

# Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

Michael Wilson Rosero

## Abstract

When we speak of the word order of a given language, we look at transitive clauses with two lexical noun arguments, the A and the O (Thompson n.d.). Philippine languages<sup>1</sup> have been analyzed to have predicate-initial basic word order in which a clause is typically verb-initial, followed by nominal or pronominal arguments. However, while a predicate-initial construction is seen as the typical pattern in any Philippine-type language, there are in-

---

<sup>1</sup>‘Philippine-type’ or ‘Philippine languages’ as used in this study refers to the languages in the Philippines that exhibit similar morphological and syntactic structures. Nolasco (2003) identifies ergativity as one universal feature of Philippine languages that gives evidence to a Philippine-typology.

stances where arguments are placed in pre-predicate position. This movement is called preposing.

A preliminary study of Kana, a Cebuano dialect, has shown that it favors preposed constructions to fulfill certain functions which include but are not limited to: (a) clitic position and movement; (b) setting the scene in a discourse narrative; (c) listing of information; and (d) exclusive contrast. Moreover, the data show preference for the preposing of A-pronominals and predicate-medial word order tendencies. In this paper, we will examine this further, and demonstrate the implications of this preference in the word order of four (4) other Philippine languages namely; Chavacano, Ilokano, Tagalog, and Waray.

## **1 Introduction**

A clause is the basic unit of discourse for accomplishing the ends in communication (Nolasco 2010, Givón 1983 as cited in Du Bois 1987). Phonetically, a clause is characterized by intonation units, “a stretch of utterance under a single coherent intonation contour” (Du Bois 1987). These units, as Chafe (1980a) hypothesized, represent “linguistic expressions of focuses of consciousness.” On the other hand, a clause defined grammatically, consists of at least of a predicate (usually a verb but can also be nominal or adjectival) and referential expressions (Payne 1997, Nolasco 2010) as seen below in (1) and (2).

## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

(1) Kana

[May<sub>PRED</sub> usa ka=táu]<sub>EXIST CL</sub>

EXIST NUM LKR=N

‘May isang tao.’

‘There was a man.’

(2) Kana

íya=ng<sub>A</sub> gi-dala<sub>PRED</sub> ang usa ka bukag<sub>O</sub>

3<sub>OBL=LKR</sub> PST-carry-TR(-on) ABS NUM LKR basket

‘Kanyang dinala ang isang basket.’

‘He took the basket.’

Clauses in Philippine languages express the interaction of two kinds of ideas: ideas of states and activities and ideas of entities or referents that participate in those states and activities (Nolasco 2010). Entities that we want to talk about are expressed by nouns while those that refer to states and activities are expressed by verbs. Nouns and verbs make up the basic predication while other word classes, like determiners, numerals, and clitic particles, enhance the basic predication (Nolasco 2010).

Philippine languages are assumed to be predicate-initial, which means that in a sentence or a clause, predicates can be found at the beginning, followed by referential expressions. Predicate-initial languages normally follow the PAO/POA (P = predicate; A = agent/source of action; O = most affected entity) order for transitive clauses.

In describing languages, Dixon (1968) used the letters S, A, and O as heuristics for identifying core grammatical relations. Mithun & Chafe (1999) used them to distinguish certain privileged participants

in events and states. The S is defined as the only core nominal argument of a single-argument (also called ‘intransitive’) clause while A is defined as the most agentive argument of a multi-argument (also referred to as ‘transitive’). The O, on the other hand, is the most patientive argument of a multi-argument clause. A referent which is not an S, A or O is referred to as oblique (OBL).

Nolasco (2003, 2006, 2011) adopted this schema for his analysis of Philippine languages. He used S to refer to the sole core argument of the intransitive constructions. In transitive constructions, A refers to the source of action, while the O refers to referential expressions that are acted upon or undergo the action and treated as the most affected entity. Although a predicate-initial construction is the most common order of constituents in Philippine-type languages, there are instances where this basic word order is altered due to pragmatic factors. There are special circumstances in which arguments are placed in a pre-predicate position. This movement is called preposing.

This paper examines the preposing phenomenon in Philippine languages as initially observed in Kana, a Cebuano dialect spoken in Southern Leyte. The data have shown that Kana, which is assumed to be predicate-initial being a variety of Cebuano, a Philippine language, favors preposed constructions under certain conditions to fulfill certain functions. These conditions functions include but are not limited to: (a) clitic position and movement; (b) setting the scene in a discourse narrative; (c) listing of information; and (d) exclusive contrast. Moreover, it this study will investigate the aforementioned pragmatic motivations for preposing in other Philippine languages

## **Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages**

and show the implications of this preference to the basic word order analysis of Philippine languages in general. It will also explore the different forms of preposed constructions. Lastly, it will look into the preposed arguments and examine how they affect the word order analysis of the language.

This paper is subdivided into five parts. Section 1 comprises this introduction which includes the scope of this study and methodology. Section 2 will discuss the related works on clause formation and word order analysis and its application in Philippine languages. Section 3 will examine the functions and pragmatic motivations for preposing in the said Philippine languages. Section 4 will deal with the implications of preposing in the word order analysis of Philippine languages. Section 5 will conclude the study.

### **1.1 Languages Used**

The languages that will be used in this study are Cebuano-Kana, Tagalog, Ilokano, Chavacano, and Waray. Kana is spoken in parts of Southern Leyte, particularly in the City of Maasin. The dialect is said to be a combination of Cebuano (ISO 639-3: ceb) and Boholano, characterized by the frequent use of the expression *kana* ‘that,’ and by the presence of the [dʒ] sound. As observed by Zorc (1977), while Bisayan varieties are commonly identified as binisaya, local names are used, often derived from the “idiosyncrasy of the grammar, vocabulary, or locale.”

Ilokano (ISO 639-3: ilo) is a member of the Cordilleran group of languages and is spoken as lingua franca in the northern region of the Philippines. Tagalog (ISO 639-3: tgl) is the basis for the national language and is the most widely spoken language. Waray (ISO 639-3: war), like Cebuano and Kana belongs to the Bisayan subgroup and is spoken in the Samar-Leyte region. Chavacano-Caviteño (ISO 639-3: cbk) is a dialect of Chavacano spoken in the Cavite area.

Nolasco (2011) identifies predicate-initial word order and ergative morphosyntax among others, as the prototypical characteristics of Philippine languages. All these languages are typically predicate-initial and follow the ergative pattern, with the exception of Chavacano-Caviteño. Chavacano is argued to be neither a Philippine-type language nor an entirely non-Philippine type. It inherited its accusative phenotype from “its Iberian father and its pragmatic and semantic genotype from its Philippine mother language” (Nolasco 2005: 432–433).

## **1.2 Data and Methodology**

The data used in this study are recordings of (a) pear stories; (b) experience/personal stories; and (c) retelling of famous folk stories from the languages. In getting the pear story data, the informants were shown the pear film (Chafe 1980b) and then asked to narrate what they have seen in their own language. The narrations were then audio recorded. For the personal and folk stories, the participants were asked to narrate some of their life experiences and famous or known native stories that

## **Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages**

they are familiar with and these were also audio recorded. The data were transcribed and classified into clauses. These clauses were analyzed and counted for preposed and basic postposed transitive constructions.

### **1.3 Scope and Delimitations**

This study will explore the phenomenon of preposing and its implications for Philippine basic word order. This research is instigated by and mostly an application of the analysis done in Kana. The author will attempt to show whether or not this analysis is applicable to other Philippine-type languages.

We will limit our discussion to core clauses. A clause is to be understood here as a construction that consists of a predicate and one or more arguments. The predicate can be verbal, nominal or adjectival; arguments can be core arguments or obliques. We will look at transitive clauses with overt lexical arguments. Those clauses with zero arguments are not included in the frequency count.

It is not the intention of the researcher to present a complete analysis of the word order structure of Philippine-type languages, but only to provide another view on one of its aspects.

