An elusive verbal suffix in Bantoanon

Bruce A. Sommer
Ethnografix Australia

1. Introduction

My doctoral dissertation, *Kunjen syntax: a generative view*, was accepted during the first summer session of the University of Hawai'i's 1970 program. My adviser was of course Dr Howard P. McKaughan, then Professor of Linguistics and Dean of Graduate Studies. With my wife, Elaine, and daughter Leanne, I had enjoyed a close relationship with Howard and Bobie McKaughan and their family, and had worshiped with them at Kapahulu Bible Church. The cherished relationship established then on campus survived for many more years despite miles and many months of separation, and our esteem and affection remains the warmest. Despite the closeness of this tie, I could never—out of respect and awe—call him "Howard", and so for many years (even after graduation) resorted to the appellation: "The Chief." It seemed to fit such a towering personality.

Coming to graduate studies as I did without an undergraduate degree—but with other studies that the University accepted provisionally as equivalent—The Chief saw to it that I was unceremoniously thrown in at the deep end. I guess his view was that I had to either sink or swim. He chose for my initial semester a seminar (!) class on Polynesian Structures under Prof. Bruce Biggs (despite Australian Aboriginal languages being my involvement). I can only surmise that he watched from the sidelines with somewhat amused interest while I flapped and gulped and splashed about until I found that—with a good deal of nail biting and much hard work—I could eventually float, and to my surprise even make slow progress. If he was ever surprised—I certainly was and I suspected the same of him—he never showed it.

This is my favorite anecdote about Howard; I quoted it at the July 1979 RELC Conference in Singapore: Commenting on a speaker visiting the Linguistic Society of Hawai'i, of which I was at one point President, I remarked to him with admiration on the collegial camaraderie of the linguistic community. I was impressed, I said, when the presenter addressed his "friends and colleagues." The Chief quickly corrected me. "That's not the way of it! They're different! Friends" he insisted, "are the people who ask questions at the end, which allow you to expound your position or analysis better." "And colleagues?" I asked. "They ask the other questions" he replied dryly.

The contribution that I here hopefully address to "friends" is what I would advance as an expression of the esteem and affection in which Howard is held by my family. It is also my personal recognition of the contribution he has made not only to SIL Philippines Branch as an entity supporting Bible Translation, but also both directly and indirectly to Philippines linguistics, lexicography and pedagogies. For instance, in undertaking the research represented here I also had access to an "Asi Language Packet" published by the Training Unit of the U.S. Peace Corps, Philippines (n.d., but dating from about 1991). To my stunned surprise, I found the glossary for this minor language attributed to the impetus of Dr Arthur Crisfield, my fellow student at the University of Hawai'i and confrere of the Pacific and Asian Linguistic Institute (PALI) founded there by Howard McKaughan. No

Loren Billings & Nelleke Goudswaard (eds.), *Piakandatu ami Dr. Howard P. McKaughan*, 289–310.
Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines and SIL Philippines, 2010.

better evidence is needed of the wide impact that he has had on scholarly research in the Archipelago—and indeed the entire Pacific basin—if not always in person, then through his many enthusiastic students.

For the theoretical orientation of my dissertation The Chief accepted my proposal for a Fillmorean case grammar perspective, which given my earlier exposure to Latin and New Testament Greek I found intuitively appealing. Published in 1972, *Kunjen syntax* remains, as far as I am aware, the only comprehensive, published account of an Australian grammar within the generative framework of the early '70s.

Case Grammar later failed to realize the potential that Fillmore (1968a, 1968b, 1969, 1977) had disclosed. Scholarly confusion broke out over the number and differentiation of logico-semantic case categories that could be regarded as primitive. Attempts to salvage case grammar by reference—for example—to Anderson's Localistic interpretation (1971, 1977), Fillmore's own Construction Grammar (1988), or the Lexicase departure of Starosta (1988) still did not comfortably account for all the complexities of constituent syntax. Case Grammar nevertheless provides, from time to time, a useful frame of reference, even in pedagogies oriented towards other theoretical perspectives, such as Bickford (1998) which SIL has used as a teaching text. Genuflection to logico-semantic cases has been noted too in the work of Foley and Van Valin (1984) and Van Valin and LaPolla (1997). A recent review by Butt (2006) has revived interest, and with that encouragement, I will again employ cases here, more as a descriptive convenience than a doctrinaire theoretical stance.

1.1 The Bisayan languages

Bantoanon—also known as Ásì—is spoken on the north and north-western side of Tablas Island in the Philippines archipelago, and on some surrounding islands, including Banton. I understand that there are now perhaps more than 150,000 speakers. Zorc (1977) classifies it as one of the Bisayan languages. The only available grammatical study from this group known to me is Wolfenden's 1971 *Hiligaynon reference grammar*—a PALI text—now sadly out of print.[1] The Wolfenden grammar was compiled as a companion volume to a pedagogical one for Peace Corps Volunteers by Cecile Motus, and its tone is therefore less formal than would otherwise be the case. This language is also known as Ilonggo.

Addressing Philippine languages from a Localistic case perspective, Brainard (1998:1) claims that

> Verbs are lexically specified for semantic roles that identify the roles [sic] played by arguments in the situation encoded in their clauses. ... A major question in Philippine linguistics is how best to analyze the relation between verbs, verb affixes, and semantic roles. The general lack of agreement among Philippinists on the answer to this question has been mainly due to two factors: the lack of one-to-one correspondence between verb affixes and semantic roles, and the lack of a principled means of constraining the inventory of semantic roles.

My own impression is that there has been a third factor: the too hasty semantic categorization of verbs as a basis for explaining their grammatical behavior—a strategy that Brainard takes as given. Hence, linguists have spoken of 'stative verbs', 'utterance verbs', 'emotion verbs', and so on, beginning their classification on semantic, rather than strictly syntactic, criteria.

The philosophical justification of this paper is in its attempt to describe some problematic Bantoanon data in formal grammatical terms.

---

[1] There had been an earlier Internet site with grammatical information, but I can no longer access it.

1.2 The bare essentials of Bantoanon morphosyntax

I have relied in this study on material collected by Misses Gail Hendrickson and Heather Kilgour of the Summer Institute of Linguistics. Miss Kilgour in particular has been most helpful in giving me access to her late language assistant, Mrs Merry Forcadas, and to her own sophisticated intuitions on the language. To them all I express my sincere thanks.

I have benefited from access to more than 10,000 example sentences in the draft Bantoanon dictionary, from which I have been able to extract appropriate illustrative material with the aid of Catspaw Inc's *Snobol4+* computer language, operating under Microsoft DOS v.6.2.

The summary that I offer below is the barest account that will serve the purposes of this paper; it is certainly not comprehensive.

*****

Like most other languages of the Philippine archipelago, Ásì manifests a morphosyntactic phenomenon here termed 'focus.' Focus is defined as the indexing, on the verb, of one associated nominal to which is ascribed discourse salience or semantic prominence at the expense of any parallel nominal. This verbal prefix indicates the functional role of that nominal, which is also marked by distinctive prepositional morphology.[2]

Only three nominal categories reflect the richer variety of logico-semantic cases that might be postulated to underlie them. Noun phrase categories labeled here as Performer,[3] Undergoer and Referent are each marked by distinctive prepositions, according—in turn—to clause level focus, which is normatively distributed on only one of these.[4] Focus and category thus determine between them the final prepositional form for each noun phrase of the clause. As noted, morphology on the verb indexes the focused noun phrase, and Realis vs. Irrealis action. It also differentiates three modalities: General (G), Aptative (A) and Subjunctive (S).[5] Modalities are also relevant to discourse parameters.

