

Binukid Pronominal Clisis

Adam Peng

National Chi Nan University

s94104514@ncnu.edu.tw

Loren Billings

National Chi Nan University

billings@ncnu.edu.tw

This language attests two paradigms of bound personal pronouns as well as one optionally bound and one free pronominal set. Of particular interest is a prohibition in Binukid of combinations in the same clause of pronouns from the two obligatorily bound paradigms. Instead, one pronoun takes the form of its counterpart from a different set. The choice of which of the two pronouns undergoes this substitution—as well as the order of two bound pronouns—depends on a person hierarchy. Roughly, this is first > second > third person, formalized using the features [\pm me] and [\pm you]. Whichever pronoun is lower on this hierarchy is also ordered second in the cluster. Not all combinations of pronouns undergo this phenomenon; if the two pronouns differ in number of syllables, then it does not occur. Other issues discussed in this study include adverbial bound forms and the position of the pronoun cluster relative to other elements in the clause.

1. Background

Most relevant information about the Binukid language is contained in Post and Gardner 1992 (hereafter, P&G), in which a grammar sketch in the front matter is the fullest description to date of the language.¹ Their dictionary proper contains sentential examples with translations into English; these constitute the main corpus of the study. In the examples that use P&G's (mostly)

¹ Other abbreviations used in this study are as follows: [\pm act], actualized (P&G: xxii); [\pm aug], whether the number of participants is augmented ([+aug] = PL but not DL, following Thomas 1955 and developed in Corbett 2000: 166–169 and Siewierska 2004: 84–87); AV, Actor voice; [\pm dist], distributive aspect (P&G: xxiii–xxiv); DL, dual (formally [–aug]); EX, exclusive; GEN, genitive; [\pm int], intensive mode (P&G: xxii); [\pm irr], irrealis (P&G: xxvi); IV, Instrument voice; [\pm me], whether the speaker is included; LIG, ligature; NEG, negation; NOM, nominative; OBL, oblique; PERF, perfect; P, preposition; PL, plural (formally [+aug]); [\pm pst], past; PV, Patient voice; Q, yes/no interrogative; RV, Referent voice (with Referent serving as a macro-role that includes Source, Location, Direction, and Beneficiary); SG, singular (formally [–aug]); [\pm you], whether the addressee is included; [\pm tns], tense, and only if a verb is [+tns] can it be [\pm pst] (P&G: xxii); \emptyset , an inaudible item; 1/2/3, first/second/third person (formally combinations of [\pm me] and [\pm you]). Additionally, in the numbered examples, verbs are underlined; personal pronouns, italicized; and whichever items are being discussed, bolded. In order not to interrupt the flow of the numbered examples, verbal morphology (its voice and any of the marked values of [+int, +dist, +aug, +act, +tns, +pst, +irr]) are listed along the left margin within square brackets. In numbered examples, unless otherwise indicated, the source is P&G.

unglossed data, we have reconstructed the glosses based on the grammar sketch. Additional data come from Post 1978, a shorter collection of narrative texts that are both glossed and translated.²

1.1 Paradigms of personal pronouns

The following table is based on P&G (xviii). We've inserted headings indicating whether the paradigms are bound or free (xix–xx) and re-ordered the rows according values for [\pm me] thence [\pm you]; this reflects their relative prominence along the person hierarchy to be developed below.

Table 1. Pronoun inventory in Binukid

PERSON/NUMBER		CASE			
Traditional labels	Formal features	NOM bound	GEN bound	OBL bound or free	NOM or GEN free
1SG	[+me, –you, –aug]	a(d)	ku(d)	kanak	siak
EX1PL	[+me, –you, +aug]	kay	day	kanay	sikay
IN1DL	[+me, +you, –aug]	ki(d)	ta(d)	kanit	sikit
IN1PL	[+me, +you, +aug]	kuy	taw	kanuy	sikuy
2SG	[–me, +you, –aug]	ka(d)	nu(d)	ikaw	sikaw
2PL	[–me, +you, +aug]	kaw	nuy	inyu	sinuy
3SG	[–me, –you, –aug]	Ø	din	kandin	Ø
3PL	[–me, –you, +aug]	siran	dan	kandan	siran

² Binukid is spoken in and around Bukidnon Province in the north-central part of Mindanao, the largest island in the southern Philippines; a speakers of the language is also called a Bukidnon (P&G: vi–vii). The only other published linguistic descriptions specifically of Binukid, to our knowledge, are Atherton 1953 and Post 1965. In terms of phylogeny, this language is considered to be part of the following subgroups of Austronesian, in descending order: Malayo-Polynesian (Blust 1977); Philippine (Zorc 1986); Greater Central Philippines (Blust 1991); Manobo (Elkins 1973–74, 1974, 1984); and, possibly, North Manobo (Harmon 1977: 212–16, 1979: 130 n. 7); cf. Stark (1961).

While we use the more traditional person/number labels in the glosses, we follow the formal features of Thomas (1955); see also Corbett (2000: 166–169) and Siewierska (2004: 84–87). The /d/-final allomorphs of six bound pronouns are used almost exclusively before *en* ‘already’, a bound adverbial. All and only the vowel-final NOM or GEN pronouns exhibit this allomorphy.³

1.2 Basic word order

Like many other languages of the area, the default order of an affirmative verbal clause is with an initial verb, followed immediately by any bound personal pronouns and then free elements. If the clause is negated, then it begins with a (free) NEG marker; it is then followed by any bound pronouns, the verb, and any other free elements (in that order). Like NEG, certain other free elements can also occur pre-verbally. They also immediately precede bound pronouns, followed by the verb and other free elements. As discussed more fully in other works in this project (e.g., Billings and Kaufman 2004, Billings and Konopasky 2003, Lee 2004, and Lee and Billings 2005), this pattern is found in many languages of the central and southern Philippines.

Clauses with NEG (or other pre-verbal free elements) diagnose whether an element is bound. Such a pre-verbal free element is hereafter called a HOST, in the sense that it allows clitics to be pre-verbal. (See Billings 2002: 54, fn. 1, regarding the prosodic and morphological uses of this term.) Without negation, as in (1a), pronouns usually go right after the initial verb. As such, it is impossible to determine whether the pronoun has that position by virtue of being bound or if the pronoun happens to be in the same position as its non-pronominal counterpart (for example, if the syntax of the language positions this particular nominal expression right after the verb).

- (1) a. [verb + **pronoun** ...] Whether the pronoun is bound or free cannot be determined.
 b. [host + **pronoun** + verb ...] The pronoun is bound.
 c. [host + verb + **pronoun** ...] The pronoun is free.

Depending on the pronoun, if the same clause has a pre-verbal potential host, then the order could be as in either of (1b–c). If the pronoun appears before the verb, as in (1b), the pronoun is bound; if after the verb, as (1c) shows, it is free. We use such structures with a non-initial verb as the key diagnostic of cliticness; hereafter, we refer to any bound pronoun that takes the orders in (1a–b)—and not the order in (1c)—as a CLITIC. Certain non-pronominal elements in Binukid can also be clitics; they appear in the same position as the pronoun in structures like (1a–b); these are

³ Exceptions such as (16b) below, with the *ad* allomorph of the NOM.ISG pronoun is used before another personal pronoun, are quite rare. Based on the distribution in the corpus, we have found no clear pattern for this allomorphy.

