

WACKERNAGEL AND VERB-ADJACENT CLISIS IN CENTRAL PHILIPPINES*

CELESTE LEE
 National Chi Nan University
 cylee@ncnu.edu.tw

LOREN BILLINGS
 National Chi Nan University
 billings@ncnu.edu.tw

This paper reports about how clausal clitics in Tagalog and several closely related languages are positioned relative to the rest of the clause. We show that the distribution of clitics belongs to the following two types: Wackernagel and verb-adjacent. One language, Tausug, attests the former type; most of the rest, only the latter. Tagalog shows a mixture of the two positioning types. In addition, Tausug, unlike other CP languages, allows an initial complementizer to serve as the initial element, which the clitics follow. The other languages' clitics are further restricted to being non-initial in the INFL phrase.

1. BACKGROUND

Clitic-hood is explicitly identified through certain syntactic constructions. This is due to the fact that in Central Philippine (hereafter: CP) languages (and in much of Austronesian), the verb tends to be clause-initial; as such, it is hard to identify which of the two types—Wackernagel (W) or verb-adjacent (VA)—is relevant. For ease of exposition, the various syntactic configurations of the verb, other non-clitic elements, and the clitic cluster are sketched in (1a-e).

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|---------|-------------|--------------------|---------|
| (1) | a. Unmarked affirmative order | | verb | <i>cluster</i> | (XP(s)) |
| | b. Unmarked negated order | NEG | verb | <i>cluster</i> | (XP(s)) |
| | c. (1a) with a fronted adjunct | adjunct | verb | <i>cluster</i> | (XP(s)) |
| | d. (1b) with a fronted adjunct | adjunct | verb | <i>cluster</i> NEG | (XP(s)) |
| | e. (1b) with a fronted adjunct | adjunct | verb | <i>cluster</i> NEG | (XP(s)) |

A number of elements are obligatorily in clitic position in CP languages. Perhaps the best example is clausal-scope GEN-case personal pronouns in much of CP (and elsewhere in Austronesian). A number of other elements are only optionally so: e.g., OBL-case pronouns in several languages, as illustrated in (15c) and (17a, d) below, and demonstratives, shown in (15d), (16a), and (18d) below. See also Billings (2005) regarding NOM-case personal pronouns appearing outside the cluster, and personal names appearing inside it. Because of such

* For collegial assistance we enthusiastically thank Daniel Kaufman and Helen Miller. We also acknowledge a grant provided by National Chi Nan University (Billings, primary investigator; Lee, research assistant). The second author also acknowledges a travel grant from the National Science Council. Nonetheless, any errors herein are our own.

optionality, it is sometimes difficult in configurations like (1a) to determine if an immediately post-verbal element is behaving as a clitic. However, a non-clitic element, such as NEG (1b) or a fronted adjunct (1c) precedes the verb; both the beginning and the end of the clitic cluster are clearly delineated. In addition, only if the verb is preceded by more than one non-clitic element, as in (1d-e), is it possible to distinguish between the two types of positioning. The most common two such elements, although relatively infrequent in corpora, are a fronted adjunct and NEG; even more rarely, multiple fronted adjuncts have also been found. In (1d) the clitic clusters are unambiguously in W position. With certain complications, (1e) can indicate VA ordering.

Recent analyses (Billings and Konopasky 2002a, 2002b, 2003) rely on Tagalog having VA ordering. In fact, although preferring VA ordering, Tagalog allows W positioning in such structures, shown in (2a-b). Corpus searches have shown a strong preference for VA ordering. Throughout this paper, the relevant clause's verb is in bold type and its clitics are italicized.¹

- (2) a. Bakit *ka* hindi **s<um>a-sagot?**
 why 2SG.NOM NEG <AV>IRR-answer
- b. Bakit hindi *ka* **s<um>a-sagot?**
 why NEG 2SG.NOM <AV>IRR-answer
 'Why aren't you answering?' (Tagalog, same translation for both)

Billings and Kaufman (2004) report that the Austronesian languages of Taiwan, the Philippines, and Sulawesi exhibit variation between W and VA positioning. Generally, the more northern languages are W, whereas most southernmost languages, in Sulawesi, are unambiguously VA.

What has not been presented so far in this regard are the more southerly languages of the Philippines, around Mindanao.² We show data primarily from the East Mindanao subgroup (Pallesen, 1985, Gallman 1997) within CP.³ These languages include Tagakaulo (Collins 1970), Kaagan, Mansaka (Svelmoe and Svelmoe 1990), and Davawenyo—all investigated in Lee

¹ The following abbreviations are used in this paper: ABIL(itative); AV: Actor voice; BV: Benefactive voice; CAUS(ative); COMP(lementizer), a lexical category; DIR(ection case); EX(clusive); GEN(itive case); INFL(ection), a lexical category; IRR(ealis); LV: Location voice; NEG(ation), a lexical category; NOM(inative case); OBL(ique case); PL(ural); PRF: perfective; PV: Patient voice; REAL(is); SG: singular; STA(tive). Angle brackets mark infixes.

