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Introduction

While Tagalog is a well-documented language and has been described in detail by various linguists over the years, little work has been done on the expression of motion events and the semantic elements encoded in those expressions. My thesis explores which semantic elements, such as source, goal, path type, directionality and manner of motion, are included in expressions of motion events. Additionally, I investigate not only how Tagalog encodes these elements, but also which ones Tagalog speakers choose to include in narrative. Not all of these elements are salient to Tagalog speakers, and some are most often not explicitly expressed. What follows is a description of the strategies Tagalog uses to include these semantic elements, and an analysis of the sentence structures that native speakers produce in trying to express multiple facets of a single motion event.

I will first provide basic backgrounds for the semantic concepts and Tagalog grammar that are pertinent to my study. The semantic background defines the terminology I will use and discusses types of path and elements of complex path. Furthermore, I will give an overview of how languages can encode different semantic elements into different parts of their language, and discuss the resulting semantic typology that has developed in the cross-linguistic study of motion events. Likewise, the Tagalog section gives a brief overview of relevant grammar and the most recent research of the expression of motion events in Tagalog. My own conclusions are generally supported by this earlier research. Manner of motion is not a salient and frequently expressed semantic element; instead, path is usually expressed in the main verb. In other words, a Tagalog speaker is much more likely to express where an entity is moving than how it is moving (*go out* vs. *fly*). When manner is expressed, it occurs as a main verb, so
that when path occurs in the same sentence it is placed in a pa-construction, a structure which is a central issue in my thesis. Finally, ground elements such as source, goal, or location are not frequently expressed, leaving the verbs bare (e.g. *He left* instead of *He left the house*).

My section “Ground Expressions” clearly delineates where certain ground elements such as source and goal can occur in combination with the different verb types and combination available. In my section “Verbal Issues” I present the possibility of a further division between manner and path verbs into manner, directional and bounded path verbs. This tripartite division is based on what these verbs seem to explicitly express semantically, as well as what ground elements they take. Bounded path verbs require the expression of a source or goal, whereas directional verbs seem to not take source or goal, but can occur with an optional location or route. While there are some exceptions to this division, it seems that at the very least there is a tendency for path verbs to divide along these lines.
Semantics of Motion

Basic components:

The semantic expression of motion events involves the use of very basic components. Leonard Talmy lists these components, what he calls “semantic categories”, and illustrates their occurrences in verbs, satellites and inflections (1985: 127-38). Of the categories he describes, my research has primarily focused on MANNER, PATH, FIGURE, and GROUND. Talmy defines FIGURE as a “conceptually movable object whose path is at issue” (1985: 61). GROUND is “the reference frame” for the motion of the figure. So, in the sentence *the dog ran through my yard* the movable object or figure is *the dog* and the reference frame or ground is *my yard*. The ground is made up of reference objects, which can be a LOCATION, SOURCE, GOAL, or PATH. Examples of these follow:

A. She swam in the lake.

B. She fell off the dock into the lake.

C. She swam along the shoreline.

In sentence A, *the lake* is an example of LOCATION; it is the setting in which the figure *(she)* is moving. In sentence B, *the dock* is the SOURCE from which the figure moved to the GOAL (however unintentional or unplanned that goal may have been) *the lake*. In sentence C, *the shoreline* is the reference object that expresses the swimmer’s PATH. The *shoreline* also happens to be the figure’s route. A PATH is any reference frame along which a figure moves, whether it is merely moving away from a source, toward a goal, between points A and B, or simply through or along a location.

Besides these ground elements, motion events also make use of specific verbs, which often specify directionality. Sometimes this directionality is optional, as with the
verb *float*, where a figure can float in place, or float towards a goal or away from a source. Different facets of a motion event, such as directionality or manner, can be incorporated within the verb. Manner of motion describes how the figure moves; examples in English are *run, swim, jump, float, or fly*. These motion verbs all describe how the motion is being done. Directional motion describes the path of the motion, so for example, *go in/enter, go out/exit, go up/ascend, go down/descend, go toward/approach, go from/leave*. Talmy uses the term *CONFLATION* to describe this incorporation of different semantic elements (1985). Ray Jackendoff illustrates how elements such as path or directionality can be lexicalized within the verb, comparing the phrase *go into* with the verb *enter* (1983: 183). In English, *enter* includes the element of path within it, without needing the satellite *into* to describe the directed motion of moving to a place within some reference object.

**Conceptual Categories:**

Jackendoff claims that there are complex concepts with internal structure, so that if an utterance does not fit into an ontological category, it is part of a structured function. A “place-function” contains a subcategorized nounphrase; for example, in the phrase *on the table*, only *table* fills an ontological category: *[THING]*; therefore, the PLACE is *on* the THING, *the table*. *[THINGS]* and *[EVENTS]* can occupy *[PLACES]*, whereas *[PATHS]* are more complex, and have a more varied structure. A path often can be a path-function with a reference object *[THING]*, as in the path *from under the table*. The path being traveled is *from* the place under the table. Thus, a path’s internal conceptual structure is a path function (*TO or FROM*, plus others, later discussed) plus a reference object (1983: 162). This path/place conceptual distinction is grammaticalized in some other languages; for
example, German prepositions use the dative case with place functions and the accusative case with path-functions.

Types of path:

The conceptual directions Jackendoff delineates are TO, FROM, TOWARDS, AWAY-FROM, and VIA, which correspond to different types of path. Jackendoff outlines three path types, BOUNDED PATHS, DIRECTIONS, and ROUTES. BOUNDED PATHS include source-paths and goal-paths using TO or FROM (1983: 165). For example, in *Tom walked to school* and *Tom left work early, school and work* are a goal and a source, respectively, at which the figure *Tom* was physically present. In directions the reference object (source or goal) is not contained within the path, that is, the figure does not have to be present at the goal or source. DIRECTIONS use the path-function TOWARD or AWAY-FROM. For example, in *she went toward the house* the figure does not actually reach the house, but is merely traveling in the direction of the house, possibly indefinitely. Directions need not reference a ground element at all, as in *they fly south for the winter*. In a ROUTE the reference object is related to some point within the path, so that a route must make use of the path-function VIA. For example, in *they strolled through the meadow* or *she drove by her school* the figure is moving VIA a location (*the meadow or her school*). Routes do not specify source or goal.

