

EXISTENTIAL, POSSESSIVE, ATTRIBUTIVE AND  
IDENTIFICATIONAL IN TAGALOG

OSAMU IKARI  
*Tokyo*

O. INTRODUCTION

We know similar constructions of the following types: existential, possessive, attributive and what we call identificational, i.e. that which expresses identification. It may be a contingent coincidence, and we may say that the four semantically distinct structures are realized in syntactically similar or identical forms. On the other hand, it is nonetheless possible to suppose that some semantic connections among them lead to the parallelism in their realization, that is, syntactically similar or identical forms.

We suppose natural semantic connections among them, the parallelism in their realization being its natural result. What we consider in this paper is the case in Tagalog.

We consider the existential as base, i.e. prototype leading to the possessive, the attributive and the identificational. The extension or generalization of the existential thus gives the others, although its degree varies from language to language.

The 'fidelity' in the realization, i.e. the forms which are syntactically identical, is not a priori guaranteed. Thus the possessive, the attributive and the identificational are not always parallel to the existential. Hence we know some asymmetry in the realization. We analyze this problem in Tagalog.

First we see the semantic connections in question. For this purpose the four constructions in Japanese and English are shown. Those in Tagalog are also shown, but we do not mention those which are analyzed later. Then we see some problems in the realization in question in Japanese and English before the analysis of Tagalog. We may show some 'divergence' from expected forms in the realization, which, occasionally, could be suggestive for the analysis in Tagalog. Then we will see the realization in Tagalog, and the asymmetry mentioned above will be shown.

1. SEMANTIC CONNECTIONS

First we shall see the parallelism in the existential, possessive, attributive and identificational constructions before we consider the semantic connections. In (1)-(12) below Japanese, English and Tagalog constructions are shown: (1)-(4) are Japanese, (5)-(8) are English and (9)-(12) are Tagalog, in the order of the existential, the possessive, the attributive and the identificational.

- (1) a. teeburu ni hon ga ar-u  
table loc book nom ar-i-mas-u (polite) (= (5a))
- b. hon wa teeburu ni ar-u  
ar-i-mas-u (polite) (= (5b))
- (2) a. okaasan wa tokei ga ar-u  
mother watch ar-i-mas-u (polite) (= (6a))
- b. tokei wa okaasan no de ar-u (written form)  
da (= (6b))  
des-u (polite)

## IKARI

- (3) a. John was sensei de ar-u (written)  
           teacher da (= (7a))  
                           des-u (polite)
- b. Mary wa utukusi-i  
                   beautiful (= (7b))
- (4) suekko wa John de ar-u (written) (= (8))  
       youngest da  
                   des-u (polite)
- (5) a. There is a book on the table  
       b. The book is on the table
- (6) a. Mother has a watch  
       b. The watch is Mother's
- (7) a. John is a teacher  
       b. Mary is beautiful
- (8) The youngest child is John
- (9) a. May libro sa mesa (= (5a))  
       b. Nasa mesa ang libro (= (5b))
- (10) a. May relos ang Nanay (= (6a))  
       b. Sa Nanay ang relos (= (6b))
- (11) a. Maestro si Juan (= (7a))  
       b. Maganda si Maria (= (7b))
- (12) Si Juan ang bunso

As is shown above, the existential is not totally extended. Its-generalization is not complete, giving asymmetry. In Japanese, as is shown by (3b), the attributive by adjective is not by the existential *ar-u* while it is generalized in the other cases. In English, on the other hand, the existential *be* is not generalized in the possessive, as in (6a). Now, in Tagalog, we also know the asymmetry. That is, in the existential itself, there occur two constructions, which are faithfully mapped on the possessive. Taking these asymmetries into consideration, we can, nonetheless, see the natural semantic connections based on the existential which allow us to extend the existential to the others although with incompleteness.

1.1. First consider the existential. Here two elements are supposed, that is, that which exists, hereinafter represented by Ex, on one hand, and the locative, i.e. where Ex is, hereafter represented by Loc, on the other. Ex is typically new information (indefinite) as is shown by (1a)/(5a)/(9a). Whereas Loc, on the contrary, is typically given information (definite).

Occasionally Ex is given information as is shown by (1b)/(5b)/(9b). Thus we suppose the existential with Ex which is new information and that with Ex which is given information. The former is called the existential with Ex-Indef, the latter the existential with Ex-Def. This distinction, which will be seen also in the possessive, is clarified by (1a)/(1b), (5a)/(5b) and (9a)/(9b).

