

An argument for the noun-verb distinction in Tagalog

Henrison Hsieh, McGill University
henrison.hsieh@mail.mcgill.ca

Southeast Asian Linguistics Society
May 27, 2016

1 Introduction

• Tagalog Phrase Structure

- Much debate without general consensus
- Some major interrelated phenomena: voice system, argument marking, extraction restrictions
- see e.g., Guilfoyle et al. 1992, Kroeger 1993, Aldridge 2004, Rackowski and Richards 2005

• The Nominalist Hypothesis

- Core claim: Apparent verbs in Tagalog are actually nouns
- Mainly for this talk: Kaufman 2009 (but see also Starosta et al. 1982 and others)
- Kaufman argues that many of the phenomena above can be straightforwardly understood under a nominalist analysis
- See the other papers in *Theoretical Linguistics* 35 for responses

• This talk

- Will argue that the nominalist analysis is unviable for Tagalog
- Will show a pattern of asymmetry and neutralization that is most readily explained by a distinction in syntactic category

Roadmap

- §2. Tagalog background
- §3. The nominalist hypothesis for Tagalog
- §4. Three construction types
- §5. Asymmetry and neutralization
- §6. Conclusion

2 Tagalog background

• “Voice” system

- Verbal morphology correlates with the thematic role of the syntactically prominent argument, marked with *ang*
- Sample paradigm from Rackowski and Richards 2005:¹

- (1) B<um>ili **ang** bata ng tela sa palengke para sa nanay.
<AV.PFV>buy NOM child GEN cloth OBL market for OBL Mother
'The child bought cloth at the market for Mother.'² Agent Voice (AV)
- (2) B<in>ili-Ø ng bata **ang** tela sa palengke para sa nanay.
<PFV>buy-PV GEN child NOM cloth OBL market for OBL Mother
'The child bought the cloth at the market for Mother.' Patient Voice (PV)
- (3) B<in>ilh-**an** ng bata ng tela **ang** palengke para sa nanay.
<PFV>buy-LV GEN child GEN cloth NOM market for OBL Mother
'The child bought cloth at the market for Mother.' Locative Voice (LV)
- (4) I-b<in>ili ng bata ng tela sa palengke **ang** nanay.
CV-<PFV>buy GEN child GEN cloth OBL market NOM Mother
'The child bought cloth at the market for Mother.' Conveyance Voice (CV)

¹Ng is a standardly abbreviated spelling. It is pronounced [naŋ].

²I gloss *ang* and *ng* as NOM and GEN respectively following Kaufman (2009), but I remain neutral as to their specific status.

- A-bar extraction
 - E.g., clefting, topicalization, *wh*-questions, and relativization
 - Generally, extraction may only target the *ang*-marked argument
 - i.e. Verb must bear AV marking to target the agent for extraction
- Examples below show this for relativization
 - Headed relatives feature the Tagalog linker (often signaling modification) mediating between head and relative clause modifier
 - Headless relatives look like relative clause modifiers without a head

(5) *Agent Voice*

- a. (**bata**=ng) b<**um**>ili ng tela sa palengke para sa nanay
child=LK <AV.PFV>buy GEN cloth OBL market for OBL Mother
'{child/one} who bought cloth at the market for Mother'
- b. * (**tela**=ng) b<**um**>ili **ang bata** sa palengke para sa nanay
cloth=LK <AV.PFV>buy NOM child OBL market for OBL Mother
'{cloth/one} that the child bought at the market for Mother'

(6) *Patient Voice*

- a. ?? (**bata**=ng) b<**in**>ili-Ø **ang tela** sa palengke para sa nanay
child=LK <PFV>buy-PV NOM cloth OBL market for OBL Mother
'{child/one} who bought cloth at the market for Mother'
- b. (**tela**=ng) b<**in**>ili-Ø ng bata sa palengke para sa nanay
cloth=LK <PFV>buy-PV NOM child OBL market for OBL Mother
'{cloth/one} that the child bought at the market for Mother'

- **Overarching question:** What are the mechanisms underlying the voice system and extraction restrictions?

