

# A Study on the Behavior of Cebuano Pronouns in Discourse\*

Michael Tanangkingsing  
*National Taipei University of Technology*

Sometimes reference grammars are limited in space and time and thus cannot always describe some given aspects of a language very accurately. Linguistics studies certainly help to fill this gap. Using narrative and conversational data, this paper attempts to accomplish this and aims to contribute to Cebuano linguistics and the study of pronouns by looking at two phenomena involving pronominal expressions in Cebuano discourse. First, I will show that two third-person pronouns never co-occur in the same clause. In transitive clauses with two human participants, only one will be referred to using a pronominal form; the other one will either be in zero form, if more topical, or in lexical form, if less topical. Second, I will investigate the factors that lead to a choice between the genitive form and the possessive form in expressing the Actor participant in a transitive event clause, identified as definiteness, verb type, and structure of the verb complex. The use of a possessive form will involve the pre-posing of the pronoun form to a pre-verb slot, which may also be a factor that contributes to word order change.

Key words: Cebuano, pronoun, discourse, definiteness

## 1. Introduction

Pronouns are words used in place of a noun, and usually grammar descriptions of languages would list them in a table and label their corresponding person, number, case, and gender. Their use is seemingly straightforward and requires very little explanation. It is therefore extremely rare to find any lengthy account of pronoun forms and pronoun use in language reference books.

In fact, pronouns are useful devices for avoiding repetition, redundancy, and achieving brevity and clarity of expression (Siewierska 2004:173). In other words, once a person or object has been mentioned in a text or discourse, speakers are likely to use a pronoun in succeeding references. In technical terms, pronominal forms emerge as markers of referents which exhibit mid-high to high accessibility; the referent is already in the forefront of the hearer's and speaker's consciousness (Siewierska 2004:173-174). That is, they are the current topic or focus of talk.

Gundel et al. (1993, 2010) propose the Givenness Hierarchy, which states that

---

\* This paper was presented at the 19<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Historical Linguistics (ICHL) in Osaka, Japan, July 25-30, 2011, the 1<sup>st</sup> Asia Pacific Corpus Linguistics Conference (APCLC) in Auckland, New Zealand, February 15-19, 2012, and the 12<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (ICAL) in Bali, Indonesia, July 2-6, 2012. I thank the audience at these conferences for their valuable comments and suggestions, and the College of Humanities and Social Sciences of Taipei Tech for funding my participation at ICAL. I especially thank Lawrence Reid and Dongyi Lin for their valuable suggestions and comments on my paper, as well as Reijiro Shibasaki for inviting me to present a paper at the Workshop on Pronouns in 19-ICHL. Finally, I am grateful to the anonymous reviewers for providing helpful comments and suggestions. However, all remaining errors are mine.

natural languages have determiners and pronouns that encode information about the cognitive status of the referent at the point just before the nominal form is encountered. Normally, when a participant is already accessible to the hearer (or already mentioned by the speaker), a pronoun is used to track this referent (Pebbley 1999:38), whereas when a third person participant is introduced and thus not as accessible, a lexical noun phrase is used.

There have been many descriptions of pronouns on a number of Austronesian languages, but very few studies on Austronesian languages have described the behavior of pronouns in discourse texts. Most notable are Nagaya on Tagalog (2006), Ewing on Cirebon Javanese (2001), and Tanangkingsing on Cebuano (2009). Nagaya (2006) presented Tagalog data showing that zero anaphora exists alongside pronominal expressions (see discussion of Tagalog excerpt in Section 3). Ewing (2001:25) noted that in Cirebon Javanese, highly accessible referents are usually left unexpressed. Furthermore, Tanangkingsing (2009) conducted a preliminary investigation on the referential expressions in Cebuano discourse, which are briefly reported in Section 2 of this paper.

In this paper Cebuano pronouns will be examined in more depth than what has been reported in Tanangkingsing (2009), particularly the avoidance of two third-person pronouns in the same clause and the choice between a possessive form and a genitive form in expressing the Actor A participant in a transitive event clause,<sup>1</sup> but some basic explanations of the pronoun forms in Cebuano will first be provided in Section 2, as well as some findings in recent research studies on referential forms in this language. Then the two main issues involving pronouns investigated here will be discussed. In Section 3, I will discuss the distribution of the nominative and genitive forms of third-person pronouns in discourse and will show that they do not co-occur in the same clause. In Section 4, I discuss the factors behind the choice between the post-verbal genitive form and the pre-verbal possessive form, which I identify as definiteness, verb type, and structure of the verb complex; I also investigate the role played by the choice between a possessive and a genitive pronominal form in word order changes in Cebuano. Finally, Section 5 concludes this paper. This whole endeavor is an attempt to fill the gap in our understanding of pronouns, not only in Cebuano but hopefully also in other languages.

My data consists of narratives and conversations collected in between 2002 and 2007 with the help of native Cebuano speakers mostly in their twenties at the time of

---

<sup>1</sup> For convenience, the letter symbols A, S, and P are used in this study. S refers to the lone argument in an intransitive clause, while A and P refer to the doer and the receiver of an action, respectively, in a transitive clause. For example, in the intransitive clause, *Paul ran away*, *Paul* is referred to as the S argument. In the transitive clause, *Paul brought his pet dog to school*, *Paul* and *his pet dog* are the A and P participants, respectively.

the recording. There are five Pear narratives totaling approximately 30 minutes in length, and the conversation data collected run about 2.5 hours. The narratives were recorded by individual speakers after they have been shown the Pear Film.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, each of the five conversation episodes was recorded by two Cebuano speakers for an approximate duration of thirty minutes, and the talk revolved around life in Taiwan and in their hometown in Cebu and Mindanao, where Cebuano is predominantly spoken. In an attempt to place this study of Cebuano pronouns within a larger Austronesian perspective, I also make use of spoken narrative data in Seediq and Kavalan, both taken from the NTU Formosan Language Corpus, and narrative data from Yakan texts (Behrens 2007). The examples of Seediq and Kavalan are from the aforementioned NTU Corpus, while the Yakan excerpts are from Behrens (2007). However, in order to illustrate a contrast or an unusual phenomenon more clearly, constructed sentences in Cebuano are also provided whenever necessary.

## 2. Pronouns in Cebuano

This section will mostly recapitulate the findings obtained in Tanangkingsing (2009). First, I will start off with a description of Cebuano pronouns from a syntactic perspective in Section 2.1 and from a discourse point of view in Section 2.2.

### 2.1 Pronoun forms and their functions

I will start with a brief account of what earlier reference grammars have written on Cebuano pronouns. Bunye & Yap (1971) discussed four classes of pronouns — nominative, possessive, genitive, and dative — and provided brief descriptions, as well as sample sentences with translations. In Pigafetta (ms.), possessive and genitive were treated as belonging to the same possessive category. Information contained in both references was purely descriptive with sample sentences and their translations. This study will discuss two issues related to pronouns in Cebuano that have not been touched upon in these previous grammars. Table 1 shows the pronominal forms in Cebuano.

As shown in Table 1, there are nominative, possessive, genitive, dative, and locative pronoun forms in Cebuano. First, the nominative pronouns have a long form and a short clitic form. The short-form clitic Nominative pronoun usually expresses the sole S argument in an intransitive event, as in (1a), and the undergoer or P referent in a transitive event, as in (1b); if the referent is not pronominalized, the lexical form is marked by *ang*, for common nouns, or *si*, for proper nouns. When the referent is

---

<sup>2</sup> The Pear Film can be viewed at <http://www.linguistics.ucsb.edu/faculty/chafe/pearfilm.htm>.

topicalized, or moved to the front of the clause, for emphasis, then the long independent form is used, as in (2).<sup>3</sup>

**Table 1. Pronoun paradigm in Cebuano**

	Nominative	Possessive	Genitive	Dative	Locative
1 <sup>st</sup> person sing	<i>ako</i> = <i>ko</i>	<i>ako</i> '(- <i>a</i> )	= <i>nako</i> '	<i>kanako</i> '	<i>sa ako</i> '
2 <sup>nd</sup> person sing	<i>ikaw</i> = <i>ka</i>	<i>imo</i> (- <i>ha</i> )	= <i>nimo</i>	<i>kanimo</i>	<i>sa imo</i>
3 <sup>rd</sup> person sing	<i>siya</i> = <i>siya</i>	<i>iya</i> (- <i>ha</i> )	= <i>niya</i>	<i>kaniya</i>	<i>sa iya</i>
1 <sup>st</sup> person pl ex	<i>kami</i> = <i>mi</i>	<i>amo</i> '(- <i>a</i> )	= <i>namo</i> '	<i>kanamo</i> '	<i>sa amo</i> '
1 <sup>st</sup> person pl in	<i>kita</i> = <i>ta</i>	<i>ato</i> '(- <i>a</i> )	= <i>nato</i> '	<i>kanato</i> '	<i>sa ato</i> '
2 <sup>nd</sup> person	<i>kamo</i> = <i>mo</i>	<i>inyo</i> (- <i>ha</i> )	= <i>ninyo</i>	<i>kaninyo</i>	<i>sa inyo</i>
3 <sup>rd</sup> person	<i>silá</i> = <i>silá</i>	<i>ilá</i> (- <i>ha</i> )	= <i>nilá</i>	<i>kanilá</i>	<i>sa ilá</i>

- (1) a. intransitive construction in Cebuano (constructed)<sup>4,5</sup>

*ni-adto=siya sa Bohol*

INTR-go=3SG.NOM LOC PN

'He/She went to Bohol.'

