

On certain sentential complements in Tagalog

François Dell

Citer ce document / Cite this document :

Dell François. On certain sentential complements in Tagalog. In: Cahiers de linguistique - Asie orientale, vol. 10, 1981. pp. 19-42;

doi : <https://doi.org/10.3406/clao.1981.1095>

https://www.persee.fr/doc/clao_0153-3320_1981_num_10_1_1095

Fichier pdf généré le 18/05/2018

francois c. dell

ON CERTAIN SENTENTIAL COMPLEMENTS

IN TAGALOG

This article deals with certain properties of the sentential complements embedded under verbs like *subok* "to try", *iwas* "to avoid", *utos* "to order", etc.

1. BASIC FEATURES OF TAGALOG SYNTAX⁽¹⁾

(1) *umiiyak si Pedro*
1 2

Pedro is crying

1 acv-imp-cry/ 2 nom

() My stay in the Philippines was funded by the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris. While I was writing this paper, I benefited from comments by E. Constantino, M. Coyaud, C. McFarland and T. Rafael. I wish to thank especially the following people, who made this work possible by answering my questions about Tagalog sentences : V. Antonio, E. Cruz, N. Del Pilar, M. Esguerra, L and E. Gamboa, C. and H. Ortiz, V. Quiambao, A. Sarmenta, A. Sotto, E. Tan, and C. Cullen, who read my English. All errors, of fact or otherwise, are mine.

(1) All examples are written in the standard spelling. Setting aside some terminological differences, the introductory discussion of this section is in accord with Schachter and Otnes (1972) (henceforth TRG) and McFarland (1976). Our term "subject" corresponds to TRG's "topic", and our term "voice", to TRG's "focus". In the glosses to the examples we use the following abbreviations : *act2v*, secondary actor voice (cf. TRG : 321 ss.) ; *acv*, active voice ; *apt*, aptative ; *bas*, basic ; *benv*, benefactive voice ; *caus*, causative voice ; *dat*, dative ; *dov*, direct objective voice ; *fut*, future ; *gen*, genitive ; *imp*, imperfective ; *insv*, instrumental voice ; *iov*, indirect objective voice ; *locv*, locative voice ; *nom*, nominative ; *pf*, perfective, *plur*, plural ; *refv*, referential voice (cf. TRG : 317) ; *sg*, singular.

(2) *naglagay ng libro sa kahon ang titser*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

the teacher put a book into the box

1 acv-pf-put/ 2 gen / 3 book / 4 dat / 5 box
 6 nom / 7 teacher

(3) *naglagay ang titser ng libro sa kahon*
 1 6 7 2 3 4 5

synonymous with (2)

These sentences illustrate the following basic facts about the syntax of Tagalog. In stylistically neutral sentences the predicate comes first. The ordering of the subject noun phrase (NP) with respect to the order complement NPs is free (TRG : 83-85). NPs are usually marked for (surface) case. There are three cases. Nominative is found on subject NPs and on those predicate NPs which bear a case marking. Genitive is typically found on direct objects and on NPs indicating possessors. Dative is found on NPs indicating the recipient of an action, or the source or goal of a movement. Case markers are proclitic particles which occurs as the leftmost element of their NP, except that demonstratives and personal pronouns have special suppletive forms (TRG : 87-95).

As a convenient expository device, we will describe the passive sentences as though they were derived from their active counterparts by operations of passivization which proceed as follows :

- a) one of the NP complements of the active sentence is put in the nominative, thus becoming the new subject.
- b) the verb is given the morphology of one of the passive voices (TRG's "goal foci", cf. p. 70).
- c) the original subject of the active sentence is demoted from the nominative to the genitive case.

(4) *inilagay ng titser ang libro sa kahon*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

the book was put into the box by the teacher

1 dov-pf-put/ 2 gen / 4 nom / 6 dat

(5) *nilagyan ng titser ng libro ang kahon*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

a book was put into the box by the teacher

1 iov-pf-put/ 2 gen / 4 gen / 6 nom

(4) and (5) are two passive sentences corresponding to the active sentence (3). Leaving aside differences of the "topic-comment" type and some restrictions on the possibility of interpreting certain NPs as definite, (3), (4) and (5) are synonymous. In (4) it is the direct object of (3) which has been turned into a subject (i.e. *libro*), whereas in (5) it is the indirect object of (3) (i.e. *kahon*), and correspondingly, in (4) the verb has taken on the affixes of the direct objective voice whereas in (5) it has taken on the affixes of the indirect objective voice. Tagalog has other passive voices besides the direct and indirect objective voices : the locative voice, the benefactive voice, the instrumental voice, and so on, which correspond to cases where the NP turned into a subject indicates, respectively, the place where an event takes place, the being on whose behalf an action is done, an instrument, etc. Each of these passive voices is marked onto the verb by a morphology of its own(2).

The following three pairs of sentences illustrate the use of the locative, instrumental, and benefactive voices.

