A Brief Syntactic Typology of Philippine Languages[*]

Lawrence A. Reid & 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 predicational 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 is examined, concluding that verbal affixation alone is an insufficient criterion. Attention is paid to the notion of "focus", with rejection of 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.

1. Introduction

Philippine languages are sufficiently distinct from other Austronesian languages that the label "Philippine Type Language" has sometimes appeared in the literature to 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 which distinguishes one language from another.

Although only a relatively few selected 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.[1]

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 case relations,[2] namely PATIENT,[3] AGENT, CORRESPONDENT, MEANS, and LOCUS, which are determined by both semantic and morphosyntactic considerations. Since we claim that all the languages under consideration are probably ergative, we do not distinguish an Accusative case form. We also assume that there are two semantic

---

[1] Our indebtedness here and throughout the paper to the work of Stanley Starosta should be obvious. We however refrain from characterizing the theoretical orientation as "Lexicase" in that we depart from it in several respects, not the 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.

[2] 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."

[3] 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."

'macroroles' that need to be specified in linguistic descriptions, that is, ACTOR and UNDERGOER.[4]

Even though we analyze Philippine languages as ergative, we choose not to use the term 'absolute', 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 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 Predicational Constructions

Philippine clause structure is typically right branching, that is, heads of constructions appear in the initial position in the 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 of it, 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.

---

[4] 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).

(1) **Central Ivatan** (Reid 1966:62)[5]

   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.'

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

   Manga   lodzoq   ani   ini.
   Det.plrl bolo.knife be[6] 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.

---

[5] 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
futr	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
Pst	past	sg	singular
s.o.	someone	s.t.	something
Top	Topic	them	theme
V	Verb	Tp.Lk	Topic Linker

[6] Miller and Miller consider the Mamanwa form *ani* to be an 'equative particle'.

(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.'

(7) **Guinaang Bontok**[7]

ʔásu=n   nan sagguŋ=ko   nan naŋtəb   ʔan sikʔa.
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.'

---

[7] 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.

(10) **Suban'on** (Verstraelen 1973:245)

> *Búat   Bonifacio   suggĕntáw.*
> 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 description that follows 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 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 be followed by only a single nominal argument, is intransitive, and the construction of which it is a part is therefore intransitive. Depending on the form of the verb, this single complement is interpreted as carrying either the actor (in dynamic structures, see section 3.3.1) or the undergoer (in stative structures, see section 3.3.2) macrorole. This complement is typically[8] 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 types of complements that a verb takes that determines its transitivity, not the 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 section 2.3.1.2.

---

[8] There are some languages such as Botolan Sambal, Ivatan, and Tagalog which allow what seem to be intranstive 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 Otanes 1972:280)
> *Kaganda   ng   dalaga!*
> beautiful   Gen   girl
> 'How beautiful the girl is!'

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.

(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 or not 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 Otanes 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 Otanes 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, that is, 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: 1) monosyllabic clitic pronouns always precede adverbial clitics; 2) adverbial clitics always precede disyllabic clitic pronouns.

(23) **Tagalog** (Schachter 1973:215; Schachter and Otanes 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 Otanes 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   Ábe

>   'I heard Ábe.'

> b. *Zígutan=da   hapa   ya   abbing.*
>   bathe=Gen.3p also   Det   child

>   'They also bathe the child.'

(28) **Tagalog** (Schachter and Otanes 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   imaínit   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 upon 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 are 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 all cases 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 which follow 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 which acts as the theme of the construction. It is coreferential with one of the nominal complements of the main clause. Only Nominative and Genitive complements which are Patients or Agents respectively of main clauses can be topicalized. The Genitive Correspondent (i.e., possessor) in a Nominative phrase can also be topicalized. Neither a Genitive or Locative (nor Oblique) complement that is the second complement of dyadic intransitive constructions, nor the third nominal complement of transitive constructions can be topicalized, because these are typically indefinite, and topicalizing would have the effect of definitizing them. Typically, topics are separated from the following verb by an intonation break, although this 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 section 2.3 we dealt with the word order of simple verbal clauses in most Philippine languages. In this section we will discuss expanded verbal structures, beginning with those which require 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 to date, 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 which have 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, and are discussed in section 3.1. Other types of extension verbs will be considered in section 3.2.

