The subgroup of Philippine languages here called Northern Luzon (earlier descriptions called it Cordilleran) is slowly becoming better understood as new descriptions of its constituent languages are being published. This paper draws on the material that is now available to move toward a reconstruction of various features of the morphosyntax of the parent of the group, Proto-Northern Luzon. An overview of the syntax of Proto-Northern Luzon is provided as a context for discussing the reconstruction of the ‘phrase markers’ of noun phrases. The paper deals specifically with the need to distinguish prepositional forms whose primary function is to mark the case of noun phrases, from nominal specifiers which specify features of their lexical head, and demonstratives which are often homophonous with and the source of nominal specifiers and case-marking prepositions. The paper restricts itself to reconstruction within one of the major subgroups of Northern Luzon – Central Cordilleran – beginning with the languages of the Nuclear Cordilleran set of languages, i.e. Bontok, Kankanaey, Balangao, and Ifugao, and then with the Kalinga-Itneg set of languages, and finally Isinai, to arrive at a set of reconstructions for the noun phrase markers of Proto-Central Cordilleran. It is argued that ‘bottom-up’ reconstruction of this type is essential in order to understand the historical processes that have brought about the plethora of forms that are found and to enable us to distinguish between forms that are retentions of reconstructed forms from those that are shared innovations.
1. Introduction

Reconstructing the morphosyntax of Proto-Northern Luzon has been a major interest of mine for many years. Numerous attempts have been made by various researchers to throw light on the internal relationships of the group and the nature of the proto-language from which the more than 50 languages spoken today descended. However the enterprise is far from complete and many problems remain. The purpose of this paper is to provide a summary of what has been done, and to outline some of the problems that interfere with achieving the goal of reconstructing the morphosyntax of Proto-Northern Luzon (P-NLZN). I intend first to provide some background on Northern Luzon itself, and then set the stage for the major focus of the paper by giving a summary of what must have been the clause structure of Proto-Northern Luzon. The discussion will then focus on two major topics. The first is the structure of the noun phrase, and deals in particular with what I consider to be the syntactic categories of the ubiquitous so-called ‘phrase markers’ of noun phrases. The second deals with the reconstruction of the forms of ‘phrase markers’. Because of space constraints, this paper will only deal with the reconstruction of ‘phrase markers’ in one of the major subgroups of Northern Luzon, Central Cordilleran. Passing reference will be made to some of the factors that hinder reconstruction of ‘phrase markers’ in early proto-languages of the Philippines. These factors include problems resulting from enclitic homophony, those resulting from what I am calling vowel grade harmony, and problems resulting from homophonous forms caused by sound change.¹

The daughter languages of P-NLZN are spoken in the mountains and valleys of the Cordillera Central of the northern Philippines (hence the earlier common name Proto-Cordilleran), but they also include languages of the Sierra Madre and the coastal regions to the east of the Sierra Madre, the languages of the Cagayan Valley between the Sierra Madre and the Cordillera Central, as well as those spoken along the north and north-west coastal areas of northern Luzon. Recent archaeological research (Bellwood et al., 2003; Bellwood & Dizon, 2005) confirms that Northern Luzon was probably the site of the first Austronesian settlements in the Philippines following their movement

¹ These problems were discussed at more length during the plenary presentation at the 10th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics in Puerto Princesa, Palawan, Philippines, where this paper was first presented. Each of these problems is being discussed more fully in other venues, see Reid (2006). I wish to thank the participants at 10-ICAL, especially Hsiu-chuan Liao, Nikolaus Himmelmann, and Andrew Pawley, for their comments.
south from Formosa and the Batanes Islands, perhaps as recently as 3600-4000 BP, and hence suggest that understanding the nature of P-NLZN is very important to an understanding of Proto-Extra-Formosan (PEF) also commonly referred to in the literature as Proto-Malayo-Polynesian, the language of the original migrants into the Philippines, and the immediate ancestral language of Proto-Northern Luzon.

The *Ethnologue* (Gordon, 2005) includes 56 languages in the group, although recent research suggests that at least a few of them are incorrectly subgrouped. The position of Umiray Dumagat, for example, one of the three languages classified in the *Ethnologue* as Southern Dumagat is probably a Central Philippine language (see Himes, 2004, p. 29), and if more were known about the other two Negrito languages of this small group, they would probably also be shown to be Central Philippine. In previous work I have done on the Negrito languages of the northern Philippines, I have suggested that it is a fallacy to include them within subgrouping hypotheses of Philippine Austronesian languages in that they probably all developed as creoles and have no direct genetic relationship with non-Negrito Philippine languages. It is as much a fallacy as it would be to include Chabacano, the Philippine Spanish creole, as an Austronesian language of the Philippines, despite its lexical, morphological, and syntactic similarities to other Philippine languages. Nevertheless, it is clear that in many respects the Negrito languages have retained a number of conservative features of the Austronesian languages that they first acquired, features which have been lost in most non-Negrito languages. It is for this reason that I continue to include them in my subgrouping of the Northern Luzon languages. The family tree given in Figure 1 is based on our current understanding of the relationships between the languages. The Northern Cordilleran branch generally follows Tharp’s (1974) tentative subgrouping of the languages, which was based on his analysis of the phonological developments in the family. However, I have removed Ilokano from his Northern Cordilleran on the basis of its different reflex of PAN *R, from the other members of that group.  

---

2 The only language of the group that I label as Northeastern Luzon which is included by Tharp (1974) in his subgrouping is Casiguran Dumagat (DGtC).
2. **On the Validity of Proto-Northern Luzon as a Subgroup**

The validity of this subgroup of Philippine languages has generally been accepted by linguists (Zorc, 1986; McFarland, 1980; Blust, 1991, etc.). Blust (1991, pp. 78-79) summarizes the major publications that have appeared in
which such a subgroup has been proposed, noting the languages which have been included within or excluded from the group. However all of the publications he refers to are primarily lexicostatistical classifications, and as Blust notes, have generally given somewhat different results from classifications based on qualitative evidence. Although there have been a number of articles which provide qualitative evidence for the inclusion or exclusion of individual languages or groups of languages in one or another of the major subgroups of NLZN (see, for example, Himes, 1996, 1998, 2004, etc.), the only attempt to provide qualitative evidence for NLZN as a whole has been that of Llamzon and Martin (1976). Unfortunately, although Llamzon and Martin attempted to find exclusively shared innovations, the features they discussed were discovered without the benefit of any reconstructed protolanguage, and were as likely to be retentions as they were to be innovations. Moreover the distribution of the features that supposedly characterize Proto-Northern Luzon (Proto-Northern Philippines in their terms), were typically not found only in this subgroup but also turned up sporadically in other subgroups.

Tharp (1974, p. 54) states, ‘Classification of the Northern Luzon languages into a distinct subgroup is based upon their pronominal systems, aspect-mode systems, lexicons, and on lexicostatistical evidence’. But the only published reconstruction of Proto-Philippine pronominal systems (Reid, 1979), is a bottom-up reconstruction which does not provide comparative evidence for innovations which might distinguish this group from other Philippine languages, and there has been no attempt to reconstruct the tense-aspect system of Proto-Northern Luzon.

In terms of phonology, Charles (1974, p. 479) notes, ‘The most significant phonological difference between the Philippine languages is that the Cordilleran languages of North Luzon like Iloko, Isneg, the Central Cordilleran languages, and Pangasinan have not merged PPH *j and *d together whereas apparently all the non-Cordilleran languages have merged these two proto-phonemes in a voiced apical obstruent’. While it is true that most NLZN languages distinguish the reflexes PPH *j and *d, with *j generally falling together with the reflex of P-NLZN *g, there are several languages that appear to reflect PPH *j as /d/, like all non-Northern Luzon languages. One of the languages is the highly endangered Arta, an isolate in the NLZN family. Two other languages (Northern and Southern Alta) are coordinate with the South-Central Cordilleran branch of the family, while the others include the Negrito groups who live along the narrow coastal strip of north-eastern Luzon and its vicinity. These languages also include the non-Negrito Paranan and Kasiguranin,

---

3 See Thomas and Healey (1962), Dyen (1965), and Walton (1979).
4 In the languages of the South-Central Cordilleran family, *j became /d/ rather than the expected /g/ in forms that had either an initial or final velar nasal, specifically the forms for ‘charcoal’ (*ʔujiŋ) and ‘name’ (*ʔ-a̯-ajan) (Conant, 1911, pp. 84-85).
at least the latter of which appears to have its ancestry in some early form of Tagalog (in which *j > /d/, and subsequently /l/ intervocally). Both of these languages have been heavily influenced by the languages of their Negrito neighbors, to the extent that they are now generally classified as belonging to Northern Cordilleran (Vanoverbergh, 1937, p. 11; Tharp, 1974, p. 61). This may account for some (for example the forms marked in the table which are also found in Tagalog), but not all of the aberrant forms. Table 1 lists some of the forms which show the reflexes of P-NLZN *j as /d/, both in intervocalic and word final positions.

Table 1. *j > /d/ in some languages of Northern Luzon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Gloss</th>
<th>ALT$S$</th>
<th>ALT$N$</th>
<th>ART</th>
<th>PRN</th>
<th>KSG</th>
<th>DGT$C$</th>
<th>P-NLZN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>betel leaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Rawaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charcoal</td>
<td>?udin</td>
<td>u'din</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*u'ij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dry</td>
<td>maddi</td>
<td>mamadi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*maj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dry in sun</td>
<td>'bilad</td>
<td>'bilad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*bilaj (TAG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gall</td>
<td>?apdu</td>
<td>?apdu’</td>
<td>apdu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*apju (TAG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>name</td>
<td>nadon</td>
<td>nadin</td>
<td>nan</td>
<td>nan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>najan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navel</td>
<td>pu comedic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*pusej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nose</td>
<td>adun</td>
<td>adun</td>
<td>adon</td>
<td>(du'pos)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*aju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palm (of hand)</td>
<td>palad</td>
<td>palad</td>
<td>palad</td>
<td>palad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>palaj</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rice (unhusked)</td>
<td>paray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*pajay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sibling</td>
<td>wadi</td>
<td></td>
<td>patwa'di</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*w-aji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weave (cloth)</td>
<td>laddi</td>
<td>ladi</td>
<td>ladi</td>
<td>lad'ey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*laja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wind</td>
<td>paras</td>
<td>paras</td>
<td>paras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*pajes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Himes (pers. comm.) notes that the Alta forms, with Isinai garon and Ilongot gadin, imply a PMCO *sadon, a doublet with PMCO *sad ‘name’.

** This form appears with a /d/ reflex of *j in all languages of the northern Philippines, and may also be a borrowing in these languages as well.

However there are two phonological innovations which are consistently found throughout NLZN languages and which provide the strongest evidence for the unity of the group. One is the loss of word-final glottal stop, e.g., PEF *pana? > P-NLZN *pana ‘shoot an arrow’. Northern Cordilleran languages (and Ilokano) also lost syllable-final glottal stop, e.g., P-NLZN *tu?lan > ILK, /tu'lan/, DGT$C$ /tulAj/ ‘bone’, while Central Cordilleran languages metathesized medial *-
?-C- sequences to become *?-C?, e.g., ItGBI /tuʔəŋ/ ‘bone’. Southern Cordilleran languages retained the P-NLZN *?-C- sequence, e.g., ILT /tuʔəŋ/ ‘bone’.

The other innovation, and one which carries considerable weight for the genetic unity of the family, is a unique metathesis, apparently found in all branches of the family but not elsewhere, by which reconstructed forms having a reflex of PEF *t and a following sibilant, reversed the order of the two consonants, such as PEF *taʔis > P-NLZN *saŋit ‘cry’; and PEF *Raʔus > P-NLZN *Ra’sut ‘hundred’. Apart from the phonological (and lexicostatistical evidence) for NLZN, there is a large body of exclusively shared lexical evidence. Himes (pers. comm.) has a database of over 750 items which are either unique forms, or have undergone some formal or semantic shift from earlier reconstructed forms.

There is also clear phonological, morphological, and lexical evidence for each of the constituent subgroups of NLZN, such as each of the groups that constitute Northern Cordilleran (Tharp, 1974), and Meso-Cordilleran, that is Altan (Reid, 1991), and Central and Southern Cordilleran (Reid, 1974; Zorc, 1986; Himes, 1998). The reconstructed phonological system of P-NLZN is given in Table 2. Notice that I include *j as one of the proto-phonemes, because of the /d/ reflexes in some of the languages of the group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ñ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘CV’ (contrastive stress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The actual phonological value of the central vowel shown as *a in this table is unknown. In languages where it is still retained as a central vowel, the quality may range from /a/ to /i/.

3. Clause Structure in Proto-Northern Luzon

The purpose of this section on clause structure in Proto-Northern Luzon is merely to provide a context for the discussion in the following sections. Little is said here of verbal morphology, a topic which would require a paper double the length of this one. The general typological features of clausal constructions, found throughout Northern Luzon, are considered to be reconstructible to the parent language. These features are typical also of the structures found in many non-

---

5 This metathesis was first described in Conant (1912), and further discussed in Dyen (1972).
Northern Luzon languages. These features have been discussed and exemplified in Reid and Liao (2004) generally for the Philippines. P-NLZN was a predicate-initial, ergative language, typically only allowing topicalized NPs and some adverbs to appear before the clause predicate. Clauses could have either a nominal or a verbal predicate. Nominal predicates could be either definite or indefinite and did not require a copula verb. Verbal predicates were either attransitive, intransitive, or transitive.

Atransitive predicates were impersonal, having no nominal complement. Intransitive predicates were either monadic, expecting only a single core argument, labeled throughout this paper as NOMINATIVE; or dyadic, expecting two core arguments, a nominative and an OBLIQUE. The nominative phrase of a monadic intransitive verbal clause could express either an actor, or an undergoer, depending on the morphology of the verb. The nominative phrase of a dyadic intransitive verbal clause expressed the actor, while the oblique phrase expressed the undergoer, forming an antipassive or pseudo-transitive construction. Unless otherwise marked, the nominative phrase was definite, or at least specific, while the oblique phrase was typically indefinite.

Atransitive verbs were marked by the infix reconstructed as PEF *<um>. When the nominative phrase of either a monadic or a dyadic intransitive clause expressed an actor, the verbal morphology reflected one of the prefixes reconstructed as PEF *maR-, and *maN-, or the infix *<um> following the first consonant of the base. When the nominative phrase expressed an undergoer, the verbal morphology reflected the prefix reconstructed as PEF *ma-, deriving an agentless passive construction. The reflex of PEF *ma- also derived a set of stative verbs.

There were in addition a limited set of monadic intransitive verbs which carried reflexes of the affixes typically appearing on syntactically transitive verbs. The nominative phrase of such verbs expressed the undergoer, affected (often in a negative way) by an agent, the referent of which is expressed in the verb (Vanoverbergh, 1955, p. 147; Liao, 2004, Ch. 2, pp. 31-33).

---

6 For a full discussion of transitivity and ergativity in Philippine languages, see Liao (2004).
7 This term is preferred over the alternate term, Absolutive, in that it captures more linguistic generalities. The functions of nominative NPs in accusative languages are little different from those labeled absolutive in ergative languages. Maintaining the term nominative moreover enables the syntactic change from ergative to accusative languages to be more clearly described.
8 Not all oblique NPs were core. Only those that encoded undergoer participants are considered to be core. They could not be topicalized by fronting. Oblique NPs could also encode location and time settings. These were peripheral arguments and could be topicalized.
9 The final nasal of this form represents an assimilating nasal the characteristics of which are discussed in Blust (2004).
Transitive predicates were either dyadic or triadic. Dyadic transitive predicates expected two core arguments, a nominative phrase and a GENITIVE phrase. 10 As an ergative language, the nominative expressed the undergoer, and the genitive phrase expressed the actor. A triadic transitive predicate, such as a causative verb, expected an additional core argument, typically expressing either a recipient or a source. An oblique phrase expressed the referent when it was a common noun; a DATIVE 11 phrase expressed the referent when it was a personal noun.

Transitive verb morphology reflected either the PEF prefix reconstructed as *ʔi-, or one of the reconstructed PEF suffixes *-an or *-an, specifying the semantic role of the nominative phrase. Verbs carrying any of the affixes listed above could be further derived with a reflex of the completive aspect infix, reconstructed as PEF *<in>, following the first consonant of the base, forming combinations such as *minaR-, and *minaN-, *<inum>, *mina-, *ʔini-, *<in> -an, and simply *<in> on bases that carried *-an when non-completive.

In addition to nominative, genitive, oblique, and dative phrases, distinctively marked LOCATIVE phrases also occurred. Case-marking was not necessarily morphological. Word order and the semantics of the lexical head of phrases functioned broadly to disambiguate phrases whose case was not morphologically marked. I use the term OBIQUE in this paper to label the case of the 'extended' core arguments of dyadic intransitive verbs and triadic transitive verbs, as well as adjuncts which are marked in the same way, either morphologically or by word order. Typically these include certain types of location and time phrases (to be discussed below) which are recognized as such not by their morphological marking but by the lexical items which constitute them. Similarly, I use the term LOCATIVE to label adjuncts that are distinctively marked from obliques and whose lexical items have either location or time reference.