3 The Nominalist Hypothesis

3.1 Motivation

- Significant overlap between the distribution and morphological potential of putative nouns and putative verbs

- **Morphological overlap**

- Nouns may bear voice (i.e., “verbal”) morphology
- Verbs may appear bare, with nominal interpretations

- **Distributional overlap**

- Nouns appear as-is (i.e. without a copula) in predicate position
- Verbs appear as-is (i.e. no relativizers) in argument position
- This overlap also applies to bare verbs and voice-marked nouns

(7) *Putative noun*

- a. **Kaibigan** ko si Tina.
friend 1S.GEN NOM Tina
'Tina is my friend.' *Bare pred.*
- b. **K<in>aibigan-Ø** ko si Tina.
<PFV>friend-PV 1S.GEN NOM Tina
'I befriended Tina.' *Voice-marked pred.*
- c. H<**in**>abol-Ø ng bata **ang kaibigan** ko.
<PFV>chase-PV GEN child NOM friend 1S.GEN
'The child chased my friend.' *Bare arg.*
- d. H<**in**>abol-Ø ng bata **ang k<in>aibigan-Ø** ko.
<PFV>chase-PV GEN child NOM <PFV>friend-PV 1S.GEN
'The child chased the one I befriended.' *Voice-marked arg.*

(8) *Putative verb*

- a. **Lakad** ni Boyet iyon.
walk GEN Boyet that.NOM
'That is Boyet's errand.' *Bare pred.*
- b. **Nag-lakad** si Boyet sa tindahan.
PFV.AV-walk NOM Boyet OBL store
'Boyet walked to the store' *Voice-marked pred.*
- c. Alam ko **ang lakad** ni Boyet.
know 1S.GEN NOM walk GEN Boyet
'I know (what) Boyet's errand (is).'
- d. H<**in**>abol-Ø ng bata **ang nag-lakad** sa tindahan.
<PFV>chase-PV GEN child NOM <PFV.AV>-walk OBL store
'The child chased the one who walked to the store.' *Voice-marked arg.*

- **Looks like:** Hard to distinguish nouns and verbs other than by meaning

3.2 Theoretical advantages

- Kaufman (2009) argues that a nominalist analysis of Tagalog accounts for more than the overlap between nouns and verbs shown above
- He argues that the voice marking and extraction restrictions can also be explained readily under this analysis (similar to Johns 1992 for Inuktitut)

• [[Paraphrases in double brackets reflect the intuition behind this view]]

- **“Verbal” predicates**

- Analyzed as simple nominal predicates
- Apparent headless relatives are thus also simple nominal predicates
- No internal clausal structure (in comparison to true relative clauses)

- **Voice system**

- Like participant nominalizers
- i.e., agent voice \approx English *-er*, patient voice \approx English *-ee*, etc.
- Tagalog sentences are inherently copular with the *ang*-marked DP functioning as the subject and the rest functioning as a DP predicate

(9) a. [B<um>ili ng tela]_{Pred} [ang bata]_{Subj}.
 <AV.PFV>buy GEN cloth NOM child
 ‘The child bought cloth.’
 [[[The child]_{Subj} [was the cloth’s buyer]_{Pred}.]]

b. [B<in>ili-Ø ng bata]_{Pred} [ang tela]_{Subj}.
 <PFV>buy-PV GEN child NOM cloth
 ‘The child bought the cloth.’
 [[[The cloth]_{Subj} [was the child’s buy-ee]_{Pred}.]]

- **Extraction restriction**

- Reduced to a cross-linguistic ban on genitive extraction out of DPs

(10) *tela=ng [b<um>ili ng tela]_{Pred} [ang bata]_{Subj}
 cloth=LK <AV.PFV>buy GEN cloth NOM child
 ‘cloth that the child bought’
 [[cloth_i (that) the child (was) its_i buyer]]

- *Ang*-marked constituents may extract because they are separate DPs

(11) bata=ng [b<um>ili ng tela]_{Pred} [ang bata]_{Subj}
 child=LK <AV.PFV>buy GEN cloth NOM child
 ‘child who bought cloth’
 [[child (that was) the cloth’s buyer]]

