

Rise and fall of referentiality: articles in Philippine languages¹

Naonori Nagaya
Rice University

1. Articles and Referentiality

The prototypical function of nominals, namely nouns and nominalized elements, is to refer to an entity, and that of articles is to ground nominals into a discourse, specifying a type of reference such as definiteness or specificity (cf. Hopper and Thompson 1984, Croft 1991, 2001). However, it often happens that the function of nominals goes beyond reference and expands to non-referential functions, and that articles also accommodate the functional change of nominals. For instance, the English indefinite article *a/an* was once employed only for already identified particulars, as in *a (certain) man*, but later comes to indicate non-specific, unidentified entities, as in *we called a taxi* (Hopper and Martin 1987). Kaufmann (this volume), Potsdam (this volume), and Yap (this volume) also point out that in Austronesian languages nominals can be employed for a variety of non-referential uses such as exclamatives.

With regards to this topic, articles in Tagalog and other Philippine languages are worthy of attention. They introduce various elements as referential expressions. In (1), for example, the Tagalog article *ang* marks a noun, an adjective and a clause as a referential expression.² In contrast, the same article can be employed to create non-referential expressions as well. It leads a sentential adverb of some kind in (2) and an exclamatory expression in (3). Here we can see the polysemy of *ang*-phrases from referential to non-referential uses.

- (1) D<um>ating **ang=aso/ma-ganda/ka~kanta.**
arrive<AF> NOM=dog/ADJ-beautiful/ASP~sing
‘**The dog/the beautiful one/the one who will sing** arrived.’

¹ I thank Laura Rabalais, Masayoshi Shibatani, Hiroto Uchihara, Foong Ha Yap and three anonymous reviewers for their valuable and insightful comments on drafts of the paper. I am also grateful to Farah Cunanan, Kathleen Diaz, Pi Ramos, Mark Felix Albert Santiago and Gilbert Tinio for sharing their precious native speakers’ intuition of Tagalog with me, to Rossana Santa Sy and Maria Christina Sy for Partido Bikol and to Lorie Sibolboro for Ilokano. Of course, responsibility for any errors is purely my own. The research presented here was partially presented as Nagaya (2007b, c, ms.) and supported in part by the National Science Foundation grant for the project “Austronesian voice systems: an eastern Indonesian perspective” (BCS-0617198) headed by Masayoshi Shibatani.

² Abbreviations used in this paper are: ADJ-adjective, AF-actor focus, ART-article, ASP-aspect marker, CAUS-causative, DAT-dative, EXC-exclusive, GEN-genitive, GRN-gerund, INC-inclusive, LF-locative focus, LK-linker, NEG-negation, NOM-nominative, P-personal name and kinship term, PF-patient focus, Q-question marker, RL-realis, SG-singular, SP-spontaneous, 1-first person, 2-second person, 3-third person, “<>”-infix, “=”-cliticization, and “~”-reduplication. The diagraph *ng* represents a velar nasal except that the article *ng* is pronounced as [naŋ] and the plural marker *mga* as [maŋa].

- (2) **Ang=alam=ko,** mag-a~aral si=Icel sa=Japan.
 NOM=know=1SG.GEN AF-ASP~study P.NOM=Icel DAT=Japan
 ‘As far as I know (lit. what I know is), Icel will study in Japan.’
- (3) **Ang=ganda=mo!**
 NOM=beautiful=2SG.GEN
 ‘How beautiful you are! (lit. ‘Your beauty.’)’

The aim of this paper is to look into such expansion and spread of non-referential uses in nominals and articles of Philippine languages with special reference to two competing articles *ang* and *yung* in Tagalog, which introduce a common noun in the nominal case. There are four main claims we argue in this paper. First, the functions of *ang*-phrases, i.e., nominals marked by *ang*, have been expanding from referential to non-referential uses, obtaining more discourse-related and subjective meanings (cf. Traugott 1989). In the literature, it has long been believed that *ang*-phrases are always referential (Schachter and Otones 1972, Schachter 1976, 1977, to name a few). By examining *ang*-phrases construction by construction, however, we argue that they can be used either referentially or non-referentially depending on the particular construction in which they find themselves (Nagaya 2007b, c, ms.).

Second, *yung* is emerging as an article for referential nominals. The article *yung* is grammaticalized from the distal demonstrative *iyon* and is often considered as a replacement for *ang* in conversations (Reid 1978, Himmelmann 2005b). However, we show that the difference in style is not the end of the story: *yung* does not have all of the non-referential functions that *ang* has, but displays nominalizing functions that *ang* does not demonstrate. *Yung* is not just a simple renewal form of the functions of *ang*, but also an addition to the whole article system in Tagalog.

Third, there are two correlated semantic changes going on in the Tagalog article system: the primary function of *ang* is shifting from referential to non-referential uses, whereas *yung* is taking over the referential uses of *ang*. In the spoken corpus we examined, the referential uses of *ang* appear less frequently than its non-referential uses, and *yung* is almost always used referentially. The semantic contrast being formed between *ang* and *yung* is in terms of referentiality.

Lastly, the same contrast between existing and emerging articles is observed in other Philippine languages as well. We can look at two cases from two Philippine languages: *ang* and *su* in Partido Bikol and *ti* and *diay* in Ilokano. In these languages, the existing articles *ang* and *ti* are acquiring non-referential uses, while the emerging ones *su* and *diay* are mainly used for introducing referential nominals.

Both elicited examples and naturally-occurring data are examined in this paper, but we mainly focus on elicited examples in order to compare Tagalog with other languages. See Nagaya (2007b, c, ms) for the details of the actual usage of Tagalog *ang* and *yung* and their referentiality in a spoken discourse.

This paper is organized as follows: we examine the usage of Tagalog *ang* and *yung* in Sections 2 and 3 respectively, observing that *ang* and *yung* have both referential and non-referential uses. In Section 4, we make a quantitative analysis of the Tagalog spoken corpus to discuss how often *ang* and *yung* are used referentially and how often they are not. In Section 5, we extend our analyses to other Philippine languages. Finally, this paper is concluded in Section 6.

2. Fall of referentiality: the usage of Tagalog *ang*

Tagalog and other Philippine languages are typical head-initial languages. Predicates usually occupy the clause-initial position, and nominals are introduced either by an article or by a linker.³ As shown in Table 1, Tagalog articles carry a variety of nominal information such as case, number, noun class and deictic meaning (Schachter and Otnes 1972, Himmelmann 2004, 2005b, Reid and Liao 2004). There are three different case forms distinguished by articles: nominative, genitive and dative.⁴ The genitive case is used for marking not just a possessor but also an agent or patient which is not the primary grammatical argument; the dative case is for a recipient, a goal, a location and other peripheral semantic roles. The usage of the nominative case is discussed in relation to *ang* in this section. Personal name articles are for personal names and kinship terms (e.g. *Kath*, *Marfeal*, *nanay* ‘mother’ and *tatay* ‘father’), whereas common nouns are for others, including nominalized elements. Number distinction is only made in personal name articles.

Table 1: Tagalog article system

		NOM	GEN	DAT
Personal name	Singular	si	ni	kay
	Plural	sina	nina	kina
Common noun		ang	ng [naŋ]	sa
	Distal	yung	nung	--
	Medial	yang	niyang	--
	Proximal	itong	nitong	--

In this section we are concerned with *ang*, whose function is to introduce common nouns in the

³ Tagalog articles are also referred to as “construction markers” (Reid 1978), “case markers” (Kroeger 1993), “phrase markers” (Ross 2002), “determiners” (Reid 2002, Reid and Liao 2004), “nominal specifiers” (Reid 2006) and so on.

⁴ There is quite a bit of controversy surrounding the case-marking typology of Tagalog. Some insist that Tagalog has an ergative-absolutive case-marking pattern (Cena 1977, Payne 1982, De Guzman 1988, Reid and Liao 2004), and others reject the analysis (Kroeger 1993, Ross 2002, Himmelmann 2005a, b). In this paper, by “nominative case” we simply mean the primary grammatical case, and do not intend to support any specific analysis of Tagalog case-marking system.

nominative case. From the beginning of Philippine linguistics, *ang*-phrases have been analyzed as always referential, that is, to have a definite, indefinite or generic referent (Bloomfield 1917, Blake 1925, Schachter and Otnes 1972, McFarland 1976, 1978, Schachter 1976, 1977, Himmelmann 1991, 2004, 2005b among others). For example, Schachter and Otnes (1972:96) say “[a]n *ang*-plus-unmarked-noun topic [read “*ang*-phrase,” NN] normally expresses either a DEFINITE meaning, ‘an identified member of the class’ (corresponding to ‘the’ plus noun in English) or a generic meaning,” Cena (1977) claims “[t]he topic [“*ang*-phrase,” NN] is absolutely referential,” Kroeger (1993:14) notes “[t]he nominative argument [“*ang*-phrase,” NN] is normally interpreted as being definite [...], but can also be generic [...],” and Himmelmann (1991:15) concludes “*ang*-phrases are always referential, but they may involve all kinds of referentiality (definite, indefinite, generic [...]).”

Although there is no immediate evidence that the original meaning of *ang* is referential, its reconstructed form suggests that this is the case. Reid (1978, 2002) argues that Tagalog “*ang* [aŋ NP]” is historically derived from

(4) *ʔi na-ŋ NP

in Proto-Philippines: *ʔi is the reconstructed form of the article for nominative common nouns, *na ‘that’ is a demonstrative, and *-ŋ is the linking element which relates the demonstrative to the following NP. Since demonstratives usually have a specific referent in the physical surrounding environment, it is natural to assume that the original function of *ang* is referential. Indeed, it is well-known that definite articles are almost always derived from demonstratives (e.g. *pæs* > *the* in English) (Greenberg 1978, Diessel 1999).

Thus, it is believed that *ang*-phrases are always referential in modern Tagalog and the reconstructed form suggests that its original function was referential too. In this section, however, by carefully examining the usage of *ang* in a variety of constructions, we argue that the hypothesis that *ang*-phrases are always referential is not true in modern Tagalog: *ang*-phrases can be either referential or non-referential depending on the particular construction in which they are used.

