

## A Brief Syntactic Typology of Philippine Languages<sup>\*</sup>

Lawrence A. Reid and Hsiu-chuan Liao

*University of Hawai'i*

This paper is a brief statement of the typological characteristics of the syntactic structures of Philippine languages. It utilizes a lexicalist theoretical framework to provide comparability among the examples cited. The word order of both verbal and non-verbal predication sentences is examined, with pronominal and non-pronominal complements, topicalization, and auxiliary verbs. Philippine languages are analyzed as morphologically ergative. The morphological criteria for determining the syntactic transitivity of verbal sentences are examined, concluding that verbal affixation alone is an insufficient criterion. Attention is paid to the notion of *focus*, rejecting the concept of *voice* as an explanation for the phenomenon. The various forms of syntactically transitive verbs that have been described by others, for example, as signaling agreement with the Nominative NP, are here described as carrying semantic features, marking the manner of their instantiation with reference to the Nominative NP. The structure of noun phrases is examined. Morphological case marking of NPs by Determiners is claimed for Genitive, Locative, and—for some languages—Oblique NPs, but it is claimed that for most languages, Nominative full NPs are case-marked only by word order. Semantic agreement features distinguishing forms of Determiners for common vs. personal, definiteness, specificity, spatial reference, and plurality of their head nouns are described. Relative clause formation strategies are described. Most are head-initial, with gapping of the Nominative NP. "Adjectives" in NP's are typically relative clauses having stative verbs as predicates.

Key words: Philippine languages, typology, syntax, ergativity, transitivity, focus, topic

### 1. Introduction

Philippine languages are sufficiently distinct from other Austronesian languages that the label "Philippine-type Language" has sometimes appeared in the literature to

---

<sup>\*</sup> This paper outlines much of the material to appear in a monograph stimulated by a paper originally presented at the *International Symposium on Austronesian Cultures: Issues Relating to Taiwan*, held at Academia Sinica in Taipei, December 8-11, 2001. We wish to thank the funding agencies responsible for the conference for enabling us to attend, and also the participants at the conference for their comments following the presentation. We are also grateful to John Wolff for his detailed comments on the paper.

characterize languages that seem to share characteristics such as the so-called “focus system” that are thought of as defining those found in the Philippines. However, despite considerable overlap in syntax and morphology, there is a wide range of typological variety found among the more than one hundred Philippine languages. This paper attempts to provide both a broad characterization of the overall typological similarities found in the morphosyntax of Philippine languages, as well as a taste of the considerable variety distinguishing one language from another.

Although only a relatively few select examples are provided in this paper, they are (unless otherwise noted) usually typical of a fairly broad range of languages. The full version of this paper contains a much broader range of examples, selected from a considerable number of the more than one hundred languages across the archipelago, from Batanes in the far north to the Sulu Archipelago in the south and covering the full range of recognized subgroups within the Philippines. A syntactic typology can best be achieved when the languages are described within the same theoretical framework. It should be clear that such a situation is difficult to achieve, in that most language descriptions are the products of their authors’ distinctive theoretical orientations, and these are often left implicit. Moreover, the terminology of each description, even when couched within the same theoretical framework frequently does not exactly match. Particularly is this true in the labeling of syntactic categories and case forms. It should be apparent from the outset that we are following a lexicalist, dependency view of the nature of grammatical structure.<sup>1</sup>

We have proceeded therefore to reanalyze the data according to our own syntactic biases, and to provide a common set of terminology in order to make the descriptions comparable. Data that is cited from published materials therefore reflect the actual spelling conventions of the original (except that 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). Literal and free translations reflect where possible that of the original, although these have also been changed at times to more accurately reflect the syntax of the example. Grammatical labels are changed to reflect our own usage.

We choose to distinguish between case forms, such as NOMINATIVE, GENITIVE, LOCATIVE, etc., marked either morphologically (i.e., by the actual form either of the nominal itself or one of its co-constituents), or syntactically (i.e., by word order), and

---

<sup>1</sup> Our indebtedness here and throughout the paper to the work of Stanley Starosta should be obvious. We do, however, refrain from characterizing the theoretical orientation as “Lexicase” in that we depart from it in several respects, not least of which is the recognition of an undergoer macrorole, and the unapologetic use of terms such as affix (where necessary) to explicate the nature of verbal “morphology” in Philippine languages.

case relations,<sup>2</sup> namely PATIENT,<sup>3</sup> AGENT, CORRESPONDENT, MEANS, and LOCUS, which are determined by both semantic and morphosyntactic considerations. Since we claim that all languages under consideration are probably ergative, we do not distinguish an Accusative case form. We also assume that there are two semantic **macroroles** needing specification in linguistic description, i.e., ACTOR and UNDERGOER.<sup>4</sup>

Even though we analyze Philippine languages as **ergative**, we choose not to use the term “absolutive”, preferring instead the typologically more general term **nominative** for the least indispensable complement of a basic predication, and the one that is most likely to undergo deletion under conditions of coreference in a relative clause, whether transitive or intransitive. Similarly, since the case-marking of noun phrases that are the **Correspondents** (or “possessors”) of possessed nouns is in most Philippine languages

<sup>2</sup> Starosta (to appear) notes that “Lexicase case roles differ from conventional Fillmorean case grammar and other ‘thematic relation’ systems in that lexicase case relations are established by grammatical criteria rather than subjective language-independent situational ones. As a consequence, lexicase has so far been able to make do with only five case relations.”

<sup>3</sup> Our definitions of the case relations are as follows: PATIENT is “the case relation of the entity which is directly affected, located, or moves through abstract or concrete space, or of which a property is predicated.” Every verb that requires a nominal complement has one—and only one—complement that carries a Patient case relation. It is the “perceptual center” of the predication (Starosta 1988:123-4); AGENT is the case relation that is required, in addition to Patient, by all transitive verbs. Starosta (1988:124) defines it as “the dynamic/salient argument external to the Patient (cf. Halliday 1985:147)”; CORRESPONDENT is the case relation defined by Starosta (1988:124) as “the actant perceived as in correspondence with the Patient... or the external frame or point of reference of the action, state, or event as a whole”; Correspondent is also the case relation of a genitively marked NP in construction with a noun head, commonly referred to as “possessive construction”; MEANS is the case relation defined by Starosta (1988:126) as “the perceived immediate affector or effector of the Patient... the means by which the action, state, or event is perceived as being realized”; LOCUS is the case relation defined by Starosta (1988:126) as “the perceived concrete or abstract source, goal, or location of the Patient... or of the action, state, or event.”

<sup>4</sup> Our use of these terms is similar to those described by Foley and Van Valin (1984:29). They state, “[actor is] the argument of a predicate which expresses the participant which performs, effects, instigates, or controls the situation denoted by the predicate, and the undergoer [is] the argument which expresses the participant which does not perform, initiate, or control any situation but rather is affected by it in some way.... the actor is not equivalent to syntactic subject, nor is undergoer equivalent to syntactic direct object. These non-equivalences are reinforced when we look at single-argument predicates, some of which have actors and some of which have undergoers as their single argument, an argument which is always syntactically the subject.” We differ from them in that we also assign undergoer role to the second argument of transitive “activity” predicates, which do not carry undergoer role in Role and Reference Grammar (Van Valin 1993:49).

identical to that which marks the Agents of transitive constructions, we choose to use the more general term **Genitive** as the label for the case that marks both of these noun phrases.

## **2. Word order of predication constructions**

Philippine clause structure is typically right branching; that is to say, heads of constructions appear in initial position of a construction. In clausal constructions, this means that the predicate occurs first, with nominal complements, adjuncts, and other modifiers of the predicate typically occurring after the predicate. Clausal predicates may be headed by one of a variety of form classes, nouns, prepositions, or verbs, each being modifiable by the dependents normally allowed by these classes.

### **2.1 Nominal predicate clauses**

Since Philippine languages do not typically utilize copula verbs, predicate nouns constitute the head of nominal clauses. There are several types of such clauses, depending on the modification (or lack thereof) of the predicate noun.

#### **2.1.1 Classificational**

Classificational nominal clauses are those in which the predicate classifies the entity expressed in the Nominative noun phrase of the clause. The predicate noun is the label of a class of objects of which the Nominative noun is an instance. The predicate noun is typically a bare noun without a specifying determiner, and since it is a predicate, is interpreted as the head of the predication.

- (1) **Central Ivatan** (Reid 1966:62)<sup>5</sup>  
 Motdeh=qako.  
 child=NOM.1S  
 ‘I am a child.’
- (2) **Botolan Sambal** (Antworth 1979:34)  
 Mangongonà hi Pedro.  
 fisherman DET Pedro  
 ‘Pedro is a fisherman.’

---

<sup>5</sup> List of Abbreviations:

[+bfct]	beneficiary affect	[+dfct]	direct affect
[+drct]	directional	[+irls]	irrealis
[+mfct]	manner affect	[+lfct]	local affect
[-irls]	realis	[+mprs]	impersonal
[prdc]	predicate	[+sttv]	stative
[-trns]	intransitive	[+trns]	transitive
[+xlry]	auxiliary	1D	first person dual
1S	first person singular	1PE	first person plural exclusive
1PI	first person plural inclusive	2S	second person singular
2P	second person plural	3S	third person singular
3P	third person plural	actr	actor (agreement)
ADV	Adverb	AGT	Agent
cmpl	completive	cntv	continuative
COR	Correspondent	DEM	Demonstrative
DET	Determiner	EMPH	Emphatic
ERG	Ergative	ex	exclusive
fut	future	GEN	Genitive
in	inclusive	LCV	Locative
LIG	Ligature	LOC	Locus
N	Noun	ngtv	negative
NOM	Nominative	NP	Noun Phrase
OBL	Oblique	PAN	Proto-Austronesian
PAT	Patient	PEF	Proto-Extra-Formosan
pfct	perfective	plrl/pl	plural
Poss	Possessive	prdc	predicate
prnn	pronoun	prog	progressive
sg	singular	s.o.	someone
s.t.	something	TOP	Topic
them	theme	V	Verb
Tp.LK	Topic Linker		

(3) **Mamanwa** (Miller and Miller 1976:27)

Manga lodzoq ani ini.  
 DET.plrl bolo knife be<sup>6</sup> this  
 ‘These are bolo-knives.’

### 2.1.2 Identificational

Identificational nominal clauses are those in which the predicate provides specific identification for the entity expressed in the Nominative noun phrase of the clause. Whereas classificational predicates are typically bare nouns, an identificational predicate is either a definite common noun (usually accompanied by a definite determiner), or a personal noun, or a personal or demonstrative pronoun.

(4) **Kapampangan** (Mirikitani 1972:135)

Ing estudyante ing anak=ku.  
 DET student DET child=GEN.1S  
 ‘My child is the student.’

(5) **Balangaw** (Shetler 1976:151)

Haén ah Juan.  
 Pred.1S DET John  
 ‘I am John.’

### 2.1.3 Possessive

Possessive nominal predicates are a subclass of identificational predicates. These contain either a genitive, a possessive pronoun, or a locatively marked noun phrase interpreted as a possessor in the predicate position.

(6) **Central Cagayan Agta** (Healey 1960:13)

Kaluhung=ku yi Tinoy.  
 relative=GEN.1S DET Tinoy  
 ‘Tinoy is my relative.’

---

<sup>6</sup> Miller and Miller consider the Mamanwa form *ani* to be an “equative particle”.

- (7) **Guinaang Bontok**<sup>7</sup>  
 ?ásu=n      nan      sagguŋ=ko      nan      nanɿtəb      ?an      sik?a.  
 dog=GEN    DET    neighbor=GEN.1S    DET    bit      LCV    you  
 ‘The one that bit you is the dog of my neighbor.’
- (8) **Tboli** (Forsberg 1992:52)  
 Ke      Ting      sewel      yó.  
 LCV    Ting      trousers    that  
 ‘Those trousers belong to Ting.’

## 2.2 Prepositional predicate constructions

A prepositional phrase may constitute a clausal predicate. Prepositions having a wide range of meanings from beneficiary or purpose (‘for’) to directional (‘to, at, from’, etc.) are found in languages throughout the Philippines as prepositional heads of clausal predicates.

- (9) **Botolan Sambal** (Antworth 1979:35-6)  
 a. Para    koni    Jose    ya      libro.  
    for    LCV    Jose    DET    book  
    ‘The book is for Jose.’  
 b. Tongkol    ha      pag-ong    ya      kowinto.  
    about      LCV    turtle      DET    story  
    ‘The story is about the turtle.’
- (10) **Suban’on** (Verstraelen 1973:245)  
 Búat    Bonifacio    suggəntáw.  
 from    Bonifacio    the man  
 ‘The man is from Bonifacio.’

## 2.3 Verbal clauses

Verbal clauses have verbs as their lexical heads. Since all verbs carry a predicate feature, they typically appear at the beginning of a sentence, and dependents of verbs such as nominal and verbal complements follow. In the following description, we distinguish between two major classes of verbal constructions: intransitive and transitive. In this section we are concerned with the word order of the nominal complements of

<sup>7</sup> Examples throughout the paper without a source reference are either from Reid’s fieldnotes or have been constructed for the paper from his own knowledge of the languages, and may be over-ridden by the judgements of native speakers.

simple verbal clauses. Later sections will deal with the detailed description of each of these types, and of constructions requiring dependent verbal clauses.

### 2.3.1 Intransitive constructions

A verb which expects only a single nominal complement (i.e., one that can only be followed by a single nominal argument) is intransitive, and the construction of which it is apart is therefore intransitive. Depending on the form of the verb, this single complement is interpreted as carrying either the actor macrorole in dynamic structures (§3.3.1) or the undergoer macrorole in stative structures (§3.3.2). This complement is typically<sup>8</sup> the Nominative complement of the construction (whether it is morphologically marked as such or is morphologically unmarked). It should be noted that although a verb which expects only a single complement is intransitive, the number of complements that a construction has does not determine its transitivity. It is the *type* of the complements that a verb takes that determines its transitivity, not their number. There are many ‘meteorological’ verbs, such as ‘rain’, etc., that are intransitive but do not allow any explicit nominal complement, while there are other verbs that expect more than one complement which may also be intransitive, as discussed in §2.3.1.2.

