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Abstract

This study of morphological Causative constructions in Hiligaynon (Visayan) and Yogad (Northern Cordilleran) reveals VOICE and ROLE in the linguistic construction of EVENTS. A 'VSO' configuration characterizes the PROPOSITIONAL NUCLEUS of each language. Verbal affixes distinguish numerous VOICES (not Active/Passive); each selects a specific EVENT PHASE (e.g. INCEPT, MIDDLE, CRUX, LIMIT) for FCCUS. Nominal Determiners and/or Pronouns indicate which of the two NUCLEAR ROLES is FOCUSED and which is UNFOCUSED.

In prototypical Causative scenarios, the morpheme -pa-, in conjunction with any of the VOICES, effects a DISPLACEMENT of the EVENT process from the ('AGENTIVE') 'S'-ROLE (or 'Causer') to a NON-NUCLEAR 'EXECUTIVE' (or 'Causee'), which acts upon the NUCLEAR ('PATIENTIVE') 'O'-ROLE (or 'Affectee'), any of which can be FOCUSED via VOICE. The result is a weak Causative (cf. German lassen). In certain other EVENTS, the Causer acts more directly upon a hybrid Causee/Affectee. Elsewhere, -pa- suggests a (non-Causative) 'change', 'gradedness', 'tendency', or 'direction' devoid of any ROLE contrast.

Hiligaynon VOICE is more ROLE-prominent than Yogad VOICE.
The NUCLEAR ROLES of Hiligaynon are either MOTILE or INERT, while Yogad shows a minimalistic ERUPTIVE/POST-ERUPTIVE contrast. (If Hiligaynon drives, Yogad drifts.) Hiligaynon morphosyntax highlights DISCONTINUITY: its word order and tripartite Pronoun inventory distinguish pre-Verbal (DISCONTINUOUS, 'asserted') and post-Verbal (CONTINUOUS, 'mentioned') PARTICIPANTS; and Prepositions marginalize NON-NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS as OBLIVES. Hiligaynon -pa- also 'intensifies', especially with 'reduplication'.

Yogad lacks pre-Verbal ('assertive') Pronouns as well as Prepositions which might mark NON-NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS as OBLIVES; DISCONTINUOUS elements are marked with the particle ay. Yogad -pa- neither 'intensifies' nor 'reduplicates'; however, the MIDDLE VOICE -pag- marks a 'direct' Causative (absent from Hiligaynon) which consistently focusses the Causee.

All Causatives thus emerge as complex epiphenomena of VOICE, ROLE, and EVENT. In prioritizing Verbal EVENT semantics over Nominal PARTICIPANT semantics, these languages expose the often disabling reocentrism of theoretical linguistics, which is informed by Noun-centered Indo-European grammar, by writing, and by its own scientism.
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Abbreviations

The following abbreviations appear in the interlinear glosses:

ACC  Accusative
ASP  ASPECT
COMP Comparative
CONJ Conjunction
DAT  Dative
DL   Dual
EXC  Exclusive
FOC  FOCUSSED/FOCUSsing
FUT  Future
IMP  Imperfective
INC  Inclusive
ITER Iterative
LINK Linkage (Ligature)
OBL  OBLIQUE
PL   Plural
QNT  Quantifier Ligature
SG   Singular
UNFOC UNFOCUSSED/UNFOCUSING
1    First Person
2    Second Person
3    Third Person
For Li Lì

Pító ka búkid ákon gínlákbay;
Lión kag tígre ákon gináway.
Walâ ko balíha ang ákon kabúdlay
Agúd makítâ ko ang kagaykón mo, 太太 ．
Chapter One

The Construction of Causatives in Linguistics

1.0 Introduction

Causative constructions (or 'Causatives') constitute a recurring motif in theoretical linguistics. The literature on Causative constructions is vast, arguably one of the most extensive in the discipline. Prominent treatises include in-depth studies of Causatives in Malagasy (Randriamasimanana 1986) and Hindi (Saksena 1982a). The most prominent collections devoted to Causative constructions include the seminal collection edited by Xolodovič (1969) and subsequent collections edited by Shibatani (1976b), Eilfort et al. (1985), and Comrie & Polinsky (1993).

This short list is hardly exhaustive. Treatments of Causatives are distributed throughout the linguistic corpus, in numerous articles in a vast array of journals and collections, where they may figure as featured explananda or as 'varia' of other targeted phenomena. The profusion of Causative studies attests to both the apparent ubiquity of such constructions across languages and to the thematic complexities that such constructions entail, including the perennial Western fascination with causality. In a widely disseminated textbook, Comrie (1981:158) suggests that:

'... causative constructions are important because their study, even within a single language, but perhaps more clearly cross-linguistically, involves the interaction of various components of the overall linguistic description, including semantics, syntax, and morphology'.
In linguistics, Causative constructions emerge *in medias res*, where numerous issues converge. Here, things come together. This convergence has gathered a multitude of perspectives, challenging every major theoretical approach to language. Causative constructions implicate the construction of EVENTS and their PARTICIPANTS (capitals mark creations of the *logos*), reevaluating the relationships between morphology, syntax, and semantics and the constitution of VOICE, ROLE, and EVENT. They invite inter-linguistic comparisons and typological generalizations. In addition, Causatives connect linguistics to other disciplines, including physics, psychology, and, of course, philosophy. Since the literature on Causatives is extremely vast and varied, any attempt to acknowledge all pertinent sources in a single chapter is doomed to failure. Selectivity is essential. Thus, the current chapter deals broadly with the main 'Causative' issues as these are addressed within mainstream linguistics.

1.1 Causative Constructions Defined

The term *causative* denotes a semantic or metaphysical category but not, strictly speaking, a formal one. In most linguistic discussions, it includes formally varied linguistic constructions which address certain life situations.

Though the term is applied differently by different linguists, Causative constructions at their most prototypical are understood to include linguistically constructed EVENTS which involve the delegation of an action from an AGENT to an
EXECUTOR, which acts upon a PATIENT on the behalf of the AGENT. Such a scenario implies an indirectness, delegation, or mediation of the flow of influence or 'Transitivity' from AGENT to PATIENT. In the English Causative sentence He caused me to redo the entire chapter, he plays the AGENT or 'Causer', which initiates the EVENT; me, the EXECUTOR or 'Causee', which mediates; and the entire chapter the PATIENT or 'Affectee', which is the final locus of influence.

However, an understanding of Causatives in terms of 'mediation' is inadequate (cf. Saksena 1982:821-824). For instance, the sentence The smell caused me to retch involves a Causer (i.e. the smell) and what might be termed a 'non-mediational Causee' or, perhaps, a hybrid 'Causee/Affectee' (i.e. me). Thus, Causative constructions more consistently involve direction or delegation than mediation. Such an understanding is implicit in an ancient Indian definition of a Causative morpheme as one whose 'primary meaning' involves 'THE ACTIVITY OF APPOINTING AN AGENCY TO GET A CERTAIN TASK DONE' (qtd. in Wali 1981:303, capitals in the original).

Also implicit in all notions of causality is sequentiality. Causality implies a sequence of cause-and-effect. According to Shibatani (1976c:1-2), the 'causative situation' involves two events such that:

(a) 'The relation between the two events is such that the speaker believes that the occurrence of one event, the "caused event," has been realized at $t_2$, which is after $t_1$, the time of the "causing event"'; and
(b) 'The relation between the causing and the caused event is such that the speaker believes that the occurrence of the caused event is wholly dependent on the occurrence of the causing event; the dependency of the two events here must be to the extent that it allows the speaker to entertain a counterfactual inference that the caused event would not have taken place at that particular time if the causing event had not taken place, provided that all else had remained the same'.

Shibatani's definition posits a belief in both the sequentaility of two events (i.e. a cause and an effect), and the necessity of the connection (i.e. the effect would not have occurred without the cause). The element of belief implicates the speaker/observer in the construction of the causality.¹ Such belief may, in fact, be predicated on mere sequentaility. The sentence *When she saw his massive missive, she quailed* involves a sequencing of two constructed EVENTS (i.e. her seeing and her quailing) between which a causal inference is likely to be drawn even though it is not explicitly specified.

The presumed necessity of the linkage between two EVENTS is the hallmark of the 'true Causative'. In practice, both speakers and linguists are less rigorous or more lenient than Shibatani's characterization suggests in recognizing or

¹David Hume, the modern deconstructionist of causality, first recognized the central role of the mind in constructing causal connections: 'This [causal] connection, therefore, which we feel in the mind, this customary transition of the imagination from one object to its usual attendant, is the sentiment or power from which we form the idea of power or necessary connection' (Hume 1728/1955:86). Cf. also Chapter 7.
constructing causal relations. Comrie (1985:330), for instance, notes that:

'If we take a sentence containing a non-causative verb (or other predicate) to be describing a certain situation $\$, then a sentence containing the corresponding causative verb will describe a situation $\text{CAUS}$ where some entity (person, thing, abstract force) either brings about situation $\$ or, at the very least, fails to prevent $\$' (boldface mine, WLS).

While not strictly logical, the equation of 'failure to prevent' with a 'cause' is a commonplace cultural practice which finds official sanction in the legal category of 'criminal negligence' and in the ecclesiastical category of 'sins of omission'. Comrie and numerous other linguists commonly apply the label Causative indiscriminantly to Permissives and Assistives (as 'sufficient' conditions) as well as to true Causatives (or 'necessary' ones).

Kemmer & Verhagen (1994:120) note--correctly--that studies of Causatives regularly invoke three parameters, namely (a) causation vs. enablement/permission, which may be more broadly conceived in terms of autonomy vs. control (cf. Comrie 1981:164-167, Givón 1975); (b) direct vs. indirect causation (or enablement), and (c) physical vs. nonphysical causation. The final parameter is, I will argue, of questionable linguistic legitimacy, an epiphenomenon of other factors, including directness and control in the aggregate of circumstances. Indeed, Kemmer & Verhagen (1994:120) qualify the last parameter by observing that 'physical causality correlates with a low degree of autonomy or control on the
part of the causee'. My discussion of Hiligaynon and Yogad (Chapters 2-6) will suggest that the vaunted parameter of the physical derives largely from 'Intensity of Involvement' and from 'Directness' in these languages.

Numerous linguistic analyses focus on the 'encoding' or 'expression' of PARTICIPANTS in Causative EVENTS. The syntactic construction of the Causee has dominated such inquiry: 'The literature on the syntax of causative constructions in different languages is huge; the literature on their semantics is very modest' (Wierzbicka 1988:237). Typological studies have discovered a tendency for Causees to be more PERIPHERAL than Subjects or Direct Objects/Affectees, i.e. than the most NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS. This tendency is summarized in the Case Hierarchy in Figure 1.1 (cf. Comrie 1976, 1981:158-177).

Subject > Direct Object > Indirect Object > Oblique

**Figure 1.1: Comrie's Case Hierarchy**

The Causee putatively occupies the highest/leftmost Case available after the positions of the equivalent 'non-Causative' Clause have been filled. The Case Hierarchy implies a 'Doubling Constraint' which would prevent Causee and Affectee from sharing the same Case. This ideal situation holds for a number of languages but not for all. Compare the following German sentences:
(1)  
(a) Ich habe mein-en Artikel von mein-em Freund  
I have my- ACC article OBL my- DAT friend  
lesen lassen²  
read let/have  
'I had my article read by my friend'  

(b) Ich habe mein-en Freund mein-en Artikel  
I have my- ACC friend my- ACC article  
lesen lassen  
read let/have  
'I had my friend read my article'  

In (1a), the PATIENT/Afectee meinen Artikel 'my article' stands in the PROPOSITIONAL NUCLEUS as an Accusative; and the EXECUTOR/Causee von meinem Freund 'by my friend', stands in the Dative Case and is shunted further to the PERIPHERY as an OBLIQUE PARTICIPANT by the Preposition von. Thus far, the Case Hierarchy seems to hold; alles ist in Ordnung. However, in (1b), both meinen Artikel and meinen Freund stand in the Accusative, i.e. both are NUCLEAR. Such 'doubling' is not uncommon, as Comrie has admitted (cf. Comrie 1981:172-175). Turkish, for instance, allows doubling on both Direct-Object and Indirect-Object PARTICIPANTS, and doubling on Accusative/Direct Object is reported to occur in Sanskrit, Dutch, Evenki, Lappish, Mongolian, Hungarian, Telugu, Tamil, Amharic, Arabic, Hebrew, the Bantu languages, Wappo, and Korean (cf. Wali 1981:290, Kozinsky & Polinsky 1993:181). Thus, Comrie's Case Hierarchy describes 'only a tendency rather than an absolute universal' (Comrie 1981:175); but such appeals to formal structure leave the nature of the doubling ²Incidentally, the German lassen is not a true Causative, being amenable to both 'Causative' and 'Permissive' readings.
shrouded in mystery (cf. also Syeed 1984).

The demonstrated inadequacy of such syntax-based typological generalizations has encouraged semantics-based approaches. A semantic approach enables a clearer grasp of the nature of contrasts like those in (1). The German sentences above are equivalent in constructing a Causative situation whereby I motivate a student to read the letter. However, they are not identical. Sentence (1a), with an OBLIQUE Causee, suggests that my goal was to get the article read, perhaps proofread; the student was my 'INSTRUMENT' for accomplishing the task. The instigating Causer is more indirectly or more distally involved. I may have directed the task from afar, perhaps phoning in my order. Sentence (1b), with the Accusative Causee in the NUCLEUS, suggests closer or more intense involvement between the Causer and Causee, which may include physical proximity. My goal was to have the student read something, perhaps to remedy his ignorance. The task is unlikely to have been directed from afar; I am more likely to have supervised him. Thus, the OBLIQUE Causee in (1a) has more autonomy than the NUCLEAR Causee in (1b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Oblique</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Accusative/Absolutive</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Figure 1.2: Causee Case-Autonomy Hierarchy**

The German examples illustrate an oft-encountered cross-linguistic tendency in the marking of Causees which has been summarized according to the hierarchy in Figure 1.2. As Casey
(Ms.) notes, this hierarchy maps a semantic progression along a scale of decreasing 'control', 'volition', 'self-initiation', 'autonomy', 'energy', 'resistance', 'prominence', 'affectedness', and/or 'strength' (the terms of the contrast vary with the linguist, language, and instance in question; I elect 'autonomy'), with the OBLIQUE Causee having the most and the NUCLEAR one--the Accusative or Absolutive--having the least of the quality in question. The more PERIPHERAL the Causee is, the higher it is in autonomy. Kemmer & Verhagen (1994) and Casey (Ms.) have responded to the cross-linguistic tendency summarized in the hierarchy common-sensibly enough, arguing that Nominal 'Case marking' is in itself meaningful. In this, they are doubtless correct; it is axiomatic in functional linguistics that distinct forms, insofar as they are forms, correspond to distinct meanings. Such a position raises the issue of the terms of this meaningfulness, which, as suggested above and below, vary for each individual language and thus cannot be fully appreciated typologically.

Despite the privileged status accorded the Nominal PARTICIPANTS in both syntactic and semantic treatments (e.g. through the establishment of 'hierarchies'), the standard typology prioritizes Verbal aspects of Causatives. The standard formal distinctions include lexical, morphological, and analytic/periphrastic Causatives. The analytic and morphological types are productive; the lexical Causatives are unproductive and hence controversial as a category, as is
discussed further below.

**Analytic** (or periphrastic) Causatives employ certain 'Causative' Verbs meaning 'cause', 'force', 'make', 'have' and the like, to name the causing EVENT, followed by Verbal Complements which name the caused EVENT or effect. (Incidentally, English is unusual in having a Verb which means 'cause' in the general sense.) The two Verbs explicitly name separate yet related EVENTS in such a way that the first EVENT implicates the execution of the second. Consider the following examples from English: The wind caused us to turn back; Congress forced Mr. Nixon to retire; The committee made me walk the plank; She had him jump(ing) through hoops. Here, the Causative Verbs caused, forced, made, and had are both 'manipulative' (affecting other PARTICIPANTS) and 'implicative' (implying successful outcomes) of the EVENTS named in the Verbal Complements, which are named by the Infinitives to turn back, to retire, walk, and jump(ing). That is, 'causing', 'forcing', 'making', 'having' and the like not only involve manipulation but implicate successful outcomes so that sentences like *The committee made me walk the plank, but I didn't do it* are semantically anomalous. The semantic implication is recognized cross-linguistically in the

---

3Of course, these Causative Verbs are not synonymous. Givón (1975), for instance, describes cause as a 'noncontrol' Causative Verb; make, as a 'direct control' Verb; and have, as a 'mediated control' Verb. (He does not discuss force, which implies 'resistance' by the 'Causee'.)
morphosyntax. Although (at least) two Verbs are explicitly involved, the 'Causative' Verb tends to be more fully fledged syntactically (e.g. via Tense/Number morphology in English) than its Complement (which is Infinitival in English). The Verbal Complements of analytic Causatives are more tightly bound syntactically and semantically than, say, those of attitudinal or epistemic Verbs (e.g. 'knowing', 'saying', 'thinking' etc.), as in Everyone knows Perot's a lunatic and Buchanan thinks we should start goose-stepping towards Bethlehem, which allow fully fledged Clausal Complements. On Givón's (1980) Binding Hierarchy of Complements, epistemic Verbs have the weakest 'binding' (taking full Clauses), while implicative manipulative Verbs (our 'Causatives') have the strongest (taking Infinitive Phrases). The strength of binding correlates with the strength of Causer influence/control on the Causee in the Complement Clause (cf. Givón 1975, 1980:335).

Such 'binding' nevertheless underscores the internal separability of constituents already implied by the 'analytic' (< Gk ana 'up' + lyein 'loosen') form of the construction. Analytic Causatives maintain a degree of syntactic/semantic independence between a 'causing' and a 'caused' EVENT, as per Shibatani's (1976c:1-2) definition above. It is therefore unsurprising that such forms usually require animate Causees, i.e. PARTICIPANTS which are capable of behaving autonomously. In English, the animacy of the Causee is enabled but not
specified by the morphosyntax; hence, Her inspirational singing caused the bread to deflate marks the bread as a 'Causee/Affectee' that is not animate in the fullest sense. Nonetheless, the EVENT implicated in the Verbal Complement is somewhat autonomous from that of the implicative Verb. The relative autonomy of the caused EVENT becomes apparent by comparison with lexical Causative equivalents, e.g. The committee walked me down the plank, Mr. Nixon was retired by the Congress, The wind turned us back, and Her inspirational singing deflated the bread, each of which portrays the Causee as a non-coöperative PATIENT, an Affectee overpowered by forces which may or may not be physical but which are more direct or intense than those observed with the analytical sort.

Morphological Causatives are more or less productively derived from non-Causative or Intransitive Verbal roots. Although cross-linguistically common, morphological Causatives are by and large exotic to speakers of Modern English, which contains a smattering of moderately productive morphemes such as -en, -ize, and -ify and such apophonically contrastive pairs as fall/fell, sit/set, lie/lay, rise/raise, see/show, and drink/drench, whose formal/semantic alteration vestigially attests to a once-productive morphemic process. The current nonproductivity of such contrasts is underscored by the suppletion (in certain varieties of English) of the (non-Causative) lie (down) and sit by (the erstwhile 'Causative')
lay and set (cf. Let's lay down and play dead and Set a spell).

Morphological Causatives tend to be more highly specialized than their analytical counterparts. Not only are such forms less easily separated into two EVENTS than the analytic sort (allowing less autonomy on the part of the Causee), they frequently have a narrower range of application. Hence, to fell names an action directed exclusively at trees, and drench may apply to inanimate items such as carpets, which are incapable of drinking in an active fashion. Similarly, deaden means 'to anaesthetize' rather than 'to kill' or 'to make dead' in the fullest sense; -ize is limited to goal-oriented actions such as modernize, itemize, and criticize; while -ify (accompanied by vowel alteration on the root) suggests processes whose results are named by Nouns (often non-English roots whose form is often altered), as in reify (⟨ L res 'thing'), deify (⟨ L deus 'god'), codify (⟨ code), and exemplify (⟨ example).

Note that these forms seem to favor non-autonomous or even inanimate Causees. Many languages have both analytic and morphological Causatives, suggesting that the semantics of causation vary within a given language. Givón (1990:556) makes the following cross-linguistic implicational generalization (boldface and brackets mine, WLS):

'If a language has both a periphrastic [or analytic] ... causative and a morphological causative, the former is more likely to code causation with a human-agentive manipulee [or
Causee], while the latter is more likely to code causation with an inanimate manipulee'.

The fact that Givón's (1990:556) generalization is, like Comrie's Case Hierarchy, not absolute justifies a detailed analysis of the semantics of causation in terms of particular languages. At this point, one can assume that the alignment of analytic Causatives with animate Causees and morphological Causatives with inanimate Causees reflects the explicit separation in analytic Causatives of causing and caused EVENTS and of the lack of such separation in morphological Causatives. The separation in the former corresponds to the participation of a Causee which is especially fit for autonomous, independent action. Animacy, or a linguistically constructed relative HUMANNESS of Causees, is statistically common but not necessarily essential with analytic Causatives.

As the English forms above suggest, the distinction between 'Causatives' and 'Transitives' may be difficult or impossible to draw in a non-arbitrary way. It is especially remarkable that these 'Transitive' 'Causatives' violate Shibatani's characterization of a 'causative situation' as one involving a 'causing EVENT' at a time $t_1$ and a separate 'caused EVENT' at a later time $t_2$. The difference is further obscured in the (not infrequent) instances in which the morphological Causative form becomes lexicalized so that the root is inseparable from the Causative morpheme, as in the English -ify series noted above, which derives Verbs from Nouns which otherwise may not be recognizable as English.
Causative morphemes tend to be derivational (and hence more prone to lexicalization) rather than inflectional, a distinction which is based on a number of criteria. One prominent criterion is semantic: in addition to semantic shifts such as the specialization noted above regarding morphological Causatives, the Causative morphology often effects a category shift of the root (e.g. from Noun to Verb) (cf. Bybee 1985:17-19). Other criteria are syntactic. The Causative morphology tends to occur closer to the root than inflectional morphology. In Turkish, kog- 'run' and -uyor 'Third Person' yield koguyor 'he/she runs'. The addition of -tur- 'cause' yields kosturuyor 'he/she makes someone run' but never, for instance, *koguyortur (ctd. in Ammon & Slobin 1979:5). Likewise, English speakers say codifies rather than *codesify. A related syntactic change wrought by Causative morphology is a Valency increase of the Verb root. In a 50-language sample of languages, 90% of the grammars included a Valency-increasing morpheme, and 'the most frequently mentioned morpheme of this sort was a causative ...' (Bybee 1985:29). If they have any relevance at all, the terms of such a contrast differ from language to language and thus beg understanding in terms of the language in question.⁴

Lexical Causatives par excellence are unproductive forms composed of single morphologically unanalyzable lexemes, each

⁴More detailed considerations for the derivational vs. inflectional contrast may be found in Anderson (1985:162-165) and Bybee (1985:18-19).
of which may be paraphrased by (or 'decomposed into') two
other lexemes, a non-Causative and a Causative term. McCawley
(1968), developing a theme earlier anticipated in Chomsky
(1965:188,214), has articulated the classic Generative
Semantics approach to such forms, positing an atomic semantic
notion 'CAUSE' in the vaunted Deep Structure. Such an
interpretation is predicated upon the possibility of
constructing equivalence relations between various productive
and unproductive forms.

To cite a classic (if hackneyed) instance, English kill
may, in certain contexts, be equated with the productive form
cause to die. A given context might indifferently warrant
one's saying either Vesuvius killed a lot of Romans or
Vesuvius caused a lot of Romans to die. The two alternates
might share an obvious equivalence, but, as with the German
sentences in (1), equivalence does not imply synonymy. To
invoke Flaubert, 'There are no synonyms'. In isolation, the
first instance suggests a direct affectedness; the Romans may
have died rather efficiently in a hail of fire and brimstone.
The second instance seems more detached or indirect; these
Romans may have succumbed to lingering injuries sustained
during the eruption or to a consequent famine resulting from
the volcanic erasure of their crops. The lexical Causative is
more likely than the analytic one to imply that the Romans
died on the same day as the volcano erupted (cf. also
Shibatani 1976c:15 and 1972). However, the language does not
specify the precise terms of the difference.

Thus, the lexical forms suggest a greater PROXIMITY of cause to effect (or Causer to Causee) than do the productive forms. Such PROXIMITY may play out in terms of SPATIO-TEMPORAL semantics, suggesting greater physical or temporal proximity of cause to effect, or of Causer to Causee. As always, context determines the precise terms of the linguistic difference, just as linguistic performances respond to and create context. Language and context are intrinsically inseparable.

Generative Semantics founders on the common error of mistaking an equivalence for an identity.⁵ (An equivalent error is to attempt to apply Dutch guilders to a Texas bar tab.) Indeed, the recognition of such an equivalence constitutes the basis for recognizing Causative constructions as a class. All Causative constructions are 'Causative' insofar as an equivalence may be recognized.

Since the different Causatives are not synonymous, the progression from analytic to morphological to lexical Causatives is often explained in terms of increasing directness of influence of the Causer upon the Causee (cf.

---

⁵An additional problem for Generative Semantics has been suggested by correlative Verbal pairs such as sell/buy, borrow/lend and give/receive. If 'buying' implies 'causing to sell', is it not equally plausible to read 'selling' as 'causing to buy'? The decision of which to prioritize as an 'originary' can be arbitrary (cf. Saksena 1982a:35-40). The Generative Semantics approach has been largely discredited in view of such complications as the ones cited above (cf. Shibatani 1976b:14-28).
Comrie 1981:165-167), as summarized in Figure 1.3. As discussed earlier, the analytic *She forced me to sit up* allows the Causee *me* more autonomy than the lexical *She set me up*, which implies either direct manipulation of my body or, metaphorically, an act of 'passive aggression' directed at me without my cooperation. Hence, a recurring theme in discussions of Causatives is the opposition of mediated, indirect, or delegational causation to causation that is unmediated, direct, or manipulative.

Indirect Analytic > Morphological > Lexical Direct

Figure 1.3: The Relative Directness of Causative Types

The criterion of 'directness' (cf. Figure 1.3) is typologically a rather vaguely defined quality whose implications differ from language to language and from example to example. Since each language has a number of different analytic Causatives (i.e. different lexical choices of implicative manipulative Verb), and, in the case of morphological Causatives, often two or more alternatives, it is safe to assume that Causative contrast involves more than the single dimension of 'directness' (cf. Givón 1975).

Besides being uni-dimensional, such general labels as 'directness', 'contact' etc. say nothing of the range of any particular construction in a particular language, i.e. when or under what circumstances a given construction is felicitous. As any beginning language student knows, languages differ in
the relative prominence they give to any particular construction. For instance, French (among other languages) requires the Definite Article in certain nomic statements (cf. *C'est la vie*), where the English equivalent (cf. *That's a life*) does not. This reflects a contrast in meaning which is not merely local but which reverberates throughout each language in systems of relations peculiar to each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Analytic</td>
<td>(a) Morphological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Middle/Transitive (^6)</td>
<td>(b) Analytic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Lexical</td>
<td>(c) Lexical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Morphological</td>
<td>(d) Middle/Transitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.4: Relative Productivity of English & Hebrew Causative Types**

English and Hebrew prefer different strategies for creating Causatives, as summarized in Figure 1.4 (adapted from Berman 1986:439-441). In English, the most productive strategy is the two-Verb analytical means, while morphological means are the least productive and most limited in range. Hebrew, in contrast, strongly prefers morphological Causatives.\(^7\) The

\(^6\)The 'Middle'/ 'Transitive' choice is exemplified by the contrasting uses of the English Verb *shut* in *The door shut* (Middle) and *We shut the door* (Transitive).

\(^7\)Children learn the preferred strategy of their native language for making Causatives early--earlier than, e.g. Passive (if applicable). Both English- and Hebrew-speaking children acquire the semantics of causative relations by age 3. Initially, both groups construct causal relations using analytic 'make' forms with Intransitive Verbs, thus explicitly differentiating cause and effect. Around the fourth year, however, Hebrew-speaking children use morphological Causatives as the primary choice (along with Verb-internal modifications...
range of the Hebrew morphological form is thus far greater than that of any English morphological form.

Even when two related languages, e.g. French and English, prefer equivalent Causative strategies, e.g. analytic Causatives, the range of a given category may differ between the languages. Ruwet (1976, ctd. in Wierzbicka 1988:244) adduces the following sentences to demonstrate differences in range between the putatively equivalent French faire and English make Causatives in the glosses:

(2) (a) Le colonel {a fait fondre/*a fondu} trois
     the colonel {has made melt /*has melted} three
     sucres dans son café
     sugars in his coffee
     'The colonel melted three lumps of sugar in his coffee'
     (I.e. 'The colonel "made melt" [*melted] three
      lumps of sugar in his coffee')
     '*The colonel made three lumps of sugar melt in
      his coffee'

     (b) Le métallurgiste {a fait fondre/a fondu}
     the metallurgist {has made melt/ has melted}
     le métal
     the metal
     'The metallurgist {has "made melt"/has melted} the
      metal'

The 'direct' English lexical Causative melt has a greater range than its 'direct' French equivalent fondre. The English melt can apply both to melting sugar and to melting metal without a Causative Verb such as make, while the French fondre

for Passive, Middle, Reciprocal, Reflexive, and Inchoative forms), frequently over-extending such use to inappropriate roots, while English speakers use analytic forms beginning with the make Causative (cf. Fletcher & Garman 1986:440-441). Around school age, children learn conventional constraints on such processes (cf. Berman 1986:442).
may apply to melting metal but not to melting sugar. The best English equivalents to the 'indirect' French faire Causatives are 'direct', i.e. lexical, forms (i.e. melted). French speakers seem to adopt a laissez faire stance toward the melting of the sugar, recognizing the autonomy of the melting process more consistently, as Ruwet (1976:158, ctd. in Wierzbicka 1988:245) suggests. The more direct form seems to require that the Causer is doing something active to the Causee.

Besides differing in range from language to language, the three Causatives types apparently require different processing strategies. In one language acquisition experiment, children (ages 2 years to 4 years, 4 months) were drawn from four different language backgrounds (i.e. Turkish, Serbo-Croatian, Italian, and English) to compare the rate at which different Causative types were learned. Overall performance was higher with Turkish (which uses a morphological Causative) than with Serbo-Croatian, English, and Italian combined (all of which use analytic Causatives). The high performance with Turkish may reflect its use of inflections absent from English and Italian (Ammon & Slobin 1979:11ff). Such 'formal' features

\[8\] It was found that children speaking inflectional languages (i.e. Turkish, Serbo-Croatian) performed better overall than those speaking word-order languages like English and Italian, in large part because the former offer more local cues such as Case marking and Verbal Inflection on both Verbs (Ammon & Slobin 1979:10ff). Obviously, such 'grammatical' features as Inflection and Case are not meaningless.
are obviously meaningful. It is also obvious that 'Causatives' implicate variable semantics that transcend the category 'Causative'.

With respect to morphological Causatives, linguists beginning with Xolodovič (1969) have commonly distinguished between 'First Causatives' and 'Second Causatives', a distinction which applies only to morphological Causatives. Analytic and lexical Causatives normally have numerous alternates which render such a distinction inadequate.

Morphologically, the Second Causative (or $C_2$) has a number of typical manifestations. It may be a doubled, reiterated, 'reduplicated' version of the First Causative form, as in Huallaga Quechua (cf. -chi- vs. -chi-chi- in wañu- 'to die', wañu-chi- 'to cause to die', wañu-chi-chi- 'to cause to kill'); it may involve the addition of an element to the First Causative, as in Japanese (cf. -as vs. -ase in odorok-as 'to surprise', odorok-ase 'to make be surprised'); it may share a part of the First Causative without including it in toto, as in Amis (where pa- is Causative and pi- is both Causative and Transitive); or, it may share no part of the First Causative, as in Dogon (cf. -ndo vs. -mo in go 'to exit', go-ndo 'to lead out', go-mo 'to cause to go out') (Kulikov 1993:123-125).

Semantically, the Second Causative may vary from the First in any of a number of ways. The parameters of cause/permission, direct/indirect influence, and, often,
physical/nonphysical, again come into play. A Second Causative may be: a 'Double' (or 'Triple' etc.) Causative, as in Turkish (cf. öl 'die', öl-dür 'to kill', öl-dür-t 'to have someone killed', öl-dür-t-tür 'to get someone to get someone to kill', öl-dür-t-tür-t 'to get someone to get someone to get someone to kill'); an Intensive Causative, where the C₂ involves more drastic means of accomplishment, as in Oromo (cf. raff-is- 'to put to sleep [by such non-intrusive means as rocking, singing, etc.]' and raff-is-iiis- 'to put to sleep [by more radical means such as administering a sleeping pill etc.]'); a Plural or Distributive Causative with respect to certain PARTICIPANTS, as in Nez Perce (cf. the Causative prefix sep'eE-, which denotes a Singular Causee and s'eEp-, which denotes a Plural one); a Distant Causative, where the Causer-Causee involvement is less intense, as in Hindi (cf. khil- 'eat', khil-aa- 'feed [someone]', khil-vaa- 'have [someone] eat'); a Permissive Causative, as in Evenki (cf. ju- 'to come out', ju-v- 'to bring, lead out', ju-v-k'en- 'to force [allow, ask, etc.] to come out'); an Assistive Causative, as in Cashibo (cf. miī 'to work', miī-ku 'to help work'); and/or a Curative Causative (i.e. 'to ask someone to do something'), as in Mansi (cf. ūnt(u)- 'to sit down', ūnt-t(u)- 'to ask to sit down') (Kulikov 1993:124,127-136). The specific terms of a C₁/C₂ contrast vary with the specific language being studied and with the specific context being considered.

The foregoing discussion suggests that a reasonably
thorough understanding of any particular Causative construction requires some understanding of the overall organization of the specific language in which it occurs. Causative constructions are semantic composites (cf. Saksena 1982a, 1982b) or assemblages involving both Nominal/PARTICIPANT and Verbal/EVENT factors peculiar to a given language. Hindi offers an example of the interactions of these elements. A traditional division in Hindi linguistics opposes 'contactive' to 'noncontactive' causation. Saksena (1982a, 1982b) decomposes the putatively simplex notion of 'contact' into a complex one. As noted above, Hindi Verbs may mark 'direct' Causatives with -aa-, as in khil-aa- 'feed (someone)' and 'indirect' Causatives with -vaa-, as in khil-vaa- 'have (someone) eat' (Saksena 1982a:76, 1982b:820). In addition, Nominal PARTICIPANTS serving as Causees may be marked as 'affected' with the Dative/Accusative -koo or as 'nonaffected' with the Instrumental -see (Saksena 1982a:24-26, 1982b:825) (cf. the alternating Case of the German Causees in [1]). Out of four possible PARTICIPANT-EVENT combinations (i.e. -aa and -koo; -aa- and -see; -vaa- and -koo; -vaa- and -see), only one (i.e. -aa-/-koo), with a directly involved Causer and an affected Causee, may be considered 'contactive'. The others differ from each other by different factors. Thus, the differentiation of Hindi Causatives involves more than the binary choice which the 'contactive' / 'noncontactive' opposition implies, thereby problematizing the 'First' /
'Second' Causative distinction.

The morphosyntactic analyses discussed above are directed at closed class phenomena (i.e. those having relatively few members, e.g. Pronouns, Prepositions, inflections for Tense, Person, or Case, certain juxtapositions) normally conceived of as the grammar. Certain other semantics-based approaches, however, have extended beyond closed classes to seek patterns in relatively open classes extending into the lexicon, further refining our understanding of causation as a linguistic construct. Lakoff & Johnson (1980) have assembled a list features extracted from various metaphorical constructions of causation. In their view, a 'prototypical' direct Causative manipulation includes the following twelve features (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:72-73):

(3)  
(a) 'The agent has as a goal some change of state in the patient'  
(b) 'The change of state is physical'  
(c) 'The agent has a "plan" for carrying out this goal'  
(d) 'The plan requires the agent's use of a motor program'  
(e) 'The agent is in control of that motor program'  
(f) 'The agent is primarily responsible for carrying out the plan'  
(g) 'The agent is the energy source ... and the patient is the energy goal...'  
(h) 'The agent touches the patient either with his body or an instrument ...'  
(i) 'The agent successfully carries out the plan'  
(j) 'The change in the patient is perceptible'  
(k) 'The agent monitors the change in the patient through sensory perception'  
(l) 'There is a single specific agent and a single specific patient'

Together, these features are said to characterize
'causation par excellence', while other kinds of causation, including 'action at a distance, nonhuman agency, the use of an intermediate agent, the occurrence of two or more agents, involuntary or uncontrolled use of the motor program' and the like may still bear sufficient family resemblance to the prototype to be understood as instances of causation (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:73). Non-prototypical causation may involve multiple AGENTS, SPATIO-TEMPORAL REMOTENESS of the AGENT, and EVENTS lacking elements of desire, plan, or control (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:72-73). Different metaphorical strategies conform in varying degrees to prototypicality; e.g. both causative metaphors Smoking can give you cancer and Smoking leads to cancer treat smoking as an animate AGENT, but in the former, the 'AGENT' is more 'prototypical' in initiating the 'giving' of a disease-process-as-entity (a gift?) to a passive receiver, while the latter is less prototypical in that the AGENT is a 'bad shepherd' which the PATIENT may or may not follow. In contrast, the CAUSATION AS EMERGENCE metaphor is exemplified by Our nation was born out of a desire for freedom (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:73-74; cf. also Turner 1987:139-183). In invoking prototypes to allow for context-sensitive fuzzy categories, Lakoff & Johnson (1980) follow a descriptive trend which has also been applied to 'Transitivity' (Hopper & Thompson 1980) 'Subject' (Keenan 1976), 'Topic' (Givón 1979), and 'Passive' (Shibatani 1985). Causatives are, like these other constructions, conceived of as semantic composites or
assemblages.

Another semantic approach subsumes Causatives under the more general heading of 'Force Dynamics' (cf. Talmy 1985a, 1985b), which treats such contrasts as 'enablement' vs. 'permission'. Talmy's semantic approach to Causatives distinguishes different types of causative meaning that are incorporated in lexemic and syntactic patterns or schemata. For example, the following sentences exemplify Force Dynamic patterns involving 'steady-state' oppositions (Talmy 1985b:71):

(4) (a) The ball kept rolling because of the wind blowing on it
(b) The log kept lying on the incline because of the ridge there
(c) The ball kept rolling despite the stiff grass
(d) The log kept lying on the incline because of the ridge there

These sentences illustrate conflicting forces of 'Agonists' (i.e. the ball and log) and 'Antagonists' (i.e. the wind, ridge, and grass). Talmy describes the sentence in (4a) as 'Causative' (i.e. of the 'extended causation of motion') (Talmy 1985b:72-73). The because_of construction in (4a), (4b), and (4d) marks the 'Antagonists' (i.e. the wind and ridge) as being stronger than the 'Agonist' (i.e. the ball and log). A weaker Antagonist (i.e. the grass) is marked by despite in (4c) (Talmy 1985b:71,73). The keep ... -ing schematic construction is an 'honorary auxiliary' whose Force Dynamic character is especially obvious (Talmy 1985b:73).

Contrasting lexicalization patterns have revealed
numerous distinctions in causal statements. The following list suggests variations on the Lakoff & Johnson (1980) prototype (adapted from Talmy 1985a:79; cf. also Talmy 1976):

(5) (a) The vase broke
(Autonomous EVENT)
(b) The vase broke from a ball's rolling into it
(Resulting-EVENT causation)
(c) A ball's rolling into it broke the vase
(Causing-EVENT causation)
(d) A ball broke the vase in rolling into it
(INSTRUMENT causation)
(e) I broke the vase in rolling a ball into it
(Unintentional AUTHOR causation)
(f) I broke the vase by rolling a ball into it
(Intentional AGENT causation)
(g) My arm broke on me when I fell
(UNDERGOER non-causation)
(h) I walked to the store
(Self-AGENTIVE causation)
(i) I sent him to the store
(Inductive causation/caused AGENCY)

The sentences in (5) distinguish between various degrees and types of AGENCY, ranging from spontaneous EVENTS involving no AGENT (e.g. [5a]) to highly Transitive, delegational EVENTS with sentient or HUMAN AGENTS and EXECUTORS (e.g. [5i]). One English lexicalization pattern is described as follows:

'virtually all English verbs that refer to death without expressing its cause ... are lexicalized for either the non-causative [5a/b] types or the [5c-e] type causative types but not for both' (Talmy 1985:84).

Thus, for example, English speakers say She passed away (non-Causative) or She was assassinated (Causative) but not *A car passed her away by rolling over her (examples mine, WLS). In contrast, most English Verbs concerned with 'the material disruption of an object' may be either non-Causative/Intransitive or Causative/Transitive (e.g. My wrist
broke/A car broke my wrist) (Talmy 1985:84, examples mine, WLS). (Note the equation here of Causative and Transitive.) Such semantic approaches as these have raised linguists' awareness of the constructed and highly variable nature of causation. In so doing, such studies of lexical and metaphorical patterns complement and enrich more standard grammar-centered linguistic approaches, particularly in their acknowledgement that 'Causative' morphology--like Causative lexemes and metaphors--typically includes 'extra-Causative' meaning. Like current grammaticalization theory, the construction of prototypes and the analysis of metaphors and schemata blur the traditional opposition between grammar and lexicon (discussed in brief later).

Like the grammar-oriented approaches, these tend to reduce the patterns of any individual language to secondary 'expressions' of 'prior' concepts inherited from the Western philosophical canon (e.g. 'causation', 'identity'). A given linguistic pattern may be treated as 'basically' causal, as an 'expression' of this category, at the risk of marginalizing broader language-specific values. Typical of this tendency is the claim that 'Languages tend to have a construction specifically designed to express causative relationships' (Kemmer & Verhagen 1994:118, emphasis mine). Prototype approaches ironically risk the reductionism they are attempting to overcome, simultaneously highlighting and devaluing intriguing peculiarities which give any particular
language (and culture) its individual character. Like the elusive 'competence' of formalist approaches, functional prototypes prioritize received (i.e. 'Western') grammatical categories at the expense of the particular linguistic phenomena, representing nonconformities or anomalies as 'departures'. The neo-Platonic character of this stance reminds us that many meta-linguistic categories (e.g. 'Transitive', 'Active', 'Passive', 'Causative' etc.) are not merely meta-linguistic but are also meta-physical inheritances from the canon of Western philosophy, itself aided and abetted by the structure of Indo-European languages (cf. Chapter 7).

It is well known but often forgotten that the 'behavior' of any given construction in a particular language normally transcends its logico-conceptual label; 'even the meaning of "elementary" linguistic units ... is never pure enough to be an exact linguistic equivalent of a logical concept' (Podlesskaya 1993:165). The clearest indication of such transcendence is the conflation of a 'Causative' construction with other 'extra-Causative' 'residue'. This residue can tell us much about the construction of causation in a particular language and, more broadly, it can refine our understanding of

---

This failure to fully consider alternatives typifies scientific discourse in general, which necessarily establishes knowledge via a Manichaean advance whereby the descriptive or explanatory terminology simultaneously highlights some meanings and obscures others. Every advance in knowledge is also an advance in ignorance (Stephen Tyler, p.c.; cf. also Bateson 1979/1980:67). I would add that some advances are more interesting than others, particularly those which transcend received categories to reframe the issue(s) in question.
the linguistic construction of EVENTS within a particular language, without being reducible to one 'originary' meaning.

One common conflation, already encountered in our discussion of analytic Causatives, is that of 'causing' with 'making'. Moreno (1993:155) observes that 'make'-Verbs are associated with 'cause' in numerous languages, including the Romance languages, English, Korean, Tamil, Telugu, Indonesian, Jacaltec, Modern Greek, Thai, and Ijo. In the English Beer makes my head hurt, my pain is presented as the product produced by the beer, which in turn might be conceived of as an animate AGENT, a sort of homunculus with his claws buried in my cranium.

Another common conflation is that of 'causation' and 'volition'. Wierzbicka notes that the English make-Causative suggests resistance on the part of the Causee, while the have-Causative suggests a non-resisting, compliant Causee, a Permissive as opposed to a true Causative (Wierzbicka 1988:240-242). As noted earlier, both resistance and assistance are consistent with causation/delegation.

Yet another common conflation is that of 'causing' and 'giving'. Thai hây 'give' may combine with tham 'make' to form the complex tham hây, which suggests purposive causation (without hây, tham suggests non-purposive causation). Spruiell (1988) discusses a similar conflation in Khmer, where the Coverb ?aov 'give' also participates in 'Causative' and 'Facilitative' (or 'Assistive') functions. 'Giving' implies
'transference' or 'displacement' (i.e. of 'gifts' or of AGENTIVE 'force'). English, too, metaphorically structures causal relations around the notion of 'giving', as in Beer gives me a headache. This metaphor personifies the beer as an autonomous, animate AGENT and the headache as a moveable object (if not as a 'gift'). Both the 'make'- and 'give'- Causatives in various languages imply a personification of the causal force (cf. again the prototype approach of Lakoff & Johnson 1980). Such personification in turn reflects the meta- metaphor EVENTS ARE ACTIONS (cf. Lakoff & Turner 1989:72-80).

Causative morphology often conflates 'means' with 'manner', typically as an 'Intensive' marker (cf. the starred English gloss of [2a] above). Dixon reports that Boumaa Fijian masuta 'pray to', combined with the 'Causative' affix va'a-, yields va'a.masuta 'earnestly beseech' (Dixon 1988:188). Similarly, Swahili chanja 'chop' alternates with chanjisha, which means either 'cause (someone) to chop' or 'chop energetically' (Comrie 1985:330). Both interpretations are consistent with intensified 'force'.

In English, 'manner' and 'path' are conflated lexically via the lexeme way (cf. Do you know the way to San José? and This is the way we wash our clothes). In Luganda, a Bantu language, kûlëtâ 'to bring' alternates with kuleësa 'to make to bring' or 'to bring by means of'; kûsalâ 'to cut', with kûsazâ 'to cut with' (cf. Bybee 1985:18). The Igbo suffix -mo conflates 'cause' with 'direction' or physical 'trajectory'
(cf. the 'transference' of 'giving'). Similarly, the Ewe Coverb tɔ 'pass by' conflates 'cause' and 'agenthood' with 'path', while le 'be at' conflates Locative, Possessive, and Temporal constructions with 'cause' and 'manner' (Heine et al. 1991:189).\(^{10}\)

The inclusion of Assistives under the rubric 'Causative' is also reflected in the formal conflation of these meanings in some languages. The English with marks 'enablement' (or 'INSTRUMENT'), 'accompaniment' (or 'COMITATIVE'), and 'manner' (cf. I ate my peas with [a knife / a friend / a grimace]).

Some confusions with 'Causative' seem more idiosyncratic. Thus, the 'Causative' of Luganda kǔbala 'to count, calculate' is kǔbaza 'to multiply' (cf. Bybee 1985:18). This might provisionally be understood in terms of 'intensification'. According to Hardy (Ms.), the Creek morpheme -ipv- conflates 'indirect causation' with 'counterexpectation', 'polite imperative', 'benefactive middle voice', and 'finality'. Most of these would seem to involve various 'disruptions' (i.e. of Transitivity, of expectations, of thematic continuity, etc.).\(^{11}\)

---

\(^{10}\) One conflation of causality with 'path' or 'direction' of movement, i.e. with goal or telos, has been enshrined in traditional grammar via the term Accusative Case ('L cāsus accusātivus), which arose from Varro's mistranslation of the Greek term designating 'the object case, referring to the recipient of some action caused to happen', derived from aitiā, which also means 'accusation' or 'charge' (Robins 1979:35, emphases mine, WLS).

\(^{11}\) The compatibility of 'disruption' with 'causation' is discussed further in Chapter 3.
While such conflations as these are routinely noted, they are rarely examined in detail. The Causative 'effect' of a form is often regarded as the 'originary' or 'first among equals' with the others treated as 'derivatives' or 'side effects' with no more inclusive categorization being attempted. Such is the power of Western metaphysical primes such as 'cause', whose ancient auras tend to outshine other, less venerated, meanings.

1.2 Groundings and Goals

The immediate goal of the current study is to explore the construction of causation in the morphosyntax of two Western Austronesian languages of the Philippines.\textsuperscript{12} The emphasis is on the interactions of the morphology and syntax with lexis and the interactions of all of the above with possible life situations. The interlinguistic comparisons will relegate certain features of the linguistic relations of each language to the linguistic construction of causation. This orientation highlights the linguistic construction of EVENTS (broadly defined to include actions, processes, states, and conditions), the construction and relationships of PARTICIPANTS to each other and to their EVENTS via ROLE, and

\textsuperscript{12}The Austronesian family, which includes perhaps 1000 languages, is divided into three principal subgroups. The oldest split divides the Formosan languages from all the rest. The most important split divides Western Malayo-Polynesian--including the languages of Indonesia, Malaysia, Madagascar, Guam, and the Philippines--from Eastern Malayo-Polynesian or Oceanic--including languages spoken from the coasts of Papua New Guinea to the islands of the Pacific, i.e. Micronesia, Melanesia, and Polynesia.
speakers' orientation to EVENTS via VOICE, as such are configured in two particular languages. In so doing, I hope to gain some rudimentary understanding of how two non-Indo-European languages construct their respective worlds. My project examines what Whorf characterized as the 'segmentation of nature' (Whorf 1941/1956:240):

'We cut up and organize the spread and flow of events as we do, largely because, through our mother tongue, we are parties to an agreement to do so, not because nature itself is segmented in exactly that way for all to see. Languages differ not only in how they build their sentences but also in how they break down nature to secure the elements to put in those sentences ... [W)e ascribe semifictitious isolation to parts of experience'.

I accept as axiomatic Sapir's (1929/1949:162) observation that 'The worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached'.

The primary explanandum, then, is the morphosyntactic

---

13 Despite bilious denunciations and misbegotten defenses of a non-existent Sapir-Whorfian Linguistic Relativity 'Hypothesis', Sapir-Whorf never claimed that language determines thought and action; Whorf's 'linguistic relativity principle' allows that 'Science of course was not CAUSED by [Indo-European] grammar; it was simply colored by it' (cf. Whorf 1940/1956:221, brackets mine, WLS); also, 'I should be the last to pretend that there is anything so definite as "a correlation" between culture and language' (Whorf 1939b/1956:138-139). Cf. also Sapir (1921/1949:218): 'Culture may be defined as what a society does and thinks. Language is a particular how of thought'. Note that freedom and determinism are not absolutes but correlative co-constructs (cf. May 1981). Language and thought may condition each other, often unconsciously, but language limits my 'freedom of movement' in the same sense that my futon does when I have gotten comfortable. To mistake the linguistic map for the territory of phenomenal reality, as does happen, is to be trapped in the error that the Hindus term māyā, i.e. 'illusion begotten of intrenched selfhood' (Whorf 1942/1956:262).
construction of EVENTS as such are delineated through Clauses, especially the interplay of VOICE and ROLE. The morphosyntax, i.e. the 'grammar', is a pervasive yet most subtle aspect of linguistic meaning, arguably the most entrenched aspect of linguistic performance. It emerges in opposition to the 'lexicon' or 'vocabulary' in a recapitulation of the familiar Aristotelian opposition of 'form' (eidos, forma) and 'matter' (hyle, materia). The precise nature of this ancient opposition as it plays out in language is difficult if not impossible to specify with great rigour. There is apparently no systematic difference in 'kind' between grammatical and lexical meanings, though the former often favor relational senses. I reject by fiat the notion of 'purely grammatical' or 'formal' elements, i.e. those with 'no meaning'. If a form is 'meaningless', it 'is' ipso facto not a 'form'. Forms are sustained--qua forms--by meaning (cf. Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 1). (Given the great range of meanings they accommodate and constrain, it is tempting to view the morphology and syntax as the most meaningful aspects of language.) The present study does not attempt a rigourous delineation of these terms but follows traditional practice in treating the morphosyntax as a closed or restricted class of items/processes and the lexicon as a more open, ill-defined one (cf. Lyons 1968:435-442). My emphasis on 'grammatical' patterns complements Talmay's (1985a) lexicalization-patterns approach; in treating grammatical patterns as meaningful, it further erodes the distinction.
between grammar and lexicon, though from the grammatical end.

I do not distinguish the semantic from the pragmatic. I cannot in good faith confine 'circumstances' to the exterior of language or banish certain 'uses' of language (i.e. certain 'meanings') to the 'outside'. Rather, a given linguistic form comes 'pre-inscribed' with certain potentialities which tend to elude pre-fabricated, traditional linguistic categories.

Certain traditional categorial oppositions, including 'Noun'/'Verb', 'Subject'/'Object', 'Active'/'Passive', and 'Transitive'/'Intransitive', are not assumed to be universal. They are largely avoided here because of the baggage they have acquired from frequent application to Western languages, much of which would be contraband in the present territory; the implications these terms have historically accrued might otherwise blind us to fresh experience. The main issue is not the application of particular terminology but the understanding of particular phenomena which should be allowed to present themselves in as unfettered a way as is humanly possible.

In order to encourage reader participation in the construction of meaning, I have provided an abundance of data. My hope is that the particular focus on Causatives will enhance appreciation of the broader morphosyntax of each of the two languages discussed--and vice versa. In the process of considering the particulars of two unfamiliar or 'exotic' languages, we should be challenged to reconsider our
metalinguistic prejudices, which enable and are enabled by our own linguistic and philosophical heritage.

The morphosyntactic organization of each language will emerge in the process of description. I will briefly anticipate by observing that, in my understanding, VOICE and ROLE do not exist as such in terms of prior or innate cognitive primitives, as is claimed by formalist dogma, but emerge as 'products of the experience of language acquisition' (Davis Ms.), including cultural experience; hence the diversity of languages.¹⁴

My linkage of Causative constructions with issues of VOICE and ROLE is not in itself novel. It has long been recognized that Causative morphosyntax frequently resembles that of Passive. Hence, for example, the Korean VOICE affix -hi- appears in both Causative and Passive Clauses (cf. Kim 1992:27ff), while the Japanese Causative inflection -(s)aše- is suspiciously parallel in form to the Passive -(r)are- (cf. Shibatani 1976a, Nagai 1985). The similarity in morphosyntax reflects a similarity in function. Both Passives and Causatives remove the 'AGENT' into the BACKGROUND, the former moving the 'PATIENT', and the latter, the 'EXECUTOR', into the FOREGROUND.

In the Philippine languages, the 'Causative' morphology

¹⁴"An appeal to 'experience' does not prioritize either the language learner or the environment in which language is learned; nor does it assert the priority of either 'nature' or 'culture'. Rather, individual/nature and environment/culture emerge as relational co-constructs in certain operations."
likewise seems out to have a value for VOICE. However, VOICE is not readily understandable in terms of 'Active' or 'Passive', an opposition of dubious relevance to these languages. Instead, the 'Causatives' of both Hiligaynon and Yogad involve a semantics of DISPLACEMENT of ROLES with respect to certain VOICES (cf. Chapters 2-5). In Yogad, the DISPLACEMENT strategy is complemented by a MIDDLE VOICE strategy which focusses 'performance' (cf. Chapter 6).

Although the current study addresses most of the standard 'Causative' issues discussed above in 1.1, these are invoked largely as comforting coördinates to guide readers through the thickets of more sinuous semantic issues. The foregrounded 'Causative' phenomena and backgrounded morphosyntactic phenomena should coöperate in reciprocal fashion, each relevating the other.

My theoretical stance may be broadly, if vaguely, termed 'functionalist', a category which arises in opposition to 'formalist'. (This 'oppositional' character surfaces periodically via certain 'negative' claims made for certain aspects of my topic, e.g. denials of 'Passive' or 'Causative' categoriality.) My approach is eclectic, and my terminology is by and large not the property of any single linguist. This eclectic functionalist approach most closely resembles that of Davis (1995, Ms.), though traces of numerous other sources will be discernable.

In practice, the current enterprise is mainly
descriptive. The contours of the linguistic universe emerge from systematic relations and differences which my description attempts to define. I do not seek 'explanation' in the sense of categorial statements which are predictive of given results (and thus in probable need of a host of post hoc justifications). There is no 'merely formal substitution of a natural law under a more general law' (Polanyi & Prosch 1975:55, ctd. in Davis 1995:69). Rather, my description is a search for what Polanyi & Prosch (1975:53) term a 'relief from puzzlement' (ctd. in Davis 1995:69), i.e. an insightful recognition of the relational patterns which hold sway in the given languages. My description includes an analysis of the phenomena of interest to me. By treating linguistic phenomena analytically, as if they existed in autonomous parts, I hope to enable a synthesis of the morphosyntax as a reminder that, pace Aristotle, language is greater than the sum of its parts, as if such 'things' as 'morphosyntax' or 'languages' existed. Indeed, there is no language in any strict sense; linguistics, aided by writing, creates its own object (cf. Davis 1995:63-70, Tyler 1987, Harris 1980, Ong 1982). As Davis (1995:67) observes, 'The problem is not that language is there and that we cannot see it. The difficulty is that we create language by looking at it' (boldface in the original).

By its very nature, description ('writing down') achieves a reification of the forms and patterns which it attends to. Indeed, any explanandum, once isolated as such, assumes a
certain degree of monolithicity, which often encourages a reduction to a 'basic' meaning which excludes other, equally valid ones. Once so 'emancipated', any explanandum becomes the 'center' or 'origin' of a constellation of issues which in turn become 'peripheral' or 'derivative'.

Thinking in terms of origins, of 'most basic' functions, can be a stumbling block to understanding. Semantic departures from the prescribed categoriality of any morph or structure (e.g. 'Causative', 'Relative Clause', 'Passive') are too rarely synthesized into a broader understanding of the language in question. Prototype approaches, I have suggested, offer one sort of distraction from the particulars of a language. But even within nontypological semantic descriptions of single languages, fractious phenomena may be written off as deviant 'counterexamples', 'side effects', 'surplus', or 'residue'. A linguist may question the semantic integrity/identity of a morpheme, so that an instance of polysemy (e.g. for in I'll swap my apple for your orange and This apple's for you) may be written off as homophony or homonymy (e.g. for in for old men and four old men). While proof positive of either assumption is not possible, the homophony 'solution' is rather too suspiciously easy (one can always draw additional distinctions); it is also uninteresting insofar as it implies a failure to engage one's imagination with a language on anything like its own terms.

Indeed, such nonconformities or anomalies, where semantic
'slippage' embarrasses categorial proprieties, are potentially the most revealing about the semantic features of the morphosyntax. Whorf recognized this clearly, noting that such 'reactances' may reveal covert categories or 'cryptotypes' of languages (cf. Whorf 1936?/1956:70-72, 1945/1956:89).\textsuperscript{15} 1.3 On Data and Method The present study is a search for patternment (cf. Whorf 1942/1956:256-263, Davis Ms.). Patterns emerge from the linguist's engagement with the data, which in turn emerge from interpersonal interactions of the linguist and the native-speaker consultants. The patterns discernable in the data give a rough idea of the way the featured languages configure the universe for their speakers.\textsuperscript{16} The meaning of any ordering, morpheme, or lexeme never fully presents itself in any given instance, but it emerges as such through recurrent contrasts.\textsuperscript{17} The researcher/observer is inescapably part of the process of meaning. No ultimate proofs of semantic claims are possible, save by divine intervention. Readers either

\textsuperscript{15}A classic English cryptotype is that of Verbs marking 'dispersion without boundary' (e.g. spread, waste, scatter), revealed by the reactance of its noncompatibility with 'completive' up (e.g. eat it up); hence the rejection of *(spread/waste/scatter) it up (Whorf 1936?/1956:70).

\textsuperscript{16}Recall that this configurative aspect of language was of special interest to Whorf, who suggested that 'the "patternment" aspect of language always overrides and controls the "lexation" (Nâma) or name-giving aspect'.

\textsuperscript{17}Recall, for example, Whorf's demonstration of the polysemy of the word electrical in electrical\textsubscript{1} apparatus and electrical\textsubscript{2} engineer (Whorf 1942/1956:260).
construct the patterns, or they do not.

The present study reflects my assumption that nothing in language operates in vacuo; any identity is relational\(^{18}\) and reflective of perceived difference. Identity and difference are essentially correlational. There is no 'exact' or 'predetermined' meaning 'within' any given linguistic performance. As Gregory Bateson (1979/1980:109) has noted:

'Difference, being of the nature of relationship, is not located in time or in space. We say that the white spot is "there," ... but the difference between the spot and the blackboard is not "there." It is not in the spot; it is not in the blackboard...'.

Of course, to be meaningful--i.e. to qualify as information--differential relations require a observer whose perception is attuned, by cognition and culture, to the differences that 'make a difference' (Bateson 1979/1980:110) within a particular context. Minus some notion of context, apart from circumstances (an unimaginable scenario to me, I confess), the meaning of linguistic forms must be hopelessly indeterminate.

Linguists (and their language consultants, if any) create their object of investigation through a process which is enabled and informed by the sophisticated technology of writing (cf. Tyler 1987, Ong 1982, Harris 1980), in accordance

\(^{18}\)Cf. Bateson (1979/1980:18): 'Children should be told that a noun is a word having a certain relationship to a predicate. A verb has a certain relation to a noun, its subject. And so on. Relationship could be used as a basis for definition, and any child could then see that there is something wrong with the sentence "'Go' is a verb"'.
with their own prejudices regarding the explanandum being sought (cf. Davis 1995). Linguistic data are as much created as they are given or inherent 'in things'. All 'sentences', 'morphemes' and the like arise from the process of analysis. Linguistic forms reveal their meanings--i.e. assume their identities--through their recurrence in contrastive instances/examples. Such iterativity (< Skt *itara 'other'? ) produces differences which eventually yield (to) identities through a process of forgetting. Thus, 'identity is a sham--always an other posing as a same' (Tyler Ms.a).

The Philippine linguistic items presented in Chapters 2-6 were elicited in conversations with native consultants during a long series of weekly sessions. I presented each language consultant with English words or sentences which he or she would then translate into his or her native (Philippine) language. I would then often suggest alternative Philippine words or sentences, which would either be rejected or accepted. In many cases, the consultant would suggest alternative readings of Philippine items. We would then discuss the implications of either response, creating imaginary scenarios to which the linguistic items might conceivably apply. The imaginary scenario was especially useful for understanding a consultant's rejection of a suggested item. Hence, the elicited sentences are integrated with imagined situational contexts and, to the degree that such integration was successful, they reflect pragmatic
potentialities inherent to the relevant linguistic performances.

An asterisk (*) implies a rejection of the material immediately following it. Such rejection does not mean that the utterance in question is ungrammatical. Rather, it suggests that the consultant and I were unable to imagine a sensible fit between the item in question and relevant circumstances; '[t]rue intuition is not a judgement of grammaticality but an evaluation of internal variables of enunciation in relation to the aggregate of the circumstances' (Deleuze & Guattari 1987:83). The asterisk thus indexes a limitation on our combined imaginations, not on the languages in question. Magical or metaphorical interpretations have not been excluded. The imagination factor is arguably a major limitation of my method, another being the absence of such linguistic variation as exists between individual speakers in all 'speech communities'.

I have sought to compensate by careful rechecking and by collecting data in some abundance to allow patterns to emerge more distinctly. In addition, I have supplemented these data from my consultant sessions with transcriptions of oral narratives (cf. Appendices A and C). In the case of Hiligaynon, I was able to consult certain Hiligaynon publications, including two translations of the Bible and articles in the popular publication Yuhum. (Unfortunately, similar attention was not possible for Yogad, which is used
primarily in domestic conversations and local political speeches and rarely committed to paper.) A number of puzzles encountered in the transcribed oral narratives and in the printed sources were explored in greater detail with the aid of the consultants. The potential for such refinement is arguably the greatest advantage of the elicitation method. I hope to inspire aspiring readers with both the will and the power to assemble patterns from these data.
Chapter Two

The Morphosyntax of Hiligaynon Morphological Causatives

2.0 Introduction to Hiligaynon Morphosyntax

Hiligaynon, which is also known as Ilonggo (and not to be confused with Ilongot), is a Visayan (or Bisayan) language spoken in the central Philippines. With approximately four million speakers and a lively popular press, it is one of the major minority languages of the Philippines.¹ In fact, after Philippine independence from Spain was achieved in 1898, Hiligaynon, like Cebuano and Ilokano, was primed for the rôle of the official language of the emergent nation, a status formally awarded to Tagalog in 1936.

The Hiligaynon data in this study were co-authored by Ms. Concha Ponce (henceforth C.P.) of Houston, Texas, from Ilog, Negros Occidental; and the Rev. Mr. Ernest Dagohoy (E.D.), also of Houston, from San José de Buenavista, Panay. Previous studies of Hiligaynon include Métrida & Aparicio (1894), Ruiz (1968), and Wolfenden (1971, 1975). Bell (1976) has discussed Hiligaynon morphological Causatives in a Relational Grammar framework.

Hiligaynon challenges some common presuppositions about the 'grammar' of natural languages. A number of familiar categories and oppositions from Indo-European languages fit

¹According to McFarland (1980:14), Hiligaynon speakers numbered 4,204,825 in 1975, compared with 10,262,735 for Cebuano. Hiligaynon has been classified as one of seven North-Central Visayan dialects; Cebuano, as one of four South Visayan dialects (McFarland 1980:60).
Hiligaynon rather poorly. In particular, the traditional oppositions of 'Noun'/'Verb', 'Subject'/'Object', 'Transitive'/'Intransitive', and 'Active'/'Passive', based on Indo-European models, are so constituted as to be relatively uninformative and even misleading regarding the semantic dimensions of the Hiligaynon morphosyntax.

The Hiligaynon 'Noun'/'Verb' opposition is a matter of nonce relations rather than of lexical specification or 'marking'. A given root is not specified as 'Noun' or 'Verb' a priori; any root can acquire either Nominal or Verbal morphology and functions. Although a 'Subject'-'Object' relation can be discerned in many instances, this is not a fundamental opposition of the grammar per se. The language does not systematically mark 'Transitivity' in either a 'semantic' or a 'grammatical' sense; a given morphosyntactic configuration may serve either a 'Transitive' or an 'Intransitive' relation.

Another challenge to typical descriptive practice is the absence of an 'Active'/'Passive' dualism in the VOICE system, despite the liberal application of this terminology by Bloomfield (1917) and subsequent Philippinists. Hiligaynon morphosyntax does create VOICE and ROLE, but these categories are constituted differently than in Indo-European languages. As we shall see, Hiligaynon combines a binary ROLE contrast with a rich chorus of VOICE relations which the vaunted binary choice between 'Active' and 'Passive' is far too crude to
reflect.

The bulk of the current chapter examines the semantics of Hiligaynon word order, ROLE, FOCUS, and VOICE—in sufficient detail, it is hoped, to empower readers to establish resonances between the various components of the general morphosyntax and the particulars of Causative constructions.

The orthography I have adopted to present instances of Hiligaynon is generally consistent with that found in such publications as Ang Biblia ('The Bible'), the Maayong Balita nga Biblia ('Good News Bible'), and the popular periodical Yuhum. Most vowels and consonants have values consistent with those in the IPA system; the sequence ng is a velar nasal corresponding, as in English orthography, to eng (i.e. [ŋ]). Certain concessions have been made for the purpose of analysis. I employ accents to indicate stress, which is not predictable and which may drift in certain roots depending on their environment. Accent marks are not normally used by native writers. In addition, I regularly use hyphens to indicate morpheme boundaries, a practice that is vanishingly rare in Hiligaynon writing, where writers normally indicate syllable-initial glottal stops following closed syllables. Such stops are here indicated with apostrophes ('), in accordance with the practice of some native writers. Thus, the Interrogative Pronoun for 'who?', written as sin-o in common Hiligaynon practice, is written as són'o in the numbered examples. Syllable-final glottal stops are indicated by
circumflexes (^) positioned over the relevant vowels. This practice, rarely observed by Hiligaynon writers, is useful for distinguishing such minimal pairs as áqi 'pass, trace' and áqî 'gay, homosexual'; walá 'left' and walâ 'not exist'. If no accent is depicted, it should be assumed that the stress falls on the syllable with the circumflex; hence, the word for 'not exist' is stressed on the final syllable. Glottal stops regularly occurring between two successive vowels within a word (as in ganháan 'door') are never orthographically depicted.

2.1.0 Orientation: Hiligaynon Morphosyntax

Hiligaynon is a language with complex Verbal morphology. This morphology selects PARTICIPANTS for VOICE and specifies ASPECT. The Verbal affix -pa-, as we will see, may be used to derive morphological Causative constructions. This 'Causative' reading is, I will argue, hardly simple; rather, it is a complex composite of the constitution and interaction of ROLE, VOICE, and EVENT. The first two of these factors receive detailed examination in the current chapter. Their interaction with the third factor is explored more fully in Chapter 3. I argue that -pa- has its own VOICE value. The goal of this study is not simply to unpack the semantics of a single morpheme; rather, this morpheme provides focus and leverage for an enriched understanding of both causation and of the general constitution of EVENT-PARTICIPANT relations throughout the language. It is my hope that my connections of 'cause'
with the particulars of EVENT dynamics, including ROLE and VOICE, will enhance appreciation of both the separateness and the interrelatedness of these aspects of language.

2.1.1 Hiligaynon Word Order, TOPIC, and ROLE

Like other Philippine languages, Hiligaynon is often described as a 'VSO' language. This is a mischaracterization on three accounts. First, word order variation does occur with considerable frequency; other attested sequences include SVO, OVS, and VOS. Second, 'Verb', 'Subject' and 'Object' are not primitive categories but composites of other semantics. And third, rather than the ROLE values suggested by the 'S' and 'O', Hiligaynon word order more consistently reflects relative TOPICALITY. (As we shall see, the 'Subject' value emerges from the frequent confluence of TOPIC with the 'AGENTIVE' ROLE.) These three interrelated themes—word-order variation; the constitution of ROLE; and the recognition of TOPIC\(^2\)—are the focus of the present section.

\(^2\)The inconsistent application by linguists of the terms TOPIC and FOCUS demands clarification. My TOPIC is, in another terminology, the theme, i.e. 'the peg on which the message is hung' (Fries 1981:30); or 'the heading to what I am saying' (Halliday 1970:163); or 'a spatial, temporal, or individual framework within which the main predication holds' (Chafe 1976:50); or 'what the sentence (etc.) is about'. In the Philippine languages, this category is independent of Nominal morphology. In contrast, Schachter (1976) and Schachter & Otanes (1972), among others, apply the term to Nominals which are rendered 'Definite' by certain Nominal morphology (cf. Figures 2.1 and 4.1). Following Kess (1975, 1976, 1979) and Naylor (1975, 1978), I term such morphology FOCUS (or FOC in interlinear glosses). In my usage, TOPIC and FOCUS are independent parameters. Cf. 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.
To begin, the Clause-initial position is only incidentally the domain of the 'Verb'. For example, Interrogative Pronouns also regularly occur in sentence-initial position. In the following examples, the form anó 'what' is used first as 'Pronoun' (sans VOICE marking) and then as 'Verb' (with such marking):

(1) (a) Anó ang gin-hímô ni Roberto
    what FOC GIN-do UNFOC Roberto
    'What did Roberto do?'

    (b) Gin-sirá nía ang ganháan
        GIN-close 3SG.UNFOC FOC door
        'He closed the door'

(2) (a) Nag-anó si Roberto
        NAG-what FOC Roberto
        'What did Roberto do?'

    (b) Nag-sirá siá sang ganháan
        NAG-closed 3SG.FOC UNFOC door
        'He closed the door'

As in (1a) and (2a), the Interrogative elements always occur first. Since these questions are more concerned with EVENTS than with PARTICIPANTS, the answers in the (b)-examples occur in the common VSO pattern, the Verb occurring first. In both the questions and answers, the 'main point' or 'heaviest information load' is situated sentence-initially. I will use the functionalist term RHEME to refer to this dynamic locus which is accorded primacy of occurrence.

The association of Clause-initial position with RHEME is especially obvious with such information (or wh-) questions. However, RHEME is not limited to 'processes' or 'actions' but may also establish the identity of a PARTICIPANT in a
presupposed ROLE in a PARTICULAR EVENT. In such a question-answer sequence, both the Interrogative Pronoun and the Nominal naming the PARTICIPANT occur sentence-initially:

(3) (a) Sín'o ang nag-sirá sang ganháan who FOC NAG-close UNFOC door 'Who closed the door?'

(b) Ang maéstra (ang nag-sirá sang ganháan) FOC teacher FOC NAG-close UNFOC door 'The teacher is the one who closed the door'

(4) (a) Anó ang gin-sirá sang babáye what FOC GIN-close UNFOC woman 'What did the woman close?'

(b) Ang ganháan (ang gin-sirá sang babáye) FOC door FOC GIN-close UNFOC woman 'The door (is what the woman closed)'

In the (b)-sentences, the EVENTS are assumed to be known to the interlocutors; the PARTICIPANTS named by the Clause-initial Nominals--i.e. the teacher and the door--are unknown in the respective ROLES ascribed to them. The 'newness' of RHEME (i.e. the newness of known PARTICIPANTS in a given ROLE) is signalled by the occurrence of a Nominal in sentence-initial position. Such is also the case in the following:

(5) Ang dóktor ang iya ______ gin-patáy FOC doctor FOC 3SG.UNFOC GIN-kill 'The doctor is the one she killed'

(6) Si Roberto ang nag-lakát sa tyánggi FOC Roberto FOC NAG-walk OBL store 'Roberto (is the one who) walked to the store'

(7) Siá gid ang gin-hákós ni Juán 3SG.FOC just FOC GIN-hug UNFOC Juan 'S/he's the very one that Juan hugged'

In (5), ang dóktor names the PARTICIPANT filling the ROLE of 'the one she killed'. In (6), Roberto fills the ROLE of 'the
one who walked into the store'. In (7), the Pronoun siá 'he, she' points to 'the one that Juan hugged'. The ROLE/PARTICIPANT distinction is even more decisive in the following:

(8) Ang dóktor ang ámon amáy
    FOC doctor FOC 1SG.UNFOC father
    'The doctor is my father'

(9) Si Jesús ang solúsyon
    FOC Jesus FOC solution
    'Jesus is the solution'

In (8), ang dóktor is the one who fills the ROLE of father, who is a father to me. In (9), the conclusion of a Hiligaynon hymn, si Jesús fills the ROLE of the previously sought-after 'solution'. Hiligaynon has no 'supplementary' Copula but forges ROLE-PARTICIPANT equivalences through juxtapositions which allow the exploitation of the RHEME semantics.

In DISCOURSE (as opposed to isolated sentences/EVENTS), the sentence-initial RHEME position announces thematic transitions in the flow or development of EVENTS. Some elements may precede the Verb. Such pre-Verbal elements (Nominal or Adverbial) may involve the introduction of new PARTICIPANTS, the placement of established PARTICIPANTS in a new ROLE, or scenic developments marking a fresh phase of narrative or descriptive EVENTS (including Temporal constructions and such 'rhetorical' transitional markers as dasón 'next, then'). Such elements announce developments which are in some sense disruptive or DISCONTINUOUS within the DISCOURSE. In a tape-recorded oral narrative, C.P. relates the
story of her family's struggle to survive in rural Negros Occidental during World War II (cf. Appendix A). The following two sentences from that narrative illustrate the use of Clause-initial Nominal Phrases to announce transitional developments:

(10) Ang géra the war nag-súgod sang 1941³
FOC war the war NAG-begin UNFOC 1941
'The war ... began in 1941'

(11) Bómba galí áto na-húlog sa atubángan gíd
bomb right there NA-drop OBL front just
sang ámon baláy
UNFOC 3PL.UNFOC house
'A bomb dropped right there in front of our house'

(12) Sang hwébes nga ádlaw may duhá ka èropláno
UNFOC Thursday LINK day have two QNT airplane
'On Thursday there were two airplanes'

(13) Dasón sang 1954 ang ámon amáy na-patáy
next UNFOC 1954 FOC 3PL.UNFOC father NA-die
'Next, in 1954, our father died'

Sentence (10) initiates the narrative and, in so doing, introduces ang géra 'the war' as the TOPIC to be discussed. Sentence (11) introduces the bomb as a new (and certainly disruptive) PARTICIPANT. This sentence initiates a new phase of the narrative detailing the aftermath of the bombing. Similarly, sang hwébes nga ádlaw in (12) sets the stage for the appearance of the airplanes and its aftermath. Sentence (13) has two pre-Verbal Nominals, the Temporal construction sang 1954 '1954' and the PARTICIPANT ang ámon amáy 'father', in pre-Verbal position, both of these being preceded

³The date '1941' and subsequent dates were rendered in English in the taped narrative. Cf. Appendix A, sentence (1).
by the transition dasón 'next'. Again, there is a concomitant disruption in the narrative, a major event, and the stage is set for a new phase of the narrative (i.e. the narrative detailing the consequences of and reactions to the death).

Entire Clauses may precede the Main Verb. A scene-setting or backgrounding function is apparent in the following, where a Dependent Clause introduced by sang precedes the Verb:

(14) Sang íya osisá- on, tanáw-on nía
UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC search-ON, look- ON 3SG.UNFOC
to gali nag-a- hámyang na
there right NAG-LOC-now
'When he inspected / On his inspection, he found him lying right there'

Here, the inspection sets the stage for the subsequent discovery of the body of the narrator's sibling.

From these few examples, a pattern emerges. If a PROPOSITIONAL PARTICIPANT is named in pre-Verbal RHEME position, it has an annunciateive function consonant with the semantics of a DISCONTINUOUS TOPIC. In contrast, he immediate post-Verbal position cites an established or CONTINUOUS TOPIC. This may be appreciated in terms of 'left dislocations', as in:

(15) Ang ákon amáy, gústo nía" ang Beatles
FOC 1SG.UNFOC father, like 3SG.UNFOC FOC Beatles
'My father, he likes the Beatles'

Here, ang ákon amáy announces 'my father' as the TOPIC to be developed, which is anaphorically named by the Pronoun nía

"Despite the orthography, no glottal stop separates the two contiguous vowels in the Third Person Singular Pronouns nía [nìya] and siá [syá, šá].
immediately after the Verb gústo. The annunciatory, DISCONTINUOUS nature of the pre-Verbal TOPIC is underscored by the first two Clauses of C.P.'s narrative (cf. Appendix A), which first announces first 'the war' and next 'Ilog' as TOPICS to be discussed:

(16) Ang géra the war nag-súgod sang 1941, á pang FOC war the war NAG-begin UNFOC 1941, but ang Ilog gin-búmba-hán sang Hapón FOC Ilog GIN-bomb- AN UNFOC Japanese sang December 13, 1941 UNFOC December 13, 1941 'The war started in 1941, but Ilog was bombed by the Japanese on December 13, 1941'

The association of CONTINUOUS TOPIC with immediate post-Verbal position is repeatedly illustrated in the same narrative, as in the following sequence:

(17) (a) Tí kamí íya dídto sa katúnggan, so 1PL.FOC ourselves there OBL marsh nag-dínalágan kamí sa póno sang lubí NAG-run 3SG.FOC OBL trunk UNFOC coconut

(b) Nag-pa- nágó kamí sa idáloc sang lubí NAG-PANG-hide 1PL.FOC OBL under UNFOC coconut 'So we ourselves there in the marsh, we ran to the trunk of a coconut tree. We hid underneath the tree.'

The sentences in (17) are contiguous in the narrative. Sentence (17a) immediately follows the observation that 'on Thursday there were two airplanes we heard that were flying above'. Sentence (17a) announces a new theme, i.e. 'our reaction to the planes'. The PARTICIPANT kamí 'we' is first announced pre-Verbally (i.e. before nagdínalágan 'ran'); then kamí 'we' takes the now-established TOPIC and runs with it. In (17b), kamí likewise follows the Verb nagpapanágo, continuing
the TOPIC further.

Note that the DISCONTINUOUS/CONTINUOUS distinction is not necessarily a contrast between 'new' and 'old' in the sense of establishment in the DISCOURSE. Any such contrast reflects the 'disruptive' or 'transitional' semantics of RHEME. Compare the following pairs:

(18) (a) Gin-hímô ko ang ákon homework, ápang GIN-do 1SG.UNFOC FOC 1SG.UNFOC homework, but nag-tán'aw lang siá sang TV NAG-watch just 3SG.FOC UNFOC TV 'I did my homework, but s/he just watched TV'

(b) Gin-hímô ko ang ákon homework, ápang GIN-do 1SG.UNFOC FOC 1SG.UNFOC homework, but siá nag-tán'aw lang sang TV 3SG.FOC NAG-watch just UNFOC TV 'I did my homework, but s/he just watched TV'

(19) (a) Gin-habóy nía ang báso GIN-throw 3SG.FOC FOC glass 'S/he threw the glass'

(b) Íya gin-habóy ang báso 3SG.UNFOC GIN-throw FOC glass 'S/he threw the glass'

Although the pre-Verbal Pronouns in the (b)-sentences conceivably might introduce a new PARTICIPANT into the DISCOURSE, they need not do so. The compound sentence in (18a) describes EVENTS occurring according to routine or expectations; each of us is following a prescribed rôle. Sentence (18b), in contrast, reads like an accusation; the TV watcher is perhaps shirking other duties. Similarly, (19b) suggests that the thrower threw the glass abruptly or surprisingly, perhaps in a temper tantrum; (19a) implies an action within the realm of expectations set by the DISCOURSE,
perhaps according to a toasting ritual. (The Pronominal alternation nía/iya is discussed further in the next section.) The DISCONTINUOUS TOPIC of Clause-initial position is an accomplishment of RHEME.

Certain obligatory correspondences further support our association of the immediate post-Verbal position with CONTINUOUS TOPIC. For one, Subject-like Nominals always occur immediately after marks of Negation. The following illustration is from C.P.'s narrative (cf. Appendix A, [21]-[22]):

(20) (a) Tí ang ámon amáy nag-pa- nágò sa halígi so FOC 1PL.UNFOC father NAG-PANG-hide OBL post 'So our father hid by the post...'

(b) ápang walâ níá ma-bàtì-í kon nag-anó na but not 3SG.UNFOC MA-hear-I when NAG-what now ang ámon ma-guláng nga ádto sa balkón FOC 1PL.UNFOC MA-older LINK there OBL balcony '... but he didn't hear anything about what our oldest brother did who was there on the balcony'

In (20a), the Phrase ang ámon amáy announces the DISCONTINUOUS TOPIC, which is continued in (20b) as níá following walâ 'not do'. The EVENT in (20b) is the failure to hear named by the Irrealis mabàtíí.

In addition, Subject-like Nominals regularly follow 'Main', Modal-like Verbs and precede the Verbal Complements:

(21) Gústo níá mag-tán'aw sang èropláno want 3SG.UNFOC MAG-watch UNFOC airplane 'S/he wants/wanted to see the/an airplane'
(22) Síling sang ámon amáy ini nga duhá ka think UNFOC 1PL.UNFOC father this.FOC LINK two QNT laláki mas dalágkó sílá íya male more big 3PL.FOC themselves

'Our father thinks/thought these two boys are/were bigger'

In (21), nía 's/he' immediately follows gústo 'wants/wanted' and precedes magtán'aw 'to see'; in (22), ang ámon amáy 'our father' immediately follows síling 'think' and precedes mas dalágkó '(are/were) bigger'.

Finally, the Familiar Pronoun ka 'thou, you' always occurs in immediate post-Verbal position, never in the pre-Verbal RHEME position:

(23) (a) Mag-pintúra ka sang baláy MAG-paint 2SG.FOC UNFOC house 'You paint the house'

(b) *Ka mag-pintúra sang baláy 2SG.UNFOC MAG-paint UNFOC house

(24) (a) Ikáw ang nag-sirá sang ganháan 2SG.FOC FOC NAG-close UNFOC door 'You're the one who closed a door'

(b) *Ka ang nag-sirá sang ganháan 2SG.FOC FOC NAG-close UNFOC door

As the mark of an always already Familiar addressee, ka suggests maximal PROXIMITY to the speaker, a CONTINUOUS relationship between the addresor and the addressee, who is always already present (i.e. CONTINUOUS) in the DISCORSIVE situation. Unlike ikáw, ka cannot occur Clause-initially (as a RHEME-like emphatic or contrastive PARTICIPANT), as this would suggest the emergence of a DISCONTINUOUS (and hence 'non-familiar') relationship. The 'familiarity' of the Familiar form precludes a DISCONTINUOUS use.
The attention of the circum-Verbal positions to information flow or TOPIC is summarized in Figure 2.1.

DISCONTINUOUS TOPIC --> EVENT --> CONTINUOUS TOPIC

Figure 2.1: TOPIC in Hiligaynon Clauses

This progression and the putatively 'basic' VSO configuration suggest that the organization of Hiligaynon Clauses marks a progression from the most dynamic or MOTILE locus to the most INERT. The correspondence of pre-Verbal position with RHEME, which may include introductory Clauses (e.g. sang íva osisávon 'when he inspected'), and the post-Verbal position with particularized EVENTS (e.g. ang ginhímó ko 'what I did'), should remind us that the conceptualization of TOPIC as Noun--as 'thing'--reflects a common reocentric bias; TOPICALITY is actually non-discrete and distributed continuously in varying degree throughout any EVENT or DISCOURSE (i.e. 'aboutness' extends to some degree to every element), as Payne (1994:358) and common sense suggest.

If word sequencing reflects TOPIC, how is ROLE constituted and recognized, given that the VSO characterization implies a linkage between post-Verbal word order and ROLE? Such linkage is neither absolute nor simple. I will argue that the Hiligaynon morphosyntax recognizes only two ROLES. These ROLES often suggest 'AGENT' and 'PATIENT', as in the following FOCUS-contrasting pair:
(25) (a) Nag-sulát ang estudyánte sang sulát  
NAG-write FOC student UNFOC letter  
'The student wrote a letter'

(b) Gin-sulát sang estudyánte ang sulát  
GIN-write UNFOC student FOC letter  
'A student wrote the letter'

Both sentences in (25) easily lend themselves to an understanding in terms of an 'AGENT' acting upon a 'PATIENT'—specifically an 'effected' rather than an 'affected' one (cf. Hopper 1985:67-88). However, an AGENT/PATIENT contrast need not arise. Note the following:

(26) Nag-támbok ang estudyánte sang inúm  
NAG-fat FOC student UNFOC drink  
'The student got fat from drinking'

The student here is not doing anything to the drinking, which in turn is not a 'thing' to be done unto. Semantic Transitivity (at least in the sense of AGENT-to-PATIENT influence) is not operative here. Yet there is some consistency between (26) and the pair in (25). A more accurately inclusive designation of the ROLE contrast involves not 'agency' or 'agenthood' but relative MOTILITY within the designated EVENT. The ROLE contrast in Hiligaynon is that of MOTILE versus INERT. Other instances of MOTILE/INERT ROLE contrasts that are not AGENTIVE/PATIENTIVE include the following:

(27) Kapúy-on ang maéstra sang lakát  
tired-ON FOC teacher UNFOC walk  
'The teacher will get / is getting tired walking'

(28) Nag-tápos ang géra sang 1945  
NAG-end FOC war UNFOC 1945  
'The war ended in 1945'
Sentences (27)-(31) have the same grammatical configuration as those with AGENT/PATIENT oppositions in (25), but none implies a Transitive influence passed from the 'S' to the 'O' PARTICIPANT.

Note that ROLE is independent of FOCUS. In (25a) above, nag- focusses the MOTILE ROLE (ang estudýánté), while in (25b), gin- focusses the INERT ROLE (ang sulát). Both examples, however, preserve the VSO sequence, with the more MOTILE PARTICIPANT preceding the more INERT one. Similarly, the student in (26) is MOTILE in the sense that he changes, undergoes a process, while the drinking is a relatively INERT (or 'effected') artifact of his activity.

Like other languages, Hiligaynon exhibits a strong correlation between TOPICALITY and MOTILITY (i.e. animacy, agentiveness). Such a connection has been amply established

5The post-Verbal 'SO' sequencing reflects TOPIC more consistently than ROLE. Consider the following TOPIC-RHEME constructions:
(a) Mas ma-áyo ang Toyota sang sa Honda more MA-good FOC Toyota UNFOC OBL Honda 'The Toyota is better than the Honda'
(b) Mas ma-áyo sang sa Honda ang Toyota more MA-good UNFOC OBL Honda FOC Toyota
in the functionalist literature (cf. Keenan 1976, Givón 1976, 1979:56-77). In the Hiligaynon linguistic universe (among others), HUMAN PARTICIPANTS are more TOPIC-worthy than NONHUMAN PARTICIPANTS. With 'Active' EVENTS such as 'biting', the MOTILE/INERT ROLES emerge clearly. In the following, gin-selects si Bimbo as the INERT PARTICIPANT, which may or may not be highly TOPICAL in the current, limited situation of speaking:

(32)  (a) Gin-kagát si Bimbo ni Juan  
GIN-bite FOC Bimbo UNFOC Juan  
'Bimbo was bitten by Juan'

(b) Gin-kagát ni Juan si Bimbo  
GIN-hug UNFOC Juan FOC Bimbo  
'Juan bit Bimbo'

The two PARTICIPANTS John and Bimbo are equally TOPIC-worthy, both being HUMAN--i.e. named by Proper Nouns. Such naming reflects a high degree of empathy or identification (read TOPICALITY) between the interlocutors and the PARTICIPANTS so named.

If a PARTICIPANT'S inherent TOPIC-worthiness 'clashes' with its relative MOTILITY in a given Clause (i.e. by placing an INERT ROLE in the 'S'-position), the tonal contour of the Clause is disrupted in compensation. If the NUCLEAR ROLES are

'Better than the Honda is the Toyota'

There are no clear ROLE (i.e. MOTILE/INERT) delineations here. Sentence (a) construes the 'S'-positioned ang Toyota as CONTINUOUS TOPIC; and (b) suggests that the immediately preceding discussion has been about the ('S'-positioned) Honda. The ROLE sements emerge with the presence of VOICE.
filled by two Common Nouns, the tonal contour of the Clause is smooth and unbroken if the MOTILE PARTICIPANT occurs first. If, however, the INERT PARTICIPANT is more TOPICAL and thus occurs first, the clash between TOPICALITY and MOTILITY is signalled by the disruption of the tonal contour, i.e. by a pause after the first (TOPICAL-but-INERT) PARTICIPANT and by subsequent stress on the second (NON-TOPICAL-but-MOTILE) PARTICIPANT. Compare the following:

(33) (a) Gin-kagát sang idô ang túl'an
GIN-bite UNFOC dog FOC bone
'The/a dog bit the bone'

(b) Gin-kagát ang túl'an, sang idô
GIN-bite FOC bone , UNFOC dog
'The bone was bitten by the dog'

Sentence (33a) suggests a pragmatically unremarkable declaration typical of most elicitations. Sentence (33b) suggests a stronger, perhaps contrastive, emphasis on the MOTILE PARTICIPANT (e.g. it was the dog and not e.g. the toddler who bit the [TOPICAL] bone) with the continued TOPICALITY of the bone. If such a pause and stress are lacking, the MOTILE/INERT contrast may, common sense permitting, suggest a Possessed-Possessor relationship, with the FOCUSED 'S' PARTICIPANT being INERT:

(34) Gin-kagát ang túl'an sang idô
GIN-bite FOC bone UNFOC dog
'The bone of the dog was bitten'

Here, ang túl'an sang idô 'the bone of the dog, the dog's bone' is a Complex Nominal Phrase. (The participation of sang in such 'Genitive' relationships is discussed further in
2.1.2.) The suprasegmental contrast in the sentences of (33) above is one reflection of the tendency to conflate relative MOTILITY—or ROLE—with high TOPICALITY.

There is a tendency in the language to conflate high individuation (involving boundedness and degrees of HUMANNESS) with TOPICALITY. Because of the culturally constructed connection between MOTILITY and TOPICALITY, Proper Nouns and Pronouns, which name linguistically constructed HUMAN PARTICIPANTS, prefer the immediately post-Verbal N, (i.e. most TOPICAL) position, regardless of their ROLE. A compensatory pause and stress are not required when TOPICAL Proper Nouns or Pronouns are immediately followed by Common Nouns:

(35) (a) Gin-kagát si María sang idô
GIN-bite FOC María UNFOC dog
'Maria was bitten by the dog'

(b) Gin-kagát siá sang idô
GIN-bite 3SG.FOC UNFOC dog
'S/he was bitten by a/the dog'

High TOPICALITY preconditions the felicitous use of Pronouns. Thus, Pronouns follow non-Pronouns only reluctantly, i.e. with compensatory pause and stress, while Proper Nouns require no such compensation:

(36) (a) Gin-kagát sang idô si María
GIN-bite UNFOC dog FOC María
'The dog bit Maria'

(b) Gin-kagát sang idô, siá
GIN-bite UNFOC dog, 3SG.FOC
'The/a dog bit him/hér'

(37) (a) Gin-kagát siá ni Juán
GIN-bite 3SG.FOC UNFOC Juan
'S/he was bitten by Juan'
(b) Gin-kagát ni Juan, siá
GIN-bite UNFOC Juan, 3SG.FOC
'Juan hugged him/her'

The (b)-sentences, with heavy stress on the Pronoun siá, imply that the referent is new to the DISCOURSE and is physically present; the stress is a gesture that should be augmented by manual indication or the like. This gesturing quality compensates for the NON-TOPOCALITY of the referent. Of course, Pronouns may easily follow other Pronouns, as in:

(38) Gin-kagát niá siá
GIN-bite 3SG.UNFOC 3SG.FOC
'S/he bit him/her'

Here, no compensatory pause and stress are needed.

The VSO sequence forms the PROPOSITIONAL NUCLEUS of the Hiligaynon Clause. The configuration of the NUCLEUS marks a progression from the most to the least dynamic portion of an EVENT. Any additional Nominals occurring outside the NUCLEUS are beyond the reach of VOICE. Nominals naming such circumstantial entities as 'RECIPIENT', 'BENEFECTEE', 'TIME', and 'LOCATION' usually occur after those naming the NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS. Note the following:

---

6INERT HUMAN PARTICIPANTS (i.e. those named by Pronouns and Proper Nouns) cannot occur in VS_ position if UNFOCUSSED; hence the unacceptability of *Nagkagát si Juan niá or *Nagkagát si Juan ni María. As discussed in 2.1.2 and 2.1.3, UNFOCUSSED Proper Nouns and Pronouns must be made OBLIQUE by an appropriate Preposition, as in Nagkagát si Juan sa íya or Nagkagát si Juan kay María.
(39) Nag-sulát ang propesór sang sulát sa estudyánte
NAG-write FOC professor UNFOC letter OBL student
sa íya baláy
OBL 3SG.UNFOC house
'The professor wrote a letter to the student at
his/her house'

(40) I-hátag ko ang ákon reló sa íya
I-give 1SG.FOC FOC 1SG.UNFOC watch OBL 3SG.OBL
bwás
tomorrow
'I'll give my watch to him/her tomorrow'

(41) Gin-kúhâ sang polís ang pusíl sang hwébes
GIN-take UNFOC police FOC pistol UNFOC Thursday
'The policeman took the pistol last Thursday'

In (39)–(41), the NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS occur as the first
and second Nominals after the Verb. The highlighted PERIPHERAL
or 'circumstantial' Nominals may follow the N₂ or 'O' position
to name a 'RECIPIENT'/'BENEFACTEE' (cf. [39] and [40]), a
'LOCATION' (in [39]), or a 'TIME' (cf. [40] and [41]). This
word order is accompanied by a single, uninterrupted tonal
contour. However, this 'ideal' word order may vary with an
appropriate pause and stress, as in:

(42) Nag-sulát sang sulát sa estudyánte, ang propesór
NAG-write UNFOC letter OBL student , FOC professor
'He wrote a letter to the student, the professor
did'

(43) I-hátag ko bwás sa íya
I-give 1SG.UNFOC tomorrow OBL 3SG.UNFOC;
ang ákon reló
FOC 1SG.UNFOC watch
'I'll give it to him/her tomorrow, my watch'

(44) Gin-kúhâ sang polís sang hwébes , ang pusíl
GIN-take UNFOC police UNFOC Thursday, FOC pistol
'The policeman took it last Thursday, the pistol'

All PERIPHERAL PARTICIPANTS (i.e. those occurring outside
the NUCLEUS) are OBLIQUE (i.e. marked with the Prepositions sa
or *kay*. Only Temporal constructions (i.e. TIMES as opposed to PARTICIPANTS) can be marked with *sang* outside the NUCLEUS (cf. *sang hwébes* 'last Thursday' in [41]). As we discuss in 2.1.2, OBLIQUENESS confers a definite boundary on PARTICIPANTS, so that one may add that NON-NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS are well-defined or 'Definite' within the terms of the language.

2.1.2 The Construction of Hiligaynon PARTICIPANTS:

Determiners, Pronouns, and Prepositions

All Nominal and Pronominal elements reflect a greater or lesser degree of FOCUS. With non-Pronouns, FOCUS is indicated by Article-like forms which I term 'Determiners' (following the practice of Baker 1994). The OBLIQUE PARTICIPANTS are constituted with Preposition-like forms. The FOCUSED Nominals are always NUCLEAR and are selected by VOICE. The pre-Nominal markers in Figure 2.2 mark a given Nominal for selection or non-selection by VOICE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Proper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOCUSED</td>
<td><em>ang</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFOCUSSED</td>
<td><em>sang</em> / <em>(sing)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBLIQUE</td>
<td><em>sa</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.2: Hiligaynon FOCUS: Determiners & Prepositions**

The most NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS are marked by *ang/si*. These are the ones selected by the Verbal VOICE affixes, anything further to the 'right' of 'O' in the VSO configuration being beyond the reach of VOICE. The Proper forms *sánday*, *nánday*, and *kánday* are Comitative. The Common Nouns may be pluralized.

The selection (or non-selection) of PARTICIPANTS by the VOICE morphology is also reflected in the Pronouns. In addition, the UNFOCUSSED Pronouns are further distinguished according to whether they occur pre- or post-positionally, either preceeding or following the Verb or Nominal they associate with (cf. Figure 2.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FOCUSSED</th>
<th>UNFOCUSSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Positional</td>
<td>Post-Positional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>akó</td>
<td>ákon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ko/nákon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>íkaw/ka</td>
<td>ímo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mo/nímo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>siá</td>
<td>iya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>níja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.INC</td>
<td>kamí</td>
<td>ámon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>námon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EXC</td>
<td>kitá</td>
<td>íno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>níno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>kamo</td>
<td>íla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>níla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.3: Hiligaynon Pronouns

Pronouns name PARTICIPANTS which are conceptually PROXIMATE or 'familiar' to the speakers in the speaking situation. Such PARTICIPANTS are invested with a high degree of empathy, via the individuation they receive through speakers' identification with them. Thus, biologically non-human things (including inanimates) may be treated as HUMAN; e.g. a pet dog might be named si Prince; and the Third Person Singular siá, which normally refers to HUMAN PARTICIPANTS, may be applied to anything that the speaker is intimately familiar
with, e.g. the bamboo in Appendix A, (88)-(93). Otherwise, NONHUMAN entities are indicated via the Demonstrative Pronouns iní/síní 'this, these', inâ/sínâ 'that, those', and á(d)to/sádto 'yon, (that/those) there'.

With the Pronouns, the FOCUSED/UNFOCUSED distinction involves a systematic contrast in the placement of word stress. The FOCUSED forms consistently stress the second syllable (if available), while the UNFOCUSED forms stress the first syllable (if two or more syllables are involved). With the Third Person Singular forms siá and nía, stress may drift in certain situations. As discussed later, the UNFOCUSED options may also mark 'Genitives', with the pre-Verbal forms occurring pre-Nominally and the post-Verbal forms, post-Nominally.

The First Person Plural Pronouns distinguish between Inclusive ('you and me') and Exclusive ('him/her/them and me'). The Second Person Singular ka 'thou, you' (a reduction of ikáw) is a Familiar form which occurs only in immediate post-Verbal position. The UNFOCUSED First Second Person Singular forms nákon and nímo occur as 'Genitive' 'Possessors' but not as PARTICIPANTS, while the reduced forms ko and mo may be either PARTICIPANTS or 'Genitive' 'Possessors'.