## 2 The Clause Structure and Basic Word Order of Philippine Languages

Clauses are composed of expressions of two kinds of ideas: ideas of states and activities and ideas of entities or referents that participate in those states and activities. Nouns expressed the entities that we want to talk about while verbs express states and activities in which nouns participate. These word classes make up the basic predication of a language. Other word classes, like determiners, numerals, and clitic particles, enhance this basic predication (Nolasco 2010).

Clauses may be unmarked or pragmatically marked. Unmarked or simple clauses are simple declarative clauses. They do not perform any specialized function other than to state an idea or transmit information (Nolasco 2010). Sentence (3) is an example of an unmarked clause. Pragmatically marked clauses are used in specialized contexts. They may exhibit variant intonation (as in questions; see example 4), word order (as in focus constructions in 5) or clause structure (as in relative clauses; see example 6).

(3) Chavacano (Santiago 2006)

Ya come el gato enantes.

Ya come Ø<sub>S</sub> el gato enantes

PST eat NOM PRT DET cat a while ago

‘Kumain ang pusa kanina.’

‘The cat ate a while ago.’



## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

(4) Kana

Kinsay nagkuha inadto ijang gikuha?

Kinsa=y nag-kuha<sub>PRED</sub>                    Ø<sub>S</sub> inadto    ija=ng  
Q=OBL INTR.PFV.n(p)ag-kuha    DIST.OBL 3 OBL=LKR  
gi-kuha                    Ø<sub>O</sub>  
IPST-kuha-TR(-on)

‘Sino ang kumuha ng kanyang kinuhang (peras)?’

‘Who took the (pears) that he harvested?’

(5) Waray

An iya kunsuylu nakadtu han luyu nga baryu.

[An iya            kunsúylu]<sub>S/FOC</sub> ná-kádtu<sub>PRED</sub>                    han luyu  
ABS 3SG.OBL N                    INT.IPFV.n(p)a-kadtu OBL faraway  
nga báryu<sub>OBL</sub>  
LKR barrio

‘Ang kanyang nililigawan, andoon sa malayong baryo.’

‘The one he is courting is in faraway barrio.’

(6) Kana

Nakahinagbu sijag bata nga nagbike.

Naka-hinagbu<sub>PRED</sub>                    sija=g                    bata [nga  
INTR.PFV.n(p)aka-hinagbu 3SG.ABS=OBL child LKR  
nag-bike                    Ø<sub>S</sub>]<sub>REL</sub>  
INTR.PFV.n(p)ag-bike

‘Nakasalubong siya ng bata na nakabike.’

‘He met a girl riding a bicycle.’

## **2.1 Strategies for Identifying Basic Word Order**

Mithun (1992) presented various strategies used by linguists in identifying the basic order of a language. This includes: (a) statistical frequency (Hawkins 1983); (b) simplest overall syntactic description (McCawley 1970); (c) least morphological marking (Hawkins 1983); and (d) least pragmatically marked or neutral order (Mithun 1992), with the discourse-initial sentences considered being the most neutral because they have no presupposed context (Pullum 1977 as cited in Mithun 1992). For others, “simple, declarative, active clauses with no complex verb or noun phrases” are assumed to exhibit neutral order (Chomsky 1957: 107; Greenberg 1993: 74, Pullum 1981 as cited in Mithun 1992: 16).

Hawkins (1983 as cited in Mithun 1992) identified that simple statistical frequency yields sufficient basis for the identification of basic order. Statistical frequency is the frequently cited common diagnostic of basic order (Dryer 1983 as cited in Mithun 1992: 20), which means “whichever order appear the most often might be considered basic.” Mithun (1992) also presented other methods, such as identifying the order preferred in potentially ambiguous sentences (Chomsky 1957 as cited in Mithun 1992) and determining the relative order between pairs of constituents.

Mithun (1992) further examined the notion of pragmatic order in terms of definiteness and the order of old and new information. In Cayuga, an Iroquoian language spoken in Ontario, indefinite nominals precede definite nominals; there is a tendency for indefinite nominals to appear in the beginning of the clauses, while definite nomi-

## **Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages**

nals tend to appear near the end (Mithun 1992). This is also found in other languages observed by Mithun (1992), such as Ngandi and Coos. The reverse is observed, however, in Chinese, Russian, Czech and other Indo-European languages (Mithun 1992).

Mithun (1992) also observed that in Cayuga, Ngandi, and Coos, new information tends to precede old information. She correlated this with the indefinite-definite distinction as new entities are most often indefinite, and old information are most often definite (Mithun 1992). Mithun (1992) came up with another observation related to the newsworthiness of the information; new information, which is usually more important than old information, precedes old information. Another reason for pragmatic ordering is topic shift; new topic, or a new point of view warrants its appearance early in a clause or sentence.

Lastly, Mithun (1992) proposed the necessity to recognize pragmatically based languages as existing word order universals are defined over rigid word orders. She argued that in a number of languages, “the order of constituents does not reflect syntactic functions, but rather their pragmatic functions” Mithun (1992: 58).

## **2.2 Basic Word Order of Philippine Languages**

In Tagalog, Nolasco (2010) claimed that simple declarative clauses are unmarked clauses that do not perform any specialized function and are considered pragmatically neutral. Unmarked clauses include (a) proper inclusion clauses, (b) equative clauses, (c) attributive clauses, (d) locative clauses, (e) existential clauses, and (f) possessive clauses. These con-

structions are simple clauses whose predicates are not verbs (Nolasco 2010).

Constantino (1965), on the other hand, claimed that the sentences in ten major Philippine languages he studied can be classified as (a) simple, (b) complex, and (c) compound. Simple sentences are further categorized based on their structural and transformational relation to each other, which include situational, equational, and identifying clauses or sentences. Situational sentences are classified into predicative and non-predicative; predicative sentences have a predicate constituent followed by a nominal constituent. The reverse order, in which the nominal constituent precedes the predicate constituent, is marked by *ay* or a sustained terminal contour (Constantino 1965).

Other alternative orders, in other words, those that are predicate-initial constructions can be considered pragmatically marked. Kaufman (2005) mentioned that Tagalog declarative sentences that are not predicate-initial are pragmatically marked because the fronted part of the sentence is focused or is topicalized. While the order of post-verbal constituents is considered basic and much more flexible, Kroeger (1993) claimed that in Tagalog, other alternative orders such as the order of pre-verbal constituent is “quite strictly determined.”

In determining the basic order, it is also important to consider the arguments present in a clause. Thompson (n.d.) suggested that the word order for a given language is easiest to figure out if we have lexical Noun Phrases for both ‘A’ and ‘O’. That is, we have to look at the transitive clauses with two lexical noun arguments.

## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

Philippine languages are assumed as predicate-initial as shown in the previous examples (1, 4, 6). Predicate-initial languages normally have a PAO/POA order for transitive clauses. Take a look at the following examples (7–11).

(7) Chavacano<sup>2</sup> (Santiago 2006)

Ta busca pa rin aquel pandesal.

Ta busca<sub>PRED</sub> pa rin  $\emptyset$ <sub>A</sub> aquel pandesal<sub>S</sub>  
NPST search PRT PRT DIST.ACC bread

‘Hinahanap ko pa rin iyong pandesal.’

‘I am still looking for your *pandesal*.’

(8) Cebuano-Kana

Gipamunit niya kini.

Gi-pam-(p)únit niya<sub>A</sub> kini<sub>O</sub>  
TR.PFV-MOD-pick 3SG.ERG PROX.ABS

‘Pinagpupulot niya ito.’

‘He picked it up.’

(9) Ilokano

Inkabil na diay bisikleta na.

In-kabil=<sub>na</sub>PRED=<sub>A</sub>  $\emptyset$ <sub>O</sub> diay bisikleta=<sub>na</sub>  
PST-put-TR(i-)=3SG.ERG PROX.ABS bicycle=3SG.GEN

‘Inilagay niya (ang basket) sa bisikleta niya.’

‘He placed (it) in his bike.’

