Attention to competition and register resolves confounds in Philippine NP-interpretation

Daniel Kaufman

Queens College, City College of New York &
Endangered Language Alliance

August 20, 2023

Introduction

- Many approaches to Philippine-type alignment systems rely heavily on the way certain arguments naturally obtain a definite or indefinite interpretation (sometimes referred to, incorrectly I think, as specific vs. non-specific).
- Yet the literature is rife with disagreements over some of the basic facts.
- It has long been noted that the *ang*-phrase or "pivot" in Tagalog and its equivalents in other Philippine languages receive a definite interpretation and that the actor voice object receives an (typically existential) indefinite interpretation. However...
  - Sabbagh (2016) argues that actor voice objects freely take specific readings in Tagalog
  - Paul et al. (2015) and Collins (2019) argue that *ang*-phrase definiteness is defeasible and does not come from *ang* itself.

Introduction

- The question boils down to whether markers such as Tagalog *ang* and *ng* are pure determiners, pure case markers, portmanteau case-marking determiners or something else, a question that has been approached from various angles (cf. Kaufman 2017, Hsieh 2020 ch.3 for overviews).

- I will argue that they are port-manteau case-marking determiners and that attempts to derive their interactions with definiteness *purely* through syntactic position are doomed to fail.

- I will not look at the definiteness/specificity of AV objects here (the focus of Sabbagh 2016) but rather focus solely on indefinite nominatives/pivots.

Introduction

- Informal definition of terms:
  - **Existential indefinite**: A referent that is unidentified to the speaker and to the hearer (e.g. If you see a taxi, let me know.)

  - **Specific indefinite**: Identified to the speaker but not the hearer (e.g. So I met an interesting linguist last night.)

  - **Definite**: Uniquely identifiable to both the speaker and the hearer (e.g. The Queen is arriving.)

Introduction

▶ The overall canonical pattern:

(1)   **Philippine-type mapping between grammatical relations and NP interpretations**

  a.   The nominative marked argument receives a definite interpretation

  b.   Non-oblique, non-nominative undergoers receive an indefinite interpretation

  c.   Genitive agents of non-actor voice predicates are unrestricted w.r.t. interpretation

(2)   H<in>abol   ng   aso ang pusa
       <PRF:PV>chase GEN dog NOM cat
       'The/A dog chased the cat.'

(3)   H<um>abol   ng   pusa ang aso
       <AV:PRF>chase GEN cat   NOM dog
       'The dog chased a cat.'

Introduction

- The referentiality of the nominative phrase/pivot has been noted by nearly all descriptions and typological overviews of Philippine languages (Bloomfield 1917; Cena 1977; McFarland 1978; Schachter and Otanes 1982; Schachter 1977, 1976; Himmelmann 1991, 1997, 2005; Kroeger 1993; Foley 1998; Reid 2002; Reid and Liao 2004; Nolasco 2003; Kaufman forthcoming, 2018), although precise descriptions can vary widely.
  - In distinction to this "received wisdom", Nagaya (2011) claims that the *ang* phrase itself is losing referentiality and is being replaced by demonstrative headed phrases in Tagalog (i.e. *yung*) and other Philippine languages.

Introduction

▶ However, NOM+one constructions had largely escaped attention between Adams and Manaster-Ramer (1988) and Paul et al. (2015), with only a few exceptions, such as Himmelmann (2005:368):

> *"It is also common to make indefinite patients and themes the subject if they are going to be major participants in the ongoing discourse, in particular if they are animate."*

(4)   doón   ay ná-kita   nilá   ang isá-ng ma-lakí-ng higante
      DIST.LOC PM RLS.POT-seen 3P.POSS   SPEC one-LK ST-size-LK giant
      'There they saw a great giant . . . [the giant is going to be the main protagonist of the ensuing episode]'

Introduction

- As my title here suggests, I believe the keys to understanding apparent exceptions are:
    - competition between alternative expressions
    - a more nuanced view of *register*

The problem

▶ Collins (2019):

> *"Evidence that <u>ang</u> does not mark definiteness in Tagalog comes from NPs modified by the quantificational expression <u>isang</u>."*

This claim is largely based on data such as (5) (cf. Adams and Manaster-Ramer 1988), which ostensibly shows that the *ang* phrase freely obtains an indefinite interpretation.

(5) D<um>ating   ang isang   lalaki.
     <AV.BEG>arrive NOM one:LNK man
     'A man arrived.'

▶ In competition with this expression, we must at least include (7).

(6) May d<um>ating   na lalaki.
     EXT <AV.BEG>arrive LNK man
     'A man arrived.'