- b. transitive construction (constructed)

*gi-hulat=siya ni Juan*

PFV.PV-wait=3SG.NOM GEN PN

'Juan waited for him/her.'

- (2) topicalization of pronoun (constructed)

*siya, ni-adto sa Bohol*

3SG.TOP<sup>6</sup> INTR-go LOC PN

'(As for) him/her, (he/she) went to Bohol.'

The possessive and genitive pronoun forms occur in nominal phrases to express possession; when attached to verbs, they represent the Actor A participant in a

<sup>3</sup> Regarding the third-person pronoun forms in Cebuano, I express them using the bound form when they are in the second position of the clause, and as a long form when they are topicalized. They are found to strictly refer only to humans in many Formosan languages, but they can be used also to indicate inanimate objects and abstract ideas in Cebuano, although this is a rare use.

<sup>4</sup> The glosses follow the List of Standard Abbreviations in the Leipzig Glossing Rules. Additional abbreviations are listed as follows: AT: atemporal, AV: actor voice, CERT: certainty, CIRC: circumstantial, DEF: definitizer, DM: discourse marker, EMPH: emphasizer, EVID: evidential, EXIST: existential, EXT: extended argument, FIL: filler, FS: false start, INTENS: intensifier particle; INTERJ: interjection particle, IV: instrumental voice, L2: foreign language, LK: linker, LV: locative voice, NEUT: neutral, PART: particle, PN: proper name, PV: patient voice, and SPONT: spontaneous.

<sup>5</sup> Clitic pronouns and enclitic particles are indicated by the equal sign '=' in the examples.

<sup>6</sup> As discussed in the preliminaries in Section 2, when topicalized, pronominal referents are expressed using the nominative form.

transitive clause. They serve the same function and thus are sometimes referred to by the same names, genitive-1 and genitive-2, or as possessives (Pigafetta, ms.), since the only difference between them is their distribution: what I call in Table 1 possessive forms occur to the left side of the head word, as illustrated in (3a) and (4), while the genitive forms occur to the right of the head word, as illustrated in (3b). Also, both forms are linked to their head words by the ligature *nga*.<sup>7</sup>

(3) a. Possessive form before head verb

*ako=ng*            *gi-ingn-an*    *ako=ng*            *igso'on*  
 1SG.POSS=LK    PFV-say-LV    1SG.POSS=LK    sibling  
 'I told my sister,'

b. Genitive form after head verb (constructed based on #3a)

*gi-ingn-an=nako'*    *ako=ng*            *igso'on*  
 PFV-say-LV=1SG.GEN 1SG.POSS=LK    sibling  
 'I told my sister,'

(4) Possessive and genitive forms with the head noun

*ako=ng*            *igso'on*,    *nag-hikog=pud*            *e*  
 1SG.POSS=LK    sibling    INTR-hang.rope=also    DM  
*igso'on=nako'*  
 sibling=1SG.GEN  
 'My brother, (he) also killed himself, (that) brother of mine'

Despite this availability of two forms to choose from and the fact that both forms are actually used by speakers, previous grammars have failed to explain this phenomenon. In addition, in Section 4 of this paper I will also investigate the motivation for the preference of one form over the other.

The possessive forms have additional features. First, they have an optional *-a* suffix. When the pronoun form ends with a vowel sound, namely, the second-person and third-person pronoun forms, an /h/ sound is inserted, so the forms become *imo(h)a*, *iya(h)a*, *inyo(h)a*, and *ila(h)a*. Second, the possessive form preceding the head noun actually functions like a determiner, as in (5), but it can also stand alone with a zero head noun, as shown in (6).

<sup>7</sup> *Nga* is a ligature, glossed 'LK', usually to link a modifier to the head noun (with numerals the ligature may be the *ka* form). The modifier may be positioned to the left or right of the head noun, and if the preceding word ends with a vowel sound, the ligature is shortened to *ng* and cliticized to the end of the previous word. It has also been argued that both forms have slightly different meanings. However, I shall not delve on this issue as it is not the main focus of this paper.

- (5) possessive form preceding a head noun

*sa ako'a=ng gi-puy'-an karon*

LOC 1SG.POSS=LK PFV-reside-LV.NMLZ now

*panagsa=ra=gyud=siya mo-pauli'*

rare=just=INTENS=3SG.NOM INTR-return

'Where I'm living right now, he very rarely comes home (there).'

- (6) possessive form occurring alone without a head noun

*ako'a-sad, gusto=nako' ang sa byenan bitaw*

1SG.POSS-also like=1SG.GEN ANG LOC in law DM

'(In) my (opinion) too, I'd prefer that, in terms of (my relationship with (my)) in-laws, ...'

The dative and the locative forms are less problematic. They are used to indicate oblique pronominal referents, especially as extended arguments in intransitive clauses, as in (7). It is also common in Cebuano for the locative form to be similar to the genitive form, as shown in (8), where *nako'* is supposed to be the locative *sa ako'*. Similarly, the locative form in (7) can also be possibly uttered as *nako'*.

- (7) locative form with case marker *sa*

*wala=y mo-sugat sa ako'*

NEG=NEUT INTR-pick 1SG.LOC

'Nobody will pick me up (at the airport).'

- (8) locative pronoun taking the genitive form

*ika=y m-angutana nako' Bert*

*ikaw=y m-pangutana sa.ako' Bert*

2SG.NOM=NEUT INTR-ask 1SG.LOC PN

'You'll (be the one to) ask me (a question), Bert.'

As mentioned earlier, in this study, I will touch on two pronoun-related phenomena, namely, the avoidance of two third-person pronouns in the same clause and the choice between possessive and genitive forms. The former phenomenon involves the nominative and genitive forms, while the latter possessive and genitive forms. From this point on, dative and locative forms will not be discussed.

## 2.2 Referential functions of Cebuano pronouns

From the discourse point of view, the first and second person pronouns in Cebuano behave rather rigidly, as shown in Table 2, which is based on conversational

data.

**Table 2. Distribution of referential expressions (conversation)**

	1 <sup>st</sup> person		2 <sup>nd</sup> person		3 <sup>rd</sup> person	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Lexical NP	-		-		<b>124</b>	<b>34.9</b>
Demonstrative + head	-		-		<b>36</b>	<b>10.1</b>
Personal pronoun	15	100	12	92.3	<b>95</b>	<b>26.8</b>
Demonstrative pronoun	-		-		<b>8</b>	<b>2.3</b>
Zero anaphora	-		1	7.7	<b>92</b>	<b>25.9</b>
Total	15	100	13	100	355	100

It can be seen from Table 2 that first and second person pronouns are obligatory, except in imperative constructions where the second-person pronominal form is optionally omitted in direct orders. Compared to the speech-act participants, third-person forms are much more interesting in that they can take various forms, namely, lexical form (45%), pronominal (or demonstrative) form (29%), or zero form (26%), as shown in Table 2. However, this is misleading and does not actually paint a clear picture of the use of referential expressions in Cebuano, for one is inclined to ask: When do speakers use a lexical form, a pronominal form, or a zero form?

If we take a closer look at the contexts where the third-person referential forms are used, we find a significant difference between the forms chosen to express human and nonhuman referents. Let's look at Table 3, which is based on conversational data.

As shown in Table 3, in close to half of the instances (45.3 percent) human referents are expressed in pronominal form, just like the human speech act participants. Looking at it from another angle, pronominal forms are overwhelmingly (>90 percent) used to refer to human entities. Moreover, it is also not surprising that some are expressed lexically (around 30.2 percent), especially when they are introduced into discourse for the first time, as shown in (9) and (10).