Before turning to the body of our analysis, we have to make clear what we mean by “referential” and “non-referential.” Referentiality is defined by many linguists in many different ways, and there is much debate over the definitions (see Lyons 1999, Payne 1997, for example). Facing the controversy, we choose to stick to what is standard in the Philippine linguistics: we use the term “referential” for nouns or nominalized elements that have a definite, indefinite or generic reference. Non-referential nominals, on the contrary, have none of these. In this definition many kinds of nominals can be non-referential, but the most important one is a property-denoting nominal. For example, the verb-predicate clause in (5) indicates a situation in

which the noun *estudyante* ‘student’ carried out the action of running described by the verb. The subject noun *estudyante* ‘student’ is referential, because it has a definite reference. In contrast, the copular clause in (6) means that the subject *Lyndie* has the property of being a student. Here, the noun *estudyante* ‘student’ does not refer to a specific individual, but is used to denote a property. Thus, it is non-referential.

- (5) T<um>a~takbo ang=estudyante.
 ASP<AF>~run NOM=student
 ‘The student is running.’
- (6) Estudyante si=Lyndie.
 student P.NOM=Lyndie
 ‘Lyndie is a student.’

In order to examine the referentiality of *ang*-phrases in this definition, we take a close look at *ang*-phrases construction by construction. There are two major reasons why we take the construction-based approach to the referentiality of *ang*-phrases. First, it often happens that a given nominal is referential in one construction, but non-referential in another construction. For example, the noun *estudyante* ‘student’ is referential when it is used as the primary grammatical argument of a verb-predicate clause as in (5), but non-referential when it appears as the complement of a predicational copular clause as in (6). When we analyze the referentiality of a given nominal, it is necessary to take into consideration the syntactic construction where the nominal is used. Second, unlike articles in other languages (e.g. *a/an* and *the* in English), *ang* has the syntactic function of marking the nominative case. Thus, its distribution in clauses is limited to several positions. We cannot analyze the referentiality of *ang*-phrases without looking at their syntactic function.

In modern Tagalog, the distribution of *ang*-phrases is restricted to the syntactic positions listed in (7). In the rest of this section, we discuss each of these uses, arguing that *ang*-phrases can be used either referentially or non-referentially.

- (7) Distribution of *ang*-phrases:
- a. Unattached nominal (Section 2.1)
 - b. Primary grammatical argument of a verb-predicate clause (Section 2.2)
 - c. Copular subject (Section 2.3)
 - d. Copular complement (Section 2.3)
 - e. Complement clause (Section 2.4)
 - f. Parenthetical (Section 2.5)
 - g. Exclamative (Section 2.6)

2.1. Unattached nominals

Ang can introduce a nominal which is not subcategorized by any predicate and can be used on its own right, for example, the titles of books, songs and narratives as in (8), (9) and (10) (henceforth, the relevant *ang*-phrases and their free translations are put in boldface). (10) is adopted from the first line of one of the narrative texts collected in Bloomfield (1917:16-17) (also cited in Himmelmann 2004:1486-1488). It refers to the two main characters of the narrative. As they refer to a specific individual, *ang*-marked unattached nominals are referential.

(8) **ang=Biblia**
 NOM=bible
 ‘**the Bible**’

(9) Wikipedia, **ang=ma-laya=ng** **ensiklopedya**
 Wikipedia NOM=ADJ-free=LK encyclopedia
 ‘Wikipedia, **the free encyclopedia**’

(10) **ang=ulol na** **unggoy at** **ang=ma-runong** **na** **pagong**
 NOM=foolish LK monkey and NOM=ADJ-clever LK turtle
 ‘**the foolish monkey and the clever turtle**’

2.2. Verb-predicate clauses

Tagalog and other Philippine languages are well-known for their voice/transitivity-marking verbal morphology, often referred to as the focus system. In this system, the primary participant of an event is realized in the nominative case or as the nominative pronoun form, and its semantic role is marked on the verb by one of the focus affixes (*m-/-um-* for Actor Focus, *-in* for Patient Focus, *-an* for Locative Focus, and *i-* for Circumstantial Focus). The article *ang* is employed to introduce such a primary grammatical argument. Let us consider (11), (12) and (13). In (11), the agent participant counts as the primary grammatical argument, and is marked by *ang*. Accordingly, the verb takes the actor focus marker *-um-*. In contrast, the semantic role of the primary grammatical argument is a patient in (12) and a recipient in (13). Thus, the verb is marked by $-\emptyset$ in (12) and by *-an* in (13) respectively (the PF marker is $-\emptyset$ in realis mood and *-in* in irrealis mood). Again, the primary grammatical argument is headed by *ang*.

(11) D<um>ating **ang=bata** sa=simbahan.
 arrive<AF> NOM=child DAT=church
 ‘**The child** arrived at the church.’

(12) K<in>ain- \emptyset =ko **ang=buko pie** na gawa sa=Batangas.

eat<RL>-PF=1SG.GEN NOM=coconut pie LK made DAT=Batangas
 ‘I ate **the coconut pie made in Batangas.**’

- (13) B<in>igy-an ni=Kim ng=pera **ang=kaibigan=niya.**
 give<RL>-LF P.GEN=Kim GEN=money NOM=friend=her
 ‘Kim gave **her friend** money.’

As has been analyzed by Schachter and Otnes (1972) and Schachter (1976, 1977), to name a few, the *ang*-phrase of a verb-predicate clause is always referential, and definite in most cases. It can also have an indefinite reading, when used with an indefinite numeral such as *isa* ‘one’ and *ilan* ‘several.’ Compare (11) and (14).

- (14) D<um>ating **ang=isa=ng bata** sa=simbahan.
 arrive<AF> NOM=one=LK child DAT=church
 ‘**A child** arrived at the church.’

2.3 Copular clauses

Tagalog copular clauses are composed of two juxtaposed nominals, that is, a copular complement and a copular subject.⁵ In the canonical order, a copular complement occupies the clause-initial position, followed by a copular subject, complying with the predicate-initial constituent order of this language, as in (15).⁶

- (15) Copular complement + copular subject

Four kinds of copular clauses are distinguished in terms of semantics and pragmatics: predicational clauses, specificational clauses, pseudocleft clauses and identificational clauses.⁷

⁵ In the original manuscript, the term “equational clause” was used instead of the “copular clause.” This is partially because there is no copulative element found in Tagalog copular clauses, and partially because it is common to refer to sentence type (15) as “equational” in Austronesian linguistics (cf. Himmelmann 2005a). However, two reviewers rejected the usage of “equational” for this sentence pattern; Tagalog “equational” clauses can be an adjective-predicate or prepositional phrase-predicate clause, which is not “equational” in a usual sense. Thus, we use the “copular clause” rather than the “equational clause” in this paper.

The term “copular predicate” is also avoided because in our analysis copular complements are predicative (i.e. denoting a property or action) only in predicational copular clauses. The terms “copula subject” and “copula complement” are introduced by Curnow (2000) and Dixon (2001) for their typology of copular clauses.

⁶ In this paper, Tagalog copular clauses are translated in such a way that a copular subject is followed by a copular complement in English free translations. This is intended to be faithful to the structure of Tagalog copular clauses in (15), although the resulting English translations might sound a bit unnatural in specificational and pseudocleft clauses (cf. Schachter and Otnes 1972:530).

⁷ See Higgins (1979), Decklerk (1988), Nishiyama (2003) and Mikkelsen (2004, 2005) for detailed studies on copular clauses. Although there is not enough space here for details, it is necessary to note that as is often the case with copular clauses in other languages, some copular clauses in Tagalog are ambiguous in terms of the four kinds

Both copular subject and complement are marked in the nominative case, except for copular complements of predicational clauses. Here we analyze the referentiality of *ang*-phrases in each kind of copular clause. Our conclusions are presented in Table 2 in advance.

Table 2: Four kinds of copular clauses

Clause type	Copular complement	Copular subject
Predicational clause	Non-referential	Referential
Specificational clause	Referential	Non-referential
Pseudocleft clause	Referential	Non-referential
Identificational clause	Referential	Referential

2.3.1. Predicational clauses

Predicational clauses simply predicate a property of a specific individual. In this construction, only the copular subject, which refers to a specific individual, is marked in the nominative case. The copular predicate, which denotes a property, is not marked by any article. For example, (16) is a predicational clause, which means that the copular subject *ang babae* ‘the woman’ has the property of being the lead in the movie.

- (16) Bida **ang=babae** sa=pelelikula.
 lead NOM=woman DAT=movie
 ‘**The woman** is the lead in the movie.’

A copular complement of this type of copular clause can be an adjective phrase or a prepositional phrase as well. Predicational clause (17) has the adjective *matangkad* ‘tall’ as its copular complement.

- (17) Ma-tangkad **ang=babae**.
 ADJ-tall NOM=woman
 ‘**The woman** is tall.’

When they are used as the copular subject of predicational clauses, *ang*-phrases are always referential, referring to a specific individual about which copular complements tell something.

2.3.2. Specificational clauses

The function of a specificational clause is to single out a specific individual who has a given property. Syntactically, the property is realized as a copular subject and the specific individual as a copular complement. For instance, (18) is a specificational clause, which identifies who has the

listed in Table 2.

property of being the lead in the movie. It does not add any new information to the copular subject, unlike predicational clauses. In other words, the function of a specificational clause is to specify a value for a variable. (18) specifies the value “the woman” for the variable “X is the lead in the movie.” Higgins (1979) and Declerck (1988) observe that specifying a value for a variable is similar to providing an answer to a question: “Who is the lead in the movie? --- The woman.”

- (18) Ang=babae ang=bida sa=pelikula.
 NOM=woman NOM=lead DAT=movie
 ‘The lead in the movie is the woman (not any others).’