- I will argue that while this approach explains several major aspects of Tagalog syntax, its application to the language in the first place is questionable

4 Three construction types

- The rest of the discussion will revolve around comparing the behavior of three morphologically defined constructions
- Motivation: Compare constructions in distinct “derivational states”
- **Bare nominals**: Constructions appearing without additional morphology

(12) a. Kaibigan ko si Tina.
 friend 1S.GEN NOM Tina
 ‘Tina is my friend.’

b. Alam ko ang lakad ni Kiko.
 know 1S.GEN NOM walk GEN Kiko
 ‘I know (what) Kiko’s errand (is).’

- **Voice phrases**: Constructions appearing with voice morphology; often appear with aspectual morphology (13a), but not always (13b)

(13) a. H<in>abol-Ø ng bata ang k<in>aibigan-Ø ko.
 <PFV>chase-PV GEN child NOM <PFV>friend-PV 1S.GEN
 ‘The child chased the one I befriended.’

b. Gusto ng bata=ng [habul-in ng aso ang pusa].
 want GEN child=LK chase-PV GEN dog NOM cat
 ‘The child wants [the dog to chase the cat].’

- **Derived nominals:** Constructions appearing with what I will analyze as the true nominalizing morphemes in Tagalog

- Having some flavor of English *-er* and *-ee*
- Agent *taga-*, patient *-in*, location *-an*³

- (14) a. Taga-linis ng opisina si Pepe.
 AGT.NMLZ-clean GEN office NOM Pepe
 ‘Pepe is an office **cleaner**.’
- b. B<um>ili si Pepe ng lagay-an ng asin.
 <AV.PFV>buy NOM Pepe GEN put-LOC.NMLZ GEN salt
 ‘Pepe bought a salt **container**.’

5 Asymmetry and neutralization

- **Asymmetry:** Constructions show different behavior in various contexts
 - Bare and derived nominals (BN and DN) pattern together
 - Voice phrases (VP) exhibit different behavior from the other two
- **Neutralization:** Embedding the three constructions in various environments causes them to pattern identically with each other
 - When marked by the determiner *ang*, the plural *mga*,⁴ or *isa* ‘one’
 - Common feature: Nominal functional morphology
- Difference in view
 - For Kaufman 2009: *ang*, *mga*, and *isa* can appear with the relevant constructions because they are all nominal to begin with
 - For this paper: These morphemes cause non-nominal constructions to become nominal (e.g., through relativization)
- The property neutralized in these examples is likely syntactic category

³-in and -an are homophonous with the corresponding voice suffixes, but affect the root differently

⁴The other standard spelling abbreviation. Pronounced [maŋa].

5.1 Coordination

- Coordination requires some similarity between coordinated objects
- Constructions of the same class can coordinate with each other

- (15) a. Guro at makata si Jennifer.
 teacher and poet NOM Jennifer
 ‘Jennifer is a teacher and poet.’ ✓BN + BN
- b. Nagtu~turo at nagsu~sulat si Jennifer.
 IMPF.AV~teach and IMPF.AV~write NOM Jennifer
 ‘Jennifer teaches and writes.’ ✓VP + VP
- c. Taga-luto at taga-laba si Jennifer.
 AGT.NMLZ-cook and AGT.NMLZ-laundry NOM Jennifer
 ‘Jennifer is a cook and a launderer/clothes-washer.’ ✓DN + DN

- **Asymmetry** in which constructions can coordinate with others
 - Bare and derived nominals are similar for coordination (16a)
 - Voice phrases are different from the other two (16b-16c)
- (16) a. Gwardya at taga-linis si Pepe.
 guard and AGT.NMLZ-clean NOM Pepe
 ‘Pepe is a security guard and a cleaner.’ ✓BN + DN
- b. *Gwardya at nagli~linis si Pepe.
 guard and IMPF.AV~clean NOM Pepe
 ‘Pepe is a security guard and cleans/is cleaning.’ *BN + VP
- c. *Nagba~bantay at taga-linis si Pepe.
 IMPF.AV~guard and AGT.NMLZ-clean NOM Pepe
 ‘Pepe guards/is guarding and is a cleaner.’ *VP + DN