## EXISTENTIAL, POSSESSIVE, ATTRIBUTIVE AND IDENTIFICATIONAL IN TAGALOG

1.2. Now how is the possessive vis-à-vis the existential? There is no essential difference from the existential in the sense that something (Ex) exists somewhere (Loc). The specification of Loc as possessor gives natural extension of the existential to the possessive. Loc specified as possessor is hereinafter represented by Locp. Thus we see the possessive: Ex Locp, which comes from the existential: Ex Loc through the specification of Loc.

In the possessive, however, Locp's determination of Ex is not the same as the existential. Ex is directly on or in Loc in the existential; for example, in (5) above *a/the book* is physically determined by *the table* as if the former is a 'content' while the latter is the 'container'. As is shown by (6) compared with (5), there is no such determination by Loc in the possessive. In (6a), for example, *Mother* is Locp corresponding to Loc in the existential, but it does not mean that *a watch*, Ex (possessed), is totally determined by *Mother*; while it is *Mother's*, it can be, for example, on the table. (See note 3 in 4.2.)

As in the existential, Ex is typically new information, although it occasionally is given. The former, the possessive with Ex-Indef, is seen in (2a)/(6a)/(10a), and the latter, the possessive with Ex-Def, is in (2b)/(6b)/(10b). The parallelism between the existential and the possessive is observed most clearly in Tagalog: (10a, b) vis-à-vis (9a, b).

1.3. While Loc is specified as Locp in the existential's generalization to the possessive, the attributive requires another specification of Loc. The attributive says that Ex is in a (permanent) state. The specification of Loc for the existential's generalization is, therefore, to regard Loc as a state. This Loc specified as state is hereinafter represented by Locs.

Now Loc is rather abstracted. However it is natural to suppose that a state, more or less stable, is something where one 'stays'. For example, John was a student, and then he was a teacher, and now he is a writer; here *student*, *teacher* and *writer* are, like Loc, where one stays. Hence Locs, i.e. Loc's specification as state, is not difficult to suppose. It seems that Japanese has an explicit realization of Locs. See (3), where *de*, which is also used as a locative marking as in 'John wa Tokyo *de* Bill ni atta' ('John met Bill in Tokyo', where *Tokyo de* is *in Tokyo*), is a marking of the stative. Thus (3a): Ex-Def Locs *ar-u* is parallel to the existential (1b): Ex-Def Loc *ar-u*.

In the case of the attributive, Ex is always given information unlike existential/possessive. What the attributive describes is some property of Ex, which means that Ex is already definite. Hence, while we see Ex-Indef/-Def Loc and Ex-Indef/-Def Locp in the existential and the possessive respectively, there is only Ex-Def Locs in the attributive.

1.4. Now consider the identificational, which, seemingly, is essentially different from the existential. We can, however, suppose the extension of the existential to the identificational, although it is not as straight-forward as the possessive and the attributive.

The identification is, as will be seen below, a sort of localization. First we have a set of the 'constants', i.e. the individuals already identified, for example, the set: John, Bill, . . . , New York, Tokyo, . . . , this boy, this house, . . . This set is, as it were, the 'real' world of the speaker/hearer. (As is shown by *this boy*, for example, the constants are often dependent on the situation of communication.) On the other hand, there are individuals who are not yet identified. They exist in the world which is ontologically supposed, but not in the 'real' world. Consider the following example as well as (4)/(8)/(12): *The criminal is John*, which typically shows what the identificational is. Here *the criminal*, being definite, is supposed ontologically, but it is not in the real world without being identified. It is a 'non-constant' and must be *localized* in the real world. The identification is to find the 'place' in the real world for a non-constant in question. In other words, to identify an individual is to determine the 'place' in the real world. Thus, in the example above, we find the place in the real world, i.e., the set: John, Bill, . . . for the non-constant: *the criminal*; that is *John*.

Thus, considering this ‘localization’, more or less abstracted, it is possible to generalized Loc for the identificational. Loc for this localization to find place in the world of constants is represented by Locc. Loc in the identificational, i.e. Locc, is always a constant as was shown above. (On the other hand, Ex in Ex Locc is always a non-constant.)

**2. THE CONSTRUCTIONS IN JAPANESE/ENGLISH**

We see some problems in Japanese and English relevant to Tagalog constructions before those in Tagalog are considered.

