

SYNTACTIC COMPARISON OF TAGALOG, MAORI AND CHAMORRO

Videa P. de Guzman
University of the Philippines

O. Introduction

The search for language universals has brought out the relevance of describing a language not as though it were an isolated piece of structure, but rather as one that is related to other languages. Studies on the comparison of languages with a view to discovering the properties which human languages share have contributed toward the formulation and/or evaluation of a general linguistic theory. Yet, the question as to what the characteristics of the "universal grammar" are is still unsettled and linguists agree that continued investigation or analysis of the world's languages may eventually yield the light.

This paper is an attempt at positing some generalizations -- some generalized syntactic relations, processes and features -- which may be considered as candidates in the current thinking about the "universal grammar." The propositions are based on a comparison of some syntactic features in the basic sentence patterns of three genetically related languages, namely, Tagalog (T), Maori (M), and Chamorro (C).

Tagalog, the principal language in the study, is one of the 75 languages in the Philippines.¹ It belongs to the Indonesian branch of the Malayo-Polynesian or Austronesian family of languages. New Zealand Maori belongs to the Polynesian branch while Chamorro, which is spoken in Guam, is also linked to the Indonesian branch.²

This study has three main parts. The first part consists of a segment of the constituent-structure rules for Tagalog. The rules are based on the major simple sentence types. The model adopted in the study is the generative model with special consideration to Fillmore's case approach.³ In the second part the sentence constructions are compared with similar constructions in Maori and Chamorro. Some special aspects or features of the sentences are analyzed and compared. The comparison yields some syntactic rules which are shared by all three languages. These rules are labelled genealogical rules. In the last part of this paper, the rules which Greenberg proposed in his article in Universals of Language⁴ are tested to determine which of them do not apply to Tagalog, what adjustments need to be made in the rules, and thereby show which rules and features are idiosyncratic to Tagalog. In the conclusion, some statements concerning the universal base or what may be considered universals on the basis of common syntactic features are proposed.

This study has certain limitations. First, it treats only the basic or major simple sentence patterns of Tagalog. No instance of sentence embedding is included in the rules. The source for Maori is Hohepa's A profile generative grammar of Maori,⁵ and for Chamorro, some of the language data contained in Anthropological Linguistics, Vol. 7, No. 2, Feb. 1965 and in Donald Topping's Lessons in Chamorro (a preliminary text). It is unfortunate that no grammar with an approach similar to that of the Maori and Tagalog⁶ references is yet available.

1. A Segment of the Constituent-Structure Rules of Tagalog

The following rules will generate the basic simple sentence patterns of Tagalog treated in this study.

1. S \rightarrow (Mod) Aux + Prop
2. Mod \rightarrow $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Interrogative} \\ \text{Imperative} \\ \text{Negative} \\ \text{Identificational} \end{array} \right\}^7$
3. Aux \rightarrow Mode (Aspect) (Voice) (Causative) (Ability)
4. Prop \rightarrow $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{VS} \\ \text{NP} \\ \text{PP} \end{array} \right\} + \text{K (Adv)}$

VS = Verb Stem; PP = Particulate Phrase⁸

5. K \rightarrow (NP [+ Agent]) (NP [+ Object]) (NP [+ Loc])
(NP [+ Ben]) (NP [+ Ins])

Condition: Choose one NP or a combination that is permitted by the co-occurring VS, NP or PP.

6. NP \rightarrow (CP (Det)) N (PossP)

CP = Case Particle; PossP = Possessive Phrase

7. PP \rightarrow $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{PR} \\ \text{PL} \\ \text{PossP} \end{array} \right.$

PR = Prepositional Phrase; PL = Locational Phrase

8. VS \rightarrow (Affix) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{V} \\ \text{Adj} \end{array} \right.$

9. PossP \rightarrow Poss mkr + N

From the preceding rules, it will be noted that each of the NP's branching from K contains a feature which triggers the selection of the corresponding case particle. It may be mentioned that some transformational rules have to operate in a process called topicalization whereby one NP developing from K is marked as the topic of the sentence.⁹ In Tagalog, topicalization involves the obligatory occurrence of the Det and the dropping of the CP in the NP. Thus, the topicalization rule is:

NP [+ Topic] \rightarrow Det + N (PossP)

2. Syntactic Comparison of Tagalog, Maori and Chamorro

A. Examples of the basic sentence patterns that can be generated by the Tagalog constituent-structure rules presented above are given below. The Tagalog examples are followed by their Maori and Chamorro equivalents. The first sentence in each group of sentences preceded by E (English) gives the English gloss.

