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ABSTRACT

SOME ASPECTS OF THE FOCUS SYSTEM
IN ISNAG

Publication NO. _____

Rodolfo Rosario Barlaan, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Arlington, 1986

Supervising Professor: Jerold A. Edmondson

This study attempts to specify how the syntactic form signals the semantic and pragmatic aspects of the focus system in the Isnag language. It specifies the correlation between the semantics and grammar of focus by proposing a ranking of the relevant semantic/participant roles called the Preferential Selection Hierarchy. This hierarchy constrains the positions the NP's can take in the clause and the co-occurrence of the NP's (i.e., which NP's may occur together in a clause).

With regard to the correlation between the pragmatics and
the grammar of focus, this study discusses, (a) the COMMENT–TOPIC structure, which is the overarching force that affects the fronting to preverbal position of some NP's and (b) the categories of presupposed items, i.e., items that are given definite status and thereby become eligible for focus marking.

Unlike previous studies on the focus phenomenon, this study observes two focus markers with additional distinct functions, e.g., *ya* (equivalent of *ang* in Tagalog), and *tu* (equivalent of *'yong/iyong* in Tagalog) particles.

It also observes that some affixes, particularly the agent and the goal focus affixes, function simultaneously as inflectional and derivational affixes. These affixes, when attached to certain classes of verbs, not only designate the role of the NP marked for focus but also change the meaning of the clause.

Overall, this study suggests a more global approach in investigating the focus phenomenon in some Philippine languages, i.e., studying focus from the viewpoint of grammar, semantics, and pragmatics.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS....................................................... iv

ABSTRACT................................................................. vi

INTRODUCTION........................................................... 1

CHAPTER 1

THE FOCUS SYSTEM: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS............. 4

1.1 What is the Focus System?.................. 4

1.2 Traditional Views of Focus.................. 7

1.3 Purpose of the Present Study................. 11

1.4 Focus System from Three Perspectives........ 14

1.4.1 The Grammatical View.................... 14

1.4.2 The Semantic View......................... 16

1.4.3 The Pragmatic View....................... 17

CHAPTER 2

THE SYNTAX AND SEMANTICS OF FOCUS......................... 20

2.1 The Focus System and the Clause............. 20

2.2 The Verbal Clause............................................. 21

2.2.1 The Co-occurrence Question.............. 22

2.2.2 The The Ordering Question............... 24

2.2.3 The Focus Agreement Question............ 25

2.2.4 The Definiteness Precedence Question... 26

2.3 The Semantic Roles............................................. 27

viii
2.4 The Preferential Selection Hierarchy ............... 29
   2.4.1 Determining the PS Hierarchy ................. 30
      2.4.1.1 Favored Complement ..................... 30
      2.4.1.2 Indispensability ....................... 31
      2.4.1.3 Positional Flexibility ................. 34
   2.4.2 The Restriction Rules ....................... 36
      2.4.2.1 The Permutation Rules .................. 36
      2.4.2.2 The Co-occurrence Restriction Rules .... 42
      2.4.2.3 The Definiteness Focus Condition ...... 44
   2.5 Clause Types .................................. 49
      2.5.1 The Focused NP as Agent ................. 49
      2.5.2 The Focused NP as Goal .................. 52
      2.5.3 The Focused NP as Instrument ............. 54
      2.5.4 The Focused NP as Beneficiary .......... 56
      2.5.5 The Focused NP as Location ............... 58
   2.6 Rationale for the PSH and the Rules .......... 60

CHAPTER 3

LEXICO-SEMANTIC ASPECT OF FOCUS ..................... 63
   3.1 The Focus ................................... 63
   3.2 Verbal Affixes ............................... 64
3.2.1 Inflectional Affixes
   3.2.1.1 The Agent Role Affixes
   3.2.1.2 The Goal Role Affixes
   3.2.1.3 The Instrument Role Affixes
   3.2.1.4 The Location Role Affixes
   3.2.1.5 The Beneficiary Role Affixes
3.2.2 Derivational Processes
   3.2.2.1 Derived Transitives
   3.2.2.2 Partitives
   3.2.2.3 Reciprocals
3.3 The Marking Particles
   3.3.1 The ya Particle
   3.3.2 The tu Particle
   3.3.3 The Non-focus Marking Particles
3.4 Pronouns and Proper Name Markers
   3.4.1 The Personal Pronoun System
      3.4.1.1 The Principal Personal
               Pronouns
      3.4.1.2 The Composite Personal
               Pronouns
   3.4.2 Demonstrative Pronouns
   3.4.3 Proper Name Markers
CHAPTER 4

THE PRAGMATICS OF FOCUS

4.1 Introduction ........................................ 115
4.2 The COMMENT-TOPIC Pragmatic Structure ........ 115
4.3 NP Fronting ........................................... 124
  4.3.1 Some Instances of Fronting ..................... 131
    4.3.1.1 Questions and Responses .................. 131
    4.3.1.2 Contrastive Identification ............... 133
    4.3.1.3 Rank Restriction .......................... 136
4.4 Aspects of Presupposed Items ....................... 138
  4.4.1 Textually Conditioned Presupposed
    Items .............................................. 139
    4.4.1.1 Textually Given ............................ 139
    4.4.1.2 Textually Non-given ...................... 139
  4.4.2 Non-textually Conditioned
    Presupposed Items ................................ 147
    4.4.2.1 Non-textually Presupposed
      Items .......................................... 148
    4.4.2.2 Non-textually Non-given
      Items .......................................... 153
4.5 Pragmatic Conditioning Factor
   in the Choice of Focus ............................... 157
TABLES

1. Focus and Definiteness ....................................... 48
2. Role Affixes ......................................................... 81
3. Non-focus Marking Particles .................................... 102
4. Isnag Principal Pronouns ...................................... 105
5. Composite Personal Pronouns .................................. 108
INTRODUCTION

Previous studies of focus in Philippine languages have dealt primarily with syntactic aspects of the focus phenomenon. Semantic studies, on the other hand, have been generally limited to treatments of the case roles of the NP referents. The pragmatics of focus has been given attention by few linguists and is limited to the features of presupposed items.

The present study investigates the focus phenomenon in a global grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic approach. Chapter 1 gives an overview of focus from these three perspectives. Chapter 2 discusses the effect of semantics on the syntax of focus. Here, I propose a ranking of the semantic (participant) roles which I call the Preferential Selection Hierarchy. This hierarchy constrains the positions the NP's can fill in the clause, and the co-occurrence of the NP's, i.e. which NP's occur together in a clause.

Chapter 3 deals with the morphological markers of focus. Unlike previous studies which discuss only one prenominal focus marking particle, this study observes two such markers with additional distinct functions, e.g. $va$ (equivalent of $ang$ in Tagalog), and $tu$ (equivalent of $'yong/iyong$ in Tagalog) particles. Moreover, some affixes, e.g. agent and goal focus affixes, observed to function simultaneously as inflectional and deriva-
tional affixes, are also discussed. These affixes, when attached to certain classes of verbs, not only designate the role of the NP marked for focus, but also change the meaning of the clause.

Chapter 4 deals the with pragmatic aspect of focus. Two points are given attention: (a) the COMMENT-TOPIC structure and its effect on the syntactic forms. Special attention is given to the influence of the COMMENT-TOPIC PRAGMATIC structure on NP fronting to preverbal position. (b) Presupposed items: these are categorized into: (1) textually given, (2) textually non-given, (3) non-textually given, and (4) non-textually non-given.

The Isnag language belongs to the Austronesian (Malayo-Polynesian language family. Both Dyen (1965:31) and Walton (1979) assign Isnag to the northern Cordilleran group in the northern Philippines. The language is spoken by approximately 27,000 people in the province of Kalinga-Apayao.

Although many of the Isnags are beginning to become literate, their basic knowledge about the world is still gained through oral literature and personal experience. For this reason, all the texts analyzed in this study are based on transcribed oral texts.

The corpus of data used in this study consists of nine conversational texts with participants ranging from three to six native Isnag speakers, both men and women, from different age groups. The length of the texts varies from one minute to thirty
one minutes. The majority of these texts have simple narratives, (i.e. isolatable texts for which only one speaker is in control) embedded in them.

All texts were spontaneous and non-elicited. My participation in the gathering of the text materials was limited to giving instructions on how the taping was to be done. Friends who volunteered to help did most of the work, e.g. taping, transcribing, and typing the materials. The recording was done with a voice-activated micro-cassette recorder that was inconspicuously carried around by an Isnag language assistant.

There are other texts which are non-conversational that were used in the analysis. These text materials are first and third person narratives which were elicited, taped, and transcribed.
CHAPTER 1

THE FOCUS SYSTEM: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATION

1.1 What is the Focus System?

The basic clause in Isneg consists of a verb with an affix followed by one or more noun phrases, one of which is marked as the 'focus item,' or what some other Philippine linguists call 'topic.' The NP is marked either by a special particle introducing the noun phrase or by a certain set of pronouns in place of the NP, in which case the marking particle is not necessary. The affix on the verb assigns the semantic role of the referent encoded by the marked NP. The focused NP, therefore, depends on the verbal affix for its semantic role. The semantic role of the focused (topic) NP may be: Agent, Goal, Location, Instrument, or Beneficiary. The relationship may be illustrated as:

```
affix + verb + NPs\text{focus} \pm (NP)\text{non-focus}
```

This relationship between the marked NP and the verb is referred
to in this study as the focus system.

The term 'focus' was first introduced by Dean (1958:59) to describe "the contrast between a noun or pronoun which is highlighted [focus NP] versus one which is not."

Let us look next at some clauses that illustrate the focus system. (The following abbreviations are used: AF= Agent is in focus; GF= Goal focus; LF=Location focus; IF=Instrument focus; BF=Beneficiary focus; A=non-focus Agent; G=non-focus Goal; FM=focus marking particle; comp=completive aspect. The focus item is underlined and in upper case in the free translation).

(1) Na=net ya tolay ka parakul.
AF-sharpen-comp. FM person G axe
'THE MAN/PERSON sharpened an axe.'

(2) S=ing-et na tolay ya parakul.
GF-sharpen-comp. A person FM axe
'A man/person sharpened THE AXE.'

(3) Pina=net=a:n na tolay ka parakul ya ba:wi.
LF-sharpen-comp. A person G axe FM shed
'A man/person sharpened an axe in THE SHED.'

(4) Pina=net na tolay ya ki:kilka parakul.
IF-sharpen-comp. A person FM file G axe
'A man/person sharpened an axe with THE FILE.'

(5) Pina=net na tolay ka parakul ya sangai:li.
BF-sharpen-comp. A person G axe FM guest.
'The man/person sharpened an axe for THE GUEST.'
All the clauses encode the same situational activity. However, different participant roles are focused in each clause. Put diagrammatically, the structure of the basic Isnag verbal clause is as follows:

```
Verbal Clause
   /\  
Marker + NP   Marker + NP*
 /\  
Role Affix + Verb (Agent) (non-Agent)
   /\  
\ya\; if focus
   /\  
\tu\; if focus
   /\  
na\; if non-focus
   /\  
\ki\; if non-focus
   /\  
\ka\; focus
```

(Where NP* = potentially multiple NPs of the non-focus type).

The role of the NP marked by \textit{ya} or \textit{tu} is indicated by the affix attached to the verb. The focus NP marking rule is:

\textit{ya} / when the referent is near the speaker and the hearer
\textit{tu} / when the referent is far from the speaker and the hearer.

(For details of \textit{ya} and \textit{tu} see 3.3)

Except for the non-focus agent, the role of the non-focus
NP is conventionally determined: NP's whose referents are usually acted upon are goal, NP's whose referents are places where activity can take place are locations, NP's with tool-like referents are Instruments, etc. The non-focus NP marking rule is:

ki / when the referent is near the speaker and the hearer
ka/when the referent is far from the speaker and the hearer.

Thus the Focus and Non-focus NP markers may be summarized as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proximal Referent</th>
<th>Distal Referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focused NP</td>
<td>ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Focus NP</td>
<td>ki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An NP can only occur once as either focused or non-focused in a given clause. And only one focused NP is allowed per clause.

1.2 Traditional Views of Focus

In previous studies of Philippine languages, the 'focus system' has received more attention than any other aspect of these languages and rightly so, for it pervades the grammar of
most of these languages.

Due to some correlation between the focus system and the European 'voice' properties, earlier studies categorized focus in terms of ACTIVE and PASSIVE. Bloomfield (1917:154) classified the different focus clauses as active, direct passive, local passive, and instrumental passive, depending on the relationship the verb has with the subject [focused item]: active when the subject has the role agent, direct passive when the subject has the logical role of affected object [goal], local passive when the subject's role refers to place or sphere, and instrumental passive when the subject indicates means or instrument.

Similar to this view is that of Mcaughan (1958), who reports a syntactic relation between the verb with its voice marker and the topic [focus item] in Maranao.

Thomas (1958:339ff) views focus as a device to "put in the limelight a noun in any of the major sentence spots," a constituent toward which "the whole sentence polarizes." Pike (1963:217) refers to the same phenomenon in terms of a "focus activity relation of the predicate; [in which] there is a relationship that exists between the predicate and the one marked substantive [focus item] component of a clause that serves as the focus complement."

Forster (1964:28) sees the focus system as the "orientation of attention toward one of the grammatical roles."
Bowen (1965:182), quite misleadingly, parallels the function of the Tagalog focus with the function of intonational emphasis in English of an item the speaker wants to bring to the listener's attention.

One view which is somewhat different from the previously mentioned ones is that of Naylor (1973). She sees focus as a relationship that exists between the verb and a certain noun in the clause which is ultimately a function of transitivity. She says:

"The linguistic expression of processes, and of the participants (and, by extension, the circumstances) associated with them, is known by the general term transitivity" (Halliday 1970:148). The functions of the participants intransitivity may be referred to as participant roles (p.7). Focus as the indicator of the participant role of the topic is a function in the system of transitivity (p.29).

There are other studies done on the focus system which are different from the previously mentioned ones. Schachter (1976) centered his study on the marked nominal especially related to the predicate. His concern was the grammatical status of the focused item. He argues that the item which is usually categorized as the subject does not, in fact, have all the characteristics of a subject. He then concludes that

there is no single syntactic category in Philippine languages that corresponds to the category identified as subject in other languages. Rather, there is a division of subject-like properties between the category we have been calling the topic and the category we have been calling actor, with a few subject-like properties reserved for the intersection of the topic and the actor, the actor topic
(513).

Rafael (1978) went beyond the syntactic level in her study of the topic [focus NP] in Tagalog. She proposed some answers to the questions: "Given a verb,...which noun gets to be chosen as topic? What triggers such choice?" She appealed to two levels of linguistic study: the level of speech act [pragmatic level], and the lexical level. She concluded that the "topic is a manifestation of some higher level phenomena and is also affected by the semantic range and even the idiosyncratic properties of certain lexical items" (p.47). That is, the topic functions at a level beyond the clause. And at the same time it is affected by some semantic properties of the lexical items involved, in particular, the verb.

Wendell and Hale (1979) took the same course as Rafael but concerned themselves with the "conditions a noun phrase must meet if it is to be eligible for selection as the focused noun phrase of the clause" (p.164).

Armour (1983) proposed some simple rules in predicting focus. His prediction rules were solely based on definiteness. The semantic features of the verb were not taken into consideration (cf. 3.2.2).
1.3 Purpose of the Present Study

As implied above, a number of claims related to the study of focus have been made in the literature. These claims include that (a) the ordering of the constituents in a clause irrespective of the focus is arbitrary, except for the verb which always occurs initially (Schachter 1976)\(^2\), (b) there is only one topic (focus) marker as has been referred to in the discussion of focus (Otanés and Schachter 1972, etc.), and (c) the 'speaker's subjective point of view' is the primary criterion in choosing which item to focus (Schachter 1977:283). These claims conflict with my intuition as a native speaker of a Philippine language. They also fail to accord with my analysis of Isnag. The present study primarily addresses these claims with the intention of contributing toward refining the theory of focus. In addition, other features of focus in Isnag will be discussed to get a complete picture of focus and to determine where the major features fit in the system.

In this first chapter, I look at the focus system on three levels of linguistic analysis: the grammatical, semantic and pragmatic. The aim is to present a global view of the focus system in Isnag before taking up the details in subsequent chapters.

In the second chapter, I discuss the NP ordering in each
clause type determined by the role assigned to the focused NP. I summarize the possible NP ordering for each type with axiomatic statements. I discuss the effects of the ranking of semantic roles on the relative ordering of the NP's in a clause. I discuss three significant focus related matters: (a) the permutational and co-occurrence restrictions imposed on the clause constituents, (b) the 'preferential selection hierarchy', and (c) the definiteness focus condition.

The 'preferential selection hierarchy' (PSH) is a concise summary of the clause constituents (more accurately, the roles of the NP's) in a hierarchical fashion. It determines which constituents can co-occur and what possible position they can take in the clause.

The third chapter deals in more detail with the focus system on the morphological level. Different morphological categories involved in the focus system are discussed. These include the affixes, the focus marking particles, the pronouns, and some special proper name markers. The analysis demonstrates that the focused NP in a clause is unambiguously marked. Chapter two also addresses the fact that in other Philippine languages, only one marking particle has been given attention: the ang particle in Tagalog, so in Maranao, ya in Botolan Sambal, go in Ivatan, etc. Isnaq, however, has two focus marking particles, each used to signal different meanings. In other Philippine languages in
which I am fluent, I also observe two marking particles. I suspect the presence of two marking particles may be more widespread than has previously been thought. In addition I discuss the inflectional and derivational function of agent and goal focus affixes.

Chapter 4 deals with the pragmatics of focus and its effect on syntax. In particular, I discuss the process of 'NP fronting' or 'NP preposing,' in which one NP precedes the verb. I posit some grammatical motivations for the process to augment the popularly advocated 'emphasis' explanation.

I also explore how information becomes definite. This part of chapter four provides some explanation why some items of information are definite in their first mention in the text. The different conditions an item must meet before it can become definite and, therefore, eligible for grammatical focusing are discussed in this chapter under two basic categories: textually definite and non-textually definite reference. The textually definite information refers to materials overtly mentioned when introduced as new information. The non-textually definite information involves definite referents that has not been overtly introduced in the text as new information. That is, the kind of information that becomes definite by association with other already definite information. The association may be due to its association with the same frame or a particular script (Schank
and Abelson 1977).

In addition to matters of definiteness mentioned above, I deal with a category in Isnag which I will refer to as *uniques*. These are constituents with unique reference: universal or local. Universal uniques are those known by all humans, such as the sun, the moon, the earth, etc. Local uniques include referents known by specific groups in specific locations (e.g. a certain mountain, creek, local landmark, etc.).

Furthermore, chapter 4 discusses the pragmatic conditioning factor in the choice of focus in terms of the relationship between the known and the unknown information.

1.4 Focus System from Three Perspectives

The traditional views just discussed above represent three perspectives of the focus system to which I will now turn my attention. The perspectives I refer to are: the grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic views.

1.4.1 The Grammatical View

The strictly grammatical view advocated by McKaughan (1958:4) for Maranao emphasizes that focus amounts to 'syntactic relations indicated by certain particles on the one hand and by
voice markers in the verb on the other.' It is a mere co-occurrence of linguistic forms, one co-occurring with the verb, the other with the noun phrase. Being only a surface view, the strictly grammatical view of focus unfortunately limits explanation since conditions on co-occurrences cannot be stated in purely grammatical terms.

In Isnag (as well as Pangasinan and Tagalog), for example, one cannot just attach the focus marking particle to any available nominal. Thus, in Isnag, the following clause occurs:

(6) Nag-putad ka ka:yu ya tolay.
AF-cut-comp. G wood FM person

'THE MAN/PERSON cut some wood.'

but not the clause:

(7) Nag-putad ya ka:yu ka tolay.
AF-cut-comp. FM wood G person

'THE WOOD cut a person.'

Clauses (6) and (7) both satisfy the syntactic definition of focus, but only (6) is acceptable; (7) is semantically anomalous (cf. section 2.2.3). Syntax is not a law unto itself, but is itself constrained at another level to which I turn next, semantics.
1.4.2 The Semantic View

In example 6 above, the affix Nag- is related to the NP marked by ya, that is, ya tolay 'the man.' From the grammatical point of view, the relationship is a mere co-occurrence of forms. However, viewed from the semantic level, the relationship becomes explainable.

Semantically, the affix (voice marker of McKaughan) assigns the semantic role of the referent encoded by the marked nominal, whether it is an Agent, Goal, Instrument, Location or Beneficiary. Thus, in (6), the nag- prefix (agent focus affix) assigns the semantic role Agent to the ya phrase 'the man.' Agents are usually animate entities. Hence, the clause is grammatically and semantically acceptable. However, in (7), the agent focus affix assigns the role agent to the ya phrase ya kayu 'the wood,' an inanimate entity that usually takes the Goal role. While the clause is grammatically well-formed, it is semantically anomalous and thus unacceptable. There is a collocational clash between the role assigned by the affix (voice marker) and the referent realized by the marked phrase. The referent, under normal circumstances, is not capable of fulfilling the role assigned to it. This semantic constraint has to be satisfied before any relationship between the affix and marked nominal is established. The referent encoded by the marked NP
has to have the potential of fulfilling the semantic role assigned to it by the verbal affix.

So far, I have considered only the affix and the marked nominal. However, the verb to which the affix is attached also plays a vital role in the focus system as a lexical item. The activity referred to by the verb dictates which semantic roles are relevant for successfully performing them. This role selection restricts the type and number of affixes the verb can accept. The verb putad 'to cut' in (6) and (7), for example, requires the Agent role, the Goal role, the Instrument role and also allows optionally a Location role and a Beneficiary role. Therefore, the verb accepts affixes appropriate to such roles. However, verbs like si:ka:d 'to stand' require only the Agent role, though they also optionally permit the Location role. The verb, then, allows only those affixes that signal these two roles.

1.4.3 The Pragmatic View

As mentioned in section 1.4.2 above, the referent encoded by the marked NP has to have the potential of fulfilling the semantic role assigned to it by the verbal affix. But in spite of the capability of fulfilling the semantic requirements, there remains yet another conditioning level that needs to be satisfied
before the candidate NP is properly marked for the focus relationship. I refer to the Pragmatic level. This level includes the whole communication situation: the speaker and the hearer and their relationship, the speaker's assessment of the hearer's knowledge of the world, and the speaker's feelings and intentions reflected in the discourse as he transmits information.

The restriction involved in marking a nominal for focus primarily involves the speaker and his hearer. In choosing which nominal to mark, the speaker takes into consideration his interlocutor's knowledge of the referent of that nominal. Generally, the hearer has to have previous knowledge of the referent (i.e. it must be old information) before the associated NP can be eligible for focus. The hearer's previous knowledge can be guaranteed by any of several ways to be discussed in 4.4.

In sum then, the focus system involves clause level phenomena in which the verb describing the action, the verb affix, and the specially marked nominal all enter into a complex relationship which functions on both the semantic and the pragmatic levels.
NOTES

1 Basic clause is used here in the same sense proposed by Keenan (1975). A clause (sentence) is basic if it can be understood independent of other clauses. Thus, 'John hit Bill' is more basic than 'Fred thinks that John hit Bill' "since we cannot understand the meaning of the latter without understanding that of the former" (p 307).

2 Schachter indicated, however, that there are some languages whose NP positions are fixed.

3 The term 'unique' was borrowed from de Beaugrande (1980).
CHAPTER 2

SEMANTIC CONSTRAINTS ON SYNTAX

2.1 The Focus System and the Clause

The verbal clause is the syntactic domain in Isnag in which the focus phenomenon is fully realized. Thus, the minimum constituents of a clause capable of demonstrating focus are the verb and a marked noun phrase (verbal clauses without overt NP's are possible, but these do not show the NP's needed to prove this point). Taking the clause as the starting point of discussion, I first briefly summarize the core syntactic facts of Isnag relevant to the focus question. I then show how a set of explanations for these facts cannot rely on syntax alone operating autonomously but requires at every level the inclusion of semantic motivations.

2.2 Verbal Clause Syntax

In chapter 1, the structure of the Isnag verbal clause was represented by the following diagram. That is, the basic verbal clause in Isnag consists of a verb inflected for focus followed by noun phrase(s) marked for focus. Often, clauses that have
more than one NP are found. In such clauses, the roles of the non-focus NP's (NP*) are signaled by their prenominal particles.

![Diagram of Verbal Activity Clause]

(Where NP* = one or more NP's)

First, I observe that in verbal clause syntax the most common syntactic clause ordering is reflected in the diagram above.

\[ V + \text{NP}_{\text{focus}} + (\text{NP}^*)_{\text{non-focus}} \]

However, NP's may, at times, precede the verb, thus manifesting a marked\(^1\) ordering of clausal constituents (see 2.2.3.7) as follows:

\[ \text{NP}_{\text{focus}} + V + (\text{NP}^*)_{\text{non-focus}} \]
The marked ordering of the constituents in such NP initial clauses will be discussed in 4.2, when it will be seen to have a primarily pragmatic motivation. For the present, however, I will restrict my discussion to purely semantic influences on syntax and, therefore, postpone discussion of such structures.

While in a strictly syntactic sense, the two constituent sequences described above, V NP NP and NP V NP exhaust the Ismag clause orderings, still they fail to answer some questions about syntactic structuring. These questions are (a) the co-occurrence question; given a verb V how many of the NP's it allows can co-occur together in the clause with it?, (b) the ordering question; how is the relative ordering of NP's determined?, (c) the question of focus agreement; what determines which specific verb affix co-occurs with which focus markers on a given noun and which non-focus markers on other nouns in the string?, and (d) the question of definiteness precedence; in case two definite NP's co-occur in the same clause, what dictates the assignment of focus? The following sections discuss each of these questions in detail.

2.2.1 The Co-occurrence Question

Even though a verb's lexical properties may allow maximally two or more NP's to occur with it, not all the possible
NP's do in fact occur together. Take for example the Isnag verb siglalt 'to split.' It allows a total of four NP's: ya tolay 'the man' (ya NP), ka bu:lu 'a bamboo' (ka NP), ka aliwa 'a knife' (ka NP), and ki ammuwa:q (ki NP). Yet, they may not all occur together in a single clause. Indeed, the situation is more complex than simply the maximum number of occurring NP's in a single clause. For, which of the NP's may occur is also a function of the affix on the verb. This kind of behavior is reflective of the fact that a verb and its affix subcategorize its nominal environment, Chomsky (1965). In other words, in Isnag the verb and its affix are the head of its phrase. The unacceptable clause below is illustrative of this property.

(1) *Nag=siglalt ya lala:ki ka bu:lu ka aliwa.
    split-comp. FM man bamboo knife

    'The man split some bamboo with a knife.'

It will be noticed that the equivalent clause in English is acceptable. In Isnag, however, the NP ka bu:lu 'a bamboo' and ka aliwa 'a knife' do not co-occur when the verb affix is nag-. That is, Isnag verbs are unlike English verbs, which typically allow the free addition of locational and temporal complements to a wide variety of verbs. This difference is a manifestation of the basic difference between focus languages like Isnag and non-focus languages like English.
2.2.2 The Ordering Question

Using the same constituents enumerated in (2.2.1), let us now look at possible ordering of NP's. With the affix nag-, the \textit{ya lalaki} 'the man' NP can co-occur with the NP \textit{ka bu:lu} 'a bamboo' and the NP \textit{ki amuwa:g} 'in the yard'. The orders verb-agent-goal-location and verb-goal-location-agent are well-formed.

(2) Nag=siqla:t ya lalaki ka bu:lu ki amuwa:g.
    split-comp. FM man bamboo yard

(3) Nag=siqla:t ka bu:lu ki amuwa:g ya lalaki.
    split-comp. bamboo yard FM man

(4) *Nag=siqla:t ya lalaki ki amuwa:g ka bu:lu.
    split-comp. FM man yard bamboo

(5) *Nag=siqla:t ki amuwa:g ka bu:lu ya lalaki.
    split-comp. yard bamboo FM man

'The man split some bamboos in the yard.'

The non-occurrence of clauses (4) verb-agent-location-goal and (5) verb-location-goal-agent cannot be accounted for by the purely syntactic facts (V NP NP) mentioned in section 2.2. At best, a purely syntactic account of the NP ordering would require an exhaustive listing of all possible forms allowed by the verb and an affix. Such an approach will inevitably miss some important generalizations.
2.2.3 The Focus Agreement Question

It was observed that in all Isnag verbal clauses there is an agreement between the affix in the verb and the marked NP. That is, the marked NP's referent must have the potential of fulfilling the semantic/participant role designated by the affix. First of all, lack of agreement between verbal affix and an NP will yield an ungrammatical sentence. In 6a, there is no NP that agrees with with the nag- prefix and therefore, 6a is not well-formed. Similarly, 6b is not well-formed as both NP's have focus markers, which is also not allowed. 6c and 6d are well-formed syntactically as they each possess one NP with the particle ya.

    AF-cut-comp. FM man G wood

b. *Nag=putad ya lalaki:ki ya ka:yu
    AF-cut-comp. FM man FM wood

    AF-cut-comp. FM man G wood

'The man cut up some wood.'

d. !Nag=putad ka lalaki:ki ya ka:yu.
    AF-cut-comp. G man FM wood

'The wood cut up some men.'

From a purely syntactic point of view, 6c and 6d are both well-formed. However, we know that only 6c is acceptable or
semantically interpretable and 6d is semantically anomalous because we cannot, under normal conditions conceive of circumstances in which wood cuts up people. The anomaly lies not in its syntactic ordering, rather, in the fact that the *ya ka:yu does not have the potential to satisfy the role required of it by the verbal affix nag-.