**2.1. EXISTENTIAL**

**2.1.1.** In the existential construction, *ar-u* in Japanese and *be* in English are used regardless of Ex’s definiteness as is shown by (1) and (5), respectively. This is not the case in Tagalog, where *may* construction is used for Ex-Indef and the construction of Loc as predicative is for Ex-Def as in (9a) and (9b).

The difficulty in Japanese is that we know the distinction of the existential for Ex-animate and Ex-inanimate. That is, *ar-u*, which is used for Ex-inanimate as in (1), is not possible for Ex-animate; in fact, *i-ru* must be used instead of *ar-u*. We have, for example, *niwa ni hito ga i-ru* ‘There are people in the garden’ vis-à-vis (1a): *teeburu ni hon ga ar-u* ‘There is a book on the table’, on one hand, and *John wa niwa ni i-ru* ‘John is in the garden’ vis-à-vis (1b): *hon wa teeburu ni ar-u* ‘The book is on the table’, on the other. (For the polite form we have *i-mas-u* instead of *i-ru* just as we have *ar-i-mas-u* instead of *ar-u*.)

However, as will be seen below, this distinction is obligatory only in the existential. In the possessive it is not obligatory, *ar-u* being possible for Ex-animate as well as Ex-inanimate. In the attributive and the identificational, only *ar-u* is used irrespective of Ex-animate/-inanimate.

**2.1.2.** Now consider Ex-Indef and Ex-Def in the existential in English. For Ex-Indef, *there*-construction is used while we see usual: S V . . . for Ex-Def. Surely an indefinite subject in normal initial position is possible in English as in (13):

- (13) A student                    came yesterday
- Someone

However, S being typically topic, non-topic S is not natural as S proper, and then the subject position, i.e. initial position, is not natural for it. It is the case for the existential with Ex-Indef. Here that which has a topiclike function is Loc rather than Ex. Thus we see the difficulty: S and topiclike function do not coincide. Avoiding non-topic S (indefinite S: Ex-Indef) in the initial position and realizing topiclike element in the initial, we might have something like: Loc *be* Ex. What is realized is *There be* Ex Loc like (5a), which would be a ‘compensation’ for the construction: Loc *be* Ex, *there* being Loc’s substitute, although its actual function is nothing but ‘place holder’ which makes possible V in the second position, avoiding indefinite S in the initial position.

However, in English, *be* is nonetheless used irrespective of Ex’s definiteness. On the other hand, in Tagalog *may* construction is used when *there*-construction is used in English, no common existential being possible between Ex-Indef and Ex-Def.

**2.2.1.** As we mentioned above, the distinction between *ar-u/i-ru* is not obligatory in the possessive. For example, *ar-u* is possible as well as *i-ru* as in *Mary wa kodomo ga ar-u/i-ru* ‘Mary has children’, where Ex: *kodomo* ‘child(ren)’ is animate. (Cf. 2.1.1.)

## EXISTENTIAL, POSSESSIVE, ATTRIBUTIVE AND IDENTIFICATIONAL IN TAGALOG

above. In (2a) only *ar-u* is possible because Ex: *tokei* 'watch' is inanimate.)

That which is used in the extension of the existential is *ar-u* as is shown in the attributive and the identificational. In (3)-(4) *i-ru* is impossible while Ex is animate: \**John wa sensei de i-ru* (cf. (3a): *John wa sensei de ar-u* 'John is a teacher'); \**suekko wa John de i-ru* (cf. (4): *suekko wa John de ar-u* 'The youngest child is John'). Hence there is no contracted form, i.e. what is used in speaking, for *de i-ru*. (In the sense of 'remain' we use *i-ru* rather than *ar-u* for Ex-animate. Thus *John wa sensei de i-ru* is possible in the sense of 'John remains a teacher'.)

2.2.2. In English the existential is not generalized for the possessive with Ex-Indef; we see *have* instead of *be* as in (6a). Here if the existential were generalized, there would be: Locp *be* Ex-Indef, where Locp is S, as is the case in Japanese. (See (2a): *okaasan wa tokei ga ar-u* 'Mother has a watch', which is literally: *Mother a watch is*, that is, Locp Ex-Indef *ar-u* with *ar-u* like the existential constructions (1): *teeburu ni hon ga ar-u* 'There is a book on the table'; *hon ga ar-u* 'There is a book on the table'; *hon wa teeburu ni ar-u* 'The book is on the table'.) Here Locp is very likely to be subject; it is not only given information (vis-à-vis Ex-Indef which is new) but animate (furthermore, very often human). Hence we see: Locp Ex-Indef *ar-u* in Japanese like (2a), where Locp is topic.