#### 2.3.1.1 Single complement intransitive clauses

The typical word order of these constructions, as noted above, requires the Nominative complement to follow the predicate, regardless of whether or not it is a pronoun or a full noun phrase.

---

<sup>8</sup> There are some languages such as Botolan Sambal, Ivatan, and Tagalog which allow what seem to be intransitive constructions in that they only expect a single nominal complement, but that complement is morphologically marked as Genitive, not Nominative. These are interpreted as exclamations; e.g.:

**Botolan Sambal** (Antworth 1979:50)

Pagkayaman ni Juan!

wealthy GEN Juan

‘How wealthy Juan is!’

**Ivatan** (Reid 1966:58)

Japia=na no tao!

good=GEN.3S GEN man

‘How good the man is!’

**Tagalog** (Schachter and Otnes 1972:280)

Kaganda ng dalaga!

beautiful GEN girl

‘How beautiful the girl is!’



(11) **Pangasinan** (Benton 1971:195)

- a. Onbungá may kiéw.  
bear fruit DET tree  
'The tree will bear fruit.'
- b. Onsabí=irá.  
arrive=NOM.3P  
'They will arrive.'

(12) **Binukid** (Post 1992:xvii, xxii)

- a. Minulì si Pedro.  
go home DET Pedro  
'Pedro went home.'
- b. Napilay su balay=dan.  
fall down DET house=GEN.3P  
'Their house fell down.'
- c. Mapurisu=ka.  
get imprisoned=NOM.2S  
'You (sg) might get imprisoned.'

### 2.3.1.2 Double-complement intransitive constructions

Intransitive verbs may also expect two nominal complements. In these constructions the non-Nominative complement carries the undergoer macrorole. It is typically marked by either a Genitive or a Locative case form, although some languages such as Ivatan have a distinct Oblique case form that is used to express this extra complement. It carries the Correspondent case relation, and is typically interpreted as indefinite or as partitive. Constructions of this sort in ergative languages are often referred to as antipassive or pseudo-transitive constructions. The morphology of the verbs of these constructions however is similar if not identical to that of other intransitive constructions, and is very different from the morphology of transitive verbs.

#### 2.3.1.2.1 With a Nominative pronoun

In these constructions word order depends upon whether the Nominative is a pronoun or a full noun phrase. All languages prefer a word order in which a Nominative pronoun occurs immediately following the verb, with the other complement following.

(13) **Tagalog** (Schachter and Otnes 1972:294)

- Humawak=siya ng libro.  
hold=NOM.3S GEN book  
'He held a book.'

(14) **Mamanwa** (Miller and Miller 1976:98)

Anhinang=hao    ka    lagkaw.  
build=NOM.1S    LCV    house  
'I will build a house.'

**2.3.1.2.2 With a Nominative full noun phrase**

Languages such as Tagalog prefer that the Nominative full noun phrase occur last and that the other complement occur between it and the verb, although the alternative order is possible.

(15) **Tagalog** (Schachter and Otnes 1972:325)

Humuli    ng    magnanakaw    ang    pulis.  
catch    GEN    thief    DET    police  
'The police caught a thief.'

Other languages typically place a Nominative full noun phrase immediately after the verb with the other complement following, but also allow the alternative order.

(16) **Arta**

Matitim    i    minabulu    ta    binarayan.  
drink    DET    widow    LCV    wine  
'The widow drank wine.'

(17) **Mamanwa** (Miller and Miller 1976:70)

Ampalit    ya    maimpis    ka    gas.  
buy    DET    child    LCV    gas  
'The child will buy gas.'

**2.3.2 Transitive constructions**

A verb which expects two nominal complements, one of which is an Agent and the other a Patient, is transitive, and the construction of which it is a part is a transitive construction. The Agent carries the actor macrorole, while the Patient carries the undergoer macrorole. Since most (if not all) Philippine languages are ergative, it is the undergoer complement that is expressed by the Nominative case form while the actor complement is expressed by the Genitive case form. The following section deals with the word order constraints of two complement transitive verbal clauses. Section 2.3.2.2 will deal with transitive clauses that have more than two complements.

### 2.3.2.1 Two-complement transitive constructions

There is a wide range of transitive verb types in Philippine languages (the so-called “non-actor focus” verbs). However, within a given language the constructions in which these verbs participate all follow basically the same word order. The relative word order of these constructions usually depends upon whether or not the complements are expressed by pronouns or by full noun phrases.

#### 2.3.2.1.1 With two nominal complements

Typically, actors precede undergoers; i.e., a Genitive complement precedes a Nominative complement.

(18) **Guinaang Bontok**

ʔiníla=n    nan    laláki    nan    gayyəm=na.  
 saw=GEN    DET    man    DET    friend=GEN.3S  
 ‘The man saw his friend.’

(19) **Pangasinan** (Benton 1971:168)

Ibatík            nen    Pedro    may    manók.  
 run away with    GEN    Pedro    DET    chicken  
 ‘Pedro will run away with the chickens.’

#### 2.3.2.1.2 With two pronominal complements

The Nominative pronoun in some languages, such as Ivatan and Guinaang Bontok, is an independent form; in others it is the short, clitic Nominative form that occurs. Since clitic pronouns in Philippine languages are second-order, they immediately follow the first verb in the clause, with Genitive clitic pronouns typically preceding Nominative clitic pronouns.

(20) **Ivatan** (Larson 1986:75)

Kanen=mo    yaken.  
 eat=GEN.2S    NOM.1S  
 ‘You (sg) can eat me.’

(21) **Guinaang Bontok**

ʔiníla=na    sakʔən.  
 saw=GEN.3S    NOM.1S  
 ‘He saw me.’

(22) **Mamanwa** (Miller and Miller 1976:42)

Tambalan=mo=hao pagqisab.  
 medicine=GEN.2S=NOM.1S again  
 ‘You (sg) medicine me again.’

In some languages such as Tagalog, however, the relative word order of the pronouns depends upon their relative phonological length, with shorter pronouns preceding longer pronouns, regardless of their case form. Thus, monosyllabic pronouns always precede disyllabic pronouns. When they cooccur with post-verbal adverbial clitics, the order becomes: (a) monosyllabic clitic pronouns always precede adverbial clitics; (b) adverbial clitics always precede disyllabic clitic pronouns.

(23) **Tagalog** (Schachter 1973:215, Schachter and Otnes 1972:185)

- a. Nakita=ko=na=siya.  
 see=GEN.1S=already=NOM.3S  
 ‘I have already seen him/her.’
- b. Nakita=ka=niya.  
 see=NOM.2S=GEN.3S  
 ‘He saw you (sg.).’

In a number of languages, there are special forms that occur when a Genitive first person pronoun is followed by a Nominative second person pronoun.

(24) **Pangasinan** (Benton 1971:86)

Benegán=taka.  
 leave behind=GEN.1S+NOM.2S  
 ‘I’ll be going now.’ (Lit., ‘I will leave you.’)

(25) **Tagalog** (Schachter and Otnes 1972:185)

Nakita=kita.  
 see=GEN.1S+NOM.2S  
 ‘I saw you (sg.).’

(26) **Mamanwa** (Miller and Miller 1976:48)

Tambalan=tako.  
 medicine=GEN.1S+NOM.2S  
 ‘I will medicine you (sg).’

### 2.3.2.1.3 With pronominal Genitive and full noun Nominative complements

Most languages require that the word order follow the basic typology of actor preceding undergoer.

(27) **Central Cagayan Agta** (Healey 1960:36)

- a. Dinangag=ku    yi    ábe.  
     hear=GEN.1S    DET    Abe  
     ‘I heard Abe.’
- b. Zígutan=da    hapa    ya    abbing.  
     bathe=GEN.3P    also    DET    child  
     ‘They also bathe the child.’

(28) **Tagalog** (Schachter and Otnes 1972:60)

- Sinulat=ko    ang    liham.  
     write=GEN.1S    DET    letter  
     ‘I wrote the letter.’

**2.3.2.1.4 With full noun Genitive and pronominal Nominative complements**

If the undergoer is a pronoun, it may either follow a Genitive full noun phrase (as in the Central Cordilleran languages, Isinai, Balangaw, Bontok (29), Kankanay, Ifugaw, Kalinga, etc.), or precede it (as in Ivatan, Ilokano (30), Tagalog, etc.).

(29) **Guinaang Bontok** (Reid 1992:263)

- Dokoyen nan    iginaang    si    imañit    daida.  
     rush after GEN    Guinaang person and Mainit person NOM.3P  
     ‘The Guinaang people and Mainit people rushed after them.’

(30) **Ilokano** (Rubino 2000:liii)

- Nakítan=ak    ni    Maria.  
     see.2/3S.actr=NOM.1S    DET    Maria  
     ‘Maria saw me.’

**2.3.2.2 Three-complement transitive constructions**

Transitive verbs may also expect more than two complements. The third complement of such verbs is interpreted as carrying the Correspondent case relation, and is often encoded with either a Locative or a Genitive case form, and as with dyadic intransitives, the Correspondent is typically interpreted either indefinitely or partitively.

The relative positions of the Genitive and Nominative complements in these constructions is the same as that described in the section above on double-complement transitive constructions. The third complement may occur in any position relative to the other two, depending on whether the third complement is a pronoun or a full noun phrase.

(31) **Guinaang Bontok**

ʔinagtan paŋdal sakʔən si kindi.  
 gave Pangchar NOM.1S LCV candy  
 ‘Pangchar gave me a candy.’

**2.3.2.3 Languages with pronominal agreement marking of Genitive and Nominative arguments**

There is a small group of languages in the Philippines that require or allow agreement marking of either or both the Genitive and Nominative third person arguments. The agreement forms in any case immediately follow their verbal (or nominal) heads, usually have forms that are identical to their corresponding third person Genitive or Nominative clitic pronouns, and are therefore treated here as though they were case-marked clitic pronouns functioning as agreement markers, even though there is evidence that (at least in some cases) the forms may already have become incorporated into the verb as agreement features of the verb, and are no longer case-carrying pronominal arguments of the verb (Reid 2001).

**2.3.2.3.1 Intransitive constructions with agreement marking**

In many Philippine languages, such as Bontok and Ilokano, there is no overt form for the third person singular Nominative pronoun, so that agreement marking only appears when the Nominative noun phrase is third person plural.

(32) **Ilokano**

Natúrog=da dagiti ubbing.  
 sleep=NOM.3P DET.plrl children  
 ‘The children are asleep.’

**2.3.2.3.2 Transitive constructions with agreement marking**

In languages that require or allow pronominal agreement marking of Genitive and Nominative arguments, the order of the clitic pronouns is strictly actor preceding undergoer, although in Kapampangan, phonological processes have reduced some sequences to a single “portmanteau” syllable (Mirikitani 1972:169-170). Similarly, the nominal complements following the agreement sequence typically follow the same relative order.

(33) **Ivatan** (Larson 1986:11)

Oyod=na=sira            a    chinasi   ni    Ina       o    manganak=na=ya.  
truly=GEN.3S=NOM.3P    LIG   pity       GEN   mother   DET   children=GEN.3S=that  
'Mother truly pitied her children.'

(34) **Kapampangan** (Mirikitani 1972:173)

Seli=ne                            ning   lalaki   ing   mangga   king   tindahan.  
bought=GEN.3S+NOM.3S   GEN   boy   DET   mango   LCV   store  
'The boy bought the mango at the store.'

## 2.4 Topicalized constructions

Topicalized constructions contain an initial definite nominal constituent acting as theme of the construction. It is coreferential with one of the nominal complements of the main clause. Only Nominative and Genitive complements, Patients or Agents respectively of main clauses, can be topicalized. The Genitive Correspondent (i.e., possessor) in a Nominative phrase can also be topicalized. A Genitive or Locative (or Oblique) complement cannot be topicalized if it is the second complement of a dyadic intransitive construction or the third nominal complement of a transitive construction; this is because these are typically indefinite, and topicalizing would have the effect of definitizing them. A topic is typically separated from a following verb by an intonation break, which may also be accompanied by a bridging constituent, sometimes referred to in the literature as a **topic linker**.

In addition to the topicalization of the basic sentence constituents described above, adjuncts of various sorts may also be topicalized, but without resumptive pronouns. These constituents include locative and temporal phrases and adverbs.

Topicalized Nominative complements typically require a resumptive clitic nominative pronoun following the verb (as in (35)-(36)), although in many languages there is no overt form when a third person singular complement is topicalized (37).

(35) **Balangaw** (Shetler 1976:147)

Dàni,            opat=ani.  
TOP.1PE    four=NOM.1PE  
'As for us (ex), we (ex) are four.'

(36) **Mamanwa** (Miller and Miller 1976:102)

Izang   manga   tao,       namagsabet=siran   nga   siran   magabaay.  
that   DET.plrl   person   decided=NOM.3P   LIG   TOP.3P   gathering wild root  
'Those people, they decided together that they will go gathering wild root.'

(37) **Botolan Sambal** (Antworth 1979:54)

Hay dolo nin damowag ay hay kipit.  
 DET cover GEN carabao TP.LK DET tight  
 ‘The cover of the carabao, it is very tight.’

A transitive construction with a topicalized Genitive Agent requires a resumptive genitive pronoun (or actor agreement marking) following the verb.

(38) **Central Ivatan** (Reid 1966:130)

Qía qam palangena qo pagad.  
 TOP.3S TP.LK lead.3S.actr DET carabao  
 ‘As for him, he is leading the carabao.’

