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ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Case Grammar and Its Application to
Waray, a Philippine Language

by
Timothy Clair Diller
Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics
University of California, Los Angeles, 1971
Professor Paul Schachter, Chairman

Case Grammar is investigated using two approaches. First, a comparison is made of a number of sub-varieties of Case Grammar which have been proposed since Fillmore (1966). Competing case constructs and representations are presented and critically evaluated. Second, the appropriateness of Case Grammar for description of an Austronesian language is demonstrated. A considerable expansion of the list of cases permits a wide variety of verb-actant relationships to be considered and a significant segment of the relatively unstudied Philippine language, Waray, to be described.
Section I: CASE METATHEORY

1.0 CASE METATHEORY IN CONTEXT

1.1 Function in Structural Linguistics

1.2 Function in Transformational Linguistics
    1.2.1 Standard Theory (ST)
    1.2.2 Interpretive Semantics (IS) or Revised Standard Theory (RST)
    1.2.3 Generative Semantics (GS)
    1.2.4 Gruberian Grammar (GRG)
    1.2.5 Case Grammar (CG)

2.0 ISSUES WITHIN CASE METATHEORY

2.1 What Are the Semantic Characteristics of Case?
    2.1.1 Can Distinct Functional Relationships Be Defined?
    2.1.2 Functional Relations as Unitary Concepts.
    2.1.3 Functional Relations as Conglomerate Primitives.
    2.1.4 Functional Relations as Feature Complexes.
    2.1.5 Can Functional Relations Be Correlated with Other Semantic Features?
    2.1.6 Should All Functional Relations Be Represented and Introduced in the Same Way?

2.2 What Are the Syntactic Characteristics or Consequences of Case?
    2.2.1 Is Case a Syntactic or Semantic Construct?
    2.2.2 What Are the Syntactic Characteristics of Functionally Related Actants?
        2.2.2.1 What is the Internal Structure of an Actant?
        2.2.2.2 What Co-occurrence Restrictions Do Actants Have?
2.2.2.3 What Transformational Potentials Do Actants Have?

2.2.2.4 What Is the Head of an Actant Relationship?

2.3 What Are the Phonological Consequences of Case?

2.4 Alternative Methods of Introducing Case Information.

2.5 What About Case Is Language Universal and What Is Language Specific?

3.0 CONTRIBUTIONS OF CASE METATHEORY
1.0 CASE METATHEORY IN CONTEXT

Fillmore (1968) has provided an extensive review of the ways in which authors have viewed "case". This section is a much briefer attempt to place Fillmore's (and other recent proponents') case theory into its more immediate setting in theoretical linguistics.

1.1 Function in Structural Linguistics

In the early 20th century, many linguists in the United States were involved in analysis and description of many of the little known languages of the American Indians. Procedures of analysis were developed first in the area of phonology. Methodologies for segmentation and classification were proposed, discussed, and employed. Quite naturally the same procedures were used in syntax. It was in this way that Structural Linguistics developed. The resultant goal of syntactic analysis was thus the determination of the immediate constituents of each sentence, and the labelling of each constituent as to its categorial and/or functional status.

One of the best known outgrowths of this approach is Tagmemic theory, in which functional and categorial information are made explicit in tagmemic notation for each constituent. That is, each tagmeme is by definition a correlation of function and filler. E.g.,

(1) a. John noticed the ball behind the box.


1.2 Function in Transformational Linguistics

In (1957), Chomsky proposed that such surface structure descrip-
tions left much unsaid. No formal characterization of the relationship between such sentences as the following was made by the Structuralist theory.

(2) a. John beat that rug.

b. That rug was beaten by John.

To provide such a relationship, Chomsky proposed that syntactic descriptions must involve two levels, deep and surface. The two were then connected by a set of transformations.

Since a number of theories have been proposed utilizing this basic insight and since the incorporation of the notion "function" differs depending on the theory under scrutiny, we shall consider several of the transformational theories proposed, outlining briefly the place of function in each. Since Case Grammar (CG) is one such theory, we will be in effect putting it in its immediate context.

1.2.1 Standard Theory (ST)

The first theory we must consider embodies the viewpoint held in TG until quite recently, a viewpoint Chomsky (1968) called the Standard Theory (ST).

In regard to function, the ST is concerned with making explicit the speaker's intuitive knowledge about the possible multiple functions a single constituent may have. Thus, it is pointed out that in example (3),

(3) Bill persuaded John to share his lunch.

John functions both as grammatical object of persuade and as logical subject of share. Similarly in example (4),

(4) John was beaten up by the thugs on Wednesday.
the speaker-hearer knows that John functions as grammatical subject but as logical object.

The deep structure characterizes the "logical" relations while the surface structure contains the "grammatical" relations. The terms "subject" and "object" are used on two levels then and are qualified by the adjectives deep (logical) and surface (grammatical). Thus, an NP may function as a deep and surface subject or as a deep object and a surface subject (as in the case in (2) above in which the passive T relates the two). Chomsky does note (1965, ftnt 32 of Ch. 2) that the concept "surface subject" is not very well defined.

The place of function in the ST can be shown by use of the familiar model which follows.

(5) Syntactic Component

Phrase Structure Rules

\[\rightarrow\]

P-marker

\[\rightarrow\]

Lexical Transformations

\[\rightarrow\]

P-marker

(Deep structure--logical function)

\[\rightarrow\]

Transformational Rules

\[\rightarrow\]

P-marker

(Surface structure--grammatical function)

Semantic Component

Rules of semantic interpretation provide semantic representation

Phonological Component

Phonological rules provide phonetic representation
Chomsky (1965) contended that he was capturing the speaker's intuitive knowledge about the underlying relationships of NP's in such sentences as the active-passive pairs. Functional relations were never overtly expressed in Chomsky's sets of rewrite rules. Rather, there was a convention which operated on the rewrite rules, noting the dominance characteristics, and thus providing the functional relation each category had. For example, one convention stated that an NP directly dominated by S functions as subject. Another stated that an NP directly dominated by VP functions as object. Functional relations were thus provided for the major constituents but were not overtly included in p-markers or FS rules.

1.2.2 Interpretive Semantics (IS) or the Revised Standard Theory (RST)

During the period in which syntactic investigations shifted from the surface level to a deeper level, there was little interaction between syntax and semantics. As Katz (1964 & 1966), Postal (1966), and others have noted, post-Bloomfieldian linguistics avoided semantic influences on syntactic description. The separation of levels in analysis (i.e., phonological, syntactic, and semantic) was maintained as much as possible. Although the barriers between phonology and syntax were attacked in the 1940's (cf. Pike (1947)), those between syntax and semantics remained until quite recently.

In consonance with the various attempts to more explicitly incorporate essentially semantic notions into the grammar (cf. Case Grammar which brings semantic notions into the syntax and Generative Semantics which merges syntax and semantics), Chomsky and Jackendoff have proposed a revision of the standard theory. The major change
has been the provision for the incorporation of semantic interpretation at various stages in a derivation. This is in sharp contrast to the previously held assumption that the only input to the semantic component was at the level of deep structure. Although no strong claims have been made for the exact place at which various parts of the semantic component operate, it has been suggested that the interpretation of functional relations and lexical entries be made at the deep structure level, that interpretation of co-reference be made throughout the T cycle, that interpretation of the scope of application of such items as negatives, quantifiers, superlatives, and certain adverbs be made at the surface structure level, and that interpretation as regarding focus and presupposition be made after some of the phonological rules have applied (such as stress placement).

The following diagram represents Jackendoff's view of IS.
Jackendoff has intentionally left the representation of semantic interpretation for the most part unspecified. (I.e., no choice is made for or against the tree format.) However, a formalization of some of the semantic constructs is provided, e.g., tables of coreference are filled in by interpretive rules (pronominalization, reflexivization, etc.) and well-formedness conditions are stated which throw out ill-formed derivations.
Lakoff (1968) has a slightly different schematization for IS which appears to be only a notational variant. As we will show in the section following on Generative Semantics (GS), Lakoff is attempting to present a parallel format for the IS and the GS theories.

Now let us consider in more detail the implications of the diagram in (6) which appears to represent also Chomsky's position in (1968). There Chomsky spent about one page discussing CG. That supposed contrast of CG and ST contains practically all his comments on "semantic" relations. Since the ST previous to Chomsky's 1968 comments did not concern itself with functional notions such as AGT and since Chomsky does not change the position he advocates as ST when he proposes IS, I take his comments on p. 9 to reflect his current position on semantic functional relations within IS rather than as a part of the ST.

On certain points Chomsky is quite clear. First, he considers the inclusion of functional notions such as AGT in the syntactic deep P-markers unnecessary and undesirable. (Cf. CG for the opposite viewpoint.) Such notions need have a role only in semantic interpretation. Second, he admits the inadequacy of the syntactic deep P-markers for indicating the different functions of the subjects such as those in (7) and (8).

(7) John opened the door.

(8) The key opened the door.

It is not so clear, however, what he considers to be the semantic constructs necessary for a statement of functional relations. He does state explicitly that there is a set of rules of semantic interpreta-
tion which assigns one or more sets of functional relationships to each deep structure P-marker. But it is unclear whether he posits a section in the semantic component (i.e., a lexicon) which indicates (perhaps by semantic features) the functional relations possible for each verb. Since he contrasts a set of rules mapping sets of functional relations onto P-markers (his view of CG) with a set of rules of semantic interpretation reading functions off the deep P-markers, he probably does not posit a section of the semantic component which indicates functions for each verb. His rules of semantic interpretation (only one is given) then take the form: if the subject is animate and the verb is one of action, then the subject may be interpreted as AGT. So given a P-marker terminating in "John opened the door", a rule of semantic interpretation will look at the P-marker, notice the action type verb, and say that the subject must be considered an AGT.

Jackendoff (class lectures, 1969, UCLA) assumes that each lexical entry does have semantic relations specified for it. He adopts (as far as they are useful) the thematic relations proposed by Gruber (cf. section 1.2.4 to follow) and in particular shows how the notion "theme" is of use in predicting the correct semantic interpretation of the relations in sentences containing matrix verbs such as "give" and "receive" which have sentences embedded under them. E.g.,

(9) a. Mary gave Alex permission to go. (Alex goes)
b. Mary received permission from Alex to go. (Mary goes)

(10) a. Mary gave Alex her/a promise to go. (Mary goes)
b. Mary received from Alex a promise to go. (Alex goes)
Thematic relations are thus conceived of as being semantic primitives which are tied to particular lexical entries but which are also useful in deciding whether a particular derived P-marker is well-formed or not. Note that there is no need to say that the indicator of the semantic relation is present in the derived P-marker. One need only be able to match an NP in the coreference tables with an NP which was marked as "theme" in the initial deep P-marker. (This can be done by comparing the distinctive symbol (e.g., a number) assigned to each NP.)

Under Jackendoff's approach, THEME, the relation generally expressed in CG by OBJ, presents no special problem since the semantic representation simply involves the symbol THEME present already on the initial deep P-marker. No rule of semantic interpretation is necessary. But under the position we have attributed to Chomsky in IS, the question arises as to what the initial deep P-marker representation can be for those actants whose case relation must become THEME by a rule of semantic interpretation. It seems that the representation will be slightly different for the majority of the verbs requiring THEME. Since we do not know the relevant semantic features for THEME's, we are in no position to propose even a few of the representations needed.

Lakoff's interpretation of IS allows another view of function. Since semantic representation is given in the form of P-markers, perhaps one could derive the functional relations of actants directly from those semantic P-markers. Presumably such a view would be quite similar to Gruber's in allowing semantic relations to be marked in pre-lexical trees and then making lexical insertion dependent on matching the characteristics of those pre-lexical systems.
Turning now to syntactic relations, it is quite clear that Chomsky (1968, p. 27) desires to maintain the deep grammatical relations which can be defined upon the deep FS configurations. It is also likely that he wishes to retain the notion grammatical relation at the derived and surface levels. He speaks about "derived subject" as well as about "topic" and "comment".

In sum, IS theory (in contrast to the ST) incorporates three types of functions: surface structure functions read off of derived P-markers, deep structure syntactic functions derivable from the deep structure P-marker configuration, and deep structure semantic functions originating either in the lexical entries and the phrase structure or in the semantic P-markers.

1.2.3 Generative Semantics (GS)

In (1965), Chomsky noted the difficulty of deciding whether certain features such as ANIMATE should be considered a part of syntax or of semantics. His obvious assumption was that one should decide somehow where to separate the two. That assumption has been challenged lately by the generative semanticists (Lakoff, McCawley, Postal, Ross, etc.) who propose a generative semantic base which replaces Chomsky's syntactic base component. The distinction between semantics and syntax is obliterated. Their assumption is that much in semantics is essential to a syntactic description and hence a base should be provided which incorporates the two.

The incorporation of functional relations in GS is at this point mostly speculation. We shall simply note possibilities of inclusion which seem compatible with the theory as now envisaged. The theory
can be diagrammed as follows:

(11) Given trees (Macawley)  =  Semantic Representation
P.S. Rules (Lakoff)         (includes topic, focus, and
\downarrow              presupposition)
     P-marker
\downarrow
Lexicon + Lexical T's
Local Derivational Constraints
\downarrow
     P-marker
Global Derivational Constraints
\downarrow
     P-marker
Phonological Rules
\downarrow
     P-marker
=  Surface Structure
=  Phonetic Representation

The GS theory differs from the IS theory in several interrelated basic ways. First, no level of particular significance exists between semantic representation and surface structure. I.e., syntax does not have a representation separable from the semantic representation.

Second, there are several types of lexical constructs which interact with each other. (a) Some entries are inserted by late lexical T's to replace a combination of two or more previously inserted entries. We'll refer to these items as "replacement" entries (e.g., kill, remind, prefer, etc.). (b) Some lexical items have only syntactic and semantic features (e.g., CAUSE, CHANGE, etc.). These inevitably disappear in the derivation either by replacement by later lexical T's or by incorporation into co-occurring entries. These entries function as semantic units which can be combined with many other entries. They represent some of the semantic notions which entries have in common and hence are "factored out" of those replacement entries. Let's call these
"factoring" entries. (c) There are entries having phonological, syntactic, and semantic features which resist further factoring (e.g., alive, perceive, similar, etc.). These are "unfactorable" entries.

(d) There are also "insertion" entries (e.g., do, to, etc.) having only syntactic and phonological features and these are put in by later lexical T's to add phonological features to complexes of syntactic features.

Third, lexical insertion operates throughout the derivation as well as at the initial deep structure level, i.e., lexical and non-lexical T's are intermixed.

Fourth, under McCawley's version (1968a), the lexical T's which operate after the initial F-marker is created introduce lexical entries devoid of semantic features. So lexical insertion in the derivation does not affect the semantic reading and semantic representation is based solely upon the initial F-marker. In Lakoff and Postal's views, replacement entries do contribute to semantic interpretation (cf. remind including the meanings of perceive-similar but adding new features as well).

Fifth, notions such as quantification, negation, focus and presupposition are handled in the very deepest structure (by higher S's in the case of quantifiers) rather than by interpretation of surface structure as in the RST.

Perhaps a partial derivation will help clarify the GS position. Viz.,
(12) S
   |   NP
   |   V
   |   [perceive]
   NP
   [men]

(13) T: Quantifier Lowering -->
S
   |   NP
   |   V
   |   NP
   |   [perceive]
   NP
   [men]
   NP
   [many men]

(14) T: Subject Raise to Object -->
S
   |   NP
   |   V
   |   NP
   |   [perceive]
   NP
   [many men]
   NP
   [similar]
   NP
   [gorillas]
Let us consider the significance of such GS proposals for the possibilities of stating functional relations.

The contention that there is no significant level between semantic representation and surface structure has major repercussions in the consideration of function. First, it suggests that the contribution of syntactic functional notions is greatly minimized. Since the semantic representation is in terms of P-markers, one might be tempted to talk about deep structure subject being defined on those P-markers. Note that this is a faulty carry-over from IS however, since in GS the initial P-marker does not have rules interpreting it semantically.
Rather, speaking directionally from a syntax central model, the initial P-marker in GS is the output of the rules of semantics. Hence syntactic functional notions have no place at all in the initial P-markers. It (or they) provides the semantic functional relations. The syntactic functions can be maintained but they retain syntax internal value only (and at a derived level). Perhaps a simple example can convince you of this result. Considering sentence (18) for example, does your intuition tell you that gorillas is in the deep structure in an object relation to similar? Or that many men begins as the subject of similar? The speaker's intuition about grammatical relations takes him only to a level in the derived structure in the GS theory. (That level is anticipated to be about equivalent to the level at the end of the case placement rules in a CG.)

The second major result of knocking out the DS level of the IS theory is that particular emphasis is laid on the semantic representation. In terms of function, this means that the semantic functions must have overt representation (presumably either in terms of features or categories). This is implicit of course in the IS theory also but there the major concern is the input to the rules of semantic interpretation rather than their output. To put the consequences of GS in another way, there is no need (or possibility) of positing rules of semantic interpretation of function in the sense of those in IS. Rather rules must be posited similar to those in a CG which dictate what surface structures are possible given a particular semantic representation of functional relations.

We turn next to the second, third and fourth ways in which GS
differs from IS. The significance of the fact that there are several
types of lexical entries which are inserted throughout the derivation
is not very clear. It depends on the choice one makes about where
functional relations are indicated. There are at least three possible
positions one could take.

