

On the Development of Comitative Verbs in Philippine Languages^{*}

Hsiu-chuan Liao

National Tsing Hua University

This paper deals with both the synchronic distribution and the diachronic change of comitative verbal forms in Philippine languages. Three research questions are addressed in this paper. First, how is the notion of comitativity encoded morphosyntactically in Philippine languages? Second, is there any formative that is commonly used to encode comitativity in Philippine languages? If there is, can such formative(s) be reconstructed for the immediate ancestor language of all Philippine languages? Third, does the common comitative marking have other functions? If so, can we posit a path for the development of these functions? Comparative data will also be drawn from other Malayo-Polynesian languages.

Key words: Malayo-Polynesian, Philippines, comitative verbs, morphosyntactic reconstruction, semantic change

1. Introduction

Cross-linguistically, the notion of comitativity is found to be encoded by one of the following strategies. First, a special comitative case form is used to express the meaning ‘along with’ or ‘accompanied by’, as in Yidj; e.g. Basque *gizonarekin* ‘with the man’, cf. *gizona* ‘the man’. Second, a derived form of an intrinsically intransitive verb is used to express the idea that an underlying comitative relation is added to the valency of the

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Workshop on Coordination and Comitativity in Austronesian Languages, held at the Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica, Taipei, 7-8 November 2009. I wish to thank Lawrence Reid and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of the paper. I would like to thank the National Science Council (NSC) of Taiwan for funding my research on Ilongot (NSC 96-2411-H-007-032; NSC 97-2410-H-007-024). I would also like to thank Ester Elphick for providing me with Cuyonon data. Thanks also go to Wei-chen Huang for putting together all relevant data into various formats that facilitated my writing. Special thanks go to Lori Capuno, Rafael Santiago, Hanna Katrina Lobo, and Eden R. Flores for their helpful comments on the Tagalog data that I gathered from various Tagalog textbooks. All errors and shortcomings are my responsibility alone.

verb; cf. Dyirbal *ninamal* ‘sit with’, cf. *ninay* ‘sit’ (Anderson 1985:186, Trask 1993:49, Crystal 2003:83). Third, comitative can be coded as an independent verb with the meaning ‘to be with’; e.g. Jabêm *wìng*, Nakanai *vikapopo*. Fourth, a preposition can be used to head a comitative phrase; e.g. Ambrym *t-*, Big Nambas *m’a*, Paama *mini* or *veni*, Puluwat *mε*. Last, a directional adverb can be employed to express the notion of comitativity; e.g. Ulithian *fagali* (Durie 1988:8).

In Philippine languages, at least two of the above strategies are employed to encode the notion of comitativity. More specifically, Strategy 2 (special verbal form) and Strategy 4 (prepositional phrases) are used to express comitativity in Philippine languages. Moreover, some Philippine languages make use of a third strategy, i.e. the use of biclausal *kasama*-type clauses, to express comitativity, as shown in the Tagalog sentence {*Umalis si Edwin kasama si Maria*. ‘Edwin left with Maria.’}. In this construction, the comitative is packaged as a subject of the independent predicate *kasama* ‘to accompany’, which makes it quite different from the prepositional strategy.¹ The expression of comitativity through prepositional phrases has been carefully investigated by Reid (2009), so it will only be briefly mentioned in §2. The focus of this paper is, instead, on the use of the verbal strategy to express comitativity in Philippine languages.

In order to provide both a synchronic description of the morphosyntactic encoding of comitativity and a diachronic account of the development of comitative verbs in Philippine languages, this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 deals with how the notion of comitativity is encoded morphosyntactically in Philippine languages. Section 3 discusses functions that are found to be associated with comitative marking in Philippine languages and some other Malayo-Polynesian languages. Section 4 posits a path for the development of the functions associated with the formative expressing comitativity. Section 5 summarizes the study and suggests directions for future research.

2. Morphosyntactic coding of comitativity in Philippine languages

Before surveying the morphosyntax of comitativity in Philippine languages in this section, I shall first discuss what the term “Philippine languages” refers to.

¹ I wish to thank a reviewer for bringing to my attention the use of the biclausal *kasama*-type clauses to express comitativity in Tagalog.

2.1 Philippine languages

The term “Philippine languages” refers to Austronesian languages spoken in the Philippine archipelago with the following two exceptions. First, Yami, spoken on Botel Tobago, or Orchid Island (Mandarin *Lányǔ*) off the southeast coast of Taiwan, is considered to be a member of the Bashiic subgroup, a first-order subgroup of Malayo-Polynesian. Second, the Sangiric languages of northern Sulawesi are considered to be “Philippine languages” because they belong to the same subgroup as Sangil, a Malayo-Polynesian language spoken in the Sarangani Islands and on the southernmost tip of the Sarangani Peninsula in Mindanao.²

2.2 Morphosyntax of comitativity in Philippine languages

This section deals with how the notion of comitativity is encoded morpho-syntactically in Philippine languages.

Two strategies are commonly utilized to encode the notion of comitativity in Philippine languages. First, Philippine languages may encode comitativity through prepositional phrases, as shown in (1)-(3).

² My definition of “Philippine languages” is similar to Blust’s (1991, 2005) GENETIC sense of “Philippine languages” with the following difference. That is, Sama-Bajaw or Samalan languages spoken within the Philippines, which are NOT considered to be Philippine languages in Blust’s (2005) study, will be considered as Philippine languages in the present study. In this study, therefore, I shall treat all of Blust’s Philippine “microgroups” as first-order subgroups of Malayo-Polynesian.

The main difference between Blust’s definition of “Philippine languages” and mine stems from the fact that Blust believes in the existence of a “Proto-Philippines”, the putative ancestral language of all Austronesian languages spoken in the Philippines (except Sama Bajaw or Samalan languages), but I do not. The validity of a “Proto-Philippine” has been questioned by Reid (1982), Ross (2005), and Pawley (2006) because there has never been any phonological, morphological, or syntactic evidence presented for a “Proto-Philippines” that would distinguish it from Proto-Malayo-Polynesian. As Ross (2005:11, 13) notes, “Just as there was no ‘Proto Formosan’, there would also have been no ‘Proto Philippine’” and “... in the absence of phonological and grammatical innovations, I remain skeptical that a Proto Philippine ever existed.” Pawley (2006:18-19) also provides several arguments against a Proto-Philippines, noting that “Reconstructions of PPH [Proto-Philippine] phonology and morphology yield systems virtually identical to those reconstructed for PMP”.

- (1) **Ilokano** (Reid 2009:287) [Northern Luzon]³
 Napan=kami [ken Marta].
 went=NOM.1PL.EXCL OBL.PERS.SG Martha⁴
 ‘We (EXCL) went with Martha.’
- (2) **Tagalog** (Reid 2009:287, 288) [Greater Central Philippines]
 Maglalakad=kayo [ng Nanay].⁵
 will.walk=NOM.2PL OBL.COMM.SG mother
 ‘You (PL) will walk with Mother.’ (or ‘You (SG) will walk with Mother.’)
- (3) **Khinina-ang Bontok** (Reid 2009:287) [Northern Luzon]
 Inilak cha-icha [an Pakoran].
 saw.1SG NOM.3PL OBL.PERS.SG Pakoran
 ‘I saw them with Pakoran.’

Second, Philippine languages may encode comitativity through a special verb form, known as a “**SOCIAL VERB**” in the literature. More specifically, “social verbs” can be used alone (as in (4), (6), and (7)) or used in combination with a prepositional phrase (as in (5), (8)-(10)) to express comitativity.

³ Data cited from published materials reflect the actual spelling conventions of the original with the following exceptions. First, clitics are indicated with an equals sign whether or not they are written with a space between them or joined to their host in the original. Second, the representation of glottal stop /ʔ/ is treated in the following ways. When the glottal stop is represented by < q > or an apostrophe < ’ > in the original, these characters will be replaced by a glottal stop < ʔ >. However, when the glottal stop is represented by a hyphen < - > in the original, it will be retained because the orthography of Filipino, the Tagalog-based national language of the Philippines, uses the hyphen to represent glottal stop in a consonant cluster. Although Filipino (or Tagalog) does not represent glottal stop between vowels, the hyphen will be retained for intervocalic glottal stop in Bontok data because Bontok people represent glottal stop between vowels in their local orthography. Literal and free translations reflect where possible that of the original, although these have also been changed at times to reflect more accurately the syntax of the example. Grammatical labels are changed to reflect my own usage. Ilongot (or Bugkalot) data used in this paper are from my own fieldnotes and are based on the dialects spoken in Buayo and Belance, Dupax del Norte, Nueva Vizcaya, the Philippines.

⁴ Abbreviations used in this paper that are not included in the Leipzig Glossing Rules are: PERS, personal; COMM, common; SOC, social; SPEC, specific; LIG, ligature; PLT, polite; REQ, requestive; CV, CV reduplication; ABIL, abilitative; s.t., something; s.o., someone.

