of the *-ng/Ø* linker has been very poorly understood, but the analysis which will be presented in chapters 5 and 6 suggests that this linker appears between elements of a complex predicate construction, or between an auxiliary and its following verb.
Another linking element, *nang*, is used to introduce adverbial elements and certain participial adjuncts. It is homophonous with the genitive case marker /nang/, but in the standard orthography the case marker is written simply as *ng*. I will follow this orthographic practice, except that the case marker will be marked as a proclitic rather than as a separate word.

### 3.2 Voice and case-marking

Three morphological cases are distinguished in Tagalog, which I will label **nominative**, **genitive** and **dative**. Dative case is used for Goals, Recipients, Locations and definite Objects; genitive case is used for Possessors, Actors, Instruments, and indefinite Objects. Nominative case may be used for any argument role, depending on the affixation of the verb as explained below. The forms of the case markers are listed in (12):

(12)

| Common noun markers: | ang | ng | sa |
| Personal name markers: | si | ni | kay |

Each verbal clause must contain one and only one nominative argument. A characteristic property of all Philippine-type languages is that the thematic role of the nominative element is reflected in a verbal affix which I will call the voice marker. The rich voice system of Tagalog is illustrated in the following examples, adapted from Foley and Van Valin (1984, p. 135):

(13) a. B-um-ili ang=lalake ng=isda sa=tindahan.
    PERF AV buy NOM man GEN fish DAT store
    *The man bought fish at the store.*

   PERF buy OV GEN man NOM fish DAT store
   *The man bought the fish at the store*

c. B-in-ilh-an ng=lalake ng=isda ang=tindahan.
   PERF buy-DV GEN man GEN fish NOM store
   *The man bought fish at the store.*

d. Ip-in-am-bili ng=lalake ng=isda ang=pera.
   IV PERF buy GEN man GEN fish NOM money
   *The man bought fish with the money.*

*The man bought fish for the child.*

The voice marker in each example reflects the role of the nominative argument in that clause: **AV** for “Active Voice” (indicating that the nominative argument is the Actor); **OV** for “Objective
Voice”; DV for “Dative/Locative Voice”; IV for “Instrumental Voice”; and BV for “Benefactive Voice”. The correlation between semantic roles and specific voice-marking affixes is less regular in Tagalog than in some other Philippine-type languages; see Ramos (1974) and De Guzman (1978) for detailed discussions of this issue. I will assume that the various forms of the verb are derived by lexical rules from an underspecified representation of the stem, but I will not try to formulate these rules in a precise way here. The resulting lexical entry will specify the case marking and semantic role of each argument of the verb.

The complex voice system of Philippine languages is often referred to as “verbal focus”, with the nominative argument said to be “in focus”. This usage of the term “focus” is quite different from the pragmatic sense in which it is normally used outside of Philippine linguistics, as will be shown in chapter 3.

There are two important factors which determine the choice of nominative argument and voice marking in pragmatically unmarked clauses: definiteness and “patient preference”. Foley and Van Valin (1984) describe these constraints in the following way:

Focused [i.e., nominative—PRK] NP’s in all Philippine languages must be referential and are normally definite... If a patient or Undergoer is definite, then it must be in focus [nominative]. (pp. 139-40)

The nominative argument is normally interpreted as being definite, as reflected in the English translations in (13), but can also be generic as in the following example:

(14) (from M. de Guzman, 1966, p. 397)
\[
\text{Matigas ang=kahoy.}
\]
\[
\text{hard NOM=wood}
\]

\textit{Wood is hard.}

Bell (1978, p. 3) states that in Cebuano, which is closely related to Tagalog, the nominative argument can be “indefinite” as long as it is marked by a numeral quantifier.\(^6\) This is also true in Tagalog, as seen in the following example:

(15) (from Bloomfield, 1917, p. 154)
\[
\text{Kinuha niya ang isa=ng aklat}
\]
\[
\text{PERF-take-OV 3.SG.GEN NOM one=LNK book}
\]

\textit{He took a (certain) book.}

### 3.3 Aspect and mood

Concerning the finite verb forms in Tagalog, Schachter and Otanes (1972) write the following:

---

\(^6\)It seems to be fairly common across languages for quantified “indefinite” NP’s to have the grammatical status of definites.
All Tagalog verbs are inflectable for three aspects: \textbf{perfective}, \textbf{imperfective} and \textbf{contemplated}. The perfective aspect characterizes an event as completed, the imperfective as not completed but begun, and the contemplated as not begun. (p. 66)

Popular grammars and language-learning textbooks usually refer to these three forms as the past tense, present tense and future tense, respectively. But as Schachter and Otanes point out, this identification of aspectual categories with fixed tenses is misleading. Tagalog is a “relative tense” language; thus the imperfective form could be used as a past progressive (“She was singing the Ave Maria when I arrived”) as well as the present progressive (“She is singing the Ave Maria”) or present habitual (“She sings the Ave Maria beautifully”). Similarly, the Tagalog perfective form can be used like the English simple past (“she sang”), present perfect (“she has sung”) or past perfect (“she had sung”).

The morphological encoding of these aspectual categories involves two types of verbal affixation: a nasal infix \textit{-in-} and reduplication. The infinitival form of the verb (the “Basic Form” in Schachter and Otanes’s terms) lacks both of these aspectual features, though it is always marked for voice. In Active Voice forms whose initial prefix begins with /m/ in the infinitive form, the infix \textit{-in-} is realized as a mutation to an identical form beginning with /n/.

Some examples are given below.\footnote{Tagalog has a number of different types of reduplication. The specific reduplication operation here involves the doubling of the initial CV of the verb root or, when prefixes totalling more than one syllable are present, of the second syllable of the verb. Paul Schachter (p.c.) points out that there is actually quite a bit of freedom in longer forms as to which CV sequence gets reduplicated. I will ignore this variation for simplicity.} Notice in the last example that the Objective Voice suffix \textit{-in} does not appear in the presence of the aspect-marking infix \textit{-in-}. As far as I know, this is true in every Philippine language.\footnote{These two affixes are etymologically distinct, the OV marker \textit{-in} < \text{PAN} *-\text{en}, the aspect marker \textit{-in-} < \text{PAN} *-\text{in-}. They have the same shape in Tagalog due to a merger of \text{PAN} *\text{e} and *i as Tagalog /i/.

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
 & Basic Form  & Perfective  & Imperfective  & Contemplated \\
\hline
bigy-an ‘give’ (DV) & \textit{b-in-}bigy-an & \textit{b-in-i-}bigy-an & \textit{bi-}bigy-an \\
mag-luto ‘cook’ (AV) & nag-luto & nag-lu-luto & mag-lu-luto \\
gawa-in ‘do, make’ (OV) & \textit{g-in-}awa & \textit{g-in-a-}gawa & ga-gawa-in \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Schachter and Otanes’s description of these three categories (quoted above) suggests that the aspectual system can be analyzed in terms of two contrastive features: \([\alpha \text{ begun}]\) and \([\beta \text{ completed}]\). This is the analysis proposed by de Guzman (1978). Essentially the same analysis was proposed by Wolfenden (1961), who referred to the contrasting features as “begun” vs. “not begun” and “continuing action” vs. “punctual action”; and by Bloomfield (1917), who used the terms “actual” vs. “contingent” and “punctual” vs. “durative”.
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Notice that both of these semantic features can be associated with a single morphological feature. The infix *-in-* marks actions as having been begun. I will refer to the distinction between actions which are actually begun and those which are not as “realis” vs. “irrealis”. Verbs which carry the infix *-in-* are in the realis aspect, and forms which lack the infix are in irrealis aspect. Similarly, the reduplication illustrated above marks actions as non-completed. Verbs which lack this reduplication are in completive aspect.

Thus “perfective” forms, which carry the infix *-in-* but lack reduplication, are in realis-completive aspect; they encode actions which are both begun and completed. “Imperfective” forms, which carry both the infix and reduplication, are in realis-noncompletive aspect, encoding actions which are begun but not completed. “Contemplated” forms, which lack the infix but carry reduplication, are in irrealis-noncompletive aspect, encoding actions which are neither begun nor completed.

Choosing the (morphologically) unmarked values for each feature would yield the contradictory category of irrealis-completive, i.e. actions which are not yet begun but already completed. Since this is clearly not a possible aspectual category, such forms can only occur as infinitives, i.e. “tenseless” verbs. The system is summarized in (17). The infinitive or “basic” form is shown for completeness, in the position suggested by its morphological features, but of course it does not bear the (mutually exclusive) semantic features associated with that cell of the matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Realis (-in-)</th>
<th>Irrealis (Ø)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ begun</td>
<td></td>
<td>– begun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncompletive (DUP)</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>Contemplated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completive (Ø)</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td><em>(Infinitive)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is another morphological distinction which will prove to be crucial in our discussion of control. Dell (1983), following Schachter and Otanes (1972), refers to the forms in question as “ability/involuntary action” (AIA) verbs, reflecting two of the primary uses of these forms. I will refer to this class of verbs as being marked for “non-volitive mood”, in contrast to
morphologically unmarked forms (Dell’s “neutral” verbs) which I will refer to as being in “volitive mood”. The semantics of these forms will be discussed in detail in chapter 4.

Non-volitive mood is marked by the prefix *maka*- in Active Voice, and by the general stative prefix *ma*- in other voices. As in realis-marked verbs, the Objective Voice suffix *-in* does not appear (or is realized by a Ø-allomorph) in non-volitive forms. The distinction between volitive and non-volitive cross-cuts the aspectual distinctions described above, so in general a non-volitive mood verb may occur in any of four forms: realis-completive, realis-noncompletive, irrealis-noncompletive, or infinitive. Examples are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(18)</th>
<th>Basic Form</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Contemplated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>maka-gamit</td>
<td><em>use (AV)</em></td>
<td>maka-gamit</td>
<td>maka-ka-gamit</td>
<td>maka-ka-gamit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maka-pag-luto</td>
<td><em>cook (AV)</em></td>
<td>maka-pag-luto</td>
<td>maka-ka-pag-luto</td>
<td>maka-ka-pag-luto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-pilit</td>
<td><em>force (OV)</em></td>
<td>na-pilit</td>
<td>na-pi-pilit</td>
<td>ma-pi-pilit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-hula-an</td>
<td><em>guess (DV)</em></td>
<td>na-hula-an</td>
<td>na-hu-hula-an</td>
<td>ma-hu-hula-an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9Wolfenden (1961) and de Guzman (1988) use the term “aptative” for the non-volitive forms. Dell identifies the contrast between volitive and non-volitive as an “aspectual distinction”, rather than a contrast in mood, and Kroeger (1990a) uses the term “stative aspect” for the AIA (non-volitive) forms, partly because one of the prefixes involved is the normal stative prefix, and partly because of parallels to the “active-stative” distinction in languages like Lakhota. But as our discussion in chapter 4 will show, the semantic contrast here is not one of temporal aspect. “Mood” seems to be a better label for this morpho-semantic category.
CHAPTER 2

Subjecthood

1. The history of the problem

Early treatments of Tagalog grammar, including Bloomfield (1917), Blake (1925), Lopez (1937, 1965), and Aspillera (1965), consistently used the term SUBJECT to refer to the ang-phrase, i.e. the argument of the clause which bears nominative case. These writers treated the non-active voices as passive constructions, Bloomfield for example referring to them as “direct passive” (my OV), “instrumental passive” (IV) and “local passive” (DV).

However, the use of this terminology carries with it the implication that the “passive” constructions are “marked” or disfavored in some way. In English and most other languages, the preferred subject of a basic transitive clause corresponds to the Actor. But as noted in the previous chapter, in Tagalog the preferred choice of nominative argument corresponds to the Undergoer. These considerations led McKaughan (1958, 1962) to adopt a terminological innovation in his description of Maranao: he chose to reserve the term SUBJECT for the logical subject, or Actor, and to call the nominative element of a clause the TOPIC. This usage was adopted in turn by a large number of Philippinists, sharing perhaps the sentiments expressed by McKaughan (1973, p. 206):

Philippine languages are very different compared to European languages. One just cannot understand the Philippine language grammar with the traditional meaning of terms in current use, or at least so I thought. McKaughan’s 1973 paper is a graceful retraction of his previous usage. He argues that subjecthood is universally distinct from any particular thematic relation, such as agent or Actor. He continues (p. 208):

I am ready to emphasize now that phrases introduced by so in Maranao or ang in Tagalog ... are SUBJECTS of their sentences. These phrases (or their pronoun substitutes) are in the most favored or primary relation to the verb. They have been nominated as subjects, and the predicate is that which says or asserts something about the subject. Please, reader, forgive me for confusing the issue by calling these subjects the ‘topic’ of the sentence.

McKaughan goes on to point out that “there is a better use for the term ‘topic’ in Philippine languages” (p. 209). He gives examples of topicalization in Maranao, i.e. movement to pre-verbal position, showing that any argument of the verb can be topicalized. However, when the
topicalized element is not the subject of the clause, a resumptive pronoun must be left to indicate its relation to the verb.

McKaughan’s argument is based primarily on typological considerations, specifically the universal distinction between semantic roles such as agent, grammatical relations such as subject, and discourse functions such as topic. However, there are language-internal syntactic factors which also raise questions about the status of subjecthood in Tagalog. When we attempt to apply the syntactic tests which are commonly used to identify subjects, the results appear to be somewhat ambiguous. This problem has been pointed out most clearly in two very influential papers by Paul Schachter.

Schachter (1976, 1977) argues that no argument of a basic transitive clause in Tagalog can be uniquely identified as the grammatical subject. He points out that when the nominative argument is not the Actor, the characteristic properties associated with subjects cross-linguistically are divided between the Actor and the nominative argument. The split as he describes it is as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative argument</th>
<th>Actor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Obligatory element of every clause</td>
<td>a. Reflexive binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Launches floating quantifiers</td>
<td>b. Equi target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Relativization</td>
<td>c. Imperative addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Relevance to word order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several different approaches have been proposed within a variety of syntactic frameworks to account for this distribution of syntactic properties. Bell (1976, 1983) presents an analysis of Cebuano within the framework of Relational Grammar. She assumes that the Actor corresponds to the “1” (i.e. subject) of the initial stratum while the nominative argument corresponds to the “1” of the final stratum. Properties such as relativization and quantifier float are associated with final 1’s, while Equi targets, imperative addressees etc. are required to be initial 1’s. Alternations in voice are thus advancements to 1, i.e. passives, as in Bloomfield’s analysis.

An alternative RG analysis, based on data from Ilokano, was proposed by Gerdts (1988). A similar analysis of Tagalog was defended by Payne (1982), though not explicitly within the RG framework. Gerdts argues that Philippine languages have an ergative case-marking system, i.e. that “absolutive” (my nominative) case is assigned to the final 2 of a transitive clause and the
final 1 of an intransitive clause. The Actor is both the initial 1 and the final 1. The Instrumental, Benefactive and Locative voices involve advancements to 2. Active Voice is the result of an antipassive rule which demotes the 2 to chômeur status, creating an intransitive clause. Actor properties are held to be properties of subjects (final 1’s), while relativization and quantifier float are assumed to be properties of final absolutes (i.e., final 2’s in transitive clauses, final 1’s in intransitive clauses).

Carrier-Duncan (1985) adopts a position similar to that of McKaughan’s earlier work (1958, 1962), i.e. that the Actor is always the grammatical subject while the ang-phrase is a grammaticalized topic. The pattern described by Schachter is taken to reveal a split between subject (i.e. Actor) properties and topic (nominative) properties.

All of these approaches have essentially assumed the correctness of Schachter’s conclusions, namely that the syntactic tests fail to identify a unique subject for most transitive clauses. The purpose of this chapter is to re-examine the evidence, looking at a broader range of data than Schachter could discuss in the short papers cited above. I will argue that the data is less equivocal than has commonly been assumed, and that the facts to be presented below strongly support analyzing the nominative argument as the grammatical subject of the clause.

In section 2, I will discuss unique syntactic properties of nominative elements; some of these were discussed in Schachter’s papers (quantifier float, relativization) and others were not (Raising, number agreement, secondary (or depictive) predicates, obviation, possessor ascension, conjunction reduction). Section 3 discusses the properties of Actors which are most problematic for my analysis, reflexive binding and Equi. We will see that neither of these properties are actually unique to Actors. The overall conclusion which emerges from the data is that nominative arguments have more properties of grammatical subjecthood, and non-nominative Actors less, than most syntacticians have assumed.

As Schachter points out, there are a number of very common construction types whose only argument bears nominative case, yet it is an over-simplification to say that the nominative element is an “obligatory element of every clause”. Section 5 of this chapter discusses in detail some constructions which systematically lack a nominative argument, and considers their

---

10It has been suggested (by Carrier-Duncan (1985) among others) that certain uses of non-volitive mood, in particular those involving unspecified Actor deletion, are actually instances of “passivization”. Under Gerdts’ analysis, passivization would be represented as 2-to-1 advancement with the Actor being demoted to chômeur, and these “passives” would be the only construction in which an Actor would not be the final 1. However, I can find no syntactic evidence for calling the Actor a non-term in non-volitive constructions.
implications for the claim that nominative arguments are grammatical subjects. I will take up the question of whether the nominative argument can be analyzed as a “topic” of some kind in chapter 3.

Section 4 will discuss a number of syntactic tests which distinguish terms from non-terms. These tests reveal two crucial facts about Tagalog grammar: (1) non-subject Actors are always terms, unlike passive agents in English; and (2) non-subject patients are also terms, contrary to the predictions of Gerdts’ ergative analysis. The implications of these results will be discussed below.

2. Nominative properties

2.1 Quantifier Float

As Schachter (1976) states, the quantifier lahat ‘all’ normally occurs within the NP which it modifies. However, it may also “float” to a position immediately following the sentence-initial verb. In this position, the quantifier is always interpreted as referring to the nominative argument of the clause, and never to the Actor or any other NP. This pattern is clearly seen in the following examples, in which there are two plural NP’s and thus a potential ambiguity in the scope of the quantifier:

(2) (from Schachter, 1976, p. 501)

a. Sumusulat lahat ang=mga=bata ng=mga=liham
   AV.IMPERF-write all NOM=PL=child GEN=PL=letter
   All the children are writing letters.
   (*The children are writing all the letters.)

b. Sinusulat lahat ng=mga=bata ang=mga=liham
   IMPERF-write-OV all GEN=PL=child NOM=PL=letter
   The/some children write all the letters.
   (*All the children are writing letters.)

As example (2) shows, there is in fact no ambiguity. When the patient (letters) is nominative argument, as in (2b), all can only be interpreted as modifying the patient and not the agent.\footnote{This is true assuming normal intonational patterns. However, Paz Naylor (p.c.) has pointed out that it is possible to insert a marked intonational break in (2b) between the verb and quantifier which would force lahat to be interpreted as part of the following NP.}

When the agent (the children) is nominative argument, as in (2a), exactly the reverse is true.
This same pattern holds true in a number of other Philippine-type languages: floating quantifiers always modify the nominative argument.

The thematic role of the quantified NP is not relevant to this phenomenon. As seen in the following examples, agents, themes and goals can all launch floating quantifiers provided they bear nominative case:

(3) a. Nagbigay lahat ang=mga=guro ng=pera sa=mga=bata.
   AV-give all NOM=PL=teacher GEN=money DAT=PL=child
   All the teachers gave money to (the) children.

b. Binigyan lahat ng=mga=guro ng=pera ang=mga=bata.
   give-DV all GEN=PL=teacher GEN=money NOM=PL=child
   (The) teachers gave money to all the children.

c. Ibinigay lahat ng=mga=guro sa=mga=bata ang=pera.
   IV-give all GEN=PL=teacher DAT=PL=child NOM=money
   (The) teachers gave all the money to (the) children.

Floating quantifiers cross-linguistically are launched by terms, i.e. direct arguments of the verb.\footnote{Early work in Relational Grammar assumed that Quantifier Float, like Relativization, was subject to “line-drawing”; see Bell (1983).}

Taken at face value, this generalization would suggest that the nominative argument is the \textit{only} direct argument of the verb. However, following Schachter (1976, p. 501), it seems more plausible to maintain that in Tagalog, quantifier-float picks out the \textit{highest} term, i.e. the grammatical subject. These facts then support the analysis of the nominative argument as the grammatical subject.

2.2 Relativization

Another characteristic property of Philippine languages is that only nominative arguments can be relativized.\footnote{Indeed, it seems to be the normal pattern for Western Austronesian languages that only subjects, or subjects and possessors, can be relativized. Some apparent exceptions in Tagalog to the rule stated here are discussed in Cena (1979).} That is, the gap in relative clauses will always correspond to the argument role which is signalled by the voice marker on the verb. This is illustrated in the following examples from Foley and Van Valin (1984, p. 141-2). Examples (4c-d) are ungrammatical because there is an overt nominative NP within the relative clause, showing that the relativized position (i.e. the gap) corresponds to a non-nominative argument.

(4) a. isda=ng i-b-in-igay ng=lalake sa=bata
   fish=LNK IV-PERF-give GEN=man DAT=child
   the fish which was given to the child by the man
b. bata=ng b-in-ig-y-an ng=lalake ng=isda
   child=LNK PERF-give-DV GEN=man GEN=fish
   the child which was given fish by the man

c. *isda=ng nag-bigay ang=lalake sa=bata
   fish=LNK AV-PERF-give NOM=man DAT=child

d. *isda=ng b-in-ig-y-an ng=lalake ang=bata
   fish=LNK PERF-give-DV GEN=man NOM=child

According to the NP-accessibility hierarchy proposed by Keenan and Comrie (1977), if only a single argument of any clause can be relativized, that argument must be the subject. In Tagalog, and in Philippine-type languages generally, the head of a relative clause may carry any thematic role with respect to the down-stairs verb; but it must always be the nominative argument, as reflected by the voice-marker on that verb. Here again we find support for analyzing the nominative argument as the grammatical subject.

It is also true that only nominative arguments can be clefted. This test does not necessarily provide independent evidence for subjecthood, since clefts in Tagalog are formed from headless relative clauses. The structure of cleft sentences will be discussed in chapter 5.

2.3 Number agreement

Tagalog verbs and adjectival predicates may optionally be marked for plural number when the nominative argument of the clause is plural. For adjectives, plural number is shown by reduplication of the initial CV of the root. The various morphological markers of plurality for verbs are discussed by Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 335).

Plural marking on the predicate is ungrammatical when the nominative argument is singular, as demonstrated in the following examples:

(5) a. Ma-ta-talino ang=mga=bata=ng Intsik.
   STAT-PL-smart NOM=PL=child=LNK Chinese
   The Chinese children are bright.

   b. *Ma-ta-talino si=Armand.
      STAT-PL-smart NOM=Armand
      (For: Armand is bright.)

(6) (Aspillera, 1969, p. 122)

   a. Nagsisikain na ang=mga=bata na=hapunan.
      AV.IMPERF.PL-eat already NOM=PL=child GEN=supper
      The children are eating their supper already.
b. *Nagsisikain na si=Maria ng=hapunan.
   AV.IMPERF.PL.-eat already NOM=Maria GEN=supper
   (for: Maria is eating her supper already.)

(7) (from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 336)
a. Nagsipangisda na sina=Ben.
   AV.PERF.PL.-fishing already NOM.PL=Ben
   Ben and the others have gone fishing.
b. *Nagsipangisda na si=Ben.
   AV.PERF.PL.-fishing already NOM=Ben
   (for: Ben has gone fishing.)

The last two examples involve verbs marked for Active Voice, and so do not enable us to distinguish between Actor and nominative agreement. When the nominative argument is not the Actor of the clause, i.e. when the verb is marked for a non-Active voice, it is still the nominative argument (marked off by brackets) which controls plural agreement. This is illustrated in the following examples:

(8) (Aspillera, 1969, p. 123)
Pinagbujbuksjan niya [ang lahat ng=mga=bintana].
   PERF.PL.-open-DV 3.SG.GEN NOM all GEN=PL=window
   She had opened all the windows.

(9) Pagsujsulatjin ni=Linda [ang=mga=liham].
   FUT.PL.-write-OV GEN=Linda NOM=PL=letter
   Linda will write the letters.

In languages of the nominative-accusative type, if only one argument agrees with the verb that argument is almost always the subject. In some morphologically ergative languages, however, only the absolutive argument agrees with the verb, even though it is not the syntactic subject. Thus the agreement facts of Tagalog, taken apart from the other evidence, would be consistent with either the ergative analysis of Gerdts (1988) or an analysis of the nominative argument as grammatical subject.

2.4 Raising

The Raising construction in Tagalog is illustrated in the following examples:

(10) Pinag-usapan si=Marcos na malapit na=ng mamatay.
    PERF-say-DV NOM=Marcos COMP STAT-close already=COMP AV-die
    Marcos was said to be about to die.
In these examples, an NP which is logically (semantically) an argument only of the complement predicate is assigned its grammatical relation by the matrix predicate and is structurally a constituent of the matrix clause. The most obvious indication that the “raised” argument is a constituent of the matrix clause comes from its pre-complementizer position in the sentence. Further evidence can be seen in the patterns of clitic placement and reflexivization.

As discussed in chapter 5, clitic pronouns in Tagalog occupy the second position in the clause headed by the verb which governs them. If the raised NP in a Raising construction is a pronoun, it must occur in second position in the MATRIX clause, as shown by the position of sila in example (15a) and ako in example (15b). This shows that the raised element becomes a constituent of the matrix clause, an argument of the matrix V, rather than remaining within the lower clause.

(15) a. (from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 268)
Gusto sila ng=Nanay (na) mag-aral mamayang.gabi.
want they(NOM) GEN=Mother COMP AV-study tonight
Mother wants them to study tonight.

b. Hindi ako inasahan ng=Nanay na dumating ngayon.
not 1.SG.NOM PERF-expect-DV GEN=Mother COMP AV-arrive now
Mother didn't expect me to arrive today.

The reflexive pronoun sarili must find its antecedent within the same minimal clause, while the non-reflexive pronoun siya must find its antecedent outside its minimal clause.\(^{14}\) As the following examples illustrate, sarili can appear as the raised element if and only if its antecedent is an element of the matrix clause, while the reverse pattern holds for siya:

\(^{14}\)More precisely, the non-reflexive pronoun siya may not take any of its co-arguments as its antecedent.
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(16) a. Inasahan ni=Linda ang=sarili niya=ng
PERF-expect-DV GEN=Linda NOM=self 3.SG.GEN=COMP
ma-halik-an ng=pangulo.
NONVOL-kiss-DV GEN=principal
Linda expected herself to be kissed by the principal.

b. Inasahan siya ni=Linda=ng ma-halik-an ng=pangulo.
PERF-expect-DV 3.SG.NOM GEN=Linda=COMP NONVOL-kiss-DV GEN=principal
Linda expected her(*self) to be kissed by the principal.

c. Inasahan ni=Linda=ng ma-halik-an siya ng=pangulo.
PERF-expect-DV GEN=Linda=COMP INVOL-kiss-DV 3.SG.NOM GEN=principal
Linda expected for the principal to kiss her.

d. Inasahan ni=Linda=ng ma-halik-an
PERF-expect-DV GEN=Linda=COMP NONVOL-kiss-DV
ng=pangulo ang=sarili niya.
NONVOL=Principal 3.SG.GEN GEN=Principal
Linda expected for the principal to kiss himself (*herself).

The experiencer of the matrix verb (Linda) must be the antecedent of sarili in (16a), where the reflexive has undergone Raising, but cannot be the antecedent of sarili in (16d), where Raising has not applied (i.e., the reflexive remains in the complement clause). Conversely, Linda can be the antecedent of siya only when siya is an element of the complement clause, as in (16c). If the pronoun undergoes Raising, as in (16b), it cannot be coreferential with Linda. This shows that the raised argument becomes a structural element of the matrix clause.

Cross-linguistically, the target or controllee in a Raising construction is always the subject of the embedded clause. As pointed out by Dell (1981), Raising in Tagalog is restricted to nominative arguments.15

expect-DV 1.SG.GEN COMP sing-OV GEN=Linda NOM=national.anthem
I expected (for) Linda to sing the national anthem.

b. Inasah-an ko ang=pambansang.awit na
expect-DV 1.SG.GEN NOM=national.anthem COMP
[awit-in ni=Linda nom].
sing-OV GEN=Linda
I expected the national anthem to be sung by Linda.

15Shibatani (1988) reports the same restriction on Raising in Cebuano.
In (17a), the complement clause contains no gap; its nominative argument (*the national anthem*) appears in its normal position. Notice that the complementizer *na* marks the initial boundary of the complement clause. In (17b), the nominative argument of the lower clause has been raised into the matrix clause. That is, there is no overt nominative argument in the complement clause, and the gap in nominative position is controlled by the nominative argument of the matrix clause. Example (17c) is ungrammatical because a non-nominative Actor phrase has been raised into the matrix clause.

Non-nominative Actors may be raised into the matrix clause only when a resumptive pronoun, or overt pronominal “trace”, appears in the complement clause, as in the following examples. I will refer to this construction as COPY-RAISING:

(18) a. Gusto ko si=Charlie na lutu-in niya ang=suman.
    want 1.SG.GEN ABS=Charlie COMP cook-OV 3.SG.GEN ABS=rice.cake
    *I want Charlie to cook the suman.*


(19) a. Inasahan ko si=Charlie na bibigyan niya ng=pera si=Linda.
    PERF-expect-DV 1.SG.GEN ABS=Charlie COMP
    FUT-give-OV GEN=money ABS=Linda 3.SG.GEN
    *I expected Charlie to give Linda some money.*

b. *Inasahan ko si Charlie na bibigyan ng pera si Linda.

In both of these examples, the overt Actor pronoun (*niya*) in the complement clause is interpreted as being coreferential with the raised argument in the matrix verb. The presence of this resumptive pronoun is obligatory, as seen by the ungrammaticality of the (b) examples with the pronoun deleted.\(^\text{16}\) Thus a crucial difference between “true” Raising and Copy-Raising is that only the latter may apply to non-subjects. Donna Gerdts (p.c.) reports the same pattern in

\(^{16}\) These are the judgements of my consultants. Nati del Pilar (p.c.) informs me that for some Tagalog speakers the resumptive pronoun is optional. Further, she states that for some speakers the verb *inasahan* does not license the construction I have called “true” Raising, but only Copy-Raising.
Ilokano: non-subject Actors may undergo Copy-Raising, but only “absolutive” (i.e., nominative) arguments can undergo true Raising.\(^{17}\)

In Tagalog Raising constructions, both the controller and controllee must be nominative arguments.\(^{18}\) That is, no overt argument of the embedded clause may bear nominative case, and the raised argument must bear nominative case in the matrix clause. Thus Raising is impossible when any other NP in the matrix clause bears nominative case. This fact is illustrated in the following examples:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(20)} \quad \text{a. Umaasa ako na awit-in ni=Linda ang=pambansang.awit.} \\
&\quad \quad \text{AV-expect 1.SG.NOM COMP sing-OV GEN=Linda NOM=national.anthem} \\
&\quad \quad I \text{ expect (for) Linda to sing the national anthem.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. *Umaasa ako ang=pambansang.awit na awit-in ni=Linda.} \\
&\quad \quad \text{AV-expect 1.SG.NOM NOM=national.anthem COMP sing-OV GEN=Linda}
\end{align*}
\]

The examples in (20) are identical to those in (17a-b) except for the voice of the matrix verb. In (20a), the Active Voice marking on \textit{umaasa} marks the experiencer (I) as being the nominative argument. This example is grammatical. However, as shown in (20b), Raising cannot apply with this form of the matrix verb because the resulting structure would violate the uniqueness constraint which requires each clause to have at most one nominative argument.

The crucial observation here is that only nominative elements can be raised, a fact which provides strong additional evidence for the subjecthood of the nominative argument.

### 2.5 Control of secondary predicates

Secondary (or depictive) predicates in Tagalog follow a pattern very similar to that described above for floated quantifiers. Adjectives such as ‘drunk’, ‘naked’, ‘raw’, etc. may either appear within the NP which they modify, or they may occur in immediately post-verbal position. In the latter case, they must always be interpreted as modifying the nominative argument, as illustrated by the following examples:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(21)} \quad \text{a. Naghain na lasing si=Maria ng=isda.} \\
&\quad \quad \text{AV-PERF-serve LNK drunk NOM=Maria GEN=fish} \\
&\quad \quad \text{Maria served the fish drunk. (Maria was drunk.)}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{17}\)Another type of “Actor-Raising” has been claimed to exist in Tagalog, which does not require a resumptive pronoun. This construction will be discussed at some length in chapter 6, where I will argue that it does not involve Raising at all but is rather a special case of the normal pattern of clitic placement.

\(^{18}\)The same restriction holds for the functional control construction discussed in chapter 4, section 6, suggesting that Raising might be analyzed as a special case of functional control.
b. Inihain na hilaw ni=Maria ang=isda.
   IV.PERF-serve LNK raw GEN=Maria NOM=fish
   Maria served the fish raw. (The fish was raw.)

c. #Inihain na lasing ni=Maria ang=isda.
   IV.PERF-serve LNK drunk GEN=Maria NOM=fish
   Maria served the fish drunk. (The fish was drunk.)

In sentence (21a) and (21b), the post-verbal modifiers ‘drunk’ and ‘raw’ can only be interpreted as modifying the nominative arguments of their clauses, ‘Maria’ and ‘the fish’, respectively. Example (21c) is anomalous, because the nominative argument of the clause, ‘the fish’, is incompatible with the selectional restrictions of the post-verbal modifier ‘drunk’. Note in particular that the modifier in this position cannot be interpreted as modifying the non-nominative Actor phrase, even when semantic plausibility strongly favors this interpretation.

2.6 Subject obviation

Hale (1982) uses the term “subject obviation” to refer to a constraint which blocks an overt subject pronoun in certain types of clauses in Warlpiri from taking the subject of the preceding clause as its antecedent. A similar phenomenon is observable in certain subordinate clause constructions in Tagalog. In some cases, when the nominative argument of the dependent clause is coreferential with the nominative argument of the main clause, it must be deleted (that is, expressed by zero-anaphora):

(22) (from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 477)
   Tinukso ni=Juan ang=bata, kaya umiyak (*siya).
   PERF-tease-OV GEN=Juan NOM=child so PERF.AV-cry (*3.SG.NOM)
   Juan teased the child, with the result that it cried.

In other types of subordinate clause, such as that in (23), the deletion is not obligatory but null nominative arguments are always interpreted as referring to the nominative argument of the main clause. The only difference between examples (23a) and (23b) is the voice marking on the main verb, which determines the case marking of the arguments. The semantic roles of the participants are identical; Derek is the Actor in both cases. But the interpretation of the zero argument in the subordinate clause varies with the case marking. It is always interpreted as referring to the nominative argument of the main clause, Marvin in (23a) and Derek in (23b).


(23) (from Ramos and Cena, 1990, pp. 151-152)

a. Tinanong ni=Derek si=Marvin, bago umalis.
   PERF-ask-OV GEN=Derek NOM=Marvin before PERF.AV-leave
   Derek asked Marvin before he left. (Marvin left)

b. Nagtanong si=Derek kay=Marvin, bago umalis.
   PERF.AV-ask NOM=Derek DAT=Marvin before PERF.AV-leave
   Derek asked Marvin before he left. (Derek left)

The subject obviation phenomenon in Tagalog remains to be investigated in detail. But clearly the crucial factors are case and voice marking, rather than semantic role, adding support to the hypothesis that alternations in case and voice reflect alternations in subjecthood.

2.7 Possessor ascension

Bell (1983, p. 191 ff.) describes a rule of “Possessor Ascension” in Cebuano, which I interpret as being the topicalization of a possessor phrase. There are various restrictions on the application of this rule, which have yet to be thoroughly investigated (see Bell, 1983, fn. 29). It can apply only with certain verbs, and seems to be most productive (though not absolutely limited to) inalienable possession. For our purposes here, the crucial fact is that only the possessor phrases of nominative arguments can undergo Possessor Ascension. That is, topicalized possessors can only be interpreted as being in a possessor relation to the nominative argument of the clause.

The Tagalog version of this construction is illustrated in the following example:

(24) a. Pinutol ng=magsasaka ang=sungay ng=kalabaw.
   PERF-cut-OV GEN=farmer NOM=horn GEN=buffalo
   The farmer cut off the buffalo’s horn.

b. Ang=kalabaw, pinutul ng=magsasaka ang=sungay.
   NOM=buffalo PERF-cut-OV GEN=farmer NOM=horn
   The buffalo, the farmer cut off the (i.e. its) horn.

In (24b), the topicalized NP (the buffalo) is interpreted as being the possessor of the nominative NP (the horn). Note that the topicalized possessor must be in some sense “affected” by the action. Compare the following example with (24b):

(25) *Ang=kalabaw, tiningnan ng=magsasaka ang=sungay.
   NOM=buffalo PERF-look-at-DV GEN=farmer NOM=horn
   (for: The buffalo, the farmer looked at the (i.e. its) horn.)

Example (25) is identical to (24b) except that the action of looking at something does not affect the possessor of the thing. The fact that only nominative arguments can “launch” possessor ascension is illustrated in the following examples:
(26) a. Si=Juan, kinagat ng=aso ang=anak.
    NOM=Juan PERF-bite-OV GEN=dog NOM=child
    *Juan, a dog bit the (i.e., his) child.

   b. *Si=Juan, kumagat ang=aso sa=anak.
    NOM=Juan PERF.AV-bite NOM=dog DAT=child
    *Juan, the dog bit the child.

In (26a), the preposed NP Juan is interpreted as being the possessor (i.e., father) of the
nominative argument (the child); thus the child, but not the dog, must be interpreted as belonging
to Juan. Sentence (26b), on the other hand, is uninterpretable. Juan can neither be interpreted as
being the possessor of the child, which is marked for dative case, nor of the dog, which is not
affected by the action.\textsuperscript{19} This shows that Possessor Ascension is uniquely associated with the
nominative argument.

2.8 Conjunction reduction

Only nominative arguments can be deleted (or omitted) from coordinate structures in the
construction which I will refer to as \textsc{Conjunction Reduction}. It is important to distinguish
Conjunction Reduction from zero anaphora (or “projdrop”), since Tagalog allows the latter to
apply quite freely. A crucial distinction between the two is that zero anaphora requires that the
antecedent actually precede the null pronoun, whether in the same sentence or in discourse
context, while Conjunction Reduction places no special requirements on linear order.

As the following examples show, a null pronoun\textsuperscript{20} may occur as the nominative argument
(27a), a non-nominative Actor (27b) or, with slightly more difficulty, a non-nominative “direct
object”. (The overt pronoun in (27c) is optional but preferred, at least for my consultants.)

Martin (1981) cites examples of null reference to dative-marked recipients, as in (27d). In each
case, the antecedent precedes the null pronoun.

(27) \textsc{Pro-drop}:
   a. Huhugasan ko ang=mga=pinggan, at pupunasan mo.
      wash-DV 1.SG.GEN NOM=PL=dish and dry-DV 2.SG.GEN
      I will wash the dishes, and you dry (them).

---

\textsuperscript{19}This example is not blocked merely because of a constraint which restricts Possessor Ascension to cases of “inalienable
possession”. The relation between a dog and its owner is a possible basis for Possessor Ascension, as shown by the following
example:

   Si=Juan, kinagat ng=ahas ang=aso.
   NOM=Juan PERF-bite-OV GEN=snake NOM=dog
   *Juan, a snake bit the (i.e., his) dog.

\textsuperscript{20}I use the term “null pronoun” to refer to a pronominal element in f-structure which is unrealized in phrase structure. These
examples could perhaps also be analyzed as cases of pragmatically conditioned “elision”.
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b. Niluto ni=Josie ang=pagkain at hinugasan ang=mga=pinggan.
   cook-OV GEN=Josie NOM=food and wash-DV NOM=PL=dish
   The food was cooked by Josie, and the dishes washed (by her).

c. Nanghuhuli ang=ama ko ng=isda,
   IMPERF.AV-catch NOM=father my GEN=fish
   at nagtitinda ang=ina ko (nito).
   and IMPERF.AV-sell NOM=mother my (this)
   My father catches fish, and my mother sells (them).

d. (from Martin, 1981, p.313)
   Kung makikita ko siya, ibibigay ko ang=sulat mo.
   if IMPERF.OV-see I(GEN) 3.SG.NOM IMPERF.IV-give I(GEN) NOM=letter your
   If I see him, I will give (him) your letter.
   However, “pro-drop” is impossible when the antecedent would follow the null pronoun. Thus
   the following examples do not involve zero anaphora but rather Conjunction Reduction. The
   data show that only the nominative argument (28a), and never a non-nominative Actor (28b) or a
   non-nominative “direct object” (28c), can be omitted in this construction.

(28)  Conjunction reduction:
   a. [Huhugasan ko __nom] at
      FUT-wash-DV 1.SG.GEN and
      [pupunasan mo ang=mga=pinggan].
      FUT-dry-DV 2.SG.GEN NOM=PL=dish
      I will wash and you dry the dishes.

   b. ?*[Niluto ang=pagkain __gen] at
      PERF-cook-OV NOM=food and
      [hinugasan ang=mga=pinggan ni=Josie].
      PERF-wash-DV NOM=PL=dish GEN=Josie
      (for: The food was cooked and the dishes washed by Josie. )

   c. ?*[Nanghuhuli ang=ama ko __gen], at [nagtitinda ang=ina ko ng=isda].
      AV-catch NOM=father my and AV-sell NOM=mother my GEN=fish
      (for: My father catches and my mother sells fish. )

One might suggest an alternative analysis of (28a) as an example of Right Node Raising.
Tagalog does appear to have a rule of Right Node Raising, illustrated in the following example:21

(29) Nagbigay ng=regalo si=Maria at
      PERF.AV-give GEN=present NOM=Maria and

---

21It is not clear how to account for the failure of RNR to license non-subject gaps in (28b-c).
Maria gave a present and the children sent a letter to Juan.

As we will show in chapter 5, the subject need not be the final argument in its clause, and in fact cannot be associated with any unique phrase structural position, so the Right Node Raising hypothesis would be unable to account for the contrast between (28a) and the ungrammatical examples in (28b-c). But even aside from this failure, examples like the following show that the nominative argument need not be the right-most element of the conjoined structure to control a nominative gap in the other conjunct, ruling out Right Node Raising as a possible analysis:22

(30) a. [Pumunta __nom sa=tindahan] at
PERF-AV-go DAT=store and
[bumili ang=kapatid ko ng=bigas].
PERF-AV-buy NOM=sibling my GEN=rice
My brother went to the store and bought some rice.

b. [Tinukso __nom ng=mga=kaibigan] at
PERF-tease-OV GEN=PL=friend and
[kinagalitan si=Juan ng=kaniya=ng guro].
PERF-anger-DV NOM=Juan GEN=3.SG.DAT=LNK teacher
Juan was teased by his friends and scolded by his teacher.

These examples also rule out an analysis in terms of VP-coordination.23 We must conclude that Conjunction Reduction is a distinct phenomenon from either Right Node Raising or pro-drop, and that only the nominative argument of a clause can be gapped under Conjunction Reduction.

Shibatani (1988) points out that in sequential narrative clauses conjoined by ‘and then’ in Cebuano, a null pronoun in Actor position takes an Actor as its antecedent if one is available in the preceding context, regardless of case marking. The same is true in Tagalog, as shown in the following examples:

(31) Hinalikan ni=David si=Linda at.saka umalis.
PERF-kiss-DV GEN=David NOM=Linda and.then PERF.AV-leave
Linda was kissed by David and then left. (i.e., David left)

This phenomenon is very different from the type of Conjunction Reduction exemplified in (28a) and (30). It is not strictly speaking a syntactic constraint, since the same constraint holds across sentence boundaries. It is rather a fact of discourse grammar, a manifestation of topic continuity,

---

22These examples are patterned on Chamorro examples presented by Chung (1990, pp. 603-606).
23Other types of evidence will be presented in chapter 5 which indicate that Tagalog actually has no VP constituent.
obviously consistent with the high topicality of Actors to be discussed in chapter 3. Foley and Van Valin (1984), Cooreman et al. (1984), Verhaar (1988) and other writers have used ellipsis in coordinate structures as a test for subjecthood in various languages. However, many of these studies are suspect because the authors often fail to distinguish between “logical coordination” and temporal sequence coordination. The former is more likely to be governed by syntactic constraints, the latter by discourse considerations.

This section has demonstrated that Conjunction Reduction, like a number of other syntactic processes in Tagalog, uniquely selects the nominative argument. All of these constructions support the claim that the nominative argument is the grammatical subject. In the following section, we will turn our attention to the two phenomena which are most frequently cited as providing evidence for the subjecthood of the Actor: reflexive binding and Equi constructions.

3 Actor properties

3.1 Reflexive binding

Schachter (1976, 1977) shows that the Actor, regardless of case marking, is always a possible antecedent for a reflexive pronoun in the same clause, and that an Actor may never itself be expressed by a reflexive pronoun. He is careful not to claim that the Actor is the only possible antecedent for a reflexive pronoun; however, most linguists who read his papers seem to assume that this is what he intended.

Andrews (1985) presents data which show that non-Actors can be antecedents of reflexives in Tagalog. Sentences like the following are ambiguous in Tagalog just as in English:

(32) (adapted from Andrews, 1985, p. 143)

a. Iniabot niya sa=bata ang=kaniya=ng sarili=ng larawan.
   PERF-IV-hand 3.SG.GEN 3. SGN 3.SI/LNK self=LNK picture
   He handed the child a picture of himself/herself.

b. Tumanggap si=Rosa ng=sulat para sa=bata
   AV PERF-receive NOM=Rosa GEN=letter to 3. SGN 3.SI/LNK self
   3. SGN=LNK self
   Rosa received a letter to the child from him/herself.
(33) a. Ipinagbili ng=hari ang=alipin sa=sarili niya.
   PERF-IV-sell GEN=king NOM=slave DAT=self 3.SG
   The king sold the slave to himself.

   b. Sinabi ni=Juan kay=Maria ang=katotohanan
      PERF-tell-OV GEN=Juan DAT=Maria NOM=truth
      tungkol sa=sarili niya.
      about DAT=self 3.SG
      John told Mary the truth about him/herself.

Bell (1976, pp. 157-158) shows that Actors are not the only possible antecedents of reflexives in Cebuano. She suggests that reflexive binding in Cebuano is governed by the thematic hierarchy of Jackendoff (1972): a reflexive must be lower than its antecedent on the thematic hierarchy. However, to make the thematic constraint work she must make certain modifications to the hierarchy.

Andrews suggests that the thematic hierarchy can also explain the behavior of reflexives in Tagalog. If this analysis is correct, then the binding properties of Actors in Tagalog reflect their status as logical subjects, rather than providing evidence about their grammatical relation. In any event, it is clear that reflexive binding is not unique to Actors (or to any other class of arguments), and thus not a diagnostic property of subjects in Tagalog.

