The Thetic/Categorical Distinction in Tagalog Revisited: A Contrastive Perspective

Naonori Nagaya

The University of Tokyo

Abstract: It has been repeatedly proposed in one way or another that there are intriguing similarities between *wa*-marked topic NPs in Japanese and *ang*-marked topic (or nominative) NPs in Tagalog and other Philippine languages (Shibatani 1988, 1991, Katagiri 2004, 2006). The key observation here is that Tagalog *ang*-marked topic NPs are not allowed in exclamative, meteorological, or existential constructions, where it is also not possible to use Japanese *wa*-marked topic NPs. More recently, Santiago (2013) proposed that the distribution of topic NPs in Tagalog can be accounted for in terms of the thetic/categorical distinction (Kuroda 1972). In this paper, I carry out a contrastive analysis of Tagalog topic NPs and Japanese topic NPs and challenge this hypothesis about the parallelism between Tagalog and Japanese. By reexamining the data already discussed in the literature and introducing additional sets of facts, it will be shown that: in Tagalog (i) non-topic-marking in allegedly thetic constructions can be explained by means of language-particular factors such as historical sources, (ii) topic NPs can appear in thetic sentences, and (iii) topic-marking is optional in some categorical sentences. Taken together, the above mentioned similarities between Tagalog and Japanese are shown to be superficial and coincidental. The contrast between thetic and categorical judgments realized in Japanese is not a good predictor of the occurrence or non-occurrence of topic NPs in Tagalog.*

Key words: Tagalog, thetic, categorical, case marking, information structure

1. Introduction

The distinction between thetic and categorical judgments was originally proposed by the 19th century philosophers Franz Brentano and Anton Marty and was later introduced into linguistic research by Kuroda (1972). This theory assumes that:

There are two different fundamental types of judgments, the categorical and the thetic. Of these, only the former conforms to the traditional paradigm of subject-predicate, while the latter represents simply the recognition or rejection of material of a judgment. Moreover, the categorical judgment is assumed to consist of two separate acts, one the act of recognition of that which is to be made the subject, and the other, the act of affirming or denying what is expressed by the predicate about the subject (Kuroda 1972: 154).

Kuroda (1972) claims that this thetic/categorical distinction is manifested by the particles *wa* and *ga* in Japanese. Consider the sentence with the *wa* particle in (1) and that with *ga* in (2).

(1) Inu=wa   hasit-te i-ru.   (Categorical)
     dog=TOP   run-GER   be-PRS.
     'The dog is running.' (Kuroda 1972: 161; glossing is mine)
(2) Inu=ga   hasit-te i-ru.   (Thetic)
     dog=NOM   run-GER   be-PRS
     'There's a dog running.' (Kuroda 1972: 161; glossing is mine)

The Japanese sentences in (1) and (2) have a subtle yet important difference in meaning that may not be immediately obvious from their English translation equivalents 'The dog is running' and 'There's a dog running'. The categorical sentence with *wa* in (1) expresses the traditional subject-predicate relation. This structure is appropriate for answering the question "What about X?". In contrast, the thetic sentence with *ga* in (2) expresses a simple recognition of the event. It is suitable as an answer to "What happened?" rather than "What about X?".

Since Kuroda's proposal, the idea of the thetic/categorical distinction has ignited debate about the implications of the distinction and its relationship to other domains such as referentiality, information structure, and stage-level vs. individual-level predicates. Linguistic manifestations of this distinction have been one of the well-discussed topics in crosslinguistic and contrastive studies of languages, and a number of attempts have been made to characterize different phenomena in different languages in terms of the thetic/categorical distinction. See Sasse (1987, 1995), Ladusaw (1994), Lambrecht (1994), Rosengren (1997), Lambrecht and Polinsky (1998), Haberland (2006), and Kageyama (2006), to name a few.

The distinction between *wa* and *ga* in Japanese captured by the thetic/categorical distinction was contrasted with a similar issue in the Philippine languages such as Cebuano and Tagalog by Shibatani (1991). Taking up the issue of the controversial status of so-called "topic" NPs in these languages (also referred to as "nominative"; see Section 2.2), Shibatani (1991) first pointed out similarities between Japanese *wa*-marked topics and *ang*- or *si*-marked "topic" NPs in the Philippine languages (*ang* is for common nouns, while *si* is for personal names).[1]

---

[1] As discussed in Section 2.2, the term "topic" is used interchangeably with "nominative" in the literature of Philippine linguistics. Also, by "*ang*-marked NPs", I mean NPs marked in the nominative case, also including NPs marked by *si* and nominative pronouns. See Table 2

One of his key observations is that, in Philippine languages, "topic" NPs are not available in exclamative, meteorological, or existential constructions. Compare the ordinary verb-predicate sentence in (3) with the exclamative, meteorological, and existential sentences in (4) through (6) in Cebuano.[2]

(3) Ni-hatag   si   Juan   ug   libro   sa   bata.   (Cebuano)
     AV-give   P.TOP Juan   GEN   book   LOC child
     'Juan gave a book to the child.' (Shibatani 1991: 106)
     cf. Zyon=**wa** kodomo=ni hon=o   age-ta.
        John=TOP child=DAT book=ACC   give-PST
        'John gave a book to the child.'

(4) Exclamative sentence:
     Ka-taas   *si/ni   Juan!   (Cebuano)
     NMLZ-tall   P.TOP/P.GEN   Juan
     'How tall John is!' (Shibatani 1991: 108)
     cf. Zyon=**no**   se=no   takasa=yo!
        John=GEN   height=GEN   tall=EXCL
        'How tall John is!'

(5) Meteorological sentence:
     Nag-ulan   na. (Cebuano)
     AV-rain   now
     'It's raining now.' (Shibatani 1991: 110)
     cf. Ame=**ga**   hut-te   i-ru.
        rain=NOM   fall-GER be-PRS
        'It is raining now.'

(6) Existential sentence:
     Naay maayong   libro   sa   tindahan.   (Cebuano)
     EXS good   book   LOC store
     'There is a good book at the store.' (Shibatani 1991: 110)
     cf. Mise=ni   ii   hon=**ga**   a-ru.
        store=LOC   good book=NOM be-PRS
        'There is a good book at the store.'