For FOCUSED PARTICIPANTS, the following substitutions are possible:

(45) Nag-inúm si Marta sang túbig
NAG-drink FOC Marta UNFOC water
'Marta drank some water'
(46) Nag-inúm ang babáye sang túbig  
NAG-drink FOC woman UNFOC water  
'The woman drank some water'

(47) Nag-inúm siá sang túbig  
NAG-drink 3SG.FOC UNFOC water  
'S/he drank some water'

Here, si Marta, ang babáye, and siá name FOCUSSED PARTICIPANTS. For UNFOCUSSED PARTICIPANTS, these substitutions may be made:

(48) Gin-inúm ni Marta ang túbig  
GIN-drink UNFOC Marta FOC water  
'Marta drank the water'

(49) Gin-inúm sang babáye ang túbig  
GIN-drink UNFOC woman FOC water  
'The/a woman drank the water'

(50) Gin-kagát níá siá  
GIN-bite 3SG.UNFOC 3SG.FOC  
'S/he bit him/her'

Note that FOCUS does not reflect ROLE or 'case'. In (45)-(47), FOCUS falls on the MOTILE PARTICIPANTS (i.e. the drinkers), while in (48)-(50) it falls on the INERT ones (i.e. the ones drunk or bitten). Rather than ROLE or 'case', FOCUS reflects the selection of a PARTICIPANT by VOICE, directing attention to the Nominal in question. In (45)-(47), the woman and her actions are of principal interest, perhaps as answers to Naganó [si Marta/ang babáye/siá]? 'What did {Marta/the woman/she} do?'. Furthermore, only a portion of the water is assumed to have been drunk. Sentences (48) and (49) seem to answer the question Diín ang túbig? 'Where's the water?'--the entire portion of which is assumed to have been drunk (cf. English I drank water and I drank the water). The idea of
'boundedness' is, of course, already implicit in the term **focus**, which implies the delineation of sharp edges with respect to a form, as when a photographer focusses an image with a camera lens.

The **FOCUSED PARTICIPANTS** are highly individuated or **bounded**; they stand out from the field. Thus salient, they may be fully disposed of by VOICE. In contrast, the **UNFOCUSED** Determiner **sang** marks a PARTICULAR as being relatively **unbounded** (and unselected); hence, the water is partially consumed in (45)-(47) and fully consumed in (48)-(49). With a more discrete item, such as a concealed handgun, the lack of attention or relative unboundedness may imply a **non-particularity** or **vagueness** regarding identity, as observed in the following:

(51) (a) Nag-kúhâ ang polís sang pusíl
NAG-take FOC police UNFOC pistol
'The policeman took a pistol'

(b) Gin-kúhâ sang polís ang pusíl
GIN-take UNFOC police FOC pistol
'A/the policeman took the pistol'

The high boundedness marked by **ang** contrasts with the unboundedness marked by **sang**. Thus, (51a) may suggest the participation of a particular policeman who took one of possibly several pistols, while (51b) may suggest the participation of one of possibly several policemen taking a particular pistol. We will discuss **sang** in more detail later.

Although **FOCUS** accords with the selection or non-selection of PARTICIPANTS by the Verbal VOICE affixes, (cf.
2.1.3), it is essentially independent of such selection. The Determiners have their own content— their own 'agenda'— which is independent of VOICE. FOCUSSED PARTICULARS may appear without corresponding VOICE affixes; ang may apply not only to VOICE-selected PARTICIPANTS/Nominals but to entire EVENTS/Verb Phrases, as in:

(52) (a) Ang dókтор nag-sirá sang ganháán
FOC doctor NAG-close UNFOC door
'The dóctor closed a door'

(b) Ang dókтор ang nag-sirá sang ganháán
FOC doctor FOC NAG-close UNFOC door
'The dóctor was the one who closed a door'
'The one who closed a door was the dóctor'

(53) (a) Ang pröpésór nag-sulát sang sulát
FOC professor NAG-write UNFOC letter
'The proféssor wrote a letter'

(b) Ang pröpésór ang nag-sulát sang sulát
FOC professor FOC NAG-write UNFOC letter
'The proféssor is the one who wrote a letter'

In (52) and (53), the Nominals ang dókтор and ang pröpésór serve as RHEME; they constitute the most vital information in the sense of an 'information flow'. The (b)-members of each pair involve a second instance of ang, which adds FOCUS to the Verb/EVENT as well. This particularizes the EVENT constituted by the Verb as marking a particular ROLE (i.e. the closer of the door or the writer of the letter). Thus, (52a) identifies the doctor as one who, among other things, closed the door; the ROLE described by nag-sirá sang ganháán is not well defined or particularized, in contrast to the situation in (52b), where ang nag-sirá sang ganháán suggests the recognition of a single particularized ROLE. Similarly, (53a) would be an
appropriate answer to *Ang pròpesór, naganó siá 'The professor, what did he/she do?', while (53b) would answer Sín'o ang nagsulát sang sulát 'Who is the one who answered the letter?'

These 'double FOCUS' constructions allow the drawing of ROLE-PARTICIPANT equivalences, in the manner of this previously cited example:

(54) Si Jesús ang solúsyon  
FOC Jesus FOC solution 
'Jesus is the solution'

Here, *Si and ang mark FOCUS on a Proper Noun and a Common Noun respectively. To be available for the framing of such an equivalence, a Nominal must be in FOCUS. It cannot appear 'naked' in such Clauses, hence the rejection of:

(55) *Dóktor ang nag-sirá sang ganháan  
doctor FOC NAG-close UNFOC door 
doctor FOC NAG-close UNFOC door

It should by now be apparent that the Determiners help create PARTICIPANTS, by framing PARTICULARS, rather than indexing a priori ones (cf. Baker 1994). Roots are not marked as Nominal or Verbal but may fill either function. Nominals occur without Determiners only when they assert the existence or existential emergence (as opposed to mere participation) of a PARTICULAR into the DISCOURSE. Note the following:

(56) May kuring sa lamésa  
have cat OBL table 
'There's a cat on the table'

(57) Bòmba galí áto (ang) na-húlog sa àtubáangan  
bomb right there (FOC) NA-fall OBL front 
sang ámon baláy  
UNFOC 1PL.EXC.FOC house

'A bomb dropped right in front of our house'
(58) Dóktor ang ákon amáy
doctor FOC 1SG.UNFOC father
'My father is a doctor'

In (56)-(58), the emphasized words are not presented as
PARTICIPANTS; they take no parts, fill no ROLES. The cat and
the bomb simply penetrate the ken of the speaker; the EVENTS
consist of their emergence into the DISCOURSE. The doctor in
(58) emerges through the father's activities as a doctor, i.e.
through his doctoring.

Unlike the English Article the, ang need not suggest
prior 'knownness' or 'familiarity'. The difference between the
focal attention established by ang and the knownness
established by the becomes apparent when we note that an
English Clause can harbour any number of instances of the (cf.
The cat sat on the mat in the living room the other night). In
contrast, Hiligaynon Clauses host a maximum of one occurrence
of ang unless, of course, ROLE-PARTICIPANT equivalences are
being drawn, as in:

(59) Ang pròpesór (ang) nag-sulát sang sulát
FOC professor FOC NAG-write UNFOC letter
'The professor is the one who wrote the/a letter'

(60) Ang propesór ang indyínír
FOC professor FOC engineer
'The professor is the engineer'

Such ROLE-PARTICIPANT equivalences may allow more than
two occurrences of ang in a given sentence, as in:

(61) Ang propesór ang indyínír, gin-lútô nía
FOC professor FOC engineer, GIN-cook 3SG.UNFOC
ang manôk
FOC chicken
'The professor, the engineer, he cooked the
chicken'
Sentences (59)-(61) have two or more occurrences of ang, though always to establish PARTICIPANT-ROLE equivalences (i.e. the professor as the letter-writer or as engineer). Barring such equivalence-making, each Hiligaynon sentence is limited to one PARTICIPANT FOCUSED by ang or si.

Incidentally, we can note that the device of juxtaposition problematizes our identifying the sentence on purely formal grounds; in (60) the string ang propesór ang indyiñir stands as a sentence, while in (61) it is an appositive name which is enfolded into a larger sentence. The inadequacy of form per se in establishing an identity should remind us that recognition of the sentence as sentence reflects the intuition or feeling (of both speaker and linguist) as much as phenomenal 'form'. The very word sentence (related to sentiment and sense and derived from Latin sententia 'feeling, opinion' < L sentire 'to feel'), betrays this. In committing linguistic per-formances to paper, linguists engage in the (inherently arbitrary) practice of 'sentencing' (cf. Sapir 1921: 35-37, Bishop & Spitz 1992).

The more liberal applicability of the English Article reflects its complicity in constructing knownness; any PARTICULAR regarded as 'familiar' may be marked with the (or, rather, the Article presents the PARTICULAR as a familiar one), which attends to the flow of information and registers the interlocutors' enmeshment in a common context. The more restricted applicability of ang reflects its rôle in directing
attention toward a PARTICULAR or establishing its momentary, transient salience or boundedness; rather than knownness, ang marks the sentence perspective, the PARTICULAR defined by FOCUS and located at the PHASE of the EVENT which is selected by VOICE.

As noted in 2.1.1, knownness/familiarity is largely the province of TOPICALITY, which is signalled by word order. We also noted that TOPIC, ROLE, and FOCUS are separate matters. The specifically perspective-marking function of FOCUS may be most purely appreciated in sentences such as the following, with contrasting TOPICS, no ROLE contrast and constant FOCUS:

(62)  (a) Sa sidlangán sang Houston ang Beaumont OBL east UNFOC Houston FOC Beaumont 'To the east of Houston is Beaumont'

(b) Sa sidlangán ang Beaumont sang Houston OBL east FOC Beaumont UNFOC Houston 'Beaumont is to the east of Houston'

(63)  (a) Mas dakô sang sa Beaumont ang Houston more big UNFOC OBL Beaumont FOC Houston 'Bigger than Beaumont is Houston'

(b) Mas dakô ang Houston sang sa Beaumont more big FOC Houston UNFOC OBL Beaumont 'Houston is bigger than Beaumont'

(64)  (a) Mas ma-áyo sang sa Honda ang Toyota more MA-good UNFOC OBL Honda FOC Toyota] 'Better than the Honda is the Toyota'

(b) Mas ma-áyo ang Toyota sang sa Honda more MA-good FOC Toyota UNFOC OBL Honda 'The Toyota is better than the Honda'

In the (a)-sentences, Houston, Beaumont and Honda are TOPICAL and the UNFOCUSSED PARTICIPANTS are introduced as standards of comparison. The (b)-sentences have a reversal in TOPICALITY,
so that Beaumont, Houston, and Toyota are the respective TOPICS. The FOCAL attention, marked by ang, remains constant in the (a)- and (b)-sentences, marking the PARTICIPANT being compared. Thus, for instance, ang Toyota is in either case understood to be better than Honda and never vice-versa. It is unfortunate that the difficulty in recognizing TOPIC and FOCUS as separate issues has been compounded by inconsistencies in linguists' terminology.

The confusion has been encouraged by the fact that our 'TOPIC' often does coincide with our 'FOCUS', as in the following question-and-answer sequences:

\[(65) \quad (a) \quad \text{Gin-anó ni Maria ang líbro} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{GIN-what UNFOC Maria FOC book} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{'What did Maria do with the book?'} \\
\quad (b) \quad \text{Gin-hátag nía ø kay Roberto} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{GIN-give 3SG.UNFOC ø OBL Roberto} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{'She gave (it) to Roberto'}\]

\[(66) \quad (a) \quad \text{Ano- hón mo ang pínta} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{what-ON 2SG.UNFOC FOC paint} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{'What will you do with the paint?'} \\
\quad (b) \quad \text{I-pínta ko ø sa díngding} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{I-paint 1SG.UNFOC ø OBL wall} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{'I'll paint (it) onto the wall'}\]

The responses in the (b)-sentences have no apparent FOCUS because the referents have been given; the elision (or so-called 'zero pronominalization') attests to their CONTINUOUS TOPICALITY (or 'persistence').\(^7\) Such responses resist a shift

\(^7\)In some other Philippine languages, including Yogad (cf. 4.1.2), anaphoric elision is used instead of the Third-Person FOCUSED Pronoun so that the analog of Hiligaynon siá is zero (ø). Given the high TOPICALITY of Pronominal PARTICIPANTS, the presence of this absence in Yogad further emphasizes the
in FOCUS to a different perspective, as in the (c)-sentences of the following:

(67)  
(a) Ano- hón mo  ang díngding
      what-ON  2SG.UNFOC FOC wall
 'What will you do to the wall?'

(b) Pinta-hán ko  ø siní  nga pínta
      paint-AN  1SG.UNFOC ø this.UNFOC LINK paint
 'I'll paint (it/them) with this paint'

(c) %I-pínta ko  (ang pínta) sa  díngding
      I-paint 1SG.UNFOC FOC paint  OBL wall
 'I'll paint (the paint) onto the wall'

(68)  
(a) Diín  ang dóktor
      where FOC doctor
 'Where's the doctor?'

(b) Nag-a- sulát ø sang íya  report
      NAG-IMP-write ø UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC report
 '(S/he's) writing his/her report'

(c) %Gin-a- sulát ang íya  report
      GIN-IMP-write FOC 3SG.UNFOC report
 '(S/he's) writing his/her report'

An acceptable response to (67a) involves the elision of the FOCUSSED PARTICIPANT ang díngding 'the wall' but excludes a shift in FOCUS to another perspective, e.g. that of the paint. Similarly, the question in (68a) focusses the doctor, as does the approved response in (68b); a sentence such as (68c), with FOCUS on the report, seems inappropriate. Hence, TOPIC and FOCUS may overlap.

However, the overlap is not absolute, as shown by the following:

__________________________

independence of FOCUS from CONTINUOUS TOPIC.
(69) (a) Natungód kay Roberto, nag-a- sulát siá regarding OBL Roberto NAG-IMP-write 3SG.FOC
    sang report
    UNFOCUS report
    'As for Roberto, he's writing a report'

(b) Natungód kay Roberto, gin-a- sulát nía regarding OBL Roberto, GIN-IMP-write 3SG.UNFOCUS
    ang report
    FOC report
    'As for Roberto, he's writing the report'

(70) Ang ákon ámay , güsto nía ang Beatles
    FOC 1SG.UNFOCUS father, like 3SG.UNFOCUS FOC Beatles
    'My father, he likes the Beatles'

Both (69a) and (69b) establish Roberto as the TOPIC with the
Phrase natungó kay Roberto 'as for/regarding Roberto'; the
anaphoric Pronoun may be either in FOCUS, as with sía in (69a)
or UNFOCUSSED, as with nía in (69b). Sentence (70) offers an
example of a ('left-displaced') FOCUSSED NEW TOPIC (ang ámon
ámay), whose anaphor (nía) is UNFOCUSSED. Hence, TOPIC and
FOCUS are separate, if related, issues.

The unboundness of the UNFOCUSSED PARTICULARS (marked
by sang, ni, and the UNFOCUSSED Pronouns) is seen in their
(unbounded, non-discrete) attachment to other elements. Both
sang and ni can join serve as attributive ligatures between
Nominals so that the first term (whether FOCUSSED or not) is
the 'head' and the second (preceded by sang or ni) the
'Partitive'/ 'Genitive' 'satellite'. The sang/ni-Phrase forges
a part-whole connection (as opposed to a boundary) with the
unbounded element as the whole or matrix. Note the following:

(71) {baláy / tiíl / lakát} sang estudyánte
    house / foot / walk UNFOCUS student
    'the student's {house / foot / walk}'
(72) \{baláy / tiíl / lakát\} ni Maria
    house / foot / walk UNFOC Maria
    'Maria's \{house / foot / walk\}'

In (71)-(72), \textit{sang} and \textit{ni} mark relatively PARTICULARS which
are construed as 'Possessors' (whether alienable and
inalienable). Such 'source' semantics are discussed further in
terms of ERUPTION in 4.1.2.

The 'Partitive'/'Genitive' reading of \textit{sang} contrasts with
the marked boundedness or 'a-partness' indicated by the
Preposition \textit{sa} in:

(73) tiíl sa síya
    foot OBL chair
    'the foot on the chair'

Here, there is no part-whole relationship between the foot and
the chair; they are separate entities that are merely in
proximity or contact. We will discuss \textit{sa} in greater detail
presently.

The Determiner \textit{sang} is indifferent to ROLE and may mark
both MOTILE and INERT PARTICIPANTS:

(74) (a) Gin-a- sulát \textit{sang} estudyánte ang líbro
        GIN-IMP-write UNFOC student FOC book
        'The/a student is writing the book'

(b) Nag-a- sulát ang estudyánte \textit{sang} líbro
    NAG-IMP-write FOC student UNFOC book
    'The student is writing a/the book'

In (74a), \textit{sang} marks the ERUPTIVE 'AGENT' (the writing
student) and in (74b), the POST-ERUPTIVE 'PATIENT' (the book
being written). Rather than marking a specific ROLE, \textit{sang}
marks a DIFFUSE matrix, a scene with respect to which EVENTS
and other PARTICIPANTS occur. This 'matrix' sense is also
apparent in the participation of *sang* in background information preceding that of the main Clause, as in:

(75) Sang íya osisá- on, tanáw-on nía
UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC search-ON, look- ON 3SG.UNFOC
to galí nag-a- hámyang na
there right NAG-IMP-lie now
'When he inspected / Upon his inspection, he found
him lying right there'

(76) Sang na-bàtí-án sang maestro ang balíta,
UNFOC NA-hear-AN UNFOC teacher FOC news
na-patáy siá
NA-die 3SG.FOC
'{When the teacher heard the news / Upon the
teacher's hearing the news}, s/he died'

(77) Sang íya na-bàtí- án ang balíta,
UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC NA-search-AN, FOC news ,
na-patáy siá
NA-die 3SG.FOC
'{When s/he heared the news / Upon his/her hearing
the news}, s/he died'

(78) Sang na-bàtí-an nía ang balíta, na-patáy
UNFOC NA-hear-AN 3SG.UNFOC FOC news , NA-die
sía
3SG.FOC
'When s/he heard the news / Upon his/her hearing the
news, s/he died'

The 'matricial' or 'scenic' reading of *sang* also appears in Temporal constructions of the past, as in:

(79) Sang hwébes nga ádlaw, na-patáy siá
UNFOC Thursday LINK day , NA-die 3SG.FOC
'Last Thursday, s/he died'

(80) Nag-tápos ang géra sang 1945
NAG-end FOC war UNFOC 1945
'The war ended in 1945'

(81) Nag-sulát akò sang hwébes
NAG-write 1SG.FOC UNFOC Thursday
'I wrote last Thursday'

Here, *sang* connects EVENTS to past or realized Temporal contexts. There is no boundary between the EVENT and its TIME.
If a Temporal construction is focussed by ang, however, it
denotes a well bounded period of time rather than a Temporal
occasion or reference point:

(82) (a) Ang 1945 ísa ka hàlandúmun nga túig
       FOC 1945 one QNT memorable LINK year
       '1945 was a memorable year'

(b) *Gin-sulát ko ang hwébes
       GIN-write 1SG.UNFOC FOC Thursday
       ('I wrote on Thursday')

In its marking of unbounded, vaguely appreciated
PARTICIPANTS; its marking of 'Genitive'/'Possessor' and
Temoral matrices; and its non-commitment to ROLE—in short, in
its 'with respect to which' character, sang registers a
DIFFUSENESS which contrasts with the FOCUS marked by ang/si.

The UNFOCUSSED form sing (cf. Figure 2.2) is an alternate
to sang which occurs much more frequently in written than in
spoken DISCOURSE. According to Wolfenden (1971:64), 'sing
marks the phrase as a definite direct object when attributive
to verbs and as an intimate associate when attributive to
nouns'. E.D. rejects such combinations as lúmpya sing manók,
which Wolfenden (1971:65) glosses as 'chicken lumpia' but
which E.D. says suggests a 'Genitive'/'Possessive'
relationship such that the chicken is seen as owning the
lumpia. In E.D.'s dialect, sing seems to suggest somewhat
greater boundedness or 'detachment' than sang. In the
following, sing mga táwo suggests that the people are somewhat
detached from the situation:
(83) \[\text{Naka-kítà sià sing mga táwo} \]
\[\text{NAKA-see 3SG.FOC UNFOC PL person} \]
's/he saw some people'

Given the rareness of its usage, the sketchiness of my data, and its apparent irrelevance to Causatives, I will ignore \text{sìng} in subsequent discussion.

In contrast to \text{sàng}-marked PARTICIPANTS, which do not specify a ROLE, NUCLEAR UNFOCussed HUMAN PARTICIPANTS marked with \text{ni} or named by UNFOCUSsing Pronouns are committed to the MOTILE ROLE. To be relatively NON-TOPOCAL and NUCLEAR (i.e. to be named in the 'O' position), such HUMAN PARTICIPANTS, Proper-Named or Pronominal, must be FOCUSsed:

\[\text{(84) (a) Gin-kágát ko siá} \]
\[\text{GIN-bite 1SG.UNFOC SG.FOC} \]
'I bit him/her'

\[\text{(b) *Nag-kágát akó nía} \]
\[\text{NAG-bite 1SG.FOC 3SG.UNFOC} \]

(85) \[\text{(a) Gin-kágát ni Roberto si Marta} \]
\[\text{GIN-bite UNFOC Roberto FOC Marta} \]
'Roberto hit Marta'

\[\text{(b) *Nag-kágát si Roberto ni Marta} \]
\[\text{NAG-bite FOC Roberto UNFOC Marta} \]

In the rejected (b)-sentences, the UNFOCUSsed Pronoun \text{ko} and the UNFOCUSsed Proper Noun \text{ni Marta} cannot occur in the NUCLEAR INERT ROLE position; such UNFOCUSsed Pronouns and Proper Nouns (e.g. \text{ko} and \text{ni Roberto}) can, however, occur in the MOTILE ROLE position, as in the acceptable (a)-sentences. The inherent TOPICALITY of such UNFOCUSsed forms reflects a cognitive/cultural reluctance of speakers to identify highly individuated, empathy-laden HUMAN PARTICIPANTS with the INERT
and NON-TOPOCAL (i.e. the inanimate and the ill defined).

Speakers prefer to identify themselves, i.e. the HUMAN, with the MOTILE and TOPICAL. Highly individualized UNFOCUSSED HUMAN PARTICULARS can be both UNFOCUSSED and INERT POST-ERUPTIVE only if they are marked as (NON-NUCLEAR) OBLIQUES:

(86)  Nag-kagát akó sa iya
      NAG-bite 1SG.FOC OBL 3SG.UNFOC
      'I bit him/her'

(87)  Nag-kagát si Roberto kay Marta
      NAG-bite FOC Roberto OBL Marta
      'Roberto bit Marta'

The Prepositions impose a well-defined boundary, consistent with individuation, on such PARTICIPANTS, segregating them from the NUCLEUS. If Pronominal PARTICULARS remain NUCLEAR (i.e. marked with sang), the UNFOCUSSED/UNFOCUSSING Pronouns cannot name PARTICIPANTS but are understood as 'Partitive'/Genitive' adjuncts to elided PARTICIPANTS:

(88)  Nag-kagát akó sang iya
      NAG-bite 1SG.FOC UNFOC 3SG.OBL
      'I bit his/her'

Like the UNFOCUSSED Proper Nouns (with ni), the UNFOCUSSED Pronouns may participate in 'source' relations. In so doing, the RHEME-marking, pre-positional forms occur pre-Nominally, while the POST-RHEME forms occur post-Nominally, as in the following:

(89)  (a) inyo lakát
      2PL.UNFOC walk
      'your walk'

        (b) lakát ninyo
            walk 2PL.UNFOC
            'your walk'
(90)  
(a) íya síya  
3SG.UNFOC chair  
'his/her chair'

(b) síya níà  
chair 3SG.UNFOC  
'his/her chair'

The RHEME-marking, pre-Nominal options exemplified in the (a)-Phrases are more assertive, emphatic, or contrastive---i.e. more DISCONTINUOUS---than the post-RHEME, post-PARTICIPANT options in the (b)-Phrases. Speakers use the former to clarify or to stake claims, as in:

(91)  
(a) Iní íya síya, indí ímo  
this.FOC 3SG.UNFOC chair, not 2SG.UNFOC  
'This is his/her chair, not yours'

(b) Iní nga síya íya, indí ímo  
this.FOC LINK chair 3SG.UNFOC not 2SG.UNFOC  
'This chair is his/hers, not yours'

(c) *Iní síya níà (*indí ímo)  
this.FOC chair 3SG.UNFOC (not 2SG.UNFOC)  
('This is a chair of his/hers, not yours?')

(d) *Iní nga síya níà, indí ímo  
this.FOC LINK chair 3SG.UNFOC, not 2SG.UNFOC  
('This chair of his/hers, not yours?')

Note that the Demonstrative Pronouns require the Ligature nga in (91b) and (91d) to form Compound Names such as iní nga síya 'this chair' (cf. pulá nga síya 'red chair'). Without nga, iní is a Demonstrative indicator, but not part of a Name. Another emphatic use of the UNFOCUSSED Pronouns is observed in TOPIC shifts, as in:

(92)  
Iní íya sía, gin-hímó sa Germany  
this.FOC 3SG.UNFOC 3SG.FOC GIN-make OBL Germany  
'As for this one, it was made in Germany'

Only the RHEME forms íya and ímo can be used assertively, not
the CONTINUOUS nia form.8

If the Determiner sang suggests 'connection' (i.e. of PARTICIPANT-to-EVENT, PARTICIPANT-to-PARTICIPANT, or PARTICIPANT-to-PARTICIPANT, or BACKGROUND-to-FOREGROUND), sa marks a 'PROJECTION', an 'a-partness', a 'deferral' or an 'approach'. Compare the following:

(93) (a) Nag-langóy akò sa subâ
    NAG-swim 1SG.FOC OBL river
    'I swam in the river'

(b) Nag-langóy akò sang subâ
    NAG-swim 1SG.FOC UNFOC river
    'I swam the/a river'

Sentence (93a) suggests an uneventful or non-adversative swim, with sa suggesting minimal involvement or interference with my progress on the river, which was merely the locus of my activity. Sentence (93b) suggests that the river might have been exceptionally wide or swift, or that I may have emerged from the river on the bank opposite from the bank I entered. In any case, the action required greater engagement or effort on my part. Thus, sang indicates a direct engagement ('being a part'), while sa suggests dissociation ('being apart'). Such OBLIQUENESS is consistent with LOCATION interpretations.

---

8 The First and Second Person Singular has two UNFOCUSSED post-Nominal variants, so that a three-way contrast is possible, as in:

(A) (a) ákon tiíl  (B) (a) ímo tiíl
    (b) tiíl nákón  (b) tiíl númo
    (c) tiíl ko    (c) tiíl mo
    'my foot'       'your foot'

The forms nákón and númo are never PARTICIPANTS in EVENTS, only 'Genitives', and are more assertive or RHEME-like than their monosyllabic counterparts.
The PROJECTIVE semantics of *sa* is most obvious in such diverse meanings as 'direction', 'location', 'reception', and 'benefaction', all of which are understandable as PROJECTIONS of a given activity or occurrence:

(94)  
Nag-ági sià  sa kwárto  
NAG-pass 3SG.FOC OBL room  
'S/he passed through the room'  

(95)  
Nag-pàng-lakát-on sià  sa kaúmhan  
NAG-PANG-walk- ON 3SG.FOC OBL field  
'S/he walked through the field'  

(96)  
Gin-habóy ko  ang bató lusót  sa bintána  
GIN-throw 1SG.UNFOC FOC stone through OBL window  
'I threw the stone through the window'  

(97)  
Sa walá ang ákon líbro  
OBL left FOC my book  
'My book is to/on the left'  

(98)  
Gin-butáng ko  ang tinápay sa ibábaw  
GIN-put 1SG.UNFOC FOC bread OBL top  
'I put the bread on top'  

(99)  
May pilás sa íya  máta  
have wound OBL 3SG.UNFOC eye  
'There is a wound in his/her eye'  

(100)  
Ma-buhó akò  sa dutá  
MA-dig 1SG.FOC OBL ground  
'I'll dig a hole in the ground'  

(101)  
Gin-hátag ko  ang líbro sa estudyánte  
GIN-give 1SG.UNFOC FOC book OBL student  
'I gave the book to the student'  

Although *sa* does not indicate part-whole relations in the manner of *sang*, the two forms may correlativey specify particular locations, as in:

(102)  
*sa* sidlangán *sang* Houston  
OBL east  UNFOC Houston  
'to the east of Houston'
(103) sa higád sang síya
OBL side UNFOC chair
'beside the chair'

(104) sa ibábaw sang lamésa
OBL top UNFOC table
'on top of the table'

(105) sa sulúd sang kwárto
OBL inside UNFOC room
'within the room'

Here, the east, the side, the top, and the inside are parts or extensions of Houston, the chair, the table, and the room respectively; these parts are PROJECTED from these 'originaries' or 'sources' by sa.

Both sa and sang can mark INERT elements (which need not be PARTICIPANTS per se), with the latter implying a NUCLEAR 'conjunction' and the former a PROJECTIVE 'disjunction' between two elements:

(106) (a) Nag-támbok si Teddy sa inúm
NAG-fat FOC Teddy OBL drink
'Teddy got fat from drinking (!)'

(b) Nag-támbok si Teddy sang inúm
NAG-fat FOC Teddy UNFOC drink
'Teddy got fat by (his known habit of) drinking'

(107) (a) Na- mátî akò sa kánta
NANG-hear 1SG.FOC OBL sing/song
'I listened to the singing'

(b) Na- mátî akò sang kánta
NANG-hear 1SG.FOC UNFOC sing/song
'I listened to a song'

Both (106)-sentences allow that the MOTILE PARTICIPANT got fat by drinking. However, (106a), with sa, implies no prior connection between Teddy and the drinking habit; he may merely be an illustration of the general assumption that drinking
fattens. Sentence (106b), with sang, implies that drinking is a recognized trait, 'a part of him' (in the words of E.D.). The sentences of (107) may seem to invoke a contrast of 'product' and 'process'. This is a secondary effect. In (107a), sa emphasizes that the identity of the song as such is alien to me; I am unfamiliar with it. Sentence (107b) suggests that it is familiar to me, a part of my experience. Thus, sang but not sa may precede the title, as in:

(108) Na- máti akò {sang / 'sa} 'My Way' NANG-hear 1SG.FOC {UNFOC/ OBL} 'My Way' 'I listened to "My Way"'

The secondary or derivative opposition of 'product' and 'process' also appears in the following, with a different alignment. In each of the following sets as well, sang implies that walking is a habit of the person in question, while sa disallows such prior connection:

(109) (a) Kapúy-on ang maéstra sa lakát tired-ON FOC teacher OBL walk 'The teacher will get tired from walking/the journey'

(b) Kapúy-on ang maéstra sang lakát tired-ON FOC teacher UNFOC walk 'The teacher will get / is getting tired walking'

(110) (a) Gin-kápoy sià sa lakát GIN-tire 3SG.FOC OBL walk 'S/he got tired from the walk'

(b) Gin-kápoy sià sang lakát GIN-tire 3SG.FOC UNFOC walk 'S/he got tired walking'

In addition to or in the stead of the habitual/non-habitual contrast, sa and sang may imply ASPECTUAL contrasts. Sentence (109a) suggests a speculative guess or 'prophecy' (E.D.'s
term) that the teacher will get tired; the walk is prospective, regarded as a pre-planned whole held at a distance. Sentence (109b) suggests that she is tiring now, 'as we speak'. Sentence (110a) suggests that she got tired from the journey, which is again considered as a self-contained course of a certain length or duration; a shorter walk might not have occasioned the hunger. Sentence (110b) implies that the activity of walking itself posed a problem; e.g. walking always makes her hungry.

Incidentally, sa-marked, OBLIQUE elements may be TOPICAL, i.e. may be named in the 'S'-position, as may sang-marked elements. Note the following:

(111) (a) Kapúy-on sa lakát ang maéstra tire-ON OBL walk FOC teacher 'The walk/journey will wear the teacher down'

(b) Kapúy-on sang lakát ang maéstra tire- ON UNFOC walk FOC teacher 'The (process of) walking will wear / is wearing the teacher down'

In both sentences of (111), the walking is seen as being more CONTINUOUSLY TOPICAL than the teacher. In (111a), sa imposes a conceptual boundary or particularity independent of VOICE. Thus, sa lakát suggests a 'journey by foot' whose delineation is independent of the teacher's participation, while sang lakát suggests its emergence via the teacher's participation.

Like sang, sa participates in Temporal constructions. These, too, suggest an independence of the sa-marked elements from experience or history. The PROJECTIVE sa suggest a future/unrealized time frame beyond experience, in contrast to
sang, which suggests a past/realized time frame:

(112) (a) sa disyębre
OBL December
'next (i.e. the coming) December'

(b) sang disyębre
UNFOC December
'last December'

(113) (a) sa hwébes
OBL Thursday
'next Thursday'

(b) sang hwébes
UNFOC Thursday
'last Thursday'

(114) (a) sa (túig) 2050
OBL (year) 2050
'in (the year) 2050'

(b) sang (túig) 1959
UNFOC (year) 1959
'in (the year) 1959'

Reversal of these alliances is not possible; the following Temporal Phrases are, from the 'current' perspective of 1997, semantically dissonant:

(115) (a) *sa 1959
OBL 1959

(b) *sang 2050
UNFOC 2050

With sang, Hiligaynon presents 'the past' as 'being present'. The past is a part of the present which cannot be undone. With sa, 'future' is conflated with PROJECTION, here understandable as a 'deferral' or an 'approach', the realm of projects. (Note that these alliances in the Hiligaynon Nominal morphology contrast with those in English Tense, which sets Past against Non-Past/Present/Future.) The contrast between
sang and sa evokes something like the Kantian distinction between the (knowable, present) phenomena and the (thinkable but unknowable, nonpresent) noumena.

Like sang, which may attach (Clausal) background information to a Main Clause, sa may link an EVENT-like PARTICULAR to the NUCLEUS. Such EVENTS are constituted as Dependent Phrases, which may lack specification of ASPECT and/or PARTICIPANTS. As expected, sang registers a greater integration between the two EVENTS than does sa. Note the following:

(116) (a) Ma-lípay gid ang propesor sa gin-hímô mo
MA-happy very FOC professor OBL GIN-do 2SG.UNFOC
'The professor will be happy that you did it'

(b) Ma-lípay gid ang propesor sang gin-hímô mo
MA-happy very FOC professor UNFOC GIN-do 2SG.UNFOC
'The professor will be happy with what you've done'

In (116a), sa implies that 'what you did' is something unprepared-for by the professor, something previously unconnected with him or her, perhaps a surprise; (116b), with sang, suggests that 'what you've done' is something the professor was known to be prepared for or hopeful of (e.g. a particular student's successful completion of a dissertation); a prior connection exists.

As with LOCATIVE constructions, sa is rather non-specific regarding the precise nature of the relationship, which may suggest goals, purposes, or reasons (all PROJECTIONS), as in the following:
In introducing processes, sa clearly betrays its orientation toward dynamism (as opposed to stasis) -- i.e. MOTILITY -- which is implicit in PROJECTION. Dynamism is implicit in 'static' Locative constructions such as sa sidlangán sang Houston, which implies 'movement in an easterly direction (or toward the East) within Houston'; perhaps it is even more obvious in the Temporal constructions which imply 'becoming actual'.

Note that sa consistently marks Phrases as opposed to Clauses. Although PROJECTION need not imply that the PROJECTED element precedes the PROJECTING element in sequence of
realization (e.g. in [121] above I finished my work before I became happy), the PROJECTED element may be understood as a telos for the PROJECTING/NUCLEAR element (including such EVENTS as 'being happy').

The dependence of the PROJECTED elements has obvious morphosyntactic manifestations. The sa-marked EVENTS consistently lack certain elements (either PARTICIPANTS or ASPECTUAL specifications) that would identify them as fully fledged Clauses:

(123) (a) *Gin-hímô mo...
  GIN-do  2SG.UNFOC
  [incomplete]

(b) Gin-hímô mo na balá ang ímo homework
  GIN-do  2SG.UNFOC now BALA FOC 2SG.UNFOC homework
  'Did you already do your homework?'

(124) pag-inúm sang serbésa³
  PAG-drink UNFOC beer
  'the drinking of beer'

(125) na-tápos ko nga hílimóon
  NA-finish 1SG.UNFOC LINK work
  'the work that I finished'

(126) pag-lútô sang ísdâ
  PAG-cook UNFOC fish
  'cooking a fish'

With highly 'binding' Main Verbs (in the sense of Givón 1980; cf. 1.1), e.g. pilirt 'force', Complement Clauses may 'borrow' Realis ASPECT (instantiation, actualization) from the

³While both of my consultants insist on the Nonfinite status of -pag-marked Verbs (implying no selection of any PARTICIPANT by VOICE), Ruiz (1968:10-11) characterizes pag- as marking 'Objective' or 'Instrumental Focus' in 'Basic Aspect' (as opposed to the Completed or Prospective). Yogad -pag-, however, does have a MIDDLE VOICE semantics (cf. Chapter 6).
Main Clause without explicitly marking it. The Complementary Verb may be marked with the 'Gerund'-like pag-, the 'Infinitival' mag-, or the likewise Irrealis -on. In the following analytic Causative, sa projects the Realis ASPECT of the Main Clause to the Complement, which is marked by the 'Gerund'-like pag- or the 'Infinitival' mag-:

(127) Gin-pílit ni Roberto ang estudyánte sa
GIN-force UNFOC Roberto FOC student OBL
pag-plántsang mga báyô
PAG-iron UNFOC PL dress
'Roberto forced the student to iron the clothes'

(128) Gin-pílit ni Roberto ang estudyánte nga
GIN-force UNFOC Roberto FOC student LINK
mag-plántsang mga báyô
MAG-iron UNFOC PL dress
'Roberto forced the student to iron the clothes'

(129) Gin-pílit ni Roberto nga plántsahón sang
GIN-force UNFOC Roberto LINK iron- ON UNFOC
estudyánte ang mga báyô
student FOC PL dress
'student saw to it that a/the student ironed the clothes'

Respecting (127)-(129), it may be assumed that the ironing has been accomplished, though the Complementary Verb is marked as Irrealis, as discussed in 2.1.4.10 The PROJECTIVE semantics of sa here again implies dynamism (MOTILITY), seen already in the sense of 'moving toward' and now in the 'Gerund'-like pag-Phrase. Sentence (127) might be more literally, if more

10The Main Verbs may show incept-oriented MOTILE VOICE (neg-; cf. 2.1.4) as well as coda-oriented INERT VOICE (gin-), e.g. Nag-pílit si Roberto sa estudyánte sa pag-plántsang mga báyô 'Roberto forced the student to iron the clothes', Nag-pílit si Roberto sa estudyánte nga mag-plántsang mga báyô 'Roberto forced the student to iron the clothes'. 
crudely, paraphrased as 'Roberto forced the student with respect to the ironing of the dress'; the process of ironing is 'the main point' (in E.D.'s terminology). Process assumes priority over any PARTICIPANTS. The Ligature nga, which binds 'Adjectives' to Nominals (e.g. pulá nga baláy 'red house'), is less dynamic insofar as it highlights the termini, the incepts or codas, of processes, rather than the Gestalts of processes as wholes. In (128), mag- highlights the incept of the process (the 'AGENT'), the act of initiating; in (129), -on highlights the coda (the 'PATIENT'), the act of finishing (cf. 2.1.4).

The Ligature nga effects a weaker linkage than sa, which implies a dependency of the PROJECTED on the NUCLEUS. The Clause linked by nga must be more fully specified for VOICE/ASPECT than the sa-Phrase. An indication of this is the fact that, with a Main Verb low in binding, e.g. hibaló 'know (that)', nga may link a Verbal Complement which explicitly marks Realis ASPECT, highlighting the initiation (e.g. via nag-; cf. 2.1.4); the Complement Clause may thus have a grammatically independent status. Alternately, if the coda/'PATIENT' is highlighted, nga introduces a Clause with Irrealis ASPECT. However, the binding of such Main Verbs is too weak to permit a Complement which is PROJECTED by sa (with its attendant underspecifications):

(130)    Gin-hibaló ni    Roberto nga    ang estudyántê
         GIN-know    UNFOC Roberto LINK FOC student
         nag-plántsa sang nga báyô
         NAG-iron    UNFOC PL dress
'Roberto knew that the student ironed the clothes'
(131) Gin-hibaló ni Roberto nga plántsa-hón
GIN-know UNFOC Roberto LINK iron- ON
sang estudyánte ang mga báyô
UNFOC student FOC PL dress
"Roberto knew that a student ironed the clothes"

(132) *Gin-hibaló ni Roberto ang estudyánte sa
GIN-know UNFOC Roberto FOC student OBL
pag-plántsa sang mga báyô
PAG-iron UNFOC PL dress

While 'forcing' precedes the 'ironing' in (127)-(129), the
'ironing' precedes the 'knowing that' in (130)-(132). The
Complementary Verb pag-plántsa is too underspecified to
complement the Perfective, outcome-oriented ginhibaló 'knew
that', which names a kind of internalization which cannot
serve be PROJECTED.

Like the Determiners, the Prepositions sa and kay
contrast low-empathy, less individuated PARTICULARS (e.g.
Common Nouns) with those invested with a high (i.e. HUMAN)
degree of empathy or individuation (e.g. Proper Nouns). If sa
suggests the PROJECTION of a particularized PARTICIPANT or
EVENT from a NUCLEUS, kay suggests the speaker's INJECTION of
individuation to another PARTICULAR, either PARTICIPANT or
EVENT. Both forms often confer a 'Dative' flavor which may be
interpreted as 'RECIPIENT', 'GOAL', 'BENEFECTEE', and the
like:

(133) (a) Nag-kádto akò sa bátâ
NAG-go 1SG.FOC OBL child
'I went to the child'

(b) Nag-kádto akò kay Maria
NAG-go 1SG.FOC OBL Maria
'I went to Maria'
(134) (a) Nag-lakát akò pakádto sa walá
NAG-walk 1SG.FOC towards OBL left
'I walked towards the left'

(b) Nag-lakát akò pakádto kay Maria
NAG-walk 1SG.FOC towards OBL Maria
'I walked towards Maria'

(135) (a) Gin-hátag ko ang líbro sa estudyánte
GIN-give 1SG.UNFOC FOC book OBL student
'I gave the book to the student'

(b) Gin-hátag ko ang líbro kay Maria
GIN-give 1SG.UNFOC FOC book OBL Maria
'I gave the book to Maria'

(136) (a) Nag-sulát akò sa bátâ
NAG-write 1SG.FOC OBL child
'I wrote to the child'

(b) Nag-sulát akò kay Roberto
NAG-write 1SG.FOC OBL Roberto
'I wrote to Roberto'

(137) (a) Nag-kádlaw akò sa maéstro
NAG-laugh 1SG.FOC OBL teacher
'I laughed at the child'

(b) Nag-kádlaw akò kay Roberto
NAG-laugh 1SG.FOC OBL Roberto
'I laughed at Roberto'

(138) (a) Ang antipára para sa máta
FOC glasses BEN OBL eye
'The eyeglasses are for the eyes'

(b) Ang antipára para kay Roberto
FOC glasses BEN OBL Roberto
'The glasses are for Roberto'

As a mark of the 'Proper', kay (like si and ni) suggests a high degree of individuation or empathy indexing the speakers' identification with the PARTICULAR in question. Such identification presents an identity as being in operation prior to the speaking (a situation which recalls the 'proprietary' relation between name and referent defended by
Plato's Cratylus in the dialogue of the same name). Note the following:

(139) (a) Nag-hátag akò sa nánay
       NAG-give 1SG.FOC OBL mother
       'I gave (it) to a mother'

       (b) Nag-hátag akò kày Nánay
       NAG-give 1SG.FOC OBL Mother
       'I gave (it) to Mother'

(140) (a) Mas ma-áyo ang Toyota sang sa Honda
       more MA-good FOC Toyota UNFOC OBL Honda
       'Toyota is better than Honda'

       (b) Mas ma-áyo ang Toyota sang kày sa Honda
       more MA-good FOC Toyota UNFOC OBL OBL Honda
       'Toyota is better than Mr. Honda'

(141) (a) Mas dakô ang Houston sang sa Beaumont
       more big FOC Houston UNFOC OBL Beaumont
       'Houston is bigger than Beaumont'

       (b) Mas dakô ang Houston sang kày sa Beaumont
       more big FOC Houston UNFOC OBL OBL Beaumont
       'Houston is bigger than Beaumont'

In (139a), sa names no mother in particular; any mother will do. Sentence (139b), with kay, applies only to the speaker's mother, the mother with whom he or she identifies as a mother. Sentence (140a), with sang sa, compares the Toyota brand with the Honda, while (140b), with sang kay, compares the Toyota car or company with Mr. Honda, whose humanity is acknowledged by kay; perhaps the interlocutors are deciding where to spend their afternoon. Finally, though the (141)-sentences have the same English gloss they differ with how Beaumont is presented. In contrast to (141a), sentence (141b) suggests a familiarity with Beaumont, which seems to have a 'face' or 'personality' (cf. the English Phrase good old Beaumont).
It has been noted that 'in many languages part of the morphology used for encoding nominal case expressions also serves to encode subordinate clauses' (Heine 1990:146). Hiligaynon is one of these languages. The PROJECTIVE/INJECTIVE contrast of sa and kay extends to the marking of EVENTS so that kay invests EVENTS with a fuller identity. Whereas sa always introduces Phrases dependent on the NUCLEUS, kay marks complete Clauses denoting prior relationships, preconditions, or reasons, being translatable as 'for' or 'because', so that pretexts are injected into given PROPOSITIONS. Compare the following:

(142) (a) Ma-lipáy-on akó sa na-tápos ko
MA-happy-ON 1SG.FOC OBL NA-finish 1SG.UNFOC
 nga hilimóon
LINK work
'I'm happy with the work that I've finished'

(b) Ma-lipáy-on akó kay na-tápos ko na
MA-happy-ON 1SG.FOC OBL NA-end 1SG.UNFOC already
ang ákon hilimóon
FOC 1SG.UNFOC work
'I'm happy because I've already finished my work'

Here, my finishing my work are seen as occasions for the EVENTS expressed in the Main Clauses (i.e. my being happy). Other instances of kay as a Conjunction include the following:

(143) Gin-súmbag nía akó kay gin-kàdlaw-án
GIN-punch 3SG.UNFOC 1SG.FOC OBL GIN-laugh- AN
ko siá
1SG.UNFOC 3SG.FOC
'S/he punched me because I laughed at him/her'

(144) Ma-lípay akó kay ma-áyo siá nga nurse
MA-happy 1SG.FOC OBL MA-good 3SG.FOC LINK nurse
'I'm happy because s/he's a good nurse'
(145) Nag-kádto akò sang dóktor kay na-inpëkṣyón
NAG-go 1SG.FOC UNFOC doctor OBL MA-infect
ang pilás
FOC wound
'I went to the doctor because the wound was infected'

(146) Gin-hátak ko ang líbro sa babáye kay siá
GIN-give 1SG.UNFOC FOC book OBL woman OBL 3SG.FOC
ma lang ang walà maka-bása
MA LANG FOC not MAKA-read
'I gave the book to the woman because she alone hadn't read it'

The strings following kay in (143)-(146) can stand as full, Independent Clauses; kay in its Conjunctive aspect subordinates these to the preceding Main Clauses.

The alignment of kay with fully fledged Clauses, which have an independent morphosyntactic identity (i.e. full development of VOICE/ASPECT and PARTICIPANT relations) and sa with Phrases, which are Dependent on the Main Clause for certain features, is consistent with the Proper/Common-Noun distinction observed earlier. Like Proper Nouns, reason Clauses instantiate entities (i.e. EVENTS) with independently developed identities which have a prior history for the speaker. The 'reason' or 'precondition' semantics of kay, like its 'Proper' semantics, recognizes a BACKGROUNDED EVENT (marked with kay) presented as being in force prior to the FOREGROUNDED one. The former EVENT serves as a precondition for the latter one so that 'each aspect is assimilated within a single whole' (Bohm 1980/1983:12). Just as a Proper Noun indexes a being that is woven into the experience of the speaker (i.e. the speaker's background), the 'Conjunctive' kay
injects a Subordinate-Clause PARTICULAR EVENT into the BACKGROUND of the Main-Clause EVENT. This high identification contrasts with the less developed, more context-dependent identity of the Common Nouns and Phrases marked by *sa*. Thus, both *sa* and *kay* frame either PARTICIPANTS or EVENTS, 'things' or 'processes', and it would be an arbitrary move to characterize them as being basically Prepositions or Conjunctions. The 'Conjunctive' and 'Prepositional' uses of the two forms consistently contrast in terms of the degree of individuation they construct, while remaining indifferent to a cut-and-dried Noun (PARTICIPANT) / Verb (EVENT) opposition.

The forms *sáñday*, *náñday*, and *kániday* (cf. Figure 2.2) mark COMITATIVE associates of the PARTICIPANT named by the Proper Noun in question, as in:

(a) *sáñday* Juan  
FOC Juan  
'Juan and his companions'

(b) *náñday* Juan  
UNFOC Juan  
'(of) Juan and his companions'

(c) *kániday* Juan  
OBL Juan  
'(to/for/etc.) Juan and his companions'

With the forms *si/sáñday*, *ni/náñday*, *kay/kániday* and the

---

11The 'Proper' ("L proprius 'own') implicates ownership, or the legal priority of the owner over the property; the possessed is an extension of the owner, who thus becomes a 'source'. Likewise, 'reasons' (as preconditions) are linked to the 'Proper' via the 'source' concept. Recall St. Thomas' argument that for God, the primal source, 'a reason can be assigned for His volition, but not a cause' (cf. Russell 1945:457).
Pronouns, Hiligaynon speakers imbue certain PARTICULARS with a high degree of empathy or personality. The highly individualized or personified nature of these PARTICIPANTS suggests Buber-esque 'I-Thou' relationships with the potential for reciprocity; other PARTICULARS, marked with ang, sang, and sa, suggest 'I-It' relationships (cf. Buber 1970). Thus, Hiligaynon Nominal morphology, like that of other Philippine languages including Yogad (cf. 4.1.2), constructs a 'human/nature' distinction which reflects cultural perceptions of differing degrees the identification of humans with their environment. (Cf. Baker [1994] for a detailed discussion of comparable relations in Ilokano and Yogad.)

2.1.3 On Transitivity, Trajectory, and Involvement

'Transitivity' in the grammatical sense is absent from Hiligaynon. The morphosyntax fails to distinguish between EVENTS which have an affected INERT PARTICIPANT and those with a Temporal construction, as in:

(148) (a) Nag-langóy akò sang subâ
NAG-swim 1SG.FOC UNFOC river
'I swam a river'

(b) Nag-langóy akò sang hwébes
NAG-swim 1SG.FOC UNFOC Thursday
'I swam last Thursday'

(149) (a) Nag-sulát akò sang sulát
NAG-write 1SG.FOC UNFOC letter
'I wrote a letter'

(b) Nag-sulát akò sang hwébes
NAG-write 1SG.FOC UNFOC Thursday
'I wrote last Thursday'

The Temporal construction sang hwébes 'last Thursday' in the
(b)-sentences parallels the PARTICIPANT constructions sang subâ 'a river' and sang sulát 'a letter' in the (a)-sentences. The sentences are grammatically identical, with no Transitive/Intransitive contrast in the morphosyntax—as is also the case in English.

Excepting the existentials may 'have/exist', indî 'not.do', and walâ 'not', there are no strictly 'Intransitive' roots. An appropriate VOICE affix can increase the Valency of any root. Note the following:

(150) (a) Nag-lakát akô {sa / *sang} dâl'an
   NAG-walk 1SG.FOC {OBL / UNFOC} path
   'I walked on the path'

   (b) Gin-lâkt-an ko ang dâl'an
   GIN-walk-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC path
   'I walked the road'

(151) (a) Nag-túlog akô sang hwébes
   NAG-sleep 1SG.FOC UNFOC Thursday
   'I slept last Thursday'

   (b) Gin-túlog ko ang sakít sang ákon úlo
   GIN-sleep 1SG.UNFOC FOC pain UNFOC 1SG.UNFOC head
   'I slept my headache away'

Though (150a) seems to mark lakát 'walk' as 'Intransitive', (150b) illustrates that this root can involve both MOTILE and INERT PARTICIPANTS. Similarly, túlog 'sleep' can take an INERT PARTICIPANT if it can be understood metaphorically. Even the OBLIQUENESS of the INERT PARTICIPANT is not definitive:

(152) (a) Nag-hakós akô sang propesór
   NAG-hug 1SG.FOC UNFOC professor
   'I hugged a professor'

   (b) Nag-hakós akô sa propesór
   NAG-hug 1SG.FOC OBL professor
   'I hugged the professor'
(c) Nag-hakós akò sa íya
NAG-hug 1SG.FOC OBL 3SG.UNFOC
'I hugged him/her'

The sentences of (152) portray the professor as the INERT PARTICIPANT, albeit first as UNFOCUSED and NUCLEAR in (152a) and then as PROJECTED/OBLIQUE in the subsequent instances.

The morphosyntax does not, then, dictate a Transitive/Intransitive binarism. Transitivity is not a dimension to which the language is markedly sensitive. Transitivity relationships reflect the lexical content rather than morphosyntax. Instead of 'Transitivity', as the action of one PARTICIPANT upon another, one might more accurately speak of 'Involvement', or the relationship of PARTICIPANTS to their EVENTS (cf. Payne 1982, Hardy 1988, Paskay 1990). While Hopper & Thompson's (1980) 'Transitivity' distributes features among the EVENT and the PARTICIPANTS,\(^\text{12}\) 'Involvement' prioritizes neither EVENT nor PARTICIPANTS but globally implicates both EVENTS and PARTICIPANTS, permitting any of these factors to receive credit or blame for the heightening or lessening of intensity.

Transitivity is not so much 'absent' as 'irrelevant' to Hiligaynon grammar. The number of PARTICIPANTS involved varies with the EVENT named by the lexical root. Some roots are more typically CENTRIPETAL, involving only one PARTICIPANT and

\(^{12}\text{Specifically, Hopper & Thompson (1980) divide features of Transitivity among EVENTS (valency, kinesis, aspect, punctuality, affirmation, and mode), AGENTS (volition and potency), and PATIENTS (affectedness and individuation).}
having the action confined to the locus of origin, while others are more typically CENTRIFUGAL, extending the action beyond the point of origin to involve more than one PARTICIPANT. Such roots may be said to exhibit a 'trajectory' from the point of origin outward.

A CENTRIPETAL root will not take a second PARTICIPANT with nag-; this is the primary test for CENTRIPETALITY. In most cases, a CENTRIPETAL root will not accept gin- (in the absence of other VOICES), which suggests an INERT recipient of an action; this co-occurrence restriction may be considered as a secondary heuristic for classifying roots. The root dakô 'big' is typically CENTRIPETAL:

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{Nag-dakô akô}
\begin{verbatim}
NAG-big 1SG.FOC
'I grew big'
\end{verbatim}
\item *\textbf{Nag-dakô akô sang tanôm}
\begin{verbatim}
NAG-big 1SG.FOC UNFOC plant
\end{verbatim}
\item *\textbf{Gin-dakô ko ang tanôm}
\begin{verbatim}
GIN-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC plant
\end{verbatim}
\end{enumerate}

With -an, though, dakô may accept a second PARTICIPANT:

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{Dakô-án ko siá}
\begin{verbatim}
big- AN 1SG.UNFOC 3SG.FOC
'I'll grow bigger than him/her'
\end{verbatim}
\end{enumerate}

Typical CENTRIFUGAL roots are hakôs 'hug' and patâv 'die/kill':

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{Nag-hakôs akô}
\begin{verbatim}
NAG-hug 1SG.FOC
'I hugged someone/something
\end{verbatim}
\item \textbf{Nag-hakôs akô sang propesor}
\begin{verbatim}
NAG-hug 1SG.FOC UNFOC professor
'I hugged a professor'
\end{verbatim}
\end{enumerate}
(c) Gin-hákós ko ang propesór
GIN-hug 1SG.UNFOC FOC professor
'I hugged the professor'

(156) (a) Nág-patáy sià sang hwébes
NAG-die/kill 3SG.FOC UNFOC Thursday
'S/he killed someone/something last Thursday'

(b) Nág-patáy sià sang lamók
NAG-die 3SG.FOC UNFOC mosquito
'S/he killed a mosquito'

(c) Gin-patáy ko ang lamók
GIN-die 1SG.UNFOC FOC mosquito
'I killed the mosquito'

Note that patáy can also mean 'die' when it occurs with na-:

(157) Na-patáy siá
NA-die 3SG.FOC
'S/he died'

The VOICE value of this root suggests that death is constructed as an imposition from without. Some roots, such as lígid 'roll', permit both CENTRIPETAL and CENTRIFUGAL readings with the given VOICE morphology. Lacking context to the contrary, this seems CENTRIPETAL, but it is CENTRIFUGAL. Note the following:

(158) (a) Nág-lígid akó
NAG-roll 1SG.FOC
'I rolled over'

(b) Nág-lígid akó sang bóla
NAG-roll 1SG.FOC UNFOC ball
'I rolled a ball'

(c) Gin-lígid ko ang bóla
GIN-roll 1SG.UNFOC FOC ball
'I rolled the ball'

As we will presently see, the flight from the center can also be enabled by the Causative morpheme -pa-.
2.1.4 The Construction of Hiligaynon EVENTS: The Verbal VOICE/ASPECT Morphology

Like other Philippine languages, Hiligaynon is notable for its rich Verbal morphology, much of which is related to VOICE and ASPECT. The VOICE affixes select either the most MOTILE ROLE or an INERT one. The Verbal VOICE/ASPECT affixes most often encountered in this study are listed in Figure 2.4.

The MOTILE VOICES highlight the emergence of the EVENT in question. As such, they select the PARTICIPANT which is the source but not the receiver of the energy or process in question. The INERT VOICES select PARTICIPANTS which come into play after the initiation of the EVENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTILE</th>
<th>Realis</th>
<th>Irrealis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTILE</td>
<td>nag-</td>
<td>nag-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTILE</td>
<td>nang-</td>
<td>mang-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTILE</td>
<td>naka-</td>
<td>maka-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INERT</td>
<td>na-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INERT</td>
<td>gin-</td>
<td>i-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INERT</td>
<td></td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INERT</td>
<td></td>
<td>-on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.4: Hiligaynon VOICE/ASPECT Affixes**

The MOTILE/INERT ROLE contrast, which is coöperatively indicated by both VOICE and FOCUS, evokes the Active/Passive binarism observed in Indo-European languages. I avoid the

13 Other affixes not discussed here include gapang-, ga-, -kig-, -i, -a, and -ay. The affixes pag- and -pang- are discussed in 3.0n. The infix =um=, described by Wolfenden (1971) and Zorc (1977), has been rejected by my consultants as a feature of Tagalog rather than of Hiligaynon.
latter characterization because of some inappropriate associations, e.g. 'agent demotion', which is not relevant to the discussion of MOTILE/INERT--and especially because of the absence of a clear-cut Subject/Object contrast in Hiligaynon and other Philippine languages.

The category of 'Subject' (and, by extension, 'Object'), which is implicated in most discussions of Active and Passive, is even more problematical in Philippine languages than in English, as was well demonstrated by Schachter (1976). As the current discussion should demonstrate, the parameters of TOPIC, FOCUS, and MOTILITY--the ingredients of 'prototypical' Subjects (cf. Keenan 1976)--are easily separable in Hiligaynon. The sensitivity of Hiligaynon morphosyntax to the inherent MOTILITY of PARTICIPANTS--to suitability of a given PARTICIPANT for a given ROLE--has consequences for the semantics of causation, as is seen throughout Chapter 3.

To illustrate the selection of PARTICIPANTS by VOICE, we may begin by comparing the Realis prefixes nag- and gin-, which focus, respectively, the MOTILE and INERT ROLES. The following illustrate the selection by these two affixes of PARTICIPANTS indicated by Common Nouns, Proper Nouns, and Pronouns:

(159) (a) Nag-kagát {ang táwo/ si Roberto / siá }
    NAG-bite    FOC person/FOC Roberto    3SG.UNFOC
    sang    idô
    UNFOC dog
    'The person bit the dog'
(b) Gin-kagát {ang táwo/ si Roberto / siá}  
GIN-bite FOC person/FOC Roberto 3SG.FOC  
sang idô  
UNFOC dog  
'The person was bitten by the dog'  

Note that nag- and gin- indicate 'instantiation' rather than 'completion' or 'past' per se. They may, for example, co-occur with the Imperfective affix -a-, as in:

(160) (a) Nag-a- kagát sià sang idô  
NAG-IMP-bite 3SG.FOC UNFOC dog  
'S/he is biting the dog'  

(b) Gin-a- kagát sià sang idô  
GIN-IMP-bite 3SG.FOC UNFOC dog  
'S/he is being bitten by the dog'  

Both (160a) and (160b) denote EVENTS that have been initiated or instantiated but which are not yet completed. As Wolfenden (1971:118-119) notes, Hiligaynon ASPECT reflects the 'condition of the action' as opposed to '(relative) time' per se. This point should become clearer in the discussion to come.

The VOICE prefix nag- has cognates in numerous Philippine languages, including Tagalog and Yogad, and is often described as signalling 'agent voice' or 'agent focus' ('AF' in most interlinear glosses). This characterization is only incidentally correct. This prefix highlights the INCEPT of EVENTS, the locus at which the EVENT may be said to 'emerge' or 'erupt'. In so doing, it confines MOTILITY to a single well-defined locus consonant with--but not reducible to--an 'AGENTIVE' interpretation.

If agency combines the initiative of an 'Efficient Cause'
with volition and control, then nag- may be said to select 'AGENTS' in the following examples:

(161) Nag-trabáho ang laláki
     NAG-work  FOC man
     'The man worked'

(162) Nag-mànggaránon kamí
     NAG-rich  1PL.FOC
     'We got rich'

(163) Nag-sirá si María sang ganháan
     NAG-close FOC María UNFOC door
     'Maria closed a door'

(164) Nag-pínta siá sang baláy
     NAG-paint 3SG.FOC UNFOC house
     'S/He painted the house'

(165) Nag-dóktor si Roberto
     NAG-doctor FOC Roberto
     'Roberto became a doctor'

(166) Nag-maéstra si María
     NAG-teacher FOC María
     'Maria became a teacher'

In (161)-(166), the EVENTS seem amenable to agency in the terms listed above; all seem to have involved volitional PARTICIPANTS in control of initiating some action. However, such qualities are not specified by the language per se. The notions of 'volition', 'control', 'initiative' and the like are imported from a larger cultural/situational context into the understanding of what any sentence 'says'. Some EVENTS, including many bodily experiences (as opposed to actions), preclude agency in the fullest sense while still allowing nag- to focus the most MOTILE PARTICIPANT:

(167) Nag-busóng siá
     NAG-pregnant 3SG.FOC
     'She got pregnant'
(168) **Nag-támbok ikáw**  
NAG-fat 2SG.FOC  
'You've grown fat'

(169) **Nag-tubô ang bátâ**  
NAG-grow FOC child  
'The child grew'

(170) **Nag-pulá ang iya máta**  
NAG-red FOC 3SG.UNFOC eye  
'His/her eyes got red'

(171) **Nag-masakít akó**  
NAG-sick 1SG.FOC  
'I got sick'

(172) **Nag-súka si Bush sang kán'on**  
NAG-vomit FOC Bush UNFOC rice  
'Bush vomited rice'

(173) **Nag-íhi ang pasyénte sang dugô**  
NAG-pee FOC patient UNFOC blood  
'The patient peed blood'

(174) **Nag-bátâ ang babáye**  
NAG-child FOC woman  
'The woman gave birth'  
'The woman became a child [i.e. acted/looked younger]'

The EVENTS named in (167)-(174) inherently involve a significant degree of happenstance. Though one may, for instance, scheme to get pregnant, such deliberation is not grammatically specified in (167); the essential matter is that the woman released her 'inner child', 'literal' or 'metaphorical', intentionally or not. The MOTILE ROLE orientation of nag- accords with 'AGENT' without specifying it, a fact which was noted by Ruiz (1968:22). It is a matter of guilt by association with the MOTILE EVENT INCEPT.

The MOTILITY derives more consistently from relations within an EVENT than from properties such as 'animacy' or
'control' which are assumed to inhere in given PARTICIPANTS. In some EVENTS the nag-FOCUSED PARTICIPANTS seem more 'PATIENTIVE' than 'AGENTIVE', e.g.:

(175) Nag-bokál ang túbig
     NAG-bubble FOC water
     'The water boiled'

(176) Nag-ínit ang túbig
     NAG-heat FOC water
     'The water heated'

(177) Nag-túnaw ang kalámay
     NAG-melt FOC sugar
     'The sugar dissolved'

The PARTICIPANTS involved in these EVENTS may not normally be regarded as inherently MOTILE (or as candidates for MOTILITY), yet they embody the movement of the EVENT, the boiling, heating, and melting respectively. Their very involvement in these EVENTS renders these PARTICIPANTS MOTILE. These PARTICIPANTS are the embodiments of movement—and certainly not the 'controlling' source per se of such movement. (Indeed, they are PARTICIPANTS only insofar as they participate in EVENTS.) The EVENT, the domain of the Verb, asserts priority over the PARTICIPANT/Noun.

With sentient PARTICIPANTS, nag- does not participate in the construction of EVENTS which inherently involve a low degree of control. Such EVENTS include 'hungering', 'thirsting', 'getting full/satiated', 'becoming sad/happy', 'being born', 'losing', 'seeing', 'dying', and 'knowing'. Neither of my two consultants could imagine a context that would justify the following combinations:
(178) *nag-gútom
     NAG-hungry

(179) *nag-úhaw
     NAG-thirsty

(180) *nag-busóg
     NAG-full

(181) *nag-subô
     NAG-sad

(182) *nag-lípay
     NAG-happy

(183) *nag-táwo
     NAG-person/born

(184) *nag-dúlâ
     NAG-lose

(185) *nag-hibaló
     NAG-know (that)

(186) *nag-kilála
     NAG-know (e.g. someone)

In addition, they also rejected the following sentences:

(187) *Nag-patáy siá
     NAG-die 3SG.FOC

(188) *Nag-kítâ akó
     NAG-see 1SG.FOC

The EVENTS named in (178)-(188) are experiences rather than deeds or actions. The MOTILE PARTICIPANT is not regarded as the source of these EVENTS; the INCEPT seems to lie prior to such involvement. Such EVENTS seem to befall the FOCUSSED PARTICIPANT and to diminish MOTILITY—particularly in the sense of 'control'. (Death comes a'calling. As discussed below, such EVENTS may be constructed with na-. ) The apparent 'control' semantics of nag- reflect its rôle in the containment of MOTILITY, as examples such as (175)-(177)
suggest, in conjunction with the ACCIDENTAL (i.e. kinesic)--as opposed to ESSENTIAL (i.e. static)--semantics of particular EVENTS. Here, as in much of life, control is illusory.

In attempting to understand the interplay of VOICE with EVENT, we should periodically remind ourselves that such so-called 'co-occurrence restrictions' are not a simple matter of mechanically matching (or not matching) particular morphemes to particular lexemes but of recognizing the dynamics of EVENTS as wholes. The roots patáy 'die' and kítâ 'see' seen in (187) and (188) above can co-occur with nag- if the MOTILITY is distributed rather than contained. For instance, the following co-occurrences are acceptable:

(189)  Nag-patáy akò sang lamók
       NAG-die 1SG.FOC UNFOC mosquito
       'I killed a mosquito'

(190)  Nag-kítâ kamí
       NAG-see 1PL.FOC
       'We met each other'

Sentence (189) is acceptable if patáy is interpreted as 'kill' rather than as 'die'; (190) requires that kítâ be read as 'meet' rather than as 'see'. In both instances, a different kind of EVENT is named, an EVENT which requires two PARTICIPANTS, and in which the effect is imposed 'Transitively' on an INERT PARTICIPANT or shared 'Reciprocally'. Thus, the EVENT involves an imposition from a MOTILE PARTICIPANT to another locus.

The attention of nag- to beginnings involves a concomitant devaluation of endings. As was suggested earlier,
Hiligaynon tends to conflate FOCUS, MOTILITY, and TOPICALITY. Since *nag*- confines MOTILITY to a bounded locus, the rejection of (191b) is understandable:

(191) (a) Nag-patáy ang polís sang kriminál  
   NAG-kill FOC police UNFOC criminal  
   'The policeman killed a criminal'

   (b) *Nag-patáy ang hubón sang kriminál  
       NAG-kill FOC crowd UNFOC criminal

In (191a), ang polís 'the policeman' is a FOCUSSED PARTICULAR. In (191b), ang hubón 'the crowd', though grammatically FOCUSSED, inherently lacks a definite boundary and cannot be selected by *nag*- as the more MOTILE PARTICIPANT in this EVENT.

If the INERT PARTICIPANT should rival the MOTILE PARTICIPANT in 'human interest'--i.e. TOPICALITY (again, implicating FOCUS and MOTILITY), *nag*- disallows its NUCLEAR connection with sang and sets it apart with an appropriate preposition, sa for Pronominal and kay for Proper Noun PARTICIPANTS. The result is a Clausal 'Antipassive' configuration, with the MOTILE PARTICIPANT in FOCUS and the INERT one constituted as an OBLIQUE in a Prepositional Phrase.

Note the following:

(192) (a) Nag-hakós ang bátâ sa íya  
   NAG-hug FOC child FOC 3SG.UNFOC  
   'The child hugged him/her'

   (b) *Nag-hakós ang bátâ (sang) íya  
       NAG-hug FOC child UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC

(193) (a) Nag-hakós akò sa íya  
   NAG-hug 1SG.FOC OBL 3SG.FOC  
   'I hugged him/her'

   (b) *Nag-hakós akò (sang) íya  
       NAG-hug 1SG.FOC UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC
(194) (a) **Nag-hakós si Bimbo sa ákon**
NAG-hug FOC Bimbo OBL 1SG.UNFOC
'Bimbo hugged me'

(b) *Nag-hakós si Bimbo (sang) ákon
NAG-hug FOC Bimbo UNFOC 1SG.UNFOC

(195) (a) **Nag-kagát ang kuring kay Roberto**
NAG-bite FOC cat OBL Roberto
'The cat bit Roberto'

(b) *Nag-kagát ang kuring ni Roberto
NAG-bite FOC cat UNFOC Roberto

(196) (a) **Nag-kagát ang babáye kay Roberto**
NAG-bite FOC woman OBL Roberto
'The woman bit Roberto'

(b) *Nag-kagát ang babáye ni Roberto
NAG-bite FOC woman UNFOC Roberto

(197) (a) **Nag-hakós si Roberto kay Juana**
NAG-hug FOC Roberto OBL Juana
'Roberto hugged Juana'

(b) *Nag-hakós si Roberto ni Juana
NAG-hug FOC Roberto UNFOC Juana

Note that the segregation of Pronominal and Proper-Noun PARTICIPANTS from the NUCLEUS is a further instance of the conflation of the OBLIQUE semantics of PROJECTION/INJECTION with dynamism ('MOTILITY') since HUMAN PARTICIPANTS embody the standard of MOTILITY, animacy, and the like.

The Prepositions also conflate the HUMAN with individuation, boundedness, particularity, and the like, as shown with the marking of Common Nouns. With PARTICIPANTS named by Common Nouns, nag- allows a choice: the INERT PARTICIPANT may be marked with sang if it is NON-PARTICULAR or unbounded or Indefinite and with sa if it is PARTICULAR or bounded or Definite. Note the following contrasts:
(198) (a) Nag-dayáw ang táwo sang dyós
     NAG-praise FOC person UNFOC god
     'The people praised a god'

     (b) Nag-dayáw ang táwo sa dyós
     NAG-praise FOC person OBL god
     'The people praised God'

(199) (a) Nag-súmbag si Juan sang díngding
     NAG-punch FOC Juan UNFOC wall
     'Juan punched a wall'

     (b) Nag-súmbag si Juan sa díngding
     NAG-punch FOC Juan OBL wall
     'Juan punched the wall'

(200) (a) Walâ nag-súmbag si Juán sang díngding
     not NAG-punch FOC Juan UNFOC wall
     'Juan didn't punch a wall'

     (b) Walâ nag-súmbag si Juán sa díngding
     not NAG-punch FOC Juan OBL wall
     'Juan didn't punch the wall'

(201) (a) Nag-hámpak akó sang síya
     NAG-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC chair
     'I hit a chair'

     (b) Nag-hámpak akó sa síya
     NAG-hit 1SG.FOC OBL chair
     'I hit the chair'

(202) (a) Nag-hákos si Marta sang ulúnan
     NAG-hug FOC Marta UNFOC pillow
     'Marta hugged a pillow'

     (b) Nag-hákos si Marta sa ulúnan
     NAG-hug FOC Marta OBL pillow
     'Marta hugged the pillow'

(203) (a) Nag-hákos si Humberto sang bátâ
     NAG-hug FOC Humberto UNFOC child
     'Humberto hugged a child'

     (b) Nag-hákos si Humberto sa bátâ
     NAG-hug FOC Humberto OBL child
     'Humberto hugged the child'

The (a)-examples, with the INERT PARTICIPANTS marked with sang, suggest PARTICIPANTS that the speaker considers non-
particular, as is implied by the Indefinite Article in the English glosses; e.g., Humberto hugged any pillow or child. In the (b)-examples, with OBLIQUE PATIENTS marked by sa, Humberto hugged a particular pillow or child, as implied by the use of the Definite Article in the English glosses. Note that, when such PARTICULARITY is otherwise implicit, the INERT PARTICIPANT cannot be marked by with sang:

(204) (a) Nag-hakós si Roberto sa íya ilóy  
      NAG-hug FOC Roberto OBL 3SG.UNFOC mother  
      'Roberto hugged his mother'

(b) *Nag-hakós si Roberto sang íya ilóy  
    NAG-hug FOC Roberto UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC mother  
    ('Roberto hugged a mother of his')?

Whether íya is understood to refer to Roberto or to another known party, its PARTICULARITY must be acknowledged by sa. The (b)-alternate, with sang, was rejected as an affront to common sense since it implies that Roberto has more than one mother.

In addition to conferring such PARTICULARITY, sa suggests a stronger sense of dynamism or movement than does sang in the (a)-sentences, more of a lunge in the hitting and hugging. This movement reflects the semantics of PROJECTION associated with sa, which may suggest a physical trajectory in such instances as the following:

(205) (a) Nag-tíro ang polís sang kriminál  
      NAG-shoot FOC police UNFOC criminal  
      'The policeman shot a criminal'

(b) Nag-tíro ang polís sa kriminál  
    NAG-shoot FOC police OBL criminal  
    'The policeman shot at the criminal'

Sentence (205a) suggests an undirected shooting whose
trajectory is somewhat random; the policeman shot, and the bullet came to rest in a bystander who happened to be a criminal. There is no sense that the criminal was the intended target. Sentence (205b), with sa, implies such an intention, whether or not the criminal was successfully shot. To draw a connection between the PARTICULARITY and PROJECTION (i.e. 'trajectory', 'intention'), we may consider that a trajectory has by definition a particular target. To be meaningful as an indicator of direction, the sa-marked Nominal must name a PARTICIPANT that is bounded or PARTICULAR. The notion of 'boundary' is implicit in that of 'target'.

Telic roots such as patáy 'kill' and gubâ 'destroy', which imply a strongly motivated and successful outcome, seem to preclude treating any INERT PARTICIPANT as OBLIQUE:

(206) (a) **Nag-patáy ang polís sang kriminál**  
NAG-kill FOC police UNFOC criminal  
'The policeman killed a criminal'

(b) *Nag-patáy ang polís sa kriminál  
NAG-kill FOC policeman OBL criminal

(207) (a) **Nag-gubâ akò sang baláy**  
NAG-destroy 1SG.FOC UNFOC house  
'I destroyed a house'

(b) *Nag-gubâ akò sa baláy  
NAG-destroy 1SG.FOC OBL house

The behavior of nag- with respect to INERT PARTICIPANTS suggests an 'animacy hierarchy'. Such hierarchies, whereby PARTICIPANTS which are highly 'AGENTIVE', animate, and Definite outrank in some way those which are less so, are common cross-linguistically. It would be more accurate to call
it an 'empathy hierarchy' whereby speakers identify most strongly with PARTICIPANTS that are highly individuated (and 'agentive' as well according to a common conflation). A similar hierarchy and ranking is implicit in Spanish, the language of the longtime imperialist overseers of the Philippines. Both Estoy buscando una criada and Estoy buscando a una criada may be glossed 'I'm looking for a maid', though each has a distinct meaning. The former sentence might imply that I want my room cleaned; any maid will do. The latter, with una criada peripheralized by the Preposition a, suggests that I am seeking a particular maid, e.g. the one who stole my watch. The more HUMAN the INERT, affected 'PATIENT' is, the more likely it is to be 'distanced' (or 'alienated').

Before proceeding to other affixes, I should acknowledge a dialectical variation in the construction of the 'hierarchy'. My two consultants differ in their treatment of Common Nouns. Note the following:

(208) (a) Nag-kagát ang idô sa kuring
   NAG-bite FOC dog OBL cat
   'The dog bit the cat'

   (b) %Nag-kagát ang idô sang kuring
      NAG-bite FOC dog UNFOC cat
      'The dog bit a cat'

(209) (a) Nag-hámpak ang babáye sa táwo
       NAG-hit FOC woman OBL person
       'The woman hit the man'

   (b) %Nag-hámpak ang babáye sang táwo
      NAG-hit FOC woman UNFOC man
      'The woman hit a man'

The (a)-sentences are acceptable to both consultants. The (b)-
sentences, however, are acceptable to E.D. but not to C.P., whose dialect responds more consistently than E.D's to inherent animacy—with full HUMANNESS being the apex thereof. For C.P., the INERT PARTICIPANT may be NUCLEAR, marked by sang, only if it is inherently less animate than the MOTILE PARTICIPANT selected by nag-, as in:

(210) Nag-kagát ang idô sang bóla
NAG-bite FOC dog UNFOC ball 'The dog bit a ball'

(211) Nag-hámpak ang babáye sang idô
NAG-hit FOC woman UNFOC dog 'The woman hit a dog'

In C.P.'s dialect, dogs and cats are equals in inherent individuation (and animacy/MOTILITY), as are women and men; meanwhile, dogs outrank balls, and women outrank dogs. We may say that the two dialects consistently observe a 'hierarchy' but draw the 'empathy line' in different places. A systematic exploration of dialectal variations exceeds the scope of the current project; however, the acknowledgement of such variation should remind us to be tolerant of differences in grammaticality judgements as well as to recognize the often unspoken consistencies involved. The theme is in the variations. My two consultants are in accord in treating Pronouns and Proper Nouns as OBLIQUES with nag- and with the other MOTILE VOICE affixes, i.e. mag-, nang-, mang-, naka-, and maka-.

While nag- marks realized EVENTS, mag- marks uninitiated ones. For instance, mag- may mark Imperative statements which
attend to the initiation of Irrealis EVENTS, e.g.:

(212) Mag-kalípay kitá
    MAG-happy 1PL.EXC.FOC
    'Let us be joyful'

(213) Mag-may kapáwa
    MAG-have light
    'Let there be light'
    [Genesis 1:3]

(214) Mag-túlog ka
    MAG-sleep 2SG.FOC
    'Sleep!'

(215) Mag-pintúra ka sang baláy
    MAG-paint 2SG.FOC UNFOC house
    'Paint the house'

(216) Indí ka mag-patáy
    not 2SG.FOC MAG-kill
    'Thou shalt not kill'
    [Exodus 20:13]

Such mag- Imperatives are rather imperious, suggestive of the
demands of a superior to a subordinate (cf. 'You are to paint
the house'); they do not happily co-occur with palíhog
'please'.

The Irrealis sense of mag- is also apparent in its
marking of Conditional Clauses and Verbal Complements:

(217) Ma-gútom akó kon indí akó mag-káon
    MA-hungry 1SG.FOC when not 1SG.FOC MAG-eat
    'I'll be hungry if I don't eat'

(218) Ma-ákig akó kon indí ka mag-památìì
    MA-angry 1SG.FOC when not 2SG.FOC MAG-listen
    'I'll get angry if you won't listen'

(219) Gáb'i na kon mag-sirá ang táwo sang ganháaan
    night now when MAG-close FOC man UNFOC door
    'It's late at night when the man closes the door'

The verb magpamátìì 'listened' may be broken into the
constituents mag + pang + báti 'hear'.
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(220) Indî làhogláhog kon mag-kagát ang kûring sang idô not joke when MAG-bite FOC cat UNFOC dog 'It's not a joke if a cat bites a dog'

(221) Gûsto nía mag- tân'aw sang èropláño want 3SG.UNFOC MAG- look UNFOC airplane 'S/he wants/wanted to see the airplane'

(222) Gûsto akó mag-káon want 1SG.FOC MAG-eat 'I/I'd like to eat'

(223) Gin-tilaw-án ko nga mag-tân'aw GIN-try- AN 1SG.UNFOC LINK MAG-look sang èropláño UNFOC airplane 'I tried to look at an airplane'

In (217)-(223), mag- marks EVENTS that are Irrealis since they have not been initiated. Note that Irrealis does not mark 'Future Tense' so much as the non-attainment of the threshold of inception with respect to a particular time.

In combination with the Imperfective affix -a-, mag- indicates statements of intent which are often promissory in their performativity. Note the following:

(224) Mag-a- sirá si Roberto sang gânñaan MAG-IMP-close FOC Roberto UNFOC door 'Roberto is planning to close the door'

(225) Mag-a- sulát akô sang sulát MAG-IMP-write 1SG.FOC UNFOC letter 'I'm planning to write a letter'

(226) Mag-a- dóktor si Roberto MAG-IMP-doctor FOC Roberto 'Roberto is planning to become a doctor'

(227) Mag-a- maëstra si María MAG-IMP-teacher FOC María 'Maria is planning to become a teacher'

Other MOTILE VOICE prefixes include nang-/mang- and naka-/maka-. These FOCUS the most MOTILE PARTICIPANT but de-
emphasize the effectedness of the INERT PARTICIPANTS and/or the effectiveness of the MOTILE ones. The forms nang- and mang- mark EVENTS which may be deliberate and controlled (i.e. agentive) but whose INERT PARTICIPANTS are affected, if at all, in a non-decisive manner. With some EVENTS, nang- construes the INERT PARTICIPANTS as Plurals:

(228) (a) Nang-hátag ang maéstra sang mga libro
           NANG-give FOC teacher UNFOC PL book
           'The teacher gave out some books'
(b)  Nag-hátag ang maéstra sang libro sa estudyánte
       NAG-give FOC teacher UNFOC book OBL student
           'The teacher gave a book to the student'

(229) (a) Nang-tán’aw akò sang mga èropláño
           NANG-look 1SG.FOC UNFOC PL airplane
           'I looked at some airplanes'
(b)  Nag-tán’aw akò sang èropláño
       NAG-look 1SG.FOC UNFOC airplane
           'I looked at an airplane'

In the (a)-sentences, nang- requires that the INERT PARTICIPANTS be not merely vague or unbounded (like those in the nag-marked [b]-sentences) but also DIFFUSE and affected/effectected serially rather than punctually. The DIFFUSENESS of such PARTICIPANTS is a concomitant of the interaction of nang- with certain EVENTS. The internal dynamics of certain EVENTS disallow any effectedness of the INERT PARTICIPANT by the MOTILE one; nang- but not nag- may co-occur with these. Note the following:
(230) (a) Na- máti ang maéstra sang kánta
NANG-hear FOC teacher UNFOC song
'The teacher listened to a song'

(b) *Nag-bátì ...
NAG-hear

(231) (a) Na- ngítà akò sang bánò
NANG-see 1SG.FOC UNFOC dress
'I looked for a dress'

(b) *Nag-kítà akó
NAG-see 1SG.FOC

(c) Nag-kítà kamí
NAG-see 1PL.INC.FOC
'We saw each other/met with each other'

In (230)-(231), nang- reduces 'hearing' to 'listening' and 'seeing' to 'looking for'. The INERT PARTICIPANTS are not Plural but merely unaffected. Such EVENTS imply an intentionality directed toward a telos. The intentionality associated with nang- reflects a motivation that arises from within the MOTILE PARTICIPANT but which is contained or not fully expended within that locus. This intentionality is also apparent in instances where the Verbal root names the object of pursuit, as in:

(232) (a) Nag-asáwa siá
NANG-wife 3SG.FOC
'He got a wife / married a woman'

(b) *Nag-asáwa siá
NAG-wife 3SG.FOC
('He became a woman'?)

\[15\] With many roots, the final -ng /ŋ/ of nang-/mang- is not realized as such; instead, the initial consonant of the root assimilates to the 'features' of voicing and nasality so that /p,b/ \(\rightarrow\) /m/, /t,d/ \(\rightarrow\) /n/, and /k,g/ \(\rightarrow\) /ŋ/.
Here, asáwa 'wife' and ísdâ 'fish' are the telic 'objects' marked by nang- for the 'pursuit'. Note that the co-occurrence of nang- with these roots is semantically anomalous, perhaps suggestive of the release or discovery of one's inner fish or inner woman.  

The intentionality reflects the self-contained nature of EVENTS marked with nang-. The action in such EVENTS erupts from within the PARTICIPANT in FOCUS. Compare the following:

(234) (a) Na- málhas akó
NANG-sweat 1SG.FOC
'I sweated'

(b) Nang-bálhas akó
NAG-sweat 1SG.FOC
'I sweated'

(235) (a) Na- númdom akò sang inóg sabát
NANG-think 1SG.FOC UNFOC possible answer
'I thought of a possible answer'

(b) Nang-dúndom akò nga ma-kádto ka subóng
NAG-think 1SG.FOC LINK MA-go 2SG.FOC now
'I thought that you'd come here now'

In (234a), my sweating seems motivated 'from within', perhaps precipitated by normal processes of nervousness or exertion. Sentence (234b) is, according to E.D., a more 'disruptive' or 'detached' sweating. I may have simply discovered sweat on my

---

16 Transfigurational EVENTS are marked with a combination of nang- and =in=, as in Nanginisídâ siá 'S/he became a fish'.

face. In (235a), my thinking is an active process of
cogitation, an attempt to figure something out; whereas in
(235b) it is a matter of opining, of 'popping off' without
effort (i.e. something 'pops into my head').

The non-telicity noted with nang- reflects in part the
ROLE content observed by the language. More basically, nang-
lingers in process at the expense of outcome. Such is clearly
the case with the following:

(236) (a) Na- námbok ang propesor
    NANG-fat FOC professor
        'The professor got fat'

    (b) Nag-támbo ang propesor
        NAG-fat FOC professor
            'The professor got fat'

In (236a), the professor's expansion is framed as a gradual
process; the professor was observed to get fat little by
little, in the course of regular encounters. In (236b), the
change is abrupt from the speaker's perspective, a discrete
change 'from A to B'. The speaker may have recently re-
established contact with the professor after a long separation
and been surprised by the latter's expansion. 17

Some Verbal roots may accommodate either an
intentionality from the MOTILE PARTICIPANT or a DIFFUSENESS of
the INERT one:

17 Davis (1995:46-48) discusses a semantics of 'arising
from within' in Ilokano =um=. The Ilokano nang-, in contrast,
marks actions which are only partially complete or whose
effects are minimal (cf. Davis 1995:49-56). Hiligaynon nang-
thus seems in part to conflate the strands of meaning which
are distributed between Ilokano nang- and =um=. 
(237) (a) **Nag-súka ang estudyánte sang kán'on**
NAG-vomit FOC student UNFOC rice
'The student vomited rice'

(b) **Nang-súka ang estudyánte sang kán'on**
NANG-vomit FOC student UNFOC rice
'The student vomited, using rice'

(c) **Nang-súka ang estudyánte {sa mga táwo /**
NANG-vomit FOC student OBL PL person
*sa táwo} OBL person
'The student vomited on the people (*person)'

In (237a), **nag-** constructs the vomiting as an accident or disruption. In (237b), **nang-** allows **sang kán'on** 'the rice' to remain as the INERT PARTICIPANT, but it is less thoroughly affected; it is a nonce 'INSTRUMENT' of the process. If the final resting place is specified, as in (237c), **nang-** suggests a prolonged, nonpunctual conclusion, here a 'victimage' of a distributed or serial vomiting. (Such things do happen, particularly during Mardi Gras.) In either case, the process is emphasized at the expense of the result.

The attention of **nang-** to process, to flux, can be most graphically illustrated in terms of bodily processes. With **nang-** they are viewed as being 'natural' or 'uneventful', while **nag-** suggests a disruption of the natural flow of things. Consider the following:

(238) (a) **Nang-íhi ang táwo (**sa íya dilárgo)**
NANG-pee FOC person OBL 3SG.UNFOC pants
'The man peed (*in his pants)'

(b) **Nag-íhi ang táwo (**sa íya dilárgo)**
NAG-pee FOC person OBL 3SG.UNFOC pants
'The man peed (in his pants)'

Sentence (238a) suggests a natural or self-contained EVENT;
the man simply 'answered the call of nature' in a routine manner. Sentence (238b), with nag-, suggests an extra-ordinary departure, i.e. an eventful EVENT. In all EVENTS, then, nang- consistently emphasizes nondisruptive process or flux, with a concomitant de-emphasis on results or 'getting things done'.

Like nag- and mag-, maka- and maka- allow EVENTS to have an effective conclusion. However, with the latter affixes, the INCEPT of the EVENT is not firmly connected with its outcome.

Note the following contrast:

(239) (a) Naka-bátyag akò sang gútom kaína
Naka-feel 1SG.FOC UNFOC hunger before
'I was feeling hunger/hungry a while ago'

(b) Nag-bátyag akò sang gútom
NAG-feel 1SG.FOC UNFOC hunger
'I felt hunger/got hungry'

Sentence (239a), with naka-, implies that I felt my stomach churning at some previous, nonspecific time, while (239b), with nag-, marks a sudden, decisive awakening of hunger.

With naka-, any agency is of a decidedly low-control sort. Such EVENTS may be viewed as accidents, as in the following:

(240) (a) Naka-bokâ akò sang báso
Naka-break 1SG.FOC UNFOC glass
'I broke a glass'

(b) Nag-bokâ akò sang báso
NAG-break 1SG.FOC UNFOC glass
'I broke a glass'

Sentence (240a) suggests that I accidentally broke a glass through clumsy handling, while (240b) implies that I did so intentionally.
The muting of the EVENT INCEPTs with naka- is also apparent in the following:

(241) (a) **Naka-pamálmhas** na  
Naka-sweat  2SG.FOC now/already  
'Have you sweated/been able to sweat?'

(b) **Nag-pamálmhas** ka  
NAG-sweat  2SG.FOC  
'Did you sweat?'

(242) (a) **Naka-káon** ka  na  
Naka-eat  2SG.FOC now  
'Have you eaten already?'

(b) **Nag-káon** ka  siní  
NAG-eat  2SG.FOC this.UNFOC  
'Did you eat this?'

Sentence (241a) suggests that the speaker met the addressee while the latter was jogging. Sweating is here considered to be a natural outcome of the context of the encounter. Sentence (241b) implies that the speaker may have noticed that the addressee's makeup was beaded or smeared. Sentence (242a) is a typical greeting for a friend who appears at one's house, while (242b) sounds like an attempt to ascertain whether the addressee has tried a certain dish. Thus, naka- marks non-disruptive beginnings consistent with a continuity of expectations, where control is not normally possible, while nag- implies more disruptive changes which are more amenable to control.

As might be expected, naka- is appropriate for EVENTS that inherently involve low control, such as the following:

---

18This is naka- + -pang- + bálhas 'sweat'.

(243) Naka-hibaló si Roberto nga gin-lútô ni Maria
Naka-know FOC Roberto LINK GIN-cook UNFOC Maria
ang ísdâ
FOC fish
'Roberto knew that Maria cooked the fish'

(244) Naka-dúlâ sià sang lápis
Naka-lose 3SG.FOC UNFOC pencil
'S/he lost a pencil'

(245) Naka-kítâ akò sang idô
Naka-see 1SG.FOC UNFOC dog
'I saw a dog'

(246) Naka-bátî si Roberto sang rékord
Naka-hear FOC Roberto UNFOC record
'Roberto heard a record'

With EVENTS that inherently imply more control, naka- may
suggest an accomplishment that is fortuitous or done in spite
of the odds:

(247) Naka-kilâla akò sa íya\(^{19}\)
Naka-know 1SG.FOC OBL 3SG.UNFOC
'I managed to get to know him/her'

(248) Naka-lángoy sià sang subâ
Naka-swim 3SG.FOC UNFOC river
'I managed to swim a river'

(249) Naka-básâ akò kay may antipára ko
Naka-read 1SG.FOC OBL have glasses 1SG.UNFOC
'I was able to read because I had glasses'

(250) Naka-patây sià
Naka-die 3SG.FOC
'S/he (accidentally) killed someone'
'S/he died'

That (250) means 'S/he killed' rather than 'S/he died' is
a reminder that the MOTILE VOICES focus originators but not

\(^{19}\) The root hibaló concerns 'knowing'in the sense of the
retention of data or facts (cf. Spanish saber and German
wissen). The root kilâla suggests knowing in the sense of
recognition or familiarity (cf. Spanish conocer and German
kennen).
recipients of actions. Like nag-, maka- is inappropriate for EVENTS which impose on the FOCUSED PARTICIPANT, e.g.:

(251)  \*Naka-gútom ...
       NAKA-hungry

(252)  \*Naka-úhaw
       NAKA-thirsty

The Irrealis alternate maka- consistently suggests 'ability' or 'potential':

(253)  Maka-kítâ akó
       MAKA-see 1SG.FOC
       'I can see'

(254)  Maka-áyo akó sang reló
       MAKA-good 1SG.FOC UNFOC watch
       'I can fix a watch'

(255)  Maka-básá akó kon may antípára
       MAKA-read 1SG.FOC when have glasses
       'I can read if I have glasses'

(256)  Maka-bátí si Juan kon may hearing aid
       MAKA-hear FOC Juan when have hearing aid
       'Juan can hear if he has a hearing aid'

In summary, the MOTILE VOICE affixes differ in terms of ASPECT and also in terms of the effectiveness of the MOTILE ROLE. From the perspective of the MOTILE ROLE, nag- and mag- suggest a concisely effective involvement in the EVENT consistent with (but not limited to or specifically indicative of) high control; nang- and mang-, a prolonged, non-telic involvement consistent with intention; and naka- and maka-, a partial detachment from the EVENT consistent with low control.

In contrast to the MOTILE VOICES, gin- (among others) orients attention toward the most directly involved INERT PARTICIPANT in the EVENT. In doing so, it may focus inherently
animate PARTICIPANTS as INERT. Unlike the MOTILE nag-, gin-
does not require Proper-named INERT PARTICIPANTS to be
OBLIQUE.

(257) (a) Gin-súmbag ni Juan si Roberto
GIN-punch UNFOC Juan FOC Roberto
'Juan punched Roberto'

cf. (b) Nag-súmbag si Juan kay Roberto
NAG-punch FOC Juan OBL Roberto
'Juan punched Roberto'

Pronominal INERT PARTICIPANTS must, however, be treated as
highly TOPICAL, meaning that they must occur in the immediate
post-RHEME position unless preceded by another Pronoun or
accompanied by suprasegmental disruption, as exemplified by
the following:

(258) Gin-súmbag nía siá
GIN-punch 3SG.UNFOC 3SG.FOC
'S/he punched him/her'

(259) Gin-súmbag siá sang táwo
GIN-punch 3SG.FOC UNFOC person
'S/he was punched by the man'

(260) Gin-súmbag sang táwo , siá
GIN-punch UNFOC person, 3SG.FOC
'The man punched him/her'

(261) *Gin-súmbag sang táwo siá
GIN-punch UNFOC person 3SG.FOC

Whereas nag- marks MOTILE PARTICIPANTS at the INCEPTS of
EVENTS, gin- focusses PARTICIPANTS which occur after the
INCEPT and which may be 'PATIENTIVE' yet MOTILE. Compare the
following:

(262) (a) Nag-túnaw ang kalámay
NAG-melt FOC sugar
'The sugar melted'
(b) Gin-túnaw ang kalámay  
GIN-melt FOC sugar  
'The sugar was melted [by someone/something]'  

The orientation of *gin-* toward the INERT PARTICIPANT that is most highly involved need not imply 'Transitivity' or an AGENT/PATIENT split. Note the following:

(263)  
Gin-busóng si Marta  
GIN-pregnant FOC Marta  
'Marta was (implanted) in her mother's womb'  
*'Marta got pregnant'  

(264)  
Gin-gowâ ko ang idô  
GIN-out 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog  
'I went out with the intention of seeing the dog'  

With *busóng* 'pregnant', *gin-* focusses not the impregnated woman (i.e. the maternal matrix or scene for the pregnancy) but the unborn child, the result or embodiment of the pregnancy. One might crudely paraphrase (263) as 'Marta was implanted (into the womb)'. (*Nabusóng si Marta*, with *na-* is 'Martha got pregnant'.) With *gowâ* 'out', *gin-* focusses the dog, which is not affected but which is the INERT goal toward which the MOTILE PARTICIPANT advances. The sense of 'intention' links the dog with the MOTILE source of the EVENT. The MOTILE/INERT contrast is thus more basic than that of AGENT/PATIENT. Both *si Marta* and *ang idô* are the occasions for the realization of the EVENTS.

In one-PARTICIPANT EVENTS, *gin-* focusses 'PATIENTS' of natural--often biological--processes, which require no AGENTS, and which, as already seen, cannot be constructed with *nag-*:

(265) (a)  
Gin-gútom akô kahápon  
GIN-hungry 1SG.FOC yesterday  
'I got hungry yesterday'
(266) (a) Gin-úhaw akó
GIN-thirsty 1SG.FOC
'I got thirsty'

(b) *Nag-úhaw akó
NAG-thirst 1SG.FOC

(267) (a) Gin-lápyō siá
GIN-tired 3SG.FOC
'S/he got tired'

(b) *Nag-lápyō siá
NAG-tired 3SG.FOC

These EVENTS involve little or no control, volition, or initiative. They do imply a process with an origin that operates prior and external to the FOCUSSED ROLE.

With EVENTS that involve an 'AGENT'/'PATIENT' split, gin-focuses PARTICIPANTS which appear to be 'PATIENTS', i.e. the INERT PARTICIPANTS most thoroughly manipulated:

(268) Gin-hakós sang babáye ang laláki
GIN-hug UNFOC woman FOC male
'The/A woman hugged the man'

(269) Gin-kagát sang kuring si Roberto
GIN-bite UNFOC cat FOC Roberto
'The/A cat bit Roberto'

(270) Gin-hakós sang babáye si Juan
GIN-hug UNFOC woman FOC Juan
'The/A woman hugged Juan'

(271) Gin-hakós ni Roberto si Juan
GIN-hug UNFOC Roberto FOC Juan
'Roberto hugged Juan'

(272) Gin-kagát nía akó
GIN-bite 3SG.UNFOC 1SG.FOC
'S/he bit me'

(273) Gin-habóy ko ang bóla
GIN-throw 1SG.UNFOC FOC ball
'I threw the ball'
(274)  Anó ang gin-hátag nía
what FOC GIN-give 3SG.UNFOC
'What did s/he give (away).EntityFramework\n
Although gin- seems to mark 'PATIENTS', it may also mark
PARTICIPANTS which a Eurocentric perspective might construe as
'INSTRUMENTS'. Compare the following:

(275)  (a) Gin-hámpak ko ang lipák
GIN-hit 1SG.UNFOC FOC stick
'I hit (something/someone) with the stick'

(b) Gin-hámpak ko ang idô
GIN-hit 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog
'I hit the dog'

(276)  (a) Gin-tíro ko ang bán sa werewolf
GIN-shoot 1SG.UNFOC FOC bullet OBL werewolf
'I shot the bullet at the werewolf'

(b) Gin-tíro ko ang pusíl sa makáwat
GIN-shoot 1SG.UNFOC FOC pistol OBL thief
'I shot the pistol at the thief'

(c) Gin-tíro ko ang makáwat
GIN-shoot 1SG.UNFOC FOC thief
'I shot the thief'

Since gin- marks the PARTICIPANT most thoroughly involved
in the EVENT--the one most 'moved'--it cannot mark the 'final
resting place' or the locus of the outer LIMIT of the EVENT.
Hence, with the EVENT 'painting', it can focus 'the paint'
that is applied but not 'the wall' to which it is applied;
with 'planting', the FOCUS is upon 'the seed' that is planted
but not 'the garden' where it comes to rest. For the latter
cases, the LIMIT-marking suffix -an (\textasciitilde -han) must be added.
Compare the following:
(277)  (a) Gin-pínta ko ang pulá nga pínta
GIN-paint 1SG.UNFOC FOC red LINK paint
sa díngding
OBL wall
'I painted the red paint on the wall'

(b) *Gin-pínta ko ang díngding
GIN-paint 1SG.UNFOC FOC wall

(c) Gin-pínta-hán ko ang díngding
GIN-paint-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC wall
'I painted the wall'

(278)  (a) Gin-tanóm ko ang líso sa hardín
GIN-plant 1SG.UNFOC FOC seed OBL garden
'I planted the seed in the garden'

(b) *Gin-tanóm ko ang hardín
GIN-plant 1SG.UNFOC FOC garden

(c) Gin-tanom-án ko ang hardín
GIN-plant-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC garden
'I planted the garden'

Thus, gin- reflects dynamism or change whose origin lies
prior to the involvement of the FOCUSED PARTICIPANT. Given
the orientation of gin- toward dynamically involved INERT
PARTICIPANTS, it is unsurprising that certain EVENTS--
generally of 'Stative' Aktionsart--cannot be marked by gin-
alone:

(279)  *gin-támbok
GIN-fat

(280)  *gin-putí
GIN-white

(281)  *gin-dyútay
GIN-little/few

(282)  *gin-maéstro
GIN-teacher

(283)  *gin-dóktor
GIN-doctor

One cannot use gin- to mean, for example 'fatten' or 'make
someone a doctor' since such states as 'being fat' or 'being a doctor' are final, static outcomes.