### 3.2 Equi

The most common and productive Equi pattern in Tagalog is that noted by Schachter (1976, p. 505). He stated: “... it is always the actor that is absent in structures analyzable as involving equi-noun-phrase deletion.” Given the near-universal requirement that Equi targets be subjects, this seems to be a powerful argument in favor of analyzing the Actor as the grammatical subject. However, Schachter himself (1985, p. 458) noted that the facts are actually more complex than

24She also states that the antecedent must precede the reflexive in the sentence. This is the preferred order in Tagalog as well, but does not appear to be an absolute requirement. Moreover, reflexives can readily undergo ay-inversion, as in the following examples:

   Ang=kanila=ng sarili ay pinupuri ng=mga=kandidato.
   NOM=3.PL=LNK self INV IMPERF-praise-OV GEN=PL=candidate
   The candidates praised themselves.

   Ang=sarili niya ay nakita ni=Juan sa=salamin.
   NOM=self 3.SG.GEN INV PERF.NONVOL-see-OV GEN=Juan DAT=mirror
   Juan saw himself in the mirror.
he realized at the time his earlier papers were written. Under certain circumstances, nominative arguments as well as Actors may be Equi targets.

A few Equi predicates (e.g. *himukin* ‘persuade’ and *magpilit* ‘insist on’) allow the controllee in a transitive complement clause to be either the Actor (regardless of case marking) or the argument which bears nominative case. Another kind of exception arises when the embedded verb is marked for non-volitive mood, in which case the controllee must be the nominative element rather than the Actor of the complement clause. Thus not all Equi targets are Actors.

A more detailed discussion of both types of exception will be deferred to chapter 4. In this section I will simply illustrate the basic control pattern, which requires that the controllee correspond to the Actor of the embedded clause. Case marking is irrelevant in this construction, so the voice marking on the downstairs verb does not affect the control relation. This pattern is illustrated in the following examples. Notice that the nominative argument of the embedded clause is the null Actor in (34a), the Theme in (34b), and the Recipient in (34c); but in all three sentences, the gap in the downstairs clause corresponds to the Actor.

(34) a. Binalak niya=ng [magbigay __nom ng=pera sa=Nanay].
PERF-plan-OV 3.SG.GEN=COMP AV-give GEN=money DAT=mother
*He planned to give money to Mother.*

b. Binalak niya=ng [ibigay __gen sa=Nanay ang=pera].
PERF-plan-OV 3.SG.GEN=COMP IV-give DAT=mother NOM=money
*He planned to give the money to Mother.*

c. Binalak niya=ng [bigyan __gen ng=pera ang=Nanay].
PERF-plan-OV 3.SG.GEN=COMP give-DV GEN=money NOM=mother
*He planned to give Mother (some/the) money.*

Similarly, alternation in the voice category of the matrix verb and the case marking of the controller does not affect the control relation, as illustrated in the following examples:

(35) (from Dell, 1981, p. 17)

a. Um-iwas ako=ng t-um-ingin kay=Lorna.
PERF-AV-avoid 1.SG.NOM=COMP AV-look.at DAT=Lorna

b. Um-iwas ako=ng tingn-an si=Lorna.
PERF-AV-avoid 1.SG.NOM=COMP look.at-DV NOM=Lorna

c. In-iwas-an ko=ng t-um-ingin kay=Lorna.
PERF-avoid-DV 1.SG.GEN=COMP AV-look.at DAT=Lorna
d. In-iwas-an ko=ng tingn-an si=Lorna.
PERF-avoid-DV 1.SG.GEN=COMP look.at-DV NOM=Lorna
I avoided looking at Lorna.

In chapter 4 I will suggest that the identity of the controller is determined by the lexical semantics of the matrix verb (following Sag and Pollard, 1991), and that the identity of the controllee is primarily determined by universal semantic constraints on this class of Equi constructions. For the moment what is important is the fact noted by Schachter (1985), namely that while Actors are the most usual choice of Equi target, nominative arguments can also be controllees in Equi constructions.

Thus neither reflexive antecedents nor Equi targets are restricted exclusively to Actors. Assuming that a single clause can have at most one grammatical subject, this implies that neither reflexive binding nor Equi constructions provide diagnostic tests for grammatical subjecthood in Tagalog.

4. Termhood

4.1 Non-obliqueness of Actors
Schachter (1976, p. 512) objected to the passive analysis of Bell (1976, 1983), under which non-nominative Actors are treated as 1-chômeurs, because chômeurs are assumed to be non-terms, i.e. oblique arguments. As such, it seems surprising that non-nominative Actors should be eligible to appear both as controllers and as controllees in Equi constructions.\(^{25}\) Moreover, the Actor is not freely deletable, at least in the unmarked (volitive) mood. Missing Actors are normally assumed to have a definite discourse antecedent. And, as noted in section 2.8, the Actor (regardless of case marking) of the previous clause is the preferred antecedent for a zero pronoun (or deleted element) in an Actor position.

In this section we will consider two other kinds of evidence which support the claim that non-nominative Actors in Tagalog are terms, i.e. non-oblique arguments. The evidence will come from control of participial clauses and restrictions on a construction which I refer to as “Adjunct Fronting”.

\(^{25}\)Schachter also cites, as further evidence against the passive analysis, the generalization that antecedents of reflexives must be terms. Since Actors are always eligible antecedents, this claim would cast further doubt on the 1-chômeur analysis. But the generalization is clearly not a universal. There are a number of languages, e.g. Marathi, in which passive agents may bind reflexive pronouns.
The results of this section have important implications for the theory of linking, i.e. the relationship between argument roles and syntactic functions. Some configurational theories of argument structure predict that “external arguments” such as agents and experiencers must either be mapped onto an external structural position (i.e., the subject position) or be suppressed, expressed as an adjunct if at all. Similarly, some linking theories based on the thematic hierarchy predict that the highest argument on the hierarchy must be the grammatical subject unless it is suppressed or demoted. The data presented in this section show that in Tagalog, non-subject agents (more generally, Actors) are terms, i.e. objects. This means that any universal theory of linking must be parameterized to allow for languages like Tagalog in which patients may be selected as subject without demoting or suppressing the agent.\(^\text{26}\)

4.1.1 Participial complements

Certain verbs in Tagalog take a complement containing a non-completive verb form which corresponds to a participial clause in English. Some examples are given below:

(36) In-iwan-an ko siya=ng [sumusulat ___nom ng=liham].
   PERF-leave-DV 1.SG.GEN 3.SG.NOM=COMP AV.IMPERF-write GEN=letter
   I left him writing a letter.

(37) In-abut-an ko siya=ng [nagbabasa ___nom ng=komiks sa=eskwel].
   PERF-find-DV 1.SG.GEN 3.SG.NOM=COMP
   AV.IMPERF-read GEN=comics DAT=school
   I caught him reading a comic book in school.

In these examples the participial verb form is in Active Voice, so the controllee (i.e. the gap in the participial clause) is both the Actor and the nominative argument of that clause. When the dependent verb is marked for non-active voice, the controllee may be either the Actor or the nominative argument. The following examples illustrate non-nominative Actor controllees:

(38) In-abut-an ko si=Manuel na [hinahalikan ___gen ang=katulong].
   PERF-find-DV 1.SG.GEN NOM=Manuel COMP
   AV.IMPERF-kiss NOM=maid
   I caught Manuel kissing the maid.

---

\(^{26}\)The Tagalog data raises another kind of problem for the Lexical Mapping Theory of Bresnan and Kanerva (1989), which predicts that agents must either be subjects or oblique arguments and never non-subject direct arguments (objects).
The controllee may also be a non-Actor nominative argument, as shown by the following example:

(40) In-abut-an ko si=Manuel na
PERF-find-DV 1.SG.GEN NOM=Manuel COMP

[hinahalikan ng=katulong __nom].
IMPERF-kiss-DV GEN=maid

I caught Manuel being kissed by the maid.

However, the controllee can never be a dative or prepositional argument. Note the following contrast:

(41) a. In-abut-an ko si=Luz na
PERF-find-DV 1.SG.GEN NOM=Luz COMP

[binibigyan ni=Juan ng=pera __nom].
IMPERF-give-DV GEN=Juan GEN=money

I caught Luz being given money by Juan.

b. *In-abut-an ko si=Luz na
PERF-find-DV 1.SG.GEN NOM=Luz LNK

[ibinibigay ni=Juan ang=pera __dat].
IV.IMPERF-give GEN=Juan NOM=money

Since both Actors and nominative phrases can be controllees in this construction, it can not be taken to be a diagnostic for subjecthood. However, since oblique arguments cannot be controllees here, it does provide additional evidence for the termhood of non-nominative Actors.

4.1.2 Participial adjuncts

In the construction discussed in the preceding section, the controller (i.e. the matrix argument interpreted as the antecedent of the gap) is lexically determined. There is also a participial adjunct construction, which is not lexically governed, involving the adverbial linking particle *nang*. In the participial adjunct construction, the controller of the participial clause may be either the Actor or the nominative argument of the matrix clause, but not a dative or prepositional argument.

(42) a. Binisita ni=Juan ang=hari nang nagiisa.
PERF-visit-OV GEN=Juan NOM=king ADV ADV.IMPERF-one

Juan visited the king alone. (Either Juan or the king is alone)
b. Bumisita si=Juan sa=hari nang nagiisa.

Juan visited the king alone. (Juan is alone)

Example (42a) is ambiguous—either the Actor (Juan) or the nominative phrase (‘the king’) could be interpreted as being the subject of ‘alone’. (The word for ‘alone’, nagiisa, is an imperfective verb form based on the root isa ‘one’.) However, example (42b) can only mean that Juan is alone, because ‘the king’ in this sentence bears dative case. Dative and prepositional arguments are oblique, and are therefore ineligible to control the participial adjunct.

4.1.3 Adjunct Fronting

Adjunct Fronting (referred to by Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 496) as “Emphatic Inversion”) is a construction which places some non-verbal element, usually an adverb, into initial position preceding the verb. In addition to adverbial phrases, PP’s and certain NP’s can also be fronted in this construction. The generalization which governs this pattern seems to be the following: only non-terms (i.e., obliques, adjuncts or adverbials) can undergo Adjunct Fronting. If this is the correct generalization, the construction provides a very useful test for termhood.

The phrase structure of this construction will be discussed in chapter 5. To summarize briefly a part of that discussion, there are two crucial features which allow us to distinguish Adjunct Fronting from other similar constructions, such as Topicalization: first, the lack of any pause or intonation break after the fronted element, and second, the position of pronouns and other second-position clitics. In Adjunct Fronting, clitic elements must immediately follow the fronted constituent, preceding the verb, because there is no internal clause boundary. However, in Topicalization the fronted constituent is outside the minimal clause, so clitics will normally follow the verb. The phrase-structure configurations which will be proposed in chapter 5 for these two constructions are roughly the following (where IP marks a clause boundary and CP corresponds to S’):

(43)  a. **Adjunct Fronting:**

    [IP XP V ... ]

    b. **Topicalization:**

    [CP XP [IP V ... ]]

The pre-verbal position of the pronouns in the following sentences shows them to be examples of Adjunct Fronting:
(44) a. (adapted from Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 497)
  for DAT=Pedro 1.SG.GEN PERF-buy-OV NOM=toy
  For Pedro I bought the toy.

b. (Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 498)
[Sa=akin] nila ibinigay ang=premyo.
  DAT=me they(GEN) IV-PERF-give NOM=prize
  To me they gave the prize.

c. (from Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 497)
[Dahil sa=iyo] ako nahuli.
  because.of DAT=you 1.SG.NOM late
  Because of you I was late.

Notice especially the example in (44b) which shows that subcategorized arguments (in this case a dative-marked recipient) can undergo Adjunct Fronting. In contrast, as pointed out by Naylor (1975, p. 55-56), non-nominative Actors, patients and (genitive) instruments never occur in this position. Neither do nominative arguments, which can only be fronted by the use of other constructions (to be discussed in chapters 3 and 5) such as Clefting, Topicalization or *ay*-Inversion. The following examples illustrate the inapplicability of Adjunct Fronting to nominative arguments (45a-b) and non-nominative Actors (45c-d).

(45) a. *Ang=libro=ng ito ko binili para kay=Pedro.
   NOM=book=LNK this 1.SG.GEN PERF-buy-OV for DAT=Pedro
   (For: This book I bought for Pedro.

b. *Si=Pedro ko binigyan ng=laruan.
   NOM=Pedro 1.SG.GEN PERF-give-DV GEN=toy
   (For: Pedro I gave this toy to.

c. *Ni=Pedro ako binigyan ng=pera.
   GEN=Pedro 1.SG.NOM PERF-give-DV GEN=money
   (For: By Pedro I was given (the) money.

d. *Ng=Nanay siya pinalo.
   GEN=mother 3.SG.NOM PERF-spank-OV
   (For: By Mother he was spanked.

So Adjunct Fronting provides further confirmation that Actors must always be terms in Tagalog.

There are two different ways in which non-nominative instruments (i.e., instruments in clauses whose verb is not marked for instrumental voice) may be case marked. Most instruments appear as prepositional objects, in preposition phrases of the form sa pamamagitan X ‘by the use of X’. But some verbs allow an instrumental argument to appear in genitive case. Both possibilities are illustrated below:
Adjunct Fronting applies freely to prepositional instruments, as we would expect, but never to genitive-marked instruments. The contrast is seen in the following examples:

(47) a. Sa=pamamagitan ng=makina ako
    DAT=use GEN=sewing.machine 1.SG.NOM
    itinahi ni=Linda ng=damit.
    BV.PERF-sew GEN=Linda GEN=dress
    With the sewing machine Linda sewed a dress for me.

    b. Sa=pamamagitan ng=sandok siya kumuha ng=sabaw.
    DAT=use GEN=ladle 3.SG.NOM AV.PERF-take GEN=soup
    With the ladle she took some soup.

(48) a. *Ng=sipit na ito ko dadalhin ang=isda sa=mesa.
    GEN=chopsticks LNK this 1.SG.GEN FUT-bring-OV NOM=fish DAT=table
    (For: With these chopsticks I’ll take the fish to the table.)

    b. *Ng=papel na iyon niya binalutan ang=libro.
    GEN=paper LNK that 3.SG.GEN PERF-wrap-DV NOM=book
    (For: With that paper she wrapped the book.)

This indicates that the genitive-marked instruments are terms, perhaps bearing the grammatical relation of restricted object, as opposed to the prepositional instruments which are probably adjuncts.

In Wh-questions, as we will see in chapter 3, the question word may either be clefted or undergo Adjunct Fronting. The former is possible only for nominative arguments, since only
nominative arguments can be clefted. The latter option is possible only when the Wh-word corresponds to an element which could itself undergo Adjunct Fronting, i.e. a non-term. Thus question formation gives us another (clearly related) test for termhood. When non-terms are questioned the Wh-word undergoes Adjunct Fronting, whereas terms may be questioned only by clefting (in the case of nominative arguments) or by leaving the Wh-word in situ, in the case of Actors (see chapter 7, example (3)).

The results of this section indicate that Adjunct Fronting provides a good test for termhood, and support the conclusions of the previous two sections, namely that Actors in Tagalog are always terms.

4.2 On the termhood of genitive patients: evidence against the ergative analysis

The crucial empirical difference between the analysis proposed here and the morphological ergative analysis of Gerdts (1988) and Payne (1982) concerns the status of non-subject patients. Under the Gerdts-Payne analysis, Active Voice is an antipassive construction in which the patient is demoted to produce an intransitive clause. This means that the patient of an AV clause (which normally gets genitive case) must be an oblique, specifically a 2-chômeur. If genitive patients can be shown to be terms, that analysis becomes much more difficult (if not impossible) to maintain.

One construction that can be used to test this prediction is Adjunct Fronting, discussed in the previous section. As the following examples show, genitive-marked patients can never undergo Adjunct Fronting. This implies that they are terms, i.e. Objects, since any non-term can appear in initial position in this construction.

(49) a. *Ng=balot siya kumain.
    GEN=duck.embryo 3.SG.NOM AV.PERF-eat
    (For: *(The) balot he ate.)

b. *Ng=isda siya hindi makakakain.
    GEN=fish 3.SG.NOM not AV.NONVOL.FUT-eat
    (For: Fish he cannot eat.)

27Genitive-marked patients and instruments cannot be questioned—they must be expressed as nominative arguments through the use of the appropriate voice marking on the verb.
This conclusion is further supported by evidence from participial adjunct constructions. As demonstrated in section 4.1.2, only terms may control the gap in a participial nang clause. The following examples illustrate that genitive patients can control these clauses, and are therefore terms:

(50) a. Hinuli ng=polis ang=magnanakaw
PERF-catch-OV GEN=police NOM=thief
nang pumapasok sa=bangko.
ADV AV.IMPERF-enter DAT=bank
The police caught the thief entering the bank.

b. Nanghuli ng=magnanakaw ang=polis
AV.PERF-catch GEN=thief NOM=police
nang pumapasok sa=bangko.
ADV AV.IMPERF-enter DAT=bank
The police caught a/the thief when entering the bank.

Sentences (50a) and (50b) are both ambiguous in the same way; either thief or police may be interpreted as the subject of entering the bank. This shows that non-nominative Actors (50a) and patients (50b) are both terms, because both are potential controllers of the participial nang clause. In contrast, example (42b) (repeated here as (51)) is unambiguous. Only Juan (the Actor) can be interpreted as the subject of alone, because the dative argument (the king) is an oblique, and hence not a possible controller.

(51) Bumisita si=Juan sa=hari nang nagiisa.
AV.PERF-visit NOM=Juan DAT=king ADV AV.IMPERF-one
Juan visited the king alone. (Juan is alone)

Thus the data from Adjunct Fronting and participial adjuncts provide clear evidence for the termhood of genitive patients. This result constitutes a strong argument against the ergative analysis proposed by Gerdts and Payne.

5. “Subjectless” sentences

There are a number of sentence types in Tagalog which are well-formed and complete even though they systematically lack a nominative argument. The existence of such sentences poses a problem to the analysis of nominative arguments as subjects, if one assumes that all sentences

---

28 The participial complement construction cannot be used to shed light on this question, because the controller in such constructions is necessarily definite and animate. Thus patient-controllees must always get nominative or dative case, and never genitive.
must have grammatical subjects. After exemplifying the most important of these patterns, we will examine their implications for our analysis of subjecthood in Tagalog.

5.1 Subjectless sentence patterns

The subjectless sentence types of Tagalog include the following:

**Existential:**

(52) (Ramos, 1971, p. 160-1)

a. May tao sa=bahay.
   exist person DAT=house
   There is someone in the house.

b. Wala=ng mais sa=palengke.
   not.exist=LNK corn DAT=market
   There is no corn in the market.

c. May nagnakaw ng=pera ko.
   exist AV.PERF-steal GEN=money my
   Somebody stole my money.

d. Wala=ng sumaklolo sa=nalunod.
   not.exist=LNK AV.PERF-help DAT=NONVOL.PERF-drown
   No one helped the one who drowned.

e. Mayroon=g tumatakbo sa=kuwarto.
   exist=LNK AV.IMPERF-run DAT=room
   There is someone running in the room.

Existential predicates take a single nominal argument marked for genitive case.29 (Whether the locative phrase in these examples is an argument or an adjunct is irrelevant to the present discussion.) This argument may either be a simple N’ (i.e., a noun plus modifiers) as in (52a-b) or a headless relative clause, as in (52c-e). In either case, the existential predicate takes no nominative argument.

**Meteorological:**

(53)  

a. Umuulan.
   AV.IMPERF-rain
   It is raining.

b. Lumindol nang malakas.
   AV.PERF-earthquake ADV strong
   There was a strong earthquake.

---

29This construction is a common method of introducing new participants into a discourse, because the argument of which existence is predicated is necessarily indefinite.
c. Babagyo raw bukas.
   AV.FUT-storm REPORT tomorrow
   They say there will be a storm tomorrow.

d. Bumabaha sa=Maynila.
   AV.IMPERF-flood DAT=Manila
   There is flooding in Manila.

Weather verbs in Tagalog have a valence of zero. That is, they take no arguments at all, and therefore no nominative argument.

Exclamatory:

(54) (Ramos, 1971, p. 164-165)
   a. Ang bastos ng=lalake!
      NOM rude GEN=man
      How rude the man is!
   b. Ang ganda ng=babae!
      NOM beautiful GEN=woman
      How beautiful the woman is!
   c. Ang takot ko sa=iyo!
      NOM scare 1.SG.GEN DAT=you(SG)
      How you scared me!
   d. Kay buti nila sa=akin!
      COMPAR good they(GEN) DAT=me
      How good they are to me!
   e. Napaka-tapang niya!
      SUPERL-brave 3.SG.GEN
      How brave he is!

   This construction usually involves adjectives preceded by the nominative marker (as in (54a-b)) or the comparative particle kay (as in (54d)), or adjectives marked for superlative degree (54e).

   Certain verb roots are also possible, as in (54c).

Recent-perfective aspect:

(55) Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 374-5)
   a. Kaaalis pa lamang ni=Pedro nang dumating ako.
      REC.PERF-leave yet only GEN=Pedro ADV AV.PERF-arrive 1.SG.NOM
      Pedro had just left when I arrived.
   b. Kakakain ko pa lamang sa=karne.
      REC.PERF-eat 1.SG.GEN yet only DAT=meat
      I have just eaten the meat.
c. Kapangunguha pa lamang ng=bata ng=mga=mangga.
   REC.PERF-gather yet only GEN=child GEN=PL=mango
   The child has just gathered some/the mangoes.

Recent-perfective aspect is marked by the prefix ka- followed by CV reduplication. A verb marked for recent-perfective aspect carries no voice marking, and no argument of such a verb gets nominative case. All arguments get the default case markings determined by their thematic relations: Actors, instruments and indefinite patients get genitive case, while definite patients and other arguments get dative case. In this respect, recent-perfective verbs are similar to gerunds, which are also unmarked for voice and allow only default case assignment. However, gerundive clauses function as NP’s, and cannot stand alone as independent sentences. Recent-perfective aspect clauses, in contrast, have much the same distribution as any other finite verbal clause.

**Experiencer verbs with indefinite objects:**

(56) Bowen (1965, pp. 334-5)
   a. Gusto namin ng=turon.
      like 1.PL.EXCL.GEN GEN=fritters
      We like turon.
   b. Ayaw ng=mga=babae ng=komiks.
      not.like GEN=PL=female GEN=comics
      The girls don’t like comics.
   c. Kailangan ko ng=bago=ng baro.
      need 1.SG.GEN GEN=new=LNK dress
      I need a new dress.
   d. Ibig niya ng=mayaman=g lalaki.
      want 3.SG.GEN GEN=rich=LNK man
      She wants a rich man.

The psych predicates in these examples belong to the class of modals (or “pseudo-verbs”), whose behaviour will be discussed at length in chapter 6. These verbs always assign genitive case to their experiencers. When the object of desire in these constructions is definite, it will normally take nominative case. But when the object is indefinite, it takes genitive case and no nominative argument is licensed in the clause.

5.2 Implications

For each of the sentence patterns exemplified above, we need to ask whether the fact that such sentences contain no nominative argument should be taken as evidence against analyzing the
nominative argument as grammatical subject. Let us begin with the existential pattern illustrated in (52).

Schachter (1977) cites a study by Eve Clark (1970) comparing Locative vs. Existential sentences like the following pair in a sample of over 30 languages:

(57) a. The book is on the table.
    b. There is a book on the table.

Of the 24 languages in Clark’s sample which used distinct syntactic structures for these two sentence types, 21 use subjectless constructions for the existential pattern while 3 (including English) use a dummy subject (like *there*) in existential sentences. So even in languages where there is no ambiguity about the existence or identity of grammatical subjects, it is very common to find subjectless sentences in existential constructions. Thus the lack of a nominative argument in Tagalog existentials does not argue against analyzing nominative argument as grammatical subject, and in fact might even be taken as evidence in favor of this analysis.

The meteorological verbs in (53) seem to be a very similar case. While I know of no cross-linguistic study of such sentences, my impression is that weather verbs in most languages take either a dummy subject or no arguments at all. Since there is no expletive (dummy) element in Tagalog, weather verbs take no arguments. Again, this does not seem to argue against the subjecthood of nominative arguments in sentences where they do occur.

In the case of experiencer verbs with indefinite objects, I believe the situation to be quite different. The “psych-predicates” exemplified in (56) above are not syntactically subjectless; the non-assignment of nominative case is due to morphological constraints. In this sentence-type the patient (i.e., the object of desire) functions as the syntactic subject of the clause. The first piece of evidence for this claim is that when the patient is definite, it always takes nominative case as in the following example:

(58) Gusto ko ang=litson.
    *like 1.SG.GEN NOM=roast.pig
    *I like/want the lechon.

A second piece of evidence comes from Wh-movement. As demonstrated in section 2, only subjects can be relativized and clefted. One type of Wh-fronting is a special instance of clefting, so only subjects can be questioned with this pattern. (These facts will be discussed in greater

30A third possibility is the use of idiomatic subjects, as in the Malay expression “Hari hendak hujan”, literally “The day wants to rain.”
The following examples illustrate the range of possibilities for extracting an element from the experiencer modal construction with an indefinite object:

(59)  
\[ \text{a. Gusto ko ng=} \text{litson.} \]  
\[ \text{like 1.SG.\text{GEN} GEN=} \text{roast.pig} \]  
\[ I \text{ like/want lechon.} \]  
\[ \text{b. Ano ang gusto mo?} \]  
\[ \text{what NOM like you(SG.\text{GEN})} \]  
\[ \text{What do you like/want?} \]  
\[ \text{c. *Sino ang gusto ng=} \text{litson?} \]  
\[ \text{who NOM like GEN=} \text{roast.pig} \]  
\[ \text{(for: Who likes lechon?)} \]  
\[ \text{d. Sino ang may gusto ng=} \text{litson?} \]  
\[ \text{who NOM have like GEN=} \text{roast.pig} \]  
\[ \text{Who likes lechon?} \]  
\[ \text{(Lit: Who has a liking for lechon?)} \]  

As (59b) shows, extraction of the patient NP is possible, but extraction of the experiencer NP (59c) is not possible. In order to express this meaning, a possessive construction (59d) must be used. These facts support the conclusion that the genitive patient (object of desire) is the syntactic subject in sentences like (59a).

There seems to be a general constraint in Tagalog (and, to some degree, in all Philippine languages) which prevents indefinite NP’s from taking nominative case. It is this constraint which gives rise to the contrast between (59a) and (58), even though in terms of grammatical relations the two sentences are identical. The alternation between nominative and genitive case marking on the patient argument reflects a difference in definiteness, rather than a difference in grammatical relation.

The exclamatory sentence pattern illustrated in (54) is more difficult to deal with. While it seems plausible to assume that the single argument of examples like (54a-e) is the subject of the clause, it is very difficult to apply any of the subjecthood tests discussed above to sentences of this type. However, Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 487) present the following example involving the superlative form of an adjective:

(60)  
\[ \text{Ang=} \text{bata ay napaka-tamad.} \]  
\[ \text{INV SUPERL-lazy} \]  
\[ \text{The child is very lazy.} \]  
\[ \text{(formal style)} \]  

Since only subjects normally undergo ay-inversion, this construction seems to indicate that the single argument of the adjectival predicate in (54e) at least is the subject.
Verbs marked for recent-perfective aspect seem to be the most problematic case, partly because different speakers seem to have different judgements about extraction from these constructions. In the sentences in (61), both the Actor and patient phrases are marked for genitive case. All speakers allow the extraction of Actors, as shown in (62). Most speakers also allow the extraction of patient when the patient phrase is a personal name, as in (63a). However, the acceptability of patient extraction is greatly reduced when the patient phrase is a common noun, perhaps because of potential ambiguity; in (63b), it may be unclear whether the child is the eater or the eaten.

(61) a. Kakakain lamang ng=bata ng=mangga.
     REC.PERC-perf eat only GEN=child GEN=mango
     The child has just eaten a/the mango.

b. Kapapagbili ko lamang ng=kalabaw.
     REC.PERC-perf sell 1.SG.GEN only GEN=buffalo
     I have just sold a buffalo.

(62) a. Sino ang kakakain lang ng=mangga?
     who NOM REC.PERC-perf eat only GEN=mango
     Who has just eaten a/the mango?

b. Sino ang kapapagbili lang ng=kalabaw?
     who NOM REC.PERC-perf sell only GEN=buffalo
     Who has just sold a buffalo?

(63) a. Ano ang kakakain lang ni=Maria?
     what NOM REC.PERC-perf eat only GEN=Maria
     What has Maria just eaten?

b. ??Ano ang kakakain lang ng=bata?
     what NOM REC.PERC-perf eat only GEN=child
     (for: What has the child just eaten?)

McGinn (1988, p. 286) gives an example in which a benefactive argument has been extracted from a recent-perfective construction. My consultants find the sentence totally ungrammatical under the benefactive interpretation, but acceptable if interpreted as in the second gloss shown below, in which the Actor has been extracted. However, some Tagalog speakers do allow the benefactive interpretation (L. Travis, p.c.).

(64) (from McGinn, 1988, p. 286)
     Sino ang kabibili lang ng=tela ni=Juan?
     who NOM REC.PERC-buy only GEN=cloth GEN=Juan
     (%%)Who was just bought cloth by Juan?
     (okay as: Who has just bought Juan’s cloth?)
The generalization seems to be that Actors are the most easily extractable argument of a recent-perfective verb, but the extraction facts do not identify a unique subject for this construction. It remains to be investigated whether or not other subjecthood tests could be applied to this construction. Until further work is done to clarify the nature of the construction, it is difficult to know how to account for the apparent extraction of non-nominative arguments. However, none of the other “subjectless” constructions discussed above appear to pose any problems for the analysis proposed here.

6. Typological considerations

The evidence discussed in the preceding sections strongly supports the claim that the nominative argument, i.e. the argument whose theta-role is reflected in the voice-marker of the verb, is the grammatical subject of the Tagalog clause. We have seen that the syntactic evidence for subjecthood in Tagalog is less equivocal than most linguists, following Schachter, have assumed. Evidence for the grammatical subjecthood of non-nominative Actors is weaker than has been claimed, in light of the observation that neither reflexive binding nor Equi-deletion are exclusively properties of Actors. Conversely, the evidence for analyzing the nominative argument as a grammatical subject is even stronger than Schachter implied, since in addition to the properties he discussed (quantifier float and relativization), a number of other properties have also been shown to pertain only to nominative arguments: Raising, Conjunction Reduction, Possessor Ascension, secondary predication, obviation and number agreement. Moreover, the existence of clause-types which systematically lack a nominative argument has been shown not to provide evidence against analyzing nominative arguments as subjects; with the possible exception of the recent-perfective construction, such clauses are either subjectless or have subjects marked for genitive case.

This analysis forces us to recognize a seemingly unique fact about the Philippine voice system, namely that the Actor is not demoted to oblique status when some other argument is selected as subject. We have identified a number of syntactic tests which confirm the termhood of non-subject Actors. The implications of this fact for the theory of linking were discussed briefly in section 4.

In chapter 1 it was claimed that the patient is the nominative argument in “basic” transitive clauses, i.e. the preferred choice of subject. Let us briefly review the evidence for that claim,
which has often been made by specialists in Philippine languages. First, the rule of subject selection itself shows a pragmatic preference for patients. In a transitive clause in which the patient is definite, the patient must be selected as subject, unless some other argument of the clause is relativized, clefted or topicalized. This pragmatic preference is confirmed by evidence from text frequency counts. For example, Cooreman, Fox and Givón (1984) report that 166 out of the 203 non-inverted transitive clauses in their sample (taken from Bloomfield’s corpus of Tagalog texts) were in non-active voice. That is, the Actor was selected as subject in only 18.2% of the non-inverted transitive clauses.

Second, there is evidence that OV forms of verbs are morphologically more “basic”, i.e. less marked, than the corresponding AV form. Cena (1977) and De Guzman (1979) note the existence of a class of Tagalog verb roots which can occur as the main verb of a transitive clause in bare, uninflected form. Even though these forms carry no voice affixation, they always function as OV forms, assigning nominative case to the patient of the clause. This means that, for these verbs at least, the underived form is that which selects the patient as subject.

Schachter and Otanes (1972) and Schachter (1977) point out another class of verbs which can appear only in OV form in main clauses. The corresponding AV form is possible only in dependent clauses, cleft constructions, etc. For this class of verbs, the OV form is less restricted in its distribution than the AV form, another criterion which is often taken to reflect relative markedness.

In some Philippine-type languages, the Active Voice form of a transitive verb is more complex morphologically than the corresponding Objective Voice form, though this is not always apparent in Tagalog. In Kimaragang Dusun, as described in Kroeger (1991), a transitive verb must bear a certain type of prefix (in addition to its voice-marking affix) whenever the patient is not selected as subject. When the patient is the subject, this prefix does not occur. Thus AV forms in general have greater morphological complexity than the corresponding OV form.

Finally, there is developmental evidence (Tucker, 1971; Segalowitz and Galang, 1978; Galang, 1982) which indicates that Tagalog children acquire OV forms earlier than the corresponding AV forms. Order of acquisition is also taken to be an indication of relative markedness.

Tagalog, then, belongs to that rare class of languages (at least, rare outside of the Philippines) in which the patient is the grammatical subject of a basic transitive clause. Mel’čuk
(1988), in his analysis of Dyirbal, coined the term PATHETIVE to describe such a voice system. Other linguists have referred to such languages as being “syntactically ergative”, but there appears to be a significant degree of confusion over the meaning of this term. Since the terminological question is of relatively minor importance for the present study, I will not discuss it further here.

An important difference between Tagalog and Dyirbal is seen in the syntactic status of the agent. In Dyirbal, ergative (or instrumental) marked agents are relatively inert, playing almost no role in the syntax, and have been analyzed as oblique arguments (Kiparsky, 1987; Mel’čuk, 1988). However, as demonstrated in section 4, in Tagalog the non-nominative agent of a transitive clause is not an oblique argument but a term. It is the syntactic termhood of Actors, together with their semantic and pragmatic prominence, which creates the apparent ambiguity of subjecthood criteria in Tagalog.
Chapter 3.
Topic and Focus

§1. Introduction

In chapter 2 a number of syntactic tests were discussed which uniquely identify the nominative argument of a clause as the grammatical subject. I argued that the unique properties of Actors are derived from their semantic and pragmatic prominence, rather than from a unique grammatical relation, and showed that their syntactic properties are similar to those of other terms (non-oblique arguments).

Many linguists have resisted analyzing the nominative argument as a grammatical subject. These linguists include both Philippinists seeking to emphasize the distinctness of Philippine languages from familiar European models and syntacticians concerned about the typological and theoretical implications of the analysis, as discussed in chapter 2, section 6. The most common alternative analysis proposed by these linguists has been to identify the nominative argument as a “topic” of some kind. Some (e.g. Carrier-Duncan, 1985) assume that the Actor is always the grammatical subject, while others (e.g. Foley and Van Valin, 1984) argue that there is no subject in Tagalog. Syntactic tests for subjecthood were discussed at some length in chapter 2. In this chapter, we will consider various kinds of evidence which could be directly relevant for deciding whether or not a given argument (in particular the *ang*-phrase) is a topic.

To identify the nominative argument as a topic does not constitute an analysis of the data unless one has some prior notion of what a topic is. In the absence of such a notion, the term “topic” is simply another label for a particular NP. Of course, there is a notorious lack of consensus among linguists as to how the term “topic” should be defined. I will not attempt to evaluate these competing definitions here, but will choose two representative approaches which seem to provide testable criteria for topichood: the notion of discourse topicality proposed by

---

31Another alternative, analyzing the *ang*-phrase as the “absolutive” in a morphologically ergative system, was discussed in chapter 2, section 4.2.
32Foley and Van Valin use the term “pivot” in a way which is often similar to the notion of subjecthood assumed here, but assume that different syntactic constructions may choose different pivots. They identify the *ang*-phrase in Tagalog as an “internal topic” which functions as the pivot of certain constructions but not others, based on essentially the same assessment of the syntactic evidence as that of Schachter (1976).
Givón (1983), and the notion of topic as a pragmatic function adopted by Bresnan and Mchombo (1987). I will show that the nominative argument in Tagalog does not have the properties predicted for topics under either of these approaches.  

§2. Continuity of discourse topic

Cooreman, Fox and Givón (1984) define discourse topicality in terms of predictability, recurrence, and continuity of reference. Rather than treating “topics” as discrete entities, they assume that topicality is a scalar property. At any given point in a discourse, the participants may be ranked according to their relative degrees of salience, pragmatic importance, or continuity, i.e. their “topicality”. The “primary clausal topic” is the most continuous, recurrent or predictable participant in the clause. In most languages, this participant is normally encoded as the subject of the clause. Cooreman, Fox and Givón use two kinds of measurements, developed by Givón (1983), to evaluate the topicality of a particular NP in a discourse. These are described as follows (Cooreman et al., p. 7):

**Referential Distance** (RD): Here one measures the gap of absence — in number of clauses — between the present occurrence and the last preceding occurrence of the topic. More continuous, important or “topical” participants will exhibit on the average smaller RD values, with the highest topic-continuity being, by definition, 1. This is a measure of anaphoric continuity/predictability of the topic, i.e. in terms of recurrence or prevalence in the preceding discourse...

**Topic Persistence** (TP): Here one measures the number of contiguous subsequent clauses in which the participant NP remains a semantic argument of the clause, following the present occurrence. More continuous, important “topical” participants will exhibit on the average larger TP values, with the lowest topic-continuity value being, by definition, 0. This is a measure of cataphoric continuity/importance of the topic, i.e. in terms of recurrence in the subsequent discourse.

Cooreman et al. present the results of Barbara Fox’s application of these measurements to a sample of Tagalog texts from Bloomfield’s corpus. The primary goal of the analysis is to evaluate the relative topicality of Actors and patients in transitive clauses. The results are somewhat difficult to interpret at first because clauses involving *ay*-inversion are not clearly

---

33I will not address here the question of whether the analysis of the nominative argument as a grammaticized topic provides an adequate or viable diachronic explanation for the emergence of the Philippine voice system in its modern form. My goal is simply to evaluate the “topic” analysis as a synchronic explanation for the syntactic facts discussed in chapter 2.
distinguished from those in basic VOS order. This is problematic because the \( ay \)-inversion construction has clear pragmatic effects, which will be discussed below. Moreover, Cooreman et al. somewhat confusingly identify non-active \( ay \)-inversion sentences (in which a patient-subject appears in initial position) as “passives”, apparently because they take topicalization of the patient to be the universal function of the passive. In this section, I will only deal with clauses which exhibit normal (non-inverted) word order. The pragmatic force of \( ay \)-inversion will be discussed in the following section.

The results of the “referential distance” (RD) measurement, i.e. the average distance (number of clauses) between the present occurrence and last previous occurrence of the participant named by the NP, are shown in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>voice category</th>
<th>AGENT</th>
<th>PATIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-Active</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Referential distance for agents and patients in non-inverted transitive Tagalog clauses (from Cooreman, Fox and Givón, 1984, p. 19).

For transitive clauses in basic word-order in which the patient bore nominative case, the RD value of the agent was 2.88, that of the patient 10.01. When the agent bore nominative case, the RD value of the agent was 1.62, that of the patient 19.02. Since lower RD values indicate higher degrees of topic continuity, these figures show that agents are much higher in topicality than patients, even when the patient is the subject.

The fact that the difference between the agent and patient values is greatest when the agent is the subject of the clause suggests that subjects are also higher in topic continuity than non-subjects. This is, of course, what we would expect, especially given the fact that Tagalog subjects tend overwhelmingly to be definite. However, when we combine the measurements for subjects (i.e., agents of active clauses with patients of non-active clauses) vs. non-subjects, as shown in Table 2, the difference is surprisingly small (8.48 vs. 6.25). Whether the difference is
actually significant cannot be determined without knowing the standard deviations, which Cooreman et al. do not give.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>voice category</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th></th>
<th>NON-SUBJECT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>avg RD</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>avg RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-Active</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Referential distance for subjects and non-subjects in non-inverted transitive Tagalog clauses (based on data from Cooreman, Fox and Givón, 1984, p. 19).

The measurements of topic persistence (TP) are shown in Table 3. Once again, it is clear that agents are much higher in topicality than patients, even in clauses where the patient is selected as subject.

| voice category | AGENT |  | PATIENT |  |
|---------------|-------|---------|---------|
|               | N | avg TP | N | avg TP |
| Active        | 37 | 1.68    | 37 | 0.06    |
| Non-Active    | 140 | 1.22    | 166 | 0.56    |

Table 3: Topic persistence for agents and patients in non-inverted transitive Tagalog clauses (from Cooreman, Fox and Givón, 1984, p. 21).

One other measurement of interest in the study relates to the use of “high-continuity NP-marking devices”, i.e. zero-anaphora and overt pronominal forms. These devices are always used to refer to participants which are highly topical or salient at that point of the discourse. In non-active clauses, as shown in Table 4, agents were far more likely than patients to be encoded via pronominalization or zero-anaphora, even though the patients are selected as subject. Unfortunately, Cooreman et al. do not give the corresponding data for active clauses. But in view of the fact that pronouns are necessarily definite, and that active clauses in unmarked word order rarely if ever contain definite patients, it seems safe to assume that the difference would be
far more extreme in active clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>voice category</th>
<th>AGENT</th>
<th></th>
<th>PATIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>pro</td>
<td>percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Active</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Pronominal reference (overt or zero) for agents and patients in non-inverted transitive Tagalog clauses (from Cooreman, Fox and Givón, 1984, p. 17).

The high topic-continuity of Actors helps to explain the observation by Shibatani (1988) which was discussed in chapter 2, section 2.7. Shibatani noted that in Cebuano temporal sequence constructions (which I referred to as “and-then” conjunction), zero anaphora in an Actor position will select as the preferred choice of antecedent the Actor of the preceding clause, regardless of case marking. That is, null anaphoric reference is interpreted in such a way as to maximize Actor continuity.

All of the measurements presented by Cooreman et al. show agents to be far higher in topic continuity than patients, even when patients are selected as the subject (i.e. nominative argument) of the clause. The conclusion to be drawn from these observations is that nominative arguments do not exhibit the high degree of salience or continuity which is often taken as a defining property of discourse topics.

§3. Pragmatic Topic and Focus

Bresnan and Mchombo (1987) use the terms “topic” and “focus” to designate grammaticized pragmatic functions. Topic and focus encode different types of information. The topic is “what is under discussion, whether previously mentioned or assumed in discourse” (p. 746), and therefore must represent given or presupposed information. “A focus expresses CONTRAST, in the sense of Chafe 1976; it designates something that is NOT presupposed (relative to some context).” Thus a focus must be understood to refer to new or unpredictable information. Topic and focus are therefore mutually incompatible categories, since the same bit of information cannot be both old and new at the same point in a discourse. This means that the same element cannot bear both the topic and focus functions in the same clause.
If the nominative argument in Philippine languages is a grammaticized topic in this sense, rather than a subject, it should not be possible for it to bear pragmatic focus. Thus one way to test the “grammaticized topic” hypothesis is to investigate whether or not the nominative argument is in fact incompatible with pragmatic focus.

In this section we will make use of two constructions commonly assumed to involve pragmatic focus: content questions and selective contrast. In the answer to a WH- question, the phrase which corresponds to the WH- word provides the crucial new information, and thus carries pragmatic focus. Similarly, “selective contrast” sentences of the form “I want X, not Y” involve the denial of a presupposition (i.e. that the speaker wants Y) and a minimally contrasting proposition which is asserted to be true (“I want X”). The contrastive element X is the crucial new information, i.e. the element which bears pragmatic focus.

We will apply these tests for pragmatic focus to both nominative and non-nominative arguments in normal (post-verbal) position, as well as to pre-verbal NP’s in a number of constructions whose structure will be discussed in chapter 5: Clefting, ay- Inversion, and Adjunct Fronting.

§3.1 WH- question-answer pairs
Recall that definite patients are normally marked for nominative case. Thus definiteness will have an effect on the form of acceptable answers to a question like the following (from Naylor, 1975, p. 48):

(1) Ano ang kinain mo?
   what NOM OV-eat you(GEN)
   What did you eat?

Naylor lists both of the following as acceptable answers to (1):

(2) §a. Kinain ko ang=isda.
    OV-eat I(GEN) NOM=fish
    I ate the fish.
§b. Kumain ako ng=isda.
AV-eat I(NOM) GEN=fish
I ate (some) fish.

The element which bears pragmatic focus in these answers is the thing which was eaten, i.e. the/some fish. The answers in (2a-b) show that both nominative and non-nominative arguments may bear pragmatic focus. Definiteness plays a role in determining whether the focus phrase gets nominative case, but these examples show that neither definiteness nor nominative case are incompatible with pragmatic focus.

Now let us apply the test to clefted and inverted NP’s. Consider the following question, which has the same grammatical structure as that in (1) above:

(3) Ano ba ang binili mo sa=pamilihan?
what QUES NOM OV-buy you(GEN) DAT=market
What did you buy at the market?

In addition to (4a-b), corresponding to the two types of answer illustrated in (2a-b) above, the cleft construction (4c) is also acceptable as an answer to (3). But the ay-Inversion construction (4d) is not possible in this context. (In the following examples, the # sign is used to indicate an answer which is grammatical but pragmatically unacceptable.)

(4) §a. Binili ko ito=ng damit.
OV-buy I(GEN) this(NOM)=LNK dress
I bought this dress.

§b. Bumili ako ng=gatas.
AV-buy I(NOM) GEN=milk
I bought some milk.

§c. Ito=ng damit ang binili ko.
this(NOM)=LNK dress NOM OV-buy I(GEN)
This dress is what I bought.

§d. #Ito=ng damit ay binili ko.
this(NOM)=LNK dress INV OV-buy I(GEN)
This dress, I bought.
Here the item bought (e.g. *this dress*) gets the focus. Once again, we see that the focused item may be marked for nominative case (4a), which should be impossible if the nominative argument were a grammaticized Topic. Example (4c) shows that a clefted NP is compatible with pragmatic focus, as we might expect. An NP in inverted position, however, as in (4d), is not compatible with pragmatic focus. Now let us consider a question with the verb in Active Voice:

(5)  (from Schachter and Otanes, p. 512)
Sino ang gumawa ng=sapatos na iyon?
who NOM AV-make GEN=shoe LNK that
Who made those shoes?

(6)  §a. ?Ginawa ni=Bing.  
OV AV-make GEN=Bing  
*Bing made (them).

§b. *Gumawa ng=sapatos na iyon si=Bing.  
AV-make GEN=shoe LNK that NOM=Bing  
*Bing made those shoes.

§c. Si=Bing ang gumawa ng=sapatos na iyon.  
NOM=Bing NOM AV-make GEN=shoe LNK that  
*Bing is the one who made those shoes.

§d. #Si=Bing ay gumawa ng=sapatos na iyon.  
NOM=Bing INV AV-make GEN=shoe LNK that  
*Bing, (he) made those shoes.

The cleft construction in (6c) is the preferred answer. The Active Voice construction in (6b) is ungrammatical (not just pragmatically bad) because it violates the rules of subject selection: although the clause exhibits normal word order, the definite patient is not selected as the subject. My consultant considered the answer in (6a) to be less than optimal, perhaps because of a preference for the voice marking of the verb in the answer to be parallel to that in the question when possible. Note however that Naylor (1975, p. 49, ex. B2) cites a parallel example as being fully acceptable. Example (6d) shows once again that the focused element cannot undergo ay-Inversion.
The examples in (4) and (6) show that clefted arguments can take pragmatic focus, whereas inverted NP’s cannot. WH-words which correspond to non-oblique arguments are normally clefted, as in examples (1), (3) and (5). This fact provides a further indication that Clefting is compatible with focus. But WH-words can never undergo ay-Inversion, since ay-Inversion is not compatible with focus:

(7) Clefting:
Sino ang gumawa ng=sapatos na iyon?
who NOM AV-make GEN=shoe LNK that
Who made those shoes?

ay-Inversion:
*Sino ay gumawa ng=sapatos na iyon?

