

SERIES A - No. 32

PAPERS IN PHILIPPINE LINGUISTICS No. 4

by

R.M. Hohulin

Lou Hohulin



PACIFIC LINGUISTICS

The Australian National University

PACIFIC LINGUISTICS is published by the *Linguistic Circle of Canberra* and consists of four series:

SERIES A - OCCASIONAL PAPERS
SERIES B - MONOGRAPHS
SERIES C - BOOKS
SERIES D - SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS.

EDITOR: S.A. Wurm. ASSOCIATE EDITORS: D.C. Laycock, C.L. Voorhoeve.

ALL CORRESPONDENCE concerning PACIFIC LINGUISTICS, including orders and subscriptions, should be addressed to:

The Secretary,
PACIFIC LINGUISTICS,
Department of Linguistics,
School of Pacific Studies,
The Australian National University,
Box 4, P.O.,
Canberra, A.C.T. 2600.
Australia.

Copyright © The Authors.
First published 1971.

The editors are indebted to the Australian National University for help in the production of this series.

This publication was made possible by an initial grant from the Hunter Douglas Fund.

National Library of Australia Card number and ISBN 0 85883 031 0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
COHESIVE ORGANISATION IN KELEY-I KALLAHAN, by R.M. Hohulin	1
INTRODUCTION	1
THEMATISATION	1
Introduction of theme	1
Theme development	3
Theme expansion	5
Verbal inflection	5
Pronouns and demonstratives	7
PARTICIPANT IDENTIFICATION	8
CO-ORDINATION AND SUB-ORDINATION	10
Conjunctions	10
Functions of <i>et</i>	10
Functions of <i>ey</i>	11
Specific comparisons of <i>et</i> and <i>ey</i>	13
<i>Notes</i>	14
<i>Bibliography</i>	16
COMPLEX PREDICATES IN KELEY-I KALLAHAN, by Lou Hohulin	19
INTRODUCTION	19
Lexical predicates	19
Case system	19
Verbal predicates	20
Nominal predicates	21
Descriptive predicates	22
COMPLEX PREDICATES	23

	<i>Page</i>
Complex verbal predicates	24
Complex nominal predicates	25
Complex descriptive predicates	26
Domination in complex predicates	26
SEMANTIC DERIVATION	27
<i>Notes</i>	29
<i>Bibliography</i>	31

COHESIVE ORGANISATION IN KELEY-I KALLAHAN

R.M. HOHULIN

INTRODUCTION

The cohesive organisation of discourse in Keley-i Kallahan¹ gives specific options for introducing and controlling the form of the message (Halliday 1967). These options include (1) thematisation, (2) management of information, (3) participant identification, and (4) coordination and subordination.

The organisation of content in discourse is marked in the surface grammar by (1) topic marking particles and topic substitutes, (2) verbal focus inflection, (3) a referential change indicator, and (4) conjunctions. Each of these expresses one or more of the options in cohesive organisation.

THEMATISATION

INTRODUCTION OF THEME

Theme is the underlying structure or the semantic configuration (Frantz 1970, Chafe 1970) behind marked topic² in the surface grammar of discourse. In Keley-i discourse there are a number of ways to mark topic in the surface grammar. Choice of marking depends on the message unit being marked, i.e. discourse, paragraph or sentence, and upon the classification (Longacre 1968) of these message units. For example, narrative paragraphs are marked differently than explanatory paragraphs: *wada* 'there is' marks the topic of narrative paragraphs, *ya* 'the' marks the topic of explanatory paragraphs. When these markers occur initially in a sentence at the beginning of a discourse, that sentence is marked as the discourse theme.

Wada hi Nebulul di Nandaul, u-ungngan Sinukud.

(topic-marker personal-name-topic-marker Nebulul location-marker Nandaul, child Sinukud)

'Nebulul of Nandaul was the child of Sinukud.'

This sentence is the topic that will be specifically talked about in the first paragraph, but it is also the discourse theme.

Wada hakey ni mebenwit e dakaippattal di duntug baley dan han-ahwa.

(topic-indicator one non-focus-particle fisherman who they-were-separated location-marker mountain house their family-unit)

'There once was a fisherman who lived with his wife beyond the mountain.'

Wada marks the sentence as topic of the paragraph. The sentence begins the discourse and is therefore considered the discourse theme. Discourses which are begun by narrative paragraphs introduced by wada are characteristically folktales.

In the following example, the forefathers who were flooded one time are marked as paragraph topic by ya. This sentence introduces an explanatory paragraph which accounts for the existence of the people living in Antipolo. This sentence marked by ya is also considered the discourse theme.

Ya hu ammed ni nunman, nalbengan idan han-aggew.

(the topic-marker forefathers non-topic-marker long-ago, flooded they one-day)

'Our forefathers of long-ago, they were flooded one time.'

When the central character of a historical narrative discourse (as opposed to a folktale narrative) occurs preceding the verb in the sentence that begins the discourse, that character and what is said about him in the sentence constitute the theme of the discourse. This sentence, however, is not marked by wada or ya, but instead the personal name topic marker hi precedes the name of the central character:

Hi apu, hi Pungud, hiningbu tu hu alma.

(personal-name-topic-marker grandfather, personal-name-topic-marker Pungud, hingbu-ceremony he focus-complement-marker(Pike 1963) crab)
'Grandfather Pungud, he made a ceremony for the crab.'

Although the sentence introducing the theme of the discourse is frequently the first sentence of the discourse, it is not unusual for the topic marked sentence to follow one or more sentences that give the setting for the discourse.

Um-ehel lak. Kaw pinhed mun dedngelen i-innep hedin neugip ityu? Ya elaw ni kandan i-innep eya inugip tun hileng.

(will-speak I. Question like you to-hear dreams when sleep we? The way-custom non-topic-marker call-they dreams that it sleeps he night) 'I will speak. Would you like to hear about dreams which occur when we sleep? The way of what they call dreams, that's what a person does when he sleeps at night.'

The following example of preparatory material preceding the discourse topic is from a dialogue:

1st speaker: Ina-nu dedan elaw etan ni elaw ni hengan pagey?

2nd speaker: Ya hu elaw ni hengan pagey ni ammed tayun nunman...

1st speaker: *(how just-try custom that non-topic-marker custom non-topic-marker hengan pagey-ceremony)*

2nd speaker: *(the focused-topic-marker custom non-topic-marker hengan pagey-ceremony non-topic-marker forefathers our of-long-ago...)*

1st speaker: *'How about telling us about the custom of the Hengan Pagey-ceremony?'*

2nd speaker: *'The custom of the Hengan Pagey-ceremony of our forefathers of long ago...'*

In the preceding example, the second speaker introduces elaw ni hengan pagey 'the custom of the Hengan Pagey-ceremony' as the discourse theme by marking the topic with ya.

Ya has two other grammatical forms, yad 'place topic-marker' and yan 'time topic-marker'. These two variant forms of ya function in the same way on discourse and paragraph level, i.e. they signal the sentence they introduce as topic of that message unit. They do not necessarily signal the topic of the sentence. The marked phrase may simply be the time or place setting of that sentence. However, when yan or yad co-occur with special verbal inflection, they signal the topic of the sentence and also signal contrastive identification.