3.1.   Constructions with Auxiliary Verbs

Extension verbs which agree with their following verbs are more- or less-closely bound to their following dependent verb. Those that are closest 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 that which 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 verbs are 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 (42)a-b. Far more restricted in Philippine languages are directional (as in (45), (48) and (51)a) and aspectual auxiliary (as in (49), (50) and (51)b) verbs.

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

    a.   *Agguy noloʔ han imbaluy=ʔu.*
         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   agdígos!
    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 section 2.3.2.1.2) when they follow an auxiliary verb as they do when they follow a 'main' verb. Those languages which have a non-clitic form for the Nominative of transitive verbs, such as Yami, Ivatan and Bontok, usually allow alternate word orders for this pronoun, either occurring after the Genitive clitic pronoun, or following the 'main' verb.

(46) **Guinaang Bontok**

    ʔadi=k   sikʔa   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 did'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.   *ʔadí=da*   *ʔi*   *ʔinʔəməs* *ʔad*   *dawəŋ.*
          ngtv=Nom.3p   go   bathe   Lcv   Chaweng

          'They're not going to take a bath at Chaweng.'

    b.   *ʔəsá=ʔak*   *ʔadi* *ʔuməy* *ʔad*   *mayníla=s* *wákas.*
          futr=Nom.1s   ngtv go   Lcv   Manila=Lcv morrow

          '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 (56)a are transitive, in that they require a Genitive complement, but their following verbs are intransitive, while in (56)b both the auxiliary and the following verb are transitive. Schachter and Otanes (1972:266) labels 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 Otanes 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 on Philippine languages of the sometimes inordinate complexity of verb forms in these languages, only some of which 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 versus 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 will 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 sections 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, whether or not marked by an affix, which specifies whether the construction which it heads will be transitive or intransitive. In the following discussion, we will consider some of the features which distinguish these verb types from one another.

3.3.1.1.1. Intransitive verbs

Intransitive dynamic verbs are verbs which 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 be a mistake however to believe that the affixes that are 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, and vice versa (see for example section 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 is suggestive, although not always proof, 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 will 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 and will not cover at this time 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, maintained in at least Ivatan, Batak, Tboli, and Kalamian Tagbanwa, replaces a word initial bilabial consonant and 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.

3.3.1.1.1.1.1.1. 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', 'walking', etc., 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 class of verbs also includes a number of semantically transitive physical actions, such as 'eating', 'drinking', 'buying', etc. 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 all cases the actor macrorole is associated with the Patient of 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**

> *ʔas   ʔuminum=da=s   wákas.*
>   [–trns]
> futr   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**

> *ʔas lumáku=da=s   nan kapi=s   wákas.*
> futr buy=Nom.3p=Lcv Det   coffee=Lcv morrow

'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', 'old', etc., commonly carry *UM* when the form is a (monadic) intransitive verb, or is a nominalization of that form. Unlike the *UM* verbs just described which are punctual, 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.'

3.3.1.1.1.1.1.2. 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 are 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.

3.3.1.1.1.1.1.2.1. 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=futr 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 (64)a, b. The reflexive MAG verbs in (64)a are all monadic intransitive verbs, with singular or plural Patient actors as their Nominative complement, while the reciprocal MAG verbs in (64)b 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.	*magbatì*	'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'

3.3.1.1.1.1.1.2.2. 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.*
> futr   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 for affixes found on intransitive verbs (section 3.3.1.1.1.1), 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 typically also imply the interpretation of the undergoer as the 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 section 3.3.1, in which the Nominative Patient carries the actor macrorole, there are 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 that 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 section 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   silíd.*
> [+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[9]   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 that requires their 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.'

---

[9] The third person singular Nominative pronoun here is zero.

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 which commonly appears before the head noun is a Determiner.[10] 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 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 (82)a-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 one that occurs with all other noun phrases, and 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 which introduce Nominative nouns as though they are in fact Nominative determiners, elsewhere in the paper we mark them only as Determiners, that is without case form specification, since we consider that Nominative full noun phrases are 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.'

---

[10] 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.

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

---

[11] 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).

[12] It should be noted, however, that Nominative phrases with pronominal exponents are case-marked.

