

# A Study of Second-Position Enclitics in Cebuano

Michael Tanangkingsing

NATIONAL TAIPEI UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Second-position enclitics in Cebuano are syntactically dispensable and truth-conditionally irrelevant; however, they add emotional flavor to utterances. This study investigates second-position enclitics in Cebuano, including their form and how they are used to express stance. The objective of this study is to investigate the form and functions of two groups of second-position enclitics, “aspectual” enclitics, and *emphasizer* and *intensifier* enclitics, as well as to examine their distribution in enclitic clusters. Conversational data show that the “aspectual” enclitics convey attitudinal stance: *=na* can convey emphasis, determination, and desperation, while *=pa* is used to imply “incompletion” or “lack,” leading to annoyance. In addition, I discuss *=man*, illustrating how it is used for downtoning and for showing politeness. I also tease apart the meanings of four seemingly synonymous high-frequency enclitics that differ in their relative frequency and preferred position in a cluster. As to function, *=ka'ayo* and *=gyud* serve to emphasize and intensify, but *=ka'ayo* has a scope over a predicate, while *=gyud* has scope over an entire proposition. On the other hand, *=lagi* and *=gud* have to be inspected in discourse: *=lagi* has the additional function of asserting one’s stance on the hearers, while *=gud* has the additional element of disagreement or dissatisfaction. Finally, I propose a relative ordering involving these two groups of enclitics in clusters.

**1. INTRODUCTION.**<sup>1</sup> Clitics are “unstressed morpheme(s) whose position is syntactically rather than lexically determined (e.g., suffixed to the preceding constituent in a clause)” (Croft 1990:189–90); in other words, they are “phonologically dependent upon a neighboring word in a construction” (Crystal 2008:80). In Cebuano, (second-position) (en)clitics are the usually monosyllabic linguistic units that occupy the “second

1. Different parts of this paper were presented at several conferences: section 2 at the 6th Conference on Language, Discourse, and Cognition, on May 4–6, 2012, at National Taiwan University; the portion on enclitic clusters at the Workshop on Stance in Discourse: Functional, Typological, and Diachronic Perspectives, on May 7–9, 2012, at Hong Kong Polytechnic University; section 3 at the 12th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (12-ICAL) on July 2–6, 2012, at Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia; and section 4 at the Workshop on Stance and Discourse: Typological, Functional, and Diachronic Perspectives, on September 3–5, 2012, at Hong Kong Polytechnic University. I thank the College of Humanities and Social Sciences of National Taipei University of Technology for research and travel funding. I also thank Foong-Ha Yap, Jheng Heng-hsiung, Fuhui Hsieh, Christopher Allen Sundita, and especially Dongyi Lin, as well as the audience at 12-ICAL who offered comments and suggestions. Any remaining errors are my own.

position” and attach or cliticize to the “first element” occupying the initial slot in the predicate (or verb) complex. Examples of predicate complexes with enclitics are shown in the sample sentences in (1).

In the three clauses in (1), the predicate complex in each is underlined, and the second-position enclitic is in bold. The “first elements” in (1a) and (1b) are verbs, namely, *gi-hold* ‘detained’ and *gi-pangayo* ‘-an’ ‘asked for’, respectively, while that of (1c) is a nominal predicate, the name *Mister Morales*; in all three examples, this first element plus clitic is bolded. In other instances, the “first element” that can occupy first position in the predicate complex can also be the negator in a negated clause or the question word in an interrogative clause,<sup>2</sup> as well as a modal or a locative/temporal adverbial; in such instances, the main verb occupies the final slot in the predicate complex.

The enclitics in (1) are, namely, =*gud*, =*gyud*, and =*na*, and these are underlined in these examples. Observe that they always attach to a first-element word, whatever its category. In previous grammars on Cebuano, including Tanangkingsing (2009), these second-position enclitics were referred to as “particles.”<sup>3</sup>

- (1) a. **Gi-hold=gud=mi** tulu ka oras.<sup>4</sup>  
 PV.PFV-hold=INTERACT=1PL.EXCL.NOM three LK hour  
 ‘(The customs) detained us for three hours.’
- b. **Gi-pangayo-an=gyud=mi=g** kwarta.  
 Gi-pangayo’-an=gyud=kami=ug<sup>5</sup> kwarta.  
 PFV-ask.for-LV=INTENS=1PL.EXCL.NOM=EXT money  
 ‘They really asked us for money.’
- c. Oy, **Mister Morales=na=to** ha.  
 Oy, Mister Morales=na=kato ha.  
 VOC PN=already=that DM  
 ‘Hey, [and to think that] that was actually Mr. Morales!’

In terms of semantics, these second-position enclitics generally lack a stable sense and rely on a context to acquire meaning. As Dita (2011) reports, enclitics in Philippine languages like Tagalog, Ilokano, and Ibanag are basically empty and expletive, lacking any identifiable meaning outside of discourse, although it has been suggested that these enclitics in general do have semantic content and internal conceptual structure (Wierzbicka

2. Negators and question words are functional notations. Negators may negate nominals and predicates, while question words can be nominals or verbs.

3. I provide a second-tier glossing for some utterances to show the standard spelling of individual morphemes whose pronunciation may have been reduced, simplified, or distorted in actual speech—the first such example being (1b). Otherwise, no additional tier is provided if there are no changes to the spelling of the words/morphemes.

4. The glosses follow the List of Standard Abbreviations in the Leipzig Glossing Rules. Additional abbreviations are listed as follows: ABIL, abilitative; ANAPH, anaphora; ASSERT, assertive; AV, actor voice; BC, backchannel; COMPAR, comparative marker; DEF, definitizer; DISCOV, discovery marker; DM, discourse marker; DN, downtoner; DUB, dubitative; EMPH, emphatizer; EPIS, epistemic; EVID, evidential; EXIST, existential; EXT, extended argument; FIL, filler; FS, false start; INTENS, intensifier; INTERACT, self-oriented interactive; INTERJ, interjection; IV, instrument voice; LK, linker; LV, locative voice; NEUT, neutral case; PART, particle; PN, proper name; PV, patient voice; REDUP, reduplication; RV, referential voice; SPONT, spontaneous; STAT, stative; SUPER, superlative marker.

5. Glottal stops in the spoken data are represented by apostrophes in this paper, although in actual Cebuano orthography these glottal stops are usually indicated by a hyphen.

1991, Wilkins 1992). They allow speakers to express a broad range of attitudes and nuances (cf. Naylor 1978). Enclitics are syntactically dispensable and truth-conditionally irrelevant, but they are “closely related to the interpretation of an utterance” (Lee 2007:363). In other words, they convey personal attitude or stance to a given proposition; they are “a contributing factor for the achievement of fluency, grace, and emotional coloring” (Trosdal 1992:46): for instance, the enclitics in (1a), (1b), and (1c) convey disagreement, intensification, and emphasis, respectively. I thus examine these enclitics in light of their usage to mark “personal attitude” or “stance” by providing short excerpts extracted from conversational data for further illustration.

In addition to explaining the meaning of these enclitics, I also attempted to work out the relative order of these enclitics in a cluster, that is, when they occur together in twos or in threes in a predicate complex. In terms of how they are distributed in a cluster, it initially looked as if their ordering was flexible. Wolff (1962, 1965) and Bunye and Yap (1971) have previously made some remarks about their relative order. The former observed that only the aspectual particles can be clearly assigned a preferred position. The latter provided a table listing the order of the enclitics in a cluster, but this is problematic. Researchers of other languages have also made similar attempts. DuBois (1976:60) and Brainard and Behrens (2002:127) attempted to plot the order of postparticles in Sarangani Manobo and of second-position clitics in Yakan, respectively; these attempts were most probably based on the comparison of sentences. Nevertheless, the descriptions of enclitics made by these studies were sentence-based and too general. Examining actual discourse data, Tanangkingsing (2009) revealed that there is some correlation between frequency and position in an enclitic cluster in Cebuano: high-frequency enclitics tend to prefer the initial position in a cluster, as shown in table 1.

