Notes on Tagalog nominalism

NIKOLAUS P. HIMMELMANN

Dan Kaufman’s brilliant paper articulates the nominalist hypothesis in very clear and up-to-date terms. For the first time, it provides the outlines of a formalized account of this hypothesis which shows the underlying coherence of a range of widely known and much studied morphosyntactic features of Tagalog.

My two comments come from a very sympathetic reader interested in further clarifying and strengthening the analysis rather than debunking it. The first comment will deal with the nature of the syntactic flexibility of content words in Tagalog (relating in particular to Kaufman’s section 3.1). The second one pertains to explanations for the ungrammaticality of genitive predicates in Tagalog (relating mostly to Kaufman’s sections 3.2 and 4.1).

1. Syntactic flexibility and the nature of lexical categories

In the introduction to his section 3 (“Categoriality on the phrasal and clausal levels”), Kaufman (henceforth K) notes: “The most celebrated symmetricality in Tagalog syntax is on the phrasal and clausal levels . . . namely, the ability of all word types to appear both in argument position . . . or in the clause initial predicate position.” A minor, but not completely irrelevant problem in this wording is the phrase “all word types” which K uses in place of the phrase “all content words” or a similar one found in the previous literature on this topic. The issues at stake here are the proper delimitation of the class of words exhibiting the astonishing syntactic flexibility and their syntactic category. For the following remarks, I take content words to be the cover term for all open class items with the exception of personal names.
Everyone, including K, I would think, would agree that, of course, not literally all word types of Tagalog evince the syntactic flexibility referred to in the quote above. Clearly, various types of closed class function words, including both the phrase-marking proclitics ang, nang and sa as well as the second position clitics do not belong here. Possibly somewhat less clear is the issue with regard to pronouns and deictics because these share some of the flexibility of content words. Still, these items form closed classes with quite a few special properties (both syntactic and semantic) which distinguishes them from the large class of content words. Hence, I fully agree with K’s comments regarding the special status of deictics at the end of his section 3.1 (K’s examples 31 and 32), but I fail to see the relevance for the overall argument because I would not have counted them among the content words to begin with.

In this regard, it may be useful to note that personal names in Tagalog also quite clearly do not belong to the class of content words. Among other things, personal names are obligatorily marked by a special set of phrase-markers (si, ni, kay), and while the distribution of personal name phrases overlaps in many respects with that of content word phrases, there are also enough differences to require a category of their own. Thus, for example, oblique kay can co-occur with oblique sa to form phrases indicating a source (e.g. sa kay Maria “from Maria”). See also Himmelmann (2005: 146).

But the preceding points are basically irrelevant for the main issue discussed in K’s section 3.1, namely the question for the proper syntactic category of Tagalog content words. This question can be tackled from two points of view, language-externally and cross-linguistically. Cross-linguistically, the argument would roughly go like this: The class of Tagalog content words shows many morphosyntactic properties generally associated with nouns. Hence, it makes sense to assign them to this class, especially if one works within the framework of an explicit (formalized) grammatical theory which uses a universalist set of basic syntactic categories. While not made explicit, this line of argument appears to be of major import to K’s account.

Language-internal evidence for assigning content words to a particular syntactic category rests essentially on the possibility of further syntactic subcategorization. Otherwise, as convincingly argued in Walter’s (1981) classic study on the lack of a noun/verb distinction, it does not make sense (from a purely language-internal perspective) to classify a large open class of content words as either nouns or verbs. Instead, the words in such a class would have to be assigned to a single macro-category (as in K’s option (20b) at the beginning of section 3.1).

In line with this consideration, K uses the occurrence of a class of words with the suffix –i in southern Tagalog dialects as an argument to assign the category noun to the large majority of content words in Tagalog. The i-suffixed words in these dialects are restricted to predicative (and more specifically, imperative) function and hence prima facie qualify as verbs. It is not quite clear to me, whether and to what extent it is really legitimate and useful to introduce dialectal evidence here, as one would still want to see an analysis which fully accounts for those varieties of Tagalog – including the standard(ized) variety – where no i-suffixed forms occur and where all content words (properly delimited along the lines indicated above) appear to be able to occur in all argument and predicate functions and positions (but see below for an important qualification).

Otherwise, I fully agree with K’s argument. In fact, the argument is much stronger for many other Philippine-type languages where word forms restricted to predicative (verbal) positions and functions are more varied and more robustly attested. In Bisayan languages, for example, there are generally two morphological classes of content words, ones suffixed with –i and ones suffixed with –a, which are restricted in this way. In these languages, the verbal forms do not only occur in imperatives but also as dependent or controlled elements in various kinds of subordinating constructions (hence the forms are often labelled subjunctive). The following example is from Cebuano where predicates negated with wala have to occur in subjunctive form:

(1)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wala?} & \quad \text{niya} & \quad \text{lutu-a} \\
\text{NEG.PST} & \quad 3.SG.GEN & \quad \text{cook-PV.SUBJ}
\end{align*}
\]

He did not cook it. (Wolff 1972: 1121)

In fact, and this is what I consider to be one of the two most difficult empirical challenges to the nominalist hypothesis (cp. Himmelmann 2005: 141), it may be the case that even in standard Tagalog the position

