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This paper presents an argument concerning the status of certain verbal affixes in Tagalog. Rather than promoting specific arguments to subject (or topic, focus, etc.), they change the verb's argument structure. The resultant verb is passive by default. Evidence will be drawn from comparison with affixes in other languages.

1. Overview

In this paper I present an argument concerning the interaction of voice and verb-deriving morphology in Tagalog. The standard analysis of, for instance, the affix -an is that it attaches to transitive verbs; the function of this affix is to promote a designated argument of the verb (the "location" argument) to subject. In this analysis, Tagalog has many kinds of passive voices: a "plain" passive with -in, which passivizes the patient, a conveyance passive with i-, which passivizes the theme, a "locational" passive with -an, which passivizes the location, etc. etc. Thus, a simple verb like 'plant', as in Celia planted flowers in the garden, has two passives. One (with i-) promotes flowers to subject, the other (with -an) promotes the garden to subject. This analysis can be called the MULTIPLE PASSIVE ANALYSIS.

I will argue for a different interpretation. The affixes form particular types of verbs — that, and nothing else, is their function. The verbs thus formed are passive by default. Consequently, Tagalog has only one passive, although it has many verb types. The suffix -an can be compared to be- in besprinkle; it specifies a semantic relation between the verb and its deep-object. The voice system then promotes the deep-object to subject. This analysis can be called the TWO-STAGE ANALYSIS.

The argument is based on a comparison with affixes in other languages, notably Dutch and Indonesian. These affixes appear to have the same functions as -an, except that they are neutral as to the voice of the verb. Similar syncretisms exist in the case of i-. Therefore, it must be possible to characterize the functions of these affixes independently of the voice system.

The paper is structured as follows. I section 2 I will present the basic data,that is,
the morphological syncretisms aluded to above. In section 3 I will briefly discuss some basic notions involved in these syncretisms, and make explicit some assumptions about how they can arise. In section 4, I demonstrate that the Dutch and Indonesian affixes are independent of voice. Also, I will briefly sketch the Tagalog voice system. Section 5 presents the main argument, based on the above preliminaries.

2. Remarkable correspondences

From a diachronic perspective, nothing changes as fast as the function range of an affix. It is surprising that three languages — Tagalog, Indonesian, and Dutch — share a very specific affix with complex behavior. In Dutch, it comes out as be-, in Tagalog as -an, in Indonesian as -i. To get a feel for the affix -an/-i/be-, consider words like belated, bespectacled, beloved, to besmear, and to belabour. Some of them only occur as adjective, not as verb. But the affix is, historically, the same as the Dutch variant of -an/-i/be-. The three affixes derive verbs that belong to a broad and varied spectrum of verb classes. Most often, it is possible to predict from the nature of the stem what the derived verb will be. Adjectives like ‘pregnant’ derive verbs like ‘to make pregnant’. Nouns like ‘weapon’ derive verbs like ‘to provide with weapons’. Verbs derived from ‘to plant’ and ‘to spray’ are roughly synonymous with their morphologically simplex base, but the affixation goes along with the appearance of a preposition meaning ‘with’. Table 1 is a schematic overview of similarities — which is not to say that there are no differences. A similarly remarkable syncretism is that between Tagalog i- and Indonesian -kan. As shown in table 2, they have roughly the same range of functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Indon.</th>
<th>Tagalog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be-</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>pregnant to make pregnant</td>
<td>wapen bewapenen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A + aff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(II)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>weapon to give weapons</td>
<td>zwanger bezwangeren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A + aff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(III)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>to plant x in y to plant y with x</td>
<td>planten beplanten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V + aff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IV)</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>to send x to y to send y x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I)</th>
<th>A + aff</th>
<th>free to set free</th>
<th>bebas bebaskan</th>
<th>bulós ibulós</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(II)</td>
<td>N + aff</td>
<td>pocket to pocket</td>
<td>kantong kantongan</td>
<td>bulsá ibulsá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(III)</td>
<td>V + aff</td>
<td>to plant to plant (smt) in (smt)</td>
<td>tanam tanamkan</td>
<td>taním itanim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V + aff</td>
<td>to go inside (of) to bring inside (of)</td>
<td>'masuk masukkan</td>
<td>pasók ipasók</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IV)</td>
<td>V + aff</td>
<td>to buy (smt) to buy (smt)</td>
<td>beli belikan</td>
<td>bili ibili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(V)</td>
<td>V + aff</td>
<td>to ask for to ask earnestly for</td>
<td>mohon mohonkan</td>
<td>luhog (um-) iluhog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(VI)</td>
<td>V + aff</td>
<td>to buy, go shopping to spend (smt)</td>
<td>belanja belanjakan</td>
<td>bili ibili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(VII)</td>
<td>V + aff</td>
<td>to sit to seat (smt)</td>
<td>duduk dudukkan</td>
<td>upó (um-) iupó</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