Predicational and specificational clauses look much the same, but differ in many ways. Compare the communicative ends of (16) and (18). The predicational clause in (16) is uttered to inform the hearer of a property which he or she did not know before, while in (18) the point of the utterance is to inform the hearer of who it is that has a certain property that they already know of. In (18), the hearer already knew that someone was the lead in the movie, but did not know who it was. Although they seem to share the same truth-conditional meaning, they have totally different communicative functions.

Semantically, both kinds of copular clauses have a specific individual and its property as their semantic components, but these semantic components are aligned in different positions. The property is expressed as a copular complement in predicational clauses, but as a copular subject in specificational clauses; the specific individual is realized as a copular subject in the former, but as a copular complement in the latter (Table 3). On their appearance, specificational clauses are inverted predicational clauses.⁸

Table 3: Predicational and specificational clauses

Clause type	Copular complement	Copular subject
Predicational clause	Property	Specific individual
Specificational clause	Specific individual	Property

The semantic contrast between predicational and specificational clauses becomes clear when they are negated. Compare (19a) and (19b), which are the negated versions of (16) and (18). The negated predicational clause in (19a) means that the copular subject does not have the property of being the lead in the movie. It implies that the woman might have a different property. She might be the supporting actress, for example. On the other hand, the negated specificational clause in (19b) indicates that the property of being the lead is not assigned to the woman but someone else. The existence of someone who has the property of being the lead in the movie is

⁸ For this reason, specificational clauses have more recently been termed inverse copular clauses (Moro 1997).

implied.

- (19) a. Hindi bida ang=babae sa=pelikula.
 NEG lead NOM=woman DAT=movie
 ‘The woman is not the lead in the movie.’
- b. Hindi ang=babae ang=bida sa=pelikula.
 NEG NOM=woman NOM=lead DAT=movie
 ‘The lead in the movie is not the woman (but someone else).’

Another interesting contrast between predicational and specificational clauses is in information structure.⁹ In a typical interpretation, predicational clauses are used to put focus on a property, but specificational clauses on a specific individual. Thus, as in (20), in order to answer the question “Who is the lead in the movie?” the specificational clause (18) is the only available option. Since the constituent in the answer that corresponds to the question word in the question is focused on (Halliday 1967), what is on focus in (20A) is the specific individual *ang babae* ‘the woman’ rather than the property (*ang bida sa pelikula* ‘the lead in the movie.’ Therefore, specificational clause (18), which puts focus on the individual, is appropriate here.

- (20) Q: Sino ang=bida sa=pelikula?
 who.NOM NOM=lead DAT=movie
 ‘Who is the lead in the movie?’
- A: *Bida ang babae sa pelikula. (=16)
 Ang=babae ang bida sa pelikula. (=18)

In the literature of Philippine linguistics, the specificational clause has been referred to as the “identificational sentence” (Ramos 1971:77-79, 110-114) or “definitized predicate” sentence (Schachter and Otones 1972:529-531), and both copular subject and complement have been treated to have a definite reference. However, we analyze the copular subject of a specificational clause as non-referential. This is because in our semantic analysis of specificational clauses, their copular subject is not used to refer to a specific individual, but to denote a property (or to introduce a variable). Semantically, it corresponds to the copular complement of a predicational clause. Both copular complements of a predicational clause and copular subjects of a specificational clause denote a property and should be analyzed as non-referential.

This analysis is borne out by pronominalization phenomena (Mikkelsen 2004, 2005). A unique trait in Tagalog pronominalization is that the third personal pronoun *siya* can be used to replace a referential nominal, whether it is animate or inanimate (Nagaya 2007b, c, ms.). Here we examine this *siya*-pronominalization particularly in two syntactic contexts, left-dislocation and question-answer pairs (Mikkelsen 2004, 2005). To begin with, let us confirm that referential

⁹ See Kaufmann (2005) and Nagaya (2005, 2007a) for the details of information structure in Tagalog.

nominals can leave *siya* as its resumptive pronoun in left-dislocation. Look at (21) and (22), which are left-dislocated versions of (11) and (12) respectively. The primary grammatical argument of a verb-predicate clause, either animate or inanimate, is referential and can be referred to by *siya*. Note that leaving a resumptive pronoun is optional in this language (Nagaya 2005, 2007a).

(21) **Ang=bata,** d<um>ating(=siya) sa=simbahan.
 NOM=child arrive<AF>=3SG.NOM DAT=church
 ‘**The child**, (s/he) arrived at the church.’

(22) **Ang=buko pie na gawa sa=Batangas,**
 NOM=coconut pie LK made DAT=Batangas
 k<in>ain-ø=ko(=siya) kahapon.
 eat<RL>-PF=1SG.GEN=3SG.NOM yesterday
 ‘**The coconut pie made in Batangas**, I ate (it) yesterday.’

The same is true of question-answer pairs (23) and (24). The primary grammatical argument in the question can be referred to by *siya* in the answer.

(23) Q: D<um>ating=na=ba **ang=bata** sa=simbahan?
 arrive<AF>=already=Q NOM=child DAT=church
 ‘Did **the child** already arrive at the church?’

A: Oo, d<um>ating=na=siya sa=simbahan.
 yes arrive<AF>=already=3SG.NOM DAT=church
 ‘Yes, s/he already arrived at the church.’

(24) Q: K<in>ain-ø=mo=na=ba
 eat<RL>-PF=2SG.GEN=already=Q
ang=buko pie na gawa sa=Batangas?
 NOM=coconut pie LK made DAT=Batangas
 ‘Did you already eat **the coconut pie made in Batangas?**’

A: Oo, k<in>ain-ø=ko=na=siya kahapon.
 yes eat<RL>-PF=1SG.GEN=already=3SG.NOM yesterday
 ‘Yes, I already ate it yesterday.’

However, *siya* cannot replace a non-referential nominal, such as predicate nominals. For instance, the predicate nominal *estudyante* ‘student’ in (6) cannot leave a resumptive pronoun in left-dislocation, or be pronominalized in a question-answer pair. See (25) and (26). Thus, the availability of *siya* hinges on the referentiality of its antecedent.

- (25) ***Ang=estudyante**, siya si=Lyndie.
 NOM=student, 3SG.NOM P.NOM=Lyndie
 Intended for ‘Lyndie is a student.’
- (26) Q: **Estudyante**=ba si=Lyndie?
 student=Q P.NOM=Lyndie?
 ‘Is Lyndie **a student**?’
- A: *Oo, siya si=Lyndie
 yes 3SG.NOM P.NOM=Lyndie
 Intended for ‘Yes, Lyndie is (a student).’

Now, let us consider the predicational clause in (27), whose copular subject is clearly referential. (27) ascribes the property of being a doctor to the specific woman to whom the copular subject is referring.

- (27) Doktora ang=babae=ng iyon.
 doctor NOM=woman=LK that
 ‘That woman is a doctor.’

When left-dislocated, the copular subject in (27) can leave the resumptive pronoun *siya* as in (28).

- (28) **Ang=babae=ng** **iyon**, doktora(=siya).
 NOM=woman=LK that doctor=3SG.NOM
 ‘**That woman**, (she) is a doctor.’

(29) is a question-answer pair made from (27). (29Q) is a predicational clause whose copular complement is an interrogative pronoun. This content question is asking what property can be predicated of the copular subject. Then (29A) is stating that the property in question is “being a doctor.” Notice that the copular subject *ang babaeng iyon* ‘that woman’ in (29Q) is referred to by *siya* in (29A). The same goes for the polar question in (30).

- (29) Q: Ano **ang=babae=ng** **iyon**?
 what NOM=woman=LK that
 ‘What is **that woman**?’
- A: Doktora=siya.
 doctor=3SG.NOM
 ‘She is a doctor.’

(30) Q: Doktora=ba **ang=babae=ng** **iyon?**
 doctor=Q NOM=woman=LK that

‘Is **that woman** a doctor?’

A: Oo, doktora=siya.

yes doctor=3SG.NOM

‘Yes, she is a doctor.’

Thus, the copular subject of a predicational clause can be referred to by *siya* both in left-dislocation and in question-answer pairs. This is not surprising at all since the copular subject of this type of copular clause refers to a specific individual, and the specific individual can be pronominalized.

However, this is not the case with the copular subject of a specificational clause. Let us use (31) for illustration.

(31) Si=Kath ang=pinaka-maganda=ng babae sa=Cainta.
 P.NOM=Kath NOM=most-beautiful=LK girl DAT=Cainta

‘The most beautiful girl in Cainta is Kath (not any others).’

(31) is a specificational clause, meaning that it is Kath (not any others) that has the property of being the most beautiful girl in Cainta. It provides the value “Kath” for the variable “X is the most beautiful girl in Cainta.” Crucially, the copular subject of this specificational clause cannot be referred to by *siya* in left-dislocation (32) and in question-answer pairs (33) and (34).

(32) **Ang=pinaka-maganda=ng babae sa=Cainta,** si=Kath(=*siya).
 NOM=most-beautiful=LK girl DAT=Cainta P.NOM=Kath=3SG.NOM

‘**The most beautiful girl in Cainta,** (*she) is Kath.’

(33) Q: Sino **ang=pinaka-maganda=ng** **babae sa=Cainta?**
 who.NOM NOM=most-beautiful=LK girl DAT=Cainta

‘Who is **the most beautiful girl in Cainta?**’

A: Si=Kath(=*siya).

P.NOM=Kath=3SG.NOM

‘(*She) is Kath.’

(34) Q: Si=Kath=ba **ang=pinaka-maganda=ng** **babae sa=Cainta?**
 P.NOM=Kath=Q NOM=most-beautiful=LK girl DAT=Cainta

‘Is **the most beautiful girl in Cainta** Kath?’

A: Oo, si=Kath(=*siya).

yes P.NOM=Kath=3SG.NOM

‘Yes, (*she) is Kath.’

Note that the copular clause *si Kath siya* itself is grammatical. In (35), for instance, the copular clause *si Kath siya* is used to state that the person the speakers are looking at is identical to their friend Kath. We call this type of copular clause an identificational clause (see Section 2.3.4 below).