THEME DEVELOPMENT

The theme of a discourse is developed throughout the paragraphs and sentences of the discourse. Paragraph topic develops the theme of the discourse by indicating what aspect of the theme is being talked about in that message unit. Similarly, each clause within a paragraph adds information which develops the topic introduced at the beginning of the paragraph.

When the first sentence of an explanatory paragraph is introduced by

ya, that sentence is topic of the paragraph and signals development of the discourse theme.

The theme of the following text, '*How the barrio of Amduntug got its name during the long ago time of our ancestors*', is given in the first sentence of the discourse. Part of this theme '*our ancestors of long ago (who lived in Amduntug)*' is then used as a basis for the development of theme in Paragraph 2. The fact that these '*ancestors were rich*' is added information and the sentence is marked as topic of the paragraph (Sentences 3 and 4). To introduce Paragraph 3 a part of the discourse theme, '*long ago*', is reiterated. This phrase is marked by yan and occurs sentence initially indicating that this sentence is topic of the paragraph and a further development of the theme. The added information which helps develop theme in this paragraph is a description of the commercial situation in that '*long ago*' time.

1. Yan iman ni ammed tayun nunman bekken ni Amduntug ngadan ni nunyan bebley. 2. Hin-appil ngadan tu.

3. Ya ida kunu tuun bimmebley di deya, kedangyan ida. 4. Wada ni emin nattan kamekkan.

5. Yan nunman endi pihhuh. 6. Hedin pinhed dan umgang heni ni pagey, mehapul ni iwa-hi da killum. 7. Hedin endi killum anin hipa human ni wadad baley yun mukanemnememay endi human di baley attan ni mu gettangan.

1. (*when during non-topic-marker forefathers our long-ago not non-topic-marker Amduntug name non-topic-marker this barrio*) 2. (*different name it*)

3. (*topic-marker topic-they it-is-said people barrio place-marker here, rich topic-they*) 4. (*there-is non-topic-marker everything that can-be-eaten*)

5. (*when long-ago none money*) 6. (*if want they buy like non-topic-marker rice, necessary non-topic-marker trade they pig*) 7. (*if none pig even whatever that non-topic-marker there-is house your you-think none that place-marker house that-one non-topic-marker you selling-to*)

1. '*During the time of our forefathers, Amduntug was not the name of this barrio.*' 2. *Its name was different.*

3. *It is said the people of this barrio were rich.* 4. *There was everything edible.*

5. *At that time there was no money.* 6. *If they wanted to buy something like rice it was necessary to trade for a pig.* 7. *If there was no pig, you used whatever was in your house that you know the person you're selling to doesn't have.'*

THEME EXPANSION

Explanatory paragraphs may also end with a sentence beginning with *ya*. The theme stated at the beginning of the paragraph is repeated in this sentence and new material may also be introduced expanding the theme. The next paragraph may repeat this expanded theme as a basis for further development of its theme. In the following example, Sentence 1 begins the text and introduces the theme of the discourse which is also the theme of the paragraph. Sentences 2-11, which are not shown here, contain the body of the paragraph. Sentence 12 repeats and expands the theme. It is also the paragraph closure.

1. *Hi apu hi Pungud, hiningbutu hu alma.*

1. *(personal-name-topic-marker grandfather personal-name-topic-marker Pungud, celebrated he focus-complement-marker crab)*

1. *'Grandfather Pungud, he celebrated a feast for a crab.'*

12. *Ya alma hiningbun apu hi Pungud et han bumaknang.*

12. *(a crab celebrated grandfather personal-name-topic-marker Pungud before became rich)*

12. *'A crab is what grandfather Pungud celebrated a feast for before he became rich.'*

'*Before he became rich*' is an expansion of the discourse-paragraph theme and completes it. Sentence 12 could be called the complete discourse-paragraph theme whereas Sentence 1 would be the incomplete theme.

VERBAL INFLECTION

Clause level topic is also an important facet in the scheme of thematisation of Keley-i discourse. Clauses develop that part of theme which has been marked as paragraph topic. Clause level topic is indicated by verbal inflection and corresponding focus-complement markers. There are four basic or simple clause level topic focusing affixes (Reid 1966) in Keley-i, (1) *um-* subject focus, (2) *i-* associate focus, (3) *-en* goal focus and, (4) *-an* referent focus. There are other affixes which mark the topic of a clause; however these are more complex than the above mentioned four.

The particle *hu* is a focus-complement marker which marks topic on the clause level. The particle is not obligatory unless there is some ambiguity in the cross reference of verbal inflection and of clause elements.

Ag kami hu manggaud ni dagah.

(negative we focus-complement-marker maN-subject focus-affix-shovel non-topic-marker early)

'We were not the ones who (started) shovel work early.'

In the preceding example, *hu* and the subject focus prefix *maN-* (related to *um-*) marks *kami* 'we' as the topic of the clause.

Yu ang-angen nattan hu pihhuh.

(you see-goal-focus-suffix-en that focus-complement-marker money)

'You will see that money.'

In the preceding example *hu* and the goal focus suffix *-en* marks *pihhuh* 'money' as the topic of the clause.

The particle *hu* also co-occurs with *ya* when the clause topic occurs in pre-verb emphasis position:

Ya ngalab hu manluttu ni sinapay.

*(the live-charcoal focus-complement-marker maN-subject-focus-affix-
make-ripe non-focus-particle bread)*

'The charcoal, it bakes the bread.'

In the preceding illustration, *ya* marks *ngalab* 'charcoal' as sentence topic while the prefix *maN-* on the verb plus the focus-complement marker *hu* refers back to *ngalab* 'charcoal' as clause topic. *Hu* also indicates that the verb *manluttu* 'it cooks' expands the sentence theme.

*Nemahig hu ewey e gullat ni beken ni ewey hu importanteh et ya hu ugub
hu tagan ala ku um-amleng ida bii.*

*(especially focus-complement-marker rattan paraphrase-link if-perchance
non-focus-particle not non-focus-particle rattan focus-marker im-
portant and sentence-topic-marker focus-complement-marker bamboo-
sprouts focus-complement-marker continuously get of-course will-be-
happy they women)*

*'There is very much rattan; if the rattan were not important and the
bamboo sprouts would be what we're getting more of, then of course the
women would be happy.'*

In the preceding example the particle *hu* occurs in three separate clauses and marks the topic of each clause. In the first clause *ewey* 'rattan' is the focused item. In the second clause *importanteh* 'important' is the focused item. In the third clause *ya hu* marks *ugub* 'bamboo sprouts' as sentence topic and the second *hu* marks *ugub* as clause topic.

The topic-marking particle *hi* precedes a personal name or a noun phrase referring to a person:

Tulli aygan hi agitu.

(he-future call person-topic-marker relative-his)

'He will call his brother.'

In the preceding example *hi* marks *agitu* 'his brother' as the focused

item of the clause.

