

Antipassives and Causatives in Ilokano:
Evidence for an Ergative Analysis

Donna B. Gerds
SUNY at Buffalo

I. Two Analyses

In Ilokano, as in the other Philippine languages, there are two basic ways of expressing 'notional' transitivity; the \emptyset - construction, given in (1a)-(3a) and the ag/-um- construction, given in (1b)-(3b).

- (1) a. T-in-ippog ti ubing dagiti botelya.
pst-knock det child det bottle
'The child knocked over the bottle.'
- b. N-ag-tippog ti ubing ka-dagiti botelya.
pst-?-knock det child OBL-det bottle
'The child knocked over the bottle.'
- (2) a. In-uray n-ak ni nanang.
pst-wait 3GEN-1NOM det mother.
'Mother waited for me.'
- b. N-ag-uray ni nanang kaniak.
pst-?-wait det mother LOBL
'Mother waited for me.'
- (3) a. M-in-ula-k ti saging.
pst-plant-1GEN det banana
'I planted the banana.'
- b. N-ag-mula ak (i)-ti- saging.
pst-?-plant 1NOM OBL-det banana
'I planted the banana.'

In this paper, I examine two alternative treatments of the above pairs of sentences. First, an analysis could be given for Ilokano which is parallel to the one proposed for Cebuano by Bell (1976, 1983). Under this analysis, which I refer to as the Passive Analysis, the sentences in (1b)-(3b) are assumed to be active transitive and the sentences in (1a)-(3a) are then argued to be Passives. Alternatively, the sentences in (1a)-(3a) could be taken as active transitive sentences. This analysis, first proposed in Gerds (1980), would argue that the sentences in (1b)-(3b) involve Antipassive; furthermore, as demonstrated below, certain rules

(this paper was presented at the Third Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages, Athens, Ohio, May, 1983)

would need to distinguish Ergatives from Absolutives. Thus, I call this an Ergative Analysis.

In this paper, I briefly outline the Ergative Analysis, giving arguments for Antipassive in Ilokano in Section II. In Section III, I introduce some further data involving Causatives, showing that such data are handled in a direct and simple fashion under the Ergative Analysis. In Section IV, I briefly illustrate the Passive Analysis and then argue that it cannot handle Causatives in a straightforward manner. I conclude that the Ergative Analysis, because it can account for a larger range of data, is to be preferred over the Passive Analysis.

II. The Ergative Analysis

I recognize two basic clause types for Ilokano. First, the simple intransitive clause in (4); I have diagrammed this clause in (5).

- (4) N-ag-taray ti ubing.
 pst-intr-run det child
 'The child ran.'

(5) 'run' taray		'the child' ti ubing
ag- (1)		S
		(ABS)
		NOM

Second, what I take to be a simple transitive clause (6) is diagrammed in (7).

- (6) T-in-ippog ti ubing dagiti botelya.
 pst-knock det child det bottle
 'The child knocked over the bottle.'

(7) 'knock over' tippog		'the child' ti ubing		'the bottles' dagiti botelya
(1)		S		Ø
		(ERG)		(ABS)
		NOM		NOM

The diagrams I use here are modifications of the stratal diagrams used in Relational Grammar.² The concepts on which these diagrams are based are essentially concepts which are central to RG: I represent the Grammatical Relation (S= subject, O= object, IO= indirect object, OBL= oblique, and CHO= chomeur) of the nominals of the clause. In addition, the levels involved in each structure are indicated; in (5) and (7) there is only one level of structure as indicated by (1). Furthermore, I give the status of each nominal with respect to final Ergativity: a nominal is finally Ergative (ERG) if it is the S in a finally transitive clause all other S and O nominals (S in a finally intransitive clause or O in a finally transitive clause) are Absolutive (ABS). Finally, I indicate the case of all nominals/pronominals in the clause and the verbal morphology involved in each clause type.

In Ilokano, two Nominal Cases are distinguished--Nom and OBL--as in the partial chart below; the NOM consists simply of a determiner, while in the OBL case a preposition precedes the determiner:

(8)		NOM	OBL
	common sg.	ti	(i)-ti
	pl.	dagiti	ka-dagiti
	proper sg.	ni	ken-ni

As seen in (4) and (6) above, final S and O are both in the NOM case. Other nominals such as the indirect object (IO) Juan in (9) are in the OBL case.

- (9) In-ted ti ubing ti kuarta ken ni Juan.
 pst-give det child det money OBL det J.
 'The child gave the money to Juan.'

In contrast, three cases are distinguished by Pronominals, as illustrated in the partial chart in (10):

(10)		GEN	NOM	OBL
	1st sg. :	ko	ak	kaniak
	2nd sg. :	mo	ka	kenka
	3rd sg. :	na	∅	ken <u>u</u> ana/kanyana

Taking 1st person pronominals as an example, we see in (11) the S of an intransitive clause is NOM.

- (11) N-ag-taray ak.
 pst-intr-run 1NOM
 'I ran.'

In contrast, the S in a transitive clause (see (12)) is GEN.

- (12) T-in-ippog ko dagiti botelya.
pst-knock 1GEN det bottle
'I knocked over the bottles.'

The O in₃ transitive clauses, on the other hand, is NOM, as seen in (13).

- (13) T-in-ippog n-ak ni Juan.
pst-knock 3GEN-1NOM det J.
'Juan knocked me over.'

