Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft

Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science

Manuels de linguistique et des sciences de communication

Mitbegründet von Gerold Ungeheuer (†)
Mitherausgegeben 1985–2001 von Hugo Steger

Herausgegeben von / Edited by / Edités par
Herbert Ernst Wiegand

Band 17.2

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

Morphologie
Morphology

Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung
An International Handbook on Inflection and Word-Formation

Herausgegeben von / Edited by
Geert Booij · Christian Lehmann · Joachim Mugdan · Stavros Skopeteas
in collaboration with Wolfgang Kesselheim

2. Halbband / Volume 2

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

∞ Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier, das die US-ANSI-Norm über Haltbarkeit erfüllt.

ISBN 3-11-017278-X

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar.

Printed in Germany
Satz: META Systems GmbH, Wustermark
Druck: Tutte Druckerei GmbH, Salzweg
Einbandgestaltung und Schutzumschlag: Rudolf Hübler, Berlin

Universals". In: Derbyshire, Desmond & Pullum, Geoffrey (eds.), *Handbook of Amazonian Languages, Vol. I*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 440–465

Payne, Doris L. (1986 b), "Noun Classification in Yagua". In: Craig, Colette (ed.), *Noun Classes and Categorization.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 113–131

Payne, Doris L. (1990 a), *The Pragmatics of Word Order: Typological Dimensions of Verb Initial Languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter

Payne, Doris L. (1990 b), "Morphological Characteristics of Lowland South American Languages". In: Payne, Doris L. (ed.), *Amazonian Linguistics: Studies in Lowland South American Languages*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 213–241

Payne, Doris L. (1992), "Narrative Discontinuity vs. Continuity in Yagua". *Discourse Processes* 15, 375–394

Payne, Doris L. & Payne, Thomas E. (1990), "Yagua". In: Derybshire, Desmond & Pullum, Geoffrey (eds.), *Handbook of Amazonian Languages, Vol. II*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 249–474

Payne, Thomas E. (1983), "Subject Inflection of Yagua Verbs". Ms.

Payne, Thomas E. (1993), *The Twins Stories: Participant Coding in Yagua Narratives*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press

Powlison, Esther (1971), "The Suprahierarchical and Hierarchical Structures of Yagua Phonology". *Linguistics* 75, 43–73

Powlison, Esther & Powlison, Paul (1958), "El sistema numérico del yagua (pebano)". *Tradición, Revista Peruana de Cultura* 21, 3–8

Powlison, Paul (1962), "Palatalization Portmanteaus in Yagua (Peba-Yaguan)". *Word* 18, 280–299

Powlison, Paul (1985), *Yagua Mythology: Epic Tendencies in a New World Mythology*. Dallas: International Museum of Cultures

Rivet, Paul (1911), "La famille linguistique Peba". *Journal de la Societé des Americanistes de Paris* 8, 173–206

Doris L. Payne, Eugene (U.S.A.)

136. Tagalog (Austronesian)

1. Introduction
2. Morphosyntax and parts of speech
3. Formal processes
4. Voice, aspect, and mood
5. Actor involvement
6. Illustrative text
7. Uncommon abbreviations
8. References

1. Introduction

1.1. The language and its speakers

Tagalog, a Meso-Philippine language belonging to the Western Malayo-Polynesian branch of the Austronesian family, is one of the major languages of the Republic of the Philippines (Constantino 1971: 112–118). In the 1990s, it was the native language of around 15 million speakers. Most Tagalog speakers live in the central parts of the island of Luzon, in particular in the provinces Batangas, Bulacan, Laguna, and Marinduque. But Tagalog is also widely spoken in the surrounding provinces (including the capital, Manila), and there are many settlements of Tagalog speakers throughout the Philippine islands, especially on Mindoro and Mindanao (cf. McFarland ^{2}1983: 29, 80). Furthermore, Tagalog is widely spoken as a second language. In 1937 it was selected as the basis for the national language Filipino (formerly called Pilipino).

Since the beginning of Spanish colonisation in 1565 the Tagalog area has always been the center of political power in the Philippines, and Tagalog has thus been strongly influenced by the colonial languages, first Spanish and then American English (from 1898 to 1946). This influence, however, has been largely on the lexicon and the phonology, but not on the morphosyntax. For example, the Manila slang, called Taglish, mainly consists of English roots, but the morphology is exclusively Tagalog. Examples include *lipstick-an* 'to put lipstick on', *i-give up* 'to give sth. up', and *mag-on* 'to start dating' (cf. Cubar 1984; the affixes are explained in 4.1). As for morphosyntax, it is not unlikely that there has been some normative influence by colonial institutions and practices

because the Spanish started using Tagalog very early on as a missionary language, writing grammars and preparing catechisms in Tagalog (a *Doctrina Christiana*, dated 1593, is the oldest preserved Tagalog document). The continuing normative influence exerted by the Manila based educated classes is shown by the fact that Tagalog exhibits surprisingly little dialectal diversity (McFarland ^{2}1983: 80). Only the dialect spoken on the small island of Marinduqe exhibits lexical and morphological idiosyncrasies that have caught the attention of linguists (Lopez 1970; Soberano 1980).

The most influential of the Spanish grammars is the one written by Totanes (^{4}1865) which has served as the basis for many analyses of Tagalog (e.g. Humboldt 1838; Müller 1882: 87–163; Marre 1901). The last and most comprehensive Tagalog grammar cast in a traditional framework is Blake (1925). Bloomfield's texts and grammar (1917) are the first attempt to present Tagalog in its own terms and a very fine and early piece of modern structuralist analysis. In addition to Bloomfield and Blake, further comprehensive statements of Tagalog morphology can be found in Lopez (1937), Schachter & Otanes (1972), and Wolff et al. (1991). A review of linguistic work on Tagalog is given in Constantino (1971: 118–145) and Reid (1981). The present article is based primarily on Bloomfield's data and analysis.

1.2. Phonology and orthography

The segmental phonology of Tagalog is relatively simple (except for problems concerning the treatment of loans for which see Matsuda French 1988:1–17). The graphemes used in the standard orthography directly reflect phonemes and basically have their IPA values. The only exception is the use of the digraph <ng> for the velar nasal [ŋ]. The use of this digraph may be slightly confusing, since it is also used for the NP-marker [naŋ], in this case written as a separate word which in turn is not to be confused with *-ng* = [ŋ], the bound allomorph of the linker *na.* A genuine problem with the standard orthography is the fact that glottal stops are not written. Glottal stops regularly occur before initial vowels and intervocalically, i.e., <tao> 'person' is [táʔo], <aral> 'study' is [ʔáral] and <magaaral> 'will study' is [magʔàʔáral]. As the last example shows, base-initial glottals are not dropped when prefixes are added. Although the phonemic status of these initial and intervocalic glottals is far from clear much recent writing on infixation in Tagalog assumes without any discussion that they are non-phonemic (e.g. Crowhurst 1998: 590 who misrepresents her older sources with regard to this point). Word-finally, the problem is further confounded by the fact that here final vowels (optionally followed by [h]) contrast with glottal stops. Thus, <baga> 'glowing charcoal' is [bágah], but <baga> 'lungs' is [bágaʔ]. Deviating from standard orthography a final glottal stop will be marked in this article by <'>.

Stress is also unmarked in standard orthography. Its analysis is somewhat controversial. Some authors (e.g. Schachter & Otanes 1972: 15–18; Wolff et al. 1991: 12) consider vowel length the primary phenomenon, while others consider vowel length an epiphenomenon of stress (cf. Bloomfield 1917: 141 f.; Matsuda French 1988: 63 f.). In this article, the latter view has been adopted, but since stress assignment in Tagalog is not fully understood, all remarks pertaining to this phenomenon must be regarded with caution. Stress clearly is phonemic in Tagalog, compare *búkas* 'tomorrow' and *bukás* 'open', and plays an important rôle in affixation (see 3.4). Bases with stress on the penultimate syllable are called barytone bases, those with stress on the final syllable oxytone bases. Primary stress on the penultimate syllable will remain unmarked (thus *bukas* for 'tomorrow'), elsewhere it will be marked by the acute accent. The grave accent marks secondary stress.

Phonological rules of relevance to the present exposition are:

- /d/ often becomes /r/ intervocalically;
- phrase-final vowels are followed by a weak glottal fricative (cf. [bagah] above);
- /u/ and /i/ in phrase-final syllables are lowered to [o] and [e], respectively;
- word-final glottal stops regularly disappear before clitics and the linker (cf. Bloomfield 1917: 136; Wolff et al. 1991: 12).

2. Morphosyntax and parts of speech

Tagalog distinguishes between two parts of speech (Bloomfield 1917: 146): **full words** and **function words** (or particles). Some function

words mark morphosyntactic slots, then usually being proclitics. Others are second position clitics (these are not discussed here; see Schachter & Otanes 1972: 187−193, 433−435 and Kroeger 1993: 118−123, 152−154). Full words may be extensively affixed and occur in the limited set of morphosyntactic slots provided for by the function words. There are five morphosyntactic slots for full words in a Tagalog clause, four of which are illustrated by the following example:

(1) *i-ni-abót ng*
CV-RLS(UGR)-within.reach GEN
màng-ga-gamot sa sundalo ang itlóg,
AV-RDP$_2$-medicine LOC soldier SPEC egg
at ang pare at siyá ay nàg-hintáy
and SPEC priest and 3.SG PM RLS.AV-wait
ng sà-sabih-in ng sundalo.
GEN RDP$_1$-say-PV GEN soldier
'The physician handed the egg to the soldier, and the priest and he waited for what the soldier would say.'

