

Depictive Construction and Grammatical Relations in Tagalog¹

Naonori Nagaya²

Keywords: Tagalog, Philippine-type, depictive, secondary predicate, grammatical relations, subject, topic, role-related, reference-related

Abstract

In this paper, I describe the depictive construction in Tagalog and try to provide an explanatory answer to the question of what counts as a controller of the depictive secondary predicate and how it is picked up. The grammatical relation approach to this question makes a wrong prediction and does not work well in Tagalog. Instead I insist that a semantico-pragmatic approach provides a more adequate account: a nominal can count as a controller if it is both semantically and pragmatically salient. The controller of the depictive must excel both in the role-related property and in the reference-related property. The grammatical relations are unnecessary to capture the depictive construction.

1 Introduction

There is plenty of interest in secondary predication in the literature. One of the points at issue is the question of what nominal counts as a subject of the depictive predicate, which we call a controller, and how the controller is picked up. The main goal of this paper is to demonstrate what serves as a controller and account for the question of the controller-selection in the Tagalog depictive construction.

The popular approach to the issue is the grammatical relation approach: whether a nominal can be a controller or not is determined by the grammatical relation of the nominal. This approach works well in languages like English, Japanese, and German. The subject and some of objects function as controllers; oblique nominals get to be controllers when they are promoted to the subject.

However, our observations here reveal that this is not the case with Tagalog. The grammatical relation approach fails to account for the controller-selection. It is quite controversial to assume grammatical relations in Tagalog and, moreover, the nominative nominal, which many linguists postulate to be subject, is not necessarily a controller. Consequently, I propose that the controller of the depictive predicate is picked up according to semantico-pragmatic factors: a nominal can count as a controller if it is both semantically and pragmatically salient. This proposal is correlated with semantic and pragmatic

¹The present paper is based on my B.A. thesis at University of Tokyo (Nagaya 2004). This paper owes much to many people. Many thanks to my consultants and friends: Delos Reyes Fernand, Edilberto A. Guevarra, Atty. Rommel S. Manuel, Melody Moya-Manuel, Dwight Moya, Maria Fe Plata, Jovilyn Verzo Tanael, and the University of Tokyo Filipino Students Association. Thanks, also, to Tooru Hayasi, Noriko T. Imanishi, Hiroshi Kumamoto, Yoshiki Nishimura, Mark Rosa, Tasaku Tsunoda, and Zendo Uwano for their insightful comments and kindness. Of course, responsibility for any errors is purely my own.

²nnagaya@gengo.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp

characteristics of the depictive construction, and supports the current analysis that AGENT is not defocused in Tagalog. Under the view of this proposal, the depictive construction in Tagalog is both role-related and reference-related, which cannot be understood in terms of the current dichotomous view between the role-related property and the reference-related property.

This paper is organized as follows: I present a general overview of Tagalog grammar in section 2, and describe and define the Tagalog depictive construction in section 3, and lastly I give a semantico-pragmatic account, instead of the grammatical relation approach, to the issue of the controller selection. I conclude this paper with some additional comments in section 5.

2 Overview of Tagalog Grammar

Tagalog is said to be a VSO language, and has 16 consonants /p, t, k, 'tʃ, b, d, g, m, n, ŋ[tʃ], s, h, l, r, w, y/, 5 vowels /i, e, a, o, u/, and 6 diphthongs /iw, ey, ay, aw, oy, uy/.³ Its typological classification is controversial; it is uncertain whether it is an accusative language or an ergative language.

2.1 Predicates and voice system

Tagalog and other so-called Philippine-type languages are known for their mysterious voice system and controversial status of subject. The curious voice system, called “focus system,” is such that Foley (1998) says “focus system [...] has been a source of contention for nearly a hundred years (Blake 1906), and this shows no sign of letting up.” In the simplest term, it focuses up a specific nominal and expresses the semantic role of that nominal by verbal morphology. Schachter and Otnes (1972: 69) say “focus is the feature of a verbal predicate that determines the semantic relationship between a predicate verb and its topic [read nominative].”

Let us look at the examples from Schachter (1976: 494-495).⁴

- (1) Mag-aalis ang babae ng bigas sa sako para sa bata.
take-out.AV.CONT NOM woman GEN rice OBL sack for child
'The woman will take some rice out of a/the sack for a/the child.'
- (2) Aalisin ng babae ang bigas sa sako para sa bata.
take-out.OV.CONT GEN woman NOM rice OBL sack for child
'A/The woman will take the rice out of a/the sack for a/the child.'
- (3) Aalisan ng babae ng bigas ang sako para sa bata.
take-out.DV.CONT GEN woman GEN rice NOM sack for child

³Henceforth, I present sentences and phrases in Tagalog according to the orthography of Tagalog.

⁴I use the following abbreviations in glossing the examples: ACC-accusative, ADV-adverbial marker, AV-actor voice, BV-beneficiary voice, CV-cause voice, CONT-contemplated aspect, DAT-dative, DV-direction voice, GEN-genitive, IV-instrument voice, IMPF-imperfective, INF-infinitive, LV-location voice, LINK-linker, NOM-nominative, OBL-oblique, OV-object voice, PRFV-perfective, PL-plural, RFV-referential voice, SG-singular, 1-first person, 2-second person, 3-third person. When I cite examples from the previous researches, I gloss them in my own manner.

‘A/The woman will take some rice out of the sack for a/the child.’

- (4) *Ipag-aalis ng babae ng bigas sa sako ang bata.*
 take-out.BV.CONT GEN woman GEN rice OBL sack NOM child

‘A/The woman will take some rice out of a/the sack for the child.’

The table below indicates the correlations between verbal affixes and semantic roles indicated by them.⁵ Affixes listed below are confined to ones which appear in this paper. Regarding other affixes, see Schachter and Otnes (1972).

Types of voice	Affixes	Semantic roles of a nominative noun
Actor Voice (AV)	<i>mag-, -um-, ma-, maka-</i>	AGENT, EXPERIENCER, THEME (intransitive)
Object Voice (OV)	<i>-in, i-, ma-</i>	THEME (non-intransitive)
Direction Voice (DV)	<i>-an</i>	GOAL, SOURCE
Location Voice (LV)	<i>-an, pag- -an</i>	LOCATION
Instrument Voice (IV)	<i>ipag-</i>	INSTRUMENT
Beneficiary Voice (BV)	<i>ipag-, i-</i>	BENEFICIARY
Cause Voice (CV)	<i>ika-</i>	CAUSE
Referential Voice (RV)	<i>pag- -an</i>	REFERENTIAL

It is not that semantic roles borne by noun phrases are always indicated by verbal morphology. Rather, when a nominal is not in the nominative case, its semantic role is indicated otherwise. Other nominals than the nominative nominal are theta-marked by case markers or prepositions, according to their semantic relations to a predicate. The interaction of the voice type with nominal marking is illustrated below at the risk of oversimplification.⁶

- (5) Non-intransitive clauses:

	AGT/EXP	THM	GL/LOC/SRC	OTHERS
Actor voice	NOM	GEN	OBL	PP
Object voice	GEN	NOM	OBL	PP
Direction voice	GEN	GEN	NOM	PP
Other voices	GEN	GEN	OBL	NOM

- (6) Intransitive clauses:

	AGT/EXP/THM	GL/LOC/SRC	OTHERS
Actor voice	NOM	OBL	PP
Direction voice	GEN	NOM	PP
Other voices	GEN	OBL	NOM

⁵Here is the list of semantic roles employed here: AGENT is an animate and volitional entity which instigates an action. EXPERIENCER is an animate entity which perceives or conceives something. THEME is an animate or inanimate entity which is in a certain state, is affected by an action, or undergoes the change-of-state. GOAL is an animate or inanimate entity to which an entity moves. SOURCE is an animate or inanimate entity from which an entity moves away. LOCATION is a place where an action happens or an thing exists in a certain state. BENEFICIARY is an animate entity which benefits from an action. INSTRUMENT is an inanimate entity by which AGENT acts. CAUSE is a reason for which an action is brought about. REFERENTIAL is a topic or subject of utterance.

⁶To elucidate each correspondence, I utilize here tentative abbreviations: AGT-AGENT, EXP-EXPERIENCER, THM-THEME, GL-GOAL, LOC-LOCATION, SRC-SOURCE, OTHERS-INSTRUMENT, BENEFICIARY, REFERENTIAL, and CAUSE; Other voices-Beneficiary voice, Location voice, Referential voice, and Cause voice.

The table shows the interaction between the voice types and the morphological marking of each semantic role. *AGENT* is in the nominative case in the Actor voice sentence, but it is in the genitive case in other voice sentences. *THEME* is in the nominative case in the intransitive Actor voice sentence and in the non-intransitive Object voice sentence, but it is realized in the genitive case in other voice sentences. Likewise, when *BENEFICIARY* is in the nominative case, the semantic role is indicated by verbal morphology. Otherwise, the role is marked by the preposition *para sa*. This is also the case with *INSTRUMENT*, *REFERENTIAL*, and *CAUSE*.

This voice system leads to problematic consequences in linguistic theories. First, it brings about the typologically controversial status of Philippine-type languages. They are considered as neither nominative-accusative or ergative-absolutive languages. Secondly, it challenges the universality of the notion of the subject and grammatical relations. In these languages, the characteristics attributed to the subject in other languages are split into two distinct nominals: the Actor nominal, which is roughly equivalent to an *AGENT* nominal, and the nominative nominal. See Schachter (1976) (1977).