(35) (While they were chatting in a coffee shop, speakers A and B saw a girl walking on the street. The girl looked like their friend, Kath, but they were not sure.)

A: Tingn-an=mo yung=babae.
look-LF=2SG.GEN NOM=woman
‘Look at the woman.’

Parang si=Kath=siya.
seem P.NOM=Kath=3SG.NOM
‘It seems she is Kath.’

B: Oo=nga, baka si=Kath=siya.
yes=indeed maybe P.NOM=Kath=3SG.NOM
‘Yeah, she might be Kath.’

Also, the *ang*-phrase *pinaka-magandang babae sa Cainta* ‘the most beautiful girl in Cainta’ can be referential in other constructions. For example, when it is used as the primary grammatical argument of a verb-predicate clause, it has a definite reference as in (36Q). There is no problem in pronominalization here. See (36A). As noted earlier, a referential nominal in one context may be non-referential in another context.

(36) Q: <Um>alis=na=ba **ang=pinaka-maganda=ng** **babae** **sa=Cainta?**
 <AF>leave=already=Q NOM=most-beautiful=LK girl DAT=Cainta
 ‘Did **the most beautiful girl in Cainta** leave already?’

A: Oo, <um>alis=na=siya.
yes <AF>leave=already=3SG.NOM
‘Yes, she already left.’

Thus, the copular subject of predicational clauses can be referred to by the personal pronoun *siya*, but that of specificational clauses cannot. The different results of the pronominalization test between the copular subject of a predicational clause and that of a specificational clause show the difference in referentiality between the two. The former can be pronominalized by *siya* because it has a referent; the latter cannot be because it is not referential. The copular subject of a specificational clause does not refer to a specific individual but denotes a property.

In contrast, the copular complement of a specificational clause, which represents a specific individual, is referential. Indeed, the copular complement of the specificational clause in (18) can be pronominalized in left-dislocation (37) and in question-answer pair (38).

(37) **Ang=babae**, siya ang=bida sa=pelikula.
 NOM=woman 3SG.NOM NOM=lead DAT=movie
 ‘**The woman**, the lead in the movie is her.’

(38) Q: **Ang=babae**=ba ang=bida sa=pelikula?
 NOM=woman=Q NOM=lead DAT=movie
 ‘Is the lead in the movie **the woman**?’

A: Oo, siya ang=bida sa=pelikula.
 yes 3SG.NOM NOM=lead DAT=movie
 ‘Yes, the lead in the movie is her.’

In summary, in specificational clauses, the copular subject is non-referential, whereas the copular complement is referential.

2.3.3. Pseudocleft clauses

Pseudocleft clauses, or simply pseudoclefts, can be analyzed in the same manner as specificational clauses. What we call pseudoclefts is a subtype of specificational clauses whose copular subject is a nominalized clause (or headless relative clause). The pseudocleft clause in (39), for example, picks out a specific individual who is involved in the action of arriving at the church. In other words, it provides the value “the child” for the variable “X arrived at the church.”

(39) Ang=bata ang=d^{um}ating sa=simbahan.
 NOM=child NOM=arrive<AF> DAT=church
 ‘The one who arrived at the church is the child (not any others).’

Lambrecht (2001:467) defines a cleft construction as “a complex sentence structure consisting of a matrix clause headed by a copula and a relative or relative-like clause whose relativized argument is coindexed with the predicative argument of the copula. Taken together, the matrix and the relative express a logically simple proposition, which can also be expressed in the form of a single clause without a change in truth conditions.” Except for the fact that Tagalog does not have a copula, this definition matches what we call pseudoclefts. Note that pseudoclefts are to be distinguished from the superficially similar example in (40). It is a straightforward predicational clause, the copular subject of which happens to be a nominalized clause.

- (40) Ma-tangkad ang=d<um>ating sa=simbahan.
 ADJ=tall NOM=arrive<AF> DAT=church
 ‘The one who arrived at the church is tall.’

In order to elucidate the characteristics of pseudoclefts, it is useful to compare pseudocleft (39) with verb-predicate clause (11), repeated here as (41), as (39) and (41) are the same in truth-condition. Semantically, the verb-predicate clause in (41) describes the action in which the *ang*-phrase is involved, while the pseudocleft in (39) tells us who it is that is involved in the action. The inverted predication we have already looked at between predicational and specificational clauses is observed between verb-predicate and pseudocleft clauses, as well.

- (41) D<um>ating ang=bata sa=simbahan.
 arrive<AF> NOM=child DAT=church
 ‘The child arrived at the church.’

When they are negated, verb-predicate and pseudocleft clauses imply different things. Compare the negated verb-predicate clause in (42a) and the negated pseudocleft in (42b). Only in the latter construction is it implied that there is someone who arrived at the church.

- (42) a. Hindi d<um>ating ang=bata sa=simbahan.
 NEG arrive<AF> NOM=child DAT=church
 ‘The child didn’t arrive at the church.’
 b. Hindi ang=bata ang=d<um>ating sa=simbahan.
 NEG NOM=child NOM=arrive<AF> DAT=church
 ‘The one who arrived at the church is not the child (but someone else).’

In terms of information structure, similarly to specificational clauses, pseudoclefts are employed to put focus exclusively on a specific individual expressed in the copular complement. Thus, narrowly focused arguments such as question words and exhaustively identified elements (‘only,’ Rizzi 1997) must appear in a copular complement of a pseudocleft clause (Nagaya 2005, 2007a). For example, it is not allowed to use the question word *sino* ‘who’ to form a content question in a verb-predicate clause (43a). The pseudocleft is required instead as in (43b). (44) shows that it is necessary to choose a pseudocleft clause (44b) in order to exhaustively identify the child as the one who arrived at the church. Verb-predicate clause (44a) is grammatical but does not have the reading of the exhaustive identification.

- (43) a. *D<um>ating sino sa=simbahan?
 arrive<AF> who.NOM DAT=church
 Intended for ‘Who arrived at the church?’

b. Sino ang=d<um>ating sa=simbahan?
 who.NOM NOM=arrive<AF> DAT=church
 ‘Who arrived at the church?’ (lit. ‘Who is the one who arrived at the church?’)

- (44) a. D<um>ating=lang ang=bata sa=simbahan.
 arrive<AF>=only NOM=child DAT=church
 *‘Only the child arrived at the church.’
 ‘The child only arrived at the church (i.e., s/he didn’t do anything).’
- b. Ang=bata=lang ang=d<um>ating sa=simbahan.
 NOM=child=only NOM=arrive<AF> DAT=church
 ‘The one who arrived at the church is only the child.’

Since the pseudocleft clause is a subtype of specificational clauses, its copular subject is analyzed as non-referential, while its copular complement is referential. The copular subject denotes an action (or variable), while the copular complement refers to a specific individual (or value), specifying who it is that is involved in the action. Again, this analysis is supported by the pronominalization test. Let us consider the referentiality of the copular subject by examining (45).

- (45) Si=Marfeal **ang=nag-u~ukulele.**
 P.NOM=Marfeal NOM=AF.RL-ASP~play.ukulele
 ‘**The one who is playing the ukulele** is Marfeal.’

The copular subject *ang nag-uukulele* ‘the one who is playing the ukulele’ cannot be referred to by *siya* in left-dislocation (46) and in question-answer pairs (47) and (48).

- (46) **Ang=nag-u~ukulele,** si=Marfeal(=*siya).
 NOM=AF.RL-ASP~play.ukulele P.NOM=Marfeal=3SG.NOM
 ‘**The one who is playing the ukulele,** (*he) is Marfeal.’

- (47) Q: Sino **ang=nag-u~ukulele?**
 who.NOM NOM=AF.RL-ASP~play.ukulele
 ‘Who is **the one who is playing the ukulele?**’
 A: Si=Marfeal(=*siya).
 P.NOM=Marfeal=3SG.NOM
 ‘(*He) is Marfeal.’

- (48) Q: Si=Marfeal=ba **ang=nag-u~ukulele?**
 P.NOM=Marfeal=Q NOM=AF.RL-ASP~play.ukulele

‘Is **the one who is playing the ukulele** Marfeal?’

A: Oo, si=Marfeal(=*siya).
 yes P.NOM=Marfeal=3SG.NOM
 ‘Yes, (*he) is Marfeal.’

On the other hand, the copular complement of a pseudocleft can be pronominalized, which shows that it is referential. See (49) and (50).

(49) **Ang=bata**, siya ang=d<um>ating sa=simbahan.
 NOM-child 3SG.NOM NOM=arrive<AF> DAT=church
 ‘**The child**, the one who arrived at the church is him/her.’

(50) Q: **Ang=bata**=ba ang=d<um>ating sa=simbahan?
 NOM=child=Q NOM=arrive<AF> DAT=church
 ‘Is the one who arrived at the church **the child**?’
 A: Oo, siya ang=d<um>ating sa=simbahan.
 yes 3SG.NOM NOM=arrive<AF> DAT=church
 ‘Yes, the one who arrived at the church is him/her.’

To conclude, in specificational and pseudocleft clauses, the copular subject is non-referential, while the copular complement is referential. Importantly, in our analysis the copular subject marked by *ang* is non-referential contrary to the prior analyses. When the semantics of these types of copular clauses is carefully examined, it turns out that the widely-accepted hypothesis that *ang*-phrases are always referential is not true.

2.3.4. Identificational clauses

The function of identificational clauses is to declare that the referent of a copular subject is identical to that of a copular complement. For example, (51) states that *ang babaeng iyon* ‘that woman,’ who the speaker is talking about, is the same person as Osang. The reversed order is possible, like (52), and does not change the meaning. It is clear from its function that both copular subject and complement are referential in this type of copular clause.

(51) Si=Osang **ang=babae=ng** **iyon**.
 P.NOM=Osang NOM=woman=LK that
 ‘**That woman** is Osang.’

(52) **Ang=babae=ng** **iyon** si=Osang.
 NOM=woman=LK that P.NOM=Osang
 ‘Osang is **that woman**.’