In (9), the speakers are talking about people committing suicide, and one of the people being talked about is the younger brother of one of the speakers, who is introduced into the discourse for the first time using a full noun phrase with a possessive first person pronoun form *akong igso'on* 'my sibling.'

In (10), the speaker is using all possible means to identify a person for the hearer, and each time, a lexical form is used: *usa (nga-)* 'one [NP]', *trabahante sa usa ka-* 'a worker at one [NP]', and *taga/sa gobyerno* '[a worker] from the government'.

**Table 3. Humanness and third-person referential expressions (conversation)**

	Human		Non-human	
	N	%	N	%
Lexical NP	44	20.8	<b>80</b>	<b>55.9</b>
Demonstrative + head	20	9.4	<b>16</b>	<b>11.2</b>
Personal pronoun	<b>94</b>	<b>44.3</b>	1	0.7
Demonstrative pronoun	<b>2</b>	<b>1.0</b>	6	4.2
Zero anaphora	52	24.5	<b>40</b>	<b>28.0</b>
Total	212	100	143	100

(9) lexical form for human referent 1

*ako=ng igso'on=pud nag-hikog e*  
 1SG.POSS=LK sibling=also AV-hang.rope DM  
 'My brother too, (he) committed suicide.'

(10) lexical form for human referent 2

*ganiha nay ni-larga, usa nga<sup>8</sup>*  
 a.while.ago EXIST AV-leave one LK  
*trabahante=man=kuno=to sa usa ka-*  
 worker=PART=EVID=that LOC one LK  
*taga- sa gubyrno, gi-hold wa' gi-pa-larga*  
 from LOC government PFV.PV-detain NEG PFV.PV-CAUS-leave  
 'A while ago, somebody (was about to) leave, a w-, they say it's a worker of a com-, from a government agency, (he was) detained, (they) didn't allow (him) to leave.'

On the other hand, when we look at nonhuman referents, we find them overwhelmingly expressed in lexical form (67.1 percent), an unsurprising finding inasmuch as they are less likely to be topical, and in conversation, topics are generally human referents that act on these nonhuman objects. Consequently, there is also a frequent need to introduce new nonhuman NPs into the discourse, usually through the S and P slots. Sometimes they occur in the Extended Argument slots in intransitive clauses,<sup>9</sup> wherein they are less likely to be tracked in the following discourse (Huang

<sup>8</sup> The examples are mostly taken from a spoken corpus, which contains repetitions and repair, so words are sometimes truncated in the middle of a clause. These truncations are indicated by a hyphen '-' at the end of a lexical unit.

<sup>9</sup> Intransitive clauses only have one argument, which is labeled S. When semantically transitive verbs are used intransitively (to refer to intransitive events, in which no Patient is affected by the action), the semantic Patient is usually marked as a non-core argument in Philippine-type languages. In Cebuano, this non-core semantic Patient is usually marked by *ug*, which I label *E*, for *Extended argument*. Es,



& Tanangkingsing 2011). Close to a third of the nonhuman referents are either in zero form or in pronominal/demonstrative form, in instances where they become topical, as in (11).

(11) topical inanimate referent

*wise=ka'ay=na' si josie e*  
 wise=EMPH=that SI PN DM  
*layo'=pa, iya=ng pa-kit'-an ( ), way abri ( )*  
 far=still 3SG.POSS=LK CAUS-see-LV NEG open

‘Josie is so wise. (When she’s) still far away (from the customs), she’d show (the officials *the money inserted in her passport*). (They’d) not open (*her luggage*).’

Excerpt (11) is a summary of a talk about a mutual friend Josie’s experience at the airport’s arrival hall; the omitted referents in the second line, *money inserted in her passport* and *her luggage*, were already known to both speakers. More often, pronoun forms are reserved for human referents and not preferred for inanimate objects, but theoretically they can still refer to nonhuman referents, as in (12). In (12), the speakers are comparing the commercial development of certain places in the Philippines; the third-person form *siya* in the utterance refers to one of the cities.

(12) demonstrative form for inanimate referent

*pero dili- dili'=ka'ayo=ka- ku'an- dili'=siya progressive*  
 but NEG NEG=very=2SG.NOM KUAN NEG=3SG.NOM progressive

‘But you’re not- you’re not- it’s not (a) progressive (area).’

Now let us consider Table 4. Table 4 shows the distribution of the pronouns and the zero forms in terms of A, S, and P. We find that the A’s and S’s, which are generally human, tend to be pronominal and the P’s, which are usually nonhuman, tend to be expressed as zero anaphora. The figures so far seem to suggest that Cebuano distinguishes between human and nonhuman referents. That is, human referents are preferred to be pronominal while nonhuman referents are preferred to be zero. Such a result is expected and confirms a phenomenon that must be also true for other languages like Yakan. In Yakan, “an animate absolute third-person is represented by *iye* or *siye*, but an inanimate absolute third-person is represented by a zero anaphor” (Brainard & Behrens 2002:39), as illustrated in (13a) and (13b).<sup>10</sup>

---

which are non-core, are found not to participate in the tracking of participants. The intransitive clauses which contain an E argument are called Extended Intransitive Clause constructions (EIC), a term coined by Dixon (1994).

<sup>10</sup> The Yakan study compares animates with inanimates, which is for reference only. In Cebuano,

**Table 4. NP form and grammatical relations<sup>11</sup>**

	Pronoun		zero		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	33	56.9	25	43.1	58	100
S	<b>66</b>	<b>71.7</b>	26	28.3	92	100
P	16	38.1	<b>26</b>	<b>61.9</b>	42	100
	113		77		192	

(13) a. Yakan (Brainard & Behrens 2002:39, example 145)

*pogpog-ne iye*  
hit-ERG.3SG ABS.3SG  
'He hit him.'

b. Yakan (Brainard & Behrens 2002:39, example 146)

*pogpog-ne*  
hit-ERG.3SG  
'He hit it.'

The trend is even clearer in Table 5.

**Table 5. Humanness, grammatical relations, and syntactic form (Pear Stories)**

		lexical		Pronominal		Zero		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A	human	4	<b>7.4</b>	31	<b>57.4</b>	19	<b>35.2</b>	54	100
	non-human	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
S	human	13	<b>17.6</b>	42	<b>56.7</b>	19	<b>25.7</b>	74	100
	non-human	13	<b>86.7</b>	0	<b>0</b>	2	<b>13.3</b>	15	100
P	human	3	<b>20</b>	11	<b>73.3</b>	1	<b>6.7</b>	15	100
	non-human	16	<b>43.2</b>	1	<b>2.7</b>	20	<b>54.1</b>	37	100
Total	human	20	<b>14.0</b>	84	<b>58.7</b>	39	<b>27.3</b>	143	100
	non-human	29	<b>55.8</b>	1	<b>1.9</b>	22	<b>42.3</b>	52	100
		49		85		61		195	

Table 5 analyzes the referential expressions in terms of humanness, grammatical relations, and syntactic form. First, A's are always human and overwhelmingly topical;

animate non-human referents in the data are treated similarly as inanimate in terms of syntax, as they also prefer the use of either full noun phrase or zero anaphora, except of course if they were personified.

<sup>11</sup> The figures are based on Pear Story narratives and a ten-minute long conversational excerpt. In addition, the Es are not included in the count, but based on my observation and impression, they are predominantly inanimate and lexical.

that is, they are pronominal or in zero form. Second, the majority of human participants are undoubtedly pronominal. Third, the non-human referents are lexical (when they are newly introduced into the discourse) or in zero form (when they have become topical in the P slot).

To summarize, there are different linguistic means used to refer to human and non-human participants in actual discourse, especially when they are topical. More accessible referents, which are more topical, tend to be expressed in forms toward the left of Gundel et al.'s Givenness hierarchy (1993) or Ariel's (1990) accessibility marking scale: zero < . . . < pronouns < . . . < demonstratives < . . . < full name. Of course, to some extent, the preference of one form over another is language and construction specific; it depends on the repertoire of encoding devices that a given language has at its disposal. In Cebuano, topical nonhuman referents are expressed in zero form, while topical human referents are preferred to be expressed using pronominal expressions.

The preference which languages like Cebuano and Yakan have for expressing human participants in pronoun form and non-human objects in lexical form or as zero anaphora reflects the behavior of pronouns in Austronesian languages being used more to refer to human referents and less for non-human referents. This might have basis in what happens in actual interaction, where people talk more often about other people, while the non-human objects being discussed change more often, and so there is very little opportunity to use pronouns to refer to them, as they are often "abandoned," so to speak, after just one mention and are thus more frequently referred to using full noun phrases.