2.2.4 The Definiteness Precedence Question

When two definite NP's occur in a clause, there is a restriction on which affix can be attached to the verb. Let us examine clauses (8)-(10).

(8) $S=\text{in}=\text{u:lung } \text{ne Dyesi tu lala:ki.}$
    $\text{GF-hit-comp. PNA Dyesi FM man}$
    'Dyesi hit THE MAN.'

(9) $\text{*NaN}=\text{u:lung } \text{nge Dyesi tu lala:ki.}$
    $\text{AF-hit-comp. PNF Dyesi G def. man}$
    'DYESI hit the man.'

(10) $\text{!NaN}=\text{u:lung } \text{nge Dyesi kitu lala:ki.}$
    $\text{AF-hit-comp. PNF Dyesi G def. man}$
    'DYESI hit (a portion of) the man.'

Of the clauses above, only clause (8) is acceptable, where the Goal NP is focused. The Agent focus clauses (9) and (10) are anomalous. Clause (9) has two definite NP's *nge Dyesi and tu.
The NP tu lala:ki is made definite by using tu which is the focus marking particle. The result is a clause with two focused NP's, a case already seen to be deviant. The deviance of (9) may be due to a syntactic constraint against having more than one focus NP per clause. Clause (10), however, shows that syntactic principles alone are not sufficient to predict that two definite NP's may not occur together. Clause (10) is grammatically well-formed but is non-sensical. When grammatical means (cf. the definite determiner kitu), other than the focus particle tu, forces an NP to become definite, then that may cause NP to change its meaning to partitive. Therefore, clause (10) demonstrates most persuasively that a change in the form (tu \(\rightarrow\) kitu) results in a change in meaning of the clause. In the following sections, I will discuss the semantic considerations from which the questions in 2.2ff will be answered.

2.3 Semantic Roles

Several linguists have observed the relationship between syntax and semantics (more specifically, semantic roles of the NP's). Fillmore (1968) succinctly expressed the relationship in terms of a rule that also reflects the ranking of the case roles in terms of subject choice for English. His rule states:
If there is an A, it becomes the subject; otherwise, if there is an I, it becomes the subject; otherwise, the subject is O.

(A=Agentive case; I=Instrumental case; O=Objective case)

Similarly, Givon (1984) ranks the various semantic case roles "according to the likelihood of their becoming subject in a simple clause" (139). The hierarchical ranking he proposes is as follows:

AGT > DAT/BEN > PAT > LOC > INSTR/ASSOC > MANN

The hierarchy is interpreted as follows:

(a) If the simple clause has an Agent argument, it will be the subject.
(b) If the simple clause has no agent but has a Dative/Benefactive argument, it will be the subject.
(c) If the simple clause has no agent, nor dative/benefactive but has a Patient argument, it will be the subject.

In the following, I will pursue the same strategy as Fillmore and Givon, but from a slightly different point of view. I will rank the various semantic roles observed to be relevant in Isnag in terms of their preferential selection by the verb. It will thus be called the PREFERENTIAL SELECTION HIERARCHY (PSH). The roles that will be ranked are:

(a) Agent (A): the participant that brings about the action.
(b) Goal (G): the participant that undergoes the effect
of the action.

(c) Location (L): the spatial location in which an event takes place.

(d) Instrument (I): the means used by the agent to accomplish the action.

(e) Beneficiary (B): the one for whose benefit the activity is done.

2.4 The Preferential Selection Hierarchy

The preferential selection hierarchy I propose will be seen to constrain the co-occurrence of the post-verbal NP's, their relative ordering in a clause, and the definiteness precedence (when a clause has two definite NP's, which one is focused ?) of the NP's. It will be used to account for the questions raised above. I will summarize the syntactic constraints imposed by the PSH in the form of rules which collaborate to define or determine a grammatical clause. I categorize the rules into (a) permutation restriction (PR) rules, and (b) co-occurrence restriction (CR) rules, and (c) the definiteness focus condition rule. The proposed hierarchy is as follows:

\[ I \rightarrow (G \rightarrow L \rightarrow B) \]

The hierarchy is grouped into the control group with the Agent as
sole member, and the non-control group with the roles inside the parentheses as members. The Agent takes precedence over the control group. In the non-control group, the Goal takes precedence over Location which, in turn, takes precedence over the Instrument or the Beneficiary.

2.4.1 Determining the FS Hierarchy

The criteria I used to determine the hierarchical ordering of the situational roles were (a) favored complement, (b) indispensability, and (c) positional flexibility. Some criteria can easily set apart one role from the others; e.g., the favored complement criterion is more diagnostic between Agent and Goal than between Location and Instrument, and the indispensability criterion is more diagnostic between the Goal and Location than between the Agent and the Goal.

2.4.1.1 Favored Complement

The favored complement criterion determines which roles is the most ubiquitous, i.e., the role may complement almost any verb whether in focus or not. This does not mean, of course, that it is always chosen as focus whenever it occurs with the verb. In one of the texts analyzed, of the 349 verbal
occurrences, 64.47 percent were inflected for goal focus and 33.52 percent were inflected for agent focus. In all the cases where the goal NP was focused, it was observed that the agent NP also occurs. However, in the instances where the agent NP was focused, there were several clauses where the goal NP did not occur. The favored complement criterion isolates the Agent role as the most pervasive of the roles, i.e., if a verb requires a semantic role at all, the agent is chosen before any other roles. The favored complement criterion puts the Agent at the highest rank in the hierarchy.

I have been assuming that semantic roles, such as the agent, goal, instrument, location, and beneficiary, correspond to the following semantic "notions": ultimate prime mover of an action, the thing affected by the action, the means or route of the primemover's action on something, the place of the action, and the entity for whose benefit the action is done, respectively. This correspondence is an oversimplification of what one really finds in the language data. Although the "roles" and the "notions" in two-or-more-argument verbs correspond rather well, in one-argument verbs, this correspondence breaks down rather severely. Thus in

(11) Nag-lugmag ya tolay.
    AF-fat-comp. FM ` person
"The person got fat."

the verb carries the agent focus affix nag-, even though the person is the thing affected and not the causer of the fattening. And, thus, when I speak of the agent being the favored complement, it is in this role sense and not the notional sense. Therefore, I wish to conclude that the Isnag focus system does not encode the semantic notions directly in its focus role affixes but something derived and somewhat altered from these, at least for intransitive clauses.

2.4.1.2 Indispensability

In Isnag the Goal NP is the most frequently focused NP, not the agent. However, the presence of a goal always presupposes the presence of an agent. Indispensability closely resembles the idea of favored complement. While favored roles occur with high frequency, the indispensable NP obligatorily occurs. On this criterion, the agent "role" ranks higher than the goal, instrument, location, or beneficiary. In clauses referring to weather phenomena, the terms appear in agent focus form as exemplified by the clauses below:

(12) Mag=udan.
    AF-rain
'It's raining.'

(13) S=um=i:nag.
    AF-sunlight

'It's sunshine'

(14) Mag=ba:li.
    AF-wind

'It's windy/It's blowing.'

Similarly, in describing states, as in clauses (15)–(18) below, the only appropriate affix is the agent focus affix.

(15) Nag=siyam  na.
    AF-cold   it

'It is cold.'

(16) Nag=pasungat na.
    AF-hot    it

'It is hot (climate).' 

(17) Mag=anggam  me Meri.
    AF-happy  PNA Meri

'Meri is happy.'

(18) Mag=ansing nge Juan.
    AF-afraid  PNA Juan

'Juan is afraid.'

Moreover, in Isnag, unlike English, a clause may not possess instrument, location, or goal without an agent, as in
The key opened the door.

The hammer broke the window.

In Isnag one finds instead that the agent is always required.

(19) L=in=uqt=an ne Inggu ya gitap ki tulbaq.
    GF-open-comp. PNA FM door I key
    'Inggu opened THE DOOR with a key.'

(20) *L=in=uqt=an ya gitap ki tulbaq.
    GF-open-comp. FM door I key
    'The key opened THE DOOR.'

(21) *Pinang=luka:t ya tulbaq kitu gitap.
    IF-open-comp. FM key G def. door
    'THE KEY opened the door.'

Of all these roles, the Agent is the most ubiquitous, or rather the default role. That is, if any term, e.g., words expressing states, process, action-process, and action, requires an affix, the agent role affix is chosen. This feature of the affix makes it reasonable to conceive of it as a **causal affix** (different from **causative affix**) on a much deeper level of analysis.

2.4.1.3 Positional Flexibility

Turning from the role properties of the various NP's to
their syntactic encoding, I note that the agent NP may appear at any post-verbal position when focused. This is not true of the other NP's. When any non-agent NP is focused, it may appear at any position post-verbally except the position immediately following the verb. This position is always filled by the non-focus agent.

When the NP's occur as non-focus, their position in the clause is fixed. When agent and goal occur together as non-focus (e.g., when Location or Instrument NP is focused), the agent always precedes the goal. When goal NP and location NP co-occur as non-focus NP's (e.g., when Instrument is focused), the goal always precedes location. When the location and instrument NP's co-occur as non-focus (e.g., when Goal NP is focused), location precedes the instrument. Beneficiary does not occur as non-focus NP. For this reason, one might make the Beneficiary the lowest rank role. However, as will be noticed in the following chapter, the affixes designating Instrument and Beneficiary roles are virtually identical. I will here put them in the same rank in the hierarchy as follows:

\[
A > G > L > I, B
\]

A further distinction in these ranked roles is between the group that exercises some control in the activity (i.e., the conscious
initiator of the action has more control than the mindless tool or the entity affected by the action) (Comrie 1980:53) and the group that does not. As it turns out, only the Agent has control of the action and therefore is bracketed out.

\[ A > ( G \succ L \succ I, B ) . \]

This hierarchical arrangement differs from the previous one in that there are two high ranking roles: the Agent and the Goal, the latter being the high rank role in the non-control group. Therefore, I shall refer to the Agent role as the highest ranking role, and I shall refer to both the Agent and the Goal as high rank roles.

2.4.2 The Restriction Rules

In the following sections, I will propose rules that constrain the relative ordering of the NP's in a clause. I call them the permutation restriction (PR) rules, co-occurrence restriction (CR) rules, and definiteness condition rule. I want to emphasize that these restriction rules work in conjunction with case frames and the role hierarchy above.
2.4.2.1 The Permutation Restriction Rules

In this section, I posit two restriction rules that constrain the permutational mobility of the NP's in a clause. In doing so, I further posit that the hierarchical ranking of the roles corresponds to the unmarked (normal) ordering of the NP's in relation to the verb, i.e., the agent NP occurs immediately following the verb, followed by the goal NP, then the location NP followed by the instrument NP, and then the beneficiary NP. Thus the normal ordering of NP's in a clause is as follows:

\[V \text{ NP/A NP/G NP/L} \begin{cases} \text{NP/I} \\ \text{NP/B} \end{cases}\]

This NP ordering is statistically validated by actual texts. In the appended text, of the 349 verbal clauses, 339 are of the form \(V + \text{NP}^*\) (*=one or more NP's), and only 10 are of the \(\text{NP} + V + \text{NP}^*\) type. This same ordering is in effect when the lowest rank instrument NP is focused, and all the higher ranking NP's occur with it. The following clause is an example.

(22) Pinag-sigla:tt na Anaway ka bu:lu ki
IF-split-comp. PNA Anaway G bamboo L

ambaw ya aliwa.
riverbank FM knife
'Anaway split some bamboo on the riverbank with THE KNIFE.'

Although the focus item *ya aliwa* 'the knife' may permute to the positions of the goal and location, the relative positions of the non-focus NP's are not interchangeable. Thus, the following clauses (23)-(25) are ungrammatical.

(23) *Pinag=sigla:t ne Anaway ki ambaw IF-split-comp. PNA Anaway L riverbank

ka bu:lu *ya aliwa.
G bamboo FM knife.

'Anaway cut some bamboo on the riverbank with THE KNIFE.'

(24) *Pinag=sigla:t ka bu:lu ne Anaway IF-split-comp. G bamboo PNA Anaway

ki ambaw *ya aliwa.
L riverbank FM knife

'Anaway cut some bamboo on the riverbank with THE KNIFE.'


ne Anaway *ya aliwa.
PNA Anaway FM knife

'Anaway split some bamboo on the riverbank with THE KNIFE.'

In clause (19) *ki ambaw 'in the yard' precedes *ka bu:lu
'some bamboo.' Clause (20) has the phrase *ka bu:lu preceding ne
Anaway 'Anaway,' and clause (21) has \textit{ki ambaw} and \textit{ka bulu} preceding \textit{ne Anaway}. All these orderings are disallowed in the language.

There are no purely syntactic constraints by which the ungrammaticality of clauses (23)-(25) may be accounted for. The clauses exhibit the normal syntactic ordering \( V \ NP \ NP \) (cf. 2.1). At best, one can only list the possible positions each NP can take, such as the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
V + & \text{ na } NP + \text{ ka } NP + \text{ ki } NP + \text{ ya } NP \\
V + & \text{ na } NP + \text{ ka } NP + \text{ ya } NP + \text{ ki } NP \\
V + & \text{ na } NP + \text{ ya } NP + \text{ ka } NP + \text{ ki } NP \\
\ldots & \\
\ldots & \\
\end{align*}
\]

or the unacceptable positions illustrated by the following:

\[
\begin{align*}
*V + & \text{ naNP + kiNP + kaNP + yaNP} \\
*V + & \text{ kaNP + naNP + kiNP + yaNP} \\
*V + & \text{ kiNP + kaNP + naNP + yaNP} \\
\ldots & \\
\ldots & \\
\end{align*}
\]

However, if we look at the relationship between the semantic roles realized by the NP's (i.e. their relative ranking in the PS hierarchy), the ungrammaticality of the clauses can be more adequately accounted for. I do this here by proposing rules
formulated from the PSH to which I now direct my discussion.

Rule 1. The G NP marked for focus may appear to the left of any other NP except the highest ranked NP, i.e., the agent NP.

Let us illustrate the effect of the rule systematically. Pick, first of all, the focus NP to be agent, and then the focus NP may occur anywhere (disregarding preverbal NP's). Clearly, the agent NP, if focused, cannot appear to the left of itself.

We next pick the goal NP as focus. This NP, by rule 1, may appear in the following positions:

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \ NP/A \ NP/G \ NP/L \ NP/I \\
V & \ NP/A \ NP/L \ NP/G \ NP/I \\
V & \ NP/A \ NP/L \ NP/I \ NP/G \\
\end{align*}
\]

but not in the following position:

\[
*V \ NP/G \ NP/A \ NP/L \ NP/I
\]

because the focused goal NP appears to the left of the non-focused agent NP.

We next pick the location NP as the focus NP. By rule 1, the NP may appear in the following positions:
V NP/A NP/G NP/L
V NP/A NP/L NP/G

but not in the position illustrated below:

*V NP/L NP/A NP/G

because the focused location NP appears to the left of the non-focused agent NP, a position disallowed by the rule.

When the focused NP is instrument NP, rule 1 predicts the following orders:

V NP/A NP/G NP/L NP/I
V NP/A NP/G NP/I NP/L
V NP/A NP/I NP/G NP/L

but not the form:

*V NP/I NP/A NP/G NP/L

When beneficiary NP is focused, the clause forms are identical to those when the instrument NP is focused.

Rule 2. Among non-focus NP's, a lower ranking NP may not precede a high ranking NP.
Rule 2 accounts for the ungrammaticality of the clauses of the following forms:

(a) *V NP/A NP/I NP/L NP/G
(b) *V NP/A NP/L NP/B NP/G
(c) *V NP/A NP/B NP/L NP/G

(The underlined NP's are marked for focus)

All the above satisfy rule 1 but they all violate rule 2, hence, they are ungrammatical. All the clause forms have the non-focus location preceding the non-focus high ranking goal.

The two permutation restriction rules define the grammatical positions of the NP's realizing the roles relevant in a situation specified by the verb. Basically, they say that lower ranking NP's are more limited in positions they can take than the higher ranking NP's. Moreover, focusing an NP increases the number of positions in which it may appear. These rules, again, are not purely syntactic but reflect the PSH, which is as much semantic as syntactic.

2.4.2.2 The Co-occurrence Restriction Rules

The PR rules above express only order itself and do not
govern which NP's occur together in any sentence. Again, any attempt to account for the co-occurring NP's by purely syntactic means will amount to a mere listing of NP co-occurrences observed in the language. In this section, I will propose rules that will determine which NP's occur together. The co-occurrence restriction rules are posited as statements of restriction on which NP's occur together. I will posit three co-occurrence rules.

Rule 3. A focused NP always allows higher ranking NP's in the hierarchy to be present in the same clause.

This rule resembles in some ways the transitivity property of a logical system: if $A > B$ and $B > C$, then $A > C$. An NP lower in the hierarchy allows the presence of higher ones. The rule allows a maximum of four NP's in a clause, e.g., when either instrument or beneficiary NP is focused. Rule 3 predicts the following clause forms:

$$V \text{ NP/A} \text{ NP/G} \text{ NP/L} \text{ NP/I}$$
$$V \text{ NP/A} \text{ NP/G} \text{ NP/L} \text{ NP/B}$$

If we focus the agent role, according to rule 3, we can have a clause with only one NP.
Rule 4. If a high ranking NP, agent or goal, is in focus, then any lower ranking NP may co-occur with it, and if a low ranking NP is in focus, then no other NP lower than it may occur.

Rule 4 disallows the occurrence of either instrument NP or beneficiary NP when location NP is focused. Thus the following clause forms are ungrammatical:

*V NP/A NP/G NP/L NP/I
*V NP/A NP/G NP/L NP/B

Rule 5. When a high rank NP is in focus, then only the next two lower NP's may co-occur with it.

Rule 5 allows the following clause forms:

(a) V NP/A NP/G NP/L
(b) V NP/A NP/G NP/L NP/I

In (a) where the agent NP is focus only the next two lower ranks, the goal and location, may occur with it. In (b) where the goal NP is focused, the location and instrument NP's are the next two lower-ranking roles and hence can occur with the focused NP.

However, rule 5 disallows the following form:

*V NP/A NP/G NP/L NP/I
There are three co-occurring lower ranking NP's with the focused agent NP. By rule 5, the instrument NP may not occur with the focused agent NP.

Rule 3, 4, and 5 pertain to which NP's are compatible. Basically, high rank NP's have a greater degree of compatibility with other NP's than lower ranking ones. Focusing circumvents some of the restrictions of the hierarchy, for example, by promoting the compatibility of some NP's.

2.4.2.3 The Definiteness Focus Condition

Rules 1-5 constrain the positions NP's take and which NP's co-occur. Among the co-occurring NP's an additional restriction is imposed by the ranking of roles with regard to definiteness. The specific restriction in question may be expressed by the following rule:

Rule 6: If two NP's are definite, the lower ranked of the two may be focused but not the higher ranked one.

In my illustration of the rule, I will consider only the agent and the goal. The lower rank NP's are governed by rule 3 and rule 4 so that rule 6 need not be applied. If the Goal NP is focused, the Agent NP can remain definite without affecting the
meaning of the clause. However, focusing the Agent NP destroys 
the definiteness of the Goal, the role lower in rank of the two. 
Let us consider the two NP's in clause (26a) below.

(26) a. Kinnaːn ne Dyesi tu bəːɡat.
GF-eat-comp. PNA Dyesi FM banana
'Dyesi ate THE BANANA.'

b. *Nangan ne Dyesi tu bəːɡat.
AF-eat-comp. PNF Dyesi FM banana
'DYESI ate the banana.'

c. Nangan ne Dyesi ka bəːɡat.
AF-eat-comp. PNF Dyesi G banana
'Dyesi ate a banana.'

The agent Dyesi, a proper name, is inherently definite. The goal
NP tu bəːɡat 'the banana' is grammatically marked definite. If
the definiteness of both NP's is to be preserved, the clause has
to focus the goal NP. Thus, clause (26a) preserves the definite-
ness of the agent and the goal. However, focusing the agent NP
and maintaining the definiteness of the goal NP will result in a
clause with two NP's in focus (26b), a structure disallowed in
Isnag. The Agent NP focus clause is grammatical if the Goal NP
is indefinite, as in (26c). However, one might argue that we can
focus the agent NP and also preserve the definiteness of the Goal
NP by using the non-focus definite marking particle kitu (see
3.3.3.). The clause will indeed be grammatical, but there will
be a corresponding change in meaning, as in (43).

(27) Nangan ne Dyesi kitu ba:kat.
AF-eat-comp. PNF Dyesi G def. banana

'DYESI ate (a portion of) the banana.'

The affected goal in clause (27) is part of the whole, compared to the affected goal of clause (26a), which is a singular whole. In this sense the two clauses do not communicate the same event. Moreover, in sentence (27), special determiners have been brought to bear to alter the definiteness relationship imposed by the focus system.

The effect of the definiteness focus condition is more obvious when both agent and goal are realized by pronouns and/or proper names. Let us consider the following clauses (28)-(29).

GF-eat-comp. 3rd pers./A-3rd pers. G

'He/She ate IT.'

b. *Nangan na.
AF-eat-comp. 3rd pers./A-3rd pers. G

'HE/SHE ate it.'

(29) a. Sinu:lung ne Idot te Dyesi.
GF-hit-comp PNA Idot PNF Dyesi

'Idot hit DYESI.'
   AF-hit-pst PNF Idot G Dyesi

'IDOT hit Dyesi.'

The (a) clauses focus the Goal and also preserve the definiteness of the Agent. It will be also noticed that all the clauses that focused the Agent NP are ungrammatical. Proper names and pronouns are, by their very nature, definite, and this inherent definiteness of NP's can interact with the focusing properties of the language as shown in Table 1 below.

<p>| TABLE 1 |
| FOCUS AND DEFINITENESS |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G O A L N P</th>
<th>Def.</th>
<th>Indef.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A G E N T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>!!AF</td>
<td>*GF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indef.</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*AP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* ungrammatical

!! there is a corresponding change in meaning of the clause.

The Definiteness Focus Condition indicates the interaction of pragmatics (through definiteness) and semantics (through the ranking of roles) to determine the acceptability (hence grammaticality) of a clause in Isnag.

It appears that focus interacts with the hierarchy in two different ways: (a) it augments the freedom of NP's to move and to co-occur but (b) restricts their capacity to be grammatically definite or indefinite. All the rules involve the hierarchy and the notion of focus.

2.5 Clause Types

Clause types in Isnag can be described in terms of the focused NP, in which case there are as many types as there are participant roles. The difference between each type lies in the number of co-occurring NP's and the position(s) the NP's can take, which is directly governed by the PSH as expressed in rules 1-5. I consider the two factors sufficient to posit a distinct clause type. The following discussion looks at the different clause types and how the rules above govern each type.
2.5.1 The Focused NP as Agent

When the focused NP is Agent (A), the constraining rules that collaborate to determine a grammatical clause are PR rules 1 and 2 and CR rules 4 and 5. PR rule 1 allows the Agent NP to take any position in the clause. CR rule 4 and 5 limit the co-occurring non-focus NP's to Goal and Location. PR rule 2 does not allow the Location NP to precede Goal NP. In rule form, the clause structure may, in this case, be described as follows:

If \( NP_A \) is focused, then:

1. \( V < NP_i \)

2. \( NP_i \not\in \{ NP_I \} \)

3. \( \{ NP_A \} < NP_L \)

where: \( NP_i \) = any NP

\( V \) = verb

\(<\) = precedes

\( \not\in \) = does not include

\( G \) = Goal

\( L \) = Location
I = Instrument
B = Beneficiary

Thus, the following acceptable orderings of NP's are generated.
The focused NP is underlined.

V NP/A NP/G NP/L
V NP/G NP/A NP/L
V NP/G NP/L NP/A

The following NP orderings are unacceptable because the non-focus Location NP precedes the non-focus Goal NP. PR rule 2 allows the transitive Goal to take precedence over spatial Location unless pragmatic forces of focus overrule (see Location focus discussion later).

*V NP/L NP/A NP/G
*V NP/L NP/G NP/A

The acceptable ordering is exemplified by the following clauses (in which PNF = marker when focus NP is Proper Name, PNA = marker when non-focus agent is Proper Name).

(30) Nang=alaq nge Anaway ka kape ka Buttet.
    AF-get-comp. PNF Anaway G coffee L Buttet
'ANA WAY got some coffee from Buttet.'

(31) Nang=alaq ka kape nge Anaway ka Buttet.
AF-get-comp. G coffee PNF Anaway L Buttet

'ANA WAY got some coffee from Buttet.'

(32) Nang=alaq ka kape ka Buttet nge Anaway.
AF-get-comp. G coffee L Buttet PNF Anaway

'ANA WAY got some coffee from Buttet.'

Thus, clauses with the following NP ordering are then unacceptable. The Location NP precedes the agent NP, a violation of PR rule 2.

(33) *Nang=alaq ka Buttet nge Anaway ka kape.
AF-get-comp. L Buttet PNA Anaway G coffee

'ANA WAY got some coffee from Buttet.'

(34) *Nang=alaq ka Buttet ka kape nge Anaway.
AF-get-comp. L Buttet G coffee PNF Anaway

'ANA WAY got some coffee from Buttet.'

2.5.2 The Focused NP as Goal

In verbal clauses where the role of the focused NP is Goal, the ordering of the co-occurring NP's is constrained by PR rules 1 and 2, and CR rules 3, 4, and 5. PR rule 1 disallows the Goal NP occurring immediately following the verb. However, it allows the focused Goal NP to permute with the other non-focus non-agent
NP's. CR rule 3 necessarily allows the occurrence of the non-focus Agent NP. CR rule 4 and 5 allow the co-occurrence of the non-focus Location NP and the non-focus Instrument NP. PR 2 disallows the occurrence of Instrument NP before the Location NP. In the form of rules, the following summarize the positional and co-occurrence restrictions of the NP's.

If \( N_P^G \) is in focus, then:

1. \( V \prec N_P^A \prec N_P^i \)
2. \( N_P^i \not\succ N_P^B \)

Thus, the only possible sequences of the constituents when the focus NP is goal (GF) are:

\[
V \quad N_P^A \quad N_P^G \quad N_P^L \quad N_P^I
\]

\[
V \quad N_P^A \quad N_P^L \quad N_P^G \quad N_P^I
\]

and \( V \quad N_P^A \quad N_P^L \quad N_P^I \quad N_P^G \)

exemplified by the clauses:

(35) S=\[\text{in-igla:t} \quad \text{na tolay ya bu:lu ki amuwa:g.} \]

GF-split-comp. A \( \text{man} \) \( \text{FM} \) \( \text{bamboo} \) \( \text{L} \) \( \text{yard} \)

\( \text{ka aliwa.} \)

I \( \text{knife} \)

'The man split THE BAMBOO in the yard with a knife.'
(36) S=in-iqla:t na tolay ki amuwa:g ya bu:lu.
    GF-split-comp. A man L yard FM bamboo
    ka aliwa.
    I knife

'The man split THE BAMBOO in the yard with a knife.'

(37) S=in-iqla:t na tolay ki amuwa:g ka aliwa
    GF-split-comp. A man L I knife
    ya bu:lu.
    FM bamboo

'The man split THE BAMBOO in the yard with a knife.'

The following NP orderings are, by the rules above, ungrammatical, because NP/GF precedes NP/A:

* V NP/G NP/A NP/L
* V NP/L NP/G NP/A

generating the following unacceptable Isnag clauses:

(38) *S=in-iqla:t ya bu:lu na tolay ki amuwa:g.
    GF-split-comp. FM bamboo A man L yard
    'The man split THE BAMBOO in the yard.'

(39) *S=in-iqla:t ki amuwa:g ya bu:lu na tolay.
    GF-split-comp. L yard FM bamboo A man
    'The man split THE BAMBOO in the yard.'
2.5.3 The Focused NP as Instrument

The constraining rules that determine the number and ordering of the clause constituents when the Instrument NP is focused are PR rule 1 and CR rule 3. The constraints they impose on the NP's may be summarized by the following statements:

If $NP_I$ is in focus, then:

1. $V < NP_A < NP_I$

2. $NP_i \notin NP_B$

Thus, acceptable orderings of clause constituents when the focused NP is Instrument are any of the following:

- $V \ NP/A \ NP/G \ NP/I$
- $V \ NP/A \ NP/I \ NP/G$
- $V \ NP/A \ NP/G \ NP/I \ NP/L$
- $V \ NP/A \ NP/G \ NP/L \ NP/I$

as exemplified in the Isnag clauses:

(40) Pa=mutad ne Ramon ka unat $ya$ aliwa.
    IF-cut-incomp. PNA Ramon G sugar-cane FM knife
'Ramon will cut the sugar-cane with THE KNIFE.'

(41) Pa=mutad ne Ramon ya aliwa ka una:t.
     IF-cut-incomp. PNA Ramon FM knife G sugar-cane

'Ramon will cut the sugar-cane with THE KNIFE.'

(42) Pa=mutad ne Ramon ka una:t ya aliwa
     IF-cut-incomp. PNA Ramon G sugar cane FM knife
     ki amuwa:ɡ.
     L yard

'Ramon will cut the sugar cane with THE KNIFE in the yard.

(43) Pa=mutad ne Ramon ka una:t ki amuwa:ɡ
     IF-cut-incomp. PNA Ramon G sugar cane L yard
     ya aliwa.
     FM knife

'Ramon will cut the sugar cane with THE KNIFE in the yard.