Except for the first word, all full words in this clause are preceded by a function word. The clause initial position is the predicate position, which is unmarked unless it is preceded by a topical constituent. In this case, the predicate is marked by the predicate marker *ay* 'PM', as in the second part of example (1). The other markers have the following functions:

sa is a general locative preposition marking oblique arguments and adjuncts. It is the final constituent of all of the more specific prepositions in Tagalog such as *hanggang sa* 'until' or *para sa* 'for'.

ang is often called a topic (or a subject) marker in the literature. The notion of subject in Tagalog is highly controversial (cf. Schachter 1976; 1995; Drossard 1984: 73−78; Foley & van Valin 1984: 134−148; DeWolf 1988: 144−150; Kroeger 1993; Naylor 1995). The fact that *ang* by itself marks neither topics nor subjects is evident from clauses containing two *ang*-phrases:

(2) *ang mga buhók lamang ang*
SPEC PL hair only SPEC
p<in>ù-putol ng patalím
<RLS(UGR)>RDP$_1$-cut GEN blade
'only the hair was cut by the blade'

In this example, the first *ang*-phrase functions as the predicate, the second as the predication base or subject (subject$_2$ in the terminology of Matthews 1981: 104−113). Subjects in this sense have to be configurationally defined in Tagalog as the *ang*-phrase which occurs either after the predicate or before the predicate marker *ay*. But this does not yet clarify the function of *ang*.

Basically, the function of *ang* is similar to that of an article (the standard analysis in traditional Tagalog grammars, cf. Blake 1925: 205 f.). It is, however, not a definite article, but includes all kinds of referentially specific expressions (definite, specific-indefinite, generic; for details, see Adams & Manaster-Ramer 1988 and Himmelmann 1991: 8−16), and is therefore glossed as SPEC here.

ng [naŋ] 'GEN' marks genitive attributes. In the literature it is common to differentiate between *ng* marking non-topic agents, direct objects, instruments, manner, etc., but there is little empirical support for such distinctions (cf. Naylor 1980: 37−42).

The fifth morphosyntactic slot, not illustrated by examples (1) and (2), is constituted by the linker (or ligature) *na* (*-ng* after vowels, /n/ or glottal stop). This particle links the elements of a modifying construction such as *ulól na unggó'* 'foolish CONN monkey', but also occurs in compounds such as *puno-ng-saging* 'tree-CONN-banana' and in complement clauses (see Gonzales 1971). The order in modifying constructions is not fixed in Tagalog, thus *unggó-ng ulól* is equally possible for 'foolish monkey'. The difference between the genitive marker *ng* and the linker pertains to referentiality as shown by the following 'minimal pair':

(3) (a) *bata-ng dalaga*
child-CONN young.woman
'girl'

(b) *bata' ng dalaga*
child GEN young.woman
'child of the young woman'

Full words are not formally differentiated with respect to the five morphosyntactic positions just illustrated. Any full word, regardless of its affixation, may occur in any position (provided its meaning is appropriate). That is, with regard to their syntactic distribution the large class of full words cannot be further divided into classes such as nouns, verbs, and adjectives (cf. Lemaréchal 1982; 1989; Himmelmann 1991; to appear; Gil 1993; Shkarban 1995; Naylor 1995; Art. 72). For example, the words *sàsabihin* in (1) and *pinùputol* in (2) which are inflected for aspect and mood (see 4.2) and which are often called verbs, occur − without any further

derivation – in a *ng*- and an *ang*-phrase, respectively. Similarly, so-called nouns may occur underived in predicate position, e.g.

(4) *Isdá' ang pàg-kain niyá.*
fish SPEC GER-eat 3.SG.POSS
'His meal was fish.'

A brief look at the list of affixes in Schachter & Otanes for what they call 'nouns' (1972: 97–106), 'adjectives' (1972: 198 f.; 216–229), and 'verbs' (1972: 344–355) immediately reveals that a subclassification of full word bases on the basis of morphological evidence is also not a straightforward enterprise since basically the same set of affixes is involved in all these formations. Nevertheless, bases appear to differ in their morphological potential. A detailed study of the different morphological classes, however, still remains to be done (see Wolff 1993 and Himmelmann to appear for some preliminary suggestions).

There is no doubt that both unaffixed bases and affixed words differ in their semantics in that some denote actions, others things, yet others states, etc. A base such as *bilí* clearly designates the action of buying, *bahay* the entity 'house', *bago* the quality 'new'. The distinction between these different kinds of concepts is sometimes grammatically marked by different stress patterns (cf. 3.4). It is not clear, however, whether these conceptual classes are in any way directly relevant to stating the (segmental) morphosyntactic regularities of Tagalog. Therefore, given the absence of clear-cut formal evidence for such categories, the terms for lexical categories such as noun, verb, adjective, etc. are avoided in this article and the terms action, entity, etc. are used whenever it is convenient to make reference to conceptual classes.

3. Formal processes

3.1. Affixation

The number of affixes in Tagalog is fairly small, but each of the major three affix categories is represented: there are two suffixes (*-in* and *-an*, see 4.1), two infixes (*-in-* and *-um-*, see 4.1 and 4.2), and about a dozen prefixes. Most of these affixes can be combined with each other so that a large number of complex formations results (Bloomfield 1917: 317–319 lists some 200 formations). This number is further increased by the fact that affixes may co-occur with other formal processes such as reduplication (see 3.3) and stress shifting (see 3.4).

Prefixes exhibit some word-like properties in that (with few exceptions) they (a) do not display any fusional characteristics (not even resyllabification takes place, which, however, is not surprising given the fact that all bases start with a consonant (cf. 1.2)), (b) mostly carry their own stress, and (c) may occasionally be used in isolation (cf. Bloomfield 1917: 213; Matsuda French 1988: 89 f.; Rubino 1998). Exceptions are, on the one hand, the prefixes *i-* (4.1) and *ka-* (5.1), the first of which is never stressed and both of which are sometimes fused with the base, e.g. *ka-ibigan* 'ASS-like-LV (friend)' is usually pronounced [kaybigan] rather than [kaʔibigan] (Bloomfield 1917: 139 f.).

The other exception is the prefix *pang-* (and related *mang-* and *nang-*), where the prefix-final nasal regularly assimilates to, and sometimes substitutes for, the initial consonant of the base. This prefix-type is very common in western Austronesian languages and is often analysed as containing an archisegmental nasal (and then is represented as /paN-/). The assimilation and substitution regularities may be summarised as follows (for the semantics of this derivation, see 5.2):

- N is regularly deleted before base-initial nasals: *maN + manhíd* → *mamanhíd* 'get numb'.
- N never substitutes for a glottal fricative or for glides: *maN + hiyá'* → *mànghiyá'* 'humiliate', *maN + walís* → *màngwalís* 'hit with a broom', *maN + yari* → *màngyari* 'happen'.
- Voiceless obstruents (apart from the glottal fricative) are regularly substituted for: *maN + pili'* → *màmili'* 'choose (several things)', *maN + takot* → *mànakot* 'frighten several people', *maN + kabayo* → *màngabayo* 'ride on horseback', *maN + sakít* → *mànakít* 'cause pain'. Glottal stop is sometimes not substituted for; the factors involved are unclear. In fact, two derivations are occasionally possible from the same base. Compare [màŋáso] 'hunt with dogs' with [màŋʔáso] 'ridicule people' (base *aso* 'dog').
- Voiced obstruents and the lateral are generally not substituted for: *maN + daya'* → *màndaya'* 'cheat people' (but *maN + dikít* → *mànikít* 'adhere'), *maN + gamót* → *mànggamót* 'practice medicine (profes-

sionally)' *maN + laró'* → *mànlaró'* 'amuse others'. For /b/ both options are common and, in a few cases, possible for the same base. Thus from *bakyá'* 'wooden shoe' it is possible to derive either *màmbakyá'* 'hit with a wooden shoe' or *màmakyá'* 'wear wooden shoes'.

In the derivation of so-called instrumental adjectives substitution is said to be optional, e.g. both *pansukláy* and *panukláy* mean 'for use in combing' (Schachter & Otanes 1972: 218–221; 319 f.).

Suffixes exhibit regular fusional tendencies in that the stem-final consonant (including the optional [h] after vowel-final bases) is regularly resyllabified with the suffix and the base-final vowel is often syncopated, e.g. *lakás + an* → *lak.sán* 'strengthen (x)', *bilí + in* → *bil.hín* 'buy (x)' (cf. Matsuda French 1988: 12 f.). There are further sporadic irregularities such as *tawan-an* 'laugh at (x)' instead of the expected **tawah-an*, and *tamn-án* 'plant in (x)' instead of the expected *?tanim-án* or **tanm-án* (cf. Bloomfield 1917: 214; Schachter & Otanes 1972: 375–380).

Infixes are always inserted after the first consonant of the base, e.g. *b<um>ilí* '<AV> buy' from *bilí*. All other formative processes precede infixation, infixes thus also occur in prefixes, e.g. *p<in>àg-tapat-án* '<RLS(UGR)>GER-fronting-LV (confided to (x))', and reduplicated syllables (cf. 3.3). In formations involving the infix *-in-* and stem-initial glides or liquids, the stem-initial consonant and the nasal of the infix are regularly metathesized, thus **l-in-uto'* but *ni-luto'* 'RLS(UGR)-cook'. With stem-initial /w/ metathesis is optional, for example, both *ni-wisik-án* and *w<in>isik-án* for 'RLS(UGR)-sprinkle-LV/<RLS(UGR)>sprinkle-LV (sprinkle on (x))'. When co-occurring with the prefix *i-* (i.e. [ʔi]), *-in-* is infixed into the following syllable, e.g. *i-b<in>igáy* 'CV-<RLS(UGR)> give' from *bigáy*. In stems beginning with a liquid, a glide or a glottal, metathesis again regularly occurs, compare *i-ni-hatíd* 'CV-RLS(UGR)-convey' (**ihinatid*), *i-ni-abót* [ʔi-ni-ʔabót] 'CV-RLS (UGR)-within.reach' (**i-in-abot*).