This contrast suggests that ay-Inversion carries with it an element of pragmatic topichood, which renders the inverted element unable to take pragmatic focus, in a way that nominative case by itself does not.

When oblique or adjunct elements are questioned, the WH-word is not clefted but instead undergoes Adjunct Fronting, as shown by the pre-verbal position of the pronominal clitic in examples like the following:

(8) (from Schachter and Otanes, p. 512)
Kanino mo ibingay ang=pera?
to.whom you(GEN) IV-give NOM=money
To whom did you give the money?

(9) §a. Ibinigay ko (ang=pera) kay=Charlie.
IV-give I(GEN) NOM=money DAT=Charlie
I gave the money to Charlie.

§b. Si Charlie ang binigyan ko (ng pera).
§c. Kay Charlie ko ibinigay (ang pera)
§d. #Si Charlie ay binigyan ko (ng pera).

The preferred answer is that given in (9a), with the focus phrase appearing as dative-marked NP in post-verbal position. But focus is also compatible with Clefting (9b) and Adjunct Fronting
(9c). (The fact that WH-words can undergo Adjunct Fronting, as in (8), also shows that Adjunct Fronting is compatible with focus.) Once again we see that focus is incompatible with *ay*-Inversion (9d).

As indicated in example (9), elements mentioned in the question are often omissible from the answer since they can be assumed to be known and salient, i.e. topical. In fact, totally elliptical answers consisting of just one word (the focus-phrase) are perfectly acceptable for most questions. Alternatively, proper names mentioned in questions may be pronominalized in answers for similar reasons. These processes can be used as a test for pragmatic topicalhood. In the following question, only one participant is mentioned (*Linda*), so she is necessarily the pragmatic topic of the answer:

(10) Ano ang ginagawa ni=Linda?
    What NOM do-OV GEN=Linda
    *What is Linda doing?*

    §b. Binabasa ang diyaryo.  *Reading the newspaper.*
    §c. Siya ay nagbabasa ng diyaryo.  *She is reading a/the newspaper.*
    §d. #Siya ang nagbabasa ng diyaryo.  She is the one reading a/the newspaper.*

The pragmatic topic *Linda* is omitted in (11a-b) and pronominalized in (11c-d). These examples show that the pragmatic topic may be a nominative NP (11a), a non-nominative NP (11b), or an inverted NP (11c). However, the pragmatic topic may not be clefted (11d). In other words, *ay*-Inversion is compatible with pragmatic topicalhood but Clefting is not.

To summarize, the Question-Answer pairs in the preceding examples show that the nominative argument is essentially neutral with respect to the pragmatic functions of topic and focus; it accepts either function, provided that other factors (e.g. constraints on subject selection in the presence of a definite patient) do not interfere. Clefted NP’s also accept pragmatic focus but are incompatible with topic. *Ay*-Inversion, on the other hand, is incompatible with pragmatic focus but does accept pragmatic topicalhood.
§3.2 Selective contrast
The following examples illustrate possible and impossible encodings of selective contrast. In each exchange, the first speaker asks a question based on a false presupposition. The contrastive element in the reply bears the pragmatic focus, e.g. *Bing* in example (13):

(12) Nakita mo ba si=Armand?
    
    Did you find Armand?

(13) §a. Hinahanap ko si=Bing, hindi si=Armand.
    
    I am looking for Bing, not Armand.

§b. ??Naghahanap ako kay=Bing, hindi kay=Armand.
    
    I am looking for Bing, not Armand.

§c. Si=Bing ang hinahanap ko, hindi si=Armand.
    
    Bing is the one I am looking for, not Armand.

§d. #Si=Bing ay hinahanap ko, hindi si=Armand.
    
    Bing, I am looking for, not Armand.

Example (13a) shows again that the nominative argument can carry pragmatic focus. Example (13b) is doubtful at best, because the Actor has been selected as subject rather than the definite Goal, which should be strongly favored. Examples (13c-d) show that clefted NP’s can carry pragmatic focus but that inverted NP’s cannot.

Thus both WH- questions and selective contrast yield the same results: clefted NP’s consistently take pragmatic focus while *ay*-inverted NP’s consistently reject it. In sentences with normal (verb-initial) word order, both nominative and non-nominative arguments may take focus, though restrictions on nominative case assignment may block either type of argument from appearing as the focused element in a particular example. The conclusion to be drawn is that the nominative argument is essentially neutral with respect to topic and focus.
On the other hand, the *ay*-Inversion construction seems like a good candidate for a grammaticized topic position. Li and Thompson (1976) mention occurrence in sentence-initial position as a characteristic feature of topics. The fronted NP in an *ay*-Inversion construction need not always be a pragmatic topic, but as we have seen it consistently rejects pragmatic focus while accepting pragmatic topichood (example 11c). Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 485) describe the effect of *ay*-Inversion as follows:

> A sentence involving *ay* inversion does not differ in denotative meaning from the related sentence without inversion. There is usually, however, a difference in stylistic level, or level of usage, between the two sentences. *Ay* inversion is characteristic of formal style, and is more common in writing, lectures, sermons, etc., than it is in ordinary conversation.

This situation is suggestive of the semantic bleaching that typically accompanies grammaticalization, and seems compatible with the hypothesis that the fronted NP in an *ay*-Inversion construction is a grammaticized topic. However, there are some uses of the *ay*-Inversion construction which do not fit this characterization. We will examine these in the next section.

### §3.3 The pragmatic functions of *ay*-Inversion

In chapter 2 it was stated that only subjects (i.e. nominative arguments) can undergo *ay*-Inversion. However, some exceptions to this generalization are pointed out by Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 487-492). First, the inverted element may be an adverbial, e.g. a manner adverb as in (14a), a time adverb, a subordinate clause or a gerund, as in (14b):

(14) (from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 489)
\[\text{§a. Madalas ay pumupunta siya dito.} \]

> often INV IMPERF-AV-go 3.SG.NOM here

> *He comes here often.* (formal style)

\[\text{§b. Pagdating ko sa=Pilipinas ay nagpunta ako sa=Baguio.} \]

> arriving 1.SG.GEN DAT=Philippines INV PERF-AV-go 1.SG.NOM DAT=Baguio

> *On arriving in the Philippines, I went to Baguio.*

Second, non-subject NP arguments can appear as the inverted element in certain contrastive constructions with meanings such as *not even X, anyone at all, whoever*, etc. The examples in
(15) show that non-subject Actors may be inverted in such constructions, while (16) gives examples of non-subject patients in similar constructions.\textsuperscript{35}

(15) (from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 490-491)
§a. Kahit sinuman ay hindi mabubuhat nang nag-iisa
    although anyone \textit{INV} not \textit{NONVOL-FUT-carry-OV ADV} alone
    ang=kahon=ng iyon.
    NOM=box=LNK that
    \textit{By anyone at all, that box cannot be lifted alone.}

§b. Ni si=Pedro ay hindi mabubuhat ito.
    even NOM=Pedro \textit{INV} not \textit{NONVOL-FUT-carry-OV} \textit{this}
    Not even Pedro can lift this.

(16) (from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 490-491)
§a. Kahit ano ay bibili si=Marcos.
    although what \textit{INV} \textit{FUT-AV-buy} NOM=Marcos
    Anything at all, Marcos will buy.

§b. Ni lapis ay hindi nagdala si=Rosa.
    even pencil \textit{INV} not \textit{PERF-AV-bring} NOM=Rosa
    Even a pencil Rosa didn’t bring.

The semantic force of the examples in (15-16) suggests that in these constructions the inverted element bears pragmatic focus, rather than topic. My hypothesis is that the pragmatic function associated with the \textit{ay}-Inversion construction depends on the grammatical relation of the inverted element. Inverted subjects bear the topic function, while inverted non-subjects bear pragmatic focus. Some support for this hypothesis comes from the constraints on double \textit{ay}-Inversion constructions. Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 489) state:

\begin{itemize}
    \item It is possible, although not very usual, for a single sentence or clause to show \textit{ay} inversion of both an adverb and [a nominative argument —PRK]. In this case, the sentence or clause includes two inversion markers. The adverb and the [nominative argument] may occur in either order, e.g.,
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{35}My consultants find these constructions somewhat archaic or literary.
The fact that the two inverted elements may appear in either order indicates that there is no phrase-structure or categorial difference between the two inversion constructions. Both have the structure indicated in chapter 5, figure (35a), in which \( \text{ay} \) heads an IP and takes an IP complement. The uniqueness requirement on pragmatic functions explains why no more than one adverbial element or one nominative argument can be inverted in any one clause. An inverted subject may cooccur with an inverted adverbial because there is no clash (i.e., no loss of uniqueness) between their pragmatic functions. The inverted subject (\( \text{kami} \)) is a topic while the inverted adverb (\( \text{bukas} \)) gets pragmatic focus.

§4 Conclusion

Certain features of the Tagalog voice system seem compatible with the use of the term “topic” for the nominative argument. The subject of a Tagalog clause is always definite or generic,\(^{36}\) any argument of the verb is eligible for subject selection, and the selection of a non-Actor as subject does not depend on the “demotion” of the Actor to oblique status. However, definiteness or specificity requirements do not in themselves justify the use of the term “topic”. A number of ergative languages have mechanisms for avoiding indefinite absolutive arguments. In Chamorro (Gibson, 1980; Cooreman, 1988), for example, antipassive is obligatory if the patient is indefinite or generic.\(^{37}\) Thus something more than definiteness must be invoked to motivate the use of the “topic” label.

Neither the Givónian measurements of topic-continuity nor pragmatic tests for topic vs. focus information types support the claim that the nominative argument in Tagalog is a topic, rather than a subject. It is conceivable that some other definition of topic could be formulated which would lead to a different conclusion, but in the absence of such a definition it would seem that this claim has very little empirical motivation.

---

\(^{36}\)Bell (1978) reports that indefinite specific subjects are possible in Cebuano, but are subject to the following restriction: “An indefinite subject must contain a numeral.” (p.3). Cross-linguistically, indefinite NP’s modified by numerals or other quantifiers typically have the grammatical properties of definites.

\(^{37}\)Dixon (1979, p. 120) notes that demonstratives in Dyirbal can only modify the absolutive argument. He cites this constraint as being parallel to definiteness requirements on subjects in other languages.
Chapter 4.
Control

1. Introduction

As pointed out in chapter 2, section 3.2, the controllee (or target) of Equi constructions in Tagalog is normally the Actor rather than the subject of the complement clause. At first glance this fact appears to pose a major problem for any analysis which takes the nominative argument to be the grammatical subject, since in most languages only subjects are eligible to function as Equi targets. The primary goal of this chapter will be to show that the Equi facts are not only consistent with the analysis of the ang-phrase as subject, but are actually predictable from the interaction of certain facts about Tagalog grammar with universal semantic constraints on Equi constructions. I will argue that the Actor is eligible to be an Equi target because, unlike passive agents in English, Actors in Tagalog are always direct (non-oblique) arguments. The Equi target must be an Actor because of the semantic constraints to be discussed below.

Two classes of exceptions to the general pattern were noted in chapter 2. First, certain Equi predicates allow the controllee to be either the Actor or the subject of the complement clause. But we will see that the syntactic constraints on the construction vary depending on which of these two options is selected. Tagalog thus provides evidence for two different kinds of control relation, one involving a semantic identification of controller with controllee, the other involving a syntactic unification. This contrast is quite parallel to the distinction drawn by Bresnan (1982) between anaphoric and functional control.

The second type of exception to the controllee-as-Actor pattern arises when the complement clause is marked for non-volitive mood. The explanation for this phenomenon follows with few if any additional assumptions from the semantic analysis to be proposed for Equi constructions. We will begin the chapter with a discussion of the general semantic constraints on Equi constructions, then discuss the semantic contrast between non-volitive and volitive mood, showing how the Equi facts of Tagalog follow from the interaction of these two sets of constraints. Finally we will discuss the contrast between functional and anaphoric control in Tagalog.
2. Semantic properties of Equi constructions

Sag and Pollard (1991) propose a semantically based theory of control. They define three classes of Equi predicates: COMMITMENT-type (*promise, try, intend, etc.*), INFLUENCE-type (*persuade, order, authorize*), and ORIENTATION-type (*want, need, hate*). They show that the identity of the controller is completely predictable from the semantic type of the matrix verb, always corresponding to the commitor, influenced participant or experiencer.

I will assume that their account of controller identification carries over into Tagalog (I am aware of no evidence to the contrary), and will concentrate here on the choice of controllee. For the moment I will restrict my attention primarily to Equi predicates of the commitment and influence type.

2.1 Actions

Jackendoff (1983) distinguishes the ontological categories of STATE and EVENT on the basis of tests like the following:

(1) (from Jackendoff, 1983, p. 179)
What happened was that
a. the pig ran away.
   b. Fred heard about the accident.
   c. *the fire truck was red.
   d. *Fred loved Louise.

This test shows that the sentences in (1a-b) express EVENTS while the sentences in (1c-d) express STATES. Certain kinds of EVENTS involve the performance of an ACTION by an ACTOR. Jackendoff uses the following diagnostic to identify ACTIONS:

(2) (from Jackendoff, 1983, p. 180)
What Fred did was
a. run away.
   b. put the book on the table.
   c. *hear about the accident.
   d. *receive a letter.
   e. *love Louise.

The sentences in (2a-d) all express EVENTS, by the diagnostic used in (1), but only those in (2a-b) involve ACTIONS. (Sentence (2e) expresses a STATE, not an EVENT, and so could not involve an ACTION.) Jackendoff comments,
... an [ACTION] can be identified independently of who is carrying it out (for instance, “Joe did the same thing Harry did”). Thus an [ACTION] is an [event] from which one argument is missing, the one corresponding to the [actor]. (Jackendoff, 1983, p. 180)

He proposes a formal representation in which certain 
EVENTS are factored into two constituents, an ACTOR and an ACTION. For example, his representation of the sentence “The man put the book on the table” is roughly the following, omitting a number of details:

\[
(3) \quad \text{[Event } \text{[ACTOR]}_i, \text{[Action CAUSE (i, [GO ([BOOK], [TO ON TABLE])])]}]\\
\]

The first argument of the predicate CAUSE is an index corresponding to the Actor. An Action, then, is represented as an Event (of the appropriate type) whose first argument position contains a variable bound by the Actor. Jackendoff states, “when the variable of an [ACTION] is bound, the result must be an [EVENT]” (p. 181).

He goes on to discuss the subclass of willful or intentional Actions. He treats intentionality as being a feature of the Action itself, rather than of the Actor. He continues:

This analysis leads to a simple treatment of imperative sentences like “Wash the dishes!” as bare VPs that express [WILLFUL ACTIONS]. Thus, for example, “Receive a letter!” and “Know the answer!” are not possible commands because they do not express [ACTIONS], and “Keep sleeping!” is odd because it expresses an [ACTION] over which it is hard to imagine exerting will. (Jackendoff, 1983, p. 182-183)

It should be pointed out here that Jackendoff’s use of the term ACTOR is more specific than the normal usage of the term in Philippine linguistics. Philippinists generally use the term “Actor” to refer to the “logical subject” of the clause (i.e. the argument which is highest on the thematic hierarchy), which may be an agent, an experiencer, a recipient, etc. However, an ACTOR in Jackendoff’s sense will also be an Actor in the Philippine sense. So where there is no danger of confusion I will not make a point of distinguishing the two senses.

The first step in our analysis is to note a fact which has been pointed out by a number of authors (including Farkas (1988), Dixon (1979) and Sag and Pollard (1991)), namely that complement clauses of Equi constructions (at least those of the commitment and influence type) are subject to essentially the same semantic constraints as imperatives. In other words, the complements of these classes of Equi predicates must express volitional actions:

(4)  
\begin{enumerate}
  \item #John authorized Bill to resemble his father.
  \item #John tried to receive a letter.
  \item #John persuaded Mary to keep sleeping.
\end{enumerate}
Example (4a) is anomalous because the complement expresses a state rather than an event. Example (4b) is anomalous because its complement expresses an event which does not involve an action, while the complement in (4c) expresses an action which cannot be volitional. At first glance the claim that the complements of Equi predicates of these types must express volitional actions may seem to be far too strong. Apparent counter-examples to this claim will be dealt with in section 2.3. First we will discuss semantic constraints on the identity of the controllee.

2.2 Responsibility

Janet Fodor (1974) suggested that English Equi constructions are subject to two distinct constraints, one semantic (and presumably universal), the other syntactic and (possibly) language-specific. Fodor noted that controllees in Equi constructions must be construed as having some kind of “control” (in a semantic sense) over the event described in the complement clause. For example, when a controllee in English corresponds to a passive subject, a sense of patient-volitionality is induced which is not present in the corresponding active sentences:

(5)  a. Ron persuaded Mikhail to kiss Nancy.
     b. Mikhail planned to kiss Nancy.

(6)  a. Ron persuaded Nancy to be kissed by Mikhail.
     b. Nancy planned to be kissed by Mikhail.

The passive sentences in (6) imply some kind of volitionality on the part of the patient (Nancy). Example (6a) suggests the paraphrase “Ron persuaded Nancy to allow herself to be kissed by Mikhail”, while example (6b) suggests the paraphrase “Nancy planned to cause/arrange for Mikhail to kiss her.” There are no such causative or permissive overtones to the active examples in (5).

Fodor labels this constraint the CONTROL CONSTRAINT, which she formulates as requiring that:

the deleted subject [= Equi target—PRK] should have some control (not necessarily exclusive control) over whether the action or situation described by the complement occurs. One can have control over a situation in this sense either by being the agent, or by permitting or inciting (letting or getting) some other agent to do something, or even by making sure that no agent does anything at all ... (p. 103)

Farkas (1988) expresses a similar intuition by saying that the Equi target must be construed as being potentially responsible for bringing the controlled situation about. She defines INTENTIONAL SITUATIONS as those which “may be viewed as being brought about by the actions
of an individual intending to bring [them] about” (p. 35). She refers to the individual who performs some action with the intention of bringing about a given situation as the INITIATOR of the situation. The RESPONSIBILITY RELATION is the relation between an intentional situation and its initiator, which Farkas defines as “a two-place relation ... holding between an individual i and a situation s ... just in case s is the result of some act performed by i with the intention of bringing s about” (p. 36). She then gives the following rule of thumb for identifying the initiator of an intentional situation:

Now if [a situation] s has an intentional agent, that agent will also be the initiator of s except if the relevant actions of the intentional agent (those which bring s about) are seen as being determined by some other participant in s, in which case that individual is the initiator of s... If s has no intentional agent, its initiator is the individual who brought s about, if such an individual exists. (pp. 37-38)

If a situation has an intentional agent, as in (7a), that agent is the initiator. However, if the agent’s actions are caused or allowed by some other individual, as in the causative and permissive interpretations assigned to (6a-b), the causer or permitter is the initiator. Otherwise, the initiator is the individual responsible for bringing the situation about (e.g. the person who put the sign in the window in (7b)). Thus the initiator need not be an argument of the clause at all. Situations which are not possibly intentional, like the main clause in (7c), do not have an initiator.

(7) (from Farkas, 1988, p. 36)
   a. John read ‘Anna Karenina’ in order to impress Mary.
   b. The shopwindow has a big sale sign in it in order to attract customers.
   c. #John resembles his father in order to annoy his grandmother.

Farkas points out several constructions in English which involve intentionality. For example, an imperative clause must refer to a possibly intentional situation (i.e. one compatible with being intentional); so too must the main clause preceding an in order to ‘rationale’ clause, as in (7). The addressee of an imperative must always be the initiator of the situation described by the imperative sentence. She then goes on to argue that the semantics of Equi constructions are similar to those of imperatives. Equi predicates (of the types under discussion here) require that their controlled situations be possibly intentional, and that their controllee be the initiator of the controlled situation, that is, the argument of the complement clause which is viewed as being primarily responsible for bringing about the controlled situation.
The observation that an Equi complement must express a “possibly intentional situation” can be restated in terms of Jackendoff’s (1983) analysis of Actions by saying, as suggested in the previous section, that the complement must express a volitional action. Since Farkas’s analysis predicts that a volitional agent will be the initiator of the situation in which it occurs, the Actor of a volitional action will be its initiator. Since the controllee must be the initiator of the controlled situation, this immediately predicts the basic Tagalog pattern: the controllee must be the Actor of the complement clause.

Provisionally, then, we can summarize the semantic constraints on the most basic class of Equi complements as follows:

(8) **CONTROL CONSTRAINT** (revised)
   a. Equi predicates require that their complement express a volitional action.
   b. The controllee must be construed as the Actor of that action.

However, this formulation ignores an important aspect of Farkas’s analysis. If the actions of a volitional agent are viewed as being caused or allowed by some other individual, then the causer rather than the agent is the initiator. As we will see in the following section, this fact accounts for a major class of exceptions to the general rule.

### 2.3 Causative coercion

Sentences like those in examples (6a-b), involving passive complements, provide the most obvious kind of counter-example to the principle stated in (8). In these examples, the controllee is the subject of a passive verb, therefore a patient or Undergoer rather than an Actor. How can we reconcile such examples with the principle stated in (8b)?

As pointed out in the previous section, examples (6a-b) are acceptable only with a special causative or permissive interpretation which is not present in the corresponding active examples. The induced *cause/allow* reading of the passive complements in these examples involves a shift in the identity of the initiator through the introduction of a causative predicate. The passive subject of the complement clause is interpreted as determining (at least in part) whether or not the event takes place.

Sag and Pollard (1991) use the term **CAUSATIVE COERCION** to describe this kind of semantic shift, which is induced in non-agentive clauses when they are used in agentive contexts such as imperatives.
If the VP of an imperative sentence is not sufficiently agentive, we make every effort to make it so. Thus in examples like [the following], the interpretation is crudely characterizable as ‘make yourself Φ’, where Φ is the state expressed by the imperative VP.

(9)  
   a. Be optimistic!  
   b. Be careful!  
   c. ??*Be tall!  
      (Sag and Pollard, 1991, p. 83)

In examples (9a-b), the imperative addressee is seen as the initiator by virtue of an induced causative interpretation. Example (9c) is anomalous because of real-world semantic constraints which make it difficult for be tall to be interpreted as a volitional Action.

Sag and Pollard formalize the notion of coercion as a lexical rule which derives causative semantic representations by inserting an unexpressed cause-type predicate in the semantic structure of the basic predicate. This rule makes available a cause/allow reading in which the derived causer is not the agent of the original clause (if any). The rule thus supplies an “initiator” for non-agentive clauses and involves a shift of “initiator” for agentive clauses, by providing an interpretation under which a non-agent takes intentional action (specifically causing or allowing) in order to bring about the specified situation.

As a first approximation, let us represent this process as a rule which acts on the semantic structure of a predicate in something like the following way:

(10) **Causative Coercion**  
    \[ P<\ldots, y, \ldots> \implies \text{CAUSE}\langle y, P<\ldots, y, \ldots>\rangle \]

This rule takes a non-agentive argument and makes it into the causer of the derived causative interpretation. The rule operates on semantic representations, but it must be pragmatically triggered. The application of such a rule is motivated by Gricean principles. For example, when a speaker utters the sentence in (6a), he appears to be violating the constraint that Equi targets must be Actors. Yet the hearer assumes that the speaker intends to utter a well-formed and meaningful sentence. In order to resolve this paradox, the hearer must appeal to a secondary rule of interpretation, namely the rule of Causative Coercion. This rule allows the hearer to derive a valid interpretation of the sentence which does not clash with the Control Constraint in (8). Under this interpretation, the passive subject is construed as an Actor, specifically the causer of the derived predicate. For the complement verb in (6a-b), kiss, Causative Coercion yields the following result:
(11) \(kiss < x, y> \Rightarrow \text{CAUSE} <y, kiss < x, y>>\)

In the derived interpretation, the kissee (Nancy) is eligible to be a controllee. I will follow Jackendoff in representing Actions as events with a variable in the Actor role. I will represent this variable as PRO, which is intended to designate a variable in semantic structure, leaving aside for the moment the question of whether or not it has any corresponding syntactic realization. Equi predicates take Actions as their complements, that is, events whose Actor is a variable. This Actor variable (i.e. the controllee) is bound by the semantically determined argument of the matrix verb (the controller), which I will indicate by co-indexing. The difference between (5a) and (6a) is shown in the following representations:

(12) a. Ron persuaded Mikhail to kiss Nancy. (= 5a)
    \(\text{persuade} < x, y_1, kiss < \text{PRO}_1, z>>\)

    b. Ron persuaded Nancy to be kissed by Mikhail. (= 6a)
    \(\text{persuade} < x, y_1, \text{CAUSE} <\text{PRO}_1, kiss < z, y_1>>\)

Since the rule of causative coercion is pragmatically triggered, it will apply only when it is “forced” to, that is, only when a particular syntactic context imposes constraints which cannot be satisfied under the basic (non-coerced) interpretation. Moreover, it will not apply vacuously, for example to produce a reading under which the agent is interpreted as causing or allowing the described event, since the agent is already assumed to be the initiator of an event unless there is some overt indication to the contrary.

2.4 Cross-linguistic evidence

There appears to be a considerable amount of cross-linguistic evidence which supports the semantic analysis outlined above. For example, the effects of the Control Constraint can be seen in Korean Equi constructions. The class of “psychological” verbs in Korean take an object marked for nominative, rather than accusative, case. In many cases there exists a corresponding non-psychological verb formed by adding the light verb -hata ‘do’ to the root. The non-psychological form follows the normal pattern of assigning accusative case to its object. Hong (1991) argues that the nominative object pattern is possible only when the situation is not viewed as being under the control of the subject (i.e., the Actor). In other words, NOM case on the object implies that the subject does not bear primary responsibility for the situation. The
psychological verb *coh- in (13b), with *John in NOM case, implies that *John is inherently likeable, that Mary would have to like him even if she didn’t want to. Example (13a), with *John in ACC case, does not convey this sense.

(13) Korean (data from Hong, 1991)
       M.-NOM J.-ACC like-INDICATIVE
       *Mary likes *John. (Mary is in control)
   b. Mary-ka John-i coh-ta.38
       M.-NOM J.-NOM like-INDICATIVE
       *Mary likes *John. (Mary is not in control).

The nominative object pattern is not possible in Equi complements. In Equi complements, the object can only take ACC marking since the controllee (the complement’s subject) must be the initiator, as shown in (14).

(14) a. Na-nun Mary-eykey John-ul cohaha-tolok
       I-TOPIC M.-DAT J.-ACC like-to
       seltukhah-yes-ta.
       persuade-PAST-INDIC
       I persuaded Mary to like *John.
   b. *Na-nun Mary-eykey John-i coh-tolok
       I-TOPIC M.-DAT J.-NOM like-to
       seltukhah-yes-ta.
       persuade-PAST-INDIC

Languages differ as to how readily they allow the rule of causative coercion to apply. Růžička (1983) points out that an English sentence like (15a) cannot be translated literally into German (15b). The closest translation equivalent must contain an overt causative, as in (15c):

(15) a. *John was persuaded to be examined.
   b. *John wurde überredet, untersucht zu werden.
       John was persuaded examined to be
   c. John wurde überredet, sich untersuchen zu lassen.
       John was persuaded himself examined to have/allow
       *John was persuaded to have himself examined /allow himself to be examined.

38Hong (p.c.) notes that the non-controlled psychological verbs are normally used only with first person subjects, or second person in questions. Thus example (13b) would be natural only in the context of a novel, where an omniscient narrator might report on the feelings of the characters.
This makes the coerced causative (or permissive) interpretation of the English sentence quite clear, and also suggests that causative coercion is more restricted than in English. But German does allow coercion, as seen in the following examples:

(16) (from Růžička, 1983, p. 323)
   a. *Er versuchte, bestraft zu werden.
      He tried to be punished.
   b. ?Er versuchte, abgeholt zu werden.
      He tried to be met (at the station).
   c. (?)Er versuchte, geröntzt zu werden.
      He tried to be X-rayed.

Růžička states:

The rise of acceptability from [16a] to [16c] is proportionate to the rise of interest of the person who tried in the realization of the action described in the complement sentence and to the increasing possibility of actively influencing the outcome [emphasis added—PRK].

Annie Zaenen (p.c.) informs me that the Dutch equivalent of (15b) is also ungrammatical. Her intuition is that passive sentences in Dutch do not allow a reading under which the action is under the control of the patient. She points out that sentences like John was willingly examined by the doctor are not ambiguous in Dutch; the adverb willingly can only refer to the agent (the doctor).

Chung (1978, p. 111-114) reports that in Maori, the Equi target must be both the Actor and the subject of the embedded clause: “Equi only deletes subjects if they are also semantic agents ... or experiencers ... It does not delete subjects that are semantic patients” (i.e. subjects of passives or stative verbs). She points out (p. 115-116) that the same restriction applies to participial purpose clauses. Once again, the controllee must be both a grammatical subject and a semantic agent or experiencer. This is not surprising, given the semantic similarity pointed out by Farkas between purpose clauses and Equi constructions. The same constraints also hold for Samoan (p. 128-131): Equi cannot apply to passive or unaccusative subjects. These facts suggest that causative coercion is impossible in Maori and Samoan.

Sells (1991) shows that passive verbs can occur in the complement of a Raising predicate in Japanese, but not in the complement of an Equi predicate. This suggests that causative coercion is impossible in Japanese.
3. Non-volitive mood and controllee choice

I have argued that the Control Constraint forces controllees to be Actors in basic Equi constructions. Exceptions to this generalization arise through the rule of causative coercion, which in Tagalog is possible only when the complement verb is marked for non-volitive mood. In order to see why this is so, we must consider in some detail the semantic contrast between volitive and non-volitive mood. Volitive verbs are morphologically unmarked. Most of the Tagalog examples discussed in preceding chapters have been in volitive mood. Non-volitive mood is marked by the prefix maka- in Active Voice, and by the general stative prefix ma- in other voices.

Non-volitive verbs may be used with a wide range of meanings.\(^{39}\) Two of the primary uses are to encode ability and accidental or involuntary action, which led Schachter and Otanes (1972) to refer to the forms in question as “ability/involuntary action” (AIA) verbs.\(^{40}\) Dell (1983) provides the most thorough discussion to date of the semantics of non-volitive mood in Tagalog, and much of the following discussion draws on his work. The generalization which emerges from the data is roughly the following: non-volitive verbs entail that the reported event must actually have taken place, while verbs in volitive mood entail only intentionality on the part of the Actor.

The distribution of volitive and non-volitive verbs differs in two important ways. First, only non-volitive verbs can be used to encode involuntary actions. Volitive verbs must involve intentional actions, but non-volitive verbs are unspecified for intentionality. In contexts such as (17a), where intentional action is highly unlikely, the involuntary interpretation is strongly preferred. But this interpretation is not possible with volitive mood, as shown in (17b).

   AV.NONVOL.PERF-drink 3.SG.NOM GEN=poison  
   He accidentally drank poison.

---

\(^{39}\)Inman (1990) has described a range of uses for non-volitional verbs in Sinhala which is surprisingly similar to the range of meanings for non-volitive verbs in Tagalog.

\(^{40}\)Historically, these two uses were distinguished by length or stress on the final syllable of the involuntary action prefix. This contrast is still stated to be productive by Aspillera (1969, p. 54-58) and Ramos (1971, p. 59, 62). However, Schachter and Otanes (1972) report that the contrast is being lost among younger educated speakers of the Manila dialect. They therefore treat the AIA verbs as being a single form with two alternate uses.
b. Um-inum siya ng=lasun.
   AV.PERF-drink 3.SG.NOM GEN=poison
   *He intentionally drank / tried to drink* poison.

Second, only volitive verbs can be used to describe an intended or attempted action which
did not actually take place. Non-volitive verbs (unless they are negated) always entail the actual
performance of the reported action and the achievement of the corresponding result state.
Volitive verbs entail only the intentionality of the action, that is, that the Actor acted (or
attempted to act) with the intent to achieve a particular result. Unless information to the contrary
is explicitly given, there is a strong conversational implicature that the action was carried out, the
result achieved, etc. But this implicature can be cancelled, as demonstrated in the following
example:

(18) (from Dell, 1983, p. 188)
   {T-in-awag / *Na-tawag} ko si=Ben,
PST-call-OV / PST-NONVOL-call-OV I(GEN) NOM=Ben
   pero wala=ng lumabas na salita sa=bibig ko.
   but not.exist=LNK come.out LNK word DAT=mouth my
   I tried to call Ben, but not a word came out of my mouth.

The corresponding non-volitive form of the verb cannot be used in (18) because non-
volitive mood necessarily entails (rather than merely implicating) the achievement of the result,
and this entailment is not defeasible. The defeasibility of volitive verbs cannot be adequately
captured in the English glosses of the examples, since simple past tense in English entails (rather
than merely implicating) the occurrence of the described event, while the phrase “tried to” does
not carry the implicature of success.

Non-volitive mood in Tagalog conveys a sense of factivity, in that it necessarily entails the
actual occurrence of the described event whereas volitive mood does not. The contrast is further
illustrated in the following examples, in which a negated non-volitive verb is used to cancel the
implicature carried by the corresponding unmarked (volitive) verb:

(19) (from Dell, 1983, p. 187)
   a. P-in-a-inom ko siya ng=gamot,
PST-CAUS-drink-OV I(GEN) he(NOM) GEN=medicine
      pero lagi niya=ng iniwas ang=bibig niya,
      but always he(GEN)=LNK avert NOM=mouth his
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kaya hindi ko rin na-pa-inom.
thus not 1.SG.GEN also PERF.NONVOL-CAUS-drink-OV
I tried to get him to take his medicine, but he kept averting his head, so I couldn’t.

b. In-abot niya ang=saging,
PST-reach-OV he(GEN) NOM=banana

pero kapos ang=patpat niya,
but lacking NOM=stick his

kaya’t hindi rin niya na-abot
thus not also he(GEN) PST.NONVOL-reach-OV
He reached for the banana, but his stick was too short, so he didn’t get it.

Because of the factivity of non-volitive verbs, only volitive mood can be used to express the idea of “try to”:

(20) (from Dell, 1983, p. 188)
Bakit mo s-in-a-sabi iyon?
why you(SG.GEN) IMPERF-say-OV that(NOM)

{Tinatakot / #Natatakot} mo
IMPERF-frighten-OV / IMPERF-NONVOL-frighten-OV 2.SG.GEN

ba ako?
Q 1.SG.NOM
Why are you saying that? Are you trying to frighten me?

Dell (p. 190, 194) summarizes the entailments of volitive and non-volitive verbs as follows:

(21) M: The Actor engaged in (or attempted) some maneuver

I: By acting as described in M, the agent intended to bring about a result R.

Volitive verbs entail the conjunction (M ∧ I). They entail nothing at all about R. Non-volitive verbs, in contrast, entail R (and, presumably, M) but nothing about I. In the latter case, the fact that no assertion is made about intentionality can by conversational implicature be interpreted as asserting non-intentionality.

I will adopt from Dowty (1979) and Foley and Van Valin (1984) the predicate “DO”, which I will use to indicate the relation between a volitional Actor and his action. With this convention, the essential semantic difference between the volitive and non-volitive forms of reach in (19b) can be represented as follows:
Volitive verbs entail that the Actor intended to perform the described action, while non-volitive verbs simply entail that a particular event has taken place, whether or not the Actor intended it to.

Dell points out that the difference between volitive and non-volitive mood in Tagalog is quite similar to the distinction proposed by Kac (1972) between ACTION and RESULT predicates. Roughly speaking, action predicates assert an action and imply a result, while result predicates assert a result and presuppose an action. Kac argues that kill is ambiguous between action and result readings, while murder can have only an action reading. He motivates this claim by suggesting that the sentence “John almost killed Fred” is ambiguous while the sentence “John almost murdered Fred” is unambiguous. Further evidence comes from examples like the following:

(23) (from Kac, 1972)
   a. John fired the bullet at Fred, coming so close that he almost killed/*murdered him.
   b. John wounded Fred so seriously that he almost killed/*murdered him.

Kac states that action predicates, but not result predicates, can be used for “the kind of situation in which someone is going to do something, and then for some reason decides against it” (p. 120). This contrast is very reminiscent of the facts presented in (18-19) above.

Jackendoff (1983, p. 180) proposes a “rule of conceptual reanalysis” which allows Events of the appropriate semantic type to be reanalyzed as the performance of an Action by an Actor:

(24) \[ \text{Event } F(X, Y, Z, ...) \]

\[ \leftrightarrow \text{Event } \left[ \text{ACTOR} \right] X , \left[ \text{Action } F(i, Y, Z, ...) \right] \]

\[ \footnote{Kac uses the term “action” for what I am calling “intentional action”, since he assumes that “an action requires an animate, sentient being to perform it” (p. 121). This difference will not cause any confusion in the present context since it is the encoding of intentional actions that we are primarily interested in, that being the semantic type which Equi predicates require as complements.} \]

\[ \footnote{In English the implied result seems to be entailed, whereas in Tagalog volitional mood it is only an implicature.} \]
The Event representation (to the left of the arrow in (24)) seems to correspond to Kac’s “result predicate”, while the performance-of-Action representation (to the right of the arrow) corresponds to Kac’s “action predicate”. Using this distinction, we can restate Dell’s conclusions in the following terms: non-volitive verbs cannot encode Actions; they allow only Event (Kac’s “result”) interpretations. Volitive verbs are used in all contexts which require Actions.\footnote{I leave open the question of whether volitive forms of certain verb stems can be used with eventive interpretation. This is a complex issue requiring further investigation.}

These results lead to the following predictions about Equi constructions in Tagalog. In section 2 it was argued that Equi predicates require the controlled situation to be of the intentional Action type. Since non-volitive verbs cannot normally express intentional Actions, this means that the verb in an Equi complement must appear in the volitive mood. In volitive mood, the Actor is always viewed as taking intentional action to bring about the intended result. Thus the Actor is always the initiator (in Farkas’s terms) and therefore, by the Control Constraint, the only possible Equi target. Therefore we predict that in a volitive-mood Equi complement, the controllee must be the Actor.

Non-volitive verbs can only be interpreted as Action-type predicates, and so become eligible to function as Equi complements, under causative coercion. This process forces a non-Actor to be construed as a “causer” and thus the initiator of the situation. Therefore whenever the complement verb in an Equi construction is marked for non-volitive mood, the controllee must be a non-Actor. Since causative coercion is pragmatically triggered, it will apply only when required by an apparent violation of the Control Constraint. No such violation arises with Equi complements in volitive-mood. We therefore predict that Equi target selection will obey the following biconditional constraint: the Actor is the controllee if and only if the complement verb is marked for volitive mood.

In the following section, we will confirm empirically the prediction that non-volitive verbs are blocked from appearing in contexts that require Actions. This constraint is not limited to Equi predicates but applies quite generally. Then we will proceed to discuss the syntactic consequences of the semantic analysis proposed above for Equi constructions.

### 4. The syntactic expression of Actions

In addition to Equi complements, there are several other syntactic environments in Tagalog in which only clauses expressing intentional Actions may appear. As predicted by the semantic
analysis of the previous section, non-volitive mood is normally impossible in these contexts; only volitional mood is normally allowed. In this section we will consider three such contexts: the *in order to* construction, predicates which take Actions as arguments, and imperatives. We will see that the constraints on Equi constructions are part of a more general pattern observed in all contexts restricted to Actions.

### 4.1 *In order to* constructions

Farkas noted that the main clause in the *in order to* construction must describe a “possibly intentional situation”. In Tagalog, the main clause verb must be in volitive mood, as demonstrated in the following examples:

(25) a. H-in-ulì ako ng=polis para lumigayá
   PERF-arrest-OV 1.SG.NOM GEN=police in.order AV-happy
   ang=presidente.
   NOM=president
   *The police arrested me to please the president.*

   b. *Nahuli ako ng polis para lumigay ang presidente.*
   PERF.NONVOL-arrest-OV

(26) a. H-in-alik-an ako ni=Rosa para galit-in
   PERF-kiss-DV 1.SG.NOM GEN=Rosa in.order anger-OV
   ang=asawa ko.
   NOM=spouse my
   *Rosa kissed me to anger my wife.*

   b. *Na-halik-an ako ni Rosa para galitín ang asawa ko.*
   PERF.NONVOL-kiss-DV

The intention to bring about the situation described in the subordinate “rationale” clause is ascribed to the Actor of the main clause. For example, in (26a) it is *Rosa* (the Actor), and not the speaker (the subject), who is trying to anger the speaker’s wife. Since the main clause Actor must be acting intentionally, the verb of the main clause must be marked for volitive mood.

### 4.2 Predicates which subcategorize for Actions

Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 156) identify a class of predicates which subcategorize for an infinitival clause that lacks an overt Actor phrase. These Actorless infinitives are used to
designate Actions. As the following examples show, the voice marking of the infinitival verb (and hence the implied case marking of the null Actor) are irrelevant. In each case, the missing Actor phrase is interpreted as having arbitrary reference, like the generic pronoun “one” in English.

(27) (adapted from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 155-156)

a. Mapanganib (ang) l-um-apit sa=ahas.
   dangerous NOM AV-approach DAT=snake
   To go near a snake is dangerous.

b. Maaksaya=ng ijtapon ang=damit na ito.
   wasteful=LNK IV-throw.out NOM=dress LNK this
   To throw out this dress would be a waste.

c. Magastos ijbili ng=bigas sa=groseri ang=pamilya.
   expensive BV-buy GEN=rice DAT=supermarket NOM=family
   It is expensive to buy rice for the family at a supermarket.

d. Mabuti=ng bigyan ng=pera ang=mga=mahihirap.
   good=LNK give-DV GEN=money NOM=PL=poor
   It is good to give money to the poor.

These Actorless infinitival clauses are formally identical to the complements of Equi verbs, as can be seen by comparing these examples with those in (35-40) below.\footnote{In fact, Schachter and Otanes (p. 157 ff.) explicitly analyze Equi constructions as involving the same type of infinitival clauses as those illustrated in (27).}

(28) a. Nakakatuwa=ng pakainin
   NONVOL.IMPERF.AV=glad=LNK CAUS-eat-OV
   ang=mga=kalapati.
   NOM=PL=pigeon
   It is fun to feed the pigeons.

\footnote{Some predicates in this class also accept an Event-type argument, which can appear in non-volitive mood. In such constructions, no gap is obligatory, but either Actor or subject may be omitted through pro-drop, as in the following example: Mapanganib ma-kagat ng=ahas.
   dangerous NONVOL-bite-OV GEN=snake
   (For someone) to be bitten by a snake is dangerous.}
Tagalog is a “pro-drop” language, and subject pro-drop is not uncommon where the antecedent is clearly understood (as in the answer to a question). However, null subjects seem to resist the arbitrary interpretation. It is impossible to get the kind of arbitrary reference for null subjects which was observed in (27) for null Actors. In fact, subjectless infinitives seem to be very difficult to process in the absence of a possible discourse antecedent for the subject gap.

(29) *Mapanganib kagat-in ng=ahas.
   dangerous bite-OV GEN=snake
   (for: To be bitten by a snake is dangerous.)

4.3 Imperatives

Imperatives are another context in which intentional action is required of the Actor. Farkas states that the addressee of an imperative must always be the initiator of the described situation. For this reason, as Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 402) note, non-volitive verbs do not normally form imperatives.

In Tagalog imperatives, the Actor is always the addressee no matter what the voice marking of the imperative verb. As in declarative sentences, the Actor is not the preferred choice for subject in a transitive imperative if any other core argument is definite. Schachter (1976) gives the following examples showing that the Actor (as in (30a)), the recipient (30b), or the theme (30c) may be selected as subject of an imperative; but the addressee is always the Actor.

(30) (from Schachter, 1976, p. 506)
   a. Mag-bigay ka sa=kaniya ng=kape.
      AV-give 2.SG.NOM DAT=him GEN=coffee
      Give him some coffee.
   b. Bigy-an mo siya ng=kape.
      give-DV 2.SG.GEN him(NOM) GEN=coffee
      Give him some coffee.
   c. I-bigay mo sa=kaniya ang=kape.
      IV-give 2.SG.GEN DAT=him NOM=coffee
      Give him the coffee.
As predicted above, non-volitive verbs cannot be used as imperatives. However, non-volitive forms are possible in a related construction which Schachter and Otanes (p. 408) refer to as the “optative”. Optative constructions are not restricted to having second person Actors; that is, the Actor need not be the addressee, as in a true imperative. According to Schachter and Otanes (p. 408), the presence of an optative particle (sana, nga, kaya or ba) is obligatory in an optative construction, unless the Actor is a third person pronoun. In the following examples, (a) is a true imperative in volitive mood, (b) shows that non-volitive imperative forms are impossible, and (c) gives the optative version of the (b) sentence:

(31)  a. Tulung-an mo ako!
     help-DV 2.SG GEN 1.SG NOM
     Help me!

     b. *Ma-tulung-an mo ako!
        NONVOL-help-DV 2.SG GEN 1.SG NOM

     c. Ma-tulung-an mo nga ako!\textsuperscript{46}
        NONVOL-help-DV 2.SG GEN please 1.SG NOM
        Will you please help me!

(32)  a. Basah-in mo ang=libro=ng ito!
      read-OV 2.SG GEN NOM=book=LNK this
      Read this book!

     b. *Ma-basa mo ang=libro=ng ito!
        NONVOL-read-OV 2.SG GEN NOM=book=LNK this

     c. Ma-basa mo nga ang=libro=ng ito!
        NONVOL-read-OV 2.SG GEN please NOM=book=LNK this
        Will you please read this book!

When the subject of an optative is a second person pronoun (i.e., the addressee), the non-volitive form of the verb is preferred but not obligatory. In the following examples, (33a) shows that a non-Actor subject addressee of a true imperative is impossible; (33b-c) give the corresponding optative versions:

(33)  a. *Suri-in ka ni=Dr.Lopez!
      examine-OV 2.SG NOM GEN=Dr.Lopez
      (for: Be examined by Dr. Lopez!)

     b. Ma-suri ka sana ni=Dr.Lopez!
        NONVOL-examine-OV 2.SG NOM OPT GEN=Dr.Lopez
        May you be examined by Dr. Lopez!

\textsuperscript{46}My consultants report that examples like those in (31c) carry a note of exasperation on the part of the speaker.
Example (33c) seems to involve the kind of permissive interpretation associated with causative coercion, as discussed in section 2.3. The more common way to express this meaning would be through the use of a reflexive causative construction (Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 325-326). Reflexive causatives involve a causative construction which contains a gap, e.g. “John caused Mary to kiss __”. This gap may be interpreted as being anaphorically bound to the causer (“John caused Mary to kiss him”). The causative verb in such a construction can be used as an imperative, as in the following example:

(34) Magpa-suri ka kay=Dr.Lopez!
     AV.CAUS-examine 2.SG.NOM DAT=Dr.Lopez
     Have yourself examined by Dr. Lopez!