Complex path:

A JOURNEY is an “extended path that includes milestones or sub-goals” (Slobin 1996: 202). Real life is more complex than single simple paths, and so language allows us to use more than a single verb and its few adjuncts. Languages have different
strategies for linking simple paths and for denoting different milestones. Milestones mark

different points along a conceptual journey, as in:

*Sally left work, and drove onto the highway. She stopped at the store for

milk before she arrived at home.*

In this example, there are multiple verbs (*leave, drive, stop, arrive*) and sub-goals
(*highway, store*) within the main journey of the figure (*Sally*) moving from work to

domine. However, this is conceptually speaking; within the framework of a language’s

syntactic capabilities, languages vary in how many ground elements they can encode

within a single “path segment”, as I will discuss further later on.

Different languages have different syntactic capabilities, and employ different

strategies for expressing complex paths. Some languages will use coordination or

gapping to include multiple ground elements under one verb. In the utterance *She ran out

of her room, down the stairs, out the front door, and down the street to her friend’s

house*, the segments of path are linked by underlying conjunctions (*ands*), which are

marked in speech by a change in intonation. Talmy’s “Lexicalization Patterns” delineates

how languages can use satellites (what in English are often prepositions such as *to, from,

up, down*) to express elements like path, path and ground combined, figure and ground

combined, and sometimes even manner of motion (1985: 103-11). In English, satellites

most often express path alone, as we have seen in *He ran in*. These often are paired with

prepositions in English (and many other Indo-European languages), as with *He ran in to

the house*.

Some languages lack the morphosyntactic structures to combine source and goal

into a single clause (Slobin 2004: 19). An extreme case is Yucatec Maya, which only
allows one ground expression per clause, as it does not distinguish between the thematic relations of source and goal (Bohnemeyer 2003: 89-90). In addition to the actual capabilities of a language’s morphology, languages exhibit preferred path segmentation. For example, a language might have a limit on the number of ground objects per clause. Dutch is such a language, and apparently prefers not to mention more than two ground objects per clause (Bohnemeyer 2003: 89).

Encoding Manner, Path and Figure:

As discussed above, CONFLATION, similar to LEXICALIZATION and INCORPORATION, refers to “representation of meaning in surface forms” (Talmy 1985: 60). Motion can be conflated in the verb with manner of motion, the motion’s path (making it a directed motion), or the figure enacting that motion.

Motion + Manner: the rock rolled (down the hill)

The test for a verb being a ‘manner of motion verb’ is if directionality can be left unspecified. A figure can roll or run or fly without necessarily going anywhere. The element of manner answers the question of ‘how?’ rather than ‘where?’

Motion + Path: the teacher entered the room

A classic example is the Spanish la botella entró a la cueva (flotando) ‘the bottle entered (moved-in) the cave, floating’. In contrast, English would use a manner of motion verb, and say the bottle floated into the cave leaving path to be specified in a satellite, or preposition.

Motion + Figure: it rained in through the window

In this combination of figure with motion, the figure itself is contained in the verb. This particular conflation of elements is a rare occurrence in English, a language which
primarily encodes manner with motion in the verb. The conflation of motion with figure is in fact only common for the Hokan languages of northern California and Navajo, but these languages have “scores of Motion + Figure verbs with the most colloquial and extensive of usages” (Talmy 1985: 73).

**Typology:**

In typological studies, researchers’ goal is to discover the general practices of a language in comparison to others: how they express certain concepts, what structures they use, in what constructions different semantic elements are lexicalized, etc. Depending on what aspects are the subject of study, a typology can describe the absolute capabilities of languages, or their tendencies or preferences. We must also keep in mind that languages are ever changing, and to be on the lookout for exceptions that may indicate that a language may be in the process of shifting from one typological category to another.

After introducing his highly organized system of semantic categories and conflation patterns, Talmy presents the concepts of **VERB-FRAMED** and **SATELLITE-FRAMED** languages. Slobin quotes him:

“Languages that characteristically map the core schema into the verb will be said to have a *framing verb* and to be *verb-framed* languages. Included among such languages are Romance, Semitic, Japanese, Tamil, Polynesian, most Bantu, most Mayan, Nez Perce, and Caddo. On the other hand, languages that characteristically map the core schema onto the satellite will be said to have a *framing satellite* and to be *satellite-framing* languages, and included among them are most Indo-European minus

By ‘core schema’ we have come to assume path. Therefore, English, a satellite-framing language (S-language) most characteristically encodes path in a satellite. A language like Spanish, a verb-framing language (V-language) most characteristically encodes path in the verb. Manner, if expressed, is often expressed as an adjunct.

The V-language’s manner expressions, therefore, when present, make manner more salient (Slobin, 1997: 457). In the Spanish example La botella entró a la cueva flotando ‘the bottle entered the cave, floating’, the occurrence of the manner of motion floating as an adjunct makes it more salient because it is an unnecessary piece of semantic information that would not otherwise be included. Salience is derived from the presence of an unexpected piece of information. A Spanish speaker expects path as the main verb; adding a manner adjunct makes manner salient.

As a result of their differing encoding patterns, languages form a salience of different elements (Talmy 1985: 122). Slobin describes the “cline of manner salience” that exists across languages (2004: 25), claiming that the differences in how languages treat manner and directionality tend to affect “narrative style” (2004: 10). For example, Slobin claims that Spanish is “more attentive to static scene setting” (1996: 205).

Enough study has been done on the semantics of motions events to write ten theses, however, moving forward, the most important concepts to remember are those of simple path. Source and goal define the boundaries of a path, and so a bounded path cannot be defined without reference to either a source or goal. Directions on the other hand do not require the expression of source or goal, but are very flexible in that they can
be expressed with any ground expression: source, goal, location, or none of the above. On the whole, languages fit into typological categories, where they tend to conflate certain semantic elements (such as manner or path) into their verbs and have other strategies for expressing other elements.