(39) **Botolan Sambal** (Antworth 1979:53)

Hi Pedro ay hiniyawan=na ya kabayo.  
 DET Pedro TP.LK saddle=GEN.3S DET horse  
 ‘Pedro, he saddled the horse.’

(40) **Kagayanen** (Harmon 1977:67)

Mari=an patinugaen=din bataq=an.  
 Mary=DET make sleep=GEN.3S child=DET  
 ‘Mary, she will put the baby to sleep.’

The Genitive Correspondent (possessor) noun phrase which is part of a Nominative phrase may also be topicalized. In some languages a resumptive pronoun is required, while in others, such as in Cebuano and Tagalog, it is not.

(41) **Cebuano** (John Wolff, pers. comm.)

Kanang mga artista, púlus artipisyal ang lihok.  
 that DET.plrl artist total artificial DET behavior  
 ‘Those artists, their behavior is totally artificial.’

### 3. Structure of verbal clauses

In §2.3 we dealt with the word order of simple verbal clauses in most Philippine languages. In this section we shall discuss expanded verbal structures, beginning with those requiring two verbal predicates. Verbs are of two types, those that do not require a dependent verb, such as all those that have appeared in the examples till now, and those that do. The former have been referred to as [–extension] verbs, the latter as [+extension] verbs. In Philippine languages there are typically two types of constructions having



extension verbs: those that may not have non-pronominal complements, and those that may. The former require the following verb to agree with them in transitivity, and sometimes also in tense or aspect. They attract to themselves any second-order pronominal or adverbial clitics, and sometimes other pronominal forms that would otherwise be complements of the following verb. These are the so-called “auxiliary” verbs, and are considered here to be the heads of their constructions, with the following “main” verbs acting as their dependents. These are discussed in §3.1; other types of extension verbs will be considered in §3.2.

### 3.1 Constructions with auxiliary verbs

Extension verbs agreeing with their following verbs are more or less closely bound to their following dependent verb. Those that are most closely bound do not have any intervening bridging constituent (often referred to in the literature as a **ligature**) between them and their complement, while those that are less loosely bound do.

#### 3.1.1 Closely bound auxiliary verbs

##### 3.1.1.1 Clauses with full noun complements, headed by auxiliary verbs without a ligature

The order of the noun phrases in these constructions is what would be expected for each language in similar clauses without auxiliary verbs. The second verb (that is the “main” verb) is a dependent of the initial verb. The most common type of auxiliary verb consists of negatives, with many languages having two different forms distinguished by aspect, the “main” verb agreeing with its head verb in its aspectual form, as in (42a-b). Far more restricted in Philippine languages are directional verbs as in (45), (48), and (51a) and aspectual auxiliary verbs as in (49), (50), and (51b).

(42) **Batad Ifugaw** (Newell 1993:21)

- a. Agguy nolo? han imbaluy=?u.  
ngtv sleep DET child=GEN.1S  
'My child did not sleep.'
- b. Adi lahhīnon Umāngob nan batu ede.  
ngtv separate Umāngob DET stone that  
'Umāngob won't separate the stones from that (soil).'

### 3.1.1.2 Clauses with pronominal complements, headed by auxiliary verbs without a ligature

As noted above, clitic pronouns in Philippine languages are second-order type: they immediately follow the first verb in the clause, and therefore attach to the auxiliary verb.

#### 3.1.1.2.1 With an intransitive “main” verb

(43) **Eastern Bontok** (Fukuda 1997:45)

Achi=yak            omoy.  
ngtv=NOM.1S    go  
‘I will not go.’

(44) **Kagayanen** (Harmon 1977:123)

Diliq=ka            magsagbak.  
ngtv=NOM.2S    make noise  
‘Don’t make a noise.’

(45) **Ilokano**

In=ka=n            agdigos!  
go=NOM.2S=now    bathe  
‘Go take a bath!’

#### 3.1.1.2.2 With a transitive “main” verb

As expected, all languages require that a Genitive clitic pronoun follow the auxiliary verb. Those languages which have clitic pronouns for the Nominative of transitive verbs maintain the same relative order for the pronouns, typically Genitive followed by Nominative (see §2.3.2.1.2) when they follow an auxiliary verb as they do when they follow a “main” verb. Those languages having a non-clitic form for the Nominative of transitive verbs, such as Yami, Ivatan, and Bontok, usually allow alternate word orders for this pronoun, whether occurring after the Genitive clitic pronoun or following the “main” verb.

(46) **Guinaang Bontok**

?adi=k            sik?a            laydən.  
ngtv=GEN.1S    NOM.2S    like  
‘I don’t like you (sg).’

(47) **Tagalog** (Schachter 1973:216)

Hindi=ko=siya            nakita    ngayon.  
ngtv=GEN.1S=NOM.3S    see    today  
‘I didn’t see him/her today.’

(48) **Ivatan** (Larson 1986:11)

Iyangay=mo=sira ipoha o manganak=ta=ya.  
 go=GEN.2S=NOM.3P throw away NOM offspring=GEN.1PI=the  
 ‘Take our (in.) children and throw them away.’

(49) **Yami** (Ho 1990:117)

Ya=na ipianuanuud iniu ni mapapu.  
 cntv=GEN.3S sing:for NOM.2P GEN Mapapu  
 ‘Mapapu is singing for you (pl).’

(50) **Manuk Mangkaw Sinama** (Akamine 1996:59)

Bey petak sigala leq ulan.  
 pfct wet NOM.3P ERG rain  
 ‘The rain wet them.’

### 3.1.1.2.3 Constructions with sequences of auxiliary verbs

Some languages allow a sequence of auxiliary verbs, the first of which is the head of the construction and therefore clitic pronouns, if any, immediately follow it in second position. Non-pronominal noun phrases follow the “main” verb.

(51) **Guinaang Bontok**

- a. ?adí=da ?i ?in?əməs ?ad dawəŋ.  
 ngtv=NOM.3P go bathe LCV Chaweng  
 ‘They’re not going to take a bath at Chaweng.’
- b. ?əsá=?ak ?adi ?uməy ?ad mayníla=s wákas.  
 fut=NOM.1S ngtv go LCV Manila=LCV tomorrow  
 ‘I will not go to Manila tomorrow.’

### 3.1.2 Less closely bound auxiliary verbs

Auxiliary verbs that require a ligature between themselves and their dependent “main” verb usually carry meanings such as ‘want, need, like, etc.’, although verbs with adverbial translations can also function in some languages as auxiliaries in the same manner. Like their closely bound counterparts described in the preceding section, they require the following verb to agree with them in transitivity, and sometimes also in tense or aspect. They attract to themselves any second-order pronominal or adverbial clitics, and sometimes other pronominal forms that would otherwise be complements of the following verb.

(52) **Ivatan** (Larson 1986:11)

Oyod=na sira a chinasi ni ina o manganak=na=ya.  
 true=GEN.3S NOM.3P LIG pity GEN mother NOM children=GEN.3S=that  
 ‘Mother truly pitied her children.’

(53) **Kapampangan** (Forman 1971:77)

É=ko bísa=ng maniwálaq.  
 ngTV=GEN.1S+NOM.3P want=LIG believe  
 ‘I don’t want to believe (it).’

(54) **Botolan Sambal** (Antworth 1979:70)

Ka-ilangan=ka=n mako ri.  
 must=NOM.2S=LK come here  
 ‘You (sg) must come here.’

### 3.2 Constructions with non-auxiliary extension verbs

The kinds of verbs which head these constructions typically carry modal meanings, like the less closely bound auxiliaries described in the previous section, but differ from them in that they do not require their following verb to agree with them in transitivity. Note that the auxiliary verbs in (55) and (56a) are transitive, in that they require a Genitive complement, but their following verbs are intransitive, while in (56b) both the auxiliary and the following verb are transitive. Schachter and Otnes (1972:266) label them “pseudo-verbs”. Most languages require a ligature between them and the following verb.

(55) **Ivatan** (Larson 1986:8)

Kakey=da a somidong sira.  
 want=GEN.3P LIG help NOM.3P  
 ‘They wanted to help them.’

(56) **Tagalog** (Schachter and Otnes 1972:266, 268)

- a. Gusto=ko=ng mangisdà.  
 want=GEN.1S=LIG go fishing  
 ‘I want to go fishing.’
- b. Gusto=ko=ng lutuin ni Maria ang pagkain.  
 want=GEN.1S=LIG cook DET Maria DET food  
 ‘I would like/want Maria to cook the food.’

### 3.3 The form of verbs in Philippine languages

Much has been made in the literature of the sometimes inordinate complexity of

verb forms in Philippine languages; only some of it can be touched on here. The most common view—one that we explicitly reject—is that verbs carry voice inflection. From this point of view, most Philippine languages have an “active” voice, sometimes called “actor focus”, and a number of “passive” voices, being variously labelled “goal/object/patient/theme/direct focus”, “instrument/associative focus”, “locative/referent focus”, “benefactive focus”, etc., which supposedly determine, or agree with, the case of the “focused/topic/subject” noun phrase. We claim that the so-called “voice-marking affixes” are not inflectional but derivational, in that they cannot freely occur on all verbs, do not freely commute with one another as in a voice-marking system, and are typically maintained in nominalizations and other derivational processes.

This view of the nature of Philippine verbs has resulted in a tendency for Philippine languages (and others with similar structures in western Malayo-Polynesian and Formosan languages) to be viewed as somehow unique among the world’s languages. Our claim is that these languages are in many respects typologically very similar to other Austronesian languages, especially those which have an ergative actancy system, and that the affixes which are said to mark instrument, locative, and benefactive focus are similar to those that have been described as applicative affixes for other languages (Mithun 1994:260, Payne 1997:54, Starosta 2002:468).

In addition to the so-called “voice-marking” affixes, there are a number of other classes of affixal forms, all of which are derivational. These include causatives, distributives, statives, etc. A number of reduplicative processes typically mark various tense or aspectual distinctions, and are likewise considered to be derivational, as are the forms that mark perfective aspect (“past tense”) in most languages. Very few of these forms can be mentioned here, and none can be discussed in detail.

### **3.3.1 Dynamic verbs**

A major distinction has been drawn between two major classes of verbs in Philippine languages: dynamic vs. stative. The distinction is necessary to capture the pervasive difference between the verbs of intransitive sentences which expect their Patient to express an actor macrorole, and those which expect it to carry an undergoer macrorole. In that the derivation of stative verbs is subsequent to the derivation of transitive verbs, we shall need to discuss the various types of both intransitive and transitive derivation, prior to the discussion of stative derivation.

#### **3.3.1.1 Transitive vs. intransitive**

In §2.3.1 and §2.3.2, a distinction was drawn between transitive and intransitive constructions. The distinction was drawn on syntactic grounds, within the boundaries of

the theory we are using. Intransitive constructions do not allow an Agent case relation. Transitive clauses do. The single complement of monadic intransitive constructions is considered to express a Patient case relation. Every verb carries with it a feature, marked by an affix or not, which specifies whether the construction which it heads will be transitive or intransitive. In the following discussion, we shall consider some of the features distinguishing these verb types from one another.

### **3.3.1.1.1 Intransitive verbs**

Intransitive dynamic verbs carry the feature  $[-trns]$ . They expect at least a nominal complement carrying the Patient case relation and the actor macrorole, and may expect other complements as well.

#### **3.3.1.1.1.1 Intransitive verbs with affixation**

Most intransitive verbs carry affixation. It would, however, be a mistake to believe that the affixes commonly found on such verbs are intransitive affixes. Many of the affixes commonly found on intransitive verbs may also be found occurring on transitive verbs, or vice versa (see for example §3.3.2.1.1.2 et seq.), and since the affixes are all derivational, they can be carried over into de-verbal nominalizations, which, when not predicational, are neither transitive nor intransitive. As noted above, an intransitive verb is one that expects a certain configuration of nominal complements; specifically, at least a Nominative Patient, and, for some intransitive verbs, possible additional nominal complements, but never (in Philippine languages) a Genitive (or Ergative) Agent. Verbs having these specifications often carry affixation which suggests—though does not always prove—that the form is intransitive. The transitivity of any verb is only clear when it is accompanied by its panoply of complements and in the context of other sentential elements. In the next sections we shall discuss some of the affixation which is commonly found on intransitive verbs, and note the features that these affixes add to the verbs on which they occur. Our discussion will focus on the forms of verbs found as heads of independent sentences, but will not cover here special verb forms found in some languages on verbs that occur as dependents of other verbs.

##### **3.3.1.1.1.1.1 Reflexes of PEF \*-um-/\*mu-/\*m-**

Most, if not all, Philippine languages retain a reflex of PEF \*-um-/\*mu-/\*m-. The alternation was probably originally the result of a phonologically conditioned metathesis of the first two consonants of a word on which the form occurred, since the infix occurred following the initial consonant of a word. However, no Philippine language today maintains all forms as phonological alternates. Some of the Central Philippine

languages (such as Cebuano), however, maintain the form as a prefix, while Inibaloi has a form *on-*, in non-perfective verbs, and *-im-*, in perfective verbs. The third variant, at least maintained in Ivatan, Batak, Tboli, and Kalamian Tagbanwa, replaces a word-initial bilabial consonant or glottal stop, and probably developed by syncopation of the initial CV syllable of an infixed word beginning with two bilabial consonants.

(57) **Kalamian Tagbanwa** (Ruch 1964:23)

- matay* < *UM+patay* 'will die naturally'  
*meles* < *UM+beles* 'will borrow naturally'  
*mekel* < *UM+qekel* 'will obtain as a matter of course'

For the purposes of this paper, the affix will be referred to as *UM*, and verbs which carry this affix as *UM* verbs.

