

PROBLEMS IN THE RECONSTRUCTION OF PROTO-PHILIPPINE CONSTRUCTION MARKERS

LAWRENCE A. REID

0. INTRODUCTION

This paper is the result of an attempt to try to define the problems that must be faced in reconstructing the construction markers of Proto-Philippines.

In order to understand what the problems are it is necessary first to make explicit some of our hypotheses about what we mean by Proto-Philippines, and secondly to discuss what we mean by 'construction markers'.

0.1. PROTO-PHILIPPINES

Linguists have for some time now assumed that all of the languages of the Philippines, and some outside the Philippines such as those of Northern Borneo, Northern Celebes and Chamorro in the Marianas Islands are genetically more closely related to each other than any is to a language group outside of this group. This implies that all these languages have developed as daughter languages from a single ancestral language that we now call Proto-Philippines. The inclusion of the languages of Northern Borneo in this 'Philippine' group has been challenged by Blust (1974), and little, if any, solid evidence supports the inclusion of Chamorro.

The evidence that has been proposed for this group is not strong. It is based primarily on the merger of some Proto-Austronesian phonemes, e.g. PAN *C, *T, *t > PPh *t; PAN *c, *s > PPh *s, PAN *ey; *ay > PPh *ay; PAN *d, *D, *z, *Z > PPh *d. Other apparent evidence, for example similarity in morphology and syntax, is becoming less significant as these features are being assigned to Proto-Austronesian or to some other language ancestral to Proto-Philippines.

It is possible that in the future we may have to reassess completely the evidence for a Proto-Philippines even comprising the languages of the geographical Philippines, however for now we will continue to operate on the assumption that there was in fact a Proto-Philippine language from which at least the languages of the geographical Philippines developed, and see where such a hypothesis leads us in the reconstruction of the construction markers of the language.

We will also assume that there are a number of more or less discrete subgroups in the Philippines, the evidence for which varies considerably in quantity and quality. Following Zorc's (1977) grouping (some of which is purely impressionistic, but is the best we have at present) we will examine the construction markers from the following language groups: (1) Cordilleran (Northern, Central, and Southern), (2) North Extension (Ivatan, Kapampangan, North Mangyan), (3) Meso-Philippine (South Mangyan, Palawan, Kalamian, Subanon, Central Philippine), (3a) Central Philippine (Tagalog, Bikol, Bisayan, Mansakan, Mamanwa), (4) Manobo (Kagayanen, Western Bukidnon, Dibabawon, Cotabato, Sarangani), (5) Danao (Maranao).

0.2. CONSTRUCTION MARKERS

As far as we know, all Philippine languages have a class of words which can be broadly characterised as construction markers (CMs). They are usually unstressed, single syllable words which have a tendency to become cliticised, that is, phonologically united to either the preceding or the following stressed word, although usually they are written as separate words. They have been called a variety of names in the literature depending on their functions, such as articles, determiners, case-marking particles, ligatures, markers, etc. Although all Philippine languages have such a class of words, the variety of their forms and functions is bewildering. I have not found two languages which exhibit precisely the same sets, and often the differences between the CMs of even fairly closely related languages is quite great.

The CMs that we will be particularly concerned with in this paper can best be characterised in the context of a brief outline of the structure of sentences which appear to be common to most, if not all, Philippine languages and are therefore probably reconstructable for Proto-Philippines.

0.3. DESCRIPTIVE SENTENCES

A descriptive sentence is one consisting of an attribute, such as a verb, an adjective, an existential word, or a noun, followed by a series of NPs (and/or PPs) in construction with it. The number of NPs which

may occur and the semantic information which they may convey is directly dependent upon the kind of attribute at the beginning of the sentence. The following examples illustrate descriptive sentences in four diverse Philippine languages - Tagalog (Tag.), Ilokano (Ilk.), Bontok (Bon.) and Ivatan (Ivt.).

1. 'A child got the dog'

a. Tag.	kinúha	naŋ	báta	ʔaŋ	ʔáso.
b. Ilk.	ʔinnála	ti	ʔubiŋ	ti	ʔásu.
c. Bon.	ʔinála-n	nan	ʔuŋa	nan	ʔásu.
d. Ivt.	ʔinahap	nu	mutdəh	ʔu	chitu.
	<i>got</i>		<i>child</i>		<i>dog</i>

2. 'The child is beautiful'

a. Tag.	maganda	ʔaŋ	bátaʔ.
b. Ilk.	napintas	ti	ʔubiŋ.
c. Bon.	napintas	nan	ʔuŋa.
d. Ivt.	mávid	ʔu	mutdəh.
	<i>beautiful</i>		<i>child</i>

3. 'There is a child in the house'

a. Tag.	mayroʔaŋ	báta	sa	báhay.
b. Ilk.	ʔadda	ʔubiŋ	ʔidiay	balay.
c. Bon.	wadʔay	ʔuŋa-s	nan	ʔábuŋ.
d. Ivt.	ʔari ʔu	mutdəh	du	vahay.
	<i>exists</i>	<i>child</i>		<i>house</i>

4. 'The child is a student'

a. Tag.	ʔestudiante	ʔaŋ	bátaʔ.
b. Ilk.	ʔestudiante	ti	ʔubiŋ.
c. Bon.	ʔuskíla	nan	ʔuŋa.
d. Ivt.	ʔestudiante	ʔu	mutdəh.
	<i>student</i>		<i>child</i>

Most of the NPs in the examples 1-4 above are introduced by CMs. The attribute at the beginning of each sentence is not introduced by a CM.

0.4. EQUATIONAL SENTENCES

An equational sentence consists of two NPs. Both are introduced by CMs. The first NP functions as an identifier of the second NP. The

second NP may itself contain one or more NPs. This sentence type is somewhat equivalent in meaning to so-called 'cleft sentences' in English. Examples 5 and 6 illustrate equational sentences.

5. *'It is the child who is the student'*

a. Tag.	ʔaŋ	báta	ʔaŋ	ʔestudiante.
b. Ilk.	ti	ʔubiŋ	ti	ʔestudiante.
c. Bon.	nan	ʔuŋa	nan	ʔoskíla.
d. Ivt.	nu	mutdəh	ʔu	ʔestudiante.
		<i>child</i>		<i>student</i>

6. *'It is the dog that the child got'*

a. Tag.	ʔaŋ	ʔáso	ʔaŋ	kinúha	naŋ	bátaʔ.
b. Ilk.	ti	ʔásu	ti	ʔinnála	ti	ʔubiŋ.
c. Bon.	nan	ʔásu	nan	ʔinála-n	nan	ʔuŋa.
d. Ivt.	nu	chitu	ʔu	ʔinahap	nu	mutdəh.
		<i>dog</i>		<i>got</i>		<i>child</i>

In both descriptive and equational sentences, the first constituent (attribute or identifier) provides new information about one of the NPs which follows. The initial constituent of these sentences from here on will be referred to as the Predicate. The NP about which the Predicate provides new information will be referred to as the Subject. (Other linguists prefer to use the term Topic for this NP.) In an equational sentence, CMs introduce both the predicate and the subject.