In ordinary verb-predicate sentences like (3), the *si*-marked topic NP is employed to introduce a primary clausal participant, an agent in this case. In the exclamative, meteorological, and existential sentences in (4), (5), and (6), however, *ang*-marked topic NPs are not employed. As in (4), using the topic marker instead of the genitive marker leads to an ungrammatical sentence. When the Cebuano examples in (3) through (6) are contrasted with their translation equivalents in Japanese, the availability of Japanese *wa*-marked topics is aligned with that of Cebuano topics.

_____

for the case-marking system in Tagalog.
[2] The original gloss was slightly changed for consistency. The label TOP is equivalent to the label NOM in the Tagalog examples below (see Section 2.2).

This line of discussion was further pursued and elaborated by Katagiri (2004, 2006). In a series of contrastive studies between Japanese and Tagalog, Katagiri (2004, 2006) discusses similarities between Japanese *wa*-marked topics and Tagalog *ang*-marked topics, successfully showing that Tagalog topic NPs show as high a degree of topichood as Japanese topics.

The two lines of research, namely, the thetic/categorical distinction in Japanese, on the one hand, and the occurrence or non-occurrence of *ang*-marked topic NPs in Philippine languages on the other, are brought together by Santiago (2013). Santiago (2013: 206) explicitly concludes that "topicless constructions represent thetic expressions" in Tagalog by examining different kinds of constructions in which *ang*-marked topic NPs do not occur, such as exclamative, meteorological, and existential constructions. As he also assumes that "Tagalog categorical statements are composed of a predicate and a topic marked by the *ang*-phrase" (Santiago 2013: 207) and that in categorical sentences "at least one entity needs to be in the nominative case [NN – in the topic form]" (2013: 208), Santiago is suggesting that the thetic/categorical distinction can account for the distribution of topic NPs in Philippine languages.

Santiago's (2013) proposal seems at least partially successful. For example, when the Cebuano examples in (3) through (6) are reexamined from a thetic/categorical distinction, it becomes evident that *ang*-marked topic NPs are allowed in categorical sentences as in (3) but not in the thetic sentences in (4) through (6), as shown in Table 1. It may therefore seem plausible to conclude that topic NPs in Cebuano are parallel with Japanese *wa*-marked topic NPs and that the occurrence or non-occurrence of topic NPs in Philippine languages is a manifestation of the thetic/categorical distinction.

Table 1. Comparison between Cebuano and Japanese

	(3) Categorical	(4) Exclamative	(5) Weather	(6) Existential
Judgment	Categorical	Thetic	Thetic	Thetic
Cebuano	ᵒᵏTOP	*TOP/ᵒᵏGEN	*TOP/ᵒᵏØ	*TOP/ᵒᵏØ
Japanese	ᵒᵏ*wa*/*ga	*wa/ᵒᵏno	*wa/ᵒᵏga	*wa/ᵒᵏga

In this paper, however, I argue against directly connecting the distribution of Tagalog topic NPs with the types of judgments, that is, analyzing the occurrence or non-occurrence of topic NPs in terms of the thetic/categorical distinction. To be more specific, by contrastively analyzing Tagalog topic NPs and Japanese *wa*-marked topic NPs, I demonstrate that the contrast between thetic and categorical judgments realized in Japanese is not a good predictor of the presence or absence of topic NPs in Tagalog. It is true that there are some similarities between Japanese *wa*-marked topic NPs and Tagalog *ang*-marked topic NPs; however, reexamining the allegedly thetic sentences will reveal that the phenomena above are not, in fact, manifestations of the thetic/categorical distinction but rather are consequences of independent language-specific factors, such as information structure constraints. In addition, more convincing evidence comes from new sets of Tagalog data:

topic NPs can appear in thetic sentences, and topic-marking is optional in some categorical sentences. Collectively, it will be shown that the surface similarities between Tagalog and Japanese are coincidental at best and that they should not be analyzed as comparative linguistic phenomena. The thetic/categorical distinction cannot account for the distribution of *ang*-marked topic NPs in Tagalog.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces basic facts about Tagalog with special reference to voice morphology and the terms "TOPIC" and "NOMINATIVE". Section 3 reexamines the construction types that have been associated with thetic judgment in the literature and show that there are always other factors to consider in describing them. Section 4 presents additional sets of data to demonstrate that Tagalog *ang*-marked topic NPs can appear in some thetic sentences, while they do not always appear in other categorical sentences. Lastly, Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Preliminaries

This section provides relevant preliminary information about Tagalog. Section 2.1 summarizes some of the typological characteristics of this language, focusing on its voice morphology. This leads to some terminological complications, which are outlined in Section 2.2.

2.1. "Focus system"

Tagalog belongs to the western Malayo-Polynesian subgroup of the Austronesian language family. It is spoken by more than 30 million speakers in and around Metro Manila in the Republic of the Philippines. This language is linguistically the same as, but ideologically distinguished from, Filipino, which is the national language and an official language of the Republic.

Typologically speaking, Tagalog is a relatively consistent head-initial language. Its clausal basic word order is VSO: predicates occupy the clause-initial position and are followed by arguments and adjuncts. This is illustrated by the example in (7).

(7) K<um>a~kain   ang= bata   ng=   isda   sa=   kusina.
     RDP<AV>~eat   NOM= child   GEN= fish   LOC= kitchen
     'The child is eating fish in the kitchen.'

One of the most striking features about Tagalog is its complex voice/valence-marking verbal morphology, sometimes referred to as the focus system (Schachter and Otanes 1972, Himmelmann 2005a, b).[3] In this Philippine-type voice system, a particular participant of an action is singled out as the primary grammatical argument and receives special marking in two ways. First, the participant selected as the primary grammatical argument is realized as a nominative NP (or topic NP, see Section 2.2 for 'topic' and 'nominative'). And second, verbs are marked for one of the four voice categories depending on the semantic role of the primary

---

[3] In addition, each verb inflects for aspect and agentivity (e.g., NVOL non-volitional).

argument: actor-voice (AV), patient-voice (PV), locative-voice (LV), and circumstantial voice (CV). The sentence in (7), for instance, is an AV construction. The primary grammatical argument *bata* 'child' is marked as nominative, and the verb is attached with the AV infix *<um>*.