### 3.3.1.1.1.1.1 Reflexes on historically underived verbs

In Philippine languages, the effect of adding *UM* to a word depends on the semantics of the word to which it is added. Forms which signify semantically intransitive physical actions, such as 'coming', 'going', or 'walking', commonly carry *UM* when the form is a monadic intransitive verb, or is a nominalization of that form. The verbs are considered to carry a semantic feature which implies the interpretation of the Patient. *UM* verbs always imply that the Patient is an actor. This verb class also includes a number of semantically transitive physical actions, such as 'eating', 'drinking', or 'buying'. These *UM* verbs typically imply intentional activity on the part of their actors. They have also been described as being punctual, or the starting point of actions that can be durative. In any case, the actor macrorole is associated with the Patient of the clause.

(58) **Ilokano**

- Tumakder dagidiay babbái intóno sumrek ti mayor.  
 [-trns] [-trns]  
 stand up those women when enter DET mayor  
 'Those women will stand up when the mayor enters.'

(59) **Guinaang Bontok**

- ?as ?uminum=da=s wákas.  
 [-trns]  
 fut drink=NOM.3P=LCV morrow  
 'They will drink tomorrow.'

In most Philippine languages, there is a class of semantically transitive *UM* verbs which are syntactically dyadic intransitive verbs. In addition to the Patient which is interpreted as actor, the verbs expect an additional complement whose case relation is always Correspondent and is interpreted as the undergoer. This complement expresses an entity whose interpretation may be either indefinite, or partitive, but is typically never definite.

(60) **Isnag** (Barlaan 1999:40)

Sumiqlat ka ma:n ka bu:lu?  
 split NOM.2S please LCV bamboo  
 ‘Would you (sg) please split a piece of bamboo?’

(61) **Guinaang Bontok**

?as lumáku=da=s nan kapi=s wákas.  
 fut buy=NOM.3P=LCV DET coffee=LCV tomorrow  
 ‘They will buy some of the coffee tomorrow.’ (Lit., ‘They will buy of/from the coffee tomorrow.’)

Forms which signify qualities, such as ‘tall’, ‘fat’, or, ‘old’, commonly carry *UM* when the form is a (monadic) intransitive verb, or is a nominalization of that form. Unlike the punctual *UM* verbs just described, these verbs carry an inchoative feature implying that the actor Patient is becoming, or has become, the state which is predicated of it. These *UM* verbs do not imply intentional activity on the part of their actors.

(62) **Ilokano**

Lumukmeg=da dagiti ubbing.  
 fat=NOM.3P DET.plrl children  
 ‘The children are getting fat.’

### 3.3.1.1.1.1.2 Reflexes on historically derived verbs

There are two large classes of verbs that historically developed by attaching *UM* to a word that had been previously derived with one of two prefixes, either PEF \*paR- or \*paN-, to form PEF \*maR- or \*maN-, respectively. There is a wide range of functions associated with each of these verbs, because of the semantic features added to the verb by the original derivations. Only a few of the common types can be mentioned here. We shall begin by discussing general features of reflexes of the PEF \*maR- verbs and follow with a brief discussion of the general features of reflexes of the PEF \*maN- verbs.



### 3.3.1.1.1.1.2.1 Reflexes of PEF \*maR-

Reflexes of PEF \*maR- verbs (henceforth *MAG* verbs) typically appear as either *ag-*, *mag-*, or *may-*, in languages in which the expected reflex of \*R is *g* or *y*. The South-Central Cordilleran languages, in which the reflex of \*R is *l*, all show the innovated form *man-*, or a further development, such as *an-*, *men-*, *en-*, or *in-*. In many languages the historical connection with the earlier derived form is maintained, with the *p-* initial forms being maintained in gerundive nominalizations. In others, however, the association must have been lost, and the *p-* initial nominalizations of the verbs are absent, except in a few frozen forms. In contrast to *UM* verbs, which are either punctual or inchoative, *MAG* verbs have been described as being durative.

#### (63) Ilokano

Agtakder=da=nto      dagidiay    babbái    idiay    tugaw=da.  
 stand=NOM.3P=fut    those      women    LCV      chair=GEN.3P  
 ‘Those women will stand on their chairs.’

Other semantic features associated with *MAG* verbs are reflexive and reciprocal. Compare *MAG* verbs with *UM* verbs derived from the same source in (64a, b). The reflexive *MAG* verbs in (64a) are all monadic intransitive verbs, with singular or plural Patient actors as their Nominative complement, while the reciprocal *MAG* verbs in (64b) are all monadic intransitive verbs, with non-singular Patient actors as their Nominative complement.

#### (64) Tagalog (Pittman 1966:12, 13)

- |    |           |                                      |          |                               |
|----|-----------|--------------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|
| a. | maggamót  | ‘to treat one’s self for an illness’ | gumamót  | ‘to treat illness’            |
|    | mag-ahit  | ‘to shave one’s self’                | umahit   | ‘to shave others’             |
|    | magsanay  | ‘to train one’s self’                | sumanay  | ‘to train others’             |
| b. | magbati   | ‘to greet each other’                | bumati   | ‘to greet another’            |
|    | magkamáy  | ‘to shake hands with each other’     | kumamáy  | ‘to shake hands with someone’ |
|    | magsiping | ‘to lie down near each other’        | sumiping | ‘to come near somebody’       |

### 3.3.1.1.1.1.2.2 Reflexes of PEF \*maN-

Reflexes of PEF \*maN- verbs are found in most Philippine languages, but have been lost in some Manobo and other languages in the south of Mindanao. In most languages which maintain a reflex, the final nasal assimilates to the point of articulation of the initial consonant of the source from which the verb is derived, with resulting loss of that consonant if it is a voiceless obstruent. Like *MAG* verbs, in many languages the historical connection with their earlier derived form is maintained, with the *p-* initial

forms being maintained in gerundive nominalizations. In others, however, the association must have been lost, and the *p*- initial nominalizations of the verbs are absent, except in a few frozen forms.

Like the two classes already discussed, reflexes of PEF \*maN- verbs (henceforth *MANG* verbs) always imply that the Patient is an actor. In contrast to *UM* verbs (which are either punctual or inchoative) and *MAG* verbs (which are durative), *MANG* verbs (especially those that are monadic) are distributive, implying multiple activities, actions, or actors over time or space. Whereas *MAG* verbs are typically monadic intransitives, *MANG* verbs are frequently dyadic intransitives with Correspondents interpreted as undergoers, and in many cases, homophonous monadic forms exist alongside their dyadic counterparts.

(65) **Guinaang Bontok**

ʔas maŋan=kami=s tuŋŋa=s masdəm.  
 fut eat=NOM.1PE=LCV corn=LCV night  
 ‘We’ll eat corn tonight.’

(66) **Isnag** (Barlaan 1999:40)

naNiqdut ki duqdut na anuq.  
 cmpl.pluck LCV feather GEN chicken  
 ‘He plucked a feather of a/the chicken.’

### 3.3.1.1.2 Transitive verbs

Transitive verbs expect a minimum of two complements to be associated with them, one an Agent, the other a Patient. The Agent always carries the actor macrorole; the Patient carries the undergoer macrorole. In many older descriptions of Philippine languages, these verbs (and the constructions which they head) were described as ‘passives’, because the Patient argument is always encoded as the Nominative noun phrase of the sentence.

#### 3.3.1.1.2.1 Transitive verbs with affixation

Most Philippine languages maintain transitive verb forms that contain one or more of a number of affixes that are reflexes of forms that have been reconstructed for early stages of the Austronesian language family (Starosta, Pawley and Reid 1982, Wolff 1973, Ross 1995a, b). As was noted above (§3.3.1.1.1.1) for affixes found on intransitive verbs, it would be a mistake to consider that these affixes make the verbs transitive. Verbs can be transitive with or without any of these affixes, and each of the affixes can be found on verbs that are intransitive, often in combination with the affixes that have been described in the sections above on intransitive verb affixation, as well as on

nominalizations that are derivations of both transitive and intransitive verbs.

### 3.3.1.1.2.1.1 Reflexes of PEF \*-ən

Reflexes of PEF \*-ən are found in all but a few languages of the Philippines. The actual form that occurs depends upon the reflex of PAN \*ə in the language. The verbs of this class (henceforth *EN* verbs) are those that have commonly been labeled in much of the literature on Philippine languages as ‘goal/object/patient/theme/direct focus’. This suffix typically appears on verbs, the semantics of which imply a directly and entirely affected undergoer. Since, in transitive clauses, an undergoer is always associated with the Patient complement, and Patients of transitive clauses in ergative languages are always expressed with a Nominative case form, the directly affected entity implied in the verb is the Nominative of a transitive clause. Thus semantically transitive *EN* verbs typically function as the heads of syntactically transitive constructions, although examples of their occurrence in syntactically intransitive constructions also occur, as in (67).

(67) **Ilokano** (Vanoverbergh 1955:147)

Kotonén ti inapúy.

[-trns,+dfct]

anted DET rice

‘The rice is full of ants.’

As noted in the previous paragraph, the presence of the *EN* ending on a verb implies that the undergoer is directly and entirely affected. We interpret this to mean that the verb carries a semantic feature in order for it to be so interpreted. We call this feature the DIRECT AFFECT feature ([+dfct]). Every transitive verb, unless marked by one of the other affect features, carries the direct affect feature, whether or not there is an *EN* ending on the verb. The presence of the *EN* ending generally marks the activity as being at least potential or in process, but never completed.

(68) **Mamanwa** (Miller 1964:90)

Bonalen=mo ya baroy.

[+trns,+dfct]

pound up=GEN.2S DET leaf

‘You (sg) will pound (completely) the leaf.’

### 3.3.1.1.2.1.2 Reflexes of PEF \*-an

Reflexes of PEF \*-an are found in nearly all Philippine languages. The verbs of this class (henceforth *AN* verbs) are those that have commonly been labeled in much of the

literature as ‘locative/referent focus’. Most *AN* verbs imply that their undergoer is an entity that is only partly, not entirely affected, or only whose surface is affected, or the end point of the action, the place to which or from which some other entity is directed. We call the feature that is part of such verb with an *AN* ending, the LOCAL AFFECT feature ([+lfct]).

(69) **Mamanwa** (Miller 1964:90)

Bonalan=mo ya baroy.

[+trns,+lfct]

pound on=GEN.2S DET leaf

‘You (sg) will pound (on) the leaf.’

### 3.3.1.1.2.1.3 Reflexes of PEF \*ʔi-

Reflexes of PEF \*ʔi- (from earlier \*Si-) are similarly widespread throughout the Philippines. The verbs of this class (henceforth *I* verbs) are those that have commonly been labeled in much of the literature on Philippine languages as ‘instrument/associative focus’. Most *I* verbs imply that their undergoer is moved in space, directed towards, or brought into association with some entity. We call the feature that is part of such a verb beginning with an *I*, the MANNER AFFECT feature ([+mfct]).

(70) **Guinaang Bontok**

ʔiyáli=m man nan kapi=k.

[+trns,+mfct]

come with=GEN.2S please DET coffee=GEN.1S

‘Please bring (lit., come-with) my coffee.’

### 3.3.1.1.2.1.4 Beneficiary affect

In addition to the three affect features that imply the semantic interpretation of the undergoer that we have discussed, Philippine languages can also typically imply the interpretation of the undergoer as beneficiary of an action. We refer to this feature as the BENEFICIARY AFFECT feature ([+bfct]). There are at least five types of languages in the Philippines, depending on how they mark such verbs: (1) those that use an *I* verb and no other for this purpose, such as Ivatan (71); (2) those that use an *AN* verb and no other for this purpose, such as Maranao (72); (3) those that use a “circumfix” *I-* *-AN* on such verbs, such as Balangaw (73), and most languages of the northern Philippines; (4) those that use either an *I* verb or *AN* verb, such as Mamanwa (74) and Tagalog (depending on the verb); and (5) those that use either an *I-* *-AN* verb or an *AN* verb, depending on the verb, such as Ilokano (75).

- (71) **Southern Ivatan** (Hidalgo and Hidalgo 1971:180)  
 Ipangamung ñi Kwan si Kusi.  
 [+trns,+bfct]  
 catch fish:for GEN John DET Jose  
 ‘John catches fish for Jose.’
- (72) **Maranao** (McKaughan and Macaraya 1967:xii, xxxii)  
 Tabasan o bebai so dati sa dinis.  
 [+trns,+bfct]  
 cut:for GEN woman DET chief OBL cloth  
 ‘The woman will cut cloth for the chief.’
- (73) **Balangaw** (Shetler 1976:50)  
 Iyanopan=yu ah Ama.  
 [+trns,+bfct]  
 hunt:for=GEN.2P DET father  
 ‘You (pl) hunt for father.’
- (74) **Mamanwa** (Miller 1964:90)  
 a. Bonalan=mo si Mam ka baroy.  
 [+trns,+bfct]  
 pound on=GEN.2S DET Mam LCV leaf  
 ‘You will pound the leaf for Mam.’  
 b. Ibonal=mo si Mam ka baroy.  
 [+trns,+bfct]  
 pound:for=GEN.2S DET Mam LCV leaf  
 ‘You will pound the leaf for Mam.’
- (75) **Ilokano** (Vanoverbergh 1955:164)  
 a. Sinaksián=mi ti lakáy.  
 [+trns,+bfct]  
 testified:for=GEN.1PE DET old man  
 ‘We (ex) testified for the old man.’  
 b. Lukatám ni ína.  
 [+trns,+bfct]  
 open.actr.2S DET mother  
 ‘Open for my mother.’

### 3.3.2 Stative verbs

In contrast to the dynamic verbs of Philippine languages described in §3.3.1, in which the Nominative Patient carries the actor macrorole, there is a large class of verbs

which are stative, in which the Nominative Patient carries the undergoer macrorole. In some recent descriptions of Philippine languages these verbs have been referred to as ‘passives’, but we shall maintain the use of the term ‘stative’, to avoid confusion with other uses of the term ‘passive’ found in the literature, which refer to the various so-called ‘focus’ types as passives. The status of stative verbs in Philippine languages, however, as true passives is probably justified, in that they are intransitive, there exists a clear derivational relationship between them and transitive verbs, and their actors are typically not expressed.