² The evidence discussed in this paper, being syntagmatic in nature, is not claimed to be useful in establishing phylogenetic relationships. In this overall project (Billings 2005, Billings and Konopasky 2002a, 2002b, 2003; Billings and Kaufman 2004; Lee 2004; Lee and Billings, to appear), the CP languages have been taken as an investigative starting point. That is, it stands to reason that Tagalog is likely to share properties with its most closely related languages. CP is the smallest subgroup that includes Tagalog. CP's successive historical lineage is Greater CP (Blust 1991, roughly similar to Southern Philippines in Zorc 1977), Philippine (following Zorc (1986), Malayo-Polynesian (Blust 1977), and Austronesian (Blust 1999). In terms of cluster-internal clitic ordering, other CP languages, see Billings and Konopasky (2003), Lee (2004), and Lee and Billings (to appear).

³ Whereas scholars agree on CP as a phylogenetic unit, they differ somewhat on the groupings both above (as the preceding footnote mentions) and below CP. Arguing against Zorc (1977) and others, Gallman (1997:2-3, 90-111; cf. Pallesen 1985:15) proposes three subgroups of CP: Tagalog, Bikol, and South CP. The last of these includes East Mindanao (the subgroup of main relevance to this study) as well as four subgroups in the Visayas.

(2004)—as well as Tausug (Hassan et al. 1994) and Mamanwa (Miller and Miller 1991; Miller and Miller 1976). Clausal clitics among these languages exhibit either W or VA positioning.⁴

2. WACKERNAGEL CLISIS

Among the aforementioned languages, only Tausug (spoken on Jolo Island in the Sulu Archipelago and environs, between Mindanao and Sabah) attests mostly W ordering. In that language, NEG or a fronted adjunct constitutes an initial element. Examples are given in (3a-b).

- (3) a. **Nag-lawag** *siya* *iban*.
 AV.PRF-search 3SG.NOM companion
 ‘He searched for a companion.’ (Tausug; Hassan et al. 1994:22)
- b. *Ayaw mu* *aku* **ligut-a** ...
 NEG 2SG.GEN 1SG.NOM spin-PV.IMPERATIVE
 ‘Don’t spin me around ...’ (Tausug; Hassan et al. 1994:288)

The clitics directly follow the verb when it appears clause-initially, as in (3a). On the other hand, the appearance of a NEG moves the clitics to pre-verbal position, exemplified in (3b).

Moving next to clauses with a fronted adjunct, we find a similar distribution:

- (4) a. *Māhang siya* **mag-liyu** *pa asawa niya puun*.
 seldom 3SG.NOM AV-go.and.stay DIR wife his first
 ‘He seldom goes and stays with his first wife.’ (Tausug; Hassan et al. 1994:296)
- b. *Gana-gana na* *aku* **m-adtu** *pa bāy niyu*.
 later PRF 1SG.NOM AV-go.to DIR house their
 ‘I’ll go to your house by and by.’ (Tausug; Hassan et al. 1994:143)

The clitics are required to move to a pre-verbal position and follow the initial adjunct.

In addition, Tausug allows complementizers to serve as the initial element:

- (5) a. *Basta aku* **maka-gaus** *m-attu da aku*.
 if 1SG.NOM AV.ABIL-means AV-go.to just 1SG.NOM
 ‘I’ll go there if I can afford to.’ (Tausug; Hassan et al. 1994:87)
- b. *Bang siya* *di’* **m-agad** ...
 if 3SG.NOM NEG AV-go.with
 ‘If he won’t go with us[,] ...’ (Tausug; Hassan et al. 1994:82)

This is unlike in Tagalog.⁵ Still, complementizers don’t always serve as the initial element in Tausug. Example (6) is given to illustrate how clitics are positioned in contrast to (5a-b).

⁴ Several of these languages use the name “Kalagan”; for this reason, we use other, more distinctive names.

⁵ In addition, (5b) involves two non-clitic elements in front of the verb, and the clitic *siya* is unambiguously in W position. This issue is discussed below. See (7a-b) and the surrounding discussion, as well as section 4, below.

- (6) ... bang di' niya aku dihil-an pagkaun.
 if NEG 3SG.GEN 1SG.NOM give-BV food
 '... if she doesn't give me food.' (Tausug; Hassan et al. 1994:81)

Tausug apparently allows either COMP phrase or INFL phrase to be the domain within which clitics must be peninitial. Clearly, not only can complementizers count as the first element of the domain of clisis, the whole COMP phrase—not just the INFL phrase, as Kroeger (1993) proposes for Tagalog—can count as the relevant W domain.⁶

As mentioned above, only if more than one non-clitic element takes pre-verbal position can we distinguish W from VA ordering. Clitics can either (i) appear between the two non-clitic pre-verbal elements or (ii) follow the second fronted element and precede the verb. The latter can be identified as VA positioning only if there is no intonation-phrase break after the first fronted element. Unlike Tagalog, the vast majority of such clauses show W ordering:

- (7) a. Agun kaw di' mā-kita' ...
 nearly 2SG.NOM NEG AV.ABIL-see ...
 'You can hardly see ...' (Tausug; Hassan et al. 1994:286)
- b. Mayta' kaw di' mag-kayba'?'
 why 2SG.NOM NEG AV-talk
 'Why don't you talk?' (Tausug; Hassan et al. 1994:233)

Examples (7a-b) represent W clitic positioning in Tausug. The clitic 2SG.NOM *kaw* follows the fronted adjunct (*agun* 'nearly' and *mayta'* 'why') and directly precedes NEG. This distribution also entails that there is no intonational break after the adjunct.