The problem

- Any Tagalog speaker will likely say that both (5) and (6) are perfectly grammatical, and here begin our problems.
- In any language, but especially in a language spoken by millions, each speaker commands multiple registers. Without controlling for register or variety, a positive grammaticality judgment simply means that the utterance is acceptable in at least *one* register.

Problems for the positional analysis

▶ According to Paul et al. (2015) and Collins (2019), *ang* and *ng* are pure case markers and the definite reading is *derived*, either by covert movement of the pivot moves to a pragmatically prominent position in the A' layer (ala Richards 2000; Pearson 2005 inter alia).

▶ But there are many serious problems with that propsal, the most obvious one being:

(7)   a.   Daga!
           rat
           'A rat!/*The rat!'

      b.   Ang daga!
           NOM rat
           'The rat!/*A rat!'

      c.   %Ang isang   daga!
           NOM one:LNK rat
           (OK for 'The other rat!')

Problems for the positional analysis

▶ According to Paul et al. (2015) and Collins (2019), *ang* and *ng* are pure case markers and the definite reading is *derived*, either by covert movement of the pivot moves to a pragmatically prominent position in the A' layer (ala Richards 2000; Pearson 2005 inter alia).

▶ But there are many serious problems with that propsal, the most obvious one being:

(7) a.   Daga!
          rat
          'A rat!/*The rat!'

     b.   Ang daga!
          NOM rat
          'The rat!/*A rat!'

     c.   %Ang isang   daga!
          NOM one:LNK rat
          (OK for 'The other rat!')

▶ In an out of the blue context, with no plausible ellipsis, only the markers could be responsible for the difference in interpretation!

Problems for the positional analysis

▶ Conversely, when the referent in the fragment is uniquely identifiable, *ang* is necessary even in such exclamative fragments:

(8) a. Ang pangulo!
NOM president
'The president!'

b. %Pangulo!
president
(For, 'The president!')

Problems for the positional analysis

▶ Earlier, we noted the indefinite reading in constructions such as (9):

(9)   D<um>ating   kanina ang isang   babae
        <AV.PRF>arrive earlier NOM one:LNK woman
        'A woman arrived earlier.'

Problems for the positional analysis

► Earlier, we noted the indefinite reading in constructions such as (9):

(9)   D<um>ating   kanina ang isang   babae
        <AV.PRF>arrive earlier NOM one:LNK woman
        'A woman arrived earlier.'

► However, the indefinite reading disappears in the fragment response:

(10) a.   Sino   ang d<um>ating   kanina?
          who.NOM NOM <AV.PRF>arrive earlier
          'Who arrived earlier?'

     b. ??Ang isang   babae.
          NOM one:LNK woman
          'The other woman.' (?*'A woman')

► Note that the facts are exactly the opposite of how they have been described. It is not the clausal syntax that licenses the <u>definite</u> reading; it is rather the clause that licenses the <u>indefinite</u> reading.

More problems

- With voiceless predicates such as *kailangan* and *gusto*, *ang* and *ng* are used <u>purely</u> as determiners, seemingly without any case marking function at all.

(11) a. Kailangan ko   ng   susi
       need   1S.GEN GEN key
       'I need a key.'

      b. Kailangan ko   ang   susi
       need   1S.GEN NOM key
       'I need the key.'

(12) a. Gusto ko   ng   asul
       like   1S.GEN GEN blue
       'I like blue/a blue one.'

      b. Gusto ko   ang   asul
       like   1S.GEN NOM key
       'I like the blue one.'

More problems

- In canonical copular clauses such as (13-a), a bare noun phrase like *problema* can only be interpreted indefinitely.
- The same NP, when preceded by *ang* can only be interpreted definitely.
- *Isa* cannot derive an indefinite interpretation in (13-c).

(13) a. Problema iyan
       problem   that.NOM
       'That is a problem.'

   b. Iyan   ang problema
      that.NOM NOM problem
      'That is the problem.'

   c. Iyan   ang isang   problema
      that.NOM NOM one:LNK problem
      'That is the other problem.'
      (Not: 'That's a problem.')

Interim summary

- What is the common denominator in all the contexts that block the indefinite reading of NOM+*one*?
  - Fragments
  - Ellipsis
  - Voiceless predicates (*gusto, kailangan*)
  - Copular clause w/non-verbal predicates

Interim summary

- What is the common denominator in all the contexts that block the indefinite reading of NOM+*one*?
  - Fragments
  - Ellipsis
  - Voiceless predicates (*gusto, kailangan*)
  - Copular clause w/non-verbal predicates

- A lack of voice (or voice options)

Empirical problems in the literature

▶ Furthermore, many of the key judgments in the relevant literature are simply asserted with examples that have two plausible interpretations. For instance,

▶ Paul et al. (2015:372) assert that *jeep* in (14) can be completely novel to both the hearer and listener. But there is nothing in the context that rules out a reading in which the jeep is uniquely identifiable by the speaker.