In short, the same morphological patterns consistently recur cross-linguistically — patterns labyrinthine enough to rule out sheer coincidence. Which properties of universal grammar are responsible for this recurrence? There is little point in framing
the question in a Chomskian manner, and ask how speakers of these languages "know" or "cognize" — whatever that means — the morphological regularities at hand. Speakers of Tagalog and Indonesian know that "be-pregnant" means 'to make pregnant' and can be used literally, while speakers of Dutch know that the same verb in their language means the same but can only be used non-literally in certain types of archaic collocations, as in De lucht was bezwangerd van een zoete geur "The air was filled (lit. made-pregnant) with a sweet fragrance." In other words, they know what the conventions are that govern the use of these verbs. The question, then, is how it can be that conventions that arise in these different speech communities resemble each other so closely, without being identical.

Baker and Hacker (1984: 374f) compare the system of a language to the network of trunk roads in Brittain. "One is predisposed to view the road system ... as the more or less haphazard product of a host of piecemeal improvements (and natural disasters!) spread over two millenia." This picture applies especially aptly to morphological systems of the type at hand. Philipinos, Indonesians, and Dutchmen have, through the ages, haphazardly constructed a morphological trunk-road system. However, the landscape appears to be virtually the same in all three cases: an abyss here, an important well there, a place particularly suited for shelter a few miles in that direction. It is not surprizing to find that the road-networks that actually evolved closely resemble each other, without being identical. The landscape, then, is a biologically determined part of the human mind. I will sharpen these ideas in the next section.

It will not be possible, however, to go very deeply into these matters; the purpose of this paper is merely to argue for a particular interpretation of the status of the affixes -an and i- in Tagalog. It is essential for the argument to be sound (as opposed to valid) that the syncretisms be investigated and analysed in detail, and that the conceptual issues involved in explaining these syncretisms are made explicit and coherent. I hope to come back to these issues at another occasion. In the present article I will content myself with the basic data presented above — putting aside many important details — and some sketchy remarks about the nature of the syncretisms in the next section, proceeding as quickly as possible to the main argument. The background assumptions into which the following discussion is embedded are — very roughly speaking — those of Reichling (1935) and Uhlenbeck (1978). Affixes are interpreted as vectors that locate the affixed word within a taxonomical space, usually relative to a stem. In this framework, it does not make sense to say that affixes have meanings, or that they can be polysemous.
3. How many functions can go in an affix?