However, there are apparent counterexamples, with the cluster after both pre-verbal elements:

- (8) Hatiku wala' niya kiya-ingatan.
 perhaps NEG 3SG.GEN BV.ABIL.REAL-know
 'Perhaps he didn't know.' (Tausug; Hassan et al. 1994:170)

In such examples, we suggest, there is an intonation-phrase break after the initial adjunct.

In this connection, consider the near-minimal pairs in (9a-b) and (10a-b). In (9a) and (10a), the initial adjunct immediately precedes any clitics. However, in (9b) and (10b)—as in (8)—the clitics do not follow the initial adjunct. The contrast is particularly interesting in (10a-b), where the initial adjunct is *gana-gana* (albeit glossed differently in the two examples by our source).

⁶ In Tausug COMP phrases without overt complementizers do not host clitics: *ing sabab Ø (*kaw) na-puklid *(kaw)* [NOM reason COMP (*2SG.NOM) PV.PRF.STA-fall *(2SG.NOM)] 'the reason you fell' (Daniel Kaufman, p.c.).

- (9) a. Subay *kaw* **mang-gisgis** ...
 should 2SG.NOM AV-brush.teeth
 ‘You should brush your teeth ...’ (Tausug; Hassan et al. 1994:77)
- b. Subay **sulut-un** *mu* in asawa mu...
 should placate-PF 2SG.GEN NOM wife your
 ‘You have to placate your wife ...’ (Tausug; Hassan et al. 1994:431)
- (10) a. Gana-gana *na* *aku* **m-adtu** pa bāy niyu.
 later PRF 1SG.NOM AV-go.to DIR house their
 ‘I’ll go to your house by and by.’ (Tausug; = (4b) above)
- b. Gana-gana di’ *siya* **d<um>atung** adlaw yan.
 perhaps NEG 3SG.NOM <AV>arrive day that
 ‘He might not arrive today.’ (Tausug; Hassan et al. 1994:143)

Our Tausug corpus is a dictionary, with isolated sentences as examples. This makes it difficult to determine various discourse properties. Moreover, a full analysis of the syntax-semantics interface is beyond the scope of this study. Still, a preliminary hypothesis can be advanced.

In (9a) the initial adjunct is a deontic modal, while in (10a) it is a temporal adverb. These are opposed to the epistemic initial adjuncts in all of (8), (9b), and (10b). In (9a) and (10a) the adjunct is intra-clausal, while in the remaining examples it is adjoined to the clause.

Another difficulty with a corpus such as this one is the lack of prosodic cues; in Hassan et al. (1994) the use of commas to indicate prosodic breaks is uncommon. This being the case, we have to make assumptions common in philological work. As it were, the clitics indicate where the clausal boundary is; the clausal boundary also the trigger for prosodic boundaries.

A similar variation in positioning can also be seen in Tagalog, a better-understood language. With some initial adjuncts, there is a certain variability in positioning:

- (11) Baka ([?]*sila*) hindi [?](*sila*) **d<um>ating** ngayon.
 perhaps 3PL.NOM NEG 3PL.NOM <AV>arrive now
 ‘They might not arrive.’ (Tagalog; Daniel Kaufman; p.c.)

Schachter and Otnes (1972:189-93) list several types of elements that can optionally serve as pre-clitic elements; many of these are non-verbal predicates (e.g., *paharap* ‘facing’). Moreover, in Tagalog some adjuncts favor a configuration with *ay*, a topic-marking element; clitics cannot immediately follow *ay*. For example, *marahil* ‘perhaps’ nearly always takes *ay*:

- (12) Marahil ay (^{*}*sila*) **um-alis** ^{*}(*sila*).
 perhaps TOP 3PL.NOM AV.PRF-left 3PL.NOM
 ‘Perhaps they left.’ (Tagalog; Daniel Kaufman; p.c.)

In Tagalog, there are three ways for an adjunct to precede a verb in a sentence, shown below in (13a-b). Kroeger (1993, following Schachter and Otnes 1972:485-500) discusses these three structures. (Non-crucially, we modify Kroeger's labels for the three constructions.)