Some verbs specify the Aptative (A) when only the Patient appears in the case frame as Performer; most of these have been termed 'stative' because of their semantics, and the fact that in root form they appear to be adjectives. These roots include *basâ* 'be wet', *baság* 'broken', *búgtò* 'snapped in two', *huyóg* 'fallen', *sunóg* 'burnt', and *udák* 'spilt'.[6] When an Agent is introduced into the case frame of these stems, then typically the General modality (G) is used. This usage is consonant with the emphasis that the Aptative places on the EVENT, while the General emphasizes the PARTICIPANTS involved.

The basic prepositional morphology of Bantoanon noun phrases can now be better understood from this tabular account:

---

2 I accept that some scholars find the term 'focus,' as used here, anathema. I contend that the function of the morphosyntax of Ásì represented here is indisputable. Whether that function is termed 'focus' or 'wheelbarrow' doesn't alter the data, and labeling cannot damage the language or its description if properly defined.

3 A useful term I have taken from Newell (1995:§6).

4 Equational clauses constitute a systematic exception.

5 In turn, these also index the volitional, intentional Agent from the accidental, unintentional Actor (a distinction common to many Philippines languages [Newell 1995:92ff.]) and certain negatives.

6 Although stress is indicated on these roots, it is not fixed, and morphophonemic shifts of stress are recorded for certain prefixes.

Table 1: Basic noun phrase prepositions[7]

	PROPER NOUNS	OTHER NPS
Focused: N preposition	si	kag[8]
Non-focused: Non-Referent; O preposition	ni	it
Non-focused: Referent; R preposition	kang	sa

Following Fillmore, each form functioning as a verb—which may be a root independently recognized as a noun, adjective, or adverb, as well as a 'native' verb—is associated with a case frame or specification of nominal complements derived from a limited inventory of logico-semantic cases. These may each be optional, or required—although Referents as such may typically appear as sentence constituents in addition to these specified complements, i.e. as nonnuclear nominals.

The Performer may be logically traced to an Agent, as with the verb *baság* 'break', an Actor when different modality morphology is employed with that verb, and even a Patient when no Agent is present. The Dative complements verbs such as *tuyóg* 'sleep', *matáy* 'die', and so on, and yet manifests Performer morphology.

In similar vein, an Undergoer may reflect a Patient or direct object, or it may be a Genitive (following Fillmore the realization of an adnominal Dative) and the Referent may be a Benefactive, Locative, Elative, and so on. A complete account of case-to-category mapping still awaits attention.

The reader should note the following conventions concerning the examples: Square brackets—i.e. [and]–are placed around the noun phrase complements of the relevant verb of each example for clarity. Moreover, that clause exemplifying the chosen verb will, where possible, be assembled on the one line where the focused noun phrase is in italic. The suffixes *=(h)on* and *=(h)an* are coded REV;[9] LK represents a variety of linking segments beyond the scope of this study. INV codes *ay*, which signals (typically) inversion of the verb and a focused nominal within the clause. The coding of pronouns depends on persons: 1, 2, 3; the inclusive/exclusive distinction: I, X; singular or plural number: S, P; Nominative, Oblique (non-nominative), or Possessive (genitive) functions: N, O, or G, respectively.

2. The nature of the problem

The problem is to account for the appearance of a verbal suffix *=on*, which cooccurs with the Irrealis aspect, and its analogue *=an*, principally with the realis aspect. Both suffixes manifest an epenthetic *h* following a stem vowel, hence the formula *=(h)on/=(h)an* is used to describe these. Because of the similarity of the forms, a fair initial assumption is that they have a common explanation. This will in fact be borne out by the data.

---

7 Plurals for proper nouns, deictic and locative forms are omitted for simplification.

8 Sometimes *ka*.

9 The accepted Bantoanon orthography relies on hyphen to represent glottal stop under certain conditions, e.g. at morpheme boundaries. This requires some other symbol to represent morpheme boundaries themselves if confusion is to be avoided, and the material remain readable by Bantoanon people. I chose the equals sign, after consultation with Ms Heather Kilgour.

As noted above, portmanteau prefixes distinguish between Irrealis (essentially future aspect; anticipated action, coded IR) and Realis (present and past; commenced action, RL). This follows the pattern reported for Hiligaynon by Wolfenden (1971:116-7).

In clauses of General Modality with Undergoer Focus (hence UF) and Referent Focus (RF) the Irrealis may be of the form *i=* or *a=* whereas the Realis is *(g)ing=*. The prefix *i=* never appears with the suffix *=(h)on*, but *a=* always does.[10] In subordinate clauses, *=an* can appear without a prefix. The prefix *(g)ing=* appears often with analogous *=(h)an*.

The suffixes *=(h)on//=(h)an* may also appear with the prefix *ina=*, which signals personal experience or consequence and is coded CSL. The General Modality *a=* and *i=* have analogues in *ma=* (Aptative) and *mag=* (which subsumes various functions, here labeled for convenience Subjunctive); *(g)ing=* has respectively its equivalents in *na=* and *gi=*. To systematically represent the possibilities, the following table is provided. Note that the epenthetic *h* is represented as *(h)*, while braces { and } enclose the verbal suffix, indicating that it can be either present or absent.

Table 2: The appearance and non-appearance of *-(h)on/-(h)an*

UF or RF	Irrealis IR	Realis RL
GENERAL MODALITY G	*i=* *a=* *=(h)on*	*(g)ing=* *{=(h)an}*
APTATIVE MODALITY A	*ma=* *{=(h)on}*	*na=* *{=(h)an*
SUBJUNCTIVE MODALITY S	POSITIVE: *a=* *=(h)an* NEGATIVE: *mag=* *{=(h)an}*	*(g)ing=* *{=(h)an}* *gi=* *=(h)e*
PERSONAL EXPERIENCE/ CONSEQUENCE CSP	*ina=* *{=(h)an}*	

In the tables of pages 136 and 137, Wolfenden (1971) shows that *i=*, *=on* and *=an* are manifested there, but with apparently much more predictable—and different—functions. It is accounting for the less transparent appearance of *=(h)on/=(h)an* in Bantoanon that is the subject of this paper.[11]

An earlier draft grammar, compiled by SIL personnel from carefully checked material in the late 1980s, identified *a=* *=(h)on* and *(g)ing=* *=(h)an* each as discontinuous morphemes indexing UF. Ma and Brainard (1998:26ff) approaching the data from a Localistic case perspective, are not consistent in their glossing of this suffix although their data do cast serious doubt on this UF analysis. Their second sentence (recoded here for consistency) immediately invalidates the "UF theory":

(1) Ma=sa=sadya=hán [*sidá*] [sa akò pag=abót].
A:IR(PF)=PRG=happy=REV 3SN R 1SN GER=arrive
'*She* will be happy/rejoicing at my arrival.'[12]

[10] Rather rarely, *a=* *=(h)an* appears – apparently being morphologically conditioned.

[11] The suffix *=(h)on/=(h)an* has an independent function on Bantoanon verbs which is not immediately relevant to this discussion.