The construction: *X be Y* is seen in the existential, the attributive and the identificational: (5b), (7) and (8) respectively. Here *X* is Ex and *Y* is Loc: Loc, Locs, Locc. In the case of Locp *be* Ex-Indef, which the existential's generalization would give, the reverse is the case; that is, *X* is Locp, *Y* is Ex. Therefore, it would be confusing unless Locp is clearly marked as such (by the dative, for example). However, this is impossible; Locp, being S, must be unmarked, i.e. nominative like the other *X*'s in the construction: *X be Y*. Then some other construction, e.g. one with *have*, like (6a), where S is designated as Locp, will be required.

2.2.3. The possessive with Ex-Def, which is not the same as that with Ex-Indef (both in Japanese and English, see (2b) and (6b)) will be discussed in comparison with Tagalog (4.2.).

### 2.3. ATTRIBUTIVE

2.3.1. Locs in Japanese has an explicit marking *de* designating stative as is seen in (3a). It is clear when compared with English counterpart (7a):

- (3a) *John wa sensei de ar-u*      (written form)  
(7a) *John is a teacher*

However a 'bare' form like English is possible for Locs in spoken form. That is, in the spoken form, the contractions: *de ar-u* → *da*; *de ar-i-mas-u* (polite) → *des-u* (polite) occur (for *ar-i-mas-u*, see (1) and (2)), and in (3a): *John wa sensei da/des-u*, bare Locs is realized. (On the other hand, the stative *de* persists in spoken form in the negative. For *John wa sensei de wa nai* 'John is not a teacher', the negative of (3a) uses *na-i*, which is the negative form of *ar-u*, and the corresponding spoken form is: *John wa sensei zyaa na-i*, where *zyaa* is the contraction of *de+wa*; thus the stative *de* persists. The polite form is: *John wa sensei de wa/zyaa ar-i-mas-e-n*, where *de wa* or *zyaa* is realized, and *de* persists.)

2.3.2. As we mentioned, the attributive by adjective in Japanese like (3b) is not parallel to the extended existential constructions. Compare (3b) with (3a): Ex-Def Locs *ar-u*. (In English the adjective construction is in the form of the existential generalized: compare (7b) with (7a).)

At the same time, however, we know a lexicalization of the possessive with Ex-Indef that makes it possible for verbs to function like adjectives. The verbs by this lexicalization show the inner structure parallel to the possessive, hence, the existential, unlike the adjectives. The examples in (14) below are Ex-Indef-*ar-u*, which brings about the parallelism with the possessive using Ex-Indef: compare the sentences in (14) with (2a).

- (14) a. *yuuki-ga-ar-u*  
           -*ar-i-mas-u* (polite)  
           courage-nom-be  
           ‘have courage’  
           John wa *yuuki-ga-ar-u/-ari-i-mas-u*  
           ‘John has courage’ (lit.)
- b. *konzyoo-ga-ar-u*  
           -*ar-i-mas-u* (polite)  
           guts-nom-be  
           ‘have guts’  
           John wa *konzyoo-ga-ar-u/-ar-i-mas-u*  
           ‘John has guts’ (lit.)
- (14) c. *seii-ga-ar-u*  
           -*ar-i-mas-u* (polite)  
           sincerity-nom-be  
           ‘have sincerity’  
           John wa *seii-ga-ar-u/-ar-i-mas-u*  
           ‘John has sincerity’ (lit.)
- d. *kakki-ga-ar-u*  
           -*ar-i-mas-u*  
           vividness-nom-be  
           ‘have vividness’  
           *mati wa kakki-ga-ar-u/-ar-i-mas-u*  
           ‘The streets have vividness’ (lit)

(The nominative *ga* is not always obligatory. For example, in *yuuki-(ga)-ar-u hito*, ‘the man who has courage’, *seii-(ga)-ar-u taido* ‘the attitude which has sincerity’, etc., *ga* is dispensable. (Cf. (14a, c) above))

These verbs function like adjectives, That is, they are used for what are expected to be expressed by adjectives. (In English, adjectives would be used for (14): (a, b): ‘John is courageous’; (c): ‘John is sincere’; (d): ‘The streets are vivid’.) Thus the asymmetry of the adjective construction is partly ‘compensated’ for by the verbs with an inner structure parallel to the possessive with Ex-Indef.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>There is another lexicalization which makes it possible for verbs to function like adjectives. The resulting verb is called a nominal verb. Its inner structure is, in turn, *Locs-ar-u* rather than Ex-Indef-*ar-u*, and parallel to the attributive rather than the possessive. In any case we can see the existential. We have (i), for example. (See the attributive constructions like (3a).)