The general pattern, then, is that only volitive mood is possible in contexts which require Action clauses. The semantic representation of Actions as Events with a variable in the Actor position explains why constructions of this type select Actors rather than subjects, that is, why only Actors can be addressees of imperatives or get arbitrary interpretation in Action-infinitive constructions.

5. Controllee choice

Now we will return to the syntactic properties of the Equi construction in Tagalog. Most of these properties are predictable from the fact that Equi verbs take Action-type complements, which are assumed to be Events with a semantic variable in the Actor position. As demonstrated in the previous section, this semantic restriction implies that Equi complements will normally appear in the volitive, rather than non-volitive, mood, and that the Equi target must be construed as the Actor of the complement clause.

Before proceding with a discussion of the syntactic facts, it will be helpful to distinguish between two classes of Equi verbs. I will refer to them as “obligatory control predicates” and “non-obligatory control predicates”.
5.1 Obligatory vs. non-obligatory control

Obligatory control predicates can only appear in Equi constructions. That is, they do not allow their complement clause to contain an Actor which is not coreferential with the controller (as in a “for-to” complement in English). This class includes utos ‘command’, bawal ‘forbid’, tangka ‘try’, sumikap ‘persist’, sumipag ‘persist’, mapilitan ‘be forced to (by circumstances)’, iwasan ‘avoid’ etc.\(^47\) Non-obligatory control predicates, in contrast, may occur either as Equi predicates or with a non-finite sentential complement equivalent to the English “for-to” complement. This class includes balak ‘plan’, magisip ‘think of’, bilin ‘instruct’, atubili ‘hesitate’, pumayag ‘agree’, etc. Some examples involving predicates of each type are given below:

**Obligatory control:**

(35) a. Binjawaljan ko si=Maria=ng awit-in
   PERF-forbid-DV 1.SG.GEN NOM=Maria=COMP sing-OV
   ang “Dahil sa iyo”
   NOM because DAT you(SG)
   I forbade Maria to sing “Because of you”.

b. ?*Binawalan ko si=Maria=ng awitin ni=Linda ang “Dahil sa iyo”.
   (I forbade Maria for Linda to sing “Because of you”.)

(36) a. Napilit-an si=Charlie=ng hiram-in
   PERF.NONVOL-force-DV NOM=Charlie=COMP borrow-OV
   ang=pera sa=bangko.
   NOM=money DAT=bank
   Charlie was forced (by circumstances) to borrow money from the bank.

b. ?*Napilitan si=Charlie=ng hiramin ni=Linda ang=pera sa=bangko.
   (Charlie was forced (by circumstances) for Linda to borrow money from the bank.)

\(^47\)There may be some speaker variation with the membership of this list. For example, the possibility of iwasan occurring with a non-controlled complement seems to depend on the semantic plausibility or contextualizability of sentences like “(?I avoided for John to borrow money from the bank.”
(37) a. Sinikap niya=ng suntukin
OV.PERF-try 3.SG.GEN=COMP hit-OV

ang=kaniya=ng amo.
NOM=his=LNK boss
He tried to hit his boss.

b. *Sinikap niya=ng suntukin ni=Linda ang=kaniya=ng amo.
(He tried for Linda to hit his/her boss.)

Non-obligatory control:

(38) a. Nagjbilin ako kay=Maria=ng awitjin
PERF.AV-instruct 1.SG.NOM DAT=Maria=COMP sing-OV

ang “Dahil sa iyo”.
NOM because DAT you(SG)
I instructed Maria to sing “Because of you”.

b. Nagjbilin ako kay=Maria=ng awitjin
PERF.AV-instruct 1.SG.NOM DAT=Maria=COMP sing-OV

ni=Ben ang “Dahil sa iyo”.
GEN=Ben NOM because DAT you(SG)
I gave Maria instructions for Ben to sing “Because of you”.

(39) a. Nag-atubili si=Maria=ng hiramjin
PERF.AV-hesitate NOM=Maria=COMP borrow-OV

ang=pera.
NOM=money
Maria hesitated to borrow the money.

b. Nag-atubili si=Maria=ng hiramjin ni=Ben
PERF.AV-hesitate NOM=Maria=COMP borrow-OV GEN=Ben

ang=pera.
NOM=money
Maria hesitated for Ben to borrow the money.
The analysis of Equi proposed in section 2 involves the binding of a variable in semantic representation, rather than a syntactic dependency. This analysis does not necessarily make any prediction as to whether or not the variable in Actor position (i.e., the controllee) is realized by any syntactic element. Miller (1988, p. 233) states that controllees in Tagalog Equi constructions can be realized by resumptive pronouns, but there appears to be a significant amount of variation between speakers on this point. Moreover, it is necessary to distinguish between obligatory and non-obligatory control predicates.

According to my consultants, non-obligatory Equi verbs may contain an overt pronominal controllee (i.e. a resumptive pronoun instead of a gap). This does not seem surprising, since they can also take full sentential complements (i.e., complement clauses with independent Actors). However, such resumptive pronouns are felt to be redundant and so are normally used only for special emphasis. Overt nominative pronouns are especially disfavored. This is apparently due to a subject-obviation effect similar to that discussed in chapter 2. For obligatory Equi verbs, some speakers seem to accept non-nominative resumptive pronouns as being at least marginally possible, while other speakers reject them. All speakers reject nominative resumptive pronouns. The following examples represent the intuitions of my consultants.

**Non-obligatory control:**

(41) a. Binalak ni=Miguel na bumili (?siya)
    PERF-plan-OV GEN=Miguel COMP AV-buy 3.SG.NOM
    ng=kotse.
    GEN=car
    Miguel planned to buy a car.
b. Binalak ni=Miguel na bilhin (niya)
PERF-plan-OV GEN=Miguel COMP buy-OV 3.SG.GEN
ang=kotse.
NOM=car
*Miguel planned to buy the car.*

**Obligatory control:**

(42) a. Nag-tangka si=Miguel na mag-nakaw (*siya)
AV.PERF-try NOM=Miguel COMP AV-steal 3.SG.NOM
ng=pera.
GEN=money
*Miguel tried to steal some money.*

b. Nag-tangka si=Miguel na nakaw-in (=?*niya)
AV.PERF-try NOM=Miguel COMP steal-OV 3.SG.GEN
ang=pera.
NOM=money
*Miguel tried to steal the money.*

I will assume that the controllee is realized in the syntax as a null pronominal element (i.e., a pronominal argument in f-structure which has no phrase structure realization) which is obligatorily coreferential with a specified argument of the matrix verb. But the semantic constraints on this element are not the same as the general constraints on “pro-drop” (zero anaphora) etc.

The gap in Equi constructions is distinguishable from normal cases of zero anaphora or discourse-governed elision in at least two ways. First, as discussed in chapter 2, zero anaphora tends to maximize Actor-continuity. That is, the antecedent of a missing (or “deleted”) Actor phrase is interpreted as being a preceding Actor, if one is available. In Equi constructions, however, the controller (or antecedent) of the Actor gap is determined by the semantic properties of the matrix verb (Sag and Pollard, 1991). With verbs like *plan, try, promise* etc. the controller is the Actor of the matrix clause, but with verbs like *command, instruct, persuade* etc. the controller is the participant to whom the command, instruction etc. is addressed.

Second, non-volitive marking on a verb does not prevent a null Actor phrase from taking a discourse antecedent in the normal way. But in Equi constructions, an Actor gap can no longer
be controlled when the complement verb is marked for non-volitive mood. The relevant facts will be illustrated below.

5.2 Controllees in volitive complements

The semantic analysis developed in sections 2 and 3 predicts that when the complement verb appears in its volitive (unmarked) form, the controllee must be the Actor of the embedded clause. This prediction is borne out for both obligatory and non-obligatory control predicates, as illustrated in the following examples:

**Obligatory control:**

(43) a. In-utus-an ko si=Maria=ng
PERF-order-DV 1.SG.GEN NOM=Maria=COMP

[halik-an __gen si=Pedro].
kiss-DV NOM=Pedro
*I ordered Maria to kiss Pedro.*

b. *In-utus-an ko si=Maria=ng
PERF-order-DV 1.SG.GEN NOM=Maria=COMP

[halik-an __nom ni=Pedro].
kiss-DV GEN=Pedro
(for: *I ordered Maria to be kissed by Pedro.*)

**Non-obligatory control:**

(44) a. Nag-atubili si=Maria=ng
PERF.AV-hesitate NOM=Maria=COMP

[bigy-an __gen ng=pera si=Ben].
give-DV GEN=money NOM=Ben
*Maria hesitated to give money to Ben.*

b. *Nag-atubili si=Maria=ng
PERF.AV-hesitate NOM=Maria=COMP

[bigy-an __nom ng=pera ni=Ben].
give-DV GEN=money GEN=Ben
(for: Maria hesitated to be given money by Ben.)

Examples (43-44) show that with unmarked (volitive mood) complements, the controllee must be the Actor of the embedded clause. Examples (43b) and (44b), in which the gap is a non-
Actor subject, are ungrammatical because their complements contain overt Actor phrases (Pedro in (43), Ben in (44)).

5.3 Controllees in non-volitive complements

When the embedded verb is marked for non-volitive mood, the pattern is reversed: the controllee must be the subject, and not the Actor. Actor gaps cannot be controlled in non-volitive complements. This holds true for both obligatory and non-obligatory control predicates, although a difference in the behavior of the two classes emerges. With obligatory control verbs, Actor gaps in non-volitive complements are simply ungrammatical. With non-obligatory control verbs, Actor gaps in non-volitive complements are grammatical but take on an arbitrary interpretation.

Obligatory control:

(45) a. *In-utus-an ko si=Maria=ng
PERF-order-DV 1.SG.GEN NOM=Maria=COMP
[ma-halik-an __gen si=Pedro].
NONVOL-kiss-DV NOM=Pedro

b. In-utus-an ko si=Maria=ng
PERF-order-DV 1.SG.GEN NOM=Maria=COMP
[ma-halik-an __nom ni=Pedro].
NONVOL-kiss-DV GEN=Pedro
I ordered Maria (to allow herself) to be kissed by Pedro.

Non-obligatory control:

(46) a. Nag-atubili si=Maria=ng
PERF.AV-hesitate NOM=Maria=COMP
[ma-bigy-an __gen ng=pera si=Ben].
NONVOL-give-DV GEN=money NOM=Ben
Maria hesitated for Ben to be given money (by someone).
b. Nag-atubili si=Maria=ng
   PERF.AV-hesitate NOM=Maria=COMP
   [ma-bigy-an _nom ng=pera ni=Ben].
   NONVOL-give-DV GEN=money GEN=Ben
   Maria hesitated (to allow herself) to be given money by Ben.

With both obligatory and non-obligatory control verbs, the controllee of a non-volitive complement must be the subject (nominative argument) of the embedded clause, as in examples (45b) and (46b). This is only possible under the “coerced” causative interpretation discussed in section 2.3. Native speakers frequently point out that such examples are equivalent to reflexive-causative constructions like that in (34). In fact, the reflexive-causative form, shown below, usually seems to be a more natural way of expressing the intended meaning. This makes it clear that non-volitive complements are possible only with a causative interpretation.

(47) a. In-utus-an ko si=Maria=ng magpa-halik
   PERF-order-DV 1.SG.GEN NOM=Maria=COMP AV.CAUS-kiss
   kay=Pedro.
   DAT=Pedro
   I ordered Maria to \{cause/allow\} herself to be kissed by Pedro.

b. Nag-atubili si=Maria=ng
   PERF.AV-hesitate NOM=Maria=COMP
   magpa-bigay ng=pera kay=Ben.
   AV.CAUS-give GEN=money DAT=Ben
   Maria hesitated to \{cause/allow\} herself to be given money by Ben.

An Actor gap in a non-volitive complement (45a) is ungrammatical with obligatory control verbs like utos. With non-obligatory control verbs, it is possible to have an Actor “gap” in an non-volitive complement as in (46a), but this gap is not a controllee. The missing Actor phrase gets an arbitrary or indefinite interpretation, rather than being coreferential with the controller. The basic pattern then, for both obligatory and non-obligatory control predicates, is the following: the controllee of an Equi construction in Tagalog is the Actor if and only if the complement verb is in the volitive mood.
6. Functional control vs. Anaphoric control

We have seen that, for most Equi predicates, when the complement verb is marked for volitive mood the controllee must be the Actor of the complement clause. In chapter 2 we noted briefly the existence of a few Equi predicates which provide counter-examples to this generalization. For these predicates, the controllee may be either the Actor or the subject. Some examples with non-Actor subject controllees are given below:

(48) adapted from Ramos (1971, p. 132):
Nagpilit si=Maria=ng bigy-an ng=pera
PERF.AV-insist.on NOM=Maria=COMP give-DV GEN=money

ni=Ben.
GEN=Ben
Maria insisted on being given money by Ben.

(49) (from Miller, 1988, p. 232)
Hjinjimok ni=Maria si=Juan=ng
persuade-OV GEN=Maria NOM=Juan=COMP

suri-in ng=bago=ng doktor.
examine-OV GEN=new=LNK doctor
Maria persuaded Juan to be examined by the new doctor.

(50) (Dell, 1981, p. 23)
Najsanay si=Lorna=ng i-pirma ni=Ben.
PERF-get.used.to NOM=Lorna=COMP BV-sign GEN=Ben
Lorna got used to being signed for by Ben.

(51) Natatakot si=Pedro=ng tanung-in ng=pulis.
IMPERF-fear NOM=Pedro=COMP question-OV GEN=police
Pedro is afraid to be questioned by the police.

In all of these examples, a nominative (i.e. subject) gap in the embedded clause is controlled by the matrix subject. Moreover, in this construction the controller as well as the controllee must be a subject. The following example, which is identical to (48) except for the voice marking on the matrix verb, is ungrammatical because the controller (Maria) is not the subject of the matrix clause:
Let us for the moment refer to the construction exemplified in (48-51) as “Subject-Subject Equi” (SSE) to indicate that both the controller and the controllee are subjects. Predicates which trigger this construction seem to be of a different semantic class from the Equi predicates discussed in the preceding sections. With the possible exception of *himukin* ‘coax; persuade’, all the matrix verbs in (48-51) seem to be of the “orientation” type (Sag and Pollard, 1991). This means that the semantic constraints discussed in section 2 do not apply to this construction. Unlike the normal Equi pattern discussed in the preceding sections, the controllee in the SSE construction need not be the Actor of the complement clause even though the complement verb is marked for volitive mood. The controllee is the recipient in (48), the patient in (49), the benefactive in (50) and the patient in (51).

Verbs which can function as SSE triggers can also appear in normal Equi constructions, as seen in the following examples. Note that the controllee in these examples is the Actor, but not the subject, of the complement clause:

(52) *Pinilit ni=Maria=ng bigy-an ng=pera*  
PERF-INSIST.ON-OV GEN=Maria=COMP give-DV GEN=money  
ni=Ben.  
GEN=Ben  
(for: *Maria insisted on being given money by Ben.* )

How can we account for the difference between the SSE construction and the “normal” Equi pattern in Tagalog? As demonstrated in chapter 2, syntactic features of case and voice are largely irrelevant in normal Equi constructions. There is no construction-specific constraint on
the case marking or grammatical relation of either controller or controllee. The following examples from Schachter (1977) show that the voice marking on the complement verb, and hence the case-marking of the controllee, is irrelevant:

(55) (from Schachter, 1977, pp. 293-294)
   a. Nag-atubili siya=ng h-um-iram ng=pera
       PERF.AV-hesitate 3.SG.NOM=COMP AV-borrow GEN=money
       sa=bangko.
       DAT=bank
       *He hesitated to borrow money from the/a bank.
   b. Nag-atubili siya=ng hiram-in ang=pera
       PERF.AV-hesitate 3.SG.NOM=COMP borrow-OV NOM=money
       sa=bangko.
       DAT=bank
       *He hesitated to borrow the money from the/a bank.
   c. Nag-atubili siya=ng hiram-an ng=pera
       PERF.AV-hesitate 3.SG.NOM=COMP borrow-DV GEN=money
       ang=bangko.
       NOM=bank
       *He hesitated to borrow money from the bank.

Similarly, examples like the following show that the voice marking on the matrix verb, and hence the case-marking of the controller, has no effect on grammaticality:

(56) a. B-in-awal-an ko si=Maria=ng kain-in
       PERF-forbid-DV 1.SG.GEN NOM=Maria=COMP eat-OV
       ang=litson.
       NOM=roast.pig
       I forbade Maria to eat the lechon.
   b. Nagbawal ako kay=Maria=ng kain-in
       PERF.AV-forbid 1.SG.NOM DAT=Maria=COMP eat-OV
       ang=litson.
       NOM=roast.pig
       I forbade Maria to eat the lechon.

Verbs which can function as SSE triggers must have two alternative subcategorizations (perhaps this is true of orientation predicates in general). They can take either an Action-type
complement, in which the Actor slot of the complement is filled by a semantic variable, or an Event-type complement. In the former case, the Actor variable is semantically identified (coindexed) with the controller, creating the “normal” Equi pattern as in (53-54). In the latter case, a syntactic dependency is created between the matrix subject and the complement subject, creating the “Subject-Subject Equi” pattern seen in (48-51). (Note that the same element is specified as controller in either case.) Unlike the normal Equi pattern, in SSE the controller and controllee must agree in case (nominative) and grammatical relation (subject). This supports the claim that the dependency between the two involves a syntactic unification, rather than merely semantic coreference.\[^{48}\]

I will treat the SSE construction as a case of functional control, as defined by Bresnan (1982), in contrast to the regular Equi construction which I take to involve anaphoric control. We can represent the difference between the control relations in (48) and (54) roughly as follows:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(57)} & \quad \textbf{Anaphoric control} (=54) \\
& \text{Nagpilit} \quad \text{si=}\text{Maria=}\text{ng} \quad \text{bigy-an} \quad \text{ng=}\text{pera} \\
& \text{PERF.AV-insist.on} \quad \text{NOM=}\text{Maria=}\text{COMP} \quad \text{give-DV} \quad \text{GEN=}\text{money} \\
& \quad \text{si=}\text{Ben.} \\
& \quad \text{NOM=}\text{Ben} \\
& \quad \text{Maria insisted on giving money to Ben.} \\
& \quad \text{Semantic structure:} \\
& \quad \text{insist} < \text{Maria}_i, \text{give} < \text{PRO}_i, \text{money, Ben}> \\
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{(58)} & \quad \textbf{Functional control} (=48) \\
& \text{Nagpilit} \quad \text{si=}\text{Maria=}\text{ng} \quad \text{bigy-an} \quad \text{ng=}\text{pera} \\
& \text{PERF.AV-insist.on} \quad \text{NOM=}\text{Maria=}\text{COMP} \quad \text{give-DV} \quad \text{GEN=}\text{money} \\
& \quad \text{ni=}\text{Ben.} \\
& \quad \text{GEN=}\text{Ben} \\
& \quad \text{Maria insisted on being given money by Ben.} \\
\end{align*}\]

\[^{48}\text{For a discussion of the importance of case marking in functional control, see Neidle (1982) and Andrews (1982).}\]
**Functional structure:**

\[
\text{insistMaria} \quad \text{give} \quad \text{money} \quad \text{Ben} \\
| \quad | \quad | \quad |
\]

[\text{PRED SUBJ XCOMP:}[\text{PRED SUBJ OBJ ACTOR}]]

The same verbs which can trigger functional control (the SSE construction) can also trigger anaphoric control, but the constraints on the two constructions are very different. Functional control constructions are subject to syntactic constraints (both controller and controllee must be subjects). However, they are not subject to the normal semantic constraints on Equi constructions (the controllee need not be an Actor). This implies that the contrast between volitive and non-volitive mood, which was analyzed in purely semantic terms, should have no effect. Anaphoric control constructions are subject to semantic constraints, as discussed in sections 2 and 3, but case and voice are irrelevant. Thus we expect to find the semantic and syntactic constraints in complementary distribution. This prediction is borne out in examples like the following:

(59) a. H-in-imok ng=Tatay si=Josie=ng
   PERF-persuade-OV GEN=father NOM=Josie=LNK
   halik-an ng=Lola niya.
   kiss-DV GEN=grandmother her

   *Father persuaded Josie to be kissed by her grandmother.*

b. *Tatay ang h-um-imok kay=Josie=ng
   father NOM PERF-AV-persuade DAT=Josie=LNK
   halik-an ng=Lola niya.
   kiss-DV GEN=grandmother her
   (for: It was *Father who persuaded Josie to be kissed by her grandmother.*)

---

49I am using the label ACTOR informally to designate the grammatical relation of the non-subject Actor, which should technically be something like OBJagt.
Example (59a) involves functional control; the controllee is a non-Actor subject, even though the embedded verb is in volitive mood. In order to see the effects of the syntactic constraint, the cleft construction is used in (59b–c) to force the matrix Actor (Father) to appear as the matrix subject, so that in these examples the controller (Josie) is no longer the matrix subject. Example (59b) is ungrammatical. It cannot be interpreted as functional control (SSE), because the controller is not the subject of the matrix clause. It cannot be interpreted as anaphoric control, because the embedded verb is marked for volitive mood but the controllee is not the Actor. Example (59c) shows that the identical expression is grammatical if the embedded verb is marked for non-volitive mood, because this allows the sentence to be interpreted, under causative coercion, as an instance of anaphoric control. In other words, (59a) satisfies the syntactic constraints of functional control while (59c) satisfies the semantic constraints of anaphoric control. Example (59b) does not satisfy either set of constraints and is therefore ungrammatical.

7. A puzzle (partially) resolved

The analysis in the previous section allows us to come very close to resolving a puzzle concerning the behavior of the modal verb *gusto* ‘want, like’. *Gusto* can function as an Equi predicate, as in example (60a). It clearly belongs to the “orientation” class of Equi verbs, and so should not be subject to the semantic constraints outlined in sections 2 and 3. Yet, somewhat surprisingly, a non-Actor subject gap in the complement clause appears to be possible only when the complement verb is marked for non-volitive mood.

(60) a. Gusto ni=Armand na bilh-in iyon=ng want GEN=Armand COMP buy-OV that(NOM)=LNK kotse.
car
*Armand wants to buy that car.*
b. *Gusto ni=Armand na hulih-in ng=pirata.
   want GEN=Armand COMP catch-OV GEN=pirate
   (for: Armand wants to be captured by pirates.)

c. Gusto ni=Armand na ma-huli ng=pirata.
   want GEN=Armand COMP NONVOL-catch-OV GEN=pirate
   Armand wants to be captured by pirates.

Non-subject Actors are possible controlleres, as seen in (60a). Examples (60b-c) show that non-Actor subjects cannot be omitted from the complement clause unless the embedded verb is a non-volitive form. If the semantic analysis proposed in sections 2 and 3 cannot be invoked here, how are we to account for these facts?

Example (60a) clearly involves anaphoric control, since the controllee is a non-subject. The controllee is the embedded Actor, so the semantic constraints on anaphoric control are satisfied. In order to be grammatical, (60b) would have to be an example of functional control, since the controllee is a non-Actor subject. But as was pointed out in chapter 2, section 5, *gusto* and a few other similar modals are morphologically defective. They do not undergo any voice alternations, and so the experiencer can never be realized as the subject. This means that the controller (the experiencer of *gusto*) in examples like (60b) can never be the matrix subject, and so the syntactic constraints on functional control can never be satisfied. Example (60b) is ungrammatical for essentially the same reasons as (59b) above: it satisfies neither the syntactic constraints on functional control nor the semantic constraints on anaphoric control.

Why then should the non-volitive mood in the complement verb of (60c) make the sentence grammatical? In the case of example (59c), we argued that the non-volitive mood made possible the application of the causative coercion rule. This in turn allowed the sentence to be interpreted as an instance of anaphoric control. But in (60c), there is no causative sense in the meaning, so this analysis seems implausible. The correct analysis seems to be that (60c) does not involve a control relation at all, but is rather a case of zero-anaphora or “pro-drop”.

In fact, the antecedent of the subject gap in (60c) is not lexically determined, as is the case in either functional or anaphoric control. Rather, it is determined by discourse context. Thus the sentence is actually ambiguous between the readings “Armand wants (someone) to be captured by pirates” and “Armand wants (himself) to be captured by pirates.” In answer to the question, “What does each member of the city council think of the new mayor?”, the sentence would be
interpreted to mean “Armand wants him to be captured by pirates.” Thus a more accurate gloss of (60c) would be something like the following:

(61) Gusto ni=Armand na ma-huli __nom
    want GEN=Armand COMP NONVOL-catch-OV (PRO)

ng=pirata.
GEN=pirate
Armand wants {him/her/himself} to be captured by pirates.

This translation makes it clear that no control relation is involved here. Compare (60b) to the following sentences, which contain overt pronouns. As (62a) shows, overt pronouns are ambiguous in exactly the same way as the gap in (60c). This is what we would expect if (60c) is an instance of pro-drop rather than control.

(62) a. Gusto ni=Armand na huli-hin siya
    want GEN=Armand COMP catch-OV 3.SG.NOM

ng=pirata.
GEN=pirate
Armand wants (for) him(self) to be captured by pirates.

b. (from Bloomfield, 1917, p. 170)
Hindi mo gusto=ng mahuli ka.
not 2.SG.GEN want=COMP NONVOL-catch-OV 2.SG.NOM
You don’t want to be arrested.

In summary, *gusto*, like the orientation-type SSE predicates discussed in section 6, may take either an Action complement or an Event complement. Action complements produce the pattern of anaphoric control illustrated in (60a), in which the gap is always the Actor. This is the same pattern induced by the regular Equi predicates discussed in section 5, which always take an Action complement. Event complements, on the other hand, do not contain a controller. They are sentential complements, like the “for-to” clauses in English. Unlike the predicates discussed in section 6, *gusto* is morphologically defective. *Gusto* has no Active Voice form, and so can never select its experiencer as the subject. For this reason, it cannot license the SSE construction (functional control). A pronominal subject in the complement clause may be coreferential with the matrix experiencer whether it is an overt pronoun, as in (62a-b), or an instance of “pro-drop”, as in (60c); but this coreference is never obligatory.
One piece of the puzzle remains to be solved: Why is pro-drop possible only when the complement verb appears in non-volitive mood, as in (60c), and not in volitive mood, as in (60b)? It is well-known that non-volitive mood is the normal verb form when an indefinite Actor is omitted, but the null subject of the complement clause in (60c) is neither indefinite nor an Actor. No correlation has been observed to my knowledge between non-volitive mood and pro-drop, or zero-anaphora, which always takes a definite antecedent. I leave this question as a topic for further research.

8. A typology of controllee choice

Finally, it will be useful to discuss in greater detail the differences between Tagalog and English. Why is it that non-subject controllees are so common in Tagalog, when they are impossible in most other languages?

The semantic account in sections 2 and 3 provides an explanation for why the controllee of an Equi construction must be the Actor of the embedded clause when the embedded verb is in volitive mood. I suggested briefly that the reason why the controllee can be the Actor (given the near-universal identification of controllee with grammatical subject) is that Actors in Tagalog are always terms (i.e. non-oblique arguments), even when they are not selected as subject.

I assume a universal syntactic constraint on control relations which minimally requires that controllees must be terms. This constraint interacts with the semantic constraint proposed above to account for the differences between Tagalog and English. In volitional agentive clauses, the agent is the initiator. Thus in a language like English, the agent of an active transitive verb will be the only possible choice for controllee. In passive constructions, the agent is demoted to oblique status, whether expressed as a by-phrase or omitted entirely. Since the syntactic constraint states that oblique arguments are not possible controllees, the passive agent is no longer eligible. Patients are normally not initiators, and so would be blocked by the semantic constraint. Thus the subject of a passive complement verb can only become an Equi target when the coercion process induces a change of interpretation which forces the patient to take on the character of an initiator. In example (6), causative coercion makes the passive subject an eligible controllee since it is both the initiator (under the coerced interpretation) and a term.

Since (as demonstrated in chapter 2) Actors in Tagalog are always terms, they always meet the syntactic criteria for eligibility as controllees, whether or not they are subjects. In volitive
mood, the Actor must be the initiator. This means that no other argument can be selected as controllee. Since Equi complements must express Actions, rather than Events, the complement verb may be marked for non-volitive mood only under causative coercion. This process forces the subject to be interpreted as a causer, and hence the initiator of the event. Thus the subject will be the controllee.

What would this typology predict for a language like Dyirbal, in which the patient is the subject of the basic transitive clause? Mel’c“uk (1988) and Kiparsky (1987) have proposed analyses of Dyirbal which treat non-absolutive agents in that language as oblique arguments. Assuming such an analysis to be correct, we would predict the following situation: Instrumental agents could not be controllees, even though they are initiators, since they are not terms; and (ignoring for the moment the possibility of coercion in Dyirbal) absolutive patients could not be controllees, even though they are subjects, since they are not initiators. Thus Equi controllees could only be intransitive subjects, which are both initiators and terms. To appear as Equi complements, transitive verbs would have to undergo the antipassive rule, demoting the patient to oblique status and making the agent the subject.

According to Dixon (1979, p. 128-9) this is exactly the pattern found in Dyirbal “jussive” constructions, involving influence-type Equi verbs such as *giga-l* ‘tell to do’. Dixon states that the embedded clause must simultaneously satisfy a “deep-structure” constraint which requires the controllee to be the Actor (intransitive subject or transitive agent) and a “shallow-structure” constraint which requires the controllee to be the absolutive argument. The result is that the verb in transitive complement clauses must appear with antipassive marking, as in (63a). Verbs in intransitive complement clauses, as in (63b), do not take antipassive marking.

(63) (from Dixon, 1979, p. 129)

   we-NOM mother-ABS tell-PAST father-DAT see-ANTIPASS-PURP
   *We told mother to watch father.*

b. Ngana yabu giga-n banagay-gu.
   we-NOM mother-ABS tell-PAST return-PURP
   *We told mother to return.*

It turns out that causative coercion is in fact possible in Dyirbal. This process allows absolutive patients to be interpreted as initiators, and thus to function as controllees in normal

---

*A similar state of affairs holds true in Jacaltec, as analyzed by Van Valin (1981). Whether or not there is independent evidence for treating non-absolutive agents as oblique arguments in Jacaltec remains to be investigated.*
transitive complements. The following example, in which the complement verb is not marked as an antipassive and the controllee is the patient-subject, was collected by Dixon and cited by Comrie (1981):\footnote{Dixon (1979) stated that such constructions are impossible, but in subsequent field-work he discovered that examples like (64) are in fact acceptable. Thanks to Avery Andrews (p.c.) for pointing out this example to me and helping me with the glosses, and to Robert Dixon (p.c.) for additional clarification.}

(64) (from Comrie, 1981, p. 112)
Ngadya bayi yaRa gigan gubi-nggu mawa-li
I-NOM man-ABS CL1 told doctor-ERG examine-PURP
I told the man to be examined by the doctor.

9. Conclusion

This chapter has presented cross-linguistic evidence for the universality of certain semantic constraints in Equi constructions, namely that the controllee must be the initiator of the controlled situation. At least two parameters of variation have been pointed out. First, languages vary as to how readily, and under what conditions, they allow a non-Actor to be interpreted (via Causative Coercion) as causer-initiator, and thus an eligible controllee. Second, languages vary as to the syntactic status of non-subject Actors. In most languages, non-subject Actors (e.g. passive agents) have the status of oblique arguments or adjuncts. Given the assumption that controllees must be terms, this explains the observation that in most languages controllees must be subjects, as well as (modulo coercion effects) Actors. In Tagalog, however, non-subject Actors are always terms, and thus syntactically eligible to be controlled. They also fulfill the semantic requirements on controllees. Moreover, in transitive clauses the Actor is not in general selected as subject. Therefore the Equi target in Tagalog is normally the Actor, rather than the subject.
Chapter 5.

Phrase structure and configurationality

1. Introduction

In this chapter I will propose an analysis of Tagalog phrase structure, and address the question of whether Tagalog is a non-configurational language. The notion of configurationality which I will assume is not simply a matter of fixed vs. free word-order, but rather involves a specific claim about the phrase-structure configuration of a language. By “non-configurational language” I mean a language with a flat clause structure, that is, one in which both the subject and the object are sisters of the verb. A configurational language is one in which the verb, object and other arguments form a constituent which excludes the subject.

It has been claimed in recent work (Speas, 1990) that no language is non-configurational in this sense; but I will attempt to show that Tagalog is such a language. Two types of evidence will be especially important. First, the binding properties of non-reflexive pronouns show that subjects in Tagalog are c-commanded by objects and other co-arguments. Second, evidence concerning the distribution of second-position clitics shows that a verb and its object do not form a maximal projection for purposes of clitic placement, giving further support to the claim that Tagalog has no VP constituent.

Miller (1988) argues at length that Tagalog has a non-configurational phrase structure, and the evidence which I will present supports this conclusion. But Miller, working within the Government-Binding framework, was forced to assume that a flat phrase structure implies that there can be no subject-object asymmetries in the language. However, as demonstrated in chapter 2, there are in fact a large number of “asymmetries” in Tagalog syntax, i.e. properties which distinguish subjects from other arguments. Tagalog is non-configurational in the sense that it lacks a VP constituent in phrase structure, but it nevertheless provides strong evidence for the importance of grammatical relations in the syntax. This implies that grammatical relations (in particular, grammatical subjecthood) cannot be defined in terms of surface phrase structure configuration.

The phrase structure which I will propose for Tagalog is similar to that proposed by Chung and McCloskey (1987) for Irish, shown in the following figure:
In this proposal, a small clause (S) is generated as sister to INFL. I take INFL to be the position of the finite verb or auxiliary element, as discussed in chapter 1. Crucially, IP in Tagalog forms a domain for clitic placement but S does not. Using the LFG formalism for the unification of optional categories, I will present a non-transformational analogue of a verb-movement analysis similar to the one proposed by Chung and McCloskey. However, my analysis differs in several respects from theirs. I will show that Tagalog allows discontinuous predicate expressions, and will argue that such patterns involve a flat (i.e. non-configurational) structure for the small clause (S).

In the final section of this chapter, I will discuss two possible alternative approaches which might allow one to analyze Tagalog as a configurational language: first, that of Guilfoyle, Hung and Travis (in press), which is perhaps the most persuasive configurational analysis for Philippine languages proposed thus far; and second, an adaptation of the “Subject Adjunction” analysis proposed by Chung (1990) for Chamorro. Both of these analyses assume that the subject can be identified with a unique position in the phrase structure, namely [SPEC, IP]. But I will argue that neither approach provides an adequate account of the Tagalog facts.

2. Word order patterns

It has often been noted that word order in Tagalog is much less rigid than in English. In pragmatically unmarked clauses, the predicate always comes first, but there is considerable flexibility in the order of NP complements. For example, Schachter and Otanes (1972) make the following observation:

[T]he following six sentences include exactly the same components, are equally grammatical, and are identical in meaning: (Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 83)

(2) Nagbigay ng=libro sa=babae ang=lalaki.
gave GEN=book DAT=woman NOM=man
The man gave the woman a book.

Kroeger — Phrase Structure and Grammatical Relations in Tagalog
The stylistic permutations illustrated in (2), which all retain the verb in initial position, do not change the meaning of the sentence in any obvious way. However, this is not to say that word order is arbitrary. There are three principles which interact in many cases to determine a preferred ordering for non-pronominal arguments of a clause:

(3) (i) the Actor phrase tends to precede all other arguments.
(ii) the NP which bears nominative case tends to follow all other arguments.
(iii) “heavier” NP’s tend to follow “lighter” NP’s.

In a basic transitive clause in which the patient bears nominative case, both principles (i) and (ii) require the Actor to precede the patient phrase, as in example (4a). Where there is a potential ambiguity, e.g. when there is more than one genitive NP, the Actor must precede the other arguments. The opposite ordering, shown in (4b), is not felt to be ungrammatical where there is no ambiguity, but is somewhat unnatural.

(4) a. Sinulat ni=Juan ang=liham.
   PERF write-OV GEN=Juan NOM=letter
   Juan wrote the letter.

b. ?Sinulat ang=liham ni=Juan.
   PERF write-OV NOM=letter GEN=Juan
   Juan wrote the letter.

In general, whenever the Actor is not the nominative argument, i.e. when the verb appears in a non-active voice, there is a very strong tendency for the Actor to precede all other arguments. However, exceptions to this rule are found in natural text, particularly when the Actor phrase is longer than a single word as in the following example:
When the verb is marked for Active Voice, the Actor bears nominative case and a conflict arises between principles (i) and (ii) above. Principle (i) would put the Actor first, but principle (ii) would require it to come last. Because of this conflict, word-order in Active Voice clauses seems to be essentially free, as illustrated in the examples cited in (2). Linguists have disagreed over which should be taken to be the basic order in Active clauses. Bloomfield (1917, p. 153), Bowen (1965, p. 151-2) and Wolfenden (1961, p. 35) state that the preferred order is that in which the nominative Actor appears in final position. This is disputed by Naylor (1975) and Bautista (1983), who state that “agent-then-patient” is the preferred order even in active clauses.52 I will simply assume that there are two “unmarked” word orders in active clauses, VSO or VOS.

Clausal complements always follow all NP complements. Numerous examples of such constructions are given in chapters 4 and 7. Adverbs and other adjunct phrases tend to occur in clause-final position, or, with special prominence, in pre-verbal position as discussed in section 4.3 of this chapter. However, once again this is only a preference and not a rigid requirement. As the following examples show, adverbial phrases can occur virtually anywhere, even preceding the Actor phrase as in (7b), though this is not the normal ordering.

52One reason for this disagreement may be that Bloomfield and Wolfenden were basing their conclusions on examples drawn from natural discourse, whereas Naylor and Bautista were working with elicited examples. But the question of which order is truly “basic” is not of major importance for present purposes.
3. Configurationality

In this section we will consider the question of configurationality in Tagalog. Section 3.1 discusses typological properties of non-configurational languages. Section 3.2 presents evidence from pronominal coreference which indicates that subjects are sisters of their co-arguments. This implies that there is no projection of V in Tagalog which includes the object but not the subject, i.e. no VP in the traditional sense.

3.1 Diagnostic properties

Free word-order of the kind illustrated in (2) is frequently taken to be one of the primary typological characteristics of non-configurational languages. Tagalog also exhibits many of the other properties which Hale (1983) and Speas (1990, p. 142) mention as being characteristic of non-configurational languages: frequent use of null anaphora, lack of expletive (dummy) NP’s, a rich case system and complex verbal morphology. There are even some contexts in which discontinuous constituents may appear, as we will see below. However, as Speas points out, these are fairly superficial typological features; many configurational languages also exhibit a number of these properties. For the most part they do not provide direct evidence concerning the constituent structure of the clause.

Speas argues that a hierarchical phrase structure, which would assign subjects and objects to distinct positions, is part of Universal Grammar. She lists a number of predictions which would follow, within the GB framework, from the claim that a given language had a flat clause structure. Essentially, these all involve the lack of some subject-object asymmetry which is often observed to hold in configurational languages because of the unique position of the subject outside the VP. Some of these predictions are summarized below:
(8) (adapted from Speas, 1990, p. 137)

**Subject/Object Asymmetry**

a. evidence for VP constituent
b. obligatory subjects
c. PRO restricted to subject position
d. no nominative reflexives
e. binding asymmetries
f. weak cross-over effects
g. ECP effects (restrictions on subject extraction)

**Prediction for flat language**

V+O will not move, delete or pronominalize
no pleonastics (dummy subjects)
on-subject controllees
nominative reflexives allowed\(^{53}\)
no binding asymmetries
weak cross-over sentences grammatical
no ECP effects for subjects

As has already been demonstrated in chapter 2, Tagalog allows various kinds of subjectless constructions, e.g. weather verbs, existential clauses, etc., in which no expletive element appears. It was also shown (chapter 2, section 3.2 and again in chapter 4) that controllees in Tagalog need not be grammatical subjects. We have seen that reflexive pronouns may be subjects, marked for nominative case, as in the following example:

(9) Pinupuri lahat ng=mga=kandidato
    IMPERF-raise-OV all GEN=PL=candidate
    ang=kanila=ng sarili.
    NOM=3.PL=LNK self

*All the candidates praised themselves.*

We have also seen that the constraints on extraction in Tagalog are in fact just the opposite of what a configurational analysis would predict: subjects may always be extracted, while objects (i.e. non-nominative patients and Actors) cannot normally be extracted (see chapter 7 for further discussion).

Miller (1988) uses the following examples to demonstrate that there is no weak cross-over effect which distinguishes between agents and patients:

(10) (from Miller, 1988, p. 113-114)

a. Sino\(i\) ang yumayapos sa=anak niya\(i\)?
    NOM IMPERF.AV-hug DAT=child 3.SG.GEN

*Who\(i\) hugs her\(i\) daughter?*

---

\(^{53}\)Speas says that if some languages were truly non-configurational, one might expect to find languages in which *only* nominative reflexives were found. However, the lack of subject-object asymmetry predicts only the possibility of nominative reflexives, not the impossibility of non-nominative reflexives.
b. Sino i ang yinayapos ng=nanay niya i?
who NOM IMPERF-hug-OV GEN=mother 3.SG.GEN

*Who does her mother hug?*

Similarly, examples like the following show that there is no asymmetry between subjects and non-subjects in weak cross-over constructions:

(11) a. Sino i ang binigyan ng=tatay niya i
who NOM PERF-give-DV GEN=father 3.SG.GEN

ng=kotse?
GEN=car

*Who was given a car by his father?*

b. Kanino i nagbigay ang=tatay niya i ng=kotse?
whom PERF.AV-give NOM=father 3.SG.GEN GEN=car

*Whom did his father give a car?*

Finally, let us consider the question of binding asymmetries in Tagalog. Since we have already seen that reflexive pronouns can appear as subjects, I will restrict my attention here to restrictions on possible antecedents of non-reflexive pronouns.

### 3.2 Pronominal coreference in Tagalog

Miller (1988, pp. 188-190) stated that pronouns in Tagalog are subject to the constraint in (12):

(12) **RNP non-coreference constraint:**
(adapted from Miller, 1988, pp. 189-190)
A referential NP cannot be co-indexed with a pronoun which both precedes and c-commands it.

However, this rule as stated fails to rule out examples like the following, suggesting that the formulation in (12) should be revised:

---

54 This fact was also noted by Miller, but he based his conclusion on the following example which involves the extraction of a non-subject agent, and which my consultants judge to be completely ungrammatical, with or without coreference (Miller, 1988, p. 114, ex. 13a):

Sino i ang dapat na sampalin ang anak niya i?
‘By whom should her child be spanked?’
(13) *Minamahal ang=anak niya i ng=nanay ni=Juan i.
IMPERF-love-OV NOM=child his GEN=mother GEN=Juan
*His i child is loved by Juan’s i mother.

Here the pronoun niya precedes Juan, but neither c-commands the other. Nothing in principle (12) predicts that coreference should be impossible, since the pronoun does not c-command its antecedent. The following reformulation makes the correct prediction, namely that coreference is impossible, since the pronoun is neither preceded nor c-commanded by its antecedent.

(14) **Rule of pronominal non-coreference:**
A (non-reflexive) pronoun must not take as its antecedent a phrase which neither precedes nor c-commands it.

In many contexts, of course, (14) has the same effect as the rule stated in (12). I will assume that (14) is the correct formulation. The effect of this constraint is illustrated in the examples in (15). (Note that none of the following examples are ungrammatical; stars are used here only to indicate that the intended coreference between a pronominal and a possible antecedent is impossible.)

(15) a. Hinalikan si=Juan i ng=babae=ng
PERF-kiss-DV NOM=Juan GEN=woman=LNK
iniligtas niya i.
PERF-rescue-OV 3.SG.GEN
Juan i was kissed by the woman whom he i rescued.

b. Humalik ang=babae=ng iniligtas
PERF-AV-kiss NOM=woman=LNK PERF-rescue-OV

ni=Juan i sa=kaniya i.
GEN=Juan 3.SG.DAT
The woman whom Juan i rescued kissed him i.

c. Hinalikan ng=babae=ng iniligtas niya i
PERF-kiss-DV GEN=woman=LNK PERF-rescue-OV 3.SG.GEN

si=Juan i.
NOM=Juan
The woman whom he i rescued kissed Juan i.
d. *Hinalikan siya₃ ng=baba=ng
   PERF-kiss-DV 3.SG.NOM GEN=woman=LNK

   iniligtas ni=Juan₃.
   PERF-rescue-OV GEN=Juan

   *He was kissed by the woman whom Juan₃ rescued.

In (15a) the antecedent Juan both precedes and c-commands the pronoun niya. In (15b) the antecedent precedes but does not c-command the pronoun, and in (15c) the antecedent (which is the subject) c-commands but does not precede the pronoun. Only in (15d), where the antecedent neither precedes nor c-commands the pronoun is coreference impossible.

We can use the rule of pronominal coreference to examine the structural relationship between the subject and other arguments. Consider the following examples:

(16) a. Nagmamahal si=Juan₃ sa=anak niya₃.
    AV-IMPERF-love NOM=Juan DAT=child his
    Juan₃ loves his child.

b. Minamahal si=Juan₃ ng=nanay niya₃.
   IMPERF-love-OV NOM=Juan GEN=mother his
   Juan₃ is loved by his mother.

(17) a. *Nagmamahal siya₃ sa=anak ni=Juan₃.
    AV-IMPERF-love 3.SG.NOM DAT=child GEN=Juan
    *He loves Juan’s child.

b. *Minamahal siya₃ ng=nanay ni=Juan₃.
   IMPERF-love-OV 3.SG.NOM GEN=mother GEN=Juan
   *He is loved by Juan’s mother.

c. *Minamahal niya₃ ang=anak ni=Juan₃.
   IMPERF-love-OV 3.SG.GEN NOM=child GEN=Juan
   *Juan’s child is loved by him.

(18) a. Nagmamahal ang=nanay ni=Juan₃ sa=kaniya₃.
    AV-IMPERF-love NOM=mother GEN=Juan DAT=him
    Juan’s mother loves him.

---

55I am assuming here that subjects in final position, as in (15c), must c-command other arguments of the same verb. Whether or not the subject in (15a) also c-commands its co-arguments is not crucial to the present argument, since it certainly precedes them.
b. *Nagmamahal sa=kaniya ni=Juan
   AV-IMPERF-love DAT=him NOM=mother GEN=Juan
   Juan’s mother loves him.

(19) a. Nagmamahal ang=nanay niya kay=Juan
   AV-IMPERF-love NOM=mother DAT=Juan
   His mother loves Juan.

b. Minamahal ang=anak niya ni=Juan
   IMPERF-love-OV NOM=child GEN=Juan
   His child is loved by Juan.

In (16), Juan as the subject (whether as agent (16a) or patient (16b)) both precedes and c-
commands the possessive pronoun niya, and so is a possible antecedent. In (17), Juan is a
possessor phrase which neither precedes nor c-commands the pronominal subject (17a-b) or
Actor (17c), and so cannot be the antecedent. Since nominative and genitive pronouns are
second-position clitics, we need to use a pronominal dative object to construct examples which
demonstrate precedence without c-command. The relevant examples are (18a), where the
possessor phrase precedes but does not c-command the pronoun, and (18b), where the possessor
phrase neither precedes nor c-commands the pronoun and thus is not a possible antecedent.