Pronominal Case, therefore, follows a typically Ergative pattern: while the S of an intransitive and the O are NOM, the S of a transitive is GEN. That is, ABS is NOM while ERG is GEN.⁴ As with Nominals, IOs and other relations are OBL, as seen in (14).

- (14) In-ted ti ubing ti kuarta kaniak.
pst-give det child det money 1OBL
'The child gave the money to me.'

There are other phenomena in Ilokano that distinguish Ergative/Absolutive. For example, the nominal which serves as the head of a Cleft must correspond to the ABS of the clause: that is, in an intransitive clause like (15) the S corresponds to the clefted nominal while in a transitive clause like (16) the O does.

- (15) Siak ti n-ag-taray.
1EMP det pst-intr-run
'I'm the one who ran.'

- (16) Dagiti botelya ti t-in-ippog ni Juan.
det bottle det pst-knock det J.
'It's the bottles that John knocked over.'

On the other hand, the clefted nominal cannot correspond to the S of a transitive clause; (17) cannot have the reading where Juan corresponds to the ERG:

- (17) Ni Juan ti t-in-ippog dagiti botelya.
det J. det pst-knock det bottle
*'It's John who knocked over the bottles.'
/'It's John who the bottles knocked over.'

Thus, the following constraint can be formulated:

(18) Clefted nominals can correspond only to ABS.

Taking these two rules--Pronominal Case and Clefting--as tests, I return to the problem of clauses like (1b)-(3b)--the ag-clauses, showing that the S in these clauses is an ABS. First, note that a pronominal subject in an ag- clause is in the NOM not the GEN case.

(19) N-ag-tippog ak ka-dagiti botelya.
pst-intr-knock INOM OBL-det bottle
'I knocked over the bottles.'

Second, note that the S of the ag- clause can correspond to the clefted nominal.

(20) Siak ti n-ag-tippog ka-dagiti botelya.
lemph det pst-intr-knock OBL-det bottle
'I'm the one who knocked over the bottles.'

By these tests, then, the S in ag- clauses is the ABS; thus, these clauses must be finally intransitive. It now becomes clear why 'notionally' transitive clauses such as (1b)-(3b) have the same verbal morphology as intransitive clauses like (4); the prefix ag- marks final intransitivity.

Two problems are raised by the discovery that ag- clause are intransitive. First, evidence must be given that the nominal in question is a final S. Second, the issue of what has happened to the second nominal must be addressed.

Although I have shown above that some rules of Ilokano make use of the distinction ERG/ABS, other rules distinguish final S. For example, only final S can serve as antecedents of Reflexives. Note that the S of a plain transitive clause, as in (21), and the S of an ag- clause, as in (22) can both antecede Reflexives.

(21) S-in-apul ni Juan ti trabaho para iti
pst-find det J. det job for OBL-det
bagi-na.
self-3GEN
'Juan found a job for himself.'

(22) N-ag-sapul ni Juan iti trabaho para
pst-intr-find det J. OBL-det job for
iti bagi-na.
OBL-det self-3GEN
'John found a job for himself.'

Thus, Reflexives give evidence that the first nominal in the ag- clause is a final S.

That the final S is an ABS indicates that ag- clauses are finally intransitive; in Relational Grammar, two types of constructions have been posited to account for the final intransitivity of a notionally transitive clause--2-3 retreat (O-IO retreat) and Antipassive. Under a 2-3 retreat analysis, the initial O retreats to IO and the clause is finally intransitive (see (23)).

(23)	(1)	S	L
	(2)	S	IO

		(ABS)	

Under an Antipassive analysis, the initial O is a chomeur ('unemployed' nominal) at final level, as represented in (24).⁶

(24)	(1)	S	L
	(2)	S	CHO

		(ABS)	

I am leaving aside the issue of the exact formulation of the Antipassive construction, preferring instead to use the simplest possible formulation as given in (24).

Although either analysis would account for the final intransitivity of the ag- clauses, the case marking of the nominals, and the status of the S as final ABS, the two analyses make different predictions regarding the second nominal. I argue here that this nominal is not an IO but rather a CHO and thus Antipassive is the proper characterization of the ag- clause. Specifically, it is possible to have clefted nominals which correspond to the IO if the clause is nominalized with paq--an morphology.⁷ Thus, the IO in (25) corresponds to the WH question (having the form of a Cleft) in (26).

- (25) B-in-asa ni Juan ti sarita ka-dagidiay
 pst-read det J. det story OBL-det
 ubbing.
 children
 'John read the story to the children.'

(26) Sino ti pag-basa-an ni Juan ti sarita?
 who det nom-read-adv det J. det story
 'Who does John read the story to?'

In contrast, O-Chomeurs cannot correspond to heads of Clefts in such nominalized constructions. Corresponding to (25) above, (27) involves 3-2 advancement; the initial IO, in advancing to O places the initial O en chomage, as represented in (28).

(27) B-in-asa-an ni Juan dagidiay ubbing
 pst-read-adv det J. det children
 iti sarita.
 OBL-det story
 'John read the children the story.'

(28)

'read'		'story'	'children'	
basa	ni Juan	iti sarita	dagidiay ubbing	
(1)	S	O	IO	
-an (2)	S	CHO	O	3-2 advancement
	(ERG)		(ABS)	
	NOM	OBL	NOM	

Evidence for 3-2 advancement comes from Clefts, since in (27) ubbing corresponds to the clefted nominal of a plain Cleft, it must be the final ABS (see (18)).