3.2. Consonant alternation

A number of prefixes display regular alternation of the initial consonant (cf. de Guzman 1978: chapter 3.3): the /p/-initial form is the basic form (used as gerund (4.3) or imperative), /m/ marks non-realis and /n/ realis (cf. 4.2). Examples are *pag-/mag-/nag-*, *paN-/maN-/naN-*, *paki-/maki-/naki-*. The alternation between the two nasal forms also occurs with the stative or potentive prefix (*ma-/na-*, cf. 5.1), but here no /p/-initial basic form exists. Furthermore, a small number of /p/-initial bases (which probably contain a fossilised prefix) exhibits this alternation, e.g. *pakiníg makiníg nakiníg* 'listen', *panoód manoód nanoód* 'watch'. This alternation probably developed from infixed formations by clipping the first (unstressed) syllable. Thus, *mag-* probably derives from **pumag-* and *nag-* from **pinag-*. Note, however, that *pinag-* is still a productive formative, i.e. the RLS (UGR) form of *pag*-derived stems (cf. 5.2).

3.3. Reduplication

There are three kinds of **reduplication** processes in Tagalog. In two of these processes the first consonant and vowel of the base are copied (CV-reduplication). The two processes differ with regard to the fact that in one the reduplicated syllable is assigned stress (RDP_1), and in the other it is not (RDP_2): *mang-gà-gamót* 'will practice medicine' vs. *màng-ga-gamot* (or *mànggagamót*) 'one who makes cures, physician'. If a base starts with a consonant cluster, only the first consonant is copied, cf. *trabaho* 'work' → *mag-tà-trabaho* 'will work'.

The third process consists in copying the first two syllables of the base (RDP_3). In the case of disyllabic bases, the complete base is copied, e.g. *lakad* 'walk' → *mag-lakàd-lakád* (RDP_3 with stress shift) 'do a little walking', *mura* 'cheap' → *mura-mura* 'rather cheap'. In the case of bases containing more than two syllables, the second syllable is copied only up to its peak, which is then assigned secondary stress, viz. *tahimik* 'peaceful' → *tahì-tahimik* 'rather peaceful', *baluktód* 'crooked' → *balù-baluktód* 'variously bent'. RDP_2 and RDP_3 generally apply to bases only, while RDP_1 freely applies to prefixes as well (see below).

Each type of reduplication may occur only once in a derivation but different types may be combined with each other, as will be seen shortly.

Tagalog reduplication phenomena have figured prominently in the discussion of the status of reduplication (cf. Art. 57) as well as the related issues concerning the boundaries between morphology and phonology and the internal structure of the morphological component (cf. Marantz 1982: 438 f., 451 f., 473–479; Carrier-Duncan 1984; Matsuda French

1988: 19–61). The argument is concerned with the interrelation of (regular) affixation and reduplication. The Tagalog evidence, however, seems inconclusive in this regard. The following is a (partial) list of the relevant phenomena:

- Formations involving nasal substitution (cf. 3.1) suggest that allomorphy rules precede reduplication, e.g. *maN* + RDP_1 + *putol* → *mamùmutol* 'will cut (a lot)'.
- Infixation, on the other hand, seems to follow reduplication (cf. Matsuda French 1988: 38), i.e., *pumùputol* 'cut' seems to be derived from *pùputol*, otherwise one would expect **pùpumutol*.
- In formations involving polysyllabic prefixes or a combination of prefixes, it is usually the second syllable of the prefix that is reduplicated (by RDP_1, receiving word level stress, cf. Matsuda French 1988: 44–52), viz. *mag* + *pa* + *putol* → *magpàpaputol* 'will cause to be cut', *maka* + *putol* → *makàkaputol* 'will be able to cut', or *maka* + *pag* + *pa* + *putol* → *makàkapàgpaputol* 'will be able to cause to be cut'. A general exception to this regularity are formations involving the prefix *i-*, which is never reduplicated and does not count in determining the second syllable, cf. *ma* + *i* + *pag* + *luto'* → *maipàpagluto'* 'will be able to cook for (x)' and *i* + *paki* + *pa* + *putol* → *ipakìkipaputol* 'will be asked to be caused to be cut'. In several instances, however, either the second syllable of the prefix or the first syllable of the base may be reduplicated, an example being *makapùputol* 'will be able to cut' which alternates with the form *makàkaputol* just mentioned (for more examples, cf. chart in Schachter & Otanes 1972: 369). This raises the problem of where to place RDP_1-reduplication in the derivation of these complex formations.
- The relation of suffixation and RDP_3 is also problematic. In some cases suffixation (and the related morphonological processes) clearly apply before RDP_3: *tingín* + *an* → *tingnán* 'look at (x)' → *tingnàn-tingnán* 'look at (x) a little'. In other cases, it is the other way around: *sakit* → *sakit-sakit* → *màgsakìt-sakitan* 'pretend to be sick'. If suffixation preceded RDP_3, **magsakisakitan* would be expected (trisyllabic base), cf. *mag* + *salitá'* + *an* → *màgsalì-salitaan* 'talk a little to each other'.
- RDP_1 and RDP_3 may co-occur. In this case either RDP_3 precedes RDP_1, e.g. *magsàsakìt-sakitan* 'will pretend to be sick' and *magsàsalì-salitaan* 'will talk a little to each other', or they may apply simultaneously (at different locations), viz. *mag* + *pa* + *ka* + *ingat* → *magpàpakaingat-ingat* 'will be extremely careful'. Carrier-Duncan (1984: 269) claims that there are also cases where RDP_2 precedes RDP_3: *mag* + *kaN* + *punit* → *magkàmpupunit* 'will tear spontaneously' → *magkàmpupù-pupunit* 'will (intensively) tear spontaneously'.
- RDP_1 and RDP_2 may co-occur as well, in which case RDP_2 precedes RDP_1. Thus from *takbó* 'run' *màg-ta-takbó* 'run wild' is derived by prefixing *mag-* and RDP_2. From the latter the imperfective aspect *mag-tà-ta-takbó* is derived by RDP_1.

3.4. Stress shift

Both primary and secondary **stress assignment** in Tagalog may be connected with a variation in meaning and this assignment is at least partially independent of segmental processes (cf., for example, the difference between RDP_1 and RDP_2 mentioned in 3.3). The data, however, are not clear, since most sources (apart from Bloomfield 1917 and Wolff et al. 1991) do not mark stress consistently (cf. 1.2). Two examples are given to illustrate the possibilities and complexities involved.

There is a substantial number of bases which differ only with respect to stress and which are clearly semantically related (unlike the pair *bukas* 'tomorrow'/*bukás* 'open' mentioned in 1.2). Examples include *abot* 'overtake' vs. *abót* 'within reach, reach for, pass', *alam* 'knowledge' vs. *alám* 'known', *buhay* 'live, life' vs. *buháy* 'alive', *bunot* 'pull out' vs. *bunót* 'pull out a lot/repeatedly', *isip* 'think, thought' vs. *isíp* 'think hard/with deliberation', *lakad* 'walk' vs. *lakád* 'on foot, barefooted', *tulog* 'sleep' vs. *tulóg* 'asleep' (cf. Bloomfield 1917: 215 f.). Wolfenden (1961: 12) characterises the meaning shifts involved as (a) accomplishment (resultative) or (b) intensification. While resultative pairs are widely attested, it is unclear whether the much more sporadic pairs not belonging to this type can all be subsumed under 'intensification' as the handful examples just given should make clear.

The complex interaction of stress assignment and affixation is illustrated by the suffix

-an (cf. Bloomfield 1917: 250−262). If this suffix marks locative voice (cf. 4.1), primary stress usually shifts one syllable to the right (i.e. to the ultimate or penultimate syllable of the derived word). Examples are *táwag* 'call' → *tawágan* 'call (x)', *gupít* 'cut (with scissors)' → *gupitán* 'cut the hair of (x)', *bilí* 'buy' → *bilhán* 'buy from (x)', *sáma* 'go along, accompany' → *samáhan* 'accompany (x)'. If *-an* derives expressions denoting either a collective action or the place where something (an entity or an action) is located, stress in oxytone bases remains on the same syllable as in the underived word: *iyák* 'cry, weep' → *iyákan* 'a crying of many', 'buy' → *bilíhan* 'place where to buy, market', *aklát* 'book' → *aklátan* 'library', *litsón* 'a roast pig' → *litsúnan* 'place to roast pigs or a barbecue (= roast-pig party)'. For barytone bases there are two possibilities: either stress shifts one syllable to the right (to the penultimate syllable of the derived word), which is often accompanied by secondary stress on the first syllable of the derived word, e.g. *sàmáhan* 'a going together of many, company', or it is shifted to the ultimate syllable of the derived word (i.e., the suffix is stressed), e.g. *básа* 'read' → *basahán* 'a reading-room, library' (vs. *basáhan* 'read sth. to (x)'), *lában* 'contrary, fight' → *labanán* 'a fighting of many, battle, war' (vs. *labánan* 'fight/oppose (x)'). Stress shift to the penultimate syllable of the derived word is used (with very few exceptions) for collective action expressions, while stress shift to the suffix is more commonly (though by no means exclusively) used for 'place where' derivations. Note that these are only regularities; differences in meaning are not always accompanied by formal differences, e.g. *dúlo* 'end' → *dulúhan* 'terminate (x)' (locative voice), but also 'end part, back yard' ('place where'; cf. Bloomfield (1917: 261) who lists a number of words which formally appear to be locative voice derivations, but the meaning of which does not fit this categorisation).