0.5. TOPICALISED SENTENCES

A topicalised sentence is one in which one of the NPs which normally follows the Predicate is placed before it in order to 'foreground' the entity in that NP. Often this is done to provide contrast with some other possible entity that could occur in that NP. This foregrounded NP will be referred to as the topicalised NP, or more simply as the Topic. Sentences 7-11 illustrate topicalised sentences.

7. *'As for the child, he got the dog'*

a. Tag.	ʔaŋ	báta	ay	kinúha niya	ʔaŋ	ʔáso.
b. Ilk.	ti	ʔubiŋ	ket	ʔinnála-na	ti	ʔásu.
c. Bon.	nan	ʔuŋa,		ʔinála-na	nan	ʔásu.
d. Ivt.	nu	mutdəh	ʔam	ʔinahap na	ʔu	chitu.
		<i>child</i>		<i>got-he</i>		<i>dog</i>

8. 'As for the child, she is beautiful'

a. Tag.	ʔaŋ	báta	ay	maganda.
b. Ilk.	ti	ʔubiŋ	ket	napintas.
c. Bon.	nan	ʔuŋa		napintas.
d. Ivt.	nu	mutdəh	ʔam	mávid.
		<i>child</i>		<i>beautiful</i>

9. 'As for the house, there is a child there'

a. Tag.	sa	báhay	ay	mayroʔoŋ	báta	doʔon.
b. Ilk.	ʔidiay	balay	ket	ʔadda	ʔubiŋ	ʔidiay.
c. Bon.	nan	ʔábuŋ,		wadʔay	ʔuŋa-s	di.
d. Ivt.	du	vahay	ʔam	ʔari ʔu	mutdəh	dawri.
		<i>house</i>		<i>exist</i>	<i>child</i>	<i>there</i>

10. 'As for the child, he is a student'

a. Tag.	ʔaŋ	báta	ay	estudiante.
b. Ilk.	ti	ʔubiŋ	ket	estudiante.
c. Bon.	nan	ʔuŋa,		ʔoskíla..
d. Ivt.	nu	mutdəh	ʔam	ʔestudiante.
		<i>child</i>		<i>student</i>

11. 'As for the dog, the child got it'

a. Tag.	ʔaŋ	ʔáso	ay	kinúha	naŋ	bátaʔ.
b. Ilk.	ti	ʔásu	ket	ʔinnála	ti	ʔubiŋ.
c. Bon.	nan	ʔásu,		ʔinála-n	nan	ʔuŋa.
d. Ivt.	nu	chitu	ʔam	ʔinahap	nu	mutdəh.
		<i>dog</i>		<i>got</i>		<i>child</i>

A CM introduces the topicalised NP, and in Tagalog, Ilokano and Ivatan a CM (the 'Topic Linker') joins the topicalised NP to the rest of the sentence. In Bontok, only a break in intonation (symbolised by a comma) acts as a topic linker.

0.6. RELATIVE CLAUSES

The only reason for mentioning relative clauses here is to introduce a context for one remaining CM that will be discussed in this paper. This CM is commonly referred to as the ligature in the literature on Philippine languages. Among other functions, it serves to link a head noun to a following relative clause. Example 12 illustrates the use of this type of CM in the four languages cited above. (The relative clause linker is underlined.)

12. '...dog which the child got'

a. Tag.	...ʔáso- <u>ng</u>	kinúha	naŋ	bátaʔ.
b. Ilk.	...ʔásu <u>nga</u>	ʔinnála	ti	ʔubiŋ.
c. Bon.	...ʔásu- <u>way</u>	ʔinála-n	nan	ʔuŋa.
d. Ivt.	...chitu <u>a</u>	ʔinahap	nu	mutdəh.
	<i>dog</i>	<i>got</i>		<i>child</i>

The CM which links a relative clause to its head noun in many languages has variants that are phonologically determined (e.g. Tag. /na/ ~ /-ŋ/, Ilk. /ŋa/ ~ /a/, etc.). Such CMs, like also those that link a topic with the sentence that follows it, are strictly grammatical markers, that is, they do not provide any semantic information about the constituents which they link. However, the CMs which have been described above as introducing NPs are not only grammatical markers, they also must agree with various semantic features of the N which they precede, such as common versus personal, singular versus plural, etc.

Three types of construction markers then are commonly found in Philippine languages. Those which introduce NPs will be referred to as determiners (Det), those which link a topicalised NP and the rest of a sentence will be referred to as topic linkers, and those which link head nouns with relative clauses will be referred to as ligatures.

1. SEMANTIC FEATURES OF DETERMINERS

In reconstructing Proto-Philippine (PPh) determiners, one of the first questions which needs to be answered is, 'What semantic features of the head noun did Det agree with in the parent language?' In other words, how many markers were there which could introduce a NP without changing its grammatical function?

When we compare languages in the Philippines we find considerable agreement on some of the semantic features which are marked. For example, probably all languages distinguish between markers for common nouns, versus those for personal nouns. This is illustrated in Table 1, which shows the common versus person Det in the subject NP of a variety of languages.

It will be noted that while there is considerable agreement in the form of the proper noun Det in Table 1, enabling us to fairly confidently reconstruct PPh *si, there is very little agreement on the form of the common noun Det in Table 1. We will face this problem in Section 4.1.1. below.

There is fairly general agreement throughout the Philippines also, that the class of proper nouns includes not only the names of people, but also certain kinship terms, especially those that can be used as

TABLE 1
Common versus Personal Subject Determiners

	Common	Personal
Ilokano	ti	ni
Agta	ya	yi
Gaddang	yo	?i
Ibanag	?i	si
Yogad	yu	si
Casiguran Dumagat	?i	ti
Umiray Dumagat	?un	?i
Isinai	di	si
Kalinga	dit	si
Kankanay	nan	si
Balangaw	hen	ah
Pangasinan	so	si
Inibaloi	?i	si
Keley-i Kallahan	hu	∅
Ivatan	?u	si
Kapampangan	?iŋ	?i
Sinauna	?i	si
Aborlan Tagbanwa	?i	si
Batak	tu	si
Subanon	?og	si
Tagalog	?aŋ	si
Bikol	?an	si
Aklanon	do ~ ro	si
Bangon	kag	si
Mamanwa	ya	si
Mansaka	yaŋ	si
Binukid Manobo	sa	si
Sarangani Manobo	sə	si
Dibabawon Manobo	tə	si
Ilianen Manobo	ka	si
Maranao	su	si
Bilaan	?i	∅

TABLE 2

Singular versus Plural Personal Subject Determiners

	Singular	Plural
Ilokano	ni	da
Agta	yi	yig
Gaddang	?i	da
Ibanag	si	da
Atta	si	di
Isneg	?i	da
Isinai	si	da
Kalinga	si	da
Ifugao	hi	da
Balangaw	?ah	da
Pangasinan	si	di
Ivatan	si	sa
Kapampangan	?i	di
Sinauna	si	ra
Aborlan Tagbanwa	si	na
Tagalog	si	sina
Tausug	hi	hinda
Butuanon	si	sila
Romblon	si	sina
Banton	si	sa
Mamanwa	si	sin
Mansaka	si	saŋ