The crucial examples are shown in (19). Here we see that a possessive pronoun inside the
subject NP can take as its antecedent either a dative object (19a) or an Actor phrase (19b) which
follows it. Since the antecedent does not precede the pronoun, rule (14) implies that it must c-
command the pronoun. This proves that the subject phrase must be c-commanded by other
arguments of the verb. In other words, there cannot be a VP constituent which excludes the
subject while including the verb and its other arguments.

---

56One of my consultants rejected these examples. In his idiolect, it seems that only linear precedence is relevant to determining
coreference possibilities. The judgements indicated are those of my teacher and primary consultant.

57Strictly speaking, this data only shows that the subject phrase must be c-commanded by other arguments of the verb when those
other arguments follow the subject. As discussed in section 5.2, a left-branching structure of the kind proposed by Chung (1990)
for Chamorro would also be consistent with the binding facts, but not with the data discussed in section 4.

The arguments in this section are based on the assumption that the dominance relation which is relevant to formulating
the non-coreference rule is defined on phrase structure. It might also be possible to replace the notion of “c-command” in (14)
with the notion of “f-command” defined in Bresnan (1982), but I will not explore this possibility here.
4. Tagalog phrase structure

As a descriptive generalization it seems accurate to say that the order of pre-verbal constituents in Tagalog is quite strictly determined, while the order of post-verbal constituents is much more flexible. In developing an analysis of the surface phrase structure which can account for these facts, I will adopt an X-bar notation similar to that used in current GB work. I will use IP (the projection of an auxiliary position) for sentence or clause-level constituents, and CP (the projection of a complementizer position) for clausal complements, i.e. S'. However, my assumptions about the nature of these categories are different in several respects from standard GB assumptions, as discussed in chapter 1.

The basic clause structure which I will propose for Tagalog is similar to that proposed by Chung and McCloskey (1987) for Irish, shown in figure (1). In this proposal, a small clause (S) is generated as sister to INFL. When the predicate XP is a verb phrase, the underlying word-order is SVO. In finite clauses which lack an auxiliary, Chung and McCloskey assumed that the finite verb would move to INFL to produce the surface VSO order.

My analysis of Tagalog is very similar, as shown in (20). In contrast to most current work in GB, I do not assume that IP is identified with S in all languages. The small clause S (often labelled “SC”) can be thought of as the domain of predication, including both a subject and a predicate. In many languages, S and IP may be identical, but in others (like Tagalog) the two need to be distinguished. S is assumed to be the only exocentric category, i.e. the only one whose category is not determined by that of its head element (except, of course, in languages where S is identified with IP).

(20) Tagalog

For ease of exposition I will begin the analysis of Tagalog phrase structure with a discussion of the constraints on pre-verbal constituents, adopting a “top-down” approach from
CP to IP, S and NP. But first it is necessary to discuss the rules of clitic placement, which will be very important in what follows.

4.1 Clitic placement

The ordering constraints on pronominal arguments are different from those on full NP’s. Nominative and genitive personal pronouns behave like second position clitics, i.e. they appear as the second element of their clause. This means that they will precede all full NP arguments of the clause. If more than one argument of the same clause is pronominal, monosyllabic forms must precede disyllabic forms. All other things being equal, Actor pronominals tend to precede other pronouns. (See Schachter (1973) for details.)

The “second position” rule means that when a negation marker or some other adverbial element appears in initial (pre-verbal) position, all clitics must also precede the verb as in the following example (clitics are underlined):

(21) (Wolfenden, 1967, DL-118)
Hindi mo pa ako mahahagkan sa=noo,
not you(GEN) yet I(NOM) NONVOL.FUT-kiss-DV DAT=forehead

sariwa pa ang=sugat.
fresh yet NOM=wound

You cannot kiss me on the forehead yet, the wound is still fresh.

The question is, how should the notion of “second position” be defined? Bloomfield (1917, p. 143, §47) states that clitics in Tagalog “follow the first orthotonic [i.e., stress-bearing—PRK] ... word of the expression to which they belong”. In other words, clitics normally appear following the first phonologically independent word of the smallest clause or NP which contains them. However, there are several facts which seem to argue against defining the position of these clitics in terms of “the first phonologically independent word”. For example, Schachter and Otanes (1972, pp. 187-189) list several types of phonologically complex expressions which function as a single unit for the purposes of clitic placement. Clitics may never appear inside these expressions, no matter how many phonological words they may contain. These expressions include proper names, numerical expressions, times of day, ages, amounts of money, etc.
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(22) a. [Bukas ng gabi nang alas.otso] siya
   tomorrow GEN night ADV eight.o’clock 3.SG.NOM
   aalis.
   FUT.AV-leave
   It’s tomorrow night at eight that he’s leaving.

b. *Bukas siya ng gabi nang alas.otso
   tomorrow 3.SG.NOM GEN night ADV eight.o’clock
   aalis.
   FUT.AV-leave

(23) a. [Isa=ng taon at apat na buwan] siya.
   one=LNK year and four LNK month 3.SG.NOM
   He is one year and four months old.

b. *Isa siya=ng taon at apat na buwan.
   one 3.SG.NOM=LNK year and four LNK month

A second class of exceptions involves coordinated lexical items as in (24) or repetitive-intensive constructions as in (25):

(24) a. Mabuti, malakas at masaya siya.
   well strong and happy 3.SG.ABS
   He is well, strong and happy.

b. *Mabuti siya, malakas at masaya.
   well 3.SG.ABS strong and happy

   kind LNK kind 2.SG.NOM
   You are very kind.

b. *Mabait ka=ng mabait.
   kind 2.SG.NOM=LNK kind

58Examples like the following may seem to violate the generalization that clitics cannot occur between elements of a coordinated lexical category:

a. [Linutu at kinain] ko ang isda.
   I cooked and ate the fish.
b. ?Linutu ko at kinain ang isda.
   I cooked and (someone) ate the fish.

But there is a crucial difference between these two examples. In (b), the Actor of second verb is ambiguous; it could be interpreted as ‘I’ or someone else. In other words, (b) involves conjunction reduction with Actor pro-drop, not V0-coordination.
Both of these constructions are probably best analyzed as complex lexical (X⁰) categories. The “intensive” adjective in (25) appears to be formed by a rule similar to reduplication, and should probably be treated as a lexical category (A⁰). Similarly, under standard assumptions the conjunction of lexical categories as in (24) is itself a lexical category. The generalization which emerges from the data is that clitics cannot occur inside a lexical category.⁵⁹

Under the analysis of Tagalog phrase structure developed below, a more precise description of the “second-position” occupied by pronominal clitics (and certain adverbial particles which also function as clitics) is the following:

(26) Clitics occur immediately after the first daughter of the smallest maximal projection which contains them.

There is an exception to this rule as well: X’ level categories do not usually host clitics. This problem will be discussed briefly in section 4.5.

Another class of exceptions to the general rule, which will be relevant to our discussion in chapter 6, is pointed out by Sityar (1989). She states that when there are two clitic pronouns in the same clause, only one of them obligatorily appears in second position; clitic-placement is optional for the second pronoun. Thus examples (27a) and (27b) are both grammatical, since one or both of the pronouns may appear in second position. Example (27c), however, in which neither pronoun appears in second position, is ungrammatical.

(27) (from Sityar, 1989, p. 16)
   a. Hindi ko siya na-kita kahapon.
      not  1.SG.GEN  3.SG.NOM  PERF.NONVOL-see-OV yesterday
      I didn’t see him yesterday.
   b. Hindi ko na-kita siya kahapon.
      not  1.SG.GEN  PERF.NONVOL-see-OV  3.SG.NOM yesterday
      I didn’t see him yesterday.
   c. *Hindi na-kita ko siya kahapon.
      not  PERF.NONVOL-see-OV I(GEN)  3.SG.NOM yesterday

This generalization is subject to two constraints. First, if one of the two clitic pronouns is monosyllabic, clitic-placement is obligatory for that pronoun since monosyllabic pronouns must precede disyllabic pronouns. This explains the contrast between (27b) and (28a). Second, clitic

⁵⁹The “may-NP” and “maging-NP” constructions could be analyzed as phrasal affixes which create a lexical category (perhaps V⁰). If this is the correct analysis, the fact that clitics cannot appear inside these constituents supports the claim that clitics cannot occur inside a lexical category.
pronouns never appear in sentence-final position if they can avoid it, i.e. if there is another position available to them. This fact is demonstrated in (28b-c):

(28) a. *Hindi siya na-kita ko  
not 3.SG.NOM PERF.NONVOL-see-OV 1.SG.GEN  
kahapon. yesterday  
(for: I didn’t see him yesterday. )

b. ?*Hindi ko na-kita siya.  
not 1.SG.GEN PERF.NONVOL-see-OV 3.SG.NOM  
(for: I didn’t see him. )

c. *Hindi ko binigyan ng=pera siya.  
not 1.SG.GEN PERF-give-DV GEN=money 3.SG.NOM  
(for: I didn’t give him (the) money. )

In the following section, and in the next chapter, we will make extensive use of clitic placement as a test for the presence of internal clause boundaries.

4.2 Pre-verbal constituents

In pragmatically unmarked clauses, the verb (or other predicator) precedes its arguments. However, there are several constructions in which a nominal or adverbial element appears in pre-verbal position. Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 485 ff.) describe three such constructions, which I will refer to as Topicalization (their “Contrastive Inversion”), ay-Inversion, and Adjunct Fronting (their “Emphatic Inversion”). A fourth, Clefting, will be discussed briefly here for purposes of comparison, but we will postpone an analysis of its structure until section 4.4. The pragmatic function of these constructions was discussed in chapter 3. In this chapter I will address only their syntactic structure.

4.2.1 Internal clause boundaries

The rule of clitic placement discussed in the preceding section gives us an important test for the structure of the constructions under consideration here, particularly for the presence of internal sentence boundaries. The pattern of clitic placement in Topicalization, ay-Inversion, and Clefting indicates that these constructions contain an internal IP-boundary. Notice the post-

---

60Sityar actually states (p. 20): “Sentences are judged ungrammatical when a clitic pronoun occurs after two or more constituents and it is in sentence final position.”
verbal position of the underlined clitic pronouns in the following examples, which indicate that
the verb in each case must be the first word of some IP.

(29) **Cleft:**

\[
\text{Ito=} \text{ng tasa ang } [\text{binili} \quad \text{ko} \quad \text{sa=} \text{pamilihan}].
\]

\[
\text{this=} \text{LNK} \quad \text{cup} \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{PERF-buy-OV} \quad 1.\text{SG.GEN} \quad \text{DAT}=\text{market}
\]

This cup is what I bought at the market.

**ay-Inversion:**

\[
\text{Ito=} \text{ng tasa ay } [\text{binili} \quad \text{ko} \quad \text{sa=} \text{pamilihan}].
\]

\[
\text{this=} \text{LNK} \quad \text{cup} \quad \text{INV} \quad \text{PERF-buy-OV} \quad 1.\text{SG.GEN} \quad \text{DAT}=\text{market}
\]

I bought this cup at the market.

**Topicalization:**

\[
\text{Ito=} \text{ng tasa, } [\text{binili} \quad \text{ko} \quad \text{sa=} \text{pamilihan}].
\]

\[
\text{this=} \text{LNK} \quad \text{cup} \quad \text{PERF-buy-OV} \quad I(\text{GEN}) \quad \text{DAT}=\text{market}
\]

This cup, I bought at the market.

(30) **Cleft:**

\[
\text{Si=} \text{Charlie ang } [\text{binigyan} \quad \text{ko} \quad \text{ng=} \text{pera}].
\]

\[
\text{NOM=} \text{Charlie} \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{PERF-give-DV} \quad 1.\text{SG.GEN} \quad \text{GEN}=\text{money}
\]

Charlie is the one I gave (the) money to.

**ay-Inversion:**

\[
\text{Si=} \text{Charlie ay } [\text{binigyan} \quad \text{ko} \quad \text{ng=} \text{pera}].
\]

\[
\text{NOM=} \text{Charlie} \quad \text{INV} \quad \text{PERF-give-DV} \quad 1.\text{SG.GEN} \quad \text{GEN}=\text{money}
\]

I gave (the) money to Charlie.

**Topicalization:**

\[
\text{Si=} \text{Charlie, } [\text{binigyan} \quad \text{ko} \quad \text{ng=} \text{pera}].
\]

\[
\text{NOM=} \text{Charlie} \quad \text{PERF-give-DV} \quad I(\text{GEN}) \quad \text{GEN}=\text{money}
\]

Charlie, I gave (the) money to.

In the Adjunct Fronting construction discussed in chapter 2, section 4.1.3, on the other
hand, the pattern of clitic placement indicates that there is no internal IP-boundary. This is
shown by the pre-verbal position of the (underlined) clitic pronouns in the following examples.
Since the pronouns must be second in their immediate IP, there can be no IP boundary separating
the fronted adverbial element from the rest of the sentence:

(31) (adapted from Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 496-497)

a. Dito siya magtatayo ng=bahay.

\[
\text{here} \quad 3.\text{SG.NOM} \quad \text{FUT.AV-build} \quad \text{GEN}=\text{house}
\]

Here he will build a house.
   for DAT=Pedro 1.SG.GEN PERF-buy-OV NOM=toy
   For Pedro I bought the toy.

Schachter and Otanes (1972, pp. 488-500) point out that certain adverbs can occur in several of these constructions. In the following examples (based on examples from Schachter and Otanes, and following their English translations) the Topicalization and ay-Inversion constructions in (32b-c) show the pronoun following the verb. However, in the Adjunct Fronting example (32a) the pronoun precedes the verb.

(32)  

a. **Adjunct Fronting**
   Bukas siya aalis.
   tomorrow 3.SG FUT.AF-leave
   It’s tomorrow that he’s leaving.

b. **Topicalization**:
   Bukas, aalis siya.
   Tomorrow, he’s leaving.

c. **ay-Inversion**:
   Bukas ay aalis siya.
   Tomorrow he’s leaving.

These facts indicate that Adjunct Fronting does not involve an internal IP boundary. An explicit analysis of the structure of this construction will be proposed in section 4.3.1.

We have argued on the basis of clitic placement that the Topicalization and ay-Inversion constructions contain an internal IP boundary which the Adjunct Fronting construction lacks. There is also phonological evidence which supports this conclusion. Schachter and Otanes (1972, pp. 493) state that in Topicalization, the fronted element must be set off from the remainder of the sentence by a pause, and that it constitutes a distinct intonation group. In ay-Inversion, the ay is optionally preceded by a pause (p. 485). In Adjunct Fronting, however, the fronted element is never set off by a pause (p. 496); the entire sentence forms a single intonational unit.

### 4.2.2 Categorial distinctions

From inspecting the examples in (29-30) and (32), the only obvious difference between Topicalization and ay-Inversion seems to be the presence of the inversion marker ay in the latter. Both constructions must contain an internal IP, as shown by the clitic-placement facts discussed in the previous section. However, Schachter and Otanes (1972, pp. 487, 495) point out an
interesting difference in the distribution of the two constructions. There is a class of modal verbs (the class referred to as “sentential operators” in chapter 6) which subcategorize for a single clausal argument. When \textit{ay}-Inversion applies to a sentence headed by such a modal, the fronted element can appear either before or after the modal as demonstrated in the following examples:

(33) (Schachter and Otanes, 1972, pp. 487)
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Kailangan=ng magtanim ng=gulay sina=Ben.
    \begin{verbatim}
    need=COMP AV-plant GEN=vegetable NOM.PL=Ben
    \end{verbatim}
    \textit{It is necessary for Ben and the others to plant vegetables.}
  \item b. Kailangan=ng sina=Ben ay magtanim ng=gulay.
    \begin{verbatim}
    need=COMP NOM.PL=Ben INV AV-plant GEN=vegetable
    \end{verbatim}
    \textit{It is necessary for Ben and the others to plant vegetables.}
  \item c. Sina=Ben ay kailangan=ng magtanim ng=gulay.
    \begin{verbatim}
    NOM.PL=Ben INV need=COMP AV-plant GEN=vegetable
    \end{verbatim}
    \textit{It is necessary for Ben and the others to plant vegetables.}
\end{itemize}

Example (33a) shows the basic order, with the modal \textit{kailangan} ‘necessary’ followed by its complement clause. Example (33b) illustrates “local” \textit{ay}-Inversion, i.e. \textit{ay}-Inversion applying within the complement clause, the fronted element appearing immediately after the modal. Example (33c) illustrates “long-distance” \textit{ay}-Inversion, with the fronted element appearing in initial position. In contrast, when Topicalization applies to the same type of sentence, the fronted element can only appear in initial position:

(34) (Schachter and Otanes, 1972, pp. 495)
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Sina=Ben, kailangan=ng magtanim ng=gulay.
    \begin{verbatim}
    NOM.PL=Ben need=COMP AV-plant GEN=vegetable
    \end{verbatim}
    \textit{It is necessary for Ben and the others to plant vegetables.}
  \item b. *Kailangan=ng sina=Ben, magtanim ng=gulay.
    \begin{verbatim}
    need=COMP NOM.PL=Ben AV-plant GEN=vegetable
    \end{verbatim}
\end{itemize}

This contrast can be explained if we analyze Topicalization as placing the fronted element in the \([\text{SPEC, CP}]\) position \(^{61}\) while \textit{ay}-Inversion places the fronted element in the \([\text{SPEC, IP}]\) position. The basic structure which I propose for the two constructions is contrasted in (35). I assume that modals like \textit{kailangan} take a CP complement which consists of the complementizer \textit{na}/\textit{-ng} followed by a sentence (IP). This IP node can dominate an \textit{ay}-Inversion construction, as

\(^{61}\) One might assume that the CP in the Topicalization construction is headed by a null complementizer. But since I am avoiding the use of empty categories, preferring to let even functional heads be considered optional, I will assume instead that there is no C at all in this structure.
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shown in (36). But a Topicalization construction must be dominated by CP, and so cannot appear in the IP position; this is why (34b) is ungrammatical.

(35)  

a. ay-Inversion:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{I'} \\
\text{I} \\
\text{ay} \\
\end{array}
\]

b. Topicalization:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{C'} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{IP} \\
\end{array}
\]

(36)  

\textit{ay-Inversion in modal complement}: (= (33b))

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{I} \\
\text{CP} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{I'} \\
\end{array}
\]

The analysis of \textit{ay}-Inversion as being dominated by IP while Topicalization is dominated by CP makes another correct prediction, namely that when both constructions are present in the same sentence, the topicalized element must precede the inverted element. This constraint, illustrated in the following examples, follows from the fact that the CP in (35b) takes an IP complement, whereas the IP headed by \textit{ay} in (35a) cannot take a CP complement.
(37) (Schachter and Otanes, 1972, pp. 494)

a. Bukas, kami ay magpapahinga.
   tomorrow 1.PL.EXCL.NOM INV FUT.AV-rest
   *Tomorrow, we’ll rest.

a’. *Bukas ay kami, magpapahinga.
   tomorrow INV 1.PL.EXCL.NOM FUT.AV-rest

b. Kami, bukas ay magpapahinga.
   1.PL.EXCL.NOM tomorrow INV FUT.AV-rest
   *We will rest tomorrow.

b’. *Kami ay bukas, magpapahinga.
   1.PL.EXCL.NOM INV tomorrow FUT.AV-rest

The analysis of ay-Inversion proposed above treats the particle ay as a kind of sentence-level AUX, i.e. an auxiliary which takes an IP rather than a VP complement. A different approach was taken by Miller (1988), who assumed that ay is the head of a distinct functional projection which he labelled RP (for “relational phrase”). However, making this distinction would force us to specify that the complement of a modal must contain the complementizer na/-ng followed by either an IP or an RP.\(^6\) Since the same disjunction would appear in a great many other rules as well, it is clear that a significant generalization would be lost.

4.3 The structure of IP

The phrase-structure proposed in (20) assumes a clause (IP) to be headed by an auxiliary or inflected verb (INFL) which takes a specifier and a complement (S). I will begin by discussing the elements which appear in the specifier position of IP ([SPEC, IP]). Section 4.3.2 will deal with the internal structure of S, and section 4.3.3 will discuss the elements which can appear in INFL.

4.3.1 SPEC of IP

Many writers, following Chomsky (1981), have assumed that the [SPEC, IP] position is reserved for the grammatical subject of a clause. However, this is not the only possible view. Kuroda (1988) argues that the [SPEC, IP] position need not be filled at all in Japanese, and that when it is filled it is irrelevant to grammatical relations. Rather, it is simply an available position which allows for word-order variation (scrambling). Diesing (1990) states that the [SPEC, IP] position in Yiddish is a Topic position, which may be filled either by the subject or by almost any

---

\(^6\)Miller does not use the IP projection at all, assuming that a basic clause consists simply of a VP, AP, NP or PP.
other element in the clause. Both writers assume that all arguments of the verb in these two languages are generated inside the VP, and may remain there at S-structure.

I will suggest that in Tagalog, [SPEC, IP] is the position of the fronted element in the Adjunct Fronting construction. The facts of clitic placement discussed in section 4.2.1 indicate that this construction has no internal IP constituent, and the only pre-verbal position available in the basic clause structure proposed in (20) is the [SPEC, IP]. The analysis of the pre-verbal element in the Adjunct Fronting construction as occupying this position makes exactly the right predictions concerning clitic placement.

(38) **Adjunct Fronting**: (=31b)

\[
[\text{Para kay=Pedro}] \text{ ko } \text{ binili } \text{ ang=laruan}.
\]

For Pedro I bought the toy.

There is another interesting piece of evidence favoring this analysis of Adjunct Fronting. Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 497) point out that parallel constraints apply to ay-Inversion and Adjunct Fronting. In both constructions, the same kinds of adverbial elements are systematically blocked from appearing in the pre-verbal position: manner adverbs, frequency adverbs, and “referential” adverbials formed with the prepositions tungkol, hinggil or ukol, all of which mean ‘about’ or ‘on the subject of’ (see Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 456). I have no explanation to offer for these specific constraints, but it seems highly unlikely that the same set of adverbials would be excluded independently in two unrelated constructions. But given the analysis proposed above for these constructions, which assumes in both cases that the fronted element occupies the [SPEC, IP] position, we can formulate a more general constraint which blocks the proscribed adverbs from appearing in that position.
Material in the [SPEC, IP] position must form a constituent. Evidence from clitic placement which supports this claim will be presented in the following section. Further evidence can be found in the scope of negation in the following examples:

(39) a. Hindi siya kinakausap ng=kahit ninuman
   not 3.SG.NOM IMPERF-speak-OV GEN=even anyone(GEN)
   sa=opisina.
   DAT=office
   *No one at all talks to him at the office.

b. [Sa=opisina] siya hindi kinakausap ng=kahit
   DAT=office 3.SG.NOM not IMPERF-talk-OV GEN=even
   ninuman.
   anyone
   *At the office no one at all talks to him.

c. [Hindi sa=opisina] siya kinakausap ng=kahit
   not DAT=office 3.SG.NOM IMPERF-talk-OV GEN=even

   (, pero sa=eskwela).
   but DAT=school
   *It is not at the office that everyone talks to him (but at school).
   (Not: *At the office no one at all talks to him. )

d. [Hindi sa=opisina] siya hindi kinakausap
   not DAT=office 3.SG.NOM not IMPERF-talk-OV
   ng=kahit ninuman.
   GEN=even anyone
   *It is not at the office that no one at all talks to him.

The negative element hindi immediately precedes the material in its scope. The quantified NP kahit sinuman means ‘everyone/anyone at all’ in positive contexts and ‘no one at all’ in negative contexts. In example (39a), the negative in initial position has scope over the whole sentence. In example (39b), a locative adjunct occurs in [SPEC, IP]; the negative has scope over the material in I’ but not over the locative. The crucial example is (39c). Here the negative can only have scope over the locative in [SPEC, IP], and not over the sentence as a whole; the quantified NP is not within the scope of the negative. Since a negative in initial position normally takes scope over the whole sentence, as in example (39a), example (39c) shows that the negative and the fronted locative obligatorily form a constituent. This conclusion is supported
by (39d), which contains two instances of the negative hindi. Double negatives are normally ungrammatical, so the second hindi cannot be interpreted as being in the scope of the first, i.e. the first hindi must take scope only over the locative with which it forms a constituent. These examples show that all material which precedes INFL must form a single constituent.63

As noted in chapter 1, constituents which appear in the [SPEC, IP] position always carry a pragmatic function, either Topic or Focus, in addition to their grammatical relation. Schachter and Otanes speak of Adjunct Fronting as having a contrastive meaning, suggesting that the fronted element bears the Focus function. In addition to Adjunct Fronting, the fronted elements in the ay-Inversion and Clefting constructions may occupy this position. In chapter 3 it was demonstrated that clefted arguments bear pragmatic Focus. When ay-Inversion applies to a subject, the inverted element bears the Topic function, while when ay-Inversion applies to a non-subject, the inverted element bears the Focus function.

As noted in chapter 2, there is a special restriction on Adjunct Fronting, namely that no term (non-oblique) argument can occur in the pre-verbal position of this construction. This is clearly not a general restriction on the [SPEC, IP] position, since subjects may appear there in the ay-Inversion and Clefting constructions. For now I will simply treat the restriction as a construction-specific stipulation.

4.3.2 Discontinuous predicates and the structure of S

Tagalog has no copula. Prepositional, nominal and adjectival phrases may function as predicates in addition to verbs. Examples of each category of non-verbal predicate are given in (40):

(40) a. Predicate Adjective
   Bago ang=mga=kotse=ng iyon.
   new NOM=PL=car=LINK that
   Those cars are new.

b. Predicate PP
   Para sa=iyo ang=mga=liham na iyon.
   for DAT=you(SG) NOM=PL=letter LINK that
   Those letters are for you.

63The clitic pronouns in these examples are used to show that there is no internal clause boundary, but they are not responsible for the obligatory constituency of the pre-verbal negative and locative elements in (39c-d). The same effects can be duplicated with non-pronominal arguments.
c. **Predicate NP**
(from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 495)

Opisyal sa=hukbo ang=panganay.

officer DAT=army NOM=eldest

*The eldest child is an officer in the army.*

These examples are all subject-final, as predicted by the structural diagram in (20). But in some non-verbal clauses, the subject appears right in the middle of the predicate phrase. For example, comparative adjectival predicates normally place the standard of comparison after the subject, as in the following examples:

(41) (from Bowen, 1965, p. 116-117)

a. Mas maganda si=Linda kaysa kay=Tentay.

more pretty NOM=Linda than DAT=Tentay

*Linda is prettier than Tentay.

b. Mas magulo ang=mga=binata kaysa

more bother NOM=PL=young.man than

sa=mga=dalaga.

DAT=PL=young.woman

*The young men are more troublesome than the young women.*

The same pattern is optionally possible with other kinds of adjectival phrases (ex. (42)), as well as NP and PP predicates (ex. (43) and (44) respectively). The following examples are all taken from Sityar (1989, p. 20-21):

(42) a. [Galit kay=Lito] si=Nenette kahapon.

angry DAT=Lito NOM=Nenette yesterday

*Nenette was angry at Lito yesterday.*

b. Galit kahapon si=Nenette kay=Lito.

angry yesterday NOM=Nenette DAT=Lito

*Nenette was angry at Lito yesterday.*

(43) a. [Anak ni=Belen] si=Romy talaga.

child GEN=Belen NOM=Romy really

*Romy is really Belen’s son.*

b. Anak talaga si=Romy ni=Belen.

child really NOM=Romy GEN=Belen

*Romy is really Belen’s son.*
(44) a. [Galing sa=Maynila] si=Ben dati.
    from DAT=Manila NOM=Ben previous
    *Ben is from Manila originally.*

b. Galing dati si=Ben sa=Maynila.
    from previous NOM=Ben DAT=Manila
    *Ben is from Manila originally.*

The examples in (42-44) suggest that there must be two different internal structures for $S$: one in which the predicate phrase forms a constituent, as shown in (45a) (repeated from (20)) and the other a flat structure as shown in (45b):

(45) a. $S$ with predicate-subject configuration

```
       IP
      /    \  I'
 SPEC  I    S
       \  /  \\
      XP  (PRED) NP  (SUBJ)
```

b. flat structure for $S$

```
       IP
      /    \  I'
 SPEC  I    S
       \  /  \\
      X^0  YP  YP
```

If the sisters of the lexical head $X^0$ are freely ordered in (45b), one might think that the structured configuration in (45a) was unnecessary. Both word-order possibilities shown in (42-44) above could be generated by the structure in (45b). However, clitic-placement patterns provide evidence that both structures for $S$ are allowed by the grammar.

Schachter and Otanes (1972, pp. 189-193) list several types of constructions in which clitics may optionally appear following either the first word or the first constituent of their clause. In other words, certain types of predicate phrases may optionally form an opaque constituent for purposes of clitic placement. These include PP’s and AdjP’s which function as
the main predicate of a sentence, as illustrated in the following examples from Schachter and Otanes (1972) (each pair of sentences is perfectly synonymous).

(46) **AdjP as predicate:**
   a. Takot sa=kulog siya.
      afraid DAT=thunder 3.SG.NOM
      *He is afraid of thunder.*
   
   b. Takot siya sa=kulog.

(47) **PP as predicate:**
   a. Galing sa=Maynila siya.
      from DAT=Manila 3.SG.NOM
      *He is from Manila.*
   
   b. Galing siya sa=Maynila.

Notice that with PP and AP predicates, the variation in clitic placement is exactly parallel to the variation in word-order with full NP subjects noted above. (This parallelism was noted by Sityar, 1989). Compare examples (44) and (47), or (46) with (48):

(48) a. Takot sa=kulog si=Jessica.
    afraid DAT=thunder NOM=Jessica
    *Jessica is afraid of thunder.*
   
   b. Takot si=Jessica sa=kulog.

These examples show that clitics can occur “inside” a predicate phrase in just the same contexts as non-clitic subject NP’s, that is, when S has the flat configuration shown in (45b).

Sityar also points out, as noted earlier, that clitic pronouns do not occur in sentence-final position when there is another position farther to the left which they could occupy. Thus the grammaticality of examples (46a) and (47a), with the clitic pronouns in final position, suggests that in these constructions something blocks them from appearing inside the predicate phrase. It appears that predicate phrases are opaque to clitic placement just in case they form a constituent in phrase structure, i.e. in configuration (45a). But this phenomenon is not restricted to predicate phrases.

Prepositional phrases which appear in [SPEC, IP], as in (49), are opaque to clitic placement. This fact was noted by Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 190). But when the same

---

64There seems to be a certain amount of speaker variation in the acceptability of the “a” examples; my consultants consider (46a) to be somewhat childish.
prepositional phrase functions as the predicate of a clause, as in (50), clitics may appear either following the PP as a whole or (preferably, for my consultants) immediately after the preposition itself.

(49)  (from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 190)
   a. Buhat sa=Maynila siya maglalakad.
      from DAT=Manila 3.SG.NOM AV.FUT-walk
      He will walk from Manila.
   b. *Buhat siya sa=Maynila maglalakad.

(50)  a. Buhat sa=Maynila siya.
       from DAT=Manila 3.SG.NOM
       He is from Manila.
   b. Buhat siya sa=Maynila.

   A similar pattern is observed with noun phrases in the following examples. From the “basic” order in (51a), example (51b) is derived by clitic placement of the possessive pronoun ko within the NP. Since the NP functions as the predicate of the clause in this example, it is also possible for the subject pronoun siya to appear inside the NP, as in (51c).

(51)  a. [Matanda=ng kapatid ko] siya.
       old=LNK sibling my 3.SG.NOM
       He is my older brother.
   b. [Matanda ko=ng kapatid] siya.
       old my=LNK sibling 3.SG.NOM
   c. (from Ramos, 1971, p. 173)
      Matanda ko siya=ng kapatid.
      old my 3.SG.NOM=LNK sibling

   However, when the same NP (marked with dative case) appears in the [SPEC, IP] position, the subject pronoun must remain outside the NP, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (52b):

(52)  a. [Sa=matanda ko=ng kapatid] siya nagbigay
       DAT=old my=LNK sibling 3.SG.NOM PERF.AV-give
       ng=sanlibo=ng peso.
       GEN=one.thousand=LNK peso
       To my older brother he gave 1000 pesos.
b. *[Sa=matanda ko siya=ng kapatid] nagbigay
   DAT=old my 3.SG.NOM=LNK sibling PERF.AV-give
   ng=sanlibo=ng peso.
   GEN=one.thousand=LNK peso

An example involving a more complex NP in [SPEC, IP] position, which demonstrates quite strikingly the fact that phrasal constituents in that position are opaque to clitic placement, is presented by Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 190):

(53) [Sa=maliit na bahay sa=probinsya] siya pupunta.
    DAT=small LNK house DAT=province 3.SG.NOM AV.FUT-go
    It’s the little house in the provinces that he’s going to.

The examples in (39) provided evidence that the material which appears in [SPEC, IP] position must form a constituent, whereas examples (41) - (44) and (48) show that a predicate PP or NP need not form a continuous constituent. Thus examples (49) - (53) show that a phrasal category must be opaque to clitic placement precisely when it must form a constituent.

Verbal predicates in Tagalog, unlike NP, PP and AP predicates, fail to exhibit the kind of optional clitic placement illustrated above. Contrast the following examples with examples (46), (47) and (51):

(54) a. Hinagkan ako ng=Nanay.
    PERF-kiss-DV 1.SG.NOM GEN=mother
    I was kissed by mother.
    b. ??Hinagkan ng=Nanay ako.
       PERF-kiss-DV GEN=mother 1.SG.NOM

(55) a. Bumili ka ba ng=bigas?
    AV.PERF-buy 2.SG.NOM Q GEN=rice
    Did you buy some rice?
    b. *Bumili ng=bigas ka ba?
       AV.PERF-buy GEN=rice 2.SG.NOM Q

These examples show that a verb never forms a constituent which can host a clitic with its object or other non-subject arguments. Based on these examples, it appears that verbal predicates never have the configuration in (45a). In other words, there is no VP in Tagalog.

These conclusions suggest that the rule which determines the placement of pronominal clitics can be approximated by the following generalization:
Clitics occur immediately after the first daughter of the maximal projection which forms their domain.

If the first daughter of their domain is an XP, the clitic must follow that XP. Otherwise, the clitic must follow the first lexical (X₀) category in the domain. There is a complication here with respect to the behavior of X’ categories, which we will return to in section 4.5. But the question of immediate concern is how the domain of clitic placement is determined. We have already seen that the IP forms the domain for the placement of clause-level pronominal arguments. Similarly, an NP constitutes the domain of clitic placement for possessive pronouns (see Sityar (1989, p. 31-33) and Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 136-138) for details). Prepositions and adjectives take only dative NP arguments, and dative pronouns are not clitics, so PP and AP do not define clitic domains.

Since pronominal clitics are NP’s, they must be arguments of some head. We will say that an NP is governed by the head of which it is an argument. This head may be lexical, e.g. a finite verb, or phrasal, e.g. a predicate PP. The rule of clitic placement can then be expressed as follows:

Clitics occur immediately after the first (lexical or phrasal) daughter of the smallest maximal projection containing the head which governs them.

Optional clitic placement like that in (50) is explained by the alternation in the category of the first daughter of the clause, the predicate, which is also the head of the clause. The predicate is phrasal in (50a) but lexical in (50b). In either case, the IP is the smallest maximal projection which contains the predicate.

If there were a VP in Tagalog, the rule in (57) would predict that it should form the domain of clitic placement for non-subject pronominal arguments of the verb. The fact that IP is always the domain for such arguments confirms our earlier conclusion that Tagalog lacks the category VP.

The Adjunct Fronting examples in (31-32) show that S does not form a domain of clitic placement either, since pronominal arguments of the clause always precede everything in S when [SPEC, IP] is filled. This fact would constitute a counter-example to (57) if S were a maximal

---

65One of the traditional tests for constituency, coordination, cannot be used to test this claim because all apparent instances of VP-coordination would be licensed by the Conjunction Reduction phenomenon discussed in chapter 2. However, there are many instances of Conjunction Reduction, such as the examples in (30) of chapter 2, which could not be analyzed as VP-coordination even if Tagalog did have a VP constituent.
projection. But under the assumption that S is the only exocentric category, S would not be predicted to have the properties of a maximal projection since it is not strictly speaking a “projection” at all. Thus the failure of S to define a domain of clitic placement argues against a possible alternative analysis under which the S constituent would be relabelled as a maximal projection of the predicate, e.g. a “VP” which contains its own subject.

In summary, patterns of clitic placement indicate that there must be two different expansions of S in Tagalog, as shown in (45). Only the second of these options is available for verbal clauses, because there is no VP in Tagalog. Both structures can be generated by the following phrase-structure rules. Recall that the head of each constituent is mapped onto the same f-structure as its mother, so the annotations (or indexes) on heads can be assigned by default rule as proposed by Grimshaw (1982). I will also assume that the default for functional projections is that they are double-headed, so both daughters of I’ would get the same index as their mother. “DF” stands for one of the Discourse Functions, Topic or Focus. The notation following the third rule is intended to mean that the first element in S is the head and that all sisters of the head are assigned a grammatical relation.

(58) IP → (XP) I’  (DF)
    I’ → I0 S
    S → (X0) YP* (HD < GR)

INFL is assumed to carry the feature [+TNS], so this position is unavailable to predicate nominals and prepositions, which cannot be inflected for aspect. The unification of optional lexical head positions is equivalent to positing a transformational rule of head-to-head movement, in this case V-to-I. Since the two head positions are adjacent, there is little direct evidence for V-movement in Tagalog. However, both positions are needed because both are filled simultaneously in auxiliary and complex predicate constructions. In the following section we will discuss some of the evidence for positing two distinct head positions; further evidence will be presented in chapter 6.

4.3.3 INFL

In the preceding section I proposed a non-transformational analogue of a verb-movement analysis for Tagalog. The intuition underlying this analysis is that tensed verbs and auxiliaries occur in a unique position. In this section, I will motivate the existence of two distinct head
positions, one inside S and the other dominated by INFL, and present some evidence for the claim that the material in S forms a constituent which excludes INFL. I will then show that Tagalog clauses which contain more than one predicate obey the following generalization:

(59) Only the first predicate in a clause can be inflected for tense; and the first predicate in a clause must be inflected for tense if it can be.

This observation motivates the assumption that tensed verbs always appear in the initial head position, INFL. Given the existence of an auxiliary position and the requirement that tensed verbs must appear there, a “verb-movement” type of analysis seems to be a fairly natural way to account for the data.

4.3.3.1 Huwag as an auxiliary

Many Philippine languages have auxiliary verbs, e.g. Kimaragang Dusun (Kroeger, 1988); Samareño (Wolff, 1973). Some related Formosan languages are extremely rich in auxiliaries, e.g. Atayal (Egerod, 1965). But in Tagalog, the only true auxiliary element seems to be huwag ‘don’t’, the negative imperative auxiliary. Huwag is always followed by a non-finite form of the verb. A linker (-ng/Ø) intervenes between the auxiliary and the following verb, but since huwag ends in a consonant, this linker is only visible when a clitic pronoun immediately follows the auxiliary. I analyze this linker, both with huwag and in the construction discussed in the next section, as being left-adjoined to S, for reasons that will be discussed in the next section and in chapter 6.

The following examples show that an oblique NP in [SPEC, IP] can precede huwag, and that when this happens clitics must also precede huwag. This pattern is predicted by the configuration in (20) if we assume that huwag is dominated by INFL.

(60) a. [Sa=opisina] mo huwag basahin ang=diyario.
    DAT=office 2.SG.GEN don’t read-OV NOM=newspaper
    In the office don’t read the newspaper.

b. ??[Sa=opisina] huwag mo=ng basahin ang=diyario.
    DAT=office 2.SG.GEN don’t read-OV NOM=newspaper

The clitic placement facts alone do not force us to recognize a constituent boundary between the auxiliary and the following verb. That is, they do not force us to recognize INFL and S as distinct (sister) constituents. The facts would be predicted equally well by assuming

66The modal verbs discussed in chapter 6 can also function as auxiliaries.
either that the auxiliary and following verb form a constituent which is not opaque to clitic placement, e.g. a V’, or by positing a totally flat structure in which both the auxiliary and the following verb are sisters of the verb’s arguments. Evidence for the existence of an S constituent is seen in the following examples, which involve coordination of a constituent which contains everything following the auxiliary, i.e. coordination of S:

(61) a. Huwag mo=ng [iwan-an ang=aklat sa=eskwela]
don’t 2.SG.GEN=LNK leave-DV NOM=book DAT=school

  o [ibigay sa=kapatid mo];
or IV=give DAT=sibling 2.SG.GEN

dalhin mo sa=akin.
bring-OV 2.SG.GEN DAT=me

Don’t leave the book at school or give it to your brother;
bring it to me.

b. Huwag mo=ng [kagalit-an ang=anak
don’t 2.SG.GEN=LNK scold-DV NOM=child

  ng=kapitbahay mo] o [paluin ang=kaniya=ng aso].
gen=neighbor your or beat-OV NOM=his=LNK dog

Don’t scold your neighbor’s child or beat his dog.

(62) Huwag ka=ng [umiyak] at [sumigaw

don’t 2.SG.NOM=LNK AV-cry and AV-shout

  sa=kapatid mo].
DAT=sibling 2.SG.GEN

Don’t cry and scream at your sister!

Example (62) shows that the conjoined S’s do not have to be parallel in structure. Notice that only the first conjunct in these examples is preceded by the linker clitic. This suggests that the linker is adjoined to S, as shown in figure (63), rather than for example forming a constituent with the embedded V. The structure of example (61b) is shown below:
4.3.3.2 Complex predicate constructions

In addition to the negative imperative construction discussed in the previous section, there are other constructions in Tagalog in which a single clause contains more than one predicate. One such construction involves an adjective plus a non-finite verb. Notice the alternation of verb forms in the following examples:

(64) a. Regular magsimba ang=Nanay ko.
   AV-worship NOM=mother my
   My mother is faithful in attending Mass.

   b. Nagasisimba ang=Nanay ko nang regular.
      IMPERF AV-worship NOM=mother my ADV regular
      My mother attends Mass faithfully.

      AV-worship NOM=mother my ADV regular

(65) a. Matagal sila=ng magtrabaho.
      slow they(NOM)=LNK AV-work
      They are slow in working.

   b. Nagtatrabaho sila nang matagal.
      IMPERF AV-work they(NOM) ADV slow
      They work slowly.
c. *Magtrabaho sila nang matagal.
   \(\text{AV-work NOM they(they)}\ \text{ADV slow}\)

In the (a) sentences, an adjective appears in initial position followed by a non-finite verb form in what appears to be a kind of a complex predicate construction. In the (b) sentences, the adjective appears finally, preceded by the adverbial particle \textit{nang}. In the latter construction, the verb form is obligatorily inflected for tense (or aspect), as shown by the contrast between the (b) and (c) sentences.

We can account for these patterns by assuming that the initial predicate of a complex predicate is the element which appears in INFL. The difference between the (a) and (b) sentences is that the initial adjective in the (a) sentences functions as an auxiliary, occupying the position in which the “tensed” element of the clause must appear. When the adjective appears in a postposed adverbial phrase, the verb must appear in its finite form because it is the head of a finite clause. Thus the fact that only the initial predicate in a complex predicate construction can be inflected for tense follows from the assumption that tensed verbs must appear in INFL.

Compare the adjectival examples in (64-65) above with the adverbial examples in (66-67):

(66) \hspace{40pt} \text{from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 452}
   \begin{enumerate}
   \item a. Bigla=ng binuksan ni=Fred ang=pintuan.
   \hspace{40pt} \text{su}dently=LNK PERF-open-DV GEN=Fred NOM=door
   \hspace{40pt} \text{\textit{Fred opened the door suddenly}.}
   \item b. Binuksan ni=Fred ang=pintuan nang bigla.
   \hspace{40pt} \text{PERF-open-DV GEN=Fred NOM=door ADV suddenly}
   \hspace{40pt} \text{\textit{Fred opened the door suddenly}.}
   \end{enumerate}

(67) \hspace{40pt} \text{from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 435}
   \begin{enumerate}
   \item a. Mabilis na naglakad si=Pedro.
   \hspace{40pt} \text{fast LNK PERF.AV-walk NOM=Pedro}
   \hspace{40pt} \text{\textit{Pedro walked quickly}.}
   \item b. Naglakad si=Pedro nang mabilis.
   \hspace{40pt} \text{PERF.AV-walk NOM=Pedro ADV fast}
   \hspace{40pt} \text{\textit{Pedro walked quickly}.}
   \end{enumerate}

While (66b) and (67b) seem to be structurally identical to (64b) and (65b), there is an important difference in the (a) sentences, where the adverbial element appears in initial position. Adjectives, like verbs, common nouns and preposition phrases, can function as the head of a
clause, but adverbs cannot. The adverbs in (66a) and (67a) are simply modifiers of the head verb, and so occupy a different structural position from the adjectives in (64a) and (65a), which are themselves the heads of their clauses. This structural difference has at least three observable effects. The most obvious of these is that a non-finite verb form appears after the initial adjectives in (64a) and (65a), whereas the verbs in (66a) and (67a) are finite forms, just as in the corresponding sentences with the adverbs in final position ((66b) and (67b)). Second, a different linker appears between the adjectives and the verbs which follow them than between the adverbs and the verbs which they modify (\(-ng/\emptyset\) in (64a) and (65a), \(na/-ng\) in (66a) and (67a)). Third, adverbial modifiers may either precede or follow their verbal heads, as in the following example. Adjective-verb complex-predicate constructions, on the other hand, cannot in general be reversed. 66

\[(68) \quad \text{(from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 437)}\]
\[a. \quad \text{Bigla=}ng \quad \text{umalis} \quad \text{ang=}bisita. \quad \quad \text{The guest suddenly left.}\]
\[\quad \text{suddenly=}\text{LNK} \quad \text{PERF.AV}-\text{leave} \quad \text{NOM}=\text{guest}\]
\[b. \quad \text{Umalis} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{bigla} \quad \text{ang=}bisita. \quad \quad \text{The guest left suddenly.}\]
\[\quad \text{PERF.AV}-\text{leave} \quad \text{LNK} \quad \text{suddenly} \quad \text{NOM}=\text{guest}\]

I suggest that adverbial modifiers form a V’ constituent with the verbs they modify, as shown in figure (69b). The structure of the adjective + verb construction is illustrated in (69a):

\[(69) \quad a. \quad (=\ 64a)\]
\[\text{Regular} \quad \text{magsimba} \quad \text{ang=}\text{Nanay ko.} \quad \quad \text{My mother is faithful in attending Mass.}\]

\[\text{Regular} \quad \text{magsimba} \quad \text{ang} \quad \text{Nanay ko}\]

\[\text{INFL} \quad \text{S} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{NP}\]

\[\text{Regular} \quad \text{magsimba} \quad \text{ang Nanay ko}\]

\[67 \text{Mabilis, like many other } ma- \text{ adjectives, can be used both as an adverb and as an adjective, and so could appear in either of the patterns discussed here.}\]

\[68 \text{Such reversal may be possible with the } ma- \text{ adjectives, which can also be used as adverbs, but this would result in a change in meaning.}\]
b. (= 66a)

\[
\text{Bigla}=\text{ng} \quad \text{binuksan} \quad \text{ni}=\text{Fred} \quad \text{ang}=\text{pintuan}.
\]

suddenly=LNK \quad \text{PERF-open-DV} \quad \text{GEN}=\text{Fred} \quad \text{NOM}=\text{door}

Fred opened the door suddenly.