The function of an affix in a word is exhaustively determined by the properties of the stem and those of the word. Each occurrence of an affix in the lexicon determines a unique function; an affix has at least as many functions as there are words containing that affix. Although it is tempting to think that the five functions of, say, Tagalog -an in table 1 are, in some sense, “really” only one abstract function, this is not true at any fundamental theoretical level. What matters is that the five functions, as defined by the five -an-words plus their stems, are to some extent similar. One can still entertain an informal, pretheoretical concept of identity. For instance, one can sensibly say that Tagalog -an in the five functions is “one” affix, but that the Tagalog affix -an that, say, forms lungtián ‘greenish’ from lungti ‘green’ constitutes a “different” affix. To put it more precisely, one would have to say that the former five functions of the affix are relatively more similar to each other than any of them is similar to its function in the Tagalog word for ‘greenish’. Think of the affixes in the table as constituting a species. Darwinism has shown that the concept of species is an arbitrary convention, handy for biologists, but devoid of theoretical status (Dennet 1995). It does not matter whether we want to view the lesser black-backed gull and the herring gull as one species, or, for that matter, coyotes, wolves and dogs. What matters is what their location is relative to each other in the design space of organisms.

The specific function of an affix in a word is atomic. We can define taxonomically higher groupings as structured conglomerates of atomic functions. These conglomerates, in as far as they are homogeneous relative to some measure of similarity, correspond to the traditional, intuitive idea of the function of an affix.

We can define similarity between affix functions as a function of similarity between the derived words. To see this, consider the word besprinkle. The stem -sprinkle indicates that the word is similar to the verb sprinkle, the prefix be- indicates similarity with besmear, bestride, beset, betray, bewitch, but also with below, before, and beyond. Inspection of the data shows that besprinkle is more akin to besmear than to beyond, and that sprinkle is more akin to smear than to yon. This must be reflected in the classification of the functions that be- has in all these examples.

Explicit reference to the stem of a derived word is not even necessary if it is true — as I will assume — that stem properties can constitute a secondary taxonomic criterion in the lexicon of derived verbs. Thus, similarity can now be characterized as follows: the more similar two words derived by an affix, the more similar the functions of the affix in those two instances. The function range of an affix constitutes a contiguous area to the extent that the range of derived words is a contiguous area in the design
space of words — the virtual lexicon.

All this does not yet suffice to explain the recurrence of syncretisms. Why would affixes strive to accumulate a contiguous range of functions? This follows from the purposes that language in general, and morphology in particular, are designed to serve: to facilitate communication. Uhlenbeck (1978) defines morphology as the means by which the lexicon can be systematically expanded. Consider what would happen if an affix would expand the lexicon in unsystematic ways. An individual language user can do this freely, idiosyncratically forming new words *ad lib* with his own personal affix. But other language users would be unable to tell the meaning of those words, unless by explicit instruction, and presumably they also would have difficulty remembering them. This puts selectional pressure on the evolution of affixes: an affix is more highly valued if its function range constitutes a contiguous area. It now follows that a morphological process of the type $x + \text{affix} \rightarrow y$ has a greater chance to arise if the range of $y$ is more systematically constrained.

The tendency to systematicity is a selectional bias, not a principle of language. It leaves open the possibility to find affixes with a function range that consists of rather haphazard blotches with lots of empty space in between. For instance, there would be nothing surprizing about a language that has an affix, say, -prüt, that forms causatives from, say, many or most class VIII verbs — whatever that may be — and also diminutives from a small but remarkable group of feminine nouns. On the (reasonable) assumption that causatives and diminutives are located in very different areas in the virtual lexicon, it would be surprizing to find in some other, historically unrelated, language an affix that would have almost exactly the same range of atomic functions. The chances that such an affix evolves on two independent occasions are vanishingly small, because no selectional considerations would favor a development in that direction. These considerations make comparative morphology a valuable tool for investigating the innate properties of the lexicon.

In sum, the only way to make sense of the syncretisms of the type found in table 1.1 is to assume that the lexicon is structured. This structure provides a measure of similarity, which, in turn, underlies the selectional pressure to which the evolution of affixes is subject: affixes strive to have homogeneous conglomerates of functions. In this sense, affixes can be said to partition the lexicon. The data discussed in section 2 can now be interpreted as showing that each of the three affixes in table 1 partitions the lexicon in (roughly) the same way; the same goes for the two affixes in table 2. This proposal will play a key role in the argument to be developed below.
4. Voice

4.1. Overview. The central argument in this paper concerns the status of the Tagalog affixes -an and i- within the Tagalog voice system. The two affixes have close counterparts in Indonesian and Dutch, as shown earlier. In the next two subsections, I will demonstrate that the Indonesian and Dutch affixes are neutral as to voice. Section 4.3 will deal briefly with some general questions concerning the Tagalog voice system.