Clauses with the sequences below are ungrammatical because NP/IF precedes NP/A:

* V NP/I NP/A NP/G

* V NP/G NP/I NP/A

Thus, clauses 18 and 19 below exemplify ungrammatical sequences.

(44) *Pa=mutad ya aliwa ne Ramon ka una:t.
     IF-cut-incomp. FM knife PN Ramon G sugar-cane

'Ramon will cut the sugar-cane with THE KNIFE.'
(45) *Pa=mutad ka una:t ya aliwa ne Ramon.
    IF-cut-incomp. G sugar-cane FM knife PN Ramon

'Ramon will cut the sugar-cane with THE KNIFE.'

2.5.4 The Focused NP as Beneficiary

When the NP in focus is Beneficiary, the NP's are ordered very much the same as in a clause where Instrument is in focus. Again, the clause structure is constrained by the PR and CR rules, specifically, PR rules 1 and 2 and CR rule 3.

If NP is in focus, then:

1. \( V < \text{NP}_A < \text{NP}_i \)
2. \( \text{NP}_i \neq \text{NP}_I \)

The acceptable positioning of the constituents then, are:

\[
\begin{align*}
V & \quad \text{NP}/A & \quad \text{NP}/G & \quad \text{NP}/B & \quad \text{NP}/L \\
V & \quad \text{NP}/A & \quad \text{NP}/B & \quad \text{NP}/G & \quad \text{NP}/L \\
V & \quad \text{NP}/A & \quad \text{NP}/G & \quad \text{NP}/L & \quad \text{NP}/B
\end{align*}
\]

Exemplified by clauses (16) and (18).

(46) Pag=ba:yu ne Gabi ka dekat
    BF-pound-rice-incomp. PN Gabi G sweet-rice
`Gabi will pound (to unhusk) some sweet-rice for THE OLD WOMAN.'

(47) Pag=ba:yu ne Gabi ya bagbakat
BF-pound-rice-incomp. PNA Gabi FM old-woman
ka dekat.
G sweet-rice

`Gabi will pound (to unhusk) some sweet-rice for THE OLD WOMAN.'

(48) Pag=ba:yu ne Gabi ka dekat ki
BF-pound-rice-incomp. PNA Gabi G sweet rice L
ambaw ya bagbakat.
downhill=village FM old-woman

`Gabi will pound some sweet rice for THE OLD WOMAN at the village downhill.

Clauses that allow the focused beneficiary to permute with the agent are ungrammatical, as illustrated by the following non-occurring clauses:

(49) *Pag=ba:yu ya bagbakat ne Gabi ka
BF-pound-rice-incomp. FM old-woman PNA Gabi G
dekat.
sweet-rice

(50) *Pag=ba:yu ka dekat ne Gabi ya
BF-pound-rice-incomp. G sweet-rice PNA Gabi FM
bagbakat.
old-woman

`Gabi will pound (to unhusk) some sweet-rice for THE OLD WOMAN.'
In clause (49), the Beneficiary precedes the Agent, and in clause (50), the Goal precedes the Agent. Both sequences are disallowed. They violate PR rule 1 (i.e. no NP can precede a non-focus Agent).

2.5.5. The Focused NP as Location

Clauses that focus Location NP manifest the same rigidity in constituent ordering as do Goal Focus, Instrument Focus, and the Beneficiary Focus clauses. They are constrained by PR rule 1 and CR rules 1 and 2.

If \( \text{NP}_{L} \) is in focus, then:

1. \( V < \text{NP}_{A} < \text{NP}_{i} \)

2. \( \text{NP}_{i} \not\ni \{ \text{NP}_{I}, \text{NP}_{B} \} \)

The only grammatical positionings of constituents then, are:

\[ V \quad \text{NP}/A \quad \text{NP}/G \quad \text{NP}/L \]

or \[ V \quad \text{NP}/A \quad \text{NP}/L \quad \text{NP}/G \]

The following clauses exemplify these orderings:
(51) Na=milag=a:n na babay ka ammay ya amuwa:g.
LF-sun-dry-comp. A woman G rice FM yard
'The woman dried (under the sun) some rice in THE YARD.'

(52) Na=milag=a:n na babay ya amuwa:g ka ammay.
LF-sun-dry-comp. A woman FM yard G rice
'The woman dried (under the sun) some rice in THE YARD.'

The following clauses that permute the focus NP with the non-focus agent NP are again ungrammatical.

(53) *Na=milag=a:n ka ammay na babay ya amuwa:g.
LF-sun-dry-comp. G rice A woman FM yard
'The woman dried (under the sun) some rice in THE YARD.'

(54) *Na=milag=a:n ya amuwa:g na babay ka ammay.
LF-sun-dry-comp. FM yard A woman G rice
'The woman dried (under the sun) some rice in THE YARD.'

2.6 Rationale for the PSH and the Rules

In this section, I will present a possible explanation why the hierarchical ranking of the roles is such that the Agent outranks Goal which outranks Location which outranks Instrument and Beneficiary. Humans are psychologically predisposed to give attention first to motion or action and to ignore a passive background or field (Gibson 1966:201). That is, participants
perceived as closest to the action, like the Agent and Goal, take prominence over the 'prop-like' and more background-like roles such as Location, Instrument, etc. Thus, for causal source of any action, A outranks G in terms of human interest. In some cases, it takes the motion of the Agent for an event to be perceived. The instigator of events is the most salient participant on stage – more so than the 'victim' (Goal/ Patient).

Furthermore, in reporting events, Runo (1975) claims that speakers empathize with the participants to different degrees. It is more difficult for speakers to empathize with Animate non-humans than with humans, and it is most difficult for speakers to empathize with Things. Hierarchically, humans outrank animate-non-humans, which, in turn, outrank things (38). Thus, the PSH in section 2.4 ranks Agent highest, followed by Goal (usually nonhumans) either as animate or inanimate. Inanimate things used as Instrument and the like are ranked lowest.

With regard to the rules 1-6, we observed that: (a) certain NP roles, although allowed by the verb, do not occur together with that verb in a clause, e.g., Goal NP does not occur with the instrument NP; (b) the NP's take specific positions when not focused; and (c) when an NP is focused, its mobility is greatly increased. I wish to give an account of these restrictions in terms of the valency of the verb, defined as 'the number and kind of noun phrase a verb can take' (Comrie 1981:51). I will
correlate the notion of valency with the rules in terms of the following principles:

(a) The valence of the verb is greatest with the high ranked roles and weakest with the lower ranked roles.

(b) The valence of the verb is increased by focusing.

The following are the implications of the two principles above:

(a) When the high rank roles are focused, the valency of the verb is strengthened and thus it can combine more unfocused NP's. However, there is a limit to the number of NP's it can hold together. Thus, when Agent or Goal is focused, two lower rank NP's may co-occur with them. However, when the lower rank NP's are focused, the verb does not get enough strength to include other non-focus lower rank NP's, and thus co-occurrence restriction rule 4 is in effect. Thus, when Location, a lower rank role, is focused, the verb cannot include Instrument, another lower rank role. However, it automatically includes roles higher than the focused NP where the valency is stronger and thus co-occurrence restriction rule 3 applies.

(b) Positionally, when not focused, the NP's occur in a certain ordering in accordance with the hierarchical ranking and thus rule 2. Increasing the valence of the verb by focusing allows the focused NP to supersede the restriction on ordering imposed by the hierarchy. Thus, rule 1 allows the focus item to appear at any position except the position of the non-focused
In sum, the PSH and the rules I have developed that make use of it in their statement are the laws of the "selective affinities" of the formation of Isnag sentences. Just like atomic valencies, certain kinds of same and different types (i.e. verbs and noun phrases) are allowed to develop bonds and form sentences. Other combinations and types of bonds are less frequent, require more effort, or are forbidden outright.
CHAPTER 3

LEXICO-SEMANTIC ASPECT OF FOCUS

3.1 The Focus

In chapter 1, the Isnag focus system was briefly characterized in terms of syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic levels. It was observed that the three basic syntactic elements that are primarily involved in the focus system are the affix, the marked nominal, and the verb. That is,

\[ \text{Focus Constituents} \]

\[ \text{Affix} + \text{Verb} \quad \text{NP (FM + N)} \]

In this chapter I will discuss the morphological markers for focus: the verbal affixes and the various prenominal focus marking (FM) particles. In the present discussion of the affixes, only those basically inflectional\(^1\) (i.e., non-derivative) affixes which designate roles of focus NP's are considered. The different particles that mark the focused NP, the particles that introduce proper names, and the focus pronoun
sets will be discussed.

3.2 Verbal Affixes

3.2.1 Inflectional Processes

Isnag verbal clauses are almost always inflected for focus. The verbs take affixes whose primary function is to designate the semantic role of the focused NP. Such affixes are either prefixes (e.g., mag-, man-, mang-), infixes (e.g., -in-, -um-), or suffixes (e.g., -an, -a:n). There are also some discontinuous affixes, usually a combination of a prefix and a suffix, such as pag-...-a:n (Location focus).

The affixes are the most consistently explicit markers for focus. Very often NP's, whatever their roles, fail to get overtly realized in the clause. The implicit referent, however, is easily recoverable from the immediate context. Thus it is very common in Isnag to have clauses like (2), (3), and (4) composed only of a verb:

(1) Inimma:n kanu ne Ludasan T3:14
   GF-hold-comp. said PNA Ludasan
   'It was said that Ludasan held (it).'

(2) Nalibat T3:030
   AF-drop-dead-comp.
'(It) died instantly.'

(3) Natay. T3:34
   AP-die-comp.
   '(It) died.'

(4) Magta:law. T3:683
   AP-run-away-incomp.
   '(He) will run away.'

In clause (1), the implied referent (it) is the NP datu sissi:tu 'the puppies' mentioned in line 001 (see Text 3 in the Appendix), earlier in the text referred to by the same speaker (Erlinda) as datu pusag 'the white ones' in line 002, Tu niddeg ke Evelyn 'the one I gave Evelyn' in line 009.

Likewise, in clause (2), the implied referent is also datu sissi:tu from line 004, which is closely linked to line 001 and later referred to in line 007 as tu isa 'the other one,' tu isa nga naluq-lugmag 'the fatter one,' in line 012, aggi:na 'third person singular,' in line 018, ya:n na sissi:tu 'that puppy,' in line 028, zero anaphor (zero pronoun) in line 029 and 030.

In clause (3), the antecedent for (it) is tu gagganag mi isa 'our other bitch,' which is in the immediately preceding line (033).

The antecedent for the missing NP in clause (4) is ya tolay 'the man' in line 682: Magsirug pe ya tolay 'The man will hide.'

There is a co-occurrence restriction between verb types and
the affixes. Affixes are selective with respect to the verb to which they can be attached, or rather the verbs are selective as to the affix they take. This is due to factors described by Longacre (1976) under the heading case frames, which group verbs with their characteristic roles. Thus, because of their semantic composition, not all verbs can take the affixes that assign for example, goal role of the focused NP, nor can they all take the affixes that assign the instrument role. The most common role affixes on verbs are categorized according to the role they specify for the marked nominal phrase (or the focused item): that is, Agent, Goal, Instrument, Location, and Beneficiary.

3.2.1.1 The Agent Role Affixes

Agent is the event participant that brings about the action specified by the verb (Fillmore 1968, Grimes 1975). Agent is typically an animate referent intentionally or unintentionally performing the action described in the verb. All verbal clauses realizing event activity in Isnag have agents.

There are four possible verb affixes that designate the Agent role of the focused item. The mag- prefix is the most common of the four. The other three are mang-, man-, and the infix -um-. These occur in the incompleteive aspect. Their corresponding completive forms are nag-, nang-, naN-, and -umm-
or -inum-, respectively. The following tree diagram shows the relationship between the verb affixes and the focused nominal marked by ya or tu to which they assign the semantic role.

```
    Agent Focus Clause
      /     \
     /       \  
  Verb     NP     NP
   |        |       |
  ya       tu     (non-agent)
  (Agent)  +Focus -Focus

incomp. {mag-}  
           {manN-}  
           {mang-}  
           {um-}    

comp. {nag-}   
              {naN-}   
              {nang-}   
              {umn-}    
```

Although all the affixes assign the same role, they are not interchangeable. Each indicates a specific semantic feature of the clause. They also indicate the plurality of the object involved in the clause or the duration of the activity described by the verb. mag- indicates plural goal and/or durative (i.e., extended) action. The affixes mang-, man-, and um- require that the number of the goal be specified. If the number of the object is not otherwise numerically specified, man- and um- indicate that it is singular or just part of a whole. Thus, the following clauses have singular goal.
If the number of the goal is not specified, the mang- affix makes the number ambiguous. Thus, this affix may be categorized as neutral in terms of plurality. In cases of verbs that do not take goal, the mang-, man-, and -um- affixes indicate a relatively short duration of the activity described by the verb. Clauses (7)-(9) are illustrative:

(7) Nag=languy ya an-anaq.
    AF-swim-comp. FM child
    'THE CHILD swam (for a long time).'

(8) Nang=languy ya an-anaq.
    AF-swim-comp FM child
    'THE CHILD swam (for a while).'

(9) L=umm=anguy ya an-anaq.
    AF-swim-comp FM child
    'THE CHILD took a swim.'

When goal is in focus, the plurality is indicated differently (see 3.2.1.2 below).

Thus the four affixes, while they primarily assign the
role agent to the focused item, also simultaneously indicate the number of the goal or the duration of the activity or both. That is, the verbal affixes are also related to the non-focus NP's of the clauses.

3.2.1.2 The Goal Role Affixes

Some events involve entities that are perceived to experience or undergo the effect of the action. The effect may be either in physical state or location (Fillmore 1968, Longacre 1976). Some linguists prefer to call this role Patient (Grimes 1975) or Undergoer (Pike and Pike 1977). I will here call it simply 'Goal.' Goal is the most frequently (overtly) occurring role in Isnag discourse.

The affixes that signal the Goal focus are the suffix -an and the prefix i- (in the non-past/completive) and -in- and ne- (in the past/completive). The following diagram shows the relationship between the affixes and the focus nominal.

When any of the affixes shown below is attached to the verb, the NP marked for focus is the logical Goal and is typically presupposed in the lexical nature of the verb. Often the item in focus is therefore not overtly expressed. Clause (10) below (utterance 6 in Text 3) illustrates this zero anaphor, in which the focus referent sissitu 'puppy' does not overtly
appear:

Goal Focus Clause

Verb NP NP

incomp. \{i- -an\} (Agent) -Focus (Goal) +Focus
comp. \{ -in- \} role \{ya\} \{tu\}

(10) Ne=patarakan ku kaggin da se de angkel GF-causative-care-comp I them and pl uncle

ka las yer.
T last year

'I asked uncle and them (his family) to take care of
(IT) last year.'

When the focus NP is not overt, its referent is normally recoverable from the immediately preceding context.

The two affixes used to designate the Goal role of the focused NP (i- and -an) are not substitutable for one another. They differ in one primary meaning component carried by the affix i-. This affix i- is a conveyance affix. It denotes a directional movement of the goal or of the agent or of the activity itself. Thus (11) and (12) below are differentiated by some
directional action from the speaker to the hearer in (12) which is missing in (11).

(11) Basa:=an mu ma:n ya:n. read-GF-incomp. you please that

'Would you please read THAT.'

(12) I=ba:sa mu ma:n ya:n. GF-incomp-read you please that

'Would you please read THAT (aloud).'

Clause (12) is understood as a request to read aloud the material, typically, for the benefit of some hearer or, in some specific cases, for the speaker himself to hear. However, clause (11) with the -an affix explicitly means the addressee is to read the material silently for his own information. Illustrating further the difference between these two affixes are clauses (13) and (14).

(13) Dasm=an mu ya nignis. wet-GF-incomp. you FM rag.

'Wet the rag.'

(14) I=dsam* mu ya nignis. GF-wet-incomp. you FM rag.

'Wet the rag.'

(The form of the verb in (13) is different from (14) due to different morphophonological processes which do not concern us
here). Clause (13) is understood as a request to wet the rag right where it is, while in clause (14), the addressee is asked to take the rag to where there is water and wet it.

The plurality of the goal when focused is indicated by the affix -a:n, whose singular equivalent is the singular affix -an, or by the discontinuous affix i-...-a:n, whose singular equivalent is the singular affix i-. The noun phrase realizing a plural focused item is, in addition, marked with the plural focus marker daya or datu. Thus, comparing singulars in (13) and (14) with plurals in (13') and (14'):

(13') Dasm=a:n mu daya nignis.
     wet-GF-incomp. you FM pl. rag
     'Wet the rags.'

(14') I=dsam=ma:n mu daya nignis.
     GF-wet-incomp. you FM pl. rag
     'Wet the rags.'

The affixes have corresponding compleventive aspect forms. The compleventive form for the suffix -an is the infix -in- inserted immediately after the first consonant of the root. The compleventive form of the plural affix is i-...-a:n. The compleventive for the singular affix i- is ne- and for the plural i-...-a:n is ne-...-a:n.

The two types of goal role affixes are subject to collo-
cational restrictions depending on the class of verbs. That is, one class of verbs takes only the affix -an and its plural, and another class only i- and its plural.

3.2.1.3 The Instrument Role Affixes

An instrument is an accessory used by an agent to accomplish the activity described by the verb. It is usually inanimate and controlled by an identifiable agent. In some rare situations, specific body parts can, in Isnag, take the Instrument role. Thus, 'muddy hand' in (15) is acceptable as instrument:

(15) Pinang=ikkam na ya nalupang nga i:ma na ka ba:gi:at.
    IF-hold-comp. he FM muddy Lk hand his G banana

'He held a banana with HIS MUDDY HAND.'

However, without the modifier 'muddy,' it would have been redundant and unacceptable in Isnag to say "He held a banana with his hand." In that instance, the Instrument function of the hand would have been entailed in the verb 'hold.' But in the case above, the presence of an adjective nalupang 'muddy,' unable to
occur apart from a noun, requires the fully specified NP, including its Instrumental marking.

The semantic role Instrument is not often found in normal everyday conversation. Its percentage of occurrence in one of the texts analyzed is only 1.7 percent. When it occurs, the noun phrase realizing the Instrument is usually fronted. The fronting of the Instrument NP may have some bearing on the rank of the Instrument role in the Preferential Selection Hierarchy. It is only in citation clauses that Instrument may be used after the verb and in a non-focus status. In all the occurrences of the Instrument found in the texts analyzed, it is always in focus. It may occur as non-focus only when it is used in a highly marked situation, i.e., when it is not the kind of instrument normally used in a particular situation as in (16):

(16) K=in=i:ru na tu kape na kitu kuremang na.  
GF-stir-comp. he FM coffee his with finger his

"He stirred his coffee with his finger."

The affixes that signal that the focused NP has the role Instrument are pag-, pang-, and paN-, for the incompletive aspect. In the completive aspect, they are pinag-, pinang-, and pinaN- respectively. Thus, incompletive forms + -in- become completive forms. The diagram below represents the relationship between the verbal affixes (attached to the verb) and the focused
Again, the affixes are not interchangeable. Like the agent focus affixes, the affixes that signal the instrumental role also indicate the plurality of the goal and the duration of the activity. Consider clauses (17)-(19) below:

(17) Pag=siqla:t na tolay ka bu:lu ya aliwa.  
    IF-split-incomp. A man G bamboo FM knife
    'The man split some pieces of bamboo with THE KNIFE.'

(18) Pang=siqla:t na tolay ka bu:lu ya aliwa.  
    IF-split-incomp. A man G bamboo FM knife
    'The man split bamboo with THE KNIFE.'

(19) Pa=nigla:t na tolay ka bu:lu ya aliwa.  
    IF-split-incomp. A man G bamboo FM knife
    'The man split a piece of bamboo with THE KNIFE.'
conveys the meaning that the splitting of bamboo is done many times, and consequently, the goal is plural and the duration of the action is relatively long. In clause (18), however, unless the number of bamboo pieces is specified, the prefix pang- is ambiguous as to the number of times the action was repeated. The goal is not singular, but it is lesser in number than the goal of the clause where the affix is pag-. In clause (19), the affix paN- definitely implies that only one piece of bamboo was split, and therefore that the action was performed only once. The affixes that signal the Instrument role of the focus NP are subject to co-occurrence restrictions with respect to the verbs with which they occur. Moreover, not many verbs allow the Instrument role.

3.2.1.4 The Location Role Affixes

The spatial Location in which an event takes place can also be focused. The affixes used to assign location role are pag-...-a:n, pang-...-a:n, and paN-...-a:n, functioning in the familiar array shown in the diagram below.

Again, the three affixes are not freely substitutable. They are, like the previous affixes, differentiated by the plurality of the goal and the duration of the activity described by the verb. The affix pag-...-a:n conveys the plurality of the object,
pang—...-a:n is ambiguous as to the number of the goal, and paN—...-a:n conveys that the goal is singular in number. Clauses (20)-(22) are illustrative.

(20) Pag=siglat=a:n na tolay ka bu:lu ya amuwa:g.
    LP-split-incomp. A man G bamboo FM backyard

'The man will split some bamboo IN THE YARD.'

(21) Pang=siglat=a:n na tolay ka bu:lu ya amuwa:g.
    LP-split-incomp. A man G bamboo FM backyard.

'The man will split bamboo IN THE YARD.'

(22) Pa=niglat=a:n na tolay ka bu:lu ya amuwa:g.
    LP-split-incomp. A man G bamboo FM backyard

'The man will split a piece of bamboo IN THE YARD.'

Most verbs can, potentially, take these affixes for location focus. The reason for the potential productivity of these
affixes seems to be that all activity happens in time and space and verbs tend not to contain lexical restrictions as to location. However, in actual practice this situational role is not frequently specified in natural everyday conversational discourse. In fact, when it does occur, it is usually fronted. It does not usually co-occur with instrument or beneficiary roles.

3.2.1.5 The Beneficiary Role Affixes

Semantically, the Beneficiary is not an active participant, but rather one for whose benefit the activity is done. Like Agent, this role usually is animate in reference. Again, it is typically overtly expressed only when it is fronted as an assertion of beneficiary identification. It can, in fact, occur as a non-fronted focused item only in citation clauses. Although the beneficiary role has the potential of occurring with many Isnaq verbal clauses, it is the least common of the explicitly manifested NP expressions in natural everyday verbal interaction. The affixes used to signal the beneficiary role of the focused NP are: pag-, pang-, pan-, and i-. The majority of the affixes shown below are identical to those used to assign the instrumental role to the focus NP. The only differentiating factor is the semantic character of the associated nominal. Because of this overlap, one might postulate that they are one and the same
role, e.g., Accessory. However, the affix i- (cf. GF i- above) also assigns a Beneficiary role to the focus item for certain verbs (see example 26 below). The verbs that take the affix i- to signal the beneficiary role of the marked nominal are relatively few.

The following are some samples of Beneficiary focus clauses in which pag-, pang-, and paN- in (23)-(25) may be compared with i- in (26).

(23) Pag=taltag na tolay ya baqbakat.  
BF-cutwood-incomp. A man EM old woman

'The man cut some wood for THE OLD WOMAN.'
(24) Pang=taltaːg na tolay ya baqbakat.  
BF-cut-wood-incomp. A man FM old woman  
'The man cut wood for THE OLD WOMAN'

(25) Pa=naltaːg na tolay ya baqbakat.  
BF-cut-wood-incomp. A man FM old woman  
'The man cut a piece of wood for THE OLD WOMAN'

(26) I=karaːrag na baqbakat ya an-anaq a magtakit.  
BF-pray-incomp. she old-woman FM child Lk sick  
'The old woman will pray for THE SICK CHILD'

The pag- affix conveys the plurality of the goal; the pang- is not specific as to the number of the goal, and the pan- and the i- convey the singularity of the goal.

The following table summarizes all the affixes introduced so far in this chapter.

3.2.2 Derivational Processes

The term derivational processes is used here to refer specifically to some secondary characteristics of some inflectional affixes. These characteristics are secondary in the sense that they only get manifested with certain classes of verbs. The affixes that will be considered here are the agent focus affixes and the goal focus affixes.
TABLE 2
ROLE AFFIXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Type</th>
<th>Tense/Aspect*</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>uncomp.</td>
<td>mag-</td>
<td>mang- maN-</td>
<td>-um-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comp.</td>
<td>nag-</td>
<td>nang- naN-</td>
<td>-um-, -inum-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>uncomp.</td>
<td>-a:n</td>
<td>___ i-</td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comp.</td>
<td>-in-a:n</td>
<td>___ ne-</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>uncomp.</td>
<td>pag---a:n</td>
<td>pang---a:n</td>
<td>paN---a:n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comp.</td>
<td>nag---a:n</td>
<td>nang---a:n</td>
<td>naN---a:n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>uncomp.</td>
<td>pag-</td>
<td>pang- paN-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comp.</td>
<td>pinag-</td>
<td>pinang- pinaN-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>uncomp.</td>
<td>pag-</td>
<td>pang- paN-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comp.</td>
<td>pinag-</td>
<td>pinang- pinaN-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uncomp.</td>
<td>i---a:n</td>
<td>___ i-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comp.</td>
<td>ne---a:n</td>
<td>___ ne-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* incomp(lete) entails non-past and comp(lete) entails past.

The choice of focus is, to a large degree, restricted by semantic limitations inherent in the verb or in the affixes occurring with the verb. Some verbs have narrow semantic flexi-
bility, which limits the number of roles they may take. Other verbs do not tolerate certain roles at all, and yet others will enforce change on the number (plurality) of the co-occurring goal.

The derivational processes I want to focus my attention on are the different changes in the meaning of the clause when the agent focus affix is chosen over the goal focus affix or vice versa. In Isnag there are different semantic shifts that are categorized here into: (a) derived transitives (b) partitives, and (c) Reciprocals. I will now discuss each of these.

3.2.2.1 Derived Transitives

There is a class of verbs in Isnag whose transitivity does not seem to be inherent in the verb root itself. Rather, it is dependent on the affix attached to the verb. These verbs tolerate both agent focus affix mag- and the goal focus affixes -an or i-. When they take the agent focus affix, they act as intransitive verbs. However, when they are inflected for goal focus, they are transitives. Based on the notion of markedness, I posit that the intransitive form is the unmarked form of these verbs. Clauses (27) and (28) below illustrate the point.

In both clauses, the verb root is anggam 'happiness/joy.' In clause (27), however, with the verb affixed for goal focus
(transitivized), the verb is Inang-anggam\textsuperscript{2} 'admired,' while in clause (28) where the verb is affixed for agent focus, the verb is Nagang-anggam\textsuperscript{2} 'was happy, rejoiced.' In this particular case, the choice of focus depends on the meaning the speaker wants to convey.

\begin{verbatim}
(27) Inang-anggam  Manang  daya  pippi:yaq
    GF-admire-comp.  older-sister  FM  pl.  chicks
    daya pa:tu.
    of-pl. ducks

'Elder sister admired the ducklings of the duck.'

(28) *Nagang-anggam  Manang  daya  pippi:yaq
    GF-happy-comp.  older-sister  FM  pl.  chicks
    daya pa:tu.
    of-pl. ducks

'Elder sister was happy about the ducklings the ducks.'
\end{verbatim}

Thus the verb anggam 'happy' regularly takes the agent focus affix if there is only one accompanying role type, that is, an intransitive clause. The same verb can be affixed for goal focus if another participant is added to this underlying one-termed element, but the agent focus affix may not replace the goal focus affix in this latter case of a derived transitive. Thus goal focus and agent focus come to signal lexical contrast (e.g., AF: "X is happy" and GF: "X admires Y").

Clause (29) and (30) further illustrate meaning change with
change of focus.

(29) ...akkān pikam nagdittāːg da anuq
not yet AF-alight-comp. FM pl. chickens
da kabbulun na magdadaːpun.
they companions Lk AF-roost-incomp.

'THE CHICKENS OF OUR FRIENDS THAT ARE ROOSTING have
not come down yet.'

(30) ...isubli̞g kammīn kumā tu 15 pesos
GF-return-I-incomp. same wish FM 15 pesos

'I want to give back THE 15 PESOS.'

(29') *...akkān pikam d=in=tāːg da anuq
not yet GF-alight-comp. FM pl. chickens
da kabbulun na magdadaːpun.
they companions Lk AG-roost-incomp.

The chickens of our friends have not been taken
down yet.

(30') *...mag=subli ḥa yaq kammīn kumā tu 15 pesos
AF-return-I-incomp. I same wish FM 15 pesos

'I wish to go back to the 15 pesos.'

Clauses (29) and (30) above have different meanings if changed to
focus for Goal and Agent respectively. The Goal focus form of
the verb in clause (29) is d=in=tāːg (as in 29') which means
'taken down.' This derived transitive form is not appropriate in
conveying the intransitive meaning the speaker wants to convey in
(29). Clause (30') is also anomalous. Here, the agent focus
form of the verb is mag=subli, which means 'to come back,'
clearly, not conveying the underlying notion of (30) which is 'to cause the money to come back,' a transitive expression. Again, Agent focus marks intransitives and Goal focus derived transitives. Speaker's choice of focus is constrained by its semantic consequences. The clauses (29') and (30') illustrate the change in the meaning of the verb with the change of focus; the meaning change consequently affects the syntax of the clause which has the same NP's but with different focus.

Thus, it is clear that the Agent focus affix actually has a dual function. It is both an inflectional and a derivational affix. The derivational function is activated by certain classes of verbs. But even when the derivational feature of the affix is in effect, the inflectional function is simultaneously at work; it changes the meaning and at the same time assigns the agent role to the focus NP. Such properties of the affix limit the speaker in his choice of focus NP. Clauses (31) and (32) below illustrate the point.