⁵ This sentence is ambiguous in that it can be interpreted as either ‘**You (PL)** will walk with Mother.’ or ‘**You (SG)** will walk with Mother.’ When the sentence contains a true adpositional comitative construction, the pronoun is interpreted as plural. However, when the pronoun is part of an inclusory construction, it is interpreted as singular (see Reid 2009 for detailed discussion).

Social verbs commonly contain the formative *maki-* or one of its related forms (*aki-*, *ki-*, *machi-/maci-* [matʃi], *makig-*, *magig-*; *paki-*, *pachi-/paci-* [patʃi], *pakig-*, *pagig-*; *naki-*, *nachi-/naci-* [natʃi], *nakig-*, *nagig-*; etc.). In general, *m*-initial forms (including *maki-*, *meki-* [məki], *mek-* [mək], *machi-/maci-*, *makig-*, *mekig-*, *magig-*, etc.) are either INFINITIVE forms, as shown in (4), or IMPERFECTIVE forms used to express an INCOMPLETED social/comitative action, as shown in (5)-(9). In Agutaynen, however, *magig-* is used as an IRREALIS form, as in (10). Please refer to tables in the Appendix for *maki-/paki-* and their related forms in various Philippine languages and other Malayo-Polynesian languages.

Like most other *m*-initial formatives (e.g. reflexes of PMP *maR-, PMP *maN-, etc.) (see Reid & Liao 2004 for details), the formative *maki-* and its related *m*-initial forms (including *maki-*, *meki-*, *mek-*, *machi-/maci-*, *makig-*, *mekig-*, *magig-*, etc.) only occur in INTRANSITIVE clauses.

- (4) **Ilokano** (Rubino 2000:lxxi) [Northern Luzon]
 In=kayó *makiá*pit.
 go=NOM.2PL SOC.harvest
 ‘Go participate in the harvest.’
- (5) **Itbayat** (Yamada 2002:34) [Bashiic]
Machiivan=kamo ryaken.
 SOC.accompany=NOM.2PL LOC.1SG
 ‘You (PL) will go with me.’
- (6) **Ibaloy** (Ruffolo 2004:252) [Northern Luzon]
 Jet *mekimisa*=kita.
 and.then IPFV.SOC.mass=NOM.1DU
 ‘...then we (DU) will attend the mass.’
- (7) **Kakilingan Sambal** (Yamashita 1992:33) [Central Luzon]
 Ag=káy *makipistá*.
 NEG=NOM.1PL.EXCL SOC.festival
 ‘We (EXCL) will not join a festival.’
- (8) **Sindangan/Central Subanen** (Arms 1996:20) [Greater Central Philippines]
Mekikpanaw=?ita dini Anita ditu dlunsud.⁶
 walk=NOM.1PL.INCL to Anita to.there town
 ‘Let’s walk together with Anita to town.’

⁶ *Makig-* (and/or *pakig-*) and their related forms in Masbatenyo and other Bisayan languages/dialects appear to reflect PMP *maki- (*paki-) with an additional final velar stop. The exact

- (9) **Masbatenyo** (Wolfenden 2001:43) [Greater Central Philippines]
 Wara=na=ako *makig*-amigo sa=iya.
 NEG=already=NOM.1SG SOC.friend LOC=3SG
 ‘I never made friends with her.’
- (10) **Agutaynen** (Quakenbush 2005:462) [Kalamian]
*Magit*tabid tang mola ong mga tangay=na.
 IRR.SOC.accompany NOM child OBL PL friend=GEN.3SG
 ‘The child will (join in and) go along with his/her friends.’

In a number of languages, the formative *ki-*, which can either be a reduced form of the formative *maki-* or a direct reflex of PMP **ki-*, appears on an infinitive form and/or a contemplated form of a social verb, as shown in (11)-(13) and (15)-(16). The formal alternation between *maki-* and *ki-* is observed at least in the Central Luzon languages Kakilingan Sambal (Yamashita 1992) and Ayta Mag-antsi (Storck & Storck 2005), and the South-Central Cordilleran languages Central Bontok [Khinina-ang Bontok] (Reid 1992b:306) and Ilongot (Liao, fieldnotes), as in (12)-(16). One thing to be noticed is that the formal alternation between *maki-* and *ki-* observed in Ilongot seems to appear only in a [-begun] event, as shown in (13) and (14), cf. (15) and (16).

- (11) **Ayta Mag-antsi** (Storck & Storck 2005:154) [Central Luzon]
Kilako=kaw kangko.
 SOC.go=NOM.2PL LOC.1SG
 ‘You (PL) all follow me.’
- (12) **Khinina-ang Bontok** (Reid 1992b:306) [Northern Luzon]
 Sa=tako=t i *kifarasig*.
 FUT=NOM.1PL.INCL=SEQ go SOC.visit.girls.in.sleeping.houses
 ‘Let’s go visit with the girls in their sleeping houses.’
- (13) **Ilongot/Bugkalot** (Liao, fieldnotes) [Northern Luzon]
Kiyaw=ak=su nu buwat.
 SOC.go=NOM.1SG=LOC.3SG FUT tomorrow
 ‘I’ll go with him/her tomorrow.’

source of the final consonant in these forms is unclear; it might be a reflex of Proto-Bisayan *g ‘durative’ (Zorc 1977:246). Similar related forms in Sindangan/Central Subanen (Arms 1996: 20) and in Agutaynen (Quakenbush 2005:462) may have developed as a result of diffusion from a Bisayan language.

- (14) **Ilongot/Bugkalot** (Liao, fieldnotes) [Northern Luzon]
Makiyaw=ka=su nu buwat.
 SOC.go=NOM.2SG=LOC.3SG FUT tomorrow
 ‘You (SG) will go with him/her tomorrow.’
- (15) **Ilongot/Bugkalot** (Liao, fieldnotes) [Northern Luzon]
Kiyaw=ak=su nitu.
 SOC.go=NOM.1SG=LOC.3SG now
 ‘I am going with him/her now.’
- (16) **Ilongot/Bugkalot** (Liao, fieldnotes) [Northern Luzon]
Kiyaw=ka=su nitu.
 SOC.go=NOM.2SG=LOC.3SG now
 ‘You (SG) are going with him/her now.’

The *m*-initial forms generally have corresponding *n*-initial forms (including *naki*-, *neki*- [nəki], *nek*- [nək], *nachi*-/*naci*-, *nakig*-, *nekig*- [nəkig], *nagig*-, etc.) that are used to express a COMPLETED social/comitative action in most Philippine languages, as shown in (17)-(21).⁷

- (17) **Southern Ivatan** (Hidalgo & Hidalgo 1971:70) [Bashiic]
Nachipanutung=sya ji Teresa.
 PFV.SOC.cook=NOM.3SG LOC Teresa
 ‘She joined Teresa in cooking.’
- (18) **Ilokano** (Rubino 2000:lxxi) [Northern Luzon]
Nakitinnúlag=da idí kalmán.
 PFV.SOC.contract=NOM.3PL yesterday
 ‘They signed a mutual contract yesterday.’

⁷ Unlike most other Philippine languages, the Southern Cordilleran languages Ibaloy (Ruffolo 2004) and Karao (Brainard 2003) make use of a non-nasal-initial perfective form *eki*- /ʔəki/ to express such an action, as shown in (i).

- (i) **Ibaloy** (Ruffolo 2004:253) [Northern Luzon]
*Eki*enop=to=y aso=to.
 ʔəki-ʔanop=to=j ʔaso=to
 PFV.SOC.hunt=GEN.3SG=NOM dog=GEN.3SG
 ‘He hunted with his dog.’

- (19) **Halitay Baytan** (Malicsi 1974:78) [Central Luzon]
Nakitutul ya ?anak kuy/kuni Pedro.
 PFV.SOC.speak DEF child LOC Pedro
 ‘The child spoke with Pedro.’
- (20) **Agutaynen** (Quakenbush 2005:462) [Kalamian]
Nagigtabid tang mola ong mga tangay=na.
 PFV.SOC.accompany NOM child OBL PL friend=GEN.3SG
 ‘The child (joined in and) went along with his/her friends.’
- (21) **Tagalog** (Schachter & Otones 1972:334) [Greater Central Philippines]
Uminom=sila ng alak; *nakiinom=ako* sa=kanila.
 PFV.drink=NOM.3PL OBL wine PFV.SOC.drink=NOM.1SG LOC=3PL
 ‘They drank wine; I drank along *with* them.’

However, in Tagalog and other Central Philippine languages, the aspectual information that the *n*-initial forms indicate is actually [+begun] rather than [+completed] (see Reid 1992a for discussion of the development of the aspect system in Tagalog). More specifically, in Tagalog and other Central Philippine languages, there is a contrast between *naki-* (or *nakig-*) ‘COMPLETIVE/PERFECTIVE: [+begun, +completed]’ and *nakiki-* (or *nakikig-*) (i.e. *naki(g)-* + CV- reduplication) ‘INCOMPLETIVE: [+begun, –completed]’, as contrasted in (22) and (23).

