

## The Syntax and Semantics of Tagalog Situation Types

Tagalog has two distinct verb classes, volitive (V) and non-volitive (NV). These classes differ in their morphology and in what they semantically entail, as shown in (1) and (2) (Kroeger 1993).

- (1) UM-inum siya ng lasun. (2) NAKA-inum siya ng lasun.  
V-drink he poison NV-drink he poison

*“He {intentionally drank/tried to drink} poison.” “He accidentally drank poison.”*

V verbs, such as *um-inum* ‘drink’ in (1), entail only that the agent acted (or attempted to act) with the intent to achieve a particular result, but V verbs do not entail the successful achievement of the corresponding result state. This information is pragmatically determined with a default reading that the action was carried out. NV verbs, such as *naka-inum* ‘drink’ in (2), entail the actual performance of the maneuver and the result state, but do not entail intentionality of the action. The intentionality is pragmatically determined, with a default reading that the action was involuntary (Kroeger 1993). Thus the intention in V verbs, and the maneuver and result state in NV verbs is the semantically entailed/lexically encoded information.

How would we represent these verb classes using event structure? And how would event structure account for the differing situation types of these verb classes? In order to account for these lexical differences, a proposed event structure must be able to account for the differing lexical information encoded in V and NV verbs.

Travis (2010) proposes a complex event structure using the Larsonian layered VP structure. The higher VP (V<sub>1</sub>P) is a lexical category that introduces the external argument, and carries information related to PROCESS. There is an Aspect Phrase that dominates the lower VP (V<sub>2</sub>P) that carries information related to TELICITY. Travis (2010) proposes that the four Vendlerian situation types may be represented by this structure because V<sub>1</sub>P and ASPP represent the major differences among the situation types (i.e. +/- TELIC and +/-PROCESS).

Travis proposes that NV verbs at first seem to have incremental accomplishment components, however these verbs are more precisely achievement situation type because in NV verb event structure, the V<sub>1</sub>P is not present and therefore PROCESS information carried by the head of V<sub>1</sub>P phrase is not present. Piñón’s (1997) tests for achievements further support this analysis. My tests and representational analysis will account for these differences and offer more support for this structure proposed by Travis (2010). In order to bring out the differences between V and NV verbs situation types, I incorporate a series of syntactic tests, as summarized in Table 1.

**TABLE 1: SYNTACTIC TESTS**

TEST	USED WITH VOLITIVE VERB	USED WITH NON-VOLITIVE VERB
halos/muntik na/kamuntik na ‘almost’	✓ (counterfactual/scalar)	✓ (counterfactual)
itigil ‘stop’	✓ (scalar)	*
simulan/umpisahan ‘start’	✓	*
sa X minuto ‘in X minutes’	✓	✓
para sa X minuto ‘for X minutes’	✓	*
pinilit ‘force’	✓	*
bahagyang natapos ‘partially finished’	✓	*

From the result of these tests, we can see the difference in situation types that Tagalog verb classes can grammatically denote (based on presence or absence of process, telicity, causation and completion):

**TABLE 2: VOLITIVE AND NON-VOLITIVE VERB SITUATION TYPES**

	STATE	ACTIVITY	ACHIEVEMENT	ACCOMPLISHMENT
<b>VOLITIVE VERBS</b>	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>NON-VOLITIVE VERBS</b>	*	*	✓	✓

Kroeger, P. 1993. *Phrase Structure and Grammatical Relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Piñón, C. 1997. Achievements in an Event Semantics. Ms., *Universität Düsseldorf*.

Travis, L. 2010. *Inner Aspect: The Articulation of VP*. New York: Springer Publications.