Tagalog has three grammatical distinctions of aspect: perfective, imperfective, and contemplated aspect.

2.2 Nominals

Nominals in Tagalog are introduced in various ways such as by case markers below and prepositions such as *para sa* ‘for,’ *tungkol sa* ‘about,’ and *dahil sa* ‘because of.’

	personal names	common nouns
nominative	si	ang
genitive	ni	ng
oblique	kay	sa

The genitive marker for common nouns is pronounced as [naŋ]. The distinction in number, singular vs. plural, is marked by the plural particle *mga* [maŋah].

One of the important aspects in Tagalog nominals is that the referentiality of each nominal is relatively predictable according to its case (and its semantic role). The nominative nominal, whose semantic role is marked by verbal morphology, is said to be definite or referential regardless of its semantic role. A genitive nominal is usually either definite or indefinite. But, a genitive nominal bearing the *THEME* role must be indefinite. In other words, a referential or definite *THEME* element must appear in the nominative case. Pronouns and personal nouns bearing the *THEME* role cannot appear in the genitive case (Schachter and Otnes 1972: 75). An oblique nominal is either definite or indefinite, but usually definite.

2.3 Modifiers

The modification in Tagalog is carried out with a linking element *na/-ng*, called “linker”.⁷

⁷If the preceding words end in /h/, /ʔ/, or /n/, the linker takes the form of an *-ng* [ŋ] instead of the final consonant. In all other cases, the linker takes the form of *na*.

- (7) maganda-ng babae
 beautiful-LINK woman
 ‘a beautiful woman.’
- (8) babae-ng maganda
 woman-LINK beautiful

The order of the modifier and the modifiee is flexible as above.

Tagalog does not have a distinct category of adverb. Adverbials are expressed in various ways. For example, a manner adverb is realized as an adjective with the adverbial marker *nang*, or an adjective with the linker.

3 Depictive Construction in Tagalog

The purpose of this section is to define and identify the depictive secondary predicate construction in Tagalog, and demonstrate what counts as a controller. At first, I give a general overview to the secondary predicate construction. After that, I present the definition and description of the depictive construction in Tagalog. The most important issue on this construction, that is, the question of what determines the controller-selection, is discussed in the following section.

3.1 Secondary predication

The predication is the most fundamental concept in the grammar of human languages. A sentence corresponds to a proposition, which comprises a predicate and a set of arguments. A predicate describes a state, an action, or a change-of-state of one of its arguments. This relation between a subject and a predicate is called “predication.” Usually, one simple sentence includes only one predication, as below.

- (9) [_S [John] [is naked]].
- (10) [_S [John] [runs fast]].

Nonetheless, there is a simple sentence which contains two subject-predicate relations at the same time. These two predications are called the primary predication and the secondary predication, respectively. In most cases, the predicate of the primary predication is a verb; that of the secondary predication is an adjective. Look at the example below.

- (11) *John* ate the supper **naked**.⁸

In this sentence, needless to say, the primary predication is the predication *ate the supper* for the subject *John*. But, there is another predication relation between *John* and *naked*: *John* is *naked* at the moment of eating the supper. Although it is a simple sentence, this sentence carries a complex meaning like ‘John was naked when he ate the supper.’

⁸In the literature, the combination of italicized and bold characters, and an coindexing are employed to indicate the secondary subject-predicate relation. I adopt the former way of indication here, which seems to be easy to read. But sometimes I utilize the latter notation when in need of indexing complex secondary predications.

There are two types of secondary predication: depictive and resultative. The depictive secondary predicate describes a temporal state of an argument of the primary predicate like below.

- (12) *John* ate the supper **naked**. [depictive]

Many works have been done about this construction: Halliday (1967), Nichols (1978), to name a few. The main target of this paper, as indicated by the title, is the depictive secondary predicate construction.

The other secondary predicate is resultative. The resultative secondary predicate describes the resulting state of an entity, which undergoes a change of state due to an action denoted by the primary predicate, as follows:

- (13) John shot *the dog* **dead**. [resultative]

The sentence describes a situation that the dog was dead because John had shot it.

The issue of theoretical and empirical importance in the secondary predicate constructions is what counts as a controller⁹ and how the controller is picked up; that is, what determines and guarantees the subject-predicate relation between a controller and a secondary predicate. One of the competing answers to the question is grammatical relations and its structural positions. In the framework of generative grammar, the structural relationships such as small clause or c-command are thought to take a crucial role in the predication relation. See Chomsky (1981), Williams (1980) (1983), and Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) among others.

This issue of the controller-selection is what I will try to solve in this paper. Although few studies have reported on the depictive construction in comparison with the resultative construction, the controller-selection in the depictive construction is also of significance.

3.2 Depictive secondary predicates in Tagalog

In this subsection, I will try to define the depictive secondary predicate construction in Tagalog and describe how the construction works.

First of all, let us look at a typical example of the depictive construction in Tagalog.¹⁰

- (14) **Nakahubad** na kinain ni *Juan* ang halo-halo.
 naked LINK eat.OV.PRFV GEN Juan NOM halo-halo
 ‘*Juan* ate the halo-halo **naked**.’

In this example, the primary predicate is *kinain* ‘ate’ and the secondary predicate *nakahubad* ‘naked.’ The latter is predicated of the argument of the primary predication, and modifies the event denoted by the primary predicate. In the sentence (14), the depictive adjective *nakahubad* ‘naked’ describes a temporal state of an AGENT of an action *kinain* ‘ate’; its

⁹We call a “subject” of the secondary subject-predicate relation as a “controller.”

¹⁰I have to note that the glosses of presented examples may include quirky English, like “I cut some meat with *the knife* **rusty**.” These glosses in unusual English are tentatively employed for the indication of the depictive secondary subject-predicate relation in Tagalog. I do not insist that these sentences are actually grammatical or acceptable in English.

semantic content is equivalent to a sentence like “Juan was naked when he ate the halo-halo.”

The depictive secondary predicate is attached to the primary predicate by means of the linker. It is attached in the pre-verbal position in (14), but it can occur in the post-verbal position as in (15).

- (15) Kinaing **lasing** *ni* *Fe* ang halo-halo.
eat.OV.PRFV.LINK drunk GEN Fe NOM halo-halo
‘*Fe* ate the halo-halo **drunk**.’

It can also appear between post-verbal elements.

- (16) Kinain ko-ng **hilaw** *ang* *isda*.
eat.OV.PRFV 1.SG.GEN-LINK raw NOM fish
‘I ate *the fish* **raw**.’

According to my observation, different positions of the depictive do not lead to different interpretations, although the pre-verbal position is the most preferred for many speakers.

The secondary subject-predicate relation modifies an event as a unit, like adverbials. In this sense, depictives are adjuncts in a clause. So depictives are omittable from a clause, as in (17).

- (17) (**Lasing** na) bumalik *ako* ng bahay kahapon.
drunk LINK return.AV.PRFV 1.SG.NOM GEN house yesterday
‘I returned to a house (**drunk**) yesterday.’

The sentence may still be acceptable, even if the depictive *lasing* ‘drunk’ is omitted.

The depictive phrase can be internally complex through the following morphological or syntactic operations: comparative formation in (18), degree adverb modification (19), intensive reduplication (20), and coordination (21).

- (18) **Mas galit** na sinipa *ni* *Eva* ang lalaki kaysa kay Linda.
more angry LINK kick.OV.PRFV GEN Eva NOM man than Linda
‘*Eva* kicked the man **angrier** than Linda.’
- (19) **Talaga-ng galit** na sinipa *ng* *bata* ang titser.
real-LINK angry LINK kick.OV.PRFV GEN child NOM teacher
‘*A/The child* kicked the teacher **really angry**.’
- (20) **Galit na galit** na sinipa *ng* *bata* ang titser.
angry LINK angry LINK kick.OV.PRFV GEN child NOM teacher
‘*A/The child* kicked the teacher **very angry**.’
- (21) **Nakahubad at galit** na sinipa *ni* *Pedro* si Juan.
naked and angry LINK kick.OV.PRFV GEN Pedro NOM Juan
‘*Pedro* kicked Juan **naked and angry**.’

Each depictive predicate takes only one controller. The depictive cannot take more than one controller at the same time, as in (22).

- (22) * **Nakahubad** na sinipa ni Tom si Mike.
 naked LINK kick.OV.PRFV GEN Tom NOM Mike
 ‘Tom kicked Mike **naked**.’

But, coordinated nominals work as a controller of one depictive, as in (23).

- (23) **Hilaw** na pinagsama ng tagapagluto *ang karne at*
 raw LINK get-together.OV.PRFV GEN cook NOM meat and
 (*ang*) *gulay*.
 (NOM) vegetable
 ‘A/The cook got together *the meat and vegetable* **raw**.’

The two nominals *karne* and *gulay* are coordinated by the conjunction *at*, and both nominals function as a controller.

On the other hand, each primary predicate takes only one depictive predicate in a clause. So, a sentence like (24) below is ungrammatical.

- (24) * Hilaw_i na kinain na nakahubad_j ni Juan_j ang isda_i.
 raw LINK eat.OV.PRFV LINK naked GEN Juan NOM fish
 ‘Juan_j ate the fish_i raw_i naked_j.’