2.4. Complement clauses

Ang also introduces an infinitival complement clause in impersonal adjective-predicate clauses as in (53) and (54). In this case, the *ang*-phrase represents a closed proposition, not a specific individual, and thus it is non-referential.¹⁰

- (53) Ma-hirap **ang=mag-mahal** **ng=syota** **ng=iba.**
ADJ-hard NOM=AF-love GEN=girlfriend GEN=another
'It is hard **to love the girlfriend of another (person).**'

- (54) Ma-saya **ang=maki-pag-kwentuhan.**
ADJ-fun NOM=AF-GRN-chat
'It is fun **to chat.**'

2.5. Parentheticals

Parentheticals are defined here as expressions used to situate the following utterance in a discourse in terms of quotation or epistemic attitude (Nagaya 2007b, c, ms, cf. "stance markers" in Yap this volume). They usually appear in the sentence-initial position,¹¹ and work as sentential adverbs of some kind. *Ang* can be used for marking such a parenthetical. In (55), for instance, *ang* introduces *totoo* 'truth,' which expresses the speaker's epistemic attitude toward the following utterance (cf. "epistemic parenthetical" in Thompson and Mulac 1991).¹² (2) is also an example of this type of parentheticals. Unlike other uses of *ang*, *ang*-parentheticals are not required constituents of a clause. (55) is still grammatical even if the *ang* parenthetical is omitted.

- (55) **Ang=totoo,** may gusto=siya sa=akin.
NOM=truth have crush=3SG.NOM DAT=3SG.DAT
'**In fact (lit. the truth is),** s/he has a crush on me.'

In contrast, the parentheticals in the following examples have textual or discourse-related meanings. In (56), the *ang*-phrase *ang sabi niya* 'his/her statement' or 'what s/he said' is

¹⁰ Note that the linker *na/-ng* is also employed for introducing a complement clause, and it is more common than marking a complement clause with *ang*. Himmelmann (1997) argues that the linker developed from a demonstrative. See also Diessel (1999:130-132) and Reid and Liao (2004:484).

¹¹ In constructed examples, *ang*-marked parentheticals can appear in the sentence-final position as well (see Nagaya 2005, 2007a for the sentence-initial/final position in Tagalog). However, no parenthetical appears in the sentence-final position in the corpus examined in Section 4.

¹² Foong Ha Yap (p.c.) points out that this use of *ang* is reminiscent of epistemic uses of the definiteness marker *-nya* in Colloquial Indonesian (Englebretson 2003) and in Malay (Yap this volume).

ordinary adjective-predicate clause, in which the proposition that Kim is beautiful is analytically expressed by the subject and the adjectival predicate. The *ang*-marked exclamative in (59), in contrast, expresses the same proposition as (58), but the proposition is packed into the single nominalized expression marked by *ang*, yielding an exclamatory meaning. Notice that the subject in (59) is marked in the genitive case rather than in the nominative case, which explicitly shows that (59) is nominalized. Another example is given in (60), which is a nominalized version of (40).

- (58) Ma-ganda si=Kim.
 ADJ-beautiful P.NOM=Kim
 ‘Kim is beautiful.’
- (59) **Ang=ganda ni=Kim!**
 NOM=beautiful P.GEN=Kim
 ‘**How beautiful Kim is!**’ (lit. ‘Kim’s beauty.’)
- (60) **Ang=tangkad ng=d<um>ating sa=simbahan!**
 NOM=tall GEN=arrive<AF> DAT=church
 ‘**How tall the one who arrived at the church is!**’
 (lit. ‘The tallness of the one who arrived at the church.’)

Ang-exclamatives are non-referential. They are not employed to refer to a specific individual, but to express the speaker’s feeling at the time of utterance.

2.7. Development from referential to non-referential uses

In this section, we have argued that *ang*-phrases can be either referential or non-referential according to the construction where they appear. Our discussions can be summarized as in (61) and (62).

- (61) Referential uses of *ang*-phrases:
 a. Unattached nominal

languages.

Bendette McFarland (p.c.) suggests that it might be possible to analyze *ang* with an exclamatory meaning as a contracted form of *ano-ng* ‘what-LK,’ which is another exclamative-forming strategy. We do not take this possibility for the following reasons: (i) there are semantic differences between *ang*-exclamatives and *anong*-exclamatives, (ii) the CVCV-reduplication for intensification is available to *ang*-exclamatives but not to *anong*-exclamatives (for example, *ang ganda-ganda mo* but **anong ganda-ganda mo*), and (iii) there exist nominalized exclamatives created by an article in other Philippine languages as well (see Section 5 and Kaufmann this volume).

¹⁴ Another way of forming an exclamative in Tagalog is the prefix *ka-* (Bloomfield 1917, Blake 1925, Schachter and Otnes 1972), whose cognates are also used for forming an exclamative in other Philippine languages (Kaufmann this volume). Interestingly, the exclamative with the prefix *ka-* is not used in the Tagalog spoken corpus (Section 4), while the *ang*-exclamative occurs frequently. Thus, we might be able to speculate that the exclamative with *ka-* is disappearing in modern Tagalog because of the emergence of the exclamative with *ang*.

- b. Primary grammatical argument of a verb-predicate clause
- c. Copular subject of predicational and identificational clauses
- d. Copular complement of identificational, specificational, and pseudocleft clauses

(62) Non-referential uses of *ang*-phrases:

- a. Copular subject of specificational and pseudocleft clauses
(→ property/action/variable)
- b. Complement clause (→ closed proposition)
- c. Parenthetical (→ the speaker's epistemic attitude/quotation/textual relation)
- d. Exclamative (→ the speaker's feeling)

At the beginning of the section, we pointed out that the original function of *ang* should be referential according to its reconstructed form (Reid 1978). If this assumption is correct, our analyses in (61) and (62) suggest that *ang* has been grammaticalizing from referential to non-referential uses: the article *ang* has been acquiring non-referential functions. Of course, further research is definitely needed to substantiate our hypothesis. Also, it still remains uncertain in what order *ang*-phrases have acquired these non-referential uses. Nevertheless, it is crucial to mention that at the emergence of non-referential uses, *ang*-phrases have obtained more discourse-related and more subjective meanings (cf “stance markers” in Yap this volume).¹⁵ In referential uses, *ang*-phrases simply refer to a specific individual. In non-referential uses, in contrast, their meaning is more abstract, textual, and subjective. Instead of referring to a specific individual, the copular subject of specificational and pseudocleft clauses is involved in the manipulation of a property, action, or variable. The complement clause marked by *ang* represents a closed proposition. *Ang*-parentheticals indicate the speaker's epistemic attitude toward a proposition or a textual meaning, while *ang*-exclamatives express the speaker's intense feeling at the moment of utterance. Both are deeply anchored in the speaker's experience, and cannot be interpreted properly if separated from the existence of the speaker. In this sense, they are highly subjective.

Also, *ang*-phrases display de-categorization or a loss of categoriality in non-referential uses (Heine, Claudi and Hünemeyer 1991 and Heine and Kuteva 2007). *Ang*-phrases are clearly nominal in referential uses, but lose their noun-like properties in non-referential uses. The copular subject of specificational and pseudocleft clauses cannot be referred to by the third

¹⁵ Concerning the nature of semantic changes that accompany grammaticalization, Traugott (1989:34-35) proposes three semantic-pragmatic tendencies.

- (i) Tendency I: Meanings based in the external described situation > meanings based in the internal (evaluative/perceptual/cognitive) described situation.
- (ii) Tendency II: Meanings based in the external or internal described situation > meanings based in the textual and metalinguistic situation.
- (iii) Tendency III: Meanings tend to become increasingly based in the speaker's subjective belief state/attitude toward the proposition.

person pronoun *siya*. The complement clause marked by *ang* is not nominal but infinitival. *Ang*-parentheticals function as sentential adverbs, and are not required in a clause. *Ang*-exclamatives can serve as sentences indicating a propositional meaning on their own right. Thus, *ang*-marked nominals show reduced categoriality in non-referential uses. Although our hypothesis on the development of *ang*-phrases needs more research for verification, the non-referential uses of *ang*-phrases demonstrate the semantic changes and de-categorization that are characteristic of grammaticalization.

3. Rise of referentiality: the usage of Tagalog *yung*

Modern Tagalog has a set of articles that are grammaticalized from the demonstratives: *iyon* ‘that (distal)’ + *-ng* > *yung*, *iyon* ‘that (medial)’ + *-ng* > *yang*, and *ito* ‘this’ + *-ng* > *itong* (see Table 1 again; *-ng* is a linking element). See also McFarland (1976), Reid (1978), and Himmelmann (2005b). Among these demonstrative-derived articles, *yung* is currently the most often used and is considered as nearly a replacement for *ang* especially in conversations (Reid 1978, Himmelmann 2005b).

Yung is not a demonstrative any longer but an article in modern Tagalog. Reid (1978:58) observes that *yung* is “usable as a definite article without demonstrative significance.” As a sign of grammaticalization, *yung* shows phonological reduction: *iyon* [ijón] + *-ng* [ŋ] → *yung* [juŋ]. Morphologically, while the demonstrative *iyon* is a free word, *yung* is a proclitic: it cannot be used independently and forms a single phonological unit with a constituent that accompanies it.

It is clear that the original meaning of *yung* is deictic and thus referential, since it is derived from the distal demonstrative *iyon*. In this section, we point out that, similarly to *ang*, *yung* has been developing from deictic to referential uses and from referential to non-referential uses. It is also emphasized that *yung* is not just a renewal or replacement for *ang*, but displays additional functions which *ang* does not have.

3.1. Referential and non-referential uses of *yung*

Similarly to *ang*, *yung* has both referential and non-referential functions. See (63)-(69) for referential uses and (70)-(72) for non-referential uses.

(63) (Unattached nominal)

Yung=Biblia.

NOM=bible

‘The Bible.’ (e.g. as an answer to a question)

(64) (Primary grammatical argument of a verb-predicate clause)

D<um>ating **yung=bata** sa=simbahan.
 arrive<AF> NOM=child DAT=church
 ‘**The child** arrived at the church.’

