

On the Transitivity of the Actor Focus and Patient Focus Constructions in Tagalog*

Maureen Joy D. Saclot
University of the Philippines, Mindanao

This paper offers functional explanations on the transitivity of the Actor Focus (AF) and the Patient Focus (PF) constructions in Tagalog. The existing studies with regard to these two structures are ambivalent as to what can be considered as the basic transitive construction. That is, both are posited to have the same functional role of encoding a transitive event. However, in this paper, it will be shown that the AF construction has a functional role of encoding an intransitive event, and the PF construction, a transitive event. Moreover, it will be pointed out that the two clause structures have different meanings and are used in different contexts. I posit the view that AF constructions with *-um/m* affix including those containing a semantic actor and a semantic patient are intransitive. Conversely, the PF structures with *-in, -an, I-* affix in the verb where semantic actor and semantic patient are always present are transitive clauses. Accordingly, in addressing the issue of transitivity, the contention whether it is definiteness or referentiality which triggers the use of Actor Focus (AF) and Patient Focus (PF) construction will be problematized. If sentences (1) *Kumain si Maria ng mangga* 'Maria ate mangoes/a mango' and (2) *Kinain ni Maria ang mangga* 'Maria ate the mango' are to be considered, there is an element of truth in claiming that AF construction in (1) correlates with indefiniteness of the patient while definiteness of the patient explains the use of PF construction in (2). There is however an Actor Focus (AF) construction where a patient is definite and the AF verb is a relativized verb, such as (3) *Si Maria ang kumain sa mangga* 'It is Maria who ate the mango'. Considering (3), the question still remains: what triggers the use of AF and PF constructions? To account for the issues of transitivity and definiteness, I cast my analyses under the transitivity hypothesis of Hopper and Thompson (1980) with particular emphasis on Agency, Affectedness of P and Individuation of O.

1. Introduction

Among the existing 'choices' of focus in Tagalog (i.e. actor focus, patient focus, beneficiary focus, and locative focus), actor focus (hereafter,AF), with a semantic actor and a semantic patient present, and patient focus (hereafter,PF) are considered to be the most problematic in terms of clausal transitivity. Previous studies with regard to these two have shown that both AF and PF clause structures are transitive. Moreover, it has been contended that these constructions are just the same and that PF clause is derived from the AF clause. Correlated with determining the difference in the transitivity between actor focus and patient focus clauses is the concept of definiteness. Much of the literature claimed that the definiteness of the object triggers the choice of focus. However, there are verbs that take *-UM* affix and have definite object (e.g. *tumulong ang bata sa matanda* 'The child helped the old lady'). In this case, it cannot be argued that definiteness or indefiniteness of the object determines the focus of the construction.

Consequently, the different studies (e.g. Schachter 1976, 1977, Rafael 1978, Bell 1978, Hopper and Thompson 1980, Naylor 1986, Adams and Manaster-Ramer 1988, Kroeger 1993, Mithun 1994, Van Valin 2001, Katagiri 2002, Nolasco 2003, Liao 2004) have raised interesting points in analyzing the focus system in Philippine languages which resulted to differing conclusions under three different frameworks: nominative-accusative, ergative-absolutive, and split voice. In the aim of classifying the Philippine languages into a particular type of case system, the aspect of context in influencing the structure and the use of Tagalog has not really been expounded and explored.

*This paper is a revised version of a master's thesis submitted in University of the Philippines, Los Banos.

The focus of this paper is not so much the debunking of any existing claims about the Tagalog focus system, as the deepening of our knowledge of how native speaker use his language in order to convey his message to his listener. It aims to explore the contextual basis of the AF and PF¹ constructions and argue that PF clause, with –IN, –AN, I- affix in its verb and where a semantic actor and a semantic patient are always present, is a transitive clause and AF clause, with –UM/M- affix in its verb including those that contain semantic actor and semantic patient, is an intransitive clause. It takes the functionalist perspective in clarifying the transitivity of these two clauses and contends that they are different constructions serving different communication needs and functions. Furthermore, it seeks to explicate the conditions and even scenarios, i.e. context, by which definite or indefinite object is used in order to understand the concept of definiteness; thus, understand the meaning of an individuated O in Tagalog clauses.

It has to be noted, though, that this paper does not attempt to resolve whether the case system of Tagalog is nominative-accusative, ergative-absolutive or split voice.