This type of sentence seems to be grammatical in German (Müller 2002: 193) and in English (Jackendoff 1990: 201).

- (25) daß er_i nackt_i die Äpfel_j ungewaschen_j aß
 that he-NOM naked the apples-ACC unwashed ate
 ‘that he_i ate the apples_j unwashed_j naked_i.’

- (26) Bill_i ate the meat_j raw_j nude_i.

But, when two or more depictives are coordinated together, one primary predicate can take all of them as its secondary predicates.

- (27) **Hilaw at itlog** na kinain ng lalaki *ang isda*.
 raw and rotten LINK eat.OV.PRFV GEN man NOM fish
 ‘A/The man ate *the fish* **raw and rotten**.’

It is impossible that different depictives in the coordinated structure are construed with different controllers. They are predicated of an identical controller.

Regarding semantic characteristics, the depictive predicate assigns a transitory property to its controller. This property of the depictive as a temporal-property assigner is totally interacted with other facets of the depictive construction. First, an adjective used as depictive is usually a stage-level adjective, which expresses temporal and non-stable properties.¹¹ The individual-level adjective cannot be employed for the depictive predicate, as in (28). Secondly, dynamic predicates are more likely to contain a depictive than stative predicates; dynamic predicates, needless to say, denote an action or change-of-state, which is intrinsically transient. The stative verb sentence with the depictive may not be acceptable, as in (29),

¹¹In general, the stage-level adjective expresses temporal and transitory properties, which can be stated in a particular place at a particular time, like *drunk*, *raw*, *sick*, *wounded*, or *wet*; the individual-level adjective expresses permanent or perpetual properties like *intelligent*, *red* or *tall*.

- (28) ***Matangkad** na binugbog ni *Mike* si Juan.
 tall LINK trounce.OV.PRFV GEN Mike NOM Juan
 ‘Mike trounced Juan **tall**.’
- (29) ***Nakahubad** na iniibig ni *Michael* ang bata.
 naked LINK like.OV.IMPF GEN Michael NOM bata
 ‘Michael likes the child **naked**.’

Thus, the adjective predicate and the noun predicate cannot be the primary predicate of the depictive construction. They are inherently stative.

In conclusion, we can identify the depictive secondary predicate in Tagalog as below:

- (30) The depictive secondary predicate in Tagalog is a predicative stage-level adjective phrase which modifies the event denoted by a dynamic primary predicate (i.e. verb predicate) and which is predicated of one of the nominals of the primary predicate. It is an adjunct attached to the primary predicate by means of the linker, either pre-verbally or post-verbally.

The depictive construction is, accordingly, a construction with such a depictive predicate.

3.3 Attributive adjective, manner adverb, and depictive

The adjective used as depictive is superficially similar to an attributive adjective (31) and a manner adverb (32), neither of which has the predication relation with a controller.

- (31) Kinain ko ang hilaw na isda.
 eat.OV.PRFV 1.SG.GEN NOM raw LINK fish
 ‘I ate the raw fish.’
- (32) Mabilis na tumakbo ang lalaki papunta sa istasyon.
 fast LINK run.AV.PRFV NOM man toward station
 ‘The man ran fast to the station.’

The depictive adjective appears to be an attributive adjective which has floated somewhere else in the sentence, or seems to be a subtype of adverb of manner.

This situation reflects ambivalent characteristics of depictives, which may be found in many other languages.¹² Depictives are predicative adjectives in that they are predicated of an argument of a primary predicate, but at the same time they are adverbs in that they modify an event denoted by the primary predicate. The depictive secondary predicate is, as it were, a hybrid between adjectives and adverbs.

However, the depictive adjective can be distinguished from the attributive adjective and the manner adverb. The depictive is neither a “floating” attributive adjective nor a manner adverb. I demonstrate how they are different from each other in the following sections.

¹²See Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann (2004) for further discussion.

3.3.1 Depictive (= predicative adjective) and attributive adjective

The semantic characteristics of the depictive distinguish it from the attributive adjective. The temporality of the depictive is correlated with the usage: it is used as predicative adjective, not attributive adjective. As Bolinger (1967) pointed out, one of the characteristics of predicative adjectives is their temporality. Taylor (2002: 455) summed up Bolinger's view as "attributive adjectives tend to characterize a thing in terms of a stable, inherent property, whereas predicative adjectives tend to denote more temporary, circumstantial properties." Thus, depictives are not involved with the type-specification, that is, specification of a type denoted by a noun (See Langacker 1991: 53, Taylor 2002: 351-352). Type-specification is employed mainly by the attributive adjective.

Regarding syntactic differences, I should cite a helpful statement of Napoli (1993: 152) about predication and modification: "[w]e could formalize the difference between modification and predication by noting that a modifier assigns a property to a head *X* while a predicate assigns a property to a phrase *X*" [XP]." This means that a depictive adjective is outside the NP of which it is predicated, but an attributive adjective is inside the NP including a noun which it modifies.

This semantic and syntactic contrast between the depictive adjective and the attributive adjective is reflected in the interpretation of the universal quantifier and the negative sentence. (i) The depictive is not involved in type-specification or does not assign a property to a head *N*: the depictive does not restrict a domain of referents unlike the attributive adjective. (ii) The depictive is negated by a negator *hindi*; an attributive adjective not. A negator *hindi* negates the association of an NP with a predicate, not with a modifier.

Universal quantifier Unlike the attributive adjective, the depictive adjective does not restrict a domain of referents which a noun phrase refers to. This trait of depictives is easily observed through the interpretation of the universal quantifier.

Let us consider a pair of examples. The sentence with a modifier (33a) is a statement about "all of the angry students," while the sentence with a depictive (33b) is about "all the students." An attributive adjective *galit* 'angry' restricts a domain of students, neither does the depictive *galit* in (33b).

- (33) a. Umalis ang lahat ng galit na estudyante sa kuwarto.
 leave.AV.PRFX NOM all GEN angry LINK student OBL room
 'All of the angry students left the room.' (Some not-angry students may still remain in the room.)
- b. **Galit** na umalis ang lahat ng estudyante sa kuwarto.
 angry LINK leave.AV.PRFX NOM all GEN student OBL room
 'All of the students left the room **angry**.' (No student remains in the room.)

In this pair of examples, the difference between the attributive adjective and the depictive adjective brings about different implications. (33a) implies that some "not angry" students may still remain in the room. But, (33b) implies that no student remains in the room.

Here is another example.

- (34) a. Kinain niya ang lahat ng hilaw na isda.
 eat.OV.PRFX 3.SG.GEN NOM all GEN raw LINK fish

‘He/She ate all of the raw fish.’ (There may be some cooked fish on the table.)

- b. **Hilaw** na kinain niya ang lahat ng isda.
raw LINK eat.OV.PRFV 3.SG.GEN NOM all GEN fish

‘He/She ate *all the fish raw*.’ (There is no fish on the table.)

Negative sentence In addition to the universal quantifier *lahat*, the interpretation of a negative sentence unveils differences between the attributive adjective and the depictive secondary predicate.

The negation marker *hindi* negates the action in a sentence with an attributive adjective as in (35a) and (36a). It cannot negate the state of Juan at the time. But, it can negate it in a sentence with a depictive predicate as in (35b) and (36b).

- (35) a. Hindi umalis si galit na Juan sa kuwarto.
not leave.AV.PRFV NOM angry LINK Juan OBL room
‘Angry Juan didn’t leave the room.’ (Juan was angry, but he didn’t leave the room.)
b. Hindi **galit** na umalis si Juan sa kuwarto.
not angry LINK leave.AV.PRFV NOM Juan OBL room
‘*Juan* didn’t leave the room **angry**.’ (Although he left the room, he was not angry.)
- (36) a. Hindi sinipa ni nakahubad na Juan si Pedro.
not kick.OV.PRFV GEN naked LINK Juan NOM Pedro
‘Naked Juan didn’t kick Pedro.’ (Juan was naked, but he didn’t kick Juan.)
b. Hindi **nakahubad** na sinipa ni Juan si Pedro.
not naked LINK kick.OV.PRFV GEN Juan NOM Pedro
‘*Juan* didn’t kick Pedro **naked**.’ (Although he kicked Pedro, Juan was not naked.)

Also here, the difference between the attributive adjective and the depictive predicate adjective leads to different implications. This observation is compatible with our analysis of the depictive adjective to be different from the attributive adjective.

3.3.2 Depictive and adverb

The depictive adjective differs from the manner adverb in marking and distribution. First, depictives are introduced only through the linker, but manner adverbs can be introduced through the so-called adverbial marker *nang*, as well.

	manner adverb	depictive
<i>nang</i> marking	✓	*
<i>-ng/na</i> marking	✓	✓

See the examples below: depictives cannot be introduced by the adverbial marker *nang*,¹³ while manner adverbs can.

¹³To be precise, the sentence (38b) is not acceptable for the depictive construction. It may be acceptable when it is interpreted to be another construction. Kroeger (1993) and Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann

(37) Manner adverb:

- a. Mabilis na tumakbo si Tom.
fast LINK run.AV.PRFV NOM Tom
'Tom ran fast.'
- b. Tumakbo si Tom nang mabilis.
run.AV.PRFV NOM Tom ADV fast.