With this background, we can now begin discussing the structure of the Proto-Northern Luzon noun phrase, specifically about the nature of the forms that introduced them. There was a class of typically monosyllabic morphemes that preceded the lexical heads of most noun phrases in P-NLZN. These morphemes are here labeled NOMINAL SPECIFIERS for reasons that I discuss in Reid (2002). This term is considered to be more appropriate than the more common term 'determiner' which I used in some of my earlier publications, and which is frequently found in the literature on Philippine languages. In summary, determiners are typically dependent on their head nouns, and in right-branching

---

10 The term genitive is used here, rather than the alternate term ergative, in that the forms which mark the actor in a transitive clause are identical to those which mark nominal possessors within a noun phrase.

11 The term dative is used here because of its general use for phrases expressing recipients. However in these languages the same form is used for a wide range of semantic roles, including agent ‘by’, source ‘from’, goal ‘to’, and concomitant ‘with’.
languages such as those found in the Philippines and in other language families throughout Southeast Asia, they occur at the outer (right-hand) edge of their noun phrase (Reid & Savetamalya, 1997).\footnote{In a number of Philippine languages (Ivatan, Kagayanen Manobo, Isinai, Casiguran Dumagat Agta, and various other Negrito languages, such as Northern Alta) that is precisely where determiners can often be found (see the Isinai examples appearing in (34)).}

The term ‘nominal specifier’ is purposefully ambiguous, in that I consider that specifiers are themselves a subclass of the syntactic category of nouns. They are non-referential extension nouns,\footnote{Extension nouns require a (following) nominal complement predicate.} but they also function to identify, or specify, or agree with, various features of their nominal complements. Nominal specifiers are considered to be the heads of the NPs which they introduce.\footnote{Ruffolo (2005, p. 316) retains the label ‘Determiner’ for these forms, while noting that they are the heads of their phrases, and require a following complement.} They carry a number of semantic features, especially of a deictic kind, some of which appear to be reconstructible to Proto-Northern Luzon.

In the discussion which follows, I intend to demonstrate that not all forms which appear to be nominal specifiers in fact are. I will claim that nominal specifiers do not themselves mark case, but instead when case is morphologically marked, the forms that do so are prepositional, not nominal. For ease of presentation, however, following Ross (2002), I will initially call all forms that introduce NPs as ‘phrase markers’ or PMs. These forms were typically unstressed. Full forms were typically proclitics (although in example sentences I usually represent them as separate words), while shortened forms were enclitics, and encliticized to any vowel-final form which immediately preceded them, whether verb, noun, pronoun, adverb, or preposition, in some cases fusing with the preceding form.

Since case-marking prepositional forms, and the nominal specifiers from which they developed, are probably in all cases homophonous with forms that can unambiguously be reconstructed as demonstratives, I will claim that each of the forms historically descended from a demonstrative. This is a claim that has been challenged in the literature, in that the deictic features of a given demonstrative may differ from those of its homophonous nominal specifier. Nevertheless in many cases the deictic features are clearly relatable, as for example where a distal demonstrative (referring to a referent that is far from speaker and addressee) has become a nominal specifier marking a noun as having past reference, or as referring to a deceased person; or a medial demonstrative (referring to a referent that is close to the addressee) has become a nominal specifier that marks a noun as being RECOGNITIONAL,\footnote{The term ‘recognitional’ is taken from Ruffolo (2005, p. 167), who acknowledges her sources for the term as Himmelmann (1996) and Diessel (1999).} that is, within
the recent common experience of speaker and addressee (‘the one that you and I have just been talking about, or experienced’).

That in some cases the deictic features of a nominal specifier and its homophonous demonstrative are clearly different is not surprising in that the paths of their semantic development become independent of one another once the morphological split has taken place. I find it inconceivable that such broad homophony could possibly have existed without the pairs of forms having ultimately a common phylogeny. Since the grammaticalization of demonstrative to nominal specifier (and case-marking preposition) is an on-going process, it will be useful to distinguish not only between prepositions and nominal specifiers, but also between these and the deictic forms which constitute part of the sequence of forms which now introduce the lexical heads of phrases.

4. On Reconstructing the Prepositions and Nominal Specifiers of Proto-Northern Luzon

Deciding on the syntactic categories of the forms of phrase markers is one thing, but reconstructing them is another. Before providing the reasons why I distinguish case-marking prepositions from nominal determiners I would like to briefly discuss the basic methodological principles involved in their reconstruction. Blust (2005, p. 218) notes that ‘the reconstruction of the meanings or functions of PAN/PMP phrase markers presents one of the most daunting challenges that a comparativist face[s] in this language family ... the attested systems of PMs exhibit an exuberant variety of structural differences ...’. This is true also for the reconstruction of the meanings and functions of PMs at lower-level subgroups in the family, as well. As Blust (2005) also notes in critiquing his own early work on reconstructing genitive forms in Austronesian, choosing homophonous and homosemantic forms from different subgroups in Austronesian and claiming them to be reconstructible to the parent language runs the risk of mistaking convergent development for inheritance. The only way to approach an understanding of the complexity of the system is to do a bottom-up reconstruction, comparing the forms and functions of PMs of closely related languages, and comparing the results with those of other lower-level subgroups, and making step-by-step decisions regarding whether the forms under consideration are retentions, or are innovations.

Apart from the ‘exuberant variety’ of forms and structural differences noted by Blust as creating problems for the comparativist, there are also the array of grammaticalization processes by which nominal demonstratives move from being nominal heads of their noun phrases into nominal specifier positions with deictic functions, and ultimately into prepositional case-marking positions without deictic function, before being dispossessed of even the case-marking functions and being lost altogether. Some of these processes will be demonstrated in the sections to follow.
4.1. Central Cordilleran

In order to demonstrate the kind of data that requires that a distinction be made between case-marking prepositions and nominal specifiers, let us take a look at the marking of definite common noun phrases in some of the Central Cordilleran languages. We begin with Nuclear Cordilleran, a relatively closely related set of languages within the Central Cordilleran subgroup. The Central Cordilleran subgroup and the Southern Cordilleran subgroup form a group coordinate with the Altan languages within Meso-Cordilleran (see Figure 1). The phonologies of all these languages developed from a system in which *R, *r, and *l fell together, to produce a phonology as shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>?,</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>u</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'CV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Proto-Meso-Cordilleran phonological system

4.1.1. Nuclear Cordilleran

The *Ethnologue* (Gordon, 2005) lists nine Nuclear Cordilleran languages grouped into three groups, Bontok-Kankanay, Balangao, and Ifugao. No two of these languages have an identical set of PMs. To simplify the presentation, I shall restrict myself at this point to discussing only those forms which introduce phrases with singular, common noun lexical heads. Phrases having plural marking and those with personal noun lexical heads will be discussed in sec. 4.1.2.3. At the end of each section, the forms that need to be reconstructed for the parent of each group will be presented.

4.1.1.1. Bontok-Kankanay

The Bontok-Kankanay languages included here are the Bontok languages, Central Bontok as spoken in Guinaang (sec. 4.1.1.1.1); Southern Bontok as spoken in Talubin (sec. 4.1.1.1.2); Eastern Bontok as spoken in Kadaklan and Barlig (sec. 4.1.1.1.3); and two Kankanay languages, Northern Kankanay as spoken in Balugang, Sagada (sec. 4.1.1.1.4) and Central Kankanay as spoken in Kibungan, Benguet (sec. 4.1.1.1.5).

4.1.1.1.1. Central Bontok (Guinaang)

The first fact to be noted about PMs is that they typically do not necessarily form a case-marking system. In Guinaang Bontok, for example, the form nan occurs as a PM introducing certain nominal predicates, topics, as well as nominative and genitive NPs. Similarly it can appear as part of a sequence of forms functioning as a PM in both genitive and oblique phrases (see Table 4).
Table 4. Bontok definite common noun phrase markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNM</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nan ~ na=[\text{PV} ]</td>
<td>(=\text{n} ) nan</td>
<td>(=\text{s} ) nan</td>
<td>(=\text{d} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(=\text{n} ) nan</td>
<td>si nan ~</td>
<td>(=\text{d} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as nan / ?is nan</td>
<td>(=\text{d} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second fact to be noted is that PMs do not fit neatly into any systematic set of semantic categories. Thus although there seems to be a systematic distinction between forms which are followed by common nouns from those which are followed by personal nouns, as in (1)a, in which it appears that nan marks a common nominative NP, and (1)b, in which si marks a syntactically equivalent personal NP, the same forms can appear with quite different functions. Thus in (1)c and (1)d, si introduces common noun phrases with a variety of cases (nominative, oblique), and in (1)e nan introduces a genitive common NP, while in (1)f its corresponding personal noun has no PM.

(1) Guinaang Bontok\textsuperscript{16}

\begin{enumerate}
\item K\textit{inmaan} \textit{nan} \textit{larikje,}\textsuperscript{17} departed [PM.-PRSN man]\textsubscript{NOM} ‘The man departed.’
\item K\textit{inmaan} \textit{si} \textit{Takchet}, departed [PM.+PRSN Takchet]\textsubscript{NOM} ‘Takchet departed.’
\item Chaan omye \textit{si} \textit{esay minutos, ...} NEG.-PAST go [PM.-SPFC one=LG minute]\textsubscript{NOM} ‘A minute had not yet gone by, ...’
\item Om\textup{\textit{a}=ak} \textit{si} \textit{p\textup{\textit{a}k}chey} \textit{si} \textit{irang} \textit{si} \textit{kasi}. get=\textsubscript{NOM,IS} [PM.-SPFC rice]\textsubscript{OBJ.} [PM.-REMT granary]\textsubscript{OBJ.} [PM.-PAST again]\textsubscript{OBJ.} ‘I will get some unhusked rice from (my) granary the day after tomorrow.’
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{16} Guinaang Bontok examples are taken from, or based on, sentences found in Reid (1976 and 1992).

\textsuperscript{17} Sentence examples are typically cited as they appear in their sources, or in the commonly accepted orthographic conventions used in the published literature on each language, with the exception that enclitic forms are connected to their phonological host by an equals sign (=), regardless of whether the source writes them as separate words, or as part of the preceding word. The second line of each example provides an analyzed, word-for-word translation of the text, with each nominal phrase surrounded by square brackets. Where the case of such a phrase is morphologically marked, either by a pronoun or by a separate morpheme, the case of the phrase is given directly beneath the appropriate morpheme. Where the case of a phrase is not morphologically marked, but is determined by word order or lexical means, the case of the phrase is marked with a subscript label after its closing square bracket. The free translations given in the third line are typically taken from the source, but are sometimes modified to provide a clearer explanation of the meaning of the text.
 waited [PM-PRSN man]_{GEN} [1S]_{NOM}
 ‘The man waited for me.’
 waited [Tacheg]_{GEN} [1S]_{NOM}
 ‘Tacheg waited for me.’
g. Kanan kamo Lomawik=b= en “Sina=*
 said report Lomawig=QUOT [there]_{PRE} =-[PM-SPFC water]_{NOM}
 ‘Lomawig reportedly said, “There’s water there!”’
h. Kinnan si utot na=ij.
 ate [PM-SPFC rat]_{GEN} [PM-PRSN=sweet;potato]_{NOM}
 ‘Rats / A rat / Some rats ate the sweet potato.’

It should also be noted that the semantic features that are carried by PMs
differ depending on the case of the noun phrase that they introduce. Thus in
(1)c, in which *si* introduces a nominative NP (‘one minute’), and (1)d, in which
it introduces the oblique NP (‘rice’) which is a core argument of the dyadic
intransitive verb ‘get’, *si* appears to carry the feature [-SPFC]. In such an oblique
NP, the exponent of the NP which follows *si* can only be interpreted in a general
(partitive) sense, somewhat equivalent to English *of*. In an oblique NP expressing
a location, *si* carries the feature [-REMT], so that the exponent of the NP can
only be interpreted as a location which is in the general vicinity, or is closely
associated with the speaker. In a genitive NP, the *si* which introduces the
phrase, as in (1)h, also carries the feature [-SPFC], but it doesn’t have a partitive
sense; finally the *si* which introduces an oblique adjunct expressing a location in
time carries the feature [-PAST], agreeing with the non-past form of the verb, and
marking the following noun as a future time word.
Some generalizations can be made however. First, *si* carries the feature
[+PRSN] only when it occurs with NPs which are not morphologically case-
marked, that is in nominal predicates, topics, and nominative NPs, and only
when it precedes a singular, personal name or kinship term of address.
Elsewhere, *si* carries the feature [-PRSN]. When *si* occurs with nominative,
genitive, and core oblique NPs, it also carries the feature [-SPFC], as in (1)c, d,
and h, while in oblique adjuncts expressing location and time, it carries the
features [-REMT] and [-PAST] respectively, as in (1)c.
The feature term [REMT] that I use to distinguish the marking of locative
phrases does not adequately represent the range of meanings that are carried by
the PM involved. Nearly all place names are marked as [+REMT], including the
name of the village itself (Guinaang), although some place names within the
village are marked as [-REMT]. All common, location nouns, such as áfon ‘house’, árang ‘granary’, ab-ařiąn ‘men’s ward house’, and pąngis ‘young women’s
dormitory’, etc., when preceded by the [-REMT] PM *si*, and not followed by
genitive pronoun, are interpreted as place names closely associated with the
speaker, as ‘granary’ in (1)d.
Table 5 provides further information about non-specific ([SPFC]) PMs in Bontok, in phrases that are morphologically unmarked as well as in genitive and oblique phrases.

**Table 5. Bontok non-specific phrase markers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNM</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>=s</td>
<td>=n</td>
<td>=s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?as /</td>
<td>?is</td>
<td>?as /</td>
<td>?is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although I have been referring to the form `si`, this form only occurs in Bontok following words ending in a consonant. When a non-specific PM immediately follows a form ending in a vowel, regardless of its word class or function, the PM is reduced to `=s`. In deliberate speech, the PM is either `as` (`/?as/) or `is` (`/?is/`), depending on the dialect. A genitive NP immediately following a form ending in a vowel is morphologically case-marked; an enclitic `=n` attaches to the preceding word. A genitive [-DFNT] PM is thus always post-consonantal `si`. A further distinction between genitive and oblique PMs is that in genitive NPs, no deliberate speech form, distinct from `si`, occurs.

In Bontok, non-specific PMs do not occur in topicalized noun phrases, since all such phrases are interpreted as definite, and by extension, specific. Nominal predicates may be either definite or indefinite and non-specific. Indefinite nominal predicates are bare nouns, that is, without a PM. Nominative NPs may be definite or indefinite although they are usually definite when they are preceded by a lexical verbal predicate, and they may be either definite or indefinite when preceded by a positive existential verb, and are always indefinite when preceded by a negative existential verb. Today, indefinite nominative NPs of existential verbs typically occur without a PM, although there is evidence that such NPs were earlier marked with either `=?` or `i` (`/?i/`).

At this point let us further consider the Bontok definite PMs given in Table 4. It should be immediately apparent that the form which marks an NP as definite is `nan` (or optionally preclitic `na=` before glottal stop initial words). This PM introduces morphologically unmarked common noun NPs (i.e., topics, nominal predicates, and nominative NPs). It may also introduce genitive NPs that are either morphologically case-marked (following a vowel-final word) or not. In a genitive NP, the form `nan` commutes with the PM `si` (and its variants), whereas in core oblique NPs `nan` follows `si` (and its variants), creating a definite partitive interpretation; compare (2)a with (2)b.

---

58 All dialects of Central Bontok use `as`, except Bontok Poblacion and Samoki which use `is`. 
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(2) Guinaang Bontok

a.  Inmáan=ak  si  jöö̞ng.
got=NOM.1S  [PM.+PTTV  pig]_{nom}
‘I got a pig.’ Lit. ‘I got of a pig.’

b.  Inmáan=ak  si  nan  jöö̞ng.
got=NOM.1S  [PM.+PTTV  PM.+DFNT  pig]_{nom}
‘I got some of the pigs.

Distributed in the same positions as the definite nan is the recognitional PM san, shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Bontok recognitional phrase markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNM</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>san</td>
<td>= n</td>
<td>san</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>san</td>
<td>san</td>
<td>san</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By utilizing this form, the speaker is making explicit his assumption that the referent is in the recent shared experience of the speaker and hearer, or is something that has just been talked about, as in (3)a,b. In oblique temporal expressions, words which refer to time periods within a day, when preceded by the PM san, refer explicitly to that period which has already been passed through on that day, while without san they refer to a future time period, as in (6)a,b.