---

<sup>2</sup>We will follow the analysis that Chavacano exhibits a nominative-accusative morphosyntax. We will mark S and A arguments as NOM and O as ACC.

(10) Tagalog

...inilalagay niya ito sa isang basket.

ini<la>lagay<sub>PRED</sub> niya<sub>A</sub> ito<sub>O</sub> sa isa=ng basket<sub>OBL</sub>  
TR.IPFV<RED>put 3SG.ERG PROX.ABS OBL NUM=LKR basket

‘Inilalagay niya ito sa isang basket.’

‘He places it in a basket.’

(11) Waray

Ginbuligan hiya han pagkarga han iya mga prutas.

Gin-bulig-an<sub>PRED</sub> hiya<sub>O</sub> Ø<sub>A</sub> han pag-karga han  
PFV-help-TR(-an) 3SG.ABS OBL.DEF NOM-carry OBL.DEF

iya mga prutas

3SG.GEN PL fruit

‘Tinulungan siya (ng mga bata) sa pagkarga ng kanyang mga prutas.’

‘Someone helped carry his fruits.’

However, there are instances that arguments are placed in a pre-predicate position as seen in (2), (4), and (5). These sentences are examples of preposing, question, and focus constructions, respectively. These constructions belong to the pragmatically marked clause types. The word order in these construction types is usually altered due to pragmatic factors.

It has also been pointed out that analysis of the word order of pronominals in a given language may be different from the order of the lexical NPs. In considering the word order, we have to take into account whether the arguments are lexical NPs or pronouns. In Kana, as was mentioned previously, pronominal arguments tend to follow

## **Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages**

the predicate-medial word order. We will discuss this in the following sections.

It is also worth mentioning that while we assume that all languages have some basic, syntactically defined constituent order, this may not be universally valid. Mithun (1992) argued against this fundamental assumption and demonstrated that the order of constituents does not really reflect their syntactic functions but rather their pragmatic functions, that is, their relative newsworthiness within the discourse. We will examine this claim in this study.

### **3 Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Philippine Languages**

Verb-initial languages tend to allow more flexibility of constituent orders than do verb-final and verb-medial. Verb-initial languages are also often less sensitive to grammatical relations (Payne 1997). Philippine languages seem to belong to this type. They have flexible word order, which is not grammatically fixed but varies according to pragmatic factors. For instance, new, indefinite, or otherwise “newsworthy” information is usually placed early in the clause.

One phenomenon that alters the basic order of constituent is preposing. Preposing may be observed in cleft, focus, and contrastive constructions and topicalization are examples of this. As observed in Kana, preposing is motivated by the following conditions: (a) clitic position and movement; (b) setting the scene in a discourse narrative; (c) listing of information; and (d) exclusive contrast.

The rest of this section will examine the abovementioned motivations employing the data from the languages used in this study. We will discuss whether the analysis of Kana word order holds true for other Philippine languages.

### **3.1 Scene Setting Function**

Perhaps one of the most useful motivations for preposing in Kana is the scene setting function.

In Kana, one of the functions of preposing is setting the scene in a discourse narrative. This usually happens at the beginning of the discourse. In (12) and (13), the preposed arguments situate the time and the state of the speech act. They present the background of the action as it takes place in the discourse.

(12) Kana

**Usa ka adlaw, upat ka mga baryohanon,** nagkasinabot nga magluto ug lugaw.

[Usa ka adlaw]<sub>OBL/PREP</sub> [upat ka mga baryohanon]<sub>S</sub>  
NUM LKR day NUM LKR PL barrio people  
nagka-sinabot<sub>PRED</sub> [nga magluto ug lugaw]<sub>RELCL</sub>  
INTR.PFV-MOD-agree.on LKR INTR.NEUT-cook OBL porridge

‘Isang araw, apat na lalaki ang nagkasundo na magluto ng lugaw.’

‘One day, four men decided to cook porridge.’



## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

(13) Kana

**Ug samtang siya namunit niini,** gitabangan siya sa tulu nga mga bata nga milabay sa iyang tungod.

[Ug samtang siya na-munit niini]<sub>OBL/PREP</sub>  
CONJ CONJ.SIMUL 3SG.ABS INTR.PFV-pick 3OBL.PROX

[gi-tabáng-an]<sub>PRED</sub> siya<sub>S</sub> sa tulu nga mga báta<sub>O</sub> [nga  
PST-help-TR(-an) 3SG.ABS ERG NUM LKR PL child LKR  
mi-labay]<sub>PRED</sub> sa íya=ng tungod<sub>OBL</sub>]<sub>REL CL</sub>]<sub>MAIN CL</sub>  
INTR.PFV-pass.by OBL 3SG.GEN=LKR front

‘At habang pinupulot niya ang mga ito, tinulungan siya ng tatlong bata na dumaan sa kanyang harapan.’

‘And while he was picking these/them up, three children, who passed by in front of him, helped him.’

They also introduce a change of scene or new themes as seen in (14). This example talks about the story of a carabao and the animal friends he met while he was traveling. In (14), he met a lizard. The preposed clause situates the location of the scene and introduces a new character in the story.

(14) Kana

**Pag-abot sa unahan,** iyang nataghon ang ilaga.

Pag-abot Ø<sub>S</sub> sa unahan íya=ng na-taghon  
INTR.NEUT-reach OBL front 3SG.ERG=LKR INTR.PFV-meet  
ang ilaga  
ABS lizard

‘Pagdating sa harapan, kanyang nakasalubong ang butiki.’

‘When (he) got in front, he ran into the lizard.’

- (15) Chavacano (Santiago 2006)

**Por la mañana**, el hombre ya desperta duespes ya anda elle na pono de peras.

[Por la mañana]<sub>OBL/PREP</sub> el hombre<sub>S</sub> ya desperta<sub>PRED</sub>  
PRT DET N.TIME DET man PST wake.up  
duespes ya anda<sub>PRED</sub> elle<sub>S</sub> na pono de peras  
CONJ.after PST go 3SG.NOM LKR tree POSS pear

‘Sa umaga, nagising ang lalaki, pagkatapos umakyat siya sa puno ng peras.’

‘In the morning, the man woke up, and climbed the pear tree afterwards.’

- (16) Ilokano

**Maysa nga aldaw**, adda maysa nga lalaki nga agburburas ti peras.

[Maysa nga aldaw]<sub>OBL/PREP</sub> adda<sub>PRED</sub> maysa nga lalaki<sub>S</sub> [nga  
one.day LKR day EXIST NUM LKR man LKR  
ag-bur~buras<sub>PRED</sub> ti peras<sub>OBL</sub>]<sub>REL CL</sub>  
INTR.IPFV-RED~harvest OBL pear

‘Isang araw, may isang lalaking namimitas ng peras.’

‘One day, there was a man harvesting pears.’

- (17) Tagalog

**Sa simula nung pelikula**, may isang magsasaka na kumukuha ng prutas sa isang puno.

## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

[Sa simula nun=g pelikula]<sub>OBL/PREP</sub> [may<sub>PRED</sub>  
OBL beginning OBL=LKR N EXIST  
isa=ng magsasaka<sub>S</sub> [na k<um>ukuha<sub>PRED</sub> ng prutas<sub>OBL</sub>  
EXIST=LKR farmer LKR INTR.PFV<RED>get OBL fruit  
sa isa=ng puno]<sub>OBL</sub>  $\emptyset$ <sub>S</sub>]<sub>REL CL</sub>  
OBL NUM=LKR tree

‘Sa simula ng pelikula, may isang magsasaka na kumukuha ng prutas sa isang puno.’

‘At the start of the film, there was a farmer who is harvesting fruits from a tree.’

(18) Waray

**Ha usa ka adlaw**, may tulo nga lalaki nga nakadto ha bukid.

[Ha usa ka=adlaw]<sub>OBL/PREP</sub> [may<sub>PRED</sub> tulo nga  
OBL NUM LKR=N EXIST NUM LKR  
lalaki]<sub>EXIST CL</sub> [nga na-kadto ha bukid]<sub>REL CL</sub>  
man LKR INTR.PFV.MOD-kadto OBL field

‘Isang araw, may tatlong lalaki na pumunta sa bukid.’