---

1 The other one relates to the fact that undergoer voice subjunctives also quite generally occur with genitive marked actors, cp. Kaufman 2009, section 5.2.
are ungrammatical because genitive predicates are generally ungrammatical in Tagalog as shown by examples such as (K’s 38b and 49):

(6) *Ni Juan ang koponan
    GEN Juan SPEC team
    (For, ‘The team is Juan’s’)

However, as noted by K, in the latter case the genitive proclitic can be replaced by a dative proclitic (K uses oblique instead of dative/locative) and then the sentence becomes grammatical (K’s 39):

(7) Kay=Juan ang koponan
    DAT=Juan SPEC team
    ‘The team is Juan’s’

This is just an instance of a very general pattern according to which genitive marking is replaced by dative or locative marking when modifier precedes modified. Thus, instead of ang libro niya for ‘her book’ one can also say ang kaniya-ng libro (SPEC 3.SG.DAT-LK book). Consequently, the question arises whether the real examples to be tested for delimiting extraction constraints in Tagalog should not rather involve dative/locative phrases, i.e.

(8) *(sa) kanino ang binili-∅?
    LOC DAT:who SPEC RLS(UG):buy-PV
    (For, ‘Who bought (it)?)

Example (8) is actually grammatical as a possible expression for ‘who has the bought thing/the bought thing belongs to whom’. But I have no natural attestations of examples of this type where the extracted phrase refers to the actor. And I have also not been able to test it properly with native speakers for this reading. Hence, I have to leave this question undecided.

Regardless of how this empirical issue is resolved, the question remains of how to explain the robust constraints on the extractability of genitive phrases in Tagalog. K suggests that an explanation may be found in relation to the restrictions on possessor extraction widely attested in the languages of the world (his section 4.1), i.e. that Tagalog is just particularly rigorous with regard to a constraint that is found generally in the languages of the world.

While I agree that this may be part of the story, it seems to me that the restrictions on extracting genitives is part of a more general pattern in Tagalog which also includes the linking particle na/-ng and the complementizer na. The linker, by its very nature, has to come in between the two constituents it connects. Hence, the inversion of balón na malalim ‘deep well’ is not *na malalim balón, but malalim na balón. As for complement clauses, it is generally impossible in Tagalog to have them precede the matrix predicate, as illustrated here with K’s (25):

(9) a. Sinabi-∅ nila na hindi sila
    RLS(UG):say-PV 3.PL.GEN LK NEG 3.PL
    mag-bá-basketbol
    AV-RDP-basketball
    ‘They said that they wouldn’t play basketball.’

b. *na hindi sila magbábasketbol sinabi nila

It seems obvious to me that complementizer na, linker na/-ng and genitive nang form a family of semantically and structurally related elements and constructions where these elements are positionally restricted to occur in between the two constituents linked by them.5 Hence, I would suggest that a comprehensive explanation of the constraints on the extraction of genitive-marked phrases in Tagalog should also be able to account for the fact that the same restriction also pertains to the complementizer na and the linker na/-ng.

3. Conclusion

In concluding these brief remarks, I would like to stress a point implicit in the title of this squib. I believe that Tagalog represents the most radical manifestation of nominalist syntax in Austronesian languages. While nominalist traits can be found in many Austronesian languages, it appears to be the case that only in (standard) Tagalog almost all differences

---

5 It is most likely that the complementizer na and the linker na/-ng both have the same historical source, but they differ in their variants, as briefly discussed by K in his section 3.1. It has also been suggested that genitive nang actually includes the linker (i.e. consists of na + ang), but this is highly speculative.
between nominal and verbal predicates have disappeared and given rise to the exclusive use of the equational clause type. That is, for (standard) Tagalog it may be possible to argue that all predication involves nominal predicates and hence nominalist syntax. For other languages, including possibly southern Tagalog dialects, the analysis for nominal predicates in equational structures needs to be complemented with an analysis of a more verbal predicate type (as it stands, it is unclear how K would analyze i-suffixed predicates in southern Tagalog and the more clearly verbal dependent forms attested in most other Philippine-type languages illustrated by the Cebuano example in (1) above). Such an analysis would have to be able to account for the fact that, at least in some languages and constructions, the marking of the arguments of the more verb-like predicates is identical with the marking of nominal predicates (i.e. in particular the genitive-marking of actors of undergoer voice verbs). But, at the same time, it has to allow verbal heads also to occur with cross-linguistically more canonically marked arguments (e.g. as direct ('accusative') complements or, in undergoer voice constructions, as oblique agents), as such marking is widespread in the symmetrical voice languages of Indonesia.

Abbreviations

| AV | ACTOR VOICE | PN | PERSONAL NAME |
| CV | CONVEYANCE VOICE | PST | PAST |
| DAT | DATIVE | PV | PATIENT VOICE |
| GEN | GENITIVE | RLS | REALIS |
| GER | GERUND | RDP | REDUPLICATION |
| IN | INCLUSIVE | SG | SINGULAR |
| LK | LINKER | SPEC | SPECIFIC ARTICLE |
| LOC | LOCATIVE | ST | STATIVE |
| NEG | NEGATION | SUBJ | SUBJUNCTIVE |
| PL | PLURAL | UG | UNDERGOER |
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