Before leaving gin-, we should note that, like Yogad and Tagalog, Hiligaynon has a form =in=, which, according to Wolfenden (1971:118), 'seems to be a free variant of gin- and can usually be substituted for it with no change of meaning'. In many instances, this judgement seems to be validated by English glosses, as in the following:

(284) (a) Gin-kagát sang kúrín g si Roberto
GIN-bite UNFOC cate FOC Roberto
'The/A cat bit Roberto'

(b) K= in-agát sang kúrín g si Roberto
bite=IN=bite UNFOC cat FOC Roberto
'The/A cat bit Roberto'

(285) (a) Gin-hakós sang babáye ang maéstro
GIN-hug UNFOC woman FOC teacher
'The/A woman hugged the teacher'

(b) H= in-akós sang babáye ang maéstro
hug=IN=hug UNFOC woman FOC teacher
'The/A woman hugged the teacher'

The (a)- and (b)-sentences above are glossed identically; they share a common 'ideational' content. However, the (b)-sentences imply a greater intensity or more obvious intentionality. In (284a), Roberto and the cat might have been playing, in which situation the cat bit him spontaneously. In (284b), the cat has made a calculated and possibly more vicious attack, as they sometimes will; 'you could see it coming' (E.D.). Sentence (285a) describes a casual hug within the norms of propriety; (285b), an intense lunge. The 'calculation' and 'intensity' reflect an EFFUSIVENESS that is
observable in other contexts, e.g.:

(286)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Nag-g= in=owâ ang túbig} \\
\text{NAG-out=IN=out FOC water} \\
\text{The water ran out (in all directions)'}
\end{array}
\]

(287)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Nag-g= in=owâ kamí sa katúnggan} \\
\text{NAG-out=IN=out 1PL OBL marsh} \\
\text{We emerged from the marsh (separately)'}
\end{array}
\]

(288)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Nag-d= in=alágan kamí} \\
\text{NAG-run=IN=run 1PL.FOC} \\
\text{We ran (in all directions)'}
\end{array}
\]

(289)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{B= in=ulígáy kamí} \\
\text{help=IN=help 1PL.FOC} \\
\text{We helped each other'}
\end{array}
\]

(290)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{sang t= in=úig} \\
\text{UNFOC year=IN=year} \\
\text{for many years'}
\end{array}
\]

(291)  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
(a) \ \text{polítika} \\
\text{'politics'} \\
\text{[i.e. the abstract institution]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
(b) \ \text{p= in=olítika} \\
\text{politics=IN=politics} \\
\text{'particular political activities, things that politics involves'}
\end{array}
\]

An additional aspect of the EFFUSIVENESS is that =in=, unlike gin-, may co-occur with MOTILE VOICES such as nag-. \(^{20}\)

The 'AGENT-PATIENT' relations that emerge with gin- are direct and unmediated; that is, the influence of the INCEPT in gin-marked Clauses is more PROXIMATE than in those marked with na-, which suggests a more REMOTE INCEPT or 'agency' whereby the INCEPT is detached from the outcome (cf. naka-). Note the following contrasts:

---

\(^{20}\)The Yogad =in=, unlike its Hiligaynon cognate, focusses 'O'-PARTICIPANTS exclusively (cf. 4.1.4).
(292) (a) Gin-káon ang bugás
GIN-eat FOC rice
'The rice was eaten'

(b) Na-káon ang bugás
NA-eat FOC rice
'The rice was got eaten'

(293) (a) Gin-bilín ko ang ákon lápis
GIN-leave 1SG.UNFOC FOC 1SG.UNFOC pencil
'I left my pencil'

(b) Na-bilín ko ang ákon lápis
NA-leave 1SG.UNFOC FOC 1SG.UNFOC pencil
'I left my pencil'

(294) (a) Gin-kàwat-án ang bángko
GIN-rob- AN FOC bank
'The bank was robbed'

(b) Na-kàwat-án ang bángko
NA-rob- AN FOC bank
'The bank was robbed'

The manifestations of relative PROXIMITY/REMOTENESS can play out differently in different situations. Sentence (292a) implies that the rice was eaten on purpose and (292b), that it might have 'gotten eaten' by mistake. Similarly, (293a) suggests that I left my pencil deliberately and (293b), that I did so unwittingly. Sentence (294a) implies a specific time frame for the robbery or a direct confrontation with the robbers, while (294b) suggests that the money may have been discovered missing long after the fact.

The following illustrate some alternative contrasts:

(295) (a) Gin-dúlâ mo ang ímo lápis
GIN-lose 1SG.UNFOC FOC 2SG.UNFOC pencil
'Did you lose your pencil?'

(b) Na-dúlâ mo ang ímo lápis
NA-lose 2SG.UNFOC FOC 2SG.UNFOC pencil
'Did you lose your pencil?'
(296) (a) Gin-inum- án ko ang báso  
    GIN-drink-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC glass  
    'I drank from the glass'

(b) Na-inum- án ko ang báso  
    NA-drink-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC glass  
    'I drank from the glass'

In (295a), there is a sense of urgency; the pencil may have been especially important, perhaps an expensive heirloom. In (295b), such urgency is lacking; any old pencil was lost. In (296a) my action may have been intentional; or, alternately, I may have drunk the entire glassful. In (296b), I drank by accident or in part.

Like the MOTILE VOICE affix naka-, the INERT VOICE form na- orients attention toward the EVENT coda at the expense of the INCEPT. Nonetheless, na- always implies that something has happened in the undetermined past; a CRUX or turning point has been crossed.²¹ Both na- and naka- share a lessening of control (in contrast with gin- and nag- respectively). With na-, this lessening of control permits a 'recessive' MOTILE ROLE, while gin- requires that such control be more salient. The (nonce, provisional) interpretation of the VOICE affixes nag- vs. naka- and gin- vs. na- in terms of 'control' supports the MOTILE/INERT characterization of ROLE in Hiligaynon. A controlling agency is not implied with na-. Compare the following:

²¹The term CRUX, along with several other semantic terms used throughout this study (including ERUPTION [cf. Chapter 4] and LIMIT), was suggested by Philip W. Davis (personal communication). Cf. also Davis et al. (Ms.).
(297) (a) Gin-anó ikáw
GIN-what 2SG.FOC
'What was done to you?'

(b) Na-anó ikáw
NA-what 2SG.FOC
'What happened to you?'

In (297a), *gin*—implies the involvement of a particular MOTILE PARTICIPANT, whereas *na*—in (297b) is much less suggestive of any such agency; the happening is more circumstantial.

Predictably, *na*—is very compatible with EVENTS that are typically regarded as being beyond control since their origin lies elsewhere:

(298) (a) Na-gútom akó kahápon
NA-hungry 1SG.FOC yesterday
'I was hungry yesterday'

(b) Gin-gútom akó kahápon
GIN-hungry 1SG.FOC yesterday
'I got hungry yesterday'

(c) *Nag-gútom akó kahápon
NAG-hungry 1SG.FOC yesterday

(299) (a) Na-úhaw akó kahápon
NA-thirsty 1SG.FOC yesterday
'I was thirsty yesterday'

(b) Gin-úhaw akó kahápon
GIN-thirsty 1SG.FOC yesterday
'I got thirsty yesterday'

(c) *Nag-úhaw akó kahápon
NAG-thirsty 1SG.FOC yesterday

(300) (a) Na-lápyó akó
NA-tired 1SG.FOC
'I got tired'

(b) Gin-lápyó akó
GIN-tired 1SG.FOC
'I got tired'

(c) *Nag-lápyó akó
NAG-tired 1SG.FOC
As attested in the (c)-sentences, nag- implies too much control to occur felicitously with these roots. The contrast of na- and gin-, once again, hinges on control. The (a)-sentences, with na-, imply physical states whose onset is gradual or vague, while the (b)-sentences, with gin- imply abrupt onsets of the states, traceable to specific sources.

The following may also co-occur with na-:

(301) Na-táwo akó sang 1959
      NA-born 1SG.FOC UNFOC 1959
      'I was born in 1959'

(302) Na-busóng si Marta
      NA-pregnant FOC Marta
      'Marta was pregnant'

(303) Na-patáy siá
      NA-die 3SG.FOC
      'S/he died'

(304) Na-dúlâ ko ang ákon lápis
      NA-lose 1SG.UNFOC FOC 1SG.UNFOC pencil
      'I lost my pencil'

(305) Na-tabô sa ámon ilóy
      NA-happen OBL 1PL.UNFOC mother
      'It happened to our mother'

(306) Na-ákig akó
      NA-angry 1SG.FOC
      'I got angry'

In (301)-(306), EVENT motivation is downplayed; the precise origin is obscure. With na-, speakers join EVENTS which are underway, so that change is in progress. Such EVENTS may serve as BACKGROUND for other EVENTS, as in:

____________________________

This sentence is from C.P. According to E.D., the Verb should be na-dula-án.
(307) Na-gútom akò kahápon sang  
NA-hungry 1SG.FOC yesterday UNFOC  
pag-abót mo  
PAG-arrive 2SG.UNFOC  
'I was hungry yesterday when you arrived (on your arrival)'

None of the Verbal roots in (298)-(307) can occur with nag-. Other roots accept either na- or nag-. With na-, the beginning of process precedes the involvement of the FOCUSED PARTICIPANT, while nag-, of course, may suggest that the initiative lies with the FOCUSED PARTICIPANT:

(308) (a) Na-dádgad si Roberto  
NA-drop FOC Roberto  
'Roberto dropped/fell'

(b) Nag-dádgad si Roberto  
NAG-fall FOC Roberto  
'Roberto dropped something'

(309) (a) Nag-kítà kamí sa plásà  
NAG-see 1PL.FOC OBL plaza  
'We met at the plaza'

(b) Na-kítà ko ang dakò nga baláy  
NA-see 1SG.UNFOC FOC big LINK house  
'I saw the big house'

In (308), the difference between na- and nag- invokes 'control'; the former VOICE marks EVENTS which are beyond control, while the latter is amenable to EVENTS which are controllable and allows the FOCUSED PARTICIPANT to impose upon the UNFOCUSED one. The difference between (309a) and (309b) is closely analogous to the contrast between the Continuous or Simple Tenses in the English sentences The Prince of Wales is seeing someone else and I see you. The nag-options suggest bounded activities that may be voluntarily begun or terminated, while the na-options suggest unbounded
activities with little control involved. The unbounded sense of na- is consistent with its devaluation of EVENT INCEPTS.

With EVENTS involving two PARTICIPANTS, na- consistently focusses the less MOTILE, more INERT one. Note the following:

(310) (a) Na-langóy ni Roberto ang subâ
NA-swim UNFOC Roberto FOC river
'Roberto was able to swim the river'

(b) *Na-langóy si Roberto sang subâ
NA-swim FOC Roberto UNFOC river

To focus the MOTILE PARTICIPANT in such a low-control EVENT, naka- may be used:

(311) Naka-langóy si Roberto sang subâ
NAKA-swim FOC Roberto UNFOC river
'Roberto was able to swim a river'

With the Irrealis affix ma-, the EVENT is PROXIMATE to the moment of speaking. Something has begun to happen or will soon happen. In many instances, ma- marks EVENTS in the immediate future. In contrast to mag-, which focusses PARTICIPANTS which may initiate EVENTS, ma- focusses low-control PARTICIPANTS swept along by the EVENT dynamics:

(312) (a) Mag-a- hánda akò sang pagkáon
MAG-IMP-ready 1SG.FOC UNFOC food
'I'll prepare some food'

(b) Ma-hánda akò sang pagkáon
MA-ready 1SG.FOC UNFOC food
'I'll prepare some food'

(313) (a) Indì ka mag-patáy
not 2SG.FOC MAG-kill
'Thou shalt not kill'

---

23This is the 'Gerundive' prefix pag- plus káon 'eat', hence 'something to eat'.
(b) Indí ka ma-patáy
not 2SG.FOC MA-kill
'You won't get killed'
'*Don't kill anybody'
'*Don't get killed'

Sentence (312a) is a promise, and (313a) proscription; both imply that an EVENT has yet to be initiated. Sentence (312b) is not a promise but a announcement of what the speaker is about to undertake. Sentence (313b) focusses ka as the victim of the killing. In either case, the EVENT is viewed as being 'in progress'.

The progressive, low-control sense of ma- is apparent in such EVENTS as the following:

(314) Ma-gútom akó
MA-hungry 1SG.FOC
'I'll be hungry'

(315) Ma-lápyô sià subóng
MA-tired 3SG.FOC now
'He's tired now'

(316) Ma-lumós akò sa kalísod
MA-drown 1SG.FOC OBL sorrow
'I'll drown in sorrow'

(317) Ma-lápyô sià sang lángoy kag ma-lumós sià
MA-tired 3SG.FOC UNFOC swim and MA-drown 3SG.FOC
'S/he'll get tired from swimming and s/he'll drown'

(318) Ma-patáy si Roberto
MA-die FOC Roberto
'Roberto will die'

(319) Ma-ákig akó
MA-angry 1SG.FOC
'I'll be angry'

The Irrealis ASPECT of ma- allows either a future or past time reference:
(320) (a) Ma-támbok siá sang (túig) 1989
    MA-fat 3SG.FOC UNFOC (year) 1989
    'S/he was fat in 1989'

(b) Ma-támbok siá sa dasón nga túig
    MA-fat 3SG.FOC OBL next LINK year
    'S/he'll be fat next year'

(321) (a) Ma-lápyô siá sang hwébes
    MA-tired 3SG.FOC UNFOC Thursday
    'S/he was tired last Thursday'

(b) Ma-lápyô siá sa hwébes
    MA-tired 3SG.FOC OBL Thursday
    'S/he'll be tired the coming Thursday'

The (a)-sentences, with Temporal constructions introduced with
sang, imply formerly realized conditions. The (b)-sentences,
whose Temporal constructions are introduced with sa, imply
not-now-realized conditions. The EVENT may 'lie' either
'ahead' or 'behind' according to context.

The low-control, PROXIMATE semantics of ma- accommodates
qualitative or 'Adjectival' roots, as in:

(322) (a) Ma-támbok ikáw
    MA-fat 2SG.FOC
    'You're fat'

(b) *Támbok ikáw
    fat 2SG.FOC

(323) (a) Ma-álam siá
    MA-smart 3SG.FOC
    'He's smart'

(b) *Álam siá
    smart 3SG.FOC

(324) (a) Ma-áyo ang propesór
    MA-good FOC professor
    'The professor is good [i.e. skilled]'

(b) *Ayo ang propesór
    good FOC professor
(325) (a) Ma-ïmon si Maria
 MA-jealous FOC Maria
 'Maria's a jealous person'

(b) *Imón si Maria
 jealous FOC Maria

These roots do not appear without ma- except as reduced forms; in deliberative speech, ma- is mandatory. The bare roots may serve as Nominals meaning 'smartness', 'goodness', and 'jealousy'. These roots seem to name qualities that are departures from norms or which cannot be assumed or generic; they have been proven by experience to apply to particular cases. There is thus a PROXIMATE alliance between the qualitative EVENT and the FOCUSSED PARTICIPANT.

We should pause to note that some roots may be employed without VOICE affixes. These include such roots dealing with cognition/saying, existence, negativity, and non-fluctuating states. Like Nominals that appear without Determiners or Prepositions, these roots may be labelled 'existential'.

Examples include the following:

(326) Gústo níà mag-káon
 like/want 3SG.UNFOC MAG-eat
 'S/he'd like to eat'

(327) Síling níà ini nga laláki mas dakô
 think/say 3SG.UNFOC this.FOC LINK male more big
 'S/he says/thinks this man is bigger'

(328) May kúring sa lamésa
 have cat OBL table
 'There's a cat on the table'

(329) Indí ka mag-patáy
 not 2SG.FOC MAG-kill
 'Thou shalt not kill'
Unlike Verbs with VOICE marking, these roots lack trajectories of influence.

The semantics of ma- recognizes what is variable/tested as opposed to what is stable/assumed. With certain 'Adjectival' roots, ma- frames an EVENT as being subject to change; something has happened to achieve the quality named. If ma- is lacking, then the quality named is understood to be an inherent attribute. Note the following:

(333) (a) Ma-init ang ádlaw
MA-hot FOC sun
'The sun is hot'

(b) Init ang ádlaw
hot FOC sun
'The sun is hot'

Sentence (333a), with ma-, is a casual statement about today's weather conditions; sometimes the sun is/seems hot and sometimes not. Sentence (333b) has the nature of a scientist's observation; from this perspective, hotness is an indisputable attribute of the sun. Such variability exists in different degrees given different PARTICIPANTS. The following was rejected because coffee is often enough not hot and must be tested:
(334) *ínít ang kapé
hot FOC coffee

Similar contrasts occur in the following:

(335) (a) Ma-pulá ang ádlaw
MA-red FOC sun
'The sun is red'

(b) Pulá ang ádlaw
red FOC sun
'The sun is red'

(336) (a) Ma-lápyô ang ákon asáwa
MA-tired FOC 1SG.UNFOC wife
'My wife is tired'

(b) Lápyô ang ákon asáwa
tired FOC 1SG.UNFOC wife
'My wife is tired'

(337) (a) Ma-talóm ang kotsílyo
MA-sharp FOC knife
'The knife is sharp'

(b) Talóm ang kotsílyo
sharp FOC knife
'Knives are sharp'

(338) (a) Ma-putí ang ákon ngípon
MA-white FOC 1SG.UNFOC tooth
'My teeth are white'
'My teeth are whiter than white'

(b) Putí ang ákon ngípon
white FOC 1SG.UNFOC tooth
'My teeth are white'

The ma-marked (a)-sentences in (335)-(338) recognize variability of the association between EVENT and PARTICIPANT, while the (b)-sentences name stable attributes of the PARTICIPANTS in question. According to (335a), the sun looks red only at certain times, e.g. in the morning and evening; (335b) construes the redness as an abiding quality with 'no probabilities' of its being otherwise. Sentence (336a) is an
inference—a statement of probabilities—based on what I think I know about my wife's vital signs, while (336b) is a definitive judgment. Sentence (337a) is a warning that this particular knife is sharp (it has been tested), while (337b) communicates an assumption or a generic statement about knives. Finally, (338a) recognizes a difference in the condition of my teeth, relative either to their former condition or to the condition of others' teeth. The teeth may formerly have been dark but have since been destained, or they may be whiter than normal.

With other qualitative EVENTS, ma- may indicate processes on the cusp of getting underway:

(339) (a) Ma-úhaw akó
MA-thirsty 1SG.FOC
'I'll be thirsty'

(b) Úháw akó
thirsty 1SG.FOC
'I'm thirsty'

(340) (a) Ma-ákig siá
MA-angry 3SG.FOC
'S/he'll get angry'

(b) Ákig siá
angry 3SG.FOC
'S/he's angry'

(341) (a) Ma-patáy si Nixon
MA-die FOC Nixon
'Nixon's going to die'

(b) Patáy si Nixon
die FOC Nixon
'Nixon's dead'

(342) (a) Ma-lípay siá subóng
MA-happy 3SG.FOC now
'S/he'll get happy now'
(b) *Lípay siá
happy 3SG.FOC

Unlike mag- or nag-, ma- allows FOCUS to occur on either
the more MOTILE or the more INERT PARTICIPANT. When the FOCUS
is placed on the relatively more MOTILE PARTICIPANT, that
PARTICIPANT is caught in a chain of events that make his or
her action imminent or in progress. When the FOCUS falls on a
more INERT PARTICIPANT, the EVENT is seen as a potentiality.

Compare the (a)- and (b)-sentences that follow:

(343) (a) Ma-káon si Roberto sang mansánas
MA-eat FOC Roberto UNFOC apple
'Roberto will/is about to eat the apple'

(b) Ma-káon ni Roberto ang mansáñas
MA-eat UNFOC Roberto FOC apple
'Roberto may/can eat the apple'

(344) (a) Ma-kagát si Roberto sang bátá
MA-bite FOC Roberto UNFOC child
'Roberto is about to bite the child'

(b) Bási, ma-kagát ni Roberto ang bátá
careful MA-bite UNFOC Roberto FOC child
'Careful, Roberto might bite the child'

(345) (a) Ma-dágdag si Roberto sang lápis\(^2\)
MA-drop FOC Roberto UNFOC pencil
'Roberto is going to drop a pencil'

(b) Bási, ma-dágdag ni Roberto ang lápis
careful MA-drop UNFOC Roberto FOC pencil
'Careful, Roberto might drop the pencil'

(346) (a) Ma-hánda akò sang pagkáon
MA-ready 1SG.FOC UNFOC food
'I'll prepare some food'

\(^2\)E.D. rejects this sentence since dágdag 'drop' is
strongly CENTRIPETAL in his dialect. He suggests Ma-búy-an ni
Roberto ang lápis 'Roberto is going to drop a pencil'.
(b) Ma-hánda xo ang pagkáon
MA-ready 1SG.UNFOC FOC food
'I can prepare the food'

In the (a)-sentences, ma- suggests an EVENT that is imminent. INERT FOCUS, on the other hand, implies a less imminent, less certain outcome. In either case, ma- consistently constructs and focusses PARTICIPANTS which are viewed as exerting little control or influence over their EVENTS.

The Irrealis prefix i- marks PARTICIPANTS which are centrally involved in the performance of a given EVENT, the MIDDLE by the EVENT is to be realized. With i-, FOCUS falls on PARTICIPANTS which might be interpreted as 'INSTRUMENTS' or as 'PATIENTS' from the perspective of English. In the following, i- seems to focus 'INSTRUMENTS':

(347) I-bása níá ang íya antípara^{25}
I-read 3SG.UNFOC FOC 3SG.UNFOC glasses
'S/he'll use his/her glasses to read'

(348) I-tahí níá ang dágom
I-sew 3SG.UNFOC FOC needle
'S/he'll sew (it) with the needle'
'S/he'll use the needle to sew'

(349) I-hámpak níá ang lípák
I-hit 3SG.UNFOC FOC stick
'S/he'll use the stick to hit (something/someone)'

(350) I-sulát níá ang lápis sa líbro
I-write 3SG.UNFOC FOC pencil OBL book
'S/he'll use the pencil to write in the book'

The glasses, the needle, the stick, and the pencil are clearly being manipulated by an 'AGENT' to accomplish their respective EVENTS of reading, sewing, hitting, and writing, as attested

^{25}The acceptability of this sentence, from C.P., is highly questionable to E.D.
by the English 'use' glosses. However, the 'INSTRUMENTAL' interpretation is, pace Ruiz (1968:11ff), less applicable to the following, which seem to focus 'PATIENTS':

(351) I-bûbô ko ang kapé
     I-pour 1SG.UNFOC FOC coffee
     'I'll pour out the coffee'

(352) I-lûgid ko ang úlo (sa ímo)
     I-roll 1SG.UNFOC FOC head (OBL 3SG.FOC)
     'I'll roll the head (to you)'

(353) I-habóy ni Hakeem ang bóla
     I-throw UNFOC Hakeem FOC ball
     'Hakeem will throw the ball'

(354) Anó ang i-hátag ko sa ímo Ginóo
     what FOC I-give 1SG.UNFOC OBL 2SG.OBL lord
     'What shall I give Thee, Master?'
     [verse from a hymn]

(355) I-balîgya sang babáye ang baláy
     I-sell UNFOC woman FOC house
     'The woman will sell the house'

(356) I-bûnggo ko ang íya úlo sa lamésa
     I-mash 1SG.UNFOC FOC 3SG.UNFOC head OBL table
     'I'll mash his/her head against the table'

(357) I-pînta ko ang dugô sa dîngding
     I-paint 1SG.UNFOC FOC blood OBL wall
     'I'll paint the blood onto the wall'

In (351)-(357), i- may seem to be selecting 'PATIENTS'. In both the 'INSTRUMENTAL' and 'PATIENTIVE' senses, i- orients attention to the midpoint of EVENT accomplishment. The i-FOCUSED PARTICIPANTS of (347)-(350) are involved in their EVENTS in media res as affected affectors. The 'PATIENTS' of (351)-(357) are INERT PARTICIPANTS involved in EVENTS whose 'playing out' or EXHAUSTION extends beyond them. ('The buck doesn't stop here'.) Thus, for example, in (351), the pouring implies pouring into or onto something, just as (352) implies
that the ball is rolled into or toward something or someone. In (354) and (355), i- marks the 'thing given' or 'house' as things that are given or sold to someone. In (356) and (357), the head and the blood are the means of the mashing and painting.

Unlike gin-, i- does not sanction such proposed CENTRIPETAL combinations as the following:

(358)    *I-gowâ akó ...
          I-out 1SG.FOC

(359)    *I-gútom ...
          I-hungry

(360)    *I-lápyô ...
          I-tired

Although gin- can combine with these roots (as illustrated earlier) to describe CENTRIPETAL instances of going out, getting hungry, and getting tired, i- is consistently CENTRIFUGAL. Thus, i- cannot contrast in parallel fashion with gin- in the following:

(361) (a) Gin-hábóy akò sang bató
          GIN-throw 1SG.FOC UNFOC rock
          'I was hit by a (thrown) rock'

          (b) *I-hábóy akò sang bató
              I-throw 1SG.FOC UNFOC rock

In contrast to i-, which concerns the MIDDLE, both -on and -an orient attention toward the EXHAUSTIVE PHASE of EVENTS. In the absence of other ASPECT markers, -on and -an are understood to be Irrealis. As such, they are used to mark both future EVENTS and Imperatives, with -on marking the greater involvement of a PARTICIPANT (i.e. the 'thing' that is
'disposed of') and -an, a more remote participation (i.e. the site where the process is EXHAUSTED). This CENTRAL/PERIPHERAL contrast can have a number of manifestations:

(362) (a) Kán-on ko ang íya pagkáon
eat-ON 1SG.UNFOC FOC 3SG.UNFOC food
'I'll eat his/her food'

(b) Kán-an ko ang íya pinggan
eat-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC 3SG.UNFOC dish
'I'll eat from his/her plate'

(363) (a) Inum-ón ko ang túbig
drink-ON 1SG.UNFOC FOC water
'I'll drink the water'

(b) Inum-án ko ang báso
drink-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC glass
'I'll drink from the glass'

(364) (a) Luto-ón ko ang súd'an
cook-ON 1SG.UNFOC FOC viand
'I'll cook the viand'

(b) Luto-án ko ang kaldéro
cook-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC pot
'I'll cook (something) in the pot'

(365) (a) Kán-on mo ang tinápay
eat-ON 1SG.UNFOC FOC bread
'You eat the bread!'

(b) Kán-an mo ang lamésa
eat-AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC table
'You eat at the table!'

(366) (a) Hámpak-ón ko siá
hit-ON 1SG.UNFOC 3SG.FOC
'I'll swat him/her (with something)'

(b) Hámpak-án ko ang lamésa
hit-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC table
'I'll use the table to hit something against'

(367) (a) Sulat-ón ko ang libro
write-ON 1SG.UNFOC FOC book
'I'll write the book'
(b) Sulát-án ko ang libro  
    write-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC book  
    'I'll write in the book'

(368) (a) Tabakó-on mo ang abáno  
    smoke- ON 2SG.UNFOC FOC cigar  
    'You'll smoke the cigar(s)'

(b) Tabakó-an mo ang abáno  
    smoke- AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC cigar  
    'You'll smoke part of the cigar'  
    'You'll smoke one of the cigars'  

(369) (a) Tinlo-ón mo ang pínggan  
    clean-ON 1SG.UNFOC FOC dish  
    'Make the dishes clean'

(b) Tinlo-án mo ang pínggan  
    clean-AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC dish  
    'Make the dishes clean'

In (362)-(369), the -on/-an contrast is variously one of  
'PATIENT'/'LOCATION',  
'effectee'/'affectee',  
and  
'part'/whole'. Though the English glosses of (369a) and (369b)  
are identical, -on implies a thorough cleansing, from inside  
out, while -an implies a less thorough wiping off. More  
generally, -on marks the GOAL (in the terminology of Wolfenden  
1971:108-111) and -an the LIMIT of the EVENT trajectory,  
beyond which 'nothing is moved'.

CENTRIPETAL EVENTS do not permit either -on or -an, e.g.:

(370) (a) *Tubô-on ...  
    grow-ON

(b) *Tubô-an ...  
    grow-AN

(371) (a) *Talóm-on ...  
    sharp-ON

---

26E.D. rejects the 'partial disposal' interpretation of this example, which was advanced by C.F.
(b) *Talóm-an ...
    sharp-AN
Growing and being sharp are qualitative EVENTS that are
presented as precluding imposition from without. In the
following, pínta 'paint' cannot co-occur with -on since pínta
already names the GOAL of the action (the substance applied),
though it may co-occur with -an (the site where the paint ends
up):

(372) (a) *Pinta-hón ...
    paint-ON
(b) Pinta-hán ko ang baláy
    paint-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC house
    'I'll paint the house'

In concert with ma-, -on forms a circumfix which allows
Verbal roots to function as 'Adjectives' describing ingrained
traits. Note the following:

(373) (a) Ma-lipáy-on siá
    MA-happy-ON 3SG.FOC
    'S/he's happy'
(b) ma-lipáy-on nga táwo
    MA-happy-ON LINK person
    'happy person'

(374) (a) Ma-lapyó-on siá
    MA-tired-ON 3SG.FOC
    'S/he tires a lot'
(b) ma-lapyó-on nga táwo
    MA-tired-ON LINK person
    'person who tires easily'

(375) (a) Ma-sakit-ón siá
    MA-sick- ON 3SG.FOC
    'S/he's sickly'
(b) ma-sakit-ón nga táwo
    MA-sick- ON LINK person
    'sickly person'
Some roots require the infix =in= to form such 'Adjectives' with the ma--on configuration:

(376) (a) **Ma-in-akíg- on siá**
    MA-IN-angry-ON 3SG.FOC
    'S/he's angry'

    (b) **ma-in-akíg- on nga táwo**
    MA-IN-angry-ON LINK person
    'irascible person'

(377) (a) **Ma-b= in-ulíg-on ang maéstro**
    MA-help=IN=help-ON FOC teacher
    'The teacher is helpful'

    (b) **ma-b= in-ulíg-on nga táwo**
    MA-help=IN=help-ON LINK person
    'helpful person'
    [cf. búlig 'help']

(378) (a) **Ma-b= in-atón- on siá**
    MA-receive=IN=receive-ON 3SG.FOC
    'S/he's receptive'

    (b) **ma-b= in-atón-on nga táwo**
    MA-help=IN=help-ON LINK person
    'receptive person'
    [cf. báton 'receive']

Some roots are altered to fit the ma--on configuration. In the following Phrases, patáy 'die' and sóbu 'sad' gain extra syllables, both requiring the insertion of an -l-:

(379) **Ma-maláty-on nga láwas**
    MA-die- ON LINK body
    'corruptible body'

(380) **Ma-s= in-olúb-on nga babáye**
    MA-sad=IN=sad- ON LINK woman
    'sad woman'

These irregularities are unfortunately beyond the scope of the current discussion, and I simply acknowledge them here. In all cases, -on is linked with the total involvement or envelopment of the PARTICIPANT in the EVENT.
The LIMIT semantics of -an (ə -han) may name PARTICIPANTS that are metonymically associated with a given process, i.e. 'the site where X happens'. When used as Nominals, these words are often (but not always) stressed on the penultimate syllable (rather than on the -an, as with Verbs). The metonymic use of -an is illustrated by the following:

(381) baligýá-an
    sell- AN
    'where one sells; market; sales counter'

(382) kalán-an\textsuperscript{27}
    eat- AN
    'where one eats; restaurant; plate'

(383) tambáy-an\textsuperscript{28}
    meet- AN
    'where one hangs out'

(384) aga- hán
    morning-AN
    'morning shift'

(385) simbá-hán
    worship-AN
    'church'

(386) diskó-hán
    disco-AN
    'discoteque'

(387) tiro- hán
    shoot-AN
    'target'

(388) hapon- án nga tubâ
    afternoon-AN LINK juice
    'afternoon juice'
    [a fermented beverage made from coconut milk in the afternoon]

\textsuperscript{27} The Verbal form of kalánan is kánan.

\textsuperscript{28} The root tambáy 'meet, hang out' is slang derived from English stand by; cf. istámbay 'one who hangs out; good-for-nothing'.
Some roots, including lígo 'bathe', do not nominalize on the pattern illustrated above. In addition to sites, -an can also focus 'BENEFACTEES', as in:

(389) Himo-án ni Maria si Juana sang báyô make-AN UNFOC Maria FOC Juana UNFOC dress 'Maria will make Juana a dress'

Like the 'LOCATIVE' sense, the 'BENEFACTIVE' reading of -an reflects an orientation towards the outermost LIMIT of the EVENT.

Although the MOTILE VOICES cannot mix with INERT VOICES (e.g. the configurations *nag-...-an, *naka-...-on, nag-i- etc. do not occur), certain INERT VOICES can co-occur. The configuration gin-...-an suggests a LIMIT that has been reached by direct encounter with an external influence, as in:

(390) Gin-dugo- án mo ang lamésa GIN-blood-AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC table 'You got the table bloodied'

(391) Gin-inum-án ko ang báso GIN-drink-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC glass 'I drank from the glass'

(392) Gin-kadlaw-án ni Roberto si Juan GIN-laugh- AN UNFOC Roberto FOC Juan 'Roberto laughed at Juan'

(393) Gin-lakt-án nía akó GIN-walk-AN 3SG.UNFOC 1SG.FOC 'S/he walked out on me'

With certain roots such as halók 'kiss', -an limits the involvement of certain PARTICIPANTS, enabling them to be selected by gin-:

(394) (a) *Gin-halók sang estudyánte ang maestro GIN-kiss UNFOC student FOC teacher
In (394b), gin-...-an suggests that the student left a kiss on a portion of the professor's anatomy; without -an, the teacher would, perhaps, be kissed all over or kissed onto something, though a specific meaning is elusive, hence the rejection of (394a). In (395a), I was gravely wounded in such a way as to be clearly affected, while in (395b) I was wounded superficially.

The na-...-an configuration may suggest a LIMIT that has been reached previously by a less controlled or unspecified MOTILE influence:

Sentence (396a) suggests that the wounding was very obvious to the speaker, while (396b) suggests that it is less obvious, perhaps less serious; I was wounded to a limited extent and might not have discovered the wound until much later. Note also the following:
(397) Na-dugo- án ang báyô
NA-blood-AN FOC dress
'The dress was/had been bloodied'

In some instances, a sense of 'being struck by' the quality
named is apparent:

(398) Na-tàmbok-án akò sang pagkáon
NA-fat- AN 1SG.FOC UNFOC food
'The food looks fatty to me'

(399) Na-dákô-án akò sa íya
NA-big- AN 1SG.FOC OBL 3SG.UNFOC
'S/he looks big to me'

(400) Na-kòrni-hán akò sa íya
NA-corny-AN 1SG.FOC OBL 3SG.UNFOC
'S/he sounds corny to me'

In sum, Hiligaynon exhibits a strong, highly refined
series of VOICE contrasts with a much less differentiated ROLE
system. The VOICE affixes orient attention to specific
portions of EVENT structure (e.g. INCEPT, MIDDLE, CRUX, or
LIMIT). The semantics of such selection has consequences for
the formation of morphological Causative sentences which will
be discussed later.

In the corpus-based study by Ruiz (1968), Hiligaynon Verb
roots are divided into four classes based on their ability to
coccur with various VOICES. Class A roots occur with 'Actor
Focus', i.e. 'our' MOTILE VOICES (including mag-/nag-); Class
B roots, with 'Object Focus', i.e. roughly our EXHAUSTIVE
VOICES (including pag-, gin-, i-, and -on); Class C roots,
with 'Instrumental-Transitive Focus', i.e. roughly our MIDDLE
VOICES (including, again, pag-, gin-, i-); and Class D roots,
with 'Locative-Benefactive Focus', i.e. the LIMIT VOICE
(including pag- and -an in combination with i- and gin-) (Ruiz 1968:13,20). The forms maka-/naka- and mang-/nang- are not mentioned. Six classes of Verb root emerge from the potential to combine with these classes of VOICE: A, AB, AD, ABD, ACD, ABCD (Ruiz 1968:96-97). Ruiz is content to list the combinations without offering a context for understanding them: 'This study has not revealed any pattern of group of verb roots according to their meanings' (Ruiz 1968:96). Nor is such explanation offered by Wolfenden (1971, 1975).

In contrast to these studies, our treatment of the Hiligaynon VOICES offers a functional, open-ended framework for making sense of the various VOICE-EVENT combinations encountered. While the current description is not as exhaustive as that of Ruiz (1968) in listing possible combinations, it provides a semantic basis for understanding various combinations. Our 'relief from puzzlement' does not imply predictability; one cannot say for sure whether a particular VOICE-EVENT combination will be validated, nor can one define in advance the terms of any given category (e.g. MOTILE, LIMIT). Instead, we seek to recognize some systematicity lurking in the apparent chaos.

2.2 The Morphosyntax of Hiligaynon Morphological Causative Constructions

The Hiligaynon morpheme -pa- is often described as a 'Causative' morpheme in Philippinist literature. As such, -pa- may distribute the MOTILITY between an 'AGENT' (Causer) and an
'EXECUTOR' (Causee) so that the 'AGENT' may be understood to
delegate the action which the 'EXECUTOR' performs. In doing
so, -pa- does not specify ASPECT, nor does it specify MOTILE
or INERT VOICE. Note the following combinations:

(401) (a) Nag-sulát akò sang libro
NAG-write 1SG.FOC UNFOC book
'I wrote a book'

(b) Nag-pa-sulát akò sang libro
NAG-PA-write 1SG.FOC UNFOC book
'I had a book written'

(402) (a) Gin-sulát ko ang libro
GIN-write 1SG.UNFOC FOC book
'I wrote the book'

(b) Gin-pa-sulát ko ang libro
GIN-PA-write 1SG.UNFOC FOC book
'I had the book written'

(403) (a) Nag-sulát akò sa libro
NAG-write 1SG.FOC OBL book
'I wrote on/in the book'

(b) Nag-pa-sulát akò sa libro
NAG-PA-write 1SG.FOC OBL book
'I had the book written on/in'

As seen here, -pa- co-occurs with both the MOTILE ROLE affix
nag- and the INERT affix gin-. The (a)-sentences involve
directly executed, unmediated actions; I myself wrote the/a
book. The (b)-sentences, with -pa-, involve mediated actions
with FOCUS on the MOTILE and INERT PARTICIPANT respectively;
I had the/a book written by someone else. The 'S'-PARTICIPANT
is no longer MOTILE but PRE-MOTILE and aloof from the
performance, which erupts in a now-MOTILE later PARTICIPANT.

A PARTICIPANT following the PRE-MOTILE 'S'-PARTICIPANT
may, if it is inherently animate and thus capable of filling
the MOTILE ROLE, i.e. capable of actions, be interpreted as the 'Causee':

(404) (a) Nag-sulát akò sa estudyánte
NAG-write 1SG.FOC OBL student
'I wrote to the student'

(b) Nag-pa-sulát akò sa estudyánte
NAG-PA-write 1SG.FOC OBL student
'I had the student write something'
'I had the student written to'

(c) Nag-pa-sulát akò sa íya
NAG-PA-write 1SG.FOC OBL 3SG.UNFOC
'I had him/her write something'
'I had him/her written to'

(d) Nag-pa-sulát akò kay Roberto
NAG-PA-write 1SG.FOC OBL Roberto
'I had Roberto write something'
'I had Roberto written to'

In (404a), without -pa-, the OBLIQUE PARTICIPANT sa estudyánte is the INERT 'RECIPIENT' of the letter. In (404b)-(404d) sa estudyánte, sa íya, and kay Roberto may be INERT 'RECIPIENTS' or 'BENEFECTEES' or they may be MOTILE 'EXECUTORS' (Causees); -pa- does not specify the relations of the INERT PARTICIPANTS to the action. Nor does -pa- specify the degree of 'force' involved; (404b)-(404d) may suggest that I gave permission to have the letters written or that I did not intervene to prevent their writing. What is important is that the PARTICIPANTS perform in such a way that is out of PHASE with their ROLES as such are indicated by their positions within the NUCLEUS (cf. Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 6). Like the German lassen (cf. 1.1), -pa- may be both 'Permissive' (as in 'letting') and 'Causative' (as in 'making', 'forcing').

The 'Causer' need not be animate in a physical sense; it
need only be conceived as being capable of instantiating an
effect. Note the following:

(405) Na-pa-hibi sang líbro ang propesór
NA-PA-cry UNFOC book FOC professor
'The book was able to make the professor cry'

(406) Nag-pa-tíg'a ang balás sa seménto
NAG-PA-hard FOC sand OBL cement
'The sand made the cement get hard'

Neither the book nor the sand is inherently MOTILE, yet each
is the occasion for an effect.

In addition, -pa- does not require that the EVENT in
question be brought to a successful conclusion. Hence, the
following are possible:

(407) Gin-pa-indyèksyon-án si María kahápon , á pang
GIN-PA-inject- AN FOC María yesterday, but
walâ siå ma-indyèksyon-í
not 3SG.FOC MA-injection- I
'Somebody gave permission to have María injected
yesterday, but she wasn't injected'

(408) Gin-pa-ponô si Juan sang buhô, á pang walâ
GIN-PA-fill FOC Juan UNFOC hole, but not
ma-pon- i
MA-fill-I
'John was told to fill the hole with dirt but
didn't'

The suffix -i marks Counterfactual statements, occurring in
both Negatives (with ma-) and Imperatives. Here, -pa-
marks EVENTS that are instigated but not completed. Again, the
nature of the contribution of the MOTILE PARTICIPANT to the
EVENT is imprecise. The MOTILE PARTICIPANT may have given

29If nag- is used, ?Nagpabíhî ang líbro sa propesór
suggests, implausibly, that 'The book was trying to cry with
the professor's help'. Cf. 3.2 for more on 'Reflexive'
Causatives.
permission or issued an order; the 'EXECUTOR' may but need not follow the trajectory to a successful completion. Hence -pa- is negligent of both the inception and the completion of EVENTS.

Strictly speaking then, Hiligaynon has no Causative morpheme, no 'true Causative'. Rather, -pa- seems to detach agency from the INCEPT of the EVENT without firmly reattaching it. In other words, -pa- effects a DISPLACEMENT of MOTILITY from the initial MOTILE PARTICIPANT (rendered PRE-MOTILE) toward a later INERT one (rendered MOTILE). With -pa-, the process in question is not confined to the locus of its origin. In marking departure from the origin, -pa- opens, as it were, a window on the flux of the EVENT at the expense of both the INCEPT and of the coda. The neglect of the termini of EVENTS accords with its ability to co-occur with both MOTILE and INERT VOICES. This neglect also allows EVENTS to be regarded as Incompletive.

With inherently CENTrifugal Verbal roots, -pa- participates in forming delegational Causative constructions, In these, 'EXECUTORS' (Causees) mediate between 'AGENTS' (Causers) and 'PATIENTS' (Affectees). Herewith follows an illustration of the possible combinations of previously discussed Hiligaynon VOICE affixes with -pa-, using the CENTrifugal roots káon 'eat' and sulát 'write'.

With the MOTILE VOICE affixes nag-/mag- and naka-/maka-, the FOCUSED PARTICIPANT is always 'AGENTIVE'. The INERT
PARTICIPANTS are 'EXECUTIVE' and 'PATIENTIVE'. The mediational 'EXECUTORS', which must be relatively MOTILE in comparison with the Affectees, are either FOCUSED with ang/si or marked as 'dynamic' OBLIQUES with sa/kay. They are never marked with ni or sang. Note the following:

(409) (a) Mag-káon ang babáye sang tinápay
    NAG-eat FOC woman UNFOC bread
    'The woman ate some bread'

(b) Mag-pa-káon ang babáye sang tinápay
    NAG-PA-eat FOC woman UNFOC bread
    sa píspis
    OBL bird
    'I had some bread eaten by the bird'

(410) (a) Mag-sulát si Marta sang líbro
    NAG-write FOC Marta UNFOC book
    'The woman wrote a book'

(b) Mag-pa-sulát si Marta sang líbro
    NAG-PA-write FOC Marta UNFOC book
    sa íya
    OBL 3SG.UNFOC
    'Marta had a book written by him/her'

(411) (a) Mag-a- káon akò siní
    MAG-IMP-eat 1SG.FOC this.UNFOC
    'I will eat this'

(b) Mag-a- pa-káon akò siní kay Maria
    MAG-IMP-PA-eat 1SG.FOC UNFOC OBL Maria
    'I will have this eaten by Maria'

(412) (a) Mag-a- sulát akò sang líbro
    MAG-IMP-write 1SG.FOC UNFOC book
    'I will write a book'

(b) Mag-a- pa-sulát akò sang líbro
    MAG-IMP-PA-write 1SG.FOC UNFOC book
    sa íya
    OBL 3SG.UNFOC
    'I have a book written by him/her'

(413) (a) Naka-káon akò sang tinápay
    NAKA-eat 1SG.FOC UNFOC bread
    'I was able to eat some bread'
(b) Maka-pa-káon akò sang tinápay
NAKA-PA-eat 1SG.FOC UNFOC bread
sa ímo
OBL 2SG.UNFOC
'I was able to have some bread eaten by you'

(414) (a) Maka-sulát ang babáye sang libro
NAKA-write FOC woman UNFOC book
'The woman managed to write a book'

(b) Maka-pa-sulát ang babáye sang libro
NAKA-PA-write FOC woman UNFOC book
sa estudyánte
OBL student
'The woman managed to have a book written by the student'

(415) (a) Maka-káon akò sang tinápay
MAKA-eat 1SG.FOC UNFOC bread
'I can eat some bread'

(b) Maka-pa-káon akò sang tinápay
MAKA-PA-eat 1SG.FOC UNFOC bread
kay Bimbo
OBL Bimbo
'I can have some bread eaten by Bimbo'

(416) (a) Maka-sulát ang babáye sang libro
NAKA-write FOC woman UNFOC book
'The woman can write a book'

(b) Maka-pa-sulát ang babáye sang libro
NAKA-PA-write FOC woman UNFOC book
kay Bimbo
OBL Bimbo
'The woman can have a book written by Bimbo'

The roots káon and sulát do not co-occur with nang- or manq- since the EVENTS in question are always effective (or affective). Hence the rejection of the following:

(417) (a) *Nang-káon ...
NANG-eat

(b) *Nang-pa-káon ...
NANG-PA-eat

(418) (a) *Nang-sulát ...
NANG-write
(b) *Nang-pa-sulát ...
    NANG-PA-write

Even with roots that accept nang- and mang-, -pa- is unable to co-occur, whether or not the initial p- is assimilated to the preceding -ng. Note the following:

(419) (a) Na- málhas akó
    NANG-sweat 1SG.FOC
    'I sweated'

(b) *Nang-pa-bálhas ...
    NANG-PA-sweat

(c) *Na-ma-bálhas ...
    NA-PA-sweat

(420) (a) Na- ngítâ akó sang lápis
    NANG-see 1SG.FOC UNFOC pencil
    'I looked for a pencil'

(b) *Nang-pa-kítâ ...
    NANG-PA-see

(c) *Na- ma-kítâ ...
    NANG-PA-see

Since these VOICES construct an EVENT as rising from within the MOTILE ROLE, they are inappropriate for either a causing source or a performing proxy. They meld the impetus and execution so that no separation is possible.

With INERT VOICE, the 'S'-PARTICIPANT is obviously never FOCUSSED. The affixes gin-, na-, and ma- may select either the mediational Causee or the terminal Affectee for FOCUS. Note the following:

(421) (a) Gin-káon ko ang tinápay
    GIN-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC bread
    'I'll eat the bread'

(b) Gin-pa-káon ko ang tinápay sa bátâ
    GIN-PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC bread OBL child
    'I had the bread eaten (by the child)'
(c) Gin-pa-káon ko sang tinápay ang bátá
GIN-PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC bread FOC child
'I had the child eat some bread'

(422) (a) Gin-sulát sang babáye ang líbro
GIN-write UNFOC woman FOC book
'The woman wrote the book'

(b) Gin-pa-sulát sang babáye ang líbro
GIN-PA-write UNFOC woman FOC book
sa estudyánte
OBL student
'The woman had the book written by the student'

(c) Gin-pa-sulát sang babáye sang líbro
GIN-PA-write UNFOC woman FOC student
ang estudyánte
FOC student
'The woman had the student write a book'

(423) (a) Na-káon ko ang tinápay
NA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC bread
'I managed to eat the bread'
'I inadvertently ate the bread'

(b) Na-pa-káon ko ang tinápay
NA-PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC bread
sa píspis
OBL bird
'I managed to have the bread eaten by the bird'

(c) Na-pa-káon ko sang tinápay ang píspis
NA-PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC bread FOC bird
'I was able to have the bird eat some bread'

(424) (a) Na-sulát sang babáye ang líbro
NA-write UNFOC woman FOC book
'The woman managed to write the book'

(b) Na-pa-sulát sang babáye ang líbro kay Roberto
NA-PA-write UNFOC woman FOC book OBL Roberto
'The woman managed to have the book written by Roberto'

(c) Na-pa-sulát sang babáye si Roberto sang líbro
NA-PA-write UNFOC woman FOC Roberto UNFOC book
'The woman had Roberto write a book'

Since na- marks a partial detachment of the performance from the MOTILE ROLE, it facilitates vagueness concerning the
identity of the 'Causers'. Note the following:

(425) Na-pa-káon ang bugás
NA-PA-eat FOC rice
'The rice was given to be eaten'

Here, the 'agency' is not at issue. This sentence might be applicable to a scenario in which someone is being encouraged to give him-/herself free range of a buffet table.

The PROXIMATE form ma- also selects low-control PARTICIPANTS for FOCUS. Like na-, ma- can focus either the 'Causee' or the 'Affectee', as in the following:

(426) (a) Ma-káon ko ang tinápay
MA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC bread
'I can eat the bread'

(b) Ma-pa-káon ko ang tinápay kay Juan
MA-PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC bread OBL Juan
'I can have the bread eaten by Juan'

(c) Ma-pa-káon ko si Juan sang tinápay
MA-PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC Juan UNFOC bread
'I can have Juan eat some bread'

(427) (a) Ma-sulát sang babáye ang sulát kay Juan
MA-write UNFOC woman FOC letter OBL Juan
'The woman can write the letter to Juan'

(b) Ma-pa-sulát sang babáye ang libro kay Juan
MA-PA-write UNFOC woman FOC book OBL Juan
'The woman can have the book written by Juan'

(c) Ma-pa-sulát sang babáye ang estudyánte
MA-PA-write UNFOC woman FOC student
sang libro
UNFOC book
'The woman can have the student write a book'

Of course, ma- may also focus the MOTILE PARTICIPANT or 'Causer', following the pattern of naq- etc.:

(428) (a) Ma-káon akò sang tinápay
MA-eat 1SG.FOC UNFOC bread
'I will eat (some) bread'
(b) Ma-pa-káon akò sang tinápay
MA-PA-eat 1SG.FOC UNFOC bread
sa písíßis
OBL bird
'I will have (some) bread eaten by the bird'

(429) (a) Ma-sulát ang babáye sang libro
MA-write FOC woman UNFOC book
'The woman will write a book'

(b) Ma-pa-sulát ang babáye sang libro kay Roberto
MA-PA-write FOC woman UNFOC book OBL Roberto
'The woman had a book written by Roberto'

Since it orients attention to the MIDDLE of EVENTS, i- marks PARTICIPANTS which may be read as 'INSTRUMENTS'. It does not, however, mark mediational Causees in the manner of gin-, na-, and ma-. Note the following:

(430) (a) I-káon ko ang tinápay
I-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC bread
'I'll eat with/using the bread'

(b) I-pa-káon ko ang tinápay sa bátå
I-PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC bread OBL child
'I'll have the bread eaten by the child'

(c) *I-pa-káon ko sang tinápay ang bátå
I-PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC bread FOC child
('I'll have the child used to eat bread')

(431) (a) I-sulát sang babáye ang lápis
I-write UNFOC woman FOC pencil
'The woman will write with the pencil'

(b) I-pa-sulát sang babáye ang lápis sa estudyánte
I-PA-write UNFOC woman FOC pencil OBL student
'The woman will have the pencil written with by the student'

(c) *I-pa-sulát ko sang lápis ang estudyánte
I-PA-write 1SG.UNRFOC UNFOC pencil FOC student
('I'll have the student used to write a pencil')

The (c)-sentences suggest that i- is narrowly trained on the MIDDLE PHASE of the EVENT structure. The MOTILITY is DISPLACED from the point of origin to a locus preceding that
attended to by i--; i- marks the INERT PARTICIPANT which is
affected by the MOTILE portion of the EVENT. Hence, if bátâ
'child' is selected by i- for FOCUS, it must be interpreted as
an INERT 'Affectee' rather than as a MOTILE 'Causee':

(432)  I-pa-káon ko      ang bátâ  (sa idô)
        I-PA-eat  1SG.UNFOC FOC child (OBL dog)
'I'll have the child eaten (by the dog)'

In sharp contrast to i-, the GOAL-oriented affix -on always
focusses the mediational, active Causee:

(433) (a) Kaón-on ko    ang tinápay
eat- ON 1SG.UNFOC FOC bread
'I'll eat the bread'

(b) Pa-kaón-on ko   sang tinápay ang bátâ
PA-eat- ON 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC bread FOC child
'I'll make the child eat some bread'

(c) *Pa-kaón-on ko   ang tinápay
PA-eat- ON 1SG.UNFOC FOC bread
('I'll have the bread eat something' ?)

(434) (a) Sulat-ón sang babáye ang libro
write-ON UNFOC woman FOC book
'The woman will write the book'

(b) Pa-sulat-ón sang babáye ang estudyánte
PA-write-ON UNFOC student FOC student
sang libro
UNFOC book
'The woman will have the student write a book'

(c) *Pa-sulat-ón sang babáye ang libro
PA-write-ON UNFOC woman FOC book
sa estudyánte
OBL student
('The woman will have the book write to a student'?)

Since it focusses the terminal LIMIT of the EVENT,
-an never focusses the Causee, which is mediational or MIDDLE-
oriented; instead, -an focusses the 'unmoved final resting
place' of the process in question. Note the following:
(435) (a) Kaón-an ko  ang iní nga lamésa
eat- AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC this.FOC LINK table
'I'll eat at this table'

(b) Pa-kaón-an ko  ang iní nga lamésa
PA-eat- AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC this.FOC LINK table
(sa mga propesór)
(OBL PL professor)
'I'll have this table eaten at (by the professors)'

(c) *Pa-kaón-an ko  ang tinápay
PA-eat- AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC bread
('I'll have the bread eaten at'?)

(436) (a) Sulat-án ang babáye {ang papél / ang lamésa}
write-AN FOC woman {FOC paper / FOC table}
'The woman will write {on the paper / at the table}

(b) Pa-sulat-án sang babáye {ang papél / ang lamésa}
PA-write-AN UNFOC woman {FOC paper / FOC table}
Kay Juan
OBL Juan
'The woman will have {the paper written on /
the table written at} by Juan'

(c) *Pa-sulat-án sang babáye si Juan sang papél
PA-write-AN UNFOC woman FOC Juan UNFOC paper
('The woman will have Juan written on/at by some
paper'?)

When two VOICE affixes co-occur to form a circumfix, -pa-
may accompany them as follows:

(437) (a) Ma-sulat-án sang babáye {ang papél / ang lamésa}
MA-write-AN UNFOC woman {FOC paper / FOC table}
'The woman can write {on the paper / at the table}'

(b) Ma-pa-sulat-án sang babáye {ang papél / ang lamésa}
MA-PA-write-AN UNFOC woman {FOC paper / FOC table
sa estudyánte
OBL student
'The woman can have {the paper written on / the
table written at} by the student

(438) (a) Na-sulat-án sang babáye {ang papél / ang lamésa}
NA-write-AN UNFOC woman {FOC paper / FOC table}
'The woman can write {on the paper / at the table}'
(b) Na-pa-sulat-án sang babáye \{ang papél / ang lamésa\}
NA-PA-write-AN UNFOC woman \{FOC paper / FOC table\}
   sa estudánte
   OBL student
'The woman was able to have \{the paper written on / the table written at\} by the student'

In addition to LOCATIONS, -an focusses PARTICIPANTS which are partially or passively affected, as in:

(439) Pa-kaón-an ko ang adóbo sa bátâ
PA-eat- AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC adobo OBL child
'I'll have the adobo eaten by the child'

Sentence (439) implies that only bits of the adobo will be eaten. The child may be a finicky eater or sick, and I expect only partial consumption of the adobo. In the following sentence pair, -an suggests in a different way a less intense involvement of the PARTICIPANTS:

(440) (a) Gin-pa-gútom ko ang idô
GIN-PA-hungry 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog
'I made the dog hungry'

(b) Gin-pa-gútóm- an ko ang idô
GIN-PA-hungry-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog
'I made the dog go hungry'

In (440a), the dog is FOCUSED by gin- as a PARTICIPANT that is actively involved in the process of getting hungry; the most obvious interpretation is that I am actively tempting the dog, perhaps waving a chicken leg in its face. In (440b), -an suggests a more passive hungering relation. I did not tempt the dog but merely (!) withheld its food, possibly through apathy or forgetfulness.

The circumfixes na-...-on and ma-...-on are possible only with 'Adjectival' roots, marking PARTICIPANTS as being wholly enveloped by the EVENT process. Even with 'Adjectives', -pa-
is not permissible:

(441) (a) *Ma-sulat-ón  
MA-write-ON

(b) *Ma-pa-sulat-ón  
MA-PA-write-ON

(442) (a) *Ma-pa-kaon-ón  
MA-PA-eat- ON

(443) (a) Ma-lipáy-on akó  
MA-happy-ON 1SG.FOC  
'I'm happy'

(b) *Ma-pa-lipáy-on ...  
MA-PA-happy-ON

To summarize, the interaction of -pa- with VOICE involves certain semantics-based restrictions. Since nang- and mang- mark EVENTS as arising from within and being confined to the MOTILE ROLE, -pa- does not occur with them. Another restriction concerns the nature of the VOICE-selected (i.e. FOCUSED) PARTICIPANT. Since, in contrast with -an, -on marks the PARTICIPANT as 'more centrally involved', it always focusses the Causee, whether the Causee is mediational or not. Likewise, the PARTICIPANT selected by -an cannot be a Causee in the mediational sense since -an marks the final LIMIT of the EVENT. By the same token, the PARTICIPANTS selected by the MOTILE VOICE affixes (nag-/-mag-, maka-, and ma-) can never be Causees but only Causers. Thus, the PARTICIPANTS at the termini of EVENTS (i.e. the most MOTILE and the most INERT) are excluded from the 'MIDDLE' ground where the Causee operates.

As noted in Chapter 1, Causees may be classified as being
either 'mediational' (in 'Causative' Clauses) or 'non-
mediational' (in 'Transitive' ones), i.e. either true Causees
or hybrid Causees/Affectees. Earlier in the present section,
it was noted that in Hiligaynon, the mediational Causees may
be either FOCUSSED (with ang or si) or OBLIQUE (with sa or
kay), i.e. either NUCLEAR or PROJECTED from the NUCLEUS. In
either case, they are well-bounded PARTICULARS. Mediational
Causees (i.e. Causees proper) are never simply UNFOCUSSED
(with sang or ni). The Proper form ni marks only 'S'-
PARTICIPANTS (i.e. Causers) at the 'source' of the EVENT. The
Common form sang may mark either the Causer at the EVENT
INCEPT or 'source' (i.e. the erstwhile MOTILE PHASE) or the
Affectee at the coda (or INERT PHASE)---but not a mediator or
EXECUTIVE Causee (in the MIDDLE). The OBLIQUE markers sa and
kay mark POST-MOTILE PARTICIPANTS (i.e. a mediational Causee
if such participation is possible or an Affectee if not).

Casey (Ms.), observes that OBLIQUE Causees in
Kapampangan---like those in other languages on record---are the
most autonomous. The same pattern holds in Hiligaynon. Note
the following:

(444) (a) Nag-pa-gówâ akô sang idô
    NAG-PA-out 1SG.FOC UNFOC dog
'I put a dog out'

(b) Nag-pa-gowâ akô sa idô
    NAG-PA-out 1SG.FOC OBL dog
'I let the dog go out'

(445) (a) Nag-pa-bása akô sang estudyânte
    NAG-PA-read 1SG.FOC UNFOC student
'I had a student read (something)'
(b) Nag-pa-bása akò sa estudyánte
NAG-PA-read 1SG.FOC OBL student
'I had the student read (something)'

(446) (a) Nag-pa-kánta akò sang babáye
NAG-PA-sing 1SG.FOC UNFOC woman
'I had a woman sing'

(b) Nag-pa-kánta akò sa babáye
NAG-PA-sing 1SG.FOC OBL woman
'I had the woman sing'

(447) (a) Nag-pa-káon akò sang bátà
NAG-PA-eat 1SG.FOC UNFOC child
'I had a child eaten'
'I had a child eat'

(b) Nag-pa-káon akò sa bátà
NAG-PA-eat 1SG.FOC OBL child
'I had the child eat'
*I had the child eaten'

(448) (a) Nag-pa-bókál si Juan sang túbig
NAG-PA-bubble FOC Juan UNFOC water
'Juan boiled some water'

(b) Nag-pa-bókál si Juan sa túbig
NAG-PA-bubble FOC Juan OBL water
'Juan boiled something in the water'
'Juan asked the water to boil'

In (444a), I displaced a dog from inside to outside, perhaps manually. The dog's responsiveness is not an issue. In (444b), the dog definitely responds to my command or invitation to leave. I have PROJECTED my will to the dog. The MOTILITY is more cleanly displaced from the MOTILE to the POST-MOTILE PARTICIPANT. In (445a), I may have had the student read as part of my teaching ritual; I may be calling students at random in fulfillment of prescribed routine; nothing remarkable 'stands out'. I may even be absent from the scene during the reading. In (446b), however, I must be present. The student seems to be reading on my behalf; perhaps I cannot
read for some reason. Similarly, (446b) suggests that I asked the woman to demonstrate the song or her ability to sing it, while (446a) suggests a more routine matter that I am not so closely involved with; perhaps I am a choir director allowing people to take their turn singing. Sentence (447a), with sang, allows the child to be the one eaten as well as the one that eats. With sa, in (447b), only the latter interpretation is possible. Likewise, the water in (448a) is an INERT PARTICIPANT. In (448b), sa túbig marks either a LOCATION or a PARTICIPANT that is magically capable of 'responding'.

The sang-marked instances, then, suggest relatively undirected responses performed to established routine. The NUCLEAR semantics of sang obscures the distinction between Causer and Causee, so that direct, physical manipulation may be suggested or, alternately, that the Causee's response is part of a familiar routine. (Note that physical manipulation per se is not specified.) In either case, the unremarkable, déjà vu quality of the Causee's response reflects the NUCLEAR semantics of sang discussed earlier, which does not allow the sang-Causee to stand out from the background.

In contrast, the sa-Causees suggest directed responses made on behalf of the MOTILE PARTICIPANT. These 'Causees' seem to be projections from the MOTILE PARTICIPANT (they are 'instrumental', according to E.D.). Since they are separate from other PARTICIPANTS, including the Causer, direct manipulation, coercion, resistance and the like are not an
issue. This greater separateness and direction accords with the previously discussed semantics of PROJECTION associated with *sa*, which removes the PARTICIPANT from the NUCLEAR matrix of the EVENT.

Only one PARTICIPANT per Clause may be marked with *sang*. Any additional occurrences of *sang* involve Temporals or 'Genitives', as in the following:

(449)  Nag-pa-sulát ang babáye sang libro sang 1989  
NAG-PA-write FOC woman UNFOC book UNFOC 1989  
'The woman had a book written in 1989'

(450)  Nag-pa-sulát ang babáye sang libro sang estudyánte  
NAG-PA-write FOC woman UNFOC book UNFOC student  
'The woman had a book of the student's written'

Even a pause will not render the second *sang*-marked element as a PARTICIPANT:

(451)  Nag-pa-sulát ang babáye sang libro, sang estudyánte  
NAG-PA-write FOC woman UNFOC book, UNFOC student  
'The woman had a book written ... (the book) of a student'

With an INERT VOICE, the Causee is either FOCUSSED (via *ang/si*) and NUCLEAR or OBLIQUE and PROJECTED from the NUCLEUS (via *sa/kay*)--never merely UNFOCUSSED (via *sang/ni*). Note the semantically anomalous nature of the following:

(452)  *Gin-pa-básá ko sang estudyánte ang libro  
GIN-PA-read 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC student FOC book  
('I had the book read a student'?)

This sentence smacks of the failed attempt of a foreigner to say 'I had a student read the book'. However, *sang estudyánte* cannot be understood to be operating as a separate entity and taking direction. A *sang*-marked PARTICIPANT is too unbounded, too non-distinct, to operate as a separate Causee. (Recall the
ontological 'dependence' of sang-constructed PARTICIPANTS.)

When the Causee acquires full identity via FOCUS, it becomes the perspective point for the Clause. The Causee may be either directed or directly manipulated. Note the following:

(453)  
\[
\text{Gin-pa-gowâ ko} \quad \text{ang idô} \\
\text{GIN-PA-out 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog} \\
'I let the dog out'
\]

This sentence allows the dog to be either physically manipulated or delegated. I might have opened the door and said 'Out!' (or, more likely, 'Gwâ!'); or I might have picked the dog up and carried it out. Physicality of manipulation (i.e. the interaction of bodies) and delegation/direction alike are unspecified by the grammar. Linguistically constituted EVENTS do not re-present such corporeal interactions, despite commonplace assumptions to the contrary: 'They [corporeal interactions, WLS] are the expressed of statements but are attributed to bodies' (Deleuze & Guattari 1987:86).

An INERT VOICE may select either the Causee or the Affectee (both INERT) for FOCUS. Note the following:

(454)  
(a) \[
\text{Gin-pa-gowâ ko} \quad \text{sang idô ang bátâ} \\
\text{GIN-PA-out 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC dog FOC child} \\
'I had the child let a dog out'
\]

(b) \[
\text{Gin-pa-gowâ ko} \quad \text{ang idô sa bátâ} \\
\text{GIN-PA-out 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog OBL child} \\
'I had the dog put out by the child'
\]

(455)  
(a) \[
\text{Gin-pa-súmbag ni} \quad \text{Juan si Maria sang dîngding} \\
\text{GIN-PA-punch UNFOC Juan FOC Maria UNFOC wall} \\
'Juan had Maria punch a wall'
(b) Gin-pa-súmbag ni Juan ang dingding kay Maria
GIN-PA-punch UNFOC Juan FOC wall OBL Maria
'Juan had Maria punch a wall'

(456) (a) Gin-pa-patáy ko siá sang lamók
GIN-PA-kill 1SG.UNFOC 3SG.FOC UNFOC mosquito
'I had him/her kill a mosquito/some mosquitoes'

(b) Gin-pa-patáy ko ang lamók sa íya
GIN-PA-kill 1SG.UNFOC FOC mosquito OBL Maria
'I made him/her kill the mosquito'
('I had the mosquito killed by him/her')

(457) (a) Gin-pa-bása ko ang estudyánte sang libro
GIN-PA-read 1SG.UNFOC FOC student UNFOC book
'I had the student read a book'

(b) Gin-pa-bása ko ang libro sa estudyánte
GIN-PA-read 1SG.UNFOC FOC book OBL student
'I had the book read by the student'

In the (a)-sentences, the FOCUS falls on the PARTICIPANT regarded as a Causee. Such focal attention may lend itself to various situations and EVENTS with various effects. The (a)-sentences may suggest a clash of wills between the Causer and Causee. The Causer may be understood to bepressuring the Causee; or, alternately, the Causee may be resisting the Causer. The (b)-sentences, with the FOCUS on the Affectee and the Causee marked as OBLIQUE, imply no clash of will between Causer and Causee. The contrast of the (a)- and (b)-examples may also suggest a contrast in intent or purpose. Regarding (456a), I may have told 'her/him' to swat mosquitoes as a ploy to keep her/him busy. The mosquitoes, marked by sang, are vaguely realized PARTICIPANTS. In (456b), I seem to have a particular mosquito marked for death and have merely appointed him/her as the executioner. Similarly, in (457a) I might have delegated the reading to educate the student; in (447b), my
objective seems to have been to get the book read, perhaps proofread. Furthermore, the (a)-sentences imply more strongly that the Causer and NUCLEAR Causee are co-present; the (b)-sentences, with OBLIQUE Causees, more easily accommodate the possibility of delegation from afar. With FOCUS on the Causee, the Causer and Causee are more proximate.

In Hiligaynon, the FOCUS marks a stronger engagement, physical or psychological, on the part of the MOTILE PARTICIPANT. The greater 'force', 'directness', 'resistance', and 'proximity' associated with the FOCUSED INERT PARTICIPANTS and the like reflect the semantics of FOCUS—and not those of a 'Causative construction' per se. Recall that FOCUS places a PARTICIPANT in the PROPOSITION NUCLEUS for direct manipulation and the like.

If both the Causee and another PARTICIPANT are both OBLIQUE, word order or suprasegmental phenomena may clarify the ROLES. Note the following examples with hátag 'give':

(458) Gin-pa-hátag ko kay Maria ang líbro
GIN-PA-give 1SG.UNFOC OBL Maria FOC book
kay Roberto
OBL Roberto
'I had Maria give the book to Roberto'

(459) Gin-pa-hátag ko ang líbro kay Maria
GIN-PA-give 1SG.UNFOC FOC book OBL Maria
kay Roberto
OBL Roberto
'I had the book given by Maria to Roberto'

(460) Gin-pa-hátag ko ang líbro kay Maria,
GIN-PA-give 1SG.UNFOC FOC book OBL Maria,
kay Roberto
OBL Roberto
'I had the book given to Maria by Roberto'
The **PRE-MOTILE** Causer occurs first. The more **MOTILE PARTICIPANT** (i.e. the 'EXECUTOR' or Causee) then precedes the more **INERT** Affectee (as in [458] and [459]), unless the sentence is marked by compensatory pause and stress, as in (460). Thus, the **POST-MOTILE PARTICIPANTS** (i.e. those after the 'S' position) reflect the **MOTILE-to-INERT** sequencing preferred in non-Causative Clauses. Otherwise, **VOICE** distinctions alone may suffice to clarify **ROLES**:

(461)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gin-pa-hátag ko} & \quad \text{si Maria sang líbro} \\
\text{GIN-PA-give 1SG.UNFOC FOC Maria UNFOC book} \\
& \quad \text{kay Roberto} \\
& \quad \text{OBL Roberto} \\
& \quad \text{'I had Maria give a book to Roberto'}
\end{align*}
\]

(462)  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Gin-pa-hatág-an ko} & \quad \text{kay Maria sang líbro} \\
\text{GIN-PA-give- AN 1SG.UNFOC OBL Maria UNFOC book} \\
& \quad \text{si Roberto} \\
& \quad \text{FOC Roberto} \\
& \quad \text{'I had Maria give a book to Roberto'}
\end{align*}
\]

In such sentences, the selection by **VOICE** is sufficient to clarify **PARTICIPANT-to-EVENT** relations.

2.3 Conclusion

Superficially, Hiligaynon adheres to certain Causative profiles discussed in Chapter 1. Like German, Hiligaynon has no true Causative morpheme. However, Causative constructions abound as **epiphenomena** or **assemblages** of **-pa-** with **EVENT** semantics (including the semantics of the **VOICE** and of the **PARTICIPANTS involved**)--which from the outset include situational variables. Semantics does not exclude pragmatics.

The association of Causative 'directness', 'force', 'resistance', and 'proximity' with **FOCUS** and 'indirectness',
'suggestion', 'permission', and 'distance' with OBLIQUENESS recalls the situation in German discussed in (1) in 1.1. Recall that the Preposition von marks a Causee as being more autonomous, more distal, and the like than one marked with Accusative.

Hiligaynon differs from German and other Indo-European languages in that ROLE categories such as Nominative, Accusative, Dative, and Instrumental do not apply. Equivalent distinctions may be discernable, but they are construed in terms of the PHASE of the EVENT rather than the ROLE of PARTICIPANTS in these EVENTS, a distinction that is generally neglected in accounts of Philippine languages. In contrast to Indo-European languages, whose morphosyntax privileges the Noun/PARTICIPANT, Hiligaynon emphasizes the Verb/EVENT. The particular PHASE of EVENT is configured by an array of VOICE affixes which direct FOCUS to a particular PHASE or locus. The directness or physicality of causative manipulation do arise in Hiligaynon, but only in an epiphenomenal manner; such distinctions are not hard-wired into the grammar.

In contrast to the other VOICE affixes, -pa- does not specify a particular locus; it may co-occur with both MOTILE and INERT VOICES. Instead, -pa- marks a DISPLACEMENT of performance/process from the origin of the EVENT to a later PHASE. This DISPLACEMENT, in combination with other VOICE and PARTICIPANT phenomena, allows a Causative/Permissive construal of many EVENTS. Such a construal is, again, epiphenomenal, not
specified as such by the grammar. The epiphenomenal nature of such causation is underscored with special emphasis by the extra-Causative performativity of -pa-, as discussed in Chapter 3.
Chapter Three
Semantic Dimensions of Hiligaynon -pa-

3.0 Introduction

The previous chapter presented the broad outlines of Hiligaynon morphosyntax with an emphasis on morphological Causatives. In this context, -pa- was treated primarily as a Causative marker, a treatment largely consistent with the thrust of a significant portion of the Philippinist literature. Such a treatment, I feel, projects an impoverished understanding of its semantics and a failure to come to terms with the spirit of the language.

This morpheme presumably derives from Proto-Austronesian *pa-, which Dahl describes as having 'causative character': 'It is found with this character from Polynesia to Madagascar, and is thus undoubtedly PAN' (Dahl 1973:119). The Proto-Oceanic reflex seems to be *paka- (cf. Harrison 1982). Maori has the Causative/Directional form whaka- (cf. Song 1991:189). The Tongan reflex faka- may operate under a 'cause' semantics (e.g. mohe 'sleep', fakamohe 'put to sleep') or under an 'act' semantics (e.g. fanongo 'hear', fakafanongo 'heed') (Harrison 1982:198). David Mead (p.c.) reports that, unlike a true Causative, the Kulisu (Bungku-Tolaki, Sulawesi) reflex pok- does not increase the Valency of the Verb or otherwise alter the ROLE structure of the EVENT. It applies only to 'Transitive' roots to yield 'Transitive' roots indicative of potentiality (e.g. keni 'grasp', pokokeni 'able to grasp';
pepate 'kill', pokopepate 'able to kill'). Harrison (1982:199) speculates that POC *paka- functioned only with an 'act' semantics and that the 'cause' semantics was a later innovation. In POC, *paka- originally occurred with 'experiencer Subject' Verbs, 'Adverbial' predicates (e.g. 'quick'), and possibly, Ergative-like 'P-Verbs', whose 'Intransitive Subject' corresponded to the 'Transitive Object' (e.g. 'the door opened' vs. 'the child opened the door').

Within the Western Austronesian languages of the Philippines, -pa- seems to be the most productive derivational affix (cf. De Guzman 1978:336), allowing both 'Causative' and 'Directional' interpretations, along with other variations. In his analysis of Tagalog, Bloomfield (1917:298) notes that '[t]he general sense of the prefix pa- [sic, WLS] is to denote something caused or ordered to undergo such and such an action' (emphasis in the original). Wolfenden (1971:126-131) describes Hiligaynon -pa- as signalling 'the Causative Mode', as distinct from the 'Purposive Mode' of pag- and the 'Distributive Mode' of -pang.2 Wolfenden (1975:126-142)

1I am indebted to David Mead for discussing *paka- with me, and especially the semantics of Kulisu poko-.

2These 'faux -pa-'s' contrast as follows: the pag-Phrase is always Dependent or Gerund-like, as in sang pagabót nía 'upon his/her arrival/arriving', sa paghimo sang bóho '(in order) to make a hole', sa paginúm sang serbésa 'through the drinking of beer', and Madásig ang pagsúnog sang baláy 'Fast was the burning of the house'. In contrast, -pang- may mark fully inflected Verbs. It may suggest serial 'PATIENTS' as in Ginpanabáko nía ang mga ábáno 'S/he smoked cigars one after
continues to discuss -pa- primarily as a 'Causative' morpheme. In a late-nineteenth-century grammar assembled by and for Spanish imperialists, Métrida & Aparicio (1894:155-156) discuss -pa- as an undifferentiated component of such larger 'preposiciones' as napa-, nagapa-, and nakapa-, so that:

'fuera de la significación de mandar, consentir, hacer que etc., ... [-pa-] significa además influir de alguna manera en el paciente ... para que haga algo, ó reciba en sí alguna alteración ó modificación ...'.

In addition, given certain combinations, -pa- may mark a direction toward a place indicated, or direct someone to wait until something or someone arrives (Métrida & Aparicio 1894:156-157). Ruiz (1968:65) distinguishes a 'Causative' -pa- from a 'Directional' one, imputing the semantic variation to homonymy as opposed to polysemy. Later studies, such as those of Bell (1981) and (for Ilokano) Gerðts (1988), focus on 'Causative' constructions as types of 'Clause Union', treating -pa- exclusively as a 'Causative' marker.

another' [cf. tabáko 'tobacco, smoke']. Or, it may mark direction or selectivity: Nanghátak akò sang mga libro 'I gave out some books' (with nang-) suggests random distribution; Nagpanghátak akò sang mga libro, a directed one, e.g. one book per person. In Nag-pang-lakát-on sià sa kaúmhan 'S/he walked through the field', -pang- suggests a walking done all the way through. In Namána sià sang propesór 'She married a professor' the husband (bána) happens to be a professor; in Nagpamána sià sang propesór, it was her explicit aim to marry a professor. Hence, -pang- intensifies 'performance', while pag- entitles it.

3I.e. '... in addition to the meaning of commanding, giving consent, having something done etc. ... [-pa-] means to influence the patient in some manner ... so that it does something, or receives some alteration or modification ...'
Though these sources vary widely in their aims, assumptions, and details, none adopts an explanatory approach toward the apparent polysemy of -pa-. In the current chapter, I will attempt to unpack the polysemy of -pa- in its interactions with EVENTS, PARTICIPANTS, and VOICES. For my own purposes, I recognize five interrelated effects of this morpheme, including (a) common Causatives (with CENTRIFUGAL roots), (b) Reflexive/Middle Causatives, (c) intensity / urgency / certainty, (d) an additional PARTICIPANT (with CENTRIPETAL roots), and (e) gradedness of process. The goal of the present chapter is not to predict the behavior of -pa- with any given root or VOICE, based on prior categories such as 'Causative', but to appreciate the range of its effects in terms of the semantics of DISPLACEMENT of performance from the origin of the EVENT.

3.1 Common Causatives

With numerous CENTRIFUGAL roots naming ACCIDENTAL EVENTS, amenable to kinetic disruption and control, -pa- marks suggests the removal of the performance from the 'S'-PARTICIPANT to a later one, allowing a 'mediational Causative' reading. Here, the CENTRIFUGAL nature of the roots is clearly established by their occurrences with nag- and gin-:

(1) (a) Nag-sulát ang babáye sang libro
    NAG-write FOC woman UNFOC book
    'The woman wrote a book'

(b) Nag-pa-sulát ang babáye sang libro sa estudyánte
    NAG-PA-write FOC woman UNFOC book OBL student
    'The woman had/let a book be written by the student'
(1') (a) Gin-sulát sang babáye ang libro
GIN-write UNFOC woman FOC book
'The woman wrote the book'

(b) Gin-pa-sulát sang babáye ang libro
GIN-PA-write UNFOC woman FOC book
sa estudyánte
OBL student
'The woman had/let the book be written by the student'

(c) Gin-pa-sulát sang babáye sang libro
GIN-PA-write UNFOC woman UNFOC book
ang estudyánte
FOC student
'The woman had/let the student write a book'

(2) (a) Nag-káon ang bátâ sang tinápay
NAG-eat FOC child UNFOC bread
'The child ate some bread'

(b) Nag-pa-káon ang bátâ sang tinápay sa idô
NAG-PA-eat FOC child UNFOC bread OBL dog
'The child had/let some bread be eaten by the dog'

(2') (a) Gin-káon sang bátâ ang tinápay
GIN-eat UNFOC child FOC bread
'The child ate the bread'

(b) Gin-pa-káon sang bátâ ang tinápay sa idô
GIN-PA-eat UNFOC child FOC bread OBL dog
'The child had/let the bread be eaten by the dog'

(c) Gin-pa-káon sang bátâ ang idô sang tinápay
GIN-PA-eat UNFOC child FOC dog UNFOC bread
'The child had/let the dog eat some bread'

(3) (a) Nag-patáy akô sang lamók
NAG-kill 1SG.FOC UNFOC mosquito
'I killed a mosquito'

(b) Nag-pa-patáy akô sang lamók sa polís
NAG-PA-kill 1SG.FOC UNFOC mosquito OBL police
'I had/let the policeman kill a mosquito'

(3') (a) Gin-patáy ko ang lamók
GIN-kill 1SG.UNFOC FOC mosquito
'I killed the mosquito'

(b) Gin-pa-patáy ko ang lamók sa polís
GIN-PA-kill 1SG.UNFOC FOC mosquito OBL police
'I had/let the mosquito be killed by the policeman'
(c) Gin-pa-patáy ko ang polís sang lamók
GIN-PA-kill 1SG.UKNFOC FOC police UNFOC mosquito
'I had/let the policeman kill a mosquito'

(4)
(a) Nag-sínggit akò sang íya ngálan
NAG-shout 1SG.FOC UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC name
sa ímo
OBL 2SG.UNFOC
'I shouted his/her name to you'

(b) Nag-pa-sínggit akò sang ímo ngálan
NAG-PA-shout 1SG.FOC UNFOC 2SG.UNFOC name
sa íya
OBL 3SG.UNFOC
'I had/let him/her shout your name'

(4')
(a) Gin-sínggit ko ang íya ngálan
GIN-shout 1SG.UNFOC FOC 3SG.UNFOC name
'I shouted his/her name'

(b) Gin-pa-sínggit ko ang íya ngálan
GIN-PA-shout 1SG.UNFOC FOC 3SG.UNFOC name
kay Roberto
OBL Roberto
'I had/let his/her name be shouted by Roberto'

(c) Gin-pa-sínggit ko si Roberto sang
GIN-PA-shout 1SG.UNFOC FOC Roberto UNFOC
íya ngálan
3SG.UNFOC name
'I had/let Roberto shout his/her name'

(5)
(a) Nag-kánta akò sang híímno
NAG-sing 1SG.FOC UNFOC hymn
'I sang a hymn'

(b) Nag-pa-kánta akò sang híímno kay Bimbo
NAG-PA-sing 1SG.FOC UNFOC hymn OBL Bimbo
'I had/let a hymn be sung by Bimbo'

(5')
(a) Gin-kánta ko ang híímno
GIN-sing 1SG.UNFOC FOC hymn
'I sang the hymn'

(b) Gin-pa-kánta ko ang híímno kay Bimbo
GIN-PA-sing 1SG.UNFOC FOC hymn OBL Bimbo
'I had/let the hymn be sung by Bimbo'

(c) Gin-pa-kánta ko si Bimbo sang híímno
GIN-PA-sing 1SG.UNFOC FOC Bimbo UNFOC hymn
'I had/let Bimbo sing a hymn'
(6) (a) Nag-langóy siá sang subâ
NAG-swim 3SG.FOC UNFOC river
'S/he swam a river'

(b) Nag-pa-langóy siá sang subâ sa íya
NAG-PA-swim 3SG.FOC UNFOC river OBL 3SG.UNFOC
'S/he had/let a river be swum by him/her'

(6') (a) Gin-lángoy ko ang subâ
GIN-swim 1SG.UNFOC FOC river
'I swam the river'

(b) Gin-pa-lángoy ko ang subâ sa íya
GIN-PA-swim 1SG.UNFOC FOC river OBL 3SG.UNFOC
'I had/let the river be swum by him/her'

(c) Gin-pa-lángoy ko siá sang subâ
GIN-PA-swim 1SG.UNFOC 3SG.FOC UNFOC river
'I had/let him/her swim a river'

(7) (a) Nag-túlog ang pasyénte sang byérnes
NAG-sleep FOC patient UNFOC Tuesday
'The patient slept last Tuesday'

(b) Nag-pa-túlog sang pasyénte ang bulúng
NAG-PA-sleep UNFOC patient FOC medicine
'The medicine made/let the patient sleep'

(7') (a) Gin-túlog ko ang sakít sang
GIN-sleep 1SG.UNFOC FOC pain UNFOC
ákon úlo
1SG.UNFOC head
'I slept my headache away'

(b) Gin-pa-túlog ko si Roberto
GIN-PA-sleep 1SG.UNFOC FOC Roberto
'I made/let Roberto sleep'

(c) Gin-pa-túlog ko ang pasyénte kay Roberto
GIN-PA-sleep 1SG.UNFOC FOC patient OBL Roberto
'I had/let the patient be put to sleep by Roberto'

(8) (a) Nag-dúnot akò sang ságing
NAG-mash 1SG.FOC UNFOC banana
'I mashed/rotted a banana'

(b) Nag-pa-dúnot akò sang ságing
NAG-PA-mash 1SG.FOC UNFOC banana
'I had/let a banana rot'
(c) **Nag-pa-dúnot akò sang ságing kay Roberto**
NAG-PA-mash 1SG.FOC UNFOC banana OBL Roberto
'I had/let Roberto mash a banana'

(8') (a) **Gin-dúnot ang ságing**
GIN-mash FOC banana
'The banana was mashed'

(b) **Gin-pa-dúnot ko ang ságing kay Roberto**
GIN-PA-mash 1SG.UNFOC FOC banana OBL Roberto
'I had/let the banana be mashed by Roberto'

(c) **Gin-pa-dúnot ko si Roberto sang ságing**
GIN-PA-mash 1SG.UNFOC FOC Roberto UNFOC banana
'I had/let Roberto mash a banana'

Each of the (a)-sentences is non-Causative; there is no mediation, no disruption of influence. Both the *nag*-marked (b)-sentences and the *gin*-marked (b)- and (c)-sentences suggest the mediation of a Causee.

The Causee need not mediate. A single PARTICIPANT may share characteristics of a Causee and Affectee simultaneously as a 'Causee/Affectee'. It may be inanimate but also self-motivating, as in the following:

(9) **Gin-pa-dúnot ko ang ságing**
GIN-PA-mash 1SG.UNFOC FOC banana
'I had/let the banana get mushy'

Here, the banana gets mushy through the playing out of its own entropic processes; I do nothing to it but rather remain aloof while the EVENT plays out. There is no 'mediation'. In the following, the (b)-sentences are ambiguous as to whether mediation is involved:

(10) (a) **Nag-lígíd akò sang bóla kay Juan**
NAG-roll 1SG.FOC UNFOC ball OBL Juan
'I rolled a ball to Juan'
(b) *Nag-pa-lígid akò sang bóla kay Juan*  
NAG-PA-roll 1SG.FOC UNFOC ball OBL Juan  
'I made/let a ball roll to Juan'  
'I made/let José roll a ball'

(10') (a) *Gin-lígid ko ang bóla*  
GIN-roll 1SG.UNFOC FOC ball  
'I rolled the ball'

(b) *Gin-pa-lígid ko ang bóla sa bátå*  
GIN-PA-roll 1SG.UNFOC FOC ball OBL child  
'I had/let the ball roll to the child'  
'I had/let the ball be rolled by the child'

(c) *Gin-pa-lígid ko sang bóla ang bátå*  
GIN-PA-roll 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC ball FOC child  
'I had the child roll a ball'

(11) (a) *Nag-lígid akò sang bóla kay Juan*  
NAG-roll 1SG.FOC UNFOC ball OBL Juan  
'I rolled a ball to Juan'

(b) *Nag-pa-lígid akò sang bóla kay Juan*  
NAG-PA-roll 1SG.FOC UNFOC ball OBL Juan  
'I made/let a ball roll to Juan'  
'I made/let Juan roll the ball'

(11') (a) *Gin-lígid ko ang bóla*  
GIN-roll 1SG.UNFOC FOC ball  
'I rolled the ball'

(b) *Gin-pa-lígid ko ang bóla sa bátå*  
GIN-PA-roll 1SG.UNFOC FOC ball OBL child  
'I had/let the ball/let roll to the child'  
'I had/let the ball be rolled by the child'

(c) *Gin-pa-lígid ko sang bóla ang bátå*  
GIN-PA-roll 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC ball FOC child  
'I had/let the child roll a ball'

(12) (a) *Nag-sándig akò sang póste*  
NAG-lean 1SG.FOC UNFOC post  
'I leaned a post over'

(b) *Nag-pa-sándig akó sang póste*  
NAG-PA-lean 1SG.FOC UNFOC post  
'I had/let a post lean over'

(c) *Nag-pa-sándig akó sang póste sa ímo*  
NAG-PA-lean 1SG.FOC UNFOC post OBL 2SG.UNFOC  
'I had/let a post be leaned over by you'
(12') (a) Gin-sándig ko ang póste
GIN-lean 1SG.UNFOC FOC post
'I leaned the post'

(b) Gin-pa-sándig ko ang póste
GIN-PA-lean 1SG.UNFOC FOC post
'I had/let the post lean over'

(c) Gin-pa-sándig ko ang póste kay Roberto
GIN-PA-lean 1SG.UNFOC FOC post OBL Roberto
'I had/let the post be leaned over by Roberto'

(d) Gin-pa-sándig ko si Roberto sang póste
GIN-PA-lean 1SG.UNFOC FOC Roberto UNFOC post
'I had/let Roberto lean a post'

The (b)-sentences may suggest mediation: I had the child roll the ball or some unnamed person lean the post. If mediation is not assumed—if I rolled the ball to the child or leaned the post over by myself—how do the (b)-sentences differ from the (a)-sentences? The (b)-sentences suggest a disruption in the continuity of the influence of the PRE-MOTILE 'S' PARTICIPANT upon subsequent PARTICIPANTS. In (11a) and (11'a), I maintained contact with the ball, like Sisyphus with his stone, and accompanied it to the goal (i.e. the child). In (11b), I shoved it toward the child or simply allowed it to roll to the child; my contact was minimal. In (12a) and (12'a), I firmly leaned the post over, holding it until it was in place. In (12b) and (12'b), I either allowed it to lean by itself or pushed it part of the way over and allowed gravity and inertia to take it to its final resting place. Whether or not it marks a mediational situation, -pa- consistently marks a DISPLACEMENT of the process from the point of origin of each EVENT.
3.2 Reflexive/Middle Causatives

With a MOTILE VOICE selecting the origin of the EVENT, -pa- can derive EVENTS whose trajectories of influence return to their points of origin. With CENTRIPETAL roots, no other PARTICIPANT need be involved. With CENTrifugal EVENTS, -pa- can suggest the involvement of other PARTICIPANTS. Note the following:

(13) (a) Nag-támbok akó
NAG-fat 1SG.FOC
'I got fat/gained weight'

(b) Nag-pa-támbok akó
NAG-PA-fat 1SG.FOC
'I got myself fat (with help)'

(14) (a) Nag-masakít ikáw
NAG-sick 2SG.FOC
'You got sick'

(b) Nag-pa-masakít ikáw
NAG-PA-sick 2SG.FOC
'You got yourself sick (with help)'

(15) (a) Nag-hibí akó
NAG-cry 1SG.FOC
'I started to cry'

(b) Nag-pa-hibí akó
NAG-PA-cry 1SG.FOC
'I made myself cry [with help]'

Although these sentences happen to be marked with nag-, other affixes, e.g. ma-, may have the same 'Reflexive' effect:

(16) (a) Ma-gútom akó
MA-hungry 1SG.FOC
'I'll be hungry'

(b) Ma-pa-gútom akó
MA-PA-hungry 1SG.FOC
'I'll get myself hungry'
The (a)-sentences suggest that I or you got fat or sick and so on with no effort; it just happened. The (b)-sentences suggest the expenditure of effort to do so, perhaps overeating to fatten up or overworking to get sick, or exposing my eyes to onions to cry. As in other Causative constructions, there is an involvement with some external means of accomplishment. With CENTRIFUGAL roots such as súmbag 'punch', lámpos 'hit', and anó 'what/do', the 'Causative' sense is more apparent:

(18) (a) Nag-súmbag ang kriminál sang rádyo
NAG-punch FOC criminal UNFOC radio
'The criminal punched a radio'

(b) Nag-pa-súmbag ang kriminál (sa polís)
NAG-PA-punch FOC criminal (OBL police)
'The criminal got himself punched (by the policeman)'

(19) (a) Nag-lámpos akò sang lamésa
NAG-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC table
'I hit a table'

(b) Nag-pa-lámpos akò sang káhoy (kay Pedro)
NAG-PA-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC wood (OBL Pedro)
'I let myself be hit with wood by Pedro'

(20) (a) Nag-anó silá
NAG-what/do 3PL.FOC
'What did they do?'

(b) Nag-pa-anó silá
NAG-PA-what/do 3PL.FOC
'What did they have done to themselves?'

As discussed in 2.1.4, roots naming low-control,
ESSENTIAL EVENTS disallow MOTILE/ERUPTIVE VOICE as marked by nag-/mag-. In displacing the MOTILITY from the 'S'-PARTICIPANT, rendering the ROLE PRE-MOTILE, -pa- enables a sense of 'intension' or 'control' to be read into the EVENT and allows the co-occurrence of e.g. nag- with such roots:

(21) (a) *Nag-gútom akò ...
    NAG-hungry 1SG.FOC

    (b) Nag-pa-gútom akò
    NAG-PA-hungry 1SG.FOC
    'I made myself hungry / went hungry intentionally'

(22) (a) *Nag-ákid ang babáye sang estudyánte
    NAG-angry FOC woman UNFOC student

    (b) Nag-pa-ákid ang babáye
    NAG-PA-angry FOC woman
    'The woman got someone angry at her'
    *'The woman made herself angry'

(23) (a) *Nag-hibaló ...
    NAG-know

    (b) Nag-pa-hibaló akò sang íya kahimtángan
    NAG-PA-know 1SG.FOC UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC situation
    kay Roberto
    OBL Roberto
    'I had his/her situation known to Roberto'

(24) (a) *Nag-kilála ...
    NAG-know

    (b) Nag-pa-kilála akò sa íya asáwa
    NAG-PA-know 1SG.FOC OBL 3SG.UNFOC wife
    'I introduced myself to his wife'

In displacing the original 'S'-PARTICIPANT from the actual 'performance' of such low-control EVENTS, -pa- allows nag- to co-occur with such roots to focus PARTICIPANTS which are read as 'controlling' instigators.

Note that -pa- does not necessarily increase Valency. It
is not a transitivizer. With some roots, in fact, it appears to grammatically 'detransitivize':

(25) (a) Nag-íntô si Roberto sang babáye
    NAG-fool FOC Roberto UNFOC woman
    'Roberto fooled a woman'

    (b) Nag-pa-íntô si Roberto
    NAG-PA-fool FOC Roberto
    'Roberto had himself fooled'
    *'Roberto had someone fooled'

(26) (a) Nag-úlî akò sang libro
    NAG-return 1SG.FOC UNFOC book
    'I returned a book'

    (b) Nag-pa-úlî akò (*sang libro)
    NAG-PA-return 1SG.FOC (*UNFOC book)
    'I returned [e.g. home]'
    *'I returned something'

(27) (a) Nag-bilín akò sang tinápây
    NAG-remain 1SG.FOC UNFOC bread
    'I left some bread'

    (b) Nag-pa-bilín akò sa kwárto
    NAG-PA-remain 1SG.FOC OBL room
    'I tarried in the room'

The (a)-sentences construct EVENTS which are CENTRIFUGAL, involving of necessity more than one PARTICIPANT. The (b)-sentences mark CENTRIPETAL EVENTS in which the effect returns to the MOTILE PARTICIPANT which originates it. Note that (26b) and (27b) are 'Middle' EVENTS rather than 'Reflexives' (i.e. I did not return myself or remain myself). Like Reflexives, Middles imply that the origin of the EVENT is also the final locus of influence.

The 'Reflexive'/'Middle' interpretation reflects in part the absence of an INERT PARTICIPANT that is understandable as a Causee. If such a PARTICIPANT is available, it may be
interpreted as a Causee if connected by sang; if the INERT PARTICIPANT is OBLIQUE, the 'Reflexive' interpretation remains:

(28) (a) Nag-pa-masakí t ikáw sang babáye
    NAG-PA-sick 2SG.FOC UNFOC woman
    'You made a woman sick'

(b) Nag-pa-masakí t ikáw sa babáye
    NAG-PA-sick 2SG.FOC OBL woman
    'You got yourself sick over the woman'

In both 'Causative' and 'Reflexive' uses, -pa- consistently suggests a heightened prolonged involvement of PARTICIPANTS in their EVENTS. This intensity reflects the disruption of the influence perceived to emanate from the 'S'-ROLE to an 'O' ROLE. With many EVENTS, such disruption allows the inference that the 'S'-PARTICIPANT is objectifying itself.

3.3 Intensity, Urgency, Certainty

The heightened intensity or urgency suggested by -pa- need not be limited to 'Reflexive' EVENTS or to Clauses marked with nag-, or, indeed to the PARTICIPANTS within the EVENT. I have not been able to identify precisely the variables which yield an 'Intensive' reading. Such readings arise with roots and VOICES that have the potential for a CENTRIPETAL reading. The Intensity of Involvement may be heightened in terms of of PARTICIPANTS in their EVENT, and of the interlocutors in the speaking situation.

A good example of the first type is found with the root ági 'pass'. The addition of -pa- to ági suggests a deeper, more intense Involvement of the PARTICIPANTS concerned. Note
the following:

(29)  (a) Agí- hán mo ang pínta
       pass-AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC paint
       'Pass by the paint!'  
       'Pass through the paint!'

       (b) Pa-agí- hán mo ang pínta
           PA-pass-AN 2SG.UFOC FOC paint
           'Pass through the paint!'  
           'Mark the paint!'  
           *'Pass by the paint!'