‘One day, there were three men who went to the field.’

In Tagalog, preposed constructions are usually *ay*-focus or contrastive focus constructions (Schachter & Otnes 1972). These constructions are referred to as inversion constructions which is characterized by “shifting to the sentence-initial clause-initial position of some sentence component that does not occur in this position in basic sentences” (Schachter & Otnes 1972).

In addition, Fox (1985) found out that the presence of *ay*-inversion in the paragraph signals a discontinuity or lack of action continuity.

Her analysis also shows that there is strong correlation between new episode and the use of *ay*-inversion (Fox 1985).

In *ay*-inversion clauses or contrastive focus constructions, preposed arguments are set off from the rest of the clause by the linker *ay* or a pause (Schachter & Otones 1972, Nolasco 2011), as seen in (17). This is the same in Ilokano, Chavacano, and Waray as seen in (15–18).

### **3.2 Listing of Information**

Listing ideas or information in a discourse narrative also alters the word order in a clause.

(19) Kana

**Ang usa**, Political Science, **ang usa pud** hingproceed sa  
Philosophy. Unja nagteacher na pud.

[Ang usa]<sub>S</sub> Political Science<sub>OBL</sub> [ang usa]<sub>S</sub> pud  
ABS NUM political science ABS NUM PRT  
hing-proceed<sub>PRED</sub> sa Philosophy<sub>OBL</sub> unja nagteacher  
INTR.PFV-proceed OBL N CONJ INTR.PFV-teacher  
na pud  
PRT PRT

‘Ang isa Political Science, ang isa naman nagpatuloy sa  
Philosophy pagkatapos nagteacher na.’

‘One (took up) Political Science, the other one continued on to  
Philosophy, and became a teacher afterwards.’

In listing information, the speaker prefers to use constructions in which argument are preposed, occupying the first slot in the clause.

## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

The arguments are marked by *ang*. These arguments are being focused or given emphasis.

(20) Waray

**An usa ha ira**, batan-on pa. **An usa nga lalaki** an nagkukuha hin mga prutas. Ngan **an usa** naman nahalin hin ira hayop nga kanding. Ngan **an usa** liwat an bata an nakuha hin prutas para ibaraligya.

[An usa ha ira]<sub>S</sub> batan-on pa [an usa nga lalaki]<sub>S</sub> an  
ABS NUM OBL 3PL.OBL bata-STAT PRT ABS NUM LKR man ABS  
nag<ku>kuha hin mga prutas<sub>OBL</sub> ngan [an usa]<sub>S</sub>  
INTR.IPFV<RED>take OBL.INDEF PL fruit LKR ABS NUM  
naman na-halin<sub>PRED</sub> hin ira hayop nga  
PRT INT.IPFV-leave OBL.INDEF 3PL.GEN animal LKR  
kanding<sub>OBL</sub> ngan [an usa]<sub>S</sub> liwat an bata an na-kuha<sub>PRED</sub>  
goat LKR ABS NUM PRT ABS child ABS INTR.PFV-take  
hin prutas<sub>OBL</sub> nga para i-b<ar>aligya  
OBL.INDEF fruit LKR PURP TR<CONT>sell

‘Ang isa sa kanila, bata pa. Ang isang lalaki ang kumukuha ng mga prutas at ang isa naman ay humihila ng kanilang hayop na kambing. At ang isa pa, ang bata ang kumuha ng prutas para ibenta.’

‘One of them was still young. The other man is picking the fruits while other is tending to their animal, a goat. And yet another, the child took away the fruits to sell them.’

(21) Tagalog

**Yung isang friend ko**, nagboyfriend. Nagkaanak lang.  
Tinakbuan. **Yung isa pa**, dadalawang taon pa lang na  
nakakasal, hiwalay na.

[Yun=g isa=ng friend ko]<sub>S</sub> nag-boyfriend<sub>PRED</sub>  
DIST.ABS=LKR NUM=LKR friend ISG.GEN INTR.PFV-boyfriend  
nagka-anak<sub>PRED</sub> lang t<in>akbu-han<sub>PRED</sub> yun=g  
INTR.PFV-have.a.child PRT <PFV>run-TR(-an) DIST.ABS=LKR  
isa pa da<da>lawa=ng taon pa lang na  
NUM PRT MOD~RED-TWO=LKR year PRT PRT PRT  
na-ka-kasal hiwalay na  
INTR.PFV-MOD-wedding separated PRT

‘Yung isang friend ko, nagboyfriend. Nagkaanak lang.  
Tinakbuan. Yung isa pa, dadalawang taon pa lang na  
nakakasal, hiwalay na.’

‘That friend of mine got a boyfriend. (She) just ended up  
pregnant. (She) got ran away. The other one, after being  
married for just two years, already got separated.’

(22) Ilokano

Ada tallo a basket. **Ti maysa** napunon. **Ti maikadwa**,  
kakargaan na pay laeng ken **ti makatlo**, awan pay karga na.

## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

Ada tallo a basket ti maysa na-puno-n ti  
EXIST NUM LKR basket ABS NUM INTR.PFV-puno-PRT ABS  
maikadwa ka<ka>rga-an na pay laeng ken ti  
NUM IPFV.RED-put-TR(-an) 3SG.ERG PRT PRT CONJ ABS  
makatlo awan pay karga na  
NUM NEG PRT content PRT

‘May tatlong basket. Ang isa, puno na. Ang ikalawa, nilalagyan pa lang niya. At ang ikatlo, wala pang laman.’

‘There were three baskets. One (of them) was already full. The second is still being filled up. And the third was still empty.’

Based on the data, Waray, Tagalog, and Ilokano follow the same pattern. Arguments being enumerated are placed before the predicate. These arguments are marked by the absolutive case marker in ergative languages; *ang* in Kana (19), *an* in Waray (20), *ang* or *yung* in Tagalog (21), and *ti* in Ilokano (22). The Chavacano data, however, show otherwise. Its syntax does not allow this construction. There is no example to support this type of preposing.

### 3.3 Exclusive Contrast

Preposing also signals exclusivity or expresses contrast. In these types of clauses, the focused participants of a state or an activity are placed in the pre-predicate position, deviating from the predicate-initial basic word order. Constituents that being focused or contrasted is generally “sufficiently important to occur early in the clause, whether it is indefinite or definite, new or old, a topic or not” (Mithun 1992).

Inversion constructions, such as *ang*-inversion, *ay*-inversion (Schachter & Otnes 1972), and oblique/adjunction inversion are examples of this.

(23) Kana

**An lalaki**, namupu ug piras.

[An lalaki]<sub>S/FOC</sub> na-mupu                      ug piras  
ABS man                      INT.PST(m-)pang-pupu OBL pear  
'Ang lalaki, namitas ng peras.'  
'The man picked pears'.

(24) Chavacano (Santiago 2006)

**si akel viejo** na ponu ta mira

si akel                      viejos                      na                      ponu ta                      mira  
PRT DIST.ACC old.man OBL puno NPST look  
'kung ang matandang lalaki sa puno ay nakatingin'  
'if the old man on the tree was looking''

(25) Ilokano

**Dagitoy tallo nga ubing** tinulungan na isuda.

[Dagitoy tallo nga ubing]<sub>A/FOC</sub> [t<in>ulung-an                      na  
3PL.OBL NUM LKR child                      <PFV>help-TR(-an) 3SG.ERG  
isuda]<sub>MAIN CL</sub>  
3PL.ABS  
'Ang tatlong batang ito, tinulungan siya nito.'  
'These three children, they helped him.'

(26) Tagalog

**Siya** ay nadistrak.



## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

[[Siya]<sub>S/FOC</sub> ay nadistrak<sub>PRED</sub>]<sub>IND CL</sub>  
3 SG.ABS LKR INTR.PFV-distract  
'Siya ay nadistrak.'  
'He was distracted.'

