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0.1. Preliminary Notes.

0.1.1. General Information. Pampangan (Pampango, Kapampangan: from * pampan 'aus einander Stehen' (Dempwolf 1938), Tagalog reflex pampan 'Mundung' and Pampangan reflex pampan 'river bank, shore'; the name is undoubtedly due to the Pampanga River) is a Philippine language spoken by inhabitants of the provinces of Pampangan and of Tarlac and of the areas in the provinces of Bulacan, Nueva Ecija, Tarlac, Zambales, and Bataan bordering on Pampanga (see Map 2) on the island of Luzon in the Philippines. The 1960 census of the Philippines lists Pampangan as having 875,531 speakers.

0.1.2. Pampangan and the Other Philippine Languages. Pampangan belongs to the Central Luzon group of languages (see Map 1), one of the five language groups proposed by Kroeber (1919), who grouped the Philippine languages into five geographical divisions: Northeastern Luzon, Northwestern Luzon, North Central, Central, and Mindanao.

Lopez (in Thompson 1953:36) would group Pampangan (and Pangasinan) into a nonrelated cluster apart from three other groups: Northern, Central, and Southern.

The above groupings are based on general inspection of different features of the Philippine languages.
Other groupings, based on vocabulary comparison, have been proposed by Conklin (1951, 1952), Chrétien (1962), Thomas and Healey (1962), and Dyen (1965). Conklin used nonstatistical techniques of matching vocabulary, while Chrétien devised a Coefficient of Similarity after surveying almost two thousand cognate groups of lexical items. Thomas and Healey and Dyen worked on modified Swadesh lists and based their groupings on lexicostatistical indices.

Conklin (in Voegelin 1952:90-4) categorizes Pampangan under his 'non-committal' group, the members of which are not clearly classifiable under either the Iloko-type languages (north) or the Tagalog-type languages (Central).

Chrétien posits a Luzon sequence, with Pampangan as a member of the series in a north-to-south sequence.

Thomas and Healey group Tagalog and Pampangan within the same subset, this subset being a member of a larger subset, the Southern Group of the Philippine Stock.

Dyen (1965:30) places Pampangan as a member of the Sulic Hesion (subordinate to the Philippine Hesion). In turn, the Philippine Hesion is subordinate to the Hesperonesian Linkage, which is in turn subordinate to the Malayopolynesian Linkage. Under the Sulic Hesion, Pampangan is coordinate with languages of the Meso-philippine Hesion (which include languages of the
Tagalic Hesion), the Dibabaon Subfamily, Kalamian, the Palawanic Subfamily, the Bukidnon Subfamily, and Cotabato Manobo. Pampangan is described as closest to the Tagalic Hesion, more specifically, to Cuyunon of the Bisayan Cluster, with which it shares a vocabulary percentage of 39.2%.

Using phonological criteria, innovations on Dempwolff's Uraustronesisch, Gonzalez (1969) places Pampangan as a transitional language between the Northern Group and the Southern Groups. Pampangan shares certain phonological features in common with Pangasinan and Sambal, likewise transitional languages.

0.2. Review of Scholarship. The scholarly literature on Pampangan is rather meager (for bibliographical surveys of Philippine linguistics prior to 1920, the date of Blake's bibliography, see Blumentritt 1882, Barrantes 1889, Pardo de Tafera 1903; for a study of the holdings of the Newberry Library on Philippine linguistics, see Welsh 1950 and Phelan 1955).

0.2.1. Pampangan in Comparative Studies. Comparative work on Pampangan has been confined for the most part to vocabulary studies. Johann Reinhold Forster (1778), a member of Captain Cook's second expedition, includes a list of forty-seven lexical items in Observations Faites, Pendant le Second Voyage de M. Cook, dans l'Hémi-
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sphère Austral. There is a list of two hundred Pampangan lexical items in Pallas's *Vocabularium Catharinae* (1787-1789). Other vocabulary lists may be found in Meyer (1878), Lacouperie (1887), and Kern (1890).

Pampangan citations are used in the comparative work of Brandstetter (1916), Conant (1907, 1909, 1910, 1912, 1916-1917), Viray (1941), and more recently, Verstraelen (1962). Mendoza (1940), basing her work on Dempwolf (1934, 1937, 1938), supplements Dempwolf's Wortschatz with the Pampangan forms available and draws conclusions concerning phonological innovations in Pampangan.

Grammatical features of Pampangan are considered in Blake's studies on Philippine comparative grammar (1906, 1907, 1910, 1916). Lopez (1965) has published a survey of syntactic features of twelve Philippine languages, among them, Pampangan, while Constantino (1965), using a transformational model, surveyed the sentence patterns of twenty-six Philippine languages, again, among them, Pampangan.

0.2.2. Pampangan in Descriptive Studies.

The first scholars of Pampangan, as in so many of the other Philippine languages, were the Spanish missionaries, who arrived with the conquistadores in 1521 and in 1565; the latter date is the year of actual Spanish settlement.
on the islands. In keeping with their ultimate purpose of evangelization, however, the missionaries published pedagogical grammars rather than theoretical descriptions.

The first recorded pedagogical grammar is D. Ochoa's 'Arte, Vocabulario, y Confesionario Pampango', a manuscript in three volumes completed circa 1580 (Blake 1920:65).

Another manuscript, in two volumes, by Sebastián Moreno, 'Sobre el Modo de Comprender el Idioma Pampango y su Poesia', dating from the same period, is listed by Pardo de Tavera (1903:186), although he doubts its existence. Blake (1920:65) likewise lists 'Modo y Forma de Leer los Caracteres de la Lengua Pampanga' by S. Moreno. It is not ascertainable at present whether or not Pardo de Tavera and Blake are referring to the same manuscript.

Francisco Coronel wrote 'Reglas para Aprender el Idioma Pampango' (Manila [?] 1617). A more complete manuscript, 'Arte y Reglas de la Lengua Pampango' (1621) as well as a 'Vocabulario Pampango' at one time existed (Blake 1920:64). Apparently, this Arte was subsequently published, for in 1875, a 'reimpresión' appeared in Manila with the title *Catecismo Pampango Arte y Vocabulario del Mismo Idioma*, by Francisco Coronel (Barrantes 1889:186). Coronel's work must have been widely circulated among the Augustinian friars, since
subsequently, Diego Bergaño refers to Coronel more than once in his own published Arte as 'mi Coronel', taking for granted that his readers were familiar with the work.

Another manuscript, 'Arte y Diccionario Pampango', was written by Álvaro de Benavente, who took the manuscript with him to China and died there in 1709. According to Barrantes (1889:171), Bergaño knew of the work, as he referred to it in his 'Advertencia al Lector'.

Still another manuscript, in one volume, dated 1710, 'Vocabulario Pampango', by S. Foronda, is mentioned by Blake (1920:64).

The only published grammar from this period (Spanish Regime, 1521-1898) other than Coronel's is Diego Bergaño's (born 1690, died 1747) *Arte de la Lengua Pampanga* and his *Vocabulario de la Lengua Pampanga en Romance*. Bergaño's Arte was first published in 1729, emended and republished in 1736. His Vocabulario appeared in 1732. Later, a third edition of the Arte, based on the 1736 edition (with only orthographic and accentual changes), was published in 1916. The 1732 Vocabulario was reprinted in 1860.

Mariano Alafon(t) wrote 'Notas y Adiciones al Arte Pampango del Padre Vergaño' undoubtedly after the publication of Bergaño's grammar; the undated manuscript is listed by Barrantes (1889:170). Alafon(t) likewise
wrote (circa 1786) 'Arte de la Lengua Española para Uso de los Naturales de la Provincia de la Pampanga' (Blake 1930:62).

A one-volume manuscript dated approximately 1765 and entitled 'Clave para Escribir y Leer en Pampango' by J. Calleja is listed in Blake (1920:63).

There are two extant manuscripts by Antonio Bravo (born 1833, died 1897) at the Newberry Library entitled 'Cuestiones Gramaticales: Sus Contestaciones' (Candaba, August 10, 1886, 3 pages) and 'Yslas Filipinas Cuestionario y Vocabulario de la Lengua Pampanga Dialecto' (Candaba, August 10, 1886, 30 pages). Previously, the same Antonio Bravo had published in 1875 Vade Mecum Filipino ó Manual de la Conversación Español Pampango (Blake 1920:34).

Pardo de Tavera (1903) lists an 1875 Manila publication in seventy pages entitled Capabalar cannon Usuc a Matampa carking Tabasna t Linica etc. Capampangan ning P. Fr. G. Masnou without annotation (Entry # 1650). From the title, freely translatable as Fitting Knowledge and Instruction in the Design and [?] of Pampangan by Father G. Masnou, the work appears to have been intended as a prescriptive grammar for the correct usage of Pampangan.

In 1876, E. Fernández published his Nuevo Vocabulario ó Manual de Conversaciones en Español, Tagalog, Pampango. This work underwent five editions (First, Binondo 1876; Second, Manila 1882; Third [?] 1887; Fourth, Manila 1896;
Fifth, Binondo 1901).

Gavino Dimalanta published his Vocabulario Pampango-Tagalog-Inglés, compiled from a Tagalog-Spanish-English vocabulary list by D. E. Fernández (presumably, the same Fernández mentioned previously) and S. G. Calderón. This book is undated and was published in Manila by J. Martínez.

Another dictionary, by Luther Parker, was published in Manila in 1905, An English-Spanish-Pampango Dictionary.

Conant (1911) published a study of 'Monosyllabic Roots in Pampango'.

In 1915, Magat published Gramatica ng Saging Castila, t Capampangan 'A Grammar of the Spanish and of the Pampangan Languages'.

0.2.3. Recent Descriptive Studies of Pampangan.
Castrillo completed a master's thesis in 1955 at the University of the Philippines entitled 'Pampango Syntax', under the direction of Lopez. The analysis, using a taxonomic model in many ways comparable to the tagmemic model, will be evaluated in the final chapter of this study, together with the articles by Lopez and by Constantino.

A doctoral thesis on Pampangan phonology, using the assumptions of phonemic theory, was completed in 1958 at the University of Texas by Clardy, who summarized her findings in a 1959 article in Phonetica. Tabasondra (1962) likewise published a study of Pampangan segmental phonemes based on the same theoretical frame of reference.
0.2.4. Sources for the Study. Among the earlier studies, I have had access to the following: Bergaño 1916, Bergaño 1860, Bravo 1886a,b, and Dimalanta [?]. I have likewise had access to unpublished vocabulary lists compiled by Perez (1964) and by the Institute of National Language in Manila (see references) and to a small 'pocket dictionary' by Manalili and Tamayo (1964).

For the rest of the data, I have had to act as my own informant, being a native speaker of Pampangan (Apalit dialect). Because of my bilingual background--I grew up in Quezon City, outside of Manila, speaking Pampangan at home and Tagalog outside--there will most likely be instances of idiolectal peculiarities and of language mixture. Such instances must be taken into account in some of my semantic interpretations, especially of those forms in this study which test the full potentialities of the language. Inspite of such possible linguistic idiosyncrasies arising from bilingualism (and subsequent exposure to Spanish and English), I find surprisingly little difference between my dialect and Bergaño's Bacolor dialect, which dates back to 1736. Nor do I find any but minor differences between my dialect and that of Clardy's Tarlac informant or that of Tabasandra, who worked with a Tarlac dialect, or that of Castrillo's San Fernando and Mexico informants (see Map 2).

To insure myself against a natural tendency to regularize my patterns, I have rechecked much of the pertinent data against letters (in Pampangan) from my
relatives and against the speech of a Pampangan-speaking relative now living in San Francisco. Still a third check, especially for unusual forms, has been a native speaker of Pampangan (Macabebe dialect) who speaks no English and who is likewise living in San Francisco at present.

Allowing for minor idiolectal peculiarities, especially in cases of polysemy, then, the semantic structures described in this study should be found to be valid for any Pampangan speaker.

0.3. The Model for Analysis. The model to be used for the analysis of the semantic structure of Pampangan is based on Chafe's generative semantic model (1962, 1965, 1967, 1968, 1970a,b, 1971; the pagination of citations from the last three references is based on the manuscripts of these works and not on the printed versions).

Basically, language is conceived of as symbolization, a process which connects the content side of language (signifié) with the expression side of language (signifiant). The generation of well-formed linguistic structures takes place initially on the content side of language, where semantic rules of formation generate the components of a well-formed sentence. After configurations of meanings have been assembled by semantic rules of formation, the generated configurations undergo postsemantic processes (comparable in function to the transformations of generative grammar) to yield surface structures. The surface
structures are then symbolized by underlying phonological sequences on the expression side of language, which undergo further phonological processes to finally yield phonetic structures (see Figure 1).

The semantic rules of formation consist of specification rules (optional ---→; obligatory → ) and of replacement rules (optional ---→; obligatory → ) which develop the nucleus of semantic structure, the verb (hereinafter V) or the predicate.

In this theory, V is considered as central, its accompanying nouns (hereinafter N) or arguments as peripheral and as determined by selectional and inflectional restrictions of V.

V is further specified as state, process, action, or process-action; such subcategories are further specifiable by added selectional units, until the choice of a lexical unit narrows down V to a particular one. In turn, once thus delimited, V is further specified by inflectional units, which are characterized by a lack of relevance to the choice of a lexical unit, insofar as inflectional units may specify any V root.

V's thus developed may be obligatorily or optionally accompanied by role-marked N's (in alphabetic order: agent, agentive beneficiary, associate, beneficiary, complement, experiencer, goal, instrument, location, material, measure, motive, norm, partitive, patient, source,
Figure 1 (from Chafe 1970b:86)
time), thus resulting in \( \sqrt{N} \) configurations manifesting various semantic relations or axes; rules for stating such cooccurrences are formulated as replacement rules.

\( N \)'s, like \( V \)'s, are further specified for selectional units, which narrow down the choice of lexical units, and for inflectional units.

Semantic marking is unary rather than binary, the presence of a semantic unit being indicated by an added marking, its absence unmarked. Where the absence of a unit is a necessary contextual restriction, a minus sign is used to explicitly state the required absence of the unit in question for the rule to apply.

Both \( V \) roots and \( N \) roots may undergo optional derivational processes, which both add meaning to a root and may change the categorization or subcategorization of a root; for example, under certain statable conditions, an inherent state \( V \) may be replaced by a derived process \( V \), or an inherent \( -\)abstract \( N \) may be replaced by a derived abstract \( N \). Such roots, basic or derived, are listed in the lexicon of a language and must be made available for selection in the process of semantic generation.

The well-formed semantic structure generated by the formation rules must then undergo various postsemantic processes to convert the initial semantic structure into a surface structure. Such postsemantic processes
typically consist of further specification and replacement
rules of transformation, which add, subtract, redistribute
semantic and postsemantic units, and finally linearize
the semantic structure to yield a linear surface structure.
In general, postsemantic processes add no new semantic
content to the initial semantic structure. It is a
moot question at present whether postsemantic processes
do add some new semantic content in certain instances

Chafe's model purports to be a radical departure
from the model of 'autonomous syntax' proposed by Chomsky
(1965), although Chomsky (1969) considers the model (as
proposed in Chafe 1967) as only a notational variant
differing from the 'standard theory' only as regards the
model's assumptions concerning the directionality of mapping
(for an answer to Chomsky, see Chafe 1970b:98-102, 1971:
10-4 in particular). It would be outside the scope of this
study to evaluate such theoretical claims and counterclaims.
It suffices to compare the results of this study of
Pampangan structures with the results of analyses of
other Philippine languages which have been completed
using Chomsky's model to see if any empirical differences
arise from the application of the two models; see, for
example, Constantino's (1960) study of Iloko; Anderson's
(1965) contrastive analysis of Cebuano and English;

In its use of V as the nucleus of a sentence, with accompanying role-marked N's, Chafe's model bears a striking resemblance to Fillmore's (1968) Case Grammar, although Fillmore's V and C's (Cases) are meant to be primitives of deep structure in syntax, distinct from the interpretative semantic component, whereas Chafe's V-N configurations are meant to be semantic rather than syntactic, syntax being incorporated into semantics.

In equating deep structure with semantic structure, abstract syntax, a development within transformational generative grammar, is similar to Chafe's generative semantics. In fact, Lakoff (1969) likewise labels his theory 'generative semantics'. In abstract syntax, however, many of Chafe's selectional and inflectional units and even certain lexical units are considered as separate predicates of hierarchically embedded one-place or two-place functions or propositions, certain clusters of which are eventually realized as lexical items: for example, (cause (become (not (live)) ))

\[ \rightarrow \text{kill}. \]

In abstract syntax, moreover, lexemes (constituted by sound and meaning) are inserted in the course of the derivation (after certain prelexical
transformations but prior to syntactic transformations). In Ross's view (see McCawley 1968b), lexical insertion can take place at any point in the derivation. On the other hand, Chafe's model considers lexical units as 'semantoids', without phonological correlates, selected as a result of previous selectional specifications and further specifiable by inflectional units. Eventually, lexical units are symbolized in surface structure, but only after the application of postsemantic processes.

In postulating a basically nonlinear semantic structure, Chafe's model has features in common with Halliday's (1966) concept of 'deep grammar'.

0.4. Scope, Limitations, and Purposes of the Study. In this study, an initial exploratory one at best, no more than an outline of the principal semantic structures of Pampangan and the rules for generating such semantic structures will be attempted.

Although this model of language lends itself to the exploration of idiom formation and analysis (see Chafe 1968, 1970a:129-30, 1970b:106-8), no attempt will be made to account for anything other than literal speech, except in connection with temporal dimensions which are often literalized as spatial dimensions. Moreover, although suggestions will be made on the necessity of ordering rules with regard to other rules, no claim will be made for either completeness or adequacy of the rule
statements and their ordering. The formulations are tentative and will undoubtedly demand revision as new data are accounted for. Still, the claim will be made that the rules formulated at least account for the examples cited and that the rules suggest the types of formulations which must be considered in accounting for semantic structures.

Considerations will be confined solely to the content side of language, the phonological processes of Pampangan being reserved, hopefully, for a later study of Pampangan phonology based on the model of generative phonology, with full cognizance of the necessary 'grammatical prerequisites'.

For the purposes of this study, the validity of Chafe's model as one among other possible models for accounting for structures on the content side of language will be assumed. The notation, rule format, manner of presentation, and where applicable, terminology for semantic units of Chafe 1970a,b will be used. By applying the model to a member of a language family (Austronesian) to which as yet it has not been applied, the study will test the applicability of the model and examine its descriptive power.

With the study of semantic structures still in its beginning stages, the structures described for Pampangan will be partial rather than complete descriptions. Still, it will be only through a study of the semantic
structures (units and configurations) and of various postsemantic processes in diverse languages that insight will be gained into the nature of the structure of the content side of language.

On the expression side of language, linguists are well on the way towards arriving at a universal phonetic framework, a frame of reference with which they can study the phonological component of languages. The progress achieved in the quest for phonological universals and for phonological constraints (formulated in the theory of marking conventions and of language-universal redundancy rules) has been made possible through a survey of the phonological structures of the major languages of the world, a survey which has liberated linguistics from a too narrow conception of what is phonologically possible and what is phonologically 'natural'. It is hoped that a comparable direction will be taken in the study of the content side of language. And it is towards this general goal that this study ultimately proposes to make a contribution.

An examination of the selectional, lexical, and inflectional units as well as of the different possible \( V \bar{N} \) configurations of a language of the Austronesian family will manifest both similarities with and differences from comparable units in English, in Onondaga, and in Wichita (Rood 1970), languages to which the model has
been applied. The study of similarities will point the way towards semantic universals. On the other hand, the discovery of dissimilarities will point the way towards the locus where languages actually differ, in the delicacy of distinctions made, in the subcategories required, in the variety of postsemantic processes.

More particularly, this study of the semantic structure of Pampangan aims to contribute to the progress of the study of the Philippine languages by exploring the content side of a language last examined in great detail in 1736 through an avenue of investigation not hitherto traversed with either care or method in the past.

0.5. Plan of the Study. Chapter I, the key chapter, describes the semantic structures of Pampangan through specification and replacement rules developing V and its cooccurring N's. Chapter II describes the main postsemantic processes in Pampangan, again through specification and replacement rules which eventually lead to surface structures. Chapter III discusses semantic structures consisting of more than one V. Chapter IV proposes the notion of 'presemantic structure' to account for uses of language other than cognitive. Chapter V summarizes the conclusions of the study and evaluates the descriptive power of the model through comparison of its empirical results with the conclusions of Bergaño's pedagogical grammar, Lopez's survey of surface syntactic features, Castrillo's taxonomy of construction types,
and Constantino's generative (phrase-structure and transformational) rules.
Notes

1 The sources for this section, to be listed separately in the bibliography, were made available during several weeks of research at the Newberry Library in Chicago during the summer of 1968. I am grateful to the administration of the Newberry Library for enabling me to have access to these otherwise unavailable sources, so conveniently gathered in one locus.

2 In the Bergaño edition available to me, the third (1916) edition, based on the second (1736) edition, no mention is made anywhere of Benavente.

3 Of Bergaño's grammar, Pardo de Tavera (1903:54) notes: 'Es la primera gramática que se ha publicado'. On the other hand, Blake (1920:38) lists Coronel's grammar as a published work. In view of the fact that in 1875, Coronel's work was released as a 'reimpresión', it seems that on this point, Blake's datum is to be preferred to Pardo de Tavera's. Unfortunately, I have had no access to Coronel's grammar. Neither the Institute of National Language in Manila nor the Newberry Library in Chicago has a copy of Coronel's 1617 grammar or his 1875 'reimpresión'. Blake states that a manuscript by Coronel entitled 'Arte y Reglas de la Lengua Pamplana' is in the Eduardo Navaro [sic?] Collection in Valladolid, Spain.
I am grateful to my colleagues at De La Salle College, Manila, Professor Marcelino Foronda, Jr. and Stephen La Brie, F.S.C., for facilitating access to the Bergaño volumes and the Castrillo thesis as well as for providing me with relevant data from the Bureau of the Census and Statistics and from the Institute of National Language.

In the light of the Castrillo study (1955) and in the light of current research in progress on Pampangan at the University of California, Los Angeles, and at the University of Hawaii, this last statement should be taken with some qualification.
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1.0. Introduction. The first part of this chapter describes and exemplifies specification rules for developing V (whether it be a state, a process, an action, or a process-action), replacement rules for stating the cooccurring role-marked N's that accompany different types of V, verb derivational processes, and specification rules for verb inflectional units. The second part of the chapter describes specification rules for N selection, noun derivational processes, and specification rules for noun inflectional units. The third part discusses new and old information, and the fourth part describes the notion of topic. A summary of these processes is given in the final part by showing the step-by-step derivation of a Pampangan sentence.

All citations will be given in a broad phonetic transcription, with accent marked as primary in every instance. Where useful for explanatory purposes, the underlying phonological representation of an utterance will be transcribed, marked by an asterisk (*). Citations unacceptable to a native speaker will be marked X AAA, while those of dubious acceptability will be marked ? AAA.

For purposes of phonetic representation, the following inventory will be used: p b t d k g \( \sim \) s m n \( {\text{ŋ}} \) w v l r ; i e a o u.
Clardy (1959) would add ƺ, ƺ̄, and ƺ to the list. Other than in loanwords from Spanish (which Clardy cites with native words), ƺ and ƺ̄ arise optionally and predictably only in t+i and d+i sequences. The formatives cited by Clardy for ƺ are Tagalog loanwords. The usual reflex of UA * ƺ is Ø in Pampangan, at least in the dialects of the informants for this study. In other words, the Pampangan dialects used for the data are ƺ-less dialects.

The glottal stop ʔ functions distinctively only in final position; in initial position, it is optional. Unlike Tagalog, Pampangan inserts no glottal stop between vowels (Tagalog taʔo, Pampangan tau 'man'), although like Tagalog, Pampangan sometimes inserts other glides between two successive vowels, the most common being ɣ. Hence, although Dempwolff's hypothesized canonical form * CV(C)CVC is useful in considering reconstructed forms, VV, VCV, VCVC formatives are quite common in Pampangan. In this study, glottal stop will be indicated only when it occurs in final position.

Other than for its accentual rules and boundary deletion rules, the phonology of Pampangan is relatively simple, as the differences in phonological shape between the underlying forms and the phonetic representations are minimal. Some of these phonological rules are:

(a) the loss of glottal stop in final position when not
followed by pause (aduáʔ 'two' but aduá la 'they are two [in number]', aduáŋ balé 'two houses'); (b) monophthongization (* matáɣ > maté 'die', * bábaw > bábo 'above'); (c) optional affrication of stops before a front vowel (* atí+yu acú 'he is here'; Spanish medio > midiú > miƙu 'almost'); (d) glide insertion (* ka+ábay > kayábe 'companion'); (e) rhotacization: * d > r in intervocalic position. (The exceptions to this last rule are best explained by considering historical and comparative data; where this rule does not apply, it usually means that a different protophone must be posited; for example, aduáʔ 'two', not x aruáʔ, but * ma+davúʔ > márayúʔ 'far'.)

The sound shifts that Spanish loanwords undergo in Pampangan demand separate study; especially intriguing are the accentual shifts; for example, Spanish Ana, Pampangan Ána, but Spanish María, Pampangan Maryá and Spanish para 'for', Pampangan pará.

It will be shown in Chapter II that the occurrence of the ligature -ŋ/a (malagú+ŋ dalága 'beautiful young woman', masantíŋ a anák 'pretty child') is structurally significant and is indicative of an incorporation process; it would seem then that the occurrence of the ligature should be postulated by a direct symbolization process rather than by a postsymbolization phonological process. (This will be explained in detail in Chapter II)
The 'suprasegmentals' or what Clardy (1959) calls 'second-order phonemes' present many problems. Lopez (1965), Constantino (1965), and Castrillo (1955) posit a phoneme of stress /\ / distinct from a phoneme of length /·/. In actual citations, however, Constantino seldom uses the stress mark, since he states that stress is for the most part predictable. Only length is marked, therefore, unless the stress is unpredictable, in which case, of course, stress is indicated. On the other hand, Clardy's study, the most detailed and comprehensive study thus far of Pampango phonology, posits two phonemes of pause (/\ / and /\ /) and four pitch phonemes (/\ / high-fall, /\ / high level, /\ / level-rise, /\ / level-level). The first phoneme of pause is equivalent to vowel length and is alternatively written as /\ / /\ / . Using the contour ('a sequence of one or more integral numbers of syllables delimited by one pause phoneme accompanied by one pitch phoneme'123) as the unit of minimal utterance, stress is postulated as predictable on the basis of the pause phonemes and the pitch phonemes. Hence, although Clardy posits three degrees of phonetic stress ([\' ], [\' ], []), stress is not considered a separate phoneme.

The study of 'suprasegmentals' demands reexamination in the light of advances in the theory of generative phonology as well as in the light of advances in techniques of instrumental investigation. Clardy's work suffers
particularly from failure to note necessary grammatical prerequisites, in other words, from failure to take full cognizance of the content side of language in studying the expression side. Her data, as a result, demand reinterpretation in this area of the suprasegmentals.

It is quite clear that the distinctive feature 'accented' must be posited as one of the features of the Pampangan sound system. Thus, there are minimal pairs which are semantically unrelated and which differ in their symbolization only by the position of the accent (for example, bákal 'iron' and bakál 'provenience for a journey'). In the lexical representation of such formatives, accent would have to be indicated. There is likewise morphological accent in Pampangan (see Wang 1968 for a discussion of lexical, morphological, and syntactic accent): mígaglákad 'will compete in walking', mígaglákad 'competing in walking', mígaglákad 'competed in walking'. The accentuation of such verb paradigms is straightforward and predictable. In the following morphologically related subset of forms, however, the accentuation is unpredictable: mášakít 'sick', masákít 'difficult', masákít 'painful', from sakít 'sickness'.

The acoustic correlates of the distinctive feature 'accented' must be investigated separately. Through better instrumental techniques, it has been discovered that the acoustic correlates of accent (or stress) in nontonal languages consist of three features which
normally cooccur: higher fundamental frequency, greater amplitude, longer duration (see, for example, my own study, 1970, of the acoustic correlates of accent in Tagalog, a closely related Philippine language). Hence, to separate perceived length from perceived loudness and perceived pitch rise seems to be unwarranted, since as a matter of fact, in most instances of accent, the accented vowel is usually higher in pitch, louder, and longer. Length, however, varies according to the segmental composition of the syllable. Accented vowels in open syllables are usually longer than accented vowels in closed syllables; in Pampangan, accented vowels in closed syllables are not noticeably long: [lá:kád] 'to walk' but [talakád] 'stance'. Moreover, if the accented open syllable is in final position, its length is likewise not noticeable: [balé] 'house'.

That length is not always a concomitant of accent is shown by the previous examples and even more dramatically by the following formatives: [má:sakít] 'sick', [masá:kit] 'difficult', and [masakít] 'painful'.

Hence, while length usually accompanies accent, other factors may intervene to reduce or noticeably increase such length, such factors being the inherent
length of the segments (for example, fricatives are inherently longer than stops) and the segmental composition of the syllable.

In my notation, therefore, such concomitant length resulting from accent and nonfinal open syllabicility is not marked.

In polysyllabic formatives, especially in V roots with affixes, the sequence of segments may have more than one accent: lákad 'to walk', lálákad 'walking'. In a more adequate description of the phonology, there will most likely be need for value-reduction rules of accent, from value 1 to value 2 in the secondary accent (the accent not on the root). Hence:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{lálákad} \\
1 \\
2
\end{array}
\]

It is not clear whether vowels with primary accent have to have greater values in their acoustic measurements than vowels with secondary accent. Perhaps the distinction is purely phonological rather than phonetic, since (extrapolating from the Tagalog data) the acoustic measurements of primary accent are not consistently greater than the acoustic measurements of secondary accent. There will probably be need for only two numerical values of phonetic accent,
since Pampangan phrases do not rise to a peak (as they do, for example, in English). Thus, in a sentence such as

(1.0.1) púpútut yaŋ dútuŋ # i Pédrú
2 1 1 1

Pedro is cutting wood

only two values are necessary, since the initial verb phrase (with object) does not rise to a peak. In Chapter II, however, it will be shown that when the latter part of the sentence is old information, there is usually a drop in pitch between the first part of the sentence (the predicate) and the second part of the sentence (the subject):

This phenomenon can probably be formally noted by positing another rule which would reduce the accent value in the phrase expressing old information to value 3:

púpútut yaŋ dútuŋ # i Pédrú
1 1 1 1
2 1 1 1
2 1 1 3

The preceding remarks are by way of proposal. In tr:
citations given in this study, as was stated earlier, examples will be transcribed with all accents as primary. The accent reduction rules of Pampangan are not clear at present and demand further investigation.

In this study, too, # will mark phrase boundary. Space indicates word boundary. Traditional Pampangan orthography is divided on the means of representing pronouns and determiners (mostly atonic) as either incorporated into the verb or the noun root, or not. Such particles are clearly minimal free forms and are moved in certain permutations. Determiners may be separated from nouns by intervening modifiers. Hence, both pronouns and determiners will be considered separate words and will be transcribed as free forms, separated from the principal verbs and nouns by spaces. Morpheme boundaries within words, where there is need to explicitly mark them in underlying representation, will be indicated by +.

1.1. Specifying V.

1.1.1. State Verbs. Consider the following sentence:

(1.1.1.1) madalumdúm

It is dark

(* ma+dalumdúm 'dark (lit. darkness+plenitivizer)').

Such a state V is specified as ambient and requires no accompanying N. A location N and/or a time N may occur
with an ambient state $V$, as in:

$$(1.1.1.2) \text{
madalumdúm } # \text{ kiŋ } \text{ balé } # \text{ kétaŋ } \text{ aldó }
$$

It was dark in the house on that day

(* baláy 'house' with determiner kiŋ, * aldáx 'day (lit. sun)' with demonstrative determiner kéta and ligature +ŋ). Such optionally occurring location and time nouns (traditional adverbal phrases of place and time) will be treated in Chapter III as traceable to separate $V$'s.

Nonambient state $V$'s require a patient $N$:

$$(1.1.1.3) \text{ másakít ya } # \text{ iŋ } \text{ tāu }
$$

The man is sick

(* ma+sakít 'sick (lit. sickness+plenitivizer)', ya 'he', tāu 'man' with subject determiner iŋ).

A state $V$ may be specified as localized, in which case it demands an accompanying location $N$, as in:

$$(1.1.1.3a) \text{ másakít ya } # \text{ (kiŋ) buntůk } # \text{ iŋ } \text{ tāu }
$$

The man is sick in the head=
The man has a headache

(buntůk 'head' with optional determiner kiŋ), where buntůk
is a location N and \textit{tau} is a patient N.

The state V may be a derived form (a predicate noun):

\begin{align*}
(1.1.1.4) & \text{ albuláryu ya} \ # \ i \text{ Pédru} \\
& \text{Pedro is a herbist}
\end{align*}

(albuláryu 'herbist', from Spanish herbolario, ya 'he', i, subject determiner for proper nouns), where the state V is semantically analyzable as herbist+predicativizer, a predicate noun.

Instead of ambient, a state V may be specified as abilitative, in which case the patient N must be selectionally specified as potent, that is, as a potential agent:

\begin{align*}
(1.1.1.5) & \text{ mákalákad ya} \ # \ i \text{ Pédru} \\
& \text{Pedro is able to walk}
\end{align*}

(* \textit{maka+lákad} 'able to walk (lit. walk+abilitativizer)').

Or a state V may be specified as mensurative, in which case it must be accompanied by a measure N (in addition to a patient N):

\begin{align*}
(1.1.1.6) & \text{ makába yaŋ atlúŋ yárda} \ # \ iŋ imálan \\
& \text{The cloth is three yards long}
\end{align*}
(* ma+kába? 'long (lit. length+plenitivizer)', ya 'it', +ŋ, ligature, atlúʔ 'three', várdá 'yard' from Spanish yarda, imálan 'cloth').

A state V may likewise be specified as motivative, in which case, instead of a patient N, a motive N is demanded:

(1.1.1.7) mákatúla ya # iŋ búbu

The clown is motivative of laughter

(* maka+túlaʔ 'funny (lit. joy, laughter+motivativizer)', búbu 'clown' from Spanish bobo 'stupid'); the label 'motivative' has purposely been chosen instead of 'causative' because of the use of the label 'causative' in some other combination. It is possible for a motivative state V to be accompanied by both a patient N and a motive N, as in:

(1.1.1.8) mákamaté # kaŋ Pédru # iŋ sakít

The sickness is motivative of death to Pedro= The sickness is causing Pedro to die

(* maka+matáy 'causing death (lit. death+motivativizer)', sakít 'sickness'), where Pédru is a patient N and sakít is a motive N.
Again, a state V may be specified as experiential:

(1.1.1.9) bísa yaŋ áutu # i Pédu

Pedro is in a state of wanting a car=
Pedro wants a car

(* bísa? 'want (a state, not a process)', ya 'he', áutu
'car' from Spanish auto), where áutu is a patient N and
Pédu is an experiencer N.

Or a state V may be specified as presential:

(1.1.1.10) atí yu # i Pédu

Pedro is present= Pedro is here

(atí 'present', yu 'he', an allosymbol for ya 'he'). The
presential state V root is likewise used for existential
sentences:

(1.1.1.11) atín táu

There is a man

(atín 'exists', the same root as atí, táu 'man'; the
sentence has no subject). In the rules, only the label
'presential' will be used hereinafter. Presential state
V's may be accompanied by a location N:
(1.1.1.12) atí yu # kiŋ balé # i Pédru
Pedro is present in the house

A state V may be alternatively specified as
directional, to or from, in which case it must be accom-
panied by a goal or a source N (in addition to a patient N):

(1.1.1.13) papuntá ya # kiŋ balé # i Pédru
Pedro is in a state of going to the house=
Pedro is headed for the house

(1.1.1.14) ibát ya # kiŋ balé # i Pédru
Pedro is in a state of having come
from the house

where both papuntá 'headed for' and ibát 'coming from'
are derived state V's from inherent action V's, with the
addition of the derivational unit deactivativizer.

State V may be further specified as habitive or
necessitative, in which case state V must be accompanied
by a beneficiary N in addition to a patient N:

(1.1.1.15) atín yaq átu # i Pédru
Pedro has a car
(1.1.1.16)* kailāŋan na ya naŋ Pédru # iŋ áutu >
kailāŋan neŋ Pédru # iŋ áutu
The car is needed by Pedro

(atín 'have', kailāŋan 'in a state of needing', na
'nonsubject he', ya 'subject it'), where áutu is a
patient N in both sentences and where Pédru is a
beneficiary N in both sentences.

Still another possible specification for state V
is associative, in which case an associate N must accompany
state V (in addition to a patient N):

(1.1.1.17)* ka+ábay na ya naŋ Pédru # iŋ anák >
kayábe neŋ Pédru # iŋ anák
The child is in the company of Pedro

(* ka+ábay 'in the company of'), where Pédru is a patient
N and anák is an associate N.

A state V may likewise be specified as similaritative,
in which case a norm N is demanded (in addition to a patient
N):

(1.1.1.18) antí yaŋ bábi? # iŋ táu
The man [looks] like a pig

(antí 'like', ya 'he', * bábuy 'pig', táu 'man' with subject
determiner iŋ), where táu is a patient N and bábi? is a norm
N.
Pampangan has no verb roots comparable to English be, belong to, be intended for, take place, be part of. Instead of a lexical root, such state V's in Pampangan are eventually symbolized as $\emptyset$, although semantically, a V with certain selectional specifications has to be posited. Consider the following sentence:

(1.1.1.19)  \begin{center} kan\ j P\acute{e}dr\textsuperscript{u} ya # i\j  \acute{\text{a}}\text{tu} \end{center}

The car [belongs] to Pedro

where semantically, V is a state V specified as possessive; with such possessive state V's, a beneficiary N, the possessor, P\acute{e}dr\textsuperscript{u}, is necessary in addition to a patient N, the object possessed, \acute{\text{a}}\text{tu}. The beneficiary N is marked by the oblique determiner for proper nouns, kanj. It seems that in instances of this sort, the matrix

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{state} \\
\text{possessive}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

is not lexically specified and is eventually deleted. Because of this, the pronoun ya 'it' is incorporated into the beneficiary noun phrase instead of the usual verb phrase, (This incorporation process will be described more fully in Chapter II)

One may likewise say:

(1.1.1.20)  \begin{center} par\acute{\text{a}} kan\ j P\acute{e}dr\textsuperscript{u} ya # i\j  \acute{\text{a}}\text{tu} \end{center}

The car [is intended] for Pedro
where semantically $V$ is a state $V$ specified as intensive. A beneficiary $N$, Pédru, is demanded in addition to a patient $N$, ātu. pará is a loanword from Spanish para 'for'. The position of ya in surface structure is usually after the verb root. In the above sentence, however, ya is postposed to the end of the beneficiary noun phrase, a clear indicator that the loanword pará is not considered in Pampangan a verb root but an element of the beneficiary noun phrase. If pará were a borrowed verb root, one would have to say:

$$^x \text{pará ya # kaŋ Pédru # iŋ ātu}$$

Moreover, one may likewise say:

$$\begin{align*}
(1.1.1.21) \ & \text{kaŋ Márkus ya # i Pédru ~} \\
& \text{pará kaŋ Márkus ya # i Pédru} \\
& \text{Pedro is in a favorable stance towards} \\
& \text{Marcos as a political candidate=} \\
& \text{Pedro is for Marcos}
\end{align*}$$

where the state $V$ is now specified as favoritive and demands a beneficiary $N$, Márkus, and a patient $N$, Pédru.

Again, the matrix \[
\begin{bmatrix}
V \\
\text{state} \\
\text{favoritive}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

is eventually deleted because not lexically specified. *ya* 'he' is incorporated
into the beneficiary noun phrase since there is no verb root to which it can be incorporated.

In the sentence

(1.1.1.22) kiŋ balé # iŋ taú?
The banquet [ is taking place ] in the house

the state V is locative but without lexical specification (and postsemantically deleted), necessitating an accompanying location N, balé, in addition to a patient N, taú?. The nonoccurrence of the pronoun va 'it' in this sentence will be explained in section 1.2.1. For more specific expressions of location, combinations of location N and partitive N are used in Pampangan:

(1.1.1.23) kiŋ kilúb na niŋ balé # iŋ taú?
The banquet [ is taking place ] in
the interior of the house= The banquet
is taking place inside the house

(kilúb 'interior' from * luʔúb, na 'nonsubject nonoblique it coreferential with balé'). The phrase kiŋ kilúb na niŋ balé 'in the interior of the house' does not seem to be traceable to an embedded sentence, since the following sentence does not occur in Pampangan:
kiŋ balé ya # iŋ kilúb

The interior [is part of] the house

It would seem then that the phrase 'in the interior of the house' must be generated directly in semantic structure, that is, locative state V's must be accompanied by a location N and MAY be accompanied by a partitive N. The rules at the end of this section will formulate this latter generalization.

Instead of locative, a state V may be specified as temporal:

(1.1.1.24) kéŋ lúnis # iŋ tawú?

The banquet [will take place] on Monday

(lúnis 'Monday' from Spanish lunes), where the state V is now temporal and is accompanied by a time N in addition to a patient N. The determiner for the time N is a demonstrative determiner, kéŋ 'lit. that near you'.

Or a state V may be specified as partitive, as in:

(1.1.1.25) kiŋ balé ya # iŋ pasbúl

The door [is part of] the house

where once more, the state V is specified as partitive but is not lexically specified and is eventually deleted;
partitive state V's are accompanied by a partitive N
in addition to a patient N.

A state V not marked by further selectional units
may be specified inflectionally by the unit equatative,
in which instance it demands a norm N:

(1.1.1.26) kasíŋ ka+taʔás na ya niŋ tůkud # iŋ anáŋk
        kasíŋ kátas ne niŋ tůkud # iŋ anáŋk

The child is as tall as the stick

(kasíŋ 'equatativizer', kátas 'tall, high' from * taʔás
'height' and * ma-> ka-, tůkud 'walking stick, cane'),
where anáŋk is a patient N and tůkud is a norm N.

Instead of equatative, a state V may be inflectionally
specified as comparative; in such an instance, a norm N is
likewise demanded:

(1.1.1.27) (mas) mátəs ya # kįŋ tůkud # iŋ anáŋk

The child is taller than the stick

(mas 'more' from Spanish más, * ma+taʔás 'tall, high (lit.
height+plentinivizer)'), where tůkud is a norm N and anáŋk
is a patient N. PreSpanish Pampangan had no symbolization
for 'more'; the Spanish loanword is still optional.

Finally, a state V may be inflectionally specified
as superlative, in which case it demands a partitive N
which is inflectionally specified as plural and total:

(1.1.1.28) pékamátas yaŋ díli # kariŋ gaŋ ának #
i Pédrü
Pedro is the tallest of all among all
of the children.

(* pék+ma+ta?ás 'tallest (lit. height+plenitivizer+
superlativizer)’, díli 'of all', ának 'children' with the
oblique plural determiner * ka+diŋ and gaŋ 'all'), where
ának is a partitive N inflectionally plural and total
and where Pédrü is a patient N. (Note the accent shift
in: ának 'child' > ának 'children'.)

It seems that the inflectional specifications
'equatative', 'comparative', and 'superlative' occur
only with state V's not further specified by other selectional
units, except for the unit 'mensurative', which may occur
with comparative:

(1.1.1.29) (mas) métas yaŋ aðuŋ talíri? # kŋ tükud #
iŋ anák
The child is taller than the stick by
two fingers
(aduá? 'two', talíri? 'finger'), where the state V is accompanied by a patient N, anák, a norm N, tükud, and a measure N, talíri? (with the numeral specification).

(Note that aduá? is an exception to the * d > r rule earlier mentioned and that -r- in talíri? is not from underlying "d, since there is no formative talídi? .)

In summary, V may be specified as state. A state V may be specified as ambient, localized, abilitative, mensurative, motivative, experiential, presentential, directional (to or from), habitive, necessitative, associative, similaritative, possessive, intitive, favoritive, locational, temporal, or partitive.

An ambient state V does not demand an accompanying N; a localized state V demands an accompanying location N; a mensurative state V demands a measure N; a motivative state V demands a motive N; an experiential state V demands an experiencer N; a presentential state V may be accompanied by a location N; a directional-to state V demands a goal N; a directional-from state V demands a source N; a necessitative state V and a habitive state V demand a beneficiary N; an associative state V demands an associate N; a similaritative state V demands a norm N.

The following subtypes of state V's are not lexically specified: possessive, intitive, favoritive, locational, temporal, partitive. Possessive, intitive,
and favorite state V's demand a beneficiary N; temporal state V's demand a time N; partitive state V's demand a partitive N; locative state V's demand a location N which may be accompanied by a partitive N.

In addition, all the above subtypes of state V (except for ambient and motivative state V's) demand an accompanying patient N; a motivative state V may be accompanied by a patient N but does not demand one. If the state V is abilitative, the accompanying patient N must be selectionally specified as potent.

Inflectionally, a state V which is not further specified by other selectional units may be specified as equative, comparative, or superlative. A mensurative state V may likewise be inflectionally specified as comparative. A state V inflectionally specified as either equative or comparative demands an accompanying norm N in addition to a patient N. A state V inflectionally specified as superlative demands a partitive N inflectionally specified as plural and total.

The preceding generalizations may be restated in the form of semantic generative rules. The rules set down below are numbered thus: S 1.1.1.1' means 'Semantic Rule number 1 in Chapter I, Part 1, Section 1'. The apostrophe indicates that the formulation is tentative and that the rule will be reformulated in the section on Restatement of Rules. The braces --{ }--are an abbreviation for
exclusive disjunction, either/or, while the parentheses--
(        )--are an abbreviation for inclusive disjunction,
and/or.

(S 1.1.1.1') \( V \longrightarrow \text{state} \)

(S 1.1.1.2')

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ambient} & \quad \text{localized} \\
\text{abilitative} & \quad \text{mensurative} \\
\text{motivative} & \quad \text{experiential} \\
\text{presential} & \quad \text{directional} \\
\text{habitue} & \quad \text{necessitative} \\
\text{associative} & \quad \text{similaritative} \\
\text{possessive} & \quad \text{intensive} \\
\text{favoritive} & \quad \text{locative} \\
\text{temporal} & \quad \text{partitive}
\end{align*}
\]

(S 1.1.1.3') \( \text{directional} \longrightarrow \{\text{to}\} \)

(S 1.1.1.4')

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{V} & \quad \text{state} \\
(\text{mensurative}) & \quad \text{other selectional units} \\
\text{root} & \longrightarrow \{\text{equatative} \} \\
& \quad \text{comparative} \\
& \quad \text{superlative}
\end{align*}
\]
(S 1.1.1.12')
\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{habitively} \\
\text{necessitatively} \\
\text{possessive} \\
\text{intuitive} \\
\text{favoritive}
\end{array} 
\rightarrow 
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{habitively} \\
\text{necessitatively} \\
\text{possessive} \\
\text{intuitive} \\
\text{favoritive}
\end{array} 
\rightarrow 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Beneficiary}
\end{array}
\]

(S 1.1.1.13')
\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{associative}
\end{array} 
\rightarrow 
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{associate}
\end{array}
\]

(S 1.1.1.14')
\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{similaritative}
\end{array} 
\rightarrow 
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{similaritative}
\end{array} 
\rightarrow 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{norm}
\end{array}
\]

(S 1.1.1.15')
\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{locative}
\end{array} 
\rightarrow 
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{locative}
\end{array} 
\rightarrow 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{location}
\end{array}
\rightarrow 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Partitive}
\end{array}
\]

(S 1.1.1.16')
\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{temporal}
\end{array} 
\rightarrow 
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{time}
\end{array}
\]

(S 1.1.1.17')
\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{partitive}
\end{array} 
\rightarrow 
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{partitive}
\end{array}
\]

(Where the broken line indicates optional accompaniment)
(S 1.1.1.18')

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \xrightarrow{\text{equative}} V \quad \text{norm} \\
\{\text{equative}\} & \xrightarrow{\text{comparative}} \{\text{equative}\} \\
\{\text{comparative}\} & \xrightarrow{\text{comparative}} 
\end{align*}
\]

(S 1.1.1.19')

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \xrightarrow{\text{superlative}} V \quad \text{partitive} \\
\text{superlative} & \xrightarrow{\text{superlative}} \text{plural} \quad \text{total}
\end{align*}
\]

(S 1.1.1.20')

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \xrightarrow{\text{patient}} V \quad \text{state} \\
\text{state} & \xrightarrow{\text{-ambient}} \text{-ambient} \\
\text{(abilitative)} & \xrightarrow{\langle\text{abilitative}\rangle \langle\text{potent}\rangle}
\end{align*}
\]

where the angle brackets \(<\rangle\) stipulate obligatory cooccurrence, that is, \(N\) must be potent if \(V\) is abilitative.

This rule is optional for \(V\).  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{state} & \xrightarrow{\text{motivative}} 
\end{align*}
\]

Sample Lexical Rules

\(V\) selectional units narrow down the selection of the verb root to a particular unit, which may be basic or derived (see section 1.1.7 for verb derivational processes).  Lexical Rules are thus formulated as specification rules with a matrix of selectional units as context.  Samples of such rules are formulated in this section.  As a notational convenience, root classes, as distinguished
from particular roots, will be written in capital letters. (When lexical roots are included in a matrix, they will be underlined to distinguish them from selectional units.)

(LR 1.1.1.1) V state → sickness+plenitivizer, herbst+predicativizer, beauty+plenitivizer,…

(LR 1.1.1.2) V state ambient → darkness+plenitivizer, light+plenitivizer,…

(LR 1.1.1.3) V state abilitative → (PROCESS-)ACTION VERB ROOT+abilitativizer

(LR 1.1.1.4) V state mensurative → length+plenitivizer, width+plenitivizer,…

(LR 1.1.1.5) V state motive → VERB ROOT/NOUN ROOT+ motivativizer

(LR 1.1.1.6) V state experiential → be i.: a state of wanting, be in a state of liking,…

(LR 1.1.1.7) V state presential → be present, exist,…
(LR 1.1.1.8) V state directional to headed for, pointed to, DIRECTIONAL ACTION VERB ROOT+ deactivativizer,...

(LR 1.1.1.9) V state directional from coming from, originating from, DIRECTIONAL ACTION VERB ROOT+ deactivativizer,...

(LR 1.1.1.10) V state habitive have

(LR 1.1.1.11) V state necessitative be in a state of needing, be in a state of lacking,...

(LR 1.1.1.12) V state associative NOUN ROOT/VERB ROOT+ associativizer

(LR 1.1.1.13) V state similaritative be like to

(LR 1.1.1.14) V state
  {intensive
  possessive
  favorite
  locative
  temporal
  partitive

  } φ (no lexical root specification)
1.1.2. Process Verbs. Consider the sentence:

\[1.1.2.1\] múmurán
It is raining

(* múrán 'to rain (lit. rain+processivizer)'), where the verb root is inflectionally specified for actual durative aspect by reduplication of the initial syllable. Nonstate V's may be inflected for other aspects: murán 'it will rain', minurán 'it rained', kauránurán 'it has just rained'. (Most citations in this section and in the next two sections will be given with actual durative inflection.) Process V's answer the question 'What's happening?' Meteorological nouns such as 'rain', 'thunder', 'lightning' may be derived into process verbs by the addition of the derivational unit processivizer. Such process V's are specified as ambient. Like ambient state V's, ambient process V's require no accompanying N.

Nonambient process V's demand a patient N:

\[1.1.2.2\] mamamáte ya # i Pédru
Pedro is dying

(* máthy 'to die'; the triplication of the initial syllable is irregular). A process V may be specified as localized,
in which instance it must be accompanied likewise by a location N:

\[(1.1.2.3) \text{ mánasákít ya # kiŋ buntúk # i Pédrú} \]

Pedro is hurting in the head

(* mánasákít 'to suffer pain (lit. sickness+processivizer)', buntúk 'head'), where buntúk is a location N and Pédrú is a patient N.

Alternatively, a process V may be specified as mensurative, in which instance it demands a measure N:

\[(1.1.2.4) \text{ díñagúl yaŋ aduŋ pulgáda # iŋ anák} \]

The child grew by two inches

(díñagúl 'to grow (lit. size+processivizer)', pulgáda 'inch' from Spanish pulgada), where pulgáda is a measure N and anák is a patient N.

Or a process V may be specified as benefactive:

\[(1.1.2.5) \text{ kamamatén yaŋ manúk # i Pédrú} \]

Pedro is being bereft of chickens (for example, because of some pestilence)

(* ka+matáŋ+an 'to be bereft (lit. die, with beneficiary subject marker)', manúk 'chicken(s)'), where manúk is a
patient N and Pédrú is a (negative) beneficiary N.

Or a process V may be specified as habitive, in which case a beneficiary N is likewise required:

(1.1.2.6) mágkasákít ya # i Pédrú

Pedro is getting to have a sickness

(* magka+sákít 'to get sick (lit. sickness+habitivizer)').

In habitive process V's, no patient N occurs, since the semantic patient is incorporated through a derivational process into the verb root.

A process V may on the other hand be specified as necessitative, in which instance a beneficiary N is likewise demanded, in addition to a patient N:

(1.1.2.7) máqailáŋan yaŋ péra # i Pédrú

Pedro is in the process of needing money

(* máq+kailoŋan 'to need (lit. need+processivizer)', péra 'money' from Spanish perra chica 'lit. little dog, colloquial for a five-centime copper coin, so called because of the dog-like engraving on the coin'), where péra is a patient N and Pédrú is a beneficiary N.

Or a process V may be specified as experiential, in which case an experiencer N is necessary:
(1.1.2.8)* ák+ákit na ya naŋ Pédru # iŋ baláy >
    ákákit neŋ Pédru # iŋ balé

The house is being seen by Pedro

(ákit 'to see', na 'nonsubject he', ya 'subject it'),
where Pédru is an experiencer N and balé is a patient N.

In summary, a V which is nonstate may be specified
as process. In turn, a process V may be further specified
as ambient, localized, mensurative, benefactive, habitive,
necessitative, or experiential.

Ambient process V's require no accompanying N.
Localized process V's require a location N; mensurative
process V's require a measure N; benefactive, habitive
and necessitative process V's require a beneficiary N;
experiential V's require an experiencer N. In addition,
all process V's, unless ambient or habitive, require a
patient N.

These generalizations may be formulated by the
following rules:

(S 1.1.2.1')  V \(\longrightarrow\) process
              -state

(S 1.1.2.2')  process \(\longrightarrow\) {{ambient
                 localized
               mensurative
               benefactive
           habitive
           necessitative
           experiential
}}
Sample Lexical Rules

(LR 1.1.2.1) $V$ process $\longrightarrow$ grow, die, STATE VERB ROOT+processivizer, ...

(LR 1.1.2.2) $V$ process ambient $\longrightarrow$ rain+processivizer, darkness+processivizer, ...

(LR 1.1.2.3) $V$ process localized $\longrightarrow$ hurt (in some part of the body), ...
(LR 1.1.2.4) \( V \)  
\[ \text{process} \rightarrow \text{length+processivizer,} \]
\[ \text{mensurative} \text{ width+processivizer,} \ldots \]

(LR 1.1.2.5) \( V \)  
\[ \text{process} \rightarrow \text{be bereft of (something),} \]
\[ \text{benefactive} \ldots \]

(LR 1.1.2.6) \( V \)  
\[ \text{process} \rightarrow \text{NOUN ROOT+habitivizer} \]
\[ \text{habitive} \]

(LR 1.1.2.7) \( V \)  
\[ \text{process} \rightarrow \text{be in the process of needing, be in the process} \]
\[ \text{necessitative} \text{ of lacking,} \ldots \]

(LR 1.1.2.8) \( V \)  
\[ \text{process} \rightarrow \text{see, hear, feel,} \ldots \]
\[ \text{experiential} \]

1.1.3. Action Verbs. Consider the sentence:

(1.1.3.1) \lálagad\ ya # i Pétru

Pedro is walking

where \lálagad\ 'to walk' is an inherent action verb inflected for actual durative aspect and where Pétru is a required agent N.

An action V may be specified as causative, in which case it demands an agentive beneficiary N:
(1.1.3.2) * pá+lákad+an na ya niŋ doktóř # i Pédrú > 
pálakářan ne niŋ doktóř # i Pédrú 
Pedro is being caused to walk by the 
doctor

(pálakářan 'to cause someone to walk (lit. walk+causativizer)', 
doktóř 'doctor' from Spanish doctor), where doktóř is an 
agent N and where Pédrú is an agentive beneficiary N, the 
recipient of the causative action who is an agent in his 
own right. The agentive beneficiary N is to be distinguished 
as a separate N relation from beneficiary N.

An action V may be specified as reciprocative, in 
which instance it demands a plural agent N:

(1.1.3.3) mipág+lákad la # di Pédrú 
Pedro and [his] companions are walking 
reciprocatively= Pedro and [his] companions 
are competing in walking

(* mipág+lákad 'to compete in walking (lit. walk+ 
reciprocativizer)'), where the notion of competition is 
derived from the literal meaning of reciprocation. la 
means 'subject they' and is coreferential with di Pédrú 
'Pedro and [his] companions'.

Instead of reciprocative, an action V may be
specified as associative, in which instance an associate 
N is demanded:

\[(1.1.3.4) \text{mákilákad ya } # kāq \text{ Suán } # \text{i Pédrú}
\]

Pedro is joining Juan in walking

\[* mákí+lákad 'to join someone in walking (lit. walk+
associativizer)']*), where Pédrú is an agent N and Suán
is an associate N.

Or, instead of reciprocative or associative, an
action V may be specified as participative, in which
case, a plural associate N must accompany V:

\[(1.1.3.5) \text{mákipaglákad ya } # \text{kari Suán } # \text{i Pédrú}
\]

Pedro is joining Juan and [his] com-
panions in walking

\[* makipag+lákad 'to join a group in walking (lit. walk+
participativizer)']*), where the notion of participation
(although clearly related to association) must be distinguished
from the latter, since the former has to do with a group
activity in which an agent shares.

An action V may be specified further as either
completable or instrumental, in which case it demands
either a complement N or an instrument N. A complement
N is distinguished from a patient N insofar as a complement
N 'completes' the meaning of the action V, is implied in the semantic content of the action V itself, as in 'to sing (a song)', 'to make (an artifact)', 'to read (a book)', 'to give (a gift)', 'to throw (an object)'.

(1.1.3.6) gágawá yaŋ lamésa # i Pédru
Pedro is making a table

(1.1.3.7) gágamít yaŋ tabák # i Pédru
Pedro is using a large knife

(gáwaŋ 'to make', lamésa 'table' from Spanish la mesa 'the table', gámít 'to use', tabák 'a large knife'), where lamésa is a complement N and where tabák is an instrument N.

Instrumental action V's demand an instrument N which is implied in the action itself, for example, the inherent action V gámít 'to use' implies a tool of some kind. Again, a V such as manéu 'to drive' from Spanish manejo 'I drive' implies a vehicle. On the other hand, there are many action V's which do not imply the use of an instrument but MAY be performed with an instrument. For example, the action of walking implies no instrument but may involve an instrument, as in 'to walk with a cane'. For such V's, the optional specification instrumentative will be used, as in:
(1.1.3.8) * ipañ+lákad na ya naŋ Pédrű # iŋ tůkud > pąglákad neŋ Pédrű # iŋ tůkud

The walking stick is being used by Pedro to walk with

(* ipañ+lákad 'to walk (with instrument subject marker)', na 'nonsubject he', tůkud 'walking stick'), where Pédrű is an agent N with nonsubject determiner naŋ and where tůkud is an instrument N with subject determiner iŋ.

Instrumentative action V's are unusual insofar as they demand that the accompanying instrument N be subject.

(Rules for such subjectivization will be formulated in Chapter II.)

A completable action V may be further specified as materiative, in which case it demands an accompanying material N:

(1.1.3.9) gągawá yaŋ lamésa # kiŋ dútuŋ # i Pédrű

Pedro is making a table out of the wood (dútuŋ 'wood'), where dútuŋ is the material out of which something is made. Material N's occur only with verbs of making.
An action V may be specified as mensurative, in which case it demands a measure N:

(1.1.3.10) lálákad yaŋ aduŋ kilómetru # i Pédu
Pedro is walking two kilometers

where kilómetru is a measure N. The specification mensurative may occur with the specification instrumental:

(1.1.3.11)* m+in+anéu na yaŋ aduŋ kilómetru
naŋ Pédu # iŋ átu>
minanéu neŋ aduŋ kilómetruŋ
Pédu # iŋ átu
The car was driven by Pedro for
two kilometers
(minanéu 'driven' from * manéu+an 'to drive(a vehicle), with instrument subject marker'), where kilómetru is a measure N and áutu is an instrument N. It seems, however, that the unit 'mensurative' does not occur with the unit 'completable', for in the following sentence

(1.1.3.12) miniyé yaŋ digálú # kiŋ alagáŋ
aduáŋ pésus # i Pédrú
Pedro gave a gift to the value of two pesos

(miniyé 'gave' from * biyáŋ, digálú 'gift', from Spanish regalo, alagá 'value', aduáŋ 'two', pésus 'peso' from Spanish pesos), it seems that the phrase 'to the value of two pesos' is actually a relative clause specifying digálú further, 'a gift which is worth two pesos'.

An action V may likewise be specified as benefactive, in which instance it demands a beneficiary N. It seems that for V to be specified as benefactive, it must be priorly specified as either completable or associative. The following examples will make this observation clear:

(1.1.3.13) bíbiyé yaŋ péra # kaŋ Suán # i Pédrú ~
babiyé yaŋ péra # kaŋ Suán # i Pédrú
Pedro is giving money to Juan
(1.1.3.14)* páki+lákad na ya naŋ Pébru # kaŋ Suán #
iŋ anáŋ >
pákilákad neŋ Pébru # kaŋ Suán #
iŋ anáŋ
The child is being associated with Juan
by Pedro in walking

(* biyáy 'to give' from UA * báŋ xaŋ 'Geben', páki+lákad
'to join someone in walking (lit. walk+associativizer)'
from * maki+lákad), where Pébru is an agent N in both
sentences, Suán is a beneficiary N in the first sentence
and an associate N in the second sentence, and anáŋ is
a beneficiary N. There is a sentence in Pampangan:

(1.1.3.15)* páŋ+lákad na ya naŋ Pébru # iŋ anáŋ >
páglákad neŋ Pébru # iŋ anáŋ
The child is being walked for by Pedro=
Pedro is walking for the benefit of
the child (e.g., by running errands
for him)

where obviously anáŋ is a beneficiary N. Such sentences,
however, will be treated in Chapter III as surface structures
of V V configurations; justification will be given for
the analysis adopted in the relevant sections in that
chapter.
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It is possible for the beneficiary N to be co-referential with the agent N (an example of the traditional dative of interest):

$$(1.1.3.16) \quad \text{pá lákad ya} \# i \text{ Pé dru}$$

Pedro is causing [someone] to take him for a walk (e.g., if he is incapacitated and has to be moved about in a wheel-chair)

The above sentence likewise means 'Pedro is managing [things]', but this meaning will not be considered at this point. For a sentence such as 1.1.3.16, the semantic unit 'interestive' will be postulated as a possible further specification of benefactive. The necessary context is coreferentiality between the beneficiary N and the agent N. An alternative way of expressing more or less the same situation as 1.1.3.16 is:

$$(1.1.3.17)^* \quad \text{pá lákad na ya naŋ Pé dru} \# iŋ \text{ sadíli na} > \text{pá lákad neŋ} \quad \text{Pé dru} \# iŋ \text{ saríli na}$$

His self is being caused by Pedro to be walked= Pedro is causing himself to be walked

(* p á lákad 'to cause oneself to be walked (lit. walk+}
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causativizer)', sar'li 'self', na 'his= nonsubject he'),
where the beneficiary N is specified by 'self' instead
of the root Péđru. Reflexive pronouns will be discussed
in the relevant section on pronouns in Chapter II.

An action V may likewise be specified as directional,
to or from, in which instance it demands either a goal
N or a source N:

(1.1.3.18) púpuntá ya # kiŋ balé # i Péđru
Pedro is going to the house

(1.1.3.19) máñibát ya # kiŋ balé # i Péđru
Pedro is coming from the house

(púntá 'to go to', máñibát 'to come from'), where balé
is a goal N in the first sentence and a source N in the
second sentence.

The possible specifications of action V's are
relatively straightforward and uncomplicated. Problems
arise, however, when these specifications are examined
for their combinatorial possibilities, for unlike the
additional selectional specifications of state and process
V's, many of the specifications of action V's are not
mutually exclusive. These various combinatorial possibilities
merit detailed investigation. The rules to be formulated
are meant to be suggestive; they are tentative, since a
definitive rule formulation would entail a survey of the complete V lexicon.

To take only three examples of a maximally specified action V:

(a) An action V may be specified as causative, reciprocative, completable, and benefactive:

(1.1.3.20)? mipágpabiyé laŋ digálu # kariŋ ának #

dí Pédrug # kariŋ bábáyi
Pedro and [his] companions are competing [with each other] in causing gifts to be given by the women to the children

where digálu 'gift' is a complement N, ának is a beneficiary N, di Pédrug is a plural agent N, and bábáyi is an agentive beneficiary N. In general, however, such a sentence would be avoided because of the ambiguity resulting from the common plural oblique marking of ának and bábáyi, kariŋ.

(b) An action V may be specified as causative, participative, completable, and if the root is gáva? 'to make', accompanied likewise by a material N:

(1.1.3.21)? mákipapagawá yaq lamésa # kiq dútuŋ #
i Pédrug # kariŋ bábáyi # kaiŋ Suán
Pedro is participating with the women in causing Juan to make a table out of the wood
where lamésa is a complement N, dútuŋ is a material N, Pédru is an agent N, bábáyi is a plural associate N, and Suán is an agentive beneficiary N. Again, however, because of the ambiguity of the oblique-marked N's (preceded by kín/kāŋ or kariň/kari), such a sentence would be avoided.

(c) An action V may be specified as causative, associative, directional to, and mensurative:

(1.1.3.22)? mákipalákad yaŋ aduŋ kilómetru #
    kín anák # kín Méníla? # i Pédru # kāŋ Suán
Pedro is joining Juan in causing the child to walk two kilometers to Manila

where kilómetru is a measure N, anák is an agentive beneficiary N, Méníla? is a goal N, Pédru is an agent N, and Suán is an associate N. Again, however, because of the three oblique-marked N's (preceded by kāŋ/kín), such a structure would be avoided.

What the three examples have demonstrated (many more can be cited) is that while there are no semantic reasons against maximally specifying an action V and postulating corresponding accompanying N's with it, there are postsemantic constraints on such specifications, since, as will be shown in Chapter II, all such N relations are ultimately marked by only three determiners, the subject
determiner i/nj, the oblique determiner kanj/kinj, and
the unmarked determiner nanj/ninj or if N is -definite,
∅. These postsemantic constraints seem to be comparable
to the global surface structure constraints of the
abstract syntacticians.

The optimal number of cooccurring N's is therefore
three; any more would result in homonymy with regard to the
determiners. It is possible to go beyond the optimal
number by having two kanj/kinj marked N's in surface structure
or by having two nanj/ninj marked N's in surface structure
with certain verb roots; in the latter case, one of the un-
marked determiners is ∅. Beyond these limits, however,
confusion results.

(1.1.3.23) pāpabiye yanj digalu # kinj anák #
kanj Suán # i Pédrup
Pedro is causing Juan to give gifts
to the child

(1.1.3.24)* pā+pā+dīnan na yanj digalu naŋ Pédrup #
iŋ anák # kaŋ Suán >
pāparīnan neŋ digaluŋ Pédrup #
iŋ anák # kaŋ Suán
The child is being caused by Pedro to
be given gifts by Juan

where digalu is a complement N, anák is a beneficiary N,
Suán is an agentive beneficiary N, and Pédru is an agent N. For the purposes of this study, sentence 1.1.3.23 will be taken as a maximally specified V which is well within the limits of ease in semantic interpretation and will be used as a basis for discussion in Chapter II, where postsemantic processes will be discussed.

Another 'strategy' for avoiding homonymy with regard to the determiners, an alternative to limitation of occurring N's to optimal three (or maximal four), would be to delete N's, provided the context permits such deletions (for example, if N is -new; see section 1.3 for a discussion of new and old information). Thus, it is possible to say, without any difficulty:

(1.1.3.20') mipágpabiıyé laŋ digálü # kariŋ ának #
   di Pédru
Pedro and [his] companions are competing [among themselves] in causing gifts to be given [by somebody] to the children

(1.1.3.21') mákipagpagawá yaŋ lamésa # kiŋ dútuŋ #
   i Pédru
Pedro is participating [with some people] in causing a table to be made out of the wood [by somebody]
In summary, a V which is neither a state nor a process V may be specified as an action V. An action V may be further specified as causative, and/or reciprocative/associative/participative and/or completable/instrumental and/or mensurative (if - completable). A completable V may likewise be specified as materiulative. A completable (but -materiulative) or associate V may be further specified as benefactive; a benefactive V may be further specified as interestive if its accompanying agent N is coreferential with its beneficiary N. Moreover, an action V may be specified as directional (to or from). Finally, any action V may be specified as instrumentative if the action may be performed with some instrument.

A causative action V demands an agentive beneficiary N; a reciprocative action V demands a plural agent N; an associative action V demands an associate N; a participative action V demands a plural associate N. A completable action V demands a complement N, and an instrumental and an instrumentative action V demand an instrument N. A materiulative action V demands a material N. A mensurative action V demands a measure N.
A benefactive action V demands a beneficiary N. A
directional-to action V demands a goal N, and a
directional-from action V demands a source N. All
action V's demand an agent N.

The following rules restate the above generalizations.
Lexical Rules will be formulated subsequently, exemplifying
some of the different possibilities. The rules generate
maximally specified V's, even configurations beyond the
optimal limits earlier described.

(S 1.1.3.1') V
    -state
    -process

(S 1.1.3.2')

(S 1.1.3.3') V
    -state
    -process

(S 1.1.3.4') V
    -state
    -process
(S 1.1.3.15') V
benefactive → V
benefactive

(S 1.1.3.16') V
directional
→
to
goal

(S 1.1.3.17') V
directional
→
from

(S 1.1.3.18') V
action
(reciprocative)
→
agent
<reciprocative> <plural>

(S 1.1.3.19') V
instrumentative
→
instrumentative

Sample Lexical Rules

(LR 1.1.3.1) V
action
→
walk, run, swim,...

(LR 1.1.3.2) V
action
causative
→ \ACTION VERB ROOT+causativizer
(cause someone to do something)

(LR 1.1.3.3) V
action
reciprocative
→ \ACTION VERB ROOT+reciprocativizer
(compete with someone in doing something)
(LR 1.1.3.4) V action associative \(\rightarrow\) ACTION VERB ROOT+ associativizer (Join someone in doing something)

(LR 1.1.3.5) V action participative \(\rightarrow\) ACTION VERB ROOT+ participativizer (participate with some group in doing something)

(LR 1.1.3.6) V action completable \(\rightarrow\) sing (a song), study (a lesson), give (a gift), read (a book), throw (a ball)...

(LR 1.1.3.7) V action instrumental \(\rightarrow\) use (a tool), drive (a car), ...

(LR 1.1.3.8) V action mensurative \(\rightarrow\) walk (so many kilometers), run (so many kilometers)...

(LR 1.1.3.9) V action completable materiative \(\rightarrow\) make (something out of some material)...

(LR 1.1.3.10) V action completable benefactive \(\rightarrow\) give (a gift to someone), ...

(LR 1.1.3.11) V action associative benefactive \(\rightarrow\) walk+associativizer (and beneficiary subject specification) (associate someone with somebody in walking)
(LR 1.1.3.12) V action → walk+causativizer benefactive (cause oneself to be walked by somebody), ...
interesitive

(LR 1.1.3.13) V action → walk to, go to, move directional towards,...
to

(LR 1.1.3.14) V action → come from, arrive from,...
directional from

(LR 1.1.3.15) V action → walk (with the use of some instrument, e.g., a cane),
instrumentative
read (a book with the use of some instrument, e.g.,
a magnifying glass), drive
(a car with the use of some instrument, e.g., gloves), ...

Some examples of maximally specified action V's:

(LR 1.1.3.16) V action → give+causativizer+
causative reciprocative completion benefactive
reciprocative (compete with someone in causing
somebody to give something to somebody else), ...

(LR 1.1.3.17) V action → make+causativizer+
causative participative completable materiative
participative (participate with some people in causing someone
to make something out of some material)
(LR 1.1.3.18) \( V \) action causative associative directional to mensurative

go to+causativizer+
associativizer (associate
with someone in causing
someone else to go to
some place for so many
kilometers), ...

(LR 1.1.3.19) \( V \) action causative participative instrumentative

walk+causativizer+
participativizer (and
instrument subject specification)
(participate with some
people in causing someone
to walk; one participates
using some kind of an
instrument, e.g., a whip), ...
1.1.4. Process-Action Verbs. Consider the sentence:

(1.1.4.1) púpútut yaŋ táli? # i Pédru
Pedro is cutting rope

(pútut 'to cut', táli? 'rope', ya 'subject he'), where táli? is a patient N and Pédru is an agent N. The patient N undergoes or 'suffers' (Latin patior) the process of being cut.

A process-action V may be specified as causative, in which instance an agentive beneficiary N is necessary:

(1.1.4.2) pípapútut yaŋ táli? # kaŋ Suán # i Pédru
Pedro is causing Juan to cut rope

where Suán is an agentive beneficiary N.

A process-action V may likewise be specified as either reciprocative or associative or participative, necessitating a plural agent N or an associate N or a plural associate N, respectively:

(1.1.4.3) mipágpútut laŋ táli? # diŋ ának
The children are competing [with each other] in cutting rope

(1.1.4.4) mákipútut yaŋ táli? # kaŋ Suán # i Pédru
Pedro is associating [himself] with Juan in cutting rope
(1.1.4.5) mákipaspútut yaŋ táli? # kariŋ ának #
i Pédrú
Pedro is participating with the children in cutting rope

A process-action V which is neither reciprocative nor associative nor participative may be specified as localized, in which case it demands a location N:

(1.1.4.6)* tíran na ya naŋ bédrú # kiŋ sálu? #
i Suán >
tíran neŋ Pédrú # kiŋ sálu? #
i Suán
Juan was hit by Pedro on the chest

(tíran 'hit' from túran 'to hit', na 'nonsubject he coreferential with Pedro', ya 'subject he coreferential with Juan', sálu? 'chest'), where sálu? is a location N.

Like action V's, process-action V's may be specified as instrumentative, if they are performed with the use of some instrument:

(1.1.4.7)* ipáŋ+pútut na yaŋ táli? naŋ Pédrú #
iŋ gumtíŋ >
pámútut neŋ tálíŋ Pédrú #
iŋ gumtíŋ
The scissors (lit. the scissor) are being used by Pedro to cut rope with

where ꙼tin is an instrument N.

A process-action V must be specified as reflexive, if its patient N and its agent N are coreferential:

\[(1.1.4.8)* \text{pá+patány+an na ya naŋ Pédru # in sadíli na > pàpatén neŋ Pédru # iŋ saríli na}
\]

His self is being killed by Pedro=
Pedro is killing himself

(patén 'to kill (lit. die+causativizer)' from * matány > patány+an, saríli 'self', na 'his'). In sentences such as 1.1.4.8, both patient N and agent N are lexically specified by Pédru; the root of the patient N is deleted and 'self' is introduced postsemantically. There is another way of expressing 'Pedro is killing himself':

\[(1.1.4.8a) \text{mágpakamaté ya # i Pédru}
\]

Pedro is committing suicide

where the lexical analysis of V is die+exertivizer+
causativizer (paka- 'exertivizer', mag- 'causativizer'), literally, 'to exert [oneself] in killing'. Perhaps it is better to consider mágpakamaté as an idiom 'to commit suicide'. A related V root is:
(1.1.4.9) * pá+i+matáy ya # kíŋ álak # i Pédrú > páimáté ya # kíŋ álak # i Pédrú

Pedro is causing himself to be killed by alcoholic beverages= Pedro is drinking himself to death

where Pédrú is both agent and patient and where álak 'alcoholic beverage' is an instrument N. The affix combination * pa+i- is restricted to the root * matáy and would have to be accounted for by a special lexical rule. In the rules on process-action V's which will be formulated, neither magpakamaté nor paimaté will be considered.

In summary, a nonstate V may be specified as process-action. A process-action V may be specified as causative and/or reciprocative, associative, or participative. A process-action V which is neither reciprocative nor associative nor participative may be specified as localized. Moreover, any process-action V may be specified as instrumentative if it is performed with the use of some instrument. Finally, process-action V's in which the agent N and the patient N are coreferential must be specified as reflexive.

Process-action V's demand both an agent N and a patient N; in addition, a causative process-action V demands an agentive beneficiary N; an associative process-action V demands an associate N; a reciprocative process-action V demands a plural agent N; a participative process-
action V demands a plural associate N; localized process-action V's demand a location N; instrumentative process-action V's demand an instrument N.

Process-action V's may be accompanied by other N's in addition to those stipulated thus far, in surface structure. Such accompanying N's (for example, time N's, other location N's, motive N's) will be treated in Chapter III as traceable in semantic structure to separate V's.

The following rules state the generalizations on process-action V's:

(S 1.1.4.1') \( V \rightarrow \text{state} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{process} \\ \text{action} \end{cases} \)

(S 1.1.4.2') \( V \rightarrow \text{process} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{causative} \\ \{ \text{reciprocative} \} \\ \{ \text{associative} \} \\ \{ \text{participative} \} \\ \{ \text{localized} \} \end{cases} \)

(S 1.1.4.3') \( V \rightarrow \text{process} \rightarrow \text{instrumentative} \)

(S 1.1.4.4') \( V \rightarrow \text{process} \rightarrow \text{reflexive} / N \rightarrow N \)

(S 1.1.4.5') \( V \rightarrow \text{causative} \rightarrow \text{causative} \)
Sample Lexical Rules

(LR 1.1.4.1) V process action → cut, kill, chew,...

(LR 1.1.4.2) V process action causative causativizer (cause someone to do something to somebody or to something)

(LR 1.1.4.3) V process action reciprocative reciprocativizer (compete with someone in doing something to somebody or to something)
(LR 1.1.4.4) \( V \) \( \rightarrow \) \text{PROCESS-ACTION VERB ROOT+ associativizer (join someone in doing something to somebody or to something)}

(LR 1.1.4.5) \( V \) \( \rightarrow \) \text{PROCESS-ACTION VERB ROOT+ participativizer (join a group in doing something to somebody or to something)}

(LR 1.1.4.6) \( V \) \( \rightarrow \) \text{hurt (somebody in some part of the body),...}

(LR 1.1.4.7) \( V \) \( \rightarrow \) \text{cut (with some instrument), kill (with some instrument),...}

(LR 1.1.4.8) \( V \) \( \rightarrow \) \text{kill oneself, cut oneself,...}

Some maximally specified process-action V's:

(LR 1.1.4.9) \( V \) \( \rightarrow \) \text{hit+causativizer (and instrument subject specification) (cause someone to hit someone else in some part of the body; one causes this using some instrument)}

(LR 1.1.4.10) \( V \) \( \rightarrow \) \text{kill+causativizer+reciprocative (compete with someone in causing someone else to kill somebody or something)}
1.1.5. Other Verb Specifications. Action V's and process-action V's may be further specified by other selectional units before V is finally narrowed down to a lexical choice (which is either a basic root or more often a derived root with affixes). The two selectional units to be described in section 1.1.5.1 were not discussed in the preceding sections because unlike the selectional units discussed earlier, these two units merely add semantic content to the root without stipulating accompanying N's.

