

WORKING PAPERS

IN

LINGUISTICS

The notes and articles in this series are progress reports on work being carried on by students and faculty in the Department. Because these papers are not finished products, readers are asked not to cite from them without noting their preliminary nature. The authors welcome any comments and suggestions that readers might offer.

Volume 49(3)
2018
(September)

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA
HONOLULU 96822

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS FACULTY

2018

Victoria B. Anderson
Andrea Berez-Kroeker (Graduate Chair)
Robert A. Blust
Lyle Campbell (Emeritus)
James N. Collins
Kenneth W. Cook (Adjunct)
Kamil Deen (Chair)
Patricia J. Donegan (Adjunct)
Katie K. Drager
Michael L. Forman (Emeritus)
Gary Holton
Bradley McDonnell
William O'Grady
Yuko Otsuka (Adjunct)
Ann Marie Peters (Emeritus)
Kenneth L. Rehg (Adjunct)
Lawrence A. Reid (Emeritus)
Amy J. Schafer
Albert J. Schütz, (Emeritus, Editor)
Rory Turnbull
James Woodward Jr. (Adjunct)

REVISITING RELATIVIZATION ASYMMETRIES IN PHILIPPINE-TYPE SYMMETRICAL VOICE LANGUAGES

IVAN BONDOC

This paper proposes an accessibility hierarchy for relativization via the gap strategy in languages with a Philippine-type symmetrical voice system. A signature property of the Philippine-type symmetrical voice system is the presence of voice morphology on the verb that selects one of the elements as syntactically prominent. Using a grammaticality judgment task, native speakers of five languages exhibiting Philippine-type symmetrical voice (Pangasinan, Western Subanon, Blaan, Tagalog, and Cebuano) were consulted on the acceptability of relativization of various arguments in the different voice types. The findings showed that in all five languages, the pivot argument is the most accessible element for relativization using the gap strategy. Yet, two of the languages surveyed also allowed the relativization of the non-pivot agent. The preliminary findings suggest a *Pivot > Non-Pivot Agent* accessibility hierarchy for symmetrical voice languages. The implications of these findings are discussed.

1. BACKGROUND. One of the most frequently studied syntactic phenomena is relativization. Relativization involves the modification of a noun phrase by a clause (Comrie 1981; Payne 1997; O’Grady 2015). Sentence (1) provides an example of relativization, in which the clause who reported the symptom modifies the noun woman.

(1) The therapist assessed the woman_i [who ____i reported the symptom].

(2) The woman reported the symptom.

Relativization results in the formation of a larger noun phrase, comprised of the head noun, the noun that is modified, and, the relative clause (RC). A relativizer such as English who, which, or that can link the head and the relative clause (O’Grady 2015).

Relative clauses can be formed in two ways. One strategy is to take a nominal element in a typical declarative clause, such as (2), and transform it to a head noun, leaving a gap in the original clause. The alternative strategy forms the relative clause in the same manner, except that a resumptive pronoun referring to the head noun fills in the gap, as in (3). The resumptive pronoun strategy is common in some languages, but is generally not possible in English:

(3) *The therapist assessed the woman_i [who she_i reported the symptom].

1.1. ACCESSIBILITY OF NPS TO RELATIVIZATION. There is variation with respect to which nominal elements can be relativized within a language. In general, this variation can be viewed in terms of markedness: in any language, less marked forms are more accessible to the relativization operation than more marked forms. Keenan and Comrie (1977) used grammatical relations to create an *accessibility hierarchy* for relativization, commonly applied to nominative-accusative languages. This hierarchy posits that all languages should be able to relativize at least subjects, and that when a certain language is capable of relativizing an element at a certain point in the hierarchy (using the *gap strategy*), all higher elements can also be relativized using the *gap strategy*. Viewing the hierarchy using the perspective of markedness, subjects are the least marked, followed by the direct objects, and so on; the objects of comparison are the most marked form.

(4) Keenan and Comrie (1977) accessibility hierarchy for relativization:

subject > direct object > indirect object > oblique > genitive > object of comparison

This accessibility hierarchy can be illustrated by using the following examples of relative clauses from English and Spanish. In English, all of the elements in the hierarchy can be relativized via the gap strategy (5–10); in contrast, Spanish only allows relativization of the genitives and the higher elements in the hierarchy (11–15); the object of comparison is not relativizable (16).

English RCs

- (5) the pathologist [who ___ examined the sample] (subject RC)
- (6) the sample [which the pathologist examined ___] (direct object RC)
- (7) the woman [who the pathologist took the sample from ___] (indirect object RC)
- (8) the beaker [where the pathologist placed the sample in ___] (oblique RC)
- (9) the woman [who the pathologist has the test results of ___] (genitive RC)
- (10) the woman [who the man is more drowsy than ___] (object of comparison RC)

Spanish RCs (data from J. Lopez, personal communication, 2016)

- (11) el doctor [que ___ trató la mujer] (subject RC)
 DET doctor REL treat.PST DET woman
 ‘the doctor who treated the woman’
- (12) la mujer [que el doctor examinó ___] (direct object RC)
 DET woman REL DET doctor examine.PST
 ‘the woman whom the doctor examined’
- (13) la mujer [a quien el doctor dio la medicina ___] (indirect object RC)
 DET woman to REL DET doctor give.PST DET medicine
 ‘the woman to whom the doctor gave the medicine’
- (14) el frasco [en donde la mujer puso la medicina ___] (oblique RC)
 DET bottle in REL DET woman put.PST DET medicine
 ‘the bottle where the woman put the medicine’
- (15) el doctor [de quien el hombre es un paciente ___] (genitive RC)
 DET doctor of REL DET man is DET patient
 ‘the doctor whom the man is a patient of’
- (16) *el hombre [que la mujer está más enfermo que ___] (object of comparison RC)
 DET man REL DET woman is more ill than
 ‘the man whom the woman is more ill than’

However, the applicability of the Keenan and Comrie hierarchy is called into question when the grammatical relations in the hierarchy, such as “subject” and “direct object,” do not have exact equivalents in languages that do not manifest nominative-accusative alignment. To factor in these differences, some researchers have tried to propose alternative accessibility hierarchies for languages with other alignment systems. For example, Liao (1999/2000) suggests the following accessibility hierarchy for ergative-absolutive languages. The absolutive NP is the least marked element, followed by the ergative NP, and so on; the object of comparison remains the most marked form.

- (17) Liao’s (1999/2000) modified accessibility hierarchy for ergative-absolutive languages:
absolutive > ergative > indirect object > oblique > genitive > object of comparison

1.2. RELATIVIZATION ACCESSIBILITY IN PHILIPPINE-TYPE SYMMETRICAL VOICE LANGUAGES. There remains a mystery, however, regarding the accessibility of nominal elements in symmetrical voice languages. Symmetrical voice languages are characterized by the presence of at least two transitive verbal

patterns, neither of which is morphologically more marked than the other (Foley 1998; Himmelmann 2005; Riesberg 2014).

Himmelmann (2005) mentions a subset of symmetrical voice languages, called Philippine-type languages, which are characterized by the presence of at least two different undergoer (non-agent) voice types, case-type markers for nominal arguments, and pronouns that exhibit second position clitic behavior. He classifies Philippine languages, most Formosan languages, selected northern languages of Borneo, and some northern Sulawesi languages as belonging to the category of Philippine-type languages.

Tagalog is a language that is typically believed to have Philippine-type symmetrical voice. A signature property of this voice system is the presence of voice morphology on the verb that selects one of the arguments as syntactically prominent, often called the *pivot*. In the more recent literature, the pivot has also been called as the *trigger*, *privileged syntactic argument*, *focused element*, and more controversially, the *subject*. The more neutral term *pivot* will be used throughout this paper.

The pivot is, by definition, the element that is accessible to most syntactic phenomena. This signature voice property of Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages is exemplified in the following two Tagalog sentences:

- (18) Nag-suri ang doktor ng bata. (agent voice)
 AV.PRF-examine PIV doctor NPIV child
 ‘The doctor examined a/the child.’
- (19) S<in>uri ng doktor ang bata. (patient voice)
 <PV.PRF>examine NPIV doctor PIV child
 ‘The doctor examined the child.’

