Syntactic Aspect of Part-of-speech Typology

Lina I. Shkarban

Senior Research Fellow
Institute of Oriental Studies
Moscow, 103777, USSR

The Philippine languages demonstrate fundamental grammatical similarity of verbs and nouns. Collation with other languages, including those of Southeast Asia, allows to place them on a scale reflecting various degrees of Noun - Verb formal differentiation (a fragment of it may look like that: Tagalog - Malay - Chinese - Russian).

Evidently, any language may be characterised by the degree of Noun - Verb divergence. It is important in view of interdependences among part-of-speech (further on - PS) system, the system of syntactic function and the "Theme - Rheme" structures in a language.

Inventories of formal elements in the light of Noun - Verb differentiation. Many linguists mention syntactic similarities between Noun and Verb in Philippine languages. Subordinate relations within VPs and NPs are most often referred to. They are marked by the same syntactic markers or the same forms of pronouns which are able to express both, agentive and possessive meanings, depending on whether the phrase is verbal or nominal, respectively. Cf. Tagalog bahay (1) nang(2) kanyang(3) ama(4) 'house(1) of(2) his(3) father(4) and ginawa(1) nang(2) kanyang(3) ama(4) 'was-done(1) by(2) his(3) father(4); bahay niya 'his house' and ginawa niya 'was-done by him'.

Universal applicability of case-markers allows them to introduce words of all classes. For example, Tag. nang bata (lit.) 'by/of child', nang nabanggit (lit.) by/of mentioned', nang marami 'by/of many', nang dalawa 'by/of two'.

The same may be said of the Nominative ang and Directional/locational/Accusative/Possessive sa markers.

Linguists are not unanimous concerning another component of formal inventory of nouns and verbs, namely, their derivational and inflectional affixes. Is it a common Noun - Verb affixal fund? Most of verbal and nominal affixes are formally identical in the con-

temporary state of Philippine languages. Etimological identity of the majority of them is indisputable, but controversies exist regarding historic paths of their evolution (see, for example, Wolff 1973; Starosta, Pawley, Reid 1982).

In Bloomfield's description of Tagalog (1917), still unsurpassable in many ways, affix inventory is treated as common for nouns and verbs, though semantically varying. From the opposite viewpoint, common morphemes are homonyms.

The problem of homonymy, its scope and limits in Philippine languages have not yet been seriously studied. There are grounds to suggest a hypothesis of a continuum of transitions from cases of complete, formal, functional and semantic, identity of verbal and nominal affixes, through various kinds of functional and semantic variability of affixes to cases of obvious homonymy.

The idea of semantic and functional variability of affixes in systems with low discernability of PSs correlates with the idea of irregularity of relations between affixes and root-morphemes in such systems. This irregularity underlies synchretic, inflectional-derivational, character of most categories even within the same word-class. Thus, every verb of a definite voice (focus) in Tagalog represents, in fact, an individual lexeme. Altogether, verbs, nouns and adjectives derived from the same root-morpheme form one "macro-paradigm" of derivates where paradigmatic boundaries of individual words are very vague. Intricate sets of paradigmatic ties within such "macro-paradigms" vary depending on semantic subgroupings of root-morphemes.

Various kinds of synchretism are found in different sections of affix inventory. It manifests itself, in particular, in pronoun- and article-like properties of case particles and, less evidently, of voice (focus) morphemes (for some detail see below). The two sets of markers (particles and affixes) together form a very distant periphery of the deictic sphere in Philippine languages.

The affinity of the most important verbal and nominal grammatical elements to deictic sphere is one of the decisive factors determining the proximity of Verb and Noun to each other in the PS system of Tagalog.

Besides the above-mentioned functional and semantic peculiarities of affixes, the Philippine type of PS systems is characterised by an important role played in PSs differentiation by structural devices (as, for example, rules of arranging various kinds of linguistic items). Space limitations allow us only to mention such formal distinctive features of PSs as differing word-

accent patterns (cf. Tag. tiráhán 'to be dwelt in' and
tiráhan 'dwelling place', awítin 'to be sung' and ãwí-
tin 'song'), rules of affix distribution (cf. Tag. af
fixes ma- and -in in verbs and adjectives: matakot 'to
be frightened' (takot 'fright'), takutin 'to be (inten
tionally) frightened (by smb. or smth.)' and matakutin
'inclined to be frightened', 'easy to frighten'); the
structural opposition 'root-words vs. affixed words':
at least in literary Tagalog the absence of any deriva
tional affix points to the nominal character of a lexe
me. A verbal lexeme obligatorily requires a derivatio
nal affix for its formation, though in the paradigms o
aspectual forms it may alternate with ∅: init. 'heat',
init 'heated' (Adj.), um-init 'to become hot', i-init
'will become hot' (the first syllable of the root-
morpheme is reduplicated).