- (i) *yuukan-de-ar-u* (written)  
           da  
           des-u (polite)  
           courage-stative-be  
           ‘be in courage’  
           John wa *yuukan-de-ar-u/-da/-des-u*  
           ‘John is in courage’ (lit.), i.e., ‘John is courageous’

## EXISTENTIAL, POSSESSIVE, ATTRIBUTIVE AND IDENTIFICATIONAL IN TAGALOG

### 3. THE CONSTRUCTIONS IN TAGALOG

First we see some further examples of (9)-(12) to make clearer the asymmetry in Tagalog. (15), (16), (17) and (18) are the examples of the existential, the possessive, the attributive and the identificational respectively:

- (15) a. *May libro sa mesa* (= (9a))  
*May parti kahapon*  
*May guro sa Central School*  
*May bigas sa tindahan*  
*May salapi sa bangko*  
'There is a book on the table'  
'There was a party yesterday'  
'There is a teacher at the Central School'  
'There is rice at the store'  
'There is money in the bank'
- b. *Nasa mesa ang libro* (= (9b))  
*Nasa kusina ang mesa*  
*Nasa paaralan ang bata*  
*Nasa bahay si Maria*  
'The book is on the table'  
'The table is in the kitchen'  
'The child is in the school'  
'Mary is in the house'
- (16) a. *May relos ang Nanay* (= (10a))  
*May lapis ang bata*  
*May pera ako*  
*May bigas tayo*  
*May salapi si Juan*  
'Mother has a watch'  
'The child has a pencil'  
'I have money'  
'We have rice'  
'Juan has money'
- b. *Sa Nanay ang relos* (= (10b))  
*Sa istudyante ang libro*  
*Kay Pedro ang lapis*  
*Sa akin ang bigas*  
'The watch is Mother's'  
'The book is the student's'  
'The pencil is Pedro's'  
'The rice is mine'

The same is said of the nominals like *tyuuzitu* 'faith', *zankoku* 'cruelty', *syooziki* 'honesty', etc. The lexicalization of the form *Locs-ar-u* parallel to the attributive makes it possible for the verbs to function like adjectives. In fact *yuukan-/tyuuzitu-/zankoku-/syooziki-de-ar-u, -da, -des-u* are adjectives in English: 'courageous', 'faithful', 'cruel' and 'honest'. Furthermore the nominal verb is widespread, reducing the range of the adjective.

- (17) a. Maestro si Juan (= (11a))  
 Artista ang babae  
 Bato ang bahay  
 'John is a teacher'  
 'The woman is an actress'  
 'The house is made of stone'
- b. Maganda si Maria (= (11b))  
 Matalino ka  
 Malaki ang bahay  
 Bago ang bahay  
 'Mary is beautiful'  
 'You are intelligent'  
 'The house is big'  
 'The house is new'
- (18) Si Juan ang bunso (= (12))  
 Si Rosa ang paborito kong kaklase  
 Ang Maynila ang bayan ko  
 Ikaw ang matalino  
 'The youngest child is Juan'  
 'My favorite classmate is Rosa'  
 'My home town is Manila'  
 'The intelligent one is you'

In the existential with Ex-Indef and the corresponding possessive ((15a) and (16a)) we see *may*-construction while the others are, as it were, Loc-predicative constructions where Loc is in the predicative position (Loc in (15b), Locp in (16b), Locs in (17) and Locc in (18)). Thus we can say that the expected Loc-predicative construction is impossible for the existential with Ex-Indef and the corresponding possessive; instead we see the *may*-construction. We consider this asymmetry in 4. (Some other constructions like *may* are seen: the existentials by *mayroon*, *marami* and *wala* like *Mayroong bigas sa tindahan*, *Maraming bigas sa tindahan* and *Walang bigas sa tindahan* 'There is rice at the store', 'There is lots of rice at the store' and 'There is no rice at the store'; and the corresponding possessives: *Mayroon tayong bigas*, *Marami tayong bigas* and *Wala tayong bigas* (here too, Ex-Indef is preceded by the linker as in the existentials): 'We have rice', 'We have lots of rice' and 'We have no rice'.)