Sentence (18) contains a verb in the *agent voice* (AV), marked by the agent voice affix [*nag-*]. The agent argument *doktor* ‘doctor’ is marked by *ang* [aŋ], making it the *pivot*. The non-pivot patient argument *bata* ‘child’ is marked with *ng* [naŋ]. In contrast, the same verb *suri* ‘examine’ in sentence (19) is marked with the *patient voice* infix (PV) [*-in-*]. The patient argument *bata* ‘child’ is now marked with *ang*, hence making it the pivot; the agent element *doktor* ‘doctor’ is marked with the non-pivot marker *ng*. The phrase markers in Tagalog are summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1. Different phrase markers in Tagalog.

Function	Phrase markers (for common nouns)
Pivot	ang
Non-pivot	ng
Oblique	sa
Locative	sa
Benefactive	para_sa
Instrumental	sa_pamamagitan_ng, gamit_ang
Causative	dahil_sa

The status of subjecthood in Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages has been heavily debated in the literature. Some consider the pivot element as the subject (e.g., Guilfoyle et al. 1992; Kroeger 1993; Riesberg 2014), while some consider the agent as the subject (e.g., Chen 2017; Schuelke and Mortensen 2018). Other authors associate subjecthood properties to both the pivot and the agent element (e.g., Schachter 1976).

The controversy over the status of subjecthood as well as other grammatical relations (e.g., direct object) in Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages raises questions regarding the applicability of the Keenan and Comrie hierarchy to this class of languages. Nonetheless, the pivot has been taken in the literature to be the most accessible element to syntactic operations such as relativization (Schachter 1976; Kroeger 1993; Riesberg 2014). Erlewine, Levin, and van Urk (2017) claims an *Austronesian Extraction Restriction* hypothesis, which states that only the pivot (which they refer to as the “subject”) is accessible to syntactic phenomena such as relativization. In a similar vein, Aldridge (2004) proposes an *Absolutive*

Extraction Restriction (with her analysis of the pivot as “absolute”) for languages with a Philippine-type voice system.

Considering the unique syntactic properties of these languages, the hierarchies proposed by Keenan and Comrie (1977) may not necessarily be applicable to languages with this alignment system. This paper revisits the claims made about the accessibility of elements to relativization, and proposes a different hierarchy for Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages. Based on data from five languages demonstrating Philippine-type symmetrical voice alignment, the following questions will be addressed:

- (a) Which elements can be relativized via the gap strategy in a sample of Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages?
- (b) What similarities and differences can be observed regarding the relativization patterns of these selected languages?
- (c) What accessibility hierarchy for relativization can be proposed for these languages?

A possible prediction would be to expect pivot-only extraction for Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages, as reported in the literature. A pivot-only extraction finding would be consistent with claims such as the Austronesian Extraction Restriction (Erlewine, Levin, and van Urk 2017) or the Absolute Extraction Restriction (Aldridge 2004). It may also lend support to analysts who suggest the pivot to be the subject, given that it is the element that participates in syntactic operations such as relativization. Following the same line of argument, such an analysis may show the applicability of the Keenan and Comrie hierarchy to Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages, with the subject as the most accessible element for relativization. However, if any of the Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages were to permit relativization of an element besides the pivot, this would entail the need to formulate a different hierarchy that factors in these elements in varying degrees of markedness. Furthermore, this finding could falsify the universal applicability of the Keenan and Comrie hierarchy, given that some of the marked elements (e.g., pivot) in Philippine-type languages do not share the properties of the grammatical relations in nominative-accusative languages. As a case in point, a problem to be encountered with considering pivots to be subjects, would be to find no logical equivalents of other grammatical relations, such as direct objects, in Philippine-type languages (elements such as non-pivot agents would be unusual for this category).

2. METHOD. Data were made up of grammaticality judgments provided by native speakers of five languages exhibiting Philippine-type symmetrical voice. These five languages were selected based on the different Philippine language microgroups they were classified under (Blust 1991). Each language is briefly described below, along with the native speaker consultants for each language.

TABLE 2. Descriptions on the languages surveyed in the study.

#	Language Surveyed	Microgroup Classification (Blust 1991)	EGIDS Classification (Simons and Fennig 2018)	Geographical Region Spoken	Native Speaker Population (Simons and Fennig 2018)	Native Speaker Consultant(s) (personal communication 2016, 2018)
1	Pangasinan	Cordilleran	language of wider communication	Pangasinan and nearby provinces	1,240,000	Francisco Rosario, Jr.
2	Western Subanon	Greater Central Philippine (Subanon branch)	developing language	Zamboanga Peninsula	125,000	Sharon Estioca

3	Blaan	Bilic	developing language	South Cotabato, Sarangani, and Davao del Sur	240,800 ¹	Gina Sanggawa Laogo
4	Tagalog	Greater Central Philippine (Central Philippine branch)	language of wider communication	Metropolitan Manila region, most of central and southern Luzon, and in Mindoro	20,000,000	Ana Maria Bondoc and Imelda Mungcal
5	Cebuano	Greater Central Philippine (Central Philippine branch)	language of wider communication	Visayas region, and in selected parts of Southern Luzon and Mindanao	15,900,000	Genevive Roble and Jayson Parba

At least one native speaker was consulted for every language in the study. Reports of inter-speaker agreement were included in cases where there is more than one speaker. Declarative sentences in the various voice types were elicited for every language. Each argument in every voice type was then tested for its relativizability via the gap strategy, and the native speakers provided their judgments on the grammatical acceptability of these relative clauses.

The relative clauses were constructed by the researcher, after equivalents of the declarative sentences were elicited. The relative clause constructions followed the general head-initial pattern as described in the literature. All relative clauses were presented to the speakers in writing. After the judgments of the native speaker consultants were given, they were asked to explain (as best they could) what made particular relative clauses ungrammatical, how those sentences can be improved, and what alternative patterns would there be in forming relative clauses. This process ensured that the ungrammaticality of the patterns stemmed from factors such as the mismatch between the relativized head and the voice morphology, and not because of other factors such as a missing particle. All responses were recorded online.

3. RESULTS. This section discusses the voice marking patterns for each of the languages surveyed in the study, along with the relevant findings on their acceptable relativization patterns. The data and example sentences are presented in Appendix A.

3.1. PANGASINAN. Pangasinan allows the agent, patient, locative, instrument, and benefactive arguments to be marked as pivot, as illustrated in examples (1), (7), (13), (19), and (25).

The table below summarizes the relative clause data presented in Appendix A Section 1. Across all voice types in Pangasinan, the pivot is the only element that can be relativized via the gap strategy; non-pivot or oblique elements cannot be relativized.

TABLE 3. Summary of relative clause data in Appendix A Section 1 (Pangasinan).

Extracted Element	Relativizable?	Examples (in appendix)
Pivot	YES	2, 8, 16, 23, 30
Non-pivots and Obliques	NO	3–6, 8, 10–12, 14–15, 17–18, 20–22, 24, 26–29

3.2. WESTERN SUBANON. Western Subanon allows agent, patient, and locative arguments to function as pivots [Appendix A, Section 2, examples (1), (5), and (9)]. The table that follows illustrates that all pivots are accessible to relativization via the gap strategy. No non-pivots or obliques are relativizable.

¹Includes total number of speakers from both Koronadal Blaan and Sarangani Blaan.

TABLE 4. Summary of relative clause data in Appendix A Section 2 (Western Subanon).

Extracted Element	Relativizable?	Examples
Pivot	YES	2, 7, 12
Non-pivots and Obliques	NO	3–4, 6, 8, 10–12

3.3. BLAAN. Blaan allows the selection of the agent, patient, locative, instrumental, and causative arguments as pivots, as illustrated in Appendix A, Section 3, examples (1), (7), (13), (19), and (25). Similar to Pangasinan and Western Subanon, Blaan allows relativization of only the pivot; non-pivots and obliques are not accessible to relativization. The examples illustrating these are summarized in the table below.