(3) Guinaang Bontok

a.  Aw jëmi̞lâm  san  jöö̞ng?
ques saw.2S  [PM. REC  pig]_{nom}
‘Have you seen the pig (we have just been talking about)?

b.  Inmáan=ak  si  san  jöö̞ng.
got=NOM.1S  [PM.+PTTV  PM. REC  pig]_{nom}
‘I got some of the pigs (we have just been talking about).’

The description as outlined above points up another problem with analyzing PMs. I noted above that in a genitive NP, the form nan commutes with si (and its variants), whereas in oblique NPs nan follows si (and its variants). I noted also that there is a further distinction between genitive and oblique forms in that no deliberate speech form, distinct from si, occurs in the genitive.

Why is this so? The evidence suggests that in oblique NPs, the PM si (and its variants) are prepositions that mark the NPs which follow them as neither nominative nor genitive (or locative).19 In a core oblique NP, where no

---

19 This analysis was first suggested in Kikusawa and Reid (2003), in their description of Talubin Bontok.
PM follows the preposition, the noun can only be interpreted indefinitely, in the same way that an unmarked predicate noun or an unmarked nominative in an existential sentence can only be interpreted indefinitely, as in the reanalyzed examples shown in (4)a,b. In genitive NPs, however, *si* is not a preposition, but a nominal specifier. It commutes with *nan* and *san*, and follows the enclitic preposition =*n*, which marks the NP as genitive. Similarly, nominative NPs are like oblique NPs in this respect, *nan* and *san* commute with each other, and are nominal specifiers. In Bontok, nominative NPs are not marked by any preposition, the nominal specifiers that occur mark semantic features of the following noun, but not its case. Throughout the rest of the paper, I will now forego the use of the term ‘phrase marker’ in favor of what I believe to be their true class membership, either preposition (P) or nominal specifier (NS).

(4) Guinaang Bontok

a. *Ináma*-ak *si* *fíog*.
   *got* = NOM.1.S [P [pig]_obl].
   ‘I got a pig.’ Lit. ‘I got of a pig.’

b. *Ináma*-ak *si* *nan* *fíog*.
   *got* = NOM.1.S [P [NS.+DFNT pig]_obl].
   ‘I got some of the pigs.’

c. *Iná*-n *nan* *lårik* *san* *fíog*.
   *got* = [P_gen [NS.+DFNT man]] [NS.REC pig]_nom.
   ‘The man got the pig (we were just talking about).’

d. *Iná*-n *si* *dət* *na=*off.
   *got* = [P_gen [NS.-DFNT rat]] [NS.-PRSN=sweet,potato]_nom.
   ‘Rats / A rat / Some rats ate the sweet potato.’

If we look at phrases that express location and time and which carry the features [-REMT] and [-PAST] respectively, illustrated in (5) and (6), we notice that they are marked like core oblique NPs, i.e. *si* (and its variants) appear to be prepositional, allowing the NS forms *nan* and *san* to follow them when the following noun is a common locative or temporal noun, but not to commute with them, as shown in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7. Bontok oblique and locative prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-REMT / -PAST</td>
<td>+REMT / +PAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V]</td>
<td>=s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C]</td>
<td><em>si</em>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?as / ?is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Bontok oblique prepositions + nominal specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-REMT / -PAST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V] = s nan / = s san</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C] si nan ~ si san</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?as nan / ?is nan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?as san / ?is san</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Guinaang Bontok (examples of oblique and locative phrases expressing location)

a. *Somkhp =ka=s dfong!*
   enter=[NOM.2s]=P [inside.of.a.house]OBL.
   ‘Come inside!’

b. *Oney =ka=s chera!*
   go=[NOM.2s]=P [outside]OBL.
   ‘Go outside!’

c. *Omai =ka=s dfong!*
   come=[NOM.2s]=P [house]OBL.
   ‘Come to (my) house!’

d. *Ipay =ma=s nan takfak!*
   enter=[GEN.2s]=P [NS.+DFNT backpack.1s]OBL.
   ‘Put (it) in my backpack!’

e. *Iniha =na=s san arang.*
   got=[GEN.3s]=P [NS.+REC. granary]OBL.
   ‘He got (it) from the granary (we were just talking about)’

f. *Omai =ka=d Fabrey!*
   come=[NOM.2s]=PLOC. [Village]OBL.
   ‘Come to (our) village!’

g. *Ome =ka=d Maynila!*
   go=[NOM.2s]=PLOC. [Manila]OBL.
   ‘Go to Manila!’

(6) Guinaang Bontok (examples of oblique and locative phrases expressing time)

a. *Omai =ka=s wiit si wakat!*
   come=NOM.2s=[P [early.morning]OBL. [P [morning]OBL.]
   ‘Come early tomorrow morning!’

b. *Iniha =d san wiit*
   saw.1s [P [NS.+REC. early.morning]OBL.
   ‘I saw (it) this morning.’

c. *Iniha =cha=s san inmalayan=cha.*
   ‘They got (it) when they came’

d. *Oney =ka=ab-arok, mai =ini kah...*
   even [P [youth.1s]OBL. NEG.EXIST saw.1s
   ‘Even in my youth, I didn’t see anything …’
c. As  kaapawani=mi,  inifat=cha=s  Lamanen.
   [P [grandparent=GEN.1P.NOM] met=3P[NOM] =NS Lamanen]NOM
   ‘When we had become grandparents, they met Lamanen.’

f. Imásā=cha=d  kasi.
   come=3P[NOM] =P [again]NOM
   ‘They came two days ago.’

g. Imásā=cha=d  kbagkha.
   come=3P[NOM] =P [yesterday]NOM
   ‘They came yesterday.’

The situation is complicated by the fact that, in Bontok, si (and its
variants) functions not only as a preposition and a nominal specifier, but also as
a conjunction, conjoining comparable groups of non-specific human nouns, as
in (7).

(7) Guinaang Bontok (examples of conjoined phrases)
a. iyAr=ar  si  iKamoyo
   person.Al-al  CON] person.Gamoyo
   ‘Al-al and Gamoyo people’

b. fejaro=s  mamigkhit
   young.men=CON] young.women
   ‘young men and women’

c. iniin-a=s  amam-a
   married.women=CON] married.men
   ‘married women and married men’

In addition, the non-past feature carried by as has apparently motivated
the development of a morphological split, by which the form now also
functions as a NS introducing a nominative phrase in which the following noun
has a future sense, as in (8)a. It also occurs as a preverbal adverb with a future
sense, and functions somewhat like an auxiliary verb in this position, except that
it does not attract second-position clitics, and in this position it does not alterate with si, as in (8)b,c. Various idiomatic expressions occur in Guinaang
Bontok, which depend for their interpretation on the future sense of as, as in
(8)d.

(8) Guinaang Bontok (examples of future nominal specifier, and adverb)
a. Nan  sâna  numang  si  omar-am.
   [NS that water.buffalo]PREP  [NS.FUTR get.NMNZ.2S]NOM
   ‘That water buffalo is what you will get.’

b. Ay  as  omey=cha=s  wâkast
   QUES ADV.FUTR go=3P[NOM] =P [morrow]NOM
   ‘Will they go tomorrow?’

c. As  omâra=ak  si  fîgog.
   ADV.FUTR get=NOM.1S [NS.+PTTV pig]NOM
   ‘I will get a pig.’

d. As  pay  fîgog
   ADV.FUTR moreover pig
   ‘What about pigs?’ or ‘Where shall we get a pig?’
The future sense of *as may have developed from its common use as an oblique preposition with telic verbs, whose action results in the formation of an entity, as in (9).

(9) Guinaang Bontok
a. Kayaw=da=sa jaron n{on i om{ay.
   ‘They cook what will be lunch for those who go to perform the apay ceremony.’
b. Pay-ina=sa forrayaw.
   put.3s=M[def]shooting.star[gen]gen.
   ‘He put what would be a shooting star (in the sky).’
c. Eng=kayo om{ara=s kamey.
   go=NOM.2s get=NS wooden.spade[gen]gen.
   ‘Go and get what will be made into wooden spades.’
d. As mangol-vel=taka=sa isiim.
   FUTR collect=1+2s[NOM]=NS galvanized.iron.sheets[gen]gen.
   ‘Let’s collect (money) for buying galvanized iron sheets.’

4.1.1.1.2. Southern Bontok (Talubin)
Talubin is one of the dialects of Southern Bontok. Its system of prepositions and nominal specifiers is similar to that of the Central Bontok dialects, including Guinaang. However, in Talubin, the distinction between *an and ban is being lost,
20 with ban (< *san) becoming the unmarked member of the set, as in (10)a-b. One other difference found in this dialect is that both *an and ban can occur as an enclitic =n following vowel-final words, as in (10)c-d.

(10) Talubin Bontok (Kikusawa & Reid, 2003)
   ‘He also gave some fire to the Apay person.’
b. . . . jast umali han janum.
   then come NS water[NOM]
   ‘... then the water came.’
c. Mawalini umali=n janum.
   possible LG come=NS water[NOM]
   ‘Then the water was able to come.’
d. Henagen=ja=n bili.
   sent=3p[gen]=NS wild.cat[NOM]
   ‘They sent the wild cat.’

4.1.1.1.3. Eastern Bontok (Kadaklan)
The examples given in (11) illustrate further developments from those discussed in the previous sections.21 Kadaklan, like the Central Bontok dialect

---

20 Among other sound changes that distinguish Southern Bontok from Central Bontok are *s > /h/ and *k > /l/.
21 Among other sound changes that distinguish Eastern Bontok from Central Bontok is *s > /h/.
in Guinaang, allows optional deletion of the final nasal of the definite NS *nan, in
effect making it a preclitic to a following form which begins with a glottal stop,
as in (11)a (compare (1)h). In addition to *nan, Kadaklan uses *hen (from *sin), as
a definite NS. This form is found as an oblique preposition plus NS sequence
(*i=n), in Southern Kankanaey (cf. (14)g), and has apparently spread from that
function to become an un-analyzable NS in morphologically unmarked NPs, as
in (11)a, as it has also in its closest neighbor to the east, Balangao (sec. 4.1.1.2.1).
Kadaklan *hen also occurs as an enclitic =n on preceding vowel-final words, as in
(11)b.

In oblique phrases, the specific form *hen (reduced to =en) has replaced
*nan and follows the preposition *ab, as in (11)c, and the preposition itself is
sometimes completely lost following vowel-final words (=b > O), leaving such
phrases as bare lexical items. Following consonant-final words, the alternate
preposition *be (from *si) occurs, as in (11)d.

Kadaklan allows non-specific marking of a genitive NP, as in Guinaang
(compare (1)h), but with *chí (from *di), rather than *i, as in (11)b. Kadaklan
prepositions and nominal specifiers are shown in Tables 9 and 10.

**Table 9. Kadaklan case-marking prepositions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V]</td>
<td>=n</td>
<td></td>
<td>=d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl]</td>
<td>=O</td>
<td>he ~ ?ah</td>
<td>?ad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 10. Kadaklan common noun, non-deictic, nominal specifiers**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-DFNT</td>
<td>chi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+DFNT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(11) Eastern Bontok (Kadaklan) (Fukuda, 1980, pp. 72, 76, 82)

a. ...ya eey *na=onga *hen ona.

and bring [NS=child]g[NS sugarcane]nom

‘.and the child brings the sugarcane.’

b. *Chí=chá *tit-ina omar-á=n *tolin.

CNTV/[3p]nom true coming=[NS sparrow]nom

‘The sparrows are truly coming.’

22 Shetler (pers. comm.) notes that in Hāgi, one hour (by walking trail) west of Natonin (the
center of the Balangao-speaking area) and between Natonin and Kadaklan, the unreduced
form ñah *hen introduces oblique phrases.
c. Ipay=na=0 kawad chi lsong ay manginauwaang ah=en lsong.  
brought=GEN.3s [place [NS mortar][gen].Lg go.around [P=]NS
mortar][gen].Lg.

'She brought the baby to the mortar place to go around the mortar.'

d. Adowan ngarud chan nomnomnom he atona, ...

now surely CNTV.3s thinking [P doing.3s][em.

'Now he is thinking what to do.'

4.1.1.1.4. Northern Kankanaey (Balugang, Sagada)

The analyses presented above for the Bontok languages are supported when we consider Bontok’s closest relative, Northern Kankanaey (commonly referred to as Kankanay). The data (drawn primarily from Hettick and Kent (1967), and Hettick and Wallace (1978), and summarized in Tables 11 and 12) show a formal distinction between the prepositional form which introduces oblique phrases, namely si and its alternate ës (as in Bontok), as in (12)a,b, and the nominal specifiers which introduce NPs. In Central Bontok, there are only three nominal specifiers which commute with one another, si, nan, and san. In Northern Kankanaey, there are four, di, nan, san, and din. These forms occur in morphologically unmarked NPs, such as topics, nominal predicates, nominatives, and genitive NPs following consonant-final forms, as in (13)a-c. Genitive phrases which follow vowel-final forms are, like Bontok, case-marked with a clitic preposition =n, as in (13)d-h. Case-marked phrases, such as the genitive, oblique, and locative PPs, allow their included NPs to be introduced by any appropriate NS.

The KNKN form din introduces NPs which refer to an entity that the speaker characterizes as being in the relatively distant past. There is no equivalent for this form in Bontok, but because it has a similar form and function to NSs that are found in other Central Cordilleran languages, it will be reconstructed to Proto-Central Cordilleran (P-CCO).

Table 11. Northern Kankanaey case-marking prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>=n</td>
<td>=s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>=Ø</td>
<td>si</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Northern Kankanaey common noun, non-deictic, nominal specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-DFNT</th>
<th>di</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>default</td>
<td>nan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+DFNT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>san</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTE</td>
<td>din</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(12) Northern Kankanay (Hettick & Kent, 1967)

a. *Mabadin ay omanay si menkataga=da*
   
   
   ‘It would be sufficient for their livelihood.’

b. *Dat konselb si nan kain.*
   
   then climb [P [NS.+DFNT tree]os]om.
   
   ‘Then he climbed into the tree.’

(13) Northern Kankanay (Hettick & Kent, 1967)

a. *Naay di siping=mo*
   
   here [NS.-DFNT money=[GEN.2S]nom
   
   ‘Here is your money (as change is handed over).’

b. *Naay nan siping=mo*
   
   here [NS.+DFNT money=[GEN.2S]nom
   
   ‘Here is your money (that has just been found),’

c. *Adi=tako bokodan di gawis ta mensawaks*
   
   NEG=[1+2p][gen]monopolize [NS.-DFNT goodness][nom so remove
di, dukos.
   
   [NS.-DFNT badness]nom
   
   ‘Let’s not monopolize the good, so that the bad will be removed.’

d. *toho=n di baat*
   
   leaf=[P[gen] [NS.-DFNT banana]os
   
   ‘banana leaves’

e. *tap-ir=n di agaw*
   
   other=[P[gen] [NS.-DFNT day]os
   
   ‘another day’

f. *tinpo=n di aman-a*
   
   time=[P[gen] [NS.-DFNT forefathers]os
   
   ‘(our) forefathers’ time’

g. *baey di gamig*
   
   house [NS.-DFNT bolos[gen
   
   ‘bolo-sheath’

h. *… tay pinatey di bango*
   
   because killed [NS.-DFNT wild.pig]om
   
   ‘… because (he was) killed by a wild pig.’

4.1.1.1.5. Central Kankanay (Kibungan, Benguet)

In the central dialects, commonly referred to simply as Kankanay, the form *din* has generalized, apparently at the expense of the other definite NS forms, and seems to carry no prior reference as it does in Northern Kankanay, as in (14)a-d.²³ Kankanay also reduces *din* to =n following vowel-final forms, as in (14)c,f. However Kankanay does not allow reduction of its oblique form *sin*, possibly to avoid structural ambiguity (Allen, L.P., 1977), as in (14)g. While the nominal specifier *din* probably has its source in a demonstrative with a

²³ Published material contains a few examples with *san*, as in (14)h,i (Allen, L.P., 1975, p. 29), although apparently without the recognitional feature associated with this form in Bontok.
frozen enclitic ligature (see discussion in sec. 4.1.1.2.1), sin appears to have its
source in a reduction of the oblique preposition *si + *nan > si=n. A similar
change is found in Balangao (4.1.1.2.1) and also in Ifugao.