(primarily in §3.1) below.⁴ Based on this distinction, a clitic's precedence relative to the free elements of the clause is called its EXTERNAL ORDER, which is elaborated on below in section 2.

If there are two or more overt clitics in a clause, then they are said to form a CLUSTER, and the clitics' precedence relative to each other within the cluster is called their INTERNAL ORDER. Billings and Kaufman's survey of clitic-ordering systems in the Austronesian languages of Taiwan, the Philippines, and Sulawesi reports (2004: 15–18) that cluster-internal ordering can be based the following factors: morphological case, semantic roles, grammatical person, and prosody. Internal ordering is one of the two unique facets of clisis in Binukid (compared to the other languages we know of); accordingly, this issue is discussed repeatedly below in this paper.

1.3 Summary of Post & Gardner's description

Here we summarize the parts of P&G's description of Binukid personal pronouns relevant to verbal clauses. (A more critical evaluation appears in the following sections.) We translate certain terminology (for example, the names of cases) wherever it is not crucial to the discussion.

To begin, as (2) through (4) show, pronouns can stand in place of non-pronominal expressions in the same morphological case (P&G: xix)—under various discourse conditions.⁵

⁴ Not all bound elements are clitics but all clitics are bound. For example, affixes that remain on the same side of the stem (with a particular part of speech) are bound. Such non-clitic bound forms are not discussed in this study.

⁵ We have added curly braces to show the beginning and end of each clitic cluster (which sometimes has only a single member). If the verb precedes the cluster, as in (4b), then it is not always possible to determine where the cluster ends. Small superscript question marks will show multiple possible right-hand braces in such examples. (In this connection), we assume that all pronouns of the first two columns of Table 1 are clitics even if the cluster is post-verbal. We do not, however, make this assumption for OBL pronouns (underlying or surface) or adverbials. The following additional orthographic conventions are used (following P&G: x–xi). Deviations from the International Phonetic Alphabet are as follows. As is common in the literature on Philippine languages, *e*, *g*, *ng*, *r*, and *y* encode a schwa vowel, voiced velar plosive, velar nasal consonant, alveolar flap, and palatal glide (respectively). The glottal stop is also rendered in a number of ways. First, it is assumed before a word-initial vowel letter or between consecutive vowel letters in a word, as the verb in (2a–b) shows—on both counts. Next, a grave accent (`) is marked over a word- or syllable-final vowel letter to indicate a following glottal stop (e.g., *pipì* 'laundry'), whereas an acute accent (´) is used to disambiguate stress. If stress is final and a glottal stop is present, then a circumflex accent (^) is used. Finally, a hyphen encodes not a morphological boundary but rather a glottal stop after a word-internal consonant; such a hyphen is often concomitant with affixation, as the verbs in (5b–c), (9a–b), (15a), and (16b) below show—but not always, as the glide-glottal sequence in (18g) shows; the root is listed as *haw-as* 'unload'. Such a system requires particular care when dealing with two verbal affixes; both encode [+int, +tns, +pst]. The IV prefix in (5b) and (9a–b) below itself begins with a glottal stop, followed by /i/ and a place-assimilating nasal consonant (defaulting to coronal before the glottal stop). The other, infixal *-in-*, marks PV. When the latter is affixed to a base that also begins with a glottal stop, as in the verb root (spelled as) *inum* 'drink' in (7a), no hyphen is spelled: *inum*.

- (2) a. Agkaen **sa** **batà** hu serà. [AV, +int, +tns]
 eat NOM child GEN viand
 ‘**The child** will eat viand.’
- b. Agkaen {Ø} hu serà. [AV, +int, +tns]
 eat NOM.3SG GEN viand
 ‘**He** will eat viand.’
- (3) a. Pinalit **hi** **Daday** su kindi. [PV, +int, +tns, +pst]
 buy GEN Daday NOM candy
 ‘**Daday** bought that candy.’
- b. Pinalit {*din*} su kindi. [PV, +int, +tns, +pst]
 buy GEN.3SG NOM candy
 ‘**She** bought that candy.’
- (4) a. Agduma {*a*} **ki** **Amay**. [AV, +int, +tns]
 accompany NOM.1SG OBL Father
 ‘I will go **with Father**.’
- b. Agduma {*a*}? **kandin**? [AV, +int, +tns]
 accompany NOM.3SG OBL.3SG
 ‘I will go **with him**.’

With these examples, there is no discernable change in order when the pronoun is substituted for the non-pronominal expression. In both of (3a–b), the GEN Actor expressions follow the verb and precede the NOM expression. In both of (4a–b), the OBL-case expressions are clause-final.

Next, the rightmost column of Table 1 is illustrated by the following examples.

- (5) a. **Siak** nadaluwan {*a*} gabi. [RV, +act, +tns, +pst]
 FREE.1SG sick NOM.1SG yesterday.
 ‘As for **me**, I was sick yesterday.’
- b. **Sinyu** in-ila {*nuy*}? en}? ba}? sa amutà? [IV, +int, +tns, +pst]
 FREE.2PL give GEN.2PL already Q NOM contribution
 ‘As for **you all**, did **you** already give a contribution?’
- c. **Saena** siran naman-uli. [AV, +int, +dist, +aug, +tns, +pst]
 GEN.those FREE.3PL go.home
 ‘As for **them**, **they** went home.’

P&G (xix) write that these pronouns can occur pre-verbally to emphasize NOM or GEN pronouns. In (5a–b) there is a NOM or GEN bound pronoun after the verb, respectively. In (5c), however, there is no such second, NOM.3SG pronoun. Only with *siran*, a demonstrative (*saena* ‘those’ or *saini* ‘these’) must precede the pronoun and no other overt pronoun appears after the verb.⁶

Moving next to the order of clitic pronouns, (6) and (7) show that NOM and GEN personal pronouns are clitics, respectively (P&G: xx). That is, (6b) and (7b) pattern like (1b) and not (1c).

- (6) a. Tuminiruga {*a*}. [AV, +int, +tns, +pst]
 accompany NOM.1SG
 ‘I slept.’
- b. Hurà {*a*} tiruga. [AV, +int]
 NEG.PERF NOM.1SG sleep
 ‘I did not sleep.’
- (7) a. Ininum {*din*} sa tambal. [PV, +int, +tns, +pst]
 drink GEN.3SG NOM medicine
 ‘He drank the medicine.’
- b. Hurà {*din*} inuma sa tambal. [PV, +int, +irr]
 NEG.PERF GEN.3SG sleep NOM medicine
 ‘He did not drink the medicine.’

However, if both of the pronouns in (6) and (7) co-occur in the same clause, then one of them must surface as its corresponding OBL form. P&G (xx) write that whichever of the two pronouns ‘includes 1st person’ precedes the other. Using our person-feature notation, we understand this to mean that whichever pronoun encodes [+me] will appear first in the pronominal cluster. Moreover, the pronoun that is [–me] will take the corresponding OBL form. We coin the term DISFORM(ATION) to refer to this phenomenon. This is exemplified in (8a–b), where we introduce two degrees of abstraction in interlinear glossing for such disformed pronouns.⁷ The label within square brackets shows its surface case; the representation between slashes, its underlying case.