4.2. Voice in Dutch. The voice system of Dutch resembles that of English so closely that it hardly deserves discussion here. It involves a morphologically derived participial form of the verb and a copula, worden ‘be (passive)’ (the verb also has other uses, including ‘become’). The participle is formed from the stem by either suffixing it with -d or -t, or by ablaut, -en-suffixation, suppletion etc. etc. in the case of strong stems (built, drunk, taken, come). In addition, however, a prefix, ge-, is added, unless the verb stem already contains a prefix. Thus, slaan ‘to hit’ yields geslagen, but beplanten ‘to plant (st) with (st)’, which has prefix be-, yields beplant, not *gebeplant. In this limited sense, there is interaction between affixation with be- and the voice system. Like in English, the agent is demoted into an optional ‘by’-phrase. Sample sentences are given in (1). Note that affixation of planten ‘to plant’ with be- yields a verb that only occurs in the ‘spray-with’ construction. Like in English, it is the direct object that passivizes.

Given that in this pertinent construction, the ‘location’ of planting is the direct object, it will become subject. This is, strictly speaking, not interaction of the two morphological systems. The one takes as input the output of the other.

(1)  

Gerard beplant de tuin met bloemen

Gerard be.plant the garden with flowers

‘Gerard plants the garden with flowers’

De tuin werd beplant met bloemen (door Gerard)

the garden was be.plant with flowers (by Gerard)

‘The garden was planted with flowers (by Gerard)’

4.3. Voice in Indonesian. Like most Austronesian languages in the area, Indonesian has a passive voice form characterized by two important, presumably correlated properties that clearly set it apart from the passive in English c.s. In the first place, the agent is a bare, non-demoted noun phrase; secondly, passive sentences do not have the
peculiar discourse-functional properties of passive sentences in English. That is, the proper translation of a passive sentence in Indonesian is very often a plain active sentence in English (Myhill 1992). The non-demoted agent is verb-adjacent. I assume that it is marked with genitive case. Cases are not morphologically marked in Indonesian; however, the typology of Austronesian languages suggests that this is so, as I have argued elsewhere (Voskuil 1993).

The Indonesian transitive verb has four voice forms: morphological active and passive, and bare active and passive. The active/passive alternation is characterized by a difference in case patterns: nominative agent, accusative patient (active); and nominative patient, genitive agent (passive). The morphological/bare voice alternation is characterized by the form of the verb (presence vs. absence of meN- (active) and di- (passive)), and constituent order (agent-verb in the bare passive, verb-agent in the morphological passive). In the bare passive, the agent must be referential, preferably a proper name or referential pronoun. In the morphological passive, a genitive agent must be third person. The morphological passive can also take an agent in a by-phrase, in which case there is no person restriction on the agent; or it can take no agent at all. In those cases, the sentence has all the discourse-functional properties of a passive sentence in English (Myhill 1992). There are many tests for subjechthood; these show that in those sentence types analysed as passive, it is the deep-object (the “patient”) that has the subject function. For discussion of these tests, I refer to Chung (1976).