On the other hand, the Loc-predicative construction is generalized when Ex is definite. As in (19)-(20) below, Loc is generalized to time ((19)) or something like benefactive ((20)):

- (19) Tuwing Linggo ang mga miting  
 'The meetings are held every Sunday'  
 (cf. Sa likod ng simbahan ang mga miting 'The meetings are held behind the church')  
 Sa umaga na ang klase namin  
 'Our class is in the morning'



## EXISTENTIAL, POSSESSIVE, ATTRIBUTIVE AND IDENTIFICATIONAL IN TAGALOG

- (20) Para sa bata ang laruan  
'The toy is for the child'  
Tungkol sa giyera ang kuwento  
'The story is about the war'  
Mula sa Maynila ang aking sapatos  
'My shoes are from Manila'

(This generalization of Loc is the same as in English, as the English translations show.)

### 4. PROBLEMS IN TAGALOG CONSTRUCTIONS

Now we consider the asymmetry with respect to the existential/possessive: *may*-construction for Ex-Indef. With respect to the *may*-construction we see the inner structure of the adjectives of *ma*-class. On the other hand, there exists another *may*-construction, that is *may* for indefinite complements. Here we will consider this construction, called *may* indefinite, too.

#### 4.1. MAY EXISTENTIAL

If the expected Loc-predicative were possible for Ex-Indef, there would be constructions like (21) parallel to (21). However (21) is impossible:

- (21) a. \*Sa mesa (ng) libro  
b. Nasa mesa ang libro (= (15b))

Here if topic is not obligatory, Loc-predicative will be possible both for Ex-Indef and Ex-Def.

However topic is obligatory in Tagalog (although O-complement constructions lack it as in *umulan* 'It rained'), which makes (21) impossible where there is no topic.

In the existential with Ex-Indef, Loc. being definite unlike Ex, can be topic. However Loc-topic as (22) is impossible, too.

- (22) \*Libro ang mesa

In the case the meaning 'There is a book on the table' is impossible, for Loc-predicative says that *libro* is Loc while it is actually Ex rather than Loc. (If (22) were possible, it would be attributive like (17a), although it is also impossible as the attributive, there being no 'The table is a book'.)

Hence a particular predicate which requires no topic is supposed: *may*. As is seen in (15a), compared with (1a), *may* corresponds to *ar-u* in Japanese in (1a), the order being the reverse: *may* – Ex – Loc vis-à-vis Loc – Ex – *ar-u*.

The same is said of the possessive. Loc-predicative is impossible for Ex-Indef just like (21):

- (23) a. \*Sa Nanay (ng) relos  
b. Sa Nanay ang relos (= (16b))

While topic is obligatory, there is no topic in (23a). On the other hand, if Locp is topic, the meaning 'Mother has a watch' is impossible just as (22), Loc-predicative saying that *relos* is Loc while it actually is Ex:

- (24) \*Relos ang Nanay

((24) is impossible also as attributive, there being no 'Mother is a watch'.)

The generalization of the existential naturally gives (16a) for the possessive with Ex-Indef.

4.2. POSSESSIVE

4.2.1. We see the parallelism between the existential with Ex-Indef and the possessive with Ex-Indef, both using *may*: (15a)/(16a), but we also see the difference; that is, while Loc in the existential is non-topic like *sa mesa*, Locp in the possessive is topic as is shown by *ang Nanay*, for example. However, this difference is not restricted to Tagalog. See (1a) and (2a) in Japanese, or (5a) and (6a) in English:

- (1) a. teeburu ni hon ga ar-u
- (2) a. okaasan wa tokei ga ar-u
- (5) a. There is a book on the table
- (6) a. Mother has a watch

where while Loc (*teeburu ni/on the table*) is non-topic in the existential, Locp is topic: *okaasan wa/Mother*.

Locp is typically human, and it has a high topicality different from Loc. Because we usually have topic, (2a)/(6a) are natural.<sup>2</sup> In Tagalog, because topic is required, (16a) is inevitable. (Although we may suppose topic even for Loc in Tagalog when the strong requirement of topic is considered, it is not possible.)

4.2.2. In Tagalog, the possessive with Ex-Def poses no problem. We see Loc-predicative: Locp Ex-Def as in (16b). On the other hand, we have Locs rather than Locp in Japanese and English, which seems curious when compared with Tagalog. See (2b) and (6b):

- (2) b. tokei wa okaasan no de ar-u/da/des-u
- (6) b. The watch is Mother's

Especially in Japanese Locp construction with *okaasan ni* 'to Mother' is totally impossible: (25b), which contrasts with Tagalog.

