

Paul Schachter

Revised by Lawrence A. Reid

1 Historical Background

Tagalog is a member of the Central Philippine subgroup of Philippine languages, forming part of the Western-Malayo-Polynesian set of Austronesian languages. It belongs in a subgroup with Bikol, Bisayan and Mansakan languages and was originally probably native to the eastern Visayas or northeast Mindanao in the Central Philippines (Zorc 1993). By the time the Spanish arrived in the Philippines (1521), Tagalog speakers had migrated north into the southern part of the island of Luzon in the Philippines, with Tagalog becoming the major language spoken in Manila and surrounding provinces; it has in recent years spread as a second language over virtually the entire Philippine archipelago. Thus, while only about a quarter of the population of the Philippines were Tagalog-speaking in 1940, in 1970 approximately half of the population were, and today it is estimated that well over 90 per cent of the 80 million total population of the Philippines is either a first- or second-language speaker of the language.

Tagalog was selected in 1937 as the national language of the Philippines, and was established as such in the 1987 Constitution of the country. Under the name of Filipino, Tagalog is now taught in schools throughout the Philippines. The spread of the language has also been favoured by urbanisation – Tagalog is native to the largest city of the Philippines, Manila, and it is used as a lingua franca in many cities with mixed populations – as well as by its prominence in the mass media.

The dialect of Tagalog which is considered standard and which underlies Filipino is the educated dialect of Manila. Other important regional dialects are those of Bataan, Batangas, Bulacan, Tanay-Paete and Tayabas. The lexicon of educated Manila Tagalog contains many borrowings from Spanish and English, the former reflecting over three centuries of colonial domination of the Philippines by Spain, the latter reflecting the period of American hegemony (1898–1946), as well as the current status of English as one of the languages (along with Filipino) of higher education in the Philippines and a lingua franca second in importance only to Filipino itself. Spanish and English have

also had some impact on the phonology of Tagalog (see Section 2, below), but little if any on the syntax and morphology. (See Section 4, however, for some instances of borrowed Spanish gender distinctions.)

2 Phonology and Orthography

Tagalog phonology has been significantly affected by the incorporation into the language of many loanwords from Spanish, English and other languages. One effect of this incorporation has been an expansion of the phonemic inventory of the language, an expansion that has influenced both the vowel and the consonant systems.

Contemporary Tagalog has the five vowel phonemes shown in Table 49.1.

Table 49.1 Tagalog Vowel Phonemes

	<i>Front</i>	<i>Central</i>	<i>Back</i>
High	i		u
Mid	e		o
Low		a	

This five-vowel system no doubt developed out of a three-vowel system in which [i] and [e] were allophones of a single phoneme and [u] and [o] were allophones of another. Contrasts between /i/ and /e/ and between /u/ and /o/ are, however, well established in contemporary Tagalog, not only in borrowed vocabulary (*misa* /mi:sa/ ‘mass’ vs *mesa* /me:sa/ ‘table’, *bus* /bu:s/ ‘bus’ vs *bos* /bo:s/ ‘boss’) but, albeit less commonly, in native vocabulary as well (*iwan* /ʔi:wan/ ‘leave’ vs *aywan* /ʔe:wan/ ‘not known’, *babuy* /ba:buy/ ‘pig-like person’ vs *baboy* /ba:boy/ ‘pig’). Vowel length in non-word-final syllables is phonemic, as the following examples illustrate: *aso* /ʔa:so/ ‘dog’, *aso* /ʔaso/ ‘smoke’, *maglalakbay* /magla:lakbay/ ‘will travel’, *maglalakbay* /maglalakbay/ ‘travel a lot’. In word-final syllables of native words, vowel length is not phonemic: the general rule is that phrase-final syllables are long, non-phrase-final syllables short. Thus *sibat* /sibat/ ‘spear’ is pronounced [siba:t] phrase-finally, but not in *sibat ba?* /sibat ba/ [sibat ba:] ‘is it a spear?’ Word-final syllables of non-native words may, however, show phonemic length. For example, borrowed monosyllabic names have a long vowel in any context: e.g. *Si Bob ba?* /si ba:b ba/ [si ba:b ba:] ‘Is it Bob?’

There are sixteen consonant phonemes that occur in native words. These are displayed in Table 49.2. Probably [d] and [r] were once allophones of a single phoneme, as is evidenced by a good deal of free or morphophonemically conditioned alternation between them (e.g. *daw* /daw/ ~ *raw* /raw/ ‘they say’, *dalita* /da:litaʔ/ ‘poverty’ vs *maralita* /mara:litaʔ/ ‘poor’). There is no doubt, however, that they now contrast, not only in loanwords (*dos* /do:s/ ‘two’ vs *Rose* /ro:s/ ‘Rose’) but in native words as well (*maramdamin* /maramda:min/ ‘sensitive’ vs *madamdamin* /madamda:min/ ‘moving’).

In addition to the consonant phonemes found in native Tagalog words, shown in Table 49.2, there are several others that only occur in loanwords but are commonly heard in the speech of many Tagalog speakers, especially those with higher education in English. These include the labio-dental fricatives /f/ and /v/ and the alveolar affricates

Table 49.2 Tagalog Consonant Phonemes

	<i>Labial</i>	<i>Dental</i>	<i>Alveolar</i>	<i>Palatal</i>	<i>Velar</i>	<i>Glottal</i>
Voiceless stop	p	t			k	ʔ
Voiced stop	b	d			g	
Nasal	m	n			ŋ	
Fricative			s			h
Lateral			l			
Tap or trill			r			
Glide	w			y		

/tʃ/ and /dʒ/ (typically represented as *ts* and *dy* respectively), e.g. *Flora* /flo:ra/ ‘Flora’, *Victor* /vi:ktor/ ‘Victor’, *tsuper* /ʃu:per/ ‘driver of a motor vehicle’, *kotse* /ko:tʃe/ ‘car’ and *dyip* /dʒi:p/ ‘jeep’, although their status as fully adopted phonemes in the language is questionable (French 1988: 56).

In native words tautosyllabic consonant clusters are restricted to syllable-initial clusters in which the second consonant is a glide: e.g. *diyán* /dyan/ ‘there’, *buwán* /bwan/ ‘month’. In loanwords syllable-initial clusters whose second consonant is /l/ or /r/ are also common, e.g. *plato* /pla:to/ ‘plate’, *grado* /gra:do/ ‘grade’; and various syllable-final clusters are found in borrowings from English, e.g. *homework* /ho:mwo:rk/, *dimples* /di:mpols/, *bridge* /bri:ds/.

The most common syllable patterns are CV and CVC, in both final and non-final syllables, and CV:, in non-final syllables only. When a CVC syllable occurs as the initial syllable of disyllabic word, a very wide range of medial CC clusters is attested. Word-internal geminate clusters do not, however, occur.

Stress is closely tied to vowel length, with some analysts considering stress as primary, while others consider vowel length to be primary. Syllables with phonemically long vowels are always stressed. Syllables with vowels that are not phonemically long but are phonetically long as a result of their occurrence in phrase-final position are also stressed if there are no phonemically long vowels in the phrase-final word. Thus the final syllable of *magaling* /magaliŋ/ [magali:ŋ] ‘excellent’ is stressed in citation, but in *magaling na* /magaliŋ na/ [magaliŋ na:] ‘it’s excellent now’, the stress falls on *na* instead. Unstressed vowels are not reduced and the language is syllable-timed rather than stress-timed.

A significant morphophonemic alternation that occurs across word boundaries includes the replacement of word-final glottal stop /ʔ/ by vowel length in non-phrase-final position, e.g. *maputi* /maputiʔ/ ‘white’, *maputi nga* /maputi: ŋaʔ/ ‘it’s really white’, *maputi nga po* /maputi: ŋa: poʔ/ ‘it’s really white, sir/madam’. Significant morphophonemic alternations *within* the word include a ‘rightward’ shift of vowel length – and hence of stress – before the verbal suffixes *-an* and *-in*, e.g. *tasa* /ta:sa/ ‘assessment’ + *-an* → *tasahan* /tasa:han/ ‘to assess s.t.’, *pala* /pa:la/ ‘shovel’ + *-in* → *palahin* /pala:hin/ ‘to shovel s.t.’, insertion of /h/ between a vowel final word and the verbal suffixes *-an* and *-in* (as in the previous examples), and a set of assimilations involving prefixes that end in nasals, such as the verbal prefix /maN-/ (where /N/ represents an unspecified nasal consonant): e.g. /maN-/ + /p/ → /mam-/ , /maN-/ + /t/ → /man-/ , /maN-/ + /k/ → /maŋ-/ , as in *mamili* (/maN-/ + /pi:liʔ/ → /mami:liʔ/) ‘choose’, *manakot* (/maN-/ + /ta:kot/ → /mana:kot/) ‘frighten’, *mangailangan* (/maN-/ + /ka:ɽilaŋan/ → /maŋa:ɽilaŋan/) ‘need’.