(14) Southern Kankanaey (Allen, J., 1978)
   a. Ipayag=mo    din    ka'iw.
      put.down=GEN.2s  [NS.+DFNT  wood]nom
      ‘Put down the stick!’
   b. Kinining=na    din    takkay=mo.
      pinched=GEN.3s  [NS.+DFNT  hand=GEN.2s]nom
      ‘She pinched your hand.’
   c. Ay innam    din    bolat.
      QUES  take.2s  [NS.+DFNT  ball]nom
      ‘Did you take the ball?’
   d. Lava    din    am-amagen    ay    dooy.
      bad  [NS.+DFNT  doing  LG  that]nom
      ‘What you are doing is bad.’
   e. Ida’wat=mo    din    ma’nok=ko.
      give=GEN.2s  [NS.+DFNT  chicken=GEN.1s]nom
      ‘Give my chicken (to someone).’
   f. Ida’wat=mo=n    ma’nok=ko.
      give=GEN.2s=[NS.+DFNT  chicken=GEN.1s]nom
      ‘Give my chicken (to someone).’
   g. Ida’wat=mo    si=n    ma’nok=ko.
      give=GEN.2s  [P=NS.+DFNT  chicken=GEN.1s]obl.
      ‘Give (something) to my chicken.’
   h. Man-abat    kanos    da    gayagen    kiling     is=san
      met  QUOT  [NS.+PL  crow  with  kiling,bird]nom
      seh bang    di    ka’ong.
      trail  [NS.-DFNT  sow]obl.
      ‘The crow and the kiling bird met on the trail of a sow.’
   i. Ay soo    kaway    san    bagang=mo    ay    mandada?
      QUES  why  in.fact  [NS.+DFNT  neck=GEN.2s  LG  bleeding]
      ‘Why, in fact, is your neck bleeding?’

4.1.1.2. Proto-Bontok-Kankanaey reconstructions
   Tables 13 and 14 show the reconstructions based on the forms
   presented in the foregoing discussion.

   Table 13. Proto-Bontok-Kankanaey case-marking prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>* = n</td>
<td>* = s</td>
<td>* = d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>= Ø</td>
<td>*si</td>
<td>*?id / *?ad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*?is / *?as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. Proto-Bontok-Kankanaey common noun specifiers

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-DFNT</td>
<td>*di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>default</td>
<td>*nan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+DFNT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>*san</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTE</td>
<td>*din</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1.2.1. Sources of Proto-Bontok-Kankanaey nominal specifiers

In various papers (Reid, 1974, pp. 526-546; 2000, pp. 38-40; 2002, pp. 301-302), I have discussed the origin of nominal specifiers in Philippine languages. In some of the papers, I claim that they originate from demonstratives still functioning as independent stressed nominals in some of the languages. In Bontok these only occur as nominative forms, while in Kankanay they may occur in either nominative or genitive constructions. These are listed with their meanings in Table 15, and are exemplified in (15), a-c. At the end of sec. 3 above, I discussed the fact that in some cases the connection between earlier demonstrative forms and nominal specifiers is transparent, while in other cases it is not. The Bontok and Kankanaey forms provide clear examples of both. While forms such as san and din carry deictic features that appear to have developed from demonstratives still in use in the language, other forms such as nan and the indefinite form di do not. The use of the demonstrative na as a proximal form is apparently fairly recent, replacing an earlier *tu, and is one of the innovations that took place in P-BON-KNK. It is far more likely that the shift from demonstrative *na to a nominal specifier must have taken place at a far more remote period in the history of these languages. The same is true of indefinite di.

I have also claimed that the final -n on the nominal specifiers is a frozen, reduced form of the ligature *na, a preposition which occurred as *=n following vowel-final forms, but *=a following consonant-final forms in P-NLZN. In P-BON-KNK and Bl.W, *=a following consonant-final forms was lost (Shetler, 1976, p. 117). There is independent evidence for this claim from various frozen constructions such as combined numerals which show this distribution, as in (16). It was retained however in some constructions in other Nuclear Cordilleran languages, such as Kiangan Ifugao, as in (17), and is still found in various languages throughout the Northern Luzon family.

Table 15. Proto-Bontok-Kankanay deictic forms

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>*na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>*sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>*di</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(15) Guinaang Bontok

a. *Ala=m na!  
   get.2S [NOM.PROX]  
   ‘Get this one!’

b. *Ay inila=m sa?  
   QUES seen.2S [NOM.MED]  
   ‘Have you seen that one (near you)?’

c. *Ay inila=m chü!  
   QUES seen.2S [NOM.DIST]  
   ‘Have you seen that one (distant)?’

(16) Guinaang Bontok

| chawan poro | 20’ | enem poro | 60’ |
| toon poro | 30’ | pitaon poro | 70’ |
| epat poro | 40’ | wamn poro | 80’ |
| limun poro | 50’ | siyam poro | 90’ |

(17) Kiangan Ifugao (Lambrecht, 1978, p. 120)

a. Aliguyun=a=di  
   Aliguyun=1G=long.ago  
   ‘Aliguyun of long ago’

b. Aligaya=n=di  
   Aligaya=1G=long.ago  
   ‘Aligaya of long ago’

c. bi tåon=a=di  
   P [year=1G=long.ago]a  
   ‘in a year long gone’

d. mala=n=di  
   occurred =1G=long.ago  
   ‘it happened long ago’

4.1.1.3. Balangao

4.1.1.3.1. Balangao non-deictic nominal specifiers

The non-deictic forms which introduce phrases in Balangao are presented in Tables 16 and 17 and are exemplified in (18) and (19). Balangao shows the same set of prepositions that are reconstructed for P-BON-KNK. However its definite NS shows the same innovation that was noted above for Eastern Bontok (Balangao’s western neighbor). The form *si, which appears to have had its source in a sequence of preposition and definite NS, was probably as follows: *si + *nan > **si=n > *si. This form is no longer morphologically complex, since it occurs as a definite NS in morphologically unmarked phrases. In oblique phrases in which the form occurs, there is no evidence that it contains both a preposition as well as a NS, since bi (< *si) as an alternate of *si has been lost, so these phrases are no longer case-marked when *si occurs, as in (18)d.
Table 16. Balangao case-marking prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>=n</td>
<td>=h</td>
<td>=d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>=∅</td>
<td>=ad</td>
<td>=ad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17. Balangao common noun specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>di</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-DEFN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+DEFN</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(18) Balangao genitive, nominative and core oblique phrases (Shetler, 1976, pp. 233-238)

a.  
Ayagan=yu  
di  éba=γ  onga, …

call=[GEN.2p]  
[NS one=LG child]_{nom}

‘You (pl.) call a child, …’

b.  
Enayagan=da  
hen  éba=γ  onga, …

call=[3p]_{gen}  
[NS one=LG child]_{nom}

‘They called a child, …’

c.  
No wuda-ay  
di  agided  
di  okom, …

e if  
[NS cargo]  
[NS élite]_{gen}  
[NS nom]

‘If any élite people have some cargo, …’

d.  
Omenpabing=a  
hen  pelak=na.

bring out=[nom.2s]  
[NS money=GEN.2s]_{obl}

‘Bring out your money.’

e.  
Nampale=da  
amin  ah  babuy  ya  manů, …

d kill=[3p]_{gen}  
[p pig  conj]  
[chicken]_{obl}

‘They all killed pigs and chickens, …’

f.  
Ulan=na=γ  
sonod=na  
yā  anū,  hen  tatayγu…

count=[GEN.3s]  
[GEN.3s]  
[sibling]  
[GEN.3s]  
[CONJ]  
[CHILDREN]_{obl}  
[NS people]_{nom}

‘He counted the people as his siblings and children …’

g.  
Ulay  agī,  bēn=γ  ayan  Panapan, …

even also wherever  
[NS]  
[destination]  
[Panapan]_{re}

‘Even also, wherever Panapan went, …’

h.  
Yadi  bēn  ap-ap=γ  aγ  ongan.

that  
[NS lord=GEN.3s]  
[NS spirit]_{gen}  
[NS nom]

‘That is the lord of the spirits.’

(19) Balangao oblique and locative phrases (Shetler, 1976, pp. 233-238)

a.  
hen  okom=ay  mandaweh  ah  bālēγ=na…

[NS élite=LG stop over]  
[obl]  
[house=GEN.3s]_{obl}

‘the élite people who stop over at his house …’

b.  
Ah  bālēγ  Panapan  
hen  ayan=da…

[obl]  
[obl]  
[Panapan]_{gen}  
[obl]  
[NS destination=3p]_{gen}  
[NS nom]

‘To Panapan’s house is where they went …’
REID

c. *Omente-ed=ayu antey away  hen biliŋ.
[cimb.with=[NOM.2p] [this wood].obl [NS mountain].obl.
‘You carry some of this wood up the mountain.’
d. *Andi wa-at, nalpo=ŋ lata yag ēmmęy ad udu.
[NS vine].top came=[obl earth] CONJ went [obl above]
‘As for the vine, it came from the earth and went to the sky.’
e. *Hen andida=ŋ baknang ad Saliŋok…
[NS those=LG rich.ones [obl Saliŋok]].top
‘As for the rich people at Saliŋok …’
f. *Ad namengban an, i nangamop ah Amlalawiŋen ah pag-pag.
[obl long.ago RPRT].top go hunting [NS Amlalawiŋen].nom [obl forest].obl.
‘Long ago, it is said, Amlalawiŋen went hunting in the forest.’

4.1.1.3.2. Balangao deictic specifiers

Now if we examine the examples given as (20)a,b we notice that, as in
Bontok, nominative phrases can consist entirely of a monosyllabic
demonstrative. Tables 18 and 19 display the basic demonstratives in Balangao.
There is evidence (to be discussed in the following section) that the earlier
medial form *=na, has been replaced by *=sa (> ha). The same forms appear
in nominal predicate and topic positions, encliticized to ya, a reduced form of
the unmarked third person singular form biŋa (< *siya), as shown in (20)c,d,e.

In (20)f, following the NS, there is a multisyllabic demonstrative
apparently containing the distal demonstrative dī, occurring as the head of the
NP and immediately followed by a sequence of ligature and referential noun.
However in the examples which follow (20)f, the demonstratives occur as
deictic nominal specifiers, with the ligature now fused as part of the nominal
specifier.

(20) Balangao (Shetler, 1976, pp. 148-149, 233-238)
a. Onga=to.
child=[NOM.this]
‘This is a child.’
b. Awa=n, Ina=ha.
possession=[GEN [mother]].nom
‘That is mother’s.’
c. Ya=to ben onga.
[3s=this].pred [NS child].nom
‘The child is this one.’
d. Ya=ha, awa=n, Ina.
[3s=that].pred [possession=[GEN [mother]].pred
‘As for that one, it belongs to mother.’
e. Anmŋ ya=di ben da=da ekamakamakan…
utterly [3s=that].pred [NS CONT=[3p].gen keep.doing].nom
‘That is how they kept doing it.’
f. Hen andida=ŋ baknang ad Saliŋok ya ben andida=ŋ tape=na,…
[NS those=LG rich.ones [obl Saliŋok]].top CONJ [NS those=LG rest=GEN.3s].top
‘As for the rich people at Saliŋok and those others,…’
g. Da=da managtag andiday ako, ...
   CNTV=[3p]NOM run [NS:those dog]NOM
   ‘Those dogs are running, …’

h. No ilan andiday tataguy dida, ...
   when see [NS:those people]GEN [3s]NOM
   ‘When those people see them, …’

i. Andi wa-al, nalpo=n lobo, ...
   [NS:that vine]POP origin=[NS earth]OH
   ‘As for that vine, it came from the earth, …’

j. Inyanamut=na andi opa=ty polgula=ty inala=na.
   took:home=GEN.3s [NS:that four=1G inch=1G:got=GEN.3s]NOM
   ‘He took home the four inches that he had gotten.’

k. Ngem danaddi=ya tagu, …
   but [those=1G person]TOP
   ‘But as for those people, …’

l. Mety amin ben tatag=waynetlo andi.
   die all [NS people=1G [went.with that.one]BVP]NOM
   ‘All the people died who went with that one.’

m. Kasen=yu gintapan annay oppeop=na.
   again=[GEN.2P] cover [NS:that wrap=[GEN.3s]NOM
   ‘You wrap another layer on it.’

Table 18. Pre-Balangao basic demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROX</th>
<th>*tu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>*na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>*di</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Balangao basic demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROX to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MED ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST di</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20. Balangao marked demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top / Prd</th>
<th>Loc Prd</th>
<th>Nom</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Obl</th>
<th>Loc Adv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clitic</td>
<td>free form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+PLRL</td>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>rato</td>
<td>=to</td>
<td>jahnatto</td>
<td>natto</td>
<td>?annatto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>raha</td>
<td>=ha</td>
<td>jahnahha</td>
<td>nahha</td>
<td>?annahha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>radi</td>
<td>=di</td>
<td>jahnaddi</td>
<td>naddi</td>
<td>?annaddi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+PLRL</td>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>danatto</td>
<td>dato</td>
<td>danatto</td>
<td>danatto</td>
<td>?andanatto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>danahha</td>
<td>daha</td>
<td>danahha</td>
<td>danahho</td>
<td>?andanahho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>danaddi</td>
<td>dadi</td>
<td>danaddi</td>
<td>danaddi</td>
<td>?andanatto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Balangao unmarked demonstratives

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-noun*</td>
<td>Post-noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-PLRL</td>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>?anto=y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>?anna=y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>?andi N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+PLRL</td>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>?antoda=y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>?annada=y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>?andida=y N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The pre-noun unmarked demonstratives occur following a nominal specifier (see example (20)f) and are linked to the following noun with the enclitic ligature =y.

Table 22. Balangao deictic nominal specifiers

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-PLRL</td>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>?anto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>?annay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>?andi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+PLRL</td>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>?antoday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MED</td>
<td>?annaday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>?andiday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That these forms are indeed deictic nominal specifiers and not demonstratives is most apparent with the medial forms which are based not on the current basic demonstrative ba (< *sa), but on the pre-B1W medial form *na. Furthermore the final consonant of these forms, although homophonous with the ligature occurring on demonstratives when preceding a referential noun, can be shown to be frozen on the nominal specifiers. The various
grammaticalization processes which have brought about each of the sets in Table 20 are described in the following section.

4.1.1.3.3. Historical development of Balangao deictic specifiers

1. Reduction of post-nominal demonstratives; loss of old ligature

The first set of changes resulted in the post-nominal enclitic deictics shown in Table 21. The ligature at this point in the history of the language was simply *a=na. The basic demonstratives were apparently enclitic to either *na or *ni, probably the latter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N=LG + DMNS</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>N=LG,DMNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=a + n(V)tu</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>N=a=ntu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=a + n(V)na</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>N=a=nnu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=a + n(V)di</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>N=a=ndi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=ant ‘PROX’
N=anna ‘MED’
N=andi ‘DIST’

2. Spread of post-nominal forms to pre-nominal position; ligature reduction

The second set of changes resulted in the spread of the post-nominal demonstratives as free forms into pre-nominal position, where they would have initially required a nominal specifier to precede them, and a ligature to follow them. The new ligature *=a, was itself a reduced sequence of the old ligature *=a followed by *ya, itself an earlier distal demonstrative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DMNS + *=LG</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tanto + =w</td>
<td>ay</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanna + =?</td>
<td>ay</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>andi + =y</td>
<td>ay</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Derivation of locational predicate forms

The third change was the development of locational predicate forms by suffixing –an ‘locative’ to nominal specifiers. The retention of the final y on these forms, formerly part of the new ligature, is evidence that on the nominal specifier base it is no longer functioning as a ligature (the parenthetical da pluralizes the demonstrative).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NS</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>PRD.LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?anto(da)y + -an</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>?anto(da)y ‘this place’ ‘PROX.(PLRL)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?anna(da)y + -an</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>?anna(da)y ‘that place (near addressee)’ ‘MED.(PLRL)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?andi(da) + -an</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>?andi(da) ‘that place (away from speaker and addressee)’ ‘DIST.(PLRL)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Shetler (1976, p. 43) lists the ligature as way. Its status as an enclitic is clear however from the following description, ‘Following a front vowel, the initial w of the particle is replaced by y; … following a back vowel there is no change in the particle; … following a consonant the w of the particle is dropped’.
REID

4. Locative adverb formation

This change, not necessarily sequential to those discussed above, was the formation of a set of locative adverbs, from an oblique preposition combining with the set of basic demonstratives. That these are no longer phrasal is clear from the fact that the medial demonstrative in these forms (\(na\)) has been replaced in phrasal constructions by the innovated basic medial demonstrative \(ba\) (from \(*sa\)). The earlier form remains as a frozen form also in linked demonstratives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P (_{col})</th>
<th>+DMNS</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>ADV.LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\text{as} + =tu)</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>(?\text{ah} \text{to}) ‘here’ ‘PROX’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{as} + =na)</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>(?\text{ah} \text{na}) ‘there, near addressee’ ‘MED’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\text{as} + =di)</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>(?\text{ah} \text{di}) ‘there, away from speaker and addressee’ ‘DIST’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Formation of deictic specifiers

The forms that occur today as deictic specifiers carry no case marking when in genitive noun phrase positions in a sentence. The same forms however are preceded by a case-marking preposition, when introducing singular common noun phrases in nominative and oblique positions in a sentence. When introducing plural common noun phrases in topic and nominative positions, the forms are homophonous with those found in genitive noun phrases, there are no case-marking prepositions preceding them. At an earlier stage of the language it is probable that the deictic specifiers for both singular and plural entities in genitive noun phrases occurred also in nominative noun phrases, both were (morphologically) unmarked. Pre-Balangao, like other members of the Central Cordilleran family had an unmarked nominal specifier \(*na\) which could introduce any definite common noun phrase, and it was to this form that earlier demonstrative forms were cliticized. However each of the resulting forms today has a geminated final consonant. The source of the gemination is suggested by the fact that there are some glottal stop initial forms in Balangao in which, following deletion of an unstressed vowel, glottal stop assimilates to the following consonant. Thus: \(*\text{h}\- + *\text{a}'\text{b}\text{ag} > *\text{hi}'\text{b}\text{ag} > \text{ib}\text{ag} ‘to put to bed’\).\(^{25}\) In the following examples, the parenthetical \(da\) pluralizes the demonstrative.