TABLE 3

Singular versus Plural Common Subject Determiners

	Singular	Plural
Ilokano	ti	dagiti
Itawis	ya	ya N ?ira
Gaddang	yo	ya N ?ira
Ibanag	?i	?i N ?ira
Atta	yu?	yu? N ira
Yogad	tu	danu
Isneg	ya	daya
Casiguran Dumagat	?i	di
Umiray Dumagat	?un	?un ?ida
Isinai	di	di N-dari
Kalinga	dit	dat
Bontok	nan	da nan
Ifugao	nan	nádan
Pangasinan	so	ray
Ivatan	?u	sa ?u
Kapampangan	?iŋ	diŋ
Sinauna	?i	?i maŋa
Aborlan Tagbanwa	?i	?i maŋa
Tagalog	?aŋ	?aŋ maŋa
Bikol	?aŋ	?aŋ maŋa
Hiligaynon	?aŋ	?aŋ maŋa
Mamanwa	ya	ya maŋa
Mansaka	yaŋ	yaŋ maŋa
W. Bukidnon Manobo	?is	?is məŋə
Sarangani Manobo	sə	sə məŋə
Maranao	su	su maŋa
Bilaan	?i	?i dad

terms of address. This was also probably true for Proto-Philippines. Today, the class of proper nouns also includes titles, such as 'attorney', 'doctor', 'teacher', etc., since these are also used as terms of address. If there were occupational titles in Proto-Philippines, such as *datu 'leader, ruler', they probably also belonged to this class and were marked with *si when occurring as the subject of a sentence.

The class of common nouns in Philippine languages includes all nouns, animate as well as inanimate, which are not personal nouns. It is generally true also that the term for 'God' is classed as common, not personal.

In addition to a distinction between the common noun Det and the personal noun Det, there are a number of languages which distinguish the marker of a singular from the marker of a plural personal noun (Table 2). Most of the languages accomplish this by replacing the singular marker with a form which is identical to the third person plural subject pronoun. Some languages however, such as Tagalog and Romblon, have added a plural morpheme /-na/ to the singular person marker. This is possibly also the origin of Mamanwa /sin/ (< *sina), as well as the Aborlan Tagbanwa /na/ which replaces the singular Det /si/. The use of /na/ as a plural morpheme associated with personal markers, although restricted to a few languages in the Meso-Philippine group, may need to be reconstructed for Proto-Philippines, since it is attested outside of the Philippines as a plural, personal Genitive marker in Amis.

Plurality of common nouns is generally marked in one of two ways (see Table 3). The first, which is found in many Philippine languages, as well as in languages outside the Philippines, in Wolio and some Oceanic languages, is /maŋa/ 'plural'. It is probable that this form was a common noun plural Det in Proto-Philippines. The second way of marking plural common nouns is found primarily in the Cordilleran group. Apparently Proto-Cordilleran lost the use of *maŋa and replaced it with a third person plural pronoun, either following the N, as in Gaddang, Ibanag, etc., or preceding the singular common noun Det as in Ilokano, Yogad and Isneg.

The forms listed in Table 1, are not the only forms that many of these languages have for marking common noun subjects. Some languages, such as those listed in Table 4, make a distinction between the Det which introduces nouns having general reference, and those having some specific reference. This distinction is interpreted in various ways, both by the speakers of the languages and by the linguists who describe them. Thus, Harmon (1974), in describing Manobo languages simply uses

the terms 'common' versus 'common specific' to characterise the difference between Western Bukidnon Manobo /kə/ and /ʔis/, a distinction which Elkins (1970) refers to as indefinite versus definite. Forster (n.d.) characterises the difference between /to/ and /ton/ in Dibabawon as definite/indefinite ('*the, a*') versus anaphoric '*the one we know about*'. Reid (1964) describes the difference between Bontok /nan/ and /san/ as involving anaphoricity or prior reference. Zorc (1977:85) indicates that the difference between Waray and Samar-Leyte /ʔan/ and /ʔit/ involves a time reference, past versus non-past. Likewise Geiser (1963) in discussing the difference between /dit/ and /nan/ states that the former refers to past time, and the latter to non-past time. The Headlands (1974) note that the difference between Casiguran Dumagat /ʔi/ and /tu/ is likewise one of present versus past. They also indicate that other semantic features are implied in this contrast, such as living versus dead, general versus specific, actual versus non-actual, in sight versus out of sight, known versus unknown, mass noun versus singular (count?) noun. Several languages have apparently expanded the past time reference to include persons who have died, such as Ivatan /simna/ versus /si/, and Kankanay /din si/ versus /si/. Ilokano has developed two past time Dets, /di/ and /tay/. The first introduces not only deceased persons, but also common nouns whose reference is some time in the past, whereas /tay/ introduces common nouns whose past time reference is only a short time prior to the speech event. Table 4 groups together some of the languages which appear to make a past/non-past, or specific/non-specific contrast in their subject markers. The question is whether Proto-Philippines had different determiners for marking anaphoricity or past time reference. Probably not, since it can be shown that the distinctions of this sort which appear in the daughter languages were originally made by introducing one of the demonstratives into a position immediately after the determiner, and subsequently reinterpreting it as a determiner.

Although most Philippine languages rely on devices other than the Det to mark definiteness or indefiniteness of NPs, there are some languages in the Bisayan group which according to Zorc (1977:85) have a distinction between a definite Det and an indefinite Det. Table 5 shows some of these languages.

There is some evidence, which will be considered in Section 4.1.1. below, that in Proto-Philippines a Nominative Det was interpretable as indefinite in certain environments. However a systematic distinction between definite and indefinite determiners was probably not present in the language.

TABLE 4

Specific versus Non-specific Common Subject Determiners

	Specific, Past	Non-specific, Non-past
Ilokano	di, tay	ti
Casiguran Dumagat	tu	?i
Kalinga	dit	nan
Kankanay	din, san	nan
Bontok	san	nan
Waray	?an	?it
Samar-Leyte	?an	?it
Dibabawon Manobo	ton	to

TABLE 5

Definite versus Indefinite Common Subject Determiners

	Definite	Indefinite
Aklanon	to ~ do	-y
Cebuano	?ag	-y
Sibalenhon	kag	-y
Waray	?an, ?it	?in
Camotes	?an	?in
Nth. Samereño	?a	?i

In summary, it appears that in Proto-Philippines distinctions existed between common and personal determiners, and that the latter were distinguished as either singular or plural. Common determiners marked plurality by the addition of a plural marker *maŋa.

2. GRAMMATICAL FUNCTIONS OF DETERMINERS

Comparing the grammatical functions of determiners, we find a number of typologically very distinct systems, which we will outline below. The problem we face is in determining which, if any, of the systems reflects the Proto-Philippine system, and what the conditions were which brought about the changes we find in the daughter languages.

It is necessary to give first a brief characterisation of the functions of the determiners of NPs which follow the Predicate.