Moreover, certain verbs demand that a selectional unit be present in their accompanying N's; mention has already been made of plural specification for certain N's accompanying V. Plural specification is inflectional. In addition, experiential V's demand an experiencer N that is selectionally animate; action V's demand an agent N that is selectionally potent. A few of these specifications will be treated in section 1.1.5.2.

1.1.5.1. Other Selectional Units of Action and Process-Action V's. Action and process-action V's may be further specified as exertive or unintentional; the two specifications are mutually exclusive. Moreover, the unit 'unintentional' is incompatible with selectional units which connote deliberateness; hence, it is likewise in exclusive disjunction with reciprocative, associative,
and participative, but not with causative.

(1.1.5.1.1)* páka+lákad na naj Pédrus
pákalákad naj Pédrus
Pedro exerts [himself] in walking

(pakalákad 'to exert [oneself] in walking (lit. walk+ exrtivizer)', na 'nonsubject he'), in which there is no subject N.

(1.1.5.1.2) mipalákad ya # i Pédrus
Pedro unintentionally walked

(mipalákad 'to walk unintentionally (lit. walk+unintentionalizer)').

By way of example, the different derivational affixes which may occur with a root (an action V) will be shown using the root lákad 'walk' (the accentual patterns signal unmarked or -actual aspect):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lákad</td>
<td>'to walk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa+lákad</td>
<td>'to cause to walk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paká+pa+lákad</td>
<td>'to exert oneself in causing to walk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mipag+ paká+pa+lákad</td>
<td>'to compete in exerting oneself in causing to walk'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
maki+ paká+pa+lákad 'to join in exerting oneself in causing to walk'
makipag+ paká+pa+lákad 'to participate in exerting oneself in causing to walk'
mipa+ pa+lákad 'to unintentionally cause someone to walk'

The lexical choice of the V root is subsequent to selectional specification. It should be repeated that the two selectional units 'exertive' and 'unintentional' make no stipulations concerning accompanying N's, whereas the units 'causative', 'reciprocative', 'associative', and 'participative' do. On the other hand, such V selectional units as 'completable', 'instrumental', 'materiative', and the like, although they make stipulations on accompanying N's, are not specified by derivational lexical units and hence receive no symbolization. The selectional unit 'instrumentative' receives no lexical symbolization but demands that its accompanying instrument N be subjectivized. This subjectivization process is mirrored in the verb root by an incorporation rule which specifies the verb root inflectionally as 'instrument subject'; this specification is eventually symbolized by the prefix ipag-.

1.1.5.2. N Selectional Specifications from V Selectional Specifications. Besides the selectional
specifications already described, all V's demand further specifications with regard to the selectional units their accompanying N's must have. For example, it has already been stated that experiential V's, state or process, demand an animate experiencer N. This requirement may be formulated by a rule such as the following:

\[(S \ 1.1.5.2.1') \ V_{\text{experiential}} \rightarrow \text{animate experiencer}\]

Alternatively, this requirement may be included in the replacement rule stating a necessary accompanying N, for example:

\[(S \ 1.1.5.2.2') \ V_{\text{experiential}} \rightarrow \text{experiential animate}\]

This rule would then be a modification of the pertinent replacement rules for experiential V's already formulated. Since the theory places no constraints on the number of symbols or specifications which may be replaced by a rule, the second formulation will be adopted and N selectional unit requirements will be incorporated into the replacement rules, in the section on Restatement of Rules.

Again, action V's demand a potent agent, an agent capable of effecting an action; it was earlier stated
that abilitative state V's demand a potent patient, a
patient that is potentially an agent. Causative V's
demand a human agent and an animate agentive beneficiary.
Benefactive action V's demand an animate agent, although
the beneficiary N need not be either human or animate.
Material N's are intrinsically animate.

Actually, these N selectional specifications
demanded by certain V's are most likely universal, because
imposed on us by our knowledge of the external world.
It is debatable, therefore, whether such specifications
should be treated in linguistics at all (for a succinct
statement of the problem arising from 'knowledge of the
language' and 'knowledge of the world', see Bolinger 1965;
for opinions against treating such specifications in a
grammar, see McCawley 1968a and Fillmore [undated]). In
any case, if considered as legitimate subject matter
for a theory of language, such specification rules are
more economically treated as language universal redundancy
rules or semantic marking conventions. Whatever specifications
are discovered to be language-specific would have to be
formulated separately, of course. It is in this section
of a semantic description that such specifications should
be described formally.

1.1.6. Summary of \( V \rightarrow N \) Relations and Restatement
of Rules. In this section, the roles which cooccurring
N's assume with regard to V, the different N relations, will
be summarized. Then, rules earlier formulated in sections 1.1.1 to 1.1.5 (excluding Lexical Rules) will be conflated and restated.

1.1.6.1. $\mathbf{V-N}$ Relations. Pampangan role-marked $N$'s may be divided into two main classes according to the type of determiner which occurs with them (nan/nin or kan/kin) when they are not subjectivized (i/in).

The following role-marked $N$'s, when nonsubjectivized, are marked by nan/nin unless special postsemantic processes intervene:

AGENT=the actor or the efficient cause; the instigator of a causative action

COMPLEMENT=that which completes the meaning of an action; in verbs of making, the product or artifact

EXPERIENCER=the subject of sentient experience

INSTRUMENT=that with which or by means of which something is done

MEASURE=that which quantifies the extent of some state or event

PATIENT=the undergoer or sufferer of physical change; the stimulus of a sensation; that which is present in a situation (hence, the usual accompaniment of state $V$'s)
The following role-marked N's when nonsubjectivized, are marked by kan/kiŋ unless special postsemantic processes intervene:

ASSOCIATE=that with which another N is joined or associated

AGENTIVE BENEFICIARY=the recipient of a causative action; occurs only with an (instigative) agent

BENEFICIARY=the recipient of benefits or misfortunes

GOAL=the place to which movement is directed

LOCATION=the place in which a situation or an event occurs

MATERIAL=that out of which something is made

MOTIVE=the final cause or reason for an event or situation; the occasion for an event or situation

NORM=the standard against which something is equated or compared

PARTITIVE=the whole in a part-whole relation

SOURCE=the place from which movement begins

TIME=the period or instant in which a situation or an event occurs

A case can be made for distinguishing PATIENT further by positing a genuine patient, that which undergoes
or suffers physical change, and an object, that which is present in a situation or an event but which does not undergo any physical change. If such a distinction is adopted, then most state V's would be accompanied not by a patient N but by an object N. Initially, this distinction was made in the course of the investigation. It was found, however, that in Pampangan, the differentiation was without consequences for later postsemantic processes; to simplify the rules, therefore, patient and object have been conflated into PATIENT.

Pampangan clearly distinguishes between an instigator, in the list, an AGENT, and a motive or reason or occasion, in the list, a MOTIVE. Hence, the term which more readily comes to mind, CAUSE, was studiously avoided as an N relation, since an instigator and a motive in many ways can be considered as causes.

Again, a case can be made for considering a BENEFICIARY a kind of GOAL; however, in cases of possession, where a BENEFICIARY is clearly present, no movement is presupposed. GOAL has therefore been reserved for locational terminal points.

The AGENTIVE BENEFICIARY is both an agent in its own right as well as a recipient of a causative action; it must be distinguished from ordinary BENEFICIARY, however, since it is possible to cause someone to give something
to somebody. The marking of AGENTIVE BENEFICIARY when nonsubject by *kàŋ/kàŋ* prompted the choice of the label 'AGENTIVE BENEFICIARY'.

The list of role-marked *N*'s set down may be added to as more *V* types are investigated. Obviously, certain similarities and parallelisms may be easily discovered, which would motivate one to reduce the inventory. In verbs of making, for example, material *N* may be considered a source *N* and the complement (or product) a goal *N*; in the list set down, however, source and goal are used only in connection with places. Moreover, there are certain similarities between patient and goal, for example, in verbs of contact such as *hit*; hence, Pāṇini subsumes product, patient, and goal under *karma* (see Ananthanarayana 1969 and Kiparsky and Staal 1969). The fact too that certain *N* relations occur only with certain *V*'s would lead one to suspect that the differentiation of roles may be a function of the semantic specification of *V*; perhaps, these different relations may be reducible to a few 'case primitives' (to use Fillmore's term), each primitive being specified further through its cooccurrence with a particular *V* type.

Until more is known about these *N* relations, however, the safer strategy is to posit as many relations as seem necessary, always keeping in mind that eventually each language
reduces these relationships into a smaller number of types in surface structure (in Pampangan, into three types). For purposes of this study, the above list will be used.

1.1.6.2. Restatement of Rules. The rules to be set down below conflate the rules earlier formulated in sections 1.1.1 to 1.1.5. As the rules are formulated, ordering is essential, especially for the replacement rules which state which N relation accompanies a particular V specification. The configurations which result will be used as bases of certain subjectivization rules which will be discussed in Chapter II. Although several units specify more than one subtype of V (state, process, action, process-action), in the restatement of rules, these units are specified separately for each subtype, since the cooccurrence restrictions of these units are not the same for each subtype. Thus, although the unit benefactive may specify a state, a process, or an action V, the specification rule for each subtype of V is separate, since the cooccurrence restrictions of the unit 'benefactive' vis-à-vis other specifications are different for each subtype of V. In state V's as well as in process V's, the unit 'benefactive' is in a relation of exclusive disjunction with other specifications of state and process V's; on the other hand, the unit 'benefactive' may cooccur
with other selectional units in action V's. Hence, the economy which may obtain as a result of conflating the specification rule for 'benefactive' with regard to state, process, and action V's is offset by the necessary restrictions that would have to be stated in the rule for each subtype of V.

(S 1.1)

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{state} \\
\text{process} \\
\text{action}
\end{array} \right. \\
\end{align*}
\]

(S 1.2)

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \rightarrow_{\text{state}} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{ambient} \\
\text{localized} \\
\text{abilitative} \\
\text{mensurative} \\
\text{motivative} \\
\text{experiential} \\
\text{presential} \\
\text{directional} \\
\text{habitue} \\
\text{necessitative} \\
\text{associative} \\
\text{similaritative} \\
\text{possessive} \\
\text{intensive} \\
\text{favoritive} \\
\text{locative} \\
\text{temporal} \\
\text{partitive}
\end{array} \right. \\
\end{align*}
\]

(S 1.3)

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \rightarrow_{\text{state}} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\text{mensurative} \\
\text{other specifications}
\end{array} \right. \rightarrow_{\text{root}} \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
equatative \\
\text{comparative} \\
\text{superlative}
\end{array} \right. \\
\end{align*}
\]
(S 1.4) \[ V \rightarrow \text{process} \]

\[ \{ \text{ambient} \text{, localized} \text{, mensurative} \text{, benefactive} \text{, habitive} \text{, necessitative} \text{, experiential} \} \]

(S 1.5) \[ V \rightarrow \text{action} \]

\[ \{ \text{causative} \text{, exertive} \}
\{ \text{reciprocative} \text{, associative} \text{, participative} \text{, unintentional} / V \text{ -exertive} \}
\{ \text{completable} \text{, instrumental} \}
\{ \text{mensurative} / V \text{ -completable} \} \]

(S 1.6) \[ V \rightarrow \text{benefactive} \text{ action} \]

\{completable\}
\{associative\}

(S 1.7) \[ V \rightarrow \text{materiative} \text{ action completable} \]

(S 1.8) \[ V \rightarrow \text{directional} \text{ action} \]

- benefactive
- materiative
(S 1.9)  \[ \text{directional} \rightarrow \{ \text{to} \} \rightarrow \{ \text{from} \} \]

(S 1.10)  
\[
\begin{align*}
V \quad &\longrightarrow \quad \text{process of action} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{causative}
\quad \text{exertive}
\quad \text{reciprocative}
\quad \{ \text{associative} \}
\quad \{ \text{participative} \}
\quad \{ \text{unintentional} \quad / \quad V \}
\text{-exertive-}
\quad \text{localized}
\end{align*}
\]

(S 1.11)  
\[ V \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{(process)} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{instrumentative} \]

(S 1.12)  
\[ V \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{completable} \quad \longrightarrow \quad V \quad \text{completable} \]

(S 1.13)  
\[ V \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{instrumental} \quad \longrightarrow \quad V \quad \text{instrumental} \]

(S 1.14)  
\[ V \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{mensurative} \quad \longrightarrow \quad V \quad \text{mensurative} \]

(S 1.15)  
\[ V \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{materiative} \quad \longrightarrow \quad V \quad \text{materiative} \]

(S 1.16)  
\[ V \quad \longrightarrow \quad \{ \text{associative} \} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \{ \text{participative} \} \quad \{ \text{plural} \} \]
(S 1.17) \[ V \xrightarrow{\text{similaritative}} V \xrightarrow{\text{Norm}} \]
\{equantative\} \{equantative\}
\{comparative\} \{comparative\}

(S 1.18) \[ V \xrightarrow{\text{Partitive}} \]
\{partitive\} \{<plural>\}
\{superlative\} \{<total>\}

(S 1.19) \[ V \xrightarrow{\text{Partitive}} \]
\{localized\} \{presential\}
\{locative\} \{locative\}

This rule is optional for \(V\) state
presential

(S 1.20) \[ V \xrightarrow{\text{goal}} \]
\{directional\} \{to\}
directional to
to

(S 1.21) \[ V \xrightarrow{\text{source}} \]
\{directional\} \{from\}
directional from

(S 1.22) \[ V \xrightarrow{\text{time}} \]
\{temporal\} \{temporal\}
temporal

(S 1.23) \[ V \xrightarrow{\text{patient}} \]
\{state\} \{state\}
\{abilitative\} \{abilitative\}
\{process\} \{process\}

This rule is optional for \(V\) state
motivative

does not apply to \(V\) process
habitive
(S 1.24) \( V \) motivative \( \rightarrow \) \( V \) motivative

(S 1.25) \( V \) benefactive
\{ habitive \\
possessive \\
intensive \\
favoritive \} \( \rightarrow \) \( V \) benefactive
\{ habitive \\
possessive \\
intensive \\
favoritive \}

(S 1.26) \( V \) causative \( \rightarrow \) \( V \) causative
potent
animate

(S 1.27) \( V \) experiential \( \rightarrow \) \( V \) experiential
animate

(S 1.28) \( V \) action
\{ causative \\
reciprocative \} \( \rightarrow \) \( V \) action
potent
\{ causative \\
reciprocative \}

where \( \alpha \) indicates that 'human' occurs
with 'causative' and 'plural' occurs with
'reciprocative'

(S 1.29) \( V \) instrumentative \( \rightarrow \) \( V \) instrumentative

(S 1.30) \( V \) action \( \rightarrow \) \( \{ \)
\{ benefactive / N N \}
\{ agent / N N \}
\{ interjective / N N \}
\{ 1 \}
\{ patient / N N \}
\{ agent / N N \}
\{ reflexive / N N \}
\{ 1 \}
\{ 1 \}
1.1.7. Verb Derivational Processes. In describing the different subtypes of action and process-action V's, lexical units consisting of root+affix have already been used, verb roots which are outputs of some prior process of derivation. It seems that such derived forms, together with nonderived basic forms, must be available to semantic generation even before a sentence is generated; these derived forms are generated by derivational processes to be described in this section and then stored in the lexicon, as it were, and made available as lexical units which may be selected to specify V after V has been specified previously by selectional units.

The V derivational processes are of two types. Some processes are purely additive, a derivational unit being added to a root without changing the root into an N or into some other subtype of V. The process may be described in general thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
V \quad \{ \text{state} \} \\
\quad \{ \text{process} \} \\
\quad \{ \text{action} \}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\rightarrow
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
V \quad \{ \text{state} \} \\
\quad \{ \text{process} \} \\
\quad \{ \text{action} \}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{root+derivational affix}
\]

Examples of derived forms generated by a process of this type have already been given in section 1.1.5, using \text{lákad} 'to walk' as a root. Such units as 'reciprocativizer',
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'associativizer', 'participativizer', 'unintentionalizer', and 'exertivizer' are derivational units added to a V root; they add meaning to the root but do not change its categorization or subcategorization. Much more interesting is the second type of V derivational processes, a process which changes the categorization of a root by making V into N or a process which changes the subcategorization of a root by making a subtype of V into another subtype. Such processes, besides changing categorization or subcategorization, likewise add meaning to the root. It is with processes of the second type that this section will deal.

1.1.7.1. State Verbs: Derivational Processes.

1.1.7.1.1. State Verbs to Process Verbs. Consider the sentence:

(1.1.7.1.1) báyu ya # iŋ balé

The house is new

One may likewise say:

(1.1.7.1.2) máginbáyu ya # iŋ balé

The house is becoming new

where the V, inflected for actual durative aspect, is
analyzable semantically as **new+fierientizer** (from Latin *fieri* 'to become') and where the derivational rule (hereinafter DR) operative is:

\[
\text{(DR 1')} \quad V \quad \rightarrow \quad V \\
\text{state} \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{process} \\
\text{root} \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{root+fierientizer}
\]

Still another possible derivation is:

\[
(1.1.7.1.1.3) \quad \text{mágbáyu ya # i Maryá} \\
\text{Maria is turning into a new person}
\]

where the verb is analyzable semantically as **new+vertitivizer** and where the operative derivational rule is:

\[
\text{(DR 2')} \quad V \quad \rightarrow \quad V \\
\text{state} \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{process} \\
\text{root} \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{root+vertitivizer}
\]

It is difficult to pinpoint the difference between *mágiñbáyu* 'becoming new' and *mágbáyu* 'turning new'. *magiñ-* can be used for becoming of any kind. It freely combines with noun roots:

\[
(1.1.7.1.1.4) \quad \text{mágiñdoktór ya # i Pédru} \\
\text{Pedro is becoming a doctor}
\]
magin- is thus a general marker for becoming, some
uses of which match those of mag-.

1.1.7.1.2. State Verbs to Action Verbs. From
báyu 'new', one can have:

(1.1.7.1.2.1) mágbáyu ya # i Maryá

The sentence is ambiguous. It may mean 'Maria is becoming
a new person' (as in 1.1.7.1.1.3) or it may mean 'Maria
is making things new'. In the second meaning, mágbáyu
is an action V and Maryá is its accompanying agent N.
The derivational rule relevant to the second meaning is:

(DR 3') V state ----> V action
           root         root+activativizer

The derived verb root magbáyu 'to make new' may become
once more a state V:

(1.1.7.1.2.2) mapágbáyu ya # i Maryá

Maria is inclined to make [things] new=
Maria believes in planned obsolescence (!)

where the state V is analyzable as new+activativizer+
inclinativizer. The rule for deriving a state V from
an action $V$ will be formulated in the pertinent section.

1.1.7.1.3. State Verbs to Process-Action Verbs.

From state $V$ báyu 'new', one may derive:

\[(1.1.7.1.3.1) \text{ mágbáyu yaŋ átu # i Maryá} \]

Maria is changing car(s)

The $V$ is analyzable as \texttt{new+activativizer+processivizer}; in other words, to derive a state $V$ into a process-action $V$, no new derivational rule need be formulated. DR 3' has to be applied; then a rule converting an action $V$ into a process-action $V$ has to be applied. This latter rule will be formulated in the pertinent section.

1.1.7.1.4. State Verbs to Derived Nouns. An inherent state $V$ such as báyu 'new' may be derived into kabáyuan~kabayuáñ 'newness'. A term such as kabáyuan may be considered a nominalized form of the state $V$ báyu 'new':

\[(1.1.7.1.4.1) \text{ báyu ya # in átu ##} \]

\[\text{masantíŋ # in kabáyuan na in átu}\]

The car is new

The newness of the car is pleasing

Hence, the discontinuous morph \texttt{ka-...-an} is a symbolization for \texttt{nominalizer}. Nominalizers for each subtype of $V$
will be postulated. Hence, a numerical subscript will be added to \textit{nominalizer} to indicate its particular subtype:

\[
(DR \ 4') \quad V \underset{\text{state}}{\rightarrow} N \underset{\text{abstract}}{\rightarrow} \quad \text{root} \quad \text{root+nominalizer}_1
\]

It should be stated at this point that the process of nominalization is a grammatical process (to be discussed in Chapter IV); the output of such a process includes a form, \textit{root+nominalizer}, a lexical item generated by a previous derivational process (DR $4'$). It is only with the generation of nominalized forms (lexical items) and not with the process of nominalization itself that this section deals.


1.1.7.2.1. Process Verbs to State Verbs. From \dáguł 'to grow', an inherent process V, one may have the following:

\[ (1.1.7.2.1.1) \quad \text{dáragúl ya # iŋ anák} \]

The child is growing [big]

Once the child has grown, one can say:
(1.1.7.2.1.2) méragúl ya # iğ anák
The child is grown

where the process-turned-state V is analyzable as grow+resultativizer. The derivational rule may be formulated thus:

(DR 5') V process $$\rightarrow$$ V state
root root+resultativizer

1.1.7.2.2. Process Verbs to Process-Action Verbs.
In the sentence

(1.1.7.2.2.1) pāragul yağ anák # i Pédrú
Pedro is causing a child to grow=
Pedro is raising a child

the process-action verb is grow+causativizer; anák is a patient N and Pédrú is an agent N. The derived process-action V, like any process-action V, may be selectionally specified as causative, in which instance it demands both an agent N and an agentive beneficiary N:

(1.1.7.2.2.2) pāparagul yağ anák # kağ Suán # i Pédrú
Pedro is causing Juan to raise children
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Note that the verb root has two prefixes (the initial \textit{pa-} is a result of reduplication for aspect), \textit{pa-} to symbolize causative specification of the process-action \textit{V}, \textit{-pa-} to symbolize the derivational unit \textit{causativizer} which converted the process \textit{V} into a process-action \textit{V}. Thus, the analysis of \textit{V} is \textit{grow+causativizer} \textit{+causativizer}.

The derivational rule may be formulated thus:

\begin{align*}
\text{(DR 6')} & \quad \text{V} \quad \text{---->} \quad \text{V} \\
& \quad \text{process} \quad \text{process} \\
& \quad \text{action} \\
& \quad \text{root} \quad \text{root+causativizer}_1
\end{align*}

1.1.7.2.3. Process Verbs to Action Verbs. In the sentence

\begin{align*}
\text{(1.1.7.2.3.1) páragúl ya # i Pédru} \\
& \quad \text{Pedro is causing [something] to grow}
\end{align*}

a patient \textit{N} is presupposed but not expressed. There seems to be no direct derivational path from process \textit{V} to action \textit{V}, since a process \textit{V} necessarily demands a patient \textit{N}, a patient \textit{N} which is missing in the above example. The more plausible path of derivation is from process \textit{V} to process-action \textit{V} (DR 6'), which introduces an agent \textit{N}; then the process-action \textit{V} may undergo a second
derivation to make it an action V. This latter rule will be formulated in the pertinent section.

1.1.7.2.4. Process Verbs to Derived Nouns.

Consider the two sentences:

(1.1.7.2.4.1) dáragúl ya # iŋ anáŋ #
mákyáma # iŋ páŋaragúl na niŋ anáŋ
The child is growing
The growing of the child is admirable

The subject phrase of the second sentence (marked iŋ is a nominalization of the first sentence. The derivation of the noun root may be formulated thus:

(DR 7') V ----> N
process abstract
root root+nominalizer

There are two other derived N's from dágul 'to grow':

(1.1.7.2.4.2) makanánú # iŋ karagulán na niŋ anáŋ
How is the growth of the child

(1.1.7.2.4.3) nánu # iŋ dagúl na niŋ sapátus mu
What is the size of your shoe?

where * ka+dágul+an means 'growth' and dágúl means 'size'.
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To account for karagulán, distinct from páragúl 'process of growing', a nominalized form, the following derivational process would have to be formulated:

(DR 8') \[ V \quad \rightarrow \quad N \]
\[ \text{process} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{abstract} \]
\[ \text{root} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{root+abstractivizer} \]

The numerical subscript for abstractivizer is necessary, since another abstractivizer (for state V's) will be postulated. In the case of dagúl 'size', however, it seems that the derived N is not from a process V but from a state V; it designates the measure of the result of growth. Another state V to abstract N process must be formulated, therefore:

(DR 4a') \[ V \quad \rightarrow \quad N \]
\[ \text{state} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{abstract} \]
\[ \text{root} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{root+abstractivizer} \]

where the input root may be a derived root from a previous derivational process.

It should be noted that there seems to be asymmetry in the symbolization of the nominalizers and abstractivizers. The symbolization for a state V nominalizer is usually ka-...-an. On the other hand, the usual symbolization for a process V
nominalizer is pana-. There is an abstractivizer for process V's, however, which has the symbolization ka-...-an, homophonous with the state V nominalizer. The symbolization for the state V abstractivizer consists of an accentual shift: dagul > dagúl.

In turn, the derived noun root dagúl 'size' may undergo a noun to state V derivation (rules for which will be formulated in section 2.2): * ma+dagúl > maragúl 'big (lit. size+plenitivizer)'.

1.1.7.3. Action Verbs: Derivational Processes.
1.1.7.3.1. Action Verbs to State Verbs. In the sentence

(1.1.7.3.1.1) palákad ya # i Pédru
Pedro is inclined to walk=
Pedro is a rover

the state V * pala+lákad 'inclined to walk (lit. walk+ inclinativizer )' is derived from inherent action V lákad 'walk'. pala- is only one among many possible derivational units which deactivate an action V and convert it into a state V. Again, one may say:

(1.1.7.3.1.2)* ka+lákad na ya naŋ Pédru # i Suán >
kalákad neŋ Pédru # i Suán
Juan is in the company of Pedro in walking
where the state V is analyzable as walk+stative associativizer; the latter unit is symbolized by ka- and is to be distinguished from (nonstative) associativizer maki-, which combines with action verb roots but does not change their subcategorization, as in makilákad 'to join in walking'.

Another productive derivational unit is 'abilitative':

(1.1.7.3.1.3) mákalákad ya # i Pédru
milalákad ya # i Pédru
Pedro is able to walk

Tentatively, maka- will be distinguished from mi- as being a different kind of abilitativizer, hence, abilitativizer₁ and abilitativizer₂. The semantic distinction between them is difficult to characterize. In mákalákad, the meaning is 'able to walk' in the sense of being able to go, for example, on many errands because of time off; in milalákad, the meaning is 'able to walk' in the sense of physical ability, for example, predicated of someone who is convalescing. However, abilitativizer₁ may likewise be used in the latter context. Moreover, certain verb roots select only maka-: mákapútut 'able to cut' but not mipupútut. maka- and mi- are unusual in that state V's in which these affixes occur can be inflectionally
specified for aspect, unlike other state V's. The
derivational rule pertinent to this section may be
formulated thus:

\[(\text{DR } 9') \quad V \xrightarrow{\text{action}} V \quad \text{state} \quad \begin{aligned}
\text{root} & \quad \text{root}^+ \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{c}
\overset{1,2}{\text{inclinativizer}} \\
\overset{1,2}{\text{stative associativizer}} \\
\overset{1,2}{\text{abilitativizer}} 
\end{array} \right. \\
\end{aligned}\]

1.1.7.3.2. Action Verbs to Process-Action Verbs.
This derivational process is problematic, since in many
instances, what appears to be a process-action V is
actually a completable, instrumental, or mensurative
action V. In the following sentence, however, there is
clearly a patient N:

\[(1.1.7.3.2.1)^* \quad \text{la+lakad+an na la nag Pédru # diŋ ūbas} >
\quad \text{lalakáran na laŋ Pédru # diŋ ūbas} \]

The grapes are being trampled on by Pedro

(\text{nonsubject he}, \text{la 'subject they coreferential with grapes'}, \text{ūbas 'grape' from Spanish uvas 'grapes' preceded
by the plural subject determiner diŋ}). If ūbas were a
location N instead of a patient N, one would say:
(1.1.7.3.2) lálákad ya # i Pédru # kariŋ úbas
Pedro is walking among the grape [vines]

The derivational process may be described thus:

(DR 10') V ----> V
  action     process
  action
root       root+processivizer

1.1.7.3.3. Action Verbs to Process Verbs. There does not seem to be a direct derivational path from action to process V's, since process V's presuppose a patient N while inherent action V's have no patients. It is possible to say:

(1.1.7.3.3.1) malalákad la # diŋ úbas
The grapes are being trampled on

but this is an instance of a process-action V becoming a process V; the derivation process for this will be formulated in the pertinent section.

1.1.7.3.4. Action Verbs to Derived Nouns. Consider the sentence pair:

(1.1.7.3.4.1) lálákad ya # i Pédru ##
* ma+dayú? # iŋ paman+låkad na naŋ Pédru >
márayú? # iŋ pamanlåkad naŋ Pédru
Pedro is walking
The walking by Pedro is far

(* ma+dayú? 'far (lit. distance+plenitivizer)'), where
pamanlåkad is analyzable as walk+nominalizer. pamanlåkad
is likewise a symbolization for 'manner of walking':

(1.1.7.3.4.2)* máka+túla? # iŋ paman+låkad na naŋ Pédru >
mákátúla? # iŋ pamanlåkad naŋ Pédru
Pedro's manner of walking is motivative
of laughter

where pamanlåkad is analyzable as walk+modalizer.
Again, in addition to låkad 'to walk', one may
likewise have låkad 'trip, journey', which is semantically
analyzable as walk+complementizer. The label 'complementizer'
is fitting insofar as the noun completes the meaning of
the verb: to walk a walk. One may likewise use låkad to
mean 'manner of walking'. The following examples will
clarify the above observations:
(1.1.7.3.4.3)* ma+kába? # iŋ lákad na naŋ Pédr u>
makába? # iŋ lákad naŋ Pédr u
Pedro's trip is long

(1.1.7.3.4.4)* máka+túla? # iŋ lákad naŋ Pédr u>
mákatúla? # iŋ lákad naŋ Pédr u
Pedro's manner of walking is motative
of laughter

It seems that lákad is a variant symbolization for
pámanlágáki. The following rule may be formulated:

(DR 11') V ---→ N
    action          abstract

    root

    root + {nominalizer
            modalizer
            complementizer

1.1.7.4.1. Process-Action Verbs to Action Verbs.

From the sentence

(1.1.7.4.1.1) púpútut yaŋ dútųŋ # i Pédr u
Pedro is cutting wood

one may have:
(1.1.7.4.1.2) pūpūtut ya # i Pédru
Pedro is cutting

which necessitates the following derivational rule:

(DR 12') \[ V \quad \rightarrow \quad V \]
process \quad \rightarrow \quad action
root \quad \rightarrow \quad root+deprocessivizer

1.1.7.4.2. Process-Action Verbs to Process Verbs.
Consider the sentence:

(1.1.7.4.2.1) mapupūtut ya # in dūtuŋ
The [piece of] wood is being cut
The [piece of] wood is apt for cutting

In the first meaning, the relevant derivational rule is:

(DR 13') \[ V \quad \rightarrow \quad V' \]
process \quad \rightarrow \quad process
action \quad \rightarrow \quad root+decausativizer

In the second meaning, it seems that to the derived root cut+decausativizer is added another derivational unit, aptativizer, which converts the process V into a state V.
Thus, DR 5' should be added to thus:

\[(\text{DR } 5a') \quad V \quad \longrightarrow \quad V \]
\[\text{process} \quad \text{state} \]
\[\text{root} \quad \text{root+aptativizer} \]

The eventual symbolization of \textit{aptativizer} is \(\emptyset\).

1.1.7.4.3. Process-Action Verbs to State Verbs.

Semantically related to

\((1.1.7.4.3.1) \quad \text{mapupútut ya # iŋ dútuŋ} \]
\[\text{The [piece of] wood is being cut} \]

is the sentence

\[(1.1.7.4.3.2) \quad \text{putút ya # iŋ dútuŋ} \]
\[\text{The [piece of] wood is cut} \]

where the state V is a derived verb root: \textit{cut+decausativizer+resultativizer}. For such a derivation, no new rules need be postulated; the derived root is the output of DR 13' and DR 5'. However, there are instances of a state V derived directly from a process-action V:
(1.1.7.4.3.3) mapágpútut yaŋ dátuŋ # i Pédrú
Pedro is inclined to cut wood=
Pedro cuts wood often

where V is cut\text{+inclinativizer}. Or:

(1.1.7.4.3.4) palapútut yaŋ dátuŋ # i Pédrú
Pedro is naturally inclined to cut wood

where V is cut\text{+inclinativizer}. One may likewise say:

(1.1.7.4.3.5) mákapútut yaŋ dátuŋ # i Pédrú
Pedro is able to cut wood

where V is cut\text{+abilitativizer}. The process may be described thus:

\[(\text{DR 14}') \quad V \quad \longrightarrow \quad V \quad \text{process} \quad \text{action} \quad \text{state} \quad \text{root} \quad \text{root } + \{ \text{inclinativizer} _{1,2} \} \quad \text{abilitativizer} _{1} \]\n
From an inherent process-action V root such as ladlád 'to
lay out', one may have the sentence:

(1.1.7.4.3.6) makaladlád ya # iŋ kulambú?
The mosquito-net is laid out

It seems, however, that the derived state V makaladlád, analyzable as lay out+decausativizer+positionalizer, is not directly derived from a process-action V but from a process V. Hence, no new rule need be formulated, but an additional derivational unit must be added to DR 5':

(DR 5b') V \[\longrightarrow\] V
process state
root root+positionalizer

1.1.7.4.4. Process-Action Verbs to Derived Nouns.
Consider the sentence pair:

(1.1.7.4.4.1) púpútut yaŋ dútuŋ # i Pédru ##
* ma+bágal # iŋ pá+mag+pútut naŋ dútuŋ naŋ Pédru
mabágal # iŋ pámagpútut naŋ dútuŋ Pédru
Pedro is cutting wood
The cutting [of] wood by Pedro is slow

(* ma+bágal 'slow (lit. slowness+plenitivizer)'), where
pámagpútut is analyzable as cut+nominalizer. The derivational process may be formulated thus:

\[
(DR \ 15') \ \text{V} \quad \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{N} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{process} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{action} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{root} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{root+nominalizer}
\]

From pútut 'to cut', one may likewise have the noun kapútut 'a slice':

\[
(1.1.7.4.4.2) \ \text{méñan yañ kapútut mañgá} \ # i \ \text{Pédu} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{Pedro ate a slice of mango}
\]

(méñan 'ate' from * mañ+kán 'to eat', mañgá 'mango'). It seems that the analyzis of kapútut should be cut+ decausativizer+resultativizer+singulary counter. Hence, the derived noun is directly traceable to a state V rather than a process-action V. A state V to -abstract N rule should be formulated therefore:

\[
(DR \ 4b') \ \text{V} \quad \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{N} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{state} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{root} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{root+singulary counter}
\]

1.1.7.5. Summary. The derivational processes described in this section may be summarized thus:
Verb-to-Verb Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(DR 1)</th>
<th>V state ----&gt; V process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>root [{fierientizer}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>root + {vertitivizer}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(DR 2)</th>
<th>V state ----&gt; V action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>root + activativizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(DR 3)</th>
<th>V process ----&gt; V state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>root {resultativizer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>root + {aptativizer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>root + {positionalizer}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(DR 4)</th>
<th>V process ----&gt; V process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>root + causativizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(DR 5)</th>
<th>V action ----&gt; V state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>root {inclinativizer}_1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>root + {abilitativizer}_1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>root + {associativizer}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(DR 6)</th>
<th>V action ----&gt; V process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>root + processivizer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(DR 7)  \[ V \rightarrow V \]
        process  \( \rightarrow \)  process
        action

        root  \( \rightarrow \)  root + decausativizer

(DR 8)  \[ V \rightarrow V \]
        process  \( \rightarrow \)  action
        action

        root  \( \rightarrow \)  root + deprocessivizer

(DR 9)  \[ V \rightarrow V \]
        process  \( \rightarrow \)  state
        action

        root  \( \rightarrow \)  root + \( \{ \)
                \[ \text{inclinativizer} \]
                \[ \text{abilitativizer} \]

Verb-to-Noun Processes

(DR 10)  \[ V \rightarrow N \]
        state  \( \rightarrow \)  abstract

        root  \( \rightarrow \)  root + \( \{ \)
                \[ \text{nominalizer} \]
                \[ \text{abstractionizer} \]

(DR 11)  \[ V \rightarrow N \]
        state  \( \rightarrow \)  -abstract

        root  \( \rightarrow \)  root + singulary counter

(DR 12)  \[ V \rightarrow N \]
        process  \( \rightarrow \)  abstract

        root  \( \rightarrow \)  root + \( \{ \)
                \[ \text{nominalizer} \]
                \[ \text{abstractionizer} \]
(DR 13) \( \text{V} \) action \( \rightarrow \) N abstract
\( \text{root} \)
\( \text{root} + \{ \text{nominalizer} \}_3 \)
\( \{ \text{complementizer} \} \)
\( \{ \text{modalizer} \} \)

(DF 14) \( \text{V} \) process action \( \rightarrow \) N abstract
\( \text{root} \)
\( \text{root} + \text{nominalizer}_4 \)

The various possibilities for derivation are manifested more graphically by the following diagram (Figure 1):
Figure 1
Figure 1 gives an idealized partial picture of a lexical item which has maximal derivational possibilities; the picture is partial since Noun-to-Verb derivations will not be treated until section 1.2.2. Within the domain of verb roots, any root (basic or derived) may travel across a derivational path, provided the path is not blocked by the lack of connecting lines (which break the circuit, as it were) or by double-headed arrows which indicate the end of a verb-to-verb path. The constraints on derivational possibilities are not clear at present and must be studied separately. In the data gathered, no examples were found of direct paths from state to process-action V's (although there were numerous examples of paths from process-action to state V's); moreover, there were no direct paths from action to process V's, nor from process to action V's.

The derivational possibilities of lexical units are highly idiosyncratic in any language. The lexicon would have to note such peculiarities of derivation, and symbolization rules would have to state irregular symbolizations of derivational units. For example, it has already been stated that \( \text{lákad} \) 'to walk' may occur with either \( \text{abilitativizer}_1 \) \( \text{maka-} \) or with \( \text{abilitativizer}_2 \) \( \text{mi-} \), whereas \( \text{pútut} \) 'to cut' may occur only with \( \text{abilitativizer}_1 \).

To take only one example of derivational possibilities, one may consider the inherent state V \( \text{báyu} \) 'new':
Figure 2
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When one considers that one can take a derived V such as magbáyu 'to make [something] new' and add to it derivational units of the first type (units which add meaning but do not affect categorization or subcategorization), then the agglutinative possibilities of the verb root in Pampangan become formidable indeed. This aptness for agglutination, symbolized usually by CV and CVCV particles, constitutes one of the distinctive features of Pampangan and would figure prominently in typologizing it. In actual usage, the number of semantic derivational units attached to the root is usually only one or two, three at the most. Still, these monstrous accretions are possible:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{magbáyu} & \quad \text{new+activativizer+processivizer} \\
(\text{mag})\text{pabáyu} & \quad \text{new+activativizer+processivizer+causativizer}_2 \\
\text{pakápabáyu} & \quad \text{new+activativizer+processivizer+causativizer+exertivizer}_2 \\
\end{align*}
\]

' to make [something] new' 
'to cause [somebody] to make [something] new' 
'to exert [oneself] in causing [somebody] to make [something] new'
makipagpakápabáyu  new+activativizer+processivizer+
causativizer +exertivizer+
participativizer
'to participate [with some group]
in exerting [oneself] in causing
[somebody] to make [something] new'

* maká+makipag+páká+pa+báyu > makápakipagpakápabáyu
(*m > p)

new+activativizer+processivizer+causativizer +
exertivizer+participativizer+abilitativizer
'to be able to participate [with some group] in
exerting [oneself] in causing [somebody] to make
[something] new'

In turn, the penultimate example, makipagpakápabáyu may
be converted into a nominal, pámakipagpakápabáyu 'the action
of participating [with some group] in exerting [oneself]
in causing [somebody] to make [something] new': new+
activativizer+processivizer+causativizer +exertivizer+
participativizer+nominalizer .

1.1.8. Verb Inflectional Units. To summarize
thus far, in generating the semantic structure of a
sentence, V must be specified for selectional units (state,
process, action, process-action; further specifications
within each verb subtype), which in turn narrow down to

a lexical unit (either an inherent verb root or a derived noun-to-verb or verb-to-verb root, previously generated by derivational processes and stored in the lexicon). Once the lexical unit has been selected, V must be specified still further by inflectional units, semantic units which specify any lexical verb root and therefore do not function to narrow down verb selection but presuppose it.

In Pampangan, these inflectional units involve such units as 'equative', 'comparative' and 'superlative' as well as 'intensive' and 'minutive' for state V's; units such as 'perseverative', 'repetitive', 'intermittent', and aspectual specifications for nonstate V's. Both state and nonstate V's may likewise be inflectionally specified as generic.

1.1.8.1. State Verb Inflections. Consider the sentences:

(1.1.8.1.1) masantīŋ ya # iŋ anāk
            The child is pretty
(1.1.8.1.2) makaluklūk ya # iŋ anāk
            The child is in a sitting position

In the first sentence, *ma+santīŋ 'pretty (lit. comeliness+ plenitivizer)' is a permanent quality, whereas in the second
sentence, *maka+luklúk 'in a sitting position (lit. sit+ positionalizer)' is an impermanent state. For the permanent quality, the inflectional unit 'generic' will be used in the sense of a permanent or habitual disposition or state. Many nongeneric state V's are formed with the derivational unit positionalizer.

It is only generic state V's which may be inflectionally specified as equative, comparative, or superlative:

(1.1.8.1.3) (mas) masantíŋ ya # kaŋ Pédru # iŋ anák

The child is better-looking than Pedro

(1.1.8.1.4)* kasiŋ santíŋ na ya naŋ Pédru # iŋ anák>

kasiŋ santíŋ neŋ Pédru # iŋ anák

The child is as good-looking as Pedro

(1.1.8.1.5) pékamasantíŋ yaŋ díli # kariŋ gay ának #
i Pédru

Pedro is the best-looking of all among all the children

It should be noted that a nongeneric state V such as maka+luklúk 'in a sitting position' cannot be inflectionally specified by the units 'equative', 'comparative', or 'superlative'.

If a generic state V is not specified as either equative, comparative, or superlative, it may be specified
as intensive or minutive:

(1.1.8.1.6) masantíŋ yaŋ masantíŋ # iŋ anák
The child is pretty-pretty-
The child is very pretty

(1.1.8.1.7) masantíŋsantíŋ ya # iŋ anák
The child is somewhat pretty

where the two types of reduplication symbolize the units 'intensive' and 'minutive' respectively. (In Chapter III, an alternative analysis for 'intensive' and 'minutive' will be proposed; the possibility that these units are separate state V's in their own right, adverbs, in other words, should at least be considered. However, for the moment, these units will be considered as inflectional units.)

Abilitative state V's, for example, mákalákad 'able to walk' (note that abilitativizer máka- should not be confused with positionalizer maka-), it has been mentioned, may likewise be specified aspectually. Aspectual specification will be discussed in connection with nonstate V's.

The inflectional specifications of state V's may be summarized by the following rules (Semantic Verb Inflectional Rules, hereinafter SVIR):
(SVIR 1)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{state} \\
\text{root} \\
\longrightarrow \\
\text{generic}
\end{array}
\]

(SVIR 2)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{state} \\
\{ \text{equative} \} \\
\{ \text{comparative} \} \\
\{ \text{superlative} \} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{generic} \\
\longrightarrow \\
\{ \text{intensive} \} \\
\{ \text{minutive} \}
\end{array}
\]

1.1.8.2. NonState Verb Inflections: Perseverative, Repetitive, Intermittent. Consider the sentences:

(1.1.8.2.1)* mi+ta+talúsad na yaŋ mi+ta+talúsad #
\[
iŋ \text{ anáŋ } >
\]
mitatalúras neŋ mitatalúras #
\[
iŋ \text{ anáŋ}
\]
The child keeps on slipping

(1.1.8.2.2)* lá+lákad na yaŋ lá+lákad # iŋ anáŋ >
\[
lá́lákad neŋ lá́lákad # iŋ anáŋ
\]
The child keeps on walking

(1.1.8.2.3)* pú+pútut na yaŋ pú+pútut dútuŋ # iŋ anáŋ >
\[
pú+pútut neŋ pú+pútut dútuŋ # iŋ anáŋ
\]
The child keeps on cutting wood

The reduplication of the nonstate V roots symbolizes a semantic unit 'perseverative'. (Again, in Chapter III, the possibility
that such a unit is an adverb, a separate state V, must not be gainsaid. However, for the moment, 'perseverative' will be considered an inflectional unit specifiable of nonstate V's).

A nonstate V may likewise be specified as 'repetitive' in the sense of an event occurring many times, hence, plurality of occurrence. This repetition may be specified further as 'intermittent' if the event is repeated only occasionally:

(1.1.8.2.4)* máŋya+talúsad ya # iŋ anák >
máŋatalúras ya # iŋ anák
The child is slipping repeatedly
*
máŋya+talú+talúsad ya # iŋ anák >
máŋatalútalúras ya # iŋ anák
The child is slipping intermittently

(1.1.8.2.5) máŋlákad ya # i Pédru
Pedro is walking repeatedly
máŋlakálákad ya # i Pédru
Pedro is walking intermittently

(1.1.8.2.6) máŋpútut yaŋ dútug # i Pédru ~
máŋmútut yaŋ dútug # i Pédru
Pedro is cutting wood repeatedly
máŋputúpútut yaŋ dútug # i Pédru
Pedro is cutting wood intermittently

In the above sentences, the unit 'repetitive' is symbolized by infix -ŋa- in 1.1.8.2.4 and by a prefix máŋ- in 1.1.8.2.5
and 1.1.8.2.6; the unit 'intermittent' is symbolized by CVCV reduplication.

It is likewise possible to have the following contrasts:

*(1.1.8.2.7) masantíŋ ya # iŋ anák
The child is pretty

* maŋa+santíŋ la # diŋ ánák >
majasantíŋ la # diŋ ánák
The children are pretty

*(1.1.8.2.8) mamamaté ya # iŋ manúk
The chicken is dying

* máŋa+matáy la # diŋ manúk >
máŋamaté la # diŋ manúk
The chickens are dying

In the above sentences, the infix -ŋa- in the second of each pair of sentences is an incorporated plural marker from the subject N; such incorporated plural specification will be treated as a postsemantic process in Chapter II. It must not be confused with the inflectional unit 'repetitive', although in process V's, -ŋa- is ambiguous, since it may mean either 'repeatedly' or 'plural subject' or sometimes both:

*(1.1.8.2.9) máŋapatalúras ya # iŋ anák
The child is slipping unintentionally repeatedly
(1.1.8.2.10) māŋapatulúras la # diŋ ának

The children are slipping unintentionally repeatedly
The children are slipping (with plural incorporation) unintentionally
The children are slipping (with plural incorporation) unintentionally repeatedly

where mipa- symbolizes 'unintentionally' and -ŋa- symbolizes either 'repeatedly' or 'incorporated plural subject marker' or both. Undoubtedly, there is a similarity between the notion of repetition and the notion of plurality; in the case of process V's, the common notion seems to be diverging into two distinct notions. In any case, instances of plural subject incorporation into V will be discussed once more in Chapter II as instances of a postsemantic process.

It is possible to have both 'perseverative' and 'repetitive' cooccur:

(1.1.8.2.11) máŋlákad neŋ máŋlákad # i Pédru
Pedro keeps on walking repeatedly

(1.1.8.2.12) máŋlakálákad neŋ máŋlakálákad # i Pédru
Pedro keeps on walking intermittently

The relevant semantic verb inflectional rules are:
1.1.8.3. Verb Inflectional Units: Aspect.

Consider the sentence:

(1.1.8.3.1) mákalákad ya # i Pédrú
Pedro is able to walk

where the abilitative state V mákalákad 'able to walk (lit. walk+abilitativizer )' must be inflectionally specified as generic, in the sense of a permanent or habitual disposition. Now, this generic ability may be either actual or nonactual. If nonactual, one says:

(1.1.8.3.2) makálákad ya # i Pédrú
Pedro will be able to walk

If actual, it may be further specified as completed:

(1.1.8.3.3) mékalákad ya # i Pédrú
Pedro was able to walk
Nonstate V's may likewise be specified as generic in the sense of 'having a timeless propensity to do such and such a thing or to undergo such and such a process' (see Chafe 1970b:271). The notion 'generic' may be exemplified better by using a frequentative time N with V:

(1.1.8.3.4) lálákad ya # i Pédro # aldóldó  
Pedro walks every day

(* aldó+aldó < * aldáw+aldáw 'daily (lit. sun+sun)'). Instead of generic, a nonstate V may be specified as actual, in which case it must be further specified as either completed or durative. An example of -actual specification is:

(1.1.8.3.5) lumákad ya # i Pédro  
Pedro will walk

It should be noted that -actual specification is likewise used for commands, since commands are intrinsically -actual:

(1.1.8.3.6) lumákad ka  
Walk!

It is likewise possible for a -actual and -state V to be generic:
(1.1.8.3.7) lumákad ka # aldóldó
   Walk every day!

If V is actual completed, one says:

(1.1.8.3.8) línákad ya # i Pédru
   Pedro walked

If V is actual durative, one says:

(1.1.8.3.9) lálákad ya # i Pédru
   Pedro is walking [right now]

It should be noted that the symbolization of actual durative aspect is homophonous with the symbolization of generic (see 1.1.8.3.4). Moreover, if a nonstate V is specified as actual and completed, it may be further specified as immediate:

(1.1.8.3.10) kalákadlákad na pá muŋ Pédru
   Pedro has just now walked

where the specification immediate occurs only when V has no other specifications occurring with it which are eventually
symbolized by affixes; no other affix, in other words, may occur with ka- and reduplication. V's specified as immediate are likewise peculiar insofar as no subject occurs in such sentences and the particles *pá? mu? 'just now' must accompany V.

In Pampangan, aspectual specification is separate from temporal specification. It is thus possible to say:

(1.1.8.3.11) púputut yaŋ dútug # i Pédru

and mean both

Pedro is cutting wood
Pedro was cutting wood

Tense or time specification is disambiguated by a contextual time adverb which may be explicitly coded:

(1.1.8.3.11a) púputut yaŋ dútug # i Pédru # nápun
Pedro was cutting wood yesterday

(1.1.8.3.11b) púputut yaŋ dútug # i Pédru # géni
Pedro is cutting wood now (or today)

Sentences such as the ones above will be discussed in Chapter III at greater length.

Although there is an intrinsic semantic connection between event and time, what seems to be cognitively salient for Pampangan V's are such semantic dimensions
as generic and nongeneric, actual and nonactual (potential),
durative and nondurative (continuative and noncontinuative),
completed and noncompleted, and if completed, immediate
or nonimmediate. (The dimensions actual/potential and
durative/nondurative are from Bloomfield 1917.)

The generalizations on inflectional aspect for
abilitative state $V$'s and for nonstate $V$'s may be
formulated thus:

(SVIR 5) \[
\begin{array}{c}
  \text{state} \\
  \text{abilitative} \\
  \text{root} + \text{abilitativizer} \\
  \rightarrow \\
  \text{generic} \\
\end{array}
\]

(SVIR 6) \[
\begin{array}{c}
  \text{state} \\
  \text{abilitative} \\
  \text{root} + \text{abilitativizer} \\
  \rightarrow \\
  \text{generic} \\
  \rightarrow \\
  \text{actual} \\
\end{array}
\]

(SVIR 7) \[
\begin{array}{c}
  \text{state} \\
  \text{abilitative} \\
  \text{root} + \text{abilitativizer} \\
  \rightarrow \\
  \text{generic} \\
  \rightarrow \\
  \text{completed} \\
\end{array}
\]

(SVIR 8) \[
\begin{array}{c}
  \text{state} \\
  \text{root} \\
  \rightarrow \\
  \{ \text{generic} \} \\
\end{array}
\]

(SVIR 9) \[
\begin{array}{c}
  \text{state} \\
  \text{root} \\
  \rightarrow \\
  \{ \text{completed} \} \\
  \rightarrow \\
  \{ \text{durative} \} \\
\end{array}
\]
(SVIR 10) V
-state
-other specifications
root
actual
completed ----> immediate

By way of summary, the various aspectual possibilities of state and nonstate V's will be exemplified:

V state root+positionlizer -generic
makabuklát ya # iŋ pasbúl
The door is open

V state noun root+plenitivizer
generic
masantíŋ ya # iŋ anák
The child is pretty

V state abilitative action verb root+ abilitativizer
generic ₁
makálakad ya # iŋ anák
The child will be able to walk

V state abilitative action verb root+ abilitativizer
generic ₁ actual
mákalakad ya # iŋ anák
The child is able to walk
V state abilitative action verb root+ abilitativizer generic l actual completed mékalákad ya # iŋ anák
The child was able to walk

V -state (action) root generic l álalákid ya # iŋ anák
The child walks [habitually]

V action root actual -actual lumákid ya # iŋ anák
The child will walk
lumákid ka
Walk!

V action root actual -actual generic lumákid ka # aldóldó
Walk every day!

V action root actual durative l álalákid ya # iŋ anák
The child is walking [right now]

V action root actual completed linákid ya # iŋ anák
The child walked
kalákad lákad na pá mu niŋ anák

The child has just now walked

1.1.8.4. Verb Inflectional Units: Negative.

Consider the sentences:

(1.1.8.4.1) é ya maganaká? # iŋ anák
The child is not kind

(1.1.8.4.2) é ya dáragúl # iŋ anák
The child is not growing

(1.1.8.4.3) é ya mámanján # iŋ anák
The child is not eating

(1.1.8.4.4) é ya púpútut dútuŋ # iŋ anák
The child is not cutting wood

The unit 'negative' is an inflectional unit insofar as it does not narrow down the choice of a lexical unit for V but may specify any V root. The relevant rule is:

(SVIR II) V

root →

negative

The unit 'negative' is postsemantically linearized by being placed before the verb root and is eventually symbolized
by an unbound and accented particle é.

It is interesting to note that Pampangan, unlike English and the other Indo-European languages, has for practical purposes no derivational unit *negativizer*, as one finds, for example, in an English noun such as *dis-honor*, an adjective such as *un-common*, and a verb such as *mis-manage*. Negative counterparts of state V's or traditional adjectives are either inflectionally negated as in

\[(1.1.8.4.5) \quad \text{é ya máyap # iŋ anák} \]

The child is not good

or another root is used, as in

\[(1.1.8.4.6) \quad \text{marók ya # iŋ anák} \]

The child is bad

It is only with a small set of verb roots that the unit *negativizer* occurs as a derivational unit:

\[(1.1.8.4.7) \quad \text{atí yu # i Péáru} \quad \text{Pedro is present} \]
\text{alá yu # i Péáru} \quad \text{Pedro is absent}

\[(1.1.8.4.8) \quad \text{atín yu # i Péáru} \quad \text{Pedro has [something]} \]
\text{alá ya # i Péáru} \quad \text{Pedro has nothing [of something]} \]
(1.1.8.4.9) iyá pin # iyán That is he, indeed
alíwa pin # iyán That is not he, indeed

where the second V in the three pairs is present+negativizer,
have+negativizer, and predicate noun+negativizer, respectively.
Considering the myriad agglutinative possibilities of
derivation in Pampangan, the restraint in the language
with regard to the derivational unit negativizer is
surprising and perhaps typologically significant.

1.2. Specifying N. This second part of the chapter
describes the selectional units for N's, noun derivational
processes, and noun inflectional units.

1.2.1. Selectional Units. The selectional units
of N serve to narrow down through successive specifications
the lexical units of the N's accompanying V. For the
most part, these selectional units are available to all
languages (doubtless a result of the basic sameness of
human nature and of human experience); specifications
become more detailed as lexical units peculiar to a
culture are described.

A distinction must first be made between abstract
and nonabstract (or concrete) nouns in Pampangan:

(1.2.1.1) masantín ya # iŋ báru mu
Your dress is pretty

(1.2.1.2) máyap # iŋ bálak mu
Your opinion is sound
(* ma+santín 'pretty (lit. comeliness+plenitivizer),
    báru? 'dress', mu 'your', * ma+káyap 'sound (lit. goodness+
    plenitivizer)', bálak 'opinion'). In the first sentence,
báru? is nonabstract and certain of its specifications
are incorporated into V and eventually symbolized as
ya 'it'; in the second sentence, however, bálak is abstract
and none of its specifications are incorporated into V.
The relevance of the semantic distinction is thus attested
by the presence or absence of the output of a postsemantic
process to be described in Chapter II as one of incorporation.

It will be shown in Chapter II that nominals (verb
root+nominalizer) as well as the outputs of nominalization
processes are considered as abstract; hence, incorporation
processes do not apply to such.

bálak is an inherently abstract noun root. In
addition to inherently abstract noun roots, there are
many derived abstract noun roots in Pampangan, the outputs
of a very productive derivational process; for example,
táu 'man' > * ka+táu+an 'man-ness=human-ness'.

N may likewise be specified as count. Thus, one may say:

(1.2.1.3) mámanján yaŋ aduáŋ ébun # i Pédrú
    Pedro is eating two eggs

but not
(1.2.1.4) máğán yaŋ aduâŋ nási? # i Pédrnu

Pedro is eating two rices

(máŋán 'to eat', aduâŋ 'two', ébun 'egg', nási? 'rice').

ébun is a count N and may be accompanied by a quantitative numerical specification aduâŋ but not nási? which although nonabstract is noncount. Noncount N's (like abstract N's) do not undergo incorporation into the verb phrase:

(1.2.1.5) maputí ya # iŋ ébun

The egg is white

(1.2.1.6) maputí? # iŋ nási?

The rice is white

(* ma+putí? 'white (lit. quality of being white+plenitivizer)').

Nonabstract (count or noncount) N's may likewise be further specified as potent, that is, as having some intrinsic motile power, as in:

(1.2.1.7)* biklát na ya niŋ ājing # iŋ pasbúl >

biklát ne niŋ ājin. # iŋ pasbúl

The door was opened by the wind

(biklát 'opened' from buklát 'to open', ājing 'wind', pasbúl 'door'), where ājin is analyzable as an agent which is redundantly potent, as was discussed in section
1.1.5. One can likewise say:

(1.2.1.8)* síníra? na ya niŋ impún # iŋ baldósa >
síníra ne niŋ impún # iŋ baldósa

The concrete floor was cracked by the tree (for example, if its roots crack the floor from beneath)

(síra? 'to break', impún 'tree', baldósa 'tile floor'
from Spanish baldosa 'paving'), where the tree, a count
N, is a potent agent of destruction.

N's which are count and potent may be further
specified as animate, as in:

(1.2.1.9) matápan ya # iŋ ásu

The dog is ferocious

(* matápan 'ferocious (lit. quality of being aggressive+ plenitivizer)'), where ásu is count, potent, and animate.
Nonanimate N's may be further specified as body of water, place, object, and the like (these will undoubtedly constitute a large set of classificatory nouns or superordinates).

The following examples may be cited:

(1.2.1.10) malápad ya # iŋ ilug

The river is wide
(*) ma+lápēd 'wide (lit. width+plenitivizer)', wherelug is count, -animate, and body of water (and perhaps, in certain contexts, potent).

(1.2.1.11) maragúl ya # iŋ báryu
The village is big

(*) ma+dagúl 'big (lit. size+plenitivizer)', báryu 'village' from Spanish barrio), where báryu is count, -animate, and place.

(1.2.1.12) mátas ya # iŋ gusáli?
The building is tall

(*) ma+taʔás 'tall (lit. height+plenitivizer)', gusáli?
'building'), where gusáli? is count, -animate, and object.

N's specified as animate may be further specified as human and/or feminine:

(1.2.1.13) sásabsáb ya # iŋ ásu
The dog is devouring [food]

(sabsáb 'to devour (cf. German fressen)', ásu 'dog'), where the verb root is specifically reserved for nonhuman animate agents; of course, if one intends to be pejorative, the verb root sabsáb may be predicated of human N's. Both
human and nonhuman N's may occur with *manjkán, a different root.

It has sometimes been claimed that Pampangan and the other Philippine languages in general do not mark for masculine and feminine gender. This observation is inaccurate. It is true that the distinction masculine/feminine is not marked in pronouns. However, the occurrence of such noun pairs as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>laláki</th>
<th>'man'</th>
<th>babáyi</th>
<th>'woman'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>táta</td>
<td>'father'</td>
<td>indáʔ~</td>
<td>'mother'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kákaʔ</td>
<td>'older brother'</td>
<td>áti</td>
<td>'older sister'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bápa</td>
<td>'uncle'</td>
<td>dára</td>
<td>'aunt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tátiyo&lt;</td>
<td>'rooster'</td>
<td>gaindúʔ</td>
<td>'hen'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* tátiyaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bulúgan</td>
<td>'male pig'</td>
<td>gaindúʔ</td>
<td>'sow'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

clearly shows that the semantic unit 'feminine' is necessary for characterizing N's. The masculine/feminine distinction is universal, although manifested in different ways in different languages. In Pampangan (and the other Philippine languages), it is less overtly marked. Even in selectional restrictions between V and N, however, the semantic unit 'feminine' must be considered. One can say:
(1.2.1.14) malagú ya # iŋ babáyi

The woman is beautiful

(* ma+lagú? 'beautiful (lit. beauty+plenitivizer)',
babáyi 'woman'), but one would not predicate malagú?
of a man, unless one intends to imply that the man is
effeminate. Instead, one would use either sexually
neutral masantíŋ 'good-looking' or sexually nonneutral
(-feminine) guápu, from Spanish guapo. Other state V
roots which demand a feminine-specified patient N are
malandíŋ 'wanton' and malastúd 'flirtatious'.

Human N's may be further specified as 'first
person' (referring to the speaker) and/or 'second person'
(referring to the hearer). The selection of first and/or
second person precludes lexical specification of N;
instead, the N specifications, together with inflectional
specifications, are directly symbolized by traditional
pronouns (pronouns will be discussed in detail in Chapter II):

(1.2.1.15) lálákd ku I am walking
(1.2.1.16) lálákd ka You are walking
(1.2.1.17) lálákd katá You and I am walking

Moreover, nonabstract count N's, animate or nonanimate
(if animate, neither first nor second person), may be further
specified as collective or unique. Collective specification
must be distinguished from inflectional plural; there are noun roots which inherently refer to a collection of persons, places, objects, and the like, which in turn may be specified inflectionally as plural. Unique N's are traditional proper nouns. Thus:

(1.2.1.18) atí yu # kiŋ balé # iŋ púluŋ

The council is in the house

where púluŋ 'council' is a collective human N.

(1.2.1.19) dakál ya kalakutí? # i Pédru

Pedro has lots of odds-and-ends

(dakál 'lots of', kalakutí? 'odds and ends'), where kalakutí? is a collective object N.

(1.2.1.20) atí yu # i Pédru

Pedro is present

where Pédru is a unique human N.

In addition, a human N may be specified as feminine:

(1.2.1.21) atí yu # i Maryá

Maria is present

where Maryá is a unique feminine human N.
In summary, N's may be specified as abstract. Nonabstract N's may be count and/or potent. Count potent N's may be further specified as animate. Nonanimate count N's may be further specified as body of water, place, object, and the like, while animate N's may be further specified as human and/or feminine. Human N's may be further specified as first and/or second person. Nonabstract count N's (if they are not specified as first and/or second person) may be further specified as collective or unique. These generalizations may be formulated through the following rules:
(S 1.2.1) \[ N \longrightarrow \text{abstract} \]

(S 1.2.2)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{N} & \quad \text{abstract} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{(count)} \\
\text{-abstract} & \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{(potent)}
\end{align*}
\]

(S 1.2.3)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{N} & \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{animate} \\
\text{count} & \\
\text{potent}
\end{align*}
\]

(S 1.2.4)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{N} & \quad \text{count} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} 
\text{body of water} \\
\text{place} \\
\text{object}
\end{cases} \\
\text{-animate} & \quad \longrightarrow \quad \ldots
\end{align*}
\]

(S 1.2.5)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{N} & \quad \text{animate} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{(feminine)}
\end{align*}
\]

(S 1.2.6)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{N} & \quad \text{human} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{(first person)} \\
\text{human} & \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{(second person)}
\end{align*}
\]

(S 1.2.7)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{N} & \quad \text{count} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} 
\text{collective} \\
\text{unique}
\end{cases} \\
\text{-first person} & \\
\text{-second person}
\end{align*}
\]
Sample Lexical Rules

(LR 1.2.1) \[N \quad \text{abstract} \rightarrow \text{thought, opinion, man+}\]
\[\text{abstractivizer, VERB ROOT+}\]
\[\text{nominalizer, ...}\]

(LR 1.2.2) \[N \quad \text{count}\]
\[\text{body of water} \rightarrow \text{river, lake, stream, sea, ...}\]

(LR 1.2.3) \[N \quad \text{count}\]
\[\text{place} \rightarrow \text{country, city, municipality, ...}\]

(LR 1.2.4) \[N \quad \text{count}\]
\[\text{object} \rightarrow \text{stone, egg, chair, table, ...}\]

(LR 1.2.5) \[N \quad \text{potent}\]
\[\rightarrow \text{wind(air), water, fire, ...}\]

(LR 1.2.6) \[N \quad \text{count}\]
\[\text{potent} \rightarrow \text{tree, car, truck, ...}\]

(LR 1.2.7) \[N \quad \text{count}\]
\[\text{-potent} \rightarrow \text{rice, corn, sugar, ...}\]

(LR 1.2.8) \[N \quad \text{count}\]
\[\text{potent}\]
\[\text{animate} \rightarrow \text{dog, cat, horse, ...}\]
(LR 1.2.9) N count potent animate human → man, uncle, older brother,...

(LR 1.2.10) N count potent animate feminine → hen, sow,...

(LR 1.2.11) N count potent animate human feminine → woman, aunt, older sister,...

(LR 1.2.12) N count object collective → odds-and-ends, equipment, furniture,...

Lexical units for 'equipment' and 'furniture' in Pampangan, kasANKápan and kuéblis from Spanish muebles, are count nouns.

(LR 1.2.13) N count object unique → Rizal Monument, Spoliarum (a famous painting by a local artist),...

(LR 1.2.14) N count place collective → archipelago, mountain range, house+locativizer (a place where houses are clustered together=village),...

(LR 1.2.15) N count place unique → Manila, Pasay City, The Philippines,...
(LR 1.2.16) N count ———> (no examples found in the data)
body of water
collective

(LR 1.2.17) N count ———> Pasig River, Lake Taal, Pampanga River,
body of water
unique

(LR 1.2.18) N count ———> herd,...
animate
collective

(LR 1.2.19) N count ———> Bantay (a dog's name), Kastanyu (a horse's name),...
animate
unique

(LR 1.2.20) N count ———> (no examples were found in the data)
animate
feminine
collective

(LR 1.2.21) N count ———> Kuning (a female cat's name), Chiquita (a female dog's name),...
animate
feminine
unique

(LR 1.2.22) N count ———> committee, council, family,...
animate
human
collective

(LR 1.2.23) N count ———> Juan, Pedro, Mario,
animate
human
unique
Bayani, Lapu-Lapu,...
(LR 1.2.24) N
count
animate
human
feminine
collective
(examples were loanwords from English and Spanish:
Catholic Women's League, YWCA,...)

(LR 1.2.25) N
count
animate
human
feminine
unique
Maria, Ana, Pilar,
Liwayway, Bulaklak,
Luningning

(In those N matrices where no examples were found in the data, the gap is accidental, since the combinations are well within the system as possible specifications of lexical items. It is probably in these areas of the lexicon where gaps exist that borrowing is most frequent.)

The influence of Christianity and of Spanish culture has done away with the native names completely in most of the Philippine languages, except in the languages of nonChristian minorities. Names for women such as
Liwayway 'lit. Dawn', Luningning 'lit. Light', Bulaklak 'lit. Flower' and for men such as Lapu-Lapu 'lit. Grupa Fish (perhaps with totemic overtones)', Bayani 'lit. Hero' are best considered as monolexemic idioms which in the process of semantic generation would have to be literalized (see Chafe 1970b:63-5). Sentential names such as 'He Who Laugh_s', quite common in Amerindian languages, are not found in Pampangan. Such descriptive appellations may
be used ad hoc to refer to somebody; in such cases, the sentence contains a relative clause:

(1.2.1.22) atí yu # in dínatág nápu

He who came yesterday is present

1.2.2. Noun Derivational Processes. Besides verb derivational processes (verb-to-verb; verb-to-noun) discussed in section 1.1.7, there are likewise noun derivational processes (noun-to-noun; noun-to-verb) by which inherent nonstate and nonevent roots become other subtypes of nonstate and nonevent roots or become derived state and event roots. Once a noun root has been derived into a verb root, it may undergo the same derivational processes that a verb root may undergo (see section 1.1.7). In this section, for purposes merely of illustration of various possibilities, only one noun root, aná'k 'child', will be used, and its derivational possibilities presented as a paradigm.

1.2.2.1. Noun-to-Noun Derivational Processes. As with verb roots, derivational processes not only add meaning but also, at times, change the subcategorization of N. From the basic root anák, the following nouns may be derived:
pékaanák  \textit{child+substitutivizer}

'one who substitutes as a child to someone, for example, a foster-child'

télaanák  \textit{child+imitativizer}

'a child-like object, for example, a cookie shaped like a child'

anákanákan  \textit{child+fictivizer}

'a make-believe child'

miának  \textit{child+dual counter}

'a group of two children'

\textit{anákanákan} is used in child's play; otherwise, in ordinary contexts, it would be pejorative. \textit{mi}- is highly productive and occurs most often with kinship terms: \textit{mitáta} 'father and child (lit. father+dual counter)', \textit{miindá?} 'mother and child (lit. mother+dual counter)', \textit{mikapatád} 'sibling and sibling (lit. sibling+dual counter)'. Initially, it might be characterized as a marker of mutuality. However, its occurrence with a kinship-neutral term such as \textit{anák} makes it more plausible to place it in the subset of counters. (It has been shown that there is a singulary counter symbolized by \textit{ka}-, as in \textit{kapútut} 'a slice'.) Although \textit{mi}- is a dual counter, it requires as a context some relation of mutuality.

\textit{Bergaño} likewise lists \textit{kayanakán}, which has several meanings. It may mean 'the state of being young', in other words, a nominal. \textit{Bergaño} glosses it as 'niñež' or 'childhood', in the frame of reference adopted in this
study, child+temporal measure marker. In my dialect, it can also mean 'the set of children', hence, child+universal collectivizer.

It should be noted that in the first, third, and fourth examples, N does not change its subcategorization; in the second example, however, N becomes -animate and -human, an object. In the fifth example, when kayanakán means 'childhood', N is abstract; when it means 'the set of children', N is collective.

The relevant rules may be formulated thus:

(DR 15) N ------→ N
root root + \{substitutivizer, fictivizer, dual counter\}

(DR 16) N ------→ N
root object root + imitativizer

(DR 17) N ------→ N
root abstract root + temporal measure marker

(DR 18) N ------→ N
root collective root + universal collectivizer
As DR 15 has been formulated, it is possible to generate a noun such as pékaanákanákan 'that which substitutes as a make-believe child (lit. child+fictivizer+substitutivizer)', admittedly an unusual combination. It is conceivable, however, in child's play, for an object of some kind to substitute as a doll or make-believe child. It seems, however, that DR 15-18 are disjunctively ordered with regard to each other, since other combinations were tried and were found to be unacceptable.

1.2.2.2. Noun-to-Verb Derivational Processes.

1.2.2.2.1. Noun to State Verbs. Consider the sentence:

(1.2.2.2.1.1) anák ya # i Pédru

The sentence is ambiguous. It has two possible meanings:

Pedro is a child

Pedro is young

It is not perfectly clear whether anák is a homonym for two separate roots, 'child' and 'young'. Tentatively, both the predicate noun and the state V (a traditional adjective) will be analyzed as derived from an inherent noun root, anák 'child'. For the first meaning, the
following rule will be necessary:

\[(DR \ 20') \quad N \quad \text{abstract} \quad \text{state} \quad \text{root} \quad \text{root + descriptivizer} \]

where descriptivizer is paraphrasable as 'having some salient characteristic of N', in this case, 'child', the characteristic being 'youth'. In a more detailed description, there will have to be listed many types of descriptivizers.

In turn, anák 'young' is derivable into an abstract N, a nominal, by DR 10 (see page 128): anák 'young' \(\rightarrow\) kayanakán 'the state of being young (lit. child+descriptivizer+nominalizer)', homophonous with but distinct from kayanakán 'childhood' and kayanakán 'the set of children'.

Again, one may have the sentence:

\[(1.2.2.2.1.2) \quad \text{makianák ya } # \ i \text{ Pédru} \]
\[\quad \text{Pedro has a child/children} \]

where the state V is analyzable as child+habitivizer.

The above sentence is distinct from although comparable to

\[(1.2.2.2.1.3) \quad \text{atín yaŋ anák } # \ i \text{ Pédru} \]
\[\quad \text{Pedro has a child/children} \]

atín is an inherent state V accompanied by a patient N anák and a beneficiary N Pédru, whereas makianák is a
derived state V accompanied by a beneficiary N Pédrú, with the semantic patient incorporated into the derived state V. Note that the copier ya 'he', which is incorporated into V and follows the verb root, is placed after makianák and not after maki-. The derivalional rule necessary may be formulated thus:

\[(\text{DR 21'}) \quad N \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{state} \quad \text{habitve} \]

\[\text{root} \quad \text{root} + \text{habitivizer}\]

A similar derivational process is operative in

\[(1.2.2.2.1.4) \quad \text{mayanák ya # i Pédrú} \]

Pedro has many children

where the state V is analyzable as child+plenitivizer.

The unit plenitivizer, symbolized by ma-, is quite productive, as many examples in preceding sections have shown. DR 21' must therefore be added to:

\[(\text{DR 21a'}) \quad N \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{state} \quad \text{habitve} \]

\[\text{root} \quad \text{root} + \text{plenitivizer}\]
1.2.2.2.2. Nouns to Process Verbs. The following sentence is ambiguous:

(1.2.2.2.2.1) mágiyanák ya # i Pédrú
Pedro is becoming a child
Pedro is becoming young

In the first meaning, the derived process V is analyzable as child+fierientizer; in the second meaning, the derived process V is analyzable as child+descriptivizer+fierientizer. The first derived root is the output of a noun-to-process V derivation; the second derived root is the output of a state-to-process V derivation already formulated as DR 1 (see page 127). The rule for the first process may be formulated thus:

(DR 22') N ----→ V  
     root                root + fierientizer  

The corresponding nominal of both process V's is pámagiyanák 'the process of becoming a child/ the process of becoming young'.

There is another state-to-process verb derivation exemplified by:
(1.2.2.2.2) méyanák ya # i Pédr u
Pedro turned youthful [in appearance]

The derived process verb root * mayanák is defective, however, insofar as it occurs only with actual completed aspect when it is used with the meaning 'to turn youthful [in appearance]'. The derived process verb root is analyzable as child+descriptivizer+vertitivizer, and its corresponding nominal is pánayanák 'the process of turning youthful [in appearance]'.

Homophonous with * ma+anák 'to turn youthful [in appearance]' is *ma+anák 'to suffer as a result of having many children':

(1.2.2.2.3) mayayanák ya # i Pédr u
Pedro is suffering from having many children

where the derived process V is analyzable as child+plenitivizer+patientizer and is the output of a state-to-process V derivation (DR 1), hence, needing no separate formulation. The corresponding nominal is pánayanák 'the process of suffering from having many children' homophonous with the formative meaning 'the process of turning youthful [in appearance]'.
Likewise directly traceable to a state V makianáŋk 'to have a child/children' is the process V magkaanáŋk 'to be in the process of having a child':

(1.2.2.2.4) mágka(y)anáŋk ya # i Pédrú
Pedro is in the process of having
a child= Pedro is becoming a father

where the derived process V is analyzable as child+
habitivizer+inchoativizer. The corresponding nominal
for the process V is pámágka(y)anáŋk 'the process of becoming
a father'.

Consider now the sentence:

(1.2.2.2.5) mipapaŋanáŋk ya # iŋ bígut
The infant is being born

where the derived process V is child+ processivizer. The
rule is statable as:

(DR 23') N ----→ V
process

root root + processivizer

The corresponding nominal is pámipaŋanáŋk 'the process of
being born', although the more common formative is páñabaít, from another root, mibaít 'to be born'.

It is possible for mipañanák 'to be born' to be accompanied by a source N:

\[(1.2.2.2.5a)\] mipañanák ya # kañ Maryá # iñ bigut

The child is being born of Mary

where Maryá seems to be a source N rather than an agent N.

Subsequently, it will be shown that there is a derived process-action V, mañanák 'to bear a child', where there is a clear agent N accompanying V.

1.2.2.2.3. Nouns to Action Verbs. In the sentence:

\[(1.2.2.2.3.1)\] máñanák ya # i Maryá

Maria is giving birth [to a child]

where the derived V, at least in Pampangan, seems to be an action V; the prefix mañ- (ñmag-) usually occurs in action V's. The derived action V is analyzable as child-action verbalizer,
where the unit action verbalizer is an ad hoc label paraphrasable as 'to produce N'. It is possible to specify such an action V as completable, in which case it will be accompanied by a complement N:

\[(1.2.2.2.3.1a) \text{ mášanáč yäŋ bígut } \# \text{ i Maryá} \]

Maria is giving birth to an infant

The derivation may be formulated thus:

\[(\text{DR 2}^{4\prime}) \quad N \quad \rightarrow \quad V \quad \text{action} \quad \text{(completable)}
\]

\[\quad \text{root} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{root + action verbalizer} \]

The corresponding nominal is pámašanáč 'the act of giving birth'.

From the derived action root mášanáč 'to give birth', some state V's may likewise be derived. One may say:

\[(1.2.2.2.3.2) \quad \text{mapášanáč ya } \# \text{ i Maryá} \]

Maria is inclined to give birth often

where the derived state V is analyzable as child+ action verbalizer+inclinatorizer. The etymology of mapášanáč is not clear; the following is a tentative reconstruction:

\[^2 \text{ * mapáš+maŋ+anáč >mapášanáč (haplology?)} \]. The corresponding nominal is kapášanákan 'the state of being inclined to give birth often'. One may likewise say:
(1.2.2.3.3) pálanákan 'ya # i Maryá
Maria is naturally inclined to
give birth often= Maria is fertile

where the derived state V is analyzable as child+action
verbalizer+inclinativizer. Were the agglutination
regular, one would expect:* pala+manj+aná+an; however,
manj- is deleted.

From the derived action root manjaná 'to give birth',
one may likewise derived certain nouns.