1. (S, VS + NP)

a. E: The canoe has gone.

T: umalis na ang bangka

M: kua haere te waka

C: ma'pus i boté

b. E: The good horse ran fast.

T: tumakbong mabilis ang magaling na kabayo

M: i oma horo te hoiho pai

C: malagu sa'dik i maolek na kabazu

c. E: The box is heavy.

T: mabigat ang kahon

M: ka taimaha te pouaka

C: makat i katton

2. (S, VS + NP + NP)

a. E: John ate some food.

T: kumain si John nang pagkain

M: i kai^nga he kai e John

C: Mangnganu si John kanu

b. E: Peter taught the children.

T: tinuruan ni Peter ang manga bata?

M: i faka^ako^tia ngaa tama^riki e Peter

C: afana?gwi? si Peter i famanagun

3. (S, VS + NP + NP + NP)

a. E: The dog will soon be taken home by Jim.

T: iuuwi na ni Jim ang aso sa bahay

M: ko te kurii ka tari^a e Jim ki te kaainga

C: para umakuni i kalagu ni as Jim gi gima

4. (S, NP + NP)

a. E: This boy is Jim.

T: si Jim ang batang ito

M: ko Jim tee^nei tama^iti

C: si Jim esti na lahi

b. E: My mother is a good woman.

T: mabait na babae ang ina ko

M: he wahine pai t^oo^ku faaea

C: maolek na palawan i nanahu

c. E: Who is he?

T: sino siya

M: ko wai iia

C: hazi gwi?

5. (S, PP + NP)

a. 1. E: John is in the house.

T: nasa bahay si John

M: kei te fare a John

C: gaigi si John gi gima

2. E: The child was at the seaside.

T: nasa tabing-dagat ang bata?

M: i te taha-moana te tama^iti

C: gaigi i patgon gi sion i tasi

b. 1. E: These horses belong to Jim and his companions.

T: kina Jim ang manga kabayong ito

M: n^aa Jim maa ee^nei hoiho

C: esti na kabazu siha i edzun Jim

2. E: Those previously mentioned objects are for the school teachers.

T: para sa manga guro nang eskwelahan ang manga iyon

M: m^aa ngaa mahita kura aua mea

C: etsu na klasi siha para i maestra siha

B. Observations on some aspects of the basic constructions¹⁰

1. Aux and Prop

A cursory look at the first constituent of each of the sentences above will show that the sentence structure of T and C differs from that of M. In the Maori rules, this constituent is called a predicate phrase, and every such phrase has an initiator. Where the predicate phrase initiator is obligatory in M, it is optional in T and C.¹¹

Hohepa says that in Maori each marker or phrase initiator carries a multifunctional load. For instance, in 1.a kua marks perfective, non-time; in 1.c ka expresses an inceptive (mode), non-time, and in 4.b he is an NP initiator which means indefinite article, non-number, non-personal proper noun. In all these cases, T and C do not have any marker,

but the same functions are expressed in the verb through the affix -um-.

The structure of the verb of T and C, therefore, exhibits complexity. Both use a system of affixation and partial reduplication to indicate the functions expressed by the phrase initiator in M. This characteristic difference may lead to good structural basis for genetic subgrouping.

Example:

T:	kumakain	'eating'	from the root word <u>kain</u>	'eat'
C:	chumochocho		from the root word <u>chocho</u>	
M:	e kai ana		<u>kai</u>	'eat' is the nucleus;
			<u>e</u>	... <u>ana</u> is the imperfective,
				non-time marker

It may be said, therefore, of Austronesian languages that they have different ways of manifesting the grammatical categories of aspect, mode, and voice. In particular, the preposed marker carries the load in Maori, while in Tagalog and Chamorro, the verb or the nucleus carries the burden.