(2) Dia membaca buku itu
3s meN.read book that
‘She reads the book’

(3) Buku itu dibaca -nya
book that di.read 3s
‘She reads the book (or: the book is read by her)

---

1 There is some controversy about the bare active; prescriptive and descriptive sources alike often claim that the construction is unacceptable or, at the very least, “sub-standard”. I submit that the construction is typical of colloquial Indonesian, but corpus research and research with informants — on which I hope to report on another occasion — lead me to the conviction that the bare active is perfectly ordinary, even “standard” Indonesian.
(4) **Buku itu dibaca oleh -nya** (morph. passive + by)
book that di.read by 3s
‘The book is read by her’

(5) **Dia telah baca buku itu** (bare active)
3s PERF read book that
‘She has read the book’

(6) **Buku itu telah dia baca** (bare passive)
book that PERF 3s read
‘She has read the book’

In one sense, lexical morphology of the type discussed in section 2 does not interact with voice at all — broadly speaking. The affixes in question, -i and -kan, derive verbs from a variety of bases. The derived verb simply behaves as underived transitive verbs of the type baca ‘to read’ do: it has four voice forms, etc. etc.

In another sense, it does interact, namely, in as far as it alters the subcategorization properties of the base; thus, **tanami** ‘to plant (st) with (st)’ stands in a different semantic relation to the direct object than **tanam** ‘to plant (st)’. But the direct object, independent of its semantic interpretation, is syntactically just a direct object. The following examples show this for the morphological voices; the bare voices work analogously.

(7) **Mayang menanam bunga mawar di kebun** (active)
Mayang meN.plant roses in garden
‘Mayang planted roses in the garden’

(8) **Bunga mawar ditanam Mayang di kebun** (passive)
roses di.plant Mayang in garden
‘Roses were planted in the garden by Mayang’

(9) **Mayang menanami kebun dengan bunga mawar** (active)
Mayang meN.plant.i garden with roses
‘Mayang planted the garden with roses’
(10)  Kebun ditanami  Mayang dengan bunga mawar  (passive)
garden di.plant.i Mayang with roses
‘The garden was planted with roses by Mayang’

Thus, there are two systems of verbal morphology, a verb-forming one, and one concerned with voice. They can be thought of as independent algorithms. Following certain rules, the one derives a transitive verb; the other, following other rules, derives a voice form — from a transitive verb.

In the details, there appear to be ‘‘real’’ interactions — cases where unexpected distributional properties in both systems correlate. For instance, in Classical Malay, verbs with -i are overwhelmingly passive, in more than 95% of the cases (Cumming 1994). This is an important fact, because, as we will see, in Tagalog a similar situation is found: the same verbs, derived with -an or i-, are 100% passive — they do not even show explicit markers for being passive.

4.4. Voice in Tagalog. Bloomfield’s (1916) definition of a passive verb is a transitive verb in a construction where something else than the agent is the subject. Is what many linguists, including Bloomfield (1917), consider the subject in Tagalog indeed the subject? If not, then the Tagalog passive is not a passive. I will argue that the question is only indirectly important to the issue of Tagalog verbal morphology, because the pertinent affixes — -an and i- — are not part of the passive (or non-passive) system at all. This is a controversial standpoint, since the morphology is standardly taken to be the very engine that drives the ‘‘voice’’ machinery. It is therefore important to see clearly what the issues are that surround the notions subject, passive, and the like.

Let me first describe the Tagalog voice system in essentially Bloomfield’s terms, and then explain the problems that are often thought to suggest a different analysis. Consider the sentences in (11) and (12), which are built around the verb basa (-um-, -in) ‘to read’.

(11)  Bumasa  siyá  ng libro
PERF.um.read  3s.NOM  ACC  book
‘He read a book (not: He read the book)’

(12)  Binasa  niyá  ang libro
PERF.read.in  3s.GEN  NOM  book
‘He read the book’
The parenthesized affixes denote the affix class the verb belongs to: it forms its active with -um-, and its passive with -in. This particular passive affix is dropped when the verb carries the perfective or, in combination with reduplication, imperfective marker for passive verbs, the infix -in-, so that it does not show in (12). In my terms, the case marker ng (pronounced ‘‘nang’’) in (11) marks accusative case, while it marks genitive case in (12) — it does not show up, since pronouns have suppletive forms instead of case markers, but cf. Binasa ng lalaki ang libro ‘‘The man (GEN) read the book (NOM),’’ with ng lalaki ‘‘man’’ for the 3s genitive pronoun niyā ‘his’. The subject is preceded by the nominative marker ang. Note that the passive sentence does not have the discourse functional properties of passive sentences in English; it normally translates into an active sentence in English, as do Indonesian passive sentences (Myhill 1992).

