

END-WEIGHT: TAGALOG VS. JAPANESE

OSAMU IKARI

Tokyo, Japan

We deal with the realization of the principle of end-weight. First we see how easy it is in Tagalog. Practically the problem will be restricted to some equational constructions; moreover it is not serious. In Japanese, in contrast to Tagalog, the end-weight is structurally (that is, due to the syntactic structure) prevented – how can the problem be solved? For the sake of comparison, we see some relevant constructions in Latin before the problem in Japanese is discussed.

1. LONG SENTENCE-COMPONENT

1.1. END-WEIGHT

We know the principle of end-weight – a long sentence-component is positioned finally. In English, see e.g., *It's a pity to make a fool of yourself, It surprised me to hear him say that, I confessed to him the difficulties I had found myself in, They moved into the kitchen every stick of furniture they possessed*, the long components being placed finally (with or without the anticipatory pronoun *it*).¹

We may also observe this end-weight in a language like Latin. Certainly, in Latin, in parallel to the usual verb-final constructions such as *Romulus Romam condidit* 'Romulus founded Rome', there occur those which do not conform to the end-weight, e.g.

Pompeius hiemare Dyrrhachii, Apolloniae omnibusque oppidis constituerat.
'Pompey had determined to winter at Dyrrhachium, Apollonia and all the towns'
Lentulus ut in oppidum reverti liceat petit.
'Lentulus demands that he be permitted to return to the town'

where the long components (*hiemare Dyrrhachii, Apolloniae omnibusque oppidis* 'to winter at Dyrrhachium, Apollonia and all the towns', *ut in oppidum reverti liceat* 'that he be permitted to return to the town') do not occur finally but precede the short components (*constituerat* 'had determined', *petit* 'demands'). But those resulting from the end-weight are nevertheless common, e.g.

Dicit Romanos arma adversariis tradere.
'He says that the Romans are surrendering their arms to the enemy'
Ariovistus respondit se prius in Galliam venisse quam populum romanum.
'Ariovistus replied that he had come to Gaul before the Roman people'
Pompeius rescripserat sese rem in summum periculum deducturum non esse.
'Pompey had replied that he would not lead the matter to the gravest danger'

where, in effect, the long components, following rather than preceding the short ones, occur finally: *Romanos arma adversariis tradere* 'that the Romans are surrendering their arms to the enemy', *se prius in Galliam venisse quam populum Romanum* 'that he had

¹ The end-weight may also be realized by the passive construction (e.g., *I was astounded that he was prepared to go to such lengths*, as opposed to *That he was prepared to go such lengths astounded me*) or by the discontinuous noun-phrase construction (e.g. *The problem arose (of) what contribution the public should pay*, as opposed to *The problem (of) . . . arose*). (see Quirk et al. 1972: 943-4; 963-8; 931-2.)

come to Gaul before the Roman people', *sese rem in summum periculum deducturum non esse* 'that he would not lead the matter to the gravest danger'. Similarly see the following:

Senatus decrevit ut is in Hispaniam mitteretur.
 'The senate decreed that he should be sent into Spain'
 Evenit ut medicus dentem ei ostenderet.
 'It happened that the physician showed him a tooth'

Here, indeed, the long components occur finally: *ut is in Hispaniam mitteretur* 'that he should be sent into Spain', *ut medicus dentem ei ostenderet*. 'that the physician showed him a tooth'.

These constructions in Latin will be mentioned when the end-weight in Japanese is discussed (3.1.).

1.2. END-WEIGHT IN TAGALOG

In Tagalog, the order of components (other than sentence-initial components) in basic sentences is not fixed, which is illustrated by (a) - (c) below:

- (a) Nagluto ng pagkain ang babae.
 Nagluto ang babae ng pagkain.
 'The woman cooked some food'
- (b) Dumadalaw kay Rosa si Maria.
 Dumadalaw si Maria kay Rosa.
 'Maria visits Rosa'
- (c) Himihiram ng pera kay Rosa si Maria.
 Humihiram ng pera si Maria kay Rosa.
 Humihiram kay Rosa ng pera si Maria.
 Humihiram kay Rosa si Maria ng pera.
 Humihiram si Maria ng pera kay Rosa.
 Humihiram si Maria kay Rosa ng pera.
 'Maria is borrowing money from Rosa'

At the same time, there is a general tendency for shorter components to precede longer components (see Schachter and Otanes 1972: 84-5). Hence the end-weight is, so to speak, a natural outcome.