There is a word kapájaná 'an associate in childbirth',
from * ka+manj+aná 'lit. child+action verbalizer+associativizer'.
For example:

(1.2.2.3.4) kapájaná neñ Maryá # i Ána
Ana is [an] associate of Marú in childbirth
(for example, if Ana gave birth more
or less at the same time)

where 'associate in childbirth' is a predicate noun.

Another interesting derivative from manjaná 'to give
birth' is the Pampangan word for 'birth tract (uterus and
vagina)', pálanákan (note the homonymy with pálanákan 'naturally
inclined to give birth often'), which may be analyzed as child+action verbalizer+perlocativizer, where perlocativizer is paraphrasable as 'place through which'.

Likewise directly derivable from mananak 'to give birth' is the derived noun root pananak 'first-born child', analyzable as child+action verbalizer+primogeniture marker.

Still other noun derivatives from 'to give birth' are panunakán 'nephew/niece', analyzable as child+action verbalizer+first descending collateralizer, and pipanánakan 'a place where one gives birth= maternity hospital', analyzable as child+action verbalizer+locativizer.

There is yet another noun-to-action V derivation productive of a subset of semantically related forms. Thus:

(1.2.2.2.3.5) mananak ya # i Maryá

Maria is dealing in children

The sentence of course makes sense only in a culture which permitted slavery. However, the derivational process itself is quite productive and is used in describing various occupational activities, as in * mag+asan 'to deal in fish (lit. fish+occupationalizer)', * mag+pálay 'to deal in unhusked rice (lit. unhusked rice+occupationalizer)'. (DR 24') must be added to, therefore:

(DR 24a') N \(\rightarrow\) V action

root \(\rightarrow\) root + occupationalizer
where the unit *occupationalizer* is paraphrasable as 'to engage in buying and selling N'.

Related in phonological shape but semantically problematic is derivative *kamagának*:

\[(1.2.2.3.6)* \text{ka-mag-ának ná ya náq Pédrú ná Suán} \]

\[\text{kamagának náq Pédrú ná Suán} \]

Juan is [a] relative of Pedro

where the state \(V\) is a predicate noun, with the noun analyzable as *child+action verbalizer+associativizer*. Although *kamagának* 'relative' is closer in phonological shape to *maganák* 'to deal in children', the unit *occupationalizer* is clearly absent in the former; *kamagának* is actually closer semantically to *kapánának* 'associate in childbirth'.

*associativizer*, symbolized like \(\text{associativizer}^2\), by \(\text{ka-}\) is paraphrasable as 'associated in childbirth by kinship ties'.

*kamagának* 'relative' may itself be derived into an action \(V\):

\[(1.2.2.3.7) \text{ká-kamagának ya # i Pédrú} \]

Pedro is engaged in the activity of making relatives (e.g., through intermarriage)

where now the derived action \(V\) is analyzable as *child+action verbalizer +associativizer +action verbalizer*, where \(\text{action verbalizer}^2\) is paraphrasable as 'to make [somebody] one's N'.
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It would seem that a proper accounting of the derived action root 'to make relatives' demands such a semantic reconstruction, at least for etymological purposes. This is not to claim, however, that the postulated concatenation of units must be psychologically present to the language performer; it seems more plausible to hypothesize that some new semantic unit 'relative' is stored which is later postsemantically literalized, as is the case with idioms.

The corresponding nominal of 'to make relatives' is págagamágának 'the action of making relatives'. The relevant derivational rule is:

\[(\text{DR 24b'}) \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{N} \\ \text{root} \end{array} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{V} \\ \text{action} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{root} + \text{action} \\ \text{verbalizer} \end{array} \]

\[\begin{array}{c} \text{1.2.2.2.4. Nouns to Process-Action Verbs. In the} \\ \text{sentence} \\ \begin{array}{c} (1.2.2.2.4.1) * \text{ánakán na ya naq Maryá # i Pédrú >} \\ \text{ánakán neq Maryá # i Pédrú} \\ \text{Pedro is being made [a] child by} \\ \text{Maria (e.g., through adoption)} \\ \end{array} \\ \end{array} \]

the derived process-action V is analyzable as child+action verbalizer +processivizer. It seems that the action of making somebody one's (adopted) child is comparable to the action of
making (somebody) a relative, hence, \textit{action verbalizer} .

On the other hand, the presence of a patient $N$ makes the postulation of the unit \textit{processivizer} necessary (a result of an action to process-action $V$ derivation). The corresponding nominal is \textit{pämaganák 'the act of making someone one's child (for example, through adoption)', homophonous with 'the act of dealing in children'. (The derived process-action $V$ anakán was not accepted by all informants; the preferred root for 'to adopt' is * ampun+án.)}

Sentence (1.2.2.2.4.1) above may be inflected for actual completed aspect:

\begin{quote}
(1.2.2.2.4.1a)\* in+anák na ya naŋ Maryá # i Pédru>
inanák neŋ Maryá # i Pédru
Pedro was made a child by Maria (for example, through adoption)
\end{quote}

From \textit{inanák} may be derived a noun root, \textit{inának} (note the accentual shift), meaning 'godchild' and semantically analyzable as \textit{child+action verbalizer +processivizer +ritual kinship marker}.

Like \textit{kamagának 'relative' inának 'godchild' may be derived into a verb root. There is a derived action $V$, maginának 'to engage in the activity of acting as godparent', analyzable as \textit{child+action verbalizer +processivizer+ritual kinship marker}}
marker+action verbalizer, as well as a derived process-action V, inánakán 'to make [somebody] one's godchild', analyzable as child+action verbalizer +processivizer

ritual kinship marker+action verbalizer +processivizer.

The corresponding nominal of both 'to engage in the activity of acting as godparent' and 'to make [somebody] one's godchild' is pámaginának.

A dialectal variant of (1.2.2.2.4.1a) is:

(1.2.2.2.4.1a') méyanák ya # kaŋ Maryá # i Pédu
Pedro was made [a] child by Maria
(for example, through adoption)

The corresponding nominal of the verb root in the above sentence is páñayanánák, which Bergaño glosses as 'filiación' or 'the process of being made someone's child (for example, through adoption)' and which is homophonous with 'the process of turning youthful [in appearance]'.

So far, no derivational process from noun to process-action V has been postulated, since the examples cited were accounted for by processes already formulated. In the sentence

(1.2.2.2.4.2)* anák+an na ya naŋ Pédu # i Maryá>
anákan neŋ Pédu # i Maryá
Maria will conceive by Pedro
the derived V seems to be a process-action V directly derivable from the noun root and analyzable as **child**-
**process-action verbalizer**. The latter label is ad hoc and is paraphrasable as 'to cause [somebody] to have N'. The correlative nominal is **pámagánakan** 'the act of begetting a child'. The derivational process may be formulated thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(DR 25')} & \quad N \quad \longrightarrow \quad V \\
& \text{process} \\
& \text{action} \\
\text{root} & \quad \text{root} + \text{process-action verbalizer}
\end{align*}
\]

1.2.2.2.5. Summary. By way of summary, the noun-to-verb derivational processes will be restated:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(DR 19)} & \quad N \quad \longrightarrow \quad V \\
& \text{state} \\
\text{root} & \quad \text{root} + \text{predicativizer} \\
\text{(DR 20)} & \quad N \quad \longrightarrow \quad V \\
& \text{state} \\
\text{root} & \quad \text{root} + \{\text{descriptivizer}\} \\
& \quad \{\text{habitivizer}\} \\
& \quad \{\text{plenitivizer}\} \\
\text{(DR 21)} & \quad N \quad \longrightarrow \quad V \\
& \text{process} \\
\text{root} & \quad \text{root} + \{\text{fierientizer}\} \\
& \quad \{\text{processivizer}\} \\
\text{(DR 22)} & \quad N \quad \longrightarrow \quad V \\
& \text{process} \\
& \text{directional} \\
& \text{from} \\
\text{root} & \quad \text{root} + \text{processivizer}_2
\end{align*}
\]
The following diagram shows the possibilities graphically; it includes only the noun-to-noun and noun-to-verb processes and not the verb-to-verb processes, which have already been discussed in section 1.1.7. To see the full derivational outline, Figure 3 should be consulted in conjunction with Figure 1 (on page 130). Following Figure 3 is a diagram showing the various possibilities derived from anāk which have been discussed, including the verb-to-verb and verb-to-noun examples cited.
The preceding sketch of the derivational possibilities of anák is far from complete. Each one of the derived V's from anák are subject to the same type of selectional specification for V's outlined in sections 1.1.1 to 1.1.5, many selectional specifications being eventually symbolized by affixes, for example: causative, associative, participative, reciprocative, exertive, abilitative. Corresponding to each V is its correlative nominal which is dependent on the phonological shape of the V with its affixes.

Moreover, derived noun roots such as inának 'godchild', kapánanák 'associate in childbirth', kamagának 'relative', pipánanákan 'maternity hospital', pálanákan 'birth tract' are subject to their own derivational possibilities, although it would seem that unlike their basic root, the possibilities are much fewer. It is not clear, however, whether this constraint is a rule of the language or a constraint arising from reality, from 'knowledge of the world'.

The paths hypothesized are tentative. A more exhaustive study of different subsets of the lexicon will give a clearer picture. In the course of the investigation, various alternatives kept presenting themselves; the diagram eventually presented was judged the most simple and most economical and the one most in keeping with the assumptions of the theory. The status of the derived nouns is especially problematic. Perhaps such derived N's as inának 'godchild' are synchronically units rather than concatenations of units, monolexemic idioms which may then be treated as basic units.
such as anák. Certainly, if this hypothesis is adopted, the alarming accretions of units postulated will be substantially reduced, at least for derived nouns.

That such paths exist seems incontrovertible. Moreover, that the treatment of the lexicon in an agglutinative language such as Pampangan demands a treatment of the kind outlined in this section seems clear. How to do this in the most economical and efficient and revealing way possible remains a problem. Certainly, it poses one of the most challenging aspects of Philippine and Austronesian linguistics. The problems are all the more formidable in a nonstandardized language such as Pampangan, with its many dialects as well as lack of a literature, since the productivity of certain processes seems to be idiosyncratic for individual language users. Multiple instances of polysemy compound the problem, itself a result of the multiple possibilities already alluded to. Many of the forms set down are undoubtedly lexicabilia, that is, combinations which were formed according to the derivational rules of the language but which perhaps have as yet not been actually used by an enterprising language performer until now. The fact that the forms were generated according to the rules of the language makes them comprehensible and acceptable to a native speaker. Until they are in general currency, these neologisms are unusual, of the same type as formatives in English such as deobnoxify
(the example is McCawley's), denoxify, antiquadrilateralism, or even some of the Latinate labels proposed in this study. That such open-endedness obtains in the lexicon of a language has long been known. When new forms are generated, the acceptability of such forms would have to be investigated. Operational tests would have to be constructed to measure the acceptability of these forms (see Zimmer 1964 for some suggestions on testing productivity in derivation). Moreover, when certain forms are found to be unacceptable, it is necessary to see if the constraint operative arises from the rules of the language or from the hearer's 'knowledge of the world'.

1.2.3. Noun Inflectional Units. After N has been specified by a root, basic or derived, it must be further specified by semantic units which do not depend on the lexical selection of N but which may specify any lexical unit; these N units, like their counterparts in V, are inflectional units.

Certain of these units ('plural', 'total') have already been mentioned in connection with specifications which an N accompanying a V must have as a result of prior specification of V (for example, it was stated that a partitive N is always plural and total when it accompanies a state V inflected as superlative). There are still other inflectional units which must be described.
N may be inflectionally specified as plural:

(1.2.3.1) masantīŋ ya # iŋ anāk  The child is pretty  
masantīŋ la # diŋ ának  The children are pretty

where plural is symbolized by the determiner diŋ and an accentual shift in the noun root. Plural specification is possible for N's which are not specified by a lexical unit but are instead specified by first and/or second person:

(1.2.3.2) masantīŋ ku  I am good-looking  
masantīŋ kamí  We are good-looking  
masantīŋ ka  You are good-looking  
masantīŋ kayú  You (plural) are good-looking  
masantīŋ katá  You and I are good-looking  
masantīŋ tāmu  You (plural) and I are good-looking  
You and we are good-looking  
You (plural) and we are good-looking

Unique N's are intrinsically -plural. However, there is a way of marking such unique N's as plural but only if they have been priorly marked as associative, in which case they have the meaning 'So-and-so and [his/her/its] companions':

(1.2.3.3) masantīŋ ya # i Pédr  Pedro is good-looking  
masantīŋ la # di Pédr  Pedro and [his] companions are good-looking
It is possible, of course, to say:

\[(1.2.3.4) \text{ masantíŋ} \text{ la} \# \text{ diŋ} \text{ Pédru} \]

The persons named Pedro are good-looking

Here, however, Pédru is no longer unique but by a derivational process, has become -unique, since one is no longer referring to an individual person but to a set of individuals having a common name.

An N, plural or -plural, may be specified as definite. Note the contrast in the two sentences:

\[(1.2.3.5) \text{ atíŋ} \text{ táo} \# \text{ kiŋ} \text{ balé} \text{ There is a man in the house} \]
\[\text{ atí yu} \# \text{ iŋ táo} \# \text{ kiŋ} \text{ balé The man is in the house} \]

in which the second instance of táo is definite. A definite N may be further specified as demonstrative:

\[(1.2.3.6) \text{ mátas} \text{ ya} \# \text{ itán} \text{ táo} \text{ That man (not near you nor me) is tall} \]

A variant of (1.2.3.6) is:

\[(1.2.3.6') \text{ mátas} \text{ ya} \# \text{ iŋ táoŋ} \text{ itá} \]

Still another variant is:
(1.2.3.6') mátas ya # itáŋ táuŋ itá

In this discussion, only sentences of the type (1.2.3.6) will be considered. In sentence (1.2.3.6), itá is a symbolization for definite demonstrative. Demonstrative may be specified further as proximate to speaker and/or proximate to hearer:

(1.2.3.7) mátas ya # iníŋ táu
This man (near me) is tall

(1.2.3.8) mátas ya # iyáŋ táu
That man (near you) is tall

(1.2.3.9) mátas ya # itíŋ táu
The man (near you and me) is tall

Nondefinite N's may be specified further as generic (if V is generic) or partitive.

(1.2.3.10) maragúl ya # iŋ patíŋ

The above sentence is ambiguous:

The whale (a definite one) is big
The whale (as a species) is big

In both sentences, the state V is inflectionally marked
as generic. In its second meaning, however, *in patíŋ* is a symbolization for 'the whale as a species', thus in effect making the whole statement a general statement. It seems, however, that when the unit 'generic' specifies a -plural N, N must be additionally specified as 'aggregate', since 'the whale as a species' refers to whales considered as an aggregation. The fact that 'generic' is eventually literalized by 'definite' may be formulated as a post-semantic process. It is possible for a general statement to have a plural subject:

(1.2.3.11) maragůł la # déŋ patíŋ

Those whales (near you) are big
Whales (in general) are big

In general statements, when N is plural and generic, a postsemantic literalization process occurs converting

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[plural]} \\
\text{[generic]}
\end{array}
\quad \text{into} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{[definite]} \\
\text{[demonstrative]} \\
\text{[proximate to hearer]}
\end{array}.
\]

It is not only state V's which are accompanied by a generic N:

(1.2.3.12) gágápaŋ ya # iŋ úlad

The worm (a definite one) is crawling
The worm (as a species) crawls
(1.2.3.13)  tágap la # déŋ úlad
Those worms (near you) are crawling
Worms (in general) crawl

As with state V's, for N to be generic, -state V must
be generic. Generic in -state V's is postsemantically
literalized as actual durative aspect.

For an example of -definite N specified as partitive,
one may cite:

(1.2.3.14)  mégan ya # kïŋ nási? # i Pédru
Pedro ate [some portion] of the rice

(1.2.3.15)  mégan ya # kariŋ dalandán # i Pédru
Pedro ate [some] of the oranges

Partitive N's present a problem. It seems that when
partitive occurs, an embedded V must be posited in
semantic structure. Thus, the structure of (1.2.3.15)
would seem to be:

```
      1
V
   / \
process
./. \.
action

\  /  /
-definite
  /\  /
orange

\  /
patient

\  /
agent

\  /
Pedro

\  /
state

\  /
partitive

\  /
orange
definite

\  /
plural
```

What this analysis tries to show is that the oranges
which were eaten by Pedro are part of a larger batch of oranges which are presupposed as known by the speaker and hearer (hence, definite). The partitive state verb \( V \) is seen then as a kind of relative clause attaching to \( N \). In Chapter III, justification will be given for considering relative clauses as quasi-inlectionally specifying \( N \) further. Moreover, \( N \) is in a patient relation to \( V \); it is likewise in a patient relation to \( V \); the patient relation for ease of reading has been placed above the \( N \) axis. A rule will be formulated subsequently whereby

\[
\begin{align*}
N, \\
count \\
root \\
definite \\
partitive
\end{align*}
\]

becomes

\[
\begin{align*}
N_{la} \\
count \\
root \\
definite \\
partitive \\
state \\
partitive \\
V \\
N \\
lb \\
root \\
definite \\
plural
\end{align*}
\]

Postsemantically, the partitive state \( V \) is deleted; so is the \( N \) because of its redundancy. Partitive \( N \) is likewise \( lb \) postsemantically marked as OBLIQUE. Hence, in sentence (1.2.3.15), the patient \( N \) is realized as \( \emptyset \) leaving only an oblique-marked partitive \( N \), *kariñ dalandán*. 
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The justification for considering partitive N's as arising in semantic structure from separate state V's is the occurrence in Pampangan of a sentence such as:

karéni la # déŋ dalandán a rén
Those oranges (near you) [are part of the batch of oranges] in this [place] (near me)

A similar configuration (nonlexically specified partitive state V accompanied by a partitive N and a patient N) must then be posited as embedded in N's specified as partitive.

A definite N may be specified further as total:

(1.2.3.16) * pégan na naŋ Pédru # iŋ gaŋ nási?
pégan naŋ Pédru # iŋ gaŋ nási?
All the rice was eaten by Pedro

When N is selectionally specified as count, for it to be specified as total, it must be priorly specified as plural:
(1.2.3.17)* pégan na la naŋ Pédru # diŋ gaŋ dalandán
   pégan na laŋ     Pédru # diŋ gaŋ dalandán
All the oranges were eaten by Pedro

It is possible to specify 'total' further as 'emphatic':

(1.2.3.16a)  pénaŋ naŋ Pédru # iŋ éganáganáŋ nási?
  x
The all-all food was eaten by Pedro=
Absolutely all the food was eaten by Pedro

(1.2.3.17a)  pégan na laŋ Pédru # diŋ éganáganáŋ dalandán
Absolutely all the oranges were eaten by Pedro

If \( N \) is count and definite, it may be further specified as individuated:

(1.2.3.18)  mátas ya # iŋ bálaŋ métuŋ a anák a atí yu kéni
  .
Each child who is here is tall

where 'individuated' is symbolized by \( bálaŋ métuŋ \) 'each (lit. each one)'.

If \( N \) is plural, it may be both total and individuated:

(1.2.3.19)  mátas la # diŋ sabláŋ ának a atí yu kéni
Each one of the children who are here is tall

where \( \begin{bmatrix} \text{total} \\ \text{individuated} \end{bmatrix} \) is symbolized by * \( \text{sabláʔ} \).
If N is -total and -individuated, it may be specified as either singulary (if it is also count and definite) or quantitative:

(1.2.3.20) mátas ya # iŋ bukúd a anák a atí yu kéni

The only child who is here is tall

where bukúd means 'only'. If N is specified as quantitative, it may be further specified as estimative or numerical (the latter only if N is selectionally count):

(1.2.3.21) ménákit yaŋ dakál a anák # i Pédru

Pedro saw many children

(1.2.3.22) ménákit yaŋ dakál a pámáŋán # i Pédru

Pedro saw much food

where dakál symbolizes both 'many' and 'much' and specifies estimative further. On the other hand, one may have:

(1.2.3.23) ménákit yaŋ aduáŋ ának # i Pédru

Pedro saw two children

where aduáŋ specifies numerical further.

The specifications 'quantitative' and 'singulary' are special in Pampangan, since when these occur, N must be replaced by an N with an attached relative clause, as with N's specified as partitive.
One can say in Pampangan:

(1.2.3.24) dakál la # diŋ dalandán
The oranges are many [in number]

(1.2.3.25) aduá la # diŋ dalandán
The oranges are two [in number]

(1.2.3.26) bukúd ya # iŋ dalandán
\[ \times \]
The orange is sole= The orange is by itself

It seems then that quantitative estimates, numbers, and 'only' are state V's in Pampangan. Sentence (1.2.3.25) is clearly not an existential sentence, for if one wanted to say, 'There are two oranges', one would say:

(1.2.3.27) atiŋ aduáŋ dalandán

Hence, for a sentence such as (1.2.3.23), the semantic configuration would be:

```
\[ \begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{process} \\
\text{experiential} \\
\text{see} \\
\text{orange} \\
\end{array} \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{patient} \\
\text{experiencer} \\
N \\
N \\
\end{array} \]
```

The embedded V functions as a kind of inflectional specification for the patient N. Structures of the above type will be discussed at greater length in Chapter III.
For the moment, a semantic rule will merely be postulated
replacing \( N \) with \( \rl N \)
\{quantitative\}
\{singulary\}

\{parent\}
\{quantitative\}
\{singulary\}

The generalizations on \( N \) inflectional units may be
summarized by the following Semantic Noun Inflectional Rules
(SNIR):

(SNIR 1) \( N \)
\{unique\}
\{root\}
\(---\rightarrow\) plural

(SNIR 2) \( N \)
\{unique\}
\{root\}
\(---\rightarrow\) associative

(SNIR 3) \( N \)
\{unique\}
\{root\}
\{associative\}
\(---\rightarrow\) plural

(SNIR 4) \( N \)
\{root\}
\(---\rightarrow\) definite

This rule is obligatory for unique \( N \) and
for \( N \) specified as first and/or second person.

(SNIR 5) definite \( ---\rightarrow\) demonstrative

(SNIR 6) demonstrative \( ---\rightarrow\)
\(\begin{array}{c}(\text{proximate to speaker})\\(\text{proximate to hearer})\end{array}\)

(SNIR 7) \( N \)
\{root\}
\{definite\}
\(---\rightarrow\)
\\{generic / \( V \)\}
\{partitive\}
The preceding rules generate multiple $N$ matrices; examples of the most common combinations generated will be given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N Form</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definite</td>
<td>atíq anák</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>There is a child [present]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite</td>
<td>atíq ának</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>There are children [present]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unique definite</td>
<td>mátas ya # i Pédru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative plural</td>
<td>Pedro is tall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unique definite</td>
<td>mátas la # di Pédru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative plural</td>
<td>Pedro and [his] companions are tall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite</td>
<td>mátas ya # iñ anák</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child is tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural definite</td>
<td>mátas la # diñ ának</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The children are tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite demonstrative</td>
<td>mátas ya # itáq anák</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That child is tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural definite demonstrative</td>
<td>mátas la # détaq ának</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those children are tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite demonstrative proximate to speaker</td>
<td>mátas ya # iníq anák</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This child (near me) is tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural definite demonstrative proximate to speaker</td>
<td>mátas la # déniq ának</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These children (near me) are tall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mátas ya # iyáŋ anák
That child (near you) is tall

mátas la # déŋ ának
Those children (near you) are tall

mátas ya # itíŋ anák
This child (near you and me) is tall

mátas la # détiŋ ának
These children (near you and me) are tall

maragúl ya # iŋ patíŋ
The whale (as a species) is big

maragúl la # déŋ patíŋ
Whales (as a species) are big

méŋan ya # kiŋ nási? # iŋ anák
The child ate [some] of the rice

méŋan ya # kiŋ dalandán # iŋ anák
The child ate [some] of the orange

méŋan ya # kariŋ dalandán # iŋ anák
The child ate [some] of the oranges
N -count
definite
total
peŋan na niŋ anák # iŋ gaŋ nási?
All the rice was eaten by the child

N -count
definite
total
emphatic
peŋan na niŋ ának # iŋ éganáganáŋ nási?
Absolutely all the rice was eaten by the child

N count
plural
definite
total
peŋan na la niŋ anák # diŋ gaŋ dalándán
All the oranges were eaten by the child

N count
plural
definite
total
emphatic
peŋan na la niŋ anák # diŋ éganáganáŋ dalándán
Absolutely all the oranges were eaten by the child

N definite
individuated
mátaŋ ya # iŋ bálaŋ métuŋ a anák a atí yu kéni
Each child who is here is tall

N plural
definite
total
individuated
mátaŋ la # diŋ sabláŋ ának a atí yu kéni
Each and all of the children who are here are tall

N count
definite
singulary
mátaŋ ya # iŋ bukúd a anák a atí yu kéni
The only child who is here is tall

N -count
quantitative
estimative
méŋan yaŋ dítak a nási? # iŋ anák
The child ate a little rice

N -count
definite
quantitative
estimative
peŋan na niŋ anák # iŋ dítak a nási a atí yu kéni
The little rice that was here was eaten by the child
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>méghan yağ dakál a dalandán # iŋ anáŋ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>The child ate many oranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estimative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>péñan na la niŋ anáŋ # diŋ dakál a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>dalandán a atí yu kéni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estimative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>méghan yağ aduág dalandán # iŋ anáŋ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>The child ate two oranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numerical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>péñan na la niŋ anáŋ # diŋ aduág dalandán</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>a atí yu kéni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numerical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>méghan yağ dítak kiŋ nási? # iŋ anáŋ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>The child ate a little of the rice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estimative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>méghan yağ aduá kariŋ dalandán # iŋ anáŋ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>The child ate two of the oranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numerical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2.4. Classifiers. In Pampangan, such noun phrases as the following occur:

(1.2.4.1) aduáŋ pátįŋ păľe
   two measures (2.72 dry quarts) of unhusked rice
aduáŋ buslųy săgéni
   two baskets (of more or less standard size) of bananas
aduáŋ kapáris a bakyá?
   two pairs of wooden slippers

(1.2.4.2) aduáŋ bútil a păľe
   two grains of unhusked rice
aduáŋ píliŋ a săgéni
   two bunches (lit. twists) of bananas
aduáŋ kapútut a tínápe
   two slices of bread

The above forms are obviously related and must be accounted for within a unified frame of reference. The phrases may be characterized by the following semantic matrices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1.2.4.1) N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-abstract</td>
<td>-abstract</td>
<td>-abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(containable)</td>
<td>(containable)</td>
<td>(pairable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unhusked rice</td>
<td>banana</td>
<td>wooden slipper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative</td>
<td>quantitative</td>
<td>quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numerical</td>
<td>numerical</td>
<td>numerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measure</td>
<td>measure</td>
<td>counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.72 dry quarts</td>
<td>basket of standard size</td>
<td>dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abstract</td>
<td>abstract</td>
<td>abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>count</td>
<td>count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>granular</td>
<td>bunched</td>
<td>sliceable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unhusked rice</td>
<td>torquable</td>
<td>bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantitative</td>
<td>banana</td>
<td>quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>numerical</td>
<td>quantitative</td>
<td>numerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>counter</td>
<td>counter</td>
<td>counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(singulary)</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
<td>(singulary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In discussing the possible specifications of N in the preceding sections, no effort was made to be exhaustive in the list of specifications for selectional and inflectional categories. As the above matrices show, in accounting for classifiers, certain specifications must be added to the inventory postulated thus far. It would seem that in the semantic generation of matrices such as the above, certain selectional specifications of N which would normally be unmarked because not absolutely necessary for lexical selection are highlighted, for example, that unhusked rice is granular, that bananas are bunched and torquable (twisted off in bunches from the tree trunk), that bread is sliceable.

Features such as 'containable' and 'pairable' are perhaps implied by the specifications '-abstract' and 'count' and therefore need not be marked because redundant; hence, the use of parentheses. Moreover, it would seem that any -abstract N may be inflectionally specified by 'measure' and any count N may be inflectionally specified by 'counter'. In turn, both 'measure' and 'counter' may be further specified by quantitative specifications special to a culture (in the Philippines,
baskets of various sizes are used as measures of fruits and vegetables, and containers (wooden or metal) of various sizes are used as measures of grain; counters (specified as sets of two, sets of twelve, sets of twenty, etc.) are perhaps near-universals.

A singulary counter, in Pampangan symbolized by ka-, for a set of one may be taken as the unmarked specification of counter; any set larger than one would then be marked: dual, trial, quadral, quintal, decimal, duodecimal, vigesimal, etc. These numeral specifications are over and above the numerical specifications postulated in section 1.2.3; thus, one can speak of 'two sets of two' or 'two pairs' or of 'two sets of twenty'.

Postsemantic processes linearizing the N matrix into a three-branched configuration will be formulated in Chapter II. The surface structure output of such processes would then be:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
Q \quad \text{(for Quantifier)} & C \quad \text{(for Classifier)} & N \\
\text{quantitative} & \text{selectional unit} & \text{other selectional units} \\
\text{numerical} & \text{counter/measure} & \\
\text{specific number} & \text{specification of amount} & \\
\text{root} & \\
\end{array}
\]

Hence, the semantic analysis of the classifiers exemplified in (1.2.4.1) and (1.2.4.2) is as follows:
(1.2.4.1) C
-abstract (containable) symbolized by pátí
measure
2.72 dry quarts

C
-abstract (containable) symbolized by buslú?
measure
basket of standard size

count (pairable) symbolized by kapáríš (from Spanish pares)
counter
dual

(1.2.4.2) C
granular symbolized by bútil
counter (singulary)

C
bunched
torquable symbolized by píliŋ
counter
indefinite set

C
sliceable symbolized by kapútut
counter (singulary)

Classifiers of the type exemplified by (1.2.4.2) are much more numerous in Malay (see Lewis 1965) than in Pampangan. Malay classifiers, however, may be analyzed within the same frame of reference. In Malay, whenever N is inflectionally specified as 'quantitative' and 'numerical', it must be additionally specified inflectionally by a counter (singulary) which, combined with a highlighted selectional
unit, is directly symbolized by a numeral classifier. As in Pampangan, which has comparable selectional units, a particular unit is factored out and highlighted; in Malay, many of these selectional units likewise figure prominently in a folk taxonomy. Moreover, this highlighting process is obligatory. Thus, whereas in Pampangan, one says:

\[
\text{aduán matsín} \quad \text{two monkeys}
\]

eone must say in Malay

\[
\text{dua ekor kēra} \quad x \\
\text{two tail monkey=} \quad \text{two monkeys}
\]

\text{ekor} is a classifier for all animals; by synecdoche, however, a unit 'caudal' is specified of animate -human N's and is used as a criterial specification for the classifier. Thus, the semantic characterization of the Malay noun phrase is:

\begin{verbatim}
N count animate caudal monkey quantitative numerical two counter (singulary)
\end{verbatim}

Postsemantically, to generate C, 'caudal' and 'counter (singulary)'
are factored out to form a separate branch:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C} \\
\text{caudal} \\
\text{counter} \\
\text{(singulary)}
\end{array}
\]

In Malay folk taxonomy, after the initial division into animate and inanimate, animate is further subdivided into human and nonhuman. On the other hand, inanimate is further subdivided into various subcategories according to geometric shape. Remnants of this taxonomic classifier system are found in Pampangan. Besides such classifiers in Pampangan as pilin 'lit. twist (since Bergaño's time, used almost exclusively for bananas), bútil 'grain (cf. Malay butir)', kapútut 'slice (cf. Malay potong)', kapirášu 'piece, from Spanish pedazo; comparable with Malay biji)', which are based on specifications lower in the folk taxonomy, there is also katáu 'person' (comparable with Malay orang) and analyzable as

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{C} \\
\text{human} \\
\text{counter} \\
\text{(singulary)}
\end{array}
\]

In Contemporary Pampangan, however, katáu is used only in questions, pilán katáu 'How many persons?'.
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In another Philippine language, Hiligaynon, one finds kabílug 'piece' instead of kapírasú; kabílug is analyzable as

C
- animate
object
round
counter
(singulary)

and attests to the use of geometric dimensions in characterizing nonanimate N's.

Besides taxonomic classifiers (elaborated in Malay and attenuated in Pampangan) as well as universal counters and measures based on more general selectional specifications such as 'count' and '-abstract', there are likewise special counters for objects of particular importance to the culture in many of the Austronesian languages, particularly, in the languages of the Polynesian branch. At one time, there must have been, at least in certain dialects, an elaborate set of such counters in Pampangan, for to the query, 'Hay diversos modos de contar según la clase de cosas como cocos, petates, pescados [,] canoas, frutas [,] etc[.]?' Bravo (1886b:27) responds: 'Muchísimas clases que por falta de lugar, no las numero'. Bravo lived in Candaba (see Map 2) where apparently these counters had been in use. In the dialects examined for this study, however, no such counters were elicited; judging from Bergaño's silence on this point,
it seems that the eighteenth century Bacolor dialect described by Bergaño did not have them either.

In any case, such special counters are easily accounted for within the same frame of reference proposed. To take only one subset of examples from Hawai'ian (see Alexander 1965:13-14): Hawaiian has a symbolization for the number 'forty', kanaha. In referring to 'forty tapas' or 'forty canoes', however, one uses iako and in referring to 'forty fish', one uses ka'an. Presumably, one can speak of 'two sets of forty tapas/canoes' and 'two sets of forty fish'. The matrices for such N's may be represented thus:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
N & N \\
\text{count} & \text{count} \\
\text{animate} & \text{animate} \\
\text{object} & \text{fish} \\
\text{tapa/canoe} & \text{quantitative} \\
\text{quantitative} & \text{numerical} \\
\text{numerical} & \text{two} \\
\text{two} & \text{counter} \\
\text{counter} & \text{forty} \\
\text{forty} & \\
\end{array}
\]

Unlike taxonomic classifiers and ordinary counters and measures, however, special counters do not factor out a selectional unit but the lexical unit itself:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
C \\
tapa/canoe \text{ symbolized by iako} \\
counter \\
fifty \\
\end{array}
\]
In the process of linearization, the lexical root is transferred into the C branch, thus in effect leaving the N branch without a lexical specification; in Chapter II, it will be shown that there is a general rule deleting matrices consisting solely of selectional units; hence, the N branch becomes $\emptyset$.

In summary, classifiers have been divided into three subtypes in this section and have been discussed within a common frame of reference. The three subtypes are: (1) ordinary measures and counters based on general selectional specifications such as 'abstract' and 'count' as criterial attributes; ordinary measures and counters are most likely universal in the sense that every language has such a subset of counters and measures but with culture-bound specifications; (s) taxonomic classifiers or (singulary) counters based on criterial selectional units which figure prominently in folk taxonomies (in Malay, taxonomic classifiers are obligatory if N is inflectionally specified as 'quantitative' and 'numerical'); (3) special counters or names of sets (of varied numeral specification) of items important to a culture. Classifiers necessitate inflectional specifications 'counter' or 'measure' and for taxonomic classifiers, the highlighting of an implied specification by the addition of a criterial selectional unit. Postsemantically, the N matrix is linearized
into a three-branched configuration, $Q \xrightarrow{C} N$; under $C$ are the criterial selectional units as well as the inflectional units 'counter' or 'measure' and their specifications; the C matrix is eventually symbolized by the so-called 'taxonomic classifiers'. What differentiates the three types of classifiers seems to be the generality of the criterial selectional units eventually factored out. Where ordinary counters and measures use as their criterial selectional unit such general specifications as 'abstract' and 'count', taxonomic classifiers use less general specifications such as 'animate', 'human', and for '-animate' and '-human' N's, such dimensions as 'round', 'elongated', and other specifications based on geometric shape. Least general of all are such criterial units factored out for the special counters, lexical units in their own right.

The analysis proposed develops the programmatic suggestions of Chafe 1970a (see page 58) and integrates the techniques of componential analysis (Goodenough 1956) within a total grammar.

That Pampangan must have had at one time some more elaborate system of taxonomic classifiers seems to be clear; on the other hand, it is less clear whether or not it ever had the same degree of elaboration that Classical Malay displays in this area. The elaboration of the Classical Malay numeral classifier system seems
to be the product of an artistic mannerism which may have been peculiar to Malay Culture.

If Bravo's response is well-founded, then Pampangan must have had at one time, in addition to the taxonomic classifiers, an elaborate set of special counters comparable to the sets found in many of the languages of the Polynesian branch.

Whether or not the classifier system belonged to Proto-Austronesian is an altogether different problem. The similarities of the dimensions necessary for the analysis of the different classifier systems which have been discovered in the languages not only of the Pacific Islands but likewise of the Asian and Western American mainland make the diffusion hypothesis more plausible than the genetic one.

To account for the classifiers in Pampangan (subtypes 1 and 2), the following semantic rules have been formulated to supplement the rules of sections 1.2.1 and 1.2.3. (The rules will not be numbered, however.)

\[
(S) \quad N \quad \longrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} \text{granular / } N \\ \text{-count} \end{cases} \\
\text{object} \\
\rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{frangible} \\ \text{sliceable} \\ \text{round} \end{cases}
\]

\[
(S) \quad N \quad \longrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} \text{fruit} \end{cases} \\
\text{object} \\
\rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{bunched} \\ \text{torquable} \end{cases}
\]

\[
(S) \quad N \quad \longrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} \text{root} \\ \text{quantitative} \end{cases} \\
\rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{measure / } N \\ \text{-abstract} \end{cases} \\
\rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{counter / } N \\ \text{count} \end{cases}
\]
(S) measure → \{ 2.72 dry quarts \\
| basket (varied sizes) \\
| wooden square box \\
| metal milk-can \\
| ...

(S) counter → \{ dual \\
| ...
| duodecimal \\
| ...
| indefinite set \\

1.3. New/-New Information. After the \( \sqrt{N} \) configuration has been fully specified for selection, lexical, and inflectional units, \( V \) and any accompanying \( N \)'s must be further specified as either new or -new (old) information, depending on the previous linguistic context. It will be seen in Chapter II that marking for new or -new is crucial for postsemantic processes of subjectivization and possible deletion.

As the replacement rules in section 1.1.6 have been formulated, it is possible to have a semantic configuration of a \( V \) with four accompanying \( N \)'s in a maximally specified \( V \) subtype. The various replacement rules give rise to the following configuration:

```
V     rel  N     rel  N     rel  N     rel  N
```

An example of a maximally specified \( V \) is V.

| action 
| causative 
| completable 
| benefactive 
| give+causativizer 
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To the question:

\[(1.3.1)\] nánú # iŋ maliliyári

What is [that which is] happening?

Or the question:

\[(1.3.2)\] makanánú

How?= What's happening?

the response could be:

\[(1.3.3)\] pápabiye yaŋ kuálta # kiŋ anák # kaŋ Suán#

i Pédru

Pedro is causing Juan to give money to the child

\(*\) pa+biyáy 'to cause to give (lit. give+causativizer), from UA * biyaj, kuálta 'money', from Spanish cuarta\), in which V and all four accompanying N's are new information. Were the sentence uttered in initial discourse, one would have the same distribution of new information:
On the other hand, one may have the following sentence sequence in the course of a discourse:

(1.3.4) mináus ya # i Pédru ##
pápabiýé yaŋ kuálta # kiŋ anáŋ # kaŋ Suán #
i Pédru
Pedro called
Pedro is causing Juan to give money to the child

where now the agent N of the second sentence is -new information. Thus, the distribution of new and -new information is now:

\[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{agentive} & \text{beneficiary} & \text{beneficiary} & \text{agent} \\
V & N & N & N \\
\text{new} & \text{new} & \text{new} & \text{new} & (\text{-new}) \\
\end{array} \]

where (\text{-new}) means unmarked. It is not only the agent N which may be -new, however, as the following sentence sequence shows:

(1.3.5) dinatáŋ ya # i Suán ##
* pa+mag+bigáy+an na ya naŋ Pédruŋ kuálta #
kiŋ anáŋ # i Suán >
pápabígíyan neŋ Pédruŋ kuálta # kiŋ anáŋ # i Suán
Juan came
Juan is being caused by Pedro to give money
to the child
(bigay is probably a loanword from Tagalog, since the usual reflex of UA *ɣ in Pampangan is ɣ), where now the agentive beneficiary N is -new information. Thus, the distribution of new and -new information is now:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agentive</th>
<th>beneficiary</th>
<th>beneficiary</th>
<th>agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>(-new)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, the following sentence sequence may occur:

(1.3.6) mákalúnus ya # iŋ anáŋ #

* pá'+pa+dínan na ya naŋ Pédrúŋ kuálta # kaŋ
Suán # iŋ anáŋ >
pápárin nan neŋ Pédrúŋ kuálta # kaŋ Suán # iŋ anáŋ
The child is pitiful
The child is being caused by Pedro to be given money to by Juan

(parínan 'to cause to be given'; dínan is another root for 'give' and is preferable to * biyaŋ in configuration of this sort). In this sentence, it is the beneficiary N which is -new information, yielding the configuration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agentive</th>
<th>beneficiary</th>
<th>beneficiary</th>
<th>agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>(-new)</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Or the complement N may be -new, as in the sequence:
(1.3.7) ó iní # iŋ kuálta ##

* pά+pa+biyáy na ya naŋ Pédru # kŋ anák #
kaŋ Suán # iŋ kuálta>
pápa biyέ neŋ Pédru # kŋ anák # kaŋ Suán # iŋ kuálta

Lo here is the money
The money is being caused by Pedro to be given
to the child by Juan

where now the distribution of -new and new information is:

| complement | beneficiary | beneficiary | agent 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new</td>
<td>(-new)</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not only the N's which may be -new, however; in a sequence such as the following, it is V which is -new in conjunction with three N's which are likewise -new:

(1.3.8)* kaŋ nínu na ya pά+pa+biyáy naŋ Pédru # kaŋ Suán # iŋ kuálta >
kanínu ne pápa biyέ Pédru # kaŋ Suán # iŋ kuálta
kiŋ anák ne pápa biyέ Pédru # kaŋ Suán #
iŋ kuálta

To whom is the money being caused by Pedro
to be given by Juan?
The money is being caused by Pedro to be given
to the child by Juan
(where the underscoring signals special emphasis on 'child').

In the response to the question of (1.3.8), the only item which is new is the beneficiary N:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{V} & \text{N} & \text{beneficiary} & \text{agent} \\
(-\text{new}) & (-\text{new}) & \text{new} & (-\text{new})
\end{array}
\]

Obviously, in any sentence, there must at least be one item, either V or N, which is new; otherwise, there would be no purpose to the speech act, unless the situation is one of mimicry or imitation.

It is possible, therefore, in a V N configuration to have all items, V and N's, new, or to have either V -new or all N's -new or V and some N's -new; most commonly, it is usually only one N which is -new, all other items being new. The following semantic rule will be necessary:

\[ (S 1.3.1) \quad \begin{array}{c}
(V) \\
N
\end{array} \rightarrow \begin{cases}
\text{new} / \{ \\
\{ \text{Initial Discourse} \\
\{ \text{if } (V) \text{ have not been} \\
\text{introduced by preceding} \\
\text{linguistic context}
\} \}
\end{cases} \]

The general constraint, namely, that at least one item be new, is a 'felicity condition' of any act of speech or communication and would therefore be a redundancy rule for which a separate rule need not be formulated in a specific grammar.
1.4. Topic. Consider the sentence:

(1.4.1) bíbiyé yaŋ kuálta # kaŋ Suán # i Pébru ~
bíbiyé yaŋ kuálta # kaŋ Suán # i Pébru
Pedro is giving [some] money to Juan

The subject of the sentence is Pébru, marked by subject
determiner i (in for [-human] N's). The process of subjectiviza-
tion, which seems to depend at least in certain contexts
on the distribution of new and -new information, will be
discussed at great length as a postsemantic process (in
Chapter II). Consider, however, the following sentence:

(1.4.1a) i Pébru # bíbiyé yaŋ kuálta # kaŋ Suán

As for Pedro, he is giving [some] money to Juan

In the above sentence, the subject noun phrase is preposed;
in ordinary Pampangan sentences, V, the most important item
in a sentence, comes first and is followed by one or more
N's. However, this unmarked linearization may be disturbed
by fronting one of the N's, in effect, making this fronted N
the most important item in the sentence, instead of V.
In this study, this type of highlighting will be labeled
'topicalization' and is to be kept distinct from
'subjectivization'. If an N is to be highlighted or
specified as 'topic', it would seem that this should be
indicated in semantic structure rather than postsemantically,
since, in effect, such highlighting is a feature of the message or semantic content of an utterance rather than a by-product of preposing processes; in other words, the claim is made that highlighting does not follow as a result of preposing but that N may be specified as 'topic' and it is because it is thus specified that it is preposed. Hence, the postsemantic process of preposing is a result of semantic specification 'topic'.

In sentence (1.4.1a), i Pédru is both subject and topic. It should be emphasized, however, that subject is distinct from topic, as the following example will show more clearly:

(1.4.1b) kaŋ Suán ya babyé kuálta # i Pédru

It is to Juan that Pedro is giving money

where now it is the beneficiary N which is marked 'topic' and preposed, while the subject agent N is in its usual position in surface structure. (Note that when a phrase marked by kaŋ/kiŋ is preposed, the copier ya 'he' (coreferential with Pédru) is interposed between the topic noun phrase and V.)

In sentence (1.4.1), it is not possible to topicalize the third N, the complement N kuálta, which is -definite; a necessary context for topicalization is definite specification. It is possible to say:
(1.4.2) kuálta # iŋ babyé na ḃaŋ Pédrup kaŋ Suán
kuálta # iŋ babyé naŋ Pédrup kaŋ Suán
That which is being given by Pedro to Juan
is money

with sentential emphasis on money, but the above sentence
is a stative sentence with a predicate N and is an
altogether different configuration from sentence (1.4.1).
However, if in sentence (1.4.1), the complement N were
definite, it would be subjectivized and then apt for
further topic specification:

(1.4.1c) bíbiyé na ya naŋ Pédrup # kaŋ Suán # iŋ kuálta >
bíbiyé neŋ Pédrup # kaŋ Suán # iŋ kuálta
The money is being given to Juan by Pedro
iŋ kuálta # bíbiyé neŋ Pédrup # kaŋ Suán
As for the money, it is being given to Juan
by Pedro

The latter occurrence of preposing is of the same type as
the preposing exemplified by (1.4.1a).

Moreover, to corroborate the earlier claim that
topicalization is independent of subjectivization, one
may consider the following examples of subjectless
sentences (which will be discussed further in Chapter II):
(1.4.3) paka+lákad na naŋ Pédru > pákálákad naŋ Pédru
Pedro exerts himself in walking

(1.4.4) ka+lákad+lákad na pá? mu? naŋ Pédru >
kálákadlákad na pá muŋ Pédru
Pedro has just now walked

(1.4.5) ka+santíŋ na naŋ Pédru↑ > kasantíŋ naŋ Pédru↑
How good-looking Pedro is!

(The rising intonation in the latter sentence is the phonological context for the u > o shift in Pédru) Now, it is possible to specify the accompanying N of each of the preceding three sentences as 'topic'. One then has:

(1.4.3a) i Pédru # pákálákad na
As for Pedro, he is exerting himself in walking

(1.4.4a) i Pédru # kalákadlákad na pá mu?
As for Pedro, he has just now walked

(1.4.5a) i Pédru # kasantíŋ na↑
As for Pedro, how good-looking he is!

where -subject definite N is marked 'topic' and is preposed. There is a postsemantic process replacing naŋ/niŋ with i/iŋ when the N is fronted, in effect replacing -subject by subject; but this is a secondary type of subjectivization which results from topicalization. Note that the copier na in each case remains -subject and is not replaced by ya.
Earlier, it was stated that any definite N, subject or non-subject, may be specified as topic and then preposed. Hence, the nonsubject but definite agent N in sentence (1.4.1c) may be topicalized:

(1.4.1d) i Pédru # bābiyé ne # kaŋ Suán # iŋ kuálta
As for Pedro, the money is being given by him to Juan

The sentence is interesting, since in effect, it has two subjects, the first subject being kuálta and the second subject (by secondary subjectivization resulting from topicalization and preposing) Pédru.

Earlier, too, the connection between new and -new specification was mentioned as a possible context for subjectivization. While new and -new specification is tied in with subjectivization, it is irrelevant to topicalization, since both new N's and -new N's may be topicalized. It is difficult to imagine contexts of -new N which need to be topicalized. For example, in a sequence such as:

(1.4.6) dínatąŋ ya # i Pédru ##
línuklúŋ ya (# i Pédru)
Pedro arrived [Then] he sat down
it would be unnatural to topicalize the second occurrence of Pédru (which is new and eventually deleted):

(1.4.6') dínatāŋ ya # i Pédru ##
    i Pédru # línuklúk ya
    ? Pedro arrived    [Then] As for Pedro, he sat down

However, in a discourse, it is entirely plausible to introduce an N, make several statements not relevant to N, and then to return to N (-new) by topicalizing it:

(1.4.6a) dínatāŋ ya # i Pédru ## ...
    i Pédru # línuklúk ya
    Pedro arrived    ... As for Pedro, he sat down

where now i Pédru is -new but topic. In such an instance, topic specification blocks deletion: a topicalized -new N cannot be deleted although a subjectivized -new N not only is deletable but often is deleted.

The relevant topicalizing rule may be formulated thus:

(S 1.4.1) N --------> topic
    definite

Before concluding this section on topicalization, it is necessary to make a remark on contrastive sentences in Pampangan. In English, it is possible to say:
Juan is as tall as Pedro

where the two N's receive equal accent. In Pampangan, one would say:

$$(1.4.7)*\quad kasi\tilde{g}\text{ ka-ta?\'{a}s na ya na}\tilde{g}\text{ P\'{e}dru }#\text{ i Su\'{a}n }>$

\[kasi\tilde{g}\ k\acute{a}\tilde{t}as\quad ne\tilde{g}\quad P\acute{e}dru\quad #\text{ i Su\'{a}n}\]

Juan is as tall as Pedro

where the main sentential accent is not on Pedro nor on Juan but on the verb root. One may topicalize either N:

$$(1.4.7a)\quad i\text{ Su\'{a}n }#\text{ kasi\tilde{g}\ k\acute{a}\tilde{t}as\ ne}\tilde{g}\text{ P\'{e}dru}\]

As for Juan, he is as tall as Pedro

$$(1.4.7b)\quad i\text{ P\acute{e}dru }#\text{ kasi\tilde{g}\ k\acute{a}\tilde{t}as\ ne }#\text{ i Su\'{a}n}\]

As for Pedro, Juan is as tall as he is

There seems to be no way of giving equal sentential accent to Su\'{a}n and P\acute{e}dru, since there is a decided drop in pitch after a topicalized N. Hence, although in surface structure, sentence (1.4.7a) seems to parallel in word order the English equivalent, the pitch configuration is altogether different:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{topic} \\
N \\
# \\
\end{array}
\]
The only instances discovered in which two N's received equal sentential accent were in sentences such as:

\[(1.4.8) \quad \text{i Pédru} \# \text{ampó} \# \text{i Suán} \# \# \text{méko} \text{ la}\]

As for Pedro and as for Juan, they left

Sentences such as the above will be analyzed in Chapter III as two-verb configurations, so that in effect, sentence (1.4.8) has two topics which originally came from two separate sentences.

\[(1.4.9) \quad \text{nínú} \# \text{in mas mátas} \# \# \text{i Pédru} \# \# \text{o} \# \# \text{i Suán}\]

Who is [he who is] taller, Pedro or Juan?

where either Pédru or Suán will fill in the missing information in nínú. Since nínú is a predicate noun in an equational sentence, the sentential accent it receives is perfectly regular; so is the sentential accent on its would-be 'fillers', Pedru and Suan. (The rising intonation at the end of i Pédru will be discussed in Chapter III.)

Hence, in Pampangan, because of the constraint that only one N may be topicalized (and fronted) in a single V configuration, there seems to be no way of symbolizing N's in comparison or contrast by means of equal sentential accent; rather, comparison and contrast is symbolized by affixation in the verb root ('equatative', 'comparative'), which likewise receives the main sentential accent.
1.5. Summary. By way of summation, to show how the semantic processes described thus far generate a well-formed semantic structure, the following Pampangan sentence will be derived step by step:

(1.5.1)* máki+biyáy laŋ digálú # ka'díŋ ának #
   di Pédru # ka'díŋ bábayi >
mákibiyé   laŋ digálú # kariŋ ának #
di Pédru # kariŋ bábayi
Pedro and [his] companions are joining the women in giving gifts to the children

(mákibiyé 'to join in giving (lit. give+associativizer)',
digálú 'gift' from Spanish regalo, ának 'children',
bábayi 'women').

The numbers in parentheses (#) indicate the step; to the left is the output of the rule which is listed to the right. (The rules on pages 101-5, 127-9, 138, 142, 146-7, 160, 167, 182-3, and 199-200 should be consulted.)
The semantic structure of the sentence may be represented thus: (It should be emphasized at this point that the semantic representation, although represented in a left-to-right order because of the two-dimensional limitations of all writing, is nonlinear; it is best to imagine the semantic representation as a kind of mobile, four branches (or semantic axes) interconnected with V as a point of origin.)
The postsemantic processes necessary to derive the above semantic structure into a surface structure will be described in the final section of Chapter II.
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2.0. Introduction. In this chapter, processes which transform semantic configurations generated by the rules of Chapter I into linear surface structures apt for symbolization will be described. These processes, called 'postsemantic processes', are 'analogous to the transformations of syntactical theory' (Chafe 1970b:582): they add, subtract, or replace specifications of V and N and finally linearize the semantic structure into a surface structure.

There are eight sections in this chapter. The first seven sections describe main postsemantic processes relevant to Pampangan; such processes include what is language-specific in the grammar of a particular language, in contrast to the semantic rules, which up to a certain degree of delicacy (the term is Halliday's, 1961) of distinction are common to languages. It will be seen, however, that although such postsemantic processes are language-specific, their features and functions find analogues in other languages. Such postsemantic processes, in a complete grammar, must be ordered; in most cases, one rule provides the necessary context for the application or nonapplication of a subsequent rule. In an outline such as this, however, the order of postsemantic processes is suggestive rather than definitive. In fact, in the discussion of certain processes, where relevant, subsequent processes which do not immediately follow are discussed for the sake of the exposition. Moreover, as one studies
any language in detail, one will no doubt discover additional postsemantic processes necessitated by certain configurations; hence, the processes outlined here make no claims to a complete inventory. The claim is made, however, that the processes described represent the main types of postsemantic processes; other processes which may be discovered subsequently can be subsumed under these types.

In Chapters III and IV, where sentences other than simple statements are discussed and where structures with more than one V are outlined, other postsemantic processes will be necessary to finally derive the surface structures of such complex configurations. The processes described in this chapter are then relevant only to the types of sentences which have been cited in Chapter I.

The final section summarizes the rules by setting them down in a tentative order and exemplifies the application of these rules by transforming the semantic configuration of the sentence generated at the conclusion of Chapter I into a surface structure.

2.1. Subjectivization. Every sentence in Pampangan, except for certain contexts to be noted, demands a noun which is subjectivized; the subject N is marked by determiner i/iŋ. Subjectivization, it has been stated in Chapter I, must be distinguished from topicalization. In using the traditional label 'subject', the study differs
in nomenclature from the work of the Summer Institute of Linguistics analysts, who use 'focus' instead of 'subject', although the distinction between subject and topic has been noted in the tagmemic literature under different labels (see, for example, Austin 1966, who discusses 'attention, emphasis, and focus' in Ata Manobo). The studious avoidance of the term 'focus' and the use of the term 'subject' will be justified in the course of the discussion. The development of the notion of subjectivization in this section develops certain seminal ideas on this point suggested by Fillmore (1968), and finally, in its use of the semantic specification new and -new as one context for subjectivization, this section is based on Chafe 1970b (see Chapter 15).

It has been observed that in the Philippine languages, there are as many subjectivization possibilities as there are accompanying N's. The citations given in Chapter I, section 1.3, seem to exemplify this apparent freedom of choice. For ostensive purposes, the following paradigm may be cited (in this section, the subject N will be written in bold letters):

\[(2.1.1) \text{ mümugsé yàŋ bòla } # \text{ kìŋ anák } # \text{ ìŋ TÁU} \]

The man is throwing a ball to the child

\[(* \text{ m+ugsàv 'to throw (lit. throw (noun)+activativer)'}),\]
bóla 'ball', from Spanish bola, anák 'child', táu 'man').

(2.1.1a) ugsány+an na ya+ŋ bóla niŋ táu # iŋ anák>
úgsen neŋ bóla niŋ táu # Iŋ ANÁK
The child is being thrown a ball by the man

(2.1.1b) i+ugsány na ya niŋ táu # kiŋ anák # iŋ bóla>
yúgsé ne niŋ táu # kiŋ anák # Iŋ BÓLA
The ball is being thrown to the child
by the man

What is necessary to determine is the context that gives
rise to the choice of one N rather than another as subject,
to incorporate the context into a rule, and then to
observe what other postsemantic processes such subject
specification triggers. Moreover, it is necessary to
investigate too whether or not this choice is always
possible.

2.1.1. Subjectless Sentences. Before dealing
with subjectivization, one must first consider instances
of sentences where there is no subject, as in:

(2.1.1.1) madalumdúm It is dark
(2.1.1.2) dádalumdúm It is getting dark

Both V's, the first a state V, the second a process V,
are ambient and because ambient, are not accompanied by
any N; if they are, such N's are ultimately traceable in semantic structure to other VN configurations. Hence, the question of subjectivization does not even arise in these sentences.

Again, consider the sentence:

(2.1.1.3) atín tâu

There is a man present

where atín is a presentational state V. Now, tâu 'man' is inflectionally specified is -definite. Were it specified as definite, one would have:

(2.1.1.3a) atí yu # IN TÁU

The man is present

Hence, for N to be subject, it must be definite. On the other hand, there are instances of N's which are specified as definite but which are not subjectivized (cases such as these have already been cited in Chapter I but will be repeated here for the sake of the exposition):

(2.1.1.4)* pákà+lákàd na nàj Pédru > pákálákad na nàj Pédru
Pedro exerts himself in walking

(2.1.1.5)* kà+lákàd+lákàd na pà? mu? nàj Pédru>
káláklákad na pà muý Pédru
Pedro has just now walked
(2.1.1.6)* ka+ta?ás na naŋ Pédru↑
kátas naŋ Pédro↑
How tall Pedro is!

It is not clear why the occurrence of the exertive marker paka-, the immediate completed actual aspect marker ka-, or the exclamative marker ka-, should block subjectivization. It seems as if the context for subjectivization blocking is phonological, the occurrence of the sound sequence ka-. This is belied, however, by such counterexamples as:

(2.1.1.7)* kasíŋ dagúl na ya naŋ Pédru # i Suán>
kasíŋ dagúl neŋ Pédru # I SUÁN
Juan is as big (tall) as Pedro

(2.1.1.8) kalákad neŋ Pédru # I SUÁN
Juan is in the company of Pedro in walking

In these instances, the occurrence of phonological ka- does not block subjectivization. Hence, the blocking of subjectivization seems to be rather arbitrary; in the rules to be formulated, the above exceptions must be duly noted.
2.1.2. Subjectivized Sentences.

2.1.2.1. All-New Sentences. In all-new sentences, sentences in which neither V nor any of its accompanying N's is -new, there is actually no choice of subject possible. Subject choice is dictated by the last N to be attached to V, following the ordered replacement rules postulated in section 1.1.6.

State V's may be considered as accompanied by N's in four possible positions (these positions become the basis for linear ordering in a later postsemantic process; at this stage of the derivation, the configuration is still conceived of as nonlinear):

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\text{partitive} & \text{norm} & \text{beneficiary} \\
\text{goal} & \text{source} & \text{associate} \\
\text{location} & \text{measure} & \text{motive} \\
\text{time} & \text{patient} & \text{experiencer} \\
V & N & N & N
\end{array}
\]

Not every V, of course, is accompanied by four N's but the above diagram is meant merely to indicate how the N's are positioned vis-à-vis each other when accompanying V. The following examples will show how the above scheme was arrived at; the examples show unmarked positioning:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>masantíŋ ya</td>
<td>'The house is pretty'</td>
<td>iy balé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makába yaŋ</td>
<td>aduáŋ kilómetru</td>
<td>iy dálan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pékamasantíŋ yaŋ díli</td>
<td>'Pedro is the best-looking of all among all the children'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mátas ya</td>
<td>kaŋ Pédro i Suán</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papuntá ya</td>
<td>kiŋ balé i Pédro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ibát ya</td>
<td>'Pedro is headed for the house'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atí yu</td>
<td>kiŋ balé i Pédro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atín yaŋ</td>
<td>'Pedro is present in the house'</td>
<td>sakít i Pédro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mákamaté</td>
<td>'Sickness is motivative of death to Pedro'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalákad neŋ</td>
<td>'Juan is in the company of Pedro in walking'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bísa yaŋ</td>
<td>'Pedro is in a state of wanting food'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>másakít ya</td>
<td>'Pedro is sick in the head= Pedro has a headache'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In these sentences, there is no choice of subject; the N in last position is usually subjectivized. The examples likewise show that the most frequent subject N in state V's is the patient N; the patient N is nonsubject only in state V's which are specified as motivative, associative, or experiential, and in the exceptions to be described below.

The exceptions arise from particular verb roots, the occurrences of which disturb the unmarked positioning described. Such a disturbance of the unmarked positioning will be accounted for subsequently by extraposition processes which place the N which is eventually to be subjectivized in the last position in a configuration. For example:

(2.1.2.1.1)* burí? na ya niŋ anák # inŋ dalandán >
burí ne niŋ anák # inŋ DALANDÁN
The orange is liked by the child

where the experiential state verb root burí? 'to like [as a permanent state]' has a subjectivized patient N instead of the expected subjectivized experiencer N (cf. bísa? 'in a [temporary] state of wanting'. There are other state V's which are accompanied by a beneficiary N which extrapose the patient N:

(2.1.2.1.2)* kailáŋan na ya niŋ anák # inŋ átu >
kailáŋan ne niŋ anák # inŋ ÁTU
The car is needed by the child
In some types of state V's which are not lexically specified (possessive, intentive, favoritive), the accompanying patient N is likewise extraposed:

(2.1.2.1.3) kaŋ Pédru ya # INJ ÆUTU
The car [belongs] to Pedro

(2.1.2.1.4) pará kaŋ Pédru ya # INJ ÆUTU
The car is [intended] for Pedro

(2.1.2.1.5) pará kaŋ Márkus ya # IPÉDRU
Pedro is [in a favoritive stance] towards Marcos [as a political candidate]

With regards to process V's, the unmarked positioning of accompanying N's may be shown thus (again, following the order of replacement rules postulated in section 1.1.6):

```
1          2          3          4
measure    location   patient   beneficiary
V          N          N          N
process
```

The following examples will illustrate the positioning of N's accompanying process V's:
mérágúl yaŋ  
aduán pulgáda  
'iŋ anák  
'The child grew by two inches'

máŋailágən yaŋ  
péra  
iŋ anák  
'The child is needing money'

mánákít yaŋ  
bálé  
iŋ anák  
'The child is seeing a house'

mánasakít yaŋ  
kiŋ buntúk  
iŋ anák  
'The child is hurting in the head'
As the examples show, the usual subject of process V's is the accompanying patient N, unless process V is experiential or necessitative. In the latter instances, the nonsubject patient is always -definite. If patient N were definite, the positioning is disturbed: patient N must be extrapoosed and eventually subjectivized.

(2.1.2.1.6)* kailagiannan na ya niŋ anák # iŋ áutu >
kailagiannan ne niŋ anák # Iŋ ÁUTU
The car will be needed by the child

(2.1.2.1.7)* ákákit na ya niŋ anák # iŋ baláy >
ákákit ne niŋ anák # Iŋ BALÉ
The house is being seen by the child

In process V's which are accompanied by a patient N and a measure N, measure N is extrapoosed if it is definite:

(2.1.2.1.8) kéraqulán na la niŋ anák # DIŋ ADUÁŋ
PULGÁDA

The two inches were grown by the child= The child grew two inches

With regard to action V's, the sample general principle concerning subjectivizing the last N to be added to the V configuration applies, except that there are more positions to be accounted for because of the greater number of possible accompanying N's:
<instrumentative>
linákad yaŋ aduáŋ kilómetros
'Pedro walked two kilometers'

ginawá yaŋ lamésa kiŋ dútuŋ
'Pedro made a table out of the wood'

ginámít yaŋ tabáŋ
'tabák
'Pedro used a large knife'

mintá ya kiŋ balé
'Pedro went to the house'

ibát ya kiŋ balé
'Pedro came from the house'

miniyé yaŋ digálulu kaŋ Suán
'Pedro gave a gift to Juan'

mákiyábe ya kaŋ Suán
'Pedro is joining Juan'

pápagawá yaŋ balé kaŋ Suán
'Pedro is causing Juan to build a house'

páŋlákad neŋ
'The cane is being used by Pedro to walk with'
As the examples show, the usual subject of action V's is the agent N; in the rules formulated in section 1.1.6, the agent N is added last to the configuration, unless V is specified as instrumentative, in which case an instrument N is added after agent N has been added. The subjectivization of the instrument N when V is instrumentative (not instrumental) is thus easily accounted for by means of the ordering of the replacement rules.

Two exceptions were found to the scheme proposed. When action V is both associative and benefactive, the accompanying beneficiary N must be extrapoosed and eventually subjectivized:

\[(2.1.2.1.9)^* \text{ páki+lákad na ya naŋ Pédrú # kaŋ Suán #} \]
\[\text{iŋ anák> pákilákad neŋ Pédrú # kaŋ Suán #} \]
\[\text{Iŋ ANÁK} \]

The child is being joined to Juan by Pedro in walking.

Since a beneficiary N and an associate N usually occupy the same position (position 3), one of them must be 'edged out'; hence, the beneficiary N is extrapoosed.

Moreover, when measure/complement/instrument N's (which usually occupy position 1 and 2) are inflectionally specified as definite, they must be extrapoosed and eventually subjectivized:
(2.1.2.1.10)* lá+lákad+an na la naŋ Pédru #
  diŋ aduá?+ŋ kilómetru >
  lalakáran na laŋ Pédru #
  DINŋ ADUÁŋ KILÓMETRU

The two kilometers are being walked by Pedro

(2.1.2.1.11)* géwa? na ya niŋ anák # iŋ lamésa >
  géwa ne niŋ anák # Iŋ LAMÉSA

The table was made by the child

(2.1.2.1.12)* g+in+ámit na ya niŋ anák # iŋ tabák >
  ginamit ne niŋ anák # Iŋ TABÁK

The large knife was used by the child

Process-action V's are accompanied by N's in four possible positions:

1         2         3         4
agentive   beneficiary agent   instrument

V        N        N        N        <N>
process action

<instrumentative>

The following examples will illustrate the above scheme:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>púpútut yaŋ</td>
<td>dútug</td>
<td>i Pédru</td>
<td>'Pedro is cutting wood'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pápapútut yaŋ</td>
<td>dútug</td>
<td>kán Suán i Pédru</td>
<td>'Pedro is causing Juan to cut wood'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pámútut neŋ</td>
<td>dútug</td>
<td>Pédru iŋ tabák</td>
<td>'The large knife is being used by Pedro to cut wood with'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the patient N is definite, however, it must be extraposed and eventually subjectivized:

\[(2.1.2.1.13)^{*} \text{ p+in+útut na ya naŋ Pédrů # iŋ dútuŋ >} \]
\[\text{pinútut neŋ Pédrů # Iŋ DÚTUŋ} \]

The wood was cut by Pedro

Moreover, when a process-action V is specified as localized and is accompanied by a location N, the patient N must likewise be extraposed:

\[(2.1.2.1.3)^{*} \text{ timbúk na ya naŋ Pédrů # kiŋ sálu? # iŋ anáŋ >} \]
\[\text{timbúk neŋ Pédrů # kiŋ sálu? # Iŋ ANÁK} \]

The child was hit by Pedro in the chest

In effect, what the preceding discussion has shown is that in all-new sentences, there is really no choice of subject. In sentences with unmarked positioning, the last N to be added to the configuration is subjectivized; in certain verb root types, an N other than the last N to be added is extraposed and eventually subjectivized. In the latter case, the extrapolation is obligatory and not optional.

2.1.2.2. Sentences with -New N's. In sentences which are not all-new and in which V is nonstate, there are other extrapolation rules which must be stated. Consider the following sentence sequences:
(2.1.2.2.i)
karatāgdatą́ŋ na pą̊ mu niŋ tą́u ## pą̊papúťut yaŋ dútuŋ # kaŋ Suán # Iŋ Tą́u
new new
The man has just now arrived The man is causing Juan to cut wood

(2.1.2.2.2)
karatāgdatą́ŋ na pą̊ muŋ Suán ## pą̊papúťutan neŋ dútuŋ niŋ tą́u # I Suán
new new
Juan has just now arrived Juan is being caused by the man to cut wood

(2.1.2.2.3)
karatāgdatą́ŋ na pą̊ mu niŋ dútuŋ ## pą̊papúťut na niŋ tą́u # kaŋ Suán # Iŋ dútuŋ
new new
The wood has just now arrived The wood is being caused by the man to be cut
by Pedro
What the sentence sequences show is that when an N is carried over from one sentence to another (the N which is carried over then is -new), it must be the subject of the following sentence.

The subjectivization process is relatively straightforward and uncomplicated when there is only one -new N to be carried over: the -new N is extrapolated and eventually subjectivized. However, when the configuration has more than one -new N, a choice seems to be possible. To take a relatively simple example:

(2.1.2.2.4) miniye yaŋ kualta # kiŋ anák # I PEDRU
            new   new

Pedro gave money to the child

Now, it is possible to carry over into a following sentence all three previously introduced N's:

(2.1.2.2.5)* p'a+ipaŋ+salí? na yaŋ bóla naŋ PEDRU #
            -new   -new
            kiŋ anák # iŋ kualta>
            -new
            pápanyali   neŋ  bólaŋ PEDRU #
            kiŋ anák # IN KUALTA

The money is being caused by Pedro to be used in buying a ball by the child

The V of the sentence is instrumentative; hence, the instrument N, following the earlier rule described for such V's, must be subject. There is then no real choice and new/-new specification
is irrelevant. However, only anák and Pédru can be carried over, in which case there is a genuine choice possible:

\[
(2.1.2.2.6) \text{pásali yaŋ bóla # kiŋ anák # I PÉDRU}
\]

-\text{new}

Pedro is causing the child to buy a ball

The sentence is ambiguous, since it means 'Pedro is causing the child to buy a ball [for Pedro]' or 'Pedro is causing the child to buy a ball [for the child]'. Actually, the first meaning is more common. Unambiguous is:

\[
(2.1.2.2.6a) \text{pásalíwan neŋ bólaŋ Pédru # INJ ANÁK}
\]

-\text{new}

The child is being caused by Pedro to buy a ball [for the child]

It is possible to extend the analysis to instances in which not three N's but more than three N's are carried over into a following sentence. However, it is difficult to find natural examples. Moreover, if more than three N's are carried over, usually one of these N's is a definite patient/complement/instrument/measure N and hence must be subjectivized according to an earlier rule postulated, once again leaving no choice and making the new/-new specification irrelevant.
It would be in order to extrapolate and state that when more than two N's are carried over from a previous sentence (provided none of the other extraposition stipulations apply), there is a choice of more than two N's to be extrapoosed and eventually subjectivized.

2.1.2.3. Extraposition Rules. The stipulations on extraposition may be formulated as postsemantic extraposition rules (postsemantic rules will be marked T #, in keeping with the earlier statement that such postsemantic rules are transformational in character):

(T 1') Extraposition Rule I

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[experiential]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[permanent liking]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[necessitative]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[possessive]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[intensive]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[favoritive]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[experiential]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[permanent liking]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[necessitative]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[possessive]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[intensive]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[favoritive]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[beneficiary]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{patient N}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V N}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{state}
\]

\[
\text{\longrightarrow}
\]
(T 2') Extraposition Rule IIa

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{measure} & \text{patient} & \text{patient} & \text{measure} \\
V & N & N & N \\
\text{process} & \text{definite} & \text{process} & \text{definite} \\
\text{mensurative} & & \text{mensurative} & \\
\end{array}
\]

(T 3') Extraposition Rule IIb

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{patient} \{\text{beneficiary}\} & \text{experiencer}\{\text{beneficiary}\} & \text{patient} \{\text{beneficiary}\} & \text{experiencer}\{\text{beneficiary}\} \\
V & N & N & N \\
\text{process} & \text{definite} & \text{necessitative} \{\text{experiential}\} & \\
\text{necessitative} \{\text{experiential}\} & & \\
\end{array}
\]

(T 4') Extraposition Rule IIIa

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{measure} & \text{rel} & \text{rel} & \text{measure} \\
V & N & N & N \\
\text{action} & \text{definite} & \text{action} & \text{definite} \\
\text{mensurative} & \text{-instrumentative} & \text{mensurative} & \text{-instrumentative} \\
\end{array}
\]

(T 5') Extraposition Rule IIIb

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{instrument} \{\text{complement}\} & \text{rel} & \text{rel} & \text{instrument} \{\text{complement}\} \\
V & N & N & N \\
\text{action} & \text{definite} & \text{instrumental} \{\text{completable}\} & \\
\text{completable} \{\text{completable}\} & \text{-instrumentative} & \\
\end{array}
\]
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(T 6') Extrapoision Rule IIIc

\[
\text{associate} \quad \text{beneficiary} \quad \text{agent}
\]
\[
\text{action} \quad \text{associative} \quad \text{benefactive}
\]

\[
\text{agent} \quad \text{associate} \quad \text{beneficiary}
\]
\[
\text{action} \quad \text{associative} \quad \text{benefactive}
\]

(T 7') Extrapoision Rule IV

\[
\text{location} \quad \text{patient} \quad \text{agent}
\]
\[
\text{process} \quad \text{definite}
\]
\[
\text{action} \quad \text{localized}
\]

\[
\text{agent} \quad \text{location} \quad \text{patient}
\]
\[
\text{process} \quad \text{definite}
\]
\[
\text{action} \quad \text{localized}
\]

The next two rules apply only if the previous ones have not applied.

(T 8') Extrapoision Rule Va

\[
\text{rel} \quad \text{rel} \quad \text{rel}
\]
\[
\text{-state} \quad \text{new} \quad \text{-new} \quad \text{new}
\]

\[
\text{rel} \quad \text{rel} \quad \text{rel}
\]
\[
\text{-state} \quad \text{new} \quad \text{new} \quad \text{-new}
\]
2.1.3. Subjectivization Rule. After the application of the Extraposition Rules (or their nonapplication, depending on the stated contexts), the outermost N, whether N be specified as new or -new (but always definite) must be specified post-semantically as SUBJECT, with the exceptions earlier noted. The rule may be stated thus:

(T 10') Subjectivization Rule

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rel} & \quad \text{rel} \quad \text{rel} \quad \text{rel} \\
V & \quad \text{N} \quad N_\alpha \quad N_\beta & \rightarrow & \text{SUBJECT} / V \\
\text{definite} & \quad \# & \rightarrow & \text{SUBJECT} / V \\
& \quad \text{- exerivizer} \\
& \quad \text{- immediate (aspect)} \\
& \quad \text{- exclamative}
\end{align*}
\]

where ## is an ad hoc abbreviation for outermost N in the configuration.
2.1.4. SUBJECT Incorporation into V. The specification of the outermost N as SUBJECT triggers another postsemantic process, an incorporation process whereby the subject choice is mirrored as an inflectional unit of V; this process accounts for the agreement between the verb root (with its affixes) and the SUBJECT N, a phenomenon which has been noticed among the Philippine languages. For example:

(2.1.4.1) mágáral yaŋ lisyún # INJ ANÁK

The child is studying [some] lesson

(mágáral 'to study' lisyún 'lesson', from Spanish lección).

In the above sentence, V must be inflectionally specified (by a postsemantic process) as agent subject, which however receives Ø symbolization. However, were lisyún the subject of the sentence, one would have:

(2.1.4.1a) págarálAN ne niŋ anák # INJ LISYÚN

The lesson is being studied by the child

where now V is inflectionally specified as complement subject; the symbolization of the incorporated specification 'complement subject' consists of the sound shift from m to p as well as the suffix -an. The rule may be formulated thus:

(T 11') SUBJECT Incorporation Rule

\[ V \xrightarrow{\text{root}} \text{rel subject} / \text{rel} \]

\[ \text{N SUBJECT} \]

where rel means 'any noun relation' selected as subject
2.1.5. Subjectivization in the Scholarly Literature on the Philippine Languages. The preceding account of subjectivization in Pampangan differs from the view of subjectivization or 'focus' prevalent in the scholarly literature on the Philippine languages (see, for example, the collection of articles introduced by Wolfenden 1964) not only in nomenclature but also in its view of subject specification in V as reflecting rather than governing subject choice.

SUBJECT specification follows the replacement rules which attach N's to nuclear V. In some well-defined contexts, the resulting configuration is disturbed (and hence, more marked) so that while the usual subject of state and process V's is the accompanying patient N and the usual subject of action and process-action V's is the accompanying agent N, some other N is subjectivized. The outermost N, post-semantically specified as SUBJECT, is the context for a further postsemantic process of incorporation copying subject specification into V; in sentences with unmarked subject choice, this subject specification is symbolized by Ø, but in sentences with marked subject choice, this subject specification is often symbolized by an affix. The mirrored subject choice in V exemplifies a kind of predicate-subject agreement which is overtly marked in V by an affixal symbolization (the symbolization can be Ø, of course).
If one adopts this view proposed, subjectivization is seen to be of the same type as subjectivization and agreement in most of the languages of the world, for example, in English (the example is based on Fillmore 1968):

The man opened the door with a knife
The door was opened by the man with a knife
A knife opened the door
The door opened with a knife
The door opened

The only distinctive characteristic of subjectivization and agreement phenomena in Pampangan is that while in English, a marked subject choice is often reflected by word order (except for traditional passive sentences, which are marked by both word order and BE-auxiliary as well as past participle), a marked subject choice in Pampangan is reflected by a verbal affix and the determiner \( i/\text{in} \) of the subject choice.

Because \( V \) usually precedes the subject \( N \) in surface structure, it has often been assumed that \( V \) governs subject choice. If one starts with \( V \), it seems that there are almost no constraints, provided one chooses the correct affix and provided one knows what types of \( N \)'s accompany a particular \( V \) root. However, as the rules of the preceding section have shown, there are severe constraints on subject choice, especially with respect to state \( V \)'s. Only when
there are more than one -new N's accompanying V is there really a choice, provided previous extraposition rules have not applied. Moreover, as Chapter IV will show, in responses to questions, subject choice is completely dictated by the question.

The use of the specification new/-new as one relevant context for subjectivization is novel and confirms Chafe's proposal (1970b) that this semantic distinction is relevant for determining rules of subjectivization in languages.

Moreover, within the frame of reference adopted here, the use of the term 'focus' is perhaps infelicitous, since 'focus' usually connotes highlighting. What has been termed 'subject' in this study is not particularly highlighted; rather, its usual place in linear structure is at the end of a sentence whereas the place of sentential accent in Pampangan is at the beginning of a sentence. Moreover, after the subject has been copied into V by a further incorporation process (see section 2.4.1), if its referent is clear from the nonlinguistic context or if it is -new, it is deletable.