(14)   D<um>a-dating   ang   isang   dyip
       <AV>IMPRF arrive NOM one:LNK jeep
       'A jeep is arriving.'

▶ Similarly, they claim that *ang isang isda* in (15) can have an existential indefinite reading, but there is nothing in the context that forces one reading or another.

(15)   Kailangang kain-in ni   Pedro ang   isang   isda
       need:LNK   eat-PV   GEN Pedro NOM one:LNK fish
       'Pedro needs to eat a fish' (a specific fish *or any fish at all*)

Empirical problems in the literature

▶ Collins (2019) asserts similar judgments with regard to *ang isang*.

(16)   Ma-i-inis   si   Mary kung mag-pa-pa-tugtog si   John ng   rekord
       NVOL-IMPRF-mad NOM Mary if   AV-CAU-IMPRF-play NOM John GEN record
       'Mary will be annoyed if John plays a record (any record).'

(17)   Ma-i-inis   si   Mary kung i-pa-pa-tugtog   ni   John ang   rekord
       NVOL-IMPRF-mad NOM Mary if   CV-CAU-IMPRF-play GEN John NOM record
       'Mary will be annoyed if John plays the record.'

(18)   Ma-i-inis   si   Mary kung i-pa-pa-tugtog   ni   John ang   isang
       NVOL-IMPRF-mad NOM Mary if   CV-CAU-IMPRF-play GEN John NOM one:LNK
       rekord
       record
       'Mary will be annoyed if John plays a record.'
       Collins: "Any record in general"
       Me: A record known to the speaker but unknown to hearer (specific indef.)

A better example

- Clearly there are <u>certain</u> contexts in which *ang isang* can introduce an argument that is novel to hearer. My empirical claims are the following:
  - Not all contexts allow an indefinite interpretation for *ang isang*
  - *Ang isang* is interpreted specifically, and (almost) never as a true existential indefinite.

- I've already shown evidence for the former claim. The proof for the latter claim is in (19), which only has one plausible interpretation.

(19) a. Nag-ha-hanap   siya   ng asawa
       AV.INIT-IMPRF-search 3S.NOM GEN spouse
       'S/he's looking for a spouse.'

    b. H\<in>a-hanap   niya ang isang asawa
       \<INIT:PV>IMPRF-search 3S.GEN NOM one:LNK spouse
       'S/he is looking for the other spouse/one of the spouses.'
       NOT: 'S/he's looking for a spouse.'

Translationese

- So where do *ang isang* indefinites come from?
- A closer look at some of Collins' data reveals that almost all the examples are from translated texts or from a formal media register.
- I argue that this has come about under influence of European contact languages (Spanish and English).

(20) Binili ko ang isang maliit na aklat sa Biola Bookworm

(21) Maingat na pinipili ng gagamba ang isang dahon, marahil mula sa mga nakalapag sa lupa.

(22) Isinalaysay ni Jesus ang isang talinhaga upang ituro sa kanila na dapat silang laging manalangin...

(23) Subali't hindi ko nakita ang isang larawan ng aking sarili.

(24) ...nakilala nila ang isang bata na si Inari, apo ni Tazuna

(25) Ano ang dapat kong gawin kung nakaligtaan ko ang isang dosis?

Translationese

- One example is especially revealing, as it contains other features only found in the translationese/newspaperese register.

  (26)   Unggoy naka-wala,   k<in>agat   ang isang   bata.
         monkey NVOL.AV-NEG.EXT <PV:PRF>bite NOM one:LNK child
         'Monkey runs away, bites a child.'

- The fronted topic is indefinite, lacks case marking, and is not followed by the topic marker *ay*. The topic is resumed by the genitive pronoun rather than being treated as the pivot.

Translationese

▶ Another example is a poor translation of a religious tract:

(27) 'But I didn't see a reflection of myself.'

translated as:

(28) Subali't hindi ko na-kita ang isang larawan ng
but NEG 1S.GEN NVOL.PV-see NOM one:LNK picture GEN
aking sarili
1S.GEN:LNK self
'I didn't see one of the pictures of myself.'

An analysis

(29)   **Constraints**

a.   COOPERATE: Discourse novel arguments are expressed as indefinites; Arguments that can be uniquely identified by the hearer are expressed as definites (cf. Gärtner 2004).

b.   NOM = FAMILIAR: the *ang* phrase contains a uniquely identifiable referent

c.   TRANSLATIONAL CONGRUENCE: An input expressed as a transitive clause in the contact language is expressed with an undergoer voice in the Philippine language. An input expressed as a plain intransitive clause in the contact language is expressed similarly in the target language.