(30)  (a) Nag-ági kitá sa ganháan
       NAG-pass 1PL.INC.FOC OBL door
       'We passed by the door'  
       'We passed through the door'

       (b) Nag-pa-ági kitá sa ganháan
           NAG-PA-pass 1PL.INC.FOC OBL door
           'We passed through the door'  
           *'We passed by the door'

(31)  (a) Ma-ági akò sa ínyo baláy
       NAG-pass 1SG.FOC OBL 2PL.POSS house
       pakádto sa tindáhan
       en.route OBL store
       'I'll pass by your house en route to the store'

       (b) Ma-pa-ági akò sa ínyo baláy
           MA-PA-pass 1SG.FOC OBL your house
           pakádto sa tyendáhan
           en.route OBL store
           'I'll pass by your house en route to the store'

In (29a), I pass by some paint (whether applied to a surface or stored in a can) without disturbing or altering it. In (29b), I cannot merely pass by but must pass through it, interacting with it directly, leaving either tracks or traces. Similarly, in (30b), I must pass through the door as opposed to by it. Sentence (30a), in contrast, allows the reading of passing by it. If the 'passing-through' reading is assumed for both sentences of (30), then (30b) differs from (30a) in suggesting a deviation from an alternate route such as a
window; my choosing the door is deliberate. Similarly, (31b) suggests a detour or departure from another expected trajectory. In all of these readings, -pa- implies a heightened Involvement of the PARTICIPANTS in their respective EVENTS.

The conceptual range of ági is quite broad. In combination with -pa- and -an ("-han"), ági suggests an image of a highly involved 'passing' consistent with such disparate concepts as 'ironing', 'sewing', 'sweeping', 'wiping', 'beating', 'tracing', and 'tracking':

(32)  
Pa-àgi- hán mo ang báyô sang plántsa  
PA-pass-AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC dress UNFOC iron  
'Iron the dress!'  
('Pass an iron on the dress')

(33)  
Pa-àgi- hán mo ang báyô sa mákina  
PA-pass-AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC dress OBL machine  
'Sew the dress!'  
('Pass the dress through the sewing machine')

(34)  
Gin-pa-àgi- hán mo ang báyô  
GIN-PA-pass-AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC dress  
'You sewed the dress'  
('You passed [needle and thread] through the dress')  
'You ironed the dress'  
('You passed [an iron] on the dress')

(35)  
Pa-àgi-hán mo sang sîlìg ang salóg  
PA-pass-ON 2SG.UNFOC UNFOC broom FOC floor  
'Sweep the floor!'  
('Pass a broom across the floor')

(36)  
Pa-àgi-hán ko ang lamésa sang habón kag  
PA-pass-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC table UNFOC soap and  
túbig water  
'I'll wipe off the table with soap and water'  
('I'll pass soap and water across the table')

(37)  
Pa-àgi-hán mo ang idô  
PA-pass-AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC dog  
'Beat the dog (and leave marks)!'
(38) Pa-âgi-hán mo sang lápis ang mápa  
    PA-pass-AN 2SG.UNFOC UNFOC pencil FOC map  
    'Trace the map with a pencil'  
    ('Pass the pencil along the map')

(39) Pa-âgi-hán mo ang èropláno sang radar  
    PA-pass-AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC airplane UNFOC radar  
    'Track the airplane with radar'

In (32)-(39), paâgihán implies the close Involvement of the PARTICIPANTS of the EVENTS with each other, an Involvement which may or may not imply physical contact.

With ága 'morning/early' (but not with hápon 'afternoon' or gáb'i 'evening'), -pa- performs as a 'Comparative', as in:

(40) (a) Ága ang íla pag-abót  
        morning/early FOC 3PL.UNFOC PAG-arrive  
        'Their arrival is/will be early'

(b) Pa-ága ang íla pag-abót  
    PA-morning/early FOC 3PL.UNFOC PAG-arrive  
    'Their arrival is earlier'

Here, -pa- marks a relocation to the morning, a departure from expectations, consonant with 'intensity' (i.e. 'really early') as well as 'gradedness'. Note that 'Involvement' need not suggest relations between PARTICIPANTS but a global increase in effectiveness.

With the root güsto 'like, want', -pa- suggests a process with no apparent endpoint, a 'bottomless pit of desire':

(41) (a) Ma-pa-gústo akò bakál sang báyô  
        MA-PA-like 1SG.FOC buy UNFOC dress  
        kon may kwárta akò  
        when have money 1SG.FOC  
        'I will buy as many dresses as I have money to'

(b) *Ma-gústo akò bakál sang báyô  
    AGT.FOC-like 1SG.FOC buy UNFOC dress
These sentences involve a DISPLACEMENT of expectations consonant with an increase of consumption, an increase that involves both the consumer (who 'tarries' in the process of consumption) and the consumed (which is consumed all the more fully).

The second dimension of intensification includes the interlocutors in the speaking situation. This effect is observed with a variety of roots and affixes. In the following, -pa- heightens intensity with which the stated objective is to be pursued, deriving EVENTS which are more assertive. Note the following:

(44) (a) I-kádto ko iníng sapátos sa Himaláyas
I-go 1SG.UNFOC this.FOC shoe OBL Himaláyas
'I'll have these shoes go to the Himalayas'

(b) I-pa-kádto ko iníng sapátos
I-PA-go 1SG.UNFOC this.FOC shoe
sa Himaláyas OBL Himaláyas
'I'll have these shoes go to the Himalayas'

(45) (a) Nag-a- bútlak ang ádlaw
NAG-IMP-rise FOC sun
'The sun is rising'

(b) Nag-a- pa-bútlak ang ádlaw
NAG-IMP-PA-rise FOC sun
'The sun is rising'

'The form iníng is a contraction of iní nga.'
(46) (a) Lígo na  
bathe now  
'Take a bath!'

(b) Pa-lígo na  
PA-bathe now  
'Take a bath!'

(47) (a) Kádto ka  
dirí  
come 2SG.UNFOC here  
'Come here!'

(b) Pa-  
kádto ka dirí  
PA-come 2SG here  
'Come here!'

(48) (a) Diín ka  
nag-kádto  
where 2SG.FOC NAG-go  
'Where did you go?'

(b) Diín ka  
nag-pa-kádto  
where 2SG.FOC NAG-PA-go  
'Where did you go?'

(49) (a) Lisó-on mo  
ang ísdâ  
turn-ON 2SG.UNFOC FOC fish  
'You turn the fish'

(b) Pa-lisó-on mo  
ang ísdâ  
PA-turn-ON 2SG.UNFOC FOC fish  
'You turn the fish'

(50) (a) Baliskar-ón ko  
ang ísdâ  
opposite-ON 2SG.UNFOC FOC fish  
'I'll turn the fish over'

(b) Pa-baliskar-ón ko  
ang ísdâ  
PA-opposite-ON 1SG.UNFOC FOC fish  
'I'll turn the fish over'

(51) (a) Tig'a-hón ko  
ang ákon  
tágiposóon  
hard- ON 1SG.UNFOC FOC 1SG.UNFOC heart  
'I'll harden my heart'

(b) Pa-tig'a-hon ko  
ang ákon  
tágiposóon  
PA-hard- ON 1SG.UNFOC FOC 1SG.UNFOC heart  
'I'll harden my heart'

The (a)-sentences are casual utterances intended to be merely informative. In (44a) and (45a), I respectively state my
intention to wear these shoes (which I may currently be wearing) or casually observe that the sun is rising. The (b)-sentences are more assertive. Sentence (44b) suggests that I will take special care to wear these shoes and none other, and (45b) reads as an urgent statement; perhaps I am warning a vampire to take cover. Sentence (46a) is an initial command to take a bath, while (46b) suggests a repetition of the command or a clarification. Similar contrasts are observed in (47)-(51). The fish in (49b) may be on the verge of burning, or I may be repeating a command. Sentence (50b) suggests that I am just about to turn the fish over, while (50a) implies an action further removed into the future. Finally, (51a) implies that I will harden my heart temporarily and 'just this once', while (51b) implies a more deliberate resolution to engage in a long-term process of change—a departure from my previous attitude.

In some instances, the DISPLACEMENT semantics renders a 'casual' or 'ordinary' or 'phatic' statement into an 'emphatic' one, e.g.:

(52)  (a) Diín ka ma-kádto
      where 2SG.UNFOC MA-go
    'Where are you going?'

      (b) Diín ka ma-pa-kádto
      where 2SG.UNFOC MA-PA-go
    'Where are you going?'

Hence, an ordinary greeting on the order of 'How's it going?' in (52a) may become an extra-ordinary quest for information in (52b). In intensifying the interpersonal Involvement of
interlocutors, -pa- is (like language itself) not merely descriptive but performative in the sense of Austin (1962); i.e. it does not "describe" or "report" or constate anything at all, ... [is] not "true" or "false"', and its utterance 'is, or is a part of, the doing of an action, which again would not normally be described as, or as "just", saying something' (Austin 1962:5).

With Irrealis ASPECT, the heightened 'Intensity of Involvement' effected by -pa- may suggest a heightened epistemic 'certainty'. This 'intensity' sense is dependent on the constitution of the MOTILE PARTICIPANT. The 'intensive'/'certain' If it is animate or HUMAN, -pa- yields a (delegational) Causative, as in:

(53) (a) Maka-patáy akò sa ímo
       MAKAP-DIE 1SG.FOC OBL 2SG.UNFOC
       'I can kill you'

(b) Maka-pa-patáy akò sa ímo
       MAKAP-PA-DIE 1SG.FOC OBL 2SG.UNFOC
       'I can have you killed'
       'I can have you kill (someone)'

If, however, the MOTILE PARTICIPANT is inanimate (and therefore incapable of verbally delegating), -pa- may convey a heightened epistemic sense of 'certainty':

(54) (a) Maka-patáy ang drúga sa ímo
       MAKAP-DIE FOC drug OBL 2SG.UNFOC
       'Drugs can kill you'

(b) Maka-pa-patáy ang drúga sa ímo
       MAKAP-PA-DIE FOC drug OBL 2SG.UNFOC
       'Drugs can (really) kill you'

(55) (a) Maka-gubá ang drúga sang ímo láwas
       MAKAP-DESTROY FOC drugs UNFOC 2SG.POSS body
       'Drugs can destroy your body'
(b) Maka-pa-gubà ang drúga sang ímo láwas
MAKA-PA-destroy FOC drugs UNFOC 2SG.POSS body
'Drugs can (really) destroy your body'

56) (a) Maka-áyo ang drúga sa ímo
MAKA-good FOC drug OBL 2SG.UNFOC
'The drug can make you well'

(b) Maka-pa-áyo ang drúga sa ímo
MAKA-PA-good FOC drug OBL 2SG.UNFOC
'The drug can make you well'

57) (a) Maka-tínlo ang detergent sang pínggan
MAKA-clean FOC detergent UNFOC plates
'The detergent can clean the plates'

(b) Maka-pa-tínlo ang detergent sang pínggan
MAKA-PA-clean FOC detergent UNFOC plate
'The detergent can clean the plates'

58) (a) Maka-lútô sang mansánas ang ínit
MAKA-ripe UNFOC apple FOC heat
'The heat can ripen the apples'

(b) Maka-pa-lútô sang mansánas ang ínit
MAKA-PA-ripe UNFOC apple FOC heat
'The heat can ripen the apples'

59) (a) Maka-pásô ang kapé sa ímo
MAKA-scald FOC coffee OBL 2SG.UNFOC
'The coffee can scald you'

(b) Maka-pa-pásô ang kapé sa ímo
MAKA-PA-scald FOC coffee OBL 2SG.UNFOC
'The coffee can scald you'

60) (a) Ma-náog akó
MA-down 1SG.FOC
'I'll go down'

(b) Ma-pa-náog akó
MA-PA-down 1SG.FOC
'I'll go down'

The (a)-sentences are more generic and more casual than the (b)-sentences, which seem more specific, intense, or urgent.

5The VOS word order is preferred since the VSO alternative Makalútô sang ínit sang mansánas is likely to be interpreted as 'The heat of the apples can ripen'.

---
Sentences (54a) and (55a), for instance, are casual statements of fact, while (54b) and (55b) sound like warnings to someone who is actually involved with drugs. Similarly, (59a) might be a cautionary statement to a person who is being shown the appointments of a kitchen; (59b) suggests that somebody is actually being careless. Sentence (60a) is a casual observation; (60b) is more of a promise. There is more commitment in it. All -pa-marked roots suggest high probability that the EVENT may be realized.

With roots naming low-control EVENTS, -pa- is necessary to allow a DISPLACEMENT of influence from a specific point of origin, as in:

(61) (a) *Maka-búgtaw ...
       MAKA-awake

       (b) Maka-pa-búgtaw ang kapé sa ímo
            MAKA-PA-awake FOC coffee OBL 2SG.OBL
            'The coffee can awaken you'

(62) (a) *Maka-bálhas ...
       MAKA-sweat

       (b) Maka-pa-bálhas ang exercise sa ímo
            MAKA-PA-sweat FOC exercise OBL 2SG.UNFOC
            'Exercise can make you sweat'

(63) (a) *Maka-lápyó ...
       MAKA-tired

       (b) Maka-pa-lápyó ang exercise sa ímo
            MAKA-PA-tired FOC exercise OBL 2SG.UNFOC
            'Exercise can make you tired'

(64) (a) *Maka-gútom ang exercise sa ímo
       MAKA-hungry FOC exercise OBL 2SG.FOC

       (b) Maka-pa-gútom ang exercise sa ímo
            MAKA-PA-hungry FOC exercise OBL 2SG.UNFOC
            'Exercise can make you hungry'
The (a)-sentences are marked as unacceptable. The (b)-sentences, however, are focussed on a particular case and assert the speaker's certainty or commitment to what he or she is saying. There is a deeper Involvement of the interlocutors in the process; they may be currently in the process of awakening, sweating, tiring, or getting hungry. In fact, the 'intensity' in question is not necessarily confined to the PARTICIPANTS within the EVENT but (as we have already seen with the emphatic use of -pa-) extends to the interlocutors within the speaking situation. With some EVENTS intensity is achieved through the reduplication of -pa-, as in:

(65)  
(a) Ma-ági akò kay José bwás  
MA-pass 1SG.FOC OBL José tomorrow  
'I'll pass (by) José('s) tomorrow'

(b) Ma-pa-ági akò kay José bwás  
MA-PA-pass 1SG.FOC OBL José tomorrow  
'I will have Jose pick me up tomorrow'

(c) Ma-pa-pa-ági akò kay José bwás  
MA-PA-PA-pass 1SG.FOC OBL José tomorrow  
'I really need Jose to pick me up tomorrow'

Sentence (65a) marks a CENTRIPETAL EVENT with minimal Involvement between the NUCLEAR akó and the OBLIQUE José (which serves as a LOCATION); I will merely pass by him (or his house). Sentence (65b) marks an increase of the EVENT-internal Involvement of the PARTICIPANTS with each other; I will have José pick me up on his way through. Sentence (65c), with -pa- reduplicated, implies a similar relationship between the PARTICIPANTS and an additional urgency on the part of the speaker, who 'really needs to be picked up'.
The reduplicated -pa- can be classified as an 'Intensive' 'Second Causative' or C2 according to the criteria enumerated by Kulikov (1993), as discussed in 1.1. However, its effects can be seen as continuous with those of the single -pa-. For more information on the semantics of reduplication and -pa-, cf. Appendix B.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the conflation of 'Causative' and 'Intensive' morphology is repeated in numerous languages. Recall that the Boumaa Fijian 'Causative' prefix va'a- derives 'watch, inspect, look after' from 'see' and 'earnestly beseech' from 'pray to' (Dixon 1988:188). The data from Ilonggo suggest that both the 'Causative' and 'Intensive' interpretations arise from a common enmeshment in process.

3.4 Additional PARTICIPANT

Many CENTRIFETAL roots such as 'stand', 'lie', 'boil', 'lean', and 'float' achieve 'Middle VOICE' readings with nag-, which focusses the site where the EVENT plays out. In such 'Middle' readings, there is no 'Transitive' influence of one PARTICIPANT upon another. These EVENTS do not impose on their single PARTICIPANT the requirement of animacy or the capacity to act; the EVENTS are of a more passive, ESSENTIAL nature, requiring no AGENT/PATIENT opposition. Since it would suggest the participation of a prior agentive force, gin- does not appear by itself with such roots. With such EVENTS, -pa- adds a more MOTILE PARTICIPANT so that the 'Middle' reading gives way to a 'Causative' reading. The participation of the former
MOTILE PARTICIPANT is DISPLACED grammatically from VS to VO, and another PARTICIPANT assumes the function of the MOTILE ROLE in the new configuration. Note the following:

(66) (a) **Nag-a-tíndog ang baláy**  
NAG-IMF-stand FOC house  
'The house is standing'

(b) **Nag-pa-tíndog akò sang baláy**  
NAG-PA-stand 1SG.FOC UNFOC house  
'I erected a house'

(c) **Nag-pa-tíndog akò sang baláy kay Roberto**  
NAG-PA-stand 1SG.FOC UNFOC house OBL Roberto  
'I had/let a house be erected by Roberto'

(d) *Nag-tíndog akò sang baláy*  
NAG-stand 1SG.FOC UNFOC house

(66') (a) *Gin-tíndog ...*  
GIN-stand

(b) **Gin-pa-tíndog ko ang báso**  
GIN-PA-stand 1SG.UNFOC FOC glass  
'I stood up the glass'

(c) **Gin-pa-tíndog ko ang báso kay Roberto**  
GIN-PA-stand 1SG.UNFOC FOC glass OBL Roberto  
'I had/let the glass be stood up by Roberto'

(d) **Gin-pa-tíndog ko si Roberto sang báso**  
GIN-PA-stand 1SG.UNFOC FOC Roberto UNFOC glass  
'I had/let Roberto stand a glass up'

(67) (a) **Nag-hígða akò**  
NAG-lie 1SG.FOC  
'I lay down'

(b) **Nag-pa-hídã akò sang kátre**  
NAG-PA-lie 1SG.FOC UNFOC bed  
'I laid a bed down'

(c) **Nag-pa-hígða akò sang kátre sa íya**  
NAG-PA-lie 1SG.FOC UNFOC bed OBL 3SG.UNFOC  
'I had/let him/her lay a bed down'

(d) *Nag-hígða akò sang kátre*  
NAG-lie 1SG.FOC UNFOC bed
(67')

(a) *Gin-híg då ...
GIN-lie

(b) Gin-pa-híg då ko ang kátre
GIN-PA-lie 1SG.UNFOC FOC bed
'I laid the bed down'

(c) Gin-pa-híg då ko ang kátre kay Roberto
GIN-PA-lie 1SG.UNFOC FOC bed OBL Roberto
'I had/let the bed be laid down by Roberto'

(d) Gin-pa-híg då ko si Roberto (sang kátre)
GIN-PA-lie 1SG.UNFOC FOC Robert (UNFOC bed)
'I had/let Roberto lie down/(lay a bed down)'

(68)

(a) Nag-bokál ang túbig
NAG-bubble FOC water
'The water boiled'

(b) Nag-pa-bokál si Juan sang túbig
NAG-PA-bubble FOC Juan UNFOC water
'Juan boiled some water'

(c) Nag-pa-bokál si Juan sang túbig
NAG-PA-bubble FOC Juan UNFOC water
sa íya asáwa
OBL 3SG.UNFOC wife
'Juan had/let some water be boiled by his wife'
'Juan had/let his wife let some water boil'

(d) *Nag-bokál si Juan sang túbig
NAG-bubble FOC Juan UNFOC water

(68')

(a) *Gin-bokál ...
GIN-bubble

(b) Gin-pa-bokál ko ang túbig
GIN-PA-bubble 1SG.UNFOC FOC water
'I had/let the water boil'

(c) Gin-pa-bokál ko ang túbig
GIN-PA-bubble 1SG.UNFOC FOC water
sa ákon asáwa
OBL 1SG.UNFOC wife
'I had/let the water be boiled by my wife'

(d) Gin-pa-bokál ko si Juan sang túbig
GIN-PA-bubble 1SG.UNFOC FOC Juan UNFOC water
'I had/let Juan boil some water'
'I had/let Juan let some water boil'
(69) (a) **Nag-lutáw ang baróto**  
NAG-float FOC boat  
'The boat floated'  

(b) **Nag-pa-lutáw ang táwo sang baróto**  
NAG-PA-float FOC man UNFOC boat  
'The man floated (let float) a boat'  

(c) **Nag-pa-lutáw ang táwo sang baróto sa indyinír**  
NAG-PA-float FOC man UNFOC boat OBL engineer  
'The man had a boat floated by the engineer'  

(d) ***_Nag-lutáw ang táwo sang baróto***  
NAG-float FOC man UNFOC boat  

(69') (a) ***_Gin-lutáw ...***  
GIN-float  

(b) **Gin-pa-lutáw ko ang baróto**  
GIN-PA-float 1SG.UNFOC FOC boat  
'I floated the boat'  

(c) **Gin-pa-lutáw ko ang baróto kay Juan**  
GIN-PA-float 1SG.UNFOC FOC boat OBL Juan  
'I the boat floated by Juan'  

(d) **Gin-pa-lutáw ko si Juan sang baróto**  
GIN-PA-float 1SG.UNFOC FOC Juan UNFOC boat  
'I had Juan float a boat'  

The starred (d)-sentences (with *nag-* ) attest to the CENTRIPETAL nature of the Verbal roots. With *-pa-, these roots may host at least one additional PARTICIPANT. In the absence of further contextual qualification, all (b)-sentences are compatible with direct, unmediated manipulation. However, *-pa- allows the intrusion of a mediating PARTICIPANT in the (c)-examples. Mediation is therefore neither specified nor precluded by *-pa-. The EVENT process may be DISPLACED to either a mediational Causee or to a hybrid EVENT-terminal Causee/Affectee. All Causees, whether mediational or terminal, may be either FOCUSSED or UNFOCUSSED.
Such DISPLACEMENT also applies to 'Middle' roots of 'Stative' Aktionsart such as the following:

(70) (a) **Nag-tíg'a ang seménto**
    NAG-hard FOC cement
    'The cement became hard'

(b) **Nag-pa-tíg'a ang táwo sang seménto**
    NAG-PA-hard FOC person UNFOC cement
    'The man had/let some cement harden'

(c) **Nag-pa-tíg'a ang táwo sang seménto**
    NAG-PA-hard FOC person UNFOC cement
    kay Roberto
    OBL Roberto
    'The man had/let Roberto harden/let harden some cement'

(d) *Nag-a- tíg'a ang táwo sa seménto*
    NAG-IMP-hard FOC person OBL cement

(70') (a) **Gin-tíg'a ...**
    GIN-hard

(b) **Gin-pa-tíg'a sang táwo ang seménto**
    GIN-PA-hard UNFOC person FOC cement
    'The man made the cement get hard'

(c) **Gin-pa-tíg'a sang táwo ang seménto sa trabahadór**
    GIN-PA-hard UNFOC person FOC cement OBL laborer
    'The man had the cement hardened by the laborer'

(d) **Gin-pa-tíg'a sang táwo ang trabahadór**
    GIN-PA-hard UNFOC person FOC laborer
    sang seménto
    UNFOC cement
    'The man had the laborer harden some cement'

(71) (a) **Nag-putí ang ákon ngípon**
    NAG-white FOC 1SG.POSS tooth
    'My teeth became white'

(b) **Nag-pa-putí akò sang ákon ngípon**
    NAG-PA-white 1SG.FOC UNFOC 1SG.POSS tooth
    'I made my teeth white'

(c) **Nag-pa-putí akò sang ákon ngípon**
    NAG-PA-white 1SG.FOC UNFOC 1SG.POSS tooth
    sa ímo
    OBL 2SG.UNFOC dentist
    'I had my teeth whitened by your dentist'
(72) (a) Nag-dyútay ang táwo
   NAG-less FOC person
   'There were fewer people (than before)'

(b) Nag-pa-dyútay akò sang túlô sang túbig
    NAG-PA-less 1SG.FOC UNFOC drip UNFOC water
    'I lessened/diminished the dripping of the water'

(c) Nag-pa-dyútay akò sang túlô sang túbig
    NAG-PA-less 1SG.FOC UNFOC drip UNFOC water
    sa pluméro
    OBL plumber
    'I had the plumber diminish the dripping of water'

(d) *Nag-dyútay akò sang túlô sang túbig
    NAG-less 1SG.FOC UNFOC drip UNFOC water

(72') (a) *Gin-dyútay ko ang túbig
    GIN-less 1SG.UNFOC FOC water

(b) Gin-pa-dyútay ko ang túbig
    GIN-PA-less 1SG.UNFOC FOC water
    'I diminished the dripping of the water'

(c) Gin-pa-dyútay ko ang túbig
    GIN-PA-less 1SG.UNFOC FOC water
    sa pluméro
    OBL plumber
    'I had the dripping of the water diminished by the plumber'

(d) Gin-pa-dyútay ko ang pluméro sang túlô
    GIN-PA-less 1SG.UNFOC FOC plumber UNFOC drip
    sang túbig
    UNFOC water
    'I had the plumber diminish the drip of the water'

(73) (a) Nag-húmok ang íya tàgiposóon
    NAG-soft FOC 3SG.UNFOC heart
    'His/her heart softened'

(b) Nag-pa-húmok akò sang íya tàgiposóon
    NAG-PA-soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC 3SG.UNFOC heart
    'I softened his/her heart'
(c) Nag-pa-húmok akò sang íya tàgiposóoon
NAG-PA-soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC 3SG.UNFOC heart
sa íya nânay
OBL 3SG.UNFOC mother
'I softened his/her heart through his/her mother'

(d) *Nag-húmok akò sang íya tàgiposóoon
NAG-soft 1SG.FOC UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC heart

(73') (a) *Gin-húmok ko ang íya tàgiposóoon
GIN-soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC 3SG.UNFOC heart

(b) Gin-pa-húmok ko ang íya tàgiposóoon
GIN-PA-soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC 3SG.POSS heart
'I made his/her heart soft/tender'

(c) Gin-pa-húmok ko ang íya tàgiposóoon
GIN-PA-soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC 3SG.POSS heart
sa íya nânay
OBL 3SG.UNFOC mother
'I made his/her heart soft/tender through his/her mother'

(d) Gin-pa-húmok ko ang íya nânay
GIN-PA-soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC 3SG.POSS mother
sang íya nânay
UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC mother
'I had/let his/her mother soften his/her heart'

(74) (a) Nag-tíg'a ang íya bàlatyágon
NAG-hard FOC 3SG.UNFOC feeling
'His/her feelings became hard'

(b) Nag-pa-tíg'a akò sang íya bàlatyágon
NAG-PA-hard 1SG.FOC UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC feeling
'I hardened his/her feelings'

(c) Nag-pa-tíg'a akò sang íya bàlatyágon
NAG-PA-hard 1SG.FOC UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC feeling
kay Maria
OBL Maria
'I had his/her feelings hardened by Maria'

(d) *Nag-tíg'a akò sang íya bàlatyágon
NAG-hard 1SG.FOC UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC feeling

(74') (a) *Gin-tíg'a ...
GIN-hard

(b) Gin-pa-tíg'a ko ang íya bàlatyágon
GIN-PA-hard 1SG.UNFOC FOC 3SG.POSS feeling
'I made his/her feelings hard'
(c) Gin-pa-tíg'a ko ang íya bâlatyágon
GIN-PA-hard 1SG.UNFOC FOC 3SG.POSS feeling
kay Juan
OBL Juan
'I made his/her feelings hard through Juan'

(d) Gin-pa-tíg'a ko si Juan
GIN-PA-hard 1SG.UNFOC FOC 3SG.POSS feeling
sang íya bâlatyágon
UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC feeling
'I made/let Juan harden his/her feelings'

(75) (a) Nag-támbok ang báboy
NAG-fat FOC pig
'The pig got fat'

(b) Nag-pa-támbok siá sang báboy
NAG-PA-fat 3SG.FOC UNFOC pig
'S/he fattened a pig'

(c) Nag-pa-támbok siá sang báboy sa babáye
NAG-PA-fat 3SG.FOC UNFOC pig OBL woman
'S/he had the woman fatten a pig'

(d) *Nag-támbok siá sang báboy
NAG-fat 3SG.FOC UNFOC pig

(75') (a) *Gin-támbok ...
GIN-fat

(b) Gin-pa-támbok níá ang báboy
GIN-PA-fat 3SG.UNFOC FOC pig
'S/he fattened the pig'

(c) Gin-pa-támbok níá ang báboy sa babáye
GIN-PA-fat 3SG.UNFOC FOC pig OBL woman
'S/he had the pig fattened by the woman'

(d) Gin-pa-támbok níá ang babáye sang báboy
GIN-PA-fat 3SG.UNFOC FOC woman UNFOC woman
'S/he had the woman fatten a pig'

(76) (a) Nag-putí ang íya kutís
NAG-white FOC 3SG.UNFOC skin
'His/her skin turned white'

(b) Nag-pa-putí ang babáye sang íya kutís
NAG-PA-white FOC woman UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC skin
'The woman whitened her skin'
(c) Nag-pa-puti ang babáye sang íya kutís
NAG-PA-white FOC woman UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC skin
sa dóktor
OBL doctor
'The woman had her skin whitened by the doctor'

(d) *Nag-puti ang babáye sang íya kutís
NAG-white FOC woman UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC skin

(76') (a) *Gin-puti ...
GIN-white

(b) Gin-pa-puti sang babáye ang íya kutís
GIN-PA-white UNFOC woman FOC 3SG.POSS skin
'The woman made his/her skin white'

(c) Gin-pa-puti sang babáye ang íya kutís
GIN-PA-white UNFOC woman FOC 3SG.POSS skin
sa dóktor
OBL doctor
'The woman had her skin whitened by the doctor'

(d) Gin-pa-puti sang babáye ang dóktor
GIN-PA-white UNFOC woman FOC doctor
sang íya kutís
UNFOC 3SG.UNFOC skin
'The woman had the doctor whiten her skin'

(77) (a) Nag-humót ang prútas
NAG-fragrant FOC fruit
'The fruit became fragrant'

(b) Nag-pa-humót ang babáye sang kwárto
NAG-PA-fragrant FOC woman UNFOC room
'The woman made/let the room get fragrant'

(c) Nag-pa-humót ang babáye sang kwárto
NAG-PA-fragrant FOC woman UNFOC room
kay Juan
OBL Juan
'The woman had/let Juan make a room get fragrant'

(d) *Nag-humót ang babáye sang kwárto
NAG-fragrant FOC woman UNFOC room

(77') (a) *Gin-humót ...
GIN-fragrant

(b) Gin-pa-humót sang babáye ang kwárto
GIN-PA-fragrant UNFOC woman FOC room
'The woman made/let the room get fragrant'
(c) Gin-pa-humót sang babáye ang kwárto
GIN-PA-fragrant UNFOC woman FOC room
   kay Juan
   OBL Juan
'The woman made/let Juan make the room fragrant'

(d) Gin-pa-humót sang babáye si Juan sang kwárto
GIN-PA-fragrant UNFOC woman FOC Juan UNFOC room
'The woman made/let Juan make a room fragrant'

In (70)-(77'), -pa- is required if more than one PARTICIPANT is to be involved. Without -pa-, nag- focusses the single PARTICIPANT involved in the EVENT, as seen in the (a)-examples, and it cannot involve an additional PARTICIPANT, as per the (d)-examples. Likewise, gin- cannot occur at all without -pa-, as per the gin-marked ('a)-examples. The causation may be direct/unmediated or indirect/mediated, as seen in the (b)/(b')- and (c)/(c')-examples.

Although the Causative sentences above have animate Causers filling the PRE-MOTILE 'S'-ROLE, we should acknowledge again that inanimate Causers may sensibly occur there as well:

(78) (a) Nag-tíg'a ang seménto
   NAG-hard FOC cement
   'The cement became hard'

(b) Nag-pa-tíg'a ang balás sang seménto
   NAG-PA-hard FOC sand UNFOC cement
   'The sand hardened some cement'

(c) *Nag-a- tíg'a ang balás sa seménto
   NAG-IMP-hard FOC sand OBL cement

(79) (a) Maka-putí ang báyô
   MAKA-hard FOC dress
   'The dress can be white'

(b) Maka-pa-putí ang Tide sang báyô
   MAKA-PA-white FOC Tide UNFOC dress
   'Tide can make clothes white'
(c) *Maka-puti ang Tide sang báyó
MAKA-white FOC Tide UNFOC dress

The (b)-sentences allow ang balás and ang Tide to act as PRE-MOTILE occasions for the hardening and whitening.

Two final examples are somewhat asymmetrical in that nag-requires -pa- to add a second PARTICIPANT (thus behaving like a CENTRIPETAL root), whereas gin- can focus an INERT PARTICIPANT without -pa- (thus behaving like a CENTRIFUGAL one):

(80)  (a) Nag-gowâ ang idô
NAG-out FOC dog
'The dog went out'

(b) Nag-pa-gowâ akò sang idô
NAG-PA-out 1SG.FOC UNFOC dog
'I let a dog out / put a dog out'

(c) Nag-pa-gowâ akò sang idô sa bátâ
NAG-PA-out 1SG.FOC UNFOC dog OBL child
'I had a dog put out by the child'

(d) *Nag-gowâ akò sang idô
NAG-out 1SG.FOC UNFOC dog

(80') (a) Gin-gowâ ko ang idô
GIN-out 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog
'I went outside to see the dog'

(b) Gin-pa-gowâ ko ang idô
GIN-PA-out 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog
'I made the dog go outside'

(c) Gin-pa-gowâ ko ang idô sa bátâ
GIN-PA-out 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog OBL child
'I had the dog put out by the child'

(d) Gin-pa-gowâ ko ang bátâ sang idô
GIN-PA-out 1SG.UNFOC FOC child UNFOC dog
'I had the child put out a dog'

(81)  (a) Nag-sândig ang póste
NAG-lean FOC post
'The post leaned over'
(b) Nag-pa-sândig akò sang póste  
NAG-PA-lean 1SG.FOC UNFOC post  
'I leaned a post over'

(c) Nag-pa-sândig akò sang póste kay José  
NAG-PA-lean 1SG.FOC UNFOC post OBL José  
'I had a post leaned by José'

(d) *Nag-sândig akò sang póste  
NAG-lean 1SG.FOC UNFOC post

(81') (a) Gin-sândig ko ang póste  
GIN-lean 1SG.UNFOC FOC post  
'I leaned the post'

(b) Gin-pa-sândig ko ang póste  
GIN-PA-lean 1SG.UNFOC FOC post  
'I leaned the post'

(c) Gin-pa-sândig ko ang póste kay José  
GIN-PA-lean 1SG.UNFOC FOC post OBL José  
'I had the poste leaned by José'

(d) Gin-pa-sândig ko si José sang póste  
GIN-PA-lean 1SG.UNFOC FOC José UNFOC post  
'I had José lean a post'

In the (b)-examples involving nag-, I respectively put a dog out (probably manually, with little cooperation) and leaned a post (again probably manually). There may be either direct or mediated Involvement between the 'S' and the 'O'. The rejection of the nag-marked (d)-sentences suggests that these roots are inherently CENTRIPETAL by the criterion of behavior with this VOICE.

However, like CENTRIFUGAL roots, these may occur with gin- as in the (a)-sentences. Here, they suggest a direct influence of the MOTILE PARTICIPANT upon the INERT one. In the (b)-examples involving gin-, I respectively told the dog to go out (and it cooperated) and made the post lean by perhaps pushing it and then allowing it to lean over by its own
momentum (its 'coöperation'); I may have simply allowed it to lean over by not interfering with its trajectory. Here, -pa- suggest a more indirect rôle for the 'S'-PARTICIPANT, which is detached from the performance. Causees may be added, as the gin-marked (c)- and (d)-sentences suggest. These orientational/positional roots treat the FOCUSED ROLE as having limited control, which does not extend beyond itself. If the MOTILE ROLE is FOCUSED, then any influence is limited to itself (sans -pa-); if the INERT ROLE is FOCUSED, it is understood to be affected by an external influence, which operates more remotely when -pa- is added. The behavior of these roots suggests that nag- and gin- are not entirely complementary as indicators of CENTRIPETALITY.

3.5 Gradedness

With CENTRIPETAL EVENTS, -pa- may add an increment of 'intensity' without adding a PARTICIPANT. We have already encountered a similar phenomenon in 3.2. In such cases, -pa- suggests the advancement of the EVENT by degrees or stages. Instead of recognizing an additional PARTICIPANT, -pa- may recognizes a gradedness in the advancement of the process concerned. Note the following:

(82)  (a) Nag-a- tîg'a ang seménto
      NAG-IMP-hard FOC cement
      'The cement has gotten harder'

      (b) Nag-a- pa-tîg'a ang seménto
          NAG-IMP-PA-hard FOC cement
          'The cement is getting harder'
(83) (a) Nag-a- humót ang búlak
NAG-IMP-fragrant FOC flower
'The flower is becoming fragrant'

(b) Nag-a- pa-humót ang búlak
NAG-IMP-PA-fragrant FOC flower
'The flower is becoming fragrant'

(84) (a) Nag-a- malá ang papél
NAG-IMP-dry FOC paper
'The paper is getting dry'

(b) Nag-a- pa-malá ang papél
NAG-IMP-PA-dry FOC paper
'The paper is getting dry'

(85) (a) Nag-a- pulá ang kinágtan sang bán'og
NAG-IMP-red FOC bite UNFOC snake
'The snakebite is getting red'

(b) Nag-a- pa-pulá ang kinágtan⁶ sang bán'og
NAG-IMP-PA-red FOC bite FOC snake
'The snakebite is getting red'

(86) (a) Nag-a- húmok ang íya tàngiposóon
NAG-IMP-soft FOC 3SG.UNFOC heart
'His/her heart is getting soft'

(b) Nag-a- pa-húmok ang íya tàngiposóon
NAG-IMP-PA-soft FOC 3SG.UNFOC heart
'His/her heart is getting soft'

(87) (a) Nag-a- dyútay ang táwo
NAG-IMP-less FOC person
'The people have become fewer'

(b) Nag-a- pa-dyútay ang táwo
NAG-IMP-PA-less FOC person
'The people are becoming fewer and fewer'

(88) (a) Nag-a- putí ang ákon ngípon
NAG-IMP-white FOC 1SG.UNFOC tooth
'My teeth are getting white'

(b) Nag-a- pa-putí ang ákon ngípon
NAG-IMP-PA-white FOC 1SG.UNFOC tooth
'My teeth are getting white'

---

⁶The word kinágtan 'bite' (i.e. wound) is derived from kagát 'bite' (the action) plus =in= plus -an.
(89) (a) Nag-dúnot ang ságing
    NAG-rot FOC banana
    'The banana rotted/got mushy'

    (b) Nag-pa-dúnot ang ságing
    NAG-PA-mash FOC banana
    The banana rotted/got mushy (by stages)'

(90) (a) Nag-lísô akò sa walá
    NAG-turn 1SG.FOC OBL left
    'I turned to the left'

    (b) Nag-pa-lísô akò sa walá
    NAG-PA-turn 1SG.FOC OBL left
    'I turned to the left'

(91) (a) Nag-a- gowâ ang idô sa baláy
    NAG-IMP-out FOC dog OBL house
    'The dog is emerging from the house'

    (b) Nag-a- pa-gowâ ang idô sa baláy
    NAG-IMP-PA-out FOC dog OBL house
    'The dog is emerging from the house (bit by bit) '

Each of the (b)-sentences suggests an EVENT which is realized by degrees. The cement is hardening, the flowers becoming fragrant, the paper getting dry, the snakebite turning red and so on, bit by bit, as observed through periodic encounters with each situation. In (90b), I seem to be turning left by degrees, while (90a) suggests one single leftward turn. Similarly, the dog in (91b) is emerging slowly, showing itself gradually. Although all these examples occur with MOTILE VOICE as marked by nag-, 'graded' readings are possible with INERT VOICES as well. Note the following:

(92) (a) Nag-a- túnaw ang kalámay
    NAG-IMP-melt FOC sugar
    'The sugar is melting'

    (b) Nag-a- pa-túnaw ang kalámay
    NAG-IMP-PA-melt FOC sugar
    'The sugar is melting'
The sentences in (92) and (93), describing the sugar, have similar contrasts. The (a)-sentences suggest the perception that the sugar is melting at a constant rate; the (b)-sentences attest to the marked change that occurs between periodic re-examinations of the progress. Sentence (94a), with -on, involves a prospective picture which I am planning to execute on a large scale. By contrast, sentence (94b), with -pa-, suggests a pre-existing picture that I will enlarge in the sense of adding new area; perhaps I am extending a mural. Sentence (95a), with -an, suggests that siá is my standard of bigness. Sentence (95b), with -pa-, suggests an intensification of bigness which, in contrast to (94b), leaves the original unchanged. Both (b)-sentences suggest an increase in degree of 'bigness', i.e. a change.
In (82)-(91), the DISPLACEMENT effect of -pa- with CENTRIPETAL EVENTS does not distribute performance across two PARTICIPANTS. It is confined to one, and it emerges in the graded, periodic substitution of a more complete manifestation of the EVENT for an earlier, slighter presence. DISPLACEMENT occurs as a series of discrete, transitory stages in the (b)-sentences of (82)-(91), each replacing the previous ones. The 'gradedness' is akin to the 'lingering' in or prolongation of process noted in some 'Intensive' readings of -pa- (cf. 3.3).

In the absence of other VOICE morphology and with a single PARTICIPANT involved, -pa- orients attention to transitory change or 'flux' of an EVENT at the expense of its initiation or completion. The middle course of an EVENT provides the ground for DISPLACEMENT which is not further oriented by other affixes of VOICE. In this usage, a process has already been initiated but has not achieved its conclusion. There is no AGENT/PATIENT contrast, simply a sense of 'getting more and more X'. Note the following contrasts with CENTRIPETAL EVENTS:

(96) (a) Pa-tátlo ang ákon áwto
   PA-three FOC 1SG.UNFOC car
     'I'm getting close to having three cars'

   (b) Tátlo ang ákon áwto
       three FOC 1SG.UNFOC car
         'My cars are three'

(97) (a) Pa-damô ang íya áwto
   PA-much FOC 3SG.UNFOC car
     'His/her cars are increasing in number'
(b) Damô ang íya áwto
much FOC 3SG.UNFOC car
'S/he has many cars'

(98) (a) Pa-táas ang íya swéldo
PA-high FOC 3SG.UNFOC salary
'His/her salary is getting high'

(b) Táas ang íya swéldo
high FOC 3SG.UNFOC salary
'His/her salary is high'

(99) (a) Pa-túgnaw ang pahahón
PA-cold FOC weather
'The weather's getting cold'

(b) Túgnaw ang pahahón
cold FOC weather
'The weather is cold'

(100) (a) Pa-lútô ang ságing?
PA-ripe FOC banana
'The banana is getting ripe'

(b) Lútô ang ságing
ripe FOC banana
'The banana is ripe'

(101) (a) Pa-nubô ang íya grádo
PA-low FOC 3SG.UNFOC grade
'His/her grades are getting lower'

(b) Nubô ang íya grádo
low FOC 3SG.UNFOC grade
'His/her grades are low'

(102) (a) Pa-támbok ang hilamón
PA-fat FOC grass
'The grass is getting more lush'

(b) Támbok ang hilamón
fat FOC grass
'The grass is lush'

(103) (a) Pa-tikô ang linya
PA-crooked FOC line
'The line is getting crooked'

---

*E.D. reports that lútô, with stress on the first syllable, means 'cook', while lútô, with stress on the second syllable, means 'ripe(n)'.*
(b) Tikò ang línya
    crooked FOC line
    'The line is crooked'

(104) (a) Pa-lába ang línya
    PA-long FOC line
    'The line is getting longer'

(b) Lába ang línya
    long FOC line
    'The line is long'

(105) (a) Pa-líp'ot ang línya
    PA-short FOC line
    'The line is getting shorter'

(b) Líp'ot ang línya
    short FOC line
    'The line is short'

(106) (a) Pa-lápyò siá
    PA-tired 3SG.FOC
    'S/he's heading toward a state of tiredness'

(b) Lápyò siá
    tired 3SG.FOC
    'S/he's tired'

(107) (a) Pa-patáy ang idô
    PA-die FOC dog
    'The dog is headed towards death'

(b) Patáy ang idô
    die FOC dog
    'The dog is dead'

(108) (a) Pa-mànggaránon akó
    PA-rich 1SG.FOC
    'I'm on the way to being rich'

(b) Mànggaránon akó
    rich 1SG.FOC
    'I'm rich'

(109) (a) Pa-túnw ang kandèla
    PA-melt FOC candle
    'The candle is starting to melt'

(b) Tunáw ang kandèla
    melt FOC candle
    'The candle is melted'
(110) (a) Pa-láýâ ang dáhon  
    PA-wither FOC leaf  
    'The leaves are starting to wither'

(b) Láýâ ang dáhon  
    wither FOC leaf  
    'The leaves are withered'

(111) (a) Pa-tínlo ang pínggan  
    PA-clean FOC dish  
    'The dishes are getting clean'

(b) Tínlo ang pínggan  
    clean FOC dish  
    'The dishes are clean'

(112) (a) Pa-bérde ang hilamón  
    PA-green FOC grass  
    'The grass is turning green'

(b) Bérde ang hilamón  
    green FOC grass  
    'The grass is green'

The (b)-sentences describe static conditions. There are no VOICE-marked trajectories of influence. The -pa-marked (a)-sentences describe processes which are underway. There is a change. In (96a), for instance, I may be negotiating for a third car and have hope that my offer will be accepted. In the absence of VOICE affixes such as nag-, the beginning and ending of each EVENT in question are neglected. There is only process, pure DISPLACEMENT.

Other EVENTS inherently imply a trajectory of progress and cannot occur without VOICE marking. Among these are 'leaning' and 'going left'. With these, -pa- provides a VOICE:

(113) (a) Pa-hiláýâ ang tower  
    PA-lean FOC tower  
    'The tower is leaning over bit by bit'

(b) *Hiláýâ ang tower  
    lean FOC tower
(114) (a) Pa-walá ang kótse  
   PA-left FOC car  
   'The car is going/turning towards the left'

(b) *Walá ang kótse  
   left FOC car  
   ('The car is left-handed')

In (113a), the tower is leaning over bit by bit in the manner of the Tower of Pisa. In (114a), the car is turning leftwards in a departure from a former trajectory. Thus, -pa- marks a change, i.e. a DISPLACEMENT from a prior status. As we have already seen with 'Reflexive' examples, -pa- does not fundamentally involve an increase of Valency. Such an increase is an accident of the dynamics of particular EVENTS. With some CENTRIFUGAL roots, again, the DISPLACEMENT may result in a 'Reflexive' command whose Involvement extends beyond the point of origin:

(115) (a) Pa-súmbag  
   PA-punch  
   'Have yourself punched'

(b) Súmbag  
   'Punch!'

In his analysis of Hiligaynon Verb roots, Ruiz recognizes 'two -pa-'/s, the causative and the directional' (Ruiz 1968:65). Such an analysis, driven by the prior categories 'cause' and 'direction', fails to apprehend the semantic connectedness behind these effects. This conflation of 'orientation' with 'delegational cause' is not as exotic as it may initially seem; a similar conflation is already familiar to English speakers via the polysemy of the word direction. In issuing directions, we put someone on a certain path.
With orientational roots, -pa- can combine to emphasize or indicate a goal or linear trajectory in space. Note the following:

(116) (a) Nag-a- sándig ang káhoy sa baláy  
     NAG-IMP-lean FOC tree OBL house  
     'The tree is leaning on the house'

(b) Nag-a- pa- sándig ang káhoy sa baláy  
     NAG-IMP-PA- lean FOC tree OBL house  
     'The tree is leaning toward the house'

(117) (a) Nag-a- sándig si Nánay sa ákon  
     NAG-IMP-lean FOC Mother OBL 1SG.UNFOC  
     'Mother is leaning on me'

(b) Nag-a- pa-sándig si Nánay sa ákon  
     NAG-IMP-PA-lean FOC Mother OBL 1SG.UNFOC  
     'Mother wants to lean on me'

The (a)-sentences suggest EVENTS which involve no movement or change. The (b)-sentences suggest movement toward a given point. With an animate PARTICIPANT such as si Nánay, volition or intention may be inferred. Recall that an intention 'literally' means a 'stretching out' toward a limit (cf. intensity). The sense of a trajectory of movement toward a goal is also discernable in the following:

(118) (a) Súkâ  
     up  
     'Go up!'

(b) Pa-súkâ ang hágdan  
     PA-up FOC stair  
     'The stairs go upwards'

(119) (a) Diín ikáw  
     where 2SG.FOC  
     'Where are you?'

(b) Pa-diín ikáw  
     PA-where 2SG.FOC  
     'Where are you going?'
(120) (a) Nag-úlî akò sang líbro
NAG-return 1SG.FOC UNFOC book
'I returned a book'

(b) Nag-pa-úlî akó (*sang líbro)
NAG-PA-return 1SG.FOC (*UNFOC book)
'I returned (e.g. home)'

With the name of a known landmark (e.g. a bank, church, or school) or a known direction (e.g. amíhan 'north', baganán 'south', 8 sidlangán 'east', and katúndan 'west', the ego-related directions walá 'left' and tó'o 'right', such terms as talíkod 'back', ibábaw 'up, above', and idálom 'down, below'), -pa- suggests a physical DISPLACEMENT toward a goal. Note the following:

(121) Nag-lakát siá pa-eskwelahán
NAG-walk 3SG.FOC PA-school
'S/he walked toward the school/schoolwards'

(122) pa-bángko
PA-bank
'bankwards'

(123) pa-dirétso
PA-straight
'straight ahead'

(124) pa-talíkod
PA-back
'backwards'

(125) pa-ibábaw
PA-above
'upwards'

(126) pa-amíhan
PA-north
'northward'

---

8 The form nabagátnan is a variant of baganán 'south'. A habagát is a 'strong wind from the south'.
(127) pa-walá  
PA-left  
'leftward'

(128) pa-Houston  
PA-Houston  
'towards Houston'

(129) pa-kapitól  
PA-capitol  
'towards the capitol'

In such vision-friendly instances, the DISPLACEMENT semantics of -pa- is particularly obvious. Other VOICE marking can co-occur with such roots to further specify a spatial trajectory, as in the following:

(130) Ma-pa-eskwélahán ka  
MA-PA-school  2SG.FOC  
'Are you going to school?'

(131) Nag-pa-simbáhan ka  
NAG-PA-church  2SG.FOC  
'You went to the church'  
'Did you go to the church?'

(132) Ma-pa-tyendáhan ka  
MA-PA-store  2SG.FOC  
'Are you going to the store?'

(133) Ma-pa-eskwélahán ka  
MA-PA-school  2SG.FOC  
'Are you going to the school?'

(134) Ma-pa-bángko akó  
MA-PA-bank  1SG.FOC  
'I'm going to the bank'

(135) Nag-pa-bángko akó  
NAG-PA-bank  1SG.FOC  
'I went to the bank'

(136) Nag-pa-amíhan akó  
NAG-PA-north  1SG.FOC  
'I went northwards'

(137) Nag-pa-Houston silá  
NAG-PA-Houston  3PL  
'The went towards Houston'
(138)  Ma-pa-kapitól akó
       MA-PA-capitol 1SG.FOC
       'I'm going to the (provincial) capitol building'

Such locations, like the cardinal directions, serve as endpoints of trajectories of movement. The 'going to the church' and 'going to the school' is a matter of travelling in those directions rather than attending services or classes in those institutions. To be felicitous, they must be familiar, reasonably proximate sites. Hence, one understands kapitól in (138) to mean a provincial capitol rather than the more impersonal national capitol or the capitol as an institution.

In a village, a collection of houses, the following would be unacceptable:

(139)  *Nag-pa-baláy akó
       NAG-PA-house 1SG.FOC

In marking such trajectories, the DISPLACEMENT semantics of -pa- overlap somewhat the PROJECTION semantics of sa. However, -pa-, unlike sa, does not specify the endpoint where the process exhausts itself. Note the following comparisons:

(140)  (a)  Nag-lísó siá  sa walá
       NAG-turn  3SG.FOC OBL left
       'S/he turned to the left'

       (b)  Nag-lísó siá  pa-walá
       NAG-turn  3SG.FOC PA-left
       'S/he turned leftward'

(141)  (a)  Nag-lakát sià  sa amíhan (sang baláy)
       NAG-walk  3SG.FOC OBL north  (UNFOC house)
       'S/he walked to the north (part of the house)'

       (b)  Nag-lakát sià  pa-amíhan
       NAG-walk  3SG.FOC PA-north
       'S/he walked northwards'
(142) (a) Nag-maného akò sa Houston
NAG-drive 1SG.FOC OBL Houston
'I drove to Houston'

(b) Nag-maného akò pa-Houston
NAG-drive 1SG.FOC PA-Houston
'I drove toward Houston'

In the (a)-examples, sa walá and sa Houston name specific
targets, goals, or endpoints, i.e. destinations which are
presumed to have been successfully arrived at. With -pa-, one
drives to a specific location to the left or to the north, and
I drive (all the way) to Houston. In the (b)-examples, pawalá,
paamíhan, and paHouston name directions (in the sense of 'X-
ward') rather than destinations. Successful arrival is not
necessarily implied.

The orientational sense of -pa- is also apparent in the
construction pakádto {sa/kay} 'towards ...', which is derived
from the root kádto 'go':

(143) (a) Nag-kádto akò sang dóktor
NAG-go 1SG.FOC UNFOC doctor
'I went to a doctor'

(b) Nag-lákát akò pa-kádto {sa walá / kay Juan}
NAG-walk 1SG.FOC PA-go {OBL left / OBL Juan}
'I walked towards {the left / Juan}'

When -pa- co-occurs with other VOICE marking in a
CENTRIPETAL EVENT, it may suggest a disruption or departure
from a previous course of action.

(144) (a) Nag-lísô ang baróto sa walá
NAG-turn FOC boat OBL left
'The boat turned left'

(b) Nag-pa-lísô ang baróto sa walá
NAG-PA-turn FOC boat OBL left
'The boat turned left'
(145) (a) Ma-ági akò sa ínyo baláy
MA-pass 1SG.FOC OBL 2PL.POSS house
pakádto sa tindáhan
en.route OBL store
'I'll pass by your house en route to the store'

(b) Ma-pa-ági akò sa ínyo baláy
MA-PA-pass 1SG.FOC OBL your house
pakádto sa tyendáhan
en.route OBL store
'I'll pass by your house en route to the store'

Sentence (144a) suggests that the turning of the boat is a matter of course; it may be drifting leftwards. Sentence (144b) in contrast implies a decisive disruption of trajectory, perhaps a sharp, right-angle turn. Sentence (145b), previously encountered in 3.3, suggests a departure or detour from my customary route. At any rate, -pa- implies a change that may be either intentional (if the MOTILE PARTICIPANT is capable of intention) or contrary to expectations (i.e. disruptive). I may be steering the boat leftwards, or a sudden current may have seized it. A sense of 'departure' is also suggested by the following sentences with tiguláng 'old, mature'. Note the following contrast:

(146) (a) Nag-a- tiguláng siá
NAG-IMP-old 3SG.FOC
'S/he's getting old'

(b) Nag-a- pa-tiguláng siá
NAG-IMP-PA-old 3SG.FOC
'S/he's headed for adulthood'

Sentence (146a), sans -pa-, suggests a maturational process that reflects passivity and inertia, a process that is part of a lifelong trajectory of aging. Sentence (146b) suggests an active, progressive process, a departure from the track
previously taken which does not actually arrive at old age.

Temporal trajectories are exemplified by such roots as ága 'morning/early', hápon 'afternoon', and gáb'i 'evening, night'.

(147) Nag-pa-ága kamí
NAG-PA-morning 1PL.FOC
'Ve stayed till morning'

(148) Nag-pa-hápon kamí sang lakát
NAG-PA-afternoon 1PL.FOC UNFOC walk
'The afternoon caught up on us (while we were)
walking'
'Ve put off our walk till afternoon'

Here, -pa- marks the morning and afternoon, as points of departure or disruptions in the flow of events. In the following sentences, -pa- indicates the moment or point in time that is waited for:

(149) Gin-pa-bútlak ko ánay ang ádlaw kag mag-lútô
GIN-PA-wait 1SG.UNFOC first FOC sun and MAG-cook
'I waited for the sun to rise and cooked'

(150) Nag-a- pa-hígdâ na akò sang na-abót ka
NAG-IMP-PA-lie now 1SG.FOC UNFOC NA-arrive 2SG.FOC
'I was already about to lie down when you arrived'

The sense of 'departure' accords with 'grade' or 'degree' in suggesting a sudden change.

In less productive fashion, -pa- is also consonant with 'conductive' semantics indicative of 'means' or 'manner'. In combination with the root ági 'pass' and the Preposition sa, -pa- forms the complex paági sa, which indicates the means by which a process is accomplished:
(151) Nag-támbo akò pa-ági sa pag-inúm sang
NAG-fat 1SG.FOC PA-pass OBL PAG-drink UNFOC
serbésa
beer
'I got fat by (means of) drinking beer'

(152) Nag-pang-abúhi siá pa-ági sa pag-sulát
NAG-PANG-live 3SG.FOC PA-pass OBL PAG-write
'S/he made a living by (means of) writing'

(153) Nag-tílno akò sang mga pínggan pa-ági sa
NAG-clean 1SG.FOC UNFOC PL plate PA-pass OBL
kískis
scrape
'I cleaned the dishes by (means of) scraping'

(154) Nag-sulát akò sang líbro pa-ági sa búlig
NAG-write 1SG.FOC UNFOC book PA-pass OBL help
nía
3SG.UNFOC
'I wrote a book through his/her help'

(155) Nag-sulát akò pa-ági sa word processor
NAG-write 1SG.FOC PA-pass OBL word processor
'I wrote with/by means of a word processor'

(156) Nag-sulát akò pa-ági sa ákon dugó
NAG-write 1SG.FOC PA-pass OBL 1SG.UNFOC blood
'I wrote by (means of) my blood'

(157) Maka-sáka ka sa baláy pa-ági sa hagdánan
MAKA-up 2SG.FOC OBL house PA-pass OBL stair
'You can go up the house by means of the stairs'

(158) Tínlo-an ko ang lamésa pa-ági sa
clean-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC table PA-pass OBL
habón kag túbig
soap and water
'I'll clean the table with/by means of soap and
water'

(159) Ma-tabók ang subá pa-ági sa baróto
MA-cross FOC river PA-pass OBL boat
'The river will be crossed by means of the boat'

(160) Ma-tabók ang subá pa-ági sa táytay
MA-cross FOC river PA-pass OBL bridge
'The river will be crossed by means of the bridge'

In (151)-(160), paági sa marks PARTICULARS which are
centrally involved in the process, which mark a 'vehicle' for
the enablement of the EVENT (cf. L via 'way' and English method <Gk meta- 'change' + hodos 'way'). Such PARTICULARS may be EVENT-like processes (e.g. 'scraping', 'writing') or PARTICIPANT-like things (e.g. 'word processor', 'bridge'). The language is indifferent to the distinction. The PARTICULARS must be centrally involved; mere 'accessories' are too peripheral for such marking:

(161) *Ma-tabók ang subâ pa-ági sa búgsang
    MA-cross FOC river PA-pass OBL paddle
    (The river will be crossed by means of the paddle)

(162) *Ma-bása akò pa-ági sa àntipára
    MA-read 1SG.FOC PA-pass OBL glasses
    (I will read by means of the glasses)

With the root anó 'what/do', -pa- derives paáno 'how', which is concerned with manner of accomplishment. Note also:

(163) (a) Anó inâ
    what that.FOC
    'What's that?'

    (b) Pa-áno ikáw
    PA-what 2SG.FOC
    'How are you?'

Sentence (163b) is an inquiry into one's state of health, i.e. into one's life processes. The following inquiries involve the means or manner whereby the processes are accomplished:

(164) Pa-áno ka nag-kádto dirí
    PA-what 2SG.FOC NAG-come here
    'How did you come here?'

(165) Pa-áno ko ma-tahí iní
    PA-what 1SG.FOC MA-sew this.FOC
    'How can I sew this?'

(166) Pa-áno nag-súgod ang koláyo
    PA-what NAG-start FOC fire
    'How did the fire start?'
(167) pa-áno mag-mángin dóktor
PA-what MAG-become doctor
'how to become a doctor'

Each of these uses invokes ways, means, or methods, indicative again of a recognition of flux or process. (An appropriate answer to (164) might be Naqlakát akó 'I walked'.)

With other VOICE marking, áno is given a trajectory of influence, and -pa- again behaves like a Causative marker, disrupting the influence:

(168) (a) Nag-anó ang babáye
NAG-what FOC woman
'What did the woman do?'

(b) Nag-pa-anó ang babáye
NAG-PA-what FOC children
'The woman allowed herself to do something'
'What did the woman have done to herself?'

(169) (a) Gin-anó ikáw
GIN-what 2SG.FOC
'What was done to you?'

(b) Gin-pa-anó ang babáye
GIN-PA-what FOC woman
'What was the woman asked to do?'

(170) (a) I-anó mo iná
I-what 2SG.UNFOC that.FOC
'What will you do with that?'

(b) I-pa-anó mo iná
I-PA-what 2SG.UNFOC that.FOC
'What will you have done with that?'

3.6 Conclusion

As we noted in 3.0, numerous linguists have discussed -pa- primarily as a 'Causative' marker. Other functions, when acknowledged, are noted as 'other'. Bloomfield notes that, in addition to 'Causatives', Tagalog -pa- may denote 'manner' (cf. paági sa), 'reflexives', 'intense' actions, and various
'actives' and 'passives', offering numerous suggestive illustrations (Bloomfield 1917:298-313). Méntrida & Aparicio (1894) offer a largely similar characterization for Hiligaynon. Ruiz distinguishes a 'Causative' -pa- from a 'Directional' one (Ruiz 1968:65). In effect, both causality and spatiality emerge as privileged categories whose interrelationship and derivative nature have been inadequately appreciated. While all such descriptions present provocative information, they have neglected to offer an explanatory account of the diversity. They suggest, or come close to suggesting, that the diversity (polysemy) of -pa- is actually a case of homonymy. This approach is undesirable because it is too easy; one can apply it to explain away any difficult example without the possibility of a full refutation. One learns little from such an approach and remains mired in the categories handed down from one's own linguistic background.

I have argued that -pa- marks a DISPLACEMENT of the performance of an EVENT from the PARTICIPANT in the MOTILE ROLE to some other PARTICIPANT. This DISPLACEMENT may, with CENTRIFUGAL roots having animate PARTICIPANTS, imply 'direction', 'delegation', or 'permission'. With many CENTRIPETAL roots, this DISPLACEMENT may also be non-delegational. In either case, -pa- assures that the process is not confined to a single locus; there is an increase in Valency, i.e. another PARTICIPANT is implied. With other roots, the DISPLACEMENT signalled by -pa- can be understood in
terms of a serial approximation of some state, a physical
direction, or a trajectory that approaches without achieving
a named endpoint. This directionality and non-achievement
reflect an involvement in the flux of an EVENT as opposed to
its termini. Finally, -pa- suggests an 'intensity' or
'urgency' with respect to certain EVENTS, which may, for
Irrealis EVENTS, also suggest a heightened sense of
'certainty'. Such 'Intensive' readings reflect the involvement
in the flux, an intensity that is itself intensified through
the reduplication of -pa-. These readings underscore the fact
that -pa- is not primarily concerned with PARTICIPANTS (or
with related domains such as the physical) but with shaping
EVENTS, as are the other affixes of VOICE.

Thus, the 'Causative' semantics of -pa- are one portion
of the complex semantics of DISPLACEMENT which configure the
EVENT, which includes the VOICE and PARTICIPANT(S). The
'Intensive' readings of -pa-, including those associated with
its reduplication, reflect the ROLE content which we have
observed elsewhere in the grammar, which contains MOTILITY as
a 'motivating source' of EVENTS. When DISPLACED by -pa- from
the ERUPTION, the MOTILITY is understood as an 'urge(ency)' or
'intentionality' motivating the PRE-MOTILE PARTICIPANT. We
would expect such 'Intensive' semantics to differ in a
language with a different constitution of ROLE. Such is the
case with Yogad.
Chapter Four

The Morphosyntax of Yogad -pa- Causatives

4.0 Introduction

Yogad is a Western Austronesian language of the Northern Cordilleran group of Philippine languages spoken in the Cagayan Valley of eastern Luzon. A 1975 census counted 13,923 speakers.¹ Yogad has been largely neglected by linguists, including Austronesianists. Earlier work on the language includes field notes by Healey (1958), a primer by Healey & Healey (1956), and a Masters thesis by Galang (1974).² More recent and more detailed treatments include Baek (1994) and Baker (1994), which, with additional material (including some adapted from the present study), are incorporated in Davis et al. (Ms.).

Yogad shares numerous structural similarities with Hiligaynon. Most of the VOICE affixes are cognate with those found in Hiligaynon and many other Philippine languages. However, the apparent sameness is often misleading. Although many of these cognates may respond to the same general semantic space, they configure it differently. In general, Yogad is markedly less responsive to ROLE, which Hiligaynon

¹According to McFarland (1980:69), ten Northern Cordilleran languages have been counted: Isnag, Adasen, Malaweg, Itawis, Ibanag, Atta, Agta, Ga-dang, Gaddang, and Yogad.

²I am indebted to G. Richard Roe, Associate Director of Academic Affairs for the SIL in Manila, for sending me copies of Healey (1958) and Healey & Healey (1956).
recognizes in terms of MOTILITY/INERTNESS. This relative indifference to ROLE is, as we shall see, reflected in the semantics of causation.

The Yogad data that follow were patiently provided by Dr. Angel Mesa of Houston, Texas. Dr. Mesa is a native of Echague, Isabela Province, Philippines.

4.1.0 Orientation: Yogad Verbal and Nominal Morphosyntax

Like Hiligaynon, Yogad may be characterized as a VSO language with complex Verbal morphology. As with Hiligaynon, this characterization demands qualification; as discussed in 4.1.1 below, the word order options differ significantly from those of Hiligaynon. Yogad uses the Verbal affix -pa- (which is cognate with the so-called Causative morpheme found in Hiligaynon and other Philippine languages) to express causation. Understanding Yogad morphological Causatives and the broader semantics of -pa- requires attention to the constitution of ROLE, VOICE, and EVENT. The first two of these are discussed at length in the current chapter; the third, mainly in Chapter 5.

4.1.1 Yogad Word Order and ROLE

The characterization of Yogad 'basic word order' as VSO requires qualification. As in Hiligaynon, sentence-initial position does not indicate 'Verb' per se but may include Interrogative Pronouns and Predicate Nominals as in the following pairs (cf. Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 2):
(1) (a) Sinní yu g= in=ákap ni Maria
who FOC hug=IN=hug UNFOC Maria
'Whom did Maria hug?'

(b) Anák na yu g= in=ákap³
child 3SG.UNFOC FOC hug=IN=hug
'She hugged her child'

(2) (a) Ganí yu p= in=at- túrak nu
what FOC PAG=IN=PAG-write 2SG.UNFOC
'What did you write with?'

(b) Lápis yu p= in=at- túrak ku
pencil FOC PAG=IN=PAG-write 1SG.UNFOC
'I used a pencil to write with'

The 'Noun'-initial (b)-sentences are appropriate as answers to
the (a)-sentences. 'Verb'-initial correspondents to the (b)-
sentences, with ginákap 'hugged' and pinattúrak 'wrote' in
initial position, would be inappropriate as responses to these
questions. Sentence-initial position in such cases is thus
more broadly understandable as marking 'RHEME' rather than
'Verb'.

In contrast to Hiligaynon, which exploits sentence-
initial RHEME to signal DISCONTINUOUS TOPICS, while using its
V__ order to mark CONTINUOUS ones, Yogad uses a construction
marked by ay to express CONTINUOUS TOPICS. This construction
seems to shift the RHEME away from the initial part of the
sentence, after or 'to the right of' the particle ay (cf. Baek
following sentences, excerpted from an oral narrative (cf.
Appendix C), illustrate the use of ay:

³The Phrase anák na is reduced to [anáña] in normal
speech.
(3) Tu ya dagún ay ma-tuyág kami tráppa ya
UNFOC LINK year AY MA-strong 1PL.FOC still LINK
magatawà
couple
"In that particular year, my wife and I were still
strong"

(4) Saw tutá wará ra yu ma-tagéna' mi
here there exist already FOC MA-feel 1PL.FOC
tu baggíbaggí mi áwstru nat-takit
UNFOC bodies 1PL.UNFOC and NAG-sick
si Mrs. ay na-panonó-mi yu
FOC Mrs. AY NA-think- 1PL.UNFOC FOC
angáy balalámun saw tu Amérika
go reply here UNFOC America
"We felt something in our bodies and the Mrs. got
so ill that we began again to think of going to
America"

In (3), the Phrase tu ya dagún sets the Temporal scene for the
action. Such scene-setting is common with Preverbal elements.
In contrast to Hiligaynon, however, the scene is CONTINUOUS
with information already implicit in the previous DISCOURSE;
the 'new' information (i.e. that we were still young) follows
ay. Similarly, (4) places the already known, CONTINUOUS
information first, before ay; the theme of the illness has
developed in the immediately preceding Clauses.

CONTINUOUS TOPIC --> ay + EVENT --> DISCONTINUOUS TOPIC

Figure 4.1: TOPIC in Yogad ay Clauses

The informational DISCONTINUITY occurs after ay, which
begins the more dynamic, RHEME-like point of departure, which
announces the decision to move to America. The sentential

"In natural speech, final consonants are often dropped.
The full form of 'feel' is tagénap."
organization of information flow or TOPIC in Yogad sentences containing ay is summarized in Figure 4.1.

Hiligaynon and Yogad thus have complementary grammars for the expression of CONTINUOUS and DISCONTINUOUS TOPICS (cf. 2.1.1). In Yogad, CONTINUITY is marked by initial position bracketed by ay, while in Hiligaynon it is marked by post-verbal position. Lack of CONTINUITY in Yogad is marked by the VSO order so that the initial content is RHEME. Here, there is greater similarity between Yogad and Hiligaynon in that both may use initial position for RHEME. Unlike Hiligaynon, Yogad has another resource for the introduction of DISCONTINUOUS TOPICS, i.e. the position after or to the 'right' of ay. Cf. Davis et al (Ms., Chapter 3). The VSO word order is especially common in corpora of elicited sentences, which offer minimal DISCURSIVE CONTINUITY. The elicited Hiligaynon corpus has a significantly greater number of instances of SVO ordering than does Yogad, reflecting similar DISCONTINUITY.

In elicited sentences, the sequencing of the two post-RHEME Nominals is essential for identifying ROLES. The first (N₁ or 'S') position marks the 'ERUPTIVE' PARTICIPANT, the conceptual locus at which the EVENT emerges; and the second (N₂ or 'O'), the 'POST-ERUPTIVE' PARTICIPANT. Note that the ERUPTIVE/POST-ERUPTIVE contrast need not imply the contrast of MOTILE/INERT:

(5) Addayá nu Dállas yu Hóuston south UNFOC Dallas FOC Houston 'Houston is south of Dallas'
In (5), Dallas serves as the reference point, occasion, or grounding from which one proceeds to locate Houston. Numerous additional examples are possible. This 'grounding' semantics is an essential connection of the N₁ position with the 'S' of 'Subject' (<L subjectus, Past Participle of subicere 'to throw under', hence 'something thrown under') insofar as it suggests a basis upon which 'something' may emerge. Other qualities we associate with the typological, grammatical category 'Subject' are less reliable. Motility and agency (prime ingredients of TOPIC-worthiness) are non-essential possibilities which may attach to this grounding but need not actually do so. Even a MOTILE/INERT contrast need not involve an AGENT-PATIENT relation. Such is the case with the MIDDLE semantics in the following:

(6)      I-bákkα nu  bintána yu marál ya
I-break UNFOC window FOC bad LINK
pat trabáho
workmanship

'The window will break due to its bad workmanship'

Here, the window is the (ERUPTIVE, but NON-AGENTIVE) locus of the breaking, while the bad workmanship is the (POST-ERUPTIVE, but NON-PATIENTIVE) cause of the breaking. The influence begins with the bad workmanship and erupts from the window—in violation of the direction one might expect if N₁ and N₂ respectively marked 'AGENT' and 'PATIENT'. Hence, the Yogad morphosyntax marks relations without specifying dynamics per se (cf. Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 4). The only reliable ROLE

\[\text{This is a combination of pág- and trabáho 'work'.}\]
contrast is that of ERUPTION and POST-ERUPTION, which in many instances may be read as 'MOTILITY' and 'INERTNESS'. Such a 'ROLE depleted' contrast is not possible in Hiligaynon, which consistently treats i-marked PARTICIPANTS as 'PATIENTS' or 'INSTRUMENTS' without such 'adherent cause' readings.

The association of the initial post-RHEME position with ERUPTIVE, 'reference-point' semantics implies that Pronouns, which name HUMAN PARTICIPANTS assumed to be familiar or contextually immediate to the interlocutors, must occur in that position and not in the '0' or $N_2$ position:

(7)  
(a)  Nak-kánna ni  kán  si Philip  
     NAG-hit  UNFOC 1SG.FOC FOC Philip  
     'Philip hit me'  
(b)  *Nak-kánna si Philip  ni  kán  
     NAG-hit  FOC Philip UNFOC 1SG.FOC

Given the sentence configuration $V + N_1 + N_2 (+ N_3 ...)$, the series $V N_1 N_2$ constitutes the NUCLEUS of the clause wherein the two ROLES play out; any additional Nominals ($N_3$ etc.) occur in the PERIPHERY as 'circumstantial' elements. Position is especially important in Yogad given the lack of an Oblique marker analagous to Hiligaynon $sa$ for Common Nouns (cf. 2.1.2).

Variation in word order is possible, but only with an alternative tonal contour involving appropriately placed pause and stress. Note the following:

(8)  
(a)  Nas-sándig si Juan tu dínding  
     NAG-lean FOC Juan UNFOC wall  
     'Juan leaned against a wall'
(b) Nas-sándig tu dínding, si Juán
    NAG-lean UNFOC wall, FOC Juan
    'Juan leaned against a wall'

(9) (a) Nas-sándig si Juan tukuni Roberto
    NAG-lean FOC Juan UNFOC Roberto
    'Juan leaned against Roberto'

(b) Nas-sándig tukuni Roberto, si Juán
    NAG-lean UNFOC Roberto, FOC Juan
    'Juan leaned against Roberto'

In (8a) and (9a), the ERUPTIVE 'AGENT' Juan occurs in N₁ position. Since the root sándig requires only one PARTICIPANT, there is no 'PATIENT'; any Nominal occurring in the PERIPHERAL N₂ position is interpreted as being 'circumstantial'; in this case, a LOCATION. The (b)-examples illustrate that word order is not strictly fixed, but that variation is possible with an appropriately place pause, indicated in these examples by a comma.

A NUCLEUS/PERIPHERY contrast such as the one posited above implies that, like Hiligaynon, Yogad has only two ROLES. In other words, while such notions as 'AGENT', 'PATIENT', 'INSTRUMENT', 'RECIPIENT', and 'BENEFACTEE' may be inferred from given instances of Yogad, they are not specified as such by the morphosyntax of the language. Any POST-NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS are, by definition, beyond the reach of VOICE. If the NUCLEUS is occupied, additional PERIPHERAL PARTICULARS (in N₂ (or 'O') position and beyond with one-argument EVENTS, in N₃ and beyond with those requiring two arguments), indicate PERIPHERAL elements whose exact sense derives from the EVENT. Typical interpretations for PERIPHERAL PARTICULARS include
'INSTRUMENT', 'TIME', and 'LOCATION'. These readings are illustrated by the final Nominal Phrase in each of the following sentences:

(10) Nat-túvak kán tu líbru tu lápis
NAG-write 1SG.FOC UNFOC book UNFOC pencil
'I wrote a book with a pencil'

(11) Nak-kánna ni Bill tu estudyánte tu batú
NAG-hit UNFOC Bill UNFOC student UNFOC rock
'Bill hit a student with a rock'

(12) Nat-tádag si Juan tu tátu yá óra
NAG-stand FOC Juan UNFOC one LINK hour
'Juan stood for one hour'

(13) Nas-sandig si Juan tu díinding
NAG-lean FOC Juan UNFOC wall
'Juan leaned against a wall'

(14) Nap-pórbya yu babáy tu sinnún tu Kmart
NAG-try FOC woman UNFOC clothes UNFOC Kmart
'The woman tried on the clothes at Kmart'

Again, the word order may be varied with appropriate pause and stress, as in:

(15) Nat-túvak kán tu lápis, tu líbru
NAG-write 1SG.FOC UNFOC pencil, UNFOC book
'I wrote a book with a pencil'
'I used a pencil to write a book'

As witnessed above, the Determiner tu indifferently marks any UNFOCUSED POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT, whether NUCLEAR or not. The non-commitment of tu to any particular ROLE suggests that Yogad morphosyntax is indifferent to the dimension of 'Transitivity' as we understand it from English; even less than that of Hiligaynon, Yogad grammar does not respect Transitivity.

Despite their being beyond VOICE, the POST-NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS are sensitive to their order of occurrence, which
reflects relative emphasis. Note the following variations:

(16) (a) Nad-damá kán tu ta óras tu Manila
NAG-walk 1SG.FOC UNFOC one hour UNFOC Manila
'I walked an hour in Manila'

(b) Nad-damá kán tu Manila tu ta óras
NAG-walk 1SG.FOC UNFOC Manila UNFOC one hour
'I walked in Manila an hour'

(17) (a) I-tubúg ni Maria yu anák na
I-send UNFOC Maria FOC child 3SG.UNFOC
tukuni Juan tu Manila
UNFOC Juan UNFOC Manila
'Maria will send her child to Juan in Manila'

(b) I-tubúg ni Maria yu anák na
I-send UNFOC Maria FOC child 3SG.UNFOC
tu Manila tukuni Juan
UNFOC Manila UNFOC Juan
'Maria will send her child to Manila to Juan'

Sentence (16a) suggests a scenario in which I engaged in my hourly walk according to my daily habit and that Manila was merely the backdrop for my exercise. Sentence (16b) suggests that my purpose was to go sightseeing in Manila and that I happened to do so for one hour. Hence, the $N_2$ position indicates the 'target' or 'goal' of the action, here understandable in terms of the AGENT's intention. Similarly, (17a) suggests that Maria intends for the child to stay with Juan, who happens to be in Manila; whereas (17b) suggests that Maria is sending the child to Manila, perhaps to attend school there, with Juan being the child's guardian there.

Compared with Hiligaynon, Yogad morphology shows little interest in the constitution of elements in the PERIPHERY. Recall that Hiligaynon allows UNFOCUSSED elements (including Spatiotemporal ones) to be marked with either sang with sa,
whereas Yogad uses *tu* for all cases. Unlike Yogad *tu*, Hiligaynon *sa* imposes a boundary on a PARTICIPANT—a 'definition' that constitutes it as being 'Definite'. The issue of 'definition' emerges in more detail in the following section.

4.1.2 The Construction of Yogad PARTICIPANTS: Determiners and Pronouns

As in Hiligaynon, the designation of the VOICE on the Verb is complemented by prenominal Determiners (or by Pronouns), which reflect a given Nominal's selection (or non-selection) by the Verbal VOICE morphology (discussed later regarding Causatives). The FOCUS markers or Determiners are presented in Figure 4.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Proper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOCussed</td>
<td><em>vu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnFOCussed ERUPTIVE</td>
<td><em>nu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnFOCussed POST-ERUPTIVE</td>
<td><em>tu</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2: Yogad FOCUS: Determiners

Yogad Determiners distinguish between uniquely identifiable or familiar HUMAN PARTICIPANTS (with *si* and *ni*) and non-unique PARTICIPANTS which may but need not be HUMAN (with *vu*, *nu*, and *tu*). Whereas Hiligaynon opposes the Proper Preposition *kay* to the Common Preposition *sa*, Yogad uses *tu* for both Common and Proper Nouns. Any UNFOCUSED PARTICIPANTS named by Pronouns or Proper Nouns also require *ku* (a cognate of Hiligaynon *kay*). In addition, with Proper Nouns, *ku* must be
followed by either ni (Singular) or ra (Plural). These concatenations yield the Compound forms tukuni and tukura. To save space and maintain simplicity, I will orthographically depict them as single (albeit complex) words and will gloss them simply as 'UNFOC(ussed)' in the interlinear glosses. This depiction has a certain psycholinguistic validity since these forms are typically pronounced in a single tonal contour.

The FOCussed/UNFOCussed distinction is also observed among the Pronouns, which are presented in Figure 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FOCussed</th>
<th>UNFOCussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>kan</td>
<td>ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>nu - m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>(va bèggi ná)</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1DL.INC</td>
<td>kitá</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.INC</td>
<td>kitam</td>
<td>tam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EXC</td>
<td>kamí</td>
<td>mí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>kam</td>
<td>maw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>sirá</td>
<td>da - ra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3: Yogad Pronouns

The UNFOCussed forms nu and da occur after consonants, while m and ra follow vowels. The Exclusive Plural Pronouns kamí and mì 'we, us' indicate that the non-speaker referents are not physically present in the speaking situation. There is no FOCussed Third Person Singular Pronoun proper, but va bèggi ná 'his/her body' may be used instead. This 'lack' marks a contrast with Hiligaynon, which provides the Pronoun siá for FOCussed Third Person Singular. Another contrast with Hiligaynon is the absence of a Pre- versus Post-Positional morphological opposition among the Pronouns. All UNFOCussed
Pronouns are unstressed, Post-Positional enclitics.

With a VOICE which places the ERUPTIVE-ROLE PARTICIPANT in FOCUS (indicated here by naq-), the following substitutions are possible:

(18) $\text{Nad-dagét si Maria tu burási}$
    $\text{NAG-sew FOC Maria UNFOC dress}$
    'Maria sewed a dress'

(19) $\text{Nad-dagét yu babáy tu burási}$
    $\text{NAG-sew FOC woman UNFOC dress}$
    'The woman sewed a dress'

(20) $\text{Nad-dagét kán tu burási}$
    $\text{NAG-sew 1SG.FOC FOC dress}$
    'I sewed a dress'

Sentences (18)-(20) illustrate the FOCUSSING elements si (with a Proper Noun), yu (with a Common Noun), and kan (the First Person Singular Pronoun), each of which is used to indicate an ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT. As in Hiligaynon, FOCUS does not indicate ROLE as such, but it marks selection by VOICE. With a VOICE, here indicated by na-, which focusses the POST-ERUPTIVE-ROLE PARTICIPANT, the following substitutions on the ERUPTIVE locus are possible:

(21) (a) $\text{Na-ámpat ni Maria yu líbru}$
    $\text{NA-pick.up UNFOC Maria FOC book}$
    'Maria was able to pick up the book'

(b) $\text{Na-ámpat nu babáy yu líbru}$
    $\text{NA-pick.up UNFOC woman FOC book}$
    'The woman was able to pick up the book'

(c) $\text{Na-ámpat na yu líbru}$
    $\text{NA-pick.up 3SG.UNFOC FOC book}$
    'S/he was able to pick up the book'

A Nominal marked by yu/si and combined with a complementarily marked Verbal element forms the basic sentence
in Yogad. The forms *yu* (for Common Nouns) and *si* (for Proper Nouns) indicate Nominals that have been selected by the Verb for VOICE.

Unlike the English Articles *the* and *a*, the Yogad Determiners *yu* and *tu* do not essentially register a differential degree of knownness or familiarity regarding PARTICIPANTS. Rather, they orient attention toward a given locus in an EVENT. Like *ang* in Hiligaynon, *yu* imposes a distinct boundary on PARTICIPANTS, imparting to them a highly defined character; the interlocutors' attention is oriented most strongly toward the PARTICIPANT focussed by *yu*, which is concomitantly selected by VOICE. The *tu*-marked PARTICIPANT has a more vaguely defined boundary; such a PARTICIPANT is often NON-PARTICULAR or Plural. Note the following contrast:

(22) (a) Nad-digút *yu* yáma *tu* anák na
NAG-bathe FOC father UNFOC child 3SG.UNFOC
'The father bathed his children'
'The father bathed one of his children'

(b) D= in=igút nu *yu* yáma *yu* anák na
bathe=IN=bathe UNFOC father FOC child 3SG.UNFOC
'The father bathed his child'

Here, *yu yáma* 'the father' and *yu anák na* 'his child' are highly individuated, well defined PARTICIPANTS, as suggested by the use of the English *the* in the gloss. In contrast, the identity of *tu anák* 'a child, some children' is of lesser interest and may be understood as being either Plural or as a any of several possible children. The *tu*-element is not particularly salient.

Note that the *yu/tu* contrast is not one of known/unknown;
the father in (22a) may be assumed to be acquainted with his child(ren) as such. As in Hiligaynon, the FOCUS markers create PARTICIPANTS (cf. Baker 1994:232). They need not focus 'Nouns' (as the names of a priori PARTICIPANTS or 'things') but may also focus EVENTS. As we would expect, however, the degree of definition varies. Note the following:

(23) Mapí yu t= in-úrák ku
good FOC write=IN=write 1SG.UNFOC
'What I wrote is good'

(24) Tátaw na tu ma-tákít yu atú na
know 3SG.UNFOC UNFOC MA-sick FOC dog 3SG.UNFOC
'S/he knows that his/her dog is sick'

In (23), the EVENT tínúrák ku 'I wrote (something)' is enfolded in the EVENT mapí 'being good'. In (24), the EVENT matakít yu atú na 'his/her dog is sick' is likewise enfolded in the EVENT tátáw na 's/he knows something'. In each case, the enfoldment creates differing degrees of PARTICIPANT-like effects from EVENTS. In (23), yu marks a more fully realized, thing-like PARTICIPANT (i.e. a book, letter etc.), in contrast to tu in (24), which marks a more EVENT-like entity. The grammar, therefore, does not firmly distinguish between process and product. The ability of tu to mark fully-fledged Clauses contrasts with the more limited ability of Hiligaynon sang, which may mark uninflected Verbal Phrases (cf. 2.1.2). Hiligaynon relies on a separate form nga to link such Subordinate Clauses. Thus, Yogad maintains less distinction between Nominal and Verbal elements than does Hiligaynon, a point elaborated in more detail below.
While the POST-ERUPTIVE Determiner *tu* can indicate any of the less motile PARTICIPANTS of a given EVENT, NUCLEAR or PERIPHERAL, *ni* and *nu*, in marking ROLE, are restricted to the only ERUPTIVE (and therefore NUCLEAR) PARTICIPANT available, a condition they share with the UNFOCUSSED Pronouns. Note the parallelism of the following:

(25) \[\text{Na-digút ni Roberto yu anák}\]
\[\text{NA-bathe UNFOC Roberto UNFOC child}\]
\[\text{'Roberto was able to bathe the child'}\]

(26) \[\text{Na-digút nu estudyánte yu anák}\]
\[\text{NA-bathe UNFOC student FOC child}\]
\[\text{'The student was able to bathe the child'}\]

(27) \[\text{Na-digút na yu anák}\]
\[\text{NA-bathe 3SG.UNFOC FOC child}\]
\[\text{'S/he was able to bathe the child'}\]

As markers of PARTICIPANTS at the ERUPTION of EVENTS, *ni*, *nu* and *na* (etc.) often mark 'AGENTS'. Agency is consistent with the semantics of ERUPTION, but it is not defining or primary (as we have already seen regarding word position and ROLE). In addition to assisting the marking of ROLE, *ni* and *nu* serve as attributive Ligatures between two Nominals so that the first Nominal so that the head and the *ni/nu*-marked second the 'Genitive' attribute. In parallel fashion, the UNFOCUSSED Pronouns, too, may mark 'Genitive' 'Possessors'. Note the following:

(28) \[\text{bigád/binaláy/agamáw} \ ni \ Juan\]
\[\text{wound/house/smile} \ \text{UNFOC Juan}\]
\[\text{the \{wound/house/smile\} of Juan'}\]

(29) \[\text{bigád/binaláy/agamáw} \ nu \ méstru\]
\[\text{wound/house/smile} \ \text{UNFOC teacher}\]
\[\text{the \{wound/house/smile\} of the teacher'}\]
Here, the UNFOCUSSED PARTICIPANTS marked by the elements ni, nu, and na name the loci with respect to which the preposed Nominals/PARTICIPANTS are identified. For example, a smile 'emerges' or 'erupts' with respect to Juan, and so on. Thus, each of the UNFOCUSSED Deictic elements can broadly be understood to mark a 'source' from which something, either an EVENT or another PARTICIPANT, proceeds. If we recall our discussion of the 'grounding' signalled by the ROLE in immediate post-RHEME position, we can understand the 'source' semantics as a form of, or complement to, ERUPTION. Therefore, the UNFOCUSSED ERUPTIVE elements (including both Determiners and Pronouns) enable the construction of both 'agency' and 'possession' without being reducible to either function.\(^6\)

It is interesting that the UNFOCUSSED Common-Noun Determiner in Yogad is more consistently ERUPTIVE than its Hiligaynon equivalent. Like Yogad nu, the Hiligaynon Determiner sang may indicate 'Possession'; recall however, that it may also mark either MOTILE or INERT ROLES (cf. 2.1.2). We might say that Hiligaynon sang is more sensitive to the bounded/unbounded distinction than to that of

\(^6\)Note that the conflation of the 'AGENTIVE' and 'Genitive' meanings in the UNFOCUSSED/UNFOCUSSING Nominal morphology is already implicit in the term genitive ('L genus 'birth'). This association of birth/parenthood with ownership is widespread among cultures and is discussed in terms of the conceptual metaphor AN OWNER IS A FATHER in Claudi & Heine (1986:313-316).
ERUPTION/POST-ERUPTION.

The series \textit{yu}, \textit{nu}, and \textit{tu} and the Ligature \textit{ya} (used to link Nominals with modifiers, cf. Hiligaynon \textit{noa}) marks a continuum of DETERMINACY, as discussed in Baker (1994:79-132). On this continuum, \textit{yu} marks maximum FOCUS, while \textit{tu} marks maximum DIFFUSENESS. We can appreciate the relative DIFFUSENESS of \textit{tu} by contrasting it with \textit{nu}. One aspect of the relatively greater DIFFUSENESS of \textit{tu} is its broader range regarding ROLE. Whereas \textit{nu} is confined to one ERUPTIVE ROLE per Clause (e.g. an 'AGENT'), \textit{tu} may introduce any number of PARTICIPANTS, and these need not be confined to the NUCLEUS. This asymmetry regarding type and number of PARTICIPANTS reflects the circumstance that an EVENT can have but one ERUPTION but numerous PHASES of EXHAUSTION. The multiplicity of paths to EXHAUSTION is attested to in the inventory of Verbal VOICE affixes, discussed in the next section.

The DIFFUSENESS differential is also apparent when we compare \textit{tu} and \textit{nu} as inter-Nominal Ligatures, as in the following (cf. Baker 1994:123):

\begin{enumerate}
\item (31) (a) Mam-mów si Pedro \textit{tu} kaddát tu binaláy
MAG-mow FOC Pedro UNFOC grass TU house
'Pedro will mow the grass around the house'

\item (b) Mam-mów si Pedro \textit{tu} kaddát \textit{nu} binaláy
MAG-mow FOC Pedro UNFOC grass NU house
'I'll mow the grass around the house'
\end{enumerate}

\footnote{Baker (1994) provocatively includes \textit{ya} in his roster of Determiners; my failure to list it as such in Figure 4.1 reflects my judgement that \textit{ya} is of minimal relevance as such in my discussion of Causatives.}
In (31a), tu kaddát includes the grass that is merely in the vicinity of the house, whereas nu kaddát in (31b) denotes the grass belonging to the house compound. Thus, nu is more precise than tu. This precision reflects a tighter definition with nu, as is further illustrated by the following (Baker 1994:123):

(32) (a) Gubín tu binaláy, yu palénke near TU house , FOC market 'The market is near the/our house'

(b) Gubín nu binaláy yu palénke near NU house FOC market 'The market is near a house'

In (32a), gubín tu binaláy may mean either 'the house' or 'our house'. There is no clear distinction or boundary. In (32b), gubín nu binaláy means 'the house' but cannot mean 'our house'. It thus indicates a more clearly bounded location, one that is more tightly cohesive. Baker (1994:123-124) notes that the DIFFUSENESS differential extends to flexibility in Phrase construction, since the Phrase gubín nu binaláy cannot be sensibly broken apart, while the tu-marked alternative can:

(33) (a) *Gubín yu palénke nu binaláy near FOC market NU house

(b) Gubín tu palénke yu binaláy near UNFOC market YU house 'The market is near the/our house'

Hence, despite the binary 'FOC(ussed)'/UNFOC(ussed)' distinction observed in the interlinear glosses, it should be remembered that FOCUS occurs in Yogad as a matter of degree respective to a continuum of FOCUSSSED and UNFOCUSSED—and not as a matter of 'knowledge' or 'familiarity'. 
A ranking of the Determiners according to degree of FOCUS may be suggested by the following chain of examples. The forms yu and nu contrast as follows (Baker 1994:99, Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 4):

(34)  (a) Mal-lábat yu disyéembre
      MAG-cold YU December
      'December is cold'

      (b) Pal-lábat nu disyéembre
      PAG-cold NU December
      'December ... cold'
      'the coldness of December'

Sentence (34a), with yu, is an observation of the 'factual character of December', which is a cold month. Utterance (34b), with nu, attends to the contingent nature of the weather, which may fluctuate in some years. Thus, yu frames its element as a more stable, actualized PARTICULAR. The form nu contrasts with tu as follows (Baker 1994:99-100, Davis et al. Chapter 4):

(35)  (a) Ammé na maskí namítta pal-lábat nu disyéembre
      not 3SG.UNFOC even once PAG-cold NU December
      'It never got cold in December'

      (b) Ammé na maskí namítta na-lábat tu disyéembre
      not 3SG.UNFOC even once NA-cold TU December
      'It never got cold in December'

Sentence (35a), with nu, is appropriate to a DISCOURSE about 'December', which was not cold even once, while (35b), with tu, is concerned less with December than with, say, cold weather, which was absent in December (among other times).

Like the Hiligaynon Ligature nga, the Yogad forms tu and ya may both introduce entire EVENTS as Verbal Complements with full inflection for VOICE/ASPECT and with PARTICIPANT
specification. Their functions converge in this respect with that observed earlier with Hiligaynon nga (cf. 2.1.2). They contrast in the following manner (Baker 1994:86, Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 4):

(36) (a) Ma-panónot ku tu s= in=érán ku
    MA-remember 1SG.UNFOC TU lock=IN=lock 1SG.UNFOC
    yu pwértal FOC door
    'I remember that I locked the door'

(b) Ma-panónot ku ya s= in=érán ku
    MA-remember 1SG.UNFOC YA lock=IN=lock 1SG.UNFOC
    yu pwértal FOC door
    'I remember that I locked the door'

Sentence (36a), with tu, suggests that the speaker is certain that she or he locked the door; with (36b), she or he must mentally replay the routine before deciding. Thus, tu frames a more stable and well defined element than ya.

The forms yu and ya embody respectively the greatest and least amount of FOCUS. The difference may be emphasized by the following contrast (Baker 1994:97, Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 4):

(37) (a) Kanáyun yu attákít nu allikúd ku
    constant YU hurting NU back 1SG.UNFOC
    'My back hurts all the time'

(b) Kanáyun ya attákít nu allikúd ku
    constant YA hurting NU back 1SG.UNFOC
    'My back hurts all the time'

Sentence (37a), with yu, is appropriate as an explanation to a doctor; the hurting is contained within a specific time frame. Sentence (37b), with ya, is not so contained; my back pain is a constant companion. This non-punctuality is also
apparent in the fact that *ya* links abiding, 'Adjectival' roots to Nominals, as in:

(38)  (a) lasáng *ya* lamésa
    red   YA table
    'red table'

(b) lamésa *ya* lasáng
    table   YA red
    'red table; table that is red'

The behavior of the Determiners with Nominals and Verbal Complements and other elements suggests a gradation of FOCUS according to the continuum of DETERMINACY in Figure 4.4 (from Baker 1994:102; cf. also Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 4). There is thus no morphological discreteness in the differentiation between Nominals and Verbs but rather a gradual DEFOCUSSING of content.

---

FOCUSSED *yu* ------ *nu* ------ *tu* ------ *ya* DIFFUSE

Figure 4.4: Continuum of Yogad DETERMINACY

---

The continuity of DETERMINACY observed above in Yogad contrasts with the relative continence of MOTILITY by FOCUS observed in Hiligaynon (cf. 2.1.2). In Yogad, to be PERIPHERAL does not entail being OBLIQUE or PROJECTED--i.e. bounded. Recall that Hiligaynon forces a sharper distinction between NUCLEAR and PERIPHERAL elements through the OBLIQUE or PROJECTIVE form *sa*, which imposes a boundary on the element (whether PARTICIPANT-like or EVENT-like) that is so marked. Likewise, the Ligature *nga* links modifying ('Adjectival') or complementizing elements, to the exclusion of other forms such
as sang. Hiligaynon thus maintains a more clear-cut distinction between the MOTILE and the INERT ROLES.

The proper form ku (cognate with Hiligaynon kay) follows tu and is followed by ni or a Pronoun to name UNFOCUSED HUMAN PARTICIPANTS which are unique in the interlocutors' experience, which involves individuation, empathy, and/or identification. While tu precedes UNFOCUSED Common Nouns, tu ku precedes all UNFOCUSED Proper Nouns and Pronouns, as in the following:

(39)  (a) Nas-sáng it Roberto tu anák
      NAG-lean FOC Roberto TU child
      'Roberto leaned against a child'

(b) Nas-sáng it Roberto tu ku ni Santos
      NAG-lean FOC Roberto TU KU NI Santos
      'Roberto leaned against Santos'

(c) Nas-sáng it Roberto tu ku nó
      NAG-lean FOC Roberto TU KU 3SG.UNFOC
      'Roberto leaned against him/her'

In (39a), ku is not required since anák 'child' is not a unique entity but the name of a class. In (39b) and (39c), however, ku marks the Proper Noun Santos and the Third Person Singular Pronoun na as highly familiar PARTICIPANTS. The kinship terms including véna 'mother' and váma 'father' can be preceded by either tukuni or tu, as follows:

(40)  (a) Nag-gákap kán tu véna
      NAG-hug 1SG.FOC UNFOC mother
      'I hugged a mother'

(b) Nag-gákap kán tukuni véna
      NAG-hug 1SG.FOC UNFOC mother
      'I hugged Mother'
(41)  (a) Nag-gákap kán tu yéna ku
NAG-hug 1SG.FOC UNFOC mother 1SG.UNFOC
'I hugged my mother'

(b) Nag-gákap kán tukuni yéna ku
NAG-hug 1SG.FOC UNFOC mother 1SG.UNFOC
'I hugged my mother'

As noted earlier, I treat tukuni as one orthographic word for convenience. This treatment does not, of course, imply that it is a simple word. Sentence (40a) suggests that I hugged any mother and none in particular; (40b) suggests that it was my own mother that I hugged, a person I am uniquely familiar with; yéna here is used as a Proper name for a unique individual. The Common/Proper distinction is not confined to what we commonly regard as 'names'. In (41) the Phrase yéna ku 'my mother' can be marked by either tu or tukuni. Sentence (41a), with tu, suggests that my mother is unknown/unfamiliar to my interlocutor, whereas in (41b), with tukuni, she is known to him or her. Note that such familiarity is constructed in such a way as to exclude NONHUMAN PARTICIPANTS, as attested by my consultant's rejection of (42b):

(42)  (a) Nag-gákap kán tu atú ku
NAG-hug 1SG.FOC UNFOC dog 1SG.UNFOC
'I hugged my dog'

(b) *Nag-gákap kán tukuni atú ku
NAG-hug 1SG.FOC UNFOC dog 1SG.UNFOC

The form -ku-(-ni/-ra) is one of several ways in which the morphology of Yogad distinguishes humans as a separate class. As we have seen, this 'privilege' is also maintained with the Determiners ni and si and with the Pronouns, which are confined to naming HUMAN PARTICIPANTS. These morphemes
inject a sense of 'personality' into PARTICIPANTS, an identification of Self with Other. For example, ni is required before UNFOCUSSED Pronouns, which name PROXIMATE HUMAN PARTICIPANTS, even if VOICE selects the more 'MOTILE' ROLE, as in the following:

(43)  Nak-kánna ni kán si Philip
      NAG-hit UNFOC 1SG.FOC FOC Philip
      'Philip hit me'

(44)  pára ni kamí (anni Philip)
      BEN UNFOC 1SG.EXC.FOC (UNFOC Philip)
      'for me (and Philip)'

In these sentences, ni, preserves a sense of 'personality' or 'familiarity' despite an 'unseemly' lack of FOCAL attention (a function also observable in the Complex form tukuni). Note also that the second instance of ni in (44) combines with the COMITATIVE particle an to form a Ligature which defines the constitution of kamí 'we'. The PARTICIPANT named by ni kán 'me' is ERUPTIVE because, being HUMAN, it is inherently TOPICAL, or CONTINUOUS within the DISCOURSE (i.e. si Philip might be a newcomer).