Tagalog is not a tone language. It does, however, have a complex intonational system. As in English, intonation may be used to distinguish pragmatically different

sentence types (e.g. requests for information vs requests for repetition), to express speaker attitudes (e.g. cordiality), to indicate contrast or emphasis, etc.

Prior to the Spanish colonisation of the Philippines, a syllabary, probably ultimately of Indian origin, had been used for writing Tagalog, but under the Spanish this was supplanted by a version of the Roman alphabet. Nowadays Tagalog uses the same 26 letters that are used for writing English, although the seven letters *c, f, j, q, v, x* and *z* are used chiefly in proper names of foreign origin and in certain other borrowings from English or Spanish. These seven letters are not included in the conventional Tagalog alphabet, or *abakada*, which consists of 20 letters (including the digraph *ng*, used for /ŋ/), in the following order: *a b k d e g h i l m n ng o p r s t u w y*. The writing system does not indicate vowel length (or stress), and does not mark /ʔ/ except as a hyphen between consonant final prefixes and words that begin with a glottal stop that would otherwise be written as vowel-initial, for example *mag-iigi* /magʔi:ʔi:gi/ ‘to adjust’. Thus words that differ from one another only in vowel length (see examples above) or only in that one ends in a vowel and the other in /ʔ/ (e.g. *bata* /ba:ta/ ‘bathrobe’ and *bata* /ba:taʔ/ ‘child’) are spelled identically. There is also some inconsistency – as well as some debate – with regard to the spelling of loanwords, e.g. *molecule* vs *molikyul*. And there are two very common words, the case-marking form /naŋ/ and the plural form /maŋa/, whose conventional spellings, respectively *ng* and *mga*, are non-phonemic. With these and a few other exceptions, however, there is a fairly good match between spelling and pronunciation.

3 Syntax

The syntax of Tagalog and other Philippine languages has been the subject of an ongoing debate among syntacticians in recent years, as a clearer understanding of the nature of the relationships between the different constructions in the language have become clearer, and the goals of linguistic theory and description have changed. The first grammars by Spanish linguists and missionaries in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries described the language in traditional Latin grammar terminology, but following the structuralist analyses of Bloomfield in the early part of the twentieth century, a model was established that typically described the language as containing a ‘focus’ system thought to be unique among the world’s languages, in which the semantic role of one of the arguments, actor, experiencer, goal, instrument, location, beneficiary, etc., could be marked with an affix on the verb, thus ‘focusing’ that participant and creating a paradigm of structural types, one of which was active (or ‘actor focus’) and the others passive (goal passive or ‘object focus’, instrument passive or ‘instrument focus’, and so on). The ‘focused’ argument has been variously labelled as topic, subject, trigger and pivot.

Various problems with the ‘focus’ model, including the fact that the so-called ‘passive’ constructions do not function as typical passives, but are the unmarked way to express any structure containing a definite patient, have resulted in a number of different approaches that are more consistent with modern linguistic theory. These approaches fall into two main categories, those that consider Tagalog (or some other Philippine language) to be an ergative or a split-ergative language, and those that consider it to have either an ‘active’, ‘fluid’, ‘hybrid’ or ‘symmetrical’ voice system. To date, the ergative analysis is the most common among studies written in a wide range of theoretical frameworks, including Relational Grammar, Role and Reference Grammar,

Categorial Grammar, Lexicase, Localist frameworks, Dixon's Basic Linguistic Theory, Government and Binding, and Minimalist frameworks, as well as general typological approaches, and will be the approach followed in the following description.

Tagalog is a predicate-initial language. That is, in the most common and basic type of clause, words or phrases that express predicates precede words or phrases that express arguments. Predicates belong to one of two classes: verbal and non-verbal. The structures of basic clauses containing these two types of predicates are discussed in turn below.

Clauses with verbal predicates consist of a verb followed by one or more arguments (noun phrases, pronouns, etc.). These arguments do not in general occur in a fixed order, although the 'focused noun phrase', referred to hereafter as the grammatical subject (or absolutive noun phrase), commonly occurs last, and word order is not used in distinguishing the roles that are assigned to the various arguments, e.g. in distinguishing an actor argument (see below) from a patient argument. Instead these roles are indicated by the form of the verb and/or the form of the argument expressions themselves.

The verb typically contains an affix – which may be a prefix, an infix or a suffix – that indicates the semantic role of the grammatical subject. This phrase has the same form, whatever the semantic role of its referent. The semantic roles of any *other* arguments in the clause, however, are indicated by the forms of the noun phrases themselves: for example, an argument that expresses the actor of a transitive clause (that is, the ergative noun phrase) is introduced by *ng* /naŋ/ if it is a common noun, or by *ni* if it is a personal name.

As an ergative language, the case-marking of the actor or experiencer of an intransitive sentence (indicated in Examples 1a–b as S) is identical to that of the most patient-like argument of a transitive sentence (indicated in Examples 2a–d as P). In these sentences the specifiers of the S and the P phrases are shown in bold font. The agent of a transitive sentence (indicated as A) carries ergative case-marking. Examples 2b–d are also transitive sentences, having the same structural features as 2a, except that the semantic role of the absolutive is different, location in 2b, beneficiary in 2c, and instrument in 2d, each marked by a different form of the transitive verb. Of each of the square-bracketed noun phrases in the examples, only those marked as S, A and P are core noun phrases, implied by the verbal semantics, others phrases are adjuncts and optional. (All of the verbs in these examples contain a reduplicating imperfective aspect prefix CV:-, thus *aalis* /ʔa:ʔalis/; other affixes, shown in bold font, either mark the semantic role of the absolutive phrase, or carry other aspectual meanings whose functions will be explained in Section 4).

1 Intransitive

a *Aalis* [ang *tindero*]_{abs.} [sa *Lunes.*]_{loc.}
will.leave S storekeeper Monday
'The storekeeper will leave on Monday.'

b *Magluluto* [ang *tindero*]_{abs.} [para sa *babae.*]_{ben.}
will.cook S storekeeper woman
'The storekeeper will cook for the woman.'

2 Transitive

a *Aalisin* [ng *tindero*]_{erg.} [ang *bigas*]_{abs.} [sa *sako.*]_{loc.}
will.take.out A storekeeper P rice sack
'A/The storekeeper will take the rice out of the sack.'

- b *Aalisan* [ng *tindero*]_{erg.} [ng *bigas*]_{obl.} [*ang sako.*]_{abs.}
 will.take.out.of A storekeeper rice P sack
 ‘A/The storekeeper will take some rice out of the sack.’
- c *Ipagaalis* [ng *tindero*]_{erg.} [ng *bigas*]_{obl.} [*ang babae.*]_{abs.}
 will.take.out.for A storekeeper rice P woman
 ‘A/The storekeeper will take out some rice for the woman.’
- d *Ipangaalis* [ng *tindero*]_{erg.} [ng *bigas*]_{obl.} [*ang sandok.*]_{abs.}
 will.take.out.with A storekeeper rice P ladle
 ‘A/The storekeeper will take out some rice with the ladle.’

The literal translations of the verbs in Examples 2b–d reflect an analysis that treats these structures as applicatives. Thus the verb in 2b is a ‘locative-effect’ verb, that in 2c is a ‘beneficiary-effect’ verb, while that in 2c is an ‘instrumental-effect’ verb. Example 2a is considered to be a simple transitive sentence.

The phrases marked as absolutive in the above examples are all introduced by the specifier *ang* that marks the following noun as a definite common noun. They are introduced by *si* if the following noun is a personal name. These forms do not themselves mark the case of the noun phrase, as phrases marked in this way can also occur with functions other than the grammatical subject of a sentence, such as nominal predicates or fronted topics. Absolutive phrases, however, can be substituted with one from the set of unmarked pronouns (see below), one of which (second person singular *ka*) unambiguously marks the phrase as the grammatical subject. Absolutive phrases typically have definite reference, whether or not they contain a demonstrative, relative clause or other means to mark definiteness. In many analyses of Tagalog, the absolutive phrase is labelled nominative, highlighting the generalisation that the syntactic properties of the phrase are almost identical in both accusative and ergative languages.

Ergative noun phrases expressing the agent of a transitive sentence are introduced by the common noun marker *ng* (/naŋ/) or by the personal noun marker *ni*, and can be substituted with one from a set of pronouns which also function as possessive pronouns, making such phrases formally identical to post-nominal possessive phrases. In many descriptions they are therefore referred to as having genitive case-marking. Ergative common noun phrases are unmarked as to definiteness, and may therefore be interpreted as either definite or indefinite, unless they contain a demonstrative or other means to mark definiteness or specificity.