Table 1 roughly groups the second-position enclitics into four distribution types in terms of their frequency in use: Group 1 enclitics, those that are most frequent in discourse and that almost always occur in the initial position of an enclitic cluster; as well as Group 2, Group 3, and Group 4 enclitics, depending on their relative frequency in the

**TABLE 1. FREQUENCY AND PREFERRED POSITION OF ENCLITICS IN CLUSTERS**

	<b>Strongly initial position</b>	<b>Initial/medial position</b>	<b>Final position</b>
<b>Group 1</b>	=man (downtoner) =na (change-of-state) =pa (incompletion) =ra (downtoner)	=lang (downtoner)	
<b>Group 2</b>		=gyud (intensifier) =lagi (intensifier) =sad (additive)	=ba (question) =ka'ayo (emphasizer) =kuno (evidential) =pud (additive)
<b>Group 3</b>		=gud (intensifier)	=gani' (emphatic) =gihapon (aspect) =bitaw (agreement) =di'ay (discovery)
<b>Group 4</b>		=baya' (weak assertion)	=unta' (optative) =kaha' (dubitative) =tingali (epistemic) =siguro (epistemic) =usa' (temporal) =unya' (temporal)

conversation data. This table also shows the preferred position of the enclitics in a cluster, namely, initial, medial, and final positions. Of the several enclitics that are shown in table 1, I will focus on two main groups in this study, namely, the Group 1 enclitics, and the Group 2 enclitics used for emphasis or intensification. First, most of the Group 1 enclitics convey aspectual information, while all the enclitics in the other groups mark attitude and stance—for example, attitudinal, epistemic, emotional, or evidential (Rhee 2011:406)—as their main function. So does that leave table 1 incoherent? In other words, do these aspectual enclitics belong to the whole set of attitudinal enclitics? This issue is covered in section 2, where I will show that these Group 1 enclitics do convey attitude or stance in many contexts, arising from their aspectual meaning. In that section, I will also discuss enclitic clusters, as it is mostly the Group 1 enclitics that pervasively occur in clusters.

Next, I will devote section 3 to the Group 2 enclitics that serve to emphasize or to intensify meaning denoted by the predicate or by the proposition. Several enclitics possess this function, but I will try to tease apart their differences in terms of usage and meaning in discourse. I also present an excerpt illustrating the actual use of enclitics in conversation. In addition to this, it was found difficult to determine the position of these Group 2 enclitics in a cluster. In section 4, I will outline their distribution relative to other enclitics, based on discourse data. Section 5 provides a conclusion.

The data used in this study consist of five approximately thirty-minute-long casual conversations between friends. After transcription, they were then checked clause by clause for enclitics, and the data gathered served as the material for this study. The examples provided in the text are all taken from this set of data unless otherwise indicated.

**2. THE GROUP 1 ENCLITICS.** The purpose of this section is mainly to discuss and illustrate the fact that Group 1 enclitics do convey attitudinal stance, in addition to their main function of expressing event structure and temporal information. The enclitics dealt with here are *=na* ‘already’ and *=pa* ‘still, yet’, as well as *=man*, the politeness marker or downtoner. There are other Group 1 enclitics, but I will devote my discussion here to just these three. Strictly speaking, aside from *=man*, the core meanings of these Group 1 enclitics do not convey any “attitude” or “stance”; however, they may do so, given the proper context, especially when phonologically stressed, and I will discuss this in 2.1. Since the Group 1 enclitics are the ones that almost always occur in enclitic clusters, I will discuss this clustering in 2.2.

**2.1 THE GROUP 1 ENCLITICS AND THEIR STANCE-MARKING FUNCTIONS.** In this section, I will show how the Group 1 enclitics convey attitude or stance, to justify their inclusion as members of the category second-position enclitics. First, I show the case for *=na* in 2.1.1 and how the meaning has metaphorically extended to other domains. Then I will illustrate the meanings and functions of *=pa* and *=man* in 2.1.2 and 2.1.3, respectively. In 2.1.4, I provide an interim summary.

**2.1.1 The enclitic =na.** With ordinary action verbs, the enclitic *=na* indicates a change of state; it literally means ‘already’, as shown in (2a). In (2b), when the enclitic *=na* is removed, the sense of ‘already’ is lost; the utterance simply reports a past action of eating.

- (2) a. Ni-ka'on=**na**=ko.  
 AV.PFV-eat=**already**=1SG.NOM  
 'I ate/finished eating already.'
- b. Ni-ka'on=ko.  
 AV.PFV-eat=1SG.NOM  
 'I ate.'

Based on this, =*na* has several extended senses: to convey emphasis, determination, and desperation. First, when paired with an emphasizer enclitic =*ka'ayo*, the enclitic =*na* can subtly stress the meaning denoted by a predicate, as in (3a). The second line in (3a) shows that the experience of "pain" not only started during the three hours of standing at customs (perfectivity), but has also reached a maximal degree (emphasis). Without the =*na*, the utterance in (3b), even with the intensifier enclitic =*ka'ayo*, would just sound like a plain complaint: *My feet were very sore*.

- (3) a. Tulu=**mi** ka oras nag-tindog,  
 three=1PL.EXCL.NOM LK hour AV.PFV-stand  
 sakit=**na=ka'ayo** ako=**ng** mga ti'il.  
 sakit=**na=ka'ayo** ako'=nga mga ti'il.  
 hurt=**already**=EMPH 1SG.POSS=LK PL foot  
 'We were standing for three hours, (and) my feet were really extremely sore.'
- b. Sakit=**ka'ayo** ako=**ng** mga ti'il.  
 Sakit=**ka'ayo** ako'=nga mga ti'il.  
 hurt=EMPH 1SG.POSS=LK PL foot  
 'My feet were very sore.'

In (4a), the enclitic =*na* further extends its sense to emphasizing a decisive stance: *It is here, not home, not anywhere else*. The absence of =*na* in (4b) signals the speaker's lack of decision; the utterance sounds very tentative and uncertain (especially with the dubitative enclitic *kaha'*). Nevertheless, the presence of the dubitative enclitic =*kaha'* does not diminish the determination conveyed by the speaker. Rather, =*kaha'* here serves more to downtone the determination sense and to seek agreement from the hearer.

- (4) a. Huna'huna'=nako', diri=**na**=lang=*kaha'*=ko mag-trabaho?  
 think=1SG.GEN here=**already**=just=DUB=1SG.NOM AV.FUT-work  
 'I was thinking, "(Maybe) I'll just get a job here?"' (lit. 'It is here *already*—more decisive, not home, not anywhere else—that I will just perhaps find a job.')
- b. ... diri=**lang**=*kaha'*=ko mag-trabaho?  
 here=just=DUB=1SG.NOM AV.FUT-work  
 '... (perhaps) I'll just get a job here?' [more uncertain than (4a)]

When the enclitic =*na* occurs with the downtoner enclitic =*lang*, the two combined seemingly generate a new sense, a sense of desperation in a situation that calls for immediate action, as in (5a); this sense of desperation conveyed by =*na*=*lang* also consists of some decisiveness to contact people. In other words, there is no more option left for Mr. Morales but to contact people. When =*na* is removed, as in (5b), the sense of desperation

is no longer detectable, but only the condescending tone of *=lang* in this context, wherein the speaker thinks there are other things worth doing.

- (5) a. Kung asa-asa=**na=lang** contact si Mr. Morales.  
COND where-REDUP=already=only contact SI PN  
 ‘Mr. Morales was (desperately) contacting people.’ (lit. ‘Mr. Morales was *just already* [=desperate] contacting people.’)
- b. Kung asa-asa=*lang* contact si Mr. Morales.  
COND where-REDUP=only contact SI PN  
 ‘Mr. Morales was just contacting people everywhere.’ (He had other worthwhile things to do.)

The combination *=na=lang* is one of the most frequent cluster combinations attested in the data. As seen in (5a), the cluster *=na=lang* can contain a sense of desperation or a tone of “surrender”; *=man*, another downtoner enclitic to be discussed in 2.1.3, does not have this sense. In *=na=lang*, the final-slot enclitic *=lang* is a downtoner, while *=na* contributes a tone of decisiveness, but, in this context, one of desperation and surrender; in other words, there is no other way to go about something. Examples (6) and (7) equally illustrate this: (6) shows that the speaker does not have any other choice but to suffer the loneliness from being away from her husband most of the time (that is, she cannot do anything about her situation), while (7) is telling the other person to stop asking questions since the answer will most probably surprise or shock her (that is, the other person should just keep his/her mouth shut). As in (5b), if *=na* is removed, the predicate in these clauses merely becomes a choice and not the only option.

- (6) Panagsa=ra=*man*=siya pa-uli’,  
rarely=only=DN=3SG.NOM CAUS-return  
 antos=**na=lang**=ko diha’.  
suffer=already=only=1SG.NOM there  
 ‘He rarely goes home, so I’ll just bear (the conditions) there.’
- (7) Ay=**na=lang** pangutana Day kay ma-kuyap-an=*unya*’=ka.  
NEG=already=just ask VOC because STAT-faint-LV=then=2SG.NOM  
 ‘Never mind asking, Day [address term for younger females], or you’ll pass out.’

The cluster *=na=lang* sometimes allows one more enclitic, such as the dubitative enclitic *=kaha*’ in (4a); another example is provided in (8a). Here, *=na=lang* conveys the tone of surrender or desperation due to something having been determined or strongly enforced, as in the previous three examples (this sense disappears once *=na=lang* is removed from the utterance, as in [8b], which will merely become a question asked out of curiosity); the speaker is moaning over the downsizing that is going to happen at her office. The dubitative enclitic *=kaha*’ contributes a sense of hesitation or insecurity; it can be equivalent to ‘I wonder.’