The distinction between accusative and genitive case is not always made because they look identical (cf. ang libro niyā ‘NOM book 3s.Gen, i.e., his book’ and ang libro ng lalaki ‘NOM book GEN man, i.e., the man’s book’). But the two functions express systematically different semantic relations — the genitive agent function expresses the agent-relation, the accusative direct object function expresses a broad range of relations, as in English. Moreover, there is a constraint on definite direct objects, which does not hold for the genitive agent. As indicated, (11) cannot be interpreted as if the book were a definite book (Adams and Manaster-Ramer 1988). Although the precise extent of the condition is unclear, and although there exist specific classes of counterexamples, the broad outlines are beyond doubt. Pronouns, which are clearly definite, do not occur in the object function; a sentence like ‘‘He hit me’’ comes out as passive (Pinukól niyá akó, with nominative 1s pronoun akó); the active, with nominative 3s pronoun siyá and genitive 1s ko, is completely out (*Pumukól ko siyá). Thus, there is a distinction to make. Cross-linguistic evidence leads to associating the passive agent with genitive case, and the active direct object with accusative (Voskuil 1993).

The question that concerns us at this point is whether the alternation in (11)–(12) is a passive alternation at all. There are many facts that would suggest that it does, but problems exist, as first noted by Schachter (1975). The most fundamental of these

---

---

2 There is an alternative strategy, which consists in marking the definite object with oblique case (Pumukól siyá sa akin). Although I will frequently make use of this strategy in examples to be discussed, the precise nature of this construction is not clear. Examples in the literature typically involve verbs that undergo the conative alternation in English (He hit (at) me); but it is unclear whether all verbs systematically allow for this.
concern binding and control: the "genitive agent" relates to the ang-phrase as if the former were a subject, and the latter a direct object that has undergone topicalization of sorts. If true, that would entail ang should be glossed as a topicalization marker — objects can, as it happens, be topicalized —, and the "genitive agent" in (12) is really the nominative subject. For further discussion, I refer to Richards (this volume) and references cited there.

A good argument in favor of "ang-marks-subject" and against "ang-marks-topic" is that only noun phrases that are selected by the verb can be marked with ang — below, I will further sharpen this to the claim that only the agent and the deep-object of the verb can be thus marked. In other words: only noun phrases with a specific, structurally defined deep grammatical function can be marked ang. The range of thematic relations that a direct object can bear vis-à-vis the verb is somewhat broader than in English (on account of its richer morphology). However, the range of elements eligible for ang-marking is incomparably smaller than the range of elements that can be topicalized in English, and especially so in German, Dutch, and Icelandic. In these verb-second languages, any constituent of the sentence can move to the preverbal topic position: prepositional phrases, adjunct noun-phrases like Sunday in Sunday I will arrive, adverbials of all denominations, certain types of floated quantifiers, etc. etc. Verb-second languages are especially relevant here, since Richards (this volume) analyses ang-promotion as parallel to topicalization in Icelandic.

A typology of landing sites that distinguishes between noun phrase positions and XP-positions — positions available to anything — clearly suggests that promotion to the function marked by ang involves landing in a noun phrase position: A-movement (Chomsky 1981). This seems to tip the balance in favour of the "ang marks nominative" analysis. In any case, however, the question is orthogonal to the central claim of the present paper, which is that the verbal affixes -an and i- are not directly involved in the voice system — or topicalization system. For concreteness I will continue to refer to ang as a nominative marker, and designate verbs with -an or i- as passive. If we would have to conclude that this is wrong, the argument still stands.