- (13) a. Adjunct fronting
 Bukas *siya* **a-alis**.
 tomorrow 3SG.NOM AV.IRR-leave
 'It's tomorrow that he's leaving.' (Tagalog; Kroeger 1993:124)
- b. External topicalization
 Bukas, **a-alis** *siya*.
 tomorrow AV.IRR-leave 3SG.NOM
 'Tomorrow, he's leaving.' (Tagalog; Kroeger 1993:125)
- c. Internal topicalization
 Bukas ay **a-alis** *siya*.
 tomorrow TOP AV.IRR-leave 3SG.NOM
 'Tomorrow he's leaving.' (Tagalog; Kroeger 1993:125)

In the literature, the two types of topicalization in (13b-c) have also been called strong and weak topicalization, respectively. Kroeger adds that in (13a) "the entire sentence forms a single intonational unit"; in (13b) "the fronted element must be set off from the remainder of the sentence by a pause"; and in (13c) "*ay* is optionally preceded by a pause" (1993:125). Note that Tausug doesn't have an overt marker like *ay* in Tagalog. It is unclear whether there is such a three-way distinction in Tausug. There seems to be a direct counterpart of (13a) and perhaps just a single kind of topicalization, both of which require some sort of prosodic break after the topic. In either event, the clitic cluster would not be able to follow any pre-verbal topicalized element.

3. VERB-ADJACENT CLISIS

Aside from Tagalog and Tausug, only VA ordering has been found for most of the CP languages around Mindanao, in unambiguous contexts.⁷ As in Tausug and Tagalog, if the verb is initial, then any clausal clitics immediately follow it:

⁷ Many of the examples and additional discussion can be found in Lee (2004).

- (14) a. ... **mag-inag** *da* *ya* *bulan* *aw* *bitun*.
 AV-shine PRF NOM moon and star
 ‘... the moon and stars are shining.’ (Tagakaulo; Murray and Murray 1983:79)
- b. ... **atag-an** *kaw* *nan* *na* *bagu* *umu* ...
 ... give-BV 2SG.NOM 3SG.GEN GEN new life
 ‘... he gave you a new life ...’ (Kaagan; Wallis 1965/1978:7)
- c. **Yang-ikag** *da* *yang* *dolyan* ...
 AV-blossom PRF NOM durian
 ‘The durian tree is blossoming already.’ (Mansaka; Svelmoe and Svelmoe 1990:204)
- d. **Maga-pa-daa** *ako* *nang* *sorat* ...
 AV-CAUS-bring 1SG.NOM GEN letter
 ‘I will send a letter ...’ (Davawenyo; Erkmann 1990:47)

As illustrated above for Tausug, the presence of NEG causes the clitics to be pre-verbal:

- (15) a. ... *wala’* *da* *nan* *silan* **pa-panaw-a**.
 NEG PRF 3SG.GEN 3PL.NOM CAUS-go-PV
 ‘... he would not let them go.’ (Tagakaulo; *Génésis ya* 2000:197 [Exodus 10.27])
- b. ... *we* *nilan* *aku* **ka-kamang** ...
 NEG 3SG.GEN 1SG.NOM PV.IRR-take
 ‘... they were not able to get me...’ (Kaagan; Wallis 1965/1978:9)
- c. ... *wa* *kaw* *kanak* **a-saot** ...
 NEG 2SG.NOM 1SG.OBL AV-catch.up
 ‘... you didn’t catch up with me ...’ (Mansaka; Svelmoe and Svelmoe 1990:489)
- d. *Di* *mo* **i-atag** *yan*?
 NEG 2SG.NOM PV.give that.NOM
 ‘You will not give it to me?’ (Davawenyo; Yamami 1985:46)

In these languages, clauses with a fronted adjunct take a similar distribution:

- (16) a. ... *ananga* *silan* *yan* **madi**.
 why 3PL.NOM that.NOM come.AV
 ‘... why he comes to them.’ (Tagakaulo; Wallis 1965/1974:6)
- b. *Agpet* *da* *sakanan* **t<um>angag**.
 soon PRF 3SG.NOM <AV>return
 ‘He will return soon.’ (Kaagan; Perez et al. 1983:4)
- c. *Nanga* *kaw* **yum-ulluk?**
 why 2SG.NOM AV-shrink.back
 ‘Why do you shrink back?’ (Mansaka; Svelmoe and Svelmoe 1990:484)
- d. *Kagabi* *pa* *ako* **a-datung** *sikun* *sa* *Manila*.
 yesterday just 1SG.NOM AV-arrive from OBL Manila
 ‘I just arrived yesterday coming from Manila.’ (Davawenyo; Erkmann 1990:7)

Because these examples are drawn from printed texts, without prosodic cues, we must assume that there is no prosodic break after the initial adjunct. From our experience, *wh*-adjuncts are particularly reliable examples of non-topic adjunct fronting. (In CP languages, fronted arguments require cleft-like structures, but adjuncts do not; *wh*-adjuncts behave as other fronted adjuncts.)