First, one could hold that functional relations must be provided
for all lexical entries having a [+V] feature. This would result in
functional relations being introduced throughout the derivation and
would require representation of functional relations to be at some
point in the derived structure as well as in the initial P-marker.

Second, one could say that functional relations need be provided
only for those lexical entries which are unfaetable (e.g., perceive)
or factoring (e.g., CAUSE). This position would result in a very
indirect representation of the speaker's intuition re: semantic
functional relations. I.e., the understanding of remind as taking an
OBJ and DAT in (18) would be represented in some obscure way by the
initial P-marker in which perceive and similar are found.

A parenthetical comment should be made here about the consequence
of considering pro-verbs to do the job of indicating functional rela-
tions.

CAUSE as a marker of AGT is not very desirable for several reasons.
First, it accounts for only a limited number of relationships which have
previously been considered AGT. Obviously only causative AGT's can be
represented in this way. Permissive, Unintentional, and Request type
AGT's will require some other representation. Second, it puts one into
the unenviable position of having to choose either to (a) have functional
relations indicated for all lexical items, in which case the same
information is stated twice for CAUSE (i.e., CAUS adds the interpretation
AGT by a convention or rule of semantic interpretation but that fact is
also stated in a lexical feature), or (b) have some lexical items with
functional features, others without, so semantic relations would be
indicated in two different ways (e.g., CAUSE implicitly requires AGT,
but /die/ has a feature [+___DAT]) or (c) to have all functional rela-
tions represented solely by pro-verbs, i.e., one would posit additional
pro-verbs to indicate semantic relations other than AGT. The desirability
(though not the feasibility) of this latter approach is questionable.
All in all, the use of CAUSE has undesirable consequences.

A third possible position on lexical insertion of functional
relations is that functional relations are provided only for the
replacement and unfactorable lexical items. This position is incon-
sistent with McCawley's theory since it requires semantic features to
be added when subparts of a tree are replaced by lexical T's which
follow non-lexical T's. It is not in conflict with Lakoff and Postal's
views though.

The fifth and last distinctive characteristic of GS noted above,
i.e., that higher S's are the source of quantifiers, negation, focus and
presupposition, seems to be relevant only in re: quantification. The
fact that quantifiers are considered V's suggests that one might need
to specify the functional relations of their subjects. The result is
the addition of a number of lexical items to the set of predicates for
which functional relations have not been satisfactorily posited.

In summary, then, depending on the uncertainties of the preceding
paragraphs, functional relations in GS's might be relevant on two separate levels (i.e., the initial P-marker and some derived P-marker) or function might be significant throughout the derivation (i.e., each time a lexical T applies). It appears that function could be incorporated quite easily in a feature format but the semantic nature of the initial P-marker would also allow a categorial origin quite naturally.

1.2.4. Gruberian Grammar (GRG)

Gruber's theory of grammar (1965) is of interest for two reasons. First, in it are found in incipient form the distinguishing characteristics of all three of the major post-ST approaches. And second, there are many observations about relations between verbs and actants which have not yet been accounted for in any other theory.

The theoretical approach is essentially a modification of the ST. As can be seen from the following diagram, which is a modified version of the one Gruber gives, one difference is the inclusion of a set of pre-lexical T rules. A second interrelated change is the content of the PS rules. Third, a much greater blocking power is given to the rules of lexical mapping. And fourth, the subcategorial lexical features themselves are considerably different.
In order to make our comments about the place of functional relations in this theory of grammar more intelligible, let us consider a few derivations according to the GRG.

(20)  

(21) T: AT --> TO  
with Motional or Possessive verbs
(22) T: Subj Prep Incorp ---

S

Agt

NP1 FROM-C

Event

(23) T: Theme Reversal ---

S

Agt

Qualifier

Verb

Theme

P

V

NP2

NOT Prep

Prep

TO NP3

TO NP4

(Preterminal String) NP1 FROM-C

[Totional]

(P)rolled the ball from the kitchen to the hall.

(Terminal String) Ed

Since /roll/ has the feature in (24) associated with it in the lexicon, any of the terminal strings in (25) are possible.

(24) /roll/ in env. (Agt) V

(25) a. John (C-Agent) rolled the ball (Theme) into the room.

b. John (C-Agent) rolled the ball (Theme) into the room with a properly placed shove (Inst).

c. A properly placed shove (Agt., Inst.) rolled the ball (Theme) into the room.

d. John (Agt., Theme) rolled into the room.

e. John (Agt., Theme) rolled into the room with an effective push (Inst.).
f. John (Theme) rolled into the room with an effective push (Agt., Inst.).

g. An effective push (Agt., Inst.) rolled John (Theme) into the room.

h. The ball (Theme) rolled into the room.

i. The ball (Theme) rolled into the room with a properly placed shove (Agt., Inst.).

A second sample derivation exhibits two additional prelexical T's and a goal type subject. Viz.,

(26)

(27) T: AT --> TO

(28) T: (NOT) TO --> AT

(29) T: Subj Prep Incorp -->

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Let us now note some of the characteristics of GRG relevant to a statement of functional relationships. We shall do so by comparing GRG with the previous theories.
Gruber's theory is similar to the ST and the IS theory in that it considers the subject (Agt or Theme)--predicate (Qualifier) dichotomy basic. It is thus quite possible to speak of deep syntactic functions such as subject. Things are complicated a bit however by the possibility of having two subjects in the deepest P-marker (i.e., an AGT and a Theme). Only in the pre-terminal P-marker does the tree invariably look like a ST initial P-marker.

The IS theory is also like GRG in that the majority of the semantic functional relations must be provided by semantic interpretive rules which look at pre-terminal strings and probably lexical features.

The beginnings of the CG approach can be seen in two characteristics of Gruber's theory. First, the pre-lexical T's provide for a limited transformational rearrangement of actants (i.e., permutation to subject position) before the normal non-lexical T's apply. Second, three functional relations, Theme, Agent, and Inst, are indicated in the syntax by node labels.

By requiring most functional relations to be read off at the pre-terminal string level, Gruber has allowed himself the possibility of utilizing some prep-phrase structures for several different functional relations. E.g., an AT NP phrase may function either as a Locative (if the verb is non-motional) or as a Source (if the verb is motional). In other words, inherent features on the verb to a certain degree determine what the function of the prep phrase accompanying it will be. In this regard, Matthew's type of CG is reminiscent of Gruber's theory (though in Matthew's CG functional relations are determined by subcategorial features on the verb).
Unlike Matthew's CG, the functional relations in GRG can not be read off a single category in the P-marker. It will be shown that in the CG approach one can look either at the verb for the feature indicating function or at the string of NP's following the verb. In Gruber's formalization, one must look at the pre-terminal string and at the features on the verb, both inherent (e.g., Motional, Possessional) and subcategorial (i.e., the features indicating incorporation). A few examples of the latter type of feature follow.

(32) /cross/ in env. \textit{V ACROSS (NP)} : indicates Direction

(33) /chase/ in env. C-Agent \textit{V A\textsubscript{FTER}} : indicates Accompaniment

(34) /arise/ in env. \textit{V UP (WARD) FROM IN NP} : indicates Goal

(35) /hover/ in env. \textit{V ABOVE NP} : indicates Location

GS theory has developed to a greater degree (with a debatable degree of success) the step which Gruber took re: incorporation of semantic units into lexical items. Whereas Gruber dwelt at length on the incorporation of prepositions and particles into the verb (and skipped hastily over the possibility of NP incorporation (such as \textit{food in eat}) and ADJ incorporation (such as \textit{bad in stink}), GS has attempted to enrich the pre-lexical structure to allow incorporation of a number of pre-lexical verbs into a single lexical item.

In summary, GRG allows for the same types of functional relations that IS does. However, in regard to derived and deep structure syntactic relations Gruber makes no comments. And in contrast, Gruber suggests a relatively complex means of indicating various semantic functional relationships. Apparently all semantic relationships can be read off of the pre-terminal and terminal levels but some are indicated directly.
while others must come via rules of semantic interpretation. And the constructs which those rules must scan are of various kinds (i.e., nodes, inherent features, and subcategorial features).

1.2.5. Case Grammar (CG)

In step with the changing views about deep and surface structure as well as those concerning the interrelatedness of syntax and semantics, Fillmore has attempted to provide a theory incorporating a portion of semantic information he feels can be fairly well systematized. Case Grammar (CG) was proposed expressly to provide a metatheory which incorporates functional relations into syntax in such a way as to capitalize on the generalizations which can be achieved by an explicit characterization of function. Functional relations such as AGT are considered to be syntactic constructs with relevance to the application and operation of a number of transformations.

The conception of grammar is basically that of the ST discussed above (cf. the diagram in (5)). The same components are posited and the rules they contain are of the same type. The primary modification is in the form of the PS rules. The verb (and noun and adjective in Stockwell et al., 1968) is conceived of as the head of various functional relationships and so the NP-Pred Phrase dichotomy is dispensed with in favor of a V-Actant relationship.

Fillmore maintains with Chomsky that functional relations are appropriate in both deep and surface levels but unlike Chomsky, he holds that the functional relations in the deep structure are not the same as those on the surface. Functions such as "subject", "object", and "indirect-object" are reserved for use on the surface level, if appropriate.
But the functions which allow incorporation of semantic information in the deep structure must be more basic. According to Fillmore the deep relations which Chomsky has defined by dominance between categories do not correspond to the relations which actually provide for semantic interpretation. Furthermore, Fillmore suggests that the right set of relations can not be stated by dominance characteristics without greatly expanding the PS rules. Thus, he proposes that a new set of relations be overtly expressed in the deep structure.

In Fillmore, Robinson, and Stockwell's views of CG, the functional relations are expressed as both categories and features in the P-markers and as features in the lexicon. A near base tree illustrates this conception.

(36)

These base P-markers undergo transformations converting them into surface structure representations. In English, for example, one obligatory transformation effects the permutation or copying of one of the actants to function as "subject".

Matthew's conception of CG differs mainly in the origin of the case notations and some prepositions. He suggests the lexicon as the source of all case information, the PS rules contributing no case
information at all. Case information in feature form on verbs is spread to the following NP's as a part of lexical insertion. PREP's which are simply case markers are introduced by an adjunction $T$. Adverbial PREP's (i.e., those which contribute lexical meaning) have a PS source. In his formalization, (36) would look like (37) after lexical insertion, the case spread convention, and prep adjunction.

(37)

```
S
  MOD
  AUX
    TNS
        [+PAST]
        capture the leopard with a net Sam
    V
        NP/DAT
            D N
    NP/INST
        P
            NP/INST
                D N
```

Under either view there are two places in the grammar which are relevant for functional readings: (a) the deep P-markers, and (b) the derived or surface P-markers. CG in effect says that Chomsky misread the intuition he thought he had captured. The deep functional relations are the semantic notions AGT, DAT, LOC, etc. "Subject", "object", etc. are solely derived functions. So the functional relations such as AGT replace the functions such as "logical subject".

CG has thus taken a preliminary step toward incorporating semantic notions. Other areas of particular semantic-syntactic interrelatedness such as co-reference, negation, questioning, quantification, presupposition, and topic-comment are viewed as independent areas by writers using a CG approach. CG is a single step toward handling one of the several
areas of semantics people are now beginning to explore. The step which
CG has taken is merely an addition to others which have previously been
made. That is, CG does not claim to be the first to break down the
artificially constructed partition between syntax and semantics. Chomsky's
conception included selectional features which straddled the boundary.
The information provided in CG is only another sort of semantic informa-
tion which has direct syntactic consequences. It seems to me that if
we hold syntax separate from semantics and it turns out that we don't
know where or how to shut off the flow of semantic information into
syntax, we should at least attempt to utilize and incorporate that part
of semantics which we have some means of representing.

Roberts (1969) contends that CG is inadequate because it doesn't
show that a particular actant is more closely related to a V than to
another actant. I.e., AGT is shown as the function of an NP within a
PROP not as a relationship between an NP and the V. This does not seem
a valid criticism for two reasons. First, the definitions of the case
relationships are in terms of their relationship to the verb. And
second, an NP does have vital functional relations within a PROP as
well as to the verb (e.g., one NP may in part determine the PREP
associated with another NP).

The apparent similarity of CG and Tagmemics (i.e., each overtly
indicates functional relations) is not very significant since the fact
that relations defined differ in their deep (CG) and surface (Tagmemics)
status overshadows the mere overt (CG and Tagmemics) versus covert (ST)
specification of function. Note also that CG differs from Tagmemics
in that CG shows function overtly only for certain constituents while
Tagmemics states function for every constituent. DET's, PREP's, CONJ's, etc. have only a single function so in both CG and the ST no functional relationship is stated for them. Hence, unlike Tagmemics, CG is not bound to the tagmeme at every point of description and hence overt specification of function is limited. It can be noted however that a greater number of FS nodes receive functional definitions in CG than in the ST.

In conclusion, then, two quite distinct types of relations have been posited for deep structures. The ST proposed functions such as "subject", "object", and "relative clause". These were defined by dominance characteristics in the initial structural configuration and were obviously syntactic in nature.

CG and GRG posited a second type of functional relation. These relations were a great deal closer to being semantic in nature (although Fillmore maintained their syntactic status). They were indicated by features or category labels and included notions such as THEME, AGT, DAT, OBJ, BEN, SOURCE, INST, LOC, etc.

IS presumably would include both types of functional relations. The syntactic relations would be defined on the deep structure configuration as in the ST and the semantic relations would be included in the semantic representation. Jackendoff (class lectures) has incorporated Gruber's functional relation THEME to account for complement subject co-reference, identity, and deletion. Other functional relations would apparently be incorporated as they were shown to be motivated.

In regard to the GS theory, since as noted above, defining syntactic type functions on the initial P-marker has little motivation and since there would be no motivated intermediate P-marker at which one
could define syntactic relations, the semantic type functional relations appear to be the only type suited to the GS theory.

2.0 ISSUES WITHIN CASE METATHEORY

The proponents of the semantic type of functional relation argue that notions such as "subject" and "object" are inadequate to explain the differing relationships between actants and verbs. Note for example the various relations between subject and verb in the sentences in (1) and the different relations between object and verb in (2).

(1) a. The boy accepted the flute.
    b. The boy gave Bill the book.
    c. The boy underwent surgery on Friday.
    d. The boy died of pneumonia.
    e. The boy has pneumonia.

(2) a. John sent the veterinarian a dog.
    b. John sent the veterinarian to a dog.
    c. The sultan bought the sheik a concubine.
    d. The sultan bought the sheik for a concubine.

Although we might propose that the semantic content of the subject relation be part of the lexical specification of the verb (as Fillmore does for the OBJ case), we shall assume the need for "semantic" relations and investigate some of the difficulties which arise in trying to utilize these various case relations.

2.1. What Are the Semantic Characteristics of Case?

In any sentence there are a number of relationships which hold between various constituents which can be thought of as describing the deep functions of the actants in that particular sentence. ("Actant"
will be used to refer to the variety of constituents which can enter into a case relationship.) Thus, one actant may function as agent (AGT) in the sentence, another as a locational (LOC), a third as a temporal (TIME), and a fourth as a causal (CAUSE), etc. Those just mentioned are the deep functions of the constituents surrounding the verb in the following sentence.

\[(3) \quad \text{AGT} \quad \text{LOC} \quad \text{TIME} \quad \text{CAUSE} \quad \text{John bounced on the bed last night because he was angry.}\]

These relationships and a considerable number of other similar relationships are considered to be the basic semantic characteristic of case. There are various questions which need to be resolved about these relationships. We turn to them next.

2.1.1. Can Distinct Functional Relationships Be Defined?

It has been assumed by all proponents of CG that distinct functional relations can be characterized and labelled. Such a view is implicit in the not infrequent claim that a particular actant can be interpreted as having either of several relations. I.e., an actant can be ambiguous in regard to its functional relationship. E.g.,

\[(4) \quad \text{John decided on the boat (LOC/NEUT).}\]

Other writers have the belief that functional relations are to some degree indistinguishable. Jespersen (1924, p. 186) puts his doubts this way. "Cases form one of the most irrational parts of language in general. Many of the notions...are ill-defined and pass imperceptibly into one another." Thus it is contended that the functional relationship of some actants is vague.

Let us consider a few examples which illustrate both points of view. AGT and DAT are seen as clearly distinct in sentences such as (5a)
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where both are present. And AGT can also be seen as distinct from DAT where both appear as subjects in sentences like those in (5b,c).

(5) a. John (AGT) gave Bill (DAT) a present.
   b. John (AGT) received the guests with great eagerness.
   c. John (DAT) received the letter on Thursday.

There are, however, other sentences in which the subject should apparently be assigned to either AGT or DAT but where one's intuition is at a loss in deciding between the two. Is an additional case relationship desirable or do AGT and DAT become indistinguishable in such sentences? Viz.,

   b. John likes Bach better than Beethoven.
   c. John slept on the sofa.
   d. John died yesterday.
   e. John underwent psychoanalysis.

A preview of section (2.2) following may aid us in understanding the relations as vague. Various syntactic criteria have been proposed for the purpose of extricating the analyst from a position of undecidability as to an actant's functional relationship. For example, the following syntactic characteristics (test) have been proposed for an AGT.