Endi kantun ag ku pinhed hi dimen.

(negative say-he negative I like person-topic-marker that-one)

'He did not say "I don't like that person."'

In the preceding example hi marks dimen 'that person' as the topic of the clause in which it occurs.

The co-occurrence of the particle nan with hi marks the person as non-topic, even though hi by itself always marks a person as topic. Thus in the following sentence, 'what was said' is the topic of the sentence rather than Ambabakal. This is indicated by verbal inflection iN- as well as the combination of non-topic markers nan hi preceding Ambabakal.

Hipalli impanghel nan hi Ambabakal?

(what spoke non-topic-markers Ambabakal?)

'What did Ambabakal say?'

The exception to this rule of nan hi marking the non-topic person of a clause is when a series of names are listed. In this case the particle di introduces the first member of that group and the particles nan hi introduce each subsequent member of the series. Whether or not the group is the topic of the clause is indicated by verbal inflection and not by nan hi:

Mannemnemnem law di Kimmayong nan hi Bahingawan.

(MaN-subject-focus-affix-thinking now plural-person-marker Kimmayong person-marker Bahingawan)

'Kimmayong and Bahingawan are thinking.'

In the preceding example the verbal inflection maN- marks Bahingawan and Kimmayong as the topic of the clause. Bahingawan is part of the topic even though he is introduced by nan hi.

PRONOUNS AND DEMONSTRATIVES

Oblique pronouns³ which occur preceding the verb are marked by occurrence in this position and by verbal inflection as topic of the clause:

Hi-gatu kuma hu binotos tayu.

(he-was-the-one ought focus-complement-marker vote we)

'He is the one we should have voted for.'

If there is also co-occurrence of special verbal inflection, contrastive identification is indicated (see the next section on participant identification).

Demonstratives⁴ occur as clause topic except for those that substitute for time and location.

Ginibbuh mi humman.

(finish we that)

'We finished that.'

PARTICIPANT IDENTIFICATION

There are several ways of indicating participant identification in Keley-1. One way is the co-occurrence of *ya* with *ngu* or with complex verbal inflection. This combination identifies the topic as contrasting with another entity which has either been mentioned elsewhere in the discourse or could be understood by the hearer.

Ya ngu (=ngu di) Du-ping wada hu apuy tu.

(the one-location-marker Du-ping there-is focus-marker fire his)

'The one on Du-ping, he had fire.'

In the preceding example the person on Mt. Du-ping is contrasted with a person on another mountain, mentioned earlier in the text, who did not have fire.

Human ang-ang-angen ali hedin ninemnem ida. Ya ngu latlattuh dan han-i-inna. Han-a-amma hu pinhed kun ellaan.

(that will-see future if think they. The one photograph they mother-and-children. Father-and-children focus-complement-marker desire I to-get)

'We will see the photographs if they remember. There is one photograph belonging to them of a mother and her children. The picture of the father and his children is the one I want.'

In the preceding example, *ya ngu* marks the photo of the mother and her children as contrastive to the one of the father and his children.

Ambeken di Genhaden nem yad (=ya di) Napayo nan-istulyahan mi ni kulyuh. *(not location-marker Genhaden but topic-marker Napayo place-of-story-telling we nor-topic-marker kulyuh)*

'It was not at Genhaden but Napayo that we told the story about the kulyuh ceremony.'

Here *ya* co-occurs with complex verbal inflection which expresses specific and contrastive identification. The place of the story-telling, *Napayo*, is contrasted with *Genhaden*, the place of the special ceremony. If the narrator were not contrasting the place of story-telling, the following example illustrates what he would say.

Nan-istulyah kamid Napayo meippanggep ni kulyuh.

(subject-focus-told-story we-at Napayo concerning kulyuh)

'We told the story about the kulyuh ceremony at Napayo.'

In the previous example the place of the story-telling, Napayo, was the topic of the sentence while the story tellers, kami 'we', are sentence topic of the later example.

Another way of marking participants is by a referential change indicator. This indicator occurs in narrative, project, and procedural paragraphs (Longacre 1968). When two participants or two groups of participants are performing a series of interchanging or simultaneous activities, the speaker may switch from the participant he was talking about by the use of neala 'instead' preceding the new participant. Therefore, neala plus the participant mentioned signals 'instead of the previously mentioned group or individual, this is the participant under consideration'. This phenomenon may function across paragraph boundaries as well as within paragraphs.

Ebuhe lumaw idan lakin anmangeyew.

Nealadda han-ina limmaw idan anman-ehhul.

(then go they men to-headhunt.

Instead-of-them, woman-and-child go they to-get-water)

'Then the men went headhunting.

Instead (of the men who went headhunting), a mother and child went to the spring to get water.'

Later in the same text:

Agda am-amtay (=am-amta ey)⁵ nalbengan ida et matey idan emin.

Entanni ey i humman law wa-watu. Nealadda hu annangayew, dimmateng idad Betbetan ey uhdangan da bebley dad Ambuhayyay (=Ambuhayya ey) nalbeng.

(negative-they know-conjunction flooded they and died they all.

After-a-while conjunctions that now dawn-it. Instead-of-they focus-marker headhunters arrived they-at Betbetan conjunction looked-down they barrio they Ambuhayya-conjunction flooded)

'They (the women and children) didn't know they had been flooded and they all died.

After a while it was now the dawning of a day. Instead of the women and children, the headhunters, they arrived at Betbetan, and looked down on their flooded barrio Ambuhayya.'

CO-ORDINATION AND SUB-ORDINATION

CONJUNCTIONS

All conjunctions in Keley-i discourse have to do with the hierarchical organisation of its content. Some of the conjunctions are hedin 'if', nem 'but', tep 'because', ebuhe 'then', ma-lat 'so that', mukun 'that's why', gullat 'if perchance', aye 'therefore', et 'and', and ey 'and, while, at the same time'. For the purpose of this paper, I am limiting our consideration of conjunctions to two, et and ey. These conjunctions seem to be almost identical in meaning.

Ballard, Conrad, and Longacre (1971) describe the deep grammar and surface grammar relations of jet and jey in Inibaloi, which is related to Keley-i. Their jet and jey of Inibaloi approximate the semantic areas of et and ey in Keley-i, but there are some differences. Both et and ey are used to manifest several rhetorical predicates in Keley-i Kallahan discourse (Grimes MS.). The following is an attempt at clarification of the semantic range and grammatical function of these two conjunctions.

The logic of discourse is expressed by the interrelationships of rhetorical predicates. These interrelationships are manifested in part by the use of et and ey as conjunctions in the surface grammar of discourse. As a general rule, et connects predicates that are directly interrelated, and ey connects those which are only remotely interrelated.

FUNCTIONS OF et

Et connects clauses in temporal sequence.

Umlidda et da kapakapaen.

(come-they and they repeatedly-touch)

'They came and repeatedly touched him.'

Et connects a modal to that which it modifies. The mode expresses an underlying descriptive lexical predicate which has been made to dominate a proposition with a lexical verbal predicate, i.e. the verbal predicate and its arguments are standing in case relationship to the descriptive predicate (Lou Hohulin MS.).