The preposition *sa* (in Examples 1a and 2a) introduces a locative noun phrase expressing either temporal or common noun spatial locations, and in combination with *para* (Example 1b) marks benefactive phrases. The equivalent personal noun marker in such phrases is *kay*.

The oblique noun phrases in the above examples are also introduced by the common noun marker *ng* (/naŋ/), and in many descriptions are referred to also as genitive. They are however distinct from ergative (or genitive) noun phrases in several respects. An oblique noun phrase can only be interpreted as indefinite and cannot be substituted with either a personal noun or a pronoun. In transitive constructions of the sort illustrated above oblique noun phrases are optional.

There is one other construction in which an oblique noun phrase occurs, but as an obligatory noun phrase implied by the verb, and expressing an indefinite theme. This is analysed here as a dyadic intransitive construction. This construction is illustrated in 3 below,

in which the oblique phrase is labelled E for ‘extended’, following the Dixon–Aikhenvald terms used in their Basic Linguistic Theory. Like the oblique adjuncts marked by *ng* in transitive sentences, this phrase is obligatorily indefinite and cannot be substituted with a personal noun or pronoun. This structure has been variously labelled as pseudo-transitive, or as anti-passive, and its analysis is the source of much controversy in the literature. For linguists who consider the semantic transitivity of this structure as primary, the phrase marked here as oblique is analysed as accusative, making Tagalog a split-ergative language. For linguists who consider that the forms of the verbal prefixes in these structures, matching as they do the affixation on monadic intransitive verbs (compare 3a with 1a, and 3b with 1b), but not the affixation of unambiguously transitive constructions, the structures are syntactically intransitive. Some contend that since this phrase is a core argument, Tagalog should be considered to have a symmetrical voice system.

3 Dyadic intransitive

- a *Gagawa* [ng *kubo*]_{obl.} [ang *tindero.*]_{abs.}
 will.make E hut S storekeeper
 ‘The storekeeper will make a hut.’
- b *Mag-aalis* [ng *bigas*]_{obl.} [ang *tindero.*]_{abs.}
 will.take.out E rice S storekeeper
 ‘The storekeeper will take out some rice.’

The distinction between each of the structures illustrated above has often been characterised as ‘voice’ so that Examples 3a–b are ‘actor voice’, 2a ‘patient voice’, 2b ‘locative voice’, 2c ‘beneficiary voice’ and 2d ‘instrumental’ or ‘conveyance voice’. The four transitive voice types have also been labelled as ‘undergoer voice’, because of their structural similarities.

Some linguists have also argued that the so-called locative, beneficiary and instrumental voices are derived applicative constructions.

As noted previously, the order of post-verbal arguments is generally free. Thus in addition to the orderings shown above, any other ordering of the arguments in the examples would also be grammatical (although some would be unusual). There is, however, a general preference for the actor as the first argument in a transitive clause and for either the actor or the oblique patient as the first argument in an extended intransitive clause.

There is also one set of nominal expressions whose order in relation to other nominal expressions and to one another is not free. These are the absolutive and ergative personal pronouns, which are *enclitics*: i.e. they occur in a fixed position immediately after the clause-initial constituent. If there are two enclitic pronouns in the same clause, they observe the rule that monosyllabic pronouns precede disyllabic pronouns. Thus in the following sentence the order of all the words is fixed:

Nakita mo siya kahapon.
 saw erg.2.sg. abs.3.sg. yesterday
 ‘You saw him yesterday.’

This contrasts with the variable ordering observable in the following sentences, which show that argument expressions are freely ordered in relation not only to one another but also to adverbs such as *kahapon* ‘yesterday’:

Nakita ni Juan si Maria kahapon.
 saw erg. Juan abs. Maria yesterday
Nakita ni Juan kahapon si Maria.
Nakita si Maria ni Juan kahapon.
Nakita si Maria kahapon ni Juan.
Nakita kahapon ni Juan si Maria.
Nakita kahapon si Maria ni Juan.
 ‘Juan saw Maria yesterday.’

In addition to enclitic pronouns, Tagalog also has a set of enclitic *adverbial particles* that occur in a fixed position in relation to other sentence elements. Note, for example, the position of the interrogative *ba* in the following sentence:

Nakita mo ba siya kahapon?
 saw erg.2.sg. Q abs.3.sg. yesterday
 ‘Did you see him yesterday?’

Clauses with non-verbal predicates are in many cases translated into English by sentences with the main verb *be*, which has no Tagalog counterpart. These clauses consist of a predicate expression followed by an absolutive noun phrase. The predicate expression may be a noun, an adjective or a prepositional phrase. Some examples are:

Abogado ang bunso.
 be.lawyer spcf. youngest.child
 ‘The youngest child is a lawyer.’

Hinog ang mga mangga.
 be.ripe spcf. pl. mango
 ‘The mangos are ripe’

Nasa kusina si Nene.
 be.in kitchen spcf.pers. Nene
 ‘Nene is in the kitchen.’

A construction consisting of a non-verbal phrasal predicate having an existential word immediately followed by an unmarked noun and an absolutive phrase is also used to express possession, as in:

[*May trak*]_{prd.} *si Ben.*
 exist truck spcf.pers. Ben
 ‘Ben has a truck.’

The same type of non-verbal predicate is also used to express existence. In this case, however, the predicate is not followed by an absolutive phrase, but is instead typically followed by a locative adverb, e.g.

[*May trak*]_{prd.} *doon.*
 EXIST truck there
 ‘There’s a truck over there.’

Although Tagalog is basically predicate-initial, there are certain fairly common constructions in which some other constituent precedes the predicate. In one such construction, the sentence-initial constituent – which may be the absolutive argument, an adverbial expression or one of certain other types of arguments – is immediately followed by the form *ay* without any change in the denotation of the construction.

Ang sulat ay tinanggap ko kahapon.
 spcf. letter received gen.1.sg. yesterday
 ‘I received the letter yesterday.’

Saanman ay makakaabot ang koreyo.
 to.any.place can.reach spcf. mail
 ‘The mail can reach any place.’

Ay constructions are more common in writing and in formal speech than they are in ordinary conversation. It has been suggested that in narratives the referent of the constituent preceding *ay* is often one that has been referred to at some earlier point and that *ay* is typically used to reintroduce such a referent.

In other types of non-predicate-initial constructions, the pre-predicate constituent may have a special discourse function, such as contrast or emphasis. When the fronted constituent is contrastive, it is typically expressed with a falling intonation and is followed by a pause (indicated in the examples with a comma). When a constituent is fronted for emphasis, there is no special intonation or pause. Some examples are:

Bukas, magpapahinga ako. Ngayon, dapat akong magtrabaho.
 tomorrow will.rest abs.1.sg today must abs.1.sg. = LG at-work
 ‘Tomorrow, I’ll rest. Today, I’ve got to work.’

Bukas, aalis si Pedro.
 tomorrow will.leave spcf.pers. Pedro
 ‘It’s tomorrow that Pedro is leaving (not today).’

Sa kantong ito umaalis ang bus.
 from corner = LG this leaves spcf. bus
 ‘This is the corner the bus leaves from.’

Just as the ordering of clause constituents shows considerable variability, so does the ordering of constituents of noun phrases. Although certain modifiers, such as numbers and other quantifiers, regularly precede the head noun and others, such as possessive noun phrases, regularly follow it, there are also several types of modifiers that may either precede or follow the head noun, e.g. demonstratives, adjectival verbs and possessive pronouns.

A demonstrative or an adjectival verb, whether it precedes or follows the noun, is linked to it by a *ligature*. The ligature has two morphophonemically conditioned alternants: if the citation form of the preceding word ends in a vowel, /ʔ/ or /n/, the ligature takes the form of an /ŋ/ (*ng*) replacing the final consonant; in all other cases, the ligature takes the form /na/ (*na*). (Ligatures also occur in certain other constructions, such as constructions involving auxiliary verbs like *dapat* ‘must’.) For example, when the

demonstrative *ito* ‘this’ precedes the ligature, the /ŋ/ form occurs and when the noun *galang* /galaŋ/ ‘bracelet’ precedes, the /na/ form occurs: thus *itong galang* /itoŋ galaŋ/, *galang na ito* /galaŋ na itoh/ ‘this bracelet’. Similarly, the noun *bata* /ba:taʔ/ ‘child’ and the adjective *gutom* /gutom/ ‘hungry’ respectively require the /ŋ/ and /na/ forms of the ligature in *batang gutom* /ba:taŋ gutom/ ‘hungry child’ and *gutom na bata* /gutom na ba:taʔ/.