(7) a. Allows imperative
   b. Allows progressive
   c. Allows purposive constructions (so that, in order that, etc.)
   d. Allows intentional adverbs such as willingly and deliberately
e. Allows INST

Now let us return to the examples in (6) and note that many of them can be taken as AGT (using one or another of these criteria) but using others of the same criteria they may also be taken as DAT. To repeat our question, does this mean that in the form in (6) they are ambiguous or vague, or do the tests simply fail?

(8) a. John wants a popsicle so that he can smear it on Sue's dress. (PURP)
    b. *Want a popsicle! (IMP)
    c. *John is wanting a popsicle. (PROG)

(9) a. John deliberately slept on the sofa. (INT-ADV)
    b. John slept on the sofa but quite unintentionally. (Not an instigator so not AGT)

(10) a. John is dying with quiet resignation. (PROG, INT-ADV)
    b. John died yesterday of malignant cancer. (Affected so DAT)
    c. *John died yesterday with a knife. (INST)

(11) a. John is undergoing psychoanalysis only with reluctance. (PROG, INT-ADV)
    b. John underwent psychoanalysis without even knowing it. (Affected and not an instigator so DAT)
    c. *John underwent psychoanalysis with a tranquilizer. (INST)

Let us look now at MEANS and INSTrument which can on occasion be easily distinguished from one another. Viz.,

(12) a. John won by playing a trick. (MEANS)
    b. John hit the table with a shoe. (INST)

Again, however, there are times when an analyst is hard put to decide between the relations. Viz.,
(13) a. John can only walk with a crutch.

b. John was able to break the stick with a hammer.

Can one say that the relation of the final actants in (13) is vague or are they clearly ambiguous?

Genitive phrases also illustrate the dual nature of functional relationships. Some readings of the phrasal relationship seem quite distinct. E.g.,

(14) The briefing of Representative Parreno was quite short. "Representative Parreno" may be taken as the OBJ of the briefing or as the AGT of the briefing. I.e., he either was briefed or did the briefing. But it is possible that he was simply associated with the briefing in some way. For example, the briefing might have been conducted under his orders of auspices. Does this involve a third functional relationship or is the relationship vague?

Although Fillmore, Stockwell et al., and others have not denied the possibility of vagueness, another writer, Frank Blake, has. He has gone so far as to claim that all fundamental relations can be distinguished "objectively". Viz.,

It has been stated that the number of possible case relations is infinite and that therefore it is practically impossible to study case from the semantic point of view. Moreover, it is argued that the semantic relations of words are so indefinite that no two authorities could agree as to what they are. I do not believe either of these strictures is valid; case relations are numerous but not infinite; they are not indefinite and subjective, depending on the lucubrations of the individual mind, but objective, definite, and determined once for all by general grammatical principles and the laws of thought. (1930, p. 48)

Blake supports this claim by listing with examples 34 different cases. The success of this venture is debatable. Some might say he
has proceeded in the right direction but has chosen the wrong labels for some relationships. This would explain the discrepancies between Blake's list and the lists other linguists have provided (cf. Poutsma's list of sixteen adverbial relationships).

Others would say his venture is doomed to failure by the inherent fuzziness of some of the relationships. The best evidence of this might be Blake's own examples of ad-nominal cases which leave the reader impressed with the indistinctness of his labels. Among the many he proposes are the following.

(15) a. descriptive—a man of the sea, an adverb of time
    b. relational—a man in stature, with respect to age
    c. possessive—the king's daughter, a daughter of the king
    d. qualitative—a man of handsome mien

Deciding whether relationships fall under the descriptive, relational, possessive, or qualitative labels presents quite a problem. Should "man of action" be descriptive or qualitative? Should "the name of the child" be descriptive or possessive? How about "the age of the child"?

If one admits the dual character of the functional relationships (i.e., that they are sometimes fuzzy and other times distinct), there are a couple of approaches possible for representing function.

First, one might abandon the quest for characterization of functional relations as discrete entities. Perhaps they could be represented as the intersection of the functions of several parameters. This would represent the imperceptible merging nature of the relationships but would blur the points of distinction. It is totally unclear to me how this approach could be formalized.
Second, one could assume that discrete functional relations exist but that they are only representable by complexes of semantic sub-relationships (many of which are found in several complexes). This approach might account for both the points of distinction and the imperceptible merging. In searching for features to represent the sub-relationships, one will be focussing attention at the same time on the areas of basic differentiation and those of minimal difference.

The dual character of actant relationships is implicitly denied if one assumes that functional relations can be characterized as discrete, indivisible entities. One's task lies in defining and labelling the separate actant relations. This approach captures the points of distinctness and overlooks the merging characteristics. It does have the merit of forcing one to look at the areas of indistinctness since one must attempt to distinguish two similar functions. This is the approach of Fillmore and Stockwell et al.

Notice that it is possible, depending on the theory of grammar chosen, to consider the interpretation of function to be dependent on transformational mutations or feature indistinctness. Thus, in Lakoff and Postal's view of GS, it might be possible to hold the indivisible entity approach and at the same time explain the fuzziness of semantic interpretation as the result of transformational changes. Similarly in the RST, where semantic interpretation is based on the configuration and verb features, conceivably the fuzziness might result from an inability to distinguish between relationships on the evidence of the verb features. Under the CG theories, however, where semantic interpretation is based directly on the case labels in the deep structure, such possibilities are not open.
Since all grammars incorporating semantic function to date have chosen to consider the relationships as indivisible entities, we shall just briefly review that position in the next section. Then the section following that will present the complex of features option and bring out factors motivating its choice.

2.1.2. Functional Relations as Unitary Concepts

Choosing to consider case labels as standing for single semantic notions leads to the following position. First, each actant must be provided with one or more (if the reading is ambiguous) functional relationships. Consider the example in (16).

(16) Billy weighed twenty kilograms.

Billy can have either of two functional relationships: NEUT (OBJ), where Billy is on the scales, or ACT, where the kilograms are on the scales. The readings are clear in (17).

(17) a. Billy weighed twenty kilograms but he is slowly gaining now.

b. Billy weighed twenty kilograms and most of them were off by a few grams.

It is assumed that there are two functional relationships, each of which is represented by a different label, and that every use of that label indicates the same relationship. Thus, the relationship between Billy and tripped in (18) is identical to Billy and weighed in (17b) above. The same should be true about every other use of the label ACT also.

(18) Billy tripped the box boy.

The relations DAT and LOC have been thought to exhibit the same consistency of interpretation. Thus, DAT in (19) has a single interpretation, as does LOC in (20).
(19) a. Alex (DAT) received the book on Thursday.
   b. She gave Alex (DAT) the book on Thursday.

(20) a. He bought the Navajo jewelry in Gallup (LOC).
   b. Gallup (LOC) is unbearably hot in the summer.

The insufficiency of viewing all case relations as exhibiting a single semantic notion was recognized at the start by Fillmore (1966) in his revival of deep case grammar. Thus, he proposed a case first called ERGATIVE (later changed to OBJECT (1968)). We shall use the equivalent term NEUT proposed in Stockwell et al. (1968). Fillmore's definition of OBJ implied a variety of subrelationships, all represented by the single label. Let us consider in more detail now the possibility of representing a number of semantic notions by a single label.

2.1.3. Functional Relations as Conglomerate Primitives

In accordance with Fillmore's definition (1968, p. 25), the NEUT case indicates "anything representable by a noun whose role in the action or state identified by the verb is identified in the semantic interpretation of the verb itself." NEUT can thus incorporate a variety of relationships, the particular relationship being lexically idiosyncratic. A few of the sub-relationships which various authors have proposed for NEUT are illustrated in (21).

(21) a. direct affective: he cut his hand, he broke the bottle
    b. indirect affective: he saw the parade
    c. positional: he put the book on the table
    d. cognate: he struck him a heavy blow
    e. place: he hit the table

Providing a definition of NEUT of this type allows a single case label to stand for multiple relationships. Naturally there can only be one
definition of this type since all other cases must have definitions which distinguish them from one another. Note however that various interpretations can be given to other cases under the single label system. LOC can thus have a great number of interpretations depending on the PREP associated with the particular usage of the case. Note the examples in (22).

(22) a. He plopped down on the log.

   b. It chased the rabbit into the hollow log.

   c. He dangled a worm over the water.

The multiple interpretations are somewhat parallel to those of NEUT. They differ in two ways. First, the specific interpretation is determined by the PREP rather than by the verb. Second, the PREP's allow specific sub-interpretations of LOC while the sub-interpretations of NEUT are not so obvious. Thus, at least two of the cases generally proposed are of the conglomerate type, incorporating several sub-interpretations. The next interesting question is of course whether any other cases have this property.

Gruber (1965) contends that the notion AGT contains two separate subparts, viz., a causative agent and a permissive agent. The verbs in (23) are said to have a causative agent associated with them, while those in (24) have a permissive agent associated with them.

(23) force, cause, give, send, enter

(24) let, allow, grant, release, admit

It may be true that an even wider range of AGT's must be permitted to allow some subjects to act as AGT even though the action is unintentional. $
The subjects in the following examples are a few candidates for the AGT case which do not seem to be either causative or permissive.
(a) Harry slipped on the ice.
(b) Melvin attributed his success to his friends.
(c) In Mexico, we always bargain for our souvenirs.

Since causative and permissive AGT's seem to be separated solely on the basis of semantic features of the verb, combining them into a single case requires the semantic interpretation rules of function to look at the semantic features of the verb to decide what sort of AGT is present. This is obviously exactly what the rules do for NEUT. But this in no way negates the possibility of allowing this for several cases as long as those cases are distinguished from all others. I.e., causative, permissive, and unintentional can be sub-interpretations of AGT as long as AGT can be distinguished from LOC, DAT, etc.

Stockwell has suggested (personal communication, 1969) that the cases MEANS and INST might be subparts of a single more comprehensive case relationships. Let's call it MINS. This would allow MINS at times to be clearly seen as an INST, at other times as MEANS, and sometimes as either or both. Accepting such a proposal, one must ask what governs the choice of one end or the other of the MINS continuum in certain sentences. Certainly we want to account for the speaker's ability to assign the relatively distinct relationships. Do semantic correlates exist and/or are there syntactic clues? In regard to this particular example (MINS) both semantic and syntactic differences exist and could be used to determine the interpretation. In some sentences the PREP's appear to be different.
(25) a. The army destroyed the houses by burning them (MEANS).
    b. The army destroyed the houses with fire (INST).

In other sentences semantic correlates of the accompanying actants appear to force one or the other meaning. Viz.

(26) a. The ants destroyed the temple with their tunneling (MEANS).
    b. The army destroyed the temple with their bombs (INST).

In both sets of examples the internal syntactic structure of the actant also appears significant for the interpretation.

A pragmatic question which must be raised when cases are seen as conglomerating is this: what is the cut-off point for building conglomerate cases?

Should AGT and DAT be collapsed into a single case (DAGT) with the interpretation being predicated on co-occurring features (e.g., IMP, PROG, purposive actant, instrumental actant, and adverbs such as willingly)? This approach would account nicely for our inability to decide between the cases in subject position. Note the following examples which can be taken either as DAT and AGT depending on context.

(27) a. The little brat wants a popsicle.
    b. Few people like Bach better than Beethoven.
    c. Your cousin slept on the sofa.
    d. Aunt Hilda died yesterday.
    e. She underwent psychoanalysis.

One obvious problem under the case as indivisible primitive approach is that we are forced to allow two DAGT's in some sentences. E.g.,

(28) Sue (DAGT) gave Evelyn (DAGT) the book.

However the need to relax the restriction on a single case type
appearing with each verb may not appear too radical when the repetitive
nature of the LOC relationships are considered. 
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Locative and Time actants can quite easily be put in multiple
combinations. Although a number of these concatenated actants may
be attributable to reduced relatives, others such as the following
may require a special source of recursiveness. Viz.,
(a) At Capistrano we sat in the chapel just under the choir
loft on the most uncomfortable chairs you can imagine.
(b) We eat supper about 6 o'clock in the evening on Saturdays.

A second (pseudo) problem is that the relationships found in the two
occurrences of DAGT are quite different. The relationships are not
unpredictable, since verbal affixes, prepositions, and/or word order
will allow semantic interpretation to be unambiguous in all permutations.
Note, however, that we have had to complicate considerably the rules of
semantic interpretation of function to allow the collapsing of AGT and
DAT.

The same two problems (multiple use of the same case and prediction
of case interpretation) hold for the proposed collapse of MEANS and INST.
Viz.,

(29) Fred opened the garage door with his left foot (INST)
by the remote control button hidden on the floor-
board (MEANS).

The decision then whether to expand cases to include several semantic
notions is affected by the syntactic and semantic complications which
arise.

The proposed genitive construction presents a particularly interest-
ing candidate for the use of a conglomerate type case relationship.
(We shall assume the lexicalist hypothesis and that some actants can be
in a case relationship to a head noun. The definitions of cases are assumed revised accordingly.) Consider some of the possible relationships of the preposed genitives in (30) which have been pointed out in the AFESP WP #17.

(30) a. Positional: Stuart's chair (the one he is sitting in)
b. Alienable: the boy's bike
c. Inalienable: Anna's hand
d. Extensional: our roof
e. Experiential: our last earthquake
f. Association: Wiley's fraternity
g. Attendance: Bob's classes
h. Creation: Frank Lloyd Wright's house
i. Dedication: Kennedy's memorial
j. Accomplishment: John's touchdown
k. Temporal: tomorrow's dinner, Caesar's Rome
l. Benefactive: Ben's house

Under the unitary concept view of case, one might propose discrete cases corresponding to the above relationships. Thus, the "creation" relationship might be considered AGT, the "inalienable" relationship might be DAT, etc. There are two obvious weaknesses to this approach. First, some of the relationships seem to fall together with others. E.g., "accomplishment", as in John's touchdown, appears to be agentive but is slightly different from the agent in "creation", as in Frank Lloyd Wright's house. Second, the relationships given in (30) seem to be only a few of those which are possible for preposed genitives.

Accepting the conglomerate primitive view of case, some (or all?)
of the relationships in (30) might be considered sub-notions of a single case. NEUT might cover a few. Note that the revised definition of NEUT would require the semantic relationship of the preposed NEUT phrase to be found in the head noun. Obviously some nouns are not too choosy about the relationships they keep. For example, the house in Ben's house can be owned by Ben, lived in by Ben, designed by Ben, built by Ben, intended for Ben, etc. Some restrictions are present, however, since it is a little difficult to imagine the house "experienced" by Ben or "attended" by Ben. Another tack might be to suggest another case entirely to account for preposed genitives, e.g., POSS. This could be defined as the case indicating the actant associated with the head noun. Stockwell et al. (1968, pp. 729ff.) has given several arguments against proposing such a case, the strongest one (though not explicitly given) being the existence of several actants with a head noun in derived nominals and those actants being clearly in one or another of the case relationships proposed to accompany verbs. A solution for the preposed genitive construction may thus include case relationships of both unitary and conglomerate nature and possibly a non-case origin for some actants.

Thus far in the paper, we have shown the unitary concept of case to be insufficient and the conglomerate primitive view an apparently suitable remedy. We shall turn next to a proposal which incorporates features of both of the views so far given which provides additional capabilities for case description.

2.1.4. Functional Relations as Feature Complexes

In phonetics, descriptions of sounds have for a considerable period of time utilized feature definitions. Thus, although sounds
have been transcribed according to one or another set of phonetic symbols, those symbols have been defined by what can be considered a set of features. For example [b] was considered to be a voiced, bilabial stop with egressive lung air. When distinctive feature theory gained prominence more attention was focused on the feature aspect of the description. Many proposals were made regarding what set of phonetic parameters was needed to permit the most economical description of all languages of the world. It was pointed out anew that only some of the phonetic features were relevant to each individual language and that the relevant features joined together in different groupings in each language. It was also shown that the use of distinctive features throughout phonology permitted the statement of some generalizations which were lost in an indivisible segment phonology.

Is such a switch in emphasis necessary in the study of case? Is there a more basic set of case features than the lists of cases proposed by Blake, Fillmore, et al.? Are there universal etic case parameters only some of which are significant to the emic case composites in a particular language? Should case definitions be composites of etic case features?

If the answers to these questions are "yes", then each actant would be assigned a set of case features which determine its function in the sentence. In the case of ambiguous readings, more than one composite of features would be assigned to the actant. Where vagueness is present, an "archicase" could be posited.

We shall present next some of the evidence in favor of having functional relationships expressed by sets of case features. Language
specific evidence is explored first.

**Combinations of Functional Relations**

It appears that Gruber (1965) has made a correct assessment when he implies that some actants may incorporate two relationships which at other times may appear distinct from one another. Consider the subjects only in the examples numbered (31-37). (Some of the examples are Gruber's.) We accept for the sake of exemplification Gruber's relation THEME as a case construct. In the following examples it marks the actant which is moved.