In Bergaño (1916), Castrillo (1965), and Constantino (1965), and in general, in the scholarly literature on the Philippine languages (including Bloomfield's 1917 Tagalog grammar), the active-passive distinction in verbs traditionally labeled 'transitive' is made much of; in the frame of reference adopted in this study, such transitive verbs are called process-action verbs or completable/instrumental/mensurative action
verbs. Thus, Bergaño speaks of the 'tres pasivas', Castrillo describes 'passive action-goal constructions', and Constantino speaks of different types of passives: goal passive, locative passive, benefactive passive, instrumental passive, reciprocal passive, and agentive passive. Insofar as an agent N is required in all such verbs and insofar as sentences with agent nouns which are not subjectivized are labeled 'passive', the distinction is valid. Passive sentences would then be all sentences in which an agent N occurs but is not subject. However, this view seems to put undue importance on an agent N accompanying V. It is quite clear that different V's rel take different N's, and that any N is of equal importance, agent whether it be N or not. It would seem then that the active/passive dichotomy is insufficient, and as Pike (1963) has observed, the possibility of subjectivizing (focusing on) different N's should lead us to postulate not two voices but as many voices as there are N types accompanying a V, insofar as each N is subjectivizable. Hence, it would be more proper to speak of an active voice (where agent N is subject), a passive voice (where patient N is subject), a benefactive voice (where beneficiary N is subject), a locative voice (where location N is subject), and so forth.
2.2. Syncretization. Once the outermost N has been postsemantically marked SUBJECT in a semantic configuration, all other accompanying N's must be specified as either OBLIQUE or left unmarked (-OBLIQUE). Eventually, subject N's are marked by the determiner i/iŋ, oblique N's by the determiner kaj/kinŋ if they are definite, -oblique N's by the determiner nan/ninŋ if they are definite. If -subject N's are -definite, they have a Ø determiner; subject N's are, of course, always definite. Which N relations must be postsemantically marked OBLIQUE is shown by the chart below and exemplified in the following sentences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agent</th>
<th>agentive beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>experiencer</td>
<td>beneficiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrument</td>
<td>motive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement</td>
<td>norm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measure</td>
<td>associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
<td>partitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-SUBJECT</td>
<td>-SUBJECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-OBLIQUE</td>
<td>OBLIQUE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the sentences below exemplifies one N -SUBJECT:

(2.2.1)* gagawən na ya niŋ anək # iŋ sılya >
gagawən ne. NINŋ AŅAK # iŋ sılya
The chair is being made by the child
(2.2.2) ákákit ne NIŇ ANÁK # iŋ balé
experincer

The house is being seen by the child

(2.2.3) gágámit yaŋ SANDŮK # iŋ anák
instrument

The child is using [a] wooden spoon

(2.2.4) gágawá yaŋ SÍLYA # iŋ anák
complement

The child is making a chair

(2.2.5) makába yaŋ ADUÁN KILÔMETRU # iŋ dálan
measure

The road is two kilometers long

(2.2.6) púputut yaŋ DŮTŮN # iŋ anák
patient

The child is cutting wood

(2.2.7) págawá yaŋ sílya # KIŇ TÁU # iŋ anák
agentive beneficiary

The child is causing the man to make a chair

(2.2.8) babiye yaŋ digálu # KIŇ ANÁK # i Pédru
beneficiary

Pedro is giving [a] gift to the child

(2.2.9) KIŇ PIST regularly # iŋ páqsmaté da diŋ manúk
motive

The death of the chickens is due to pestilence

(2.2.10) maragúl ya # KIŇ ANÁK # i Pédru
norm

Pedro is taller (lit. bigger) than the child

(2.2.11) mákilákad ya # KIŇ TÁU # i Pédru
associate

Pedro is joining the man in walking

(2.2.12) pékamaragúl yaŋ díli # KARIŇ GAŇ ANÁK # i Pédru
partitive

Pedro is the biggest of all among all the children
(2.2.13) gágawá yaŋ sílya # KINŋ DÚTUNŋ # iŋ tāu
       material
The man is making a chair out of the wood

(2.2.14) máñibát ya # KINŋ BALEŋ # iŋ anák
       source
The child is coming from the house

(2.2.15) púpunta ya # KINŋ BALEŋ # iŋ anák
       goal
The child is going to the house

(2.2.16) atí yu # KINŋ BALEŋ # iŋ anák
       location
The child is present in the house

(2.2.17) KINŋ LÚNIS # iŋ pistá
       time
The fiesta takes place on Mondays

Sentences (2.2.3) to (2.2.6) exemplify -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE
-definite N's, marked by Ø determiner. OBLIQUE-marked N's
are usually definite. However, in the sentence:

(2.2.18) antí yaŋ bábi? # i Pédru
       Pedro is like a pig,

usually
the norm N, which is OBLIQUE, is likewise -definite, and
receives Ø determiner. An easy way to account for this is
to make OBLIQUE specification dependent on prior definite
specification as a context.

There are irregularities to the oblique/-oblique
specifications described above; these will be accounted for
by other postsemantic processes involving oblique/-oblique
shifts. The rule may be formulated thus:

(T 12') Syncretization Rule

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{agentive beneficiary} \\
\text{beneficiary} \\
\text{motive} \\
\text{norm} \\
\text{associate} \\
\text{partitive} \\
\text{material} \\
\text{source} \\
\text{goal} \\
\text{location} \\
\text{time} \\
N \\
\text{definite}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\rightarrow \quad \text{OBLIQUE} \quad \text{-SUBJECT}\]

The term 'syncretization' has been used in labeling the rule, since the postsemantic process of specifying a subset of the N relations as oblique and the rest as -oblique amounts to a traditional syncretization of 'cases'. In Pampangan, the underlying semantic relations between V and N are reduced to three surface 'cases': nominative (i/iy), dative (kan/kin), and genitive (nang/nin). Lopez (1941), in his study of Tagalog, posits a 'nominative case', a 'locative case', and an 'attributive case', corresponding to the three cases posited above. If one considers case as a surface category rather than as a deep category, in the frame of reference in this study, as a postsemantic specification rather than as a semantic relation, then Lopez's
threefold division would be valid likewise for Pampangan (and most likely, for the other Philippine languages as well). It would be futile, however, to attempt to discover a Grundbedeutung or even a Gesamtbedeutung for these surface structure cases, since, for example, the nominative case has a potential of seventeen Bedeutungen and perhaps even more should it be deemed necessary in the future to posit more N relations.

2.3. Oblique/-Oblique Specification Shifts.

2.3.1. Shift: N to N. Consider the OBLIQUE -OBLIQUE sentences:

(2.3.1.1) ūli na niŋ pistí # iŋ sakít
The sickness is due to the pestilence

(2.3.1.2) kailágan neŋ Pédrů # iŋ átu
The car is needed by Pedro

(2.3.1.3) kasíŋ dagúl neŋ Pédrů # i Suán
Juan is as big as Pedro

(2.3.1.4) kalúpa neŋ Pédrů # i Suán
Juan looks like (lit. of the same face as) Pedro
where the motive N, the beneficiary N, the norm N, ordinarily specified as OBLIQUE, are -OBLIQUE. It seems that the shift is conditioned by particular verb roots or derivational affixes of verb roots. The rule may be formulated thus:

\[
\text{(T 13')} \quad \text{OBLIQUE to -OBLIQUE Shift Rule I}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{motive} & \text{motive} \\
\text{beneficiary} & \text{beneficiary} \\
\text{norm} & \text{norm} \\
N & N \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\rightarrow & / & \leftarrow \\
\text{OBLIQUE} & \text{state} \\
\text{due to} \\
\text{need} \\
\text{equatativizer} \\
\text{similaritativizer} \\
\end{array}
\]

There are yet other instances of OBLIQUE to -OBLIQUE shift. Consider the following sentences:

\[(2.3.1.5) \quad \text{masantĩŋ } \text{ya} \# \text{ iŋ piyálũŋan na niŋ anáŋ} \\
\text{The boy of the child is pretty}
\]

\[(2.3.1.6) \quad \text{malatí } \text{ya} \# \text{ iŋ turnílyũ na niŋ piyálũŋan} \\
\text{The screw of the toy is small}
\]

\[(2.3.1.7) \quad \text{maragúl } \text{ya} \# \text{ iŋ kilúb na niŋ balé} \\
\text{The inside of the house is big}
\]

In sentence (2.3.1.5), \text{anáŋ} is a beneficiary N; in sentence (2.3.1.6), \text{piyálũŋan} is a partitive N; and in sentence (2.3.1.7) \text{balé} is a partitive N. The semantic structures of the first two sentences will be discussed in Chapter III; the third sentence has already been accounted for by the rules of
of Chapter I (see section 1.1.6). What is relevant at this point is that the beneficiary $N$ and the partitive $N$'s, which are ordinarily OBLIQUE, are \(-OBLIQUE\) in $N \, N$ surface substructures. The rule may be formulated thus:

$\quad (T \ 1^4') \ OBLIQUE \ \rightarrow \ -OBLIQUE \ \text{Shift \ Rule \ II}$

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\{\text{beneficiary}\} \\
\{\text{partitive}\} \\
N
\end{array}
\quad \rightarrow \quad 
\begin{array}{c}
\{\text{beneficiary}\} \\
\{\text{partitive}\} \\
N / N
\end{array}
\quad 
\begin{array}{c}
\text{OBLIQUE} \\
\text{-OBLIQUE}
\end{array}
\]

2.3.2. Shift: $N$ to $N$. Consider the following sentences:

\[(2.3.2.1)^* \ \text{di+dínan na yaŋ péra naŋ Pédrú # iŋ anák} \]
\[\quad \text{dirínan neŋ péraŋ Pédrú # iŋ anák} \]

The child is being given money by Pedro

The above sentence is perfectly regular, with the nonsubject agent $N$ marked by $náŋ$. However, consider the sentence:

\[(2.3.2.2) \ \text{mirirínan yaŋ péra # kąŋ Pédrú # iŋ anák} \]

\[x \quad \text{The child is being able to be given money by Pedro=} \]

Pedro= Pedro is getting to give money to the child

As a result of the derivational lexical unit added to $dínan$, symbolized by $mi-$, the nonsubject agent $N$ is now marked by oblique $kan$. It is difficult to label the semantic unit
symbolized by mi-; merely as a convenience, it will be labeled 'nonactive abilitativizer' and is best translated as 'get to'. Again, consider the sentence:

(2.3.2.3) mákamaté # kaŋ Pédru # iŋ sakít

The sickness is motive of death to Pedro

where now the patient N, when nonsubject normally marked by naŋ, is marked by oblique kaŋ, in the presence of motivativizer symbolized by maka-. The rule may be formulated thus:

(T 15') -OBLIQUE to OBLIQUE Shift Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\{\text{agent} \} \\
\{\text{patient} \} \\
N \quad \text{definite}
\end{array}
\rightarrow
\begin{array}{c}
\{\text{agent} \} \\
\{\text{patient} \} \\
N \quad \text{definite}
\end{array}
/ \\
V
\]

\text{-OBLIQUE}
\quad \text{OBLIQUE}

\begin{array}{c}
\{\text{action} \\
\{\text{nonactive abilitativizer} \\
\{\text{state} \\
\text{motivativizer}
\}
\}
\end{array}

2.4. Incorporations.

2.4.1. Incorporation of Specifications of N into V.

Consider the sentences:

(2.4.1.1) matápaŋ ya # i Pédru Pedro is brave

(2.4.1.2) sisikán ya # i Pédru Pedro is growing stronger

(2.4.1.3) gágápaŋ ya # i Pédru Pedro is crawling
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Some specifications of SUBJECT N are copied into the verb phrase, symbolized by the particle ya, translatable as 'he, she, it'. An incorporation process must be posited, therefore, copying features of the SUBJECT N into V, the incorporated copier eventually symbolized as an unbound formative.

If SUBJECT N is plural, the copier must likewise be plural:

\[(2.4.1.4) \text{matápaŋ YA } # \text{iŋ anáŋ } \text{The child is brave} \]
\[\text{matápaŋ LA } # \text{diŋ anáŋ } \text{The children are brave} \]

Moreover, if the SUBJECT N is inflectionally specified as 'total', 'total' may be part of the coper matrix:

\[(2.4.1.5) \text{matápaŋ LA } # \text{diŋ gaŋ áŋ } \text{ All the children are brave} \]

Not all SUBJECT N's are incorporated, however:

\[(2.4.1.6) \text{máyaŋ } # \text{iŋ bášak mu } \text{Your opinion is good} \]
\[(2.4.1.7) \text{mabáyaŋ } # \text{iŋ buri mu } \text{What you want is} \]
\[\text{difficult (lit. heavy)} \]
\[(2.4.1.8) \text{masantíŋ } # \text{iŋ dapáť mu } \text{What you are doing (or did) is fine} \]

The SUBJECT N's in the above sentences are abstract. In (2.4.1.8), if the referent of N is a particular artifact and
not just 'what has been done', the sentence would be:

(2.4.1.8a) masantíŋ YA # iŋ dépat mu
What you did (that is, the artifact) is fine

It is not only abstract N's which are not copied:

(2.4.1.9) búbusúk # iŋ urán
The rain is pouring
(2.4.1.10) malulútu? # iŋ pámaŋán
The food is getting cooked
(2.4.1.11) ákakamaté na niŋ anák # iŋ lagnát
Fever is causing the child to die

The N's in the above sentences are concrete (-abstract),
but they are likewise -count.

Since all N's which are subjectivized must be definite,
the inflectional unit definite need not be indicated in the
rule which will be formulated. To keep the rule as general
as possible, the inflectional unit 'total' will be stipulated
as obligatorily copied and then by a later postsemantic
deletion process, optionally deletable. The subject
incorporation rule may be formulated thus (the necessity for
the explicit inclusion of the lexical root in the rule will
be clarified below):
(T 16') SUBJECT Incorporation Rule I

Note that it is the inflectional units which are incorporated into V as N' and not the selectional or lexical units.

In Chapter I, several examples were given of state V's which were not specified by a lexical unit:

(2.4.1.12) kaŋ Pédru ya # iŋ balé
The house [belongs] to Pedro

(2.4.1.13) pará kiŋ snák ya # iŋ maníka?
The doll [is intended] for the child

(2.4.1.14) pará kaŋ Márkus ya # i Pédru
Pedro is [in a favoritive stance] towards Marcos [ as a political candidate ]

(2.4.1.15) kiŋ balé # iŋ taú?
The banquet [is taking place] in the house

(2.4.1.16) kéŋ lúnís # iŋ taú?
The banquet [will take place] on Monday

(2.4.1.17) kiŋ balé ya # iŋ pasbúl
The door [is part] of the house
The V's of the preceding sentences are V's without lexical specification: V

Now, without a lexical state

possessive
intensive
favoritive
locative
temporal
partitive
(no lexical root)

root, the copier (N') has no 'carrier' to attach to in surface structure. In the case of sentence (2.4.1.15) and (2.4.1.16), the question of incorporation does not arise, since tau?

'banquet, merry-making' is selectionally specified as abstract (an event, not an object) in Pampangan and hence is not copied. In general, it seems that only abstract N's may occur with nonlexically specified locative or temporal state V's. If a -abstract count N is to be located in space, a presentational state V is used instead:

(2.4.1.18) ati yu # kη balé # iŋ bòla

The ball is present in the house

Hence, to account for the incorporation process for state V's which are not lexically specified, only the following subtypes need be considered: possessive, intensive, favoritive, and partitive. In these V's, the copier is incorporated not into V, which is eventually deleted, but into the accompanying beneficiary N or partitive N branch. A second SUBJECT Incorporation Rule will therefore be necessary:
In most of the examples given thus far, the SUBJECT copier is symbolized by ¥a. In sentence (2.4.1.18), however, the symbolization for the copier is ¥u. Variant symbolizations of the copier occur with the state presential V atí:

(2.4.1.19) atí YU  # i Pédru
Pedro is present

(2.4.1.19a) atí LU  # di Pédru
Pedro and [his] companions are present

(2.4.1.19b) atí LUÑÁN  # di Pédru
Pedro and all [his] companions are present
The third sentence is interesting insofar as 'total' is postsemantically deleted from SUBJECT N but retained in SUBJECT N'.

2.4.2. Incorporation of Specifications of N

- SUBJECT
- OBLIQUE

into V. It is not only the SUBJECT N which is copied into V. Consider the sentences:

(2.4.2.1) burí NA niŋ anák # iŋ p'amaglakbê
Travel is liked by the child

(2.4.2.2) kararagulán NA niŋ anák # iŋ imálan
The cloth(es) are being grown out of by the child= The child is growing out of his clothes

(2.4.2.3) kakanán NA niŋ anak # iŋ p'amagján
The food is being eaten by the child

In the examples cited, the nonsubject nonoblique N, marked by naŋ/niŋ, is copied and incorporated into V as na. Since the subject in each of the sentences is either abstract or -count, it is not copied into V.

Not every nonsubject and nonoblique N is copied into V, however, as the following sentences show:

(2.4.2.4) bísa yaŋ p'amagján # iŋ anak
The child wants [some] food
(2.4.2.5) gágámit yaŋ tabák # iŋ anák
The child is using [a] knife

(2.4.2.6) lálákd yaŋ aduág kilómétru # iŋ anák
The child is walking two kilometers

(2.4.2.7) gágavá yaŋ sílya # iŋ anák
The child is making [a] chair

In the sentences cited, the nonsubject and nonoblique N is likewise -definite; hence, the determiner has Ø symbolization. It is evident then that the inflectional unit 'definite' must be included as a context for the incorporation rule. Moreover, if N is plural, N' must likewise be plural:

(2.4.2.8) kakanán NA      niŋ anák # iŋ pámáŋán
kakanán DA      diŋ anak # iŋ pámáŋán
The food is being eaten by the child
The food is being eaten by the children

The determiner for nonsubject and nonoblique plural agent 'child' is diŋ and although homophonic with the plural subject determiner diŋ must be distinguished from it. The nonsubject and nonoblique plural copier is symbolized by da. Moreover, nonsubject and nonoblique N may be inflectionally specified as 'total' and copied accordingly:

(2.4.2.9) kakanán DANÁN # diŋ gaŋ ánák # iŋ pámáŋán
The food is being eaten by all the children
The examples cited thus far have copied SUBJECT N or -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE N, not both. It is possible to copy both into V:

\[(2.4.2.10)\] ka+kán+án NA YA niŋ anáŋ # iŋ manúk >
\[\text{kakanán NE niŋ anáŋ # iŋ manúk}\]

The chicken is being eaten by the child

\[(2.4.2.11)\] kakanán NA LA niŋ anáŋ # diŋ gaŋ manúk ~
\[\text{kakanán NO niŋ anáŋ # diŋ gaŋ manúk}\]

The chickens are being eaten by the child

\[(2.4.2.12)\] kakanán NA LÁNÁN niŋ anáŋ # diŋ gaŋ manúk ~
\[\text{kakanán NÓJÁN niŋ anáŋ # diŋ gaŋ manúk}\]

All the chickens are being eaten by the child

\[(2.4.2.13)\] ka+kán+án DA YA diŋ ánák # iŋ manúk >
\[\text{kakanán DE diŋ ánák # iŋ manúk}\]

The chicken is being eaten by the children

\[(2.4.2.14)\] ka+kán+án DAÑÁN YA diŋ gaŋ ánák # iŋ manúk >
\[\text{kakanán DÉJÁN diŋ gaŋ ánák # iŋ manúk}\]

The chicken is being eaten by all the children

\[(2.4.2.15)\] kakanán DA LA diŋ ánák # diŋ manúk ~
\[\text{kakanán DO diŋ ánák # diŋ manúk}\]

The chickens are being eaten by the children

\[(2.4.2.16)\] ka+kán+án DA+ÑÁN LA+ÑÁN diŋ gaŋ ánák #
\[\text{diŋ gaŋ manúk >}\]
\[\text{kakanán DALÁNÁN diŋ gaŋ ánák #}\]
\[\text{diŋ gaŋ manúk ~}\]
kakanán DONAN  diŋ gaŋ ának # diŋ gaŋ manúk
All the chickens are being eaten by all the children

It was necessary to state the various possibilities in full
to show the regularity of patterning of the N' N' combinations,
called by Castrillo 'portmanteau pronouns'; in failing to
note explicitly the basic sameness of the variants, Castrillo
has unduly enlarged the inventory of such 'portmanteau
pronouns'.

The metathesis (syllabic) shown in (2.4.2.14) is
sporadic and not regular: * da+nan+yá > * dayáŋan > déŋan.
The obligatory deletion of the semantic unit 'total' in the
nonoblique copier of (2.4.2.16) may be accounted for by an
obligatory deletion rule to be stated in section 2.6.2.5.
It is difficult to find 'phonologically natural' reasons
for the optional phonological rule exemplified by 'na+la > no
and 'da+la > do'. It would be better perhaps to consider
na la / no and da la / do as variants in the symbolization
of the N' N' combinations.

It is not clear whether a nonsubject and nonoblique
definite N must likewise be selectionally specified as
nonabstract and count to be copied. Usually, abstract N's
and -count N's, if definite, are subject N's and not copied.
In sentences such as

(2.4.2.17) pête NE nǐŋ lagnáŋ # i Pédru
Pedro was killed by the fever

(2.4.2.18) pête NE nǐŋ pámagáral # i Pédru
Pedro was killed by [too much] study

lagnáŋ 'fever' is inherent -count and pámagáral 'studying' is inherently abstract; yet both are copied into V as na.
It seems, however, that in the above sentences, both N's have undergone a derivational process in effect personifying them, for one also says:

(2.4.2.19) pête NE nǐŋ tulísān # i Pédru
Pedro was killed by the robber

This point deserves further investigation. In the statement of the incorporation rule, tentatively, no selectional units will be used as contexts for incorporation: in other words, the rule states that all nonsubject and nonoblique definite N's are copied into V:

(T 18') -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE N Incorporation Rule

```
  \-rel
  \N
V \-root
   \-SUBJECT
root

edefinite
(plural)
(total)

   \-OBLIQUE
```
2.4.3. Incorporation of Specifications of N into OBLIQUE V. In general, oblique-marked N's are not copied and incorporated into V, with one exception:

(2.4.3.1) pékamaragúl yan DÍLI # kariŋ gaŋ ának #
i Pédrú
Pedro is the biggest of all among all the children

díli is an invariant form and occurs only with partitive N's in which a state V is inflected as superlative. The rule may be formulated thus:

(T 19') OBLIQUE N Incorporation Rule
2.4.4. Incorporation of Specifications of N

- SUBJECT
- OBLIQUE

into N. It has been shown in section 2.3.1 that in N substructures in which the second N is beneficiary or partitive, OBLIQUE beneficiary or partitive N becomes OBLIQUE by a Shift Rule. In turn, the resulting -SUBJECT OBLIQUE N must undergo an incorporation process:

(2.4.4.1) masatìŋ ya # iŋ balé NA niŋ anák
   The house of the child is pretty

(2.4.4.2) malati ya # iŋ turnilyú NA niŋ piyáluŋan
   The screw [which is part] of the toy is small

If the beneficiary or partitive N is plural (and total), the specifications plural (and total) must likewise be incorporated into the first N:

(2.4.4.3) masatìŋ ya # iŋ balé DA diŋ ának
   The house of the children is pretty

(2.4.4.4) masatìŋ ya # iŋ balé DANÁN diŋ gaŋ ának
   The house of all the children is pretty

Sentence (2.4.4.1) has the variant:

(2.4.4.1') masatìŋ ya # iŋ balé niŋ anák

Since sentences such as (2.4.4.3) in which the N' is plural
do not allow a similar deletion, it will perhaps not be necessary to formulate a deletion rule for (2.4.4.1') but attribute the optional loss of NA to phonological haplography. The phonological rather than semantic reason for the deletion becomes more evident when the beneficiary N is unique:

\[
(2.4.4.1a) \quad \text{ma+santiŋ ya} \quad \text{ŋ balɑ́y NA} \quad \text{ŋj Pedru} >
\]
\[
\text{masantiŋ ya} \quad \text{ŋ balé NAŋ} \quad \text{Pédr}u
\]

The house of Pedro is pretty

The incorporation rule may be formulated thus:

\[
(T \ 20') \quad \text{SUBJECT} - \text{OBLIQUE} \ N \ \text{Incorporation Rule II}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rel} & \quad \{\text{beneficiary}\} \\
\text{N} & \quad \{\text{partitive}\} \\
\text{N} & \\
\text{root} & \\
\text{definite} & \\
\text{(plural)} & \\
\text{(total)} & \\
\text{rel} & \\
\text{SUBJECT} & \\
\text{OBLIQUE} & \\
\{\text{beneficiary}\} & \\
\text{N} & \\
\text{rel} & \\
\text{definite} & \\
\text{(plural)} & \\
\text{(total)} & \\
\text{SUBJECT} & \\
\text{OBLIQUE} & \\
\end{align*}
\]
2.4.5. Optional Incorporation of Plural into V -action

Consider the sentence pairs:

(2.4.5.1) malagú la # diŋ dúlagá ~
maŋalagú la # diŋ dúlagá
The young women are beautiful

(2.4.5.2) mamamaté la # diŋ manúk ~
máŋamaté la # diŋ manúk
The chickens are dying

In both examples, the infix -ŋa- is an optional plural marker incorporated into V and mirrors the plural inflection of SUBJECT N. It seems, however, that -ŋa- symbolizes plurality only with nonaction V's. In action V's, -ŋa-, as was shown in Chapter I (see section 1.1.82), symbolizes repetition of action rather than plurality of subject:

(2.4.5.3) lálákad ya # i Pédrú
Pedro is walking ~
maŋlákad ya # i Pédrú
Pedro walks repeatedly=
Pedro walks to many places

Note that -ŋa- as a symbolization for repetition occurs with a nonplural subject N, whereas -ŋa- as a symbolization for plurality in nonaction V's may occur only with a plural
subject 

Since -ŋa- is an infix, it needs a 'carrier', a prefix to hang on to; hence, mag- in (2.4.5.3): * mag+ŋa > manj-. The common symbolization of plurality and repetition attests to a semantic relation. More than likely, the semantic units 'plural' and 'repetitive' have diverged from a common unit. An interesting instance of ambivalence is manifest in:

(2.4.5.4) máŋapatalúras la # diŋ 'ának

(from mipatalúras 'to slip unintentionally (lit. slip+ unintentionalizer)'). The sentence may mean:

The children are slipping unintentionally

in which case -ŋa- symbolizes a plural marker from plural SUBJECT patient N. Or it may mean:

The children are slipping unintentionally repeatedly

where now -ŋa- symbolizes 'repetitive' and perhaps simultaneously, 'plural'. The above sentence is an exception, since the regular rule is for -ŋa- to have only the second meaning, 'plural', when it occurs with nonaction V's. The example presents an interesting instance of language in change. The relevant rule may be
formulated thus:

(T 21') Plural Incorporation Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{patient} \\
V \\
\text{-action} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{subject} \\
\hline
\text{plural} \\
N \\
\text{SUBJECT} \\
\hline
\text{patient} \\
V \\
\text{-action} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{plural} \\
\text{subject}
\end{array}
\]

2.4.6. Incorporation of \( N \) into \( V \). Consider the
\(-\text{SUBJECT} -\text{OBLIQUE} \)

sentence:

(2.4.6.1)* \( \text{má+maŋ+kán ya} \ # \ \text{ságín} \ # \ \text{i Pédrú} > \)
\( \text{mámaŋán ya} + \ŋ \ \text{ságín} \ # \ \text{i Pédrú} > \)
\( \text{mámaŋán yaŋ} \ \text{ságín} \ # \ \text{i Pédrú} \)

Pedro is eating [a] banana

where the patient \( N \) (-\text{SUBJECT} -\text{OBLIQUE} -\text{definite}) has been
linked to \( V \) (and copier \( N' \)) by means of the ligature \( -ŋ \).
Even if the nonsubject and nonoblique \( N \) is definite, linking
still occurs:

(2.4.6.2)* \( \text{ka+kan+án na ya} \ # \ \text{naŋ} \ \text{Pédrú} \ # \ \text{iŋ ságín} > \)
\( \text{kakanán neŋ} \ \text{Pédrú} \ # \ \text{iŋ ságín} \)

The banana is being eaten by Pedro
The phonological synthesis *na+ya+naŋ > neŋ does not occur when the nonsubject and nonoblique N is nonunique, but the absence of pause still attests to incorporation, phonologically manifest as boundary deletion:

\[(2.4.6.3)^* \text{ka+kan+an na ya # niŋ anáŋ # iŋ ságin >} \]
\[\text{kakanán ne niŋ anáŋ # iŋ ságin} \]

The banana is being eaten by the child

It should be noted that when there is more than one nonsubject nonoblique N (in certain maximally specified V's), even the second nonsubject and nonoblique N is incorporated into V:

\[(2.4.6.4)^* \text{ga+gawá? ya # lamésa # kiŋ dütuŋ # i Pédrú >} \]
\[\text{gága\'awa? yaŋ lamésa # kiŋ dütuŋ # i Pédrú} \]

Pedro is making [a] table out of the wood

\[(2.4.6.5)^* \text{ga+gáwa?+an na ya # lamésa # naŋ Pédrú #} \]
\[\text{iŋ dütuŋ} \]
\[\text{gagáwan neŋ lamésaŋ} \]
\[\text{Pédrú #} \]
\[\text{iŋ dütuŋ} \]

The wood is being made into [a] table by Pedro

Or:

\[(2.4.6.5a)^* \text{ga+gáwa?+an na ya # lamesa # niŋ anáŋ #} \]
\[\text{iŋ dütuŋ} \]
\[\text{gagáwan neŋ lamésa niŋ anáŋ #} \]
\[\text{iŋ dütuŋ} \]

The wood is being made into [a] table by the child
The occurrence of sentences such as (2.4.6.5) and (2.4.6.5a) where there are two nonsubject and nonoblique N's seems to occur only with action V's with more than two accompanying N's in which the agent N is nonsubject; in such instances, the other nonsubject and nonoblique N is always -definite (and therefore without a determiner).

The incorporation of nonsubject and nonoblique N's into V is analogous to the closer relation in English between the verb and its direct object on the one hand and the subject on the other hand. In Pampangan, the integration in the verb phrase resulting from such incorporation is so close that the two nonsubject and nonoblique N's may even exchange positions in surface structure:

(2.4.6.5') gagáwan neŋ Pédruŋ lamésa # iy dútunŋ

The wood is being made by Pedro into [a] table

The incorporation rule may be formulated thus:

(T 22') -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE N Incorporation Rule

The output of (T 22') may undergo the optional transposition:
2.4.7. Status of # Boundary Marker in Pampangan.

By now, from the examples given, it should be clear that a special status is given to the # boundary marker in Pampangan, a marker earlier called a 'phrase boundary'. In other words, the phrase has structural importance in Pampangan as an operational concept for accounting for certain grammatical phenomena. The # boundary marker, phonologically interpretable as pause, is correlated to a branch in the semantic configuration, either a V (with its incorporations) or an N (with its determiner and its incorporations).

There is thus need in Pampangan to postulate as a significant and functional unit an element larger than a word but smaller than a sentence. Without such a unit, it will be difficult to adequately account for the occurrence of ligature $\text{a}^-\text{h}$, which functions to link not words (indicated by spaces) but phrases (indicated by #) where # has been deleted. Hence, the ligature is more than just a phonological additive for 'ease of articulation' but is a marker for the deletion of #, a marker for incorporation.
Consider the two sentences:

(2.4.7.1) masantĩŋ ya # iŋ ìgu?
The rattan basket is pretty

(2.4.7.2) masantĩŋ ya+ŋ ìgu? # iyán
That is a pretty rattan basket

In the first sentence, there is no ligature to link ya and iŋ because the two formatives belong to different branches:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\sqrt{V} & N' & \sqrt{D} & N \\
\text{masantĩŋ} & \text{ya} & iŋ & \text{ìgu}?
\end{array}
\]

In the second sentence, however, where 'pretty rattan basket' is an embedded $\sqrt{V}N$ structure, in surface structure, the configuration is:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\sqrt{V} & \sqrt{N'} & N & N \\
\text{masantĩŋ} & ya+ŋ & \text{ìgu}? & iyán
\end{array}
\]

In the second sentence, there is a ligature between ya and ìgu? precisely because ìgu? is incorporated within the $\sqrt{V}N'N$ branch.

Confronted then with a surface structure, the absence of # attests to prior incorporation:

(2.4.7.3) gagáwan neŋ lamészŋ Pédru # iŋ dútuŋ
The wood is being made into [a] table by Pedro
which may be represented thus:

\[
V \quad N' \quad N' \quad N \quad D \quad N \quad D \quad N
\]

gagáwan na ya+t lamésa+ naŋ Pédru iŋ dútunŋ

Within a branch, for example, \( V \quad N' \quad N' \), one must distinguish between words (indicated by spaces) and affixes (where explicitation is necessary, indicated by +). The unbound status of the copiers, particles or clitics (in subsequent chapters, more of these clitics incorporated within \( V \) will be discussed), makes it necessary to distinguish them from the bound affixes. For example:

\[
(2.4.7.1) \quad \text{ma+santíŋ ya } \# \text{ iŋ ígu?}
\]

The rattan basket is pretty

Now the clitic \( ya \) may be transposed, as in negative sentences:

\[
(2.4.7.1a) \quad \text{é ya ma+santíŋ } \# \text{ iŋ ígu?}
\]

The rattan basket is not pretty

Moreover, between determiner and \( N \), a traditional adjective (state \( V \)) may be interposed:

\[
(2.4.7.1b) \quad \text{é ya ma+santíŋ } \# \text{ iŋ malatiŋ ígu?}
\]

The little rattan basket is not pretty
Now the prefix ma- and other affixes of V, infixes and suffixes, do not show the same facility for transposition but are always bound. If one were to consider these particles as part of masantíŋ (as Bergaño and Castrillo do), one would have then:

\[(2.4.7.1) \text{masantíŋya} \neq iŋígu?\]

A transcription of this type, if it is not to be arbitrary, would be hard put to account for the transposability of ya and the nontransposability of ma-.

Later chapters will show that some of these particles incorporated into V, freely transposable within V but never outside of V, are disyllabic and sometimes even discontinuous. Where disyllabic, they often have their own accent. Hence, any attempt at a more detailed description of accent rules would have to postulate different types of boundaries within V.

2.5. Pronouns. Traditional pronouns (personal first, second, and third person; possessive; demonstrative; reflexive) in the frame of reference adopted in this study arise from various processes, notably incorporation and/or deletion as well as the direct symbolization of nonlexically specified N matrices. Hence, they are not generated by a uniform process of a formative 'taking the place of a noun'.
2.5.1. Third Person Pronouns. In the sentence:

(2.5.1.1) mátas ya # i Pédru

Pedro is tall

*ya* does not take the place of *i Pédru* but by a process of incorporation copies features or specifications of SUBJECT N into V. If, however, *Pédru* is -new information, the lexical unit *Pédru* may be deleted after the incorporation process, leaving a matrix $\begin{bmatrix} N \\ selectional units \\ X \\ inflectional units \end{bmatrix}$. By a general deletion process which will be formulated later, such nonlexically specified matrices must be deleted. Thus:

(2.5.1.1a) mátas ya

He is tall

so that in effect, the traditional third person pronoun subject arises from the symbolization of the copier N', SUBJECT by *ya*.

A similar process takes place to generate nonsubject and nonoblique third person pronouns. In the sentence

(2.5.1.2) págarálan na niŋ anák # iŋ kímiŋa

Chemistry is being studied by the child

there is no copier for the subject because *kímiŋa* 'chemistry'
(from Spanish química) is both abstract and -count. The nonsubject and nonoblique agent N is, however, copied as na. Now, if both the subject and the agent N's are -new, their lexical units can be deleted (both have to be -new since if only the agent N is -new, it would be subject). Once the lexical units are deleted, both N branches must be deleted. The resulting sentence is:

(2.5.1.2a) págarálan na

He is studying [it]

where now the incorporated copier na (N′) is the -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE

pronoun (actually the copier of anák).

It seems that the pronoun as a genuine proform or substitute for a noun arises only with oblique-marked N's. In the sentence:

(2.5.1.3)* b'in+i'yáy na ya naŋ Pédrú # kaŋ Suán # in ŋ átu > biniyé néŋ Pédrú # kaŋ Suán # in ŋ átu

The car was given by Pedro to Juan

if all N's were -new, the lexical unit in each of the N matrices would be deleted (after incorporation). This deletion of the lexical units triggers deletion of the whole N and of the whole N but not of the N -SUBJECT -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE -OBLIQUE
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Instead, it is directly symbolized as kayá:

(2.5.1.3a) biniyé ne  # kayá #
    He gave it to him

so that in effect, kayá symbolizes not a copier (unlike ya and na) but \( \begin{bmatrix} N \\ \text{selectional units} \\ \times \\ \text{inflectional units} \\ \text{OBLIQUE} \end{bmatrix} \); it is a genuine proform.

Not every third-person pronoun need arise from an original lexical unit in semantic structure. In other words, not every 'he/she/it' need arise from a noun root which is subsequently deleted. It could very well be that no lexical root is specified in semantic structure, because the person (or object) being referred to is present or is being pointed to. Thus, an initial sentence in a discourse may be:

(2.5.1.4) makagayák ya
    He/She [the speaker points to a person who is approaching] is all dressed up

where the patient N is \( \begin{bmatrix} \text{patient} \\ N \\ \text{selectional units} \\ \times \\ \text{inflectional units} \\ \text{new} \\ \text{SUBJECT} \end{bmatrix} \). With the processes described thus far, such instances of N matrices without lexical units are easily accounted for as subsequently
giving rise to pronouns. Like any SUBJECT N, the N of (2.5.1.4) is copied into V, the copier eventually symbolized as \textit{ya}. Since N is not lexically specified, no deletion process is necessary to delete the root. The more general process already alluded to, however, applies: the whole N branch must be deleted.

Hence, it was necessary to posit a two-step deletion process: the first process deletes a noun root which is -new; the second process deletes any N branch which is not lexically specified and which is not oblique-marked. In this way, pronouns which arise from both new and -new N matrices are accounted for.

Moreover, since what is eventually symbolized in Pampangan are either N copiers with only inflectional specifications or OBLIQUE N's with only inflectional specifications (a process will be postulated in section 2.6.2.3 deleting selectional units), the lack of gender distinction for third-person pronouns in Pampangan finds a general explanation; hence, \textit{ya} is a symbolization for 'he/she/it'.

2.5.2. First and/or Second Person Pronouns. The same processes already described for third-person pronouns apply to first and/or second person pronouns:
(2.5.2.1) másakít ku I am sick
másakít ka You are sick
másakít katá You and I are sick

where the patient N is \[
\begin{array}{c}
N \\
\text{other selectional units} \\
\text{first person} \\
\text{second person} \\
\text{inflectional units} \\
\text{SUBJECT}
\end{array}
\]. When N is selectionally specified by first and/or second person and not by a lexical unit, the incorporation process results in copying of certain specifications of N into V, including first and/or second person specifications. Thus:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
N \\
\text{first person} \\
\text{second person} \quad \text{first person} \\
\text{second person} \\
\text{inflectional units} \\
\text{SUBJECT} \\
\text{SUBJECT}
\end{array}
\]

N, which is not lexically specified, is eventually deleted by the general deletion process already referred to.

The same processes apply to nonsubject and nonoblique N’s specified as first and/or second person:

(2.5.2.2) burí ku # in pámagáral Studying is liked by me
burí mu # in pámagáral Studying is liked by you
burí ta # in pámagáral Studying is liked by you and me
where the subject, because abstract is not copied into V;
only -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE N is copied as ku, mu, and ta.
(Note that the symbolization for subject first person N'
is the same as for nonsubject nonoblique first person N').
Again, what has happened is that the nonsubject nonoblique
N, selectionally specified as first and/or second person,
is incorporated into V as N'; the N matrix is then deleted
because not lexically specified; the symbolization of N'
in each instance generates the nonsubject and nonoblique
first and/or second person pronoun.

In the case of oblique-marked first and/or second person
pronouns, no incorporation takes place but direct symbolization
of the oblique-marked nonlexically specified N matrices:

\[(2.5.2.3) \text{ biniyé neq Pédr} # \text{ kanáku } # \text{ i} \text{q áutu} \]

The car was given by Pedro to me
biniyé neq Pédr # kéka # iq áutu
The car was given by Pedro to you
biniyé neq Pédr # kékatá # iq áutu
The car was given by Pedro to you and me

where the beneficiary N is
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
N \\
\text{other selectional units} \\
\text{(first person)} \\
\text{(second person)} \\
\text{inflectional units} \\
\text{OBLIQUE}
\end{bmatrix}
\]
2.5.3. Possessive Pronouns. In section 2.4.4, (T 20') was formulated, yielding the output:

```
  rel
N  N'  beneficiary
  -SUBJECT  -SUBJECT
  -OBLIQUE  -OBLIQUE
```

An example of a noun phrase with such a configuration is:

(2.5.3.1) iŋ balé na nɪŋ aŋák

the house of the child

where aŋák is a beneficiary N, the possessor, and balé is a patient N, the object possessed. Now, the oblique-turned-oblique beneficiary N is copied into the patient N as na, the copier coreferential with nɪŋ aŋák. If, however, the lexical unit of the beneficiary N matrix is -new, then the root is deletable; once deleted, the nonlexically specified matrix must then be deleted, leaving:

(2.5.3.1a) iŋ balé na

his house

Hence, traditional possessive pronouns in Pampangan are actually nonsubject and nonoblique N's, copiers incorporated into the N which refers to the object possessed:
(2.5.3.2) ìŋ balé ku my house
ìŋ balé mu your house
ìŋ balé ta our (your and my) house
ìŋ balé na his/her/its house

However, as variants of the above, one may likewise say:

(2.5.3.2') ìŋ kanáku+ŋ balé my house
ìŋ kéka+ŋ balé your house
ìŋ kékatá+ŋ balé our (hour and my) house
ìŋ kayá+ŋ balé his/her/its house

To account for the above variant expressions of possession, it will be necessary to postulate that the rule (T 14') earlier postulated shifting oblique to -oblique specification for \( N \) \( N \) configurations is optional for

```
beneficiary
\( N \)
-SUBJECT
OBLIQUE
```

If (T 14') is not applied, beneficiary \( N \) remains OBLIQUE.
It must be subsequently be interposed between the determiner and the root of \( N \):

```
\( D \)
beneficiary
\( N \)
-SUBJECT
OBLIQUE
```
to yield a surface structure such as:

\[(2.5.3.3) \ iŋ \ kaŋ \ Pédruyŋ \ balé\]

the house [which belongs] to Pedro

The above phrase is less common than

\[(2.5.3.3a)\ast \ iŋ \ balé \ na \ naŋ \ Pédruy > iŋ \ balé \ naŋ \ Pédruy\]

the house of Pedro

but is perfectly acceptable. Now, the lexical root of
the beneficiary \text{N} of \text{(2.5.3.3)} may be deleted, if \text{-nev}, to yield:

\[(2.5.3.3b) \ iŋ \ kayáŋ \ balé\]

his house

where \text{kayá} is \begin{bmatrix} \text{beneficiary} \\ \text{N} \\ \text{(no lexical root)} \\ \text{OBLIQUE} \end{bmatrix}. Again, it should be noted

that \text{kayá} is not a copier but the direct symbolization of
a nonlexically specified oblique-marked \text{N} matrix.

In addition to revising (T 14'), another rule will be
necessary (a linearization rule):
The above rule is a linearization rule and comes much later in the derivational process (see section 2.7) but is formulated at this point because of its relevance to possessive pronouns.

2.5.4. Demonstrative Pronouns. Traditional demonstrative pronouns arise from analogous processes, although the specification 'demonstrative' blocks the general deletion rule for nonlexically specified N matrices. In a sentence such as

(2.5.4.1) masantiŋ ya # itáŋ balé

That house is beautiful

the unit 'demonstrative' is not copied into V under the N' matrix. Subsequently, N is linearized as D N, with the unit 'demonstrative' under D and eventually symbolized as itá.

Now, if the root house is -new, it may be deleted. Or if the root is not used to specify N in semantic structure (for example, if the speaker is pointing to the house), N may be nonlexically specified. In both cases, the rootless N matrix is not deleted; the unit 'demonstrative' prevents such deletion. Then, the whole N matrix is directly symbolized as:
(2.5.4.1a) masantíŋ ya # itá
That is beautiful

where the demonstrative pronoun itá is truly a proform or substitute for itán balé.
The same processes apply to nonsubject demonstratives:

(2.5.4.2)* séliŋ na ya nítaŋ táu # iŋ baláy >
séli ne nítaŋ táu # iŋ balé
The house was bought by that man

where nítaŋ táu is copied into V as na and where the nonsubject and nonoblique determiner matrix contains the specification 'demonstrative' symbolized by níta. Again, if the nonsubject and nonoblique matrix is without a lexical unit, one has:

(2.5.4.2a) séli ne níta # iŋ balé
The house was bought by that [man]

Or:

(2.5.4.2b) séli ne níta
It was bought by that [man]

For oblique-marked demonstrative pronouns, no copying process need be postulated:
(2.5.4.3) biniyé neğ Pédrú # kaníta+ŋ tāu # iŋ ˈalut

The car was given by Pedro to that man

Again, if for some reason, the beneficiary N matrix is without a lexical unit, one would have:

(2.5.4.3a) biniyé neğ Pédrú # kaníta # iŋ ˈalut

The car was given by Pedro to that [man]

Or:

(2.5.4.3b) biniye né # kaníta

It was given by him to that [man]

2.5.4. Summary of Rules for Pronouns. The following rules generate personal and demonstrative pronouns in Pampangan (they apply after the incorporation processes earlier formulated):

(T 25') First and/or Second Person Incorporation into V
Rule I

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} & \text{N} & \text{V}' & \text{N}' \\
\text{count} & \text{potent} & \text{animate} & \text{human} \\
\text{(first person)} & \text{(second person)} & \text{(second person)} & \text{(second person)} \\
\text{(plural)} & \text{(plural)} & \text{(plural)} & \text{definite} \\
\text{SUBJECT} & \text{SUBJECT} & \text{SUBJECT} & \text{SUBJECT}
\end{array}
\]
(T 26') First and/or Second Person Incorporation into V
Rule II

V N' \rightarrow rel N
SUBJECT count
potent
animate
human
(first person)
(second person)
(plural)
definite

-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE

V N' N'
SUBJECT
(rel N
SUBJECT count
potent
animate
human
(first person)
(second person)
(plural)
definite

-OBLIQUE

(T 27') First and/or Second Person Incorporation into V
Rule III

\{beneficiary\} N N \rightarrow \{beneficiary\} N N'
\{partitive\} count
potent
animate
human
(first person)
(second person)
(plural)
definite

-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE

\{beneficiary\} N N
\{partitive\} count
potent
animate
human
(first person)
(second person)
(plural)
definite

-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE

-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE

(Partitive has been included to account for noun phrases such as 'my head', where 'my' refers to the whole (partitive N) of which 'head' is a part.)
(T 28') Deletion of -new root in N Rule

rel
N
selectional units
root
inflectional units
\rightarrow
rel
N
selectional units
inflectional units

-new

(T 29') General Deletion Rule

rel
N
selectional units
(no lexical root)
inflectional units
\rightarrow
\emptyset

demonstrative

-OBLIQUE

2.5.6. Symbolization Rules for Personal and Demonstrative Pronouns. The matrices symbolized below result after other deletion processes have applied (notably, deletion of selectional units of N, to be formulated in section 2.6.2.3). Note that pronouns arise as a result of the symbolization of N demonstrative and N matrices as well as of N' matrices.

OBLIQUE

(Sy 2.5.6.1) N'
SUBJECT
\rightarrow
\{ iya / /\#_\_ \}
\{ yu / V / ati \}
\{ ya \}

(Sy 2.5.6.2) N'
plural
\rightarrow
\{ ila / /\#_\_ \}
\{ lu / V / ati \}
\{ la \}

(Sy 2.5.6.3) N'
-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE
\rightarrow
na

(Sy 2.5.6.4) N'
plural
-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE
\rightarrow
da
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(Sy 2.5.6.5) N
  -SUBJECT
  OBLIQUE → * ka+ya > kayá

(Sy 2.5.6.6) N
  plural
  -SUBJECT
  OBLIQUE → * ka+da+íla>kadéla >karéla

(Sy 2.5.6.7) N'
  first person
  SUBJECT → { yáku / # # } 'I'
  ku

(Sy 2.5.6.8) N'
  first person
  plural
  SUBJECT → { íkami / # # } 'we'
  kamí

(Sy 2.5.6.9) N'
  first person
  -SUBJECT
  -OBLIQUE → ku

(Sy 2.5.6.10) N'
  first person
  plural
  -SUBJECT
  -OBLIQUE → mi

(Sy 2.5.6.11) N
  first person
  -SUBJECT
  OBLIQUE → { * ka+n+a ku > kanáku }
  { * ka+ a ku > káku }

(Sy 2.5.6.12) N
  first person
  plural
  -SUBJECT
  OBLIQUE → * ka+íkami > kékamí
  keke

(Sy 2.5.6.13) N'
  second person
  SUBJECT → { ika / # # } 'you'
  ka

(Sy 2.5.6.14) N'
  second person
  plural
  SUBJECT → { íkayú / # # } 'you (plural)'
  kayú

(Sy 2.5.6.15) N'
  second person
  -SUBJECT
  -OBLIQUE → mu
(Sy 2.5.6.16) N'
second person
plural
-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE

yu

(Sy 2.5.6.17) N
second person
-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE

* ka+íka > kéka

(Sy 2.5.6.18) N
second person
plural
-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE

* ka+íkayú > kékayú ~ keko

(Sy 2.5.6.19) N'
first person
second person
SUBJECT

\{íkatá / #\} 'you and I'

\{katá\}

(Sy 2.5.6.20) N'
first person
second person
plural
SUBJECT

\{íkatámú / #\} 'you (plural) and I'

\{támú\} 'you (plural) and we'

(Sy 2.5.6.21) N'
first person
second person
-OBLIQUE

ta

(Sy 2.5.6.22) N'
first person
second person
plural
-OBLIQUE

támú

(Sy 2.5.6.23) N
first person
second person
-OBLIQUE

* ka+íkatá > kékatá

(Sy 2.5.6.24) N
first person
second person
plural
-OBLIQUE

* ka+íkatámú > kékatámú
(Sy 2.5.6.25) N
demonstrative → itá 'that (yonder)'
SUBJECT

(Sy 2.5.6.26) N
plural
demonstrative → * da+itá > délta
SUBJECT
'OBLIQUE
'those (yonder)'

(Sy 2.5.6.27) N
demonstrative → * n+itá > míta
SUBJECT
'OBLIQUE

(Sy 2.5.6.28) N
plural
demonstrative → * da+itá > délta
SUBJECT
'OBLIQUE
(cf. Sy 2.5.6.26)

(Sy 2.5.6.29) N
demonstrative → \{ * ka+n+itá > kaníta \}
SUBJECT
'OBLIQUE
\{ * ka+itá > káta \}

(Sy 2.5.6.30) N
plural
demonstrative → * ka+da+itá > kadéta > karéta
SUBJECT
'OBLIQUE

(Sy 2.5.6.31) N
demonstrative → iní 'this (near me)'
proximate to speaker
SUBJECT

(Sy 2.5.6.32) N
plural
demonstrative → * da+iní > déni
proximate to speaker
'SUBJECT
'these (near me)'

(Sy 2.5.6.33) N
demonstrative → *n+iní > níni
proximate to speaker
SUBJECT
'OBLIQUE

(Sy 2.5.6.34) N
plural
demonstrative → * da+da+iní > dadéni >
proximate to speaker
'SUBJECT
'OBLIQUE
daréni
(Sy 2.5.6.35) N
  demonstrative \rightarrow \{ *ka+n+ini > kanini \}
  proximate to speaker \{ *ka+ini > keni \}
  -SUBJECT
  OBLIQUE

(Sy 2.5.6.36) N
  plural \rightarrow *ka+da+ini > kadeni >
  demonstrative proximate to speaker kareni
  -SUBJECT
  OBLIQUE

(Sy 2.5.6.37) N
  demonstrative \rightarrow iyán 'that (near you)'
  proximate to hearer
  -SUBJECT

(Sy 2.5.6.38) N
  plural \rightarrow *da+iyán > dén
  demonstrative proximate to hearer 'those (near you)'
  -SUBJECT

(Sy 2.5.6.39) N
  demonstrative \rightarrow *n+iyán > niyán
  proximate to hearer
  -SUBJECT
  -OBLIQUE

(Sy 2.5.6.40) N
  plural \rightarrow *da+da+iyán > *dadén >
  demonstrative proximate to hearer darén
  -SUBJECT
  -OBLIQUE

(Sy 2.5.6.41) N
  demonstrative \rightarrow *ka+iyán > kén
  proximate to hearer
  -SUBJECT
  OBLIQUE

(Sy 2.5.6.42) N
  plural \rightarrow *ka+da+iyán > * kadén >
  demonstrative proximate to hearer karén
  -SUBJECT
  OBLIQUE
(Sy 2.5.6.43) N
demonstrative → ití
proximate to speaker
proximate to hearer 'this (near you and me)'
SUBJECT

(Sy 2.5.6.44) N
plural
demonstrative → * da+ití > děti
proximate to speaker
proximate to hearer 'these (near you and me)'
SUBJECT

(Sy 2.5.6.45) N
demonstrative → * n+ití > níti
proximate to speaker
proximate to hearer
-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE

(Sy 2.5.6.46) N
plural
demonstrative → * da+da+ití > * çadéti >
daréti
proximate to speaker
proximate to hearer
-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE

(Sy 2.5.6.47) N
demonstrative → * ka+n+ití > kaníti 
proximate to speaker
proximate to hearer * ka+ ití > kóti
-SUBJECT
OBLIQUE

(Sy 2.5.6.48) N
plural
demonstrative → * ka+da+ití > * kadéti >
kareti
proximate to speaker
proximate to hearer
-SUBJECT
OBLIQUE
(Sy 2.5.6.43) N demonstrative proximate to speaker proximate to hearer SUBJECT
             ití 'this (near you and me)'

(Sy 2.5.6.44) N plural demonstrative proximate to speaker proximate to hearer SUBJECT
             * da+ití > déti 'these (near you and me)'

(Sy 2.5.6.45) N demonstrative proximate to speaker proximate to hearer -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE
             * n+ití > níti

(Sy 2.5.6.46) N plural demonstrative proximate to speaker proximate to hearer -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE
             * da+da+ití > * dadéti > daréti

(Sy 2.5.6.47) N demonstrative proximate to speaker proximate to hearer -SUBJECT OBLIQUE
             * ka+n+ití > kaníti
             * ka+ ití > kéti

(Sy 2.5.6.48) N plural demonstrative proximate to speaker proximate to hearer -SUBJECT OBLIQUE
             * ka+da+ití > * kadéti > karéti
2.5.7. First and Second Person Pronouns in V. The rules formulated for N's specified as first and/or second person permit the incorporation of two first and/or second person N's into V. Thus:

\[
(2.5.7.1) \text{kalugurán mu kú}
\]

I am loved by you

where \textit{mu} is a symbolization for \(N'\) and \textit{kú} is a symbolization for \(N'\). It is interesting to note that one cannot say in Pampangan 'You love me' but only 'I am loved by you'. The reason for this is that patient/complement/instrument/measure N, when \(-\text{SUBJECT}\), can never be definite, as was shown earlier. If it is definite, it must be extraposed and subjectivized. And since first and/or second person is always definite, any occurrence of first and/or second person in a patient/complement/instrument/measure N is always extraposed and subjectivized.

Using the frame

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{X} \quad \text{is loved by} \quad \text{Y} \\
\text{SUBJECT} \quad \text{-SUBJECT} \\
\text{-OBLIQUE} \\
\end{array}
\]

one may consider all the possible first and/or second person and third person combinations. The different possibilities are charted in Table 1. In general, the combinations are as
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>First Person</th>
<th>First Person</th>
<th>Second Person</th>
<th>Second Person</th>
<th>First Person</th>
<th>First Person</th>
<th>Third Person</th>
<th>Third Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>* ku ka</td>
<td>*ku kayu</td>
<td>da ká</td>
<td>da kayu</td>
<td>*ke ya&gt;</td>
<td>ku la</td>
<td>*kamí ya&gt;</td>
<td>*kamí la&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>* mi ka</td>
<td>*mi kayu</td>
<td>da ká</td>
<td>da kayu</td>
<td>*mi ya&gt;</td>
<td>mi lá</td>
<td>*mi ya&gt;</td>
<td>*mi la&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>mu kú</td>
<td>mu kamí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*mu ya&gt;</td>
<td>mu lá</td>
<td>*mu ya&gt;</td>
<td>*mu la&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>yu kú</td>
<td>yu kamí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*yu ya&gt;</td>
<td>yu lá</td>
<td>*yu ya&gt;</td>
<td>*yu la&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*ta ya&gt;</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>*ta ya&gt;</td>
<td>*ta la&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>ná ku</td>
<td>na kamí</td>
<td>na ká</td>
<td>na kayú</td>
<td>na katá</td>
<td>na katámu</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>na lá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>dá ku</td>
<td>da kamí</td>
<td>da ká</td>
<td>da kayú</td>
<td>da katá</td>
<td>da katámu</td>
<td>da lá</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
predicted, with the application of certain phonological rules comparable to those already outlined for $\bar{N} \bar{N}$ combinations for third persons, except for two combinations which will be explained.

Reflexive structures such as 'I am loved by myself' are not charted. Reflexive pronouns will be discussed in the next section.

Two combinations are irregular; they are noted by double lines in Table 1. In a sentence such as 'You are loved by me', if the occurrence of $N$ copiers were perfectly regular, one would expect:

$$x$$

(2.5.7.2) kalugurán ku ká

Instead, one has:

(2.5.7.2) kalugurán da ká

which also means 'You are loved by them'. Moreover, if one wanted to say 'You are loved by us', the expected combination would be:

$$x$$

(2.5.7.3) kalugurán mi ká

Instead, however, one must say:
(2.5.7.3) kalugurán da ká

which means 'You are loved by us' as well as 'You are loved by me' and 'You are loved by them'. If one wanted to disambiguate (2.5.7.3), one would say:

(2.5.7.3a) yáku # kalugurán da ká
As for me, you are loved by me

(2.5.7.3b) íkamí # kalugurán da ká
As for us, you are loved by us

The same kind of ambiguity arises with:

(2.5.7.4) kalugurán da kayú

which may mean:

You (plural) are loved by them
You (plural) are loved by me
You (plural) are loved by us

To disambiguate the last two meanings, one would say:

(2.5.7.4a) yáku # kalugurán da kayú
As for me, you (plural) are loved by me

(2.5.7.4b) íkamí # kalugurán da kayú
As for us, you (plural) are loved by us
The preceding double ambiguity is explained by a postsemantic neutralization rule:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
N' \quad \text{first person (plural)} \\
-\text{SUBJECT} \\
-\text{OBLIQUE}
\end{array} \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
N' \quad \text{second person (plural)} \\
V \quad N' \\
-\text{SUBJECT} \\
-\text{OBLIQUE}
\end{array}
\]

2.5.8. Reflexive Pronouns. Traditional reflexive pronouns in Pampangan arise when the agent N and the patient N are coreferential in a process-action V and when the agent N and the beneficiary or goal N are coreferential in an action V. The formative symbolizing 'self' is *sa+díli > saríli*, which is best considered as introduced postsemantically. Consider the sentence:

\[(2.5.8.1) \text{papatén ne} \bar{\text{g}} \text{Pedru # i} \bar{\text{q}} \text{saríli na} \]
\[\bar{\times}\]
\[\text{His self is being killed by Pedro=}\]
\[\text{Pedro is killing himself}\]

Note that in reflexive sentences, the formative 'self' is always definite and therefore either SUBJECT (as in the above) or OBLIQUE (as in the following example):

\[(2.5.8.2) \text{gágátit yan larú? # kíq saríli na # i Pédru}\]
\[\text{Pedro is using oil on himself}\]
Note too that 'self' is referentially neutral; it is specified by the copier incorporated into it, in this case, by na. Other copiers possible are:

(2.5.8.3) kúkuskusán ku # in saríli ku

\[\times\]

My self is being wiped by me

kúkuskusán mu # in saríli mu

\[\times\]

Your self is being wiped by you

kúkuskusán ta # in saríli ta

\[\times\]

Your and my self is being wiped by you and me

To account for the postsemantic introduction of saríli, the necessary context is coreferentiality. What seems to happen is the following (taking 2.5.8.1 as an example):

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{Partitive} & \text{Count} & \text{Definite} \\
N & 0 & \text{definite} \\
\text{Count} & \text{potent} & \text{Pedro} \\
\text{Definite} & \text{animate} & \text{SUBJECT} \\
\end{array}
\]

where the zero subscript for the first N is a notation for referential neutrality. Since one cannot say in Pampangan:

(2.5.8.4) kaŋ Pedru # in saríli na

\[\times\]

His self is part of Pedro

the \[\text{N} \times \text{N}\] configuration does not seem to arise from an underlying state V (as does in buntúk naŋ Pedru 'the head which is part of Pedro=Pedro's head) but is a direct replacement
of N in a context of coreferentiality. Once the \( \overline{N} \) configuration is generated, the usual rules for such configurations follow. Partitive is initially marked as OBLIQUE but then is shifted to -OBLIQUE. Then partitive N is copied into N (symbolized by na); since the root of the partitive N is -new (it is the same root found in the agent N matrix), it is deleted, leaving an N matrix without lexical specification and therefore deletable. The surface structure of the resulting noun phrase is:

\[\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{D} & \overline{N} & N' \\
\text{definite} & 0 & \\
\text{SUBJECT} & -\text{SUBJECT} & -\text{OBLIQUE} \\
\text{na} & \text{sa\'ili na} & \\
\end{array}\]

The relevant rule for generating reflexive pronouns is therefore:

\[(T \, 31') \text{ Reflexive Rule} \]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{rel} \\
N \\
\text{root} \\
\text{definite} \\
\text{rel} \\
\overline{N} \\
\text{partitive} \\
0 \\
N \\
\text{root} \\
\text{definite} \\
\text{rel} \\
V \\
\text{action} \\
1 \\
N \\
N \\
1 \\
\end{array}\]
In Chapter I, sentences such as the following were cited:

(2.5.8.5) mágpakamaté ya # i Péedru
Pedro is committing suicide

(2.5.8.6) pálikad ya # i Péedru
Pedro is having himself walked [by somebody]
Pedro is managing [e.g. a factory]

The above sentences are best accounted for as idioms, the semantic verb root 'to commit suicide' being literalized by \textit{die+causativizer +deprocessivizer+exertivizer}. In the second sentence, two separate roots 'to cause oneself to be walked [by somebody]' and 'to manage [something]' are both literalized as \textit{walk+causativizer}. Hence, the question of reflexive pronouns does not even arise in accounting for the above sentences.

2.6. Replacements: Deletions and Neutralizations.
In the preceding section on pronouns, deletion processes have already been discussed and a general deletion rule formulated. The deletion processes already discussed will be recapitulated and discussed within a more comprehensive view of deletion processes in the language. In addition to deletions, an important neutralization process was discovered which promises a partial solution to the thorny problem of verb subject markers in Pampangan.
The processes to be discussed in this section all involve replacement:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{unit a} & \rightarrow \text{unit b} \\
\text{unit a} & \rightarrow [\text{unit b} \\
\text{unit a} & \rightarrow [\text{unit c} \\
\text{unit a} & \rightarrow [\text{unit d} \\
\end{align*}
\]

A particular type of replacement is:

\[
\begin{align*}
V / N & \rightarrow \emptyset \\
\text{unit a} & \rightarrow \emptyset \\
[\text{unit a} \\
\text{unit b} \\
\text{unit c} ] & \rightarrow \emptyset \\
\end{align*}
\]

which is, of course, deletion. On the other hand, one may have a replacement process such as:

\[
\begin{align*}
[\text{unit a} \\
\text{unit b} \\
\text{unit c} ] & \rightarrow \text{unit a} \\
[\text{unit a} \\
\text{unit b} \\
\text{unit c} ] & \rightarrow \text{unit d} \\
\end{align*}
\]

where, in effect, earlier established contrasts or oppositions are neutralized into a common unit; hence, the process is
one of neutralization.

This rather simplified typology has been adopted merely as a means of unifying the discussion of processes to be discussed in this section. A more detailed analysis will surely reveal other subtypes and render more subtle distinctions necessary.

Replacement, deletion, and neutralization processes relevant to V's will first be discussed; then those relevant to N's. In general, the general principle is that all units necessary for symbolization must be retained, while those unnecessary for symbolization must be postsemantically deleted; hence, in the theory, zero morphs, which troubled American structuralists so much, do not arise, since such zero morphs will have been deleted prior to the symbolization process. Moreover, instances of ambiguity and polysemy are accounted for by either general replacement or neutralization processes, whereby semantic distinctions are postsemantically neutralized in surface structure.

2.6.1. Replacements in V.

2.6.1.1. Deletion of V. Examples have been given in Chapter I of sentences which in surface structure have no verbs (favoritive/partitive/intentive/temporal/locative/possessive state V's). To cite only one example:
(2.6.1.1.1) kaŋ Pédr˚u ya # iŋ átu

The car belongs to Pedro

where the possesive state V matrix is not lexically
specified by a verb root. Since V receives no symbolization,
it must be postulated as postsemantically deleted:

(T 32') V Deletion Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{state} \\
\text{(no lexical root)}
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \emptyset
\]

2.6.1.2. Deletion of V Selectional Units. Once
V has been narrowed down to a particular lexical unit,
a verb root (basic or derived), the selectional units
which functioned to narrow it down are no longer necessary
and must consequently be deleted:

(T 33') Deletion of V Selection Units Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
x \\
\text{root} \\
y
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{root} \\
y
\end{array}
\]

where \( x = \text{selectional units}; \ y = \text{inflexional units} \n
If a selectional unit is necessary as a context for later
processes or for symbolization, it must be retained; no such
units were discovered for V.
2.6.1.3. Deletion of V Derivational Units. Because of the centrality of the verb as the nucleus of a sentence, a basic verb root, once selected, is never deleted in a \( \sqrt{V} N \) structure. Of course, if a verb root were never selected in semantic structure, the Verb Deletion Rule (T 32') would apply, in effect deleting the whole V branch. In Chapter III, however, where \( \sqrt{V} V \) structures are discussed, the second occurrence of a verb root is a context for deletion, since the second root is then -new.

However, derivational units added to basic verb roots, if they are not eventually symbolized, must be inferred to be postsemantically deleted. In a more adequate grammar, such units must be marked by deletion-rule features in the lexicon. For example, among the derivational units posited in section 1.1.7 (see pages 127-8), the following units must be deleted: (1) processivizer: In a sentence such as lalakáran na laŋ Pédru # diŋ úbas 'The grapes are being trampled on by Pedro', the verb root is analyzable as walk + processivizer. The unit is necessary to transform the action verb into a process-action verb. Since, however, -an is not a derivational unit but a marker for patient subject, processivizer receives no symbolization and must then be inferred to be deleted. Thus, both the action verb root and the process-action verb root receive the same symbolization, lákad. (2) deprocessivizer: In a sentence such as púpútut va # i Pédru 'Pedro is cutting [something]', the inherent process-action verb root pútut has become an action verb root but with no change in symbolization; hence, the unit deprocessivizer
must be posited as deleted. (3) **predicativizer**: In **anák ya # i Pédrù 'Pedro is a child'**, the derived state V, **child+predicativizer**, receives the same symbolization as **child**; hence, **predicativizer** is postulated as deleted. 

(4) **descriptivizer**: In **anák ya # i Pédrù 'Pedro is young'**, the derived state V is **child+descriptivizer**; again, since the verb receives the same symbolization as **child**, the unit **descriptivizer** must be postulated as deleted. 

(5) **action verbalizer**: In **kákamagának ya # i Pédrù 'Pedro is engaging in the activity of making relatives'**, the derived action V, **relative+action verbalizer**, receives the same symbolization as **relative**; hence, **action verbalizer**, must be postulated as deleted. 

(6) **process-action verbalizer**: In **anákan neq Suán # i Maryá 'Maria will conceive because of Juan'**, the derived process-action V, **child+process-action verbalizer**, receives the same symbolization as **child**, since **-an** is not a derivational unit but a marker for subject choice. Hence, the derivational unit must be postulated as deleted.

For the deletion of derivational units, particular rules will be necessary. Only a general rule (suggestive of the type of rule necessary) will be formulated:

\[
(T_{34}) \quad V \text{ Derivational Units Deletion Rule} \\
V \quad \text{root+derivational unit} \rightarrow \quad V \quad \text{root}
\]
2.6.1.4. Deletion and Replacement of V Inflectional Units. In Chapter I, V's were described as inflectionally specifiable by 'generic'.

In state V's, 'generic' receives no symbolization and hence must be postulated as deleted; however, in nonstate V's, 'generic' receives the same symbolization as actual durative aspect:

(2.6.1.4.1) lálákad ya # i Pédr u
Pedro is walking [right now]
Pedro walks [habitually]

Hence, a postsemantic rule must be posited replacing 'generic' by 'actual durative'.

Aspectual deletion rules must likewise be posited. In the above sentence, the unit 'actual' is not symbolized, 'durative' being symbolized by the reduplication. Hence, it must be posited as deleted. Neither does the unit 'actual' receive any symbolization in

(2.6.1.4.2) línákad ya # i Pédr u
Pedro walked

where the unit 'completed' is symbolized by -in-. Moreover,
in the following sentence, neither 'actual' nor 'completed' is symbolized but only 'immediate' (symbolized by ka- and reduplication of the whole root):

\[(2.6.1.4.3) \text{ kalákadákad na pá muŋ Pédru} \]

Pedro has just now walked

The replacement and deletion processes postulated may be formulated by the following rules:

\[(T\ 35') \text{ Generic Deletion Rule} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{state} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{generic}
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{state} \\
\text{root}
\end{array}
\]

\[(T\ 36') \text{ Generic Replacement Rule} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{-state} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{generic}
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{-state} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{actual} \\
\text{durative}
\end{array}
\]

\[(T\ 37') \text{ Actual Deletion Rule} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{-state} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{actual}
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{-state} \\
\text{root}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\{\text{durative}\} \quad \{\text{completed}\}
\]
(T 38') Actual Completed Deletion Rule

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \quad V \\
\text{-state} & \quad \text{-state} \\
\text{root} & \quad \text{root} \\
\text{actual} & \quad \text{completed} \\
\text{completed} & \quad \text{immediate} \\
\text{immediate} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

2.6.1.5. Deletion and Neutralization of Some V Subject Specifications. In section 2.1.4, an incorporation rule (T 11') was formulated whereby the choice of subject is mirrored in the verb root as an inflectional specification of V. Hence, after the application of the incorporation rule, the V matrix is:

\[
\begin{align*}
V \quad \text{selectional units} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{inflectional units (aspect and repetition)} \\
\text{incorporated rel subject} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Consider the following sentences, however:

(2.6.1.5.1) makába yaŋ aduŋŋ kilómetru # in dáln
The road is two kilometers long

where the patient N is subject. Now the verb root must be accompanied by a patient N as subject; no other subject is permitted. Yet, there is no overt subject marker, although semantically there is an incorporated specification 'patient subject'. The root is kába? 'length'; ma- is a derivational unit 'plenitivizer' and not a subject marker.

In general, there is a danger, in analyzing the Philippine languages, to confuse derivational units like ma- with subject markers, which are often Ø. It is
interesting to note that Bergaño distinguishes subject markers and derivational units quite clearly in his Arte; the overt subject markers he discusses under his 'tres pasivas' as voice markers (which they are) and the overt derivational units he discusses in a separate chapter as 'protocompuestos' (his term for prefixed roots). Although eventually both subject markers and derivational units appear in symbolization as verbal affixes, the two types of units are totally distinct types and must be so distinguished if confusion is not to result.

   It is not only the specification 'patient subject' which is not overtly marked in the root of state V's but likewise other types of subject specification. For example, in:

(2.6.1.5.2) burí naŋ Pédru # inŋ pámaŋán
   The food is liked by Pedro

(2.6.1.5.3) bísa yaŋ pámaŋán # i Pédru
   Pedro wants [some] food

neither burí? nor bísa? are overtly marked by 'patient topic' and 'experiencer topic', though both clearly must have these incorporated specifications since no other subject choice is possible.

   Again, in a motivative state V:
(2.6.1.5.4) mákatúla ya # iŋ búbú
The clown is motivative of laughter

the verb root has no overt marker for the motive subject
since mˈaka- is not a subject marker but a derivational
unit 'motivativizer'.

As a final example, one may cite:

(2.6.1.5.5) kasiŋ kátas neŋ Pédru # iŋ anák
The child is as tall as Pedro

where again, the verb root must be accompanied by a
patient subject; this obligatory specification 'patient
subject' finds no overt marking, however, since kasiŋ
and the m to k shift in mátas 'tall' is a symbolization
for 'equatatativizer'.

Hence, a deletion rule which in effect deletes all
incorporated subject specifications in a state V must be
formulated:

(T 39') Subject Specification Deletion Rule I

```
V
state
root
rel subject  →  V
state
root
```
For process V's, except for the instances which will be discussed below, the same type of deletion seems to occur:

(2.6.1.5.6) mamamaté ya # iŋ tâu
The man is dying

where the verb root *matáy, which is specified as 'patient subject', has no overt marker for this specification. Again:

(2.6.1.5.7) mágkasakit ya # i Pédrū
Pedro is getting to have a sickness

where the obligatory beneficiary N subject is not overtly marked in the verb root, since magka- is a derivational unit meaning 'habitivizer'. Or:

(2.6.1.5.8) mánákit yaŋ balé # i Pédrū
Pedro is seeing a house

where the experiencer N Pédrū is subject; there is no overt marking for this subject specification since the verb is analyzable as see and inflectional marker for 'repetitive' symbolized by *-ŋa-, hence, literally, 'to see repeatedly', where the experiential process of seeing seems to have been originally conceived of as a series of discrete successive experiences. In
(2.6.1.5.9)* máγ+kailáγan yaγ áutu # i Pédrú>
máγailáγan yaγ áutu # i Pédrú
Pedro is needing a car
man- is not a subject marker but a derivational unit which derives a state V, kailánan 'in a state of need', into a process V.

It seems that the subject specification is overtly marked only when the original configuration has been disturbed, in other words, when an extraposition rule has been applied. Hence:

\[(2.6.1.5.10) \text{mérargúl yáŋ aduáŋ pulgáda} \# iŋ anák\]

The child grew big by two inches

but

\[(2.6.1.5.10a) \text{KérargulÁN na la niŋ anák} \# diŋ aduáŋ pulgáda\]

The two inches were grown by the child

This matter, however, demands further study, since in the sentence

\[(2.6.1.5.11) \text{ákákit neŋ Pédrù} \# iŋ balé\]

The house is being seen by Pedro

there is no overt marker for the patient subject selection although the unmarked subject for experiential process V's is the experiencer N (see sentence 2.6.1.5.8).

Moreover, in a sentence such as:
(2.6.1.5.12) KématéN yaq kalugurán # i Pédrú
Pedro was bereft of a loved one

the choice of beneficiary subject is overtly marked by
* ka-....-an although no extrapolation was necessary,
since the beneficiary N is usually attached to the
configuration after the patient N.

The following rule is therefore formulated with
the proviso that certain roots will be exceptions:

(T 40') Subject Specification Deletion Rule II

\[
\begin{array}{lcl}
\text{V process} & \rightarrow & \text{V process} \\
\text{root} & \rightarrow & \text{root} \\
\text{rel subject} & \rightarrow & / \text{if no extrapolation rules have applied}
\end{array}
\]

It is with action V's and process-action V's that
most problems arise with regard to the symbolization of
the subject specification. To begin with, if the V
specification is 'agent subject', it is never overtly marked
and therefore the specification must be postulated as deleted:

(2.6.1.5.13) lálákd yá # i Pédrú
Pedro is walking

(2.6.1.5.14) pálákd yá # i Pédrú
Pedro is managing [something]

(2.6.1.5.15) mágáral yá # i Pedrú
Pedro is studying
where pa- is a marker for 'causativizer' and where mag- is a marker for a derivational unit 'activativizer'. The following rule may therefore be formulated:

(T 41') Subject Specification Deletion Rule III

\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \\
(\text{process}) \\
\text{action} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{agent subject} \\
\rightarrow \\
\text{root}
\end{array}
\]

Consider now the following sentences:

(2.6.1.5.16) puputútAN neŋ Pédru # iŋ dútun patient subject

The wood is being cut by Pedro

(2.6.1.5.17) babásAN neŋ Pédru # iŋ librú complement subject

The book is being read by Pedro

(2.6.1.5.18) gagamítAN neŋ Pédru # iŋ lagári? instrument subject

The saw is being used by Pedro

(2.6.1.5.19) lalakárAN na laŋ Pédru # diŋ aduŋ kilómetro measure subject

The two kilometers are being walked by Pedro

(2.6.1.5.20) dirínAN neŋ kuáltan Pédru # i Suán beneficiary subject

Juan is being given money by Pedro

(2.6.1.5.21) pupuntAN neŋ Pédru # iŋ balé goal subject

The house is being gone to by Pedro
What the examples above show is that different subject specifications are neutralized into a common subject marker symbolized by suffix -an. This postsemantic neutralization of various subject specifications into a common subject specification has caused undue confusion among certain linguists who have examined the Philippine languages. Some have subsumed all the above subject specifications under 'goal'. To do this, however, would be to return to the search for a 'common or basic meaning' for the surface subject marker, an enterprise that has proven unsatisfactory thus far. Only by straining can one consider the subject in sentence (2.6.1.5.22) as a 'goal', in this analysis, a source N. Another proposal has been to consider -an a general marker for a subject specification describable as
'unspecific locus'. Again, however, it is highly artificial to consider patients, complements, instruments, and measures as in any way locative. The more economical and certainly the more semantically plausible analysis would be to posit as many N relations to V as there are discoverable and then to postulate postsemantic rules to account for the convergences in symbolization. In this case, what has happened can be accounted for by the following neutralization rule:

(T 42') Subject Specification Neutralization Rule I

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \quad (\text{process}) \\
\text{action} & \\
\text{root}^* & \\
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{patient subject} \\
\text{complement subject} \\
\text{instrument subject} \\
\text{measure subject} \\
\text{beneficiary subject} \\
\text{goal subject} \\
\text{source subject} \\
\text{material subject} \\
\text{associate subject} \\
\text{agentive beneficiary subject} \\
\end{array} \right. \\
\rightarrow & \\
V & \quad (\text{process}) \\
\text{action} & \\
\text{root}^* & \\
\text{common subject} \\
\end{align*}
\]

where root* means that this neutralization rule applies to a particular subset of verb roots (a large subset); one cannot formulate a rule that applies to all roots since certain roots are not subject to this neutralization rule. Moreover, common subject indicates that there is a more than one type of common subject. Thus:
(2.6.1.5.26) Itúlak neŋ Pédrú # iŋ âutu  
patient subject

The car will be pushed by Pedro

(2.6.1.5.27) Ibiýé neŋ Pédrú # iŋ âutu  
complement subject

The car will be given by Pedro

(2.6.1.5.28) Igawa neŋ piyálúŋan Pédrú # iŋ anák  
beneficiary subject

x

The child will be made for a toy by Pedro= Pedro will make a toy for the child

where patient, complement, and beneficiary subject are symbolized by a common subject marker i-. For the above verb roots, -an cannot be used as a symbolization for the same subject specification. Another neutralization rule may then be formulated:

(T 43') Subject Specification Neutralization Rule II

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
V & (\text{process}) & V \\
\text{action} & \rightarrow & \text{action} \\
\text{root**} & \{ \text{patient subject} \} & \text{root**} \\
\{ \text{complement subject} \} & \rightarrow & \text{common subject} \\
\{ \text{beneficiary subject} \} & b
\end{array}
\]

where root** is an abbreviation for a subset of verb roots that take i- as a subject marker.