### **3.3.2.1 Stative verbs with *ma-***

#### **3.3.2.1.1 Reflexes of PEF \**ma-***

The reflex of the PEF \**ma-* affix which typically appears on stative verbs (henceforth *MA* verbs), should not be confused with the same phonological sequence that appears on reflexes of *MAG* and *MANG* verbs, each of which are the result of the addition of the original \*-um- form on words first derived with *paR-*, *paN-* respectively, so that alternation still exists in many languages between the *m-* initial forms as verbs and the *p-* initial forms as gerunds or other nominalizations. Stative verbs do not show a derivational relationship with any *p-* initial forms.

In many Philippine languages stative verbs can be derived with a perfective aspect feature, which results in the initial bilabial nasal being replaced with an alveolar nasal. Phonological processes in other languages have resulted in other patterns of change affecting the form of *MA* verbs.

Although intransitive, *MA* verbs are clearly different from the intransitive verbs discussed in §3.3.1.1.1. Dynamic intransitive verbs require that their Nominative Patients be interpreted as actors. Stative intransitive verbs on the other hand require that their Nominative Patients be interpreted as undergoers.

Stative verbs typically have a derivational relationship with (dynamic) transitive verbs and also carry the same affect features as their derivationally related transitive verbs. The following sections provide examples of stative verbs carrying affect features.

#### **3.3.2.1.1.1 Direct affect statives**

Direct affect statives are derivationally related to *EN* verbs. A *MA* verb that is not marked for any other affect feature carries a direct affect feature.

(76) **Ilokano** (Vanoverbergh 1955:194)

Maála ti págay.

[+sttv,+dfct]

taken DET rice

‘The rice is taken.’

**3.3.2.1.1.2 Local affect statives**

Many local affect stative verbs are derivationally related to *AN* verbs. A *MA* verb that carries this feature shows both a *ma-* initial sequence and an *-an* final sequence.

(77) **Ilokano** (Vanoverbergh 1955:194)

Nasagádan ti silid.

[+sttv,+lfct]

swept DET room

‘The room was swept.’

**3.3.2.1.1.3 Manner affect statives**

Manner affect statives are derivationally related to *I* verbs. A *MA* verb that carries this feature shows a *maʔi-* or *may-* initial sequence, although in some languages (such as Ifugaw and Inibaloi) the form appears as *me-*.

(78) **Ilokano** (Vanoverbergh 1955:195)

Mayáyus ti róot.

[+sttv,+mfct]

carried away by current DET grass

‘The grass is carried away by the current.’

**3.3.2.1.1.4 Beneficiary affect statives**

Beneficiary affect statives are derivationally related to, and carry the same affect feature affixes as transitive verbs with a beneficiary affect feature, whether it be *ʔi-*, *-an*, or both *ʔi-* and *-an*. A *MA* verb that carries this feature shows a *ma-* initial sequence as well as the appropriate feature marking for the language.

(79) **Ilokano** (Vanoverbergh 1955:195)

Maidaítan<sup>9</sup> ití bádo.  
 [+sttv,+bfct]  
 sew:for DET coat  
 ‘(He) has a coat made for him.’

### 3.3.2.1.1.5 Statives with expressed actors

Although stative verbs typically do not allow actors, some languages do allow actors to occur with *MA* verbs, which then also carry a potential or abilitative (in perfective forms) meaning. In at least some of these languages the structure is apparently being reinterpreted as a transitive construction, creating a new class of transitive structures; that is, one that takes a Genitive Agent, as well a Nominative Patient, and requires Patients to be only potentially or involuntarily affected.

(80) **Mamanwa** (Miller and Miller 1976:82)

Nabelad ya maimpis ka segaq.  
 [+sttv,+dfct]  
 be sunned DET child DET sun  
 ‘The child was overheated by the sun.’

(81) **Kabayan Inibaloi** (Roberta Ruffolo, pers.comm.)

Maon-an=ko=y aso.  
 [+sttv,+lfct]  
 be seen=GEN.1S=DET dog  
 ‘The dog was seen by me.’ / ‘I happened to see the dog.’

## 4. Structure of noun phrases

### 4.1 Word order

Noun phrases in Philippine languages are typically strongly right branching, with heads preceding modifiers. The only noun phrase constituent commonly appearing before the head noun is a Determiner.<sup>10</sup> Genitively marked possessive noun phrases always follow their head nouns, as do all relative clauses and other modifying elements. The great majority of Philippine languages do not have a distinctive form class of

<sup>9</sup> The third person singular Nominative pronoun here is zero.

<sup>10</sup> The classification of these forms as Determiners has recently been argued against in Reid (2002), where evidence is presented that at least some of these forms are better analyzed as a type of noun that is the head of its construction and requires a following predicate, either noun or verb, as its complement.



Adjectives, although many descriptions of Philippine languages utilize the term and some argue for it (e.g., Rubino 2000:liv). Most descriptive terms are either unmarked, like nouns, or carry affixation which marks them as a type of stative verb.

## 4.2 Determiners

There is a class of usually monosyllabic morphemes that precede the heads of most noun phrases in Philippine languages. These morphemes are Determiners and carry a number of semantic and syntactic features. Probably the most diverse determiner systems are found in languages in the northern parts of the Philippines, such as Ivatan, and some of the Negrito languages such as Casiguran Dumagat Agta, with languages in the south, such as Cotabato Manobo, Tboli, and Blaan having far fewer distinctive forms, and much simpler systems.

### 4.2.1 Syntactic and semantic agreement features of determiner systems

#### 4.2.1.1 Case-marking agreement features

Philippine languages show a considerable range in the number of distinctively marked nominal complements in verbal sentences. The languages with the greatest number of such distinctions are Ivatan (as in (82a-b)) and Kabayan Inibaloi, with Nominative, Genitive, Oblique, Locative, and Topic marking. Maranao (83) has four distinctive sets, Nominative, Genitive, Oblique, and Locative. Tagalog (84) and Guinaang Bontok (85) distinguish three sets: Nominative, Genitive, and Locative. Ilokano (86) has only two distinctively marked sets of case-marking Determiners, one that marks Locative noun phrases, and another that occurs with all other noun phrases; even this distinction is being lost, with Locative common noun phrases in Ilokano casual speech being marked in the same way as other phrases. Blaan (87) has few Determiners, relying primarily on word order and the form of pronouns to distinguish the case of its nominal complements. Although in this section we mark the forms introducing Nominative nouns as though they are in fact Nominative determiners, elsewhere in the paper we mark them only as Determiners (i.e., without case form specification), since we consider Nominative full noun phrases to be typically morphologically unmarked. (See the following section for more discussion.)

#### (82) Ivatan (Reid 1966:22)

- a. Mangamoqmo qo    tao    so    motdeh no    boday    do    vahay.  
     frighten            NOM    man    OBL    child    GEN    snake    LCV    house  
     ‘The man is frightening a child with a snake in the house.’

- b. No tao qam mangamoqmo so motdeh no boday do vahay.  
 TOP man TP.LK frighten OBL child GEN snake LCV house  
 ‘As for the man, (he is) frightening a child with a snake in the house.’

(83) **Maranao** (McKaughan 1958)

- Pekilana’an o raga so bok=ian sa pomada ki ina’=ian.  
 put on oil GEN girl NOM hair=GEN.3S OBL oil LCV mother=GEN.3S  
 ‘The girl will have her mother oil her hair with pomade.’

(84) **Tagalog**

- Ibinigay ng laláke ang libro sa bátà sa paaralan.  
 gave GEN man NOM book LCV child LCV school  
 ‘The man gave the book to the child in school.’

(85) **Guinaang Bontok**

- ʔiníla=n nan laláki nan ʔinmáli=d gugga.  
 saw=GEN DET man DET came=LCV yesterday  
 ‘The man saw the one who came yesterday.’

(86) **Ilokano**

- Nangan ti kabsat=ko ti innapoy (i)ti balay ti kaarrúba=k.  
 ate DET friend=GEN.1S DET cooked rice LCV house DET neighbor=GEN.1S  
 ‘My friend ate rice at my neighbor’s house.’

(87) **Blaan** (Abrams 1961:397)

- Nbat=ale dad angok benge kayu.  
 throw=NOM.3P plrl monkey fruit tree  
 ‘The monkeys throw them fruit of the tree.’

#### 4.2.1.1.1 Nominative

Although many descriptions of Philippine languages mark the Determiner preceding the head of a Nominative<sup>11</sup> noun as a case marker, we claim here that most Nominative full noun phrases are unmarked morphologically, and are distinguished primarily by position.<sup>12</sup> Typically, the Determiners listed as Nominative case markers (e.g., Tagalog *ang* (88a)) are also indistinguishable from those marking any definite noun, whether predicate (as in (88b)), Topic (i.e., fronted noun phrase, or theme), or whether cross-referenced with a following Nominative or not (as in (88c)), or phrase-internal definite complements, whether part of a Nominative noun phrase or not. The only agreement

<sup>11</sup> The Nominative noun phrase in Philippine languages is referred to in the literature in a number of ways, (primary) topic, subject, the focused noun phrase, trigger (Wouk 1986:136, Schachter 1990), and most recently, as pivot (Himmelman 1991, Ross 1995b).

<sup>12</sup> It should be noted, however, that Nominative phrases with pronominal exponents are case-marked.

feature that is common among these noun phrase types is not syntactic case, but the semantic feature of definiteness.

(88) **Tagalog**

- a. Pumasok ang babae.  
entered DET woman  
'The woman entered.'
- b. Ang babae ang pumasok.  
DET woman DET entered  
'The one who entered was the woman.'
- c. Ang babae, ay pumasok.  
DET woman TP.LK entered  
'As for the woman, she entered.'

**4.2.1.1.2 Genitive**

Most languages (but not Ilokano, and some southern Philippine languages) require the Determiner of a Genitive noun phrase to agree with the case of its head noun, so that the forms that precede a Nominative noun phrase are different from those that introduce a Genitive noun phrase. As indicated in §1, Genitive noun phrases typically express both the Agent of a transitive clause as well as the Correspondent, or 'possessor', of possessed nouns.

(89) **Guinaang Bontok**

- a. ?iníla=n nan magmaggit nan ?ásu=n nan sagguy=ko.  
saw=GEN DET young woman DET dog=GEN DET neighbor=GEN.1S  
'The young woman saw the dog of my neighbor.'
- b. ?iníla=n Dəgyəm nan ?ásu=n Takdəg.  
saw=GEN Chegyem DET dog=GEN Takcheg  
'Chegyem saw Takcheg's dog.'
- c. ?iníla=k si Dəgyəm.  
saw=GEN.1S DET Chegyem  
'I saw Chegyem.'
- d. ?iníla=k nan ?ásu=m.  
saw=GEN.1S DET dog=GEN.2S  
'I saw your (sg) dog.'
- e. ?iníla=m nan ?ásu=k.  
saw=GEN.2S DET dog=GEN.1S  
'You (sg) saw my dog.'

#### 4.2.1.1.3 Locative

All Philippine languages typically have a Determiner set which agrees with the head of a Locative phrase. In some languages, this form is ambiguous as to whether it is a Determiner or a Preposition. Unless there is clear evidence that the form is in fact a Preposition, we are here taking the position that it is a Determiner. Locative noun phrases typically encode locative and time expressions (90a), and purpose expressions (90b), all of which carry the Locus case relation. They may also express Means, such as instruments (90c), and Correspondent, such as the second complement of dyadic intransitive constructions (90d).

##### (90) Guinaang Bontok

- a. ?as ?ilá?ək si Dəgyəm ?as wákas ?as ?ili.  
fut see.1S DET Chegyem LCV tomorrow LCV village  
'I'll see Chegyem in the village tomorrow.'
- b. Gumá?əbka man ?as kapi=k.  
saw=NOM.2S ADV LCV coffee=GEN.1S  
'Please make a cup of coffee for me.'
- c. Kəláyam man sa ?as gípan=ku.  
peel=GEN.2S ADV that LCV knife=GEN.1S  
'Peel that one with my knife.'
- d. Naŋán=ak ?as nan ?ítab.  
saw=NOM.1S LCV DET bean  
'I ate some of the beans.'

#### 4.2.1.1.4 Oblique

A few languages, such as Yami and Ivatan, have a distinctive Determiner preceding indefinite nouns that are the second complement of dyadic intransitive constructions (82).

#### 4.2.1.2 Semantic agreement features

Determiners usually agree with their head nouns in one or more of a number of semantic features, depending on the language. The agreement features that we shall describe below distinguish the forms of determiners occurring with common vs. personal head nouns (4.2.1.2.1), their definiteness (4.2.1.2.2), spatial distance (4.2.1.2.3), specificity (4.2.1.2.4), and/or plurality (4.2.1.2.5).

#### 4.2.1.2.1 Common vs. personal

Probably all Philippine languages mark the distinction between common and personal nouns with different determiners. A number of Northern Luzon languages continue to use a reflex of Proto-Extra Formosan \*qi either as a personal noun marker (Itawis, Isnag, Gaddang) or as a common noun marker (the Negrito languages: Arta, Palanan and Casiguran Dumagat Agta, as well as in Ibanag). Pangasinan, although having different Determiners before Nominative common and personal nouns when the preceding word ends in a consonant (*si* and *so* respectively, among others), when following a word ending in a vowel, both personal and common Nominative nouns are preceded by -y.

Many Philippine languages outside the Northern Luzon group also retain an *i* (or -y) as a Determiner on Nominative common noun phrases; however, few languages still maintain a reflex of \*qi as a Determiner on Nominative personal nouns. Kapampangan has both *ing* (common noun) and *i* (personal noun) markers, and its distantly related sister language in the Sambalic subgroup, Sinauna Negrito, although heavily influenced by Tagalog, still maintains *i* as its personal noun marker in Nominative phrases. Murut in Northern Borneo also retains *i* with this function.