A commonly used method for discovering the tendencies of a language is to gather narratives. In contrast to elicited sentences, narratives lend speakers the freedom to structure expressions as they most naturally would. Instead of translating an utterance from the researcher’s language, they are creating their own structures, and so providing a version of their language that is closer to everyday “real” language. For his study of directed motion, Slobin cites descriptions of scenes from narratives of Mercer Meyers’ illustrated children’s book *Frog, Where Are You?* (1996: 202). For example, in “the cliff scene”, the little boy, whose search for his pet frog is the premise of the story, climbs atop a rock, grabbing (what look like) branches to lift himself, only to be lifted into the air, as a deer raises its head and antlers (onto which the boy is holding). The deer runs, with the boy on his head, and the boy’s dog chasing them both. The scene ends at the edge of a small cliff, where the deer abruptly stops, so that the boy and his dog fall into the pond close below. As we can see, even in five pages of simple illustrations, there are many directed motions, figures, grounds, paths, and the like; the scene is ripe for analysis. The complexity of the so-called “Frog Story” has aided many different scholars in cross-linguistic research of directed motion events. The textless picture book is presented to native speakers of different languages at different ages, and from this data linguists have been able to form semantic typologies of these languages.
The majority of my background knowledge of Tagalog typology comes from Huang’s paper “Reference to Motion Events in Six Austronesian Languages: Toward a Semantic Typology”. In his study of six Western Austronesian (WAN) languages, Huang offers a typology based off of collected Frog Story narratives from the six languages; however, he acknowledges the limitations of this study, stating that “there is still a dearth of cross-linguistic research on such issues as lexicalization pattern and characteristic narrative styles for motion events in Austronesian languages” (2005: 311). Huang disputes Slobin’s claim that Austronesian languages are primarily serial-verb languages (2005: 311, footnote 3) and instead uses the WAN languages as evidence for a four-way typological division, adding Macro-event and Serial-verb languages to the previously established Verb-framing and Satellite-framing languages. He concludes that Tagalog and Cebuano are most closely V-languages in their encoding preferences of motion events, meaning that they should express path in the verb and manner in a satellite. However, as we will see, when manner and path are combined in a sentence, manner takes the position of the main verb, while path is expressed in a secondary position.
Tagalog

Basic Structure

In Tagalog normally the verb is sentence-initial followed by an agent noun phrase and then a theme or patient noun phrase, locative phrases, or other additional information.

(1) tumakbo ang palaka sa tubig
    jump  GM-frog  GM-water
    ‘the frog jumped into the water’

An exception to this is the ay-construction, in which the subject is fronted, basically to call extra attention to it.

(2) ang lalaki ay pumunta sa tindahan
    GM-man  ay go toward GM-store
    ‘the man went to the store’

Otherwise a system of grammatical markers (marked by ‘GM’ in the glosses):

*ang*, *ng*, and *sa*, marks the grammatical role of phrases in the sentence. Typically, *ang* will mark agent, *ng* patient or theme, *sa* location or sometimes recipient; this allows the order of noun phrases to be relatively fluid. However, the use of these markers becomes very complex because they can be rearranged with different word orders, and in certain situations they can even be applied to verbs. In the interests of simplicity I have avoided such sentence constructs that have complex usages of these topic markers, and so for the most part they do not become an issue in interpreting the data for my project. For proper nouns, instead of *ang* and *ng*, the topic markers are *si* and *ni* respectively.

Tagalog makes use of a system of linkers as well (‘LK’ in the glosses), which can occur in a variety of constructions. Note that when the linker *ng* follows a word ending in
a vowel, it is written and pronounced as a coda, attached to the end of that preceding word.

\[(3) \quad \text{ang dalawa ng bata} \rightarrow \text{ang dalawang bata}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{GM-two-LK-child} & \quad \text{GM-two-LK-child} \\
\text{‘two children’}
\end{align*}
\]

The linker also occurs as *na*, depending on the words and phonemes adjoining it.

Tagalog also has a complex system of verb morphology. Most of the verb markers in my data are restricted to the *um-* affix, and so for the sake of simplicity I will not be glossing these markers, since, like the grammatical markers, they do not significantly affect my study.

An important issue that was not made clear in the studies I have read is that of defining verb categories. Generally speaking, Tagalog categories are difficult to clearly define, as many of its lexical items can change categories fairly easily, an issue that is still under investigation by professional linguists. For this reason, I am hesitant to classify the construction that is of primary interest in this study, the pa-path construction. The construction affixes *pa-* to the root of a path verb in a sentence where a manner verb takes typical verbal markings. For example, the verb root *alis* ‘go away’ can appear as a main verb *umalis*, or in this pa-construction as *paalis*. The issue of categorization becomes more complex however, with “verb roots” such as *labas*, which, like *alis*, can appear as *lumabas* or *palabas*, but can also appear without verbal markings in location phrases, such as *sa labas ng bahay* ‘(at) outside the house’.

Paul Schachter, the renowned authority on Tagalog grammar, refers to the *pa-* construction as adjectival. In a section he titles “Pa- adjectives”, he addresses the
affixation of *pa-* in Tagalog, distinguishing between “intermittent-activity adjectives”, “incipient-activity adjectives” and “*pa-* manner adjectives” (1972: 216-18). I have found his section on “*pa-* manner adjectives” to be most relevant to my study, as Schachter likens the construction to an “adverbial expression of manner in English”. He briefly gives examples with English translations, only one of which is motion related:

\[(4)\quad t\text{-}um-agilid \rightarrow pa\text{-}tagilid\]

‘move sideways’ \(\rightarrow\) ‘sideways’

However, this *pa-* manner adjective occurs with nominalized verbs, as we see in his examples:

\[(5)\quad \text{pasayaw ang baba ni Rosa sa hagdanan.}\]

\(\text{pa\text{-}dance GM\text{-}descend GM\text{-}Rosa GM\text{-}stairs}\)

‘Rosa was descending the stairs as if dancing.’

Literally: ‘Rosa’s descending the stairs was (done) as if dancing’

\[(6)\quad \text{patagilid ang lakad ng alimango}\]

\(\text{pa\text{-}move sideways GM\text{-}walk GM\text{-}crab}\)

‘The crab walked sideways’

Literally: ‘The crab’s walking was sideways.’

This type of expression is relevant but opposite to the construction I have found in studying the expression of motion events. Although I have seen the *pa*-affix on verbs of manner, it is clear that this is dispreferred, at least in expressions of directed motion. Huang’s findings confirm that although Tagalog speakers will accept a *pa*-manner construction, they will much more commonly place the manner verb in typical verb
position and affix *pa* to a path verb. The construction and usage of *pa*-affixation becomes a main focus in my thesis, as I examine what types of semantic elements it can take, where it can occur in sentence structure, and which constructions its presence restricts against.
Methodology

In previous research, I began to explore how Tagalog expresses directed motion. This research focused on how path elements, specifically source, goal, and manner are encoded in Tagalog. To do this, I used the technique used by Slobin (1996), and provided my Tagalog consultant with the Frog Story to elicit a simple narrative. I wanted to see what types of expressions are possible and which motion event elements the speaker might be resistant to expressing. This provided a clue as to how directed motion might be encoded. I found that in what English speakers would call the prepositional phrase, there is very seldom an expression of source and goal combined. Also, directionality appears to be expressed in the verb, and when more than one facet of (what we would consider) a single directed motion event needs to be expressed, an additional clause is created. The narrative I collected in this current study supported these observations.