4. Voice, aspect, and mood

Tagalog and the other Philippine languages are most famous for a phenomenon variously called voice, orientation, case marking on the verb (cf. Blake 1906; Ramos 1974), or 'focus', a term introduced in the late 1950s to underscore the exceptional nature of the phenomenon (cf. Llamzon 1973: 168). The last term is widely used to refer to the pragmatic phenomenon of highlighting new or contrastive information. 'Focus'-affixes in Philippine languages do not have such a highlighting function. The participant 'focussed' on by these affixes is usually given information and often remains unexpressed. Therefore, this term is avoided here. Instead, **voice** is chosen because it is the least misleading term (see 4.1).

The literature on voice in Tagalog is fairly extensive (see − in addition to the general reference works mentioned in 1.1 − Müller 1882: 136−142; Marre 1901: 574−582; Blake 1906; Scheerer 1924; Capell 1964; Llamzon 1973; 1976: 89; Wolfenden 1961: 14−16; Ramos 1971: 21−23, 56−69; 1974: 19−40; Foley 1976: 105−113; McFarland 1976: 16−24; de Guzman 1978: chapter 3; Drossard 1984: 34−51; Himmelmann 1987: 92−125; DeWolf 1988; Shibatani 1988). Since voice marking is formally tied to aspectual and modal distinctions, these three categories will be treated together in one section.

4.1. Voice

Tagalog predicate expressions usually display a voice affix that indicates the semantic rôle of one of the participants involved in the state of affairs denoted by the predicate. There are four such affixes, as illustrated by the following examples:

(5) *t<um>angó' ang unggó'*
<AV>nod SPEC monkey
'the monkey nodded in assent'

(6) *dikdik-ín siyá sa lusóng*
crush-PV 3.SG LOC mortar
'(that) he (i.e., the turtle) be crushed in a mortar'

(7) *hulug-an mo akó!*
drop-LV 2.SG.POSS 1.SG
'drop me (some)!'

(8) *kung i-tà-tanim niyá ang*
if CV-RDP$_1$-plant 3.SG.POSS SPEC
kaniyá-ng ka-parte
DAT.3.SG-CONN ASS-part
'if he would plant his part (for him)'

As briefly shown in 2, the NP-markers *ang* and *ng* in Tagalog do not signal semantic rôles. Rather, the voice affixes indicate the semantic rôle of the participant which appears in the *ang*-phrase (*siyá* in (6) and *akó* in (7) are *ang*-forms of the pronoun). Thus, the infix *-um-* in (5) indicates that it is the monkey who does the nodding, and in (6) the suffix

-in indicates that the turtle is going to be the undergoer of the crushing (rather than the actor), etc.

Before discussing some of the more remarkable features of this voice marking system in more detail, it should be noted that the **actor voice** marking infix *-um-* does not only occur in clauses with a subject which is in full control of an action. It is also used for subjects which are involved in a process, as in *p<um>ulá* 'become red' or *l<um>ù-lutang* 'be floating'. Furthermore, it occurs in subject-less expressions for natural events such as *um-ulán* 'rain' or *l<um>indól* 'earthquake'.

In addition to *-um-*, the prefix *mag-* (realis *nag-*) also marks actor voice, cf. *nag-là-laró' silá* 'RLS.AV-RDP$_1$-play 3.PL (they are playing)'. Following de Guzman (1978: chapter 3), this prefix is analysed here as involving the prefix *pag-* used in gerund formation (see 4.3), actor voice (and mood) being signalled by consonant alternation (cf. 3.2). The difference between the two actor voice affixes is further commented upon in 5.2.

One of the remarkable features of voice marking in Tagalog, which sets it apart from voice marking systems in many other languages, is the fact that both actor as well as **undergoer voices** involve overt morphological marking, while in languages such as English only undergoer orientation (passive) is explicitly marked. In other words, actor voice and undergoer voice are equally marked in Tagalog (at least in morphological terms).

Another peculiarity is the fact that there is not only one affix for undergoer orientation. Instead, three different ways in which the undergoer may be involved in a given state of affairs are distinguished:

- *-in* (**patient voice**) indicates a directly affected undergoer, such as the turtle in (6), the hair in (2), or *itó* in *inum-ín mo itó* 'drink-PV 2.SG.POSS PROX (drink this)'.
- *-an* (**locative voice**) is used for recipients (see (7)), addressees, beneficiaries, and the location where an action takes place, e.g.:

  (9) *ni-lakar-an ko ang*
  RLS(UGR)-walk-LV 1.SG.POSS SPEC
  ma-bató-ng kalye
  STAT-stone-CONN street
  'I walked on a stony road'

  More generally, it is used for indirect undergoers, i.e. undergoers which are not directly affected by the action denoted by the predicate, as in *inum-án mo itó* 'drink-LV 2.SG.POSS PROX (drink from/some of this)' or *buks-án mo ang pintó'* 'open-LV 2.SG.POSS SPEC door (open the door)'.

- *i-* (**conveyance voice**) indicates an undergoer that is moved (a displaced theme), such as the egg in (1) or one half of the banana tree in (8). It is also used for the instrumental rôle, instruments thus being conceived of as moving undergoers:

  (10) *Ang iták ay i-p<in>utol*
  SPEC bolo PM CV-<RLS(UGR)>cut
  ko ng saging.
  1.SG.POSS GEN banana
  'I cut bananas with the bolo.'

  Furthermore, *i-* may also indicate the beneficiary of an action with a few bases (e.g. *i-bilí* 'buy for (x)'), a usage not easily accounted for by any of the analyses proposed for this prefix (cf. Himmelmann 1987: 103–22, 139 f.).

A third cross-linguistically remarkable feature of the voice affixes is that they may be applied to all kinds of bases without any further derivation. That is, the above affixes cannot only be attached to bases denoting actions but also to ones denoting things (e.g. *bató* 'stone' → *batuh-ín* 'throw stones at (x)'), masses (e.g. *tubig* 'water' → *tubig-an* 'add water to (x)'), states (e.g. *bago* 'new' → *baguh-in* 'change (x)' or *i-bago* 'move (x) to another position'), or animate beings (e.g. *langgám* 'ant' → *langgam-ín* 'be infested with ants'). Of course, the derivational possibilities depend on the semantic compatibility of base and affix, and thus are more restricted with regard to, for example, expressions for human beings than for action expressions.

It is common to treat voice with respect to action expressions as inflection, and voice with regard to non-action expressions as derivation. There is, however, no formal evidence to support this distinction. On the contrary, the analysis of voice as inflection leads to extremely complex systems of 'verb' classes in Tagalog. That there is little clear-cut evidence for such classifications is shown by the fact that the proposed classifications differ extremely. Blake (1925), for example, proposes 17 classes, de Guzman (1978) about 80 (cf. Himmelmann 1987: 69, 129–145). The main empirical observation here is that there is no simple classification for action expressions

with regard to their voice marking. In particular, there are no productive inflectional paradigms for voice, as suggested by the commonly used 'paradigmatic' examples in the literature. Instead, derivations from all kinds bases are only partially predictable on the basis of their semantics and exhibit a large number of idiosyncrasies, which again suggests derivation rather than inflection. See McFarland (1976) and Ramos & Bautista (1986) for instructive surveys of those derivations which are actually attested for a given action base (see also Art. 38).

With regard to the three features just mentioned, Tagalog voice marking has much in common with nominalising morphology in other languages. Like much of the morphology used for deriving nouns (or, in many languages, participles) from verbs, the voice affixes change the orientation of a given base in such a way that it may be used to refer to one of the participants involved in the state of affairs denoted by the base (cf. Lehmann 1984: 151 f., who introduces the term **orientation** for analysing nominalisation strategies). In this view, *-um-* is an actor orienting infix which derives from a base such as *tangó'* 'nod, nodding in assent' a word *tumangó'* which could be glossed as 'one who nods, nodder'. This expression no longer directly denotes the action of nodding, but rather the participant who nods. That is, in the Tagalog clause (5) *tumangó' ang unggó'* both *tumangó'* and *unggó'* refer to the same entity. Imitating the equational structure of this clause it could be rendered as 'nodd-er in assent (was) the monkey'. Similarly, example (6) is 'he (be) crush-ee in the mortar', example (7) 'I (be) the place of your dropping/your droppery', and example (8) 'if his plant-ee (would be) his part' (cf. DeWolf 1988: 157 f.). Note, however, that Tagalog voice affixes are not nominalising in a morphosyntactic sense, since they do not change the syntactic category of the base (both base and derived word are full words which can be used in any of the five major morphosyntactic slots discussed in 2). That is, the similarity of Tagalog voice affixes and noun or participle-forming morphology is primarily a semantic one.

With regard to this semantic similarity, it should be noted that the voice marking formatives do not only occur in expressions which denote actions, processes or states (or, more precisely, a participant involved therein). Most of the voice marking affixes also occur in formations which clearly denote entities. The major possibilities pertaining to locative *-an* are mentioned in 3.4. Actor voice marking *mag-* (plus RDP_2) occurs in formations denoting professionals, thus from *nakaw* 'steal' *màg-na-nakaw* 'thief' may be derived. This form differs only with respect to stress from the action denoting formation *mag-nà-nakaw* 'will steal' (cf. 3.3 and Bloomfield 1917: 242 f.; Schachter & Otanes 1972: 103). Furthermore, *mag-* is used together with kinship terms to indicate two (with RDP_2 several) persons between which the relation designated by the base holds: *màg-iná* 'mother and child' (< *iná* 'mother'), *màg-pipinsan* 'several cousins' (cf. Bloomfield 1917: 242; Schachter & Otanes 1972: 102). The suffix *-in* may denote entities undergoing the action denoted by the base, e.g. *aral* 'study' → *aralín* 'lesson'. Again, it is stress that (often) differentiates action and thing, compare *aralín* with *aralin* 'study (x)'. Other examples are *kumpuní* 'repair' → *kùmpunihin* 'things to repair' vs. *kumpunihín* 'repair (x)'; *kain* 'eat' → *kanin* 'boiled rice' or 'eat (x)' (no difference whatsoever, compare also *kakanín* 'sweets'); *inóm* 'drink' → *inumín* 'drinking water' or 'drink (x)', cf. also *ìnumin* 'beverage' (cf. Bloomfield 1917: 247; Schachter & Otanes 1972: 99 f.). There are no derivations with *-um-* or *i-* which denote entities in a similar way.