In effect, unlike those conforming to the end-weight such as the following:

Darating bukas ang isang babaeng nakilala ko sa probinsya.
 'A woman I met in the provinces is coming tomorrow'
 Aalis si Rosa bukas ng alas otso ng gabi.
 'Rosa is leaving tomorrow night at eight'

where there occur finally the long components: *ang isang babaeng nakilala ko sa probinsya* 'a woman I met in the provinces', *bukas ng alas otso ng gabi* 'Tomorrow night at eight', the alternatives shown below which do not conform to the end-weight are not common:

Darating ang isang babaeng nakilala ko sa probinsya bukas.
 Aalis bukas ng alas otso ng gabi si Rosa.

Meanwhile we may see those constructions conforming to the end-weight which are shown below; that is,

Ipinagbabawal ng batas lakaran ang daan.
 'The law forbids walking in the street'
 { Inilagan ni Juan ang } mag-aral ng Kastila.
 { Inilagan ni Juang }
 'Juan avoided studying Spanish'
 { Ikinagalak ng titser ang } pumunta sa bagong iskwela.
 { Ikinagalak ng titser }
 'The teacher was pleased about going to a new school'
 Nagalak ang titser (na) pumunta sa bagong iskwela.
 'The teacher was pleased about going to a new school'

Here, in effect, there occur finally the long components i.e. the nominalized basic forms: *lakaran ang daan* 'walking in the street', (*ang*) *mag-aral ng Kastila* 'studying Spanish', (*ang*) *pumunta sa bagong iskwela* 'going to a new school', *pumunta sa bagong eskwela* 'going to a new school'.

Similarly the following constructions are noticeable; that is,

Nagtataka ang titser at si Juan ang pinili namin.
 'The teacher is surprised that Juan was the one we chose'
 Nahihya ang Nanay at wala siyang maihahandog na pagkain.
 'Mother is embarrassed that she has no food to offer'

where the long components i.e. the *at*-clauses occur finally.

2. PROBLEMS IN TAGALOG

Now some problems are pointed out with respect to the realization of the end-weight in Tagalog: that is, speech-noun constructions (2.2) and obligatory inversion related to nominal-clause constructions (2.3).

2.1. SOME NOMINAL-CLAUSE CONSTRUCTIONS

First we see the nominal-clause constructions (a)–(e) below relevant to those problems of the end-weight which are to be discussed in 2.2. and 2.3. below.

(a) Quotations. Quotation-clause constructions are the following. Namely, in the case of direct quotation:

Sinabi ni Juan kay Pedro, "Wala akong pera."
 'Juan told Pedro, "I don't have any money."
 Nagsabi si Juan kay Pedro, "Wala akong pera."
 'Juan told Pedro, "I don't have any money."

or, in the case of indirect quotation:

Sinabi ng Nanay na maghintay ang mga bata.
 'Mother said that the children should wait'
 Nag-utos ang Nanay kay Manuel na tapusin (niya) ang trabaho.
 'Mother ordered Manuel to finish the work'
 Nagtanong ang Nanay sa akin kung kailan siya darating.
 'Mother asked me when he was coming'

(b) Verbs of perception. For verbs such as *makabalita/mabalitaan* 'hear (news of)', *makakita/makita* 'see', *makapansin/mapansin* '(happen to) notice', *makarinig/marinig*

'hear', etc., see constructions such as the following:

Nakita ni Manuel na puno ang bus.
 'Manuel saw that the bus was already full'
 Napansin ni Pedrong umiiyak ang bata.
 'Pedro noticed that the child was crying'