### **3. Avoidance of two third-person pronominal forms in a single clause**

In this section I discuss the first issue involving pronouns by showing that in Cebuano discourse, speakers don't prefer the use of two third-person pronominal forms in a single clause. To do this, I needed to look at transitive clauses.<sup>12</sup> As they are transitive, the A arguments of these clauses are more topical than the P's, which are normally inanimate objects handled by the human A. However, as human participants tend to be pronominalized more than non-human referents, I looked for clauses with two human participants, so it is possible that the Patient/Recipient participant will in certain instances be more topical. Moreover, for the purposes of this

---

<sup>12</sup> The transitive clauses include so-called "ditransitive" clauses in other languages like English, where a clause can take two objects, the Recipient and the Theme. This "ditransitive" construction is not possible in Cebuano; instead, the Theme is expressed as an extended (E) argument marked by the marker *ug* in what is termed the Extended Locative Voice (ELV) construction (see Tanangkingsing 2009).

study, I also looked at Extended Intransitive Clause (EIC) constructions, where two human characters participate in an event. In these constructions, the S referent is more topical than the Extended human argument (cf. Huang & Tanangkingsing 2011).

At the initial phase, I considered narratives as more ideal than conversational data, inasmuch as in conversation, the speakers more often talk about themselves. While first-person and second-person participants are obligatorily pronominal, the clauses involving speech-act participants are not restricted by this “only-one-pronominal-form” rule. Moreover, in narratives speakers usually tell stories about people and things. The Pear stories were narrated by the speakers after they were shown a six-minute film about a boy stealing pears from an old man, encountering a girl while he takes the pears on his bike, and coming across three boys along his way. Since it was more possible to find a few transitive events involving two human participants, I checked the Pear narratives first.

I obtained 17 clauses with human Agents and human Patients (or Ss and Es in EIC constructions). Of these clauses, 14 had A’s that were more topical than the P’s, while only 3 had P’s more topical than the A’s. As expected, in each of the clauses only one of the two human participants is expressed in pronominal form. The second human participant is either in zero anaphora form, as in (15), or in lexical form, as in (14), even in clauses where both are at the same time topical.

In the first three clauses of (14), only one of the three boys encountered by the protagonist in the Pear Story is being referred to (notice the singular form), and *he* is expressed in pronominal form (*siya* in line 1 and *iya* in line 3) as the boy is now the focus in this part of the narrative. In line 3, the main protagonist, which is temporarily relegated to the background while the boy is in focus, returns to the scene and is reintroduced into the story by a lexical expression. Having returned to the scene, the main protagonist is now in pronominal form in line 4, while a full NP is used for the other human referent because the referent has changed from just one of the boys to all three of them. Another excerpt is provided in (15).

(14) excerpt from Pear Story

<sup>1</sup>*unya?*    *naka-kita’=man=siya,*    *o*    <sup>2</sup>*na’a=ma=y*    *kalo’*  
 then    INTR-see=PART=3SG.NOM    INTERJ    EXIST=PART=NEUT    hat  
<sup>3</sup>*iya=ng*    *gi-hatag*    *sa*    *ato=ng*    *nag-bisiklita*  
 3SG.POSS=LK    PFV.PV-give    LOC    that=LK    INTR.NMZR-bicycle  
<sup>4</sup>*gi-taga-an=niya*    *ang tulo*    *ka*    *bata’*  
 PFV-give-LV=3SG.GEN    ANG    three    LK    child  
*ug*    *tag-sa*    *ka*    *bu’ok*    *nga*    *prutas*  
 EXT    each-one    LK    piece    LK    fruit

*di',* <sup>5</sup>*mga bata', pag-abot sa= may punu'an*  
 DM PL child NMLZ-arrive LOC by tree  
<sup>6</sup>*kato=ng tawo na-mick up sa prutas*  
 that=LK person INTR-pick.up LOC fruit  
<sup>7</sup>*pag-kana'og=niya usa=na=lang ka bu'uk ka'ing*  
 NMLZ-go.down=3SG.GEN one=already=only LK piece basket  
*na-kit-an=niya*  
 SPONT-see-LV=3SG.GEN

‘Then, he saw (that) there was a hat. He gave (it) to the (child) riding a bike. (The child) he gave the three children one piece of fruit (each). So, the boys, (as they) reached by the tree, that person picking fruits, (upon) his descent from (the tree), he saw only one basket (left).’

**Table 6. Referential tracking in excerpt (14)**

clause	child	boys	hat	fruit	man	basket
1		S (pron)				
2			S (lex) [pres]			
3	<b>Goal (lex)</b>	<b>A (pron)</b>	P (zero)			
4	<b>A (pron)</b>	<b>P (lex)</b>		E (lex)		
5		topic (lex)				
6					topic (lex)	
7					A (pron)	P (lex)

In (15), line 1 reintroduces the three boys encountered by the main protagonist of the Pear Story, so they become the focus of this part of the narrative. In line 3, they are expressed in zero anaphora as they are now more topical while the main protagonist, still topical, is in pronominal form. Notice also that the inanimate ‘fruit’ remains zero throughout, at least in this part of the narrative.

(15) excerpt from Pear Story

<sup>1</sup>... *kadto=ng mga ming-labay nga mga tulo ka bata'*  
 that=LK PL INTR-pass.by LK PL three LK child  
<sup>2</sup>*a na-hulog, di',* <sup>3</sup>*gi-tabang-an=siya=g ( ) pa-nguha'*  
 INTERJ INTR-fall DM PFV-help-LV=3SG.NOM=COMP NMLZ-take  
<sup>4</sup>*gi-balik didto sa iya-ha=ng sudl-an-an*  
 PFV.PV-return there LOC 3SG.POSS-DEF=LK contain-LV-NMLZ

‘Those three children passing by, ... (The basket suddenly) fell, so (they) helped him get (the fruits) and placed (them) back into his basket.’

**Table 7. Referential tracking in excerpt (15)**

clause	child	three boys	fruit	basket
1		topic (lex)		
2			S (zero)	
3	P (pron)	A (zero)	[E (zero)]	
4		A (zero)	P (zero)	Loc (lex)

We now turn to conversation. In ordinary conversation, any reference to a person would almost always involve either one of the speech-act participants. In rare instances where an event talked about involves two non-speech act human participants, the same phenomenon is observed: at most only one of the participants is expressed in pronominal form. Excerpts (16) and (17) below are shown for illustration. In (16) only the P is pronominal while the A is zero; in (17) only the A is pronominal while the P is zero.

(16) conversation

*unya' diha'=kuno sa immigration no/*  
 then there=EVID LOC immigration DM  
*gi-ingn-an=siya (A), money money give me money*  
 PFV-say-LV=3SG.NOM [L2] [L2] [L2] [L2] [L2]  
 'Then (he told me) there at the immigration counter, (the immigration officials) told him, "money, money, give me money!"'

(17) conversation

*pag-pa-dulong=na=siya sa customs,*  
 when-CAUS-toward=already=3SG.NOM LOC customs  
*iya=na=ng dad-'on=niya ang pushcart*  
 3SG.POSS=that=LK take-PV.INF=3SG.GEN ANG pushcart  
 'When she goes to customs, she would take her pushcart.'  
*hay mammammam diri mammammam*  
 hi VOC here VOC  
*kahibawo=na=man na'a=y kwarta na'-*  
 know=already=PART EXIST=NEUT money that  
 'Hi ma'am, here ma'am! (They) already know there's money there (inserted in her passport).'  
*wise=ka'ay=na' si josie e,*  
 wise=EMPH=that SI PN DM  
*layo'=pa, iya=ng pa-kit-'an (P),*  
 far=still 3SG.POSS=LK CAUS-see-LV

*wa=y*            *abri*  
 NEG=NEUT    open

‘Josie really knows (how to go about it). (When) she’s still a distance away, she’ll show (the customs officials the money inserted inside her passport). (Then they) won’t open (her suitcases).’

This phenomenon is not restricted to Cebuano. Tagalog, a more frequently studied Philippine language, also exhibits this avoidance of two pronominal forms. In fact, when Himmelmann (1999:258) strongly stated that, “zero anaphora for actors in undergoer-oriented constructions does not occur in natural Tagalog speech (and writing),” Nagaya (2006) was able to prove otherwise, with the excerpt in (18), which involves two distinct third-person referents. In line 19, the A participants “the three boys” were in zero form with only the Benefactee *child* in pronominal form.