(31) a. Sam rolled the ball down the hill. *(AGT only)*

   b. The lifeguard floated the inner tube across the lake. *(AGT only)*

(32) The log floated across the lake. *(THEME only)*

(33) a. The miser inherited his money from his uncle. *(GOAL only)*

   b. The house got a new roof. *(GOAL only)*

(34) The house lost its roof. *(SOURCE only)*

(35) a. Sam rolled down the hill. *(AGT and THEME)*

   b. The lifeguard floated across the lake. *(AGT and THEME)*

(36) a. Avery willingly got the book. *(AGT and GOAL)*

   b. Avis fetched the book. *(AGT and GOAL)*

(37) a. The butler intentionally lost the game. *(AGT and SO)*

   b. John brought Bill a book. *(AGT and SOURCE)*

Note that in the first four examples the subject has only a single functional relationship. In the last three, however, each subject has two relationships, AGT being present in all three and THEME, GOAL, and SOURCE appearing in (35), (36), and (37) respectively. Aside from the appeal to intuition in regard to the double nature of the subjects, what
other evidence is there for this analysis?

Assume first the AGT must be retained as subject. Then note that for sentence (38) it is impossible to add a SOURCE actant. Viz.,

(38) *The butler intentionally lost the game from Sue.

The ungrammaticality of (38) can be explained by saying that for this verb the SOURCE actant is obligatorily incorporated into the subject position. In the remainder of the examples having complete subjects, it is possible to add an actant having the second of the features formerly in the subject. But note that the interpretation of the subject changes when this is done; evidence that the case features characterizing the subject have changed.

(39) a. Sam rolled the ball down the hill. (Sam no longer rolls down the hill.)

b. The lifeguard floated the inner tube across the lake. (The lifeguard no longer floats across.)

(40) a. Avery willingly got the book to the library on time. (Avery no longer takes possession of the book.)

b. Avis fetched the book to Mother. (Avis no longer gets the book.)

(41) John brought Bill a book from Ed. (Ed is now the source.)

The representation of composite case relations such as those in (39–41) is quite complex if not impossible in the first two formalizations but can be handled naturally in a feature complex analysis.

Cross-classification

Several case relationships apparently incorporate identical case notions. Thus, in favor of the case feature approach is the similarity found between the temporal and locational actants. As Blake (1930) has pointed out, both are divisible by such parameters as "stative", "ablative", "terminal", and "durational" or "spatial". Viz.,

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Temporal</th>
<th>Locational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>in the morning</td>
<td>at the cross roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>since the war</td>
<td>from France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal</td>
<td>until Monday</td>
<td>to the circus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durational/</td>
<td>during the night</td>
<td>along the road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To incorporate this cross-cutting information neatly in a case analysis a case feature formalization is essential.

**Co-occurrence Restrictions with a Cross-classifying Feature**

It appears that the feature ACT is essential in stating various co-occurrence restrictions. (Whether the feature is used in syntactic blocking or in stating semantic ill-formedness does not concern us here.) And those restrictions hold whether the actant is simply ACT or a combination of ACT-THEME, ACT-SOURCE, ACT-GOAL. In other words, one need not state the restrictions we will present independently for each of the complexes but a single statement of restriction can be made utilizing the feature ACT.

The following restrictions (among others) have been suggested as indicative of an agentive relationship.

*First, purposive constructions, those beginning with so that, in order that/to, are only possible if an ACT is present. Viz.,

\[(43)\]  
a. Ned (ACT-THEME) splashed into the sea to amuse the gawkers.

b. *The ball (THEME) splashed into the sea to amuse the gawkers.
(44) a. Burt (AGT-SO) sold me on the book to prove his persuasiveness.
   b. *This article (SO) sold me on the book to prove its persuasiveness.

(45) a. Some women (AGT-GO) buy lots of things to impress people.
   b. *A dollar (GO) buys lots of things to impress people.

Second, adverbs such as willingly and deliberately can only occur with agents. Viz.,

   b. *The ball (THEME) deliberately splashed into the sea.

(47) a. Burt (AGT-SO) deliberately sold me on the book.
   b. *This article (SO) deliberately sold me on the book.

(48) a. Some women (AGT-GO) deliberately buy lots of things.
   b. *A dollar (GO) deliberately buys lots of things.

This argument is weakened by the fact that the tests proposed for agentiveness can only be taken as suggestive. The IMP test seems irrelevant to this argument. The PROG test is invalid since the THEME, SO, and GO actants utilize the progressive as easily as do the AGT's. And finally INST does not readily occur with any of the composite agentive cases illustrated above.

Neutralization

Features have been shown to be advantageous in explaining neutralization. In phonology, for example, the lack of distinction between nasals when they assimilate to a following stop is easily shown in the lexicon by the omission of specification for the features indicating point of articulation. Note however that the fact that the segments are nasal is not lost.
Now in regard to functional relationships, viewing case relations as feature complexes allows us to consider certain features as "suppressed" or "non-distinctive" in some appearances of the feature complexes. Thus, it is possible within a feature complex theory to say that neutralization is the cause of our inability to decide what the exact functional relationship of an actant is (i.e., to decide between two similar functional relationships or to decide between sub-interpreta-
tions of a case relation.) But as in phonology, we do know the range our choice must fall within. Some examples of the application of this capability were given in (27). Others follow.

(49) a. Max convinced me most politicians are liars with a few well-chosen anecdotes (MEANS/INST).
    b. Ed can only walk with a crutch (MEANS/INST).

(50) Upon my entering the room TIME/CAUS), they all stood up.

The possible use of neutralization with preposed genitives is evident in the examples given in (30).

The case feature theory also allows a second option which intui-
tively reflects what happens in semantic interpretation but which can not be expressed in any of our present theories of grammar. One could consider actants which have two (or more) contextually distinct func-
tional relations to be non-distinct in the deepest semantic structure. Then the semantic interpretation takes into account context and assigns one of the possible readings to the actant. Viz.,

(51) a. Frank got the money from the bank yesterday.
    b. It came a day late. (Frank is DAT)
    c. But he got wet doing it. (Frank is AGT).

No theory yet proposed allows extra-sentential context to be considered
in the interpretation of semantic functions, but if and when such a theory is proposed, the feature complex representation would permit the approach to assignment of function just sketched above.

There are several other areas which can be suggested for investigation where evidence might be found in favor of the feature complex approach. First, one might try to find some transformational potential which is associated with more than one case and then show that the potential can be correlated with a functional semantic feature the cases have in common. Second, one might try to find co-occurrence restrictions between various semantic features and features within a functional complex.

Turning to language universal evidence, one might try to show that the semantic make-up of a particular functional relationship in language A is very similar but not identical to another functional relationship in language B. I.e., one could try to show that the functional relationships were alike in having certain features in common but different in that others were distinct. Under a conglomerate or unitary formalization of case, one would be forced to posit different cases (or at least indicate their different interpretations) for different languages.

In conclusion, the use of feature complexes to represent case relationships has several advantages over the unitary concept and the conglomerate primitive formalizations. First, it allows a relationship to be either a single semantic notion or a bundle of relations. Second, it provides for the possibility of representing sub-relationships of a case in the case label itself. Third, this provision permits increasing the number of cases without increasing the number of case notions. I.e., various feature complexes may be constructed using the same basic case.
features. This will allow for differences in case relations between languages when and if they are found. Fourth, it allows one to represent the fact that similar case notions are found in different case relations. And lastly, it provides an explanation for the fact that the relations of some actants are not easily assigned to one case or another. I.e., neutralization is handled naturally.

On the other hand, until a set of case features can be posited, the adoption of such a position weakens the case hypothesis by not providing enough substance to allow empirical counterexamples.

2.1.5. Can Functional Relations Be Correlated with Other Semantic Features?

Fillmore (1968, p. 26) proposed that certain cases be linked redundantly with the "semantic" feature ANIMATE which appears on the NP the case relation is associated with. Thus the NP's functioning as AGT and DAT were considered ANIMATE while those functioning as INST were INANIMATE.

DAT and ANIMATE

In regard to DAT, one can find many counter-examples to its obligatory link to animacy. Many of the following are similar to those proposed by F. Braun (AFESP WP#38, 6-68).

(52) a. John (D) possessed a car.
    b. That piece of tin (?) possessed some peculiar properties.

(53) a. John (D) underwent a drastic change in the hospital.
    b. The package (?) underwent a drastic change in the mall.

(54) a. John (D) is losing his self-confidence.
    b. The car (?) is losing its shine.
(55) a. John robbed Mary (D) of her last nickel.
    b. John robbed the bank (?) of all its quarters.

(56) a. John gave him (D) a bath.
    b. John gave the floor (?) a good sweeping.

(57) a. John attributed his good looks to his mother (D).
    b. John attributed his cough to his cigarettes (?)

Assuming Fillmore's obligatory connection between DAT and ANIMATE, one must either find a new case label for all the actants marked with a question mark or reclassify the actants marked as D as something else. (The 'something else' is clearly not NEUT in the above examples since that is a co-occurring case.) If, on the other hand, we choose to remove the obligatory link to ANIMATE for DAT, the resulting definition of DAT leaves it in many instances describing actant relationships here-to-fore subsumed under NEUT. DAT would be redefined as follows: "The animate being or inanimate object affected by the action or state identified by the verb." And it would apply to the underlined actant in (58) as well as to those above.

(58) John destroyed the barn.

Thus, the choice to dissociate DAT and ANIMATE leads one to reconsider the validity of the case label DAT itself. We shall pick up the problem later in the section on DAT and AFFECTED.

AGT and ANIMACY

In regard to AGT, the argument for or against AGT being ANIMATE depends on how one interprets the definition given by Fillmore for AGT. If "responsible source" refers to a rational source, then it appears indisputable that AGT must be ANIMATE. If not, it is possible to find arguments against the claim that AGT must be animate. Again F. Braun
has provided some relevant examples (AFESP WP#13, 7-68).

(59) a. God destroyed the walls of Jericho.
   b. The army destroyed the artifacts.
   c. The ants destroyed the temple.
   d. Humidity destroyed the pictures.
   e. An earthquake destroyed the walls of Jericho.

Arguing against the AGT-ANIMATE link, one might contend that each of these subjects bears the same relationship to the verb, i.e., they are the "source responsible" for the destruction following and hence they should all be considered AGT's. But assuming the obligatory link between AGT and animacy, one might note the co-occurrence restrictions between the subjects and INST, and propose that the subjects in (d,e) are actually INST's since INST cannot occur with them.

Then, looking at example (c) from the second position, one would require that INST occur not just with any animate AGT but only with AGT's which can design or have rationality. Note the interpretation in (60).

(60) The ants destroyed the temple with a tree.

The speaker-hearer attributes the ants some sort of rationality or ability to plan an action. As Gruber would put it, the function "intender of the action" is associated with the ants.

From the view in which AGT's can be INANIMATE, one could extend the argument just given for (c) and say that the co-occurrence restriction between INST and the subjects in (d,e) is based not on the fact that an INST is in the subject position (an analysis that doesn't account for (c)), but rather on the fact that INST does not occur with a subject unless the subject can be interpreted as "intender of
the action". Since "humidity" and "earthquake" can not have intentions, they can't co-occur with INST.

This extension does not go far enough however. Intentionality and permissiveness (the characteristic of Gruber's second type of AGT) seem to be connected in some way to the type of instrument allowed. Inspection of the examples in (61) suggests that lower animals can use only inalienables as INST. This is shown to be incorrect by the examples in (62).

(61) a. The ant contaminated the chemical with its right antenna.
     b. The beetle killed the ant with its pincer.
     c. The dog knocked over the lamp with its tail.

(62) a. The spider caught the fly with its web.
     b. The bird cracked the egg with a stone.

The type of instrument does seem to be crucial, however. Note that the spider in (62a) can use his web without being thought of as a rational creature (presumably because web-weaving is thought of as being an instinctive action), but the ants using a tree in (60) must be thought of as intenders of the action (presumably because tree-wielding is a rational activity. Further, note that the dog and the ant in (61) need not be "intending" the action (or even "permitting" it). Some AGT's seem to have a relationship of "unintentional responsible source".

Another apparent argument against the AGT-ANIMATE link is the fact that there are a few inanimates which seem to allow some sort of INST phrase. Viz.,
(63) a. The wind knocked down the fence with just a single gust.

        b. The airplane knocked me down with its backwash.

To maintain the link, one could consider the with-phrases above as MEANS (or maybe MANNER?). Notice that all five examples in (59) allow MEANS.

(64) The ants destroyed the temple with their tunneling.

If the with-phrases in (63) are taken as INST phrases, one must say that the AGT can be either animate or inanimate, and that the action can be intended, permitted, or unintentional (accidental or co-incidental). Then AGT's which are inanimate must have an unintentional
interpretation but allow INST just as the animate AGT's do. AGT's which are animate can allow any of the three relationships. The definition of AGT would be changed to "the source responsible for the action identified in the verb" or "the perceived instigator or instigation of the action identified by the verb". And INST would no longer be allowed to become "subject".

A few more arguments in favor of this position follow. First, it allows the subjects of the following sentences to be uniformly considered AGT's (in addition to those examples so far given in this section on AGT).

(65) a. John (A) blew out the candles (N).
    b. The wind (A) blew out the candles (N).

(66) a. Their youngest son (A) touched me (D) deeply.
    b. Their kindness (A) touched me (D) deeply.

(67) a. Their left fielder (A) robbed me (D) of a homerun (N).
    b. That high fence (A) robbed me (D) of a homerun (N).

(68) a. The small clown (A) gave us (D) a good laugh (N).
    b. His predicament (A) gave us (D) a good laugh (N).

(69) a. Joyce Haber (A) attributed her success (N) to luck (G).
    b. The gossip column (A) attributed her success (N) to luck.

Second, it simplifies the statement of surface prep marking since "by" no longer marks INST, its surface prep generally being "with". Note that all of the subjects in the above sentences take the prep "by" when the sentences are passivized. (This is not in itself an argument, however, that the subject is an AGT, since DAT also takes "by" when passivized. E.g., "The letter was received by Bill on Thursday.")
But there is at least one more factor which argues against the position just presented. There are a number of inanimate subjects which do not permit INST's with them even when taken as unintentional sources. "Humidity" and "earthquake" in (59 d,c) appear to be two examples of this. This co-occurrence restriction is unaccounted for.

INST and ANIMATE

In regard to INST, it is possible to find examples of animate beings apparently being used as INST's. Viz.,

(70) a. James Bond broke the window with the Russian.
   b. The kidnappers were bargaining for the ransom with the woman.
   c. The police stopped the demonstrators with police dogs.
   d. I rapped him on the head with my snake. (Postal's eg)
   e. I shielded myself with him.

Perhaps one can assume that beings animate in the real world are attributed the semantic feature [-ANIMATE].

This latter concept in reverse might be an explanation also for the inanimate apparently used as AGT's and DAT's.

The markedness convention does not appear to have much potential as a remedy for this correlation, even though a majority of AGT's seem to be animate and a majority of INST's inanimate. There certainly is no relevance to choosing the optimal description.

DAT and AFFECTED

Recall in Fillmore's analysis that the DAT is the animate being affected by the action or state. Although this can not be disproved, it is not difficult to find examples of inanimate objects which are "affected." Viz.,
(71) a. Hiram crushed the can with one hand.
   
   b. Sally marred the table top with her nail file.
   
   c. The cat scratched the sofa in climbing up.

In Fillmore's view these objects are in the NEUT case. The desirability of such a course is questionable when one attempts to decide on the case relationships of the parallel animate actants in the following sentences.

(72) a. Hiram crushed his opponent with one hand.
   
   b. The cat scratched Harry in climbing up.

They meet the requirements of the DAT case but appear to have the same relationship as the underlined actants in (72). Either the DAT case must be extended to include inanimates or the "affected" characteristic is not a distinguishing feature of the DAT case.

On the opposite side of the coin, it is possible to find actants which have most of the characteristics of DAT but which are not "affected".

(73) a. Elizabeth signaled to Harry that she was finished.
   
   b. Sam wrote a letter to his fiancee.

The unaffectedness of the underlined actant is clear since in (a) Harry might not even have noticed the signal and in (b) Sam's fiancee might not have gotten the letter.

We turn now from the ties suggested by Fillmore between cases and features on the NP's they are associated with to ties between cases and features on the verbs they are associated with. Gruber (1965) has implied and Chomsky (1968) has suggested that the semantic functional relations be tied to certain inherent features on the verb which we assume here to be semantic in nature.
AGT and ACTIVE

Chomsky suggests that AGT be correlated with the feature [+ACTIVE] on the verb. Several problems have been raised which such a suggestion must face. Gruber (1965, p. 136) has pointed out that not all active verbs require animate subjects. Viz.,

(74) The ball is rolling down the hill.

Hence, one must either abandon the tie between AGT and +ANIMATE or be content with a unidirectional predication, i.e., all agentive verbs are active but not vice versa. At any rate, both concepts (active and AGT) must be postulated. Macaulay (1970, p. 4) has questioned the possibility of predicting an AGT actant on the presence of an active verb. His examples of active verbs with non-AGT subjects follow.

(75) a. The President arrived at five o'clock.
   b. Jackie Stewart won the race easily.
   c. I concluded that the report was accurate.
   d. David believes her story.
   e. The doctor cured my asthma.
   f. Karl enjoyed meeting you.