Although a demonstrative and the noun it modifies may occur in either order, the alternative orderings are generally not in free variation, but are, rather, conditioned by discourse factors. The constituent that comes second typically represents the more salient information and may, for example, be contrastive. Thus:

Mahal *itong* *galang.* (*Pero* *mura* *itong* *singsing.*)
be.expensive this = LG bracelet but cheap this = LG ring
‘This bracelet is expensive. (But this ring is cheap.)’

Mahal *ang galang na ito.* (*Pero mura ang galang na iyan.*)
be.expensive spcf. bracelet LG this but cheap spcf. bracelet LG that
‘This bracelet is expensive. (But that bracelet is cheap.)’

(As the first example illustrates, when the grammatical subject begins with a demonstrative, no specifying form is used.) The alternative orderings of adjectival verbs and the nouns they modify, on the other hand, often do appear to be a matter of free variation. Some analysts, however, contend that the initial form in such constructions is the syntactic head, and the form that follows the ligature is a relative clause with a predicate nominal as its head, i.e. ‘this one which is a bracelet’ vs ‘the bracelet which is this one’; see the discussion on relative clauses below.

Possessive pronouns, as noted, may also either precede or follow the noun, but in this case a difference in form is associated with the difference in order. When the possessive pronoun precedes, it takes the locative form and is obligatorily linked to the following noun by a ligature. When the possessive pronoun follows, it takes a form that has been called the genitive form and there is no ligature. For example, ‘my house’ may be expressed as either *aking bahay* (the locative first person singular pronoun *akin* + ligature + *bahay* ‘house’, i.e. ‘mine which is a house’) or *bahay ko* (*bahay* + the genitive first person singular pronoun *ko*). The orderings are both very common and there is no obvious difference in usage between them.

Yes–no questions in Tagalog are characterised by rising intonation, as opposed to the characteristic falling intonation of statements. A yes–no question may be distinguished from the corresponding statement by intonation alone or it may, in addition, be marked by the enclitic interrogative form *ba*. This word also occurs optionally in question-word questions. The latter, however, have their own distinctive intonation patterns, which differ from those of both yes–no questions and statements. (The most common intonation patterns for both question-word questions and statements are falling patterns, but the patterns differ in detail: the question-word questions start with high pitch and fall steadily throughout; the statements start with mid pitch, rise to high pitch on the last stressed syllable and then fall.)

The questioned constituent normally comes first in a question-word question. If this constituent is an adverbial argument or a locative argument, any clitic pronouns and/or adverbs contained in the clause attach to it, as with other fronted constituents, e.g.

Kailan mo (ba) siya nakita?
 when gen.2.sg. Q abs.3.sg. saw
 ‘When did you see him?’

Sa aling parti ka (ba) pumunta?
 loc. which = LG party abs.2.sg. Q went
 ‘Which party did you go to?’

If the questioned constituent is an absolutive noun phrase, a wh-cleft construction is used, the question word itself forming the predicate, and the rest of the clause expressed as an absolutive construction introduced by one of the specifiers that introduce such phrases, such as *ang*. Some examples are:

Ano (ba) ang ginawa mo kahapon?
 what Q spcf. did gen.2.sg yesterday
 ‘What did you do yesterday?’ Lit. ‘What is it that you did yesterday?’

Sino (ba) ang gumawa ng sapatos na iyon?
 who Q spcf. made obl. shoes LG that
 ‘Who made those shoes?’ Lit. ‘Who is it that made those shoes?’

If the questioned constituent is a genitive noun phrase, a wh-in situ construction is used, a genitively marked question word appearing in the body of the clause, following the predicate, such as:

Ninakaw nino ang kotse mo?
 stole gen.who spcf. car gen.2.sg
 ‘Who stole your car?’ (Kroeger 1993: 212)

Imperative sentences of the most common type have a falling intonation pattern like that of question-word questions. Syntactically they are just like statements with verbal predicates and second-person actors (which are either absolutive, if the patient is indefinite, or genitive, if the patient is definite), except that the verb is in the infinitive form, rather than one of the finite forms that are found in statements. Some examples are:

Mag-alis ka ng bigas sa sako!
 take.out abs.2.sg. obl. rice loc. sack
 ‘Take some rice out of a/the sack.’

Basahin mo nga ang librong ito!
 read-pt. gen.2.sg please spcf. book = LG this
 ‘Please read this book.’

(*Nga* ‘please’ in the last example is an enclitic adverbial particle.)

Hortative sentences are identical to imperatives, except that the actor is a first person plural inclusive pronoun (see Section 4). For example:

Mag-alis tayo ng bigas sa sako.
 take.out abs.1.ipl. obl. rice loc. sack
 ‘Let’s take some rice out of a/the sack.’

Basahin nga natin ang librong ito.
 read-pt. please gen.1.ipl. spcf. book = LG this
 ‘Please let’s read this book.’

Tagalog has distinct ways of negating imperative/hortative clauses, existential/possessive clauses and clauses of other types. Imperatives and hortatives are negated with the clause-initial prohibitive form *huwag*, which is immediately followed by any enclitic pronouns and adverbs, then by a ligature and then by the verb. Examples are:

Huwag kang mag-alis ng bigas sa sako!
 proh. abs.2.sg. = LG take.out obl. rice loc. sack
 ‘Don’t take any rice out of a/the sack!’

Huwag nga nating basahin ang librong ito.
 PROH please gen.1.ipl. = LG read spcf. book = LG this
 ‘Please, let’s not read this book.’

Existential and possessive clauses are negated with the clause-initial negative existential form *wala*. *Wala* replaces the affirmative existential form *may(roon)*, and is followed by a ligature. Any enclitics in the clause come between *wala* and the ligature. Examples are:

Wala akong pera.
 neg.exist. abs.1.sg. = LG money
 ‘I don’t have any money.’

Walang bahay doon.
 neg.exist. = LG house there
 ‘There isn’t a house there.’

Clauses of other types are negated with the clause-initial negative form *hindi*. Again, any enclitics immediately follow the negative form. *Hindi* is not, however, followed by a ligature.

Hindi ko nakita si Rosa.
 neg. gen.1.sg. saw spcf.pers. Rosa
 ‘I didn’t see Rosa.’

Hindi mayaman si Rosa.
 neg. rich spcf.pers. Rosa
 ‘Rosa isn’t rich.’

It should be noted that there are certain subject-like properties that are associated not with the absolutive noun phrase but, rather, with the actor. For example, as we have already seen, the actor, whether or not it also happens to be the grammatical subject,

always represents the addressee of an imperative sentence. It is also the actor that controls the reference of a reflexive (expressed by a possessive pronoun and the nominal *sarili* ‘self’), as illustrated by the following sentences:

Mag-aalaala ang lolo sa kaniyang sarili.
worry.about spcf. grandfather loc poss. = LG self
‘Grandfather will worry about himself.’

Aalalahanin ng lolo ang kaniyang sarili.
worry.about gen. grandfather spcf. poss. = LG self
‘Grandfather will worry about himself.’

Since the first of these sentences has an intransitive verb, the actor, which is the reflexive controller, happens to be the grammatical subject as well. The second sentence, however, has a transitive verb and here we can see clearly that the reflexive controller is the actor and *not* the grammatical subject, since in this case it is the subject itself that is reflexivised.

On the other hand, there *are* certain subject-like properties that are associated with the absolutive noun phrase. One such property is relativisability. Only absolutive arguments (and certain constituents of such arguments) may be relativised in Tagalog. Thus if one wishes to relativise an actor, an intransitive clause must be used; if one wishes to relativise a patient, a transitive clause must be used; etc. The following examples illustrate this. (As the examples show, relativisation in Tagalog involves the deletion of the relativised argument from the relative clause. The head of the relative clause and the clause itself may occur in either order, but head-first is the more common ordering. A ligature occurs between the head and the relative clause.)

Iyon ang babaeng maghuluto ng isda.
that spcf. woman = LG will.cook obl. fish
‘That’s the woman who will cook some fish.’

Iyon ang isdang iluluto ng babae.
that spcf. fish = LG will.cook gen. woman
‘That’s the fish that a/the woman will cook.’

In the first sentence the actor is relativised, so the verb in the relative clause must be intransitive; in the second sentence the patient is relativised, so the verb in the relative clause must be transitive. Similarly, if a locative argument is relativised, the verb in the relative clause must be derived as a locative-effect verb, and if a benefactive argument is relativised, the verb in the relative clause must be derived as a beneficiary-effect verb, as in:

Iyon ang sakong aalisan ko ng bigas.
that spcf. sack = LG will.take.out.from gen.1.sg. obl. rice
‘That’s the sack that I’ll take some rice out of.’