- (22) **Tagalog** (Rubino 1998:xx) [Greater Central Philippines]
Nakikain=siyá sa=amin.
 PFV.SOC.eat=NOM.3SG LOC=1PL.EXCL
 ‘She ate with us (EXCL).’
- (23) **Tagalog** (Schachter 1976:510) [Greater Central Philippines]
Nakikikain=siya ng hapunan sa Nanay.
 IPFV.SOC.eat=NOM.3SG OBL supper LOC mother
 ‘He is eating supper with Mother.’

In addition to *m*-initial forms and *n*-initial forms, some Philippine languages also have *p*-initial forms (including *paki-*, *peki-* [pəki], *pachi-/paci-*, *pakig-*, *pekig-* [pəkig], *pagig-*, etc.). Like other *p/m* matches (e.g. reflexes of *paN-/*maN-, reflexes of *paR-/*maR-, etc.), the historical connection between *maki-* (or its related *m*-initial forms) and *paki-* (or its related *p*-initial forms) is maintained in some languages, with the *m*-initial forms being maintained as verbs and the *p*-initial forms as GERUNDS or other NOMINALIZATIONS, as shown in (24) and (25). However, in some languages (e.g. the

Northern Luzon languages Dupanangan Agta, Khinina-ang Bontok, etc.), the association must have been lost, and the *p*-initial nominalizations of the *maki*- (or its related *m*-initial) verbs are absent (Robinson 2008, Reid n.d.). By contrast, in other languages (e.g. Southwest Palawano and Cuyonon), the association has also been lost; however, in this case, the *p*-initial forms (*peki*- in S.W. Palawano; *pakig*- in Cuyonon) have been retained whereas the *m*-initial forms have been lost (Davis 1995, Ester Elphick, p.c.).

- (24) **Masbatenyo** (Wolfenden 2001:373) [Greater Central Philippines]

Makig-usad=ka sa=amon.
 SOC.one=NOM.2SG LOC=1PL.EXCL
 ‘You (SG) unite with us (EXCL).’

- (25) **Masbatenyo** (Wolfenden 2001:373) [Greater Central Philippines]

An imo *pakig*-usad sa imo asawa wara
 SPEC POSS.2SG union LOC POSS.2SG spouse NEG
 sin katapusan.
 OBL end
 ‘Your (SG) union with your (SG) wife has no end.’

In some Philippine languages, the *p*-initial forms may have functions other than GERUNDS or other NOMINALIZATIONS of the *maki*- (or its related *m*-initial) social verbs.

First, *p*-initial forms may serve as the imperative form of a social verb, as in Ibaloy (26).

- (26) **Ibaloy** (Ruffolo 2004:252) [Northern Luzon]

*Pakit*olong=ka!
 IMP.SOC.help=NOM.2SG
 ‘Join in to help!’

Second, *p*-initial forms may serve as the dependent form of a social verb, as in Cebuano (27).

- (27) **Cebuano** (Zorc 1977:142) [Greater Central Philippines]

?ayáw ?ug *pakig*?áway ni mánuy=nímu.
 NEG LIG SOC.fight GEN big.brother=GEN.2SG
 ‘Don’t pick a fight with your (SG) big brother.’

Third, *p*-initial forms may serve as the imperfective form of a social verb, as in Agutaynen (28).

- (28) **Agutaynen** (Quakenbush 2005:462) [Kalamian]
Pagigtabid tang mola ong mga tangay=na.
IPFV.SOC.accompany NOM child OBL PL friend=GEN.3SG
'The child (has joined in and) is going along with his/her friends.'

Fourth, *p*-initial forms may serve as a requestive verb or as a polite imperative verb, as illustrated by the Tagalog example in (29).

- (29) **Tagalog** (Ramos & Cena 1990:90) [Greater Central Philippines]
*Paki*abot=mo=nga ang libro.
PLT.REQ.pass=GEN.2SG=please SPEC book
'You (SG) please hand over the book.'

One might consider such a usage of *paki*- forms rather unsurprising because it seems to follow Ross's (1995:743) observation that atemporal forms (i.e. *p*-initial forms) can function as plain imperatives. But it must be noted that *paki*- is not the only form that can appear in imperative constructions in Tagalog, *maki*- also can (as in *Makipagkamay=ka sa Pangulo*. 'Shake hands with the President!' (Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino [KWF] 2000:295); *Makibagay sa mga kapit-bahay*. 'Be in harmony with your neighbors!' (KWF 2000:52)). However, unlike *paki*- forms, the use of *maki*- forms in imperative constructions does not encode 'please' or 'politeness', but only encodes the 'social/comitative' sense.

Having looked at the distribution of *maki*-/*paki*- (or their related forms) in various Philippine languages, one might wonder whether the *m*-/*p*- alternation discussed here can be considered as an "Actor Voice"/"non-Actor-Voice" alternation. Such an analysis is tempting, but it fails to explain two facts: (1) why many Philippine languages (especially those belonging in the Bashiic subgroup and the Northern Luzon subgroup of Malayo-Polynesian languages) have only *maki*- forms but no *paki*- forms, or vice versa; (2) why *maki*- forms and *paki*- forms have complementary functions in languages such as Tagalog; more specifically, why only *maki*- forms are used in "permissive" social constructions, whereas only *paki*- forms are used in polite request/polite imperative constructions.

In this section, I have dealt with the morphosyntactic coding of comitativity in Philippine languages. In the next section, I shall discuss functions that are found to be associated with comitative marking in Philippine languages and some other Malayo-Polynesian languages.

3. Functions associated with comitative marking in Philippine languages

3.1 Social/comitative

In addition to expressing **actions performed in the company of other people**, as already shown in examples (4)-(24) in §2, the formative *maki-* and its related *m-*initial forms are commonly used to **ask permission to join in an action started earlier by another agent**—“this either through interference or by favor of someone else” (Bloomfield 1917:263, Shkarban & Rachkov 2007:925), as in (30)-(34). The inclusion of the sense “permission” in social constructions appears to be possible only with *maki-* or its related *m-*initial forms, but NOT with *paki-* or its related *p-*initial forms. As observed in Ramos & Cena (1990:96), in Tagalog, “*Maki-* is the actor-focus counterpart of the prefix *paki-* which makes the verb base a request form. **Unlike *paki-*, however, *maki-* can also be used to ask permission to use or partake of something owned by someone...**” (Bold font added by HCL).

- (30) **Ilokano** (Rubino 2000:lxxi) [Northern Luzon]
*Maki*núm=ak man?
 SOC.drink=NOM.1SG please
 ‘May I have a drink (*with* you)?’
- (31) **Ibaloy** (Ruffolo 2004:252) [Northern Luzon]
*Meki*daw=ak=**ka** so=n si?kayo.
 IPFV.SOC.go=NOM.1SG=please OBL=GEN 2PL
 ‘May I please go with you (PL)?’
- (32) **Dupaningan Agta** (Robinson 2008:176) [Northern Luzon]
*Maki*etnod=ak=bi?
 SOC.sit=NOM.1SG=also
 ‘May I sit (with you)?’
- (33) **Tagalog** (Ramos & Goulet 1981:154) [Greater Central Philippines]
*Maki*iluto=na=lang=ako sa=inyo paminsan-minsan.
 SOC.CV.cook=now=only=NOM.1SG LOC=2PL now.and.then
 ‘I will share your (PL) cooking facilities with you now and then.’
- (34) **Bikol** (Mintz 1971:193) [Greater Central Philippines]
*Maki*bása=ka saindá.
 SOC.read=NOM.2SG LOC.3PL
 ‘Ask to read with them.’

3.2 Polite request/polite imperative

Aside from the difference in their ability to form the “permissive” social construction, the *m*-initial forms (and/or *n*-initial forms) and *p*-initial forms also differ in their ability to form polite imperative or polite request constructions. In Tagalog and a small number of other Philippine languages, there is a **POLITE REQUEST** or **POLITE IMPERATIVE** construction that can only be expressed by *paki*- or its related *p*-initial forms, but NOT by their corresponding nasal-initial forms (Ramos 1985:132-134, Ramos & Cena 1990, Shkarban & Rachkov 2007:928, Maree 2007:209, Rubino 2000, Antworth 1979,⁸ Storck & Storck 2005, Mintz 1971, Lobel & Tria 2000:70, Wolfenden 1975). Examples of the use of *paki*- or its related forms in polite imperative/polite request constructions are shown in (35)-(39).