(6) *nagdurog siya ng mani sa plato*
 1 2 3 4 5 6

he crushed some peanuts on the plate

1 acv-pf-crush / 2 nom-3sg / 3 gen / 4 peanut
5 dat / 6 plate

(6') *pinagdurugan niya ng mani ang plato*
 1 2 3 4 5 6

he crushed some peanuts on the plate

1 locv-pf-crush / 2 gen-3sg / 3 gen / 4 peanut
5 nom / 6 plate

(7) *nagdurog siya ng mani sa pamamagitan ng kutsara*⁽³⁾
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

he crushed some peanuts with the spoon

5 dat / 6 by means of / 7 gen / 8 spoon

(2) The morphology of voice is rather complex. A convenient outline may be found in McFarland (1976 : 12-24).

(3) Slightly bookish.

(7') *ipinandurog niya ng mani ang kutsara*
 1 2 3 4 5 6

he used the spoon to crush some peanuts

1 insv-pf-crush / 2 gen-3sg / 5 nom

(8) *nagdurog siya ng mani para sa inyo*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

he crushed some peanuts for you

5 for / 6 dat / 7 dat-2plur

(8') *ipinagdurog niya kayo ng mani*
 1 2 3 4 5

same meaning as (8)

1 benv-pf-crush / 2 gen-3sg / 3 nom-2plur

2. THE LIGATURE

Before examining the internal structure of sentential complements in Tagalog, we must clarify some basic properties of the complementizer which heads them, the so-called "ligature". Due to the extreme freedom of word ordering in Tagalog, it is often difficult to ascertain the surface constituent structure of sentences. The position of the ligature, however, provides a very reliable clue as to the location of the leftward boundary of embedded sentences, once one accepts certain assumptions that I will try to make clear below. The Tagalog ligature (henceforth LG) is a grammatical morpheme which introduces a wide range of modifiers and complements to adjectives, nouns and verbs(4), relative clauses and sentential complements among other things. However LG has a few basic properties which are invariant throughout the whole gamut of contexts in which it appears. Consider the following :

(9) *NA ihatid ka sa erport*
 1 2 3 4

to take you to the airport (not a complete sentence, but a possible answer to the question *ano ang binalak ni Pedro ?* "What did Pedro plan to do ?")

1 LG / 2 dov-bas-escort / 3 nom-2sg / 4 dat

(4) For some discussion, cf. Buhain (1958), Gonzales (1971).

ON CERTAIN SENTENTIAL COMPLEMENTS IN TAGALOG

- (10) *binalak ni Inday NA ihatid ka sa erport*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Inday planned to take you to the airport

1 dov-pf-plan / 2 gen / 4 LG

- (11) *binalak ni Pedro-NG ihatid ka sa erport*

Pedro planned to take you to the airport

- (12) *iyang ang libro-NG ipinadala ko sa Maynila*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

that is the book I sent to Manila

1 nom-that / 2 nom / 3 book / 4 LG / 5 dov-caus-pf-carry / 6 gen-1sg / 7 dat

(9) and sentences (10-12) illustrate the well-known fact that the phonological shape of LG depends (among other things) on what immediately precedes it. LG shows up as /na/ when no other word precedes it in the sentence (cf. 9) or when the preceding word ends in a non-syllabic segment which is neither /n/ nor a glottal stop (cf. 10). But when the preceding word ends in a vowel, a glottal stop or /n/ (cf. 11-12), the LG can show up either as /na/ or as a velar nasal (spelled *-ng*) closing the last syllable of that word. In this phonological context, the choice between the variants *na* and *-ng* depends on the interplay of syntactic and stylistic factors that need not concern us here. The LG will be written in capitals in all our examples for the sake of conspicuousness.

Although the phonological shape of the LG depends on that of the word which *precedes* it, and although it looks in some cases as though it were a suffix to that word, it is our contention that from the point of view of syntax, the only thing that matters to the proper placement of the ligature in sentences, is what *follows* it :

Ligature Placement Rule : the ligature is always the leftmost term of the constituent that it introduces.

This single ordering statement is, in our opinion, all that need be said about the placement of the ligature in Tagalog.

There are two types of facts which indicate that, although the LG is in some cases attached to the word which precedes it, it always has a much closer syntactic relationship with the word that follows it.

First, whereas the LG can appear without anything preceding it in the same utterance (cf. 9), it cannot be left dangling at the end of a sentence. In particular, the LG does not show up if the complement it introduces is elided for some reason. Consider for instance sentence (13), whose main verb *mayroon* requires its complement to be introduced by the ligature (cf. TRG : 275). The correct elliptical form of (13) (as in an answer to a question) is (14), not (15) :

(13) *mayroon siya-NG pera*
 1 2 3 4

he has some money

1 have / 2 nom-3sg / 3 LG / 4 money

(14) *mayroon siya* he has some

(15) **mayroon siya-NG*

This is simply accounted for if one assumes that in (13) the constituent which is the complement of *mayroon* is the sequence *-NG pera*, rather than the word *pera* alone. Then, the ellipsis of the complement of *mayroon* ipso facto entails that of the LG.