2.1. Case Forms

Probably no Philippine language distinguishes more than four distinct case forms, utilising distinctions in the determiner system, although all languages extend the range of their determiners by the use of preposition-like words. Thus Tagalog (as analysed by de Guzman, 1976) has three case forms: Accusative /naŋ/ (written ng), Nominative /ʔaŋ/ (ang), and Locative /sa/, as well as three cases realised by a preposition plus a determiner: Benefactive /para sa/, Reason /dáhil sa/, and Comitative /kasáma naŋ/. We will not concern ourselves here with case forms which are marked by a preposition. A language like Ivatan differs from Tagalog in that the case relations which are expressed by Tag. /naŋ/ (Agent, Dative [=Experiencer] Object [=Patient] and Instrument, see examples 13-15 below, from de Guzman 1976, but written phonemically), are divided between two case forms, /nu/ (which expresses Agent, Dative and Instrument) and /su/ (which expresses Object, see examples 16-17 below from Reid 1966).

13. 'The prisoner will be given a sentence by the judge'

Tag.	gagawáran	naŋ	hukom	ʔaŋ	bilanggo	naŋ	parúsa
	lay-on		judge		prisoner		sentence
			+AGT				+OBJ

14. 'The judge was seen by the prisoner'

Tag.	nakíta	naŋ	bilanggo	ʔaŋ	hukom
	see		prisoner		judge
			+DAT		+OBJ

15. *'He drew with a pencil'*

Tag. naggúhit siya naṅ lápís
 draw he pencil
 +INS

16. *'The fire is being blown by the man, with a bamboo tube'*

Ivt. ?alupan nu tau ?u ?apuy nu taguvi
 blow man fire bamboo tube
 +AGT +INS

17. *'The man is frightening a child'*

Ivt. maṅamu?mu ?u tau su mutdèh
 frighten man child
 +OBJ

We will use the term Genitive to label the case form which marks the Agent of a 'passive' verb, since throughout the Philippines, the same form typically marks the Possessor in a possessive construction. The case form which typically marks an indefinite Object in an unembedded sentence will be labelled as Accusative. This use of Accusative should be carefully noted. It applies only to indefinite objects of non-embedded sentences. In such sentences a definite object is either subjectivalised, or reinterpreted as a kind of Locative and marked with a Locative case form.

A further difference between Tagalog and Ivatan can be seen in sentences 5a and 5d, and 7a and 7d above (repeated below as 18 and 19 a and b respectively). Tagalog uses the nominative Det /'aṅ/ to mark a predicative NP in an equational sentence, as well as a topicalised NP. Ivatan however uses the genitive /nu/ to mark these NPs. A personal noun in this position in Ivatan is not marked like a genitive (/ni/), but like a nominative (/si/).

18. *'It is the child who is a student'*

a. Tag. ?aṅ báta ?aṅ ?estudiante
 b. Ivt. nu mutdèh ?u ?estudiante
 child student

19. *'As for the child he got the dog'*

a. Tag. ?aṅ báta ay kinúha niya ?aṅ ?aso
 b. Ivt. nu mutdèh ?am ?inahap na ?u chitu
 child got he dog

CHART 1
Type 1 Determiner System

	TOP	NOM	GEN	ACC	LOC
Blaan	ʔi/∅				di/ku, kane
Ilokano	ti/ni				ʔiti/kenni

CHART 2
Type 2 Determiner System

	TOP	NOM	GEN	ACC	LOC
Agta	ya/yi		na/ni		ta/te
Bontok	nan/si		(-n) nan/(-n) ∅		ʔas/ʔan
Kalinga	dit/si		(-n) dit/(-n) qod		si/ʔan
Balangaw	hen/ʔah		(-n) hen/(-n) ∅		ʔah/ʔ

CHART 3
Type 3 Determiner System

	TOP	NOM	GEN	ACC	LOC
Tagalog	ʔaŋ/si		naŋ/ni		sa/kay
Hiligaynon	ʔaŋ/si		saŋ/ni		sa/kay
Tagbanwa	ʔi/si		ʔit/ni		kat/ki
Batak	tu/si		ʔit/ʔi		kat/kay
Mamanwa	ya/si		na/ni		ka/kan
Mansaka	yaŋ/si		naŋ/ni		saŋ/kay
Subanon	ʔog/si		nog/ni		sog/ʔ

In characterising the various determiner systems in the Philippine languages then, a basic typological pattern having five points will be used as a comparative grid. The five points will be labelled Topic (Top), Nominative (Nom), Genitive (Gen), Accusative (Acc) and Locative (Loc).

2.2. TYPE 1 DETERMINER SYSTEM

This system, represented by Bilaan and by Ilokano, is the least marked of the systems. It distinguishes between only two determiners, one for Locative and one for everything else.

Whereas in Ilokano the determiners are obligatory, in Bilaan /ʔi/ is often used only as a specifier, in other contexts it may be omitted. The Locative /di/, however, is never omitted. Personal noun determiners follow the same system for both languages. Ilokano has /ni/ for all forms except the Locative, which is /kenni/. Bilaan does not mark any personal noun except a (directional) Locative, which is marked with either /ku/ or /kane/. This system is illustrated in Chart 1, and examples of the common noun determiners are given in 20a-c (from Abrams 1970), and 21a-b.

20a. *'The turtle takes along his house'*

Bil.	ʔi	fnu	kanen	sanseben	ʔi	balin
		turtle	he	carry-he		house
			TOP			NOM

20b. *'He is the thrower of rocks on this path'*

Bil.	kanen	sa	sambat	ʔi	dad	batu	di	ba	dalan	ʔani
	he		indeed	throw		plur. rock		way	path	this
							ACC			LOC

20c. *'The people throw them here'*

Bil.	bat	ʔi	dad	to	ʔale	dini
	throw		plur. man		they	here
					GEN	NOM LOC

21a. *'The child got rocks at the river'*

Ilk.	nañála	ti	ʔubiñ	ti	batu	ʔiti	karayan
	got		child		rock		river
			NOM		ACC		LOC

21b. *'The child got the rock'*

Ilk.	ʔinnála	ti	ʔubiñ	ti	batu
	got		child		rock
			GEN		NOM

2.3. TYPE 2 DETERMINER SYSTEM

This system, presented in Chart 2, is represented by Agta from the Northern Cordilleran group, and Bontok, Kalinga and Balangaw from the Central Cordilleran group. It is a fairly widespread system in the Cordilleran group, and probably reflects the system present in Proto-Cordilleran. It is characterised by three distinct sets of determiners, one of which marks the Subject of the sentence (NOM), as well as functioning as the article which introduces a Topic NP, and the Predicate NP of an equational sentence. The second set marks the Genitive, that is the agent of 'passive' sentences and a noun possessor. The third set combines the Accusative and Locative into one case form.

2.4. TYPE 3 DETERMINER SYSTEM

This system, presented in Chart 3, and represented by languages from the Meso-Philippine group, is widespread throughout the Central Philippines and Palawan. It also appears in Subanon, and probably reflects the system of Proto-Meso-Philippines. Like the system we have just discussed it consists of three sets of determiners. One set, like that in Type 2, is used for the Nominative and related functions. The other two sets divide up the case functions differently from the non-Nominative sets in the Type 2 system. In Type 3 the Genitive marker also marks the Accusative, or indefinite object. The Locative marker is distinct from the Accusative, although its function, besides marking location and direction, is also used to mark definite objects of non-embedded transitive clauses.