At the morphophonemic level there is also a struc
tural tendency to differentiate PSs by different ways
of shaping morpheme junctures: in verbs elements of fu
sion are often observed, while in their nominal or ad
jectival correlates a pure agglutinative technique may
be used: Tag. mamili 'to do shopping' (from bili 'buy-
ing') - pambili 'for use in buying' (Adj.).

If we compare this situation with Malay (Bahasa
Indonesia), we shall find there separate derivational
inventories of Verb and Noun. In syntax, prepositions
are unable to introduce other words than nouns. The
structural opposition "root-words - affixed words" is
irrelevant for Noun - Verb differentiation: there are
many intransitive root-verbs, ∅-form of transitive
verbs is quite regular in verbal paradigms, e.g., mem-
baca 'to read', dibaca 'to be read', baca 'to be read,
to read'. In Bahasa Indonesia there aren't word-accent
patterns of phonemic value. But still, some peripheral
models of affixed words display partial intersection o
derivational inventories of verbs and nouns (for examp
verbs and nouns with -an and ke-an affixes).

In Chinese and typologically similar languages of
Indochina (of different genetic affiliation, like Bur-
mese, Khmer, Vietnamese, Tai, Chru), grammaticalised
and semi-grammaticalised elements expressing meanings
of tense/aspect, intravert vs. extravert, upward vs.
downward orientation of action, pre- and postpositions
locatives, copulas in binominative (equational) senten
ces, etc., are rather strictly distributed between Ver
and Noun. One of the noticeable exceptions is the attr
butive marker (for example, Chinese de) pointing to a
somewhat lowered distinctiveness of PSs with regard to
syntactic function of Attribute.

In European languages with a high degree of syn-
thesism, such as Latin or Russian, derivational and in

flectional inventories, rich due to complex systems of declension and conjugation, in combination with such structural devices as government and agreement (in subordinate relations within VPs and NPs) - all provide conditions for high differentiation of Noun and Verb.

Two levels of functional organisation of a sentence from the point of view of Noun - Verb differentiation. The notion of PS may be used as one of the clues to internal systemic relations in languages. Much has been done in this connection in general theory of grammar. We shall base our arguing on two fundamental ideas helping to understand the place of PSs in internal relations in grammar. One of them concerns systemic relations of PSs with syntactic functions, such as Subject, Predicate, Attribute, etc. The other deals with such functional units as Theme and Rheme.

Correspondences between PSs and syntactic functions (for example, Subject and Predicate) are regarded as constitutive for both sets of grammatical entities. Both, members of PS systems and syntactic functions base their identity on mutual correspondences between members of the two sets.

Initially, the idea was worked out on the material of European languages. Such eminent scholars as Bally (1950), Tesnière (1976), Kuriłowicz (1936) made it clear that fixed relations between a PS and its main function bring about special means of transferring a PS into its secondary functions which, in their turn, appear as main functions for other PSs. This phenomenon was called translation by Tesnière, transposition (a more preferred term now) by Bally and syntactic derivation by Kuriłowicz. Special derivational means are important in these processes. Rich inventory of morphemes specialising either on nominalisation, on verbalisation, or on adjectivalisation, etc., in European languages clearly points to a high level of PS differentiation.

Eventually, it became clear that distinctness of correspondences among PSs and their respective functions in various languages vary. This and related problems were studied, in particular, by representatives of the Russian school of syntactic typology, first of all, by Meshchaninov (1945).

Philippine languages demonstrate vague correspondences among word-classes, on the one hand, and syntactic functions (Subject, Predicate, Attribute, etc.) on the other. One of the striking evidences could be found in morphology. It is the absence of special derivational means of transposition, differing from non-transpositional ones. In this connection, practically unlimited verbalising ability of voice (focus) markers may be