- (35) **Tagalog** (Ramos 1985:134) [Greater Central Philippines]
*Paki*abot=mo=**nga** ang asin.
 PLT.REQ.pass=GEN.2SG=please SPEC salt
 ‘Please pass the salt.’
- (36) **Ilokano** (Rubino 2000:416) [Northern Luzon]
*Paki*ited=mo=nto **man** laengen.
 PLT.REQ.give=GEN.2SG=FUT please just
 ‘Please just give it to him.’
- (37) **Ibatan** (Maree 2007:209) [Bashiic]
*Pach*ahap=mo=**pa**=w nyaya.
 PLT.REQ.get=GEM.2SG=please=NOM that
 ‘Please get that (for me).’
- (38) **Ayta Mag-antsi** (Storck & Storck 2005:256) [Central Luzon]
*Paki*dwang=mo ya toyò.
 PLT.REQ.pass=GEN.2SG NOM soy.sauce
 ‘Please pass the soy sauce.’

⁸ In addition to the comitative function, both *maki*- and *paki*- forms are claimed “to express a polite request” in Botolan Sambal (Antworth 1979:22). However, the examples of *maki*- forms (e.g. *maki-alih* ‘to remove **by request**’ and *makitikap* ‘to look for **by request**’) provided by Antworth are translated as ‘to do s.t. **by request**’. This leads to the treatment of *maki*- forms in Botolan Sambal as instances of REQUESTIVE verbs, rather than instances of polite request verbs.

- (39) **Bikol** (Mintz 1971:196) [Greater Central Philippines]
Pakiadalan=mo an Bikol.
 PLT.REQ.study=GEN.2SG SPEC Bikol
 ‘Please study Bikol.’

Based on data available so far, the *paki-* (or *pachi-*) polite request/polite imperative construction is found in Ilokano [Northern Luzon], Ibatan [Bashiic], a number of Central Luzon languages (Ayta Mag-antsi, Botolan Sambal, and Kapampangan) (Gonzalez 1981), and a number of Greater Central Philippine languages (including the Central Philippine languages Tagalog, Bikol, and Hiligaynon). On the surface, the polite request/polite imperative construction appears to be quite widespread in that it is found in FOUR different subgroups of Malayo-Polynesian languages spoken in the Philippines. However, a close look at its distribution suggests that the superficially wide distribution of this construction is probably the result of DIFFUSION rather than the result of direct inheritance because this construction is mainly found in Tagalog and other languages that appear to have been under the (direct or indirect) influence of Tagalog. More specifically, the polite request/polite imperative usage of the *paki-* (or *pachi-*) form was an innovation that probably took place in Tagalog and has then spread gradually to other languages.

The diffusion hypothesis can be supported by the fact that with the exception of Ilokano and Ibatan, languages with the *paki-* (or *pachi-*) polite request/polite imperative construction are spoken in more or less geographically contiguous areas. With the prominent status of Tagalog in the Philippines, it is very likely that the polite request/polite imperative usage of the *paki-* (or *pachi-*) form could have been borrowed into its neighboring areas as well as non-neighboring areas.

As for the polite request/polite imperative usage of the *paki-* form in Ilokano, it is obviously borrowed from Tagalog. Under the entry *paki-* in *The Ilokano Dictionary and Grammar*, Rubino (2000:416) provides the following information:

paki-: 1. Nominalizing prefix for *maki-* verbs serving an instrumental purpose. **pakikuyog** companion. 2. (Tag.) polite verbalizer, forming transitive social verbs or verbs of request. **Pakibagayo man laengen a madmadi ti riknak**. Can you please just tell him that I’m not feeling well? **Pakiitedmonto man laengen**. Please just give it to him.

As for the polite request/polite imperative usage of the *pachi-* form in Ibatan, it is probably the result of influence from Ilokano and/or the result of direct influence from Tagalog. Maree (2007:xxiii) notes “...Ibatan speakers who live on the western slopes of Babuyan Claro speak a dialect that tends to be influenced more by Ilokano, while those who live on the eastern slopes speak a dialect that is more influenced by Ivatan....”.

3.3 Requestive

Although the nasal-initial forms (with *m-* or *n-*initials) and *p-*initial forms differ in their ability to occur in the “permissive” social construction and the polite imperative or polite request construction, both can be used as a REQUESTIVE verb to express the meaning ‘ask s.o. to do s.t.’, as shown in (40)-(42).

- (40) **Halitaq Baytan** (Malicsi 1974:52) [Central Luzon]
Pakikuwaen=ya ni Pidro nin kwalta.
 REQ.get=NOM.3SG GEN Pedro OBL money
 ‘Pedro will ask him to get money.’
- (41) **Hiligaynon** (Wolfenden 1975:93) [Greater Central Philippines]
Pakigdala=ko sang basket kay Mr. Cruz.
 REQ.send=GEN.1SG OBL basket LOC Mr. Cruz
 ‘I will request that the basket be sent to Mr. Cruz.’
- (42) **Bantik** (Utsumi 2009:8) [Sangiric]
 I=deki *pakikohi* ku.
 PERS=Deki REQ.move GEN.1SG
 ‘I asked [ordered] Deki to move.’

The requestive sense of the *maki-/naki-/paki-* forms is NOT as commonly attested as the ‘social/comitative’ sense of these forms. It is found in a number of languages spoken in the Philippines (including Halitaq Baytan, Hiligaynon, and the Samalan language Yakan (as shown in (43)-(44)), Sabah (including Kalabuan (Spitzack 1988), Tindal Dusun, as in (45)-(46), Timugon Murut (Prentice 1971), etc.), north Sulawesi (as in Bantik (42)), and central Sulawesi (as in Kaili, (47)-(48)), etc.)

- (43) **Yakan** (Behrens 2002:243) [Samalan]
Mekitabang=ku si=iye ngalabas.
 REQ.help=1SG to=3SG cut.grass
 ‘I asked him to help cut grass.’
- (44) **Yakan** (Behrens 2002:266) [Samalan]
Pekilabo? beteng=ku si=iye.
 REQ.throw.down young.coconut=1SG to=3SG
 ‘I asked him to throw down a coconut.’

- (45) **Tindal Dusun** (Robinson 2005:27) [non-Philippine: Dusunic]
Mokisinsib=oku dia.
 REQ.cut=NOM.1SG OBL.2SG
 ‘I want you (SG) to cut my hair.’
- (46) **Tindal Dusun** (Robinson 2005:27) [non-Philippine: Dusunic]
 Oŋé *pokisinsib* i Michael.
 go REQ.cut PERS Michael
 ‘Go ask Michael for a haircut.’
- (47) **Kaili** (Evans 1996:183) [non-Philippine: Celebic]
 Yaku *mekidau* baju.
 1SG REQ.IRR.sew dress
 ‘I will ask that a dress be sewn.’
- (48) **Kaili** (Evans 1996:183) [non-Philippine: Celebic]
 Yaku *mompekidau* baju nte Tira.
 1SG REQ.IRR.sew dress with Tira
 ‘I will ask Tira to sew a dress.’

3.4 Causative

The last function that can be associated with *maki-/naki-/paki-* and their variant forms is “causative”. The formative *paki-* is considered to be a CAUSATIVE morpheme in Bantik (Utsumi 2009) and in Maranao (McKaughan & Macaraya 1996). However, a careful examination of Bantik and Maranao data suggests that some occurrences of *paki-* are better analyzed as “requestive” rather than “causative”, as already shown in (42). Better candidates of *paki-* ‘causative’ are presented in (49)-(51).

- (49) **Maranao** (McKaughan & Macaraya 1996:6) [Greater Central Philippines]
Pakitabasen o mama ko wataq so karatas.
 CAUS.cut.TR GEN man OBL child SPEC paper
 ‘The man will have the child cut the paper.’
- (50) **Bantik** (Utsumi 2009:8) [Sangiric]
 I=susi *mapakitondo* oto? si=stenli su=daren.
 PERS=Susy ABIL.CAUS/REQ.push car PERS=Stenly LOC=road
 ‘Susy can ask Stenly to push the car on the road.’ /
 ‘Susy can have Stenly push the car on the road.’

- (51) **Bantik** (Utsumi 2009:8) [Sangiric]
 Oto? *pakitondo?* ni=susi si=stenli su=daren.
 car CAUS/REQ.push PERS=Susy PERS=Stenly LOC=road
 ‘Susy will ask Stenly to push the car on the road.’ /
 ‘Susy will have Stenly push the car on the road.’

The ‘causative’ sense of *meki-/peki-* can be observed in Yakan, as shown in (52). Behrens (2002:243) also considers *meke-/peke-* as a ‘causative’ morpheme in Yakan. Although Yakan *meke-* looks like a reflex of ‘causative’ **maka-* and *meki-* a reflex of ‘requestive’ **maki-*, both forms are treated as variants of *maka-* in Behrens’s (2002:243, 249, 266, 285) *Yakan-English Dictionary*. The same kind of alternation is also found in the corresponding *p*-initial forms, i.e. *peke-* and *peki-* are also treated as variants of *paka-*. It is very likely that reflexes of **maka-/paka-* and **maki-/paki-* have become variants of one another due to the striking similarity in their forms and functions.