4.2. Aspect and mood

Voice marked forms occur in two aspects (perfective and imperfective) and two moods (realis and non-realis). **Imperfective** aspect is indicated by RDP_1 (**perfective** aspect is unmarked), **realis** mood is indicated by the infix *-in-* or consonant alternation (/m/ → /n/, cf. 3.2), **non-realis** again being unmarked. These formations are illustrated in Tab. 136.1 with the paradigms for the base *bilí* 'buy', one of the few bases which occurs with all voice affixes. A number of different analyses and terminologies have been proposed for these forms (see Werlen in Bader et al. 1994: 95–100 and Kroeger 1993: 15–18 for overviews). The terminology used here reflects the formal make-up of the paradigms but it is not quite felicitous in all instances with regard to the function of the forms.

Aspect-mood formation is highly regular both formally and semantically and thus clearly is an instance of inflection. It exists for every voice-marked form and is also found for other affix combinations, e.g. *maki-*, *makìki-*, *naki-*, *nakìki-* (see 5.2). With

	AV ('buy')	AV ('sell')	PV	LV	CV
NON.RLS/PFV	*b<um>ilí*	*màg-bilí*	*bilh-ín*	*bilh-án*	*i-bilí*
NON.RLS/IPFV	*bibilí*	*mag-bibilí*	*bìbilh-ín*	*bìbilh-án*	*i-bìbilí*
RLS/PFV	*b<um>ilí*	*nàg-bilí*	*b-in-ilí*	*b-in-ilh-án*	*i-b-in-ilí*
RLS/IPFV	*b<um>ìbilí*	*nag-bìbilí*	*b-in-ìbilí*	*b-in-ìbilh-án*	*i-b-in-ìbilí*

Tab. 136.1: Aspect-mood paradigms for *bilí* 'buy'

a few exceptions not dealt with here, the contexts of use for each form are the same regardless of the meaning of the base. Thus, NON.RLS/PFV (also called *basic form*; cf. Schachter & Otanes 1972: 66 f.) is used in hypothetical and complement clauses and in commands (cf. (6) and (7)), NON.RLS/IPFV (Schachter & Otanes' *contemplated aspect*) is used for future events (cf. (8)), RLS/PFV (Schachter & Otanes' *perfective aspect*) and RLS/IPFV (Schachter & Otanes' *imperfective aspect*) for past and present events, respectively (see illustrative text in 6).

In addition, there is a recent perfective formation (with prefix *ka-* + RDP_1) which involves no voice marking and does not allow for subjects (*ang*-phrases). Hence, all participant expressions are either genitive or locative marked:

(11) *Ka-là-laró ko pa*
RECENT.PFV-RDP_1-play 1.SG.POSS still
lamang sa bata'.
only LOC child
'I have just finished playing with the child.'

As may be immediately observable there are some asymmetries in the paradigms in Tab. 136.1. Strictly speaking, the realis patient voice forms do not have a marker for voice and, similarly, there is also no marker for actor voice in the NON.RLS/IPFV form of the *um*-paradigm. These asymmetries are probably relevant for unravelling the diachronic development of the voice marking system. Their relevance for the synchronic analysis of the system is still in need of further exploration (see Himmelmann 1987: 157–171; Blake 1988: 79 f. for some discussion). In this regard it may be noted that although most action expressions in Tagalog are voice and hence also aspect-mood marked, it is possible to use bases denoting actions without further affixation. In such uses action bases may be semantically undergoer oriented (often with a resultative connotation). For example, in (11) *antáy* could be replaced with the patient voice form *inantáy*.

(12) *Antáy ko ang sagót mo.*
wait 1.SG.POSS SPEC answer 2.SG.POSS
'I wait for/expect your answer.'

But unaffixed bases may also occur in imperatives with actor orientation, e.g. *hintáy ka* 'you wait' (which could also be rendered with *mag-hintáy ka*), and for denoting a state of affairs without orientation:

(13) *Iyák ang sagót niyá sa akin.*
cry SPEC answer 3.SG.POSS LOC DAT.1.SG
'His answer to me was crying/to cry.'

In this last usage, unaffixed bases are similar to gerunds, to which we now turn.

4.3. Gerunds

For bases denoting a state of affairs it is possible to derive a form which is neither voice marked nor aspectually and modally inflected. This is done by prefixing *pag-* to the base according to the following correspondence rules which hold between actor voice and gerundial forms (cf. Schachter & Otanes 1972: 160):

ACTOR VOICE	GERUND
-um-	*pag-*
mag-	*pag-*RDP_2
mang-	*paN-*RDP_2

Tab. 136.2: Gerund formation

Gerunds are further derivable from stative expressions (cf. 5.1, prefix *ma-* is substituted by *pagka-*) and joint action expressions (cf. 5.2, prefix *maki-* replaced by *pakiki-*). In general, gerunds may not be used in predicate position, since they are not oriented towards one of the participants of the state of affairs denoted. Only in a clause such as *pàg-lu-luto' ng pagkain ang trabaho niyá* 'GER-RDP_2-cook GEN food SPEC work 3.SG.POSS (his job is

cooking food)' may a gerund be used predicatively (*pagkain* − which may also mean 'eating' − is a semantically specialised gerund from *kain* 'eat'). Gerunds are most commonly used in noun phrases, e.g. *nàg-umpisá ng pàg-si-sigáw* 'RLS.AV-begin GEN GER-RDP$_2$-shout ((the turtle) began shouting/to shout)' and *nàng-galing sa pàg-su-sugál niyá* 'RLS.AV-come.from LOC GER-RDP$_2$-gamble 3.SG.POSS ((this) is due to his gambling)', or in subordinate clauses (usually with a temporal meaning) *pag-balik ni Gabby sa Pilipinas ...* 'GER-return GEN.PN Gabby LOC Philippines (when Gabby returned to the Philippines ...)'. As shown by the preceding examples, all participants involved in the state of affairs denoted by a gerund have to be expressed in genitive or locative phrases.

A special perfective form of the gerund indicates that the event took place before that of the main clause. It involves the prefix *ka-* (which may be optionally reduplicated) following the general gerund formatives mentioned above (cf. Schachter & Otanes 1972: 161). Compare *pàg-punta* 'going' with *pàg-(ka)-ka-punta* 'having gone'. Gerunds may become the basis for further derivations involving voice, aspect, and mood (see 5.2).

Formations with *paN-* without reduplication regularly denote instruments used in the state of affairs denoted by the base, e.g. *pàmutol* 'cutting instrument' (< *putol* 'cut'), *pànghampás* 'a whip' (< *hampás* 'whip'), *pàngkapé* 'means for buying coffee', etc. (cf. Bloomfield 1917: 224 f.).

5. Actor involvement

Although much less widely discussed, Tagalog morphology concerning the way an actor is involved in a given state of affairs is even more elaborate than the voice morphology. The basic split here is that between dynamic and stative or potentive formations (for statives see also Drossard 1984: 64−72). The **dynamic** forms are morphologically unmarked and have been dealt with in 4. That is, an action expression marked for voice (and aspect and mood) generally implies a volitional actor who is in full control of the action (the major exception being some expressions for processes marked with *-um-* briefly mentioned in 4.1).

5.1. Stative and potentive

States of affairs which do not involve a controlling actor are expressed by a related but different set of formations. Two different scenarios have to be distinguished here. On the one hand, the state of affairs may be such that it excludes the involvement of an actor for principled conceptual reasons. This is typically the case for **stative** expressions such as 'be hungry', 'be angry', 'be adrift', and the like. On the other hand, the state of affairs may be such that in principle it allows for controlling actors but in the specific instance at hand the conceptually possible controlling actor is not in full control of the event. This is the case when someone happens to do something without having the intention to do it. Formations expressing this second possibility are called **potentive**.

A completely regular correspondence exists between dynamic and potentive formations. That is, for each dynamic form there is a corresponding potentive form. The major potentive formatives are *maka-* for actor voice and *ma-* for the undergoer voices. For details compare Tab. 136.1 with Tab. 136.3.

The typical use of potentive forms is for involuntary actions:

(14) *Biglá niyá-ng*
sudden 3.SG.POSS-CONN
nà-bigkás iyón:
RLS.POT.PV-enunciation DIST
'(Terrified) she suddenly exclaimed this: …'

This includes actions done accidentally, i.e. the actor may be in control of the action but did not really intend its outcome:

	AV('buy')	AV('sell')	PV	LV	CV
NON.RLS/PFV	*maka-bilí*	*maka-pagbilí*	*ma-bilí*	*ma-bilh-án*	*ma-i-bilí*
NON.RLS/IPFV	*maka-bìbilí*	*maka-pagbìbilí*	*ma-bìbilí*	*ma-bìbilh-án*	*ma-i-bìbilí*
RLS/PFV	*naka-bilí*	*naka-pagbilí*	*na-bilí*	*na-bilh-án*	*na-i-bilí*
RLS/IPFV	*naka-bìbilí*	*naka-pagbìbilí*	*na-bìbilí*	*na-bìbilh-án*	*na-i-bìbilí*

Tab. 136.3: Potentive aspect/mood paradigms for *bilí* 'purchase, sale'

	STAT	STAT.LV	STAT.CV	STAT.AV
NON.RLS/PFV	*ma-galit*	*ka-galit-an*	*i-ka-galit*	*maka-galit*
NON.RLS/IPFV	*ma-gàgalit*	*ka-gàgalit-an*	*i-ka-gàgalit*	*maka-gàgalit*
RLS/PFV	*na-galit*	*kina-galit-an*	*i-kina-galit*	*naka-galit*
RLS/IPFV	*na-gàgalit*	*kina-gàgalit-an*	*i-kina-gàgalit*	*naka-gàgalit*

Tab. 136.4: Voice and aspect/mood paradigms for stative bases (base *galit* 'anger')

(15) *Na-i-luto ko na.*
RLS.POT-CV-cooked 1.SG.POSS now
'I happen to have cooked it already (by mistake).'