- Effect is **neutralized** when both conjuncts are marked with *mga* or *ang*

(17) a. **Mga** gwardya at **mga** taga-linis sila.
 PL guard ang PL AGT.NMLZ-clean 3P.NOM
 ‘They are security guards and cleaners.’ cf. (16a)

b. **Mga** gwardya at **mga** nagli~linis sila.
 PL guard ang PL IMPF.AV~clean 3P.NOM
 ‘They are security guards and ones who clean.’ cf. (16b)

c. **Mga** nagba~bantay at **mga** taga-linis sila.
 PL IMPF.AV~guard ang PL AGT.NMLZ-clean 3P.NOM
 ‘They are cleaners and ones who guard.’ cf. (16c)

(18) a. Si Pepe **ang** gwardya at **ang** taga-linis.
 NOM Pepe PL guard ang PL AGT.NMLZ-clean
 ‘Pepe is the security guard and cleaner.’ cf. (16a)

b. Si Pepe **ang** gwardya at **ang** nagli~linis.
 NOM Pepe PL guard ang PL IMPF.AV~clean
 ‘Pepe is the security guard and one who cleans.’ cf. (16b)

c. Si Pepe **ang** nagba~bantay at **ang** taga-linis.
 NOM Pepe PL IMPF.AV~guard ang PL AGT.NMLZ-clean
 ‘Pepe is the cleaner and one who guards.’ cf. (16c)

• **Recap**

- Voice phrases cannot be coordinated with bare and derived nominals
- The determiner *ang* and the plural *mga* eliminate this restriction
- Easily understood assuming that the presence of *ang* and *mga* indicates larger nominal structure embedding the relevant constructions
- For Kaufman 2009:
 - Voice phrases are analyzed as nominal to begin with, so some other property(-ies) are needed to account for the mismatch data in (16)
 - Additionally, the property(-ies) must further interact with *ang* and *mga* to produce the neutralization effect in (17-18)

- Summary table:

(Coordination OK between constructions with the same letter)⁵

	<u>BN</u>	<u>DN</u>	<u>VP</u>	<i>ang</i> X	<i>mga</i> X	<i>isang</i> X
COORDINATION	A	A	B	C	D	(no data)

5.2 **Question-answer parallelism**

- The structure of a question typically constrains forms of possible answers
- In Tagalog, answers must generally be parallel to *wh*-elements, especially for fragment answers; *sino* in (19a):

- Compatible with a nominative (*ang*-marked) answer (19b)
- Not compatible with an oblique (*sa*-marked) answer (19c)

(19) a. Q: **Sino** ang b<in>igy-an ng babae ng susi?
 who.NOM NOM <PFV>give-LV GEN woman GEN key
 ‘Who did the woman give a key to?’

b. A: **Si Rica** (ang b<in>igy-an ng babae ng susi).
 NOM Rica NOM <PFV>give-LV GEN woman GEN key
 ‘(The woman gave a key to) Rica.’

c. # A: (B<in>igay ng babae ang susi) **Kay Rica**.
 <PFV>give.PV GEN woman NOM key OBL Rica
 ‘(The woman gave the key) to Rica.’

- **Asymmetry** in possible answers to questions asking ‘what’

- Bare and derived nominals (21a-b) are fine
- Voice phrases (21c) are infelicitous

(20) Q: **Ano** ang kina~kain ni Kim?
 what.NOM NOM IMPF~eat.PV GEN Kim
 ‘What is Kim eating?’

⁵Coordination is strange with two instances of *isa* ‘one’. Compare with (15a).

(i) ***Isa=ng guro** at **isa=ng makata** si Jennifer.
 one=LK teacher and one=LK poet NOM Jennifer
 ‘Jennifer is a teacher and poet.’