- (52) **Yakan** (Behrens 2002:243) [Samalan]
*Meke?*eddo? (/meki?eddo?) kenna=ku si=ka?u.
 CAUS/REQ.get fish=1SG LOC=2SG
 ‘I make (ask, cause) you (SG) (to) get fish for me.’

4. The development of PMP **maki-* (**paki-*) ‘social/comitative’

The forms and functions associated with comitative marking in Philippine languages have already been dealt with in §2 and §3, respectively. In this section, I shall discuss the developmental path of the functions associated with the formative expressing comitativity in Philippine languages. Comparative data from other Malayo-Polynesian languages will also be employed wherever relevant.

4.1 PMP **maki-* (**paki-*): ‘social/comitative’ or ‘requestive’?

In §3, four functions were associated with the pair of formatives *maki-/paki-* or their variant forms: (1) social (including two subtypes: ‘comitative’ and ‘permissive’ social); (2) polite request/polite imperative; (3) requestive; and (4) causative. Among these, two of the functions have been reconstructed by other scholars for **paki-/maki-*: (a) social/comitative, and (b) requestive.

Blust (2009:364) reconstructs **maki-/paki-* ‘petitive’ (‘requestive’ in my analysis) based on evidence from Tagalog, Bikol, Timugon Murut, Tindal Dusun, Kadazan Dusun, Bolaang Mongondow, and Tondano. He does NOT assign this reconstruction to any level

of protolanguage probably because he is uncertain as to whether the requestive meaning and the social/comitative meaning should be attributed to a single polysemous formative *maki-* or two homophonous formatives *maki-*, as shown in the following quote.

Clear reflexes of this affix pair are confined to the central and southern Philippines and to some Philippine-type languages of northern Borneo and Sulawesi, as with Tagalog *maki-* ‘ask for, make a request for; join in company; imitate’, *paki-* “‘prefix forming nouns to denote favor asked or requested’.... It is unclear whether Tagalog *maki-* is a single polysemous prefix or two homophonous prefixes. If the first interpretation is adopted Northern Philippine forms of corresponding shape such as Ilokano *maki-* ‘participative (social) intransitive verbal prefix’, *paki-* ‘nominalizing prefix for *maki-* verbs serving an instrumental purpose’ can be included in this set. Otherwise, the evidence for *maki/paki-* is geographically more restricted.” (Blust 2009:364-365)

Ross (1988:284-286), however, reconstructs PMP **paki-* ‘do (s.t.) together’ (‘social/comitative’ in my analysis) on the basis of evidence from both Oceanic languages (especially those spoken in New Ireland) and western Austronesian languages (including Cebuano, Hiligaynon, Tagalog, Ilokano, Western Bukidnon Manobo, and Toba Batak). He notes that two sets of reflexes of reciprocal forms are attested in the Oceanic languages spoken in New Ireland. The coexistence of two sets of reflexes suggests the need to reconstruct two forms for ‘reciprocal’ in POC, i.e. **paRi-* and **pa(k)i-*. He associates two meanings with POC **pa(k)i-*: (a) reciprocal, and (b) comitative.⁹ However, he acknowledges a problem with the reconstruction of **pa(k)i-*; namely, NO Oceanic languages appear to have a reflex that contains a phoneme reflecting *-k-*. Thus, the reflexes that he has attributed to POC **pa(k)i-* may instead be irregular reflexes of POC **paRi-* (Malcolm Ross, p.c.).

A survey of functions associated with *maki-/paki-* and their related forms in Philippine languages suggests that both Blust’s (2009) and Ross’s (p.c.) reconstructions

⁹ Although both the ‘reciprocal’ and ‘comitative’ meanings were reconstructed for POC **pa(k)i-* by Ross (p.c.), I do not think that the meaning ‘reciprocal’ should be reconstructed for PMP **paki-*. Instead, I consider that PMP **paR-/*maR-* are better associated with the ‘reciprocal’ sense whereas PMP **maki-* (and/or **paki-*) had a ‘social/comitative’ sense. Such a reconstruction is supported by the fact that in Tagalog and many other Philippine languages, reflexes of **paR-* can co-occur with reflexes of **maki-* (and/or **paki-*) to express social reciprocal events, as in Tagalog [comitative/social + reciprocal] *makipagkamay* ‘to shake hands together with s.o.’ (cf. [reciprocal] *magkamay* ‘to shake hands with each other’); [comitative/social + reciprocal] *makipagpalitan* ‘to join in the action of exchange’ (cf. [reciprocal] *magpalitan* ‘to exchange s.t. with each other’), etc. (Shkarban & Rachkov 2007:926).

are relevant to the development of the formative pair *maki-/paki-*. However, they offer us only a partial picture of the development of *maki-/paki-*.

On the basis of available data from different subgroups of Malayo-Polynesian languages spoken in the Philippines as well as supporting evidence from a number of other Malayo-Polynesian languages spoken outside the Philippines, I reconstruct **maki-* (**paki-*) to PMP (Proto-Malayo-Polynesian) with the meaning ‘social/comitative’. This reconstruction is partially similar to Ross’s reconstruction and partially similar to Blust’s reconstruction.

Ross reconstructs only **paki-* ‘do (s.t.) together’, but NOT **maki-*, to PMP because (1) he considers **maki-* to reflect *-um- + **paki-* and (2) **maki-* is certainly NOT reflected in Oceanic languages (Malcolm Ross, p.c.). However, evidence from Malayo-Polynesian languages spoken in the Philippines and other Malayo-Polynesian languages spoken in Sabah and Sulawesi points to the need to reconstruct **maki-* to PMP.

As already mentioned in §3.1 and §3.2, although both *maki-* and *paki-* (or their related *m-/p-*initial forms) can appear in a comitative social construction, they differ from each other in their ability to occur in the “permissive” social construction and the polite imperative/polite request construction. More specifically, only *maki-* and its related *m-*initial forms can appear in the “permissive” social construction, whereas only *paki-* and its related *p-*initial forms can appear in the polite request/polite imperative construction. If we assume that the formative **maki-* is historically secondary (because of the possibility that it reflects *-um- + **paki-*) and its occurrence is fully predictable from the distribution of **paki-*, we would fail to explain why only *maki-* and its related *m-*initial forms, but NOT *paki-* and its related *p-*initial forms, can appear in the “permissive” social construction. Although **maki-* may derive historically from *-um-+ **paki-* (see Wolff 1973, Blust 2004, 2009 for details), its presence (or possible co-presence with **paki-*) in PMP can hardly be questioned.

There is another possible analysis for the reconstruction of ‘social/comitative’; namely, only **maki-* (but NOT **paki-*) is reconstructible with the meaning ‘social/comitative’ for PMP, and **paki-* developed as a back-formation from **maki-* by analogy with the *m/p* pairing commonly found in Philippine languages (e.g. PMP **maR-/paR-*; PMP **maN-/paN-*, etc.). This seems a plausible analysis given the following supporting evidence:

- 1) Some northern Philippine languages (Dupanangan Agta, Mainit Bontok, Khinina-ang Bontok, and Eastern Bontok, etc.) only have the form *maki-* (as well as *naki-*), but no *paki-* (Fukuda 1997, Nava 1986, Reid n.d.).¹⁰

¹⁰ Reid (p.c.) comments “the *p-* initial forms such as *pag-*, *pang-*, and *paka-* have generally been lost in Bontok languages, and *paki-* may have also been lost”.

- 2) Although both Yami [Bashiic] and Ayta Mag-antsi [Central Luzon] have both *m*-initial and *p*-initial forms, ‘comitative’ nouns are expressed by *machi-/maki-*, rather than by *pachi-/paki-*,¹¹ as shown in (53) and (55).
- 3) In languages such as Central Tagbanwa that retain the ‘social/comitative’ meaning only in fossilized forms, it is *maki-*, rather than *paki-*, that has been retained on fossilized nouns, as shown in (58).

The above discussion suggests that the ‘social/comitative’ meaning can definitely be attributed to PMP **maki-* (and possibly also to ?PMP **paki-*).

Having discussed the form(s) that can be attributed to the ‘social/comitative’ meaning for PMP, I shall now turn to the question of which function(s) can be reconstructed for PMP.

Blust (2009:364) reconstructs **maki-/paki-* ‘petitive’ without assigning this reconstruction to any level of protolanguage. Although I agree with Blust in considering that **maki-* (and possibly also **paki-*) should be reconstructed, I consider the ‘requestive’ meaning (Blust’s ‘petitive’) HISTORICALLY SECONDARY.