---

\(^{25}\) Shetler (1976, p. 42) cites the base of this verb as \(\text{b}\text{h}\text{b}\text{g}\) (where the vowel \(\text{e}\) represents \(\text{i}/\)), however in the cognate Bontok form, the medial consonant of the equivalent form is not geminated, and the medial consonant cluster is metathesized: \(\text{b}\text{on}\text{g}\) \(*\text{h}\- + *\text{a}'\text{b}\text{ag} > *\text{hi}'\text{b}\text{ag} > \text{ib}\text{g} ‘to put to bed’\). Most Balangao forms having an initial weak syllable with a glottal stop onset undergo metathesis of the medial consonant cluster, following weak vowel deletion, like Bontok.
6. Derivation of nominative and oblique deictic specifiers

The nominative forms were derived by cliticizing the basic singular demonstrative set to the preposition *ab (from *as) for nominative singular. The plural forms carry the plural marker da found on the basic forms. These forms were apparently originally personal demonstratives (‘this person’, etc.), but now carry general reference. For the oblique forms, both the singular and plural forms of the basic set were cliticized to the oblique preposition *an (from *kan).

4.1.1.4. Ifugao

Considerable data is available for at least two Ifugao languages that enable us to make a more-informed reconstruction for Proto-Ifugao than that offered in Reid (1979). The first is the extensive description of forms given for Bataifugao, in Newell (1993) and the other is that spoken in Kiangan (referred to as Tuwali Ifugao in Gordon, 2005; Lambrecht, 1978; Racho, 1979).

4.1.1.4.1. Bataifugao

The description provided here is my best attempt to fit the material discussed by Newell (1993) into the framework given in this paper. Newell has noted numerous facts that support this analysis, not least of which is the recognition that some of what are here called nominal specifiers have their origin as deictics, and that the -n ending on them has its source in the enclitic form of a ligature (presently IFG an). Newell treats several of the forms as ‘common noun determiners’, but also notes that they have a deictic component and calls such forms ‘demonstrative adjectives’. For a complete description of the distribution and functions of the various forms, see Newell (1993, pp. 12-14, 81).

The IFGBT prepositions presented in Table 23 correspond in most details to those found both in Bontok and Kankanay, and in Balangao, except that topic (and predicate) positions are (optionally) marked with the preposition ba, as in (21)a,b. Newell (1993, p. 274) notes that the form bay (from earlier *say) is bimorphemic, being a sequence of ba + [the enclitic form of] di. Other prepositions are exemplified in (21)c-d. The same sequence of forms is found
in Inibaloi. In that \( \equiv y \) distinguishes indefinite nominative phrases from all others, it is here considered to be a case-marking prepositional form, with a different function from the \( \equiv y \) that occurs as part of the form \( by \).

Table 24 presents a summary of IfGBT common noun non-deictic specifiers, while Table 25 shows the IfGBT basic demonstratives.\(^{26}\) Examples are provided in(21)e-i.

**Table 23. Batad Ifugao case-marking prepositions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP/PRD</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hay</td>
<td>( \equiv y ) / ( =\Omega )</td>
<td>( =n )</td>
<td>( =h )</td>
<td>( =d )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C]</td>
<td>( \Omega )</td>
<td>( =\Omega )</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>( ?ad )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Following \( i \) or \( e \), no form appears; following other vowels, the form is \( \equiv y \).*

**Table 24. Batad Ifugao common noun specifiers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-DFNT</th>
<th>+DFNT</th>
<th>REMT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C]</td>
<td>default</td>
<td>nan**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>han**</td>
<td>din***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*‘When not otherwise specified by context, \( han \) usually indicates an indefinite person or thing, \( nan \) a definite person or thing.’ (Newell, 1993, p. 266)

**Newell reports stylistic variants \( han \) and \( han din \) for \( nan \) and \( din \), respectively. Note that these forms correspond to the Kiangan Ifugao deictic specifiers, listed in Table 28.

***‘If a named period of time is indicated, ... reference is to at least one period of time separated from the present [past or future].’ (Newell, 1993, p. 216)

**Table 25. Batad Ifugao basic demonstratives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>- PLRL</th>
<th>+ PLRL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>(he)te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>(he)ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>(he)de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>date / hātu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>dane / hāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>dade / hādi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{26}\) Although I do not consider topics and nominal predicates to be ‘case-marked’, the prepositions that introduce them function in a similar way to those that case-mark other NPs, in that they identify the function of the NP, and particularly in the case of topics they serve also to foreground the phrase within a discourse.
(21) Batad Ifugao (Newell, 1993, pp. 13, 216, 274, 285)

a. Hay aton di binañi'ya umay=da=ñ h wångwång an manåloñ.  
   ‘As for what the men do, they will go to the river to fish.’

b. Hay Hñigñ di panyawan=da=ñ mà'et.  

c. Ñña=a’ di bulbing=’u=ñ mapboñ.  
   buy=[NOM.1S] [NS shirt=GEN.1S]NOM=[P part [nice]NOM]  ‘I will buy a nice shirt for myself.’

d. Mungalbát nan binañi’hi mà’et hì=nan umay=da.  

e. Inab’añanha han mîyapat an nangwabñit.  
   came.upon.3S [NS fourth]NOM I.G fishing  ‘He came upon a fourth one fishing.’

f. Añi=ñu ilhág nan wadá=ñ Inlagwi.  
   NEG=GEN.2P tell [NS place=[P GEN [Inlagwi]NOM]  ‘Do not tell the place where Inlagwi is.’

g. Pëñbòd=’u diñ patanì ti tùngbin.  
   enjoy=GEN.1S [NS.REMT planting.season]NOM because cool  ‘I enjoyed that planting season because it was cool.’

h. Nàñi diñ mëni=’u.  
   dead [NS.REMT chicken=GEN.1S]NOM  ‘Those chickens of mine (that I had before) died.’

i. Do’ól diñ ulba=ñ h diñ nàdñy.  
   many [NS.DEFNT deer]NOM=[P part [NS long.ago]NOM]  ‘There were many deer during that past long ago.’

4.1.1.4.2. Kiangan Ifugao

As shown in Table 26, IfGKì marks topics with a distinct preposition, as does IfGBT, as in (22)a. Lambrecht (1978, p. 10) notes that the oblique form ab is ‘exceptionally used after maid [i.e., as an indefinite marker following a negative existential verb] in budbùd [epic poetry] chant’ and occurs frequently in the Banaue area, see (22)b. For similar types of construction in Bontok with the oblique preposition as / =s, see the examples in (9). Although Lambrecht considers ab to be a metathesized form of ba, there is no evidence that it is. Table 27 shows the NS forms in IfGKì, with examples provided in (22)b-h. Although the description for Kiangan is not as detailed as that for Batad, it seems clear that the former language has lost a number of the semantic distinctions that are found in the latter. Neither of the forms appears with a final (ligature) nasal, although it is found on the end of the common noun classifiers, given in Table 28, and illustrated in (23). Lambrecht (1978, p. 172) states ‘In budbùd [epic poetry], and in the Kiangan and Hapaw areas, ba is the case marker di... or affixed -y if the previous word ends in a vowel. In other areas, ba is more often replaced by nan [see the description of Batad Ifugao
above] (which somewhat implies a demonstrative meaning), or sometimes by the inverted form *ab*.

Table 26. Kiangan Ifugao case-marking prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOP</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hay</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>=y</td>
<td>=n</td>
<td>=h</td>
<td>=d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27. Kiangan Ifugao common noun specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DFNT</th>
<th>di / ha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 28. Kiangan Ifugao deictic specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PROX</th>
<th>DIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- PLRL</td>
<td>hantu(=n) / hatu(=n)*</td>
<td>handi(=n) / hadi(=n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ PLRL</td>
<td>hantu(=n) / hatu(=n)</td>
<td>hannada(=n) / hanada(=n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lambrecht (1978, p. viii) states, ‘*n of *ban is commonly omitted in Central Ifugao’.

(22) Kiangan Ifugao (Lambrecht, 1978, pp. viii, 10, 313, 205, 528)

a. *Hay balê=da ya yugik tinibo.*
   [Ptop [house=3p]gen]top and NEG.1s saw
   ‘(It was) their village and I didn’t see it.’

b. *Linahína=y balê=da.*
   passed.by.3s=[Ns house=3p]nom
   ‘He passed by their house.’

c. *Umâ=y inta.*
   come=[Ns child]nom
   ‘The child will come.’

d. *Munâbel di wangwâng.*
   strong,flowing [Ns river]nom
   ‘The current of the river is strong.’

e. *Ançé=n di akâ.*
   skirt=[Pgen [Ns little, girl]nomo]
   ‘the little girl’s skirt’

f. *Umê=ak hi payô.*
   go=[Nom.1s [P rice field]nom]nom
   ‘I’m going to my ricefield.’

g. *Maiâ ah umâli.*
   NEG.exist [P [come]gen]obl
   ‘None will come.’ Lit. ‘None are the ones who will come.’
h. *Naπẹ=ak ad Bontok ad kahiyatán.
    came=[NOM.1S [P.loc [Bontok]3S] [P.loc [morning.time]3S]
    ‘I came from Bontok this morning.’

(23) Kiangan Ifugao (Lambrecht, 1978, p. viii)
Paying=+ n bän=nâ=n babú.
field=[P.gen [NS=that=1G woman]3S]3S
    ‘(It is) the rice field of that woman.’

4.1.1.5. Proto-Ifugao reconstructions
The prepositional forms reconstructed for P-IFG (shown in Table 29) are cognate with those given in previous sections, with the addition of a topic-marking preposition ha. Although the preposition ab apparently occurs only in ritual texts, its presence in earlier forms of the language is evidenced by the cognate forms in P-BON-KNK and in BLW. The presence in P-IFG of three different definite nominal specifiers (shown in Table 30), having their source in deictics, is supported by the cognate forms in P-BON-KNK, although their functions differ. The basic demonstrative forms of P-IFG were different from those of P-BON-KNK, as can be seen by comparing Table 15 with Table 31, but are the same as are reconstructible for Pre-Balangao. It is interesting to note that among all the Central Cordilleran languages, it is only in Ifugao that *=y is retained as an enclitic NS. Remnants of its former use are found in the other languages, but not as part of the system of nominal specifiers, as in Ifugao.

Table 29. Proto-Ifugao case-marking prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ha(y)</td>
<td>*=n</td>
<td>*=h</td>
<td>*=d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*=O</td>
<td>*?i</td>
<td>*?ad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30. Proto-Ifugao common noun specifiers

| DFNT | V/ |  
|------|---|---|
| -    | *=y |   |
| +    | di / *nan / *han |   |
| DIST | din |   |
Table 31. Proto-Ifugao basic demonstrative forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROX</th>
<th>*na</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>*na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>*nA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2. Proto-Nuclear Cordilleran reconstructions

4.1.2.1. P-NuCo prepositions and singular common noun specifiers

On the basis of the foregoing descriptions, it is possible to reconstruct P-NuCo case-marking prepositions, and nominal specifiers which introduce singular common nouns as shown in Tables 32 and 33.

Table 32. Proto-Nuclear Cordilleran case-marking prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sa</td>
<td>Ø / *=n</td>
<td>*?iA / *?as</td>
<td>*=d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33. Proto-Nuclear Cordilleran common noun specifiers

| -DFNT |  *
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+DFNT</td>
<td>default</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>*anan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTE</td>
<td>*adin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2.2. P-NuCo plural common noun phrases

There is little difference between the Nuclear Cordilleran languages in the specifiers which mark plural common nouns and singular and plural personal nouns. Unmarked common noun phrases (topics, nominal predicates, nominatives, etc.) were pluralized by making them coreferential with a third person plural pronoun, a reflex of P-NLZN *=da, encliticized to the predicate, as exemplified with Bontok data in (24)b (compare (1)a, repeated here as (24)a), and for Balangao, with example (26); or by using a plural demonstrative as head of the following NP, either linked to a referential form as in (24)c, and (26)j, or not, as in (24)d. Genitive common noun phrases were pluralized in the same way, without a genitive preposition, as in (24)f (compare (4)a, repeated here as (24)c). Unmarked NPs which were not adjacent to the predicate (such as nominative NPs of transitive clauses) were pluralizable only by using a plural demonstrative as in (24)g (see also Balangao examples in (20)f). A core oblique NP with a definite NS (interpreted partitively), could be pluralized in the same way, as in (24)h (compare (4)b), and also adjunct oblique NPs expressing
location, as in (24)i (compare (5)d). Indefinite nominal predicates and nominative NPs were not pluralizable, but could be interpreted in a generic sense (compare (1)a, repeated here as (24)a), or by using a plural demonstrative as head of the following NP, either linked to a referential form (24)c, or not, as in (24)d.

(24) Guinaang Bontok (pluralization of common noun phrases)

a. \textit{Kinmaan} nan \textit{larāki}.
   departed [PM.-PRSN \textit{man}][NOM]
   ‘The man departed.’

b. \textit{Kinmaan}=\textit{cha} nan \textit{larrāki}.
   departed=[3P][NOM] [PM.-PRSN \textit{men}][NOM]
   ‘The men departed.’

c. \textit{Kinmaan} nan \textit{cheeycha}=\textit{y} \textit{larrāki}.
   departed [PM.-PRSN that.PLRL=LG \textit{men}][NOM]
   ‘Those men departed.’

d. \textit{Kinmaan} nan \textit{cheeycha}.
   departed [PM.-PRSN that.PLRL][NOM]
   ‘Those ones departed.’

e. \textit{Ināsa}=\textit{n} nan \textit{larāki} san \textit{fūtōg}.
   \textit{got}=[P\textit{GEN} \textit{NS}+DFNT \textit{man}][NOM] \textit{pig}*[NOM]
   ‘The man got the pig (we were just talking about).’

f. \textit{Ināsa}=\textit{cha} nan \textit{larrāki} san \textit{fūtōg}.
   \textit{got}=[3P][\textit{GEN} \textit{NS}+DFNT \textit{men}][\textit{GEN} \textit{NS}+REC \textit{pig}][NOM]
   ‘The man got the pig (we were just talking about).’

g. \textit{Ināsa}=\textit{ti} nan \textit{larāki} san \textit{cheeycha}=\textit{y} \textit{fūtōg}.
   \textit{got}=[P\textit{GEN} \textit{NS}+DFNT \textit{man}][\textit{NS}+REC that.PLRL=LG \textit{pig}][NOM]
   ‘The man got those pigs (we were just talking about).’

h. \textit{Ināsa}=	extit{ak} si nan \textit{sānachā}=\textit{y} \textit{fūtōg}.
   \textit{got}=\textit{NOM.1S} [P \textit{NS}+DFNT that.PLRL=LG \textit{pig}][NOM]
   ‘I got some of those pigs (near you).’

i. \textit{Ipay}=\textit{ne}=\textit{s} nan \textit{māycha}=\textit{y} \textit{takfa}.
   \textit{enter}=[\textit{GEN.2S}]=[P \textit{NS}+DFNT this.PLRL=LG \textit{backpack.1S}][NOM]
   ‘Put (them) in those backpacks!’

4.1.2.3 P-NuCO personal noun phrases

Unmarked singular personal noun phrases (topics, nominal predicates, and nominatives) can be reconstructed with the ubiquitous nominal specifier *si, and an enclitic variant *=s when part of a nominative phrase following a vowel-final word, as exemplified with Bontok data in (25)a,b,c. The only NuCO language which has an innovation (apart from regular sound change) is Balangao which retains a reflex of the clitic form *=s (as =b) as in (26)a, but which has replaced *si with \textit{a}\textit{b}; as in (26)b,c. Since, in Balangao, =b is homophonous with the enclitic form of the common noun oblique preposition \textit{a}\textit{b} (see Table 16 and (26)d), this form has been extended to replace the inherited personal noun phrase NS.
Genitive and oblique singular personal noun phrases had no nominal specifier between the preposition and the lexical head, as exemplified in Balangao (26)c,d,h and Talubin Bontok (27)d.

Core oblique phrases in triadic transitive constructions with personal nouns were case-marked as datives by the preposition *kan, but did not allow any nominal specifier, as in (26)e (*k > Blw /?/, and is not represented at the beginning of a word in the local orthography, hence an). The dative preposition also had an enclitic form, =n, as in (26)k.