In this system, then, voice oppositions are indicated in two ways. Compare the AV construction in (7) and the PV construction in (8). In the PV construction in (8), the patient *isda* 'fish' is chosen as the primary grammatical argument, which is marked through the rearrangement of case assignment and verbal morphology.

(8) K<in>a~kain   ng=   bata   ang= isda sa=   kusina.
     RDP<PV.RL>~eat   GEN= child NOM= fish LOC= kitchen
     'The child is eating the fish in the kitchen.'

There are at least two features that make this Philippine-type voice system stand out in the typology of voice phenomena. First, factors affecting the choice between the different voice categories still remain unknown (Himmelmann 2005a, b). Although several theories have been proposed, there is no agreement yet as to which factor is the most decisive. An exception is the observation that definite NPs, especially definite patient NPs, tend to be selected as primary grammatical arguments (Ceña 1977, McFarland 1978, Foley and Van Valin 1984, Wouk 1986, Shibatani 1988, Kroeger 1993, Himmelmann 2005a, b). Observe that the patient argument *isda* 'fish' receives an indefinite or partitive interpretation in the AV construction in (7) but a definite interpretation in the PV construction in (8).[4]

Second, peripheral participants such as location and beneficiary can be selected as primary grammatical arguments in addition to agent and patient participants, although this peripheral voice choice is not available in all circumstances or allowed for all verbs. See the LV construction in (9) and the CV construction in (10).

(9)   K<in>ain-an ng=   bata   ang= plato=ng ito.
      eat<RL>-LV GEN= child NOM= dish=LK this
      'The child ate off of this dish.'

(10) I-k<in>ain ng=   bata   ang= nanay   =niya.
      CV-eat<RL> GEN= child NOM= mother =3SG.GEN
      'The child ate for his/her mother.'

Now consider the nominal structure in Tagalog. Tagalog NPs take three different forms depending on the grammatical function they achieve: nominative (NOM/TOP), genitive (GEN), and locative (LOC). Lexical noun phrases are marked by nominal particles in Table 2, while pronouns inflect for case and number.

---

[4] This does not mean, however, that non-nominative NPs cannot have a definite interpretation. In particular, whether in nominative case or not, actor NPs can have a definite interpretation, as in *bata* in (8). See also note 9.

Table 2. Tagalog nominal particles

	NOM/TOP	GEN	LOC
Common noun	*ang*	*ng* [naŋ]	*sa*
Personal name (SG)	*si*	*ni*	*kay*
Personal name (PL)	*sina*	*nina*	*kina*

Nominative NPs are used for the primary grammatical argument of a clause,[5] while genitive NPs express not only possessor participants but also non-primary grammatical arguments. Locative NPs are used to express adjuncts sometimes in combination with prepositions. In the actor voice construction in (7), for example, the agent participant *bata* 'child' is the primary grammatical argument. Therefore, it appears in the nominative form; the patient participant *isda* 'fish' is marked as genitive. The locative NP *kusina* 'kitchen' provides a spatial setting for the event of eating.

2.2. Subject and topic

Since the 1970s, Tagalog has been famous for the controversial status of its subject. Schachter (1976, 1977) was the first to point out split subjecthood between nominative NPs and actor (agent) NPs in Tagalog. On the one hand, nominative NPs have some of the morphosyntactic properties often associated with subject, such as relativization and floating quantifiers, but not always. On the other hand, actor NPs can be targets of equi-NP deletion and bind reflexives, whether they are marked in the nominative case or not. Schachter's conclusion was that neither nominative NPs nor actor NPs should be analyzed as subjects. In more recent studies, some have argued that nominative NPs are subjects, while others have rejected this analysis (see Shibatani 1988, 1991, Kroeger 1993, Himmelmann 2005a, b, for instance).

Reflective of this controversy over how to analyze nominative arguments, several different labels are given to the nominal markers *ang*, *si*, and *sina*; the choice between these labels depends on how one understands the nature of the primary grammatical argument. Schachter and Otanes (1972) and Schachter (1976, 1977) prefer the label TOP(ic), mainly because nominative NPs do not always show subject-like properties but always have a definite interpretation as in Japanese topic.[6] This terminology has been followed by Shibatani (1988, 1991), Richards (2000), and Katagiri (2004, 2006), among others. In contrast, other linguists have avoided the label TOP and adopted the label NOM(inative), including Kroeger (1993), Nagaya (2009), Kaufmann (2009, 2011), and Santiago (2013). This position assumes that the term NOM refers to the morphological formal category realized

---

[5] The nominative marker *ang* has several other grammaticalized uses (Nagaya 2011).

[6] It is worth noting that, although he glosses *ang* as TOP, Schachter (1976: 496) clearly states that topic NPs in Tagalog do not function as the center of attention established by the discourse. In other words, he does not consider topic NPs in Tagalog as discourse topics.

by *ang*, *si*, and *sina*, reserving the term TOP for purely pragmatic purposes. Other authors prefer yet another term: 'specific' (Himmelmann 2005a, b), 'trigger' (Wouk 1986), 'absolutive', and so on. To put it differently, there are at least several competing labels for nominative NPs, although practically they can be used interchangeably. See French (1987/1988) for a historical overview of these terminological complications.

In the rest of this paper, I will use the label NOM(inative) for the nominal particles *ang*, *si*, and *sina*, because the purpose of this paper is to examine whether or not arguments with these particles correspond to Japanese *wa*-marked topic NPs. I do not want the discussion that follows to rest on the premise that the primary grammatical argument in Tagalog is a topic as understood in Japanese linguistics.

Thus, we can now reformulate the main question of this paper as follows: do Tagalog nominative NPs really behave like Japanese *wa*-marked topic NPs? Can the thetic/categorical distinction account for the occurrence or non-occurrence of Tagalog nominative NPs? I will turn to these questions in Sections 3 and 4.