(30)   **Assumptions**

a.   ∃-closure: Arguments in VP receive existential indef. interpretation

b.   *isa* coerces a specific indefinite reading (cf. Paul et al. 2015:382).

Spoken Tagalog

habol(aso$_{fam}$)(pusa$_{nov}$)	COOPERATION	CONGRUENCE	NOM=fam
a. ☞ $_{VP}$[h\<um>abol ng pusa] ang aso \<AV>chase GEN cat NOM dog			
b. habol-in ng aso ang pusa chase-PV GEN dog NOM cat	*!		*
c. habol-in ng aso ang isang pusa chase-PV GEN dog NOM one:LNK cat			*!

Translationese Tagalog

the dog chases a cat habol(aso$_{fam}$)(pusa$_{nov}$)	COOPERATION	CONGRUENCE	NOM=fam
a. $_{VP}$[h\<um>abol ng pusa] ang aso \<AV>chase GEN cat NOM dog		*!	
b. habol-in ng aso ang pusa chase-PV GEN dog NOM cat	*!		*
c. ☞ habol-in ng aso ang isang pusa chase-PV GEN dog NOM one:LNK cat			*

Spoken Tagalog

habol(aso$_{fam}$)(pusa$_{fam}$)	COOPERATION	CONGRUENCE	NOM=fam
a. $_{VP}$[h<um>abol ng pusa] ang aso <AV>chase GEN cat NOM dog	*!		
b. ☞ habol-in ng aso ang pusa chase-PV GEN dog NOM cat			
c. habol-in ng aso ang isang pusa chase-PV GEN dog NOM one:LNK cat			

Translationese Tagalog

the dog chases the cat habol(aso$_{fam}$)(pusa$_{fam}$)	COOPERATION	CONGRUENCE	NOM=fam
a. $_{VP}$[h<um>abol ng pusa] ang aso <AV>chase GEN cat NOM dog	*!	*	
b. ☞ habol-in ng aso ang pusa chase-PV GEN dog NOM cat			
c. habol-in ng aso ang isang pusa chase-PV GEN dog NOM one:LNK cat	*!		

Spoken Tagalog

habol(aso$_{nov}$)(pusa$_{nov}$)	COOPERATION	CONGRUENCE	NOM=fam
a. $_{VP}$[h<um>abol ng pusa] ang aso <AV>chase GEN cat NOM dog	*!		*
b. ☞ may asong $_{VP}$[h<um>abol ng pusa] EXT dog:LNK <AV>chase GEN cat			
c. habol-in ng aso ang pusa chase-PV GEN dog NOM cat	*!		*
d. habol-in ng aso ang isang pusa chase-PV GEN dog NOM one:LNK cat			*!

Translationese Tagalog

a dog chases a cat habol(aso$_{nov}$)(pusa$_{nov}$)	COOPERATION	CONGRUENCE	NOM=fam
a. $_{VP}$[h<um>abol ng pusa] ang aso <AV>chase GEN cat NOM dog	*!	*	*
b. may asong $_{VP}$[h<um>abol ng pusa] EXT dog:LNK <AV>chase GEN cat		*!	
c. habol-in ng aso ang pusa chase-PV GEN dog NOM cat	*!		*
d. ☞ habol-in ng aso ang isang pusa chase-PV GEN dog NOM one:LNK cat			*

Spoken Tagalog

dating(lalaki$_{nov}$)	COOPERATION	CONGRUENCE	NOM=fam
a.　d<um>ating　ang　lalaki 　　<AV>arrive　NOM　man	*!		*
b.　d<um>ating　ang　isang　lalaki 　　<AV>arrive　NOM　one:LNK　man			*!
c. ☞　may d<um>ating　na　lalaki 　　EXT　<AV>arrive　LNK　man			

Translationese Tagalog

a man arrived dating(lalaki$_{nov}$)	COOPERATION	CONGRUENCE	NOM=fam
a.　d<um>ating　ang　lalaki 　　<AV>arrive　NOM　man	*!		*
b. ☞　d<um>ating　ang　isang　lalaki 　　<AV>arrive　NOM　one:LNK　man			*
c.　may d<um>ating　na　lalaki 　　EXT　<AV>arrive　LNK　man		*!	

The diachronic picture

- If I am correct in attributing the use of *ang isang* to language contact, we should be able to see it emerging in the historical record, as we have good records of several Philippine languages changing over the course of 300-400 years.

- Of course, much of the earlier could have also been 'translationese' and written by non-native speakers, but optimally this can be sorted out through careful analysis.

The diachronic picture

- Doctrina Cristiana (1593) - zero instances of *ang isang*.
- Francisco (Balagtas) Baltazar's (1838) *Florante at Laura* - Only 4 instances of *ang isang*.