Kankanay and Talubin Bontok have changed the vowel of the Dative preposition to /a/. Guinaang Bontok has replaced the personal oblique preposition *kan, with an (or =n following a vowel-final form), as in (25)d,e. There are two possible explanations for the change, either it was borrowed from a language in which *k > /?/ (such as Guinaang Kalinga),\textsuperscript{27} or the form has changed by analogy with the homophonous an which functions as a NS in Oblique phrases expressing a personal location. The nominal specifier is freely translated as ‘the place of’, as in (25)f, and is possibly a reduction of kad-an ‘place’ (/kaʔdan/ > /kadʔan/, cf. /ʔadan-án/ ‘to reach some place’). Support for the relatedness of the preposition and the nominal specifier, however, comes from other dialects of Bontok, such as Talubin, where both forms are ken, as in (27)a, and also from the Kankanay dialects, which also reflect *kan as ken. Since *kan as a nominal specifier only occurs in Bontok and Kankanay dialects, it is probably not reconstructible to P-NUCO.

Ifugao dialects are problematic in that like Balangao and Bontok the elitic form of the dative preposition is =n, implying an earlier *kan, but the non-elitic form is a reflex of *kay, i.e., IfgBT /ʔay/, IfgKI /ke/. Since the Ifugao languages are the only Nuclear Cordilleran languages to show this form, and Ifugao does not have i as a singular personal noun NS, as some Northern Cordilleran languages do, it cannot be considered to be a regular development, but is probably a borrowed form; however, see further discussion on this form in sec. 4.3.

Plural personal noun phrases in P-NUCO all contained a NS *da. In unmarked NPs, the form substituted for the singular NS *si, as in (25)g. In the case-marked genitive and dative phrases, however, the plural NS *da occurred between the preposition and the lexical head, as in (25)h and (27)b. Table 34 shows the P-NUCO reconstructed prepositions with their following singular and plural personal noun specifiers.

\textsuperscript{27} See sec. 4.2.2 for further evidence of contact between Guinaang Bontok and Guinaang Kalinga.
Table 34. Proto-Nuclear Cordilleran prepositions + personal noun specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNM</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>DAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-PLRL</td>
<td>*si / *es</td>
<td>*n</td>
<td>*kan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+PLRL</td>
<td>*da</td>
<td>*n da</td>
<td>*kan da</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(25) Guinaang Bontok (personal noun phrases)

a. Kinmaan si Takecheg.
   departed [NS.+PRSN Takecheg]NOM
   ‘Takecheg departed.’

b. Si Takecheg ket, kinmaan.
   [NS.+PRSN Takecheg]TOP TPLK departed
   ‘As for Takecheg, he left.’

c. Inila-na=s Takecheg,
   saw=[GEN.3S]=[NS.+PRSN Takecheg]NOM
   ‘He saw Takecheg.’

d. Egiwar=m=na to-i.
   give=[GEN.2S]=PlAT that.person
   ‘Give (it) to that person (over there).’

e. Masayep=ak an asawak
   skip=[NOM.1S] [PlAT wife.1S]
   ‘I’m sleeping with my wife.’

f. E[n=]tako inkarang as an Cherweg.
   go=[NOM.1+2P] do,inkarang [PlATL [NS.+PRSN Cherweg]]
   ‘Let’s go perform the inkarang ceremony at Cherweg’s place.’

g. Kinmaan cha Takecheg.
   departed [NS.+PRSN Takecheg]NOM
   ‘Takecheg (and others) departed.’

h. Egiwar=m=na cha Takecheg
   give=[GEN.2S]=PlATL Takecheg
   ‘Give (it) to Takecheg (and others).’

i. Inira=n cha Takecheg nan payen=na.
   got=[PlAT [NS.+PLRL Takecheg]] [NS pond.field=[GEN.3S]]NOM
   ‘Takecheg (and others) got his pond field.’

(26) Balangao (Shetler, 1976)

a. Nanben’u=ha Uuyama.
   sacrifice=[NS.+PRSN Uuyama]NOM
   ‘Uuyama performed a sacrifice.’ (p.237)

b. Èmméy ah Amlalawiyén=ay mangila.
   departed [NS.+PRSN Amlalawiyén]NOM=1G see
   ‘Amlalawiyén went to see.’ (p. 236)

c. Mátéy ah Uménúgan=ay ama=na Uuyama.
   die [NS.+PRSN Uménúgan =1G father=[PlATU Uuyama]]NOM
   ‘Uménúgan who was the father of Uuyama died.’ (p.237)

d. Iyéy=da ah báley Uuyama.
   took=[GEN.3P] [P house [Uuyama.,]]NOM
   ‘They took (it) to the house of Uuyama.’ (p.238)
REID

c.  *ipateko=*yu=to  an  Juan.
cause.bend=[GEN.2P]=this.one]_omin  [P_DAT [Juan]_om]
‘Have Juan bend this.’ (p.143)

f.  *Ah Panapan, publi yay tatagy…*
s [NS Panapan]_pron [poor LG person]_omi
‘As for Panapan, he was a poor person…”

g.  Ad awaw=ay natéy ah Panapan….  
P_loc now=LG dead [NS Panapan]_omin
‘Now that Panapan is dead…”

h.  Maid anén Panapan.
NEG.EXIST food [Panapan]_gen
‘Panapan had nothing to eat…”

i.  *Mangan=*da  ano  hin ongta.
  eat=[3P]_omin  Rprt [NS spirit]_omin
‘The spirits eat, they say.”

j.  *Hen andida=*y bakna ng ad Saliyok, ay *da* Onsat…
  [NS those=LG rich.ones [P_loc Saliyok]_top LG [NS.PRL.pl Onsat]_imi
‘As for the rich people at Saliyok, that is Onsat and his companions…”

k.  *Hýada=*n munlaydan *hin tatagy=*n  Panapan.
  that=[NS like.reason [NS people]_omin =P_DAT Panapan]
‘That was the reason the people liked Panapan.”

(27) Talubin Bontok (Kikusawa & Reid, 2003)

a.  *Inháblí=*ja=*=h  ken  Lumawig.
    return=[3P]_omin =P NS Lumawig]_omx
‘They returned to Lumawig’s place.’ (p. 119)

b.  *Kanani=*yu  ken  ja  amá=*ja.
    say=[GEN.2P] [P_DAT NS.PRL.pl father=GEN.2P]
‘Tell (it) to your father.” (p. 104)

c.  *Hima=*ja  han  hin-agik.
    return=home=[3P]_omin [NS sibling]_omin
‘The siblings returned home.’ (p.105)

d.  *Umae  ken  kavatayjanna.
    go [P_DAT [sister]_om]
‘He went to his sister.” (p.130)

4.2 Kalinga-Itneg

The Ethnologue (Gordon, 2005) lists nine varieties of Kalinga and four of
Itneg, so the information provided here is merely a sample of the variety that
probably exists. There are at least two Kalinga languages which have fairly
extensive published data available. The first, Limos Kalinga (Ferreirinho, 1993),
has an insightful description of the relevant forms. The other is Guinaang
Kalinga (Gieser, 1963).

4.2.1 Limos Kalinga

Ferreirinho (1993) notes that nominative noun phrases in KLAL1 are not
case-marked. The forms that she lists that mark case are given in Table 35.
Three forms that are of interest are the topic-marking preposition *sa*   found also
in P-NuCO, and the Oblique and Locative forms ʔut and ʔud. The equivalent forms in NuCO languages have either an i or an a vowel.

Table 35. Limos Kalinga case-marking prepositions
(adapted from Ferreirinho, 1993, pp. 9-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sa</td>
<td>Vj</td>
<td>=n</td>
<td>=d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cj</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>si / ?at</td>
<td>?ud</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NSs (referred to by Ferreirinho as ‘determiners’) are given in Table 36. The final nasal on the proximal and (visible) distal forms is a frozen enclitic ligature, as is found in the NuCO languages. Ferreirinho refers to these as ‘determiner ligatures’, and compares them to the ligature which follows the same deictic forms when they function as ‘adjectival demonstratives’, shown in Table 37.28

Table 36. Limos Kalinga common noun specifiers
(adapted from Ferreirinho, 1993, pp. 9-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROX</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>nat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST (visible)</td>
<td>din</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST (out-of-sight)</td>
<td>Vj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cj</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37. Limos Kalinga ‘adjectival demonstratives’
(adapted from Ferreirinho, 1993, pp. 9-10)

| PROX | tu=a  |
| MED  | nat=a |
| DIST | di=a  |

Although Ferreirinho labels the nominal specifiers with the same descriptive terms that she gives to the basic demonstratives, in the process of becoming nominal specifiers their meanings have changed. Ferreirinho notes that di is the unmarked form, presumably the form that occurs most frequently. She labels the two distal forms as ‘visible’ vs. ‘out-of-sight’, but her description suggests that forms with final -n are unmarked, and those with final -t are commonly found in narrative discourse helping to disambiguate structures which have non-past verbal forms as in fact having occurred in the past, citing

28 In KLAL the form of the ligature has been generalized in this environment. The variant, =a, which only occurs elsewhere following consonant-final words, has replaced the vowel-final variant following demonstratives. In other environments, =n typically follows vowel-final words (Ferreirinho, 1993, p. 15).
Gieser (1972, p. 22), ‘Case marking particles with final t are particularly diagnostic of Kalinga narrative discourse when they mark constructions that otherwise give no indication of past time reference’.

Note also that the nominal specifier dit is frequently reduced to the enclitic =t creating homophony with the oblique prepositional enclitic =t, a reduction of the full form Pat. The sequential combinations of Limos Kalinga case-marking prepositions and nominal specifiers are shown in Table 38.

Table 38. Limos Kalinga case-marking prepositions + nominal specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP</th>
<th>UNM</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sa tu-n</td>
<td>tu-n</td>
<td>=n tu-n</td>
<td>(?u)t tu-n</td>
<td>(di) tu-n</td>
<td>si tu-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa nat</td>
<td>nat</td>
<td>=n nat</td>
<td>(?u)t nat</td>
<td>(di) nat</td>
<td>si nat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sa di-n</td>
<td>di-n</td>
<td>=n di-n</td>
<td>(?u)t di-n</td>
<td>(di) di-n</td>
<td>si di-n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*When ambiguity may result, the free form di optionally occurs before common nouns and ad optionally occurs before personal nouns (Ferreirinho, 1993, p. 11).

4.2.2 Guinaang Kalinga

The forms occurring as prepositions in KLAGU are shown in Table 39, and are exemplified in (28)a-e. The only form that appears to be innovative here is the glottal stop enclitic form of si. Examples show either si, =s, or =? following vowel-final words (as in (28)d,e,h). Historically the source of a glottal stop in this position can only be from *k, but there are no possible prepositions having a velar stop from which this could derive. The locative form ?ud is cognate with the identical form in KLALI, and is reconstructible to P-KLA. Although the locative form ?ud found in Lubuagan Kalinga and in some of the NuCO languages apparently does not occur as such in KLAGU, the form does appear as an adverb with a sequential sense, typically found in temporal phrases, and at the beginning of sequential clauses, as in (29). The form does not necessarily have past reference, it seems to commonly occur in narrative contexts, and probably is an independent development from a sequence of a ligature and a demonstrative, *a+di, also found in Isinai (see sec. 4.2.4.2).

Table 39. Guinaang Kalinga case-marking prepositions (adapted from Gieser, 1963, p. 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP / Prd</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>si</td>
<td>=n</td>
<td>=s / =?</td>
<td>=d / =?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This form occurs in the dialect of Kalinga spoken in Lubuagan.
The nominal specifiers of KLAGU are shown in Table 40, with examples in (28)f-l. As in BONGU, there is homophony between the indefinite NS *si* and the preposition of the same form. Since these are the only two languages which show this homophony, it supports local claims, possibly reflected also in the common name of the two communities, that there has been population movement between them in the past. The expected indefinite NS *di* also occurs and supports its reconstruction to P-CCO. Further evidence of contact between the two Guinaang communities is found in the form of the KLAGU basic proximate demonstrative, *na* (see Table 41), with examples of their occurrence in (30). Only in the Bontok and Kankanaey languages is the same form found with this meaning. Elsewhere in the CCO languages, *na* only occurs as a basic demonstrative meaning ‘near addressee’. This perhaps accounts for the presence of a final *i* on the KLAGU form *nat* ‘near addressee’. It was disambiguated from *na* ‘near speaker’ by adding an enclitic form of *ta* (occurring also in Ilokano) meaning ‘near addressee’. This form (*ta*) may also have been the source of the final consonant on the nominal specifiers with past reference, KLAGU *sit* and *dit*, which are now apparently monomorphemic.

**Table 40. Guinaang Kalinga nominal specifiers** (adapted from Gieser, 1963, p. 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indefinite</th>
<th><em>di</em> / <em>si</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>default</td>
<td>nan / [=n]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite</td>
<td>-PAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+PAST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 41. Guinaang Kalinga basic demonstratives** (Gieser, 1963, p. 79)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROX</th>
<th><em>na</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td><em>nat</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td><em>di</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(28) Guinaang Kalinga (Gieser, 1963, pp. 18, 24, 28, 59, 76-78, 86)

a. *si=*n *mankilaw*=mi… *nan* *manregen*=da *si=*n *npa*=a

*P [NS prepare.meat=GEN.1P…]PRD [NS chop.in.pieces=[3P]GEN [P [NS deer]s]=om]NOM*

‘The time we prepare *kilaw* meat … is when we chop the deer in pieces.’

b. *si=*n *tanak*=a *latiki*, *tanmay* *nagayu*

*P [NS child=LG male]=om went collected.wood*

‘As for the boy, he went to get wood.’

c. *tanay*=da *pon* *lumaw* *si* *makahulan.*

*NEG=[3P]NOM ADV go.out [P . month.period]TEM*

‘They do not go out for a month.’
d. *mansa* =ta =si *toblit.*
exchange=[1+2s]_{nom} [p] skin]_{obl.}
‘Let’s exchange skins.’

e. *mangwa=* da =*tudamal.*
[make=[3p]_{nom} =[p] animal.night.sacrifice]_{obl.}
‘They kill a sacrificial animal at night.’

f. *timbag* =n dit lubang =si=t buta.
told=[p]_{gen} [ns water.buffalo] p=[ns cow]_{obl.}
‘The water buffalo told (something) to the cow.’

g. *tumis* =*tumi* =si *taway* =si=t gattok=a saklot=na.
shave=nom.1p [p rattan]_{obl.} p=[ns permanent=[lg tie=gen.3s]_{gen} ]_{obl.}
‘We shave rattan for its permanent ties.’

h. *tadlong* =no=s nan *tandi.*
set.fire.stones=gen.2s=[p ns that.one]_{loc}
‘Set (them) as fire stones at that place’

i. *tingda=* da =n gawa=na.
tied=[3p]_{gen} =ns center=gen.3s]_{nom}
‘They tied its center.’

j. *patuyon* =da =si *tagu.*
kill=[3p]_{gen} [ns person]_{nom}
‘They kill a person.’

k. *pong* =di wa*l*
source [ns stream]_{gen}
‘source of a stream’

l. na*tawin* pon niwawat dit *pita*=da…
be.all=[3p]_{nom} ADV distributed [ns meat=[3p]_{gen} ]_{nom}
‘When the meat was completely distributed…’

(29) Guinaang Kalinga (Gieser, 1963, pp. 36-37, 39-41)

a. *magampot* *pad* ma*ñulaban,* *tinisong=*mi nan ataknang nan boloy,
*pad* pinutdan=mi
finish SEQ digging measure=en.1p [ns height [ns house]_{gen} ]_{nom}

b. *magampot* *pad* nan langon,* *tiniva=*mi.
finish SEQ [ns hair.burning]_{nom} butcher=gen.1p
‘After the hair is completely burned off, we butcher (it).’

c. *magampot* *pad* nan patutan,* *tasi=*da *mangan* dan *tagu.*
finish SEQ [ns distribution]_{nom} again=[3p]_{nom} cat [ns.pl. people]_{nom}
‘After the (meat) is distributed, the people eat again.’

d. *wadawad* *pad* nan *pasalang=*mi=n nan *padad,* ...
exist SEQ [ns use=gen.1p=lg fencing]_{nom}
‘When all of the things used for fencing are gathered, …’
c. Ḉassa=da pon Ḉabos Ḉad Ḉanon dan matipuy...
   NEG=[3P][GEN ADV] also SEQ eat [NS.PLRI. vegetables][NOM]
   ‘Then they also do not eat vegetables...’

f. Ḉawmi Ḉad mabīgat Ḉad
   finish SEQ next.day SEQ
   ‘later’ ‘the next day’

(30) Guinaang Kalinga (Gieser, 1963, p. 79)

Pan na ‘this, proximal’    si na ‘here, proximal’
Pan nat ‘that, medial’    si nat ‘there, medial’
Pan di ‘that, distal’    si di ‘there, distal’

The reconstructed Proto-Kalinga prepositions, basic demonstratives and
nominal specifiers, based on the data described above are shown in Tables 42-
44. Limos Kalinga gives evidence that the preposition which marked a topic
was the same as that which is reconstructible for P-NuCO, *sa and that
Guinaang Kalinga has replaced it with si, in effect neutralizing the marking of
obliges, topics, and nominal predicates. Limos Kalinga also gives evidence of
an Ḉn-initial oblique form, corresponding to its Ḉn-initial locative form, Ḉnd. The
final alveolar consonant on the KLALI oblique preposition Ḉut probably doesn’t
have its source in *ta as proposed above for the final alveolar consonant of the
Guinaang Kalinga forms, but is an irregular development of the enclitic form of
*si. Each of the basic demonstratives that occurred following *?us began with
an alveolar stop (as shown in Table 37), so that sequences of *?us=tu, *?us=na,
and *?us=di became by assimilation respectively **?ut=tu, **?ut=na, and
**?ut=di. Evidence that this was so is that now the enclitic form of the KLALI
nominal specifier ȋ is also =t. More will be said about these oblique forms in
sec. 4.2.5.