As we have discussed so far, the conditions that prompt preposing of arguments in these languages allow either full absolutive NPs, full NP obliques, or subordinate clauses to be preposed. The languages tend to place these items first in the clause and are considered newsworthy. They are newsworthy because they (a) represent significant new information, (b) introduce a new topic, and (c) point out a significant contrast.

### 3.4 Clitic Position and Movement

Clitic particles constitute a rather mixed group with respect to the meanings they can add to the predicate or parts of the sentence. They usually follow the first full word in the sentence. In Philippine languages, clitics can either be adverbial or pronominal.

The position and movement of pronouns define the word order in a clause. In a predicate-initial language, pronouns normally occupy the second position in the clause and occur to the right of the verb or some other head of the clause. The following examples illustrate this.

- (27) Kana  
ug igisakay **niya** iyang igidalang bisiklita

ug i-gi-sakay niya iya=ng i-gi-dala=ng  
CONJ TR(i-)-PST-load 3SG.ERG 3SG.GEN=LKR TR-PFV-bring=LKR

bisiklita

bicycle

‘at isinakay niya sa kanyang dinalang bisikleta’

‘and he loaded (it) onto his bike that he brought’

(28) Cebuano-Kana

Gipamunit **niya kini**.

Gi-pam-(p)únit niya<sub>A</sub> kini<sub>O</sub>

TR.PFV-MOD-pick 3SG.ERG PROX.ABS

‘Pinagpupulot niya ito.’

‘He picked it up.’

(29) Chavacano (Santiago 2006)

Ya rangka **ele** akel bayabas.

Ya rangka<sub>PRED</sub> ele<sub>A</sub> akel bayabas<sub>O</sub>

PST harvest 3SG.NOM DIST.ACC guava

‘Inani niya ang bayabas.’

‘He harvested the guavas.’

(30) Ilokano

Innala **na** ti maysa nga basket.

In-nala na ti maysa nga basket

<PST>take-TR(-en) 3SG.ERG ABS NUM LKR basket

‘Kinuha niya ang isang basket.’

‘He took a basket.’

(31) Tagalog

Ibinalik **nila** ang sumbrero.

## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

[I-b<in>alik<sub>PRED</sub> nila<sub>A</sub> ang sumbrero<sub>O</sub>]<sub>IND CL</sub>  
TR(i-)<PST>return 3PL.ERG ABS hat  
'Ibinalik nila ang sumbrelo.'  
'They returned the hat.'

(32) Waray

Ginbuligan **hiya** han pagkarga han iya mga prutas.  
Gin-bulig-an<sub>PRED</sub> hiya<sub>O</sub> han pag-karga han  
INT.PFV-bulig-an 3SG.ABS OBL.DEF NOM-load OBL.DEF  
iya mga prutas  
3SG.OBL N fruit  
'Tinulungan siya sa pagkarga ng kanyang mga prutas.'  
'(They) helped him in loading his fruits.'

However, there are several pragmatic factors affecting and altering the position of clitic pronouns. See the following examples.

(33) Kana

kay wa na **ja** mahimo  
kay wa<sub>PRED</sub> na (si)ja ma-himo  
PURP NEG PRT 3SG.ABS INTR.NEUT(ma-)-do  
'Wala na siyang magawa.'  
'There was nothing he could do.'

(34) Ilokano

Gapota haan **na** nakita diay bato.  
Gapota haan=na<sub>A</sub> na-kita diay bato<sub>O</sub>  
REAS NEG=3SG.ERG INTR.PFV-see DIST.ABS stone  
'Dahil hindi niya nakita yung bato.'

‘Because he did not see the rock.’

(35) Tagalog

Hindi **nila** pinansin ang isa’t isa.

Hindi nila<sub>A</sub> p<in>ansin<sub>PRED</sub> ang isa’t isa<sub>O</sub>  
NEG 3PL.ERG <PFV>notice-TR(-in) ABS each.other

‘Hindi nila pinansin ang isa’t isa.’

‘They ignored each other.’

(36) Waray

kay diri **hiya** nakita han iya gindadrivan

kay diri<sub>PRED</sub> hiya<sub>A</sub> na-kita han iya<sub>OBL</sub>  
REAS NEG 3SG.ERG INTR.PFV-see ABS 3SG.GEN

gin<da>driv-an

IPFV<RED>drive-TR(-an)

‘dahil hindi niya nakita ang kanyang pinagdadrivan’

‘because he did not see his way’

(37) Chavacano (Santiago 2006)

Modo no akel vieho no ta mira.

Modo no akel vieho<sub>S</sub> no ta mira  
REAS NEG DIST.ABS old.man NEG NPST look

‘Just because that old man is not looking, (he) is looking at the back.’

In (33–37), negation can alter the ordering of pronouns in a clause. Clitics automatically follow the first full word, which in the case of negation clauses is the negator.

## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

Preposing also allows pronominals to move in a clause. So far, we have only seen full NPs being preposed. However, in the case of Kana, it is the pronominals that are frequently preposed.

In this section, we have presented the different functions and motivations for preposing in Chavacano, Ilokano, Tagalog, Kana, and Waray, namely: (a) setting the scene; (b) information listing; (c) exclusive contrast; and (d) clitic position and movement. The next section will deal with the preposing of pronominal arguments and its implications on the word order analysis as shown in Kana.

### 4 Preposing in Kana and Its Implication in the Word Order Analysis

A preliminary analysis of Kana preposing shows that while lexical NPs follow the predicate-initial word order, pronominals prefer predicate-medial. While we could speculate that postposed<sup>3</sup> constructions (i.e., POA/PAO) would occur more frequently than preposed constructions (i.e., AOP/APO), the data have shown otherwise.

In determining the basic order in Kana, we employed the simplest method: statistical frequency. As shown in Table 1, preposed constructions are by no means the rare alternative order in Kana constructions. Preposed constructions outnumber basic postposed constructions. This is true for both transitive and intransitive clauses.

---

<sup>3</sup>As opposed to preposed constructions, postposed constructions are the basic transitive constructions in which pronouns occur post-verbally.

	Postposed	Preposed	Zero Anaphora	Total
Intransitive	113 (36.5%)	125 (40.3%)	72 (23.2%)	310 (81.8%)
Transitive	18 (26.1%)	33 (47.8%)	18 (26.1%)	69 (18.2%)
Total	131 (34.5%)	158 (41.7%)	90 (23.7%)	379 (100%)

**Table 1. Counts of Postposed, Preposed, and Zero Anaphoric Constructions**

	Postposed	Preposed	Total
Intransitive	113 (47.5%)	125 (53.5%)	238 (82.4%)
Transitive	18 (35.2%)	33 (64.7%)	51 (17.6%)
Total	131 (45.3%)	158 (54.7%)	289 (100%)

**Table 2. Counts of Postposed and Preposed Constructions**

We limited our count to those clauses with overt arguments, thus the zero anaphoric constructions were eliminated. The results in Table 2 have shown likewise.

Table 3 illustrates that in intransitive clauses, a variety of arguments can be preposed. Preposed noun phrases and oblique clauses outnumber their postposed counterparts. Oblique clauses are usually preposed because of their scene-setting function, as discussed in Section 3.1. They function to introduce new participants or new information in the discourse. Pronouns are also preposed but have lower frequency than postposed ones. However, it can be observed that pronominal arguments are most often employed to track reference of topical arguments across clauses.

## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

Intransitive	Noun Phrases	Pronouns	Oblique Clauses	Total
Preposed	46 (36.5%)	44 (34.9%)	36 (28.6%)	126 (52.5%)
Postposed	43 (37.7%)	69 (60.5%)	2 (1.8%)	114 (47.5%)
Total	89 (37.1%)	113 (47.1%)	38 (15.8%)	240 (100%)

**Table 3. Comparison of Counts of Preposed and Postposed Arguments in Intransitive Clauses**

Transitive	Noun Phrases		Pronouns		Total
	A	O	A	O	
Preposed	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.6%)	32 (82.1%)	6 (15.3%)	39 (49.3%)
Postposed	9 (22.5%)	20 (50.0%)	8 (20.0%)	3 (7.5%)	40 (50.6%)
Total	9 (11.4%)	21 (26.6%)	40 (50.6%)	9 (11.4%)	79 (100%)

**Table 4. Comparison of Counts of Preposed and Postposed Arguments in Transitive Clauses**

Table 4 shows the counts of A and O arguments in transitive clauses in Kana. A-arguments are often referred to by pronouns. O-arguments, on the other hand, are referred to by noun phrases. Topical arguments are also pronominalized which is evident in the frequency of A-pronominals. Moreover, A-pronominals are the ones usually preposed.

It is also important to discuss the forms of preposed pronominal arguments in Kana. See the following examples.

(38) Kana

Gipalingkod sa tigulang nga baje ang estranghero ug gipakaon  
**nija.**

Gi-pa-lingkod sa ti-gulang nga baje ang estranghero  
TR.PFV-MOD-sit ERG STAT-gulang LKR woman ABS stranger  
ug gi-pa-kaon nija  
CONJ TR.PFV-MOD-eat 3SG.ERG

‘Pinaupo ng matandang babae ang estranghero at pinakain  
niya (ang estranghero).’

‘The old woman made the stranger sit and gave him something  
to eat.’

(39) Kana

**Iyang** gibutang sa mga bukag ang iyang pinupu nga mga piras.

Íya=ng<sub>A</sub> gi-butang sa mga bukag ang  
3SG.OBL=LKR PFV-put-TR(-an) OBL PL basket ABS  
íya=ng p<in>ùpù nga mga píras  
3SG.OBL=LKR <PFV>pick-TR(-on) LKR PL pear

‘Tapos inilagay niya sa mga basket ang kanyang kinuha na mga  
peras.’

‘Afterwards, he placed the pears he placed in the basket.’

Example (38) is the basic transitive construction in a predicate-initial language, such as Kana. Example (39) is the preposed equivalent. Notice that in a preposed construction, the ergative pronoun *nija/niya* takes the form *iyang*, which is morphologically identical to oblique form *ijaliya* when preposed. Zorc (1977) observed that Bisayan pronouns, specifically third genitive and oblique pronouns share the same root *-ja*.



## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

We maintain that Kana is an ergative language in which S and O are marked the same (absolutive) and A is marked differently (ergative). However, with the occurrence of the preposed construction, the A takes two forms, the ergative and genitive/oblique. S-pronominals, however, have only one form for preposed and postposed constructions.

Person	Ergative (Postposed)	Ergative (Preposed)
<b>Singular</b>		
1 <sup>st</sup>	nako	ako
2 <sup>nd</sup>	nimo	imo
3 <sup>rd</sup>	niya/nija	iya/ija
<b>Plural</b>		
1 <sup>st</sup>	namo	amo
2 <sup>nd</sup> inclusive	nato	ato
2 <sup>nd</sup> exclusive	ninyo	inyo
3 <sup>rd</sup>	nila	ila

**Table 5. Pronominal Forms in Preposed and Postposed Constructions**

In this section, we looked at the counts of preposed and postposed constructions in Kana. Both construction types have the preference for preposing. We also looked at the forms of preposed arguments. In intransitive clauses, noun phrases, pronominals, and oblique clauses are usually preposed. This illustrates the “newsworthiness principle”; the element that introduces a new topic or that points out a significant contrast is often preposed and placed in the pre-predicate position. S-noun phrases and pronominals are often used to signal exclusive contrast and single out the topical arguments, while oblique clauses are utilized for the scene-setting function in discourse.

Looking at the transitive clauses, the data have shown that Kana favors preposing of A-pronominals over postposing. This preference has certain implications. It appears that the analysis of Kana word order must no longer assume a strictly predicate-initial pattern. Preposed constructions show that Kana has a predicate-medial tendency, with A-pronominals occupying the leftmost position of a clause followed by a verb. The APO word order seems to have already been grammaticalized in Kana.

Pronouns correspond to old information in discourse. They take the place of the full noun phrases previously mentioned in discourse. New information, on the other hand, is referred to by noun phrases. The preposing of pronominals implies that old information is more significant and newsworthy.

Based on the discourse data, pronominalization is the most useful way to track reference. The counts have shown significantly that, compared to noun phrases, pronouns are often used to monitor arguments across clauses. Traditionally, noun phrases are the types of constituents considered when analyzing the basic word order of a language. This may tell us one thing: we may have to re-consider the word order analysis in Philippine languages since analyses that have been made only discussed word order in terms of full NPs. This paper presents a new point of view in the analysis of basic order, particularly in Philippine languages.

## **4.1 Pronominal Preposing in Other Philippine Languages**

We have discussed that preposing also occurs in Ilokano, Tagalog, Chavacano, and Waray under certain conditions. We have demonstrated that while these languages allow preposing, the preposed arguments are usually oblique NPs and clauses which are of no importance in considering the word order of a language. This time, we will further examine the phenomenon of preposing in terms of pronominal arguments and determine whether the analysis of preposing in Kana also applies to these languages.

### **4.1.1 Ilokano**

Ilokano is essentially predicate-initial (Rubino 2000, Rafal 2009). It also has an ergative morphosyntax, like Kana (Gerdtz 1988, Nolasco & Saclot 2005, Rubino 1997, 2000). Although it allows preposing, the frequency is very much lower (27.6%) than the basic postposed construction (72.4%). Table 6 illustrates this.

	Preposed	Postposed	Total
Intransitive	33 (31.7%)	71 (68.2%)	104 (77.6%)
Transitive	4 (13.3%)	26 (86.7%)	30 (22.4%)
Total	37 (27.6%)	97 (72.4%)	134 (100%)

**Table 6. Ilokano Preposed and Postposed Constructions**

Among the preposed constituents, oblique clauses tend to move to the pre-predicate position. Further, there were no instances of preposing of pronominals.

Preposed	Pronouns	Noun Phrases	Oblique Clauses	Total
Intransitive	0 (0.0%)	11 (33.3%)	22 (66.7%)	33 (89.2%)
Transitive	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (100.0%)	4 (10.8%)
Total	0 (0.0%)	11 (29.7%)	26 (70.3%)	37 (100%)

**Table 7. Frequency Count of Preposed Arguments in Ilokano**

Also, unlike Kana, Ilokano does not (or rarely) allows preposing of pronominals. Preposed arguments are usually oblique nominal phrases and subordinate clauses whose function is to set or signal a change of themes or scenes in a stretch of discourse. Table 7 and 8 demonstrate this.

## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

	Intransitive		Transitive			Total
	S	OBL	A	O	OBL	
Pronominals	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Lexical NPs	6 (54.5%)	5 (45.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (29.7%)
Clause	0 (0.0%)	22 (84.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (15.4%)	26 (70.3%)
Total	6 (16.2%)	27 (72.9%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (10.8%)	37 (100%)

**Table 8. Frequency Count of Preposed Arguments in Ilokano**

### 4.1.2 Tagalog

Tagalog is generally held to be a verb-first language (Schachter & Otanes 1972, Naylor 2005, Nolasco 2010), and for the most part it is true that nominal arguments must follow the verb, with pronouns occurring as second-position enclitics. However, there are some exceptions, as the language also allows a clause type where pronouns occur to the left of the verb.

Culwell-Kanarek (2005) discussed the different pronominal forms that pre-verbal and post-verbal pronouns take as they occur in a clause. Like Kana, the Tagalog ergative pronoun takes a different form, which is morphologically identical to the oblique, having the same pronoun root.

- (40) Tagalog  
 Tinawag **niya** ang bata.  
 T<in>awag niya ang bata  
 <PST>call-TR(-in) 3SG.ERG ABS child  
 ‘Tinawag niya ang bata.’  
 ‘He called the child.’