(18) Tagalog, Text X: “Pear story (2)” 011-019 (Nagaya 2006:87)

11. *paglipad*      *nung*      *sombbrero*    *niya*,  
     flying.off      GEN      hat            3SG.GEN
12. *tumalikod*      *siya*.  
     turned.around 3SG.ABS
13. *nasemplang*    *siya*.  
     toppled            3SG.ABS
14. *nalaglag*    *yung*      *mga*      *prutas*      *na*      *dala*      *niya*.  
     fell            ABS      PL      fruit      LK      carry      3SG.ABS
15. *tapos*      *hindi*      *niya*      *na*      *alam*      *yung*  
     then      not      3SG.ERG already      know      ABS  
     *gagawin*      *niya*  
     will.be.doing 3SG.ERG
16. *nahirapan*      *na*      *siya*  
     had.difficulty already 3SG.ERG
17. *may*      *nakakita*      *sa*      *kanyang*      *tatlong*      *batang*  
     exist      saw            DAT      3SG.DAT-LK      three-LK      child-LK
18. *tatlong*      *bata*      *na*      *namamasyal*  
     three-LK      child      LK      roaming.around
19. *tinulungan* ( )      *siyang*      *ilagay*      *yung*      *prutas*      *sa*      *kaing*  
     helped      A      3SG.ABS      put      ABS      fruit      DAT      basket

‘When his hat flew off, he turned around. He toppled down. The fruits he was carrying fell down. Then he did not know what he would do. He had difficulty. There were three children who were roaming around who saw him. (They)

helped him to put the fruits back into the basket.’

This holds true for Kagayanen as well (Pebley 1999). Pebley noted that if the participants are all third person singular, then there is referential competition. Only one participant, not two, can be referred to with one type of pronoun in a given clause; no two third-person pronominal forms can occur in two-participant clauses. One is almost always encoded using a higher or lower accessibility form than the other.

I also checked the National Taiwan University Archives for Formosan Languages for data from other languages as well. I proceeded directly to the parts that feature two human participants, namely, the old man and the boy at the start of the narrative, the boy meeting the girl on a bike, and one of the three boys returning the hat to its owner. The same phenomenon was observed: No two third-person pronominal forms in the same clause. Examples are given in (19) to (21), which illustrate the first event featuring the old man and the boy. In each instance, the old man is consistently coded with a higher accessible form than the boy or the boy with a goat.

(19) Cebuano Pear 5:8

*unya’ gi-agi-an=lang=siya* ( )  
 then PFV-pass-LV=only=3SG.NOM (A)  
 ‘Then (he) just passed by him.’

(20) Seediq Pear 3:9

*miyah mita u, ( ) ya na miyah mowi nasi na hay*  
 come see PART EPIS he come steal pear his PART  
 ‘(He) came down to check, (he) thought (that) person was going to steal his pears.’

(21) Seediq Pear 1:19-21

*niqan kian laqi senaw,*  
 EXIST one child male  
*tapa densia, muda siyaw na*  
 ride bicycle pass beside him  
 ‘A boy, (he) rode a bicycle, and (he) passed beside him.’

Second, the boy met a girl on a bike on his way. In this event, in each of the instances in (22)-(23), the boy is consistently coded with a higher accessibility form than the girl.



(22) Kavalan Pear B29

*sim-qatapung tu usiq ay 'nay qa-zitinsya tazungan nani*  
 RECIP-meet OBL one LK that QA-bicycle female DM  
 '(he) met a girl who rode a bicycle.'

(23) Seediq 56-58, 60

*bobo na qmnita kingan laqi mqedin laqi kiya*  
 then 3SG see one child girl child that  
 'That boy saw a small girl.'

*aapa didensa ka laqi mqedin kiya uri*  
 ride bicycle 3SG child girl that also  
 'That girl was also riding a bicycle.'

*taan na laqi mqedin kiya wa*  
 see 3SG child girl that PART  
 'He saw that girl.'

*lnlungun mu uxe kesun snkahun laqi mqedin kiya ka laqi kiya*  
 thought 1SG NEG that like child girl that LK child that  
 'I think the boy did not really like the girl.'

The third episode depicts a boy returning a hat to its owner. Depending on the story line or how the story is narrated, either one of the boys or the hat owner is pronominalized in (24) and (25).

The last example (25) seems to be a counterexample of the “rule” that I am concerned with in this section. If we look closely at the data, the two human participants are expressed in pronominal forms *na* and *heya*. However, I did not mention that producing two third-person pronominal forms is unacceptable; this is just not preferred at all. Although not preferred, such a construction is still one grammatical resource that speakers can avail themselves of. The excerpt in (25) shows this less preferred construction to be actually used by a speaker.

A possible explanation for the actual occurrence of (25) is the difference between both *na* and *heya*, both third person pronouns, in terms of morphological status; the former is a short-form clitic while the latter a long-form word (Jonathan Kuo, p.c.). In other words, formal variation signals a difference in the degree of topicality, just as lexical and pronominal forms represent varying degrees of speaker/hearer familiarity. Moreover, Kuo (ms.) states that the sequence *na-heya* seems to violate the observation that when third-person pronouns are involved, a ‘Nom-Gen’ cluster is formed; therefore, he suggests based on Blust (1995) and Ross (2006) that there exists a relationship between third person and demonstrative pronouns, and that the form in (25) can in fact be also possibly analyzed as a demonstrative. Moreover, if the

pronoun forms in excerpt (25) conform to the latter analysis above, it would certainly be interesting to see how two pronominal forms, i.e. the free form and the bound form, can signal different nominal statuses, if there is really such a distinction between them.

(24) Cebuano Pear 5:34

*iya=ng gi-uli didto sa bata'*  
 3SG.POSS=LK PFV.PV-return there LOC child  
 'He returned (the hat) to the boy there.'

(25) Seediq 4:92

*s-bege na heya ka bunuh na*  
 IV-give 3SG 3SG LK hat 3SG.POSS  
 'He gave him his hat.'

To summarize, in this section I have shown that the expression of two third-person human referents in pronominal form is not preferred in Cebuano. This is not just limited to singular referents but also to plural ones, as illustrated in (14) and (15), where one of the third-person human referents is a group of boys. Of course, singular third-person human referents seem to be more frequent in discourse than plural third-person referents. In addition, I have examined data not only from Cebuano, but also from other Philippine-type languages, namely, Kagayanen (cf. Pebley 1999), Tagalog (cf. Nagaya 2006), Kavalan, and Seediq, and the data show that the more topical referent will almost always be expressed in zero/clitic form, while the less topical referent will always be expressed in lexical form.

The fact that several languages exhibit this similar phenomenon means that there must be common factors at work in these languages. From the perspective of information processing, speakers and hearers need to avoid confusion in distinguishing between third-person participants, especially in complicated transitive events involving humans. Therefore, as third-person forms are more anaphoric than deictic, the referential expressions have to be distinct enough. In other words, the speakers must agree between themselves the more topical and less topical participants at the current moment and use corresponding forms to help keep track of the characters in the reported events in a narrative or in a conversation.

Moreover, pronouns in Cebuano, as well as most other Philippine-type languages, do not have gender distinction, but is this phenomenon examined here a result of such a lack of gender distinction in the pronouns of this language? Or does it also exist in languages with gender distinction, such as English and Japanese? In fact, Cebuano, English, and Japanese, as well as other languages for that matter, syntactically allow

clauses with two overt third-person pronouns, as illustrated in (26), (27), and (28), respectively.

(26) Cebuano (constructed from 14)

*gi-taga-an=niya            sila*  
 PFV-give-LV=3SG.GEN    3PL.NOM  
*ug            tag-sa            ka   bu'ok            nga   prutas*  
 EXT            each-one            LK   piece            LK   fruit  
 ‘He gave each of them a piece of fruit.’

(27) English (constructed): **She** gave **him** a pen.

(28) Japanese (constructed from Van Valin 2001:60, example 2.77a)

**kanojo**    ga            **kare**        ni    kunsyoo    o        atae-ta  
 3SG.F    NOM        3SG.M    DAT   medal    ACC   give-past  
 ‘She gave him a/the medal.’  
 ‘She gave a/the medal to him.’