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 section 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. *ʔiníla=n nan magmaggit   nan ʔásu=n   nan sagguŋ=ko.*
saw=Gen Det young.woman Det   dog=Gen Det neighbor=Gen.1s

'The young woman saw the dog of my neighbor.'

b. *ʔiníla=n Dəgyəm   nan   ʔásu=n   Takdəg.*
saw=Gen Chegyem Det   dog=Gen Takcheg

'Chegyem saw Takcheg's dog.'

c. *ʔiníla=k   si   Dəgyəm.*
saw=Gen.1s Det   Chegyem

'I saw Chegyem.'

d. *ʔiníla=k   nan ʔásu=m.*
saw=Gen.1s Det   dog=Gen.2s

'I saw your (sg) dog.'

f. *ʔiníla=m   nan ʔásu=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 take the position here that it is a Determiner. Locative noun phrases typically encode locative and time expressions ((90)a), and purpose expressions ((90)b), all of which carry the Locus case relation. They may also express Means, such as instruments ((90)c), and Correspondent, such as the second complement of dyadic intransitive constructions ((90)d).

(90) **Guinaang Bontok**

a. *ʔas ʔiláʔək si   Dəgyəm   ʔas wákas   ʔas   ʔíli.*
futr see.1s Det   Chegyem Lcv tomorrow Lcv   village

'I'll see Chegyem in the village tomorrow.'

    b.   *Gumáʔəbka   man   ʔas   kapi=k.*
        saw=Nom.2s Adv Lcv coffee=Gen.1s

        'Please make a cup of coffee for me.'

    c.   *Kəláyam   man   sa   ʔas   gípan=ku.*
        peel=Gen.2s Adv that Lcv knife=Gen.1s

        'Peel that one with my knife.'

    d.   *Naŋán=ak   ʔas   nan   ʔítab.*
        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 which precedes 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 will 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 either a Locative, Genitive, or Oblique Determiner, as described in section 4.2.1.1. Thus, in (91)a, *mansánas* 'apple' can only be interpreted as definite, since it is the Nominative Patient of a transitive sentence, while in (91)b, 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. 1) 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). 2) Under certain discourse conditions the discussion of which are 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)[13]

    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.'

---

[13] Bell (1978:3) notes: "While Cebuano permits indefinite subjects, indefinite subject do not occur freely….indefinite 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."

b. *Ni'adto=ng   panahona, lima ka   kinhaso=ng   daw salamin nakaplagan sa*
    that.Obl=Lig   time   five Lig seashell=Lig like mirror find   Lcv

   mga   bata=ng nagdula sa   babayon.
   Det.plrl child=Lig play   Lcv   beach

   'At that time, five shining seashells were found by children who were playing on the beach.'

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 (94)a-b.

(94) **Guinaang Bontok**

a. *Dəpapə=m   nan   sána   ʔásu!*
    catch.2s.actr Det   that.near.one dog

   'Catch that (near) dog!'

b. *Dəpapə=m   san   ʔásu!*
    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, 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 be 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).[14] 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 or not it is Nominative, to enhance its specificity, but is never attached to a Locative Correspondent, which can only have an indefinite, non-specific interpretation (compare (97)a and b). The same phenomenon is found in Tasaday (98), and perhaps in some other Manobo languages in the south of the Philippines.

(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.'

---

[14] Finkbeiner 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." (Finkbeiner 1983:9).

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 (99)a, it precedes the plural Determiner *da*, whereas in (99)b, it follows the clitic pronoun =*da*.

(99) **Ilokano**

   a. *Mapan=to   da   Juan.*
      go=futr   Det.plrl   Juan

      'Juan and companions will go.'

   b. *Mapan=da=nto.*
      go=Nom.3p=futr

      '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 (100)a-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 (100)c-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   Pst   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 (100)c-d, are typically accomplished with a Locative expression, interpreted as "with", as in (101).

(101) **Guinaang Bontok**

      Siya   sa   nan ʔásu=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[15] 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.

1. 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 section 2.3.2.3.

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

> *Naguribat=ida   ya   affi.*
> dim=Nom.3p   Det lights
>
> 'The lights are dim.'

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

> *Ayagám=kid   mantu sin ya atu ikid na   ugta.*
> 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   ʔumawid nan tapí=na.*
> again=Nom.3p   return   Det other=Gen.3s
>
> 'The rest of them returned again.'