Unlike Tausug, but as in Tagalog, complementizers cannot serve as the initial pre-clitic element. As shown above, only one non-clitic element (following the complementizer) appears in front of the verb. In (17a-c) this element is NEG; in (17d) it is a fronted adjunct (*adi* ‘here’).

- (17) a. Manang dili’ *pa kaw kanan mag-pa-kita’* ...
 but NEG yet 2SG.NOM 3SG.OBL AV-CAUS-see
 ‘But don’t let him see you.’
 (Tagakaulo; *Ya Kasampetanan* 1999:9, 2000a:10-11, 2000b:11, 2004:20 [Ruth 3.3])
- b. ... para di *nilan sakanan i-pa-kila.*
 so NEG 3PL.GEN 3SG.NOM LV-CAUS-know
 ‘... so they do not say who he was.’ (Kaagan; *Ya Marayaw* 1980:16 [Mark 3.12])
- c. ... antak dili *ko ikaw gapos-on.*
 so.that NEG 1SG.NOM 2SG.GEN bind-PV
 ‘... so that I won’t have to tie you up.’ (Mansaka; Svelmoe and Svelmoe 1990:128)
- d. ... kay *adi kaw da pag-uya* kanami.
 because here 2SG.NOM PRF AV-stay EX1PL.OBL
 ‘... because now you will stay here with us.’ (Davawenyo; Buat 2001:19)

The crucial configuration that differentiates VA from W clitic ordering lies in the most complex and rare configuration: [first (*cluster*) second (*cluster*) **verb** ...]. Based on our corpus search, Tagakaulo, Kaagan, Mansaka, and Davawenyo exhibit VA ordering.

- (18) a. ... ananga’ wala’ *da mu kami kilala?*
 why NEG PRF 2SG.GEN EX1PL.NOM recognize.PV
 ‘... why do you not recognize us?’ (Tagakaulo; Guili 1978:76)
- b. Nanga di *da kaw mag-kila* sa utaw?
 why NEG PRF 2SG.NOM AV-know OBL person
 ‘Why don’t you recognize people anymore?’ (Kaagan; Perez et al. 1983:53)
- c. Nanga wara *kaw a-ágad* ni Damyasan ... ?
 why NEG 2SG.NOM AV-accompany GEN Damyasan
 ‘Why did you not go with Damyasan ... ?’ (Mansaka; Svelmoe and Svelmoe 1990:8)
- d. Basi di *mo atag* yan.
 maybe NEG 2SG.GEN give.PV that.NOM
 ‘Maybe you will not give that (to me).’ (Davawenyo; Yamami 1985:50)

Assuming that the initial adjunct is not set off by an intonation-phrase break in any of (18a-d), then these examples show that the clitics take unambiguous VA ordering.⁸

Preliminary searches of materials on Mamanwa (Miller and Miller 1991, Miller and Miller 1976), also discussed in section 4 below, show that, as in the CP languages of Southeast Mindanao, clitics show only VA ordering.⁹ Helen Miller (p.c.) also confirms that unambiguous W ordering (i.e., with the clitic cluster between two pre-verbal non-clitic elements) is not found.

The type of VA ordering found in these CP languages is historically transitional. Like Bulgarian (Billings and Konopasky 2002a, Rudin et al. 1999), in these languages the clitic cluster must be next to the verb, but there is also a non-initiality requirement. Furthermore, the domain within which clitics must not be initial is apparently the INFL phrase. That is to say, we have found no convincing evidence in these languages of clitics immediately following a complementizer and preceding a verb. Languages further south, in Sulawesi, do not attest such a non-initiality requirement (Billings and Kaufman 2004:20-21). Thus, the CP languages of Southeast Mindanao are transitional between W ordering and certain clitics in the languages of Sulawesi, in which ordering is based solely on positioning relative to the verb (and crucially not dependent on non-initiality within COMP phrase or INFL phrase). This transitional status is also discussed by Wanner (1996) regarding medieval Romance languages preserved in corpora.

To summarize so far, we have shown how the languages of Southeast Mindanao and Mamanwa exhibit VA ordering (plus non-initiality within INFL phrase), whereas Tausug shows W ordering. Tagalog exhibits mostly VA ordering (with the same non-initiality requirement) but occasionally also attests unambiguous W ordering. The CP languages can also be typed according to the domain within clitics are peninitial (if W) or non-initial (if VA). Tausug allows an initial complementizer to be the initial element, whereas the remaining CP languages restrict this domain to INFL phrase.

4. WHY TAUSUG IS DIFFERENT

This final body section attempts to explain the typological distinctiveness of Tausug relative to the other languages (those for which we have data, at least). Tausug is unique within CP in both (i) allowing complementizers to appear immediately before the clitic cluster and (ii) showing no signs of VA ordering, just W. We show that both of these features were probably borrowed from the Sama-Bajaw languages with which Tausug has been in contact throughout the historical period.