1.1 Theoretical Perspectives

To elucidate the conditions by which AF and PF constructions are likely to be chosen by native Tagalog speaker, the transitivity parameters of Hopper and Thompson (1980), with particular emphasis on Agency, Affectedness of P and Individuation of O, are employed. In addition, some semantic correlates in Nolasco's (2003) revised transitivity parameters (adopted from Hopper and Thompson) are utilized to further explain the functional differences of AF clause and PF clause, thereby, leads to a better understanding of what Philippine transitivity is.

1.1.1 Transitivity Hypothesis: Hopper and Thompson (1980)

Traditionally, transitivity is understood as a property of a clause that involves many components, one of which is the presence of an object of the verb. Furthermore, it emphasizes the activity being 'carried over or transferred' effectively from an agent to the patient (Hopper and Thompson 1980). Thus, generally, transitivity involves participants and an action.

In Van Den Berg's observation (1995:161), this hypothesis becomes a "powerful explanatory theory for many aspects of morphosyntactic organizations in a wide variety of languages." This hypothesis is stated as follows: "If two clauses (a) and (b) in a language differ in that (a) is higher in transitivity according to any of the features 1A-J, then, if a concomitant grammatical or semantic difference appears elsewhere in the clause, that difference will also show (a) to be higher in transitivity" (Hopper and Thompson 1980:255).

The following is the scale of parameters of features A-J:

	HIGH	LOW
A. Participants	2 or more participants	1 participant
B. Kinesis	action	non-action
C. Aspect	telic	atelic
D. Punctuality	punctual	non-punctual
E. Volitionality	volitional	non-volitional
F. Affirmation	affirmative	negative
G. Mode	realis	irrealis
H. Agency	A high in potency	A low in potency
I. Affectedness of O	O totally affected	O not affected
J. Individuation of O	O highly individuated	O non-individuated

¹ The following abbreviations appear in glosses: PF=patient focus;AF=actor focus;ANG=ANG actor, ANG patient;NG=NG patient, NG actor;SA=SA patient, location, beneficiary;SI/NI/KAY=case markers for proper nouns;PL=plural;LNK=linker;IMPF=imperfective;PERF=perfective;PAST=past tense;PRT=particle;PRES=present tense;QNT=quantifier;1SG=1st person singular;2SG=2nd person singular;3SG=3rd person singular

Nolasco (2003) has found Hopper and Thompson's semantic parameters useful in analyzing the transitivity and ergativity of Philippine languages. However, he made some modifications of these parameters to suit the Philippine contexts, namely, distinctness of the A and P vs. S; action vs. state; telic vs. atelic; punctual vs. non-punctual; deliberate vs. volitional; particular vs. general; external vs. internal; effortful vs. effortless; total affectedness of the P vs. partial affectedness of the P; and high individuation of the P vs. non-individuation of the P.

2. Agency

According to Shibatani (1985:833), a prototypical transitive clause, in Hopper and Thompson's sense, involves a typical agent—one who acts volitionally and has high potency. In an AF construction, actor is low in potency and does not act volitionally; whereas, in a PF construction, actor is high in potency and acts volitionally.

Let us examine the following set of sentences to clarify these assumptions²:

- (1) a. P-um-atay ang mga bata ng aso.
 PAST.AF (-um-).kill ANG PL child NG dog
 'The children killed a dog.'
- b. P-in-atay ng mga bata ang aso.
 PAST.PF (-in-).kill NG PL child ANG dog
 'The children killed the dog.'

When the informants were asked which would be their choice of utterance, all of them answered (1b). (1a) is not the common and natural utterance since the verb *pumatay* 'kill' presupposes the idea that killing is an inherent characteristic of the actor, the children, in this example. It seems that such particular action is innate to them such that they are able to do it voluntarily. It can be observed, then, that the type of actor performing the act affects and influences what form of verb is utilized, specifically for verbs whose stems are highly transitive, such as kill. Hence, (1b) is preferred than (1a) because the actor has acted out of his character. Moreover, the act of killing the dog has been done deliberately and with effort brought about by the fact that it is not the nature of the actor to perform such act. Thus, to describe an event in which a serial killer has attacked again and killed his fourth victim, the acceptable statement would be:

- (2) P-um-atay muli ang serial killer.
 PAST.AF (-um-).kill again ANG serial killer
 'The serial killer killed again.'

But to describe an event in which two friends were drinking while discussing who would be the better president, ERAP or FPJ, and then suddenly an argument ensued which led to the friend killing his other friend, the event would be stated as:

² The samples used to analyze the transitivity of AF and PF structures were taken from two romance novels, examples in some scholarly works, and clauses made by the author of this paper. In order to validate the grammaticality and the meaning being given to a particular sample clause, the following informants were interviewed: Teodula Saclot, Sharon Saclot, and Emma Baclayon (Lipa, Batangas), Antonio Ramos, Marie Soriano-Cruz, and Karen Cayamanda (Laguna), Marina Pramoso (Tondo, Manila).