- (21) a. A: Luto ni Harvey ang kina~kain ni Kim.
 cook GEN Harvey NOM IMPF~eat.PV GEN Kim
 'Kim is eating Harvey's cooking.'
- b. A: Lutu-in ni Harvey ang kina~kain ni Kim.
 cook-THM.NMLZ GEN Harvey NOM IMPF~eat.PV GEN Kim
 'Kim is eating Harvey's cooking.'
- c. # A: Ni-luto-Ø ni Harvey ang kina~kain ni Kim.
 PFV-cook-PV GEN Harvey NOM IMPF~eat.PV GEN Kim
 'Harvey cooked what Kim is eating.'
- **Neutralization** with determiner *ang*, plural *mga*, and *isa* 'one'
- (22) a. A: {**Ang /Mga /Isa=ng**} luto ni Harvey ang kina~kain ni Kim.
 NOM PL one=LK cook GEN Harvey NOM IMPF~eat.PV GEN Kim
 'What Kim is eating is Harvey's cooking.' (cf. 21a)
- b. A: {**Ang /Mga /Isa=ng**} lutu-in ni H. ang kina~kain ni K.
 NOM PL one=LK cook-THM.NMLZ GEN H. NOM IMPF~eat.PV GEN K.
 'What Kim is eating is Harvey's cooking.' (cf. 21b)
- c. A: {**Ang /Mga /Isa=ng**} ni-luto-Ø ni H. ang kina~kain ni Kim.
 NOM PL one=LK PFV-cook-PV GEN H. NOM IMPF~eat.PV GEN Kim
 'What Kim is eating is what Harvey cooked.' (cf. 21c)

- **Same pattern:** Voice phrases behave differently from bare and derived nominals, but this is neutralized in the presence of *ang*, *mga*, and *isa*
- **Same logic:** Some property is neutralized by *ang*, *mga*, and *isa*; syntactic category is the most likely candidate
- **Additionally:** Parallelism with *ano* 'what' also suggests that felicitous answers need to be nominal

– VPs non-nominal w/o overt nominal marking, contra Kaufman (2009)

- Summary table:

	<u>BN</u>	<u>DN</u>	<u>VP</u>	<i>ang</i> X	<i>mga</i> X	<i>isang</i> X
COORDINATION	A	A	B	C	D	(no data)
ANSWER TO <i>what</i>	✓	✓	#	✓	✓	✓

5.3 Infinitival embeddings

- Extending on observations by Richards (2009)
 - Non-verbal predicates appear as-is in matrix contexts, in (23)
 - Under certain embeddings, *maging* obligatorily appears, in (24)
 - Examples (23-24) adapted from Richards 2009

- (23) a. Doktor si Jessica. b. Maganda si Jessica.
 doctor NOM Jessica beautiful NOM Jessica
 'Jessica is a doctor.' 'Jessica is beautiful'
- (24) a. Ayoko na=ng [**(maging)** doktor si Jessica].
 don't.want.IS.GEN NOW=LK AV.be doctor NOM Jessica
 'I don't want Jessica to be a doctor anymore.'⁶
- b. Ayoko na=ng [**(maging)** maganda si Jessica].
 don't.want.IS.GEN NOW=LK AV.be beautiful NOM Jessica
 'I don't want Jessica to be beautiful anymore.'
- Richards notes **different** behavior for verbal (voice phrase) embeddings
 - The verb must appear in infinitival (aspect-less) form
 - Insertion of *maging* is ungrammatical⁷
- (25) a. Nagba~basa ng libro ang bata.
 IMPF.AV~read GEN book NOM child
 'The child is reading a book.'
- b. Ayoko na=ng [**(maging)** mag-basa ng libro ang bata].
 don't.want.IS.GEN NOW=LK AV.be AV-read GEN book NOM child
 'I don't want the child to read books anymore.'⁸

⁶ Ayoko is a contraction of *ayaw ko* 'don't.want IS.GEN'.

⁷ *Maging* is ungrammatical even with aspect marked on the verb. In fact, verbal predicates cannot appear in this construction valued for aspect.

(ii) * Ayoko na=ng **(maging)** nagba~basa ng libro ang bata.
 don't.want.IS.GEN NOW=LK AV.be IMPF.AV~read GEN book NOM child
 'I don't want the child to be one who reads books anymore.'