This observation supports the separation of Aux and Prop as shown in the Tagalog CS rules, which places Aux on a node higher than where it used to be in the "classical" transformational grammar phrase-structure rules. By putting Aux on a higher node, instead of having it branch out from the VS or VP, all the grammatical categories included therein can operate on the whole structure of Prop. That is, the functions

indicated in Aux will be reflected in whatever the structure of Prop is in specific languages, e.g.,

Marker + { VS
NP
PP } ... or simply { VS
NP
PP } .

2. Possessive Phrase

A comparison of the possessive phrases in the three languages shows some structural facts which might have otherwise been concealed.

Examples:

- (1) E: This is the man's house.
 T: ito ang bahay nang tao
 M: ko tee^{nei} te fare oo te tangata
 C: esti i gima ni i taotao
- (2) E: On the contrary, his birthday was yesterday.
 T: sa katunayan kahapon ang kaarawan niya
 M: i^{nanahi} kee t^{oo}na huritau
 C: lugat nipa^{gu} nigap i gupot niya

In (1), the T possessive phrase is marked by nang and immediately followed by the head tao 'man'. There is no overt determiner before the head^{11a} unlike in M where the possessive marker oo is distinct from the determiner te. It is interesting to note that in this respect C has the same structure as M, not T. The C possessive phrase is introduced by ni, followed by the determiner i and then

by the head taotao. In (2), the possessive pronoun for both T and C is niya 'third person, singular, non-topic'. The Tagalog set of possessive pronouns all begin with n- except those for the first and second person, singular. Consequently, the function of these forms becomes easily identifiable. On the other hand, M affixes the possessive marker and the pronoun to the determiner to indicate the possessor-possessed relationship, e.g., t'oo'na huritau 'his birthday'.

In connection with the order of the possessor and the possessed, it can be noted that the possessive pronoun of T and C comes after the possessed noun, as illustrated in (1). However, it appears that in M the complex possessive pronoun is restricted to occur only before the possessed noun. This observation gains support in Hisanosuki Izui's study.¹² According to him, the characteristics of possessives are some of the most useful criteria to decide the relationship of each of the languages of Micronesia to each of the three subgroups. He says that the possessive pronoun suffix are in principle attached directly to any noun in the Indonesian group regardless of the nature of their meaning and the mode of relation between the owner and the owned.¹³ In Polynesian, however, he observes that the possessive pronouns are not bound to the nouns.

3. Number in the NP and VS 'VP

Plurality in the Tagalog NP is expressed by the particle manga or by a numeral placed before the singular form of the noun head.

Examples:

E: The children's parents were in Auckland.

T: nasa Auckland ang manga magulang nang manga bata?

M: i aakarana ngaa ma^a^tua oo ngaa tama^riki

It will be observed that in M the plural affixes are attached to the nouns, tua to ma and riki to tama 'parent' and 'child', respectively. In addition to this signal, the plural form of the determiner is also used. ngaa means 'the, plural, non-personal'. In C the particle siha after the noun marks plurality of the preceding noun. Hence, i maestra siha means 'the teachers'.

A more complex number concord is exhibited in the NP's when the noun head is modified.

Examples:

E: These are the good children.

T: ito ang mababait na mga bata?

M: ko ngaa tama^riki pa^pai ee^nei

C: esti i man-'good' fanagu'on

In M, the determiner, the noun, and the modifier are all marked for plural. The modifier, pai 'good', shows plurality

by the reduplication of the initial CV. Similarly, T indicates plurality in the modifier by reduplication of the first CV of the root, e.g. bait 'goodness' is the root word of mabait 'good'. In C the man- before the modifier (the equivalent was not available) marks it as plural.

One option that is possible in T is that where manga occurs before the noun head, the modifier may remain unmarked. On the other hand, where the modifier is already marked for plural, the plural particle manga may be omitted before the noun modified. Hence, the following sentences may also be used in T for the meaning 'These are the good children.'