Table 42. Proto-Kalinga case-marking prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP / PRD</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sa</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*=n</td>
<td>*=s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*O</td>
<td>*?us / *si</td>
<td>*?ud / *?ad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 43. Proto-Kalinga nominal specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indefinite</th>
<th>*di</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>default</td>
<td>*nan / *=n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defineite</td>
<td>-PAST *din / *=n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+PAST *dit / *=t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.3 Binongan Itneg

Of the four varieties of Itneg spoken in the province of Abra that are listed in the *Ethnologue* (Gordon, 2005), the only published data available is that from Binongan Itneg (ITGBI) as spoken in Nalbuan, Baay, of the municipality of Baay-Licuan (Walton, J., 1975), although brief statements relating to the ‘basic CRE [construction reference expression] articles’ of other languages in the group (as well as elsewhere in the northern Philippines) are found in McFarland (1977).

Examining the Itneg data (illustrated in (31) a-i) reveals a difference between this language and Kalinga in the function of the form *si*. While *si* occurs both as an oblique preposition and as an indefinite nominal specifier in Kalinga, and only occurs with definite nouns in topic positions, in Itneg it is a definite nominal specifier and occurs as such in nominative, topic, and presumably predicative noun phrases. It has been replaced as an oblique preposition by *kan*, apparently by generalizing the personal dative preposition to also mark phrases that have common noun exponents.

In Reid (1974, pp. 545-547), I discussed the Itneg genitive prepositions illustrated in (31) b, e, j, k and (32) a-f. Since this is the only Central Cordilleran language that uses the full form *ni*, rather than the reduced form *n*, to mark genitive common noun phrases, it is probable that the form was borrowed from Ilokano, a language from which Itneg has borrowed heavily in all areas of its morphosyntax. The inherited reduced form still optionally marks genitive proper noun phrases in Itneg, as in (32) f.

Binongan Itneg appears to be neutralizing the distinction between nominal specifiers which distinguish spatial distinction between a reference close to the speaker (*tu*), and one close to the addressee (*ta*). Both deictics occur as an enclitic *t* attached to either a preceding preposition, or to a preceding nominal specifier. Although the data shows frequent occurrence of the unreduced form *ta*, on forms such as *nita*, *sita*, and *dita*, alongside *nit*, *sit*, and *dit*, with English translations as either ‘this’, ‘that’, or simply ‘the’, forms with an attached *tu*, such as *nitu*, *situ*, and *ditu* are not found in the published data. The form *to* (from *tu*) does appear as an indefinite NS following a negative, as in (31). Binongan Itneg case-marking prepositions are given in Table 45 and its nominal specifiers in Table 46.

Table 44. Proto-Kalinga basic demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROX</th>
<th>*ni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>*na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>*di</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 45. Binongan Itneg case-marking prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ni</td>
<td>kan</td>
<td>di</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 46. Binongan Itneg nominal specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Default</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definite</td>
<td>si=t(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>si=n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The possible development of Itneg specifiers is shown in Table 47. The language as spoken today still maintains earlier structures as variants, alongside the forms which represent later developments. Thus Stage 3 forms in which ta is functioning as a demonstrative linked to its following noun with the borrowed ligature nga are found, as in (31)i,m, alongside Stage 4 forms in which ta has become a nominal specifier, as in (31)j,k. Table 48 shows the forms of Binongan Itneg adverbial demonstratives.

Table 47. Development of Itneg deictic specifiers

Genitive

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>P=N_{DNMS}=LG</td>
<td>NS=N_{DNMS}=LG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROX: ni=t=a N</td>
<td>ni=t=a N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MED:  ni=ta=a N</td>
<td>ni=ta=a N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIST: ni=di=a N</td>
<td>ni=di=a N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>P= N_{DNMS}=LG</td>
<td>NS= N_{DNMS}=LG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROX: ni=t=a N</td>
<td>si=t=a N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MED:  ni=t=a N</td>
<td>si=t=a N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIST: ni=di=a N</td>
<td>si=di=a N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 2 (Loss of demonstrative vowel)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P= N_{DNMS}=LG</td>
<td>NS= N_{DNMS}=LG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROX: ni=t=a N</td>
<td>si=t=a N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MED:  ni=t=a N</td>
<td>si=t=a N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIST: ni=di=a N</td>
<td>si=di=a N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 3 (Ligature replacement borrowed from ILK)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P= N_{DNMS}=LG</td>
<td>NS= N_{DNMS}=LG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROX: ni=t nga N</td>
<td>si=t nga N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIST: ni=di nga N</td>
<td>si=di nga N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 4 (Loss of ligature)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P=NS</th>
<th>NS=NDNS</th>
<th>NS_DNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>ni=t N</td>
<td>si=t N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>ni=d N</td>
<td>si=d N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 5 (Demonstrative clitic fuses with NS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P=NS</th>
<th>NS_DNS</th>
<th>NS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>ni=t N</td>
<td>si N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>ni=d N</td>
<td>sid N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 48. Itneg deictic adverbs (Walton, J., 1975, pp. 53, 57)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROX</th>
<th>tu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>kanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>kantan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(31) Binongan Itneg (Walton, J., 1975)

   went=[3P]_GEN [P_Tomeng-ey]_LOC until [P_Lowaben]_LOC go.gather.rattan
   ‘They went to Tomeng-ey as far as Lowaben, gathering rattan.’ (p.22)

b. *Sit olö ni=t babey, izya kan sit idawis=da kan ta bakes.
   [NS head [P_GEN=[NS pig]]_TOP [3S]_PRP REPT [NS share=3P]_GEN [P_OBL [NS woman]_GEN]
   ‘As for the head of the pig, that is what they gave the old woman as her share.’ (p.5)

c. *Bagis met sit managana.
   intestines also [NS saw=3S]_GEN
   ‘Intestines is what she saw.’ (p.5)

d. *Iylinim kay sit lapit=kon.
   return.2s also [NS saw=GEN.1s]_GEN
   ‘Please return my pencil.’ (p.5)

e. *Lontaw kan di paghekaan ni=d atasa=a, ...
   arrive [P_OBL [NS excavation [P_GEN [NS spouse=GEN.3s]]]]
   ‘(When she) arrived where her husband was excavating, …’ (p.5)

f. Sengam no awad payyet ta pagy kan ta alang.
   see.2s if EXIST yet [NS rice]_GEN [P_OBL [NS granary]_GEN]
   ‘See if there is still rice in the granary.’ (p.5)

g. *Intono og-ogna ta Sabado, omuli=kayo.
   until morning [NS Saturday]_GEN come=NOM.2p
   ‘On Saturday morning, you (pl) come.’ (p.5)

h. *Kan di awi, awad dat luo=a maghalu.
   [P_OBL [NS old.time]] exist NS.PL.PL people=LG wear.loincloth
   ‘In the old times some people wore loincloths. (p.11)
j.  
Naid  ta ragsak  ni=t  pamilya  no naid  to onlos.
NEG.EXIST [NS family]NOM if NEG.EXIST [NS unity]NOM
‘A family has no happiness if there is no unity’ (p.12)

k.  
... kon=ta  kano  ni=ta  babai=ya  iMainit.
... say=GEN.3S REPT [PGEN=NS woman=LG Mainit.person]]
‘... said the Mainit woman.’ (p.55)

l.  
Isalde=d=nosit  mangbhat  kan=ta  nga  as.
stop=GEN.2S [NS beating [Poram. [that LG dog]]NOM
‘Stop beating that dog.’ (p.11)

m.  
Gapota  naliw=da  si=ta  nga  bokal...
because caught= [3S]GEN [NS=that LG wild.pig]NOM
‘Because they caught that wild pig...’ (p.11)

(32) Binongan Itneg
a.  
bula  nit  anak  ‘the ball of the child’
b.  
bula  nid  anak  ‘the ball of that child’
c.  
bula  nita  nga  anak  ‘the ball of this child’, lit. ‘the ball of this one who is a child’
d.  
buli  nidi  nga  anak  ‘the ball of that child’, lit. ‘the ball of that one who is a child’
e.  
buli  ni  Juan  ‘John’s ball’
f.  
buli=\n  Juan  ‘John’s ball’

4.2.4 P-Kalinga-Itneg reconstructions

Based on the data presented in the preceding sections, this section provides reconstructions of Proto-Kalinga-Itneg prepositions and singular common noun specifiers in sec. 4.2.4.1, followed in sec. 4.2.4.2 by the reconstructions of the plural common noun specifiers, and in sec. 4.2.4.3 by the reconstructions of personal noun specifiers.

4.2.4.1 P-KLA-ItG prepositions and singular common noun specifiers

Comparing Kalinga and Itneg with forms reconstructed above for Proto-Nuclear Cordilleran, it appears that Itneg has been more innovative than Kalinga, especially in its development of si as an unmarked nominal specifier. The reconstructed set of prepositions for the parent language (Table 49) then appears more like what is found in the Kalinga languages, than in the Itneg languages. The same is true of the reconstructed P-KLA-ItG nominal specifiers (Table 50), and the reconstructed P-KLA-ItG basic deictics (Table 51). Itneg has replaced the near-addressee form *na with the equivalent Ilokano form ta, although evidence of its presence in the language at an earlier stage can be seen in the final nasal of the unmarked form si=n, which occurs in some nominative noun phrases.
Table 49. Proto-Kalinga-Itneg case-marking prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*sa</td>
<td>Ø / *=n</td>
<td>*?us / *si / *=s</td>
<td>*?ud / *di / =d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50. Proto-Kalinga-Itneg singular common noun specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indefinite</th>
<th>*di</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-PAST</td>
<td>*din / *=t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+PAST</td>
<td>*dit / *=t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 51. Proto-Kalinga-Itneg basic demonstratives

| PROX | *tu |
| MED  | *na |
| DIST | *di |

4.2.4.2 P- KLA-ITG plural common noun phrases

In Itneg, unmarked plural common noun phrases replace the proximal and distal NS forms, sit and sid (from earlier si=ta and si=di), with dat and dad respectively, as in (33)a,b. Genitive plural common noun phrases become morphologically unmarked in the plural, and use the same plural forms as other unmarked phrases. Oblique plural phrases require plural demonstrative heads, cliticized to a preposition ka which appears to be a borrowing from Ilokano, see Table 52.

Table 52. Itneg plural deictic prepositions + nominal specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNM</th>
<th>OBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+PLRL</td>
<td>dat, ka=datuwe, ka=data, dad=adi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(33) Binongan Itneg (Walton, J., 1975)

a. Kayanan  dat  tan.
   went [NS,PLRL people]NOM
   'Those people went.' (p.6)

b. Kan di awi, awad  dat  tan=wa magbaal.
   [P,LOC [NS old.time]] exist [NS,PLRL people=LG wear.loincloth]NOM
   'In the old times some people wore loincloths. (p.11)

Kalinga languages, like Itneg, replace unmarked singular common noun specifiers with plural forms dat and dan (from earlier *da=ta and *da=na, respectively). But unlike Itneg, Kalinga languages retain the preposition *= when the phrase is genitive (and follows a vowel-final word), the NS forms occurring in the expected position, following the preposition.
4.2.4.3 P-KLA-ITG personal noun phrases

A comparison of the forms marking Kalinga and Itneg singular and plural personal noun phrases with those already reconstructed for P-NuCO, enables us to reconstruct a system of prepositions and nominal specifiers for P-KLA-ITG with very similar forms. In Itneg, unmarked personal noun phrases have NS forms *si and *da for singular and plural respectively. Genitive personal nouns are not marked following a genitive preposition when singular, but are marked with *da when plural. Dative forms are either unmarked or have a nominal specifier *ni, following the dative preposition when singular, but are marked with *da when plural (see Table 53).

Table 53. Itneg personal noun specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNM</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>DAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-PLRL</td>
<td>*si</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø (*ni)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+PLRL</td>
<td>*da</td>
<td>*da</td>
<td>*da</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kalinga has a very similar distribution of forms marking personal phrases. The only difference is the use of a singular NS *ʔud, following a genitive preposition. This is clearly an innovative form, but its source is opaque. Elsewhere in Kalinga, the form is a locative preposition (see Table 54).

Table 54. Kalinga personal noun specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNM</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>DAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-PLRL</td>
<td>*si / *=t</td>
<td>*ʔud</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+PLRL</td>
<td>*da</td>
<td>*da</td>
<td>*da</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reconstructed Proto-Kalinga-Itneg sequences of prepositions and nominal specifiers is shown in Table 55.

Table 55. P-KLA-ITG prepositions + personal noun specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNM</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>DAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-PLRL</td>
<td>*si / *=s</td>
<td>*=n</td>
<td>**kan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+PLRL</td>
<td>*da</td>
<td>*=n da</td>
<td>*kan da</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.5 Proto-North Central Cordilleran reconstructions

Following the pattern set in the preceding sections, we now reconstruct the forms for the next higher subgroup, Proto-North-Central Cordilleran, the parent of the Nuclear Cordilleran and the Kalinga-Itneg languages. Case-
marking prepositions will be reconstructed in sec. 4.2.5.1 and nominal specifiers in sec. 4.2.5.2.

4.2.5.1 P-NCCO case-marking prepositions
Comparing the reconstructions of P-Nuco and P-Kla-Itg case-marking prepositions (Tables 32 and 40), two interesting problems arise. In the locative forms, three different vowels are found, the forms are *ʔad, *ʔid, and *ʔud. These, along with the other reconstructible form, *di, which was originally probably a distal demonstrative, is the first hint that there may have been a three-way set of locative forms, *ʔa=di, *ʔi=di, and *ʔu=di that were distinguished by the quality of the vowel at some early point in the history of these languages, corresponding in some way to the set of genitive forms, *na, *ni, and *nu first proposed in Reid (1981), and discussed more recently by Ross (2002) and Blust (2005). There are several problems with this proposal, however. The first is that although there is external evidence for a locative form with an i-vowel in Ilokano idî, to my knowledge there is no evidence for the postulated full locative forms *ʔadì and *ʔudi in any Philippine language.

The second problem is that there is no difference in meaning between the reflexes of *ʔad, *ʔid and *ʔud in the Northern Luzon languages that have them. The third problem is that there seems to be no explanation for why even adjacent communities within the same language area sometimes reflect different forms.

Finally, the oblique forms of languages match the vowel-grade of their locative preposition; those with *ʔad ‘locative’ have *ʔas ‘oblique’; those with *ʔid ‘locative’ have *ʔis ‘oblique’; and KilaI with *ʔid ‘locative’ has *ʔit (< *ʔis) ‘oblique’, suggesting that a vocalic template, or VOWEL-GRADE HARMONY is applied to the forms (see Reid, 2006). This appears to be confirmed by the fact that the Nuco languages which show *ʔad ‘locative’ and *ʔis ‘oblique’, also have nun and san as nominal specifiers, but have lost (or never had) the common noun specifier din. This form is found only in those languages which use *ʔid ‘locative’ and *ʔis ‘oblique’.