(29) Sino ti b-in-asa-an ni Juan iti
 who det pst-read-adv det J. OBL-det
 sarita?
 story
 'Who did John read the story to?'

Returning to the issue at hand, sarita the final O-Chomeur cannot correspond to the clefted nominal even if the clause is nominalized with pag--an morphology.

(30) *Ania ti pag-basa-an-an ni Juan dagidiay
 what det nom-read-adv-adv det J. det
 ubbing?
 children
 (What does John read to the children?)

In summary, as seen by (26) vs. *(30), final IOs but not final

O-Chomeurs can correspond to clefted nominals when the clause is nominalized with pag--an morphology. Applying this test to the 2nd nominal in ag- clauses such as (31), we see in (32) that such Clefts are not possible.

(31) N-ag-uray ni nanang ken-ni Juan.
 pst-intr-wait det mother OBL-det J.
 'Mother waited for Juan.'

(32) *Sino ti pag-ag-uray-an ni nanang?
 who det nom-intr-wait-adv det mother
 (Who does mother wait for?)

I conclude then that ag- clauses involve O-Chomeurs--not IOs--and are thus best characterized as Antipassives..

III. Antipassives and Causatives

In this section, I give an analysis of Ilokano Causatives which accounts for the fact that when the Causative is based on a notionally transitive clause three alternative sentence exist:

- (33) a. P-in-a-asikaso-k ti daydiay ners diay
 pst-cs-care-1GEN det det nurse det
 agsakit.
 patient
- b. P-in-ag-asikaso-k ti ners ti daydiay
 pst-cs-intr-care-1GEN det nurse det det
 agsakit.
 patient
- c. N-ag-pa-asikao ak ti dadiay ners ti
 pst-intr-cs-care 1NOM det det nurse det
 daydiay agsakit.
 det patient
 'I had the nurse take care of the patient.'
- (34) a. P-in-a-basa ni Juan ti maysa nga istoria
 pst-cs-read det J. det one lnk story
 kaniak.
 1OBL
- b. P-in-ag-basa n-ak ni Juan
 pst-cs-intr-read 3GEN-1NOM det J.
 iti maysa nga istoria.
 OBL-det one lnk story

c. N-ag-pa-basa ni Juan kaniak iti
 pst-intr-cs-read det J. IOBL OBL-det
 maysa nga istoria.
 one lnk story
 'John let me read one story.'

I claim that such Causatives involve Causative Clause Union as proposed by Perlmutter and Postal (1974) and Gibson and Raposo (to appear); the basic idea of CCU is that the initial structure involves two clauses which are collapsed into a single clause. In Ilokano, as in many other languages including French, Japanese, and Turkish (see Aissen (1974)), the S of an intransitive clause is assigned the O relation, the S of a transitive clause is assigned the IO relation, and other nominals simply inherit their relations in CCU.¹⁰ Thus, cases of CCU involving an embedded intransitive clause (like (35)) can be represented as in (36).¹¹

(35) P-in-ag-taray n-ak ni Juan.
 pst-cs-intr-run 3GEN-1NOM det J.
 'John made me run.'

(36)

'run'		'me'	
taray	ni Juan	ak	
ag- (1)	S	[S]	(Intransitive) CCU
pa (2)	S	O	
	(ERG)	(ABS)	
	NOM	NOM	

The bi-clausal initial structure is represented by the bracketing in level (1) and union into a single clause is represented by the lack of bracketing in level (2). Evidence that the embedded subject is object in the Causative comes from the fact that it is final ABS as seen by the NOM pronominal case and that it can correspond to a clefted nominal as in (37).

(37) Siak ti p-in-ag-taray ni Juan.
 LEMP det pst-cs-intr-run det J.
 'I'm the one who John made run.'

In contrast, in CCU involving an embedded transitive clause (like (38)) the embedded subject is indirect object, as represented in (39).

(38) P-in-a-basa ni Juan ti maysa nga istoria
 pst-cs-read det J. det one lnk story
 kaniak.
 LOBL
 'John let me read one story.'

'read'		'me'	'one story'	
basa	ni Juan	kaniak	ti maysa nga istoria	
(1)	S	[S	O]	(Transitive)
pa- (2)	S	IO	O	
	(ERG)		(ABS)	CCU
	NOM	OBL	NOM	

That istoria is the final O can be ascertained by the fact that it corresponds to the clefted nominal in a plain Cleft:

(39) Maysa nga istoria ti p-in-a-basa ni Juan
 one lnk story det pst-cs-read det J.
 daniak.
 LOBL
 'One story is what John let me read.'

In addition, the embedded subject can be seen to be a final IO in that it can correspond to the clefted nominal in a Cleft involving nominalization with pag--an.

(40) Sino ti pag-pa-basa-an ni Juan ti maysa
 who det nom-cs-read-adv det J. det one
 nga istoria?
 lnk story
 'Who does John let read one story?'

Thus, Ilokano has a type of CCU which distinguishes embedded S of intransitives from embedded S of transitives.