- (31)   At saka madalas ilalâ ng tapang,
             ay ang guniguning takot ng kalaban,
             <u>ang isang</u> guerrerong palaring magdiwang
             mababalita na at pangingilagan.

  (32)   Di nag iláng buwan ang sa Reynong tuwà
             at pasasalamat sa pagka-timawa,
             dumating <u>ang isang</u> hukbong maninira
             ng taga-Turkyang masakim na lubha.

  (33)   Nang gabing malungkot na kinabukasan
             wakas na tadhanang ako'i pupugutan,
             sa carcel ay nasok <u>ang isang</u> general
             dala ang patawad na laong pamatáy.

The diachronic picture

(34)   Nang paghanaping ko'y ikáw ang nataós
         pinipilit niyaóng táong balakyót,
         hindi ko nabata't bininit sa búsog
         <u>ang isang</u> palasóng sa lilo'y tumapos..."

The diachronic picture

- Jose Rizal's (1891) *El Filibusterismo*, translated into Tagalog from Spanish by Patricio Mariano in 1911 shows 220 instances of *ang isang*.

- (35) a. Walâng kabuluháng isip-in ang isáng bagay na hindî
  NEG:LNK meaning:LNK think-PV NOM one:LNK thing LNK NEG
  mang-ya-yari.
  AV.DIST-IMPRF-happen
  'There's no meaning to think about a thing that will not happen.'

  b. No vale la pena pensar en lo que no puede
  NEG worth DEF.FEM sorrow think.INF in 3S.MSC.ACC COMP NEG can
  suceder...
  happen.INF
  'It's not worth thinking about that which cannot happen.'

- Why not *mag-isip ng isang bagay*?

The diachronic picture

- (36) a. Ang mğa naka-basa   nğ unang   bahagi nğ kabuhayang itó,
  NOM PL AV.ABL.PRF-read GEN first:LNK part GEN storyLNK   this
  ay ma-a-alaala   marahil ang isáng   matandâng
  TOP PV.ABL-IMPRF-remember perhaps NOM one:LNK old:LNK
  magkakahóy na na-ni-nirahan   doon sa kalookan nğ
  woodchopper LNK AV.DIST.INIT-IMPRF there OBL depth   GEN
  isáng   gubat.
  one:LNK forest

  b. Los   que han leido la primera parte de esta historia, se
  those who have read the first   part of this history REFL
  acordarán   tal vez   de un viejo leñador   que vivía allá en
  will.remember perhaps of an old   woodchopper that lived there in
  el   fondo de un bosque.
  the depth of a   forest.
  'Those who have read the first of this history will perhaps remember
  an old woodchopper that lived there in the depths of the forest.'

The diachronic picture

- (36) a. Ang mǧa naka-basa   nǧ unang   bahagi nǧ kabuhayang itó,
  NOM PL AV.ABL.PRF-read GEN first:LNK part   GEN storyLNK   this
  ay ma-a-alaala   marahil ang isáng   matandâng
  TOP PV.ABL-IMPRF-remember perhaps NOM one:LNK old:LNK
  magkakahóy na na-ni-nirahan   doon sa kalookan nǧ
  woodchopper LNK AV.DIST.INIT-IMPRF there OBL depth   GEN
  isáng   gubat.
  one:LNK forest

  b. Los   que han leido la primera parte de esta historia, se
  those who have read the first   part of this history REFL
  acordarán   tal vez de un viejo leñador   que vivía allá en
  will.remember perhaps of an old   woodchopper that lived there in
  el   fondo de un bosque.
  the depth of a   forest.
  'Those who have read the first of this history will perhaps remember
  an old woodchopper that lived there in the depths of the forest.'

- Why not *makakaalaala marahil ng isáng matandâng magkakahóy*?

The diachronic picture

- (37) a. At nag-ma-tigás na sa hindî pagba-bayad ni i-bigáy <u>ang</u>
  CONJ AV.PRF-ADJ-hard LNK OBL NEG GER-pay nor CV-give NOM
  <u>isáng</u> <u>dangkal</u> man lamang ng kaniyáng lupà
  one:LNK handspan even only GEN 3S.OBL land

  b. Y se negó resueltamente á pagar ni á ceder <u>un palmo</u>
  CONJ REFL refused resolutely to pay:INF nor to cede:INF a palm
  siquiera de sus tierras,
  even of his lands
  'And he refused to pay or cede not a single handspan of his land.'

- Why not *magbigáy ng isáng dangkal man lamang*?