Gallman (1997) proposes three primary subgroups within East Mindanao. Along with Southeast Mindanao (which includes Tagakaulo, Kaagan, and Mansaka) and another that includes Davawenyo, of relevance to this discussion is Northeast Mindanao, which includes

⁸ This assumption is not as safe in (18d) because its epistemic meaning is similar to those above of (8), (9b), and (10b) in Tausug, as well as (11) and (12) in Tagalog. This was the best example we could find for Davawenyo.

⁹ Mamanwa is spoken on the northwestern tip of Mindanao, as well as in Panoan and the southern end of Leyte: the next two islands to the north of Mindanao on the Pacific Coast (Miller and Miller 1976:6).

Tausug and Mamanwa. From a standpoint of both inherited and contact-induced change, Pallesen (1985) has documented the historical relationships among the languages of the Sulu Archipelago, where Tausug is encircled by Sama-Bajaw languages. Pallesen shows that Tausug is most closely related phylogenically to Butuan. In turn, Butuan-Tausug—along with Surigaonun, Mamanwa, and possibly Cebuano—is a primary subgroup of Northeast Mindanao.¹⁰ In prehistoric times, Pallesen proposes, the Tausug migrated from Northeastern Mindanao to Jolo Island, on the far side of Mindanao. Continuing contact with the Sama-Bajaw peoples has led to plenty of borrowing. Included in this, we argue here, is (i) the form of some complementizers, (ii) their availability as initial elements in the domain of clisis, and (iii) *W* rather than *VA* ordering. We list comparable structures from Tagalog, Mamanwa (as the closest relative to Tausug for which we have sufficient data), Tausug, and Mapun (the Sama-Bajaw language for which data is most available).

In simple clauses, all of these languages generally begin with the verb (as is the prevalent case throughout the Taiwan-to-Sulawesi area. Any clausal clitics immediately follow:

- (19)a. **Mag-lu-luto** *ako* *ng* *itlog*.
 AV-IRR-cook 1SG.NOM GEN egg
 ‘I will cook eggs.’ (Tagalog)
- b. **Bonal-en** *mo* *ya* *baroy*.
 pound-PV 2SG.GEN NOM leaf
 ‘You will pound the leaf.’ (Mamanwa; Miller and Miller 1974:68)
- c. **Nag-lawag** *siya* *iban*.
 AV.PRF-search 3SG.NOM companion
 ‘He searched for a companion.’ (Tausug; = (3a) above)
- d. **Buwat-an** *ku* *ya* *lutu’*.
 make-BV 1SG.GEN 3SG.NOM lunch
 ‘I will make him a lunch.’ (Mapun; Collins et al. 2001:18)

Add clausal negation to (19a-d) and the following familiar orders are observed, as in (15) above:

¹⁰ No corpus data are available for Butuan or Surigaonun. Nor have we investigated Cebuano positioning within a clause, but see Billings and Konopasky (2002b:15-23) regarding cluster-internal ordering in Cebuano (and Bikol).

- (20)a. Hindi *ka* **mag-lu-luto** ng itlog.
 NEG 2SG.NOM AV-IRR-cook GEN egg
 ‘You won’t cook eggs.’ (Tagalog)
- b. Waraq *siran* **maka-ri-rini**.
 NEG 3PL.NOM AV.ABIL-IRR-come.here
 ‘They weren’t able to come here.’ (Mamanwa; Miller and Miller 1974:77)
- c. Ayaw *mu* *aku* **ligut-a** ...
 NEG 2SG.GEN 1SG.NOM spin-AV.IMPERATIVE
 ‘Don’t spin me around...’ (Tausug; = (3b) above)
- d. Ya’ *ku* **pilay** pa luma’ bi batna’a.
 NEG 1SG.NOM go DIR house your now
 ‘I’m not going to your house now.’ (Mapun; Collins et al. 2001:591)

These languages then diverge if there is an overt complementizer. In Tagalog and Mamanwa any clausal clitics follow NEG, as in (17). In Tausug and Mapun they follow the complementizer:

- (21)a. Kung hindi *ka* **nag-luto** ng itlog, ...
 if NEG 2SG.NOM AV.PRF-cook GEN egg
 ‘If you didn’t cook eggs, ...’ (Tagalog)
- b. ... kon waraq *hao* **maka-ri-rini**.
 if NEG 1SG.NOM AV.ABIL-IRR-come.here
 ‘... If I would not have come here[,] ...’ (Mamanwa; Miller and Miller 1974:137)
- c. Bang *siya* *di’* **m-agad** ...
 if 3SG.NOM NEG AV-go.with
 ‘If he won’t go with us[,] ...’ (Tausug; = (5b) above)
- d. Bong *ko* *ya’* **pa-tagong** nangis, ...
 if 2SG.NOM NEG AV-stop AV.cry
 ‘If you don’t stop crying, ...’ (Mapun; Collins et al. 2001:115)

Note as well the very form of the complementizer: *k*-initial in Tagalog and Mamanwa but *b*-initial in Tausug and Mapun. Indeed, other Sama-Bajaw languages that are situated closer to Tausug than Mapun—Yakan (Behrens 2002:41) and Sama Bangingi’ (Gault 1999:17)—attest *bang*, segmentally identical to the Tausug complementizer. All this suggests to us that Tausug borrowed much of its clitic-positioning grammar in addition to this lexeme. Somewhat similarly, Bayer (1999) reports how Hindi (and other languages of India) and Turkish, languages with clause-*final* complementizers, borrowed *ki* from Persian, a language with clause-*initial* complementizers. The directionality of this element was maintained in both of these borrowing situations. If such striking forms of borrowing can exist, then it seems reasonable for Tausug to have borrowed W ordering, within a COMP-phrase domain, from its recent Sama-Bajaw neighbors along with *bang* itself.