With the forms -ku-, si, and ni, the grammar of Yogad recognizes and constructs a distinction between PARTICIPANTS which are so highly individualized as to be familiar or personal, and those less personal marked with yu and tu. Thus, Yogad Nominal morphology, like that of Hiligaynon and the other Philippine languages, enforces a human/nature distinction which implies differing degrees of integration of humans with their environment.
4.1.3 The CENTRIPETAL/CENTRIFUGAL EVENT Distinction in Yogad

As in Hiligaynon, the distinction between CENTRIPETAL and CENTRIFUGAL EVENTS is more valid than that of 'Intransitive' and 'Transitive' ones (cf. 2.1.3). Because the Yogad Determiner tu does not in itself distinguish between NUCLEAR and OBLIQUE PARTICIPANTS (cf. Hiligaynon sang and sa), a demonstration of these two categories of EVENT for Yogad is desirable.

Again, the term 'CENTRIPETAL' characterizes such Verbs/EVENTS as dáma 'walk', tádag 'stand', and sándig 'lean', which involve an inward-directed trajectory of influence such as we see in the following ERUPTION-FOCUSSED sentence:

(45) Nad-damá kán (tu binaláy ku)
    NAG-walk 1SG.FOC (UNFOC house 1SG.UNFOC)
    'I walked (in my house)'

(46) Nat-tádag kán tu káma ku
    NAG-stand 1SG.FOC UNFOC bed 1SG.UNFOC
    'I stood up in bed'
    *'I stood a bed up'

(47) Nas-sándig kán tukuni Santos
    NAG-lean 1SG.FOC UNFOC Santos
    'I leaned over/toward Santos'
    *'I leaned Santos over'

Sentences (45)-(47) construct CENTRIPETAL EVENTS insofar as the action fails to involve another PARTICIPANT; any additional tu-marked Nominal Phrase names a LOCATION, such as 'my house'. The morphosyntactic configuration is, of course, indistinguishable from what we would expect of a 'Transitive' sentence; and therefore (as we have already discussed) 'Transitive' is not an informative category, as becomes more
apparent when we realize that all Verbal roots may, with an appropriate marking for VOICE, be multi-valent, as, for example, *damá 'walk' is\(^8\) with -an in:

\[(48) \quad \text{Damá-n ku yu ñáìëdámán} \]
\[\text{walk-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC path} \]
\['I'll walk the path'\]

Here, two PARTICIPANTS, *ku 'I' and *yu ñáìëdámán 'the path', are co-involved in the EVENT of walking.

In contrast, 'CENTRIFUGAL' Verbs/EVENTS such as *kánnâ 'hit', *pörba 'try' or *mow 'mow' (an English loanword) suggest a trajectory of influence from one PARTICIPANT to another, a relation of Involvement whose trajectory does not return to the point of ERUPTION. Such is illustrated by the following:

\[(49) \quad \text{(a) Nak-kánnâ si Philip} \]
\[\text{NAG-hit FOC Philip} \]
\['Philip hit something' \]
\['Philip hit himself/was hit'\]

\[(49) \quad \text{(b) Nak-kánnâ si Philip tu ñáìë manók} \]
\[\text{NAG-hit FOC Philip UNFOC chicken} \]
\['Philip hit a chicken'\]

\[(50) \quad \text{(a) Nap-pörba si Marta} \]
\[\text{NAG-try FOC Marta} \]
\['Marta tried something'\]

\[(50) \quad \text{(b) Nap-pörba si Marta tu medisíína} \]
\[\text{NAG-try FOC Marta UNFOC medicine} \]
\['Marta tried some medicine'\]

\[(51) \quad \text{(a) Nap-pîlî yu mésíírum} \]
\[\text{NAG-try FOC teacher} \]
\['The teacher chose something'\]

---
\(^8\)Of course, the English equivalent is also Transitive. Cf. *I walked the dog, *I was walked to my cell, and even *Thirty miles of highway were walked before sunrise.
(b) Nap-pili yu méstru tu anák
NAG-choose FOC teacher UNFOC child
'The teacher chose a child'

The CENTRIFUGAL nature of these roots is revealed by the observation that, even with FOCUS on the point of ERUPTION (as in the [a]-sentences), there is an implied 'elsewhere' beyond the ERUPTION.

Some roots allow both CENTRIPETAL or CENTRIFUGAL readings. Hence, the CENTRIPETAL/CENTRIFUGAL distinction applies to EVENTS rather than to specific roots. In the following examples, digút 'bathe', dásag 'down', and gaggád 'restrain' are CENTRIPETAL in the (a)-sentences and CENTRIFUGAL in the (b)-sentences:

(52) (a) Nad-digút kán tu danúm
NAG-bathe 1SG.FOC UNFOC water/river
'I bathed (myself) with water'
'*I bathed someone in the river/water'

(b) Nad-digút kán tu anák
NAG-bathe 1SG.FOC UNFOC child
'I bathed a child'

(53) (a) Nad-dásag kán tu bás
NAG-down 1SG.FOC UNFOC bus
'I got down from the bus'
'*I got someone down from the bus'

(b) Nad-dásag kán tu kahón
NAG-down 1SG.FOC UNFOC box
'I put down the box'

(54) (a) Nag-gaggád yu presidénte
NAG-restrain FOC president
'The president restrained himself'
'*The president restrained someone'

(b) Nag-gaggád yu presidénte tu atáwa na
NAG-restrain FOC president UNFOC wife 3SG.UNFOC
'The president restrained his wife'
The (a)-sentences above permit CENTRIPETAL readings. Note that some roots are more permissive than others; sentence (54a) allows both CENTRIPETAL and CENTRIFUGAL readings, in contrast to the other (a)-sentences in (52) and (53), which imply CENTRIPETAL EVENTS only.

The CENTRIFUGAL/CENTRIPETAL status of a given Verb root—i.e. the identity of the EVENT—may reflect the PARTICIPANTS involved. The most recurrent variable in this regard seems to be animacy. In the following, (55a) is CENTRIPETAL and (55b), CENTRIFUGAL:

(55) (a) Nad-darál yu kárne
NAG-destroy FOC meat
'The meat spoiled'

(b) Nad-darál yu anák
NAG-destroy FOC child
'The child destroyed (something)'
*'The child destroyed him/herself'
*'The child rotted'

Here, a CENTRIPETAL understanding of the root darál 'rot, destroy' is required with the inanimate PARTICIPANT yu kárne 'the meat', while the animate PARTICIPANT yu báta 'the child' requires a CENTRIFUGAL reading (though the rejection of the third proposed reading may simply reflect my consultant's sense of decency). Such complications imply that the pragmatic constitution of particular EVENTS will be informative about such phenomena as causation.

4.1.4 The Construction of Yogad EVENTS: Yogad Verbal VOICE/ASPECT Morphology

As in Hiligaynon, the variable of VOICE involves
complementary markings on Nominals and Verbs. The Yogad Verb stem typically consists of a root and one or more VOICE affixes. These affixes select the PARTICIPANT in the ERUPTIVE or POST-ERUPTIVE ROLE for FOCUS. Again, ASPECT is Realis (instantiated) or Irrealis (uninstantiated). Figure 4.5 presents most of the VOICE affixes encountered in this study (others will be introduced as they are needed). 9

With the exception of =in= and -an, the inventory in Figure 4.5 exhibits a formal-semantic symmetry. The n-initial member of the set nag-/mag-, na-/ma-, and ni-/i- marks an EVENT as Realis or instantiated, with the other member being Irrealis. The ERUPTIVE form num- is a reduction of =in= plus =um= which may occur on vowel-initial roots.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Realis</th>
<th>Irrealis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERUPTIVE nag-</td>
<td>mag-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERUPTIVE inum- ~ num-</td>
<td>=um=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERUPTIVE maka-</td>
<td>maka-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-ERUPTIVE na-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-ERUPTIVE ni-</td>
<td>i-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST-ERUPTIVE =in=</td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.5: Yogad VOICE/ASPECT Affixes

Before vowels, the final consonant of nag- and mag- appears as -g (i.e. [g]). Before consonants, it assimilates completely, resulting in a geminated consonant cluster, as illustrated by the following:

9 The affixes -pag- and ag- are presented and discussed in Chapter 6.
(56) nag-amáw  
NAG-smile  
'smiled' 

(57) nap-patú  
NAG-heat  
'heated' 

(58) mam-mów  
MAG-mow  
'will mow' 

In some circumstances, particularly before initial vowels, the forms mag-, nag-, and -pag- alternate with eng-terminal forms mang-, nang-, and -pang-, as in:

(59) mang-ufút  
MAG- use  
'uses, will use' 

(60) nang-ummá  
NAG- kiss  
'kissed' 

(61) pang-i-túllu  
PAG- I-raise  
'will promote' 

These alternates are of relatively limited currency and are discussed more fully later (cf. Appendix C). 

In conjunction with placement in immediate post-RHEME position, the Verbal affixes nag- and mag- select the locus of the ROLE which we have been calling 'ERUPTIVE', with nag- marking an EVENT that has been realized and mag-, an unrealized one:

(62) (a) Nad-digút yu táwlay  
NAG-bathe FOC person  
'The man will take a bath'  
* 'The man will bathe somebody'
(b) Mad-digút yu táwlay
   MAG-bathe FOC person
   'The man will take a bath'
   *'The man will bathe somebody'

(63) (a) Náb-bísín yu táwlay
       NAG-hungry FOC person
       'The man got hungry'

(b) Náb-bísín yu táwlay
    MAG-hungry FOC person
    'The man will get hungry'

Note that experiential Verbs such as bísín 'hungry' may occur
with mag-/nag-, in contrast to the situation in Hiligaynon,
which requires the 'low-control' ma-/na-. Yogad is, as we
shall continue to see, largely insensitive to the niceties of
ROLE in terms of a MOTILE/INERT contrast.

The Irrealis semantics of mag- are consonant with
Imperative statements, as in the following:

(64)    Mag-iddá ká
        MAG-lie 2SG.FOC
        'Lie down!'

(65)    Mag-kánna ká
        MAG-hit 2SG.FOC
        'Hit (it)!'

(66)    Ammém ya mas-sigarílyu
        not LINK MAG-smoke
        'Don't smoke'

The Irrealis status of mag- is also apparent in its
participation in 'Infinitival' Verbal complements, as in:

(67)    Kabbát ku yu mat-tulúg
        like 1SG.UNFOC FOC MAG-swim
        'I like to swim'

Although the ERUPTIVE semantics of nag- and mag- are
rather obvious in the examples above, we must emphasize that
such semantics need not imply agency. As in Hiligaynon, agency
is but one possible accompaniment of the 'inceptive' semantics of nag-/mag- and the semantic dimensions of the EVENT involved, as implied by the following nag-marked sentences:

(68) Nad-dagá yu bigád
    NAG-bleed FOC wound
    'The wound bled/started bleeding'

(69) Nab-búk si Roberto
    NAG-hair FOC Roberto
    'Roberto grew hair'

(70) Nak-kurúg yu prediksyón
    NAG-true FOC prediction
    'The prediction turned out to be true'

(71) Nat-tuláng yu ikán
    NAG-bone FOC fish
    'The fish is/turned out to be boney'

None of the actions named in (68)-(71) above is strongly agentive. Sentence (68) suggests that the wound is the cite of (spontaneous) bleeding, and (69), that hair has erupted from Roberto's body. The prediction in (70) is certainly not responsible for its outcome but is the 'reference point' for the truth. And sentence (71) does not suggest that the fish sprouted bones; the emphasis is on the speaker's relation to the EVENT. The bones emerged into the speaker's experience. In all instances, nag- consistently focusses the locus where the EVENT erupts into interlocutors' attention. The VOICE affixes may be understood as orientations to and formulations of speakers' experience. (Recall our discussion of how the Determiners help create PARTICIPANTS, whereby speakers imbue certain PARTICIPANTS with a greater or lesser degree of empathy.)
The separation of VOICE from ROLE is more complete than in Hiligaynon. First, Hiligaynon NUCLEAR ROLES are more consistently committed to a MOTILE/INERT contrast; there is no nag-marked Hiligaynon counterpart to, say, (71). Secondly, Hiligaynon systematically requires MOTILE PARTICIPANTS to be well bounded--and separated. With a VOICE which selects the MOTILE ROLE, Hiligaynon marks PERIPHERAL PARTICIPANTS as OBLIQUES with sa, which imposes a defining boundary. Any INERT NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS are vaguely defined with sang. There are no OBLIQUE PARTICIPANTS in Yogad, which applies tu indifferently to both NUCLEAR and NON-NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS. This lack of a boundary-marking Preposition accords with the lack of a MOTILE ROLE.

This being said, Yogad VOICE is not entirely unrelated to ROLE. For one thing, an ERUPTIVE VOICE allows POST-ERUPTIVE Common Nouns but not POST-ERUPTIVE Proper Nouns to occur in the NUCLEUS:

(72) (a) Nak-kánna kán tu profesóř
    NAG-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC profesor
    'I hit a professor'

(b) *Nak-kánna kán tukuni Philip
    NAG-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC Philip

In (72), an 'animacy (or empathy) hierarchy' arises when we compare UNFOCUSSED NUCLEAR Common Nouns such as tu profesóř with UNFOCUSSED NUCLEAR Proper Nouns such as *tukuni Philip. Only the former may be POST-ERUPTIVE. To appear in the NUCLEUS, POST-ERUPTIVE Proper Nouns must be FOCUSSED:
Here, **si Philip** is a Nominal which is selected for FOCUS by the VOICE infix =in=.

In addition, **nag-/mag-** cannot occur with experience-like EVENTS, which allow little or no control. The roots **bisín** 'hungry', **ítá** 'see', and **tay** 'die' are informative. The ERUPTIVE **nag-** or **mag-** may co-occur with **bisín** if a definite point of departure, consistent with control, is understood, as in:

(74) (a) **Nab-bisín kán**
    NAG-hungry 1SG.FOC
    'I fasted/went hungry'

(b) **Mab-bisín kán**
    MAG-hungry 1SG.FOC
    'I will fast/get hungry'

These sentences, with ERUPTIVE **nag-/mag-**, imply a disruption of routine that begins on my initiative. I fasted or will begin to fast. With POST-ERUPTIVE **na-/ma-**, I simply become hungry, according to routine processes:

(75) (a) **Na-bisín kán**
    NA-hungry 1SG.FOC
    'I got hungry'

(b) **Ma-bisín kán**
    MA-hungry 1SG.FOC
    'I'm hungry'

The root **ítá** 'see' names an EVENT which allows too little control to co-occur with **nag-**. However, it may occur with **na-** and **naka-**, as in:

(76) *Nag-ítá kán*
    NAG-see 1SG.FOC
(77) Naka-itá kán tu báníğ
NAKA-see 1SG.FOC UNFOC ghost
'I saw a ghost'

(78) Na-itá ku yu báníğ
NA-see 1SG.UNFOC FOC ghost
'I saw the ghost'

This root means 'seeing' in the sense of 'spotting' or 'spying'. A related alternate form, gíta, may co-occur with nag-, though it means 'look for, look after':

(79) Nag-gíta kán tu anák
NAG-see 1SG.FOC UNFOC child
'I [looked for / looked after] {a child / some children}'

The root táy 'die', like itá, co-occurs with na-/ma- rather than nag-/mag-:

(80) (a) Na-táy si Roberto
NA-die FOC Roberto
'Roberto died'

(b) *Na-táy si Roberto
NAG-die FOC Roberto

(81) (a) Ma-táy si Roberto
MA-die FOC Roberto
'Roberto will die'

(b) *Ma-táy si Roberto
MAG-die FOC Roberto

As in Hiligaynon, Yogad VOICE presents death as an experience that comes to one rather than a deed that arises from within one's self.

In contrast to nag- and mag-, which imply a trajectory of influence, the affix =um= (or, with Realis EVENTS, num-) marks EVENTS which have no effect beyond the ERUPTION:

(82) (a) Um-útón yu lóbu
UM-rise FOC balloon
'The balloon is rising'
(b) **Num-** utón yu lóbu
    IN.UM-rise FOC balloon
    'The balloon rose'

(c) **Nag-utón ...**
    NAG-rise

Here, =**um**= marks utón 'rise' as involving only one PARTICIPANT, the balloon. But =**um**= is not confined to CENTRIPETAL EVENTS. When more than one PARTICIPANT is involved, the non-effectiveness of =**um**= may take other forms. For example, it may imply 'intention' as opposed to 'actualization' (Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 4):

(83) (a) **Mab-bibdí kán tu nobéla**
    MAG-read 1SG.FOC UNFOC novel
    'I'm reading a novel'

(b) **B= um=ibdí kán tu nobéla**
    read=UM=read 1SG.FOC UNFOC novel
    'I intend to read a novel'

(c) **B= in-um=ibdí kán tu nobéla**
    read=IN-UM=read 1SG.FOC UNFOC novel
    'I convinced myself to read a novel'

In (83b) and (83c), =**um**= implies an unfulfilled intention to read a novel, as opposed to the realization implied by mag- in (83a). A 'Perfective' sense is achieved when =**um**= combines with =in=. With some processes, the contrast may invoke 'naturalness', with =**um**= implying an action that is 'a matter of course' or 'in the nature of things'. Note the following (Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 4):

(84) (a) **Nag-angát kán**
    NAG-breathe 1SG.FOC
    'I took a breath'

(b) **Num- angát kán**
    IN.UM-breathe 1SG.FOC
    'I took a breath'
Sentence (84a), with *nag*- , is what I might say about receiving CPR, while (84b), with =um=, describes what I might do for a doctor who is giving me a physical examination; there is no consequence with the latter as there is with the former, which describes a type of disruption.

The final ERUPTIVE affix pair is *maka/-naka-. Like their Hiligaynon cognates, these affixes mark low-control EVENTS or, more generally, render the ERUPTION of the EVENT as 'REMOTE' from its performance so that a sense of 'potential' remains:

(85) (a) **Maka-duffúng kán**
    MAKÁ-help 1SG.FOC
    'I can/will be able to help'

(b) **Naka-duffúng kán**
    NAKÁ-help 1SG.FOC
    'I was able to help'

(86) (a) **Maka-kánna kán tu mamamánok**
    MAKÁ-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC bird
    'I can hit a bird'

(b) **Naka-kánna kán tu mamamánok**
    NAKÁ-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC bird
    'I was able to hit a bird'

(87) (a) **Maka-íta kán tu letrátu**
    MAKÁ-see 1SG.FOC UNFOC picture
    'I can see a picture'

(b) **Naka-íta kán tu letrátu**
    NAKÁ-see 1SG.FOC UNFOC picture
    'I was able to see a picture'

(88) (a) **Maka-bisín kán tu atú**
    MAKÁ-hunger 1SG.FOC UNFOC dog
    'I can make a dog hungry'

(b) **Naka-bisín kán tu atú**
    NAKÁ-hunger 1SG.FOC UNFOC dog
    'I was able to make a dog hungry'

The remainder of our discussion of VOICE concerns those
which select the POST-ERUPTIVE ROLE. The infix =in=, recently encountered as a Perfective marker which may combine with =um=, marks a PHASE of EVENT wherein all PARTICIPANTS have a maximally close and complete involvement with one another, i.e. where relationships are PERSVASIVE. (Note that 'closeness' is consonant with the 'closure' and 'completeness' suggested by its use as a Perfective marker.) With such roots as síná 'lie' and túppak 'spit' (which, let us remember, lack inherent Noun/Verb categoriality), =in= suggests a 'suffusion' of one PARTICIPANT with another (Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 5):

(89)  
S= in=ina yu presidéntę
lie=IN=lie FOC president
'The president is full of lies'

(90)  
T= in=úppak yu arínóla
spit=IN=spit FOC bedpan
'There's plenty of spit in the bedpan'

Here, the president and the bedpan are respectively suffused with lies and spit.\(^{10}\) Note that the determination of ROLE in terms of 'AGENT', 'PATIENT', 'INSTRUMENT' and so on is again problematical. It is only when the inner dynamics of a given EVENT permit that an AGENT/PATIENT contrast plainly emerges, as in:

(91)  
K= in=náenna ku si Philip
hit=IN=hit 1SG.UNFOC FOC Philip
'I hit Philip''

The PERSVASIVE semantics of =in= suggests a depth of involvement of PARTICIPANTS which contrasts with that enabled

---

\(^{10}\)The EFFUSIVE semantics of the Hiligaynon cognate =in= does not seem to allow such 'suffusive' readings but seems more consistently to require an 'AGENT'/''PATIENT' opposition.
by na-. Note the following:

(92) (a) B= in=áta ni Juan yu sinnún wet=IN=wet UNFOC Juan FOC cloth
      'Juan wet the cloth'

(b) Na-báta ni Juan yu sinnún NA-wet UNFOC Juan FOC cloth
      'Juan was able to/managed to wet the cloth'

(93) (a) G= in=afút ni Roberto yu mammánok catch=IN=catch UNFOC Roberto FOC bird
      'Roberto caught the bird'

(b) Na-gafút ni Roberto yu mammánok NA-catch UNFOC Roberto FOC bird
      'Roberto caught/was able to catch the bird'

(94) (a) T= in=akáw yu kwártu steal=IN=steal FOC money
      'The money was stolen'

(b) Na-takáw yu kwártu NA-steal FOC money
      'The money was stolen'

(95) (a) T= in=akáw ni Santos yu kwártu steal=IN=steal UNFOC Santos FOC money
      'Santos stole the money'

(b) Na-takáw ni Santos yu kwártu NA-steal UNFOC Santos FOC money
      'Santos was able to steal the money'

In each of the (a)-sentences, =in= suggests an EVENT which is decisively effective, while in the (b)-sentences na- an EVENT which is inadvertently or indirectly successful. In (92a), Juan wet the cloth 'without let or hindrance' and did so intentionally, while in (92b) he may have done so by accident or only by exerting himself, e.g. by squirting water at it from a distance. Sentence (93a) suggests that the bird was caught by hand, while (93b) suggests the involvement of an intervening factor such as a trap. Sentence (94b) suggests
that the thief was not seen and that there are no suspects, whereas in (94a) the speaker may have witnessed the theft or may have been directly robbed. In (95b), Santos, the explicitly mentioned ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT, is assumed to have encountered some difficulty or obstacle in stealing the money, whereas in (95a) he performed the theft without incident. Thus, na- implies EVENTS which project a debilitated or 'REMOTE' ERUPTION—even with single-PARTICIPANT EVENTS:

(96)   Na-báta yu sinnún
       NA-wet FOC cloth
      'The cloth got wet'

(97)   Na-tómba yu pasyénte
       NA-fall FOC patient
      'The patient fell down'

(98)   Na-bisín yu pasyénte
       NA-hungry FOC patient
      'The patient got hungry'

In (96), the cloth seems to have gotten wet in spite of circumstances that might have prevented it; it may have been taken into the house to avoid rain which managed to wet it by blowing through the window. In (97), which names an inherently CENTRIPETAL EVENT, the single PARTICIPANT is more PATIENTIVE than AGENTIVE since the fall was not deliberate. And in (98), bisín '(become) hungry' is a low-control EVENT with no AGENT.

The 'low-control' semantics observed with na- recognize a transitional stage or turning point—a CRUX in the EVENT (cf. Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 5). Note the following contrast:

(99) (a) Na-pusít yu lappáw
      NA-pick FOC flower
     'The flower was picked'
(b) **Ma-pusít yu lappáw**
**MA-pick FOC flower**
'The flower will be picked '

With **na**-, a CRUX has been passed; the speaker may have discovered his prize chrysanthemum missing from the stem in its flowerpot. With **ma**-, the flower is about to be picked, on the cusp of the process. These instances seem to suggest that **na**- and **ma**- contrast merely in terms of ASPECT.

However, as in Hiligaynon, the **na**-/**ma**- distinction involves more than a contrast in ASPECT. In Yogad, **ma**- posits the PROXIMITY of PARTICIPANTS to certain qualities (cf. Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 5).\(^{11}\)

Consider, for example, the following:

(100) (a) **Ma-lasáng yu kótye**
**MA-red FOC car**
'The car is reddish'

(b) **Na-lasáng yu kótye ku**
**NA-red FOC car 1SG.UNFOC**
'My car was reddened'

(101) (a) **Ma-tabá yu kólak ku**
**MA-fat FOC friend 1SG.UNFOC**
'My friend is fat'

(b) **Na-tabá yu kólak ku**
**NA-fat FOC friend 1SG.UNFOC**
'My friend got fattened'

In the (b)-sentences, **na**- presents current states or conditions (i.e. the redness of my car or the obesity of my friend) as the results of some CRUCIAL prior occurrence: the car is not merely red but has been reddened; the friend, not

\(^{11}\) I wish to thank Philip W. Davis for many of the insights into **ma**- provided here. For a more detailed treatment of **ma**-, cf. Davis et al. (Ms. Chapter 5).
merely fat but fattened.

In the (a)-sentences, ma- delineates a PROXIMATE association between the selected PARTICIPANT and the quality named by the EVENT. In (100a), the car is 'close to being red'; ma- implies an approach to an ideal that is not fully achieved. A similar approach is appreciable in (101a). Note, however, that my friend is 'fat' rather than 'almost fat'. The PROXIMITY here may be better appreciated by comparing the English sentences He's (trash/shit) with He's (trashy/shitty). The former option asserts an identity of he with the noxious substances, i.e. he embodies their properties (at the cost of his humanity); while the latter implies a 'mere' PROXIMITY between he and these substances, so that he shares some of their properties, allowing an equivalence to be drawn (cf. He's as (disgusting/worthless/dumb) as shit). In like fashion, Yogad ma- suggests a PROXIMITY to the quality named, while a bare root would imply and identity or class membership; hence the rejection of:

(102)    *Tabá yú kólak ku
         fat  FOC friend 1SG.UNFOC
         ('My friend is a piece of fat?)

The PROXIMATE semantics can, with more 'Active' EVENTS, play out in terms of intensity or compulsiveness:

(103)    Ma-sélos si Maria
         MA-jealous FOC Maria
         'Maria's very jealous/prone to jealousy'

(104)    Ma-amáw si Juan
         MA-smile FOC Juan
         'Juan smiles a lot/is full of smiles'
The CENTRIFUGAL EVENTS allow ma- to focus either the ERUPTIVE or the POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT. The further from the ERUPTION a PARTICIPANT is, the less intense or compulsive is the action. In fact, as in Hiligaynon, the intensity reduces to a potentiality:

(109) (a) Ma-palúga kán  tu  abáng  
MA-row  1SG.FOC UNFOC boat  
'I row boats a lot'  

(b) Ma-palúga ku  yu  abáng  
MA-row  1SG.UNFOC FOC boat  
'I can row the boat'  

(110) (a) Ma-dálu kán  tu  láppaw  
MA-smell 1SG.FOC UNFOC flower  
'I'm compelled to smell the flower'  

(b) Ma-dálu ku  yu  láppaw  
MA-smell 1SG.UNFOC FOC flower  
'I can smell the flower'  

(111) (a) Ma-nakám  si  Roberto  tu  babáye  
MA-think FOC Roberto UNFOC woman  
'Roberto is always thinking about a woman'  

(b) Ma-nakám ni  Roberto  yu  babáye  
MA-think UNFOC Roberto FOC woman  
'Roberto can think about the woman'  

The (a)-sentences, with ERUPTIVE FOCUS, indicate compulsive
behavior. The (b)-sentences, with POST-ERUPTIVE FOCUS, imply behavior that is merely 'potential'; the greater distance from the ERUPTION to the point of FOCUS thus weakens the intensity. Some roots allow two possible readings, one involving the FOCUSSED PARTICIPANT as a POST-ERUPTIVE target for a PROXIMATE future action, and the other as an ERUPTIVE source or embodiment quality closely associated with it:

(112)  
Ma-kíbu yu káldu
MA-stir FOC broth
'The broth will be stirred'
'The broth is stirrable'

(113)  
Ma-pílì si Roberto
MA-select FOC Roberto
'Roberto will be selected'
'Roberto is selective'

Finally, ma- allows only POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANTS to receive FOCUS with certain EVENTS. These include báttang 'leave' and gáku 'cook'. ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANTS are excluded from possible FOCUS. Furthermore, if an ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT is not explicitly present, ma- implies a definite sense of future, of 'will'; if the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT is explicitly present the intensity is lowered, suggesting 'potential'. Note the following:

(114) (a) *Ma-báttang kán tu líbru ku
MA-leave 1SG.FOC UNFOC book 1SG.UNFOC

(b)  
Ma-báttang yu líbru ku
MA-leave FOC book 1SG.UNFOC
'My book will be left'
*'My book can be left'

(c)  
Ma-báttang ku yu líbru ku
MA-leave 1SG.UNFOC FOC book 1SG.UNFOC
'I can leave the book'
*'I will leave the book'
(115) (a) *Ma-gáku yu méstra tu manók
    MA-cook FOC teacher UNFOC chicken

(b) Ma-gáku yu manók
    MA-cook FOC chicken
    'The chicken will be cooked'
    *'The chicken can be cooked'

(c) Ma-gáku nu méstra yu manók
    MA-cook UNFOC teacher FOC chicken
    'The teacher can cook the chicken'
    *'The teacher will cook the chicken'

Some EVENTS are so constituted as to allow no possibility
of a 'MOTILE' PARTICIPANT. With these, ma- suggests an abiding
quality that English speakers associate with 'Adjectives'. In
addition to colors such as lasáng 'red' in (100a) above, these
include the following:

(116) Ma-gàwagawayán si Lily
    MA-happy FOC Lily
    'Lily is happy'

(117) Ma-tabá yu méstru ku
    MA-fat FOC teacher 1SG.UNFOC
    'My teacher is fat'

(118) Ma-patú yu kafé
    MA-hot FOC coffee
    'The coffee is hot'

(119) Ma-kayáng yu estudyánte
    MA-lazy FOC student
    'The student is lazy'

(120) Ma-línis yu burási ku
    MA-clean FOC clothes 1SG.UNFOC
    'My clothes are clean'

(121) Ma-bisín yu estudyánte
    MA-hungry FOC student
    'The student is hungry'

Other seemingly 'Adjectival' EVENTS may occur without
VOICE affixes; with these, ma- contributes a sense of
heightened intensity or increased degree:
(122) (a) Parayág yu méstru
   proud FOC teacher
   'The teacher is proud'

   (b) Ma-parayág kán
   MA-proud 1SG.FOC
   'I'm very proud'

(123) (a) Márikat yu kótye
   dirt FOC car
   'The car is dirty'

   (b) Ma-márikat yu kótye
   MA-dirt FOC car
   'The car is very dirty'

(124) (a) Kurúg yu istórya
   true FOC story
   'The story is true'

   (b) Ma-kurúg yu istórya
   MA-true FOC story
   'The story is very true'

(125) (a) Ngísit yu ngipán ni Juan
   dark FOC teeth UNFOC Juan
   'Juan's teeth are dark/black'

   (b) Ma-ngísit yu ngipán ni Juan
   MA-dark FOC teeth UNFOC Juan
   'Juan's teeth are darker'

(126) (a) Gubín da yu fétya nu kasál
   near already FOC date UNFOC wedding
   'The wedding date is near'

   (b) Ma-gubín da yu fétya nu kasál
   MA-near already FOC date UNFOC wedding
   'The wedding date is very/extremely near'

The (a)-sentences of (122)-(126) imply a static, ever-abiding quality. In the (b)-sentences, ma- suggests an advancement of the state or property named. For example, (125a) implies that Juan's teeth are normally dark (perhaps because he chews tobacco), while (125b) suggests a graded increase in the degree of darkness. Likewise, (126b) marks the approach of the
target date. In either case, ma- marks an approach toward an ideal.

The possible absence of morphological VOICE marking on such roots suggests that these EVENTS lack a 'trajectory' of progress. This lack is also found on roots indicative of negation, existence, identity, and mentation:

(127) Ammém mas-sigarílyu
       not     MAG-cigarette
      'No smoking'

(128) Wará babáy ku
       exist woman 1SG.UNFOC
      'I have a woman with me'

(129) Estudyánte kán
       student 1SG.FOC
      'I'm a student'

(130) Tatáw ku yu ma-takít
       know 1SG.UNFOC FOC MA-pain
       'I know what's painful/who's sick'

With ni-/í-, attention is FOCUSSED on the MIDDLE of an EVENT as opposed to the EXHAUSTION named by =in=, na-, and ma-. The FOCUS is on the means or process by which the EVENT is accomplished, as graphically illustrated by the following examples with í-:

(131) I-káñna mo yu bátu tu dínding
       I-hit 2SG.UNFOC FOC rock UNFOC wall
      'Use the rock to hit a wall'

(132) I-taráng ni Roberto yu sombréru tu dínding
       I-hang UNFOC Roberto FOC hat UNFOC wall
      'Roberto will hang the hat on the wall'

(133) I-basíyu ni Maria yu mabáw nu kaldéru
       I-empty UNFOC Maria FOC rice UNFOC pot
      'Maria will empty the rice from the pot'
(134) I-dagét ni Maria yu butúnes tu burási
I-sew UNFOC Maria FOC button UNFOC dress
'Maria will sew the buttons on the dress'

(135) I-dakál ku yu pagínúm12 tu gatták
I-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC drinking UNFOC milk
'I'll grow big by drinking milk'

In (131), i- seems, from the perspective of English, to select an 'INSTRUMENT'; in (132)-(134), 'PATIENTS' of a sort. In (135), the FOCUS is on pagínúm 'drinking' as a means to becoming big. Both 'PATIENTIVE' and 'INSTRUMENTAL' readings of (131)-(135) find their consistency in the fact that i- marks a PHASE of the EVENT in which the PARTICIPANT is not at the coda or 'final resting place': the rock ends up at the wall; the rice, in the pot; the buttons, on the dress; and the drinking of milk, in my growth. The following are semantically anomalous:

(136) *I-basíyu ni Maria yu kaldéru
I-empty UNFOC Maria FOC pot

(137) *I-dagét ni Maria yu burási
I-sew UNFOC Maria FOC dress

In (135), the root dakál 'big' names an EVENT that is especially 'Mediopassive' in character, since the first appearance of dakál in ku (in the ERUPTIVE ROLE) does not result in an outward flight of influence. Instead, any influence is from the FOCussed POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT to the ERUPTIVE one. This is also seen in the following:

---

12 This is pag- and inúm 'drink'. For a lengthy discussion of pag-, cf. Chapter 6.
(138) (a) **Ni-taláw ni Juan yu natáy**  
**NI-scare UNFOC Juan FOC dead**  
'Juan got scared (because) of the dead'

(b) **I-taláw ni Juan yu natáy**  
**I-scare UNFOC Juan FOC dead**  
'Juan will become scared (because) of the dead'

(139) (a) **Ni-bungá nu kayú yu frútás**  
**NI-fruit UNFOC tree FOC fruit**  
'The tree is bountiful in fruit/bore the fruit'

(b) **I-bungá nu kayú yu frútás**  
**I-fruit UNFOC tree FOC fruit**  
'The tree will be bountiful in fruit/will bear the fruit'

The sentences of (138) focus **yu natáy** 'the dead' as the cause of Juan's fright. In (139), the **frútás** 'fruit' is the natural outcome of the tree's expected and unremarkable fruitfulness.

In other words, we note once again that VOICE marks relations rather than dynamics. The sentences of (139) would be appropriate to a remark about a commercial fruit tree in an orchard, but inappropriate if said about an isolated tree not expected to bear fruit. The latter case would require the ERUPTIVE **nag-**, as in:

(140) **Nab-bungá yu kayú tu frútás**  
**NAG-fruit FOC tree UNFOC fruit**  
'The tree bore fruit'

The absolute terminus of EVENTS is the FOCUS of **-an**, contrasted with **i-** in the following:

(141) (a) **Galut-án ni Roberto yu kabáyu**  
**tie- AN UNFOC Roberto FOC horse**  
'Roberto will tie the horse'

(b) **I-galút ni Roberto yu lubíd**  
**I-tie UNFOC Roberto FOC rope**  
'Roberto will tie the rope'
In the (a)-sentences, -an focusses the final termini of the EVENTS in question, i.e. the horse being tied and the city being left behind. This contrasts with i-, which focusses on the rope being tied with and the family being displaced. If i- orients attention toward the MIDDLE phases of the EVENT, then -an focusses what might be termed the LIMIT of EXHAUSTION, the locus 'where the buck stops'. Note also the following:

(143) Katurug-an nu yu óras nu balíta
sleep- AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC time UNFOC news
'You'll sleep through the news'

(144) Damá-n ku yu dåddamá
walk-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC path
'I walk the path'

In (143), the sleep period is co-terminal with the time for the news program, while in (144) -an focusses the dåddamá 'path' as the site with respect to which the walking occurs.

As a marker of EVENT termini, -an contrasts with the incept-oriented semantics of mag-/nag-. However, unlike these, -an does not uniquely specify ASPECT and may 'borrow' Realis ASPECT from other affixes, as in:

(145) (a) Ma-lingat-án ku yu kamiséta ku
MA-sweat- AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC undershirt 1SG.UNFOC
'I perspire in my undershirt'

(b) Na-lingat-án ku yu kamiséta ku
NA-sweat- AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC undershirt 1SG.UNFOC
'I perspired in my undershirt'
(146) Na-pissáy-an yu túrak túta dumánga
NA-tear- AN FOC letter when arrived
' A piece of the letter was torn when it arrived'

(147) Na-gàggad- án yu pasyénte
NA-restrain-AN FOC patient
'The patient was restrained'

Note also the co-occurrence of ni-/-i- and -an, which can focus a given PARTICIPANT as the 'proxy' or locus where another PARTICIPANT performs:

(148) I-gákwa-ān ni Philip si Pat tu adóbo
I-cook-AN UNFOC Philip FOC Pat UNFOC adobo
'Philip will cook adobo for/in the stead of Pat'

The semantics of ni-/-i- and of ni-/-i--an receives further attention in 6.2.5.

A surprising combination is that of i- with ERUPTIVE VOICES marked by nang- or mang-. Compare the following (Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 4):

(149) (a) Nang-i-dagét kán tu burási
NAG- I-sew 1SG.FOC UNFOC dress
'I sewed a dress'

(b) Nad-dagét kán tu burási
NAG-sew 1SG.FOC UNFOC dress
'I sewed a dress'

Sentence (149a) suggests that the motivation does not lie within the speaker but beyond him or her; the speaker is

---

13The nang-/mang-VOICES are largely restricted to vowel-initial sub sequents (exception: nan-/man-untúru, from tuntúru 'teach'; cf. Appendix C). They mark actions whose influence extends beyond the ERUPTION, perhaps suggesting 'purpose'; hence, Nagatáwa sirá 'They married each other' but Nangatáwa sirá 'They each married someone else'; also, Maguláw kán 'I'm becoming dizzy' but Manguláw kán 'I'll confuse someone'; Naganúp kán tu babúy 'I hunted pigs [i.e. to kill them off]' but Nanganúp kán tu babúy 'I hunted pigs [i.e. for food, money, etc.]' (Philip W Davis, personal communication).
sewing toward a purpose or cause; -i- directs attention toward the MIDDLE of the EVENT, contributing a sense of telos (cf. Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 4).

To summarize, each of the Verbal affixes orients attention toward a specific phase of a given EVENT—e.g. its ERUPTION, its MIDDLE, or its EXHAUSTION—in addition to marking ASPECTUAL affiliations. The applicability of each affix or combination thereof with certain EVENTS (as well as the effects of such co-occurrence) reflects the speakers' constitution/perception of specific EVENTS as shaped by the content of the affixes.

4.2 The Morphosyntax of Yogad -pa- Causatives

The effects of the Yogad morpheme -pa- are largely comparable to those of its cognate in Hiligaynon. This being the case, the morphosyntax of Yogad Causatives is presented here in less detail than that of Hiligaynon in 2.2. The current discussion will present the basics of the Yogad phenomenon, highlighting the points of departure from Hiligaynon.

As in Hiligaynon, -pa- effects a DISPLACEMENT of EVENT process from the point of origin to a point beyond. The 'S'-PARTICIPANT is detached from the actual performance of the EVENT. Consider the following sentences:

(150) (a) Nad-digút kán
NAG-bathe 1SG.FOC
'I bathed myself'
(b) Nap-pa-digút kán
    NAG-PA-bathe 1SG.FOC
    'I had myself bathed'

In (150a), without -pa-, the 'S'-PARTICIPANT kan is the locus of the ERUPTION of the EVENT, the one which reflexively performs the action. In (150b), the performance is DISPLACED to another PARTICIPANT, which is non-explicit. The action in question is first emergent in some PARTICIPANT other than the one in V_0 position. The 'S'-PARTICIPANT is, reflexively, both the Affectee of the bathing and also the PRE-ERUPTIVE origin of the process.

Even when an 'O'-PARTICIPANT is made explicit, the precise nature of its involvement remains unspecified:

(151) (a) Nad-digút kán tu anák
    NAG-bathe 1SG.FOC UNFOC child
    'I bathed a child'

(b) Nap-pa-digút kán tu anák
    NAG-PA-bathe 1SG.FOC UNFOC child
    'I had a child bathe me'
    'I had a child bathe somebody'
    'I had a child bathed (by somebody)'

In (151b), the 'O'-PARTICIPANT tu anák may be read as the terminal Affectee or as the mediational Causee (in which case the Affectee may also be the Causer or origin of the process). Furthermore, the precise rôle of the PRE-ERUPTIVE Causer is likewise unspecified. The 'Causer' may have forced or merely permitted the performance to occur. The removal of the 'S'-PARTICIPANT from the performance leaves room for a variety of interpretations of its involvement.

The interpretation accorded any additional POST-ERUPTIVE
elements reflects their perceived suitability for given ROLES. Thus, a Nominal root naming an inanimate entity (e.g. danúm 'water') may be interpreted not as a PARTICIPANT but as a LOCATION. A root naming an animate entity (e.g. babáy 'woman') will more likely be interpreted as a Causee, if such a relation is plausible:

(152) Nap-pa-digit kán tu anák tu danúm
NAG-PA-bathe 1SG.FOC UNFOC child UNFOC water
'I had a child bathed in water'
'I had a child bathe itself in water'
'I had a child bathe someone/something in water'

(153) Nap-pa-digit kán tu anák tu babáy
NAG-PA-bathe 1SG.FOC UNFOC child UNFOC woman
'I had a child bathed by a woman'
'*I had a child bathe a woman'

Here, tu babáy, being more plausible as a Causee, occurs as N₃, following tu anák as the Affectee.

If the two POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANTS involved are clearly equal in plausibility as Causees (i.e. equally 'animate'), then the Causee, as the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT, immediately follows the PRE-ERUPTIVE or originary one to occupy the N₂ position, immediately preceding the last involved PARTICIPANT outside the NUCLEUS in N₃ position:

(154) (a) Nap-pa-digit kán tu anák tu mestrú
NAG-PA-bathe 1SG.FOC UNFOC child UNFOC teacher
'I had teacher bathe a child'
'*I had a child bathe a teacher'

(b) Nap-pa-digit kán tu táelay tu babáy
NAG-PA-bathe 1SG.FOC UNFOC man UNFOC woman
'I had a man bathe a woman'
'*I had a woman bathe a man'

(155) (a) Nap-pa-kánnu kán tu póste tu táelay
NAG-PA-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC post UNFOC person
'I had a post hit by a man'
In sentence (154a), tu anak 'child' occurs as a Causee in N₂ or 'O'-position because a child is reckoned to be typically less likely to bathe a teacher than vice versa; the presumably more capable tu méstru 'teacher' follows in N₃ as the Causee. A more obvious contrast in suitability occurs in (155a), where the Affectee tu póstè 'post' is inherently less animate than the Causee tu táwlay 'person/man' and thus appears in 'O'-position. Such a difference in animacy does not apply to a woman as opposed to a man; (154b) can only mean that the man bathed a woman and not vice-versa. Given this equivalence, tu táwlay (as N₂ and Causee) precedes tu babáy (as N₃ and Affectee) in both (b)-examples. Hence, when an Affectee is highly animate or 'capable', the NUCLEAR ordering of ERUPTIVE-before-POST-ERUPTIVE prevails; the performance is DISPLACED 'out of PHASE' from the 'S'-position, with the Causee preceding the Affectee. When an Affectee is less animate or capable, it retains the NUCLEAR 'O'-position, with the more animate Causee following. In either case, the initial 'S'-position remains aloof from the performance.

Proper-Noun PARTICIPANTS are inherently more ERUPTIVE than Common-Noun ones; i.e. Yogad conflates high individuation, identification, empathy and the like with ERUPTIVE semantics. Sources are well defined. Thus, Proper Noun Causees always follow Affectees. Hence, tukuni Roberto
occurs outside the NUCLEUS in \( N_3 \) position in the following:

(156) \textbf{Nap-pa-digút kán \; tu \; babáy tukuni Roberto}  
\textit{NAG-PA-bathe 1SG.FOC UNFOC woman UNFOC Roberto}  
'I had a woman bathed by Roberto'  
*'I had a woman bathe Roberto'  

(157) \textbf{Nap-pa-kánna kán \; tu \; babáy tukuni Roberto}  
\textit{NAG-PA-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC woman UNFOC Roberto}  
'I had a woman hit by Roberto'  
*'I had a woman hit Roberto'  

Of course, variation in word order is possible with appropriate pause and stress:

(158) \textbf{Nad-digút kán \; tukuni Roberto, \; tu \; babáy}  
\textit{NAG-bathe 1SG.FOC UNFOC Roberto, UNFOC woman}  
'I had Roberto bathe a woman'

In selecting the PRE-ERUPTIVE origin of an EVENT, \textit{nag-} (like other ERUPTIVE VOICES) does not allow the terminus of the EVENT to be highly individualized. Hence, it is impossible to use \textit{nag-} to say 'I had Roberto hit Santos':

(159) \textbf{*Nap-pa-kánna ku \; tukuni Roberto tukuni Santos}  
\textit{NAG-PA-hit 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC Roberto UNFOC Santos}  
One must instead focus the terminal Affectee and banish the mediational Causee from the NUCLEUS:

(160) \textbf{P= \; in=a- kánna ku \; si Santos tukuni Roberto}  
\textit{PA=IN=PA-hit 1SG.UNFOC FOC Santos UNFOC Roberto}  
'I had Santos hit by Roberto'  

With a three-PARTICIPANT EVENT such as \textit{yáda} 'give' and HUMAN PARTICIPANTS, the ordering reflects relative ERUPTIVENESS, with the PRE-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT occurring first, followed by the ERUPTIVE Causee, the POST-ERUPTIVE Affectee, and the 'RECIPIENT'/'BENEFACTEE':
Nap-pa-yáda kán tu méstru tu líbru
NAG-PA-give 1SG.FOC UNFOC teacher UNFOC book
tu estudýánte
UNFOC student
'I had the teacher give a book to a student'

Nap-pa-yáda si Marta tukuni Pedro tu líbru
NAG-PA-give FOC Marta UNFOC Pedro UNFOC book
tukuni Santos
UNFOC Santos
'Marta had Pedro give a book to Santos'

The POST-ERUPTIVE PHASE again recapitulates the
ERUPTIVE/'MOTILE'-to-POST-ERUPTIVE/'INERT' ordering of the
non-DISPLACED NUCLEUS.

Since Yogad has no OBLIQUE marker, the Causee, when
specified, takes one of two forms: UNFOCUSSED, with tu or tu
ku... (with either ERUPTIVE or POST-ERUPTIVE VOICE); or
FOCUSSED with yu or si (with POST-ERUPTIVE VOICE only). Since
it is by definition never ERUPTIVE, the Causee is never marked
with nu or ni. Note the following:

(a) Nap-pa-kuttád kán tu bóla tu anák
NAG-PA-kick 1SG.FOC UNFOC ball UNFOC child
'I had a ball kicked by a child'

(b) P= in=a- kuttád nu anák yu bóla
PA=IN=PA-kick UNFOC child FOC ball
tu kólak na
UNFOC friend 3SG.UNFOC
'The child had/let a ball (be) kicked by his/her
friend'

(c) P= in=a- kuttád nu anák yu kólak na
PA=IN=PA-kick UNFOC child FOC friend 3SG.UNFOC
tu bóla
UNFOC ball
'The child had/let his/her friend kick a ball'

With the ERUPTIVE maka- and maka- marking 'ability', as
in the following, -pa- removes the performance from the
FOCUSSED PARTICIPANT:
(164) (a) **Naka-kánna kán tu mammánok**
NAKA-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC bird
'I was able to hit a bird'

(b) **Naka-pa-kánna kán tu mammánok tu anák**
NAKA-PA-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC bird UNFOC child
'I was able to have a bird hit by a child'

(165) (a) **Naka-íta yu pasyénte tu letrátu (tu dínding)**
NAKA-see FOC patient UNFOC picture (UNFOC wall)
'The patient was able to see a picture (on a/the wall)'

(b) **Naka-pa-íta yu dóktor tu letrátu tu pasyénte**
NAKA-PA-see FOC doctor UNFOC picture UNFOC patient
'The doctor was able to have a patient see a picture'

(166) (a) **Maka-kánna kán tu mammánok**
MAKA-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC bird
'I can hit a bird'

(b) **Maka-pa-kánna kán tu mammánok tu anák**
MAKA-PA-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC bird UNFOC child
'I can have a bird hit by a child'

(167) (a) **Maka-íta yu pasyénte tu letrátu (tu dínding)**
MAKA-see FOC patient UNFOC picture (UNFOC wall)
'The patient can see a picture (on a/the wall)'

(b) **Maka-pa-íta yu dóktor tu letrátu tu pasyénte**
NAKA-PA-see FOC doctor UNFOC picture UNFOC patient
'The doctor can have a patient see a picture'

As with the Hiligaynon (and Yogad) VOICES **mang-*/nang-**, 

=um= does not co-occur with -pa-:

(168)  **xP= um=a- bibbid ...**
PA=UM=PA-read

(169)  **xNang-pa-angát ...**
NANG-PA-breathe

The starred specimens are semantically anomalous, given the semantics of 'containment' observable with =um=, and the sense of 'connection' (between initiation and follow-up) observed with nang-, each of which -pa- disrupts.
The MIDDLE VOICES ni- and i- select the terminal Affectee, which is manipulated by the Causee—but never the mediational Causee (nor, of course the Causer):

(170) (a) **Ni-taráng ni Juan yu sombréru**
    NI-hang UNFOC Juan FOC hat
    'Juan hung up the hat'

(b) **Ni-pa-taráng ni Roberto yu sombréru tukuni Juan**
    NI-PA-hang UNFOC Roberto FOC hat UNFOC Juan
    'Roberto had the hat hung by Juan'

(c) ***Ni-pa-taráng ni Roberto si Juan tu sombréru**
    NI-PA-hang UNFOC Roberto FOC Juan UNFOC hat

(171) (a) **Ni-lussáw si Roberto**
    NI-hate FOC Roberto
    'Roberto was angered (moved by anger) by someone'

(b) **Ni-pa-lussáw si Roberto tu anák**
    NI-PA-hate FOC Roberto UNFOC child
    'R was hated by a child'

(172) (a) **I-básíyu ni Maria yu mabáw tu kaldéru**
    I-empty UNFOC Maria FOC rice UNFOC pot
    'Maria will empty the rice from a pot'

(b) **I-pa-básíyu ni Maria yu mabáw tu kaldéru**
    I-PA-empty UNFOC Maria FOC rice UNFOC pot
    tu anák
    UNFOC child
    'Maria will have the rice emptied from a pot by a child'

(c) **?I-pa-básíyu ni Maria yu anák tu kaldéru**
    I-PA-empty UNFOC Maria FOC child UNFOC pot
    'Maria will have the child emptied from a pot'
    *'Maria will have the child empty a pot'

(173) (a) **I-gór-du nu seméntu yu bátu**
    I-rough UNFOC cement FOC rock
    'The cement will get rough from the stones [in the mix]'

(b) **I-pa-gór-du ku yu seméntu tu kántéru**
    I-PA-rough 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement UNFOC mason
    'I made the cement rough through the mason'

(c) ***I-pa-gór-du ku yu kántéru tu seméntu**
    I-PA-rough 1SG.UNFOC FOC mason UNFOC cement
With the exception of -an, the EXHAUSTIVE VOICES may select any POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT, either the mediational Causee or the terminal Affectee. Note the following (cf. Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 6):

(174) (a) K= in=uttád nu anák yu bóla
    kick=IN=kick UNFOC child FOC ball
    'The child kicked the ball'

(b) P= in=a- kuttád nu anák yu bóla
    PA=IN=PA-kick UNFOC child FOC ball
    tu kólok na
    UNFOC friend 3SG.UNFOC
    'The child had/let the ball (be) kicked by his/her friend'

(c) P= in=a- kuttád nu anák yu kólok na
    PA=IN=PA-kick UNFOC child FOC friend 3SG.UNFOC
    tu bóla
    UNFOC ball
    'The child had/let his/her friend kick a ball'

(175) (a) In-akkán nu atú yu tuláng
    IN-eat UNFOC dog FOC bone
    'The dog ate the bone'

(b) P= in=a- akkán ku yu tuláng tu atú
    PA=IN=PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC bone UNFOC dog
    'I had the bone eaten by a dog'

(c) P= in=a- akkán ku yu atú tu tuláng
    PA=IN=PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog UNFOC bone
    'I fed the dog/had the dog eat a bone'

(176) (a) G= in=atáng ku yu burási
    buy=IN=buy 1SG.UNFOC FOC dress
    'I bought the dress'

(b) P= in=a- gatáng ku yu burási tukuni Marta
    PA=IN=PA-buy 1SG.UNFOC FOC dress UNFOC Marta
    'I had the dress bought by Marta'
    (*'I made someone buy the dress for Marta')

(c) P= in=a- gatáng ku si Marta tu burási
    PA=IN=PA-buy 1SG.UNFOC FOC Marta UNFOC dress
    'I made Marta buy a dress/some dresses'
(177) (a) S= in-isim ni Maria yu balíta hear=IN=hear UNFOC Maria FOC news 'Maria heard the news'

(b) P= in=a- sisim ni Juan yu balíta tukuni Maria PA=IN=PA-hear UNFOC Juan FOC news UNFOC Maria 'Juan had the news heard by Maria'

(c) P=in=a-sisim ni Juan si Maria tu balíta PA=IN=PA-hear UNFOC Juan FOC Maria UNFOC news 'Juan made Maria hear some news'

(178) (a) K= in=orólig ni Juan yu bóla tukuni Philip roll=IN=roll UNFOC Juan FOC ball UNFOC Philip 'Juan rolled the ball to Philip'

(b) P= in=a- korólig ni Juan yu bóla tukuni Philip PA=IN=PA-roll UNFOC Juan FOC ball UNFOC Philip 'Juan had the ball roll to Philip'

(c) P= in=a- korólig ni Juan si Philip tu bóla PA=IN=PA-roll UNFOC Juan FOC Philip UNFOC ball 'Juan had Philip roll a ball' 'Juan had Philip roll to a ball'

In (174)-(178), the (b)-sentences select the Affectee, and the (c)-sentences the Causee.¹⁴

The VOICES na- and ma- allow similar latitude in the selection of a POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT for FOCUS. Note the following (cf. Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 6):

(179) (a) Na-bibbíd ni Juan yu líbru NA-read UNFOC Juan FOC book 'Juan managed to read the book'

(b) Na-pa-bibbíd ku yu líbru tukuni Juan NA-PA-read 1SG.UNFOC FOC book UNFOC Juan 'I managed to have the book read by Juan'

¹⁴Note that =in= occurs after the initial consonant in a given word, so that e.g. *pagnatáng ('caused to sell') never occurs, though ginatáng 'sold' and pinagatáng do; by this criterion (among others), -pa- might be classified as derivational rather than inflectional. Cf.1.1.
(c) Na-pa-bibbid ku si Juan tu libru
NA-PA-read 1SG.UNFOC FOC Juan UNFOC book
'I was able to get Juan to read a book'

(180) (a) Na-pa-talóbu yu lappáw
NA-PA-grow FOC flower
'The flower was able to be grown'

(b) Na-pa-talóbu ku yu estudyánte tu láppaw
NA-PA-grow 1SG.UNFOC FOC student UNFOC flower
'I was able to have the student grow a flower'

(c) Na-pa-talóbu ku yu láppaw tu estudyánte
NA-PA-grow 1SG.UNFOC FOC flower UNFOC student
'I was able to have the flower grown by a student'

(181) (a) Ma-bibbid ni Juan yu libru
MA-read UNFOC Juan FOC book
'Juan can read the book'

(b) Ma-pa-bibbid ku yu libru tukuni Juan
MA-PA-read 1SG.UNFOC FOC book UNFOC Juan
'I can have the book read by Juan'

(c) Ma-pa-bibbid ku si Juan tu libru
MA-PA-read 1SG.UNFOC FOC Juan UNFOC book
'I can get Juan to read a book'

(182) (a) Ma-palúga ku yu abáng
MA-row 1SG.UNFOC FOC boat
'I can row the boat'

(b) Ma-pa-palúga ku yu abáng tu babáy
MA-PA-row 1SG.UNFOC FOC boat UNFOC woman
'I can have the boat rowed by a woman'

(c) Ma-pa-palúga ku yu babáye tu abáng
MA-PA-row 1SG.UNFOC FOC woman UNFOC boat
'I can have the woman row a boat'

(183) (a) Ma-kuttád yu kabáyu
MA-kick FOC horse
'The horse is a kicker'

(b) Ma-pa-kuttád nu kassíb nu langáw yu kabáyu
MA-PA-kick UNFOC bite UNFOC fly FOC horse
'The bite of the fly can make the horse kick'

(c) Ma-pa-kuttád ku yu póste tu kabáyu
MA-PA-kick 1SG.UNFOC FOC post UNFOC horse
'I had the post kicked by a horse'
As with Causees, Causers need not be specified in Yogad -pa-Causatives, and ma- and na- allow the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT to be vaguely defined:

(184) (a) Ma-palúga kán tu abáng
MA-row 1SG.FOC UNFOC boat
'I row boats a lot'

(b) Ma-pa-palúga kán tu abáng tu babáy
MA-PA-row 1SG.FOC UNFOC boat UNFOC woman
'I be made to row a boat'

(185) (a) Ma-ánggam si Juan
MA-love FOC Juan
'J is a loving person'

(b) Ma-pa-ánggam si Juan
MA-PA-love FOC Juan
'J can be made to love someone'

(186) (a) Ma-ayág kán
MA-call 1SG.FOC
'I am a caller'

(b) Ma-pa-ayág kán
MA-PA-call 1SG.FOC
'I can be made to call'

(187) (a) Ma-lingát kán
MA-sweat 1SG.FOC
'I'm a sweaty person'

(b) Ma-pa-lingát kán
MA-PA-sweat 1SG.FOC
'I'm a sweaty person'

(188) (a) Ma-tatáw kán
MA-know 1SG.FOC
'I'll get known/famous'
'I can be known'
'I can be knowledgeable'

(b) Ma-pa-tatáw kán
MA-PA-know 1SG.FOC
'I'll be made knowledgeable'

(189) (a) Na-digút yu estudýánte
NA-bathe FOC student
'The student was/got bathed'
*'The student was able to bathe'
(b) Na-pa-digít yu estudyánte
NA-PA-bathe FOC student
'The student was made to was obliged to bathe'

(190) (a) Na-ánggam kán
NA-love 1SG.FOC
'I got loved'

(b) Na-pa-ánggam kán (tu trabáho ku)
NA-PA-love 1SG.FOC UNFOC work 1SG.UNFOC
'I was made to love (my work)'

(191) (a) Ma-duffún kán tu víktima nu luníg
MA-help 1SG.FOC UNFOC victim UNFOC earthquake
'I'll help earthquake victims'

(b) Ma-pa-duffún kán tu víktima nu luníg
MA-PA-help 1SG.FOC UNFOC victim UNFOC earthquake
'I'm having to help earthquake victims'

(192) (a) *Na-bótus ...
NA-vote

(b) Na-pa-bótus kamí
NA-PA-vote 1PL.FOC
'We had to vote'

(193) (a) Na-lussáw yu méstru
NA-hate FOC teacher
'The teacher was angry/hateful'

(b) Na-pa-lussáw yu méstru
NA-PA-hate FOC teacher
'The teacher was made angry/hateful'

(194) (a) Na-taráng yu buladór tu kayú
NA-hang FOC kite UNFOC tree
'The kite was/had been hung in a tree'

(b) Na-pa-taráng yu buladór tu kayú
NA-PA-hang FOC kite UNFOC tree
'The kite got hung in a tree'

The (b)-sentences suggest the involvement of an unspecified impetus which need not be a specific 'thing' or PARTICIPANT. It may be nothing more definite than a 'compulsion' driven by 'circumstance'. I may, for instance, have been seduced by my routine into loving my work or felt compelled by an ill-
defined malaise into voting. Hence, the ROLES of 'AGENT', 'EXECUTOR', and 'PATIENT' are not specified by the 'Causative' -\textipa{pa}-; rather, the DISPLACEMENT signalled by -\textipa{pa}- is one of several conditions for the emergence of 'Causatives'. The ability of the combination of \textipa{na}- and -\textipa{pa}- to suggest circumstantial causes is apparently much more robust in Yogad than in Hiligaynon; my Hiligaynon consultants were reluctant to allow such 'circumstantial' interpretations of analogous Hiligaynon sentences, a circumstance which suggests a greater commitment of that language to the containment of ROLE within PARTICIPANTS.

The LIMIT-marking affix -\textipa{an} may, by definition, not focus the mediational Causee. PARTICIPANTS selected by -\textipa{an} are final Affectees, as in:

(195) (a) Bintay-\textipa{án} ku \quad yu \quad binaláy
    watch- AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC house
    'I'll watch the house'

(b) Pa-bintay-\textipa{án} ku \quad yu \quad binaláy
    PA-watch- AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC house
    (tu \quad estudyán\textipa{nte})
    (UNFOC student)
    'I'll have the house watched (by a student)'

(c) *Pa-bintay-\textipa{án} ku \quad yu \quad estudyán\textipa{nte} \quad tu \quad binaláy
    PA-watch- AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC student \quad UNFOC house

(196) (a) I-gatang-\textipa{án} ku \quad yu \quad aná\textipa{k} ku
    I-buy- AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC child 1SG.UNFOC
    tu \quad burási
    UNFOC dress
    'I'm going to buy my child a dress'
In both the (a)- and (b)-sentences, -pa- focusses the terminal limit of the EVENT, whether or not -pa- detaches the performance from the origin. Attempts to focus mediational Causees fail. Non-mediational 'Causees', however, may be focussed by -an:

(197) (a) Na-selos- án si Dole ni Clinton
NA-jealous-AN FOC Humberto UNFOC Clinton
'Dole was jealous of Clinton'

(b) Na-pa-selos- án si Dole tukuni Clinton
NA-PA-jealous-AN FOC Dole UNFOC Clinton
'Dole was made jealous by Clinton'

Here, si Dole is a 'Causee/Afectee' but not a mediator.

4.3 Conclusion

As we have seen, Yogad morphosyntax achieves a remarkable separation of the content of VOICE from that of ROLE. While VOICE may orient attention to various phases of an EVENT (e.g. ERUPTION, MIDDLE, EXHAUSTION), it in itself marks relations and not dynamics or direction of influence.

The Nominal ROLE morphology distinguishes degrees of FOCUS/DIFFUSENESS and makes no rigid distinction between PARTICIPANTS/'things' on the one hand and EVENTS/'processes' on the other (as seen e.g. with respect to Verbal Complements). The absence of an OBLIQUE marker is symptomatic
of the attenuated nature of ROLE; recall that Hiligaynon more consistently contains or particularizes MOTILITY via FOCUS (if relatively MOTILE within the NUCLEUS) or PROJECTION (if relatively INERT outside the NUCLEUS). Yogad is not, of course, entirely oblivious to ROLE distinctions. Proper Nouns and Pronouns are inherently ERUPTIVE and require special treatment to be considered otherwise.

In both languages, the semantics of causation involves DISPLACEMENT. The major morphosyntactic contrast between the languages involves the encoding of the mediational Causee, which in Hiligaynon must be FOCUSED within the NUCLEUS or PROJECTED from the NUCLEUS, but which Yogad marks as either FOCUSED within the NUCLEUS or UNFOCUSED outside the NUCLEUS. This contrast reflects the different emphasis each language accords to ROLE. Further repercussions of this ROLE differential emerge in Chapter 5.
Chapter Five
The Semantic Dimensions of Yogad -pa-

5.0 Introduction

The current chapter explores the semantic range of -pa- in Yogad. Besides common Causatives, Yogad -pa- signals Reflexive/Middle Causative EVENTS, an additional PARTICIPANT with CENTRIPETAL EVENTS to form mediational CENTRIFUGAL ones, and 'tendency' or 'gradedness' in the accomplishment of either type of EVENT.

The semantic range of Yogad -pa- broadly resembles that of its Hiligaynon cognate. However, a comparison of the extra-Causative semantics of -pa- in each language reveals systematic differences which reflect and resonate with the distinctive constitution of VOICE and ROLE in each language.

5.1 Common Causatives

With CENTRIFUGAL roots (e.g. kánna 'hit', pusít 'pick', láttu 'jump', and íta 'see'), -pa- yields morphological Causatives par excellence. These are sentences in which the EVENT is understood to be initiated by an motile AGENT which 'causes' a 'MOTILE' EXECUTOR to act upon an 'INERT' PATIENT. As discussed in the previous chapter, the PARTICIPANT in the PRE-ERUPTIVE ROLE is the Causer, the NUCLEAR POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT, the Causee, and the NON-NUCLEAR POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT, the Afectee. Note the following:

(1) (a) Nap-pusít kán tu bagát para tukuni Santos
NAG-pick 1SG.FOC UNFOC banana BEN UNFOC Santos
'I picked bananas for Santos'
(b) Nap-pa-pusít kán tu bagát tu anák
NAG-PA-pick 1SG.FOC UNFOC banana UNFOC child
'I had the bananas picked by a child'

(c) Nap-pa-pusít kán tu bagát tukuni Santos
NAG-PA-pick 1SG.FOC UNFOC banana UNFOC Santos
'I had bananas picked by Santos'

(2) (a) Nal-láttu si Juan tu gibáw
NAG-jump FOC Juan UNFOC fence
'Juan jumped a fence'

(b) Nap-pa-láttu si Juan tu gibáw
NAG-PA-jump FOC Juan UNFOC fence
tu anák
UNFOC child
'Juan had the fence jumped by a child'

(c) Nap-pa-láttu si Juan tu gibáw
NAG-PA-jump FOC Juan UNFOC fence
tukuni Roberto
UNFOC Roberto
'Juan had the fence jumped by Roberto'

(3) (a) Nas-sisím kán tu balíta
NAG-hear 1SG.FOC UNFOC news
'I heard some news'

(b) Nap-pa-sisím kán tu balíta tu estudyánte
NAG-PA-hear 1SG.FOC UNFOC news UNFOC student
'I had the news heard by a student'

(c) Nap-pa-sisím kán tu balíta tukuni Maria
NAG-PA-hear 1SG.FOC UNFOC news UNFOC Maria
'I had the news heard by Maria'

(4) (a) Nagg-íta kán tu anák¹
NAG-see 1SG.FOC UNFOC child
'I saw/looked for/looked after a child'

¹The doubling of the terminal -g of nag-, mag-, and -pag- provides a limited contrast between the acting and the process/manner of acting, e.g. Magítá kán tu dótók 'I'm seeing a doctor' but Maggítá kán tu dótók 'I'm looking for a doctor'; Yu pagítá ku av anéohos 'What I see with is glasses' but Yu paggítá ku av amme na mapí 'My eyesight (i.e. way of seeing) is not good' (Philip W. Davis, personal communication).
(b) Nap-pa-íta kán tu anák tu méstru
NAG-PA-see 1SG.FOC UNFOC child UNFOC teacher
'I had the child seen by a teacher'

(c) Nap-pa-íta kán tu anák tukuni Roberto
NAG-PA-see 1SG.FOC UNFOC child UNFOC Roberto
'I had a child supervised/looked for by Roberto'

None of the (a)-sentences contains -pa-; they are all 'non- Causative' insofar as there is no intermediary or delegate involved. For example, in (1a), the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT kan 'I' picks bananas directly. The (b)- and (c)-sentences, with -pa-, suggest the mediational participation of a 'Causee', which is named alternately by NON-NUCLEAR Common and Proper Nouns, e.g. tu anák and tukuni Santos respectively in (1). Note that the NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS (in N₂) of the (b)- and (c)-examples of (1)-(4) are less animate or otherwise less capable of acting upon another PARTICIPANT than are the NON-NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS. The Causees are thus NON-NUCLEAR (or N₂). If the second NUCLEAR PARTICIPANT is as plausible as an actor as the NON-NUCLEAR one, then it may be read as the Causee so that the Causee occurs in NUCLEAR (N₂) position and the Affectee in the PERIPHERY, as in the following (b)-sentence:

(5) (a) Nak-kánna kán tu babáy
NAG-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC woman
'I hit a woman'

(b) Nap-pa-kánna kán tu profesór tu babáy
NAG-PA-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC professor UNFOC woman
'I had a professor hit a woman'
*'I had a woman hit a professor'
(c) Nap-pa-kánna kán tu babáy tukuni Roberto
NAG-PA-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC woman UNFOC Roberto
'I had a woman hit by Roberto
'*I had Roberto hit a woman'

In (5b), both tu profesór and tu babáy are equally animate and plausible as actors; hence, the former is read as the ERUPTIVE mediational 'Causee' and the latter as the POST-ERUPTIVE 'Affectee'. Such PARTICIPANTS following the 'S'-PARTICIPANT thus follow the ERUPTIVE-to-POST-ERUPTIVE ordering of NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS in non-'Causative' Clauses, maintaining the minimal ROLE contrast in the absence of an inherent differentiation.

The (c)-examples of (1)-(5) illustrate the ordering of PARTICIPANTS with Proper-Noun Causees. Such highly individualized and empathy-laden PARTICIPANTS are considered inherently more 'ERUPTIVE' than Common-Noun PARTICIPANTS and, as Causees, occur outside of the NUCLEUS in N₃ position. UNFOCUSED Proper-Noun PARTICIPANTS cannot be treated as POST-ERUPTIVE within the NUCLEUS since they cannot be outranked. To say e.g. 'I had Roberto hit by Pedro', it is necessary to provide the NUCLEAR POST-ERUPTIVE Roberto with more robust definition via FOCUS, as in:

(6) (a) P= in=a- kánna ku si Roberto tukuni Pedro
PA=IN=PA-hit 1SG.UNFOC FOC Roberto UNFOC Pedro
'I had Roberto hit by Pedro'

(b) *Nap-pa-kánna kán tukuni Roberto tukuni Pedro
NAG-PA-hit 1SG.FOC UNFOC Roberto UNFOC Pedro

Note that all the sentences in (1)-(5) create CENTRIFUGAL EVENTS, which include POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANTS, and -pa-
adds yet another PARTICIPANT which is interpreted as a Causee. Such Valency increases are one reason that many linguists treat 'Causatives' as special instances of 'Transitives' (cf. e.g. the title of Comrie & Polinsky's [1993] collection, Causatives and Transitivity).

Another reason for such treatment seems to be that 'Causative' morphology can become lexicalized (cf. 1.1). At least one instance involves morphophonemic alteration. The final -a of the morphemes ma-, na-, and pa- may merge with a root-initial i- to yield [e]. Hence, the following two sentences are equivalent:

(7)  (a) Na-íta yu atú
     NA-see FOC dog
     'The dog was seen'

     (b) Né-íta yu atú
     NE-see FOC dog
     'The dog was seen'

The (7a)-example is regarded as less natural and more deliberative—perhaps more 'literary'—than the (7b)-example. Likewise, -pa- combined with itá 'see' yields péta 'show':

(8)  Nap-péta kán tu anáku tu méstru
     NAG-PETA 1SG.FOC UNFOC child UNFOC teacher
     'I showed the child to the teacher'

(9)  I-péta ku tu líbru ku tukuni Angel
     I-PETA 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC book 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC Angel
     'I'll show my book to Angel'

The péta-form can construct a CENTRIPETAL EVENT such as:

(10) Nap-péta yu kótye tu tagénap nu gabi
     NAG-PETA FOC car UNFOC dream UNFOC night
     'The car appeared (showed itself) in a dream last night'

This form might be understood as a lexicalization of -pa- in
which -pa- fails to maintain its own shape.

Another example of lexicalization is provided by tay 'die'. As discussed in 4.1.4, the root tay 'die' cannot co-
occur with nag-/mag- alone, since dying is considered to be 'beyond control':

(11) *Nag-táy si Roberto
    NAG-die FOC Roberto

(12) *Mat-táy si Roberto
    MAG-die FOC Roberto

In order to say 'Roberto died' or 'Roberto will die', the EXHAUSTIVE na- or ma- must be used:

(13) Na-táy si Roberto
    NA-die FOC Roberto
    'Roberto died'

(14) Ma-táy si Roberto
    MA-die FOC Roberto
    'Roberto is going to die'

In combination with -pa-, 'die' yields 'kill, cause to die', in conformity with the 'transitivizing' pattern established above. However, in contrast to previous examples, patáy is CENTRIFUGAL and cannot have a delegational ('Causative') sense. With nag-/mag-, the root means 'kill' and not 'have someone kill(ed)'

(15) Map-patáy si Pedro (*tukuni Maria)
    NAG-kill FOC Pedro (UNFOC Maria)
    'Pedro killed someone'
    '*Pedro had someone killed'

(16) Map-patáy si Pedro (*tukuni Maria)
    MAG-kill FOC Pedro (UNFOC Maria)
    'Pedro will kill someone'
    '*Pedro will have someone killed'

The killing is direct and punctual—as opposed to a less
effective 'causing to die' (cf. 1.1). With the EXHAUSTIVE na-, ma- and =in=, the FOCUSED PARTICIPANT predictably becomes the victim. No 'Causee' can be added:

(17) Na-patáy si Roberto
    NA-kill FOC Roberto
    'Roberto was killed'

(18) Ma-patáy si Roberto
    MA-kill FOC Roberto
    'Roberto will be killed'

(19) P= in=atáy ni Pedro si Roberto (*tukuni Maria)
    kill=IN=kil PFOC Pedro FOC Roberto (UNFOC Maria)
    'Pedro killed Roberto'

The most persuasive evidence for lexicalization is that patáy may be preceded by -pa- to derive a 'Causative':

(20) Nap-pa-patáy si Roberto (tukuni Maria)
    NAG-PA-kill FOC Roberto (UNFOC Maria)
    'Roberto will have someone killed (by Maria)'

(21) Na-pa-patáy si Roberto
    NA-PA-kill FOC Roberto
    'Somebody had Roberto killed'

(22) P= in=a- patáy ni Pedro si Roberto tukuni Maria
    PA=IN=PA-kil PFOC Pedro FOC Roberto UNFOC Maria
    'Pedro had Roberto killed by Maria'

In contrast to Hiligaynon and Tagalog, Yogad does not reduplicate -pa-. The non-reduplicability of -pa- elsewhere in my Yogad corpus is a strong indication of its lexicalized status here.

In the following sections, variations in EVENT type and FOCUS will suggest that neither 'cause' nor 'animacy' per se is essential to the meaning of -pa-; throughout, -pa- indicates a DISPLACEMENT of process from the origin of the EVENT to a later PHASE.
5.2 Reflexive/Dissociative EVENTS

With certain CENTRIPETAL EVENTS, -pa- may not increase the Valency (as in Hiligaynon). If the process does not thus extend to a second PARTICIPANT, the DISPLACEMENT of process from the ERUPTION may effect a dissociative gap which may suggest a heightened effort or reflexivity. In such cases, -pa- heightens the involvement of the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT in the process in question without necessarily increasing the Valency. (Note again that -pa- is not a transitivizer.)

Such EVENTS require the involvement of animate or sentient PARTICIPANTS, preferably HUMAN PARTICIPANTS. For the DISPLACEMENT to suggest 'effort', such EVENTS must be easily amenable to a low-control interpretation which allows the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT to be read as patientive.

From the root nónot\(^2\) 'think, mind', -pa- can derive either Causative/CENTRIFUGAL or non-Causative/CENTRIPETAL readings, regardless of whether the FOCUS falls on the ERUPTIVE or POST-ERUPTIVE ROLE. Without -pa-, nónot suggests a low-effort, passive type of thinking whereby ideas merely emerge; or, alternately, it indicates the FOCUSED PARTICIPANT as the source or locus of 'brains' (as a Nominal, nónot means 'mind'). Agency, insofar as it involves volition or effort, is weak or nonexistent. With -pa-, a sense of heightened involvement or effort is added. Compare the following pairs:

\[^2\]In normal speech, nónot is often shortened to nóno. Cf. Appendix C.
(23) (a) Nan-nónot kán
    NAG-think 1SG.FOC
    'I thought (of something)'
    'I have brains'

(b) Map-pa-nónot kán
    NAG-PA-think 1SG.FOC
    'I thought of something'

(24) (a) Man-nónot yu táwlay
    MAG-think FOC person
    'The person will think'
    'Man(kind) thinks'

(b) Map-pa-nónot yu táwlay
    MAG-PA-think FOC person
    'The person will think'

Note that the (a)-examples allow 'generic' interpretations such as 'I have brains' and 'mankind thinks', which are precluded when -pa- is present, as in the (b)-examples. And although the alternate, 'non-generic' English glosses of (23a) and (24a) are identical to the (b)-glosses, there is, of course, a difference: the -pa-marked versions imply heightened involvement, an ('AGENTIVE') effort, an active 'conjuring' of ideas or memories as opposed to a more passive recognition of such. (This semantic alignment recalls the generic/casual reading of Irrealis EVENTS without -pa- and their particular/urgent reading with -pa- noted in Hiligaynon, as discussed in 3.3.) This morphosyntactic recognition of the active and passive modes of thinking has an English analogue in the contrast between the Simple and Continuous Tenses as exemplified by I thought you were married (meaning 'opined' or 'believed') and I'm thinking now (meaning 'I'm cogitating'). The 'conjuring' sense of -pa- is also apparent in the
following Imperative, which requires the addressee to imagine or 'picture' a visible form:

(25) Map-pa-nótó̱t ku tu lasáng ya triangle
   MAG-PA-think 2SG.FOC UNFOC red LINK triangle
   'Think of a red triangle'

With EXHAUSTIVE VOICES, including na-, ma- and =in=, CENTRIFUGAL readings are required, while -pa- continues to suggest heightened involvement/effort:

(26) (a) Na-nótó̱t ku yu nappása
   NA-think 1SG.UNFOC FOC past
   'I thought of the past'

(b) Na-pa-nótó̱t ku yu nappása
   NA-PA-think 1SG.UNFOC FOC past
   'I was able to think of the past'

(27) (a) Ma-nótó̱t ku yu nappása
   MA-think 1SG.UNFOC FOC past
   'I can think of the past'

(b) Ma-pa-nótó̱t ku yu nappása
   MA-PA-think 1SG.UNFOC FOC past
   'I can remember the past'

(28) (a) N= in=ó̱tó̱t ku yu istó̱rya
   think=IN=think 1SG.UNFOC FOC story
   'I thought of the story'

(b) P= in=a- nótó̱t ku yu istó̱rya
   PA=IN=PA-think 1SG.FOC FOC story
   'I thought of the story'

The (a)-sentences imply the passive, spontaneous thinking of the sort whereby an idea 'pops into one's mind'. The (b)-examples imply deliberate expenditures of effort to overcome the obstacles of memory. With na-, this suggests an obstacle overcome; with ma-, the deeper involvement of 'remembering' as

---

3Note the use of nag + pá̱sa 'pass, happen' to name 'what (has) passed' = 'the past'.
opposed to 'thinking of'; and with the Perfective =in=, this contrast includes the additional suggestion of a greater time lapse between the EVENT described and the moment of speaking than is implied in (28a) (cf. the discussion of 'Stative' EVENTS). Each of these differences reflects a discontinuity of execution which is consonant with causation.

When the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT of certain CENTRIPETAL EVENTS is FOCUSED, the DISPLACEMENT from the ERUPTIVE locus signalled by -pa- may suggest a detachment of the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT from its ROLE so that the PARTICIPANT becomes both 'AGENT' and 'PATIENT'; concomitantly, 'effort' is typically increased. Relevant roots include *Iréra* 'dream', *Lingá* 'sweat', *Pasirán* 'shame', *Uwáw* 'thirst', *Bisún* 'hungry', and *Raddám* 'sad'. With -pa-, these roots allow both a 'Reflexive' and a 'Causative' reading:

(29) (a) *Nak-*Iréra* si Roberto
    *Nag*-dream  *FOC* Roberto
    'Roberto dreamed'

(b) *Nak-*pa-*Iréra* si Roberto
    *Nag*-PA-dream  *FOC* Roberto
    'Roberto made himself dream'
    'Roberto made someone dream'

(30) (a) *Nal-*Lingá* yu presidénte
    *Nag*-sweat  *FOC* president
    'The president sweated'

(b) *Nak-*pa-*Lingá* yu presidénte
    *Nag*-PA-sweat  *FOC* president
    'The president made himself perspire'
    'The president made somebody perspire'

(31) (a) *Map-*Pasirán kán
    *MAG*-shame  *1SG.FOC*
    'I feel guilty'
(b) Map-pa-pasirán kán tu eskwéla
MAG-PA-shame 1SG.FOC UNFOC school
'I'll have myself shamed/feeling guilty at school'
'I'll have someone shame a school'

(32) (a) Nag-uwáw kán
NAG-thirsty 1SG.FOC
'I became thirsty'

(b) Nap-pa-uwáw kán
NAG-PA-thirsty 1SG.FOC
'I made myself thirsty'
'I made someone thirsty'

(33) (a) Nab-bisín kán
NAG-hungry 1SG.FOC
'I fasted / went hungry'

(b) Nap-pa-bisín kán
NAG-PA-hungry 1SG.FOC
'I (deliberately) made myself hungry'
'I made someone/something hungry'

(34) (a) Nar-raddám kán
NAG-sad 1SG.FOC
'I became sad'

(b) Nap-pa-raddám kán
NAG-PA-sad 1SG.FOC
'I made myself sad'
'I made someone sad'

The (a)-sentences indicate actions that are regarded as having arisen spontaneously, with no particular effort expended. The (b)-sentences may be either 'Causative' or 'Reflexive'. In either case, -pa- marks a perceived dissociation of the 'S'-PARTICIPANT from the experiential EVENT indicated, a split of a subjective (or controlling) self from an objectified (or controlled) self.

Certain roots, including búntut 'stink' and korólig 'roll', name physical processes; yet they, too, permit both CENTRIPETAL and CENTRIFUGAL readings which, with -pa-, may
involve either direct or indirect influence. Note the following:

(35) (a) **Nab-búntut kán**  
NAG-stink 1SG.FOC  
'I became smelly'

(b) **Nap-pa-búntut kán**  
NAG-PA-stink 1SG.FOC  
'I made myself smelly'  
'I made something smelly'

(36) (a) **Nak-korólig kán**  
NAG-roll 1SG.FOC  
'I rolled (myself)'

(b) **Nap-pa-korólig kán**  
NAG-PA-roll 1SG.FOC  
'I made/let myself roll'  
'I rolled something'

The (a)-sentences construct EVENTS which are casually realized, with little or no intention. I became smelly from missing a bath or began to roll downhill (either actively, like a child playing, or more passively or indirectly, in a wheelchair). The (b)-sentences name more intentional processes. I purposely became smelly, possibly by rubbing myself with something offensive; and I may have started rolling and simply allowed myself to continue without interference. The -pa-sentences thus imply an intention which is enabled by a detachment of the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT from the process. For this reason, the following (b)-sentences were rejected:

(37) (a) **Nab-búntut yu atú**  
NAG-stink FOC dog  
'The dog became smelly'.
(b) *Nap-pa-búntut yu atú
    NAG-PA-stink  FOC dog

(38) (a) Nak-korólig yu kótye
    NAG-roll  FOC car
    'The car started to roll'

  (b) *Nap-pa-korólig yu kótye
    NAG-PA-roll  FOC car

The (a)-sentences name EVENTS which erupt, as it were, spontaneously; the dog has become smelly since our last encounter, and the car started to roll for no apparent reason, as if through its own volition. The rejection of (37b) reflects the consultant's belief that a dog would be incapable of Reflexive detachment, an incapacity that is even more obvious with (38b). That is, there is no easily imaginable context to validate these Clauses as descriptions of natural phenomena.

The 'Reflexive' readings of these roots is more indicative of ERUPTIVE VOICE semantics than of CENTRIPETALITY or CENTRIFUGALITY. The signalling by -pa- of 'detachment' and 'intention' may be apparent even in EVENTS that are CENTRIFUGAL. With búntut 'stink' and korólig 'roll' (as well as others in the current section), both CENTRIPETAL and CENTRIFUGAL readings are possible, and -pa- again implies an intentionality which arises from the flight (DISPLACEMENT) of process from the ERUPTIVE PHASE:

'To suggest the participation of an exterior force in initiating the process, na- can be used: Nakorólig yu kótye 'The car was rolled'.

The (a)-sentences illustrate CENTRIPETAL readings of the Verbs; the (b)-sentences, CENTRIFUGAL ones. The (c)-sentences, with -pa-, may be read as being either delegational or non-delegational. (According to my consultant, these sentences seem more strongly non-delegational in isolation.) If non-Causative interpretations are granted the (c)-sentences, then they contrast with the (b)-sentences in implying a greater directedness (or deliberation). Sentence (39b) suggests that I made the cheese malodorous unintentionally; something I did or did not do caused it to spoil. Sentence (39c), with -pa-, suggests that I made it stink on purpose; it may be a
Likewise, (40b) suggests an unaimed kick that happened to put the ball in the student's path; (40c) implies that I deliberately aimed the kick toward the student. The association of -pa- with intentional directedness recalls the polysemy of direction noted with reference to Hiligaynon in 3.5.

The effort enhancement indicated by -pa- is thus not due specifically to the mental/emotional nature of the roots but rather to a combination of the (potentially) CENTRIPETAL nature of the roots, the animate/sentient nature of the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANTS, and of the DISPLACEMENT effected by -pa-. The sense of 'enhanced effort' is not primary but is derivative of the DISPLACEMENT of FOCUSSED ERUPTION from the primary (or 'S') PARTICIPANT.

Some mental/emotional roots are inherently CENTRIFUGAL (i.e. they require an 'Object') and allow only delegational, 'Causative' readings with -pa-, even with ERUPTIVE VOICE:

(41) (a) Nat-tatáw kán  
NAG-know 1SG.FOC  
'I had knowledge of something'

(b) Nap-pa-tatáw kán  
NAG-PA-know 1SG.FOC  
'I made someone know something'  
'*I made myself know something'

(42) (a) Nal-lussáw kán  
NAG-hate 1SG.FOC  
'I became hateful/angry (about/at something)'

(b) Nap-pa-lussáw kán  
NAG-PA-hate 1SG.FOC  
'I had myself hated by somebody'  
'*I had myself hate somebody'
(43) (a) Nal-lubún kán
NAG-guess 1SG.FOC
'I guessed something'

(b) Nap-pa-lubún kán
NAG-PA-guess 1SG.FOC
'I had someone guess something'
'*I made myself guess something'

(44) (a) Mak-kayáw si Juan tu eskwéla
MAG-tabu FOC Juan UNFOC school
'Juan will criticize (something) in a school'
'Juan will criticize schools'

(b) Map-pa-kayáw si Juan tu eskwéla
NAG-PA-tabu FOC Juan UNFOC school
'Juan will have himself criticized at school'
'Juan will get someone to criticize a school'
'*Juan will criticize himself'

(45) (a) Nag-ánggam si Juan tu babáy
NAG-love FOC Juan UNFOC woman
'Juan courted/adored a woman'

(b) Nap-pa-ánggam si Juan tu babáy
NAG-PA-love FOC Juan UNFOC woman
'Juan had a woman love him'
'Juan had a woman loved by somebody'
'*Juan had himself love a woman'

Here, the process may come to rest with the 'S'-PARTICIPANT, but only after other PARTICIPANTS are involved. Such situations are not true Reflexives. The failure of the Reflexive glosses in (41)-(45) follows from the circumstance that these EVENTS are inherently CENTRIFUGAL. Though psychological in nature, these CENTRIFUGAL roots follow the same pattern as kánna 'hit':

(46) (a) Nak-kánna kán
NAG-hit 1SG.FOC
'I hit somebody/something'

(b) Nap-pa-kánna kán
NAG-PA-hit 1SG.FOC
'I had myself hit'
'I asked to be hit (and was)'
The effort enhancement of Yogad -pa- superficially resembles the enhancement of 'intensity' of involvement or 'urgency' in Hiligaynon. However, there is a vital difference. In Yogad, the intensification of Involvement implicit in many 'Reflexive' uses of -pa- is confined to the PARTICIPANTS which are explicitly operative within the EVENT, and it seems to reflect a DISPLACEMENT of performance from the ERUPTION which is not enhanced by the 'urgency' or 'intensity' of ROLE. While Hiligaynon -pa- certainly achieves indexes a heightened Involvement regarding the PARTICIPANTS within the EVENT, it has the further performative effect of intensifying the interpersonal Involvement of the interlocutors within the linguistic situation, as noted vis-à-vis the phatic versus emphatic contrast of utterances discussed in 3.3. In 'failing' to heighten the performative intensity of the interlocutor relations, the Yogad -pa- suggests a 'detachment' of the ERUPTIVE ROLE from the POST-ERUPTIVE scene, a dissociation which allows Reflexive or otherwise process-oriented readings to take place.

5.3 Additional PARTICIPANT

CENTRIPETAL Verbs, those in which the action or process is normally confined to a single PARTICIPANT, highlight the ability of -pa- to suggest the influence of one PARTICIPANT upon another, as has already been exemplified with the lexicalized patáy. Thus, two PARTICIPANTS partake of the quality or action named by the Verb. In effect, the Yogad
Causative marker can render 'Stative' and 'Middle' EVENTS kinetic and CENTRIFUGAL.

With qualitative or 'Adjectival' roots such as lasáng 'red', dakál 'big', mémak 'soft', méggat 'hard', ngísit 'black, dark' etc., -pa- may establish an AGENT-PATIENT relational dimension, a trajectory of influence consistent with the 'intentional', 'directed' readings already encountered. Such a ROLE-marked interpretation is derivative of implicit knowledge of the ways of the world. In the following, 'AGENTS' are implicit, while the 'PATIENTS' are FOCUSSSED with -pa-:

(47) Pa-dakál yu lamésa
     PA-big FOC table
     'The table will be/is being made bigger'

(48) Pa-fínú yu utón nu lamésa
     PA-smooth FOC top UNFOC table
     'The table top will be/is being made smoother'

(49) Pa-tátaw yu sekrétu
     PA-know FOC secret
     'The secret will be/is getting known'

(50) Pa-damá yu daddámán
     PA-walk FOC road
     'The road is will be/is getting walked on'

(51) Pa-íta yu letrátu
     PA-see FOC picture
     'The picture will be/is getting seen'

Sentences (47)-(51) suggest PARTICIPANT relationships: the secret is known, the road is walked on, and the picture is seen by virtue of other PARTICIPANTS doing the knowing, walking, and seeing.

This implicit ROLE contrast reflects our knowledge of the
relationship of certain PARTICIPANTS to certain EVENTS. It is not, of course, specified by the grammar. (How, for instance, can a table get bigger unless someone makes it so?) Some EVENTS, such as 'walking', implies animate PARTICIPANTS which serve as AGENTS. Others, like 'getting red' or 'getting big', do not require AGENTS and are more readily imaginable with inanimate PARTICIPANTS. Note the following:

(52)     Pa-lasáng yu lunár  
PA-red  FOC mole  
'The mole is getting red(der)'

(53)     Pa-dakál yu dulám  
PA-big  FOC cloud  
'The cloud is getting bigger'

(54)     Pa-dakál yu lunár  
PA-big  FOC mole  
'The mole is getting bigger'

(55)     Pa-dakál si Roberto  
PA-big  FOC Roberto  
'Roberto is getting big(ger)'

In (52)-(55), no AGENT is involved. The mole is becoming red. The mole, the cloud, and Roberto are growing larger. While the cloud may be changing before the speaker's eyes, the other PARTICIPANTS seem to be changing more slowly---by degrees, or in stages. The speaker is keeping periodic tabs on them. This difference in interpretation derives not from the grammar but from experience-based plausibility. The interpretation of 'gradual change' is discussed further in 5.4. In any case, the -pa-FOCUSED PARTICIPANT embodies the (EXHAUSTIVE) 'GOAL' of the playing out of the process. Such 'pure DISPLACEMENT' (i.e. detachment from both beginnings and conclusions) is reflected
in the following pa-V ya pa-V constructions:

(56)Pa-dakál ya pa-dakál yu lunár  
PA-big LINK PA-big FOC mole  
'The mole is getting bigger and bigger'

(57)Pa-raddám ya pa-raddám yu presidénte  
PA-sad LINK PA-sad FOC president  
'The president is getting sadder and sadder'

As in Hiligaynon (cf. 3.5), Yogad -pa- has a VOICE value of its own, indicative of a trajectory. (Recall that Predicate Nominals and Verbs with Stative Aktionsart--i.e. assertions of identity or quality--have no trajectories and appear without VOICE affixes.)

CENTRIFUGAL roots further underscore the VOICE value of -pa-. With these roots, an 'AGENT'/ 'PATIENT' opposition may be implied such that the FOCUSED PARTICIPANT can be understood as both 'Causer' and 'Affected':

(58)Pa-kánna kán  
PA-hit 1SG.FOC  
'Make someone hit me'  
'I'm having myself be hit'  
'*I'm hitting myself'

(59)Pa-íta kán  
PA-see 1SG.FOC  
'Make someone see me'  
'I'm having myself be seen'  
'*I'm looking at/after myself'

(60)Pa-lussáw kán  
PA-hate 1SG.FOC  
'Make someone hate me'  
'I'll be hated'  
'I'll have somebody hate me'

(61)Pa-damá kán  
PA-walk 1SG.FOC  
'I'll have somebody walk on me'

Sentences (58)-(61) show kan 'I' to be the terminus of each
EVENT, the 'target' of the hitting, seeing, hating, and walking. They may also understood to be delegational since the PARTICIPANT kan is inherently capable of delegating. There is an implicit yet unspecified DISPLACEMENT of influence from and toward the sole PARTICIPANT. Since the performance is DISPLACED from the FOCUSED PARTICIPANT, a 'Reflexive' interpretation in a strict sense is not allowed. Reflexivity reflects a combination of DISPLACEMENT and Eruptive Voice, as already discussed.

A delegational reading is more obvious when two PARTICIPANTS are explicit, as in:

(62) Pa-dakál ku yu lamésa
     PA-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC table
     'I'll have the table enlarged'

(63) Pa-damá ku yu bakulúd
     PA-walk 1SG.UNFOC FOC mountain
     'I'll have the mountain walked'

In clauses like these, with a specified 'S' PARTICIPANT and no other VOICES involved, -pa- implies that its influence is indirect or delegational. The 'S'-PARTICIPANT is detached from the performance. Note the following:

(64) (a) Lasáng yu lamésa
     red FOC table
     'The table is red'

     (b) Pa-lasáng ku yu lamésa
         PA-red 1SG.UNFOC FOC table
         'I'll have the table reddened'

     (c) *Lasáng ku yu lamésa
         red 1SG.UNFOC FOC table

(65) (a) Dakál yu letrátu
     big FOC picture
     'The picture is big'
(b) Pa-dakál ku yu letrátu
   PA-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC picture
   'I'll have the picture enlarged'

(c) *Dakál ku yu letrátu
    big 1SG.UNFOC FOC picture

(66) (a) Mémak yu kárne
   soft FOC meat
   'The meat is soft/tender'

(b) Pa-mémak ku yu kárne
    PA-soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC meat
    'I'll have the meat tenderized'

(c) *Mémak ku yu kárne
    soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC meat

(67) (a) Méggat yu seméntu
   hard FOC cement
   'The cement is hard'

(b) Pa-méggat ku yu seméntu
    PA-hard 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement
    'I'll have the cement hardened'

(c) *Méggat ku yu seméntu
    soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement

(68) (a) Górdù yu seméntu
   rough FOC cement
   'The cement is rough'

(b) Pa-górdù ku yu seméntu
    PA-rough 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement
    'I'll have the cement roughened'

(c) *Górdù ku yu seméntu
    rough 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement

(69) (a) Fínu yu utón nu lamésa
   smooth FOC top UNFOC table
   'The table top is smooth'

(b) Pa-fínu ku yu pínta
    PA-smooth 1SG.UNFOC FOC paint
    'I can have the paint smoothed'

(c) *Fínu ku yu pínta
    smooth 1SG.UNFOC FOC paint
(70)  
(a) Ngísit yu ngípan ku  
black FOC tooth 1SG.UNFOC  
'My teeth are black'  

(b) Pa-ngísit ku yu ngípan ku  
PA-black 1SG.UNFOC FOC tooth 1SG.UNFOC  
'I will have my teeth blackened'  

(c) *Ngísit na yu ngípan na  
black 3SG.UNFOC FOC tooth 3SG.UNFOC  

(71) 
(a) Bágu yu binaláy  
new FOC house  
'The house is new'  

(b) Pa-bágu ku yu binaláy  
PA-new 1SG.UNFOC FOC house  
'I'll have the house renovated'  

(c) *Bágu ku yu binaláy  
new 1SG.UNFOC FOC house  

Without **-pa-**, these roots are of 'Stative' Aktionsart and are therefore CENTRIPETAL. Without **-pa-** (as attested by the [c]-examples), no trajectory connects the two PARTICIPANTS. In (64)-(71), the 'Causative' effects of **-pa-** are obvious. The (a)-examples indicate 'Stative' conditions or qualities (e.g. [70a] implies that my teeth are black or dark, due, perhaps, to tobacco chewing); whereas the (b)-examples call attention to processes (e.g. in [b] my teeth might have been quickly blackened with some paint for a costume party). As noted, the (b)-sentences behave like delegational Causatives, which involve the intervention of a third PARTICIPANT, which may be rendered explicit, as in:  

(72)  
Pa-lasáng ku yu lamésa tu pintór  
PA-red 1SG.UNFOC FOC table UNFOC painter  
'I'll have the table reddened by a painter'  

Although the DISPLACEMENT semantics of **-pa-** may suggest
delegation with CENTRIPETAL roots, the commitment to such an interpretation can vary according to the other VOICE morphology involved. With ERUPTIVE VOICE, a delegational Causative interpretation is strongly favored:

(73) (a) **Nad-dakál yu danúm**
NAG-big FOC water
'The river swelled'

(b) **Nap-pa-dakál kán tu dínding**
NAG-PA-big 1SG.FOC UNFOC wall
'I had a wall enlarged (by someone)'

(c) *Nad-dakál kán tu dínding*
NAG-big 1SG.FOC UNFOC wall

(74) (a) **Nang-ngísit yu bók ku**
NAG-dark FOC hair 1SG.UNFOC
'My hair became black'

(b) **Nap-pa-ngísit kán tu bók ku**
NAG-PA-dark 1SG.FOC UNFOC hair 1SG.UNFOC
(tu barbéru)
(UNFOC barber)
'I had my hair darkened (by a barber)'

(c) *Nang-ngísit kán tu bók ku*
NAG- black 1SG.FOC UNFOC hair 1SG.UNFOC

(75) (a) **Nal-lasáng yu mansánas**
NAG-red FOC apple
'The apple became red'

(b) **Nap-pa-lasáng kán tu lamésa (tu pintór)**
NAG-PA-red 1SG.FOC UNFOC table (UNFOC painter)
'I had the table reddened (by a painter)'

(c) *Nal-lasáng kán tu lamésa*
NAG-red 1SG.FOC UNFOC table

(76) (a) **Nag-górdú yu seméntu**
NAG-rough FOC cement
'The cement became rough'

(b) **Nap-pa-górdú kán tu seméntu**
NAG-PA-rough 1SG.FOC UNFOC cement
'I had the cement roughened'
(c) *Nag-górdú kán tu seméntu
     NAG-rough 1SG.FOC UNFOC cement

(77) (a) Nab-bágu yu pintúra nu eskwéla
     NAG-new FOC paint UNFOC school
     'The school's paint was changed'

(b) Nap-pa-bágu kán tu binaláy
     NAG-PA-new 1SG.FOC UNFOC house
     'I had the house renovated'

(c) *Nab-bágu kán tu binaláy
     NAG-new 1SG.FOC UNFOC house

(78) (a) Nag-ittúd kán tu kótye
     NAG-stop 1SG.FOC UNFOC car
     'I stopped in a car'
     *'I stopped a car'

(b) Nap-pa-ittúd kán tu kótye
     NAG-PA-stop 1SG.FOC UNFOC car
     'I stopped a car (myself)'
     'I had someone stop a car'

The (a)-sentences focus the ERUPTIONS of the STATES in question; something happens. The (b)-sentences illustrate the DISPLACEMENT of the ERUPTION from the PARTICIPANT in FOCUS; the EVENT involves more than a single locus, namely the ERUPTIVE and POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANTS such as 'I' and 'cement' in (76b) and 'I' and 'house' in (77b). In DISPLACING the ERUPTION, -pa- increases the grammatical Valency, converting CENTRIPETAL roots into CENTRIFUGAL ones. (The consultant's rejection of the [c]-sentences illustrates the inherently CENTRIPETAL nature of these roots.)