(c) Verbs of mental process. Likewise for verbs such as *humula/hulaan* 'guess/predict', *makalimot/makalimutan* '(happen to) forget', *mag-akala/akalain* 'think (mistakenly)', *umisip/isipin* 'think', etc.:

Inakala ni Rosang paparoon ang Nanay.
 'Rosa thought (mistakenly) that Mother would be there'
 Nakalimutan ni Rosa kung dapat siyang maghintay, o hindi.
 'Rosa forgot whether she was supposed to wait or not'

(d) Verbs such as *magpasya/pagpasyahan* 'decide', *maniwala/paniwalaan* 'believe', etc. For them, see for example,

Pinagpasyahan ni Pedro kung saan sila pupunta.
 'Pedro decided where they would go'
 Nagpasya si Pedro kung saan sila pupunta.
 'Pedro decided where they would go'

(e) Verbs such as *magalak/ikagalak* 'be pleased (about/that)', *magulat/ikagulat* 'be surprised (about/that)', *mainis/ikainis* 'be annoyed (about/that)', *matuwa/ikatuwa* 'be happy (about/that)', etc. In this case, see the following:

Ikinatuwa ni Rosang naroon sina Maria.
 'Rosa was happy that Maria and the others were there'
 Natuwa si Rosang naroon sina Maria.
 'Rosa was happy that Maria and the others were there'

2.2. SPEECH-NOUN CONSTRUCTIONS

We know those equational constructions by speech nouns (*sabi* 'something said/told', *szgot* 'answer', *sigaw* 'something shouted, *tanong* 'question', etc.) which correspond to the quotation-clause constructions (2.1. (a) above). That is, e.g.,

"Wala akong pera," ang sabi niya.
 'He said, "I don't have any money."
 "Saan ka pupunta?" ang tanong niya.
 'He asked, "where are you going?"'

vis-à-vis the direct-quotation constructions, or

Matulog (daw) sila, ang sabi niya.
 'He said that they should go to sleep'
 Bakit (ba) (raw) ninyo siya tinawag, ang sabi niya.
 'He asked why you called him'

vis-à-vis the indirect-quotation constructions.

As far as the examples above are concerned, there will be no problem with regard to the end-weight, because in these equational constructions the nominal-clause predicates and the topics corresponding to them are equally short.

The problem, however, arises when the nominal-clause predicate is long while the topic is short. For example,

"Ipinagbabawal ng batas lakaran ang daan," ang sabi niya.
'He said, "The law forbids walking in the street."'

does not conform to the end-weight.

Here it is the inversion that may solve the problem. In Tagalog, in fact, we know the inversion illustrated by the second members of (a) and (b) below:

- (a) Tinanggap ko ang sulat kahapon.
Ang sulat ay tinanggap ko kahapon.
'I received the letter yesterday'
- (b) Kayamanan ng mga magulang ang mga anak.
Ang mga anak ay kayamanan mg mga magulang.
'Children are the parents' jewels'

where the topics, *ang sulat* 'the letter' and *ang mga anak* 'children', being preposed, occur initially; and this inversion is also applicable to the speech-noun constructions above. Namely, due to the inversion, there occur constructions such as the following:

Ang sabi niya'y "Wala akong pera."
'He said, "I don't have any money."'
Ang tanong niya'y "Saan ka pupunta?"
'He asked, "Where are you going?"'
Ang sabi niya'y matulog (daw) sila.
'He said that they should go to sleep'
Ang sabi niya'y bakit (ba) (raw) ninyo siya tinawag.
'He asked why you called him'

Accordingly, the inversion may serve to avoid the above-mentioned nonconformity, the end-weight being realized. That is, for example, the inversion gives rise to the following construction which does conform to the end-weight:

Ang sabi niya'y "Ipinagbabawal ng batas lakaran ang daan."
'He said, "The law forbids walking in the street."'