(38) Depictive:

- a. **Nakahubad** na sinipa ni Tom si Juan.
naked LINK kick.OV.PRFV GEN Tom NOM Juan
'Tom kicked Juan **naked**.'
- b. *Sinipa ni Tom si Juan nang **nakahubad**.
kick.OV.PRFV GEN Tom NOM Juan ADV naked

Secondly, the contexts in which the depictive is allowed to occur is restricted in comparison with manner adverbs. The depictive can occur in the matrix sentence, the adverbial clauses, and the complement clauses, but, it cannot appear in the relative clause, the gerund, and the nominalized verbal. On the contrary, such a restricted distribution is not found in manner adverbs.

The depictive construction can occur inside various adverbial clauses.

- (39) Nagalit si Juan, sapagkat **nakahubad** na sinipa
get-angry.AV.PRFV NOM Juan because naked LINK kick.OV.PRFV
ni Tom siya.
GEN Tom 3.SG.NOM
'Juan got angry, because Tom kicked him **naked**.'
- (40) Noong **nakahubad** na sinipa ni Tom si Juan,
when naked LINK kick.OV.PRFV GEN Tom NOM Juan
nagalit siya.
get-angry.PERV.AF 3.SG.NOM
'When Tom kicked Juan **naked**, he (=Juan) got angry.'
- (41) **Nakahubad** na kinakain ni Juan ang papaya, habang **hilaw** na
naked LINK eat.OV.IMPF GEN Juan NOM papaya while raw LINK
kinakain ko ang isda.
eat.OV.IMPF 1.SG.GEN NOM fish

(2004) analyze this construction as a biclausal construction, which is different from the depictive construction. I adopt their analysis here. This analysis is borne out by the pair of examples below.

- i. Tumakbo siya nang nakahubad ako.
run.AV.PRFV 3.SG.NOM ADV naked 1.SG.NOM
'He/She ran when I was naked.'
- ii. Tumakbo siya-ng **nakahubad** (*ako).
run.AV.PRFV 3.SG.NOM-LINK naked 1.SG.NOM

The adjective in the *nang*-clause can have a subject which is independent of the arguments of the main clause. This is not the case with the depictive construction.

‘*Juan* was eating the papaya **naked**, while I was eating *the fish raw*.’

It can be used in various types of complement clauses as below.

- (42) Alam ko-ng [kinain na **nakahubad** *ni Tom* ang karne
know 1.SG.GEN-LINK eat.OV.PRFV LINK naked GEN Tom NOM meat
kahapon].
yesterday
‘I know that *Tom* ate the meat **naked** yesterday.’
- (43) Nakita ko-ng [tumakbo na **nakahubad** *si Juan*].
see.OV.PRFV 1.SG.GEN-LINK run.AV.PRFV LINK naked NOM Juan
‘I saw *Juan* run **naked**.’
- (44) Inutusan ni Maria *si Eva* na [tumakbo na **nakahubad**].
order.DV.PRFV GEN Maria NOM Eva COMP run.AV.INF LINK naked
‘Maria ordered *Eva* to run **naked**. (Eva will be naked when she runs.)’
- (45) Natanggap ko ang balita-ng [**nakahubad** na
receive.OV.PRFV 1.SG.GEN NOM news-LINK naked LINK
kinain *ni Tom* ang karne kahapon].
eat.OV.PRFV GEN Tom NOM meat yesterday
‘I received the news that *Tom* ate the meat **naked** yesterday.’

However, the depictive reading is excluded in the relative clause. The adjective inside the relative clause is only construed with its head noun, and thus works only as attributive adjective.

- (46) Ang isda ang pagkain_i na [kinakain na nakahubad_{i/*j} ng bata_j].
NOM fish NOM food LINK eat.OV.IMPF LINK naked GEN child

In this sentence, the depictive interpretation ‘the food which *a/the child* is eating **naked** is the fish’ is not allowed. The adjective *nakahubad* ‘naked’ in the relative clause is not associated with a nominal *bata* ‘child’ in the relative clause, but with a head noun of the relative clause. So, the actual interpretation of this sentence is ‘the naked food which *a/the child* is eating is the fish,’ although this interpretation is odd.

When this relative clause occurs as matrix sentence, the depictive interpretation is possible as indexed by the subscripts *j* like this.

- (47) Nakahubad_j na kinakain ng bata_j ang pagkain.
naked LINK eat.OV.IMPF GEN child NOM food
‘The/A child_j is eating the food naked_j.’

This situation is also the case with the gerund and nominalized verbal.¹⁴ The adjective in these contexts allow only the modifier reading, where the adjective restricts a domain of referents denoted by its head noun; it exclude the depictive reading.

¹⁴The nominalized verbal is one of the usages of verbals. It can be considered to be a headless relative clause. See Schachter and Otanes (1972: 150-153).

- (48) *Maayos ang pagkain na [nakahubad ng bata ng hapunan].
 good NOM eating LINK naked GEN child GEN supper
 ‘A/The child’s eating of a supper **naked** is good.’
- (49) *May [kinain na nakahubad ni Juan].
 be eat.OV.PRFV LINK naked GEN Juan
 ‘There is something which *Juan* ate **naked**.’

These sentences will be acceptable without depictives.

On the other hand, the manner adverb can appear in the contexts where the depictive cannot occur.

- (50) Si Juan ang lalaki-ng tumakbo nang mabilis.
 NOM Juan NOM man-LINK run.AV.PRFV ADV fast
 ‘The man who ran fast is Juan.’
- (51) Maayos ang pagtakbo niya nang mabilis.
 good NOM running 3.SG.GEN ADV fast
 ‘His/Her running fast is good.’
- (52) May tumakbo nang mabilis kahapon.
 be run.AV.PRFV ADV fast yesterday
 ‘There is someone who ran fast yesterday.’

The manner adverb appears in the relative clause (50), the gerund (51), and the nominalized verbal (52).

3.4 Inventory of controllers

It is time to turn to the crux of the depictive construction: what counts as a controller and how it is picked up. In Tagalog, Kroeger (1993) picked up this topic as a phenomenon concerning subjecthood of Tagalog. He insisted that only a nominal in the nominative case can be a controller of the depictive and this observation supports his claim that the nominative nominal is the subject. Kroeger (1993: 30) said, “Adjectives such as ‘drunk’ ‘naked’, ‘raw’, etc. may either appear within the NP which they modify, or they may occur in immediately post-verbal position. In the latter case, they must be interpreted as modifying the nominative argument [...]”

His claims, however, are contrary to the facts. Look at this example.

- (53) **Nakahubad** na kinain ni Juan ang hapunan.
 naked LINK eat.OV.PRFV GEN Juan NOM supper
 ‘*Juan* ate the supper **naked**.’

In this example, the depictive predicate is located in the pre-verbal position, and is predicated of the nominal which is not in the nominative case. His observation and generalization may be empirically wrong.

Cena (1995: 15) has already pointed out that non-nominative nominals can be associated with depictives. He concluded that “linear order, not [grammatical] relation, controls secondary predicates. However, real-world expectations can override linear order.” It is

true that linear order and real-world expectations play an important role in the controller-selection. But, as I will demonstrate later, linear order is one of factors affecting the controller-selection, and the actual controller-selection can be contrary to real-world expectations.

Now let us turn to our observations, which are presented in the table below in advance. The data presented here are arranged according to semantic roles and cases.

(54) The inventory of possible controllers:

semantic roles	nominative case	non-nominative case
AGENT	ok	ok
EXPERIENCER	ok	ok
THEME	ok	*
GOAL [+animate]	*	*
GOAL [-animate]	ok/?	?
SOURCE [+animate]	*	*
SOURCE [-animate]	ok/?	?
LOCATION	ok/?	??/*
INSTRUMENT	*	*
BENEFICIARY	*	*
CAUSE	*	*
REFERENTIAL	*	*

In this table, the mark “ok” means that a nominal bearing a certain semantic role can be a controller in a certain case, and “*” means that it cannot. The slashed pairs such as “ok/?” indicate that the judgments of the construction vary according to sentences, contexts, or individuals.

As presented above, AGENT can be picked up as a controller regardless of the voice and its case: Actor voice (55), Object voice (56), Direction voice (57-58), Location voice (59), Beneficiary voice (60), Instrument voice (61), and Referential voice (62).

- (55) **Lasing** na tumakbo ang lalaki papunta sa dagat.
 drunk LINK run.AV.PRFV NOM man toward beach
 ‘The man ran to the beach **drunk**.’
- (56) **Lasing** na inilagay niya ang asin sa kanya-ng tsaa.
 drunk LINK put.OV.PRFV 3.SG.GEN NOM salt OBL 3.SG.OBL-LINK tea
 ‘He/She put salt to his/her tea **drunk**.’
- (57) **Sugatan** na inabutan ni Fe ng tubig si Melody.
 wounded LINK hand.DV.PRFV GEN Fe GEN water NOM Melody
 ‘Fe handed water Melody **wounded**.’
- (58) **Lasing** na binilhan ni Zaena si Pedro ng tinapay.
 drunk LINK buy.DV.PRFV GEN Zaena NOM Pedro GEN bread
 ‘Zaena bought bread from Pedro **drunk**.’
- (59) **Nakahubad** na pinamangkaan niya ang ilog.
 naked LINK go-boating.LV.PRFV 3.SG.GEN NOM river

‘*He/She* went boating in the river **naked**.’