Second, if one considers the LG as belonging to the same constituent as the word which follows it, then a grammar of Tagalog need not contain any special provisions concerning word ordering in sentences containing a LG. Consider for instance sentence (16), where the verb is followed by three NPs, one of which (*papa*) is introduced by a LG (TRG : 394-5) :

(16) *tinawag NA papa ni Lorna si Pedro*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Lorna called Pedro papa

1 dov-pf-call / 2 LG / 4 gen / 6 nom

If one considers the sequence *LG+papa* to be a constituent, one can envision all the sequences obtained from (16) by trying the different orderings of this constituent relative to the two others NPs(5) :

(17) *tinawag NA PAPA si Pedro ni Lorna*
 1 2 3 6 7 4 5

(18) *tinawag ni Lorna-NG PAPA si Pedro*
 1 4 5 2 3 6 7

(19) *tinawag si Pedro-NG PAPA ni Lorna*
 1 6 7 2 3 4 5

(20) *tinawag ni Lorna si Pedro-NG PAPA*
 1 4 5 6 7 2 3

(5) The word *papa* is written in capitals for the sake of conspicuousness

ON CERTAIN SENTENTIAL COMPLEMENTS IN TAGALOG

- (21) *tinawag si Pedro ni Lorna-NG PAPA*
 1 6 7 4 5 2 3

All six sentences (16) to (21) are grammatical and synonymous. This is but a particular case of the freedom of ordering enjoyed by the NPs behind the verb in Tagalog (cf. TRG : 83), and needs no special mention. On the other hand, whenever the sequence *LG + papa* is broken or reshuffled, the resulting sentence is ungrammatical, as in (22-23) :

- (22) **tinawag NA ni Lorna PAPA si Pedro*
 1 2 4 5 3 6 7

- (23) **tinawag ni Lorna PAPA-NG si Pedro*
 1 4 5 3 2 6 7

Consider also the contrast between the grammatical sequence (24), where the LG follows the interrogative enclitic particle *ba*, and the ungrammatical sequence (25), where it precedes it :

- (24) *tinawag ba-NG PAPA si Pedro ni Lorna ?*

did Lorna call Pedro papa ?

- (25) **tinawag NA ba PAPA si Pedro ni Lorna*

A grammar of Tagalog need not contain any special statements to guarantee that the LG always be located to the right of all the enclitic words(6). This restriction just follows from the following facts about clitic placement, which have to be accounted for anyway, whatever one's particular views about the LG : (i) in a sentence, aside from the leftmost word, onto which all the enclitics are attached, all the other non-enclitics appear to the right of all the enclitics(7) ; (ii) only monomorphemic items can be enclitics. Hence constituents which have the LG as their leftmost term cannot be enclitics, since they contain at least two morphemes (the ligature morpheme plus another one).

There are, to be sure, apparent counter-examples to the Ligature Placement Rule, such as for instance sentence (26), which is accepted by some speakers as synonymous with (10) :

(6) For such statements, cf. for instance TRG : 189 D, Blake (1925 : 292-293).

(7) This is an oversimplification. For some discussion in the direction of a more accurate statement, cf. TRG : 186. In sentence (24) the enclitic particle *ba* is attached to the leftmost word *tinawag*, and all the remaining words, which are not enclitic, appear to the right of *ba*.

- (26) *binalak ka ni Inday NA ihatid sa erport*
 1 6 2 3 4 5 7

In (26) the subject *ka* of the sentential complement appears to the left of the LG. This sentence and others similar to it form a very homogeneous set of cases which are most conveniently seen as resulting from a movement transformation. As far as the LG is concerned, we believe that movement transformations only effect reorderings of a very restricted sort. Let us call "LG complements" any constituent introduced by the ligature. It is our contention that no transformation can ever move the LG out of its complement-initial position nor take material from outside the LG complement and insert it between the LG and the rest of the LG complement. All that movement transformations can do is to take some material out of the LG complement and move it to the left of the LG. For instance, sentence (26) is obtained from sentence (10) by taking the subject *ka* of the sentential complement *NA ihatid ka sa erport*, and moving it up into the matrix sentence (cf. below sec. 6).

3. EQUI OPERATES REGARDLESS OF VOICE

- (27) *si Pedro ang umiwas sa butas*
 1 2 3 4 5 6

it is Pedro who avoided the hole

1 nom / 3 nom / 4 acv-pf-avoid / 5 dat / 6 hole

- (28) *iniwasan ni Pedro ang butas*
 1 2 3 4 5

Pedro avoided the hole

1 iov-pf-avoid / 2 gen / 4 nom / 5 hole

Sentences (27-28) illustrate the fact that the verb *iwas* can appear in the active or the indirect objective voice with an NP as an object. Sentences (29-30) below illustrate the fact that this object can also consist in a whole sentence whose verb is in the "basic form" (cf. TRG : 68), an inflection which corresponds in part to the infinitive in English.