TABLE 5. Summary of relative clause data in Appendix A Section 3 (Blaan).

Extracted Element	Relativizable?	Examples
Pivot	YES	2, 9, 16, 23, 30
Non-pivots and Obliques	NO	3–6, 8, 10–12, 14–15, 17–18, 20–22, 24, 26–29

3.4. TAGALOG. Tagalog allows the selection of the agent, patient, locative, benefactive, instrumental, and causative arguments as pivots [Appendix 2, Section 4, examples (1), (8), (15), (22), (29), and (36)]. In contrast with the languages discussed above, Tagalog allows relativization of not just the pivot, but also of the non-pivot agent argument. Both consultants expressed 100% agreement with the sentence judgments. The relative clause data supporting these findings are summarized in table 6.

TABLE 6. Summary of relative clause data in Appendix A Section 4 (Tagalog).

Extracted Element	Relativizable?	Examples
Pivot	YES	2, 10, 18, 26, 34, 42
Non-pivot Agents	YES	9, 16, 23, 30, 37
Other Non-pivots and Obliques	NO	3–7, 11–14, 17, 19–21, 24–25, 27–28, 31–33, 35, 39–41

3.5. CEBUANO. Cebuano has voice patterns that take the agent, patient, locative, instrumental, and causative arguments as pivots, as illustrated in sentences (1), (7), (13), (19), and (25) in Appendix A, Section 5. As with all surveyed languages in the study, Cebuano allows relativization of the pivot argument. It was similar to Tagalog, however, with its acceptable extraction of the agent non-pivot argument for relativization. Other non-pivots and obliques are not accessible to relativization (Table 7). Both consultants expressed 100% agreement with the sentence judgments.

TABLE 7. Summary of relative clause data in Appendix A Section 5 (Cebuano).

Extracted Element	Relativizable?	Examples
Pivot	YES	2, 9, 16, 23, 30
Non-pivot Agents	YES	8, 14, 20, 26
Other Non-pivots and Obliques	NO	3–6, 10–12, 15, 17–18, 21–22, 24, 28–29

4. DISCUSSION. The current study investigated a potential accessibility hierarchy for relativization via the gap strategy in languages with a Philippine-type symmetrical voice system. Table 8 below summarizes the findings.

TABLE 8. Summary of the relativizable elements in the five languages surveyed.

Language Subgroup	Language	Pivot	Non-Pivot Agent	Other Non-Pivots and Obliques
1 AN: WMP: PH: Cordilleran	Pangasinan	✓	✗	✗
2 AN: WMP: PH: GCP: Subanon	Western Subanon	✓	✗	✗
3 AN: WMP: PH: Bilic	Blaan	✓	✗	✗
4 AN: WMP: PH: GCP: Central Phils	Tagalog	✓	✓	✗
5 AN: WMP: PH: GCP: Central Phils	Cebuano	✓	✓	✗

The results clearly show that the pivot is consistently the most accessible element for relativization, as is reported in earlier literature (Schachter 1976; Aldridge 2004; Erlewine, Levin, and van Urk 2017). Hence, we would expect the pivot to be at the top of the accessibility hierarchy. However, what has often been ignored in the literature is the extractability of agent non-pivots for relativization in some languages, such as Tagalog and Cebuano. This finding invalidates the “pivot-only” extraction restriction as proposed by Aldridge (2004) and Erlewine and colleagues (2017). The other non-pivots and oblique elements, on the other hand, are consistently non-accessible for relativization.

These results are suggestive of a *Pivot > Non-Pivot Agent* accessibility hierarchy for Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages. This potential hierarchy also allows us to classify Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages into two groups: a more conservative group of languages, which allow “pivot-only” extraction, at least for relativization; and a less conservative group, which allow the extraction of either the pivot or the agent non-pivot. It is worth exploring in future research whether the extraction of non-pivot agents in less conservative languages such as Tagalog and Cebuano is a case of historical innovation, given that both languages belong to the same Central Philippine subgroup.² An investigation of more Central Philippine and other Philippine-type languages in future research would potentially determine whether the licensing of the agent non-pivot for relativization remains a characteristic of just the Central Philippine subgroup.

Regardless of the cross-linguistic differences in morphosyntactic typology, variation in accessibility still somewhat appeals to a universal theory of markedness: less marked forms are more relativizable than more marked forms. Hence, in the case of Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages, we can suppose that the pivot is the least marked element for relativization, followed by the non-pivot agent.

Yet, these findings also bring forth the discordance of the Keenan and Comrie hierarchy to Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages: the grammatical relations present in the Keenan and Comrie hierarchy, i.e., the subject and the direct object, do not have exact equivalents in Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages. A reanalysis of the Keenan and Comrie hierarchy in terms of the pivot-as-subject hypothesis creates a problem for the equivalent element of the “direct object”: the “non-pivot agent” does not have comparable syntactic properties of “direct objects.” This mismatch in grammatical relations falsifies the applicability of the Keenan and Comrie hierarchy to the languages under study.

Investigations of languages such as these shed light on the long-standing puzzle of the nature of Philippine-type extraction restriction. One generalization that these studies offer is the identification of the element that is accessible to a variety of syntactic phenomena. Relativization patterns suggest that the “pivot” is the most accessible or the least marked element, followed by the agent non-pivot. Studies of other syntactic operations such as raising, control of secondary predicates, possessor ascension, and quantifier float concur with the pivot being the most accessible element (Schachter 1976; Guilfoyle et al. 1992; Kroeger 1993; Aldridge 2004; Riesberg 2014). However, a different picture emerges with other syntactic facts such as reflexive and variable binding, since they target an agent argument as antecedent, independent

²The term “conservative” refers to the historical context where the upper-level parent languages (the primary branches of Proto-Austronesian) licenses only the pivot for extraction (Chen 2017), and some of the lower-level parent languages (from which some of the daughter Philippine languages branched out) may have allowed innovations for other elements (such as the agent non-pivot) to be accessible for relativization as well.

of whether it is also the pivot (Chen 2017; Schuelke and Mortensen 2018). The further development of any syntactic theory will need to factor in these clashing observations and calls for the need to further investigate understudied languages such as Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages.

The hypotheses brought forth in this paper might not be fully generalizable due to the limited number of languages surveyed in the study, creating the need for testing of the proposed accessibility hierarchy with more Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages. The findings of the current study will also benefit from being validated by more native speaker participants. In addition, the possibility of calculating acceptability in relative clauses and other patterns in terms of a continuum rather than a binary contrast can also be explored in the future.

This study also reported variation with respect to the arguments that can be selected as pivots in the five different languages (Table 8). Further investigations with more languages call for exploring a possible implicational hierarchy for pivot selection, which exists in Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages.

TABLE 9. Summary of the elements that can be selected as pivots in the five languages surveyed.

LANGUAGE	AGENT	PATIENT	LOCATIVE	INSTRUMENT	CAUSATIVE	BENEFACTIVE
Pangasinan	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓
Western Subanon	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗
Blaan	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗
Tagalog	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cebuano	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗

This paper offered a potential accessibility hierarchy for Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages based on the five languages surveyed. Besides the pivot often being reported to be accessible to relativization extraction, the study finds that agent non-pivots can also be relativized in selected languages. Based on this finding, a *Pivot > Non-pivot Agent* hierarchy is proposed. Despite the limitations of the study, the current paper offered some insights on the implications of the findings to the broader picture of syntax and opened the doors for further investigating the typological and syntactic issues that arise in Philippine-type symmetrical voice languages.

ABBREVIATIONS

AG	agent	LOC	locative
AN	Austronesian	LV	locative voice
AV	agent voice	NPIV	non-pivot
BEN	benefactive	OBL	oblique
BV	benefactive voice	PAT	patient
CAU	cause (argument)	PH	Philippine (subgroup)
CV	causative voice	PIV	pivot
DC	declarative clause	PRF	perfective
DEM	demonstrative	PV	patient voice
DET	determiner	RC	relative clause
GCP	Greater Central Philippine (subgroup)	REL	relativizer
INS	instrument	WMP	Western Malayo-Polynesian
IV	instrumental voice		

APPENDIX A

SECTION 1. PANGASINAN

MICROGROUP: AUSTRONESIAN: WESTERN MALAYO-POLYNESIAN: PHILIPPINE: CORDILLERAN

TABLE 10. Relativizable elements in Pangasinan via the gap strategy.