(65) (Copular subject of a predicational clause)

Bida **yung=babae** sa=pelikula.
 lead NOM=woman DAT=movie
 ‘**The woman** is the lead in the movie.’

(66) (Copular subject of an identificational clause)

Si=Osang **yung=babae=ng** **iyon.**
 P.NOM=Osang NOM=woman=LK that
 ‘**That woman** is Osang.’

(67) (Copular complement of an identificational clause)

Yung=babae=ng **iyon** si=Osang.
 NOM=woman=LK that P.NOM=Osang
 ‘Osang is **that woman**.’

(68) (Copular complement of a specificational clause)

Yung=bata ang=bida sa=pelikula.
 NOM=child NOM=lead DAT=movie
 ‘The lead in the movie is **the child**.’

(69) (Copular complement of a pseudocleft clause)

Yung=bata ang=d<um>ating sa=simbahan.
 NOM=child NOM=arrive<AF> DAT=church
 ‘The one who arrived at the church is **the child**.’

(70) (Copular subject of a specificational clause)

Si=Piolo **yung=bida** **sa=pelikula.**
 P.NOM=Piolo NOM=lead DAT=movie
 ‘**The lead in the movie** is Piolo.’

(71) (Copular subject of a pseudocleft clause)

Si=Lorie **yung=d<um>ating** **sa=simbahan.**
 P.NOM=Lorie NOM=arrive<AF> DAT=church
 ‘**The one who arrived at the church** is Lorie.’

(72) (Complement clause)

Ma-hirap **yung=mag-mahal** **ng=syota** **ng=iba.**
 ADJ-hard NOM=AF-love GEN=girlfriend GEN=another
 ‘It is hard **to love the girlfriend of another (person).**’

However, it is not true that *yung* has exactly the same distribution as *ang*: parentheticals with *yung* are not preferred, and exclamatives cannot be formed by *yung*. See (73) and (74).

- (73) ?**Yung=totoo**, may gusto=siya sa=akin.
 NOM=true have crush=3SG.NOM DAT=3SG.DAT
 ‘**In fact (lit. the truth is)**, s/he has a crush on me.’ (cf. 55)
- (74) ***Yung=ganda ni=Kim!**
 NOM=beautifulP.GEN=Kim
 Intended for ‘**How beautiful Kim is!**’ (cf. 59)

Thus, *yung* has been grammaticalized to such an extent that it can be used either referentially or non-referentially. However, its grammaticalization has not yet gone so far as *ang*. *Yung* does not have all of the non-referential uses that *ang* has developed.

3.2. Carried-over and expanded functions of *yung*

Although this has received little attention in prior studies, the article *yung* has several functions which *ang* does not: one is carried over from its demonstrative meaning, and another is an expanded nominalizing function that only *yung* displays. First, *yung* may still convey a spatial deictic meaning. In (75), for instance, the *yung*-phrase is used deictically, referring to a specific ball away from the speaker and hearer. This interpretation is not possible when *ang* is used instead of *yung*.

- (75) Kun-in=mo **yung=bola!**
 get-PF=2SG.GEN NOM=ball
 ‘**Get the ball (which is far from the speaker and hearer)!**’

Second, *yung* can nominalize constituents that *ang* and other articles cannot nominalize. For example, *yung* introduces a personal name already marked by the personal name article *si* in (76), yielding the interpretation that John Rey, to whom the *yung*-phrase is referring, is away from the speaker and hearer.¹⁶ In (77), *yung* leads the temporal noun *kagabi* ‘last night’ to refer to the message the speaker sent the night before. *Ang* is not possible in these contexts.

¹⁶ One of the reviewers, who is a native speaker of Tagalog, reports that (76) has an alternative reading in which John Rey is socially distant (or distanced) from the speaker, and that one cannot use (76) if John Rey is the speaker's brother, for example, regardless of his location at the time of utterance.

- (76) Na-kausap=mo=na=ba **yung=si=John Rey?**
 SP.RL-talk.to=2SG.GEN=already=Q NOM=P.NOM=John Rey?
 ‘Did you already talk to **John Rey?**’

- (77) (The speaker is saying that s/he sent a message to the hearer by mistake.)
 Wrong send **yung=kagabi.**
 wrong send NOM=last.night
 ‘**The message I sent to you last night** was the one sent to a wrong address.’¹⁷

Moreover, *yung* can nominalize a full clause. In (78), the *yung*-marked clause *yung nakabikini ka* ‘you were wearing a bikini’ works as a referential expression, meaning the picture (drawing, video, etc.) where the hearer was wearing a bikini. (79) is a pseudocleft in which the copular subject is left-dislocated. The copular complement is the *yung*-marked complex sentence *yung kapag nag-birthday ako maraming regalo* ‘when I have a birthday, there are a lot of gifts,’ which refers to the specific event the speaker likes the most. Again, the use of *ang* in these environments results in ungrammatical sentences.

- (78) Pa-kita=mo sa=akin **yung=naka-bikini=ka.**
 CAUS-see=2SG.GEN DAT=1SG.DAT NOM=wear.bikini=2SG.NOM
 ‘Show me **the picture (drawing, video etc.) where you were wearing a bikini.**’

- (79) Ang=pinaka-gusto=ko,
 NOM=most-like=1SG.GEN
yung=kapag nag-birthday=ako marami=ng regalo.
 NOM=when AF.RL-have.birthday=1SG.NOM many=LK gift
 ‘What I like the most is **the situation that when I have my birthday, there are a lot of gifts.**’

In this section, we have showed that *yung* has both referential and non-referential uses like *ang*, but lacks some non-referential uses that *ang* has, and possesses some referential uses that *ang*

¹⁷ We have to note, however, that the interpretation that the *yung*-phrase refers to the message is due to pragmatic reasons rather than syntactic ones. The more precise translation for *yung kagabi* is ‘something pertaining to last night’ and the interpretation in question is obtained because the copular complement in (77) is *wrong send* ‘the message sent to a wrong address.’ Thus, in other contexts the same *yung*-phrase can mean a different thing.

- (i) Ma-saya **yung=kagabi.**
 ADJ-fun NOM=last.night
 ‘**What happened last night (e.g. party)** was fun.’
- (ii) Su~suut-in=ko=ulit **yung=kagabi.**
 ASP~wear-PF=1SG.GEN=again NOM=last.night
 ‘I will wear again **the one I wore last night (e.g. jacket).**’

does not. Therefore, *yung* is not a mere replacement for *ang* but is also an addition to the Tagalog article system.¹⁸

4. Evolution from referential to non-referential uses

We have so far observed that both *ang* and *yung* have developed referential and non-referential uses but with different focal points. *Ang* has a variety of non-referential uses, even being able to create parentheticals and exclamatives. In contrast, the main function of *yung* is referential. It still retains its deictic implication in some contexts and has an expanded nominalizing function but it lacks the function of forming an exclamative.

The next question to ask is, then, how frequently are *ang* and *yung* used referentially and non-referentially? In order to answer this question, we have to look at the actual usage of these articles.

4.1. Corpus-based approach to *ang* and *yung*

Nagaya (2007b, c, ms) has conducted a quantitative investigation into referential and non-referential uses of *ang* and *yung* in a spoken corpus. A spoken corpus rather than a written one is examined to look at the actual usage of *ang* and *yung* and to compare them. As noted earlier, *yung* is usually used in informal speech, like conversations, and is avoided in formal style (Reid 1978, Himmelmann 2005).

The corpus examined, the Tagalog spoken corpus, was collected by asking native speakers to do three distinct tasks: have conversations, tell narratives, and relate pear stories. Native speakers of Tagalog had conversations with their close friends (conversations), produced a story about a specific topic given to them (narratives), and retold the Pear film (Chase 1980) (pear stories). The total duration is approximately 303 minutes (115 minutes for conversations, 111 minutes for narratives and 77 minutes for pear stories), and the total number of words is 45,708 (18,965 words for conversations, 17,084 words for narratives and 9,659 words for pear stories). All participants who have contributed to this corpus are native speakers of Tagalog born and raised in Manila and its neighboring provinces such as Bulacan, Rizal and Quezon.

In Table 4 the frequency of occurrence of each use of *ang* and *yung* in the Tagalog spoken corpus is given. As seen from the table, *ang* is often used non-referentially. Interestingly, the most frequent use of *ang* in our spoken corpus is to form an exclamative: 157 examples of *ang* (36.4%) are employed for this purpose. In contrast, the use of *ang* as the primary grammatical

¹⁸ As Foong Ha Yap (p.c.) notes, there are some functional overlaps between Tagalog *yung* and Malay *yang* (see Yap this volume). But they are not etymologically directly related. According to Scott Paauw (p.c.), the etymology of Malay *yang* has been much discussed, with no conclusive answer as yet. One of the plausible hypotheses is that *yang* developed from *ia* (third person singular pronoun) + *nan/nang* (Old Malay equivalent to *yang*).

argument of a verb-predicate clause is relatively infrequent. It consists of 78 examples (18.1%), which is as frequent as the *ang*-marked parentheticals. In terms of referentiality, 112 examples of *ang* (26.0%) are used referentially, while 319 examples (74.0%) are employed non-referentially. See Table 5.

