Appendix:


In a lexicalised grammar where verbal categories project all lexical restrictions on combinatory modalities and syntactic information such as case and agreement, all of these options are possible.
Tagalog’s voice system, and cases.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>DAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common noun markers:</strong></td>
<td><em>ang</em></td>
<td><em>ng</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal name markers:</strong></td>
<td><em>si</em></td>
<td><em>ni</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All data in this section are from Kroeger 1993.*
‘The man bought (*the) fish at the store.’

‘The man bought the fish at the store.’

‘The man bought fish at the store.’
Binding possibilities are such that less oblique arguments can bind more obliques, independent of case:

*Nag-iisip sila sa=kanilang sarili*

AV-think.about NOM.they DAT=their self

‘They think about themselves.’

* Iniisip sila ng kanilang sarili *

DV.think.about NOM.they GEN their self

‘They think about themselves.’

* Sinaktan ng=babae ang=kaniyang sarili *

DV.hurt GEN=woman NOM=her self

‘A/the woman hurt herself.’
Voice system of Tagalog seems to set up the following correspondence to semantic arguments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>GEN/DAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>DAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If we replace NOM with ABS, and GEN with ERG, we get

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>ERG/DAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV</td>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>DAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective Voice is considered more basic than Active Voice in Tagalog studies.
Every voiced verbal clause must have an *ang*-NP, i.e. absolutive.

But glossing Tagalog as an ergative language needs further support.

Tagalog’s relativisation is pivotal, headed by the linker *ng*: Only *ang*-marked NPs can be relativised, independent of their LF role:

* Iyon ang=baro=ng [b-um-ili ang=babae] S/NP_{erg}
  that ABS=dress=LNK PERF.AV-buy ABS=woman
  * for ‘That’s the dress that a/the woman bought.’

* Iyon ang=babae=ng [b-in-ili ang=baro] S/NP_{erg}
  that ABS=woman=LNK PERF-buy.OV ABS=dress
  * for ‘That’s a/the woman who bought a dress.’
In OV, the patient can extract, although the agent cannot:

\[
\text{lyon ang=baro=ng } [\text{b-in-ili } ng=babae ] \text{S/NP}_{abs}
\]
	hath \text{ABS=dress=LNK PERF-buy.OV ERG=woman}

‘That’s the dress that a/the woman bought.’

If linker (relative marker) is a pivot in the lexicon, these facts follow. And it will be the kind of pivot that we see in ergative languages:
‘That’s the dress that a/the woman bought.’
Coordination does not seem to be asymmetric: any NP can be shared across conjuncts:

[Huhugasan ko] at [pupunasan mo] ang=mga=pinggan
FUT-wash-DV 1.SG.ERG and FUT-dry-DV 2.SG.ERG ABS=PL=dish
‘I will wash and you dry the dishes.’

?*[Niluto ang=pagkain] at [hinugasan ang=mga=pinggan] ni=Josie
PERF-cook-OV ABS=food and PERF-wash–DV ABS=PL=dish ERG=J
for ‘The food was cooked and the dishes washed by Josie.’

?*[Nanghuhuli ang=ama ko] at [nagtitinda ang=ina ko] ng=isda
AV(antierg).IMPERF-catch ABS=father my and AV.IMPERF(antierg)-sell ABS=mother my ERG=fish
for ‘My father catches and my mother sells fish.’
Maria gave a present and the children sent a letter to Juan.

‘Maria gave a present and the children sent a letter to Juan.’

Tagalog seems to be a partially ergative language because there are pivots in the lexicon (of ergative kind; ie. missing absolutive NPs).
Foley (1998) considers Tagalog to be a third type distinct from ergative and accusative patterns. Machlachlan and Nakamura agree on Tagalog’s ergativity, and so do Payne (1982) and de Guzman (1978), but Guilfoyle et al. (1992) consider it accusative.

Bozsahin and Steedman (2005) claim that there is no need to posit an accusative sub-system for Tagalog due to AV voice; so it is not mixed ergative.
A strictly lexicalised grammar equipped with PLA predicts that, if subject is not discernible in the lexical syntactic type of a verb, there can be no asymmetry.

This seems to be borne out in Tagalog: verbs in recent past do not carry voice, and none of their arguments are *ang*-marked (Baldridge, 2004).
And, any argument can extract:

*Kabibili* (*lang ni*) *Juan ng tela*

buy-RECPAST just ERG J ERG cloth

‘Juan has just bought some cloth.’

*Sino ang kabibili* (*lang ng tela*)?

who ABS buy-RECPAST just ERG cloth

‘Who has just bought some cloth?’

*Ano ang kabibili* (*lang ni Juan*)?

what ABS buy-RECPAST just ERG J

‘What has Juan just bought?’