Kayyaggud ngu et aggak ngu unnuden inhel nan hi kuyen naya.

(good contrastive-particle conjunction neg-I contrastive-particle follow speech person-marker what's-his-name)

'It's good that I didn't follow the talk of what's-his-name.'

Dammutu et ahan ni kullugen da.

(possible conjunction desire non-focus-particle believe they)

'It is possible that they will obey.'

Hedin et aggak mettey, um-ali ak ali mewan.

(if conjunction neg-I die, come I future again)

'If I don't die, I will come again.'

Other modals which have been observed followed by et in this sense are: hipa 'what', endi 'there is none', pangu 'suppose', inna-nu 'how', wada 'there is', hiya 'it's enough', eleg 'no' (rejection), eteng 'large', gullat 'if perchance', nema-ma 'especially, more', eggu 'dislike', pinhed ku 'I want/like', beken 'it is not'.

Et introduces intention propositions. The intention proposition introducer consists of a quotation introduction formula plus et. Since ey is an integral feature of the quotation introduction formula, the two conjunctions et and ey co-occur in intention proposition introducers.

Kanda et ey umtukwab ida nem eleggu.

(said-they conjunction conjunction will-open they but dislike)

'They intended that they will open the house, but I didn't like (for them to do it).'

Kanda et ey mi a-awiten.

(said-they conjunction conjunction we call)

'They intended that we will go and call her.'

Et connects things which belong to the same semantic domain or which have been brought together in a collection forming a group:

Alina, ya guggullu, asukal, taba, itlug et danum.

'Flour, orange, sugar, fat, eggs, and water.'

These are ingredients in a recipe, all of which could be connected with et.

Al-en mi wangal ni bayyaung et gameng.

(will-get we blanket bayyaung and gameng)

'We will get a bayyaung blanket and a gameng blanket.'

In-eyagan da kalew et gawang.

(called they kalew and gawang)

'They called the kalew bird and the gawang bird.'

pitun pihhuh et halipe

(seven pesos and fifty centavos)

'seven pesos and fifty centavos'

FUNCTIONS OF ey

Ey ends the quotation introduction formula.

Dingngel kudman ey kankui, "Kayyaggud kayat immepea duplano".
(heard-it I-there conjunction said-I-conjunction good indeed it-landed airplane)

'I heard it there and said, "It's good that the airplane landed."'

Ey connects clauses which are simultaneous.

Umdateng di Cabigat ey nahdem.
(arrived plural-person-marker Cabigat conjunction night)

'Cabigat and his companions arrived and it was night.'

Umheneppitan ida ey tukaiddu-ping hi Bugan.
(continuously-talking they conjunction he-defeated Bugan)

'When they were arguing, he defeated Bugan.'

Menginum ida ey agda peki-innum hi Cabigat.
(drink they conjunction neg-they allow-to-drink person-marker Cabigat)

'They drank wine and they didn't allow Cabigat to drink with them.'

Ey connects clauses of circumstance-result.

Na-gah hak di dallin ey nak kamanpudapudan.
(fell I location-marker outside conjunction I continuously-roll)

'I fell outside and I was rolling.'

Himbat tu deplah ey i nehupi hebat tu.
(pecked he rock conjunction it-flattened beak his)

'He pecked the rock and his beak was flattened.'

Man-egudulladul ey nemahig dilluh e kameebuebung danum.
(thundered-rained conjunction much waves paraphrase-link mounting water)

'It thundered-rained and there were great waves, the water mounted.'

Ey connects things of different semantic domains or things which are spatially separate.

Humman hu manuk ey babuy.
(that focus-marker chicken conjunction pig)

'That is the chickens and the pigs.'

Lakkay kuma et ka menaddan ni ubi ey singsing.
(go should conjunction you prepare non-focus-particle sweet-potato conjunction sweet-potato-leaves)

'You go and prepare the sweet potato and sweet potato leaves.'

Sweet potatoes and sweet potato leaves are probably considered as different semantic domains on the following basis: sweet potatoes grow below the ground and are food for people; sweet potato leaves grow above the ground and are food for pigs.

Nak menaddan ni kubkub et kebi ey ballunglung et wada pengipekkanan ta.
 (I prepare non-topic-particle pigpen conjunction chicken-coop conjunction
 pig-trough conjunction there-is place-to-feed we)
 'I will go to prepare a pigpen and a chicken coop and a trough and there
 will be a place for us to feed the pigs.'

Pigpens and chicken coops are both made by binding materials together with rattan, whereas a pig trough is carved out of a solid piece of wood. The pigpen and chicken coop are connected by *et*, and the pig trough is connected to them by *ey*.

Dammutun mambanggad klnedangyan yu ey ketegguan yu.
 (possible will-return riches your conjunction life-your)
 'You can get back your riches and your life.'

SPECIFIC COMPARISONS OF *et* AND *ey*

If one substitutes the conjunctions *et* and *ey* for one another, the propositions they connect manifest different rhetorical predicates. When two propositions are connected by *et* the first proposition may be intensive:

Dimmateng di Du-ping et ang-angen tu hi agitu.
 (he-arrived location-marker Du-ping conjunction saw he person-marker
 relative-his)
 'He arrived at Mt Du-ping (with the intention of seeing his relative)
and he saw her.'

However if these two propositions were connected by *ey*, the sentence would mean, 'he arrived at Du-ping and there he happened to see his relative'.

The quotation from the next sentence in the same text also reveals rhetorical categories. If these propositions had been connected by *et*, the sentence would have meant 'How is it that (of all people) you're the only woman alive and I'm the only man alive'. However the propositions were connected by *ey* and thereby express quite a different meaning:

"Inna-nu ey hakey kan netagun bii ey hakey yak ni netagun laki?"
 (how conjunction one you living woman conjunction one I non-topic-particle living man)
 'How is it that you're the only woman alive and I'm the only man alive?
 (Well, well, how about that.)'

The next sentence in the text appropriately states 'Then they married each other'.

NOTES

1. Keley-i Kallahan is the language of approximately 2500 people in the Kiangan municipality of Ifugao Province, Central Luzon, Philippines. The data for this paper were collected under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics in Napayo, a barrio situated in Kiangan municipality, during the years 1963-4. The author has been intermittently resident in the area during the years 1962-71. The orthography is as follows: consonants p, t, ty, k, b, d, dy, g, s, h, l, m, n, ng, y, w; vowels i, e, a, u. Glottal stop is not written between vowels or word initially, where it always occurs; it is written as a hyphen in clusters with another consonant, and one hyphen between vowels represents a geminate glottal cluster. Keley-i Kallahan is included in Kalanguya, which is classified by Dyen (1965) as part of the Ifugao Subfamily of the Philippine branch of Malayopolynesian languages.