With the MIDDLE VOICES ni- and i-, a delegational sense is similarly preferred:

(79) (a) Ni-górdú nu seméntu yu batú
     NI-rough UNFOC cement FOC stone
     'The cement got rough due to the stones'
(b) Ni-pa-górdú ku yu seméntu tu kantéru
NI-PA-rough 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement UNFOC mason
'I had a mason roughen the cement'

(c) *Ni-górdú ku yu seméntu
NI-rough 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement

(80) (a) I-dakál ku yu paginúm tu gatták
I-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC drinking UNFOC milk
'I'll get big/grow by drinking milk'

(b) I-pa-dakál ku yu lamésa
I-PA-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC table
'I'll have the table enlarged'

(c) *I-dakál ku yu lamésa
I-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC table

One aspect of the MIDDLENESS indicated by ni-/í- is that the performance of the EVENT is assumed to be internally motivated with regard to the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT, e.g. the cement in (79a) and I in (80a). Hence, (79a) implies that the stones are part of the cement mixture itself and are understood to be making it rough 'from within', inherently, while (80a) suggests that my growing big is a result of my action, i.e. is confined to me. Both (b)-sentences imply a history prior to the ERUPTION of the EVENT at the cement and table respectively. Hence, (80b) suggests that the table already exists and is to be enlarged. Without í-, one is speaking of a prospective table whose design is under consideration:

(81) Pa-dakál ku yu lamésa
PA-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC table
'I'll have the table made bigger'

With the ERUPTIVE and MIDDLE VOICES, then, delegational 'Causative' readings are strongly preferred to non-delegational 'Transitive' ones. The 'S'-PARTICIPANT is
thoroughly detached from the performance, which erupts at a later PHASE.

With EXHAUSTION-oriented VOICE affixes such as =in=, -pa- allows non-delegational, 'Transitive' readings in addition to delegational, 'Causative' ones:

(82) (a) In-ittúd ku yu kótye  
    IN-stop 1SG.UNFOC FOC car  
    'I stopped the car'

(b) P= in=a- ittúd ku yu kótye  
    PA=IN=PA-stop 1SG.UNFOC FOC car  
    'I stopped the car'  [Preferred]  
    'I had the car stopped'

(83) (a) Ng= in=ísit ku yu bók ku  
    dark=IN=dark 1SG.UNFOC FOC hair 1SG.UNFOC  
    'I darkened my hair (myself)'  
    *'I had my hair darkened'

(b) P= in=a- ngísit ku yu bók ku  
    PA=IN=PA-dark 1SG.UNFOC FOC hair 1SG.UNFOC  
    (tu barbèru)  
    (UNFOC barber)  
    'I darkened my hair'  [Preferred]  
    'I had my hair darkened (by a barber)'

(84) (a) G= in-órdu ku yu seméntu nu driveway  
    rough=IN-rough 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement UNFOC driveway  
    'I made the driveway cement rough'  
    *'I had the driveway cement roughened'

(b) P= in=a- gördu ku yu seméntu nu driveway  
    PA=IN=PA-rough 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement UNFOC driveway  
    (tu obréru)  
    (UNFOC laborer)  
    'I roughened the driveway cement (myself)'  
    'I had the driveway cement roughened (by a laborer)'

(85) (a) D= in=akál ku yu letrátu  
    big=IN=big 1SG.UNFOC FOC picture  
    'I enlarged the picture'  
    *'I had the picture enlarged'

(b) P= in=a-dakál ku yu letrátu  
    PA=IN-PA-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC picture  
    'I enlarged the picture'  
    'I had the picture enlarged'
(86) (a) M= in-émak ku yu kárne
    soft=IN=soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC meat
    'I softened the meat'
    '*I had the meat softened'

(b) P= in=a- mémak ku yu kárne
    PA=IN=PA-soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC meat
    'I softened the meat'
    'I had the meat softened'

(87) (a) M= in-éggat ku yu seméntu
    hard=IN=hard 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement
    'I made the cement hard(er)'
    '*I had the cement hardened'

(b) P= in=a- méggat ku yu seméntu
    PA=IN=PA-hard 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement
    'I hardened the cement'
    'I had the cement hardened'

(88) (a) P= in-ulláw ku yu ngípan ku
    white=IN=white 1SG.UNFOC FOC tooth 1SG.UNFOC
    'I whitened my teeth'
    '*I had my teeth whitened'

(b) P= in=a- fulláw ku yu ngípan ku
    PA=IN=PA-white 1SG.UNFOC FOC tooth 1SG.FOC
    'I whitened my teeth'
    'I had my teeth whitened'

(89) (a) B= in-ágú ku yu ugáli ku
    new=IN=new 1SG.UNFOC FOC trait 1SG.UNFOC
    'I changed my traits/habits'

(b) P= in=a- bágu ku yu ugáli ku
    PA=IN=PA-new 1SG.UNFOC FOC trait 1SG.UNFOC
    'I changed my traits/habits'
    'I had my traits/habits changed'

The (a)-sentences here are clearly non-delegational since =in= creates a PERVASIVE relationship between the ERUPTIVE and POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANTS. For the (b)-sentences, my consultant prefers non-delegational/non-mediational readings, though delegational ('Causative') readings, too, are possible.

If we assume non-delegational ('Transitive') readings for the (b)-examples, they contrast with the (a)-examples in terms
of the punctuality of execution: the -pa-marked sentences imply actions that are appreciated in stages, or gradually. The DISPLACEMENT implies process. Hence, for example, (88a), sans -pa-, might suggest the efficient effects of a single cleaning, while (88b), with -pa-, implies a more time-consuming program of dental hygiene. Similarly, (89a) suggests an abrupt change of habit made 'cold turkey'; and (89b), a more time-consuming, effort intensive set of new habits such as adopting an exercise program.

The contribution by -pa- of experiential grades or stages to the accomplishment of EVENTS is also observed in Hiligaynon (cf. 3.5). Unlike Hiligaynon, however, Yogad permits the addition of a PARTICIPANT to CENTRIPETAL EVENTS, including 'Stative' ones, without -pa-. Recall that Hiligaynon gin- requires -pa- if it is to occur with 'Stative' or 'Middle' CENTRIPETAL roots (cf. 3.4). There, the ROLES clearly juxtapose a 'mover' and a 'moved', a distinction that is maintained by the 'disjunctive' -pa-. The PERVERSIVE co-involvement of the two NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS achieved with the Yogad equivalent =in=, without -pa-, reflects the broader tendency of the language to minimize the ROLE distinction between NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS; Yogad -pa- contributes a 'disjunctive' contrast or DISPLACEMENT consistent with 'Causative' readings.

Like =in=, the other EXHAUSTIVE VOICES select PARTICIPANTS which are conceptually 'REMOTE' from the ERUPTIVE
PHASE. Again, non-delegational or non-mediational readings seem to be preferred over delegational ones:

(90)  (a) Ma-pa-dakál ku yu letrátu
      MA-PA-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC picture
      'I can enlarge the picture (myself)' [Preferred]
      'I can have the picture enlarged'

      (b) Ma-pa-dakál ku yu letrátu tu pintór
      MA-PA-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC picture UNFOC painter
      'I can have the picture enlarged by a painter'

(91)  (a) Ma-pa-górdu ku yu seméntu
      MA-PA-rough 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement
      'I can roughen the cement (myself)'
      'I can have the cement roughened'

      (b) Ma-pa-górdu ku yu seméntu tu kantéru
      MA-PA-rough 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement UNFOC mason
      'I can have the cement roughened by a mason'

(92)  (a) Ma-pa-dakál ku yu letrátu
      NA-PA-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC picture
      'I was able to enlarge the picture'

      (b) Ma-pa-dakál ku yu letrátu tu obréru
      NA-PA-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC picture UNFOC laborer
      'I was able to have the picture enlarged by a laborer'

(93)  (a) Ma-pa-górdu ku yu seméntu
      NA-PA-rough 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement
      'I was able roughen the cement'

      (b) Ma-pa-dakál ku yu seméntu tukuni Philip
      NA-PA-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement UNFOC Philip
      'I was able to have the cement roughened by Philip'

Although the perceived contrast in directness is intuitive and prone to individual variation, a consistent pattern emerges from the data, as summarized in Figure 5.1. The farther the FOCUS is from the origin (i.e. the 'S'), the more direct the causation is perceived to be (in the absence of disambiguating information). This perception is a 'side effect' of the Clausal perspective created by VOICE. The
ERUPTIVE and MIDDLE VOICES lend greater FOCUS or definition to the first part of EVENT process, so that the relatively DIFFUSE EXHAUSTION is easily distributed among PARTICIPANTS with -pa-.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXHAUSTIVE VOICE</th>
<th>Direct causation preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NON-EXHAUSTIVE VOICE</td>
<td>Indirect causation preferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.1: Yogad VOICE-Directness Correspondences

The ERUPTIONS of EVENTS, whether actually FOCUSSED or not, seem to be inherently—or ideally—well defined. (In elicited utterances, ERUPTIVE PARTICULARS—whether 'agentive' or 'possessive'—marked by UNFOCUSSED nu, were translated with the English Definite Article and, upon enquiry, were said to be 'definite'.) Thus, when the EXHAUSTIVE VOICES bring EVENTS to a FOCUSSED conclusion, it is likely that the earlier PHASES are nonetheless somewhat well defined, so that -pa- suggests a non-mediational 'Transitive' reading rather than a mediational 'Causative' one. The tendency to regard ERUPTIONS as well defined sources may reflect a tendency to personify EVENT sources as 'AGENTS', in accord with the common conceptual metaphor EVENTS ARE ACTIONS, i.e. the result of a personal force (cf. Lakoff & Turner 1989).

In any EVENT, -pa- suggests 'change'. A dynamic must be in play. A major syntactic distinction between DISPLACEMENT and the influence of one PARTICIPANT upon another in an inherently CENTRIFUGAL (i.e. 'Transitive') EVENT concerns the participation of an NON-NUCLEAR tu-marked PARTICIPANT.
CENTRIFUGAL roots allow UNFOCUSSED NON-NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS to play a common-sense-derived rôle in the EVENT, including that of a mediating 'INSTRUMENT', as with batú 'rock' in the following (cf. 4.1.1):

(94) (a) Nak-kánna ni Bill tu estudyánte tu batú NAG-hit UNFOC Bill UNFOC student UNFOC rock 'Bill hit a student with a rock'

(b) K= in-áanna ni Bill si Juan tu batú hit=IN=hit UNFOC Bill FOC Juan UNFOC rock 'Bill hit Juan with a rock'

Here, regardless of whether the VOICE is ERUPTIVE or EXHAUSTIVE, tu batú, which lies beyond VOICE, may, given common-sense knowledge of the world, be interpreted as an 'INSTRUMENT'.

In contrast, none of the UNFOCUSSED POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANTS in the following -pa-marked sentences achieves an analogous 'INSTRUMENT' reading:

(95) (a) *Nap-pa-ngísit kán tu bók ku NAG-PA-dark 1SG.FOC UNFOC hair 1SG.UNFOC tu kolór UNFOC dye

(b) *Nap-pa-ngísit kán tu kolór NAG-PA-dark 1SG.FOC UNFOC dye tu bók ku UNFOC hair 1SG.UNFOC

(c) *P= in=a- ngísit ku yu bók ku PA=IN=PA-dark 1SG.UNFOC FOC hair 1SG.UNFOC tu kolór UNFOC dye

(96) (a) *Nap-pa-lasáng kán tu lamésa tu brótya NAG-PA-red 1SG.FOC UNFOC table UNFOC brush

(b) *Nap-pa-lasáng kán tu brótya tu lamésa NAG-PA-red 1SG.FOC UNFOC brush UNFOC table
Here, neither tu kolór, tu brótya, nor tu seméntu can be interpreted as an 'INSTRUMENT', regardless of the ordering of the POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANTS, and regardless of whether FOCUS falls on an ERUPTIVE or on a POST-ERUPTIVE ROLE.

The sought-after 'INSTRUMENTAL' sense may be achieved in any of three ways: (a) by adding an additional explanatory Clause connected with the Ligature ya, (b) by adding a 'Gerundival' Nominal marked with -pag-, or (c) by adding a 'MOTILE' PARTICIPANT capable of acting as a 'Causee'. Note the following:

(98) (a) Nap-pa-ngísit kán tu bók ku ya
NAG-PA-dark 1SG.FOC UNFOC hair 1SG.UNFOC LINK
nangyúsa kán tu kolór
using 1SG.FOC UNFOC dye
'I had my hair darkened using [I used] dye'

(b) Nap-pa-ngísit kán tu bók ku
NAG-PA-dark 1SG.FOC UNFOC hair 1SG.UNFOC
tu pakkolór
UNFOC dyeing
'I had my hair darkened by dyeing it'

(c) Nap-pa-ngísit kán tu bók ku
NAG-PA-red 1SG.FOC UNFOC hair 1SG.UNFOC
tu barbérú
UNFOC barber
'I had my hair darkened by a barber'
(99) (a) **Nap-pa-lasáng kán tu lamésa ya**
    NAG-PA-red 1SG.FOC UNFOC table LINK
    nangyúsa kán tu brótya
    using 1SG.FOC UNFOC brush
    'I had a table enlarged, using [I used] a brush'

(b) **Nap-pa-lasáng kán tu lamésa tu pabbrótya**
    NAG-PA-red 1SG.FOC UNFOC table UNFOC brushing
    'I had a table reddened by brushing it'

(c) **Nap-pa-lasáng kán tu lamésa tu pintór**
    NAG-PA-red 1SG.FOC UNFOC table UNFOC painter
    'I had a table reddened by a painter'

(100) (a) **Nap-pa-dakál kán tu dýnding ya**
    NAG-PA-big 1SG.FOC UNFOC wall LINK
    nangyúsa kán tu seméntu
    using 1SG.FOC UNFOC cement
    'I had a wall enlarged using [I used] cement'

(b) **Nap-pa-dakál kán tu dýnding**
    NAG-PA-big 1SG.FOC UNFOC wall
    tu pagyúsa tu seméntu
    UNFOC using UNFOC cement
    'I'll have a wall enlarged by using cement'

(c) **Nap-pa-dakál kán tu dýnding tu karpentéru**
    NAG-PA-big 1SG.FOC UNFOC wall UNFOC carpenter
    'I had a wall enlarged by a carpenter'

The 'MOTILE INSTRUMENTAL' interpretation of such **tu-Phrase PARTICULARS** is also possible with POST-ERUPTIVE VOICE, as in:

(101) (a) **P= in=a- lasáng ku yu lamésa**
    PA=IN=PA-red 1SG.UNFOC FOC table
    tu pabbrótya
    UNFOC brushing
    'I reddened the table by brushing it'

(b) **P= in=a- lasáng ku yu lamésa**
    PA=IN=PA-red 1SG.UNFOC FOC table
    tu karpentéru
    UNFOC carpenter
    'I had the table reddened by a carpenter'

Thus, with -pa-expanded CENTRIPEPETAL roots, any intermediary, 'INSTRUMENTAL' force must be dynamic: either a fully fledged

---

5This is **nang** + **i** + **úsa** 'use'.

EVENT (e.g. 'I used a brush'), a reduced EVENT or process (e.g. 'dyeing', 'brushing', and 'using cement' as opposed to 'dye', 'brush', or 'cement'), or a 'MOTILE' PARTICIPANT capable of executing a process as a 'Causee' (e.g. a barber or a carpenter).

This preference for POST-NUCLEAR dynamism further refines our understanding of DISPLACEMENT in Yogad. The distance between the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANTS kan and ku in (98)-(100) and the POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANTS seméntu, kolór, and brótya renders the direct application of an 'INSTRUMENT' meaningless. The connection is bridged by another EVENT. Note, for instance, that in (85a) (Dinakál ku vu letrátu 'I enlarged a picture'), the ERUPTIVE ku is directly involved with vu letrátu via 'bigness'; in (85b) (Pinadakál ku vu letrátu 'I enlarged the picture/had the picture enlarged'), 'bigness' first erupts in vu letrátu, which is not directly involved with ku. But ku can be seen as doing something else, i.e. using some tool. It is because ku is not enmeshed in the trajectory of padakál that no connection with an 'INSTRUMENT' is possible. This pattern reinforces our understanding of the DISPLACEMENT of -pa-.6

An informative apparent exception is the following:

6In Hiligaynon, such processes are introduced by paági sa, e.g. Nag-pa-tínlo akó sang pínggan [pa-ági sa kískis / * sa kískis] 'I had the plates cleaned by scraping'; sa sans paági is reserved for PARTICIPANTS, which are accorded a more independent, self-contained status.
(102) Nap-pa-mapí yu dótktor tu pasyénte tu medisína
NAG-PA-good FOC doctor UNFOC patient UNFOC medicine
'The doctor made a patient well with medicine'

Here, tu medisína does seem to behave as an 'INSTRUMENT'.
However, the acceptability of this apparent exception seems to
reflect the inner dynamics of the relation of the medicine to
the EVENT of 'getting well' or 'curing'. The 'PATIENTIVE'
patient takes the medicine on the doctor's orders and is
therefore a more ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT than the medicine, which
is the most 'INERT' one; an 'INSTRUMENTAL' reading still makes
no sense. Sentence (102) is understood as an abbreviation of
the following:

(103) Nap-pa-mapí yu dótktor tu pasyénte
NAG-PA-good FOC doctor UNFOC patient
tu paginúm na tu medisína
UNFOC drinking 3SG.UNFOC UNFOC medicine
'The doctor made a patient well by his/her drinking
medicine'

In contrast to other CENTRIPETAL roots, orientational or
positional roots strongly imply a direct, undelegated,
unmediated manipulation of the POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT by
the ERUPTIVE one, even when the ERUPTIVE ROLE is FOCUSSED, as
in the following:

(104) (a) Nas-sándig si Juan tu dínding
NAG-lean FOC Juan UNFOC wall
'Juan leaned against a wall'

(b) Nap-pa-sándig si Juan tu assirát tu dínding
NAG-PA-lean FOC Juan UNFOC broom UNFOC wall
'Juan leaned a broom against a wall'
'*Juan had a broom leaned against a wall'

(c) *Nas-sándig si Juan tu assirát tu dínding
NAG-lean FOC Juan UNFOC broom UNFOC wall
(105) (a) Nat-tádag si Juan tu tátu ya óra
NAG-stand FOC Juan UNFOC one LINK hour
'Juan stood for one hour'

(b) Nap-pa-tádag si Juan tu lamésa
NAG-PA-stand FOC Juan UNFOC table
'Juan stood a table up (himself)'

(c) *Nat-tádag si Juan tu binaláy
NAG-stand FOC Juan UNFOC house

(106) (a) Nag-iddá si Juan tu káma
NAG-lie FOC Juan UNFOC bed
'Juan lay on a bed'

(b) Nap-pa-iddá si Juan tu káma
NAG-PA-lie FOC Juan UNFOC bed
'Juan made someone lie in a bed'
'Juan laid a bed down (himself)'
(*'Juan had a bed laid down')

(c) *Nag-iddá si Juan tu póste
NAG-lie FOC Juan UNFOC post
(Juan lay a post down)

The (a)-sentences of (104)-(106) narrate CENTRIPETAL EVENTS
and the (b)-sentences (with -pa-), CENTRIFUGAL ones, with
their tu-Phrases being interpreted as 'PATIENTS'. The rejected
(c)-examples attest that -pa- is required for the CENTRIFUGAL
readings of the (b)-versions.

Once again, delegational readings emerge in appropriate
contexts:

(107) Nap-pa-iddá kán tu bók ku tu
NAG-PA-lie 1SG.FOC UNFOC hair 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC
barbéru
barber
'I had a barber get my hair to lie down/flat'

(108) Nap-pa-sándig kán tu assirát tu dínding
NAG-PA-lean 1SG.FOC UNFOC broom UNFOC wall
tukuni Roberto
UNFOC Roberto
'I had Roberto lean the broom against a wall'

The preference of these orientational roots for unmediated,
direct manipulation with both POST-ERUPTIVE and ERUPTIVE VOICE marks these roots as a special class, as discussed further in 5.4.

Like qualitative, 'Adjectival' roots, these positional roots may have no trajectory and occur without VOICE marking:

(109) Tádag yu póste
     stand FOC post
     'The post is upright/erect'

(110) Iddá yu bók ku
     lie FOC hair 1SG.UNFOC
     'My hair lies flat'

These roots easily allow 'Causative' and 'non-Causative' readings with -pa-:

(111) Pa-sándig kán
     PA-lean 1SG.FOC
     'I'll lean/I'm in a leaning position'
     'I'll be leaned over'

(112) Pa-iddá kán
     PA-lie 1SG.FOC
     'I'll lie down in a reclining position'
     'I'll be laid down'

(113) Pa-tádag kán
     PA-stand 1SG.FOC
     'I'm standing in an upright position'
     'I'll be stood up'

The non-delegational option reflects the 'self-contained' nature of the actions being constructed. With both the delegational and non-delegational interpretations, -pa- consistently invokes 'change', an essential part of 'cause'.

5.4 Tendency, Gradedness

The orientational/positional roots just discussed, including sándig 'lean', tádag 'stand', iddá 'lie (flat)', and tábik 'beside' offer the most graphic illustrations of the
semantics of DISPLACEMENT. Combined with -pa-, these roots may suggest 'tendencies' or 'grades' that have visible manifestations.

In the absence of other VOICE marking, these roots suggest a 'change' which may be construed as a 'tendency'.

Note the following:

(114) (a) Sándig yu kayú
      lean FOC tree
      'The tree is leaning'

(b) Pa-sándig yu kayú
    PA-lean FOC tree
    'The tree has a tendency to lean'

(115) (a) Tádag yu bók ku
       stand FOC hair 1SG.UNFOC
       'My hair stands up'

(b) Pa-tádag yu bók ku
    PA-stand FOC hair 1SG.UNFOC
    'My hair has a tendency to stand up'

(116) (a) Iddá yu bók ku
       lie FOC hair 1SG.UNFOC
       'My hair lies flat'

(b) Pa-iddá yu bók ku
    PA-lie FOC hair 1SG.UNFOC
    'My hair has a tendency to lie flat'

The (a)-sentences of (114)-(116) describes Stative EVENTS involving the maintenance of positions. Sentence (114a) indicates that the tree is one that leans 'naturally'; (115a), that my hair is normally erect; and (116a), that my hair is naturally flat. In these instances, there is no suggestion of kinesis. The (b)-sentences do not describe apparent movement, but they do acknowledge change, an historical contrast between 'before' and 'after'. This 'historical' sense resembles the
'gradedness' discussed with reference to Hiligaynon -pa- in 3.5. As in Hiligaynon, Yogad -pa- acknowledges past and lesser 'grades' or 'degrees' of the quality named—in a word, 'change'.

It must be remembered that 'kinesis' per se is not indicated by the morphology of Yogad (i.e. either by -pa- or the other VOICE affixes) but emerges from the dynamics of the EVENT. In the following examples, -pa- indicates a history, a contrast between 'then' and 'now':

(117) (a) Tádag yu kompanáryo
stand FOC belfry
'The belfry is erect'

(b) Pa-tádag yu kompanáryo
PA-stand FOC belfry
'The belfry is standing'

(118) (a) Sándig yu tower
lean FOC tower
'The tower is inclined'

(b) Pa-sándig yu Tower of Pisa
PA-lean FOC Tower of Pisa
'The Tower of Pisa is leaning'

The (a)-examples imply no condition different from the present one. The belfry is erect and the tower incline by design; nothing has happened. The (b)-examples, with -pa- imply change; something has happened. The belfry may have been leaning before and is now standing (note the difference between the 'Stative Adjective' erect and the Gerund standing in the English glosses); or, perhaps, it has been discovered to have survived a bombing in which other buildings were levelled. The Tower of Pisa similarly suggests a history of
shifting not necessarily apparent to the senses of the speaker.

With an animate PARTICIPANT such as Juan, a progressive sense of -pa- is more obvious:

(119) (a) Tádag si Juan
    stand FOC Juan
    'Juan is erect'

    (b) Pa-tádag si Juan
        PA-tádag FOC Juan
        'Juan is going to stand/is getting up'

Note that -pa- may also mark an Imperative to change positions:

(120) (a) tábik nu university
    side UNFOC university
    'opposite to the university'
    'beside the university'

    (b) Pa-tábik!
        PA-side
        '(Step) aside!'

Item (120a) suggests a location relative to the university, while (120b) suggests a motion—a clear instance of DISPLACEMENT.

Thus, -pa- can derive a process from a static condition, an outcome that is consistent with our previous discussion of its 'transitivizing' effects with 'Stative' Verbs. Rather than 'cause', 'transitivity', or even 'kinesis' per se, -pa- evokes recognition of difference between two EVENTS, without further specifying the linkage between them. In spatial terms, -pa- acknowledges a literal trajectory. The indifference of the DISPLACEMENT to specific routes allows room for 'delegational' Causative sentences such as:
(121) Pa-sándig ku yu póste
PA-lean 1SG.UNFOC FOC post
'I'll lean the post'
'I'll have the post leaned'

A sense of 'tendency' consonant with DISPLACEMENT is perhaps most obvious with the cardinal directions, (i.e. silawán 'east', taggápán 'west', allód 'north', and addayá 'south', normally enumerated in this order). Without a VOICE affix, the Verb denoting the direction is a static position or reference point. The addition of -pa- neither increases Valency nor adds kinesis per se to any of the EVENT-internal PARTICIPANTS, as exemplified by the following:

(122) (a) Addayá nu Dallas yu Houston
south UNFOC Dallas FOC Houston
'South of Dallas is Houston'

(b) Pa-addayá nu Houston yu Dallas
PA-south UNFOC Houston FOC Dallas
'Southwards/somewhere to the south of Dallas is Houston'

(123) (a) Addayá yu abáng
south FOC boat
'The boat is at the south'

(b) Pa-addayá yu abáng
PA-south FOC boat
'The boat is southerly'

The (a)-examples indicate the positions of Houston and the boat relative to a known reference point (Dallas in [122a]; a known landmark in [123a]). In the (b)-examples, -pa- seems to add a sense of imprecision or uncertainty to the statement of direction; addayá 'south' is no longer a fixed reference point or position but a pathway, i.e. 'southwards/southerly'. The emphasis is on the journey/process as opposed to the
arrival/achievement. Since neither Dallas nor abáng 'boat' is moving, any kinesis must be understood in terms of the process of becoming that is implied; thus, one might paraphrase (122b) as 'If you follow the compass south, you'll get to the boat'. Again, -pa- recognizes no endpoint (e.g. 'the south') but rather a trajectory of DISPLACEMENT (e.g. 'southwards'). In so doing, -pa- opens a window on the process of the EVENT, on the performance itself rather than on any incept or endpoint. The compatibility of -pa- with such 'middleness' is implicit in the fact that it co-occurs freely with both ERUPTIVE and POST-ERUPTIVE VOICE affixes. The DISPLACEMENT semantics are perhaps more obvious with the following 'Stative' Verbs of position (including wígi 'left', wanán 'right', utón 'up, above', gukáb 'down, under', and góngan 'underneath, below'). Note the following interpretations of wígi and utón:

(124) (a) Tu wígi yu binaláy
UNFOC left FOC house
'The house is at the left'

(b) Tu pa-wígi yu binaláy
UNFOC PA-left FOC house'
'Towards the left is the house'

(125) (a) Wígi (yu kamót ku) yu pattúrak ku
left (FOC hand 1SG.UNFOC) FOC writing 1SG.UNFOC
'I write with my left hand'

(b) Pa-wígi yu pattúrak ku
PA-left FOC writing 1SG.UNFOC
'I write towards the left'
('My [way of] writing goes leftwards')

(126) (a) Utón yu igáw
up FOC sun
'The sun is up'
(b) Pa-utón yu igáw  
   PA-up FOC sun  
   'The sun is going up'

In the (a)-sentences of (124) and (125), wiši indicates specific locations: the left lot (with choice limited by a given matrix) and the left hand (with choice limited by human anatomy). The (b)-sentences, with -pa-, illustrate orientations or directions—or, rather, process-linked trajectories. Similarly, utón suggests the process whereby the sun is DISPLACED. Again, no terminal points are acknowledged.

The 'tendency' and the orientational senses of -pa- are consonant with the gradedness discussed in 3.5. Changes occur in degrees. This gradedness of process is especially apparent in the pa-V ya pa-V construction already encountered, which can be glossed as '(becoming/getting) more and more X':

(127) Pa-fínu ya pa-fínu yu batú  
      PA-smooth LINK PA-smooth FOC stone  
      'The stone is getting smoother and smoother'  
      'Have the stone made smoother'

(128) Pa-kánna ya pa-kánna yu boksínéru  
      PA-hit LINK PA-hit FOC boxer  
      'The boxer is letting himself be hit and hit'  
      'Someone will have the boxer hit and hit'  
      'Have the boxer hit and hit'

(129) Pa-mémak ya pa-mémak yu kárne  
      PA-soft LINK PA-soft FOC meat  
      'The meat is getting softer and softer'  
      'Have the meat made softer and softer'

(130) pa-raddám ya pa-raddám  
      PA-sad LINK PA-sad  
      '(becoming) sadder and sadder'

(131) pa-dakál ya pa-dakál  
      PA-big LINK PA-big  
      '(becoming) bigger and bigger'
(132) pa-addayá ya pa-addayá
    PA-south LINK PA-south
    '(going) more and more southerly'

The 'gradedness' here reflects experiential increments of DISPLACEMENT.

Of course, even directional Verbs like wígi can be made to behave as delegational Causatives with amenable PARTICIPANTS, as in:

(133) Pa-wígi ku yu alángan nu lamésa
    PA-left 1SG.UNFOC FOC face UNFOC table
    tukuni Roberto
    UNFOC Roberto
    'I'll have Roberto make the table face left'

Here again, we note the indifference of -pa- to the means of accomplishment.

When such Verbs are combined with VOICE affixes such as nag-, which suggests a trajectory, -pa- indicates a heightened abruptness of change, a marked disruption or departure from a previous trend. Note the following:

(134) (a) Nag-addayá yu abáng
    NAG-south FOC boat
    'The boat turned south/became southbound/went south'

    (b) Nap-pa-addayá yu abáng
    NAG-PA-south FOC boat
    'The boat went south(wards)'

(135) (a) Nàw-wígi yu kótye
    NAG-left FOC car
    'The car turned left'

    (b) Nap-pa-wígi yu kótye
    NAG-PA-left FOC car
    'The car turned towards the left'

With the ERUPTIVE nag-, these orientational/directional roots indicate shifts in the orientations/trajectories indicated--
i.e. departures (cf. 3.5). In the (a)-examples, the beginning of a trend of motion is acknowledged. In (134a), the boat oriented itself towards the south or was pushed in a southerly direction by some external force such as the wind or water currents. Similarly, the car in (135a) either veered left or traveled in the left lane without altering its main trajectory. In the (b)-examples, with -pa-, the boat and car are understood to have followed more consistently southward or leftward courses; the new directions seem to be internally motivated. The consistency of the change in the -pa-marked examples is part and parcel of DISPLACEMENT.

Orientational roots can participate in CENTRIPETAL EVENTS which may be rendered CENTRIFUGAL, as in:

(136) (a) Nag-addayá kán tu abáng
NAG-south 1SG.FOC UNFOC boat
'I went south in a boat'
'I faced south (while) in a boat'

(b) Nap-pa-addayá kán tu abáng
NAG-PA-south 1SG.FOC UNFOC boat
'I made a boat go south'

In (136a), tu abáng names a LOCATION; in (136b), a POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT responsive to the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT. Unlike other CENTRIPETAL roots, however, orientational roots may be interpreted as non-delegational even with ERUPTIVE VOICE.

5.5 Conclusion

I have argued that, much as in Hiligaynon, the Yogad morpheme -pa- marks a DISPLACEMENT of the ERUPTION from the origin of the EVENT toward an unspecified later PHASE. Certain
EVENTS with certain VOICE values and PARTICIPANT types encourage a 'Causative'/'Permissive' reading. This claim makes sense only in terms of the semantic context of Yogad VOICES and of Yogad EVENT types. The DISPLACEMENT may play out in terms of increased Valency (i.e. the involvement of an additional PARTICIPANT), of increased 'dissociation' (sometimes suggestive of involvement or effort), or of 'tendency'--all of which meanings involve 'change' or 'process' or 'flux'. These various manifestations of DISPLACEMENT stem from various combinations or values of VOICE and EVENT type.

A notable contrast with Hiligaynon is that -pa- does not behave as an Intensive which performatively heightens interlocutor involvement. As noted earlier, one reflection of the non-Intensive character of Yogad -pa- is its non-reduplicability. (Recall that in Hiligaynon--as in Tagalog--the reduplication of -pa- heightens Involvement, between either the PARTICIPANTS in the EVENT or he interlocutors in the speaking situation.) The lack of intensive meaning is resonant with the minimal ROLE contrast in the language, which need not involve MOTILITY. To suggest a more intense causation, Yogad offers another strategy, as discussed in Chapter 6.
Chapter Six

A Second Yogad Causative: -pag-

6.0 Introduction: 'First Causative' -pa- vs. 'Second Causative' -pag-

Yogad provides an alternative productive way to invoke cause qua delegation. The Verbal VOICE-marking affix -pag-, noted briefly in Chapters 2 (Hiligaynon) and 5 (Yogad) as a 'Gerund' marker used for naming processes (e.g. pabrótya 'brushing'), is in Yogad also productive of morphological Causatives. Like -pa-, -pag- does not specify ASPECT but may borrow Realis from =in=, ni-, and na-.

A significant point of contrast between -pa- and -pag- involves their possibilities of co-occurrence with other VOICE affixes. By manipulating the VOICES which co-occur with -pa-, one may place the FOCUS on either an ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT or on an appropriate POST-ERUPTIVE one:

(1) (a) Nap-pa-bibíd kán tu líbru tukuni Maria
NAG-PA-read 1SG.FOC UNFOC book UNFOC Maria
'I had a book read by Maria'

(b) Na-pa-bibíd ku si Maria tu líbru
NA-PA-read 1SG.UNFOC FOC Maria UNFOC book
'I was able to have Maria read a book'

(c) Na-pa-bibíd ku yu líbru tukuni Maria
NA-PA-read 1SG.UNFOC FOC book UNFOC Maria
'I was able to have the book read by Maria'

(2) (a) Nap-pa-akkán kán tu tuláng tu atú
NAG-PA-eat 1SG.FOC UNFOC bone UNFOC dog
'I had the bone eaten by a dog'

(b) P= in=a- akkán ku yu atú tu tuláng
PA=IN=PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog UNFOC bone
'I fed the dog a bone'
(c) P= in=a- akkán ku yu tuldáng tu atú PA=IN=PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC bone UNFOC dog
'I had the bone eaten by a dog'

(3) (a) Náp-pa-damá si Roberto tu bakulúd tukuni Juan NAG-PA-walk FOC Roberto UNFOC mountain UNFOC Juan 'Roberto had the mountains walked in by Juan'

(b) P= in=a- damá ni Roberto si Juan tu bakulúd PA=IN=PA-walk UNFOC Roberto FOC Juan UNFOC mountain 'Roberto made Juan walk in/through the mountains'

(c) P= in=a- damá ni Roberto yu bakulúd tukuni Juan PA=IN=PA-walk UNFOC Roberto FOC mountain UNFOC Juan 'Roberto had the mountains walked by Juan'

(4) (a) Náp-pa-damá kán tu daddamán tukuni Marta NAG-PA-walk 1SG.FOC UNFOC road UNFOC Marta 'I had a road walked in by Marta'

(b) P= in=a-damá ku si Marta tu daddamán PA=IN=PA-walk 1SG.UNFOC FOC Marta UNFOC road 'I had Marta walk in the road'

(c) P= in=a- damá ku yu daddamán tukuni Marta PA=IN=PA-walk 1SG.UNFOC FOC road UNFOC Marta 'I had the road walked by Marta'

(5) (a) Náp-pa-inúm kán tu danúm tu anák NAG-PA-drink 1SG.FOC UNFOC water UNFOC child 'I had some water drunk by a child'

(b) P= in=a- inúm ku yu anák tu danúm PA=IN=PA-drink 1SG.UNFOC FOC child UNFOC water 'I had the child drink water'

(c) P= in=a- inúm ku yu danúm tu anák PA=IN=PA-drink 1SG.UNFOC FOC water UNFOC child 'I had the water drunk by a child'

In the (a)-, (b)-, and (c)-examples of (1)-(5), the FOCUS occurs respectively on the 'Causer', 'Causee', and 'Affectee'. As discussed earlier, each variation carries a different emphasis so that the main point of each variant differs from the others. The (a)-sentences highlight what I or Roberto did, e.g. 'making/letting someone read' or 'making/letting someone
walk'. The (b)- and (c)-sentences contrast according to which ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT is highlighted. E.g. (1b) highlights 'what Maria was made to do', perhaps as a means of educating herself; and (1c), 'what happened to the book', e.g. how it got proofread. The (2)-sentences involve similar contrasts. Sentence (3b), with FOCUS on Juan, implies that Juan began walking while already in the mountains and just 'walked around'; (3c), with FOCUS on bakulúd, implies that Juan started outside the mountains and walked them from end to end. Similarly, (4b) implies that Marta walked in the road (as opposed to on the grass); and (4c), that she walked 'all the way from beginning to end'. In (5b), the child drank some of the water; and in (5c), all of it.

The -pag-form is more restricted than -pa- regarding the morphemic company it may keep. Specifically, -pag- cannot co-occur with ERUPTIVE VOICES (e.g. nag-/mag-) but may with POST-ERUPTIVE VOICES. Note the following:

(6) (a) Na-pab-bibbíd ku si Maria tu líbru
NA-PAG-read 1SG.UNFOC FOC Maria UNFOC book
'I was able to have Maria read a book'

(b) *Nag-pab-bibbíd ...
NAG-PAG-read

(7) (a) P= in-ag- akkán ku yu atú
PAG=IN=PAG-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog
'I made the dog eat'

(b) *Nag-pag-akkán ...
NAG-PAG-eat

Note that when =in= combines with the derivational -pa- to form the prefix pina-, the execution remains direct. As
illustrated by (6), the final -g of -pag- assimilates to any following consonant in the manner already observed with mag- and nag-. For this reason, non-native listeners may mistake the -pag- form for the -pa- form.

The distinction becomes more clear when one takes FOCUS into account. As the (b)-sentences suggest, -pag- does not co-occur with ERUPTIVE VOICE affixes (i.e. nag-, mag-, and =um=). In contrast to -pa-, -pag- does not suggest a DISPLACEMENT of ERUPTION. Instead, -pag- seeks the MIDDLE PHASE of pure performance. Like the -see Causee of Hindi (cf. Saksena 1980, 1982a, 1982b), the Yogad -pag-FOCUSSED Causee exhibits a strong affinity with 'INSTRUMENT'-like semantics, which is consistent with its orientation toward the performance of EVENTS.

The MIDDLE PHASE highlighted by -pag- may host either animate 'EXECUTORS' or inanimate 'INSTRUMENTS':

(8) (a) P= in=ag- inúm ku yu anák tu básu PAG=IN=PAG-drink 1SG.UNFOC FOC child UNFOC glass 'I made the child drink from a glass'

(b) P= in=ag- inúm ku yu básu tu danúm PAG=IN=PAG-drink 1SG.UNFOC FOC glass UNFOC water 'I used the glass to drink water'

(9) (a) Pab-bántay ku yu atú tu kótye PAG-watch 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog UNFOC car 'I'll use the dog to watch a car'

(b) Pab-bántay ku yu flashlight tu kótye PAG-watch 1SG.UNFOC FOC flashlight UNFOC car 'I'll use the flashlight to watch a car'

In (8) and (9), -pag- focusses PARTICIPANTS at the MIDDLE PHASE. Note that -pag- does not distinguish between animate
'EXECUTORS' or inanimate 'INSTRUMENTS'. Such distinctions are brought from worldly experience, which is configured by language. The MIDDLE semantics implies a direct connection to the ERUPTIVE PHASE, a connection which implies a deep mutual involvement of the ERUPTIVE and MIDDLE PARTICIPANTS, which, with inanimate MIDDLE PARTICIPANTS (cf. the [b]-examples) plays as direct physical contact; and, with animate ones, as a proximity which may be either physical or psychic. The language does not specify a physical/non-physical contrast.

By contrasting the MIDDLE Causatives marked by -pag- with the DISPLACED ones marked by -pa-, we may begin to understand the semantic dimensions of the former. The terms of the -pa-/pag- contrast vary with the EVENT so that the grammatical contrast itself cannot easily be reduced to any particular terms.

6.1.0 Indirect vs. Direct Causation

Generally, the contrast between DISPLACING -pa-Causatives and MIDDLE -pag-Causatives can be most easily understood in terms of the directness of the causation. When contrasted with each other, -pa- suggests a 'direct' causation; and -pag-, an 'indirect' one. In the following, these affixes co-occur with the 'Perfective' =in=:

(10) (a) P= in=a- digút ku si Maria
PA=IN=PA-bathe 1SG.UNFOC FOC Maria
'I had someone bathe Maria'

(b) P= in=ad- digút ku si Maria
PAG=IN=PAG-bathe 1SG.UNFOC FOC Maria
'I made/asked Maria to take a bath'
(11) (a) \( p= \text{in=a- } \text{bullák ku } \text{yu polo shirt} \)
\( \text{PA=IN=PA-small 1SG.UNFOC FOC polo shirt} \)
\( \text{(tu sástri)} \)
\( \text{(UNFOC tailor)} \)
'I had the polo shirt made smaller (by the tailor)' 

(b) \( p= \text{in=ab- } \text{bullák ku } \text{yu polo shirt} \)
\( \text{PAG=IN=PAG-small 1SG.UNFOC FOC polo shirt} \)
'I caused the polo shirt to get smaller'

(12) (a) \( p= \text{in=a- } \text{dammáng ku } \text{yu abáng tu danúm} \)
\( \text{PA=IN=PA-bank 1SG.UNFOC FOC boat UNFOC water} \)
'I made the boat cross the river'

(b) \( p= \text{in=ad- } \text{dammáng ku } \text{yu abáng tu danúm} \)
\( \text{PAG=IN=PAG-bank 1SG.UNFOC FOC boat UNFOC water} \)
'I used the boat to cross the river'

(13) (a) \( p= \text{in=a- } \text{tabá nu } \text{atáwa na si Roberto} \)
\( \text{PA=IN=PA-fat UNFOC wife 3SG.UNFOC FOC Roberto} \)
'Roberto's wife made him fat'

(b) \( p= \text{in=at- } \text{tabá nu } \text{atáwa na si Roberto} \)
\( \text{PAG=IN=PAG-fat UNFOC wife 3SG.UNFOC FOC Roberto} \)
'Roberto's wife made him get fat'

In the (b)-examples of (10)-(13) above, -\text{pag}- suggests a direct connection between the 'S'-PARTICIPANT and an 'O'-PARTICIPANT. The (a)-examples, with -\text{pa}-, imply a DISPLACEMENT of contact between the two which is understandable as indirectness. In (10a), I need not have spoken to Maria at all; I merely delegated the bathing to someone else. In (10b), I actually confronted her and told her to bathe. In (11a), I delegated the shrinking of the shirt to the tailor, while in (11b) I myself did something to shrink it, perhaps scalded it. In (12a), I had the boat conducted to the other side of the bank but did not row it myself; I need not have been in the boat at all. In (12b), I must have been in the boat, which is understood as the means by which I got to the opposite bank.
In (13a), Roberto's wife made him fat in the natural course of her culinary practices, 'without trying', whereas (13b) implies that she explicitly confronted him with the goal (and means) of getting fat.

Hence, -pa- implies a less direct involvement of the PRE-ERUPTIVE 'S'-ROLE with the performance which is DISPLACED to a later PHASE; while -pag- implies greater directness between the ERUPTIVE 'S'-ROLE and FOCUSED POST-ERUPTIVE 'O'-ROLE. With animate OR HUMAN 'S' and 'O'-PARTICIPANTS, the -pag-Causative is more confrontational than the -pa-Causative. The indirect/direct contrast between -pa- and -pag- may be described in various terms according to the dynamics of specific EVENTS and the PARTICIPANTS involved.

6.1.1 Requesting/Permitting vs. Commanding/Forcing

With HUMAN Causers and Causees, i.e. PARTICIPANTS which are presumed to be capable of speech, the 'directness' differential between -pa- and -pag- may play as a contrast between 'requesting' or 'permitting' (with -pa-) on the one hand and 'commanding' or 'forcing' (with -pag-) on the other.

Note the following:

(14) (a) \[ P= \text{in}=\text{a-} \text{damá ni Roberto si Juan tu bakulúd} \]
\[ PA=\text{IN}=\text{PA-walk UNFOC Roberto FOC Juan UNFOC mountain} \]
'Roberto made Juan walk in the mountains'

(b) \[ P= \text{in}=\text{ad-} \text{damá ni Roberto si Juan tu} \]
\[ PAG=\text{IN}=\text{PAG-walk UNFOC Roberto FOC Juan UNFOC bakulúd mountain} \]
'Roberto made Juan walk in the mountains'
The (a)-sentences, with -pa-, primarily suggest requests initiated by the PRE-ERUPTIVE 'S'-PARTICIPANTS in V__0 position. They may also imply permission granted by the originary PARTICIPANTS. In other words, they allow latitude in identifying the originary agency of the EVENT, which may lie with the PRE-ERUPTIVE or with the DISPLACED ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT. 'Agency' is problematical here. In (14a), I might have asked Rolfo to speak, so that the initiative begins with me, or alternately, I might have permitted him to do so, responding to his initiative. In addition, the -pa-sentences imply a certain efficiency of execution with no hindrances, while the -pag-sentences may involve some inefficiency.
The (b)-sentences, with -paq-, suggest applications of either verbal or physical force so that the ERUPTIVE 'S'-PARTICIPANTS definitely provide the impetus to the actions undertaken by the Causees. With HUMAN PARTICIPANTS in the NUCLEUS, this 'force dynamic' may imply a confrontation, a 'clash of wills' in which the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT prevails through verbal and/or physical means. This understanding follows from speakers' knowledge of human motives and activities as much as from knowledge of grammar. Hence, in (17b), the 'force' can be interpreted in terms of threats or persuasion that I applied to Rolfo to have him speak. This 'force' concomitantly implies 'resistance'; it is not so much a matter of 'force' as a differance in forces. Such 'force'/'resistance' may involve a certain inefficiency which contrasts with the more efficient execution suggested by the DISPLACING -pa-Causative, where force/resistance is not an issue.

The terms of the -pa-/paq- contrast in (14)-(17), as elsewhere, reflect peculiarities or accidents of EVENT content (including the constitution of PARTICIPANTS) as such is configured by the 'Causative' morphology. The latitude that -pa- allows in terms of a 'request' / 'permission' interpretation, in addition to the efficiency implied, is understandable in terms of what we already know about -pa- and its detachment of the 'S'-ROLE from actual performance (cf. Chapter 5).
The 'force'/'resistance' dimension in the (b)-sentences reflects the performance-related MIDDLE orientation of -pag- in addition to the specific semantics of each EVENT in question. The inefficiency of execution is part and parcel of this orientation toward the MIDDLE of the EVENT. The progress of the EVENT is embedded so much in the course of life that it is victim of all life's vicissitudes, experiencing all the effort and failures which that condition brings with it.

Again, it is significant that -pag- does not specify the locus of effort that may inhere in a given EVENT. Effort may arise from either ERUPTIVE or POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANTS. The indifference of -pag- to the source of the effort reflects the relative indifference of the language to ROLE and the direction of flow in EVENTS.

While the HUMANNESS or animacy of at least one of the PARTICIPANTS might be a necessary condition for the 'force'/'resistance' reading of -pag-, it is not sufficient. Some EVENTS, e.g. 'becoming angry', may seem less amenable to 'command' or 'force' interpretations, simply because it is less easy to imagine a scenario in which one person commands another to become angry. Note the following:

(18) (a) P= in=a- patú na yu úlu ku
PA=IN=PA-heat 3SG.UNFOC FOC head 1SG.UNFOC
'S/he made me angry'
(Lit. 'S/he made my head hot')

(b) P= in=ap -patú na yu úlu ku
PAG=IN=PAG-heat 3SG.UNFOC FOC head 1SG.UNFOC
'S/he caused my anger'

Both (18a) and (18b) imply that my anger is a response to
someone else. However, (18a) requires no effort on the part of the 'S'-PARTICIPANT; he or she is simply the occasion for my reaction (cf. the fatal effect of the oblivious John Lennon on the obsessed Mark David Chapman). Sentence (18b) implies that the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT acted as an 'AGENT' who expended some sort of effort to inspire my anger. Shooting my dog or playing music too loudly would qualify. In these circumstances, the contrast between -pa-marked EVENTS and those marked with -pag- suggests such terms as 'ease' versus 'effort'.

All such characterizations assume, of course, that the EVENTS in question provide a context where such variables as 'ease', 'effort', 'permission', 'force', etc. make sense. Minimally, such contexts require sentient or animate animate PARTICIPANTS which are capable of such offers and responses. At least one of these PARTICIPANTS may be NONHUMAN, as in:

(19) (a) \[ P= \text{in=a- akkán ku} \quad \text{yu atú tu kárne} \]
\[ \text{PA=IN=PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog UNFOC meat} \]
'I fed the dog some meat'

(b) \[ P= \text{in=ag- akkán ku} \quad \text{yu atú tu kárne} \]
\[ \text{PAG=IN=PAG-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog UNFOC meat} \]
'I made the dog eat some meat'

(20) (a) \[ P= \text{in=a- lingát nu} \quad \text{patú si Juan} \]
\[ \text{PA=IN=PA-sweat UNFOC heat FOC Juan} \]
'The heat had Juan sweat'

(b) \[ P= \text{in=al- lingát nu} \quad \text{patú si Juan} \]
\[ \text{PAG=IN=PAG-sweat UNFOC heat FOC Juan} \]
'Juan sweated from the heat'

In (19a), I merely provided meat for the dog. In (19b), I forced the dog to eat, perhaps by command, by physically force-feeding, or by starving it beforehand. Since bothe
PARTICIPANTS are animate, a 'command' interpretation is possible. When the 'S'-PARTICIPANT is inanimate, such an interpretation is not necessary and may not be possible (or, at least, plausible). Sentence (20a) suggests simply that the heat provided the occasion for Juan's sweating without implying any particular effort on his part ('No sweat', one might say). Sentence (20b) implies that 'Juan was doing something active' (my consultant's words) to precipitate the sweat; in other words, Juan was assisting the heat through his own effort.

6.1.2 Ease vs. Difficulty/Obstacle

The most common -\textit{pa}-/-\textit{pag}-Causative contrast in my corpus is that of 'ease' vs. 'difficulty'. This contrast is, of course, implicit in the previously illustrated contrasts of 'direct'/ 'indirect, 'permission'/'force', and 'ease'/ 'effort'. The 'ease'/ 'difficulty' contrast may apply regardless of the animacy/inanimacy of the Causee. The following, with HUMAN Causers and Causees, implies all of these contrasts:

(21) (a) \textit{P=} in=\textit{a-} damá ni Roberto tukuni Juan yu bakulúd \\
\textit{PA=}IN=\textit{PA-walk} UNFOC Roberto UNFOC Juan FOC mountain \\
'Roberto made Juan walk in the mountains'

(b) \textit{P=} in=\textit{ad-} damá ni Roberto si Juan \\
\textit{PAG=}IN=\textit{PAG-walk} UNFOC Roberto FOC Juan \\
tu bakulúd \\
UNFOC mountain \\
'Roberto made Juan walk in the mountains'

(22) (a) Ni-\textit{pa-raddám} ni Juan yu balíta \\
NI-\textit{PA-sad} UNFOC Juan FOC news \\
'Juan was saddened by the news'
In (21a), Roberto occasioned Juan's walk over or through the
mountains. No particular difficulty was involved. Sentence
(21b), in contrast, implies that Juan was resistant to
Roberto's suggestion and that Roberto had to coax or prod him
into coöperating; the sentence thus may evoke 'forcing' and
'commanding' (by Roberto) and 'effort' (including Juan's
resistance). Sentence (22a) suggested that the sad news struck
quickly, while (22b) suggests that it required time to soak
in. A certain inefficiency is implied. Both examples are
consistent with a 'difficulty' reading.

Difficulty implies effort. Both (circumstantial)
'difficulty' and (deliberate) 'effort' are involved in the
(b)-sentences that follow:

(23) (a) P= in=a- korólig ku yu bóla
PA=IN-PA-roll 1SG.UNFOC FOC ball
'I rolled the ball'

(b) P= in=ak- korólig ku yu bóla
PAG=IN=PAG-roll 1SG.UNFOC FOC ball
'I rolled the ball'

(24) (a) P= in=a- andár ku yu kótye
PA=IN=PA-start 1SG.UNFOC FOC car
'I started the car'

(b) P= in=ag- andár ku yu kótye
PAG=IN=PAG-start 1SG.UNFOC FOC car
'I started the car'

(25) (a) P= in=a- ittúd ku yu kótye ku
PA=IN=PA-stop 1SG.UNFOC FOC car 1SG.UNFOC
tu Houston
UNFOC Houston
'I stopped the car in Houston'
(b) P= in-ag- ittúd ku yu kótye ku
PAG=IN=PAG-stop 1SG.UNFOC FOC car 1SG.UNFOC
tu Houston
UNFOC Houston
'I stopped the car in Houston'

Sentence (23a) suggests that I rolled the ball with ease; performance was not an issue. Sentence (23b) suggests the involvement of a difficulty of some sort—perhaps an obstacle in the path or the effects of gravity or my injured leg—a difficulty which required extra effort on my part. Similarly, (24a) and (25a) imply ease in starting and stopping the car. Sentences (24b) and (25b), however, suggest a mechanical defect in the car. In (24b), this involves increased effort by me to start it. However, (25b) seems to involve little or no effort since stopping a car is reckoned to be easier than starting one. Instead, I may be forced to stop because of a mechanical defect, an obstacle. The car and I have conflicting impulses. The inanimate and even mechanical nature of yu bóla 'the ball' and yu kótye 'the car' permits understanding of the -pag-marked examples in terms of broader circumstantial difficulties or obstacles. (Recall that the proverbial monkey wrench is a tool that disables.)

The CRUCIAL affix na- marks EVENTS which are realized with less than optimal control. With na-, -pa- seems to imply an EVENT achieved despite the odds; -pag- heightens the perception of difficulty (and, possibly, effort). Note the following:
(26) (a) **Na-pa-pusít ku tukuni Santos yu bagát**
    NA-PA-pick 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC Santos FOC banana
    'I was able to let Santos pick the bananas'

    (b) **Na-pap-pusít ku si Santos**
        NA-PAG-pick 1SG.UNFOC FOC Santos tu bagát
        UNFOC banana
        'I was able to cause Santos to pick the bananas'

(27) (a) **Na-pa-taláw ni Pédro yu anák**
    NA-PA-scare UNFOC Pedro FOC child
    'Pedro was able to scare the child'

(b) **Na-pat-taláw ni Pédro yu anák**
    NA-PAG-scare UNFOC Pedro FOC child
    'Pedro scared the child'

(28) (a) **Na-pa-raddám nu estudyánte yu mústra**
    NA-PA-sad UNFOC student FOC teacher
    'The student was able to sadden the teacher'

(b) **Na-par-raddám nu estudyánte yu mústra**
    NA-PAG-sad UNFOC student FOC teacher
    'The student was able to sadden the teacher'

(29) (a) **Na-pa-réteg ni Juan yu babáy**
    NA-PA-thin UNFOC Juan FOC woman
    'Juan was able to make the woman thin'

(b) **Na-par-réteg ni Juan yu babáy**
    NA-PAG-thin UNFOC Juan FOC woman
    'Juan was able to make the woman thin'

(30) (a) **Na-pa-mémak ku yu ice cream**
    NA-PA-soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC ice cream
    'I was able to soften the ice cream'

(b) **Na-pam-mémak ku yu ice cream**
    NA-PAG-soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC ice cream
    'I was able to soften the ice cream'

(31) (a) **Na-pa-lábat ni Juan yu kafé**
    NA-PA-cool UNFOC Juan FOC coffee
    'Juan was able to make the coffee cold'

(b) **Na-pal-lábat ni Juan yu kafé**
    NA-PAG-cool UNFOC Juan FOC coffee
    'Juan was able to make the coffee cold'
(32) (a) **Na-pa-lábat nu ice yu kafé**
    **NA-PA-cool UNFOC ice FOC coffee**
    'The ice was able to cool the coffee'

(b) **Na-pal-lábat nu ice yu kafé**
    **NA-PAG-cool UNFOC ice FOC coffee**
    'The ice was able to cool the coffee'

Sentence (26a) implies that I managed to have or allow Santos to pick the bananas despite, say, his arthritis. Santos need not have resisted actively. Sentence (26b), on the other hand, suggests a 'force'/'resistance' dynamic; I had to prod Santos into cooperating. In short, -pag- implies some sort of resistance which is to be overcome. Sentences (27b) and (28b) imply a difficulty in provoking fear or sadness which is concomitant with taking extra pains to do so; the victims seem to be resistant, perhaps oblivious, to the more casual approaches implied in the (a)-sentences. Sentence (29a) implies that Juan was relatively uninvolved in making the woman thin; perhaps he merely prescribed a diet. Sentence (29b), on the other hand, implies that he supervised her throughout her reduction, perhaps nagging her or guiding her through exercises. Sentences (30b), (31b), and (32b) suggest difficulty in softening the ice cream and cooling the coffee; perhaps the former is exceedingly cold and the latter exceedingly warm.

The -pa-marked (a)-sentences imply no particular force/resistance dynamic in the accomplishment of the EVENTS in question. The 'S'-ROLE is detached from the performance. The -pag-marked (b)-sentences consistently suggest some
difficulty in execution, a difficulty whose source and nature is not specified. The 'S'-ROLE is directly involved with the FOCUSED 'O'-ROLE, and this direct involvement assumes various guises across EVENTS.

6.1.3 Delegation vs. Assistance

The 'attached'/'detached' contrast just alluded to may play out in terms of 'delegation'/'assistance'. With certain EVENTS, including 'breathing', 'sweating', and 'bleeding', the -pag-marked Causee seems to be receiving assistance from the Causer. Note the following contrast:

(33) (a) P= in=a- angát ku si Juan tu medísina PA=IN=PA-breathe 1SG.UNFOC FOC Juan UNFOC medicine 'I had Juan breathe the medicine'
(b) P= in=ag- angát ku si Juan tu medísina PAG=IN=PAG-breathe 1SG.UNFOC FOC Juan UNFOC medicine 'I made Juan breathe the medicine'

In (33a), I simply ordered Juan to breathe. In (33b), I assisted him in some way, perhaps using a respirator or giving him a tracheotomy. Such 'Assistive' readings of -pag- may occur with other EXHAUSTIVE VOICES, e.g. -an, na-, and =in=:

(34) (a) Pa-angat- án nu si Juan tu medísina PA-breathe-AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC Juan UNFOC medicine 'Have/let Juan breathe the medicine!'
(b) Pag-angat- án nu si Juan tu medísina PAG-breathe-AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC Juan UNFOC medicine 'Make Juan breathe the medicine!'

(35) (a) Na-pa-angát tu dakál yu pasyénte NA-PA-breathe UNFOC big FOC patient 'The patient was caused/allowed to breathe deeply'
(b) Na-pag-angát nu dóktor yu pasyénte NA-PAG-breathe UNFOC doctor FOC patient 'The doctor was able to make the patient breathe'
In (34a) and (35a), the FOCUSED PARTICIPANTS si Juan and yu pasyénte are understood to be coöperative and largely autonomous in the task of breathing. In (34b) and (34b), they seem to be less autonomous and probably physically assisted. In (36a), the doctor seems to have done something trivial, e.g. removing a blindfold or turning on the light, thus allowing Juan to see. Sentence (36b) suggests deeper intervention--more radical means such as performing surgery. In (37a), my wound started to bleed spontaneously, and I merely allowed it to continue, a case of non-interference-as-causation. In (38b), I used an instrument or otherwise exerted special force to occasion the bleeding.

Note that the 'Assistive' readings of -pag- (typical of Kulikov's [1993:131] 'Second Causative') are consonant with the previously discussed notions of 'effort' and 'difficulty' as previously discussed. Note also the following:
(38) (a) \[ P= in=a- tabá ku \text{ } yu \text{ } bábuy \]
\[ PA=IN=PA-fat \text{ } 1SG.UNFOC \text{ } FOC \text{ } pig \]
'I fattened the pig'

(b) \[ P= in=at- tabá ku \text{ } yu \text{ } bábuy \]
\[ PAG=IN=PAAT-fat \text{ } 1SG.UNFOC \text{ } FOC \text{ } pig \]
'I fattened the pig'

(39) (a) \[ P= in=a- lingát nu \text{ } patú si \text{ } Juan \]
\[ PA=IN=PA-sweat \text{ } UNFOC \text{ } heat \text{ } FOC \text{ } Juan \]
'The heat had Juan sweat'

(b) \[ P= in=al- lingát nu \text{ } patú si \text{ } Juan \]
\[ PAG=IN=PAAT-sweat \text{ } UNFOC \text{ } heat \text{ } FOC \text{ } Juan \]
'Juan sweated from the heat'

(40) (a) \[ P= in=a- lábat nu \text{ } babáy \text{ } yu \text{ } kafé \]
\[ PA=IN=PA-cool \text{ } UNFOC \text{ } woman \text{ } FOC \text{ } coffee \]
'The woman cooled the coffee'

(b) \[ P= in=al- lábat nu \text{ } babáy \text{ } yu \text{ } kafé \]
\[ PA=IN=PAAT-cool \text{ } UNFOC \text{ } woman \text{ } FOC \text{ } coffee \]
'The woman cooled the coffee'

(41) (a) \[ P= in=a- talóbu ku \text{ } yu \text{ } bárbas ku \]
\[ PA=IN=PA-grow \text{ } 1SG.UNFOC \text{ } FOC \text{ } beard \text{ } 1SG.UNFOC \]
'I made/let my beard grow'

(b) \[ P= in=at- talóbu ku \text{ } yu \text{ } bárbas ku \]
\[ PAG=IN=PAAT-grow \text{ } 1SG.UNFOC \text{ } FOC \text{ } beard \text{ } 1SG.UNFOC \]
'I let my beard grow'

Sentence (38a) implies that I took no extraordinary measures but allowed the pig to get fat as a matter of course. Sentence (38b) implies specific effort (or assistance or difficulty) directed toward that goal, e.g. giving the pig extra feed. Similarly, (39a) implies that Juan got hot from mere exposure to the heat; (39b), that he 'assisted' the heat by exerting himself in some task or other.

Sentences (40a) and (41a) imply no difficulty; the woman let the coffee cool, and I let my beard grow. The corresponding (b)-sentences imply some difficulty or hindrance
and the concomitant assistance. The coffee might be exceptionally hot and my beard, exceptionally sparse. Both (b)-sentences also imply a need for more time to accomplish the process in question, a sort of 'malingering' which is discussed more fully later. These last examples emphasize that the 'Assistive' readings of -pag-, like the other readings already discussed, are parasitic upon the MIDDLE orientation of -pag-, which ties the ERUPTIVE 'S'-ROLE to a FOCUSED POST-ERUPTIVE ROLE.

6.1.4 Certainty vs. Uncertainty

With CENTRIPETAL EVENTS marked by ma-, -pag- suggests the speaker's doubt or uncertainty that the EVENT can be executed:

(42) (a) Ma-pa-mapí nu dóktor yu pasyénte
MA-PA-good UNFOC doctor FOC patient
( tu medisína)
(UNFOC medicine)
'The doctor can cure the patient (with medicine)'

(b) Ma-pam-mapí nu dóktor yu pasyénte
MA-PAG-good UNFOC doctor FOC patient
'The doctor can cure the patient'

(c) *Ma-mapí nu doktor yu pasyénte
MA-good UNFOC doctor FOC patient

(43) (a) Ma-pa-mémak ku yu ice cream
MA-PA-soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC ice cream
'I can soften the ice cream'

(b) Ma-pam-mémak ku yu ice cream
MA-PAG-soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC ice cream
'I can soften the ice cream'

(c) *Ma-mémak ku yu ice cream
MA-soft 1SG.UNFOC FOC ice cream

(44) (a) Ma-pa-nginá ni Exxon yu présyo nu gasolina
MA-PA-dear UNFOC Exxon FOC price UNFOC gasoline
'Exxon can make the price of gasoline more dear'
(b) **Ma-pang-nginá ni Exxon yu présyo**
**MA-PAG- dear UNFOC Exxon FOC price**
nu gasolína
**UNFOC gasoline**
'Exxon can make the price of gasoline more dear'

(c) **Ma-nginá ni Exxon yu présyo nu gasolína**
**MA-dear UNFOC Exxon FOC price UNFOC gasoline**

(45) (a) **Ma-pa-patú nu afúy yu akkanán**
**MA-PA-hot UNFOC fire FOC food**
'The fire can make the food hot'

(b) **Ma-pap-patú nu afúy yu akkanán**
**MA-PAG-hot UNFOC fire FOC food**
'The fire can make the food hot'

(c) **Ma-patú nu afúy yu akkanán**
**MA-hot UNFOC fire FOC food**

(46) (a) **Ma-pa-dakál ku yu letrátu**
**MA-PA-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC picture**
'I can enlarge the picture'

(b) **Ma-pad-dakál ku yu letrátu**
**MA-PAG-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC picture**
'I can enlarge the picture'

(c) **Ma-dakál ku yu letrátu**
**MA-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC picture**

(47) (a) **Ma-pa-górdu ku yu seméntu**
**MA-PA-rough 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement**
'I can have the cement roughened'

(b) **Ma-pag-górdu ku yu seméntu**
**MA-PAG-rough 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement**
'I can roughen the cement'

(c) **Ma-górdu ku yu seméntu**
**MA-rafted 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement**

(48) (a) **Ma-pa-mémpit ni Juan yu dínding**
**MA-PA-thin UNFOC Juan FOC wall**
'Juan can make the wall thin'

(b) **Ma-pam-mémpit ni Juan yu dínding**
**MA-PAG-thin UNFOC Juan FOC wall**
'Juan can make the wall thin'

(c) **Ma-mémpit ni Juan yu dínding**
**MA-thin UNFOC Juan FOC wall**
In the (a)-examples, -pa- implies situations in which the ability of the 'S'-PARTICIPANTS is not in question; they are assumed to be equal to their appointed tasks. They may also imply mediated EVENTS, e.g. 'I had/let someone soften the ice cream'. The -pag-marked (b)-examples, however, imply doubt on the part of the speaker so that, in my consultant's words, the potential 'needs to be proven'. For example, in (48a), with -pa-, Juan is deemed capable of making the wall thin by, say, scraping it down with a trowel. In (48b) the speaker evinces doubt: Juan's ability has been untested, or the task has otherwise been deemed too daunting.

The rejection of the (c)-sentences reflects the inherently CENTRIFUGAL status of the roots. With CENTRIFUGAL roots such as bibbíd 'read', a mediational Causee is more clearly called for, so that -pa- suggests 'ease' of delegation and -pag-, 'difficulty' (in establishing coöperation) and 'uncertainty' (because of implicit difficulty):

(49) (a) Ma-pa-bibbíd ku si Juan tu líbru
        MA-PA-read 1SG.UNFOC FOC Juan UNFOC book
        'I can make Juan read a book'

        (b) Ma-pa-bibbíd ku si Juan tu líbru
        MA-PA-read 1SG.UNFOC FOC Juan UNFOC book
        'I can make Juan read a book'

Sentence (49a), featuring the CENTRIFUGAL Verb bibbíd 'read' with a -pa-marked Causative marks an EVENT which is 'very certain', in contrast with (49b), with -pag-, which evoked both uncertainty and difficulty (which need not be mutually exclusive) for my consultant. Perhaps Juan is a poor reader,
or maybe the print is badly faded. Hence, -pag- suggests a barrier to 'accomplishment' or a more circuitous route to the matter.

6.1.5 Completeness vs. Persistence

The linguistic selection through -pag- of the MIDDLE may involve a prolongation of or 'malingering' in the process in question. This 'Persistive' sense seems to be especially prominent when -pag- co-occurs with the 'Perfective' =in=, which, in contrast to ma-, is oriented toward completion. In combination with =in= and 'Non-Punctual' or 'Durative' Verbal; roots, -pa- and -pag- seem to differ with regard to ASPECT. While -pa- indicates completeness regarding the state or condition in question, the orientation of -pag- toward 'performance' may suggest noncompleteness or persistence.

Note the following:

(50) (a) P= in=a- lábat nu ice yu kafé
PA=IN=PA-cool UNFOC ice FOC coffee
'The ice cooled the coffee'

(b) P= in=a1- lábat nu ice yu kafé
PAG=IN=PAG-cool UNFOC ice FOC coffee
'The ice cooled/has been cooling the coffee'

(51) (a) P= in=a- taláw ni Philip yu anák
PA=IN=PA-scare UNFOC Philip FOC child
'Philip scared the child'

(b) P= in=a1- taláw ni Philip yu anák
PAG=IN=PAG-scare UNFOC Philip FOC child
'Philip caused the child's fear'

(52) (a) P= in=a- réteg na kán nu flu
PA=IN=PA-thin now 1SG.FOC UNFOC flu
'The flu made me thin'
(b) P= in=ar- réteg ku yu flu
PAG=IN=PAG- thin 1SG.UNFOC FOC flu
'The flu made me thin'
'I was/am sick because of the flu'

(53) (a) P= in=a- tabá na kán nu butter
PA=IN=PA-fat now 1SG.FOC UNFOC butter
'Butter made me fat'

(b) P= in=at- tabá ku yu butter
PAG=IN=PAG-fat 1SG.UNFOC FOC butter
'Butter caused me to be fat(ter)'

(54) (a) P= in=a- takít nu patú nu igáw yu trabajadór
PA=IN=PA-sick UNFOC heat UNFOC sun FOC worker
'The heat of the sun made the worker sick'

(b) P= in=at- takít nu patú nu igáw
PAG=IN=PAG-sick UNFOC heat UNFOC sun
yu trabajadór
FOC worker
'The heat of the sun made the worker sick'
'The worker got sick because of the heat of the sun'

(55) (a) P= in=agawagawayán nu anák yu méstru
PA=IN=PAG-happy UNFOC child FOC teacher
'The child made the teacher happy'

(b) P= in=ag- gawagawayán nu anák yu méstru
PAG=IN=PAG-happy UNFOC child FOC teacher
'The child made the teacher happy'
'The child was happy because of the child'

(56) (a) P= in=a- mégat ku yu seméntu
PA=IN=PAG-hard 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement
'I hardened the cement'
'I had the cement hardened'

(b) P= in=am- mégat ku yu seméntu
PAG=IN=PAG-hard 1SG.UNFOC FOC cement
'I let the cement harden'

In contrast to the (a)-examples, with -pa-, the -pag-marked (b)-examples imply the persistence of the condition named. Sentence (50a) implies that the coffee has, at the time of speaking, already completely cooled; it may, in fact, have been consumed. In (50b), with -pag-, the cooling process is
still underway; the sentence emphasizes that it is the ice (as opposed to something else) which is responsible for the cooling. Similarly, (51b) implies that the child is still scared; Philip is named as the cause of that fear. In (52b) and (53b), I am still sick and still eating butter, respectively; furthermore, the flu and my butter-eating are the featured causes of my illness and obesity. Similarly, in (54b) the heat explains why the worker is sick; and in (55b), the child is posited as the cause of the teacher's happiness.

The contrast of (56) provides an informative departure from our expectations. Sentence (56a) implies that I made the cement hard in the preparation process, by mixing it to a certain grade. My participation in the initial phase allowed me to distance myself from the subsequent process of hardening. In (56b), I need not have done anything 'active' to assist the hardening but may simply have been forced to wait for the process to complete itself. Thus, as suggested earlier, the 'directness' of -pag-marked participation does not essentially imply 'effort' or 'assistance'; -pag- in itself does not specify the nature of the involvement of the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT in the EVENT. In addition, (56) reminds us again that the terms of any given linguistic contrast are not predictable.

In sum, the (b)-sentences of (50)-(56) above are best understood as explanations of the underlying causes of EVENTS that are known or recognized, given by the context of
situation. (Note the 'because'-laden English glosses.) There is, in other words, a direct link between cause and effect. The sense of persistence reflects the pragmatic factor that the -pag-marked sentences are likely offerings to questions about current conditions (e.g. fatness, sickness etc.). The impingement of this (MIDDLE) VOICE upon ASPECT is not surprising in view of the formal conflation of these two variables in the VOICE/ASPECT affixes.

6.2.0 The Semantic Range of -pag- in Performance

The characterization of -pag- in such terms as 'directness', 'force', 'difficulty', 'assistance', 'uncertainty', and 'persistence' follows from the comparison of -pa- and -pag- qua 'Causative' markers. There is nothing sacred about the terms used to explain these contrasts. These divisions are somewhat arbitrary and reflect the native consultant's responses to the data; other divisions or conflations might be chosen. None of the presented meanings is simply 'present' in the morphology; each reflects contextual factors, including that of comparison with -pa-.

For the purposes of thematic continuity, I have thus far discussed -pag- mainly as a 'Second Causative'. However, such an understanding is both impoverished and misleading since -pag- is complicit in a number of functions which are related yet which seem quite distinct from the vantage point of English. I have no authority to claim priority for any one of these functions. I merely note that, like -pa-, -pag- is only
incidentally a 'Causative' morpheme.

The MIDDLE semantics of -pag- plays out in ways that need not imply a 'Causee'. Among the effects of -pag- are 'Causee' ('EXECUTOR', 'INSTRUMENT'), 'way', 'process', 'manner', 'means', 'site', 'utensil', and 'proxy'.

6.2.1 EXECUTOR, INSTRUMENT, Means

All -pag-marked Causative sentences examples cited in 6.1 have their FOCUS on the Causee. This consistency is significant to our understanding of the semantics of this morpheme. If -pa- indicates a detachment from the EVENT termini, -pag- indicates an attachment to the MIDDLE ground. Recall the preference of -pag- for 'INSTRUMENT'-like PARTICIPANTS:

(57) (a) Pap-pínta ku yu brush
        PAG-paint 1SG.UNFOC FOC brush
        'I'll paint with the brush'

        (b) *Pap-pínta ku yu dínding
            PAG-paint 1SG.UNFOC FOC wall

(58) (a) Pat-tullú ku yu jack tu kótye
        PAG-raise 1SG.UNFOC FOC jack UNFOC car
        'I'll use the jack to raise the car'

        (b) *Pat-tullú ku yu kótye
            PAG-raise 1SG.UNFOC FOC car

(59) (a) Pag-inúm ni Maria yu dilá na
        PAG-drink UNFOC Maria FOC tongue 3SG.UNFOC
tu danúm
        UNFOC water
        'Maria will drink water with her tongue'

        (b) *Pag-inúm ni Maria yu danúm
            PAG-drink UNFOC Maria FOC water

(60) (a) Pas-supílyu ku yu supílyu
        PAG-brush 1SG.UNFOC FOC toothbrush
        'I'll brush with the toothbrush'
(b) *Pas-supílyu ku yu ngípan
   PAG-toothbrush 1SG.UNFOC FOC tooth

(61) (a) Pat-taláw ku yu danúm tu anák
   PAG-scare 1SG.UNFOC FOC water UNFOC child
   'I'll use the water to scare a child'

(b) *Pat-taláw ku yu anák tu danúm
   PAG-frighten 1SG.UNFOC FOC child UNFOC water

(62) (a) Pat-tatáw nu dóktor yu stéthoscope tu takít
   PAG-know UNFOC doctor FOC stethoscope UNFOC illness
   'The doctor will use the stethoscope to know the illness'

(b) *Pat-tatáw nu dóktor yu takít
   PAG-know UNFOC doctor FOC illness

(63) (a) Pat-lasáng ku yu pínta tu lamésa
   PAG-red 1SG.UNFOC FOC paint UNFOC table
   'I'll use the paint to make the table red'

(b) *Pat-lasáng ku yu lamésa
   PAG-red 1SG.UNFOC FOC table

(64) (a) Pat-bántay ku yu atú tu kótye
   PAG-watch 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog UNFOC car
   'I'll use the dog to watch a car'

(b) *Pat-bántay ku yu kótye
   PAG-watch 1SG.UNFOC FOC car

Here, *-pag-* focusses MIDDLE PARTICIPANTS, including both inanimate 'INSTRUMENTS', e.g. yu pínta in (63a); or animate 'EXECUTORS', e.g. yu atú in (64a), but not EXHAUSTIVE ones.

Such 'EXECUTIVE'/'INSTRUMENTAL' readings are also possible with CENTRIPETAL roots bearing a combination of *-pag-* and *-pa-:

(65) Pap-pa-bágu ku yu pínta tu binaláy
   PAG-PA-new 1SG.UNFOC FOC paint UNFOC house
   'I'll have the house made new with paint'

In (65), yu pínta is focussed as the 'INSTRUMENT' whereby the house will be renovated. While *-pag-* highlights the MIDDLE,
the site of performance, -pa- indicates a DISPLACEMENT from
the ERUPTION. This DISPLACEMENT may be understood as the
delegation of the job, or it may imply that the paint is one
of several aspects of the renovation, which occurs in stages.
Without -pag-, -pa- focusses yu binaláy as the object of a
(meditated but otherwise unspecified) renovation:

(66) (a) Pa-bágu ku yu binaláy
PA-new 1SG.UNFOC FOC house
'I'll have the house remodeled'

(b) *Pa-bágu ku yu pínta
PA-new 1SG.UNFOC FOC paint

In the following, sans -pa-, the paint is the sole unmediated
means of renovation, directly applied:

(67) Pab-bágu ku yu pínta tu binaláy
PAG-new 1SG.UNFOC FOC paint UNFOC house
'I'll use the paint to renovate a house'

Our initial emphasis on the 'EXECUTIVE' effects of -pag-
might imply that -pag- is fundamentally concerned with
focussing EXECUTIVE/INSTRUMENTAL PARTICIPANTS, i.e. 'Causees'.
Such an emphasis on 'things' is more reflective of the
reocentric bias of the discipline of linguistics than it is of
the Yogad language.

A given morphosyntactic configuration may mark either
'things' or 'processes'. Consider the following:

(68) Pap-patú ni Roberto yu afúy (tu danúm)
PAG-heat UNFOC Roberto FOC fire (UNFOC water)
'Roberto will use the fire to get hot/(heat water)'

Here, -pag- seems to focus yu afúy 'the fire' as an
'INSTRUMENT', an extension of a prior object. This pointing-
toward-things is one potentiality of the language, but it is
hardly essential. Rather, reo-indication reflects a certain combination of language and context. Sentence (68) is cut to the same morphosyntactic pattern as the following, where -pag- and yu do not focus a 'thing':

(69) Pap-patú ni Roberto yu uminúm tu binaráyan
PAG-heat UNFOC Roberto FOC drink UNFOC wine
'Roberto will get hot by (the drinking of) wine'
*'Roberto will heat the wine/use the wine to heat (something)'

Here, -pag- and yu select the Phrase uminúm tu binaráyan 'drinking of wine'--as a PARTICULAR EVENT. If this Phrase frames an EVENT as a PARTICULAR--a 'thing'--then this 'thing' is one constituted by language. Language does not re-present. Recall our discussion of the creative aspect of FOCUS in 2.1.2 and 4.1.2. A reocentric 'INSTRUMENTAL' or 'EXECUTIVE' reading is but one possible application of -pag- and yu, but a meaning which is particularly salient to linguists, due largely to its ready susceptibility to visualization.

More generally, -pag- focusses 'ways' or 'means' of accomplishing EVENTS.¹ Note the following:

---

¹With some vowel-initial roots, -pag- may have a limited contrast with -pang-. The latter form more consistently invokes the extension of an action beyond the point of origin, a more extensive immersion in process, often evoking 'purpose' or 'manner' rather than 'way' or 'means'; hence, Paqúsip ku yu garsíb tu bok ku 'I'll use scissors to cut my hair' but Pángúsip ku yu garsíb tu bok na 'I'll use scissors to cut his hair'; Pagànggám ku yu pattúrak 'I'll use writing for courting' but Pánganggám ku yu mapi ya pángngu-pángngu 'I'll use good deeds for courting' (Philip W. Davis, personal communication). Cf. also Appendix C.
(70) Mapí yu p= in=ab- burásí nu yéna na
good FOC PAG=IN=PAG-dress UNFOC mother 3SG.UNFOC
tu anák
UNFOC child
'The way his/her mother dresses the child is good'

(71) Yú pad-damá ni Juan ay káttu babáy
FOC PAG-walk UNFOC Juan AY like woman
'Juan walks like a woman'
('The walking of Juan is woman-like')

(72) Mapí yu pad-damá ni Juan
good FOC PAG-walk UNFOC Juan
'Juan is walking well'
'The way Juan walks is good'

(73) Pad-damá ni Juan ay mapí
PAG-walk UNFOC Juan AY good
'John is walking well'
('The walking of Juan is good')

(74) Yú pap-pusít ni Santos tu lappáw ay gársib
FOC PAG-pick UNFOC Santos FOC flower AY saw
'The way Santos picks flowers is with a saw'

(75) Yú pat-tántam ku tu àkkanán ay dilá
FOC PAG-taste 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC food AY tongue
ku
1SG.UNFOC
'The way I tasted the food is with my tongue'

(76) Yú pap-pa-talóbu ku tu lappáw ay
FOC PAG-PA-grow 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC flower AY
abóno
fertilizer
'What I use to grow flowers is fertilizer'

(77) Yú p= in=ap- pa-dakál ku tu kúku
FOC PAG=IN=PAG-PA-big 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC wealth
ku ay pag-gàtagatáng
1SG.UNFOC AY PAG-investment
'The way I had/let my personal possessions
increase/be increased was investments'

(78) Pab-báiyu nu tu básu yu pab-búbbu
PAG-empty 2SG.UNFOC UNFOC glass FOC PAG-pour
tu nágyan
UNFOC contents
'Empty the glass by pouring out its contents'

In (70), -pág- invokes the act of dressing; in (71)-(73),
various manners of walking; in (74)-(75), various means of accomplishing various other tasks, including picking flowers, and tasting food. Note that (77) and (78) have two instances of -pag- apiece, each of which invokes processes or performances.

There is otherwise no morphosyntactic distinction between the process-oriented 'means'/procedure' and the thing-oriented 'EXECUTOR'/INSTRUMENT'/Causee'; these various meanings are local results of the combination of -pag- with other semantics which intervene in the intermingling of physical bodies.

This MIDDLE orientation of -pag- may imply a persistence or lingering in process, as we have already observed in 6.1.5. Such is also the case with the following contrast:

(79) (a) P= in=a- raddám nu balíta yu táwlay
PA=IN=PA-sad UNFOC news FOC person
'The news made the people feel sad'

(b) P= in=ap- pa-raddám nu balíta yu táwlay
PAG=IN=PAG-PA-sad UNFOC news FOC person
'The news caused the people's sadness'

In (79), -pa- effects a DISPLACEMENT of sadness from the ERUPTIVE to a POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT. In (79b), -pag- emphasizes the 'soaking in' process of the saddening news. In (79a), without -pag-, the news strikes quickly, causing an instantaneous effect.

In combination with other EXHAUSTIVE VOICE affixes such as na- or =in=, -pag- can focus PARTICIPANTS which English encourages us to regard as 'PATIENTS' rather than
'INSTRUMENTS'. However, even these require the acknowledgment of the means/procedure of accomplishment. Note the following:

(80) Na-pab-batták ku yu binaláy;
    NA-PAG-explode 1SG.UNFOC FOC house
    nangyúsa kán tu dinamita
    used 1SG.FOC UNFOC dynamite
'I blew up the house, using [I used] the dynamite'

(81) Na-pag-angát nu dóktor yu pasyénte,
    NA-PAG-breathe UNFOC doctor FOC patient
    nangyúsa tu respirator
    used UNFOC respirator
'The doctor was able to make the patient breathe, using [s/he used] a respirator'

(82) Na-pag-andár ku yu kótye; nangyúsa kán
    NA-PAG-start 1SG.UNFOC FOC car used 1SG.FOC
tu manikėta
    UNFOC crank
'I started the car, using [I used] a crank'

(83) P= in-ag- andár ku tu kótye yúsan yu
    PAG=IN=PAG-start 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC car use FOC
    alláddu
    key
'I had the car started using the key'

The forms yúsa, nangyúsa, and yúsan may be glossed as 'using' or 's/he used'. Sentences (80)-(83) feel 'incomplete' to my consultant if these 'using' forms are absent. Although they lack INSTRUMENTS (i.e. PARTICIPANTS as we normally understand them), they do indicate means or procedures whereby the respective EVENTS have been realized.

The indifference of -pag- to the PARTICIPANT/EVENT status of its FCCUS is a further indication of the derivative nature of PARTICIPANTS as such. That is, PARTICIPANTS are PARTICIPANTS only insofar as they 'take part' in EVENTS. The grammar does not observe a 'hard-wired' distinction between 'thing' and 'process', 'Noun' and 'Verb'. 
6.2.2 Site, Utensil

As a MIDDLE VOICE affix, -pag- may, as we have seen, suggest the mediation of a PARTICIPANT in effecting some end. In combination with the EXHAUSTIVE LIMIT suffix -an, -pag- forms a productive circumfix which focusses metonyms of the actions indicated. These metonyms may be either mediational PARTICIPANTS (i.e. 'EXECUTORS'/ 'INSTRUMENTS') or LOCATIONS where an EVENT unfolds. Note the following:

(84) (a) pal-láku
PAG-sell
'what one uses to sell; advertisement'

(b) pal-lákw-an
PAG-sell-AN
'where one sells; market'

In both (84a) and (84b), -pag- indicates a PARTICIPANT involved in the performance of a given EVENT, i.e. 'selling'.

The MIDDLE semantics of -pag- is consonant with a notion of 'purpose', since purpose implies a now-to-then trajectory. More specifically, -pag- implies a purpose that is adherent or imposed 'from without' in contrast to, e.g. ag-, which implies a purpose which arises spontaneously from a given situation, as seen in the following contrast between -pag-...-an and ag-...-an:

(85) (a) Pal-lákw-an ku tu ikán yu palénke
PAG-sell-AN 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC fish FOC market
'I'll sell fish in the market'

(b) Al-lákw-an ku tu ikán yu palénke
AG-sell-AN 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC fish FOC market
'I sell fish in the market'

Here, the -pag-marked Verb clearly focusses the market as a
restricted, 'usual' site for selling fish, while -ag- indicates an action that is less planned and more habitual, recurrent, or ill defined, i.e. DIFFUSE. When these circumfixed roots name PARTICIPANTS, the -pag-marked Nominal indicates a more restricted site of the playing-out of the EVENT, whose restrictedness is imposed from without. The PARTICIPANTS are understood as either 'INSTRUMENTS' ('utensils') or pre-designated 'LOCATIONS':

(86) (a) pag-gákw-an
        PAG-cook-AN
        'cooking utensil'

        (b) ag-gákw-an
        AG-cook-AN
        'usual site for cooking; kitchen'

(87) (a) pap-pátw-an
        PAG-heat-AN
        'heating pan'

        (b) ap-pátw-an
        AG-heat-AN
        'usual place or utensil used to heat something'

(88) (a) pab-básúr-an
        PAG-trash-AN
        'designated place for trash; trash bag or garbage can'

        (b) ab-básúr-an
        AG-trash-AN
        'where trash usually goes; landfill'

(89) (a) pap-patáy-an
        PAG-kill- AN
        'slaughterhouse'

        (b) ap-patáy-an
        AG-kill-AN
        'where slaughter happens; killing fields'

(90) (a) pak-kann- án
        PAG-shoot-AN
        'place for shooting; target range'
(b) ak-kann-án
AG-shoot-AN
'where shooting occurs; killing field'

(91) (a) pag-gatang-án
PAG-buy-AN
'place for buying; money counter'

(b) ag-gatang-án
AG-buy-AN
'usual place for buying; store; crackhouse'

The (a)-examples in (86)-(91), marked with -pag-, consistently indicate sites or utensils for actions that have been predesignated for the action or process indicated. In other words, -pag- ties the action or process to a prior influence. In contrast, ag-, in the (b)-examples, indicates sites or nonce utensils for actions that emerge spontaneously in the performance of the EVENT, from the 'internal' dynamics of the EVENT. The MIDDLE hearkens back to the ERUPTION, i.e. to a beginning to which it is attached and to which, in certain cases, it may seem to respond.

6.2.3 Proxy

Although -pag- (unlike -pa-) preserves the ERUPTIVE/POST-ERUPTIVE alignment of the 'S'- and 'O'-ROLES, it does not prescribe dynamics. We noted earlier that -pag- is indifferent to the direction of influence (i.e. to dynamics) and that influence may in some EVENTS flow from the POST-ERUPTIVE to the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT, as in:

(92) Pap-patú nu danúm yu afúy
PAG-heat UNFOC water FOC fire
'The water will get hot due to the fire'

This instance reminds us that -pag- is primarily concerned
with relations.

This emphasis on relations is emphasized by the behavior of -pag- with HUMAN PARTICIPANTS. In the absence of other VOICES, -pag- may focus a POST-ERUPTIVE HUMAN PARTICIPANT as an 'INERT' occasion for the performance of the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT. The ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT serves as a 'Proxy' for the FOCUSSED PARTICIPANT, performing in its place. If the -pag-FOCUSSED PARTICIPANT is inanimate, it serves as an 'INSTRUMENT' in the now-familiar pattern. Compare the following:

(93) (a) Pad-dánnag ku yu méstru tu túrak
     PAG-drop 1SG.UNFOC FOC teacher UNFOC letter
     'I'll drop off/mail a letter for the teacher'
     (*'I'll have the teacher drop off a letter')

(b) Pad-dánnag ku yu kótye ku
     PAG-drop 1SG.UNFOC FOC car 1SG.UNFOC
     tu túrak
     UNFOC letter
     'I'll use my car to mail a letter'

(94) (a) Pag-gatáng ku si Philip tu líbru
     PAG-buy 1SG.UNFOC FOC Philip UNFOC book
     'I'll buy books for Philip'
     (*'I'll use Philip to buy books')

(b) Pag-gatáng ku yu kwártu tu líbru
     PAG-buy 1SG.UNFOC FOC money UNFOC book
     'I'll use the money to buy a book'

(95) (a) Pap-pínta ni Juan si Pedro tu letrátu
     PAG-paint UNFOC Juan FOC Pedro UNFOC picture
     'Juan will paint a picture for Pedro'
     (*'Juan will make Pedro paint a picture')

(b) Pap-pínta ni Juan yu brótya tu letrátu
     PAG-paint UNFOC Juan FOC brush UNFOC picture
     'Juan will use the brush to paint a picture'
(96) (a) Pad-dámá ni Roberto si José tu bakulúd PAG-walk UNFOC Roberto FOC José UNFOC mountain 'Roberto will walk a mountain for José' (*'Roberto will make Jose walk a mountain')

(b) Pad-dámá ni Roberto yu sapátos ku PAG-walk UNFOC Roberto FOC shoe 1SG.UNFOC tu bakulúd UNFOC mountain 'Roberto will use my shoes to walk a mountain'

(97) (a) Pag-gíta ku yu babáy tu binaláy PAG-see 1SG.UNFOC FOC woman UNFOC house 'I'll look for/find a house for the woman' (*'I'll make the woman find a house')

(b) Pag-gíta ku yu antyóhos ku PAG-see 1SG.UNFOC FOC glasses 1SG.UNFOC tu binaláy UNFOC house 'I'll use my glasses to see a house'

(98) (a) Pas-sissím ku yu méstru tu músaka PAG-hear 1SG.UNFOC FOC teacher UNFOC music 'I heard music for the teacher' (*'I had the teacher hear music')

(b) Pas-sissím ku yu rádyo tu músaka PAG-hear 1SG.UNFOC FOC radio UNFOC music 'I'll use the radio to hear some music'

(99) (a) Pag-addyá ku si Roberto tu atú PAG-south 1SG.UNFOC FOC Roberto UNFOC dog 'I'll bring a dog south for Roberto' (*'I'll have Roberto bring a dog south')

(b) Pag-addyá ku yu abáng PAG-south 1SG.UNFOC FOC boat 'I'll use the boat to go south'

(100) (a) Pap-pa-dákál ku yu méstru PAG-PA-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC teacher tu kúku na UNFOC wealth 3SG.UNFOC 'I will have his/her wealth increase for the teacher' (*'I'll have the teacher increase his/her wealth')
In the English glosses of the (a)-sentences, for is to be understood in the sense of 'in the stead of', 'in lieu of', implying a 'replacement'. The ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT serves as a 'Proxy' for the FOCUSED POST-ERUPTIVE one, performing in his/her stead. For example, in (101a), Philip assumes Pat's designated place in the kitchen. Such a 'Proxy' reading reflects the animacy/HUMANNESS of the FOCUSED PARTICIPANT; as the (b)-sentences imply, only 'Causative' readings make sense.2

Any 'BENEFACTIVE' reading is derivative. In most readily imagined circumstances, a Proxy's performance is likely to entail a 'benefit' for the replacee. The 'replacement' semantics makes it difficult to envisage scenarios for EVENTS where such substitutions are unlikely, e.g.:

Note that the English for is, like -pag-, polysemous in suggesting 'replacement' (I'll swap my onion for your cake), as well as 'purpose' consistent with 'INSTRUMENT' (What's this thing for?; The food's for eating) and with 'BENEFACTEE' (with animate/individualized PARTICIPANTS, cf. This is for my wife).
(102) (a) *Pag-angát ku yu méstru
   PAG-bathe 1SG.UNFOC FOC teacher
   ('I'll breathe in place of the teacher?')

   (b) Pag-angát ku yu labí ku
       PAG-bathe 1SG.FOC FOC mouth 1SG.UNFOC
       'I'll use my mouth to breathe'

The asterisk before (102a) attests not to ungrammaticality per
se but to my consultant's understandable difficulty in
imagining a scenario where one could be said to breathe in the
place of someone else (a breathing drill?).

For a -pag-FOCUSSED HUMAN PARTICIPANT to be read as a
'Causee' in an Irrealis Clause, it must be distanced from the
MIDDLE with the LIMIT affix -an, as in:

(103) (a) Pad-digút ku si Maria
       PAG-bathe 1SG.UNFOC FOC Maria
       'I'll bathe for/in lieu of Maria'

   (b) Pad-digut-án ku si Maria
       PAG-bathe-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC Maria
       'I'll make Maria bathe'

cf. (c) Pad-digut-án ku yu bathroom
       PAG-bathe-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC bathroom
       'I'll bathe in the bathroom'

(104) (a) Pab-bibbíd nu si Juan tu líbru
       PAG-read 2SG.UNFOC FOC Juan UNFOC book
       'You'll read a book for/instead of Juan'

   (b) Pab-bibbid-án nu si Juan tu líbru
       PAG-read- AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC Juan UNFOC book
       'You'll make Juan read a book'

cf. (c) Pab-bibbid-án nu yu library tu líbru
       PAG-read- AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC library UNFOC book
       'You'll read books at the library'

(105) (a) Par-raddám ku yu estudyánte
       PAG-sad 1SG.UNFOC FOC student
       'I'll get sad for/instead of the student'
(b) Par-raddam-án ku yu estudyánnte
PAG-sad- AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC student
'I'll make the student sad'

cf. (c) Par-raddam-án ku yu funeral
PAG-sad- AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC funeral
'I'll get sad at the funeral'

As the 'Locative' readings of the (c)-sentences suggest, the pag-...-an circumfix focusses a PARTICULAR marking the site where the performance occurs.

Both 'Causative' and 'Proxy' readings of -pag- involve 'replacement' or 'in lieu of' semantics which play out in the performance-oriented MIDDLE of EVENTS. These readings differ according to which NUCLEAR PARTICIPANT has greater relative 'MOTILITY' to 'perform' the EVENT named. The FOCUSED POST-ERUPTIVE ROLE performs in the 'Causative' and the ERUPTIVE ROLE in the 'Proxy' readings. The conflation of these two potential readings reflects the relational (ERUPTIVE-TO-MIDDLE) as opposed to the dynamic ('MOTILE'-TO-'INERT') emphasis of -pag- and of the language as a whole. In both 'Causative' and 'Proxy' readings, the ERUPTIVE/POST-ERUPTIVE alignments in the NUCLEUS remain constant, with the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT taking the initiative, regardless of which PARTICIPANT performs.

The PERSISIVE affix =in= brings PARTICIPANTS together in a number of ways already discussed (cf. 4.1.4). Unlike -pag-, =in= is decidedly 'Perfective'; any EVENT dynamics are regarded from the perspective of their accomplishment. When -pag- co-occurs with =in=, the EVENT is not only 'Perfective',
but, with pinag-FOCUSSED HUMAN PARTICIPANTS, it is potentially 'ambiguous', uniquely allowing both 'Causative' and 'Proxy' readings with FOCUSSED HUMAN PARTICIPANTS:

(106) P= in=ad- dánnag ku yu méstru tu túrak PAG=IN=PAG-drop 1SG.UNFOC FOC teacher UNFOC letter 'I mailed a letter for the teacher' 'I had the teacher mail a letter'

(107) P= in=ag- gátáng ku si Philip tu líbru PAG=IN=PAG-buy 1SG.UNFOC FOC Philip UNFOC book 'I bought books for Philip' 'I made Philip buy books'

(108) P= in=ap- pínta ni Juan si Pedro tu letrátu PAG=IN=PAG-paint UNFOC Juan FOC Pedro UNFOC picture 'Juan painted a picture for Pedro' 'Juan made Pedro paint a picture'

(109) P= in=ag- gáku ni Philip si Pat tu adóbo PAG=IN=PAG-cook UNFOC Philip FOC Pat UNFOC adobo 'Philip cooked adobo for Pat' 'Philip made Pat cook adobo'

(110) P= in=ad- dáma ni Roberto si José tu PAG=IN=PAG-walk UNFOC Roberto FOC José UNFOC mountain 'Roberto walked a mountain for José' 'Roberto made José walk a mountain'

(111) P= in=ag- gíta ku si Juan tu binaláy PAG=IN=PAG-see 1SG.UNFOC FOC Juan UNFOC house 'I looked for/found a house for Juan' 'I made Juan see a house'

(112) P= in=as- sissím ku yu méstru tu músika PAG=IN=PAG-hear 1SG.UNFOC FOC teacher UNFOC music 'I heard some music for the teacher' 'I had the teacher hear some music'

(113) P= in=ap- pa-dakál ku yu méstru PAG=IN=PAG-PA-big 1SG.UNFOC FOC teacher tu kúku na UNFOC wealth 3SG.UNFOC 'I had his/her wealth increase(d) for the teacher' 'I had the teacher increase his/her wealth'

As indicated by the English glosses, the combination of -pag-
with \( =\text{in}= \) permits FOCUSSED HUMAN PARTICIPANTS to have two readings (barring other contextual constraints). That is, with FOCUSSED HUMAN PARTICIPANTS, \( =\text{in}= \) uniquely allows two readings of \(-\text{pag}-\), suggesting an indifference to which NUCLEAR PARTICIPANT is performing. The PERVERSIVENESS of \( =\text{in}= \) neutralizes 'direction', which may go either way, or no way, as we observe in the following instance (cf. Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 5):

\[
(114) \quad T= \text{in-úppak} \ yu \ \text{arinóla} \\
\quad \text{spit=IN=spit} \ \text{FOC bedpan} \\
\quad \text{'There's plenty of spit in the bedpan'}
\]

The indifference of the PERVERSIVE \( =\text{in}= \) to direction of flow recalls the observation that, when total entropy is achieved within a system, linear time becomes irrelevant.