⁶ By the definitions given in the preceding subsection, *siran* in (5c) may well be a clitic, with the demonstrative as its host. We set this issue aside, primarily because prosodic cues are not available from our corpus search. Note as well that the initial pronouns in (5a–b) are free. As the discussion of (1a–c) mentions, pronouns that remain in post-verbal position are free. The converse is not true; not all pre-verbal pronouns are clitics. Clitics in Binukid are never sentence- or clause-initial and generally appear adjacent to the clause’s verb—but see discussion of (20a).

⁷ Other work within this research program (Billings and Kaufman 2004: 16) has claimed that ‘if person is used as a factor, the only conclusive examples in our view are a third-person clitic pronoun having to follow a first- or second-person clitic pronoun.’ The new evidence from Binukid obviously requires a revision of that statement.

- (8) a. Naahà {*ku*}[?] *ikaw*}[?]. [PV, +act, +tns, +pst]
 see GEN.1SG [OBL]/NOM/.2SG
 ‘I saw you.’
- b. Naahà {*a*}[?] *ikaw*}[?]. [PV, +act, +tns, +pst]
 see NOM.1SG [OBL]/GEN/.2SG
 ‘You saw me.’
- c. Naahà {*ku* *Ø*}. [PV, +act, +tns, +pst]
 see GEN.1SG NOM.3SG
 ‘I saw him.’

As (8c) also shows, if the NOM.3SG pronoun co-occurs with a GEN pronoun, then no disformation occurs (P&G: xx). That is, only an overt clitic pronoun can be disformed into its OBL counterpart.

Next, P&G (xx) discuss underlyingly OBL pronouns separately with regard to ordering, as shown in (9a–b). They point out that the OBL non-pronominal expression in (9a) follows—whereas the OBL pronoun in (9b) precedes—the NOM-case expression (*su supas* ‘that bread’):

- (9) a. In-ila {*din*} su supas **duun ku batà**. [IV, +int, +tns, +pst]
 give GEN.3SG NOM bread P OBL child
 ‘He gave bread [sic.] to that child.’
- b. In-ila {*din*}[?] **kandin**}[?] su supas. [IV, +int, +tns, +pst]
 give GEN.3SG OBL.3SG NOM bread
 ‘He gave that bread to him.’

That is, in (9b) the OBL pronoun appears adjacent to the GEN pronoun, not inconsistent with its positioning as a clitic pronoun in verb-initial clauses. As (9b) also shows, a GEN pronoun precedes such an underlyingly OBL pronoun if the two are adjacent. However, P&G do not exemplify the context in (1b) or (1c) for OBL pronouns; this issue is clarified in section 2 below.

This concludes the background section. In the remainder of this paper, we clarify three issues not fully addressed in P&G’s grammar sketch. These are organized mainly around external (§2) and internal (§3) ordering. We also conclude with various theoretical speculations (§4).

2. External ordering

This section examines structures with pre-verbal hosts, in which any clitics precede the verb. This is sketched above in (1b) and exemplified in (6b) and (7b). One of the outstanding questions here is whether the surface-OBL pronouns in (8a–b) above must be pre-verbal if there is negation, and therefore whether those pronouns are clitics. In fact, the corpus almost always shows

disformed-OBL pronouns preceding the verb if there is a pre-verbal host. At the end of this section, we also discuss two subtypes of external ordering and whether Binukid attests these. Although internal ordering is not the main issue in this section, in order to determine whether disformed, surface-OBL pronouns have the same ordering as underlyingly OBL pronouns, it is necessary to use clauses with pairs of pronominal clitics. Additionally, some of the data are so rare that only examples with clusters are available. Still, the main issue here is external ordering.

2.1 Are OBL pronouns clitics?

Basic examples are shown in (10a–b). The order is [NEG + *pronoun* + ***pronoun*** + verb ...]:

- (10) a. Hari {*kay* ***kandin*** tagsimahen ta [PV, +int, +dur, +tns]
 NEG NOM.EX1PL [OBL]/GEN/.3SG speak because
 ‘She is not speaking to us because [...]’ (111)

- b. Hari {*ku* ***ikaw*** mailahan hu begas ta [RV]
 NEG GEN.1SG [OBL]/NOM/.2SG give GEN rice because
 ‘I cannot give you any rice because [...]’ (152)

In these negated clauses, the disformed (or surface-OBL) pronoun is pre-verbal. In (10a–b) the disformed pronouns are underlyingly GEN and NOM, respectively. The corpus includes three more tokens identical to (10a) in the relevant respects: [NEG + {NOM + ***disformed-OBL***} + verb ...].

By contrast, (11a–b) show the only disformation examples in which the verb stands between the two pronouns.⁸ The disformed pronouns in both of (11a–b) happen to be underlyingly GEN.

- (11) a. ku hari {***ki*** buligan ***kandan.*** [RV]
 if NEG NOM.IN1DL help [OBL]/GEN/.3PL
 ‘[It does not matter] if they do not help us.’ (125)

- b. ta daw {***kay*** masambagan ***kandin.*** [RV]
 so.that NOM.EX1PL advise [OBL]/GEN/.3SG
 ‘[We will go to the chieftain] so that he can give us advice.’ (128)

Based on (11a–b), disformation does not appear to be triggered by a surface-adjacency restriction. The latter, less person-prominent pronoun of the clause is disformed despite being on the other side of the verb from the first pronoun. This observation is relevant to the issue of determining what motivates OBL disformation; this issue is taken up again in section 4 below.

⁸ Starting with (11a–b), if additional context from another clause of the sentence is necessary (in our estimation), we give in square brackets the rest of the original sentence’s translation—more than just the exemplified/glossed clause. In addition, the validity of *ta daw* as *kay*’s host and therefore as a potential host for *kandin* is shown in (18i) below.

Underlyingly (as opposed to disformed) OBL pronouns are relatively rare, and pre-verbal clisis is restricted to just a few environments (most commonly negation). For this reason, there are relatively few examples where the optionality of OBL-pronominal cliticness can be tested. Both of (12a–b) begin with a potential (NEG) host. The post-verbal positioning of the underlyingly OBL pronoun in each example shows that it is clearly in non-clitic position.

- (12) a. Hari agbatuk *kanak* ta [AV, +int, +tns]
 NEG look.in.the.eye OBL.1SG because
 ‘She does not look me in the eye because [she is ashamed.]’ (22)
- b. Hurà {en} panima *kanay* [AV, +int, +dist]
 NEG.PERF already speak OBL.EX1PL
 ‘He would not speak to us [but just give us a glance.]’ (135)

Moreover, in (12b) a non-pronominal clitic is present. (See §3.3 below.) These are the only examples we found of a disformed-OBL pronoun in non-clitic position. By contrast, we found only one example of an underlyingly OBL pronoun in unambiguously clitic position, as follows.⁹

- (13) ha hurà {ku *kandan*} naahà. [PV, +act, +tns, +pst]
 LIG NEG.PERF GEN.1SG OBL.3PL see (24)
- a. ‘[...] that I had not seen *any* of them.’
 b. ‘[...] that I had not seen *it* in them.’

The scarcity of data with underlying-OBL pronouns allow us to conclude merely that both possibilities exist, in (12) and (13). On the other hand, because disformed-OBL pronouns occur more frequently, we can say that they overwhelmingly appear in clitic position.