1. ito ang mabait na manga bata?
2. ito ang mababait na bata?

With VS's/VP's, plurality is formally marked only in T and C.

Examples:

1. E: We are big.
T: malalaki'tayo
C: mandangkolo ham
2. E: They stayed.
T: nagsitigil sila/nangagsitigil sila
C: manyaga siha (from the root saga)

It may be mentioned again that the plural form of the verb in T is not obligatory. The unmarked form malaki 'big' in 1 and tumigil 'stayed' in 2 are also acceptable. This apparent

optionality of the rule on number agreement suggests two things to the analyst: 1) that the language is not really strict about number agreement, or 2) that the language is undergoing change in this particular aspect, that is, it is going towards the direction of simplification. However, it is still safe to say that "standard" speech adheres to the rules on number concord.

4. The Subject of Case

As early as 1906, Frank Blake noted that in the Philippine languages the "case-indicating function of the verb" expressed by affixation was developed to a high degree.¹⁴ He identified an agentive case denoted by the active verb and an accusative, dative, instrumental, locative, and ablative denoted by the different passive verb forms. Besides the verbal affixes, the forms of the preposed markers in the verbal complements, which in this paper are labeled case particles (CP), indicate case relationships between the nominal expression and the verb.¹⁵

Aside from the particular "case" relationship that exists between each of the nominal expressions and the verb, there is another grammatical relationship between the verb and one of the nominal expressions which is "focused" by the verb. McKaughan refers to this particular nominal expression as the

topic of the sentence.¹⁶ Starosta calls it the subject of the sentence.¹⁷

The following examples in Tagalog will show the case-marking affixes (underlined) in the verb and their corresponding topics (in capital letters).

a. Agentive case

pumitas ANG BATA nang buko sa puno para sa bisita¹⁸

'The child picked a young coconut from the tree for the guest.'

b. Objective case

pipitasin nang bata nang sungkit ANG BUKO sa puno para sa bisita

'The child will pick the young coconut with a pole from the tree for the guest.'

c. Locative case

pipitasan nang bata nang buko ANG PUNO para sa bisita

'The child will pick a young coconut from the tree for the guest.'

d. Benefactive case

ipipitas nang bata ANG BISITA nang buko sa puno

'The child will pick a young coconut from the tree for the guest.'

e. Instrumental case

ipangpipitas nang bata nang buko sa puno ANG SUNGKIT para

sa bisita

'The child will use the pole to pick the young coconut from the tree for the guest.'

The case particle nang is used to indicate non-focus agent, object, or instrument; sa, location; and para sa, benefactive. Specific sets of pronouns and demonstratives also distinguish the various relationships.

It will be noted that in the preceding examples there is a wide range of flexibility with which one may choose any of the verbal complements to become the topic or the subject of the sentence. Tagalog verbs, however, differ in their privilege of occurrence with these complements. Some complements are obligatory, others are optional, and others are non-occurrent.¹⁹

In Chamorro, a similar expression of case relationships can be observed. The following examples show distinct cases in the language:

a. Agentive:

si Pete lumie i palawan

'Pete saw the woman.'

b. Objective:

linie i palawan as Pete

'It was the woman that Pete saw.'

hinatsa i lamasa ni patgon

'The child lifted the table.'

c. Referential:

hu kuentose si Pete

'I talked to Pete.'

hu sangane si Pete ni estoria²⁰

'I told the story to Pete.'

d. Benefactive:

hu kuentosiye si Pete

'I talked for Pete (in his stead).'

hu sanganiye si Pete ni estoria

'I told the story for Pete.'

No examples similar to those in Tagalog where a verb is shown with the various case-marking affixes could be found in the data available. Most verbs show contrast between the agentive and the objective or the referential and the benefactive. In fact, one sophisticated native speaker of Chamorro could not give an example of a verb focusing a locative noun phrase. This particular case may occur only in Philippine languages, hence, is language specific.

Furthermore, Chamorro has no instrumental focus construction. When an action is performed with a specified instrument, the instrument is marked by the particle ni.²¹ Note the following sentence which is referential focus:

hu achaye i amigu-ho ni espehos ni mattiyu

'I hammered the glass for my friend with the hammer.'