Voice	Arguments				
	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Patient</i>	<i>Locative</i>	<i>Instrument</i>	<i>Benefactive</i>
Agent	PIVOT	NPIVOT	OBL	OBL	OBL
Patient	NPIVOT	PIVOT	OBL	OBL	OBL
Locative	NPIVOT	NPIVOT	PIVOT	OBL	OBL
Instrument	NPIVOT	NPIVOT	OBL	PIVOT	OBL
Benefactive	NPIVOT	NPIVOT	OBL	OBL	PIVOT

Shaded areas reflect elements that are not accessible for relativization.

#	Voice	Clause	Element Extracted	Func of Extracted	Example
1	AV	DC	-	-	Nan-luto so laki ya baaw ed banga AV.PRF-cook PIV man NPIV rice LOC pot parad_samay ogaw gamit_so kiew. BEN child INS wood ‘The man cooked rice in the pot for the child with the wood.’
2	AV	RC	AG	PIV	laki ya [nan-luto — ya baaw ...] man REL AV.PRF-cook NPIV rice ‘the man who cooked rice’
3	AV	RC	PAT	NPIV	*baaw ya [nan-luto so laki — ...] rice REL AV.PRF-cook PIV man for: ‘the rice that the man cooked’
4	AV	RC	LOC	OBL	*banga ya [nan-luto so laki ya baaw — ...] pot REL AV.PRF-cook PIV man NPIV rice for: ‘the pot where the man cooked rice’

5	AV	RC	BEN	OBL	*ogaw ya [nan-luto so laki ya baaw ____ ...] child REL AV.PRF-cook PIV man NPIV rice for: ‘the child for whom the man cooked rice’
6	AV	RC	INS	OBL	*kiew ya [nan-luto so laki ya baaw ____ ...] wood REL AV.PRF-cook PIV man NPIV rice for: ‘the wood with which the man cooked the rice’
7	PV	DC	-	-	In-luto ya laki so baaw ed banga PV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV rice LOC pot parad_samay ogaw gamit_so kiew. BEN child INS wood ‘The man cooked rice in the pot for the child using the wood.’
8	PV	RC	AG	NPIV	*laki ya [in-luto ____ so baaw ...] man REL PV.PRF-cook PIV rice for: ‘the man that cooked rice’
9	PV	RC	PAT	PIV	baaw ya [in-luto ya laki ____ ...] rice REL PV.PRF-cook NPIV man ‘the rice that the man cooked’
10	PV	RC	LOC	OBL	*banga ya [in-luto ya laki so baaw ____ ...] pot REL PV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV rice for: ‘the pot where the man cooked the rice’
11	PV	RC	BEN	OBL	*ogaw ya [in-luto ya laki so baaw ____ ...] child REL PV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV rice for: ‘the child for whom the man cooked the rice’
12	PV	RC	INS	OBL	*kiew ya [in-luto ya laki so baaw ____ ...] wood REL PV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV rice for: ‘the wood with which the man cooked the rice’

Bondoc: Revisiting Relativization Asymmetries in Philippine-Type Symmetrical Voice Languages

13	LV	DC	-	-	Nan-lutu-an ya laki ya baaw so banga LV.PRF-cook-LV NPIV man NPIV rice PIV pot parad_samay ogaw gamit_so kiew. BEN child INS wood ‘The man cooked rice in the pot for the child using the wood.’
14	LV	RC	AG	NPIV	*laki ya [nan-lutu-an ____ ya baaw so banga ...] man REL LV.PRF-cook-LV NPIV man PIV pot for: ‘the man who cooked rice in the pot’
15	LV	RC	PAT	NPIV	*baaw ya [nan-lutu-an ya laki ____ so banga ...] rice REL LV.PRF-cook-LV NPIV man PIV pot for: ‘the rice which the man cooked in the pot’
16	LV	RC	LOC	PIV	banga ya [nan-lutu-an ya laki ya baaw ____ ...] pot REL LV.PRF-cook-LV NPIV man NPIV rice ‘pot where the man cooked the rice’
17	LV	RC	BEN	OBL	*ogaw ya [nan-lutu-an ya laki ya baaw ____ ...] child REL LV.PRF-cook-LV NPIV man NPIV rice for: ‘the child for whom the man cooked the rice’
18	LV	RC	INS	OBL	*kiew ya [nan-lutu-an ya laki ya baaw ____ ...] wood REL LV.PRF-cook-LV NPIV man NPIV rice for: ‘the wood with which the man cooked rice with’
19	BV	DC	-	-	In-lutu-an ya laki ya baaw so ogaw BV.PRF-cook-BV NPIV man NPIV rice PIV child ed banga gamit_so kiew. LOC pot INS wood ‘The man cooked rice in the pot for the child using the wood.’
20	BV	RC	AG	NPIV	*laki ya [in-lutu-an ____ ya baaw so ogaw ...] man REL BV.PRF-cook-BV NPIV rice PIV child for: ‘the man who cooked rice for the child’

21	BV	RC	PAT	NPIV	*baaw ya [in-lutu-an ya laki ____ so ogaw ...] rice REL BV.PRF-cook-BV NPIV man PIV child for: ‘the rice that the man cooked for the child’
22	BV	RC	LOC	OBL	*banga ya [in-lutu-an ya laki so ogaw ____ ...] pot REL BV.PRF-cook-BV NPIV man PIV child for: ‘the pot where the man cooked for the child’
23	BV	RC	BEN	PIV	ogaw ya [in-lutu-an ya laki ya baaw ____ ...] child REL BV.PRF-cook-BV NPIV man NPIV rice ‘child for whom the man cooked rice’
24	BV	RC	INS	OBL	*kiew ya [in-lutu-an ya laki ya baaw ____ ...] wood REL BV.PRF-cook-BV NPIV man NPIV rice for: ‘the wood with which the man cooked rice’
25	IV	DC	-	-	Impan-luto ya laki ya baaw so kiew IV.PRF-cook NPIV man NPIV rice PIV wood ed banga parad_samay ogaw. LOC pot BEN child ‘The man cooked rice in the pot for the child using the wood.’
26	IV	RC	AG	NPIV	*laki ya [impan-luto ____ ya baaw so kiew ...] man REL IV.PRF-cook NPIV rice PIV wood for: ‘the man who cooked with the wood’
27	IV	RC	PAT	NPIV	*baaw ya [impan-luto ya laki ____ so kiew ...] rice REL IV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV wood for: ‘the rice that the man cooked with the wood’
28	IV	RC	LOC	OBL	*banga ya [impan-luto ya laki ya baaw ____ so kiew ...] pot REL IV.PRF-cook NPIV man NPIV rice PIV wood for: ‘the pot where the man cooked the rice with the wood’
29	IV	RC	BEN	OBL	*ogaw ya [impan-luto ya laki ya baaw so kiew ____ ...] child REL IV.PRF-cook NPIV man NPIV rice PIV wood for: ‘the child for whom the man cooked the rice with the wood’

Bondoc: Revisiting Relativization Asymmetries in Philippine-Type Symmetrical Voice Languages

30	IV	RC	INS	PIV	kiew ya [impan-luto ya laki ya baaw ____ ...] wood REL IV.PRF-cook NPIV man NPIV rice 'the wood that the man cooked the rice with'
----	----	----	-----	-----	---

SECTION 2. WESTERN SUBANON

MICROGROUP: AUSTRONESIAN: WESTERN MALAYO-POLYNESIAN: PHILIPPINE: GREATER CENTRAL PHILIPPINE: SUBANUN

TABLE 9. Relativizable elements in Western Subanon via the gap strategy.