- (29) *umiwas si Pedro-NG mabasa ng ulan ang buhok niya*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

- (30) *iniwasan ni Pedro-NG mabasa ng ulan ang buhok niya*
 11 12

Pedro avoided getting his hair wet under the rain

1 acv-pf-avoid / 2 nom / 4 LG / 5 dov-apt-pf-wet /

ON CERTAIN SENTENTIAL COMPLEMENTS IN TAGALOG

6 gen / 7 rain / 8 nom / 9 hair / 10 gen-3sg /
11 iov-pf-avoid / 12 gen

Consider now sentences (31-38) :

(31) *umiwas ako-NG tumingin ako kay Lorna*
1 2 3 4 5 6

(32) *umiwas ako-NG tingnan ko si Lorna*
1 2 3 7 8 9

I avoided looking at Lorna

1 acv-pf-avoid / 2 nom-1sg / 3 LG / 4 acv-bas-look /
5 nom-1sg / 6 dat / 7 iov-bas-look / 8 gen-1sg / 9 nom

(33) *iniwasan ko-NG tumingin ako kay Lorna*
10 11 3 4 5 6

(34) *iniwasan ko-NG tingnan ko si Lorna*
10 11 3 7 8 9

10 iov-pf-avoid / 11 gen-1sg

(35) *umiwas ako-NG tumingin kay Lorna*
1 2 3 4 6

(36) *umiwas ako-NG tingnan si Lorna*
1 2 3 7 9

(37) *iniwasan ko-NG tumingin kay Lorna*
10 11 3 4 6

(38) *iniwasan ko-NG tingnan si Lorna*
10 11 3 7 9

These sentences, which are all synonymous, illustrate the fact that in certain cases, when the matrix clause and the embedded clause share a coreferential NP (in our example it is the 1sg pronoun), this NP can

optionally⁽⁸⁾ be deleted. We are assuming here for Tagalog an analogue of the rule of Equi-NP Deletion (henceforth Equi) that has been posited for English (cf. rule 2 in Rosenbaum 1967 : 6) and other languages (e.g. for French, cf. Gross 1968). From the point of view of this paper it is irrelevant whether one chooses to account for Equi phenomena by a deletion rule, as assumed here, or some kind of interpretive device.

Such a deletion can operate regardless of the voice of the higher (i.e. matrix) clause and of that of the lower (i.e. embedded) clause. In (31-32) the matrix clause is in the active voice, while in (33-34) the matrix clause is in a passive voice. In sentences (31) and (33) the embedded clause is in the active voice, whereas in (32) and (34) it is in a passive voice. Sentences (35-38) are the analogues of (31-34), with deletion of the shared coreferential NP in the embedded clause.

The next group of sentences (39-43) illustrate the fact that the deletion of the shared coreferential NP in the lower clause can operate whatever the voice of that clause.

(39a) *umiwas si Pedro-NG durugin ang mani*
 1 2 3 4 5 6

(39b) *iniwasan ni Pedro-NG durugin ang mani*
 7 8 3 4 5 6

Pedro avoided crushing the peanuts

1 acv-pf-avoid / 2 nom / 3 LG / 4 dov-bas-crush /
 5 nom / 6 peanut / 7 iov-pf-avoid / 8 gen

(40a) *umiwas si Pedro-NG paglabhan ang palanggana*
 1 2 3

(40b) *iniwasan ni Pedro-NG paglabhan ang palanggana*
 1 2 3

Pedro avoided washing in the basin

1 locv-bas-wash / 2 nom / 3 basin

(8) Some speakers reject sentences (31-34). This means that for them the deletion of the coreferential NP is obligatory in sentential complements of the verb *iwas*, while for those speakers who accept these sentences, the deletion in question is only optional. T. Rafael pointed out to me that sentences 30, 33, 37, 39b, 40b, etc. sounded much better to her informants than their active voice counterparts, respectively 29, 31, 35, 39a, 40a, although it was not clear whether they still considered the latter sentences acceptable. Any acceptability problem disappears if the active sentences are modified so as to begin by *si Pedro ang umiwas...*, *ako ang umiwas...* This modification does not affect the points made in the text.

T. Rafael has pointed out to us that (37'-38') are equally acceptable as variants of (37-38) :

(37') *iniwasan ko ang tumingin kay Lorna*

(38') *iniwasan ko ang tingnan si Lorna*

where *ang* is the nominative marker (for similar examples, cf. TRG : 157). This might at first seem to indicate that the final velar nasal, which we construed in (37-38) as an occurrence of the postvocalic allomorph of the ligature, is in fact an elided variant of the nominative marker *ang* and that sentential complements are headed by the ligature only when they are not subjects in the matrix sentence. But then consider the following, which differ from (37-38) in that the actor of the matrix sentence ends in a consonant other than *n* :

(37'') *iniwasan ni Manuel* $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} NA \\ ang \end{array} \right\}$ *tumingin kay Lorna*

(38'') *iniwasan ni Manuel* $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} NA \\ ang \end{array} \right\}$ *tingnan si Lorna*