It also includes perceptions over which the actor (= experiencer) has no control as in:

(16) *doón ay nà-kita nilá*
DIST.LOC PM RLS.POT.PV-see 3.PL.POSS
ang isá-ng ma-lakí-ng higante
SPEC one-CONN STAT-size-CONN giant
'there they saw a great giant ...'

In a second, somewhat different use potentive forms express the ability of an actor to perform the action in question:

(17) *kung inyóng*
kung inyó-ng
if 2.PL.DAT-CONN
mapagtiisán iyán
ma-pag-tiís-an iyán
POT-GER-suffer-LV that
'if you are able to endure this ...'

(18) *at hindí makabaríl sa kanyá.*
at hindi' maka-baríl sa kanyá
and NEG POT.AV-gun LOC 3.SG.DAT
'(The man got bitten by the ants) and wasn't able to shoot at him.'

Turning now to stative expressions, these also come in four different voices, two of which are formally identical to the potentive voice forms. Because of the formal similarities, the same labels have been chosen here for glossing these stative voices. However, their syntax and semantics differ quite clearly from the potentive formations so that the labels are not really indicative of their functions.

In the basic voice form for statives, which is simply called *stative* here, the subject is a theme, i.e. an entity which is in, or currently is undergoing, a given state. The forms are identical to the patient voice forms of the potentive paradigm, i.e. base plus prefix *ma-*. The forms of the stative actor voice are morphologically identical to the potentive actor voice forms, i.e. base plus *maka-*. The stative locative and conveyance voices are marked by the prefix *ka-* to which the basic voice affixes *-an* and *i-*, respectively, are added. See Tab. 136.4 for an overview of the forms.

The only really productive formation is the basic stative formation. Almost every Tagalog content word base can be prefixed with *ma-* and then expresses a state:

(19) *na-galit siyá*
RLS.STAT-anger 3.SG
'she was/got angry'

With bases such as *basag* 'crack, break', which allow both a state and an action reading, the form *nabasag* is ambiguous: It can mean 'be in a broken state' (stative) or 'happen to break/able to break' (potentive patient voice). In context, these readings are generally distinguished by the presence of an overt actor expression in the potentive use (*nabasag niyá* 's/he happened to break it/was able to break it').

The stative locative voice is common with bases expressing emotions. The subject expresses the person or thing at which the emotion is directed:

(20) *kinagalitan siyá ng*
in-ka-galit-an siyá ng
RLS(UGR)-STAT-anger-LV 3.SG GEN
Nanay
nanay
mother
'mother was angry with him/her'

Frequently, stative locative voice derivations take on some more specialised meanings. Thus, *kagalitan* also means 'to reprove, to scold, to rebuke'. In addition, stative locative voice derivations are possible with a (relatively small) number of stative expressions which do not pertain to emotions. They then denote the place at which a given state occurs (e.g. *ka-matay-an* 'place where someone died', *ka-hulug-an* 'place where someone falls').

The stative conveyance voice is also most common with bases expressing emotions. Stative conveyance voice formations always have the connotation of causation, that is, the subject specifies the reason for the emotion:

(21) *ikinagalít* *niyá* *akó*
i-in-ka-galit *niyá* *akó*
CV-RLS(UGR)-STAT-anger 3.SG.POSS 1.SG
'she got angry at me (I was the reason for her being angry)'

The stative conveyance voice is found with a somewhat broader range of bases than the stative locative voice. These include *ikabasá'* 'get wet on account of', *ikabagsák* 'fall on account of', *ikatawa* 'laugh on account of', *ikaiyák* 'cry on account of', etc.

The stative actor voice is very similar in meaning to the stative conveyance voice since it also specifies the cause for a given state. But the two formations differ in their grammar and productivity. In the stative conveyance voice construction (as in the stative locative voice construction), the theme argument (i.e. the one who experiences an emotion in the case of emotions) is grammatically coded as a genitive argument. In the stative actor voice construction it is a locative argument:

(22) *lahát ng kanyáng sabihin*
lahát ng kanyá-ng sabi-in
all GEN 3.SG.DAT-CONN statement-PV
ay nakagàgalit sa
*ay naka-*RDP$_1$*-galit sa*
PM RLS.STAT.AV-RDP$_1$-anger LOC
akin
akin
1.SG.DAT
'everything he says irritates me'

The subject expression in the stative actor voice construction usually refers to an inanimate cause (some state of affairs or a thing). With regard to productivity, the stative actor voice forms are the least common of all stative formations and whenever they occur they often take on somewhat specialised meanings (thus *makagalit* is 'irritate, antagonise, give offence' rather than a plain 'make angry'). Furthermore, the stative actor voice derivations are often conventionalised in one of the four aspect/mood forms, for example, *naka-àawa'* 'arousing pity, pitiable' (< *awa'* 'mercy, compassion'), *nakàka-litó* (or *naka-lìlitó*) 'confusing' (< *litó* 'confused, at a loss'), or *nakàka-gandá* (or *naka-gàgandá*) 'beautifying' (< *gandá* 'beauty').

5.2. Further modes of actor involvement

The following prefixes mark further modes of actor involvement:

– *pa-* is a **causative** prefix and compatible with all voice affixes (see McFarland 1984 for ample exemplification and discussion). Actor voice is used when the causer is the subject, patient voice when the causee is the subject, e.g. *p<in>a-talím niyá itó* '<RLS(UGR)>CAUS-sharp 3.SG.POSS PROX (he made this sharp)' and *pa-patul-in mo si Huán ng kugon* 'CAUS-cut-PV 2.SG.POSS PN Juan GEN species.of.grass (have Juan cut the cugon-weeds)'. Patient voice in non-causative constructions becomes conveyance voice in causative ones. Compare the following two examples:

(23) *Nànakaw-in ba natin*
RDP$_1$*-nakaw-in ba natin*
RDP$_1$-stealing-PV INT 1.PI.POSS
ang bangkáy ni Andrea?
ang bangkáy ni Andrea
SPEC corpse GEN.PN Andrea
'Will we steal Andrea's corpse?'

(24) *Ipanànakaw ba uli'*
*i-pa-*RDP$_1$*-nakaw ba uli'*
CV-CAUS-RDP$_1$-stealing INT again
sa atin ang bangkáy
sa atin ang bangkáy
LOC 1.PI.DAT SPEC corpse
ni Andrea?
ni Andrea
GEN.PN Andrea
'Is (he) asking us to steal Andrea's corpse again?'

– *paki-* indicates that the actor joins an ongoing action (**sociative**). It may also be used to make a polite request or to indicate that something is done as a favour. Next to actor voice *maki-*, all undergoer voices are possible, for example:

(25) *i-p<in>àki-hulog ni*
CV-<RLS(UGR)>SOCIAT-fall GEN.PN
Pedro ang aking sulat
Pedro SPEC DAT.1.SG.CONN letter
'Pedro mailed my letter (along with his)'

– *si-* only co-occurs with *mag-* and indicates **plurality** of (individual) actors, e.g. *nàg-si-ilag silá sa bayan* 'RLS.AV-PL-flee 3.PL LOC town (they all fled from the town)'.

Further differences in the conceptualisation of an action are indicated by the prefixes *pag-* and *paN-*. As illustrated in 4.3, these prefixes are used to derive gerunds. Such gerunds, which do not have an inherent orientation, are also compatible with voice affixes. Thus, contrasting sets such as the following occur: *p-um-utol* 'cut', *màg-putol* 'cut several things', *màmutol* 'cut selectively or in quantity'. Similar contrasts involving undergoer voices are rare (an example is *tapakan* 'step on' vs. *pàg-tatapakan* 'step on repeatedly'). The use of voice marked *paN*-derivatives is not very common and generally indicates intensive, distributive or repeated action, e.g. *bumilí* 'buy' vs. *nàmilí* 'shop', *humampás* 'hit with a whip' vs. *mànghampás* 'whip people, go whipping'.

The major contrast is the one between *-um-* and *mag-* (cf. Blake 1925: 248 f.; Lopez 1937: 46–49; Pittman 1966; Schachter & Otanes 1972: 292 f.; Drossard 1984: 87–92; Himmelmann 1987: 185–188). Often *mag-* indicates the greater frequency or intensity of an action, cf. *bumasa* 'read' vs. *magbasa* 'to read a lot/study'. A similar formation, i.e. the prefixing of *mag-* plus RDP_2, is possible in principle for any base to indicate intensive or repeated action (cf. Schachter & Otanes (1972: 337 f.); Bloomfield (1917: 237–239) specifies stress shifts which may also occur). *mag-* and *-um-* may even co-occur to indicate a high degree of intensity, cf. *màg-um-aral* 'study diligently' or *mag-s-um-igáw* 'shout (long and very loud)'. In other instances, the contrast seems to pertain to transitivity: *t<um>ayó' kami* '<AV>stand.upright 1.PE (we stood up)' vs. *nag-tayó' kami ng bahay* 'RLS.AV-stand.upright 1.PE GEN house (we erected a house)'. Note that in the corresponding undergoer voices no *pag-* appears: *i-t<in>ayó' niyá ang bahay* 'CV-<RLS(UGR)> stand.upright 3.SG.POSS SPEC house (he erected the house)'. In this type of example, the base denotes some kind of position or motion, and the *um*-form denotes an actor who moves himself, the *mag*-form an actor who moves something. A similar contrast exists with respect to bases denoting qualities, e.g. *um-init* 'become/get hot' vs. *mag-init* 'make hot, heat'. Much quoted, but unique is the contrast between *bumilí* 'buy' and *màg-bilí* 'sell'.