The infinitival Action constructions discussed in chapter 4, section 4.2, appear to have the same structure as the Adj + V complex predicates in (64-65) above. Assuming that this is correct, the following example, in which an S has undergone Right Node Raising, provides further support for the existence of an S-constituent:

(70) Mabuti, pero hindi importante=ng, magsuot

good but not important=LNK \quad \text{AV-wear}

ng=korbata kung bibisita ka sa=kanila.

GEN=necktie if FUT.AV-visit 2.SG.NOM DAT=them

It is nice, but not important, to wear a tie when you visit them.

Notice that although both adjectives end in a vowel, only the second one has the linker clitic attached to it. This shows that the linker is part of the embedded S constituent, and not adjoined to the matrix predicate.

4.3.4 Further notes on IP

In the preceding section, I argued that the finite element in an Aux + V or complex predicate construction must appear in the INFL position as a sister to the S constituent. For the sake of maximum generality, I will assume that head of a simple finite verbal clause (i.e. the finite verb) also occupies the INFL position.

This analysis suggests a new generalization concerning the puzzling distribution of the linker -ng/Ø. Under the analysis proposed above, this linker appears between multiple predicates in a single clause, as when the clause contains an auxiliary or in complex predicate constructions.
Examples like (70) above suggest that the linker adjoins to S, rather than to the verb. The fact that it must always immediately precede the embedded verb follows from the fact that the lexical head must always be initial in S.

The observable differences between a complex predicate construction and a V’ constituent include constraints on word order and the choice of linkers. Secondary predicates of the sort discussed in chapter 2, section 2.5, appear to form a V’ constituent with the main verb of the clause. This is indicated by the alternation in word-order, the use of the na linker, and the invariant tense marking on the verb in the following examples from Aspillera (1969, p. 156):

(71) a. Dumating na pagod ang=ama ko.
PERF.AV-arrive LNK tired NOM=father my
My father arrived tired.

b. Pagod na dumating ang=ama ko.
tired LNK PERF.AV-arrive NOM=father my
My father arrived tired.

(72) a. Nag-balik na gutom ang=lalaki.
PERF.AV-return LNK hungry NOM=man
The man returned hungry.

b. Gutom na nag-balik ang=lalaki.
hungry LNK PERF.AV-return NOM=man
The man returned hungry.

For non-verbal clauses, I have assumed that nothing appears in INFL. One might suppose that non-verbal clauses are not IP’s at all, but rather consist simply of an S constituent, that is, a matrix small clause as proposed by Rapoport (1987). However, the matrix small clause analysis would predict that there could be no [SPEC, IP] position in non-verbal clauses. This prediction is incorrect, as demonstrated in the following examples:

(73) a. [Noon=ng Lunes] ako nasa Maynila.
at.time=LNK Monday 1.SG.NOM at Manila
On Monday I was in Manila.

b. [Sa=opisina] siya amo, pero [sa=bahay] siya alipin.
DAT=office 3.SG.NOM boss but DAT=house 3.SG.NOM slave
At the office he is the boss, but at home he is a slave.

---

69 One could also assume that INFL contains a null copula, but I know of no evidence to support such a claim.
c. [Noon=ng giyera] ako opisyal sa=hukbo.
   at.time=LNK war 1.SG.NOM officer DAT=army
   During the war I was an officer in the army.

The placement of clitic pronouns in these examples shows that the initial oblique or
adjunct element occupies the [SPEC, IP] position. This means that non-verbal clauses must form
an IP. The same holds for non-finite complements as well:

(74) a. Binabalak ko=ng
   IMPERF-plan-OV 1.SG.GEN=COMP
   [bukas siya bisitahin].
   tomorrow 3.SG.NOM visit-OV
   I am planning to visit him tomorrow.

b. Inutusan ko si=Maria=ng
   PERF-order-DV 1.SG.GEN NOM=Maria=COMP
   [dito ako salubungin].
   here 1.SG.NOM meet-OV
   I ordered Maria to meet me here.

In these examples, the clitic pronouns in the complement clause occur before the verb
because there is an adverbial element in the [SPEC, IP] position. Thus, while one might assume
that the non-finite verb in these examples is dominated by S rather than INFL, the non-finite
complement itself must constitute an IP constituent, since the [SPEC, IP] position is filled. Even
though IP is assumed to be a projection of the finite element, not all IP’s contain an inflected
element. This is consistent with our assumption that heads can be optional.

I am assuming that finite verbs can only occur in the INFL position; however, it is not the
case that only finite verbs can only occur in this position. In English, even non-finite
complements can contain auxiliary verbs, as in “The teacher warned the students to be working
when she returned.” Similarly, non-finite complements in Tagalog can contain auxiliaries or
complex predicates, as in the following examples. In these examples, the complement INFL
position is filled by an auxiliary element, even though the complement clause is non-finite. The
structure of sentence (75c) is shown in (76).
(75) a. Inutusan ng=Nanay si=Maria=ng huwag
   PERF-order-DV GEN=mother NOM=Maria=COMP don’t

   Ø kain-in ang=kendi.
   LNK eat-OV NOM=candy
   Mother ordered Maria not to eat the candy.

b. Napilitan si=Manuel na bilis-an=ng
   PERF.NONV-force-DV NOM=Manuel COMP fast-DV=LNK

   anihin ang=palay.
   harvest-OV NOM=rice
   Manuel was forced to harvest his rice quickly.

c. Ipinagbilin ng=guro si=Juan=ng
   PERF-IV-instruct GEN=teacher NOM=Juan=COMP

   lakas-an=ng magsalita.
   loud-DV=LNK AV-talk
   The teacher instructed Juan to speak loudly.

(76) (= 75c)

Finally, examples like the following seem to provide evidence that a mono-clausal structure in Tagalog can have at most one auxiliary. That is, the INFL position must be unique. In (77a), the INFL position is occupied by the verbal element bilisan, derived from the adjective stem bilis ‘fast’. In (77b), the INFL position is occupied by the negative auxiliary huwag, while the head position in S is occupied by the main verb kumain ‘eat’; so there is no position avialable
for bilisan to occupy, and the sentence is ungrammatical. In order to express the meaning intended for (77b), the speaker has two options. Either the main verb can be changed into a gerund, as in (77c), making it possible for bilisan to occupy the head position in S; or the adverbial form mabilis can be used, appearing in sentence-final position as in (77d).

(77)  a. Bilis-an mo=ng kumain!
    fast-DV  2.SG.GEN=COMP AV-eat
    Eat quickly!

    b. *Huwag mo=ng bilis-an=ng kumain!
    don’t  2.SG.GEN=COMP fast-DV=LNK AV-eat
    (for: Don’t eat quickly!)

    c. Huwag mo=ng bilis-an ang=pagkain mo!
    don’t  2.SG.GEN=COMP fast-DV NOM=GER-eat 2.SG.GEN
    Don’t hurry your eating!

    d. Huwag ka=ng kumain nang mabilis!
    don’t  2.SG.NOM=COMP AV-eat ADV fast
    Don’t eat quickly!

4.4 Equative clauses and Clefting

As mentioned above, NP’s may serve as clausal predicates but they are never case-marked in this position. A distinct type of clause structure, the Equative construction, involves the juxtaposition of two NP’s, both of which are marked for nominative case. Equative clauses do not contain any copula or other verbal element. In addition to the structural difference between nominal predicates and equative clauses, i.e. the lack of case marking in the former, there is a semantic difference as well. Both nominal elements in an Equative clause are normally definite, whereas nominal predicates are normally generic.\(^{70}\)

Clefting involves an Equative sentence of the form NP-NP, in which the second NP is a headless relative clause. Some examples, repeated from (29-30), are shown in (78):

(78)  a. [Ito=ng tasa] [ang binili ko
    this(NOM)=LNK cup NOM PERF-buy-OV 1.SG.GEN
    sa=pamilihan].
    DAT=market
    This cup is what I bought at the market.

\(^{70}\)This means that relative clauses do not appear in nominal predicates, since restrictive relative clauses create specific NP’s and non-restrictive relative clauses normally take definite heads.
b. [Si=Charlie] [ang binigyan ko ng=pera].
   NOM=Charlie NOM PERF-give-DV 1.SG.GEN GEN=money
   *Charlie is the one I gave (the) money to.*

The first NP is the subject of the clause, with the headless relative functioning as a
“predicate” phrase. Since Tagalog clauses are normally predicate-initial, this suggests that
clefting involves an inversion construction similar to those discussed in section 4.2. I assume
that both NP’s in a regular Equative clause are daughters of S, while a clefted NP (i.e., the
subject of a cleft sentence) appears in some preposed position. But before discussing the phrase
structure of cleft sentences, it is necessary to clarify the structure of headless relative clauses,
which means that we must also say something about relative clauses and NP’s in general.

Adjectives and other nominal modifiers can, like adverbs, either precede or follow the head
which they modify. Moreover, the same linker appears between head and modifier in both cases.
I will therefore assume that adjectives form an N’ constituent with the head noun, analogous to
the V’ constituent in (69b). Case-markers are always the first element in their phrase, and non-
pronominal genitive possessor phrases are always last. Some linguists have analyzed the case-
markers as prepositions, treating all NP’s as PP’s. This analysis is consistent with the fact that
Tagalog is in general a head-initial language, but otherwise it does not seem to be well-
motivated.71 For now I will simply treat case-markers as proclitics to the NP, pending future
investigation of their position in phrase structure. I will assume that the [SPEC, NP] position
contains the possessor phrase, if any. The basic structure which I am assuming for the noun
phrase is something like the following:

---
71 For one thing, lexical prepositions always take dative NP’s as objects. Under the “case-marker as preposition” analysis, this
would mean that lexical prepositions take PP’s as objects while “functional prepositions” (i.e. case-markers) take NP’s as objects.
A number of other distributional generalizations would require the same distinction between lexical and functional prepositions.
Another way of accounting for the initial position of the case-marker might be to assume that the case-marker is
actually the head of a KP (“Case Phrase”), as proposed by Lamontagne and Travis (1987). But again, aside from the head-initial
word order tendency, it is not clear that there is any strong motivation in Tagalog for this proposal.
Relative clauses, like other modifiers, can either precede or follow their head noun. Moreover, the body of the relative clause constitutes a domain for clitic placement, as shown by the position of the clitic pronoun ko in the following examples:

(80) (from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 124)

a. Pumunta ka sa [tindahan=ng [pinuntahan ko]].
   \[AV-go \text{ you(NOM)} \text{ DAT store=LNK PERF-go-DV I(GEN)}\]
   \textit{Go to the store that I went to.}

b. Pumunta ka sa [[pinuntahan ko]=ng tindahan].
   \[AV-go \text{ you(NOM)} \text{ DAT PERF-go-DV I(GEN)=LNK store}\]
   \textit{Go to the store that I went to.}

These observations indicate that the body of the relative clause is immediately dominated by IP, and that it joins with the head noun to form an N’ constituent, as shown in the following diagram:

(81) Relative clause (=80a; order of N’ elements may be reversed)
representations, this means that a headless relative clause will consist of an IP immediately dominated by an N’.

Returning to the analysis of cleft sentences, it was stated above that the headless relative functions as the “predicate” of an equative construction with a preposed subject NP. We could assume that the clefted element (the subject) appears either in [SPEC, CP] or [SPEC, IP]. Since the headless relative clause contains an IP which forms a domain of clitic placement, we cannot use clitic placement to distinguish these two possibilities. But examples like the following show that clefted Wh-words follow the complementizer in embedded questions, suggesting that clefted elements appear in [SPEC, IP].

(82) Itinanong niya kung sino ang bibisitahin
PERF-IV-ask 3.SG.GEN if who NOM FUT-visit-OV
mo.
2.SG.GEN
He asked who you are going to visit.

If this conclusion is correct, then we may assume that the structure of cleft sentences is as shown in (83):
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4.5 Clitic placement and modifiers

In section 4.1, the rule of clitic placement was formulated as follows (repeated from (57)):

(84) Clitics occur immediately after the first (lexical or phrasal) daughter of the smallest maximal projection containing the head which governs them.

It was noted there that a complication arises when the initial constituent of the domain is an X’ category, i.e. a lexical head plus its modifier(s). Normally, X’ categories are “transparent” for purposes of clitic placement. In other words, the clitics are not hosted by the X’ constituent as a whole but by its first lexical daughter, as in the following example:

(85) [Bigla niya=ng binuksan] ang=pintuan.
    suddenly 3.SG.GEN=LNK PERF-open-DV NOM=door
    He opened the door suddenly.

Here the first constituent of the IP is a V’ consisting of [Adv + V]. The clitic appears inside the V’, immediately following the adverb. (Recall that a head and its modifier may appear in either order relative to each other.) But examples like the following suggest that, provided the modifier is in initial position, a V’ may optionally host a clitic; clitics may immediately follow either the head or the modifier.\(^{72}\)

\(^{72}\)My impression is that the order in the (b) examples, in which the clitic appears following the X’ constituent, is reasonably natural in N’ (Adj + N) constructions but relatively disfavored in V’ (Adv + V) constructions.
(86) (from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 193)
a. [Madalas ko=ng naririnig] iyon.
   often 1.SG.GEN=LNK IMPERF-hear-OV that(NOM)
   I’ve often heard that.

(87) (from Sityar, 1989, p. 24)
a. [Bigla nila=ng pinasok] ang=silid.
   suddenly 3.PL.GEN=LINK PERF-enter-OV NOM=room
b. [Bigla=ng pinasok] nila ang=silid.
   They suddenly entered the room.

My consultants find the (b) examples less natural than the (a) examples, but both are grammatical. However, this variation is only possible when the modifier is in initial position. When the head comes first, it appears that clitics can only appear inside the X’ constituent, immediately following the head, as in example (88c); it is extremely unnatural for the clitic to follow the modifier, as in (88d):

(88) a. [Unti-unti niya=ng isinulat] ang=kaniya=ng
   little-by-little 3.SG.GEN=LKNK PERF-IV-write NOM=his=LKNK
   huli=ng paalam.
   last=LKNK farewell
   Little-by-little he wrote his final farewell.
b. [Unti-unti=ng isinulat] niya ang=kaniya=ng
   little-by-little=LKNK PERF-IV-write 3.SG.GEN NOM=his=LKNK
   huli=ng paalam.
   last=LKNK farewell
c. [Isinulat niya=ng unti-unti] ang=kaniya=ng
   PERF-IV-write 3.SG.GEN=LKNK little-by-little NOM=his=LKNK
   huli=ng paalam.
   last=LKNK farewell
d. ?*[Isinulat na unti-unti] niya
   PERF-IV-write LKNK little-by-little 3.SG.GEN
   ang=kaniya=ng huli=ng paalam.
   NOM=his=LKNK last=LKNK farewell
Thus there appears to be a difference between XP and $X^0$ categories on the one hand, which always function as clitic hosts when they are the initial constituent in a domain, and $X'$ categories on the other, which do not in general host clitics but may optionally do so provided the head is the last element in the $X'$. These facts obviously require a more complicated mechanism for clitic placement than has been assumed thus far.

It is not possible to deal adequately with these issues within the context of the present work. One approach which could be explored might be to define the locus of clitic placement in terms of prosodic structure, as has been proposed by Zec and Inkelas (1991) among others, rather than purely in terms of syntactic constituency. Clause-level clitics in Tagalog are always adjacent to the INFL position, since INFL will always be the first or second element in the clause. This suggests that these clitics could be base-generated in INFL, specifically as the leftmost element in INFL, with a prosodic subcategorization which requires them to have at least one prosodic constituent of the appropriate size (e.g. a phonological phrase) to their left. The prosodic parsing algorithm which builds phonological phrases might look first for maximal projections, mapping each XP in the domain onto a phonological phrase. Then it could assign each remaining lexical projection to its own phonological phrase. This procedure would account for all examples discussed above except (86b) and (87b); some special procedure would be needed to account for these. Clearly, these suggestions are highly tentative, and I will not try to develop them further here.

5. Problems for a configurational analysis

In section 4, I argued that the phrase structure of verbal clauses in Tagalog is non-configurational, in that both the subject and object are sisters of the verb within the exocentric constituent S. In this section, I will discuss two alternative analyses which treat Tagalog as a configurational language. The first is a very interesting proposal by Guilfoyle, Hung and Travis (in press) which argues that Philippine languages actually have two structural subject positions, one filled by the Actor and the other by the nominative argument. The second alternative is an adaptation of the “Subject Adjunction” analysis proposed by Chung (1990) for Chamorro, which assumes that the subject is base-generated in a structural subject position ([SPEC, IP]) and can optionally be lowered into the VP to create the appearance of non-configurationality. Both approaches are successful in accounting for certain aspects of Tagalog grammar, but I will argue
that neither can provide an adequate analysis for the full range of facts discussed in the preceding sections.

5.1 Two structural subjects (Guilfoyle, Hung and Travis)

Guilfoyle, Hung and Travis (in press) attempt to account for the apparent split in subjecthood properties in a number of Malayo-Polynesian languages in purely structural terms. Their basic proposal, drawing on the work of Fukui and Speas (1986), Koopman and Sportiche (1988), Kuroda (1988) and others, is that there are two subject positions available. One of these (SPEC of VP) is internal to the verb phrase, the other (SPEC of IP) is external. For Philippine-type languages, which are strongly verb-initial, the configuration would be as shown in (89):

\[(89)\] D-structure:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{I'} \\
\text{SPEC} \\
\text{INFL} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{SPEC} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{NP}
\end{array}
\]

Guilfoyle et al. propose that all arguments of the verb are generated within the VP at D-structure. The most prominent theta-role (i.e. the role of the Actor or logical subject) is assigned to the argument in SPEC of VP position. One argument of the verb moves up to the external subject position (SPEC of IP), and the verb itself moves up to INFL. The result is a verb-initial S-structure pattern, as shown in (90):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{IP} \\
\text{I'} \\
\text{SPEC} \\
\text{INFL} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{SPEC} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{NP}
\end{array}
\]
The Guilfoyle et al. proposal has a number of attractive features. It correctly predicts the preferred position of the Actor and subject in non-active clauses, and it allows a natural explanation of how a patient can be selected as the grammatical subject (i.e., SPEC of IP) without the agent (SPEC of VP) being demoted to oblique or adjunct status. The analysis also provides an account for at least some of the grammatical subjecthood properties discussed in chapter 2.

For example, Guilfoyle et al. suggest that floated quantifiers are adjoined to INFL and licensed by AGR, which is co-indexed with the NP in the [SPEC, IP] position. This co-indexation explains why floated quantifiers are interpreted as modifying that NP. Guilfoyle et al. account for the fact that only grammatical subjects can be extracted by proposing that the VP is a barrier to extraction in Malayo-Polynesian languages, and that the [SPEC, IP] position provides an “escape hatch”. Thus only the element which moves to [SPEC, IP] can be extracted.

These successful aspects of the Guilfoyle et al. analysis are an impressive achievement. However, the analysis is less successful on other points, such as control and binding, and runs into serious problems with certain word-order facts, particularly for languages like Cebuano. Since their proposal is the most successful attempt that I know of to relate grammatical relations in Philippine languages to surface phrase structural positions, it is worthwhile discussing in some detail the points at which the analysis breaks down.\(^73\)

\(^{73}\)I will not attempt to show here why the morphological analysis proposed for Malagasy, and the Case-theory explanation for NP movement to the SPEC of IP position, cannot be extended to Philippine languages, as Guilfoyle et al. assume. Kroeger (1990b) discusses this problem and proposes a solution maintaining the same basic assumptions about S-structure and D-structure configurations.
Perhaps the strongest evidence against the Guilfoyle et al. analysis comes from the data on pronominal coreference discussed in section 3.2 of this chapter. Examples like (19a-b) show that subjects in Tagalog are c-commanded by their co-arguments, which should be impossible under the Guilfoyle et al. proposal. However, the examples in (19) are not in the most basic word-order; this was necessary in order to separate c-command from linear precedence. Such sentences could not be generated at all under the Guilfoyle et al. proposal as it stands, but would require the addition of some additional mechanism such as “scrambling” rules. Depending on how such rules were defined, they might alter the c-command relationships between the subject and other arguments as well as the linear order of elements.

But even in sentences exhibiting basic word-order, the c-command relationships are not consistent with the S-structure proposed by Guilfoyle et al. This structure predicts that Actors, which are generated in [SPEC, VP], should c-command all other non-subject arguments of the verb. However, this is not the case as shown in the following examples:

(91) a. Itinago ni=María_i sa=asawa niya_i ang=pera.
    IV-PERF-hide GEN=María DAT=spouse her NOM=money
    *María_i hid the money from her_i husband.

b. Itinago ng=asawa ni=María_i sa=kaniya_i ang=pera.
    IV-PERF-hide GEN=spouse GEN=María DAT=her NOM=money
    Maria’s_i husband hid the money from her_i.

c. *Itinago niya_i sa=asawa ni=María_i ang=pera.
    IV-PERF-hide 3.SG.GEN DAT=spouse GEN=María NOM=money
    *She_i hid the money from Maria’s_i husband

d. Itinago ng=asawa niya_i kay=María_i ang=pera.
    IV-PERF-hide GEN=spouse her DAT=María NOM=money
    Her_i husband hid the money from María_i.

All of these sentences exhibit “basic” word order, and so are consistent with the structure posited by Guilfoyle et al. In (91a) the antecedent María is the Actor. Since it precedes the pronoun niya, we cannot tell whether it also c-commands it or not. In (91b) the antecedent is a possessor to the Actor; it precedes but does not c-command the pronoun. In (91c) the antecedent neither precedes nor c-commands the pronoun and coreference is impossible, as predicted by principle (14).
In (91d) the antecedent (Maria) does not precede the pronoun. Therefore the fact that the example is grammatical with the intended coreference means that the antecedent must c-command the pronoun. But notice that the antecedent is a dative argument (“indirect object”), while the pronoun is part of the Actor phrase. This means that the Actor is c-commanded by the dative NP. This would be impossible if the Actor is in [SPEC, VP] while the dative NP is inside V’, as predicted by the Guilfoyle et al. analysis. Rather, these facts support the hypothesis that Tagalog clause structure is flat, and that all arguments of the verb are sisters.

Of course, Guilfoyle et al. do not discuss pronominal coreference at all. Let us consider the success of their analysis in accounting for the data which they use to motivate it. With regard to the unique properties of Actors, they adopt essentially the position which I argued for in chapter 2, namely that these properties are due to semantic (thematic) prominence rather than a unique grammatical relation. But they conclude:

However, as Agents are always base-generated in SPEC of VP, it is possible to maintain a purely structural account of these binding facts, with the antecedents of reflexives and PROs being associated with the structural position SPEC of VP. (p. 32)

They do not go into any details about how such an account might be constructed, but on the face of it this approach would seem to make the wrong predictions for both the binding and the control facts. To begin with, a “purely structural account” of reflexive binding would presumably predict that a reflexive pronoun cannot c-command its antecedent. However, on their analysis that is exactly what must be true in simple sentences like the following:

(92) Sinisisi ni=Maria ang=kaniya=ng sarili.
IMPERF-blame-OV GEN=Maria NOM=her=LNK self
Maria blames herself.

The nominative reflexive in [SPEC, IP] must c-command its antecedent, the Actor, in [SPEC, VP]. Yet this sentence is not only grammatical, it is the preferred way to express this meaning. If a purely structural account is to be given for these facts, one would have to assume that Binding Condition A applies at D-structure in Tagalog.\(^\text{74}\) Since Guilfoyle et al. adopt the UTAH (Uniformity of Theta Assignment Hypothesis) of Baker (1988), the assumption that the principles which govern reflexive binding hold at D-structure is completely equivalent to saying

\(^{74}\)Or perhaps at LF, if D-structure is completely reconstructed at LF.
that they are defined in terms of the thematic hierarchy, as proposed by Bell (1976) and Andrews (1985).

Control (Equi) constructions are also problematic for the Guilfoyle et al. analysis. The fact that an overt Actor is always licensed in [SPEC, VP] shows that this position is governed and Case-marked. Guilfoyle et al. suggest that the verb + voice-marker complex in INFL somehow licenses all arguments to remain inside the VP except for the grammatical subject, which is licensed in [SPEC, IP] by SPEC-head agreement. Kroeger (1990b) argues that a more plausible analysis of the morphology (at least for Philippine languages) requires one to assume that all non-subjects get inherent Case, realized on the Actor as GEN. Whatever the mechanism for licensing overt Actor phrases, Guilfoyle et al. (fn. 20) are forced to assume that [SPEC, VP] is only optionally governed and Case-marked, in order to allow PRO to appear in the [SPEC, VP] position (i.e., to allow the Actor to be the controller). They note that a similar proposal has been made for Irish by McCloskey (1984) and Chung and McCloskey (1987). But this assumption certainly weakens the empirical content of the analysis.

Quite apart from questions of elegance and empirical content, their assumption that [SPEC, VP] is optionally governed and Case-marked seems to interact with their theory of passivization to make a false prediction. Guilfoyle et al. propose that the presence of an oblique by-phrase in passive constructions is determined by the ability of the [SPEC, VP] to receive Case in a particular language:

Finally, strong predictions can be made about the presence or absence of adjunct by-phrases in various languages depending on the status of the SPEC of VP and the SPEC of IP in these languages. (p. 42)

They predict that when [SPEC, VP] can be licensed at S-structure, there will be no need for an oblique or prepositional by-phrase to express the agent of a passive. They cite Malay as an example of a language which allows both possibilities, with the passive agent either being licensed in the SPEC of VP or appearing as an adjunct phrase with the preposition oleh. Now if [SPEC, VP] is only optionally governed and Case-marked in Tagalog, then we would expect optionally to get oblique agent phrases in non-active clauses, as in Malay. But this never happens. If the proposed theory of passivization is correct, it would seem that [SPEC, VP] must

---

In order to account for examples like those in (32-33) in chapter 2, they might need to assume a flat V’, with all arguments of the verb except the Actor generated as sisters of V. This would obviously contradict UTAH, but since nothing else in their analysis crucially hinges on UTAH anyway, it would probably not be an insurmountable problem.
always be governed in Tagalog. The control facts would have to be accounted for by allowing PRO to be governed, in violation of the PRO theorem, or by assuming that the controllee in Tagalog is actually pro instead of PRO. The latter is closest in spirit to the analysis proposed in chapter 4 of the present work.

The basic word-order patterns of Tagalog and other Malayo-Polynesian languages are cited by Guilfoyle et al. as one of the primary motivations for their analysis. We have already noted how the analysis accounts for the post-verbal position of Actors and final position of subjects in non-active clauses. This they correctly take to be the most basic word order. They do not attempt to provide an account for alternative word orders, which (as demonstrated in (2)) are perfectly grammatical. One can imagine a rule of “Heavy NP Shift”, which could be invoked to account for examples like (4b) and (5). Some more drastic kind of scrambling mechanism would be needed to account for other possible constituent orders, such as those in (19) and the following examples. The flexibility of word order which makes it necessary to appeal to such rules reduces the motivation for the kind of highly articulated phrase structure which they propose.

(93) a. Binigyan ang=pangulo ni=Juan ng=liham.
   PERF-give-DV NOM=principal GEN=Juan GEN=letter
   Juan gave the principal a/the letter.

b. Ibinigay sa=pangulo ni=Juan ang=liham.
   IV-PERF-give DAT=principal GEN=Juan NOM=letter
   Juan gave the letter to the principal.

c. Ibinigay ang=liham sa=pangulo ni=Juan.
   IV-PERF-give NOM=letter DAT=principal GEN=Juan
   Juan gave the letter to the principal.

Guilfoyle et al. state that their proposal is intended to account only for the unmarked word order possibilities. Presumably if rules such as Heavy NP Shift or scrambling were adopted, the sentence patterns resulting from the application of such rules would be considered to be marked. But some other mechanism would still be needed to account for the word order in Tagalog active clauses in which the Actor-subject immediately follows the verb, rather than appearing in clause-final position. As pointed out in section 2 of this chapter, the VSX order is just as “basic” as the VXS order, and so should not be derived via scrambling rules. Guilfoyle et al., noting this fact, conclude that Actor-subjects may optionally fail to move to the [SPEC, IP] position, and can remain in [SPEC, VP] at S-structure. (To account for this failure, they again rely on the
The hypothesis that INFL optionally governs down into the SPEC of VP position and licenses the Actor to remain there. Yet these post-verbal subjects have the same properties with respect to extraction, quantifier float etc. as subjects in clause-final ([SPEC, IP]) position. This presents a problem for their analysis, since those properties are explained in purely configurational terms.

The same problem arises for both active and non-active clauses in Cebuano. The preferred order in non-active clauses in Cebuano is V-Actor-Subj-Obj-Oblique (Bell, 1976; Dryer, 1978). To account for this basic order, Guilfoyle et al. propose that all nominative phrases remain internal to the VP in Cebuano, rather than moving to the [SPEC, IP] position. Now nominative NP’s in Cebuano have the same unique status with respect to quantifier float and extraction as in Tagalog. Thus the “internal subject” proposal, while offering an explanation for the word order facts, creates a major problem for the analysis, which predicts that only the argument in the [SPEC, IP] position should exhibit these properties.

Guilfoyle et al. suggest (page 36) that an expletive “pro” (a null dummy pronoun) appears in [SPEC, IP] which is co-indexed with the subject. At LF, the subject moves into [SPEC, IP] to replace this expletive, motivated by a principle of grammar which prohibits expletives from occurring in LF. This proposal would make the correct prediction about floating quantifiers, which are evaluated at LF. It is more difficult to see how this hypothesis would account for Wh-movement, which must occur at S-structure. The subject must be able to move through [SPEC, IP], which provides the only “escape hatch” for extraction, at S-structure, but it cannot remain there until LF. In other words, some mechanism is required which will ensure that only empty categories can remain in [SPEC, IP] at S-structure.

However these technical difficulties might be resolved, the use of expletive null pronouns is an exceedingly powerful mechanism. These invisible coindexing relations are assumed to have important consequences in the syntax, yet they are constrained neither by the normal

76L. Travis (p.c.) and T. Payne (p.c.) inform me that the word-order preference in Cebuano is more flexible than Dryer’s paper implies. However, what is important here is simply that the Actor precedes the subject in the most basic or preferred ordering. Moreover, a number of other Philippine languages exhibit the order discussed here either obligatorily or as a strong preference.

77They explain the position of the subject, immediately following the trace of V, by assuming that instrumental and locative voice constructions are the result of preposition incorporation (Baker, 1988). The V+P complex moves into INFL, but its trace assigns Case to the prepositional object (i.e. the instrumental or locative subject) under adjacency. Unfortunately for their hypothesis, they propose the same analysis for instrumental and locative voice constructions in Tagalog and Malagasy, but are forced to stipulate that in these languages the V+P complex in INFL can license everything except the prepositional object, which must move to [SPEC, IP] to get Case (fn. 10). This is obviously a violation of Baker’s Government Transparency Corollary.

78Perhaps Wh-movement at S-structure would have the effect of replacing the expletive with a trace. If there is some principle which would ensure that an expletive can only be replaced by something it is coindexed with, this would explain why only the subject can pass through the escape hatch in [SPEC, IP]. Some additional stipulation would still be needed to ensure that [SPEC, IP] could contain a Wh-trace or an expletive pro at S-structure, but not an overt NP.
binding principles for pronominal elements nor by the normal principles governing empty
categories. Moreover, in many languages expletives can only be coindexed with indefinite NP’s.
Thus it seems surprising that in Tagalog and Cebuano these invisible expletives should be
coindexed only with subjects, which are virtually always definite.

In summary, the crucial assumption of the Guilfoyle et al. analysis is that Actors and
subjects can be associated with specific positions in surface phrase structure ([SPEC, VP] and
[SPEC, IP], respectively). Word-order and anaphora facts in Tagalog and Cebuano show that this
assumption cannot be maintained. Rather, an optimal analysis seems to require us to assume that
semantic roles such as Actor and grammatical relations such as subject are defined independently
of phrase structure, and are only indirectly mapped onto structural positions.

5.2 Subject Adjunction (Chung, 1990)

The proposal of Guilfoyle et al. that the subject in Cebuano is co-indexed with a null
pleonastic element in [SPEC, IP] is very similar to the Subject Adjunction analysis proposed for
Chamorro by Chung (1990). Chung argues that the subject in Chamorro is base-generated in
[SPEC, IP], with VOS as the underlying word-order. The preferred VSO order is derived by the
subject moving down into the VP and adjoining to V. Other possible orders arise when the
subject adjoins to any projection of V. When the subject moves, it leaves behind a null expletive
element with which it is co-indexed.

(94) VSO order in Chamorro (Chung, 1990)
No attempt (to my knowledge) has thus far been made to extend this analysis to Philippine languages, but the structural similarities between Tagalog and Chamorro make it seem like a possibility that should be explored. As a first approximation one might simply adopt the analysis proposed by Chung for Chamorro, with the minimal adjustments necessary to make it fit the Philippine facts, along something like the following lines: Assume that the nominative NP (the subject) is base-generated in [SPEC, IP]. The subject can optionally move down into the VP and adjoin to some projection of V, in which case it is replaced by a null expletive pronoun with which it is co-indexed. The S-structure of a Cebuano non-active clause under this analysis would be as shown below:

(95)

Of course, this analysis cannot be evaluated at the level of detail one might like, because it has never been developed as a serious proposal for the Philippine languages. But at first glance, it seems to have some descriptive advantages over that of Guilfoyle et al. First, it cannot be falsified by evidence from pronominal coreference. In the left-branching configuration which Chung assumes, linear precedence is directly correlated to hierarchical dominance; the adjoined subject is c-commanded by all and only the arguments which follow it. That is, all co-arguments of the subject will either precede or c-command it. Thus the rule of pronominal non-coreference in (14) cannot distinguish between this left-branching phrase structure and the flat structure proposed for Tagalog in section 4.

Chung does not discuss the mechanism by which this “replacement” is permitted, but cites as a precedent similar proposals by Rizzi and Burzio for analyzing free inversion in Italian.
Second, the Subject Adjunction hypothesis provides a very natural account for much of the word-order variation which was so problematic for the Guilfoyle et al. proposal. Since the subject can adjoin to any projection of V, it can appear following any constituent in the VP. Of course, this alone will not account for all the word-order possibilities unless we also assume that the mapping of non-subject arguments to positions in the VP is flexible, contrary to the assumption of Guilfoyle et al. under the UTAH. Moreover, the distinction between marked and unmarked word orders, which was so important to Guilfoyle et al., becomes merely a matter of stipulation under the Subject Adjunction hypothesis. One would have to assume that Subject Adjunction is a marked option for Tagalog non-active clauses. It is an unmarked option for Tagalog active clauses if the subject adjoins to V₀, but marked if the subject adjoins to some higher projection of V. Subject Adjunction is the preferred option for both types of clauses in Cebuano, though the preferred adjunction sites are different: the subject adjoins to V₀ in active clauses and to V' in non-active clauses. These stipulations could presumably be related to the functional or pragmatic constraints on linear precedence stated in (3); but it is significant that linear precedence rather than constituency is the phenomenon for which it is possible to state well-motivated generalizations.

One reason that these stipulations as to when Subject Adjunction occurs seem so arbitrary is that no explanation has been given as to why it occurs. In the proposal by Guilfoyle et al., NP movement to [SPEC, IP] was assumed to be motivated by the Case theory; the subject had to move in order to get Case. In contrast, it is not at all clear what principle of grammar could motivate the Subject Adjunction operation.

The Subject Adjunction hypothesis could not give a structural account for the binding and control facts, even at D-structure, since D-structure is not assumed to reflect thematic prominence. It would presumably account for the facts of quantifier float in the same way as Guilfoyle et al., in terms of movement at LF. Constraints on extraction would be most readily accounted for by an external ordering constraint: Wh-movement must precede Subject Adjunction. Assuming once again that VP is a barrier, this ordering makes the correct prediction that only the element base-generated in [SPEC, IP] (i.e., the subject) can be extracted. Of course, this kind of external rule ordering is a very powerful device and is not normally allowed within

---

80The assumption that the Actor NP is the immediate sister of the verb within V' is of course unusual, but could perhaps be justified by the “deep ergativity” of the grammar.
most versions of GB; but I will not attempt here to propose other ways of accounting for the extraction facts under this analysis.

One aspect of Tagalog grammar which seems quite problematic for the Subject Adjunction hypothesis is the pattern of clitic placement. First, if the [SPEC, IP] is assumed to be post-verbal and filled by either the subject or a null expletive, then some other, pre-verbal position must be posited for the initial element of the Adjunct Fronting construction. This position must be within the same minimal IP as the verb, because whatever constituent fills this position obligatorily hosts any clitic pronominal arguments of the verb, as illustrated in (31). In effect, we would have to assume that IP has two specifier positions, one initial (the Adjunct Fronting position) and the other final (the subject position). This complication of the X-bar schema has no independent motivation.

Second, it is not clear how the Subject Adjunction hypothesis could account for the asymmetry between verbal and non-verbal clauses with respect to clitic placement illustrated in (46-47), (51) and (54-55) above. Under this hypothesis, it would be necessary to stipulate that VP is the only maximal projection which cannot host a clitic. In section 4, the clitic placement facts were cited as evidence that Tagalog lacks a VP constituent entirely; this conclusion is incompatible with the Subject Adjunction analysis.

In the previous section it was observed that co-indexation to a null expletive element is an extremely powerful mechanism, especially since it is not subject to constraints which are normally assumed to apply to pronominal elements and empty categories. The Subject Adjunction operation is just as powerful formally, and in fact even more problematic from a theoretical standpoint. It involves a radically new kind of movement, one which does not leave a trace in the usual sense but instead creates a null pronominal “replacement” in the vacated position. This new kind of movement is thus exempt from the constraints which normally make downward movement impossible. Chung offers some justification for this relatively drastic innovation on the grounds that VSO languages force us to modify either the theory of movement or the theory of phrase structure. She proposes that the theory of movement should be made less constrained in order to preserve the theory of phrase structure in essentially its standard form. However, we have seen that adopting the Subject Adjunction analysis for Tagalog would necessitate making undesirable modifications to the phrase structure analysis as well, in order to account for the facts of clitic placement and other data discussed in this chapter.
Finally, it should be pointed out that the Subject Adjunction hypothesis involves a “structural” representation of grammatical relations only in a very limited, technical sense. All subjects, regardless of semantic role, are assumed to be base-generated in the [SPEC, IP] position. This implies that the voice alternations in Philippine languages\textsuperscript{81} are the result of lexical rules operating on argument structure (precisely the hypothesis adopted in the present study), rather than instances of NP movement. In other words, NP’s do not get to be subjects by moving into the subject position. Rather, they are base-generated in that position because they have already been designated as subjects. Thus even if the syntactic properties of subjects could be successfully explained in terms of their structural position, the grammar would still have to contain some prior notion of subjecthood which is independent of phrase structure.

\textsuperscript{81}Chung (1990) does not discuss passivization in Chamorro, but assumes that passive subjects are base-generated in [SPEC, IP]. Thus the comments in the text would seem to hold for Chamorro as well.
Chapter 6.
Modal verbs and Clause Reduction

1. Introduction

In this chapter I will discuss Clause Reduction in Tagalog. The defining property of this construction is that it involves an alternation between a biclausal structure, i.e. one clause embedded within another, and a monoclausal structure containing two predicates but no internal clause boundary. The term “Clause Reduction” was coined by Aissen and Perlmutter (1983), who describe a similar construction in Spanish. Other authors (Rizzi, 1982/1978; Rosen, 1989) have referred to this construction in Romance languages as “restructuring”.

A second goal of this chapter is to describe the behavior of modal verbs in Tagalog, in particular their ability to trigger Raising and Equi. After demonstrating the general patterns which can be observed in the behavior of modal verbs, I will focus on developing an account for several apparent exceptions to these generalizations. These exceptions will be shown to provide additional evidence for the existence of the Clause Reduction construction. In each case, the exceptions involve pronouns in a special way. I will argue that a unified explanation for these exceptions can be given by analyzing the problematic sentences as monoclausal, i.e. instances of Clause Reduction. What looks like Raising or Equi is actually the result of the normal rules of clitic placement, discussed in chapter 5, applying within these complex monoclausal constructions.

The Clause Reduction pattern is not restricted to modal verbs. It can also apply to normal Equi constructions, as will be shown in section 3.5 below. The analysis which will be proposed treats Clause Reduction as a process of argument structure composition, in which the argument structures of two distinct predicates, which share a common argument, merge to form a single complex predicate. I will use the formal representation of argument merger proposed by Alsina and Joshi (1991) for causative constructions.

Clause Reduction does not create a new kind of structure, but rather exhibits the same structural properties as the AUX + V and Adj + V constructions discussed in chapter 5, section 4.3.3. In both cases, only the initial predicate (the one occupying the INFL position) may be
inflected for tense, while case marking and grammatical relations are determined by the subordinate predicate (the one internal to S). I assume that this structure is base-generated in the case of Clause Reduction, as it is for those other constructions, rather than being created by a syntactic “restructuring” operation on the phrase structure.

2. *Modals*

Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 262 ff.) describe various Tagalog sentence patterns involving a class of predicates which they refer to as “pseudo-verbs”, and which I will call “modals”. These predicates differ from normal verbs in several respects. They are morphologically defective, accepting neither voice- nor aspect-marking affixation, and (with a single exception) allow no variation in subject-selection.

The seven modal predicates which Schachter and Otanes discuss may be classified according to their syntactic behaviour. They exhibit two quite distinct patterns. The first pattern involves those predicates which take an NP object in their most basic usage. This construction is exemplified in the following examples:

(1) a. Gusto ko ang=litson.
   want 1.SG.GEN NOM=roast.pork
   *I want/like the lechon (roasted pork).*

b. Ayaw ni=Pedro ito=ng baro.
   not.want GEN=Pedro this(NOM)=LNK shirt
   *Pedro doesn’t want/like this shirt.*

I will refer to predicates of this type as “experiencer-modals”, because they seem to be a special class of experiencer verbs. They are lexically specified as taking two arguments, an experiencer and a goal. The experiencer is always marked for genitive case. The goal may be nominal, as in (1), prepositional (as in “I like (it) in Manila”) or sentential (e.g. “I want John to win”). Other predicates in this class which are mentioned by Schachter and Otanes include *ibig* and *nais*, which both mean ‘want’ or ‘like’.

The second pattern is characteristic of the sub-class of modals which I will refer to as “sentential operators”. Predicates of this type can generally take neither an experiencer nor an...
NP object. In their most basic usage they take as their sole argument a sentence, which may be finite or non-finite:

(2) a. Dapat na babasahin ni=Pedro iyon=ng
    should COMP FUT-read-OV GEN=Pedro that(NOM)=LNK
    liham.
    letter
    *It is fitting for Pedro to read that letter.*
    or: *Pedro should read that letter.*

b. Puwede=ng babasahin ni=Pedro iyon=ng
    possible=COMP FUT-read-OV GEN=Pedro that(NOM)=LNK
    liham.
    letter
    *It is possible that Pedro will read that letter.*

c. Maaari=ng sinurat ni=Pedro iyon=ng
    possible=COMP PERF-write-OV GEN=Pedro that(NOM)=LNK
    liham.
    letter
    *It is possible that Pedro wrote that letter.*

One predicate can occur in either of these two patterns, namely *kailangan* ‘need; necessary’.

(3) a. Kailangan ko ang=singsing ng=Ninong.
    need 1.SG.GEN NOM=ring GEN=godfather
    *I need Godfather’s ring.*

b. Kailangan=ng nagaaral nang mabuti si=Armand.
    need=COMP IMPERF-AV-study ADV well NOM=A.
    *It is necessary for Armand to study hard.*

There is a third type of predicate which must be included in our discussion of modals. This class includes a number of words which are basically nouns, such as *kaya* ‘ability’, *ugali* ‘habit’, *hilig* ‘pleasure’ etc., but which can also function as Equi predicates. I will refer to words in this class as “modal nouns”.83 The Equi pattern will be illustrated in the following section.

83In terms of the discussion in ch. 4, we might say that the modal nouns are “obligatory control” modals, in that they function as modals only in Equi constructions; while experiencer modals are “non-obligatory control” modals, in that they allow but do not require the Equi construction.
2.1 Equi

Both experiencer modals and modal nouns can function as Equi predicates. As shown in chapter 4, the target (controllee) of the Equi construction must (normally) be the Actor of the complement clause. Thus the clearest cases of Equi (as opposed to Raising or some other construction) will be those in which the complement verb is marked for non-Active voice, i.e. where the subject of the complement clause is not the Actor. The following example contrasts a simple sentential complement construction in which there is no control relation (4a), with an Equi construction in which the Actor of the complement clause is controlled by the experiencer of the matrix verb (4b).

(4) (adapted from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, pp. 266)

a. Gusto ni=Maria=ng lutuin ko ang=pagkain.
   want GEN=Maria=COMP cook-OV 1.SG.GEN NOM=food
   Maria wants for me to cook the food.

b. Gusto ni=Maria=ng lutuin ang=pagkain.
   want GEN=Maria=COMP cook-OV NOM=food
   Maria wants to cook the food.

While the Actor of the Equi complement clause, as the controllee, must be unexpressed, the subject and all other normal arguments of the embedded verb may be overtly expressed. In the following example, the overt arguments of the complement clause are a benefactive (the subject), a theme and a goal:

(5) (from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, pp. 269)

Kailangan ko=ng isulat ang=Tatay ng=liham
need 1.SG.GEN=COMP BV-write NOM=father GEN=letter

kay=Ricardo.
DAT=Ricardo

I need to write a letter to Ricardo for Father.

Any of the experiencer modals and modal nouns can appear in Equi patterns like the following:
(6) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gusto} & \quad \text{Ayaw} & \quad \text{Ibig} \\
\text{Kailangan} & \quad \text{Kaya} & \quad \text{Ugali} & \quad \text{Hilig}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
i=\text{Miguel} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{basahin} \quad \text{ang=diyario.}
\]
\[
\text{GEN= Miguel} \quad \text{COMP} \quad \text{read-OV} \quad \text{NOM=newspaper}
\]

*Miguel* \{wants, doesn’t want, wants, needs, is able, is accustomed, enjoys\} to read the newspaper.

However, such constructions are marginal with the sentential operators *maaari* and *puwede*, and impossible with *dapat*. Notice that *maaari* and *puwede*, to the extent that they allow the Equi pattern at all, require the controller (Miguel) to bear nominative case, in contrast to the genitive case marking in (6).\(^{84}\) With *dapat*, the construction is impossible whether the controller bears nominative or genitive case.

(7) \[
\begin{align*}
\text{??Maaari} & \quad \text{??Puwede} \\
\text{*Dapat}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
i=\text{Miguel} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{basahin} \quad \text{ang=diyario.}
\]
\[
\text{NOM= Miguel} \quad \text{COMP} \quad \text{read-OV} \quad \text{NOM=newspaper}
\]

*Miguel* \{can, can, should\} read the newspaper.