- (60) **May-sakit** na ibinili *ni Juan* si Ligaya ng gamot.
sick LINK buy.BV.PRFV GEN Juan NOM Ligaya GEN medicine
‘*Juan* bought Ligaya a medicine **sick**.’
- (61) **Lasing** na ipinaghiwa *niya* ng karne ang kutsilyo.
drunk LINK cut.IV.PRFV 3.SG.GEN GEN meat NOM knife
‘*He/She* cut some meat with the knife **drunk**.’
- (62) **Nakahubad** na pinag-awayan *nila* si Tom.
naked LINK quarrel.RfV.PRFV 3.PL.GEN NOM Tom
‘*They* quarreled over Tom **naked**.’

Thus, the AGENT nominal can count as a controller in any case.

THEME can work as a controller only when it is in the nominative case. As noted earlier, THEME in the genitive case is indefinite, while THEME in the nominative case is definite.

- (63) a. * **Hilaw** na humiwa ang lalaki ng isda.
raw LINK cut.AV.PRFV NOM man GEN fish
‘The man cut *some meat* **raw**.’
- b. **Hilaw** na hiniwa ng lalaki ang isda.
raw LINK cut.OV.PRFV GEN man NOM fish
‘A/The man cut *the fish* **raw**.’
- c. * **Hilaw** na ipinaghiwa ng lalaki ng isda ang kutsilyo.
raw LINK cut.IV.PRFV GEN man GEN fish NOM knife
‘A/The man cut *some meat* with the knife **raw**.’
- (64) a. * **Hilaw** na nagbigay si Rudy ng isda sa bata.
raw LINK give.AV.PRFV NOM Rudy GEN fish OBL child
‘Rudy gave *some fish* to a/the child **raw**.’
- b. **Hilaw** na binigay ni Rudy ang isda sa bata.
raw LINK give.OV.PRFV GEN Rudy NOM fish OBL child
‘Rudy gave *the fish* to a/the child **raw**.’
- c. * **Hilaw** na binigyan ni Rudy ng isda ang bata.
raw LINK give.DV.PRFV GEN Rudy GEN fish NOM child
‘Rudy gave the child *some fish* **raw**.’

In section 4.3.1, we will argue that this contrast of acceptability is brought about by the language-specific constraint that genitive THEME nominals must be indefinite and low in topicality.

As for nominals bearing GOAL and SOURCE, they can be controllers when they are inanimate but cannot when they are animate. In (65)-(66), an inanimate GOAL serves as a controller regardless of the case. This is the case with an inanimate SOURCE as in (67)-(68).

- (65) **Sira-sira**-ng binalikan ni Fe ang kuwarto.
broken-LINK return.DV.PRFV GEN Fe NOM room

‘Fe returned to *the room* **broken**.’
(The room was already broken when Fe return there.)

- (66) ? **Sira-sira**-ng pumunta sa bahay siya.
broken-LINK go.AV.PRFV OBL house 3.SG.NOM
‘He/She went to *a/the house* **broken**.’
- (67) **Madilim** na nilisan niya ang kuwarto.
dark LINK leave.DV.PRFV 3.SG.GEN NOM room
‘He/She left *the room* **dark**.’
(The room was dark when he/she left there.)
- (68) ? **Madilim** na umalis siya sa kuwarto.
dark LINK leave.AV.PRFV 3.SG.NOM OBL room
‘He/She left *a/the room* **dark**.’

On the contrary, depictives are not predicated of animate GOAL nominals (69)-(70) and animate SOURCE nominals (71)-(72) in any cases as below. Rather, the depictive adjectives in these sentences are construed with AGENT nominals.

- (69) * **May-sakit** na binigyan ni Juan ng gamot ang lalaki.
sick LINK give.DV.PRFV GEN Juan GEN medicine NOM man
‘Juan gave *the man* a medicine **sick**.’
- (70) * **May-sakit** na nagbigay si Juan ng gamot sa lalaki.
sick LINK give.AV.PRFV NOM Juan GEN medicine OBL man
‘Juan gave a medicine to *a/the man* **sick**.’
- (71) * **May-sakit** na binilhan ni Tom ng tinapay si Pedro.
sick LINK buy.DV.PRFV GEN Tom GEN bread NOM Pedro
‘Tom bought bread from *Pedro* **sick**.’
- (72) * **May-sakit** na bumili si Tom ng tinapay sa Pedro.
sick LINK buy.AV.PRFV NOM Tom GEN bread OBL Pedro
‘Tom bought bread from *Pedro* **sick**.’

I will discuss this contrast later in section 4.3.2.

Other roles than those already shown above are presented below; EXPERIENCER (73)-(74), LOCATION (75)-(76), INSTRUMENT (77)-(78), BENEFICIARY (79)-(80), REFERENTIAL (81)-(82), and CAUSE (83)-(84).

- (73) **Nakahubad** na nakakita siya ng larawan.
naked LINK see.AV.PRFV 3.SG.NOM GEN painting
‘He/She saw some paintings **naked**.’
- (74) **Nakahubad** na nakita niya ang larawan.
naked LINK see.OV.PRFV 3.SG.GEN ANG painting
‘He/She saw the painting **naked**.’
- (75) **Basa**-ng tinulugan ng bata ang sofa
wet-LINK sleep.LV.PRFV GEN child NOM sofa
‘A/The child slept in *the sofa* **wet**.’

- (76) ?? **Basa**-ng natulog ang bata *sa sofa*.
 wet-LINK sleep.AV.PRFV NOM child OBL sofa
 ‘The child slept in *a/the sofa* **wet**.’
- (77) * **Kinakalawang** na ipinaghiwa niya ng karne *ang kutsilyo*.
 rusty LINK cut.IV.PRFV 3.SG.GEN GEN meat NOM knife
 ‘He/She cut some meat with *the knife* **rusty**.’
- (78) * **Kinakalawang** na hiniwa niya ang karne
 rusty LINK cut.OV.PRFV 3.SG.GEN NOM meat
 sa pamamagitan ng *kutsilyo*.
 with knife
 ‘He/She cut the meat with *a/the knife* **rusty**.’
- (79) * **Sugatan** na ipinagluto ni Pedro ng hapunan *si Eddie*.
 wounded LINK cook.BV.PRFV GEN Pedro GEN supper NOM Eddie
 ‘Pedro cooked *Eddie* supper **wounded**.’
- (80) * **Sugatan** na nagluto si Pedro ng hapunan para kay *Eddie*
 wounded LINK cook.AV.PRFV NOM Pedro GEN supper for Eddie
 ‘Pedro cooked supper for *Eddie* **wounded**.’
- (81) * **Sugatan** na pinag-usapan namin *ang lalaki*.
 wounded LINK talk.RfV.PRFV 1.PL.GEN NOM guy
 ‘We talked about *the guy* **wounded**.’
- (82) * **Sugatan** na nag-usap kami tungkol sa *lalaki*.
 wounded LINK talk.AV.PRFV 1.PL.NOM about man
 ‘We talked about *a/the man* **wounded**.’
- (83) * **Nakahubad** na ikinagalit ni Tom *si Juan*.
 naked LINK cause-angry.CV.PRFV GEN Tom NOM Juan
 ‘*Juan* caused Tom to get angry **naked**.’
- (84) * **Nakahubad** na nagalit si Tom dahil kay *Juan*.
 naked LINK get-angry.AV.PRFV NOM Tom because of Juan
 ‘Tom got angry because of *Juan* **naked**.’

3.5 Summary

In this subsection, I described the depictive secondary predicate in Tagalog from a viewpoint ranging from form to meaning. Like depictives in other languages, Tagalog depictives are adjunct elements in a clause and assign transitory properties to a controller, which is one of the nominals of the primary verbal predicate. The function of the depictive predicate as a temporary property assigner is intimately interacted with other characteristics of the depictive construction.

I have demonstrated what serves as a controller in what case in the Tagalog depictive construction. The nominative nominal cannot necessarily work as a controller, contrary to Kroeger’s generalization.

4 Semantico-Pragmatic Approach to the Depictive Construction

In this section, I try to provide an account for the way the controller is selected as in (54). To this issue, current approaches, which we put under the rubric of “the grammatical relation approach,” cannot give an explanatory answer. Rather, I propose here another approach which can explain and predict the facts of the controller-selection in Tagalog.

4.1 Grammatical relation approach

In the literature, the issue of the controller-selection has been captured in terms of grammatical relations. This approach, which we call “grammatical relation approach,” is summarized like this:

(85) Grammatical Relation Approach:

- a. The likelihood to be a controller is subject to the Accessibility Hierarchy.¹⁵ Languages vary in what relations can count as controllers.
- b. Low-ranked nominals in the hierarchy can get the status of controller through promotion by voice alternation.

Now, let us take a look at how this approach works, taking example of English, Japanese, and German. In the framework of generative grammar,¹⁶ depictives in English are categorized into two categories according to the grammatical relations: a subject-oriented depictive and an object-oriented depictive. This categorization reflects the observation that the depictive secondary predicate is predicated of the subject (86) and the direct object (87), but not the indirect object (88).

(86) *John* ate the supper **naked**.

(87) John ate *the supper* **cold**.

(88) They_i gave the patients_j the drugs drunk_{i/*j}.

Although the indirect object cannot be associated with the depictive in English, different voices lead to different situations. When the indirect object is promoted to the subject, the derived subject can work as a controller like this:

(89) The patients_j were given the drugs drunk_j.