As already discussed in §2 and §3.1, the ‘social/comitative’ meaning of PMP **maki-* (**paki-*) can be found in at least FIVE subgroups of Malayo-Polynesian languages spoken in the Philippines, i.e. Northern Luzon, Central Luzon, Bashiic (including geographically distant Yami), Greater Central Philippines, and Kalamian subgroups. Moreover, the distribution of the ‘social/comitative’ meaning is LESS RESTRICTED than the distribution of other meanings associated with *maki-* and *paki-* (or their related *m-/p*-initial forms) within each subgroup and across all subgroups. Furthermore, the ‘social/comitative’ meaning of PMP **maki-* (**paki-*) is found not only in verbal forms, but also in nominal forms, as shown in (53)–(57).

- (53) **Yami** [Bashiic]: *mačikilijan* ‘fellow-villager’ (Asai 1936:56)¹²
- (54) **Ilokano** [Northern Luzon]: *pakikuyog* ‘companion’ (Rubino 2000:416)
- (55) **Ayta Mag-antsi** [Central Luzon]: *makilalaki* ‘(n.) adulteress’ (Storck & Storck 2005:194)

¹¹ An anonymous reviewer suggests that the reason why *maki-* forms rather than *paki-* forms surface in comitative nouns in Yami (*mačikilijan* ‘(n.) fellow-villager’) and Ayta Mag-antsi (*makilalaki* ‘(n.) adulteress’) is related to the fact that these two nouns are both actor-oriented. As already discussed in §2.2, I have reservations about considering the *m-/p*- alternation as an Actor Voice/non-Actor-Voice alternation.

¹² The form *mačikilijan* ‘fellow-villager’ appears to be a reflex of PMP **kaʔiliyán* ‘fellow-villager’ from **ka-* -an + **ʔili* ‘village’ (cf. **Bontok** *ka-iliyán* ‘fellow-villager’) re-derived with **maki-*. Note also that the change from **ki* to *chi* must have taken place before the reduction of **kaʔi* to *ki* (Lawrence Reid, p.c.).

- (56) **Masbatenyo** [Greater Central Philippines]: *pakipagkápwa* ‘(n.) human relations’ (Wolfenden 2001:270, 373)
- (57) **Tagalog** [Greater Central Philippines]: *pakikisama* ‘companionship’ (English 1986:957)

In some languages, a reflex of PMP *maki-/*paki- is only retained as a fossilized form in nouns, as shown in (58).

- (58) **Central Tagbanwa** [Greater Central Philippines]: *makibahay* ‘(n.) neighborliness, good relations’ (Scebold 2003:109)

By contrast, the ‘requestive’ meaning is found in VERBS. Moreover, in terms of geographical distribution or distribution within a subgroup or across subgroups, it is MORE RESTRICTED than the ‘social/comitative’ meaning of *maki- (*paki-). Unlike the ‘social/comitative’ meaning, which is widespread in different subgroups of Malayo-Polynesian languages spoken in the Philippines, the ‘requestive’ meaning is mainly found in a number of languages spoken in central and southern Philippines, Sabah, and north and central Sulawesi.

The broad distribution of the ‘social/comitative’ meaning in both verbal forms and nominal forms in Philippine languages points to the reconstruction of the ‘social/comitative’ meaning, rather than the ‘requestive’ meaning, to PMP *maki- (*paki-).

Having discussed the reasons why *maki- (*paki-) should be reconstructed with the meaning ‘social/comitative’ for PMP, I shall move on to the discussion of the development of PMP *maki- (*paki-) in the next section.

4.2 The development of PMP *maki- (*paki-) ‘social/comitative’

Based on the distribution of reflexes of PMP *maki- (*paki-) in Philippine languages as well as in some other Malayo-Polynesian languages, the following path of semantic change is posited for the development of PMP *maki- (*paki-) ‘social/comitative’.

Note that Figure 1 should be understood to represent the divergent development of the semantic senses associated with *maki- (*paki-). Some languages retain only the sense reconstructed for PMP (i.e. ‘social/comitative’). Others maintain one or more of the latter senses as well. Some others have lost the original sense of PMP *maki- (*paki-) and maintain only the latter senses. Since the various senses appear to be natural developments of the reconstructed sense, they do NOT provide evidence for subgrouping.

One thing to be noticed is that in Philippine languages that have developed the ‘requestive’ sense and/or the ‘polite imperative/polite request’ sense, they have maintained the reconstructed sense ‘social/comitative’ as well. As already discussed in §3.2, Tagalog and a number of Philippine languages that might have been under the (direct or indirect) influence of Tagalog (e.g. Ilokano [Northern Luzon]; Ibatan [Bashiic]; Ayta Mag-antsi, Botolan Sambal, and Kapampangan [Central Luzon]; Bikol and Hiligaynon [Greater Central Philippines]) belong to this group.

In Stage 3, reflexes of PMP *maki- (*paki-) have developed an additional ‘causative’ sense but still retain the ‘requestive’ sense. The ‘causative’ sense of reflexes of PMP *maki- (*paki-) can be found in Maranao [Greater Central Philippines]; Bantik [Sangiric]; Yakan [Samalan]; etc. In those languages that have developed a ‘causative’ sense for PMP *maki- (*paki-), they are found to have maintained the ‘requestive’ sense, but have lost the original ‘comitative’ sense of PMP *maki- (*paki-).

In Stage 4, reflexes of PMP *maki- (*paki-) would be expected to maintain the ‘causative’ sense but lose the ‘requestive’ sense. My survey of reflexes of PMP *maki- (*paki-) in Philippine languages (as well as other Malayo-Polynesian languages) shows that none of the languages investigated belong to this group. However, we cannot rule out the possibility that some languages might develop into this stage in the future.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I have discussed how the notion of comitativity is encoded morphosyntactically in Philippine languages. Three related formatives (and their variants) are found to be associated with the expression of ‘doing s.t. together’: *maki-*, *naki-*, and *paki-*. The difference between *maki-* and *naki-* (or their variants) can be easily characterized as reflecting the aspectual difference between [–completed] and [+completed] events in most Philippine languages, or the aspectual difference between [–begun] and [+begun] events in Tagalog and other Central Philippine languages. However, no simple solution like this can be offered for the difference between the nasal-initial forms (*maki-* and *naki-* or their variants) and the *p*-initial forms (*paki-* or its variants).

The difference between the nasal-initial forms and the *p*-initial forms appears to be somewhat complex. Although the functions associated with the former do overlap with the latter, they differ significantly in their ability to occur in two types of syntactic construction. First, only *maki-* or its related *m*-initial forms can be used in the “permissive” social construction. Second, only *paki-* or its related *p*-initial forms can be used in the polite imperative or polite request construction. The fact that the distribution of *m*-initial forms is NOT identical to that of *p*-initial forms points to the need to

reconstruct *maki- ‘social/comitative’ to PMP. Whether *paki- was co-present with *maki- at the PMP stage or it was developed as a back-formation from *maki- by analogy with the *m/p* pairing commonly found in Philippine languages is an interesting topic to be explored further in the future.

Another interesting issue related to the above discussion is whether *maki- was monomorphemic or bimorphemic, i.e. whether *maki- could have been two morphemes, the old ‘AF’ form *ma-, or the stative *ma- + comitative *ki-. The bimorphemic analysis is supported by Schachter & Otnes’ (1972:301) analysis of the following words: *makialam/pakialaman* ‘meddle with’, *makibagay/pakibagayan* ‘adapt oneself to’, *makinig/pakinggan* ‘listen to’, *makisama/pakisamahan* ‘get along with’, ‘live with’.

It may be noted that the bases in this class all begin with *ki-*. This *ki-* is probably related historically to the prefix component *ki-* that occurs in social verbs (cf. §5.14), but it is most conveniently treated as part of the base in the case of the verbs under discussion. The elements that follow the *ki-* of *-kialam-**kibagay* and *-kisama* also occur independently: *alam* ‘something known’, *bagay* ‘suitable’, *sama* ‘company’. The element that follows the *ki-* of *-kinig* does not occur independently, but is perhaps a contracted form of *dinig*, the base of the object verb *makarinig/marinig* ‘hear’. (Schachter & Otnes 1972:301)

Having discussed the forms and functions associated with social/comitative marking in Philippine languages in §2 and §3, I posit a path for the development of senses associated with reflexes of PMP *maki- (*paki-) ‘social/comitative’ in §4.2. A number of questions related to the development of PMP *maki- (*paki-) are yet to be answered.

First, Nojima (2009) discusses the occurrence of *makis-/pakis-* ‘to request, ask for’ in Southern Bunun (Formosan). This formative pair is only attested on nine bases, as shown in (61). The forms and function of the Southern Bunun formative pair *makis-/pakis-* appear to be quite similar to reflexes of PMP *maki- (*paki-). However, in the northern dialect of Bunun, the equivalent forms of the Southern Bunun forms are *makic-/pakic-*, rather than *makis-/pakis-*. This leads to the reconstruction of Proto-Bunun *makic-/*pakic-, which do not correspond to *maki-/paki-* in Philippine languages (cf. Proto-Bunun *tanjic ‘to cry’ and PMP *tanjis ‘to cry’). Whether or not the Southern Bunun formative pair *makis-/pakis-* ‘to request, ask for’ is historically related to *maki-/paki-* in Philippine languages is a further question to be explored.