5. SUMMARY AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This paper has reported on the two positioning types observed in several CP languages. Most of the languages position their clitics in such a way that they are adjacent to the verb, with the added proviso that the clitics not be initial. One language, Tausug, exhibits peninitial positioning. Tagalog shows a mixture, favoring the former type. Tausug is also distinct in allowing clitics to follow an overt determiner. We also show how Tausug borrowed these distinctions, from neighboring Sama-Bajaw languages that it came into contact with.

This paper also demonstrates how the rest of the CP languages, situated between the W languages to their north and the languages in Sulawesi, represent a transitional type. Whereas many languages of Sulawesi show VA clisis without a non-initiality restriction, most of the CP languages retain non-initiality (within INFL phrase), a historical vestige of W positioning.

Suffice it to say, much remains to be done in describing clisis in this part of Austronesian. To begin, just a few of the languages have been investigated so far in CP alone (and the majority of these, especially in the Visayas and Bikol areas, still have not been investigated in this regard). To the north, the Central Luzon and Cordilleran languages are also largely unexplored, although Reid (2001) is an inroad. Huang et al. (1999) also chart the languages of Taiwan in this regard.

REFERENCES

- BAYER, JOSEF. 1999. Final complementizers in hybrid languages. *Journal of Linguistics* 35, 233-71.
- BEHRENS, DIETLINDE. 2002. *Yakan-English Dictionary*. (Special Monograph Issue, 40.2.) Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- BILLINGS, LOREN A. 2005. Ordering clitics and postverbal R-expressions in Tagalog: A unified analysis? In Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley, and Sheila Ann Dooley (eds.). *Verb First: On the Syntax of Verb-initial Languages*, pp. 303-39. (Linguistik Aktuell, 73.) Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- BILLINGS, LOREN, and DANIEL KAUFMAN. 2004. Towards a typology of Austronesian pronominal clisis. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 34, 15-29. (Proceedings of AFLA 11.)
- BILLINGS, LOREN, and ABIGAIL KONOPASKY. 2002a. Morphology's role in ordering verb-adjacent clitics. *West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* 21, 29-42.
- . 2002b. The role of morphology in ordering verb-adjacent clitics: From syntax to prosody in Bulgarian and Tagalog. *Linguistics in Potsdam* 19, 1-26.
- . 2003. Reassessing the role of syntax inside the morphological word: Verb-adjacent clitics in Tagalog and Bulgarian. *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics* 19, 20-34. (Proceedings of AFLA 9.)
- BLUST, ROBERT. 1977. The Proto-Austronesian pronouns and Austronesian subgrouping: A preliminary report. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 9.2, 1-15. [Honolulu: Department of Linguistics, University of Hawai'i.]
- . 1991. The Greater Central Philippines hypothesis. *Oceanic Linguistics* 30, 73-129.