Manuel avoided looking at Lorna

The *na* which occurs in the sentences above is the postconsonantic allomorph of the ligature. The situation, then, is the following : sentential complements of *iwas* "to avoid", *utos* "to order", *sanay* "to get used to", and other verbs with similar syntactic properties, can always be headed by the ligature, whatever the syntactic role of these sentential complements in the matrix clause. Furthermore, when such a sentential complement is the subject of the matrix clause, it may in certain cases⁽⁹⁾ be headed by the nominative marker, instead of the ligature. As noted in TRG : 155, sentential complements are never headed by the genitive or dative marker. Sentential complements, then, differ from the NPs filling the same syntactic slots in the matrix clause, in that they need not bear a case marker and can do so only when they are subjects. This distinguishes sharply the sentential complements from the free relative clauses, which have exactly the same case marking possibilities as *bona fide* NPs. I am using the expression "free relative clause" by analogy with English, to refer to a relative clause which is hooked onto a lexically unspecified head noun, such as the relative clause *what I gave him* in *he ate what I gave him*. In English, a relative pronoun (e.g. *what*) shows

(9) Apart from the requirement that the sentential complements be the subject of the matrix clause, it is not yet known what exactly are the conditions under which the ligature can be replaced by the nominative marker.

up as the head, but in Tagalog, where there are no relative pronouns, the position of the head in free relative clauses is empty(10). Compare (46) and (47) :

(46) *iniwasan niya ang mga babae-NG namimili sa palengke*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

he avoided the women who did their shopping at the market

1 iov-pf-avoid / 2 gen-3sg / 3 nom / 4 plur /

5 women / 6 LG / 7 acv-imp-shop / 8 dat / 9 market

(47) *iniwasan niya ang mga namimili sa palengke*
 1 2 3 4 7 8 9

he avoided those who did their shopping at the market

In (46-47), the strings *ang mga...palengke* are complex NPs, i.e. NPs containing an embedded clause, and like NPs in general, they bear a case marking (*ang*, in our examples). In (46) the relative clause *namimili sa palengke* modifies the head noun *babae*, to which it is attached by the ligature. In (47) there is no head noun, and as a result the relative clause immediately follows the case and number markers. Although free relative clauses and sentential complements may on the surface look very similar (compare (47) with (48)), they must carefully be kept apart(11).

(48) *iniwasan niya-NG mamili sa palengke*
 1 2 10 11 8 9

he avoided shopping at the market

10 LG / 11 acv-bas-shop

Relative clauses, but not sentential complements, are subject to Ross's (1967) Complex NP Constraint, which prohibits moving material from inside a relative clause. (49) and (50) are the sentences corresponding to (48) and (47) respectively, when the locative phrase in the embedded clause is replaced by the questions word *saan* "where" (questioned phrases must be sentence-initial, cf. TRG : 504 ff.) :

(10) For more discussion of relative clauses, free or otherwise, cf. our paper in preparation, *a*.

(11) Relative clauses attached to a nonnull head are dealt with in TRG : 123ss. (under the heading "noun head with modifying phrase"), whereas free relative clauses are treated as nominalizations (TRG : 150 ss.), on a par with sentential complements (TRG : 153ss.).

- (49) *saan niya iniwasan-G mamili*
 2 1 10 11
 where did he avoid shopping ?

- (50) **saan niya iniwasan ang mga namimili*
 2 1 3 4 7
 *where did he avoid those who were shopping ?

The readings of (49) and (50) under consideration here are those where the word *saan* concerns the place of shopping. Under that interpretation, (49) is grammatical, but not (50)⁽¹²⁾. Sentences (51-54) are other examples of the same point :

- (51) *natatakot siya-NG lumapit kay Pedro*
 1 2 3 4 5
 he is afraid of approaching Pedro
 1 acv-imp-be afraid / 2 nom-3sg / 3 LG /
 4 acv-bas-approach / 5 dat

- (52) *kanino siya natatakot NA lumapit*
 6 2 1 3 4
 whom is afraid of approaching ?
 6 dat-who

- (53) *natatakot siya sa lumapit kay Pedro*
 1 2 7 8 5
 he is afraid of the one who approached Pedro
 7 dat / 8 acv-pf-approach

- (54) **kanino siya natatakot sa lumapit*
 6 2 1 7 8
 *whom is he afraid of the one who approached ?

(12) (50) is grammatical when the word *saan* concerns the place where the avoidance occurred (as is its English translation with the corresponding interpretation of *where*), but this is irrelevant here.