Apart from such contrasting sets there are also several bases which only allow voice marking for *pag*-derived stems. For example, from *bawal* 'prohibited' neither **bumawal* nor **ibawal* may be derived, but only *magbawal* and *ipagbawal*. These bases do not display a common semantic or phonological feature. Other examples are *bilin* 'order, instruction', *kanuló* 'betrayal', *lingkód* 'servant', etc. (cf. McFarland 1976 Appendix II; Himmelmann 1987: 151). Another group of bases – which again does not exhibit a common denominator – allows actor orientation only with *mag-*, while undergoer orientation is possible without prior derivation. For example, from *luto'* 'cook' **lumuto'* may not be derived but only *magluto'*, while the undergoer voice form is simply *iluto'* or *lutu'in*. Other bases belonging to this group are *dasál* 'prayer', *hugas* 'wash', *punas* 'wipe off', *libíng* 'burial', *bayad* 'payment', *kahoy* 'wood', *hubád* 'naked', etc. (cf. Himmelmann 1987: 179 f.).

6. Illustrative text

The standard Tagalog orthography is used with the modifications noted in 1.2.

Ang ulól na unggó' at ang
SPEC foolish CONN monkey and SPEC

ma-runong na pagóng. Minsan ang
STAT-knowledge CONN turtle once SPEC

pagóng habang na-lì-ligo' sa
turtle while RLS.AV-RDP_1-swim LOC

ilog, ay nakà-kita siyá ng
river PM RLS.AV.POT:RDP_1-see 3.SG GEN

isa-ng puno-ng-saging na
one-CONN tree-CONN-banana CONN

l<um>ù-lutang at t<in>à-tangáy
<AV>RDP_1-float and <RLS(UGR)>RDP_1-carry.off

ng agos. H<in>ila niyá sa
GEN flow <RLS(UGR)>pull 3.SG.POSS LOC

pasigan, dàtapwát hindí niyá
river but NEG 3.SG.POSS

ma-dalá sa lupa'. Dahil dito
POT.PV-carry LOC earth cause LOC.PROX

t<in>awag niyá ang ka-ibig-an
<RLS(UGR)>call 3.SG.POSS SPEC ASS-like-LV

niyá-ng unggó' at i-ni-alay
3.SG.POSS-CONN monkey and CV-RLS(UGR)-offer
niyá ang ka-putol ng
3.SG.POSS SPEC ASS-cut GEN
puno-ng-saging kung i-tà-taním
tree-CONN-banana if CV-RDP$_1$-plant
niyá ang kaniyá-ng ka-parte.
3.SG.POSS SPEC DAT.3.SG-CONN ASS-part
T<um>angó' ang unggó' at
<AV>nod SPEC monkey and
h<in>até' nilá sa gitná' mulá'
<RLS(UGR)>divide 3.PL.POSS LOC middle begin
sa mag-kàbilá-ng dulo ang puno ng
LOC AV-other.side-CONN end SPEC tree GEN
saging. In-angkín ng unggó'
banana RLS(UGR)-appropriate GEN monkey
ang ka-putol na may mga dahon,
SPEC ASS-cut CONN EXIST PL leaf
dahil sa panukala' niyá na iyón
cause LOC plan 3.SG.POSS CONN DIST
ay tù-tubo' na ma-buti kaysa
PM RDP$_1$-grow CONN STAT-good than
ka-putol na wala-ng dahon.
ASS-cut CONN NEG.EXIST-CONN leaf
Nang maka-raán ang ilang araw,
when AV.STAT-way SPEC some:CONN day
ang puno ng unggó' ay namatáy,
SPEC tree GEN monkey PM RLS.STAT:dead
yamang ang sa pagóng ay t<um>ubo'
whereas SPEC LOC turtle PM <AV>grow
hanggang sa mag-bunga. Ang mga saging
until LOC AV-fruit SPEC PL banana
ay na-hinóg, dàtapwát hindí
PM RLS.STAT-ripe but NEG
ma-akyát ng pagóng. Dahil dito
POT.PV-climb GEN turtle cause LOC.PROX
t<in>awag niyá ang kaniyá-ng
<RLS(UGR)>call 3.SG.POSS SPEC DAT.3.SG-CONN
ka-ibig-ang unggó' at
ASS-like-LV.CONN monkey and
i-ni-alay niyá ang ila-ng
CV-RLS(UGR)-offer 3.SG.POSS SPEC few-CONN
bunga ng saging kung à-akyat-ín
fruit GEN banana if RDP$_1$-climb-PV
niyá ang puno'. Ang unggo' ay
3.SG.POSS SPEC tree SPEC monkey PM
um-akyát at k<um>ain ng makàkaya.
AV-climb and <AV>eat GEN utmost
S<in>abi ng pagóng: "Hulug-an
<RLS(UGR)>say GEN turtle drop-LV
mo akó." Dàtapuwát
2.SG.POSS 1.SG but
i-s<in>agót ng unggó':
CV-<RLS(UGR)>answer GEN monkey
"Balát man at ma-linamnám ay
skin though and STAT-delicious PM
hindí kitá hù-hulug-an." Ang
NEG 1.SG.POSS:2.SG RDP$_1$-drop-LV SPEC
pagóng ay na-galit at nag-sabug
turtle PM RLS.STAT-angry and RLS.AV-scatter
siyá ng tiník sa paligíd ng
3.SG GEN spine LOC surroundings GEN
puno'. Nang l<um>uksó ang unggó'
tree when <AV>jump SPEC monkey
na-tiník siyá. P<in>àg-bintang-án
RLS.STAT-spine 3.SG <RLS(UGR)>GER-suspect-LV
niyá ang pagóng at kaniyá-ng
3.SG SPEC turtle and DAT.3.SG-CONN
h<in>anap upang pa-rusah-an
<RLS(UGR)>look.for so.that CAUS-suffer-LV
niyá. Nà-huli niyá ang
3.SG.POSS RLS.POT.PV-catch 3.SG.POSS SPEC
pagóng sa kabilá' ng isa-ng tuód.
turtle LOC other.side GEN one-CONN stump
S<in>abi niyá sa pagóng:
<RLS(UGR)>say 3.SG.POSS LOC turtle
"kitá ay aking pa-rù-rusah-an.
1.DI PM DAT.1.SG.CONN CAUS-RDP$_1$-suffer-LV
Mamili ka sa dalawá. Dikdik-ín
AV:choose 2.SG LOC two crush-PV
kitá sa lusóng o lunur-in
1.SG.POSS:2.SG LOC mortar or drown-PV
kitá sa ilog?" Ang ma-runong
1.SG.POSS:2.SG LOC river SPEC STAT-knowledge
na pagóng ay nàg-umpisá ng
CONN turtle PM RLS.AV-begin GEN
pàg-si-sigáw at h<in>ilíng
GER-RDP$_2$-shout and <RLS(UGR)>request
niyá sa unggó' na, kung
3.SG.POSS LOC monkey CONN if
ma-à-are', ay dikdik-ín siyá sa
STAT-RDP$_1$-possible PM crush-PV 3.SG LOC
lusóng. Dàtapwát i-s<in>agót ng
mortar but CV-<RLS(UGR)>answer GEN
unggó': "I-bì-bigáy ko sa iyó
monkey CV-RDP$_1$-give 1.SG.POSS LOC DAT.2.SG
ang pa-rusa na hindí mo gustó."
SPEC CAUS-suffer CONN NEG 2.SG.POSS liking
At i-ni-hagis niyá sa ilog
and CV-RLS(UGR)-throw 3.SG.POSS LOC river

ang pagóng. Nang d<um>apo' ang pagóng
SPEC turtle when <AV>alight SPEC turtle

sa tubig ay nàg-si-sigáw siyá at
LOC water PM RLS.AV-RDP$_2$-shout 3.SG and

s<in>abi niyá sa unggó':
<RLS(UGR)>say 3.SG.POSS LOC monkey

"Salamat, ka-ibig-an. Itó ang
thank ASS-like-LV PROX SPEC

aking tirah-an!"
DAT.1.SG.CONN dwell-LOC

Bloomfield's (1917) translation:

"Once upon a time, when the turtle was swimming in the river, he saw a banana-tree adrift and being carried along by the current. He dragged it to the beach, but was not able to carry it up to the solid ground. Therefore he called his friend, the monkey, and offered him a half of the banana-tree, if he would plant his part for him. The monkey agreed, and they divided the banana-tree at the middle, half-way from either end. The monkey took the half which had leaves, because he thought it would grow better than the half which had none.

When a few days had passed, the monkey's tree died, while that of the turtle grew until it bore fruit. The bananas grew ripe, but the turtle could not climb for them. Therefore he called his friend, the monkey, and offered him some of the fruits of the banana, if he would climb the tree. The monkey climbed up and ate for all he was worth.

Said the turtle: 'Throw me some.'

But the monkey answered: 'Though sweet the skins, I'd throw you none.'

The turtle got angry and scattered spines round the foot of the tree. When the monkey jumped down, he landed on the spines. He suspected the turtle and looked for him, in order to punish him. He found the turtle behind a stump.

Said he to the turtle: 'I am going to punish you. Choose between the two: shall I bray you in a mortar or drown you in the river?'

The clever turtle began to shout and begged the monkey, if it were possible, to bray him in a mortar.

But the monkey answered: 'I shall give you the punishment you don't want.'

And he threw the turtle into the river.