- (8) a. Pila=**na**=lang=**kaha**=y ma-bilin,  
 Pila=**na**=lang=**kaha**'=y ma-bilin,  
 how.many=already=only=DUB=NEUT AV.FUT-remain  
 ma'o=**na**=y problema karon.  
 ma'o=**kana**'=y problema karon.  
 ANAPH=that=NEUT problem now  
 '(I wonder) how many of us staff will stay; that's the problem now.'
- b. Pila=**kaha**=y ma-bilin, ...  
 Pila=**kaha**'=y ma-bilin, ...  
 how.many=DUB=NEUT AV.FUT-remain  
 '(I wonder) how many staff will stay, ...'

The examples above illustrate the instability of the meaning of the enclitic =*na* in different linguistic and situational contexts. Starting with a change-of-state sense, the enclitic =*na* has developed stance-marking functions to convey emphasis, determination, and desperation.

These excerpts in (5)–(8) also show the collocation strength of =*na*=*lang*. They can, thus, be treated as a single unit; not only do they have a high frequency, they have also further acquired a new meaning slightly distinct from the individual senses of each enclitic.

**2.1.2 The enclitic =*pa* 'still, yet'.** The enclitic =*pa* canonically expresses incompleteness 'not yet,' as in (9a), or a temporary, continuous state 'still,' as in (10a). When =*pa* is removed from the utterances, (9b) and (10b) become just reports that 'he has not been to our place' and that something is 'hot', respectively.

- (9) a. Wa'=**pa**=siya ka-adto sa ato'?'  
 Wala'=**pa**=siya naka-adto sa ato'?'  
 NEG=still=3SG.NOM AV.ABIL-go LOC 1PL.INCL.POSS  
 'Has he been to our (place) yet?' (lit. 'He has not yet been to our place?')
- b. Wa'=siya ka-adto sa ato'?'  
 Wala'=siya naka-adto sa ato'?'  
 NEG=3SG.NOM AV.ABIL-go LOC 1PL.INCL.POSS  
 'He wasn't able to go to our (place)?'
- (10) a. Pa-ka'on=**nimo**, init=**pa**.  
 CAUS-eat=2SG.GEN hot=still  
 'You make (them) eat (it) (while it's) still hot.'
- b. Init.  
 hot  
 '(It's) hot.'

An extended semantic function of =*pa* includes 'else', as in (11). Here, the enclitic =*pa* represents the remaining part that makes up the entire group of foreign workers, an extension from the 'incomplete' or 'not yet' sense.

- (11) Unsa=**pa** uba=ng mga foreign workers?  
 Unsa=**pa** uban=nga mga foreign workers  
 what=else other=LK PL foreign workers  
 'What other foreign workers are there?' (> 'Where else are they from?')

A sense similar to ‘not yet occurring’, as illustrated in (9a) and (11), is ‘not yet reaching a certain point or standard’, as illustrated in (12). This could further imply dissatisfaction, as one tends to feel so when a situation “does not reach an expected goal or standard.” If the enclitic *=pa* is removed, the utterance in (12) will just be a plain report that ‘the minimum wage does not reach two hundred.’

- (12) Wala’=**pa**=ma=y dos cientos ato=ng minimum.  
 Wala’=**pa**=man=y dos cientos ato’=nga minimum.  
 NEG=even=DN=NEUT two hundred 1PL.INCL.POSS=LK minimum  
 ‘Our minimum wage is not even two hundred (pesos).’

Extending to the temporal domain in (13a), the enclitic *=pa* refers to a situation where something should have been accomplished at an earlier period of time in the past before the intended reference time ‘now’. This is used, in exaggeration sometimes, when one is annoyed or impatient about the slow turn of events. Thus, the *=pa* can imply annoyance. Example (13b), without the *=pa*, is merely reporting that ‘it was a while ago that we went out’; there is neither an assumption that something should have been done nor is there an indication of annoyance or impatience on the part of the speaker.

- (13) a. Kung weekday ni, ganiha=**pa**=ta ni-gawas.  
 if weekday this awhile.ago=even=1PL.INCL.NOM AV.PFV-move.out  
 ‘If it were a weekday, we would have been out of here a long time ago.’  
 b. Ganiha=ta ni-gawas.  
 awhile.ago=1PL.INCL.NOM AV.PFV-move.out  
 ‘We went out of here a while ago.’

Furthermore, the enclitic *=pa* can also be used in comparative structures, as in (14). Of course, the comparison sense still remains even when *=pa* is removed, as the morpheme *mas* also serves this function. That means that the *=pa* here functions to stress or to exaggerate the inferiority or the superiority of the referent indicated in the nominative-marked nominal.

- (14) Di ba mas nindot=**pa** sa Thailand ang sa Pilipinas?  
 DM COMPAR nice=even LOC PN ANG LOC PN  
 ‘Isn’t it (that) [the one in] the Philippines is nicer than (that of) Thailand?’

**2.1.3 The ubiquitous politeness enclitic =man.** The enclitic *=man*, which is the most ubiquitous one in the category and which can possibly combine with all the other enclitics, seems to compensate for the lack of a politeness word in Cebuano. This enclitic functions to tone down the force of a proposition and allows the speaker to sound less intimidating or less impolite. This is illustrated in (15) and (16). The speaker in (15) is summing up her impression of some people she met; however, the comment sounded too strongly negative, and so she mitigates it with *=man*. In (16), the speaker asks a sensitive question about the other person’s salary. It is normally rude to do this, although Asian people tend to do so anyway. Cebuano speakers use the *=man* to make the utterance less intrusive, making them sound as if they are not really minding other people’s personal business.

- (15) Baga'=man=gyud=ka'ay=na'=sila=g      nawong.  
 Baga'=man=gyud=ka'ayo=kana'=sila=ug      nawong.  
 thick=DN=INTENS=EMPH=that=3PL.NOM=EXT      face  
 'They have really thick faces, if I may say so.'
- (16) Pila=man=sab imo-ha=ng      sweldo.  
 Pila=man=sab imo-a=nga      sweldo.  
 how.much=DN=also 2SG.POSS-DEF=LK salary  
 'How much is your salary, if I may ask?'

Here I propose that the enclitic =man is a politeness marker, albeit not entirely similar to the politeness marker =ho/=po in Tagalog. Tagalog =ho/=po is used to make oneself polite in front of superiors or elders, while Cebuano =man merely tones down the force of an utterance, so it can be used even in conversation with peers and younger people. Nevertheless, both function to turn an utterance into a more polite one. Moreover, even in a Cebuano narrative, a speaker can utilize the enclitic =man to create a polite interaction with an imagined audience, as shown in (17), extracted from a Pear Story narrative. The Tagalog =ho/=po, however, is seldom used to serve this function or in other noninteractive contexts.

- (17) Ang tulu ka bukag,  
 ANG three LK basket  
 ngano=ng duha=na=man=lang ka bukag nga pears  
 ngano=nga duha=na=man=lang ka bukag nga pears  
 why=LK two=already=DN=only LK basket LK pears  
 ang na-bilin, na-hibulong=siya?  
 ANG INTR-leave INTR-wonder=3SG.NOM?  
 Na-wa='=na=man ang usa.  
 Na-wala'=na=man ang usa.  
 INTR-lose=already=DN ANG one  
 'The three baskets, why are there just two baskets of pears left, he wondered?  
 One (of the baskets) is gone.'

As shown in the preceding paragraphs, =man can mitigate a criticism or a harsh word and can be combined with almost any other enclitic available for use to the speaker. The pervasiveness of this enclitic, thus, depicts the means by which speakers sound polite. In addition to this function, by the softening of the tone of an utterance, the enclitic =man can also be exploited to portray oneself as somebody in an inferior status or position to be pitied, as illustrated in (18), where the speaker is describing her sorry situation.

- (18) Di'=man=pud=ka maka-tubag di'=man=pud=ka maka-sulti  
 NEG=DN=also=2SG.NOM AV.ABIL-answer NEG=DN=also=2SG.NOM AV.ABIL-say  
 sa imo=ng on your behalf nga wa'=ka ka-buhat ani  
 sa imo=nga on your behalf nga wala'=ka maka-buhat ani  
 OBL 2SG.POSS=LK on your behalf COMP NEG=2SG.NOM AV.ABIL-do this  
 nga wa'=ka maka-sala' wala'=man m-aminaw sa imo  
 nga wala'=ka maka-sala' wala'=man m-paminaw sa imo  
 COMP NEG=2SG.NOM AV.ABIL-err NEG=DN AV.listen DAT 2SG.POSS

dahil di'=ka=**man** ka-istorya.  
 dahil dili'=ka=**man** maka-istorya.  
 because NEG=2SG.NOM=DN AV.ABIL-tell

'You can't even answer (them) or say (anything) in your behalf, that you haven't done this, that you haven't done something wrong, because nobody listens to you, since you can't say (anything).'