LOC/GOAL and MOTIONAL/POSSESSONAL

Gruber proposes a number of verb features which have some influence on the function of the actants associated with the verb. His rewrite of the Verb is as follows:

(76) Verb → [V, \{Motional \text{Durational}\}, \{Positional \text{Possessional}\}\{Identificational \text{Circumstantial}\}\}

None of these features indicates directly the functional relation of any particular actant. Rather, these features trigger off several
pre-lexical transformations which in turn determine functional relationships indirectly by changing the prepositions.

For example, either [Motional] or [Possessional] will convert a potential LOC into a GOAL. It should be made clear that Gruber expressly avoided converting a labelled functional relation to another. Rather he was concerned with converting one pre-lexical prep into another and with rewriting the pre-lexical preps with the correct lexical preps. Thus, one pre-lexical T specified that with either a [Motional] or [Possessional] verb the pre-lexical prep AT could be converted to TO. Cf. example (27) in section I (1.2.4). Also, [Possessional] requires an AT to be mapped onto by /to/. Note the conversion from line (a) to (b).

(77) a. NP FROM [V, Motional, Possessional] THEME AT NP
    b. John gave the book to Bill.

[Positional], by contrast, requires AT to be rewritten as /with/, Viz.

(78) John has the book with him.

It is not clear to me how many of the functional relations can be accounted for by the combination of V feature and prep information. Certainly only a small number, including SOURCE, GOAL, LOC, and DIRECTION. Gruber did not give rules of semantic interpretation for his prep phrases. He simply tried to predict the phonological shapes of some of the preps which could occur with various verbs.

2.1.6. Should All Functional Relationships Be Represented and Introduced in the Same Way?

Fillmore, Gruber, and Stockwell et al., have considered a subset of functional relationships which have a great deal in common. They all have similar co-occurrence restrictions and T-potentials. But there
are a number of other functional relations (which are different in a number of ways) which have been ignored. Blake opted to put all the functional relations he could think of into a single semantic case analysis. Fortunately for him, he did not have to worry about incorporating his lists into a transformational grammar. In this analysis, it is imperative to inquire as to the possibility of handling all functional relations in a similar way. To clarify the problem, let us consider some of the ways in which actants in various functional relationships differ from one another.

First, the functional qualities of the relationships are not homogeneous. Thus, some elements describe people or objects involved in the action of the verb, while others describe spatial, temporal, and motivational, etc. aspects of the action of people and objects and on other people and objects. In Tagmemic terms, some relationships seem to be semantically nuclear (e.g., ACT, NEUT) while others are peripheral (e.g., TIME, PURP).

Second, the internal syntactic structure of the actants having such relationships is also quite diverse. One finds single words as well as various types of phrases, including noun phrases and prepositional phrases with NP's, nominalizations, and sentences. Note the following possibilities.

(79) He shot a buck \{ Tuesday.  
yesterday evening.  
after hunting season.  
during his traipsing through the forest.  
while he was sitting on that log. \}
Third, the elements to which the actants hold their relationships are also quite diverse. Some actants are closely attached to a verb. Others to a noun or pronoun. Some seem attached to a sentence. Others appear to be practically independent. Viz.,

(80) a. Bill dissects frogs in biology class. (AGT of verb)
   b. A portrait by Raphael would make a handsome gift. (AGT of noun)
   c. He got a cat even though he can't stand cat hair. (CONCESS-ADVERS of sentence)
   d. Jane, wipe your feet before you come in. (VOCATIVE)

Fourth, the actants differ in their transformational potentials. Some may be fronted, others become subject, object, etc., and pro-forms are allowed for some and not for others.

Fifth, the sets of actants which are closely vs. loosely tied to the verb (i.e., in terms of co-occurrence restrictions and T-potentials) are language specific in composition. For example, in English \textit{TIME} is not one of the cases which undergoes the subject placement transformation and so is "loosely" tied by that criterion. In Waray, \textit{TIME} like the others of the "closely" tied set (AGT, GOAL, NEUT, etc.) does undergo topicalization. Even worse, within a language, the same functional relationship sometimes appears to be in the close set and sometimes in the loose set. Cf. Fillmore's (1968, p. 26, ftnt 34) discussion of Hall's (1965) observations on optionality and obligatoriness of actants with particular verbs.

To restate the problem then, should an analysis of functional relations treat them all alike? In CG terms, should all functional relations be considered cases? Two approaches can be taken. First, one can call every actant in a definable relationship a case and then
proceed to point out the different characteristics which cases incorporate. Or, second, one can establish various criteria which actants in functional relationships must satisfy to qualify for casehood. It might appear that the end result differs only terminologically but that is not the case. The first approach requires an analysis of the whole spectrum of actant relationships. The second approach requires an analysis only of those actants separated off by certain syntactic criteria. Most writers have followed the second pattern as we shall see in the following section. In the analysis of Waray which follows in SECTION III, we shall take a tack more akin to the first just for the fun of finding out how deep the swamp gets and what the possibilities are of routing one's way through (or back out). As many relationships as can be taken as cases are and those which can not are separated off and commented on.

2.2 What Are the Syntactic Characteristics or Consequences of Case?

Assuming that cases have syntactic characteristics presupposes that case is a syntactic construct. That supposition is not universally held. Assuming that cases have syntactic consequences makes no claim about the semantic or syntactic nature of case constructs. I.e., a purely semantic construct may have syntactic consequences.

2.2.1 Is Case a Syntactic or Semantic Construct?

As implied in part (1.2.2) above, the IS theory contends that case relationships are solely semantic in nature. There is no need at all to incorporate a representation of the functional relationships into the syntactic representation.

I interpret Fillmore, on the other hand, to assume that case relationships are semantically relevant syntactic relationships, i.e., they
are syntactic constructs which have extremely close ties to semantics.

In attempting to decide between these two positions, it should be kept in mind that the two theories may be incommensurable. I.e., it is not clear what sort of argument could be advanced to support the syntactic character of the case notions. To show, for example, that case is useful in stating which case placement transformations can and can not apply is not considered an argument at all from the IS position since no case placement transformations are posited. Jackendoff (U.C.L.A. seminar, 1969) has shown how the case relation THEME can be considered solely semantic but be utilized in semantic interpretation of complement subjects after various syntactic transformations have applied. Perhaps a demonstration that prepositions can be inserted on the basis of case information would argue for having case relationships represented at the deep structure level.

If the claim of the IS theory that functional relations are purely semantic can not be refuted, the strongest revision of IS theory one could make would be that interpretation of function must be at several levels in the derivation. That is, by showing that transformations change the function of a category, the IS position would be forced to interpret function at several levels or consider one or more of those levels insignificant. Note here that the change in function must be of the same type of function. I.e., it has been accepted that transformations change subject-object function. And it is also accepted in the IS theory that the functions PRESUPPOSITION and FOCUS are changed by transformations and hence these functions are read off at the post-surface structure level. But can it be shown that transformations add
to or change semantic functional relations such as AGT?

Gruber implies that the pre-lexical transformations do in fact at least add to the functional relationships. Consider the following sentences.

(1) a. John sold the book to Bill.
   b. Bill bought the book from John.

In (a) Bill functions simply as GOAL. In (b), however, Bill is both GOAL and AGT. Similarly in (a) John is both AGT and SOURCE, while in (b) he is only SOURCE. This analysis requires sentences (a) and (b) to have the same initial pre-lexical structure but different pre-lexical transformations. Again the theories may be incommensurable, Gruber's theory has the additional construct "pre-lexical system" which has no counterpart in IS theory.

Quite likely the position of introduction of the case constructs is not of great significance. Fillmore out of practicality chose to make case a syntactic construct. Since semantic constructs were hardly represented at all and his purpose was to show the syntactic relevance of case constructs, it was most natural for him to consider them syntactic constructs. Since Chomsky and Jackendoff were intent on expanding the semantic component it was natural to include functional relations in that component.

It would be logically possible to consider next the syntactic repercussions of case relations and then separately the syntactic characteristics of the actants which enter into these case relations. Instead, these two points are merged together in the next section and the implicit assumption is made that case does have syntactic repercussions. Even if one decides that case has no syntactic repercussions,
one must investigate the syntactic characteristics of the actants which enter into functional relationships. What those characteristics are has by no means been agreed on. Various characteristics can be and have been proposed and utilized by different authors. We are naturally obliged to ask the next question then.

2.2.2. What Are the Syntactic Characteristics of Functionally Related Actants?

In determining the syntactic characteristics of actants we must ask at least four basic questions. The way these questions are answered reveals our own decisions as to what sort of syntactic phenomenon case is and also provides us with a start toward describing the constructional status of the different actants within a grammar.

(2) a. What is the internal structure of an actant?
   b. What co-occurrence restrictions does an actant have?
   c. What transformational potential does an actant have?
   d. What is the head of an actant relationship?

2.2.2.1. What is the Internal Structure of an Actant?

The internal surface structure of actants is by no means uniform. Some actants are NP's, others prep phrases of various internal structure, and still others are sentential nominals. But when transformational restructurings are taken into account, it is possible to argue convincingly (as Fillmore has) that a number of surface NP actants must actually be provided with the capability of being prep phrases in the deep structure.

NOUN-AL CASES

The structure proposed for a simplex noun-al case is as follows.

(3) \[
\begin{array}{c}
P \\
\hline
\text{P} \\
\text{AC} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{N}
\end{array}
\]
Matthews (n.d., p. 17-18) takes issue with this, proposing that the prep arises transformationally with some actants, but conceding that those preps which contribute lexical information must be provided with a PS source. He thus proposes the structures in (4a) and (4b) respectively for actants before and after an adjunction transformation which introduces a case marking prep.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
(4) \\
\text{a. NP/LOC} \\
\text{Prep} \quad \text{Det} \quad \text{N} \\
\text{under} \quad \text{the} \quad \text{stove} \\
\text{b. NP/AGT} \\
\text{Prep} \quad \text{NP/AGT} \\
\text{Prep} \quad \text{Det} \quad \text{N} \\
\text{by} \quad \text{the} \quad \text{girl}
\end{array}
\]

A couple of arguments against Matthews' position come to mind. First, there seems to be a gradation in the lexical contribution of preps. (All preps appear to make a case marking contribution.) \textit{Of} has no appreciable lexical contribution while \textit{under} is at the opposite extreme. \textit{For} seems to be midway under the analysis of a single BEN case. I.e., it provides the simple syntactic information that a BEN is involved but incorporates at least two lexical readings only subtly different (cf. the discussions in Section II, Chap. 3 on benefactives and in particular preference and reservation). Second, the structure building power of Chomsky-adjunction is required.

Stockwell \textit{et al.} (1968) provided also for a complex noun-al case. This allows for cases to dominate other cases which have a noun as head. The embedded case may be either noun-al (5) or sentential (6).
SENTENTIAL CASES

It is curious that in Blake's consideration of case relations he had nothing at all to say regarding cases which were sentential. Every one of his examples of case relations is non-sentential and in fact none appear even to involve nominalization. Although he nowhere prescribed the appearance of sentences as cases, he never hints that such a case structure exists.

Fillmore and later writers have generally conceded the case relationship of some embedded sentences. Ignoring for the moment the question of which cases may be sentential, let us review various proposals regarding the PS source of the embedded sentences.

Fillmore (1968) has proposed that the OBJ case may be sentential and the rewrite which he suggests for sentential OBJ's is shown next.

(7) 

```
S
      \--|---\  
      \     \ 
      MOD   PROP
      /     /  
V     OBJ   ...
      /     /   
      S     S
```

Robinson (1968) has noted Kiparsky and Kiparsky's article "Fact" (1968) as well as Rosenbaum's (1967) half-way retraction of sentential complements and suggests that most such embedded sentences should have a NP structure. Her proposal may be represented in our symbolization as follows:
Sentences such as the ones in (9) result.

(9)  a. It shocked me that he left.

       b. That he left shocked me.

Other sentences which appear to be actual cases of sentential complementation, Robinson provides with a source which is more similar to Fillmore's. The difference is that PROP has been substituted for S and a PREP precedes PROP. This structure is provided for verbs such as force, allow, and order. Viz.,

(10)  S

       MOD
       PROP

       V

       AC

       AC

       P

       PROP

       NP

       S

       NP

       D

       N

       shock

       it/fact

       that he left

       me

       PAST

       force

       go

       him

       they
Sentences such as the following result.

(11) a. They forced him to go.

   b. The king ordered the proclamation to be read.

The motivation for the PREP–PROP structure is the automatic elimination of tense markers (found in MOD) which make such embeddings ungrammatical. Viz.,

(12) a. *They forced him to be going.

   b. *The king ordered the proclamation to have been read.

Note that temporal adverbials which have co-occurrence restrictions with tense must also sometimes be ruled out somehow.

(13) a. *They forced him to go tomorrow.

   But  b. The king ordered the proclamation to be read tomorrow.

Fillmore has limited the appearance of sentential actants to the OBJ case and Stockwell et al. (1968) have added INST and ESS as two more cases which can be sentential. However, if syntactic restrictions are made secondary, and semantic functional relationships are primary, one would have a difficult time arguing that actants having temporal and other functions can not also be sentential. If one accepts the phrase "before Sunday" as case related, is it possible to contend that "before Bill left" does not have an identical semantic relation?

Many of these sentential actants seem to have the underlying structure PREP–S. Some of these actants function as temporals, concessives, causals, etc. Viz.,

(14) a. She wrote the letter after Bill had left.

   b. He kept courting her even though she despised him.

   c. She jumped because he pinched her.
The proposed tree structure for a sentence such as (14) is the following.

(15)  

```
S
 /  
MOD PROP
 /  
PAST AC AC
  /  
write she the letter after Bill left
```

The sentential actant is considered non-nominal without conclusive justification. Clefting of non-sentential actants is noticeably better than that of sentential ones however. Viz.,

(16)  

a. ? It's next Thursday I'll be needing it by.

b. ?? It's Thursday she won't need this before.

 c. * It's Bill had left she wrote the letter after.

Other sentential actants not in the OBJ case may have a nominal origin with a structure quite similar to that proposed by Robinson in (8). Katz and Postal (1964) suggested this possibility for the sentential actants introduced by interrogative pro-forms. E.g.,
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b. She came when we were leaving.

2.2.2.2. What Co-occurrence Restrictions Do Actants Have?

Co-occurrence Relations Between Cases and Head Verbs/Nouns.

Considering the expanded list of cases proposed above for English, we note that some of them have co-occurrence restrictions with verbs/nouns. I.e., some verbs/nouns allow only certain cases. Thus, case C may for verb V/noun N be either obligatorily present or obligatorily absent. These possibilities can be expressed respectively as follows: +C and -C. But since the latter has usually been represented by its absence, with a convention indicating that fact, the former has been represented simply by its presence without the "+" sign.
A number of cases apparently occur with any verb. Others have obligatory status with some verbs and optional status with other verbs. Cases having optional status have previously been indicated either by parenthesization (Fillmore, 1968) or as unmarked by "+" or "-" (Stockwell et al., 1968). But in order to enhance lexical economy, it appears desirable to distinguish between the two sorts of optionality just discussed. I.e., it is extremely wasteful to talk about those cases which are optional for every verb when talking about each individual verb. On the other hand, it is essential to indicate the status of those cases which are optional for a particular verb but not for all verbs.

It is proposed then that cases which can occur with any verb be introduced by a lexical redundancy rule. It operates on the case frame feature (which already contains the obligatory markings and the marking for the cases which are optional for that particular verb) adding the remainder of the cases (those universally optional) into the case frame feature.

Co-occurrence Restrictions Between Cases and Dominating Verbs

There are a few verbs which apparently require a particular case to be present in the PROP of their sentential object. These verbs have been labelled "suasion" verbs and include "force", "persuade", etc. Macaulay (1970) has given some examples illustrating the ill-formedness of sentences having AGT-less PROP's in the sentential object. Viz.,

(18) a. *I forced the potatoes to cook.
b. *I persuaded Carl to enjoy meeting you.

Schachter (personal communication, 1970) has pointed out that the constraint is even greater for these verbs, in that the AGT of the
embedded sentence must be identical to the DAT case of the higher sentence. Viz.,

(19) a. *I forced the potatoes to be cooked by Harry.
   b. Bill was forced to cook the potatoes.

Co-occurrence Restrictions Between Cases

There are a variety of co-occurrence restrictions which obtain between cases under a PROP.

First, one case may be in a dependency relation to another; for example, \( C_1 \) being dependent on the presence of \( C_2 \). Such a relationship has been commonly shown with nested parenthesis. Viz.,

(20) \( ((C_1) C_2) \)

Fillmore has proposed the linked parenthesis notation to represent an equi-dependent alternative case relationship. Thus, the interpretation of (21) is that either one or the other of the cases must be present.

(21) \( (C_1 \uparrow C_2) \)

The use throughout of the + and - signs will permit an even greater number of simplified representations if they become necessary and useful.

As examples of the co-occurrence restrictions between cases, note that Fillmore (1968, p. 31) contends that Benefactive and "outer locative" actants depend on the presence of the AGT; that Macaulay (1970) suggests that MANNER actants depend on the presence of an AGT; and that Lee (1969) and Jackendoff (1969B) maintain that a PURPOSE actant requires an AGT.
Co-occurrence Restrictions Between Cases and MOD

There are several cases which have co-occurrence restrictions with items within the modality constituent. Temporal cases have obvious agreement conditions to be met. Viz.,

(22) a. *Yesterday he will fly home.
   b. *You can write letters all day yesterday.
   c. *She read a novel tomorrow.