3. Reexamining the proposed thetic constructions

A list of the constructions that have been associated with thetic sentences in Tagalog is given in (11). These construction types were discussed by Santiago (2013), who proposed the strongest version of the thetic/categorical hypothesis for Tagalog. Crucially, according to his observations, nominative NPs do not appear in these construction types.

(11)   a. exclamatives
       b. intensives
       c. recent perfect construction
       d. *pag*-subordinate clauses
       e. existentials
       f. pseudo verbs
       g. whether verbs

In this section, I reexamine these constructions one by one and show that there are always language-specific reasons why nominative NPs do not appear in these sentences and that the thetic/categorical distinction is not the only theory that can account for the distribution of nominative NPs in the way suggested by Santiago (2013). Note that, in this and the following sections, each example is given with its Japanese translation equivalent, through which the theticity of each example is identified: the sentence represents a categorical judgment if the subject NP is marked by *wa* in Japanese, but a thetic judgment if it is not.

3.1. Exclamatives, intensives, and recent perfect

Let us first consider exclamative and intensive constructions. Tagalog exclamative constructions are formed by attaching the nominative particle *ang* or the exclamative marker *kay* to an adjectival root, while intensive constructions are created with the combination of the intensifying prefix *napaka-* with an adjectival root. See

(12), (13), and (14), respectively.

(12) Ang=   ganda   ni=   Maria!
     NOM=   beautiful P.GEN=   Maria
     'How beautiful Maria is!'
     cf. Maria **no** utukusisa yo!

(13) Kay=   ganda   ni=   Maria!
     EXCL=   beautiful P.GEN=   Maria
     'How beautiful Maria is!'
     cf. Maria **no** utukusisa yo!

(14) Napaka-ganda   ni=   Maria!
     INTENSIVE-beautiful   P.GEN=   Maria
     'How beautiful Maria is!'
     cf. Maria **no** utukusisa yo!

As seen in (12), (13), and (14), nominative arguments do not appear in these constructions, just as *wa*-marked topics are not allowed in Japanese translation equivalents. At first glance, the lack of nominative arguments in these constructions may seem to be comparable to the lack of *wa*-marked topics in Japanese. In particular, Santiago (2013: 210) insists that these construction types represent a thetic judgment in that they express a "strong reaction to a (usually newly recognized) quality."

However, this apparent similarity between exclamative constructions in the two languages is a coincidence. As thoroughly discussed by Kaufman (2009, 2011), these constructions were historically derived from nominalization. In (12), the nominative particle *ang* is added to nominalize the entire expression (see also Nagaya 2011); in (13) and (14), the nominalizer **ka-* is attached, although it is now lexicalized in _kay_ and _napaka-_. It is not at all surprising that these nominalization-based exclamative and intensive expressions take a genitive argument rather than a nominative argument. In other words, the primary grammatical argument in these exclamative and intensive constructions receives non-nominative case marking not because of the thetic judgments they represent but because of their historical origins as nominalizations.[7,8] See Yap and Grunow-Hårsta (2010) for a general review of nominalization-based exclamatives.

The same argument applies to the recent perfect construction in (15).

(15) Ka-a~alis   =lang ni=   Maria!
     RPF-RDP~leave   =just P.GEN=   Maria
     'Maria has just left.'
     cf. Maria **wa/ga** satta bakari da.

---

[7] It is fair to say that Japanese and Tagalog are similar insofar as they both have a variety of nominalization-based exclamative constructions. But this fact does not automatically mean that these constructions in both languages represent a thetic judgment.
[8] The Cebuano *ka*-exclamative sentence in (4) is also a nominalization-based exclamative construction.

In (15), the recent perfect predicate is formed via the prefix *ka-* and reduplication. This recent perfect construction takes a genitive argument rather than a nominative argument, not because it represents a thetic judgment but because the recent perfect prefix *ka-* was historically derived from the nominalizer **ka-* (Kaufman 2011).

3.2. Subordinate clauses

Santiago (2013) has tried to connect the use of genitive arguments in *pag*-subordinate clauses to a thetic judgment. As seen in (16), the *pag*-subordinate clause takes a genitive argument rather than a nominative one.

(16) Pag-dating   ni=   Pedro dito,
     when-arrive   P.GEN=   Pedro here,
     i-pa-alam   =mo   sa=   akin.
     CV-CAUS-know =2SG.GEN   LOC=   1SG.LOC
     'When Pedro arrives here, let me know.'
     cf. Pedoro **ga** tuitara, watasi ni sirasete kudasai.

However, this is a hasty generalization for many reasons. First of all, as Shibatani (1991) and Katagiri (2004, 2006) have already noted, the genitive marking of arguments of *pag*-subordinate clauses is again a consequence of the historical origin of the prefix *pag-*. It has the same origin as the gerund-forming prefix *pag-*, which is still used in modern Tagalog to form verbal nouns, as in (17).

(17) Kasama sa=   plano =ko   ang=   pag-punta   doon.
     included LOC= plan   =1SG.GEN NOM= GER-go   there
     'Going there is included in my plan.'

Second, other subordinate clauses can readily take nominative arguments, as in the *kung* 'if' clause in (18). Full subordinate clauses are very common in Tagalog.

(18) Kung   ka~kain   =ka   ng=   marami=ng   gulay
     if   RDP~eat(AV)   =2SG.NOM GEN= many=LK   vegetable
     ma-gi~ging   malusog =ka.
     AV-RDP-become   healthy   =2SG.NOM
     'If you eat a lot of vegetables, you will become healthy.'
     cf. Mosi anata **ga** takusan yasai o tabetara, anata wa kenkoo ni naru.

Lastly and more importantly, *pag*-marked subordinate clauses can be full clauses with a nominative NP and an inflecting verb, as in (19), without a noticeable difference in meaning from (16).