In combination with all other EXHAUSTIVE VOICES, \(-\text{pag}-\) has only 'Causative' readings, no 'Proxy' ones. That is, \( \text{na-}, \ \text{ma-}, \) and \( \text{-an} \), as illustrated in various places above, effect a 'pull' toward the coda of the EVENT. With the other MIDDLE VOICE \( i-\), \(-\text{pag}-\) may contrast and combine in ways that accentuate divergences from a direct trajectory of accomplishment, as discussed in 6.2.4.

6.2.4 Adherent vs. Inherent Cause

Both \(-\text{pag}-\) and \( i-\) orient attention toward the MIDDLE PHASE of performance. But \(-\text{pag}-\) marks a greater degree of divergence from the direct trajectory of accomplishment than \( i-\). While \(-\text{pag}-\) marks the involvement of a PARTICIPANT that is adherent or external to the locus of ERUPTION, \( i-\) marks a
PARTICIPANT that is inherent in, or internal to, the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT. Note the following 'Mediopassive' sentences, wherein the FOCUSED PARTICIPANTS serve as 'grounds', 'occasions', or 'underlying causes' for the ERUPTION of their respective EVENTS:

(115) (a) Pab-bakká nu bintána yu malábat
    PAG-shatter UNFOC window FOC cold
    'The window will break because of the cold'

(b) I-bakká nu bintána yu marál
    I-shatter UNFOC window FOC bad
    ya pak-ka-trabáho
    LINK PAG-KA-work
    'The window will break through its bad manufacture'

(116) (a) Pab-bungá nu kayú yu pang-iýúsa
    PAG-fruitful UNFOC tree FOC PAG- use
tu abóno
    UNFOC fertilizer
    'The tree is bountiful because of the use of fertilizer'

(b) I-bungá nu kayú yu frútas
    I-fruitful UNFOC tree FOC fruit
    'The tree is bountiful through its fruit'

Here, each nu-marked PARTICIPANT is the ERUPTIVE locus for each EVENT. The yu-marked PARTICIPANTS focussed by -pag- and í- are the ground, occasion, or underlying cause of each ERUPTION. Thus, in (115a), the cold which shatters the window does not emanate from the window but from an external source. In sentence (115b), however, í- focusses the inherently poor workmanship of the window as the cause; the window harbours the seeds of its own destruction. In (116a), the -pag-FOCUSED abóno 'fertilizer' is the externally intruding occasion for the fruitfulness of the tree. The implication is that the tree would not be bountiful without the fertilizer. In (116b) the
FOCUS falls on the frútas 'fruit' as the manifestation of the inherently bountiful nature of the tree; the tree is naturally fruitful.

The adherent/inherent contrast may also appear in terms of an ASPECTUAL contrast between EVENTS that are prospective and those that are currently underway or in progress:

(117) (a) Pat-takít ku yu siffún
PAG-ill 1SG.UNFOC FOC cold
'I'll get ill with a cold'

(b) I-takít ku yu siffún
I-ill 1SG.UNFOC FOC cold
'I'm getting ill from a cold'

(118) (a) Pad-dakál nu mulá yu urán
PAG-big UNFOC plant FOC rain
'The plant will get big with rain'

(b) I-dakál nu mulá yu urán
I-big UNFOC plant FOC rain
'The plant will get big with rain'

(119) (a) Pas-sipílyu ku yu supílyu tu ngípan
PAG-brush 1SG.UNFOC FOC toothbrush UNFOC tooth
'I'm going to use the toothbrush to brush my teeth'

(b) I-sipílyu ku yu supílyu tu ngípan
I-brush 1SG.UNFOC FOC toothbrush UNFOC tooth
'I'm going to use the toothbrush to brush my teeth'

(120) (a) Pag-gatáng ku yu kwártu ku tu
PAG-buy 1SG.UNFOC FOC money 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC
 tu burási
UNFOC dress
'I'll use the money to buy a dress'

(b) I-gatáng ku yu kwártu ku tu burási
I-buy 1SG.UNFOC FOC money 1SG.UNFOC UNFOC dress
'I'll use the money to buy a dress'

Sentence (117a), with -pag-, implies a prospective occurrence, one that may or may not actually be realized. It may, for instance, express an objection to leaving on ceiling fan
during a gusty rainstorm. The sif\text{\`u}n 'cold' is not yet part of me. Sentence (117b), with i-, suggests an occurrence that is already underway. The illness lies in potentia within me and is indeed currently emerging. Similarly, (118a) implies that the plant needs rain, which may or may not be forthcoming. In any case, rain must be added for the growing to occur. Sentence (118b) may imply that the rain has already come and the consequential growing now in progress. An alternative reading of (118b) is that the rain is incidental or superfluous to the growing of the plant; the plant is self-sufficient and may simply not require more rain. In the (a)-examples of (119)-(120), marked with -pag-, the toothbrush and the money are not yet in hand; in the i-marked (b)-examples, these 'INSTRUMENTS' are already in hand and in the process of deployment. The MIDDLE VOICE i- operates at a point beyond intention and motivation, as when the trigger of a gun pulls the finger of the gun fetishist in a moment of homicidal abandon. Again, i- is closer to the direct trajectory of accomplishment than -pag-.

Another related contrast occurs in terms of a 'specific' versus a 'generic' PROPOSITION. Note the following:

(121) (a) Pap-patú nu danúm yu afúy
PAG-hot UNFOC water FOC fire
'The water will get hot by the fire'

(b) I-patú nu danúm yu afúy
I-hot UNFOC water FOC fire
'Water heats up with fire'
(122) (a) Pad-darál nu kárne yu patú ya tyémpu
PAG-destoy UNFOC meat FOC heat LINK weather
'The meat will spoil due to the heat of the weather'

(b) I-darál nu kárne yu patú ya tyémpu
I-destroy UNFOC meat FOC heat LINK weather
'Meat spoils due to the heat of the weather'

Sentence (121a) suggests that some specific water has the prospect of heating up with the application of the fire; somebody is going to apply the fire to the water. Sentence (121b) makes the generic statement that water heats up when fire is added. This prospect lies in the inherent nature of water and fire, which is part of speakers' repertoire of general knowledge. Similarly, (122a) is a warning about preserving a particular piece of meat, while (122b) is a general observation about the effects of heat on meat.

If 'performance' is imagined as a divergence from a straightforward, direct path of execution, the 'inherent'/ 'adherent' contrast plays out it terms of differing degrees of divergence from this path. The association of i- with an internally motivated ERUPTION is a symptom of a relatively closer adherence to 'the true path' than we find with -pag-, which strays farther afield.

6.2.5 Performance in Context

Our understanding of this performance orientation can be further refined by a systematic comparison of the MIDDLE VOICES -pag- and i- with the EXHAUSTIVE VOICE -an. As explained in 4.1.4, -an marks the most direct trajectory to the coda of an EVENT, while i- marks a MIDDLE PHASE. Note the
following (cf. Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 4):

(123) (a) Galut-án ku yu kabáyu
tie- AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC horse
'I'll tie the horse'

(b) I-galút ku yu lubúd
I-tie 1SG.UNFOC FOC rope
'I'll tie the rope'

In (123a), -an focusses the kabáyu 'horse' as the terminus of the tying. In (123b), i- focusses the lubúd 'rope' as the means by which tying is accomplished; the rope is simply knotted but is not attached to something else. There is no final terminus.

The adherent/inherent contrast between -pag- and i- is also noticeable with 'Proxy' readings. The circumfix i-...-an, like -pag-, suggest the performance of the ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANT in place of a POST-ERUPTIVE one. The following contrast is typical:

(124) (a) Pag-gáku ku yu méstru tu adóbo
PAG-cook 1SG.UNFOC FOC teacher FOC adobo
'I'll cook some adobo for/in lieu of the teacher'

(b) I-gákw-an ku yu méstru tu adóbo
I-cook-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC teacher UNFOC adobo
'I'll cook some adobo for/in lieu of the teacher'

(125) (a) Pad-digút ku si Maria
PAG-bathe 1SG.UNFOC FOC Maria
'I'll bathe for Maria/in Maria's place'

(b) I-digut-án ku si Maria
I-bathe-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC Maria
'I'll bathe for Maria/in Maria's place'

In the (a)-sentences, with -pag-, I spontaneously (perhaps surprisingly) volunteer to do the cooking and the bathing. Or, alternately, I may have been hired or appointed. In any case,
my decision is external to any relationship I may have had with the FOCUSED PARTICIPANTS. In the (b)-sentences, with i-...-an, I do the cooking and bathing as a favor; there is a pre-existing relationship whose internal dynamics lead me to replace the teacher in the task. Once again, -pag- suggests a PHASE/PARTICIPANT that is more distant from either EVENT terminus or farther 'out of the loop' than i- allows.

When -pag- and -an combine as the circumfix pag-...-an (cf. 6.2.4), the ERUPTIVE and FOCUSED POST-ERUPTIVE PARTICIPANTS are more remote from each other:

(126) (a) Pad-digit-án ku si Maria
    PAG-bathe-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC Maria
    'I'll make Maria bathe'

    (b) Pad-digit-án ku yu bathroom
        PAG-bathe-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC bathroom
        'I'll bathe in the bathroom'

The combination of i- and -pag- focusses a PARTICIPANT that is even more remote:

(127) I-pad-digit ku si Maria
    I-PAG-bathe 1SG.UNFOC FOC Maria
    'I'll bathe for (the sake of) Maria'

(128) I-pad-dagét ku si Maria tu burási
    I-PAG-sew 2SG.UNFOC FOC Maria UNFOC dress
    'I'll sew a dress for Maria'

(129) I-pap-pusít ni Juan yu babáy tu lappáw
    I-PAG-pick UNFOC Juan FOC woman UNFOC flower
    'Juan picked flowers for the woman'

Here, ipag- focusses the PARTICIPANTS si Maria and yu babáy as 'BENEFECTEES', i.e. as the PARTICIPANTS most far removed from the direct execution of the EVENT.

The following three-way contrasts illustrate more
succinctly the contrast between -pag- and these other POST-
ERUPTIVE affixes (cf. Davis et al. Ms. Chapter 4):

(130) (a) Pínta-n ku yu binaláy
    paint-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC house
    'I'll paint the house'

(b) I-pínta ku yu lasáng ya pínta
    I-paint 1SG.UNFOC FOC red LINK paint
    tu binaláy
    UNFOC house
    'I'll use the red paint to paint the house'

(c) Pap-pínta ku yu brótya tu binaláy
    PAG-paint 1SG.UNFOC FOC brush UNFOC house
    'I'll use the brush to paint the house'

(131) (a) Daget-án nu yu burási tu tanúd
    sew- AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC dress UNFOC needle
    annu binóía
    and thread
    'You'll sew the dress with a needle and thread'

(b) I-dagét nu yu butúnes tu burási
    I-sew 2SG.UNFOC FOC buttons UNFOC dress
    'You'll sew the buttons on the dress'

(c) Pad-dagét ku yu tanúd annu binóía
    PAG-sew 1SG.UNFOC FOC needle and thread
    'I'll sew with the needle and thread'

In the (a)-sentences, -an focusses the loci of EXHAUSTION, respectively the binaláy 'house' and burási 'dress' where the paint and buttons come to rest. In the (b)- and (c)-sentences, i- and -pag- focus the means whereby the painting and sewing are accomplished, i- focussing the pínta 'paint' and butúnes 'buttons' as PARTICIPANTS proximately involved with the accomplishment and -pag- focussing the brótya 'brush' and tinúd annu binóía 'needle and thread' as PARTICIPANTS more remotely involved. Other suggested alignments of VOICE and PARTICIPANT were rejected.
(132) (a) *Daget-án nu yu butónes tu burási
    sew- AN 2SG.UNFOC FOC buttons UNFOC dress
    
    (b) *I-dagét nu yu burási
        I-sew 2SG.UNFOC FOC dress

(133) (a) *I-dagét nu yu tanúd annu binóla
        I-sew 2SG.UNFOC FOC needle and thread
    
    (b) *Pad-dagét nu yu butónes tu burási
        PAG-sew 2SG.UNFOC FOC button UNFOC dress

(134) (a) *Pintá-n ku yu lasáng ya pínta
        paint-AN 1SG.UNFOC FOC red LINK paint
    
    (b) *I-pínta ku yu binaláy
        I-paint 1SG.UNFOC FOC house

(135) (a) *I-pínta ku yu brótya tu binaláy
        I-paint 1SG.UNFOC FOC brush UNFOC house
    
    (b) *Pap-pínta ku yu lasáng ya pínta
        PAG-paint 1SG.UNFOC FOC red LINK paint
tu binaláy
        UNFOC house

Thus, -pag- creates a semantic space which complements
the semantic spaces of other affixes. The 'Causative'
semantics are simply part of a large constellation of meanings
that emerge when we examine minimal contrasts.

6.3 Conclusion

As we have seen, -pag- sometimes focusses EXECUTORS,
sometimes 'sites', sometimes 'utensils', sometimes
'preconditions', sometimes 'proxies'. It would be
unwarrantably authoritarian (and certainly uninformative) to
assign pre-eminence to any of these readings. It is more
interesting to regard these readings as refractions of a
semantic contrast through different contexts.

Yogad made be said to have two productive and contrasting
'Causative' forms. However, the contrasts between -pa- and -pag- do not correspond neatly to the oppositions of a 'First' and 'Second' Causative as described by either Kulikov (1993) or Saksena (Saksena 1982a:75-105, 1982b). By the criterion of productivity, the -pa- form (which may occur with all other VOICES and which functions as a 'Causative' marker in most if not all other Philippine languages) should be considered the 'First Causative' and the -pag- form (which is restricted to co-occurrence with POST-ERUPTIVE VOICES and which only irregularly functions as a 'Causative' across languages), the 'Second Causative'.

If this alignment is assumed, Yogad presents some problems for the characterization of First and Second Causatives. As discussed in 1.1, Kulikov (1993:128-131) suggests that Second Causatives are often more distant, more intensive (i.e. suggestive of more radical means of accomplishment), more iterative, often suggestive of Plural Causees, more permissive, assistive, and/or curative (i.e. 'asking someone to do something'). A first (and relatively minor) difficulty with applying this characterization to Yogad is that some of the terms of the contrast are inapplicable; e.g. Yogad Causative morphology does not suggest an iterative/non-iterative contrast, nor does the Singular/Plural distinction come into play. But prototypes are made to be departed from.

A second (and more significant) difficulty is that
Kulikov's 'Second Causative' features are distributed between both -pa- and -pag-Causatives (e.g. the 'First Causative' -pa- is more consistently 'indirect', 'permissive', and 'delegational' [i.e. 'curative'], while the 'Second' -pag-Causative is more 'direct', 'intensive' and 'assistive'). Sakseina (1982a, 1982b), too, equates the 'First' with the 'Direct' Causative (i.e. Hindi -aa-) and the 'Second' with the 'Indirect' (-vaa-) form (cf. 1.1).

The contrast between -pa- and -pag- can be appreciated most informatively in the terms of relations peculiar to Yogad. I have argued that the two Yogad Causatives relate a semantic contrast between 'DISPLACEMENT' and 'MIDDLE'. Each strategy invokes a characteristic constellation of attributes. In ecclesiastical terms, -pa- and -pag- respectively mark Causatives of omission and commissio. The DISPLACING form -pa-reconfigures the ERUPTIVE ROLE as PRE-ERUPTIVE, removing it from performance. It evokes 'indirectness', 'direction', 'completeness', and 'certainty'. The MIDDLE form -pag-invokes 'directness', 'inefficiency', 'obstacle', 'assistance', 'doubt', and 'replacement'/'Proxy'.

In their divergent ways, each form permits 'delegational' and 'mediational' readings, the hallmark of the 'Causative' as it is usually understood. The indirect, non-intrusive performance of the -pa- Causee, whether FOCUSED or UNFOCUSED, is part and parcel of the DISPLACEMENT of the playing out of EVENTS from their point of origin--a
DISPLACEMENT that is indifferent to the actual performance. The VOICE value of -pa- invokes a flight from the origin of the EVENT to a non-specified destination.

The more direct (or 'confrontational'/'adversarial') involvement of the -pag- Causee is likewise part and parcel of an emphasis on the MIDDLE ground of performance. The directness of contact between Causer and Causee reflects the FOCUS on the POST-ERUPTIVE execution of EVENTS, a flight toward the MIDDLE.

The attribution of 'cause' is, in either case, a secondary addendum. The delegational 'Causative' semantics reflect the dynamics of specific CENTRIFUGAL EVENTS, in addition to the nature of the PARTICIPANTS involved, and in addition to the framing perspective of VOICE, including the VOICE value of -pa- and -pag-. Thus, rather than being specialized, hard-wired modules which fit typological categories, 'Causative' 'constructions' emerge as complex accidental assemblages.
Chapter Seven
Connections and Departures

7.0 Introduction

From the cross-linguistic perspective presented in Chapter 1, the Philippine Causatives discussed in Chapters 2-6 may seem to offer nothing substantially new. If we limit ourselves to a mere listing of the contents, we must admit that there is, as it were, nothing new under this sun. This is to be expected, since in defining our explanandum we have limited our enquiries to issues that are already familiar from numerous sources and languages. The Philippine languages present nothing new apart from their own uniqueness, i.e. the particular selection and blending of elements that all languages attend to in some fashion or other. I would suggest, however, that the facts of the Philippine languages as unfolded here confront us—as 'Westerners' (or people 'Westernized' in our thinking) and particularly as linguists—with a challenge to our typical reocentrist mode of thinking.

Chapter 1 unfolded a typical disciplinary context (or web of contexts) for the subsequent discussion of Philippine linguistic constructions of causation. Chapters 2-6 examined the constriction of EVENTS and of causation in Hiligaynon and Yogad. The 'causality' of morphological 'Causatives' emerged there as a semantic composite or assemblage of EVENT, VOICE, and ROLE within certain contexts of speaking. Clearly, Causatives as such are more than the sum of their parts. The
current, concluding chapter summarizes the analyses of these languages and relevantes the findings to linguistic theory and beyond.

The preceding chapters have been largely demonstrative of issues normally delimited by linguistics in the terms the discipline normally employs. The current chapter is something of a departure, being more freely speculative in a brief attempt to recover connections between mainstream linguistics and other contexts often neglected or disregarded within the discipline. In the interest of 'plain speaking', I will find it expedient in the final pages to loosen some of the trappings of 'objectivity', especially the strictures of conventional 'plain style', which have until now aided my demonstrations. My aim is not to distance myself from the descriptions I have meticulously wrought--far from it. Rather, I seek to enhance their integrity.

7.1 Hiligaynon and Yogad Compared: A Summary and Synthesis

Both Hiligaynon and Yogad make numerous VOICE distinctions to select specific PHASES of EVENTS for FOCUS. As we have seen, these VOICES elude the binary 'Active'/'Passive' contrast typical of Indo-European. While the VOICE cognates of each language select similar semantic territory, these two languages differ markedly in the degree to which VOICE mixes with ROLE.

The PROPOSITIONAL NUCLEUS of the Clause in each language hosts a maximum of two ROLES (i.e. the 'S' and 'O' of the
'VSO' configuration). Hiligaynon construes the 'S'-ROLE as relatively MOTILE and the 'O'-ROLE as relatively INERT. The NUCLEAR word order reflects relative CONTINUITY of TOPIC rather than ROLE per se, with __V position hosting DISCONTINUOUS TOPICS and V___, CONTINUOUS TOPICS. The 'S'-value of the latter position reflects a statistical tendency to topicalize MOTILE PARTICIPANTS more often than INERT ones. The ROLE assignment takes into account the relative fitness of a PARTICIPANT for MOTILITY/INERTNESS (e.g. 'animacy'). For Yogad, the NUCLEAR ROLE content is attenuated to a minimalistic ERUPTIVE/POST-ERUPTIVE contrast regardless of the 'inherent' ROLE-worthiness of (Common-Noun) PARTICIPANTS.

Hiligaynon VOICE is more ROLE-prominent than Yogad VOICE. In Hiligaynon, MOTILE VOICES such as nag- consistently select 'AGENTS' or otherwise dynamic ROLES, while INERT VOICES such as the MIDDLE i- consistently mark 'INSTRUMENTS' or otherwise affected PARTICIPANTS. In contrast, Yogad nag- may mark PARTICIPANTS which merely 'erupt' into the interlocutors' ken, while POST-ERUPTIVE VOICES including the INHERENT MIDDLE i- may select non-affected PARTICIPANTS in spontaneous EVENTS (e.g. the inherent 'flaw' which leads to a window's breaking). Such ERUPTIVE/POST-ERUPTIVE relations, lacking in 'AGENT'/'PATIENT' dynamics, are not permitted by Hiligaynon VOICE.

Hiligaynon morphosyntax, which more strongly differentiates ROLE, is generally more attuned to
DISCONTINUITY than that of Yogad. The 'Nominal' FOCUS markers or Determiners of each language highlight the PARTICIPANT corresponding to the EVENT PHASE which has been selected (or not selected) by VOICE. The Hiligaynon Determiners ang (FOCUSSSED) and sang (UNFOCUSSSED) are not linked to ROLE; i.e. ang and sang may each mark either MOTILE or INERT PARTICIPANTS, depending upon VOICE. With MOTILE VOICES, the PARTICIPANT with greater relative MOTILITY is always 'bounded' or 'contained'--i.e. by FOCUS if NUCLEAR and by OBLIQUENESS via the Prepositions sa or kay if NON-NUCLEAR. Mediational Causees fall into the latter category. In non-mediated DISPLACED EVENTS (i.e. 'Transi-Causatives'), the hybrid 'Causees'/'Affectees' may be UNFOCUSSSED with sang, but only as automata enmeshed in routine, deprived of full existence. Dependent Clauses and 'Adjectival' elements are linked and separated with the Ligature nga. In Yogad, 'MOTILITY' is not so contained; the ROLE not FOCUSSSED by yu is marked by nu if ERUPTIVE or tu if POST-ERUPTIVE. No Preposition exists to marginalize NON-NUCLEAR (or PERIPHERAL) PARTICULARS as OBLIQUES, and the Determiner tu may also introduce Dependent Clauses, thus further obscuring the distinction between PARTICIPANT and EVENT.¹

¹The 'incontinence' of Yogad forms spreads into their very phonology. Recall the complete assimilation of the final -g in nag-, mag-, and -pag- to any following consonant. The UNFOCUSSSED Pronouns are unstressed encitics whose initial consonant may assimilate completely to the final consonant of the preceding word (cf. Appendix C for instances).
The CONTINUITY contrast is further reflected in the Pronoun inventory of each language. Hiligaynon has three Pronoun sets: FOCUSED, UNFOCUSED Pre-Positional, and UNFOCUSED Post-Positional. The Pre-Positional forms, which may precede Verbs (to mark DISCONTINUOUS TOPICS with 'SVO' or 'OVS' Clause configurations) or Nominals (as 'Genitives'), are more DISCONTINUOUS (read 'asserted') than the CONTINUOUS (read 'mentioned') Post-Positional forms. Yogad, by contrast, has only two Pronoun sets, FOCUSED and UNFOCUSED, with no implicit 'asserted'/'mentioned' differentiation. Any DISCONTINUOUS elements are preceded by the particle ay.

As we have seen, the interlinguistic contrast in CONTINUITY or 'assertiveness' extends to the semantics of 'Causative constructions'. In each language, the form (or two cognate forms) -pa- signals a DISPLACEMENT of performance so that the MOTILITY or ERUPTION of the EVENT is shifted out of PHASE with the NUCLEAR ROLE content, be it MOTILE/INERT (as in Hiligaynon) or ERUPTIVE/POST-ERUPTIVE (as in Yogad). With CENTRIFUGAL EVENTS, the 'S'-PARTICIPANT is PRE-MOTILE or PRE-ERUPTIVE, detached from performance, while a mediating Causee in the PERIPHERY is directly engaged in performance. With CENTRIPETAL EVENTS, the 'S'-PARTICIPANT is not the final PARTICIPANT involved in the EVENT, and the performance may or may not be mediated. The DISPLACEMENT semantics of -pa- is most obvious as such in 'extra-Causative' readings of 'gradedness' and 'tendency'. In fact, without the addition of
VOICE, -pa-, the putatively 'Causative' morpheme, utterly belies this characterization by detaching process from either INCEPT or EXHAUSTION as a mark of pure change.

In Hiligaynon, the greater ROLE prominence conflates the DISPLACEMENT of MOTILITY with heightened 'intensity', 'urgency' or 'certainty'; -pa- assumes a distinctly performative (as opposed to descriptive) dimension vis-à-vis interlocuter interaction. With many roots, the Involvement may be further intensified by the reduplication of -pa- (cf. Appendix B). The mediational Causee, as a NON-NUCLEAR locus of MOTILITY, is always bounded or contained, either by FOCUS via the Determiners ang or si or by OBLIQUENESS via the Prepositions sa or kay. In Yogad, the DISPLACEMENT of performance marked by -pa- is more consistently indirect and is never 'Intensive'. Mediational Causees in Yogad may be either FOCUSED via the Determiners yu or si or UNFOCUSED via tu. If Hiligaynon drives, Yogad drifts.

As if in compensation, Yogad employs an alternate strategy, the ADHERENT MIDDLE VOICE -pag-, to derive a Causative which is more 'direct' (and thus often more 'intense') via the connection that this VOICE establishes through the shared NUCLEARITY of the 'S'- and 'O'-ROLES. The MIDDLE semantics of -pag- are apparent with such 'extra-Causative' 'effects' as 'difficulty', 'hindrance', 'force', 'assistance', 'uncertainty', 'persistence', 'site', 'utensil', and 'proxy'. 
Hiligaynon and Yogad highlight two highly productive strategies for deriving 'delegational causation', i.e. (a) DISPLACEMENT of performance from the 'AGENT', regardless of FOCUS, and (b) MIDDLE semantics which selects the 'EXECUTOR' for FOCUS. In the process, these languages relegate the contributions of VOICE and ROLE in the linguistic construction of EVENTS.

Philippine morphological Causatives thus reflect Verb-centered linguistic strategies for structuring EVENTS. Causatives arise from the resources of the language at large as one set of patterns woven into the fabric of the language. There is, we have observed, no single 'Causative' form, only variations in the mutual cooperation of VOICE and ROLE in EVENTS.

7.2 Inside Linguistics

Although the 'content' of VOICE and ROLE is universal in human cognition and linguistic practice, there is no universally applicable inventory of ROLES, nor is VOICE necessarily a binary or tripartite distinction tied to a specific morphosyntax.² Neither VOICE nor ROLE is primary; they are 'separate but inseparable' co-constructs (Davis Ms.).

Any ROLE content may derive from either the semantics of the PARTICIPANTS themselves (which, across languages, range

²The framework for the current discussion about VOICE and ROLE derives from the work of Philip W. Davis. Elements of his discussion are disseminated throughout a number of sources, including Davis (1995), Davis (Ms.), and Davis et al. (Ms.).
from HUMAN to NONHUMAN) or from the semantics of EVENTS as wholes (Davis Ms.). In our two Philippine languages, the latter is the more consistent case. However, HUMAN PARTICIPANTS, marked with the Determiners si and ni or with the Pronouns, are 'privileged' via such 'marking' and/or by the ROLES they may fill. Recall that a HUMAN PARTICIPANT, if UNFOCUSED and NUCLEAR, can only fill the 'S'-ROLE, be it MOTILE or ERUPTIVE. Thus, the Philippine languages separate PARTICIPANTS into two classes that recapitulate Martin Buber's 'I-Thou' (HUMAN) and 'I-It' (NONHUMAN) relationships (cf. Buber 1970). In other languages, such as Navaho (cf. Comrie 1981:190), there may prevail a more finely graded linguistic ranking of PARTICIPANTS between the fully HUMAN and the fully NONHUMAN, a grammatically forged Great Chain of Being.

In all languages, ROLES emerge as 'as if' strategies, as 'metaphors mediating the relation between PARTICIPANTS and EVENTS' (Davis Ms.). Such ROLES do not so much re-present reality as define it for a particular culture. Hence, for example, sugar may in some instances be construed as 'passive' or 'Objective' (e.g. I melted the sugar on my tongue and in others as 'active' or 'Subjective' (The sugar melted on my tongue). English, which, unlike our Philippine languages, lacks a true MIDDLE VOICE, formally conflates pure EVENTS with ACTIONS (which require AGENTS). Similarly, the personification of 'cause' as a volitional AGENT--as a 'thing'--may be at variance with phenomenal, 'literal' experience in such
putatively 'metaphorical' constructions as Smoking causes cancer, Smoking leads to cancer, Smoking gives you cancer, Cancer comes from smoking, or Smoking (is what) brought his cancer about. These metaphors treat the implicit 'actor' (i.e. the unnamed smoker) as the 'passive' recipient of the poisonous 'gift' of smoking (cf. Lakoff & Turner 1989:72-80).³

Figure 7.1: Relations of VOICE, ROLE, EVENT & PARTICIPANT

In any language, the available ROLES are 'modulated by variations in VOICE' and vice versa (Davis Ms.). All VOICES arise from the specific content of EVENTS, modulating ROLES by orienting speakers' attention to certain PHASES of EVENTS, selecting certain ROLES as more NUCLEAR and treating others as more PERIPHERAL (cf. 7.1).

The specific results of VOICE/ROLE vary with the content

³Tyler (Ms.b) notes that the English sentence I grew up manages to avoid all Subject/Object, AGENT/PATIENT agonisms and thereby achieves a 'Middle' effect. (I was not grown up by my parents, nor did I reflexively grow myself up; I just grew up.) This example shows that, in spite of the overwhelming amount of Subject-Object patterment in English Clauses, even the English pattern does not basically or essentially mark processes as the products of things.
of specific EVENTS. Some EVENTS may be relatively ESSENTIAL (arising intrinsically, with static continuity) and therefore less amenable to 'AGENT'/ 'PATIENT' contrasts and 'control' generally than those which are more ACCIDENTAL (arising extrinsically, with kinetic disruption). The parameters for these various relations are summarized for ease of reference in Figure 7.1 (adapted from Davis Ms. and Davis et al. Ms.).

To summarize: although specific ROLES and VOICES are not universal (cf. the EVENT-PARTICIPANT relations continuum, whose precise terms vary according to the specific languages involved), all speakers, through the conventions of their natural languages, identify with some PARTICIPANTS more empathetically than with others (hence the HUMAN-NONHUMAN scale).⁴ Speakers also differentiate between EVENTS which are kinesic/disruptive and those which are more static/continuous (hence the ACCIDENTAL-ESSENTIAL scale). Speakers have certain established strategies of relating EVENTS to PARTICIPANTS and vice versa; and it is these language-specific ways of relating

---

⁴I have altered Davis' 'HUMAN-INANIMATE' scale to a scale of 'HUMAN-NONHUMAN' in acknowledgement of the fact that humans often project their 'human empathy' onto biologically inanimate objects, e.g. religious icons or photographs. Recall that Hiligaynon speakers can go either sa Beaumont 'to Beaumont (as a faceless location on the map)' or kay Beaumont '(back) to Beaumont (as a locus with personality)'. Different things are accorded different degrees of human empathy, as conditioned by both culture and personal traits. Recall that a Filipino dog may be humanized as si Prince; also, as seen in Appendix A, pieces of bamboo, as daily intimates, are dignified via personal Pronouns. Conversely, human beings may be dehumanized by various linguistic (and nonlinguistic) means.
the two that we term VOICE and ROLE (though it might be more accurate to speak of 'VOICING' and 'ROLING'). The continua of Figure 7.1 name in general terms the extreme end-points of relations that all human cultures construct through language. The values at the endpoints are not oppositions but mutually defining terms, each unthinkable without the other. Each continuum predicts that every language will make systematic relative distinctions with reference to a particular quality—a given element may be constructed as more or less HUMAN, MOTILE, ACCIDENTAL etc.—but none predicts the precise segmentation that any particular language will create.

It will have been noted that the discussion of EVENT semantics presented throughout this study (and summarized in Figure 7.1) offers two senses of 'EVENT' as a linguistic construct. In the holistic, macro-sense, which treats entire Clauses (cf. the middle continuum of Figure 7.1), PARTICIPANTS are seamlessly integrated by ROLE and EVENT-PARTICIPANT relations modulated by VOICE; i.e. PARTICIPANTS, ROLE, and VOICE are not distinguished as such. This holistic macro-EVENT corresponds more or less to a layman's sense of 'EVENT'. In the more analytical, truncated, micro-sense, which focusses upon Verbal roots (cf. the third continuum at the bottom of Figure 7.1), EVENTS are differentiated according to variations in content which are reflected in the various semantic reactances with given VOICE-ROLE combinations. It is this truncated micro-EVENT (or, rather, the practice of such
truncation) which elevates VOICE and ROLE, both of which—like all the constructs of science—emerge as such from the (often strenuous) efforts of certain specialists (in this case, linguists). As Bateson (1979/1980:42) announces in a section heading: 'THE DIVISION OF THE PERCEIVED UNIVERSE INTO PARTS AND WHOLES IS CONVENIENT AND MAY BE NECESSARY, BUT NO NECESSITY DETERMINES HOW IT SHALL BE DONE' (capitals in the original). Even as he forged the modern 'linguistic consciousness', Saussure (1983:9) was forced to admit that 'no one object of linguistic study emerges of its own accord'. We are forced to create our objects of research⁵ without any definitive assurance that we have done so justly. Russell (1985:47) is doubtless correct in noting that 'The doctrine of perpetual flux, as taught by Heraclitus, is painful, and science ... can do nothing to refute it'.

Languages vary in the extent to which PARTICIPANTS are allowed to 'stand out' from EVENTS, to 'assert themselves' via ROLE. In many Indo-European languages such as Hindi (cf. 1.1) and others such as Bella Coola (cf. Saunders & Davis 1982), Nouns are encoded with Case markers which specify the ROLE the PARTICIPANTS play; PARTICIPANTS are thus well defined through their ROLES, and such notions as 'control' are of particular relevance. Being is, as it were, subservient to beings. In many other languages, like those of the Philippines, EVENT

⁵Recall that even the God of Genesis created the world in large part by imposing divisions on pre-existent chaotic matter.
processes achieve relatively greater configuration through VOICE; any PARTICIPANTS emerge from these EVENTS insofar as they are summoned by VOICE (or, alternatively, marginalized as OBLIQUES). Being is a kinesic process in which beings emerge as temporary singularities in the Heraclitean flux of DISCOURSE. (In this connection, it is interesting to recall that the Philippine languages have no Copula.)

Some prominent recent treatments of Philippine Causative contructions (among others) have focussed primarily on the hierarchical relationships of PARTICIPANTS, taking the category 'Causative' as a 'hard-wired' set of formal relations as opposed to a semantic assemblage with componential variation. Formalist accounts, including those of Bell (1981), Gerdts (1988), De Guzman (1988), Verhaar (1988), and Coorman et al. (1988), have examined Philippine (and other Austronesian) languages and/or Causatives in a Relational Grammar framework, in which Causative constructions are represented as instances of Causative Clause Union (or CCU). Such an interpretation (cf. Gerdts 1988, De Guzman 1988) assumes, implausibly and hubristically, that morphological Causative Clauses reflect a reduction of two Clauses/EVENTS as opposed to the expansion of single Clauses/EVENTS (via -pa-) demonstrated in the current study (and also noted by Kemmer & Verhagen 1994). The first fatal error of the RG stance is to mistake a discernable equivalence between two classes (i.e. morphological and analytical Causatives) for an identity. The
second is the culturally hubristic assumption that the analytical form is a 'more basic', foundational 'originary'. (The tacit assumption that English provides the standard of transcendent logic and truth taints formalist approaches to an appalling degree.)

Such egregious Eurocentrism (analogous to the 'Why don't they learn English!' mentality of many Americans abroad) can be a stumbling block to understanding—or, rather, to understanding anything new. The RG studies of Philippine languages typically assume the category 'Subject', which, as shown in the present analysis (and in Schachter 1976), is not a salient category in Philippine languages. Furthermore, much tiresome debate has revolved about the relative merits of a 'Passive Analysis' (PA) or an 'Ergative Analysis' (EA), despite evidence that the Philippine VOICE system eludes these binary oppositions. While such patternings may be discernible in specific instances of these and all other languages, they emerge, I argue, as epiphenomena of language-specific morphosyntactic (and therefore semantic) combinations. Formal analyses reveal nothing about language-specific categories except, to a limited extent, Indo-European ones (usually English). Instead of following the cues of the languages they claim to analyze, many linguists attempt to conform the languages to Eurocentric relations constituted prior to the analysis. De Guzman (1988:326), for instance, argues that:

'EA is to be preferred because, unlike PA, it does not need to "resort to global devices, i.e. making
reference to 'initial level' and to 'acting terms'." EA refers only to final relations'.

Note that the analysis is driven by a search for elegance as defined by the peculiarities of Relational Grammar. It does not occur to the writer that an either/or approach may be unwarranted; rather, the binary nature of the choice is driven by the requirements of the elected theory, a cultural construct which takes sentences as primary or basic explananda. Such analyses tend to be less productive of new information than reproductive of the analytical apparatus which is being employed—and prioritized (cf. Bishop & Spitz 1992).6

But unwarranted Eurocentrism has not been monopolized by formalists. Tyler (Ms.a) suggests that:

'all grammatical analysis, because it starts from language-as-sentenced, privileges the nominal functions of subject/object, agent/patient, source/goal, and defines the verb relative to them'.

Both formalist and functionalist accounts of Causatives tend to prioritize PARTICIPANTS at the expense of EVENTS. This PARTICIPANT orientation is especially apparent in discussions of the Caussee (and the 'autonomy' etc. thereof), which for historical reasons is usually understood in terms of 'Case', a Noun-oriented notion. (One wonders how linguistics would have framed such issues if it had originated in the

_____________________

6Cf. also Tyler (1987:200-201): '[A]s science communicated better and better about itself, it had less and less to say about the world'.
Philippines.) Bell (1983), De Guzman (1988), Kemmer & Verhagen (1994) and Casey (Ms.) are cases in point. Their analyses deal with Nominal elements in terms of 'Cases', including 'Ergative', 'Absolutive', 'Dative', and 'Genitive'. Such terminology forces all languages into a pre-determined pattern informed by the Indo-European emphasis on the Noun.

The Causee Case-Autonomy Hierarchy, a Noun-oriented construct (cf. Figure 1.2), is, generously construed, only somewhat applicable to Hiligaynon--and not at all to Yogad. Hiligaynon's more prominent ROLE content is reflected in the OBLIQUE option for Nominals which name certain 'animate' or 'individuated' PARTICULARS. The Prepositions, as we have seen, have an inherently dynamic (or 'MOTILE') character consonant with their rôle in marking Causees. As illustrated in numerous examples, such OBLIQUE PARTICIPANTS are imbued with more autonomy (etc.) than NUCLEAR ones, which are bounded by FOCUS and constrained by VOICE. However, Hiligaynon departs significantly from the Hierarchy in making no differentiation between 'Datives' and other OBLIQUES. This 'absence' underscores an important contrast between the Philippine languages and many others, including the Indo-European ones; namely, unlike the latter, the Philippine languages are not concerned with 'Case' per se and are only minimally concerned with ROLE, the domain of the Noun; instead, VOICE, which prioritizes the Verbal domain, carries most of the semantic burden. The relative prominence of VOICE and concomitant
recession of ROLE is carried to an even greater extreme in
Yogad, which entirely lacks OBLIQUES and applies tu (or tu ku
...) indifferently to both NUCLEAR and NON-NUCLEAR
PARTICIPANTS, regardless of their innate 'MOTILITY'. The -pa-
Causees are either NUCLEAR (and thus either FOCUSED or
UNFOCUSED) or NON-NUCLEAR (or PERIPHERAL).

The particulars of Hiligaynon and Yogad provide a context
for re-evaluating the parameters specific to Causatives which
were presented in section 1.1 (i.e. cause vs. enablement [or
control vs. autonomy], direct vs. indirect causation, and
physical vs. non-physical causation). While these themes have
surfaced in our analyses, they assert themselves to a varying
degree in each language. They emerge as accidents of certain
EVENTS, in collusion with such factors as the construction of
PARTICIPANTS through ROLE and the orientation into the EVENTS
provided by VOICE.

The parameter of control (cf. Givón 1975), a PARTICIPANT-
centered concept, is similarly unspecified as such. Hiligaynon
is more amenable to codifying control than Yogad (cf. the
inapplicability of Hiligaynon nag- to such inherently 'low-
control' EVENTS as 'getting hungry' and 'dying'). Yet even in
Hiligaynon, it is the containment of MOTILITY and not
'control' per se that is most consistently reflected by
VOICE/ROLE. In both languages, one is at liberty (conditions
permitting) to read any 'Causative' as a 'Permissive'.

The parameter of directness of the influence of the
Causer upon the Causee derives from specific VOICE semantics. In both Hiligaynon and Yogad, -pa- removes the MOTILE/ERUPTIVE 'source' from the INERT/POST-ERUPTIVE 'outcome', thus implying a 'disruption' or 'indirectness' of influence which, in Hiligaynon, is increased by the reduplication of -pa-. In Hiligaynon the 'disruptive' aspect of -pa- emerges in 'Intensive' readings which are witnessed in some other languages but which are not universal. In fact, 'causality' per se is not a necessary or universal aspect of grammar, including even the grammar of 'Causative' constructions. Recall that -pa-, an essential mark of the 'Causative', is distinctly non-causal since it marks pure DISPLACEMENT, i.e. kinesis, without the necessity of any 'AGENT'/'PATIENT' opposition. In Yogad, the 'indirect' DISPLACING -pa- is complemented by the ADHERENT MIDDLE -pag-, highlights a distinctly NUCLEAR PHASE. This VOICE, too, involves other semantics already articulated which are peculiar to Yogad. The reduction of these morphemes to simple expressions of 'cause' becomes especially untenable in light of the discourses about 'Second Causatives', which, as the reduplication of -pa- in Hiligaynon, may correspond to a decrease in 'Directness' but an increase in 'Intensity', while the 'Second Causative' (i.e. -pag-) of Yogad increases 'Intensity' while being more 'Direct' than the 'First Causative'.

The metaphysical category 'cause', whether 'direct' or 'indirect', is not a primitive in the linguistic morphosyntax
of the Philippine languages and is therefore not a universal semantic primitive, though complex 'Causative constructions' arise with some frequency in these and many other languages. As Sapir (1921:39) notes of other human experiential constructs:

'Desire, purpose, emotion are the color of the objective world; they are ... strictly speaking, never absent from normal speech, but their expression is not of a truly linguistic nature'.

Sapir's (1921:38) celebrated observation that 'All grammars leak' still holds water; furthermore, the leakage often proceeds from the meta-physical (e.g. 'cause') to the metalinguistic (e.g. 'Causative') realm, as discussed further below.

The physical/non-physical parameter that emerges in metalinguistic discussions of Causatives (cf. Talmy 1976, Kemmer & Verhagen 1994) is not a fundamental opposition of language per se. Rather, this 'opposition' reflects the interpenetration of linguistic performances with 'the aggregate of the circumstances'. Hence, a -pag-Causative, in being more 'direct' than a -pa-Causative, may suggest a greater physical proximity of Causer and Causee. However, as we have seen, -pag- need not suggest 'physical proximity' but might instead evoke 'hindrance', 'resistance' and the like, whether or not the 'expression' of these is physical in nature.

The inclusion of the physical/non-physical parameter as a basic linguistic opposition tells us more about our
'Western' philosophy, grounded in metaphysics, than about language per se. Western epistemologies tend to assume the physical as a 'primary' reality which is 'represented' by language. My assumption that each language creates a unique world (cf. 1.2) implies that languages are not basically representational or descriptive in nature. A language is not so much a representation of a reality constituted prior to language as a virtual reality that establishes its own terms (Tyler Ms.b). As Tyler (Ms.b) observes, 'Virtual realities parallel the real and its representations and are not dependent on them' (emphasis in the original). The distinction between (and the interdependence of) the phenomenal world of experience and the virtual world of linguistic construction is nicely drawn by Deleuze & Guattari (1987:86):

'When knife cuts flesh, when food or poison spreads through the body, when a drop of wine falls into water, there is an intermingling of bodies; but the statements, "The knife is cutting the flesh," "I am eating," "The water is turning red" express incorporeal transformations of an entirely different nature (events).'

In effecting such 'transformations', language 'intervenes' to make phenomenal experiences meaningful by connecting them to other similarly reconstituted experiences. In the examples given above, language cuts disparate events (i.e. the phenomenal processes of 'cutting', 'eating', 'turning red')

---

7Mathematics is another virtuality which 'creates the world in which it works' (Tyler Ms.b).
into EVENTS (i.e. linguistic constructs) of a certain pattern
(i.e. Noun (BE) Verb-ing), creating certain formal/semantic
equivalences that do not inhere 'in themselves' in the (non-
linguistic) phenomenal world (cf. also I'm thinking and The
tower is leaning). In such pronouncements as I now pronounce
you husband and wife, Okay, he's dead, The water's warm
enough, The war's over, and Looks like Bubba's just grown
himself a great big beard, language imposes discreteness upon
continuous experience (just how many hairs, I Stoically ask,
make a beard?). As Tyler (Ms.b) observes:

'Virtual reals create themselves not by mirrors
that picture themselves to themselves, but by
juxtapositions and concatenations that do not
require a prior syntax or objects to be juxtaposed
and concatenated'.

Thoroughly non-representational, non-descriptive linguistic
performances are easily evoked through the presentation of
such items as Hello!, Hey there! and How's it going?, the
'performative' utterances of Austin (1962) (but are not all
utterances performative?), which abound in practical language-
teaching texts but dwindle to the vanishingly point in the
discourses of theoretical linguistics. Such utterances are
nonetheless demonstratively abundant and certainly 'basic',
the vital tools and lubricants of social intercourse. All
natural languages, argues Tyler (Ms.b), may 'do such things as
describing or representing, but these are not their primary,
originally, necessary, or most important functions'. If Tyler is correct, the abundance of non-descriptive, non-representational utterances in daily discourse opens to question the priorities, assumptions, and values of most linguistic theories, which generally take representation or description as 'basic' and marginalize other 'uses' of language as ' peripheral'--if not 'derivative'.

Philippine morphosyntax prioritizes the Verb by endowing Verbs with numerous VOICE distinctions while maintaining minimal ROLE distinctions among the Nominals. The grammars of the Philippine languages confront us with an alternative to the Noun/PARTICIPANT-centered conceptualization of EVENTS that dominates most typological practice, i.e. a conceptualization of EVENTS as processes of EVENTING that are not dependent on the initiation or control of Nominal PARTICIPANTS (cf. Whorf 1939a/1956:147, Bohm 1980/1983). The Philippine languages are thus attuned to a way of speaking and thinking that the physicist David Bohm (1980/1983:30,31) has characterized as the 'rheomode' (in contrast to what I may term the Western 'reomode'), which is described as:

'a mode in which movement is to be taken as primary in our thinking and in which this notion will be incorporated into the language structure by allowing the verb rather than the noun to play a primary role'.

---

9An amusing--yet serious--critique of the misbegotten attempt by Speech Act theorists to derive 'performative' utterances (as a distinct type) from the (putatively 'foundational' or 'originary') 'constative' ones is provided by Derrida (1988).
Like certain other 'subversive' twentieth-century writers including Benjamin Whorf, Martin Heidegger, and Jacques Derrida, Bohm has attempted to 'de-stabilize' the Indo-European Noun, to reconcile kinesis (motion, change)—the homuncular joker in the metaphysical deck—with mimesis (imitation, representation) (cf. Tyler 1987:47-48). This ancient philosophical agonism informs linguistics through such foundational 'oppositions' as langue vs. parole, competence vs. performance, and synchrony vs. diachrony. Within linguistics, certain discourse-based approaches, most notably Hopper's (1987) Emergent Grammar, have tried to resolve these agonisms-qua-oppositions in favor of kinesis. If none of these attempts at reconciliation, within and without linguistics, has been widely successful, one can blame the intractability of our Indo-European linguistic habits, whereby our languages (i.e. our practices of languaging, including our burgeoning production of 'written' texts) condition our reocentrism. Such habits profoundly inform the discipline of linguistics.

7.3 Beyond Linguistics

If descriptive or representational utterances (i.e. the sentences which constitute EVENTS) are indeed but a specialized application of language, why do they figure so prominently in linguistics? Why are Causative constructions such a compelling sub-genre? The reasons, I suspect, may have less to do with the essentials of language than with Western cultural priorities, assumptions, and values which have
developed from particular historical circumstances—in which Indo-European linguistic habits have played a vital part.

In particular, reocentric thinking/speaking/writing, centering on 'things', (re)stabilizes Western metaphysics, conditioned (NB: not 'caused'!) by the Subject-and-Predicate and Case-marking patternment of Indo-European. Such thinking has been reinforced by the development of the technology and culture of writing, which has also reinforced the colonization of kinesis by mimesis and the spatialization of time (cf. Ong 1982, Tyler 1987:22).

Language and philosophy (including its derivative sciences) have so conditioned each other that their categories, 'expressed' via language, inextricably overlap. The overlap of the grammatical with the philosophical has been especially obvious in the Geisteswissenschaften, the human or social sciences, which have derived from ancient philosophical (or, more precisely, metaphysical) discourses and which inevitably reflect linguistic distinctions. For example, Aristotle's ten Categories (or 'Predications') emerge from an attempt to exhaust all of the possible applications of the Verb 'be'—which, as the Philippine languages remind us, is far from being a universal feature of natural languages. Recall that Aristotle's ten Categories include Substance (ousia), Quality (poion), Quantity (poson), Relation (pros ti), Place (pou), Time (pote), Short-Term Condition/State (keisthai), Long-Term Condition/State (ekhein),
Action/Activity (poiein), and Passivity (paskhein)—all of them familiar and recurring terms in the descriptive projects of linguistics and other social sciences. As Derrida (1982:188) astutely observes:

'Philosophy is not only before linguistics as one might find oneself facing a new science, a new way of seeing or a new object; it is also before linguistics, preceding linguistics by virtue of all the concepts philosophy still provides it, for better or for worse; and it sometimes intervenes in the most critical, and occasionally in the most dogmatic, least scientific, operations of the linguist'.

Perhaps no grammaticalism is more ubiquitous—and more slippery—than the dualism of Subject/Object, which informs all extant Western philosophical traditions, including the social sciences which these have spawned. In Gestalt psychology, for instance, the Subject/Object dualism is submerged in the opposition of the Figure (the Object which is 'thrown in the way') which 'stands against' (cf. German Gegenstand) the Ground (or Subject), which is 'thrown under' the Object as its background or basis.¹⁰ In anthropological fieldwork, attempts to collapse the Subject/Object dualism into the hyphenated Participant-Observer have unwittingly reinforced it. The Observer-qua-Subject still has the final word and thus continues to subject the Participant-qua-Object to an objectification to which she, as the objectified subject of the ethnographic text, is in no position to object (cf.

¹⁰The Freudian developmental stages have correspondences not only to Subject/Object (oral), but also to Active/Passive (anal), and Masculine/Feminine, i.e. Gender (genital).
Tyler 1987:89-102).

Piaget's (1954) classic account of the infant's cognitive construction of the object-as-thing (through kinesic interactions with the environment) simultaneously recounts the co-emergence of the Subject and reminds us that we must learn to think in terms of Subjects and Objects.\(^{11}\) The observation that the cognitive recognition of causal relations precedes that of reciprocal or reflexive ones (cf. Piaget 1974) further emphasizes the agonistic nature of identities and demonstrates the primacy of kinesis, as physics has done vis-à-vis the sub-atomic domain. This seismic shift in consciousness, which has gained momentum throughout the current, now-waning century, has been largely unheeded in the pseudo-scientific discourses of the social sciences, which continue to borrow their

\(^{11}\)Piaget (1954) describes six stages through which the concept 'object' emerges in infant cognition. In the first two, sensorimotor engagement with the environment 'is' the infant/environment; the infant recognizes certain activities rather than any 'object'. This phenomenalistic mode of existence gradually yields a Subject/Object dichotomy. Initially, the infant tries to 'conjure' a 'disappeared' object in certain ritualistic movements, then begins 'tracking' it actively (Stage III), reverting to the 'conjuring' strategy if it disappears. Then, at 8-10 mo., she learns to initiate a search for a 'disappeared' object from its vanishing point (IV). Then, at about 1 year, the child wholly ceases to search for a 'disappeared' object in the place it initially emerged from, though all displacements must be visible (V). Finally, at around 18 mo., the child considers 'invisible' movements in its search for an object that has now acquired cognitive permanence (VI). Also, Sacks (1995:108-152) recounts the difficulties a blind adult encounters in constructing visible objects after recovering vision late in life. Subjectivity/objectivity is something we learn only through the expenditure of great effort. Both studies suggest that movement (kinesis) is a more primal experience than stasis.
enabling metaphors from nineteenth-century theories of biology and geology, and--especially since World War II--from Newtonian physics. Of all the social sciences, linguistics should be the discipline most sensitive to this earth-moving insight into reality, but this change seems hardly to have registered. Elsewhere, beyond linguistics, a consciousness of the central role of language in the production of knowledge has emerged with a vengeance, gaining explicit recognition in philosophy, in the Geisteswissenschaften, and even in the Naturwissenschaften (cf. Tyler 1987:200-201), as suggested, more or less explicitly, by such titles as I and Thou (Buber 1970), A Grammar of Motives (Burke 1945/1969), and Physics as Metaphor (Jones 1982), not to mention the long and growing roster of texts that are rather un informatively (and sometimes wrongly) labelled 'postmodernist'.

This is not to deny that causality figures prominently in natural languages--or at least, that causal interpretations can be projected into sundry linguistic forms. In addition to Causative constructions proper of the 'let George do it' variety discussed in Chapters 1-6, all languages construct or implicate causality lexically, through various analytic means or through Conjunctions (both Subordinating and Coördinating), through Adverbial constructions, or through simple juxtaposition. Tyler (1978:347-348) adduces the following sentences to a demonstration of some of the choices available in English (emphases in the original):
(1) (a) Because the lightning struck it, the tree fell
(b) Since the lightning struck it, the tree fell
(c) If the lightning struck it, then the tree fell
(d) The lightning struck it, then the tree fell
(e) The tree fell, for the lightning (had) struck it
(f) When the lightning struck it, the tree fell
(g) The lightning struck it, so the tree fell
(h) The lightning struck it, and the tree fell
(i) The lightning struck it, {making/and made} the tree fall
(j) The lightning struck it, {causing/and caused} the tree to fall
(k) The lightning struck it, consequently the tree fell
(l) The lightning struck it, therefore the tree fell
(m) The lightning struck it, thus the tree fell
(n) The tree fell, as the lightning (had) struck it

To these I add:

(o) The lightning struck; the tree fell

In some of these sentences--e.g. (1a), with because; (1b), with since; (1g), with so; and (1l), with therefore--the causal link between the two EVENTS is strong (offering 'sufficient' grounds for assuming a causal relationship). In others--e.g. (1c), with if and then; (1f), with when; (1h), with and; and (1f), with when--it is weak (providing the 'necessary' minimum to begin to establish a causal connection), so that the first EVENT is a more of a precondition than a cause; or, in other words, it is a 'cause' in the same sense that having a set of lungs is a 'cause' of lung cancer. Note that the sequencing of the sentences need not be iconic, as in (1n). The FOREGROUNDED Main Clause may occur first and the BACKGROUNDED Dependent Clause, specifying
the cause or reason, second. In other instances, such as (10), mere sequencing provides a pretext for forging causal connections. Thus, despite the protests of logicians, post hoc, ergo propter hoc reasoning remains a vital strategy of common sense. It bears reiterating here that language is more than the sum of its parts—certainly more than the sum of its forms. To be adequately meaningful to survive as forms, linguistic forms must accommodate innumerable circumstances.

Whatever else it might involve, the before-and-after movement of causality, from cause to effect or from effect to cause, inescapably implicates sequence. As Tyler (1978:348) observes, 'Sequence, temporal succession, cause and consequence comprise a closely related family of concepts which we express in the polysemy of "follow" (boldface mine, WLS). Even before assuming the meaning 'cause', the Greek

12Sequencing may, however, be entirely unspecified by a given causal form and instead projected 'from without'. Copeland (1990:199-201) reports that the Tarahumara form mapu introduces 'complements of non-implicative causatives' as Dependent Clauses:

(a) Wasi mi'ri-boa [mapu-gita ke u'kú-a-ra]
cow kill- FUT [MAPU-INST KE rain-A-RA]
'We sacrifice a cow [so that it will rain]'
('It will rain, because we are sacrificing a cow')

(b) Pe nehte-ma moe-ko [mapu-gita burito rihimara kame]
CONJ kick- MA you-KO [MAPU-INST burro brother be]
'Well, you are always kicking [because you are the brother of a donkey]!
('You are the brother of a donkey, so you are always kicking')

Here, mapu introduces an explanation or reason as a BACKGROUND which may be manifest either (a) after or (b) before the FOREGROUNDED EVENT of the Main Clause.
aiti ("the "credit" for good or bad, the legal "responsibility," for an act' [Taylor 1919/1955:50]) and the Latin causa ('the case and hence also that which is the case, in the sense that something comes to pass and becomes due' [Heidegger 1971:175]) already suggested a succession of (legalistic) events.

It is linear sequencing, implicating time, which distinguishes the if...then of causality from the timeless if...then of logic (cf. Bateson 1979/1980:64-67). The notion of sequence implicates a linear (i.e. spatial) construction of time which imposes order on events.\(^\text{13}\) While this ordering may make reality (seem) more manageable in certain respects, it does not transcend reality to a higher truth. According to Bateson (1979/1980:66): 'Lineal thinking will always generate either the teleological fallacy (that end determines process) or the myth of some supernatural controlling agency' (boldface mine, WLS). Both of these related notions reflect, in large part, the enduring legacy of Aristotle.

The commonsense conceptualization of causality in terms of the mechanical 'push' is a post-Baconian, post-Newtonian, post-industrial impoverishment of prior understandings.\(^\text{16}\) The arena of life provides ample room for conflicting

\(^{13}\) The morphological conflation via Philippine -pa- of 'Causative', 'Transitive', and 'Orientational Directive' semantics is no mere coincidence insofar as these three notions all implicate lineal thinking.

\(^{14}\) Cf. Piaget's (1974) grounding of nascent transitivity and causality in the child's manipulation of physical objects.
explanations--i.e. interpretations--and all cultures have, through their languages, risen to the challenge--hence Talmy's (1976:47) rediscovery that 'there is no single situational notion of causation'. As Talmy implies, the human sciences have not taken sufficient note of this. Deleuze & Guattari (1987:431) concur through their observation that 'the human sciences, with their materialist, evolutionary, and even dialectical schemas, lag behind the richness and complexity of causal relations in physics, or even biology'. To gain a small inkling of what the social sciences are missing, we could do worse than to briefly visit physics, beginning with Aristotle.

Aristotle's classic conceptualization of causality, developed in the Physics and Metaphysics, posits four Causes--or, rather, four senses of 'cause'--each of which is attuned to a distinct sense of the question 'Why?' (in an interesting contrast to the 'causes' of Causatives, which more consistently invoke the question 'How?'). Aristotle's Causes (cf. Physics: Book II, Chapter 2) include the Material Cause ('that out of which a thing comes to be and which persists ... e.g. the bronze of the statue, the silver of the bowl, and the genera of which the bronze and the silver are species'), the Formal Cause ('the statement of the essence, and its genera ... e.g. of the octave the relation of 2:1 ... and the parts in the definition'), the Efficient Cause ('the primary source of the change or coming to rest; e.g. the man who gave advice ... the father is cause of the child'), and the Final Cause or
telos ('"that for the sake of which" a thing is done, e.g.
health is the cause of walking about') (Aristotle 1941:240-
241).  

As a reocentrist, Aristotle is reluctant to allow one
event to serve as a cause for another, but he does recognize
'all the intermediate steps which are brought about through
the action of something else as means towards the end',
including 'reduction of flesh, purging, drugs, or surgical
instruments' as 'means toward health' (Aristotle 1941:241).
Although 'some are activities, others instruments' (Aristotle
1941:241), all seem to imply the participation of Efficient
Causes working toward a specific goal. 16 Since, as Aristotle
(1941:248) admits, the Formal, Efficient, and Final Causes

15As motivations for human actions, these causes
correspond to Burke's (1945) Scene (Material Cause), Act
(Formal Cause), Agent (Efficient Cause), and Purpose (Final
Cause). His Agency (in the sense of 'means') corresponds to
the 'Instrumental' aspects of the Philippine Causatives
derived via -pa- and -pag- (answering 'How?'); the -pag-form
also suggests Purpose (answering 'Wherefore?').

16Cf. Givón's (1979:342) 'teleological imperative', which
argues that: 'Where no external cause can be observed, and a
change in the state of the universe nevertheless occurs, then
an internal cause must be at work. That is, at least some
participant in the change must be an agent, capable of
volitional action' (emphasis in the original). Aristotle's
influence is also apparent in Moreno's (1993:160-163)
hypothesis that Causative constructions must involve at least
two of three semantic primitives, namely 'force' (Efficient
Cause), 'transition' (Motion, kinesis), and 'purpose' (Final
Cause). Although such primitives may be abstractable from
specific causal formulations, these terms are, as Moreno
admits, typological meta-terms rather than language-specific
semantic terms. As such, they abandon language-specific
semantics in favor of traditional metaphysical ready-mades.
have a tendency to coalesce.\textsuperscript{17} Physical explanations usually highlight either the end (i.e. the Final Cause) or the necessity (i.e. Material Cause) of a given process.

Aristotle's conceptualization of causality has a distinctly teleological emphasis which, though abandoned by the natural sciences, persists in our commonsense view of the world and in the social sciences. It is this teleological aspect of 'cause', highlighting a sense of 'purpose', that we invoke when we speak of 'good causes' or 'lost causes'. In the teleological--and theological--conceptualization of Aristotle, Nature aspires to the goodness of God, the 'unmoved mover'--a conceptualization which, fortified by the ministrations of the scholastic Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century, informed (and increasingly hindered) Western scientific progress until the ascendancy of mechanical explanations, which increasingly relied on Efficient Causes of a Material nature, as these were developed in the textualizing practices that emerged in nineteenth-century Europe as the Naturwissenschaften. As 'explanations' of natural phenomena, Final Causes were gradually lost to the advancements of science and the

\textsuperscript{17}Thus, a(n) (Efficient) parent produces (Final) offspring of the same Form but of different Material. Regarding manufactures, which are motivated by human intelligence, an (Efficient) artist may be moved to apply paint to a canvas, the Material Cause(s), according to a Form she has in mind, the depiction of which is the 'end' or Final Cause. Note that, with the fruits of natural processes like sexual reproduction, the Form is that of the Efficient Cause, while this is not the case with the fruits of intelligence (i.e. the painter is not herself a painting).
technological 'refinements' of the Industrial Revolution. The final scientific stronghold of teleological explanations was biology, which eventually surrendered, by and large, to the Efficient causality of Darwinian natural selection.

Though largely eliminated from the Naturwissenschaften, teleology continues to inform the Geisteswissenschaften, those 'human sciences' which have persistently mimicked aspects of the former in their quest for legitimacy. In particular, Aristotle's telic doctrine of the Four Causes has informed linguistic studies in ways both overt and covert. Most overtly, the Aristotelian Causes served as an explanatory framework for Thomas of Erfurt's fourteenth-century Grammatica Speculativa (cf. Harris & Taylor 1989:75-85). And, as we have seen, causality (as embodied in Causative constructions in natural languages) provides an extremely productive stimulus for meta-linguistic analyses in the modern departmental discipline of linguistics.

More covertly (because empirically 'unprovable'), teleology informs all 'functionalist' views of language whereby language serves as a 'means' or 'instrument' of communication, reflecting a reality 'beyond' its own structures. Such thinking is particularly salient in accounts of language acquisition and of grammaticalization, each of which is difficult to conceive of as such without positing a goal orientation of some sort; hence, for instance, Hopper & Traugott's (1993:66) claim that:
'the claim that grammaticalization (and indeed language change in general) is motivated by speaker-hearer interactions and communicative strategies is a claim that change is goal-oriented'.

Teleology is probably unavoidable in the human sciences,\textsuperscript{18} since goal-orientation is an undeniably crucial dimension of human activity and experience and since language, culture, and psychology cannot exist 'in themselves' apart from human beings. Thus, Hopper & Traugott (1993:66) admit that 'languages clearly are not goal-oriented, but ... their speakers may be, consciously or unconsciously'.

Nevertheless, linguists do well to be suspicious of teleological explanations. Grammaticalization studies occasionally foster the impression that certain languages (or parts thereof) are suffering a 'midlife crisis' which time will eventually mend (thus providing yet another way of writing off fractious non-conformity to a priori categories and assumptions). At its most insidious, teleological thinking validates a spurious sense of entitlement insofar as it feeds the 'evolutionary prejudice' which Sapir (1921/1949:123) condemned as 'probably the most powerful deterrent of all to clear thinking'. Instances of the abuse of such thinking abound throughout the sciences; linguistics has been no

\textsuperscript{18}That this should be a 'problem' is a measure of the desire of the human sciences to resemble the natural sciences.
exception.19

In abandoning teleology in favor of mechanical causes, Western scientists (and would-be scientists) have not escaped their mythologizing past, which continues to be facilitated (NB: not 'caused'!) by their grammatical habits. The mythological status of mechanical causality, which implies that any given event must have been initiated by an animate(d) being (cf. Talmý's 'Force Dynamics' and the modern myth-maker Freud's 'drives' on which they are in part modelled), was quite obvious to Whorf (1941/1956:243):

'We are constantly reading into nature fictional acting entities, simply because our verbs must have substantives in front of them. We have to say "It flashed" or "A light flashed," setting up an actor, "it" or "light," to perform what we call an action, "to flash." Yet the flashing and the light are one and the same!'

Whorf's insight was neither new nor novel. The status of such 'fictional entities' in 'reality' had been in much dispute--largely theological--among the scholastics in the Middle Ages, in which 'realists' struggled to save the 'truth'

19E.g. in the nineteenth century, A.W. Schlegel's typological division of languages into isolative, agglutinative, and inflective types was expanded and given temporal organization by Wilhelm von Humbolt to suggest an evolution from the most 'primitive' (i.e. the isolative, e.g. Chinese) to the most 'advanced' (i.e. the inflective, especially Sanskrit, and by extension, Indo-European as a whole--naturlich) (cf. Harris & Taylor 1989:151-164). Even today, alphabetic writing tends to be viewed as writing par excellence, the outcome of a self-perfecting developmental process beginning with pictures and extending through pictograms or logograms to syllabaries and ending with phonocentric alphabets, despite the fact that one sort of system need not develop into another (cf. Harris 1986:57-75).
from 'nominalists' (cf. Harris & Taylor 1989:xv, Russell 1945:463-476). In the increasingly positivistic nineteenth century, Friedrich Nietzsche, a displaced and marginalized linguist,\(^{20}\) had also recognized the enabling condition that grammar provides for our continuing (if unacknowledged) indulgence in mythology. In a passage strikingly similar to Whorf’s (above), the wandering German philologist criticizes our commonsense, 'vulgar' understanding which, even while subject to 'the seduction of language', (mis)informs the sciences (Nietzsche 1887/1967:45):

>'For just as the popular mind separates the lightning from its flash and takes the latter for an action, for the operation of a subject called lightning, so popular morality mistakes strength for expressions of strength, as if there were a neutral substratum behind the strong man, which was free to express strength or not to do so. But there is no such substratum; there is no "being" behind doing, effecting, becoming; the "doer" is merely a fiction added to the deed; the deed is everything. The popular mind in fact doubles the deed; when it sees the lightning flash, it is the deed of a deed; it posits the same event first as cause and then a second time as its effect. Scientists do no better when they say "force moves," "force causes," and the like ... [O]ur entire science still lies under the misleading influence of language and has not disposed of that little changeling, the "subject"' (On the Genealogy of Morals: First Essay, Section 13).

In the latter part of the twentieth century, the physicist

\(^{20}\)Nietzsche found it necessary to displace himself from the university (and, frequently, from the Germanic regions) because of his intense awareness of the way in which philology had unproductively shackled its enterprise. He has subsequently been so marginalized within linguistic studies that few people (within or without linguistics) seem to be aware that he had started his professional career—and most promisingly—as a linguist.
David Bohm (1980/1983:29) concurred with these linguists in observing that:

'the subject-verb-object structure of sentences ... implies that all action arises in a separate entity, the subject, and that, in cases described by a transitive verb, this action crosses over the space between them to another separate entity, the object'.

Can there be any doubt? In Western thinking, the Thing is King. Recall that Nouns are 'names' (of 'things') and that Substantives name 'substances' which 'stand beneath' the phenomenal world of appearances, according to the 'naive' commonsense understanding of Indo-European peoples (cf. Whorf (1939a/1956:141).

But what is a thing? At its most basic, a 'thing' is an assemblage (cf. Whorf 1939a/1956:147-148, Heidegger 1971:174, Tyler 1987:152-156, Bohm 1980/1983:54), a gathering, which may be understood in terms of an 'object', an 'action', an 'event', a 'condition', and/or a 'meeting' (Bohm 1980/1983:54). The Anglo-Saxon term seems to have designated a legislative body which gathered seasonally or under certain specified conditions (cf. Tyler 1987:152). A similar origin applies to the Latin equivalent res 'thing', which referred to 'something' which 'concerns somebody, an affair, a contested matter, a case at law', also known as a causa (here akin to the 'for the sake of' sense of the Final Cause) (Heidegger 1971:175). Like the venerated monolith at the core of the Kaaba, the thing gathers—or, rather, '[t]he thing things. Thinging gathers' (Heidegger 1971:174)--and it does so whether
or not it exists as a tangible, visible 'object' or 'substance'. In the words of Deleuze & Guattari (1987:263):

'Climate, wind, season, hour are not of another nature than the things, animals, or people that populate them, follow them, sleep and awaken with them. This should be read without a pause: the-animal-stalks-at-five-o'clock'.

Or, in the more staccato cadences of the seasoned social scientist, Bateson (1979/1980:67, boldface mine, WLS) observes that:

'Language continually asserts by the syntax of subject and predicate that "things" somehow "have" qualities and attributes. A more precise way of talking would insist that the "things" are produced, are seen as separate from other "things," and are made "real" by their internal relations and by their behavior in relationship with other things and with the speaker'.

Things deeply inform our thinking--in both the mundane, practical domain and--especially--in the abstract discourses of the sciences. Tyler (1987:154) challenges us to 'spend a whole day in normal talk without once using the term [thing]' because '"the thing is that," "things," "somethings," "everythings" and "nothings" overpopulate our everyday patterns of speech ...' When we speak of thinking,21 'our thinking must be of something, about something, with something, even when nothing much is there' (Tyler 1987:154-155). To reiterate, the recurrences that consitute linguistic patterning--the virtually real--force equivalences among

---

21Recall that Whorf (1940/1956:220) argues that '"Talk" OUGHT TO BE a more noble and dignified word than "think"' (capitals in the original).
phenomenal 'events' and 'objects' that otherwise, 'in themselves', have little in common--privileging 'objects' in the process (Tyler 1987:155):

'Grammar, by means of collocation, confirms us in our lexical addiction to things and makes us unresistant conspirators to the continuing hegemony of things as objects of thought and topics of discourse. That is how things "pile up" and "get the better of us".'

'To be real is to be a "thing"', writes the physicist Bohm (1980/1983:54). Things are the very stuff of reality (again, < L res 'thing'). Like that 'little changeling, the "subject"', a 'real thing' is really a redundancy. In the social sciences, 'things' are assumed to 'underlie' behaviors and processes, and as such they thus constitute the (ever-elusive) 'objects' of research (e.g. the economist's 'market', the cognitive scientist's 'memory traces', and the Chomskian linguist's 'L[anguage] A[quisision] D[evice]', among other machinic hyper-realities).

Among this assembly, causes are special things. The privileged status of 'cause' in the vast and fertile family of things is obvious in the cross-linguistic procession of 'res, Ding, causa, cosa, chose, and thing' assembled by Heidegger (1971:175-176). In a sense, causality 'just doesn't bear thinking about'. The skeptical empiricist Hume demonstrated that causality (as a 'necessary connection' between two events) vanishes under scrutiny; we can only observe the constant conjunction of certain events so that our understanding of causality 'is derived entirely from
experience, and ... all of our experimental conclusions proceed from the supposition that the future will be conformable to the past' (Hume 1748/1955:49). Causality invokes resemblances, i.e. 'the resemblance of the past to the future' (Hume 1748/1955:51). Attempts to 'get at' causality--including that of Causatives--through analytical means have left it as such 'untouched'. Conjunction is empirically observable; causality is not. When subject to analysis, all causes are lost. Its nature as an assemblage-

22Regarding the 'necessity' of a given connection, Bohm (1957:16) notes that 'it is a general failure of causal relationships that they do not in reality determine future effects uniquely'. Every prediction contains a range for error, e.g. a one-to-many correspondence which 'will in general limit the effect to a certain range of possiblilities', as when one aims a gun toward a specific target and fires successive shots (Bohm 1957:16). There is likewise a many-to-one correspondence so that 'many different kinds of causes can produce essentially the same effect'; e.g. all rain within a given watershed area will reach the same destination regardless of precisely where it drops (Bohm 1957:17).

23As Russell (1945:666-667) notes, 'where psychology is concerned [as opposed to physics, WLS], Hume allows himself to believe in causation in a sense which, in general he condemns'. If causal connections result from the habit of conjoining A and B, we have merely deferred our understanding since 'the law of habit is itself a causal law' (Russell 1945:667). Hume does, however, demonstrate that 'pure empiricism is not a sufficient basis for science' (Russell 1945:674).

24It is interesting that Whorf, arguing that 'covert categories are quite apt to be more rational than overt ones' (1936?/1956:80), selects causation as his illustrative instance. A covert category may evolve 'a deep persuasion of a principle behind phenomena', e.g. 'of force, of causation' so that '[1]ater this covert idea may be more or less duplicated in a word and a lexical concept invented by a philosopher: e.g., CAUSATION. From this point of view many preliterate ('primitive') communities, far from being subrational, may show the human mind functioning on a higher
-or the mental dynamic of assembling the unity of before-and-
after, cause-and-effect--constitutes *la cosa de la causa*, the
'thingliness' of the 'cause' (which, like *la cosa nostra*, is
often a covert operation). Likewise, we have noted that
linguistic Causative constructions, as things, have repeatedly
occasioned a vast and varied collection of languages,
linguistic theories and theorists, linguistic explanatory, and
metalinguistic descriptive/explanatory devices. Here, things
come together. (Of course, they rarely seem to do so
seamlessly.)

Like all myths (which, by definition, address vital human
matters), most stories of causality contain a strongly
anthropomorphic dimension. (This is, after all, what makes
myths meaningful.) An especially explicit recognition and
acknowledgement of this anthropomorphism is encountered in the
prototype of the causative manipulation situation assembled by
Lakoff & Johnson (1980:72-73), as discussed in 1.1. Recall
that this model contains the features of an essentially human
Efficient Cause which acts toward a set goal (Final Cause)
according to a plan (Formal Cause), using his/her body or an
instrumental extension thereof to effect a perceptible
physical change in something (Material Causes). Clearly, the
homunculus continues to perform a vital rôle in folk
conceptualizations of the universe, despite the premature

and more complex plane of rationality than among civilized
men. We do not know that civilization is synonymous with
rationality' (Whorf 1936?/1956:81).
protests of certain physical scientists that causality as we
know it has been dispensed with.

Twentieth-century physical field theory has, of course, reduced causality to a statistical phenomenon by acknowledging Heisenbergian indeterminacy. Causal laws disappear when observers carry their measurements of physical phenomena to a quantum-mechanical degree of precision. In the sub-atomic realm, 'forces' become 'interactions' (another anthropomorphism!) reflecting, for example, 'the collective macroscopic effect of ... multiple photon exchanges' (Capra 1991:217). All local causes have, from this perspective, disappeared, so that it is the whole which determines the behavior of its parts.25 A scientist's prediction that a certain percentage of entities will go a certain way cannot also predict which particular entities will go that way, just as an insurance company's actuarial tables can predict more or less how many individuals will die next year without being able to identify precisely who will die. This scientific perspective, which heralds a startling re-emergence of the Heraclitean flux which likewise dissolves hope of ultimate

25Bohm (1957:69) discourages a too-facile dismissal of causality by noting (and later demonstrating) that 'the indeterminacy principle necessitates a renunciation of causality only if we assume that this principle has an absolute and final validity ... On the other hand, if we suppose that this principle applies only as a good approximation and only in some limited domain ... , then room is left open for new kinds of causal laws to apply in new domains'.
certainty in a sea of probabilities, remains difficult for most Western(ized) people to imagine in terms of 'causality'. This perspective seems to many to bespeak an alienation from vital 'humane' concerns which typifies--and should remain confined to--the physics lab or the insurance company.27

Bohm explicitly recognizes the physicist's recovery of the Heraclitean flux of the pre-Socratics, which the modern equation of matter with energy implies. In this flux, 'things' are abstracted from the flowing movement, arising and vanishing in the total process of the flow' (Bohm 1980/1983:48):

'Not only is everything changing, but all is flux. That is to say, what is is the process of becoming itself, while all objects, events, entities, conditions, structures, etc., are forms that can be

26Linguists, take note! This admission from the 'hardest' of the 'hard' sciences should inspire all linguists with real humility regarding their own even-more-ghostly creations. Tom Stoppard's (1982:54) play The Real Thing takes the proper tone: 'There is, I suppose, a world of objects which have a certain form, like this coffee mug. I turn it, and it has no handle. I tilt it, and it has no cavity. But there is something real here which is always a mug with a handle. I suppose. But politics, justice, patriotism--they aren't even like coffee mugs. There's nothing real there separate from our perception of them. So if you try to stick labels on them, "farce," "fraud," "condemned," and try to change them as though there were something there to change, you'll get frustrated, and frustration will finally make you violent. If you know this and proceed with humility, you may perhaps alter people's perceptions so that they behave a little differently at that axis of behavior where we locate politics or justice; but if you don't know this, then you're acting on a mistake. Prejudice is the expression of this mistake'.

27It is interesting that Whorf was quite familiar with both of these contexts, which may well have reinforced his conception of causality and other scientisms in terms of myth.
abstracted from this process'.\(^{28}\)

Capra (1991) explicitly likens this 'rheomode' to a world view shared by many Eastern religions. The behaviour of sub-atomic particles graphically evokes Shiva's rhythmic dance of creation and destruction (cf. Capra 1991:242-245). Here, as in spacetime at large, 'all events are connected, but the connections are not causal' (Capra 1991:186). This mode of understanding encouraged Bohm (1980/1983:177) to propose a new 'implicate order' of the universe such that an holistic 'total order' is implicit in ('folded into') each region of space and time: 'everything is enfolded into everything' rather like the image of a hologram.\(^{29}\) This new order contrasts with the current 'explicate order', which preserves strict linearity and the determinism of local cause-and-effect.\(^{30}\)

---

\(^{28}\)Tyler (1987:136) implies that if this consciousness were truly to be realized, '[w]e would no longer think of time as a locus or container and we would no longer speak of "being on time" or "being in time," but of "being time," and we would find it stranger to say "I am an object" than to say "I am time".

\(^{29}\)Cf. Leibniz (1902:263): 'Now, this interconnection, relationship, or this adaptation of all things to each particular one, and of each one to all the rest, brings it about that every simple substance has relations which express all the others and that it is consequently a perpetual living mirror of the universe' (TheMonadology: Section 56). Bohm (1980/1983:207) acknowledges the similarity of his implicate order to Leibniz's monadology but suggests that 'Leibniz's monads had a permanent existence, whereas our basic elements are only moments and are thus not permanent'. Bohm's 'things' are apparently less real than Leibniz's.

\(^{30}\)Likewise, as the last fin de siècle approached, Nietzsche mused that '[t]here is no after-one-another, but only an into-one-another, a process in which the single moments that succeed each other do not condition each other as
Despite such 'liberationist' rhetoric, natural scientists have not actually dispensed with causality in their thinking and writing, even when they claim they have. As Jones (1982:100) notes, 'causality is the lifeblood of the sciences'. Every 'explanation' invokes causality. To this extent, causality remains a necessary myth in science. This viability carries the risk that many 'observers' will fail to recognize when modes of human behavior are being projected onto nature. This is unfortunate. In the post-industrial era (as in previous eras), unscrupulous powers have often projected human lusts and appetites onto nature and then, with cynical duplicity, have invoked that 'nature' to justify and enable the noxious practices they have spawned (hence, for example, the social Darwinist discourses of 'business ethics'). Such duplicity intensely annoyed Nietzsche (1968/1886:219), who forcefully denounced the social forces of positivism which reify causes as 'forces of nature':

'One should not wrongly reify "cause" and "effect," as the natural scientists do (and whoever, like them, now "naturalizes" in his thinking), according to the prevailing mechanical doltishness which makes the cause press and push until it "effects" its end; one should use "cause" and "effect" only as pure concepts, that is to say, as conventional fictions for the purpose of designation and communication—*not* for explanation. In the "itself" there is nothing of "causal connections," of

causes and effects' (The Will to Power; item 631, ctd. in Kaufmann 1974:263). This anticipation of Bohm's (1980/1983) 'implicate order' is itself suggested by the Verbal morphosyntax of Causatives, whereby cause-and-effect are formally conflated by either Givónian (1980) binding or by morphological expansion.
"necessity," or of "psychological non-freedom"; there the effect does not follow the cause, there is no rule of "law." It is we alone who have devised cause, sequence, for-each-other, relativity, constraint, number, law, freedom, motive, and purpose; and when we project and mix this symbol world into things as if it existed "in itself," we act once more as we have always acted—mythologically' (Beyond Good and Evil: Part I, Section 12).

A particularly tenacious modern 'naturalization' has been the construction of will as a quasi-mechanical 'force' which 'moves' the machinic body. This is an advancement upon the mind/body dualism established by Plato and reinforced by Descartes. Interestingly, while Descartes had argued that the mind and the body operate in separate yet parallel synchronicity, Europeans in the nineteenth century, informed by encroaching industrialism, increasingly integrated the two in terms of the celebrated Victorian 'virtue' of 'will power' (cf. May 1969). This designation of will as 'cause' is yet another 'expression' of the modernist myth of the self-sufficient subject, of the inviolable integrity of the Cartesian cogito; as Tyler (Ms.a) notes, 'Wherever will and intentionality are implicated in the process of communication,

---

31 According to Descartes (1968:163), '... I consider man's body as being a machine, so built and composed of bones, veins, muscles, nerves, and skin, that although it had no mind in it, it would still move in all the same ways that it does at present, when it does not move by the direction of its will, or, consequently, with the help of the mind ...' (Sixth Meditation).

32 Cf. Descartes (1968:164): '[T]here is a great difference between mind and body, in that body, by its nature, is always divisible and that mind is entirely indivisible' (Sixth Meditation).
the subject is privileged over the other’.\textsuperscript{33}

Needless to say, philosophy and psychological analysis have severely problematized the nature of 'will' as a unified subjectivity in 'control' of matter. A scholar may, for instance, have the (conscious and stated) intention of finishing a research project, but this cannot occur until her (unconscious) intentionality is engaged (cf. May 1969:234). The mind's willful control over the body, over matter, is thus problematical. (Anglo-American legal systems assume this, for in the law the establishment of intentionality—an inherently uncertain and arbitrary affair—is essential to finding culpability.)

Since the mythical entities that move our (meta)physical world are basically humans (writ either 'large' or 'small'), it is arguably in the dimension of human (inter)actions that causality, whether as (Efficient) 'push' or (Final) 'pull', remains most intensely viable. Questions pertaining to causality (or the lack thereof) often dissolves the

\textsuperscript{33}Incidentally, May (1969:228) reminds us that intention, a purpose-linked notion, derives from Latin in 'into, toward' plus tendere 'to stretch' so that intention suggests a 'stretching toward something', a relationship. It is interesting that Hiligaynon -pa- gathers similar notions in suggesting 'tendency', 'intention', and 'intensity' along with (turning or moving toward a) 'direction'. Its 'interpersonal intensification' performativity also suggests 'tending to' and '(giving or paying) attention' (cf. Heidegger's Sorge 'care'). Thus, -pa- may mark an attractive force (cf. 'love') as well as a driving one (cf. 'will'). This language thus attends to the active nature of meaning.
rationalistic gap between epistemology and ethics. As mentioned in 1.1, Christianity distinguishes sins of commission (i.e. actively doing harm) from sins of omission (i.e. failing to prevent harm). The law distinguishes tort from negligence and murder from manslaughter. The current passionate medico-legal debates about the 'right to die' and 'physician-assisted suicide' repeatedly relate issues of causality. If a physician indirectly assists or facilitates a patient's death by making a lethal amount of 'pain killer' available (with instructions) or, more directly, injects a lethal dosage into the patient, what is she culpable of in either case (if she is 'culpable' at all)? By removing a comatose patient's life-support system (and thus 'allowing' him to die), is a physician not also 'causing' the patient's death? There may be, after all, some real justice in the linguist's ranking of 'Permissives' ('allowing to die') and 'Assistives' ('helping to die') under the superordinate 'Causatives' ('causing to die' or 'killing'), and it emerges with particular force and

34I.e. between treating people as 'things' and as 'people', which relates the issue of mind vs. matter. Even at a 'prehuman' biological level, there is a fundamental distinction in how causality operates, as explained by Bateson (1980:106): '[F]or the material universe, we shall commonly be able to say that the 'cause' of an event is some force or impact exerted upon some part of the material system by some one other part. One part acts upon another part. In contrast, in the world of ideas, it takes a relationship, either between two parts or between a part at time 1 and the same part at time 2, to activate some third component which we may call the receiver. What the receiver (e.g., a sensor end organ) responds to is a difference or a change.'
urgency in such intense human scenarios.\textsuperscript{35}

The myth of causality also speaks deeply to the Western yearning for origins, a desire which implicitly acknowledges a consciousness of displacement (or of something being out of place). This yearning, inherited in large part from Plato, animates every scientific enterprise.\textsuperscript{36} In medicine, for example, it drives the ongoing searches for the 'cause(s)' of cancer and AIDS, those 'foreign invaders' that ravage our bodies and which we hope to track down and annihilate at their source. In linguistics, it continues to stimulate ongoing projects in the reconstruction of protolanguages and etymologies. However, despite its considerable productivity and demonstrable 'usefulness', originary thinking (like much else) can become an objectionably naïve dead end when it is wrongly 'reified'.

In linguistics, the naïveté of such originary thinking is particularly obvious in the numerous discarded (?) theories of meaning which are based on reference. An especially egregious example is taken from a source that is commonly regarded as the foundational text of linguistics as a departmental discipline (Bloomfield 1933:149, brackets mine, WLS):

'\textit{The central meaning is favored in the sense that we

\textsuperscript{35}Recall that Hiligaynon -pa- in conjunction with VOICE often implicates 'intention', 'intensity', and/or 'urgency' in an effort to 'get things moving'.

\textsuperscript{36}Recall that 'originality', as a Western virtue, is (at least touted as) a desirable quality for work in both the arts and sciences.
understand a form (that is, respond to it) in the central meaning unless some feature of the practical situation forces us to look to a transferred meaning. If we hear someone say There goes a fox! we look for a real [] fox, and if this is out of the question, we are likely [] to take the utterance as displaced [] speech ...'

By this criterion, the majority of utterances we make in daily discourse are 'displaced' from their 'natural' contexts. (Apparently, the most 'natural' topic for a 'real' conversation is the speakers' proximate physical environment.) This reduction of meaning to reference-as-physical-presence recapitulates a sort of degenerate Platonist nostalgia for originary lost Forms, where the Forms have been displaced from the transcendent realm to the mundane.\(^{37}\) Though current readers may respond to such intrepid positivism with laughter, 'originary' thinking in terms of 'things' continues to operate in linguistics in such putative oppositions as literal vs. metaphorical, competence vs. performance, and \textit{langue} vs. \textit{parole}—illegally, I believe, insofar as the first term of

\(^{37}\)In an apparently precocious realization of Bloomfield's vision, Jonathan Swift's (1961:158-159) Lappan linguists at the Academy of Lagado had, two centuries before, perfected 'a Scheme for entirely abolishing all Words whatsoever' in the reocentrist belief that, 'since Words are only Names for \textit{Things}, it would be more convenient for all Men to carry about them, such \textit{Things} as were necessary to express the particular Business they are to discourse on'. This method 'hath only this Inconvenience attending it; that if a Man's Business be very great, ... he must be obliged in Proportion to carry a greater Bundle of \textit{Things} upon his Back ... I have often beheld two of those Sages almost sinking under the Weight of their Packs ...' In practice, this method was confined to a small group of the 'Learned and Wise' due to the influence of 'Women in conjunction with the Vulgar and Illiterate', for '[s]uch constant irreconcilable Enemies to Science are the common People' (\textit{Gulliver's Travels}: Book III, Chapter 5).
each pair, as a self-constituted 'thing', is privileged as the basis or grounding for the second.

A current body of discourse, exemplified by Lakoff & Johnson (1980), has sought to invoke bodily experience as a firm, reliable epistemological grounding. The desired reliability is, I believe, not to be found there. Though particular bodily experiences may be in some sense universal, I would argue that they remain—as such—ineffable, confined to the domain of the private and personal, because whatever is universal in particular bodies acquires its universality—as such—only through the intervention of language, i.e. of a particular language, which (to reiterate once again) imposes its own reality on things. After all, nobody is forced to single-handedly re-invent his or her body; every culture and language always already provides an abundance of body terms and metaphors (cf. Tyler Ms.b). In complementary fashion, the currently popular discourse on grammaticalization likewise assumes the physical dimension to be basic via its commonplace word-for-thing surrogationalism, but it recapitulates a too-familiar story of the transcendence of the physical (i.e. through successive 'semantic bleachings'), a pilgrim's progress from Noun (or Verb) to affix (cf. Hopper & Traugott 1993:106-112), i.e. from thing to relation, from concrete to abstract, from material to spiritual (cf. Tyler 1987:171,
Causality, like lineal thinking in general, exists as a 'cultural lie' that we tell ourselves to render life predictable and negotiable. As Jones (1982:100) argues:

'Causality is the antithesis of randomness, chance, spontaneity. It is the element of order in time ... Causal time, like structural space, provides a metaphor of order that wards off the fear of chaos and death'.

Throughout the ascendancy of modern science, which derived from (theological) philosophy, the universe had been understood as a cosmos, an ordered whole, with causality serving as the principle of order (Newton's universe, now largely assimilated into our common sense, is one such cosmos), which could be understood through the parts that analysis revealed. If mechanical causality still predominates in our ordering of reality, it has done so largely at the behest of the 'empowering' Enlightenment discourses of science and technology which have emerged as such in relatively recent times. As Jung (1960:69-70) notes:

'the rationalistic attitude of the West is not the

38 An example of a Noun-to-affix movement is provided by German Wegen 'ways' > wegen 'because of'; an example of Verb-to-affix is English have 'hold, possess' > auxiliary (cf. I have eaten) > clitic (cf. We've built a garage) (Hopper & Traugott 1993:106-109). Although all metalinguistic descriptions may be allegorical, I am especially suspicious of this allegory. Many 'grammaticalizations' have doubtless occurred more or less as described, but the enormous interest they have generated seems motivated in large part by Western (meta)normatives of the transcendence of the corporeal. The recontextual conclusion that a given linguistic form must have originally referred to a 'thing' is itself a 'thing' that 'comes' far too easily and perhaps prematurely.
only possible one and is not all-embracing, but is in many ways a prejudice and a bias that ought perhaps to be corrected ... The concept of Tao pervades the whole philosophical thought of China. Causality occupies this paramount position with us, but it has acquired its importance only in the course of the last two centuries, thanks to the levelling influence of the statistical method on the one hand and the unparalleled success of the natural sciences on the other ...'

All systems of thought (like all lies) both enable and disable. Western rationalism--particularly as encountered in the human sciences--still stigmatizes as 'irrational' the noncausal aspects of reality which we encounter daily and understand in deeply personal ways, including chance (cf. Bohm 1957) and the 'magical causality' that Jung (1960) has recognized in synchronicity. (All causality, I would add, is 'magical' at heart.) As Jung (1960:69) explains:

'The causality principle asserts that the connection between cause and effect is a necessary one. The synchronicity principle asserts that the terms of a meaningful coincidence are connected by simultaneity and meaning'.

In contrast to causal determinism, which has a 'timelike' separation (and gathering) of events (e.g. somebody across town dials my number and, seconds later, my phone whirs), synchronicity has a separation (and gathering) which is 'spacelike' (e.g. I mention a long-lost friend's name at the same time that the phone whirs, and the caller turns out to be that same friend) (Jones 1982:104). Given the very vastness of spacetime, it is obvious that causality can link only a mere fraction of all events. As Jones (1982:112, boldface mine, WLS) argues:
'Causality and synchronicity are not polar opposites complementing one another. Rather, causally related events that can be interpreted only in terms of the modern metaphors of space and time form a subclass of the far more numerous synchronously related events. Causality is thus a metaphor-linked notion. It can exist only relative to a specific view of space and time'.

The scientist's 'celebration' of causality is thus simply one point of view among others, albeit a viewpoint which is privileged in vast disproportion to its applicability to either the universe at large or to the minutiae of daily concerns. Just as the temporal ordering of events seen across vast distances depends on the observer's position, so is all order a function of perspective.

There is no gainsaying that causality is a useful myth in the temporal, workaday domain; it has certainly been a most productive one. However, like all belief systems, causality simultaneously enables and disables. The price of linear order has been high. If it enables 'progress' (an especially questionable modernist value), it also creates its own anxieties. As Jones (1982:102) argues:

'If causality is the temporal ordering mechanism that secures us against chaos, it has also given to time its quality of relentlessness and inevitability so that we feel ourselves being dragged kicking and screaming toward inescapable death. Our linear, sequential, causal time is like a narrow one-way road to doom'.

If this assessment is correct, the linear order would seem to exacerbate the fear of death which, Becker (1973) argues, stimulates all people and peoples to construct their self-validating causa sui projects in their flights from cruel
determinism; everyone 'wants to conquer death by becoming the
teacher of himself' (Becker 1973:36). Such projects of
validation, writ large, are an (if not 'the') essential
function of every culture. Becker (1973:4-5) argues that every
person who comes into the world:

'must desperately justify himself as an object of
primary value in the universe; he must stand out,
be a hero, make the biggest possible contribution
to world life, show that he counts more than
anything or anyone else ... [S]ociety is and always
has been ... a symbolic action system ... designed
to serve as a vehicle for earthly heroism ... What
the anthropologists call "cultural relativity" is
thus really the relativity of hero-systems the
world over'.

Our predominant hero system, the validating mythology of
science-and-technology, has, in the years since World War II,
clearly metamorphosed into a burgeoning cult of techno-fascism
(cf. Tyler Ms.b) which encourages its initiates to master
reality by a 'divide and conquer' strategy. This reminds us
that institutional knowledge structures are always power
structures. The (Pyrrhic?) triumph of the analytic method has
undeniably brought the Westernized world some spectacular
successes--its 'progress'--as well as its (self-fulfilling?)
apocalyptic dread. Like Shiva, modern physics creates and

39Language is a vital part of such cultural projects. Recall, for instance, that Philippine Nominal morphology
distinguishes HUMAN from NON-HUMAN PARTICIPANTS through (a)
the 'Proper' Determiners si/ni and through (b) restrictions on
placement within the NUCLEUS; i.e. a HUMAN PARTICIPANT cannot
occur as a NUCLEAR 'PATIENT' if it is UNFOCUSED; in order to
'stand out' properly, an UNFOCUSED HUMAN 'PATIENT' must be
'pushed' out of the NUCLEUS via the Preposition kay in
Hiligaynon (or 'sheltered' by the cognate 'particle' ku in
Yogad) in order not to be 'overwhelmed'.
destroys. The same discipline that rediscovered the Heraclitean flux and created 'spacetime' (where the speed of light [cf. *kinesis*] is a reliable absolute), has also—in its most practical and productive aspect (the justification for its lavish funding)—created an overwhelmingly redundant abundance of weapons which constitute the surest potential for global annihilation. The paradoxical, schizoid performativity of this knowledge structure is part and parcel of our collective project of Enlightenment.\textsuperscript{40} According to Sloterdijk (1987:130-131):

'The bomb is really the only Buddha that Western reason could understand. Its calm and its irony are infinite. It makes no difference to it how it fulfills its mission, whether in mute waiting or as a firecloud; for it, the change of aggregate circumstances has no relevance. As with Buddha, everything that could be said is said through its mere existence. The bomb is not one bit more evil than reality and not one bit more destructive than we are'.

The present discursive foray into recent world history, including its touches of orientalism, is intended to remind us that the university is not a retreat from the 'real world'; with increasing frankness, the university asserts itself in the global marketplace, hand in hand with the forces of modern techno-fascism which, like a global cancer, are voraciously

\textsuperscript{40}Events of the present century have graphically and repeatedly demonstrated the dangers inherent in all institutionalized knowledge structures, which are always vulnerable to exploitation by cynical powers. Derrida's 'nihilistic' project of 'deconstruction' is an extended acknowledgement of these dangers; he is deconstructing because he is all too aware that unchecked construction can lead, and has led, to Auschwitz.
incorporating all culture and nature (cf. Tyler Ms.b). As a
departmental discipline constructed within the university,
linguistics is unavoidably enfolded in the power structures
and power relations that move the world at large. The Western
urge to dominion over nature and culture, i.e. the
Enlightenment project of 'overcoming', thus profoundly informs
the discipline of linguistics, quite independently of the
personal politics of its constituent linguists. The
institutional will to power emerges in both the rhetoric and
the choice of topics which 'mainstream' linguists consider
appropriate.

As to the first, the rhetoric of mainstream linguistics
is oftentimes unabashedly fascistic. Deleuze & Guattari
(1987:3-25) decry the 'arborescent thinking' of formalism,
whose hierarchical branches shelter numerous and various
shadow-play\textsuperscript{41} acts of domination, involving, for instance,
'Government', 'Binding', 'C-Command', and sundry militaristic-
corporate 'Advancements' and 'Promotions'. In functionalism,
too, the agonism of 'Force Dynamic' relations mercilessly pits
more or less aggressive 'Antagonists' against more or less
resistant 'Agonists', as noted in 1.1. (Is such 'dog-eat-dog'
naturalist machismo really necessary? If not, why is it so
pervasive?) Furthermore, in all major theories, the Subject

\textsuperscript{41}The term shadow-play is used advisedly. Recall that the
English word theory is etymologically akin to theater, each of
which is geared to provide a 'feast for the eyes' (which may
or may not prove appetizing).
maintains its dominion over both Verbs and Objects, subjecting both to its primary and ultimate control (Tyler Ms.b).