2.5. TYPE 4 DETERMINER SYSTEM

This system occurs in only a few languages, among them are Kapampangan, Maranao, and Cebuano. This system, presented in Chart 4, distinguishes four sets of determiners. One set is used for Nominative and Topic, and one each for the Genitive, Accusative and Locative forms. This type is characterised by the fact that indefinite objects have developed their own marker, distinct from other markers. Definite objects are marked by the Locative form as in Type 4. The Accusative may have other functions besides the marking of indefinite objects; Maranao, for example, uses /sa/ also to mark an indefinite Instrument in some sentence types, as well as 'intimate associations' (McKaughan 1958:12,20) such as /solotan sa taraka/ '*Tarakan Sultan*'.

CHART 4
Type 4 Determiner System

	TOP	NOM	GEN	ACC	LOC
Kapampangan	ʔiŋ/ʔi		niŋ/naŋ	yaŋ	kiŋ/kaŋ
Maranao	su/si		ʔu/ʔi	sa	ku/ki
Cebuano	ʔag/si		sa/ni	ʔug	sa/kaŋ

CHART 5
Type 5 Determiner System

	TOP	NOM	GEN	ACC	LOC
Inibaloi	say/si	ʔi/si	ni/nen	(su) ni/(su) nen	
Pangasinan	say/si	so/si	na/nen	ed/kinen	

CHART 6
Type 6 Determiner System

	TOP	NOM	GEN	ACC	LOC
Ivatan	nu/si	ʔu/si	nu/ni	su	du/di

2.6. TYPE 5 DETERMINER SYSTEM

This system, presented in Chart 5, is represented by Inibaloi and Pangasinan, two languages of the Southern Cordilleran group. It is similar to other Cordilleran languages in having conflated the Accusative and Locative forms. It is different from them in that the Topic and definite NP Predicate markers are different from the Nominative. It seems clear that this is a development which took place in the immediate parent language of this pair of languages. The form /say/ being a combination of /sa/ plus the Nominative marker /'i/. In both languages the personal marker /si/ occurs as both Topic and Nominative.

2.7. TYPE 6 DETERMINER SYSTEM

This system is represented only by Ivatan, and is presented in Chart 6. It is similar to Type 4 in having a distinct Accusative marker for indefinite objects. It is different from type 4 in that, like Inibaloi and Pangasinan in Type 6, it has developed a distinction between the common markers for Topic and Nominative. Ivatan has extended the function of the Genitive /nu/ for this purpose, retaining the Nominative /si/ to mark personal Topics.

Apart from marking indefinite objects, /su/ also functions to mark Manner phrases, such as /su makalu/ 'quickly'.

2.8. THE PROTO-PHILIPPINE DETERMINER SYSTEM

With at least six different determiner systems occurring in Philippine languages today, it is no simple task to determine which, if any, of these systems was present in Proto-Philippines. If we look outside the Philippines at languages which have similar syntactic systems we get no help. Murut (Prentice 1971), for example, appears to have a Type 2 system like most of the Cordilleran languages:

	NM	GEN	ACC LOC
Murut	ó/i	ru, nu/ri	ra/ri

Formosan languages show a variety of different systems, none of which neatly correspond to any in the Philippines. The system which comes closest is Ami which is similar to the Ivatan Type 6 system.

	TOP	NOM	GEN	ACC	LOC
Ami	ʔu	ko/ci	no/ni	to/ci (-an)	i/ici (-an)

It is probable that Proto-Philippines did not distinguish between determiners which mark Topic and Nominative NPs. It is also probable that these were distinct from those which marked the Genitive and Locative NPs. It is also probable that the determiners which marked Genitive and Locative NPs were different from each other since no Philippine language uses the same case form for these two NPs. Whether Proto-Philippines had an Accusative form distinct from both the Genitive and the Locative, or whether it was the Genitive form or the Locative form which marked indefinite objects is unclear. However it is possible that a system like Type 3 which appears in the majority of the Meso-Philippine languages as well as in Manobo languages was the Proto-Philippine system. In the languages that have such a system, indefinite objects are marked as Genitive, whereas definite objects are marked as Locative. Such a system could conceivably develop naturally into a Type 2 system where the Locative forms are used for both definite and indefinite objects.

For Proto-Philippines then, I tentatively postulate a three-way distinction in the case forms: Nominative, Genitive and Locative. The Nominative forms functioned also as articles introducing definite, non-case marked Topic NPs, as well as definite Predicate nominals. The Genitive (which might better be labelled Accusative) forms marked not only nominal possessors and agents of 'passive' sentences, but also indefinite objects, as well as instrument and manner NPs. Locative forms marked definite objects, indirect objects, location and time NPs.

4. PHONOLOGICAL SHAPES OF PROTO-PHILIPPINES CMs

This section will outline some of the problems which exist in reconstructing the phonological shapes of the CMs of Proto-Philippines. The first section will deal with the Determiners, the second with the Topic Linker and the final section with the Ligature.

4.1. DETERMINERS

4.1.1. The Proto-Philippine Nominative determiners were probably *ʔi 'common' and *si 'personal'. Evidence for *si is strong and the reconstruction cannot be doubted. Notice in Table 1 the wide distribution of si forms through every branch of the family. The

reconstruction of *ʔi as the common determiner rests upon its appearance with this function in one or more languages of most branches of the family (see Table 1). In many languages which no longer show /ʔi/ with this function, the form appears petrified as /-y/ on otherwise vowel-final forms which would be expected to precede a Nominative NP. In Bontok, for example (as in other Cordilleran languages) the positive existential appears as either /wa(da)/ or /wadʔay/. The former occurs before a Nominative NP carrying the Det /nan/. The latter occurs before an indefinite NP without a Det. Similarly, many languages from the Bisayan subgroup have /-y/ final negative existentials (Samar-Leyte /waʔáy/, Hiligaynon /waʔáy/, Cebuano /waláy/, Tausug /waáy/) occurring before indefinite NPs.

In many Cordilleran languages, the adverbial particle which can be reconstructed for Proto-Philippines as *pa 'yet, still', appears as /pay/. This form is probably also the result of the fusion of *ʔi 'nominative common determiner' with a preceding vowel final form. In Inibaloi, which still maintains /ʔi/ as the nominative Det, the fusion with /pa/ is a synchronic process, i.e. /pa/ occurs when not preceding /ʔi/, and /pay/ occurs as a combination of /pa/ + /ʔi/.

The appearance of determiners such as /ʔu/, /nu/, /su/, /du/, /yu/, /tu/, etc., in Philippine languages, as well as in related languages outside of the Philippines suggests that both i-grade and u-grade determiners be reconstructed for Proto-Philippines. The distinction between the two grades however is still unclear. Ivatan, which is perhaps the only language to make a systematic difference between the two grades uses u-grade determiners for common nouns and i-grade for personal nouns, e.g.