- (25) a. hon wa teeburu ni ar-u (= (1b))
- b. \*tokei wa okaasan ni ar-u
- (26) a. Nasa mesa ang libro (= (15b))
- b. Sa Nanay ang relos (= (16b))

While in Tagalog we see Locp: *sa Nanay* for the possessive: (26b), the expected Locp: *okaasan ni* is not possible ((25b)) in Japanese.

In (2b)/(6b) there is no Locp. (Cf. French: *La montre est à maman* where there exists Locp: *à maman* 'to Mother'.) Here, instead, we have the attributive construction. This construction, despite the asymmetry without Locp, can be natural, too. In the case

<sup>2</sup>In Japanese when topic is not possible, as in the complement sentence, i.e., . . . . *koto/no*, we can see Locp in the form of dative *ni* instead of topic as in (2a):

- (i) okaasan ni tokei ga ar-u koto/no
- 'that Mother has a watch'

In (i) we see *okaasan ni* 'to Mother'; *ni* is occasionally replaced by the nominative *ga*, giving *okaasan ga tokei ga ar-u koto/no*

## EXISTENTIAL, POSSESSIVE, ATTRIBUTIVE AND IDENTIFICATIONAL IN TAGALOG

of the possessive with Ex-Def, there is no locative determination like the attributive.<sup>3</sup> (There is no locative determination for 'Mary is beautiful', unlike ordinary processes.) This enables us to suppose the construction of the possessive with Ex-Def as parallel to the attributive.

### 4.3. LEXICAL STRUCTURE OF ADJECTIVES

We have seen some adjectives in (17b). Here we consider the adjectives: *ma*+base. As is seen in (27) below, *ma*-adjectives mean 'having an abundance of what what the base designates', the base being a noun designating a quality or a physical object.

(27)	maganda	'beautiful'	;	ganda	'beauty'
	matalino	'intelligent'	;	talino	'intelligence'
	malaki	'big'	;	laki	'size'
	mabigat	'heavy'	;	bigat	'weight'
	mabundok	'mountainous'	;	bundok	'mountain'

The attributive construction with an adjective as in (17b) is Loc-predicative with Locs of Adj and there is no asymmetry. On the other hand, in the case of *ma*-adjectives, the inner structure is a *may*-construction. It is *may*-Ex-Indef (Locp) (see (28)), just like the lexicalization in Japanese: (Locp) Ex-Indef-*ar-u* (see (14) (11.3)).

(28)	<i>may</i> -Ex-Indef (Locp)	:	
	may-ganda (si Maria)	:	Maganda si Maria
	may-talino (ko)	:	Matalino ko
	may-laki (ang bahay)	:	Malaki ang bahay

### 4.4. *May* INDEFINITE

Now we consider the *may*-construction for indefinite complements. As was mentioned above, *may* is used for indefinite complements as well as the existential/possessive with Ex-Indef.

Tagalog requires at least one definite complement. In communication it is natural to have definite elements, because a conversation is possible through commonalities between the speaker and the hearer. That is, what one speaks depends on what is already spoken or presupposed, insofar as one tries to say what the hearer can understand without difficulty, some definite elements, i.e. those which are already understood, are necessary. We can, thus, construct sentences based on them. In Tagalog, with this givenness required, that which has some prominence in the givenness is established as topic in Tagalog grammar. We can see some examples of this requirement of definite elements in the following:

<sup>3</sup>In the case of the possessive with Ex-Indef, the locative determination is not always unnatural. For example we have (i):

- (i) May salapi sa bangko si Juan  
 John has money in the bank  
 (Cf. May salapi si Juan ((16a))/John has money.)

It seems contradictory to have two Loc's at the same time. In (i) *Juan/John* is locative, i.e., Locp, whereas there is another locative, i.e. Loc: *sa bangko/in bank*. However, as was mentioned in 1.2., Locp does not physically determine Ex like Loc, and it is eventually possible to suppose a physical determination, i.e. locative proper, Loc, for the possessive. However, it is not for Ex-Def.