Voice	Arguments		
	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Patient</i>	<i>Locative</i>
Agent	PIVOT	NPIVOT	OBL
Patient	NPIVOT	PIVOT	OBL
Locative	NPIVOT	NPIVOT	PIVOT

Shaded areas reflect elements that are not accessible for relativization.

#	Voice	Clause	Element Extracted	Func of Extracted	Example
1	AV	DC	-	-	Mig-apuy og laki nog gomoy sog kulon. AV-cook PIV man NPIV rice LOC pot 'The man cooked the rice in the pot.'
2	AV	RC	AG	PIV	og laki kitu nog [mig-apuy ____ nog gomoy sog kulon] PIV man DEM REL AV-cook NPIV rice LOC pot 'that man who cooked rice in the pot'
3	AV	RC	PAT	NPIV	*og gomoy kitu nog [mig-apuy og laki ____ sog kulon] PIV rice DEM REL AV-cook PIV man LOC pot for: 'that rice that the man cooked in the pot'
4	AV	RC	LOC	OBL	*og kulon kitu nog [mig-apuy og laki nog gomoy ____] PIV man DEM REL AV-cook PIV man NPIV rice for: 'that pot where the man cooked the rice'

5	PV	DC	-	-	K<in>an nog laki kitu og mompalam sog atop <PV>eat NPIV man DEM PIV mango LOC roof ‘That man ate the mango on the roof.’
6	PV	RC	AG	NPIV	*og laki kitu nog [k<in>an ___ og mompalam sog atop] PIV man DEM REL <PV>eat PIV mango LOC roof for: ‘that man who ate mango on the roof’
7	PV	RC	PAT	PIV	og mompalam kitu nog [k<in>an nog laki kitu ___ sog atop] PIV mango DEM REL <PV>eat NPIV man DEM LOC roof ‘that mango that that man ate on the roof’
8	PV	RC	LOC	OBL	*og atop kitu nog [k<in>an nog laki kitu og mompalam ___] PIV roof DEM REL <PV>eat NPIV man DEM PIV mango for: ‘that roof where the man ate the mango’
9	LV	DC	-	-	In-oit-an nog laki kitu nog mompalam og libun kitu LV-bring-LV NPIV man DEM NPIV mango PIV woman DEM ‘That man brought mangoes to that woman.’
10	LV	RC	AG	NPIV	*og laki kitu nog [in-oit-an ___ nog mompalam og libun kitu] PIV man DEM REL LV-bring-LV NPIV mango PIV woman DEM for: ‘that man who brought mangoes to that woman’
11	LV	RC	PAT	NPIV	*og mompalam kitu nog [in-oit-an nog laki kitu ___ og libun kitu] PIV mango DEM REL LV-bring-LV NPIV man DEM PIV woman DEM for: ‘that mango which the man brought to that woman’
12	LV	RC	LOC	PIV	og libun kitu nog [in-oit-an nog laki kitu nog mompalam ___] PIV woman DEM REL LV-bring-LV NPIV man DEM NPIV mango ‘that woman to whom that man brought the mango’

SECTION 3. BLAAN

MICROGROUP: AUSTRONESIAN: WESTERN MALAYO-POLYNESIAN: PHILIPPINE: BILIC

TABLE 10. Relativizable elements in Blaan via the gap strategy.

Voice	Arguments				
	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Patient</i>	<i>Locative</i>	<i>Instrument</i>	<i>Cause</i>
Agent	PIVOT	NPIVOT	OBL	OBL	OBL
Patient	NPIVOT	PIVOT	OBL	OBL	OBL
Locative	NPIVOT	NPIVOT	PIVOT	OBL	OBL
Instrument	NPIVOT	NPIVOT	OBL	PIVOT	OBL
Cause	NPIVOT	-	OBL	OBL	PIVOT

Shaded areas reflect elements that are not accessible for relativization.

#	Voice	Clause	Element Extracted	Func of Extracted	Example
1	AV	DC	-	-	T<m>agah i lagi i nalaf di kulang <AV>cook PIV man NPIV fish LOC pot fagu_di snuk du_nun kastifun. INS firewood CAU feast 'The man cooked fish in the pot with the firewood for the feast.'
2	AV	RC	AG	PIV	lagi i [t<m>agah ___ i nalaf ...] man REL <AV>cook NPIV fish 'the man who cooked the fish'
3	AV	RC	PAT	NPIV	*nalaf i [t<m>agah i lagi ___ ...] fish REL <AV>cook PIV man for: 'the fish that the man cooked'
4	AV	RC	LOC	OBL	*kulang i [t<m>agah i lagi i nalaf ___ ...] pot REL <AV>cook PIV man NPIV fish for: 'the pot where the man cooked the fish'
5	AV	RC	INS	OBL	*snuk i [t<m>agah i lagi i nalaf ___ ...] firewood REL <AV>cook PIV man NPIV fish for: 'the firewood with which the man cooked the fish'

6	AV	RC	CAU	OBL	*kastifun i [t<m>agah i lagi i nalaf ___ ...] feast REL <AV>cook PIV man NPIV fish for: ‘the feast for which the man cooked the fish’
7	PV	DC	-	-	T<n>agah i lagi i nalaf di kulang <PV>cook NPIV man PIV fish LOC pot fagu_di snuk du_nun kastifun. INS firewood CAU feast ‘The man cooked fish in the pot with the firewood for the feast.’
8	PV	RC	AG	NPIV	*lagi i [t<n>agah ___ i nalaf ...] man REL <PV>cook PIV fish for: ‘the man who cooked the fish’
9	PV	RC	PAT	PIV	nalaf i [t<n>agah i lagi ___ ...] fish REL <PV>cook NPIV man ‘the fish that the man cooked’
10	PV	RC	LOC	OBL	*kulang i [t<n>agah i lagi i nalaf ___ ...] pot REL <PV>cook NPIV man PIV fish for: ‘the pot where the man cooked the fish’
11	PV	RC	INS	OBL	*snuk i [t<n>agah i lagi i nalaf ___ ...] firewood REL <PV>cook NPIV man PIV fish for: ‘the firewood with which the man cooked the fish’
12	PV	RC	CAU	OBL	*kastifun i [t<m>agah i lagi i nalaf ___ ...] feast REL <PV>cook NPIV man PIV fish for: ‘the feast for which the man cooked the fish’
13	LV	DC	-	-	Gu-t<m>agah i lagi i nalaf i kulang LV-<LV>cook NPIV man NPIV fish PIV pot fagu_di snuk du_nun kastifun. INS firewood CAU feast ‘The man cooked fish in the pot with the firewood for the feast.’

Bondoc: Revisiting Relativization Asymmetries in Philippine-Type Symmetrical Voice Languages

14	LV	RC	AG	NPIV	*lagi i [gu-t<m>agah ___ i nalaf i kulang ...] man REL LV-<LV>cook NPIV fish PIV pot for: 'the man who cooked the fish in the pot'
15	LV	RC	PAT	NPIV	*nalaf i [gu-t<m>agah i lagi ___ i kulang ...] fish REL LV-<LV>cook NPIV man PIV pot for: 'the fish that the man cooked in the pot'
16	LV	RC	LOC	PIV	kulang i [gu-t<m>agah i lagi i nalaf ___ ...] pot REL LV-<LV>cook NPIV man NPIV fish 'the pot where the man cooked the fish'
17	LV	RC	INS	OBL	*snuk i [gu-t<m>agah i lagi i nalaf i kulang ___ ...] pot REL LV-<LV>cook NPIV man NPIV fish PIV pot for: 'the firewood with which the man cooked the fish in the pot'
18	LV	RC	CAU	OBL	*kastifun i [gu-t<m>agah i lagi i nalaf i kulang ___ ...] feast REL LV-<LV>cook NPIV man NPIV fish PIV pot for: 'the feast for which the man cooked the fish in the pot'
19	IV	DC	-	-	Tagah i lagi i nalaf i snuk IV.cook NPIV man NPIV fish PIV firewood di kulang du_nun kastifun. LOC pot CAU feast 'The man cooked fish in the pot with the firewood for the feast.'
20	IV	RC	AG	NPIV	*lagi i [tagah ___ i nalaf i snuk ...] man REL IV.cook NPIV fish PIV firewood for: 'the man who cooked the fish with the firewood'
21	IV	RC	PAT	NPIV	*nalaf i [tagah i lagi ___ i snuk ...] fish REL IV.cook NPIV man PIV firewood for: 'the fish that the man cooked with the firewood'
22	IV	RC	LOC	OBL	*kulang i [tagah i lagi i nalaf i snuk ___ ...] pot REL IV.cook NPIV man NPIV fish PIV firewood for: 'the pot where the man cooked the fish with the firewood'