The enclitic =*man* is the most frequently occurring enclitic in the data, whether alone or in clusters, seemingly showing that speakers of Cebuano employ this as a sort of downtoner in the same way that speakers of Tagalog use =*ho*/*po* as a politeness marker. In clusters, it frequently cooccurs with the other Group 1 enclitics, where it can be used to tone down the force of an utterance, since based on our observation of =*na* and =*pa*, they can be used to mark a strong stance, both positive (like determination) and negative (like desperation).

In this section, I have shown through the uses of the enclitics =*na* and =*pa* that the so-called "aspectual" enclitics do function to mark stance. For both =*na* and =*pa*, the pathway from their origin as an expression of "aspect" to the conveying of "stance" has been illustrated with extracts from actual conversation. The enclitic =*na* expresses completion of an action, and takes on senses indicating emphasis, decision, and determination, as one tends to be determined when a decision is made; furthermore, a stance of desperation is conveyed, as one tends to be desperate when overly determined. On the other hand, the enclitic =*pa* expresses temporariness ('still') and incompleteness ('yet'), as well as being used in instances that imply "incompleteness" or "lack," as in situations of shortage or comparison. Moreover, it has taken on a more negative nuance of annoyance, as one tends to feel annoyed when something fails to get done, or does not reach a certain goal. Finally, =*man* serves to tone down the force of an utterance. Overall, the discussion has illustrated the coherence of the second-position enclitics as a set of linguistic units that convey attitudinal stance.

**2.2 ENCLITIC CLUSTERS.** Enclitic clusters refer to the multiple enclitics, whether in twos or in threes, that attach to the first element in a clause. At first glance, there is no clear order observed between the various enclitics, but it will be shown that there is a generally preferred pattern.

First, the Group 1 enclitics =*na*/*pa* strongly prefer the initial position in a cluster. This means that even when they occur with other Group 1 enclitics such as =*man*, they always take the first position. Thus =*na* and =*pa* are shown to form a cluster with =*man* in the examples given in (19) and (20), respectively.

- (19) Ang tulu ka bukag,  
 ANG three LK basket  
 ngano=ng duha=**na**=**man**=lang ka bukag nga pears  
 ngano=nga duha=**na**=**man**=lang ka bukag nga pears  
 why=LK two=already=DN=only LK basket LK pears  
 ang na-bilin, na-hibulong=siya?  
 ANG INTR-leave INTR-wonder=3SG.NOM

Na-wa=<sup>c</sup>=**na=man** ang usa.

Na-wala'<sup>c</sup>=**na=man** ang usa.

INTR-lose=already=DN ANG one

'The three baskets, why are there just two baskets of pears left, he wondered?  
One (of the baskets) is gone.'

(20) Wala'<sup>c</sup>=**pa=ma=y** dos cientos ato=ng minimum.

wala'<sup>c</sup>=**pa=man=y** dos cientos ato'<sup>c</sup>=nga minimum.

NEG=even=DN=NEUT two hundred 1PL.INCL.POSS=LK minimum

'Our minimum wage is not even two hundred (pesos).'

Theoretically, almost all the enclitics can be combined to form clusters. Combinations may produce the sum of the meanings of the enclitics involved, especially when they belong to distinct semantic categories. A good example is a cluster that has the hearsay evidential marker =*kumu*. Any other enclitic combined with =*kumu* is relatively easier to understand. A very straightforward reason for this is the fact that =*kumu* is the only evidential enclitic in the paradigm and so its semantic content is rather stable; it neither affects the meaning of the other enclitics in the cluster, nor is its meaning affected by the addition of other enclitics. This is clearly illustrated in (21) and (22) below. In (21), the third and last line contains an evidential enclitic and an emphasizer enclitic, a combination whose meaning is not difficult to grasp: =*kumu* contributes an evidential sense, while =*ka'ayo* emphasizes the predicate, *wala=y ka-ila* 'the state of not knowing anybody'. As an enclitic, =*ka'ayo* is normally placed within the verb complex, but here it is very likely uttered as an afterthought. Similarly, each enclitic in (22) contributes to the meaning: =*na* a change of state, or more precisely a decisive stance, and =*kumu* the evidential sense.

(21) Na'a=man=sab=ko=y ma-dungog sa ako'

EXIST=DN=also=1SG.NOM=NEUT SPONT.FUT-hear DAT 1SG.POSS

nga dugay=na=kunu=ko diri

COMP long.time=already=EVID=1SG.NOM here

wala'<sup>c</sup>=**kunu=ko=y** ka-ila **kayo.**

wala'<sup>c</sup>=**kunu=ko=y** ka-ila **ka'ayo.**

NEG=EVID=1SG.NOM=NEUT COM-know EMPH

'There are also (rumors) about me that I hear, that I've been here for a long time, (but) that I don't have so many friends too.'

(22) Dili'<sup>c</sup>=**na=kunu=siya** ma-nakop kay iya=ng asawa Pilipina.

dili'<sup>c</sup>=**na=kunu=siya** maN-dakop kay iya=nga asawa Pilipina.

NEG=already=EVID=3SG.NOM AV-catch because 3SG.POSS=LK wife Filipina

'According to him, he won't arrest (illegal workers anymore), since he married a Filipina.'

**3. EMPHASIZER AND INTENSIFIER ENCLITICS.** In this section, I will tease out the semantic distinctions between the enclitics that convey intensification and emphasis, as it has been observed that sometimes two emphasers/intensifiers occur together in an enclitic cluster, which initially leads one to conjecture that there must be differences in meaning between them. First, table 2 lists the four emphaser/intensifier enclitics in terms of the number of tokens and their position in a cluster based on conversational data.

TABLE 2. EMPHASIZER AND INTENSIFIER ENCLITICS IN CEBUANO

Clitic	Gloss	N	Single clitic	Tokens			
				2-clitic cluster		3-clitic cluster	
				Initial	Final	Medial	Final
=gyud	INTENS	196	147	15	31	2	1
=ka'ayo	EMPH	184	125	1	49	0	9
=lagi	ASSERT	84	71	6	7	0	0
=gud	INTERACT	33	13	3	14	2	1

Table 2 shows that, as to frequency, =gyud and =ka'ayo are high-frequency enclitics, while =lagi and =gud are low-frequency ones. In terms of their distribution in a cluster, =ka'ayo and =gud are preferred in the final position, while =gyud and =lagi are attested in both medial and final positions. The semantic distinctions are discussed in the respective subsections. In the end of this section, I will also give an example illustrating the use of these enclitics in actual conversation.

**3.1 THE ENCLITIC =ka'ayo 'VERY'.** The enclitic *ka'ayo* emphasizes the degree or intensity of the feature denoted by the verb/predicate. In the second line in (3), repeated below as (23a), =ka'ayo emphasizes the degree of the pain or soreness of the feet, while in (24a) it emphasizes *dugay* 'for a long time', the length of time spent standing. However, if we remove =ka'ayo from both utterances, as in (23b) and (24b), what remains is merely a plain reporting of circumstances, that 'my feet were sore' and 'we were standing for a long time'. As to how sore and how long, the speaker would not consider these worth reporting.

- (23) a. Tulo=mi ka oras nag-tindog.  
 three=1PL.EXCL.NOM LK hour AV.PFV-stand  
 sakit=na=**ka'ayo** ako=ng mga ti'il.  
 sakit=na=**ka'ayo** ako'=nga mga ti'il.  
 hurt=already=EMPH 1SG.POSS=LK PL foot  
 'We were standing for three hours, (and) my feet were already very sore.'
- b. Sakit ako=ng mga ti'il.  
 Sakit ako'=nga mga ti'il  
 hurt 1SG.POSS=LK PL foot  
 'My feet were sore.'
- (24) a. Dugay=**ka'ayo**=mi nag-tindog.  
 long=EMPH=1PL.EXCL.NOM AV.PFV-stand  
 'We were standing for a very long time.'
- b. Dugay=mi nag-tindog.  
 long=1PL.EXCL.NOM AV.PFV-stand  
 'We were standing for a long time.'

**3.2 THE ENCLITIC =gyud.** The enclitic =gyud is an intensifier; it intensifies the meaning of an entire proposition, sometimes to the point of exaggeration. Variations include =gayud and =dyud. In (25a), =gyud is used to intensify the propositions in the two clauses: first, that "I DO cook", and second, that "he NEVER buys a meal box." Similarly, in (26a), the speaker stresses that she does see her husband every week. With-

out the enclitic =*gyud*, the clauses in (25a) and (26a) would become plain reports of future events, as illustrated in (25b), (25c), and (26b). This enclitic is more or less equivalent to the English *really*.