The sentences in (26), (27), and (28) each contain two overt human third-person referents expressed in pronominal form (shown in bold), but the languages differ in whether they allow third-person pronouns to co-occur or not. The Cebuano sentence in (26) is theoretically possible, but as this study has shown, such is not attested in actual spoken discourse; only one of them can be expressed pronominally. In terms of referential expressions, English is rather rigid. First, subjects are obligatory, as are objects of transitive verbs, regardless of whether they are full noun phrases or in pronominal form. In other words, the pronominal forms ‘she’ and ‘him’ in (27) should be overtly expressed and cannot be zero. English allows ellipsis of referential expressions only in coordinated clauses with shared elements, or “initial ellipsis” (Biber et al. 2000:156), which is common even in writing. Ellipsis could also be attested in conversational sequences, such as question-and-answer sequences, wherein the referents are recoverable from the preceding immediate context. Of course ellipsis is not the same phenomenon at all as the pronoun “dropping” being presented here. Moreover, Japanese, whose pronouns also possess gender distinction features like English, must also syntactically allow two third-person pronouns in a single clause, as shown in (28), but this language has been known to allow zero anaphoric referential expressions like Cebuano. It is supposed, then, that the same phenomenon as that discussed in this section must be possible in Japanese, albeit maybe in a slightly different way. Therefore, I conjecture that the non-preference for two third-person pronominal forms in a single clause is not the result of a lack of gender distinction but its dependence on whether the language allows pro-dropping; that is, if a language

allows it, the more likely that the phenomenon discussed here will be exhibited.

#### 4. Pronouns and word order

In this section, I will discuss the second issue in this study, namely, how pronouns play a role in word order in Cebuano. The discussion in this section will primarily cover transitive clauses, as intransitive clauses in Cebuano are strictly predicate-initial, as shown in (1), repeated here as (29a). When a pronominal argument of an intransitive clause is moved to pre-verb position, it is topicalized, and the pronoun retains its nominative form, as illustrated in (2), repeated here as (29b), and discussed in Section 2. Topicalization, an entirely different construction, will not be discussed in this study.

(29) a. intransitive construction in Cebuano (constructed)

*ni-adto=siya sa Bohol*  
 INTR-go=3SG.NOM LOC PN  
 ‘He/She went to Bohol.’

b. topicalization construction in Cebuano (constructed)

*siya, ni-adto sa Bohol*  
 3SG.TOP<sup>13</sup> INTR-go LOC PN  
 ‘(As for) him/her, he/she went to Bohol.’

In transitive clauses in Cebuano, the pronominal genitive A may be pre-posed, as in (30a). When there is a pronominal nominative P at the same time, this P will also be very likely to be pre-posed, as shown in (30b), but unlike its A counterpart, the P pronoun retains its nominative case marking. This pre-posing seems to serve for emphasis, while the simultaneous pre-posing of the pronominal P is obligatory unless the P is in full noun phrase form. Both (30a) and (30b) are derived from (30c), where the pronominal forms are in their original position. Looking at the corpus data, I attempt to examine the contexts in which such pre-posing occurs.

(30) a. Pre-posing of pronominal A

*ako=ng gi-adto si Julie sa Bohol*  
 1SG.POSS=LK PFV.PV-go SI PN LOC PN  
 ‘I went (to see/visit/...) Julie in Bohol.’

---

<sup>13</sup> As discussed in the preliminaries in Section 2, when topicalized, pronominal referents are expressed using the nominative form.

b. Pre-posing of pronominal A with pronominal P

*ako=siya=ng*                      *gi-adto*              *sa*      *Bohol*  
 1SG.POSS=3SG.NOM=LK      PFV.PV-go              LOC    PN

‘I went (to see/visit/...) her in Bohol.’

c. Pre-posing of pronominal A with pronominal P

*gi-adto=nako’*                      *siya/si Julie*              *sa*      *Bohol*  
 PFV.PV-go=1SG.GEN      3SG.NOM/NOM.PN      LOC    PN

‘I went (to see/visit/...) her/Julie in Bohol.’

Notice that the A pronominal forms in (30a) and (30b) are in possessive form. As shown in the pronoun paradigm in Table 1, there are two pronominal forms in Cebuano utilized to express the A participant in transitive clauses, namely, the genitive form and the possessive form. When the A pronoun follows the “head + noun/verb” order, the pronoun takes a genitive form, as in (31a); this is the default form. When the A pronoun is pre-posed and precedes the head, the possessive form must be used, as in (31b).

(31) a. Head-pronoun order (constructed)

*gi-lutu’=nako’*                      *ang*      *isda=niya*  
 PFV.PV-cook=1SG.GEN      ANG      fish=3SG.GEN

‘I cooked his/her fish.’

b. Pronoun-head order (constructed)

*ako=ng*              *gi-lutu’*              *ang*      *iya=ng*              *isda*  
 1SG.POSS=LK      PFV.PV-cook      ANG      3SG.POSS=LK      fish

‘I cooked his/her fish.’

The language thus offers speakers a choice between two strategies, and as previous findings have shown, the pre-posing strategy accounts for approximately more than one third of the transitive clauses in conversational data. We cannot ignore the fact then that there must be certain factors behind the choices that speakers make with regard to the expression of pronominal arguments. Why such a construction offers an equally valid choice for speakers therefore needs to be accounted for.

In ordinary conversation talk, P’s tend to change too often and too rapidly, due to the fact that conversation talk is usually about people and human activities, as well as the things that they do in their daily lives, and so most of the clauses are intransitive, and if there are any P’s, they would have lower persistence. Nevertheless, there were still a few transitive clauses with possessive A’s found in the data. Most of these A referents are singular in number; since singular pronouns tend to be more definite than

plural form pronouns, these A's must also be very definite. As for the P referents in clauses with pre-posed A's, they are also definite P's, being zero or pronominal, while only very few are either lexical or paired with a demonstrative, suggesting that the P is more or less definite most of the time.

In the Pear narratives, the story centers on a basket of pears, picked from a tree, placed in a basket, taken away by a boy and put on a bicycle. The pears then fell to the ground and were picked up again, given away, and eaten. Therefore, the P arguments tend to be relatively more stable and thus topical, allowing for more transitive clauses. An examination of these transitive Pear Story clauses reveals these results: in the 15 clauses with pre-posed A's, the P is zero in 12 instances, and a demonstrative in 1, showing us that close to 90% of the tokens have P referents that are definite, which is similar to previous results obtained from conversational data in Tanangkingsing (2009). In both narrative and conversational texts, having a definite P seems therefore to be one of the factors that influence the pre-posing of A's.

Another observed factor is the fact that roughly over one-third of the clauses with pre-posed A's consist of the verb of saying *ingon*. This supports the statement that the P's must be definite, as when someone tells something to somebody, the Recipient of the message has to be a definite person. The P's can also be covert but topical, especially with quotations. Both (32) and (33) show that the speakers are expressed in pre-verbal possessive form, while although the addressee is omitted, their identities are very clear from the previous context. In (32), the addressee is the speaker's husband, while in (33), it is the customs officials. Also, it can be noticed that there is almost always a direct quotation following.<sup>14</sup>

(32) verb of saying event

<i>ako=ng</i>	<i>gi-ingn-an,</i>	<i>hatag-i</i>	<i>imo-ng-</i>	<i>imo=ng</i>	<i>nanay</i>
1SG.POSS=LK	PFV-say-LV	give-LV.IMP	FS	2SG.POSS=LK	mom
<i>basta</i>	<i>ang iya-ng-</i>	<i>ang</i>	<i>ako-a</i>		
DM	FS	ANG	1SG.POSS-DEF		
<i>okay=ra</i>	<i>taga-an=ko=niya=g</i>		<i>gamay</i>	<i>o-</i>	
okay=just	give-LV=1SG.NOM=3SG.GEN=EXT		little		

<sup>14</sup> In using verbs like *ingon* that take a Recipient nominal and a Patient nominal in the form of a message, Cebuano, as well as most Philippine-type languages, employs various transitive clauses that position either nominals in the nominative position (P), depending on which is more topical or more definite. If the Recipient is more topical, then the Extended Locative Voice (ELV) construction is employed: VERB=A<sub>GEN</sub>=P<sub>NOM</sub> comp NP<sub>[message]</sub>, where the P is the recipient and the message is positioned in a complement clause. But when the message is highlighted and more topical/definite than the recipient, then the message will be in the nominative slot in a patient voice construction: VERB=A<sub>GEN</sub> NP<sub>NOM</sub> NP<sub>OBL</sub>, where NP<sub>NOM</sub> is the message and NP<sub>OBL</sub> is the recipient. In addition, only recipients, which are human, can be pronominalized, so the issue being discussed here involves only the ELV construction, where the non-Actor core NP is the recipient.

*wa=man=sab=ko=y*                      *gastu-han*

NEG=PART=also=1SG.NOM=NEUT    spend-LV

‘I told (him to) give to your mom. as for his- ..., for me, it’s all right that he gives me a little amount, (as) I don’t have anything to spend on anyway.’