TABLE 6
Ivatan Determiners

	NOM	GEN	ACC	LOC
common	ʔu	nu	su	du
personal	si	ni	-	di

But evidence from other Philippine languages seems to show conclusively that whereas *si and *ni were personal noun determiners in Proto-Philippines, *ʔi was at that time a common noun determiner.¹ We may assume that *ʔi occurred in positions which allowed indefinite interpretations of the NP. Since relics of *ʔu do not appear in these positions, it is possible that this form occurred in positions which only allowed definite interpretations of the NP, such as topic and

identificational (i.e. definite nominal) predicates. Both *su and *ʔu are possible reconstructions since *su is reflected as a nominative in Southern Cordilleran languages (alternating in Pangasinan with /-y/ < *ʔi) as well as in Maranao, whereas *ʔu is reflected in Ivatan, and possibly in Subanon /ʔog/.

4.1.2. The Proto-Philippine Genitive determiners were *na or *nu 'common' and *ni 'personal'. Evidence from both Philippine and non-Philippine languages supports the reconstruction of *ni as the personal determiner.

*ni must be reconstructed with this function for Proto-Northern Cordilleran, Proto-Southern Cordilleran, Proto-Meso-Philippines, and Proto-Manobo. Outside the Philippines /ni/ occurs as the personal Genitive Determiner in Tondano of the Northern Celebes, Ami, Kavalan and Saisiyat of Formosa, as well as in a number of other widely separated languages. A number of languages provide evidence for *na as the common Genitive Determiner. /na/ appears in Agta, Atta, Isneg, Ibanag, Casiguran Dumagat and Gaddang of the Northern Cordilleran subgroup, and *na-ŋ is reconstructed for Proto-Bisayan. Outside of the Philippines supporting evidence comes from Proto-Oceanic where an Actor-possessor nominalisation is marked *na, and in Formosa where Kavalan has /na/ and Atayal /naʔ/ for the Genitive common Determiner. However various languages both within, and from outside the Philippines suggest that the Proto-Philippine common Genitive Determiner was *nu. These languages include Ivatan, Yogad, Casiguran Dumagat /nu/, Umiray Dumagat /nu-n/, Subanon /no-g/, Buhi /nu/(?) and Ilongot /nu(n)/.

External supporting evidence comes from Ami, Saisiyat and Tsou /no/ in Formosa, and Murut /nu/.

4.1.3. The Proto-Philippine Locative determiners were *di or *sa common, and *ka ni or *kay (<*ka ʔi) personal. Evidence for these reconstructions will appear in a forthcoming paper.

4.2. THE PROTO-PHILIPPINES TOPIC LINKER

Evidence from both the Cordilleran languages, and from Meso-Philippine languages suggests a reconstruction *ʔay.

4.3. THE PROTO-PHILIPPINE LIGATURE

Blust (1974) reconstructs a PAN linker *ŋ(a) which connected two numerals in a multiplicative relationship. It is probable that in Proto-Philippines the ligature which joined numerals in a multiplicative

relationship also linked other nominal Head plus attribute constructions. Although in the Philippines many languages show reflexes of a Proto-Philippines * η (a), a number of languages, such as Maranao, Bilaan, Ivatan and Yogad only have /a/ as the ligature, and no nasal appears even in numeral constructions. Other languages have enclitics marking definiteness which suggest an /a/ ligature at an earlier stage of the language. For example, Isinai /-ad/, and Kagayanen /-an/, compare Ivatan /-ay/ (</a/ + /ya/), Bilaan /ani/, Bunun /ani/, etc. These languages agree with a number of Formosan languages such as Ami, Paiwan and Rukai which also have /a/ as the Ligature and have no nasal linker, even in numeral constructions.

At least two forms must therefore be reconstructed for the Proto-Philippines ligature, * η (a) and *a. In some languages such as Ilokano, both forms appear, often interchangeably. Whether this was true for Proto-Philippines is unclear.

The appearance of /na/ as the ligature in some languages, such as Tagalog (where it appears in phonological alternation with /-ŋ/, as well as in a few languages outside the Philippines, such as Toba Batak, is no evidence that this ligature should be reconstructed for Proto-Philippines let alone PAN as was done by Dempwolff and endorsed by Blust. The use of a demonstrative (which *na certainly was in PAN, and in PPh) as a relative pronoun is attested in many languages outside of Austronesian. The Tagalog and Toba Batak /na/ ligatures are probably the result of independent development.

5. SPECULATIONS ON THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF DETERMINERS

The reconstruction of Proto-Philippine determiners in the preceding section leaves begging the question as to why the majority of Philippine languages reflect something other than has been reconstructed.

It is not possible in this paper to attempt to account for even a small part of this diversity. Various factors such as analogical levelling, shifting grammatical functions, and borrowing have had their effect. In this section two widely attested types of change associated with NP markers will be shown to have brought about many of the different Dets present in Philippine languages today. These two changes are demonstrative to determiner shift, and unmarking of subjects.

William Foley (1976) has shown fairly convincingly that certain syntactic constructions are more tightly bound than others. The scale of bondedness ranges from the most tightly bound constructions, Article

+ Noun to the most weakly bound, Relative clauses + Noun. The distribution of the ligatures in Austronesian languages reflects the degree of bonding.

His Table I illustrates:

	Tag.	Pal.	Ilo.	T.B.	Tol.	Wol.	Mlg.
Articles	x						
Deictics	x	x					
Interrogations	x	x	x				
Quantifiers	x	x	x	x			
Adjectives	x	x	x	x	x		
Participles		x					
Rel. Clauses	x	x	x	x	x	x	

Foley's examples for languages that bind determiners to their head noun with a ligature include Tagalog, Cebuano and Bikol, all languages which have determiners ending in a nasal.

He charts them as follows:

	TP common	TP proper	nonTP common	nonTP proper	Oblique common	Oblique proper
Tag.	a-ŋ	si	na-ŋ	ni	sa	kay
Ceb.	a-ŋ	si	sa	ni	sa	ka-ŋ
Bkl.	a-n	si	ni-n	ni	sa	ki

He could have added a number of examples from the Central Cordilleran subgroup which also have Determiners ending with a nasal, e.g.

	TP common	TP proper	nonTP common	nonTP proper	Oblique common	Oblique proper
Bontok	nan	si	(-n)nan	(-n)	?asnan	?an

He states

all these languages agree in using the ligature with the common noun marker...In modern Tagalog the case markers with the ligature never appear without it, so that its use with them appears fossilized. Speakers are not aware of the equivalence between the -ng in ang and the [ligature -ng] occurring elsewhere. However, this historical source for the -ng in ang is well motivated especially in view of the fact that the a in ang is cognate with the Palauan particle a.

Foley is correct in much of what he says here, but his interpretation of the facts is open to question.

I believe that although the /-ŋ/ in Tagalog /ʔaŋ/ is historically the ligature /-ŋ/, it does not only appear fossilised, it is in fact fossilised. Bikol, for example, still retains a /-ŋ/ ligature like Tagalog but has changed the velar nasal on the articles to an alveolar nasal, just as Bontok has done. (Tausug uses either /ʔaŋ/ or /ʔan/ variably.) Even Tagalog assimilates the velar nasal on its articles to the point of articulation of the following consonant, /ʔaŋ bátaʔ/ > /ʔam bátaʔ/, in natural speech.