(61) Southern Bunun (Nojima 2009)	
<i>makis-saiv</i>	‘ask for, request, beg’
<i>makis-suhis</i>	‘request for returning’
<i>makis-dangaz</i>	‘help to request’
<i>makis-baas</i>	‘request back’
<i>makis-ʔunu</i>	‘request next (??)’
<i>makis-pusan/pakis-pusan-an</i>	‘request two times’
<i>makis-ʔamin/pakis-ʔamin-an</i>	‘request all’
<i>makis-laliva</i>	‘request mistakenly’
<i>makis-sasu/pakis-sasu-an</i>	‘request immediately’

Second, I posit a fourth stage for the development of senses associated with the reflexes of PMP *maki- (*paki-), i.e. a stage in which only the ‘causative’ sense for PMP *maki- (*paki-) is retained, for which no language has yet been identified. A larger-scale investigation of reflexes of PMP *maki- (*paki-), especially of Malayo-Polynesian languages spoken in the southern Philippines, Borneo, and in north and central Sulawesi, might offer evidence for positing this stage.

Third, due to space limitations, the role that speech acts might play and the way that tense/aspect/mood (TAM) might affect the interpretation of data are not covered in this study. These are interesting topics that deserve further exploration.

Appendix

maki-/paki- and their Related Forms in Philippine Languages and Other Malayo-Polynesian Languages

Table 1: *maki-/paki-* and their related forms with a ‘social/comitative’ sense

Subgroup	Language name	* <i>maki-</i>	* <i>naki-</i>	* <i>paki-</i>
Northern Luzon	Ilokano	<i>maki-</i>	<i>naki-</i>	
	Dupaningan Agta	<i>maki-</i>	<i>naki-</i>	
	Isnag		<i>naki-</i>	
	Eastern Bontok	<i>mek-</i>		
	Central Bontok	(<i>ma</i>) <i>ki-</i>	<i>naki-</i>	
	Karao	<i>meki-</i>	<i>eki-; eki--an</i>	<i>peki--an; peki--i</i>
	Ibaloy	<i>meki-; emeki-</i>	<i>eki-</i>	<i>paki-</i>
	Pangasinan		<i>aki-; aki--an</i>	
	Ilongot	(<i>ma</i>) <i>ki-</i>	<i>naki-</i>	
Central Luzon	Botolan Sambal	<i>maki-</i>		
	Kakilingan Sambal	(<i>ma</i>) <i>ki-</i>	<i>naki-</i>	
	Halitaq Baytan [Sambal]		<i>naki-</i>	
	Ayta Mag-antsi	<i>maki-; ki-</i>		<i>paki-</i>
	Kapampangan	<i>maki-</i>		<i>paki-</i>
Bashiic	Southern Ivatan	<i>machi-</i>	<i>nachi-</i>	
	Ibatan	<i>machi-</i>	<i>nachi-</i>	
	Itbayat	<i>mach(i)-</i>	<i>naci-</i>	<i>pach(i)--an</i>
	Ivasay [Ivatan]	<i>maci-</i>	<i>naci-</i>	
	Isamorong [Ivatan]	<i>maci-</i>	<i>naci-</i>	
	Babuyan	<i>maci-</i>	<i>naci-</i>	
	Imorod [Yami]	<i>maci-</i>		
	Iranomilek [Yami]		<i>nimaci-</i>	
Yami	<i>maci-</i>		<i>paci-; ipaci-; paci--an</i>	

Greater Central Philippines	Tagalog	<i>maki-</i>	<i>naki-</i>	
	Bikol	<i>maki-</i>		<i>paki-; paki--an; ipaki-</i>
	Masbatenyo	<i>maki-/makig-</i>	<i>naki-/nakig-</i>	
	Cebuano	<i>makig-</i>	<i>nakig-</i>	<i>pakig-; pakig--an; gi-pakig--an; pakig--i</i>
	Aklanon		<i>nakig-</i>	
	Northern Samareño	<i>maki-</i>		
	Cuyonon			<i>pakig-</i>
	Southwest Palawano			<i>peki-; ipeki-</i>
	Central Tagbanwa	<i>maki-</i>		
	Sindangan/Central Subanen	<i>mekig-</i>		<i>pekig-</i>
Kalamian	Agutaynen	<i>magig-</i>	<i>nagig-</i>	<i>pagig-</i>

Table 2: *paki-* and its related forms with a ‘polite imperative/polite request’ function

Subgroup	Language name	*maki-	*naki-	*paki-
Northern Luzon	Ilokano			<i>paki-</i>
Central Luzon	Botolan Sambal			<i>(i)paki-; paki--an</i>
	Ayta Mag-antsi			<i>paki-</i>
	Kapampangan			<i>paki-</i>
Bashiic	Ibatan			<i>pachi-</i>
Greater Central Philippines	Tagalog			<i>paki-; paki--(h)an</i>
	Bikol			<i>paki-; ipaki-; paki--an</i>
	Hiligaynon			<i>pakig-; ipakig-</i>

Table 3: *maki-/paki-* and their related forms with a ‘requestive’ function

Subgroup	Language name	* <i>maki-</i>	* <i>naki-</i>	* <i>paki-</i>
Northern Luzon	Ilokano	<i>maki-</i> ¹³		
Central Luzon	Botolan Sambal	<i>maki-</i>		
	Halitaq Baytan [Sambal]			<i>paki-; paki--an; ?ipaki-</i>
	Kapampangan	<i>maki-; ki-</i>		
Greater Central Philippines	Tagalog	<i>maki-</i>		
	Bikol	<i>maki-</i>	<i>naki-</i>	
non-Philippine: Dusunic	Timugon Murut	<i>maki-</i>	<i>naki-</i>	<i>paki-</i>
non-Philippine: Dusunic	Tindal Dusun	<i>moki-</i>		<i>poki-</i>
non-Philippine: Paitanic	Kalabuan	<i>maki-</i>		
non-Philippine: Celebic	Kaili	<i>meki-</i>		<i>peki-</i>

Table 4: *maki-/paki-* and their related forms with a ‘requestive’/‘causative’ function

Subgroup	Language name	* <i>maki-</i>	* <i>naki-</i>	* <i>paki-</i>
Greater Central Philippines	Maranao	(<i>ma</i>) <i>ki-</i>		<i>paki-</i>
Sangiric	Bantik	<i>mapaki-</i>	<i>napaki-</i>	<i>paki-; paki--an</i>
Samalan	Yakan	<i>maka- ~ meke- ~ meki-</i>		<i>paka- ~ peke- ~ peki-</i>

¹³ The ‘requestive’ meaning of *maki-* is found only with certain items such as *makinateng=ak=to*. ‘I will ask for vegetable.’ in Ilokano (Rubino 2000:349).

References

- Anderson, Stephen R. 1985. Inflectional morphology. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol. 3: *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, ed. by Timothy Shopen, 150-201. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Antworth, Evan L. 1979. *Grammatical Sketch of Botolan Sambal*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Arms, D. G. 1996. Categories of the Sindangan Subanen verb. *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics*, No. 3, ed. by Hein Steinhauer, 1-32. Pacific Linguistics A-84. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Asai, Erin. 1936. *A Study of the Yami Language: An Indonesian Language Spoken on Botel Tobago Island*. Leiden: Universiteitsboekhandel en Antiquariaat J. Ginsberg.
- Behrens, Dietlinde. 2002. *Yakan-English Dictionary*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1917. *Tagalog Texts with Grammatical Analysis*. Urbana: University of Illinois.
- Blust, Robert A. 1991. The Greater Central Philippines hypothesis. *Oceanic Linguistics* 30.2:73-129.
- Blust, Robert A. 2004. Austronesian nasal substitution: a survey. *Oceanic Linguistics* 43.1:73-148.
- Blust, Robert A. 2005. The linguistic macrohistory of the Philippines: some speculations. *Current Issues in Philippine Linguistics and Anthropology: Parangal kay Lawrence A. Reid*, ed. by Hsiu-chuan Liao & Carl R. Galvez Rubino, 31-68. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines & SIL.
- Blust, Robert A. 2009. *The Austronesian Languages*. Pacific Linguistics 602. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Brainard, Sherri. (comp.) 2003. *Karao Texts*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines & SIL.
- Crystal, David. 2003. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (5th edition). Malden & Oxford: Blackwell.
- Davis, Bill. 1995. *S. W. Palawano Grammar*. Manuscript.
- Durie, Mark. 1988. Verb serialization and “verbal-prepositions” in Oceanic languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 27.1-2:1-23.
- English, Leo J. 1986. *Tagalog-English Dictionary*. Manila: National Book Store.
- Evans, Donna. 1996. Causation in Kaili. *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics*, No. 3, ed. by Hein Steinhauer, 173-189. Pacific Linguistics A-84. Canberra: The Australian National University.