Now there are, as well as speech nouns, mental process nouns (*isip* '(a) thought' or *akala* '(a mistaken) thought' (see 2.1. (c) above)), in which case the inversion is not only applicable but obligatory. There occur, thus, those like *Ang isip ko'y maaga pa* 'I thought that it was still early'. In consequence, we may also see those conforming to the end-weight, such as the following (see the example just mentioned):

Ang isip ko'y kayamanan ng mga magulang ang mga anak.
'I thought that children were parents' jewels'

2.3. OBLIGATORY INVERSION

Here we consider obligatory inversion related to the constructions shown in 2.1.; that is, the inversion of the topic is obligatory when it is a nominalized object-focus verb as is shown by the equational constructions in (a)-(e) below.

(a) First, as for the quotation-clause constructions (see 2.1. (a)), having topics such as *ang sasabihin niya* 'what he will tell', etc., the inversion is obligatory and gives rise to constructions such as the following:

Ang sasabihin niya sa akin ay "Wala akong pera."
 'What he will tell me is, "I don't have any money.'

Ang sinabi ng Nanay ay maghintay (daw) tayo.
 'What Mother said was that we should wait'

Ang itinanong ko'y kung narito ka.
 'What I asked was whether you were here'

Due to the inversion, the topics (nominalized object-focus verbs) *ang sasabihin niya sa akin* 'what he will tell me', *ang sinabi ng Nanay* 'what Mother said', *ang itinanong ko* 'what I asked', precede the quotation-clause predicates, "Wala akong pera", "I don't have any money", *maghintay (daw) tayo* 'that we should wait', *kung narito ka* 'whether you were here'.

(b) The same is true of verbs of perception (2.1. (b)). Namely, having topics such as *ang nakita ni Pedro* 'what Pedro saw', etc., the inversion is obligatory, e.g.

Ang nakita ni Pedro'y puno na ang bus.
 'What Pedro saw was that the bus was already full'

Ang narinig ko'y darating siya bukas.
 'What I heard is that he's coming tomorrow'

That is, the topics (nominalized object-focus verbs), *ang nakita ni Pedro* 'what Pedro saw', *ang narinig ko* 'what I heard', precede the nominal-clause predicates, *puno na ang bus* 'that the bus was already full', *darating siya bukas* 'that he's coming tomorrow'.

(c) The same is also true of verbs of mental process (2.1 (c)). Namely we have for example,

Ang inisip ko'y ikaw ang panganay.
 'What I thought was that you were the eldest child'

The topic, *ang inisip ko* 'what I thought', precedes the nominal-clause predicate, *ikaw ang panganay* 'that you were the eldest child'.

(d) Likewise for the verbs seen in 2.1. (d); there occur, due to the obligatory inversion, constructions such as the following:

Ang pinagpasyan niya'y uuwi sila.
 'What he decided was that they would go home'

(d) The obligatory inversion equally takes place for the verbs seen in 2.1.(e), e.g.,

Ang ikinatuwa ko'y naroon ka.
 'What I was happy about was that you were there'

(f) In addition, finally, for some nominals, such as *karaingan* 'complaint', *problema* 'problem', etc. or adjectivals, such as *kahiya-hiya* 'shameful', *interesante* 'interesting', etc. (or a few (nominalized) verbals, such as *kagulatan* 'be surprised at', etc.), there occur in parallel to (a)-(e) above, constructions due to the obligatory inversion, e.g.,

Ang karaingan niya'y wala siyang pera.
 'His complaint is that he doesn't have any money'

Ang kahiya-hiya'y hindi nila siya tinutulungan.
 'What is shameful is that they don't help him'

Now as far as the examples in (a)-(f) above are concerned, since the topics and the nominal-clause predicates corresponding to them are equally short, the problem does not arise.

Nevertheless, in the constructions in question, since the preposed topic may be long while the nominal-clause predicate is short, the nonconformity to the end-weight can take place. Practically, however, such nonconformity is rare. That is, in most cases the obligatory inversion above causes no difficulty.

(It often happens that the nominal-clause predicate is long while the preposed topic is short, as in

Ang sinasabi niya ay "Kung Lunes umaalis sa Maynila ang eruplano."
 'What he said is, "It's on Monday that the plane leaves Manila.'"