For this study, in addition to wanting to discover how Tagalog encodes semantic concepts like manner of motion and directionality, I wanted to be able define how Tagalog expresses specific ground elements like source and goal. Thus far, Schachter had only made general descriptions of how Tagalog treats locatives; I wanted to generate a clear cut description of Tagalog ground elements in combination with different types of verbs, and from there investigate the unique verbal issues of Tagalog motion events. To achieve these multiple goals, I first created English sentences and had my consultant Gloria Jean Tanglao-Aguas (hereafter Jean) translate them into Tagalog.

Jean was born and raised in the Philippines just north of Manila. Although she lives in the United States now, she returns to the Philippines routinely, and speaks Tagalog as a first language in her home. She and her husband are also active in the
Filipino community on the William and Mary campus. Her high level of contact with Tagalog-speaking communities, along with her high level of education and fluency in English made her a most helpful consultant. Over the course of several months, I conducted about ten elicitation sessions with her in her home, throughout which she not only provided Tagalog sentences, but also discussed the various semantic issues that were the focus of my study.

In these elicitation sessions, I tried to explain the semantic elements that needed to be carried over and expressed in Tagalog. By discussing the different semantic elements as we went, much of my data has been clarified by Jean’s explanations of their underlying semantic sense. Sometimes the translation of English to Tagalog led to unnatural Tagalog sentences (e.g. the clause *na gumagapang*). The sentences were acceptable Tagalog sentences, but they would not naturally be produced in normal speech. Generally, these sentences were elicited in sets, as in each session I attempted to focus on a different facet of Tagalog semantics.

Once I felt I had a firm grasp of how Tagalog motion events were generally expressed, I gave Jean the story book *Frog, Where Are You?* to look over, and then recorded the story she produced. The first story she provided was mostly dialogue, with the boy asking various creatures if they had seen his frog. I asked Jean to try and make the story more detailed, expressing actions and motions. She narrated another story which I then transcribed, and asked her to make corrections to my spelling, and things of that nature.¹

¹ Instead she provided me with a story she had written, explaining that my transcription was not very good and the written story she provided me was a better flowing story. She said that the two were comparable, discussing approximately the same things, but the narrated story was choppy, a mere description segment of what was going on in each picture, and not a flowing story.
After analyzing both the narrative and the elicited sentences, I created a set of my own Tagalog sentences, to confirm my observations, but also to test some assumptions I had made. When I provided a sentence that was unacceptable or not explicit, Jean provided an acceptable or clearer version of the sentence.

While working on with the narrative did provide a clear general picture of Tagalog tendencies in expressing motion events, there was little more that could be practically extracted without also exploring numerous other issues. The sentence elicitation allows for a concrete analysis of the strategies available to Tagalog speakers in expressing motion events.
Ground Expressions

In this section I will describe the use of the ground expressions source and goal, as they occur with different verb types both singularly and combined. Two main perspectives in examining the data must be kept in mind. Firstly, verb types distinguish between ground expression types. As demonstrated in Table 1, I have grouped ground expressions into ‘source/goal’ and ‘location/route’, a division based upon which expressions verbs will take.

Table 1: Verb type determines what type of ground expression may accompany the verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Type: verb root</th>
<th>Ground Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source/Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gapang ‘crawl’, langoy ‘swim’,</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lipad ‘fly’, takbo ‘run’, talon ‘jump’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akyat ‘go up’, baba ‘go down’,</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pasok ‘go in’, labas ‘go out’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punta ‘go toward’,</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alis ‘go away from’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distinction I make in between the two types of path verbs, bounded path vs. direction, will be more completely explained in the section ‘Verbal Issues’, however, is it important to know from the outset which ground expressions different verb types can take.

The layout of this section is reflected in the structure of Table 2 below, which represents the trends I observed in the combination of different verbs and ground expressions. For each ground expression I will describe its occurrence (or absence) with each verb combination. I will also highlight major exceptions to these patterns. As I proceed, I will present the observations that have led me to hypothesize the further division of path verbs.

Table 2: Combinations of ground expressions and verbs
Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ground Expressions</th>
<th>No Source No Goal</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Source and Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Path No Manner</td>
<td>optional sa-phrase expressing location or route</td>
<td>punta + G</td>
<td>alis + S</td>
<td>galing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path Manner Manner and Path</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mv + papunta + G</td>
<td>Mv + galing + S + papunta + G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*there are few examples for this combination, and it seems that source can be expressed either with *alis* as a main verb or with *galing*. Goal is always expressed with *papunta*.

As shown, goal is only expressed with the verb *punta*, while source is expressed with the verb *alis* or the word *galing*, though never *alis* and *galing* together. In this section I discuss the reasons that *galing* is not a path verb but an expression of origin. Note that without a path verb, source and goal cannot be explicitly expressed. Additionally, there are some interesting variations within and exceptions to the paradigm as it is presented here, issues which are all dealt with in this section.

**No Source or Goal:**

Where no motion event is taking place, and merely a state or achievement is being described, source and goal are not expressed, but other ground expressions that define the location of the event are necessary.

(5) ang batang larlaki ay nasa loob ng bahay

GM-child-LK-boy ay loc inside LK house

‘the boy is located inside the house’
The term /nasa/ is used to describe state of location, and therefore requires a ground expression. In the narrative Jean provided, the boy repeatedly asks ‘palaka, palaka, nasaan ka?’ ‘frog, frog, where are you?’, a question seeking a location expression for its answer. While most ground expressions take the topic marker sa, nasa takes a ground expression phrase without sa.

(6) ang bata ay nasa ilalim ng mesa

GM-child ay loc. under LK table

‘the child is located under the table’

Another type of non-motion event that appeared in the data was ‘achievements’. Achievements can be defined as occurring instantaneously; therefore, although listeners can assume motion is involved in the event, the achievements dumating or nakarating ‘arrive’ do not semantically incorporate motion. Because of this, the only ground expression an achievement can take is a description of its location. In 7, the ground expression sa tindahan ‘at the store’ provides this locative detail.