Returning now to the problem of the possibility of three Causatives based on notionally transitive clauses (see (34)), CCU of the type exemplified in (38) corresponds to (34a) leaving (34b) and (34c) to be accounted for. I claim that in (34b), the embedded clause involves Antipassive and is thus intransitive; in CCU, since the S of intransitives is

distinguished from the S of transitives, the embedded S is an O in the Union parallel to the CCU with an embedded intransitive exemplified in (36); (34b) is represented as follows:¹²

(41)

	'read'	ni Juan	'me'	'one story'	
	basa		ak	iti maysa nga istoria	
	(1)	S	[S	O]	
ag-	(2)	S	[S	CHO]	Antipassive CCU
pa-	(3)	S	O	CHO	
		(ERG)	(ABS)		
		NOM	NOM	OBL	

The evidence for this analysis is as follows: first, Juan is final ERG and as such cues agreement signalled by the 3rd person GEN pronominal; 'me' is final ABS as seen by the NOM pronominal form and by the fact that it can correspond to the clefted nominal in a plain Cleft, as seen in (42).

(42) Siak ti p-in-ag-basa ni Juan iti
 LEMP det past-cs-intr-read det J. OBL-det
 maysa nga istoria.
 one lnk story
 'It's me that John let read one story.'

Furthermore, the analysis represented in (41) automatically accounts for the verbal morphology. I am assuming that Ilokano like many other languages obeys what I call the Satellite Principle (see Gerdts (1981)):¹³

(43) Affixes are ordered from the root outward--
 that is, suffixes are ordered from left to
 right and prefixes from right to left--
 according to the order of the syntactic
 levels.

For example, in (36) the intransitive level (1) is signalled by the prefix ag- while the CCU in level (2) is signalled by the prefix pa-, resulting in the prefix ordering pa+ ag+ root (that is, right to left away from the root as specified in (43)), which undergoes phonological simplification to yield pag-.¹⁴ Note that pag- is also the predicted form in ((34b);

the Antipassive in level (2) is signalled by *ag-* while the CCU in level (3) is signalled by *pa*, resulting in *pa,+ag+root*, as seen in (41). In contrast, (38) does not involve an intransitive and consequently cannot have a marker for intransitivity such as *ag-*; thus *pag-* is not possible in (38), as seen in (44).¹⁵

- (44) *P-in-ag-basa ni Juan ti maysa nga
 pst-cs-intr-read det J. det one lnk
 istoria kaniak.
 story LOBL
 (John let me read one story.)

As for the third Causative (34c), I claim that this involves CCU at level (2) and, since the embedded clause in level (1) is transitive, the S of the embedded clause is an indirect object in the union and the O of the embedded clause inherits its relation in the union, as in (38); furthermore, level (3) involves Antipassive and the O is placed en chomage, as represented in (45).

- (45) N-ag-pa-basa ni Juan kaniak iti
 pst-intr-cs-read det J. LOBL OBL-det
 maysa nga istoria.
 one lnk story

	'read' basa	ni Juan	'me' kaniak	'one story' iti maysa nga istoria
(1)	S		[S	O]
pa- (2)	S		IO	O
ag- (3)	S		IO	CHO
	(ABS)			
	NOM	OBL		OBL

CCU
Antipassive

Since (45) is finally intransitive, the S Juan is the final ABS and as such can correspond to the clefted nominal in a plain Cleft:

- (46) Ni Juan ti n-ag-pa-basa kaniak iti
 det J. det pst-intr-cs-read LOBL OBL-det
 maysa nga istoria.
 one lnk story
 'It's John who let me read one story.'

Again the verbal morphology is automatically accounted for: CCU at level (2) is signalled by pa- and Antipassive at level (3) by ag- resulting in ag-+pa-+root.

To summarize, an analysis of Ilokano Causatives which involves CCU and Antipassive accounts for the grammatical relations of the nominals as well as the verbal morphology in a straightforward manner. There are three types of Causatives:

- (47) a. P-in-a-aramid ko ken-ni Juan ti
pst-cs-make lGEN OBL-det J. det
eroplano.
airplane
- b. P-in-ag-aramid ko ni Juan iti
pst-cs-make lGEN det J. OBL-det
eroplano.
airplane
- c. N-ag-pa-aramid ak ken-ni Juan iti
pst-intr-cs-make lNOM OBL-det J. OBL-det
eroplano.
airplane.
'I had John make the airplane.'

those like (47a) involving only CCU hence prefix pa-; those like (47b) involving Antipassive then CCU hence prefixes pa-+ag; and those like (47c) involving CCU then Antipassive hence prefixes ag-+pa-.¹⁶

IV. The Passive Analysis

In this section, I briefly outline a grammar of Ilokano under the Passive Analysis, showing that, while the properties of non-causatives discussed in §II are easily handled under this analysis, the Causatives discussed in the preceding section present some difficulty for the Passive Analysis. Specifically, I review the analysis of Philippine Causatives posited by Bell and Perlmutter (to appear) showing that their analysis cannot accommodate the data in a straightforward manner.

As mentioned in §I, the Ergative Analysis and the Passive Analysis differ with respect to one basic assumption. Under the Passive analysis, clauses like (48) are regarded as active transitive.

- (48) N-ag-tippog ti ubing ka-dagiti botelya.
 pst-?-knock det child OBL-det bottle
 'The child knocked over the bottle.'