Ang itinanong ng Nanay ay kung sino raw ang bagong titser nina Maria.
 'What Mother asked is who the new teacher of Maria and the others is'

Obviously these conform to the end-weight.)

Finally we may treat, in parallel to (a)-(f) above, the obligatory inversion in the case of nominalized pseudo-verbs or pseudo-verb phrases, such as *Ang dapat ay tumira sila dito* 'What is fitting is for them to live here'. Here, too, the nonconformity to the end-weight is rare.

3. PROBLEMS IN JAPANESE

In Tagalog, in most cases, the end-weight is, so to speak, a natural outcome. In Japanese, on the contrary, nonconformity to the end-weight is structural. We must deal with this structural nonconformity.

3.1. STRUCTURAL NONCONFORMITY

In Japanese the verb is regularly placed at the end, as in

Maria wa Rosa o yonda.
 'Maria called Rosa'

Maria wa Rosa ni kane o ageta.
 'Maria gave money to Rosa'

Maria wa Rosa kara kane o karita.
 'Maria borrowed money from Rosa'

The verbs occur finally: *yonda* 'called', *ageta* 'gave', *karita* 'borrowed', *wa/o/ni/kara* being markers of-topic/accusative/dative/ablative. (It is noted that components other than the verb may be arranged freely, though the canonical order is distinguished from the noncanonical ones (the examples above are canonical) where, in fact, postposed components are focused; e.g. *Maria wa kane o Rosa ni ageta*, as opposed to *Maria wa Rosa ni kane o ageta* above, is 'Maria gave money to Rosa, not to the other persons'.)

Hence structural nonconformity to the end-weight; namely the problem arises when there occurs a long component, as in

- (a) keibu wa "Carlos wa Tokyo ni iru" to itta.
 'The inspector said, "Carlos is in Tokyo"'
 keibu wa Carlos wa Tokyo ni iru to handansita
 'The inspector guessed that Carlos was in Tokyo'

- (b) *keibu wa Carlos ga Tokyo ni iru koto o sitteiru.*
 'The inspector knows that Carlos is in Tokyo'
keibu wa Carlos ga Tokyo ni iru koto ni tyuumokusita.
 'The inspector noticed that Carlos was in Tokyo'

In effect, the clauses, *to*-clauses in (a), *koto*-clauses in (b), precede the verbs, *itta* 'said', *handansita* 'guessed', *sitteiru* 'know', *tyuumokusita* 'noticed', which occur finally. (*Ga* in (b) is a marker of nominative).

Notice that as was mentioned (1.1.), in Latin, as well, in parallel to the usual verb-final constructions, such as *Romulus Romam condidit* 'Romulus founded Rome', *Aeneas e patria fugit* 'Aeneas fled from his fatherland', *Nautae Graeci urbem flammis absumpserunt* 'Greek sailors destroyed the city by flames', there occur those which parallel the above constructions in Japanese; e.g.

Lentulus ut in oppidum reverti liceat petit.
 'Lentulus demands that he be permitted to return to the town'

However, unlike Japanese, Latin often realizes the end-weight; as was mentioned (1.1.), those like *Dicit Romanos arma adversariis tradere* 'He says that the Romans are surrendering their arms to the enemy', etc. are common. Furthermore, unlike Japanese, Latin may make use of the anticipatory pronoun which is important to the realization of the end-weight; see, for example,

Hoc periculum etiam maius hoc videbatur quod in odio simili multitudo hominum haec erat maxima.
 'The present danger seemed still graver because of this, that is, the fact that in a similar hatred the present crowd was considerable'

where the second *hoc* (abl. n. sg. of *hic* 'this') is the anticipatory pronoun (= *quod in odio simili* ... 'the fact that in a similar hatred...').²

Now as far as the examples (a) and (b) above are concerned, since the clauses are relatively short, no serious nonconformity takes place. However, the problem, indeed, arises when such clauses are, as is often the case, rather long.

3.2. AVOIDANCE OF NONCONFORMITY

It will be necessary to avoid that nonconformity to the end-weight which is structural in Japanese. It is, in fact, often possible — paraphrases serve to solve the problem, though, aside from the case of the relative clause seen below, they are somewhat clumsy; it is, therefore, not always preferable to use them repeatedly.