(31) Ay kane pisu=an na ngin na=lnga:t
   And when GF-put-incomp. he now AF-faint-comp
taq manin.
I again

'And when he put (medicine) on it, I again fainted.'

(31') *Ay kane mag=pisuq in, na=lnga:t
   And when AF-jump-into-incomp. now AF-faint-comp.
taq  manin.
I    again.

'And when he jumped into (something), I again fainted.'

The verb *pisu-an* 'to put something into' in clause (31) is inflected for goal focus, and the goal is necessary in the activity described by the verb. However, if the agent NP is focused instead, thus using the affix *mag-*, the verbal predicate is *mag=pisug*, which means 'to jump into something (usually water),' and the verb will become intransitive and the clause will not tolerate any goal. Thus, clause (31') above, an agent focus clause, is inappropriate in the same context as (31). The following clauses are additional examples of verbs of the same characteristics described above.

(32) Mag=siruq  ya tolay.  T3:682
    AF-hide-incomp.  FM  person

    'The person will hide.'

(33) Mag=ta:law       T3:683a
    AF-run-away-incomp.

    '(He) will run away.'

(34) Mag=li:si        T3:683b
    AF-get-away-incomp.

    '(He) will get away.'
The verbs *siruq* 'hide,' *tailaw* 'run away,' and *li:si* 'avoid,' if given goal affixes will be acceptable, but with the meanings 'put away,' 'take away,' and 'to save/protect,' respectively.

### 3.2.2.2 Partitives

This type of semantic change with the change of focus usually affects the goal, e.g., its plurality or its affectedness, only part or the whole is affected when it is realized by a mass noun. The following clause illustrates the point.

(N35) *Ay na=niqḍut ki duqḍut anuq.* T3:48
   And AF-pluck-comp. G feather chicken

   'And (HE) plucked out a feather from the chicken.'

The verb *nan= iqḍut* 'pluck out' is inflected in (35) to assign the agent role to the focused NP. While the Agent is thus marked as definite, the Goal 'feather' is not definite. The corresponding goal focus clause is:

(N35') *Ay s=im= iqḍut na ya duqḍut anuq.*
   And GF-pluck out-comp. he FM feather chicken

   'He plucked out THE FEATHER of the chicken.'

Here, Goal as well as Agent is definite and the former is
focused.

Clause (36) and (36') below differ in their meaning by the part-whole relationship of the goal.

(36) Mang=irod ka ma:n ka danum kiya amutu.
    AF-bail-out-incomp. you please G water L jar

'Would YOU please bail out some water from the jar.'

(36') Kirod=an mu ma:n ya danum kiya
    GE-bail-out-incomp. you please FM water L
    kiya amutu.
    L jar

'Would you please bail out THE WATER from the jar.'

Clause (36) means that only some water is bailed out of the jar, while clause (36') means that all of the water in the jar has to be bailed out.

If the speaker, then, intends to communicate that only part of the goal required by the verb is affected, he is not given any choice; he has to focus the agent NP.

Similarly, clause (37) and (38) below illustrate the partitive contrast which the verbal affix can signal:

(37) (Bila:ng=an da ya piraq may) maddi da
    GF-count-incomp. they FM money but won't they
    mang=alaq.
    AF-take-incomp.

'(They count the money but) THEY won't take any of
it.'

The verb alaq 'to get' is inflected for agent focus, conveying the meaning that only part of the goal is affected, i.e., 'they count the money but they will not take any of it.' The goal focus counterpart, however, is:

(38) (Bila:ng=an da ya piraq may) maddi
     GF-count-incomp. they FM money but won't
da alaq.
they GF-take-incomp.

'(The count the money but) they will not take IT'

Clause (38) means that the whole goal is affected, i.e., 'they count the money but they will not take (all of) it.' The verb alaq$^3$ involves the total amount of the money.

3.2.2.3 Reciprocals

Reciprocal action refers to an activity in which two participants in an event are alternately involved as agent and goal in an activity, i.e., participant 1 is agent, participant 2 is goal and vice versa. Reciprocal activity is indicated by the agent focus verbal affix mag- in that class of verbs that can semantically involve reciprocal activity. Verbs of this sort include surlung 'to punch,' patay 'to kill,' singan 'to see,'
bagbaqna:n 'to converse' etc. as the following clauses exemplify:

AF-punch-incomp. FM pl. children
'THE CHILDREN are fistfighting.'

(40) Mag=patay daya magama.
AF-kill-incomp. FM pl. father and son
'THE FATHER AND HIS SON are fighting.'

(41) Mag=singan kami kala:wa.
AF-see-incomp. we (excl.) tomorrow
'WE will see each other tomorrow.'

(42) Mag-anoman tada nu kala:wa AS 46
AF-talk-incomp we (incl.) when tomorrow
'WE will talk tomorrow.'

The goal focus form of the verbs illustrated by clauses (39')-(42') below neutralizes the reciprocity of the activity expressed by the agent focus form verbs in clauses (39)-(42), changing them into unilateral activity from agent to goal. There is no indication of role switch of the participants in the activity.

(39') Sulu:ng=an na an-anaq ya an-anaq.
GF-punch-incomp. A. child FM child
'The child will hit THE CHILD.'

(40') Patay=an na ama ya an-anaq na.
GF-kill-incomp. A father FM child his
'The father is beating HIS CHILD.'

(41') Sinn-an ku kala:wa.
GF-see-incomp. I tomorrow

'I will see (HIM) tomorrow.'

(42') Amoman-an takayu kala:wa.
GF-talk-incomp. I-you tomorrow

'I will talk to YOU tomorrow.'

Again, similar to its function with reference to partitives, goal focus has a 'bounding' effect, specifying a delimited action and object, while agent focus signals multiple actions and objects.

The options for focus are again restricted by the intended meaning. One form expresses one type of relationship of the participants in the event, and another form expresses yet another relationship of the same participants in the same event.

3.3 The Marking Particles

All NP's in Isnag verbal clauses are marked by particles as focused items or non-focused items. The non-focused items are marked by the particles for their semantic role in the activity described by the verb, i.e., Goal, Agent, Location, etc. The role of the NP marked for focus is designated by affixation in the verb, which I have described in 3.2 above. In a given clause, only one NP can be marked for focus, and each NP is
assigned only one role in that clause. I turn now to the details of that marking.

Perhaps the most central feature of the focus item is its DEFINITENESS. This is indicated grammatically by definite marking particles. Normally, information is marked for definiteness because it was previously mentioned in the text (textual definiteness) or it was previously known, from common experience, by both the speaker and the hearer (non-textual definiteness). Non-textual information may be marked for definiteness without first being overtly mentioned in the text as indefinite information. Most Philippine language researchers claim to have found only one definite (focus) marker. In Tagalog, the ang particle is the only NP particle claimed to mark focus (Schachter and Otanes 1972, Schachter 1976:495). In Maranao (McKaughan 1958:15) the corresponding particle is so. In Botolan Sambal (Antworth 1979:13), it is ya, etc.

In Isnag however, the textually definite information is marked differently from the non-textually definite information. In Isnag however, there are two particles used to mark definite information; the particles ya and tu. These two particles are not mutually substitutable. Their usage will be discussed in sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2. Equivalent particles have been observed in Pangasinan: the particles so and may. Brichoux (1984) observed the equivalent particles in Sindangan Subanen,
and I suspect that there are other languages which may have more than one marker. In Tagalog, the particle 'yong, the equivalent of tu, although seldom encountered in written texts, is commonly used in everyday conversation in the same slot as the ang particle.

3.3.1 The ya Particle

Grammatically, the particle ya marks the focus NP whose role is designated by the verbal affix. The ya form indicates singular and daya plural referents. The diagram below shows the positional ordering of the ya NP with respect to the verb:

![Diagram of clause structure](image)

On the pragmatic level, the ya particle signals definiteness (detailed discussion is in 4.4), i.e., information already known by the hearer. Thus, anuq 'chicken' in clause (43) below is marked definite by ya:

...
The marked nominal anug 'chicken' was first introduced in an earlier clause as a non-focus item. Specifically, the NP ki anug 'to the chicken' in clause (44) establishes the referent anug 'chicken' using the non-focus particle ki.

In cases where the referent represented by the nominal is visible and in close proximity to both the hearer and the speaker at the time of the conversation, the encoding NP is also marked by ya. Thus in a clause like (45a):

   AF-fell-comp. FM man

'THE MAN fell.'
the man is in one particular speech situation a part of the shared knowledge of both speaker and hearer by virtue of his visibility and proximity to them. If, on the other hand, the particle tu were used as in clause (45b) above, the referent of the NP tu tolay 'the man/person' would be understood as geographically distant from the speaker and the hearer. Compare (46a) and (46b):

(46) a. ...ma=bong ngala ya dur-duri ki si:dung
GF-break-incomp. only FM jar L under-the-house

'When THE (ANTIQUE) JAR under the house breaks...'  

*b. ...ma=bong ngala tu dur-duri ki si:dung.
GF-break-incomp. only FM ant.-jar L under-the-house

'When THAT (ANTIQUE) JAR under (proximal) the house breaks...'  

In (46a) the jar is under the house where the speaker and hearer are having the conversation. The jar is thus spatially proximal to the speaker and hearer and correctly takes ya. Clause (46b), however, is unacceptable. The nominal dur-duri 'the antique jar' marked for focus is also marked as distant from the speaker.
and the hearer by tu while the non-focus location ki sidung 'under the house' is marked as proximal to the speaker and the hearer. For (46b) to be acceptable, either ya must replace tu or the NP ki sidung 'under the house' has to be changed to kitu sidung 'under the (distant) house.'

However, ya is also used to mark nominals whose referents are not proximal physically to the hearer and the speaker. When such is the case, the hearer infers a generic referent from his general world knowledge. Despite its definiteness, the referent encoded by the nominal is not uniquely identifiable. Such nominals are exemplified in generic references such as in (47)-(49).

(47) Akkan ma=biya:g ya tolay ki makka:n nala.
not AF-live-incomp. FM person G food only
'MAN does not live by bread alone.'

(48) Nu magitara:ut daya anu.
when AF-crow-incomp. FM pl. chicken
'When THE CHICKENS crow,' i.e. early morning.

(49) Tumugkaw daya idaw.
AF-bite-incomp. FM pl. snake
'SNAKES bite.'

In fictional narrative, this use of ya regularly refers to conventionally known entities from the culturally familiar cast of characters and scenes. In this sense, the referent of daya
pabeg kapit 'a group of small frogs' in clause (50), ya an-anaq 'the child' in clause (51), ya tablang 'the tablang tree' in clause (52), and ya an-anuq 'the bird' in clause (53) are any member from their respective classes that match the features of a prototypical member of each class.

(50) D=in-atang na daya pabeg kapit. TNBJ:3
GF-saw-comp. he FM-pl. group small frog

'He/she saw THE GROUP OF SMALL FROGS.'

(51) Na=dukaq na ya an-anaq ki nagsanga:lan na
dalen. K:8
GF-find-comp. he FM child L intersection Lk path

'He/she found THE CHILD at the crossroad.'

(52) Na=langad da ya tablang. SG:009
GF-see-up-comp. they FM tablang tree.

'They looked up and saw THE TABLANG TREE.'

(53) In=umbet ya an-anuq. DA:9
GF-come-comp. FM bird

'THE BIRD came.'

If the focus markers ya and daya in clauses (50)-(53) are replaced with the focus marker tu and datu respectively, the clauses will remain grammatically acceptable as in (50')-(53') below:

(50') D=in-atang na datu pabeg kapit. TNBJ:3
GF-saw-comp he FM-pl. group small frog
'He/she saw THE GROUP OF SMALL FROGS.'

(51') Na=dukaq na tu an-anaq ki nagsa:lan na
gF-find-comp. he FM child L intersection Lk
dalen. K:8
path

'He/she found THE CHILD at the crossroad.'

(52') Na=langad da tu tablang. SG:009
gF-see-up-comp. they FM tablang tree.

'They looked up and saw THE TABLANG TREE.'

(53') In=umbet tu an-anaq. DA:9
gF-come-comp. FM bird

'THE BIRD came.'

However, the hearer interprets these clauses differently. He will try to search out the referents of the NP's marked with tu and datu in clauses (50)-(53) in some specifically unique experience he previously had with the speaker and will try to identify the unique referents encoded by the definite NP's (cf 3.3.2). If unable to identify such NP's with unique referents, the hearer will typically feel obliged to request more information regarding the NP's.

3.3.2 The tu Particle

The particle tu has three primary functions: it signals (a) experientially anaphoric referents, as in clauses (54) and
(55) below, (b) spatially remote referents as in clauses (54)-(56), and (c) deceased referents as in clause (57). The diagram below shows the positional ordering of the tu NP with respect to the verb.

The referent encoded by an NP marked with tu can be uniquely identified in the real world by the hearer, usually, from a previous experience he and the speaker had. Thus, in clauses (54)-(55):

(54) I=nalaq ne Idot tu aliwa.
    GF-get-comp. PA Idot FM knife

'Idot took THE KNIFE.'

(55) Apangi=rarat tala ne Marlon tu kawitain
    GF-just-kill-incomp. only PNA Marlon FM rooster

na nga p=in=altu ne Aldrin. T3:83
his Lk GF-spear-comp. PNA Aldrin

'Marlon just killed HIS ROOSTER which Aldrin speared.'
the knife in (54) and the rooster in (55) are uniquely identifiable to both the speaker and the hearer through some previous shared experience. They both saw/know the particular knife and the rooster referred to.

Simultaneously, the referent encoded by the tu NP is remote in relation to the interlocutors. Thus, tu aliwa 'the knife' in (5), and tu kawitan 'the rooster' in (55), and tu isa 'one (puppy)' in clause (56) below are geographically remote from the interlocutors.

(56) Ata:n ka allod tu isa T3:5
there-is L downstream FM one

'ONE is in the downstream town.'

Furthermore, tu before a proper name (or the like), when accompanied by the particle ten, signals that the referent is deceased. Thus, tu Ikit ten 'the aunt' in clause (57) is a deceased relative of the speaker:

(57) An-anaq de Sislangat se tu Ikit ten.
child PN-pl. Sislangat and FM aunt dec. part.

'(She is) the child of Sislangat and (the deceased) AUNT (of ours).'</n

In Tagalog, by way of comparison, the equivalent of tu is the particle 'yong. Thus in the clause (Liwayway 1985, Nov. 26),
(58) Na=sira=an 'yong dyip na sinakyan ko.
GP-pst-break-down FM jeep Lk rode in I

'THE JEEP I took broke down.'

the marker is 'yong instead of ang. Had the Tagalog particle been ang (cf. Isnaq ya), the NP dyip 'jeep' would have been any referent possessing the characteristics of a 'jeep,' (i.e., generic).

3.3.3 The Non-focus Marking Particles

While the semantic role of the focus NP is designated by the verbal affix, the semantic role of the non-focus NP's is signaled by prenominal Particles.

Non-focus NP's can be definite or indefinite and are marked by different particles as Table 2 shows.

The non-focus definite particles shown on Table 2 clearly incorporate the focus markers tu (e.g. kitu) and ya (e.g. kiya). Further, comparing these non-focus definite and indefinite particles (na vs. naya/natu, ki vs. kiya/kitu) it becomes clear that tu and ya are definitizers.

The definite non-focus particles naya and natu, carry the same meanings discussed in sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2, i.e., the tu component continues to signal distal entities both spatially and temporally, and ya signals proximal entities.
TABLE 3
NON-FOCUS MARKING PARTICLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>Definite</th>
<th>Indefinite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sing.</td>
<td>sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plural</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>natu, naya</td>
<td>na, $\emptyset$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>natu, datu</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>kitu</td>
<td>ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td>ki, ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kitu, kiya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td></td>
<td>ka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The beneficiary role is not included in the table since it does not occur in a non-focus form. The plurality of the non-focus indefinite goal is, as mentioned earlier (3.1.1), signaled in the verb affix.

3.4 Pronouns and Proper Name Markers

Pronouns imply that their referents have been previously given in the text or are instances of shared knowledge. They
fill the same position as the noun phrase marked by tu or ya. All pronouns indicate old information, and hence are always definite. The following tree shows the grammatical positions of these NP types:

```
  Clause
   /       \
  /        \ 
NP        NP
  /  \
 Verb + Affix {Pronoun Proper Name} {Pronoun Proper Name}
  /            \
Agent         Goal

role
```

The pronoun realizing the Agent always precedes the pronoun realizing the Goal, and the Goal always agree with the role indicated by the affix in the verb.

When the focused item is encoded in Isnag by a pronoun, it is not introduced by a grammatical marker or particle. Instead, specific pronouns and sets of pronouns themselves encode certain specific focus. However, when the focused item is encoded by a proper name, it is preceded, as we shall see below (3.4.3), by a particle with the form Ce, (where C= the last phoneme of the preceding word). Also, when the agent and goal are realized by
proper names and/or pronouns, the goal NP is always focused.

3.4.1 The Personal Pronoun System

There are two primary groups of personal pronouns in Isnag: the principal personal pronoun and the composite pronouns. The principal pronouns are the set that are commonly used as NP substitutes for specific situational roles. The composite personal pronouns are a set of all the possible pronoun combinations that commonly co-occur in clauses, i.e., two participants in an activity which are encoded by pronouns.

3.4.1.1 The Principal Personal Pronouns

The Personal Pronouns are summarized in Table 3 below. The table distinguishes principal personal pronouns as agentive, oblique (realizing the other roles, e.g., beneficiary, or location), and possessive. I discuss these categories in more detail in the following sections.
TABLE 4
ISNAG PRINCIPAL PERSONAL PRONOUNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numb.</th>
<th>Pers.</th>
<th>Agentive</th>
<th>Oblique</th>
<th>Poss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fronted Agent/Goal</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Non-Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>iyaq</td>
<td>Caq</td>
<td>ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>daqta</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ikaw</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>aggi:na</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>1 exc.</td>
<td>dakami</td>
<td>kami</td>
<td>mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incl.</td>
<td>daqtada</td>
<td>tada</td>
<td>tada</td>
<td>kadaqtada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>daqta</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>dakayu</td>
<td>kayu</td>
<td>nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>aggi:da</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.1.1.1 The Agentive Pronouns

There are, as indicated in table 3 above, three different subsets in the agentive pronoun set: the fronted agent or goal, the focus, and the non-focus. The fronted agent pronouns are put to use for a variety of purposes, e.g., contrastive identification and rank restriction (discussed in detail in 4.2). Since
the same set of pronouns is used to realize fronted goals as well as agents, it can be said that this set of pronouns is specifically inflected for fronting.

The agent focus pronouns (Cag, ta, etc.) are commonly used in pronominal referencing in discourse, i.e., when a participant has been introduced and is being traced down the ensuing narrative. They always occur immediately following the verb.

The non-focus agent pronoun set (ku, ta, etc.) is inflected only for the agency role when a non-agent NP is focused. Like the agent focus pronouns, they too occur immediately following the verb.

3.4.1.1.2 The Oblique Pronouns

The pronouns in the oblique set of Table 3 (kiyag, kadaq-
ta, etc.) take a role parallel to that of location. This is made clear when they are fronted, for the verb is, in such cases, inflected for location focus. Clause (59) below illustrates the point:

us-obl. FM LF-stay-comp. A visitor

'The visitor stayed WITH US.'
The pronouns in the oblique set can only occur as focus when fronted. They are always non-focus when they occur in a regular verb-initial clause. More of the rationale for this patterning will emerge in the discussion of fronting in pragmatic function (section 4.3).

3.4.1.2 The Composite Personal Pronouns

The composite personal pronouns may be summarized as shown in Table 5.

The composite personal pronouns are the result of the fusion of the pronouns realizing the agent and the goal. Some of these composite pronouns can be teased apart to recover the individual component pronouns. For example, kuda above is constituted of Agentive 1st person ku fused with 3rd plural goal da. However, there are some which have been remodelled on the analogy of other forms (e.g., taka after naka). There are traces, however, of the component pronouns which give an idea of which part came from which pronoun. The relative position of the composite pronouns with respect to the verb is still evident. The following diagram with sample composite forms illustrates the pattern.
### TABLE 5
COMPOSITE PERSONAL PRONOUNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>taka</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>naq</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td>nakami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>naq</td>
<td>naka</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>nakami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>mika</td>
<td>mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1+2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>mika</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>daq</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>nu</td>
<td>dakami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>daq</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>dakami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All the pronouns in Table 4 occur only post-verbally (cf. pronouns in Table 4). The first part of the composite pronoun always realizes the agent, and the verb can only be inflected for goal focus. The verb is inflected for agent only in case Agent is fronted, in which case the fronted pronoun set must be used.

3.4.2 Demonstrative Pronouns

Demonstrative pronouns, a subset of the deictics of Isnag, may also fill the same slot as focused NP's or pronouns. Deictics, like pronouns, are always definite, indicating referents within the view of the speaker and hearer.

Isnag distinguishes three demonstratives: idi 'this,' ya:n 'that,' and tune 'yonder.' Idi is used to refer to items close to the speaker, ya:n to refer to items closer to the hearer, and tune to refer to items far from both speaker and hearer. The demonstrative ya:n is also used in anaphoric reference, while idi is usually used in cataphoric reference. Clause (60) illustrates anaphoric ya:n.

(60) Akkan nag=takit ya:n na sissitu. (T3:28)
not AP-sick-comp. that Lk puppy

'THAT PUPPY did not get sick.'

The phrase ya:n na sissitu 'that puppy' is the equivalent of the
focused NP. The demonstrative *ya:n* refers anaphorically to the referent 'puppy' just mentioned in the preceding context. The clause can also be appropriately glossed as 'The puppy I just mentioned did not get sick.' Further uses of *ya:n* are illustrated in clauses (61) and (62):

(61) We yaq maq a ussan kagiy=an AF-go-incomp. I cert. Lk again GF-tell-incomp.
    *ya:n* nu kala:wa. T3:359
    that when tomorrow

'I will go back and tell him THAT again tomorrow.'

(62) Tu g=in=aga:ban maq ne Marlon. T3:382
    FM GF-cut-surgically-comp. cert PNA Marlon
    *ya:n*.
    that

'THAT was the same one from which Marlon took a piece of wire.'

(63) and (64) contain examples of cataphoric *idi*:

(63) Gigna=:n nu *idi* ya kagiy=an GF-listen-incomp. you pl. this Lk GF-tell-incomp.
    ku kadakayu annanaq,
    I to you pl. children

'Children, listen to what I am going to tell you.'

(64) *Idi* nga istorya ay mepanggap kitu naggi=inatay mi. this Lk story Lk about T AF-wake-comp. we
'This story is about the wake we had.'

3.4.3 Proper Name Markers

Proper names, like other NP's, are also preceded by particles which specify their situational role. The particle morphophonemically represented as Ce marks proper name focus (PNF), whether it has the role agent or goal. C is the final consonant of the preceding word. If the last segment of the preceding word is a vowel, C → //y// if the vowel is //i// or //e//; C → //w// if the vowel is //o// or //u//, and C → //ng// (velar nasal) if the vowel is //a//. Clauses (65) and (66) illustrate this particle marking the focused proper name:

(65) Nang=alaq e* Idot ka ba:gat.  
AG-get-comp PNF Idot G banana

'IDOT got some bananas.'

(66) Na=nalug ge Inggu.  
AG-swim-comp. PNF Inggu

'INGGU swam.'

(e* in (65) is actually ge but initial glottal is always orthographically deleted.)

If a proper name agent (PNA) is not in focus, it is preceded by the particle ne. Clauses (67)-(70) exemplify this use.
(67) S=im-unlung ne Albano we Kiyu.
GF-hit-comp. PNA Albano PNF Kiyu

'Albano hit KIYU.'

(68) N=idd=an ne Gabi ka ba:ga:t te Elena.
GF-give-comp. PNA Gabi G banana PNF Elena

'Gabi gave ELENA some bananas.'

(69) In=alaq ne Idot ya ba:ga:t.
GF-get-comp. PA Idot FM banana

'Idot got THE BANANA.'

(70) S=im-igla:t ne Anaway ya bu:lu.
GF-split-comp. PA Anaway FM bamboo

'Anaway split THE BAMBOO.'

In cases of the proper name in oblique function (PNO) the particle used to introduce the proper name is ke (plural is kade). Clauses (71)-(73) below illustrate the use of the particle:

(71) N=idde ne Gabi tu ba:ga:t ke Elena.
GF-give-comp PNA Gabi FM banana PNO Elena

'Gabi gave THE BANANA to Elena.'

(72) K=im-agi ku win ke Dominggo.
GF-tell-comp. I already PNO Dominggo

'I already (IT) to told Dominggo.'

(73) Nag=gaga:ya:m maq kade Barad.
AF-visit-comp. I PNO pl. Barad

'I visited the Barad's.'
NOTES

1 Inflectional affixes are those whose functions are generally predictable. The affix does not add a significant meaning to the word to which it is attached. It does not change the meaning of the stem. The -s in boys is inflectional, while the -ish in boyish is derivational.

2 The reduplication in the prefix designates longer duration of the action.

3 alaq 'to get' is one of the very few verbs in Isnag that is unaffixed when focused for Goal.
CHAPTER 4

THE PRAGMATICS OF FOCUS

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will deal with the pragmatic considerations of the focus system, which include Comment-Topic structure and presupposed items. I propose that (a) the Comment-Topic structure is the motivating factor in the fronting of an NP which is then marked for focus, (b) the presupposed items extend beyond those explicitly mentioned in the text, and (c) the discourse structure constrains the choice of focus NP.

4.2 The COMMENT-TOPIC Pragmatic Structure

The immediate constituents of a clause (sentence) proposed by Hockett (1958:201), particularly for English, are Topic and Comment. Thus, in clause (1) below:

(1) John ran away.

John is the topic and ran away is the comment.

In the example, the relationship between the Topic and the Comment is that the latter says something about the former.
(Hockett 1958:201). Topic then is that part of the clause about which something is said, and comment is that which is said about it. With these characteristics of topic and comment, let us examine some non-verbal Isnag clauses.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{COMMENT} & \text{TOPIC} \\
(2) & \text{Napiya daya babbay.} \\
& \text{beautiful FM women} \\
& \text{'THE WOMEN are beautiful,'} \\
(3) & \text{Nalu:tu win daya kapaya.} \\
& \text{ripe already FM papaya fruits} \\
& \text{'THE PAPAYA FRUITS are already ripe.'} \\
(4) & \text{Karpinteru maq e Pidio.} \\
& \text{carpenter cert. PNF Pidio} \\
& \text{'PIDIO is a carpenter.'} \\
(5) & \text{Kala:wa ya amildap da.} \\
& \text{tomorrow FM feast they} \\
& \text{'THEIR FEAST is tomorrow.'} \\
(6) & \text{Kuwa ga:yan Elena tu laddung.} \\
& \text{possessive so-it-is Elena FM scarf} \\
& \text{'THE SCARF was actually Elena's.'} \\
\end{array}
\]

In clause (2), the thing about which something is said
(Topic) is *daya babbay 'the women,' and what is said about them
(Comment) is *Napiya 'beautiful.' In terms of topic and comment,
clause (2) has comment occurring initially followed by the topic.
Likewise, clauses (3)-(6) have the structure in which the comment
occurs initially followed by the topic. Reversing the ordering
of the clauses will make them ungrammatical, as illustrated by
the following clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2)' *Daya babbay napiya.</td>
<td>'THE WOMEN are beautiful.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM-pl. women beautiful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)' *Daya kapa:ya nalu:tu win.</td>
<td>'THE PAPAYA FRUITS are already ripe.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM-pl. papaya-fruit ripe already</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)' *E Pidio, karpinteru maq.</td>
<td>'PIDIO is a carpenter.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pidio carpenter cert.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)' *Ya amildap da kala:wa.</td>
<td>'THEIR FEAST is tomorrow.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM feast they tomorrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)' *Tu laddaung kuwa gayam Elena.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM scarf own so-it-is Elena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
'THE SCARF was actually Elena's.'