5. Voice and lexical morphology in Tagalog

Tradition has it that the Tagalog voice system is rich in distinct types of passivization rules; I call this the multiple passive analysis. A verb like tanim (mag-, i-, -an) ‘to plant’ has, besides an active with mag-, two passive forms, each of which promotes a different argument of the verb to subject, as shown in (14) and (15): itanim has as
subject the things planted (flowers), \textit{tammän} has as subject the ‘‘location’’ of the planting (the garden). The affixes pick out a labelled argument of the verb — agent, patient, location, etc. etc. — and promote it to nominative.

(13) \textit{Nagtaním} siyá ng bulaklák sa hardín  
\text{PERF.mag.plant 3s.NOM ACC flowers OBL garden}  
‘She planted flowers in the garden’

(14) \textit{Itinaním} niyá ang bulaklák sa hardín  
\text{PERF.i.plant 3s.GEN NOM flowers OBL garden}  
‘She planted the flowers in the garden’

(15) \textit{Tinamnán} niyá ng bulaklák ang hardín  
\text{PERF.plant.an GEN.3s ACC flowers NOM garden}  
‘She planted the garden with flowers’

Surprisingly, perhaps, the same verb has the same properties and more in English. It has a passive form that promotes the thing planted (\textit{The flowers were planted in the garden}) and it has one that promotes the ‘‘location’’ argument (\textit{The garden was planted with flowers}). That English fails to make a morphological difference between the two passives is a result of its poor morphology — Indonesian and Dutch do make such a difference. Unlike Tagalog, however, English, Dutch, and Indonesian have an active construction that corresponds to the ‘‘locaitional passive’’: Celia planted the garden with flowers. The Tagalog active verb \textit{magtanim} realizes the ‘plant-in’ alternant, as in (13), but not the ‘plant-with’ alternant, as shown in (16). Similarly, \textit{tamnán} in (15) realizes the ‘plant-with’ alternant in the passive, but there is no active counterpart, with either \textit{mag}- or \textit{-um}- (the two active voice markers); there is no \textit{magtamnán} or \textit{tumamnán}.

(16) * \textit{Nagtaním} siyá ng hardín ng bulaklák  
\text{PERF.mag.plant NOM.3s ACC garden ACC flowers}  
‘He planted the garden with flowers’

In this respect, \textit{-an} differs from Indonesian \textit{-i} and Dutch \textit{be}-: although it marks the ‘plant-with’ alternant in the ‘plant-in/plant-with’ alternation, like its Indonesian and Dutch counterparts, the derived verb exclusively occurs in the passive voice.

Note, furthermore, that Tagalog verbs derived with \textit{i}- or \textit{-an} not only require the
passive voice, but also fail to carry overt, independent markers of the passive voice. Thus, whereas the Indonesian verb *tanami* ‘plant-with’ carries the usual markers of passive voice when it occurs in that voice (for instance, the passive marker *di-* in the morphological passive, see ex. (10) above), the Tagalog verb *tammân* ‘to plant-with’ has no voice morphology at all. Specifically, it does not carry the passive marker *-in*, exemplified in (12), over and above the suffix *-an*; there is no such thing as *tammânin*. Tagalog verbs derived with *i-* or *-an* are passive by default.

The multiple passive analysis holds that the Tagalog ‘voice’ affixes directly encode the semantic relation that the subject bears to the verb. Ultimately, the present view fully endorses this: it cannot be denied that the pertinent relation covaries with the affix on the verb. However, the present view fundamentally differs from the traditional one in the way in which this encoding is established. My analysis posits two levels: a ‘‘lexical’’ level, and a ‘‘voice’’ level. The affixes reflect the semantic relation between the verb and its deep-object; the voice system promotes the deep object to subject. Thus, what holds true of the interaction between lexical verb morphology and voice in Indonesian, also holds true of Tagalog: the two systems can be thought of as independent algorithms. Following certain rules, the one derives a transitive verb; the other, following other rules, derives a voice form — from a transitive verb.

Schematically, the argument in favor of the present view — which I call the two-stage analysis of the Tagalog voice system — is as follows.