This example clearly demonstrates that the grammatical relations determine what count as a controller in English; the identical GOAL nominal serves as a controller when it is subject, but does not when it is indirect object.

In Japanese, Koizumi (1994) has observed that the subject and some of direct objects count as controllers. The subject counts as a controller (Koizumi 1994: 27).

¹⁵The Accessibility Hierarchy (Keenan and Comrie 1977: 66): Subject > Direct Object > Indirect Object > Obliques > Genitives > Objects of Comparison

¹⁶To be more precise, generative grammar has captured depictives in terms of phrase structures, not grammatical relations. Grammatical relations are reduced to the names of the positions in phrase structures under this approach. But, as far as English, Japanese, and German are concerned, their “subject” and “object” are equivalent to grammatical relations in an ordinary sense.

- (90) *Taroo-ga hadaka-de hon-o yonda.*
 Taro-NOM naked book-ACC read
 ‘*Taro* read a book **naked**.’

The so-called dative subjects can serve as controllers, according to Koizumi (1994: 45).

- (91) *Taroo-ni hadaka-de enzetu-ga dekiru.*
 Taro-DAT naked speech-NOM capable
 ‘*Taroo* can give a speech **naked**.’
- (92) *Taroo-ga [Ziroo-ni kimono-sugata-de piano-o hik] aseta.*
 Taro-NOM Jiro-DAT in kimono piano-ACC play made
 ‘Taro made *Jiro* play the piano **in kimono**.’

In the case of the object, affected-THEME objects can serve as controllers as in (93), but unaffected-THEME objects cannot, as in (94). Look at examples from Koizumi (1994: 49, 52).

- (93) *Taroo-ga aizin-o hadaka-de korosita.*
 Taro-NOM lover-ACC naked killed
 ‘Taro killed *his lover* **naked**.’
- (94) * *Taroo-ga Ziroo-o hadaka-de izimeta.*
 Taro-NOM Jiro-ACC naked mistreated
 ‘Taro mistreated *Jiro* **naked**.’

Moreover, Koizumi (1994: 45) observes that the depictive cannot be predicated of the dative objects like this:

- (95) * *Taroo-ga Ziroo-ni deesui-zyootai-de mayaku-o utta.*
 Taro-NOM Jiro-DAT dead-drunk drug-ACC injected
 ‘Taro injected a drug into *Jiro* **dead-drunk**.’

As described above, non-affected THEME objects and dative objects cannot serve as controllers in Japanese. However, when they are promoted to the subject, they can count as controllers.

- (96) *Ziroo-ga hadaka-de Taroo-ni izimerareta.*
 Jiro-NOM naked Taro-by was mistreated
 ‘*Jiro* was mistreated by Taro **naked**.’
- (97) ? *Ziroo-ga deesui-zyootai-de Taroo-ni mayaku-o utareta.*
 Jiro-NOM dead-drunk Taro-by drug-ACC was-injected
 ‘*Jiro* was injected with a drug by Taro **dead-drunk**.’

In these sentences, the depictives are predicated of the subjects *Ziroo*.

Müller (2002: 180-182) shows German examples parallel to English and Japanese. Look at the contrastive pair of examples. In German, the accusative object can be a controller as in (98). But, the dative object is unlikely to be a controller, as in (99).

- (98) Er_i sah sie_j nackt_{i/j}.
 he-NOM saw her-ACC naked
 ‘He_i saw her_j naked_{i/j}.’
- (99) Er_i half ihr_j nackt_{i/??j}.
 he-NOM helped her-DAT naked
 ‘He_i helped her_j naked_{i/??j}.’

This is the case with the examples below, which correspond to (88) in English and (95) in Japanese.

- (100) Die Krankenschwester_i gab John_j die Medizin krank_{i/*j}.
 the nurse gave John-DAT the medicine-ACC ill
 ‘The nurse_i gave John_j medicine sick_{i/*j}.’

But, when these dative noun phrases are promoted to the subject, the depictive reading gets allowed in both sentences.

- (101) Ihr_j wurde nackt_j geholfen.
 her-DAT was naked helped
 ‘She_j was helped naked_j.’
- (102) John_j wurde die Medizin nackt_j verabreicht.
 John-DAT was the medicine-NOM naked given
 ‘John_j was given the medicine naked_j.’

Thus, this grammatical relation approach seems to succeed in capturing the issue of the controller-selection in the depictive construction of these languages. In the case of Tagalog, however, this approach does not work well, contrary to Kroeger’s generalization that the depictive is necessarily predicated of a nominative nominal, which he considers to be a subject.

4.2 Grammatical relation approach fails in Tagalog

The grammatical relation approach, truly, works effectively in the languages presented above; it is difficult to apply to the Tagalog depictive construction.

First of all, it remains to be seen whether grammatical relations are universal and crosslinguistic notions. See discussions in Dryers (1997) and Van Valin and LaPolla (1997).

Moreover, it is doubtful that grammatical relations can be assumed in Tagalog. Since Schachter (1976) threw doubt on the universality of the subject, the notion of subject and other grammatical relations in the Philippine languages including Tagalog is quite controversial: Tagalog challenges the universality of these notions. In Tagalog and other Philippine-type languages, the subjecthood attributed to the subject in other languages is split into two distinct nominals: Actor (\cong AGENT) and nominative nominals. See Schachter (1976) (1977), Foley and Van Valin (1984), Shibatani (1988), and Kroeger (1993).

Even if we assume grammatical relations in Tagalog, we still need to solve the disputable question what constituent has what grammatical relation. It must be solved in

advance of the application of the grammatical relation approach to the depictive construction. If there is a subject at all in Tagalog, we may have two competing candidates: the Actor nominal or the nominative nominal. When we suppose that the nominative nominal is the subject,¹⁷ on one hand, our observation opposes the prediction of the grammatical relation approach that the subject can always serve as a controller.

Of course, nominative nominals work as controllers in many cases, and the “promotion” to the nominative case sometimes makes the depictive interpretation possible. Let us look at a pair of “locative alternation”-like or “applicative”-like sentences. In the pair of sentences, the status of the nominative leads to the status of a controller.

- (103) a. **Basa-ng** ikinarga niya *ang dayami* sa trak.
 wet-LINK load.OV.PRFV 3.SG.GEN NOM hay OBL truck
 ‘He/She loaded *the hay* on the truck **wet**.’
- b. **Basa-ng** kinargahan niya ng dayami *ang trak*.
 wet-LINK load.DV.PRFV 3.SG.GEN GEN hay NOM truck
 ‘He/She loaded *the truck* with hay **wet**.’

In each example, the nominative is a controller, regardless of the semantic roles. A THEME nominal is a controller in (103a), while a GOAL nominal is a controller in (103b).

The next is a transitive sentence.

- (104) a. **Sira-sira-ng** bumasa si Rudy ng libro.
 broken-LINK read.AV.PRFV NOM Rudy GEN book
 ‘Rudy read a book **broken**.’
- b. **Sira-sira-ng** binasa ni Rudy *ang libro*.
 broken-LINK read.OV.PRFV GEN Rudy NOM book
 ‘Rudy read *the book* **broken**.’

On the one hand, when a THEME nominal is in the nominative case, it is associated with the depictive *sira-sira*. Rudy read the torn book without mending it. On the other, when an AGENT nominal is in the nominative case, it is linked with the depictive *sira-sira*. Rudy read a book when he was in the state of being psychologically broken, furious or crazy.

However, the nominative nominal does not necessarily work as a controller in our observations: the status of the nominative case does not always guarantee the controller status.

- (105) * **Sugatan** na pinag-usapan namin *ang lalaki*.
 wounded LINK talk.RfV.PRFV 1.PL.GEN NOM guy
 ‘We talked about *the guy* **wounded**.’

In this example, the depictive *sugatan* ‘wounded’ cannot be predicated of the nominative nominal *lalaki*. Here is another pair of examples. The voice alternation affects nothing.

- (106) a. * **May-sakit** na nagbigay kay Ligaya si Mike ng gamot.
 sick LINK give.AV.PRFV OBL Ligaya NOM Mike GEN medicine
 ‘Mike gave a medicine to *Ligaya* **sick**.’

¹⁷Many linguistics adopted this option such as Hoekstra (1986), Langacker (1991), and Kroeger (1993).

- b. * **May-sakit** na binigyan si *Ligaya* ni Mike ng gamot.
 sick LINK give.DV.PRFV NOM Ligaya GEN Mike GEN medicine
 ‘Mike gave *Ligaya* a medicine **sick**.’
 Or ‘*Ligaya* was given a medicine by Mike **sick**.’

The nominative animate GOAL does not function as a controller, even when the interpretation would be pragmatically plausible. As such, when we assume the nominative nominal is the subject, the grammatical relation approach does not work well and makes the wrong prediction.

On the other hand, when we suppose that the Actor nominal is the subject, it does not lead to the violation of the prediction that the subject can always serve as a controller: Actor nominals roughly correspond to AGENT nominals and AGENT nominals can always count as controllers. But, the problem of this option is that we have few pieces of empirical evidence to set up other grammatical relations in Tagalog, which are necessary for the grammatical relation approach to function effectively.