2.2 Hosts

The examples in (11a–b) above each actually show two orthographic words in front of the clitic. This subsection sorts out which elements crucially allow a clitic (cluster) be pre-verbal.

To begin, as the examples in (14) through (16) show, a complementizer cannot serve as host.

⁹ The italics in the translations of (13a–b) are not for prosodic emphasis. P&G (24) translate (13) as ‘[...] that I have not seen them.’ As such, this example appeared to be the only exception to the generalization below (in §3.2) that clusters with NOM.3PL *siran* do not undergo disformation. Since presenting our talk at the 10-ICAL conference, we were able to do some informant work and verified that only the partitive or locative interpretations in (13a–b) are possible with this sentence; ‘... I have not seen them’ would be rendered as [... hurà {ku *siran*} naahà]. In addition, as this paper’s final footnote also shows, we are revising the study to include the results of that field research. For the most part, the elicited data either confirms the corpus or fills in Table 2’s empirical gaps. The correction in (13) is our only direct contradiction of P&G. Thus, in order not to disseminate facts that we now know to be in error (and because of the extreme theoretical import of this example), we decided to use the corrected translations in (13a–b).

(14) a. **Ku** buligan {*a*}? *ikaw*? [RV, +int]
 if help NOM.1SG [OBL]/GEN/.2SG
 ‘If you help me, [...]’ (29)

b. **Ku** hari {*nu*} magawhat sa bunga hu kayu [PV, +act]
 if NEG GEN.2SG reach GEN fruit GEN tree
 ‘If you cannot reach the fruit of a tree [...]’ (60)

(15) a. **ta** ag-ilahan {*ku*}? *ikaw*? hu begas. [RV, +int, +tns]
 because give GEN.1SG [OBL]/NOM/.2SG GEN milled.rice
 ‘[...] because I will give you rice.’ (54)

b. **ta** hurà {*a* *kandin*} buligi hu trabahu ku. [RV, +int, +irr]
 because NEG.PERF NOM.1SG [OBL]/GEN/.3SG help GEN work my
 ‘[...] because he did not help me in my work.’ (102)

(16) a. **aman** napauk {*a*}. [PV, +act, +tns, +pst]
 so get.angry NOM.1SG
 ‘[...] so I became angry.’ (46)

b. **aman** hari {*ad* *kandin*} ag-akwagen. [PV, +int, +tns]
 so NEG NOM.1SG [OBL]/GEN/.3SG bark
 ‘[...] so it does not bark at me.’ (71)

The (a) and (b) examples here are affirmative and negated, respectively. From our corpus search, no examples of clitics were found immediately after these three complementizers (for example, *[**aman** {*a*} ...]). Therefore, complementizers do not constitute potential hosts in Binukid.

We even found one sentence with a complementizer followed by a relative-clause marker:

(17) **ta** **kada** magtrabahu {*a*} [AV, +int, +dur]
 because whenever work NOM.1SG
 ‘[...] because whenever I work, [...]’ (19)

This is the only example we found of *kada*; it too clearly does not serve as host. In addition, the combination of *ta* with *kada* has no effect; cf. (15a–b) above. Indeed, in all of (14) through (17), some other non-clitic word—either the verb or a (NEG) host—must precede the clitic pronoun(s).

So far in this study, clitics have followed either NEG or the verb itself. Other hosts are listed as follows, where (18b–c) happen to come from the same sentence and are translated together. As these examples show, quite a number of elements can immediately precede a clitic. Of

particular interest is *ta daw* ‘so that’ in (18i), which P&G consistently list as two orthographic words, although we have not found *ta daw* interrupted by other material with the same meaning.

- (18) a. **ku iyan** {*a ikaw*} ipaatabang hu manahu. [IV, +cau, +tns]
 if CLEFT NOM.1SG [OBL]/GEN/.2SG face OBL visitors
 ‘[...] if I am the one made [by you] to face the visitor.’ (57)
- b. **Anay** {*a*} makanareg hu duriyan [AV]
 first.time NOM.1SG smell GEN durian.fruit
- c. **apit** {*a*} makautà. [AV]
 almost NOM.1SG vomit
 ‘The first time I smelled durian fruit I almost vomited.’ (7)
- d. **Sigi** {*kay*} tag-ampù [AV, +int, +dur, +tns]
 always NOM.EX1PL pray
 ‘We always pray [...]’ (134)
- e. **Samug** {*kay*} agdiyà ta Malaybalay ta [IV, +int, +tns]
 sometimes NOM.EX1PL go OBL Malaybalay because
 ‘We sometimes go to Malaybalay because [...]’ (129)
- f. **Kamulu** {*kay pa*} tagkaen [AV, +int, +dur, +tns]
 while NOM.EX1PL still eat
 ‘While we were still eating [...]’ (37)
- g. **Diyà** {*day*} ighaw-as sa mga karga day [IV, +int, +tns]
 there GEN.EX1PL unload NOM [+aug] cargo our
 ‘We will unload our cargo [...]’ (69)
- h. **dini** {*my*} ikabya sa bugtà ta dibaluy. [IV, +int, +tns, +irr]
 here GEN.2PL throw NOM dirt OBL opposite.side
 ‘[When you dig the hole,] throw the dirt to the other side.’ (34)
- i. **ta daw** {*ka kandin*} mabutawanan. [RV]
 so.that NOM.2PL [OBL]/GEN/.3SG release
 ‘[Poke the crocodile in the eye] so that it will let go of you.’ (158)

In any event, the combined *ta daw* ‘so that’ invariably counts as a host. Nor is (18i) the only example of its type; we found another example (P&G: 6) identical to it in the relevant respects.

P&G list a number of elements spelled as two words. The two parts often resemble other words in the dictionary. For example, *daw* by itself means ‘and’. (We have not uncovered clitics

immediately following *daw* in this meaning.) By itself, *ta* is listed with three meanings: ‘because’, as in (15a–b) and (17) above; as a GEN.IN1DL pronoun, as in (26) below; and as a non-pronominal OBL marker, as in (18h). There is also an entry *daw pa* ‘just now/in a little while’ (P&G: 51) where the *daw* portion can host a clitic pronoun in the following verbless example: *Daw ka pa iman* ‘wait here a little while yet’ (where *ka* is NOM.2SG and *iman* ‘now’).

Thus, quite a number of elements can host a clitic (cluster). At this point, because this is a corpus study, we merely list the possible hosts. The crucial determiner of which elements can host a clitic is not an easy issue even in far more studied Philippine languages. For instance, Schachter and Otnes (1972: 187–193) resort to listing obligatory and optional hosts in Tagalog.

So far in section 2, we have shown that clitics are positioned quite uniformly: before a verb if there is either NEG or one of the initial elements in (18a–i). If the verb does not follow a potential host, then any clitics follow it. We also confirmed that OBL pronouns are optionally clitic.

2.3 Further external-ordering issues

Having answered the main questions, of whether disformed and underlyingly OBL pronouns are clitics, only one additional issue remains under our overall rubric of external ordering. What kind of clitic position does Binukid employ? Because the verb is at or near the beginning of the clause, it is difficult to distinguish crucially between two main clitic-position types.