- (25) a. Bisa=g mag-hilana=ko=g kwarenta,  
 Bisa=ug mag-hilana=ko=ug kwarenta,  
 even=COMP AV.FUT-fever=1SG.NOM=EXT forty  
 mag-lutu'=gyud=ko  
 AV.FUT-cook=INTENS=1SG.NOM  
 di'=gyud=siya mo-palit ug piantang sa ako'-a.  
 dili'=gyud=siya mo-palit ug piantang sa ako'-a.  
 NEG=INTENS=3SG.NOM AV.FUT-buy EXT meal box LOC 1SG.POSS-DEF  
 'Even if I were having a fever of 40 degrees, I would really cook.  
 He would never ever buy a meal box for me.'
- b. ... mag-lutu'=ko.  
 AV.FUT-cook=1SG.NOM  
 '... I will cook.'
- c. Di'=siya mo-palit ug piantang sa ako'-a.  
 Dili'=siya mo-palit ug piantang sa ako'-a.  
 NEG=3SG.NOM AV.FUT-buy EXT meal box LOC 1SG.POSS-DEF  
 'He would not buy a meal box for me.'
- (26) a. Basta kada-semana mag-kita'=gyud=mi.  
 PART every-week AV.FUT-see=INTENS=1PL.EXCL.NOM  
 'Every week, we do see each other.'
- b. Kada-semana mag-kita'=mi.  
 every-week AV.FUT-see=1PL.EXCL.NOM  
 'Every week, we see each other.'

The same exaggeration or intensification is conveyed in (27). In (27), this enclitic is uttered emphatically where the speaker feels incredulity about the solitary situation of L, which would be missing were the speaker to decide not to use =*gyud*.

- (27) J: Ikaw=ra=gyud dinhi.  
 2SG.NOM=just=INTENS here

L: M.  
 BC

J: 'So, REALLY, you are alone here?'

L: 'Yeah.'

The excerpt in (28a) pairs =*gyud* with =*na*, where =*na* conveys a decisive sense, so that both certainty, expressed through =*na*, and intensity, expressed through =*gyud*, are contained in this utterance. In (28b), without the decisive =*na*, the utterance would only stress the fact that 'his ways cannot be changed', but the determination to do it is lacking; whereas in (28c), the speaker conveys the certainty that 'nobody can change his ways', although opting not to emphasize it.

- (28) a. Di'=na=**gyud**=nimo ma-usab ang ila=ng ugali.  
 Dili'=na=**gyud**=nimo ma-usab ang ila=nga ugali.  
NEG=already=INTENS=2SG.GEN SPONT-change ANG 3PL.POSS=LK character  
 'You can never really change their ways.' (=na: decisive, =gyud: intensifier)
- b. Di'=gyud=nimo ma-usab ang ila=ng ugali.  
 Dili'=gyud=nimo ma-usab ang ila=nga ugali.  
NEG=INTENS=2SG.GEN SPONT-change ANG 3PL.POSS=LK character  
 'You really cannot change their ways.'
- c. Di'=na=nimo ma-usab ang ila=ng ugali.  
 Dili'=na=nimo ma-usab ang ila=nga ugali.  
NEG=already=2SG.GEN SPONT-change ANG 3PL.POSS=LK character  
 'You can never again change their ways.' (previously possible)

As mentioned at the start of this section, both =gyud and =ka'ayo are highly frequent, and, thus, are often reduced in speech. The emphasizer =ka'ayo is reduced by one syllable to =kayo. In articulation, the intensifier gyud is uttered with an alveolar sound, as in the initial sound of 'just,' instead of velar, as in the initial sound of 'get.' This is illustrated in the first line in (29).

- (29) L: Ako, gahi'=**dyud**=kayo=ako=ng-  
 ako, gahi'=**gyud**=ka'ayo=ako'=nga  
1SG.NOM hard=INTENS=EMPH=1SG.POSS=LK  
 klaro=**ka'ay**=ko sa tanan=g Bisaya'. [laughter]  
 klaro=**ka'ayo**=ko sa tanan=nga Bisaya'.  
clear=EMPH=1SG.NOM SUPER=LK from the Visayas
- J: Pero kahibao=na=ka mag-ku'an mag-taiwanese?  
 but know=already=2SG.NOM AV-DUMMY AV-(speak).Taiwanese?
- L: Gamay=ra.  
 little=just
- L: 'Me, (my Tagalog) really has a very strong accent. It's so obvious that I'm from the Visayas.'
- J: 'But you know how to speak ... to speak ... Taiwanese?'
- L: 'A little bit.'

Moreover, as shown in the second line in (29), the clitic =ka'ayo is also used in superlative modifier expressions with sa tanan 'of all'. This =ka'ayo sa tanan expression does not really make a comparison; it conveys a further extent or degree of the situation denoted by the predicate. Compare again the three constructions in (30a-c).

- (30) a. Klaro=ko=ng Bisaya'.  
 Klaro=ko=nga Bisaya'.  
clear=1SG.NOM=LK from.the.Visayas  
 '(It is) obvious (that) I am from the Visayas.'
- b. Klaro=**ka'ay**=ko=ng Bisaya'. [laughter]  
 Klaro=**ka'ayo**=ko=nga Bisaya'.  
clear=EMPH=1SG.NOM=LK from.the.Visayas  
 '(It is) very obvious (that) I am from the Visayas.'

- c. Klaro=**ka'ay**=ko **sa tanan**=g Bisaya'. [laughter]  
 Klaro=**ka'ayo**=ko **sa tanan**=nga Bisaya'.  
 clear=EMPH=1SG.NOM SUPER=LK from.the.Visayas  
 '(It is) the most obvious thing of all (compared to everything else)  
 (that) I am from the Visayas.'

Furthermore, the first line in (29) shows an enclitic cluster in a single clause; one possibility is that in most cases the enclitics contribute separately to the meaning of the utterance. The enclitic =*kayo* (shortened form of =*ka'ayo*) emphasizes the "hardness" (or more precisely, the *strong accent*) of the speaker; without it, the description of the accent is not emphasized. Moreover, =*gyud* intensifies the meaning of the whole clause; without it, the speaker lacks assertion. On the other hand, it is also possible for the two enclitics to form a strong bond, especially when they occur together so often that they almost become a single unit. Another quite typical example would be the cluster =*na=lang*, as already illustrated in (5)–(8).

Both =*ka'ayo* and =*gyud* seem to be roughly equivalent to the English *really*. The difference between the =*gyud* 'really' and the =*ka'ayo* 'really' can be illustrated in (31). In (31a), 'really' modifies the whole proposition, that 'you DO have a strong accent', and is roughly translated into =*gyud* in Cebuano. In (31b), 'really' modifies the predicate or attribute of strength, and is more or less similar to Cebuano =*ka'ayo*.

- (31) a. REALLY, you have a strong accent.  
 b. Your accent is REALLY strong.

**3.3 THE ENCLITIC =*lagi*.** Just like =*gyud*, the assertion clitic =*lagi* also emphasizes the extent or degree of the attribute denoted by the proposition; however, it also involves a sense of convincing or involving the hearer in the modification of the referent noun. In (32a), =*lagi* attempts to convince the hearer that "I can't stand it"; the use of =*lagi* sounds stronger in force than when only =*ka'ayo* is used, as in (32b). The utterance in (32a) is accompanied with a tone of slight annoyance, as the speaker might have assumed that the hearer would refuse to believe her story. Examples (32b), (32c), and (32d) will merely be reports of the speaker's situation without any indication of assertion or attempt to convince the hearer, although (32b) could sound more emphatic than (32c) because of =*ka'ayo*, while in (32d), there is also emphasis through =*gyud*, but the speaker is oblivious to how the hearer would react.

- (32) a. Pastilan di'=**lagi**=ko ka-agwanta.  
 Pastilan dili'=**lagi**=ko maka-agwanta.  
 INTERJ NEG=ASSERT=1SG.NOM AV.ABIL-stand  
 'Oh boy, I really couldn't stand it.'  
 b. Pastilan di'=**ka'ayo**=ko ka-agwanta.  
 Pastilan dili'=**ka'ayo**=ko maka-agwanta.  
 INTERJ NEG=EMPH=1SG.NOM AV.ABIL-stand  
 'Oh boy, I couldn't stand it.'

- c. Pastilan di'=ko ka-agwanta.  
 Pastilan dili'=ko maka-agwanta.  
 INTERJ NEG=1SG.NOM AV.ABIL-stand  
 'Oh boy, I couldn't stand it.'
- d. Pastilan di'=**gyud**=ko ka-agwanta.  
 Pastilan dili'=**gyud**=ko maka-agwanta.  
 INTERJ NEG=INTENS=1SG.NOM AV.ABIL-stand  
 'Oh boy, I really couldn't stand it.'