1. The function of certain affixes in Indonesian and Dutch is to derive specific types of verbs from specific types of stems.

2. The partitionings in the verbal lexicon established by these affixes are identical (at the correct level of abstraction, thus allowing for reasonable margins).

---

3 However, passive verbs have a different aspectual paradigm. The perfective and imperfective aspects are formed with an infix, *-in-*, which does not occur on active verbs. The issue is rather complicated, because active verbs with *mag-* have *nag-* in the pertinent aspects. Historically, the *mag-* ~ *nag-* alternation can be shown to involve the infix *-in-*: *nag-* can be traced back historically to *minag-* (Wolff 1971).

4 Recall that Dutch verbs with *be-* refuse the passive marker *ge-* (see 3.2), a similarity that I will not explore.
3. The functioning of the pertinent affixes in both languages is independent of the functioning of the voice system.

4. The Tagalog affixes *i*- and *-an* establish the same partitionings in the verbal lexicon as those referred to in 2.

5. Therefore, there must be level at which the functioning of the Tagalog affixes is independent of the functioning of the voice system.

The proper level is the interface between word-formation and voicing. A central notion is **deep-object**, which I define as the noun phrase that is accusative in the active and nominative in the passive (it has nothing to do with "deep-structure"). Thus, the Tagalog affixes reflect the semantic relation between the deep-object and the verb; next, the voice system passivizes the verb, promoting the deep-object to nominative. The passive rule has nothing to do with (is blind to) the semantic relation between the verb and the deep object. If this is correct, Tagalog only has one single passive alternation.

The two-stage analysis is not merely terminologically different from the traditional view. Let me briefly discuss an important empirical difference. Consider once again the sentence in (15) above, *Tinamnán niyá ng bulaklák ang hardín* "She planted the garden with flowers." The two-stage analysis leads to the following conclusion: *ang hardín* "the garden" is nominative, hence, it is the deep-object. This entails that *ng bulaklák* "flowers" is not the deep-object. Rather, it must have a status comparable to *flowers in to plant the garden with flowers*: it is a prepositional complement of sorts. Thus, although the noun phrase looks exactly like the direct object in (13) (*Nagtaním niyá ng bulaklák sa hardín* "She planted flowers in the garden"), the two-stage analysis forces us to posit a fundamental difference between the two.

The multiple passive analysis, on the other hand, is forced to analyse both instances as accusative direct objects: they are structurally identical. The affix on the verb in (15), *-an*, promotes the location argument of the verb to subject; the verbal affix in (13), *mag-*, promotes the agent. By definition, neither of the affixes interacts with the theme argument (flowers); this argument is a constant factor.

Strikingly, there exist important syntactic differences between *ng bulaklák* "flowers" in (13) and *ng bulaklák* "with flowers" in (15), which I have discussed elsewhere (Voskuil 1994) — there, I argue in addition that these differences suggest that *ng bulaklák* in (15) is indeed a prepositional complement, with an invisible preposition. The main difference is that *ng bulaklák* in (13) behaves as an ordinary
direct object, that is, it cannot be definite, and undergoes alternations typical of direct objects. *Ng bulaklák* in (15) has none of these properties. It does not behave as a direct object.

In the above discussion I have consistently referred to *ang* as a nominative marker. An alternative theory exists: *ang* is a topic marker. The outcome of that debate will have consequences for the analysis of the Tagalog voice system. But the issue of the multiple passive vs. the two-stage analysis will remain largely unaffected by whatever the outcome is. This can be seen from the fact that both sides in the subject-or-topic debate assume the traditional multiple passive analysis. What the one glosses as “location-topic marker,” the other will gloss as “location-subject marker” (compare, for instance, Kroeger (1993) and Carrier-Duncan (1985)). The two-stage analysis is especially immune for developments on that score, since it disconnects the functioning of the affixes from the functioning of the “voice” system — or whatever it is.
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