Perhaps features sensitive to the MOD context can be placed on the relevant temporal words to indicate deviant collocations?

Fillmore (1968, p. 31) and others have suggested that the AGT case must be present whenever the PROG aspect is chosen. This accounts for the deviance of (23).

(23) *John is weighing 100 pounds.

But such a claim is not consistent with the rest of his theory. Note that it would logically lead Fillmore to an acceptance of the inanimate AGT hypothesis.

(24) a. The rope is slowly twisting.
   b. The stew is simmering.
   c. Our position is looking more hopeless.

Furthermore, it demands "affected" subjects (sometimes considered DAT's) to be AGT's. E.g.,

(25) a. My pet canary is dying.
   b. She is falling.

Co-occurrence Restrictions Between Cases and PREPS

As Fillmore has pointed out, the underlying case relationship either completely or partially determines the surface form of the pre-
position associated with it. E.g., AGT invariably has "by" associated with it in English if a PREP is present.

A second putative connection between cases and preps does not appear well-founded. I.e., it does not seem to be the case that the presence or absence of one case affects the prep on a concurrent one. Fillmore has suggested that the prep of INST is "with" when AGT is present and "by" when AGT is absent, but this merely reflects the fact that "by" occurs in the passive with whatever corresponds to the active subject. (An observation owed to P. Schachter.)

2.2.2.3. What Transformational Potentials Do Actants Have?

There are a variety of transformational potentials that actants have. Naturally these T-potentials are language specific and so it should be kept in mind that if they are used to decide what a case is, then "case" is a language specific construct. Let us look at a few of the T-potentials English actants possess. Among them are the following: a) subjectivalization and objectivalization, b) fronting, c) pro-ing, and d) imperative subject deletion.

**Subjectivalization and Objectivalization**

A few actants in English have the capability of becoming the surface subject or object. Viz.,

(26) a. bought John (AGT) book (NEUT) Bill (RESV)

   b. + John bought a book for Bill. AGT--subject/NEUT--object

   c. + The book was bought for Bill by John. NEUT--subject

   d. + John bought Bill a book. AGT--subject/RESV--object

These T-potentials were of particular interest to Fillmore, since they demonstrate nicely the underlying case functions which hold regard-
less of the surface realizations. In fact, one reading "The Case for Case" might think that an implicit criterion for an actant being a case is its ability to undergo one of the above T processes. Note that if this potential were used as a factor in determining whether an actant is in a case relationship certain complexities would arise.

First, one would have to decide whether a case relationship can be applied to an actant only when that actant has at least the optional ability to undergo the T criterion or whether the case relationship also holds for actants unable to pass the test in a given sentence but which bear the same functional relationship. For example, would "the room" be in a case relationship in (27) but not in (28)?

(27) The room is hot. + is hot in the room

(28) She left her coat in the room.

The tension between syntactic and semantic grounds for casehood has been resolved in most instances by laying stress on semantics. Thus, LOC is considered a case in (28) even though it does not pass a T-potential test. But other actants (e.g., MANNER, CAUSE, RESULT, PURPOSE, etc.) which never undergo a criterion T have generally not been conceded casehood status.

When more than a single head category is allowed, other complications arise. A single case may have different T-potential when attached to different head categories. I.e., what passes the subjectivalization test when with a head verb may have no T-potential at all when with a head noun and vice versa. If an actant occurs only with N or V as head, we simply state that the case appears only with N or V. But if the actant can occur with both V and N, but has the significant T-potential only with V, do we say it is in a case relationship only with V?—(Cf.
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topicalization in the description of Waray following.) Again the use of a T-potential test for casehood has placed syntax and semantics in conflict.

A similar situation obtains when two actants bear the same functional relationship to verbs X and Y but only with verb X or Y does the T-potential test succeed. One escape from these difficulties is to say that if an actant passes any T-potential test, its relationship is a case relationship and so any other actant bearing the same relationship must be in a case relationship also (even if it does not pass the T-potential test). This approach leaves us with (a) some actants which are considered cases because they sometimes pass a T criterion, and (b) some actants which never pass a T criterion and hence are never considered cases.

The approach taken in Section II avoids most of these difficulties since the semantic character of the relationship predominates. The T potential in Waray corresponding to some degree with subjectivization is topicalization. It is not used at all as a criterion for casehood. An interesting sidelight here is that those actants which undergo topicalization in Waray are not the same set as those which are involved in subjectivization in English.

**Fronting**

Some actants can be made to precede a surface subject, while others can not. Viz.,

(29) a. Racial problems are not so obvious in the Philippines.
    b. In the Philippines racial problems are not so obvious.
(30) a. We're leaving for Chicago tomorrow.
b. Tomorrow we're leaving for Chicago.

(31) a. She sang with the choir last night.
    b. *With the choir she sang last night.

(32) a. She slept at Mary's last night.
    b. *At Mary's she slept last night.

We are simply noting that the transformation which provides for placing an actant in the initial emphatic position applies selectively. It can also be pointed out that that selectivity does not rely solely on the functional relationship of the actant, i.e., some actants indicating LOC can be fronted, others can not, so this T-potential is hardly suitable for distinguishing case relationships if that is desired.

**Pro-ing**

Some actants have pro-forms characteristic of them. Others can not be pro-ed. Once again the distinction appears to be one of intensity of verbal attachment as well as of case relationship. Viz.,

(33) a. He studied at MIT.
    b. What did he do there? He studied.

(34) a. He washed in cold water.
    b. *What did he do there? He washed.

Hence, again the syntactic characteristic pro-ing is not a valid criterion for deciding for or against including an actant as a "case".

**Imperative Subject Deletion**

Fillmore (1968, p. 31) contends that 'true imperatives' can only be derived from an underlying sentence containing an AGT. He thus uses the IMP transformation as a test for a particular actant relationship in the deep structure. This test motivates the revision of the case
frame of "learn" from [+O D A] (cf. (35)) to [+O A S] (cf. (36)).

(35) Mary (D) learned a song (O) from John (A).
(36) Mary (A) learned a song (O) from John (S).

Fillmore's contention is that the feature STATIVE is no longer needed since the absence of AGT in the deep structure blocks the IMP transformation on the tree which would result in (37).

(37) *Hear that song all afternoon, ok?

There are a number of examples which can be raised which are a problem for the AGT -- IMP tie. A few follow.

(38) a. Don't be late.
    b. Have a good time.

(39) a. Become a programmer in your spare time.
    b. Learn that song by 5 o'clock.

It appears that a general correlation holds but IMP subject deletion can not be based on the notion AGT.

2.2.2.4. What Is the Head of a Case Relationship?

Some writers (e.g., Fillmore, Stockwell et al., Matthews) have considered as case related only those actants which have a lexical category as head. Blake has posited other cases which have no lexical category as head. We consider next both of these possibilities.

LEXICAL CATEGORIES AS HEAD

Quite a number of lexical categories have been proposed as heads of case relations. Blake considers verbs, nouns, pronouns, adjectives, and adverbs as having that quality.

Is V a Valid Head?

V has been undisputed as head of cases. Recent Case grammarians
have indicated it as such by their PROP rewrite rules which contain V followed by the cases related to it.

Is N a Valid Head?

Blake proposed that N could be the head of practically all cases. One can surmise that this was because N and various types of actants co-occur contiguously in the surface string and in many sentences the actants can not be considered ad-verbal. Viz.,

(40) A student at U.C.L.A. broke my tail bone.

Naturally Blake did not consider the possibility of deriving these actants from a relative clause since the process of relating deep and surface structures transformationally was not yet proposed. Now that it is possible to derive the underlined phrase above as a reduced relative, is it necessary to maintain N as a head of case relationships? I.e., since we undoubtedly wish to retain a relative clause source as a non-case structure, isn't it desirable to avoid providing two sources for identical surface strings? Note the result of allowing both RREL reduction and cases on head N's. (We shall assume the NOM-S relative clause analysis proposed in Stockwell et al. (1968).)

Allowing cases on N's, and having a rule of REL REDUCTION which operates when the predicate of the relative clause is a prep phrase, one can propose both of the following sources for the subject in (40).
In sum, the phrase is ambiguous as to whether it begins as a relative clause and gets reduced or begins as a case attached to a head noun.
A similar dual source can be proposed for more problematic sentences if special rules of reduction are allowed. Viz.,

\[(43)\]

a. The man with the gun says he means business.

b. The man \textit{man has a gun} says he means business.

So, looking at only Blake's motivation for \textit{N} as head, one could argue forcefully for eliminating \textit{N} as head of cases. Nevertheless we shall show momentarily that we do indeed wish to retain \textit{N} as head of cases. After that we'll return to the problem of the ambiguity just noted.

Fillmore proposed \textit{N} as head of the DAT case to account for instances of inalienable possession and for structures in which it is semantically inappropriate to posit an underlying \textit{S} of the form "\textit{X has Y}". E.g., "My missing tooth" is one such phrase to which "I have a tooth" does not accord well. Allowing the DAT also provides two sources for those languages in which alienable and inalienable possessive pronouns are distinguished in the surface forms.

Stockwell \textit{et al.} at one time considered making \textit{N} head of a \textbf{PARTITIVE} case. This would provide a source for such prep phrases as those underlined below.

\[(44)\]

a. Some of the \textit{fellows} went to Lasky's last night.

b. I finished the last \textit{of the books} yesterday.

The underlying strings would be as follows with the underlined phrase a \textbf{PARTITIVE} case on the preceding noun.

\[(45)\]

a. Some fellows of the \textit{fellows} went to Lasky's last night.

b. I finished the last book(s) of the books yesterday.

Although the \textbf{PARTITIVE} source was retained in the final version, PART
was not considered a case for at least four reasons. Foremost was
the fact that there are no nouns with idiosyncratic constraints on PART.

Having looked at some inconclusive arguments for N as head, let us
now consider the strongest motivation. Stockwell et al. (1968) has
shown in detail that one of the great benefits of the Case Grammar
approach is the fact that it allows one to adopt the lexicalist hypo-
thesis and at the same time maintain the parallelism between PROP and
NOM. Having N as head of cases provides a natural structural source
for "derived nominals". (Cf. Chomsky (1968) for arguments for the
desirability of distinguishing derived from gerundive nominals.) The
following tree illustrates a derived nominal source and the use of
cases on N.

\( (46) \)

\[ S \]
\[ MOD \]
\[ PROP \]
\[ V \]
\[ NEUT \]
\[ DAT \]
\[ MANN \]
\[ P \]
\[ NP \]
\[ D \]
\[ NOM \]
\[ N \]
\[ NEUT \]
\[ AGT \]
\[ PAST \]
\[ touch \]
\[ consideration \]
\[ his \]
\[ needs \]
\[ they \]
\[ me \]
\[ deeply \]

\( (47) \) Their consideration of his needs touched me deeply.

Now, accepting the need for cases on head nouns, we are faced
with the fact mentioned above of there being two sources possible for
many noun-actant relationships. As has been pointed out in Stockwell
et al. (1968, p. 490-1) many actant relationships are generally inter-
interpreted as coming from Rel Reduction (48), others from a case source (49), and only a few from either (50).

(48) a. The letter from your cousin is on the sofa.
    b. The man on the balcony is probably a policeman.

(49) a. The introduction of the speaker took 12 minutes.
    b. The author of the book gave a short speech.

(50) My agent in London wrote that the skinheads are everywhere. Stockwell et al. also point out that several rather undependable tests are possible to determine what sort of relationship is present after the sentence has been generated. Both tests involve the possibility of inserting material between the head and the associated actant. The claim is that only with reduced rel's can a RREL clause or a frequency adverb be inserted. Viz.,

(51) a. The man usually on the balcony is not there now.
    b. ?The man who we were depending on on the balcony is gone.

(52) a. *The introduction often of the speaker will never happen.
    b. *The introduction which I am referring to of the speaker took 12 minutes.

(53) a. My cousin usually in London isn't there now.
    b. ?My cousin who got married in France in London wrote yesterday.

Note that the tests for (51) and (53) give the same results so perhaps every reduced REL phrase has a case counterpart.

At any rate, under the assumption that semantic interpretation is based solely on deep structure, we have (a) allowed two different independently well-motivated syntactic processes to result in the same
surface structure and at the same time (b) required two semantic rules to provide the same semantic representation (one operating on cases and one on RREL's). Under the assumption that semantic interpretation is based partly on derived syntactic structures, only the first observation would be true since interpretation of the relative clause derivation could follow Rel Reduction.

**Can Each Actant Be Assigned Unambiguously to a N or V Head?**

In most sentences there is no problem at all in deciding whether a particular case has a noun or verb as head. Some cases occur only with nouns (e.g., PARTitive) or only with verbs (e.g., FACTitive and MANNER) so ambiguity is impossible. Other cases can not be interpreted as attached to a noun so enter into the case frame of the verb obligatorily on interpretation. Viz.,

(54) He threw the crabs **off a cliff**.

In still other sentences the case is unambiguously nominal (at least at a derived level) since it occurs with the subject of an equational sentence. Viz.,

(55) The tree **in the garden** is big.

There are sentences, however, where the decision between head noun and head verb is not so easily made. Note the following examples.

(56) A gift **for Mom** arrived.

(57) a. I sent a gift **for Mom** yesterday.

b. I bought a gift **for Mom** yesterday.

The BEN in (56) seems clearly nominal. Those in (57) seem ambiguous or vague in their attachment. Note, however, that only two of the BEN interpretations, "benefit" and "reservational", can have
either a verb or a noun as head. The "substitutive" BEN interpretation requires a verb as head. (Cf. Section II, Chap. 3 (2.6))

Are PN, ADJ, and ADV Valid Heads?

In positing PN's, ADJ's, and ADV's as heads of cases, Blake adds a few more cases unique (for him) to those categories. Thus, PN requires the PARTitive case. Note however that if PN's are considered pro-forms of NP's, the PART case is slipped into the list required for N's as head.

ADJ requires the addition of INCLINATIONAL and COMPARative in Blake's analysis. Assuming that ADJ and V are a single category, these two cases must be added to the list having V as head. The INCLINATIONAL case appears ill-founded since it appears with no other head category and might well be considered semantically equivalent to NEUT.

ADV adds only PART and COMPAR which are present under V and N if the revisions just considered are made.

The use of ADJ and ADV as heads of case relationships is completely avoided in this paper for two reasons. First, a consideration of those cases having N's and V's as head leaves few if any cases aside. And second, one's decision as to ADJ and ADV as heads rests squarely on one's decision about the categorial status of ADJ and ADV. Since that status is presently in dispute and since case may not add much evidence either way, the use of ADJ and ADV as heads of cases is ignored.

NON-LEXICAL CATEGORIES AS HEAD

Three Case Types Supposedly Headless

Turning now to the possibility of having cases which do not have any lexical category as head, let us look first at the three sets of
cases which Blake suggested. They are: appositive, independent, and predicative.

There are three appositive cases. The DESCRIPTIVE case covers what are now considered non-restrictive relative clauses or appositive clauses.

(58) a. John, the carpenter
    b. We, the people of the United States (Blake, p. 46)

Though their particular source is presently in dispute, a derivational non-case origin appears acceptable.

The CIRCUMSTANTIAL case is practically indistinguishable from the MANNER case. E.g.,

(59) a. He acted as king.
    b. He, relying on his strength, rushed forward. (Blake, p. 46)

The RESULTANT case can also be considered a case with a N or V as head. E.g.,

(60) a. The father named his son John.
    b. They elected him consul. (Blake, p. 46)

So, of the appositives, none are lexically headless cases. One is not a case and the latter two may have category heads.

There are two independent cases. INTRODUCTIVE applies to items considered in many other grammars to be "nominative absolute" and "sentence topics". E.g.,

(61) This man (as for this man), nothing can be done for him. (Blake, p. 37)

Ross's left dislocation T is a probable source for such constructions.

VOCATIVE describes the relationship of the underlined item in the
following example.

(62) John, close the door. (Blake, p. 37)

Case Grammar provides no natural source for the VOCATIVE actant.

Blake's third set of cases, the predicative cases, presents difficult problems for a CG. No analysis, including the present one, has provided a well-integrated description of those actants found in the "predicate" usage. Nevertheless an analysis is given in Section II, Chapter 3 (2.13) which utilizes a V head for predicate cases.

We turn next to a consideration of the possibility of cases having nodes other than terminal symbols as heads.

Can Actants Be Case Related to S or PROP?

Is it possible for a case to have an S or a PROP as head? For example, should the base structure of (63) be (64) or (65) or (66)?

(63) She wrote a letter during the Rose Parade.

(64) $S$

  $\text{MOD}$

  $\text{PROP}$

  $\text{V}$

  $\text{NEUT}$

  $\text{AGT}$

  $\text{TIME}$

  $\text{PAST}$

  write

  a letter

  she

  during the Rose Parade.

(65) $S$

  $\text{MOD}$

  $\text{PROP}$

  $\text{TIME}$

  $\text{V}$

  $\text{NEUT}$

  $\text{AGT}$

  $\text{PAST}$

  write

  a letter

  she

  during the Rose Parade.
(66)

```
     S
   /   \
S    TIME
 /    / \
MOD PROP
 /    /  \
V   NEUT AGT
 /  /  \
PAST write a letter she during the Rose Parade
```

Let us note the considerations suggesting that some actants should be attached outside the PROP.