2. 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 (105)a), Ilokano *dagiti* (106), Isnag *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 (105)b), Ilokano *kadagiti* (106), and Isnag *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=Gen1s   Det.plrl men   Lcv.plrl houses=Gen.3p
>
> 'I saw the men in their houses.'

---

[15] 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.

3. 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 nor in Isnag. 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   tolay   dikoku.
help   also Det other Nom.3p Lig   person   Lcv.1s

'The other people will also help me.'

4. 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 dɔ́ʔəyda   (ay) lallaláki.
saw=Gen.1s   Det   those.ones Lig   person

'I saw those men.'

5. 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, *sina*, *nina*, and *kina* (Romblomanon: *siná*, *niná*, and *kiná*, and Sibalenhon: *sína*, *nína*, and *kína* (Zorc 1977:82)), which are distinct from those discussed above.

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 (116)a, 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 (116)b, 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,[16] 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 (117)a and (118)a) as for those with a single complement. Similarly, transitive clauses with an extra complement (as in (118)b) 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.'

---

[16] Referred to in some descriptions as Absolutive.

    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[17] relativize in the same way. Thus, in (119)a, the verb carries benefactor-affect marking, while in (119)b, it carries manner-affect. 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.'

4.3.2. Non-Verbal Relative Clauses

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

---

[17] The so-called 'focus', 'voice-marking' affixes, 'trigger-marking' affixes (Schachter 1990:949-954), or 'pivot' morphemes.

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 (122)a-b, with the relative clauses which can be formed upon them, (123)a-b, respectively.

(122) **Tagalog** (Schachter and Otanes 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 section 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 (124)a-b, and (126). The clauses from which such Ilokano relative clauses are formed are shown in (125)a-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. *Baró   dagiti   bádo.*
         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 which precedes 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 upon examples such as (130)a-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 (130)c-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. *ʔintu   nan   ʔinmayan nan dakdakəl (ay bútug=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.   *ʔintu   nan   ʔinmayan   nan   bútug=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   bútug=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 (131)a-d.

(131) **Guinaang Bontok**

    a.   *Sínu   nan   ʔiníla=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   ʔiníla=m)?*
        who   Det   young.woman   Lig   saw=Gen.2s

        'Who is the young woman (that you saw)?'

    c.   *Magmaggit   nan   ʔiníla=m.*
        young.woman   Det   seen.one=Gen.2s

        'The one you saw is a young woman.'

    d.   *ʔiníla=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,[18] nor the Correspondent of either an intransitive or a transitive sentence, regardless of the formal marking of these phrases in a language. However, the

---

[18] 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   ʻiKadasan   ʻa   ʻinʻanop=to=y   ʻaso=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.'

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

"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 (132)b, 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'   ang   ba'ba'.*
   fear   Nom.3s Lcv   group   Gen Iyo' Bruno Lig   bloody   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'

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   futr 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 futr 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   in'an=to=iray   nangkatoling tan katambaleg=a too=n   abadeg i*
        and.then saw=Gen.3s=Det.plrl black.plrl   and huge=Lig   person=Lig big   Det

        mata=cha, sangi=cha, tan tangida=ra.
        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 Ph.D. 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: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Ph.D. 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/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

DuBois, Carl D. 1976. *Sarangani Manobo: An introductory guide*. Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph Issue Number 6. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Finkbeiner, Marianne. 1983. Paranan noun markers. Ms.

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 Ph.D. 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: Research School of Pacific Studies, 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 M.A. 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 Press of Hawai'i.

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 Publishing Company.

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 Number 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* No. 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.tufs.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. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

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, Cheng-hwa Tsang, Dah-an Ho, Ying-kuei Huang and Chiu-yu Tseng, 727-91. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Rubino, Carl Ralph Galvez. 2000. *Ilocano dictionary and grammar*. PALI Language Texts. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Ruch, Edward R. 1964. The phonological and morphophonemic systems of Kalamian Tagbanwa. Ithaca: Cornell University M.A. 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. Otanes. 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: Pacific Linguistics.

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 Publishing Co.

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. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University.

Zorc, R. David Paul. 1977. *The Bisayan dialects of the Philippines: Subgrouping and reconstruction*. Pacific Linguistics C-44. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University.