In general the sentential operator type of modal predicate does not permit Equi constructions, as shown by the examples in (7). Thus the grammaticality of the following type of sentence seems problematic:\(^{85}\)

(8) *Puwede ko=ng basahin ang=Intsik.*

possible 1.SG.GEN=COMP read-OV NOM=Chinese

*It is possible for me to read Chinese.*

or: *I can read Chinese.*

This example seems to have all the structural features of an Equi construction, especially in light of the second possible English translation, since the Actor of the complement verb is apparently unexpressed. But note that the “controller” in this example is a pronoun, while the controllers in the ungrammatical examples in (7) are full NP’s. Crucially, examples like (8) are possible only when the Actor is expressed by a pronoun. This restriction is not normally a

\(^{84}\)My consultants accept “Equi”-like structures with the controller-Actor in genitive case as marginally acceptable under a special “emphatic” interpretation, e.g. “Puwede ni Marcos na ipapatay ka.” (‘Marcos can have you killed.’). The position of the clitic pronoun *ka* suggests a bi-clausal structure. Whether this is related to the “Actor-Raising” phenomenon discussed below remains to be investigated. In both cases only proper names are even marginally acceptable for my consultants.

\(^{85}\)The complementizer *na* and the linker -*ng* have homophonous allomorphs following a final vowel or */n/*. I have glossed the velar nasal clitic in example (8) as a complementizer to be consistent with the suggestion that it involves an Equi construction, but under the analysis given in section 3 this clitic is actually the linker -*ng*. 
property of Equi constructions in Tagalog. In section 5, we will present an analysis of such examples showing that they are not Equi structures, but actually involve a “reduction” or “restructuring” of the clause.

2.2 Raising

As mentioned in chapter 2, Raising applies only to grammatical subjects but is not in general restricted to any particular thematic role(s). Under certain circumstances, both experiencer modals and sentential operators can function as Raising predicates. But this is possible only when the subject of the complement clause is also the Actor of that clause, i.e. when the complement verb is marked for Active Voice.

Two apparent counter-examples to this claim are the “Actor Raising” pattern reported by Miller (1988) and a very interesting phenomenon which I will refer to as “Parasitic Control”, in which Raising appears to be licensed only when Equi also applies. In this section I will argue that neither is an instance of true Raising. In section 5, I will present an alternative analysis of the problematic constructions.

2.2.1 Actor-Subject Raising

Some examples of Raising constructions involving modals are given below:

(9) Gusto ako ni=Manuel na magbili ng=isda.
    want 1.SG.NOM GEN=Manuel COMP AV-sell GEN=fish
    Manuel wants me to sell fish.

(10) Gusto ni=Linda si=Jessica na mag-aral
    want GEN=Linda NOM=Jessica COMP AV-study
    nang mabuti.\(^{86}\)
    ADV well
    Linda wants Jessica to study hard.

In these examples the subject of the matrix verb, I in (9) and Jessica in (10), controls a gap which corresponds to the embedded subject. This gap is also an Actor due to the Active Voice marking on the embedded verb. In Tagalog, Raising of non-Actor subjects is impossible when the matrix verb is a modal. This interesting restriction is apparently quite specific to Tagalog.

\(^{86}\)My consultants find (10) acceptable but slightly awkward, for reasons as yet unknown to me.
According to Shibatani (1988), there is no such constraint in Cebuano, a very closely related language:

(11) **Cebuano** (from Shibatani, 1988, p. 122-123):

a. Gusto ko nga basajhon ni=Juan like 1.SG.GEN COMP read-GF GEN=Juan  
   kining libro. 
   this(NOM) book 
   *I desire that Juan read this book.*

b. Gusto ko kining libro nga basa-hon like 1.SG.GEN this(NOM) book COMP read-GF  
   ni=Juan. 
   GEN=Juan 
   *I want this book to be read by Juan.*

Example (11b) shows the output of the Raising rule applied to (11a). In (11b) the subject of the lower clause (the thing to be read) is controlled by the subject of *gusto* (i.e., *this book*). But in Tagalog, such constructions are impossible. Example (12b) would be the output of (12a) after the embedded subject, *the national anthem*, is raised into the matrix subject position; but the result is ungrammatical.

(12) a. Gusto ko=ng awitin ni=Marina want 1.SG.GEN=COMP sing-OV GEN=Marina  
   ang=pambansang.awit. 
   NOM=national.anthem 
   *I want for Marina to sing the national anthem.*

b. *Gusto ko ang=pambansang.awit na awitin ni=Marina.  
   want 1.SG.GEN NOM=national.anthem COMP  
   awitin ni=Marina. 
   sing-OV GEN=Marina*

In contrast, Raising applies freely to non-Actor subjects when the matrix verb is a non-modal Raising predicate such as *inasahan* ‘expect’. Note the contrast between (11b) and (13b):
(13) a. Inasah-an ko na awit-in ni=Linda
    expect-DV 1.SG.GEN COMP sing-OV GEN=Linda
    ang=pambansang.awit.
    NOM=national.anthem
    *I expected (for) Linda to sing the national anthem.

b. Inasah-an ko ang=pambansang.awit na
    expect-DV 1.SG.GEN NOM=national.anthem COMP
    awitin ni=Maria.
    sing-OV GEN=Maria
    *I expected the national anthem to be sung by Linda.

These examples show that Raising is restricted to Actor subjects when the matrix verb is a modal. This is not an idiosyncratic property of *gusto*, but is true for all modals which allow Raising at all:

(14) a. **Actor Subject:**
    Ayaw ko si=Armand na
    not.want 1.SG.GEN NOM=Armand COMP
    magluto ng=suman.
    AV=cook GEN=rice.cake
    *I don’t want Armand to cook suman.

b. **Non-Actor Subject:**
    *Ayaw ko si=Armand na bigyan
    not.want 1.SG.GEN NOM=Armand COMP cook-DV
    ni=Imelda ng=premyo.
    GEN=Imelda GEN=prize
    (For: *I don’t want Armand to be given the prize by Imelda.*)

(15) a. **Actor Subject:**
    Ibig ako ni=Manuel na pumatay ng=aso.
    want 1.SG.NOM GEN=Manuel COMP AV=kill GEN=dog
    Manuel wants me to kill the dog.
b. **Non-Actor Subject**:

*Ibig ako ni=Manuel na patayin
want 1.SG.NOM GEN=Manuel COMP kill-OV

ng=komunista.
GEN=communists

(For: *Manuel wants me to be killed by the communists.* )

Sentential operators also allow Raising, as in (16a), and are also subject to the restriction that Raising cannot apply to non-Actor subjects, as demonstrated in (16b):  

(16) a. **Actor Subject**:

\[
\underline{\text{Maaari}} \quad \text{si=Miguel na magbasa ng=diyario.} \\
\underline{\text{Puwede}} \quad \text{NOM=Miguel COMP read GEN=newspaper} \\
\underline{\text{Dapat}} \quad \text{ni=Miguel}.
\]

*Miguel {can, can, should} read a/the newspaper.*

b. **Non-Actor Subject**:

\[
\underline{*Maaari} \quad \text{ang=diyario na basahin ni=Miguel.} \\
\underline{*Puwede} \quad \text{NOM=newspaper COMP read-OV GEN=Miguel} \\
\underline{*Dapat} \quad \text{ni=Miguel.}
\]

(For: *The newspaper{can, can, should} be read by Miguel.* )

But, as with the Equi construction, pronouns exhibit exceptional behavior with regard to Raising. In the following example, a non-Actor subject pronoun appears to have undergone Raising:

(17) Dapat ka=ng gantihan ng=amo mo.
should 2.SG.NOM=COMP reward-DV GEN=boss your

*You should be rewarded by your boss.*

Examples like (17) appear to falsify our claim that Raising can apply only to subjects. Miller (1988) reports this type of Raising as applying also to full NP’s, but my consultants reject such examples. In the next section we will examine his data in greater detail.

### 2.2.2 “Actor-Raising”?

Miller (1988) presents the following examples to demonstrate that the sentential operators *dapat* and *maaari* allow Raising of both non-subject Actors and non-Actor subjects. (The “?”

---

87The examples in (16a) appear to be ambiguous between Raising and Equi, because the embedded verb is marked for Active Voice and so the controllee is both Actor and subject. However, as we saw in example (7), Equi is unnatural with the sentential operators (impossible in the case of *dapat*) when the embedded verb is marked for a non-active voice. Voice and case marking are crucial factors in the Raising construction, but irrelevant to Equi, suggesting that (16a) involves Raising.
before (18c) and (19c) is based on his evaluation of equivalent sentences in his discussion on page 33-34.)

(18) (From Miller, 1988, pp. 29-30, ex. 18)
   a. Dapat na paluin ng=mga=magulang niya
      ought COMP spank-OV GEN=PL=parents 3.SG.GEN
      ang masama=ng bata=ng iyan.
      NOM bad=LNK child=LNK that
      His/her parents ought to spank that naughty child.

   b. Dapat ang masamang bata=ng iyan=ng
      ought NOM bad=LNK child=LNK that=COMP
      paluin ng=mga=magulang niya.
      spank-OV GEN=PL=parents 3.SG.GEN
      His/her parents ought to spank that naughty child.

   c. ?Dapat ng=mga=magulang niya paluin
      ought GEN=PL=parents 3.SG.GEN spank-OV
      ang masama=ng bata=ng iyan.
      NOM bad=LNK child=LNK that
      His/her parents ought to spank that naughty child.

(19) (From Miller, 1988, pp. 29-30, ex. 20)
   a. Maaari=ng paluin ng=guro
      can=COMP spank-OV GEN=teacher
      ang masama=ng estudyante=ng iyan.
      NOM bad=LNK student=LNK that
      The teacher can spank that naughty student.

   b. Maaari ang=masama=ng estudyante=ng iyan=ng
      can NOM=bad=LNK student=LNK that=COMP
      paluin ng=guro.
      spank-OV GEN=teacher
      The teacher can spank that naughty student.
c. ?Maaari ng=guro=ng paluin
   can   GEN=teacher=COMP spank-OV
   ang masama=ng estudante=ng iyan.
   NOM bad=LNK student=LNK that
   The teacher can spank that naughty student.

My consultants reject both the (b) and (c) sentences in these examples as being totally ungrammatical. The (b) sentences as intended would involve Raising of non-Actor subjects. Once again, if the raised argument is a pronominal clitic, the examples are fully grammatical:

(20) a. Dapat siya=ng paluin ng=guro.
   ought 3.SG.NOM=LNK spank-OV GEN=teacher
   He/she ought to be spanked by the/a teacher.
   b. Maaari siya=ng paluin ng=guro.
   can 3.SG.NOM=LNK spank-OV GEN=teacher
   He/she can be spanked by the/a teacher.

However, sentences like (18b) and (19b), in which the raised argument is a common NP, are only acceptable if the nasal ligature is interpreted as a contracted form of the nominative case marker *ang*, rather than as the complementizer -ng suggested by Miller’s gloss. That is, the sentences can only be interpreted as cleft constructions meaning something like That naughty child is the one his parents should spank. The point can be made more clearly by choosing subject phrases that end in a consonant which causes the complementizer to be realized as *na* rather than -ng. Compare the following examples with (18b) and (19b):

(21) a. Dapat ito=ng baboy {ang/*na}
   ought this(NOM)=LNK Manuel NOM/*COMP
   litson-in mo para sa=pista.
   roast.pork-OW 2.SG.GEN for DAT=feast.day
   This pig is the one you ought to roast for the feast day.
   (*You ought to roast this pig for the feast day. )
   b. Maaari ito=ng baboy {ang/*na}
   can this(NOM)=LNK Manuel NOM/*COMP
   litson-in mo para sa=pista.
   roast.pork-OW 2.SG.GEN for DAT=feast.day
   This pig is the one you can roast for the feast day.
   (*You can roast this pig for the feast day. )
Thus the disagreement of judgements could simply be due to the potential ambiguity of the nasal clitic in Miller’s examples. On the other hand, it could be due to a dialectal difference, for example if Miller’s consultants speak a dialect in which these sentential operators function as true Raising predicates.

Raising of proper names is at least marginally acceptable to my consultants with *maaari* and *puwede*, but not with *dapat*. In order to be acceptable, this construction must be interpreted as placing special emphasis on the action involved, in contrast with the neutral (and preferred) pattern in (18a) and (19a).88

(22)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{ ?Maaari si}=\text{Manuel na dakpin ng}=\text{polis.} \\
& \text{can ABS}=\text{Manuel COMP arrest-OV GEN}=\text{police} \\
& \text{Manuel could be arrested by the police.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
b. & \text{ *Dapat si}=\text{Manuel na dakpin ng}=\text{polis.} \\
& \text{ought ABS}=\text{Manuel COMP arrest-OV GEN}=\text{police} \\
& \text{(For: Manuel should be arrested by the police.)}
\end{align*}

Examples (18c) and (19c) involve Raising of non-subject Actors. Note that these examples are structurally identical to (8), except that the raised argument is a common NP rather than a pronoun. Miller reports “differing degrees of acceptability” depending on the type of NP which is raised. He attributes this difference to a “definiteness constraint” on the Raising operation:

Raising of intrinsically definite NPs as agents—proper names and pronouns—is markedly more acceptable than raising of common-noun-headed NPs as agents. Most important, raising of an indefinite NP agent is unacceptable. (p. 34)

Thus he marks sentences like (18c) and (19c), in which the raised non-subject Actor is a definite common NP, with a “?”. My consultants find such examples totally unacceptable. However, when the Actor is expressed by a proper name such constructions do improve marginally. Thus examples like the following, while not fully grammatical, are not as bad as those in (18c) and (19c).

(23)  
\begin{align*}
a. & \text{ ??Maaari ni}=\text{Linda=ng paluin} \\
& \text{can GEN}=\text{Linda=COMP spank-OV} \\
& \text{ang masama=ng estudyante=ng iyan.} \\
& \text{NOM bad=LNK student=LNK that} \\
& \text{Linda can spank that naughty student.}
\end{align*}

88The asymmetry between *dapat* and *maaari* illustrated in (22) may be related to the similar contrast in the Equi constructions illustrated in (7). Alternatively, the acceptability of example (22a) can perhaps be explained in terms of the pattern discussed in section 5.2, in which the subject-NP can, for some speakers and in certain constructions, appear in the normal clitic position.
According, we find an apparent dialect difference between my consultants and Miller’s. I want to be quite explicit in pointing out such differences, because examples of conflicting grammaticality judgements seem to be so numerous in the literature on Tagalog syntax. This is not (at least in most cases) a matter of “right” vs. “wrong”; I assume that all of these judgements are valid for some speakers. But it is difficult to make progress until we begin to sort out the empirical facts. It will take a great deal of further work to discover whether these differences are due to regional dialects, age or social class differences, contextual factors or purely idiolectal variation, and the first step must be to catalogue the differences that exist.

It appears that in the dialect spoken by Miller’s consultants, Actors have a number of characteristics (in addition to being eligible for Raising) which are associated only with grammatical subjects in the dialect spoken by my consultants. For example, Miller’s consultants accept examples like the following (Barry Miller, p.c.):

(24) (*)May bata=ng kinain ang=litson.
exist child=LNK PERF-eat-OV ABS=roast.pig
A child ate the lechon. (Lit: There was a child who ate the lechon.)

For my consultants, this is completely ungrammatical. It could only be interpreted as meaning “The lechon ate a child”, but under this interpretation the case marking on litson should be genitive. In contrast, existential sentences like that in (25) are considered fully grammatical (see Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 278) for a number of similar examples).

(25) May kinain ang=bata.
exist PERF-eat-OV ABS=child
The child ate something.
(Lit: There was something which the child ate.)

---

My consultants react to the example in (24) as being characteristic of speakers from Cavite and Quezon provinces, but I do not know where Miller’s consultants actually come from.
I will not try to account for this difference here. The important point for the purposes of this chapter is that my consultants, like Miller’s, find “Actor-Raising” of pronominal Actor NP’s fully acceptable:

(26) a. Maaari niya=ng paluin
    can 3.SG.GEN=COMP spank-OV

    ang=masama=ng estudyante=ng iyan.
    NOM=bad=LNK student=LNK that
    She can spank that naughty student.

b. Dapat niya=ng paluin
    ought 3.SG.GEN=COMP spank-OV

    ang=masama=ng bata=ng iyan.
    NOM=bad=LNK child=LNK that
    He should spank that naughty child.

Miller’s consultants also feel a clear contrast in acceptability between examples like (26), in which the raised Actor is a pronominal NP, and (23), in which the raised Actor is a proper name. Miller notes:

Importantly, there is a sharp distinction in acceptability between raising of pronominals and non-pronominals. (p. 73)

Thus the generalizations which I will try to account for are the following: Actor-Raising is fully grammatical only with pronouns. It is in general impossible with full NP’s, but marginally better with proper names than with common noun NP’s. The fact that pronouns are the exception to the general pattern is reminiscent of the Equi facts noted in section 2.1. A unified analysis for the two exceptional patterns will be presented in section 5.

2.2.3 “Parasitic control”

As we saw in section 2.2.1, the Tagalog modal gusto does not in general allow a non-Actor subject of its complement clause to be raised. However, there is an exception to this generalization of a most surprising kind: Raising appears to apply to the subject just in case Equi simultaneously applies to the Actor. That is, a subject gap can apparently be controlled by the matrix subject just in case the Actor gap is also controlled by the matrix Actor (i.e., the genitive experiencer of gusto). I will tentatively refer to this phenomenon as “parasitic control”. This pattern is demonstrated in the following examples:
Example (27a) is grammatical either with an overt Actor phrase in the embedded clause (by Maria) or without it. When the overt Actor is present we have a sentential “for-to” complement of the simplest kind, involving no syntactic gaps. When it is absent, we have an Equi construction of the familiar type discussed in section 2.1. Example (27b) shows that the result of Raising applied to the (non-Equi) “for-to” complement is ungrammatical. However, example (27c) suggests that the result of Raising applied to the corresponding Equi construction is fully grammatical. This would imply that Raising is possible only if Equi also applies.

The first clue to a possible analysis for these constructions is that they are much better when the raised subject is pronominal. Thus my consultants find (27c) somewhat unnatural, whereas examples like the following are perfectly natural:

(28) Gusto ko siya=ng halikan.\textsuperscript{90}
\begin{align*}
\text{want} & \quad \text{1.SG.GEN}\quad \text{3.SG.GEN}=\text{COMP} \quad \text{kiss-DV} \\
& \text{I want to kiss her.}
\end{align*}

In fact, Schachter and Otanes (p. 269) report that Raising is obligatory in Equi constructions when the matrix verb is a modal and the embedded subject is a pronoun. Since true Raising applies equally to pronominal and non-pronominal subjects, the contrast in naturalness between (27c) and (28) suggests that something other than Raising is responsible for this phenomenon. In section 5.2 I will present an analysis which treats examples like (27c) and (28) as instances of Clause Reduction, with (27c) resulting from a restricted (but independently attested) rule of subject placement.

\textsuperscript{90}The comments in footnote 4 apply to this example as well.
3. The Clause Reduction construction

In section 2 we noted four exceptions to the generalizations we have proposed concerning the behavior of modals: “Equi” with sentential operators (ex. 8), “Raising” of non-Actor subjects (ex. 17), “Actor Raising” (ex. 26), and “parasitic control” (ex. 27-28). It is interesting to note that in each case, the problematic pattern is possible only with pronominal elements, or is noticeably more acceptable with pronominal elements. This fact is surprising, in that neither Equi nor Raising are limited to pronominal targets. On the other hand, some other phenomena in Tagalog are restricted to pronominal NP’s, notably clitic placement.

The question which naturally arises is whether the problematic cases noted in the preceding section can be reanalyzed in terms of clitic placement. The problem with this approach is that the rules of clitic placement are clause-bounded. We have crucially relied on this fact in using clitic placement as a diagnostic for the presence of internal clause boundaries. Raising and Equi, on the other hand, involve biclausal dependencies.

In this section I will present evidence for the existence of a Clause Reduction construction in Tagalog, which has no internal IP boundary separating the two verbs. In section 5, I will show how the existence of this construction allows us to account for the problematic cases noted above. I will argue that the problem cases are in fact monoclausal, being instances of Clause Reduction, and are thus readily explained by the normal rules of clitic placement discussed in chapter 5.

3.1 Evidence for Clause Reduction

Clause Reduction licenses an alternation between biclausal structures and semantically equivalent monoclausal structures which contain two verbs in a kind of complex-predicate relationship. It is possible with modals of all three classes as well as with other types of matrix verbs, specifically Equi predicates. The alternation is illustrated in the following examples using the modal nouns *kaya* ‘able to’ and *ugali* ‘accustomed to’. (Recall from section 2 that words of this class have modal properties only when functioning as Equi predicates.) Examples (29a) and (30a) involve the normal biclausal structure discussed in section 2.1; examples (29b) and (30b) involve the Clause Reduction pattern which is the focus of our attention here.

(29) a. Kaya ni=Manuel na bumili ng=bago=ng kotse.
   able GEN=Manuel COMP AV-buy GEN=new=LNK car
   Manuel is able to buy a new car.
b. Kaya=ng bumili si=Manuel ng=bago=ng kotse.
   able=LNK AV-buy NOM=Manuel GEN=new=LNK car
   Manuel is able to buy a new car.

(30) a. Ugali ni=Linda=ng tumakbo sa=umaga.
   habit GEN=Linda=COMP AV-run DAT=morning
   Linda habitually runs in the mornings.

b. Ugali=ng tumakbo si=Linda sa=umaga.
   habit=LNK AV-run NOM=Linda DAT=morning
   Linda habitually runs in the mornings.

There are two important differences between the (a) and (b) examples, involving the position and case marking of the Actor phrase. In example (29a), the Actor NP (Maria) occurs between the two predicates, preceding the complementizer and functioning as the controller of the gap in the embedded clause. Its case marking (GEN) is determined by the modal. In example (29b), on the other hand, the Actor NP follows the complement verb (buy), and its case marking (NOM) is determined by that verb. These two facts indicate that in (29b) the Actor phrase belongs to the same clause as the complement verb, whereas they belong to different clauses in (29a). The meaning of the two sentences is identical. Thus the Actor phrase is semantically an argument of both the modal and the complement verb in (29b) just as it is in the Equi construction in (29a). The same alternation is exhibited in (30a-b).

When the complement verb is not in Active Voice, as it is in examples (29) - (30), the Actor NP will always get GEN case. But its position will still provide a useful diagnostic. For example, the occurrence of the Actor phrase (ni Maria) following the complement verb in example (31) indicates that the sentence is an instance of Clause Reduction.

(31) Hindi kaya=ng bayaran ni=Maria ang=bago=ng kotse.
    not able=LNK pay-DV GEN=Maria NOM=new=LNK car
    Maria cannot pay for the new car.

Clitic placement also provides evidence for the presence or absence of internal clause boundaries. In the following example, the Actor phrase follows the complement verb, indicating that the sentence involves Clause Reduction. At the same time, the pronominal subject of the complement verb appears before the modal, because of the initial adverbial element (hindi). Recall that the rules of clitic placement would make the pronoun second in its immediate clause. Since it is semantically an argument of the complement verb but not of the modal, its position
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shows that there is no clause boundary between the two verbs. That is, Clause Reduction constructions do not contain any internal IP boundary.

(32) a. Hindi siya kaya=ng utusan ni=Pedro.
   not 3.SG.NOM able=LNK order-DV GEN=Pedro
   *Pedro cannot order her around.

b. *Hindi kaya=ng utusan siya ni=Pedro.

c. Hindi kaya ni=Pedro=ng utusan siya. (Biclausal)

Examples (32b) and (32c) show that clitic-fronting is obligatory in the monoclausal structure (32b), as predicted by this analysis, but does not occur in the biclausal structure (32c). It might be argued that Raising could produce a pattern like (32a) without eliminating internal clause boundaries, since the clitic pronoun is the subject of the lower verb. However, we can rule out Raising as a possible analysis for this example in two ways. First, the modal kaya is not a Raising predicate, as can be seen in the following examples:

(33) a. Kaya ni=Maria=ng bilhin ang=kotse ko.
   able GEN=Maria=COMP AV-buy NOM=car my
   Maria is able to buy my car.

b. *Kaya ni=Maria ang=kotse ko=ng bilhin.
   able GEN=Maria NOM=car my=COMP AV-buy

Second, the construction illustrated in (32a) is possible only for pronouns. If we replace the pronominal subject with a full nominative NP, the resulting sentence is ungrammatical.

(34) *Hindi kaya si=Maria=ng utusan ni=Pedro.
   not able NOM=Maria=COMP order-DV GEN=Pedro
   (for: Pedro cannot order Maria around.)

Since Raising makes no distinction between pronominal and non-pronominal subjects, the contrast between (32a) and (34) must be explained by the rules of clitic placement, implying that no IP boundary occurs between the two predicates in these sentences.

Some examples of Clause Reduction involving other modals are given below. Note the change in position of the Actor phrase, correlating with a change from GEN to NOM case:

(35) (from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 270)

a. Bi-clausal
   Gusto ng=Nanay (na) pumunta sa=tindahan.
   want GEN=Mother COMP AV-go DAT=store
   Mother wants to go to the store.
b. **Clause Reduction**

Gusto=ng pumunta sa=tindahan ang=Nanay.

\[ \begin{array}{ll} \text{want=} & \text{LNK AV-go} \\
\text{DAT=store} & \text{NOM=Mother} \\
\end{array} \]

Mother wants to go to the store.

(36) (from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 270)

a. **Bi-clausal**

Kailangan ni=Pedro=ng kumain ng=karne.

\[ \begin{array}{ll} \text{need} & \text{GEN=Pedro=COMP AV-eat} \\
\text{GEN=meat} & \end{array} \]

Pedro needs to eat meat.

b. **Clause Reduction**

Kailangan=ng kumain ng=karne si=Pedro.

\[ \begin{array}{ll} \text{need=} & \text{LNK AV-eat} \\
\text{GEN=meat} & \text{NOM=Pedro} \\
\end{array} \]

Pedro needs to eat meat.

(37) (from Bloomfield, 1917, p. 168, §152)

**Clause Reduction**

Maaari mo nga=ng ihulug sa=koreyo ang=akin=ng sulat?

\[ \begin{array}{ll} \text{possible} & \text{2.SG.GEN please=} \\
\text{LNK IV-throw DAT=mail} & \text{NOM=my=LNK letter} \\
\end{array} \]

Can you please mail my letter?

(38) (adapted from Bloomfield, 1917, p. 195, §267)

**Clause Reduction**

Hindi na siya ibig Ø labanan ng=mga=tao.

\[ \begin{array}{ll} \text{not already} & \text{3.SG.NOM want LNK oppose-DV} \\
\text{GEN=PL=people} & \end{array} \]

He was no longer desired to be opposed by people.

(I.e., He was no longer sought as an opponent.)

In example (37), the GEN case marking of the pronoun mo ‘you’ indicates that Clause Reduction is involved. As shown in the preceding section, the modal maaari assigns NOM case to the Actor-controller in the Equi construction. Thus the pronoun in (37) is getting its case assignment from the second verb, ihulug. Similarly, the NOM case of the pronoun in (38) shows that it cannot be the experiencer argument of ibig, which would take GEN case, but rather must
be the subject of *labanan* ‘to be opposed’. Since modals do not allow Raising of non-Actor subjects, example (38) can only be the result of clitic-placement under Clause Reduction.

### 3.2 Phrase structure effects

The two predicates in the Clause Reduction construction appear to stand in the same structural relationship to each other as the auxiliary *huwag* to its following verb, or the adjective to its complement verb in the complex-predicate constructions discussed in chapter 5. The patterns of clitic placement in all three cases are the same. Moreover, in all three cases only the initial predicate may be inflected for tense, while case marking and grammatical relations are determined by the second predicate. Thus it seems natural to assume that the modal verb in the Clause Reduction construction occurs in the INFL position, while the embedded verb is dominated by S.

The phrase structure of the biclausal and monoclausal constructions are contrasted in the following examples. (In order to save space, I will suppress non-branching I´ and C´ nodes.) In the biclausal construction (39), each verb assigns case to its own arguments, but under Clause Reduction (40) the embedded verb assigns case to all arguments of the clause. The clause can contain only one nominative argument, and the theta role of that argument is determined by the voice marking of the embedded verb.

(39) **Biclausal** (= 29a)

Kaya ni=Manuel na bumili ng=bagong=ng kotse.

*Manuel is able to buy a new car.*
The data discussed thus far would also be consistent with the hypothesis that the two verbs in the Clause Reduction construction form a constituent, e.g. a V’ or a complex V, rather than being in the positions shown above. This hypothesis would be problematic for several reasons. If the two verbs formed a complex V, then we would predict that clitics could never appear between them, since lexical (Xₒ) categories are opaque to clitic placement, as demonstrated in chapter 5. If the two verbs formed a V’ constituent, then we would have to explain why the order of elements is fixed (unlike the V + Adv constructions discussed in chapter 5) and why the linker -ng/Ø is used rather than na.

But there is more direct evidence that the structure in (40) is the correct one. The following examples, which show S’s being coordinated (41) and undergoing Right Node Raising (42), provide evidence for an S constituent in the Clause Reduction construction:

(41) **Coordination:**
   a. Maaari mo=ng [bilhin ang=bahay ni=Linda]
   can 2.SG GEN=LNK buy-OV NOM=house GEN=Linda

   o [upahan ang=bahay ni=David].
   or rent-DV NOM=house GEN=David
   *You can buy Linda’s house or rent David’s house.*
b. Hindi mo dapat Ø [tawanang ang=mga=lumpo]
not 2.SG.GEN ought LNK laugh-DV NOM=PL=cripple

or [hamakin ang=mga=mahihirap].

You should not mock the crippled or belittle the poor.

(42) **Right Node Raising:**
Gusto ko, pero hindi ko puwede=ng,
want 1.SG.GEN but not 1.SG.GEN can=LNK

bilhin ang=bahay na iyon.
buy-OV NOM=house LNK that

I want to, but can’t, buy that house.

As noted in chapter 5, the fact that there is only one linker in these examples suggests that the linker is adjoined to S, as indicated the figure below, rather than to either verb. The phrase structure for sentence (41a) is shown in figure (43):

(43)

Clitic pronouns normally follow the first (X₀ or XP) constituent in their immediate IP. Thus the absence of internal IP boundaries in the phrase structure configuration in (40) correctly predicts the position of the pronominal clitic in (32a). The contrast between the biclausal and Clause Reduction constructions with respect to clitic placement is illustrated in the following examples:
(44) Biclausal
Hindi kaya ni=Pedro=ng bigyan siya ng=pera.
not able GEN=Pedro=COMP give-DV 3.SG.NOM GEN=money
Pedro cannot give her money.

In both (44) and (45), the clitic pronoun siya appears as the second word in its immediately dominating IP. In the biclausal structure (44), it immediately follows the verb of the embedded
clause. But under Clause Reduction there is no internal IP boundary, and the pronoun appears as the second word in the sentence as a whole, immediately following the negative element in [SPEC, IP].

Sentential operator modals like *dapat* take only a sentential argument. Since they have no Actor argument, there is no word-order variation to indicate that Clause Reduction has applied unless the complement clause contains a clitic. Thus only the position of the clitic distinguishes between the monoclausal and biclausal constructions in the following examples:

(46) **Biclausal:**

Hindi *dapat* utusan siya ni=Pedro.

*Pedro should not order her around.*

---

The expected linker in the biclausal construction in (46) would be *na*. Schachter and Otanes (1972) state that *na* is optional in such constructions, and my consultants accept the sentence with *na* as being equivalent. I will provisionally assume that *na* can optionally be deleted following *dapat.*
(47) **Monoclausal:**

Hindi siya dapat utusan ni=Pedro.
not 3.SG.NOM should order-DV GEN=Pedro
Pedro should not order her around.

3.3 **A further note on clitic placement**

The analysis of Clause Reduction outlined above predicts that the placement of pronominal clitics should exhibit an “all-or-nothing” pattern. That is, pronominal arguments of the complement verb should either all follow that verb, in the biclausal pattern, or all precede that verb and its linker, in the monoclausal construction. This pattern is illustrated in the following examples, in which the complement verb takes two pronominal arguments. In (48a), the biclausal pattern, both pronouns follow the complement verb, while in (48b), the Clause Reduction pattern, both pronouns occur in second position, following the modal. Another example of this pattern is given in (49).

(48) (from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, pp. 272)

a. Dapat (na) makausap ko siya.
ought COMP converse-OV 1.SG.GEN 3.SG.NOM
I should talk to him.

b. Dapat ko siya=ng makausap.
ought 1.SG.GEN 3.SG.NOM=LNK converse-OV
I should talk to him.
While this “all-or-nothing” pattern of clitic placement appears to be true as a description of preferred word order, it is not an absolute requirement. In some cases it is possible for one pronoun to “climb” leftward while a second is left behind. In the following examples the (a) sentences, in which both pronouns precede the linker, illustrate the normal Clause Reduction pattern. The corresponding (b) sentences, in which only the Actor pronoun has undergone “clitic climbing”, are (at least for my consultants) still grammatical but somewhat less natural.

(50) a. Dapat mo ako=ng gantihan.

ought 2.SG.GEN 1.SG.NOM=LNK reward-DV
You ought to reward me.

b. ?Dapat mo=ng gantihan ako.

ought 2.SG.GEN=LNK reward-DV 1.SG.NOM
You ought to reward me.

(51) a. Maaari mo siya=ng utusan.

can 2.SG.GEN 3.SG.NOM=LNK order-DV
You can order him around.

b. ?Maaari mo=ng utusan siya.

can 2.SG.GEN=LNK order-DV 3.SG.NOM
You can order him around.

These facts are readily explained by an exception to the clitic-placement rule pointed out by Sityar (1989). As noted in chapter 5, section 4.1, when there are two clitic pronouns in the same clause, clitic-placement is optional for the second pronoun. Since monosyllabic pronouns must precede disyllabic pronouns, it is the monosyllabic pronoun that must undergo clitic-placement, as in (50b) and (51b).

3.4 Constraints on Clause Reduction

There are two constraints on the application of Clause Reduction. First, if the matrix verb takes arguments of its own, Clause Reduction is possible only when a control relation exists

---

92Different speakers appear to react differently to such examples. Sityar’s data would predict that the (b) examples should be fully acceptable.
between a matrix argument and an argument of the embedded verb. Second, the embedded verb must be a non-finite form.

3.4.1 Control

Aissen and Perlmutter (1983) point out that Clause Reduction in Spanish applies only to Equi and Raising verbs, though not to all such verbs. Analyzing the construction as a special type of Clause Union, they draw the following generalization:

Clause Union is possible with these verbs only if the complement has no 1 [i.e., no subject—PRK]. (p. 381)

That is, the subject of the complement verb must always be controlled by an argument of the matrix verb for Clause Reduction to apply. In Tagalog there is a parallel constraint: when the matrix verb has a possible controller in its argument structure, that argument must control an argument of the embedded verb for Clause Reduction to occur. This constraint is most easily demonstrated with experiencer-modal, which have an Experiencer role in their argument structure and can be used either as control (Equi) or non-control predicates.

Experiencer-modal can trigger Clause Reduction only in Equi constructions, when the Actor of the embedded clause is controlled by the matrix experiencher. Thus (52b) is grammatical, because Clause Reduction has applied to an Equi construction, while (53b) is ungrammatical because Clause Reduction has applied to a sentential complement construction with an overt Actor in the embedded clause:

(52) **Equi:**

a. Gusto ni=Linda=ng paluin si=Jessica.
   want GEN=Linda=COMP spank-OV NOM=Jessica
   *Linda wants to spank Jessica.*

b. Gusto=ng paluin ni=Linda si=Jessica.
   LNK spank-OV GEN=Linda NOM=Jessica
   *Linda wants to spank Jessica.*

(53) **Non-Equi:**

a. Gusto ni=Linda=ng paluin ni=David
   want GEN=Linda=COMP spank-OV GEN=David
   si=Jessica.
   NOM=Jessica
   *Linda wants David to spank Jessica.*
b. *Gusto=ng paluin ni=Linda ni=David si=Jessica.

These examples show that with experiencer-modals (like *gusto*), Clause Reduction can only occur in Equi constructions (a fact which will be important in our discussion of "parasitic control" in section 5.2). With the class of modal nouns, such as *kaya* ‘able’, this contrast cannot be observed, because predicates of this type function as modal verbs only in Equi constructions. In other words, the constraint is always satisfied since a control relation is always present. On the other hand, sentential operators have no Actor argument of their own, and so no control relation is possible. There is no matrix argument to function as a controller, and so the constraint stated above does not apply (or perhaps is vacuously satisfied). Thus Clause Reduction is possible with these verbs, as shown by examples like the following (similar examples were given in (46-51) above):

(54) Hindi ako dapat bigyan ni=Linda ng=pera.
    not 1.SG.NOM ought give-DV GEN=Linda GEN=money
    *I should not be given money by Linda.*

These facts indicate that, as in Spanish, a control relation must exist between one of the matrix arguments (if there are any) and an argument of the embedded verb in order for Clause Reduction to apply. However, contrary to the formulation of Aissen and Perlmutter, this constraint cannot be stated in terms of grammatical relations. Given the analysis of subjecthood presented in chapter 2, and of control in chapter 4, it is clear that the controlled argument in examples like (52b) is not the subject but the Actor of the embedded clause. This fact suggests that Clause Reduction should be analyzed as an alternation in argument structure, rather than an operation defined on grammatical relations as in the Clause Union hypothesis of Aissen and Perlmutter. This suggestion will be developed in section 4.

### 3.4.2 Uniqueness of tense

The second constraint is that the embedded verb in a Clause Reduction construction must be non-finite. In the previous section it was demonstrated that, with some classes of modals, Clause Reduction is possible only when the embedded Actor is the controllee of an Equi construction. But Equi can only apply to non-finite complements. Therefore, in order to show that the two constraints are independent of each other, we must investigate the application of Clause Reduction to non-Equi constructions.
Sentential operators have no matrix experiencer or Actor, and so allow Clause Reduction to apply even when their clausal complement contains an overt Actor, as in example (54). Such constructions therefore provide an environment in which the independence of the two constraints can be demonstrated. Sentential operators may take either finite or non-finite complements. However, Clause Reduction is possible only when the complement verb is non-finite, as demonstrated in the following examples:

(55)  
**Finite complement**  
\[a. \text{Bi-clausal (sentential operator)}\]
\[
\text{Dapat (na) binasa mo na  
ought \ COMP \ PERF-read-OV \ 2.SG.GEN \ already  
ang=liham ko.  
NOM=letter my}  
\]
\[\text{You should have already read my letter.}\]

\[b. \text{Clause Reduction}\]
\[
*\text{Dapat mo=ng binasa na}  
ought \ 2.SG.GEN=LNK \ PERF-read-OV \ already  
ang=liham ko.  
NOM=letter my}  
\]

(56)  
**Non-Finite complement**  
\[a. \text{Bi-clausal (sentential operator)}\]
\[
\text{Dapat (na) basahin mo ang=liham ko.  
ought \ COMP \ read-OV \ 2.SG.GEN \ NOM=letter my}  
\]
\[\text{You should read my letter.}\]

\[b. \text{Clause Reduction}\]
\[
\text{Dapat mo=ng basahin ang=liham ko.}  
ought \ 2.SG.GEN=LNK \ read-OV \ NOM=letter my}  
\]
\[\text{You should read my letter.}\]

The examples in (55) involve a finite complement verb followed by a perfective aspectual particle. As (55b) shows, Clause Reduction cannot apply in such cases. However, example (56) involves a non-finite complement, and Clause Reduction is fully grammatical.

The finiteness constraint can be viewed as a requirement that each finite clause must have a unique tense bearing element. In chapter 5 it was stated that a tensed verb must appear under INFL, while a non-finite verb may occur within S. The constraint under discussion here follows from this requirement under the assumption that a single INFL node can dominate at most one
tensed element. This is a very natural assumption, and the phrase structure rules proposed in chapter 5 seem to ensure that this will in fact be the case. Since the result of Clause Reduction is a monoclausal structure, it will contain only one INFL position, which will be occupied by the matrix modal or Equi verb. Thus the presence of another tensed verb in the clause would violate the uniqueness requirement.

### 3.5 Clause Reduction with Equi verbs

Since Equi is what makes it possible for modals like *gusto* to trigger Clause Reduction, it is not surprising that normal (i.e. non-modal) Equi verbs can also trigger this construction. Some examples are given below:

(57) a. Sinubuk ni=Manuel na hulihin
    PERF-try-OV GEN=Manuel COMP catch-OV
    ang=kalabaw niya.
    NOM=buffalo 3.SG.GEN
    Manuel tried to catch his buffalo.

b. Sinubuk Ø hulihin ni=Manuel
    PERF-try-OV LNK catch-OV GEN=Manuel
    ang=kalabaw niya.
    NOM=buffalo 3.SG.GEN
    Manuel tried to catch his buffalo.

c. Sinubuk niya ako=ng hulihin.
    PERF-try-OV 3.SG.GEN 1.SG.NOM=LNK catch-OV
    He tried to catch me.

(58) a. Binalak ni=Maria=ng bisitahin
    PERF-plan-OV GEN=Maria=COMP visit-OV
    ang=kapatid niya.
    NOM=sibling 3.SG.GEN
    Maria planned to visit her sister.

b. Binalak Ø bisitahin ni=Maria
    PERF-plan-OV LNK visit-OV GEN=Maria
    ang=kapatid niya.
    NOM=sibling 3.SG.GEN
    Maria planned to visit her sister.
c. Binalak ko siya=ng bisitahin.
   PERF-plan-OV 1.SG.GEN 3.SG.NOM=LNK visit-OV
   *I planned to visit her.*

Examples (57a) and (58a) illustrate the normal biclausal Equi pattern. Examples (57b) and (58b) are the result of Clause Reduction, as shown by the position of the controller following the complement verb. Examples (57c) and (58c) are also monoclausal, as shown by the position of the pronominal subject of the complement clause.

Because the matrix verb in these examples is marked for Objective Voice, there is no alternation in the case marking of the controller. In the following examples, with the matrix verb in Active Voice, the case marking of the controller (Luz or Maria) is determined by the matrix verb in the biclausal (a) sentences and the complement verb in the monoclausal (b) sentences:

(59) a. Nag-sikap si=Luz na hiramin
    PERF-AV-try NOM=Luz COMP borrow-OV
    ang=pera sa=bangko.
    NOM=money DAT=bank
    *Luz tried to borrow money from the bank.*

b. Nag-sikap Ø hiramin ni=Luz
    PERF-AV-try LNK borrow-OV GEN=Luz
    ang=pera sa=bangko.
    NOM=money DAT=bank
    *Luz tried to borrow money from the bank.*

(60) a. Nag-balak si=Maria=ng bisitahin
    PERF-AV-plan NOM=Maria=COMP visit-OV
    ang=kapatid niya.
    NOM=sibling 3.SG.GEN
    *Maria planned to visit her sister.*

b. Nag-balak Ø bisitahin ni=Maria
    PERF-AV-plan LNK visit-OV GEN=Maria
    ang=kapatid niya.
    NOM=sibling 3.SG.GEN
    *Maria planned to visit her sister.*
So the evidence from word order, clitic placement and case marking all confirms that Clause Reduction can be triggered by normal Equi verbs as well as modals.

4. Clause Reduction as argument structure composition

We have seen that Clause Reduction has a variety of visible effects, including word order, clitic placement, case marking, etc., which indicate a contrast between biclausal and monoclausal structures. But what kind of process is involved in the Clause Reduction alternation? Is it fundamentally an operation on phrase structure, on grammatical relations or on argument structure?

All three kinds of analysis have been proposed for the Restructuring construction in Romance languages. For example, Rizzi (1982) viewed it as an operation which would literally change the phrase structure of a sentence:

I will argue for the existence of a restructuring rule in Italian syntax, that is, a rule which changes the structure of a phrase marker without affecting its terminal string. This rule, governed by a restrictive but significant class of main verbs, will be shown to optionally transform an underlying bisentential structure into a simple sentence, creating a unique verbal complex consisting of the main and the embedded verb. (p. 2)

Aissen and Perlmutter (1983) analyze Clause Reduction in Spanish as an operation which “makes dependents of the complement verb dependents of the matrix verb” (p. 364). In other words, it allows the matrix verb to assign grammatical relations to the arguments of its complement verb. They argue that Clause Reduction can be treated as a special case of the rule of Clause Union, stated in terms of grammatical relations, with the added restriction noted above that it applies only when the embedded clause lacks a subject.

Rosen (1989) argues that Restructuring in Romance languages must be viewed as an operation on argument structure. She proposes that the matrix verbs which trigger Restructuring are “light verbs” which have no argument structure of their own, though they do carry semantic content (represented in “Lexical Conceptual Structure”). Restructuring involves a merger of the argument structure of the embedded verb with the empty argument structure of the matrix light verb. The argument structure of the resulting complex predicate is always identical to the argument structure of the embedded verb.93 Part of the motivation for this proposal is the fact

---

93Rosen’s “light verb” hypothesis as it stands would not account for “object Equi” verbs which trigger Restructuring in Spanish (e.g. ordenar ‘order’; permitir ‘permit’). The problem is that the subject of these matrix verbs is not an argument of the embedded verb at all, yet it appears as an argument of the complex predicate under Restructuring. This means that the output of the merger is an argument structure which is different from the argument structure of the embedded verb, so these matrix verbs
that tests for unaccusativity treat the matrix verb in a restructuring construction as if it were invisible; unaccusativity in the embedded verb causes the entire construction to behave like an unaccusative.

As noted in section 3.4.1, the fact that control licenses Clause Reduction in Tagalog, as in Romance, suggests that the correct analysis must be stated in terms of argument structure rather than grammatical relations, since control in Tagalog is often determined by semantic roles (e.g. Actor) rather than grammatical relations.\textsuperscript{94} The hypothesis which I will explore here is that Clause Reduction is an example of argument structure composition, involving the merger of the argument structures of two distinct predicates through the “fusion” or sharing of an argument.\textsuperscript{95} The result is a complex argument structure similar to that of a morphological causative construction. (The similarities between restructuring and causative formation in Romance have been noted by a number of authors.) This complex argument structure is mapped onto a monoclausal functional structure, as in the case of causatives. The observed changes in phrase structure and grammatical relations follow automatically from the general principles which map argument structure into functional structure and phrase structure.

Alsina and Joshi (1991) have proposed an analysis of causative constructions in which the causee is simultaneously the patient of the causative predicate and either the agent or an affected argument of the embedded predicate. The two thematic roles which the causee bears are said to be “fused”, identified with each other in argument structure. Under their proposal, the argument structure for Tagalog causatives like those in (61a-b) would be as in (61c).

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\text{(61) a. Pinabili ng=NaNay si=Mar=ng=bigas.} \\
\text{PERF-CAUS-buy-OV GEN=mother NOM=Maria GEN=rice} \\
\text{Mother let/made/had Maria buy some rice.}
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
\text{b. Nagpabili kay=Maria ng=bigas ang=NaNay.} \\
\text{PERF.AV-CAUS-buy DAT=Maria GEN=rice NOM=mother} \\
\text{Mother let/made/had Maria buy some rice.}
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

\textsuperscript{94}I do not wish to take a position on the question of whether argument structure constitutes a separate level of representation from semantic structure. For convenience, I will adopt here the conception of argument structure assumed by Alsina and Joshi (1991), taking it to be a projection of the semantic structure which includes some syntactic information as well. I assume that the control relation stated in terms of semantic structure in chapter 4 is projected into argument structure.