(19) Pag   d<um>ating   si=   Pedro dito,
     when   arrive<AV>   P.NOM= Pedro here,
     i-pa-alam   =mo   sa=   akin.
     CV-CAUS-know =2SG.GEN   LOC=   1SG.LOC
     'When Pedro arrives here, let me know.'

cf. Pedoro **ga** tuitara, watasi ni sirasete kudasai.

To summarize, the genitive marking of arguments in *pag*-marked subordinate clauses is just another case of nominalization-induced genitive-case marking, and has nothing to do with the type of judgment they represent.

Before closing this subsection, let me introduce another subordinate clause that takes a genitive argument. Although they have not yet been so analyzed in the literature, *ka*-marked subordinate clauses take a non-nominative argument, as in (20).

(20) Halos   mabaliw =na   =ako   sa=
      almost   crazy   =now   =1SG.NOM   LOC=
      ka-i~isip   =ko   sa=   graduation thesis.
      NMLZ-RDP~think =1SG.GEN   LOC=   graduation thesis
      'I am almost crazy now because I am thinking about the graduation thesis.'

Again, the same argument applies to this *ka*-reason clause, too. The subordinate marker *ka*- has the same origin as the nominalizer *ka- as discussed in Section 3.1.

3.3. Existential constructions and pseudo verbs

Nominative NPs do not appear in some types of existential constructions and pseudo verb constructions. See the *may* existential construction in (21) and the *gusto* pseudo verb construction in (22). Note that, in Tagalog, pseudo verbs refer to a small set of non-inflecting predicates that take two arguments like verbs, including *gusto* 'want/like', *ayaw* 'dislike', and *kailangan* 'need' (Schachter and Otanes 1972: 261).

(21) May= aso   sa=   bahay.
      EXS= dog LOC=   house
      'There is a dog in the house.'
      cf. Ie ni inu **ga** iru.
(22) Gusto   ng=   bata   ng=   saging.
      want   GEN=   child   GEN=   banana
      'The child wants a banana.'
      cf. Kodomo wa banana **ga** hosii.

In (21), the existential predicate *may* appears with the entity noun *aso* 'dog', which is not marked in the nominative case. Using the nominative case here results in an ungrammatical sentence (i.e., **May ang aso sa bahay*). In (22), the two arguments of the pseudo verb *gusto* 'want' are realized as genitive NPs.

Santiago (2013) suggests that the absence of nominative NPs in these constructions is due to the thetic judgment they represent. However, there is another way to look at these phenomena. As mentioned in Section 2.2, nominative NPs have a strong tendency to have a definite referent. It is therefore not surprising that such NPs do not appear in the existential or pseudo verb constructions that

prefer an indefinite NP. Nominative NPs are avoided in (21) and (22) to comply with the indefinite constraint imposed on each construction (see also Schachter 1977: 288–290).[9]

Indeed, nominative NPs are acceptable in contexts where such constraints are not applied. See the locative existential construction in (23) and the definite pseudo verb construction in (24).

(23) Nasa=   bahay ang=   aso.
     LOC.EXS= house NOM=   dog
     'The dog is in the house.'
     cf. Inu **wa** ie ni iru.
(24) Gusto   ng=   bata   ang=   saging.
     want   GEN= child   NOM= banana
     'The child wants the banana.'
     cf. Kodomo wa (sono) banana **ga** hosii.

The locative existential construction in (23) has much the same meaning as the *may* existential construction in (21), except for the referentiality of *aso* 'dog'. The same is also true of the pseudo verb constructions in (22) and (24). Thus, the lack of nominative marking in (21) and (22) is not because of the thetic judgments the sentences represent but is a way to avoid a definite interpretation imposed by the nominative marker *ang*.

3.4. Weather verbs
Since Schachter (1976, 1977), it has been well recognized that nominative NPs do not appear in weather or meteorological verbs in Tagalog. See (25) and (26): no nominative NPs are employed in Tagalog, while *ga*-marked NPs are used in Japanese equivalents.

(25) <Um>ulan   kahapon.
     rain<AV>   yesterday
     'It rained yesterday.'
     cf. Kinoo ame **ga** hutta.
(26) L<um>indol   sa=   Indonesia.
     earthquake<AV>   LOC= Indonesia
     'There was an earthquake in Indonesia.'
     cf. Indonesia de zisin **ga** atta.

This observation seems to provide compelling evidence for the thetic analysis of non-nominative marking in Tagalog. But there are two reasons why this is not a tenable argument. First, Tagalog and Japanese belong to different types in the

---

[9] We can safely say that if it is marked in the nominative case, an NP has a definite interpretation (cf. Nagaya 2011). But the opposite is not always true. In particular, genitive NPs with an actor and actor-like role can have a definite interpretation, as in *bata* 'the child' in (22) and (24). See also note 4.

formal typology of meteorological expressions proposed by Eriksen, Kittilä, and Kolehmainen (2010). Japanese is of the intransitive predicate type, where relatively semantically rich subject NPs are employed, such as the *ame* 'rain' and *jishin* 'earthquake' NPs above. In contrast, Tagalog is of the atransitive (i.e., zero argument) predicate type, in which the only obligatory element in a meteorological expression is a predicate denoting meteorological events, such as the verb roots *ulan* 'rain' and *lindol* 'earthquake', and no argument appears. In this type of language, there is no point in discussing how to code arguments, because the meteorological expressions lack one in the first place. Therefore, weather verbs in Japanese and Tagalog are not comparable phenomena with regard to the formal marking of arguments.

Second, under special circumstances, Tagalog weather verbs can take an argument. In this case, interestingly, this argument is marked in the nominative case, contrary to what is expected from the thetic/categorical distinction. Consider (27).

(27)   <Um>ulan =ka   naman.
       rain<AV>   =2SG.NOM   please
       'Please rain!'

The meteorological expression in (27) is used when the speaker wants it to rain very soon. It is uttered as if the speaker were talking to God or whoever might be in control of the weather, to which the personal pronoun *ka* 'you' refers. Importantly, this personal pronoun is marked in the nominative case, although meteorological expressions tend to represent a thetic judgment. Thus, the thetic/categorical distinction fails to predict the distribution of nominative NPs in sentences such as (27).