Hierarchies hold a special fascination for linguists of many stripes. In the present study, we have noted that the Case Hierarchy of Control (cf. Figure 1.3) delineates a 'pecking order' of autonomy—i.e. of power—whereby Causees are most resistant when most directly manipulated (or NUCLEAR) and most efficiently obliging when removed (perhaps alienated?) from the direct reach of the powers that be (via OBLIQUE status). Such hierarchies inescapably invoke human power relations, including those that persist in the three extant Medieval hierarchies, namely the military, the church, and the university. The ubiquity of such hierarchies in metalinguistic enterprises subliminally 'reconciles' linguists (as institutionalized subjects in a hierarchical university system) to the fact of hierarchy while simultaneously holding out the uncertain hope that they, too, might one day 'come out on top'.

Such power struggles emerge somewhat less noticeably in the conventional practice of setting off and faithfully enumerating data like so many biological specimens. Apart from the (overestimated?) organizational or logistical usefulness it may serve, this practice covertly maintains the illusion that the linguist has succeeded in imposing order on language. A similar function is served by the imposition and observance of the conventions of 'plain style' (cf. Tyler 1987:5-10),
which banishes the potentially subversive intrusion of puns and poetry, lest the signifier's gross materiality 'have its way with' the vaunted integrity of the signified concept, to the embarrassment of puritanical theorists who might be discomfited by viewing or reporting any but the most Platonic relations. Such intrusions would also compromise the linguist's vaunted position as a self-sufficient subjectivity in control of language.

The discipline's will to power is on occasion rendered explicit, no more obviously than when linguists are being rhetorically enlisted into a collective scientific enterprise. An especially noteworthy instance may be found at a critical foundational moment in the discipline's history, specifically the ominous coda of Bloomfield's Language (1933:509), where the author, attempting to situate the study of language firmly among the Naturwissenschaften, muses that:

'The methods and results of linguistics, in spite of their modest scope, resemble those of natural science, the domain in which science has been most successful. It is only a prospect, but not hopelessly remote, that the study of language may help us toward the understanding and control of human events'.

Over sixty years later, we are apparently no closer to attaining this enticing prospect. Theoretical linguists remain at a distinct disadvantage when vying with natural scientists for funding. To receive any funding at all, they frequently play the language games of 'science' with redoubled (if duplicitous) enthusiasm. Nietzsche's (1888/1954:508) century-
old complaint seems especially applicable to the situation and temper of contemporary linguistics:

'... I have never tired of calling attention to the despiritualizing influence of our current science-industry. The hard helotism to which the tremendous range of the sciences condemns every scholar today is a main reason why those with a fuller, richer, profounder disposition no longer find a congenial education and congenial educators. There is nothing of which our culture suffers more than of the superabundance of pretentious jobbers and fragments of humanity; our universities are, against their will, the real hothouses for this kind of withering of the instincts of the spirit' (Twilight of the Idols: 'What the Germans Lack', Section 3).”

I would add that if linguistics must link its professional fortunes to 'science', it would do well to choose more current and viable models than those available in the nineteenth century, the seventeenth century, or the fifth century B.C.E. These enterprises are lost causes.

As they themselves occasionally lament, linguists remain marginal forces in society at large. The meagerness of their actual influence on public attitudes has been amply demonstrated by the recent public discourses on Ebonics, which have been, by and large, tragi-comically troglodytic in tone and substance. This cultural marginalization of linguistics

---

42The marginalization of Nietzsche, Whorf, and Sapir by linguistics (and other disciplines) reflects in large part their unwillingness to shackle themselves to any contemporary scientific orthodoxy. This perennial displacement is the penalty they pay for public eruptions of erudition that no single discipline could contain.

43Such 'engaging', 'therapeutic' rôles seem more professionally justifiable among linguists of the 'hyphenated' variety. Sociolinguists and various other 'applied linguists' are more ably geared toward addressing broader concerns. At
is, I suspect, part and parcel of the discipline's neglect of
the range of performativity of language. Linguists' failures
to engage with a larger audience reflects in part the
limitations they have deliberately (if often semi-consciously)
built into their enterprise.

The often disabling institutional will to power is
mirrored in the linguist's favored range (and treatment) of
topics. By confining its horizons to the realm of 'things' and
the manipulations thereof, of 'things doing things to things',
i.e. by treating descriptive or representational utterances as
normative, linguistics has both defined and confined its
relevance within the world, achieving a self-definition of
sorts if not self-fulfillment. Non-reocentric uses of language
are written off as the proper domain of other discourses, e.g.
literature, psychology, and philosophy. Linguistics displaces
itself from the humanities to seek harbour in the sciences,
excluding literature and aesthetic concerns from its purview.
Bloomfield (1933:21-22) was quite explicit about the
foundational function of this exclusion:

'[T]he individual features in which the language of
a great writer differs from the ordinary speech of
his time and place, interest the linguist no more

the other extreme, formalists seem—qua formalists—rather
distinctly disabled, Chomsky's extra-linguistic political
unfortunately true that the idea of helping others has a low
status in our times and is consequently not well rewarded, but
in the case of ESL, language teaching, and speech and language
remediation, they are at least rewarded. There are jobs in
these fields, which is more than can be said for theoretical
linguistics'.


than do the individual features of any other person's speech, and much less than do the features that are common to all speakers'.

Needless to say, early professional hopes that this declared differentiation of linguistics from literature and the other humanities would yield a firm identity have been imperfectly realized; linguistics operates in a perpetual state of crisis, as one readily gathers from both public and private utterances of linguists when they assemble (and dissemble) at their conferences.

The reocentric language of techno-science reinforces linguistics in an even subtler way. The linguists' own projects of description and representation are mirrored (if not 'reduplicated') in the predominantly reocentric utterances they prefer to examine. Linguistics produces descriptions of descriptions and representations of representations in such abundance that description and representation seem to be the primary--if not the sole--functions of language. Even while this focus limits the scope of the discipline, it paradoxically and subliminally expresses and reinforces the institutional quest for power. As the Olympian detachment of many of our 'representatives' in Washington (etc.) should remind us, the power to represent is ultimately power over other people. To the degree that mere re-presentation

---

"The contrast with Sapir could not be greater; Sapir's (1921/1949:221-231) Language devotes an entire chapter to literature. Cf. also Bishop & Spitz (1992)."
dominates an enterprise (as in all formalism), it marks a failure to engage creatively with others (i.e. other people, other languages). In conjunction with the linguist's overt 'power' rhetoric, such non-engagement often lends an embarrassing masturbatory tone to the enterprise, betraying the relative impotence of a discipline which has failed to fully explore its own potential.

Of course, linguistics is not entirely impotent. When allied with various technological enterprises (e.g. artificial intelligence), it often achieves a respectable degree of institutional sway, for better or worse. Even in anthropological fieldwork projects like the present one, linguistics benefits from the power differential of the global market which has displaced and made available a sizable pool of language consultants.\(^{45}\)

As topics for analysis, Causativity and Transitivity are especially attractive, I believe, because they directly evoke the power relations that move society. They reaffirm the Enlightenment project of imposing order on nature and culture. If Transitives validate the manipulation of objects in the physical universe (the domain of techno-science), Causatives validate the control of humans by other humans encountered in numerous institutional settings (the domain of techno-fascism). In the process, the study of both Causatives and

\(^{45}\)For two moving accounts of the personal dimensions of such displacements, cf. Appendices A and C.
Transitives reaffirms the Subject/Object dualism conditioned by the Indo-European grammar which informs linguistics. As Tyler observes (Ms.b):

'English grammar systematically dissociates [the] action and process from the agent and the object or permits them to be assigned to the agent or the object as if they were alienable and transferable attributes'.

If the AGENTS of Transitives are dissociated 'accidental tourists', the AGENTS of Causatives are doubly aloof and insulated from consequences (as our analysis of Philippine DISPLACEMENT semantics suggests). The mythology of causality which pervades our everyday thinking and our scientific enterprises establishes an illusion that human control over events is ultimately possible and thus implicitly endorses the goals of techno-science. As Tyler (Ms.b) observes:

'The agent, disengaged from the process, stands outside of it, is unaffected by it, and can interfere in it without being mutually affected. This disengaged agent is the source and instrument of the idea of objectivity'.

As noted earlier, the Causatives of linguistics address 'how'-oriented questions (i.e. 'how things get done') in contrast to the 'why'-oriented 'be-causes' of Aristotle. This focus reflects, I believe, the culture-wide ascendancy of the

---

46Once again, grammar and knowledge construction are inextricably intertwined. Cf. also Whorf (1941/1956:240): 'English and similar tongues lead us to think of the universe as a collection of rather distinct objects and events corresponding to words. Indeed this is the classic picture of classical physics and astronomy--that the universe is essentially a collection of detached objects of different sizes'.
instrumentalist concerns of modern techno-science. More broadly, it dramatizes a longstanding cultural fascination with method, which, as a scheme that one follows, also implicates the linear sequencing that enables causality.\footnote{Cf. Tyler (1987:188-189): 'One of the constant themes of western thought has been the search for apodictic and universal method. We can trace it in the reforms of rhetoric, in the emancipation of logic from dialectic, in the allegorical textual hermeneutics of the scholastics, and in the Cartesian and Baconian revolt against tradition that produced scientific method. In our own times we see it in the triumph of formalism in all branches of thought ...' In an excess of democracy, any idiot can follow the Method and attain Truth.} This instrumentalist emphasis deflects attention from the ethical aspects of human interaction, reinforcing the presumed split between ethics and epistemology, just as the separation of linguistics from literature reaffirms the ancient Platonic/Aristotelian removal of poetry from scientific discourse. As Burke (1945/1969:447) observes:

'\textit{To consider language as a means of information or knowledge is to consider it epistemologically, semantically, in terms of "science." To consider it as a mode of action is to consider it in terms of "poetry."}'

As this separation suggests, linguistics values the productive aspects of language over the novel. In so doing, it aligns itself with the world of work at the expense of play, failing to recognize that 'play' is often 'productive'. (As Piaget and others have demonstrated, each of us [re]creates the world largely through play.) This same emphasis on productivity, which is endemic to the social sciences and
academia at large, has produced a redundant superabundance of texts throughout linguistics and other disciplines. As Tyler (1995:277) notes:

'Books are everywhere in excess, an excess that symbolizes their irrelevance. The overproduction of books, and printed matter generally, is akin to the reproductive frenzy that marks biological populations on the verge of extinction'.

This productivity is mainly 'for show'; few 'readers' have time and inclination to engage deeply with their texts, which are in any case overwhelmingly redundant (Tyler 1995:278).

The burgeoning production of texts, with its attendant global deforestation, is the most tangible aspect of the reocentrism which informs linguistics and other social sciences. As Tyler (1987) argues at length, linguistics is enabled by the technology of writing, which encourages the predominance of visual tropes for knowing-as-seeing (cf. German wissen, English vision) as opposed to knowing-as-doing (cf. the 'can-do' of German kennen and können). Writing reduces language to a product which is separable from its producer and the circumstances of its production (cf. Ong 1982, Tyler 1987). In addition to being 'surrogates' for 'things', words themselves become 'things' as opposed to 'deeds'. It is in large part the alienation of speakers from language and the separation of language from action which preconditions linguistics (cf. Tyler 1987). Minus the consciousness-shifting contribution of writing, already operational in Western discourses since Plato and Aristotle,
linguistics would have no 'object' as such; languages (and their constituent sentences, words, morphemes etc.) would otherwise be difficult to visualize. The linguist's distinction between morphology and lexicon (cf. Aristotle's 'form'/ 'matter' distinction) arises from the easy isolability of segments on the printed page (cf. Tyler 1987:192-193). The discipline's videocentrism yields (to) 'forms', 'shapes', and 'morphemes', which 'per-form' and 'in-form'. Without the reocentric terminology of 'things', of 'languages' and their constituent 'parts', the current text might well have been unwritable—perhaps, qua linguistics text, literally unimaginable. To the extent that it remains dependent on writing, on written texts, linguistics (like other social sciences) cannot really escape reocentrism. In the very process of creating its object of enquiry, linguistics is complicit in 'things'. Writing reifies.

In sum, linguistics remains complicit in power arrangements which pervade our current scientized-and-technologized culture at large. In its complicity, linguistics finds itself positioned rather like the Causee, the 'middleman' who operates in medias res, responding to pressures from 'above' and 'below' and thereby sharing the pains and privileges of both Subject and Object. Subjected to the causes of techno-science, linguistics likewise 'passes the buck' in subjecting language(s) and language enthusiasts to scientisms which are often more dogmatic than scientific.
The notion of 'complicity' suggests that one is neither 'in control' nor completely 'under control'. Most power arrangements leave room for choices. I, for instance, strenuously disapprove of bombing Iraqi children, of funding greedy 'private' corporations, and of polluting the environment, but I have not (yet) found it worth my effort to seriously protest such practices by, say, withholding taxes or ceasing to drive. Everybody has his or her own threshold of tolerance. We all make messy compromises in the interests of 'getting by'. Such is the human condition. This being the case, it behooves us as linguists (for linguists are human beings) to be less rigid in our thinking and writing. In view of the inherent uncertainty that reigns in even the 'hardest' of sciences, we certainly have little room for smugness. We might instead try to cultivate a sense of humility about our own projects and discoveries. (After all, nothing that is truly certain is likely to be very interesting.) In the process, we might learn to treat others, including our fellow professional linguists, with genuine tolerance and respect. This does not exclude challenging others so long as we realize that we too are vulnerable to error. Since we are all 'sentenced', humility would seem the most sensible course. Are the stakes really too low for this?

It cannot have escaped notice that I myself am deeply complicit in many of the practices which I seemingly condemn (but which I primarily wish to open to question). I admit
this. I acknowledge my own obvious complicity in many of the forces and practices I have described, many of which may inform my actions in ways I am totally unaware of. Like Faust, I have taken what was offered me. Institutional support has given me a mouthpiece, and even a voice. I have followed the disciplinary conventions while being (or trying to be) more or less aware of their conventionality. I hope that my analyses have given an inkling of the essential rôle of language(s) in the construction of reality, which, as Plato realized, may be other than what we commonly take it to be. Viewed even in its most deromanticized, 'nuts-and-bolts' aspect, language seduces us, both as speakers and as analysts. I have tried in my descriptions to leave the door open for uses of language which 'defy' description. As my data demonstrate, even 'descriptions' are 'actions', informed by ethical concerns. The 'intensive' uses of Hiligaynon -pa- and the construction of HUMANNESS via the Determiners show that even these most 'descriptive' acts fail to distinguish thought from action and epistemology from ethics. I have not rejected description but have attempted to delineate some of its limits as well as some of its potential.

We all fall prey to our own languages, and to the discourses spawned through them. The forms and conventions of any discipline, like those of any language, both enable and disable. They allow scholars to be productive; but, like the categories of one's own language, they limit what we can say,
think, or write—if we allow them to do so. The will to power is often facilitated by a will to ignorance, which itself can be facilitated by conventions of language. This is, I believe, Whorf's point about the seemingly dictatorial—but, in reality, seductive—power of language over our thought and practice. 48

As a virtuality which creates its own world, language cannot be the Form of transcendent Reason or Truth. In employing language to understand language, linguistics does not transcend language but remains deeply informed by particular languages and cultures. This being the case, linguistics can apply its more or less rigorous methods to the necessary task of unfolding and exposing the highly contingent and constructed nature of all knowledge structures; and it may reconcile us to our existence in a relativistic universe by confronting us with otherness, both 'theirs' and 'ours', if we remain open to such experience. At its best, linguistics renders the exotic familiar and the familiar, exotic. (As Whorf [1942/1956:264] affirms, 'Alienness turns into a new and often clarifying way of looking at things'.) This is not a trivial goal or accomplishment. To do so requires—and

48 We all know people who seem to talk, think, and act almost wholly in clichés. Such immersion in the illusiveness that a given language provides can be evil as well as banal. Adolf Eichmann, among other Nazis, is said to have been almost robotically inclined to speak, think, and act according to the dictates of certain linguistic conventions. And all of us are prone, at least on occasion, to consider our thoughts to be 'good as gold' and our deeds 'right as rain'.
promotes—a paradoxically enabling humility, an appreciation of the possibilities and of the limitations of any method or doctrine. The current study demonstrates, and Tyler (Ms.a) explicitly reminds us, that all categories (including the linguist's meta-linguistic ones) are 'duplicitous. They cannot be the same as what they categorize, and they create sames by a kind of falsification', i.e. 'by an act of forgetting—the forgetting of differences'. Lest we forget, the Greek god Morpheus (morpheme, morph, form, shape, body, thing) was the god of dreams; that is to say, the shaper of illusions, desires, and fears.49

49This terminal sentence is adapted from Bishop & Spitz (1992:23). Cf. also Whorf (1942/1956:269-270): 'Science ... has not yet freed itself from the illusory necessities of common logic which are at bottom necessities of grammatical pattern in Western Aryan grammar; necessities for substances which are only necessities for substantives ... and so on'. Cf. also Nietzsche (1888/1954:483): 'I am afraid we are not rid of God because we still have faith in grammar' (Twilight of the Idols: "Reason" in Philosophy', Section 5).
Appendix A

Hiligaynon Oral Narrative

(1) ang géra the war nag-súgod sang nineteen forty-one
FOC war the war NAG-begin UNFOC nineteen forty-one
'the war started in 1941'

(2) ápang ang Ílog gin-bùmba-hán sang Hapón
but FOC Ilog GIN-bomb- AN UNFOC Japanese
sang December thirteenth nineteen forty-one
UNFOC December thirteenth nineteen forty-one
'but Ilog was bombed by the Japanese on December 13, 1941'

(3) walâ kamí sa ámon baláy
not we OBL our house
'we were not at our home'

(4) kay gin-pa-lakát kamí sang ámon amáy
for GIN-PA-walk we UNFOC our father
'because we were made to leave by our father'

(5) kag ang ámon ilóy opúd
and FOC our mother together
sang ákon ápat ka mánghod nga mga laláki
UNFOC my four QNT sibling LINK PL male
nag-lakát kamí sa katónggan
NAG-walk we OBL marsh
'and our mother, together with my four brothers and me,
  we went to the forest'

---

'This oral narrative was recorded by Concha Ponce in August, 1991. It was transcribed by Walter Spitz and Lynn Poulton and corrected by Ernest Dagohoy. Any errors are my own. Instances of -pa- occur in (4), (6), (9), (26), (42), (72), (81), (98), (101), (106), and (111).
(6) kag nag-pa-bilín ang duhá nákon ka ma-guláng
and NAG-PA-stay FOC two my KA MA-elder
nga laláki opúd sang ákon amáy sa ámon baláy
LINK male together UNFOC my father OBL our house
'and my two older brothers, together with my father, stayed at our house'

(7) kay silíng sang ámon amáy iní duhá ka laláki
for think UNFOC our father these two QNT male
mas da=lág=ko³ silá íya
more big=LA=big they themselves
'because our father thought that these two boys were bigger'

(8) kag kon anó gid mán ang ma-hanábô
and what really also FOC MA-happen
ma-dásig silá mag-dalágan sa ámon
MA-fast they MAG-run OBL us
'and, whatever might happen, they can run faster than us'

(9) ti nag-pa-bílin silá sa ámon baláy
so NAG-PA-stay they OBL our house
'so they stayed at our house'

(10) kag kamí íya nga mga ma-gácmay pa opúd
and we ourselves LINK PL MA-younger also together
ámon ilóy nag-ibákuit kamí sa katúnggan
our mother NAG-evacuate we OBL marsh
'and we younger ones, together with our mother, we evacuated into the marsh'

(11) sang hvébes nga ádlaw may duhá ka éropláno
UNFOC Thurs. LINK day have two QNT airplane

²The root guláng can be glossed as 'ripe', as in Guláng na ang ságing 'The banana is ripe'; or as 'old' as in Guláng ang káhoy 'The tree is old'. Cf. tiguláng 'elderly'.

³The form dalácko 'big' is applied to members of collectives, as in dalácko ang panímaláy ko 'The people in my family are big'.
nga na-batí-án
LINK NA-hear-AN

nga nag-a- lupád sa ibábaw
LINK NAG-IMP-fly OBL above

'on Thursday there were two airplanes we heard that were flying above'

(12) tî kamí íva dîdto sa katúnggan
so we ourselves there OBL marsh

nag-d= in-alágan kamí sa pónó sang lubí
NAG-run=IN-run we OBL trunk UNFOC coconut

'so we there in the marsh, we ran to the trunk of a coconut (tree)'

(13) nag-pa- nágô' kamí sa idálom sang lubí
NAG-PANG-hide we OBL under UNFOC coconut

'we hid under a coconut (tree)'

(14) kag qin-hapâ kamí sang táwo nga ámon nadángpan
and PF- lie us UNFOC person LINK our guardian

dîdto sa katúnggan
there OBL marsh

'and our guardian lay us flat there in the marsh'

(15) però dîdto gali íva sa ámon baláy
but there right he OBL our house

ang ámon ma-gulàng gid sa tanán
FOC our MA-older really OBL all

nag-dalágan siá sa qwâ
NAG-run he OBL out

'but right there at home our eldest brother of all, he ran outside'

(16) key qústo níia mag-tán'aw sang èropláno
for want he MAG-see UNFOC airplane

'because he wanted to see the airplanes'

'The root form is tâgo 'hide'.
(17) ti ang na-kítâ  
FOC NA-see  
nga èropánö nag-a- póurma sang vi  
LINK airplane NAG-IMP-form UNFOC 'V'  
it was seen that the airplanes were forming a "V"'

(18) ti lugár nga ma-lapít na sa baláy  
place LINK MA-near now OBL house  
may nag-dalágan siá sa bálkon sang baláy  
have NAG-run he OBL balcony UNFOC house  
'when it was near the house, he ran to the balcony of the house'

(19) kag may na-bātî-án  
and have NA-hear-AN  
nga ma-túnoq nga lopók  
LINK MA-big LINK report  
'and there was heard a loud report'

(20) bómba gali áto na-húlog sa atubángan gid  
bomb surprise there NA-fall OBL front right  
sang ámon baláy  
UNFOC our house  
'a bomb dropped right in front of our house'

(21) ti ang ámon amáy nag-pa- nágö sa halígi  
so FCC our father NAG-PANG-hide OBL post  
opūd sang isá ko ka ma-guláng nag-pa- nágö man  
together UNFOC one I QNT MA-older NAG-PANG-hide too  
'so our father hid by the post [of the house] together with one older brother who hid also'

(22) ápaŋg walâ nía ma-batî-i  
but not he MA-hear-I  
kon nag-anó na ang ámon ma-guláng  
when NAG-do now FOC our MA-older  
nga ádto sa bálkon  
LINK there OBL balcony
'but he didn't hear anything about what our oldest brother did who was there on the balcony'

(23) hála nía táwag nga táwag
    ITER he call LINK call

    'he called and called'

(24) ti walâ sang nag-a- sabât
    not UNFOC NAG-IMP-answer

    '(but) nobody was answering'

(25) ti nag-dalágan na lang ang ámon amáy
    so NAG-run now only FOC our father

    opúd sang ákon ma-guláng nga iká duhá
    together UNFOC my MA-elder LINK ORD two

    'so my father ran, together with my second-oldest brother'

(26) nag-lúmpat silá pa-náog sa baláy
    NAG-jump they PA-down OBL house

    'they jumped down from the house'

(27) kag nag-hápâ silá sa idálom
    and NAG-lie.prone they OBL under

    'and lay flat underneath'

(28) ang ámon alyíbi nga pónô sang túbig sang ulán
    FOC our watertank LINK full UNFOC water UNFOC rain

    na-búsloot sang bála sang bómbo
    NA-rupture UNFOC schrapnel UNFOC bomb

    'our watertank, full of rain water, was ruptured by schrapnel from the bomb'

(29) ti nag-a- g= in=ówâ lang nga túbig
    so NAG-IMP-out=IN=out only LINK water

    'so out went the water'

(30) ti qa-hápâ silá sa dutâ
    so GA-lie.prone they OBL ground

    nga qa-íliq ang túbig
    LINK GA-pour FOC water
'so they were lying on the ground, drenched with water' 

(31) tì na-básà silá nga duhá
    so NA-wet they LINK two

ásta nga daw _ nag-táwhay na
    until LINK somewhat NAG-peace now

nga walà na ang èropláno
    LINK no now FOC airplane

'so they were wet until it became somewhat peaceful and there were no airplanes'

(32) gin-tawág sang ámon amáv _ ang ámon ma-guláng
    GIN-call UNFOC our father FOC our MA-elder

'our father called our eldest (brother)'

(33) tì walà sang nag-a- _ sabát
    not UNFOC NAG-IMP-answer

'there was no answer'

(34) sang íva osisá- on
    UNFOC he search-ON

tanaw-ón nía to _ galì nag-a- _ hámyang _ na
    look- ON he there right NAG-IMP-lie.down now

'then when he inspected [upon his inspection], he found him lying there'

(35) kag may pilás sa matá nga walá sa kílid
    and have wound OBL eye LINK left OBL side

man nga _ walá kag ang ísa nía ka _ tiíl nga _ walá
    also LINK left and FOC one he QNT foot LINK left

'and there was a wound in his left eye, in his left side and his one left foot'

(36) tì daw _ na-lísang _ siá
    so somewhat NA-confuse he

sang anó na-lísang _ ang ámon amáv
    UNFOC what NA-confuse FOC our father

'he was somewhat confused our father was confused'

(37) tì íva ádto gin-potós nía ang ámon ma-guláng sa baníg
    so he there GIN-wrap he FOC our MA-elder OBL mat
'so he there, he wrapped our oldest brother in a mat'

(38) *gin-lókot níà sa baníg*
GIN-roll he OBL mat

'he rolled (him) in a mat'

(39) *gin-kárga sa karíto*
[inaudible] GIN-carry OBL cart

'(he) carried (him) to a cart'

(40) *kag gin-dal-á sa semetáryo*
and GIN-take-A OBL cemetary

'and took (him) to the cemetery'

*ápang indí níà ma-lubóng dáyun*
but not he [inaudible] MA-bury immediately

'but he was not able to bury him immediately'

(41) *kay güsto níà*
for want he

*nga ma-kítâ ni Mámang ang ámon ilóy*
LINK MA-see UNFOC Mom FOC our mother

'because he wants Mom, our mother, to see him'

(42) *gin-pa-tawág ang ámon ilóy*
GIN-PA-call FOC our mother

'somebody called for my mother'

*kag nag-kádto dádto na sivá sa kátoliko semetáryo*
and NAG-go there now he OBL Catholic cemetary

'and she went to the Catholic cemetary'

(43) *kag dádto gin-lubóng ádto siá*
and there GIN-bury there he

'and there he was buried'

(44) *walâ na siá ma-sulúd sa longón o kófin*
not now he MA-put.in OBL longón or coffin

'he was not put in a longon or coffin'
(45) walâ na kay àlang-àlang na\(^5\)
    not now for raw- raw now

    'not now because there was no time'

(46) kag qin-lubóng to\(^6\) siá sa ma-lapít sa pónô
    and GIN-bury there he OBL MA-near OBL trunk

sang akásya
UNFOC acacia

nga inâ tándâ
LINK that mark

nga dirâ siá na-lubóng
LINK there he NA-bury

    'and he was buried there in the vicinity of the acacia
tree, where there is a sign that he is buried there'

(47) tî nag-anó kamí
    so NAG-what we

    'so what did we do'

(48) nag-balík kamí sa katónggan
    NAG-return we OBL marsh

    'we returned to the marsh'

(49) nag-típon kamí sa katónggan
    NAG-gather we OBL marsh

    'we gathered in the marsh'

(50) kag dîdto kamí nag-povó sa sulúd
    and there we NAG-dwell OBL within

sang ma-láwig nga t= in-úig
UNFOC MA-long LINK year=IN=year

    'and there we lived for many long years'

(51) tî kon nag-a- kinanglánan kamí sang pag-káon
    so when NAG-IMP-need we UNFOC PAG-eat

---

\(^5\)The use of àlang 'raw' to indicate lack of time suggests
the alternate English gloss 'The time was not yet ripe'.

\(^6\)This is an abbreviation of ádto 'there'.
ang ámon amáy nag-a- gòwà-gòwà
FOC our father NAG-IMP-out-out

'so if we needed food, our father would go out (from time to time)'

(52) gin-a- tátap níà ang dútâ
GIN-IMP-care he FOC soil

nga ma-támnan sang más okón anó dâ
LINK MA-plant UNFOC corn or what there

nga mga talamnónun
LINK PL crop

nga ma-kinánlan' námon
LINK MA-need we

agóð nga índì man kamí ma-gútom-an
so that LINK not also we MA-hunger-AN

'he would take care of the soil to plant corn or whatever crops that we might need so that we would not be left hungry'

(53) tì wálâ man kamí nag-a- tinér sa ísá ka logár
so not also we NAG-IMP-stay OBL one QNT place

'also we didn't stay in one place'

(54) kay gin-a- húnähónà
for GIN-IMP-think

nga kon diín ang labìng ma-áyo
LINK if where FOC most MA-good

nga maka-pa- nágō kamí
LINK MAKA-PANG-hide we

nga índì kamí ma-kítá sang mga Hápon
LINK not we MA-see UNFOC PL Japanese

'because (he) decided where the best place to hide us (was) where we would not be seen by the Japanese'

(55) tì nag-a- bálhin- bálhin kamí sang lugár
so NAG-IMP-transfer-transfer we UNFOC place

'The root kinánlan is an abbreviated form of kinahánglan 'need'.

500
kon diín kamí ma-ístar
if where we MA-stay
'so we kept changing places where we could stay'

(56) kag agód índì man kamí ma-kuláng-an sang pag-káon
and so.that not also we MA-lack- AN UNFOC PAG-eat

ang ámon amày nag-a- pang-ísdå
FOC our father NAG-IMP-PANG-fish

'and so that we would not have a lack of food, our father would go fishing'

(57) ang ámon ilóy nag-a- bulù-balígya
FOC our mother NAG-IMP-BULU-sell

sang mga kon anó dâ
UNFOC PL if what there

ngá mga isdâ man dâ o étan
LINK PL fish also there or vegetable

'our mother was selling anything, fish or whatever or vegetables'

(58) i-balígyá agód ma-saportár sa ámon
I-sell so.that MA-support OBL our

ngá índì kamí ma-gutóm- an
LINK not we MA-hunger-AN
'she'll sell (things) to support us so that we would not go hungry'

(59) índì kamí ma-kuláng-an sang ámon mga kinanglánon
not we MA-lack- AN UNFOC our PL need

'[and] we won't lack the things we need'

(60) nag-tínír kamí sa katúnggan sa sulúd
NAG-stay we OBL marsh OBL within

sang nineteen forty-one
UNFOC nineteen forty-one

'we stayed in the marsh throughout 1941'

(61) nag-gowà kamí sang nineteen forty-four
NAG-out we UNFOC nineteen forty-four

---

8This is an abbreviation of dirâ 'there'.
'we came out in 1944'

(62) **kag amotó nga may balítâ**
and then LINK have news

**nga na-pêrdi ang Hapón**
LINK NA-lose FOC Japanese

'and then there was news that the Japanese lost'

(63) **nag-sorénder _ ang Hapón**
NAG-surrender FOC Japanese

'the Japanese surrendered'

(64) **kag dasón nga si Makártor dídto nag-lánd sa Bataán**
and next LINK FOC McArthur there NAG-land OBL Bataan

'and next that MacArthur had landed at Bataan'

(65) **tí ma-sádyá kamí**
MA-happy we

**nga nag-q= in=ówâ kamí sa katúnggan**
LINK NAG-out=IN=out we OBL marsh

'so we were happy that we left the marsh (one by one)'

(66) **kag nag-balîk kamí sa ámon balây**
and NAG-return we OBL our house

'and we returned to our house'

(67) **ápang ang ámon amây si Pá pang índî na gústo**
but FOC our father FOC Papa not now want

**mag-istár kamí sa balây**
MAG-stay we OBL house

'but our father, Papa, now didn't want us to stay [that we stay] in the house'

(68) **kay sîlíng níá**
for say he

**dirâ na-patây ang ámon ma-gulâng**
there NA-die FOC our MA-elder

'because he said (that) (it was) there (that) our eldest brother had died'
(69) ti ma-dùm-dom- án nía líwan ang na-tabó
        MA-remember-AN he again FOC NA-happen

sa ámon ma-guláng
OBL our MA-elder

'he will remember again what had happened to our oldest brother'

(70) ti indí na siá dídto maq-istar
so not now he there MAG-stay

'so, he didn't want to stay there'

(71) naq-bálhin kamí sa isá man ka logár
NAG-transfer we OBL one also QNT place

nga ámon man dutâ
FOC our again soil

'we moved to another place that was also our land'

(72) naq-pa-tókod dídto sang baláy
NAG-PA-prop there UNFOC house

nga kwán lang nípâ kawáyan kag tapî
LINK whatever'only palm bamboo and lumber

'there (we) built a house using palm bamboo and lumber'

(73) kag ma-áyo- áyo man nga baláy
and MA-good-good also LINK house

'and it was also a good house'

(74) kag dasón dídto kamí nag-púvô
and next there we NAG-dwell

'and we lived there next'

(75) kag sang walâ pa ma-patáv ang ámon ma-guláng
and UNFOC not yet MA-die FOC our MA-elder

pitó kamí tanán-tanán
seven we all- all

The form kwán indicates an item of whose name the speaker is uncertain. Cf. Nagkwán sia 'He did some thing' and si Kwán 'Mr./Ms. So-and-so'.
tî ánum ka laláki kaq īsa ka babáve akó
six QNT boy and one QNT girl me
'and before our eldest brother died, we were seven all
in all, six boys and one girl, me'

(76) kaq sang ma-patáy ang āmon ma-guláng
and UNFOC MA-die FOC our MA-elder
námon tî limâ ka laláki kaq īsá ka babáve akó
we so five QNT male and one QNT girl I
'and after the death of our brother, we were five boys
and one girl, me'

(77) tî ang āmon amáy
FOC our father
maéstro to siá sang ántes ang géra
teacher there he UNFOC before FOC war
'our father, he was a teacher before the war'

(78) sang walá pa ang géra maéstro ádto siá
UNFOC not yet FOC war teacher there he
'before the war he was a teacher there'

(79) tî sang tápos na ang géra
UNFOC end now FOC war
nag-bokás liwát ang kláse
NAG-open again FOC class
'so, after the war ended, classes opened again'

(80) nag-maéstro na man siá
NAG-teach now also he
'he became a teacher once again'

(81) tî kamí nga mga kabatáan qin-pa-iskwéla
we LINK PL children GIN-PA-school
man kamí
also we
'we children, we were also sent to school again'

(82) kaq sang pag-ka-géra na gréd tú pa akò gréd tú
OBL UNFOC PAG-KA-war now grade two yet I grade two
'and when the war came I was in grade two'

(83) ang isá ko ka ma-guláng gred tu sa
FOC one 1SG QNT MA-elder grade two OBL [inaudible]

'(and) one of my brothers was in grade two'

nga mgá mánghod walá pa silá nag-a- iskvéla
LINK PL younger not yet they NAG-IMP-school

'(and) the rest of my younger brothers, they were not going to school'

(84) sang nag-géra ang ámon nga vánges nga bráder
UNFOC NAG-war FOC our LINK youngest LINK brother

nga útod nga laláki one year old
LINK sibling LINK male one year old

'When the war broke out our youngest brother (was) one year old'

(85) ti logár nga nag-balík kamí sa katúngran
so place LINK NAG-return we OBL marsh

ma-kádto sa iskweláhan
MA-go OBL school

'so, when we came out of the marsh, we went to school'

(86) walá kamí sang lápis
not we UNFOC pencil

'we didn't have pencils'

(87) walá sang papél
not UNFOC paper

'didn't have paper'

(88) ti ang gin-a- gámìt nga papél ang dáhon sang ságing
so FOC GIN-IMP-use LINK paper FOC leaf UNFOC banana

kag ang ámon lápis kawáyan
and FOC our pencil bamboo

'so, we used banana leaves for paper and, for our pencils, bamboo'

(89) kawáyan nga gin-a- hímò nga paráho sang lápis
bamboo LINK GIN-IMP-use LINK like UNFOC pencil
'bamboo is just like a pencil'

(90) péro walâ inâ nag-a- áqi
    but not that NAG-IMP-mark

    'except it doesn't leave a mark'

(91) walâ sang_ led
    not UNFOC lead

    'it has no lead'

(92) kondi pointed lang siá
    but pointed only it

    'but it is only pointed'

(93) ma-talídís lang siá
    MA-pointed only it

    'it is only pointed'

(94) kag amó 10 ini_ ang gin-suláts sa dáhon sang ságing
    and just this FOC GIN-write OBL leaf UNFOC banana

    'and this is what we wrote with on the banana leaves'

(95) kag dídéto ka-ávo_ man sádto sang_ mga maéstro
    and there KA-good also then UNFOC PL teacher

    'and there the teachers then were good, too'

(96) dídéto nga_ ma-gámít lang kon anó lang11
    there LINK MA-use only when what only

    nga_ ma-gámít
    LINK MA-use

    'there we just used anything that could be used'

(97) kay kúlang kamí sádto sa_ ga= la=mitón
    for lacking we the OBL use=LA=use

    'because we lacked the things that were needed'

---

10Cf. the use of amó in such assertions as Amó ini_ 'This is it' and Amó ató siá 'It was him'.

11The phrase lang kon ano lang translates as 'whatever'.
ásta nga nag-táwhay na
until LINK NAG-peace now

'until things were peaceful'

(98) kag gin-pa-iskwéla kamí
and GIN-PA-school we
'we were sent to school'

(99) kag naka-tápos kamí
LINK NAKA-end we
nga duhá nga ma-guláng námon
LINK two LINK MA-elder we

'and we finished, we two who were older'

(100) akó kag ákon ma-guláng
I and my MA-elder
naka-tápos kamí
NAKA-finish we

'I and my elder brother, we finished'

(101) gin-pa-iskwéla kamí sa èleméntari
GIN-PA-school we OBL elementary
ásta mag-háyskul
until MAG-highschool
ásta mag-kólíj
until MAG-college

'we were sent to school from elementary to high school to college'

(102) dasón sang nineteen fifty-four
next UNFOC nineteen fifty-four
ang ámon amáy na-patáy
FOC our father NA-die

'next, in 1944, our father died'

(103) gin-a- konsiderá ató siá
GIN-IMP-consider there he
nga retired teacher
LINK retired teacher

'he was considered a retired teacher'
(104) tí may pénsony
    have pension

'he had a pension'

(105) ang íya nga pénsony iná nga mántli pénsony nía
    FOC his LINK pension that LINK monthly pension he

ka-gamáy man-lang
KA-small also quite

'his pension, his monthly pension was quite small'

(106) dasón ang ámon na man nga ilóy amó
    next FOC our now also LINK mother just

ang nag-pa- ningóhâ
FOC NAG-PANG-try

nga ma-pa-iskwéla kamí tanán-tanán
LINK MA-PA-school us all -all

'then our mother also tried her best to send us all to school'

(107) tí naka-tápos akó maéstra
    so NAKA-finish I teacher

'so, I became a teacher'

(108) nag-maéstra akó
    NAG-teacher I

'I became a teacher'

(109) ang ákon [kwan nga] útod nga laláki nag-maéstro
    FOC my whatever LINK sibling LINK male NAG-teacher

'my brother became a teacher'

(110) tí b= in-uligáy kamí akò kag ang ákon
    so help=IN=help we I and FOC my

ma-guláng nga laláki
MA-elder LINK male

'so, we helped each other, I and my older brother'

12 This is tingóhâ 'try'.

(111) help=IN=help we FOC our PL sibling

ngā ma-pa-iskwélā ma silá
LINK MA-PA-school also they

ngā maka-tápos ma silá kon ano nga kórso
LINK MAKA-end also they with what LINK course

'we helped our brothers to get them to school so they could finish whatever courses'

(112) tī salāmat sa Ginóo
so thank OBL lord

'so thank the Lord'

kay kamí tànan-tánan maka-tápos sa kōlij
for we all- all NAKA-finish OBL college

'because we all managed to finish college'

(113) naka-grádweyt ang dasón sa ákon nga indyinír
NAKA-graduate FOC next OBL my LINK engineer

mekánikal eléktrikal indyinír
mechanical electrical engineer

'my next (brother) graduated as an engineer, a mechanical-electrical engineer'

(114) ang sonúd sa íva indyinír man
FOC follow OB him engineer also

'and the one following him is an engineer also'

(115) ang iká tátlo kómers grádwet
FOC ORD three commerce graduate

'the third is a commerce graduate'

(116) ang dasón ang second to the last kómers grádwet
FOC next FOC second to the last commerce graduate

'the next, the second to the last, is a commerce graduate'

(117) kag ang vángges déntis
and FOC youngest dentist

'and the youngest (is a) dentist'
(118) dasón nag-l= in-ápta na man kamí
next NAG-spread=IN-spread now also we

 nga da= lág=kó na kamí
 LINK big=LA= big now we

'then we all spread out [i.e. went our separate ways] when we grew up [we who were now big]' 

(119) ang ákon nga ma-guláng naq-pang-asáwa sang maéstra
FOC my LINK MA-elder NAG-PANG-wife UNFOC teacher

'my older brother married a teacher'

(120) ti may bátâ si lá
have child they

 nga isá ka bílog ári na di káron man
 LINK one QNT part here already here now also

'they have one child who is also here now'

(121) ga-iskwéla dá³³ sa Houston Baptist University
GA-school there OBL

 graduating siá sa núrsing
 graduating she OBL nursing

'(she) goes to school there at Houston Baptist University, graduating in nursing'

(122) dasón akò ári na man dirí
next I here now also here

'I'm here now too'

(123) maéstra akò sa Philippines sang thirty-five years
teacher I OBL Philippines UNFOC thirty-five years

'I was a teacher in the Philippines for thirty-five years'

(124) gáling¹⁴ dirí indí akò ka-maéstra
but here not I KA-teacher

'but here I cannot teach'

¹³This is an abbreviation of dira⁵⁵ 'there'.

¹⁴This is an abbreviation of ugalíng 'but', 'however'.

(125) kay walâ certificate to teach
     for not.exist certificate to teach

     'because I don't have a certificate to teach'

(126) dasón ang sonúd sa ákon amo ang indyínir
     next FOC follow OBL me just FOC engineer

     naka-pang-asáwa siá sa nurse
     NAKA-PANG-wife also OBL nurse

     'then the one just next to me, the engineer, he married
      a nurse'

(127) kag may tátlo silá ka bátâ
     and have three they QNT child

     'and they have three children'

(128) ári siá dirí sa Houston
     here he here OBL Houston

     'he is here in Houston'

(129) ang dasón sa íva indyínir man
     FOC next OBL him engineer also

     naka-pang-asáwa man midwife
     NAKA-PANG-wife also midwife

     'the one next to him, also an engineer, married a
      midwife'

(130) may tátlo man silá ka báta ári man dirí
     have three also they QNT child here also here

     'they also have three children (who are) here'

(131) ang dasón sa íva si Ramón
     FOC next OBL him FOC Rámon

     naka-pang-asáwa man íva sang pármasis
     NAKA-PANG-wife also he UNFOC pharmacist

     'the one next to him, Ramón, he married a pharmacist'

(132) áto silá sa Mòntreál Kánada
     there they OBL

     'they're in Montreal, Canada'
(133) \textbf{kag ang vángges námon ang děntis ári dirí} 
and FOC youngest ours FOC dentist here here 

'and our youngest, the dentist, is here'

(134) \textbf{istória sang ámon panimaláy} 
story UNFOC our family 

'this is the story of our family'
Appendix B

Hiligaynon Reduplication and -pa-

Like other Philippine languages, Hiligaynon employs 'reduplication'. Hiligaynon reduplication is almost entirely restricted to roots as opposed to affixes (cf. Tagalog in Naylor 1986). The only inflectional or derivational morpheme that seems to reduplicate is -pa-.

Hiligaynon root reduplication suggests 'non-perfectiveness' or 'non-telicity'. Used Nominally, reduplicated roots name PARTICULARS which are not fully actualized members of their class. Note the following:

(1) awtò-áwto
car- car
'toy car'

(2) balày-bálay
house-house
'toy house, playhouse'

(3) doktòr-dókctor
doctor-doctor
'make-believe doctor; quack'

(4) màèstra-màèstra
teacher-teacher
'make-believe teacher'

(5) dyòs-díyos
god -god
'false god'

(6) adlàw-ádlaw
day- day
'every day'

In (1)-(5), reduplication suggests counterfeits and the like. Item (6), with ádlaw 'day' being reduplicated, suggests an iterative occurrence with 'no end in sight'.

With roots used Verbally, reduplication may suggest a process lacking a focus or decisive goal:

(7) Langòy-lángoy lang kàmi
swim- swim only 1PL.FOC
'We're just swimming (around)'

(8) Nag-a- lùmpat-lùmpat ang bátà
NAG-IMP-jump- jump FOC child
'The child is jumping and jumping'
(9) Nag-a- hibi-hibi ang báta
NAG-IMP-cry-cry FOC child
'The child has been crying and crying'

(10) Nag-a- tinlo-tínlo akò sang lamésa
NAG-IMP-clean-clean 1SG.FOC UNFOC table
'I'm just cleaning off the table'

Sentences (7)-(10) name EVENTS which have no apparent end, in
the dual senses of 'purpose' and 'completion'. A lack of
seriousness may be implied. Sentence (10) implies a casual
wiping off of the table, as opposed to a thorough attempt at
cleaning. Such unboundedness is often consonant with
BACKGROUNDING:

(11) Nag-a- kàon-kàon gid silá sang mag-abót
NAG-IMP-eat- eat just 3PL.FOC UNFOC MAG-arrive
ang íla bisíta
FOC 3PL.UNFOC visitor
'They were just eating when their visitor arrived'

(12) Ma-dulùm-dúlùm na sang mag-abót siá
MA-dark-dark already UNFOC MAG-arrive 3SG.FOC
'It was getting dark when she arrived'

In (11)-(12), kàonkàon 'eating' and dulùmdulùm 'darkening'
serve as BACKGROUNDED processes which set the stage for the
FOREGROUNDED processes of 'arriving'.
With qualitative, 'Adjectival' roots, the nontelicity may
suggest a gradedness of the named quality, e.g. a Comparative
construction such as the following:

(13) Ini nga kwárto ma-dulùm-dúlùm sang sa siná
this.FOC LINK room MA-dark- dark UNFOC OBL that.UNFOC
'This room is darker than that one'

(14) Ang ámon baláy dakô-dakô sang sa ínyo
FOC 1PL.EXC house big-big UNFOC OBL 2PL.POSS
'Our house is bigger than yours'

(15) Ang ámon síya gamày-gamày sang sa siní
FOC 3PL.POSS chair small-small UNFOC OBL this
'Our chair is smaller than this one'

Note that Comparative forms accent the final syllables of each
occurrence of the reduplicated root. If the stress of the
second occurrence is shifted to the first syllable, the
reduplicated roots suggest Superlatives:\n\n(16) (a) dakō-dakō  
  big- big  
  'bigger'
(b) dakō-ðákō (gid)  
  big- big (really)  
  'biggest'

(17) (a) dulùm-dulùm  
  dark- dark  
  'darker'
(b) dulùm-dúlm (gid)  
  dark- dark (really)  
  'darkest'

The nontelicity may suggest augmentation, as above, or diminishment as in the following (note the stress contrast):

(18) (a) Ma-áyo ang reló  
  MA-good FOC watch  
  'The watch is good/functional'
(b) Ma-áyo- áyo na ang reló  
  MA-good-good now FOC watch  
  'The watch is semi-fixed'

(19) (a) Ma-áyo akó  
  MA-good 1SG.FOC  
  'I'm well'
(b) Ma-áyo- ayó na akó  
  MA-good-good now 1SG.FOC  
  'I'm so-so'

In (18b), maàvoáyo, accented in the 'Superlative' pattern, suggests a trajectory of improvement that has not been fully achieved. In (19b), maàvoayó, accented in the 'Comparative' pattern, suggests a trajectory of decline. In both cases, the reduplicated áyo implies sub-optimal situations; full goodness/wellness is not achieved.

With a number of Verbal roots, but by no means with all, -pa- may be reduplicated. Such roots seem to be either inherently CENTRIFETAL or at least capable of CENTRIFETAL (typically 'Middle VOICE') readings. With these roots, the

---

1Another way of indicating the Superlative degree involves the prefixation of pínaka- to the root, as in pínaka-dakō 'biggest'.
reduplication of -pa- results in an increased intensity of Involvement of PARTICIPANTS in their EVENTS:

(20) (a) Gin-pa-dugô sang dóktor ang pilás GIN-PA-bleed UNFOC doctor FOC wound 'The doctor made the wound bleed'

(b) Gin-pa-pa-dugô sang dóktor ang pilás GIN-PA-PA-bleed UNFOC doctor FOC wound 'The doctor made the wound bleed'

(21) (a) Gin-pa-íhi ko ang idô sa papél GIN-PA-pee 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog OBL paper 'I made/let the dog pee on the paper'

(b) Gin-pa-pa-íhi ko ang idô sa papél GIN-PA-PA-pee 2SG.UNFOC FOC dog OBL paper 'I made the dog pee on the paper'

(22) (a) Gin-pa-ágî ko ang idô sa ganháan GIN-PA-pass 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog OBL door 'I let the dog pass through the door'

(b) Gin-pa-pa-ágî ko ang idô sa ganháan GIN-PA-PA-pass 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog OBL door 'I had the dog pass through the door'

(23) (a) Gin-pa-ágî ko ang kàrabáw sa subâ GIN-PA-pass 1SG.UNFOC FOC buffalo OBL river 'I let the buffalo cross the river'

(b) Gin-pa-pa-ágî ko ang kàrabáw sa subâ GIN-PA-PA-pass 1SG.UNFOC FOC buffalo OBL river 'I made the buffalo cross the river'

(24) (a) Gin-pa-bokál ko ang túbîg GIN-PA-bubble 1SG.UNFOC FOC water 'I boiled the water' 'I let the water boil'

(b) Gin-pa-pa-bokál ko ang túbîg GIN-PA-PA-bubble 1SG.UNFOC FOC water 'I boiled the water'

(25) (a) Gin-pa-túlog ang táwo GIN-PA-sleep FOC man 'The man was allowed to sleep'

(b) Gin-pa-pa-túlog ang táwo GIN-PA-PA-sleep FOC man 'The man was allowed to sleep'
(26) (a) Gin-pa-káon ko ang idô sang tinápay
GIN-PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog UNFOC bread
'I fed the bread to the dog'
'I let the dog eat the bread'

(b) Gin-pa-pa-káon ko ang idô sang tinápay
GIN-PA-PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog UNFOC bread
*I fed bread to the dog
*I let the dog eat the bread

(27) (a) Gin-pa-kúhâ sang túbig si Maria
GIN-PA-get UNFOC water FOC Maria
'Maria was told to get water'

(b) Gin-pa-pa-kúhâ sang túbig si Maria
GIN-PA-PA-get UNFOC water FOC Maria
'Maria was allowed to get water'

The (a)-sentences suggest 'casual' Causatives or Permissives whereby the MOTILE PARTICIPANT causes or permits the performance of the EVENT in question. The (b)-sentences seem more clearly Causative than Permissive and suggest that the Causer has shown some force and the Causee has resistance in the execution of the EVENT. Hence (20a) suggests that the doctor may have inadvertently caused bleeding while treating the patient; (20b) suggests that the doctor intended to bleed the patient and used direct force. Sentence (21a) implies that I laid the groundwork for the dog to pee; e.g. I left some paper out for the purpose. Sentence (21b) implies that I stood over the dog and commanded it to perform. Sentence (22a) suggests that I motioned for the dog to pass through the door; (22b), that I did so with special vigor or that I drove it out or blocked another means of egress, e.g. a window. Similarly, (23a) suggests I allowed the buffalo to cross the river as they desired; (23b), that I drove them and/or blocked other alternatives. Sentence (24a) suggests that I turned on the water and let it boil; (24b), that I hovered over it, stoking the fire or otherwise helping it to boil. Sentence (25a) suggests that the man was left unmolested so that he could sleep; (25b), that he was actively shielded from any disturbance, perhaps by a bodyguard. Sentence (26a) suggests that I left food out for the dog to eat at will; (26b) requires suggests that I actively fed the dog or did something to overcome its resistance. Similarly, (27a) is unremarkable, but (27b) suggests that Maria resisted or was allowed to only after a struggle. In all these cases, the reduplicated -pa- suggests a heightened directness or intensity of involvement of the PARTICIPANTS in their EVENTS, which may play out in the complementary terms of 'force' and 'resistance'.

The 'Intensive' reading of the reduplicated -pa- prevails regardless of whether FOCUS falls on the terminal Affectee or the mediational Causee:
(28) (a) Gin-pa-pa-dugô sang doktor ang pilás sa nurse
GIN-PA-PA-bleed UNFOC doctor FOC wound OBL nurse
'The doctor had the wound bled by the nurse'

(b) Gin-pa-pa-dugô sang doktor ang nurse sang pilás
GIN-PA-PA-blood UNFOC doctor FOC nurse UNFOC wound
'The doctor had the nurse bleed a wound'

(29) (a) Gin-pa-pa-bokál ko ang túbig kay Maria
GIN-PA-PA-bubble 1SG.UNFOC FOC water OBL Maria
'I had the water boiled by Maria'

(b) Gin-pa-pa-bokál ko si Maria sang túbig
GIN-PA-PA-bubble 1SG.UNFOC FOC Maria UNFOC water
'I had Maria boil some water'

The 'Intensive' reading of reduplicated -pa- occurs with irrealis ASPECT as well. Note the following, with ma-:

(30) (a) Ma-pa-káon ko ang bátâ
MA-PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC child
'I can feed the child'
'I can let the child eat'

(b) Ma-pa-pa-káon ko ang bátâ
MA-PA-PA-eat 1SG.UNFOC FOC child
'I can (really) make the child eat'

Both (30)-sentences suggest that I can feed the child. Sentence (30a) implies no difficulty, but (30b) implies that force--perhaps forceful persuasion--may be required; the child is capable of resistance. Note that [30b] also suggests more active participation on the part of the Causee/Afectee. A third interpretation of (30b) is that I am emphasizing my ability to my interlocutor.

Reduplicated -pa- may thus have a 'performative' dimension of the sort discussed in 3.3. That is, it may intensify the interpersonal relations of the interlocutors in the speech situation to communicate urgency or emphasis, to make a clarification of what has just been uttered:

(31) (a) Nag-a- káon ang idô
NAG-IMP-eat FOC dog
'The dog's eating'

(b) Nag-a- pa-káon akô sang idô
NAG-IMP-PA-eat 1SG.FOC UNFOC dog
'I'm feeding the/a dog'

(c) Nag-a- pa-pa-káon pa akó sang idô
NAG-IMP-PA-PA-eat PA 1SG.FOC UNFOC dog
'I'm feeding the dog!'
(32) (a) Nag-básag akò sang báso  
NAG-break 1SG.FOC UNFOC glass  
'I broke a glass'

(b) Nag-pa-básag akò sang báso kay Pedro  
NAG-PA-break 1SG.FOC UNFOC glass OBL Pedro  
'I had Pedro break a glass'

(c) Nag-pa-pa-básag akò sang báso kay Pedro  
NAG-PA-PA-break 1SG.FOC UNFOC glass OBL Pedro  
'I had Pedro break a glass'

The (b)-sentences are more casual than the (c)-sentences, which seem more emphatic. For instance, (31c) may serve as a (repetitive) clarification of an answer to the question Anó ang nagaanó ka dirâ 'What is it that you're doing there?', whose repetitiveness is iconically suggested by the repetition of reduplication (a term which in itself embodies a curious redundancy/repetition).

As briefly noted earlier, the reduplicated -pa- may suggest a heightened autonomy on the part of an animate Causee (as opposed to an inanimate Causee/Affectee of the sort often encountered in 3.4), allowing it to have more active participation and implying a more indirect involvement by the Causer. The issues of force and resistance emerge:

(33) (a) Nag-a- káon ang idô  
NAG-IMP-eat FOC dog  
'The dog is eating'

(b) Nag-a- pa-káon akò sang idô  
NAG-IMP-PA-eat 1SG.FOC UNFOC dog  
'I'm feeding a/the dog'

(c) Nag-a- pa-pa-káon akò sang idô  
NAG-IMP-PA-PA-eat 1SG.FOC UNFOC dog  
'I'm letting a/the dog eat'  
'I'm having someone feed a/the dog'

(34) (a) Gin-inúm ni Roberto ang bulúng  
GIN-drink UNFOC Roberto FOC medicine  
'Roberto drank the medicine'

(b) Gin-pa-inúm sang dóktor ang bulúng kay Roberto  
GIN-PA-drink UNFOC doctor FOC medicine OBL Roberto  
'The doctor made/let Roberto drink the medicine'
(c) Gin-pa-pa-inúm sang dóktor ang bulúng
GIN-PA-PA-drink UNFOC doctor FOC medicine
kay Roberto
OBL Roberto
'The doctor made Roberto take the medicine'

(35) (a) Ma-pa-lakát ko ang idó kay Roberto
MA-PA-walk 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog OBL Roberto
'I can make the dog walk to Roberto'

(b) Ma-pa-pa-lakát ko ang idó kay Roberto
MA-PA-PA-walk 1SG.UNFOC FOC dog OBL Roberto
'I can make Roberto walk the dog'
*'I can make the dog walk to Roberto'

In these examples, the appearance of -pa- accords with a greater distance between the NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS in that the erstwhile INERT Causee acquires increasing autonomy; i.e. performance is increasingly DISPLACED from the ERUPTION. In the reduplicated alternatives, the animate Causee is more responsible/responsive for the execution of the EVENT. For instance, the doctor in (b) may have assisted Roberto, 'fed' him the medicine; in (c), however, Roberto seems to be administering it himself, under doctor's orders and possibly under duress. The Causer, in directing the Causee, plays a less direct rôle in the EVENT; the 'S'-PARTICIPANT is simultaneously more aloof and more imperious. Indirectness need not imply lack of intensity.

The indirectness of influence may entail physical/spatial separation of the Causer and Causee, as seen in the examples immediately above. Such a reading is especially obvious with roots denoting physical trajectories:

(36) (a) Ma-náog akó
MA-down 1SG.FOC
'I'll go down'

(b) Ma-pa-náog akó
MA-PA-down 1SG.FOC
'I'll (really) go down'

(c) Ma-pa-pa-náog akó (sa íya)
MA-PA-PA-down 1SG.FOC (OBL 3SG.UNFOC)
'I'll make someone go down'
*'I'll go down'

(37) (a) Na-náog ang bátâ sa káhoy
NA-down FOC child OBL tree
'The child went down the tree'
(b) Na-pa-náog sang báta ang kuring
NA-PA-down UNFOC child FOC cat
'The child was able to get the cat down'

(c) Na-pa-pa-náog sang báta ang kuring
NA-PA-PA-náog UNFOC child FOC cat
'The child was able to get the cat down'

(38) (a) Nag-gowâ akó
NAG-out 1SG.FOC
'I went out'

(b) Nag-pa-gowâ akó sang idô
NAG-PA-out 1SG.FOC UNFOC dog
'I let/put a dog go out'

(c) Nag-pa-pa-gowâ akó sang idô (sa báta)
NAG-PA-PA-out 1SG.FOC UNFOC dog (OBL child)
'I had/let someone/(the child) let a dog go out'

(39) (a) Nag-pa-dúulong ang báta sa íya nánay2
NAG-PA-approach FOC child OBL 3SG.UNFOC mother
'The child approached its mother'

(b) Nag-pa-pa-dúulong ang tátay sang báta
NAG-PA-approach FOC father UNFOC child
sa íya nánay
OBL 3SG.UNFOC mother
'The father caused someone to make the child go
towards its mother'

(c) *Nag-dúulong ...
NAG-approach

In (36b), a single -pa- heightens intensity in the form of
'certainty' (i.e. I will definitely go down), while in (36c)
the reduplicated form increases the distance between the PRE-
MOTILE ROLE filled by akó and the performance embodied in the
now-MOTILE íya. In (37b) the child seems to remove the cat
directly, carrying it, while (37c) implies that the cat got
down by itself in response to the child's urging; the child
may have thrown a rock at the cat or otherwise driven it down.
In (38c), the dog may likewise have been driven out. In (39a),

2These examples with dúulong 'approach' are from Ruiz
(1968:65), who uses the non-Causative nature of the single
-pa- as evidence for an homophonous 'directional' -pa-. Ruiz
notes that '[t]hese two /-pa-/s, the causative and the
directional, may stand in construction [sic] together in the
same verb formation ...' (1968:65), a characterization I decry
as being uninformative.
a single -pa- is obligatory to mark a physical trajectory with nag- or -an; seventeen roots in his corpus were determined to require -pa- in such circumstances (Ruiz 1968:64). Apparently, -pa- does not reduplicate with roots which name the goals of trajectories, e.g.:  

(40) (a) Nag-pa-Houston siá (*sa íya)  
NAG-PATh1 proprium 3SG.FOC (*OBL 3SG.UNFOC)  
'S/he went towards Houston'  
*'S/he had somebody (him/her) go towards Houston'

(b) *Nag-pa-pa-Houston siá (*sa íya)  
NAG-PATh2 proprium 3SG.FOC (*OBL 3SG.UNFOC)  
'S/he went towards Houston'

With FOCUS on the PRE-MOTILE (or DISPLACED 'S'-) ROLE, the reduplicated -pa- may suggest a heightened need or urgency that the EVENT be accomplished:

(41) (a) Ma-pa-ági akò kay José bwás  
MA-PATh1 proprium 1SG.FOC OBL 3SG.FOC  
'I will have Jose pick me up tomorrow'

(b) Ma-pa-pa-ági akò kay José bwás  
MA-PATh1 proprium 1SG.FOC OBL 3SG.FOC  
'I (really) need Jose to pick me up tomorrow'

(42) (a) Ma-pa-kúhá akò sang túbig kay Pedro  
MA-PATh1 proprium 1SG.FOC UNFOC water OBL 3SG.FOC  
'I'll let Pedro fetch water for me'

(b) Ma-pa-pa-kúhá akò sang túbig kay Pedro  
MA-PATh1 proprium 1SG.FOC UNFOC water OBL 3SG.FOC  
'I'm waiting for Pedro to take water for me'

(43) (a) Ma-pa-káon akò sang bátà  
MA-PATh1 proprium 1SG.FOC UNFOC child  
'I have to feed a baby'

(b) Ma-pa-pa-káon akò sang bátà  
MA-PATh1 proprium 1SG.FOC UNFOC child  
'I (really) have to feed a baby'

All (b)-sentences of (41)-(43) suggest a heightened urgency that the action occur. There exists a 'strong need' or 'urgency' for being picked up, for receiving the water, and for feeding the baby.

With other EVENTS and irrealis ASPECT, as with ma-, the Intensive reading of reduplicated -pa- suggests a heightened epistemic certainty:
(44) (a) Ma-pa-támbok akò sang ice cream
    MA-PA-fat 1SG.FOC UNFOC ice cream
    'Ice cream can make me fat'

    (b) Ma-pa-pa-támbok akò sang ice cream
    MA-PA-PA-fat 1SG.FOC UNFOC ice cream
    'Ice cream (really) can make me fat'

(45) (a) Ma-sándig akò sa díngding
    MA-lean 1SG.FOC OBL wall
    'I'll lean against the wall'

    (b) Ma-pa-sándig akò sang póste
    MA-PA-lean 1SG.FOC UNFOC post
    'I'm going to lean a post'

    (c) Ma-pa-pa-sándig akò sang póste
    MA-PA-PA-lean 1SG.FOC UNFOC post
    'I'm going to lean a post/have a post leaned'

(46) (a) Ma-pa-dúl'ong akò sang babáye sa tyángge
    MA-PA-drive 1SG.FOC UNFOC woman OBL market
    'I'll have a woman driven to the market'

    (b) Ma-pa-pa-dúl'ong akò sang babáye sa tyángge
    MA-PA-PA-drive 1SG.FOC UNFOC woman OBL market
    'I'll have a woman driven to the market'

(47) (a) Ma-pa-súmbag akò sang polís
    MA-PA-punch 1SG.FOC UNFOC police
    'I'll have a policeman punched'

    (b) Ma-pa-pa-súmbag akò sang polís
    MA-PA-PA-punch 1SG.FOC UNFOC police
    'I'll (really) have a policeman punched'

(48) (a) Ma-pa-súmbag ko ang polís
    MA-PA-punch 1SG.UNFOC FOC police
    'I can have the policeman punched'

    (b) Ma-pa-pa-súmbag ko ang polís
    MA-PA-PA-punch 1SG.UNFOC FOC police
    'I can (really) have the policeman punched'

The (b)-sentences of (44)-(48) suggest a greater sense of the speaker's commitment to the truth of what he or she is saying. Note that this 'Intensive', 'certain' sense holds regardless of whether the FOCUS is on the 'S' ROLE or on an 'O'-ROLE.

With Reflexive EVENTS, the intensity associated with the reduplicated -pa- may suggest heightened intensity, which may imply a more marked intentionality or certainty:
(49) (a) Ma-gútom akó  
   MA-hungry 1SG.FOC  
   'I'll be hungry'

   (b) Ma-pa-gútom akó  
   MA-PA-hungry 1SG.FOC  
   'I'll get myself hungry'

   (c) Ma-pa-pa-gútom akó  
   MA-PA-PA-hungry 1SG.FOC  
   'I'll get myself hungry'

(50) (a) Ma-lápyô siá  
   MA-tired 3SG.FOC  
   'S/he's tired'

   (b) Ma-pa-lápyô siá  
   MA-PA-tired 3SG.FOC  
   'S/he'll tire her/himself'

   (c) Ma-pa-pa-lápyô siá  
   MA-PA-PA-tired 3SG.FOC  
   'S/he'll tire her/himself'

(51) (a) Ma-patáy siá  
   MA-die 3SG.FOC  
   'S/he'll die'

   (b) Ma-pa-patáy siá  
   MA-PA-die 3SG.FOC  
   'S/he'll have her/himself killed'

   (c) Ma-pa-pa-patáy siá  
   MA-PA-PA-die 3SG.FOC  
   'She'll have her/himself killed'

(52) (a) Ma-ákig akó  
   MA-angry 1SG.FOC  
   'I'll get angry'

   (b) Ma-pa-ákig akó  
   MA-PA-angry 1SG.FOC  
   'I'll provoke somebody to anger'

   (c) Ma-pa-pa-ákig akó  
   MA-PA-PA-angry 1SG.FOC  
   'I'll let someone get angry at me'  
   'I'll provoke someone'

(53) (a) Ma-súmbag akó sang polís  
   MA-punch 1SG.FOC UNFOC police  
   'I'll punch a policeman'
(b) Ma-pa-súmbag àkò sang polís
MA-PA-punch 1SG.FOC UNFOC police
'I'll have a policeman punched'

(c) Ma-pa-pa-súmbag àkò sang polís
MA-PA-PA-punch 1SG.FOC UNFOC police
'I'll have a policeman punched'

(54) (a) Ma-súmbag ko ang polís
MA-punch 1SG.UNFOC FOC police
'I can punch the policeman

(b) Ma-pa-súmbag ko ang polís
MA-PA-punch 1SG.UNFOC FOC police
'I can have the policeman punched'

(c) Ma-pa-pa-súmbag ko ang polís
MA-PA-PA-súmbag 1SG.UNFOC FOC police
'I can have the policeman hit'

(55) (a) Ma-sándig àkò sang póste
MA-lean 1SG.FOC UNFOC post
'I'll lean a post'

(b) Ma-pa-sándig àkò sang póste
MA-PA-lean 1SG.FOC UNFOC post
'I'm going to have/let a post lean(ed)'

(c) Ma-pa-pa-sándig àkò sang póste
MA-PA-PA-lean 1SG.FOC UNFOC post
'I'm going to have/let a post lean(ed)'

The (c)-instances of (49)-(55) suggest great determination or effort to achieve the end discussed. Intensity correlates directly with the increased distance between the Causer and the Causee. Note, however, that delegation/mediation in itself does not require the reduplication of -pa-. The single-pa-examples can, if pressed, accommodate a mediational 'Causative' reading, e.g.:

(56) Ma-pa-lápyô siá kay Roberto
MA-PA-tired 3SG.FOC OBL Roberto
'S/he'll get Roberto to wear him/her, out'

The increased degree of distance between the DISPLACED 'S'-ROLE and the performance is independent of FOCUS. Note the following counterparts of (55b) and (55c), which focus the Causee/Affec tee:

(57) (a) Ma-pa-sándig ko ang póste
MA-PA-lean 1SG.UNFOC FOC post
'I can lean the post'
Finally, with some qualitative or 'Adjectival' roots, the reduplicated -pa- may suggest 'Reflexive' 'Causatives' requiring assistance as opposed to the 'change' suggested by a single -pa-:

(58) (a) Ma-tambi akó
MA-fat 1SG.FOC
'I'm fat'

(b) Ma-pa-tambi akó
MA-PA-fat 1SG.FOC
'I'll get fat / gain weight'

(c) Ma-pa-pa-tambi akó
MA-PA-PA-fat 1SG.FOC
'I'll have myself fattened'

(59) (a) Ma-lumós siá
MA-drown 3SG.FOC
'S/he'll drown'

(b) Ma-pa-lumós siá
MA-PA-drown 3SG.FOC
'S/he'll be drowned (by somebody)'

(c) Ma-pa-pa-lumós siá
MA-PA-PA-drown 3SG.FOC
'S/he'll have her/himself drowned'

Again, the 'S'-ROLE is less directly involved as one proceeds from (a) to (c) in (58) and (59), as the EVENTS become progressively more directed/delegational. The increased degree of separation of the 'S'-ROLE from performance seems to account for my consultants' intuitions that, when delegation/mediation is to be assumed, the reduplicated versions with roots such as bokál (cf. [24]) frequently 'sound better' than non-reduplicated ones. The increased DISPLACEMENT of the PRE-MOTILE 'S'-ROLE from actual performance may, as we have seen, have the paradoxical result of making the 'S'-PARTICIPANT seem more intensely/actively involved in the process (cf. [20]-[27]).

Rather than being a distinct 'Second Causative', the reduplicated -pa- is continuous in its effects with its non-reduplicated version, marking an intensification thereof. While -pa- shifts ROLE/MOTILITY out of PHASE with the NUCLEAR PARTICIPANTS, the reduplication of -pa- can be seen to increase the degree of such DISPLACEMENT of MOTILITY (intensity, urgency, urging) beyond the 'S'-ROLE.
Appendix C

Yogad Oral Narrative

(1) saw tu agaw ay abidan ku ... o allun ku
here TU day AY speak I or tell I

tu ku ra danu estudvante ya ma-sisim ni kan yu
TU KU them PL student YA MA-hear NI me YU

agangé mi saw tu América
1 go our here TU America

'Today I am going to tell to the students hearing
me about our coming to America'

(2) na-bavagga ya dagun ya kabbat nu anak mi
NA-long.time YA year YA want NU child our

ya angay kamí saw tu América
YA go we here TU America

'It has been many years that our children wanted us
to come here to America'

(3) také tu mé-ta2 mi ammá ganí yu América, yu
so TU ME-see we if what YU America, YU

allun da ya luta nu libre addu nu
tell they YA land NU free and NU

oportunidade, annu mé-a mi a... danú
opportunity, and ME-see we [pause] PL

áfu mi saw tu ya ne-anak3
grandchild our here TU YA NE-bear/child

---

1 This oral narrative, which appears in Baker (1994)
and Davis et al. (Ms.), was recorded by Angel Mesa and
transcribed by John Baker. All errors are my own.
Instances of -pa- occur in (4), (8), (10), (11), (18),
(36), (42); -pa- occurs as -pe- (i.e. pa + [i]) in (5)
and (6). Instances of -pag- occur in (4), (14), (32),
(33), (37), (38), (43), (54), (55), (57), (62), and (65);
-pang- occurs in (47) and (51).

2 This is ma + íta.

3 This is na + i + anak.
sáw tu Amérika  
here TU America

'So we can see what America is, the land of the 
free and of opportunity and we can see our 
grandchildren born here in America'

(4) kabbát mi yu angáy sáw tu Amérika ya ma-dagán  
want we YU go here TU America YA MA-soon

kúnta na-pa-nonó- mi⁴ ya i-bayabayág mi ambít,  
but NA-PA-think-we YA I-delay we first

také tu ma-balín yu wáqi ra va mang-aláp  
so TU MA-finish YU sister their YA MAG- receive

trappá tu kúrso na ya také tu ma-balín  
still TU course she YA so.that TU MA-finish

na yu pak-ka-dóktór na také tu  
she YU PAG-KA-doctor she so.that TU

makálap ya bàggi ná⁵ tu bórdexsam annu  
take YA body her TU board.exam and

mag-gíng na full-fledged dóktór ya bàggi ná  
MAG-become she full-fledged doctor YA body her

'We wanted to come to America fast but we thought 
we would delay it so that their sister who was 
still taking courses could finish in order for 
her to finish becoming a doctor in order for 
her to take the board exam and to become a 
full-fledged doctor'

(5) wará ra yú wálu ... o táfalu ya dagún  
exist already YU eight or ten YA year

ya dáti ya na-i-pe-tubúg⁶ ni Marissa, yu anák ku  
YA before YA NA-I-PE-send NI Marisa YU child my

ya dadakallán tu ku rá attanán, yu passport mi  
YA eldest TU KU them all YU passport our

⁴This is na + pa + nonót + mi.

⁵Recall that ya bàggi ná 'his/her body' serves as the FOCUSED Third Person Singular Pronoun (cf. 4.1.2).

⁶This is na- + i- + pa- + itubúg.
'There were already eight or ten years since Marissa, the oldest of my children, had sent our passports'

(6) tutá dagún nu 1980 ammá ammé ku mak-kamali ay in year of 1980 if not I MAG-mistaken AY 1980 yuví ya na-i-pe-tubúg na yu papéles kúnta 1980 it.was YA NA-I-PE-send she YU papers but ammé mi ya in-indón tu aksyón not we YA IN-give TU action

'It was in 1980, if I am not mistaken, it was 1980 that she sent the papers, but we did not take action'

(7) tutá dagún ay ma-tuyág kamí tràppa ya magatawá in year AY MA-strong we still YA couple 'In that particular year my wife and I were still strong'

(8) saw tutá wará ra yu ma-tagéná-mi7 tu here exist already YU MA-feel we TU baggíbaggí mi áwstru nat-takít [yu ...] bodies we and NAG-sick YU si Mrs. ay na-pa-nonó- mi yu angáy balálamun SI Mrs. AY NA-PA-think-we YU go reply sáw tu Amérika here TU America 'We felt something in our bodies and the Mrs. got ill that we began again to think of going to America'

(9) ántu tutá dagún nu dyós, dagún mil nwébe and in year NU lord, year thousand nine svéntos nubénta ay nang-itubúg dammán hundred ninety AY NANG-send again yu anák ku tu papéles ya na-gafú saw tu YU child I TU papers YA NA-from here TU

7This is ma + tagenáp + mi.
America TU petition for us YA get-AN again

'So in the year of our lord 1990, my child sent papers from America as petition for us, to get us again'

(10) saw, na-pa-nonó- mi ra ya angáv kamí balalámun here NA-PA-think-we again YA go we reply

'Now, we again thought seriously of going'

(11) tutá bulán nu húnyo ay na-prepára kamí ra in month NU June AY NA-got.ready we again

ya angáy tu Manila ya map-pa-interbyú YA go to Manila YA MAG-PA-interview

tu U.S. Embassy také tu ma-lá- mi⁸⁸ yu TU U.S. Embassy so TU MA-get we YU

passport ya m- awág⁹ ... tu pa ... tu agangáy saw passport YA MA-need TU TU go here

tu Amérika TU America

'In the month of June we got ready again to go to Manila to be interviewed in order to get the passport we need to go to America'

(12) kúnta adáddu yu ne-símmusímmu¹⁰ sáw pa ya bulán but many YU NE-happenings here PA YA month

'But there many things that happened in this month'

(13) yaw ya bulán ay ántu ya ne-símmu yu ma-tuvág this YA month AY when YA NE-happen YU MA-strong

a earthquake ... ya na-limmunn-án ku earthquake YA NA-forget-AN I

---

⁸This is ma + aláp + mi.

⁹This is ma- + awág.

¹⁰This is na- + i- + símmu₂.
tu Yógad ... yu ma-tuvág ya luníg
TU Yogad ... YU MA-strong YA earthquake

'This was the month that the strong earthquake... I forget the Yogad ... the strong earthquake happened'

(14) dyáw kamí tu wará yu appointment mi tu
be there we TU exist YU appointment our TU
St. Luke's Medical Center ya ántu [pageksam ...
St. Luke's Medical Center YA when
pina...] pag eksamen án da ta ku danú angáy
PAG-examine-AN they KU PL go
tu Ámeríka ammá ma-i-pása rá
TU America if MA-I-pass they

yu health eksáminasyón
YU health examination

'We were there where our appointment was, at St. Luke's Medical Center, where they examine those going to America to see whether they pass the health examination'

(15) hustú hustú tutá dyaw kamí tu 5th floor nu
just then as be there we TU 5th floor NU
medical building párá tu health eksaminasyón
medical building for TU health examination

ya má-ku¹¹ ni kamí ay antú akkésimmu nutá
YA MA-perform.on NI us AY when happen
ma-tuvág luníg ... ya nan-numérú
MA-strong earthquake ... YA NAG-number
tu ma-turuk tu seven point tu Richter Scale
TU MA-above TU seven point TU Richter Scale

'It was just then as we were there on the fifth floor of the medical building for the health examination to be performed on us when the big earthquake happened, which numbered above seven points on the Richter Scale'

¹¹This is ma- + akú.
(16) **hustúhustú va dyáw** kán tu x-ray room tutá
    just.then YA be.there I TU x-ray room when

    **ne-símmu yaw a luníg**
    NE-happen this YA earthquake

    'It was just when I was in the x-ray room that this
    earthquake occurred'

(17) **yu luníg siká ay [tató va ...] tató**
    YU earthquake you.know AY one YA one

    **tu ku rá danú forces majeurs yu me-símmusímmu**
    TU KU they PL forces majeurs YU ME-happen

    **tu nature va ammé m ... va ammé m**
    TU nature YA not you YA not you

    **ya tatáw ya me-símmu [ya ma-tató-m ya]**
    YA know YA ME-happen YA MA-know-you YA

    **tu yaw a ne-símmusímmu ay káttu [na...ka]**
    TU this YA NE-happen AY but

    **na-kumbínsí ni kán ya wará yu dyós**
    NA-convince NI me YA exist YU god

    'The earthquake, you know, is one of the major
    forces which happen in nature in which you
    don't ... you don't know what is going to
    happen when this occurs, but I was convinced
    that God exists'

(18) **te tutá ne-símmu yaw ay attanán yu táwlaw**
    because when NE-happen this AY all YU people

    **[tuyí unáng-ngu¹² va dyaw] tu ya building**
    it.was inside.of YA be.there TU YA building

    **ay awán ** tu p= in=a- nonó- da¹³ ammá**
    AY not.exist TI PA=IN=PA-think-they if

    **bakkán tu ... yu dyós**
    not.exist TU YU god

---

¹²This is unáng + nu 'inside of'.

¹³This is nonót + ra.
'Because when this happened all the people inside that building didn't think any other thing but God'

(19) attanán av nad-dasál áwstru nad-dasál annu all AY NAG-pray and NAG-pray and
na-malitúd av [va ... ] yu dyaw tu nonó-da
NA-kneel AY YA YU be.there TU mind-their
ay yu dyós talagá AY YU god really

'Everyone prayed and prayed and knelt and what was in their minds was really God'

(20) ne-símmu yuví ... nabalín a ne-símmu yuví NE-happen it.was after YA NE-happen it.was
n- angáy kemí ra tu binaláy áwstru tu méka NAG-go we again TU home and TU
talwágaw ay na-tawli kemí dammán ay wará third.day AY NA-go.back we again AY exist
dammán tutá dyáy kemí dammán tu utún again when be.there we again TU inside
wará dammán yu aftershock exist again YU aftershock

'It happened... after this happened we went home again and on the third day we went back again and it happened again while we were there again inside; there was an aftershock again'

(21) di [na atana] nak-karéla dammán atanán yu táwlay so NAG-run.out again all YU people
awstrú kúnna tuyi dammán balat yu and be.how again also YU
iku yu né-símmu whatchamacallit YU NE-happen

---

14This is pa + nonót + ra.
15This is nag + angáy 'go'.
16This is talú a igáw 'third day'.
'So everybody ran out again and that's how things happened again'

(22) tu allángu dyós ay attanán yu physical eksàminasyón
    TU grace.of god    AY all    YU physical examination

[áwstru ay] mi áddu ya magatawá ay mapí
    we two    AY couple    AY good

ántu va n- aprobá- n yu passport mi ya
    be.how YA NA-approve-AN YU passport we YA

angáy sáw tu Amérika
    go    here TU America

'By the grace of God, since both of our physical examinations were good that's how our passports to come to America were approved'

(23) tutá diáya nu októbre bente mil nwébe svéntos
    on date NU October twenty thousand nine hundred

nubénta antú-ra yu agangáy sáw tu Amérika
    ninety that's when YU go    here TU America

'On the twentieth of October, 1990, is when we arrived in America'

(24) yu také mi ya takáy sáw tu Amérika ay
    YU means we YA ride    here TU America AY

Northwest Airlines ya na-ìtubúg ay yu
    Northwest Airlines YA NA-send    AY YU

attanán yu pasáhe mi ay na-gafú tu ku rá
    all    YU fare    we AY NA-come.from TU KU them

danú áddu ya aná- mi17 saw ya yu nagagán
    PL two    YA child-we    here YA YU name

da av si Marissa addún ni Sosya
    their AY SI Marissa and    NI Sosya

'We got here by means of Northwest Airlines; all of our fare was sent to us; it came from our two children here whose names are Marissa and Sosya'

17This is anák + mi.
(25) [tutá] yu priméru ya istopóber ya na-dásaq-an
YU first YA stop.over YA NA-get.off-AN
mi ay Japan tu Narita Airport
we AY Japan TU Narita Airport
'The first stop over where we got off was Japan at Narita Airport'

(26) nabalín tu Narita Airport nad-dáság kamí tu ...
after TU Narita Airport NAG-get.off we TU
yu port of entry ay tu Chicago
YU port of entry AY TU Chicago
'After Narita Airport, we got off at ... the port of entry was Chicago'

(27) [ay] ... tuyí tu Chicago ay na-gín da kamí pa
there TU Chicago AY NA-go they us also
d= in-áfung danú kapíttta ni Mommy...
meet=IN=meet PL cousin NI Mommy
tu kapíttta ni Mrs. danú kapítttana na va
TU cousin NI Mrs. PL cousins her YA
dyaw__ tu Chicago da Renato áwstru
be.there TU Chicago they Renato and
danú familía na ay n- angáy pa__ sirá,
PL family his AY NAG-go also they
[yu] na-gín da kamí pa ya in-ítá
NA-go they us also YA IN-see
'It was in Chicago that Mommy's cousins came to meet us, the Mrs.' cousin, her cousins who are in Chicago, Renato and his family came to see us too'

(28) mangá ___ pig ___ ya óras kamí lan tu Chicago
more.or.less how.much YA hours we just TU Chicago
[tu ta iku] ay n-angáy kamí ra___ saw tu Houston
AY NAG-go we already here TU Houston
'We were in Chicago just a few hours and then we came to Houston'

(29) tutá gubín kamí ra___ saw tu Houston, Texas
when near we already here TU Houston, Texas,
AY MAG-come you see TU Chicago AY

na-change plane kámí, tátá ya
NA-change plane we one YA

búllak [da] ya airplane ya in-alá-mi¹⁸
small YA airplane YA IN-take-we

'When we were getting close to Houston, Texas... coming from Chicago, you see, we changed planes; we took a smaller plane'

(30) yaw_yu airplane ay nag-istópober tu Denver
this TU airplane AY NAG-stop over TU Denver

'This plane stopped over in Denver'

(31) áwstru tutá dyaw kámí tu Denver... ma-gafú tu
and when be there we DENVER... MA-coming TU

Denver ay n- angáy kámí ra tu Houston
Denver AY NAG-come we already TU Houston

'And when we were in Denver... coming from Denver we came already to Houston'

(32) tutá [dyaw kámí ang] gubín kámí ra saw
when near we already here

tu Houston ay pak-kubébut da ammá insáw
TU Houston AY PAG-ask they if where

yu pad-disag ám-mi¹⁹
YU PAG-get off-AN-we

'As we approached Houston, they asked us where we were getting off'

(33) yu pad-disag ám-mi saw siká tu Houston
YU PAG-get off-AN we here you see in Houston

ay áddu yu airport
AY two YU airport

'In Houston where we were to get off, you see, there are two airports'

¹⁸This is aláp + mi.

¹⁹This is pad- + disag + -an + mi.
(34) **yu airport ay yu Intercontinental addún nu Hobby**
YU airport AY YU Intercontinental and NU Hobby

'The airports are Intercontinental and Hobby'

(35) **yu priméru ya na-disag- án nu areplánu ay Hobby**
YU first YA NA-get.off-AN NU airplane AY Hobby

'The first place the plane landed was Hobby'

(36) **yu dyaw __ tu pa-nonó- mi ay mad-diság kamí**
YU be.there TU PA-think-we AY MAG-get.off we

ra__ tuví
already there

'What was in our minds was getting off there'

(37) **ammé mi tatáw ammá insáw, karíq mi ya**
not we know if where, think we YA

magatawá ammá antú __ ra₂₀ yuvi
couple if that's how already it.is

**yu pad-disag- ám-mi**
YU PAG-get.off-AN-we

'We did not know if this was the place; we thought that is the place we get off'

(38) **kuntá mapí te __ yu dyaw __ tu tabí-mí²¹ ya**
but good because YU be.there TU next-we YA

**pasahéro né-ta na yu ticket mi ya tu**
passenger NE-see he YU ticket we YA TU

**Intercontinental Airport tu pad-disag- ám-mi**
Intercontinental Airport TU PAG-get.off-AN-we

'But it was good that there was next to us a passenger who saw our tickets were for Intercontinental Airport'

(39) **ántu ya n- angáy kamí dammán nat-takáy kamí**
and YA NAG-go we again NAG-ride we

______________________________

²₀The Phrase antú ra means 'that's when'.

²¹This is tabík + mi 'next to us'.
dammán tu areplánu nad-derétyu kamí ra
again TU airplane NAD-arrive we already

tu Intercontinental Airport
TU Intercontinental Airport

'And we got inside the plane again to ride the plane to get to Intercontinental Airport'

(40) tuyí na-gín na kamí ra pa ya in-ità
NA-come he we already also YA IN-see

in-aláp ni Svam yu manugáng ku va Indyan ya
IN-take NI Shyam VU son-in-law my YA Indian YA

Bombay ya ma-trabáho pa tu ... akáttu tatá
Bombay YA MA-work also TU ... as one

ya inhinyéro sawwé tu ... master electronic
YA engineer now TU ... master electronic

engineer ... saw tu Schlumberger
engineer ... there TU Schlumberger

'He also came to see us and to pick us up, my son-in-law who is an East Indian, who works at ... as an engineer now at ... master electronic engineer ... there at Schlumberger'

(41) tuyí mangá gabí rá tutá dé um-ángá
TU approx. night already then arrive=UM=arrive

kamí saw, maa óras sigúru,
we there approx. time I.think,

manga alasdyés alasónsi tu gabí
approx. at.ten at.eleven TU evening

ya ni-vági22 rá kamí binaláy ra
YA NI-go already we home their

'It was already night when we arrived home, approximately, I think at ten or eleven in the evening when we got to their home'

(42) tuyí kamí ya na-gyán tu mangá valú o svam
there we YA NA-stay TU more.or.less eight or nine

22This is ni + ági.
a bulán dagáyna n-angáy kami pa-dammán
YA month before NAG-go we PA-other

tu tatá dammán ya anak ku wagí
TU one other YA child my sibling

balat ni Marissa ya tan anak
also NI Marissa YA COMP young/child

'There we stayed for about eight or nine months
before we went to another place, to another of
my children, also a sister of Marissa, who is
younger'

(43) sawwé ya bâqqi ná yu pag-qinán ni kigat
now YA body her YU PAG-stay we until

sawwé ya bulán
now YA month

'Now hers is the place we stayed until this month'

(44) na-limmun-án ku pa ya in-allú-n23 ni kám ya
NA-forget-AN I also YA IN-tell-EN NI you YA

NA-begin one January TU year NU 1991

ay in-aláp ba kán ya mang-untúru24
AY IN-bring they I YA MANG-teach

tu Yogad saw tu Rice University
TU Yogad here TU Rice University

'In passing, I'll tell you [when] beginning in
January... in the year 1991, they brought me
to teach Yogad here at Rice University'

(45) yaw ya trabáho ay bakkán tu tálaga yu
this YA work AY not TU real YU

trabáho ku te yu tálaga na-balín ku
work I because YU real NA-finish I

23 The suffix -(e)n is a form of very limited
currency. Cf. Davis et al. (Ms. Chapter 6).

24 This is mang + tuntúru.
ay nang-alák-kam-pa\textsuperscript{25} tu medisína sína
AY NAG- take-I- also TU medicine there

tu Filipínas
TU Philippines

'This work is not my real work because I really finished, I also took medicine there in the Philippines.'

(46) si kán ay tatá ya foreign medical graduate kontá
SI I AY one YA foreign medical graduate but

sawwé yu trabáho ku ay man- untúru
now YU work I AY MANG-teach

'I am a foreign medical graduate but now my work is teaching'

(47) bakkán tu línya ku yaw ya trabáho kunta in-ala ku
not TU line I this YA work but IN-get I

lan te awán balat tu akw-án ku áwstru
just because exist no also TU do- AN I and

wará pa bullák ay váda ra, ya káttu pa
exist also little YA give they YA as also

iku... tu óras ya pan- untúru ku áwstru
whatever ... TU hours YA PANG-teach I and

na-pa-nónot ku tu yaw ya trabáho máski bakkán
NA-PA-think I TU this YA work although not

línya ku awstru paying job ay maka-duffúng kán tu
line I and paying job AY MAKÁ-help I TU

pang- i-túllu tu ábid va Yogad
PANG- I-raise TU language YA Yogad

'This is not my line of work, but I just got it because I don't have anything to do and they also give a little, whatever... for the hours I teach and I thought although this work is not my line and not a paying job, I will be able to help promote the Yogad language'

(48) mé tam tatáw ammá tu daddánga nu dagún o
not we know if TU coming NU year or

\textsuperscript{25}This is nang + aláp + kan + pa.
daddamá nu daqún yu tatá tu ku ra danú
passing NU year YU one TU KU they PL

studvénte ay wará [yu] nání mallawán mang-i-túrak
student AY exist FUT MANG-I-write

tu [ o mallawan tu históriya tu] history nu
write future TU history TU history NU

Rice University ya wará pa yu nang-i-tuntúru
Rice University YA there.is also YU NANG-I-teach

tu ábid ya Yogad
TU language YA Yogad

'We don't know in the coming or the passing of the years, there will be one of the students who will turn out to write the history of Rice University that there was also someone who taught Yogad'

(49) médyá ma-digat i-tuntúru yav ya Yogad te
little MA-difficult I-teach this YA Yogad because

bakkán tu káttu danú tanakwán ya ábid o dialect
not TU as PL other YA language or dialect

nu Filipino ya wará yu ... established
NU Philippines YA there.is YU established

wará ra yu nang-i-tuntúru tu ku rá
there.is already YU NANG-I-teach TU KU they

danáw [iku yi] ya ábid
these YA language

'It's a little difficult to teach this Yogad because it's not like other languages or dialects of the Philippines for which there are... established, there is already someone who taught, retaught these languages'

(50) [yu] wará yu grammar na [yu]
exist YU grammar it

'There are grammars of them'

(51) wará ra yu káttu náku ya outline ya
exist already YU as make YA outline YA

pang-i-tuntúru saw ya ábid
PANG-I-teach this YA language
'There is already something like an outline made to teach this language'

(52) ántu va médyu káttu ma-digát kunta gafú tu SO YA little as MA-difficult but because TU
danú estudyánte ku [ay] va mang-aláp saw a kúrsu PL student I YA MANG-take this YA course
ay ... panáy ya intelihénte áwstru panáy ya AY all YA intelligent and all YA
atánnang yu q= in=ugwám-ba áwstru high YU study=IN=study-they and
talágá pa va mapí tu ... mapí yu úlu ra really also also YA good TU good YU head their

'So it's a little bit difficult, but because my students who are taking this course are all intelligent and they all study it to a high level and also have really good heads'

(53) talaga ma-dagán nu sirá ya ma-tuntúru-an really MA-fast you they MA-teach-AN

'You teach them easily'

(54) tu mamítta [ma] tráppa imbéssa si kán yu TU once more instead SI I YU
man- untúru tu ku rá si kán yu MANG-teach TU KU they SI I YU
maka-gugwám tu ku rá te mas MAKA-learn TU KU they because more
mapí yu [pangi] ... pag-intyénde ra good YU PAG-understand already

'For once, instead of me teaching them, it is I who learns from them because they understand better'

(55) tu wará yu subject ya in-alába yu [yu] TU there.is YU subject YA IN-take.they YA
tatáw-ra [yu] amná kassándi yu íku know-they if how YU what.do.you.call.it

... pag-gugwám tu tatá ya lenggwáhe PAG-learn TU one YA language
'There is a subject they took to know how to learn a language'

(56) káttu saw tu ginangku ya departmentu ya
so here TU YA department YA

mang-i-tuntúru linguistics panáy linguistics
MANG-I-teach linguistics all linguistics

addánu semiotics
and semiotics

'Like here in the department where they teach linguistics, all linguistics and semiotics'

(57) yu yaw ay tata ya subject ya i-tuntúru na
YU this AY one YA subject YA I-teach it

yu ammá kassándi yu [pangi] pag-gugwám mu tu
YU if how YU PAG-learn you TU

tatá ya lingwáhe ya yúsana yu science nu symbols
one YA language YA using YU science NU symbols

áwstru yu ammá kassándi yu íky nu ammá kassándi yu
and YU if how YU any NU if how YU

ákkatu na, nu grammar nu tatá ya language
done it, NU grammar NU one YA language

o dialect
or dialect

'This is a subject that teaches how you can learn any language at all, using the science of symbols and how it is done, the grammar of any language or dialect'

(58) sawwé ya kabbádak ka²⁶ ya ma-tatáw danú
now YA want also YA MA-know PL

estudyánte ammá kassándi yu Yogad
student if how YU Yogad

'Now the students also want to know what Yogad is like'

(59) allú-n ku tu ku rá yu Yógad ay talagáya
tell-EN I TU KU they YU Yogad AY really

²⁶This is kabbádak + pa.
ábid nu tatá ya lawáng tu Isabela
language NU one YA town TU Isabela

'I tell them Yogad is really the dialect of one
language in the town of Isabela'

(60) yu ábid danú ... ábid nu naturáles
YU language language natives
tu Itváge talagá yu Yogad
TU Echague really YU Yogad

'The language of... language of the natives in
Echague really is Yogad'

(61) Ammé ku tatáw ammá annínna yu Yogad, ammá
not I know if how YU Yogad if
sínni o ammá kassándi nag-qafán nu, ammá ganí
who or if how NAG-come if what
nagàfugáfan nu ábid- da Yogad
origin NU language YA Yogad

'I do not know how Yogad came to be, who it came
from or how it came to be, what the origin of
the Yogad language is'

(62) kúnta ni kán pag-îta káttu adáddu pa yu ábid
but NI I PAG-see as many also YU word
o root word a mag-gáfu tu Inglés, adáddu pa
or root word YA MAG-come TU English many also
yu mag-gáfu tu Spanish, ya awán tráppa tu
YU MAG-come TU Spanish, YA not.exist still TU
tu translation na [ya] tu Yogad
TU translation it TU Yogad

'But it looks to me like there are many root words
that come from English, also many come from
Spanish, that still don't have an equivalent
in Yogad'

(63) ántu ya siggamítta embés púro Yogad
so YA once.in.a.while instead.of pure Yogad
yu ma-i-tuntúru ku tu ku danú estudyánte
YU MA-I-teach I TU KU PL student
saw a massisim ni kán ay angkárwan wará yu words, here YA hear NI I AY sometimes exist YU words

yu ábid ya m- allú ku tu English o Spanish
YU word YA MA-say I TU English or spanish

'So once in a while, instead of pure Yogad, I teach the students here hearing me, there are sometimes words that I say in English or Spanish'

yu Yogad ay tatá ya ábid _____ ya bakkán
YU Yogad AY one YA language YA not

tráppa tu adáddu yu nag-uguwán tu ku ná still TU many YU NAG-study TU KU it

'Yogad is one language for which there are still not many studies'

wará pa _____ danú [ta] Peace Corps ya n- angáy exist already PL Peace Corps YA NAG-go

sína n-angáy tu Ityáge nag-uguwán tu Yogad kunta there NAG-go TU Echague NAG-learn TU Yogad but

ammé ku tatáw ammá wará yu in-angu rá ya not I know if exist YU IN-make they YA

pag-uguwam, o studies, tu grammar nu Yogad PAG-learn or studies TU grammar NU Yogad

'There are also those Peace Corps people who came there to Echague to study Yogad, but I don't know if there is something they made, or studies, in the grammar of Yogad'

antú ya náni ammá ma-bakasyón kán mamíutta tu so YA when if MA-vacation I once TU

Ityáge dammán tu Filipínas ay purbáng ku tu Echague again TU Philippines AY try I YA

i-research ammá sinní danú...danú Peace Corps ya I-research if who PL ...PL Peace Corps YA
naká-gi²⁷ sína také tu nammú na ya maká-lap²⁸
Naka-go there so TU can YA Naka-get
tu kuminiksyón tu ku rá danú nákú ra ra
TU communication TU Ku they PL make they already
trabáho ma mégafu tu ábid ya Yogad
work concerning TU language YA Yogad

'So later when I will take a vacation once again to
Efugoe in the Philippines, I'll try to
research these Peace Corps whose were able to
go there so that they are able to get some
information about the works they have made
concerning the Yogad language'

(67) yu Yogad ay tatá ya ábid, ya tatá ya lugár
YU Yogad Ay one YA language YA one YA place

pastu tatá ya ... lawáng ya yu kaddwán nu
one YA town YA YU majority NU

táwlay ay yu ábid da ay Yogad kunta sawwéva ay
people Ay Yu language they Ay Yogad but now Ay

wará ra yu Yogad a nang-atáwa tu Ilokano,
exist already YU Yogad YA NANG-marry TU Ilokano

wará ra pa yu Ilokano a nang-atáwa tu
exist already also YU Ilokano YA NANG-marry TU

Yogad, wará ra pa yu Yogad a nang-atáwa
Yogad exist already also YU Yogad YA NANG-marry

tu Tagalog
TU Tagalog

'Yogad is a language in one town where there is a
majority of people whose language is Yogad,
but now there are already Yogads who married
Ilokanos, there are also Ilokanos married to
Yogads, there are Yogads married to Tagalogs'

(68) sawwéva ay ma-pangápanágá ra yu Yogad
now AY MA-branch already YU Yogad

'Already, Yogad is branching off'
(69) wará ra yu naká-gi tu tanakwán a
exist already YU NAKA-go TU other
lugár
place

‘Now there are those who were able to go to other
places’

(70) káttu sawwéva ay wará ra yu Yogad
so now AY exist already YU Yogad
tu Amérika
TU America

‘So now there is already a Yogad in America’

(71) si kán yu priméru ya Yogad a dyáw
SI I YU first YA Yogad YA located
saw tu Amérika
here TU America

‘I am the first Yogad to be here in America’
References


Davis, Philip W. Ms. Voice and role. Houston: Rice University Department of Linguistics.


Hardy, Donald E. Ms. Creek ipV and aspectual perfect. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Department of English.


Harris, Roy. 1986. The origin of writing. La Salle, IL: Open Court.


Leibniz, G.W. 1902. Discourse on metaphysics, correspondence with Arnauld, monadology. La Salle, IL: Open Court Classics.


Tyler, Stephen A. Ms.a. I dreamt I was Queen Nefertiti and I was making love to her. Houston: Rice University Department of Anthropology.

Tyler, Stephen A. Ms.b. Vile bodies: A mental machination. Houston: Rice University Department of Anthropology.