When the turtle arrived in the water, he set up a shout and said to the monkey: 'Thank you, friend! This is my home.'" (Bloomfield 1917: 16)

7. Uncommon abbreviations

AV	actor voice
CV	conveyance voice
LV	locative voice
PM	predicate marker
PN	proper noun
PV	patient voice
SOCIAT	sociative
SPEC	specifier

8. References

Adams, Karen L. & Manaster-Ramer, Alexis (1988), "Some Questions of Topic/Focus Choice in Tagalog". *Oceanic Linguistics* XXVII, 79–101

Bader, Thomas & Werlen, Iwan & Wymann, Adrian (1994), *Towards a Typology of Modality*. Bern: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft (Arbeitspapier 32)

Blake, Barry J. (1988), "Tagalog and the Manila-Mt Isa Axis". In: *La Trobe Working Papers in Linguistics* 1. Melbourne: La Trobe University, 77–90

Blake, Frank R. (1906), "Expression of Case by the Verb in Tagalog". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 27, 183–189

Blake, Frank R. (1925), *A Grammar of the Tagalog Language*. New Haven: American Oriental Society (American Oriental Series 1)

Bloomfield, Leonard (1917), *Tagalog Texts with Grammatical Analysis*. Urbana: The Univ. of Illinois (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 3.2–4)

Capell, Arthur (1964), "Verbal Systems in Philippine Languages". *Philippine Journal of Science* 93, 231–249

Carrier-Duncan, Jill (1984), "Some Problems with Prosodic Accounts of Reduplication". In: Aronoff, Mark & Oehrle, Richard T. (eds.), *Language, Sound, Structure. Studies in Phonology Presented to Morris Halle by His Teacher and Students*. Cambridge/MA, London: MIT Press, 260–286

Constantino, Ernesto (1971), "Tagalog and other Major Languages of the Philippines". In: Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics*, *Vol. VIII*.1. The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 112–154

Crowhurst, Megan J. (1998), "*Um* Infixation and Prefixation in Toba Batak". *Language* 74, 590–604

Cubar, Ernesto H. (1984), "From Borrowed Noun to Verb: A Study of Functional Shift in Philippine Languages". In: Paz, Consuelo J. & del Corro, Anicia (eds.), *Studies on Philippine Minor Languages*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 119–133

DeWolf, Charles M. (1988), "Voice in Austronesian Languages of Philippine Type: Passive, Ergative, or Neither?". In: Shibatani (ed.), 143–193

Drossard, Werner (1984), *Das Tagalog als Repräsentant des aktivischen Sprachbaus*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr

Foley, William A. (1976), *Comparative Syntax in Austronesian*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley [UMI 77–4453]

Foley, William A. & van Valin, Robert (1984), *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge Univ. Press

Gil, David (1993), "Tagalog Semantics", *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 19, 390–403

Gonzales, Andrew B. (1971), "The Tagalog Nasal Ligature: A Reinterpretation". *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 2.1, 28–43

Guzman, Videa P. de (1978), *Syntactic Derivation of Tagalog Verbs*, Honululu: Univ. Press of Hawaii (Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication 16)

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. (1987), *Morphosyntax und Morphologie: Die Ausrichtungsaffixe im Tagalog*. München: Fink (Studien zur Theoretischen Linguistik 8)

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. (1991), *The Philippine Challenge to Universal Grammar*. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft (Arbeitspapier 15)

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. (to appear), "Lexical Categories and Voice in Tagalog". In: Austin, Peter & Musgrave, Simon (eds.), *Voice and Grammatical Functions in Austronesian*. Stanford: CSLI

Humboldt, Wilhelm von (1838), *Über die Kawi Sprache, Vol. II*, Berlin: Dümmler

Kroeger, Paul R. (1993), *Phrase Structure and Grammatical Relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI

Lehmann, Christian (1984), *Der Relativsatz*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr

Lemaréchal, Alain (1982), "Sémantisme des parties du discours et sémantisme des relations". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 77.1, 1–39

Lemaréchal, Alain (1989), *Les parties du discours: Sémantique et syntaxe*. Paris: P. U. F.

Llamzon, Teodoro A. (1973), "The Four Focus Transformations of Tagalog". In: Gonzales, Andrew B. (ed.), *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez*. Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines, 168–183

Llamzon, Teodoro A. (1976), *Modern Tagalog: A Functional-Structural Description*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton (Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 122)

Lopez, Cecilio (1937), "Preliminary Study of the Affixes in Tagalog". In: Constantino, Ernesto (1977, ed.), *Selected Writings of Cecilio Lopez in Philippine Linguistics*. Diliman: Univ. of the Philippines Press, 28–104

Lopez, Cecilio (1970), "On the Boak Tagalog of the Island of Marinduque". *The Archive* (University of the Philippines) 1.2, 1–53

Marantz, Alec (1982), "Re Reduplication". *Linguistic Inquiry* 13, 435–482

Marre, Aristide (1901), "Grammaire tagalog, composé sur un nouveau plan". *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunden* 53, 547–92

Matsuda French, Koleen (1988), *Insights into Tagalog: Reduplication, Infixation, and Stress from Nonlinear Phonology*. Dallas: The Summer Institute of Linguistics and The University of Texas at Arlington (Publications in Linguistics 84)

Matthews, P[eter] H. (1981), *Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

McFarland, Curtis D. (1976), *A Provisional Classification of Tagalog Verbs*. Tokio: Institute for the Study of Languages & Cultures of Asia & Africa (Monograph Series 8)

McFarland, Curtis D. (^{2}1983), *A Linguistic Atlas of the Philippines*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines

McFarland, Curtis D. (1984), "Tagalog Causative Verbs". *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 15, 19–47

Müller, Friedrich (1882), *Grundriss der Sprachwissenschaft, II, Band II. Abt., Die Sprachen der Schlichthaarigen Rassen.* Wien: Alfred Hölder

Naylor, Paz B. (1980), "Linking, Relation-Marking, and Tagalog Syntax". In: Naylor, Paz B. (ed.), *Austronesian Syntax. Papers from the Second Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages [Ann Arbor 1976].* Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies (Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia 15), 33–49

Naylor, Paz B. (1995), "Subject, Topic, and Tagalog Syntax". In: Benett, David & Bynon, Theo-

dora & Hewitt, George B. (eds.), *Subject, Voice and Ergativity*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 161−201

Pittman, Richard (1966), "Tagalog -um- and -mag-: An Interim Report". In: *Papers in Philippine Linguistics* 1, Canberra: Pacific Linguistics (Series A.8), 9−20

Ramos, Teresita V. (1971), *Tagalog Structures*. Honululu: Univ. Press of Hawaii

Ramos, Teresita V. (1974), *The Case System of Tagalog Verbs*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics (Series B.27)

Ramos, Teresita V. & Bautista, Maria L. S. (1986), *Handbook of Tagalog Verbs: Inflections, Modes, Aspects.* Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press

Reid, Lawrence A. (1981), "Philippine Linguistics: The State of the Art: 1970−1980". In: Hart, Donn W. (ed.), *Philippine Studies: Political Science, Economics, and Linguistics*. Northern Illinois University, Center for Southeast Asian Studies Occasional Paper 8, 223−230

Rubino, Carl R. G. (1998), "The Morphological Realization and Production of a Nonprototypical Morpheme: The Tagalog Derivational Clitic". *Linguistics* 36, 1147−1166

Schachter, Paul (1976), "The Subject in Philippine Languages, Topic, Actor, Actor-Topic or None of the Above". In: Li, Charles N. (ed.), *Subject and Topic*. New York etc.: Academic Press, 491−518

Schachter, Paul (1995), *The Subject in Tagalog: Still None of the Above*. Los Angeles: UCLA/Department of Linguistics (UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics 15)

Schachter, Paul & Otanes, Fe T. (1972), *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley etc.: Univ. of California Press

Scheerer, Otto (1924), "On the Essential Difference Between the Verbs of the European and the Philippine Languages". *Philippine Journal of Education* 7, 1−10

Shibatani, Masayoshi (1988), "Voice in Philippine Languages". In: Shibatani (ed.), 85−142

Shibatani, Masayoshi (1988, ed.), *Passive and Voice*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins (Typological Studies in Language 16)

Shkarban, Lisa I. (1995), *Grammatičeskij stroj tagal'skovo jazyka*, Moskva: Nauka

Soberano, Rosa (1980), *The dialects of Marinduque Tagalog*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics (Series B.69)

Totanes, Sebastian de ([4]1865), *Arte de la lengua tagala y manual tagalog*. Binondo: Miguel Sanchez y Ca [[1]1745]

Wolfenden, Elmer (1961), *A Re-statement of Tagalog Grammar*. Manila: SIL and Institute of National Language

Wolff, John U. (1993), "Why Roots Add the Affixes with which they Occur". In: Reesink, Ger (ed.), *Topics in Descriptive Austronesian Linguistics.* Leiden: Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië, 217−244

Wolff, John U. with Centeno, M. T. C. & Rau, D. V. (1991), *Pilipino through Self-Instruction, Vol. 1−4*. Ithaca: Cornell Southeast Asia Program

Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, Bochum (Germany)

137. Diyari (Pama-Nyungan)

1. Introduction
2. Morphological type
3. Parts of speech
4. Nominal morphology
5. Pronoun morphology
6. Verb morphology
7. Predicate determiner morphology
8. Particles
9. Post-inflectional morphology
10. Illustrative text
11. Uncommon abbreviations
12. References

1. Introduction

The Diyari language was traditionally spoken in the far north of South Australia, to the east of Lake Eyre along the lower reaches of Cooper Creek − a mostly dry watercourse that runs from western Queensland into Lake Eyre. This is one of the driest and hottest regions of Australia with an average annual rainfall of about 100 mm (or 4 inches) and summer temperatures regularly reaching 45