First we deal with the *to*-clause construction mentioned above (see 3.1., examples

(a)).³

By means of *tugi no yoo ni* which, being 'what follows'-genitive marker-'appearance'-adverbial particle, is equivalent to *as follows*, we have, for instance, vis-à-vis those like 3.1. (a) i.e. *keibu wa "... to itta* 'The inspector said, "...', *keibu wa ... to handansita* 'The inspector guessed that ...', the paraphrases:

² See also the following where *id* (nom. n. sg. of *is* 'this, that') is the anticipatory pronoun:

Id primum Ponticis ridiculum visum est fictilibus dimicare.
 'At first it seemed ridiculous to Pontics to fight with earthen vessels'

(*Id* (subject) = *fictilibus dimicare* 'to fight with earthen vessels'.)

³ Naturally the indirect as well as direct quotation clause occurs for the verb *iu* 'say' (*ita* 'said') or the like. It is a *to*-clause, as well.

keibu wa tugi no yoo ni itta; sunawati, "..."
 'The inspector said as follows; that is, "...'

keibu wa tugi no yoo ni handansita; sunawati, ...
 'The inspector guessed as follows; that is, ...'

Here one may use *koo* 'thus' as well as *tugi no yoo ni* 'as follows', as in

keibu wa koo itta; sunawati, "..."
 'The inspector said thus; that is, "...'

keibu wa koo handansita; sunawati, ...
 'The inspector guessed thus; that is, ...'

As a matter of fact, we may say that *tugi no yoo ni* 'as follows' or *koo* 'thus' are equivalents of the anticipatory pronoun.⁴ The nonconformity may be thus avoided.

Secondly consider the *koto*-clause construction mentioned above (see 3.1., examples (b)).

In this case, by means of *tugi no koto* 'the following thing' ('what follows'-genitive marker-'thing'; the subordinator *koto* derives from the noun *koto* 'thing') rather than *tugi no yoo ni* 'as follows' or *koo* 'thus', we have, for instance, vis-à-vis those like 3.1. (b) i.e. *keibu wa ... koto o sitteiru* 'The inspector knows that ...', *keibu wa ... koto ni tyuumokusita* 'The inspector noticed that ...', the paraphrases:

keibu wa tugi no koto o sitteiru; sunawati, ...
 'The inspector knows the following thing; that is, ...'

keibu wa tugi no koto ni tyuumokusita; sunawati, ...
 'The inspector noticed the following thing; that is, ...'

We may, once again, say that *tugi no koto* 'the following thing' is an equivalent of the anticipatory pronoun. The nonconformity may be, thus, avoided in the same way.

(We also know a clause similar to a *koto*-clause, i.e., a *no*-clause. As for the *no*-clause construction, such as *keibu wa Carlos ga aruiteiru no o mita* 'The inspector saw Carlos walking', however, the paraphrase is not possible, because there is no *tugi no no* in parallel to *tugi no kot* 'the following thing'.)

Now it is also necessary to deal with the nonconformity in terms of the appositive-clause construction, the examples of which are seen in the following (see Quirk et al. 1972: 874-6; 882-3):

keibu wa Carlos ga Tokyo ni iru toyuu uwasa o sitteiru.
 'The inspector knows the rumor that Carlos is in Tokyo'
 kebu wa Carlos ga Tokyo ni iru toyuu zizitu ni tyuumokusita.
 'The inspector noticed the fact that Carlos was in Tokyo'

where *Carlos ga ... toyuu* is the appositive clause while *uwasa* 'rumor'/*zizitu* 'fact' are the heads. The problem arises when the clause is long.

⁴ With respect to these cataphoric signals and those seen below, see Quirk et al. 1972: 700-2; 704.