- Fukuda, Takashi. 1997. A discourse-oriented grammar of Eastern Bontoc. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 10.1:1-116.
- Gonzalez, Andrew. 1981. *Pampangan: Towards a Meaning-based Description*. Pacific Linguistics C-48. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Hidalgo, Cesar A., and Araceli C. Hidalgo. 1971. *A Tagmemic Grammar of Ivatan*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino [KWF]. 2000. *Diksyunaryong Filipino-English*. Manila: Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino.
- Lobel, Jason William, and Fr. Wilmer Joseph S. Tria. 2000. *An Satuyang Tataramon: A Study of the Bikol Language*. Naga City: Lobel and Tria Partnership, Co.
- Malicsi, Jonathan C. 1974. *A Structural Sketch of Halitaq Baytan (a Sambal Aeta Dialect)*. Diliman, Quezon City: University of the Philippines MA thesis.
- Maree, Rundell D. 2007. *Ibatan: A Grammatical Sketch of the Language of Babuyan Claro Island*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- McKaughan, Howard P., and Batua A. Macaraya. (comps.) 1996. *A Maranao Dictionary*. Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- Mintz, Malcolm W. 1971. *Bikol Grammar Notes*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Nava, Betty A. 1986. *A Grammatical Sketch of Mainit Bontoc*. Diliman, Quezon City: University of the Philippines MA thesis.
- Nojima, Motoyasu. 2009. Bunun prefix *makis-/pakis-* "to request, ask for": [An] evidence for PAN **makis-/pakis-*. Paper presented at the 11th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (11-ICAL), June 22-25, 2009. Aussois, France.
- Pawley, Andrew. 2006. Origins of the Filipinos: linguistic and archaeological evidence. Paper presented at the 9th Philippine Linguistics Congress (9 PLC), January 25-27, 2006. Diliman, Quezon City: University of the Philippines.
- Prentice, David J. 1971. *The Murut Languages of Sabah*. Pacific Linguistics C-18. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Quakenbush, John Stephen. 2005. Some Agutaynen grammatical details: personal pronouns, nominal markers, and tense/aspect/mode. *Linguistics and Language Education in the Philippines and Beyond: A Festschrift in Honor of Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista*, ed. by Danilo T. Dayag & John Stephen Quakenbush, 437-477. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Ramos, Teresita V. 1985. *Conversational Tagalog: A Functional-Situational Approach*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Ramos, Teresita V., and Resty M. Cena. 1990. *Modern Tagalog: Grammatical Explanations and Exercises for Non-native Speakers*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

- Ramos, Teresita V., and Rosalina Morales Goulet. 1981. *Intermediate Tagalog: Developing Cultural Awareness through Language*. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawai'i.
- Rau, D. Victoria, and Maa-Neu Dong. 2006. *Yami Texts with Reference Grammar and Dictionary*. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1982. The demise of Proto-Philippines. *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, Vol. 2: *Tracking the Travellers*, ed. by Amran Halim, Lois Carrington & Stephen A. Wurm, 201-216. Pacific Linguistics C-75. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1992a. On the development of the aspect system in some Philippine languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 31.1:65-91.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1992b. *Guinaang Bontok Texts*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 2009. Inclusive constructions and their development in Philippine languages. *Austronesian Historical Linguistics and Culture History: A Festschrift for Robert Blust*, ed. by K. Alexander Adelaar & Andrew Pawley, 267-294. Pacific Linguistics 601. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Reid, Lawrence A. (comp.) n.d. Talking Dictionary of Khinina-ang Bontok. <http://htq.minpaku.ac.jp/databases/bontok/>
- Reid, Lawrence A., and Hsiu-chuan Liao. 2004. A brief syntactic typology of Philippine languages. *Language and Linguistics* 5.2:433-490.
- Robinson, Laura C. 2005. A sketch grammar of Tindal Dusun. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in Linguistics* 36.5:1-31.
- Robinson, Laura C. 2008. *Dupaningan Agta: Grammar, Vocabulary, and Texts*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i dissertation.
- Ross, Malcolm. 1988. *Proto Oceanic and the Austronesian Languages of Western Melanesia*. Pacific Linguistics C-98. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Ross, Malcolm. 1995. Reconstructing Proto-Austronesian verbal morphology: evidence from Taiwan. *Austronesian Studies Relating to Taiwan*, ed. by Paul Jen-kuei Li, Cheng-hwa Tsang, Ying-kuei Huang, Dah-an Ho & Chiu-yu Tseng, 727-791. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.
- Ross, Malcolm. 2005. The Batanic languages in relation to the early history of the Malayo-Polynesian subgroup of Austronesian. *Journal of Austronesian Studies* 1.2:1-23.
- Rubino, Carl R. Galvez. 1998. *Tagalog (Pilipino): Tagalog-English English-Tagalog Standard Dictionary*. New York: Hippocrene Books.
- Rubino, Carl R. Galvez. 2000. *Ilocano Dictionary and Grammar*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

- Ruffolo, Roberta. 2004. *Topics in the Morpho-syntax of Ibaloy, Northern Philippines*. Canberra: The Australian National University dissertation.
- Scebold, Robert A. 2003. *Central Tagbanwa, a Philippine Language on the Brink of Extinction: Sociolinguistics, Grammar, and Lexicon*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: topic, actor, actor-topic, or none of the above? *Subject and Topic*, ed. by Charles N. Li, 491-518. New York: Academic Press.
- Schachter, Paul, and Fe T. Otones. 1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Shkarban, Lina I., and Gennadij E. Rachkov. 2007. Chapter 22: Reciprocal, sociative, and comitative constructions in Tagalog. *Reciprocal Constructions*, Vol. 3, ed. by Vladimir P. Nedjalkov, Emma Š Geniušienė & Zlatka Guentchéva, 887-931. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Spitzack, John A. 1988. Kalabuan clauses. *Borneo Language Studies I: Sabah Syntax Papers*, ed. by Charles Peck, 100-148. Dallas: SIL.
- Storck, Kurt, and Margaret Storck. (comps.) 2005. *Ayta Mag-antsi-English Dictionary*. Manila: SIL.
- Trask, Robert Lawrence. 1993. *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Tsuchida, Shigeru, Ernesto Constantino, Yukihiro Yamada, and Tsunekazu Moriguchi. 1989. *Batanic Languages: Lists of Sentences for Grammatical Features*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo.
- Utsumi, Atsuko. 2009. Semantic roles and the voice systems of Sangiric languages. Paper presented at the 11th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (11-ICAL), June 22-25, 2009. Aussois, France.
- Wolfenden, Elmer P. 1975. *A Description of Hiligaynon Syntax*. Norman: SIL.
- Wolfenden, Elmer P. (comp.) 2001. *A Masbatenyo-English Dictionary*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Wolff, John U. 1972. *A Dictionary of Cebuano Visayan*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Wolff, John U. 1973. Verbal inflection in Proto-Austronesian. *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez: Essays in Honor of Cecilio Lopez on His Seventy-fifth Birthday*, ed. by Andrew B. Gonzalez, 71-91. Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Yamada, Yukihiro. (comp.) 2002. *Itbayat-English Dictionary*. Osaka: ELPR, Osaka Gakuin University.
- Yamashita, Michiko. 1992. *Kakilingan Sambal Texts with Grammatical Analysis*. Diliman, Quezon City: Cecilio Lopez Archives of the Philippine Languages and

Hsiu-chuan Liao

Philippine Linguistics Circle.

Zorc, R. David. 1977. *The Bisayan Dialects of the Philippines: Subgrouping and Reconstruction*. Pacific Linguistics C-44. Canberra: The Australian National University.

[Received 12 January 2010; revised 29 June 2010; accepted 20 August 2010]

Institute of Linguistics
National Tsing Hua University
101, Sec. 2, Kuangfu Road
Hsinchu 300, Taiwan
hcliao@mx.nthu.edu.tw

菲律賓南島語的伴同動詞之發展

廖秀娟

國立清華大學

本文探討菲律賓南島語的伴同動詞之分布與歷時演變。透過探究下列三個研究問題的答案，我們得以重建菲律賓南島語的伴同動詞之演變途徑。

- (1) 「伴同」的概念是如何在菲律賓南島語的形態句法結構上表現出來的？
- (2) 是否有任何一個構形成分 (*formative*) 是常被用來表達伴同的概念？如果有的話，此構形成分是否可以被重建至菲律賓南島語的共同始祖語言？
- (3) 此常用的伴同標記是否有其他功能？如果有的話，我們是否能建構出這些功能的可能發展途徑？

關鍵詞：菲律賓南島語，原始馬玻語，伴同動詞，形態句法重建，語意演變