ON CERTAIN SENTENTIAL COMPLEMENTS IN TAGALOG

Again in conformity with the Complex NP constraint, one can relativize out of a sentential complement, but not out of a relative clause. For instance, one can relativize out of the sentential complement of *gusto* "want" in (55), as shown by the grammaticality of (56) :

- (55) *gusto nila-NG iwasan-G pag-usapan iyong babae*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 they want to avoid discussing that woman
 1 want / 2 gen-3plur / 3 LG / 4 iov-bas-avoid /
 5 LG / 6 refv-bas-discuss / 7 nom-that / 8 woman

- (56) *iyang ang babae-NG gusto nila-NG iwasan-G pag-usapan*
 9 10 8 3 1 2 3 4 5 6
 that is the woman they want to avoid discussing
 9 nom-that / 10 nom

But one cannot relativize out of the free relative clause which is the subject of *gusto* "to like" in (57), as shown by the ungrammaticality of (58) :

- (57) *gusto nila ang mga umiwas NA pag-usapan iyong babae*
 1 2 10 11 12 13 6 7 8
 they like those who avoid discussing that woman
 11 plur / 12 acv-imp-avoid / 13 LG

- (58) **iyang ang babae-NG gusto nila ang mga umiwas NA pag-usapan*
 9 10 8 3 1 2 10 1 12 13 6
 *that is the woman whom they like those who avoid
 discussing

5. EQUI ON NON-ACTORS ?

Let us adapt from Schachter (1976 : 505, 508) the term "actor" to designate (i) the subject NP in an active sentence (ii) in a passive sentence, the NP which has the subject as its analogue in the corresponding active sentence. By this definition, the actor is *ang titser* in (2), and it is *ng titser* in (4) and in (5) since this NP is the analogue of the subject of the corresponding active sentence (2).

ON CERTAIN SENTENTIAL COMPLEMENTS IN TAGALOG

(b) *kinawiwilihan niya-NG makiliti ni Pedro*
 1 2

same meanings as (a)

1 iov-imp-enjoy / 2 gen-3sg

(62) *ugali ni Pedro-NG matulungan ni Lorna*
 1 2 3 4 5 6

it is in Pedro's habit to be helped by Lorna

1 habit / 2 gen / 4 LG / 5 iov-apt-bas-help

6 gen

(63) *handa na ang bangos NA maisilbi sa mga bisita*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

the milkfish is ready to be served to the guests

1 ready / 2 already / 3 nom / 4 milkfish / 5 LG

6 dov-apt-bas-serve / 7 dat / 8 plur / 9 guest

The deletion of the subject of the lower clause is allowed whatever the voice of the verb in that clause, as is illustrated in the following examples⁽¹⁴⁾.

(64) *nasanay si Lorna-NG maaway ni Pedro*
 1 2 3 4 5 6

Lorna got used to being shouted at by Pedro

1 acv-pf-get used / 2 nom / 4 LG / 5 dov-apt-bas-
 quarrel / 6 gen

(14) One of my informants tended to accept sentences involving the deletion of a non-actor subject only when the verb of the embedded clause was an aptative form. For instance, the analogues of (64) and (65) with a non-aptative verb in the embedded clause are the sentences (i) and (ii), where *awayin* and *painumin* are the non-aptative forms corresponding to *maaway* and *mapainom* respectively :

(i) *nasanay si Lorna-NG awayin ni Pedro*

(ii) *nasanay si Lorna-NG painumin ng suka*

Whereas the other informants found (i) and (ii) as readily acceptable as (64) and (65), one of them accepted only (64) and (65), to the exclusion of (i) and (ii). In the whole inflectional paradigm of the Tagalog verb, the aptative/non-aptative contrast is probably the most poorly understood. For some discussion, cf. in preparation, *b*.

- (65) *nasanay si Lorna-NG mapainom ng suka*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Lorna got used to people having her drink vinegar
 5 act2v-caus-apt-bas-drink / 6 gen / 7 vinegar
- (66) *nasanay si Lorna-NG mapag-usapan sa tibi*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
 Lorna got used to being talked about on TV
 5 refv-apt-bas-talk / 6 dat / 7 television
- (67) *nasanay si Lorna-NG ipirma ni Ben*
 1 2 3 4 5 6
 Lorna got used to Ben signing for her
 5 benv-bas-sign / 6 gen
- (68) *nasanay si Lorna-NG mahingian ko ng pera*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 Lorna got used to my asking her for money
 5 iov-apt-bas-ask / 6 gen-1sg / 7 gen / 8 money
- (69) *nasanay si Lorna-NG ipatawag ni Ben*
 1 2 3 4 5 6
 Lorna got used to Ben having her called
 5 dov-caus-bas-call / 6 gen
- (70) *nasanay si Lorna-NG maipantukso sa mga kliente*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
 Lorna got used to being used as a bait for the customers
 5 insv-apt-bas-tempt / 6 dat / 7 plur / 8 customer

Finally, a shared coreferential NP cannot be deleted in the embedded clause unless it is either the actor or the subject of that clause. Consider for instance sentence (71).

ON CERTAIN SENTENTIAL COMPLEMENTS IN TAGALOG

(71) *ipakilala mo ang bata sa akin*
 1 2 3 4 5 6

introduce the child to me

1 dov-bas-introduce / 2 gen-2sg / 3 nom / 4 child /
 5 dat / 6 dat-1sg

When this sentence is used as an embedded clause, its actor can be deleted if coreferential with that of the matrix sentence, as shown in (72), and its subject can be deleted if coreferential with the actor of the matrix sentence, as shown in (73). But the complement *sa akin*, which is neither an actor nor a subject in (71), cannot be deleted even if the actor of the matrix sentence is a first person singular pronoun. This is shown by the difference between (74) and (75).