- (3) P-in-atay ng lasing na lalaki ang kanya-ng kaibigan dahilan sa
 PAST.PF (-in-).kill NG drunk LNK man ANG 3SG-LNK friend because of
 pagtatalo kung sino ang mas magigi-ng magaling na presidente,
 argument SUB who ANG much will.become-LNK better LNK president
 si ERAP ba o si FPJ?
 SI ERAP PRT or SI FPJ
 ‘A drunk man killed his friend because of an argument on who will be the much
 better president, is it ERAP or is it FPJ?’

Thus, the factor of doing an act voluntarily and without effort correlates with AF construction. Conversely, an act done deliberately and with effort correlates with PF construction. It can be observed that if the stem verb is high in transitivity, it is not only the degree of Affectedness of the P (this is discussed in the next section) that has to be considered, it is also the actor’s potency to do a particular act. Consequently, the actor in the AF verb *pumatay* ‘kill’ is low in potency since the act is willful and voluntary, as opposed to PF verb *pinatay* ‘kill’ in which the actor is high in potency because he has acted with purpose and with effort.

Let us proceed with examining further these observations in the following sentences (the following examples are adapted from Katagiri 2002):

- (4) a. ? k-um-agat ang aso sa anak ni Juan.
 PAST.AF (-um-).bite ANG dog SA child NI Juan
 ‘The dog bit the child of Juan.’
 b. k-in-agat ng aso ang anak ni Juan.
 PAST.PF (-in-).bite NG dog ANG child NI Juan
 ‘A dog bit the child of Juan.’

Why is it that (4a) is awkward and unnatural? The claim here is that it is because of the actor performing the act. It is not a human actor, thus, the ability of it to bite willfully a human being does not seem natural. 4a presents an idea in which the child is there for the dog to bite and the dog simply has to have a taste of the array of food, one of which is the child of Juan, which is being presented to him. It is natural for a dog to bite a bone of a leftover food or bite anything inanimate. But if it is going to bite a human patient, then it is because it is provoked to do so. Thus, (4b) is usually the preferred construction.

Let us examine the other example:

- (5) a. ? s-um-ira ang bata ng mesa.
 PAST.AF (-um-).break ANG child NG table
 ‘The child broke a table.’
 b. s-in-ira ng bata ang mesa.
 PAST.PF (-in-).destroy NG child ANG table
 ‘A child broke the table.’

The (5a) construction is awkward and unnatural, too, since the verb ‘to break’ has usually a centrifugal tendency (to borrow the term of Naylor 1986) . By this, I mean, that someone needs to exert the effort in order to destroy or break something. Besides, it is an unnatural reaction for

- (11)a. t-um-uklaw ang ahas ng ibon.
 PAST.AF (-um).attack ANG snake NG bird
 ‘The snake attacked the bird.’
- b. t-in-uklaw ng ahas ang ibon.
 PAST.PF (-in-).attack NG snake ANG bird
 ‘A snake attacked the bird.’
- (12)a. t-um-uka ang manok ng kanin.
 PAST.AF (-um).peck ANG hen/rooster NG rice
 ‘The hen/rooster pecked a rice.’
- b. t-in-uka ng manok ang kanin.
 PAST.PF (-in-).peck NG hen/rooster ANG rice
 ‘A hen/rooster pecked the rice.’

It has to be said that the construction of all the sentences in (10a), (11a), and (12a) are easily accepted in the intuition of native speakers, as opposed to the sentences in which the patient is a human patient. I contend that it must be because of the ability of the nonhuman actor to do the act to an inanimate patient is natural and acceptable in the reality perceived by a human actor. It is now easier to understand why most inanimate and nonhuman actor occurs only in AF construction with it being the only argument; thus, making such construction an intransitive one. It is because this kind of actor has to be doing an action that is inherent and/or innate in his nature. Thus, *bumuhos ang ulan* ‘the rain falls’, *sumikat ang araw* ‘the sun rises’, *umagos ang tubig* ‘the water flows’, *dumaloy ang luha* ‘the tear falls’, etc., are all possible only in an AF construction but not in a PF construction because the latter would need an agent that is acting volitionally, purposely, deliberately, and intentionally.