⁸Ungrammatical instances of *maging* are typeset with a strikethrough as an aid to the reader.

- Now consider derived nominal embeddings (a), which require *maging*, patterning with bare nominals and adjectives, not with voice phrases (b)
- (26) a. Gusto ko=ng ***(maging)** taga-luto ng gulay si Fe.
 want 1S.GEN=LK AV.be AGT.NMLZ-cook GEN vegetable NOM Fe
 'I want Fe to be a vegetable cook.'
- b. Gusto ko=ng ***(maging)** mag-luto ng gulay si Fe.
 want 1S.GEN=LK AV.be AV-cook GEN vegetable NOM Fe
 'I want Fe to cook vegetables.'
- (27) a. Gusto ko=ng ***(maging)** lagay-an ni Juliet ng pera ang kaho=ng ito.
 want 1S.GEN=LK AV.be put-LOC.NMLZ GEN Juliet GEN money NOM box=LK this
 'I want this box to be Juliet's money container.'
- b. Gusto ko=ng ***(maging)** lagy-an ni J. ng pera ang kaho=ng ito.
 want 1S.GEN=LK AV.be put-LV GEN J. GEN money NOM box=LK this
 'I want Juliet to put money in this box.'
- Again, asymmetry is **neutralized** with *isa* 'one' marking the embedding
- (28) a. Gusto ko=ng ***(maging)** isa=ng taga-luto ng gulay si Fe.
 want 1S.GEN=LK AV.be one=LK AGT.NMLZ-cook GEN vegetable NOM Fe
 'I want Fe to be a vegetable cook.' (cf. 26a)
- b. Gusto ko=ng ***(maging)** isa=ng naglu~luto ng gulay si Fe.
 want 1S.GEN=LK AV.be one=LK IMPF.AV-cook GEN vegetable NOM Fe
 'I want Fe to be one who cooks vegetables.' (cf. 26b)
- (29) a. Gusto ko=ng ***(maging)** isa=ng lagay-an ni Juliet ng pera ang kaho=ng ito.
 want 1S.GEN=LK AV.be one=LK put-LOC.NMLZ GEN Juliet GEN money NOM box=LK this
 'I want this box to be Juliet's money container.' (cf. 27a)
- b. Gusto ko=ng ***(maging)** isa=ng nila~lagy-an ni Juliet ng pera ang kaho=ng ito.
 want 1S.GEN=LK AV.be one=LK IMPF~put-LV GEN Juliet GEN money NOM box=LK this
 'I want this box to be something that Juliet puts money in.' (cf. 27b)

- Note: Reappearance of aspect on voice phrases with *isa* (28b-29b)
 - Reduced structure when embedded directly under e.g. *gusto, ayaw*
 - Full clausal structure when coerced to a nominal; consistent with a relative clause analysis
- **Same Pattern:** Asymmetrical behavior is neutralized by a nominal element
- **Additionally:** The direction of neutralization is consistent with Richards's (2009) copular analysis of *maging*: appears with non-verbal elements
 - Voice phrases without any overt nominal marking are non-nominal, contra Kaufman (2009)
- **Additionally:** Reappearance of aspect with *isa* is indicative of relativization
- **Finally:** Note that *maging* itself behaves like a voice phrase

- (30) a. Gusto ko=ng **maging** doktor si Juliet.
 want 1S.GEN=LK AV.be doctor NOM Juliet
 'I want Juliet to be a doctor.'
- b. Gusto ko=ng **maging isa=ng magiging** doktor si Juliet.
 want 1S.GEN=LK AV.be one=LK AV.FUT.be doctor NOM Juliet
 'I want Juliet to be someone who will become a doctor.'

• Summary table:⁹

	<u>BN</u>	<u>DN</u>	<u>VP</u>	<i>ang</i> X	<i>mga</i> X	<i>isang</i> X
COORDINATION	A	A	B	C	D	(no data)
ANSWER TO <i>what</i>	✓	✓	#	✓	✓	✓
<i>Maging</i> -INSERTION	✓	✓	*	(no data)	(no data)	✓

⁹ This construction is independently ill-formed with *mga* and *ang*. Compare (iii-iv) to (24a).