3.5 Summary

In this section, I reexamined the Tagalog data that have been associated with a thetic judgment in the literature and showed that the non-nominative marking in these construction types has language-specific reasons for such encoding. Exclamative, *napaka*-intensive, *ka*-recent perfect, and *pag*-subordinate constructions are historically derived from nominalization expressions, which impose genitive marking on arguments. In existential and pseudo verb constructions, non-nominative marking is preferred to comply with the indefinite constraint. Tagalog weather verbs do not have a nominative NP because they belong to the atransitive type in the formal typology of meteorological expressions. See Table 3 for a summary of the discussions thus far, in which particles used for each construction type in Tagalog and Japanese are listed along with the language-particular factors for non-nominative marking in Tagalog.

In other words, the above mentioned superficial similarities between Tagalog and Japanese stem from three language-particular factors: non-nominative marking is available when constructions have a nominalization origin, impose an indefinite constraint, or do not require an argument. Contrary to Santiago (2013), these language-particular factors cannot be lumped together under the single name of thetic judgments. Of course, it is still possible to insist, for example, that the nomi-

Table 3. "Thetic constructions" reexamined

Construction type	Tagalog	Japanese	Language-particular factor
exclamatives	GEN	*no*	nominalization
napaka-intensives	GEN	*no*	nominalization
recent perfect construction	GEN	*wa/ga*	nominalization
pag-subordinate clauses	GEN	*ga*	nominalization
existentials	ø	*ga*	indefiniteness constraint
pseudo verbs	GEN	*ga*	indefiniteness constraint
weather verbs	ø or NOM	*ga*	atransitive predicate

nal origin of these structures is a linguistic realization of the thetic judgment. But such an attempt would face more difficulties in describing the data presented in the next section.

4. Nominative "thetic" sentences and non-nominative "categorical" sentences
In Section 3, it was demonstrated that the pieces of evidence for the thetic analysis of non-nominative constructions do not solely support this hypothesis and can also be accounted for by language-specific factors. In this section, I examine additional data that have not been discussed in the literature and argue that they constitute undeniable evidence against the parallelism between Japanese *wa*-marked topics and Tagalog *ang*-marked NPs.

4.1. Answering the 'What happened?' question
Within Lambrecht's (1994) conceptual framework for information structure, three different focus categories are distinguished: Predicate-Focus, Sentence-Focus, and Argument-Focus. The first two focus categories are relevant to my discussion here, because they are closely connected with categorical and thetic judgments, respectively (Lambrecht and Polinsky 1998).

The Predicate-Focus category corresponds to a traditional concept of topic-comment structure and therefore a categorical judgment (cf. (1)). It is typically used to answer questions like "How's X" and "What happened to X". In Tagalog, not surprisingly, this focus structure is realized with sentences with a nominative NP. See (28), for instance.

(28) Q: Kumusta ang= kotse =mo?
       how   NOM= car   =2SG.GEN
      'How's your car?'
   A: Na-sira   (ang=   kotse =ko).
      NVOL.PV.RL-break (NOM= car =1SG.GEN)
      '(My car) broke down.' (Nagaya 2007: 351)
      cf. Watasi no kuruma **wa** kowareta.

In the Sentence-Focus category, in contrast, the entire sentence is in focus, expressing all new information and representing a thetic judgment (cf. (2)).

Sentences of this focus category are typically employed in answers to questions like 'What happened?' and 'What's the matter?'. If the thetic/categorical account of nominative NPs in Tagalog were correct, one could expect nominative NPs to be disallowed in this thetic context. However, this is not the case. The answer in (29) is a case in point.

(29) Q: Ano   ang=   nang-yari?
          what   NOM=   AV.RL-happen
          'What happened?'
      A: Na-sira   ang=   kotse   =ko.
          NVOL.PV.RL-break   NOM=   car   =1SG.GEN
          'My car broke down.' (Nagaya 2007: 351–352)
          cf. Watasi no kuruma **ga** kowareta.

In the question-answer pair in (29), Person Q utters the "What's happened?" question, which induces a typical thetic context. Then, Person A says his or her answer (29)A, which is supposed to represent a thetic judgment. This is borne out by the Japanese translation. The particle *ga* rather than *wa* is used. However, in Tagalog, the nominative NP *ang kotse ko* 'my car' is employed, contrary to the prediction above. There is no other way to express this meaning in this situation.

In other words, it is possible to use nominative NPs in Sentence-Focus or thetic contexts in Tagalog. This simple fact clearly indicates that the contrast between nominative and non-nominative marking in Tagalog cannot be reduced to the thetic/categorical distinction.

4.2. Impersonal constructions

Although it has not been well recognized in the literature, nonverbal predicates concerning temperature and ambience can optionally take an impersonal construction in Tagalog. This is illustrated by (30) and (31).

(30) Malamig   ang=/sa=   Baguio.
       cold   NOM=/LOC=   Baguio
       'It's cold in Baguio.'
       cf. Bagio **wa** samui.
(31) Pasko=ng   Pasko   =na   ang=/sa=   Manila.
       Christmas=LK   Christmas   =now   NOM=/LOC=   Manila
       'It's very Christmas-ish in Manila now.'
       cf. Manira **wa** kurisumasu no hun'iki da.

As shown in (30), adjective predicates of temperature such as *malamig* 'cold' and *mainit* 'hot' can be predicated of either the nominative NP or the locative NP, without leading to a noticeable difference in meaning. Similarly, in (31), the nominal predicate *Paskong Pasko* 'very Christmas-ish' can be employed either with the nominative NP or with the locative NP.

As indicated in the Japanese translations, these sentences are categorical. But nominative marking is optional in these sentences. It follows from this observation

that nominative marking does not always correspond to categorical judgments. Although Santiago (2013: 208) states that in categorical sentences "at least one entity needs to be in the nominative case," some categorical sentences can lack a nominative NP, as in (30) and (31).

4.3. Complement clauses

Yet another syntactic context where nominative NPs are optional in categorical sentences is clausal complementation. In Tagalog, complement clauses are not marked in the nominative case, even when they are expected to be. Compare (32) and (33).