The first type is the WACKERNAGEL (or post-initial) position, in which a clitic follows some initial element of the clause (Wackernagel 1892/1953). The other is VERB-ADJACENT, in which the clitics must remain next to the verb. Billings (2002: 54–57) distinguishes between the two types, and Billings and Kaufman (2004: 18–24) discuss the distinction within the context of Austronesian and the diachronic tendency for Wackernagel clitics to turn into verb-adjacent ones, with an added TOBLER-MUSSAFIA effect ruling out absolute-initial positioning (Mussafia 1886, 1898; Tobler 1875/1912). Only if with two potential hosts can this be resolved, as diagramed in (19a–b), where *X* stands for a potential host: NEG or any of the emboldened elements in (18a–i).

- (19) a. [X + **cluster** + X + verb ...] The pronoun is unambiguously in Wackernagel position.
 b. [X + X + **cluster** + verb ...] The pronoun is unambiguously verb-adjacent.

In most of the data we found—namely, in (20a–c)—the second *X* is NEG (specifically *hari*). In (20d), the second *X* is *sigi* ‘always’; see (18d) above for proof of this adverb’s *X*-hood. Next, in (20a) the first *X* is *apit* ‘almost’; cf. (18c). The first *X* in (20b) is *sinamug* ‘sometimes’; cf. *samug* ‘sometimes’ in (18e) above.¹⁰ And in (20c–d) the first *X* is *ta daw* ‘so that’; cf. (18i) above.

¹⁰ The apparent *-in-* affix of *sinamug* in (20b) seems to be optional with this adverb (P&G:136). However, it is not entirely clear that *sinamug* can also serve as an *X*; we assume that it can. Incidentally, *aman* ‘so’ in (20b) is not an *X*; see (16a–b) above and (23a) below. In (20b) *aman* merely happens to precede the two *X* elements.

- (20) a. **Apit** {*kud* en} **hari** agkaantus sa kapasù [PV, +act, +tns]
 almost NOM.1SG already NEG endure NOM heat
 ‘I almost cannot endure the heat [...]’ (8)
- b. aman **sinamug** **hari** {en *siran*} tagpakakaen. [AV, +dur, +act, +tns]
 so sometimes NEG already NOM.3PL eat
 ‘[...] so sometimes they cannot eat.’ (1)
- c. **ta daw** **hari** {*nu*} malipatan. [RV]
 so.that NEG GEN.2SG forget
 ‘[...] so that you will not forget it.’ (41)
- d. **ta daw** **sigi** {*kay*} makaghemayan. [AV, +dur]
 so.that always NOM.IN1PL rice.field
 ‘[...] so that we can have a rice field all the time.’ (21)

In all, six relevant examples were found. Two more tokens like (20c), also with the order [... **ta daw** + hari + *pronoun* + verb ...], were found (P&G: 41, 142); these are not listed here. Of these examples, only (20a) fits the Wackernagel order, as diagrammed in (19a), with only the first *X* preceding any clitics. In all the remaining three types (or five tokens) of this order that we found, the clitic cluster follows both *X*s and is crucially adjacent to the verb. Thus, Binukid attests a mixture of systems. The same mixture of Wackernagel and verb-adjacent positioning has been observed for Tagalog and Tausug (Lee and Billings 2005). Presumably, Binukid is in transition from a Wackernagel to a verb-adjacent system (Billings and Kaufman 2004: 21–24).

To summarize this section, we have shown that disformed-OBL pronouns are overwhelmingly in clitic position, while most underlyingly OBL pronouns are not. An inventory of free elements that can host a pre-verbal clitic has also been presented. In addition, the overall position of the clitic cluster relative to the rest of the clause has been determined: primarily verb-adjacent.

3. Cluster-internal issues

Although plenty of examples with clusters of two or more clitics have been exemplified in the preceding section, this internal ordering still has not been addressed in and of itself. In this section, we concentrate on three facets of the Binukid clitic cluster not fully addressed in P&G: the person hierarchy, clusters with a NOM.3PL pronoun, and non-pronominal clitics.

3.1 The person hierarchy

We now consider all the possible combinations of underlyingly NOM or GEN personal pronouns and show that not just the feature distinction [\pm me] needs to be considered. It is also possible for neither pronoun to be [+me]. In such environments, we propose, [\pm you] emerges as a

crucial ordering factor. For example, in sentences like ‘they saw you’, does the pronoun for ‘they’, with less person prominence, become disformed into the surface-OBL form? To fill in the picture, still fully in the spirit of P&G, the feature distinction [\pm you] (as well as morphosemantic properties like number, case, semantic roles, and even prosody) are considered. It is also possible for both pronouns to have the feature settings [$-$ me, $-$ you], in which case factors other than grammatical person weigh on the two pronominal clitics’ internal ordering. We propose that either prosody or a combination of person and either number or semantic roles is necessary. Details of our empirical findings are laid out in Table 2 (shown on the next page). In the table, NOM pronouns are emboldened, GEN forms underlined, and disformed-OBL pronouns italicized.

Before discussing the findings themselves, it is necessary to address the gaps in the table. To begin, as the diagonally striped cells show, it is impossible for both pronouns to be [$+$ me]. Similarly, as the grey-shaded cells in the center of the table show, combinations of [$+$ you] pronouns are also illicit. Such restrictions are common in the pronoun-ordering literature; see Dubois (1976: 50) and Weaver and Weaver (1964: 161, 169 n. 3) for examples from other Manobo languages. Next, as the series of cells with *N/A* (for ‘not applicable’) show, no overt cluster is possible. Recall from (8c) above that NOM.3SG \emptyset does not undergo disformation. Another type of missing data comes from empirical gaps, marked with large question marks.

Although there is a certain amount of chance involved in which combinations will appear in the corpus, two factors explain most of the question marks. First, from similar studies (e.g., Lee 2004), it has been observed that clusters involving inclusive (formally [$+$ me, $+$ you]) pronouns are comparatively rare. Not only do inclusive pronouns require more complex combinations of participants (because of the co-occurrence restrictions), but an inclusive pronoun can only co-occur with a third-person (or [$-$ me, $-$ you]) pronoun. Aside from cells involving inclusive pronouns, the remaining cells with question marks each involve at least one plural (or [$+$ aug]) pronoun. In general, these are also less common. Regardless of these empirical gaps, there remain sufficient data (16 out of 28 possible cells) to draw conclusions about internal ordering.

As the cells in either the same column or the same row as any other cell that has diagonal stripes show, if one of the pronouns is [$+$ me], then it will appear first in the cluster; the other pronoun, necessarily [$-$ me], will be disformed into its OBL counterpart (e.g., {**a** *kandan*} or [V day *ikaw*]—both exhibiting disformation). Next, as the relatively few cells in either the same column or the same row with any other cell that has grey shading show, whichever pronoun is [$+$ you] will precede the other pronoun, which will often be disformed into its OBL counterpart (e.g., {**ka** *kanda*} or {nu *siran*}, only the first of which exhibits disformation). This leaves just one cell (out of two a possible two) in which both pronouns are [$-$ me, $-$ you]: {din *siran*}, fully exemplified in (21d) below. Because both of these pronouns are [$-$ me, $-$ you], grammatical person must not be what is affecting the ordering. The explanation must come from elsewhere.