Thus, it can be observed that the factor of animacy on the part of the actor also has an influence on the choice of construction, contrary to popular assumption that definiteness of O is the most likely reason for choosing either AF or PF construction. This means that there are other reasons for the use of each construction. To clarify this point, let us further examine the agency parameter with the use of the verb *kain* ‘to eat’ :

- (13) a. K-um-ain si Maria ng mangga
 PAST.AF (-um-).eat SI Maria NG mango
 ‘Maria ate a mango/mangoes.’
- b. K-in-ain ni Maria ang mangga.
 PAST.PF (-in-).eat NI Maria ANG mango
 ‘Maria ate the mango.’

(13a) has been posited as the active voice in Tagalog and (13b) as the passive voice. In addition, these two constructions are said to depict the same transitive situation and that both have transitive verbs. It is the contention in this paper that (13b) is not the passive transformation of (13a) and that (13a) has an intransitive verb. Indeed, both constructions describe a situation wherein there is an eater (Maria) and the eaten object (mango). However, the question is why would there be two ways of conveying an event? My point here is that the speaker has at his disposal various means by which to communicate his ideas. In (13a) he sees or would want his

listener to interpret his statement as simply a matter-of-fact description of the event in which the actor has acted willfully. In (13b), however, the speaker would want to relay the message that the actor has acted purposely and deliberately. Not only did the actor went out of her way to make sure she will eat but she made sure that it is the mango that will be eaten. Let's put this in a particular scenario. For instance, the mother of Maria went to the market to buy one kilo of mango. She told her children that they should not eat this mango as it would be given as an offering to the church. She put the mango on the table and went out of the house to do some chores. When she went inside she saw that there was one piece of mango missing. And so she asked her children where it was. The most likely response for such question and scenario will be (13b) and not (13a). A semantic actor, then, who has acted naturally, effortlessly, voluntarily is usually associated in the AF constructions. On the other hand, the actor who has acted intentionally, deliberately, effortfully can normally be found in a PF construction.

3. Affectedness of P

In the previous section, I have tried to elucidate the reasons for claiming that AF construction, specifically with –UM/ M- affix, is intransitive. It consists of an actor that is acting naturally and voluntarily in such a way that the action he does is affecting none other than himself. In a sense, the movement is ‘moving towards him’, a centripetal (to borrow the term of Naylor 1986, *Pasarili* ‘internal’ in Nolasco 2003) manifestation of the act. Hence, though there are two arguments, a semantic actor and a semantic patient, in the clause, it is still considered intransitive since the patient is partially affected or not affected at all. Conversely, PF construction is transitive, specifically with the –IN-, I- affixes, since it consists of an actor that is acting purposely, deliberately and intentionally in such a way that the action is moving away from him, a centrifugal (Naylor 1986; *Paiba* ‘external’ in Nolasco 2003) manifestation of the act. Hence, the action is transferred from the source to the patient that is totally affected. Recall that transitivity means an effective transferal of action from the actor to the patient, whereby the patient will be totally affected by the action of the actor. Based on the discussion of agency, it can be deduced that in the AF construction the patient is not totally affected or not affected. Conversely, in the PF construction the patient is totally affected. Nolasco (2003) posits that total or partial affectedness of P depends on the modality of the verb that is why there is a need to examine carefully the meaning of the verb together with its voice marker. I use the following examples to examine this claim.

- (14) a. nag-hugas ako ng pinggan.
 PAST.AF (nag-).wash 1SG NG plates
 ‘I washed a plate/ plates.’
 b. h-in-ugasan ko ang pinggan.
 PAST.PF(-in).wash 1SG ANG plates
 ‘I washed the plates.’

What exactly is the difference between the two? The most obvious one is in their cases in which the patient in (14a) takes NG while in (14b) it takes ANG. Other than that, it would seem correct to assume that these constructions are actually encoding the same transitive event. But a closer look at the modality of the verb would show that these two clauses have two different interpretations. In the former, it gives an interpretation that the actor is a good fellow. Again, since the actor has acted voluntarily and willfully, such interpretation is likely to occur. In the latter, it seems that the actor has to be commanded to do the washing of dishes or the actor is

forced to wash the dishes since no one is washing it. There seems to be ‘an external compelling force’ that necessitates him to do such a thing, whether he likes to wash the dishes or not. Thus, the actor here is acting deliberately and purposely with the intention of finishing the dishes. It is very apparent in the PF construction that the patient is highly affected since the actor is acting deliberately, intentionally, effortfully because he has the intention of getting something out of that patient.