[12] The adjective *sádya* 'happy' does not, as a verb, appear at first blush to conform to the analysis that follows. A better reading of the semantic value of the verb is 'become happy, enjoy, be entertained', and its nuclear complements can then be accommodated more readily to the analysis.

Here, the Aptative Irrealis prefix *ma=* indisputably indexes (*inter alia*) Performer Focus (PF) yet *=(h)an* also appears. The suffix must, therefore, be seen as at least partially independent of *a=* and UF. Modifying this sentence with the Realis, an appropriate structure, with similar evidence, would be:

(2) Na=sa=sadya=hán [*sidá*] tong akó ay nag=abót.
A:RL(PF)=PRG=happy=REV 3SN when 1SN INV G:RL(PF)=arrive
'*She* is happy/rejoicing since I arrived.'

Furthermore, sentences (3)-(5) could each be regarded as reciprocals, where the action of a participant X on another participant Y is identical with that of Y on X. There is thus a sense in which each of the participants is both Agent and Patient—but morphologically, it is the former which takes precedence as Performer:

(3) Nag=su=subli=án [*sinrá*] [sa pag=yutò].
G:RL(PF)=PRG=substitute=REV 3PN R GER=cook
'*They*'re taking turns at cooking.'

(4) Nag=yanit-yanit=an [*sinrá*] [it buhók] tong sinrá
G:RL(PF)=RECIP=pull=REV 3PN G hair when 3PN

ay nag=-away.
INV G:RL(PF)=fight
'*They* pulled each other's hair roughly when they had their fight.'

(5) [*Kag mag=nubyo*] ay nag=sumpa-=án Nak
N NOM=loved.one INV G:RL(PF)=pledge=REV REL

sinrá ay indî mag=ka=limot sa usa'g-usá.
3PN INV NEG S:IR(PF)=HAB=forget R one.another
'*The lovers* vowed that (they) would not forsake one another.'

Nevertheless, each is a case where *=an* appears independent of Undergoer Focus. Data such as these indicate that the "UF Theory" has little to recommend it.

3. The data speak

The first necessary observation consistent with the above claims is that *=(h)on* appears only with the Irrealis *a=*, and never with the Irrealis *i=* prefix, as shown in (6) vs. (7).

(6) A=pa=sadur=on [*ka*] [nakò] [it akò disisyón] [iság].
G:IR(PF)=CS=know=REV 2SN 1SO G 1SP decision later
'I will let *you* know my decision later.'

(7) I=pa=sador[13] [nakò] [sa imó] [*kag akò disisyón*] [iság].
G:IR(UF)=CS=know 1SO R 2SO N 1SP decision later
'I will let you know *my decision* later.'

[13] The distinction between *u* and *o* is subphonemic, but speakers prefer to maintain the distinction in the orthography. Glottal stop is not represented before initial vowels, but as hyphen or grave accent elsewhere.

Where both sentences effect slight differences in the meaning of 'I will let you know my decision later' and that the alternation between *i=* and *a=* correlates not only with the appearance of *=(h)on*, but also with a quite distinct choice of focus (i.e. PF vs. UF; not represented in the English gloss here). This characteristic of Bantoanon clause structure is critical and will be explored more fully in the rest of the paper.

*****

Given these sentences, we cannot avoid the conclusion then that *i=* is functionally different from *a=* and that this difference correlates with the appearance of *=(h)on*. Consequently, the parameters that select *i=* over *a=* should illuminate the requirement or otherwise of *=(h)an* with other prefixes, such as *(g)ing=* and *ina=*. But these parameters are not immediately transparent, although the sentence pair above strongly suggests that focus is involved.

In order to expand the relevant corpus and to ensure that the analysis is general, this exposition will also consider Realis *(g)ing=* and its modal analogues *na=*, *gi=* as well as *ina=*.

Consider first the verb *abáya* 'be delayed, be hindered' which can manifest a Dative as the Performer, and which is here in focus, as shown in (8).

(8)

Na=-abaya	[*akó*]	[it	pag=-abót]	dahil	nag=-istorya=han
A:RL(PF)=delay	1SN	G	GER=arrive	because	G:RL(PF)=talk=REV

pa	kamí	it	tong	akò	amiga.
still	1PXN	G	still	1SP	friend

'*I* was delayed in arriving because I was still chatting with my friend.'

In such instances, the Performer typically appears with an Aptative Modality prefix. But when an Agent causes the delay or detention from an activity on the part of another participant, that latter entity assumes the role of a Patient. Consequently, General Modality can govern the prefix; thus, *=(h)on/=(h)an* appears on the verb, as shown in (9).

(9)

A=-abaya=hon	[*sida*]	[nakò]	[sa	ida	trabaho].
G:IR(UF)=delay=REV	3SN	1SO	R	3SP	work

'I will keep *her* from her work.'

Note that in (9) the form *sidá* 'she' of the main clause is understood as part of the case frame of *abáya* in the subordinate clause, and that the same entity is in focus in both clauses. In this situation, the suffix *=han* is not required. It will later be shown to be necessary when there **is** a switch of focus between clauses.

(10)

Na=hulí	*sidá*'t[14]	abót	dahil	ing=-abaya	[it
A:RL(PF)=late	3SN=G	arrive	because	G:RL(UF)=delay	G

ida	ka=kilaya]	[sa	rayan].
3SP	NOM=acquainted	R	path

'*She* was late to arrive because (she) was delayed on the road by her acquaintance.'

[14] The preposition *it* is elided to *'t* following a vowel.

A similar case to *abáya* is provided by *hudâ* 'shy, embarrassed' where the Dative 'subject' or focused noun phrase appears without *=an* (in (11) and (12)) even when the unfocused Agent *sa mga bisita* appears in (12). (Note that this noun phrase is rendered as a Referent, with the preposition *sa*, rather than with *it*.) The participant being embarrassed is still in focus. The unanticipated focus on an Agent requires *-an* in (13), and the embarrassed entity becomes a Patient.

(11) Na=hu=hudâ mag=bísaya [*kag anák*] [sa akò].
A:RL(PF)=PRG=shy S:IR(PF)=speak N child R 1SO
'*The child* is too shy to speak to me.'

(12) [*Sidá*] ay na=hudâ [sa mga[15] bisita] dahil bukô sidá hanrâ.
3SN INV A:RL(PF)=shy R PL visitor because NEG 3SN ready
'*He* was embarrassed by the visitors because (*he*) wasn't prepared.'

(13) Indì [*ka*] [nakò gusto=ng] ma=hud-=an.[16]
NEG 2SN 1SO wanting=LK A:IR(UF)=shy=REV
'I wasn't wanting to embarrass *you*.'

Specifically, the shift of focus from a Performer manifesting a Dative to a Performer of Agent origin—which is not normative—triggers the introduction of *=an*, as in (14).

As noted above, another parameter affecting the appearance of *=(h)on/=(h)an* is the switch of focus between the requirement of one clause and the structure of another in the same sentence. The same verb, *hudâ*, here has no overt complements at all in the subordinate clause, but it is understood from the context that mother and child are respectively referenced as Agent and Patient complements. That subordinate clause would in solo require that one of these be marked for focus. However, the focus in the main clause is on *kag salâ it ida anák* 'the fault of her child' with *it nanay* 'mother' clearly an unfocused Performer. Thus, *=an* is introduced on *hudâ* to resolve the conflict of focus between clauses.