This lone {*din siran*} example might be explained in a number of ways: in terms of number (requiring the only [-aug] pronoun to be first), semantic roles (requiring the pronoun encoding the Actor to be first), or even prosody (requiring the pronoun with the fewer number of syllables to be first). These are all considered in previous studies (especially Lee 2004), and in GEN.ACTOR-before-NOM.Patient systems, it has been hypothesized that it is the semantic roles (and not the case or grammatical relations) that are relevant (Billings and Kaufman 2004). As Brainard and Vander Molen (2005: 391, 393-394) have also suggested regarding other languages (primarily Obo Manobo), with two [-me, -you] pronouns, the ordering could be decided by the arguments' topicality in the discourse. Regardless which mechanism is used for this personless cell, there is clearly a person hierarchy that predicts the ordering of most combinations: a [+me] pronoun appearing first if there is one; thence, [+you] first if there is one; and the last ordering criterion based on either grammatical number ([-aug] first if there is one), roles (Actor first), or prosody (light before heavy), or pragmatics (more topical first). In section 4 below we speculate about the most likely property that weighs in when neither pronoun has positive person features.

Thus, Table 2 confirms P&G's observation: a [+me] pronoun must go first. We have merely addressed the remaining eight cells (shown within heavy black lines) in the tables. Of these, we found data for five cells. These are consistent with a requirement that (if both pronouns are [-me]), a [+you] pronoun precedes the other (necessarily [-you]) form. And if neither pronoun has person features, then any number of properties could decide the cluster's internal ordering.

3.2 Exceptions involving underlyingly NOM.3PL pronouns

Here we append a notable exception to P&G's account of disformation. In clusters with an underlyingly NOM.3PL pronoun, *siran* is not disformed into a corresponding OBL form.

- (21) a. Pigpahaglasan {*ku* *siran*} ha [RV, +int, +dur, +tns, +pst]
 tell.without.sincerity GEN.1SG NOM.3PL LIG
 'I told them [to attend the wedding (but it was not a real invitation).]' (108)
- b. Pigpanalahuran {*day* *siran*} [RV, +int, +dur, +tns, +pst]
 pay.respect GEN.EX1PL NOM.3PL
 'We called out a greeting to them [...]' (110–111)
- c. Pamarai {*nu* *siran*} ha [RV, +int, +irr]
 bid.farewell GEN.2SG NOM.3PL LIG
 'Tell them that [we are leaving.]' (110)
- d. Giyahan {*din* *siran*} ta [RV, +int]
 guide GEN.3SG NOM.3PL because
 'He will guide them because [...]' (63)

In all, we found these four types; the patterns in (21a–b) each attest one additional token.

According to P&G’s description, all these *siran* forms should be disformed into the corresponding OBL form (namely, OBL.3PL *kandan*); this is not found. Assuming that *siran* is consistently an exception to disformation, then we see an insight into this phenomenon’s cause. As Table 1 shows, *siran* is the only disyllabic NOM or GEN clitic pronoun. All others (except the inaudible NOM.3SG form) are monosyllabic. As such, perhaps it is this prosodic distinction that allows *siran* to coexist with a monosyllabic clitic pronoun. As the following subsection also shows, *siran* is unique among clitic pronouns in its ordering relative to adverbial clitics as well.

3.3 Non-pronominal clitics

A few examples above have included adverbial clitics in addition to pronouns. The four unambiguous examples of this so far are (16f) with *pa* ‘still’ as well as (12b) and (20a–b) with *en* ‘already’. These two adverbial clitics happen to be aspectual; this is not the only kind of non-pronominal clitic. Rather than list the clitics, these two and a slightly more complicated one will suffice to illustrate the relative ordering of adverbial and pronominal clitics within a cluster.

As (12b) above already shows, *en* ‘already’ can be the sole clitic of its clause; (22a–b) show two more such examples. In these examples *en* follows and precedes the verb, respectively.

- (22) a. Migsahà {en} su pinya. [AV, +int, +dur, +tns, +pst]
 sprout already NOM pineapple
 ‘That pineapple is growing shoots.’ (125)
- b. Hurà {en} agkaabutan hu mga etaw [RV, +int, +tns]
 NEG.PERF already go.for.refuge GEN [+aug] people
 ‘There is no place where the people can go for refuge [...]’ (1)

Whereas in each of (12b) and (22a–b) there is only the lone clitic *en*, in (23a–c) there are various combinations of pronominal clitics with *en*. In each example, the clitic cluster is preceded by NEG and followed by the clause’s verb. For instance, in (23a–b) *en* precedes and follows a clitic pronoun, respectively. Similarly, in (23c), *en* both precedes and follows pronominal clitics.¹¹

¹¹ Usually, *pa* ‘still’ is in clitic position, as exemplified in (18f) above; in (23b) it clearly appears outside the cluster. We offer no definitive explanation. (Perhaps *pa* takes clitic and non-clitic positions depending on its scope.)

- (23) a. aman hari {**en** *siran*} pakagahinawa. [AV, +act]
 so NEG already NOM.3PL breathe
 ‘[...] so they could not breathe.’ (31)
- b. Hari {**kad** **en**} tagyawat pa ta banuwa ta [AV, +int, +dur, +tns]
 NEG NOM.2SG already delay still OBL town because
 ‘Do not be wasting time in town [...]’ (166)
- c. Hurà {**kay** **en** *kandin*} kalingi [RV, +int, +tns]
 NEG.PERF NOM.EX1PL already [OBL]/GEN/.3SG take.notice
 ‘He no longer took notice of us [...]’ (95)

As the preceding subsection concludes, the invariant factor is prosody, with a monosyllabic pronoun preceding *en*, which then precedes a disyllabic pronoun. Additional examples of *en* with pronominal clitics appear above in (20a–b), analogous to (23a–b), irrespectively.

Next, we present adverbial clitics that are variously glossed as ‘just’. First, consider (24):

- (24) Iyan {**dà**} migdiyà ta [AV, +int, +dur, +tns, +pst]
 CLEFT only go.there because
 ‘He is the only one who went there because [no one wanted to go with him.]’ (46)

Here the NOM.3SG pronoun is null (as in Table 1 above). The relevant overt clitic here is *dà* ‘only’. Recall from (18a) that the cleft marker *iyán* is one of the hosts. The more common way to express the same meaning as *dà* is with the two-part element *bà dà*, glossed as ‘just, merely’. Somewhat trivially, the interlinear glosses for both *bà* and *dà* have been left off.

- (25) a. Bà {**dà** *siran*} miglagat hu wahig ta [AV, +int, +dur, +tns, +pst]
 NOM.3PL boil GEN water because
 ‘They just boiled water because [they had no food.]’ (12)
- b. Bà {**din** **dà**} pigbali su tubu ta [PV, +int, +dur, +tns, +pst]
 GEN.3SG break.off NOM sugarcane because
 ‘He just broke off that sugarcane because [he had no bolo.]’ (17)
- c. bà {**kay** **dà** *kandin*} pigsilap. [PV, +int, +dur, +tns, +pst]
 NOM.EX1PL [OBL]/GEN/.3SG glance
 ‘[He would not speak to us but] just give us a glance.’ (135)

The examples in (25a–c) mirror those of (23a–c) above on this page with identical environments: (a) before *siran*, (b) after a monosyllabic pronoun (*kad* or *din*); and (c) between *kay* and *kandin*.