Table 4: Referential and non-referential uses of *ang* and *yung*

Referentiality	Uses	<i>ang</i>		<i>yung</i>	
		#	%	#	%
Referential	Unattached nominal	6	1.4	205	14.5
	Primary argument of a verb-predicate clause	78	18.1	756	53.5
	Subject of a predicational clause	28	6.5	234	16.6
	Subject of an identificational clause	0	0.0	17	1.2
	Complement of an identificational clause	0	0.0	1	0.1
	Complement of a specificational clause	0	0.0	21	1.5
	Complement of a pseudocleft clause	0	0.0	4	0.3
Non-referential	Subject of a specificational clause	40	9.3	97	6.9
	Subject of a pseudocleft clause	50	11.6	78	5.5
	Complement clause	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Parenthetical	72	16.7	0	0.0
	Exclamative	157	36.4	0	0.0
Total		431	100.0	1413	100.0

Table 5: Referentiality of *ang* and *yung*

Referentiality	<i>ang</i>		<i>yung</i>	
	#	%	#	%
Referential uses	112	26.0	1238	87.6
Non-referential uses	319	74.0	175	12.4
Total	431	100.0	1413	100.0

On the other hand, *yung* is almost always used referentially. 1,238 examples of *yung* (87.6%) are used referentially, while 175 examples (12.4%) are employed non-referentially. The most frequent use of *yung* is to introduce the primary grammatical argument of a verb-predicate clause (756 examples, 53.5%), followed by marking the copular subject of a predicational clause (234 examples, 16.6%). Its non-referential uses are not impossible but rarely appear in the spoken corpus. The use of forming a parenthetical or exclamative, which constitutes a significant fraction of the total uses of *ang*, is not found for *yung*. In conclusion, *ang* frequently appears in non-referential uses, but *yung* is often employed referentially in the spoken corpus.

4.2. Renewal and expansion in the Tagalog article system

The results revealed in the previous sections suggest that two semantic changes are going on in the Tagalog article system. Both *ang* and *yung* have been grammaticalizing from deictic to referential uses and from referential to non-referential uses. But the developments of the two articles have proceeded at different paces and to different stages. *Ang*-phrases are now becoming less referential, obtaining discourse-related and subjective meanings. To be more precise, its primary usage has been moving from referential to non-referential, subjective and discourse-related uses. The original demonstrative meaning of *ang* is completely bleached out in modern Tagalog, and its frequent uses are non-referential ones in spoken discourse. The widely-accepted hypothesis that *ang*-phrases are always referential can no longer be upheld.

Keeping in step with the de-referentialization of *ang*, *yung* is now taking over the referential uses of *ang*, as hinted already in Reid (1978). This process of grammaticalization has made progress to such an extent that in spoken discourse *yung* is the default article for marking referential nominals. It still maintains its original deictic meaning, and has acquired an expanded nominalizing function that *ang* does not have. Although *yung* has non-referential uses as well, these appear infrequently. Taken together, there is an emerging semantic distinction between *ang* and *yung* in spoken discourse: *ang* is for non-referential uses, and *yung* for referential uses.

5. Development of non-referentiality across Philippine languages

Traditionally, not only Tagalog *ang* but also its equivalents in other Philippine languages have been believed to be referential. Reid and Liao (2004:469) observes “[i]n all Philippine languages, Nominative phrases [*ang*-phrases and their equivalents,” NN] typically have a definite interpretation, that is, the speaker assumes that the addressee knows the general reference of the actant which is the head of the phrase.”

In this section, we explore the possibility that our analyses of Tagalog articles can be applied to article systems in other Philippine languages, by looking at cases from two other Philippine languages: *ang* and *su* in Bikol (Partido dialect, Central Philippines) and *ti* and *diay* in Ilokano (Northern Philippines). We point out that nominals marked by these articles can be either referential or non-referential, and that in these languages, too, there is evidence of an existing article obtaining non-referential uses and a newer article emerging for referential nominals.

5.1. Bikol *ang* and *su*

The Partido dialect of Bikol has two articles for common nouns in the nominative case, *ang* and *su*. Both are considered to mark a definite nominal, but *su* is more specific and more emphatic

than *ang* (McFarland 1978).¹⁹ Indeed, *ang* and *su* can be used almost interchangeably as in (80)-(87). When both articles are available, *su* allows for a distal deictic reading, but *ang* does not.

(80) (Primary grammatical argument of a verb-predicate clause)

Nag-abot **ang/su=aki** sa=simbahan.
 AF.RL-arrive NOM=child DAT=church
 ‘**The child** arrived at the church.’

(81) (Copular subject of a predicational clause)

Bida **ang/su=bayi** sa=pelikula.
 lead NOM=woman DAT=movie
 ‘**The woman** is the lead in the movie.’

(82) (Copular subject of an identificational clause)

Si=Osang **ang/su=bayi=ng** **itu.**
 P.NOM=Osang NOM=woman=LK that
 ‘**That woman** is Osang.’

(83) (Copular complement of an identificational clause)

Ang/Su=bayi=ng **itu** si=Osang.
 NOM=woman=LK that P.NOM=Osang
 ‘Osang is **that woman**.’

(84) (Copular complement of a specificational clause)

Ang/Su=bayi ang=bida se=pelikula.
 NOM=woman NOM=lead DAT=movie
 ‘The lead in the movie is **the woman**.’

(85) (Copular complement of a pseudocleft clause)

Ang/Su=aki ang=nag-abot sa=simbahan.
 NOM=child NOM=AF.RL-arrive DAT=church
 ‘The one who arrived at the church is **the child**.’

(86) (Copular subject of a specificational clause)

¹⁹ *Ang* [an] in this dialect is equivalent to *an* [an] in the dialect of Bikol on which McFarland (1978) works. Pangasinan (Northern Philippines), Matigsalug Manuvu (South Mindanao) and other Manobo languages have *su* as a demonstrative (Nolasco Ma. Ricardo p.c., and Mark Felix Albert Santiago p.c.). However, *su* is not a demonstrative but an article in Partido Bikol. Demonstratives in this language are *ito* ‘that (distal),’ *iyang/an* ‘that (medial),’ and *ini* ‘this.’

Si=Piolo **ang/su=bida** **sa=pelikula.**
 P.NOM=Piolo NOM=lead DAT=movie
 ‘**The lead in the movie** is Piolo.’

(87) (Copular subject of a pseudocleft clause)
 Si=Lorie **ang/su=nag-abot** **sa=simbahan.**
 P.NOM=Lorie NOM=AF.RL-arrive DAT=church
 ‘**The one who arrived at the church** is Lorie.’

Interestingly, *ang* is the only available article to introduce a complement clause and a parenthetical. See (88) and (89). *Su* cannot be used for these types of non-referential expressions.

(88) Ma-sakit **ang/*su=ma-moot** **sa=ilusyo** **ning=iba.**
 ADJ-hard NOM=AF-love DAT=girlfriend GEN=another
 ‘It is hard **to love the girlfriend of another (person).**’

(89) **Ang/*Su=tutuo**, mai gusto=siya sakuya.
 NOM=true have crush=3SG.NOM 3SG.DAT
 ‘**In fact (lit. the truth is)**, s/he has a crush on me.’

It is not possible, however, to use *ang* or *su* to form an exclamative in this language. They are not yet grammaticalized to accommodate a subjective meaning like in exclamatives. For this purpose, another article *ung* is employed like (90). This article is used only for forming an exclamative in this dialect of Bikol.

(90) **Ung=gayun=mo.**
 ART=beautiful=2SG.GEN
 ‘**How beautiful you are!** (lit. ‘Your beauty.’)’

In summary, the two articles in Partido Bikol, *ang* and *su*, show the same grammaticalization patterns from referential to non-referential uses as *ang* and *yung* in Tagalog. *Ang* can be used even for the non-referential uses that are discourse-related and subjective, but *su* cannot. Neither of them can create an exclamative.

5.2. Ilokano *ti* and *diay*

There are two articles for core arguments in Ilokano, *ti* and *diay*. *Ti* is the older article employed mainly in written discourse, whereas *diay* recently developed from the distal demonstrative pronoun *daydiay* and is often used in informal speech (Reid 1978, Rubino 1997). *Ti* and *diay* can

be used either referentially or non-referentially as in (91)-(97). However, the consultant reports that *diay* is preferred for referential uses (91)-(95) and *ti* is for non-referential uses (96)-(97).

- (91) (Primary grammatical argument of a verb-predicate clause)
 S<imm>angpet **?ti/diay=ubing** idiy=simbaan.
 arrive<AF.RL> NOM=child there=church
 ‘**The child** arrived at the church.’
- (92) (Copular subject of a predicational clause)
 Bida **?ti/diay=babai** idiy=pelikula.
 lead NOM=woman there=movie
 ‘**The woman** is the lead in the movie.’
- (93) (Copular subject of an identificational clause)²⁰
 Ni=Osang **?ti/diay=babai nga daydiay**.
 P.NOM=Osang NOM=woman LK that
 ‘**That woman** is Osang.’
- (94) (Copular complement of a specificational clause)
?Ti/Diay=babai ti=bida idiy=pelikula.
 NOM=woman NOM=lead there=movie
 ‘The lead in the movie is **the woman**.’
- (95) (Copular complement of a pseudocleft clause)
?Ti/Diay=ubing ti=s<imm>angpet idiy=simbaan.
 NOM=child NOM=arrive<AF.RL> there=church
 ‘The one who arrived at the church is **the child**.’
- (96) (Copular subject of a specificational clause)
 Ni=Piolo **ti/?diay=bida idiy=pelikula**.
 P.NOM=Piolo NOM=lead there=movie
 ‘**The lead in the movie** is Piolo.’
- (97) (Copular subject of a pseudocleft clause)
 Ni=Lorie **ti/?diay=s<imm>angpet idiy=simbaan**.
 P.NOM=Lorie NOM=arrive<AF.RL> there=church

²⁰ The distal demonstrative *daydiay* rather than *ti* or *diay* is used for making the copular complement of an identificational clause.

(i) Daydiay nga babai ni=Osang.
 that LK woman P.NOM=Osang
 ‘Osang is that woman.’

‘**The one who arrived at the church** is Lorie.’

Crucially, *diay* cannot create a complement clause (98), a parenthetical (99) and an exclamative (100). *Ti* is the only available article to express these types of non-referential uses.

(98) Na-rigat **ti/*diay=ag-ayat** **ti=noby**a **ti=sabali** (a tao).
ADJ-hard NOM=AF-love NOM=girlfriend NOM=another LK person
‘It is hard **to love the girlfriend of another.**’

(99) **Ti/*Diay=kuskusto**, adda kayat=na kaniak.
NOM=truth have crush=3SG.NOM 1SG.DAT
‘**In fact (lit. the truth is)**, s/he had a crush on me.’