- (41) Tagalog  
**Kanyang** tinawag ang bata.  
 Kanya=ng t<in>awag ang bata  
 3SG.ERG=LKR <PST>call-TR(-in) ABS child  
 ‘Kanyang tinawag ang bata.’  
 ‘He called the child.’

Although Tagalog allows preverbal pronouns to occur, the percentage of its occurrence is not that significant. Based on the data, pronominals are rarely preposed. Table 9 shows that in transitive clauses, preposed arguments are usually noun phrases or subordinate clauses. Unlike Kana, however, Tagalog constructions prefer the basic (postposed) constructions over preposed.

	Preposed	Postposed	Total
Intransitive	36 (23.4%)	118 (76.4%)	154 (71.3%)
Transitive	16 (25.8%)	46 (74.2%)	62 (28.7%)
Total	52 (24.1%)	164 (75.9%)	216 (100%)

**Table 9. Tagalog Preposed and Postposed Constructions**

## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

Oblique clauses (57.1%) tend to be preposed among the constituent types, followed by noun phrases (36.7%). Pronouns are rarely preposed in Tagalog, and they only occur in intransitive constructions.

Preposed	Pronouns	Noun Phrases	Oblique Clauses	Total
Intransitive	3 (8.8%)	8 (23.5%)	23 (67.6%)	34 (69.4%)
Transitive	0 (0.0%)	10 (66.7%)	5 (33.3%)	15 (30.6%)
Total	3 (6.1%)	18 (36.7%)	28 (57.1%)	49 (100%)

**Table 10. Frequency Count of Preposed Arguments in Tagalog**

	Intransitive		Transitive		Total	
	S	OBL	A	O		OBL
Pronominals	3 (100%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.1%)
Lexical NPs	5 (27.7%)	3 (16.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	10 (55.6%)	18 (36.7%)
Clause	0 (0.0%)	23 (82.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (17.9%)	28 (57.1%)
Total	8 (16.3%)	26 (53.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	15 (30.6%)	49 (100%)

**Table 11. Frequency Count of Preposed Arguments in Tagalog**

It can also be observed from the data that *ay*-inversion is employed when an argument is preposed.

(42) Tagalog

**Ang isa sa kanila** ay naglalaro ng paddle ball.

Ang isa sa kanila ay nag-la~laro ng  
ABS NUM OBL 3PL.OBL LKR INTR.IPFV-RED~laro OBL  
paddle ball  
paddle ball

‘Ang isa sa kanila ay naglalaro ng paddle ball.’

‘One of them is playing the paddle ball.’

(43) Tagalog

**Bilang pasasalamat** ay binigyan ng bata ang tatlo ng tig-iisang prutas.

Bilang pasasalamat ay b<in>ig(a)y-an ng bata ang tatlo  
CONJ thank.you LKR <PFV>give-TR(-an) ERG child ABS NUM  
ng tig-isa=ng prutas  
OBL NOM-NUM=LKR fruit

‘Bilang pasasalamat ay binigyan ng bata ang tatlo ng tig-isang prutas.’

‘As token of gratitude, the three children were given one pear each by the child.’

### 4.1.3 Chavacano

Transitive constructions in Chavacano show rare instances of preposed constructions. Even though it is a creole borne from the contact between accusative and ergative languages, Chavacano strictly follows the accusative morphosyntax of its Iberian superstrate. It is strictly predicate-initial and only allows noun phrases and subordinate clauses



**Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages**

to be preposed. No example of pronominal preposing has been obtained from the data.

	Preposed	Postposed	Total
Intransitive	32 (25.6%)	93 (74.4%)	125 (75.3%)
Transitive	7 (17.1%)	34 (82.9%)	41 (24.7%)
Total	39 (34.5%)	127 (76.5%)	166 (100%)

**Table 12. Chavacano Preposed and Postposed Constructions**

Preposed	Pronouns	Noun Phrases	Oblique Clauses	Total
Intransitive	0 (0.0%)	18 (56.3%)	14 (43.7%)	32 (82.1%)
Transitive	0 (0.0%)	3 (42.9%)	4 (57.1%)	7 (17.9%)
Total	0 (0.0%)	21 (53.8%)	18 (46.1%)	39 (100%)

**Table 13. Frequency Count of Preposed Arguments in Chavacano**

	Intransitive		Transitive			Total
	S	OBL	A	O	OBL	
Pronominals	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Lexical NPs	5 (23.8%)	13 (61.9%)	2 (9.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (4.8%)	21 (53.8%)
Clause	0 (0.0%)	14 (77.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (22.2%)	18 (46.1%)
Total	5 (12.8%)	27 (69.2%)	2 (5.1%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (12.8%)	39 (100%)

**Table 14. Frequency Count of Preposed Arguments in Chavacano**

#### **4.1.4 Waray**

Waray is closest structurally and genetically to Kana, among the languages used in this study. They both belong to the same language subgroup, which is the Bisayan subgroup of languages.

An analysis of Waray transitive clauses shows that preposed constructions outnumber over postposed. 54.5% percent of transitive clauses are preposed constructions.

## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

	Preposed	Postposed	Total
Intransitive	48 (38.4%)	77 (61.6%)	125 (79.1%)
Transitive	18 (54.5%)	15 (45.5%)	33 (20.9%)
Total	66 (41.7%)	92 (58.2%)	158 (100%)

**Table 15. Waray Preposed and Postposed Constructions**

Preposed arguments consist of noun phrases (57.6%), which occur more frequently than oblique cases (31.8%) and pronominals (10.6%). Preposed tend to occur in intransitive clauses (72.7%) compared to transitive clauses.

Preposed	Pronouns	Noun Phrases	Oblique Clauses	Total
Intransitive	0 (0.0%)	34 (70.8%)	14 (29.2%)	48 (72.7%)
Transitive	7 (38.9%)	4 (22.2%)	7 (38.9%)	18 (27.3%)
Total	7 (10.6%)	38 (57.6%)	21 (31.8%)	66 (100%)

**Table 16. Frequency Count of Preposed Arguments in Waray**

Lexical NPs are also preposed more frequently than the other types of constituents. It is noteworthy than in Waray, there were no instances of preposing in pronominals in both transitive and intransitive clauses.

	Intransitive		Transitive			Total
	S	OBL	A	O	OBL	
Pronominals	0 (100%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Lexical NPs	19 (43.2%)	15 (34.1%)	7 (15.9%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.8%)	44 (66.7%)
Clause	0 (0.0%)	14 (63.6%)	1 (4.5%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (31.8%)	22 (33.3%)
Total	19 (28.8%)	29 (43.9%)	8 (12.1%)	0 (0.0%)	10 (15.2%)	66 (100%)

**Table 17. Frequency Count of Preposed Arguments in Waray**

## **5 Summary and Conclusion**

Philippine languages have been analyzed to be predicate-initial. Simple and pragmatically neutral clauses which exhibit the basic order of constituents are expected to follow the PAO/POA pattern. Other alternative orders where the nominal arguments and other constituents are placed before the predicate are considered pragmatically marked. These instances are referred to as preposing.

Employing statistical frequency, one of the most common diagnostic strategies to determine the basic order of languages (Hawkins 1983; Dryer 1993 as cited in Mithun 1992), the data have shown that preposed constructions, specifically involving pronominals, have higher frequency of occurrence in Kana. It was also observed that prepos-

## **Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages**

ing phenomena in Kana are prompted by pragmatic functions. For instance, topical and newsworthy elements are usually preposed in a clause. In intransitive clauses, noun phrases and pronominal arguments are preposed because they usually introduce new topic or signal contrast. Oblique phrases are preposed for their scene-setting function in discourse. In transitive clauses, ergative pronouns are usually preposed. These pronouns referred to topical arguments in discourse.

In this study, it was shown that preposed constructions in selected Philippine languages are influenced by the following conditions: (a) setting the scene and introducing new themes in a discourse narrative; (b) listing ideas or information; (c) expressing exclusivity or contrast; and (d) clitic movement and position.