Iyon ang batang ipagluluto ko ng pagkain.
that spcf. child = LG will.cook.for gen.1.sg. obl. food
‘That’s the child I’ll cook some food for.’

If one attempts to relativise a non-subject argument, the result is ungrammatical, e.g.

**Iyon ang babaeng iluluto ang isda.*
 that spcf. woman = LG will.cook spcf. fish

Although verbs and nouns are clearly distinguished from one another on a *morphological* basis in Tagalog (see Section 4), distributionally or syntactically they are rather similar. We have already seen that they can serve as predicates. In addition, they can serve as (heads of) arguments or as modifiers. A verbal argument may be analysed as a headless relative clause. For example, compare the following with the last grammatical example cited:

Iyon ang ipagluluto ko ng pagkain.
 that spcf. will.cook.for gen.1.sg. obl. food
 ‘That’s the one I’ll cook some food for.’

Here the phrase headed by the verb *ipagluluto*, which has the form of a relative clause, is functioning as the absolutive argument of the sentence. Some relevant examples involving adjectival verbs are:

Sino ang batang pinakamatalino sa klase?
 who spcf. child = LG smartest loc. class
 ‘Who is the smartest child in the class?’

Sino ang pinakamatalino sa klase?
 who spcf. smartest loc. class
 ‘Who is the smartest one in the class?’

We have already seen various types of verbs (in relative clauses) serving as modifiers, in highly similar constructions involving a ligature between the head and the modifier. Nouns too occur as modifiers in this type of construction: e.g. *gulay na repolyo* ‘vegetable dish made from cabbage’ (cf. *gulay* ‘vegetable (dish)’, *repolyo* ‘cabbage’), *laruang kalan* ‘toy stove’ (cf. *laruan* ‘toy’, *kalan* ‘stove’). Thus the syntactic similarities among nouns and verbs in Tagalog are quite striking, although, as we shall see, there are clear morphological grounds for distinguishing them.

4 Morphology

Tagalog verb morphology is quite complex. The verb stem may be polymorphemic and there are obligatory subject-marking and aspectual affixes – which may be prefixes, suffixes or infixes – as well as affixes with a wide range of other functions. The following selective summary of Tagalog verb morphology treats, in order: stem formation, subject-marking affixation, other non-aspectual affixation and aspectual affixation.

Many Tagalog verb stems consist of a single morpheme: e.g. *abot* (cf. *umabot* ‘reach for’, which consists of the intransitive verbal affix *-um-* plus *abot*), *iyak* (cf. *umiyak* ‘cry’), *uwi* (cf. *umuwi* ‘go home’). However, there are also a great many verb stems that are analysable as consisting of two or more morphemes. Of these, the most common are those involving the stem-forming prefixes *pag-* and *paN-*.

Pag- combines very productively with nouns to form verb stems that denote characteristic activities involving the referents of the nouns. For example, *pagbus* is the stem of the intransitive verb *magbus* ‘ride a bus’, *pag-Ingles* (cf. *Ingles* ‘English’) is the stem of *mag-Ingles* ‘speak English’, *pagtsinelas* (cf. *tsinelas* ‘slippers’) is the stem of *magtsinelas* ‘wear slippers’, and *pag-ingat* (cf. *ingat* ‘care’) is the stem of intransitive *mag-ingat* ‘take care’, and transitive *pag-ingatan* ‘be careful of s.t.’. (In intransitive verbs, the initial /p/ of *pag-* and *paN-* is assimilated to the intransitive prefix *m-*, historically a reflex of Proto-Austronesian *-um-.) For some purposes – see below – it is convenient to refer to the resultant forms, *mag-* and *maN-*, as if they were single affixes rather than composites.

In addition, *pag-* combines with certain simple verb stems to form the stems of ‘intensive’ verbs, i.e. verbs that designate intense, frequent or prolonged performance of the activity designated by the simple stem. For example, *pag-* combines with *kain* ‘eat’ to form the stem of *magkain* ‘eat (repeatedly, etc.)’ and with *lakad* ‘walk’ to form the stem of *maglakad* ‘walk (repeatedly, etc.)’. *Pag-* also forms verb stems with adjectival verbs, which may themselves be morphologically complex – e.g. *pagmabait* (cf. *mabait* ‘kind’, *bait* ‘kindness’), which is the stem of intransitive *magmabait* and transitive *pagmabaitan* ‘pretend to be kind to s.o.’ – and even with certain compounds – e.g. *pagmagandang-gabi* (cf. *magandang gabi* ‘good evening (the greeting)’), which is the stem of *magmagandang-gabi* ‘wish good evening’.

Like *pag-*, but less productively, *paN-* combines with nouns to form stems that denote characteristic activities involving the referents of the nouns. For example, *pamangka* (cf. *bangka* ‘boat’ – see Section 2 for the assimilation of certain morpheme-initial consonants to prefixal /N/) is the stem of the intransitive verb *mamangka* ‘go boating’, and *panganak* (cf. *anak* ‘child, offspring’) is the stem of intransitive *manganak* and transitive *ipanganak* ‘give birth to s.o.’. *PaN-* also combines with certain nouns and simple verb stems to form stems that denote destructive or harmful activity and with certain other simple verb stems to form stems that denote activity directed towards multiple objects. For example, *paN-* combines with *walis* ‘broom’ to form the stem of *mangwalis* ‘hit with a broom’ and with *kain* ‘eat’ to form the stem of *mangain* ‘devour’; it also combines with *kuha* ‘get’ to form the stem of *manguha* ‘gather’ and with *tahi* ‘sew’ to form the stem of *manahi* ‘sew (a number of things, or professionally)’.

There is also a *paN-*stem-forming prefix – distinguishable from the one just discussed on the basis of a different pattern of morphophonemic alternations – that forms the stem of instrumental-effect verbs. This type of stem may occur independently as a noun with instrumental meaning. Examples are *pam(p)unas* ‘something to wipe with’ (cf. *punas* ‘sponge bath’), which is the stem of the instrumental-effect transitive verb *ipam(p)unas* ‘wipe with s.t.’, and *pan(s)ulat* ‘something to write with’ (cf. *sulat* ‘letter’), which is the stem of the instrumental-effect verb *ipan(s)ulat* ‘write with s.t.’.

Among the other stem-forming affixes that deserve mention are two different reduplicating prefixes, one monosyllabic, the other disyllabic. The monosyllabic reduplicating prefix is in general a copy of the first consonant and vowel of the following simple verb stem (but see the discussion of aspectual reduplication below). In one of its uses it combines with *pag-* to form certain additional intensive verbs: e.g. *pagtatapak* the stem of the transitive verb *pagtatapakan* ‘step (repeatedly, etc.) on s.t.’ (cf. *tapakan* ‘step on s.t.’) and *pagbabagsak*, the stem of transitive *ipagbabagsak* ‘drop (repeatedly, etc.) on s.t.’ (cf. *ibagsak* ‘drop s.t.’).

The disyllabic reduplicating prefix generally consists of a copy of the first two (usually the only two) syllables of the following simple stem. One use of the disyllabic

reduplicating prefix is to form the stem of ‘moderative’ verbs, i.e. verbs that designate activities performed in moderation, occasionally, at random, etc. Some examples are *hiya-hiya*, the stem of intransitive *mahiya-hiya* ‘be a little ashamed’ (cf. *mahiya* ‘be ashamed’) and *linis-linis*, the stem of transitive *linis-linisin* ‘clean s.t. a little’ (cf. *linisin* ‘clean s.t.’).

As indicated above, the subject-marking affixes are said to mark the semantic role of the absolutive phrase. Among the roles that may be affixally marked are: actor, patient, location, beneficiary and instrument. (Others, which will not be discussed here, include location, reason and referent (‘about’ object).) The affixes that most commonly mark these roles are shown in Table 49.3.

The affixes that signal that the absolutive noun phrase expresses an actor form verbs that are either monadic or dyadic intransitives. The other affixes typically occur in canonical transitive constructions, although they may also occur in a small number of clearly intransitive constructions in which the subject is experiencer of an ‘afflicted’ or ‘adversely affected’ state, e.g. *antukin* ‘feel sleepy’ (cf. *antok* ‘drowsiness’), *lamukin* ‘be infested with mosquitos’ (cf. *lamok* ‘mosquito’), *langgamin* ‘be infested with ants’ (cf. *langgam* ‘ant’), *kilabutan* ‘feel terrified’ (cf. *kilabot* ‘goose pimples’), *pawisan* ‘sweat’, etc. These also include physical conditions derived from the following nouns: *sipon* ‘cold’, *lagnat* ‘fever’ and *malat* ‘hoarseness’, as well as natural phenomena, such as *ulan* ‘rain’, *bagyo* ‘storm’, *lindol* ‘earthquake’, etc. (De Guzman 1978).