(7) dumating ako sa tindahan

arrive I GM-store

‘I arrived at the store’

In the Frog Story, Jean uses such achievements as tumakas ‘escape’, nagpreno ‘stop’ and makarating ‘arrive’. Only makarating is accompanied by a ground expression, sa dulo ng bundok ‘at the edge of a mountain’. Here again, the ground expression is a location at which the figure (‘the deer’ in this case) ‘arrives’.

---

2 This is probably because it is already incorporated in the term. Upon examination, /nasa/ may prove to be a combination of the linker /na/ and the location marker /sal/, merely linking the subject to its location, however, this issue is not pertinent to my study.

3 As opposed to ‘accomplishments’, which are completed actions that have occurred over a period of time. Compare winning a race, an ‘achievement’ to painting a room, an ‘accomplishment’.
Even when a motion event is taking place, in expressions of path, where
directionality is encoded in the verb, no ground expressions are needed, as they can be
assumed. This is most clearly evidenced in examples I gathered of going up stairs. A
Tagalog speaker can either be explicit in describing the route or location of the figure’s
upward motion, or leave that detail to be assumed by the listener. In 8, Jean provided an
explicit expression of someone going upstairs, however, she said that 9 would be
understood to have the same meaning, assuming there was no extraordinary context
blocking that interpretation.

(8) umakyat siya sa hagdanan
   ascend 3S GM-stair
   ‘he went up the stairs’

(9) umakyat siya
   ascend 3S
   ‘he went up (the stairs)’

This agrees with Tagalog’s tendency to omit or not express unnecessary or given
information that can be assumed. In contrast to this optional omission, I have found that
bounded path verbs do require the explicit expression of ground, punta with goal, alis
with source. In my final sentence elicitation session, Jean rejected 10 which I provided,
explaining that a goal must be specified.

(10) *pumunta siya
    go toward 3S
    ‘he went’
The need for a source with *alis* is less clear, as there seems to be conflicting evidence within the data. Conflicting with this theory is 11a, where Jean provided *alis* as a main verb without an explicit source. However, the pair of 11b and 11c for which I have extensive explanations from Jean seem to prove 11a to be a unique exception to the rule.

(11) a. umalis ako papuntang tindahan
    go away I pa-go toward GM-store
    ’I left for/towards the store’

b. *umalis siya papunta sa tindahan
    go away 3S pa-go toward GM-store
    ‘he left for the store’

c. umalis siya ng bahay para papunta sa tindahan
    go away 3S GM-house for pa-go toward GM-store
    ‘he left the house in order to go to the store’

While sentence 11a allows the bounded path verb *alis* to occur without the obligatory source, sentences 11b and 11c indicate that *alis* does require an expression of source.

Motion events expressing only manner of motion, without any reference to path, can be expressed without reference to any ground elements, as in 12a, or a location can be specified, as in 12b in the phrase *sa ilalim nang alapaap* ‘(at) under a cloud’.

(12) a. ang eroplano lumipad
    GM-airplane fly
    ‘the plane flew’

b. lumipad ang eroplano *sa ilalim nang alapaap*
    fly GM-airplane GM-under-LK-cloud
‘the plane flew (at) under a cloud’

In my data, these location expressions always take the form of a relation to an object, as seen in 12b, *sa ilalim nang alapaap* ‘at under a cloud’. Other examples of such phrases are *sa loob nang alapaap* ‘at inside the cloud’, *sa itaas ng mesa* ‘at top of the table’, or *sa labas ng bahay* ‘at outside of the house’.

In the Frog Story, I found only one verb that clearly encoded manner of motion, *nag-ta-takbo*. This manner verb occurred bare, without any ground expressions.

(13) nagtatakbo ang usa

run GM-deer

‘the deer runs’

The appearance of only this single simple sentence in the story confirms that manner of motion is not typically expressed in motion events, and when it is, it is not usually accompanied by path elements, either adjunct path verbs or ground expressions. This sentence is followed by a more complex sentence which does express the goal of the running motion (‘the edge of a mountain’), however, it is expresses it in a completely separate clause or sentence.

(14) ngunit [nang makarating ito sa dulo ng bundok] biglang nagpreno,

nahulog tuloy sina Pedro at Bantay [sa tubig na nasa ilalim ng bundok]

‘But [when it arrives at the edge of a mountain] it suddenly stops, and so both Pedro and Bantay fall [into the water that is beneath the mountain].’
Even this sentence must be broken into multiple clauses, the main clauses being ‘but it
suddenly stops’ and ‘and so both Bantay and Pedro fall’, with ‘when it arrives at the edge
of a mountain’ and ‘into the water that is beneath the mountain’ being additional phrases
that express complex path elements.

In addition to manner of motion, bounded path or directionality can be specified
as well. To do this, an additional form that encodes path is needed with the main verb that
encodes manner. I define the main verb as the one carrying the typical verbal markings
that would be found in a simple sentence. Various structures surfaced in exploring the
different combinations of manner with bounded path and directionality, although the
explicit expression of a source or goal decreased this flexibility dramatically. Most often
in my data, manner of motion took the markings of a regular verb, while the path verb
fell into a pa-path construction in a secondary position, as in 15 and 16.

(15) lumangoy siya pababa
    swim 3S pa-descend
    ‘she swam down(ward)’

(16) lumutang ang lobo paakyat
    float GM-balloon pa-ascend
    ‘the balloon floated up(ward)’

This pa-path construction is simply the verb root with a pa- prefixed, occurring without
the typical markings seen on verbs. Without explicit expression of source or goal, it
seems that any manner + path construction can only encode a general directionality. If a
bounded path (rather than a mere direction) is to be expressed, the ground elements
defining that path must be explicitly expressed.
Goal:

Explicit expression of goal only occurs with the verb *punta*, which expresses bounded path to/toward. There was no clear goal to be found in expressions of either states or achievements, but also with verbs of manner of motion. In some cases, a goal “reading” could be derived from a *sa* phrase on a manner verb; however, this meaning was not explicit, and rather was determined only by context or interpretation. In a sentence like 17, for example, the ground expression can act as a location or goal or even source. Only a more complex construction (or context) can exactly define the referent’s semantic role.