The following passage is taken from the story ‘*Dahil Sa Pag-ibig*’. In this scene, the use of *bumalik* ‘return’, an AF verb, is taken into consideration. This shows a tendency of the AF to be used in context where someone in a much lower status does a certain action with a sense of obligation towards someone who is occupying a higher position in the society. The context of the story is this: when Jennifer learned that Andre has tricked her into having a dinner with him, she immediately stood up and started to leave. Andre warned her to return. She was undecided whether to do so, but she could see that he was serious in his warning, thus,

- (15) nagpupuyos man ang galit sa dibdib ay
 burning though ANG anger SA deep.inside LNK
b-um-alik siya sa mesa.
 PAST.AF (-um-).return 2sg SA table
 ‘though she is burning with anger, she returned to the table.’

Though, the actor is doing something out of her own free will, the verb used is still in AF form because such verb connotes a sense of respect, formality and obligation done by someone to a superior. Thus to say, *binalikan niya ang mesa* ‘she returned to the table’ connotes a sense of purpose towards accomplishing what is on that table and not the obligation she has to return to the table to heed the warning of someone who has higher status than her. Out of respect, formality and a sense of obligation, one utilizes the AF verbs rather than the PF verbs. Take a look at these sentences:

- (16) a. K-um-uha ako ng dalawa-ng lapis.
 PAST.AF (-um-).take 1sg NG QNT- LNK pencil
 ‘I took two pencils.’
 b. K-in-uha ko ang dalawa-ng lapis.
 PAST.AF (-in-).take 1sg ANG QNT- LNK pencil
 ‘I took the two pencils.’

This is the context of the above clauses: It was late in the evening, a junior faculty stayed in the faculty room since she has work to finish. She suddenly remembered that she needed two pencils for the activity she was preparing for her class. However, the senior faculty who was in charge of the supplies was no longer there. So the following day, she informed her superior about it. In this given scenario, (16a) is chosen as the proper utterance rather than (16b). Why? Because, somehow, it gives a sense of formality. Aside from that, since this kind of construction is neutral, its underlying meaning says that ‘I’m sorry but I took two pencils, I needed it last night but you were not here, so...’ Contrary to (16b) that makes the act deliberate and has the underlying meaning that says ‘I took two pencils and that is it’. There is also the added meaning that she intends to keep the pencils. It seems that the patient in (16a) is not affected at all. It is

simply there as an inherent argument of the verb. The patient in all of the AF constructions is a ‘non-instigating affected participant in the state of affairs’ (Van Valin, In Press).

There are instances that the AF constructions are used instead of the PF ones because the latter connotes a tone of command. Thus, when someone who is lower in status uses the PF to ask a superior about something, it is taken as rude. Take a look at the sentences below:

- (17) a. Inay, nag-luto ka ng pansit?
 mother PAST.AF.(nag-).cook 2SG NG Chinese.noodle
 ‘Mother, did you cook a Chinese noodle?’
- b. Inay, ni-luto mo ang pansit?
 mother PAST.PF.(ni-).cook 2SG ANG Chinese.noodle
 ‘Mother, did you cook the Chinese noodle?’

In (17a), a daughter or a son does not ask her/his mother whether she has cooked the ‘*pansit*’ in a very direct way. (17b) connotes a sense of directness that when someone who is considered less superior asks using this construction, it would appear that he is being rude and unmindful of his manners. However, (17a) connotes a sense of hesitation on the part of the source of the question. Thus, the hesitancy part gives a sense of respect on the part of the person being asked. In (17a), the *pansit* ‘chinese dish of noodles’ being referred to is not the cooked noodles but is still referred to the uncooked ingredients to make this noodle. Compared to the (17b) in which the use of the PF verb has just referred to the noodles as the already cooked Chinese dish noodles. Thus, it can be observed that P is totally affected, in a sense that it has changed its status from uncooked noodles made up of its ingredients to already cooked noodles.

- (18) a. K-um-ain ka na ng agahan?
 PAST. IMPF.AF (-um-).eat 2SG already NG breakfast
 ‘Have you already eaten a breakfast?’
- b. K-in-ain mo na ang agahan?
 PAST.PERF.PF (-in-).eat 2SG already ANG breakfast
 ‘You have eaten the breakfast already?’

What makes (18b) a rude question is that one is insinuating that the person being asked is voracious. It means that he has consumed everything that has been prepared for breakfast without even thinking of others who have not yet eaten. Whereas, (18a) is simply an inquiry whether the person has already eaten his breakfast or is yet to eat it.