Thus, the basic structure exhibited by the non-verbal clauses (2)-(6) is Comment-Topic. The parts introduced by ya, daya, and tu are topics and the parts preceding them are comments. Therefore, while in English "the speaker announces a topic and then says something about it" (Hockett 1958:201), in Isnag and some other Philippine languages, the speaker makes a comment about a topic to be immediately announced. Thus, the Comment-Topic structure in clauses (2)-(6) above is an implementation of the following structure:

```
Speech Act
(Clause)

  COMMENT
  |
  ADJ/NP
  |
  poss. NP

  TOPIC
  |
  ya + NP

Let us now examine the structure of verbal clauses in terms of Comment-Topic by considering the following verbal clauses:
(7) In=ang=anggam Manang daya pippi:yaq
GF=cont.-admire-comp. older-sister FM ducklings

datu pa:tuq. T3:081
FM ducks-my

'Older sister admired THE DUCKLINGS OF MY DUCKS.'

(8) Nag-lalawa:n daya sissi:tu. T3:147
AF=come-out-comp. FM puppies

'THE PUPPIES came out.'

(9) Na=rput datu anuq mi. T3:230
AF=mass-death-comp. FM chickens our

'OUR CHICKENS died in great numbers.'

(10) Ma=sigru:t=a:n nin tu untuq tu
AF=taper-comp. now FM top FM

kapa:ya. T3:120
papaya tree.

'THE TOP OF THE PAPAYA TREE is now tapered (because the leaves dried out and fell).

(11) Ma=pna:t pe datu bunga na. T3:125
AF=fall-incomp. also FM fruit it

'ITS FRUITS are falling.'

If we isolate the clause constituents on the basis of the features of Topic and Comment, all the clause constituents introduced by daya, ya, datu, and tu are those about which something is said (Topics) and the constituents preceding them are Comments. That is, the comments appear initially in the clause followed by the topic.

Now, let us try to put the constituents introduced by daya
and the like at the initial position in the clause.

(7)' *Daya pippi:ya datu p:iatuq in=ang=anggam
       FM ducklings FM ducks-my GF-admire-comp.

       Manang,
       older-sister

       'Older sister admired THE DUCKLINGS of my ducks.'

(8)' *Daya sissi:tu nag=lalawa:n.
       FM puppies AG-come-out-comp.

       'THE PUPPIES came out.'

(9) *Datu anuq mi na=rput.
       FM chickens our AF-mass.death.

       'OUR CHICKENS died in great numbers.'

(10) *Tu untuq tu kapa:ya ma=sigru:t=a:n
       FM top FM papaya tree AF-taper-incomp.

       'THE TOP OF THE PAPAYA TREE becomes tapered (because
       the leaves dried up and fell).

(11) *Datu bu:nga na ma=pna:t pe.
       FM fruit its AF-fall-incomp. also

       'ITS FRUITS also fall.'

There are no occurrences of Topic-Comment type observed in
the texts. Therefore, I conclude that Comment-Topic is the basic
structure of Isnag clauses. I want to point out, however, that
in citation clauses, where we may have more than two NP's, it is
acceptable to have a discontinuous comment as illustrated by the
following clause (12a):
COMMENT TOPEIC

(12) a. Ginatang ne Ambadan ya anug ka 15 pesos
   GF-buy-comp. PNA Ambadan EM chicken G 15 pesos
   'Ambadan bought THE CHICKEN for 15 pesos.'

   COMMENT TOPEIC
   b. Ginatang ne Ambadan ka 15 pesos ya anug.
   GF-buy-comp. PNA Ambadan G 15 pesos EM chicken
   'Ambadan bought THE CHICKEN for 15 pesos.'

This ordering is one of the unpopular ones, the form that can be labeled 'we-can-say-it-but-we-don't' form. It is acceptable as a context-independent clause.

At this point I want to summarize the features of COMMENT and TOPIC. Logically, what is said about something (Comment) is not previously known by the hearer (new information); in other words, it is asserted. The thing about which the comment is made (Topic) is already known to the hearer (old information) and is thus presupposed. One does not, for example, say

*A woman is beautiful.

unless a woman is generic.

It is nonsensical to make a comment on something that is not previously known to the hearer.

I want to limit my discussion to these contrasting features
of COMMENT and TOPIC. Constituents with the corresponding features will then be identified appropriately. That is, clause constituents which are new and/or asserted will be designated comments and those that are old and/or presupposed will be designated topic. If in a clause, one constituent is new and another is old, then they are comment and topic respectively. However, if both are old information, the contrast will be between asserted and presupposed. The asserted information which also carries the phonological stress is comment, and the presupposed information which is phonologically unstressed is topic.

Furthermore, asserted information (Comment) and presupposed information (Topic) may be contrasted in terms of negation and question. The asserted information, being the part of the clause that is open to challenge by the hearer, is questionable and, therefore, negatable (Givon 1984:256), while the presupposed information, having been accepted by the speaker and the hearer as true is not anymore questionable and thus non-negatable (252). Presumably, for the same reason (i.e. comment is clause initial followed by the Topic), negatives and questions occur clause initially.

Although in the examples the comments were all single words, there are cases where they can be more than one word. Similarly, the topic may consist of a whole clause that is presupposed. Thus we find in texts clauses such as the following:
(12) Nadakeq agbugubugung ay daya duddu:ma
tonga tolay. T3:025
Lk people
'SOME PEOPLE'S speech is accursed.'

(13) Awan ga:ym sopung tu anu nga
none so good-result FM chicken Lk
n-idde na kiyaq. T3:058
GF-give-comp. he to-me
'THE CHICKEN he gave me has no good use.'

(14) Palotan tutu wala ya agbunga na. T3:095
exceedingly very much FM fruiting it
'ITS ABILITY TO BEAR FRUIT is exceedingly great.'

(15) Uma:n ka maluqsaw tu aganggam na. T3:244
like G angry FM admiration her
'HER ADMIRATION was like a show of anger.'

Again, the part of the clause preceded by daya, ya, and tu
constitutes the topic and the part preceding it is the whole comment.

In Tagalog, Schachter and Otanes (1972:60) propose the same
structure for the basic sentence. Other Philippine linguists
posit the same, particularly for non-verbal clauses (Porter
4.3 NP Fronting?

By way of reminder, the form of a clause with fronted NP is as diagrammed below (in which NP* = one or more NP):

```
  Clause
   /\   /
  NP  V NP*
```

The traditional reasons given for fronting are for emphasis, for highlighting an item (or giving it some prominence), and for topicalizing. I wish here to discuss the more common reasons given: emphasis and topicalization. I will argue that fronting an NP in Isnag is not topicalization. In doing so, I will appeal to the COMMENT_TOPIC pragmatic structuring of the clause (sentence) discussed above (section 4.2). That is, I interpret topicalization as putting an NP not normally in a topic position into the topic position. The structure may be diagrammed as:
In the diagram above, as in normal V, NP* ordering, the COMMENT also precedes the TOPIC. The principle, then, is that any constituent at the beginning of the clause is Comment and following is the Topic. For this reason, fronting of an NP is not topicalization because the NP does not fill the TOPIC slot when fronted. Rather, it fills the COMMENT slot, which is clause initial. Consider the clauses (8)-(12).

(8) a. Tolay ya nangan kitu anuq.
    person FM AF-eat-*comp G def. chicken
    'A person ate the chicken.'

    TOPIC

b. *Ya nangan kitu anuq, tolay.
    FM AF-eat-*comp G def. chicken person
    'A person ate the chicken.'
(9) a. Abuy ya pinarti da kagidamen.
   pig FM GF-butcher-comp. they yesterday
   'A pig was what they butchered yesterday.'

(10) a. Nge Idot ya nangan kitu ba:gal.
    PNA Idot FM AR-eat-comp. G def. banana
    'Idot ate the banana.'

(11) a. Sigarilyo ya sinakaw ne Juan.
    cigarette FM GF-steal-comp. PNA Juan
    'It was a cigarette that Juan stole.'
All the fronted NP's are in the Comment position. They exhibit the characteristics of the Comment constituent, i.e., they are all instances of new information being asserted. The topic constituents are all preceded by the definite particle *ya*, a topic (focus NP) marker. All that follows the *ya* particle is old and presupposed information. The starred (ungrammatical) clauses have fronted topics. They show that fronting the topic, the presupposed constituent, is ungrammatical.

In the succeeding paragraphs I will propose a reason for NP fronting. First, however, I want to discuss emphasis, another reason given for fronting an NP. I agree that emphasis is a more plausible characterization of fronting than others, as I shall discuss next.

Halliday (1967) suggests that new information is given stress to emphasize it. Old/given information, in contrast, is not stressed, not emphasized. Generally, then, it is the new
information that gets emphasized, not the old.

In terms of the comment-topic structure of Isneg we expect, then, the comment, the new and asserted information to be emphasized, not the topic as the old and presupposed information. All the parts of clauses (8)–(12) following ya or tu particles are all presupposed. The information preceding ya or tu is new. As a matter of fact, we can posit that the topic in clauses such as those above is copied from questions whose answers are the clauses with fronted NP's. Let us consider the questions (8)'–(12)' . All the (1)'s in the answers (2)'s are the same as clauses (8)–(12). The (2)'s are, by themselves, also appropriate answers to the questions.

(8)' a. Naganna ya nangan kitu anuq?
   What FM AF-eat-comp G def. chicken
   'What ate the chicken?'

   Ans. b. 1. Tolay ya nangan kitu anuq.
          person FM AF-eat-comp. G def. chicken
          'A person ate the chicken.'

          2. Tolay
          person
          'A person.'

(9)' a. Naganna ya pinarti da kagidamen?
   what FM GF-butcher-comp. they yesterday
   'What did they butcher yesterday?'
Ans. b. 1. Abuy ya pinarti da kagidamen.
 pig FM GF-butcher-comp. they yesterday

 'A pig (is what they butchered yesterday).

 2. Abuy
 pig

 'A pig.'

(10) a. Inna ya nangan kitu ba:gat?
 who FM AF-eat-comp. G def. banana

 'Who ate the banana?'

Ans. b. 1. Nge Idot ya nangan kitu ba:gart.
 PNA Idot FM AF-eat-comp G def. banana

 'Idot is the one who ate the banana.'

 2. Nge Idot.
 PNA Idot

 'Idot.'

(11) a. Naganna ya sina:kaw ne Juan?
 what FM GF-steal-comp. PNA Juan

 'What did Juan steal?'

Ans. b. 1. Sigarilyo ya sina:kaw ne Juan.
cigarette FM GF-steal-comp. PNA Juan

 'Cigarette is what Juan stole.'

 2. Sigarilyo.
 Cigarette

 'Cigarettes.'

(12) a. Inna tu inumbet kadaddanen?
 who FM AF-come-comp. a while ago

 'Who came a while ago?'
In the (b) clauses above, the speaker asserts the previously unknown participants, which are answers to questions (8)'-(12)'. They all are new information, and therefore they have to fill the comment position and, hence, they are fronted.

In all the clauses (8)-(12), the basic comment-topic clause structure is preserved. The primary effect of fronting an NP then is to preserve the comment-topic pragmatic structure of Isnag clause. It now becomes clear also that ya (or its equivalent) functions to partition Comment from Topic whether that Topic is a single NP or the verb plus the following NP's. Thus,

```
Speech Act (Clause)
   
   COMMENT
   
   TOPIC

(a) Normal:   Verb + stress   ya   NP (NP)

(b) Fronted:   NP or + stress
               WH-form   ya   V   NP (NP)
```
Thus, the overarching pragmatic template remains constant while syntactic constituents are permuted to achieve specific semantic effects.

In the following section, I next cite instances that will support the claim that fronting is only a special case of COMMENT-TOPIC structuring.

4.3.1 Some Instances of Fronting

Instances when NP's are fronted include questions and complete answers to questions, contrastive identification, and rank restriction.

4.3.1.1 Questions and Responses

In the preceding section, I suggested that some of the fronted NP's are answers to questions. The case I am referring to is where the answer could have been given as an independent NP, but the speaker chose to give the answer in a complete clause. I will elaborate on the case further in this section. Consider the question (13) below.

(13) Inna ya nangan kitu anuq?
what FM AF-eat-comp. G def chicken

'What ate the chicken?'
In pragmatic terms, one may assume a structure like the following for the interrogative sentence (13):

\[
\text{Speech Act-Interrogative} \\
\text{(Clause)} \\
\text{COMMENT} \\
\text{WH} \\
\text{Inna} \\
\text{TOPIC} \\
y + V + \text{NP}
\]

In response to (13) an addressee could appropriately answer the question merely with an NP, e.g., *tolay 'a person.* But if he chooses to give the answer in full form, it will be:

(14) *Tolay ya nangan kitu anug.*

person EM AF-eat-comp. G def chicken

'A person is what ate the chicken.'

It will be noticed that the phrase introduced by the particle *ya* is a copy of the question minus the question marker. The copied question is the presupposed information, while the answer NP is the asserted information, hence filling the comment position and
substituting for the original form inna. Diagrammatically, clause (14) then appears as:

```
Clause
   COMMENT  TOPIC
   Tolay    ya nangan kitu anuq.
```

4.3.1.2 Contrastive Identification

Very often new information is introduced by means of a contrastive relation with a previously known item. The contrast can be stated as 'this item, (the asserted information) not the other item' (the presupposed item). Thus, la:pis 'pencil' is first introduced in clause (15) in a contrastive relationship with aliwa 'knife,' an item made definite by virtue of its being a member of a Frame activated by the term kattab 'stab' mentioned earlier in the discourse (cf. section 4.4.1.2.1)

(15) La:pis ya maN=gan kadaqtada akkan pencil FM AP-eat-incomp. us-obl. not
    aliwa ngin. TM:018
    knife anymore

'A pencil is what will eat us, not the knife
However, when the presupposed item is explicitly mentioned earlier in the discourse, it is usually left implicit (not overtly mentioned and thus represented by zero anaphor). The asserted item is always made overt. Contrastive identification of this type is illustrated by clause (16) below (not in parenthesis).

(16) (Magpannakit ta gane nu) baka ya AF-sorrow-incomp. we-dual won't-we if steer FM kaddawan da. T3:160 GF-claim-incomp. they

'We will grieve won't we, if a steer is what they will claim.'

The baka 'steer,' is new information, and it is the asserted information which is also contrasted with the presupposed items, the previously mentioned items: the puppies, and the papaya fruit.

When the presupposed item is explicitly mentioned in the immediately preceding context, we will expect a contrastive construction of the type illustrated by clause (16). However, when the presupposed item is not explicitly mentioned, it is usually made explicit in the contrastive construction as in clause (15). Contrastive identification also carries the meaning of contraexpectation. The unexpected item is asserted informa-
tion (comment) and therefore gets fronted. Clauses (17) and (18) are illustrative:

(17) Aggi:da kammin' ya mamatay kada
    they unexpectedly FM AF-kill-incomp. G

    anna:naq da. T3:674
    children their

    'They (themselves) unexpectedly will (be the one
to) kill their children.'

Culturally, people do not kill their own relatives. In clause
(17), however, the opposite is communicated. The relative, unex-
pectedly, is the one who will kill his own children, instead of
the normal offended non-relative. Consider further clause (18):

(18) (Tangkurap lugud agkaq) aggi:da ya
    instead then surely they FM

    matay mapak-pakuna. T3:684
    GF-die-incomp. in-such-case

    'They will be the one instead who will die if such is
the case.'

The aggi:da 'they,' who try to kill their enemies, are the ones
who, unexpectedly, get killed instead. 'They,' the new (asser-
ted) information, is in contrast with 'their enemies,' the
presupposed information which is retrievable from context. The
contrast is made even more explicit by the added particle tang-
kurap 'instead.' Examples (17) and (18) illustrate the Comment-Topic structure in which both contain old information. The comment is asserted and thus receives phonological stress and the topic is presupposed and therefore it is unstressed. In (17) the assertion made is that the parents will kill their children instead of the presupposed or expected offended non-relative. Likewise, in (18), the assertion is that aggida da 'they' who try to kill their enemy will be the ones who will get killed instead.

4.3.1.3 Rank Restriction

I have proposed a ranking of the different semantic roles in terms of preferential selection by the verb (section 2.3). I posited that the ranking imposes some restrictions on the relationship of the different roles, their co-occurrence, and their relative positions in the clause. I also proposed that one of the co-occurrence restrictions imposed by the PS hierarchy is on the co-occurrence of two definite NP's. When both the agent and the goal are realized by pronouns and/or proper names, only the goal can be focused in the normal V, NP, NP, constituent order (2.3.1.3). I proposed a rule of definiteness focus condition. I will restate the rule here:
If two NP's are definite, the lower ranked of the two may be focused but not the higher ranked one.

This definiteness restriction can, however, be circumvented by fronting. That is, when both agent and goal are definite and are realized by pronouns and/or proper names, the agent can be focused by fronting it. Clause (19) illustrates the point:

    he AG-shine-comp. them
    'He shone on them.' /'It was he who shone on them.'

    b. *Nani:la:g aggi:na kaggida
       AP-shine-comp. he them
       'He shone on them.'

It is ungrammatical to have the same clause in agent focus in the normal V, NP, NP, order, e.g., clause (19)b. If, for some reason, the normal V, NP, NP order has to be preserved, the clause must be in the goal focus, illustrated in clause (20)a below.

(20) a. Dinila:gan nada.
       GF-shine-comp. he they
       'He shone on them.'

    b. *Nani:la:g nada.
       AP-shine-comp. he they
'He shone on them.

The agent focus clause in (20)b is ungrammatical.

NP fronting is clearly a syntactic phenomenon. However, the motivation for fronting is not explainable on the basis of syntactic facts about verbs and noun phrases but on the basis of their pragmatic features, i.e. whether they are new and/or asserted information or old and/or presupposed information. In this respect, the pragmatic aspect of focus constrains the syntactic ordering of the verbs and the noun phrases.

4.4 Aspects of Presupposed Items

In this part of chapter 4, I discuss the pragmatic considerations in choosing the NP for focusing. Specifically, I discuss different features that make an NP eligible for focus.

In previous studies of Philippine languages, several researchers have been unanimous in the observation that all focus items are necessarily definite (Schachter and Otanes 1972:60, Naylor 1973:107, Schachter 1976:496, etc.). Indefinite NP's may not be focused. Definiteness has been well discussed and defined by philosophers and linguists. I will not attempt to add to the definitions they set forth. Instead, I simply assume that definite information is that information that is presumed to be in the consciousness of the hearer at the time of utterance.
(Chafe 1976:30). It is, therefore, so treated by the speaker through appropriate linguistic signals. The hearer in turn confirms or disconfirms by virtue of his reaction (Givon 1978:296, 1984:399).

In this section, I discuss the various categories of definite information in Isnaq. These categories may be summarized as follows:

![Definite Information Diagram]

4.4.1 Textually Conditioned Definite Information

Textually definite information is that which is given definite status by virtue of being mentioned explicitly in the text or by close association with other actually mentioned items. I here categorize these as textually given and non-textually given definite information, respectively.
4.4.1.1 Textually Given

Textually given definite information includes only that which is explicitly mentioned earlier in the text. Ordinarily, such information is first introduced as new information (and therefore indefinite) either with an existential clause or in relation to other already definite information. The clauses (21) and (22) below illustrate the means of introducing new information.

(21) Ata:n maq pe kapa:ya kitu agra:ng there-is cert. also papaya L front
kurung mi. T3:093
poultry-house our

'There also was a papaya tree in front of our poultry house.'

(22) Kitu isa nga Dominggo nag=sabbu L one Lk Sunday AF-temper-comp.
kami ka parakul. AS:1
we G axe

'One Sunday we tempered axes.'

The kapa:ya 'papaya tree' is introduced as new information in clause (21) and the parakul 'axes' is introduced as new information in clause (22). It will be noticed that in both clauses (21) and (22), the only known information is the speaker himself. In (21) the clause only asserts the existence of the item the
speaker is trying to introduce. In (22), the only known (old/presupposed) information is the speaker and his friends, and therefore it is the only eligible topic as indicated by the pronoun kami 'we (exclusive)' inflected for agent focus agreeing with the prefix nag-. In their subsequent mention, the new information will be referred to as definite information marked by any of the following: definite article (tu or ya), pronominal reference (see 3.3), proper names, or zero anaphora. Thus, in subsequent reference kapa:ya 'papaya tree' in clause (23) below, is referred to by the pronoun na 'it', and with the definite particle (focus marker) tu in clause (24).

(23)...palotan tutu wala agbunga na. T3:095 exceedingly very much fruit-bearing it 'It bears so much fruit.'

(24)...ma=sigru:ta:n tu untuq tu kapa:ya. T3:119 GF-taper-incomp. FM top FM papaya tree 'The top of the papaya tree became tapered (because all its leaves fell).

Similarly, parakul 'axe' mentioned in (25) is subsequently referred to in (26) by a full noun phrase with the definite particle tu. It is also referred to by the use of zero anaphor in clause (27).
(25) Kitu is na Dominggo nag=sabbu kami
when one Lk Sunday AF-temper-comp. we
ka parakul. AS 001
G axe

'One Sunday, we tempered axes.'

(26) ...s=in=et ku win tu parakul ku. AS:005
GF-sharpen-comp. I already FM axe my

'I immediately sharpened my axe.'

(27) Ay di:kod natadam tutu wala AS:009
And therefore sharp very much

'Therefore (it) was very very sharp.'

Textually established fictional characters are typically introduced by existential clauses and then referred to by names. Clauses (28) and (29) are illustrations.

(28) 'Tu nunna nga algaw ay ata:n magata:wa. DM:1
L first Lk day Lk there-is husband-wife

'In the olden days, there was a husband and wife.'

(29) De Berto se Sanang. DM:2
PN pl Berto and Sanang

'They are Berto and Sanang.'

While introduction of participants with the existential clause is applicable only to fictional characters, participants who exist in the real world are very rarely introduced in this fashion. Instead, they are immediately introduced as definite information
by means of proper names.

4.4.1.2 Textually Non-given

Most of the definite reference in Ismag texts, especially conversational texts, does not fall into the category of textually given information. It is, rather, given situationally by virtue of culturally conventional associations. Such associations involve lexico-semantic relationships such as the those invoked by the notions of Frame (van Dijk 1977, and Minsky 1980) and Script (Schank and Abelson 1977).

4.4.1.2.1 Frames

Van Dijk (1977:18-21) defines Frame as the "structural representation of our world knowledge." It includes both "cognitively and socially (culturally) determined knowledge." He also proposes that "frames define units or chunks of concepts which are not essentially but typically related."

The frame format "is one of links fanning out from a conceptual control center, with no single commitment to a sequence of actualization" (de Beaugrande 1980:140). Frame is a "set of static facts about the world" (Brown and Yule 1983:243). Each given item in the discourse, then, belongs to a frame or a semantic domain.
When an item B belongs in the same semantic domain as the item A mentioned earlier in the discourse, then Item B is given the status of definiteness at its first explicit mention. Consider the Isnag clauses below.

(30) Ataːn maŋ pe kapaːya kitu agraːng
    there-is cert. also papaya-tree L front
    kurung mi...  T3:093
    poultry-house our

"There was also a papaya tree in front of our poultry house.

(31) ma=siɡruːtaːŋ nin tu untuŋ tu kapaːya T3:119
    GF-taper-incomp now FM Top FM papaya tree

'THE TOP OF THE PAPAYA TREE became tapered (because all the leaves dried up and fell).'

(32) Ay mapnaːt pe tu buːŋga na. T3:125
    And GF-fall- incomp. also FM fruit it

'And ITS FRUIT fell too.'

The untuŋ 'top' in clause (31) was not mentioned earlier in the discourse. It is definite in clause (31) because of its semantic association with the kapaːya 'papaya tree' mentioned in clause (30). Similarly, tu buːŋga na 'its fruit' (32) is also definite as a member of the same semantic domain or frame.

When an item is given definite status, all items and events within the same frame are also evoked in the consciousness of the
hearer (du Bois 1980:215) and therefore are equally eligible for definite reference. Thus a definite reference to 'apartment' in English at the same time implies the definiteness of conventionally expected sections of the 'apartment,' e.g., kitchen, living room, bathroom, etc. (Linde, 1983:207).

Similarly, du Bois (1980:236) says that "knowing the semantic class of a referent will give us an appropriate idea of whether or not it will be definite at first mention." For if the new referent belongs to a Frame already introduced, its definiteness is predetermined.

4.4.1.2.2 The Script

Another notion which explains discourse definiteness is Script. It is analogous to Frame, but the elements within a script are not static. Event sequences are involved (Schank and Abelson 1977). These are "action stereotypes (Bower, et al 1979) for peoples' knowledge of routine activities." It instructs them on how they should act and what they should say (de Beaugrande 1980:140ff) in specific situations.

When a particular activity in a script is described in a text, the entire script is evoked in the consciousness of the hearer. All action and all entities in the entire script thus become eligible for definiteness without specific previous men-
tion in the discourse. As an illustration, let us examine clauses (33) and (34).

(33) Nawe nanglawan ya AF-go-comp. AF-take-out-rice-from-granary-comp. FM
isa nga bagbakat. SSB:1
one Lk old-woman
'One old woman went to get rice from the granary.'

(34) a. ...se na 'we
and she AF-go-comp.
b. ne=bila:g ka ambaw. SSB:2
GF-sun-dry-comp. L river-bank

'And then she went to dry (IT) on the riverbank.'

The verb nanglawan 'get rice from the granary,' in clause (33), which is unique to the rice-pounding script elicits the whole process of pounding (to unhusk) rice. Incidentally, the action nanglawan is the first activity in the script. The primary element 'rice' in the script is not overtly mentioned. It is inherent in the verb nanglawan 'to get rice from the granary.' Thus, the speaker can refer to rice in clause (34b) via the definitizing zero anaphor and Goal focus.

In another text, Ya Mamalet 'Making Wild-animal Trap called Balet;' the first mention of the term mamalet 'to make wild-animal trap called Balet' brings into the consciousness of the hearer his experiential knowledge of making this particular
trap. This reference also activates the entire procedure with all the steps, processes, materials, and participants necessary to accomplish the goal, i.e., to make the trap for catching wild animals for food. All these then become eligible for definiteness and, consequently, eligible for focus. We thus find definite marking (ya) of items such as ya li:tu 'tying vine,' ya da:wr 'the spring,' ya maya:n 'the spear' etc., in this text even on their first mention, since they are all conventional parts and materials for making the trap. Animals usually caught in such traps are also treated as definite in their first mention, e.g., ya addag lama:n 'the back of the wild pig,' ya ughta, 'the deer,' etc.

In the text AN:8, items such as tu ba:si 'the sugar cane wine,' ya a:tu 'the dog,' tu bassaw 'the reed' were not previously mentioned, but they are given definite status in clause (35) below. They are all prescribed elements in the Isnag 'animistic ceremony' mentioned earlier in the discourse.

(35) Sinampatangguq se ya a:tu, a:buy, tu ba:si, bamboo-music-inst. and FM dog pig FM wine

tu bassaw.
FM reed

'(We have) bamboo musical instrument, THE DOG, PIG, THE SUGAR WINE, THE REED.'
4.4.2 Non Textually Conditioned Presupposed Items

In addition to the items textually given by the speaker, there are other items which are also given definite status by virtue of being present in the immediate physical context of the communication situation.

There is also information that may not be physically present in the immediate context of the communication situation but which is assumed by the speaker to be known to the hearer. This is also given definite status (see 4.4.2.2). I will categorize these items as 'non-textually non-given.'

4.4.2.1 Non-Textually Presupposed Items

Entities that are physically present in the communication situation are given definite status. The speaker and the hearer are, of course, always definite (Brown and Yule 1983:183, du Bois, 1980:235). Clauses (36)-(38) have items in them that are given definite status due to their presence in the communication situation.

(36) Kitu isa nga Dominggo, nag=sabbu kami
     L one Lk Sunday AF-temper-comp. us

     ka parakul. AS:1
     G axe
'One Sunday, we tempered axes.'

(37) Ne'y! Awan datu sissitu nu win. T3:001
Oh none EM pl. puppy your already

'Oh, YOUR PUPPIES are all gone.'

(38) Nganna pe yala ya a:tu kitunni. T2a:12
too-much also just EM dog there

' THAT DOG there is just too much.'

The pronoun kami 'we excl.' in clause (36) refers to the speaker himself who is, obviously, physically present at the time of communication. In clause (37), the speaker refers to datu sissitu 'the puppies,' some of which are physically present at the time of the discourse. Likewise, ya a:tu kitunni 'that dog there' involves a physically present referent.

Another class of entities given definite status in their first mention are the uniques. These are "entities which every sensorily endowed member of a communication group is assumed to know" (de Beaugrande 1980:138), e.g., the sun, moon, sky, etc. Thus, ya mata 'the sun' in clause (39) is definite in its first mention.

(39) Ay kane gabì tagenap ku ya mata
And when evening GF-dream-comp. I EM sun

nga tang-tangapi:ngit tu masingan ku.
Lk only half EM GF-see-incomp. I

'And in the evening I dreamt of the sun of which I
could see only half.'

Speakers are not, of course, certain what their hearers know or do not know. But to carry on a meaningful and productive conversation, the speaker usually makes assumptions and conveys them to the hearer via appropriate linguistic signals. In English, we employ the definite articles (DuBois 1970, Kramsky 1972) or in many cases, phonological stress/intonation to signal the assumption that certain information is known to the hearer (Halliday 1976, Bolinger 1972). Our assumption may be confirmed by our hearer, or he may reject it. If our assumption is rejected, the hearer typically reflects the rejection somehow in subsequent linguistic or other responses. If such information is crucial, the speaker normally takes time to establish a file of the new information in the hearer's memory. He specifies this information by linking it to other information already known. Thus, for example, in the following portion of conversation from text 8, Udoy makes the wrong assumption that Ramon already knows Kulling. Realizing her mistake through Ramon's denial, she then makes a deliberate effort to help Ramon establish the 'Kulling' file. Ramon elicits some delimiting information to isolate Kulling in the conversation from the other possible Kullings.

Udoy: Adu kanu maq tolay kiyan de Kulling da many it-is-said cert. people there PN Kulling they
There are many people there, reportedly. Kulling and her family. They live in two separate houses, her and her father's other family members. Their father lives in a separate house.'

Ramon: Kulling nga?
Kulling Lk

'Kulling who?'

Udoy: Naggan na tu Kulling ne ammanaang ne ata:wa
what it NOM Kulling of niece/nephew of spouse

Tangelan.
Tangelan

'Kulling, the niece of Tangelan's wife.'

Lina: Ata:wa Paulo ya:n
spouse Paulo that

'She is Paulo's wife.'

Jose: Paulo tada maq a.
Paulo our cert.

'Our very own Paulo.'

Udoy: Manurgang de uwa ina Arsit.
child-in-law of mother Arsit

'She is the daughter-in-law of Arsit's mother.'

Jose: An-anag de Siglangat se itu i:kit ten. Paulo
child of Siglangat and that aunt dec. part. Paulo

'tada kam a.
our same cert.

'He is the son of Siglangat and our deceased Aunt. Our
own Paulo.'

Udoj: Paulo nu wa iAgutungan nga an-anag de Siglangat
Paulo your Lk from-Agutungan Lk child of Siglangat
se tun Konay.
and that Konay

'Your Paulo who is from Agutungan, who is also the son of
Siglangat and the deceased Konay.'

Jose: Wagi ne anti ya magan-anag kaggin:na
sibling of auant NOM parent of him
'His mother (parent) is aunt's sibling.'

Ramon: Wagi natu ata:wa ne Busal..? Busal ne Bunay.
sibling of spouse of Busal Busal of Bunay

'The sibling of Busal's wife..? Busal, Bunay's husband.'

Jose: Mn.. wagi Balag.
yes sibling Balag

'Yes, sibling of Balag.'

It will be noticed that each of the three participants
tried to associate the unknown Kulling with people they are more
sure are known to Ramon, the only way Ramon will be able to know
and identify Kulling.

In Isnag, the primary mechanism used to cue the hearer as to
the information status of some information, i.e. whether the
information is assumed by the speaker as old or new to the
hearer, is the focus system. Thus, in (1) (from Text 3 utterance
1), the speaker makes the correct assumption that 'the puppies'
are in fact known to the hearers. The plural focus marker datu
thus marks sissi:tu 'puppies' as old information:
(40) Ramon: Ney! Awan datu sissitu nu win. T3:1

'Oh, so YOUR PUPPIES are gone!'

4.4.2.2 Non-Textually Non-given Items

There is information which is given definite status which is neither given in the text nor physically present in the communication situation. It is made definite by virtue of its direct association with entities physically present in the communication situation. In this sense, it is the same as the Frames and Scripts mentioned in 4.4.1.2, where information is made definite by its association with information explicitly mentioned in the text. While Frames and Scripts are activated by explicit mention of any of their constituents, the non-textually non-given items are activated by the physically present item in the communication situation to which they are associated. In other words, the non-textually non-given items are part of the Frame of the situationally present items.

The non-textually non-given items include entities stored in the knowledge shared by the speaker and hearer through personal familiarity or mutual experience (de Beaugrande 1980:138), and entities associated with either the speaker or the hearer, such as their kin and their possessions. It also includes insti-
tutionalized entities, prototypical entities that function as representative of a class, superlative entities that occupy the extreme position on some variable scale (de Beaugrande 1980:138), proper names and locations, and culturally shared items (Givon 1984:399ff). The focus items in clauses (41)-(44) are made definite in their first mention.

(41) Nasamnga akkaq ala pe tu baqbakat ku kitun (T9:3) grave modal only also FM old-woman my before

'I believe MY WIFE was also very grave before (when she was sick).

The item tu baqbakat ku 'my wife' though never mentioned earlier, is definite by its associative (kinship) relation with the speaker.

(42) I=bbruweng ku manin ya pu:kug ku (T2b:1b) GE-drain-incomp. I again FM pig-pen my

'I'll drain MY PIG PEN again.'

The pu:kug 'pig pen' is definite by its possessive association with the speaker. Furthermore, the item is a common possession of members of the culture of speaker and hearer.

'UCCP' is a familiar local institution and is thus also definite in (43) without being mentioned earlier.
(43) Ag-agb=a:n daya U CCP da kanu.
GF-mock-incomp. FM pl. U CCP they reportedly

'They are mocked by THE U CCP people, reportedly.'

The 'Iloko' and the 'Ibanag' people are definite in their first
mention in (44) by virtue of their uniqueness as cultural groups.

(44) Na:gan naya am-ammu daya Iloko se da
what G GF-know-tsl F pl. Iloko and F pl.
Ibanag ki makapakka=pakkaw. NBD:72
Ibanag of AF-exult-incomp.

'What do THE IBANAG PEOPLE and THE ILOKO PEOPLE know
about self-exultation.'

The proper name 'Evelyn' in (45) below has not been mentioned
earlier but is given definite status since she is the only
person by that name in the village.

(45) Tu n=iddeq ke Evelyn T3:009
MP GF-give-comp. PN Evelyn

'The one I gave EVELYN.'

A specific location such as Santa Fe in (46) is given definite
status in its first mention since it is unambiguous.

(46) Na=nalen kayu win ka Santa Fe. T2b:11
AF-walk-comp. you pl. already L Santa Fe

'And YOU then came via Santa Fe.'
Titles are treated as proper names in Isnag. They are categorized as uniquely identifiable entities. Hence, *meyor 'mayor'* in clause (47) is preceded by the particle *ce* usually used for proper names, e.g., *ye Bulut.*

(47) Nawe ye Meyor ra nagdaq=dagdaq kada
AF-go-comp. PN mayor Lk AF-visit-pst L'pl.

baranggay na. T7:3
districts his

'THE MAYOR went to visit his districts.'

There are some entities which can be categorized as uniques in certain specific contexts. The item *datu pulis 'the policemen'* in text TNBD (Tu Nagpatay de Bucao se Daw-ayan "The Fight between Bucao and Daw-ayan") is identified by the hearers of the discourse as the policemen in the town in whose jurisdiction the story was told. Also *tu dispinsari 'the dispensary'* is understood as the dispensary of the hospital in the same town where the story was told. In general, the items *ya saturday 'the spring water trough'* (a trough channelling the water from the source spring to the middle of the village), and *ya iskul 'the school'* are always referred to by the villagers as definite items and are understood to refer to the water trough and the school in the village.

Furthermore, *nge gubernador 'the governor'* is understood by the hearer to refer to the governor of the province the speaker
and the hearer are located in at the time of the interaction. Also *nge presidenti* 'the president' only refers to the president of the country where the participants are during the conversation.

4.5 The Pragmatic Conditioning Factor in the Choice of Focus

Under the pragmatic category, I explore here only the dominant factor of Topic Maintenance. *Topic* as used here is the referential material being talked about in a stretch of communicative exchange. Typically, a topic develops immediately when an item is introduced either as new information related to old, or as old information. When introduced as new information, such an item is non-focus. However, in subsequent reference to it, the item must necessarily be in focus unless the topic changes. When the interlocutors decide to maintain a topic, they use appropriate signals, one of which is the focus system. Therefore, if the chosen topic is being treated semantically as Goal, the majority of the clauses in that stretch of communication will incorporate Goal focus marking. Goal topic maintenance is illustrated by the following clauses (48)-(51), in which the topic is *ar:tu* 'dog' and her *sissi:tu* 'puppies.'
(48) (Tu:ya nu ata:n mag-an-anaq atu
that's why when there is AF-give-birth-incomp. dog
mi)
or
'That's why when we have a bitch (dog) that gives
birth,

isir=siruq na ababbing ki linung
GF-hide-comp. he/she child L under

puga:ru. T3:138
table-stove

'The child hides (THEM) under the table-stove.'

(49) Di na palawan=an da sissitu. T3:142
not she/he GF-let-out-incomp. FM pl. puppy

'She will not let THE PUPPIES out.'

(50) Wayya ta la kod kannaw=an
rhet.q we dual rhet.q would GF-taboo-incomp.

kaddaw=an nu magda=dakkal T3:145
GF-ask-for-incomp. when AG-grow-big-incomp.

'Would we hold THEM back if someone ask for THEM as
long as THEY are big enough.'

(51) Allak=kan mu datu sissitu amang...T3:151.
GF-get-incomp. you FM pl. puppy mother

'Mom, you get THE PUPPIES.'

Within the stretch of communication illustrated above, the
speakers did not have the choice of focus NP. They will not
choose for focus the agent NP if they are not ready to change the
topic of their conversation. Therefore, once the topic is
chosen, the speaker does not have a choice on which NP to focus.
The choice left to the speaker to make is whether or not to change the topic, in which case the focus will subsequently be changed.

Thus, focusing the agent NP in any of the clauses above will terminate, at least interrupt, the continuity of the topic. It will be a signal that the speaker is switching to another topic. Thus, if we change the goal focused clause (51) into an agent focused clause (52) below, the topic will change to, say, 'hunting dogs.' Strictly speaking, when such a change of focus NP occurs, the referent of the topic sissitu 'puppies' in clauses (48)-(51) will be different from the referent of the sissitu 'puppy' in clause (52). It is in these terms that there is a change in topic.

(52) Mang=allaq ka ka sissitu amang.
    AF-get-incomp. you (sing.) G puppy mother

'Mom, you get a puppy.'

When the chosen topic is typically an agent, the clauses in the stretch of communication will focus the agent NP. The clauses (53)-(57) illustrate a stretch of communication where the topic is an agent. When any of the clauses is focused for location the topic will change. Choosing the location NP as focus is a signal that the interlocutors are ready to change their topic.
In the clauses below, both the agents and the location are all definite and are equally qualified for focusing. However, the agent NP’s are chosen for focus over the location.

(53) Na=nalen kayu win ka Santa Fe. T2b:15
    AG-walk-comp. you pl. now L Santa Fe.
    'YOU came via Santa Fe.'

(54)... (nag)=daretsu kami la ngin ka
    AF-go-straight-comp. we now already L
    Bagabag. T2b:12
    Bagabag
    'WE (then) went straight to Bagabag.'

(55) Nag=plane kayu nawe ka
    AF-take-plane-comp. you AP-go-comp. L
    Bagabag. T2b:13
    Bagabag
    'Did YOU take a plane going to Bagabag?'

(56) Nag=bus kami. T2b:14
    AF-take-bus-comp. we
    'WE took a bus.'

(57) May na=nalen kayu ka Santa Fe. T2b:15
    but AP-walk-comp. you L Santa Fe
    'But YOU came via SANTA FE.'

Focusing any of the clause from (53)–(57) for location will change the topic from the travelers (the manner of their travel) to their route. Let us illustrate this by changing clauses (53) and (54).
(53) D=in=alen nu win ya Santa Fe. 
GF-walk-comp. you pl. now FM Santa Fe

'You then went through SANTA FE.'

(54) D=in=aretsu mi la ngin ya Bagabag. 
GF-go-straight-comp. we no already FM Bagabag

'We then went straight to Bagabag.'

It will noticed that the focused NP's typically are all location. However, their role in the above clauses as designated by the verbal affix is Goal. They are not focusable as Location. The following clauses are not acceptable.

(53)' *D=in=alen=ai:n nu win ya Santa Fe. 
LF-walk-comp. you pl. now FM Santa Fe

'You came through Santa Fe.'

(54)' *D=in=aretsu=wa:n mi la ngin ya Bagabag. 
LF-walk-comp. we no already FM Bagabag

'We then went straight through Bagabag.'

In section 3.3, I mentioned that the central feature of the focus item is its definiteness. Before an NP receives the ya marking it has to be definite, i.e., it is in the consciousness of the hearer or is easily evoked in his consciousness. The ya NP is one of the NP's occurring postverbally. The markers ya, ka, ki, etc. are not assigned arbitrarily. Their assignment to an NP depends on the definiteness status of the NP, which is a
pragmatic feature. Thus, the \textit{ya NP} is constrained by the pragmatic feature of definiteness.
CONCLUSION

We observed in the study that the focus phenomenon in Isnag is fully manifested by the clause, through its constituents and the positions they take in the clause.

We also observed that the pragmatic and semantic levels of language interact to determine focus, which is then manifested in the syntax of the clause. The syntactic form accommodates the input from the pragmatic and semantic aspects in defining focus. There is then a very close interdependence of pragmatic, semantic, and syntactic levels of Isnag in manifesting the focus phenomenon. This is demonstrated most tellingly in the clause in which the Agent and Goal NP's are both definite (a pragmatic feature). The Preferential Selection Hierarchy (the ranking of the semantic roles) imposes constraints on the clause, preventing the Agent NP from being focused (cf. 2.2.4, example (9)) and the focused Goal NP from preceding the non-focus Agent NP.

Due to the close interdependence of the three levels, i.e., pragmatics, semantics and syntax, the focus phenomenon cannot be fully described in terms of only one level. Therefore, attempting to describe the focus phenomenon in strictly grammatical or semantic terms will be inadequate and will encounter serious problems.

Subsequently, I would like to see more studies
investigating the focus system in the way suggested in this study (i.e., a multilevel analysis). However, there are some specific areas that may need to be studied in the immediate future that would, hopefully, offer a simpler analysis than what has been presented here. Specifically, I would like to look into the possibility of revising the rules suggested in chapter 2. This may require a restatement of the Preferential Selection Hierarchy and consequently the restriction rules (see 2.4.2).