The same is true for (33), where the speaker wants to convince the hearer about why she regretted not going to Chiangmai. When the assertive enclitic =*lagi* is removed from (33a), this leaves (33b) as merely a plain report of the speaker's preference. On the other hand, (33c) is similar to (33a) in the stress of the proposition but without the intention of convincing the hearer.

- (33) a. Chiangmai ang wa'=nako' na-adto-an, nag-mahay=ko  
 PN ANG NEG=1SG.GEN SPONT-go-LV AV.PFV-regret=1SG.NOM  
 kay ganahan=**lagi**=ko sa apak-apak sa elepante.  
 because like=ASSERT=1SG.NOM OBL step-REDUP GEN elephant  
 'Chiangmai (in Thailand) is the place I haven't been to, and I'm regretting (it), since I really like the foot massage of the elephants, (and they have that in Chiangmai).'
- b. ... kay ganahan=ko sa apak-apak sa elepante.  
 because like=1SG.NOM OBL step-REDUP GEN elephant  
 '... since I like the elephant foot massage.'
- c. ... kay ganahan=**gyud**=ko sa apak-apak sa elepante.  
 because like=INTENS=1SG.NOM OBL step-REDUP GEN elephant  
 '... since I DO like the elephant foot massage.'

Hearer involvement as an essential element in the semantics of the enclitic =*lagi* is illustrated even more clearly in (34) and (35). Both excerpts show =*lagi* used within conversation; =*lagi* in each instance is a positive response to the proposition uttered by the other speaker. In other words, the speaker is in complete agreement with the other person(s) in the conversation, as though she is the one trying to convince the other person(s). In (34), L completely agrees with the feelings conveyed by T by the use of =*lagi*, and this use of =*lagi* seems to imply that T has not stressed it enough. Probably due to the fact that =*lagi* involves the sense of agreement, it has evolved into a marker that signals stance agreement between speakers; in other words, the expression *ma'o=lagi(=na')* by L in (34) can even be reduced to just one emphatic =*lagi*, as shown in (35).

- (34) T: Antos=**gyud**=ko.  
 suffer=INTENS=1SG.NOM
- L: Ma'o=sad=**lagi**=na'.  
 Ma'o=sad=**lagi**=kana'.  
 ANAPH=also=ASSERT=that
- T: 'I really suffered.'
- L: 'I also agree with you on that.'

(35) L: *Gusto=man=namo'* ...  
like=DN=1PL.EXCL.GEN

J: *Pero wala'=man* ...  
but NEG=DN

L: *Pero mag-huwat=na=lang=ko=g i-hatag sa ginoo.*  
*pero mag-huwat=na=lang=ko=ug i-hatag sa ginoo.*  
but AV.FUT-wait=already=just=1SG.NOM=COMP RV-give OBL God

J: **Lagi.**  
ASSERT

L: *Daghan=na=mi=ng na-hitabo nga i-pa-doctor.*  
many=already=1PL.EXCL.NOM=LK SPONT-happen LK RV-CAUS-see.doctor

J: *O= no treinta=na=gud=ka edad nimo.*  
BC= BC thirty=already=INTERACT=2SG.NOM age 2SG.GEN

L: *Basta mag-idad=na=ko=g thirty*  
*basta mag-idad=na=ko=ug thirty*  
anyway AV.FUT-age=already=1SG.NOM=EXT thirty  
*dili'=na=ko mag-minyo [laughter] a dili' mag-minyo*  
NEG=already=1SG.NOM AV.FUT-marry PART NEG AV.FUT-marry  
*dili' mag-anak.*  
NEG AV.FUT-have.baby

L: 'We want (to have a baby) ...'

J: 'But you don't (have a baby yet) ...'

L: 'But I'll just wait for God to give me (one).'

J: 'I cannot agree more.'

L: 'We've already "experienced" several times, er, (we've) seen doctors.'

J: 'Yeah, I know, you're almost thirty years old.'

L: 'Anyway, (when) I'm already thirty, I won't get married, I mean, have a baby.'

In both excerpts, the =*lagi* cannot be replaced by =*ka'ayo*, as neither utterance contains any predicate to be stressed. Similarly, as =*gyud* does not involve the element of hearer involvement, it will convey a slightly different meaning when used to replace =*lagi* in (34): the sense of convincing the other participant in the conversation disappears, although the sense of stance agreement is still there, due, of course, to the other enclitic =*sad*, which also signals similar stance between the speakers.

**3.4 THE ENCLITIC =*gud*.** The enclitic =*gud* gives an emphatic comment but does not impose it on the hearer. In addition, =*gud* is used to serve as some reaction of disagreement or dissatisfaction to the proposition uttered, and it is this element that differentiates =*gud* from =*ka'ayo* and =*gyud*, as =*ka'ayo* and =*gyud* serve more to stress. The speaker does not impose any pressure on the hearer to conform, and this distinguishes =*gud* from =*lagi*. In (36), the speaker uses =*gud* to emphasize her disbelief at hearing the cost of something, a sort of protest at the mention of the exorbitant price; however, the speaker *W* opts to keep her reaction to herself and does not impose it on *T*.



(39) Makig-minyo'=kunu=siya=nako',

RECIP-marry=EVID=3SG.NOM=1SG.OBL

Mora=g di'=ko mo-tu'u, kay unsa=**gud** ...

Mora=ug dili'=ko mo-tu'u, kay unsa=**gud** ...

seem=COMP NEG=1SG.NOM AV.FUT-believe because what=INTERACT

'(He told me that) he wanted to get married with me. It's like I wouldn't believe (it), since what (on earth) (does that mean) ...'

In this section, I have teased apart the meanings of the four high-frequency enclitics, which seemingly possess similar meanings at first glance. First of all, the four differ in their relative frequency and preferred position in a cluster. =*ka'ayo* and =*gyud* function to emphasize and intensify, respectively, but the former has a scope over the predicate, while the latter's scope is over the entire proposition.

The assertion enclitics =*lagi* and =*gud* function to make emphases just like =*ka'ayo*, but their frequency in discourse is not as high as the emphasizer enclitic =*ka'ayo*, most likely because =*lagi* has the additional function of asserting one's stance on the hearers, and =*gud* has the additional element of disagreement; therefore, they are dispreferred actions in talk and interaction.

**3.5 A CONVERSATIONAL EXCERPT.** Here I will show in (40) an excerpt from conversational data illustrating how these enclitics, especially the emphasizer and intensifier enclitics, work in actual language use. This is taken from a conversation between two friends who are discussing the events that took place at the airport when a mutual friend, Josie, returned to Manila.

(40) 1. T: Si Josie, iya=**gyu**=ng tuyu'-un pa-kita' [laughter].

Si Josie, iya=**gyud**=nga tuyu'-un pa-kita'.

SI PN 3SG.POSS=INTENS=LK deliberate-PV.FUT CAUS-see

2. M ako di=**gyud**=ko mo-hatag

BC 1SG.TOP NEG=INTENS=1SG.NOM AV-give

3. W: Di=ba, imong kung hatag-an=nimo

NEG=Q FS if give-LV=2SG.GEN

4. mora imo=**ra=sa**=ng gi-tolerate ba.

mora imo=**ra=sad**=nga gi-tolerate ba.

seem.like 2SG.POSS=just=also=LK PV.PFV-tolerate DM

5. T: [O=]ma'o=**lagi**

ANAPH=ASSERT

6. W: Ila=ng style =**ba** nga ...

Ila=nga style =**ba** nga ...

3PL.POSS=LK style PART COMP

7. T: Sa-una nag-uli=ko=g TV, si Mister Morales/

Sa-una nag-uli'=ko=ug TV, si Mister Morales

LOC-first AV.PFV-bring=1SG.NOM=EXT TV SI PN

8. gi-hold=**gud**=mi tulu ka oras.

PV.PFV-hold=INTERACT=1PL.EXCL.NOM three LK hour

9. Gi-pangayo-an=**gyud**=mi=g kwarta.  
 Gi-pangayo'-an=**gyud**=kami=ug kwarta.  
 PFV-ask.for-LV=INTENS=1PL.EXCL.NOM=EXT money
10. Oy, Mister Morales=**na**=to ha!  
 VOC PN=already=that DM
11. Ingon si Mister Morales  
 say SI PN
12. bisa=g abot-an=ta=g ugma diri,  
 bisa=ug abot-an=kita=ug ugma diri,  
 even=COMP arrive-LV.FUT=1PL.INCL.NOM=EXT tomorrow here
13. di=**gyud**=ko mo-hatag bisa=g usa ka dako'.  
 dili'=**gyud**=ko mo-hatag bisa=ug usa ka dako'.  
 NEG=INTENS=1SG.NOM AV-give even=COMP one LK big

T: 'Josie, she would surely show [her U.S. dollars] on purpose. As for me, I will never give [a single cent].'