It can be observed, then, that the affix used in certain construction as well as the factor of affectedness of P has to do with certain modality. As far as I am concerned (and which my informants have seconded) the sentences in (a) connote a sense of respect towards the person being asked and depicts good manners towards the speaker. It mostly has to do with the AF affixes used which render the construction less emphatic, less purposely and almost neutral, thus, not affecting, or partially affecting the object being asked about. As opposed to the (b) sentences, in which, the PF affixes have rendered the construction more emphatic, and purposeful, thus, making the action of the actor totally affecting the status of a patient.

4. Individuation of O

As stated in the Transitivity parameters of Hopper and Thompson, a clause is highly transitive if the patient is highly individuated. By individuated, it means that the entity is considered to be a concrete, distinct and particularized entity. Two discourse-pragmatic factors indicate such individuation, namely, definiteness and referentiality. However based on the previous discussions, it has been observed that definiteness and referentiality are not the only pragmatic factors that could affect the AF and PF constructions in Tagalog. One has to consider the context, the agent, and the affectedness of the P. Moreover, one also has to consider the semantics of the verb particularly the features it takes when AF affix or PF affix is used.

This is not to disregard the influence of definiteness and referentiality in the information structuring of Tagalog. But this is an elaboration of how individuation of O is perceived by a native Tagalog speaker. Take a look at these sentences:

- (19) a. S-um-untok si Pedro kay Jose.
 PAST.AF (-um-).hit SI Pedro KAY Jose
 ‘Pedro hit Jose.’
- b. S-in-untok ni Pedro si Jose.
 PAST.PF (-in-).hit NI Pedro SI Jose
 ‘Pedro hit Jose.’

The patient in both sentences is both definite and referential. However, (19a) implies that *kay Jose* though definite and referential is not an individuated O since it presupposes the idea that the patient is not the only one that is hit by the actor, at the same time the actor is not the only who hit the patient. Whereas in (b), it is very definite that THE actor is the only one who hit THE patient. With these examples, it says that an individuated O in Tagalog (and most probably in Philippine languages) deals with patient being the ONLY ONE affected by the ONLY ONE actor. Thus, sentence, such as *kumain si Maria ng mangga* ‘Maria ate a mango/mangoes’, implies that the child ate not only the mango but other food as well.

Let us expound on the statement through these examples:

- (20) a. Na-nood si Alex ng Extra Challenge.
 PAST.AF (na-).watch SI Alex NG extra challenge
 ‘Alex watched Extra Challenge.’
- b. P-in-anood ni Alex nag Extra Challenge.
 PAST.PF (-in-).watch NI Alex ANG extra challenge
 ‘Alex watched the Extra Challenge.’

Now, in these sentences, the patient ‘Extra Challenge’ is known, familiar and even identified by both the speaker and the hearer. In (a) it takes a NG marker and then in (b), it takes an ANG marker. But what is the difference between these two constructions? Although, the patient is definite and referential, it is not individuated in (a). It is because in (a) it is not only *extra challenge* that the actor *Alex* has watched. It could be that while watching the extra challenge, he was also watching other television program. However, in (b), it is pointing specifically that the actor watched only that particular television program.

- (21) a. H-um-alik si Andro kay Emma.
 PAST.AF (-um-).kiss SI Andro KAY Emma
 ‘Andro kissed Emma.’
- b. H-in-alikan ni Andro kay Emma.
 PAST.PF (-in-).kiss NI Andro KAY Emma
 ‘Andro kissed Emma.’

In these sentences, (a) presupposes the idea that it is not only Andro who have kissed Emma. There could be other people who have kissed her. But in (b), only Andro has kissed Emma, and that it is only Emma that Andro kissed. Another interpretation that (a) has which has to do with the modality of the verb *halik* ‘to kiss’ is that it is a perfunctory kiss, but not in (b). The PF sentence implies that among so many girls that Andro could have kissed, he particularly chose Emma and purposely kissed her.

- (22) a. B-um-angga si Juan sa puno.
 PAST.AF (-um-).collide SI Juan SA tree
 ‘Juan collided to the tree.’
- b. B-in-angga ni Juan ang puno.
 PAST.PF (-in-).bump NI Juan ANG tree
 ‘Juan bumped the tree.’

(a) implies that Juan collided with a tree but it could be any tree within the vicinity he was in when the event happened. Moreover, the collision is perceived to be accidental. Contrary to (b), in which Juan purposely and intentionally bumped himself to a particular tree. The action can even be perceived as premeditated.