The reason the ligature was originally attached to these forms was not because these languages linked Articles and Nouns by a ligature as Foley supposes, it is because the forms to which they became attached were originally deictics.

The form reconstructable for the nominative common noun determiner in Proto-Philippines is *ʔi. However numerous languages, including Tagalog and Palauan, share a form /ʔa/ and Foley proposes, as Brandstetter before him, that *a was a PAN article.

It is possible that in Pre-AN *a was a demonstrative. But it probably did not become a PAN article. Its occurrence as one of the ligature forms in Formosan and some Philippine languages implies that in PAN it had already become a subordinating particle. If *a was not a PAN article, where did these /ʔa/ determiners come from that appear in Tagalog, Palauan and Paiwan? To answer this question it is necessary first to recognise that the historical source of articles in many languages is from demonstratives (usually the demonstrative which has the most distant (spatial) use).

Foley noted for English that the has a demonstrative source. It apparently developed from the OE masculine nominative /sē/ 'that' with /s/ > /ð/ by analogy with /ð/ initial forms such as the neuter nominative /ðæt/ and /ðis/. Likewise in Norwegian, /de/ is pronounced [dɛ] when it has demonstrative force, and [dɪ] when it has the function of what is called the definite article of the adjective. In Latin /ille/ 'distant one' became the definite article /le/ in Romance languages. In some Utu-Aztecan languages, particularly the Cupan sub-branch, the 3rd singular pronoun, e.g. /pəʔ/ (Cupeño), /poʔ/ (Luiseño) and /peʔ/ (Cahuilla), which have demonstrative force, have become 'given' information or anaphoric markers which immediately precede common nouns, i.e. they function as definite articles, e.g. Cupeño /pə naxaniʃ/ 'the man' (Roderick Jacobs, personal communication). In Austronesian languages Foley has noted the synchronic development of Indonesian /itu/ 'that' to the function of a definite article. The same process is taking place in Philippine languages. In Ilokano, for example, the demonstrative /daydiay/ 'that' appears as /diay/, replacing the

determiner /ti/ for many speakers. Likewise in Tagalog a contrast is developing between /'iyon/ 'that' with contrastive demonstrative meaning, and /yon/ which is usable as a definite article without demonstrative significance. Further examples could be drawn from many other Austronesian and non-Austronesian languages.

One of the demonstratives which can be reconstructed for Proto-Philippines (and also for PAN) is *na 'that'. (Kagayanen Manobo /na-n/ 'that one'; Casiguran Dumagat /'i-na/ 'that, there'; Sinauna /'i-na-/ base for all nominative demonstratives: /'inayta/ 'this', /'inayya/ 'that, near', /'inaypu/ 'that, far'; Bontok /sa-na/, Balangaw /ah na/, Ifugao /hi-na/, Kalinga /si-na-t/ 'to, at that (near place)'. Note also the Formosan cognates, Rukai /'i-na/ 'that (ACC)'; Ami /'i-na/ 'this', etc.)

It is probable that *na frequently appeared following a determiner to build referentiality into common noun phrases where reference may have otherwise been ambiguous. It was mentioned above that Proto-Philippines *'i was used as a determiner before both definite and indefinite NPs, and maintains the latter function in several languages that have replaced their reflex of *'i before definite NPs, e.g.

Mansaka
(Svelmoe 1974)

'There is fish already'
aon da-y kara
exist already-Det fish

'There is no fish'
wa-y kara
neg. exist-Det fish

Ivatan
(Reid 1966)

'Like a man'
akma-y tao
like-Det man

Bontok

'There is a man'
wad'a-y aso
exist-Det dog

The structure of the NP in Proto-Philippines was no doubt the same as is found not only in Philippine languages today, but also in Formosan languages and in Malagasy, i.e. Determiner Head Ligature Attribute. A demonstrative could appear as the Head, preceding a noun attribute, or following a Head noun as a demonstrative attribute, e.g.

Bilaan
(Abrams 1970)

'What are you doing?'
dét 'i nimoam a-yé
what Det doing Lg-that (near)

Tagalog

'Get that dog'

kúnin mo ?iyon ?áso
get you that-Lg dog

kúnin mo ?aŋ ?ásoŋ ?iyon
get you Det dog-Lg that

Insertion of *na before the noun in a Proto-Philippine NP would have produced a sequence such as the following:

PPh *?i na-ŋ ?a:su 'that dog (Nom)'.
 (Note: The original text has a typo 'a:su' which has been corrected to 'a:so' based on the context of the example above.)

The sequence *?i na-ŋ (with *-ŋ functioning as the ligature) then became *naŋ by a process not unlike that which produced *le* from *Lat. ille* in the Romance languages. *?i is lost, and *naŋ becomes the determiner, with *-ŋ no longer functioning as a Ligature but becoming part of the determiner. This stage of the development is reflected in languages like Bontok, where /nan/ is the common nominative determiner.

The final stage in the development of Tagalog /?aŋ/ is the result of reanalysing *naŋ as *n-aŋ where *n- is a case marker and /aŋ/ is a definite determiner. Once again unmarking of the subject takes place and /n-/ is lost.

The postulated sequence for the development of Tagalog /?aŋ/ then is as follows:

1. Det Head
?i ?a:su
2. Det Head Lg. Att
?i na -ŋ ?a:su
3. Det Head
(?i)naŋ ?a:su
4. Case Marker Det Head
n- aŋ ?a:su
5. Det Head
?aŋ ?a:su

Recognising the *na demonstrative as the source for these forms also accounts for the lack of a velar nasal on the great majority of proper name determiners. One does not generally need to further enhance the referentiality of personal names. There are some languages however, such as Kapampangan, where the personal determiner does end in a velar nasal. This is probably best accounted for by analogical extension of

the nasal from the corresponding common noun determiner once it had lost its ligature function.

The sequence of events sketched for the development of Tagalog /ʔaŋ/ is matched in numerous languages of the Philippines and since they involve two well-known and independently verifiable kinds of syntactic change (demonstrative to determiner shift, and unmarking of Subject NPs) the likelihood that a similar sequence occurred in the history of Palauan to produce the article /a/ (at least in some of its functions) should not be overlooked.

Evidence from Paiwan provides interesting support for the sequence of changes postulated for the development of Tagalog /ʔaŋ/. In Paiwan (Ferrell 1974) both the Nominative determiner and the Ligature are /a/, e.g.