That \*(q)i was indeed used to mark personal nouns in the parent of the Northern Luzon languages, and has not simply been generalized to that function from its common noun marking function, is suggested by the fact that the full (i.e., non-enclitic) form of Nominative personal pronouns must be reconstructed with \*qi- immediately preceding the pronoun base. It is also suggested by the fact that \*(n)i must be reconstructed as the marker for both common and personal Genitive nouns, and is retained as such in Arta. In Inibaloi and Keley-i Kallahan it is retained only as a Genitive common noun marker, but in Ilongot (as in many other Northern Luzon languages) it appears only as a Genitive personal noun marker.

#### 4.2.1.2.2 Definite vs. indefinite

In all Philippine languages, Nominative phrases typically have a definite interpretation; that is, the speaker assumes that the addressee knows the general reference of the actant which is the head of the phrase. This is especially true of the Nominative Patients of transitive sentences (except when preceded by a numeral, to be described in the following paragraph). An indefinite actant is typically expressed by a phrase carrying the Correspondent case relation in an intransitive clause and is marked with a Locative, Genitive, or Oblique Determiner, as described in §4.2.1.1. Thus in (91a), *mansánas* ‘apple’ can only be interpreted as definite, since it is the Nominative Patient of a transitive sentence; while in (91b), an intransitive sentence, it can only be interpreted indefinitely,

since it is the Correspondent of an intransitive sentence.

(91) **Ilokano**

- a. Kanem            ti        mansánas.  
eat.2S.actr        DET    apple  
'You eat the apple.'
- b. Mangan=ka    (i)ti    mansánas.  
eat=NOM.2S    DET    apple  
'You eat an apple.' or 'You eat some apples.'

Nominative phrases are interpreted indefinitely under a few specifiable conditions: (a) when the head of the noun phrase is a numeral, often the numeral 'one', especially when introducing a new participant within a discourse, as in (92) and (93); (b) under certain discourse conditions (the discussion of which is beyond the scope of this paper). Bell (1978:4) notes that, "The requirement that indefinite subjects contain a numeral strongly suggests that final subjects of verbal sentences must be specific, even if not definite."

(92) **Ilokano**

- a. Immay ti        maysa a        balásang.  
came    DET    one        LIG    young woman  
'A young woman came.'
- b. Pinatay=da    ti        maysa a        nuang.  
killed=GEN.3P    DET    one        LIG    water buffalo  
'They killed a water buffalo.'

(93) **Cebuano** (Wolff 1967:340, cited in Bell 1978)<sup>13</sup>

- a. Usa ka    ambunga=ng    magti'ayon mi'abot sa    syudad sa    Manila.  
one LIG handsome=LIG couple    arrive    LCV city        LCV Manila  
'A handsome couple arrived in Manila.'
- b. Ni'adto=ng    panahona, lima ka    kinhaso=ng    daw salamin  
that.OBL=LIG time        five LIG seashell=LIG like mirror  
nakaplagan sa    mga    bata=ng    nagdula sa    babayon.  
find            LCV DET.plrl child=LIG play        LCV beach  
'At that time, five shining seashells were found by children who were playing on the beach.'

<sup>13</sup> Bell (1978:3) notes: "While Cebuano permits indefinite subjects, indefinite subjects do not occur freely.... [I]ndefinite subjects are better in pre-verbal position, at least in paragraph-initial sentences... There is another, much more serious restriction on indefinite subjects. An indefinite subject must contain a numeral."

#### 4.2.1.2.3 Proximate vs. remote

In the Northeast Luzon languages such as Paranan (Finkbeiner 1983:9), Casiguran Dumagat (Headland and Headland 1974:xxxii), as well as in Isnag (Barlaan 1977:111-114, 121), a distinction is made between nouns that have been described as present, seen, known, near, specific, factual, or alive, that is, features that we define as PROXIMATE, versus those that are past, absent, unseen, unknown, far, general, fictional, or dead, that is, features that we define as REMOTE. In the Northeast Luzon languages, proximate nouns are typically marked by Determiners with either an *i* or an *a* vowel, whereas remote nouns are marked by Determiners with a *u* vowel. In Isnag, the same association can be made.

Some Central and Southern Cordilleran languages, such as Guinaang Bontok, similarly have different Determiners for nouns that are either neutral or remote in terms of time reference and those which, although out of sight, are within the recent experience of both speaker and addressee, as in (94a-b).

##### (94) Guinaang Bontok

- a. Dəpapə=m    nan    sána            ?ásu!  
     catch.2S.actr   DET   that near one   dog  
     ‘Catch that (near) dog!’
- b. Dəpapə=m    san    ?ásu!  
     catch.2S.actr   DET   dog  
     ‘Catch that (recent) dog!’

#### 4.2.1.2.4 Specific vs. non-specific

In the previous section it was noted that in Philippine languages, Nominative noun phrases typically have a definite interpretation; that is to say, the speaker assumes that the addressee knows the general reference of the actant that is the head of the phrase. Knowing the general reference of an actant does not imply that the addressee knows the specific actant being referred to. Although Nominative phrases are typically definite, they may or may not be specific. The degree of specificity often depends on the presence of a demonstrative, either as the head of the noun phrase, or as a post-head modifier, or on the presence of some other post-head modifier such as a genitively marked noun phrase, or a relative clause. A number of languages mark a distinction between specific and non-specific phrases, with the specific phrase being invariably marked by a form which is either a demonstrative, or can be shown to have been a demonstrative at some earlier stage of the language. In some languages, such as Ilokano and Casiguran Dumagat Agta, such forms have actually grammaticalized into Determiners; in other cases they

may continue to be functioning as the head noun of the phrase.

In most Philippine languages, demonstratives may occur both as the head of a noun phrase and as a post-head modifier of a non-demonstrative head noun, often in the same construction (95).

(95) **Ilokano**

Nakíta=na      daydiay      nga      áso      a      daydiay.  
 saw=GEN.3S      that one      LIG      dog      LIG      that one  
 ‘He saw that dog (not some other).’

Such post-head demonstrative modifier phrases have, in a number of Philippine languages, become phonologically attached to their preceding head noun, usually with erosion of the final vowel of the demonstrative, forming a class of enclitic demonstratives. In Paranan, the forms are =*en*, =*ud*, or =*id*, and they may occur phonologically attached to the head of any noun phrase, Nominative, Genitive, or Locative which is preceded by a proximate Determiner (96).<sup>14</sup> The non-reduced enclitic forms occur in Paranan as emphatic (“pointing”) demonstratives.

(96) **Paranan** (Finkbeiner 1983:9)

- a. Nagbunga      iyan      i      bayabas=mi=yen.  
 fruited      that one      DET      guava=GEN.1PE=that near  
 ‘That guava tree of ours (ex.) bore fruit.’
- b. Madukas      i      anak=id      a      maupos.  
 bad      DET      child=that unknown      LIG      talkative  
 ‘A child who is talkative is bad.’
- c. Inkonya=mu      i      papel=idi?  
 what do=GEN.2S      DET      paper=this  
 ‘What did you (sg) do with this paper here?’

In Arta, a northern Luzon Negrito language, an enclitic =*i* is commonly attached to nouns, whether it is Nominative or not, to enhance its specificity; but it is never attached to a Locative Correspondent, which can only have an indefinite, non-specific interpretation. (Compare (97a) and (97b)). The same phenomenon is found in Tasaday (98), and perhaps in some other Manobo languages in the south of the Philippines.

<sup>14</sup> Finkbeiner (1983:9) notes, “The present marking suffix /-en/ implies the object is seen, near, and specific or present in time, while the suffix /-ud/ implies far distance in location or time, but still seen or known. /-id/ seems to imply future, absence, unknown, or very close.”



(97) **Arta**

- a. Tinim=di        i        binarayan=i.  
drank=GEN.3P   DET   wine=ADV  
‘They drank the wine.’
- b. Matitim    i        minabulu    ta        binarayan.  
drinking    DET   widow        LCV   wine  
‘The widow is drinking wine.’

(98) **Tasaday** (Reid 1999:9)

- Aken        sidu=i        migdega.  
NOM.1S    there=ADV   lie down  
‘I’ll lie down over there.’

#### 4.2.1.2.5 Singular vs. plural

A distinction between singular and plural Determiners for personal nouns occurs throughout the Philippines. The forms in the Cordilleran languages of the northern Philippines, as well as in some of the other languages of the Philippines are usually the same as the enclitic third person Nominative pronouns. Whereas the pronouns are second-position clitics, the plural Determiners are free forms; although as unstressed forms they may, like other Determiners, become phonologically attached to either the immediately preceding or following stressed form. This can be seen from the position of the future time adverbial clitic (=to following a consonant, =nto following a vowel) in Ilokano. In (99a), it precedes the plural Determiner *da*, whereas in (99b), it follows the clitic pronoun =*da*.

(99) **Ilokano**

- a. Mapan=to    da        Juan.  
go=fut        DET.plrl   Juan  
‘Juan and companions will go.’
- b. Mapan=da=nto.  
go=NOM.3P=fut  
‘They will go.’

Tboli appears to retain a historically earlier system, in which the plural form is still a third person agreement pronoun, with an otherwise unmarked head noun immediately following, as in (100a-b). That these are in fact pronouns, and not plural Determiners is suggested by the fact that both first and second person plural pronouns can occur in the same types of construction, as in (100c-d).

(100) **Tboli** (Forsberg 1992:11)

- a. Omin        le            Yê            Bong    gna.  
and then    NOM.3P    Mother    Big       go ahead  
'And then Big Mother and her companions went ahead.'
- b. Wen        le            Yê.  
there is    NOM.3P    Mother  
'There is Mother and the rest of the family.'
- c. Lewu    me            Kasi    funen.  
two        NOM.1PE   Kasi    owner.GEN.3S  
'Kasi and I are the owners.' (Lit., 'We two Kasi are the owners.')
- d. Gunun        deng    nù    se        tahu    blóng    ye        Dimas?  
where.GEN.3S   PAST   be    EMPH   true   division   NOM.2P   Dimas  
'Where is the true boundary between you and Dimas?'

In most Philippine languages, expansions of the head of plural personal nouns, as also of plural pronoun heads, such as those in (100c-d), are typically accomplished with a Locative expression, interpreted as 'with', as in (101).

(101) **Guinaang Bontok**

- Siya    sa        nan    ?ásu=mi        an        takdəg.  
prdc.3S   that   DET   dog=GEN.1PE   with   Takcheg  
'The dog that is Takcheg's and mine is that one.'

The marking of plural common noun phrases, although not obligatory in Philippine languages,<sup>15</sup> is commonly accomplished by the use of one or more of a number of pluralizing strategies. These are presented below, in the order in which they appear to have developed historically.

(a) By third person plural pronominal agreement with a marked common noun phrase, commonly in immediate appositional relationship to it, as in Itawis, Central Cagayan Agta, Guinaang Bontok, etc., as described above in §2.3.2.3.

(102) **Itawis** (Natividad and Solomon 1970:23)

- Naguribat=ida    ya        affi.  
dim=NOM.3P    DET    lights  
'The lights are dim.'

---

<sup>15</sup> Common nouns typically can have either singular or plural reference without overt marking. Most languages also have morphological devices for deriving plural nouns from some subclasses of singular nouns.

(103) **Central Cagayan Agta** (Healey 1960:62)

Ayagám=kid            mantu   sin   ya   atu   ikid   na   ugtá.  
 call.2S.actr=NOM.3P   then   here   DET   dog   plrl   DET   deer  
 ‘Then call here the dog and the deer.’

(104) **Guinaang Bontok**

Kasí=da            ?umawid   nan   tapí=na.  
 again=NOM.3P   return   DET   other=GEN.3S  
 ‘The rest of them returned again.’

(b) By means of a common noun Determiner, usually a compound of a third person plural pronoun, either (*da* or *di*) and a common Determiner. This strategy is commonly found in the languages of the Northern Philippines, as in Yogad *danu* (as in (105a)), Ilokano *dagiti* (106), Isneg *daya*, and Ilongot *díma*. These forms have apparently developed independently in these languages, in that the latter part of each form reflects the Determiners that have developed in those languages. That they are in fact functioning as Determiners and not as a sequence of pronoun plus Determiner is evidenced from the presence of Locative forms in which the compound is itself prefixed with the appropriate Locative marker; e.g., Yogad *takudanu* (as in (105b)), Ilokano *kadagiti* (106), and Isneg *kadayá*.

(105) **Yogad**

- a. Akkanan   danu            tolay   yu            ma:baw.  
 eating       DET.plrl   man   DET   cooked rice  
 ‘The men are eating the rice.’  
 b. Ya:da=m            yu            kwa:rto   takudanu   tolay.  
 give=GEN.2S   DET   money   LCV.plrl   man  
 ‘Give the money to the people.’

(106) **Ilokano**

Nakíta=k            dagiti            tattáo            kadagiti            babbalay=da.  
 saw=GEN.1S   DET.plrl   men   LCV.plrl   houses=GEN.3P  
 ‘I saw the men in their houses.’

(c) By following the head noun with a free (non-enclitic) third person plural pronoun. Constructions of this type occur in most of the Cagayan Valley languages of Northern Luzon, such as Central Cagayan Agta (107), Itawis (108), Gaddang, Ibanag and Atta, but not in Yogad or Isneg. It is also found in Paranan (109), on the northeastern coast of Luzon, and in Isinai, a Central Cordilleran language.

(107) **Central Cagayan Agta** (Healey 1960:15)

Awán ya lalaki=mi kiden.  
ngtv.exist DET man=GEN.1PE NOM.3P  
'Our (ex.) menfolk are not here.'

(108) **Itawis** (Natividad and Solomon 1970:19)

Lalakay ira nay.  
men DET.plrl NOM.that (remote)  
'Those are old men.'

(109) **Paranan** (Finkbeiner 1984)

Umagum bi en agum hidi a tolaiy dikoku.  
help also DET other NOM.3P LIG person LCV.1S  
'The other people will also help me.'