W: 'Isn't it that, if you give [to them], it seems like you are just also tolerating them [their practices]?'

T: 'I cannot agree more!' (lit. 'That (is) really (true).') [affirming and intensifying what has been said]

W: 'Their way of [doing things], which is ...' [in a questioning tone, disagreement]

T: 'Before, I brought a TV, (and) Mr. Morales, (the customs official) detained us for three hours. [a bit of exaggeration] They really asked us for money. [emphatic: that was really true!] Hey, [and to think that] that was actually Mr. Morales! [and not just somebody else] Mr. Morales said, even if it would take us until tomorrow. I would NEVER give even a cent.' [repeated emphasis]

In line 1, the intensifier =*gyud* exaggerates the action of Josie, that is, showing her U.S. dollars to customs officials as she approaches them. This intensification produces an exaggerated utterance (by the use of =*gyud*) and evokes a vivid picture of customs people calling out to Josie—a familiar scene very common in the 1980s and '90s—who had inserted U.S. dollar bills inside her travel documents and was deliberately sticking them out of her passport in exchange for speedy inspection of her bags and luggage. In line 2, another intensifier is used to make a strong emphasis: speaker T makes it clear that she would never give a single cent, if she were to be in the same circumstances; this also creates a strong contrast with the action of Josie.

In lines 3 and 4, speaker W uses the cluster =*ra=sad* emphasizing the resulting circumstance caused by this “inappropriate” behavior, to bring home the fact that it will encourage such kinds of bribery. Speaker T agrees by using =*lagi* (roughly equivalent to Tagalog =*talaga*), both affirming and intensifying what has been said in the previous turn. In line 6, speaker W wanted to continue reasoning against such practices and utilizes =*ba*, an interrogative enclitic, uttered in a questioning tone that expresses disagreement. However, he is interrupted by speaker T, who narrates her own experience.

Speaker T goes on to tell her own story (starting in line 7) of being harassed at customs for not “voluntarily” giving anything. In line 8, she uses =*gud* to emphasize the fact

that she was detained for three hours, which is a bit of an exaggeration. The next line is what she wants to stress to speaker W, which is the incredible idea of her being asked for money by the customs officials. She does not, however, impose this on speaker W. The enclitic serves to show disagreement toward the proposition; in other words, she thinks the customs officer was not right in detaining her. Line 10 shows the emphatic function of =*na* to stress the fact that the person accompanying her on her trip was Mr. Morales, who was then a diplomat, and not just some ordinary person, yet that this did not stop the customs official from insisting on having them pay “customs taxes.” The excerpt ends with speaker T’s repetition of the reiteration of her refusal to “dance to the tune” through the intensifier =*gyud*. Overall, this excerpt has shown how enclitics provide the “emotional coloring” (Trosdal 1992) to daily utterances.

**4. THE RELATIVE ORDER OF ENCLITICS IN CLUSTERS.** Bunye and Yap (1971) proposed a table showing the relative positions of various attitudinal enclitics (see table 3). However, the table is problematic. First, the study was not based on corpus data, and the orderings were certainly determined based on intuition, which is not entirely reliable. In addition, it is not known why the anaphoric *ma’o* is listed together with and positioned after the first set (=na, =pa, =ra), as this particle does not behave like an enclitic at all, and so is generally not treated as one.

Wolff (1962, 1965) also proposed a general formula: =pa/=na + =ra + =man/=ba plus any other enclitic and pronouns. In other words, the order of the enclitics other than =pa, =na, =ra, and =man is free, although certain orders are more frequent than others. These clitics are also usually found in the initial position in enclitic clusters: in my own data, this is attested in 222 instances (81 percent) of two-clitic clusters, and in all of the 21 three-clitic clusters. Moreover, Wolff collected a huge amount of written data, and therefore his observation can be said to be accurate, and is supported by the data I have collected. In this study, I will build upon this and attempt to incorporate the ordering of the intensifier and emphazier enclitics into the formula.

As discussed in 3.2, =*gyud* stresses an entire proposition, and looking at the data, we see that it can be positioned in any slot in a cluster. It comes after the Group 1 and the Group 2 enclitics and before the Group 3 and Group 4 enclitics. There is just one exception: we observe both =*gyud*=*ka’ayo* and *ka’ayo*=*gyud*, but the data yielded nine tokens for the former combination against only one for the latter. The former is also the order attested in a three-clitic cluster (2 tokens). I, therefore, believe that the former should be the preferred order, as =*ka’ayo* also tends to prefer the final position in a cluster, as we shall see below. An instance is shown in (41).

**TABLE 3. RELATIVE POSITIONS OF PARTICLES (Bunye and Yap 1971:53)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
na	ma’o	man	lang	pud	gyud	unta’	kuno	ka’ayo
pa		ba	di’ay	sab	gud		bitaw	tingali
ra					gani’			kaha’
					lagi			

- (41) Baga'=man=**gyud**=ka'ay=na'=sila=g      nawong.  
 Baga'=man=**gyud**=ka'ayo=kana'=sila=ug      nawong.  
 thick=DN=INTENS=EMPH=that=3PL.NOM=EXT      face  
 'They have really thick faces, if I may say so.'

When I looked at the tokens containing =ka'ayo, it was observed that it was clearly a final-slot clitic. The only exceptions are =ka'ayo=pud and =ka'ayo=gyud. As the data showed, =pud is problematic in terms of its position in a cluster, so I will leave the discussion of =pud until later in this section. As for ka'ayo=gyud, this is the only token found, so obviously the less preferred form, as there are nine tokens of =gyud=ka'ayo. If we check the excerpt containing this combination, example (42), we find that they do not strictly form a cluster. In (42), there is an intervening nominal phrase between them, and so they are not modifying the same predicate at all. If we eliminate this combination type, we obtain the preferred order of =gyud preceding =ka'ayo.

- (42) Ma'o=lagi, maka-ingon=sad=ko      nga  
 ANAPH=ASSERT    AV.ABIL-say=also=1SG.NOM    COMP  
 swerte=**ka'ayo**    sa    uban=**gyud**...  
 lucky=EMPH                    OBL    other=INTENS  
 'So that's why I can say that (I'm) much luckier than other (foreign spouses) ...'

In (43), we observe both combinations of =pud and =ka'ayo. Looking at all the clusters that involve both enclitics, there is reason to believe that ka'ayo is a final-slot enclitic. In the second line in (43), the ordering of the two enclitics is reversed; however, this is a dispreferred order, and, moreover, =pud here can be treated as an afterthought. Furthermore, if we observe closely the enclitics found in the last column in table 1, they tend to be polysyllabic enclitics, while almost all the nonfinal-position slots contain monosyllabic enclitics. Therefore, there are more reasons to believe that =pud should precede ka'ayo.

- (43) Unya' daghan=**pud**=ka'ay=ng      nag-abroad.  
 Unya' daghan=**pud**=ka'ayo=nga      nag-abroad  
 then    many=also=EMPH=LK                    AV.PFV-go.abroad  
 Tan'aw-a sa- sa    ano airport, punu'=**ka'ayo**=**pud**.  
 see-IMP.PV                    LOC    FIL    airport    filled=EMPH=also  
 'Then, very many also went abroad. See (the-) the airport, so filled with (people going abroad), also.'

One more reason to believe that =ka'ayo should be a final-slot enclitic is the finding in Bybee (1985) that "emphatic morphemes" in certain languages are peripheral to the verb: emphatic morphemes are one of the first prefixes in Kutenai, Pawnee, and Kiwai, or one of the last suffixes in Diegueno, Tarascan, and Kwakiutl (1985:185). This is another reason why I choose to label it an "emphasizer" enclitic.

As for the assertive marker =lagi, we find a similar situation in which two word orders are attested with the evidential *kumu*, as in (44) and (45). Based on the combination types attested, =lagi is very similar to =gyud in its distribution: it usually comes after the Group 1 and Group 2 enclitics and precedes the other low-frequency enclitics. Therefore, we will preliminarily identify =lagi=*kumu* as the preferred order between the two.