The relevant initial free element (or host) that the clitics follow in all of (25a–c) is *bà*, which P&G do not list by itself.¹² The example given with the dictionary entry for *bà dà* is shown in (25a); at first blush, it resembles the *ta daw* example above in (18i). However, this is just because NOM.3PL *siran*—like OBL.3SG *kandin* in (25c)—must follow an adverbial clitic. A monosyllabic pronoun—e.g., GEN.3SG *din* in (25b) or NOM.EX1PL *kay* in (25c)—must precede *dà*. Thus, this discontinuous entry consists of a free element *bà* followed by an adverbial clitic *dà*.

To conclude section 3, we have shown that the order of two clitic pronouns relative to each other is based on a person hierarchy; if person is not relevant, then one of several additional properties of the pronouns could be the deciding factor in the pronouns' internal ordering. In addition, we show that disformation does not take place if one of the pronouns is NOM.3PL *siran*. This suggests that the crucial factor triggering disformation is prosodic. Finally, we have shown how adverbial clitics are ordered within the cluster. Again, *siran* is exceptional in that adverbial clitics precede *siran* but follow all other clitic pronouns. In the following section, we consider theoretical explanations for the facts reported in this paper thus far.

4. Speculations about theoretical issues

While the facts so far are somewhat sketchy (as evidenced by the question marks in Table 2), certain explanations can be explored. In this section, we consider two issues: First, which component of the grammar does the ordering of free elements and the two kinds of clitics (pronominal and adverbial)? Next, how is disformation handled by the grammar?

A doctrine made explicit in Bošković (2001) is that all ordering is done by the syntax. We agree that this should be the null hypothesis (barring evidence to the contrary). Thus, it is worth examining whether all ordering—among free elements (of course), as well as the clitics' external and internal ordering—can be formalized using syntactic theory. Here we outline briefly such an approach. We will not examine the syntax of just free elements; see, for example, Billings (2005) and the papers in the same volume for approaches to the syntax of several verb-initial languages. Assuming then, that there is an approach for situating the complementizer, various hosts, the verb, and nominal expressions (in this order), how might the syntax position the clitics as well (after or before the verb depending on the absence or presence of a preceding host, respectively)?

Assume that between the complementizer and the projection containing the verb and its arguments there is a combined projection for negation and aspect. Recall that one of the two NEG elements, *hurà*, actually combines NEG and aspectual (PERF) semantics; for simplicity, call this projection NEGP. If there is a NEG element, then this occupies the head of NEGP; if not, the verb

¹² However, *bà su* 'as if' is listed (P&G: 12), again as two orthographic words. It remains unclear if the two parts of this dictionary entry can be separated; the only examples we found show *bà* adjacent to *su* (P&G: 12, 14). Another two-part adverbial is *dayun dà* 'always/continually'; all of these examples are contiguous as well (P&G: 24, 34, 52).

raises to this position. Below NEG_P are two projections corresponding to person features: [+me]_P and [+you]_P. Pronouns raise to these projections' heads to check off their respective features if they have them. Another projection below these would be needed to attract *din* GEN.3SG in (21d) below. Perhaps it checks a D feature (for 'deictic')—in the sense of Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998)—that attracts the (GEN-case) Actor if possible.¹³ Only one pronoun, NOM.3PL *siran*, will not be attracted to one of the aforementioned head positions. Because it too can precede the verb. And the only feature that it has a marked value for is [+aug], so we posit a [+aug]_P (just above the projection that contains the verb and its arguments). A pronoun with feature settings of more than one of these projections will pass through each head, checking off each feature. We leave it to the reader to verify that this combination of syntactic projections results in the correct internal and external orders of NEG, the verb, and any pronominal clitics.

Two main problems remain: the optional non-clisis of (especially disformed) OBL pronouns and the positioning of adverbial clitics. For the former we have no solution at this point, but for the latter we refer to the approach to Billings and Konopasky (2003: 30–32) regarding Tagalog, the internal ordering of which is identical to that of Binukid. In both languages, a monosyllabic pronoun (if any) precedes any adverbial clitics, which in turn precede any disyllabic pronoun. Billings and Konopasky argue that adverbial clitics (unlike pronominal ones) are phrasal affixes, inserted after the syntax spells out to the morphology (and probably even after disformation).

We further assume that the actual phonological forms of lexical items are inserted only after the syntax has produced a linearly ordered string of elements (Halle and Marantz 1993). Thus, whether a pronoun is mono- or disyllabic will become apparent only at this point: in the morphological component. It is precisely here that disformation takes place. Combinations of two monosyllabic pronouns will result in the second pronoun taking its corresponding OBL form. (Underlyingly disyllabic pairs of pronouns do not co-occur because there is no disyllabic GEN pronoun.) Thus, all ordering is syntactic, but disformation itself is based on prosodic weight.

Perhaps cluster-mate monosyllabic pronouns are disallowed by the Obligatory Contour Principle (the rationale common in phonological theory used to rule out adjacent elements that are alike in some way). In order for most underlyingly NOM or GEN pronouns to be realized as disyllabic, this argument goes, they are disformed into their OBL counterparts. Only if one of the pronouns is disyllabic *siran* does disformation NOT occur. There is one reason to question this phonological rationale: the disformation examples in which the two pronouns are non-adjacent.

¹³ The only other properties that distinguish *din* from *siran* in (21a) are prosody (i.e., number of syllables) and grammatical number. From Bošković's hypothesis that only the syntax should order words, it might follow that the syntax should also not have access to phonological information (also Halle and Marantz 1993). For this reason, we eliminate prosody from consideration with regard to even internal ordering. (However, we do consider prosody as a factor in disformation.) As for number, no Philippine language that we know about uses this property to order clitics.

We begin with (23c) and (25c), in which an adverbial clitic separates the two clitic pronouns. These would not be impossible to explain away using the phrasal-affix scenario of Billings and Konopasky (2003) mentioned above. The far more difficult examples to account for using this scenario would be (11a–b), in which the verb itself separates the first pronoun from the other, disformed one. The only account that comes to mind—that is, while assuming that (syntactic) movement PRECEDES (morphological) disformation—would require that the lower copy of a non-trivial chain be pronounced in place of the higher copy (Bošković 2001). Still, it remains unclear (i) how disformation would apply to pairs of pronouns the highest copies of which do not surface as adjacent and (ii) why the lower copy of an OBL pronoun would be pronounced. Disformation is still poorly understood. These problems therefore must await further research.

A phenomenon quite similar to disformation—found in many languages of Taiwan (Atayalic), the Philippines, and Sabah—has been called politeness substitution (Billings 2005: 311–12, 337 n. 18 specifically discussing Tagalog). In combinations of (underlyingly) GEN.1SG and NOM.2SG pronouns, in addition to the aforementioned obligatory disformation (of NOM.2SG *ka* into OBL.2SG *ikaw*), GEN.1SG *ku* can also be realized as GEN.IN1DL *ta* as follows.¹⁴

- (26) *Ipabulung* {*ta*}? *ikaw*}? diyà ki Apù. [IV, +cau, +tns, +irr]
 medicine GEN.IN1DL [OBL]/NOM/.2SG P OBL grandmother
 ‘We’ll get you medicined [*sic*] at Grandmother’s.’ (Post 1978: 66)

Thus, with *ta ikaw* clusters, **both** underlying pronoun forms are realized as different surface forms: for separate reasons.¹⁵ It is unclear to us whether this substitution takes place at a lexical level, prior to syntactic merger, or (along with disformation) in the morphological component.