The diachronic picture

- (38) a. Sa mǧa araw na hindî siyá   nag-la-lakbáy,   ay
  OBL PL day LNK NEG 3S.NOM AV.INIT-IMPRF-travel TOP
  d<in>a-daán   niyá   sa pagli-libót sa kaniyáng bukirín
  <PV.INIT-IMPRF-pass 3S.GEN OBL GER-circle OBL 3S.OBL:LNK field
  na dalá ang isáng   baríl...
  LNK carry NOM one:LNK gun

  b. Los días que le   dejaban libres los viajes, los   empleaba
  the days COMP 3S.DAT left   free the travels 3P.MSC.ACC used
  en recorrer sus campos armado de una escopeta,
  in touring his fields armed of a   gun
  'The days that were not occupied by traveling, he would use to tour
  his fields armed with a gun.'

- Why not *dala ng (isang) baril*? Disallowed by undergoer orientation of bare
  root predicates.

The diachronic picture

- (39) a. ¿mayroon pa bang kabanalbanalang bagay na gaya nğ
  EXT still QM:LNK holy:LNK thing LNK like GEN
  pa-kan-in ang isáng iná?
  CAU-eat-PV NOM one:LNK mother

  b. ¿qué cosa hay más sagrada que alimentar á una madre?
  what thing EXT more sacred COMP feed:INF to a mother
  'What is more sacred than feeding a mother?'

- Why not *magpakain ng (isang) ina?*

The cross-linguistic picture

- Let's look at Maguindanawn, a Danaw language of western Mindanao with a different history of language contact. The facts are strikingly similar to what I have claimed for spoken Tagalog. (Many thanks to Shandra Gonsang for all the Maguindanawn examples and her detailed judgments.)

  (40)   Aden babay   a   naka-uma.
         EXT   woman LNK AV.NVOL-arrive
         'A woman arrived.' (Lit: 'There is a woman who arrived.')

  (41)   Naka-uma   i   sakataw a   babay.
         AV.NVOL-arrive NOM one   LNK woman
         'A woman arrived.'

- Gonsang notes that the first is more natural and the second is more formal.

▶ Here we can see the difference between the actor voice, in (42) with an existential indef. object, and the patient voice in (43), with a definite object.

(42)   Pang-ilay   sekanin sa kaluma.
         PROG.AV-seek 3S.NOM OBL spouse
         'S/he is looking for a spouse.'

(43)   Pang-ilay   nin   i   kaluma nin.
         PROG.PV-seek 3S.GEN NOM spouse 3S.GEN
         'S/he is looking for his/her spouse.'

▶ Here, when we try to force an indefinite reading on the nominative argument with *sakataw* 'one', it fails, just as in Tagalog:

(44)   Pang-ilay   nin   i   sakataw a   kaluma.
         PROG.PV-seek 3S.GEN NOM one   LNK spouse
         'He is looking for his other wife.'

The Bible as a multilingual corpus

- Bible translations provide an interesting comparative corpus (although there are many confounding factors; translator, source, etc.).
- Genesis 2:10 provides a good existential indefinite as intransitive subject: 'Now a river flowed out of Eden to water the garden'.
- Both the old Tagalog version and the newer one, introduce 'river' with an existential:

(45) At   may isang   ilog na   l<um>abas   sa   Eden na   d<um>ilig   sa
     CONJ EXT one:LNK river LNK <AV.PRF>exit OBL Eden LNK <AV.PRF>water OBL
     halamanan
     garden

(46) Sa   Eden ay   may ilog   na   d<um>a~daloy   na   siyang
     OBL Eden TOP EXT river LNK <AV.BEG>IMPRF~flow LNK 3S.NOM:LNK
     nag-bi-bigay   ng   tubig sa   halamanan.
     AV-IMPRF-give GEN water OBL garden

The Bible as a multilingual corpus

- But Cebuano differs, using the cardinal strategy with *ang usa ka*:

(47) Ug   mi-gula gikan sa   Eden ang usa ka   suba sa   pag-tubig sa tanaman
      CONJ AV-flow from OBL Eden NOM one COUNT river OBL AV-water OBL garden

- This is not coincidental. Bell (1978) shows that Cebuano, which arguably underwent far heavier contact with Spanish in the early colonial period, diverges from Tagalog in exactly this way; both in licensing indefinite pivots as well as definite AV objects more easily.

The cardinal strategy

- Matthew 8:2: 'And behold, there came to him a leper...'