This paper was written at a linguistic workshop held at Nasuli, Malaybalay, Bukidnon, Philippines during the months of May-July 1971. Joseph E. Grimes of Cornell University and the Summer Institute of Linguistics conducted the workshop, and I am indebted to him for his help and suggestions in writing this paper. The workshop was partly funded by National Science Foundation Grant GS-3180. The analysis of the data was expedited by a concordance made on an IBM 1410 computer at the University of Oklahoma by the Linguistic Information Retrieval Project of the Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Oklahoma Research Institute, which was partially supported by National Science Foundation grant GS-270.

2. Forster (1964) characterises the topic as 'some element toward which attention is directed, i.e. the thing-about-which-we-are-talking'. Elkins distinguishes the paragraph or discourse topic from the sentence topic (Longacre 1968). In this paper I also make this distinction, but in addition I distinguish between discourse topic and paragraph topic.

3. Oblique pronouns occur as indirect objects in the surface grammar except when they occur in preverb position. In preverb position they are either subject or direct object of a clause. Keley-1 oblique pronouns are hi-gak 1s, hi-gam 2s, hi-gatu 3s, hi-gami lp-excl, hi-gayu 2p-excl, hi-gada 3p, hi-gata l2s-excl, hi-gatyu lp-incl.

4. Some Keley-1 demonstratives are huya '*this (near speaker)*', huttan '*that (near or in hand of addressee)*', ditten '*that (near addressee)*', dimen '*that (at a relative distance from both speaker and addressee)*', humman '*that (far from both hearer and speaker)*'.

5. When the conjunctions et and ey are preceded by grammatical forms that end in a vowel, the vowel of the conjunction is lost and the remaining consonant is fused to the preceding form.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AUSTIN, Virginia M.

- 1966 "Attention, emphasis and focus in Ata Manobo." *Hartford Publications in Linguistics* No.20.

BALLARD, D. Lee, CONRAD, Robert J. and LONGACRE, Robert E.

- 1971 "The deep and surface grammar of interclausal relations", *Foundations of Language*. 7:1.70-118.

DYEN, Isidore

- 1965 "A lexicostatistical classification of the Austronesian languages", *Indiana University Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics*, Memoir 19, supplement to *International Journal of American Linguistics*. 31:1.

FORSTER, Jannette

- 1964 "Dual structure of Dibabawon verbal clauses", *Oceanic Linguistics*. 3:1.26-48.

GRIMES, Joseph E.

- n.d. "Outlines and overlays." MS. To appear in *Language*.

HOHULIN, Lou

- 1971 "Complex predicates in Keley-1 Kallahan." *Pacific Linguistics, Series A, No.32, Papers in Philippine Linguistics No.4*.

LONGACRE, Robert E.

- 1968 *Discourse, paragraph and sentence structure in selected Philippine languages*. Santa Ana: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

PIKE, Kenneth L.

1963 "A syntactic paradigm", *Language*. 39:2.216-230. (April-June 1963.)

REID, Lawrence A.

1966 *An Ivatan syntax*, *Oceanic Linguistic Special Publication No.2*.

1972 Pacific Linguistics, The Australian National University, 1972. DOI:10.15167/PL-657

C1972 Pacific Linguistics and/or the author(s). Online edition licensed 2015 CC BY-SA 4.0, with permission of PL. Asealang.net/CRCL initiative.

COMPLEX PREDICATES IN KELEY-I KALLAHAN

LOU HOHULIN

INTRODUCTION

In the morphology of Keley-i Kallahan¹ I distinguish two kinds of morpheme classes, major and minor, in relation to the semantics of the language. The major classes include nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs; the minor classes include particles, conjunctions, substitutes, and expletives (Weinreich 1966). In this paper I discuss the semantic predicates that underlie the major classes of morphemes and the formation of complex predicates that underlie morpheme combinations.

LEXICAL PREDICATES

Semantic predicates that underlie the major classes of morphemes are called **lexical predicates** (Grimes MS.). Lexical predicates are those which have arguments that stand in case relationships with them (Fillmore 1968, Frantz 1970). These predicates may be classified as verbal, nominal, and descriptive. Criteria for classifying them in this way are their distinguishing intrinsic features, their potential for adding abstract predicates (Langendoen 1969, 1970) to form complex predicates, and semantic derivation potential. In general verbal predicates underlie verbs, nominal predicates underlie nouns, and descriptive predicates underlie adjectives and adverbs.

CASE SYSTEM

The classes and subclasses of Keley-i predicates are selectional units; whereas individual members of the classes are lexical units (Chafe 1970). The selectional units, i.e. classes, indicate the obligatory and optional arguments which may stand in case relationship to them. Lexical units define specifically their own semantics as well as

place constraints on the expression of relationships by other lexical units.

Arguments which may stand in case relationship with Keley-i predicates are Agent, Patient, Source, Goal, Range, Beneficiary, Instrument, Experiencer and Essive.

More detailed studies of case relationships have been done by Hettick (MS.) and West (MS.) in two other closely related Philippine languages, Kankaray and Amganad Ifugao.²

VERBAL PREDICATES

A verbal predicate describes an occurrence. This lexical predicate has innate semantic features, which classify the verb it describes and indicate the roles of co-occurring nominals. Predicates are classified as action, process, action-process, state, experience, and ambient (Chafe 1970). Co-occurring nominals in the surface grammar manifest the underlying arguments that stand in case relationships to the predicate.

The following verbal predicate classes are general and therefore case relationships are treated from a broad perspective. Specific treatment would require the description of subclasses and that is not within the scope of this paper.³

An action predicate describes an action performed, but not upon anything. The agentive case relationship is obligatory. The corresponding surface verb has traditionally been considered intransitive. Examples of Keley-i action predicates are *elaw* 'go', *ali* 'come', *besik* 'run', *dep-ah* 'jump down', *dateng* 'arrive', *baktad* 'lie down on back', *egah* 'fall', *epa* 'alight', *hegep* 'enter', *ehep* 'go out'.

A process predicate describes a process which brings about a change of state or position, and a patient argument is obligatory. The corresponding surface verb has traditionally been considered passive. Examples of Keley-i process predicates are *atu* 'become tired', *wetwet* 'become poor', *dunut* 'rot, referring to wooden things', *labah* 'pass', *bewel* 'rot, referring to vegetables and fruit', *laing* 'become skilled or intelligent', *ligat* 'become hard', *pigut* 'become thin'.

An action-process predicate describes an action performed which brings about a change in the state or position of an element. The corresponding surface verb is transitive and always takes a direct object. Action-process predicates obligatorily have an agent and a patient argument standing in case relationship. These predicates are further classified by the kinds of actions performed upon the patient, and the kinds of patients.

State change predicates are one subclass of action process predicates.

Examples of this subclass are *beyu 'pound rice or coffee'*, *inum 'drink'*, *ekan 'eat'*, *kapya 'make something'*.

Transitive motion predicates are another subclass of action process predicates. Examples of this subclass are *ha-ad 'place something'*, *talū 'hide something'*, *huup 'join together'*, *kamdug 'mix together'*.

Extended action predicates are another subclass of action process predicates. Examples of this subclass are *adug 'guard something'*, *tukwab 'open a bottle or can'*, *gabut 'cut grass'*, *ulah 'wash'*.