'The child eats'

k/m/an a alak
eats NM child

'daughter'

alak a vavaian
child female

Ferrell cites the following Actor Focus construction:

'The man hunts wild pigs in the mountains with a spear'

ʔ/m/alup	a	caucau	tua	vavuy	{	tua	}	gadu	tua	vuluq
					{	i	tua	}		
					{	i		}		
hunts		NM man		pig			mountain		spear	

Of particular interest here is the set of variant locative markers. Ferrell indicates that inclusion of the form /tua/ gives relative specificity to the locative NP whereas its exclusion makes the locative more general. When it co-occurs with /i/, Ferrell says /tua/ is semantically comparable to the definite article in English. Now the status of *tu as a PAN demonstrative can probably not be questioned. Its occurrence with i- as either a locative or NM marker is widespread. We can probably assume then that the sequence /itua gadu/ was probably originally Det + Dem + Lg + N. The form /tu-a/ has been generalised across the NPs as an Oblique determiner, however it does not appear in the Nominative. We can probably assume however from what we have seen occurring in the Philippines, that it also originally functioned as a Nominative determiner, and in fact this was where the form probably has its origin, since it is usual to stress the referentiality of subject, and only after the demonstrative has lost its demonstrative function is it generalised to less clearly referential positions. It

is probable then that Paiwan /a/ Nominative determiner is all that is left of a reanalysed /tu-a/ with loss of /tu/ to unmark the subject.

N O T E

1. It is probable however that at some point prior to the dispersion of Philippine languages *ʔi was a personal noun determiner. This is suggested by the presence of an *ʔi- formative on reconstructed long nominative personal pronouns. Proto-Cordilleran and Proto-Manobo pronouns, however probably reflect the Proto-Philippine long nominative pronouns with a *si formative, e.g. Proto-Cordilleran *siyakən '1 sg', *siʔikami '1 pl' etc.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABRAMS, Norman

1961 'Word Base Classes in Bilaan'. *Lingua* 10/4:391-402.

1970 'Bilaan Morphology'. *PL*, A-24:1-62.

ASHLEY, Seymour

1964 A Descriptive Analysis of Tausug. Manuscript. S.I.L.,
Philippines.

BALLARD, D. Lee and Arlene S. BALLARD

n.d. Inibaloi III: Word Analysis. Manuscript. S.I.L.,
Philippines.

BENTON, Richard A.

1971 *Pangasinan Reference Grammar*. PALI Language Texts:
Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

BLUST, Robert A.

1974 The Proto-North Sarawak Vowel Deletion Hypothesis. Ph.D.
dissertation. University of Hawaii, Honolulu.

BUNYE, Maria V.R. and Elsa P. YAP

1971 *Cebuano Grammar Notes*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines.
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

CONANT, Carlos Everett

1915 'Grammatical Notes on the Isinai Language (Philippines)'.
JAOS 35:289-92.

CUNNINGHAM, Margaret C.

- 1965 Another Sketch of Ifugao Grammar. Manuscript. S.I.L.,
Philippines.

ELKINS, Richard E.

- 1970 *Major Grammatical Patterns of Western Bukidnon Manobo*.
S.I.L. Publications in Linguistics 26. Norman, Oklahoma.

FERRELL, Raleigh

- 1974 Construction Markers and Subgrouping of Formosan Languages.
Paper presented to the First International Conference on
Comparative Austronesian Linguistics, Honolulu, Hawaii.

FOLEY, William A.

- 1976 Comparative Syntax in Austronesian. Ph.D. dissertation.
University of California, Berkeley.

FORSTER, Jannette

- n.d. *Dibabawon Transient Clauses, a Suggested Analysis*. S.I.L.
Mimeograph.

GIESER, Carl Richard

- 1963 *A Grammatical Sketch of Kalinga*. Manila: S.I.L.
Philippines.

GONZALEZ, Andrew

- 1972 *Pampangan: Outline of a Generative Semantic Description*.
Manila: Research Council, De La Salle College.

GUZMAN, Videia P. de

- 1976 Syntactic Derivation of Tagalog Verbs. Ph.D. dissertation.
University of Hawaii, Honolulu.

HARMON, Carol

- 1974 'Reconstructions of Proto-Manobo Pronouns and Case Marking
Particles'. *WPLUH* 6/6:13-46.

HEADLAND, Janet

- 1966 'Case-marking Particles in Casiguran Dumagat'. *Philippine
Journal for Language Teaching* 4/1:58-9. Manila.

- HEADLAND, Thomas N. and Janet D. HEADLAND
1974 *A Dumagat (Casiguran)-English Dictionary*. PL, C-28.
Canberra.
- HEALEY, A.
1958 'Notes on Yogad'. OLM 3:77-82.
- HEALEY, Phyllis M.
1960 *An Agta Grammar*. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- HIDALGO, Cesar A. and Araceli C. HIDALGO
1971 *A Tagmemic Grammar of Ivatan*. Linguistic Society of the
Philippines Special Monograph 2. Manila.
- HUSSEY, Jean
1966 'Noun Phrase Markers in Aborlan Tagbanwa'. PL, A-8:33-8.
- MARYOTT, Kenneth R.
1963 'The Substantive Phrases of Sangir'. *Papers on Philippine
Languages* 1:50-62. Manila: S.I.L. and the Institute of
National Language.
- McKAUGHAN, Howard
1958 *The Inflection and Syntax of Maranao Verbs*. Manila:
Institute of National Language.
- MILLER, Jeanne and Helen MILLER
1976 *Mamanwa Grammar*. LD, AP 8.
- MINTZ, Malcolm W.
1971 *Bikol Grammar Notes*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines.
Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- MIRIKITANI, Leatrice T.
1972 *Kapampangan Syntax*. OL Special Publication 10. Honolulu:
University of Hawaii Press.
- MOREY, Virginia and Howard P. McKAUGHAN, eds
1961 *Cebuano Reference Materials*. Manila: S.I.L. and the
Philippine Association for Language Teaching.

POST, Ursula R.

1968 Binukid Phrase Structure. Manuscript. S.I.L., Philippines.

PRENTICE, D.J.

1971 *The Murut Languages of Sabah*. PL, C-18.

RACHO, Alberto L.

1970 'Some Phrase Structure Rules for Kiangan-Ifugao Noun and Verb Phrases'. *PJL* 1/2:85-97.

REID, Lawrence A.

1964 Bontoc Clause Structure. M.A. thesis, University of Hawaii.

1966 *An Ivatan Syntax*. *OL* Special Publication No.2. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

ROE, Richard

A Problem in Determining Grammatical Relationships in Isneg. Manuscript. S.I.L., Philippines.

SANTOS, Pilar

1975 *Sinauna Tagalog, a Genetic Study of its Relationships to Other Philippine Languages*. M.A. thesis, Ateneo de Manila University, Quezon City.

SHAND, Jean

1964 'A Matrix of Introducer Tagmemes [in Ilianen Manobo]'. *OL* 3:110-15.

SHETLER, Joanne

1976 *Notes on Balangao Grammar*. LD, AP 11.

SVELMOE, Gordon and Thelma SVELMOE

1974 *Notes on Mansaka Grammar*. LD, AP 6.

VERSTRAELEN, Eugene, SVD

1973 'Analysis of Ibanag'. *Philippine Quarterly of Culture and Society* 1:39-57, 175-199. Manila.

WOLFENDEN, Elmer P.

1971 *Hiligaynon Reference Grammar*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

ZORC, R.D.

1977 *The Bisayan Dialects of the Philippines: Subgrouping and Reconstruction.* PL, C-44.