(48) *Tagalog*
     At   narito, l<um>apit   sa   kaniya ang isang   ketongin
     and here   <AV:PRF>near OBL 3S.OBL NOM one:LNK leper

(49) *Ilokano*
     Imma-sideg kenkuana ti   maysa a   lalaki nga agkukutel
     AV.PRF-near 3s.OBL   NOM one   LNK man LNK leper

(50) *Samareño*
     Hin-marani ha   iya in   usa nga sanlahon
     AV.PRF-near OBL 3s   NOM one LNK leper

(51) *Pangasinan*
     L<inm>ad   sikatoy sakey a   toon   akating
     <AV.PRF>near 3S.OBL one   LNK man:LNK leper

Existential strategy > cardinal strategy

(52) *Cebuano* (older version = existential, new revised = cardinal)

a.   Ug ania karon, usa ka   sanlahon mi-duol
     and EXT now   one COUNT leper   AV-near

b.   Unya mi-duol kaniya ang usa ka   sanlahon
     then AV-near 3S.OBL NOM one COUNT leper

The existential strategy

(53) *Bikol Buhi'non*

Kina agko usad na   pudpurun yo   r<omin>ani   sa   sakanya.
CONJ EXT   one   LNK leper   NOM <AV.PRF>near OBL 3s

(54) *Botolan Sambal*

Hapa-eg, ma-in napa-karani konay   mihay   tawoy   ma-in liproso
then   EXT   PRF.CAU-near 3s.OBL:LNK one:LNK person:LNK EXT   leprosy

(55) *Sambal*

Tongwa, main nako   kona   nin a-say lalaki a   main masakit kitong.
then   EXT   AV.PRF.near 3s.OBL ?   ?-NOM person LNK EXT   sickness leprosy

(56) *Matigsalug*

Ne   due sabeka ne   etew   ne   ibungen ne   mig-pa-rani   kandin
CONJ EXT one   LNK person LNK leprosy LNK AV.PRF-CAU-near 3s.OBL

The existential strategy

(57) *Manobo Agusan*

Na,   meyduon otow   no   pig-sangla   no   mig-duguk   ki   Jesus
then EXT   person LNK PV.PRF-leprosy LNK AV.PRF-approach OBL Jesus

(58) *Yakan*

Manjari, niyaʔ pī   pu si   Isa   dambuwaʔ aʔa   inipul.
then   EXT   approachʔ toʔ PERS Jesus CLS   person LEPER

(59) *Sinama*

Manjari aniyaʔ aʔa   niʔipul p<in>aʔan   ni   si   Isa
then   EXT   person LEPER <PV>approach 3S.GEN NOM Jesus CLS

(60) *Bantoanon*

Ag   inggwa it   usa=ng   tawo=ng   di sakit   nak kitong nak nag-pa-yungot
CONJ EXT   NOM one=LNK person=LNK ? sickness LNK leprosy LNK AV.PRF-CAU-near

Exceptional existential examples

(61) *Hiligaynon*

Dayon may isa ka aruon nga nag-pa-lapit sa iya,
then EXT one COUNT leper LNK AV.PRF-CAU-near OBL 3s

(62) *Kinaray-a*

Dayon, may sangka aruon nga nag-pa-rapit
then EXT one leper LNK PRF-CAU-near

(63) *Romblomanon*

May isa ka tawo nga kitungon ang nag-pa-lapit sa iya.
EXT one COUNT person LNK leper NOM AV-CAU-near OBL 3s

Exceptional cardinal languages

(64) *Eastern Kalagan*

Ansinyan d<yom>ood kanan yang sangka otaw na sanglaun.
then   <AV.PRF>near 3S.OBL NOM ONE.COUNT person LNK leper

(65) *Pahanan Agta*

Tapos ay te bigla a umm-adeni ni Jesus a essa a tolay a
then ? EXT suddenly LNK AV.PRF-near OBL Jesus LNK one LNK person LNK
te sakit a ketong.
EXT sickness LNK leprosy

(66) *Ayta Abellen*

Haanin, h<inum>aley ya kana ye maghay lakin kinating
?   <AV.PRF>near 3S.NOM 3S.OBL NOM one:LNK man:LNK leper

(67) *Mag-antsi Ayta*

D<inum>ani kana ya mihay lalaki ya nag-hakit ketong
<AV.PRF>near 3S.OBL NOM one:LNK man NOM AV.PRF-sickness leprosy

Exceptional cardinal languages

(68) *Brooke's Point Palawano*

K<imin>abi?   eset kenye sembatung taaw   neng maya eldew-eldew beke?
<AV.PRF>approach OBL 3S.OBL one:CLAS   person LNK   EXT   leprosy   PRT

(69) *Paranan*

Umm-adeni dikona en essa a   tolay   a   kinetong
AV.PRF-near 3S.OBL ?   one LNK person LNK leper

(70) *Maranao*

Na   miy-obay   rekaniyan so   sakataw a   mama a   pekebowa
CONJ AV.PRF-approach 3S.OBL   NOM CLS   LNK man LNK leper

(71) *Hanunoo*

Nag-pa-karani   sa   kanya ti   usa ka   tawu   may batas,
AV.PRF-CAU-near OBL 3S.OBL NOM one COUNT person EXT leprosy

(72) *Mangali Kalinga*

Baag?en umm-adani kan siya lalaki ye   na-leprosy
then   AV.PRF-near OBL 3s man   LNK ADJ-leprosy

Conclusion

- I have highlighted serious empirical flaws in the recent literature on Tagalog NP-interpretation and offered the outlines of a more sociolinguistically informed, competition-based analysis that I believe better accounts for Philippine linguistic reality.