(14) Ing=lipr=an [it nanay] [*kag salâ it ida anák*]
G:RL(UF)=conceal=REV G mother N fault G 3SP child

agór indì ma=hud-=an.
so.that NEG G:IR(PF)=shy=REV
'His mother covered up *the wrongdoing of her child*, so (he) wouldn't be embarrassed.'

Another example of case governed alternation is provided by *súmpà* 'curse', as in (15) vs. (16). Example (15) suggests that *súmpà* is complemented by an Agent and a Patient, such that the later, as Undergoer, can be in focus without triggering *=(h)on*.

(15) Indì [nakò] i=sumpà [*sidá*].
NEG 1SO G:IR(UF)=curse 3SN
'I will not curse *him*.'

---

[15] The sequence *mga* is an orthographic convention for Plural *manga* in many Philippine spelling systems.

[16] The verb *hudâ*, with a final glottal stop, is reduced here to *hud'*, after the pattern of many such verbs. As noted, the accepted orthography represents glottal stop, but its form must be adjusted in this case to the hyphen, -.

In (16), *ka* 'you' is the focus of the matrix clause, but *kináng kriminal* 'that criminal' is focused in the conditional clause that follows. The structure therefore requires that *=on* be suffixed to the verb of the matrix clause.

(16)

A = sumpa- = ón	[*ka*]	[it	imo	ma = guyang]	pag	kiná = ng
G:IR(UF) = curse = REV	2SN	G	2SP	LK = old	if/when	DEM = LK

criminal	kag	imo	a = pa = ka = say = án.
criminal	N	2SO	G:IR(UF) = CS = HAB = marry = REV

'Your parents will curse *you* if you marry that criminal.'

*****

The observations with respect to *abáya*, *hudâ*, and *súmpà* above are at the crux of the analysis. What will be shown to be at issue in a given clause is the consequence of discourse choice of focus on a nominal. This may be one that is not nuclear to the verb, or one that is focused in another clause, but such focus is not normative to the verb in question. That is to say, when focus is assigned anywhere in the sentence to a nominal which is at variance from the focus inherently assigned by a verb, the hearer/reader is alerted to this skewing by *=(h)an/=(h)on.*

Inasmuch as focus is a discourse feature, the insertion of *=(h)an/=(h)on* is a discourse phenomenon also.

The inventory of cases in intraclausal roles that trigger *=(h)an/=(h)on* will be shown to embrace most possible options. There may be some occasional difficulty in unambiguously assigning noun phrases to specific cases (in the Fillmorean sense) but the number and character of noun phrase complements to Bantoanon verbs will usually be transparent.

4. Focus and intraclausal case considerations

Pursuing this analysis, consider next the verb *pa.-indì* 'reject, refuse' which appears to have only one role associated with it.[17] Given its function in (17) and (18), that noun phrase is identified as a focused Performer and assumed to be an Agent.

(17)

Na = pa.-indì	gihapon	[*sidá*]	mag = pa = kasáy	abér
A:RL(PF) = refuse	even.now	3SN	S:IR(PF) = CS = marry	even

ina = haná- = an = ey	it	baríl.
CSQ = threaten = REV = already	G	gun

'*He* keeps on refusing to be married even when (he's) threatened with a gun.'

(18)

Pag	pangabáy	nakò	sa	ida	nak	a = -ib = han	akó,
when	plead	1SO	R	3SO	REL	G:IR(UF) = join.in = REV	1SN

nag = pa.-indì	[*sidá*].
G:RL(PF) = refuse	3SN

'When I requested her to accompany *me*, she refused.'

[17] This appears to be a fossilized form of the causative *pa=* and the negative *indì*; I have attempted to recognize this fact with a stop between the historically understood elements. Causative *pa=* appears as an element in several forms that are assumed to have been similarly fossilized.

When that participant refuses something/someone—in the role of a Patient or Direct Object—and when that entity is brought into focus, the verb requires the *=an* suffix, as in (19) and (20).

Clearly, the elements of the case frame of *pa.-indì* 'refuse, reject' and the placement of focus bear on the requirement for *=an*. However, unlike *hudâ*, where an introduced Agent triggers *=an*, the verb *pa.-indì* is associated natively with an Agent, and it is a focused Patient as Undergoer which is the element requiring *=an*.

(19) Ing=pa.-indi-=an [nakò] [*sidá*]. sa pag=bakáy it isrâ
G:RL(UF)=refuse=REV 1SO 3SN R GER=buy G fish

dahil ingwa pa kamí.
because there.are still 1PXN
'I refused *her* over buying fish because we still have some.'

(20) Indì natò gi=pa.-indi-=án [*kag tawag it Diyós*] [sa
NEG 1PIO S:RL(UF)=refuse=REV N summons G God R

atò kabuhì].
1PIP life
'Let's not reject *God's call* in our life.'

Consider further the following pair of sentences where *ragpák* 'slap' is the verb.

The suffix appears in (21), where the noun phrase complements of *ragpák* 'slap' are at first a little confusing. For this sentence, the form *sidá* 'her' confirms that the focus is on 'her', but the logical object of the action of slapping is the mosquito, *namók*, marked with the General preposition *it*. In this instance, *sida* 'her' is actually the LOCUS of the action, and hence derives from a Locative—not a Patient. (The noun phrase rendered '[her] arm' is actually an adnominal Locative to 'mosquito.') The initial translation is therefore misleading; the less elegant literal version better reflects the Bantoanon. But here it is the nonnuclear Locative that is in focus, and therefore the verb attracts the *=an* suffix.

(21) Ing=ragpak=án [nakò] [*sidá*] [it namók sa braso].
G:RL(RF)=slap=REV 1SO 3SN G mosquito R arm
'I slapped *her* on the arm where there was a mosquito.' or '*She* was the one on whose arm I slapped the mosquito.'

On the other hand, in (22), *=an* does not appear since the mosquito, *namók sa agtang it anák*, is more readily understood as the focused Undergoer and logical object of the act of slapping. (It is, once again a complex noun phrase with an embedded adnominal Locative 'chin' and Genitive 'the child's'.)

(22) Ing=ragpák [nidá] [*kag namók sa agtang it anák*].
G:RL(UF)=slap 3SO N mosquito R chin G child
'He slapped *the mosquito on the child's chin*.'[18]

[18] This sentence could also be read as having *sa agtang it anák* as an independent Referent noun phrase.

We conclude that the case frame of *ragpák* natively requires an Agent and a Patient, as in (22). When a nonnuclear Locative is introduced and brought into focus as in (21), the suffix *=an* is required. This provides another pattern of case constituents which requires *=an*.

A clearer instance of the syntactic perturbation effected by Referent focus on a Locative can be provided by *hápros* 'hurt, ache'. Probably *hápros* is essentially a noun; its verbal function concerns us here.

Example (23) has only the Performer, *kag akò ngisi*, marked with the focus preposition *kag*, as indexed on the verb by *nag=*. This noun phrase doubtless derives from a Dative origin. The Genitive, *akò*, is regarded as adnominal to *ngisi*.

Example (24) has two noun phrase complements: *akó* and *it ngisi*. The root *hápros* 'hurt', here as a verb again, appears with the prefix *ina=* typical of personal experiences. The pronoun *akó* is in focus, but its sense is very different from that in (23) because it is now a nominative and reflecting focus. However, as with *ragpák* above, this focused noun phrase derives from a Locative. The proper sense of the sentence might be rendered '(My) tooth is hurting (at) me.' The result is that *=an* is required on the verb.