- (44) Karon reklamo=man=ko nga, lu'uy-a=sad=nako'  
 now complain=DN=1SG.NOM COMP pity-DEF=also=1SG.GEN  
 diri, mora=ra=ko=g gi-pa-puyu' ing'ani ...  
 diri, mora=ra=ko=ug gi-pa-puyu' ingon'ani ...  
 here like=just=1SG.NOM=COMP PV.PFV-CAUS-live like.this  
 m-angita'=lagi=kunu=siya  
 m-pangita'=lagi=kunu=siya  
 AV-find=ASSERT=EVID=3SG.NOM  
 bisì=lagi=siya, unya' ako=sad m-angita' ...  
 bisì=lagi=siya, unya' ako=sad m-pangita' ...  
 busy=ASSERT=3SG.NOM then 1SG.NOM=also AV-find  
 'Now I('d) complain that I'm such a poor guy, it's like making me stay  
 here like this, ... (he said) he'd look (for a bigger place, but) he's so  
 busy, then (when) I look for (one on my own), ...'
- (45) Pangay'-an=gyud=ka=g kwarta  
 Pangayo'-an=gyud=ka=ug kwarta  
 ask.for-LV=INTENS=2SG.NOM=EXT money  
 wa'=man=ko=y dala=g peso  
 wala'=man=ko=y dala=nga peso  
 NEG=DN=1SG.NOM=NEUT carry=LK peso  
 unsa=ma=y ako=ng dad ... i-hatag.  
 unsa=man=y ako=nga dala ... i-hatag.  
 what=DN=NEUT 1SG.NOM=LK FS IV-give  
 Daghan=kunu=lagi=mi=g daa  
 Daghan=kunu=lagi=kami=ug dala  
 many=EVID=ASSERT=1PL.EXCL.NOM=EXT bring  
 mga daa namo', mga wa=ma=y pulus...  
 mga dala namo', mga wala'=man=y pulus...  
 PL bring 1PL.EXCL.GEN PL NEG=DN=NEUT worth  
 wa-wa-wala=dyud value, a-ako' gi-pa-abri tanan.  
 FS-FS-NEG=INTENS value FS-1SG.POSS PV.PFV-CAUS-open all  
 '(They'd) ask you for money, (but) I didn't bring any pesos, what shall I  
 bring/give? (They said) we had too much baggage, (but) our bags,  
 they're worthless, no value whatsoever, (so) I let (them) open all of  
 them.'

In (46), the enclitic =*gud* is in final position, like =*ka'ayo*; it follows other enclitics except the emphasizer =*ka'ayo*. In fact, it is only attested to be following the Group 1 and other Group 2 enclitics, as well as =*gyud* in =*gyud=gud* in (46).

- (46) T: Dugay=na=nako'=na' na-dung-gan  
 Dugay=na=nako'=kana' na-dungog-an  
 long.time=already=1SG.GEN=that SPONT-hear-LV  
 ma'o=ra=gihapon=intawon.  
 ANAPH=just=still=pitifully.  
 Pobre=gihapon, wa=y kwarta mga tawo.  
 Pobre=gihapon, wala'=y kwarta mga tawo.  
 poor=still NEG=NEUT money PL person



of attested enclitic occurrences in the data. This conforms to the fact that the cognitive capabilities of our brains can allow us to convey only so much “information” at a time.

**5. CONCLUSION.** In summary, I have discussed the forms and functions of two groups of second-position enclitics in Cebuano, namely, the Group 1 enclitics and the emphasizer and intensifier enclitics. I showed their relative frequency and position within the predicate complex, as well as in an enclitic cluster. These Group 1 enclitics tend to be positioned in the front in an enclitic cluster. In addition, I have revised and expanded the relative ordering of the enclitics proposed by Bunye and Yap (1971) and Wolff (1962, 1965) by incorporating the emphasizer and intensifier enclitics into the formula.

I have also illustrated the semantics of these enclitics and how they can vary with context, especially when aspectual enclitics are used to convey attitudinal stance; and I have shown how emphasizer and intensifier enclitics can be distinguished from each other in the nuances that they express. The enclitic *=na* conveys completion of an action and further takes on stances of emphasis, decision, determination, and desperation. On the other hand, the enclitic *=pa* expresses temporariness (‘still’) and incompleteness (‘yet’), as well as being used in instances that imply “incompletion” or “lack,” as in situations of shortage or comparison, which usually lead to a nuance of annoyance. As for *=man*, it serves to tone down the force of utterances; I have also proposed that it serves as a linguistic resource for mitigating one’s utterances and for sounding polite in Cebuano.

As for the Group 2 enclitics, *=ka’ayo* and *=gyud* function to emphasize and intensify, respectively, but the former has scope over the stative predicate, while the latter has scope over the entire proposition. The assertion enclitics *=lagi* and *=gud* function to provide emphasis just like *=ka’ayo*, but their frequency in discourse is not as high as expected, most likely because *=lagi* has the additional function of asserting one’s stance to the hearers, and *=gud* the additional element of disagreement; therefore, they are dispreferred actions in talk and interaction.

More importantly, these enclitics can be stacked together into a cluster in a single utterance, enabling the speaker to convey differing degrees or attitude, thus making them an extremely convenient and economical means for conveying complex stance. The meaning produced by these clusters may either be summative, or an entirely new sense may be produced. Nevertheless, single enclitics are still far more common than clusters.

There are, however, several more enclitics that have yet to be examined in more detail, in terms of their meaning and the contexts in which they can occur. They have not been discussed here, and their relative order in clusters has not yet been determined because they are low in frequency—thus, more effort is needed to collect more data. Likewise, second-position enclitics in other Philippine languages can also be examined to see whether the patterns that are found in this study also hold in those languages. Future studies on enclitics in different Philippine languages can also provide valuable material, especially for typology and historical linguistics. Until the enclitics of other Philippine languages are investigated, it will be difficult to ascertain which enclitics across languages convey similar attitudinal information. For instance, without further evidence and data analyses, it cannot be ascertained whether Ilokano *ngarud* corresponds to Tagalog *=talaga* or *=nga’*, or to Cebuano *=gyud* or *=lagi*.

Despite their pervasiveness in language use, enclitics have been largely overlooked in grammatical descriptions for a long time, in favor of the morphologically rich verbal systems of these Philippine-type languages. In fact, like the morphological issues, these enclitics should not be ignored, inasmuch as they provide the subtle nuances of stance or speaker attitude, conveying aspectual information and various stances critical in the conduct of daily interaction. In order to carry out a very natural conversation in a Philippine language, these enclitics are indispensable, unless one doesn't mind sounding dull. It is only fitting that linguistic studies put more emphasis on and devote more space to describing them. At the same time, future studies on second-position enclitics should also proceed with a focus on their interactional functions in discourse, following Kim's (2005, 2011) studies on the Korean evidential markers *-telako* and *-tamye*, just as Cebuano *=lagi* and *=gud* cannot be clearly described without being placed in a conversational context. It would, of course, also be an interesting study to pursue how they are learned by children in their native language.

## REFERENCES

- Brainard, Sherri, and Dietlinde Behrens. 2002. *A grammar of Yakan*. Manila: Linguistics Society of the Philippines.
- Bunye, Maria V. R., and Elsa P. Yap. 1971. *Cebuano grammar notes*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Bybee, Joan L. 1985. *Morphology: A study of the relation between meaning and form*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Croft, William. 1990. *Typology and universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, David. 2008. *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics*. 6th ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dita, Shirley. 2011. Discourse particles as stance markers in Philippine languages. Paper presented at Stance phenomena in Asian languages: Typological, diachronic, and discourse perspectives, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, July 18–20.
- DuBois, Carl D. 1976. *Sarangani Manobo*. Manila: Linguistics Society of the Philippines.
- Kim, Mary Shin. 2005. Evidentiality in achieving entitlement, objectivity, and detachment in Korean conversation. *Discourse Studies* 7(1): 87–108.
- . 2011. Negotiating epistemic rights to information in Korean conversation: An examination of the Korean evidential marker *-tamye*. *Discourse Studies* 13(4): 435–59.
- Lee, Duck-Young. 2007. Involvement and the Japanese interactive particles *yo* and *ne*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 39:363–88.
- Naylor, Paz Buenaventura. 1978. Expressions of irrealis in some Philippine languages. *University of Michigan Publications in Linguistics* 2(4):131–43.
- Pigafetta, Antonio. n.d. Cebuano-Visayan grammar. Unpublished MS.
- Rhee, Seongha. 2011. Nominalization and stance marking in Korean. In *Nominalization in Asian languages: Diachronic and typological perspectives*, vol. 2: *Korean, Japanese and Austronesian languages*, ed. by Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Härsta, and Janick Wrona, 393–422. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schachter, Paul, and Fe T. Otanes. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tanangkingsing, Michael. 2009. A functional reference grammar of Cebuano. PhD diss., National Taiwan University.
- Trask, R. L. 1993. *A dictionary of grammatical terms in linguistics*. New York: Routledge.

- Trosdal, Mimi B. 1992. *Formal-functional grammar of the Cebuano language*. Cebu City: Salvador and Pilar Sala Foundation, Inc.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1991. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wilkins, David. 1992. Interjections as deictics. *Journal of Pragmatics* 18:245–71.
- Wolff, John U. 1962. *A description of Cebuano Visayan: Texts, analysis, and vocabulary*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- . 1965. Cebu Visayan syntax. PhD diss., Yale University.
- . 1972. *A dictionary of Cebuano Visaya*. Ithaca, NY: Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, and Linguistics Society of the Philippines.