'knock' tippog	'the child' ti ubing	'the bottles' ka-dagiti botelya
ag- (1)	S	O
	NOM	OBL

while clauses like (49) are then argued to be Passives.¹⁷

- (49) T-in-ippog ti ubing dagiti botelya.
 pst-knock det child det bottle
 'The bottles were knocked over by the child.'

'knock' tippog	'the child' ti ubing	'the bottles' dagiti botelya
(1)	S	O
∅ (2)	CHO	S
	NOM	NOM

As seen in level (2) in (49), Passive involves the advancement of the O to S placing the S of level (1) en chomage. Upon comparison of clauses like (48) and (49) with the intransitive clause in (50)

- (50) N-ag-taray ti ubing.
 pst-act-run det child
 'The child ran.'

(represented in (5) above), several generalizations are possible. First, regarding verbal morphology, active intransitive and transitive clauses are marked--for example, ag- in (48) and (50), hereafter called a marker of act(ive)-while Passive clauses are unmarked. Second, with respect to nominal case, final S and S-Chomeur are NOM while other nominals, including O, are OBL. Finally, if data involving pronominals is considered (see (11)-(14) above), final S is NOM, S-Chomeur is GEN, and others are OBL.

Expanding the range of phenomena to Clefts (see (15)-(17)) and Reflexives (see (21)-(22)), the following generalizations are possible:

(51) Clefted nominals can correspond only to final S.

A generalization concerning Clefts is also possible under the Passive Analysis, as seen in (15)-(17) above, the S ~~is~~ ^{a simple} intransitive, the S of the ag-clause, and the final S of the Passive can correspond to the Clefted nominal while the S-Chomeur in a Passive cannot. Finally, with respect to Reflexives, it was noted above that the 'notional' subject of either an ag-clause or a Passive can serve as antecedent; for example, in (51),

(51) N-ag-sapul ni Juan iti trabaho para
 pst-act-find det J. OBL-det job for
 iti bagi-na.
 OBL-det self-3GEN
 'John found a job for himself.'

an active clause, the S serves as antecedent, while in (52),

(52) S-in-apul ni Juan ti trabaho para iti
 pst-find det J. det job for OBL-det
 bagi-na.
 sell-3GEN
 'A job was found by John for himself.'

a Passive clause, the initial S which is a final Chomeur serves as antecedent. The appropriate generalization, then, is:

(53) Initial subjects serve as antecedents to Reflexives.

In summary, the range of phenomena treated in §2 under the Ergative Analysis can also be accommodated under the Passive Analysis. I have given the generalizations made by both analyses below. ¹⁸

	<u>ERGATIVE ANALYSIS</u>	<u>PASSIVE ANALYSIS</u>
<u>Nominal Case</u>		
NOM	Final S & O	Final S & S-Chomeur
OBL	others	others

<u>Pronominal Case</u>		
GEN	ERG	S-Chomeur
NOM	ABS	S
OBL	others	others

(54) cont.

<u>Clefts</u>	final ABS	final S
<u>Reflexive antecedent</u>	final S	initial S

Turning now to Causatives, I assume as do Bell and Perlmutter (to appear) that CCU as discussed above is involved; in summary:

(55) <u>Final Relation in Embedded Clause</u>	<u>Relation in Union</u>
S in transitive	= IO
S in intransitive	= O
others	= inherit same relation

Under the Passive Analysis, (56) would involve CCU, as represented below:

(56) N-ag-pa-basa ni Juan kaniak iti
 pst-act-cs-read det J. IOBL OBL-det
 maysa nga istoria.
 one 1nk story
 'John let me read one story.'

'read'	ni Juan	'me'	'one story'
basa		kaniak	iti maysa nga istoria
(1)	S	[S	O]
pa- (2)	S	IO	O
ag-			
	NOM	OBL	OBL

CCU
Active

Since Juan is the Final S, it is NOM and can correspond to a clefted nominal (see (46) above): the other nominals are OBL. Furthermore, since (56) is an active rather than a passive clause, ag- is prefixed to the verb in this clause. Note that although the embedded clause in (56) is an active one at level (1), the prefix ag- does not result (e.g. ag+pa+ag= agpag). This would follow from a general principle: ag- is marked only on basic clauses and the embedded clause of a Causative is not a basic clause. With this one small assumption,

Causatives like (56) are handled automatically under the Passive Analysis.

A second case of Causative also provides no challenge to the Passive Analysis. Causatives like (57) can be analyzed as involving Passive in the level following CCU.

- (57) P-in-a-basa ni Juan ti maysa nga istoria
 pst-cs-read det J. det one lnk story
 kaniak.
 LOBL
 'John let me read one story.'

	'read' basa	ni Juan	'me' kaniak	'one story' iti maysa nga istoria	
	(1)	S	[S	O]	
pa-	(2)	S	IO	O	CCU
Ø	(3)	CHO	IO	S	Passive
		NOM	OBL	NOM	

In (57), the O of the embedded clause inherits its relation in the Union then in level (3) advances to final S via Passive; evidence for this nominal being final S comes from its ability to correspond to a clefted nominal as in (39) above. Furthermore, since (57) is not active, the verb in this sentence lacks the ag- prefix.

While the Passive Analysis handles two types of Causatives without any difficulty, the third type of Causative, those like (58), present a challenge to the Passive Analysis.

- (58) P-in-ag-basa n-ak ni Juan iti
 pst-cs-act-read 3GEN-1NOM det J. OBL-det
 maysa nga istoria.
 one lnk story
 'John let me read one story.'