(23) Nag=ha=hapros [*kag akò ngisi*].
G:RL(PF)=PRG=hurt N 1SG tooth
'*My tooth* is hurting.'

(24) Ina=haprus=án[19] [*akó*] [it ngisi].
CSL=hurt=REV 1SN G tooth
'*I* have a toothache.'/ '(My) tooth is hurting *(at) me*.'

A similar situation obtains with *yámhong* 'swelling'—another 'one-place' verb, probably having a Dative complement, as *hápros*. It evinces the same structure when a Locative is introduced as a Referent and assigned focus.

Consider further the contrast between the uses of *bakáy* 'buy' in (25)-(27) (as noted, *im=* is a variant of *(g)ing=* before a bilabial).

The nuclear noun phrase complements of *bakáy* are the logical Agent and Patient, as attested in (25). Focus is there expressed on the Undergoer 'those thongs.' In (26), the logical Agent is missing, while a Referent of Benefactive origin, *Nena*, is in focus and triggers *=an*. Even when the Agent reappears as in (27), *=an* remains on the verb because of the unexpected focus again on a Benefactive noun phrase that is not nuclear to the verb.

Focus on a non nuclear Referent mapped from a Benefactive origin therefore provides yet another pattern requiring *=(h)an/=(h)on* insertion.

Note also that the sentences with *ragpák* and *hápros* (having focus on a Referent from a Locative origin) and those with *bakáy* (focus on an original Benefactive) require *=(h)an/=(h)on* insertion. Such structures make the "UF Theory" untenable.

(25) Im=bakáy [*nakò*] [kiná=ng tsinelas nak puyá].
G:RL(UF)=buy 1SN G.DEM=LK thongs REL red
'*I* bought those red thongs.'

(26) Im=baky=an [*si Nena*] [it hitso nak barò].
G:RL(RF)=buy=REV N Nena G ready.made REL dress
'*Nena* was bought a ready made dress'

19 As noted, alternation of *o* with *u* is purely orthographic, and the loss of final stem vowel of the verb is not uncommon before *=(h)an/=(h)on*.

(27) Im = baky = an patí [nidá] [*si Rosa*] [it reló].
G:RL(RF) = buy = REV also 3SO N Rosa G watch
'He also bought a watch *for Rosa*.'/ 'He also bought *Rosa* a watch.'

The verb *tapón* 'infect', by way of contrast, permits three associated arguments, as in (28) and (29). In (28), there are reflections of an Agent *nakò*, a Dative *sa imò* and an Instrument *kag akò sip-on*. It would appear that the normative case frame of *tapón* comprises simply an Instrument: i.e. that which infects. Focus on this entity allows Irrealis *i* = .

(28) I = tapón [nakò] [sa imo] [*kag akò sip-on*].
G:IR(UF) = infect 1SO R 2SO N 1SG head.cold
'I will infect you with *my cold*.' (lit. 'It is *my cold* with which I will infect you.')

Realignment of focus among the nominals to effect the more 'serious' warning, as in (29), triggers the syntactic necessity of *a* = and the suffix = *an*.

(29) A = tápn = an [*ka*] [nakò] [it akò sip-on].
G:IR(UF) = infect = REV 2SN 1SO G 1SP head.cold
'I will infect *you* with my cold.' (lit. 'It is *you* I will infect with my cold.')

The noun *ságnat* 'fever', is employed as a verb as in (30). As a verb *ságnat* is not associated here with a Locative, after the fashion of *hápros*, or with an Instrumentive, as *tapón*, but rather with a Patient manifest as Performer, and so it therefore conforms with the analysis so far.

In (30), *itahapon* is a nonnuclear noun phrase and elicits no requirement for = *an* because it is not in focus.

(30) Ing = sagnat [*sidá*] [itahapon].
G:RL(PF) = fever 3SN yesterday
'*She* caught a fever yesterday.'

Similarly, in (31), the clause with *ságnat* includes but one associated role—the Performer here reflecting a Dative.

(31) Ma = pa = li-lì akó nak pay ina = sagnat [*akó*].
A:IR(PF) = CS = check.up 1SN REL seems.like CSL = fever 1SN
'I'll have to go to see the doctor because it seems *I* have a fever.'

On the other hand, (32) evinces two noun phrase complements to the verb, viz., *akó* 'I' and *it kalíng presyo* 'high price.' But notionally, while *akó* is still the sufferer of the fever, causation is now implied between the price as Agent (or perhaps Instrument) and what is now a Patient: *akò*. Hence, the alternative translation is appropriate. This structure is a departure from the normative case complementarity of *ságnat*, and consequent focus on one of these further entities introduces = *(h)on/* = *(h)an*.

(32) [*Akó*] ay a = sagnat = ón [it kalí = ng presyo]
1SN INV G:IR(UF) = fever = REV G this = LK price

kung akò a = -atu = hon.
if 1SO G:IR(UF) = attend = REV
'*I* will get a fever at the high price if I give in to it.' or 'The high price will give *me* a fever if I give in to it.'

The adjective *ínit* 'hot' provides some additional evidence, but introduces further problems. To become hot is the property of a Patient; to heat something requires recognition of an effecting Agent, while the Patient is again that which rises in temperature. The condition of BEING hot or SUFFERING heat relies on the semantics of a Dative—the experiencer of the condition. In (33), only a Patient appears with a non nuclear Locative (of time).

(33) Ka = -init [*kag anák*] [it gab-í].
LK(PF) = hot N child G night
'*The child* was feverish (i.e. became hot) last night.'

When an Agent appears as the Performer and focus is manifested on that nominal, = *an* is still not required, as in (34). This suggests that not only is the Agent nuclear to *ínit*, but that *ínit* tolerates an Agent as a complement of the verb even as a focused Performer, without = *an*.

(34) Nag = -a = -asu = -asó kag pugón sa bapór dahil
G:RL(PF) = PRG = smoke = smoke N galley R ship because

nag = -i = -init [it tubì] [*kag kusinero*].
G:RL(PF) = PRG = hot G water N cook
'The galley of the ship is emitting smoke because *the cook* is boiling water.'

The next structure implies that some external factor such as temperature or humidity affected the child, as in (35). Although at first sight this is an instance of a Patient underlying the Performer, it is more properly assigned to a Dative, so = *an* appears.

(35) Na = -init = an [*kag anák*] [it gab-í].
A:RL(UF) = hot = REV N child G night
'*The child* became hot last night.'

Of course effecting focus on the Agent as Performer—as in the sentence concerning the cook boiling water—requires no = *an*, as in (36).

(36) Ma = -init [*akó*] [it tubì].
G:IR(PF) = hot 1SN G water
'*I* will heat the water.'

In order to accommodate the next version of this sentence, a further revision is necessary: *ínit* appears to inherently require focus on the Agent when it appears with a Patient, failing which = *(h)on/= (h)an* is required, as in (37).

(37) A = -init = on [nakò] [*kag tubì*].
G:IR(UF) = hot = REV 1SO N water
'I will heat *the water*.' (lit. '*The water* is what I will heat.')

In (38), an Agent again appears triggering =*an* even though the Agent is not in focus. Perhaps the reason is the required focus on the Agent, as in (36). Alternatively, perhaps the reason is that the flowers, which are in focus, are not being elevated in temperature but are being burned or scorched, and comprise therefore a Dative. If that is the case, there is evidence of further case frame flexibility in the specification of Bantoanon verbs.