A stative predicate describes a characteristic state of someone or something. A patient argument obligatorily stands in case relationship. The corresponding surface verb is passive. Few Keley-i predicates are innately stative; the majority of statives are derived, particularly from action and process predicates. Examples of those which seem to be innately stative are *belah 'white'*, *delang 'red'*, *lulaw 'yellow'*, *awet 'hard, referring to a substance'*.

An experience predicate describes an emotion or perception felt by someone, and obligatorily takes an experiencer argument. The corresponding surface verb is intransitive. Examples of Keley-i experience predicates are *baing 'ashamed'*, *bunget 'angry'*, *amleng 'happy'*, *almet 'displeased'*, *inglay 'sad'*, *guhu 'irritated'*, *ingha 'accustomed to'*, *egyat 'startled'*, *takut 'afraid'*, *kel-ew 'afraid with physical sensations'*.

An ambient predicate describes a process which is different from the process predicate in that it does not have a patient argument. An ambient predicate stands alone as a predication only. Examples of Keley-i ambient predicates are *hileng 'night'*, *wa-wa 'dawn/day'*, *ugew 'dry season'*, *lemlem 'wet season'*.

NOMINAL PREDICATES

A nominal predicate describes a time, person, place, or thing and expresses an argument in case relationship to verbal predicates. This lexical predicate has two intrinsic semantic features, one which identifies its referent and a second which indicates the essive argument as obligatory. When the essive argument is explicitly expressed in the surface grammar, the nominal predicate with its argument stands alone as a proposition and is expressed by a clause in the surface grammar which has been described in Philippine languages as an equative or non-verbal clause (Reid 1966, Newell 1964). However, when the essive argument is suppressed in the surface grammar nominal predicates are expressed as nouns in subjective or objective relation to the verb.

Members of this class of predicates are further identified and classified by the kinds of arguments they manifest, by their potential for

adding abstract predicates to form complex predicates, and their derivation potential.

Some classes of Keley-i nominal predicates are human, animal, directional-place, time, thing, and place-thing.

A human predicate expresses generic person classes and kinship terms. Examples of generic classes are *tuu* 'person', *laki* 'male', *bii* 'female'. Examples of kinship terms are *ama* 'father', *ina* 'mother', *agi* 'sibling'.

Examples of animal predicates are *killum* 'pig', *ahhu* 'dog', *puha* 'cat', *newang* 'carabao'.

Examples of directional-place predicates are *ba-hil* 'other side (place)', *bawang* 'inside (place)', *ehpen* 'down (place)', *ahpat* 'up (place)'.

Examples of time predicates are *aggew* 'day', *bulan* 'month', *toon* 'year', *olas* 'hour'.

Examples of place-thing predicates are *kabunyan* 'sky', *puyek* 'earth', *payew* 'rice field', *duntug* 'mountain', *bebley* 'barrio', *dalan* 'trail'.

The thing predicates are the largest class, and of course, may be separated into many smaller classes such as food, instruments, clothing, etc., but it is not within the scope of this paper to discuss every semantic class. Examples of thing predicates are *itlug* 'egg', *gaga* 'cooked rice', *pala* 'shovel', *pinway* 'bolo', *ginallit* 'woven skirt', *pa-ngaw* 'necklace'.

DESCRIPTIVE PREDICATES

A descriptive predicate qualifies occurrence, time, person, place, or thing, and intrinsically indicates that which it qualifies as its patient argument. This argument is obligatory. Syntactically, descriptive predicates are expressed as adjectives and adverbs in the surface grammar. When an adverb is expressed in the surface grammar, the underlying descriptive predicate has been made to dominate a proposition with a verbal lexical predicate, i.e. the verbal predicate and its arguments are embedded in the patient argument of the descriptive: *Kayyaggud et hi-gatyu nengibbuh e tuud Antipolo.* (*good that we-all finished, we the people of Antipolo*) 'It's good that we are the ones who finished it, we the people of Antipolo.' When an adjective is expressed in the surface grammar, the underlying descriptive predicate has been made to dominate a proposition with a nominal lexical predicate, i.e. the nominal predicate with its essive argument is embedded in the patient argument: *In-ali tu dakel ni unah.* (*brought he much sugar cane*) 'He brought much sugar cane.'

Members of the descriptive class of predicates are further identified and classified according to the kinds of things selected as the patient

argument, derivation potential and potential for adding abstract predicates to form complex predicates.

Two classes of descriptive predicates are comparative and quantitative.

Examples of comparative predicates are *kayyaggud* 'good', *lewah* 'bad', *eta-gey* 'high', *babba* 'low', *dukkey* 'long', *sikey* 'short'.

Examples of quantitative predicates are numbers, *dewwa* 'two', *na-nem* 'sixty'. Other quantitative predicates are *ekut* 'small amount', *dakei* 'much/many', *emin* 'all'.

COMPLEX PREDICATES

A complex predicate consists of two or more predicates which are capable of being consolidated into a single surface form, i.e. root and affixes. The underlying semantic predicate which is considered to be the base predicate is the one which is expressed as the root in the surface grammar. Affixes and reduplication morphemes are considered as expressing underlying abstract predicates.

Base predicates, verbal, nominal and descriptive, differ in their capacity to receive additional semantic meaning in the form of abstract predicates. Individual members of these predicate classes may also differ from one another in this way.

Lexical predicates are treated as complex in Keley-1 when their precise meaning is best expressed by relating it to two or more propositions that are so constructed that they can be consolidated (Frantz 1970). If a single clause in the surface grammar may be paraphrased by two or more clauses each expressing one of the underlying propositions, the propositions are likely to be consolidated from two or more lexical predicates into one.

Nakkaiddenaddan kennen ni killum (*I-present-habitually-prepare food of pig*) 'I am habitually preparing the food for the pigs' is one clause. The verb *nakkaiddenaddan*, however, expresses three underlying propositions, 'what I am talking about is taking place while I am talking', represented by the present tense prefix *ka-*, 'what I am talking about takes place habitually', represented by the habitative aspect infix *-en-*, and 'someone prepares something', represented by the stem *iddaddan* (*associate-focus-prefix-prepare*).⁴ The three propositions could be transformed into two clauses by embedding the innermost one, 'prepare', as the object of the one that immediately dominates it, 'repeatedly': *Nakkaituluy ni idaddan kennen ni killum* (*I-present-repeat prepare food of pig*) 'I am repeatedly preparing the food for the pigs'. Although the tense alone can never be expressed as a separate clause in the surface

grammar, the fact that verbs may assume any tense is the deciding factor in treating tense as one of the underlying propositions. The three propositions are consolidated into one complex verb in the first example, but total consolidation is not obligatory, as the second example shows. The underlying semantic predicate is considered to be one complex verbal predicate consolidated from a base verbal predicate, action-process and two abstract predicates, tense and habitative.

The noun phrase in the clause *kennen ni killum* 'food for pigs' is considered as having four underlying propositions 'something is food', represented by the root *kennen*, 'someone intends something for an animate destination', represented by connective *ni*, 'something animate is a pig', represented by the root *killum*, 'something is multiple' which is not expressed in the surface grammar but is understood by the underlying case relationship between the verbal predicate and nominal predicate. The four propositions are considered as consolidated, expressed as one complex nominal predicate.