In other Philippine languages, the data have shown that while Ilokano, Tagalog, and Chavacano allow preposing, the preposed arguments are usually oblique NPs and subordinate clauses. These languages prefer post-verbal pronoun constructions and tend to prepose full NPs. The data have shown that only Kana and Waray show preference to pronominal preposing. This is evident in the percentage of occurrence of preposed constructions, which is higher than the basic postposed construction.

Ilokano, Tagalog, and Chavacano are basically predicate-initial. This holds true in terms of both nominal and pronominal arguments. Kana and Waray have predicate-medial tendencies, with the ergative pronominal occupying the leftmost of the clause in the pre-predicate position. They favor the APO constructions over the PAO/POA constructions.

Word order generalizations traditionally consider lexical noun phrases in determining the basic order of constituents in a clause. However, recent studies (Nagaya 2006, Nagaya & Santiago 2006) have shown that pronominalization is most often used in tracking reference across clauses in Philippine languages. It is also the most unmarked and most useful way to monitor reference in Kana discourse. This may tell us one thing: we may have to re-consider the word order analysis in Philippine languages since analyses that have been made only discussed word order in terms of full NPs. This paper offers a new point of view in the analysis of word order in Philippine-type languages.

We also agree with Mithun (1992) in her claim that the order of constituents can be reflective of pragmatic functions rather than syntactic functions. The phenomenon of preposing illustrates the “newsworthiness principle.” “Newsworthy” information or items are preposed and placed before the predicate or early in the clause, or in the beginning of discourse. It usually (a) represents significant new information, (b) introduces new topic, and (c) points out a significant contrast. Philippine-type languages allow topical arguments to move in a clause depending on their relative significance in the discourse.

This study is not meant to provide a conclusive analysis on the pronominal word order of Philippine languages. However, it is hoped that it provided a good starting point for further studies on the basic order of Philippine languages, particularly in terms of pragmatic ordering and on the basis of pronominal arguments.

## List of Terms and Abbreviations

∅	zero-marked	INTSV	intensive
1	first person	IMP	imperative
12	dual person	IPFV	imperfective
2	second person	LKR	linker
3	third person	LOC	locative
ʼ	glottal stop	MED	medial
=	cliticization	MOD	modifier
-	morpheme boundary	MODE	mode
.	morpheme with several metalanguage elements	NEG	negator
< >	infixation	NEUT	neutral tense-aspect
A	agent or source of action	NOM	nominalization
ABS	absolutive	NONSPEC	non-specific
AGENT	semantic agent	NUM	numeral
APT	aptative	O	patient or most affected entity
BEN	beneficiary/recipient	OBL	oblique
CAUS	causative	PAT	semantic patient
CONJ	conjunction	PFV	perfective
COMPR	comparative	PL	plural
C <sub>1</sub> V <sub>1</sub>	first syllable reduplication	POSS	possessive
DIST	distal	PR	personal
DISTR	distributive	PROX	proximal
ERG	ergative	PRSP	prospective
FOC	focus	PRT	particle
GEN	genitive	QW	question word
INCP	inceptive future	RED	reduplication
IND	indicative	RCP	reciprocal
INTR	intransitive	RPFV	recent perfective
		S	only argument of an intransitive construction

STAT	stative verb	TR	transitive
STEM	stem	Vlr	first vowel + <i>r</i>
TA	tense-aspect		reduplication

## References

- Chafe, Wallace L. 1980a. The deployment of consciousness in the production of a narrative. In *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1980b. *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Constantino, Ernesto. 1965. The sentence patterns of twenty-six Philippine languages. *Lingua* 15. 71–124. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841\(65\)90009-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(65)90009-4).
- Culwell-Kanarek, Nathan. 2005. Pre-verbal pronouns in Tagalog syntax. *UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics* (12).
- Dixon, Robert Malcolm Ward. 1968. *The Dyirbal language of North Queensland*. University of London doctoral dissertation.
- Du Bois, John W. 1987. The discourse basis of ergativity. *Language* 63(4). 805–855. <https://doi.org/10.2307/415719>.
- Fox, Barbara A. 1985. Word-order inversion and discourse continuity in Tagalog. *Text* 5(1–2). 39–54. <https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1985.5.1-2.39>.
- Gerds, Donna B. 1988. Antipassives and causatives in Ilokano: Evidence for an ergative analysis. In Richard McGinn (ed.), *Studies in Austronesian Linguistics*. Ohio University Press.



## Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages

- Kaufman, Daniel. 2005. Aspects of pragmatic focus in Tagalog. In I Wayan Arka & Malcolm Ross (eds.), *The many faces of austronesian voice systems: Some new empirical studies*, 175–196. Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, ANU.
- Kroeger, Paul R. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1992. Is basic word order universal? In Doris L. Payne (ed.), *Pragmatics of word order flexibility*, 15–61. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.22.02mit>.
- Mithun, Marianne & Wallace Chafe. 1999. What are S, A, and O? *Studies in Language* 23(3). 579–596. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.23.3.05mit>.
- Nagaya, Naonori. 2006. Topicality and reference-tracking in Tagalog. In *Proceedings of the 9th Philippine Linguistics Congress*. University of the Philippines Department of Linguistics.
- Nagaya, Naonori & Mark Felix Albert Santiago. 2006. Pagtunton sa mga kalahok sa isang naratibo. In *Proceedings of the 9th Philippine Linguistics Congress*. University of the Philippines Department of Linguistics.
- Naylor, Paz Buenaventura. 2005. On the stative predicate: Tagalog “existentials” revisited. In Hsiu-Chuan Liao & Carl Ralph Galvez Rubino (eds.), *Current issues in Philippine linguistics and anthropology: Parangal kay Lawrence A. Reid*, 419–435.
- Nolasco, Ricardo. 2003. *Ang pagkatransitibo at ikinaergatibo ng mga Wikang Pilipino: Isang pagsusuri sa sistemang bose*. University of the Philippines Diliman doctoral dissertation.

- Nolasco, Ricardo. 2005. The Chabacano challenge to Philippine ergativity. In *Linguistics and language education in the Philippines and beyond: A festschrift in honor of Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista*, 401–433.
- Nolasco, Ricardo. 2006. Ano ang S, A at O sa mga wikang Pilipino? In *Proceedings of the 9th Philippine Linguistics Congress*. University of the Philippines Department of Linguistics.
- Nolasco, Ricardo. 2010. What is a Philippine-type language? University of the Philippines Diliman.
- Nolasco, Ricardo. 2011. Grammar notes on the national language. University of the Philippines Diliman.
- Nolasco, Ricardo & Maureen Joy Saclot. 2005. M- and S-transitivity in Philippine type languages. In *International Course and Conference on Role and Reference Grammar*. University at Buffalo, The State University of New York.
- Payne, Thomas Edward. 1997. *Describing morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rafal, Jeremy. 2009. Analyzing Ilokano pseudoclefts. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 15(1). <https://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol15/iss1/20>.
- Rubino, Carl Ralph Galvez. 1997. *A reference grammar of Ilocano*. University of California Santa Barbara doctoral dissertation.
- Rubino, Carl Ralph Galvez. 2000. *Ilocano dictionary and grammar* (PALI Language Texts).
- Santiago, Mark Felix Albert D. 2006. Reference-tracking and discourse pattern in Chabacano-Caviteño. Paper presentation. In *1st Philippine-Japan Linguistics Congress*. University of the Philippines Mindanao.

## **Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages**

- Schachter, Paul & Fe T. Otanes. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*.  
University of California Press.
- Thompson, Sandra. N.d. *Lecture notes in Ling 109/209 (Word Order)*.  
Ohio State University.
- Zorc, R. David. 1977. *The Bisayan dialects of the Philippines:  
Subgrouping and reconstruction* (Series C 44). Canberra: Pacific  
Linguistics. 328 pp.

*This page is intentionally left blank.*