Undoubtedly, the deletion and neutralization rules formulated would have to be expanded as the verb lexicon of Pampangan is more thoroughly investigated.
Below are listed the most common verb affixes which symbolize subject specification (in addition to -an and i-):

- anan  
  goal subject
  source subject

ipañ-  
  instrument subject
  beneficiary subject

pag-  
  beneficiary subject

* m > p-----an  
  complement subject
  associate subject
  location subject

ka-----an  
  beneficiary subject
  location subject
  time subject
  motive subject

aka-  
  motive subject

Bergaño cites only 'tres pasivas' or nonagent subject markers in his Arte (i-, -an, -anan) although the other affixes occur in his corpus. -anan seems to be a variant of -an, although in the following example, -anan is clearly preferable:

(2.6.1.5.29) sulatÁNAN neŋ Pédrú # i Suán
  Juan will be written to by Pedro

On the other hand, -anan can not be used in the following:

(2.6.1.5.30) sulúŋAN neŋ Pédrú # iŋ balé
  The house will be proceeded to by Pedro
In the following sentence, -anan is obligatory:

\[(2.6.1.5.31) \text{kuanAN} \, \text{ne} \, \text{pérq} \text{Pedru} \, x \text{i Suán} \]
Juan will be gotten from money by Pedro=
Pedro will get money from Juan

And in

\[(2.6.1.5.32) \text{puntAN} \text{na laq} \text{Pedru} \, x \text{díq} \text{kálugúran} \text{na} \]
His friends will be gone to by Pedro

-anan has taken on (perhaps because of the reduplication) the added meaning of repetition or plurality of event.

2.6.2. Replacements in N.

2.6.2.1. Deletion of Noun Root. In a semantic configuration, if a noun root is repeated, it is no longer new information. In such instances, it is optionally deletable, unless it is specified as TOPIC. The rule may be stated thus:

\[(T \, 4 \, 4') \text{Noun Root Deletion Rule} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{rel} \\
\text{N} \\
x \\
\text{root} \\
y \\
\text{-new} \\
\text{-TOPIC}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{rel} \\
\text{N} \\
x \\
\text{x} \\
\text{y} \\
\text{y}
\end{array}
\]

where \(x=\)selectional units, \(y=\)inflectional units
In simple $\bar{V}N$ configurations, the deletion of a noun root is straightforward; in more complicated $\bar{V}V$ configurations, however, where there is a hierarchy of $N$'s arising from embeddings, the order of deletion is significant (such deletions in $\bar{V}V$ configurations will be discussed in Chapter III).

2.6.2.2. Deletion of $N$. After incorporation processes have applied (resulting in the copying of specifications of $N$ into $V$), there is a general rule (probably with parallels in other languages) whereby an $N$ branch is deleted, if it has no lexical unit (the process is comparable to the deletion of $V$ branches when $V$ has no lexical unit), provided $N$ is neither specified as OBLIQUE or as TOPIC. The rule may be stated thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(T 45')} & \quad N \text{ Deletion Rule} \\
N & \xrightarrow{\text{no root}} \emptyset \\
y & -\text{OBLIQUE} \\
& -\text{TOPIC}
\end{align*}
\]

It is necessary to posit a two-step deletion process (Step 1: deletion of noun root; Step 2: deletion of $N$ branch) since the second process (T 46') is a more general rule, applicable to an $N$ matrix which was not lexically specified by a noun root even in semantic structure (as in first and/or second person pronouns).
2.6.2.3. Deletion of N Selectional Units. After N has been lexically specified by a noun root, selectional units for N are superfluous and must be postsemantically deleted. However, unlike V selectional units, all of which are deleted, certain N selectional units are retained, where they are relevant for surface structure and eventual symbolization. For example, unique human N's are distinguished in surface structure by the special determiner 1 (which is not used for unique -human N's). Moreover, as was shown in the section on classifiers in Chapter I, certain criterial selectional units are retained for the proper symbolization of counters and measures. These criterial selectional units include 'clustered' and 'twisted off' for the symbolization of pílin, 'granular' for the symbolization of bútîl, 'sliceable' for kapútut, 'frangible' for kapirásu. A general rule may thus be formulated:

(T 46') N Selectional Units Deletion Rule

\[
\begin{align*}
N & \times \\
& \left\{ \langle \text{classificatory specifications} \rangle \right\} \\
& \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\langle \text{human} \rangle \\
\langle \text{unique} \rangle \\
\end{array} \right] \\
\frac{\text{root}}{\langle \text{(counter/measure)} \rangle} & \rightarrow \\
\end{align*}
\]
N

\{\langle\text{classificatory specifications}\rangle\}
\{\langle\text{human}\rangle\}
\{\langle\text{unique}\rangle\}
\text{root}
\langle\langle\text{counter/measure}\rangle\rangle
\text{y}

2.6.2.4. Deletion of N Derivational Units. Among the N derivational units discussed in section 1.2.3 (see pages 128-9), the only derivational unit which is to be deleted is the unit complementizer. In makába? # \text{in lákad na} 'His trip is long', lákad is analyzable as walk+complementizer; since its symbolization is identical with that of walk, complementizer must be postulated as deleted. In general, it seems that noun derivational units are less subject to deletion than verb derivational units. The process may be formulated thus:

\[ (T' 47' ) \quad \text{N Derivational Units Deletion Rule} \]
\[ \text{N root+derivational unit} \rightarrow \text{N root} \]

2.6.2.5. Deletion and Replacement of N Inflectional Units. Consider the sentence:

\[ (2.6.2.5.1) \quad \text{muntá ya # kiŋ Méníla? # i Pédru} \]
\text{Pedro is going to Manila}
One may likewise say:

\[(2.6.2.5.1') \text{ muntá ya } # \text{ Méníla? } # \text{ i Pédrù}\]

Again, consider the sentence:

\[(2.6.2.5.2) \text{ kákawé ya } # \text{ kiŋ ilug na niŋ Pampáŋga } # \text{ i Pédrù } \sim \text{ kákawé ya } # \text{ kiŋ ilug } \text{ Pampáŋga } # \text{ i Pédrù}\]

Pedro is swimming in the river [which is part of Pampanga]

It seems that the inflectional specifications of unique place N's are optionally deletable:

\[\text{(T 48') } N \text{ Inflectional Units Deletion Rule I}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
N & N \\
place & place \\
unique & unique \\
root & root & \sim \\
\end{array}
\]

In a complete grammar, (T 49') would have to be applied before the application of (T 47'), which deletes selectional units of N.

In a sentence such as:

\[(2.6.2.5.3) \text{ matápaŋ la } # \text{ di Pédrù}\]

Pedro and [his] companions are brave
the determiner di is a symbolization for 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{human} \\
\text{unique} \\
\text{definite} \\
\text{associative} \\
\text{plural}
\end{array}
\].

However, since i is a symbolization for 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{human} \\
\text{unique} \\
\text{definite}
\end{array}
\] and 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{plural}
\end{array}
\]

\(\text{d}^{-}\) is the usual symbolization for plural, it seems that postsemantically, the unit 'associative' is deleted:

(T 49') Associative Deletion Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
N \\
\text{human} \\
\text{unique} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{definite} \\
\text{associative} \\
\text{plural}
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
N \\
\text{human} \\
\text{unique} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{definite} \\
\text{plural}
\end{array}
\]

In the sentence:

(2.6.2.5.4) mámañán yaŋ ságin # i Pédrų
Pedro is eating [a] banana
Pedro is eating bananas

the nonsubject and nonoblique nondefinite patient N is neutralized as to number specification by the deletion of the unit 'plural':

(T 50') N Plural Deletion Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
N \\
\text{root} \\
\text{plural} \\
\text{-definite} \\
\text{-SUBJECT} \\
\text{-OBLIQUE}
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
N \\
\text{root} \\
\text{-definite} \\
\text{-SUBJECT} \\
\text{-OBLIQUE}
\end{array}
\]
The deletion of the unit 'total' in N' has already been mentioned:

\[(2.6.2.5.5)\] māmaqān la # diŋ gaŋ ának ~
māmaqān laŋán diŋ gaŋ ának
All the children are eating.

In cases where both N's are specified as 'total', the marker of the first N' is obligatorily deleted:

\[(2.6.2.5.6)*\] ka+kanaŋ daŋ laŋán # diŋ gaŋ ának #
diŋ gaŋ dalandán >
kakanán da laŋán # diŋ gaŋ ának
diŋ gaŋ dalandán
All the oranges are being eaten by all the children.

In instances where N is specified as plural, associative, and total, it is the 'total' specification of N and not of N' which is obligatorily deleted:

\[(2.6.2.5.7)*\] atí luŋən # di gaŋ Pédrú >
atí luŋán # di Pédrú
Pedro and [his] companions are all here.
The rules may be stated thus:

\[(T\ 51')\ \text{Total Deletion Rule I}\]
\[N' \quad \longrightarrow \quad N' \quad \text{total}\]

\[(T\ 52')\ \text{Total Deletion Rule II}\]
\[N' \quad \longrightarrow \quad N' / V \quad \bar{h} \quad N' \quad \text{total}\]

\[(T\ 53')\ \text{Total Deletion Rule III}\]
\[N\]
human
unique
root
definite
associative
plural
total
\[N\]
human
unique
root
definite
associative
plural
total

The last rule would have to be applied after the incorporation processes described, since 'total' is copied before it is deleted.

In section 1.2.3, it was stated that

\[(2.6.2.5.8)\ \text{maragul ya # in patiŋ}\]

is ambiguous, since it may mean:

The whale (a definite one) is big
The whale (as a species) is big

In its second meaning, where \(N\) is generic, the definite SUBJECT marker \(\text{in}\) functions likewise as a generic indicator.
Hence, \(\text{[generic aggregate]}\) is replaced by \(\text{[definite]}\). On the other hand, if \(N\) is \(\text{[generic plural]}\), it is replaced by \(\text{[plural definite demonstrative proximate to hearer]}\):

\[
\begin{align*}
(2.6.2.5.9) & \text{ maragul la # den patiŋ} \\
& \text{Those whales (near you) are big} \\
& \text{Whales (as a species) are big}
\end{align*}
\]

The relevant replacement rules may be formulated thus:

\[
(\text{T 54'}) \text{ Generic Replacement Rule} \\
\begin{array}{ccc}
\begin{array}{c}
N \\
\text{root}
\end{array}
& \rightarrow & \\
\begin{array}{c}
N \\
\text{root}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[aggregat}e]
\end{array}
\cup
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[plural ]}
\end{array}
\cup
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[definite ]}
\end{array}
\cup
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[plural definite demonstrative proximate to hearer ]}
\end{array}
\]

2.7. Linearizations.

2.7.1. Major Processes. The structures described thus far are essentially nonlinear configurations, although the term 'extraposition' has been used in connection with the required context for subjectivization. The term has been adopted merely as a convenient label; the structures up to this point of the derivation are still conceived of
as nonlinear (unless otherwise noted). The postsemantic processes thus far yield a nonlinear semantic structure which may be represented thus (using a V with maximal specifications for accompanying N's):

```
V  N'  N'  rel  rel  rel  rel
-SUBJECT  SUBJECT  -SUBJECT  -SUBJECT  -SUBJECT  SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE  -OBLIQUE  OBLIQUE  OBLIQUE  OBLIQUE  OBLIQUE
```

As a prelude to symbolization, the whole structure must be linearized by a process to be labeled 'Primary Linearization', following Chafe. As a notation for linear semantic structures, rel will no longer be indicated but only V and N (as well as N'). Hence, any configuration without rel is intended to be a linear (left to right) configuration. Besides Primary Linearization, there will be three other types of major linearization processes: Preposing, Postposing (distinct from Extraposition), and Interposing. In a subsequent section, minor linearization processes (linearization within V and N) will be postulated.

2.7.1.1. Primary Linearization. The rule may be formulated thus:
(T 55') Primary Linearization Rule

If no other major linearization processes are applied, (T 55') will yield such surface linear structures as:

(2.7.1.1)

babiye  ya  
Pedro is giving [something]

papabiyé  ya  # kaŋ Suán # i Pédrú
Pedro is causing Juan to give [something]

papabiyé  ya # kiŋ anák # kaŋ Suán # i Pédrú
to the child

papabiyé  yaŋ kuálta # kiŋ anák # kaŋ Suán # i Pédrú
to the child

Pedro is causing Juan to give money to the child

2.7.1.2. Postposing. Instead of the fourth sentence of (2.7.1.1), one may have:

(2.7.1.2.1)

papabiyé  yaŋ kuálta # kiŋ anák # i Pédrú # kaŋ Suán
Pedro is causing money to be given to the child by Juan
The optional postposing rule may be formulated thus:

(T 56') OBLIQUE N Postposing Rule I

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
V & N' & N' & N & N & N \\
& a & b & & & \hline
\end{array}
\]

OBLIQUE OBLIQUE SUBJECT

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
V & N' & N' & N & N & N \\
& & a & N & b & \hline
\end{array}
\]

OBLIQUE SUBJECT OBLIQUE

It is not only \( N_\phi \) which may be postposed but likewise \( N_\alpha \).

It seems, however, that if \( N_\alpha \) is postposed, \( N_\phi \) must likewise be postposed:

(T 57') OBLIQUE N Postposing Rule II

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
V & N' & N' & N & N & N \\
& a & k & & & \hline
\end{array}
\]

OBLIQUE OBLIQUE SUBJECT

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
V & N' & N' & N & N & N \\
& & a & b & \hline
\end{array}
\]

SUBJECT OBLIQUE OBLIQUE

The above rule applies to a sentence with only one OBLIQUE N:

(2.7.1.2.2) babiyé yan kuálta # kiŋ anák # i Pédro ~
babiyé yaŋ kuálta # i Pédro # kiŋ anák

Pedro is giving money to the child
2.7.1.3. Preposing. In Pampangan, the main sentential accent falls on the initial phrase, which in sentences with unmarked linear order is V and any of its possible incorporations. It is possible, however, to highlight not V but one of the N's in the sentence. Such highlighting was labeled topicalization in Chapter I (distinct from subjectivization, which was discussed earlier in this chapter). An N semantically specified as TOPIC must be preposed, to place it in the most prominent position in the sentence and to make it possible for the TOPIC N to receive the main sentential accent. Thus:

(2.7.1.3.1) bíbiyé yaŋ kuálta # kiŋ anák # i Pédrú

Pedro is giving money to the child

(2.7.1.3.1a) i Pédrú # bíbiyé yaŋ kuálta # kiŋ anák

TOPIC

As for Pedro, he is giving money to the child

(2.7.1.3.1b) kiŋ anák ya bíbiyé kuálta # i Pédrú

TOPIC

It is to the child that Pedro is giving money

When an OBLIQUE N is topicalized and preposed, it attracts to itself the copier (N'), in effect, deleting the boundary marker; moreover, it seems that in a sentence such as (2.7.1.3.1b), it is the whole initial phrase which receives sentential accent and not just anák.

As the rule for TOPIC specification has been formulated in Chapter I, kuálta cannot be topicalized since it is -definite.
(T 55') Primary Linearization Rule

If no other major linearization processes are applied, (T 55') will yield such surface linear structures as:

(2.7.1.1.1)

babiye
Pedro is giving [something]

Papa bbye
Pedro is causing Juan to give [something]

Papa bbye
Pedro is causing Juan to give [something] to the child

Papa bbye
Pedro is causing Juan to give money to the child

2.7.1.2. Postposing. Instead of the fourth sentence of (2.7.1.1.1), one may have:

(2.7.1.2.1)

Papa bbye
Pedro is causing money to be given to the child by Juan
The optional postposing rule may be formulated thus:

\[ (T \ 56') \text{ OBLIQUE N Postposing Rule I} \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
V & N' & N' & N & N & _a & _b \\
\end{array}
\]

\[ \text{OBLIQUE OBLIQUE SUBJECT} \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
V & N' & N' & N & N & N & N \\
\end{array}
\]

\[ \text{OBLIQUE SUBJECT OBLIQUE} \]

It is not only \( N_a \) which may be postposed but likewise \( N_b \).

It seems, however, that if \( N_a \) is postposed, \( N_b \) must likewise be postposed:

\[ (T \ 57') \text{ OBLIQUE N Postposing Rule II} \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
V & N' & N' & N & N & N & N \\
\end{array}
\]

\[ \text{OBLIQUE OBLIQUE SUBJECT} \]

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
V & N' & N' & N & N & N & N \\
\end{array}
\]

\[ \text{SUBJECT OBLIQUE OBLIQUE} \]

The above rule applies to a sentence with only one OBLIQUE N:

\[ (2.7.1.2.2) \text{ babyé' yan kuáltà # kìŋ anák # i Pédrù } \]

\[ \text{ babyé' yaŋ kuáltà # i Pédrù # kìŋ anák } \]

Pedro is giving money to the child
2.7.1.3. Preposing. In Pampangan, the main sentential accent falls on the initial phrase, which in sentences with unmarked linear order is V and any of its possible incorporations. It is possible, however, to highlight not V but one of the N's in the sentence. Such highlighting was labeled topicalization in Chapter I (distinct from subjectivization, which was discussed earlier in this chapter). An N semantically specified as TOPIC must be preposed, to place it in the most prominent position in the sentence and to make it possible for the TOPIC N to receive the main sentential accent. Thus:

(2.7.1.3.1) bíbiyé yaŋ kuálta # kiŋ anák # i Pédrú

Pedro is giving money to the child

(2.7.1.3.1a) i Pédrú # bíbiyé yaŋ kuálta # kiŋ anák

TOPIC

As for Pedro, he is giving money to the child

(2.7.1.3.1b) kiŋ anák ya bíbiyé kuálta # i Pédrú

TOPIC

It is to the child that Pedro is giving money.

When an OBLIQUE N is topicalized and preposed, it attracts to itself the copier (N'), in effect, deleting the boundary marker; moreover, it seems that in a sentence such as (2.7.1.3.1b), it is the whole initial phrase which receives sentential accent and not just anák.

As the rule for TOPIC specification has been formulated in Chapter I, kuálta cannot be topicalized since it is -definite.
It is possible, however, to topicalize a -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE N, provided it is definite:

(2.7.1.3.2) babiyé neŋ Pédru # kiŋ anák # iŋ kuálta
   The money is being given to the child by Pedro

(2.7.1.3.2a) i Pédru # babiyé ne # kiŋ anák # iŋ kuálta
   As for Pedro, the money is being given by
   him to the child

Note, however, that when a -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE N is topicalized
and fronted, determiner niŋ is replaced by determiner i,
the SUBJECT determiner. In effect, sentence (2.7.1.3.2a)
has two subjects, a primary subject, iŋ kuálta, and a
secondary subject, i Pédru, the latter a result of topicalization
and preposing.

The following rules need to be formulated for N's marked
TOPIC:

(T 58') TOPIC Preposing Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{TOPIC} \\
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{N} \\
\text{TOPIC} \\
\text{V} \\
\end{array}
\]

(T 59') N' Interposing Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{N} \\
\text{TOPIC} \\
\text{OBLIQUE} \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{N'} \\
\text{N'} \\
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{N} \\
\text{TOPIC} \\
\text{OBLIQUE} \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{N'} \\
\text{N'} \\
\text{V} \\
\end{array}
\]

(T 60') Secondary Subjectivization Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{N} \\
\text{definite} \\
\text{TOPIC} \\
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{N} \\
\text{definite} \\
\text{SUBJECT} \\
\end{array}
\]
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Pronouns may likewise be specified as TOPIC; if so specified, after the incorporation processes copying SUBJECT N and -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE N, the N matrix, instead of being deleted, is preposed and directly symbolized by the full SUBJECT form of the pronoun (in the symbolization rules given, the form listed as occurring in the context "##__"):

(2.7.1.3.3) másakít ku # Ø
I am sick
yáku # másakít ku
As for me, I am sick

(2.7.1.3.4)* b+in+iyáy ku ya # iŋ librú>
biniyé ke # iŋ librú
The book was given by me
yáku # biniyé ke # iŋ librú
As for me, the book was given by me

OBLIQUE pronouns which are also TOPIC are preposed, attract the copier(s) to themselves and are symbolized by the usual oblique form of pronouns:

(2.7.1.3.5) biniyé neŋ Pédrú # kanáku # iŋ librú
The book was given by Pedro to me

* ka+n+áku na ya b+in+iyáy naŋ Pédrú # iŋ librú>
kanáku ne biniyé Pédrú # iŋ librú
It was to me that the book was given by Pedro
2.7.1.4. Sentential Accent in Pampangan. The remarks on sentential accent that will be made in this section are tentative at best. They are based on the theory of generative phonology as a frame of reference and on what has been discovered so far concerning the acoustic correlates of accent (or stress) in nontonal languages. More particularly, the hypotheses are based on a previous instrumental study of accent in Tagalog (see Gonzalez 1970), another Philippine language, closely related to Pampangan. Naturally, the hypotheses, where they have to do with acoustic correlates, would have to be confirmed by instrumental data, which unfortunately is unavailable for Pampangan at present. Still, the relevance of sentential accent to the material being discussed in the preceding section on preposing and topicalization makes it worthwhile to at least essay some suggestions.

It has been observed that the ordinary intonation pattern of Tagalog sentences consists of an initial peak followed by descent. Since in both Tagalog and Pampangan, the nucleus of a sentence, V, is normally in initial position, the prominence given to initial position finds semantic justification. Bowen (1965:14) speaks of the 'descending stair-step pattern of Tagalog intonation' and Llamzon (1966) describes the intonation pattern of Tagalog statements as /221↓/ (using the Trager and Smith notation). Gonzalez, using his own speech as data, confirmed this descending pattern instrumentally; it was discovered that after an initial peak, amplitude descended sharply although fundamental
frequency remained more or less within the same range. Since, however, perceptual pitch is a function of both amplitude and fundamental frequency, Gonzalez' findings do not contradict the noninstrumental observations of either Bowen or Llamzon, although Bowen's postulation of a stair-step pattern

```
/...\ |...\ |...\ |↓ /```

for longer sentences is perhaps a personal idiosyncrasy of his informants. What seems to be criterial is the initial peak followed by gradual descent, with the stages in this descent not significant. Hence, it would not do to consider the most common intonation pattern of Tagalog as the mirror-image of the rising terrace-level pattern of Acatlan Mixtec.

In Gonzalez' study, however, the descending pattern was not found to obtain in the speech of a second informant, another native speaker. In the data of the second informant, both amplitude and fundamental frequency remained more or less within the same range from the beginning of the sentence to the end, with naturally small peaks on the accented syllables. It would seem then that the descent is optional, perhaps a function of expressivity associated with new and -new information.

In general, the sound structure of Pampangan is almost identical with that of Tagalog. There are, of course, phonological rules peculiar to Pampangan, resulting in
phonetic differences between Tagalog and Pampangan, but the basic inventory of morphophonemes is identical.

Based solely on noninstrumental observation, I make the following hypotheses concerning accent in Pampangan: In a sentence such as

(2.7.1.4.1) mámağán yaŋ más # i Pédrú

Pedro is eating corn

all the accented vowels in morphophonemic representation begin with an initial value of 1 (acoustically, if the correlates of accent in Pampangan are the same as the correlates of accent in Tagalog, the vowel of accented syllables has a higher frequency, greater amplitude, and longer duration than a nonaccented vowel). Thus:

mámağán yaŋ más # i Pédrú

1 1 1 1

There is need for a phonological rule reducing value 1 to 2 for all accented vowels which are not the loci for the main accent of a polysyllabic word. Usually, this main accent falls on the root:

mámağán yaŋ más # i Pédrú

2 1 1 1
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There is likewise a noticeable lengthening of initial *ma-* [maː] which is predictable and which would have to be noted in a less broad transcription. Unlike English, Pampangan phrases do not rise to a peak syllable. Hence, there seems to be no need to postulate a further phonological rule to reduce values of 2 to 3. In general, the intonation pattern of an all-new Pampangan sentence would be:

\[
\text{#}
\]

This relative uniformity (with accented syllables naturally forming minor crests) plus the lack of vowel reduction and the well-nigh uniform CV- syllable structure of the language is doubtless responsible for the impression that it is a 'syllable-timed' language, for the preceding features give an impression of uniformity, although Gonzalez' instrument-measured data for Tagalog belies any claim to a uniform syllable duration for Tagalog (and presumably for Pampangan). The descending pattern must still be accounted for, since it is quite common. It would seem that the descent occurs in phrases which are -new; these phrases are likewise candidates for deletion. Thus, if the subject N of the example is -new, an optional reduction to 3 of all accented vowels in the -new phrase may be postulated:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{mámaγán } & \text{yaŋ } & \text{maís } & \text{# } \\
2 & 1 & 1 & 3
\end{array}
\]
This would give rise to a descending step-pattern:

\[ \text{#} \]

I shall hypothesize further that what may be contained in the first part of the sentence may not only be \( V \) or \( \sqrt{N} \) but even \( \sqrt{N} N N N \), provided these \( N \)'s are marked new. Where the \( N \)'s are marked -new, the descent begins. Hence, the general intonation pattern of a sentence such as:

\[
(2.7.1.4.2) \text{ babyé yaq kuáltə } # \text{ kiŋ anák } # \text{ i Pédru } \\
\text{ Pedro is giving money to the child}
\]

would be

\[ \text{#} \]

\[ \text{#} \]

It is interesting to note that when \( N \) is TOPIC and preposed, the peak occurs initially and there is usually a sharp descent after the TOPIC \( N \):

\[
(2.7.1.4.2a) \text{ i Pédru } # \text{ babyé yaq kuáltə } # \text{ kiŋ anák } \\
\text{ As for Pedro, he is giving money to the child}
\]
When the topicalized N is OBLIQUE, it seems that the descent does not begin until after the first pause, since the OBLIQUE N has been incorporated into the verb phrase:

\[(2.7.1.4.2b) \text{kiŋ aná́k ya babyé kuálta} \# \text{i Pédrú} \]

It is to the child that Pedro is giving money.

The descent (or reduction to value 3) is optional, since if the descent does not occur, communication is not impaired, although its nonoccurrence in -new phrases would seem unusual to a native speaker.

2.7.2. Minor Linearization Processes. Sequential to the major linearization processes described in section 2.7.1 will be minor linearization processes involving V and each one of the accompanying N's.

2.7.2.1. Linearization of V. The first linearization process separates negative (if it occurs) from the rest of the V matrix: \( V \) is replaced by \( \text{negative} \). Moreover, like the proposed OBLIQUE N which is topicalized, negative attracts the copiers to itself so that an interposing process would have to be postulated to account for:
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If V has more than one copier, then both copiers must be interposed between the negative and the verb root:

(2.7.2.1.2)  biniyé ne niŋ anák # iŋ átu
            é ne biniyé    niŋ anák # iŋ átu

            The car was given by the child
            The car was not given by the child

The usual symbolization for 'negative' is tonic é. However, the symbolization for the expression 'No' is alí. And when the verb root is deleted, the symbolization for 'not' is likewise alí: alí ya 'He is not' instead of * é ya. The two forms are most likely from a Proto-Pampangan form * alí > a i > é. It is not uncommon for ProtoAustronesian * l to become y and eventually ∅ in Pampangan. The ai>é shift is a current phonological rule.

After negative specification has been linearized into a separate subbranch, there will be need of a rule linearizing V further into

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{aspectual specifications} \\
\text{intensive} \\
\text{minutive} \\
\text{perseverative}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{root} \\
\text{(plural incorporation)} \\
\text{(repetitive)} \\
\text{(rel subject)}
\end{array}
\]
At this point in the derivation, the deletion processes have already applied; hence, it is possible for the incorporated rel subject to have been deleted. In a pedagogical grammar, it will perhaps be more economical to symbolize \[ V \]
\[ \text{root} \]
\[ (\text{plural}) \]
\[ (\text{repetitive}) \]
\[ (\text{rel subject}) \]
directly since the final linearization of \( V \) (\text{root} and inflectional specifications) is erratic, although the agglutination is relatively transparent once the sequence is known. A general pattern of verb root linearization is

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{PREFIX} & \text{INFIX} & \text{ROOT} & \text{SUFFIX} \\
\end{array}
\]

Incorporated plural, symbolized by \(-\text{na}-\) is always an infix; if there is no prefix, *\( \text{mag}- \) is used, as in: \( \text{lákad} \) 'walk'
*\( \text{man+na+lákad} \rightarrow \text{manlákad} \) 'to walk, repeatedly'. While rel subject is often \( \emptyset \) in unmarked configurations, if extrapolation has taken place, rel subject is overtly symbolized. The marker for rel subject may be a prefix (e.g., \( \text{i-} \)) or a suffix (e.g., \(-\text{an} \)) or a discontinuous morph (e.g., \( \text{ka-...-an} \)). In the latter case, some type of 'affix-hopping rule' would have to be formulated as part of the symbolization process: *\( \text{ka-...-an+matáy} \rightarrow \text{kamatáyan} \).

In terms of the theory, 'zero morphs' (semantic units which receive no symbolization), to use the terminology of American structural linguistics, do not arise, since they
are postsemantically deleted before symbolization takes place. So-called 'portmanteau morphs' are directly symbolized as matrices of semantic units (determiners, counters, measures, copiers, nonlexically specified N's which are not deleted). It is 'carriers' such as *māg- in māŋlākad which give rise to 'empty morphs' (symbolizations with no correlative semantic unit).

The remaining units (aspectual specifications; intensive, minutive, perseverative, intermittent) presuppose that the root with its affixes has already been symbolized before their own symbolization can take place. Aspect is symbolized in Pampangan by various processes: accentual shift, infixing, suffixing, reduplication, or a combination of these. The other specifications are symbolized by various types of reduplications. Hence, another symbolization process of the following type must be posited:

$$\text{aspectual specifications with affixes} \rightarrow \text{XXX}$$

For example: durative + māŋlākad $\rightarrow$ māŋlākad

Still a third stage of symbolization must be posited if the output of the above rule is specified as intensive/minutive (for state V's) or intermittent/perseverative (for -state V's). The latter specifications presuppose symbolization of V for root and for aspect and use this symbolization as input. Thus:
\{ intensive \} \\
\{ minutive \} \\
\{ intermittent \} + \{ symbolized root \} — YYY \\
\{ perseverative \} \\
\{ symbolized aspect \} — YYY

For example:

\text{intermittent} + \text{máŋlákad} —— \text{máŋ+láká+lákad}

The following linearization processes for V must be posited:

(T 61') \text{V Linearization Rule I}

\begin{align*}
\text{V} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{(aspectual specifications)} \\
\text{(negative)} \\
\text{( incorporated) plural} \\
\text{( incorporated) rel subject} \\
\end{align*}
(T 62') V Linearization Rule II

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{v} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{(plural/repititive)} \\
\text{(rel subject)} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{PREFIX} & \text{INFIX} & \text{ROOT} & \text{SUFFIX}
\end{array}
\]

The last rule is intended only as a general statement since various roots manifest idiosyncratic properties of linearization based on their constituent roots (basic or derived) and affixes. For purposes of analysis, linearizations of the above type would be useful; for pedagogical purposes, however, it is perhaps more economical to bypass (T 62') and symbolize its input directly. For V's inflected as negative, there is a further linearizing rule necessary:

(T 63') Negative Interposing Rule

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{negative} & \text{v} & \text{N} & \text{N'} \\
\text{negative} & \text{N'} & \text{N'} & \text{v}
\end{array}
\]

Symbolization of Aspect

The symbolizations of the different aspectual inflections vary according as V is a basic root or V is accompanied by affixes. A table of the type set down in Table II would have to be consulted for the symbolization of aspect:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOT</th>
<th>Aspect 1: actual</th>
<th>Aspect 2: actual completed</th>
<th>Aspect 3: actual durative generic</th>
<th>Aspect 4: actual completed immediate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV(C)CVC</td>
<td>C+um+V(C)CVC</td>
<td>C+in+V(C)CVC</td>
<td>CV+CV(C)CVC</td>
<td>ka+(root)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lákad 'to walk'</td>
<td>lumákad</td>
<td>línákad</td>
<td>lálákad</td>
<td>kalákadalákad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ladláp 'to lay out'</td>
<td>lumadlád</td>
<td>línadlád</td>
<td>láladlád</td>
<td>kaladládladlád</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCVC</td>
<td>m+VCVC</td>
<td>m+in+VCVC</td>
<td>m+V+m+VCVC</td>
<td>ka+(root)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urán 'rain'</td>
<td>murán</td>
<td>minurán</td>
<td>múmurán</td>
<td>kauránurán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>m+VC</td>
<td>m+in+VC</td>
<td>m+V+m+VC</td>
<td>ka+(root)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II: Verb Inflection
Aspectual Paradigms
Table II: cont’d.

Verb Inflection: Aspectual Paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFIX(E)+ROOT</th>
<th>Aspect 1: -actual</th>
<th>Aspect 2: actual completed</th>
<th>Aspect 3: actual durative generic</th>
<th>Aspect 4: actual completed immediate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a(ka)+CV(C)CVC</td>
<td>a(ka)+CV(C)CVC</td>
<td>a(ka)+CV(C)CVC</td>
<td>a+CV+CV(C)CVC</td>
<td>a+ka+ka+CV(C)CVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asúlat 'write'</td>
<td>ásúlat</td>
<td>ásúlat</td>
<td>ásusúlat</td>
<td>ákasúlat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akasúlat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i+CV(C)CVC</td>
<td>i+CV(C)CVC</td>
<td>C+in+V(C)CVC</td>
<td>CV+CV(C)CVC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isúlat</td>
<td>isúlat</td>
<td>sinúlat</td>
<td>súsúlat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma(ka)+</td>
<td>ma(ka)+</td>
<td>me(ka)+</td>
<td>ma(ka)+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maki+</td>
<td>maki+</td>
<td>meki+</td>
<td>maki+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma$q$+ CV(C)CVC</td>
<td>ma$q$+ CV(C)CVC</td>
<td>me$q$+ CV(C)CVC</td>
<td>ma$q$+ CV(C)CVC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma(qa)+</td>
<td>ma(qa)+</td>
<td>me(qa)+</td>
<td>ma(qa)+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma$q$apa+</td>
<td>ma$q$apa+</td>
<td>me$q$apa+</td>
<td>ma$q$apa+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man+</td>
<td>man+</td>
<td>men+</td>
<td>man+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mag(pa)+</td>
<td>mag(pa)+</td>
<td>meg(pa)+</td>
<td>meg(pa)+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magiŋ+</td>
<td>magiŋ+</td>
<td>megiŋ+</td>
<td>magiŋ+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magiŋmarók 'to turn bad'</td>
<td>magiŋmarók</td>
<td>mégiŋmarók</td>
<td>magiŋmarók</td>
<td>magiŋmarók</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect 1: actual</td>
<td>Aspect 2: actual</td>
<td>Aspect 3: actual</td>
<td>Aspect 4: actual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td>generic</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C(C)(C)V.CV+can</td>
<td>i(C)(C)V.CV+can</td>
<td>i(C)(C)V.CV+can</td>
<td>ma+CV(C)(C)V.CV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sulatanan</td>
<td>silatanan</td>
<td>susilatanan</td>
<td>malakaran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write</td>
<td>melakaran</td>
<td>ma+CV(C)(C)V.CV</td>
<td>meltakaran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malakaran</td>
<td>ma+CV(C)(C)V.CV</td>
<td>ma+CV(C)(C)V.CV</td>
<td>ma+CV(C)(C)V.CV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II: cont'd.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect 1: actual</th>
<th>Aspect 2: -actual</th>
<th>Aspect 3:</th>
<th>Aspect 4: actual completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PR1</td>
<td>PR2</td>
<td>PR3</td>
<td>PR4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUFFIX:</td>
<td>SUFFIX:</td>
<td>SUFFIX:</td>
<td>SUFFIX:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m'pa+</td>
<td>m'pa+</td>
<td>m'pa+</td>
<td>m'pa+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m'pasgaban</td>
<td>m'pasgaban</td>
<td>m'pasgaban</td>
<td>m'pasgaban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p+</td>
<td>p+</td>
<td>p+</td>
<td>p+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peka+</td>
<td>peka+</td>
<td>peka+</td>
<td>peka+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pki+</td>
<td>pki+</td>
<td>pki+</td>
<td>pki+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ip+</td>
<td>ip+</td>
<td>ip+</td>
<td>ip+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p+</td>
<td>p+</td>
<td>p+</td>
<td>p+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panyulat</td>
<td>panyulat</td>
<td>panyulat</td>
<td>panyulat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
<td>pdir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
<td>p1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.7.2.2. Linearization of N. Consider the sentence:

(2.7.2.2.1) mátudtúd laŋán # détiŋ sablāŋ ának a réti

Each and all of these children (near you and me) and me) are sleeping

where the subject is N which must be

child
plural
definite
demonstrative
proximate to speaker
proximate to hearer
total
individuated

SUBJECT

linearized by a minor process into

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D a</th>
<th>D b</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>plural</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite</td>
<td>individuated</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

demonstrative
proximate to speaker
proximate to hearer

SUBJECT

where D is a convenient label for determiner (the subdivision into two types, a and b, is rendered necessary because of other processes that will be described subsequently). Note that the unit 'plural' is not transferred into Da but is copied into Dā. This retention of 'plural' in N seems to be a property of particular lexical roots, in this case, 'child': anáŋ 'child' ának 'children'. Other roots do not retain the plural specification. Moreover, whenever N is inflectionally specified as 'demonstrative', there is an optional copying process:
It is not clear whether this copying process (an instance of reduplication of a certain type) adds meaning; perhaps the reduplication emphasizes the unit 'demonstrative'. In my idiolect, it seems that the reduplication adds no new meaning. Conceivably, it could. This would mean that the unit 'demonstrative' may be further specified as 'emphatic'. The context then for the copying process outlined above would be the unit 'emphatic'. After Da has been copied, its copier, Da', must be postposed. Hence, the surface substructure of the subject phrase of sentence (2.7.2.2.1) would be:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{D a} & \text{D b} & \text{N} & \text{D a'} \\
\text{plural} & \text{total} & \text{child} & \text{plural} \\
\text{definite} & \text{individuated} & \text{plur} & \text{definite} \\
\text{demonstrative} & & & \text{demonstrative} \\
\text{proximate to speaker} & & & \text{proximate to speaker} \\
\text{proximate to hearer} & & & \text{proximate to hearer} \\
\text{SUBJECT} & & & \text{SUBJECT} \\
* \text{děti}^+η & \text{sablá}^+η & \text{ának} & \text{a děti}
\end{array}
\]
In such instances, after the linearization of N, there has to be another interposing process placing two in the position between D a and N:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
D & a & \mathcal{V} & N \\
plural & two & child & plural \\
definite & & & definite \\
demonstrative & & & demonstrative \\
proximate to & & & proximate to \\
speaker & & & speaker \\
proximate to & & & proximate to \\
hearer & & & hearer \\
SUBJECT & & & SUBJECT \\
\end{array}
\]

\( N, \) if -definite, can be both quantitative and partitive:

\[ (2.7.2.2.3) \text{ méñan yañ adúa kariñ dalandán Ÿ i Pëdru} \]

Pedro ate two of the oranges

in which the patient \( N \) is \( N \). The semantic substructure may be represented thus:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{patient} & \text{N} & \mathcal{V} & \text{partitive} \\
\text{orange} & & & N \\
\text{state} & \text{quantitative} & \text{two} & \mathcal{V} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{orange} & \text{plural} & \text{definite} & \text{OBLIQUE} \\
\text{state} & \text{quantitative} & \text{two} & \text{partitive} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{orange} & \text{plural} & \text{definite} & \text{OBLIQUE} \\
\text{state} & \text{quantitative} & \text{two} & \text{partitive} \\
\end{array}
\]
A variant (actually the preferred one) of (2.7.2.2.1) is:

(2.7.2.2.1') mátudtúd laŋán # diŋ suŋblaŋ ának a réti

It would seem then that the copying process for demonstratives has a variant output:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{D a} & \quad \text{----›} & \quad \text{D a} & \quad \text{D a} \,'
\text{plural} & \quad \text{plural} & \quad \text{plural} \\
\text{definite} & \quad \text{definite} & \quad \text{definite} \\
\text{demonstrative} & \quad \text{demonstrative} \\
\text{proximate to speaker} & \quad \text{proximate to speaker} \\
\text{proximate to hearer} & \quad \text{proximate to hearer} \\
\text{SUBJECT} & \quad \text{SUBJECT} & \quad \text{SUBJECT}
\end{align*}
\]

Consider now the sentence:

(2.7.2.2.2) mátudtúd la # détiŋ aduŋ alláŋ ának a réti

These two children (near you and me) are sleeping.

It was shown in Chapter I that when N is specified as quantitative (estimative or numerical), the structure of N is replaced by:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{patient} & \quad \text{patient} \\
\text{child} & \quad \text{state} \\
\text{plural} & \quad \text{quantitative} \\
\text{definite} & \quad \text{numerical} \\
\text{demonstrative} & \quad \text{two} \\
\text{proximate to speaker} & \\
\text{proximate to hearer} & \\
\text{SUBJECT} & \\
\end{align*}
\]
Since orange is repeated, one of the occurrences is -new. In partitive matrices, it seems that it is the unit to the left which is deleted; moreover, since the partitive state $V$ is without lexical specification, it is likewise deleted, leaving only a $\overline{V} \overline{N}$ structure. After $N$ has been linearized, the surface substructure is:

```
V
 two
 D
 plural
definite
 OBLIQUE

* aduá?
 ka+diŋ
dalandán
```

$N$ may likewise be inflectionally specified for counters or measures, as in:

(2.7.2.2.4) kinuá na laŋ Pédru # diŋ aduáŋ piliŋ a ságin

The two bunches of bananas were taken by Pedro

The subject $N$ may be characterized thus:

```
 clustered
twisted off
banana
counter
indefinite
plural
definite
quantitative
numerical
two
SUBJECT
```
The matrix must first be linearized thus:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
  \text{banana} \\
  \text{clustered} \\
  \text{twisted off} \\
  \text{counter} \\
  \text{indefinite set} \\
  \text{definite} \\
  \text{plural} \\
  \text{quantitative} \\
  \text{numerical} \\
  \text{two} \\
  \text{SUBJECT} \\
\end{array} \]

\( C \) postsemantically behaves as an ordinary \( N \). It must be replaced by:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
  \text{patient} \\
  \text{clustered} \\
  \text{twisted off} \\
  \text{counter} \\
  \text{indefinite set} \\
  \text{definite} \\
  \text{plural} \\
  \text{SUBJECT} \\
\end{array} \]

The usual processes for quantitative \( N \)'s are then applied; in surface substructure, \( N \) is postposed; \( \text{two} \) is interposed between the subject determiner and the classifier:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
  \text{definite} \\
  \text{plural} \\
  \text{SUBJECT} \\
  \text{two} \\
  \text{clustered} \\
  \text{twisted off} \\
  \text{counter} \\
  \text{indefinite set} \\
  \text{banana} \\
  \text{diŋ} \\
  \text{aduáʔ+ŋ piliŋ} \\
  \text{a ságin} \\
\end{array} \]
As with verb roots, there will be need of a further linearization process for noun roots:

```
PREFIX    ROOT    SUFFIX
```

The root itself, of course, may be a derived root, composed of several basic roots or a reduplicated root. Again, as with verbs, in the symbolization process, there will be need for an 'affix-hopping rule' as in:

```
abstractivizer die → * ka-...-an + matáy →
                     kamatáyan 'death'
```

In general, infixes do not occur in noun roots, unless of course one considers a prefix to which is added still another prefix as a kind of infix. Hence, in the linearization of the noun root set down above, INFIX is not included.

The minor linearization processes for N may be formulated thus (it is assumed that the numerical state V and the partitive state V which may accompany N is generated by the semantic rules):
(T 64') Noun Root Deletion Rule for Partitive

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{rel} \quad \text{partitive} \\
N \quad \text{root}_a \\
\text{definite} \quad \text{state} \\
\text{plural} \quad \text{partitive} \\
\text{definite} \\
\text{rel} \quad \text{partitive} \\
N \quad \text{root}_a \\
\text{definite} \quad \text{state} \\
\text{plural} \quad \text{partitive} \\
\text{definite} \\
\end{array}
\]

(Eventually, both \(N\) and \(V\) are deleted, but such branch deletions of \(V\) and \(N\) have already been formulated.)

(T 65') C Linearization Rule I

\[
\begin{array}{c}
N \quad \text{selectional units} \\
\text{root} \quad \text{counter} \\
\text{measure} \quad y \\
\text{rel} \quad \text{selectional units} \\
N \quad \text{root} \\
\text{counter} \\
\text{measure} \quad y
\end{array}
\]

where selectional units = units not deleted by the process deleting selectional units; for classifiers, these include criterial units such as 'sliceable', 'human', 'twisted off', and the like; \(y\) = inflectional units which have not been deleted by previous processes.

(T 66') C Linearization Rule II

\[
\begin{array}{c}
C \quad \text{selectional units} \\
\text{counter} \\
\text{measure} \quad (\text{plural}) \\
(\text{definite}) \\
(\text{demonstrative}) \\
(\text{total}) \\
(\text{individuated}) \\
\text{rel} \quad (\text{subject}) \\
\text{rel} \quad (\text{oblique})
\end{array}
\]
(T 67') N Linearization Rule

N
(human)
(unique)
root
-counter
-measure

(plural)
(definite)
(demonstrative)

(SUBJECT)
(OBLIQUE)

D a
(human)
(unique)
(plural)
(definite)
(demonstrative)

D b
(total)
(individuated)

N
(root \rightarrow

\{\{\{SUBJECT\}\}\{\{OBLIQUE\}\}\}

(T 68') Demonstrative Copying Rule

\[\begin{array}{c}
D a \\
(human) \\
(unique) \\
(plural) \\
definite \\
demonstrative
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
D a \\
(human) \\
(unique) \\
(plural) \\
definite \\
demonstrative
\end{array} \quad D a^{'}
\]

\{\{\{SUBJECT\}\}\{\{OBLIQUE\}\}\}

where root* indicates a subset of roots which retain plural

(Certain of the units listed in parentheses in T 66' and T 67' are mutually exclusive; the earlier semantic rules with their restrictions will prevent their occurrence. The rule is merely intended to show how units will be linearized; not all the units listed occur at once.)
(T 69') Demonstrative Copier Postposing Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
D_a & D_a' & D_b & N \\
\rightarrow
\end{array}
\]
\[
D_a & D_b & N \\
\rightarrow & D_a'
\]

(T 70') Number Interposing Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
D_a & C/N \\
state & quantitative
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
D_a & V \\
state & quantitative
\end{array}
\]

(The rule is optional since one can have \textit{diŋ ának a aduá} 'the two children' as well as \textit{diŋ aduán ának}; \textit{diŋ pilin a ságín a aduá} 'the two bunches of bananas' as well as \textit{diŋ aduán pilin a ságín}.)

(T 71') Noun Root Linearization Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
N \\
\rightarrow \text{PREFIX} \quad \text{ROOT} \quad \text{SUFFIX}
\end{array}
\]

if root is not a basic root
2.8. Summary. In this section, the rules formulated in sections 2.1 to 2.7 will be set down successively, with the revisions and the reordering suggested by the topics discussed. These rules will then be applied to the post-semantic derivation of the semantic structure generated at the conclusion of Chapter I to show how the rules apply.

2.8.1. Restatement of Rules. (The numbering of the rules in this section supersedes that of previous sections; in the derivation of the sentence in the section following, this numbering will be followed.)

(T 1) Extrapolation Rule I

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{patient} \\
V \\
\text{experiencer} \\
\text{beneficiary} \\
\text{motive} \\
N \\
\text{state} \\
\text{experiential} \\
\text{permanent liking} \\
\{ \text{necessitative} \} \\
\{ \text{possessive} \} \\
\{ \text{intensive} \} \\
\{ \text{favoritive} \} \\
\{ \text{motivative} \} \\
\rightarrow
\end{array}
\]
Extrapolation Rule VI

- associate - beneficiary 
\[ V \quad N \quad N \quad N \quad \rightarrow \]
action
associative
benefactive

- agent - associate - beneficiary 
\[ V \quad N \quad N \quad N \quad \rightarrow \]
action
associative
benefactive

Extrapolation Rule VII

- location - patient - agent 
\[ V \quad N \quad N \quad N \quad \rightarrow \]
process
action
localized

- agent - location - agent 
\[ V \quad N \quad N \quad N \quad \rightarrow \]
process
action
localized

The next rule applies only if (T l) has not applied

(T 2) Extrapolation Rule I (for -new N)

- rel - rel - rel - rel 
\[ V \quad N \quad N \quad N \quad N \quad \rightarrow \]
-state -new

- rel - rel - rel - rel 
\[ V \quad N \quad N \quad N \quad N \quad \rightarrow \]
-state -new

Extrapolation Rule II (for -new N)

- rel - rel - rel - rel 
\[ V \quad N \quad N \quad Na \quad Nb \quad N \quad \rightarrow \]
-new -new

\{ 
- rel - rel - rel - rel 
\[ V \quad N \quad N \quad Nb \quad Na \quad \rightarrow \]
-new -new 
\}

- rel - rel - rel - rel 
\[ V \quad N \quad Na \quad N \quad Nb \quad \rightarrow \]
-new -new 

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
(T 3) Reflexive Rule

\[
\text{rel} \quad \text{partitive} \\
N \quad N \\
\text{root} \quad \text{root} \\
\text{definite} \quad \text{definite} \\
\text{agent} \\
V \quad N \quad N \\
\text{action} \quad 1 \quad 1
\]
(T 4) Subjectivization Rule

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rel} & \quad \text{SUBJECT} / V \\
N & \quad \text{definite} \quad \rightarrow \\
\end{align*}
\]

where ## means outermost or extrapoosed N

(T 5) Subject Incorporation Rule

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \quad \text{rel subject} / N \\
\text{root} & \quad \rightarrow \\
\end{align*}
\]

(T 6) Syncretization Rule

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{agentive beneficiary} \quad \text{beneficiary} \quad \text{motive} \quad \text{norm} \quad \text{associate} \quad \text{partitive} \quad \text{material} \quad \text{source} \quad \text{goal} \quad \text{location} \quad \text{time} \\
N & \quad \rightarrow \\
\end{align*}
\]

(T 7) OBLIQUE to -OBLIQUE Shift Rule I

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{motive} & \quad \text{beneficiary} \\
N & \quad \text{norm} \quad \rightarrow \\
\text{OBLIQUE} & \quad \text{-OBLIQUE} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{due to} & \quad \text{need} \quad \text{equate} \quad \text{similar} \\
V & \quad \rightarrow \\
\end{align*}
\]
OBLIQUE to -OBLIQUE Shift Rule II

beneficiary
N    ---->  beneficiary
     OBLIQUE     /  N  N

partitive
N    ---->  partitive
     OBLIQUE     /  N  N

(T 8) -OBLIQUE to OBLIQUE Shift Rule

{patient}
{agent}
N    ---->  -SUBJECT
     -OBLIQUE     /  state

(T 9) SUBJECT Incorporation Rule Ia

rel
V    ---->  rel
N    N'    N
-abstract  -abstract
count  count
root  root
(plural)  (plural)
(total)  (total)
SUBJECT  SUBJECT  SUBJECT

SUBJECT Incorporation Rule Ib

rel
V    ---->  rel
N    N'    N
(first person)  (first person)
(second person)  (second person)
(plural)  (plural)
SUBJECT  SUBJECT  SUBJECT

SUBJECT Incorporation Rule II

rel  rel
V    ---->  state
N    N  N
(no root)  -abstract
            count
            root
            (plural)
            (total)
            SUBJECT
(T 10) -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE Incorporation Rule Ia

- SUBJECT - OBLIQUE Incorporation Rule Ib

- SUBJECT - OBLIQUE Incorporation Rule IIa
(T 11) OBLIQUE Incorporation Rule

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\v \quad N' \\
\quad state \\
\quad root \\
\quad superlative \\
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
\quad \text{partitive} \\
\quad N \\
\quad root \\
\quad total \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{SUBJECT} \\
\text{OBLIQUE} \\
\end{array} \]

(T 12) Plural Incorporation Rule

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\v \quad N \\
\quad -action \\
\quad root \\
\quad patient \\
\quad subject \\
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{cc}
\quad \text{patient} \\
\quad V \\
\quad root \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{SUBJECT} \\
\text{OBLIQUE} \\
\end{array} \]

(T 13) First Person Plural Neutralization Rule

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
N' \\
\text{first person} \\
\text{(plural)} \\
\text{-SUBJECT} \\
\text{-OBLIQUE} \\
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{cc}
N' \\
\text{second person} \\
\text{(plural)} \\
\text{-SUBJECT} \\
\text{-OBLIQUE} \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\v \\
\text{N} \\
\text{N'} \\
\end{array} \]

(T 14) -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE N Incorporation Rule

\[ \begin{array}{cccc}
\v \quad N' \\
\quad -subject \\
\quad -oblique \\
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{cccc}
\quad N' \\
\quad Na \\
\quad Nb \\
\quad -subject \\
\quad -oblique \\
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{cccc}
\quad N' \\
\quad -subject \\
\quad -oblique \\
\end{array} \]
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(T 15) -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE (Incorporated) N Transposition Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\bar{V} \bar{N} \bar{N} \bar{N} \bar{N} \bar{N} \\
-\text{SUBJECT} \ -\text{SUBJECT} \\
-\text{OBLIQUE} \ -\text{OBLIQUE} \\
\end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
\bar{V} \bar{N} \bar{N} \bar{N} \bar{N} \bar{N} \\
-\text{SUBJECT} \ -\text{SUBJECT} \\
-\text{OBLIQUE} \ -\text{OBLIQUE} \\
\end{array}
\]

(T 16) V Deletion Rule

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{selectional units} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \emptyset \\
\text{(no lexical root)} & \quad
\end{align*}
\]

(T 17) V Derivational Units Deletion Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\bar{V} \\
\text{root + derivational unit} \\
\text{generic}
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
\bar{V} \\
\text{root}
\end{array}
\]

(This rule is a general rule; particular lexical items which are deletable must be listed.)

(T 18) Aspect Replacement Rules

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{V} & \quad \text{V} \\
\text{state} & \quad \text{state} \\
\text{root} & \quad \text{root} \\
\text{generic} & \quad
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{V} & \quad \text{V} \\
-\text{state} & \quad -\text{state} \\
\text{root} & \quad \text{root} \\
\text{generic} & \quad \text{actual} \\
& \quad \text{durative}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{V} & \quad \text{V} \\
-\text{state} & \quad -\text{state} \\
\text{root} & \quad \text{root} \\
\text{actual durative} & \quad \text{durative} \\
\{
\text{actual completed} \\
\text{actual completed} \\
\text{actual completed immediate}
\} & \quad \{
\text{completed} \\
\text{immediate}
\}
\end{align*}
\]
(T19) Rel Subject Specification Deletion Rules

\[
\begin{align*}
V &\quad V \\
\text{state} &\quad \text{state} \\
\text{root} &\quad \text{root} \\
\text{rel subject} &\quad \rightarrow \\
V &\quad V \\
\text{process} &\quad \text{process} \\
\text{root} &\quad \text{root} \\
\text{rel subject} &\quad \rightarrow \\
V &\quad V \\
\text{(process)} &\quad \text{(process)} \\
\text{action} &\quad \text{action} \\
\text{root} &\quad \text{root} \\
\text{agent subject} &\quad \rightarrow \\
\end{align*}
\]

-(T1)  
-(T2)

(T20) Rel Subject Specification Neutralization Rules

\[
\begin{align*}
V &\quad V \\
\text{(process)} &\quad \text{(process)} \\
\text{action} &\quad \text{action} \\
\text{root} &\quad \text{root} \\
\text{patient} &\quad \rightarrow \\
\{ \text{complement} \} &\quad \text{subject} \\
\{ \text{instrument} \} &\quad \text{common subject} \\
\{ \text{measure} \} &\quad a \\
\{ \text{beneficiary} \} &\quad \text{subject} \\
\{ \text{goal} \} &\quad \text{common subject} \\
\{ \text{source} \} &\quad b \\
\{ \text{material} \} &\quad \text{subject} \\
\{ \text{associate} \} &\quad \text{subject} \\
\{ \text{agentive} \} &\quad \text{subject} \\
\{ \text{beneficiary} \} &\quad \text{subject} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{root}^* = \text{subset of V roots that take -an}\]

\[
\begin{align*}
V &\quad V \\
\text{(process)} &\quad \text{(process)} \\
\text{action} &\quad \text{action} \\
\text{root} &\quad \text{root} \\
\text{patient} &\quad \rightarrow \\
\{ \text{complement} \} &\quad \text{subject} \\
\{ \text{beneficiary} \} &\quad \text{subject} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{root}^* = \text{subset of V roots that take i-}\]
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V Selectional Units Deletion Rule

\[
\begin{align*}
V \\
\text{selectional units} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{V} \\
\text{root} & \\
\text{inflectional units} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{inflectional units}
\end{align*}
\]

N Root Deletion Rule

\[
\begin{align*}
N \\
\text{selectional units} & \quad \rightarrow \quad N \\
\text{root} & \\
\text{inflectional units} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{inflectional units} \\
\text{-new} & \\
\text{-TOPIC} &
\end{align*}
\]

N Deletion Rule

\[
\begin{align*}
N \\
\text{selectional units} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \emptyset \\
\text{(no lexical root)} & \\
\text{inflectional units} & \\
\text{-TOPIC} & \\
\text{-OBLIQUE} &
\end{align*}
\]

N Derivational Units Deletion Rule

\[
\begin{align*}
N \\
\text{root+derivational unit} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{root} \\
\text{(This rule is a general rule; particular lexical items which are deletable must be listed.)}
\end{align*}
\]

N Inflectional Units Deletion Rules

\[
\begin{align*}
N \\
\text{place} & \quad \rightarrow \quad N \\
\text{unique} & \\
\text{root} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{root} \\
\text{inflectional units} & \\
\text{root} & \rightarrow \text{root} \\
\text{associative} & \rightarrow \text{associate state} \\
\text{plural} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{plural presential} \\
\text{total} & \\
\text{partitive} & \rightarrow \text{partitive} \\
\text{N} & \rightarrow \text{plural} \\
\text{plural} & \rightarrow \text{plural} \\
\text{total} &
\end{align*}
\]
(T 26) Generic Replacement Rule

N  \( \longrightarrow \)  N

root  \( \longrightarrow \)  root

generic  \{ aggregate \}

generic  \{ definite \}

aggregate  \{ definite \}

plural  \( \longrightarrow \)  demonstrative

proximate to

hearer

(T 27) N Selectional Units Deletion Rule

N  (classificatory units)  N  (classificatory units)

x  \( \longrightarrow \)  root

(human)  \( \longrightarrow \)  (human)

(unique)  \( \longrightarrow \)  (unique)

root  \( \longrightarrow \)  counter

(counter)  \( \longrightarrow \)  measure

(measure)  \( \longrightarrow \)  measure

y  \( \longrightarrow \)  measure

x=other selectional units besides those listed

y=other inflectional units besides those listed

(T 28) Primary Linearization

\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \ V' N' \ N' \ N \ \text{subject} \quad N \ \text{oblique} \quad N \ \text{oblique} \quad \text{subject} \\
\end{array}
\]
(T 29) Postposing Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \quad N' \quad N \quad Na \quad Nb \quad N \\
\text{-SUBJECT} \\
\text{-OBLIQUE} \quad \text{OBLIQUE} \quad \text{OBLIQUE} \quad \text{SUBJECT}
\end{array}
\]

(T 30) TOPIC Preposing Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \quad N \\
\text{TOPIC} \quad \longrightarrow \quad N \quad V \\
\text{TOPIC}
\end{array}
\]

(T 31) N' Interposing Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
N \quad V \quad N' \quad N' \\
\text{TOPIC} \\
\text{OBLIQUE} \quad \longrightarrow \quad N \quad N' \quad N' \quad V \\
\text{TOPIC} \\
\text{OBLIQUE}
\end{array}
\]

(T 32) Secondary Subjectivization Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
N \\
\text{TOPIC} \\
\text{-SUBJECT} \\
\text{-OBLIQUE} \quad \longrightarrow \quad N \\
\text{SUBJECT}
\end{array}
\]
(T 33) V Linearization Rule

(Not all the units listed under V are compatible; previous semantic rules would prevent incompatible cooccurrence. The rule is merely intended to suggest how the units are linearized when they DO occur.)

V
root+derivational unit
plural
repetitive
intermittent
perseverative
intensive
minutive
ASPECT
rel subject
negative

negative intermittent ASPECT
perseverative
intensive
minutive

root+derivational unit
plural
repetitive

(T 34) N' Interposing Rule II

negative V N' N' \(\rightarrow\) negative N' N' V

(T 35) Verb Root Linearization Rule

V
root+(derivational unit)
(plural)
(repetitive)

\(\rightarrow\) PREFIX INFIX ROOT SUFFIX
(T 36) C Linearization Rule

\[
\begin{array}{c}
N \\
\text{classificatory unit(s)} \\
\text{root} \\
\{\text{counter}\} \\
\{\text{measure}\} \\
y
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
N \\
\text{classificatory unit(s)} \\
\text{root} \\
\{\text{counter}\} \\
\{\text{measure}\} \\
y
\end{array}
\]

y=other inflectional units

(T 37) N (and C) Linearization Rule

(The units listed under N are not all compatible; the rules for semantic structure would prevent incompatible cooccurrence. The rule is meant to suggest how these units are linearized when they DO occur.)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
N/C \\
<\text{classificatory unit(s)}> \\
\text{human} \\
\text{unique} \\
\{\text{root}\} \\
\{\text{____}\} \\
\text{plural} \\
\text{definite} \\
\text{definite} \\
\text{demonstrative} \\
\text{total} \\
\text{individuated} \\
\{\text{counter}\} \\
\{\text{measure}\} \\
\{\text{SUBJECT}\} \\
\{\text{OBLIQUE}\}
\end{array}
\]
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Quantitative Interposing Rule

N Root Deletion Rule in Partitive Phrases

Demonstrative Copying Rule

Demonstrative Copier Postposing Rule

Noun Root Linearization Rule
2.8.2. Postsemantic Derivation of a Pampangan Sentence. By way of example, the semantic structure derived at the conclusion of Chapter I will be derived postsemantically into a surface structure through the application of the rules restated in section 2.8.1. All T numbers refer to this section and not to the preceding sections.

The sentence which was semantically generated in Chapter I was:

(2.8.2.1) mákibiyé laŋ digálú # karíŋ ának #
di Pédrú # kariŋ bábáyi

Pedro and [his] companions are joining the women in giving gift(s) to the children

(mákibiyé 'to join in giving', digálú 'gift(s)', ának 'children', bábáyi 'women'). Applying the rules of Chapter I, the sentence has the following semantic structure:
**SEMANTIC STRUCTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>action</td>
<td>count</td>
<td>count</td>
<td>count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative</td>
<td>potent</td>
<td>potent</td>
<td>potent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completable</td>
<td>animate</td>
<td>animate</td>
<td>animate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefactive</td>
<td>human</td>
<td>human</td>
<td>human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>unique</td>
<td>unique</td>
<td>Pedro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSTSEMANTIC PROCESSES**

1. T 4: Subjektivization Rule
2. T 5: Subject Incorporation Rule
3. T 6: Syncretization Rule
4. T 9': Subject Incorporation Rule Ia
V
action
associative
completable
benefactive

 N' complement
plural
SUBJECT

N count
object

(5) T 14: -SUBJECT -OBLIQUE N
Incorporation Rule

gift

(6) T 18: Aspect Replacement Rule

(7) T 19: Rel Subject Specification Deletion Rule

give+
associativizer

actual
durative

new

agent subject

actual → Ø

agent subject → Ø

V

give+
associativizer
durative

new

(8) T 21: V Selectional Units Deletion Rule

complement
N
count
object

agent
N
count
potent
animate
human
unique
Pedro
associative → Ø
plural
definite
new
SUBJECT

(9) T 25: N Inflectional Units Deletion Rule
(10) T 27: N Selectional Units Deletion Rule

(11) T 28: Primary Linearization Rule

(12) T 24: Postposing Rule
The surface structure is as follows:
(Since the sentence is all-new, the step-down intonation pattern does not obtain; there is no accentual value lower than 2.)
Chapter III  Multiple V's in Semantic Structures

3.0. Introduction

3.1. \( \text{V} \text{V} \text{V} \) Configurations of Equal Rank

3.1.1. Explicit Linking

3.1.1.1. Conjunctive
3.1.1.2. Adversative
3.1.1.3. Supererogative
3.1.1.4. Purposive
3.1.1.5. Resultative
3.1.1.6. Concessive
3.1.1.7. Disjunctive
3.1.1.8. Conditional
3.1.1.9. Summary

3.1.2. Implicit Linking

3.1.2.1. Additive
3.1.2.2. Iterative
3.1.2.3. Seriative
3.1.2.4. Subitive
3.1.2.5. Solitive
3.1.2.6. Precedent
3.1.2.7. Caditive
3.1.2.8. Explanative
3.1.2.9. Summary
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3.2. \( \overline{V} \overline{V} \) Configurations of Unequal Rank

3.2.1. \( \overline{V} \overline{V} \overline{N} \) Configurations

3.2.1.1. Manner Adverbs

3.2.1.2. Frequency and Instance Adverbs

3.2.2. \( \overline{V} \overline{V} \overline{N} \) Configurations

3.2.2.1. Sentential Adverbs

3.2.2.1.1. Adverbs of Place, Time, Benefaction, Motivation

3.2.2.1.1.1. Locative

3.2.2.1.1.2. Temporal

3.2.2.1.1.3. Benefactive

3.2.2.1.1.4. Motivative

3.2.2.1.1.5. Integrating Subjectivization

3.2.2.1.2. Commentative, Validative, Certain, Necessitative, Frequentative

3.2.2.2. Other Embeddings

3.2.2.2.1. Embeddings in \( V \) experiential

3.2.2.2.2. Embeddings in \( V \) action completable

3.2.2.2.3. Embeddings in \( V \) action verbal completable

3.2.2.3. Nominalization

3.2.3. Relativization

3.2.3.1. Restrictive Clauses
3.2.3.1.1. Relative Clauses with State V
3.2.3.1.2. Relative Clauses with NonState V
3.2.3.1.3. Relative Clauses in Generic Statements
3.2.3.2. NonRestrictive Clauses
3.2.3.3. Deletion of Root in N’s with Relative Clauses

3.2.4. Summary

3.3. Illustration
3.0. Introduction. This chapter will treat of various topics. It is unified, however, in that every structure considered is a structure of more than one V. The discussion will be informal. As the exposition proceeds, there will be need to add to or revise the semantic and postsemantic rules formulated in Chapters I and II. However, no attempt will be made to integrate these additions and revisions into the sets of rules already formulated in the preceding chapters. As more is learned about the structures of Pampangan, there will be need for further revision and modification.

Each one of the topics treated in this chapter is deserving of separate treatment; until these topics are discussed in detail, it will not be possible to have an adequate grammar of Pampangan. In a study of this sort, with quite limited objectives, it would serve no useful purpose to formalize the additions and revisions to the rules to be suggested by structures of more than one V; the rules formulated in Chapters I and II were meant to be suggestive rather than definitive. With knowledge so scarce concerning structures of more complex nature, the formulation of definitive rules would be an unrealistic objective. Rather, the structures suggested by the different topics in this chapter will be described and then informal suggestions will be given as to what postsemantic processes would be required to derive such semantic structures into surface structures.

The first major subdivision of the chapter considers structures in which \( \overline{V} \) are of equal rank; the second major subdivision considers structures in which \( \overline{V} \) are of unequal rank. In the second subdivision will be treated structures
in Pampangan manifesting complementation and embedding, to use the terminology of transformational generative grammar. The final section summarizes the chapter by informally discussing the semantic and postsemantic derivation of a complex sentence.

3.1. \( V \bar{V} \) Configurations of Equal Rank.

3.1.1. Explicit Linking.

3.1.1.1. Conjunctive. The most unproblematic \( V \bar{V} \) configuration of equal rank is that exemplified by \( V \) structures linked by 'and':

\[
(3.1.1.1.1) \text{malagú ya # i Maryá ## at (saká?) ## maganaká ya # i Ana}
\]

María is pretty and Ana is kind

(malagú? 'pretty', maganaká? 'kind', at (saká?) 'and (also)').

A variant of the conjunctive linker is \( \text{ampó} \); the latter, in my dialect, is preferable for \( \bar{N} \bar{N} \) linking. Note that in the example, none of the \( N \)'s or the \( V \)'s are repeated. All are marked new (presuming initial discourse) and there is therefore no context for deletion. It is possible, however, to have either \( V \) or \( N \), or both \( V \) and \( N \), to be repeated in such configurations. Consider first the sentence:
(3.1.1.1.2) gigili yaŋ karni # i Pedru ## at sakå? ##
magbukal yaŋ manük # i Suán
Pedro is slicing meat and Juan is
boiling [a] chicken

(gíli? 'to slice', kární 'meat' from Spanish carne, magbukál
'to boil', manük 'chicken'). Since no repetition of any
root occurs, no deletion is possible. It is possible,
however, for both V's to have the same root:

(3.1.1.1.3) gigili yaŋ karni # i Pedru ## at sakå? ##
gigili yaŋ manük # i Suán
Pedro is slicing meat and Juan is slicing
[a] chicken

Although both V's have the same lexical unit gíli? 'to slice',
no deletion is possible. Neither is there deletion possible
if both \( V \rightarrow N \) configurations have the same patient \( N \) but
different verb roots:

(3.1.1.1.4) gigili yaŋ karni # i Pedru ## at sakå? ##
mágbukál yaŋ kární # i Suán
Pedro is slicing meat and Juan is boiling
meat

However, if both \( V \rightarrow N \) configurations share the same verb
root and the same (patient) noun root, one may have:
(3.1.1.1.5) gigilí yaq kárni i Pédrù #(#) at saká? #(#)
i Suán
Pedro and Juan are slicing meat

It should be noted that reference-wise, the two actions are distinct. Pedro and Juan are not participating in the same action, although they are engaging in the same type of activity. Thus, it seems that the context for deletion is not identity of reference, what Frege (1952) calls Bedeutung, but identity of meaning, what Frege calls Sinn, in the frame of reference used in this study, identity of semantic lexical units. The repeated lexical unit is -new. If deletion is to take place, however, the whole branch, V with all its incorporations, must be deleted, and not just V or incorporated N in V.

Both subjects may be specified as TOPIC, in which case they must be preposed:

(3.1.1.1.6) i Pédrù #(#) at saká? #(#) i Suán #
gigilí laq kárni
As for Pedro and Juan, they are slicing meat

Note, however, that in topicalizing the two conjoined subjects, there is an additional postsemantic process pluralizing the copier (ya to la), thus in effect integrating the two conjoined sentences into an even more compact unit. Other examples of this integrating drift will be shown with regard to certain adverbs.
A variant of (3.1.1.1.5) is:

(3.1.1.1.5') * gi+gili? ya+n karni # i Pedru ila na
   naŋ Suän>
   gilili yaŋ karni # i Pedru ilaŋ
   Suän
   Pedro, they [as well as] Juan, is slicing
   meat= Pedro and Juan are slicing meat

What seems to have happened in this sentence is that the
conjoined subjects undergo a postsemantic copying process
whereby N' symbolized by ila 'they' is generated and
plural
SUBJECT
interposed between the two N's. There is an added post-
semantic process deleting SUBJECT in the second N: i to naŋ.
Again, this copying process seems to manifest the same tendency
towards integration.

It was remarked earlier that when two sentences are
conjoined and when they have the same lexical unit for a
patient N but different verb roots, such a patient N cannot
be deleted. This is true as long as patient N is -definite.
If the second patient N is definite (because it refers to
the same object), then it can be deleted:

(3.1.1.1.7) gilili yaŋ karni # i Pedru ## at saká? ##
   búbukál neŋ Suän (# iŋ karni)
   Pedro is slicing meat, and it [the meat]
   is being boiled by Juan
In this sentence, the second occurrence of 'meat' is definite, and following earlier rules laid down for extraposition and subjectivization, it must be extraposed and subjectivized because definite. Because it is -new, however, it is deletable.

3.1.1.2. Adversative. Consider the sentence:

(3.1.1.2.1) malagú ya # i Maryá ## dápot ## é ya maganaká? (# i Maryá)

Maris is pretty, but she is not kind

besides dápot, there are other symbolizations for 'but': subálit, óneŋ, and Spanish loanword pero (note the accentual shift). Each V N configuration in the V N V N combination undergoes the postsemantic processes already described, with the adversative relation symbolized by the formatives already mentioned. Admittedly, the label 'adversative' does not capture all the uses of dápot; in a more adequate grammar, there may be several types of 'adversative'.

3.1.1.3. Supererogative. In the sentence:

(3.1.1.3.1) é ya mu malagú? # i Maryá ## nuŋ é maganaká ya (mu) namán (# i Maryá)

Maria is not only pretty but she is likewise kind
Combined in the collocation é mu? (lit. 'not only)...nuŋ é
(lit. 'but not')...mu? namán ('also') are notions of con-
junction and addition. Perhaps it is best to consider the
unit as semantically 'supererogative', an idiom literalized
by the units already mentioned in the collocation; the
second instance of mu? is optionally deletable. An alternative
method of treating the unit 'supererogative' is to directly
symbolize it by the collocation and then to posit affix-hopping
rules of symbolization that will distribute these units
across the sequence of formatives. The interposing of ya
between e and mu? has already been discussed in connection
with negatives.

3.1.1.4. Purposive. Consider the sentence:

(3.1.1.4.1) tinalakád ya # i Pédru ## bá yaŋ
lumákad (# i Pédru)

Pedro stood up in order that he will walk

Again, no special problems are posed by the structure other
than that of interposing N' (ya) between ba and the V root.
ba symbolizes 'purposive'. What is interesting, however,
is that through this interposing, the semantic unit 'purposive'
is integrated into the V phrase, so that in surface structure,
one obtains [Purposive N' V], with the loss of
boundary marker and the occurrence of linker -ŋ. Exactly how
to formulate this change is difficult. The following is merely suggestive:

Another example involving 'purposive' points to still another problem:

(3.1.1.4.2) míminúm yañ panúlu # i Pédru ## báŋ
kantá ## kumáyang ya (# i Pédru)

Pedro is taking (lit. drinking) medicine
so that (from such an action) he will get well

The analysis of Kantá is problematic. Obviously, it is a symbolization for \[ N \]

(no root)
definite
demonstrative
OBLIQUE

nonlexically specified N's, however, Kantá does not refer to an object but seemingly to the whole preceding \( \sqrt{V N} \) configuration, the fact of Pedro taking his medicine. Strictly speaking then, Kantá is not a pronoun but a pro sentence. If one accepts this analysis, then a copying process for whole \( \sqrt{V N} \) configurations must be posited, considering such configurations as somehow reified, hence N, and then copied as \( N' \) and incorporated into the linker 'purposive'. With such a pro sentence, the second \( \sqrt{V N} \) configuration is completely free to undergo the usual postsemantic processes, without further
changes from 'purposive'. The process may be described thus:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
V \quad N \\
\text{root} \quad \text{root}
\end{array} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
V \quad N \\
\text{root} \quad \text{root}
\end{array} \quad \text{(no root)}
\]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{purposive}
\end{array} \quad \rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{N}
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{N}
\end{array}
\]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{N}
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{purposive} \\
\text{N'}
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
V \\
\text{N}
\end{array}
\]

N' would have to be specified as OBLIQUE and then incorporated into the linker:

3.1.1.5. Resultative. Consider the sentence:

(3.1.1.5.1) mégóbra ya # i Pédrü ## inyá? ## mikuáltá ya (# i Pédrü)

Pedro worked; hence, he got rich

The first \[ V \quad N \] configuration may be characterized as 'cause' and the second \[ V \quad N \] configuration as 'effect', and this relationship is symbolized by inyá? 'hence, that is why'. Again, no special problems seem to obtain with such cause-effect sentences from the point of view of grammatical structure. The converse of cause-effect sentences are effect-cause sentences, such as:
(3.1.1.5.2) kákáyap ya # i Pédru ## ulin ##
míminúm yaq panúlu (# i Pédru)
Pedro is getting well because he is taking medicine

The symbolization of the linker 'causative' is úlin 'because'.

3.1.1.6. Concessive. In the sentence:

(3.1.1.6.1) malagú ya mú rin # i Maryá ## (agiyáq ) ##
             (agiyáman)
é ya maganaká? (# i Maryá)
Maria is in any case pretty although she may not be kind

The collocation 'in any case', symbolized by * mú din, will be discussed in a subsequent section as a separate unit in itself. Although not absolutely essential, it is preferable to include * mú din when using 'concessive', symbolized by agiyáqw agiyáman 'although, even if'.

3.1.1.7. Disjunctive.

3.1.1.7.1. Disjunctive Statements. Consider the sentence:

(3.1.1.7.1.1) malagú ya # i Maryá ↓ # o ## masípag
              ya # i āna↓
Either Maria is pretty, or Ana is hard-working
(o 'or' is probably from Spanish ¡; note that the intonation drops at the end of each part of the disjunction). As in conjunctive sentences, the occurrence of the same lexical root presents contexts for deletion. Thus:

\[(3.1.1.7.1.2) \text{ malagú ya # i Maryá } \# \# \# \# \#
\]
\[
\text{malagú ya # i Ána}
\]

Either Maria is pretty, or Ana is pretty

The second V is -new because repeated; it has no incorporated N's which are new and which may therefore block deletion. Hence, the second V may be deleted:

\[(3.1.1.7.1.2') \text{ malagú ya # i Maryá } \# \# \# \# \# \# \# i Ána.
\]

Either Maria or Ana is pretty

On the other hand, it may be the N root which is lexically the same:

\[(3.1.1.7.1.3) \text{ malagú ya # i Maryá } \# \# \# \# \#
\]
\[
\text{masípag ya # i Maryá}
\]

Either Maria is pretty, or Maria is hard-working

With the optional deletion of the -new N, one has:
(3.1.1.7.1.3') malagú ya # i Maryá #(# o #(#
masípag ya
Either Maria is pretty, or she is hard-working

There is an optional postposing rule of the SUBJECT N which is possible:

(3.1.1.7.1.3'') malagú ya #(# o #(# masípag ya # i Maryá
Maria is either pretty or hard-working

On the other hand, the subject may be marked TOPIC:

(3.1.1.7.1.3a) i Maryá # malagú ya #( ) o #(#)
masípag ya
As for Maria, she is either pretty or hard-working

(where → is a notation for nonterminal or sustained pause).
The various transpositions exemplified give rise to the deletion of at least one boundary marker when boundary marker is #( ), since the pause is decidedly shorter. This deletion of one of the boundary markers can probably be formulated as a phonological rule rather than a semantic rule, since it has no semantic import and unlike the deletion of single boundary markers does not signal incorporation.

It is possible, in a disjunction, to have the second
\( \bar{V} \bar{N} \) identical with the first \( \bar{V} \bar{N} \) except for negative:

(3.1.1.7.1.4) malagú ya # i Maryá #( #) o #( #)

é ya malagú? # i Maryá

Either Maria is pretty, or Maria is not pretty

The utterance of such a statement is perhaps limited to logic classes, but the sentence is grammatical. With a sentence such as the above, the following deletions are possible:

(3.1.1.7.1.4') malagú ya # i Maryá #( #) o #( #)

é ya malagú?

Either Maria is pretty, or she is not pretty

(3.1.1.7.1.4'') malagú ya #( #) o #( #) é ya malagú? #

i Maryá

Maria is either pretty, or (she is) not pretty

The latter sentence is identical with the former one except for the postposing of the subject. Another variant is:

(3.1.1.7.1.4'''') malagú ya # i Maryá #( #) o #( #) alí ya

Either Maria is pretty, or she is not
Again, this last sentence may have the subject postposed:

\[
(3.1.1.7.1.4'')\quad \text{malagú ya } \#(#) \ o \ #(#) \ alí ya \ #
\]

\[
i \text{Maryá}
\]

Maria is either pretty or not

In the last two examples, the change in the symbolization of negative from \(\acute{e}\) to \(\text{alí}\) should be noted. Finally, the subject may be marked TOPIC:

\[
(3.1.1.7.1.4'')\quad \text{i Maryá} \rightarrow #\quad \text{malagú ya } \#(#) \ o \ #(#)
\]

\[
\text{alí ya}
\]

As for Maria, she is either pretty, or she is not

3.1.1.7.2. Disjunctive Clauses in Conjunctive Sentences.

Consider the sentence:

\[
(3.1.1.7.2.1)\quad \text{bísa ya mán } \uparrow \#(#) \ \acute{e} \ \text{ya man bísa? } \rightarrow #
\]

\[
i \text{Pedru} \rightarrow \#(#) \ \text{makó ku } \downarrow
\]

Whether Pedro likes it or does not like it, I am leaving

The semantic structure of the sentence is:

- \text{disjunctive}
  - V
  - N
  - V
  - N
  - negative
The example is interesting insofar as it shows a disjunction with the symbolization \textit{man...man}, probably more representative of the language than the Spanish loanword \textit{ó}.

Moreover, the terminal markers for intonation (\textbackslash{} for unmarked breath-group, \textuparrow{} for marked breath-group, \textrightarrow{} for sustained pause: the notation is a mere convenience and is not based on phonemic theory) are interesting. At the end of the first part of the disjunction, there is a marked breath-group (the label is based on Lieberman 1967). It will be seen in Chapter IV that the same phenomenon (marked breath-group) occurs at the end of the first clause of a disjunctive interrogative. In disjunctive statements, however, the unmarked breath-group occurs at the end of each part of the disjunction, except seemingly when the disjunctive statement is part of a larger statement, in which case the marked breath-group occurs.

Chafe (see 1970b, Chapter 19) proposes, quite convincingly, that in English, the marked breath-group arises not because of the unit 'interrogative' but because of the unit 'disjunctive'. In Pampangan, initially, this does not seem to be so, since it was found that in ordinary disjunctive statements, \textbackslash{} occurs at the end of each part of the disjunction. However, if one takes \textuparrow{} to be a marker for 'interrogative', it will be difficult to explain why \textuparrow{} occurs in sentence (3.1.1.7.2.1) and in a sentence such as
(3.1.1.7.2.2) dátan̄ yɔ # i Pédru ↑ #(#) o #(#) i Suán ↓

Either Pedro or Juan will arrive

where ↑ occurs and where 'interrogative' is clearly absent; ↑ the context for the # # shift in Pédru.

Because of the occurrence of sentences (3.1.1.7.2.1) and (3.1.1.7.2.2), tentatively, I shall take the position that ↑ is a marker not for 'interrogative' but for 'disjunctive'.

I am now left with the problem of accounting for the occurrence of ↑ in disjunctive questions.

I shall account for the latter by postulating a phonological rule

\[
(\text{Ph}) \uparrow \longrightarrow \downarrow / \begin{array}{c}
\text{disjunctive} \\
\text{interrogative}
\end{array} \\
\hspace{6em} # #
\]

the motivation of which seems to be the avoidance of homophony.

It will be shown in Chapter IV that yes-no questions in Pampangan are differentiated from corresponding statements only by intonation, since there is no interrogative marker or change in word order:

(3.1.1.7.2.3) dátan̄ yɔ # i Pédru ↓ #(#) o #(#) é ya
dátan̄ # i Pédru ↓

Either Pedro will come, or Pedro will not come

(3.1.1.7.2.4) dátan̄ yɔ # i Pédru ↑ #(#) o #(#) é ya
dátan̄ # i Pédru ↓

Will Pedro come, or will Pedro not come?
To prevent homophony, the phonological rule applies to (3.1.1.7.2.3). In larger statements, however, where the context would disambiguate any potential ambiguity, there is no need for the phonological rule and the usual symbolization for 'disjunctive' (↑) occurs:

(3.1.1.7.2.5) \[ \text{dátaŋ ya mán} \uparrow \#(\#) \xi \text{ ya man dátaŋ} \rightarrow \#
\]
\[ \text{i Pedrú} \rightarrow \#(\#) \text{ makó ku} \downarrow \]
Whether Pedro will come or Pedro will not come, I am leaving

3.1.1.8. Conditional. A \[ \text{\uparrow \downarrow} \] configuration of equal rank may be specified as conditional, expressing an if-then relation:

(3.1.1.8.1) \[ \text{nuŋ murán} \#(\#) \text{ luqûb ya} \# \text{ kiŋ balé} \# \text{ iŋ anák} \]
If it rains, the child will go into the house in which the condition is factual and nongeneric. It seems that unmarked conditions of this type have the added stipulation that the apodosis (or then clause) must also be specified as -actual (aspect). Any other aspect specification would bring in the notion of inference, which will be discussed in Chapter IV, or a general condition:

(3.1.1.8.2) \[ \text{nuŋ minurán} \#(\#) \text{ línub ya} \# \text{ kiŋ balé} \# \text{ iŋ anák} \]
If it rained, then [I infer that] the child went into the house
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(3.1.1.8.3) nuŋ múmurán ## lúlub ya # kiŋ balé # in anák
Whenever it rains, the child goes into the house

The latter sentence is generic. In generic conditions, other symbolizations of 'if' are ustúŋ 'whenever' (from Spanish justo 'punctually'), or patiyé 'whenever' or andát~indát 'whenever'. In generic conditions, both V's are usually generic. However, it is possible to have the second V -actual, as in:

(3.1.1.8.4) nuŋ múmurán # kéni # aldóló ##
makó ku
If it rains here every day, then I shall leave

It is possible for a conditional to be specified as contra-
factual (or subjunctive):

(3.1.1.8.5) nuŋ dinatáŋ ya sána # i Péáru ##
mintá kamí sána # kiŋ pistá
If Pedro had come, then we would have
gone to the fiesta [but he did not come]

Contrafactual sentences presuppose a previous occurrence which contradicts the protasis (or if clause). The semantic
structure of the sentence may be represented thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>conditional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>root</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unit 'subjunctive' may thus be considered an inflectional unit specifying the V matrix further as 'contrary to fact' in the same way that in Chapter I, 'negative' was considered as specifying a V matrix further. Since 'subjunctive' may specify any V root and does not serve to narrow down lexical choice to a particular unit, it is best seen as an inflectional unit. In Pampangan, the unit specifies both V's in a conditional sentence and is eventually linearized and symbolized as sána.

In contrafactual or subjunctive conditions, the state or event may be specified for its usual aspectual possibilities; the only restriction seems to be that if V is -actual, then V must likewise be -actual. If V is actual, V may be specified for any aspect, dictated only by reality:

(3.1.1.8.6) nuŋ dátaŋ ya sána # i Pédru ## muntá kamí sána # kiŋ pistá
If Pedro were coming, we would then go to the fiesta (but he is not coming)

(3.1.1.8.7) nuŋ dinatáŋ ya sána # i Pédru ## muntá kamí sána # kiŋ pistá
If Pedro had come, then we would go to the fiesta (but he did not come)
(3.1.1.8.8) nuŋ dínatãŋ ya sáña # i Pédrû ##
púpuntá kãmí sáña # qení # kiŋ pístá
If Pedro had come, then we would be going
to the fiesta right now (but he did not come)

A conditional sentence can be both generic and subjunctive:

(3.1.1.8.9) nuŋ é ya sáña mamamaté # iŋ táu ##
magìŋ paraisú ya sáña # iŋ yátuŋ ití
If man were not mortal (lit. is not
dying), then this world would become a
paradise

Unlike English, Pampangan shows no postsemantic aspectual
shifts necessary for different conditional combinations.
Aspectual specification seems to arise from the constraints
of extramental reality itself, with no necessary postsemantic
shifts in aspectual specification to derive surface structures.
Rather, markers such as 'subjunctive' are symbolized by particles
such as sáña and sá? linearized within the V phrase.

3.1.1.9. Summary. The discussion in the preceding
sections may be summarized by the rule (conceived of as a
semantic rule necessary for V V structures):
(S) \[ V \longrightarrow V \] ______

\{conjunctive
adversative
supererogative
purposive
resultative
concessive
disjunctive
conditional\}

where = is a notation interpretable as 'of equal rank'
and where ______ indicates by a convention the place where
the units of the rule are placed in the configuration.
Postsemantic processes triggered by the above specifications
will not be formulated; for the most part, as the examples
have shown, these processes are of the same type as those
already described in Chapter II. What is interesting about
the above specifications for \( \overline{V} \overline{V} \) is their exclusive dis-
junction. In the next section, 'implicit linkings' will
be described, the combinatorial possibilities of which are
quite formidable.

3.1.2. Implicit Linking. The topics to be discussed
in this section have to do with specifications incorporated
into \( V \) or \( N \) which are linearized in surface structure and
symbolized by particles or clitics within \( V \) or \( N \). It seems
that they are best analyzed semantically as presupposing a
previous \( \overline{V} \overline{N} \) configuration of the same rank:

\[
\text{Preceding Linguistic Context} \\
\overline{V} \overline{N} \overline{V} \overline{N} \overline{V} \overline{N} \overline{V} \overline{N} \overline{V} \overline{N}
\]
with a specification x incorporated into V or N arising from the preceding linguistic context. Hence, markers indicated by x have been treated in this chapter on \( V \rightarrow V \) configurations; for ostensive purposes, a possible preceding linguistic context will be given in each example.

3.1.2.1. Additive. Consider the sentence sequence:

\[(3.1.2.1.1) \text{lálákad ya } \# \text{ i Pedru } \#\#
\]
\[\text{lálákad ya } \mu \text{ nu } \text{ namán } \# \text{ i Suán}\]

Pedro is walking

[In addition to Pedro] Juan, too, is walking

The semantic configuration may be represented thus:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{1} \\
V \\
\text{N} \\
\text{1}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{1} \\
	ext{-new} \\
V \\
\text{N} \\
\text{2} \\
\text{additive}
\end{array}
\]

N is semantically marked as additive, from the preceding linguistic context; postsemantically, however, 'additive' is incorporated into V. This specification in V renders V\(_1\), which is -new, immune from deletion. Eventually, 'additive' is linearized within the V phrase and symbolized as \((\mu) \text{ nu } \text{ namán}\).

On the other hand, it may not be N but V which is specified initially as additive:
(3.1.2.1.2) lálákad ya # i Pédru ##
bábása yá namán (# i Pédru)
Pedro is walking
[In addition to walking] he is likewise reading
(He is reading while walking)

The structure may be shown thus:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} & \text{N} \\
1 & 1
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{V} & \text{N} \\
2 & 1
d\text{additive} & -\text{new}
\end{array}
\]

Since the second N is -new and since it has no other specifications which would block deletion, the second N is deleted. The structure 'additive' is incorporated into V and is eventually linearized in V and symbolized as namán. (Note the similarity as well as difference in symbolization with an additive arising from N, (mu) namán.) Because of optional mu, ambiguity obtains in a sentence such as:

(3.1.2.1.3) mágáral yá namán # iŋ anáŋ
The child [like someone else] is studying
The child [in addition to doing other things] is studying
The first meaning may be expressed unambiguously by:

(3.1.2.1.3') mágáral yá mu namán # íñ anák

Or 'child' may be TOPIC and preposed:

(3.1.2.1.3'') íñ anák man # mágáral ya
As for the child, he [like someone else] is studying

Note that in the above instance, 'additive' is not incorporated into V but stays as a unit under (preposed) N. Of course, it is possible to say:

(3.1.2.1.4) íñ anák man # mágáral yá namán
As for the child, he [like someone else] is likewise studying [in addition to doing other things]

3.1.2.2. Iterative. Consider the sentence:

(3.1.2.2.1) línákad ya # nápun # i Pédrú ##
línákad né namán # ñéni (# i Pédrú)
Pedro walked yesterday
He again walked today
The semantic structure of the sentence is:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
V \quad N \\
1 \quad 1
\end{array}
\]

The second occurrence of \( V \) is specified as iterative; this additional specification seems to block deletion (as did the specification additive). On the other hand, \( N \) is deleted since it has the necessary context for deletion. It is possible to have a predicate noun specified as iterative:

\[
(3.1.2.2.2) \quad \text{nínú} \quad # \quad \text{iŋ minyambút} \\
\text{i Péáru na namán} \quad # \quad \text{iŋ minyambút} \\
\text{Who is it who won?} \\
\text{It was Pedro again who won}
\]

The symbolization of 'iterative' is \( \text{na namán} \) (\( \text{na} \) in this collocation must not be confused with nonsubject and nonoblique copier \( \text{na} \)). 'Iterative' occurs when \( V \) and \( N \) are a repetition of a preceding \( V \) and \( N \) and is incorporated only into \( V \).

3.1.2.3. Seriative. Consider the sentences:
(3.1.2.3.1) dakál ya gáwan # i Pédru ##
sínúlat ya (# i Pédru)##
magáral ya pá (# i Pédru)
Pedro has many things to do
He wrote [a letter]
He will still study

The structure is:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
V & N & \ldots & V & N & V & N \\
& & & & \text{seriative} & & \\
\end{array}
\]

pa signals that V is part of a series, something still remaining. If the sequence of actions is located in the past, it is possible to have V actual:

(3.1.2.3.2) mégóbra ya # i Pédru ##
líňákad ya pá (# i Pédru )
Pedro worked
He still walked

However, when the temporal specification is -past, V is usually -actual, since it expresses something still waiting to be done.

In the sentence sequence

(3.1.2.3.3) líňákad ya # nanaíŋ ábak # i Pédru ##
lálákad ya pá # ḷéni (# i Pédru )
Pedro [began to] walk this morning
He is still walking now
It is not clear whether *pa* expresses a different semantic unit '-completed' to emphasize aspectual 'durative'. For the moment, I shall subsume '-completed' under 'seriative'. Clearly *pa* is seriative when it occurs with a predicate noun:

(3.1.2.3.4) *ninu pa # iŋ dáratáŋ*

*i Pedro pa # iŋ dáratáŋ*

Who else is arriving?

Pedro still [is to be listed among] those who are arriving

Seriative may be specified of either *V* or *N*. The following example presents an interesting instance of ambiguity: If one wanted to ask in Pampangan 'Who is still eating?', it would seem that the correct utterance would be:

(3.1.2.3.5) *ninu # iŋ mámaŋán pa*

Who is it who is eating still?

However, there seems to be a general constraint against placing the formatives being discussed in this section (3.1.2) outside of the initial phrase, which is usually *V*, so that *pa* must be incorporated into the initial phrase:

(3.1.2.3.5') *ninu pa # iŋ mámaŋán*

which now becomes ambiguous, since it may mean:
Who else is eating?
Who is still eating?

3.1.2.4. Subitive. Consider the sentences:

(3.1.2.4.1)* mégral na ya # iŋ anák>
mégral ne # iŋ anák

The child has already studied

(na 'already' is not to be confused with copier na 'nonsubject
and nonoblique he'.)

(3.1.2.4.2) magral na ká

\(X\)

Study already= Study [it's time]

(3.1.2.4.3) makó ne # i Pédro

Pedro is ready to leave

It is difficult to characterize the meaning of na; it is not
even clear whether several units are expressed homophonously
by na. Tentatively, the meanings are subsumed under 'subitive',
admittedly an unsatisfactory label. Perhaps 'immediate' would
be more apropos; however, 'immediate' has been used in
connection with aspect. Although both concepts are clearly
related and even cooccur, they must be kept separate; hence,
the choice of a different label. Moreover, it is difficult to
characterize the preceding linguistic context that gives rise
to na because there are so many possible ones: when na occurs with a command, it means that the person giving the mandate is telling the executor that it is time to accomplish the task; on the other hand, na may signal posterior, not prior, immediacy, as when one reports that something has been accomplished. Again, one may report that a state or situation obtains as expected, as in:

(3.1.2.4.4) masalése ne # i Pédrú
Pedro is already well [he was sick before]

The occurrence of na may be semantically represented thus:

\[
\text{VARIOUS PRESUPPOSITIONS} \quad \sqrt{\text{immediate}}
\]

Another interesting occurrence of na is:

(3.1.2.4.5) SPEAKER A: nínu # iŋ magóbra
SPEAKER B: i Pédrú na # iŋ magóbra
Who is it who will work?
Let Pedro be the one who will work

where now na does not signal 'subitive' but 'selective'. Conative functions of language will be discussed in detail in Chapter IV. It seems that 'selective' is a distinct unit from 'subitive'.
3.1.2.5. Solitive. Consider the sentence:

\[(3.1.2.5.1) \text{mámiyáluŋ } \text{ya } \text{mu? } \# \text{ iŋ anáŋ }\]

The child is only playing (he is doing nothing else)

The relevant linguistic context seems to be the negation of any other activity:

\[
\text{PRESUPPOSITION}
\]
\[
\text{Negative: no other V}
\]
\[
\text{solitive}
\]

It is not only V's which may be specified by solitive but likewise N's, which must, however, be predicativized:

\[(3.1.2.5.2) \text{nínu } \# \text{ iŋ mámiyáluŋ}
\]
\[
\text{i Pédrú } \text{mu? } \# \text{ iŋ mámiyáluŋ}
\]

The one who is playing is who= Who is playing?
The one who is playing is Pedro alone

It is interesting that in Pampangan, one cannot say 'Only Pedro plays' but only 'The one who is playing is Pedro alone', thus necessitating an equational sentence with a predicate noun into which 'solitive' can be incorporated. Which again confirms the earlier observation that specifications such as 'solitive', which are incorporated from some previous context, must be incorporated into the first part of the succeeding sentence, which is usually the position for V.
3.1.2.6. Precedent. In the sentence:

(3.1.2.6.1) magáral ya pá mu? # i Pédrú
Pedro will first study (before he does anything else)

which is representable semantically as:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(sequential)} \\
V \quad N \\
1 \quad 2
\end{array}
\]

where \( V \) precedes \( V \); the unit 'precedent' is incorporated into \( V \) and symbolized as \( \text{pá} \) (\( \text{mu} \)) (not to be confused with seriative \( \text{pa} \)). Again, 'precedent' may be incorporated into a predicate noun to indicate sequence or ordering:

(3.1.2.6.2) i Pédrú pá mu? # iq dátan
The one who will come (before anyone else)
will be Pedro

3.1.2.7. Caditive. Consider the sentence:

(3.1.2.7.1) lumákad yá mú rin # i Pédrú
(No matter what happens) Pedro will walk

where the semantic structure is representable as:
In structures of this type, the previous context may be any event or state which in point of time is prior to what is expressed (hence, what is expressed is sequential to what is unexpressed) and the expressed V incorporates 'caditive' as an inflectional marker (from cadere 'to fall, happen'), translatable as 'in any case'. 'Caditive' is symbolized by * (mú) din. Again, 'caditive' may be incorporated into a predicate noun:

(3.1.2.7.2) i Pédrú mú rin # iŋ gáwa kiŋ balé
The one who will build the house will be Pedro in any case

3.1.2.8. Explanative. Consider the sentence:

(3.1.2.8.1) métudúd ya # i Pédrú ##
mitutundú ya kasí (# i Pédrú)
Pedro went to sleep
(Because) he was sleepy

where the semantic structure is representable as:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{explanative} \\
1 & 2 \\
\end{array} \]
The unit 'explanative' is incorporated into \( V \), although semantically, it is the whole \( \frac{V}{N} \) configuration which explains the reason for \( V \). 'Explanative' is post-semantically linearized and symbolized by \( kasi \).

3.1.2.9. Summary. In addition to the units which may specify the link between two \( V \)'s of equal rank, the units 'explanative' and 'sequential' must be posited:

\[
(S) \quad \frac{V}{V} \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \rightarrow \quad \{ \text{explanative} \}
\]

\[
(S) \quad \frac{V}{V} \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \rightarrow \quad \{ \text{sequential} \}
\]

What makes the two units above different from the other overt linkers discussed in section 3.1.1 is that they are not directly symbolized by particles but provide the context for the incorporation of units into either \( V \), units which in turn are symbolized by particles within the \( V \) phrase:

\[
(S) \quad \frac{V}{V} \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{precedent} / \quad \frac{V}{V}
\]

\[
(S) \quad \frac{V}{V} \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{explanative} / \quad \frac{V}{V}
\]

The above two rules may be integrated into more general rules:
The reasons for the cooccurrence restrictions of the various specification units of $V$ seem to be phonological rather than semantic. Semantically, there is nothing to prevent the specifications from occurring together, except perhaps 'additive' and 'solitive', although cases are imaginable when the two may cooccur. Rather, what seems to prevent occurrence together is the avoidance of homophony, since many of the symbolizations are quite similar, and in the case of discontinuous morphs, some particles are identical:

precedent $\quad$ pāʔ (muʔ)
seriative $\quad$ pa
solitive $\quad$ muʔ (namán)
additive $\quad$ (mu) namán
iterative $\quad$ na namán
subitive $\quad$ na
caditive $\quad$ (mu)' din
explanative $\quad$ kasi
The linearization rule for such particles is quite rigid:

\[
(PS) \quad V \\
\quad 2 \\
\quad \text{seriative} \\
\quad \{\text{solitive}\} \\
\quad \{\text{additive}\} \\
\quad \{\text{iterative}\} \\
\quad \text{raditive} \\
\quad \text{explanative}
\]

\[
\text{V} \\
\quad \text{seriative} \\
\quad \{\text{solitive}\} \\
\quad \{\text{additive}\} \\
\quad \{\text{iterative}\} \\
\quad \{\text{subitive}\} \\
\quad \text{caditive} \\
\quad \text{explanative}
\]

An example of a maximally specified \( V \) would be:

\[2\]

(3.1.2.9.1) lálákad ya pá mu namán din kasí # i Pédrur

Because, in any case, Pedro is still only walking (he is doing nothing else)

where the verb is \( V \) is linearized as

walk \\
seriative \\
solitive \\
caditive \\
explanative

lálákad ya pá mu? namán din kasí

Fortunately, the particles do not occur in such formidable combinations in actual usage.
The units discussed are interesting since they act as linkers in discourse and would no doubt figure prominently in a semantic analysis that is extended to the discourse level. Moreover, they mirror preceding sentences which may not immediately precede the sentence in which they are incorporated. It is thus possible to carry over into succeeding sentences indicators from previous sentences quite distant from the present sentence being uttered.

In Chapter IV, other particles which may be incorporated into V in addition to those discussed thus far will be described.

3.2. $\sqrt{V}_V$ Configurations of Unequal Rank. The structures to be described in this second major division of the chapter consist of structures of more than one V. Unlike the structures discussed in the first division, however, the second V in these structures is unequal in rank with regard to the first V. In this section will be discussed different types of adverbs, nominalization, complementation, and relativization.

3.2.1. $\sqrt{V}_V \sqrt{N}_N$ Configurations.

3.2.1.1. Manner Adverbs. Consider the sentence:

(3.2.1.1.1) masalése yaq káwe # iŋ anāk

The child swims well
The basic configuration seems to be