23	IV	RC	INS	PIV	snuk i [tagah i lagi i nalaf ____ ...] firewood REL IV.cook NPIV man NPIV fish 'the firewood with which the man cooked the fish'
24	IV	RC	CAU	OBL	*kastifun i [tagah i lagi i snuk ____ ...] feast REL LV-<LV>cook NPIV man PIV firewood for: 'the feast for which the man cooked with the pot'
25	CV	DC	-	-	Fati i bayani i ksenan di kasagla fagu_di ksamuk. CV.die NPIV hero PIV freedom LOC war INS bloodshed 'The hero died in the war for the freedom by bloodshed.'
26	CV	RC	AG	NPIV	*bayani i [fati ____ i ksenan di kasagla ...] hero REL CV.die PIV freedom LOC war for: 'the hero who died in the war for the freedom'
27	CV	RC	PAT	NPIV	-
28	CV	RC	LOC	OBL	*kasagla i [fati i bayani i ksenan ____ ...] war REL CV.die NPIV hero PIV freedom for: 'the war where the hero died for the freedom'
29	CV	RC	INS	OBL	*ksamuk i [fati i bayani i ksenan ____ ...] hero REL CV.die NPIV hero PIV war for: 'bloodshed by which the hero died for the freedom'
30	CV	RC	CAU	PIV	ksenan i [fati i bayani ____ di kasagla ...] freedom REL CV.die NPIV hero LOC war 'freedom for which the hero died in the war'

SECTION 4. TAGALOG

MICROGROUP: AUSTRONESIAN: WESTERN MALAYO-POLYNESIAN: PHILIPPINE: GREATER CENTRAL PHILIPPINE: CENTRAL PHILIPPINE

TABLE 11. Relativizable elements in Tagalog via the gap strategy.

Voice	Arguments					
	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Patient</i>	<i>Locative</i>	<i>Benefactive</i>	<i>Instrument</i>	<i>Cause</i>
Agent	PIVOT	NPIVOT	OBL	OBL	OBL	OBL
Patient	NPIVOT	PIVOT	OBL	OBL	OBL	OBL
Locative	NPIVOT	NPIVOT	PIVOT	OBL	OBL	OBL
Benefactive	NPIVOT	NPIVOT	OBL	PIVOT	OBL	OBL
Instrument	NPIVOT	NPIVOT	OBL	OBL	PIVOT	OBL
Cause	NPIVOT	-	OBL	OBL	OBL	PIVOT

Shaded areas reflect elements that are not accessible for relativization.

#	Voice	Clause	Element Extracted	Func of Extracted	Example
1	AV	DC	-	-	<p>Nag-luto ang lalaki ng kanin sa palayok para_sa bata AV.PRF-cook PIV man NPIV rice LOC pot BEN child</p> <p>sa_pamamagitan_ng panggatong dahil_sa handaan. INS firewood CAU feast</p> <p>‘The man cooked rice in the pot for the child with the firewood for the feast.’</p>
2	AV	RC	AG	PIV	<p>lalaki na [nag-luto ___ ng kanin ...] man REL AV.PRF-cook NPIV rice</p> <p>‘the man who cooked rice’</p>
3	AV	RC	PAT	NPIV	<p>*kanin na [nag-luto ang lalaki ___ ...] rice REL AV.PRF-cook PIV man</p> <p>for: ‘the rice that the man cooked’</p>
4	AV	RC	LOC	OBL	<p>*palayok na [nag-luto ang lalaki ___ ...] pot REL AV.PRF-cook PIV man</p> <p>for: ‘the pot where the man cooked’</p>

5	AV	RC	BEN	OBL	*bata na [nag-luto ang lalaki ___ ...] child REL AV.PRF-cook PIV man for: 'the child for whom the man cooked'
6	AV	RC	INS	OBL	*panggatong na [nag-luto ang lalaki ___ ...] firewood REL AV.PRF-cook PIV man for: 'the firewood with which the man cooked'
7	AV	RC	CAU	OBL	*handaan na [nag-luto ang lalaki ___ ...] feast REL AV.PRF-cook PIV man for: 'the feast for which the man cooked'
8	PV	DC	-	-	Ni-luto ng lalaki ang kanin sa palayok para_sa bata PV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV rice LOC pot BEN child sa_pamamagitan_ng panggatong dahil_sa handaan. INS firewood CAU feast 'The man cooked rice in the pot for the child with the firewood for the feast.'
9	PV	RC	AG	NPIV	lalaki na [ni-luto ___ ang kanin ...] man REL PV.PRF-cook PIV rice 'the man who cooked rice'
10	PV	RC	PAT	PIV	kanin na [ni-luto ng lalaki ___ ...] rice REL PV.PRF-cook NPIV man 'the rice that the man cooked'
11	PV	RC	LOC	OBL	*palayok na [ni-luto ng lalaki ang kanin ___ ...] pot REL PV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV rice for: 'the pot where the man cooked the rice'
12	PV	RC	BEN	OBL	*bata na [ni-luto ng lalaki ang kanin ___ ...] child REL PV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV rice for: 'the child for whom the man cooked the rice'
13	PV	RC	INS	OBL	*panggatong na [ni-luto ng lalaki ang kanin ___ ...] firewood REL PV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV rice for: 'the firewood with which the man cooked the rice'

Bondoc: Revisiting Relativization Asymmetries in Philippine-Type Symmetrical Voice Languages

14	PV	RC	CAU	OBL	*handaan na [ni-luto ng lalaki ang kanin ___ ...] feast REL PV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV rice for: 'the feast for which the man cooked the rice'
15	LV	DC	-	-	Ni-lutu-an ng lalaki ng kanin ang palayok para_sa bata PRF-cook-LV NPIV man NPIV rice PIV pot BEN child sa_pamamagitan_ng panggatong dahil_sa handaan. INS firewood CAU feast 'The man cooked rice in the pot for the child with the firewood for the feast.'
16	LV	RC	AG	NPIV	lalaki na [ni-lutu-an ___ ng kanin ang palayok ...] man REL PRF-cook-LV NPIV rice PIV pot 'the man who cooked rice in the pot'
17	LV	RC	PAT	NPIV	*kanin na [ni-lutu-an ng lalaki ___ ang palayok ...] rice REL PRF-cook-LV NPIV man PIV pot for: 'rice that the man cooked in the pot'
18	LV	RC	LOC	PIV	palayok na [ni-lutu-an ng lalaki ng kanin ___ ...] pot REL PRF-cook-LV NPIV man NPIV rice 'the pot where the man cooked the rice'
19	LV	RC	BEN	OBL	*bata na [ni-lutu-an ng lalaki ng kanin ang palayok ___ ...] child REL PRF-cook-LV NPIV man NPIV rice PIV pot for: 'the child for whom the man cooked rice in the pot'
20	LV	RC	INS	OBL	*panggatong na [ni-lutu-an ng lalaki ng kanin ang palayok ___ ...] firewood REL PRF-cook-LV NPIV man NPIV rice PIV pot for: 'the firewood with which the man cooked rice in the pot'
21	LV	RC	CAU	OBL	*handaan na [ni-lutu-an ng lalaki ng kanin ang palayok ___ ...] feast REL PRF-cook-LV NPIV man NPIV rice PIV pot for: 'the feast for which the man cooked rice in the pot'