(32) Alam =niya   ang= lihim =ko.
      know =3SG.GEN   NOM= secret =1SG.GEN
      'S/he knows my secret.'

(33) Alam =niya   na <u>espiya =ako</u>.
      know =3SG.GEN   LK spy   =1SG.NOM
      'S/he know that <u>I am a spy</u>.'
      cf. Kanozyo/kare **wa** <u>watasi ga supai da</u> to sitteiru.

In (32) and (33), the complement-taking predicate *alam* 'know' is used. Although it does not take a voice affix, it is inherently a PV predicate, as in (32). The thing known is marked in the nominative case when it is a lexical NP. But the complement clause in (33), indicated with an underline, is marked with a linker rather than with the nominative marker. Non-nominative marking is readily available in such categorical sentences.

Another example is given in (34), in which the adjective *mahirap* 'difficult' takes a complement.

(34) Mahirap   ang=/na   <u>mag-mahal   ng=   syota   ng= iba</u>.
      difficult   NOM=/LK   AV-love   GEN=   lover   GEN= other
      '<u>Loving someone else's boyfriend/girlfriend</u> is difficult.' (cf. Nagaya 2011: 607–608)
      cf. Tanin no koibito o aisuru koto **wa** muzukasii.

In (34), the adjective *mahirap* 'difficult' is predicated of the complement *mag-mahal ng syota ng iba* 'loving someone else's boyfriend/girlfriend'. When adjectives take such an infinitive complement, nominative marking is optional even though sentences represent a categorical judgment.

4.4. Summary

In this section, it was demonstrated that the existence or absence of nominative NPs cannot be predicted from the thetic/categorical distinction: nominative NPs are fully allowed in Sentence-Focus or thetic contexts, while non-nominative marking of arguments is available even in several categorical contexts. This discussion is summarized in Table 4, which clearly shows that there is no one-to-one correspondence between nominative marking in Tagalog and the thetic/categorical

distinction. Taken together, I have argued that the thetic/categorical distinction is irrelevant to (non-)nominative marking in Tagalog.

Table 4. Mismatch between (non-)nominative marking and judgment type

Construction type	Tagalog	Japanese	Judgment type
Sentence-Focus constructions	NOM	*ga*	Thetic
Impersonal constructions	NOM or LOC	*wa*	Categorical
Complement clauses	NOM or LK	*wa*	Categorical

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that the thetic/categorical distinction cannot account for the distribution of nominative (or topic) NPs in Tagalog. It was shown that (i) non-nominative marking in allegedly thetic constructions can be explained by means of language-specific factors (Section 3), (ii) nominative NPs can appear in thetic sentences (Section 4.1), and (iii) nominative marking is optional in some categorical sentences (Sections 4.2 and 4.3). Taken together, this study has clarified that the similarities between Japanese *wa* and Tagalog *ang*, *si*, and *sina* are superficial and coincidental. The thetic analysis of non-nominative marking in Tagalog is intriguing enough, but it is not possible to predict the occurrence/non-occurrence of nominative NPs by means of the thetic/categorical distinction.

This being the case, what is the nominative marker in Tagalog? My answer is uninteresting. It is nothing more or less than a language-particular case particle. As mentioned in Section 2.2, nominative NPs behave like subjects in some contexts, but not always. Likewise, the nominative particles *ang*, *si*, and *sina* may appear similar to Japanese *wa* in some cases but not always. The language-particular category realized by *ang*, *si*, and *sina* is not on par with crosslinguistic grammatical relations such as subject or topic. There is ample evidence to suggest that grammatical categories are language-particular (Dryer 1997, Croft 2001, Haspelmath 2007, 2010).

Needless to say, contrastive studies of different languages have proven to be one of the most effective methodologies in linguistics. Kuroda's (1972) insight has ignited a number of fruitful contrastive works, and there is no doubt that contrastive studies of Japanese and the Philippine languages have revealed a number of important facts about voice phenomena and grammatical relations in Philippine languages that otherwise might have gone unnoticed (Shibatani 1988, 1991, Katagiri 2004, 2006). But it is also important to recognize that every language has its own history, logic, and categories. Even in contrastive studies, we must be cautious about jumping to surface similarities when a more adequate language-specific account is available.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this paper:

ACC	accusative	AV	actor voice
CAUS	causative	CV	circumstantial voice
DAT	dative	EXCL	exclamative
EXS	existential	GEN	genitive
GER	gerundive	LK	linker
LOC	locative	LV	locative voice
NMLZ	nominalization	NOM	nominative
NVOL	non-volitional	P	personal name/kinship term
PL	plural	PRS	present
PST	past	PV	patient voice
RDP	reduplicant	RL	realis
RPF	recent perfect	SG	singular
TOP	topic	1	first person
2	second person	3	third person
"< >"	infix	"="	cliticization
"~"	reduplication		

References

Adelaar, Alexander and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann (eds.) (2005) *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*. London: Routledge.

Ceña, Resty M. (1977) Patient primacy in Tagalog. The LSA Annual Meeting, Chicago.

Croft, William (2001) *Radical construction grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dryer, Matthew S. (1997) Are grammatical relations universal? In: Joan L. Bybee, John Haiman, and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.) *Essays on language function and language type: Dedicated to T. Givón*, 115–143. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Eriksen, Pål, Seppo Kittilä, and Leena Kolehmainen (2010) The linguistics of weather: Cross-linguistic patterns of meteorological expressions. *Studies in Language* 34(3): 565–601.

Foley, William A. and Robert D. Van Valin Jr. (1984) *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

French, Koleen Matsuda (1987/1988) The focus system in Philippine languages: An historical overview. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 18/19: 1–27.

Haberland, Hartmut (2006) Thetic–categorical distinction. In: Keith Brown (ed.) *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*, Second edition, Volume 12, 676–677. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Haspelmath, Martin (2007) Pre-established categories don't exist: Consequences for language description and typology. *Linguistic Typology* 11(1): 119–132.