COMPLEX VERBAL PREDICATES

Verbal predicates have greater potential for adding abstract predicates than nominal and descriptive predicates. This potential involves both the variety of additional meanings that may be superimposed, and the fact that a larger number of meanings may be added at one time. Some of the abstract predicates which may be added to a verbal base predicate, expressed in the surface grammar as affixes and reduplicative morphemes, are tense⁵, aspects such as continuative (Syl₁ C₁ reduplication), repetitive (Syl₁ CV₂ reduplication), habitative (-en-), collective (*mampan-*), newly completed (*pake-*). 'Newly completed' is the only aspect with which tense may not co-occur. The addition of these abstract predicates does not result in case frame adjustment.

In *beyubeyuen ku kapih* (*future-repeatedly-pound I coffee*) 'I will repeatedly pound coffee' the verb *beyubeyuen* expresses three underlying propositions, 'what I am talking about will take place later', represented by the future tense goal focus suffix -en, 'what I am talking about will take place repeatedly', represented by Syl₁ CV₂ reduplication, and 'someone pounds something', represented by the stem *beyu*. This underlying structure could also be expressed as *ittuluy ku beyuen kapih* (*future-continue I future-pound coffee*) 'I will continually pound coffee', with attention called to the action of pounding itself, pre-verb, blocking the complete consolidation transformation.

Mampan-edug ityun emin eyad bebley tayu hedin hileng (*collective-future-guard we-all all in barrio our when night*) 'We all will guard at the same time everything in our barrio when it's night'. The verb

mampan-edug expresses three underlying propositions *'what I am talking about will take place later'*, represented by the m- of mampan-, *'what I am talking about all of us will do at the same time'*, represented by mampan-, and *'someone will guard somewhere'*, represented by the stem edug.

Other meanings which may be added to verbal base predicates are reflexive (man-), reciprocal (man-in-), and cooperative (meki-). The addition of these meanings does not result in case frame adjustment, but there is a change in the surface mapping of the base predicate.

In mandaddan nak ni umlaw di Kiangang (*reflexive-prepare I connector go location-marker Kiangang*) *'I will prepare myself to go to Kiangang'*, the verb mandaddan expresses three underlying propositions *'what I am talking about will take place later'*, represented by the m- of man-, *'someone will prepare something'*, represented by the stem daddan, *'the one who will prepare something'* and *'the thing prepared'* are the same represented by the reflexive prefix man-. The case frame norm for the base predicate *'prepare'* is a case relationship with two arguments, agent and patient. With the addition of reflexive meaning, there is no change in the actual case relationships of the base predicate, but rather the co-referentiality (Frantz 1970) of the two arguments, agent and patient, is made explicit and expressed as one form in the surface grammar.⁶

Causative is an example of an abstract predicate which when added to a base predicate involves a case frame adjustment. The addition of this abstract predicate does not change the case relationships of the base predicate; it simply adds a case element of its own, i.e. instigating cause, which has to be placed in relation to the case frame of the base predicate. In impainnum ku bubud ni hi-gatu (*past-causative-drink I wine particle him*) *'I caused the wine to be drunk by him'*, the verb impainnum expresses the underlying propositions *'what I am talking about took place'*, represented by im-, *'someone caused something to be done'*, represented by pa-, *'someone drank something'*, represented by the stem inum. The case frame norm for the base predicate *'drink'* is a case relationship with two arguments, agent and patient. The addition of the abstract predicate *'cause'* expands the basic case frame to include a causative agent.

COMPLEX NOMINAL PREDICATES

Quantification and definiteness are meaning categories which may be superimposed upon nominal predicates. Unitary (han-) plural (ke- Sy₁, reduplication), and distributive (ka- Sy₁CV₂ reduplication) are sub-

categories of quantification, whereas possessive (pronoun enclitic) is considered as a subcategory of definiteness.

In *nandaladalan nak di kebbebley* (*past-repetitive-walk I to many-barrios*) '*I walked (visited) to many barrios*' the noun *kebbebley* expresses two underlying propositions '*something being talked about is a barrio*', represented by the stem *bebley*, '*something being talked about is multiple*', represented by *ke-* Syl_1 reduplication. If special prominence was to be given to the quantifier, the two propositions would not be consolidated: *dakel ni bebley*.

In *ilaw mud kabelebeley* (*imperative-take you each-house*) '*you take (it) to each house*', the noun *kabelebeley* expresses two underlying propositions, '*something is a house*', represented by the stem *baley*, and '*what is being talked about involves each house*', represented by *ka-* Syl_1CV_2 reduplication.

The following is an example of the imposition of possessive meaning upon a nominal predicate. In *illan Tomas pingwaytu* (*past-got Tomas bolo-3rd person singular*) '*Tomas got his bolo knife*', the noun *pingwaytu* expresses two underlying propositions, '*something is a bolo*', represented by the stem *pingway*, and '*something belongs to the male*', represented by 3rd person pronoun *tu*.

COMPLEX DESCRIPTIVE PREDICATES

Although one class of descriptive predicates are considered to be innately comparative, added comparative meanings of '*more than*' (*ke-* Syl_1C_1 reduplication -an) or '*the most*' (*ka-* -in-) may be superimposed upon this class.

In *ya baley Tomas kekakkayyaggudan* (*particle house Tomas comparative-good*) '*the house of Tomas is better (than other houses)*', *kekakkayyaggudan* expresses two underlying propositions, '*something is good*', represented by the stem *kayyaggud*, and '*something is better than others*', represented by *ke-* Syl_1C_1 reduplication -an.

In *ina-nu kadinakel ni tuud Manila* (*how superlative-many particle people-in Manila*) '*how is it that the most people are in Manila*', *kadinakel* expresses two underlying propositions, '*something is many*' represented by the stem *dakel* and '*something is superlative many, i.e. the most*', represented by *ka-* -in-.

DOMINATION IN COMPLEX PREDICATES

While this analysis clarifies verbal usage considerably, it is obvious that the loose ends of the system will only be tied down by following out their patterns of occurrence in complete discourse of

various kinds (Huisman MS.). From the point of view of linguistic theory, this constitutes a claim that morphological structures are not independent of the rest of language; for one part they relate to clause structure as shown in this paper, but they also express discourse relations.

An understanding of discourse relations would seem to be needed to fill out the remainder of the theory of proposition domination with the transformations that cover complete and incomplete consolidation. To illustrate the potential complexity of the system whose main characteristics I have sketched, take for example *hi-gak nampengipeyudung idan tuu* (*I-topic subject-focus-distributive-contrastive-identification-causative-continuative-sit 3rd-person-plural person*) '*I was the one who caused the people to sit continually*'. There are at least six underlying propositions; but because this example was analysed outside of a discourse setting, I have been unable to fully determine which proposition dominates which. The propositions are as follows: '*what I am talking about has been completed already*', represented by the *n-* in *nam-*, '*what I am talking about is done continually*', represented by *Sy|*, reduplication, '*someone caused someone else to do something*', represented by *pe-*, '*the one who caused the action is contrasted to others who might have caused it*', represented by *pengi-*, '*the people who did the action are semantically important*', represented by *nam-*, and '*someone sat*', represented by the stem *yudung*. The relative importance of the propositions represented in the complex predicate is indeterminate without a much wider context as reference. Also, I believe that there are factors in discourse relations like Halliday's information focus (1967) that determine whether there is total consolidation of propositions, allowing their expression as one clause in the surface grammar, or whether several clauses are strung out to express a different relative importance of the underlying propositions.