(17) naglakad siya sa tindahan

walk 3S GM-store

‘he walked (to/from/inside of) the store’

Here, the phrase *sa tindahan* can act as the location of motion ‘walking [around] inside the store’, the goal ‘walk to the store’, or even source ‘walk from the store’. In order to explicitly express goal, *punta* is needed in an adjunct to the main manner verb.

(18) naglakad siya papunta sa tindahan

walk 3S pa-go toward GM-store

‘he walked to the store’

18 is explicit in conveying that the figure walked *going toward* the store.

With path alone encoded in the verb, goal can only be expressed with *punta* in a *sa*-phrase. As we see below in 19 and 20, the figures, *ang lalaki* and *ang bata* respectively, move toward a place, or goal, *sa tindahan* and *sa ilalim ng mesa* respectively.
(19) pumunta sa tindahan ang lalaki
    go toward GM-store GM-man
    ‘the man went to the store’

(20) ang bata pumunta sa ilalim ng mesa
    GM-child go toward GM-under-LK-table
    ‘the baby went to under the table’

With path and manner expressed in the motion event, goal still appears in a sa (or ng) phrase following punta, which occurs this time in a pa-construction. Comparing 19 and 21 below, it is clear that the path verb punta is pushed to adjunct position by the manner verb takbo, which takes main verb position with the typical verbal markings (um- in this case).

(19) pumunta sa tindahan ang lalaki
    go toward GM-store GM-man
    ‘the man went to the store’

(21) tumakbo ang lalaki papunta sa tindahan
    run GM-man pa-go toward GM-store
    ‘the man ran going to the store’

Though the adjunct path verb papunta occurs consistently to express goal with main manner verbs, it cannot occur as adjunct to a main path verb. In order to express two directions, separate clauses or explicit expression of ground elements are necessary. 11b is unacceptable because it attempts to adjunct a path verb punta ‘go towards’ with a main path verb alis ‘go away’.

(11) b. *umalis siya papunta sa tindahan
To express both of these directions, ground expressions must be attached to each verb, and so, a more complex construction is formed, as in 11c, where *alis* takes a source *ng bahay* ‘the house’ and *punta* takes a goal *sa tindahan* ‘the store’.

(11) c. umalis siya ng bahay para papunta sa tindahan

‘he left the house in order to go to the store’

The use of *punta* sis required to combine manner of motion with a goal. Since the use of *punta* blocks the use of a directional path verb, an additional clause of some sort is necessary to express the goal of a directional motion. One strategy is to specify the location of the goal in a relative clause, leaving the listener to infer directionality. A good example of this strategy is in 22b, where the goal *bato* ‘rock’ is ‘located’ *nasa* at the ‘bottom’ *baba*. 22a is a simple sentence filled to capacity, combining manner, bounded path and goal, and cannot include the element of directionality. In order to express this element, 22b includes the relative clause *sa bato na nasa bato* ‘the rock that is at the bottom’. This is a typical strategy for Tagalog speakers in expressing more than the semantic limits of a single clause. This extra information of where the goal is located must be pushed to a relative clause.

(22) a. lumangoy ang palaka papunta sa bato

‘the frog swam towards a rock’

---

4 It is also interesting that the verb root *baba*, which takes both the typical aspectual marker *um-* and the *pa-* affix, here occurs as a location noun. This is a prime example of the category shifting that Tagalog words can easily undergo.
With manner expressed in main verb position, including goal and directionality seems to be semantic overload for one clause. The solution, 22b, though still not explicitly expressing directional motion, allows the listener to infer that the goal is located below the figure, and so the motion must be directed downward. Even a single verb that encodes both manner and directionality must attach a subordinate clause to express a goal, as in 23.

(23) ang palaka ay sumisid para pumunta sa bato
   GM-frog   ay dive for go toward GM-rock
   ‘the frog dove in order to go to the rock’

*sumisid* ‘dive’ encodes manner ‘swim’ and directionality ‘downward’, and therefore the additional semantic information (bounded path and goal in this case) must be pushed to another clause with another main verb: *para pumunta sa bato* ‘for the purpose of going to the rock’. In this case, the adjunct clause expresses purpose; the frog dove for the purpose of going to the rock. This indirectly expresses goal for the main clause: the frog’s purpose or aim of swimming downward is to reach its ultimate goal of the rock, but this cannot all be expressed in a single clause.

**Source:**

Like goal, source seems to only be explicitly expressed with a bounded path. Additionally, Tagalog has a term *galing* to allow for the expression of source as a state or attribute optionally without a path verb.
This utterance literally means “the man is from the store” and merely implies motion. Also, additional contexts could lend a stronger sense of motion, as opposed to origin. Thus, in translation, a motion verb ‘went’ or ‘came’ is inserted, but literally *galing* is an expression of origin. A clearer example of this is 25, where none of the figures are undergoing motion of any kind.

(25) galing sa nanay ko ang regalong ito
from GM-mother my GM-gift this
‘this gift is from my mother’

This term *galing* plus a *sa*-phrase expressing source can stand alone without any “verb”, as seen above in 25, or can occur with a manner of motion verb, which still does not specify directed motion, as in sentence 26. This combination of a manner of motion verb plus *galing* is much closer to expressing directed motion, but it is still not equivalent to a verb such as *alis* which literally means ‘going away-from’.

(26) naglakad siya galing sa tindahan
walk 3S from GM-store
‘he walked from the store’

More literally this means “he, being from the store, walked”. In my data *galing* never appears with a main path verb, and occurs with *punta* only when it is in the *pa*-construction *pa-punta*, with or without a manner verb, as in 27a and b respectively.

(27) a. galing sa tindahan ang lalaki papunta sa bahay
from GM-store GM-man pa-go toward GM-house
‘the man went from the store to the house’

b. naglakad ang lalaki galing sa tindahan papunta sa bahay
walk GM-man from GM-store pa-go toward GM-house
‘the man walked from the store to the house’

This serves as further evidence that *galing* is not an expression of directed motion, but merely that of attributive origin or source. Further evidence are the sentences below that express directionality in a path verb *alis* or *labas*, and express source not with *galing* but in a *sa* (or *ng*) phrase, regardless of expression of manner of motion.