In this case, *tugi no* 'following' ('what follows'-genitive marker) is used; in effect, vis-à-vis those like *keibu wa... toyuu uwasa o sitteiru* 'The inspector knows the rumor that ...', *keibu wa... toyuu zizitu ni tyuumokusita* 'The inspector noticed the fact that ...' we have the paraphrases:

keibu wa tugi no uwasa o sitteiru; sunawati, ...
 'The inspector knows the following rummor; that is, ...'

keibu wa tugi no zizitu ni tyuumokusita; sunawati, ...
 'The inspector noticed the following fact; that is, ...'

One may avoid, in this way, the nonconformity due to the appositive clause.

Finally it is necessary to mention the relative clause which often constructs a long component. In Japanese, the relative clause, containing no relative pronoun, precedes the head; e.g.

keibu ga sagasiteiru otoko
 'the man whom the inspector is looking for'

keibu o sagasiteiru otoko
 'the man who is looking for the inspector'

where *keibu ga sagasiteiru* corresponds to the relative clause *whom the inspector is looking for* and *keibu o sagasiteiru* corresponds to the relative clause *who is looking for the inspector* while *otoko* 'man' is the head. The first example, for instance, occurs in sentences such as the following:

keibu ga sagasiteiru otoko wa Tokyo ni iru.
 'The man whom the inspector is looking for is in Tokyo'

Juan wa keibu ga sagasiteiru otoko o sitteiru.
 'Juan knows the man whom the inspector is looking for'

What matters here is the coordination. Namely, we have those paraphrases by means of the coordination which can avoid the nonconformity. (This is also true of a language like English; e.g. *The new gas stove which I bought last month has an efficient oven* (this does not conform to the end-weight) may be, by means of the coordination, paraphrased into *I bought a new gas stove last month and it has an efficient oven.*)

In effect, vis-à-vis the examples above, for instance, we have the paraphrases which can avoid the nonconformity:

keibu wa otoko o sagasiteiru ga sono otoko wa Tokyo ni iru.
 'The inspector is looking for a man and the man is in Tokyo'

keibu wa otoko o sagasiteiru ga Juan wa sono otoko o sitteiru.
 'The inspector is looking for a man and Juan knows the man'

where *keibu wa otoko o sagasiteiru* 'The inspector is looking for a man' and *sono otoko wa Tokyo ni iru* 'The man is in Tokyo' / *Juan wa sono otoko o sitteiru* 'Juan knows the man' (*sono* 'that') are, indeed, coordinated by the coordinator *ga* 'and'.

Thus the coordination illustrated above is helpful when the relative clause is long.⁵

⁵ In the examples above, since the relative clause is short, the paraphrase, in reality, is not necessary

4. CONCLUSION

In Tagalog the end-weight is a natural outcome. Without having recourse to any particular device, the end-weight is realized in accordance with the syntax of Tagalog, except for some equational constructions. Whereas in Japanese the reverse is the case; the end-weight is, indeed, structurally prevented. As a matter of fact, when there occurs a long sentence-component, it cannot be positioned finally — the end position is regularly reserved for the verb. It is, nevertheless, necessary to avoid the nonconformity to the end-weight resulting from the syntax of Japanese. This problem, in effect, may be solved by means of the paraphrases.

REFERENCES

- ASPILLERA, PARALUMAN. 1969. *Basic Tagalog*. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle.
- BOWEN, J. DONALD. 1965. *Beginning Tagalog*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- COMRIE, BERNARD. 1981. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- DELÉANI, SIMONE and VERMANDER, JEAN-MARIE. 1975. *Initiation à la langue latine et a son système* Eleventh edition. Paris. SEDES.
- FUCHS, CATHERINE. 1980. De quelques approches linguistiques du phénomène de la paraphrase. *Le Français Moderne* 48: 97-109.
- GILDERSLEEVE, B. and LODGE, GONZALES. 1980. *Latin grammar*. London: Macmillan Education.
- GIVÓN, TALMY, 1979. *On understanding grammar*. New York, San Francisco, London: Academic Press.
- QUIRK, RANDOLPH, et al. 1972. *A grammar of contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- SCHACHTER, PAUL and OTANES, FE. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- SERBAT, GUY. 1980. *Les structures du Latin* Second edition. Paris: Picard.