Let us use other examples:

- (23) a. B-um-ili si Sharon ng regalo para kay Laurize.
 PAST.AF (-um-).buy SI Sharon NG gift for Laurize
 ‘Sharon bought a gift for Laurize.’
- b. B-in-ili ni Sharon ang regalo para kay Laurize.
 PAST.PF (-in-).buy NI Sharon ANG gift for Laurize
 ‘Sharon bought the gift for Laurize.’

In (a), ‘Sharon’ went to the mall or any other place to buy a gift for Laurize, yet, this gift *ng regalo* is not yet decided by Sharon. She still does not know what gift she is going to buy. She simply went to the place so she can look for a possible gift to buy for Laurize. Whereas, in (b), she already has in mind what gift she is going to buy. It does seem to account for the pragmatic factor of definiteness; however, an entity that is definite in Tagalog implies that both speaker and hearer can identify what that entity is. By identify, it does not mean identification but identifiability. This means that, by the use of *ang regalo* ‘the gift’ the hearer can actually think of a particular thing, e.g. dress, dolls, that the actor is most likely to buy as a gift. Though, it does not mean that the hearer can determine exactly the kind of dress or doll that would be bought. This sentence indicates that in order for a particular patient to be definite, it must be familiar and identifiable to both the speaker and hearer.

There is another factor that influences the perception of an individuated O in a Tagalog clause structure. Take a look at this narrative taken from a romance novel (*Ikaw lang at Ako* by Ranessa Ynea): Louise had accidentally hit Ariel in the head with a vase, thinking that he was an intruder. When Ariel lost consciousness, she put him in a room. The following morning, she tried to find out how he was doing. They had sort of an argument because of what happened the other night, when suddenly she noticed that Ariel was looking at her in a strange way. She looked at herself and found out that she's wearing only a short and a transparent shirt, so this is what she did:

- (24) *Mabilis niya-ng h-in-albot ang na-mataan-g kumot at*
 hastily 2SG-LNK PAST.PF (-in-).grab ANG PAST.AF.(na-)see-LNK blanket and
na-i-balabal sa katawan saka b-in-aling-an ang lalaki-ng
 PAST.PF. (-i-).wrap SA body then PAST.PF. (-in-, -an).turn ANG man-LNK
naka-balandra pa rin sa sahig.
 PRES.IMPF.AF (naka-).lie still SA floor
 'She hastily grabbed the blanket that she saw and wrap (it) to (her) body,
 then turned to the man who is lying still on the floor.'

The author did not use *mabilis siyang humalbot ng namataang kumot* 'she hastily grabbed a blanket' in this particular passage because the blanket is already there in the room and on that bed. It seems then that the familiarity of the referent of the definite NP is governed by the physical situation in which the speaker and the hearer are located. In this case, the writer of the story is trying to let her readers imagine that the actor and the patient are in one location only and that the actor is able to get particularly THE blanket because it is already there in the room. If she used the AF verb, it would presuppose the idea that the actor has looked around the room for a blanket to cover herself. Thus, it gives an idea that the blanket is not immediately visible to the actor.

So far, the given instances have indicated the concept of individuation of O in Tagalog. To reiterate:

- (a) individuation of O has to be one actor affecting only one patient;
- (b) familiarity and identifiability have to go together in order for a patient to be individuated;
- (c) spatio-temporal context influences the identifiability of a referent, consequently, affects its perception of being definite or not;
- (d) the NG marker indicates a patient that is partitive, thus, not an individuated O, whereas, ANG marker indicates a patient in its entirety, thus an individuated O.

5. Transitivity and Voice Markers

It is evident in the preceding discussions of the three transitivity parameters that the semantic properties of a Tagalog clause are manifested through the voice markers. These voice markers determine the semantic roles that the participants take in the communication act. Furthermore, they indicate what would be the meaning of the predicate, which consequently highly affects the conditions by which a particular clause is used. From all the samples used, it can be observed that the –UM/M- AFFIX correlates with intransitivity and –IN, -AN, I- AFFIXES correlate with transitivity.

The –UM/M AFFIX when attached to the stem of the verb has rendered the semantic actor (ANG Actor in this paper), the most affected entity. Verbs with this affix make the action moves towards the semantic actor rendering it as the most involved participant in the situation and

relegating the semantic patient in an AF clause as a participant that would not have a distinct and ‘independent existence apart from the predicate’ (Keenan 1976).