(33) verb of saying event

*banda huli iya=ng*                      *gi-ingn-an*

part    end    3SG.POSS=LK    PFV-say-LV

*pila=man*                      *imo=ng*                      *gi- gusto*                      *ani*

how.much=PART    2SG.POSS=LK    FS    like                      this

*sigi mag-bayad=na=lang=mi*                      *diri*

DM    AV-pay=already=just=1PL.EXCL.NOM    here

*kung pila*                      *imo=ng*                      *ganahan*

if                      how.much                      2SG.POSS=LK    like

‘At the end, he asked (the customs guy), “How much do you want for this. Okay, we’ll just pay whatever amount you like.”’

Other Philippine-type languages also exhibit such a phenomenon. Pronouns in Hiligaynon, and probably other languages belonging to the Greater Central Philippines group, can also be pre-posed, and I conjecture that the factors at work must also be the same. However, such a pre-posing of bound pronouns in some languages such as Tagalog produces utterances that sound literary or archaic, at least in the urban speech of Manila speakers, although I was informed it is perfectly ordinary-sounding to speakers in the rural Batangas area. For northern languages such as Ilokano and Kapampangan (Mike Pangilinan, p.c.), the A pronoun must be in the absolutive form when positioned before the verb as they serve instead as “subjects” of identificational nominal predicates; for example, *Isuna ket ulbod* ‘S/he is a liar’ (Shirley Dita, p.c.).

Another factor that has contributed to the possibility of pre-posed A’s is the structure of the verb complex in Cebuano. The pronouns, being clitics, phonologically attach to the first-element slot occupied by the main predicate or verb. However, whenever there is a negation term (like in 34a), an existential word, a question word (like in 35a), a modal (like in 36), or a temporal or locative adverb, they would always occupy the first position, while the main verb always occupies the final slot. The pronominal arguments then cliticize to the pre-verbal first element, as illustrated in (34a), (35a), and (36). In (34a), (35a), and (36), the pre-verbal first element and the main verb are in bold. However, if (34a) were a positive sentence, then it would be the main verb *mo-balik* occupying the first-slot position, to which the enclitics attach, as in (34b); if (35a) were a yes-no question instead of a wh- question, then the first-slot

position would be occupied by the main verb *mag-kita'* occupying the first-slot position, to which the enclitics attach, as in (35b).

Therefore, as shown in the excerpts in (34)-(36), the pronominal clitics attach to the first-element word and become pre-verbal. However, if the verb complex structure consists of only the main predicate without any preceding elements, then the A cannot be pre-posed; otherwise this A pronominal form will occupy the first position, not the second position. In fact, 23 out of 64 clauses in conversational data and 2 out of 18 clauses in narrative data with pre-posed A's have these pre-verbal elements. These pre-verbal elements are mostly negation words (N=19); the others are modifier words (N=5) and an existential verb (N=1).

(34) a. negator as first element

*di'*=*man=pud=ko*                      *mo-balik*      *sa*      *iya-ha*                      *oy*  
 EG=PART=also=1SG.NOM      INTR-return      OBL      3SG.POSS-DEF      INTERJ  
*kapoy=ra*  
 tiring=INTENS

'I'm not going to return to him [his side]! (I'm) too tired!'

b. constructed based on (34a)

*mo-balik*=*man=pud=ko*                      *sa*      *iya-ha*  
 INTR-return=PART=also=1SG.NOM      OBL      3SG.POSS-DEF  
 'I will return to him [his side]!'

(35) a. adverbial question word as first element

T: *unya'*      *sa*      *usa*      *ka*      *semana*,  
 then      OBL      one      LK      week  
*ka-pila*=*man=mo*                                      *mag-kita'*  
 FREQ-how.many=PART=2PL.NOM      RECIP-see

L: *ka-usa=ra*

FREQ-one=only

T: 'Then, in each week, how many times do you see each other?'

L: 'Only once (a week).'

b. constructed based on (35a)

T: *mag-kita'*=*man=mo*  
 RECIP-see=PART=2PL.NOM  
 'You are going to meet (each other).'

(36) modality verb in first-element position

*ma'o=man*      *ato=ng*                                      *kunswelo*      *mga*      *babayi*  
 ANAPH=PART      1PL.INCL.POSS=LK      enjoyment      PL      girl



*ganahan=ta*                      *mag-pa-gwapa*  
 like=1PL.INCL.NOM            INTR-CAUS-beautiful  
 ‘It’s our enjoyment, as girls; we like to make ourselves beautiful.’

In Yakan, pronominal forms are also pre-posed to a certain extent, as long as they are independent words. In the first line in (37) and the third line in (38), the subordinator *pegge* ‘because’ triggers the pre-posing of the free form *iye*. However, pronominal affixes like the *-ku* in the second line in (38) are not pre-posed; it is interpreted as conveying actual possession. In (37) and (38), a second tier is inserted to clearly show the individual morphemes that may be distorted by phonological and morphological processes like affixation in actual speech.

To summarize, pronominal forms in Cebuano can be pre-posed when the patient referent is definite. Pre-posing is also very likely with verbs of saying, especially *ingon*. The structure of the verb complex in Cebuano, where the main predicate occupies the final slot and the pronominals are enclitic, also allows pre-posing to occur. It has to be noted though, that this pre-posing due to the structure of the predicate complex is obligatory, which is slightly different from the first two conditions aforementioned, where the pre-posing is optional.

(37) Yakan (Behrens 2007:62, *A Story About When We First Evacuated* 033)

*pegge’ iye dem atey kayihin*  
*pegge’ iye dem atey kami-in*  
 because 3SG in heart GEN.1PL.EXCL-DEF  
*gey du pi me hilaga’in si tengnga’ ebbut*  
*ga’i du pi me hilaga’in si tengnga’ ebbut*  
 NEG CERT go PL vigilante-TRM OBL middle fire  
 ‘Because what was in our minds was that the vigilantes would not go to the middle of the fire.’

(38) Yakan (Behrens 2007:56, *A Story About When We First Evacuated* 006)

*seguwa’ ga’du isab miya’an ta’ambanne*  
*seguwa’ ga’du isab miya’an ta-amban-ne*  
 but not CERT also that ABL-leave.behind-3SG.ERG  
*pegge’ gey ambananku kabewin*  
*pegge’ gey amban-an-ku kabew-in*  
 because not leave.behind-CL-1SG.ERG carabao-DEF  
*bu gey isab iye ka’ara’ara’ ngambanan aku*  
*bu ga’i isab iye ka-ara’ara’ N-amban-an aku*  
 and not also 3SG.ABS CIRC-dare INTR-leave.behind-CL 1SG.OBL

‘However, she could not leave it behind because I would not leave the carabao and she did no dare leave me.’

Unlike Philippine languages, in which predicate-initial clauses predominate, Indonesian-type languages, such as Javanese and Karo Batak, are SVO languages, where the subject normally occupies the clause-initial position and the object is placed postverbally, as illustrated in (39) and (40).

(39) Javanese transitive clause (Ogloblin 2005:602, example 10)

*Ibu m-ènèh-i bocah lima dhuwit papat*  
 mother AV-give-TR child five duwit four  
 ‘Mother gives five children four *duwits* (a small coin).’

(40) Karo Batak transitive clause (Woollams 2005:544, example 29)

*Embun me-kapal n-utup-i matawari*  
 cloud ADJ-thick AV-cover-LOC sun  
 ‘Thick cloud obscured the sun.’

Hence, such a pre-posing of pronominal forms in Cebuano must have facilitated the development of Philippine-type languages into Indonesian-type languages (Ross 2002). Starosta, Pawley & Reid (1982:152-158) argue that through auxiliary axing, enclitics get stranded in front of a predicate as a result of the loss of the auxiliary verb and become proclitics (Kikusawa 2003), as illustrated in (41).

In (41), the auxiliary *walaq* is phonologically reduced leaving *ku* stranded in front of the verb, and the remaining clause resembles that of an Indonesian-type language.<sup>15</sup> Other than such auxiliary deletion, Kikusawa (2008) argues that other changes took place, such as the phonological conditioning of two clitic pronouns in transitive sentences, the development of portmanteau forms for certain sequences of a genitive pronoun and a nominative pronoun, and the change in the number of contrasting transitive sentences.

(41) Cebuano (Wolff 1996:26, cited in Ross 2002:53)

*Walaq=ku hugas-i ang manga platu*  
 NEG=GEN.1SG wash-LV.AT ANG PL plate  
 ‘I didn’t wash the plates.’

<sup>15</sup> The remaining clause, as shown in the second sentence in (41), is not acceptable in modern Cebuano.