There are two problems with Causatives like (58): first, the S of the embedded clause is unexpectedly the S at final level of the Causative; second, the ag- prefix is signalling that the embedded clause is active, and, as we have seen above, it is necessary to ban such marking in the Causatives in (56) and (57).

Bell and Perlmutter (to appear), addressing the parallel problem for Hiligaynon and other Philippine languages, offer a

solution to the first of these difficulties.¹⁹ Under this analysis, (58) would be represented as follows:

(59)

	'read' basa	ni Juan	'me' kaniak	'one story' iti maysa nga istoria	
	(1)	S	[S	O]	
pa-	(2)	S	IO	O	CCU
Ø	(3)	S	O	CHO	3-2 Advancement
Ø	(4)	CHO	S	CHO	Passive
		NOM	NOM	OBL	

They claim that the union level (2) is as expected: the embedded S is the IO in the Union. This nominal then advances to O placing istoria, the inherited O, en chomage; this advancement (3-2 advancement) is not correlated with any verbal morphology. Finally, 'me' advances to final S via Passive, placing the initial S en chomage. This analysis is able to account for the Case of the nominals involved: the S-Chomeur is NOM an cues agreement in the form of a GEN pronominal, the final S is NOM, and the O-Chomeur is OBL. Furthermore, the final S, as seen in (42) above, can correspond to a clefted nominal.

However, there is a serious problem with this analysis. It requires a 3-2 advancement construction which is unmotivated elsewhere in the grammar of Ilokano, or, as Bell and Perlmutter point out, of Hiligaynon. That is, 3-2 advancement exists only in Causatives like (58). Furthermore, Bell and Perlmutter formulate a constraint on 3-2 advancement that requires the IO that has advanced to O to continue to advance to S, the end result being that level (3) in (59) is completely abstract in the sense that Causatives like (58) provide no evidence for that level.²⁰ Specifically, for the three nominals involved, two of them--the S and O--bear different grammatical relations at the final level, and the third--the O-Chomeur--behaves in every respect like an O. (Note that under the Passive Analysis, there are no other O-Chomeurs in the grammar to compare this nominal with.) Finally, 3-2 advancement has no corresponding verbal morphology, as mentioned above. In sum, the sole motivation for positing level (3) is to account for the fact that the embedded S appears as S of the Causative.²¹

An obvious question is raised by the analysis in (59): why bother to posit the abstract level (3); why not posit advancement of the IO directly to S, as represented in (60)?

J

(60)

'read'	ni Juan	'me'	'one story'
basa		ak	iti maysa nga istoria

(1)	S	[S	0]	
pa-	S	IO	0	CCU
Ø	CHO	S	0	3-1 Advancement

As Bell and Perlmutter point out, the problem with the analysis in (60) is that 3-1 advancement is attested elsewhere in the grammar.²² Specifically, clauses like (61) (which involve 3-2 advancement under the Ergative Analysis (cf. (28)) would involve this construction.

(61) B-in-asa-an ni Juan dagidiay ubbing
 pst-read-adv det det children
 iti sarita.
 OBL-det story
 'John read the children the story.'

'read'	ni Juan	'children'	'story'
basa		dagidiay ubbing	iti sarita

(1)	S	IO	0	
-an	CHO	S	0	3-1 Advancement
	NOM	NOM	OBL	

Evidence that ubbing is the final S comes from the NOM case and also from the fact that this nominal can correspond to the clefted nominal in a plain Cleft, as in (29) above. Relevant to the discussion of Causatives is the observation that 3-1 advancement is accompanied by a certain verbal morphology—the suffix -an.²³ As Bell and Perlmutter point out, the lack of this morphology on the verb in Causatives like (58) rules out the possibility that 3-1 advancement is involved.

In summary, then, Causatives like (58) present a challenge to the Passive Analysis. The first difficulty posed by such Causatives is to account for the unexpected appearance of the embedded S as the S at the final level of the Causative. The solution proposed by Bell and Perlmutter, invoking 3-2 advancement, accommodates this nominal, but in an ad hoc manner. The second problem with Causatives like (58) is the appearance of the prefixes pa-+tag- = pag-. Note that Bell and Perlmutter's analysis does not account for this at all. As pointed out above, Causatives like (56) and (57)

clearly show that it is necessary to ban ag- from marking active clauses embedded in Causatives; otherwise -ag-+pa-+ag- would be expected for (56) and pa-+ag- would be expected for (57) as well as for (58). Therefore, the analysis in (59) is inadequate for two reasons; it fails to accommodate the verbal morphology of (58) and it resorts to an otherwise unattested construction--3-2 advancement--to account for the final grammatical relation of the nominals.²⁴

V. Conclusion

In this paper, I have contrasted two alternative analyses of Philippine languages. Using data from Ilokano, I have briefly outlined a Passive Analysis parallel to Bell's analysis of Cebuano and have offered an alternative analysis of my own--the Ergative Analysis. I have shown that for basic clausal phenomena either analysis can adequately accommodate Ilokano; a summary of the rules under each analysis is given in (54).

However, when Causatives were brought under consideration, it was shown that the Passive Analysis faces major problems in accommodating the three types of Causatives formed on notionally transitive embedded clauses. Causatives like (58) are analyzed by Bell and Perlmutter as involving an abstract level with 3-2 advancement, as represented in (59); however, their analysis, even with this 'fudge', cannot account for the verbal morphology of Causatives like (58).