(72) *natatakot ka-NG ipakilala ang bata sa akin*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

you are afraid of introducing the child to me

1 acv-imp-fear / 2 nom-2sg / 3 LG / 4 dov-bas-introduce /
 5 nom / 6 child / 7 dat / 8 dat-1sg

(73) *natatakot ang bata-NG maipakilala mo sa akin*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

the child is afraid of being introduced by you to me

1 acv-imp-fear / 2 nom / 3 child / 4 LG /
 5 dov-apt-bas-introduce / 6 gen-2sg / 7 dat / 8 dat-1sg

(74) *natatakot ako-NG ipakilala mo ang bata sa akin*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

I am afraid of your introducing the child to me

1 acv-imp-fear / 2 nom-1sg / 3 LG / 4 dov-bas-introduce /
 5 gen-2sg / 6 nom / 7 child / 8 dat / 9 dat-1sg

(75) *natatakot ako-NG ipakilala mo ang bata*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I am afraid of your introducing the child

Although sentence (75) differs from sentence (74) only in that it lacks a dative complement *sa akin* in the embedded clause, it is not synonymous with it, as it would be if it derived from the same underlying structure as (74) by the deletion of *sa akin*(15). Contrary to (74), (75) carries no indication as to whom the child might be introduced to. The meaning relationship between (74) and (75) is exactly the same as that between (71) and (76).

(76) *ipakilala mo ang bata*
 1 2 3 4

introduce the child

In both (75) and (76) the person to whom the child is introduced is left unspecified.

Let us call "controller" the coreferential NP whose occurrence triggers the operation of Equi. For instance, the controller of Equi in (72) is *ka*, and in (73) it is *ang bata*. In all the examples given above, the controller is the actor of the matrix clause. But this need not always be the case, as illustrated by sentences (77)-(79).

(77) (a) *nagbiling ako kay Pepe-NG tumawag kay Lorna*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

(b) *ipinagbiling ko kay Pepe-NG tumawag kay Lorna*
 8 9 3 4 5 6 7

I left instructions to Pepe to call up Lorna

1 acv-pf-instruct / 2 nom-1sg / 3 dat / 5 LG /

6 acv-bas-call up / 7 dat / 8 dov-pf-instruct / 9 gen-1sg

(78) (a) *nagbiling ako kay Pepe-NG tawagan si Lorna*
 1 2 3 4 5 10 11

(b) *ipinagbiling ko kay Pepe-NG tawagan si Lorna*
 8 9 3 4 5 10 11

same meaning as (77)

10 iov-bas-call up / 11 nom

(15) This remains true when the non-aptative form *ipakilala* in (75) is replaced by its aptative analogue *maipakilala*.

ON CERTAIN SENTENTIAL COMPLEMENTS IN TAGALOG

(79) (a) *ugali ni Pedro-NG tumulong kay Lorna*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

(b) *ugali ni Pedro-NG tulungan si Lorna*
 1 2 3 4 8 9

it is Pedro's habit to help Lorna

1 habit / 2 gen / 4 LG / 5 acv-bas-help / 6 dat /
 8 iov-bas-help / 9 nom

In sentences (77)-(78) the controller of Equi is a dative complement (*kay Pedro*) to the verb⁽¹⁶⁾, whereas in (79) it is a genitive complement (*ni Pedro*) belonging to the predicate NP.

6. SUBJECT RAISING

(80) *iniwasan niya-NG lapitan ako*
 1 2 3 4 5

(81) *iniwasan niya ako-NG lapitan*
 1 2 5 3 4

he avoided approaching me

1 iov-pf-avoid / 2 gen-3sg / 3 LG / 4 iov-bas-approach /
 5 nom-1sg

(80) and (81) illustrate the fact that a personal pronoun which is the subject of a sentential complement can in certain cases be raised into the matrix clause⁽¹⁷⁾. As far as sequential ordering in the matrix sentence is concerned, pronouns thus raised behave no differently from the others⁽¹⁸⁾ :

(16) All four sentences (77a-78b) are cognitively synonymous. Sentences (77a-b) have an embedded clause in the active voice, while (78a-b) have an embedded clause in a passive voice. Sentences (77a) and (78a) have the active voice in the matrix clause, whereas sentences (77b) and (78b) have the verb of the matrix clause in the direct objective voice (its subject is the embedded clause taken as a whole).

(17) In fact not only personal pronouns, but all subject NPs can be thus raised. However stylistic factors come into play, which have to do with the length of the raised constituent relative to its environment, and we will use here only data concerning personal pronouns.

(18) On the ordering of pronouns, cf. TRG : 183-193, and Schachter (1973).

(82) *iniwasan ba niya-NG lapitan ka ?*
 1 6 2 3 4 7

(83) *iniwasan ka ba niya-NG lapitan ?*
 1 7 6 2 3 4

did he avoid approaching you ?