First, some actants do not have co-occurrence restrictions with the V. E.g., unlike AGT and NEUT which for many verbs are obligatorily present or absent, TIME appears to have no obligatory connection to any verb in regard to presence or absence. The same can be said for PURPOSE, RESULT, and others.

Second, some actants do not undergo the T's characteristic of those cases closely tied to the verb. In English, INST can only rarely be objectivalized, while TM, MANN, BEN and others do not undergo either subjectivalization or objectivalization. In Waray, a number of cases can not be topicalized. In English, INST can not be preposed, while TIME always can. Some LOC's can be preposed and others can't. Cf. (2.2.2.3) above.

Third, it has been suggested that the only PROP case which can be sentential in nature is the NEUT case. If one follows this approach, then TIME, MANN, MEANS and perhaps others must be placed outside the PROP.

Fourth, the possibility of some actants being outside the PROP as
well as inside would allow for the multiplicity of identical cases within a single sentence. Matthews suggested such a approach. Sentences such as the following could easily be generated.

(67) She cooked the rice before he left before I could stop her.

Although this approach provides a source for a number of additional cases and their realizations (e.g., LOC and BEN), it certainly does not account for all. Viz.,

(68) On Sunday when we went to the beach, during the volleyball game I lost a contact lens in the sand.

Fifth, it can be argued that the scope of negation requires some actants to be outside the PROP. Recall Lakoff's (1965, p. F-18) often used example with the CAUSAL clause, in which the act negated can either include the CAUSAL clause or not.

(69) I don't beat my wife because I like her.

Similar ambiguities are argued to hold for TIME and perhaps LOC actants in Stockwell et al. (1968, p. 275).

(70) a. He doesn't eat dinner two nights a week.

b. He doesn't go to church at the University.

Sixth, the fact that the scope of some cases includes conjoined S's has been suggested as evidence that the case be attached to a higher S.

(71) John roped and tied the calf in 7 seconds.

The point brought out was that (72) is not a paraphrase of (71).

(72) John roped the calf in 7 seconds and John tied the calf in 7 seconds.

Two replies can be made, neither wholly satisfactory. First, (72) can be a paraphrase if one interprets the 7 seconds as being the same 7
seconds. And, second, if phrasal conjunction is assumed, then the temporal clause of (71) can still be within the PROP.

Seventh, one might argue that some actants are in relationship to the sentence as a whole since they have restrictions with sentence characteristic items such as TNS. Thus, sentential COND cases might be considered to have a sentential head because of the TNS constraints.

(73) a. John would have gone if I had gone.

b. *John would have gone if I will go.

This conclusion is certainly not forced, however, since one can conceive of co-occurrence restrictions with the MOD while the case remains within the PROP.

Finally, Stockwell et al. (1968, p. 958) suggest that the case COM should be outside the PROP since NP's within it do not undergo reflexivization.

(74) *Ted took the handball with himself.

This criterion would place COM not only outside the PROP but outside S since reflexivization up to this time has been held to have the domain S rather than PROP. But COM doesn't meet the other criteria proposed above for extra-PROP cases.

There are also problems attendant with the assumption that some cases are outside the PROP. First, the various criteria given above do not split off the same cases exactly. E.g., MANN does have co-occurrence restrictions with some verbs (e.g., "know" does not allow MANN) but it does not undergo subjectivization or objectivization. One is thus forced to choose one (or several) of the criteria as dominant so that any case meeting that (those) criteria is in (or out) of the
PROP, while the other criteria are supplementary.

Second, if one assumes that the actants outside PROP do not have co-occurrence restrictions with the verb, there are ramifications for the introduction of case information. Either one must assume that cases are introduced by PS rules or that there is a lexical convention which inserts the totally optional case features outside the PROP. This is in contrast to idiosyncratic specification of the case features on the actants within the PROP. Cf. Section 2.4 "Alternative Methods of Introducing Case Information".

The heavy preponderance of arguments in favor of cases outside the PROP notwithstanding, I have chosen to include all cases in the description of Waray in Section II as inside the PROP. The motivation for this decision is given in the introduction to Chapter 3 of Section II.

2.3. What Are the Phonological Consequences of Case?

Some writers consider case a surface phenomenon, linking and limiting the case of a language to the different phonological forms and markers which are present in that language. Thus, a case system has traditionally been proposed to describe the inflectional variations of the English pronouns. Nominative, accusative, and genitive cases are said to be inflectionally reflected in the following forms: he/she, him/her, his/her. CG recognizes the existence of such phonologically based systems but considers them derived from an underlying case system. Thus, accusative him appears as the surface representative of various underlying cases, among which are LOCative, NEUTral, BENefactive and even AGenTive. Viz.,
(1) a. I saw a cockroach on him.
   b. Harry shot him.
   c. She did it for him.
   d. The third pigeon was shot by him.

An underlying system of cases can have universal application while a phonologically based system can not. The universality of surface case forms has little meaning since no two languages utilize all of the same forms. There can be no metatheory if the distinction of case is phonological. CG attempts to demonstrate that languages have a common semantic-syntactic construct, "case".

Having noted the primacy of an underlying case system, let us emphasize the fact that the way the underlying case system is tied to the phonological system is of great interest. In the partial grammar of Waray which follows, the phonological representation of case features will continually be pointed out. It will also be apparent throughout that languages utilize various surface cues to indicate the underlying case relationships. Word order in English and verbal affixation in Waray contribute to the assignment of a few of the case relationships. Prepositions have case marking function in both English and Waray.

2.4. Alternative Methods of Introducing Case Information

Category Versus Feature Form of Case Information

If one accepts Fillmore's notion of a universal set of cases, there are at least two forms in which case information can appear in the grammar: (a) as a category and (b) as a feature.
Fillmore (1966) and Stockwell et al. (1968) choose to represent it both as category and feature. In the PS rules, the information is initially categorial but derivatively in feature form. In the lexicon, the information is in feature form for prepositions but in the case frame on verbs it is referred to in its category form.

Deep P-markers according to Stockwell et al. (1968) are as follows (with considerable abbreviation).

(1) a. \[
\begin{array}{c}
S \\
\text{MOD} \\
\text{PROP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{I} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{NP} \\
\end{array}
\]

b. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{DET} \\
\text{NOM} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{I} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{NP} \\
\end{array}
\]

[+0] [+0] [+I] [+I]  [+0] [+0] [+I] [+I]

The purpose of the case feature on lower nodes is to allow lexical insertion to take cognizance of the syntactic function of the NP dominating the lexical categories. The case information on individual lexical entries is matched against particular trees and lexical insertion can take place.

If one accepts a feature complex analysis of case and considers only case features to be universal, it follows that case information is inherently in feature form. The PROP consists of a V followed by a string of actants whose syntactic functions (cases) are indicated by features appended to them. The NOM has a similar structure. This is the position taken in Section II which follows. The simplified tree structure following illustrates this position.
The source of the case information on the tree nodes is the next issue.

**PS Versus Lexical Source of Case Information**

Correlative to the category form of case information is the PS source of that information. I.e., in order to have cases as categories, the PS rules must be of the form following.

(3) a. \( \text{PROP} \longrightarrow V (O) (D) (L) (A) \ldots \)

b. \( \text{NOM} \longrightarrow N (O) (D) (L) \ldots \)

Chomsky has presented two arguments against a rule of this type. First, it mixes categorial and functional information. And second, it is redundant since the functional information is contained implicitly in the dominance relations. In regard to the first argument, one can reply that mixing the information is a disadvantage only if it hinders the reader's interpretation of the rule. In regard to the second point, it obviously no longer applies since dominance relations are insufficient to determine functional relations.

If case information is in the form of features only, there are two possible ways in which the features may be introduced. The first mixes category and feature notation in rules such as the following.
(4) a. PROP ----> V AC AC AC ... 
     [±O] [±D] [±L] 

b. NOM ----> N AC AC AC ... 
     [±O] [±D] [±L] 

In light of Chomsky's (1970, p. 208) proposal that categories are simply feature complexes, such a rule is not far fetched. However, noting the second alternative, it appears to be unnecessary.

The second possibility utilizes simple PS rules such as the following.

(5) a. PROP ----> V AC^n 

b. NOM ----> N AC^n 

The source of the case information is the lexicon itself during lexical insertion. The verb is equipped with a feature which states the cases allowable and a part of the operation of lexical insertion is the spreading of that case information to the actants following the verb. The final result is identical to that in (4).

This second approach is quite similar to that employed by Jane Robinson (1968). However, in her formalization the lexical case information is added only to the category K (i.e., PREP). Case-related features such as ANIM are added to the N in the same prep phrase.

Having lexical entries fill in the case relationships of the actants following the verb has several things in its favor. First, it simplifies the PS rules in two ways. (a) It eliminates the mixture of case information and category information. Only category information remains in the PS trees. Case information instead of being found in two places (PS and Lexicon) now originates only in the lexicon (without adding any lexical constructs). It allows one to avoid
choosing either of the following alternatives, both deficient. One need not have a series of rules such as: DAT --> P NP, AGT --> P NP, etc., which obviously miss a generalization. And one need not propose a rule of the type in (6), which requires PS rules to be a mixture of "one-many" and "many-many" form.

(6) (DAT, AGT, LOC, etc.) --> P NP

Second, case information is uniformly found as a feature on a category.

Matthews' removal of case from the PS rules seemed to involve another implicit argument. That was that the subjectivalization T's could be made to apply easier if ordering of cases was allowed to be lexically determined. The force of such an argument is language specific of course since ordering of actants is of no value in some languages (cf. the present description of Waray).

The obvious argument against having the lexicon as the source of case information is that a new T must be proposed which spreads the case information to the actants following the V in each PROP. Cf. Section II, Chapter 5 for implementation of this T. The ability of the lexical insertion operation to match the number of actants with the number of cases on the verbal feature is no different from its previous ability to match the actants of the tree with the cases on the verb feature. Rather than matching symbols now one matches number of symbols. (This is easily taken care of by a condition on the Case Spread T.)

Case Related Information

A distinction must be made between case information itself (e.g., that an actant is [+AGT] and related information (e.g., that the [+AGT]
actant is obligatory and that it must become subject). Thus, we must find the most economical way to state co-occurrence restrictions and transformational potentials as well as introduce the case features themselves. Let us review in detail what the case related information is.

In re: co-occurrence restrictions, we must state what cases can occur with which heads in all the possibilities of obligatoriness and optionality. In re: T-potential, we must provide for T's such as subjectivalization, fronting, and pro-ing.

Fillmore hoped to provide enough information for both co-occurrence restrictions and subjectivalization by means of a case frame. The case frame primarily stated the co-occurrence restrictions but redundantly provided information allowing the subjectivalization rules to operate. With some verbs, special features were required to produce the correct subjectivalization. E.g.,

(7) a. The picture pleased John. NEUT → subj; DAT → object
    b. John liked the picture. NEUT → object; DAT → subj

When other T-potentials such as fronting are considered complexities arise. The sets of case features utilized in co-occurrence restrictions and fronting for a particular verb are not disjoint. Viz.,

(8) For his wife Sam bought a bracelet but for his mother he got some roses.

One cannot claim that fronting operates only on those cases not provided by the case frame of the verb. Some other means must be provided to distinguish which of those cases can be fronted.

We shall proceed as Fillmore did under the assumption that a case frame can state all those cases in co-occurrence restrictions with the
head and that the T-potentials can be tipped off directly from that case frame or with exception features where necessary.

2.5. What About Case in Language Universal and What is Language Specific?

If one accepts the position that cases are not feature composites, one has two choices regarding the universality of the case information. First, one can assume the universality of a set of cases. Blake does this but makes no attempt to provide definitions for his list of cases. He presumably assumes that the reader can provide such information himself. This approach is of course open to the criticism of not providing an objective criterion for the application of the constructs to another language. Fillmore has tried to fill in this lacuna by providing a set of definitions for his cases. His position then is that a set of case constructs can be provided with defining features that will allow their application to any language.

Second, one can reject the possibility of universal case definitions. This Matthews has done. He talks about semantic "rules of thumb" (n.d., p.37-8, ft.7 and 10) but states that justification of case must be on syntactic evidence alone. Since his evidence is from English, Matthews has provided evidence for a certain set of constructs within English. He has provided no argument that those constructs have relevance to non-Indo-European languages. In short, he has not considered case to have language universal significance and has provided no way of explaining that a case function Y in English has a counterpart in Waray.

If one accepts the position that case information does involve feature.composites, one again has two logical possibilities. One could say as Matthews does that case feature composites have language specific
relevance only. The same objection holds.

Or, one can contend that the list of case features is universal. The definition of case relationships comes as particular case features are chosen in a particular language and find themselves grouped together in language specific ways.

One might ask if it is proper to provide each composite of case features in a particular language with a case label. Providing the composition of the features does not change drastically through transformational changes, such a procedure would be mnemonically helpful. In such a situation, one might say that the case labels are language specific and the case features are language universals.

Although I accept the last position given as best, the choice rests not upon a body of arguments based on a study of case in many languages but simply upon the belief that the position is best suited to choosing between the first and last positions. I.e., if one looks for case features and finds that the feature complexes are identical from language to language, the first position is substantiated. But if the feature complexes turn out to be comprised differently in different languages, then the last position is substantiated. Assuming the first position, the last is never tested.

3.0. CONTRIBUTIONS OF CASE METATHEORY

Although the following are listed as contributions of CG, it is recognized that their usefulness can be disputed. What appears to be a contribution to a backer of CG may be considered a liability to a devotee of another metatheory.

CG allows for the incorporation of a large number of semantic
constructs which have syntactic relevance. It is contended that the inclusion of these semantic notions not only incorporates intuitive relations not yet described but simplifies the description of other constructs, some on the border of syntax and semantics and others purely syntactic.

The first contribution is the introduction of the functional relationship which actants hold to their head. Consider the following.

(1) John threw Bill the ball.

"John" is not only the surface subject but is shown to be in an agentive relationship. "The ball" is held to be in neutral relationship. And "Bill" is in a dative relationship but is realized as a surface object. It can also be pointed out that CG allows a simple means of expressing the fact that in general only a single instance of any functional relation can occur in simple S. (The equivocation is included pending a satisfactory analysis of a stacking of LOC's and TIME's.)

The specification of the underlying function of the actants allows a second contribution: a tying together of various sentences utilizing the same verbs but different cases or the same cases in different surface relationships. Fillmore's thread-bare examples will suffice.

(2) a. John (AGT) opened the door (NEUT).
   b. The door (NEUT) was opened by John (AGT).
   c. John (AGT) opened the door (NEUT) with the key (INST).
   d. The key (INST) opened the door (NEUT).

Stockwell et al. (1968, p. 10) amplifies this point considerably considering the contribution from the standpoint of simplifying lexical entries. Rather than having several lexical entries for "open" (and
hosts of other verbs) and quite complicated sub-categorial and selectional restrictions for each one, CG has allowed a single lexical entry to relate systematically the various sentences above.

A third contribution is the more complete account provided for co-occurrence of verbs with actants, actants with actants, and prepositions with actants. The indefinite prep phrase category has given way to a specification of the type of prep phrase allowed by a particular verb. Preps can not appear haphazardly under any prep phrase but have features sensitive to the case relationship they appear in. Thus, the prep of AGT is characteristically "by". Other preps are transformationally inserted and deleted. Not all preps can be predicted since a one-many relationship holds between many cases and their preps but a significant advance has been made in that direction.

Fourth, CG avoids the language specific nature of the NP--Pred Phrase dichotomy as a deep structure. The concept "subject" is removed from the PS rewrite rules since all NP's follow the head V in parallel dominance relation. The problem of choosing between active and passive as primary thus never arises since both are equally derived.

A fifth contribution depends on one's decision about the nature of cases. If one holds that DAT and AGT are invariably animate while INST is invariably inanimate, then it follows that CG has simplified the specification of selectional features. Redundancy rules can fill in what before had to be provided through special selectional features on each verb. If one does not accept DAT and AGT as invariably animate and INST as inanimate, he might argue the uselessness of case information for selectional matters. Note however, that if the markedness system
is utilized in our representation of redundancies, some simplicity may still be achieved by stating that animate is the unmarked specification for AGT and DAT while inanimate is the marked specification and conversely for INST.

**Sixth,** as Stockwell *et al.* (1968, p. 6-8) point out, the CG theory permits one to adopt the lexicalist hypothesis and the X-bar convention and at the same time avoid the inelegancies which arise with a deep structure subject-predicate analysis. The arguments can be summarized as follows. (a) The subject-predicate analysis forces one into a lack of parallelism between NP ($\bar{N}$) and Predicate Phrase ($\bar{V}$) and hence vitiates the use of the X-bar convention. Note that in (3) "the enemy's" is the specifier of $\bar{N}$ and dominated by $\bar{V}$, but in (4) "the enemy" is not the specifier of $\bar{V}$ and in fact is outside $\bar{V}$.