The verbal affixes –IN, -AN and I- , on the other hand, render the most agent-like participant as distinct and independent entity that acts with deliberation, purpose, effort and intention, thereby, totally affecting and changing the state of an independent, particularized and distinct patient-like participant.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, I have attempted to clarify the difference between an AF clause, with a semantic actor and semantic patient present, and a PF clause using the transitivity parameters of Hopper and Thompson (1980). Through the Agency, Affectedness of P and Individuation of O parameters certain observations are made with regard to the AF construction: that although it is semantically transitive, syntactically it is intransitive. Since the semantic actor in this clause has acted willfully, volitionally, effortlessly, his potency to affect change to the semantic patient is low. Thus, semantic patient is not totally or may not even be affected. In this clause, the semantic actor remains to be the salient participant and the semantic patient an ‘inherent argument of the verb’ (Van Valin and La Polla 1997). Conversely, in a PF clause, the semantic actor and semantic patient are two distinct and independent entities. In this way, when the actor does an action, he is consciously, deliberately, and intentionally doing so in order to affect change to the patient.

Much of the literature with regard to AF and PF constructions points to the definiteness of the object as the trigger for such choice of clause. Although it is undoubtedly significant, it hardly captures the complete picture of what constitute a definite O in Tagalog clause. The given examples in section 4 show that individuation of the O is a critical factor in the choice of construction. An individuated O is usually associated with: (a) one actor affecting only one patient, (b) identifiability and familiarity of the patient, (c) spatio-temporal context of the patient that influences its identifiability, and (d) NG marker for partitive and non-individuated patient, and ANG marker for distinct, particularized, independent patient.

Clearly, semantic and pragmatic factors motivate the syntactic manifestation of Tagalog. Investigating these semantic correlates and pragmatic factors are crucial if we are to understand what Philippine transitivity. For by understanding it, the rich focus system will also be understood.

References

- Adams, Karen.L and Alexis Manaster-Ramer. 1988. Some Questions of Topic/Focus Choice in Tagalog. *Oceanic Linguistics* 17:79-101.
- Bell, Sarah. J. 1978. Two Differences in Definiteness in Cebuano and Tagalog. *Oceanic Linguistics* 17:1-9.
- Hopper, Paul.J. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language* 56:251-299.
- Katagiri, Masumi. 2002. Towards a Unified Account of the Philippine-type Voice System. In *Villareal, C.D., L.R. Tope and P. Jurilla (eds.) Ruptures and Departures: Language and Culture in Southeast Asia*. Diliman: University of the Philippines.
- Keenan, Edward. L. 1976. Towards a Universal Definition of "Subject". In *Li, Charles (ed) Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press.
- Kroeger, Paul. 1993. Phrase Structure and Grammatical Relations in Tagalog. *CSLI Publications*.
- Liao, Hsiu-Chuan. 2004. Transitivity and Ergativity in Formosan and Philippine Languages. Ph.D dissertation, University of Hawai'i.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1994. The Implication of Ergativity for a Philippine Voice System. In *Fox, B. and P. Hopper (eds) Voice: Form and Function*. 247-277. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Naylor, Paz Buenaventura 1986. On the Pragmatics of Focus. In *Geraghty, P., L. Carrington and S.A. Wurm (eds) FOCAL* 1: 43-57.
- Nolasco, Ricardo Ma. 2003. Ang Pagkatransitibo at Ikinaergatibo ng mga Wikang Pilipino: Isang Pagsusuri sa Sistemang Bose. Ph. D. dissertation, UP Diliman, Diliman , Quezon City, Philippines.
- Rafael, Teresita.C. 1978. Topic in Tagalog Revisited. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 2:1. 36-48.
- Schachter, Paul. 1976. The Subject in Philippine Languages: Topic, actor, topic-actor or none Of the above. In *Li, Charles (ed) Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press.
- Schachter, Paul. 1977. Reference-Related and Role-Related Properties of Subjects. In *Cole, P. and J. Saddocks (eds) Syntax and Semantics*. New York: Academic Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi.1985. Passives and Related Constructions: *Language* 61: 821-848.
- Van Den Berg, René. 1995. Verb Clause Transitivity and The Definiteness Shift In Mura: A Counterexample to the Transitivity Hypothesis? *Oceanic Linguistics* 34: 161-189.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr and Randy J. La Polla. 1997. *Syntax: structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. 2001. *An Introduction to Syntax*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. In Press. *Introduction to Role and Reference Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The preceding document was presented at the Tenth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (10-ICAL). To properly reference this work, please use the following format:

<LastName>, <FirstName>. 2006. <PaperTitle>. Paper presented at Tenth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics. 17-20 January 2006. Puerto Princesa City, Palawan, Philippines.
<http://www.sil.org/asia/philippines/ical/papers.html>

For other papers that were presented at 10-ICAL, please visit <http://www.sil.org/asia/philippines/ical/papers.html>.