(d) By a plural demonstrative as the head of the phrase with a following dependent noun, as in Ilokano (110) and Guinaang Bontok (111). Constructions such as these occur in probably all languages of the family, since all languages have developed plural demonstratives.

(110) **Ilokano**

Aláem dagitoy (a) mangga.  
get.2S.actr these ones LIG mango  
'Get these mangos.'

(111) **Guinaang Bontok**

Iníla=k nan dǎʔəyda (ay) lallaláki.  
saw=GEN.1S DET those ones LIG person  
'I saw those men.'

(e) The languages of the central and southern Philippines, from Tagalog south, typically mark common nouns as plural by use of the plural Determiner *manga*, commonly abbreviated in the orthographies of Tagalog, Bikol, and some of the Central Philippine languages as *mga* (as in (112)-(113)). Tboli marks a common noun with the form *kem* (114). Manuk Mangkaw Sinama performs the same function with *saga* (115).

(112) **Bikol** (Mintz 1971:99)

Binarakál=ko an mga lápis.  
bought=GEN.1S DET DET.plrl pencil  
'I bought pencils.'

- (113) **Sarangani Manobo** (DuBois 1976:9)  
 Doen   menge   otaw.  
 exist   some   person  
 ‘There are some people.’
- (114) **Tboli** (Forsberg 1992:10)  
 kem gunù   ‘houses’  
 kem kudà   ‘horses’  
 kem libun   ‘girls’
- (115) **Manuk Mangkaw Sinama** (Akamine 1996:66)  
 Maha   bilahi   paragan   saga       anak-anak.  
 ngtv   like   run       DET.plrl   child  
 ‘The children do not like to run.’

Tagalog and some sister languages in the Central Philippines also have a set of plural determiners for personal nouns distinct from those discussed above: *sina*, *nina*, and *kina* (Romblomanon: *siná*, *niná*, and *kiná*, and Sibalenhon: *sína*, *nína*, and *kína* Zorc (1977:82)).

### 4.3 Relative clauses

The primary strategy for forming relative clauses in Philippine languages is to relativize upon the Nominative noun phrase and to replace it with a gap in the relative clause.

#### 4.3.1 Verbal relative clauses

The most obvious examples of these relative clauses are those in which the language requires a ligature between the head noun in the matrix clause and the relative clause, and in which the head of the relative clause is a verbal form. In (116a), the relative clause is intransitive, with a gap in place of the Nominative actant, which is coreferential with *fiarasang* ‘young lady’ of the matrix clause. In (116b), the relative clause is transitive. Since Eastern Bontok, like other Philippine languages, is ergative, it is the Patient of a transitive clause that is Nominatively marked,<sup>16</sup> and it is this noun phrase which is gapped in the relative clause and is coreferential with *kinchi tona* ‘this candy’ of the matrix clause. Similar pairs of intransitive-transitive relative clauses are given in (117)–(118). It should be noted that the pattern is the same for dyadic intransitive clauses (as in (117a) and (118a)) as for those with a single complement. Similarly,

<sup>16</sup> Referred to in some descriptions as Absolutive.

transitive clauses with an extra complement (as in (118b)) relativize in the same way as those with only two complements.

(116) **Eastern Bontok** (Fukuda 1997:66)

- a. Ammay hen fiarasang ay inmali ah oswelaqan.  
good DET young lady LIG came [-trns] DET school  
'The lady who came to school is good.'
- b. Ammay hen kinchi tona ay kenan hen fiarasang.  
good DET candy this LIG ate [+trns] DET young lady  
'This candy which the lady ate is good.'

(117) **Hiligaynon** (Wolfenden 1971:167-8)

- a. Nawalá' ang duhá ka nagbakál sang manyíka.  
was lost DET two LIG bought [-trns] DET doll  
'The two who bought a doll were lost.'
- b. Mahál ang pulá nga ginbakál=ko.  
expensive DET red LIG bought [+trns]=GEN.1S  
'The red article I bought is expensive.'

(118) **Mansaka** (Svelmoe and Svelmoe 1974:55, 57)

- a. Kikita=ko si Ilik na yagaloto sang bugas.  
see=GEN.1S DET Ilik LIG cook [-trns] OBL rice  
'I see Ilik cooking the rice.'
- b. yang bugas na pyapadara nang dato sang maystro  
DET rice LIG sent [+trns] GEN leader OBL teacher  
'the rice that the leader sent to the teacher'

Similarly, transitive clauses with applicative affixes<sup>17</sup> relativize in the same way. Thus the verb carries beneficiary-affect marking in (119a), while it carries manner-affect in (119b). In each case, it is the Nominative noun phrase which is relativized upon.

(119) **Eastern Bontok** (Fukuda 1997:66)

- a. Cha matoy hen amqama ay iloktowan=mi.  
prog die DET old man LIG get yam:for=GEN.1PE  
'The old man that we (ex.) go and get yams for is dying.'
- b. Nangina hen safon ay imqos=mo.  
expensive DET soap LIG bathe with=GEN.2S  
'The soap that you (sg.) take a bath with is expensive.'

<sup>17</sup> The so-called "focus", "voice-marking" affixes, "trigger-marking" affixes (Schachter 1990: 949-954), or "pivot" morphemes.

### 4.3.2 Non-verbal relative clauses

All non-verbal clauses are intransitive, and may be relativized in the same manner as verbal clauses; i.e., with a gap replacing the Nominative noun phrase, as in (120)-(121). Compare the relative clauses in (120a) and (120c), with the nominal clauses upon which they are based in (120b) and (120d), respectively.

#### 4.3.2.1 Nominal relative clauses

##### (120) **Guinaang Bontok**

- a. Sakʔən ay ʔamʔama nan ʔuməy.  
 TOP.1S   LIG   married man   DET   go  
 'I, who am married, will go.'
- b. ʔamʔama=ʔak.  
 married man=NOM.1S  
 'I am a married man.'
- c. Nan náʔay ay bənəŋ nan ʔaláʔəm.  
 DET   this one   LIG   bolo   DET   get.2S.actr  
 'The one you will get is this bolo (not that one).'
- d. Bənəŋ nan náʔay.  
 bolo   DET   this one  
 'This one is a bolo.'

##### (121) **Mansaka** (Svelmoe and Svelmoe 1974:57)

- Kikita ko kamo na kawbayan.  
 see   GEN.1S   NOM.2P   LIG   women  
 'I see you women.' (Lit., 'I see you who are women.')

#### 4.3.2.2 Prepositional relative clauses

All prepositional clauses are likewise intransitive, and may be relativized in the same manner, that is, with a gap replacing the Nominative noun phrase. Compare the prepositional clauses in (122a-b), with the relative clauses which can be formed upon them, (123a-b) respectively.

##### (122) **Tagalog** (Schachter and Otnes 1972:259-60)

- a. Para sa pagluluto ng kanin ang palayok na ito.  
 for LCV cooking GEN rice DET pot   LIG this  
 'This pot is (used) for cooking rice.'

- b. Hinggil sa negosyo ang usapan=nila.  
 about LCV business DET conversation=GEN.3P  
 ‘Their conversation is about business.’

(123) **Tagalog**

- a. ang palayok na ito=ng para sa pagluluto ng kanin  
 DET pot LIG this=LIG for LCV cooking GEN rice  
 ‘this pot that is (used) for cooking rice’  
 b. ang usapan=nila=ng hinggil sa negosyo  
 DET conversation=GEN.3P=LIG about LCV business  
 ‘their conversation that is about business’

### 4.3.3 “Adjectival” relative clauses

As mentioned in §4.1, the great majority of Philippine languages do not have a distinctive form class of adjectives. Most descriptive terms are either unmarked, like nouns, or carry affixation which marks them as a type of stative verb, so that an English structure that contains an adjective usually appears in Philippine languages as a relative clause construction, as in (124a-b) and (126). The clauses from which such Ilokano relative clauses are formed are shown in (125a-b) respectively.

(124) **Ilokano** (Reid; Rubino 2000:lxxx)

- a. dagiti baró a bádo  
 DET.plrl new one LIG clothes  
 ‘the new clothes’  
 b. ti naímas a digó  
 DET delicious LIG broth  
 ‘the delicious broth’

(125) **Ilokano**

- a. Bádo dagiti baró.  
 new DET.plrl clothes  
 ‘The clothes are new.’  
 b. Naímas ti digó.  
 delicious DET broth  
 ‘The broth is delicious.’

(126) **Hiligaynon** (Wolfenden 1971:167)

- Diútay nga báta si Pédro.  
 small LIG child DET Pedro  
 ‘Pedro is a small child.’



#### 4.3.4 Position of relative clauses in relation to their head nouns

Some linguists claim that there is freedom of word order for relative clauses in Philippine languages, that the relative clauses in (124)-(126) are actually head final, while those illustrated in (127) are head initial. By such an analysis, (128)-(129) would contain both head-initial and head-final relative clauses. However, in each of these constructions it is the form preceding the ligature that acts as the syntactic head of the construction in that it may stand alone, without the following relative clause, and it is the relative clause which is the specifying constituent. These claims are based on examples like (130a-b), and the fact that these relative clauses have appropriate basic clauses in which their predicates provide specification for their Nominative complements, as shown in (130c-d) respectively.

(127) **Botolan Sambal** (Antworth 1979:58)

- a. ya kabayo ya malhay  
 DET horse LIG large  
 ‘the horse that is large’
- b. ya lapis ya nikatak  
 DET pencil LIG lost  
 ‘the pencil that was lost’

(128) **Ilokano**

Nakíta=na daydiay nga áso a daydiay.  
 saw=GEN.3S that one LIG dog LIG that one  
 ‘He saw that dog (not some other).’

(129) **Mansaka** (Svelmoe and Svelmoe 1974:51)

yang mataba na baboy na maitum  
 DET fat LIG pig LIG black  
 ‘the fat, black pig’

(130) **Guinaang Bontok**

- a. ?intu nan ?inmayan nan dakdakəl (ay bú tug=ku)?  
 where DET went place GEN big one LIG pig=GEN.1S  
 ‘Where has my big (pig) gone?’ (Lit., ‘Where is the gone-place of the big one (that is my pig)?’)
- b. ?intu nan ?inmayan nan bú tug=ku (ay dakdakəl)?  
 where DET went place DET pig=GEN.1S LIG big one  
 ‘Where has my pig (the big one) gone?’ (Lit., ‘Where is the gone-place of my pig (that is the big one)?’)

- c. Bútug=ku    nan    dakdakəl.  
     pig=GEN.1S   DET   big one  
     ‘The big one is my pig.’
- d. Nan    dakdakəl    nan    bú tug=ku.  
     DET   big one    DET   pig=GEN.1S  
     ‘My pig is the big one.’

Examples in which verbal relative clauses appear to be head final, are similarly actually head-initial nominalized verbs, as demonstrated in (131a-d).

(131) **Guinaang Bontok**

- a. Sínu    nan    ?iníla=m                      (ay    magmaggit)?  
     who    DET   seen one=GEN.2S    LIG   young woman  
     ‘Who is the one you saw (that is a young woman)?’
- b. Sínu    nan    magmaggit                      (ay    ?iníla=m)?  
     who    DET   young woman    LIG   saw=GEN.2S  
     ‘Who is the young woman (that you saw)?’
- c. Magmaggit            nan    ?iníla=m.  
     young woman    DET   seen one=GEN.2S  
     ‘The one you saw is a young woman.’
- d. ?iníla=m            nan    magmaggit.  
     saw=GEN.2S    DET   young woman  
     ‘You saw a young woman.’

#### 4.3.5 Relativization of other-than-nominative nouns

The most commonly relativized nouns are Nominative, however a few other nouns may also be relativized. To our knowledge, there is no Philippine language which unambiguously allows relativization of either the Genitive Agent of a transitive sentence,<sup>18</sup> or the Correspondent of either an intransitive or a transitive sentence,

<sup>18</sup> Brainard (1997:120) claims that Karao exhibits a type of relative clause which modifies the argument of an existential clause. In such cases, either an ergative NP (Genitive Agent in our terminology) or an absolutive (or Nominative) NP can occur. When it is a Genitive Agent, it requires an anaphoric pronoun in the relative clause. When it is Nominative, there is a gap. An alternative analysis, and one which we prefer, claims that these are not relative clauses, but complements of the existential verb. An example follows.

**Karao** (Brainard 1997:120)

Gwara    di=y            ‘iKadasan            ‘a    ‘in‘anop=to=y            ‘aso=tho.  
     exists    there=DET   person Kadasan   LIG   hunt [+trns]=GEN.3S=DET   dog=GEN.3S  
     ‘There was a person from Kadasan who went hunting with his dog.’

regardless of the formal marking of these phrases in a language. However, the “possessor” of a possessed noun (i.e., a Genitive Correspondent in our theory) can be relativized.

#### 4.3.5.1 Relativization of a genitive correspondent possessor

Two different strategies are found in Philippine languages when the “possessor” of a possessed noun is relativized. Relativization of such a noun can only take place from the Nominative noun phrase of an intransitive (verbal or non-verbal) construction.

##### 4.3.5.1.1 Utilizing the gap strategy

This strategy is found at least in Tagalog, Cebuano (132), and in Mansaka (133), where what may be an inalienable possessor is relativized with a gap where the possessor would occur in a non-relativized construction. From the ungrammaticality of (132b), and similar structures in other languages, there are apparently restrictions on the kind and/or distribution of possessives that are relativizable, restrictions that are not yet fully understood.

#### (132) Cebuano (Bell 1976:124)

- a. Nahadlok siya sa sakop ni Iyo' Bruno nga nagkadugo'  
fear NOM.3S LCV group GEN Iyo' Bruno LIG bloody  
ang ba'ba'.  
DET mouth  
'He was afraid of Iyo Bruno's group, whose mouths were bloody.'
- b. \*Kusgan ang baka nga giputlan niya ang sungay.  
strong DET cow LIG cut off [+trns] GEN.3S DET horn  
'The cow whose horns were cut off by him was strong.'