(38) Na=-i=-init=an [it adlaw] [*kag amò buyak*].
G:RL(UF)=PRG=hot=REV G sun N 1PXG flower
'The sun is shining on *our flowers*' (in the sense of withering them up).

Even so, Example (39) is difficult to accommodate; even the assignment of *ida itlóg* to a Dative origin is stretching the point considerably. Nor is the assignment of *manók* to an Instrumentive any more comfortable.

(39) Ing=-i=-init=an [it manók] [*kag ida itlóg*].
G:RL(UF)=PRG=hot=REV G hen N 3SP egg
'*Her eggs* are being incubated/hatched by the hen.' or 'The hen is incubating/hatching *her eggs*.'

Example (40) has the Performer in focus but it derives from an underlying Dative or experiencer of the condition, not a Patient, so =*an* is required.

(40) Ina=-init=an [*akó*] [dahil sa akò soksok].
CSL=hot=REV 1SN because R 1SP apparel
'What I'm wearing is making *me* feel hot.' (lit. '*I* am feeling hot because of my clothes.')

A similar analysis applies to (41) and (42).

(41) Ina=-init=an [*akó*] [sa kwarto=ng ma=sikò].
CSL=hot=REV 1SN R room=LK LK=crowded
'*I* feel hot in a crowded room.'

(42) Ayâ gi=tupár sa akò nak [*akó*] ay ina=-init=an.
NEG S:IR(UF)=sit.beside R 1SO REL 1SN INV CSL=hot=REV
'Don't sit beside me because *I* feel hot.'

The form *ínit* as a verb, therefore, appears to have a case frame which may variously be expressed as follows. However, each of these alternatives must be attached to specified focus options which determine whether =*(h)on/=(h)an* is required.

init +V [(P) / (D) / (A P) / (A D?)]

At this point it is worth reflecting on Wolfenden's (1971:106-7) observations on details of Hiligaynon syntax (italics mine - BAS):

> It is also probable that verb roots have a set of inherent features which they bring to the grammatical construction.... Such an assumption contributes materially to the description of the verbs. *It helps to account for the difference in affix potential among verb roots, and it may also provide a basis for distinguishing classes of lexical roots.*

> Such inherent features should be a part of the dictionary entry for each root. Unfortunately, our investigations of these features are not complete enough to permit a full statement of inherent features for every root. However, it is important for the reader to know that verb roots are not simply labels for kinds of actions (e.g., run, laugh, eat, think, etc.,); they also have restricting grammatical features which need to be taken into consideration when learning the function of a new root. Where such features are already known they are specified in the dictionary, but the inherent set of features for some verb roots cannot yet be specified either fully or in detail.

What Wolfenden appears to be advocating is the necessity for recognizing some 'inherent' characteristics of Hiligaynon verbs that impact on grammatical structures. His proposal is tantalizing in that he does not stipulate which of the grammatical structures might be so influenced. Given the characteristics of syntax shared between Hiligaynon and Bantoanon, it is reasonable to propose that at least differential focus is implied. If so it would seem that Hiligaynon shares with Bantoanon sophisticated interaction between focus and the nuclear complements of verbs, which here is attributed to case frames.

However, (43)-(45) suggest that there are other parameters relevant to *=(h)on/=(h)an* with respect to *ínit.* The verb *sánrok* 'serve up' is derived from a root meaning 'food served and given ready to eat, a gift of food, a plate.'

Sánrok is a verb in (43) (nominalized by *kag*) as indexed by the statistically less frequent Realis infix *<in>*. Perhaps the structure being reflected here is ['The food [that was given to us] was heated by me']. Consequently there is no interclausal conflict over focus.

The stem *sánrok* in (44) is a noun, not in a verbal function. Focus is on the Patient as Undergoer, but as yet the analysis is not sophisticated enough to account for either the *=on* attached to *ínit*, or the failure of the sentence with *Iínit nakò* ... One factor that may be relevant, and will be mentioned briefly later, is sentence complexity.

(43)	Ing=-init	[nakò]	[*kag*	*s+in+anrok*]	[sa	amò].	
	G:RL(UF)=hot	1SO	N	food.given+RL	R	1PXO	
	'I heated up *the food given* to us.'						

(44)	A=-init=on	[nakò]	[*kalí=ng*	*ida*	*sanrok*]	[sa	atò].
	G:RL(UF)=hot=REV	1SO	N:DEM=LK	3SP	food.given	R	1PIO
	'I'll warm up *this food she's given* to us.'						

(45) *I=-init [nakò] [*kalíng ida sanrok*] [sa atò].

Example (46) is another case that attests the failure of the "UF Theory" of marking with *a=*=(h)on/=(h)an*, since the Performer, *akó* 'I', is in focus. However, here the Performer is understood as a Benefactive again, with *it adóbo* derived from a Patient and *it akò kayungot* from an Agent.[20]

(46)	Ing=sanruk=án	[*akó*]	[it	adobo]	[it	akò	ka=yungot].
	G:RL(RF)=give.food=REV	1SN	G	adobo	G	1SP	LK=neighbor
	'*I* was given some adobo by my neighbor.'						

[20] It is not entirely clear yet why some 'demoted' Agents like this are marked with *it/ni*, and others with *sa/kang.*

But with Future *i*=, no *=an* is required, and the appearance of *i*= suggests a case frame that is normative—here comprising an Agent and a Patient, as in (47).

(47) I=sanrok [nakò] [kang Jun] [*kag suyâ*].
G:IR(UF)=give.food 1SO R Jun N viand
'I'll give some of the *viand* for Jun.'

(48) Ma=sanrok [*akó*] [it suyâ] [sa pinggán] [para kang Jun].
G:IR(PF)=give.food 1SN G viand R plate for R Jun
'*I* will dish up some viand onto the plate for Jun.'

This verb exhibits *=(h)an/=(h)on* when another role is introduced and is in focus. Focus on a Benefactive (or perhaps Dative) triggers *=an* in (49).

(49) Ing=sanruk=án [nakò] [*si Jun*] [it suyâ].
G:IR(RF)=give.food=REV 1SO R Jun G viand
'I gave *Jun* some viand.'

However, in (50), it appears to be the appearance of an Elative *sa kaldéro* 'from the pot' in lieu of the Allative (such as *sa pinggán* 'onto the plate' in (48)) that requires *=on*. The difficulty is that *sa pinggán* is not in focus, and so there is no immediately obvious explanation for *=(h)an/=(h)on*.

(50) A=sanruk=ón [nakò] [*kag suyâ*] [sa kaldero].
G:IR(UF)=give.food=REV 1SO N viand R pot
'I'll dish up *the viand* from the pot.'

5. Focus and reciprocals

It was noted earlier that reciprocals—where X performs on Y the same action as Y upon X—in fact imply coreference between Agent and Patient. Not all verbs allow such coreference, but some can imply or have the potential for it: *ámbit* 'resemble', *harô* 'kiss', *istórya* 'converse' for example. It was observed that the noun *súblì* has the sense of 'substitute' or 'successor', as in (51), and it carries the sense of 'replace' into its verbal functions, as in (52).

(51) [*Si Cristo*] kag nag=sublì [sa atò] [sa krus].
N Christ N G:RL(PF)=substitute R 1PXO R cross
'*Christ* was the one who substituted for us on the cross.'