- . 1999. Subgrouping, circularity and extinction: Some issues in Austronesian comparative linguistics. In Elizabeth Zeitoun and Paul Jen-kuei Li (eds.). *Selected Papers from the Eighth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistic*, pp. 31-94. (Symposium series of the Institute of Linguistics (Preparatory Office), 1.) Taipei: Institute of Linguistics (Preparatory Office), Academia Sinica.
- BUAT, AZUCENA. 2001. *Manga Gogodanun nang manga Kalagan* (Davawenyo traditional stories). [Ritsuko Yamami (ed.).] Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- COLLINS, GRACE C. 1970. *Two Views of Kalagan Grammar*. PhD dissertation, Bloomington: Indiana University.
- COLLINS, MILLARD, VIRGINIA COLLINS, and SULFILIX HASHIM. 2001. *Mapun-English Dictionary*. Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- [ERKMANN, ERIKA.] 1990. *Magabaaw-baaw kita sang Yagakatuna-tuna na Piyaglaongan* (Let's talk in different languages: Phrase book in English, Filipino, Cebuano, and Davawenyo). [Manila:] Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- GALLMAN, ANDREW F. 1997. *Proto East Mindanao and its Internal Relationships*. (Special Monograph Issue, 44.) Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- GAULT, JOANN MARIE. 1999. *An Ergative Description of Sama Bangingi'*. (Special Monograph Issue, 46.) Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Génésis ya Pagpalekat aw Éxudo ya Pagpaluwa' sa manga Ytaw na Isra-el* (Genesis and Exodus). 2000. South Holland, Illinois: Bible League.
- GUILI, BILHAMIN. 1978. Ya bauw aw ubal (The turtle and monkey). *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 2.2, 69-76.
- HASSAN, IRENE U., NURHADAN HALUD, SEYMOUR A. ASHLEY, and MARY L. ASHLEY. 1994. *Tausug-English Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- HUANG, LILLIAN M., ELIZABETH ZEITOUN, MARIE M. YEH, ANNA H. CHANG, and JOY J. WU. 1999. A typological study of pronominal systems in some Formosan languages. In Wang Hsu, Feng-fu Tsao, and Chin-fa Lien (eds.). *Selected Papers from the Fifth International Conference on Chinese Linguistics*, pp. 165-98. Taipei: Crane.
- KROEGER, PAUL. 1993. *Phrase Structure and Grammatical Relations in Tagalog*. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- LEE, CELESTE CHIA-YEN. 2004. The Ordering of Clitic Pronouns in the Languages of Southeast Mindanao. MA thesis, Shalu: Providence University. [In addition, available electronically at <http://ethesis.lib.pu.edu.tw/ETD-db/ETD-search-c/view_etd?URN=etd-0719104-175815>.]
- LEE, CELESTE, and LOREN BILLINGS. To appear. Clitic-pronoun clusters in Central Philippine. *Southeast Asian Linguistic Society* (SEALS 14). Tempe: Program for Southeast Asian Studies, Arizona State University.
- MILLER, JEANNE, and HELEN MILLER. 1976. *Mamanwa Grammar*. (Asian-Pacific Series, 8.) Huntington Beach, California: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- MILLER, HELEN, and JEANNE MILLER. 1991. *Mamanwa Texts*. (Studies in Philippine Linguistics, Supplementary Series, 5.) Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- MURRAY, DON W., and MARY E. MURRAY. 1983. *Tagakaulu Kalagan dictionary*. Ms. Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

- PALLESEN, A. KEMP. 1985. *Culture Contact and Language Convergence*. (Special Monograph Issue, 24.) Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- PEREZ, LORENZO, ÅSA WENDEL, and DAG WENDEL. 1983. *Kagan-Kalagan-English dictionary*. Ms. Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- REID, LAWRENCE A. 2001. On the development of agreement markers in some Northern Philippine languages. In Joel Bradshaw and Kenneth L. Rehg (eds.). *Issues in Austronesian Morphology: A Focusschrift for Byron W. Bender*, pp. 235-57. (Pacific Linguistics, 519.) Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.
- RUDIN, CATHERINE, CHRISTINA KRAMER, LOREN BILLINGS, and MATTHEW BAERMAN. 1999. Macedonian and Bulgarian *li* questions: Beyond syntax. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17, 541-86.
- SCHACHTER, PAUL, and FE T. OTANES. 1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- SVELMOE, GORDON, and THELMA SVELMOE. 1990. *Mansaka Dictionary*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- WALLIS, ETHEL E. 1965/1974. *Talili*. [Don W. Murray and Mary E. Murray (trans.).] Manila: Marshburn Press. [Original English title: *Tariri: My Story*. New York: Harper and Row.]
- WALLIS, ETHEL E. 1965/1978. *Tariri*. Dag Wendel and Åsa Wendel (trans.). Manila: Translators Committee of the Philippines. [Original English title: *Tariri: My Story*. New York: Harper and Row.]
- WANNER, DIETER. 1996. Second position clitics in medieval Romance. In Aaron L. Halpern and Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.). *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, pp. 537-78. (CSLI Lecture Notes, 61.) Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- Ya Kasampetanen kan Ruth* (Ruth, Tagakaulo). 1999. Malungon, Sarangani Province: Tagakaulo Kalagan Lutheran Mission.
- Ya Kasampetanen kan Ruth* (Ruth, Tagakaulo-Filipino). 2000a. Malungon, Sarangani Province: Tagakaulo Kalagan Lutheran Mission.
- Ya Kasampetanen kan Ruth* (The story of Ruth, Tagakaulo-English). 2000b. Malungon, Sarangani Province: Tagakaulo Kalagan Lutheran Mission.
- Ya Kasampetanen kan Ruth* (The story of Ruth, Tagakaulo-English). 2004. 2nd ed. [South Holland, Illinois:] Bible League.
- Ya Marayaw Tingeg na Timanen kan Jesu Kristo na Pigsulat ni Markos* (Gospel of Mark). 1980. New York: International Bible Society.
- YAMAMI, RITSUKO. 1985. Preliminary Davawenyo Kalagan grammar. Ms. Arlington: University of Texas.
- ZORC, R. DAVID. 1977. *The Bisayan Dialects of the Philippines: Subgroupings and Reconstruction*. (Pacific Linguistics, C-44.) Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.
- . 1986. The genetic relationships of Philippine languages. In Paul Geraghty, Lois Carrington, and S. A. Wurm (eds.). *FOCAL II: Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, pp. 147-73. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.