It will be observed that in T and C, the same particle marks the object and the instrument. The particle gi marks location in C.

For Maori, Hohepa identifies various phrase initiators which demarcate salient syntactic units.²² The contrast in focus can be observed in the following examples:

a. Agentive:

i mahi i te whare te tangata

'The man built the house.'

kua patu i a Kani a John

'John hit Kani.'

b. Objective:

kua ito^hia e te tangata te whare

'The house was looked at by the man.'

i patu^a e John a Kani

'Kani was hit by John.'

ka patu^a te tangata ki te raakau

'The man was hit at the tree.'

The non-focus object is introduced by the particle i and the non-focus agent by e. The locative phrase is preceded by ki. Hohepa adds that the NP preceded by ki is ambiguous in that it may either be an object or an instrument, such that ki te raakau in the last sentence may also mean 'with the stick.' It will be observed that in the

last example the agent is not mentioned. The same type of structure is also found in both T and C.

It is interesting to note that according to Hohepa²³ the possibility of permutation of VP and NP is ko + NP + VP with ko being an NP focus specifier. Hence, sentence 3.a on page 38, ko te kurii ka tari^a e Jim ki te kaainga 'The dog will soon be taken home by Jim.', may also be reordered ka tari^a e Jim te kurii ki te kaainga. Hohepa commented further that "there are strong arguments supporting the notion that in a case grammar, /ko/ is the case-marker for the subject."²⁴ It may be stated, however, that since ko indicates the subject only when it occurs sentence initially, there must be other indicators of the subject when it occurs in non-initial position. As in Tagalog, I would posit that the presence or absence of the CP or the phrase-initiator such as i for objective and e for agentive in the NP's and the distinctive form of the verb, e.g. unmarked for the agentive focus and V + /(i)a/ for objective, are the indicators of case in M. Note that in the sentence i faka^ako^tia ngaa tama^riki e Pete 'Pete taught the children', the subject or topic is ngaa tama^riki 'children', objective case, otherwise it should be preposed by i. In addition, Pete is preposed by e indicating that it is in non-focus relation to the verb, otherwise it should be marked by a. Finally, the verb with (i)a suffix indicates an object-focus construction.

For lack of data, it is not possible to determine the extent of transformations from one case-focus to another as in Tagalog. It may be possible that in M, only the agentive and the objective cases are clearly marked.

The subject of case is too interesting an area to miss particularly in the study of the three target languages here. Even at this preliminary stage, I would venture to say of Austronesian languages that the "case" of nominal expressions is marked either by a preposed particle or by an affix in the verb when the nominal expression is the topic/subject of the sentence. In this connection, Fillmore's concept of topicalization proves to be significant. It can be observed that once an NP is chosen to become the topic of the sentence, certain mechanical changes occur in the phrase itself and in the verb. I think that in formulating a sentence, the choice of the topic comes first and this topic triggers the selection of the appropriate affix (or its absence, as the case may be) by the verb. The verb also determines the occurrence of other unfocused complements.

The languages investigated here reveal that each has its own restrictions as to which of the complements may be topicalized. It appears that T allows the widest privilege in topicalization. However, although a locative or an instrumental topic is possible, the use of either is fairly limited. The verb forms co-occurring with either topic occur most frequently

in either question or "nominalized" expressions. For instance, the locative focus form of the verb punta 'to go' is puntahan, hence, ano ang pupuntahan nila means 'What is it that they are going to?' In sungkit ang ipangpipitas ko 'It is a pole that I will use for picking', the 'pole' sungkit identifies the 'instrument to be used for picking' ipangpipitas.

From the preceding observations, the following genealogical rules and statements may be said to apply to the languages T, M and C:

a. On Aux and Prop²⁵

$$\text{Prop} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{VP} \\ \text{NP} \end{array} \right\} \text{K}$$

$$\text{VP} \rightarrow (\text{VP mkr}) \text{VS}$$

b. On Possessive Phrase

$$\text{PossP} \rightarrow \text{Poss mkr (Det) N}$$

c. On Number Agreement

(1) NP \rightarrow CP + Det + N

N \rightarrow CS

[+N] \rightarrow [+ singular]

The number feature of the M is copied by the Det.