The forms of the affixes given in the table are those that occur in infinitives. Some subject-marking affixes assume different forms in certain finite (i.e. aspect marked) verbs. These forms will be presented later, in connection with the discussion of aspectual affixation.

As Table 49.3 shows, there are several different affixes that signal actor, patient and location subjects. The choice among these affixes is lexically determined and to some extent idiosyncratic, although there are certain generalisations that can be made.

The intransitive affixes, all of which mark that the actor is subject and all of which involve the phoneme /m/, are the infix *-um-* and the prefixes *m-*, *ma-* and *maka-*. *-um-* is infixed between the first consonant and first vowel of the stem, e.g. *humingi* ‘borrow’ (stem: *hingi*), *sumulat* ‘write’ (stem: *sulat*), *tumakbo* ‘run’ (stem: *takbo*). (In the written form of verbs whose stem-initial consonant is /ʔ/, *-um-* appears as a prefix, since /ʔ/ is not represented in the standard orthography: e.g. *umabot* /ʔumabot/ ‘reach for’ (stem: *abot* /ʔabot/)). *-um-* is the most common affix in intransitive verbs with actor-subject verbs having single-morpheme stems and its occurrence in certain subclasses of verbs is predictable, e.g. in verbs of ‘becoming’ where the stem also occurs as the stem of a *ma-* adjectival verb, cf. *gumanda* ‘become beautiful’, *maganda* ‘be beautiful’, *tumaas* ‘become tall’, *mataas* ‘be tall’.

The prefix *m-* replaces the initial *p-* of the stem-forming prefixes *pag-* and *paN-*, resulting in the forms *mag-* and *maN-* respectively, as in *magbigay* ‘give’, *magluto* ‘cook’,

Table 49.3 Affixes

Actor	-um-, m-, ma-, maka-
Patient	-in, i-, -an, ma-
Location	-an, -in
Beneficiary, Instrument	i-

mangisda ‘fish’ (cf. *isda* ‘fish (noun)’), *mangailangan* ‘need’ (cf. *kailangan* ‘need (noun)’). As indicated above, *mag-* occurs productively in verbs that express a characteristic activity involving the referent of the noun that underlies them (e.g. *mag-Ingles* ‘speak English’). There are also certain regular correspondences between *-um-* and *mag-* verbs formed with the same stem, e.g. cases in which the *-um-* verb takes two arguments and the *mag-* verb three, such as: *pumasok* ‘come/go into’ and *magpasok* ‘bring/take into’, *lumabas* ‘come/go outside’ and *maglabas* ‘bring/take outside’. *MaN-* too has certain characteristic uses – for example in verbs indicating destructive activity, such as *mangwalis* ‘hit with a broom’ (cf. *magwalis* ‘sweep’) – but it is considerably less common than *mag-*.

Intransitive *ma-* (there is also a transitive *ma-*) occurs productively in verbs of ‘becoming’ whose stems are unaffixed adjectival verbs – e.g. *mabingi* ‘become deaf’ (cf. *bingi* ‘be deaf’), *mamahal* ‘become expensive’ (cf. *mahal* ‘be expensive’) – and idiosyncratically in a relatively small number of other common verbs, e.g. *matulog* ‘sleep’, *matuto* ‘learn’. *Maka-* occurs idiosyncratically in a few common verbs, e.g. *makakita* ‘see’, *makarinig* ‘hear’. (*Maka-* also occurs productively in abilitative verbs – see below.)

The most common affixes marking simple transitive verbs are *-in* and *i-*. *-in* is the most frequent transitive counterpart of intransitive *-um-* verbs in corresponding sets formed with the same stem (e.g. intransitive *humuli* ‘catch’/transitive *hulihin* ‘catch s.t.’) and *i-* is the most frequent counterpart of intransitive *m-* verbs, (though there are also a good many intransitive *m-*/transitive *-in* correspondences, including some cases where *-in* and *i-* are apparently in free variation, e.g. intransitive *magluto* ‘cook’/transitive *iluto* ~ *lutuin* ‘cook s.t.’). The stem-forming prefix *pag-* that occurs in intransitive *m-* verbs is often obligatorily absent – less often optionally absent – from the corresponding simple transitive verbs. (This is also true of locative-effect verbs formed with *-in*, and of both simple transitive and locative-effect transitive verbs formed with *-an* – see below.) For example, the transitive counterpart of intransitive *magbigay* ‘give’ is *ibigay* ‘give s.t.’ and the transitive counterpart of intransitive *magkaila* ‘deny’ is either *ikaila* or *ipagkaila*. (On the other hand, the transitive counterpart of intransitive *magbili* ‘sell’ is *ipagbili*, in which *pag-* is obligatorily retained.) Much less commonly, a stem-forming prefix *paN-* that occurs in an intransitive verb is omitted from the transitive counterpart, e.g. the patient-transitive counterpart of intransitive *mangailangan* ‘need’ is *kailanganin*.

The suffix *-an*, which is the most common locative-effect affix, occurs less frequently as a simple transitive affix, often in verbs that express actions involving surface contact with, or surface effect on, the patient, e.g. *labhan* ‘launder s.t.’, *pintahan* ‘paint s.t.’, *walisan* ‘sweep s.t.’, *hawakan* ‘hold s.t.’. *Ma-* is the transitive counterpart of intransitive *maka-* and occurs idiosyncratically in a few verbs: e.g. *makita* ‘see s.t.’, *marinig* ‘hear s.t.’.

Some examples of locative-effect verbs with *-an* are: *puntahan* ‘go to some place’, *up(u)an* ‘sit on s.t.’, *masdan* ‘look at s.t.’, *bilhan* ‘buy from some place’ (also functioning as a beneficiary-effect verb with the meaning ‘buy for someone’). The suffix *-in* occurs idiosyncratically as a locative-effect affix in a few verbs – e.g. *pupuin* ‘use *po* (sir/madam) in addressing someone’ – and more systematically in certain other cases, among them cases in which locative-effect *-an* is, as it were, pre-empted. These are cases in which *-an* is used as the locative-effect affix of a three argument verb and *-in* as the locative-effect affix of a two-argument verb formed with the same stem: e.g. *pasukan* ‘bring/take into some place’ vs *pasukin* ‘come/go into some place’, *labasan* ‘bring/take to some place outside’ vs *labasin* ‘come/go to some place outside’.

Beneficiary-effect verbs are formed with *i-* or *-an*, depending on the verb class. Any stem-forming *pag-* or *paN-* in the corresponding intransitive verb is retained. Examples are: *ipirma* ‘sign for s.o.’ (cf. intransitive *pumirma* ‘sign’), *ipaglaba* ‘launder for s.o.’ (cf. intransitive *maglaba* ‘launder’), *ipanguha* ‘gather for s.o.’ (cf. *manguha* ‘gather’).

Instrumental-effect verbs are also formed with *i-*, but in this case the stem must usually be formed with the prefix *paN-*, as in *ipam(p)unas* ‘wipe with s.t.’, *ipan(s)ulat* ‘write with s.t.’ However, if the simple stem itself designates an instrument, alternative instrument-effect formations without any stem-forming prefix or with the stem-forming prefix *pag-* also occur. Thus, the stem *suklay* ‘comb’ occurs in instrumental-effect *isuklay* and *ipagsuklay* as well as *ipan(s)uklay* ‘comb with (a certain comb)’, and the stem *gunting* ‘scissors’ occurs in instrumental-effect *igunting* and *ipaggunting* as well as *ipanggunting* ‘cut with (a certain pair of scissors)’.

Apart from affixes which signal the semantic role of the grammatical subject (often referred to as the ‘voice’ affixes), there are a good many other non-aspectual affixes, among them affixes with abilitative and causative meanings. The abilitative affixes are *maka-* and *ma-*. *Maka-* occurs in intransitive verbs, in which it replaces *-um-* or *m-*, e.g. intransitive *makaawit* ‘be able to sing’ (cf. *umawit* ‘sing’), intransitive *makapagluto* ‘be able to cook’ (cf. *magluto* ‘cook’), intransitive *makapangisda* ‘be able to fish’ (cf. *mangisda* ‘fish’). *Ma-* occurs with transitive verbs. It replaces *-in*, but co-occurs with *i-* or *-an*: e.g. transitive *magamit* ‘be able to use s.t.’ (cf. *gamitin* ‘use’), benefactive-effect transitive *maibili* ‘be able to buy for s.o.’ (cf. *ibili* ‘buy for s.o.’), locative-effect transitive *mapuntahan* ‘be able to go to some place’ (cf. *puntahan* ‘go to some place’).