(52) Nag=sublì [*akó*] [sa ida dati=ng ka=-ibhan=an].
G:RL(PF)=substitute 1SN R 3SP former=LK LK=accompany=REV
'*I* took the place of her former companion.'

As a verb it can also have the sense of 'take turns' (i.e. 'substitute for one another') with plural Agents affecting plural Patients and hence it meets the criteria of coreferentiality, and so triggers *=an*, as in (53)-(54).

(53) Nag=su=subli-=an [*sinrá*] [sa pag=yutò].
G:RL(PF)=PRG=substitute=REV 3PN R GER=cook
'*They*'re taking turns at cooking.'

(54) Ma = subli- = an [*kitá*] [it tsinelas] iság.
G:IR(PF) = substitute 1PIN G slippers later
'*We* will take turns with the slippers later.'

Instances of *súblì* in (55)-(56) are accounted for because, once again, focus falls on a noun phrase that is not nuclear to the verb—probably a Locative or Goal.

(55) A = subli- = on [nakò] [*kag trabaho = ng yâ nidá*
G:IR(UF) = substitute = REV 1SO N work = LK NEG 3SO

na = tapos].
A:RL(UF) = finish
'I'll do in her place *the work that she didn't finish*.'

(56) Ing = subli- = an [nidá] [*kag ida tatay sa pagigíng*
G:RL(UF) = substitute = REV 3SO N 3SP father R gentle

manug.rumaya it inra negosyo].
manager G 3PP business
'He followed *his father* as manager of their business.'

Verbs such as *súmpà* 'pledge, agree' (with *usa'g-usá* 'one another') can also meet the criterion of coreferentiality between Agent and Patient. The suffix *= an* is therefore required, as in (57).

(57) [*Kag mag = nubyo*] ay nag = sumpa- = an nak
N NOM = loved.one INV G:RL(PF) = pledge = REV REL

sinrá ay indì mag = ka = limot sa usa'g-usá.
3PN INV NEG S:IR(PF) = HAB = forget R one.another
'*The lovers* vowed that they would not forsake one another.'

6. Focus and interclausal constraints

One of the sentences with the verb *hudâ* was shown to require *= (h)an/= (h)on* because of structural dissonance between its two clauses. The verb *lipór* 'conceal' referenced the two participants that were attached to *hudâ* but in a structure that was not normative to the latter verb. The expected focus requirements of *hudâ* were therefore not met, and so *= (h)an/= (h)on* was introduced. Interclausal instances of this structural character are not infrequent in the corpus.

For example, we noted earlier that *ragpák* 'slap' was normatively associated with an Agent and a Patient. This is relevant to the assignment of focus between clauses, and the consequent requirement for *= (h)on/= (h)an*.

In (58), the initial conditional clause has *kináng bunáng* 'those threads' as the focused complement of *sali-ábor*. But the clause—the principal one—which follows, has *ikáw* 'you' as the focused element. As noted in (57), the example with *súmpà*, where there is such a switch in focus reference between clauses, it appears to require *= (h)on/= (h)an* when that focus is exceptional to the verb.

(58) Pag mag = s + in + ali-abor *kiná = ng* *bunáng* *sa* *kahón*,
If/when S:IR(PF) + RL = tangle N:DEM = LK thread R box

[akò] [*ikáw*] a = ragpak = ón.
1SO 2SN G:IR(UF) = slap = REV
'If *those threads* in the box get entangled with each other, I'll spank *you*.'

Equally, from the following sentence we conclude that *hántop* 'comprehend, understand' has an inherent focus on the Agent, manifested as the Performer. Focus on the Patient as Undergoer requires the *= an* suffix, as in (59).

(59) Na = hantup = án bagá [nimó] [*kag* *akò* *pag = tudlò*]?
A:RL(UF) = comprehend = REV Q 2SO N SP GER = teach
'Did you comprehend *what I taught*/*my teaching*?'

Example (60) preserves focus on the Undergoer as part of the first clause, but *human*—in the second clause—cannot appear with Undergoer focus without incurring *= on*.

(60) A = hantup = ón anay [nimó] [it ma = -ado] [*kag* *imo*
G:IR(UF) = comprehend = REV first 2SO G LK = good N 2SP

plano] bag-o a = human = on.
plan before G:IR(UF) = make = REV
'You must think *your plan* through well first before doing it.'

The rule appears to be general; consider the following structure.

In (61), *sa kuyúngan* manifests a Locative in the first clause, and is there appropriately identified with a Referent preposition in respect of *túgpà* 'alight.' In the second clause, *ápot* 'catch fire' requires a Patient as performer, and so indexes *kuyúngan* 'roof' in the first. The result is that *ápot* must recognize the inappropriate nature of a Locative being in focus, and so introduces *= an*.

(61) Kung [*kag* *alipayók*] ay na = tugpà [sa kuyungan] ay
if N sparks INV A:RL(PF) = alight R roof INV

na = -a = -aput = án [*kalí*] ag na = rukót.
A:RL(PF) = PRG = catch.fire = REV N:DEM and A:RL(PF) = burn
'If *flying sparks* land on the roof then *it* will catch on fire and burn.'

Interclausal conflicts of focus are clearly implicated in the selection of *= (h)an/= (h)on*. The case of *abáya*, cited in Section 3, attests that coreferentiality of focus between verbs inhibits the suffix if such focus is appropriate to those verbs.

7. Focus and the causative Verb *pa =*

There is a Bantoanon verbal prefix, *pa =*, which operates (*inter alia*) as a causative (CS) verb. In effect, it parallels the instances of interclausal switching of focus, because it introduces the possibility of additional arguments to the clause, and thereby also complexities of focus. For example, to the verb *humán* 'make, do'—as noted above—we assign just one normatively focused argument, an Agent, as shown in (62).

(62) Nag=human [*sinrá*] [it sampuyo=ng bayumbò] [para
G:RL(PF)=make 3PN G ten=LK voting.booth for

ma=gamit sa eleksyon].
G:IR(PF)=use R election
'*They* made ten voting booths to be used in the election.'

By contrast, Focus on a Patient, as Undergoer, again triggers =*an*, as in (63),

(63) [*Abáng ramò kag inra mga obras* nak a=human=ón [ngasing].
very many N 3PP PL job REL G:IR(UF)=make=REV today
'*There are a lot of jobs* they will have to do today.' (lit. '*Very many are their jobs* that must be done today.')

Humán also accepts *pa=* as a prefix. However, a great deal depends upon whether the Undergoer is interpreted as a function of *pa=*, or of *human*, as contrasted in (64) and (65).

Example (64) appears to equate with '[It will be caused by us [to be made a chicken coop]].' Between the 'clause' with *pa=* and that of *humán* there is **no** switch in reference of focus.

(64) I=pa=human [*namò*] [kag kulungan].
G:IR(UF)=CS=make 1PXO N chicken.coop
'*We*'ll have a chicken coop made.'

On the other hand, Example (65) is best represented as '[A chicken coop will be caused by us [Jun make it]]' where the Agent of *pa=* and that of *human* are **not** coreferential. Hence, the affix =*on* appears.[21]

(65) A=pa=human=ón [namò] [*si Jun*] [it kulungan].
G:IR(P2F)=CS=make 1PXO N Jun G chicken.coop
'We will have *Jun* make a chicken coop.'