Thus, the grammatical relation approach fails to explain the controller-selection of the depictive construction. When I adopt the assumption that there is no grammatical relation in Tagalog, the grammatical relation approach, of course, cannot explain our data. Even if I consider a nominative nominal or Actor nominal as the subject, the approach still contradicts our observations and needs some empirically invalid assumptions. For these reasons, we have to abandon the grammatical relation approach here and pursue other possibilities.

4.3 Semantico-pragmatic approach

Faced with the impotence of the grammatical relation approach in Tagalog, Nagaya (2004) proposed that a both semantically and pragmatically salient nominal can be the controller.

- (107) A nominal can count as a controller if it is ranked high both in (a) the semantic hierarchy and in (b) the topicality hierarchies:
- a. Semantic hierarchy:
 AGENT¹⁸ > THEME > SOURCE/GOAL/LOCATION > OTHERS
 - b. Topicality hierarchies: originally proposed in Givón (1976: 152)
 - i. human > non-human
 - ii. definite > indefinite
 - iii. more involved participant > less involved participant
 - iv. 1st person > 2nd person > 3rd person

This proposal tries to grasp two generalizations found in our observations of the controller-selection (54), repeated as (108): (i) the semantic role of a nominal is deeply relevant to whether a nominal can be a controller or not, and (ii) the nominative case is relevant to the licensing of a controller, although the status of the nominative case does not necessarily lead to the status of the controller. This ambivalent situation is reflected in our two-way

¹⁸ AGENT is viewed to include EXPERIENCER here.

proposal. The controller of the depictive must be both semantically and pragmatically salient.

(108) (=54) The inventory of possible controllers:

semantic roles	nominative case	non-nominative case
AGENT	ok	ok
EXPERIENCER	ok	ok
THEME	ok	*
GOAL [+animate]	*	*
GOAL [-animate]	ok/?	?
SOURCE [+animate]	*	*
SOURCE [-animate]	ok/?	?
LOCATION	ok/?	??/*
INSTRUMENT	*	*
BENEFICIARY	*	*
CAUSE	*	*
REFERENTIAL	*	*

Adequacy of this two-way analysis is attributed to the correlation between our proposal and semantico-pragmatic characteristics of the depictive construction. On the one hand, the depictive secondary predicate characterizes a dynamic event by assigning a transitory property to a participant of the event. This characteristic is embodied such that the depictive should be a stage-level adjective, and they are likely to be attached to dynamic verbal predicates. This trait is also reflected in the semantic hierarchy: AGENT > THEME > GOAL/LOCATION/SOURCE > OTHERS. The order of the likelihood to be a controller is the order of the degree of their involvement in a dynamic event.

On the other hand, the depictives is a predicative adjective, which gives a certain property to something specific. So, it is not surprising that the “subject” of the secondary subject-predicate relation needs to be high in topicality. The controller, a subject of a depictive predicate, must excel in topicality. Thus, it is semantically or pragmatically plausible that the semantic hierarchy and the topicality hierarchies are involved with the controller-selection.

4.3.1 Factors affecting the topicality

Topicality is a very controversial and intricate notion by itself, which contains animacy, definiteness, old information, presupposition and so on. Thus, we adopt the multiple hierarchies for the topicality. The topicality in Tagalog nominals is affected by at least three factors: voice system, the case of THEME, and constituent order.

Voice and nominative case The nominative nominal, whose semantic role is marked by verbal morphology, is definite or referential. This definiteness is a very important trait for topicality of a nominal. (107b-ii) means that definite nominals are likely to be controllers. Moreover, we can admit that the alternation from other case to the nominative case makes

a nominal more involved with an event in that the semantic role of a nominal is marked in verbal morphology. Thus, voice and nominative case affect the topicality of a nominal.

We again confirm that these effects are due to discoursal or pragmatic functions of the nominative case and voice, not due to the grammatical relation of the nominative nominal. If these effects are brought about by the grammatical relation of the nominative nominal, it predicts that all the nominative nominals can be controllers, contrary to the facts. Rather, as we have proposed, what counts as a controller is a both semantically and pragmatically salient nominal in a sentence. The grammatical relations, if any, are irrelevant to this construction.

Indefinite THEME The THEME nominal can serve as a controller in the nominative case, while it cannot in the genitive case. This contrast is induced by language-specific constraint.

As noted earlier, the nominative THEME nominal must be definite, while the genitive THEME nominal must be indefinite. Foley and Van Valin (1984: 139) state that “[f]ocused NPs [read nominative NPs] in all Philippine languages must be referential and are normally definite. [...] If a patient or undergoer [read THEME] is definite, then it must be in focus [read in the nominative case]. Non-patient/undergoers which are not in focus [read in the nominative case] may be interpreted as definite or indefinite, depending upon context, but a non-focused [read genitive] patient/undergoer cannot be interpreted as definite.” This language-specific constraint on the THEME nominal in Tagalog prevents the genitive THEME from being a controller.¹⁹ A depictive is not accessible to a low-topical nominal, as is expressed in our proposal.

On the other hand, non-nominative nominals bearing other semantic roles than THEME may be definite or indefinite according to (non-)linguistic contexts where they appear. In consequence, an inanimate GOAL nominal, for example, may serve as a controller even when it is in the oblique case.

Constituent order The constituent order takes an important role in topicality. A nominal in the directly post-predicate position is considered to be high in topicality.

- (109) a. **Nakahubad** na binugbog *ni Tom* si Juan.
 naked LINK trounce.OV.PRFV GEN Tom NOM Juan
 ‘Tom trounced Juan **naked**.’
 b. **Nakahubad** na binugbog *si Juan* ni Tom.
 naked LINK trounce.OV.PRFV NOM Juan GEN Tom
 ‘Tom trounced *Juan* **naked**.’

There is a tendency that a nominal following a predicate is likely to be a controller.

¹⁹It is not impossible to consider that the THEME nominal in the genitive case loses the status of argument and it is a chômeur. But Kroeger (1993: 47-48) demonstrates that they are still arguments on the basis of the observation of Adjunct Fronting and participial adjuncts. See also Shibatani (1988).

4.3.2 AGENT is not defocused

As has been demonstrated earlier in the examples (69)-(72), animate GOAL/SOURCE nominals are not associated with the depictive predicate. Rather, an AGENT nominal serves as a controller in these examples. At first glance, this situation seems to be counter examples to our proposal: even though they are considered to be located high in both hierarchies, animate GOAL/SOURCE nominals do not serve as controllers.

However, these phenomena are not opposed to our proposal, but rather they support it. In the view of our proposal, in the clauses where a depictive adjective can be pragmatically construed both with an AGENT nominal and with a GOAL/SOURCE nominal, the existence of the AGENT nominal blocks the secondary predication between an animate GOAL/SOURCE nominal and a depictive predicate. This is because the AGENT nominal outranks the animate GOAL/SOURCE nominal in the semantic and pragmatic saliency. When there are both an animate AGENT and animate GOAL/SOURCE nominals in a clause, the depictive is bound to be predicated of an AGENT nominal, which is more salient than animate GOAL/SOURCE nominals. Tentatively, we label this blocking effect as an AGENT effect.

This account of the AGENT effect predicts that inanimate GOAL and SOURCE nominals can be controllers, whether AGENT is in the clause or not, because there is few depictive predicate which can be pragmatically predicated both of AGENT and of inanimate GOAL/SOURCE nominals. In fact, even when there is an AGENT in the clause, inanimate GOAL and SOURCE nominals can be controllers. See (65)-(68).

To be precise, this blocking effect is not restricted to animate GOAL/SOURCE nominals. It can affect any non-AGENT nominals, which potentially share a depictive with the AGENT nominal. In the case of animate THEME, it is rarely a controller because of the AGENT effect. But, it can be a controller when it is highly topical.

- (110) **Nakahubad** na sinipa siya ng bata.
 naked LINK kick.OV.PRFV 3.SG.NOM GEN child
 ‘A/The child kicked *him/her* **naked**.’

In this example, a THEME nominal is a personal pronoun in the nominative case and located in the immediately post-verbal position. So it is possible that it works as a controller. The contrast between animate THEME and animate SOURCE/GOAL is reflected in their different positions in the semantic hierarchy and topicality hierarchies of our proposal.

The AGENT effect, in addition, has a significant implication for the inquiry into the voice system in the Philippine languages. This voice system is different from other voice systems of other languages with regard to the AGENT effect. In other languages like English, Japanese, and German, an animate GOAL is unlikely to be a controller in an active sentence. That is, the AGENT effect is observed like this.

- (111) They_i gave the patients_j the drugs drunk_{i/*j}.
 (112) Taroo_i-ga Ziroo_j-ni deesui-zyootai-de_{i/*j} mayaku-o utta.
 Taro-NOM Jiro-DAT dead-drunk drug-ACC injected
 ‘Taro_i injected a drug into Jiro_j dead-drunk_{i/*j}.’
 (113) Die Krankenschwester_i gab John_j die Medizin krank_{i/*j}.
 the nurse gave John-DAT the medicine-ACC ill

‘The nurse_i gave John_j medicine sick_{i/*j}.’

But, in these languages, an operation of passive can cancel the AGENT effect like below.

(114) The patients_j were given the drugs drunk_j.

(115) Ziroo_j-ga deesui-zyootai-de_{i/j} Taroo_i-ni mayaku-o utareta.
 Jiro-NOM dead-drunk Taro-by drug-ACC was-injected
 ‘Jiro_j was injected with a drug by Taro_i dead-drunk_{i/j}.’