(100) **Ti/*Diay=gago!**
NOM=stupid
‘**How stupid it is!**’

Thus, in Ilokano, the existing article *ti* has developed a wide variety of non-referential functions, while the newly-grammaticalized article *diay* only covers referential functions and a few non-referential functions.

5.3. Summary

In this section we have suggested that our analyses of the Tagalog articles can be applied to the articles in Partido Bikol and Ilokano. Nominals marked by the nominative articles in these languages are often analyzed as referential (or definite). However, they are referential in some constructions but non-referential in other constructions. Also, we have confirmed that in these languages as well, the older articles can be used for different kinds of non-referential uses, while the emerging ones are mainly for referential nominals and have not obtained several non-referential uses. The development of the articles in these languages is not equal or homogeneous, however. Tagalog *ang* and Ilokano *ti* have obtained the function of creating an exclamative, whereas Partido Bikol *ang* has not acquired this function. Tagalog *yung* can be used even for complement clauses and parentheticals, but Partido Bikol *su* and Ilokano *diay* cannot.

From these observations, one may speculate that the semantic changes that are going on in the Tagalog articles system, namely, (i) the de-referentialization of the older article and (ii) the takeover of referential uses by the new article, are taking place in other Philippine languages too. Needless to say, further research and more data from other Philippine languages are necessary to determine whether this hypothesis is valid or not.

6. Conclusions

This paper has examined the referential and non-referential uses of articles and nominals in Philippine languages and proposed the hypothesis that their development has been proceeding from referential to non-referential uses. Tagalog *ang* and *yung* have their origin in demonstratives, the former being grammaticalized from **na* in Proto Philippines and the latter from *iyon* in Tagalog. The older article *ang* has lost its original deictic meaning, and its functions have been shifting from referential uses to non-referential uses. Although it has long been believed that *ang*-phrases are always referential, our careful examination of *ang*-phrases in various constructions has revealed that they can be either referential or non-referential. They have even acquired the function of expressing discourse-related and subjective meanings in parentheticals and exclamatives. Moreover it was observed that in the spoken corpus the referential uses of *ang* occur less frequently than its non-referential uses. The widely-accepted hypothesis on the referentiality of *ang* is not true.

In contrast, the newly-grammaticalized article *yung* is taking over the referential functions that *ang* is losing. In the Tagalog spoken corpus, *yung* almost always marks referential nominals. At the same time, it still keeps its original deictic meaning, unlike *ang*, and has obtained an additional nominalizing function which *ang* does not demonstrate. Taken together, there is an emerging semantic difference between *ang* and *yung*: *ang* is preferred for non-referential uses, and *yung* for referential uses.

Lastly, by examining *ang* and *su* in Partido Bikol and *ti* and *diay* in Ilokano, this paper has also suggested that nominals marked by these articles, which have been believed to be always referential, can be either referential or non-referential, and that in these languages as well we see evidence of an existing article acquiring non-referential uses and a newer one emerging for referential nominals.

References

- Blake, Frank R. 1925. *A Grammar of the Tagalog Language*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1917. *Tagalog Texts with Grammatical Analysis*. Urbana: The University of Illinois.
- Cena, Resty M. 1977. Patient primacy in Tagalog. Presented at the LSA Annual Meeting, Chicago.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1980. *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural, and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Croft, William. 1991. *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations: The Cognitive*

- Organization of Information*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Croft, William. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic Theory in Typological Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Curnow, Timothy Jowan. 2000. Towards a cross-linguistic typology of copula constructions. In John Henderson, ed., *Proceedings of the 1999 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, <http://www.linguistics.uwa.edu.au/research/als99/proceedings>
- Declerck, Renaat. 1988. *Studies on Copular Sentences, Clefts, and Pseudo-clefts*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- De Guzman, Videia P. 1988. Ergative analysis for Philippine languages: An analysis. In Richard McGinn, ed., *Studies in Austronesian Linguistics*, 323-345. Athens: Center for Southeast Asia Studies, Center for International Studies, Ohio University.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, Function and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 2002. Copula clauses in Australian languages: A typological perspective. *Anthropological Linguistics* 44:1-36.
- Englebretson, Robert. 2003. *Searching for Structure: The Problem of Complementation in Colloquial Indonesian Conversation*. Studies in Discourse and Grammar, 13. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1978. How does a language acquire gender markers? In Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson and Edith Moravcsik, eds., *Universals of Human Language*, Volume 3, *Word Structure* 47-82. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English. Part 2. *Journal of Linguistics* 3:177-274.
- Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hünemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva. 2007. *The Genesis of Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Higgins, Francis Roger. 1979. *The Pseudo-cleft Construction in English*. New York: Garland.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 1991. *The Philippine Challenge to Universal Grammar*. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 1997. *Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase: Zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2004. Tagalog (Austronesian). In Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann and Joachim Mugdan, eds., *Morphology: A Handbook on Inflection and Word Formation*, Volume 2, 1473-1490. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2005a. The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar: Typological characteristics. In Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelman, eds., *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 110-181. London: Routledge.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2005b. Tagalog. In Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelman,

- eds., *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 350-376. London: Routledge.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Janice Martin. 1987. Structuralism and diachrony: the development of the indefinite article in English. In Anna Giacalone Ramat, Onofrio Carruba, and Guiliano Bernini, eds., *Papers from the 7th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, 295-304. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1984. The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar. *Language* 60:703-752.
- Kaufman, Daniel. 2005. Aspects of pragmatic focus in Tagalog. In I Wayan Arka and Malcom Ross, eds., *The Many Faces of Austronesian Voice Systems: Some New Empirical Studies*, 175-196. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Kaufman, Daniel. This volume. Exclamatives and temporal nominalizations in Austronesian. In Foong Ha Yap and Janick Wrona, eds., *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*, Volume II: *Asia-Pacific Languages*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase Structure and Grammatical Relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 2001. A framework for the analysis of cleft constructions. *Linguistics* 39:463-516.
- Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McFarland, Curtis D. 1976. *A Provisional Classification of Tagalog Verbs*. Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa Monograph Series, No.8. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- McFarland, Curtis D. 1978. Definite objects and subject selection in Philippine languages. In Casilda Edrial-Luzares and Austin Hale, eds., *Studies in Philippine Linguistics*, Volume 2, 139-182. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Mikkelsen, Line. 2004. *Specifying Who: On the Structure, Meaning, and Use of Specificational Copular Clauses*. PhD Dissertation, University of California Santa Cruz.
- Mikkelsen, Line. 2005. *Copular Clauses: Specification, Predication, and Equation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Moro, Andrea. 1997. *The Raising of Predicates: Predicative Noun Phrases and the Theory of Clause Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nagaya, Naonori. 2005. Information structure and constituent order in Tagalog. Presented at the 2005 International Course and Conference on Role and Reference Grammar, Academia Sinica, Taipei, June 26-30.
- Nagaya, Naonori. 2007a. Information structure and constituent order in Tagalog. *Language and Linguistics* 8: 343-372.
- Nagaya, Naonori. 2007b. Rethinking referentiality of Tagalog *ang*-phrases. Presented at the 2007 annual conference of the Australian Linguistic Society, Adelaide, September 26-28.
- Nagaya, Naonori. 2007c. Referentiality of Tagalog *ang*-phrases revisited: referential, definite,

- specific, or none of the above? Presented at the Linguistic Colloquium, Rice University, Houston, November 8.
- Nagaya, Naonori. ms. Rethinking the referentiality of Tagalog *ang*-phrases. Rice University, Houston, Texas.
- Nishiyama, Yuji. 2003. *Nihongo Meishiku no Imiron to Goyoron [Semantics and Pragmatics of Noun Phrases in Japanese]*. Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.
- Payne, Thomas E. 1982. Role and reference related subject properties and ergativity in Yup'ik Eskimo and Tagalog. *Studies in Language* 6:75-106.
- Payne, Thomas E. 1997. *Describing Morphosyntax: A Guide for Field Linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Potsdam, Eric. This volume. Expressing exclamatives in Malagasy. In Foong Ha Yap and Janick Wrona, eds., *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives, Volume II: Asia-Pacific Languages*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ramos, Teresita V. 1971. *Tagalog Structures*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1978. Problems in the reconstruction of Proto-Philippine construction markers. In S. A. Wurm and Lois Carrington, eds., *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings, Fascicle I, Western Austronesian*, 33-66. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 2002. Determiners, nouns, or what? Problems in the analysis of some commonly occurring forms in Philippine languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 41:295-309.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 2006. On reconstructing the morphosyntax of Proto-Northern Luzon. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 37:1-63.
- Reid, Lawrence A. and Hsiu-chuan Liao. 2004. A brief syntactic typology of Philippine languages. *Language and Linguistics* 5:433-490.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman, ed., *Elements of Grammar*, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Ross, Malcolm. 2002. The history and transitivity of western Austronesian voice and voice-marking. In Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross, eds., *The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Voice Systems*, 17-62. Pacific Linguistics, 518. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Rubino, Carl Ralph Galvez. 1997. *A Reference Grammar of Ilocano*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: Topic, Actor, Actor-Topic, or none of the above. In Charles N. Li, ed., *Subject and Topic*, 491-518. New York: Academic Press.
- Schachter, Paul. 1977. Reference-related and role-related properties of subjects. In Peter Cole and Jerrold M. Sadock, eds., *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 8: Grammatical Relations*, 279-306. New York: Academic Press.
- Schachter, Paul and Fe T. Otnes. 1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkley: University of California Press.

- Thompson, Sandra A. and Anthony Mulac. 1991. The discourse conditions for the use of the complementizer *that* in conversational English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 15: 237-251.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1989. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language* 65: 31-55.
- Wrona, Janick. 2009. Non-derived stand-alone nominalization in Japanese. In Foong Ha Yap and Janick Wrona, eds., *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*, Volume I: *Sino-Tibetan and Iranian Languages*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Yap, Foong Ha. this volume. Nominalizers (and copulas) in Malay. In Foong Ha Yap and Janick Wrona, eds., *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*, Volume II: *Asia-Pacific Languages*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.