Causative verbs are all formed with the causative stem-forming prefix *pa-*, which occurs in addition to the voice affixes. Causative verbs, in a sense, have two actors, one causing the other to act. However, morphologically (as well as syntactically), only the ‘causer’ is treated as an actor, while the ‘causee’ is treated as a kind of patient. Thus, when the causer is the grammatical subject, the intransitive voice affix *mag-* (*m-* + *pag-*) is invariably used, but when the causee is the subject, the transitive affix *-in* is invariably used: e.g. causative intransitive *magpapunta* ‘cause to go’/causative transitive *papuntahin* ‘cause s.o. to go’ (cf. non-causative intransitive *pumunta* ‘go’), causative intransitive *magpatsinelas* ‘cause to wear slippers’/causative transitive *papagtsinelasin* ‘cause s.o. to wear slippers’ (cf. non-causative intransitive *magtsinelas* ‘wear slippers’).

There are also causative verbs in which the subject is some argument other than the causer or the causee. Under these circumstances, the same voice affix that occurs in the corresponding non-causative verb is ordinarily used, except that *-in* (which is, as it were, pre-empted, to mark the causee as subject) is replaced by *i-* in basic causative transitive verbs and by *-an* in causative location-effect verbs. Thus causative transitive *ipalinis* ‘cause to clean s.t.’ (cf. *linisin* ‘clean s.t.’) has as its grammatical subject the object cleaned, while *palinisin* ‘cause s.o. to clean’ has as its subject the causee, the one caused to do the cleaning. Similarly, causative location-effect *papasukan* ‘cause to enter some place’ (cf. transitive *pasukin* ‘enter some place’) has as its subject the place entered, while *papasukin* ‘cause s.o. to enter’ has as its subject the one caused to enter. Some other relevant examples are: *papintahan* ‘cause to paint s.t.’ (cf. *pintahan* ‘paint s.t.’), *pasulatan* ‘cause to write to s.o.’ (cf. *sulatan* ‘write to s.o.’), *ipabili* ‘cause to buy for s.o.’ (cf. *ibili* ‘buy for s.o.’).

Turning now to aspectual affixation, let us begin with a brief overview of the Tagalog aspect system. Tagalog, then, makes no true tense distinctions like the English past–non-past distinction, but instead makes a distinction between events viewed as

actual, or realis and events viewed as hypothetical, or irrealis. Among the actual events, there is a distinction between those viewed as complete and those viewed as incomplete. Events viewed as complete are in the *perfective* aspect, those viewed as incomplete are in the *imperfective* aspect and those viewed as hypothetical are in the *contemplated* aspect. The perfective aspect is often translated into English by the past or the present perfect, the imperfective aspect by the simple present or by the present or past progressive and the contemplated aspect by the future, e.g. perf. *nagwalis* ‘swept, has swept’, imperf. *nagwawalis* ‘sweeps, is/was sweeping’, cont. *magwawalis* ‘will sweep’. There are, however, other translation equivalents in certain cases. For example, the imperfective rather than the perfective form is used for the equivalent of the English negative perfect. Thus ‘hasn’t swept yet’ is expressed by *hindi pa nagwawalis*, not **hindi pa nagwalis*. (*Hindi* is a negative form, *pa* an enclitic adverb.)

From a morphological point of view, aspect is marked in Tagalog by two patterns of affixation, one of which is common to imperfective and contemplative verbs, the other to imperfective and perfective verbs. The pattern that is common to imperfective and contemplated verbs can be called ‘incompleteness’ marking (since hypothetical events are necessarily incomplete), while the pattern common to imperfective and perfective verbs can be called ‘actuality’ marking.

Incompleteness marking involves a monosyllabic reduplicating prefix. This prefix normally consists of a copy of the first consonant and first vowel of the following syllable, except that the vowel of the reduplicating prefix is always long, whatever the length of the vowel in the following syllable. (Vowel length distinguishes this aspectual reduplication from the stem-forming reduplication mentioned above, which always involves a *short* vowel. Compare, for example, the aspectual reduplicating prefix /la:/ in *maglalakbay* /magla:lakbay/ ‘will travel’ and the stem-forming (intensive) reduplicating prefix /la/ in *maglalakbay* /maglalakbay/ ‘travel (repeatedly, etc.)’.)

The rules for the placement of the aspectual reduplicating prefix in relation to other prefixes are rather complex. Some prefixes always precede the reduplicating prefix, but others may either precede or follow it, resulting in the possibility of alternative orderings. For example, in the contemplated and imperfective forms of the verb *maipabili* ‘be able to cause to buy’, the reduplicating prefix follows the abilitative prefix *ma-* but may either precede or follow the transitive prefix *i-* and the causative prefix *pa-*; thus cont. *maipabili*, *maipapabili* and *maipabibili* ‘will be able to cause to buy’ are all well formed.

Actuality marking, which is common to imperfective and perfective verbs, in most cases involves an affix that contains the phoneme /n/. The sole exceptions to this generalisation are verbs whose infinitives are formed with the actor-trigger infix *-um-*, in which actuality marking consists simply in the retention of this infix. The infix, in other words, is present in imperfective and perfective forms, but absent from contemplated forms. For example, the imperfective and perfective forms of the verb *pumunta* ‘go’ (stem: *punta*) are, respectively, *pumupunta* and *pumunta*, while the contemplated form is *pupunta*. (As these examples illustrate, the perfective forms of *-um-* verbs are identical with the infinitives.)

There are three actuality-marking affixes that contain /n/, the prefix *n-*, the prefix *ni-* and the infix *-in-*. The prefix *n-* occurs as a replacement of *m-* in all prefixes that begin with the latter in the infinitive. For example, *nagwalis* and *nagwawalis* are the perfective and imperfective forms corresponding to the infinitive *magwalis* ‘sweep’. Similarly, *nangisda* is the perfective form of *mangisda* ‘fish’, and intransitive *nakakita*/transitive *nakita* are the perfective forms of intransitive *makakita*/transitive *makita* ‘see s.t.’. *The*

prefix *ni-* and the infix *-in-* occur in all other cases as either free or morphophonemically conditioned alternants. For example, the perfective form corresponding to the infinitive *lagyan* ‘put on s.t.’ may be either *nilagyan* or *linagyan*, but the perfective form corresponding to *iabot* ‘hand to someone’ must be *iniabot* and that corresponding to *hiraman* ‘borrow from someone’ must be *hiniraman*.

If the verb marked by *ni-* or *-in-* contains the prefix *i-*, this always precedes the *ni-* or *-in-*, as in *iniyuko* ~ *iyinuko*, the perfective forms of *iyuko* ‘bend s.t.’, or *ibinigay*, the perfective form of *ibigay* ‘give s.t.’. Otherwise, *ni-* is always word-initial and *-in-* always follows the first consonant of the word. A special property of verbs whose infinitives are formed with the suffix *-in* is the loss of this suffix in the actuality-marked forms. Thus, corresponding to the infinitive *yayain* ‘invite someone’, we find perfective *niyaya* ~ *yinaya* and imperfective *niyayaya* ~ *yinayaya* (cf. the contemplated form *yayayain*, in which the suffix *-in* is retained).

The morphology of adjectival verbs in Tagalog is also rather complex. Probably the most common formations are those involving the prefix *ma-*, e.g. *mabuti* ‘be good’ (cf. *buti* ‘goodness’), *masama* ‘be bad’ (cf. *sama* ‘badness’), *malaki* ‘be big’ (cf. *laki* ‘bigness’), *maliit* ‘be small’ (cf. *liit* ‘smallness’). There are also many unaffixed adjectival verbs – e.g. *mahal* ‘be expensive’, *mura* ‘be cheap’, *hinog* ‘be ripe’, *hilaw* ‘be raw’ – as well as many that are formed with various other affixes, e.g. *-an*, as in *putikan* ‘be virtually covered with mud’ (cf. *putik* ‘mud’), *-in*, as in *lagnatin* ‘be susceptible to fever’ (cf. *lagnat* ‘fever’) (and other ‘adversely affected’ forms), and *maka-*, as in *makabayan* ‘be patriotic’ (cf. *bayan* ‘country’).

In certain cases adjectival verbs may be morphologically marked for number or gender. Many *ma-* adjectival verbs are marked as plural by a monosyllabic reduplicating prefix occurring between *ma-* and the stem: e.g. *mabubuti* ‘be good (pl.)’, *masasama* ‘be bad (pl.)’. Such plural marking is, however, optional, and the non-pluralised forms may in general be used with plural as well as with singular referents. Gender marking is restricted to certain borrowed forms from Spanish, which occur in two gender-marked forms, a feminine form ending in *-a* and a masculine form ending in *-o*, e.g. *komika* (f.)/*komiko* (m.) ‘be funny’, *simpatika* (f.)/*simpatiko* (m.) ‘be pleasing’, *tonta* (f.)/*tonto* (m.) ‘be stupid’.