(116) John_j wurde die Medizin nackt_j verabreicht.
 John-DAT was the medicine-NOM naked given
 ‘John_j was given the medicine naked_j.’

These examples clearly demonstrate that the AGENT effect can be canceled by utilizing the passive construction, whose “primary function is that of ‘agent defocusing’” (Shibatani 1985: 830). After AGENTS are defocused, animate GOAL nominals work as controllers as in these three examples (114-116).

However, this is not the case with Tagalog. Animate GOAL and SOURCE nominals, whether in the nominative case or in the oblique case, do not count as controllers. This fact reveals that the Tagalog voice system is irrelevant to the function of “agent defocusing,” that is, it is not an operation of passive. It is the very point which Shibatani (1988) has pointed out in his article. Shibatani (1988: 96) claims “[p]ast analyses that view the Philippine non-actor topic [read non-Actor voice] construction passive miss important overall characteristics of this construction that are not shared by the prototypical passive: [...] it [= the construction] is not an agent defocusing mechanism in that it syntactically encodes both agent and patient, just as in active transitive clauses in other languages.” Our discussion and proposal of the depictive construction offer supportive evidence for his claim in addition to his three pieces of evidence.

The observation that the AGENT effect is not canceled by the voice change in Tagalog is also compatible with Cooreman, Fox, and Givón (1984: 22) “If the topicality status of the NP arguments in the various type is defined in a discourse-based manner, then Tagalog is as much a “surface” (morphological) ergative languages as Chamorro, one in which the agent is more topical in connected discourse than the patient.”

In conclusion, our proposal easily accounts for the unacceptability of animate GOAL/SOURCE controllers. Moreover, the AGENT effect and our analysis provide the further evidence to the analysis that AGENT is not defocused in non-Actor voice sentences.

4.4 Summary: semantic and pragmatic saliency

In this section, I demonstrated that the semantico-pragmatic approach, rather than the grammatical relation approach, can solve the issue of the controller-selection in the Tagalog depictive construction: a nominal can count as a controller if it excels in semantic and pragmatic saliency. This analysis of the depictive construction in Tagalog, in turn, might be applicable to the depictive construction in other languages. But, I will not pursue that possibility here.

5 Conclusion and Further Speculation

In this paper, after describing the depictive construction, I have argued that the grammatical relation approach gets us nowhere for this construction, and the approach which involves semantics and pragmatics provides an explanatory account. This claim is reminiscent of Schachter's dichotomy between role-relatedness and reference-relatedness.

I conclude this paper by arguing how the depictive construction is related to other constructions in Tagalog and how important this construction is.

5.1 Role-related and reference-related constructions

Schachter (1977: 279) claims that "in Philippine languages there is no single constituent type with a clear preponderance of the syntactic properties that are commonly associated with subjects in other languages. Instead the set of so-called subject properties [...] divided into two subsets," that is, an Actor nominal and a nominative nominal. According to Schachter (1976, 1977), the Actor (\equiv AGENT) nominal and the nominative nominal have different syntactic characteristics, which are presented below.

- (117) The Actor nominal (role-related property)
 - a. Reflexive binder
 - b. Equi target
 - c. Imperative addressee
- (118) The Nominative nominal (reference-related property)
 - a. Launching quantifier floating
 - b. Relativization

The properties in (117) and (118) are attributed to only one nominal in other languages, but two distinct nominals in Tagalog. From this observation, he concluded that there is no subject in Tagalog and the subjecthood is divided into the Actor nominal and the nominative nominal. The subject properties attributed to the Actor nominal are considered role-related; the other properties are viewed reference-related.

Put it differently, there are two types of constructions in Tagalog: the role-related construction and the reference-related construction. They differ in the way to select a nominal which takes a primary role in the construction. In the former construction, it is picked up according only to a semantic role of a nominal, while, in the latter construction, it is selected exclusively from the view point of referentiality or topicality of a nominal. Different nominals take a primary role in different constructions.²⁰

For example, in the reflexive construction, which is a role-related construction, a controller must be an Actor nominal, whether it appears in the nominative case or not. On the other hand, in the relative construction, which is a reference-related construction, the controller must be a nominative nominal regardless of its semantic role.

It is in this regard that the depictive construction, which we dealt with here, is of theoretical importance; this construction is relevant both to role-relatedness and to reference-relatedness. As has been demonstrated here, both semantic roles and topicality determine

²⁰I owe this view to Foley and Van Valin (1984) and Van Valin and LaPolla (1997).

what counts as a controller, that is, a nominal which takes a primary role in the depictive construction. The one cannot provide an account on the controller-selection without the other. The construction is, as it were, a “role-and-reference-related construction.”

The relationships of these constructions can be summarized like below, with regard to role-related property and reference-related property.

(119) Constructions in Tagalog:

Constructions	Role-related	Reference-related
Reflexive	✓	
Imperative	✓	
Equi	✓	
Relativization		✓
Floating quantifier		✓
Depictive	✓	✓

We have demonstrated that Tagalog has a construction which is both role-related and reference-related.

5.2 Concluding remarks

In this paper, I describe and demonstrate what the depictive construction in Tagalog is, how it works, and what determines the controller-selection. In section 3, I defined the depictive secondary predicate as (30), repeated as (120) here.

(120) The depictive secondary predicate in Tagalog is a predicative stage-level adjective phrase which modifies the event denoted by a dynamic primary predicate (i.e. verb predicate) and which is predicated of one of the nominals of the primary predicate. It is an adjunct attached to the primary predicate by means of the linker, either pre-verbally or post-verbally.

and, described characteristics of the depictive in various regards. Then, in section 4, on the issue of the controller-selection, I have given an explanation to it, not by the grammatical relation approach, but by the semantico-pragmatic approach. To capture this construction, it suffices to employ the notions of the semantic roles and topicality, and, in addition, the grammatical relation-based approach makes the wrong prediction. What we claim instead is that a semantically and pragmatically salient nominal can count as a controller. The controller of the depictive must excel both in the role-related property and in the reference-related property.

We can conclude, at least for the depictive construction, that the grammatical relations are unnecessary in Tagalog.

References

- Blake, Frank. 1906. "The expression of case of the verb in Tagalog." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 27:183–189.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1967. "Adjectives in English: Attribution and predication." *Lingua* 18:1–34.
- Cena, Resty M. 1995. "Surviving Without Relations." *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 26(1/2):1–32.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 1997. Are Grammatical Relations universal? In *Essays on Language Function and Language Type*, ed. J. Bybee, J. Haiman & S. A. Thompson. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Foley, William A. 1998. Symmetrical Voice Systems and Precategoriality in Philippine Languages. In *Workshop on Voice and Grammatical Functions in Austronesian Languages*. The University of Queensland, Brisbane.
- Foley, William A. & Robert D. Van Valin Jr. 1984. *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Givón, Talmy. 1976. Topic, pronoun and grammatical agreement. In *Subject and Topic*, ed. Charles Li. New York: Academic Press.
- Halliday, Mark A. K. 1967. "Notes on transitivity and theme in English." *Journal of Linguistics* 3:37–81.
- Hoekstra, Eric. 1986. "On the structural Subject Position in Tagalog." *Lingua* 70:41–56.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1990. *Semantic Structures*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Keenan, Edward & Bernard Comrie. 1977. "Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar." *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:68–99.
- Koizumi, Masatoshi. 1994. "Secondary Predicates." *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3:25–79.
- Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase Structure and Grammatical Relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Langacker, Ronald. 1991. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar Vol. 2 Descriptive Application*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1995. *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*. Mass.: MIT Press.
- Müller, Stefan. 2002. *Complex Predicates: Verbal Complexes, Resultative Constructions, and Particle Verbs in German*. Stanford: CSLI publications.

- Nagaya, Naonori. 2004. Depictive Secondary Predicates and Split Subjecthood in Tagalog. B.A. thesis. University of Tokyo.
- Napoli, Donna Jo. 1993. *Syntax: theory and problems*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1978. "Secondary Predicates." *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4:114–127.
- Schachter, Paul. 1976. The Subject in Philippine Languages: Topic, Actor, Actor-Topic, or None of the Above. In *Subject and Topic*, ed. Charels N. Li. New York: Academic Press.
- Schachter, Paul. 1977. Reference-related and role-related properties of subjects. In *Grammatical Relations (Syntax and Semantics 8)*, ed. P. Cole & J. Saddock. New York: Academic Press pp. 279–306.
- Schachter, Paul & Fe T. Otones. 1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Schultze-Berndt, Eva & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann. 2004. "Depictive secondary predicates in cross-linguistic perspective." *Linguistic Typology* 8:59–131.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1985. "Passives and Related constructions: A prototype analysis." *Language* 61:821–848.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1988. Voice in Philippine languages. In *Passive and Voice*, ed. Masayoshi Shibatani. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins pp. 85–142.
- Taylor, John R. 2002. *Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Valin Jr., Robert D. & Randy J. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, meaning, and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, Edwin. 1980. "Predication." *Linguistic Inquiry* 11:203–38.
- Williams, Edwin. 1983. "Against Small Clause." *Linguistic Inquiry* 14:287–308.

Naonori Nagaya

The abstract in Japanese is here in the original version. But I deleted it for convenience of readers who cannot display Japanese characters with their computers.
(2004/10/08 1:06 JST)