#### (133) Mansaka (Svelmoe and Svelmoe 1974:51)

- a. yang otaw na way anak  
DET person LIG ngtv.exist child  
'the man who has no child'
- b. yang otaw na masakit yang siki  
DET person LIG painful DET leg  
'the man whose leg is painful'

---

Translated as a complement of the existential verb, it would be, 'There was hunting with his dog, a person from Kadasan.'

#### 4.3.5.1.2 With resumptive pronoun strategy

The other strategy for relativizing a possessor in Philippine languages is to have a resumptive Genitive pronoun in the position where the possessor would occur in a non-relativized construction. In these languages the possession that is involved is either alienable or inalienable, as in (134)-(135).

##### (134) **Guinaang Bontok**

- a. Nan tágu ay wadʔay ʔásu=na nan ʔas ʔuməy.  
 DET person LIG exist dog=GEN.3S DET fut go  
 ‘The one to go will be the person who has a dog.’
- b. Nan tágu ay ʔinsakit nan sikí=da nan ʔas ʔadi ʔuməy.  
 DET person LIG painful DET leg=GEN.3P DET fut ngtv go  
 ‘The ones who will not go are the people whose legs are sore.’

##### (135) **Kabayan Inibaloi** (Roberta Ruffolo, pers. comm.)

- a. Bara=d chiyay i kamatis ya enkontiling i dames=to.  
 exist=LCV there DET tomato plant LIG tiny DET fruit=GEN.3S  
 ‘Here there are tomato plants whose fruit are very small.’
- b. Yet inʼan=to=iray nangatoling tan katambaleg=a  
 and then saw=GEN.3S=DET.plrl black.plrl and huge=LIG  
 too=n abadeg i mata=cha, sangi=cha, tan tangida=ra.  
 person=LIG big DET eye=GEN.3P tooth=GEN.3P and tongue=GEN.3P  
 ‘And then he saw those huge, black people whose eyes, teeth and tongues were big.’

#### 4.3.6 Relative clause marking

All the examples of relative clauses in the above sections have indicated their presence following a ligature, a form which historically had its origin in a Proto-Austronesian demonstrative \*(n)a. The general function of the ligature was to introduce dependent structures, and it occurred not only before relative clauses but also before sentential complements with verbal heads. In several Philippine languages such as Ivatan (136) and Hiligaynon (137), the form *ka* occurs as a special ligature preceding relative clauses having numeral nouns as their heads.

##### (136) **Ivatan** (Reid 1966:101)

- qo qása ka kamay  
 DET one LIG finger  
 ‘one finger’

(137) **Hiligaynon** (Wolfenden 1971:168)

Nagalangóy siá sa isá ka piníli' nga ádlaw.  
 was swimming NOM.3S DET one LIG chosen LIG day  
 'He was swimming on one particular day.'

In most Manobo languages and in other languages in the south of the Philippines such as Manuk Mangkaw Sinama (138), ligatures have been lost, except in what were originally relative clauses headed by a numeral but which are now probably part of compound nouns.

(138) **Manuk Mangkaw Sinama** (Akamine 1996:83-4)

- a. anak-anak tuli  
 child sleep  
 'the child who is sleeping'
- b. lumaq poteq  
 house white  
 'the white house'
- c. lalla ma lepa  
 man at boat  
 'the man in the boat'

## 5. Conclusion

The space restrictions necessarily imposed on articles of this sort, have unfortunately meant that much that could and should be said about the syntactic typology of Philippine languages is left unsaid. Moreover, only the minimum number of examples to exemplify our claims could be included. The theoretical basis of the analysis is hardly more than alluded to, and we encourage interested readers to delve into the literature referred to for clarification of some of the notions we have here taken for granted.

A number of areas of syntax for which typological description has not been included in this paper, and which will be covered in a monograph in preparation, include a fuller characterization of the typology of verbal complementation structures, of existential verbal structures, of causative structures, of types of negation, and of patterns of occurrence of typically monosyllabic clitic adverbs. In this paper, moreover, we only begin to cover the immense complexity found in verbs and other form classes. These will also be addressed in the forthcoming monograph.

The amount of literature available today on Philippine languages is immense and constantly growing, and there is no doubt that our coverage may well have missed some

important works. We hope that readers who know of counter-examples to those presented, or who believe that our analysis of specific examples is incorrect, will contact us to enable us to give a better picture of the typology of this group of languages.

## References

- Abrams, Norm. 1961. Word base classes in Bilaan. *Lingua* 10.4:391-402.
- Akamine, Jun. 1996. *A Grammatical Analysis of Manuk Mangkaw Sinama*. Diliman: University of the Philippines dissertation.
- Antworth, Evan L. 1979. *A Grammatical Sketch of Botolan Sambal*. Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph Issue No.8. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Barlaan, Rodolfo R. 1977. Fact and fiction in Isneg narrative discourse. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1.2:110-42.
- Barlaan, Rodolfo Rosario. 1999. *Aspects of Focus in Isnag*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Bell, Sarah J. 1976. *Cebuano Subjects in Two Frameworks*. Cambridge: MIT dissertation.
- Bell, Sarah J. 1978. Two differences in definiteness in Cebuano and Tagalog. *Oceanic Linguistics* 17.1:1-9.
- Benton, Richard A. 1971. *Pangasinan Reference Grammar*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Brainard, Sherri. 1997. Ergativity and grammatical relations in Karao. *Grammatical Relations: A Functionalist Perspective*, ed. by T. Givón, 85-154. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- DuBois, Carl D. 1976. *Sarangani Manobo: An Introductory Guide*. Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph Issue No.6. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Finkbeiner, Marianne. 1983. Paranan noun markers. Manuscript.
- Foley, William A., and Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. 1984. *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Forman, Michael L. 1971. *Kapampangan Grammar Notes*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Forsberg, Vivian M. 1992. A pedagogical grammar of Tboli. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 9.1:1-110.
- Fukuda, Takashi. 1997. A discourse-oriented grammar of Eastern Bontoc. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 10.1:1-116.
- Harmon, Carol W. 1977. *Kagayanen and the Manobo Subgroup of Philippine Languages*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i dissertation.

- Halliday, M. A. K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Baltimore: Edward Arnold.
- Headland, Thomas N., and Janet D. Headland. 1974. *A Dumagat (Casiguran)-English Dictionary*. Pacific Linguistics C-28. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Healey, Phyllis M. 1960. *An Agta Grammar*. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- Ho, Arlene Y. L. 1990. *Yami Structure: A Descriptive Study of the Yami Language*. Hsinchu: National Tsing Hua University MA thesis.
- Larson, Virginia. 1986. *Ivatan Texts*. Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- McKaughan, Howard P. 1958. *The Inflection and Syntax of Maranao Verbs*. Publications of the Institute of National Language. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- McKaughan, Howard P., and Batua A. Macaraya. 1967. *A Maranao Dictionary*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Miller, Jeanne. 1964. The role of verb stems in the Mamanwa kernel verbal clauses. *Oceanic Linguistics* 3.1:87-100.
- Miller, Jeanne, and Helen Miller. 1976. *Mamanwa Grammar*. Language Data: Asian-Pacific Series No.8. Huntington Beach: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Mintz, Malcolm W. 1971. *Bikol Grammar Notes*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Mirikitani, Leatrice T. 1972. *Kapampangan Syntax*. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No.10. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1994. The implications of ergativity for a Philippine voice system. *Voice: Form and Function*, ed. by Barbara Fox and Paul J. Hopper, 247-277. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Natividad, Mateo C., and Syble Solomon. 1970. *A Guide to Learning Itawis Dialect*. Manila: Peace Corps.
- Newell, Leonard E. 1993. *Batad Ifugao Dictionary with Ethnographic Notes*. Linguistic Society of the Philippines Special Monograph Issue No.33. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Payne, Thomas E. 1997. *Describing Morphosyntax: A Guide for Field Linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pittman, Richard. 1966. Tagalog -um- and mag-. An interim report. *Papers in Philippine Linguistics* 1:9-20. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Post, Ursula. 1992. Binukid dictionary. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 9.2:1-210.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1966. *An Ivatan Syntax*. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No.2. Honolulu: Pacific and Asian Linguistics Institute, University of Hawai'i.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1995. *Tasaday Cave Tape Transcriptions*. On-line at <http://www.aa2411s.aa.tufts.ac.jp/~reid/Tasaday/index.html>.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 2001. On the development of agreement markers in some Northern Philippine languages. *Issues in Austronesian Morphology: A Focusschrift for Byron*

- W. Bender, ed. by Joel Bradshaw and Kenneth L. Rehg, 235-257. Pacific Linguistics 519. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 2002. Determiners, nouns or what? Problems in the analysis of some commonly occurring forms in Philippine languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 41.2:295-309.
- Ross, Malcolm D. 1995a. Some current issues in Austronesian linguistics. *Comparative Austronesian Dictionary*, vol.1, ed. by D. T. Tryon, 45-120. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ross, Malcolm D. 1995b. Reconstructing Proto-Austronesian verbal morphology: Evidence from Taiwan. *Austronesian Studies Relating to Taiwan*, ed. by Paul Jen-kuei Li et al., 727-91. Symposium Series of the Institute of History and Philology, No.3. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Rubino, Carl Ralph Galvez. 2000. *Ilocano Dictionary and Grammar*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Ruch, Edward R. 1964. *The Phonological and Morphophonemic Systems of Kalamian Tagbanwa*. Ithaca: Cornell University MA thesis.
- Schachter, Paul. 1973. Constraints on clitic order in Tagalog. *Parangay Kay Cecilio Lopez: Essays in Honor of Cecilio Lopez on His Seventy-fifth Birthday*, ed. by Andrew B. Gonzalez, F.S.C., 214-231. Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Schachter, Paul. 1990. Tagalog. *The World's Major Languages*, ed. by Bernard Comrie, 936-958. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schachter, Paul, and Fe T. Otnes. 1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Shetler, Joanne. 1976. *Notes on Balangao Grammar*. Language Data: Asian-Pacific Series No.9. Huntington Beach: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Starosta, Stanley. 1988. *The Case for Lexicase: An Outline of Lexicase Grammatical Theory*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Starosta, Stanley. 2002. Austronesian 'focus' as derivation: Evidence from nominalization. *Language and Linguistics* 3.2:427-479.
- Starosta, Stanley. (to appear). Lexicase revisited. *Encyclopedia of Languages and Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Starosta, Stanley, Andrew K. Pawley, and Lawrence A. Reid. 1982. The evolution of focus in Austronesian. *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, vol. 2: *Tracking the Travelers*, ed. by Stephen A. Wurm and Lois Carrington, 145-70. Pacific Linguistics C-75. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Svelmoe, Gordon, and Thelma Svelmoe. 1974. *Notes on Mansaka Grammar*. Language Data: Asian-Pacific Series No.6. Huntington Beach: Summer Institute of Linguistics.



- Van Valin, Robert D., Jr. 1993. A synopsis of role and reference grammar. *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*, ed. by Robert D. Van Valin, Jr., 1-164. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Vanoverbergh, Morice. 1955. *Iloko Grammar*. Baguio City: Catholic School Press.
- Verstraelen, Eugene S.V.D. 1973. Some elementary data of the Suban'on language. *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez: Essays in Honor of Cecilio Lopez on His Seventy-fifth Birthday*, ed. by Andrew B. Gonzalez, F.S.C., 236-51. Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Wolfenden, Elmer P. 1971. *Hiligaynon Reference Grammar*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Wolff, John. 1967. *Beginning Cebuano*, Part II. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- 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, F.S.C., 71-91. Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Wouk, Fay. 1986. Transitivity in Proto-Malayo-Polynesian and Proto-Austronesian. *FOCAL I: Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, ed. by Paul Geraghty, Lois Carrington and S. A. Wurm, 133-158. Pacific Linguistics C-93. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Zorc, R. David Paul. 1977. *The Bisayan Dialects of the Philippines: Subgrouping and Reconstruction*. Pacific Linguistics C-44. Canberra: The Australian National University.

[Received 2 September 2002; revised 17 June 2003; accepted 19 December 2003]

Lawrence A. Reid  
Department of Linguistics  
University of Hawai'i at Manoa  
1890 East-West Road, Moore 569  
Honolulu, HI 96822  
USA  
reid@hawaii.edu

Hsiu-chuan Liao  
Department of Linguistics  
University of Hawai'i at Manoa  
1890 East-West Road, Moore 569  
Honolulu, HI 96822  
USA  
hsiuchua@hawaii.edu

## 菲律賓南島語的句法結構簡介

Lawrence A. Reid

廖秀娟

夏威夷大學

本文以詞彙學派 (lexicalist) 的理論架構來分析及描述菲律賓南島語的句法結構特徵。文中探討三項主題：(一) 詞序，(二) 動詞句的結構，(三) 名詞組的結構。

在詞序方面，我們探討以動詞或以非動詞（即名詞組與介詞組）為謂語的句型其謂語與(非)人稱代名詞等名詞補語及助動詞之間相對詞序。此外，我們也討論主題化句型的詞序。

在動詞句的結構方面，我們檢視動詞形態與句子及物性之間的關連性。我們發現動詞形態本身並無法使我們準確無誤地判斷動詞的及物性。此外，我們將「焦點詞綴」分析為動詞所帶有的與主格名詞組詮釋有關的語義成分，而非所謂的「語義角色呼應」。

在名詞組的結構方面，我們探討限制詞的句法功能與語義功能。此外，我們也探討關係子句結構。我們主張菲律賓南島語並無「形容詞」的存在。名詞組中所謂的「形容詞」實際上是以狀態動詞為謂語的關係子句。

關鍵詞：菲律賓南島語，句法類型，作格性，及物性，焦點，主題