(2) An N with a feature [- singular] is marked by a particle placed before or after it.

(3) The number feature of the NP topic is also copied by the VP or NP of the Prop. Plurality is

commonly manifested by the reduplication of the first CV of the root. Granted that modifiers are derived from the basic construction, the number feature of the modifier, e.g. an adjective, noun or verb, is retained to agree with the modified noun.

d. On Case Manifestation

- (1) The possible relationships between verbs and nominals may be of five types: Agent, Object, Location, Benefactive, or Instrumental.
- (2) These sentential functions are formally definable in terms of case-marking particles and verbal inflections.

3. Some Typological Adjustment Rules

Tagalog is identified as a VSO language, hence, by Greenberg's propositions²⁶ we will find prepositions, genitives following the nouns, and adjectives following the nouns. There are, however, some statements that do not hold true. Some alternate orders are more dominant in the language. It may be mentioned that in the treatment of this section, the basis is surface ordering.²⁷ I am inclined to believe that word order within a phrase belongs to the underlying structure while phrase order in the sentence is more on the surface. This may be said of VSO languages only since in English,

the positions of the various phrases within the sentence are more or less fixed.

I shall limit my comments here on Greenberg's rules that have to be adjusted for Tagalog, and where applicable, for Maori and Chamorro as well.

U6²⁸ which states that all languages with dominant VSO order have SVO as an alternative or as the only alternative basic order. It may be added that for T, another alternative order is VOS.

U14 states that in conditional statements, the conditional clause precedes the conclusion normally. In T, however, the reverse order is just as normal. The rule may be revised as:
Conditional clause + Conclusion Conclusion + Conditional clause.

U16 presumes the existence of inflected auxiliaries in languages. This posits a problem because it should be qualified whether inflected auxiliary refers to a lexical category or to a grammatical category. If it is the former, some VSO languages do not have it; if it is the latter, it may operate on the particle before the verb or on the verb itself.

U17 states that NA is the dominant order for VSO. This applies to all the languages investigated in this study, but the reverse is as common in T and C. Hence, NA ~ AN.

U20 identifies the order of the items Dem, Num, and Desc Adj when any or all of them precede the N as occurring in that order. If they follow, the order is either the same or its exact opposite. For T, the rule needs to be adjusted as follows: Dem + Num + Adj + N-Dem + Num + N + Adj-Num + Adj + N + Dem. One fixed order is apparent here, that is, Num never follows the N. This also applies to other quantifiers. For example:

maraming tao 'lots of people'

dalawang sakong bigas 'two sacks of rice'

U23 states that with much better than chance frequency, if the CN usually precedes the PN, the genitive precedes its governing N. The rule for T on this is always CN + PN and the GN~NG, the latter being more common in final position in the sentence.

4. Conclusion

The few syntactic comparisons attempted at in this paper reveal some simple relations which may be considered as strong candidates for characteristic features of the "universal grammar." The following statements are, therefore, posited:

A. The "universal base" consists of grammatical categories and grammatical functions occurring in an unordered sequence.

Hence, the rules of the type are as follows:

- 1) S \rightarrow (M), Aux, Prop
- 2) Aux \rightarrow Mode, (Tense) (Aspect)
- 3) Prop \rightarrow Predicate, K
- 4) K \rightarrow $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\text{NP } [+Agent]) (\text{NP } [+Object]) \\ (\text{NP } [+Loc]) \dots^{29} \end{array} \right\}$

B. The substantive universals proposed are V, N and Det - verb, noun and determiner, respectively. Grammatical categories such as number and case, and the lexical feature [+Personal] for N are also suggested.

C. It is not clear whether a strict division between typological and genealogical rules should be set up in that order after the universal base rules. If we accept modification or specification in the genealogical rules, how can the rules of ordering apply to categories not yet specified in the input?

D. It could be posited that as genealogical rules develop more specific constituent-structure rules for the genetic family, the typological rules continue to apply adjustment rules of ordering.