6 question marker / 7 nom-2sg

Consider the following :

(84) *nagpilit ako-NG tulungan sila*
 1 2 3 4 5

(85) *pinilit ko-NG tulungan sila*
 6 7 3 4 5

(86) **nagpilit ako sila-NG tulungan*
 1 2 5 3 4

(87) *pinilit ko sila-NG tulungan*
 6 7 5 3 4

I did my best to help them

1 acv-pf-strive / 2 nom-1sg / 3 LG / 4 iov-bas-help /
 5 nom-3plur / 6 dov-pf-strive / 7 gen-1sg

(84) and (85) are synonymous and differ only in the voice of the matrix clause. The subject of the embedded clause can be raised in (85), hence the grammatical sentence (87), which has the same meaning as (85), but it cannot be raised in (84), as shown by the ungrammaticality of (86). To account for this, we venture the following restriction on raising :

(88) A subject can be raised out of a sentential complement only if that sentential complement is itself a subject in its matrix clause(19).

The ungrammaticality of (86) cannot just be a matter of violating an output constraint on pronoun sequences which would prohibit a sequence like *ako sila*, or even a constraint against verbs with two nominative complements. For if one raises *sila* in the next higher clause in (89) one obtains (90), which contains no pronoun sequence and no verb

(19) i.e. only "maximal subjects" can be raised. On the notion of "maximal subject", cf. in preparation, *a*.

ON CERTAIN SENTENTIAL COMPLEMENTS IN TAGALOG

with two nominative complements, but is nonetheless ungrammatical :

(89) *kakaunti lang ang mga nagpilit NA tulungan sila*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

(90) **kakaunti lang ang mga nagpilit sila-NG tulungan*
 1 2 3 4 5 8 6 7

Only a few people did their best to help them

1 few / 2 only / 3 nom / 4 plur / 5 acv-pf-strive /
 6 LG / 7 iov-bas-help / 8 nom-3plur

Restriction (88) accounts for the ungrammaticality of (90).

Finally, the subject of a sentential complement S can be raised into a clause which is higher up in the syntactic tree than the clause immediately dominating S. For instance, in (91), *siya* can be raised from S₃ to S₁, yielding the grammatical sentence (92), which has the same meaning as (91) :

(91) *[gusto ko [-NG makasanayan [-G tulungan siya]]]*
 S₁ S₂ S₃

(92) *gusto ko siya-NG makasanayan-G tulungan*
 1 2 7 3 4 5 6

I want to get used to helping him

1 want / 2 gen-1sg / 3 LG / 4 apt-iov-bas-get used /
 5 LG / 6 iov-bas-help / 7 nom-3sg

But consider now (93), which is identical with (91) except for the verb in S₂, which is in the active voice (apt-acv-bas-get used).

(93) *gusto ko-NG masanay NA tulungan siya*
 1 2 3 5 6 7

If *siya* is raised from S₃ to S₁ in (93), one obtains (94), which is ungrammatical.

(94) **gusto ko siya-NG masanay NA tulungan*
 1 2 7 3 5 6

The ungrammaticality of (94) is due to a violation of restriction (88) : in (93), S₂ is indeed the subject of S₁, but S₃ is not the subject of S₂.

REFERENCES

- BLAKE, F.R., 1925 : *A Grammar of the Tagalog Language*,
New Haven : American Oriental Society.
- BUHAIN, A., 1958 : The Tagalog particle *na*, *Philippine Journal of Science* 87 : 473-478.
- CUBAR, N.I., 1974 : *Complex Sentences in Tagalog, Cebuano and Hiligaynon*, University of the Philippines, Social Science and Humanities Research Committee, Quezon City, mimeographed.
- DELL, F., in preparation, *a* : Tagalog Complex Existential Sentences.
----- in preparation, *b* : An aspectual distinction in Tagalog.
- GONZALEZ, A., 1971 : The Tagalog Nasal Ligature : A Reinterpretation,
Philippine Journal of Linguistics II-1 : 28-43.
- GROSS, M., 1968 : *Grammaire transformationnelle du Français. Syntaxe du Verbe*, Paris : Larousse.
- McFARLAND, C.D., 1976 : *A Provisional Classification of Tagalog Verbs*, Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Monograph Series, N° 8, Tokyo : Gaikokugo Daigaku.
- OTANES, F., 1966 : *A Contrastive Analysis of English and Tagalog Verb Complementation*, unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of California Los Angeles.
- ROSENBAUM, P., 1967 : *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions*, Cambridge, Mass. : The M.I.T. Press.
- ROSS, J.R., 1967 : *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*, PhD Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, distributed by the Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington, Indiana.
- SCHACHTER, P., 1973 : Constraints on clitic order in Tagalog, in Andrew B. Gonzalez, ed., *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez. Essays in Honour of Cecilio Lopez on his seventy-fifth birthday*, *Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph Issue* N° 4, Quezon City, 214-231.
- 1976 : The subject in Philippine Languages : topic, actor, actor-topic, or none of the above ? in C. Li, ed., *Subject and Topic*, New York : Academic Press, 493-518.
- and F. OTANES, 1972 : *Tagalog Reference Grammar*, Berkeley : University of California Press.

François DELL
C.N.R.S., Paris