- (29) a. Naliligo ako araw-araw  
 b. Nakakita siya ng babae  
 c. Nagbigay siya ng pera kay Maria  
 d. Nakita siya ni Juan  
 e. Ibinigay ni Juan itong pera kay Maria  
 f. Binigyan ni Juan ng pera si Maria
- a: 'I bathe everyday'  
 b: 'He saw a woman'  
 c: 'He gave some money to Mary'  
 d: 'John saw him'  
 e: 'John gave this money to Mary'  
 f: 'John gave Mary some money'

In (29) there is at least one definite complement. (One of definite complements is established as topic. In a-c, it is actor, while it is goal and direction in d-e and f respectively.)

However, we encounter, nonetheless, the cases where there is no definite complement. Consider the sentences corresponding to (13), for example.

- (13) A student                    came yesterday  
 Someone

How can we realize this? There being no definite complement, ordinary constructions like (29) are impossible. We only have something like (30), where  $\emptyset$  corresponds to someone, with the lack of indefinite pronoun in Tagalog.

- (30) \*Dumating      ng istudyante                    kahapon  
 $\emptyset$

There being no definite complement, there cannot be topic, and without topic, (30) is impossible. Thus some other construction is required to realize (13). It is a periphrastic one: 'There is a student/one who came yesterday', which, with *may*, is admitted without definite complement (see IV.1.) Hence there occurs *may*-constructions:

- (31) a. May istudyanteng dumating kahapon  
 b. May dumating kahapon

(Here for 'a student who came', *dumating na istudyante* is possible as well as *istudyanteng dumating*.)

Now consider the cases where goal or direction complements correspond to indefinite pronouns. We see indefinite pronouns for goal and direction in (32b) and (32c) respectively, while actor complement corresponds to indefinite pronoun in (32a). As will be seen, (32b)/(32c) contrast with (32a). (In (32a) we see other complements, goal or direction, while there is none in (31b) above.)

- (32) a. May nakakita ng babae                    (cf. (29b))  
 'Someone saw a woman'
- May nagbigay ng pera kay Maria                    (cf. (29c))  
 'Someone gave money to Mary'

**EXISTENTIAL, POSSESSIVE, ATTRIBUTIVE AND IDENTIFICATIONAL IN TAGALOG**

- b. May nakita si Juan (cf. (29d))  
 'John saw something'
- May ibinigay si Juan kay Maria (cf. (29e))  
 'John gave something to Mary'
- c. May binigyan si Juan ng pera (cf. (29f))  
 'John gave someone money'

Here, why does topic occur in (32b,c)? As was seen in (29d,e) and (29f), *nakita* and *ibinigay* are goal-focus, and *binigyan* is direction-focus; therefore, as in (29d,e) or (29f), actor is expected to be non-topic in (32b) and (32c). Non-topic actor: *ni Juan*, however, is impossible:

- (33) \*May nakita ni Juan (cf. (32b))  
 \*May ibinigay ni Juan kay Maria (cf. (32b))  
 \*May binigyan ni Juan ng pera (cf. (32c))

actor is topic in (32b,c): *si Juan*.

At the same time, why is topic restricted to actor? In (32b), direction *kay Maria* is definite as well as actor: *Juan*, and then topic, if it is to be supposed, can be direction. But topic is actor. (in (32c) topic cannot be goal: *ng pera*, which is indefinite. As is seen in (29), non-topic goal is normally indefinite.) The same is true of (32a). Director *kay Maria* is definite, and then topic can be direction; however, lacking definite actor, there is no topic. (In the other example, topic cannot be goal: *ng babae* which is indefinite like the goal in (32c).)

At this point, let us reconsider *may* existential/possessive. In (15a) and (16a), the constructions are: *May Ex Loc(p)*, where *Loc(p)* is normally required. This canonical structure would be naturally expected for *may* indefinite. Then, in *may* indefinite, what could be this *Loc(p)*?

*Loc(p)* is a 'permanent' element in *may* existential/possessive (and in general, in the existentials generalized) in the sense above, i.e., canonical requirement. And, it is typically definite as was mentioned in 1. Now what is the permanent element in processes in general? As is seen (29), for example, it is actor, which appears necessarily in the frame: A-G (b,d); A-G-D (c,e,f); as well, in A-D; at the same time, when there is only one complement, it is normally actor as in (a). And actor is usually definite.

Furthermore, in the case of *Locp*, it shares another characteristic with actor. *Locp* can 'control' the possessed (Ex); for example, when John has some money, *Locp*, i.e. John, has a control on Ex, i.e., money; he can retain it, on the one hand; he can give it to someone else, the ownership being lost, on the other. Actor, on the other hand, is that which controls the processes. Thus they coincide with respect to the characteristics of controller.<sup>4</sup>