There is no evidence, moreover, that this template is associated with deictic reference. As I have tried to demonstrate, these prepositions have no deictic reference at all, they function only to mark case. Deictic reference is carried by nominal specifiers, or by demonstratives which follow the specifiers. It is probable that only *si and its enclitic form *=s are reconstructible as oblique prepositions, and that the other oblique forms have been innovated on the basis of a common vocalic template between locative and oblique forms. This is not surprising, since both location and time semantic roles are carried by both locative and oblique phrases. While it seems clear that this innovation has
taken place in the daughter languages of this group, it is unclear whether or not it was operating in the parent language. Because of the way the forms are distributed, however, it is probable that it was not. For this reason, I place parentheses around the problematic oblique prepositions in Table 56. In the table I also include a column for nominative. The zero mark is to make explicit that such phrases were not morphologically case-marked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 56. P-NCCO case-marking prepositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.5.2 P-NCCO nominal specifiers

Table 57 presents the reconstructed system of nominal specifiers for P-NCCO, based on the reconstructions provided in the previous sections. The basic semantic distinction marked by nominal specifiers in P-NCCO was between personal and non-personal nouns. Personal nouns included not only the names of people and names given to pet animals and animal participants in stories, but also kinship terms of address, as well as titles. Singular vs. plural distinctions were maintained throughout the system. The marking of singular personal nouns, however, differed depending on the case of the phrase. The reconstructed form *si only occurred in unmarked NPs, usually topics, nominal predicates, and nominatives. No personal noun could occur in a phrase marked as oblique, since such phrases had indefinite reference. Oblique phrases expressing a personal location were formally marked with a dative preposition, and were like genitive phrases in not allowing a nominal specifier, unless plural. The explanation for the absence of singular nominal specifiers in these positions is clear. The forms which are reconstructed as genitive and oblique prepositions *=n and *kan, respectively, both have a final nasal which historically had its source as the enclitic variant of a personal nominal specifier *ni.

It is unclear how many semantic distinctions were made by non-personal NS forms. At least in nominative and genitive NPs, a distinction occurred between definite and indefinite forms. Other unmarked NPs did not make this distinction because topics were already marked as definite, by their pre-predicate position, and by the form *sa which introduced them. Nominal predicates which were indefinite had no NS preceding them, neither did indefinite obliques. Datives were restricted to personal nouns (and pronominal forms), and were therefore always definite. Only Ifugao reflects *=y as an indefinite NS, the enclitic form of *di. However other languages show the form as a frozen ending on some existential verbs with indefinite nominative complements. It is probable that *nan (*na + ligature *=n) was the default
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definite form, although it has been replaced in a number of languages, and in
some, such as IfgK1, it has been reintroduced as a deictic specifier with medial
reference. Both proximal *tu and distal *di also formed the basis of NS forms
that alternated with the inherited default form *nan; see Table 58 for the set of
reconstructed P-NCCO basic demonstratives.

Table 57. P-NCCO nominal specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-PRS</th>
<th>UNM</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>OBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-DFNT</td>
<td>*di / *y</td>
<td>*di</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ DFNT</td>
<td>default</td>
<td>*nan</td>
<td>*tun</td>
<td>*din</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*da</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+PRSN</td>
<td>-PLRL</td>
<td>*si / *s</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+PLRL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 58. P-NCCO basic demonstratives

| PROX | *tu |
| MED | *na |
| DIST | *di |

4.3 Isinai

Isinai is primarily spoken in three barangays, Aritao, Dupax, and
Bambang, in the province of Nueva Vizcaya. The data that is given here are
from notes taken during fieldwork in Aritao (Reid, 1973). Further information
on the forms discussed here and their phonological development can be found
in Conant (1915), Scheerer (1918), Paz (1965), and Himes (1990, 1996). Isinai
case-marking prepositions are shown in Table 59, and Isinai nominal specifiers
are given in Table 60. Examples are provided in (34).

Isinai is a first-order branch of Central Cordilleran, and is unique among
the other languages of the subgroup in having developed a general, post-
nominal clitic definite determiner, =ad or =ar. The source of the determiner is
clear. It is a reduced form of the ligature =a and a deictic form $di (*a + $di >
=ad). In Reid (1974, p. 543), I suggested that the use of =ad as a marker of
Isinai past time nouns (a function it also has in neighboring Bayaninan Ifugao)
was the source of its general use as a definite determiner in Isinai. In that paper
I also reconstructed *qad (i.e., *?ad) as one of the P-CCO locative markers. I am
now of the opinion that this was an incorrect reconstruction, the form doesn’t
occur, for example, with that function as a locative preposition in Isinai, even
though the form is widely used in the language. Rather, the P-CCO prepositions
marking such phrases were *ʔidi and possibly *ʔudi (from earlier prepositions plus a deictic noun *ʔi=di, and *ʔu=di), from which developed P-NCCO *ʔid and *ʔud, and the locative di prepositions in Itg and Isi. The a-initial locative (and oblique) forms found in some of the NuCo languages, as well as in Lubuagan Kalinga, have developed by analogy with such forms, and by using an a-vowel template (nan, san, ṭas, ṭad, etc.), as noted above in sec. 4.2.5.1. The ṭad ‘sequential adverb’ forms of Guinaang Kalinga, illustrated in (29), probably also have the same source, i.e., ligature =a plus a deictic form di. One other fact that should be mentioned about the distribution of Isinai =ad is that it is not simply a post-nominal definite determiner, it occurs at the outermost edge of full NPs, and thus serves to definitize the head of the NP, not necessarily the lexical item to which it is attached, as in (34)i,j, where it attaches to an already definite personal noun which is part of an embedded genitive phrase, but definitizes the nouns ‘dog’ and ‘house’, respectively.

The Isinai oblique enclitic =t does not have its source in an assimilative process as described above to account for the equivalent form in Limos Kalinga. In Isinai, *s > t at the end of a word as a regular phonological process (see Himes, 1990). The oblique preposition has spread in Isinai and fused with the inherited locative form, thus partly neutralizing the case-marking function of the form.

The Isinai dative preposition is problematic in that it suggests a P-Cco dative preposition *ka + =y singular personal NS, a form reflected as such in Ilog (see sec. 4.1.2.3), but not found in other Central Cordilleran languages. Isinai has apparently lost its reflex of *ka, allowing the nominal specifier to become a dative preposition. The genitive preposition, enclitic =n following a vowel final form, and the prepositional marking of topics with sa are cognate with forms reconstructed above for PNCCO.

Isinai has a very restricted set of nominal specifiers, making do with two common noun forms si and di, marking a distinction between definite and indefinite. It should be noted that there is homophony between indefinite si which functions as a nominal specifier (it commutes with di, for example, in genitive noun phrases following the enclitic =n preposition), as in (34)a,b, and the preposition si which marks oblique case, and can allow either an indefinite noun to follow it (without a following determiner), as in (34)c, or a definite noun (with a following determiner), as in (34)d.

A common noun phrase in Isinai was pluralized as described above in sec. 4.1.2.2, by making it coreferential with a third person plural pronoun, a reflex of P-NLZN *=da, and by following it with a plural demonstrative, as in (34)k.

There are also two personal noun specifiers, the expected singular form si which occurs in unmarked NPs, and ṭan (a regular reflex of *kan), which
optionally occurs before singular personal nouns in genitive NPs, as in (34)i,j. 
The personal plural NS is a reflex of *da, and functions as it does in other CCo 
languages.

Table 59. Isinai case-marking prepositions (adapted from Scheerer, 1918 and Reid, 1973)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V]</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>=n</td>
<td>=t</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G]</td>
<td>=O</td>
<td>si</td>
<td></td>
<td>ñi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 60. Isinai nominal specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-PRSN</th>
<th>-DFNT</th>
<th>si</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+DFNT</td>
<td>di</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+PRSN</th>
<th>-PLRL</th>
<th>si</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+PLRL</td>
<td>da</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(34) Isinai (Reid, 1973)

a. Datu si pimana?
   where [NS living.place.3S]_NOM
   ‘Where does he live?’ (0004)

b. Diy si ñsara=mi.
   exist [NS food=GEN.1P]_NOM
   ‘We (ex.) have food.’ (00024)

c. Imimmar mungia?u si bavny?
   how catch [P [pig]]_OBL.
   ‘How does one catch a pig?’ (0007)

d. Masalw di bawat=ar si merkado=ar.
   can.buy [NS rice=DET]_NOM [P [market=DET]]_OBL.
   ‘Rice can be bought in the market.’ (0032)

e. Ampane=t lutuyan di mung=ad.
   wallow=[P mud.hole]_OBL. [NS water.buffalo=DET]_NOM
   ‘The water buffalo is wallowing in a mud hole.’ (0051.2)

f. Mari=a? ñamoy si bihat?
   NEG=[NOM.1S] go [P [tomorrow]]_OBL.
   ‘I will not go tomorrow.’ (0017)

g. Maram?ot si Jnau.
   heavy [NS Juan]_NOM
   ‘I will not go tomorrow.’ (0126.1.1)

h. ñator=nu di kwarta=r ñi Maria.
   give=[NOM.1S] [NS money=DET]_NOM [P_DAT] [Maria]
   ‘Give the money to Maria.’ (0092)
4.4 Proto-Central Cordilleran reconstructions

Comparison of the Isinai system with that reconstructed for P-NCCO faces the problem that any comparativist faces when dealing with a bifurcating tree. Where differences exist between the branches, a decision must be made as to which form is conservative, maintaining the earlier system, and which is innovative. The prepositional forms are easiest to reconstruct to the parent of the two branches, P-CCO; however, two problems are encountered.

The first is with the dative forms. The presence of a reflex of *kay is only found in Ifugao languages, but Isinai also shows evidence of it having once had that form as a dative preposition. Isinai also has a reflex of *kan, but functioning as a personal nominal specifier in genitive phrases, an innovative change from its reconstructed function in P-NCCO as a dative preposition. I reconstruct both to the parent language, but with no clear idea as to the difference in function between them (if any).

The second problem is with the locative forms. As discussed earlier in this paper, I choose to reconstruct *?idi, *?udi and *di as locative prepositions. Since *di is also reconstructible as a distal demonstrative, and probably also functioned as a distal nominal specifier, in P-CCO it may not yet have fused with the earlier locative prepositions *?i, and *?u. That it could probably occur alone as a locative preposition is suggested by the fact that the locative enclitic form in nearly all the daughter languages is =d. I also choose to reconstruct P-CCO *=y as a nominative preposition, rather than as a nominal specifier, without an equivalent form following consonant-final forms, somewhat paralleling the genitive preposition. An *?i preposition needs to be reconstructed for P-SCO, the sister language P-CCO, suggesting that this was also its function in P-CCO (see Table 61).  

---

29 Since completing the writing of this paper, further work has been done on the reconstruction of the oblique and locative case-marking prepositions in Proto-Central Cordilleran and its daughter subgroups. The results are somewhat different from those presented here. The reader is referred to Reid (2006) for more information.
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Table 61. P-CCO case-marking prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>*sa</td>
<td>*s=n</td>
<td>*s=y</td>
<td>*s=n / *s=y</td>
<td>*s=d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>*s=n</td>
<td>*s=y</td>
<td>*s=n</td>
<td>*s=n</td>
<td>*s=d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*s=...</td>
<td>*s=*y</td>
<td>*s=...</td>
<td>*s=...</td>
<td>*s=...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The P-CCO nominal specifiers are reconstructed with the same general problems discussed in the preceding paragraphs, deciding what is conservative, and what is innovative. Specifically the question needs to be answered with the deictic non-personal specifiers. To what extent had the demonstrative forms become nominal specifiers? Since the process has clear parallels in other NLZLN languages, and even in CCO languages the results differ depending on innovations which have taken place in the basic demonstrative set, I assume that this grammaticalization process took place independently in at least some of the daughter languages. I assume moreover that the proto-language also allowed demonstratives to become nominal specifiers, but am conservative in reconstructing them, even though it is fairly clear what the forms of the demonstratives were. I reconstruct only the distal nominal specifier *di as a deictic form, even though it is probable that others existed. A contrast existed between definite and indefinite specifiers, a contrast that is found in all the daughter languages of the group (see Tables 62 and 63).

Table 62. P-CCO nominal specifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-PRSN</th>
<th>-DFNT</th>
<th>*di</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+DFNT</td>
<td>*da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+DIST</td>
<td>*di</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+PRSN</th>
<th>-PLRL</th>
<th>*s=y / *y=n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+PLRL</td>
<td>*da</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 63. P-CCO basic demonstratives

| PROX | *tu |
| MGD  | *na |
| DIST | *di |
5. Conclusion

The writing of this paper began with the goal of completing a reconstruction of the morphosyntax of Proto-Northern Luzon, in particular the reconstruction of the sets of case-marking forms, nominal specifiers, and demonstratives that typically occur in the left-most position of nominal phrases in the languages that constitute this family. Although the general patterns of clause formation are reasonably clear, not differing in too great detail from what is found in other languages of the Philippines, considerable difficulty was encountered in determining the reconstructible forms and functions of the multitude of typically monosyllabic forms that occur in the daughter languages. Despite a number of attempts to reconstruct these forms for early stages of Austronesian languages by the present author and others, it is clear that insufficient attention has been paid to the problems of independent innovation and the underlying motivations for these innovations. This paper then has focused not on widespread comparison of morphemes with similar forms and functions, which cannot distinguish between independent and shared innovation, but rather on the detailed examination of sets of closely related languages within a single subgroup. This kind of ‘bottom-up’ reconstruction requires an explanation for why morphemes with the same function in each of the languages may differ from one another in subtle ways. For its success, considerable detail is required in the descriptions of the languages, and in particular of the dialectal forms that occur. This paper, then, has succeeded in reconstructing only a relatively small part of the original goal, those forms that may have been present in the parent of only one of the constituent subgroups of the family, Proto-Central Cordilleran.

The discussion has argued for a distinction to be made among the so-called ‘phrase markers’, recognizing that these forms are constituted of sets with distinct morphosyntactic privileges. Some of the forms clearly primarily mark the case of the phrase which they introduce (case-marking prepositions), while others function to specify some other feature of the lexical noun that they precede (nominal specifiers), but do not specify case. The paper has also introduced some of the factors that have resulted in the irregular developments that permeate the system. These factors include homophony of the enclitic forms of different full forms, resulting in the development of homophony of the full forms themselves (cf. the development of the Balangao personal noun specifier ab from earlier *si, sec. 4.1.2.3). Another such factor is what I am calling ‘vowel grade harmony’ by which prepositions introducing different case-marked phrases, such as obliques and locatives which originally may have had different vowels, appear to have had a common vocalic template applied to them (cf. the development of these prepositions discussed in sec. 4.2.5.1). Full discussion of these and other factors will appear in future papers.

Reconstruction of the case-marking prepositions, nominal specifiers, and demonstratives for other subgroups within the Northern Luzon family is required before any attempt is made to reconstruct the forms for Proto-Northern Luzon itself. And only when this is done, can one begin to make claims about equivalent forms at deeper time-depths.
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Abbreviations

C .......... consonant
P .......... preposition / plural (following a numeral)
S .......... singular (following a numeral)
V .......... vowel

ADV .......... adverb
DAT .......... dative
DET .......... determiner
GEN .......... genitive
LOC .......... locative
MED .......... medial
NEG .......... negative
NOM .......... nominative
OBL .......... oblique
PRD .......... predicate
REC .......... recognitional
SEQ .......... sequential adverb
TEM .......... temporal
TOP .......... topic
UNM .......... unmarked

LG .......... ligature
NS .......... nominal specifier
NP .......... noun phrase
PM .......... phrase marker
PP .......... prepositional phrase
ANTE .......... antedate
CNTV .......... continuative
CONJ .......... conjunction
DFNT .......... definite
DMNS .......... demonstrative
DIST .......... distal
FUTR .......... future
NMLZ .......... nominalizer
PLRL .......... plural
PROX .......... proximal/proximate
PRSNI .......... personal
PTTV .......... partitive
QUOT .......... quotation
RLTV .......... relative clause
REMT .......... remote
REPT .......... reported event
SPFC .......... specific
TPLK .......... topic linker

Language Names

AGT(CC) .......... Central Cagayan (Gattaran) Agta
ALT ................. Northern Alta
ALTS ............... Southern Alta
ART ............... Arta
ATT .............. Atta
BLW ............. Balangao
BON ........... Bontok
BONGU .......... Guinaang Bontok
DGTC .......... Casiguran Dumagat (Agra)
DGTEC .......... Eastern Cagayan Dumagat (Agra)
DGTP .......... Palanan Dumagat (Agra)
GAD .......... Gaddang
IBG ............. Ibanag
IBL .......... InibaloI
IFG .......... Ifugao
IFGBT ........ Batad Ifugao
IFGKI ........ Kiangan Ifugao

CCO .......... Central Cordilleran
MCO .......... Meso-Cordilleran
NCO .......... Northern Cordilleran
NLZN .......... Northern Luzon
NUCO .......... Nuclear Cordilleran
PAN .......... Proto-Austronesian
P-ICI .......... Proto-Ifugao
P-KLA .......... Proto-Kalinga
P-NLZ .......... Proto-Northern Luzon
P-NUC .......... Proto-Nuclear Cordilleran
P-PH .......... Proto-Philippines

P-BON-KNK ...... Proto-Bontok-Kankanay
P-CCO .......... Proto-Central Cordilleran
P-IHG .......... Proto-Iling
P-KL .......... Proto-Kalinga
P-LMN .......... Proto-Lumad
P-NUC .......... Proto-Nuclear Cordilleran
P-PH .......... Proto-Philippines
P-SCO .......... Proto-Southern Cordilleran
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