In contrast, Causatives under the Ergative Analysis can be handled in a straightforward manner. The three types of Causatives, I claim, involve only OCU (see (38)), Antipassive then OCU (see (41)), or OCU then Antipassive (see (45)); the verbal morphology involved in each Causative correlates with each level exactly as predicted for non-causative constructions.

I conclude that the Ergative Analysis is the preferred analysis for Ilokano. Furthermore, preliminary analyses of Tagalog, Cebuano, and Hiligaynon indicate that parallel arguments for the Ergative Analysis can be constructed in these languages, these languages differing in only minor details with respect to nominal case and verbal morphology. In summary, I propose that the Ergative Analysis as proposed for Ilokano is generalizable to all Philippine languages.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the native speakers of Ilokano who have assisted me in my research: Eva Aguinaldo, of National City, California, Rosalina Bumtay, a graduate student in

Linguistics at SUNY-Buffalo, and Juliet Roldan, of Calgary, Alberta. I would also like to thank the many people who have given me comments and questions concerning the Ergative Analysis, especially Videa De Guzman and Lorna Rowsell who participated in an 8-hour seminar that I gave at the University of Calgary, April, 1982.

My research on Ilokano has been funded by the Department of Linguistics, University of Calgary, a University Post-Doctoral Fellowship, University of Calgary, a Research Development Fund Grant, State University of New York at Buffalo, and the National Science Foundation through Grant No. BNS78-17498 to the University of California, San Diego.

The work presented here is a very small fragment of a much larger project—Gerdts (in preparation). I welcome questions and comments about any aspect of this project.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in the Ilokano glosses:

act	active prefix (ag-)
adv	advancement suffix (-an)
cs	causative prefix (pa-)
det	determiner
EMP	Emphatic/independent pronominal forms
GEN	Genitive case
intr	intransitive prefix (ag-)
lnk	linker (nga)
NOM	Nominative case
nom	nominalizer (pag-)
OBL	Oblique case
pl	plural
pst	past tense infix (-in-)
sg	singular
1	1st person
2	2nd person
3	3rd person

Notes

¹I am limiting the present discussion to clauses involving ag-. For a discussion of -um- see Gerdts (in preparation).

²See Perlmutter (1980) for an introduction to Relational grammar. The modifications I make here in order to present

the analysis more clearly to those unfamiliar with Relational Grammar introduce some theoretical imprecision into the discussion. For a more technically accurate discussion of these data, see Gerdts (in preparation).

³In clauses like (13) where the final object is a first or second person, and thus represented by a pronominal clitic, the third person subject clitic is required even when a nominal (Juan) is present. This is not the case when the final object is a third person nominal, as seen in (14).

⁴The GEN case is also used for possessors:

(i) ni nanang ko 'my mother'
 det mother 1GEN

⁵In actuality, the proper formulation of the condition on antecedents of Reflexives is somewhat more complicated. See Gerdts (in preparation) for discussion.

⁶In Relational Grammar, the accepted version of Antipassive involves retreat of the initial S to O, thus motivating the chomage of the initial O, and a re-advancement of the retreat O to S, represented as follows:

(i)	(1)	S	O
	(2)	O	CHO
	(3)	S	CHO

Originally proposed by Postal (1977), this version of Antipassive has been argued for in Choctaw by Davies (1984). Although many languages are thought to have Antipassives, the Choctaw case is the sole evidence put forward for the analysis above. As I have found no evidence to justify the more complicated analysis, I use the simplified version of Antipassive given in (24) for the time being, noting that such an analysis violates a law proposed as universal by Perlmutter and Postal (1983)—the Motivated Chomage Law.

⁷For a detailed discussion of pag—an, see Gerdts (in preparation).

⁸Ilokano also has advancements of various oblique relations to object; see Gerdts (in preparation) for discussion.

⁹Note that if only one ag- is present in (32), the

sentence is grammatical but has a different meaning: 'In whose place does mother wait?'

¹⁰In some cases which are outside the scope of the present discussion inheritance is blocked as predicted by Gibson and Raposo (to appear).

¹¹Causatives like (i) are also possible; I claim that the source of such Causatives is an intransitive verb with -um- not ag-:

(i) P-in-a-taray n-ak ni Juan.
 pst-cs-run 3GEN-1NOM det J.
 'John made me run.'

See Gerdts (in preparation) for discussion.

¹²Many other languages have Causatives which involve Antipassive in the embedded clause; see, for example, Gerdts (1980a), Gibson (1980), and Gibson and Raposo (to appear).

¹³The Satellite Principle is intended to accommodate verbal morphology which interfaces with the syntax--that is, derivational morphology of the type that signals valency changes, transitivity, etc. It is not intended to characterize inflectional morphology such as past tense. In Gerdts (in preparation) I give examples which involve both prefixes and suffixes in Ilokano; I give a more precise version of the Satellite Principle to accommodate these data.

¹⁴Note that 3GEN na- + 1NOM -ak = nak exhibits the same simplification.

¹⁵Causatives like (44) have led Silva-Corvalan to posit that pa- is an older and more productive form than pag-; in comparison, the skewed distribution of pa- and pag- is automatically accounted for under my analysis.