22	BV	DC	-	-	<p>Ip<in>ag-luto ng lalaki ng kanin sa palayok ang bata BV<PRF>-cook NPIV man NPIV rice LOC pot PIV child</p> <p>sa_pamamagitan_ng panggatong dahil_sa handaan. INS firewood CAU feast</p> <p>‘The man cooked rice in the pot for the child with the firewood for the feast.’</p>
23	BV	RC	AG	NPIV	<p>lalaki na [ip<in>ag-luto ___ ng kanin ang bata ...] man REL BV<PRF>-cook NPIV rice PIV child</p> <p>‘the man who cooked rice for the child’</p>
24	BV	RC	PAT	NPIV	<p>*kanin na [ip<in>ag-luto ng lalaki ___ ang bata ...] rice REL BV<PRF>-cook NPIV rice PIV child</p> <p>for: ‘the rice which the man cooked rice’</p>
25	BV	RC	LOC	OBL	<p>*palayok na [ip<in>ag-luto ng lalaki ng kanin ang bata ___ ...] pot REL BV<PRF>-cook NPIV man NPIV rice PIV child</p> <p>for: ‘the rice which the man cooked rice’</p>
26	BV	RC	BEN	PIV	<p>bata na [ip<in>ag-luto ng lalaki ng kanin ___ ...] child REL BV<PRF>-cook NPIV man NPIV child</p> <p>‘the child for whom the man cooked rice’</p>
27	BV	RC	INS	OBL	<p>*panggatong na [ip<in>ag-luto ng lalaki ng kanin ang bata ___ ...] firewood REL BV<PRF>-cook NPIV man NPIV rice PIV child</p> <p>for: ‘the firewood with which the man cooked for the rice’</p>
28	BV	RC	CAU	OBL	<p>*handaan na [ip<in>ag-luto ng lalaki ng kanin ang bata ___ ...] feast REL BV<PRF>-cook NPIV man NPIV rice PIV child</p> <p>for: ‘the feast for which the man cooked for the child’</p>
29	IV	DC	-	-	<p>Ip<in>ang-luto ng lalaki ng kanin sa palayok ang panggatong IV<PRF>-cook NPIV man NPIV rice LOC pot PIV firewood</p> <p>para_sa bata dahil_sa handaan. BEN child CAU feast</p> <p>‘The man cooked rice in the pot with the firewood for the child for the feast.’</p>

Bondoc: Revisiting Relativization Asymmetries in Philippine-Type Symmetrical Voice Languages

30	IV	RC	AG	NPIV	lalaki na [ip<in>ang-luto ___ ng kanin ang panggatong ...] man REL IV<PRF>-cook NPIV rice PIV firewood 'the man who cooked rice with the firewood'
31	IV	RC	PAT	NPIV	*kanin na [ip<in>ang-luto ng lalaki ___ ang panggatong ...] rice REL IV<PRF>-cook NPIV man PIV firewood for: 'the rice that the man cooked with the firewood'
32	IV	RC	LOC	OBL	*palayok na [ip<in>ang-luto ng lalaki ng kanin ang panggatong ___ ...] pot REL IV<PRF>-cook NPIV man NPIV rice PIV firewood for: 'the pot where the man cooked the rice with the firewood'
33	IV	RC	BEN	OBL	*bata na [ip<in>ang-luto ng lalaki ng kanin ang panggatong ___ ...] child REL IV<PRF>-cook NPIV man NPIV rice PIV firewood 'the child for whom the man cooked rice with the firewood'
34	IV	RC	INS	PIV	pangatong na [ip<in>ang-luto ng lalaki ng kanin ___ ...] firewood REL IV<PRF>-cook NPIV man NPIV rice 'the firewood with which the man cooked rice'
35	IV	RC	CAU	OBL	*handaan na [ip<in>ang-luto ng lalaki ng kanin ang panggatong ___ ...] feast REL IV<PRF>-cook NPIV man NPIV rice PIV firewood for: 'the feast for which the man cooked for the child with the firewood'
36	CV	DC	-	-	Ik<in>a-matay ng bayani sa digmaan ang pakikipaglaban CV<PRF>-die NPIV hero LOC war PIV fighting sa_pamamagitan_ng dahas para_sa kalayaan. INS bloodshed BEN independence 'The hero died of fighting in the war by bloodshed for independence.'
37	CV	RC	AG	NPIV	bayani na [ik<in>a-matay ___ ang pagtatanggol sa digmaan ...] hero REL CV<PRF>-die PIV fighting LOC war 'the hero who died of fighting in the war'
38	CV	RC	PAT	NPIV	-

39	CV	RC	LOC	OBL	*digmaan na [ik<in>a-matay ng bayani ___ ang pakikipaglaban ...] war REL CV<PRF>-die NPIV hero PIV fighting for: ‘the war where the hero died of fighting’
40	CV	RC	BEN	OBL	*kalayaan na [ik<in>a-matay ng bayani ang pakikipaglaban ___ ...] freedom REL CV<PRF>-die NPIV hero PIV fighting for: ‘the freedom for which the hero died of fighting’
41	CV	RC	INS	OBL	*dahas na [ik<in>a-matay ng bayani ang pagtatanggol ___ ...] bloodshed REL CV<PRF>-die NPIV hero PIV fighting for: ‘bloodshed by which the hero died of fighting’
42	CV	RC	CAU	PIV	pakikipaglaban na [ik<in>a-matay ng bayani sa digmaan ___ ...] fighting REL CV<PRF>-die NPIV hero LOC war ‘fighting of which the hero died in the war’

SECTION 5. CEBUANO

MICROGROUP: AUSTRONESIAN: WESTERN MALAYO-POLYNESIAN: PHILIPPINE: GREATER CENTRAL PHILIPPINE: CENTRAL PHILIPPINE

TABLE 12. Relativizable elements in Cebuano via the gap strategy.

Voice	Arguments				
	<i>Agent</i>	<i>Patient</i>	<i>Locative</i>	<i>Instrument</i>	<i>Causative</i>
Agent	PIVOT	NPIVOT	OBL	OBL	OBL
Patient	NPIVOT	PIVOT	OBL	OBL	OBL
Locative	NPIVOT	NPIVOT	PIVOT	OBL	OBL
Instrument	NPIVOT	NPIVOT	OBL	PIVOT	OBL
Causative	NPIVOT	-	OBL	OBL	PIVOT

Shaded areas reflect elements that are not accessible for relativization.

Bondoc: Revisiting Relativization Asymmetries in Philippine-Type Symmetrical Voice Languages

#	Voice	Clause	Element Extracted	Func of Extracted	Example
1	AV	DC	-	-	Nag-luto ang lalaki og kan-on sa kulon AV.PRF-cook PIV man NPIV rice LOC pot gamit_ang sugnod tungod_sa kasaulugan. INS firewood CAU feast 'The man cooked rice in the pot with the firewood for the feast.'
2	AV	RC	AG	PIV	lalaki na [nag-luto ___ og kan-on sa kulon ...] man REL AV.PRF-cook NPIV rice LOC pot 'the man who cooked rice in the pot'
3	AV	RC	PAT	NPIV	*kan-on nga [nag-luto ang lalaki ___ sa kulon ...] rice REL AV.PRF-cook PIV man LOC pot for: 'rice that the man cooked in the pot'
4	AV	RC	LOC	OBL	*kulon nga [nag-luto ang lalaki og kan-on ___ ...] pot REL AV.PRF-cook PIV man NPIV rice for: 'pot where the man cooked rice'
5	AV	RC	INS	OBL	*sugnod nga [nag-luto ang lalaki og kan-on ___ ...] firewood REL AV.PRF-cook PIV man NPIV rice for: 'firewood with which the man cooked rice'
6	AV	RC	CAU	OBL	*kasaulugan nga [nag-luto ang lalaki og kan-on ___ ...] feast REL AV.PRF-cook PIV man NPIV rice for: 'feast for which the man cooked rice'
7	PV	DC	-	-	Gi-luto sa lalaki ang kan-on sa kulon PV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV rice LOC pot gamit_ang sugnod tungod_sa kasaulugan. INS firewood CAU feast 'The man cooked rice in the pot with the firewood for the feast.'