Haspelmath, Martin (2010) Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies. *Language* 86(3): 663–687.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. (2005a) The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar: Typological characteristics. In: Adelaar and Himmelmann (2005), 110–181.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. (2005b) Tagalog. In: Adelaar and Himmelmann (2005), 350–376.

Kageyama, Taro (2006) Property description as a voice phenomenon. In: Tasaku Tsunoda

and Taro Kageyama (eds.) *Voice and grammatical relations: In honor of Masayoshi Shibatani*, 85–114. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Katagiri, Masumi (2004) Piripinsyogo ni okeru syudai: Tagarogugo no *ang*-ku no syudaisei o tyuusin ni [Topics in Philippine languages: With special reference to *ang*-phrases in Tagalog]. In: Takashi Masuoka (ed.) *Syudai no taisyoo* [Contrastive studies on topics], 89–113. Tokyo: Kurosio.

Katagiri, Masumi (2006) Topichood of the Philippine topic: Revisited from a cross-linguistic perspective. *The structure of language: Views from Asian languages*, 37–61. Okayama: Faculty of Letters, Okayama University.

Kaufman, Daniel (2009) Austronesian nominalism and its consequences: A Tagalog case study. *Theoretical Linguistics* 35(1): 1–49.

Kaufman, Daniel (2011) Exclamatives and temporal nominalizations in Austronesian. In: Yap, Grunow-Hårsta, and Wrona (2011), 721–754.

Kroeger, Paul (1993) *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Kuroda, S.-Y. (1972) The categorical and the thetic judgment: Evidence from Japanese syntax. *Foundations of Language* 9(2): 153–185.

Ladusaw, William A. (1994) Thetic and categorical, stage and individual, weak and strong. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 4: 220–229.

Lambrecht, Knud (1994) *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lambrecht, Knud and Maria Polinsky (1998) Typological variation in sentence-focus constructions. In: Kora Singer, Randall Eggert, and Gregory Anderson (eds.) *Proceedings of the thirty-third annual meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society: Papers from the panels*, 189–206. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.

McFarland, Curtis D. (1978) Definite objects and subject selection in Philippine languages. In: Casilda Edrial-Luzares and Austin Hale (eds.) *Studies in Philippine linguistics*, Volume 2, 139–182. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Nagaya, Naonori (2007) Information structure and constituent order in Tagalog. *Language and Linguistics* 8(1): 343–372.

Nagaya, Naonori (2009) The middle voice in Tagalog. *Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 1: 159–188.

Nagaya, Naonori (2011) Rise and fall of referentiality: Articles in Philippine languages. In: Yap, Grunow-Hårsta, and Wrona (2011), 589–626.

Richards, Norvin (2000) Another look at Tagalog subjects. In: Ileana Paul, Vivianne Phillips, and Lisa Travis (eds.) *Formal issues in Austronesian linguistics*, 105–116. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Rosengren, Inger (1997) The thetic/categorical distinction revisited once more. *Linguistics* 35(3): 439–480.

Santiago, Paul Julian (2013) Topicless constructions as thetic statements in Tagalog. *Handbook of the 147th meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan*, 206–211.

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen (1987) The thetic/categorical distinction revisited. *Linguistics* 25(3): 511–580.

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen (1995) 'Theticity' and VS order: a case study. *STUF - Language Typology and Universals* 48(1–2): 3–31.

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

Schachter, Paul (1977) Reference-related and role-related properties of subjects. In: Peter Cole and Jerrold M. Sadock (eds.) *Syntax and semantics*, Volume 8: *Grammatical relations*, 279–306. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Schachter, Paul and Fe T. Otanes (1972) *Tagalog reference grammar.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Shibatani, Masayoshi (1988) Voice in Philippine languages. In: Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.) *Passive and voice*, 85–142. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Shibatani, Masayoshi (1991) Grammaticization of topic into subject. In: Elizabeth C. Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.) *Approaches to grammaticalization*, Volume 2: *Types of grammatical markers*, 93–133. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Wouk, Fay (1986) Transitivity in Batak and Tagalog. *Studies in Language* 10(2): 391–424.

Yap, Foong Ha and Karen Grunow-Hårsta (2010) Non-referential uses of nominalization constructions: Asian perspectives. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 4(12): 1154–1175.

Yap, Foong Ha, Karen Grunow-Hårsta, and Janick Wrona (eds.) (2011) *Nominalization in Asian languages: Diachronic and typological perspectives*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Author's contact information:

Department of Linguistics

The University of Tokyo

7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo, Tokyo, 113-0033 JAPAN

e-mail: nagaya@l.u-tokyo.ac.jp

【要　旨】

タガログ語におけるthetic/categorical判断再訪
──対照研究の観点から──

長屋　尚典

東京大学

　　日本語の「は」で標示された主題名詞句とタガログ語などのフィリピン諸語の *ang* で標示された主題名詞句（あるいは主格名詞句）の間に興味深い共通点があることはこれまでに何度も指摘されてきた（Shibatani 1988, 1991; Katagiri 2004, 2006）。その背景には，感嘆文，気候・天候文，存在文など，日本語で主題の「は」が用いられにくい環境で，*ang* もまた使われないという観察がある。さらに近年，Santiago（2013）によって，タガログ語の主題名詞句の分布が thetic/categorical という判断の区別（Kuroda 1972）で説明できるという説が提案された。本論文では，タガログ語の主題名詞句と日本語の主題名詞句の対照研究を行い，thetic/categorical の区別でタガログ語と日本語の平行性を捉える仮説に異議を唱える。具体的には，先行研究で既に議論されているデータを再分析し，新しいデータを提示することによって，タガログ語において（i）thetic な文における非主題標示はタガログ語に特殊な要因によって説明できること，（ii）thetic な文に主題名詞句が出現することも可能であること，さらに（iii）categorical な文のなかには主題標示が必須ではない文もあることを示す。このように，タガログ語と日本語の共通点は表面的なものであり偶然の産物である。日本語で指摘される thetic/categorical という判断の違いによって，タガログ語の主題名詞句の出現・非出現を予測することはできない。