Another area that deserves further investigation is the matter of agency, or rather the affixes that signal agency. In two-or-more-argument verbs, the semantic role Agent, the ultimate primemover of an action, is signalled by the affix nag-. However, in some one-argument verbs, the Agent focus affix nag- does not signal roles which correspond to any primemover, rather to some patient-like participant (cf. 2.4.1.1).

The particles ya and tu may eventually need to be investigated in much more detail. Their respective functions are by no means exhausted in this study. In addition, a study of their discourse function may prove crucial in understanding the Isnag literature.

In chapter 4, I argued that the occurrence of a preverbal NP is motivated by the Comment-Topic structure of the Isnag clause. I have stated that, characteristically, the fronted NP is new, asserted, negatable, and questionable. The possibility
of occurrence of old and presupposed information in the preverbal position is yet to be verified and investigated. Such a possibility can be conceived of in a situation where two interlocutors are recounting an experience in which they both participated or both observed, in which all the information is shared, and hence definite.

In sum, it is the hope of this study that several other areas of study of the focus system have been evoked and would eventually contribute to the refinement of the theory of the focus (topic) system of Philippine languages.
APPENDIX

TEXT 3 (Conversational Discourse)
ABBREVIATIONS

caus = causative

cert. = certitude particle

comp. = completive aspect

cont. = continuative

def. = definite

dimin = diminutive

disapp. = disappointment particle

excl. = exclusive

hest. = hesitation particle

impl. = implied

incl. = inclusive

incomp. = incompletive aspect

Lk = link

mann. = manner

Obl. = oblique pronoun

part. = particle

pl. = plural

PN = proper name

PNA = marker when non-focus agent is proper name

poss. = possessive

prn. = pronoun

puzzl = puzzlement
Q = question
recip = reciprocal
rhet = rhetorical
sing. = singular
uncert = uncertainty
unexpec = unexpected particle

Text Abbreviations

AN = An-anitu 'Spirits'
AS = Amante's Story
DA = Dungkuwan se Ayu 'Dungkuwan and Ayu'
K = Kibkibbali 'About Kibkibbali'
NBD = Ngaptay de Bucao se Daw-ayan 'Duel Between Bucao and Daw-ayan'
SG = Story of Gisorab
SSB = Story of the Sussuwetan Bird
TNEBJ = Tu Nekatay de Bagabag se Juan 'The Death of Bagabag and John'
T2a = Text 2 (a)
T2b = Text 2 (b)
T3 = Text 3
T7 = Text 7
T9 = Text 9
Conversational Discourse

Ramon: Ney! Awan datu sissi:tu nu win! oh none FM-pl. puppies your already 001

Oh! You don't have your puppies anymore.

Erlinda: Datu pusaq?... Ata:n kam isa nga 002
          FM-pl. white there-is yet one Lk
          naniw-ni:wa:ng
          very-skinny 003

The white ones?...There's still one and very skinny.

Ludag: Datu kuwa nu? 004
          FM-pl. own your

How about yours?

Ramon: Ata:n isa nga nagki-kiramtu. 005
          there-is one Lk sickly-thin

We have only one (left) and (it) is sickly and skinny.

Monoq: 'Nammin da tutu wala natay? 006
          GF-consume-comp. they very much GF-die-comp.

Did they all die?

Ramon: Ata:n ka allod tu isa may 007
          there-is L upstream FM-sing. one but
magimmamatay pe. dying also 008

One is in the downstream village but it is also dying.

Erlinda: Tu niddleke Evelyn. 009

Nepatarakan ku kagida se 010
GF-take-care-comp. I them and

de angkel ka las yer. 011
PNA uncl L last year

The one I gave Evelyn. I asked her and Uncle to take
care of it last year.

Ramon: Tu isa nga naluglugmag gala 012
FM-sing. one Lk fatter only

nga.... 013
Lk

The one that was a little fatter that was...

Erlinda: Inimman kanu ne 014
GF-hold-comp. disc. PNA-sing.

Ludasan. Likud din Ludasan nin, 015
Ludasan back now Ludasan now

newaren kanu win. 016
GF-fall-dead-comp. disc. now

I was told that Ludasan held it. And when Ludasan left,
it fell dead, reportedly, just like that.

Ramon: ....innanama:n ku wa akkan 017
GF-hope/expect-comp. I Lk not
I was hoping it would live because it was fatter (than the rest of them). (A puppy) like it is worth more than 200 pesos in Ilocos. My son-in-law said that a puppy just weaned from its mother would cost 200 pesos. But...
Nalibat. Ay datu sissi:tu
AF-died-comp. and FM-pl. puppies

natu isa nga gaganaq mi,
possessive one Lk bitch our

nammin da la pe natay.
GF-consume-comp. they just also AF-die-comp.

Pati tu gaganaq mi isa.
including FM-sing. bitch our one

Natay 'Ra la 'ta:n
AF-die-comp. rhet.-q rhet.-pat. there-is

pangisuqli:na:n mu kitu luqluqmag
LF-push-incomp. you L plumpness

natu gaganaq mi nga bigbitig.
possessive bitch our Lk very-small

Tu garit. Natay maq. la
FM-sing. striped AF-died-comp. cert. just

tun. Nagtakit. Panda kiya we
that. AF-sick-comp. since L AF-go-pst

namalikat ne
AF-utter-comp. PNA_sing.

kuwa ka a:tu kadakami.
what's-his-name G dog 2nd Per. obl.

That puppy did not get sick. It was bitten by some dogs. It
died instantly. The puppies of our other bitch, they also all
died. Also our other bitch, it died. Our small bitch was so
fat, the striped one. That one died (unexpectedly). It got sick
since what's his name, uttered the word 'dog' to us.

Monoq: Sa:yang maq. ala.
a-waste cert. only

It surely was a shame (waste).
Erlinda: Ata:n kid ubraan da tuni a 042 there-is seems GF-do-incomp. they those ..

Those people seem to do something (to make the puppies sick).

Ramon: Tu lugud ya.... FM-sing. then Lk

That's the reason that...

Erlinda: Ata:n inubra ne 044 there-is GF-do-comp. PNA-sing.

Ludasan na nagmud ku ki 045
Ludasan Lk GF-notice-comp. I obl.

anuq a weq inadang 046
chicken Lk AF-go-comp-I GF-ask-comp.

kaggi:da ta pagba:ng na 047
3rd. Per. obl. because GF-offer-incomp. he
indeed and AF-pluck-out-comp. G feather
na anuq. Maddi umab-abay 049
possessive chicken will-not AF-grew-icomp.

ya anuq a kadi inala 050
FM-sing. chicken .. cert. GF-get-comp.

ku kaggi:da. Nagangaya:n na 051
I 3rd Per. obl. AF-end-up-comp. it
natay. Ata na:n Sipat nga 052
AF-die-comp. Because said Sipat Lk

"Kanna:m pikam mala pe ya 053
what-to-do-you yet only also FM-sing.
duq:duq:dut?" na:n Sipat. 054
feather-dimin. said Sipat
"Ta:nib ta." Ay malugsa nguyo herbal-medicine we-dual and AF-mad-incomp. we Sipat. Nanigdut kammala PNF Sipat AF-pluck-out-comp. anyway a nga Ludasan. Ney! ngamay at:wan PNF Ludasan Oh but none gayam sopung tu anuq nga so good-result FM-sing. chicken Lk nidde na. GF-give-comp. he

I noticed something that Ludasan did on the chicken I got from them because they offered (it to me). He plucked out a feather from the chicken. The chicken I got from them is not growing at all. It finally died. (That happened) because Sipat said, "What would you do with the feather?" Sipat said. "I'll use it as medicine." Sipat was upset. But Ludasan plucked out some feathers anyway. But oh, the chicken he gave to me was no use (to me).

Monoq: Napiya la nu akkan gata:ngan good only if not GF-buy-incomp. daya kuwa FM-pl. ....

It's good if you don't buy the....

Erlinda: Akkan. Ta ipaqba:g . na maq no because GF-offer-incomp. he cert. lugud. "Umbet ka ka balay, surely AF-come-incomp. you L house ta iddan taka ka anuq," because GF-give-incomp. you-me G chicken
na:n na la ur-ura:yan.
said he just matter-of-factly

No. Because he offers it. "Come to the house because I'll give you a chicken," he says casually.

Monoq: Ay ya:n nala sa:yang a
and that only waste ..

But it's only a waste.

Ramon: Awan kid kam kukkuwaan na
none seems yet GF-do-incomp. 3rd. Per. sing.

du:du:ma may ya pinangkata:dam
some but FM-sing. sharpness

kid naya bugung da na:n
seems oblique-sing. mouth their said

ku. Tu yanni ya baqbakat
I FM-sing. that FM-sing. old-woman

ki allod, ay dumu:ma tutu wala
L downstream Lk exceptional very much

tadam bugung naya:n Umma:n
sharpness mouth oblique-her. same

pe ye Manang Martina.
also PNF elder-sister Martina

Ata:n da pa:tu mi kitu
there-is FM-pl. duck our L

kowad pa:tu nga inalaq baqbakat
there-was duck Lk GF-get-comp. old-woman

kanna:n Dadakkal lin datu
there-far big-pl. already FM-pl.
pippi:yaq na. Se itu pa:tu
ducklings it and FM-sing. duck

ne Ittin na we na
possessive-per. Ittin Lk AF-go-comp. she

neamung kadatu pa:tuq.
GF-add-comp. Obl-the duck-my

Inang-anggam Manang daya
pippi:yaq datu pa:tuq. Ney!
dicklings FM-pl. duck-my oh

naggugu:nud da la nga natay.
AF-follow-comp. they just Lk AF-die-comp.

Awan tallu algaw na. Awan nin
none three day it none already

ina:gaq datu duwa nga paganaan.
brood FM-pl. two Lk hen

I think some of them don't do anything, but I think it's just that their speech is acursed. the old woman downstream is also one (of them). Her spech is exceptionally sharp (acursed). The same is true with elder sister Martina. We had some ducks, that time when we still had the duck my wife got (from Ilocos). Its ducklings were already big. Ittin also had a duck that she added to my ducks. And, what a pity, they all died one after the other. In less than three days, the two ducks had no more brood.

Monq: Ora:wan da kuwaan...
even none they GF-do-incomp.

Even if they don't do anything...

Ramon: ....a:wan da kuwaan may bugung
....none they GF-do-incomp. but mouth
da pe
their also
Monoq: ...bugung da pe yala ya
...mouth their also only FM-sing.

kuwa
....

Ramon: ...yala ya kuwa maddi
...only FM-sing. .... bad

anganggam... da kiya kuwa...
admiration their obl. ....

admire the...

yea bad admiration their

Yes. The way they admire is wrong.

Ramon: Ata:n maq pe kapaye kita
there-is cert. also papaya-tree L

agra:ng kurung mi kitun na
front poultry-house our L Lk

palota:n tutu wala ya agbu:nga
exceedingly very much FM-sing. fruiting

na. 'Bet pe ya:n de
its AP-come-incomp. also that PNF

anti kiya ri:mut, ata:wa
aunt L downstream-village spouse

ne manong Labay,
Poss._Per.sing. elder-brother Labay
We also had a papaya tree in front of our poultry house that had lots of fruit, and was very low. It bore big fruit. Aunt. from the downstream part of the village, the wife of elder brother Labay, came. She and Martina and Aunt who is a pensioner, came and they were competing on who claims which of the fruit of the papaya tree...
Yes...since they made claims, I was a little upset because, "This is mine," they said. Have you heard of anyone making claims on things which are not puppies or chickens or piglets?

Erlinda: Kapa:ya
papaya

It was papaya fruit.

Ramon: Og. Likud da na:n mu ay; Yes turn-back they said you Lk
ur-ura:yan datu kapa:ya with-no-reason FM-pl. papaya-fruit

bu:nga na.
fruit it

After they left then, the fruit began falling with no apparent reason. They fell in twos and more.

Monoq: Taanna na:d pe? why puzzl-part also

I wonder why.

Ramon: Awan na... Adaddu kid a none Lk long uncert. cert.

ya duwa bu:la:n... na:gan tura FM-sing. two month what why

nga masigr:tan nin tu untuq Lk GF-taper-incomp. already FM-sing top

tu kapa:ya nga FM-sing. papaya-tree Lk
There was no...I think in less than two months... I was surprised that the top of the papaya tree dried out and the leaves turned yellow. What finally happened to it was that it just fell down.

Monoq: Ay mapna:t pe tu bu:nga and GF-drop-incomp. also FM-sing. fruit

Ramon: Og.... As! "Akkan kayu napiya yes disapp. not you-pl. nice

nga tolay," nain maq ne
Lk person said cert. PNA

bagbakat. Pe din nu a:wan maq di old-woman also wish if none cert. not
anggamman daya:n nu atain GF-admire-incomp. those when there-is

masingan da kadaqtada nga GF-see-incomp. they 1st Per. obl Lk

kabbulun da nga dumu:ma nga companions their Lk exceptional Lk
kuwa...
best.

Yes...Oh my! "you are not good people," my wife said. "There's nothing that you...you have a very destructive speech," my wife said. It's good if they don't admire anything they see in us their companions, they are very...

Ludag: Nganna pe tutu wala da wonder-part. also very much FM-pl.
dudduma.
others

Why are some people such a...

Ramon: Tu:ya nu ata:n that's-why when there-is
magan-anaq a:tu mi, isir-sirug AF-give-birth-incomp. dog our GF-hide-incomp.
na ababbing ki linung na A child L underneath poss.
yu linung na puga:ru FM-sing. underneath poss. stove-table
kiya panda ngala nga tabla. Di I any only Lk plank not
na palawanan da sissi:tu. 3rd.per GF-let-out-incomp. FM-pl. puppies
Se kam lumawan da sissi:tu and then AF-get-out-incomp. FM-pl. puppies
win nu dadakkal da ngin. already when big-pl. they already
That's why when we have a dog that gives birth, my child hides them under the stove table. She will surround it with some planks. She won't let the puppies come out. The puppies will come out only when they are already big.

Erlinda: Wayya ta la kod kannawan rhet.Q we-dual only ... GF-taboo-incomp.

kaddawan nu maqdadakkal. GF-name-to-own-incomp. when AF-get-big-incomp.

Why should we prohibit anyone to ask for them when they get big? (rhet. Q).

Ramon: 'Ra la nga naglalawa:n why unexpectedly Lk AF-get-out-pl.-comp.
da sissitu. Ata:n manang FM-pl. puppies there-is elder-sister
Martina nga mangla:la ka 149
Martina Lk AF-talk-while-walking-incomp. L
kalse:a nga maqpatu:lung... path Lk AF-go-upstream-incomp.
"Alakkan mu datu GF-get-pl.incomp. you-sing. FM-pl.
sissitu amang ta ata:n puppies mother because there-is
ne ukoq Martina," na:n na PNF grandmother Martina said A
ababbing. "Matay manin daya:n nu child GF-die-incomp. again those if
kuwa," na:n na. Makagalaq aq 155
.... said 3rd-per. AF-laugh-incomp. I
la ke Minda, just PN-obl. Minda
(One day) the puppies got out. And there was elder sister Martina on the path talking heading upstream. "Mom, get all the puppies; here comes grandma Martina," the child said. "Those (puppies) will all die if..." she said. I laughed at Minda's reaction.

Ludag: Nganna agkaq pe agbugubugung 157
wonder-part. ..... also speech

da dudduma tolay. 158
FM-pl. others person

Why is the speech of some people so (bad).

Ramon: Ata:n pe ya tangadagu:nan na.... 159
there-is also Lk one-year Lk

There was also a year that...

Erlinda: ....magpannakit ta gane nu ba:ka 160
.....AF-upset-incomp. we-dual ..... if cattle

ya kaddawan da.... 161
FM-sing. GF-name-to-own-incomp. they

Ramon: Tu ya:n ya makagalaq aq 162
speci. that FM-sing. AF-laugh-incomp. I

a makarungat te Arling... 163
Lk AF-get-mad-incomp. Lk Arling

Nagpuraq aq 164
AF-feed-chicken-n-pst I

pag-pagmaka:t. Kitu nabay-baya:g 165
very-very-early-morning L long-time-ago

g a dagun. Ata:n kid da... tu 166
Lk year there-is uncert. Lk FM
 idi meka glu dagun nin ka panda kiya:n 167
 this third year now L since L

 na nag pura ku. 168
 Lk AF-feed-chicken-comp. I

 Nepaqmu pe ya adu anuq 169
 GF-coincident-comp. also Lk many chicken

 mi kurug. Nepaqmu la nga 170
 poss. truly GF-coincident-comp. just Lk

 tu kaadu anuq mi Tu... 171
 L many-mann. chicken poss. Lk

 sanguwa:nan natu labbet Coronet. 172
 before of-the coming Coronet

 Nag pura q a q ki 173
 AF-feed-chicken-comp. I L

 pagpag maka:t tin. 'Ra pe 174
 very-early-morning now rhet.Q. also

 la at a:n ne anti. 175
 rhet.Q. there-is PNF aunt

 Anti pensionada. Makagalaq a q a 176
 Aunt pensioner AF-laugh-incomp. I Lk

 makarungat a:ta ammuq 'ra 177
 AF-upset-incomp. because FG-know-I-incomp. why

 umma:n ka nadakeq tu uray natu 178
 like G bad FM-sing. mind G

tolay kiyaq a magsisi:ngan kiyaq 179
 person 1st Per. Obl. Lk AF-look-incomp. 1st Per. Obl

 a mag pur a q a q a masingan 180
 Lk AF-feed-chicken-comp. I Lk GF-see-incomp.

 na nga adu tutu wala datu 181
 3rd-per. Lk many very much FM-pl.

 pur-a:n ku. Ta 182
 GF-feed-chicken-incomp. I because
That time I laughed and was (at the same time) mad, Arling...I fed the chickens early morning. It was years ago. I think there is...this is the third year since that time I fed the chickens. Incidentally, it was the time we truly had many chickens. It was the time before Coronet came. I fed the chickens early morning. Unexpectedly, aunt was also there; aunt the pensioner. I laughed and was upset because, I don't know, it seems like she was not happy to see me feeding my chickens, seeing that the chickens I was feeding were so many. Because our yard on the downstream side was covered with...

Monoq: ....kadatu anuq....
.....of the chicken

Ramon: ....kadatu anuq a dadakkal Puwera
.....of the chicken Lk big-pl. excluding

la pippi:yaq. "Neeeeeey!" na:n natu
just chicks oooooooh said A

baqbakat. "Nganna nga tabbun
old-woman wonder-part. Lk many

anuq mu!" 'ra na la na:n.
chicken your why 3rd per. just said

Umma:n kiyai:n tu angngagi
like that FM-sing. mann.-say

na. Umma:n ka maluqasaw... akkan
3rd per. like G AF-mad-incomp. not

ku ammu nu maluqasaw tun onu
I GF-know-incomp. if AF-mad-incomp. that or
said the old woman. "You got so many chickens!" she said, unexpectedly. That's the way she said it. she sounded like she was mad...I didn't know if she was mad then or it was her admiration. Because they (the chickens) died in twos after that (incident)...I don't of anything she did.

Monoq: Tu la tu naganggam. that just FM-sing. AF-admire-comp.

She just admired (the chickens).

Ramon: Og... "Ata:n da Anti, yes there-is 3rd per.-pl. aunt
ata:n ag-agissa nga anuq deddi there-is very-few Lk chicken these
anna:naq," na:n ku maq a. Ka panda children said I cert. .. L since
na:n mu ay bittiq matay nu said you Lk few GF-die-incomp. if
duwa... kiya isa nga algaw. Ata:n two in one Lk day there-is
da la malu:sa:ng ki unag 203 3rd pl. just GF-decompose-incomp. L inside
kurung Mangwa ngaq ki 204 poultry-house AF-do-incomp. I 0
Yea. "There's a few of them, Aunt, they are the children's," so I said. Since then, believe it or not, if only two die in a day, that's few. There are some that just putrefy inside the poultry house. I had to do something. I started killing them (to eat). Because I know they are all going to die.

Monoq: Tu win tu ammum
FM now FM-sing. know-you sing.

pamagyana:n.
do

That was the only thing you know you can do.

Ramon: Og... Mangwa ngaq ka
yes AF-make-incomp. Lk-I O

ammuq kiya:n nin. Melug
GF-know-incomp-I there now almost

magpungtu ya algaw
AF-recip.-end-incomp. FM-sing. day

agpartiq in a:ta tittu
kill-I already because the-only

ammuq. Tinabid na
GF-know-incomp-I GF-take-comp. 3rd per.

kid kiya... akkan nala kid
uncert. L not only uncert.
maγku:ra:ng nga... nu di nasur-suruq 217
AF-lack-incomp. Lk if not a-little-more

tallu pu:lu daya dadakkal lala 218
three tens FM-pl. big-ones-pl. only

nga pappartiyan ku. Ay nu 219
Lk GF-can-kill-incomp. I and if

pi:piaq a:lala ay alaq na 220
chicks only Lk GF-get-incomp. 3rd per.

kid ya duwa gatut. 221
uncert. FM-sing. two hundred

Yea... I had to think of something I can do. I killed two in a
day, one in the morning and one in the evening. That was the only
thing I know I can do. There were around... it was no less
than... there were more than thirty of the big ones that I killed.
And of the chicks, there were around two hundred of them.

Monoq: Ta adu da kammala ngin nin a. 222
so many 3rd pl. cert. surely now ..

There are really many of them.

Ramon: ... pi:piaq... a:ta maggannu-gannud 223
... chicken... because in-succession

daya:n. Ata:n da nga 224
those there is 3rd pl. Lk

magpapa:da. Datu noray 225
AF-recip-same-incomp. FM-pl. any

maggi:nda:n... 226
AF-simultaneous-incomp.

those of the same age, those that came out the same time

Monoq: ... maggi:nda:n na mpsit 227
... AF-simultaneous Lk GF-hatch-incomp.
Ramon: Oq, a:wan na la nga kuwa... 228
yes none 3rd per. just Lk hest.

a:wan kid tang-tanga bu:la:n, 229
none uncert. only-one month

narput datu anuq mi. 230
GF-mass-death-comp. FM-pl. chicken our

Yea. There was no...in less than a month, our chickens all died.

Erlinda: Awan maq pe anuq mi. 231
none cert. also chicken our

We also don't have anymore chickens.

Ludag: O rungat a:tu la tuni yin nga 232
oh fierce dog just that already Lk

na:n ku. 233
said I

Yea, but it was just dogs' fierce (attacks).

Ramon: Dudduwa tu.... dudduwa.... Ta 234
only-two FM-sing. only-two rhet.Q

di maq lugud maggarutongot ta, 235
not cert. so AF-gnash-teeth-npst Lk

amnuq tu maq 236
GF-know-incomp-I it's-it cert.

Only two...only two...She was gnashing her teeth...I don't know why...

Monoq: Tu kanu ya:n maddi nu 237
that reportedly that not if
magnarutongot ya maquni. 238
AF-gnash-teeth-incomp. FM-sing. AF-talk-incomp.

Oray nu maganggam se akkan 239
even if AF-happy-incomp. or not

ya kuwa na nu ata:n 240
FM-sing. impl, 3rd per. if there-is

ya ngarutongot na, ay tu 241
FM-sing. gnash-teeth 3rd per. Lk that

kanu ya:n ya maddi. 242
reportedly that FM-sing. not-good

That's what was wrong, I heard, when the one speaking gnashed his/her teeth. Whether he/she is admiring or not if the speaker gnashes his/her teeth, that is not good.

Ramón: Umma:n ka maluqsaw tu 243
like O AF-mad-incomp. FM-sing.

aganggam na nga makasingan kadatu 244
admiration 3rd Lk AF-see-incomp. of-the

pur-a:n ku. "Anuq mi nga:min 245
GF-feed-incomp. I chicken our all

daya:n," na:n ku maq a:ta kurug 246
those said I cert. because true

anuq mi nga:min da ata:n 247
chicken our all FM-pl. there-is

kitu kuwa. Ata nasa:pa ngaq maq 248
L impl. because early I cert.

a mangatangya kadaya anuq. 249
Lk AF-mind-incomp. Obl-pl. chicken

Tsansa'an ku ya akkan pikam 250
GF-time-incomp. I FM-sing. not yet
nagditta:g da anuq da 251
AF-alight-comp. FM-pl. chicken 3rd per.pl.
kabbulun na magdada:pun Ta 252
companions Lk AF-roost-cont.-incomp. because
adu ya akkan makada:sir 253
many FM-sing. not AF-compete-incomp.
ki puraq in nu... 254
dat. feed now if

Her admiration (of the chickens) was like she was also mad, when she saw the chickens I was feeding. "Those are all my chickens," I said because it was true that those in the (yard) were all our chickens. Because I take care of the chickens very early in the morning. I do it when the chickens of our neighbors haven't yet come down from their roost. Because many can't eat of the feed when...

Monog: ....magditta:g da nga:min... 255
....AF-alight-incomp. they all

They all come down.

Ramon: ....magdita:g nga:min da anuq 256
....AF-alight-incomp. all they chicken
a noray makar-karu wala 257
Lk any short-while Lk
magdada:pun.... Makagalaq aq pe 258
AF-roost-incomp. AF-laught-incomp. I also
makarungat ki Anti. "Na:gan tura 259
AF-get-mad-incomp. G aunt what why
naga:mud datu anuq 260
GF-bewitched-comp. FM-pl. chicken
tada?" na:n ku maq a. 261
our-incl. said I cert. ...
laugh and I also get upset at Aunt. "What happened, why were our chickens bewitched?" I said.

Monoq: ...kaggi:na?
...3rd-per.-obl.

To her?

Erlinda: Ammuq kod datu anuq 262
GF-know-incomp-I surely EM-pl. chicken

mi, ra da napu:put pe 263
our-excl. why they GF-die-out-comp. also

yin.
already 264

I don't know what happened to our chickens. Almost all of them are already gone.

Monoq: Akkan mu la kinagi 265
not you-sing. just GF-tell-comp.

kaggi:na.
3rd per.-obl. 266

Didn't you tell her?

Ramon: Akkan. Ta adu u:nay debate 267
no because many very argument

mapadatang nu kuwa... "Wayya la 268
GF-arise-incomp. if impl. rhet.Q just

nga ata:n kinuwaq!" ba:rang nu 269
Lk there-is GF-do-comp.-I maybe if

na:n da kadaqta.
said they 1st-pl.-obl. 270
No. Because there will be so much discussion if..."Why, did I do anything?" they might say to me.

Monoq: Siyampre a. of-course so

Without a doubt.

Ramon: Akkan ta wayya maguspetsa ka not we-dual surely AF-suspect-incomp. G
kinuwa na isa tolay nu... GF-do-comp. 3rd per. one person if

I don't want to suspect anyone of doing anything if....

Mono: Oray nu akkan maguspetsa a.
even if not AF-suspect-incomp. surely

Even if you don't suspect (anyone).

Erlinda: Tu maq pe datu magda:yaw that cert. also FM-pl. AF-praise-incomp.
kadatu anuq mi kitun 0-def.-pl. chicken our-excl. in-the-comp.
ta adu pe datu anuq because many also FM-pl. chicken
mi. Giya:n da ngin! our-excl. place they now

There were also those who admired our chickens, because we also had plenty of chickens. They're all gone too!

Ramon: Tittu pikam tun na nakauqnuq only-that yet that Lk AF-collect-comp.
ku ka anuq a ad-adu panda kitu
I o chicken Lk good-many since L
agmimi:nas. Agmimi:nas pe tu
mining-time mining-time also FM-sing.

adu anuq ku.
many chicken my

That was the only time I was able to raise that many chickens since the mine exploration time. We also had plenty of chickens during the mine exploration.

Monoq: Maq a ta adu sangai:li
surely so because many visitors
nu
your-pl.

Yea, because you had so many visitors.

Ramon: May immin pe yala datu
But GF-consume-comp. also only FM-pl.
Tagalog. Immin mi
Tagalog-people GF-consume-comp. we
nepassida kadatu Tagalog.
GF-feed-comp Obl.prn Tagalog-people
Awan kam sopu-sopung tu minas
none ... good-result FM-sing. mine
sa...
Lk

But the Tagalog people consumed them. We fed them to the Tagalog people. But the mining (project) was a failure.

Erlinha: Awan ka la nga kuwa datu...
none .. just Lk impl. FM-pl.
ata:n nga:min mangantu...
there-is all circumstances

There is no...of the...Many things happened...

Monoq: Naggas-gastuwam tada ngin.
GF-cont.-spend-comp. we-incl. already

We spent money for.

Ramon: Oq... Kane managlod
yes when AF-go-downstream-incomp.
dé Alli se Coronet nan
PFN Alli and Coronet said

mu ay pinabalu:nan kuda ka
you-sing. Lk GF-take-comp. I-they G

One-kilo karne se duwa ngabgi anug.
tangakilo karne se duwa ngabgi anug.
one-kilo meat and two piece chicken

Di yaq ammu pe tu
not I GF-know-incomp. also FM-sing.
nagparti kitun nu...
AF-butcher-animal-comp. then if

nerana pe kitu na
GF-coincident-comp. also G-def. AF-go-comp.
da. "Ra pe la uwad karne ya
they why also just there-was meat Lk

paba:lun ku kadatu anna:naq.
GF-carry-out-comp. I 0-def.pl. children

Pinarti da maq a ka
GF-kill-comp. they cert. surely L

Kabugao.

Kabugao
Yea. When Alli and Coronet went downstream, I gave them one kilo of meat (beef) and two chickens. I don't remember who butchered (a steer) then...it coincided with their trip back. It was good incidentally, that I was able to give them meat. They killed them when they got to Kabugao.

Monoq:  Datu anuq?  
FM-pl. chicken

The chickens.

Ramon:  Oq.  
yes

Yes.

Erlinda:  Adu kam dedde anuq mi nu many still these chicken our-excl. if
        di umawan naq ata:n not GF-lost-incomp. I there-is
        umawan, umawan naq ata:n GF-lost-incomp. I there-is
        umawan. Dedde a:yam de GF-lost-incomp. these pet 3rd. per. poss.pl
        Annawan kammala ngin Nasukalan Annawan same surely GF-find-out-comp.
        ku win nga... anuq ne I already Lk chicken 3rd, Per.poss.-sing.
        Esta nga nawei nelaku Esta Lk AF-go-comp. GF-sell-comp.
        ne Romel ke PNA Romel Obl. prn. sing
        Ambadan ka piptin pesos. Kidde Ambadan G fifteen pesos this-time
yala naweq naggaga:yan .
only AF-go-comp-I AF-visit-comp.

ke Ambadan .
Obl. prn-sing. Ambadan

We would have plenty of chickens if not when I'm gone, a chicken will be gone too, when I'm gone a chicken will be gone too. I blame Annawan's children. I already found out that...the chicken of Esta ...Romel sold to Ambadan for 15 pesos. It was just recently when I went to visit with Ambadan.

Ramon: Ata:n maq pe duwa nga anuq
there-is cert. also two Lk chicken

a pagmugmugawang mi. May akkan
Lk wanderer our-excl. But not

ku ippay kada anna:naq.
I GF-blame-incomp obl.prn-pl. children

Ta iya akkan wayya masingan.
because that not surely GF-see-incomp.

Nu kurug ga.... Na:gan kuma ya
if true Lk what might FM-sing.

ipatay da ta ay dadakkal
cause-die-incomp. they rhet.Q Lk big-pl.

da nga anuq in. Akkan wayya
they Lk chicken already not surely

pippi:yaq.
chicks

We also have two chickens that are lost. But I am not suspecting that the children have anything to do with them. Because I don't see anything. If it's true...What will they die of? They are already big chickens. The are not chicks.

Erlinda: Kurug ga naloko da. "Makin anuq
true Lk wicked they whose chicken

kitunni?" na:n ku maq a kiddi na 325
that-there said I surely Lk here it

nawe yaq naggaga:yam kitu 326
AE-go-comp. I AE-visit-comp. L

gi:da:m ka giya:n de Ambadan. 327
afternoon L place poss.-prn-pl. Ambadan

"Anug mi ya:n a!" na:n 328
chicken our-excl. that surely said

ne Ambadan. Tu ya:n 329
PNA Ambadan the-one that

ya nela:ku ne Romel 330
FM-sing. GF-sell-comp. PNA Romel

la we na nippay 331
Lk AF-go-incomp. 3rd.Per.sing. GF-put-comp.

kiddi na nga kinagi na 332
here it Lk GF-tell-comp. 3rd.Per.sing.

kiyaq may a:wan naq." na:n na. 333
1st.obl.sing but none I said he

"Alaq mu anug ku ikaw, 334
GF-get-incomp. you-sing. chicken my you

piptin pesos sala," na:n na 335
fifteenth pesos only said he

kiyaq. May "Ilbet mu 336
obl.1st.Per.sing. but GF-bring-incomp. you

a," na:n ku kaggi:na may 337
surely said I 3rd.Per.obl.sing. but

a:wan naq kitu we na 338
none I when AF-go-incomp. he

nagitulud," na:n ne kuwa Ambadan. 339
AF-bring-comp. said PNA hest. Ambadan
Ney! may tu anuq kammala Esta 340
Oh but FM-sing. chicken surely Esta

ngin, say. Ata ya anuq 341
now surely because FM-sing. chicken

a sina:kaw na ka Nangaligan ay 342
Lk GF-steal-comp. he L Nangaligan Lk

sissa nga kawi:tan. Nagba:yad ka 343
only-one Lk rooster AG-cost-comp. G
twintipayb pesos. "Negaya:t ku 344
twenty-five pesos GF-take-from-comp. I

ka Nangaligan," na:n na kanu 345
L Nangaligan said he reportedly

ke Ambadan. Ney! may 346
3rd.obl.sing. Ambadan Oh but
tu anuq ku, say. "Anuq ku 347
FM-sing. chicken my ... chicken my

ya:n," na:n ku maq ke 348
that said I surely 3rd.Per.obl.

Ambadan GF-return-incomp. I said I

May akkan ipalubus ne Ambadan. 350
but not GF-allow-incomp. PNA Ambadan

Ata isubliiq kammin kuma 351
because GF-return-incomp. same wish
tu piptin pesos ta 352
FM-sing. fifteenth pesos because

anuq ne Esta ya:n. Ba:yad 353
chicken 3rd per.poss. Esta that payment

a:gas... kane kuwa... 354
medicine when impl.
They are truly bad guys. "Whose chicken is that?" I said when I went to visit with Ambadan yesterday afternoon. "That's our chicken," Ambadan said. "That's the one Romel sold to me, that he told me that he would put here, but I was not in," he said. "You buy my chicken for only 15 pesos," he said to me. And, "bring it here," I said to him but I was not in when he brought it here," Ambadan said. But it was surely Esta's chicken! Because the chicken he stole in Nangaligan is a rooster. He sold it for 25 pesos. "I got it from Nangaligan," he reportedly said to Ambadan. But it surely was my chicken! "That's my chicken," I said to Ambadan. "I'll give back what you paid for it," I said. But Ambadan wouldn't let me. I want to give back the 15 pesos because that was Esta's chicken. It was a payment for some medicine...when...

Ramon: .."Akkan ku kuma subliya:n ya:n 355
.... not I wish GF-return-incomp. that
nu di anuq ne narsi," na:n 356
if not chicken PN poss. nurse said
ta a. 357
we-dual ..

not the nurse's chicken," you tell them.

Erlinda: We yaq maq a 358
AF-go-incomp. I cert. surely
ussan kagiyan ya:n nu 359
GF-repeat-incomp. GF-tell-incomp. that when
kala:wa. Ta magpa:laq aq ka 360
tomorrow because AF-caus.-get-incomp. I G
anuq piddeq kaggi:da 361
chicken GF-caus.-give-incomp. 3rd.obl.pl.
Ta papaadu ne 362
because GF-caus.-multiply-incomp. PNA
Cristita ya anuq na ta 363
Cristita FM chicken 3rd.Per.poss. because
I will surely go back and tell him that tomorrow. I will ask someone to get a chicken to give them. Because Cristita asked me to raise her chicken, because even when she goes to Manila she said, "I'll come again on my vacation time, even if I stay in Manila," she said.

Ramon: Kagiyana ta. "Akkan ku wayya 368
GF-tell-incomp. we-dual not I surely
appoliyan ya:n nu di ya 369
GF-take-back-incomp. that if not Lk
anuq ne narsi," na:n ta. 370
chicken 3rd.Per.poss. nurse said we-dual
You tell them. "I will not get that back if it is not the nurse's chicken," you say.

Ludag: May ya ubra de Romel maq ide
but FM-sing work PN poss. pl. Romel cert this
Taka:wan da maq nga:min ya anu
GF-steal-incomp. they cert. all FM-sing. chicken
That's Romel's (and someone else's) fault (doings). they even steal chickens.

Erlinda: Tuya weq kammin kuma 371
that's-why AF-go-incomp.-I again wish
alaq tu anuq ki 372
GF-get-incomp. FM-sing. chicken L
That's why I want to get back the chicken in the downstream village.

Ludag: ....Subliya:n mu ya:n. ....GF-return-incomp. you that

Erlinda: Tu ya:n ya iddeq the-one that FM-sing. GF-give-incomp.-I
kaggi:da. 3rd Per. obl. pl.

That's what I'll give them.

Ramon: A pangira:rat tala ne Marlon 377
GF-just-kill-comp. just PNA Marlon

tu kawi:ta:n na nga pinaltuq 378
FM-sing. rooster his Lk GF-spear-comp.
ne Aldrin. Tu 379
PNA Aldrin FM-sing.

ginaga:ban... 380
GF-treat-comp.

Marlon just killed his rooster that Aldrin shot with a spear gun.
It was the one he (Marlon) treated....

Erlinda: Naganemic kala. 381
AF-sick-comp. only

It got sick.
Ramon: Og... Tu gina:ga:ban mag na 382
yes FM-sing. GF-treat-comp. cert. he

ya:n. Kengan na tutu wala ya:n 383
that GF-spare-incomp. he very much that

na anuq na.
Lk chicken his

Yea...Marlon treated it. He didn't want to kill that chicken of his.

Erlinda: "Si:lag ka din agkaq nu 385
AF-discipline-incomp. you may ..... if

binugbug naka," na:n ku maq.
GF-beat-comp. he-you said I cert.