8	PV	RC	AG	NPIV	lalaki nga [gi-luto ____ ang kan-on sa kulon ...] man REL PV.PRF-cook PIV rice LOC pot 'the man who cooked rice in the pot'
9	PV	RC	PAT	PIV	kan-on nga [gi-luto sa lalaki ____ sa kulon ...] rice REL PV.PRF-cook NPIV man ____ LOC pot 'the rice that the man cooked in the pot'
10	PV	RC	LOC	OBL	*kulon nga [gi-luto sa lalaki ang kan-on ____ ...] pot REL PV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV rice for: 'pot where the man cooked rice'
11	PV	RC	INS	OBL	*sugnod nga [gi-luto sa lalaki ang kan-on ____ ...] firewood REL PV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV rice for: 'firewood with which the man cooked rice'
12	PV	RC	CAU	OBL	*kasaulugan nga [gi-luto sa lalaki ang kan-on ____ ...] feast REL PV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV rice for: 'feast for which the man cooked rice'
13	LV	DC	-	-	Gi-lutu-an sa lalaki og kan-on ang kulon PRF-cook-LV NPIV man NPIV rice PIV pot gamit_ang sugnod tungod_sa kasaulugan. INS firewood CAU feast 'The man cooked rice in the pot with the firewood for the feast.'
14	LV	RC	AG	NPIV	lalaki nga [gi-lutu-an ____ sa kan-on ang kulon ...] man REL PRF-cook-LV NPIV rice PIV pot 'the man who cooked rice in the pot'
15	LV	RC	PAT	NPIV	*kan-on nga [gi-lutu-an sa lalaki ____ sa kulon ...] rice REL PRF-cook-LV NPIV man ____ LOC pot for: 'the rice that the man cooked in the pot'
16	LV	RC	LOC	PIV	kulon nga [gi-lutu-an sa lalaki og kan-on ____ ...] pot REL PRF-cook-LV NPIV man NPIV rice 'the pot where the man cooked the rice in the pot'

Bondoc: Revisiting Relativization Asymmetries in Philippine-Type Symmetrical Voice Languages

17	LV	RC	INS	OBL	*sugnod nga [gi-lutu-an sa lalaki og kan-on ang kulon ____ ...] firewood REL PRF-cook-LV NPIV man PIV rice PIV pot for: 'firewood with which the man cooked rice in the pot'
18	LV	RC	CAU	OBL	*kasaulugan nga [gi-lutu-an sa lalaki og kan-on ang kulon ____ ...] feast REL PRF-cook-LV NPIV man PIV rice PIV pot for: 'feast for which the man cooked rice'
19	IV	DC	-	-	Gipang-luto sa lalaki og kan-on ang sugnod IV.PRF-cook NPIV man NPIV rice PIV firewood sa kulon tungod sa kasaulugan. LOC pot CAU feast 'The man cooked rice in the pot with the firewood for the feast.'
20	IV	RC	AG	NPIV	lalaki nga [gipang-luto ____ sa kan-on ang sugnod ...] man REL IV.PRF-cook NPIV rice PIV firewood 'the man who cooked rice with the firewood'
21	IV	RC	PAT	NPIV	*kan-on nga [gipang-luto sa lalaki ____ ang sugnod ...] rice REL IV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV firewood for: 'the rice that the man cooked with the firewood'
22	IV	RC	LOC	OBL	*kulon nga [gipang-luto sa lalaki ang sugnod ____ ...] pot REL IV.PRF-cook NPIV man PIV firewood for: 'the pot that the man cooked with the firewood'
23	IV	RC	INS	PIV	sugnod nga [gipang-luto sa lalaki og kan-on ____ ...] firewood REL IV.PRF-cook NPIV man NPIV rice 'the firewood with which the man cooked rice'
24	IV	RC	CAU	OBL	*kasaulugan nga [gipang-luto sa lalaki og kan-on ang sugnod ____ ...] feast REL IV.PRF-cook NPIV man NPIV rice PIV firewood for: 'the feast for which the man cooked rice with the firewood'

25	CV	DC	-	-	Gika-maty-an sa bayani ang pakig-away CV.PRF-die-CV NPIV hero PIV fighting sa gubat pinaagi_sa pagkabayolente. LOC war INS bloodshed 'The hero died of fighting in the war by bloodshed.'
26	CV	RC	AG	NPIV	bayani nga [gika-maty-an ____ ang pakig-away sa gubat ...] hero REL CV.PRF-die-CV ____ PIV fighting LOC war 'the hero who died of fighting in the war by bloodshed.'
27	CV	RC	PAT	-	-
28	CV	RC	LOC	OBL	*gubat nga [gika-maty-an sa bayani ang pakig-away ____ ...] war REL CV.PRF-die-CV NPIV hero PIV fighting for: 'war where the hero died of fighting'
29	CV	RC	INS	OBL	*pagkabayolente nga [gika-maty-an sa bayani ang pakig-away ____ ...] bloodshed REL CV.PRF-die-CV NPIV hero PIV fighting for: 'bloodshed by which the hero died of fighting'
30	CV	RC	CAU	PIV	pakig-away nga [gika-maty-an sa bayani sa gubat ____ ...] fighting REL CV.PRF-die-CV NPIV hero LOC war 'fighting of which the hero died in the war'

REFERENCES

- ALDRIDGE, EDITH. 2004. Ergativity and verb-initial word order in Austronesian languages. Cornell University PhD dissertation.
- BLUST, ROBERT. 1991. The greater central Philippines hypothesis. *Oceanic Linguistics* 30(2):73–129.
- CHEN, VICTORIA. 2017. A reexamination of the Philippine-type voice system and its implication for Austronesian primary-level subgrouping. University of Hawai'i at Mānoa PhD dissertation.
- COMRIE, BERNARD. 1981. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ERLEWINE, MICHAEL YOSHITAKA; THEODORE LEVIN; and COPPE VAN URK. 2017. Ergativity and Austronesian-type voice systems. *Oxford handbook of ergativity*, ed. by Jessica Coon, Diane Massam, and Lisa deMena Travis, 373–96. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- FOLEY, WILLIAM. 1998. Symmetrical voice systems and precategoriality in Philippine languages. In *LFG98 Conference, Workshop on Voice and Grammatical Functions in Austronesian Languages*, Brisbane, Australia. Accessed March 2018 from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.7.7620>
- FOLEY, WILLIAM, and ROBERT VAN VALIN JR. 1983. *Functional syntax and universal grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GUILFOYLE, EITHNE; HENRIETTA HUNG; and LISA TRAVIS. 1992. Spec of IP and spec of VP: Two subjects in Austronesian languages. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10:375–414.
- HIMMELMANN, NIKOLAUS. 2005. The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar: Typological characteristics. *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, ed. by K. Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus Himmelmann, 110–81. New York: Routledge.
- KEENAN, EDWARD, and BERNARD COMRIE. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63–100.
- KROEGER, PAUL. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- SIMONS, GARY F., and CHARLES D. FENNIG (eds.). 2018. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. 21th ed. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Accessed March 2018 from <http://www.ethnologue.com>.
- LIAO, HSIU-CHUAN. 1999/2000. The noun phrase accessibility hierarchy: A view from ergative languages. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in Linguistics* 31:121–42.
- O'GRADY, WILLIAM. 2015. *The syntax files*. Unpublished Course Reader, Department of Linguistics, University of Hawai'i.
- PAYNE, THOMAS. 1997. *Describing morphosyntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- RIESBERG, SONJA. 2014. *Symmetrical voice and linking in Western Austronesian languages*. Boston; Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. doi: 10.1515/9781614518716
- SCHACHTER, PAUL. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: Topic, actor, actor-topic, or none of the above. *Subject and topic*, ed. by Charles N. Li, 493–518. New York: Academic Press.
- SCHACHTER, PAUL, and FE OTANES. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*. California: University of California Press.
- SCHUELKE, PETER, and CHRISTIAN MORTENSEN. 2018. Towards a typology of extraction patterns in Austronesian symmetrical-voice languages. Paper presented at the 28th Meeting of the Southeast Asian Languages Society, Kaohsiung, Taiwan.

ipbondoc@hawaii.edu