E. Even feature development rules may be specified in the genealogical rules.

The generalizations arrived at in this study can be treated as mere proposals which stand to be tested in other languages. They have to find support or rejection in other related or even unrelated languages since they are based only

on a very limited amount of data within a narrow range or scope. Despite these limitations, it is the investigator's hope that this study will serve as a springboard for a wider and more rigorous comparison.

N O T E S

1. Anthropological Linguistics, 1964, 6:88.
2. George Grace, 1965. "Oceanic Linguistic Classification," Anthropological Linguistics 7:265-97.
3. Charles Fillmore, 1968, "The Case for Case," Universals in Linguistic Theory, edited by E. Bach and R. Harms, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., pp. 1-88.
4. Joseph Greenberg, 1968, "Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements," Universals of Language, edited by J. Greenberg, Cambridge: MIT Press, Paperback edition, pp. 73-113.
5. Patrick Hohepa, 1967, A Profile Generative Grammar of Maori, Supplement to International Journal of American Linguistics 33.
6. Ernesto Constantino, 1965, "The Sentence Patterns of Twenty-Six Philippine Languages," Lingua 15:71-124.

7. Mod may include other categories.
8. Adopted from Ernesto Constantino. op. cit., pp. 110-11.
9. Charles Fillmore, op. cit., pp. 57-60.
10. It may be mentioned that the preceding illustrations of the basic constructions are controlled by what is available in Maori. However, the analysis extended over about a hundred more instances of the major sentence patterns.
11. Ernesto Constantino. op. cit., considers the predicate marker in T kernel sentences obligatory.
- 11a. nang may be analyzed as consisting of n- 'possessive marker' prefixed to the determiner ang; compare nang with its counterpart ni before proper names. --- E. C.
12. Hisanosuki Izui, 1965, "The Languages of Micronesia: Their Unity and Diversity," Lingua 14:353-354.
13. It will suffice to say of T that it has a set of possessive pronouns which occurs obligatorily before the possessed noun, e.g. kaniya in ang kaniyang kaarawan is the counterpart of niya in ang kaarawan niya 'his/her birthday'.
14. Frank Blake, 1906, "Expression of Case by the Verb in Tagalog." Journal of the American Oriental Society 27:183-84.
15. Howard McKaughan, 1962 "Overt Relation Markers in Maranao," Language 38:47-51.
16. Howard McKaughan, 1958, The Inflection and Syntax of Maranao Verbs. Manila.

17. Stanley Starosta, 1968, "Tsou Focus," Unpublished Paper.
18. The past form of the verb is used to show the affix -um-. Note that the instrumental noun phrase nang sungkit is not permitted here.
19. Joseph Kess, 1967, Syntactic Features of Tagalog Verbs, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, U. H., p. 20.
20. It will be observed that the phrases ni estoria and nipatgon lack the determiner i. Aware of the widespread vowel harmony and phonological assimilation in the language, I think the i has been assimilated in ni. See also D. Topping, 1968, "Chamorro Vowel Harmony," Oceanic Linguistics 7.
21. Donald Topping, op. cit., p. 399.
22. Patrick Hohepa, op. cit., p. 15
23. Patrick Hohepa, 1968, "The Ergative-Passive Split in Polynesian," Unpublished paper, p. 3.
24. Ibid., p. 5.
25. The third item PP, in rule 4, p. 35, for Tagalog has been deleted here since the status of the "genitive" as being derived from NP is still a problem, and the prepositional phrase seems to have lost its distinction from the NP.
26. Joseph Greenberg, op. cit.
27. In Ernesto Constantino, op. cit., the order of his kernel sentences is SVO. His VSO-type is derivable from the SVO.

The question that can be raised is whether it is the order in the deep structure or the surface structure that should be considered in connection with typology.

28. The number corresponds to the universals stated on pp. 110-112 of Greenberg, *op. cit.*

29. The field of selection of the various NP's is left open to accommodate those that are not revealed in the languages analyzed. It may be added that the Topicalization rule is implied in the preceding rule.