Although a number of issues remain unresolved, we have filled in the picture about clisis in Binukid in the following respects. All ordering (except perhaps that of adverbial clitics) is done by the syntax; projections for person, deictic, and number features ensure this. However, prosody becomes relevant after the syntax, in the morphological component, where disformation occurs.¹⁶

¹⁴ This phenomenon refers to politeness because the contexts in which this substitution takes place have to do with cooperation between the 1SG Actor and the 2SG Patient. It is similar to situations in English where inclusive *let’s* is used even if the addressee couldn’t possibly participate in the action: for example, a dentist saying, *Let’s have a look at that wisdom tooth that’s bothering you*. Such a molar would hard for the addressee to see, even with a mirror. What the dentist means, perhaps, is that (s)he wants the addressee to cooperate, perhaps by opening wide. Note as well that the situation in (26) is also that of medical treatment. Billings (2005: 312) lists a similar Tagalog situation.

¹⁵ No examples of politeness substitution were found in P&G. Post’s earlier texts were elicited in a mountainous location (1978: 62), whereas P&G’s sentences come from a combination of that area and a lowland locale, both in Bukidnon Province (P&G: vii). Perhaps substitution was more prevalent in one place (or time) than in the other.

¹⁶ As a preceding footnote mentions, this version reflects the facts as we understood them (from the corpus) when we presented our talk at the 10-ICAL conference. A revision is being prepared as a result of our recent field work.

References

- Alexiadou, Artemis, and Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1998. Parameterizing Agr: Word order, V-movement, and EPP-checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12:491-539.
- Atherton, William. 1953. Binokid [sic] phonemes. *Folklore Studies* 12:101-101. (*Papers on Philippine linguistics*.)
- Billings, Loren A. 2002. Phrasal clitics. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 10(1-2):53-104. (*A special volume in honor of Leonard H. Babby*, ed. by James E. Lavine and Gerald R. Greenberg.)
- Billings, Loren A. 2005. Ordering clitics and postverbal R-expressions in Tagalog: A unified analysis? In *Verb first: On the syntax of verb-initial languages*, ed. by Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley, and Sheila Ann Dooley, 303-339. *Linguistik Aktuell* 73. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Billings, Loren, and Daniel Kaufman. 2004. Towards a typology of Austronesian pronominal clisis. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 34:15-29. (*Proceedings of AFLA 11*, ed. by Paul Law.)
- Billings, Loren, and Abigail Konopasky. 2003. Reassessing the role of syntax inside the morphological word: verb-adjacent clitics in Tagalog and Bulgarian. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 34:15-29. (*Proceedings of AFLA 9*, ed. by Anastasia Riehl and Thess Savella.)
- Blust, Robert. 1977. The Proto-Austronesian pronouns and Austronesian subgrouping: A preliminary report. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 9(2):1-15. (Honolulu: Department of Linguistics, University of Hawai'i.)
- Blust, Robert. 1991. The Greater Central Philippines hypothesis. *Oceanic Linguistics* 30(2):73-129.
- Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface: Cliticization and related phenomena*. North-Holland Linguistic Series: Linguistic Variations 60. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Brainard, Sherri, and Ena Vander Molen. 2005. Word order inverse in Obo Manobo. In *Current issues in Philippine linguistics and anthropology: Parangal kay Lawrence A. Reid*, ed. by Hsiu-chuan Laio and Carl R. Galvez Rubino, 364-418. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines and SIL Philippines.
- Corbett, Greville G. 2000. *Number*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dubois, Carl D. 1976. *Sarangani Manobo: An introductory guide*. Philippine Journal of Linguistics special monograph issue 6. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Elkins, Richard E. 1973-74. A preliminary Proto-Manobo word list. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 4(1)-5(2):23-40.
- Elkins, Richard E. 1974. A Proto-Manobo word list. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13(1-2):601-641.

- Elkins, Richard E. 1984. An extended Proto-Manobo word list. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 14(2)-15(1):218-229. (*Panagani: Essays in honor of Bonifacio P. Sibayan on his sixty-seventh birthday*, ed. by Andrew B. Gonzalez.)
- Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, ed. by Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, 111-176. *Current Studies in Linguistics* 24. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Harmon, Carol W. 1977. *Kagayanen and the Manobo subgroup of Philippine languages*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawai'i.
- Harmon, Carol W. 1979. Proto-Manobo pronouns and case marking particles. *Papers in Philippine Linguistics* 10:113-133. *Pacific Linguistics A-55*. Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.
- Lee, Celeste Chia-Yen. 2004. The ordering of clitic pronouns in the languages of Southeast Mindanao. M.A. thesis, Providence University.
- Lee, Celeste, and Loren Billings. 2005. Wackernagel and verb-adjacent clisis in Central Philippines. *UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics* 12:241-254. (= *Proceedings of the 12th meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*, ed. by Jeffrey Heinz and Dimitris Ntelitheos.)
- Mussafia, A. 1886. Una particolarità sintattica della lingua italiana dei primi secoli. In [Graziadio I. Ascoli et al.] *In memoria Napoleone Caix e Ugo Angelo Canello: Miscellanea di filologia e linguistica*, 155-261 (errata: 474–475). Firenze: Successori Le Monnier.
- Mussafia, A. 1898. Enclisi o proclisi del pronome personale atono qual oggetto. *Romania* 27(105):145-146.
- Post, Ursula. 1965. Morphophonemic alternations in Binukid. *Philippine Social Sciences and Humanities Review* 30(1):52-56.
- Post, Ursula. 1978. Binukid texts. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 2(2):62-68.
- Post, Ursula, and Mary Jane Gardner. 1992. Binukid dictionary. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 9(2):i-xxviii, 1-210.
- Schachter, Paul, and Fe T. Otones. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stark, Donald S. 1961. Proto-Binukid-Dibabaon. *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota* 5:65-76.
- Thomas, David. 1955. Three analyses of the Ilocano pronoun system. *Word* 11(2):204-208.
- Tobler, Adolf. 1875/1912. [Review of] Jules Le Coultre, *de l'ordre des mot dan Crestien de Troyes*. Extrait du programme de Pâques 1875 du Collège Vitzthum. Dresde 1875 ... [sic].

- Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 2(34):1057-1082. (Reprinted in his *Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik* 5. Leipzig: Hirzel, 395–415.)
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1892/1953. Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1:333-436. (Reprinted in his *Kleine Schriften* 1. Göttingen: Vanderheock & Ruprecht, 11–104.)
- Weaver, Dan, and Marilou Weaver. 1964. Ranking of personal pronouns in Agusan Manobo. *Oceanic Linguistics* 3(1):161-170.
- Zorc, R. David. 1986. The genetic relationships of Philippine languages. In *Focal II: Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, 147-173. Pacific Linguistics A-55. Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

The preceding document was presented at the Tenth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (10-ICAL). To properly reference this work, please use the following format:

<LastName>, <FirstName>. 2006. <PaperTitle>. Paper presented at Tenth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics. 17-20 January 2006. Puerto Princesa City, Palawan, Philippines.
<http://www.sil.org/asia/philippines/ical/papers.html>

For other papers that were presented at 10-ICAL, please visit <http://www.sil.org/asia/philippines/ical/papers.html>.