```
agent
V
1
action
swim
child
```

Now, *masalése* 'well, adeptly', a state $V$ in its own right, specifies the verb root 'to swim' further by describing the manner of swimming. It is necessary then in semantic representation to show the relation between $V$ and this new state $V$; at the same time, it is necessary to show that this relation obtains only between $V$ and $V$ and not between $V$ and the agent $N$. Chafe (1970b) would represent the above sentence as:

```
agent
V
1
action
swim
child
```

I find the above representation unsatisfactory insofar as it does not seem to show the subordination of $V$ to $V$ adequately nor does it neatly represent the stipulation that the agent $N$ accompanies $V$ and not $V$. Tentatively, I would like to propose that $V$ is a kind of inflectional unit specifying $V$ further and like any inflectional unit not really serving
to narrow down lexical choice to a particular unit but presupposing lexical choice and adding new specifications to this already selected lexical unit. Hence:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{2 state} \\
\text{manner} \\
\text{well} \\
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{1 action} \\
\text{1 swim} \\
\text{1 child} \\
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{N} \\
\end{array}
\quad
\text{agent}
\]

The postsemantic processes that the above configuration would have to undergo are: subjectivization of the agent $N$, incorporation of specifications of the agent $N$ into $V$, interposing of the copier $va$ between $V$ and $V$, and various linearizations.

Sentence (3.2.1.1.1) is ambiguous, since it means

The child is swimming well [right now]

The child [habitually] swims well

The second meaning is more naturally expressed by sentence (3.2.1.1.1); it should be noticed that the aspectual specifications of $V$ have been postsemantically deleted. If one wanted to maintain the overt marking for actual durative, one would apply a permutation rule:

(3.2.1.1.1') kákawé yaŋ masalése # iŋ anák

The child is swimming well
It is possible for $V$ to be inflectionally negative:

$$(3.2.1.1.2) \quad 'ya$ masalése káwe $\# iŋ\ anāk$$

The child does not swim well

Note that when $ya$ is interposed between negative and $V$, the linker $-ŋ$ does not occur whereas when $ya$ is interposed between $V$ and $V$, the linker $-ŋ$ does occur. It was stated earlier that the linker occurs when two branches ($N$ and/or $V$) previously separate are incorporated into one branch, which is what happens when $ya$ is interposed between $V$ and $V$:

The specification 'negative', however, does not arise from a separate branch but from an inflectional unit of $V$.

When $N'$ is interposed between negative and $V$, the two branches have already been incorporated into one branch; hence, the nonoccurrence of the linker $-ŋ$ finds a plausible explanation by appeal to rule ordering.

In sentences such as (3.2.1.1.2), the copier $ya$ is optionally deletable:

$$(3.2.1.1.2') \quad 'ya$ masalése káwe $\# iŋ\ anāk$$

If the subject is -new, the whole branch may be deleted,
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yielding a surface structure without overt reflexes of accompanying N's (from this point of view, similar to structures with ambient V's):

(3.2.1.1.2') é masalése káwe

He does not swim well

In Chapter I, sentences such as

(3.2.1.1.3) máyap yaŋ máyap # iŋ anák

The child is exceedingly good

were analyzed as having state V inflectionally specified as 'intensive'; in turn, the unit 'intensive' was symbolized by the reduplication process. An alternative would be to analyze 'intensive' as arising from a separate state V:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{patient} \\
V \\
2 \\
\text{state} \\
\text{manner} \\
\text{intensive} \\
\text{good} \\
\text{child}
\end{array}
\]

In this case, the V branch is not lexically specified; a postsemantic process would copy the root of V into V, thus generating the reduplication quite neatly. If one accepts this analysis, then a sentence such as

(3.2.1.1.4)* lá+lákad na yaŋ lá+lákad # i Pédrú>
lálákid neŋ lálañad # i Pédrú

Pedro perseveres in walking
would be analyzable as

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{agent} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{V} \\
1 \\
\text{action} \\
\text{state} \\
\text{manner} \\
\text{perseverative} \\
\text{walk} \\
\text{Pedro}
\end{array}
\]

where again the state V is not lexically specified but postsemantically accepts an incorporated verb root from V. The interposed na (distinct from copier na and 'subitive' na) is introduced postsemantically and is semantically vacuous.

3.2.1.2. Frequency and Instance Adverbs. Consider the sentence:

\[(3.2.1.2.1) \text{ maralás yaŋ kákawé # i Pédrù} \]

Pedro swims often

where again it seems that the nucleus of the sentence is

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{agent} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{V} \\
1 \\
\text{action} \\
\text{swim} \\
\text{Pedro}
\end{array}
\]

Now the notion of frequency or 'often' specifies 'to swim' quasi-inflectionally; moreover, it is not directly related to the agent N. For this reason, it seems to share properties
of manner adverbs (and in surface structure appears as a manner adverb). Hence:

Again, the usual postsemantic processes apply: subjectivization of the agent N, incorporation of specifications of the agent N into V, interposing of the copier between V and V, and various linearizations.

Instead of frequentative, V may be specified as instantive; in such cases, the verb root is usually a form derived from a number formative:

(3.2.1.2.2) makatatlú yaŋ kínawé # i Pédrú
Pedro swam three times

where makatatlú? is analyzable as three+instantivizer.

3.2.2. \( V \overline{V} \overline{N} \) Configurations.

3.2.2.1. Sentential Adverbs: Commentative, Validative, Certaintive, Necessitative, Frequentative. Consider the sentence:

(3.2.2.1.1) máyap (#) iŋ kákawé ya # iŋ anáŋk
The [fact that] the child is swimming
is good [to hear]
The semantic structure of the sentence is:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{patient} \\
\text{agent} \\
V \\
\text{V} \\
1 \\
\text{state} \\
\text{commentative} \\
good \\
\text{swim} \\
\text{child} \\
definite
\end{array}
\]

where the embedded $V \overset{2}{\longrightarrow} N$ subconfiguration is in a patient relation to the commentative state $V$. It is necessary to differentiate sentence (3.2.2.1.1) from a sentence such as:

(3.2.2.1.2) máyap yaŋ káwe # iŋ anáŋ

The child swims well

The first sentence has a sentential adverb predicated of a $V \overset{2}{\longrightarrow} N$ configuration while the second sentence has a manner adverb predicated of another $V$. The nominal nature of the embedded patient is corroborated by the definite specification (itself the context for the subjectivization of the whole clause). Since the embedded subconfiguration is abstract, it is not copied into $V$. However, within the embedded $V \overset{1}{\longrightarrow} N$ configuration, the usual postsemantic processes of subjectivization and incorporation apply.

By a later deletion process, the determiner $iŋ$ is optionally deletable, so that one can have the variant:

(3.2.2.1.1') máyap #(#) kákawé ya # iŋ anáŋ

[That] the child is swimming is good [to hear]
It should be noted that if the boundary marker is not # but ##, as in

\[(3.2.2.1.3) \text{ máyap } \#\# \text{ kákawé } \text{ ya } \# \text{ iŋ an'ák} \]

Good: The child is swimming

the sentence, although semantically similar to (3.2.2.1.1) in its overall communicative effect, has a different semantic configuration. In sentence (3.2.2.1.3), what obtains is a $\sqrt{\text{V}}$ configuration of equal rank with no overt marker between the two V's.

The negative counterpart of (3.2.2.1.1) is:

\[(3.2.2.1.1a) \text{ 'e mayap } \#(\#) \text{ iŋ kákawé } \text{ ya } \# \text{ iŋ an'ák} \]

The [fact that] the child is swimming

is not good [to hear]

In the above example, the subject determiner iŋ is not deletable; hence, the specification 'definite' is necessary in semantic structure.

Other types of sentential adverbs (validative, certaintive, necessitative) need only exemplification:

\[(3.2.2.1.4) \text{ tutú? } \#(\#) \text{ iŋ kákawé } \text{ ya } \# \text{ iŋ an'ák} \]

The [fact that] the child is swimming is true

\[(3.2.2.1.5) \text{ piu } \#(\#) \text{ iŋ kákawé } \text{ ya } \# \text{ iŋ an'ák} \]

The [fact that] the child is swimming is almost certain
(3.2.2.1.6) kailágan #( #) iŋ káwe ya # iŋ anáŋk
The [happening that] the child will
swim is necessary

In the above sentences, it is possible for the boundary
marker to be deleted altogether; phonologically, this
deletion provides the context for vowel syncope and in
(3.2.2.1.6) nasal simplification:

(3.2.2.1.4') tutú+ŋ kákáwe ya # iŋ anáŋk
(3.2.2.1.5') piu+ŋ kákáwe ya # iŋ anáŋk
(3.2.2.1.6')∗ kailágan+ŋ káwe ya # iŋ anáŋk >
kailáŋaŋ káwe ya # iŋ anáŋk

It was necessary to list the variants to show their essential
sameness; failure to note their essential sameness leads to
difficulties in analysis. Moreover, (3.2.2.1.5) has a
variant:

(3.2.2.1.5'') piu yãŋ kákáwe' # iŋ anáŋk

where the interposition of the copier makes the surface
structure similar to the surface structure of sentences
with manner adverbs.

In section 3.2.1.2, frequency adverbs were discussed.
There, it was stated that frequency adverbs in general do not
modify a V N configuration but only another V. However, it
is likewise possible to have a frequency adverb as a sentential adverb. Contrast the two sentences:

(3.2.2.1.7) maralás yaŋ kákwé # iŋ anák
The child swims often

(3.2.2.1.8) maralás #(#) iŋ kákwé ya # iŋ anák
The [fact that] the child is swimming [happens] often

The specification generic usually cooccurs with a frequentative sentential adverb:

(3.2.2.1.9) aldóllo #(#) kákwé ya # iŋ anák
[That] the child is swimming [happens]
daily= Daily the child swims

Other derived frequentative state V's are bénibéni 'nightly (lit. night+night)' and búlanbúlan 'monthly (lit. moon+moon)'. Sentences such as (3.2.2.1.9) usually delete the determiner iŋ; its retention would render the sentence unnatural although not ungrammatical. Moreover, the frequentative state V may be postposed or interposed:

(3.2.2.1.9) kákwé ya # iŋ anák #(#) aldóllo
kákwé ya #(#) aldóllo #(#) iŋ anák
3.2.2.1.2. Adverbial Phrases of Place, Time, Benefaction, and Motivation.

3.2.2.1.2.1. Locative. Consider the sentence:

(3.2.2.1.2.1.1) kiŋ balé # iŋ pistá

The fiesta [is taking place] in the house

A simple structure such as the above may be juxtaposed and compared to a more complicated structure which seems to manifest the same basic configuration:

(3.2.2.1.2.1.2) kiŋ balé ## mēgáral ya # iŋ anak

In the house the child studied

In both examples, what seems to obtain is an object or event (with its accompanying dramatis personae) located in some space; in other words, the semantic structure of the first example seems to be

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>location</th>
<th>patient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no root)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td>fiesta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

while the semantic structure of the second example is...
Since the locative state V is not lexically specified, it is deleted. On the other hand, the patient substructure undergoes the usual postsemantic processes of any V (subjectivization and incorporation and various linearizations), finally yielding the surface structure:

The location N may be postposed, yielding the preferred variant:

(3.2.2.1.2.1.2') mégáral ya # iŋ anάk #(盏) kiŋ balé

Or the location N may be interposed between V and subject:

(3.2.2.1.2.1.2'') mégáral ya #(盏) kiŋ balé #(盏) iŋ anάk

If the location N is specified as TOPIC, it must be preposed:

(3.2.2.1.2.1.2''') kiŋ balé ya mégáral # iŋ anάk

It was in the house that the child studied
Still another possibility is offered for location N.

If location N is -new, as in the sequence

\[(3.2.1.2.1.3) \text{ atín silič } ##
\]
\[\text{mágáral ya } # \text{iŋ anāk } ##(\#) \text{ karín kiŋ silič}\]

There is a room

The child is studying there in the room

Now, the second occurrence of silič renders it -new. kiŋ silič may therefore be deleted:

\[(3.2.1.2.1.3') \text{ mágáral ya } # \text{iŋ anāk } ##(\#) \text{ karín}\]

The child is studying there

Or, one may say:

\[(3.2.1.2.1.3'') \text{ atín silič } ##
\]
\[\text{pipágáralan ne niŋ anāk } (\# \text{iŋ silič)}\]

There is a room

The room is being studied in by the child

where the location N in the second sentence is extraposed and subjectivized, copied into V as *ya, and then deleted because -new. The integration of the location N into the $\sqrt[2]{N}$ configuration is now complete, since in surface structure, the configuration resembles a $\sqrt[2]{N}$ configuration. This process will be called 'Integrating Subjectivization'; more
examples of it will be given in subsequent sections. For this reason, no rule will be formulated at this juncture.

It might be objected that this way of viewing location N's is artificial and unnecessarily complicates semantic structure. Why not consider the location N in the example as just another accompanying N by specifying the action V as locative instead of postulating the location N as traceable to a separate state V? Pāṇini seemingly held this view, for he postulated adhikārana 'place in which' as a basic kāraka relation.

There is no doubt that a location N accompanies the nuclear structure of certain nonstate V's and even certain state V's which are not specified as locative. For example, in the rules formulated in Chapter I, a presential state V may be optionally accompanied by a location N. Moreover, directional action V's are accompanied by a kind of location N insofar as a source or a goal N is a kind of location N. However, in sentences such as (3.2.2.1.2.1.3), the location N is clearly extraneous to the nucleus of the second sentence. To include a location N in a verb root such as 'to study' would unduly complicate the semantic rules formulated in Chapter I, since as a result, any nonstate V and many state V's can be specified as locative and then accompanied by a location N. Moreover, such a view would miss the clear parallelism between sentences (3.2.2.1.2.1.1) and (3.2.2.1.2.1.2).

A final word should be said about the symbolization of oblique determiners in location N's. In Chapter II, symbolization rules were given for oblique-marked demonstrative
pronouns (the symbolizations of which were homophonous with oblique-marked demonstrative determiners):

kanítaŋ anák 'to that child'
káníta 'to that [one]' 

In the rules given, there were variant symbolizations for these oblique-marked demonstrative pronouns:

kanítaŋ anák 'to that child'
ké taŋ balé 'to that house'

kaníta is usually used with human N's but keta occurs with any N (including human N's). What is interesting is that kéta is likewise a symbolization for the locative proform 'there (neither near you nor me)', unlike in English, where there is a distinction between that and there (and this and here). To cite the other types of demonstratives:

kaníniŋ anák 'to this child (near me)'
* ka+iňi+ŋ baláy>
kéniŋ balé 'to this house (near me)'
kéni 'to this [place] near me=here'

* ka+iyan+ŋ anák
kéŋ anák 'to that child (near you)'
kéŋ balé 'to that house (near you)'
ké'n 'to that [place] near you=there'
'to this child (near you and me)'

'10 to this house (near you and me)'

'10 to this [place] near you and me=
here'

Besides kéta, kéni, kén, and kéti, there is another locative
proform karín 'there yonder' which is analyzable as '-proxi-
mate to speaker, -proximate to hearer, distal'. 'Distal'
is a new specification hitherto not discussed in connection
with demonstratives. It is necessary to account for karín
and for nandín 'earlier on the same day', a temporal pro-
form (to be discussed in the next section). karín and
nandín are unusual since there is no subject form for these
demonstratives.

3.2.2.1.2.2. Temporal.

3.2.2.1.2.2.1. Temporal Idioms. Consider the following
sentence:

(3.2.2.1.2.2.1.1) búkas # in pistá
The fiesta [will take place] tomorrow

where the verb is V . Other temporal verb roots are
state
temporal
future
tomorrow
nápun 'yesterday (lit. late afternoon+preteritivizer)',
nakéni 'last night (lit. night+preteritivizer)', póta 'later'.
Aside from such inherently temporal verb roots, time is
likewise indicated in Pampangan by a nonlexically specified
temporal state V accompanied by a time N with the root aldó <
* aldáw 'day (lit. sun)' and/or spatial units.

It is perhaps a language universal that time is expressed
in terms of spatial units such as 'proximate to speaker' and
'proximate to hearer'. What is interesting is the degree
to which Pampangan exploits the dimensions of space to
express different temporal categories. To account for such
temporal state V's expressed in spatial units, postsemantic
literalization rules whereby semantic units of time are
replaced by semantic units of space will be needed. These
time semantic units are idioms (following Chafe's definition
of idioms) and must be literalized by matrices of spatial
units. Like other idioms, temporal idioms present special
problems which must be noted in the lexicon.

To express 'today' (for the purposes of this analysis,
'today' will be characterized as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
 \text{-past} \\
 \text{-future}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where 'specific'

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
 \text{specific}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

is paraphrasable as 'specific day', there are alternative ways:

\[(3.2.2.1.2.2.1.2) \text{ iniŋ aldó a ini # inŋ pistá}

The fiesta [will take place on] this day
where 'on this day' is literalized as sun
definite
demonstrative
proximate to speaker
SUBJECT

The postsemantic process of demonstrative copying (formulated
in Chapter II) must likewise be applied. One can likewise say:

(3.2.2.1.2.2.1.2') itíŋ aldó a ití # iŋ pistá
The fiesta [will take place on] this day

where now 'on this day' is literalized as sun
definite
demonstrative
proximate to speaker
proximate to hearer
SUBJECT

It is not clear whether there is a difference in meaning
between iníŋ aldó a iní and itíŋ aldó a ití; in my idiolect,
they are genuine variants, but it could very well be that
in some other dialect, the former would have the added
specification 'immediate'.

Still a third way of expressing 'on this day' is:

(3.2.2.1.2.2.1.2'') něníŋ aldó a iní # iŋ pistá
The fiesta [will take place on]
this day

where now the literalization is sun
definite
demonstrative
proximate to speaker
-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE
To express \[ \text{past} \] \[ \text{-specific} \], one says:

\[(3.2.2.1.2.2.1.3) \] \( \text{kétaŋ aldó} \ # \ iŋ \ \text{pistá} \)

The fiesta \( \text{[took place]} \) on that
sun neither near you nor me= The
fiesta \( \text{[took place]} \) at some point
in the past

where the literalization is \( \text{sun} \) . If one wanted
definite 

demonstrative

OBLIQUE

to be specific, one would say:

\[(3.2.2.1.2.2.1.3a) \] \( \text{itáŋ aldó} \ a \ itá \ # \ iŋ \ \text{pistá} \)

The fiesta \( \text{[took place on]} \) that
specific day in the past

where now the literalization is \( \text{sun} \) and where the

definite 

demonstrative

SUBJECT

process of demonstrative copying must likewise be applied.

A variant of the preceding sentence is

\[(3.2.2.1.2.2.1.3a') \] \( \text{kétaŋ aldó} \ a \ itá \ # \ iŋ \ \text{pistá} \)

The fiesta \( \text{[took place]} \) on that
specific day in the past
where, instead of SUBJECT, \textit{sun} is OBLIQUE, with the usual demonstrative copying process.

To express \textit{[future \underline{specific}]} , one would say:

(3.2.2.1.2.2.1.4) kéj aldó a iyán # iŋ pistá
iyán aldó a iyán # iŋ pistá

The fiesta [will take place] on that specific day

where the literalization is \textit{sun}

definite
demonstrative
proximate to hearer
SUBJECT/ OBLIQUE

Other temporal idioms do not use the lexical unit \textit{sun} but \textit{N} without lexical specification:

(3.2.2.1.2.2.1.5) jéni # iŋ pistá

The fiesta [is taking place] presently
The fiesta [will take place] today
The fiesta [took place] today

Note that \textit{jéni} is unmarked as to time; a preceding linguistic context will have to specify the time. 'Today' is literalized as \textit{N}.

The same symbolization \textit{jéni} is
definite
demonstrative
proximate to speaker
-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE

likewise used for 'right now' which may be characterized as
[\text{future \hspace{1em} futur}] \text{ while 'today' is characterizable as [\text{future \hspace{1em} futur}].}

[\text{past \hspace{1em} pass}] [\text{specific \hspace{1em} spec}]

To emphasize the notion of 'immediate', the Spanish loanword \text{mismo} 'same' is added:

\begin{equation}
\text{(3.2.2.1.2.2.1.6) } \eta \text{\^{e}ni mism\'u \# i\^{e} pist\'{a}}
\end{equation}

The fiesta [is taking place] right now

'To express 'earlier on the same day' another nonlexically specified N is used:

\begin{equation}
\text{(3.2.2.1.2.2.1.7) } \text{nand\'in \# i\^{e} pist\'{a}}
\end{equation}

The fiesta [took place] earlier today

The temporal juncture referred to by 'earlier on the same day' is difficult to fit into the subsystem of contrasting temporal dimensions described thus far without introducing uneconomic distinctions. Perhaps a simpler alternative would be to consider 'earlier on the same day' an idiom literalized by N . The unit 'distal' has already been intro-
defined
demonstrative
distal
-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE

duced in connection with kar\text{\'i\'n} 'there yonder'.

To express 'during daytime', the lexical unit \text{sun} is used once more:
(3.2.2.1.2.2.1.8) ṃeṅ aldō # ìŋ pistá
The fiesta [takes place] during daytime

where the idiom is literalized as sun
definite
demonstrative
proximate to hearer
-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE

In the sentence

(3.2.2.1.2.2.1.9) indáıt bůlan # ìŋ pistá
The fiesta [takes place] each month

the time N is literalized as moon; indáıt is used
definite
individuated
SUBJECT

to symbolize 'each' and is used in expressing temporal recurrence.

Undoubtedly, there are many more such idioms. The following literalization rules are by way of illustration. They show that although spatial dimensions are exploited to express temporal dimensions, the correspondences are ad hoc and not completely regular:
Temporal to Spatial Literalization Rule I

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{time} & \quad \text{location} \\
\text{V} & \quad \text{V} \\
\text{state} & \quad \text{state} \\
\text{day} & \quad \text{sun} \\
\text{temporal} & \quad \text{locative} \\
\text{past} & \quad \text{definite} \\
\text{-specific} & \quad \text{demonstrative} \\
\text{past} & \quad -\text{proximate to speaker} \\
\text{specific} & \quad -\text{proximate to hearer} \\
\text{future} & \quad \{\text{SUBJECT}\} \\
\text{specific} & \quad \{\text{OBLIQUE}\} \\
\text{-past} & \quad \text{proximate to hearer} \\
\text{-future} & \quad \{\text{SUBJECT}\} \\
\text{specific} & \quad \{\text{OBLIQUE}\} \\
\text{during} & \quad \text{proximate to hearer} \\
\end{align*}
\]

* The Demonstrative Copying Rule must likewise be applied.

Temporal to Spatial Literalization Rule II

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{time} & \quad \text{location} \\
\text{V} & \quad \text{V} \\
\text{state} & \quad \text{state} \\
\text{month} & \quad \text{definite} \\
\text{temporal} & \quad \text{locative} \\
\text{definite} & \quad \text{individuated} \\
\text{recurrent} & \quad \text{individuated} \\
\end{align*}
\]
**Temporal to Spatial Literalization Rule III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V N state</td>
<td>V N state (no root)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal</td>
<td>locative definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- past
- future
- specific
- past
- future
- specific
- immediate
- earlier

**This particular matrix likewise requires the addition of an emphatic specification symbolized by the Spanish loanword *mismo*.**

3.2.2.1.2.2.2. Adverbial Phrases of Time. Consider the sentence:

\[(3.2.2.1.2.2.1) \text{kétaq aldó a itá} \# \text{iq pistá}\]

The fiesta [took place] on that specific day

the semantic structure of which may be represented thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>patient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V N state</td>
<td>V N state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal</td>
<td>(no root)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>day fiesta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Now a state $V$ which is temporal may be predicated not only of a patient $N$ but of a $\overline{V} \overline{N}$ configuration in a patient relation to the temporal state $V$:

\[(3.2.2.1.2.2.2.2)\] kētaŋ aldó a itá $(#)$

migpistá ya $\#$ i Pédru

On that specific day Pedro held a celebration

where the semantic structure is

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{time} \\
V \quad N
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{patient} \\
1 \\
\text{state} \\
\text{temporal} \\
(\text{no root})
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Agent} \\
V \quad N \\
2 \\
\text{action} \\
\text{hold celebration}
\end{array}
\]

As with locative state $V$'s which are not lexically specified, the temporal state $V$ is postsemantically deleted. In turn, the patient substructure undergoes the usual processes of subjectivization and incorporation. The time $N$ may be postposed:

\[(3.2.2.1.2.2.2.2')\] migpistá ya $\#$ i Pédru $(#)$

kētaŋ aldó a itá

Or the time $N$ may be interposed between $V$ and the subject:

\[(3.2.2.1.2.2.2.2''')\] migpistá ya $(#)$ kētaŋ aldó a itá $(#)$

i Pédru
Or if the time N is TOPIC:

(3.2.2.1.2.2.2.a) kętaŋ aldó a itá ya migpista’ #
i Pédru
It was on that specific day
that Pedro held a celebration

It should be noted that the above sentence, following
the literalization rules earlier set down, may likewise
be expressed by:

(3.2.2.1.2.2.2.2’’’) itáŋ aldó a itá (#(#) migpista’
yá # i Pédru

where the occurrence of two subject N’s is another cogent
confirmation of the claim that the time N in this sentence
is somehow unintegrated with the rest of the sentence.
The two subject N’s corroborate the hypothesis that the
structure is originally a V V structure.

Consider now the sentence sequence:

(3.2.2.1.2.2.2.3) kasayá na niŋ aldó a itá  ##
pípagpistán neŋ Pédrú (# itáŋ aldó a itá)
How happy that specific day was!
That specific day was feasted in by Pedro
In the first sentence, 'that specific day' is a nonsubject patient N. The sentence following has the same semantic structure as (3.2.2.1.2.2.2.2); however, because the time N is -new, it is extraposed and subjectivized, with the incorporated time subject marker pipag-...-an added to the verb root. This process is similar to the one described in the section on locative adverbs as 'Integrating Subjectivization', so that in effect, what was semantically a $\sqrt{V\sqrt{V}}$ configuration (with the second V embedded) becomes in surface structure a $\sqrt{V\sqrt{N\sqrt{N}}}$ configuration, with the time N subjectivized.

3.2.2.1.2.2.3. Aspectual Harmony. If the proposed analysis of time adverbs is accepted, namely, that traditional adverbs of time are actually state temporal V's predicated of an embedded $\sqrt{V\sqrt{N}}$ configuration, then aspectual harmony rules whereby the specifications of $V_{1}$ constrain the aspectual specifications of $V_{2}$ must likewise be posited.

If $V_{1}$ is future, $V_{2}$ must be -actual:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{If } V_{1} \text{ is future, } V_{2} \text{ must be -actual:} \\
(3.2.2.1.2.2.3.1) \text{ kéq lúnis } #(#) \text{ makó ya } # \text{ i Pédrú} \\
\text{Next Monday Pedro will leave} \\
\end{array}$$

If $V_{1}$ is past, $V_{2}$ cannot be -actual:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\text{If } V_{1} \text{ is past, } V_{2} \text{ cannot be -actual:} \\
(3.2.2.1.2.2.3.2) \text{ kétaq lúnis } #(#) \text{ méko ya } # \text{ i Pédrú} \\
\text{Last Monday Pedro left} \\
\end{array}$$
(3.2.2.1.2.2.3.3) kétaŋ lúnis #(#) mámakó ya # i Pé'dru
Last Monday Pedro was leaving

If V is neither past nor future, there seem to be no constraints
on aspectual specification of V:

(3.2.2.1.2.2.3.4) ngéniŋ lúnis a ini #(#) makó ya # i Pé'dru
On this Monday [today] Pedro will leave

(3.2.2.1.2.2.3.5) ngéniŋ lúnis a ini #(#) mámakó ya #
i Pé'dru
On this Monday [today] Pedro is leaving [presently]

(3.2.2.1.2.2.3.6) ngéniŋ lúnis a ini #(#) méko ya # i Pé'dru
On this Monday [today] Pedro left

(3.2.2.1.2.2.3.7) ngéniŋ lúnis a ini #(#) kalakólakó na
pá muŋ Pé'dru
On this Monday [today] Pedro has just
now left

The semantic rules for aspectual harmony may be
formulated thus:

\[
(S ) \quad V_{2} \quad \longrightarrow \quad -\text{actual} / \quad V_{1}^{\text{future}}
\]

\[
(S ) \quad V_{2} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{actual} / \quad V_{1}^{\text{past}}
\]
A sentence such was

\[(3.2.2.1.2.2.3.8) \text{ mámako\, ya\, # i Pédu}\]

may be translated in English as

Pedro is leaving

Pedro was leaving

In Pampangan, it is unmarked for time. The whole event may be located in time only by a preceding temporal state V uttered earlier in the discourse or obvious from the context of situation.

A seeming exception to the aspectual harmony rules formulated is the sentence sequence:

\[(3.2.2.1.2.2.3.9) \text{ nápun\, #(#) mámako\, ya\, sána\, # i Pédu\, ##}
\text{ óne\, ## dínataŋ\, ya\, # iŋ\, kapatád\, na\, ##}
\text{ é\, ne\, méko\, ##}

Yesterday Pedro intended to leave

but his brother came

he did not leave anymore

Problematic is the sentence makó\, ya\, sána\, # i Pédu\ 'Pedro intended to leave' where V is -actual, although V is temporal past. It was stated earlier that if V is past, V must always be actual. The cause for the apparent irregularity
is the presence of the semantic unit 'intend to'. Such units will be treated at greater length in Chapter IV. It seems that the semantic structure of the sentence in question is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
<th>patient</th>
<th>experiencer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V N</td>
<td>V patient N</td>
<td>N 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>experiential action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>temporal</td>
<td>intensive</td>
<td>leave Pedro Pedro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>-actual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The occurrence of past in V locates the whole patient subconfiguration in past time. However, the earlier rule on the necessity of a V subordinate to a past V to be aspectually actual seems to apply only to an immediately subordinated or dominated V. In this instance, the immediately dominated V is not leave but a nonlexically specified V 'intensive'. Hence, the fact that leave is not aspectually specified as 'actual' is not really irregular, since it is V and not V which must be actual. Eventually, of course, V is deleted, but not before incorporating 'intensive' into V which is eventually symbolized by sána. In a more adequate grammar, the earlier Aspectual Harmony Rule formulated must be made quite explicit concerning its area of dominance, namely, that the rule applies only to an immediately subordinated V.
Again, consider another apparent irregularity:

\[
(3.2.2.1.2.2.3.10) \quad \text{kęq áras a dátaq ka } \#(\#) \text{ ménan nà ku}
\]

\[\times\]

On that hour near you that you shall arrive, I already ate. On the hour when you shall arrive, I shall already have eaten.

The example seems to violate the earlier stipulation that if V is future, V must be -actual; in this case, mę̄gan 'ate'

\[1\]

\[2\]

is actual completed instead of the expected -actual. The semantic structure of the sentence may be represented thus:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

state

future

(temporal)

(hour)

definite

demonstrative

(proximate to)

hearer

action

(second)

arrive

(actual)

3

action first

person

eat

person

subjective

actual

completed
```

The clause 'when you shall arrive' may be looked upon as completing the meaning of hour; it is not directly related to the state V but to the time N. The whole configuration including the patient subconfiguration is located in future time because of V; however, it seems that only V is subject to the Aspectual Harmony Rule earlier formulated: it must be -actual. Again, therefore, the above example is not an irregularity; what is necessary is to explicitly state the domain of the Aspectual Harmony Rule.
Tense-aspect relations demand separate treatment.

No doubt, more constraints will be found as more structures are analyzed. It seems, however, that in such analysis, the notion of 'domain' and 'what is immediately dominated' or at least linked immediately to another temporal state V, become very relevant.

3.2.2.1.2.3. Benefactive. Consider the sentence:

(3.2.2.1.2.3.1)   pará kiŋ anák ya # iŋ digálu
                   The gift is [intended] for the child

where pará is from Spanish para 'for', which has been assimilated into the language. It serves to make explicit the notion of 'intended for', 'for the sake of', 'for the benefit of'.

The structure for the above sentence may be represented thus:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{beneficiary} & \text{patient} \\
\text{V} & \text{N} & \text{N} \\
\text{state} & \text{child+for} & \text{gift} \\
\text{benefactive} & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Now, it is possible for a benefactive state V to be accompanied not only by a patient N but a whole \( \text{V} N \) configuration in a patient-like relation to V:

(3.2.2.1.2.3.2)   pará kiŋ anák #(#) lálákad ya # i Pédrú
                   For the benefit of the child Pedro is walking
The structure of the sentence may be represented thus:

Since V is not lexically specified, it is postsemantically deleted. V undergoes the usual postsemantic processes of subjectivization and incorporation. The beneficiary N may be postposed:

\[(3.2.2.1.2.3.2') \text{lálákad ya } \# \text{ i Pédru } \#(#) \text{ pará kiŋ anák}\]

Pedro is walking for the benefit of the child

Or it may be interposed between V and the agent N:

\[(3.2.2.1.2.3.2'') \text{lálákad ya } \\ (#(#)) \text{ pará kiŋ anák } \\ (#(#)) \text{ i Pédru}\]

Pedro for the benefit of the child is walking

If the beneficiary N is TOPIC, it must be preposed:

\[(3.2.2.1.2.3.2a) \text{ pará kiŋ anák ya lálákad } \# \text{ i Pédru}\]

It is for the benefit of the child that Pedro is walking

Consider now the sentence sequence:
(3.2.1.2.3.3) kaĩn tv niq anák
paglákad neq Pédr (nq anák)

How weak the child is!

The child is being walked for by Pedro=
Pedro is walking for the benefit of the child

In the second sentence, the beneficiary N, which is $-new,$
is integrated into the embedded $\sqrt{2}N$ configuration by being
extraposed and subjectivized after $V$ has been deleted.

It should be noted that the beneficiary $N$ in the second
sentence is extraneous to the meaning of the sentence 'Pedro
is walking'; there is nothing in the meaning of 'to walk'
to imply a beneficiary $N$ whereas a beneficiary $N$ is demanded
by an intrinsically benefactive root such as 'to give'. It
is possible to undergo any process or to perform any action
for the sake of somebody, in which case the configuration
would be

```
  V
  \|-- beneficiary
    \|-- patient
  \  \N
  \  1
  \  \N
   \V
   \  \N
    \  2
```

but it is only a relatively restricted subset of verb roots
which is intrinsically benefactive and demands an accompanying
beneficiary $N$, in which case the configuration would be
It should be noted too that the usual marker for the incorporated subject specification in the verb root for structures of the first type is pag-, whereas the usual marker for the incorporated subject specification in the verb root for structures of the second type is Ø and for structures of the third type, -an:

(3.2.2.1.2.3.4) māɡailaŋan yaŋ péra # iŋ anák
The child is needing money

(3.2.2.1.2.3.5) dirīnAN neŋ digáluŋ Pédro # iŋ anák
The child is being given a gift by Pédro

Finally, in contemporary Pampangan, unless the beneficiary N in configurations of the first type is subject, the nonsubject beneficiary N phrase must always occur with Spanish loanword pará (this is not true for structures of the second and third type):

(3.2.2.1.2.3.6) lálákad ya # i Pédro #(#) pará kīŋ anák
lálákad ya # i Pédru #(#) kįŋ anák

Pedro is walking for the benefit of the child

The sentence marked $^x$ is acceptable, but it means 'Pedro is walking towards the child'.

3.2.2.1.2.4. Motivative. Consider the sentence:

(3.2.2.1.2.4.1) kią pistí # iŋ sakít

The sickness [is due] to the pestilence

where a motivative state $V$ is predicated of a patient $N$:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{motive} \\
V \\
\text{state} \\
\text{motivative} \\
\text{pestilence} \\
\end{array}
\quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{patient} \\
N \\
\end{array}
\]

Instead of an ordinary patient, one may have an embedded $\sqrt{V \ N}$ configuration in a patient relation to the motivative state $V$:

(3.2.2.1.2.4.2) kią pistí #(#) mamamaté la # diŋ manúŋ

Because of the pestilence the chickens are dying
The semantic structure may be represented thus:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{motive} & \text{patient} \\
V & N \\
\text{state} \hspace{1cm} \text{motivative} \\
\text{pestilence} & \text{die} & \text{chicken}
\end{array}
\]

Since \( V \) is not lexically specified, it is eventually deleted; the embedded configuration undergoes the usual postsemantic processes of subjectivization and incorporation. It is possible for the motive \( N \) to be postposed to yield the preferred variant:

\((3.2.2.1.2.4.2')\) mamamaté la # diŋ manúk #( ) kiŋ pistí
The chickens are dying because of the pestilence

Or the motive \( N \) may be interposed between \( V \) and the patient \( N \):

\((3.2.2.1.2.4.2'')\) mamamaté la #( ) kiŋ pistí #( ) diŋ manúk
The chickens, because of the pestilence, are dying

Again, it is possible to have the sentence sequence:

\((3.2.2.1.2.4.3)\) atín pistí ##
akakamaté da diŋ manúk # iŋ pistí
There is a pestilence
The pestilence [is the occasion/motive for] the chickens dying
Thus, the motive \(N\), which is -new, may be extraposed and then subjectivized, in effect integrating the motive \(N\) into the embedded \(V^2N\) configuration by an Integrating Subjectivization Process. Since \(pisti\) is -count, it is not copied into \(V\); probably because there is no copier in \(V\), the -new noun phrase \(in\ pisti\) is not deleted in this instance.

It is possible for the motivative state \(V\) to be lexically specified:

\[(3.2.2.1.2.4.4) \text{ ūli na niŋ pisti } \#\# \text{ mamamate la } \# \text{ diŋ manúk}\]

By reason of the pestilence the chickens are dying

\(\text{ūli}\) is problematic as to etymology. It is probably the same root found in *\(m+ulí\)' to return to one's point of origin=to go home' and hence is best considered a noun root meaning 'origin'. Hence, in the above, it seems to be a predicate noun, \text{origin+predicativizer}. It is likewise unusual insofar as its accompanying motive \(N\) (ordinarily postsemantically OBLIQUE) is always -SUBJECT and -OBLIQUE and copied into the predicate noun as \(na\). It is likewise possible to say:

\[(3.2.2.1.2.4.4') \text{ mamamate la } \# \text{ diŋ manúk } \#\# \text{ ūli na niŋ pisti}\]

The chickens are dying by reason of the pestilence

It is, however, not possible to interpose the phrase 'by reason of the pestilence' between \(V\) and the patient \(N\).
It is possible for the embedded \( V^N \) to be any subtype of \( V \):

\[
(3.2.2.1.2.4.5) \quad \text{úli mu } #(#) \text{ masantín ya } # \text{ igbalé}
\]

By reason of you the house is pretty

\[
(3.2.2.1.2.4.6) \quad \text{úli na niŋ pálí? } #(#) \text{ mándílu ya } # \text{ iŋ anák}
\]

By reason of the heat the child is bathing

Since state \( V \)'s do not allow a choice in subjectivization, the integrating subjectivization process cannot apply to (3.2.2.4.5). However, it is possible with action \( V \)'s to say:

\[
(3.2.2.1.2.4.6a) \quad \text{akakadílu na niŋ anák } # \text{ iŋ pálí?}
\]

The heat [is the occasion/motive for] the child bathing

In this case, it seems that the root must be deleted first before integrating subjectivization can take place. Moreover, with action and process-action \( V \)'s, unless the motive \( N \) is subjectivized, it is not possible for the motive \( N \) to occur without \( úli \). Thus, it is not possible to say:

\[
(3.2.2.1.2.4.6b) \quad \text{mándílu ya } # \text{ iŋ anák } #(#) \text{ kiŋ pálí?}
\]

The child is bathing by reason of the heat whereas it is possible to say

\[
(3.2.2.1.2.4.7) \quad \text{mamamáte ya } # \text{ iŋ anák } #(#) \text{ kiŋ pálí?}
\]

The child is dying by reason of the heat
3.2.2.1.2.5. Integrating Subjectivization. The last four sections on locative, temporal, benefactive, and motive structures had this in common: traditional adverbs of place and of time and adverbial phrases of benefaction and motivation were treated as arising from separate state V's predicated of an embedded V N configuration in a patient-like relation to the state V. In each case, the semantic structure was:

```
  Rel
  V  N
  1  1
state
  V
  2
  Rel
  N
  2
```

For structures such as the above, ordering of the postsemantic rules is crucial. Since the embedded V N patient is -definite, it is neither subjectivized nor copied, but rel N is marked OBLIQUE. Then V is deleted because not lexically specified, yielding the configuration:

```
  Rel
  N
  1
  OBLIQUE
  V
  2
```

If N is -new, its root may be deleted and the N branch directly symbolized by a pronoun (the rel of N are all eventually marked OBLIQUE and hence, even if not lexically specified, are not deleted but symbolized directly by oblique-marked pronouns) or N may be extraposed:

```
  Rel
  V  N
  2  2
  rel
  N
  1
  OBLIQUE
```
Once extraposed, N may be subjectivized and incorporated into V. The incorporated subject specifications (eventually symbolized by affixes added to the verb root) arising from what originally in semantic structure were \( \text{VV} \) configurations seem to constitute a subset by themselves and should be marked in some way. Eventually, they are symbolized as:

- **pipag-...-an** 'location subject'
- **aka-**
  - **pipag-...-an** 'time subject'
- **pag-**
  - **'beneficiary subject'**
- **aka-**
  - **ka-...-an** 'motive subject'

On the other hand, in V configurations where location, time, or motive is subject (only in state V's), the incorporated marker for subject choice is \( \emptyset \); in V configurations where beneficiary N is subject, it is \( \emptyset \) for state and process V's and `an` for action and process-action V's.

Thus, no new postsemantic processes need be posited other than a new extraposition rule (which applies after the deletion of V):

\[ (T ) \text{ Extrapolation Rule} \]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{N} & | & \text{rel} & \rightarrow \\
\text{V} & \text{-new} & \text{N} & \text{1} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{V} & | & \text{rel} & \rightarrow \\
\text{N} & \text{1} & \text{-new} & \text{2} \\
\end{array}
\]
3.2.2.2. Other Structures. Many of the configurations to be discussed in this section have been treated in the transformational generative grammar literature as instances of complementation. Within the frame of reference adopted in this study, such complementation arises from the same type of embedded V N configurations already discussed; typically, however, the matrix sentence in such embeddings manifests a configuration more complex than the configurations hitherto described.

3.2.2.2.1. Embeddings in V experiential

following sentence:

\[(3.2.2.2.1.1) \text{ burí naŋ Pédru }(#) iŋ makó ya # i Suán} \]

The [fact that] Juan will leave is liked by Pedro

where the clause 'Juan will leave' is the patient in an experiential state V and where Pédru is the experiencer N:

```
V
1
state
experiential
like

patient

agent

action

leave

Juan

definite

experiencer

N

1

2

2

Pedro
```

The whole patient subconfiguration is inflected as definite.
Because the patient is definite, it must be extraposited and eventually subjectivized; the subject, however, is abstract and is not copied into V. By a later process, the determiner may be deleted, to yield the more common variant:

(3.2.2.2.1.1') burí naŋ Pédrú (#) makó ya # i Suán

Alternatively, instead of deletion, SUBJECT may be shifted to OBLIQUE, to yield the equally common:

(3.2.2.2.1.1'') burí naŋ Pédrú (#) kiŋ makó ya # i Suán

[To the effect that] Juan will leave

is liked by Pedro

The prior specification of patient as SUBJECT as a context for deletion or shift is necessary to account for the fact that the experiencer is -SUBJECT and -OBLIQUE; the unmarked subject of experiential V's is the experiencer N.

Where the embedded \( V^2 \) has been subjectivized, there are no aspectual restrictions on \( V \), so that one can have the following:

(3.2.2.2.1.2)* burí? na naŋ Pédrú (#) iŋ dátaŋ ya # i Suán >

burí naŋ Pédrú (#) iŋ dátaŋ ya # i Suán

The [fact that] Juan will arrive is liked by Pedro
(3.2.2.2.1.3) burí naŋ Pédru (#) iŋ dínatág ya # i Suán
The [fact that] Juan arrived is liked by Pedro

(3.2.2.2.1.4) burí naŋ Pédru (#) iŋ dáratág ya # i Suán
The [fact that] Juan is arriving [right now] is liked by Pedro

(3.2.2.2.1.5) burí naŋ Pédru (#) iŋ karatáŋdatág na pā muŋ Suán
The [fact that] Juan has just now arrived is liked by Pedro

It is not necessary, however, that the patient be definite. If patient is -definite, the subconfiguration is not extraposed and subjectivized but remains -SUBJECT and -OBLIQUE; since it is likewise -definite, the determiner is Ø. In configurations where the patient is -definite, one of the embedded N's is always coreferential with one of the matrix N's and is eventually deleted. Thus:

(3.2.2.2.1.6) bísa yəŋ makó # i Suán
Juan wants to leave

where the configuration is

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>patient</th>
<th>experiencer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiential action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>want</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
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The embedded N is -new and deleted, leaving the configuration

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{patient} & \text{experiencer} \\
V & V & N \\
1 & 2 & 1
\end{array}
\]

The experiencer N is subjectivized and copied into V; since the patient is -SUBJECT and -OBLIQUE, it is likewise incorporated into V, thus yielding a surface structure

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{V} & \text{N'} & \text{V} \\
1 & 2 & N
\end{array}
\]

Note that the surface structure of the sentence parallels the surface structure of sentences with manner adverbs and frequency or instance adverbs (see section 3.2.1). Another requirement of the above configuration is that V is always unmarked for aspect.

Other experiential V's (process) which may be cited are mísip 'to think' and magnása? 'to expect, to hope', which may be accompanied by a \( \sqrt{N} \) patient, definite or -definite. Whenever there is no N in the embedding which is coreferential with an N in the matrix, the whole \( \sqrt{N} \) embedding is always extraposed and subjectivized:

\[
(3.2.2.2.1.7) \quad \text{mísip yaq makó # i Pédrú} \\
\quad \text{Pedro is thinking of leaving}
\]

\[
(3.2.2.2.1.8) \quad \text{ísipan naq Pédrú #(#) iŋ makó ya # i Suán} \\
\quad \text{The [event that] Juan will leave is being thought of by Pedro}
\]
(3.2.2.2.1.9) mágnása yaq makó # i Pédro
Pedro is hoping to leave

(3.2.2.2.1.10) págnásan naq Pédro #(#) iŋ makó ya # i Suán
The [event that] Juan will leave is being hoped for by Pedro

3.2.2.2. Embeddings in V. Consider the action completable sentence:

(3.2.2.2.2.1) méyari yaq méqan # i Pédro
Pedro finished eating

where the configuration is:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
V & \text{complement} & \text{agent} \\
1 & V & N & 1 \\
\text{action} & 2 & 1 \\
\text{completable} & \text{action} & \text{Pedro} & \text{Pedro} \\
\text{finish} & \text{eat} & \text{Pedro} & \text{Pedro} \\
\end{array}
\]

Again, the 'N' in the embedding (which is -new) is deleted,

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
V & \text{N'} & V & N \\
1 & 2 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]

in the matrix is subjectivized and copied into V; the comple-

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
V & \text{N'} & V & N \\
1 & 2 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]

ment (V') is incorporated into V. The resulting structure

is:
What is interesting about verbs such as mayári? 'to finish' is that the V in the accompanying \( \overline{N} \) patient must always harmonize aspectually with V or else be unmarked (\(-\text{actual}\)):

(3.2.2.2.2) mayári yan mámanan # i Pédrudurative durative

mayári yaŋ maŋan # i Pédrudurative \(-\text{actual}\)

Pedro is finishing eating

(3.2.2.2.3) méyári yaŋ méƞan # i Pédrucompleted completed

méyári yaŋ maŋan # i Pédrucompleted \(-\text{actual}\)

Pedro finished eating

(3.2.2.2.4) mayári yaŋ maŋan # i Pédru-actual -actual

Pedro will finish eating

However, if \( V \) is \text{actual} completed immediate, \( V \) must be \text{actual} completed or \(-\text{actual}\):

(3.2.2.2.5) kayáriyári na pá muŋ méŋan Pédruaactual actual

completed completed immediate

kayáriyári na pá muŋ maŋan Pédruactual \(-\text{actual}\)

completed immediate

Pedro has just now finished eating
Other examples of \( V \) which take a \( V N \) complement are:

(3.2.2.2.6) \( \text{ibát yan méñan} \# i \text{Pédru} \)

Pedro came from eating = Pedro completed eating

(3.2.2.2.7) \( \text{dínátáŋ yaŋ méñan} \# i \text{Pédru} \)

Pedro came ate = Pedro happened to eat

The following rules may be formulated to account for the aspectual harmony patterns exemplified:

\[
(S) \quad V_2 \xrightarrow{\text{completed}} \begin{cases} \text{completable} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{actual} \\
\text{completed} \\
\text{immediate} \end{cases} / \quad V_1 \quad V_2 N_1
\]

\[
(S) \quad V_2 \xrightarrow{\text{aspect}_a} \begin{cases} \text{completable} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{aspect}_a \end{cases} / \quad V_1 \quad V_2 N_1
\]

(The two rules are disjunctively ordered with regard to each other; if the first one applies, the second one cannot apply.)
3.2.2.3. Embeddings in V. Consider the sentence:

(3.2.2.3.1) sasabiyán nañ Pédrú #(#) iŋ makó ya kanú # i Suán

The [event that] Juan will reportedly leave is being said by Pedro

where the structure is

kanú, the symbolization of 'reportive' is optional and is used only in structures of this type; since what is said is always definite (it refers to a definite utterance earlier said by someone in the context of discourse), a completable verbal action V is always accompanied by a subjectivized complement. Hence, the complement is extraposed and subjectivized; since it is abstract, it is not copied into V. If there is an N in the embedding which is coreferential with an N in the matrix, it must be deleted:
(3.2.2.3.2) sasabiyán naįj Pédrú #(#) iŋ makó ya kanú (# i Pédrú)
The [event that] he [Pedro] will reportedly reportedly leave is being said by Pedro

Sentence (3.2.2.3.1) has the following more common variants:

(3.2.2.3.1') sasabiyán naįj Pédrú #(#) makó ya kanú # i Suán

(3.2.2.3.1'') sasabiyán naįj Pédrú #(#) kiŋ makó ya kanú # i Suán

Hence, the specifications [definite] may eventually be deleted or SUBJECT may be shifted to OBLIQUE.

With reported speech, which is always extraposed, there are no restrictions on aspectual specification. Unlike in English, indirect statements do not necessitate aspectual (or tense) changes in the embedded V to make aspect (or tense) harmonize with the matrix V.

It is possible to delete V and the agent N if they are -new, to yield:

(3.2.2.3.1a) makó ya kanú # i Suán
Juan will reportedly leave
In such a case, kanú is not optional, since it is the only clue left that the original statement was once part of a configuration, the complement in fact, of a verb of speaking.

There is an interesting verbal activity root in Pampangan symbolized as qá which is completely unspecified for aspect and which always deletes the subject determiner or shifts SUBJECT to OBLIQUE:

\[(3.2.2.2.3.3) \textit{qá naq Pédrú} (#)(kiŋ) makó ya kanú # \]
\[i \textit{Suán} \]
[To the effect that] Juan will reportedly leave is being said by Pedro

So far, only indirect statements have been exemplified; questions have not been dealt with. Questions will be treated at great length in Chapter IV; anticipating the discussion in Chapter IV, embedded questions will be exemplified:

\[(3.2.2.2.3.4) \textit{kukutáŋ naq Pédrú} (#)(nuŋ nánánu} ya \]
\[kanú # i \textit{Suán} \]
What Juan is reportedly doing is being asked by Pedro

Again, the unit 'reportive' symbolized by kanú is optional; it seems that the extraposed complement is not subjectivized (there is no -an affixed to the verb root; -an is the usual marker for complement subject choice); moreover, nuŋ is
phonologically similar to naŋ/nin, the -SUBJECT and -OBLIQUE
determiner. naŋ is likewise a symbolization for 'if'.