¹⁶Note that Causatives which involve Antipassive in the embedded clause, OCU, and then Antipassive again are not possible. A language specific constraint is needed to account for these. Halkomelem, as noted in Gerdts (1981) also blocks such Causatives.

¹⁷In Gerdts (1979a, 1979b, 1980b, and in preparation) I give a more thorough treatment of the Passive Analysis in Ilokano.

¹⁸ In Gerdts (1980b, in preparation) I give a much broader class of data. Note that the class of constructions referring to final ABS in the Ergative Analysis would be characterized as Role-related by Schachter (1977) and those referring to final S in the Ergative Analysis would be Reference-related. For a comparison of a grammar making reference to grammatical relations versus one referring to Topic/Focus, see Gerdts (in preparation).

¹⁹ Bell (1976) also addressed this problem. Bell (1981a, 1981b) points out the theoretical consequences of their analysis.

²⁰ In fact, Bell (1981a, 1981b) compares Relational Grammar to Lexical Syntax (as developed by Bresnan and others) and concludes that "LS cannot mimic any RG analysis involving such a non-realizable stratum." (Bell, 1981b, p. 21) Note, however, under the Ergative Analysis, there is no abstract level, as reiterated below; thus Philippine Causatives do not provide an argument for preferring RG to frameworks which do not allow abstract syntactic levels.

²¹ Note that Bell and Perlmutter could have posited instead an analysis which involved Antipassive in the embedded clause in (58), but again, such an analysis would be unmotivated elsewhere in the grammar under the Passive Analysis; furthermore, such an analysis would also have no account for pag-.

²² For an excellent discussion of the advancement of various obliques to subject, see Bell (1983). In Gerdts (1979a), I applied Bell's arguments from Cebuano to the parallel Ilokano data.

²³ Note that not only Passive but all cases of advancements to subject result in the lack of active verbal morphology.

²⁴ Gibson and Raposo (to appear) suggest an alternative α
to Bell and Perlmutter which involves a different type of Clause Union for Causatives like (58); they posit that the embedded S (not the embedded O) is the O in the Union, as represented below:

(i)

	'read' basa	ni Juan	'me' ak	'one story' iti maysa nga istoria	
	(1)	S	S	O	
pa-	(2)	S	O	CHO	ccu
Ø	(3)	CHO	S	CHO	Passive
		NOM	NOM	OBL	

Note, however, that their analysis, as does Bell and Perlmutter's, fails to predict the proper verbal morphology pag-. Furthermore, they fail to consider other Causatives; for example, Causatives like (57), where the embedded O is the S of the Causative, would present a problem to this analysis.

Bibliography

- Aissen, J. 1974. Verb raising. *Linguistic Inquiry* 5.324-66.
- Bell, S. 1976. Cebuano subjects in two frameworks. Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- 1981a. Analysis of causatives of transitives in Hiligaynon in relational grammar and extended lexicalist theory. Annual Meeting of the Canadian Linguistic Association, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
- 1981b. Comparative restrictiveness of relational grammar and lexical syntax. *Lingua* 55.1-39.
- S. 1983. Advancements and ascensions in Cebuano. *Studies in relational grammar 1*, ed. by D. Perlmutter. University of Chicago Press.
- , and D. Perlmutter (to appear). Clause union and advancements in three Philippine languages.
- Davies, W. 1984. Antipassive: Choctaw evidence for a universal characterization. *Studies in relational grammar 2*, ed. by D. Perlmutter and C. Rosen. University of Chicago Press. pp. 331-377.
- Gerdts, D. 1979a. Oblique advancement and focus in Ilokano. Annual Meeting of the Canadian Linguistic Association, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, June, 1979.
- 1979b. Out of control in Ilokano. Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society. pp. 81-93.

- . 1980a. Antipassives and causatives in Halkomelem. Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, pp. 300-314.
- . 1980b. Towards an ergative analysis of Ilokano. Annual Meeting of the Canadian Linguistic Association, Montreal, Quebec.
- . 1981. Object and absolutive in Halkomelem Salish. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, San Diego.
- . in preparation. The ergative structure of Philippine languages.
- Gibson, J. 1980. Clause union in Chamorro and universal grammar. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, San Diego.
- , and E. Raposo. to appear. Clause union, the stratal uniqueness law and the chomeur relation.
- Perlmutter, D. 1980. Relational grammar. Syntax and semantics: current approaches to syntax, ed. by E. Moravcsik and J. Wirth. Academic Press 13.195-229.
- . (ed.) 1983. Studies in relational grammar 1. University of Chicago Press.
- , and P. Postal. 1974. Lectures on relational grammar. Summer Linguistic Institute of the Linguistic Society of America, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- , ----- . 1983. Some proposed laws of basic clause structure. Studies in relational grammar 1, ed. by Perlmutter. University of Chicago Press, pp. 81-128.
- Postal, P. 1977. Antipassive in French. Proceeding of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society. Cambridge, Mass: MIT. Reprinted in *Linguisticae Investigationes* 1.333-74.
- Schachter, P. 1977. Reference-related and role-related properties of subjects. Syntax and semantics: grammatical relations, ed. by P. Cole and J. Sadock. Academic Press 8.279-306.
- Silva-Corvalan, C. 1978. The Ilokano causative in universal grammar. Proceeding of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, pp. 223-237.