\**ku=hugas-i*                      *ang manga platu*  
 GEN.1SG=wash-LV.AT    ANG PL            plate  
 Intended: ‘I washed the plates.’

Nevertheless, the motivation behind the pre-posing of the pronominal forms is not really surprising when viewed from the perspective of cognitive information status, which states that given information, which is much easier to process, tends to be expressed in lighter form and positioned earlier in the clause than heavier new information. When human referents are definite and therefore topical, they are often pronominal or in zero form, and it is not unexpected that as lighter forms, they are positioned before the head. In fact, pronominal forms positioned before a “head,” be it a verb or a noun, can be said to be focused, and the following unit, originally the “head” ceases to be one and becomes the “modifier,” as illustrated by the example and the translations in (42a) and (42b).

(42) a. Genitive pronoun following the head word

*gi-ka'on=niya*  
 PFV.PV-eat=3SG.GEN  
 verbal: ‘S/he ate [SOMETHING].’  
 nominal: ‘something that s/he ate’

b. Possessive pronoun preceding the head word

*iya=ng*                      *gi-ka'on*  
 3SG.POSS=LK    PV.PFV-eat  
 verbal: ‘S/HE ate [something].’  
 nominal: ‘his/hers which [s/he/(?somebody)] ate’

Both sentences in (42) basically have the same meaning; the difference, if any, is very subtle. (42a) is the usual form, which has the focus on the object. In other words, the eat-er is new information, so the A participant can even be in lexical form in this V(=)A pattern. In (42b), the Possessor *iya-* becomes the head and the following verbal entity becomes the modifier, as illustrated in the translation of the nominal reading in (42b). This is like the contrast between the genitive ‘s and the possessive *of* in English, where the former indicates animate, light, and given information, while the latter expresses inanimate, heavy, and new information.

## 5. Conclusion

It is always assumed to be ideal that reference grammars can describe a language

in a way in which the description conforms to the speech of native speakers; however, this is usually not often the case. This paper has illustrated this with the behavior of pronouns in actual language use. First, I provided data that show speakers of Cebuano not preferring the use of two third-person pronouns in a single clause. Reference grammars will not usually tell readers what form is preferred. Second, I observed that the pre-posing of pronouns is brought about by several factors, which are definiteness, verb type, and structure of the verb complex. Transitive clauses with definite P's are more likely to have A's pre-posed, verbs of saying are more likely to have A's pre-posed, and the occurrence of pre-verb elements in the verb complex allow A's to be obligatorily pre-posed. It would be worth investigating related Philippine languages that exhibit this similar phenomenon and further examining their syntactic environments, semantic denotations, and pragmatic contexts to uncover the actual motivations that induce these phenomena.

To investigate the two issues, I have used two types of spoken data, namely, conversation and narrative data. Each has its strengths and weaknesses. Narrative data is useful in the sense that the number of transitive clauses is relatively more than that of other spoken genres, and it is easy to manipulate the nature of the referents that occur in the narrative. In the Pear Story, different human protagonists are made to interact with one another so that the narrator needs a means to depict events that involve two human referents. From these the behavior of third person pronouns in discourse can be easily observed. Conversation requires spontaneous actions and responses between the interlocutors, and the resulting interaction reflects the various contextual patterns in which different pronominal forms are produced.

Pronouns are pervasive in language and knowledge of their use is important in correct usage. Nevertheless, they exhibit different types of behavior in discourse that traditional grammatical accounts have failed to demonstrate. In this paper, pronouns have been shown to vary with context in their form and function, which contributes also to the important role they play in language change.

### References

- Ariel, Mira. 1990. *Accessing Noun Phrase Antecedents*. London: Croom Helm.
- Behrens, Dietlinde. 2007. *Yakan Texts*. Manila: Linguistics Society of the Philippines.
- Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson.
- Blust, Robert. 1995. *Austronesian Comparative Dictionary*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i. Retrieved June 28, 2012 from <http://www.trussel2.com/acd/>.

- Brainard, Sherri, and Dietlinde Behrens. 2002. *A Grammar of Yakan*. Manila: Linguistics Society of the Philippines.
- Bunye, Maria V. R., and Elsa P. Yap. 1971. *Cebuano Grammar Notes*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ewing, Michael C. 2001. Reference and recovery in Cirebon Javanese. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 21.1:25-47.
- Gundel, Jeanette K., Nancy Hedberg, and Ron Zacharski. 1993. Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language* 69.2:274-307.
- Gundel, Jeanette K., Mamadou Bassene, Bryan Gordon, Linda Humnick, and Amel Khalfaoui. 2010. Testing predictions of the Givenness Hierarchy framework: A crosslinguistic investigation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42:1770-1785.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 1999. The lack of zero anaphora and incipient person marking in Tagalog. *Oceanic Linguistics* 38:231-269.
- Huang, Shuanfan, and Michael Tanangkingsing. 2011. A discourse explanation of the transitivity phenomena in Kavalan, Sqliq, and Atayal. *Oceanic Linguistics* 50.1:93-119.
- Kikusawa, Ritsuko. 2003. The development of some Indonesian pronominal systems. *Historical Linguistics 2001: Selected Papers from the 15<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Melbourne, August 13-17, 2001*, ed. by Barry J. Blake, Kate Burridge, and Jo Taylor, 237-268. *Current Issues in Linguistics Theory* 237. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kikusawa, Ritsuko. 2008. Historical changes in pronoun positions in Extra-Formosan languages. *Current Issues in Austronesian Linguistics: Papers from the 10th ICAL Studies in Philippine Languages and Cultures (SPLC)*, 17:66-87.
- Kuo, Jonathan. The origin of marked order in Truku Seediq clitic pronoun clusters. Manuscript, University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Honolulu.
- Nagaya, Naonori. 2006. Preferred referential expressions in Tagalog. *Tokyo University Linguistics Papers* 25:83-106.
- Oglobin, Alexander K. 2005. Javanese. *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, ed. by Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelman, 590-624. London & New York: Routledge.
- Pebley, Carol Jean. 1999. Participant reference in Kagayanen. *Studies in Philippine Languages and Culture* 10.2:21-49.
- Pigafetta, Antonio. Cebuano-Visayan grammar. Manuscript.
- Ross, Malcolm D. 2002. The history and transitivity of western Austronesian voice and voice-marking. *The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Voice Systems*, ed. by Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross, 17-62. Canberra: Pacific

Linguistics.

- Ross, Malcolm D. 2006. Reconstructing the case-marking and personal pronoun systems of proto-Austronesian. *Streams Converging into an Ocean: Festschrift in Honor of Professor Paul Jen-kuei Li on his 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, ed. by Henry Y. Chang, Lillian M. Huang, and Dah-an Ho, 521-563. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Starosta, Stanley, Andrew Pawley, and Lawrence Reid. 1982. The evolution of focus in Austronesian. *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, vol. 2: Tracking the Travelers*, ed. by Amran Halim, Lois Carrington, and S. A. Wurm, 145-170. *Pacific Linguistics Series C*, No. 75. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Tanangkingsing, Michael. 2009. A Functional Reference Grammar of Cebuano. Doctoral dissertation, National Taiwan University, Taiwan.
- Van Valin, Robert D. 2001. *An Introduction to Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolff, John U. 1996. The development of the passive verb with pronominal prefix in western Austronesian languages. *Reconstruction, Classification, Description: Festschrift in Honor of Isidore Dyen*, ed. by Bernd Nothofer, 15-40. Hamburg: Abera.
- Woollams, Geoff. 2005. Karo Batak. *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, ed. by Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, 534-561. London & New York: Routledge.

[Received August 23, 2012; revised November 5, 2012; accepted April 9, 2013]

Department of English  
National Taipei University of Technology  
Taipei, TAIWAN  
Michael Tanangkingsing: [miguel@ntut.edu.tw](mailto:miguel@ntut.edu.tw)

## Cebuano 語代名詞在篇章裡的行為

洪媽益

國立台北科技大學

功能語法參考書通常受到地域時空等限制，無法很準確地描述語言的所有層面，因此語言學的研究可以彌補這種缺陷。本研究利用口語語料試圖觀察 Cebuano 語代名詞在篇章裡的現象。第一，同一句裡不會有兩個第三人稱代名詞；句子如果已經有一個第三人稱代名詞，另外一個論元要用名詞或零回指的方式來表達。第二，及物句裡決定主事者論元以屬格或以所有格的形式表達的因素主要有特定性、動詞種類，以及動詞詞組的結構；主事者論元移動至動詞前面時以所有格形式表達，並且可能造成該語言詞序變化的因素之一。

關鍵詞：Cebuano 語、代名詞、篇章、特指性