Direct quotations present no unusual features. The unit 'reportive' does not occur; there are no pronominal
shifts. Like indirect quotations, direct quotations may be
extraposed and subjectivized, although the determiner must
be deleted. In fact, no determiner is possible and the full
sentential boundary marker (##) is maintained:

(3.2.2.2.3.5) sasabiyán naŋ Pédro ## makó ku

[It] is being said by Pedro: 'I will leave'

The complement may be marked TOPIC and preposed:

(3.2.2.2.3.5a) makó ku ## sasabiyán naŋ Pédro

'I will leave', [it] is being said by Pedro

3.2.2. Nominalization. Consider the sentences:

(3.2.2.1) máyap(#) iŋ lálákad ka # i Pédro

The [fact that] Pedro is walking is good [to hear]

(3.2.2.2)* máyap(#) iŋ pámagg+lákad na naŋ Pédro

máyap(#) iŋ pámaglákad naŋ Pédro

The act of walking by Pedro is good=

Pedro walks all right
The semantic structure of the first sentence has already been analyzed in section 3.2.2.1.1 as

```
\begin{array}{c}
| V \ \\
| \ \\
| \ \\
| \ \\
| \ \\
| \ \\
\end{array}
```

```
\begin{array}{c}
| V \ \\
| patient \ \\
| agent \ \\
| \ \\
| \ \\
| \ \\
\end{array}
```

```
\begin{array}{c}
| 1 \ \\
| state \ \\
| \ \\
| \ \\
| \ \\
\end{array}
```

```
\begin{array}{c}
| 2 \ \\
| action \ \\
| \ \\
| \ \\
| \ \\
\end{array}
```

```
\begin{array}{c}
| good \ \\
| \ \\
| \ \\
\end{array}
```

On the other hand, the semantic structure of the second sentence (after some postsemantic processes have applied) seems to be

```
\begin{array}{c}
| V \ \\
| patient \ \\
| agent \ \\
| \ \\
| \ \\
| \ \\
\end{array}
```

```
\begin{array}{c}
| 1 \ \\
| state \ \\
| \ \\
\end{array}
```

```
\begin{array}{c}
| 2 \ \\
| walk+nominalizer \ \\
| \ \\
| \ \\
\end{array}
```

```
\begin{array}{c}
| 3 \ \\
| Pedro \ \\
| \ \\
\end{array}
```

Obviously the two structures are related. At the same time, there is obviously a distinction between 'the fact that Pedro walks' and 'the act of walking by Pedro'. Semantically, therefore, the initial structure of the second sentence must reflect this semantic difference, presuming that all semantic information must be indicated in the initial structure. It would not do, therefore, to state that the first structure becomes the second structure (in the transformational generative grammar literature, this process was labeled 'nominalization'; see Lees 1960); rather the representation of the two structures must show their sameness and at the same time their difference. I propose that the initial semantic configuration of the second sentence is:
The occurrence of NOM (for 'nominalized') triggers a post-semantic process replacing the patient subconfiguration with:

Since the nominal N is definite, it is subjectivized but not copied into V (since it is abstract); the agent N, since it is not SUBJECT, is -SUBJECT and -OBLIQUE; by a process already described for \( N \) \( N \) configurations, agent N is copied into abstract N as na, thus generating the surface structure:

As the process has been described, it is possible to generate a nominal even in initial discourse. Typically, however, nominals arise in the context of discourse when a preceding \( \overline{V} N \) structure is repeated as an embedded \( \overline{V} N \) structure.
in a subsequent sentence:

(3.2.2.3) lálákad ya # iŋ anák ##
ákákit naŋ Pédru #(k) iŋ pámglákad na niŋ anák
The child is walking
The act of walking by the child is being seen
by Pedro

Instead of nominalizing, however, the language performer may
focus on the fact that the child is walking:

(3.2.2.3a) ákákit naŋ Pédru #(k) (kiŋ) lálákad ya # iŋ anák
[To the effect that] the child is walking is
being seen by Pedro

Nominals are considered abstract and hence are never
copied into V; moreover, they are always definite. Hence,
a nominal in surface structure must always be marked by iŋ,
kiŋ, or if -SUBJECT and -OBLIQUE, niŋ. The following
examples will clarify this:

(3.2.2.4) masantín ya # iŋ anák ##
mákayáma #(k) iŋ kasantiqán na niŋ anák
The child is pretty
The prettiness of the child is motivative
of pleasure
(3.2.2.5) dáragúl ya # iŋ anák ##
mákayáma #(,) iŋ páŋaragúl na niŋ anák
The child is growing
The growing of the child is motivative of
pleasure

(3.2.2.6) lúluksú ya # iŋ anák ##
mákayáma #(,) iŋ pámagluksú na niŋ anák
The child is jumping
The jumping by the child is motivative of
pleasure

(3.2.2.7) púpútut yaq dútuŋ # iŋ anák ##
mákayáma #(,) iŋ pámagpútut na+y dútuŋ niŋ anák
The child is cutting wood
The cutting of wood by the child is motivative
of pleasure

In the examples given above of different nominals arising from
various verb subtypes, the nominal was SUBJECT. The next two
examples show the nominal as -SUBJECT:

(3.2.2.8) matúla ya # i Suán #(,) kiŋ pámagpútut na+y
dútuŋ niŋ anák
Juan is full of amusement from the cutting
of wood by the child

(3.2.2.9) péte ne niŋ pámaglákad # i Pédru
Pedro died from the act of walking (e.g.,
because of a weak heart)
When a verb root is nominalized, its aspect specifications are deleted:

\[(3.2.2.10) \text{línákad ya # i Pédrú #} \]
\[\text{íkit naŋ Suán # nápun #(#) iŋ pámaglákad naŋ Pédrú} \]
Pedro walked
The act of walking by Pedro was seen by Juan yesterday

However, a nominal retains the other inflectional specifications of its verb root (as well as any derivational units attaching to the basic root):

\[(3.2.2.11) \text{pálákad yaŋ opísína # i Pédrú #} \]
\[\text{burí naŋ Suán #(#) iŋ pámagpalákad naŋ opísínaŋ Pédrú} \]
Pedro is managing [an] office
The managing by Pedro of an office is liked by Juan

where the derivational unit pa 'causativizer' is carried into the nominal.
(3.2.2.12) máŋlákad ya # i Pédru ##
mákainis ##(# iŋ pámáŋlákad naŋ Pédru
Pedro walks repeatedly = Pedro walks
to many places
The walking by Pedro to many places is
motivative of irritation

where the frequentative marker maŋ- is carried into the nominal.

(3.2.2.13) puputútAN ne niŋ anák # iŋ dútŋ ##
mákayáma ##(# iŋ pámIputut na niŋ anák kiŋ dútŋ
The [piece of] wood is being cut by the child
The act of cutting the [piece of wood] by
the child is motivative of pleasure

In the preceding sentence, the subject marker -an is not
carried over into the nominal but the infix -mi- seems to
symbolize a different subject choice since the usual nominal
for 'cutting' (with unmarked agent subject) is pámagputut.
Note, too, the shift in the determiner of the former
subject (iŋ to kiŋ: SUBJECT to OBLIQUE); the shift is unusual
insofar as a patient N is usually not specified as OBLIQUE.

It is possible not only for a V N configuration to be
nominalized but likewise a V \:\: V N configuration:
(3.2.2.14) maraläs yaŋ lûluksû # iŋ anák
The child jumps often

Either one of the V's in the \( \sqrt{\sqrt{}} \) configuration above may be nominalized. If maraläs is nominalized, two structures are possible:

(3.2.2.14a) é máyap #(#) iŋ karaläsan na+ŋ lûluksû nĩŋ anák
(3.2.2.14a') é máyap #(#) iŋ karaläsan na+ŋ pâmagluksû nĩŋ anák
The frequency of jumping by the child is not good

On the other hand, if lûluksû is nominalized, only one output is possible:

(3.2.2.14b) é mayap #(#) iŋ pâmagluksû na+ŋ maraläs nĩŋ anák
The frequent jumping by the child is not good

There is thus pressure in nominalization to nominalize the main verb luksû even when the adjunct state verb maraläs is the locus of nominalization; indirectly, this seems to be a confirmation of the peripheral character of the adverb with regard to the rest of the sentence.

In general, the symbolizations for nominalization are:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{state} \\
\text{root} \\
\text{patient subject} \rightarrow \emptyset \quad \text{ka+root+án}
\end{array}
\]
Where the verb root has a derivational unit attached to it, the derivational unit is included, preceded by the nominalizing prefix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mipaglútu?</td>
<td>pá+mipaglútu?</td>
<td>'reciprocal cooking'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makilútu?</td>
<td>pá+makilútu?</td>
<td>'associative cooking'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makipaglútu?</td>
<td>pá+makipaglútu?</td>
<td>'participative cooking'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misábi</td>
<td>pá+misábi</td>
<td>'mutual speaking=agreement'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lexical idiosyncrasies in the symbolization of nominalized forms would have to be stated by lower level symbolization rules.
3.2.3. Relativization.

3.2.3.1. Restrictive Clauses.

3.2.3.1.1. Relative Clauses with State V. Consider the sentence:

\[(3.2.3.1.1.1)\] masantịŋ ya #(#) iŋ balé a maputí?

The house [which] is white is pretty

The semantic structure of the sentence may be represented thus:

```
                     patient
                        /
                       V
                         |
                         N
                         |
                  state
                        |
                    pretty
                        |
                house
                        |
                definite
                        /
                    state
                        /
                white
```

V, a state V, is accompanied by a patient N, which in turn 1 seems to be further specified as a white house. Clearly, V is subordinate to V; on the other hand, the patient N 2 stands in a patient relation to the state V. As the representation above attempts to show, V specifies the house (which is definite) as white. The information 'white' is something superadded to house; it is not necessary for the lexical choice of house, although 'white' serves to identify which house. The attachment of the V line to the perpendicular line to the right of house is meant to convey this inflectional type of specification. On the other hand, definite is specified of the whole N subconfiguration.
including its attached V. N is in a patient relation to both V's.

If one accepts the proposed representation as an adequate one for the semantic structure of the sentence, the postsemantic processes necessary are relatively simple. The patient N is subjectivized and copied into V. Unlike the analysis proposed in the literature on relative clauses emanating from transformational generative grammarians, no deletion process is necessary. In English, there would be need of a copying process to account for WH-forms. In Pampangan, there is no need for either a deletion or a copying process, only the incorporation of V into the N branch to account for the occurrence of the linker a/-ŋ. Thus, the surface structure of the sentence would be:

A later process, an optional one, may interpose V between D and N:

(3.2.3.1.1') masantínŋ ya # iŋ maputíŋŋ balé

Besides simple state V's like mapútí? 'white', other state V's may occur in inflectional specification to an N. State V's which are not further specified account for traditional adjectives. Instead of an ordinary state V,
however, one may have a state V further specified as
locative, temporal, possessive, or partitive. These types
of state V's are not lexically specified but demand another
accompanying N in addition to a patient N:

\[
(3.2.3.1.1.2) \text{ masantíŋ} \text{ ya } # \text{ in} \text{ bálë } \text{ kiŋ} \text{ atbé}
\]

The house [which] is in the field is pretty

where the semantic structure may be represented as

```
V
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{patient} \\
\text{state} \\
\text{prety}
\end{array} \]
\[ \text{N} \]
```

```
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Location} \\
\text{state} \\
\text{locative (no root)} \\
\text{field}
\end{array} \]
\[ \text{N} \]
```

Again, the N house occurs in a patient relation to both
V and V. Since V is not lexically specified, it is
postsemantically deleted, and the resulting configuration
undergoes the same processes already described for adjectives
in relative clauses except that in surface structure, instead
of V, one has an oblique-marked (location) N instead.

\[
(3.2.3.1.1.3) \text{ masantíŋ} \text{ ya } # \text{ in} \text{ sínë } \text{ kétaŋ} \text{ lúnis}
\]

The movie [which was shown] on Monday
was nice

where the semantic structure may be represented as
Possessive and partitive state V's show the same type of semantic structure (but require other postsemantic processes):

\[(3.2.3.1.1.4)\] masantĩq ya # in balé na niŋ anák
The house [which belongs to] the child
is pretty.

\[(3.2.3.1.1.5)\] masantĩq ya # iŋ sálas na niŋ balé
The living-room [which is part] of the
house is pretty.

The semantic structures of the two sentences may be represented thus:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{patient} \\
V \\
1\\
\text{state} \\
\text{pretty} \\
\text{house} \\
\text{definite}
\end{array}
\]
Since \( V \) is not lexically specified, it is postsemantically deleted; in turn, \( N \) is attached to \( N \), yielding a subconfiguration:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{beneficiary} \\
\text{partitive}
\end{array}
\]

Following rules set down in Chapter II, such configurations provide the context for the following processes: OBLIQUE specification for beneficiary/partitive \( N \) is shifted to \(-OBLIQUE\); the beneficiary/partitive \( N \) is then copied into \( N \) as \text{na}.

It is interesting to note that in surface structure, the following noun phrases appear as having the same structure although they arise from three different types of subordinate state \( V \)'s:

\[
iŋ \text{ balé na niŋ anák} \quad \text{The house [which belongs to] the child}
\]

\[
iŋ \text{ sálas na niŋ balé} \quad \text{The living-room [which is part] of the house}
\]

\[
iŋ \text{ pámablákaŋ na niŋ táu} \quad \text{The act of walking by the man}
\]
In such \( N \overline{N} \) structures, it is possible to delete the second \( N \) (beneficiary/partitive/agent) if it is -new or if it is obvious from the nonlinguistic context:

\[
\begin{align*}
iŋ balé na & \quad \text{The house [which belongs to] him= his house} \\
iŋ sálas na & \quad \text{The living-room [which is part] of it=its living-room} \\
iŋ pámaglákad na & \quad \text{The act of walking by him= his act of walking}
\end{align*}
\]

On the other hand, it is likewise possible to delete the first \( N \) root if it is -new or obvious from the nonlinguistic context (note the accent on the determiner):

\[
\begin{align*}
iŋ & \quad \text{kiŋ anák} \quad \text{That [which belongs] to the child} \\
iŋ & \quad \text{kiŋ balé} \quad \text{That [which is part of] the house} \\
iŋ & \quad \text{kiŋ tál} \quad \text{The [action which is being performed by] the man}
\end{align*}
\]

To generate the above structures, however, it seems that the deletion must take place before the OBLIQUE shift; once one no longer has an \( \overline{N} \overline{N} \) root root structure, the context for the OBLIQUE to -OBLIQUE shift no longer obtains. Moreover, it is possible to delete the root of the second \( N \) of the first and third examples above (but not of the second), in effect
pronominalizing the OBLIQUE N:

in kayá That [which belongs] to him

in kayá The [action which is being performed by] him

3.2.3.1.2. Relative Clauses with NonState V. Consider the sentence:

(3.2.3.1.2.1) masipag ya # in táuq púpútut dútuq

The man [who] is cutting wood is industrious

where the semantic structure may be represented as

\[ \text{industrious} \quad \text{man} \quad \text{definite} \]

\[ \text{patient} \quad \text{agent} \quad \text{Patient} \]

\[ \text{state} \quad \text{1} \quad \text{2} \]

\[ \text{process action cut wood} \]

The structure is interesting insofar as it shows possibilities hitherto not discussed. Note that man is a patient N in relation to V but an agent N in relation to V; 'definite' specifies the whole patient subconfiguration (including the attached V N). Moreover, the attached relative clause inflectionally specifies N.
by identifying 'which man'. Postsemantically, too, $\sqrt{N}$ must be incorporated into the $N$ branch to account for the occurrence of the linker $\frac{1}{3}$ in tái.

It is likewise possible to say:

(3.2.3.1.2.2) maragul ya # in důtuŋ a puputušan na niŋ tái

The [piece of] wood [which] is being cut by the man is big

where the semantic structure is:

What is interesting about the above sentence is that $V$ is marked by the affix $-an$, the patient subject marker were $V$ an independent structure. In other words, there is an agreement relation between matrix $N$ and its attached (or dependent) $V$. Other than having no subject (what would have been its subject is in the matrix $V$ configuration (where it need not be subject), $V$ is postsemantically treated like any ordinary $V$. Since it has no object, it receives no copier $ya$ but its accompanying $-SUBJECT$ and $-OBLIQUE$ agent $N$ is copied into it as $na$. 
Returning now to sentence (3.2.3.1.2.1), one may have the sentence:

\[(3.2.3.1.2.1a)\] masípag ya # inŋ táuŋ púpútut kiŋ dútuŋ

\[
\text{The man [who] is cutting the [piece of] wood is industrious}
\]

It was stated in Chapter II that the patient N is usually -definite; if it were definite, it would have to be subjectivized. Semantically, 'wood' in the above sentence is definite: there is a particular piece of wood being referred to. On the other hand, definite patient N cannot be subjectivized since the attached $\overline{V} N$ configuration has no subject; moreover, if this attached $\overline{V} N$ configuration had a subject, as it now stands, it would be the agent N. Pampangan solves the dilemma, as it were, by shifting -OBLIQUE to OBLIQUE and marking 'wood' by kiŋ.

The examples given thus far show a restrictive relative clause attached to a subject N in the matrix sentence. This need not be the case, however; the only context necessary for a restrictive clause is that it be definite and that its attached $\overline{V} N$ subconfiguration serve to identify which N is being spoken of. Thus, one may have the sentence:

\[(3.2.3.1.2.3)\] biniyé ne niŋ táuŋ makuálta # kiŋ babáyiŋ malagú? # iŋ áutuŋ sélí na (niŋ táu)

\[
\text{The car [which] was bought (by the man) was given by the man [who] was rich to}
\]
3.2.3.1.3. Relative Clauses in Generic Statements.

Consider the sentence:

(3.2.3.1.3.1) mikukuálta la # déŋ tāuŋ mágóbraŋ masalése
Those men [who] work well grow rich

where the semantic structure is:

```
V
\[\text{patient}\]
\[\text{agent}\]
\[\text{man} \]
\[\text{work} \]
\[\text{plural} \]
\[\text{generic} \]
\[\text{generic} \]
\[\text{generic} \]
```

In the above sentence, as was shown for generic statements in Chapter I, the inflectional specification 'generic' of V characterizes the rest of the structure as generic; the attached \(\overline{V-V}\) configuration restricts 'men' to a particular subset of 'men', namely, 'those who work hard'. 'Generic', as was shown in Chapter II, triggers postsemantic processes: 'generic' is replaced by \(\emptyset\) in state V's, by 'actual durative' in nonstate V's; in N's, plural generic is replaced by \([\text{plural}\]
\[\text{demonstrative}\]
\[\text{proximate to hearer}\] \). The cited sentence has a corresponding nonplural version:

(3.2.3.1.3.1a) mikukuálta ya # inŋ tāuŋ mágóbraŋ masalése
The man [who] works well grows rich
where the subject $N$ is \[\text{generic aggregate}\]. The last example has a preferred variant in which $V$, instead of 'actual durative', is unmarked (-actual):

\[
(3.2.3.1.3.1a') \text{ mikuálta ya } \# \text{ iŋ tāuŋ mágóbraŋ masalése}
\]

The man [who] works well will grow rich

\[
3.2.3.2. \text{ NonRestrictive Clauses. Consider the following sentence:}
\]

\[
(3.2.3.2.1) \text{ mámanaŋ yaŋ maŋaŋ maslám } \# \text{ iŋ anák}
\]

The child is eating [a] mango [which] is sour

where the semantic configuration is

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{patient} & \text{agent} \\
V & N & N \\
1 & \text{process} & \text{action} \\
eat & \text{mango} & \text{state} \\
2 & \text{child} & \text{sour}
\end{array}
\]

The patient $N$ is -definite or unmarked. The state $V$ 'sour' specifies the patient $N$ further but is really nonessential to the patient $N$; it does not serve to identify $\text{mango}$ as a particular mango.

Consider now the sentence:
Big Pedro arrived

In the above sentence, the agent N is unique (and redundantly definite); it needs no further specification for identification. Presuming that the interlocutors know Pedro, the predication 'big' is redundant since it is known that Pedro is big (among his circle of acquaintances). What seems to obtain is that there is an optional selectional specification 'big' which is implied by Pedro and that this selectional specification may be highlighted by being copied as a separate V attached to N (in other words, a kind of relative clause). Thus, the agent N may be characterized as

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{N} \\
\text{count} \\
\text{potent} \\
\text{animate} \\
\text{human} \\
\text{unique} \\
\text{(big+selectivizer)} \\
\text{Pedro} \\
\text{definite}
\end{array}
\]

The selectional unit 'big+selectivizer', a derived unit from the inherent verb root 'big' is a redundant specifier of Pedro. Its occurrence in the matrix is the context for a replacement process highlighting 'big', so that the output of this replacement process yields the following semantic structure:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{PEDRÓ} \\
\text{state} \\
\text{big}
\end{array}
\]
The lone N plays a dual role: it is an agent in relation to V and a patient in relation to V. Note that the perpendicular line to the right of Pedro extends to 'definite'; to this line is attached V, an indication that V further specifies an already fully specified definitized N matrix. The configuration calls for no additional semantic processes which have not already been discussed.

Some clauses which have been described in the traditional grammar handbooks as 'nonrestrictive' are better described as parenthetical. For example, the following sentences seem to be genuine variants:

John, who arrived yesterday, ate here
John (John arrived yesterday) ate here
John (he arrived yesterday) ate here
John--John arrived yesterday--ate here
John--he arrived yesterday--ate here

To express similar sentences in Pampangan, one would say:

(3.2.3.3) méñan ya # kéri ## i Pédruñ dínatáŋ nápun

The above sentence is unnatural, however. It would be preferable to express the above sentence as two separate sentences or to topicalize Pédru, utter the attached configuration parenthetically, and then say the rest of
the sentence:

(3.2.3.3') méñan ya # keni # i Pé'dru ##
dínatʻaŋ ya # nápun (# i Pé'dru)
Pedro ate here
He arrived yesterday

(3.2.3.3'') i Pé'dru ## dínatʻaŋ ya # nápun ##
méñan ya # keni
As for Pedro--he came yesterday--he ate here

In any case, the clause 'he came here yesterday' is clearly peripheral to the rest of the sentence. In fact, a case can be made for considering both clauses 'John ate here' and 'John came here yesterday' as of equal rank, connected by a common agent N (the configuration below does not include the adverbs of time and of place, which would complicate the structure unduly):

```
  / \      /     \    
  |   agent  |   V   |
  V N      V
  1 2
  action  action

  eat Pedro  arrive
  definite
```
3.2.3.3. Deletion of Root in N's with Relative Clauses.
In section 3.2.3.1.1, examples were given of surface \( \overline{N} N \) configurations in which the root of the first \( N \) was deleted, leaving only the determiner and the second \( N \). In general, for all \( N \)'s with an attached relative clause, it seems possible to perform a similar deletion, leaving only the determiner and the attached \( \overline{V} N \) configuration. This seems to apply to both restrictive and nonrestrictive clauses. Moreover, it is likewise possible to generate \( N \)'s with attached relative clauses which are not lexically specified, if the referent of the lexical root is obvious from the nonlinguistic context. The contexts for deletion is, of course, that already mentioned, namely, the specification -new. The outputs of either root deletion or nonlexical specification in such structures give rise to descriptive appellations.

(3.2.3.3.1) atí yu # iŋ tåuŋ dínatáŋ
The man [who] arrived is present

(3.2.3.3.1a) atí yu iŋ dínatáŋ
The [one who] arrived is present

(3.2.3.3.2) mikuálta ya # iŋ tåuŋ mágóbraŋ masalése
The man [who] works well will grow rich

(3.2.3.3.2a) mikuálta ya # iŋ mágóbraŋ masalése
The [one who] works well will grow rich

(3.2.3.3.3) mámaŋán yaŋ maŋgáŋ maslám # i Pédrú
Pedro is eating [a] mango [which] is sour

(3.2.3.3.3a) mámaŋán yaŋ maslám # i Pédrú
Pedro is eating [something which] is sour
(3.2.3.3.4) dínatáŋ ya # i Pédrug maragúl
Big Pedro arrived
(3.2.3.3.4a) dínatáŋ ya # i maragúl
Big [One] arrived

3.2.4. Summary. By way of summary, semantic rules (and relevant postsemantic rules) will be formulated to generate the structures discussed in section 3.2.

(S )

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
& V & V & V \\
1 & \text{root} & \text{state} & \text{root} \\
\end{array}
\]

(S )

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
& V & V \\
1 & \text{process} & \text{state} & \\
\end{array}
\]

(S )

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
& V & V \\
1 & \text{completable} & \text{completable} & \\
\end{array}
\]

(S )

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
& V + \text{NOM} & V & V \\
2 & \text{root} & \text{rel} & \text{rel} \\
\end{array}
\]

The preceding rule triggers a postsemantic process:

(T )

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
& \text{rel} & \text{N} \\
2 & \text{root} & \text{root+nominalizer} & \text{definite} \\
\end{array}
\]
(S ) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{rel} \\
N \\
-\text{unique} \\
\rightarrow \text{root} \\
(\text{definite}) \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{rel} \\
N \\
-\text{unique} \\
\rightarrow \text{root} \\
(\text{definite}) \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{rel} \\
N \\
-\text{unique} \\
\rightarrow \text{root} \\
(\text{definite}) \\
\]

\[
(N \text{ may be definite or } -\text{definite; it is always definite for restrictive clauses; if it is } -\text{definite, one type of nonrestrictive clause is generated.})
\]

(T ) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{rel} \\
N \\
\text{unique} \\
\rightarrow \text{verb root+selectivizer} \\
\rightarrow \text{root} \\
\rightarrow \text{definite} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{rel} \\
N \\
\text{unique} \\
\rightarrow \text{verb root} \\
\rightarrow \text{root} \\
\rightarrow \text{definite} \\
\end{array}
\]
3.3. Illustration. By way of summarizing the whole chapter and to illustrate the different structures discussed in this chapter in the context of a larger structure, the following (admittedly contrived) sentence will be semantically analyzed and postsemantic processes for its surface structure derivation suggested:

(3.3.1.) másakít ya mán*# é ya man másakít # i Maryá ## bísa yaq makiyábe # kų́ n pámpapgpištá da diŋ ának # kę́ n búlan a dáratáŋ

Whether Maria is sick or Maris is not sick, she wants to join the festivities of the children in the month [which] is coming=

Whether or not Maria is sick, she wishes to join the children's festivities next month

(másakít 'sick (lit. sickness+plenitivizer)', man...é man 'whether or not', bísa? 'in a state of wanting', makiyábe 'join (lit. companion+associativizer)', pámpapgpištá 'festivities (lit. fiesta+reciprocativizer+nominalizer)', ának 'children', búlan 'month (lit. moon), dátaŋ 'come, arrive').

The semantic structure of the above sentence may be represented thus (specifications not relevant to the discussions of this chapter will not be included in the representation):
Basically, the sentence is a conjunction between a disjunctive statement and an ordinary statement. The conjunction is factual and not overtly marked. There is a presupposition that if Maria is sick, she is not expected to want to join the festivities; the sentence asserts the contrary: she does want to join. The linker for the disjunction is mans...man, loosely translatable as 'whether...or'. The second major clause consists of an experiential V which demands an experiencer N and a patient N, the latter the object of experience. Now the patient is an embedded V-N configuration which consists of an associative action verb (V₄) which in turn demands an accompanying agent N and an associate N. The associate N happens to be an abstract noun (an action root nominalization) accompanied by an agent N. Of this nominalization is predicated a temporal state verb (V₆). The temporal state V is not lexically specified but is accompanied (in addition to the patient) a time N which in turn has an attached relative clause (V₇). To speak of 'month' as 'coming' is undoubtedly to speak metaphorically.
After the initial occurrence of *Maria (N*) 1a, all further occurrences of it are -new. By a convention, it will be postulated that postsemantic processes apply to the lowest V configuration. The postsemantic processes will then be applicable cyclically. There will thus be a total of seven cycles corresponding to the seven V's. The processes necessary for each cycle will be described informally.

**Cycle 1**  
Incorporation of V to the N branch

**Cycle 2**  
Specification of N as OBLIQUE
Deletion of V

**Cycle 3**  
Replacement of V +NOM by Nominal
Specification of resulting Nominal as OBLIQUE
Incorporation of specifications of -SUBJECT and -OBLIQUE N into Nominal

**Cycle 4**  
Deletion of N

**Cycle 5**  
SUBJECT specification of N
Incorporation of specifications of N into V
Incorporation of patient subconfiguration into V
Deletion of N

**Cycle 6**  
SUBJECT specification of N
Incorporation of specifications of N into V
Deletion of N

Cycle 7

SUBJECT specification of N

Incorporation of specifications of N into V

Linearizations (Major and Minor, including the postponing
of undeleted N to the right of V).

The resulting surface structure is:
whether negative N' or V definite 1
plenitivizer sickness SUBJECT

ma + sakít ya man ↑# é ya man ma + sakít # i Maryá ##

want associativizer companion OBLIQUE nominalizer reciprocativizer fiesta -OBLIQUE SUBJECT plural child plural
bísa? ya+y maki + ábay # kiŋ pá + mipag + pistá da # diŋ ának #

Phonetic representation
#

másakít ya mán ↑# é ya man másakít # i Maryá ## bísa yaŋ makiyábe # kiŋ pámipagpístá da (#) diŋ ának #

kiŋ búlan a dáratán #
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4.0. Introduction: Theoretical Framework. The by-
now traditional frame of reference proposed by Communication
Theory will be taken as a starting point for the discussion
of topics in this chapter.

Every communication event, every instance of a speech
act, presupposes a Speaker (Voice) and a Hearer (Addressee)
and a Message. The whole area of reality, of which Speaker
and Hearer form a part, is codable; the actual message,
however, expresses only what has been actually coded.

```
codable
  coded
SPEAKER                  MESSAGE                  HEARER
  coded
```

What is coded, of course, concerns language directly; it is
the structure on the content side of the code which consti-
tutes the subject matter of this study, that is, the content
side of a particular code.

It seems, however, that one cannot discuss the area
of the message or of what is coded, without taking into
account the adjacent area of the codable. In other words,
it seems that there is an area of the codable which is
directly relevant to the actual coded message although it
may not be actually included in the message. This area,
for the purposes of this study, I shall call 'presemantic'
to distinguish it from the area of the 'semantic' (the subject matter of Chapters I and III) and the area of the 'postsemantic' (the subject matter of Chapter II).

On the other hand, the presemantic area is to be distinguished from the Speaker's and Hearer's knowledge of reality—which is too wide for treatment, at least at the present stage of our knowledge.

Thus, the presemantic area is, as it were, midway between the area of the coded message and the area of the Speaker's and Hearer's total knowledge of reality. Although it constitutes part of the area of the codable rather than the coded, what distinguishes it from the Speaker and the Hearer's total knowledge of reality is its immediate relevance to the coded message. The following diagram attempts to represent this distinction thus:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PreSemantic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreSemantic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Knowledge of Reality
```

What will be said in this chapter concerning the presemantic area is, of course, exploratory in character. On the other hand, there are many important aspects and details of Pampangan grammar that do not lend themselves to satisfactory treatment without taking into account what I shall call 'presemantic structures'; hence, the topics in this chapter.
What I shall discuss under 'presemantic structures' constitutes the area of what the Oxford School of Linguistic Philosophy has called 'performatives' and 'illocutionary and perlocutionary verbs' (see Austin 1962 and Searle 1969 for an exposition of the theory and Ross 1968 for an attempt to deal with one type of performative in a transformational generative grammar framework) and of what some of the abstract syntacticists have called the area of 'presuppositions' (see Morgan 1969) and 'hypersentences and superhypersentences' (see Sadock 1969a,b).

This chapter will attempt to deal with similar phenomena insofar as such phenomena find analogues in Pampangan within the frame of reference adopted in this study. What will be essayed, therefore, is a way of treating such phenomena within the theory. That such phenomena have to be accounted for in a grammar is incontrovertible; unless they are treated, the two other important functions of language in addition to what Bühler (1934) calls Darstellungsfunktion (cognitive function), that of Kundgabefunktion (expression function) and that of Appellfunktion (conative function), would not be accounted for. How such phenomena are treated depends, of course, on the orientation of the model being used.

In discussing the presemantic area, the method of explicit paraphrase will be used as a heuristic device. The device has been adopted merely as a convenience, with no psycholinguistic validity claimed for the presemantic.
structures discussed; the claim, however, is that the information represented by these presemantic structures must be cognitively salient to the interlocutors and must be mentally processed in some way.

By treating presemantic structures, codable phenomena immediately relevant to the coded message, as if they were actually coded, rules of the same form as the semantic specification and replacement rules can be formulated. They will be distinguished from semantic rules (S ) and postsemantic rules (T ) by being marked (PS ). The usefulness of this heuristic device will be demonstrated as the discussion proceeds.

The first section of the chapter deals with social markers in speech which have linguistic reflexes; the next two sections discuss presemantic structures relevant to expressive and conative functions of language. The final section summarizes the discussion and shows the relevance of presemantic structure to a small segment of discourse.

4.1. Social Markers.

4.1.1. Respectful. Consider the sentence:

(4.1.1.1)* Ginúŋ Réyes ## dínatáŋ na ya pu? # i Pédru >
Ginúŋ Réyes ## dínatáŋ né pu? # i Pédru
Mr. Reyes, Sir, Pedro has already arrived
(Ginú 'mister (lit. lord)', dátaŋ 'arrive', na 'subitive: already', puʔ 'respect marker'). The above sentence exemplifies the traditional vocative case as well as the use of the sociolinguistic marker puʔ as an indicator of respect. Although puʔ is loosely translated as 'Sir/Mister/Madam', it is not really a title but merely a respect marker attached to the verb. It is used in talking to someone who is superior in age or social rank or to someone who is an equal but with whom one is not on familiar terms (hence, it figures prominently in introductions). The latter use (among social equals) is disappearing in urban areas, where a less formal attitude is prevalent. The marker is carried all through a discourse every time a verb is used, even when one is not addressing the hearer directly but merely reporting to him about a third person, as in the example given. Although puʔ cannot be considered a pronoun, in its explicit indication of respect toward the addressee, it is comparable to the 'ethical dative' of older German and of Modern Basque (where gender distinction is further coded). However, since the ethical dative is usually employed in colloquial rather than formal discourse, the function of puʔ in Pampangan shares features with the function of German Sie and Basque suk.

To treat of such sociolinguistic phenomena and to integrate them within a semantic theory, it seems that the message must be located within what I would call a presemantic configuration consisting of a presemantic verb of action which is further specified as verbal, completable, and
directional (to), involving the Speaker as agent, the Hearer as goal, and the Message (a semantic configuration embedded in the presemantic configuration) as complement. The presemantic verb as well as its accompanying N's (when they are not coded) I shall label 'illocutionary verb and illocutionary nouns', using 'illocutionary' in its etymological meaning of 'not said, not expressed'; merely as a notational convenience, I shall use an asterisk to indicate an illocutionary category: V* and N*. The following presemantic rule will be needed (in a more adequate formulation, several rules developing the configuration in various stages may be necessary):

(P S 1') V*

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{action} \\
\text{verbal} \\
\text{completable} \\
\text{directional} \\
\text{to}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Complement} \\
\text{goal} \\
\text{agent}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
V* \\
\text{action} \\
\text{verbal} \\
\text{completable} \\
\text{directional} \\
\text{to}
\end{array} \]

In the sentence given at the beginning of this section, the Hearer is explicitly coded; once thus coded, goal N* enters the semantic area and must be represented as goal N. It is possible, of course, for the whole presemantic configuration to be explicitly coded, in which case it ceases to be a pre-
semantic configuration but must be represented as a semantic one, as in:

(4.1.1.2) Gínúŋ Réyes ## sasabiyán ku pú? #
kékayú ## dínatán né pu? # i Pédrú
Mr. Reyes, Sir, [it] is being said by me to you: Pedro has already arrived

(sabiyán 'to tell [somebody]', kékayú 'to you (plural)').

Now, V* may be further specified as respectful:

(PS 2') V* ----> respectful

Once thus specified, all accompanying N*'s of V* must likewise be specified as respectful:

(PS 3') rel
   N*  ----> respectful / V*  respectful

It is this specification that sets the 'social tone' of the message and has repercussions on the rest of the presemantic as well as semantic structure:

(S 1 ) v
     root
     --->
     respectful / V*  respectful

(S 2 ) rel
     N
     --->
     respectful / V  respectful
Rule (S1) incorporates 'respectful' into semantic V, in effect characterizing the whole MESSAGE as 'respectful'. In semantic structure, this specification would be an inflectional unit of V eventually linearized and symbolized by pu?. In a discourse, this specification is automatically incorporated into all succeeding V's and is repeated within each verb phrase.

In Pampangan, pu? is the only reflex of 'respectful' in semantic structure, although 'respectful' triggers a postsemantic process which will be described subsequently.

In a language such as Thai, however, with its elaborate court language, and in the 'language of courtesy' of Samoa, the specification 'respectful' (there may be several degrees) determines the symbolization or a particular noun or verb root; in such cases, it seems that 'respectful' is not postsemantically deletable but is carried into surface structure determining the symbolization of a particular root:

\[
\text{(Sy ) } \quad \begin{array}{c} N \\ \text{root} \\ \text{respectful} \end{array} \rightarrow YYY
\]

The unit 'respectful' in such cases does not determine lexical choice—it is the same lexical root which is specified—only the symbolization differs because of the 'respectful' incorporation.

In Javanese, the semantic unit 'respectful' must be carried over into the expression side of language and constitutes one of the labels in a labeled bracketing, a context for the application of certain phonological rules.
In Pampangan, if the goal \( N^* \) specified as respectful is coded, a postsemantic process adding the semantic unit 'plural' is obligatory; moreover, if 'second person' specifies any of the accompanying semantic \( N \)'s in the \( V \) configuration, the unit 'plural' must likewise be added to the \( N \) matrix.

\[
\begin{array}{*{20}c}
(T & ) & N \\
\text{second person} & \rightarrow & \text{plural / respectful}
\end{array}
\]

A similar postsemantic process is quite common in many languages of the world. One instance that readily comes to mind is the use of \textit{vous} in French. In Malay, it seems that 'respectful' is not deleted but together with 'second person' dictates the particular symbolization that 'you' will take, so that what obtains is a symbolization rule such as:

\[
\begin{array}{*{20}c}
(Sy & ) & N \\
\text{second person} & \rightarrow & \text{XXX}
\end{array}
\]

An alternative effect of 'respectful' in Malay is the literalization of \( \begin{bmatrix} N \\ \text{second person} \\ \text{respectful} \end{bmatrix} \) by a title such as 'Lord' or 'Master'.

The specification of the agent \( N^* \) (the Speaker) as respectful triggers no special postsemantic processes in Pampangan if \( N^* \) is coded. However, in Malay, and doubtless
in many languages of the world where 'respectful' plays a more prominent role, the specification 'respectful' affects the symbolization of 'I' or triggers a literalization process whereby \[ N \]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{first person} \\
\text{respectful}
\end{array}
\]
is literalized by a third person epithet such as 'Your servant'.

In Pampangan, there is another way of marking 'respectful' with regard to a goal \( N \) which is specified as second person and respectful which finds a parallel in other languages. Thus, it is not uncommon to be asked by a waiter:

\[(4.1.1.3) \text{bísa na la púŋ mañán # di Ginúŋ Réyes} \]
Do Mr. Reyes and [his] companions wish to eat now= Mr. Reyes, Sir, do you wish to eat now?

where \[ N \]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{second person} \\
\text{respectful}
\end{array}
\]
is literalized as \[ N \]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{name+title} \\
\text{associative} \\
\text{plural}
\end{array}
\].

Again, this method of signaling respect is not uncommon. In a French restaurant, a waiter would ask, 'Is Monsieur ready to eat now?' What makes the Pampangan sentence interesting is its redundant marking: the literalization whereby second person is expressed by a name; the marking of the name as associative plural; the incorporation of 'respectful' in \( V \), symbolized as \( pu^n \).
4.1.2. Familiar. Consider the following sentences:

(4.1.2.1) Pedro↑ ♯ muntá ku ♯ kéni ♯ búkas
Pedro, I am coming here tomorrow

(4.1.2.2) Máŋ Pédro↑ ♯ muntá ku pú? ♯ kéni ♯ búkas
Mr. Pedro, Sir, I am coming here tomorrow

(4.1.2.3) Ábe ♯ muntá katá ♯ kéni ♯ búkas
Friend, you and I are coming here tomorrow=
Friend, I am coming here tomorrow

The first sentence is unmarked for 'respectful' or 'familiar'. The second sentence is specified as 'respectful': máŋ is a title used for an elder male. The third sentence is specified as 'familiar': * ábay is a title for 'friend'; literally, it means 'companion'. What makes the third sentence different from the first one is the further specification of 'first person' by 'second person', rendering the agent N 'inclusive'. Thus, 'familiar' triggers a postsemantic process adding 'second person' to the agent N matrix, a kind of 'conspiratorial we' definitely indicating to the Hearer that one considers him a friend. The relevant rules are:

\[(\text{PS 4}^\prime) \quad \text{v*} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{familiar} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{respectful}\]

In turn, there will be need of a semantic rule:

\[(\text{S 3} \quad \text{v}_{\text{root}} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{familiar / v*}} \quad \text{familiar}\]
Then, there will be need for a postsemantic rule:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
(T ) \quad N \\
\text{first person} \quad \xrightarrow{V} \quad \text{second person / familiar}
\end{array}
\]

4.2. Expressive Functions. An illocutionary verb (V\*) specified as action, verbal, completable, directional (to), has been postulated as generating a presematic structure in which is embedded a semantic structure. Such a V\*, besides being optionally specifiable as 'respectful' or 'familiar', may likewise be specified as either 'expressive' or 'conative', using these terms in their traditional sense, on the one hand, 'indicating the speaker's attitude towards a proposition', on the other hand, 'indicating the speaker's intention to induce some kind of response from the hearer'. When V\* is either expressive or conative, it generates a complement (N\*) in which is embedded another presematic verb (to be noted as V***) which in turn is accompanied by its own complement (N**), a semantic configuration.

4.2.1. V**

: Apparentive, Informative, Questive, state

experiential Superprehensives. Consider the following sentences:

\[(4.2.1.1)*\] ma+lagú? ya áta? # iŋ dalága >

malagú yáta? # iŋ dalága
It seems to me that the young woman is pretty

(4.2.1.2) malagú ya palá # in dalága

I am now informed that the young woman is pretty. So the young woman is pretty

(4.2.1.3) malagú ya kayá? # in dalága

I wonder if the young woman is pretty

(4.2.1.4) malagú ya # in dalága ↑k

It surprises me to be informed that the young woman is pretty

(where ↑k is an ad hoc notation indicating not only marked breath-group but the appropriate kinesic gestures of surprise).

The sentences cited presuppose an experiencer (the Speaker) indicating his reaction to some stimulus (semantically, a \( \sqrt{V/N} \) configuration referring to some state or event). A presemantic verb, \( V^\ast \), embedded in the complement (\( N^* \)) of \( V^\ast \), an experiential state \( V^\ast \) further specified as apperceived, informative, or questive, must then be posited. If specified as informative, it may be further specified as superprehensive. The configuration may be represented thus:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\sqrt{V/N} \\
\text{state} \\
\text{experiential}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{patient} \\
\text{experimenter}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{N}^* \\
\text{N}^*
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Speaker}
\end{array}
\]

The following rules may be formulated:
(PS 5')

V*

action

verbal

descriptive

completable

/--------------------------/ complement

V*  

N*

action

verbal

descriptive

completable
(PS 6') \( V^* \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{state} \\
(PS 7') \quad V^* \\
\quad \text{state} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{experiential} \\
(PS 8') \quad V^* \\
\quad \text{experiential} \quad \rightarrow \quad \{ \text{apparentive} \} \\
\text{informative} \\
\text{questive} \\
(PS 9') \quad V^* \\
\quad \text{informative} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{superprehensive} \\

The semantic rules would have to postulate that the above specifications are incorporated into semantic \( V \) and eventually linearized within \( V \), except for 'superprehensive', which is postposed. The symbolization of 'apparentive' is \( \aleph \), of 'informative' is \( \text{palá} \), of 'questive' is \( \text{kayá} \), and of 'superprehensive' is \( \uparrow_k \).

4.2.2. \( V^* \) . \( V^* \), instead of being specified as action
state, may be specified as action; action may then be further specified as either psychological or verbal. If specified as psychological, it may be either ratiocinative or velleitative. Under ratiocinative is inferential specification; under velleitative, purposive and optative.

4.2.2.1. \( V^* \) : Ratiocinative and Velleitative.
action
psychological

4.2.2.1.1. Ratiocinative: Inferential. Consider the sentence:
(4.2.2.1.1.1) nuŋ makaniyán "dínatág ya # i Pédro
If such [is the case], [then I infer
that] Pedro arrived

(nuŋ 'if', makaniyán 'such is the case (a prosentence
referring to a previous $V \, N$ configuration), dátan 'arrive').
The unit 'inferential' is incorporated into semantic $V$ but
is postsemantically deleted. Hence, it receives no symbolization.

4.2.2.1.2. Velleitive: Purposive and Optative.
Consider the sentence:

(4.2.2.1.2.1) muntá ku sána # (kiŋ) Ménila'
I purposed to go to Manila (but...)

where the unit 'purposive' must be incorporated into semantic
$V$ and postsemantically linearized and symbolized by sána~sáŋ.
It presupposes that the intention was never realized because
of some state or event that prevented the accomplishing of
the action.

Instead of aiming to do something, one may opt for a
state or situation, in other words, wish for it, as in:

(4.2.2.1.2.2) doktór ku sána
I wish I were a doctor
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where the unit 'optative' is symbolized by $\text{sán}a \sim \text{sá}?$, homophonous with the symbolization for 'purposive'. It is possible to wish for an event or situation contrary to fact (traditional subjunctive), as in:

\[(4.2.2.1.2.3) \text{ nunj doktór ku sána} \]

If only I were a doctor (but I am not a doctor)

where the unit 'subjunctive' or 'contrary to fact' is an inflectional specification of semantic V. 'Subjunctive' is postsemantically linearized by being preposed and symbolized by nunj 'if', while 'optative' is postposed and symbolized by $\text{sán}a \sim \text{sá}?$.

The relevant presemantic rules for section 4.2.2.1 are:

\[(\text{PS } 10') \quad \text{V}^{**} \rightarrow \text{action} \]

\[(\text{PS } 11') \quad \text{V}^{**} \rightarrow \text{psychological action} \]

\[(\text{PS } 12') \quad \text{psychological} \rightarrow \{ \text{ratiocinative} \} \]

\[(\text{PS } 13') \quad \text{ratiocinative} \rightarrow \text{inferential} \]

\[(\text{PS } 14') \quad \text{velleitve} \rightarrow \{ \text{purposive} \} \]
4.2.2.2. V** : Exclamative, Concursive, Demurrant.

action
verbal

Instead of being specified as 'psychological', V** may be
specified as 'verbal'. A verbal V** may be further specified
as 'exclamative', 'concursive', and 'demurrant'.

Consider the sentence:

(4.2.2.2.1) kasantín na niŋ anák↑

How pretty the child is!

where the presemantic unit 'exclamative' has been incor-
porated into the state V masantín 'pretty'. Postsemantically,
the unit 'exclamative' blocks subjectivization. In symbolization,
it calls for a marked breath-group (↑) and shifts m to k:
masantín > kasantín. Peculiar properties of particular lexical
items would have to be stated in symbolization rules; for
example, 'exclamative' is sometimes symbolized by ka---an
and :

(4.2.2.2.2) kayanakán na niŋ babáye↑

How young the woman is!

The rising intonation is the phonological context for the i
to e shift: babáyí > babáye. Besides blocking subjectivization,
'exclamative' is likewise incompatible with 'negative'. Moreover,
'exclamative' occurs only with state V's.
Instead of 'exclamative', V** may be specified as 'concursive':

\[(4.2.2.2.3)\]  ma+santīŋ ya pin # iŋ anák>
\[\text{masantīŋ yá pin } # \ iŋ \ anák}\]
I concur: The child is pretty

where \text{pin} symbolizes agreement or concurrence with a previous statement.

On the other hand, instead of concurring, one may demur (in Pampangan, this demur is a mild one; another V root would be necessary for explicit disagreement):\n
\[(4.2.2.2.4)\]  ma+santīŋ na ya man # iŋ anák>
\[\text{masantīŋ né man } # \ iŋ \ anák}\]
I beg to differ: The child is pretty

The symbolization for 'demurrant' is \text{na...man} (\text{na} is not to be confused with the copier \text{na} nor with 'subitive' \text{na} nor with the semantically vacuous \text{na} used in V's specified as perseverative) and is linearized by having the subject copier interposed between its discontinuous morphs. If there are two copiers, both copiers are interposed between \text{na} and \text{man}:
(4.2.2.2.5)* b+in+i'yá na na ya man niŋ anák # iŋ librú >
 biniyé na né man niŋ anák # iŋ librú
 I beg to differ: The book was given by
 the child

It is interesting to note that 'exclamative' and 'concursive'
may occur together:

(4.2.2.2.6)* ka+santíŋ na pin niŋ anák↑
 kasantíŋ ná pin niŋ anák↑
 I concur: How pretty the child is!

presupposing that someone else has previous remarked, 'How
pretty the child is!' Moreover, 'concursive' may not occur
with 'demurrant' with regard to the same statement, but
one may concur with somebody else's demur:

(4.2.2.2.7)* ma+santíŋ na ya man pin # iŋ anák>
 masantíŋ né man pin # iŋ anák
 I concur with X's demur: The child is
 pretty

Again, it is possible for 'demurrant' and 'exclamative' to
occur together:

(4.2.2.2.8) kasantíŋ na na mán niŋ anák↑
 I beg to differ: How pretty the child is!
The preceding sentence presupposes that a comment such as 'The child is ugly' has been made; one disagrees with the comment and on the contrary adds a new comment to the effect that not only is the child not ugly but that the child is actually pretty. Finally, it is possible to have all three specifications together:

\[(4.2.2.2.9) \text{ kasantįŋ na na mán pin niŋ anáŋ} \]

I concur [with someone's demur and contrary comment]: On the contrary, how pretty the child is!

The specifications described play a very important role in discourse, since they link an utterance with previous utterances in the discourse, utterances which may be several sentences removed from a present one being said. The following pre-semantic rules may be formulated:

\[(PS\ 15') v^{**}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{action} \\
\text{-psychological}
\end{array} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{verbal}
\]

\[(PS\ 16') v^{**}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{verbal} \\
\end{array} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} 
\text{exclamative} \\
\text{concursive} \\
\text{demurrant}
\end{cases}
\]

The specifications must be incorporated into semantic V and eventually linearized and symbolized within the verb phrase.
4.3. Conative Functions.

4.3.1. \( v^* \): Imperative and Precative. An conative

action \( v^* \), instead of being specified as expressive,
may be specified as conative, insofar as the Speaker seeks
to induce a response on the part of the Hearer. The
specification 'conative' denotes commands of all kinds, including
answer questions.
commands to . In turn, 'conative' may be further
specified as 'precative' or 'requestive' and hence,
a request would be considered more marked than a command.

4.3.1.1. Commands. Consider the sentence:

\[(4.3.1.1)\]  muntá ka # kéni

Come here
You will come here

As the glosses indicate, the sentence is ambiguous. In both
instances, \( V \) is aspectually -actual. There is thus no overt
linguistic marking for 'conative'. If \( V \) is negative, an
interesting aspectual shift obtains:

\[(4.3.1.1a)\]  é ka púpuntá # kéni

Do not come here
You are not coming here

There is thus need to posit a postsemantic rule:
(T )  
\[ V \] 
-\text{state}  
\[ V \]  
-\text{state}  
\[ \text{root} \rightarrow \text{root} / V^* \]  
\[ \text{actual} / V^* \]  
\[ \text{negative} \]  
\[ \text{negative} \]  

Of course, a prior semantic rule for commands would need to be posited:

\[(S^{4}) V \]  
\[ \text{root} \rightarrow \text{actual} / V^* \]  
\[ \text{conative} \]

4.3.1.2. Requests. \( V^* \) may be further specified as 'precative':

\[(4.3.1.2.1) \text{ muntá na ka mó } # \text{ kéne} \]  
Kindly come here

where 'precative', incorporated as an inflectional unit into \( V \), is linearized in \( V \) and symbolized by the discontinuous morphs \( na...mó \) and a marked breath-group terminal marker (\( \uparrow \)). A negative request likewise triggers an aspectual shift:

\[(4.3.1.2.1a) \text{ é na ka mó púpunta } # \text{ kéne} \]  
Kindly do not come here

Another way of expressing a request is to literalize it as a wish:
(4.3.1.2.2) muntá ka sána # kēni
I wish you would come here=
Kindly come here

With the use of idioms such as the above, perhaps 'preadeative'
can be specified further for various degrees of precation.
With certain verb roots, there is a redundant preadeative marker paki-:

(4.3.1.2.3)* paki+súlat mu na ya mó # ini $> $
pakisúlat mu né mo # ini $>
This will be included among those things
you are writing, kindly= Please write this

It should be noted in the above sentence that the discontinuous
preadeative morph does not enclose the copiers but is interposed
between the two copiers:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N'</th>
<th>precative</th>
<th>N'</th>
<th>precative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>second person</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
-SUBJECT
-OBLIQUE

mu na ya mó
```

Without preadeative specification, one would have:

(4.3.1.2.3a) pakisúlat me # ini
This is to be included by you among those
items which you are writing
where the subject is an associate N (-animate) and the verb root has the derivational unit associativizer ( * maki→ paki- because of the associate subject). It is possible to express (4.3.1.2.3) without paki-:

(4.3.1.2.3') isúlat mu né mo # iné↑

Kindly write this

The addition of paki- seems to strengthen the notion of precation: one is requesting the hearer to do something but only because he is doing other similar things to which this task can be added. It seems that paki- is best treated as the literalization of 'precative' specified further as 'not wishing to impose'. The following presemantic rules may be formulated:

(PS 17') \( \overset{\text{conative}}{\text{V}} \) ----→ conative action -expressive

(PS 18') \( \overset{\text{precative}}{\text{V}} \) ----→ conative

'Precative' is incorporated into semantic V and is linearized and symbolized by na...mo' and ↑.

4.3.2. \( \overset{\text{V}}{\text{V}} \). In the preceding section on conative action verbal action V*, it was proposed that in every command or request, a V* must be postulated in presemantic structure, a V* which is accompanied by an agent N*, the Speaker, a goal
N*, the Hearer, and a complement N*, under which is embedded the MESSAGE, with its semantic structure, what is to be done. Now, where V* is conative, the embedded semantic V is an action, a task to be performed, and the agent N is always 'second person', which is of course coreferential with the Hearer. The configuration may be represented thus:

```
  ┌─┐   ┌─┐   ┌─┐
  V* ─── N* ─── goal ─── agent
  action    agent    l
  verbal V    N    Hearer    Speaker
  conative action    l
  (precative) second person
```

It is possible, however, for the verb embedded in complement N* to be likewise an illocutionary V instead of a semantic V. Such an embedded illocutionary V will be noted as V**; like any illocutionary verb, V** must be accompanied by a complement N** which in turn may dominate an embedded semantic V. The following example will clarify this:

```
(4.3.2.1) lótsen  ## dátaŋ ya#' i Pédr

Believe me, Pedro is coming
```

where lótsen is a formative (of unknown etymology at present) loosely translatable as 'believe me'; the unit may therefore be labeled 'fiduciative'. The above sentence is an instance of the following situation: The Speaker is asking (V* is therefore conative) the Hearer to do something (complement
N*) and this something, as with other conative V* 's, is an action, an action which is psychological, the action of believing. In turn, the embedded verb implies an agent (the Hearer) and a beneficiary (the Speaker) as well as a complement, the MESSAGE itself, namely, that Pedro is coming. Now it seems that the fiduciative verb is an illocutionary verb, hence V**--the only indicator is an unanalyzable formative which actually stands for the whole V** configuration (with its accompanying N** 's) except for the message itself, which is coded. The configuration may be represented thus:

```
  V*
  |    complement
  |    N*
  |    goal
  |    agent
  |    N*
  |    agent
  |    N*
  |    Speaker
  |    Hearer

  verbal
  conative
  completable
  psychological
  directional
  fiduciative
  completable
  benefactive

  complement
  N**

  V
  N
  action

  come
  Pedro
```
4.3.2.1. $V^*$ : Fiduciative, Pretensive, action psychological

Suppositive. Consider the following sentences:

(4.3.2.1.1) $\text{lótsêŋ} \ # \text{malagú ya # iŋ dalága} \sim$
$\text{malagú ya # iŋ dalága} \ # \text{lótsêŋ}$
Believe me, the young woman is pretty

(4.3.2.1.2) $\text{nunŋ wáři}? \ # \text{malagú ya # iŋ dalága} \sim$
$\text{malagú ya # iŋ dalága} \ # \text{nunŋ wáři}?$
Let us pretend that the young woman is pretty

(4.3.2.1.3) $\text{malagú ya mó # iŋ dalága}$
Let us suppose that the young woman is pretty

It seems best to treat $\text{lótsêŋ}\sim\text{lótsin}$ as a direct symbolization of $V^*$ while $\text{nunŋ wáři}$? ($\text{nunŋ}$ is likewise used to action psychological fiduciative symbolize 'if') is a direct symbolization of $V^*$ action psychological pretensive

In the case of 'suppositive', it seems that $V^*$ is not symbolized directly but that the unit 'suppositive' is incorporated into semantic $V$ and is eventually linearized and symbolized as $\text{mó}$, a particle within the verb phrase.
The following presemantic rules may be formulated:

(PS 19') \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{y*} \\
\text{action} \\
\text{verbal} \\
\text{conative} \\
\text{completatable}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{y*} & \text{complement} & \text{N*} \\
\text{action} & \text{verbal} & \text{v**} \\
\text{completatable}
\end{array}
\]

(PS 20') \[
\begin{array}{c}
v** \\
\text{action}
\end{array}
\]

(PS 21') \[
\begin{array}{c}
v** \\
\text{psychological}
\end{array} \quad \text{\{fiduciative\}}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{psychological} \quad \text{\{pretensive\}}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{suppositive}
\end{array}
\]

4.3.2.2. \[
\begin{array}{c}
v** \\
\text{action} \\
\text{verbal}
\end{array}
\]

Instead of psychological, action v**

may be specified as verbal. Under this type will be treated

different kinds of questions.

4.3.2.2.1. Interrogative. Consider the correlative

sentences:
(4.3.2.2.1.1) nánánú ya # i Pédru

púpútut yaŋ dátuŋ (# i Pédru)

x

Pedro is whatting= What is Pedro doing?
He is cutting wood

The congruence between the query and the response is striking and shows clearly the structure of content questions. In the query, the analysis of the verb is (A) while in the response, the analysis of the verb is (B):

(A) V
process
action
(no root)
actual
durative
agent subject

(B) V
process
action
cut
actual
durative
agent subject

In other words, the response merely lexically specifies the root that was missing in the query. The presemantic structure of the query is more complicated, however, as the configurations following show. Semantically, 'interrogative', a specification of \( V^{**} \), is paraphrasable as 'You tell me by filling in the blank'; the unit is eventually incorporated into semantic \( V \), which thus becomes \( V \) with its other specifications interrogative

and is eventually symbolized by nánánú. As the second configuration which follows shows, the response is much simpler since the semantic structure \( \sqrt{V} N \) is directly dominated by complement \( N^* \) without an intervening \( V^{**} \):
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It is perhaps redundant to remark that in the response, V in the instance given is new whereas the subject is -new and hence is usually deleted, unless there is a special reason for not deleting it (for example, emphasis).

The symbolization of the different types of V
interrogative may be exemplified thus:

(4.3.2.2.1.2) mananánu ya # i Pédru
  mamamaté ya (# i Pédru)
  x
  Pedro is being whatted=
  What is happening to Pedro?
  He is dying

(4.3.2.2.1.3) makanánu ya # i Pédru
  másakít ya (# i Pédru)
  x
  Pedro is like what= How is Pedro?
  He is sick

It is possible for V _______ to be specified for a
interrogative
lexical derivational unit; it seems that only the root need be missing:

\[(4.3.2.1.4) \text{mákanánu ya } \# \text{ i Pédrú} \]
\[\text{mákalákad ya } (# \text{ i Pédrú})\]

Pedro is able to do what= What is Pedro able to do?

He can walk

where \text{abilitativizer} \quad \text{is symbolized by máka-}; the verb in the question is therefore \text{V} \quad \text{interrogative+abilitativizer} \quad \text{1}.

Again, \text{V interrogative} \quad \text{may be specified for other aspects, as in:}

\[(4.3.2.1.5) \text{nÍNánú ya } \# \text{ i Pédrú} \]
\[\text{mÍNútut yaq dútuq } (# \text{ i Pédrú}) \quad x\]

Pedro whatted= What did Pedro do?

He cut wood

\[(4.3.2.1.6) \text{nUMánú ya } \# \text{ i Pédrú} \]
\[\text{pUMútut yaq dútuq } (# \text{ i Pédrú}) \quad x\]

Pedro will what= What will Pedro do?

He will cut wood

\[(4.3.2.1.7) \text{KAnánunánú na pá muŋ } \text{Pédrú} \]
\[\text{KApútuptútut na pá muŋ dútuq } (\text{Pédrú}) \quad x\]

Pedro has just now whatted= What has Pedro just now done?

He has just now cut wood
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It is possible for \( V \), like any \( V \), to be specified \textit{interrogative} postsemantically for a subject other than agent or patient. Only two examples will be cited to illustrate:

\begin{align*}
(4.2.3.3.1.8) & \text{nanánAN} \quad \text{neŋ \ Pédru} \quad \# \ iŋ \ důtůŋ} \\
& \quad \text{putútAN} \quad \text{neŋ \ Pédru} \quad \# \ iŋ \ důtůŋ} \\
& \quad \times \quad \text{The wood is being whatted by Pedro=} \\
& \quad \text{What is Pedro doing to the wood?} \\
& \quad \text{It is being cut by Pedro} \\
(4.2.3.3.1.9) & \text{IPAŋ+nánu} \quad \text{na ya naŋ \ Pédru} \quad \# \ iŋ \ \text{tabák >} \\
& \quad \text{páŋnánu} \quad \text{neŋ} \quad \text{Pédru} \quad \# \ iŋ \ \text{tabák} \\
& \quad \times \quad \text{The knife is being whatted with by Pedro=} \\
& \quad \text{What is Pedro doing with the knife?} \\
& \quad \text{It is being used to cut with by Pedro}
\end{align*}

4.3.2.2.2. \( V \). A state \( V \) may be further \textit{numerical} \textit{interrogative} specified as quantitative and numerical and instead of being lexically specified, incorporate 'interrogative' from \( V** \) \textit{interrogative}

\begin{align*}
(4.3.2.2.2.1) & \text{piľán} \quad \text{la} \quad \# \ \text{diŋ ának} \\
& \quad \text{aduá} \quad \text{la} \quad \# \ \text{diŋ ának}
\end{align*}
The children are how many =
How many children are there?
They are two [in number]

A numerical quantitative state V may be further specified as ordinal:

\[ (4.3.2.2.2) \] ikapilán ya # iŋ anák
ikaduá ya (# iŋ anák)
\[ x \]
The child is what rank = What is the rank of the child?
He is second [in rank]

Instead of ordinal, V may be specified as grouped:

\[ (4.3.2.2.3) \] tiyápilán pilán la # diŋ ánák
makanánu la # diŋ ánák
tiduátiduá la (# diŋ ánák)
How are the children = How many children are in each group?
They are in groups of two

The question for a state V specified as numerical and grouped is irregular; following the pattern earlier established, one would expect \[ tiyápilán pilán \] 'lit. in groups of how many + how many'; however, makanánu is used, the same formative for 'how'.
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Instead of ordinal or grouped, a numerical quantitative state $V$ may be specified as instantive:

$$(4.3.2.2.2.4) \text{ makatapilán } \# \text{ in pámaglútu?}$$

$$(4.3.2.2.2.4a) x \text{ makataduá? } (\# \text{ in pámaglútu?})$$

The cooking is how many times=

How many times does one cook?

It is done twice

Problematic are questions such as 'How much?' and 'How much each?' Consider the sentence:

$$(4.3.2.2.2.5) \text{ aduá yaŋ pésus } \# \text{ in librú}$$

The book [costs] two pesos

which may be analyzed as:

```
| measure | state |
-|---------|-------|
| N       | N     |
| V       | V     |
| 1       | 2     |
| state   | state |
| mensurative | quantitative |
| peso | book |
| numerical | two |
```

The verbal nature of numbers in Pampangan has already been discussed in Chapter I. Now, if $V$ is interrogative, one has:

$$(4.3.2.2.2.5a) \text{ pilán yaŋ pésus } \# \text{ in librú}$$

The book [costs] how many pesos?
where pilan symbolizes V 2

state
quantitative
numerical
interrogative

one can likewise ask:

(4.3.2.2.2.6) magkanu ya # inq librú
aduá yaŋ pésus (# inq librú)
How much [does] the book [cost]?
It [costs] two pesos

It seems that magkanu is a symbolization of the configuration

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{measure} \\
V \\
1 \\
\text{state} \\
\text{mensurative} \\
N \\
\text{patient} \\
V \\
2 \\
\text{state} \\
\text{quantitative} \\
\text{numerical}
\end{array}
\]

into which 'interrogative' has been incorporated from V**

interrogative

How to formalize this remains a problem.

librú 'book' may be inflectionally specified as plural and individuated, as in:

(4.3.2.2.2.7) tiyápilán laŋ pésus # diŋ librú
tiyátidua laŋ pésus (# diŋ librú)
The books [cost] how many pesos each?
They [cost] two pesos each
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where tiyátiду́? * tiyá+t+adú? (with syllabic epenthesis)<
* tiyá+adú? is a symbolization of $V^2$ with the
individuated
unit 'individuated' incorporated into the verb from the
patient $N$, librú, and symbolized as an affix. The same
incorporation seems to occur in a related question:

(4.3.2.2.2.7a) tiyámagkánú la # diŋ librú
The books [cost] how much each?

where tiyámagkánú is a direct symbolization of the configuration
described for magkánú with the incorporated unit 'individuated'.

In symbolization quite similar to (4.3.2.2.2.7) but
distinct semantically is:

(4.3.2.2.2.8) tiyápiλán laŋ dalandán # diŋ ának
tiyátiду́? laŋ dalandán (# diŋ ának)
The children [are to be given] how
many oranges each?
They [are to be given] two oranges each

The semantic structure of the sentence may be represented as:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>state</th>
<th>distributive</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>patient</th>
<th>beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(two)</td>
<td>numerical</td>
<td></td>
<td>child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quantitative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>individuated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
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where again tiváplán symbolizes V. Hence,

\[ \text{state} \]
\[ \text{quantitative} \]
\[ \text{numerical} \]
\[ \text{interrogative} \]
\[ \text{individuated} \]

the formative is analyzable in exactly the same way in both sentences (4.3.2.2.7 and 4.3.2.2.8); what makes the two sentences distinct is the entirely different specification of V (mensurative and distributive) and the resulting difference in configuration.

4.3.2.2.3. Classificatory Verbs. There are two classificatory verbs in Pampangan which are used in questions: maliyári 'lit. to happen', which is used for process V's or for any-state V and gáwa? 'lit. to make', which is used for action and process-action V's. One may ask:

\[(4.3.2.2.3.1) \quad \text{mananánu ya # i Pédr} \]
\[ x \]
\[ \text{Pedro is being whatted= What is happening to Pedro?} \]

Or alternatively one may ask:

\[(4.3.2.2.3.2) \quad \text{nánu # in maliyári kaŋ Pédr} \]
\[ \text{The [event which] is happening to Pedro is what?} \]

The configuration of the second sentence is altogether different:
The embedded \( V \rightarrow N \) configuration is in a patient relation to \( V \), which is completely unspecified. However, the fact that \( V \) is specified as a process indicates that the response must begin with a process \( V \). The answer to the query may take two forms:

(4.3.2.2.3.2a) mamamaté # iŋ maliliyári kaŋ Pédro  
The [event which] is happening to Pedro is dying  
(4.3.2.2.3.2b) mamamaté ya (# i Pédro)  
He is dying

ma'liyári classifies the response as a process. In answering the question, therefore, the language performer must begin with a process \( V \) (adding the accompanying \( N \) by applying the semantic rules). One then has a configuration:
Hence, a truly equational sentence is generated. It seems that a choice is allowed in the deletion processes to be applied. One may either delete the whole \( \overline{V} \overline{N} \) subconfiguration which is -new anyway, or one may retain this subconfiguration and delete the -new matrix (patient \( N \)) to the left, but not both, since a process \( V \), unless it is ambient, must have at least one accompanying \( N \) (or at least, a copier).

The same types of processes apply to classificatory action and process-action \( V \) gáwaʔ, which needs only exemplification. One may ask:

\[
(4.3.2.2.3.3) \quad \text{nánánu ya # i Pédru} \\
\text{Pedro is whatting=} \text{ What is Pedro doing?}
\]

Or one may ask:

\[
(4.3.2.2.3.4) \quad \text{nánu # iŋ gagáwan naŋ Pédru} \\
\text{The [action which] is being made by} \\
\text{Pedro is what=} \text{ What is Pedro doing?}
\]

To which the responses would be:

\[
(4.3.2.2.3.5a) \quad \text{púputut dútuŋ # iŋ gagáwan naŋ Pédru} \\
\text{The [action which] is being made by Pedro} \\
\text{is cutting wood}
\]

\[
(4.3.2.2.3.5b) \quad \text{púputut yañ dútuŋ (# i Pédru)} \\
\text{He is cutting wood}
\]
Note that in structures such as (4.3.2.2.3.5a) and (4.3.2.2.3.2a), there are no copiers in the subconfiguration to the left. This may easily be accounted for by positing the deletion of the -new agent or patient N before the incorporation rules apply.

4.3.3.2.4. N interrogative. In preceding sections, questions generated by nonlexically specified V's incorporating 'interrogative' from V** have been described. It interrogative is possible, however, to have V lexically specified and instead to have one or more N's nonlexically specified and incorporating 'interrogative'. Such N matrices interrogative when symbolized give rise to different types of WH-formatives, to use the label current in the transformational generative grammar literature.

4.3.3.2.4.1. N interrogative OBLIQUE

(4.3.3.2.4.1.1)* kaŋ nínu ya miniýé péra # iŋ tāu >
kaŋ nínu ya miniýé péra # iŋ tāu
kaŋ Pédru ya miniýé péra (# iŋ tāu)
It is to whom that the man gave money
It is to Pedro that he gave money
where the matrix N in the query is replaced by human
interrogative
definite
OBLIQUE

beneficiary
N in the response. Since kanínu is likewise used
human
Pedro
definite
OBLIQUE

for -unique noun roots, the selectional unit 'unique' does
not seem to be criterial for the eventual symbolization
of the matrix. However, the selectional unit 'human' is
relevant, since there is a formative nánu 'what', which is
used for -human N's. It seems that an oblique interrogative
N must be additionally specified as TOPIC to explain the
preposing of the N and the interposing of the copier between
the interrogative and the V.

Like any N, oblique-marked interrogative N may
be inflectionally specified as plural:

\[(4.3.3.2.4.1.1a)*\]
kaŋ nínunínu ya miniýé péra # iŋ tár
ka +nínunínu ya miniýé péra # iŋ tár
kari Pédru ya miniýé péra (# iŋ tár)

It is to whom (plural) that the man
gave money?

It is to Pedro and his companions
that he gave money
Other types of N's which are interrogative and which are OBLIQUE give rise to other query words:

\[(4.3.3.2.4.1.2)\]
\[
\text{kapilán ya makó # i Pédru}
\]
\[
\text{kéŋ lünis ya makó (# i Pédru)}
\]
It is when that Pedro will leave?
It is on Monday that he will leave

\[(4.3.3.2.4.1.3)\]
\[
\text{núkarín ya muntá # i Pédru}
\]
\[
\text{kiŋ balé ya muntá (# i Pédru)}
\]
It is where that Pedro will go to?
It is to the house that he will go to

Location N's, source N's, and goal N's, which are postsemantically OBLIQUE, when interrogative, are symbolized by * nú+ka+dīn > núkarín; karín, it will be recalled, is likewise the symbolization for the distal demonstrative.

Motive N's, which are usually marked OBLIQUE, demand a somewhat different treatment:

\[(4.3.3.2.4.1.4)\]
\[
\text{óbákit méte ya # iŋ manúk}
\]
\[
\text{úli na niŋ pistí (## méte ya # iŋ manúk)}
\]
Why is it that the chicken died?
(The chicken died) because of the pestilence

It seems that óbákit is a symbolization for a whole \( V \) configuration which is interrogative:
One may, however, likewise ask:

(4.3.3.2.4.1.5) úli na nín élő nánu "# méte ya # iñ manúk
úli na nín pistí ("# méte ya # iñ manúk)
It is because of what that the chicken died
(The chicken died) because of the pestilence

Instances such as nín élő nánu 'of what', which is -OBLIQUE, will be discussed in the next section.

4.3.2.2.4.2. N . Consider the sentence:
interrogative
-OBLIQUE

(4.3.2.2.4.2.1) babiyé yañ digálú # kiñ anák # iñ tál
The man is giving [a] gift to the child

where the semantic structure is:

If the configuration is embedded in a V** presemantic interrogative
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structure, with one or more of the N's not lexically specified, various types of WH-questions may be derived. In the preceding section, oblique-marked N's which were 'interrogative' were seen as topicalized and then preposed. The process was quite straightforward and uncomplicated. In the sentence cited, however, if one were to ask a question about the other N's (the subject N, an agent, or the -OBLIQUE and -SUBJECT N, a complement), the configuration of the question seems to be altogether different from the configuration of the declarative sentence cited:

(4.3.2.2.4.2.2) nánu # iŋ (báge a) bábiye na niŋ tāu #
             kiŋ anáŋ
             digálu (# iŋ (báge a) bábiye na niŋ tāu #
             kiŋ anáŋ)

The (object which) is being given by the man to the child is what? = What is the man giving to the child? (The object which) is being given by the man to the child is a) gift

The subject N, with an attached relative clause, has for its noun root a classificatory noun * bágay 'lit. thing'; it is usually deleted. The semantic structure may be represented thus:
In effect, what obtains is a patient configuration which consists of a classificatory noun root *bagay 'thing' to which is attached a restrictive relative clause which identifies which thing (the thing given to the child by the man); of this patient N is predicated a state V(1), which is a predicate noun; the |a|har, however, is not lexically specified but is interrogative. In the response, interrogative is replaced by a noun root, gift, which specifies the classificatory noun thing further into a particular kind of thing, a gift. Note that V has no subject or incorporated copier for the subject, although it agrees with baga, which would have been its subject if it were an independent sentence.

Instead of asking about the complement N, one may ask about the agent N:

(4.3.2.2.4.2.3)* ī nú # īŋ táuŋ bablyé digálu # kiŋ anák>

ī nú # īŋ táuŋ bablyé digálu # kiŋ anák

The (person who) is giving a gift to the child is who=Who is giving a gift to the child?

ī Pedru (♯ īŋ táuŋ bablyé digálu # kiŋ anák)
(The person who is giving a gift to the child is) Pedro

The same type of configuration described in connection with nú applies to nú, except that nú is definite and is subjectivized. The determiner is deleted, however; the classificatory noun tāu 'man, person' is likewise deletable.
It is possible for a predicate noun such as *nínú* and *nánu* to be predicated of ordinary patient *N*'s instead of \( \sqrt[3]{\text{V}} \text{N} \) configurations in a patient relation to the predicate noun. Such structures give rise to 'equational sentences':

\[(4.3.2.2.4.2.4) \text{ nánu } \text{ ya } \# \text{ i Pédru} \]
\[\text{dóktór } \text{ ya } \# \text{ i Pédru) } \]
Pedro is [a] what?
He is a doctor

\[(4.3.2.2.4.2.5) \# \text{i nínú } \# \text{ iŋ doktó} \]
\[\text{i Pédru } \# \text{iŋ doktó) } \]
The doctor is who?
He is Pedro

In the preceding sentence, the subject does not undergo incorporation of some of its specifications into the state *V*, a definite predicate noun.

Nonoblique interrogative *N*'s may be specified inflectionally as plural:

\[(4.3.2.2.4.2.6) \text{nínunínú } \# \text{ diŋ dínatáŋ} \]
The [people who] arrived are who (plural)?

Besides *nánú* 'what' and *nínú* 'who', there is also

\( \text{sánu, the symbolization for } \text{N} \)
\( \begin{array}{c}
\text{human} \\
\text{interrogative} \\
\text{definite} \\
\text{partitive}
\end{array} \)
(4.3.2.4.2.7) iŋ sánu kariŋ ānak # iŋ mílayí?
The [one who] ran is which of the
children= Which one of the children
ran?

(4.3.2.4.2.8) iŋ sánu kariŋ dalandán # iŋ péŋan na
niŋ anāk
The [one which] was eaten by the child
is which of the oranges= Which one of
the oranges was eaten by the child?

What makes analysis sometimes difficult for occurrences
of nánu and nínu is that there is a phonological rule which
optionally deletes # and which brings about a phonological
context for possible syncope:

(4.3.2.4.9) nínu # iŋ gágawāŋ lamésa ~
nínu + ŋ gágawāŋ lamésa
The [person by whom] a table is being
made is who?= Who is making a table?

(4.3.2.4.10) nánu # iŋ gágáwan na niŋ anāk ~
nánu + ŋ gágáwan na niŋ anāk

The last sentence is ambiguous, for it means both:

The [object which] is being made by the
child is what= What is the child making?
The [action which] is being done by the
child is what= What is the child doing?
It should be emphasized that question words such as ní nu 'Who (unique or -unique)?', nán u 'What?', and sán u 'Which?' are basically N's without lexical specification.

In other types of questions which will be discussed, these formatives are treated like ordinary N's; they may be OBLIQUE (* kan/kiŋ ní nu > kaní nu; kiŋ nán u; kiŋ sán u), SUBJECT (* i/iŋ ní nu > ní nu; iŋ nán u; iŋ sán u), -SUBJECT and -OBLIQUE (* naŋ/niŋ ní nu > ní nu; niŋ nán u; niŋ sán u). When ní nu is SUBJECT, the determiner is deleted.

What makes the types of questions discussed in this section different from the types of questions discussed in the immediately preceding section is their totally different semantic structure. Questions which ask about beneficiary N's, location N's, source N's, goal N's (which are all postsemantically OBLIQUE) have exactly the same configuration as ordinary sentences without interrogatives except that the OBLIQUE N is topicalized and preposed. Other types of questions, however, which have to do with N's which are -OBLIQUE postsemantically demand a configuration in which the question word is a predicate noun. Instead of asking

(4.3.2.2.4.2.11) iŋ sán u # iŋ gé wa naŋ Pé dr u
The [object which] was made by Pedro
is which [one]? = Which one did Pedro make?

one may ask:
(4.3.2.2.4.2.11a) géwa neɁ Pédro # iɁ sánu

The which was made by Pédro?

where the structure of the sentence is exactly the same as that of its noninterrogative counterpart except that the subject N is without lexical specification. However, the above sentence is not commonly used (in echo questions which will be discussed subsequently, it is used). The usual form of questions translatable by 'Who?', 'Which?', 'What?' is that of (4.3.2.2.4.2.11) and not of (4.3.2.2.4.2.11a).

It is difficult to make a case for considering the latter sentence as a 'transform' of the former sentence, since the structures are basically different; it would seem then that in the semantic generation of questions such as 'Who?', 'Which?' and 'What?' (as opposed to questions such as 'To whom?', 'For whom?', 'When?', 'Where?'), one begins with a totally different semantic configuration, a configuration different from its declarative correlative; the configuration of the response to the query is, of course, congruent with the configuration of the query. Thus:

(4.3.2.2.4.2.12) DECLARATIVE
lálákad ya # i Pédro
Pedro is walking
INTERROGATIVE
nínú # iɁ lálákad
i Pédu (# iɁ lálákad)
The [person who] is walking is who?
4.3.2.2.4.3. Classificatory Nouns in Questions.

An N which is not lexically specified but instead incorporates 'interrogative' in lieu of a root may optionally be specified selectionally by a classificatory noun:

(4.3.2.2.4.3.1) kiŋ sántuŋ anāk ne biniyé Pédrũ # iŋ librũ
It is to which child that the book was given by Pedro?

(4.3.2.2.4.3.2) iŋ sántuŋ anāk # iŋ mágāral
The [person who] is studying is which child [among the children]?

(4.3.2.2.4.3.3) iŋ sántuŋ tāu # iŋ mágāral
The [person who] is studying is which man [among the men]?

(4.3.2.2.4.3.4) nánuŋ bāge # iŋ gagáwan na niŋ anāk
The [object which] is being made by the child is what thing?

Somewhat strained but acceptable is:

(4.3.2.2.4.3.5) nínuŋ tāu # iŋ dínāŋ
The [person who] arrived is who person=
Who is it who arrived?

The predicate nouns in all the examples are state V's which are specified by an N with the following matrix:
Classificatory nouns (which are lexical units in their own right) are superordinates under which may be listed more specific subclasses in a folk taxonomy. Such classificatory nouns are anák 'child', táu 'man', báge 'object', which although lexical units in themselves are likewise superordinates to more particular subclasses of children or men or objects or even to unique instances of children or of men or of objects. In questions such as those exemplified, the classificatory noun is given; the response must fill in the interrogative with a root subordinate to the classificatory noun.