Adjectival verbs may also be morphologically marked as intensive or moderate. Intensive formations involve the prefix *napaka-* (which replaces the *ma-* of a *ma-* adjectival form), while moderate formations involve disyllabic reduplication. Examples are: *napakabuti* ‘be very good’, *napakamahal* ‘be very expensive’, *mabuti-buti* ‘be rather good’, *mahal-mahal* ‘be rather expensive’.

The comparative of equality is marked by *(ka)sing-*, e.g. *(ka)singbuti* ‘be as good as’, *(ka)singmahal* ‘be as expensive as’, and the superlative is marked by *pinaka-*, e.g. *pinakamabuti* ‘be best’, *pinakamahal* ‘be most expensive’. (Note that the *ma-* of a *ma-* adjectival verb such as *mabuti* ‘be good’ is dropped after *(ka)sing-* but retained after *pinaka-*.) The comparative of inequality is, however, expressed syntactically (by a preceding *mas*, *lalong* or *higit na* ‘more’ and a following *kaysa* or *(kaysa) sa* ‘than’).

Tagalog noun morphology is relatively simple. Nouns are not inflected for case or number (there is, however, obligatory syntactic role marking involving case-marking forms like *ng* and *sa* – see above – as well as optional syntactic pluralisation, involving the plural form *mga*), and only certain nouns borrowed from Spanish are marked for gender: e.g. *amiga* (f.)/*amigo* (m.) ‘friend’, *sekretarya* (f.)/*sekretaryo* (m.) ‘secretary’. Nonetheless, a good many morphologically complex nouns occur and some of these reflect quite productive patterns of affixation. Among the latter are: affixation with *-an*

to express a place associated with what the stem designates, as in *aklatan* ‘library’ (cf. *aklat* ‘book’), *halamanan* ‘garden’ (cf. *halaman* ‘plant’); affixation with *-in* to express the object of the action expressed by a verb formed with the same stem, as in *awitin* ‘song’ (cf. *umawit* ‘sing’), *bilihin* ‘something to buy’ (cf. *bumili* ‘buy’); and affixation with *taga-* to express the performer of the action of a verb formed with the same stem, as in *tagasulat* ‘writer’ (cf. *sumulat* ‘write’), *tagapagbili* ‘seller’ (cf. *magbili* ‘sell’), *tagapangisda* ‘fisherman’ (cf. *mangisda* ‘fish’).

The Tagalog personal pronoun system is summarised in Table 49.4. The person–number categories that are distinguished are first, second and third person, singular and plural. There are, however, two distinct types of first person plural. When the addressee is not included in the group being referred to (i.e. when the meaning is ‘he/she/they and I’), the *exclusive* forms are used. When, on the other hand, the addressee *is* included in the group being referred to (i.e. when the meaning is ‘you (and he/she/they) and I’), the *inclusive* forms are used. Some dialects of Tagalog also make a distinction between first person inclusive and first person dual forms, although the distinction is lost in the dialect commonly used in Manila. Note that no gender distinctions are made: the same third person singular forms are used to refer to males and females. While, in general, Tagalog personal pronouns are, strictly *personal*, in the sense that they are used to refer only to human beings (and to humanised animals, such as pets or animals in folktales), the third person singular *siya* can also be used for a non-human referent. However, where English would use *it* (or *they* with a non-human referent), Tagalog commonly uses either no pronoun at all or a demonstrative.

Table 49.4 Personal Pronouns

	<i>Genitive</i>	<i>Locative</i>	Unmarked
Singular			
1st person	ko	akin	ako
2nd person	mo	iyo	ka/ikaw
3rd person	niya	kaniya	siya
Plural			
1st person-exclusive	namin	amin	kami
1st person-inclusive	natin	atin	tayo
2nd person	ninyo	inyo	kayo
3rd person	nila	kanila	nila

Each personal pronoun category is associated with three distinct forms, except for the second person singular, which is associated with four. The genitive is the form that occurs in the same contexts as personal noun phrases marked by *ni*, that is personal actors of transitive sentences and possessors of nouns. The locative is the form that occurs after the preposition *sa* or as a prenominal possessive pronoun. This set of pronouns is labelled by some analysts as dative. The unmarked form is that which occurs in most other contexts, e.g. in isolation, as a nominal predicate, as a fronted topic or when the pronoun functions as the grammatical subject of the clause. In the case of the second person singular pronoun, there are two forms: *ka*, an enclitic pronoun which functions exclusively as a subject and is unambiguously absolutive, and *ikaw*, which is a free form that occurs in unmarked contexts such as in isolation, as a nominal predicate or a fronted topic.

A similar three-way distinction is made in the demonstrative pronouns, as shown in Table 49.5.

Table 49.5 Demonstrative Pronouns

	<i>Genitive</i>	<i>Locative</i>	<i>Unmarked</i>
'this'	nito	dito	ito
'that (near addressee)'	niyan	diyan	iyan
'that (not near addressee)'	niyon, noon	doon	iyon

Three demonstrative categories are distinguished, one equivalent to English 'this' and two that divide the range of English 'that', one of them used when the referent is near the addressee, the other when it is not. Again the genitive forms are those that occur in the same contexts as common nouns marked by *ng* (*niyon* and *noon* are free variants), and function as actors of transitive sentences or as demonstrative possessors of nouns. The locative forms of the demonstratives occur in the same contexts as *sa* phrases (including directional and locative *sa* phrases, in which case the demonstratives have the meanings 'here' and 'there'). And the unmarked forms occur in most other contexts.

Finally, it may be mentioned that there are also three contextually distinguished forms of the personal-name marker, i.e. the marker that is used when the head noun is a personal name: the *ng* form *ni*, the *sa* form *kay* and the unmarked form *si*. Such formal distinctions within the nominal system serve to identify the semantic and/or syntactic roles of arguments more or less unambiguously, thus allowing for the freedom of word order which, together with the voice-marking system and the complex verbal morphology, constitute perhaps the most striking typological features of Tagalog.

Bibliography

Tagalog grammar was first studied by Spanish missionaries in the sixteenth century, but it was only in the twentieth century that the language was analysed on its own terms, rather than on the basis of often inappropriate European models. Bloomfield's (1917) influential grammar, written from a classic structuralist perspective, served as the basis for the first grammar by a native speaker of the language, Lopez (1940). The most comprehensive grammar of the language written to date is Schachter and Otones (1972). Various descriptions of the morphology and syntax of Tagalog have appeared since then, including De Guzman (1978), Kroeger (1993) and Maclachlan (1996). Ramos and Bautista (1986) is a handbook of Tagalog verbs with permissible affixation. Himmelmann (2004) provides an excellent description of Tagalog morphology. Recent chapters giving overviews of Tagalog include De Guzman (2001) and Himmelmann (2005).

References

- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1917. *Tagalog Texts with Grammatical Analysis*. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. III (University of Illinois, Urbana)
- De Guzman, Videia P. 1978. *Syntactic Derivation of Tagalog Verbs*. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication, vol. 16 (University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu)

-
- 2001. 'Tagalog', in Jane Garry and Carl Rubino (eds) *Facts about the World's Major Languages: An Encyclopedia of the World's Major Languages, Past and Present* (D.H. Wilson, New York and Dublin), pp. 703–7
- French, Koleen Matsuda. 1988. *Insights into Tagalog: Reduplication, Infixation, and Stress from Nonlinear Phonology* (The Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, TX)
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2004. 'Tagalog', in Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann and Joachim Mugdan (eds), in collaboration with Wolfgang Kesselheim and Stavros Skopeteas, *Morphology: An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-formation, Vol. 2, 1473–90* (de Gruyter, Berlin)
- 2005. 'Tagalog', in Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelman (eds) *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar* (Routledge, New York), pp. 350–76
- Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase Structure and Grammatical Relations in Tagalog*. Dissertations in Linguistics (Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford)
- Lopez, Cecilio. 1940. *The Tagalog Language (An Outline of its Psycho-morphological Analysis)* (Bureau of Printing, Manila)
- Maclachlan, Anna E. 1996. 'Aspects of Ergativity in Tagalog' (PhD dissertation, McGill University)
- Ramos, Teresita V. and Bautista, Maria Lourdes S. 1986. *Handbook of Tagalog Verbs, Inflections, Modes, and Aspects* (University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu)
- Schachter, Paul and Otones, Fe T. 1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar* (University of California Press, Berkeley)
- Zorc, David Paul. 1993. 'The Prehistory and Origin of the Tagalog People', in Øyvind Dahl (ed.) *Language – A Doorway between Human Cultures: Tributes to Dr Otto Chr. Dahl on his Ninetieth Birthday* (Novus, Oslo), pp. 201–11