(28) umalis ang lalaki sa tindahan
    go away GM-man GM-store
    ‘the man left the store’

(29) lumabas siya ng tindahan
    go out 3S GM-store
    ‘he went out of the store’

(30) umalis ang lalaki sa tindahan na tumatakbo
    go away GM-man GM-store LK run
    ‘the man left the store running’

(31) ang pusa ay tumatakbo palabas ng bahay
    GM-cat ay run pa-go out GM-house
    ‘the cat ran out of the house’
28 and 29 express path without manner of motion with the verbs *alis* and *labas*, and 30 and 31 couple these path verbs with manner verbs, in a subordinate clause in 30, *na tumatakbo* ‘(while) running’, and in the main verb in 31 *tumatakbo* ‘ran’.

**Source and Goal:**

In the combination of a manner verb and path verb, source is always expressed with *galing*, in a very predictable structure: [Vmanner] *galing sa* [source NP] *papunta sa/ng* [goal NP], with figure inserted in various places. Unsurprisingly, the combination of source and goal tends to make use of the patterns of individual expression of these ground elements. For example I found no examples of source and goal expressed together without the bounded path verb *punta*, which always occurred in the pa-construction, (or once in a subordinate clause). As seen in the examples below, *pa-punta* occurred either with a path verb (11a, *umalis*), a *galing* phrase (32), or a manner verb with a *galing* phrase (33, *naglakad galing*). In each example here, *pa-punta* occurs sentence-finally followed by the goal nounphrase. In all sentences that combined source and goal, expression of goal followed expression of source, so that a Tagalog speaker would never say “he walked to the store from the house”.

(11) a. *umalis* ako papuntang tindahan

> go away 1S pa-go toward-LK store

‘I left going towards the store’

(32) *galing sa bahay* ang lalaki papunta sa tindahan

> from GM-house GM-man pa-go toward GM-store

‘the man went from the house to the store’

(33) ang lalaki ay naglakad galing sa tindahan papunta sa bahay
GM-man ay walk from GM-store pa-go toward GM-house

‘the man walked from the store to the house’

In these combinations source is explicitly referenced only in a *galing* phrase, as we can see above in 32 and 33. In 11a, with the verb *alis*, source is not explicitly expressed, but must be assumed.

Alternate strategies can be undertaken to express the combination of source and goal in a single motion event. For example, compare 11c with 34.

(11) c. umalis siya ng bahay para papunta sa tindahan

go away 3S GM-house for pa-go toward GM-store

‘he left the house in order to go to the store’

(34) umalis siya sa bahay papunta sa tindahan

go away 3S GM-house pa-go toward GM-store

‘he left the house going to the store’

Both express motion away from the house, towards the store; however 11c inserts *para* to include a meaning of purpose for the second motion. This structurally breaks the motion event in two so that, instead of one fluid event of motion from point A to point B, the description is of a figure moving away from point A so that he may move towards point B.

As I have demonstrated, Tagalog has clear strategies for expressing ground elements in expressions with different types of verbs. Expressing path with source or goal requires the use of the path verbs *punta* or *alis*, and disallows the expression of directionality in the same clause. Tagalog proves to have varying strategies for expressing this additional information.
Verbal Issues

In expressing motion events, the necessity for reference to source or goal depends on the verb. As I have established in the previous section, verbs expressing manner of motion cannot take source or goal, but can take ground expressions referencing location of motion. Tagalog path verbs can express either directionality (e.g. going upward or downward) or bounded path (e.g. going to or away-from). It seems that verbs expressing directionality do not take source or goal (only location, optionally), whereas verbs expressing bounded path require a goal or source. These general trends are displayed in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Verb type determines what type of ground expression may accompany the verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Type: verb root</th>
<th>Ground Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source/Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akyat ‘go up’, baba ‘go down’, pasok ‘go in’, labas ‘go out’</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounded Path:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punta ‘go toward’, alis ‘go away from’</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this section I will present my argument for distinguishing between the two path verb types. As demonstrated in the previous section and in Table 1, direction verbs and bounded path verbs take different types of ground expressions. This is true for verb roots in main verb position as well as in the pa-construction, the latter of which creates interesting issues which I will present here.

The most recent research I have found regarding this issue is Huang’s paper on the typology of motion events in six Western Austronesian languages. The focus of his paper is on furthering the typology set out by Talmy, Slobin and others in establishing where and how the elements of path and manner are encoded in motion events. In his
paper, Huang notes that Tagalog does not allow multiple verbs per clause and instead must subordinate any additional verb. He goes on to explain that with manner in the main verb, path must be expressed in a pa-path construction, which is formed by simply prefixing the pa-affix to a verb “root” which occurs without the markers typically seen on verbs. My research confirms these findings.

Huang’s paper, in pursuing a broader typological definition for Western Austronesian languages, does not pursue this issue further. From my own examination of Tagalog motion events I have decided that Tagalog verbs must be further divided from a dichotomy of manner and path verbs to a tripartite division between manner, bounded path, and directional/route verbs. This division is based in what types of ground expressions each verb type can take. There are three basic types of ground expressions that I have identified in my study of Tagalog: location (or route), source and goal. Without explicit expression of source or goal, it seems that any manner + path construction can only encode a general directionality. If a bounded path (rather than a mere direction) is to be expressed, the ground elements defining that path must be explicitly expressed. Therefore, it is not safe to say that any path verb can be placed into this pa-path construction. Only verbs expressing general direction can occur here without source or goal. For example, 35 is not a complete utterance because the verb *alis ‘leave/go away from’ expresses bounded path and so requires a source. To become acceptable, 35a must include an expression of source, as in 35b.

(35) a. *gumapang siya paalis
crawl 3S pa-go away

‘he crawled away-from/leaving’
b. gumapang siya paalis ng bahay
crawl 3S pa-go away GM-house
‘he crawled away-from/leaving the house’

In clarifying this point, I discovered that there is a semantic difference between *alis* and *labas* that allows 36a to remain acceptable where 35a is not. *alis*, like *punta*, expresses bounded path, and has a meaning of ‘motion away from’ [+X ground element]; *labas* more closely expresses directionality of exiting or moving outward, which can take a ground element or not.

(36) a. ang bata ay gumapang palabas
GM-child ay crawl pa-go out
‘the boy crawled out’

b. ang bata ay gumapang palabas ng bahay
GM-child ay crawl pa-go out GM-house
‘the boy crawled out of the house’

When *labas*, or any other directional verb, does take an apparent ground element, as in 36b, it is seems likely that the ground element is more of an object or theme of the verb rather than a source or goal. Therefore, the noun phrase here that we would have identified as a source, *ng bahay* ‘house’, is actually the theme or general location of the outward motion of *palabas* ‘go out/exit’.