SEMANTIC DERIVATION

In Keley-1 a distinction must be made between abstract predicates and semantic derivation. Semantic derivation covers the exclusion of case frame elements which are innately a part of a lexical unit, the addition of case frame elements which are not innately a part of a lexical unit, i.e. not part of the regular meaning but added for a particular utterance, or certain semantic distinctions that do not actually change the case frame. Derivation is expressed in the surface grammar by affixation, e.g. a noun which is a free form is affixed with verbal affixation to derive a verb.

Deriving a verbal predicate from a nominal is an example of the exclusion of a case frame element which is innately a part of a lexical unit and the addition of other case frame elements which are not part of a lexical entry. By excluding the essive and adding an agent, the nominal place-thing predicate *dalan 'trail'* may be derived by adding *man-* prefix to the verbal action predicate *mandellan 'walk'*. In semantic derivation arguments which are an innate part of the semantic structure of both the noun and the verbal action predicate, such as range or goal, are carried through unchanged.

An example of a distinction being made without changing case frames is the derivation of a verbal process predicate from a descriptive predicate. A descriptive predicate is expressed as a free form in the surface grammar, i.e. an adjective in a noun phrase. To derive a verb from the adjective, verbal affixation (*me-*) must be added. The case frame in the semantic structure remains the same, a patient. However, a distinction is made between the innate state of the patient (descriptive) and the process a patient may undergo (verb).

NOTES

1. Keley-i Kallahan is the language of approximately 2500 people in the Kiangan municipality of Ifugao Province, Central Luzon, Philippines. The data for this paper were recorded in Napayo, a barrio situated in Kiangan municipality during the years 1963-4. The author and her husband have been intermittently resident in the area during the years 1962-71. The orthography is as follows: consonants b, d, dy, g, p, t, ty, k, s, h, l, m, n, ng, y, w; vowels i, e [ɛ], a, u. Glottal stop is not written between vowels or word initially; it is written as a hyphen in clusters with another consonant, and one hyphen between vowels represents a geminate glottal cluster.

This paper was written at a linguistic workshop held at Nasuli, Malaybalay, Bukidnon, Philippines during the months of May-July 1971. I would like to express my appreciation to Joseph E. Grimes of Cornell University and the Summer Institute of Linguistics, who conducted the workshop. I am indebted to him for his help in the writing of this paper. The workshop was partly funded by National Science Foundation Grant GS-3180. The analysis of the data was expedited by a concordance made on the IBM 1410 computer at the University of Oklahoma by the Linguistic Information Retrieval Project of the Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Oklahoma Research Institute, which was partially supported by National Science Foundation Grant GS-270.

2. Keley-i Kallahan is included in Kalanguya which is classified by Dyen (1965) as part of the Ifugao Subfamily of the Philippine branch of Malayopolynesian languages. Amganad Ifugao is classified as part of the Ifugao Subfamily and Kankanay is classified in the Igorot Subfamily. Harold Conklin and Lawrence Reid (personal communication) suggest that Keley-i be named Kallahan, which generally would refer to the language classified as Kalanguya by Dyen.

3. Hettick (MS.) defines case frames more precisely and distinguishes further classes. For example, she separates body position verbs from intransitive motion verbs. Generally speaking, these would fit into my action predicate class. In defining case frame, Hettick describes full case frames, whereas I have defined only the arguments which must obligatorily be expressed.

4. Keley-i focus affixes include um- subject focus, i- associate focus, -en goal focus, and -an referent focus.

5. Each focus affix in Keley-i has its own tense forms, e.g. um- future subject focus, -imm- past subject focus, kaum- present subject focus; i- future associate focus, in- past associate focus, kaiC₁ reduplication present associate focus.

Syl₁ means that the first syllable of the stem is reduplicated. Syl₁C₁ means that the first syllable of the stem is reduplicated followed by a reduplication of the first consonant of the stem. Syl₁CV₂ means that the first syllable of the stem is reduplicated followed by a reduplication of second consonant and vowel of the stem.

6. Reflexive, reciprocal and cooperative are treated here in a way that is compatible with the notion of underlying structure as pure constituent structure. Co-referentiality conditions, however, are more likely to operate on a different kind of element that so far has been handled only informally in linguistic theory. If they are not compatible with partition into constituents, some of the observations made here will have to be reformulated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AUSTIN, Virginia M.

- 1966 "Attention, emphasis and focus in Ata Manobo", *Hartford publications in linguistics* No. 20.

CHAFE, Wallace L.

- 1970 *Meaning and the structure of language*. Chicago.

DYEN, Isidore

- 1965 *A lexicostatistical classification of the Austronesian languages* (Indiana University Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics, Memoir 19), supplement to *International Journal of American Linguistics* 31:1.

FILMORE, Charles J.

- 1968 "The case for case", *Universals in linguistic theory*, edited by Emmon Bach and Robert Harms; 1-88. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

FORSTER, Jannette

- 1964 "Dual structure of Dibabawon verbal clauses", *Oceanic Linguistics* 3:1.26-48.

FRANTZ, Donald Gene

- 1970 "Toward a generative grammar of Blackfoot", University of Alberta doctoral dissertation.

GRIMES, Joseph E.

- n.d. "Outlines and overlays." MS. To appear in *Language*.

HALLIDAY, M.A.K.

- 1967 "Notes on transitivity and theme in English, Part 2", *Journal*

of Linguistics 3:199-244.

HETTICK, Donna

n.d. "Verb stem classes in Northern Kankanay." MS. Submitted to *Oceanic Linguistics*.

HUISMAN, Roberta

n.d. "Angaataha narrative discourse." MS. Submitted to *Linguistics*.

KERR, Harland B.

1965 "The case-marking and classifying function of Cotabato Manobo voice affixes", *Oceanic Linguistics* 4:1.15-47.

LANGENDOEN, D. Terence

1970 *Essentials of English grammar*. Holt Rhinehart & Winston, New York.

NEWELL, Leonard E.

1964 "Independent clause types of Batad Ifugao", *Oceanic Linguistics* 3:171-99.

REID, Lawrence A.

1966 *An Ivatan Syntax*. *Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication* No. 2.

WEINREICH, Uriel

1966 "Explorations in semantic theory", *Current trends in linguistics 3: Theoretical Foundations*, 395-477. Mouton & Co., The Hague.

WEST, Anne

n.d. "The semantics of focus in Amganad Ifugao." MS. Submitted to *Linguistics*.