"You would have learned your lesson if he beat you up," I said.

Ramon: "Si:lag ka pe. 387
GF-discipline-comp. you also

Si:lag kayu wa 388
GF-discipline-incomp. you-pl. Lk

magkikenga kada anuq nu 389
AF-spare-incomp. FM-pl. chicken you-pl.

nga...," na:n ku maq ke 390
Lk said I cert. PN-obl.

Marlon.

"You also learned your lesson. You, who won't kill any of his chickens..." I certainly told Marlon.

Erlinda: Paanna:n ne Marlon 392
GF-what-to-do-incomp. PNA Marlon
What's going on with Marlon?

Ramon: Waq maq naya amit naya
where cert. G savor it-def.
naniw-ni:wa:ng?
very-skinny

Where's the good taste of a very skinny chicken?

Ludag: Na:n ku maq ki:di ke
said I cert. this PN obl.sing.

Emma, "Kanna:n mu ya anuq
Emma why you FM-sing. chicken
nu kenga:n Ay tura
you-pl. GF-spare-incomp. and why
makadaqdaqdaq ay...
AF-roam-cont.-incomp. Lk

I told Emma this,"What are you saving your chicken for. It
wanders around and....

Erlinda: Masdaa:wan naq pe ta
AP-wonder-incomp. I also because
gaggaya:t kami ka nga:tu
just-arrive-from us-excl. L uphill
kiya:n. Na:gan tura ata:n nala
there what why there-is just
tu anuq a sikkaagtu ka
FM-sing. chicken Lk AF-carry-incomp. G
ba:rus! Ay nagbulbu:lun kami
I was really surprised because we came from the village uphill then. And there was the chicken with the wire spear. Aldrin and I were together when we came.

Ludag: Tu pe tu bakkan ku ammu nu the-one also the-one not I know if aggi:na. May...

3rd per. sing. but

That was also the reason why I can't say it it was him (who did it). But...

Erlinda: Tu:tu na:n ku wa, "Nagbubu:lun that-was-why said I Lk AF-together-comp.

kami maq se de Aldrin," us-excl. cert. and PNF Aldrin

na:n ku wa ipatpa:t ke said I Lk GF-insist-incomp. 3rd per. obl.

manang Emma. Ata gusto.
elder-sister Emma because right

Nagbubu:lun kami. Ney! may AF-together-comp. we-excl. Oh but

e Aldrin kammala ngin.
PNF-fronted Aldrin sure enough

That was why I said, "Aldrin and I were together," I insisted to elder sister Emma. Because it was true. We were together. but it was truly Aldrin who did it!

Ramon: Ata:n ta la magtula:yaw... there-is us-dual only AF-deny-incomp.
Mamin piga nu la kod ya
how many you-pl. only ... FM-sing.
kuwa da nu itu oras na tu
impl. they if the time it FM-sing.
kuwa da.
impl. 3rd per.pl.

You were denying it... It won't take very much time for them to... when it is the for their... to...

Monoq: ....angwa da...
....act 3rd Per.pl.

Erlinda: Ata nasingan ne Sudaq
because GF-see-comp. Dt.Per.sing. Sudaq
ya anuq kitu giy:a:n
FM-sing. chicken L place
na. Gaya:t ka
3rd per.sing. AF-come-from-comp. L
alod. Sikkaagtu ka ba:rus.
downstream AF-carry-cont.incomp. G wire
Di:kod kane nasingan ku ki:di
therefore when GF-see-comp. I here,
"Na:gan na kinuwa na
what it GF-do-comp. 3rd per.sing.
aniuq?" na:n ku. Ay a:wan a Aldrin
chicken said I and none .. Aldrin
nin ta nagbubu:lun kami
already because AF-together-comp. we-excl.
maq lugud ngamay nangaw-a:t
cert. surely but AF-go-directly-comp.
maq ki ambaw. cert. L riverbank

Because Sudaq saw the chicken where he was. It came from downstream. It was carrying the wire. Therefore when I saw it here, "What happened to the chicken?" I said. Aldrin was not around anymore. We were together but he went straight ahead to the riverbank.

Monoq: Nangaw-alt maq a:ta 429
AF-go-directly-comp. he cert. because
uwad maq lugud din na 430
there-was cert. surely already Lk
ba:sul. Ba:sul na. 431
sin sin his

He went straight ahead (to the riverbank) because there was already a wrongdoing. His wrongdoing.

Ludag: O, may inumbet kammin. "Ne 432
yes but AF-come-comp again here
tu ba:rus mu," na:n ned 433
FM-sing. wire your-sing. said this
Marlon. "Oq tu ya:n tu 434
Marlon yes, the-one that FM-sing.
ba:rus ku," na:n ne Aldrin. 435
wire my said PNA Aldrin


Ramon: Ammu ne Marlon 436
GF-know-incomp. PNA Marlon
tu ba:rus na ta da:ti 437
FM-sing. wire his because originally
mas-asian na kammala ngin 438
GP-see-cont.-incomp. 3rd Per. surely ....

nin kiya us-usaran 439
.... since GF-use-cont.-incomp.

na. 440
3rd Per. sing.

Marlon knows his wire spear because he sees it when he (Aldrin) uses it.

Ludag: Kuwa, kagginga kanu ya 441
huest. 3rd Per. obl. sing. reportedly Lk
nangba: sal ya nakasingan 442
AF-hammer-comp. FM-sing. AF-see-comp.
ne Marlon. 443
PNA Marlon

No. Marlon saw it when he (Aldrin) was making it.

Erlinda: Akkan maq lugud ammu ya 444
not cert. so know FM-sing.
pamagyan a mi kadatuni 445
dakami se Aloy. 446
us-excl. and Aloy

We, Aloy and I, don't know what to do with those guys.

Ramon: Awan nala a. 447
none absolutely surely

Nothing at all.
Erlinda: Ta... luqsawan mida se because GF-scold-incomp. us-them and

de Aloy, palattug ne 449
PNG Aloy gun 3rd Per.poss.sing.

Victor ya pamalsu da. 450
Victor FM-sing. IF-threat-incomp. they

Tu:ya ata:n ki uray ku ay 451
that's-why there-is L mind my Lk

pagamomanan mi lugud dala se 452
GF-discuss-incomp. we-excl. then just and

Aloy. Idarum lugud dala 453
Aloy GF-sue-incomp. then just

aggila. Senu kuwa dala lugud 454
3rd Per.pl. so-that impl. just then

ki palattug ta ittu peyang kaw 455
G gun because the-one always you

ya im-imma:n da. Tu 456
FM-sing. GF-hold-incomp. 3rd per. the-one

maq nangitanab da 457
cert. IF-ambush-comp. 3rd per.pl.

ke Aloy. Netanab 458
PN-obl. Aloy GF-ambush-comp.

da maq Aloy ka kuwa kane 459
3rd per.pl. cert. Aloy G impl. when

binugbug ne Aloy 460
GF-beat-comp. PNA Aloy

ye Romel la kuwa ka 461
PNG Romel Lk impl G

nasukalan nagta:kaw kitu 462
Because Aloy and I scolded them but they threatened us with Victor’s gun. That’s why what I’m thinking is that Aloy and I will agree that we’ll just sue them. So that they will be...for the gun because they always carry it. They used it in an ambush attempt on Aloy. They ambushed Aloy at...when Aloy beat up Romel who was found out to have stolen Dumayag’s flashlight battery.

Monoq: Og. Patayan da pikam yes GF-kil-incomp. 3rd per.pl. yet
me Aloy kiya:n nu kuwa...
PNG Aloy there when impl.

Yea. They might yet kill Aloy when...

Erlinda: Ay ugdan da pikam and GF-warn-incomp. 3rd per.pl. yet
me Balangit. Gapu kiya
PNG Balangit due G
sina:kaw da nga nga:min
GF-steal-comp. 3rd per.pl. Lk all
la:wig ne Balangit. Ay
fish-hooks PN-pos. sing. Balangit and
napiya ngin nu we
good already if AF-go-incomp.
pakup-ku:pan ya bukya
GF-confiscate-incomp. FM-sing. home-made-gun
da kiya:n na duwa.
3rd per.pl. there Lk two
They even threatened Balangit. The reason was Balangit's fish hooks that they stole. It will be better if we have their two homemade guns confiscated.

Ramon: Duwa kurug ya bukya two truly FM-sing. homemade-guns
da Tu kuwa Erning 3rd Per.poss. FM-sing. own Erning
se tu kinuwa Victor. 475 and FM-sing. GF-make-comp. Victor

They truly have two homemade-guns. They have the one Erning made and the one that Victor made.

Erlinda: Akkan da kurug napiya nga tolay. 476 not they truly good Lk person
Ay nu ikaw kuma pe ya 477 and if you wish also Lk
mana:kam, kanna:n mu na:d parent why you-sing. wonder
da idde pe ya 479 Lk GF-give-incomp. also FM-sing.
umma:n kiya:n kada anna:naq. 480 like that obl. prn.pl. children

They truly are not nice people. And the parents why would they even give those things (the guns) to the children!

Ludag: Taka:wan da kanu. 481 GF-steal-incomp. they reportedly

They, reportedly, steal them.

Erlinda: Isiruq mu a ka 482 GF-hide-incomp. you-sing. subjn 0
They should hide it (from them) if they don't want to get implicated (in a crime).

Ramon: ....mira:ara:as.  
....GF-implicate-incomp.

Ludag: Ammu ta kod mag  
GF-know-incomp. we-dual rhet.Q cert.

tutu wala ya ur-uray daya  
very much FM-sing. mind FM-pl.

anna:nag. 'Ra da nga.. tu  
children why they Lk the-one

daya:n nin daya umma:n ki na:n  
that now FM-pl. like 0 said

naya... isiruq ta...  
A GF-hide-incomp. we-dual

I have no idea what's in the mind of the children, why they...those are (the result of not following what) is said, that they should hide the...

Monoq: Se ippaq ta pe  
and GF-remove-incomp we-dual also

tu maya:n na.  
FM-sing. content 3rd. poss.

Isiruq ta ya maya:n  
GF-hide-incomp we-dual FM-sing. content
And we should also take out the bullets. We should also hide the bullets.

**Erlinda:** O nu iwaren mu ay 495
or when GF-expose-incomp. you-sing. Lk
a:wan na maya:n kuma...
none 3rd per.-sing. content wish

Nu...
when...

Or, if they just put them any place where they can be found, they should take out the bullets...When/If...

**Ramon:** Nakad-adi:na:ng nge Aldrin nu 498
AF-act-good PNF Aldrin when
tul-tulduwan ku.
GF-teach-contin.-incomp I

Aldrin seems so nice when I advice him.

**Erlinda:** Awan na paqnan g ara:mid 500
none 3rd per. very-much bad-deeds
nu ata:n kidde, may kane 501
when there-is here but when
magbungguy da manin 502
AF-gang-together-incomp. they again
na.... Sigura:du maq a weq 503
Lk surely cert. Lk AF-go-incomp.
ruqru:tan ya isa 504
GF-rope-and-take-incomp. FM-sing. one

ba:ka daya:n basta 505
cow/steer 3rd per.-poss.-pl. as-soon-as

mabong ngala ya 506
GF-break-incomp. only FM-sing.

dur-duri ki si:dung. Akkan 507
antique-jar L under-the-house not

nala nga magba:bas ya:n 508
just Lk AF-without-fail-incomp. that

basta bongan da la 509
when GF-break-incomp. they just

ya dur-duri ki 510
FM-sing. antique-jar L

si:dung ngu.
under-the-house ....

Ruqru:tan ya isa 512
GF-rope-and-take-incomp. FM-sing. one

ba:ka da. Ta 513
cow/steer 3rd per. poss.-pl. because

molaw waq... 514
AF-get-tired-incomp. I

Nolaw waq tutu wala 515
GF-get-tired-comp. I very much

kaday:n nin a nga 516
3rd per. obl.pl. already .. Lk

anna:naq. Akkan da tutu wala 517
children not they very much

iddan ya kasittolay 518
GF-give-incomp. FM-sing. fellow-people

da... Paqwa da kuma 519
3rd poss. pl. GF-go-incomp. they wish
He isn't that bad when he is here, but when the two of them get together again (they do bad things)...I will surely rope one of their steers if/when the antique jar under the house gets broken (because of their foolishness). I would surely do that if they break the antique jar under the house. I will rope one of their steers. Because...I'm tired...I have been tired of these children. They don't give their fellowmen any break. They (the parents) should ask the P.C. (Philippine Constabulary) to arrest them. They know what to do.

Ramon: Mng.

yes  

Yes.

Erlinda: ....ka mabaya:g ga dagu-dagun na

....L long-time Lk years Lk

akkan da kuma nga we

not they wish Lk AP-go-incomp.

sin-sinnan da.

GF-see/visit-incomp. they

should not visit them.

Ramon: Padisiplinaan ku kurug pe

GF-Caus.-discipline-incomp. I truly also

daya anna:naq ku kadaya polis

FM-pl. children my olb.prn.pl police

se da PC nu iyaq ya

and pl. PC if I(front.) FM-sing.
I will surely have my children disciplined by the policemen and the P.C's. if I were like those people.

and Aloy but do-not they anna:naq. children

That's what Aloy and I wanted to do but they wouldn't handover the children (to us).

Mono: Basta ata:n la bittiq as-soon-as there-is just little
ba:sul da ngin umma:n kiya sin their already like Dat.
kuwa da ki anuq i, impl. their 0 chicken now
idarum muda kiya:n nin GF-sue-incomp. you-them there already
ta senu magnaqma:n da. because so-that AF-mature-incomp. they
Saballiq manin nu ikuwa different again if GF-impl.incomp.
muda la nga a:wan da you-them just Lk none 3rd. per.
As soon as they commit even a small crime like what they did with the chicken, you should sue them right away so that they will learn a lesson. It wouldn't be good if you get them arrested without their committing a crime...there will be a big....

RamonL: ....ikaw wa maganaq ya 543
       ....you (front.) Lk parent FM-sing.
       mawe mangikalbit kada 544
       AF-go-incomp. AF-secretly-tell-incomp. Obl
       polis se daya kuwa.... 545
       policemen and FM-pl. impl.

The parents themselves should be the ones to tell on them to the policemen and the....

Monoq:      ....go...
      ....yes...

Yes, that's what I mean.

Ramon: .....talaga nga.... "Tulu:gan daq 547
       ....surely Lk GF-help-incomp. you-me
       ta akkan ku meturung . 548
       because not I GF-control-incomp.
       da anna:naq ku, " nain ta, 549
       FM-pl. children my said we-dual
       "Tu:ya masa:pu:la 550
       that's-why necessary Lk
my children;' we should say. 'That's why you must discipline them. Take them and discipline them in the camp.'

'Erlinda: "Umbe
tay ki uma:n 554
AF-come-incomp. you-pl. L like
ki:di;" se ta na:n. 555
this and we-dual said

'You (children) come at this time;' we would then say to them.

Ramón: Oq. 556
yes

Yes.

'Erlinda: Se respitaran da, di:kod 557
and GF-entertain-incomp. them therefore
umbet datu anna:nag. 558
AF-come-incomp. EM-pl. children
Patiliw tada 559
GF-caus.-arrest-incomp. we-dual-them
ngin- already 560

And we will entertain them (the policemen and the P.C's.). Therefore the children will also come, and then we'll get them arrested.
They surprised me in the pineapple plantation that they passed through, because they were running away from Victor, but Victor was not mad at them at all. I couldn't believe why they were able to go through under the pineapple plants. We didn't see them at all. They then went uphill (to their house). They went through the uphill-field-boundary. They are like lizards, those people.
Erlinda: Maqsayan kurug ya GF-decrease-incomp. truly FM-sing.
ara:mid datuni nu
bad-deeds those if
pakunan ta.
GF-do-like-that-incomp. we-dual

They will surely slow down on their evil deeds if that's what we do.

Ludag: Nama:ru we Aldrin nin may se good Lk Aldrin already but and
umbet peyang Romel. Tu:tu AF-come-incomp. always Romel that's-why
nangwa da ngin ki AF-do-comp. they already G
ammu da.
GF-know-incomp. they

Aldrin had already reformed and then Romel comes here very often. Then they started doing their thing.

Ramon: Mira:as pe ye Victor GF-implicate-incomp. also PNG Victor
kitu:ni nu akkan na nga there if not he Lk
pakunan.
GF-do-like-that-incomp.

Victor will get implicated (in their bad deeds) if he does not do such things.

Erlinda: umabay ya umabay ay: 584 AF-get-big-incomp. Lk AF-get-big-incomp. ..
Their (bad) work is on the increase.

Ramon: Makapatay maq datuni nu
AF-kill-incomp. cert. those when
kuwa...
impl.

They will commit murder sooner or later.

Erlinda: Saballi ma:n-kam ipaqbag
wrong on-the-contrary GF-answer-incomp.
da ke... 'ya na:n ku
they PN-obl. that's-why said I
wa igduq nada, nga na:n
Lk GF-protect-incomp. he-them Lk said
ku ta saballi ipaqbag
I because wrong GF-answer-incomp.
da ke Aloy ya naqdasal
they PN obl. Aloy Lk AF-scold-comp.
kaggi:na ka Kabugao. "Pumatay
3rd per.obl. L Kabugao AF-kill-incomp.
ta ka tolay," na:n na
we-dual 0 person said he
kanu ma:n-kamin. Dim
reportedly on-the-contrary not-you
igduq ya annex:qaq
GF-protect/side-incomp. FM-sing. children
mu  kiya:n  na  sao.  597
2nd per.poss.  L  Lk  words

His answer to...was not good...that's why I think he is protecting them, because their answer to Aloy who rebuked him in Kabugao was not good. 'Should I kill, then?' he, reportedly, said, instead. That kind of answer surely shows that he is protecting his children.

Ramon:  Mng.
   yes

Yes.

Erlinda: "Pumatay  ka  ngala.
AF-kill-incomp.  you  only

Ikaw  kappela  ya  makamu
you(emph.)  alone  Lk  AF-know-incomp.

win,"  na:n  ne  Aloy  ay.
already  said  PNA  Aloy  cert.

Tu  maq  ya  akkan  naq
that's-why  cert.  FM-sing.  not  I

makagalit  ki  balay  yi,
AF-get-away-incomp.  L  house  here

ta  amminan  da  nga:min
because  GF-consume-incomp.  they  all

ilakuwa:n  bagga:t  mi,
GF-sell-incomp.  rice  our-excl.  cert.

Leggeq  ka  allod
while-away-I  L  downstream

nakiseminar  na:n  mu,  limma
AF-attend-seminar-comp.  said  you  five
salup nelaku da.
ganta GF-sell-comp. they

"You just kill if that's what you want. I'll leave you alone with your problem, "Aloy then said...I can't leave home because they will sell our rice. When I went downstream to attend a seminar, they sold five gantas of our rice."

Ramon: Uuuuuu! Tu maq ala bakkan Oooohh! That's cert. only not.
maminan de Romel ka GF-run-out-incomp. PNA Romel G
sigarilyu. cigarrete

Oh, no wonder Romel didn't run out cigarrete.

Ludag: "Sippatay yaq ka tolay, AF-long-to-kill-incomp. I G person
sippatay yaq ka tolay," AF-long-to-kill-incomp. I G person
na:n maq Romel kanidde. "Uuuuy! 613
said cert. Romel here oooohh
Piga dur-duri nu ta?" how-many antique-jar you-pl. Q

'Oh, I want to kill, I want to kill someone,' Romel said when he was here. 'Ahh! How many antique jars do you have?'

Erlinda: Awa ku ya anuq GF-get-incomp. I FM-sing. chicken

kiya:n pagmaka:t, anuq de that morning chicken 3rd. poss. pl.
Aldrin, ta weg
Aldrin because AF-go-incomp.

ita:li kita anuq kanna:n.
Gf-exchange-npst L chicken there

Di:kod mangulis saq kammin
therefore AF-do-again-incomp. I again

magsingir ka anuq da...
AF-collect-incomp. G chicken their

May partiy an ku win a.
but GF-kill-incomp. I already cert.

Ta tallu wala nga anuq
because three already Lk chicken

kinnan: dayan: kita naggubra
GF-eat-comp. those L AF-work-comp.

mi ka nga:tu
we-excl. L uphill-village

kitun... Nangippan da
sometime-ago AF-take-comp. they

nangipasente kiyaq
AF-take-to-hospital-comp. 1st per.obl.

na:n mu, da:ga ngala ya
said you blood just FM-sing.

tebol. Nagkalbaw da ka anuq.
table. AF-steal-comp. they 0 chicken

Mai ya ara:mid tolay.
I-don't-know FM-sing. bad-work person

Ata:n naq maq lugud
there-is I cert. now

sumraq in gapu kadaya:n
AF-enter-incomp. already due those

na tolay. Meram-ra:man ngamin
Lk person GF-implicate-incomp. all
I will get the chicken in the morning, Aldrin's family's chicken, and I will exchange it with the chicken yonder. And then I will again ask for a chicken from them for the exchange. But I will eat it. Because they ate three chickens when we worked in the village uphill...When I was taken to the hospital, our table was full of blood when I came back. They stole and ate some chickens. Their deeds are evil. Sometimes I want to go wild in the forest because of these people. All villagers get involved, I think because they (the people) get into trouble (because of them).

Their many chickens are already gone. They vanish one by one. Because they eat them when Annawan goes to work.

Erlinda: Anuq de Aguinaldo, duwa nga u:pa, kinnan da kanu.

Lk hen GF-eat-comp. they reportedly
Se da kanu immin
and they reportedly GF-consume-comp.

pinat-paitan ya ammay
GF-cut-down-comp. FM-sing. rice

de Aloy... Nga:min
3rd poss. pl. Aloy all

ba:ga:t naliku:bag.
banana-tree GF-fall-down-comp.

Aguinaldo’s chickens, two hens, they also ate them, it was said. And then they, reportedly, cut the rice plants of Aloy’s family. They also cut down their banana trees.

Ludag: Al-alnga:n kanu Annawan da ngamay
GF-scold-incomp. reportedly Annawan they but

aga-a:gu:di tutu wala Romel ki aliwa.
GF-strike-and-miss-incomp. very much Romel I knife

Annawan rebukes them but Romel threatens to strike her with a knife.

Erlinda: Nga:mi:n balet Aloy mawe
all pig-trap Aloy AF-go-incomp.

da kanu kul-kulsap...
they reportedly GF-uncock-incomp.

Ammu na tuni allang tal 648
GF-know-incomp. he that scolding rhet.Q

Ya masa:pul na tuni
FM-sing. GF-need-incomp. he that

ya abay ya disiplina:
FM-sing. big Lk disciplinary-action

All of Aloy’s pig traps, they also deactivated all of them... He does not listen to any rebuke anymore. What he needs is more
severe discipline.

Ramon:  Mmq
  Yes.

  Yes.

Erlinda:  ....abay ya tolay yin.
  ....big Lk person already

Monoq:  MePC nga agdisiplina.
  GF-PC-incomp. Lk mann.-discipline

A discipline through the P.C's.

Erlinda:  Taannam kanu ya
  how reportedly FM-sing.

  mangisipsip kitu:ni ay
  AF-secretly-report-incomp. that Lk

  akkan ikaw bu:gut makin
  not you-sing. true own

  an-anaq. Di ittu pay ya
  child not the-one ... Lk

  magan-anaq ya mangippan kiya
  parent FM-sing. AF-take-incomp. L

  adayyu. Tu maq peyang ya:n
  far-place the-one cert. always that

  kagiyan mi se Aloy
  GF-tell-incomp. we-excl. and Aloy

  ke Victor. Ngamay
  3rd.Per.-Obl.-pl. Victor but
ammuq kod 'ra akkan na 662
GF-know-incomp.-I rhet.Q why not he
kuwan. "Ata:n ammu 663
GF-do-incomp. there-is GF-know-incomp.
ta makadisipi:na kaday:a:n 664
we-dual AF-discipline-incomp. obl.prn.pl.
nu piya:n ta kammala ngin," 665
if like we-dual surely cert.
na:n ku maq tutu wala ngamay.... 666
said I cert. very much but

How can you tell on them (to the P.C.) when you are not the real parents. The parents themselves should be the ones to take them away. That's what Aloy and I always tell Victor. But I don't know why he would not do it. 'I know of some people who can discipline them if we only want it,' I flatly said but....

Ludag: Bangngag kayu ma:n kammin 667
deaf you-pl. on-the-contrary
kiya.... mangabaga:tan . da 668
L AF-massacre-incomp. they
kanu nu ata:n na.... 669
reportedly when there-is Lk

Don't you hear what they say...they said they will massacre the villagers if someone....

Erlinda: ....Akkan naq ala mali:dug 670
....not I just AF-worry-incomp.

kadaya:n...
obl.-prn-pl.

I am not worried at all by that.
Ludag: "Magpatay kada anna:naq
AF-kill-incomp. G-pl. children
3rd per.poss.

Ludag: "Aggi:da kammin mamatay
3rd (front.)pl. same AF-kill-incomp.
kada anna:naq da senu
G children 3rd per.poss. so-that
mangabaga:tan da ngin
AF-massacre-incomp. 3rd per.pl. already
nu kuwa...
when impl.

They themselves will kill their children and then they will massacre the (people) when...

Ramon: Adu la ngin nu ata:n isa duwa
many .. already if there-is one two

If there is one or two, that's already plenty...

Erlinda: "Nu ata:n mapatay ta
if there-is GF-kill-incomp. we-dual
nga uma:n kadatuni....
Lk like those

If they will be able to kill anyone at all, people like them...

Ramon: 'Ra mu la ma:laq
rhet.Q you-sing. .. GF-get-incomp.
mammin mapatay ya tolay! 681
finish GF-kill-incomp. FM-sing. person

Magsiruq pe ya tolay. 682
AF-hide-incomp. also FM-sing. person

Magta:law. Magli:si. 683
AF-run-away-incomp. AF-save-reflex-incomp.

You can’t kill all people. People will hide from you. they will
ran away. They will protect themselves.

Erlinda: Tangkurap lugud agkaq
instead then unexpec.

aggi:da ya matay 685
3rd per.front.pl. FM-sing. GF-die-incomp.

mapak-pakuna.
GF-happen-incomp.

They might be the ones who will get killed instead.

Ramon: Kanna:n takayu id-idagga:n nu 687
why I-you-pl. GF-wait-incomp. if

we daq patayan nin. 688
AG-go-incomp. you-me GF-kill-incomp. already

'Ra ngaq ala.... 689
why I just

Why should I wait for you if you are coming to kill me? Why
should I...

Ludag: ...Oq maq a nu 690
yes cert. .. if

mapadaldal mu may nu 691
GF-see-some-by-incomp. you-sing. but if
ipadat daka la 692
GF-kill-unaware-incomp. they-you just

kiya:n. 693
there

Surely, if you see him coming but if he kills without your knowing it...

Erlinda: Ay agkod maq...
oh rhet.Ø there-is cert.

That would surely not happen.

Ramon: As....
disapp.-part.

Oh?

Erlinda: "Iddagga:n daq kidde," na:n na 696
GF-wait-incomp. you-me here said he
nu atm:n sikkabuka:nan na 697
when there-is GF-long-to-fight-incomp. he
maq kiyaa:n. Di ipakammu 698
cert. there not GF-make-known-incomp.
na pe nu pumatay a... 699
he also when AF-kill-incomp. ..
Luqsawan daq maq a datun 700
GF-angry-incomp. they-me cert. .. those

"Wait for me here," he says when he gets into a fight with someone. Therefore he also lets you know when he wants to kill
you...they will not like me because...

Monoq: (Se) pe ta bittiq kam and also that few yet
tu kuwa ne Ulat: FM-sing. impl. PNA Ulat

And why is it that there were only very few that Ulat....

Ramon: Mng. 'Tu tu. akkan yes the-one DTF-sig. not sikkungat pumatay.... AF-long-to-stop-incomp. AF-kill-incomp.

Yes. He was the one who did not want to stop killing people.

Monoq: Oq... Akkan na kam nammin tu yes not he ... consume FM tolay. 707 people

Yes.. But he did not (kill) all the people.

Erlinda: Di da maq kam umanan da not they cert. ... massacre pl.
tolay nu kuwa...
people when hest.

Didn't they say that they will massacre the people if/when...

Ludag: We manin da anna:naq AF-go-incomp. again they-pl. children.
Induan mi kaden da anna:naq GF-kind-incomp. we ..... they children bibittiq da iskul ngamay small-pl. they students but
The children leave again. We are very kind to the small children who are going to school but they always miss classes and this is the reason Arling scolded them, (for) their absence from class. May unexpectedly, 'Arling sent us out,' they said (I believe). And they left.

Erlinda: Ammu ya:n nu umbet Romel, 719
know that when AF-come-incomp. Romel
ay umma:n kanu kituni a 720
Lk like hedge part. that ..
nga 'a:wan ub-ubraan. Ay nu 'ra 721
Lk none GF-do-incomp. And when why
ka la miqdam ka biting ngin 722
you just wink G little already
ay ata:n naqwa ngin a 723
and there-is happen already surely
ki balay mu wa umawan oray 724
L house your Lk AF-disappear-incomp. even
nu inna kiya:n Kanda:du na 725
if what there.. padlock of
You know, when Romel comes here, he looks like someone who does nothing bad. But any moment you wink even just a little, something will disappear in house house whatever it may be...Our chest padlock, you wouldn't believe it, it was mutilated and lying in the...I don't know what they used to pry and drill it with. Even the hinge you wouldn't believe how much the...

Monoq: ...Tukil. pry

Erlinda: Oq. Yes.

Yes.

Ramon: Na:gan kuma ya alaq da? what wish FM GF-take-comp. they

What did they want to get from there?

Erlinda: Maga:pul da ka piraq. AF-find-incomp. they G money
They are looking for some money.

Ramon: Maga:pul da ka piraq? 735
          AF-find-incomp. they G money

Are they looking for some money?

Monoq: Maga:pul da maq a ka 736
          AF-find-incomp. they cert. surely G
          piraq, ikaw Ta ittu ya:n 737
          money you-sing. Because it-is that
          ya sapu:lan da. 738
          FM GF look-for-incomp. they

Surely, you know they are looking for some money. Because that's what they always look for.

Erlinda: Ay na:n ne Victor, 'Akkan da 739
          And said PNA Victor not they
          kod maq kut-kutiyan ya piraq 740
          ... cert. GF touch-incomp. FM money
          ku oray nu iwaren 741
          my even if GF put-in-the-open-incomp.
          ku,' na:n na. Kanna:n da 742
          I said he why they
          takawan ya piraq ki 743
          GF steal-incomp. FM sing. money L
          balay da ta? Ta 744
          house their rhet. Q because
          mammuwan da lugud nu kuwa... 745
          GF know-incomp. they cert. when impl.
And Victor said, 'You know, they don't ever touch my money even if I put it out in the open,' he said. And why will they steal the money in their house? Because they (the parents) will know when...

Ludag: Bila:ngan da kanu maq 746
       GF-count-incomp. they reportedly surely

       ya piraq may maddi da 747
       FM-sing. money but not they

       mangalaq a:ta... 748
       AF-take-incomp. because

They, reportedly, will count the money but they never take any of it because...

Erlinda: Oq, a:ta balay da. Ta 749
       yes because house their because

       a:wan saba:li mapatil-tila:n di 750
       none other GF-blame-incomp. not

       aggi:da. Tu:ya "magta:kaw 751
       3rd Per.pl.front. that's-why AF-steal-comp.

       ta ki:di ta kuwa," na:n 752
       we-dual here because impl. said

       da kada babalay Maya:n mu 753
       they L-pl. houses. imagine you-sing.

       kanu tu sina:kaw 754
       reportedly FM-sing. GF-steal-comp.

       ne Romel kitu kuwa, 755
       PNA Romel when hest.

       a:kit ne Diyoner. 756
       marriage PNA Diyoner

       Aggi:da se itu an-anaq 757
       3rd per. pl.front. and the-one child
Yes, because it is in their house. No one will be the target of suspicion but them. That's why, 'Let us (excl.) steal here because...' they, in other houses. You would not believe what Romel again stole during the, during Diyoner's wedding. He and the Leon's other son...cigarette. They got in through the window of Ramon's house. (They took) one box of cigarettes. Could you imagine the value of the one box of cigarette?

Ramon: Mesa pe ide mangwa pe
one also this AF-do-incomp. also

ide an-anaq ne Leon
this child PN poss. Leon

bittiq, kadayam. Tu dayam
little those the-one those

daya nagamet kiya
FM-pl. AF-destroy-incomp. G

ta:lad ku, panillod
sugar-cane-plant my downstream-side

balay de Manong kitu
house PN poss. elder-brother L

gabi. Aggi:da se Joel.
night 3rd per.pl.front.. and Joel

De Motan se Joel. We 771
PNF Motan and Joel AF-go-comp.
da inamet ya tanga 772
they GF-destroy-comp. FM-sing. one
pun na ta:lad ku nga 773
hill Lk sugar-cane-plant my Lk
pane kade Dalenog. Akkan 774
side Dt.Per.obl.pl. Dalenog not
da makali:si a ta 775
they AF-escape-incomp. cert. because
nasingan Dalenog da. 776
GF-see-comp. Dalenog they
Aggi:na nani:la:ɡ 777
3rd per.sing.front. AF-shine-comp.
kaggi:da. 778
3rd per.obl.pl.

Leon's little son, is also one of them who does things like that. They are the ones who stole some of my sugar cane that I planted at the downstream side of Elder brother's house, last night. He and Joel. Motan and Joel. They stole one hill of my sugar cane plantation near Dalenog's house. They cannot deny it because Dalenog shone on them. He was the one who shone on them.

Erlinda: 'Ra ta di pada:san 779
why we-dual not GF-try-incomp.
pilta:ngan.... nam de 780
GF-break-limb-incomp. but PNA
Dalenog tal 781
Dalenog rhst.Q

Why didn't Dalenog try to hit and debilitate them.
    thought he if pig they

He will mistake them as pigs.

Ramon: "Busid," akkan da na:n a
        lie not they said cert.
        ta akkan iyaq ya
        because not me-front.. FM-sing.
        magbaqa:na:n kiy:a:n. Ya
        AF-talk-incomp. that FM-sing.
        nakasingan. Akkan ku pe
        AF-see-comp. not I also

        am-ammu ya:n. Ngamay tu
        GF-know-incomp. that but FM-sing.
        maq pe la nga nagiqnaq
        cert. also just Lk GF-hear-comp-I
        ya istorya daya:n
        FM-sing. conversation them
        de Manang.
        PNA elder-sister

They cannot say that it is not true because it's not me who tells
the story. The one who saw them. I did not know it. But I
overheard the story of Elder sister and her friends.

Monoq: Akkan ikaw ya nakadi:la:g.
        not you FM-sing. AF-shine-comp.

You were the one who shone on them.

Ramon: Melug ku maq lugud
        AF-desire-incomp. I cert. surely
we kagiyan kitu pagmaka:t 793 AF-go-incomp. GF-tell-incomp. L morning
ta... "Pangaasi nu ta 794 Lk please you because
sikwa:tan nuda anna:naq nu," 795 GF-watch-incomp. you-they children your
na:n ku kuma may lam-lamtan ku 796 said I wish but GF-think-incomp. I
manin, ya mana:kan na 797 again FM-sing. parent Gen.
anna:naq ay akkan da ipaqrob 798 children Lk not they GF-send-incomp.
y a maglokoloko," na:n 799 FM-sing. AF-do-foolishness-incomp. said
manin na uray ku. 800 again gen. mind my

I wanted to tell on them in the morning.'Would you please watch your children closely,' I wanted to say but it occurred in my mind that the parents of the children would not let them do the foolish things, I said in my mind.

Erlinda: O, may middan da ka 801 yes but GF-give-incomp. they G
disiplina maq. 802 discipline cert.

Yes, but they will be disciplined.

Ramon: Partuwat na an-anaq ya 803 creation gen. child FM-sing.
umma:n kiya:n na aramid. 804 like that Lk bad-work
Those kinds of bad deeds are the children's own creation. That's why I did not continue what I wanted to do because I did not want the parents to get insulted if... If I will tell them.

Erlinda: May ittu ya:n ya agkuna but the-one that FM-sing. to-be

da maq. May ittu ya:n they cert. but the-one that

ya agkuna da duddu:ma. FM-sing. being they others

But that's the reason that they do such things. But that the reason why some children do such things.

Ramon: Akkan ku maq ialllang not I cert. GF-prohibit-incomp.

daya noray adaddu win kadaya FM-pl. anyone long already among
I will not hold back the longer sugar canes. There is a place where the children usually get some sugar cane, on either side of our poultry house. There are two hills. I will not prohibit the children from getting them when they want to chew some sugar cane.

Monoq: Nu we da magadang. if AF-go-incomp. they AF-ask-incomp.

When they ask for it.

Ramon: Og, we da magadang. yes AF-go-incomp. they AF-ask-incomp.

Kanna:n ta iallang why we-dual GF-prohibit-incomp.

ya mabalin kanan ta! 827
FM-sing. can GF-eat-incomp. rhet.Q

Tu neta:lad ku ka pane 828
FM-sing. GF-plant-comp. I L side
kade Dalenog ay ittu pikam 829
Dt.Per.pl. Dalenog Lk this-is yet

ya anggaya:t na nga 830
FM-sing. beginning 3rd pr.sing. Lk

kuwa... gumnika:t. Akkan ku 831
hest AF-get-up-incomp. not I

cert. GF-prohibit-incomp. already when

wayya iallang ngin nu 832
cert. GF-prohibit-incomp. already when

adaddu win. Tu ta 833
long already the-one we-dual

agta:lad kiya i:li ta... 834
planting L village because...

Yes, if they come and ask. Why would I hold back anything that is edible? Those that I planted near Dalenog's house are just beginning to develop stalks. I will not hold them back when they get longer. The reason we plant sugar cane in the village is to...
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