- (iii) Gusto nila=ng **maging** (***mga**) doktor sina Fe at Juliet.
 want 3P.GEN=LK AV.be PL doctor NOM.PL Fe and Juliet
 'They want Fe and Juliet to be doctors.'
- (iv) Gusto ko=ng **maging** (***ang**) doktor si Juliet.
 want 1S.GEN=LK AV.be NOM doctor NOM Juliet
 'I want Juliet to become the doctor.'

6 Summary and conclusion

	<u>BN</u>	<u>DN</u>	<u>VP</u>	<i>ang</i> X	<i>mga</i> X	<i>isang</i> X
COORDINATION	A	A	B	C	D	(no data)
ANSWER TO <i>what</i>	✓	✓	#	✓	✓	✓
<i>Maging</i> -INSERTION	✓	✓	*	(no data)	(no data)	✓

• Data presented

- **Asymmetry:** In a number of environments, bare and derived nominals behave similarly, while voice phrases behave differently
- **Neutralization:** Difference in behavior is eliminated when these constructions appear with the determiner *ang*, the plural *mga*, or *isa* ‘one’
- Crucial: Asymmetry detectable only with “unmarked” constructions

• This analysis

- Argues that the asymmetry is caused by difference in syntactic category, which is subsequently neutralized by the clearly nominal structure imposed by *ang*, *mga*, and *isa*
- Does not assume anything about the syntactic category of the constructions involved or any properties that might fall out from them
- Only makes assumptions about the nature of the three morphemes that cause neutralization

• Problem for Kaufman (2009)

- Two (sets of) properties must be proposed: one responsible for the asymmetry between the three constructions, and one responsible for the three (possibly more) neutralization triggers
- These properties must be generalizable across the three (possibly more) contexts discussed

Abbreviations used

{1/2/3}{s/P} = {1st/2nd/3rd} Person {Singular/Plural}, AGT.NMLZ = Agent Nominalizer, AV = Agent Voice, CV = Conveyance Voice, FUT = Future Aspect,

GEN = Genitive, IMPF = Imperfective Aspect, LK = Linker, LOC.NMLZ = Locative Nominalizer, LV = Locative Voice, NOM = Nominative, OBL = Oblique, PFV = Perfective Aspect, PL = Plural, PV = Patient Voice, THM.NMLZ = Theme Nominalizer

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge Lisa Travis and Junko Shimoyama for their invaluable guidance and encouragement on this project, as well as Dan Kaufman, Hadas Kotek, Mark Baker, and the audience at BLS42 for helpful comments and discussion on some of the ideas in this paper. Thanks also to my various Tagalog consultants who endured randomly timed grammaticality judgement questions, sometimes at strange hours of the night. All uncited data is from them or my own native speaker intuitions. To the best of my knowledge, all speakers I consulted (including myself) speak the dialect of Tagalog used in Manila. All errors and misquotations are my own.

References

- Aldridge, Edith. 2004. Ergativity and word order in Austronesian languages. Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University.
- Guilfoyle, Eithne, Henrietta Hung, and Lisa Travis. 1992. Spec of IP and spec of VP: Two subjects in Austronesian languages. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 10:375–414.
- Johns, Alana. 1992. Deriving ergativity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23:57–97.
- Kaufman, Daniel. 2009. Austronesian nominalism and its consequences: A Tagalog case study. *Theoretical Linguistics* 35:1–49.
- Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Dissertations in Linguistics. Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Rackowski, Andrea, and Norvin Richards. 2005. Phase edge and extraction: A Tagalog case study. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:565–599.
- Richards, Norvin. 2009. The Tagalog copula. In *Proceedings of AFLA 16*.
- Starosta, Stanley, Andrew Pawley, and Lawrence Reid. 1982. The evolution of focus in Austronesian. In *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, ed. Amran Halim, Lois Carrington, and Stephen Wurm, volume 2 of *Pacific Linguistics Series C*, 145–170. Canberra: Australian National University.