Postsemantically, the N matrix which is selectionally specified by a classificatory noun must be linearized as two branches (following rules set down in Chapter II):

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{N} & \text{N} & \text{N} \\
\hline
\text{selectional units} & \text{classificatory noun} & \text{root} \\
\hline
\text{interrogative} & \text{kiŋ} & \text{sánuŋ} & \text{anák} \\
 & \text{iŋ} & \text{sánuŋ} & \text{táu} \\
 & \text{nánuŋ} & \text{báge} \\
 & \text{nínųŋ} & \text{táu} \\
\end{array}
\]
4.3.2.2.4.4. Summary. In summary, to generate interrogatives or content questions, the following rules will be necessary:

\[
\text{(PS 23)} \quad y^{**} \quad \text{action} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{verbal} \quad \text{-psychological}
\]

\[
\text{(PS 24)} \quad y^{**} \quad \text{verbal} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{interrogative} / y^* \quad \text{conative}
\]

\[
\text{(S 5)} \quad (V) \quad x \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{(no root)}
\]

where \( \text{x=selectional units (including classificatory verbs or nouns)} \)

\[
\text{(S 6)} \quad (V) \quad (V) \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{interrogative} / y^{**} \quad \text{interrogative}
\]

\[
\text{(S 7)} \quad N \quad \text{interrogative} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{TOPIC}
\]

\text{OBLIQUE}

Some Symbolization Rules for Interrogatives

\[
\text{(Sy 1)} \quad V \quad N \quad \rightarrow \quad \{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{nánú} \quad \text{'What?'} \\
\text{makanánú} \quad \text{'How?'}
\end{array} \}
\]

\( \text{interrogative} \quad \text{interrogative} \)

(The above symbolizations are used for completely unspecified questions such as 'How are things?' There is a possibility that such a question is an idiom needing literalization; in such a case, the symbolization rule would not hold.)
| Sy | Verb | State | Quantitative | Numerical | Interrogative | Measure | Individuated | Ordinalizer | Instantivizer | Magkánü | Tiyápílan | Ikapílan | "How is...?" | "How many?" | "In what rank?" | "lit. How?= In groups of how many?" | "How many times?" | "How many/much each?" | "How much?" |
|----|------|-------|--------------|-----------|--------------|---------|--------------|------------|-------------|---------|-----------|---------|----------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 5  | V    | makanánu | pilán       | ikapílan  | makatapílan  | tiyápílan | magkánü      | 2          |             |         |           |         | How is...?     | How many?    | In what rank?  | "lit. How?= In groups of how many?" | How many times? | How many/much each? | How much? |

(This matrix will probably be better treated as an idiom.)
(Sy 9) V
1 state
mensurative interrogative
N monetary
patient
V 2 state quantitative numerical interrogative individuated

\[\text{tiyámagkánú} \quad '\text{How much each?}'\]

(Sy 10) V
motive
state
N motive
motivative interrogative interrogative

\[\{\text{bákit} \quad '\text{Why?}'\} \quad \{\text{'óbákit}\}\]

(Sy 11) V
process
interrogative -actual
patient subject
\[\text{manánu} \quad '\text{What will happen to}\_\_\_?'\]

(Sy 12) aspect:
durative + manánu
\[\text{manánánú} \quad '\text{What is happening to}\_\_\_?'\]

(Sy 13) aspect:
completed + manánu
\[\{\text{ménánu}\} \quad \{\text{nínánu}\}\]
\[\text{manánánú} \quad '\text{What happened to}\_\_\_?'\]

(Sy 14) V
process
interrogative -actual
plural
patient subject
\[\text{mañanánú} \quad '\text{What will happen to}\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\,(\text{plural})?'\]

(Sy 15) V
(process)
action
interrogative -actual
agent subject
\[\text{numánú} \quad '\text{What will X do?}'\]
(Sy 16) aspect: durative + nánu → nánánú
'What is X doing?'

(Sy 17) aspect: completed + nánu → nínánú
'What did X do?'

(Sy 18) aspect: immediate + nánu → kanánunánú
'What did X just now do?'

(Sy 19) V
(process)
action interrogative repetitive -actual agent subject → magánánú
'What will X do repeatedly?'

(Sy 20) V
(process)
action interrogative -actual common subject a → nánan
'What will be done to ___ by X?'

(Sy 21) V
(process)
action interrogative -actual instrumental subject → ipánánánú
'What will be done with ___ by X?'

(Sy 22) N
human unique interrogative definite → nínu
'Who?'
(Sy 23)  
\[
\begin{align*}
N & \quad \text{human} \\
\langle\text{unique}\rangle & \\
\text{interrogative} & \\
\langle\text{associative}\rangle & \\
\text{plural} & \\
\text{definite} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{nínunínú} \\
& \quad \text{'}Who (associative plural/plural)?' \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Sy 24)  
\[
\begin{align*}
N & \quad \text{interrogative} \\
& \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{nánu} \\
& \quad \text{'}What?' \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Sy 25)  
\[
\begin{align*}
N & \quad \text{interrogative} \\
\text{plural} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{nánunánú} \\
& \quad \text{'}What (plural)?' \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Sy 26)  
\[
\begin{align*}
N & \quad \text{interrogative} \\
\text{definite} & \\
\text{partitive} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{sánú} \\
& \quad \text{'}Which (among X)?' \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Sy 27)  
\[
\begin{align*}
N & \quad \text{interrogative} \\
\text{plural} & \\
\text{definite} & \\
\text{partitive} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{sánusánú} \\
& \quad \text{'}Which ones (among X)?' \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Sy 28)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \text{location} \} & \\
\{ \text{source} \} & \\
\text{goal} & \\
N & \quad \text{interrogative} \\
\text{definite} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{núkarín} \\
& \quad \text{'}Where? To where? From where?' \\
\end{align*}
\]

(Sy 29)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{time} & \\
N & \quad \text{interrogative} \\
\text{definite} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{kapilán} \\
& \quad \text{'}When?' \\
\end{align*}
\]
There is a subset of formatives in Pampangan
the symbolizations of which resemble those of interrogative
N's; these formatives, are, however, not interrogative although
they are likewise not lexically specified. These are forms
translatable as 'whoever', 'whichever', and 'whatever'.
Instead of having the unit 'interrogative' as part of the
N matrix, it seems that these formatives have the specification
instead '-known'. Moreover, they never occur as simple
N matrices but must always be accompanied by a restrictive
relative clause. 'Whoever' and 'whichever' are inflectionally
definite; 'whatever' is unmarked for the specification definite.
It may be specified as such, in which case it is accompanied
by a determiner. Moreover, these forms may specify any
rel N in a sentence and be postsemantically SUBJECT, OBLIQUE,
or -SUBJECT and -OBLIQUE. Only examples for 'whoever' will
be cited:

(4.3.2.2.4.4.1) kalugurán ke # iní nínuman a kalugurán mu
[The] whoever is loved by you is loved
by me

(4.3.2.2.4.4.2) ibiye me # iní # kiŋ nínuman a atí yu
karín
This is to be given by you to
whoever is over there

(4.3.2.2.4.4.3) gáwan ne niŋ nínuman a atí yu kéni # iní
This will be done by whoever is here
The following symbolization rules may be given:

(Sy 30) \[ N \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{human} \\
(\text{unique}) \\
-\text{known} \\
\text{definite}
\end{array} \longrightarrow nínúman 'whoever'

(Sy 31) \[ N \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{human} \\
\langle (\text{unique}) \rangle \\
-\text{known} \\
\langle (\text{associative}) \rangle \\
\text{plural} \\
\text{definite}
\end{array} \longrightarrow ninúnínúman 'whoever (plural)'

(Sy 32) \[ N \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
-\text{known} \\
\text{definite} \\
\text{partitive}
\end{array} \longrightarrow sánúman 'whichever'

(Sy 33) \[ N \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
-\text{known} \\
\text{plural} \\
\text{definite} \\
\text{partitive}
\end{array} \longrightarrow sanúsánúman 'whichever (plural)'

(Sy 34) \[ N \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
-\text{known}
\end{array} \longrightarrow nánúman 'whatever'

(Sy 35) \[ N \]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
-\text{known} \\
\text{plural}
\end{array} \longrightarrow nanúnánúman 'whatever (plural)'

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
4.3.2.3. \( V^{**} \)

action

verbal

4.3.2.3.1. Selective.

4.3.2.3.1.1. Disjunctive Questions. In Chapter III, it was shown that a sentence may consist of a disjunction of two or more \( V \) configurations:

\[(4.3.2.3.1.1) \text{ makó ya } \# \text{ i Suán } \#\# \text{ o } \#\# \text{ dátąŋ} \]

\[
\text{ ya } \# \text{ i Maryá } \#\# \text{ o } \#\# \text{ múli ya } \#
\]

\[
i \text{ Pédrú}
\]

Either Juan will leave, or Maria will arrive, or Pedro will go home.

In the sentence above, the Speaker is stating three propositions but judging only one as true. \( V^{*} \) is action, verbal, and expressive. There is embedded in complement \( N^{*} \) a judicial verbal action \( V^{**} \), and in complement \( N^{**} \), the semantic propositions are embedded. If, however, one asks:

\[(4.3.2.3.1.1.2) \text{ makó ya } \# \text{ i Suán } \#\# \text{ o } \#\# \text{ dátąŋ} \]

\[
\text{ ya } \# \text{ i Maryá } \#\# \text{ o } \#\# \text{ múli ya } \#
\]

\[
i \text{ Pédrú}
\]

Will Juan leave, or will Maria arrive, or will Pedro go home?

[Select one of the three.]
it is not the Speaker who selects but the Speaker is asking the Hearer to select. V* is thus action, verbal, conative. In the complement N* is embedded a V** action, verbal, selective. Semantically, selective is incorporated into embedded V in N**. Since the rising intonation (↑) was hypothesized as signaling disjunction rather than 'selective', it seems that 'selective' is eventually deleted. The same type of situation obtains in sentences with only two clauses in a disjunctive relation:

(4.3.2.3.1.1.3) makó ya # i Suán↑## o ## dátaŋ ya #
i Maryá
Will Juan leave, or will Maria arrive?
[Select one of the two]

4.3.2.3.1.2. Yes/No Questions. A type of question which has received much attention in the literature on transformational generative grammar (undeservedly, it seems to me, since it has distracted attention from other far more interesting question types) is a disjunctive V¬¬ configuration in which the second V is identical with the first V except for the additional specification 'negative' of the second V:

(4.3.2.3.1.2.1) makó ya # i Suán↑## o ## é ya makó # i Suán
Will Juan Leave, or will Juan not leave?
[Select one of the two]
The above sentence, in presemantic structure, is embedded in a complement N** accompanying a V** which is specified as action, verbal, and selective. Because of the -new items in the second V, the following deletions are possible:

(4.3.2.3.1.2.1') makó ya # i Suán ↑## o ## é ya mako'
Will Juan leave, or will he not leave?
[Select one of the two]

(4.3.2.3.1.2.1'') makó ya # i Suán ↑## o ## alí ya
Will Juan leave, or will he not?
[Select one of the two]

(4.3.2.3.1.2.1'''') makó ya # i Suán↑
Will Juan leave?

The last possibility is unusual insofar as the negative specification in the second V is new information; it is, however, deletable, probably because the symbolization of disjunction by ↑ makes the negative alternative redundant. Since the first proposition is a contradictory of the other, to give the affirmative is to imply its negative correlate.

4.3.2.3.1.3. Indirect Questions. In such indirect questions as

(4.3.2.3.1.3.1) kukutáŋ naŋ Pédrú # kaŋ Suán ## nuŋ nánánu ya # i Maryá
It is being asked by Pedro of Juan what Maria is doing
the semantic configuration is:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{complement} & \text{goal} & \text{agent} \\
V^* & N^* & N^*
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{action} & \text{goal} & \text{agent} & \text{Hearer} & \text{Speaker} \\
\text{verbal} & N & N & & \\
\text{action} & N & N & & \\
\text{verbal} & & & & \\
\text{completable} & & & & \\
\text{directional} & & & & \\
\text{to} & & & & \\
\text{ask} & & & & \\
\text{complement} & \text{agent} & & \\
Y & N & & \\
\text{action} & & & & \\
\text{interrogative} & & & & Maria
\end{array}
\]

It is possible for the complement of ask to be not merely a V configuration but a disjunctive \( \overline{V} \overline{V} \) configuration:

\[(4.3.2.3.1.3.2) \text{ kukutāŋ naŋ Pédrú # kaŋ Suán ##}
\text{ nun dātaŋ ya # i Maryá # o #} \\
\text{ é ya dātaŋ # i Maryá}
\]

It is being asked by Pedro of Juan whether Maria will arrive or Maria will not arrive.

In such indirect questions, V* is not specified as conative and hence, the unit 'selective' does not arise at all. In fact, there is no V** but a V (with its own embeddings) embedded in a complement N*. Hence, indirect questions are not questions at all but merely reports.
4.3.2.3.1.4. Summary. The following rules generate disjunctive questions:

\[(PS 25')\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{v**} \\
\text{action} &\longrightarrow \text{selective / v*} \\
\text{verbal} &\longrightarrow \text{conative}
\end{align*}\]

\[(PS 26')\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{v**} \\
\text{action} &\longrightarrow \\
\text{verbal} &\longrightarrow \\
\text{selective} &\longrightarrow \\
\text{completable} &\longrightarrow
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{complement} \\
\text{N**} \\
\text{v**} \\
\text{action} &\longrightarrow \text{selective / v*} \\
\text{verbal} &\longrightarrow \text{selective} \\
\text{completable} &\longrightarrow \\
1 &\longrightarrow \text{disjunctive} \\
2 &\longrightarrow \text{disjunctive} \\
n &\longrightarrow \text{disjunctive}
\end{array}\]

\[(S 9 )\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{v} \\
\text{root} &\longrightarrow \text{selective / v**} \\
\text{selective} &\longrightarrow \text{selective}
\end{align*}\]

4.3.2.3.2. Confirmative. Consider the sentences:

\[(4.3.2.3.2.1)\]

\[\text{mabágal ya # in átu # # ne↑}\]

The car is slow: confirm this proposition

\[(4.3.2.3.2.1a)\]

\[\text{é ya mabágal # in átu # # ne↑}\]

The car is not slow: confirm this proposition

(The symbolization ne↑ is likewise used as a signal for checking comprehension, in other words, it is an expression for requesting feedback, especially in explanation. It is
loosely paraphrasable as 'Understand?'). The sentences exemplify the following situation: the Speaker makes a statement (affirmative or negative); in turn, he asks the Hearer to confirm his statement. Thus, it seems that the presemantic and semantic configuration is:

```
V* complement N* agent
  goal
action V** N** N** Hearer Speaker
verbal action Hearer
conative verbal STATEMENT
confirmative completable
```

Semantically, 'confirmative' does not seem to be incorporated into V but is directly symbolized by ne↑ which is placed at the end of the symbolization for semantic V N (the statement).

An interesting instance of 'confirmative' is exemplified by the following sentence:

(4.3.2.3.2.2) malagú ya wári? # iŋ dalága
I infer that the young woman is pretty:
confirm my inference

What seems to happen here is that the proposition 'The young woman is pretty' is the complement to two presemantic structures. On the one hand, there is a V** with an N** complement:

```
action
psychological
ratiocinative
inferential
completable
```

in which the proposition is embedded. On the other hand,
there is a V** in which the complement N** has action 
verbal 
confirmative completable

embedded in it the same proposition. Moreover, the first V** is embedded in a V* configuration while the second V** is embedded in a V* configuration. Semantically, V incorporates the unit 'inferential' and linearizes it within the verb phrase; it is symbolized as \( \text{wári?} \). 'Confirmative' is deleted and therefore receives \( \emptyset \) symbolization.

The relevant presemantic rule for confirmative questions is:

\[
(\text{PS 27'}) \quad V** \quad \xrightarrow{\text{confirmative}} \quad V^* \\
\text{action} \quad \quad \text{conative} \\
\text{verbal} \\
\]

4.3.2.3.3. Echoic. Consider the following situation:

\((4.3.2.3.3.1)\) SPEAKER A: malagú ya # iŋ dalága
The young woman is pretty

SPEAKER B: malagú ya # iŋ dalága↑
Did I hear you right:
The young woman is pretty

Note that the utterance of SPEAKER B is homophonous with the question 'Is the young woman pretty, (or is the young woman not pretty?') Only the context disambiguates the utterance. In the situation above, SPEAKER B is checking his auditory channels as it were and asking SPEAKER A to
confirm his checking. For this type of question, the usual label 'echoic' will be used. The presemantic structure demands a V* which in turn has a complement N* with conative

an embedded V**. Embedded in complement N** is the action verbal echoic

repeated message. The unit 'echoic' is directly symbolized by ↑. The following rule may be formulated:

\[(PS \xi') \quad V** \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{echoic} / V* \quad \text{conative} \quad \]

action verbal

Consider now the following situation:

\[(4.3.2.3.3.2) \quad \text{SPEAKER A:} \]

\[\text{biniyé neŋ Pédrù # kaŋ Suán # iŋ áutu} \]

The car was given by Pedro to Juan

Now, the Hearer, SPEAKER B, because of some channel noise, might have missed part of the message or the whole message. If he missed the whole message, he will say:

\[\text{SPEAKER B:} \]

* nánu↑ > náno ↑

What [did you say]?
If he missed the lexical specification of the agent, he would ask:

\[
\text{biniyé ne níno}^\uparrow \ (# \text{kaŋ Suán # iŋ áutu})
\]

If he missed the beneficiary, he would ask:

\[
\text{biniyé ne (ŋ Peďru) # kaníno}^\uparrow \ (# \text{iŋ áutu})
\]

If he missed the complement, he would ask:

\[
\text{biniyé (neŋ Peďru # kaŋ Suán) # iŋ náno}^\uparrow
\]

Note that the above sentences use the name formatives as in content questions: \underline{N}. The rising \underline{interrogative} intonation signals the request for channel check and the interrogative N, an N with lexical gap, localizes the part of the message which needs repeating. What the Speaker is asking the Hearer to do is to fill in a lexical gap which has been missed because of channel noise. An alternative way of expressing echo questions with lexical gaps would be:

\[
\text{nínú # iŋ miniyé}^\uparrow \ (# \text{kiŋ áutu # kaŋ Suán})
\]
The [person who] gave the car to Juan is who?

\[
\text{kanínu ne biniyé}^\uparrow \ (\text{Peďru # iŋ áutu})
\]
The car was given by Pedro to whom?

\[
\text{nánu # iŋ biniyé na}^\uparrow \ (\text{ŋ Peďru kaŋ Suán})
\]
The [object which] was given by Pedro to Juan was what?
The preceding echo questions are homophonous with ordinary content questions except for the marked breath-group, which is clearly a symbolization for 'echoic'. Note too that in echoic questions, while other N's may be deleted, the verb is always expressed as a kind of support for the N with lexical gap.

In questions which are echoic, V* is conative, V** is echoic, and the embedded V N configuration of V** contains in addition N matrices with lexical gaps. The hearer is thus asked to specify an N matrix further by supplying the lexical root not heard. For such echo questions with lexical gaps, therefore, another rule must be added:

$$\begin{align*}
\text{(PS29') } & \quad \text{V**} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{specific}} \quad \text{echoic} \\
\text{(PS30') } & \quad \text{V**} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{echoic}} \quad \text{specific} \quad \text{completable} \\
& \quad \text{V**} \quad \text{echoic} \quad \text{specific} \quad \text{completable} \\
& \quad \text{N**} \quad \text{complement} \quad \text{completable} \\
& \quad \text{N} \quad \text{root} \quad \text{completable} \\
\end{align*}$$

4.3.2.3.4. Reassurative. Consider the following sentence:

$$\begin{align*}
\text{(4.3.2.3.4.1) } & \quad \text{malagú ya galán # in dalága} \\
\quad \text{Is the young woman perhaps pretty?} \\
\quad \text{Paraphrase: } & \quad \text{[You tell me that the young woman is not pretty. I am not so sure}
\end{align*}$$
about this.) Reassure me that she is not pretty.

Again, it seems that a V* conative must be posited with an N* complement in which is embedded V** ; accompanying action verbal reassuring

V** is a complement M** in which the proposition 'The young woman is not pretty' is embedded. The unit 'negative' is deleted, however; instead, 'reassuring' is incorporated into semantic V 'pretty' and then linearized and symbolized as galáq. The presemantic rules may be formulated this:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(PS 31')} & \quad \text{V**} \quad \text{action verbal} \\
& \quad \text{reassuring / V* conative}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(PS 32')} & \quad \text{V**} \quad \text{action verbal reassuring completable} \\
& \quad \text{M** complement V completable negative}
\end{align*}
\]

In the sentences:

(4.3.2.3.4.2) SPEAKER A: malagú ya # iŋ dalága
The young woman is pretty

SPEAKER B: malagú ya # iŋ dalága
\[\text{[Surprised] Did I hear you right: The young woman is pretty. [Reassure me by saying yes]}\]
The terminal marker $^k$ is an ad hoc notation for the appropriate facial gestures as well as heightened pitch. It is difficult to characterize the meanings added to the basic proposition 'The young woman is pretty' by this marker. There is definitely an element of surprise (hence, 'superprehensile'), an intention to check one's auditory channels (hence, 'echoic'), and a request to be assured not that one has heard right but that the proposition is true (hence, 'reassurative'). Moreover, the heightened pitch is probably a signal of 'heightened involvement'; it seems, however, that this heightening of the pitch may be added as a phonological feature of any symbolization to signal 'heightened involvement'; undoubtedly, it is a residue of man's more primitive communication system. Note that in the preceding sentence, the request to be reassured is not added to a negative statement but a positive one: one wants to be reassured that something is true.

No rules will be formulated to account for sentences of the preceding type. They demand further exploration; perhaps, the notion that a proposition may be shared by several illocutionary verbs will provide a fruitful avenue of investigation.

4.3.2.3.5. Concursive. Consider the sentence:

\[(4.3.2.3.5.1) \text{'e ya malagú } # i \text{ Maryá }^k k\]

Is not Maria pretty?

Paraphrase: I consider Maria pretty.
The example should be distinguished from an earlier sentence (see section 4.3.2.3.2) here repeated:

\[(4.3.2.3.5.2) \text{ malagú ya # i Maryá ## ne} \uparrow \]

Maria is pretty, isn't she?
Paraphrase: Maria is pretty. Confirm this.

In this latter sentence, the notion of opinion does not come up. The proposition is presented as a fact, a fact to be confirmed. To show this even more clearly, a nonstate V may be cited:

\[(4.3.2.3.5.3) \text{ dinatáq yá # i Maryá ## ne} \uparrow \]

Maria arrived, didn't she?
Paraphrase: Maria arrived. Confirm this.

In the first sentence cited (4.3.2.3.5.1), there is presupposed the Speaker's opinion or judgment that Maria is pretty. The terminal marker is an ad hoc notation: \(\uparrow k\)k is used instead of \(\uparrow k\) (the latter was used for 'superprehensive'). The request for concurrence is accompanied by facial gestures; there is, however, no heightened pitch rise. Moreover, sentence (4.3.2.3.5.1) must be distinguished from:

\[(4.3.2.3.5.4) \text{ e ya malagú # i Maryá} \uparrow \]

Did I hear you right: Maria is not pretty
which is homophonous with (4.3.2.3.5.1) except for the paralinguistic features. This last example is an echoic question, a request on the part of the speaker checking his auditory channel for the hearer to confirm that he heard right. Moreover, one must distinguish (4.3.2.3.5.1) and (4.3.2.3.5.4) from

\[(4.3.2.3.5.5) \ e \ ya \ malag"\? \# \ i \ Mary\^k\]

[Surprised] Maria is not pretty, you say? Did I hear you right?

which is a combination of 'superprehensive' and 'echoic'.

Sentence (4.3.2.3.5.1) may be accounted for thus: \(V^*\) is conative, with an embedded \(V^{**}\) concursive. At the same time, the nuclear semantic proposition is likewise embedded in \(V^{**}\) judicial which in turn is embedded in \(V^*\) expressive. The negative unit is problematic: the proposition is clearly not negative. Perhaps it is best seen as as a literalization of 'judicial'; 'concursive' is then symbolized by the terminal marker.

The following presemantic rules may be formulated:

\[(PS \ 33') \quad V^{**} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{judicial} \quad / \quad V^* \quad \text{expressive}
\]

action psychological

\[(PS \ 34') \quad V^{**} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \text{concursive} \quad / \quad V^* \quad \text{conative}
\]

action verbal
4.4. Summary. In this final section, the presemantc rules earlier formulated will be restated. The rules are suggestive and attempt to account only for the citations in this chapter. Moreover, although there has been mention of semantic structures embedded in more than one presemantc structure, such instances of 'shared embedding' will not be accounted for by the rules. This whole chapter attempts to grapple with this fascinating area of linguistic research in terms of the model used; because of its exploratory nature, the rules formulated are tentative at best. It should be noted that the theory lends itself easily to the eventual deletion of these presemantc structures since in Chapter II, a general deletion process was formulated by which all (-OBLIQUE) N's and V's which are not lexically specified are deleted.

4.4.1. Restatement of Rules

(PS 1) \( V^* \rightarrow \) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{action} \\
\text{verbal} \\
\text{completable} \\
\text{directional} \\
\text{to}
\end{array}
\]

(PS 2) \( V^* \rightarrow \) \{
\begin{array}{c}
\text{respectful} \\
\text{familiar}
\end{array}
\}

(PS 3) \( V^* \rightarrow \) \{
\begin{array}{c}
\text{expressive} \\
\text{conative}
\end{array}
\}

(PS 4) \( V^* \rightarrow \) precative

conative
(PS 5) \[ v^* \] action verbal completable directional to \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{complement} \\
\text{goal} \\
\text{agent}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{N*} \\
\text{N*} \\
\text{N*}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Hearer} \\
\text{Speaker}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\{\text{expressive}\}
\]

\[
\{\text{conative}\}
\]

\(v^*\) is obligatory for expressive, optional for conative

(PS 6) \[ v^* \rightarrow \{\text{state} / v^* \text{ expressive}\} \]

(PS 7) \[ v^* \rightarrow \text{experiential} \]

(PS 8) \[ v^* \rightarrow \{\text{psychological}\} \]

(PS 9) \[ v^* \rightarrow \{\text{apparentive}\} \]
\[ \{\text{informative}\} \]
\[ \{\text{questive}\} \]

(PS 10) \[ v^* \rightarrow \text{superprehensive} \]

(PS 11) \[ v^* \rightarrow \{\text{ratiocinative}\} \]
\[ \{\text{vellelitve}\} \]
\[ / v^* \text{ expressive} \]
\[ \{\text{fiduciative}\} \]
\[ \{\text{pretensive}\} \]
\[ \{\text{suppositive}\} \]
\[ / v^* \text{ conative} \]

(PS 12) \[ v^* \rightarrow \{\text{judicial}\} \]
\[ \{\text{inferential}\} \]
(PS 13) \[
(y^{**} \quad \text{velleitve} \quad \rightarrow \quad \{ \text{purposive} \}) \quad \{ \text{optative} \}
\]

(PS 14) \[
(y^{**} \quad \text{verbal} \quad \rightarrow \quad \{ \text{exclamative} \}) \quad \{ \text{conversive} \} \quad \{ \text{demurrant} \} \quad \{ \text{expressive} \}
\]

(PS 15) \[
(y^{**} \quad \text{echoic} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{specific}
\]

(PS 16) \[
(y^{**} \quad \text{experiential} \quad \rightarrow \quad \{ \text{completable} \}
\]

(PS 17) \[
(y^{**} \quad \text{action} \quad \rightarrow \quad \{ \text{completable} \}
\]
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(PS 18) v**
  action
  verbal
  exclamative
  (concursive)
  demurrant
completable
directional
to

  complement  goal  agent
  v**  N**  N**  N**
  action  Hearer  Speaker
  verbal
  (exclamative)
  (concursive)
  (demurrant)
completable
directional
to

V
The following diagram summarizes the different possibilities schematically; the cooccurrence restrictions, however, are found in the rules themselves.
4.4.2. Exemplification. By way of summary and example, a sample discourse will be cited and then analyzed presemantically and semantically. Postsemantic processes will not be discussed. The sample discourse will exemplify many of the configurations discussed, show the necessity of postulating presemantic structures, and demonstrate the necessity of intersentential connections that must be posited for an adequate account of discourse.

**DIALOGUE**

**SPEAKER A**

kēta puŋ lúnis ## mígkapistá puʔ # kiŋ Pampánga
that Sir Monday was fiesta Sir in Pampanga

Last Monday, Sir, there was a fiesta in Pampanga

kasantíŋ na puʔ niŋ pistá↑
how enjoyable Sir fiesta it

How enjoyable the fiesta was, Sir!

mintá kayu puʔ sána # karín
went you Sir wish there plural

I wish you had gone there, Sir.

óbákit ᵇ kayu puʔ mintá.
why not you Sir went plural

Why did you not go there, Sir?
SPEAKER B  okupádu katá kási
occupied you because I
Because I was busy

masantíŋ palá # inŋ pistá
enjoyable so the fiesta
So the fiesta was enjoyable

muntá katá sána
go you intensive I
I intended to go

sabiyan mu na mó ke'katá #
tell you kindly to you me

nuŋ nánu inŋ milyári káriŋ↑
what the happened there
Kindly tell me what happened there

From the use of puŋ and the pluralization of 'second person', it is obvious that the first speaker (SPEAKER A) is lower in social rank (or younger) than the second speaker (SPEAKER B). On the other hand, from the use of the pronoun 'You and I' to refer to himself, SPEAKER B is trying to be familiar with SPEAKER A. Perhaps he is a politician trying to ingratiate himself with a common person.
The presemantic and semantic structure of the first sentence may be represented thus:

\[(A\ 1) \quad \text{kétapuŋ lúnís # mígkapístá puŋ # kiŋ Pampánga} \]

Last Monday, Sir, there was a fiesta in Pampanga

\[\text{action} \quad \text{time} \quad \text{patient} \quad \text{location} \quad \text{process} \quad \text{presential} \quad \text{fiesta+ habitivizer} \quad \text{actual} \quad \text{completed} \]

\[\text{Verbal} \quad \text{completable} \quad \text{directional} \quad \text{to} \quad \text{respectful} \quad \text{past} \quad \text{state} \quad \text{definite} \quad \text{temporal} \quad \text{demonstrative} \quad \text{N} \quad \text{N} \quad \text{N} \quad \text{Speaker A} \quad \text{Hearer A} \quad \text{E} \]

The first sentence consists of a temporal state V specified as past without a lexical root; it is accompanied by a time N and a patient N. The patient N is a V configuration consisting of a presential process V. Presential verbs, it was stated in Chapter I, may be accompanied by a location N and usually by a patient N; in this instance, however, by a derivational process, what would normally be a patient N has been incorporated into the derived process V. Note that 'respectful' must be included in both the accompanying time and patient. Moreover, 'past' specification in V dictates actual completed aspect in V.

Consider now the second sentence:

\[(A\ 2) \quad \text{kasantíŋ na puŋ niŋ pístá} \]

How enjoyable the fiesta was, Sir!

The structure may be represented thus:
The second sentence is a simple state V embedded, however, in an exclamative V**. Note that 'respectful' is carried over from the preceding sentence into V* and semantically into V. Moreover, 'exclamative' is incorporated into V. Finally, although there is no overt marking, it is implied that the state occurred some time in the past, from the past specification of V.

(A3) mintá kayu pú? sána # karín

I wish you had gone there, Sir.

The third sentence expresses a wish on the part of the speaker. 'Velleitive' is thus incorporated into V; moreover, 'respectful'
is carried over from the initial $V^*$ into the whole sentence, semantically into $V^*$, which postsemantically causes the addition of 'plural' into agent $N$. The goal, the fiesta, is -new information; it is eventually symbolized by the locative pronominal 'there'. Moreover, the initial 'past' specification dictates once more that $V^*$ be actual completed.

(A 4) óbákit é kayu pú? mintá (# karín )

Why did you not go (there), Sir?
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The fourth sentence is a question. In semantic structure, the motive state \( V \) (\( V^5 \)) and its accompanying motive \( N \) is not lexically specified and instead incorporates 'interrogative' from \( V^{**} \). Moreover, since the goal \( N \) is new, it is deleted outright. Again, 'respectful' is carried over, incorporated into \( V \) and postsemantically causes the 'plural' specification of agent \( N \). Once more, 'past' dictates that \( V \) be actual completed.

The sentences uttered by SPEAKER B may be analyzed thus:

(B 1) okupádu katá kasi

Because I was busy

- \( V^* \) complement
- \( N^* \) agent
- action
- \( N^* \) Hearer A
- verbal
- completable
- directional
- to
- familiar
- state
- occupied
- explanatory
- \( (Bu'nd) \)
- \( (P\text{ast}) \)

The first sentence of SPEAKER B is in answer to the question of SPEAKER A; because of this, 'explanative' is included as a specification of \( V \). The familiar tone is initiated in this new discourse unit and is carried into \( V \); it has no overt reflex other than the postsemantic specification of
'second person' of patient N. Again, 'past' is carried into the continuation of the discourse although it has no overt reflex since V, a state V, is not specified for aspect relative to time.

(B 2) masantíŋ palá # iŋ pistá

So the fiesta was enjoyable

Although 'fiesta' is -new, perhaps because it is the first time that SPEAKER B is referring to it, it is not deleted. 'Familiar' and 'past' are carried over but have no overt reflexes. The unit 'informative' is incorporated into V.
(B 3) muntá katá sána (# karín )
I intended to go (there)

The sentence expresses an intention that was never
carried out. The goal is -new and is deleted outright.

Again, 'familiar' is carried over into semantic structure
and postsemantically causes the addition of 'second person'
to the agent N. Moreover, 'purposive' is incorporated into
V. Note, however, that the aspect is -actual, although
the intention is still localizable in the past. It seems
that in semantic structures which are embedded in V**
purposive, 'past' is incorporated into V** but not into
semantic V, which is aspectually unmarked (-actual).
Kindly tell me what happened there.
(B 4) expresses a request. Since the illocutionary V is neither expressive nor conative, there is no embedded V**. Rather, the complement N* is a verbal action V with its own complement, which in turn consists of a locative state V accompanied by a location N and a patient. The patient is unusual:

\[ \text{nánu iŋ milyári} \]

lit. the [event which] occurred is what independently,

\[ \text{nánu # iŋ milyári} \]

means

What happened?

\text{maliyári} 'lit. to happen' is a classificatory verb for any nonstate V. The expected answer to it is some nonstate V which is then accompanied by its own N's. The whole patient subconfiguration is definite.

Again, 'familiar' is carried into the sentence from the initial (B 1) sentence and postsemantically causes the additional specification of 'second person' to the goal N matrix. 'Precative' is incorporated into V ; moreover, 'past' dictates that the aspectual specifications of V be actual completed. Since the location N accompanying V
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is -new, the root is deleted, leaving a locative pronominal 'there'.

The analysis shows how initial 'social tone' must be carried through every sentence in the discourse unit and how this specification is incorporated into the semantic structures and postsemantically causes certain additions of units. Moreover, it likewise shows how certain presemantic units must be incorporated into V; intersentential connectors which link the discourse units together must likewise be incorporated into subsequent V's. Finally, the temporal placing of the event 'fiesta' in the past, expressed by the first sentence, incorporates 'past' into all the relevant nonstate V's, and although unexpressed, into the state V's as well, thus explaining why the glosses are in the past tense, except when a V is embedded in a purposive
V** (it is then -actual).
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5.0. Introduction. This chapter, by way of summary and conclusion, reviews the main findings of the study. The first section summarizes conclusions on the principal topics discussed; the second section discusses hypotheses and proposed analyses which in some ways depart from or are meant to be an extension of Chafe's theory, especially the proposals of Chapter IV, where the notion of presemantic structure was introduced. The third section surveys four important studies on Pampangan and reviews certain of their conclusions in the light of the findings in this study. Finally, areas of future research suggested by this study will be outlined.

5.1. General Conclusions. Following the model proposed by Chafe, the basic sentence configuration is considered as generated by initial V, which is specified further for selectional units which narrow the lexical choice to a particular lexical unit (basic or derived). In turn, this lexical unit is specified further for inflectional units. On the basis of the selectional and inflectional units of V, accompanying N's are postulated, N's in different relations to V; in turn, these N's are specified further by selectional, lexical (basic or derived), and inflectional units.

The most important selectional specifications of V are those of state, process, and (process-)action; these subtypes of V may be further specified by other selectional units. Such selectional units typically necessitate a special
type of accompanying N.

The following N relations (vis-à-vis V) were discovered: agent, experiencer, agentive beneficiary, instrument, complement, measure, patient, beneficiary, material, norm, associate, partitive, source, goal, location, and time. This inventory increases the list suggested by Fillmore (in his study of 'deep structure' cases) and by Chafe.

In general, the selectional and inflectional units discovered for Pampangan were similar to those discovered for Onondaga and for English by Chafe. The mode of combination of these units as well as their postsemantic behavior was, of course, different. In Pampangan, tense and aspect specifications are kept separate. Aspektual specifications are inflectional units specifying nonstate V's and a small subset of state V's; one type of aspektual specification, 'generic', is a possible inflectional unit for both state and nonstate V's. Tense specifications, on the other hand, are selectional units of state V's specified as temporal. Where an utterance contains both tense and aspect specification, it is usually a $\sqrt{V}$ $V$ configuration or a $V$ configuration with an incorporated tense specification from a previous temporal state V. Among the units specified for N, the only specification that was peculiar to Pampangan was 'associative plural', a possible inflectional specification for unique N's.

Pampangan shows its most distinctive characteristics in the area of derivational units and of derivational processes. It was demonstrated that the possibilities for agglutinative
combinations of noun and verb roots with prefixes, infixes, and suffixes were formidable. Rather than seek for what Sapir (1921) calls the 'invariant word' (symbolization), Pampangan seeks for variant words, roots with a multitude of possible variants (in symbolization) through affixing. The semantic treatment of affixes in Pampangan, within an integrated grammatical study, provides one of the most challenging tasks of Pampangan (and Philippine) linguistics; its treatment will undoubtedly make a significant contribution to the general theory of lexicology. Such treatment must of course go beyond mere listing (there are ample lists in Bergaño and in the publications of the Institute of National Language, Manila) but integrate such lists as rules in a grammar.

It was found that the above N relations ultimately reduce to three types in surface structure: SUBJECT, OBLIQUE, and unmarked (-SUBJECT and -OBLIQUE). Moreover, it was likewise discovered that there seems to be a limit in semantic structure to the number of N's accompanying V. It was hypothesized that this constraint was partially conditioned by the limited number of surface markers (the determiners) and hence showed a tendency to avoid constructional homonymy. An optimally specified V can contain in surface structure one subject, one or two oblique-marked nouns, and one unmarked noun. There may be other oblique-marked nouns in surface structure, but
these oblique-marked nouns are ultimately traceable to separate state V's in semantic structure; such instances are labeled in traditional grammar 'sentential adverbs' and 'adverbial phrases'.

The three surface N types correspond to Bloomfield's (1917) three 'cases' (Bloomfield calls these 'cases in a very wide sense' (161): subjective, disjunctive, and local) as well as to Lopez's (1941:53) three cases (nominative, attributive, and locative). These cases were postulated by both Bloomfield and Lopez for Tagalog, but they are applicable to Pampangan. Bergaño, using Latin as a model, remarks: '...tiene esta lengua su distinción y variación de casos; porque así como en el singular de genu, siendo todos los casos una misma voz invariable, se halla el nominativo, genitivo, dativo, etc., según la preposición or artículo que se la antepone; así también los nombres de esta lengua se varían por casos, según el artículo que les precede'(5). He lists the following casos: nominativo, genitivo, dativo, acusativo, vocativo, and ablativo.

On the notion of subjectivization, it was shown that a distinction must be made between 'subject' and 'topic'; the latter triggers a preposing process. Except in initial discourse and in certain well-defined conditions, the subject N is usually specified as -new (or old) information. Hence, in discourse, one of the functions of subjectivization is to link a sentence with a preceding sentence; moreover, because
the subject N is usually -new in such instances, it is
deletable. On the other hand, topicalization consists of
highlighting or emphasizing an N; hence, even if an N
specified as TOPIC is -new, it is never deleted.

The failure to distinguish between subject and
topic has resulted in some confusion. For example, Blake,
as early as 1906, remarked: 'In Tagalog in a verbal sentence,
that adjunct of the verb which is of most importance in the
eyes of the speaker or writer is made the subject of the
sentence'(186). It is difficult to see how something which
is so readily deletable can be 'of most importance'. It
seems that Bloomfield, with his usual uncanny insight into
languages, even into those which he himself did not speak,
captured the notion of subjectivization in the Philippine
languages much better when he remarked: 'In general the
choice between these four constructions [active, direct
passive, instrumental passive, local passive] is made in
accordance with the logical situation: the definite,
known object underlying the predicate as starting point
of discourse is chosen as subject...' (1917:93; italics
mine).

Moreover, the phenomenon of subjectivization, which
has often been mentioned in the scholarly literature as one
of the distinctive features of the Philippine languages, is
really not that distinctive. The possibility of different
'voices' (different subject choices) is quite common in the
languages of the world. What makes Pampangan (and the other Philippine languages) interesting is that these voice markers are overtly marked (see McKaughan 1962) by affixes, affixes which have been shown not to govern the subject but presuppose subject choice and are governed by such subject choice, being introduced postsemantically into V by an incorporation process following prior specification of one of the N's accompanying V as SUBJECT. The whole process is comparable to N-V (in Pampangan surface structure, usually V-N) agreement, a postsemantic process quite widespread among the languages of the world. Whether or not one chooses to consider the possibility of different subject choices in a basically identical semantic configuration as an instance of the etic-emic distinction, as Pike (1963) does, depends on whether or not one finds this distinction useful in an area outside of phonology.

Traditional adverbs (manner, time, location, benefaction, motivation, instrument; sentential) were considered to be separate state V's specifying another V further or predicated of a $\sqrt{N}$ configuration. Negative was treated as an inflectional unit of V. Instances of embedding were considered as developments in N: either a $\sqrt{N}$ subconfiguration in lieu of an ordinary N (complementation) or a $\sqrt{N}$ subconfiguration attached to an N (relativization) specifying an N further quasi-inflectionally. Factive clauses were treated as embedded $\sqrt{N}$ configurations, the whole configuration being inflectionally specified as definite. Nominalizations were considered as generated in
semantic structure by an operator labeled NOM added to V in an embedded structure; in surface structure, nominals appear as lexical units with the components verb root+nominalizer.

Finally, the notion of presemantic structure was proposed to explain certain phenomena in Pampangan (mostly particles incorporated into semantic V) which otherwise would not lend themselves to clear and orderly exposition. It was proposed that underlying every speech act is a presemantic directional (to) completable verbal activity V* with an accompanying goal N* (the Hearer), complement N* (the message), and agent N* (the Speaker). Embedded within complement N* is the actual semantic structure. Moreover, where V* is specified as expressive and in certain instances where V* is specified as conative, there is another V** embedded in the complement N* which in turn may receive its own specifications as well as accompanying N** 's. In such cases, the semantic structure is embedded within the complement N** of V**. It was within this frame of reference that other sentence types (imperatives, requests, exclamations, questions) were accounted for, to distinguish them from statements or declarative sentences. Semantic structures embedded in such presemantic configurations could, of course, consist of more than one V, of equal or unequal rank.

5.2. Problematic Questions. The outline has followed Chafe's proposals for the most part. In the following areas, however, the study has departed from Chafe 1970a,b:
(1) It has increased Chafe's inventory of N relations. Since Chafe himself did not intend his list to be exhaustive, the postulation of additional N relations is not unexpected. Moreover, as new data are gathered, the list proposed for Pampangan can be augmented. Ultimately, of course, these N relations or 'deep structure cases' must be syncretized in surface structure. The usefulness of distinguishing between a patient and an object (on the one hand, an N which 'suffers' change of some kind, and on the other hand, an N which is 'just there' and is not affected) needs further investigation; in this study, these N relations were treated as one.

(2) Chafe analyzes adverbs of manner by means of the following configuration:

```
    patient    rel
    V      V
state     N
manner
```

In this study, manner adverbs and certain adverbs of frequency and instance are analyzed by means of the following configuration:

```
    V2       rel
    V1  V
state  N
root
manner
```

This configuration was proposed to highlight the subordinate character of V as well as to show the absence of direct
relation between $N_1$ and $V_2$. Thus, manner and frequency/instance adverbs are considered as quasi-inflectionally specifying a nuclear $V$ which has already been specified as to root. The configuration likewise shows the independent status of $\sqrt{V_1N_1}$ as opposed to the dependent status of $V_2$.

(3) With Chafe, other types of adverbs (including sentential adverbs) were considered as state $V$'s predicated of a $\sqrt{V_1N}$ configuration which was in a patient relation to the state $V$. Besides the patient relation, however, in many instances where the state $V$ was not lexically specified, there was in addition another $N$ relation:

\[
\text{rel} \quad \text{patient} \\
\text{state} \\
\sqrt{V_1N_1} \\
\sqrt{V_2N_2}
\]

In Pampangan, the possibility that an embedded $\sqrt{V_1N}$ relation may be inflectionally specified as definite must be posited, to generate factitive clauses as well as instances of complementation in which the whole complement (an embedded $\sqrt{V_1N}$) is subjectivized, so that the following subconfiguration must be established as a possibility:

\[
\text{rel} \\
\sqrt{V_1N_1} \\
\text{definite}
\]
Complementation would then consist of the following structure:

```
   complement                 agent
     V
l action                  rel
complet}able             2
      (definite)
```

On the other hand, nominalization would consist of exactly the same subconfiguration (as complement) but with the addition of NOM (which triggers a special postsemantic process):

```
  rel
  \[ V + NOM \quad \overset{rel}{\to} \]
     N
         definite
```

(4) The treatment of relativization is based not on Chafe 1970a,b but on later (unpublished) work by Chafe. Thus, where Chafe would analyze relative structures thus:

```
   \[ N \]
  l \{specificative\}
root \{partitive\}
    \[ V \quad \overset{\text{new}}{\to} N \]
```

the revised configuration that would be proposed would be:
The revised configuration attempts to show that relative clauses in some ways inflectionally specify an N. Moreover, the positing of such a configuration renders deletion of a second N (¬new) unnecessary, since N occurs only once. In terms of eventual linearization in Pampangan, the diagram captures better what seems to happen in Pampangan.

Likewise, the proposal that an optional selectional unit (represented as 'verb root+selectivizer') of a unique N may be highlighted by a relative clause (as in 'Big Pedro') is novel.

(5) Chafe considers numbers as inflectional specifications of N. In the study, I propose that when an N is specified inflectionally as quantitative, there is an additional replacement rule whereby N becomes

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{root} \\
\text{quantitative} \\
\text{numerical/estimative} \\
\text{number / much} \\
\text{many}
\end{align*}
\]

The justification for considering numbers and words of quantitative estimate such as 'much' or 'many' as separate state V's arises
from the occurrence of such sentences in Pampangan as:

(5.2.1) adu' la # diŋ tâu The men are two [in number]

as opposed to

(5.2.2) atŋ aduŋ tâu There are two men

(6) Where the study has differed from Chafe’s model in a substantive manner is in its proposal concerning presemantic structure. Actually, however, rather than a departure from the model, the positing of presemantic structures can be considered as ONE possible development of the model.

The units I have posited in Chapter IV as arising from presemantic structure Chafe would include directly as either inflectional units of V in semantic structure or (in the case of interrogatives) as a selectional specification ‘interrogative’ of V or N in lieu of a missing root. In this study, such units are treated likewise as either inflectional units or as selectional units in lieu of a root (in the case of content questions), but a presemantic structure is posited as a context. Hence, these units are seen as not so much generated directly but incorporated from a prior generative rule.

I have found the postulation of presemantic structures necessary to account for respectful and familiar language as well as to account for the implied Speaker-Hearer shifts in expressive and conative functions of language.
While Ross (1968) uses instances of reflexive use in English as cogent evidence for a declarative performative abstract verb, I have used respectful and familiar language and the array of particles in the verb phrase as evidence for illocutionary verbs in Pampangan, since it is the latter type of evidence that seems most available in Pampangan for positing frames more abstract than the semantic structures posited in Chapters I and III. The illocutionary verbs \( V^* \) and \( V^{**} \) posited in Chapter IV are comparable to the abstract verbs posited by R. Lakoff (1969) for Latin complementation and to the verbs of Sadock's (1969a,b) 'hypersentences' and 'superhypersentences'.

It must be emphasized, however, that the presemantic units hypothesized, unless they are coded in semantic structure, are never symbolized. Hence, while paraphrase has been used as a heuristic device, the characterization of presemantic structure consists of presemantic selectional units which are never lexicalized nor symbolized unless these units are incorporated into \( V \) or \( N \). One of the merits of Chafe's model is precisely the distinction made between selectional and lexical units on the one hand and lexical specification and symbolization on the other hand. The two distinctions help to characterize presemantic units quite neatly: they are semantic selectional units which are never lexicalized; they are symbolized only if they have been incorporated into semantic matrices. Moreover, the general deletion rules postulated in Chapter II whereby any \( V \) matrix or nonoblique \( N \)
matrix which is not lexically specified is deleted makes
a similar deletion of such nonlexically specified V*/V**
and N*/N** matrices all the more plausible.

What makes the postulation of presemantic structures
attractive to me is that it integrates traditional notions
concerning functions of language other than cognitive
(expressive and conative) in a total theory of language
.consisting of semantic and phonological structures in
Chafe's model), which in turn integrates the work of
componential analysis in anthropological linguistics within
a generative frame of reference in grammar.

It might be objected that the positing of illocutionary
verbs smacks of what Firth calls 'the personification of
categories' (1957:21) or what he would call 'the hypostasization
of paraphrase', to adapt a term he used when he accused
American structural linguists of 'the hypostasization of
the letter' in their different versions of phonemic theory.

My earlier qualifications with regard to the proposal
attempts to avoid such 'hypostasization'. The proposed pre-
semantic structures make no claim to psycholinguistic reality
other than the fact that the matters they seek to account for
must somehow be processed by the language performer. The
structures are postulated as convenient fictions; they are,
(1925-1926)
to borrow Dempwolff's 'label for his reconstructions, mere
Kunstgriffe, useful for presenting the data in a unified
and orderly fashion.
The manner of representation and the notation as well as the attempted formalism (through the formulation of presemantic rules) are of course by way of proposal. Where a more viable manner of dealing with such phenomena in an integrated grammar is discovered, then that manner should be adopted. But that such phenomena (social tone, expressive and conative functions) must be accounted for in a grammar seems to me indisputable; no theory of language can be considered adequate unless it accounts for these fascinating and intriguing functions of language.

5.3. Review of Scholarship. In the introduction, it was stated that relatively little published scholarship on the structure of Pampangan is available. The available works (Bergaño's pedagogical grammar, Castrillo's survey of main construction types, Lopez's comparative studies of surface structure features, and Constantino's survey of twenty-six Philippine languages and their sentence patterns) will be reviewed informally and their conclusions compared with the findings of this study.

5.3.1. Bergaño. Bergaño's (1916) Arte is a treasure-trove of data for semantic analysis not only of eighteenth-century Pampangan but also of contemporary Pampangan, since the language has changed very little since Bergaño's period.
The changes that have taken place consist for the most part of accentual modifications and changes in the lexical inventory together with the addition of minor phonological rules.

Many of Bergaño's citations of complex sentences are linguistically interesting, since in my own idiolect and in the idiolects of my informants, such sophisticated structures would seldom arise in ordinary conversations.

Bergaño's aim was pedagogical: 'A este fin... apliqué la cortedad de mi talento, reduciendo a reglas, por do puedan gobernarse los ministros, los modos de hablar de una lengua más incognita a nosotros, que lo fue la de los Egipcios a Joseph'(viii). Like other missionary grammarians of the period, Bergaño used Latin-based grammars as his model: 'Por conformarme en todo lo posible al arte de la lengua latina, trato, seguido a los nominativos del verbo, sum, est, fui...' (22). From a semantic viewpoint, Bergaño was still very much under the influence, even in the eighteenth century, of the medieval modalists (see Robins 1967), for he speaks of significación and modo de significar: 'Advíerte, que no es lo mismo con una misma significación que con un mismo modo de significar, mira y nóta lo bien. Es verdad, que el verbo ilub primera, lubán segunda, luban tercera, siempre tiene una misma significación, que es entrar,...; pero cada pasiva tiene su diverso modo de
significar'(64). In medieval parlance, 'enter' is the substantial or essential meaning (significación); the variant meanings of 'enter' resulting from affixal augmentation are the accidental meanings (modos de significar). In this study, these 'accidental meanings' are added to the root as further specifications. It might be noted that Bergaño's distinction between significación and modo de significar is comparable to Pike's emic/etic distinction.

For a foreigner, Bergaño had an amazing knowledge of Pampangan. Hence, while one may not agree with his model or his analysis and presentation, his data are impeccable. (It is difficult to evaluate his accentuation properly, since this is an area where quite a few changes seem to have taken place. His 1917 editors, moreover, took the liberty of revising these accentuations in the name of modernization, rendering access to the original difficult; see the editors' remarks on pages iii and iv, 'Dos Palabras sobre esta Tercera Edición'.) From a theoretical viewpoint, the grammar retains the same validity that any Latin-based analysis of another language has. Nouns are declined, five cases (six, including the vocative) are posited, verbs are conjugated, tense and aspect are treated together, and three passives are discussed. His treatment of affixes is typical of any taxonomic-based model. He devotes entire chapters to individual affixes (and their combinations) and lists the multitude of divergent meanings that such affixes may have, in the meantime complaining of the homonymy evident in the language, 'siendo tan diversas
las inteligencias'(63). His keen understanding of the language makes him aware of nuances of meaning and ambiguities which I, as a native speaker, never realized until I started detailed analysis. Moreover, his Latinate labels for such semantic units I have adopted where possible, since they fitted very well into my own Latinate scheme of labels.

Bergaño was quite cognizant of the different expressive units with which Pampangan is so rich: 'En todas las lenguas significan estas los afectos del alma y son mas difíciles, si no imposibles de trasuntar: explicarélas como pudiere'(198). Where he is unable to formulate rules, he resorts to listing and refers the reader to his Vocabulario: 'No hay mas remedio que examinar uno por uno, o ir al Vocabulario'(145). It is interesting to note that Bergaño had glimmerings of the notion of transformation. He remarks: '...ya la pasiva no muda el sentido de la activa'(148). Moreover, he connects sentences by stating that one sentence 'nace de', 'sale de' from another sentence.

5.3.2. Castrillo. Castrillo's M.A. thesis (1955), based on Pittman's (1948) formulae for nuclear structures, is basically a taxonomy of surface structure types: 'This language study attempts to show the possible sentence constructions in the Pampango language'(1). The types surveyed are: active (action-actor), passive (action-goal), equational (identification, description), conjunction, subordination,
and other minor types. Following Lopez (1941), Castrillo describes three types of noun phrases: noun phrases in conjunctive attribution (*iŋ marimlé+iŋ gátas 'the cold milk'), noun phrases in disjunctive attribution (*iŋ balé naŋ Pédru 'the house of Pedro'), and locative attribution (*kaŋ Pédru 'to Pedro'). Expansions of V are considered (through addition of accompanying N's) as well as expansions of N (through relative clauses).

The work was completed in the heyday of American structuralist theory (the standard sources are listed in the bibliography) and uses an item-and-arrangement model (instead of a process model) in its listing of the various forms for pronouns; because of this, the treatment of the pronouns, especially of the so-called portmanteau pronouns (the term is from Hockett 1947), combinations of N copiers, is unsatisfactory. The lists of forms could easily be reduced and valid insights into the semantics of the pronouns easily discovered had a process model been adopted.

Castrillo analyzes ku in

\[(5.3.2.1) \text{sinúlat ku... I wrote it...}\]

as a portmanteau pronoun and glosses ku as 'I-it'. Actually, a phrase such as the above would not occur by itself:

\[(5.3.2.1a) \text{sinúlat ku} \# iŋ sinábi mu\]

What you said was written by me
In this sentence, the subject is abstract and is not copied. Hence, there is no copier or pronoun for the subject in V and ku (as well as the subset of pronouns which are -SUBJECT and -OBLIQUE) are not portmanteau pronouns but simple pronouns.

Moreover, the postulation of only two voices (active and passive) is inadequate, considering the different possibilities for subjectivization: there are as many voices as there are N relations discovered in the language.

The formulas for the different construction types, formulas consisting of concatenated morpheme classes, use pronouns where N's would normally occur. Undoubtedly, this is due to the fact that in Pampangan, many N's are deletable whereas their copiers (incorporated in V) are never deleted. Hence, where one is considering only surface structures, pronouns occur more regularly than noun roots. Semantically, however, this is unfortunate, since pronouns are clearly derivatives of N roots.

5.3.3. Lopez. Lopez (1965) surveys twelve Philippine languages (among them, Pampangan) and groups them according to their surface features. The criteria for grouping are: whether a particular surface unit exists in a language; among those languages which have the particular surface unit, whether its symbolization is cognate with a corresponding surface unit in another language, or not. While the study is interesting from the point of view of comparative syntax
and the grammatical typology of the Philippine languages, the study contains little that is useful for the purposes of this study. Two types of structures are examined, structures of predication and structures of attribution.

Among the structures of predication, Lopez speaks of 'circumlocutory definite object predication' and cites (6):

(5.3.3.1) ing anak ya pin ing mi:turan ning bola
   The child was (the one) hit by the ball

(The citation is given in Lopez's transcription.) In my dialect, kinj bola, instead of niŋ bola, would be used. Without syncopation, the sentence would be (in my transcription):

(5.3.3.1') iŋ anáŋ # iyá pin # iŋ mítúran kiŋ bóla
   The child he indeed the [one who] was hit by the ball= As for the child, the one who was hit by the ball was he indeed

The above sentence would arise in the following situation. Someone asks a question: 'Who was hit by the ball?'

(5.3.3.2) nínu # iŋ mítúran kiŋ bóla
   The [one who] was hit by the ball is who?= Who was hit by the ball?

   to which the answer would be:
(5.3.3.2a) iyá # iŋ mítúran kíŋ bόla
The [one who] was hit by the ball is he

where the context makes the lexical specification of iyá
unnecessary. If the lexical root is specified, one would have:

(5.3.3.2b) iŋ anáŋ # iŋ mítúran kíŋ bόla
The [one who] was hit by the ball is the child

In structures such as the above where the predicate noun is
a subjectivized N, no subject copying process occurs; hence,
there is no ya in the predicate. Now, another speaker, on
hearing the response, may agree with the responder ('concursive')
and say:

(5.3.3.2c) iŋ anáŋ pín # iŋ mítúran kíŋ bόla
Yes, indeed, the [one who] was hit by the
ball is the child

It seems that in the above sentence, one may additionally
specify the predicate noun as TOPIC, in which case it seems
that it is the predicate noun which is copied and not the
subject:

(5.3.3.2d) iŋ anáŋ # iyá pín # iŋ mítúran kíŋ bόla
As for the child, the [one who] was hit
by the ball is he indeed
The preceding 'derivalional history' is tentative; the sentence could probably be derived by a different order. In any case, it is highly marked and occurs quite infrequently. It is not clear why Lopez chose to single out constructions of this type as a special basis for grouping the Philippine languages.

Three types of (surface) N/V relations are posited: conjunctive (malagu±ñ dalága 'pretty young woman'), disjunctive (balé nin dalága 'house of the young woman'), locative (kin± anák 'to the child'). Under 'locative' are included 'time', 'place', 'possession'. Serial relation of N's is signaled by at (and ampo). It is not clear why Lopez calls the negative specification of V a relation of 'absolute attributive': é marók 'not bad'.

Among the command sentences, Lopez lists Pampangan:

(5.3.3.3) mekéni

Come in! (2nd person sing. familiar)

and remarks: 'In...Pm. S [Subject] is Ø in the 2nd pers. sing.'(13). The remark shows the inadequacies of an item-and-arrangement model. The underlying form of the command is:

(5.3.3.3') *umé ka # kéni

You come to this place
The initial vowel undergoes apheresis; by haplology, ka ke-becomes ka. The subject pronoun is thus ka 'you', it is not φ.

Lopez's study, it has been remarked, is based on a taxonomic survey of surface features. Its model is Bloomfield (1917): 'Bloomfield's chapter on 'Syntax' serves as a model, for to this writer his Tagalog Texts with Grammatical Analysis... as a treatise on any single Philippine language, remains unmatched' (3). From the point of view of typology, the study of surface features is still valid, since such surface features are the outputs of postsemantic processes (or transformations). It is precisely in this postsemantic area that languages differ and it is in this postsemantic area that language-specific features are most prominent. To examine therefore and to compare the results of such language-specific rules remains a worthwhile undertaking in grouping and typologizing. In the last section, I shall return to this point and relate a work such as Lopez's to the question of semantic analysis, comparative grammar, and diachronic linguistics.

5.3.4. Constantino. In terms of its theoretical import, Constantino's (1965) study of 'The Sentence Patterns of Twenty-Six Philippine Languages' remains the most significant from the point of view of modern linguistics.

Essentially, the article, which appeared in Lingua, is a report of research in progress, since Constantino's aim is an
ambitious one: '...this is an attempt to construct a single grammar in generative transformational form of the twenty-six Philippine languages [surveyed]'(109).

The model for analysis is based on Chomsky (1957). Phrase-structure rules are formulated to generate 'kernel' sentences, 'from which we derive the other sentences by means of transformational rules'(77). The study is limited, however, to declarative sentences.

The set of base-structure rules is common to the twenty-six languages; where special rules have to be formulated for particular languages, such rules are formulated at the end of the section on base-structure rules. One such rule (Rule 25) is formulated for Pampangan, essentially a symbolization rule for determiners in a subject N. The second set of rules are transformational rules, many of which are shared by several languages; where a transformational rule applies to only one language, then that rule is language-specific. Five such specific rules are formulated for Pampangan (Rules 10, 15, 16, 19, 20); for the most part, these rules generate what I have called in this study 'incorporation processes', copying features of N into V. Constantino labels such copying as 'addition'; where no copying takes place or where copiers are deleted, the process in Constantino's rules is a 'deletion' process. For the purposes of this study, only Constantino's rules concerning Pampangan are relevant.
Constantino's concept of a 'kernel sentence' is problematic (apart from the problems engendered by revisions in the theory of transformational generative grammar). He takes 'the definite sentence' as the 'kernel' and the input to his transformations. Such a definite sentence is exemplified by the following (80):

Kap.: / qìŋ qanak qìŋ milayi. /  
the child the ran-away  
It was the child who ran away

(The citation is given in Constantino's transcription. /q/ is a glottal stop; in my notation, glottal stop was stated to be optional in initial position and not noted in the transcription. ././ signals falling intonation.) The phrase-structure (immediate constituent) analysis is:

IC 1  
SUBJECT  
qìŋ qanak  
the child

IC 2  
PREDICATE  
qìŋ milayi  
the ran-away

Constantino's gloss is accurate: 'It was the child who ran away', more literally, 'The [one who] ran away [was] the child'. It is the analysis which is problematic. First of all, the sentence is clearly an equational sentence where inq anáŋ 'the child' is not the subject but the predicate (a predicate noun)
and where iŋ mílayi? 'the [one who] ran away' is the subject
(an N with an attached relative clause). The semantic structure
would be:

```
   V
   \ 1
  \ state
  \ N
   \ child+predicativizer
      \ definite
SUBJECT
```

The sentence is highly marked and occurs only as a response
to a question:

```
nínu # iŋ mílayi?
The [one who] ran away is who=
Who ran away?
```

to which the response could be:

```
iŋ anák (# iŋ mílayi?)
(The one who ran away is) the child
```

There is thus a radical disagreement between the semantic
configuration I propose and Constantino's IC-analysis, for his
subject is my predicate (a predicate noun) and his predicate
(a verbal one) is my subject (an N with an attached relative
clause).
In a footnote, Constantino mentions Bloomfield:
'Bloomfield...analyzes IC always as predicate and IC always as subject. We have not followed this analysis in every respect'(77). Actually, it seems to me that Bloomfield's unerring linguistic good sense should have been followed once more on this point.

In any case, Constantino postulates a PM (Predicate Marker) for verbal definite sentences (such as the one cited):
'The predicate of a definite sentence consists of a verb or verb phrase, an adjective, a common noun, or a particulate phrase, preceded by a predicate marker'. Since Constantino's citations all include the predicate marked by qin, I can only conclude that he intended qin to be PM, although he glosses qin rightly as 'the'. On the basis of what I have established in the preceding chapters, qin is clearly a subject determiner and not a predicate marker homophonous with subject determiner qin in Constantino's IC.

With the 'definite sentence' as kernel, Rule 14 is postulated, transforming a 'definite sentence' into an 'indefinite sentence' by what amounts to a simple process of deletion (116):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{INPUT} & \quad / \text{qin qanak qin milayi} . / \\
\text{OUTPUT} & \quad / \text{qanak ya qin milayi} . / \\
\text{It was the child who ran away} \\
\text{It was a child who ran away}
\end{align*}
\]

ya is considered an addition of a nominative pronoun and is
not relevant at this point. Semantically, the difference is manifest by Constantino's own glosses. I fail to see, however, what justification there is for transforming a sentence which refers to a definite child to a sentence which refers to any child. Formally, of course, the transformation process is a simple instance of formative deletion. However, what constrains the theory of transformational generative grammar from postulating the most fanciful transformations (from one phrase marker to another phrase marker) is precisely the postulate, made explicit by Katz and Postal (1964), that meaning is preserved through the transformational cycle and that no new semantic content is added by transformations (qualifications to this postulate have been proposed lately by Chomsky 1969). But where two sentences are semantically distinct, no matter how closely they resemble each other in their surface structures and in their lexemes, one cannot state that one sentence is transformed into another sentence.

With the above 'transformation', Constantino discusses various types of 'indefinite sentences' (where the IC, Constantino's subject, no longer has the article mö): 'An adjective may occur as the subject of the goal or locative passive sentence, in which case it will not be preceded by any marker' (67). He cites a Tagalog example (number 57) for which I shall give the Pampangan equivalent:

márayú? # iñ linákad na niñ anák
What was walked by the child is far
Constantino's citation is:

Tag. / mala'yo qan q nilakad naq bataq. / 
far    the walked   PAM-child the

The child walked far away

where PAM is 'Passive Actor Marker' (/"/ is a marker for vowel length). The gloss is inexact. The subject of the sentence is the whole clause in qanak na niq anak 'that which was walked by the child/ (the) what was walked by the child', of which is predicated the state V 'far'.

A third transformation using the 'definite sentence' as kernel is postulated, the output of which is a 'situational sentence' (in this study, a sentence with a nonstate V). Rule 17, the Rule on Situational Sentences, would derive the following (119):

INPUT / qan q anak q milayi. / 
   the child the ran-away

OUTPUT / milayi ya q q anak / 
   ran-he the child away

It was the child who ran away
The child ran away

The derivation of the output from the input, from a purely formal viewpoint, is quite simple (precluding considerations
of *va): transposition of qiŋ qaŋak to the end of the sentence, deletion of qiŋ preceding miŋyi. Semantically, however, the two sentences are quite distinct. The first sentence is an equational sentence, usually an answer to the question, 'Who ran away?' The second sentence is a simple statement, 'The child ran away'.

The implausible transformations proposed demonstrate quite clearly, if nothing else, the function of semantics in grammar (even if one does not accept Chafe's position that syntax is actually not distinct from but part of semantics): what moves the transformational generative grammarian to postulate sentential connections is identity of semantic import. There is nothing in the theory of formal language itself (more especially, in the theory of the characterization of the transformational component) to prevent one phrase marker from being transformed into a totally different phrase marker; in other words, transformational rules can be made as powerful as warranted. The constraint, as far as natural languages are concerned, seems to me to be semantic: only such transformations which preserve semantic identity can be posited. In grammatical analysis, then, semantic considerations are primary. One must not be led by surface similarities in structure and in lexical choice as well as symbolization to posit transformations where such transformations are semantically implausible.

Surely, to derive ordinary nonstate V sentences from an equational sentence seems implausible, considering that
one goes from a highly marked equational sentence to the least marked (and most frequent) type of $V^N$ structure. Such considerations must outweigh any aesthetic considerations that perfectly balanced IC's in equational sentences present.

A close comparison between the description of various data in this study and Constantino's analysis will show further points of disagreement of lesser importance. They will be stated only summarily.

(1) Constantino equates tense and aspect: 'Note that the verbal affix has three components: voice, mode and tense or aspect'(76). He formulates a rule:

$$\text{T魔鬼} \rightarrow \text{TA + MD (MA)}$$

where T魔鬼=Tense Marker, TA=Tense/Aspect, MD=Mode, MA=ability. The derivational rules given in Chapter I show quite clearly that abilitativizer (in Pampangan, symbolized by maka-) is only one among many other possible derivational units; since it is a lexical (derivational) unit, it should be analyzed separately from inflectional units (tense/aspect and mode). Tense, it was shown in Chapter III, is best considered a selectional unit of a temporal state $V$; in turn, the temporal state $V$ is predicated of an embedded $V^N$ configuration. Postsemantically, tense units may be incorporated as inflectional units into a subordinate or embedded $V$. Moreover, tense dictates aspeccual specification in a subordinate $V$;
aspectual specifications are inflectional units of V. Traditional mode (indicative, imperative, optative) was analyzed in terms of illocutionary verbs; where overtly marked, such markers would be incorporated into semantic V as inflectional units and eventually linearized and symbolized as unbound particles, not affixes.

(2) Constantino places great emphasis on the active/passive dichotomy. Thus, all verbal sentences (in this study, Constantino's verbal sentences would be analyzed as equational sentences in which the subject N has an attached relative clause the V of which is an action or a process-action V) in which the agent N of the relative clause is -SUBJECT and -OBLIQUE are labeled 'passive'. Hence, different types of passives are posited: goal (=patient), locative, benefactive, instrumental, reciprocal (e.g., the interlocutor in a conversation, hence, either a goal or an associate N), agentive (in this study, motive). To be perfectly consistent, if one adopts the active/passive dichotomy as primary, then one should add to the above list of passives the following: complementative, mensurative, materiative, normative, associative, partitive, abessive (source), adessive (goal), temporal, experiential. Because of these different N relations, the two -SUBJECT determiners, nan/nin and kan/kin, are labeled by Constantino as homophonous formatives of different markers: CM (Complement Marker), IGM (Indefinite Goal Marker), DGM (Definite Goal Marker), LM (Locative Marker), BM (Benefactive Marker), IM (Instrumental
Marker), RAM (Reciprocal Agentive Marker), AM (Agentive Marker). In this analysis, such relations were postulated as obtaining in semantic structure but postsemantically marked as either OBLIQUE or -OBLIQUE.

(3) Constantino formulates rules for 'addition of nominative pronoun' (ya) and 'addition of passive agentive pronoun' (na) and notes: 'If the noun is an inanimate noun, the addition of the pronoun is optional' (95). In Chapter II, it was shown that not only is a nonsubject and nonoblique agent N copied but likewise a nonsubject and nonoblique patient N in a process V. Moreover, it is not the selectional specification '-animate' which blocks subject copying but the specifications 'abstract' or '-count'. Finally, in equational sentences where the predicate noun is subjectivized, the subject N is not copied either.

(4) Constantino formulates two rules for 'addition of nominative pronoun', Rules 15 and 19, corresponding to the incorporation processes I have described. Thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{INPUT} & \quad / \quad \text{milayi} \quad \text{qi$q\bar{g}$} \quad \text{qanak.} \\
\text{OUTPUT} & \quad / \quad \text{milayi} \quad \text{ya} \quad \text{qi$q\bar{g}$} \quad \text{qanak.} \\
& \quad \text{\textquoteleft The child ran away\textquoteright}
\end{align*}
\]

where \textit{ya} copies 'the child'; this rule is formulated as Rule 19.
As an example of Rule 15, the following is cited:

**INPUT** / qanak qiŋ meŋan kiŋ mangga. /

**OUTPUT** / qanak ya qiŋ meŋan kiŋ mangga. /

'It was a child who ate the mango'

Constantino states that *ya* in this case does not refer to the *qiŋ* phrase (which in this case Constantino considers as the predicate) but to the 'indefinite subject' *qanak*. Hence, the necessity for formulating a separate rule, Rule 15, since, according to Constantino, what is copied is the initial formative. My analysis, however, has shown that in this instance, *ya* still copies the *qiŋ* phrase provided one considers *qanak* not as the subject but as the predicate, a -definite (and -SUBJECT) predicate noun. There is therefore no need to postulate two rules for the addition of nominative pronoun' (see pages 117 and 119 of Constantino).

(5) Constantino proposes the following derivation (117-8):

(a) / qiŋ qanak qiŋ meŋan kiŋ mangga. /
   'It was the child who ate the mango'

(b) / qiŋ mangga qiŋ peŋa' niŋ qanak. /
   'It was the mango which was eaten by the child'

(c) / qiŋ mangga qiŋ peŋa' na niŋ qanak. /
   'It was the mango which was eaten by the child'

(d) / mangga qiŋ peŋa' na niŋ qanak. /
   'It was a mango that was eaten by the child'
The sequence (a) to (b) to (c) is an example of the passive transformation, the choice of patient N instead of agent N as subject. It is with the sequence (c) to (d), from definite to indefinite, that an objection may be raised, the objection already raised concerning constraints on transformations. Moreover, I fail to see the usefulness of the (d) to (f) sequence, since the output of (d) is identical with the output of (f). In other words, the copier ya was introduced transformationally and then deleted. Actually, the transformation postulated between (d) and (e) is dubious, since literally (d) means

What was eaten by the child was a mango
What was eaten by the child were mangoes

where the predicate noun is -definite. On the other hand, (e) means:

What was eaten by the child was the mango

where the predicate noun is definite. Once again, the semantic
Import of the two sentences is different; it is dubious therefore that (e) is derived from (d). The same objection may be raised to the postulation of a transformation from (e) to (f) since the definite to indefinite switch is once more questionable.

(7) Constantino analyzes the phrase

\[
\text{ken} \quad \text{qanak}
\]

LM-DM-the child

where LM is Locative Marker, DM is Definite Marker; he differentiates it from

\[
\text{kiŋ} \quad \text{qanak}
\]

LM-the child

(see page 84). Rather than differentiate \text{kiŋ} from \text{ken} by the semantic unit 'definite', the differentiating unit is 'demonstrative: proximate to speaker'. Hence, \text{ken qanak} means 'to that child near you'. Both \text{kiŋ} and \text{ken} are 'definite'.

(8) 'A particle (PRT) occurs between the possessive article, affirmative or negative, and the common noun...'(91). The example given is:

\[
\text{qatiŋ} \quad \text{sampa'ga}
\]

possessive particle-PRT flower

'there is a flower'
In my analysis, -ŋ is the recurring ligature; it is not a special particle but is indicative of the incorporation of N sampága into the V branch, atín. atín is a presential (and existential) state V, not a 'possessive particle'.

(8) Constantino cites the sentence (100):

Kap. / pa'ra ya kiŋ dala'ga qiŋ sampa'ga. / for it LM- maiden the flower the

'The flower is for the maiden'

The copier ya should be placed after dalága rather than after pará; the misplacing of ya is perhaps a typographical oversight. The positioning of the copier is important, however, since if the above citation were correct, pará would be clearly a lexically specified state V branch. In my analysis, the above sentence would have a nonlexically specified intensive state V which is eventually deleted. The Spanish loanword pará is a lexical unit added to the beneficiary N branch, not to V.

5.4. Areas for Future Research. This study of Pampangan, entitled an 'outline', pretends to be no more than that. The rules which were formulated were suggestive and were aimed not so much at exhaustiveness as at indicating ways of fruitfully examining aspects of the language using a semantic model. That Chafe's semantic model is viable has been amply demonstrated.
Moreover, the insights it has given concerning phenomena which hitherto have been problematic invites the researcher to probe more deeply into the language, using it as a model.

The N relations demand further examination, since the inventory presented, although undoubtedly covering the main types, is most likely not complete. It seems that the most fruitful approach is to postulate as many N relations as have bearing on semantic structures and then to reduce these relations to certain surface categories, in other words, to posit postsemantic syncretization processes which eventually yield surface cases, in Pampangan, three.

The derivational processes described in Chapter I demand a separate and exhaustive study in themselves, and as I have mentioned, their study should contribute to the general theory of lexicology. Moreover, any bilingual dictionary of Pampangan will eventually have to deal with the particular symbolizations of the various affixes and the idiosyncratic symbolizations these take in combination with other affixes. The bilingual dictionary will take different forms according to its purposes. A pedagogical bilingual dictionary, for example, would do well to list rules such as

\[
(Sy) \quad \text{root+\left(\text{derivational unit}\right)} \quad \xrightarrow{\text{repetitive}} \quad \text{PREFIX+INFIX+ROOT+\text{plural}}
\]

rel subject

\[
\xrightarrow{\text{Suffix}}
\]

since in actual language use, one normally uses whole combinations rather than individual units. The different symbolizations
of the incorporated subject markers likewise demand separate treatment.

Chafe's semantic model demands a lexicon different from a dictionary. The lexicon will consist of a list of specification rules whereby matrices of selectional units eventually narrow lexical choice down to a definite unit, based on previous specifications. Hence:

$$\text{(LEXICAL RULE) V/N}$$

\[
\text{selectional unit } x \\
\text{selectional unit } y \\
\text{selectional unit } z \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{root+ (derivational unit)}
\]

The dictionary, on the other hand, will consist of a list of replacement rules whereby lexical units or matrices of selectional and inflectional units (mostly the latter) are directly symbolized by phonological sequences. Prior to symbolization, the deletion processes will have applied. Hence:

$$\text{(SYMBOLIZATION RULE)}$$

\[
\text{root} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{AAA} \\
\text{derivational unit} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{BBB} \\
\text{[selectional unit]} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{CCC} \\
\text{inflectional unit(s)} \\
\]

The tense-aspect relations between temporal state V and nonstate V have to be formulated through aspectual harmony rules and through tense governance rules for aspect.
The area of presemantic structure necessitates more elaborate and formal treatment; it seems, too, that this field of research will yield very important insights into semantic universals as well as the general theory of communication.

Ultimately, of course, semantic considerations in language will lead into discourse analysis which, except for the work of Harris (1952), whose concept of semantic structure is totally different from the type of semantic structure presupposed in this study, and the initial work of the tagmemicists, notably, of Pike and Longacre (see Pike 1966 for a list of available published material), has been studiously avoided by linguists, leaving the field to rhetoricians, few of whom have the adequate conceptual tools and formalism necessary for this type of inquiry. The area of discourse analysis invites the linguist to new endeavors for which at present he does have the necessary tools for analysis; it is an area which he can ill neglect, since so many of the facts of language will prove recalcitrant to adequate formulation as long as he confines himself to the nuclear sentence.

Finally, the study of the semantic structures and postsemantic processes of Pampangan (and of the other Philippine languages) will yield data for linguistic typology, so necessary in comparative work, as well as for more satisfactory groupings based on grammatical criteria (on the content side of language) to complement phonological criteria (on the expression side of
language). While this study in many details disagrees with Constantino's formulations, Constantino's own objective, to write a common grammar for the Philippine languages, remains a valid and feasible undertaking, since the Philippine languages are similar enough at this stage of their evolution to permit such a common grammar. On the basis of shared innovations comparable to the work of Lopez, formulated in terms not of mere surface features, however, but in terms of postsemantic processes (or transformations), perhaps insight into the stages of diversification that these languages have undergone can be gained and clues about the history of these languages attained, thus contributing to the progress of diachronic linguistics.
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