The same case can be made for the following pair of sentences, where *Tang Igò* is the Agent attached to *humán* in each case, while *kulúngan* is the patient of *pa=* in (66), but of *humán* in (67). Examples (66) and (67) might be viewed as '[A chicken coop we will cause [to be made by Uncle Igo]]' and '[We will cause [Uncle Igo make a chicken coop]]', respectively.

(66) I=pa=human [namò] [kang Tang Igò] [*kag kulungan*].
G:IR(UF)=CS=make 1PXO R Uncle Igo N chicken.coop
'We will have *a chicken coop* made by Uncle Igo.'

(67) A=pa=human=ón [namò] [*si Tang Igò*] [it kulungan].
G:IR(P2F)=CS=make=REV 1PXO N uncle Igo G chicken.coop
'We will have *Uncle Igo* make a chicken coop.'

The inherent focus of *butáng* 'insert, place in/on' falls on the nuclear Patient. It exhibits the same sort of structure with *pa=*, as shown in (68) and (69).

[21] The coding "P2F" recognizes focus on the second of the verbal forms, i.e. *humán*, rather than *pa-*.

(68) I=pa=butáng [nakò] [sa ida] [*kag mga yamít*] [sa kuráy].
G:IR(UF)=CS=put 1SO R 3SO N PL clothing R fence
'I'll have *the clothes* put on the fence by her.' or '[I will cause *the clothes* [she will put them on the fence.]]'

(69) A=pa=butang=ón [nakò] [*sida*] [it mga yamít] [sa kuráy].
G:IR(P2F)=CS=put=REV 1SO 3SN G PL clothing R fence
'I'll have *her* put the clothes on the fence.' or '[I will cause [*she* will put the clothes on the fence.]]'

The assertion concerning *pa=* and its variability in structures involving focus, and hence *=(h)an/=(h)on*, appears to be general, as shown in (70)-(72).

(70) A=pa=yupar=ón [nakò] [*kag pispis*].
G:IR(UF)=CS=fly 1SO N bird
'I'll let *the bird* fly.' or '[I'll cause *the bird* [to fly]].'

(71) A=pa=-abut=on [nakò] [*sida*] [iság sa hápon].
G:IR(UF)=CS=arrive=REV 1SO 3SN later R afternoon
'I will expect *her* later this afternoon.' or '[I'll anticipate [*she* will arrive later this afternoon]].'

(72) Ing=pa=ngayan=an [nidá] [*kag ida anák nak Rey*].
G:RL(UF)=CS=name=REV 3SO N 3SP child REL Rey
'She named *her child Rey*.' or '[She caused [*her child* was named *Rey*]].'

8. Summary

At this point we have approached an understanding of the conditions under which *=(h)on/=(h)an* appears. It is required in the following situations:

a. when the 'inherent focus' or a permissible default term for focus on a nuclear complement of a verb is not realized (as with *pa-.índi*, *ragpák*, *hápros*, *bakáy*, *tapón*, *sánruk* and *ínit* cases, above), i.e. when focus is realized on a nonnuclear or inappropriate complement of a verb.

b. when the structure of one clause assigns an inappropriate focus for the verb in another clause which necessarily references the focused noun phrase. (The cases of *abáya, ragpák, humán* and *ápot* demonstrated this; *pa=* is a special case.)

It is possibly also required in the situation when there could be possible confusion over the identity of the focused complement by virtue of complexity in the clause. For example, the above analysis of the sentences with *bakáy* 'buy' above does not accord with (73) where four noun phrases are in evidence and focus is expressed on the Patient, but *a= =on* nevertheless appears. Again, it is suggested that there could be confusion over the identity of noun phrase complements, which *a= =on* resolves.

(73) A=baky=on [nakò] [it bilóg] [*kalí=ng isrâ*] [para sa imo].
G:IR(UF)=buy=REV 1SO G whole N:DEM=LK fish for R 2SO
'I will buy *this* whole *fish* for you.'

As a consequence of these conclusions, we can also state that General Irrealis *i=* signals coincidence with 'inherent' focus for some verbs. Rather than the alternate *a=* triggering *=(h)on/=(h)an*, it appears to be more reasonable to argue that *a=* is conditioned by the suffix.

9. Conclusion

The suffixes *=(h)on/=(h)an* are formally redundant, but serve to disambiguate for the reader/hearer matters of interpretation when an unanticipated but acceptable case entity is chosen for focus. It can be therefore regarded as a discourse function, effected by the choice of role participants and by focus.

However, we cannot avoid the conclusion that despite the complexity of the analysis here, which explains much of the corpus, in a few cases the precise conditions requiring the suffixes *=(h)an/=(h)on* remain unclear. Possibly the issue here is the resolution of the potential for semantic confusion in complex sentences—again, a matter of discourse clarity.

What emerges quite clearly from this account is the hypothesis that typically the nuclear specification of many Bantoanon verbs requires normatively a limited range of role participants or arguments, to one or more of which focus may be assigned inherently or by default without morphological consequence. When focus is assigned, by virtue of discourse requirements, on a non nuclear nominal which is nevertheless appropriate to the semantics of the verb, an adjustment is called for. That adjustment is typically effected with the suffixes *=(h)an/=(h)on*. In the Irrealis of General Modality, this adjustment can effect the alternation between *i=* and *a= =(h)on*.

It will require further research and input before the analysis can be improved upon. In particular, it will require a sophisticated account of the case frame of Bantoanon verbs before this description can be confirmed, refined or discounted. The direction of such research is what I understand Wolfenden to have been advocating.

References

Anderson, J. M. 1971. *The grammar of case: towards a localistic theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, J. M. 1977. *On case grammar: Prologomena to a theory of grammatical relations*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bickford, Albert J. 1998. *Tools for analyzing the world's languages.* Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Brainard, Sherri. 1998. Localist case grammar and Philippine verbs. In Sherri Brainard (ed.), *Localist case grammar and Philippine verbs*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines. 1–9.

Butt, Miriam. 2006. *Theories of Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1968a. The case for case. In Emmon Bach and Robert T. Harms (eds.), *Universals in linguistic theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1–88.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1968b. Lexical entries for verbs. *Foundations of language* 4. 373–93.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1969. Towards a modern theory of case. In D. A. Reibel and Sanford A. Schane (eds.), *Modern studies in English: Readings in Transformational Grammar*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall. 361–375.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1977. The case for case reopened. In Peter Cole and Jerold M. Sadock (eds.), *Syntax and semantics 8: Grammatical relations*. New York: Academic Press. 59–82.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1988. The mechanisms of construction grammar. *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*. Berkeley: University of California. 35–55.

Foley, William A., & Robert D. Van Valin. 1984. *Functional syntax and universal grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ma, Youngrye, & Sherri Brainard. 1998. Emotion verbs in Bantoanon. In Sherri Brainard (ed.), *Localist case grammar and Philippine verbs* (LSP 45). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines. 26–34.

Newell, Leonard. 1995. *Handbook on lexicography for Philippine and other languages*. Linguistic Society of the Philippines Special Monograph Issue 36. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Van Valin, Robert D., & Randy J. LaPolla. 1997. *Syntax: Structure, meaning and function.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Starosta, Stanley. 1988. *The case for lexicase: An outline of lexicase grammatical theory*. London: Pinter.

Wolfenden, Elmer P. 1971. *Hiligaynon reference grammar*. (PALI Language Texts: Philippines). Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press.

Zorc, David. 1977. *The Bisayan dialects of the Philippines: Subgrouping and reconstructions.* (Pacific Linguistics C–44). Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.