- The overall picture is that Philippine languages start with a *bayanihan* system of NP-interpretation with cooperative labor between the case marking determiners and the syntax.

- But via contact, some languages have developed a register with a more Indo-European style of NP-interpretation, where most of the work takes place within the DP itself via definite and indefinite determiners.

- To a large extent, this supports the "traditionalist" account for Philippine-type languages.

Conclusion

- Other factors involved, which deserve more attention:
- A possible reduction of referentiality in the nominative as it competes with pivot phrases headed by bleached demonstratives (*yung*) (Nagaya 2011).
- A possible reprioritization of Nolasco's (2003) transitivity parameters such that affectedness, for instance, takes priority over patient definiteness in determining voice choice within a particular register.

References I

Adams, Karen L., and Alexis Manaster-Ramer. 1988. Some questions of topic/focus choice in Tagalog. Oceanic Linguistics 27:79–101.

Bell, Sarah J. 1978. Two differences in definiteness in Cebuano and Tagalog. Oceanic Linguistics 17:1–9.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1917. Tagalog Texts with Grammatical Analysis. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Cena, Resty M. 1977. Patient primacy in Tagalog. Paper presented at the LSA Annual Meeting, Chicago.

Collins, James. 2019. Definiteness determined by syntax: A case study in Tagalog. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 37:1367–1420.

Foley, William A. 1998. Symmetrical voice systems and precategoriality in philippine languages. Paper presented at the 3rd LFG conference, Brisbane.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 1991. The Philippine challenge to universal grammar. Institute for Linguistics, University of Köln Working Papers 15.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 1997. Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase: Zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur. Number 362 in Linguistische Arbeiten. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2005. Tagalog. In The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar, ed. Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus Himmelmann, 350–376. London: Routledge.

References II

Kaufman, Daniel. 2018. Austronesian predication and the emergence of biclausal clefts in Indonesian languages. In Perspectives on information structure in Austronesian languages, ed. Sonja Riesberg, Asako Shiohara, and Atsuko Utsumi, Studies in Diversity Linguistics, 207–245. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Kaufman, Daniel. forthcoming. The languages of central and southern Philippines. In Oxford Guide to the Malayo-Polynesian languages of Southeast Asia, ed. Alexander Adelaar and Antoinette Schapper. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kroeger, Paul. 1993. Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog. Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University.

McFarland, C. D. 1978. Definite objects and subject selection in Philippine languages. In Studies in Philippine Linguistics, ed. C. Edrial-Luzares and A. Hale, volume 2, 139–182. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Nagaya, Naonori. 2011. Rise and fall of referentiality: articles in Philippine languages. In Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives, ed. Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta, and Janick Wrona, 589–626. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Nolasco, Ricardo Ma. 2003. Ang pagkaergatibo at pagkatransitibo ng mga wikang pilipino: Isang pagsusuri sa sistemang bose. Doctoral Dissertation, University of the Philippines, Diliman.

Paul, Ileana, Key Cortes, and Lareina Milambiling. 2015. Definiteness without D: The case of ang and ng in Tagalog. Canadian Journal of Linguistics 60:361–390.

Pearson, Matthew. 2005. The Malagasy subject/topic as an A′-element. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 23:381–457.

References III

Reid, Lawrence A, and Hsiu-chuan Liao. 2004. A brief syntactic typology of Philippine languages. Language and Linguistics 5:433.

Reid, Lawrence Andrew. 2002. Determiners, nouns, or what? problems in the analysis of some commonly occurring forms in philippine languages. Oceanic Linguistics 41:295–309.

Richards, Norvin. 2000. Another look at Tagalog subjects. In Formal Issues in Austronesian Linguistics, ed. Ileana Paul, Vivianne Phillips, and Lisa Travis, 105–116. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: Topic, actor, actor- topic, or none of the above. In Subject and Topic, ed. Charles Li, 491–518. New York: Academic Press.

Schachter, Paul. 1977. Reference-related and role-related properties of subjects. In Grammatical Relations, ed. Peter Cole and Jerry Saddock, Syntax and Semantics 8, 279–306. New York: Academic Press.

Schachter, Paul, and Fe T Otanes. 1982. Tagalog Reference Grammar. University of California Press.