Along similar lines, some directional verbs seem to not be able to take ground expressions or simple location. 37a is unacceptable because it is a path adjunct with a ground expression. Note that 37b, having deleted the ground expression of 37a, is acceptable.
These restrictions on ground expressions have led me to hypothesize that there are in fact two separate classes of what have previously been considered one semantic category of path verbs. One class expresses directionality, which can take either no ground expression or an expression of location; any ground expression that accompanies a directional verb tends to describe either the general location or setting of the motion, or the route along which the motion is being directed. The other class of verbs expresses a bounded path, which must take a goal or source, where the figure clearly moves from one point to another (though not necessarily expressing both points of reference). 5

This division of general path verbs into separate classes of directional and bounded path verbs creates some issues for the semantic categorization of ground expressions. Some ground elements that appear to be source or goal may be locations.

---

5 The only issue I have come across that conflicts with this theory is the parallel constructions of the acceptable 38 and the unacceptable 37a.

(37) a. *lumangoy ang palaka pababa sa tubig
   swim GM-frog pa-go down GM-water
   ‘the frog swam down in the water’

b. lumangoy ang palaka pababa
   swim GM-frog pa-go down
   ‘the frog swam down’

In both sentences a main verb of manner is joined by a path adjunct expressing motion downward, alternately along a mountain (38) or within water (37a). The difference between running down a mountainside and swimming down within a body of water may be the difference in acceptability. This nuanced difference has not been the main focus point of my thesis, and so, with few other examples of these constructions, I cannot draw any firm conclusions about this hypothesis.
For example, I had originally designed 39, 40, and 31 to elicit Jackendoff’s cognitive constructs of motion TO a PLACE (as opposed to motion AT a PLACE); however if we reexamine the ground expressions in the context of this new verbal division, their categorization as goals (for 39 and 40) and source (for sentence 31) is no longer so clear.

(39) ang pusa ay tumalon paakyat ng mesa

GM-cat ay jump pa-go up GM-table

‘the cat jumped atop the table’

_Literally:_ “the cat jumped going up the table”

(40) ang bata ay tumakbong papasok sa bahay

GM-child ay run-LK pa-go in GM-house

‘the boy ran inside the house’

_Literally:_ “the boy ran going in the house”

(31) ang pusa ay tumakbo palabas ng bahay

GM-cat ay run pa-go out GM-house

‘the cat ran out of the house’

_Literally:_ “the cat ran going out (of) the house”

Furthermore, by comparison, 41 reveals the more accurate expression of Jackendoff’s constructs, where the figure is crawling, going to a place known as ‘under the table’.

(41) ang bata ay gumapang papunta sa ilalim ng mesa

GM-child ay crawl pa-go toward GM-under-LK-table

‘the baby crawled under the table’

By comparison to 41, the ground expressions in 39, 40, and 31 are more like themes than sources or goals. The figure is interacting with them, moving along them. In Tagalog,
‘jumping up a table’ is similar to ‘jumping up the stairs’. An English speaker would say “jump to the top of the table”, thus making ‘the top of the table’ a goal, however this exact expression is not possible in Tagalog, and interpretations of ground elements must be appropriately adjusted.

It is more difficult to draw conclusions about expressing motion away from. I also tried to elicit Jackendoff’s cognitive construct of motion FROM a PLACE, however the majority of my data for this construct were incomparable, as they followed the ‘English translation’ paradigm of simply adding manner in a subordinate clause at the end, as in 30 with the clause na tumatakbo ‘(while) running’.

(30) umalis  ang lalaki sa tindahan na tumatakbo
    go away GM-man GM-store LK-run
    ‘the man went from the store running’

35b was a unique divergence from this paradigm and is the only example I have of paalis as an adjunct6. The sentence parallels the construction used for manner and motion towards using papunta (of which there are many examples), as seen below in 42.

(35) b. gmapang siya paalis ng bahay
    crawl 3S pa-go away GM-house
    ‘he crawled leaving the house’

(42) gmapang ang lalaki papunta sa tindahan
    crawl GM-man pa-go toward GM-store
    ‘the man crawled to the store’

6 The form paalis occurs elsewhere as what Schachter calls an incipient adjectival, which does not concern this study.
This leads me to conclude that *punta* and *alis* are in a class of their own, as far as I can
tell from the data I have collected. These are the only two verbs I have collected that
follow the patterns I have observed for the class of bounded path verbs. Though the data
is limited in scope, it is consistent in support of this division of verb classes, and so as I
continue with my examination of ground expressions, I will make reference to path verbs
as either being directional or bounded path verbs.
Conclusions

In general, my findings are supported by previous research in Tagalog: manner is not a salient semantic element; when manner is expressed, it occurs as a main verb; when path and manner occur in the same sentence, the path verb is placed in a pa-construction; and finally, ground elements are not frequently expressed, leaving the verbs bare. Jean’s narrative for ‘Frog, Where Are You?’ further confirms that manner of motion is not salient to Tagalog speakers, and also supports the claim that reference to directionality and ground elements is only made when necessary.

Beyond the established categorization of motion verbs into manner and path, Tagalog shows strong signs of having further division into directional and bounded path verbs. This tripartite division between manner, direction, and bounded path is based on the semantic meanings of the verbs, as well as what ground elements the verbs in each class take. With only the rarest of exceptions, bounded path verbs require the expression of a source or goal, whereas directional verbs generally do not take source or goal, but can occur with an optional location or route. The division is made more opaque by the loose grasp we have on the semantic categories of source, goal, and location. With clearer semantic definitions for these ground elements, it may be possible to more definitively delineate the verbal categories. For now, it is clear that at the very least there is a tendency for path verbs to divide along these lines.

Punta and alis can be thought of as two sides to the same bounded path coin. For the most part, goal is only expressed with the verb punta, while source is expressed with the verb alis or the word galing (which is clearly not a path verb but an expression of origin). In order to include semantic information such as ground expressions or direction
of motion that would otherwise not “fit” into a single simple sentence, Tagalog makes use of relative and subordinate clauses. In expressing motion events, Tagalog has a limit to the number of semantic elements per clause, and though it has not been the focus of this study, it is highly probable that there are further rules or patterns for positioning semantic elements outside of a single clause.
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