\textsuperscript{95}Thanks to Alex Alsina for helping me develop the ideas in this section.
c. CAUSE <agent patient> buy <agent patient> >>

The argument structure in (61c) is mapped into a monoclausal f-structure with a single predicate, whose meaning is a composition of the meanings of the merged predicates, and a single set of grammatical arguments. The fused thematic roles of the causee are treated as a single argument. The assignment of case marking and grammatical relations depends on the voice affixation of the causative verb, as in any other verbal clause. In (61a), the verb is marked for Objective Voice, which selects the matrix patient (i.e., the causee) as subject. In (61b), the verb is marked for Active Voice, which selects the matrix agent (i.e., the causer) as subject. The causee in (61b) gets dative case, the normal marking for definite animate patients in Tagalog (as in some Romance languages).

I suggest that Clause Reduction in Tagalog is the result of a similar kind of argument structure composition. Support for this idea comes from the pattern of case marking in Clause Reduction constructions involving transitive Equi verbs such as utos ‘order’. Example (62a) shows the normal (biclausal) Equi pattern, (62b-c) show two different possible voice and case-marking patterns in the corresponding (monoclausal) Clause Reduction pattern. (All three sentences mean the same thing.)

(62) **Biclausal:**
a. Inutusan ng=Nanay si=Maria=ng bumili
   PERF-order-DV GEN=mother NOM=Maria=COMP AV-buy
   ng=bigas.
   GEN=rice
   *Mother ordered Maria to buy some rice.*

**Monoclausal:**
b. Inutusan=ng bumili ng=bigas ng=Nanay
   PERF-order-DV=LNK AV-buy GEN=rice GEN=mother
   si=Maria.
   NOM=Maria
c. Nagutos Ø bumili kay=Maria ng=bigas
AV.PERF-order LNK AV-buy DAT=Maria GEN=rice
ang=Nanay.
NOM=mother

The pattern of case marking in the Clause Reduction examples (62b-c) is identical to that in the causative examples in (61a-b). Non-subject controllees, like non-subject causees, get dative case (62c and 61b). Non-subject controllers, like non-subject causers, are treated as Actors and so get genitive case (62b and 61a). This striking parallelism is predicted under the assumption that causatives and Clause Reduction are both manifestations of the same basic phenomenon.

Under this proposal, the contrast between the biclausal Equi pattern in (62a) and the monoclausal Clause Reduction pattern in (62b-c) results from an alternation in argument structure, as represented below:

(63) **Equi**

\[
\text{order} < \text{agent}, \text{patient}, \text{Action} >
\]

\[
\text{buy} < \text{agent}, \text{patient} > \quad \Leftrightarrow
\]

**Clause Reduction**

\[
\text{order} < \text{agent\ patient} \quad \text{buy} < \text{agent\ patient} >
\]

The difference between these two representations lies primarily in the relationship between the argument roles of the controller and controllee. In the Equi pattern, the two roles are distinct but coreferential. They are mapped into distinct elements in f-structure, which are assigned grammatical relations in two different clauses but are identified via anaphoric control. In the Clause Reduction pattern, the two roles are fused and are mapped onto a single element in f-structure. The grammatical relation and case marking of this element are determined by the more prominent of the two roles, in this case the patient.

A number of questions remain to be investigated regarding the range of possible voice-marking patterns in Clause Reduction with transitive Equi predicates. It is not clear why examples like the following, in which neither verb is marked for Active Voice, should be unacceptable. Perhaps it is due to the ambiguity as to which of the genitive NP’s is the Actor:
Also, we need some other account for sentential operators, since they have no arguments of their own and so cannot license the fusion of an argument position. Perhaps something like Rosen’s light-verb hypothesis is correct for this class of predicates. Miller (1988, p. 66-67) states that sentential operators in a biclausal structure can take either an epistemic or a deontic reading, whereas under Clause Reduction only the deontic reading is possible. This semantic difference may point to an analysis of these predicates as having two subcategorizations, one which allows them to function like the sentential adverbs in English which have similar meanings (necessary, possible, etc.), the other more like an English modal (may, must). Only the second of these would allow Clause Reduction. I will not pursue this question further here.

5. Explaining irregular modal examples

In this section we will use the analysis of Clause Reduction sketched out above to account for the puzzles noted in section 2.

5.1 Equi and “Actor-Raising” revisited

In section 2.2 we noted that sentential operators do not generally function as Equi predicates. This is in fact what we would expect, in that they lack any argument in their predicate-argument structure which could function as a controller. However, we noted a class of apparent exceptions to this generalization which involves a pronominal NP apparently functioning as the controller of an Equi construction. The crucial example was (8), repeated here as (65):

(65) Puwede ko=ng basahin ang=Intsik.
possible 1.SG.GEN=COMP read-OV NOM=Chinese
*It is possible for me to read Chinese.*
or: *I can read Chinese.*

But if (65) is an example of Clause Reduction, there is nothing in any way exceptional about the construction. Under this assumption, (65) is a single clause, i.e. it contains no internal
IP boundaries, as shown in (66). In this structure, the position of the clitic Actor pronoun is predicted directly by the normal rules of clitic placement. Thus example (65) does not involve Equi at all. It is a monoclausal construction, systematically related by the rule of Clause Reduction to the biclausal example in (67):

(66)

(67) Puwede=ng basahin ko ang=Intsik.
possible=COMP read-OV 1.SG.GEN NOM=Chinese
It is possible for me to read Chinese.

Similarly, the problematic cases of Raising and “Actor Raising” involving pronouns (section 2.2) can be readily analyzed as resulting from normal rules of clitic placement applying to a monoclausal sentence formed by Clause Reduction. The crucial examples, (17) and (26b), are repeated here as (68-69). In each case, the clitic pronoun occurs exactly where the rules of
clitic placement would predict under the assumption that the sentences are monoclausal, as shown in the accompanying diagrams.₆

(68) Dapat ka=ng gantihan ng=amo mo.
should 2.SG.NOM=LNK reward-DV GEN=boss your
You should be rewarded by your boss.

(69) Dapat niya=ng paluin ang=masama=ng
ought 3.SG.GEN=LNK spank-OV NOM=bad=LNK
bata=ng iyan.
child=LNK that
He should spank that naughty child.

5.2. “Parasitic control” revisited
In section 2.2.3 I described a phenomenon which I referred to as “parasitic control” in which Raising appears to be possible only if Equi also applies. In this section I will suggest that

₆Note that the “Actor Raising” examples in (69) are structurally identical to the problematic “Equi” pattern in (66).
the apparent Raising in this puzzling pattern is actually the result of clitic placement under Clause Reduction. The dependence on Equi is not a linkage between two different types of control relation, but rather the result of constraints on Clause Reduction discussed in section 3.4.1.

The pattern in question involves modal verbs like *gusto* ‘want, like’, which are optional control predicates. The crucial examples are repeated below:

(70) a. Gusto ko=ng tawagan (ni=Maria) si=Juan.
   want 1.SG.GEN=COMP call-DV GEN=Maria NOM=Juan
   I want to call Juan. / I want for Maria to call Juan.

b. Gusto ko si=Maria=ng tumawag kay=Juan.
   want 1.SG.GEN NOM=Maria=COMP AV-call DAT=Juan
   I want Maria to call Juan.

c. *Gusto ko si=Juan=ng tawagan ni=Maria.
   want 1.SG.GEN NOM=Juan=COMP call-DV GEN=Maria
   (For: I want Juan to be called by Maria.)

d. (adapted from Schachter and Otanes, 1972, p. 269)
   Gusto ko si=Juan=ng tawagan.
   want 1.SG.GEN NOM=Juan=COMP call-DV
   I want to call Juan.

Raising can apply to Actor subjects in the non-Equi pattern (70b). But when the subject of the embedded clause is not the Actor (70c-d), it appears that Raising can apply to the subject just in case Equi simultaneously applies to the Actor.

The constraint that the word order in (70d) is possible only when Equi applies is strongly reminiscent of the constraint on Clause Reduction mentioned in section 3.4.1, i.e. that Clause Reduction is possible for experiencer-modal verbs and modal nouns only when the Actor of the embedded verb is a controllee.

Under a Clause Reduction analysis, (70d) would actually be a monoclausal construction, rather than a biclausal Raising construction. But so far we have observed Raising-type effects due to Clause Reduction only in the position of pronouns, since their position is determined by a rule of clitic placement which is sensitive to the presence of internal IP boundaries. The “raised” element in (70d), on the other hand, is a full (non-pronominal) NP, specifically a proper name. How then could Clause Reduction make possible any alternate analysis of (70d)?

Schachter and Otanes (1972) make the following observation:
[Subject—PRK] ang phrases other than personal pronouns occasionally occur in typically enclitic positions. The placement of such a [subject] in enclitic position is always optional. Optional enclitic behavior may be manifested by non-personal-pronoun [subjects] in, for example, sentences introduced by mayroon, hindi, or wala ... and in sentences with modification constructions in predicate position. ... Optional enclitic behavior may also occasionally be manifested by non-personal-pronoun [subjects] in constructions of various other types. (p. 184)

In other words, there are certain constructions in which non-pronominal subjects may optionally behave like clitics, appearing in second position in their immediate clause. Since in Raising constructions both controller and controllee are always subjects, clitic-like behavior of a subject NP under Clause Reduction could produce results superficially indistinguishable from Raising. If we assume that the Equi construction involving modals like gusto is one of those constructions which allow the NP-clitic phenomenon described by Schachter and Otanes, then examples like (70d) are predicted immediately from our analysis of Clause Reduction outlined above. The fact that some speakers accept such examples only for pronominal subjects, as pointed out in example (28), supports the Clause Reduction analysis.

Further support for the analysis of “parasitic control” as a Clause Reduction construction is seen in the following examples. The phrase structure configuration for each example is shown below it. The subject pronoun ako can only be raised out of the Equi complement when the Actor phrase Manuel, which is the Equi controller, follows the content verb as in (71b), indicating that Clause Reduction is involved. When the Actor precedes the complementizer, as in (71a), there is an internal clause boundary which blocks the movement of the clitic pronoun into the matrix IP. Both (71a) and (71b) involve Equi, so it is clear that the “parasitic control” construction is dependent on Clause Reduction and not on Equi per se.
   want 1.SG.NOM GEN=Manuel COMP kill-OV
   (For: Manuel wants to kill me.)

b. Gusto ako=ng patayin ni=Manuel.
   want 1.SG.NOM=LNK kill-OV GEN=Manuel
   Manuel wants to kill me. 

These examples show clearly that it is Clause Reduction, and not Equi, which licenses the “parasitic control” construction.

---

97If (71b) were biclausal in structure, we might expect the interpretation *I want to be killed by Manuel, rather than the actual interpretation Manuel wants to kill me. But this would require the 1st person pronoun to be a genitive form, as experiencer of gusto, rather than the nominative observed in (71b).
Chapter 7.

Unbounded dependencies

1. Introduction

It has long been recognized that the properties of unbounded (“long-distance” or “filler-gap”) dependencies, such as Wh-fronting, relativization, etc., are different in many respects from those of local dependencies such as Equi and Raising. For example, Equi and Raising are lexically governed (i.e. triggered only by a specific set of matrix verbs), clause-bounded (the clause containing the controller must immediately dominate the clause containing the controllee) and apply only to non-finite complements. Unbounded dependencies, on the other hand, are constructionally rather than lexically governed; may cross an arbitrary number of clause boundaries, as the label “unbounded” suggests; and may extend equally into finite and non-finite complements.

For these and other reasons, many theories of syntax use completely different mechanisms to represent unbounded dependencies from those used to represent other types of dependencies. In GB, Wh-movement and NP-movement are assumed to have very different formal properties, including the positions from which movement can take place, possible landing sites (A vs. A-bar positions), and the nature of the trace which is left behind. In HPSG and GPSG, unbounded dependencies are defined in terms of SLASH features which define a path through the phrase structure from the gap to the filler.

Early work in LFG used a similar formal device (bounded domination metavariables) in representing unbounded dependencies. Kaplan and Bresnan (1982) argued that “constituent control” (unbounded) dependencies were defined on phrase structure configurations, in contrast to “functional control” dependencies (e.g. Equi and Raising) which are defined on grammatical relations. Unbounded dependencies were analyzed as the identification of two phrase structure

---

98It is true that certain manner-of-speaking verbs, such as snap, howl, etc., do not allow extraction out of their complement clauses. For this reason, the verbs that do allow long-distance dependencies are sometimes referred to as “bridge verbs”. However, it seems to be the non-bridge class which is exceptional, not only in blocking extraction but in other ways as well, for example in failing to passivize. Therefore I will assume that there is nothing in the lexical entry of the bridge verbs which explicitly licenses long-distance dependencies; rather, some feature must appear in the lexical entry of the non-bridge verbs which blocks these dependencies.
positions, while functional control was analyzed as the identification of a specified grammatical relation in the matrix clause with the subject of the subordinate clause.

Kaplan and Zaenen (1989) have recently argued that long-distance dependencies should be defined in terms of grammatical relations, rather than phrase structure. They propose a formalism called \textit{FUNCTIONAL UNCERTAINTY} which allows them to define the path from filler to gap in the functional structure, and present data from Icelandic and Japanese which would be difficult to account for purely in terms of phrase structure.

In this chapter I will show that the functional uncertainty formalism provides an extremely simple and elegant account of the constraints on long-distance dependencies in Tagalog. Given the analysis presented in chapter 5, it is very difficult to see how these facts could be explained in terms of phrase structure. Thus the Tagalog data offers additional support for the Kaplan and Zaenen proposal.

\section*{2. Constraints on unbounded dependencies}

Unbounded dependencies in Tagalog are subject to the following two constraints: (i) the gap (or unexpressed argument) must always be the subject (nominative element) of its immediate clause; and (ii) a subordinate clause which contains a gap must itself be the subject of its immediate matrix clause. In other words, Tagalog not only allows but actually requires violations of the Sentential Subject Constraint in long-distance dependencies. As will be demonstrated below, this requirement determines the voice marking on each verb between the gap and its filler, producing an effect quite similar to the “Wh-agreement” phenomenon reported in Chamorro and Palauan (Chung, 1982; Georgopoulos, 1984).

In this section, I will provide evidence for the existence of the constraints stated in (i) and (ii). In the following section, I will show how the functional uncertainty approach of allows us to unify the two constraints as a single principle of the grammar.

\subsection*{2.1 The constraint on gaps}

The fact that gaps in Tagalog must always be subjects was illustrated in chapter 2, section 2.2. Recall that subjects are marked with nominative case, and that the voice-marking affixes on the verb reflect the thematic role of the subject. This means that in a filler-gap dependency, no overt element of the smallest clause containing the gap can bear nominative case; and the voice
marker on the verb in that clause will indicate the thematic role assigned to the filler. Further examples are given below:

(1) **Relativization:**

a. ang=bata=ng [nanuksu kay=Josie]
   NOM=child=LNK PERF.AV-tease DAT=Josie
   *the child who teased Josie*

b. *ang=bata=ng [tinuksu si=Josie]
   NOM=child=LNK PERF.OV-tease NOM=Josie

c. ang=bata=ng [tinuksu ni=Josie]
   NOM=child=LNK PERF.OV-tease GEN=Josie
   *the child who Josie teased*

d. *ang=bata=ng [nanuksu si=Josie]
   NOM=child=LNK PERF.AV-tease NOM=Josie

Examples (1a,c) show that both agents and patients may be relativized provided they are subjects. Examples (1b,d) show that neither agents nor patients may be relativized when they are not subjects. The latter examples are ill-formed because they contain an overt nominative element within the relative clause.

Just as with relativization, subjects (regardless of theta-role) can undergo Wh-Fronting and Clefting, while non-subjects cannot. (See chapters 3 and 5 for examples of Clefting.)

(2) **Wh-fronting:**

a. Sino ang nagnakaw ng=kotse mo?
   who NOM PERF.AV-steal GEN=car your(SG)
   *Who stole your car?*

b. *Sino ang ninakaw ang=kotse mo?
   who NOM PERF.OV-steal NOM=car your(SG)

c. Ano ang ninakaw ng=katulong mo?
   what NOM PERF.OV-steal GEN=maid your(SG)
   *What did your maid steal?*

d. *Ano ang nagnakaw ang=katulong mo?
   what NOM PERF.AV-steal NOM=maid your(SG)

Non-subject Actors can be questioned by a Wh-word *in situ*, though Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 512) note that this is infrequent. Compare the following example, showing the Wh-word *in situ*, with the ungrammatical (2b) in which the fronted Wh-word corresponds to a non-subject Actor:
(3) Ninakaw nino ang=kotse mo?
   PERF.OV-steal by.whom NOM=car your(SG)
   Who stole your car?

There are two apparent exceptions to the claim that only subjects can be “extracted”. (I will at times use the familiar metaphor of “extraction” to refer to filler-gap dependencies, without presupposing that such dependencies are created by actual movement of syntactic elements.) The first exception involves Wh-fronting of oblique elements, the second Topicalization of non-subjects. I will argue that neither of these constructions involves a filler-gap dependency.

Questions in which the Wh-word corresponds to an oblique or adverbial element differ from the Wh-question pattern discussed above in two important ways. First, such sentences do not contain an internal IP boundary, as shown by the pre-verbal position of the pronominal clitics in the following examples. Second, this type of question construction does not place any restrictions on the voice of the verb or the presence of an overt subject. In fact, there must in general be a subject distinct from the question word in normal post-verbal position (*money in *(4a), *toy in *(4b), *present in *(4c)), though of course it could be eliminated by zero-anaphora (“pro-drop”).

(4) a. (from Schachter and Otanes, p. 512)
   Kanino mo ibinigay ang=pera?
   to.whom 2.SG.GEN PERF-IV-give NOM=money
   To whom did you give the money?

b. Para kanino mo binili ang=laruan?
   for who(DAT) 2.SG.GEN PERF-buy-OV NOM=toy
   For whom did you buy the toy?

c. (from Schachter and Otanes, p. 507)
   Sa=ano mo ibabalot ang=regalo?
   DAT=what 2.SG.GEN FUT-IV-wrap NOM=present
   What will you wrap the present in?

Both of these observations are predicted if, as suggested in chapter 3, oblique and adverbial Wh-words are pre-posed by the Adjunct Fronting construction rather than Clefting. As demonstrated in chapter 5, Adjunct Fronting does not involve an internal IP boundary, and there is no reason to suspect that such constructions contain a gap at all. If Adjunct Fronting did involve a filler-gap dependency, the filler and its gap would be elements of the same minimal clause, which seems highly unusual.
Clefting, on the other hand, was analyzed as an equational construction whose predicate is a headless relative clause. Thus the constraints on relativization explain why only subjects can be clefted. Moreover, the relative clause always contains an IP constituent, which accounts for the difference in clitic placement between the examples in (4), in which an oblique Wh-word has undergone Adjunct Fronting, and (5), in which a subject Wh-word is clefted:

(5) a. Sino ang binigyan mo ng=pera?
   who NOM PERF-give-DV 2.SG.GEN GEN=mone
   Who did you give (the) money to?

b. Sino ang ibinili mo ng=laruan?
   who NOM BV.PERF-buy 2.SG.GEN GEN=toy
   Who did you buy a/the toy for?

c. Ano ang ipinangbalot mo sa=regalo?
   what NOM IV.PERF-wrap 2.SG.GEN DAT=present
   What did you wrap the present in?

The contrasting phrase structures for oblique vs. non-oblique Wh-questions, corresponding to examples (4b) and (5b) respectively, are shown in the following figures. Under the analysis to be proposed below, the “gap” in sentences like (5b) is assumed to be an element in functional structure which is unrealized in the phrase structure, so the tree in (6b) contains no “trace” element or other empty category.

(6) a. **Oblique Wh-fronting (Adjunct Fronting)**: (ex. 4b)
b. **Subject Wh-fronting (clefting):** (ex. 5b)

The second apparent exception to the generalization that only subjects can be extracted involves the Topicalization construction, which can apply to both subjects and non-subjects. Schachter and Otanes (1972, p. 493 ff.) report that this construction often has a contrastive function, but in other examples it seems to function as what Dik (1978) calls a “Theme”. He defines the Theme as an “external pragmatic function” which “defines the universe of discourse with respect to which the subsequent predication is presented as relevant” (p. 19).

(7) **Topicalization of non-subjects:**

a. Si=Juan, malaki ang=ulo.  
   NOM=Juan big NOM=head  
   *Juan has a big head.*

b. Sa=Maynila, marami=ng kotse.  
   DAT=Manila many=LNK car  
   *In Manila there are many cars.*

c. (from Schachter and Otanes, p. 495)  
   Para sa=iyo, binili ko ito.  
   for DAT=you(SG) buy-OV I(GEN) this(NOM)  
   *For you, I bought this.*

(8) **Topicalization of subjects:** (from Schachter and Otanes, p. 493)  
   Kami, magpapahinga. Kayo, magtatrabaho.  
   1pl.NOM.EXCL AV.FUT-rest 2pl.NOM AV.FUT-work  
   *We will rest. You will work.*
When a non-subject direct argument of the verb is topicalized, a resumptive pronoun must be inserted as in the following example:

(9) Si=Juan, linutu niya ang=pansit.
     NOM=Juan cook-OV him(GEN) NOM=noodles
     Juan, he cooked the pansit (noodles).

Resumptive pronouns are impossible in relative clauses, cleft sentences and other constructions which must involve a filler-gap dependency. Thus examples like (9) strongly suggest that the dependency in Topicalization is of a different nature. The same conclusion was reached by Miller (1988), who argues that Topicalization is a fundamentally different process from ay-Inversion. He suggests that ay-Inversion must involve the syntactic extraction of an argument of the verb while Topicalization involves a strictly semantic dependency. He makes the following comments on the Topicalization construction:

We may think of the initial NP as an adjunct in the sense of Hale (1983, 1986), for example, bearing a construed relation with the verb under coreference with an empty resumptive pronoun in a post-V argument position.

We need not posit the existence of an “empty resumptive pronoun” in such constructions. What is crucial is that the topicalized element bear a “construed relation” to the clause which follows, and that this relation be recoverable or inferrable by the hearer. Possessor Ascension, discussed in section 2.7 of chapter 2, appears to be a special case of the Topicalization construction. As noted there, Possessor Ascension is subject to semantic as well as syntactic constraints: the topicalized possessor must be construed as being affected by the described action.

2.2. The constraint on extraction domains

As stated above, subordinate clauses which contain gaps must themselves be the subject of their immediate matrix clause. That is, contrary to English where extraction out of sentential subjects is impossible, long-distance extraction in Tagalog is possible only out of a sentential subject. This is equally true whether the subordinate clause which contains the gap is the finite complement of a verb like say or a non-finite complement, as in an Equi construction. Both contexts are illustrated below.

Miller (1988, p. 41) presents the following example as fully grammatical, but for my consultants it is only marginal at best:

Si=Juan, linutu ang=pansit.
     NOM=Juan PERF=cook-OV NOM=noodles
     Juan cooked the pansit (noodles).

---
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Example (10) shows the range of voice possibilities for the verb *sabi* ‘say’ and its finite complement clause. The Active Voice form *nagsabi* selects the speaker as matrix subject; the Dative Voice form *sinabihan* selects the hearer as matrix subject; and the Objective Voice form *sinabi* selects the sentential (CP) complement itself as the subject of the matrix clause. None of these forms place any special restrictions on the choice of subject in the complement clause.

However, when an element of the complement clause is involved in a filler-gap dependency, the voice markers on the two verbs must indicate that both the gap and the complement clause which contains it are subjects of their respective clauses. No other combination of verb forms is possible:

(11) a. Alin=ng kotse ang sinabi mo kay=Pedro na binili ni=Linda?  
    Which car did you tell Pedro that Linda bought?

    b. Aling kotse ang *nagsabi ka kay Pedro  
       *sinabihan mo si Pedro  
       *sinabi mo kay Pedro  
       na binili ni Linda na bumili si Linda ?

Further embeddings are possible, provided that the voice morphology of each successive matrix verb marks its complement clause as a sentential subject, as in the following example:¹⁰⁰

---

¹⁰⁰ The language consultant who constructed this example called it verbose but completely grammatical.
(12) Alin=ng kotse ang inaakala mo=ng
which=LNK car NOM IMPERF-think-OV 2.SG.GEN=COMP

sinabi ni=Pedro na binili ni=Linda?
PERF-say-OV GEN=Pedro COMP PERF-buy-OV GEN=Linda
Which car do you think that Pedro said that Linda bought?

The same pattern holds for extraction from a non-finite complement. The following
examples involving the Equi predicate bawal ‘forbid’ show that when there is no filler-gap
dependency, there are no restrictions on the voice marking of either the matrix verb or the
controlled verb. However, when an element of the controlled clause is extracted, the voice
markers on the two verbs must select both the gap and the controlled clause as subjects.

(13) \begin{align*}
\{ \text{Nagbawal ako kay=Maria} \} & = \{ \text{awitin ang} \text{song} \} \\
\{ \text{Binawalan ko si=Maria} \} & = \{ \text{umawit ng} \text{song} \} \\
\{ \text{Ipinagbawal ko kay=Maria} \} & = \{ \text{sing-OV NOM} \text{song} \} \\
\{ \text{PERF.AV-forbid 1.SG.NOM DAT=Maria} \} & = \{ \text{AV-sing GEN} \text{song} \} \\
\{ \text{PERF.DV-forbid 1.SG.GEN NOM=Maria} \} & = \{ \text{sing-OV GEN} \text{song} \} \\
\{ \text{PERF.IV-forbid 1.SG.GEN DAT=Maria} \} & = \{ \text{sing-OV NOM} \text{song} \}
\end{align*}

I forbade Maria to sing this song/a song.

(14) a. Aling kanta ang ipinagbawal mo
which song NOM PERF.IV-forbid 2.SG.GEN

kay=Maria=ng awitin?
DAT=Maria=COMP sing-OV
Which song did you forbid Maria to sing?

b. Aling kanta ang
which song NOM PERF.IV-forbid 2.SG.GEN

kay=Maria=ng awitin?

The same effect can be illustrated with the ay-inversion construction. When ay-inversion
applies to an embedded clause, the inverted element may either occur in sentence-initial position,
as in (15c), or in an intermediate position as in example (15b):

(15) a. Sinabi ni=Pedro na ninakaw ni=Josie
PERF.OV-say GEN=Pedro COMP PERF.OV-steal GEN=Josie
ang=kotse mo.
NOM=car your
*Pedro said that Josie stole your car.*

b. Sinabi ni=Pedro na ang=kotse mo ay
PERF.OV-say GEN=Pedro COMP NOM=car your INV

ninakaw ni=Josie.
PERF.OV-steal GEN=Josie
*Pedro said that your car, Josie stole.*

c. Ang=kotse mo ay sinabi ni=Pedro na
NOM=car your INV PERF-say-OV GEN=Pedro COMP

ninakaw ni=Josie.
PERF.OV-steal GEN=Josie
*Your car, Pedro said that Josie stole.*

When the inverted element appears in an intermediate position, as in (15b), any of several possible voice markers may appear on the matrix verb. Compare the forms of the matrix verb in the following examples with that in (15b):

(16) a. Nagsabi si=Pedro na ang=kotse mo ay
PERF.AV-say NOM=Pedro COMP NOM=car your INV

ninakaw ni=Josie.\(^{101}\)
PERF.OV-steal GEN=Josie
*Pedro said that your car, Josie stole.*

b. Sinabihan ako ni=Pedro na ang=kotse
PERF-say-DV 1.SG.NOM GEN=Pedro COMP NOM=car

mo ay ninakaw ni=Josie.
your INV PERF.OV-steal GEN=Josie
*I was told by Pedro that your car, Josie stole.*

But when the inverted element appears in sentence-initial position, as in (15c), this variation in the voice marking of the matrix verb is impossible. Note the contrast between (16a-b) and the following examples:

\(^{101}\)The use of Active Voice here is perhaps somewhat unnatural because of the preference for the utterance, as a definite Undergoer, to be the subject.
Examples (16-17) show that the constraint on extraction domains determines the voice category of each verb on the hierarchical path between the gap and its filler, but does not constrain the voice marking of those verbs which do not lie between the gap and filler. As noted in section 1, this pattern is very reminiscent of the “Wh-agreement” facts in Chamorro and Palauan.

As in the case of the constraint discussed in the previous section, adjunct-like elements provide an apparent exception to the constraint on extraction domains. Oblique and adverbial Wh-phrases appear to undergo long-distance extraction. Note that in the following examples involving such elements, there is in every case an overt subject NP in the clause to which the Wh-element is interpreted as belonging:

(18) a. Para kanino sinabi ni=Pedro=ng
for whom PERF-say-OV GEN=Pedro=COMP

binili niya ang=laruan?
PERF-buy-OV 3.SG.GEN NOM=toy
For whom did Pedro say he bought the toy?

b. Kailan sinabi ni=Pedro=ng aalis
when PERF-say-OV GEN=Pedro=COMP AV-FUT-leave

siya?
3.SG.NOM
When did Pedro say he would leave?
c. Kanino sinabi ni=Pedro=ng ibinigay to.whom PERF-say-OV GEN=Pedro=COMP PERF.BV-give
   niya ang=pera?
   3.SG.GEN NOM=money
   To whom did Pedro say he gave the money?

d. Dahil sa=ano sinabi ng=Doktor na because DAT=what PERF-say-OV GEN=doctor COMP
   namatay si=Juan?
   PERF.die NOM=Juan
   Because of what did the doctor say Juan died?

   However, this apparent extraction of non-term elements does not impose the same
   restrictions on the extraction domain as those which have been demonstrated in this section for
   normal long-distance dependencies in Tagalog. There is no requirement that the embedded
   clause out of which the oblique or adverbial element is “extracted” be a sentential subject of the
   matrix clause. Consider the following examples:

   (19) a. Para kanino pinaalalahanan ka for whom PERF-remind-DV 2.SG.NOM
       ni=Pedro=ng bumili ng=laruan?
       GEN=Pedro=COMP AV-buy GEN=toy
       For whom did Pedro remind you to buy a toy?

   b. Kanino pinaalalahanan ka ni=Pedro=ng to.whom PERF-remind-DV 2.SG.NOM GEN=Pedro=COMP
       ibigay ang=pera?
       IV-give NOM=money
       To whom did Pedro remind you to give the money?

   c. ??Ano=ng libro (ang) pinaalalahanan ka what=LNK book (NOM) PERF-remind-DV 2.SG.NOM
       ni=Pedro=ng ibigay kay=Linda?
       GEN=Pedro=COMP IV-give DAT=Linda
       What book did Pedro remind you to give to Linda?
d. Ano=ng libro ang ipinajalajala sa=iyo
   what=LNK book NOM IV-PERF-remind DAT=yō

   ni=Pedro=ng ibigay kay=Linda?
   GEN=Pedro=COMP IV-give DAT=Linda

   What book did Pedro remind you to give to Linda?

In examples (19a-c), the matrix verb governs an overt subject NP (you), which means that
the embedded clause from which the Wh-element has apparently been extracted is not a
sentential subject. The resulting construction is grammatical in (19a-b), where the Wh-element
corresponds to an oblique argument (for whom and to whom). But in (19c), where the subject of
the embedded clause has been extracted, the result is marginal at best. In order to express the
intended meaning of (19c), we must use the form of the matrix verb which will mark the
embedded clause as a sentential subject, as in (19d). Notice that in (19d), the pronoun you is
marked for dative rather than nominative case.102

We have seen that oblique and adverbal questions like those in (4) and (18) are
exceptional in two respects. First, the extracted element need not be a subject, and second the
domain of extraction need not be a sentential subject. I suggest that this exceptional behaviour
follows from the fact that the long-distance “extraction” of non-term Wh-elements does not
involve a filler-gap dependency at all. Rather, it appears to be a special case of the
Topicalization construction discussed in the previous section. The relation of the oblique Wh-
element to the clause over which it takes scope is that of an adjunct, involving a semantic
dependency but no syntactic dependency.

Although there is no intonation break separating the oblique Wh-element from the rest of
the sentence in (19a-b), the fact that the clitic pronoun follows the verb indicates that Wh-
element in those examples occupies the [SPEC, CP] position, rather than [SPEC, IP]. This
provides further evidence that the construction involved is a kind of Topicalization, since [SPEC, CP]
is the position which topicalized elements occupy according to the analysis presented in
chapter 5. Under this assumption, then, the constraints which require that all gaps be subjects,
and that long-distance extraction be allowed only out of sentential subjects, are exceptionless.

102Judgements in this area appear to be quite difficult, and the data needs to be explored further. But the contrast between (20c)
and (20d) is fairly clear.
3. A unified account

Under the analysis proposed by Guilfoyle, Hung and Travis (in press), one could account for both of these constraints at once by stipulating that VP is always a barrier (i.e., opaque to extraction) in Tagalog. The crucial feature of their analysis was that the subject always occupies a unique position in the surface phrase structure, namely [SPEC, IP]. Since only the subject is external to the VP under this analysis, only the subject could be extracted. Moreover, sentential complements would normally be embedded inside the VP of the matrix clause. Since the matrix VP would also be a barrier, nothing could be extracted from an embedded clause until that clause had moved into the matrix [SPEC, IP] position, i.e. become a sentential subject. Only then would its own subject be eligible for extraction, being outside of both the matrix and complement VP constituents.

The problem with this approach, of course, is that the phrase structure assumed by Guilfoyle et al. makes the wrong predictions about word order, clitic placement, pronominal binding, etc. Moreover, there is no evidence that sentential subjects occupy a different position in the phrase structure from other sentential complements. Sentential complements always follow all other arguments of the verb, regardless of case marking or grammatical relation. In the following examples, repeated from (11), there is no evidence for a change in phrase structural position of the sentential complement; only the case and voice markings have changed:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\{\text{Nagsabi ako kay Pedro}\} \\
&\{\text{Sinabihan ko si Pedro} \\
&\text{Sinabi ko kay Pedro}\} \\
&\text{na binili ni=Linda ang=kotse.}
\end{align*}
\]

As was demonstrated in chapter 5, subjects do not occupy a unique position in the phrase structure. Subjects are always sisters of their co-arguments, and so any barrier in the phrase structure which blocked the extraction of other arguments would block the extraction of subjects as well. Thus no purely phrase structural analysis seems able to account for the Tagalog extraction facts. An analysis in terms of grammatical relations seems to be required.
In this section I will demonstrate that the Functional Uncertainty formalism proposed by Kaplan and Zaenen (1989) makes it possible to give a unified account for the two constraints discussed in the previous section. The basic assumptions behind this formalism are the following: filler-gap dependencies are base-generated, and are mediated via functional structure rather than phrase-structure. The “gap” is not a syntactic element such as an empty category or an empty node in the phrase-structure. Rather, it is an element of functional structure which is unified (identified) with some other element of functional structure and thus (locally) unexpressed in the phrase-structure.

I will use a simplified version of the LFG formalism in this discussion, in order to represent the mapping between functional structure and constituent structure with maximal ease. The following example shows the functional structure and constituent structure of the Tagalog sentence in (15a). Note that the order of elements within any single constituent in functional structure is arbitrary. I have arranged them to maximize the parallelism between the two levels. I will again use the label ACTOR as a mnemonic label for the grammatical relation of non-subject Actors, which should technically be something like OBJ\textsuperscript{agt}. Recall that in this example the complement clause is itself the subject of the matrix verb.

(21) (= 15a)
Sinabi ni=Pedro na ninakaw ni=Josie ang=kotse mo.
OV-say GEN=Pedro COMP OV-steal GEN=Josie NOM=car your
Pedro said that Josie stole your car.

In Kaplan and Zaenen’s approach, the dependency between fillers and gaps is defined in terms of a functional structure pathway which connects them. For example, in the English example (22a), the gap corresponds to the object of the complement clause, designated (COMP OBJ) for “complement’s object”. The TOPIC (Mary) is interpreted as filling the object’s role. Thus the f-structure pathway between filler and gap would be expressed by the equation in (22b). The relationship between functional structure and constituent structure would be as shown in (22c):
(22) a. Mary John claimed that he had telephoned (but Susan he admitted that he was unable to contact.)

b. (TOP) = (COMP OBJ)

c. “Functional Uncertainty” means that the formalism allows us to define a theoretically unbounded number of legitimate filler-gap dependencies through the use of variables in the equations which define the allowable f-structure dependencies. For example, to allow for the topicalization of objects of complement clauses to an arbitrary depth of embedding (e.g., “Mary John claimed that the police acknowledged that Bill admitted he had telephoned”), we would employ the following equation, using the Kleene star to specify a string of COMP’s of length zero or greater:

(23) (TOP) = (COMP* OBJ)

Of course, other arguments besides direct objects can be topicalized in English. Kaplan and Zaenen propose the following topicalization rule for English. It says that any grammatical function other than a complement can be topicalized out of an arbitrarily deep series of closed and open complements:

(24) (TOP) = ({COMP, XCOMP}* (GF – COMP))

Now for Tagalog, the “uncertainty” in filler-gap dependencies is of a very limited character. We do not need to use variables at all -- only subjects can be extracted, and every element on the pathway between filler and gap must itself be a subject. This can be expressed with great simplicity in the following way:

(25) (TOP) = (SUBJ+)

---

103 COMP designates a “closed” (i.e., sentential) complement, while XCOMP designates an “open” complement, i.e. a complement (generally non-finite) whose unexpressed subject is controlled.
That is, a gap may be a subject, the subject of a (sentential) subject, a subject’s subject’s subject, etc. (The symbol “++” is used to specify the string of SUBJ’s as being of length one or greater.) Of course, in clefting and Wh-fronting, we need to specify that the filler is a focused element, rather than a topic. Kaplan and Zaenen use the variable DF to range over the set of discourse functions, including at least TOPIC and FOCUS. Thus we could state the general pattern of filler-gap dependencies in Tagalog as follows:

\[(26) \quad (DF) = (SUBJ^+)\]

The phrase structure rule which would license the subject-Topicalization construction would be something like the following:

\[(27) \quad CP \rightarrow (XP) \quad C'\]
\[(\text{DF})\]
\[C' \rightarrow C \quad IP\]

The rule of functional identification in (26) will ensure that the TOPIC or FOCUS phrase is unified with the SUBJ of its complement IP (or some lower sentential subject), and thus must bear nominative case. The principles of uniqueness and coherence will ensure that no other subject can occur in the same minimal clause as the gap. Since the rules of case marking associate nominative case only with subjects, no overt nominative NP will occur in that clause or, for the same reasons, in any of the matrix clauses containing it. And the general principles of voice marking (a set of lexical rules defining the relationship between voice morphology and subject selection for any given verb) will ensure the correct form for each verb which lies on the pathway between filler and gap. None of these details need to be stipulated.

In summary, the unique status of the subject with respect to extraction in Tagalog, together with the evidence presented in chapter 5 showing that the subject does not have a unique position in phrase structure, suggests that the constraints on long-distance dependencies in Tagalog should be defined in terms of grammatical relations rather than phrase structure. Functional Uncertainty provides a way not only of expressing the constraints but also of unifying them into a single maximally simple statement. What remains to be developed is a typology of possible

---

104 For simplicity’s sake, I am assuming here that the Topicalization of subjects involves a true (syntactic) long-distance dependency, whereas the Topicalization of non-subjects does not, for reasons stated in section 2. Topicalization provides the simplest example of how the Functional Uncertainty formalism works; the phrase structure rules for relative clauses and clefting introduce certain complexities which are irrelevant to the immediate concerns of this chapter.
constraints. Out of the infinitely many regular expressions allowed by the Functional Uncertainty formalism, which ones are actually used in the grammars of human languages? Can one account for the observed range of cross-linguistic variation? I leave these questions as topics for future research.
Chapter 8.

Conclusion

1. Summary

This dissertation has presented evidence to support a number of analytical claims about Tagalog grammar. First, a wide variety of syntactic tests were used to show that the argument whose semantic role is reflected in the voice marking of the verb, i.e. the NP which bears nominative case, is the grammatical subject of the clause. This result allows us to sort out the factors which contribute to the typological distinctiveness of the Philippine-type voice system.

Evidence from morphological complexity, distributional restrictions, constraints on subject selection, text frequency and child language acquisition all support the conclusion that the patient, rather than the agent, is the unmarked choice for subject in a transitive clause (chapter 2, section 6). However, agents (or, more generally, Actors) always have a unique semantic and pragmatic prominence, as discussed in chapters 3 and 4. And, contrary to the situation in most other languages, non-subject Actors in Tagalog have the syntactic status of terms (direct arguments), rather than obliques or adjuncts (chapter 2, section 4.1). It is this “non-demotion” (i.e., non-obliqueness) of Actors, together with their semantic and pragmatic prominence, which creates the apparent ambiguity of subjecthood properties.

A significant amount of evidence, including constraints on word-order, clitic placement, and pronominal coreference, has been presented in support of the claim that Tagalog is a non-configurational language. But this does not mean that Tagalog grammar makes no reference to the notion of phrase structure constituency whatsoever, or that the phrase structure of the clause is completely flat. On the contrary, I have argued that Tagalog has a very well-defined phrase structure, and that it can be analyzed using essentially the same kind of X-bar theory which has been successfully applied to a wide variety of other languages. The non-configurationality effects in Tagalog are entirely localized to a single constituent, namely S. Within S, the subject of a verbal clause must be a sister to all other arguments of the verb. The linear order of the daughters of S is determined by functional and pragmatic factors (see chapter 5, example (3))
rather than by rigid constituent boundaries. But apart from S, the internal structure of all other constituents seems to be highly configurational.

2. Theoretical implications

The specific analysis of Tagalog proposed here has a number of implications for syntactic theory in general. Four of these are noted here:

First, **Tagalog has a well-defined grammatical subject**. Thus, contrary to arguments made by Schachter (1976, 1977) and Foley and Van Valin (1984), Tagalog does NOT provide evidence against the universality of grammatical relations, in particular the subject relation. There may in fact be languages which lack the category of grammatical subject, but Tagalog is not one of them. This is a significant result, since data from Tagalog has frequently been cited as crucial evidence for the claim that subjecthood cannot be a linguistic universal.

Second, **grammatical relations are defined independently of phrase structure**. Although a large number of syntactic processes apply only to subjects in Tagalog, no unique subject position can be identified in Tagalog phrase structure. This implies that subjecthood cannot be defined in terms of surface phrase structure configuration. Neither can grammatical relations be defined in terms of pragmatic functions, as for example in the work of Givón (1983) and Cooreman, Fox and Givón (1984) who define the subject of a clause as the argument which displays the highest degree of topicality, the direct object as the second highest, etc. As demonstrated in chapter 3, subjects in Tagalog are not in general the most topical element (in Givón’s terms) of the sentence. Thus grammatical relations must have an independent status in the grammar, and cannot be reduced to either phrase structural position or semantic or pragmatic prominence.

Third, **patients can become subjects even when the agent is expressed as a direct (non-oblique) argument of the verb**. The non-demotion of Actors in Tagalog forces us to re-examine standard assumptions about the syntactic mechanism of subject selection. In Relational Grammar, the agent is assumed to be the initial subject. When non-agents advance to subjecthood, as in passivization, a universal principle requires that the agent must be placed “en chômage”, that is, demoted to oblique status. The standard GB analysis of passivization, following Chomsky (1981), is that the passive morphology “absorbs” the agentive theta-role,
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105 Durie (1987), for example, claims that Acehnese is such a language.
which means that the agent must either be expressed as an adjunct (a prepositional by-phrase) or remain unexpressed. Some lexical theories of passivization assume that the linking of semantic roles to syntactic arguments is tightly constrained by the thematic hierarchy. Since the agent is the highest argument on the hierarchy, these theories predict that a non-agent can become the grammatical subject only when the agent is suppressed or demoted.

The Tagalog facts are problematic for all of these approaches, because non-subject agents in Tagalog always have the status of direct arguments, i.e., “objects”. Subject selection in Tagalog does not work by demotion or suppression of thematically more prominent arguments. Rather, all arguments seem to be equally eligible for mapping onto the subject relation, provided that they satisfy the various semantic and pragmatic constraints discussed in earlier chapters. Thus as Guilfoyle, Hung and Travis (in press) point out, data from Tagalog (and other Malay-J Polynesian languages) challenges the universality of Burzio’s Generalization. This generalization, translated into theory-neutral terms, essentially says that patient-like arguments can become subjects only when no syntactically expressed argument of the verb bears an agent-like semantic role. Tagalog provides a clear counter-example to this claim.

Finally, **Tagalog is non-configurational**. If my analysis of Tagalog phrase structure is correct, it provides a counter-example to the claim by Speas (1990) that there are no non-configurational languages. The issue is whether or not Tagalog has a VP constituent which excludes the subject. Two crucial pieces of evidence were presented in chapter 5 which indicate that Tagalog has no such constituent. First, the subject is c-commanded by its co-arguments, as shown by the facts of pronominal coreference in chapter 5, example (19). Second, the verb and its object (or other arguments) never form a constituent which can either host clitics (chapter 5, examples (54-55)) or define a domain of clitic placement. In contrast, maximal projections of every other category obligatorily exhibit both of these properties.

### 3. The “Internal Subject” hypothesis

The analysis developed in chapter 5 posited a distinction between S and IP. This may seem to be a somewhat radical departure from the standard X-bar theory of phrase structure. Another alternative which should be considered is that the constituent I have labelled “S” may really be a VP which includes its subject, along the lines of the “internal subject hypothesis” proposed for a variety of languages by Fukui and Speas (1986), Koopman and Sportiche (1988), Kuroda (1988),
Diesing (1990), Guilfoyle, Hung and Travis (in press) and others. But the idea that a VP can contain its own subject is also a significant departure from earlier assumptions about phrase structure.

There are two considerations which seem to argue against replacing “S” with “VP” for Tagalog. First, S never constitutes a domain of clitic placement. This fact is consistent with the rule of clitic placement in (57) of chapter 5 only if S is not a maximal projection. Under the assumption that S is an exocentric category, one would not expect it to be a maximal projection since it is not a projection at all. Second, S is the only non-configurational category in Tagalog. Again, this could be argued to follow from the fact that it is the only exocentric category. If we re-labelled this constituent as VP for verbal clauses, we would presumably want to identify it as PP, NP or AP for non-verbal clauses. We would have to say that configurationality is optional for the latter three categories but impossible for VP. Moreover, it would be necessary to posit a new X” level for non-verbal lexical categories, and to stipulate that X⁰ and X” categories could host clitics but not X’ or XP categories. These stipulations seem clearly undesireable.

There seem to be good reasons for recognizing the distinction between S and IP in Tagalog. This suggests that it might be useful to re-examine those languages which have previously been analyzed as having VP-internal subjects, to see whether the same distinction is justified in these languages as well. If so, the constituent which has been previously analyzed as a VP might be better analyzed as an S. The question to be asked is this: if there is evidence that the subject and predicate form a constituent smaller than the clause (IP), does this constituent have the properties of a maximal projection (assuming that independent criteria for identifying maximal projections can be established in the relevant languages)? In this way, the internal subject hypothesis can be empirically tested on a language-by-language basis.