(3) $\bar{N}$
    \[ [\text{SPEC, } \bar{N}] \]
    \[ \bar{N} \]
    \[ \bar{N} \]
    \[ \bar{N} \]
the enemy's destruction of the city

(4) $\bar{V}$
    \[ [\text{SPEC, } \bar{V}] \]
    \[ \bar{V} \]
    \[ \bar{V} \]
    \[ \bar{V} \]
    \[ \bar{V} \]
    \[ \bar{V} \]
The enemy destroyed the city.
In a CG analysis the parallelism is maintained since both instances of "the enemy" originate as NP's in case relationship to parallel N and V.

(b) The lack of parallelism just noted with the subject-predicate analysis also voids the hope of the lexicalist hypothesis of stating subcategorial and selectional restrictions economically (i.e., of collapsing these restrictions for N's and V's) and also requires independent rules of semantic interpretation.
SECTION II: A PARTIAL CASE GRAMMAR OF WARAY

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

1.0 LANGUAGE ORIENTATION
   1.1 Geographical and Demographical
   1.2 Genetic

2.0 SOURCES OF INFORMATION
   2.1 Informants
   2.2 Writings

3.0 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

4.0 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

5.0 SOME PHONOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF WARAY
   5.1 Phonemic Inventory
   5.2 Morphophonemics
   5.3 Writing Systems
1.0 LANGUAGE ORIENTATION

1.1. Geographical and Demographical

Waray is also known as Winaray, Waray-Waray, Lineye-Samaron, Samareño, Leyteño, Sinamareño, Samar-Leyte, and Bisayan. Bisayan is much too broad a term since Cebuano, Ilonggo, Boholano, and other Visayan languages could also be called Bisayan. Samareño, Leyteño, and Sinamareño are all more properly dialectal appellatives since they are regional in nature. Although there is some emotional feeling against the term "Waray" since it also has the meaning "none, nothing", I have chosen this term since it is the most commonly used name for the language.

Waray is spoken by approximately two million Filipinos living mainly on Samar and Leyte. The western half of Leyte is predominantly Cebuano speaking with the division following the mountain range running the length of Leyte from North to South. The linguistic division is easily understood since transportation and hence communication is much easier between Western Leyte and Cebu than between Western and Eastern Leyte.

Biliran island is also split by Cebuano and Waray. Other islands off the coast of Samar with few exceptions have Waray speaking inhabitants. Waray is spoken on all of Samar, but northern Samar is affected to some degree by Bicol, the language spoken on Luzon just across the San Bernardino Strait.

Waray is generally considered to be split into two major dialects, Lineyte and Samareño, which are tied to the obvious geographical separation. The correctness of such a division is not unchallengable.
A simple phonological survey finds similarities shared by Samar and the
difficult to reach areas of Leyte which the Tacloban area does not
possess. For example, an isogloss chart of the /h-s/ split in the ART's
finds /h/ in the Tacloban area but /s/ in Samar and the remote Leyte
areas. In light of this, one could posit innovations beginning at
Tacloban and spreading into the surrounding Leyte areas but having
little affect on Samar.

It is also generally held that at least three separate dialects
exist on Samar: (a) a northern Samareño spoken around Catarman, (b)
a western Samareño centered in Catbalogan and Calbayog, and (c) an
eastern Samareño focussed in Borongan.

The dialect this study is based on is mainly that spoken in
Tacloban. Due to contacts with non-Waray (mostly Cebuano and Tagalog
speaking) and a high educational level (introducing Spanish terms), the
Tacloban dialect is more greatly influenced by borrowing than other
Waray dialects.

1.2. Genetic

Following Dyen's Lexicostatistical Classification of Austronesian
Languages (1965), Waray is a member of the Philippine Hesion, which is
a member of the Northwest Hesion, itself a member of the Hesperonesian
Linkage, which in turn is part of the MalayoPolynesian Linkage, one of
40 members of the Austronesian Linkage. Waray specifically is not
included in the listing of Dyen. We can with good probability predict
its falling into one of two relationships: membership in the Bisayan
cluster or membership in the Tagalic Hesion.
2.0 SOURCES OF INFORMATION

2.1. Informants

The data upon which this study is based were collected over a period of three years, beginning the Fall of 1967 and ending in the Spring of 1970. During the year 1967-68, about four hours a week were spent in data collection at UCLA. From October, 1968, to August, 1969, data collection and analysis were full-time while the author lived in Tacloban City, Philippines. This latter study was made possible by a Fulbright-Hays grant through the Philippine-American Educational Foundation. Back at UCLA in the Fall of 1969, research again continued part time. This was supported in part by a grant from the Center for South and Southeast Asia Studies, University of California, Berkeley.

During the first year of part-time study in the States, Zaida Elefano, age 28, acted as informant. Zaida was born and reared in Tacloban City. Her father was a Tagalog speaker and her mother a Waray. In the home, Tagalog, Waray, and English were spoken. Having Cebuano and Ilonggo speaking friends, Zaida also acquired these languages. She graduated from Leyte High School and received a B.S. in Elementary Education from Leyte Normal School. From 1960 to 1967, she worked in the Department of Education of the Bureau of Public Schools in Manila as Assistant Curriculum Coordinator. While in Manila she took units at the University of the Philippines toward a M.Ed. In 1966, she was a Colombo Plan Scholar to Japan. Zaida arrived in Los Angeles in August, 1967, and we began our work in September. Obviously adept at languages, Zaida was an extremely competent and
sympathetic informant. Her intuitive grasp of syntactic relationships more than offset her mixed idiolect.

During the year of full-time study in Tacloban, there were two principal informants. The first was Teofilo Pacaña, age 66 and retired. He is a native of Caibiran, Biliran, a subprovince of northern Leyte, where he lived until 1945. As a child, Teofilo spoke Waray as a first language. Living in an area becoming progressively more Cebuano, he soon learned Cebuano as well as Spanish, English, and Tagalog. Teofilo attended the National University of Manila until the death of his father. Returning to Caibiran he taught elementary school for four years. He then entered politics holding the position of Secretary of the Mayor for twelve years. After a short term of service with the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Teofilo served as Inspector with the Philippine National Bank from 1946 to his retirement in 1954. Having had a broad range of experiences, Teofilo was a sophisticated source of information both linguistic and cultural. In comparing his idiolect with others, it has become apparent that Caibiran Waray is markedly different from Tacloban Waray. Fortunately, it appears that most differences are of a lexical nature.

The second main informant in Tacloban was Emiliana Agustin, age 36. Miling has lived in Tacloban since birth, her parents both being Leyteños. Since the language of the home was exclusively Waray, Miling learned English and Tagalog in school. Cebuano was picked up from friends. Miling received an Elementary Teachers Certificate from Leyte Normal School, the BSE from Divine Word University, and lacks only her thesis for an M.A. from the same school. She has taught elementary
school continuously from 1951 to the present. Her eagerness to assist coupled with her relatively "uncorrupted" idiolect made her a valuable help.

During the second year of part-time study in the States, Linda Olmedo, age 28, provided invaluable help by expanding greatly the set of Waray structures under consideration. Linda is a native of MacArthur, Leyte, having spent the first twelve years of her life there. As a child she learned Waray at home and Tagalog and English at school. Upon graduating from high school at St. Paul's College in Tacloban City, Linda attended Far Eastern University of Manila. She received a B.S. in nursing there in 1962. Then until coming to the States in June, 1969, she worked as a nurse at the Far Eastern University Hospital. Presently she is employed at the UCLA Medical Center. The fact that Linda speaks an "uncontaminated" Waray representative of Southern Leyte lends additional breadth to this study.

Other Warays have been of valuable assistance also. Milagros Asoy, age 38, a native of Tacloban City and whose parents are also both Warays, assisted both as an informant and as a researcher (working on an historical project). She has also been an elementary teacher since 1950, having earned an E.T.C. from Leyte Normal School and a B.S.E. from Divine Word University. Milagros speaks Cebuano as well as Waray and English.

Baby Jaro conscientiously put in long and difficult hours at the typewriter making my practically indecipherable hand-writings legible.

2.2. Writings

There are two major written sources of information on Waray syntax:
John and Ida Wolff's *Beginning Waray* (1967) and Norberto Romualdez' *Bisayan Grammar* (1908). Though both are miles away from the theoretical approach employed in this thesis, they have helped immeasurably by calling attention to unexplored areas and by providing testable hypotheses.


A number of dictionaries have been made (none are currently in print) and some old grammars written in Spanish are available in the Divine Word Museum. See the bibliography for details.

3.0 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study of Waray has two primary objectives. First, it is meant to demonstrate the applicability of the Case Grammar metatheory to Philippine languages (utilizing Waray as the test language). Any success of the description demonstrates the validity of the metatheory. Failures in description may but do not necessarily reflect on the adequacy of the metatheory since the failure may be due to the obtuseness of the writer. Where inadequacies of the metatheory become apparent, cognizance is made of the deficiency and modifications are generally proposed.

Second, the thesis provides a partial syntactic description of a relatively neglected major language of the Philippines. A glance at the bibliography suffices to bear out the paucity of materials available on Waray.
4.0 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

Only a rudimentary introduction to the phonological system of Waray is given. The following section presents a brief survey of the phonemes of Waray and their relationship to the writing system.

Since this thesis is aimed at testing and expanding Case Grammar, those parts of syntax which have little direct bearing on this aim have been omitted or passed over with little comment. Such topics as questioning, negation, conjunction, and relativization only enter incidentally into this study. It is assumed (perhaps falsely) that these operations do not hinge upon knowledge of case relationships and conversely that case relationships are not affected by these operations. The same can be said about POST-ART structures such as cardinals and ordinals. Derivational morphology is also omitted. Comparative and superlative formations of adjectives and nouns are left for later considerations.

This study is expected to make a contribution to only one small area of semantics and that is the way in which a speaker-hearer relates various actants to their head items. Some linguists have considered this "syntactic meaning".

Rudimentary translations have been provided for all Waray sentences and the lexical items. Some componential analysis of ART structure is provided. Rough semantic correlates for verbal particles have been suggested. Semantics as a (w)hole is left for future writers to fill in.

5.0 SOME PHONOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF WARAY

5.1. Phonemic Inventory

A phonemic analysis of Waray finds 19 segmental phonemes. They are
presented in the chart which follows.

(1)

**CONSONANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LABIAL</th>
<th>DENTAL</th>
<th>VELAR</th>
<th>POST-VELAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stops: vl</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vd</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal:</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives:</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral:</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flap:</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi vowels:</td>
<td>LABIO-VELAR</td>
<td>PALATAL</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOWELS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRONT</th>
<th>BACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regard to allophonic variation, the flap /r/ sometimes appears as a trill and the high vowels range downward to mid in some syllables.

The most significant suprasegmental is a vowel lengthening feature. In the examples of this thesis, I have written vowel length with an acute accent where it is syntactically significant. Stress operates independently of vowel length but according to Wolff is predictable.
There are also loan phonemes which occur more of less frequently depending on the speaker's sophistication in the use of loan words. Any non-Waray phonemes may be used if the speaker has the ability and chooses to use the "foreign" phoneme when it appears in a loan word. Two examples are /j/ and /f/. 

(2) a. dyografi "geography"
   b. fif "fifth"

Quite commonly the closest Waray phoneme is substituted. E.g.,

(3) /fusil/ (Spanish) "gun" becomes /pusil/ (Waray)

Borrowed phonotactics are wide-spread. Consonant clusters such as /ts/ are now common. E.g., /diritsu/ "straight" and /Intsik/ "Chinese".

5.2. Morphophonemics

The morphophonemic deviation from the above phonemic chart which is significant for our study is the use of /N/. It appears on the verbal affixes /maN-/ and /paN-/ and hence is constantly in application. The phonemic realization of the morphophonemic /N/ are as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
N & \rightarrow [\{p,b\} \{t,d,s\} \{k,g,q\} [g,l] [m,n,ng,h,w]] \\
& \rightarrow m \ n \ ng \ {n,ng} + [g,l] \\
& \rightarrow n + [m,n,ng,h,w]
\end{align*}
\]

For example, /paN--/ + /pili/ --> /pamili/.

The surface syllable initial consonant clusters of the shape [Cw] and [Cy] arise from underlying /Cuw/ and /Ciwy/ respectively. Infixation and reduplication effectively demonstrate that a vowel is
is involved. Viz.,

Infixation:

(5) Palit + in ---> pinalit
(6) Kwarta + in ---> kinwarta
(7) Pyirdi + in ---> pinyirdi

Reduplication:

(8) Palit + mag-R ---> magpapalit
(9) Kwarta + mag-R ---> magkwukwarta
(10) Pyirdi + mag-R ---> magpyirdi

5.3. Writing Systems

Two writing systems are used in this thesis. Proper names have been written in accordance with the accepted spelling. All other words are transcribed following the phonemic inventory given above. It differs from the current spelling system of Waray (taught in grades one and two and utilized in general communications) in the following ways.

Waray is commonly spelled with a five vowel system: /o/ and /e/ being used in final closed syllables rather than /u/ and /i/ respectively. Only /a/, /u/, and /i/ are used by this writer.

In accepted spelling /-/ is used to represent /q/ when between identical vowels. /' / is used for /q/ when word final. Word initial /q/ is omitted. In this thesis, /q/ is used consistently throughout except in word initial position where it is omitted.

/ŋ/ is written as /ng/ both in accepted spelling and in this thesis.

/c/ is written either as /s/ or /k/ depending on the pronunciation. /qu/ in the accepted spelling is transcribed by the symbol /k/ in this thesis.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The semi-formalized grammar which follows is modelled for the most part after the grammar found in Stockwell et al. (1968). The PS rules are of a case type and reflect the lexicalist hypothesis. Matthews' version (n.d.) of the introduction of case information is chosen. The T rules are shown to influence meaning and so a Revised Standard Theory view of semantics is taken. A second lexical lookup is assumed to provide the phonological information for ART's, verbal affixes, and other items which undergo major phonological change due to syntactic factors.

Case grammars of English have assumed the existence of a number of underlying deep cases. These cases are indicated on the surface by actant order, verb form (BE + PERF verb indicates NEUT or DAT/GOAL is subject when AGT present), and prepositions. A few derived functions (e.g., subject and genitive) have also been assumed. These are marked by word order (subject normally precedes the verb), case form of pronouns (he, his, him) and prepositions (by marking postposed subject). The relationships between deep and derived functions are governed by rules of the following sort. Case X may or may not take on the derived function Y depending on Z. In the Stockwell et al. grammar, the Z consisted of such things as the position of the case in the case frame and rule features on the verb. It is also possible to note correlations between various cases and also between the markers of derived functions (e.g., a pronoun functioning as subject is always in the nominative case).

In this description of Waray, deep case relations are posited
which in general are identical to those posited for English. Some new cases are proposed however. Cases are marked on the surface by verb form, articles, and prepositions (actant order following the verb being free). Derived functions are also argued for but they are shown to be of a different sort than those in English. These are indicated by verb affixes, case form of pronouns (hiya, niya, ha iya), and case form of articles (hi, kan). Rules can be given for relating deep case and derived function and correlations among constructs on each level can be made as in English.

This section is concerned with the surface structure of Waray and in particular with the derived functional relations that actants can assume. In succeeding sections we will consider in detail the deep functional relations which can be posited for Waray.

2.0 INTRODUCTION OF DERIVED FUNCTIONS INTO THE GRAMMAR

Five derived functions are posited for Waray: ACTOR, OBJECT, REFERENT, ASSOCIATE, and REFERENT-ASSOCIATE. All verbs having a

"Actor, referent, and associate" are borrowed from the SIL writers in *Oceanic Linguistics* 3.1.1964, where they are considered "situational" labels (a term we also borrow here). A fourth situational label used by the SIL writers, "goal", we reserve for use as a deep functional relation. Instead we substitute "object" following Stockwell et al.

topicalized actant (a discussion of topicalization follows) must be affixed in accordance with one of these five functions. Which function is used depends for the most part on the deep case of the actant topicalized. It will be argued that the derived functional relations are normally predictable from underlying case information. As in English,
some verbs optionally allow either of two cases to assume a derived function. E.g., "Water filled the pool." "The pool filled with water." Also some verbs optionally allow a case to assume either of two derived functions. E.g., "He showed Bill his grade." "Bill was shown his grade." As in English, not all cases in a PROP assume a derived function. An English example of this is the inability of a TIME actant to function as "subject".

Unlike English, derived functions in Waray are not represented by structural configuration. Rather they are marked by features on the actants. It should not be surprising that derived functions in some languages are not expressed by structural characteristics. In fact, it appears natural that those languages with greater restrictions on word order require more tightly structured derived P-markers than those languages with freer word order. Waray allows all its actants to follow the verb and the order of these actants in relation to one another is not fixed except by style. So it turns out for Waray that both deep and derived functions are indicated by feature representation. We shall demonstrate in this section that just as one derives the dominance characteristics (and hence function) of derived P-markers from the deep structure in English by transformations, so in Waray one derives by transformation the features characterizing derived function from the deep structure. Depending on one's views about the source of causative actants (cf. Section II, Chapter 3 (2.8)), the transformations which provide derived functions operate either within the cycle or in the last cycle. Let us proceed through a partial derivation noting the relevant issues.
2.1. Case Information

It is assumed that a set of PS rules provides trees such as the one in (1a). Through lexical insertion, lexical entries having syntactic, semantic, and usually phonological information are added as in (1b). Case information is present as a feature on the verb or head noun. (Phonological representation in these examples is in taxonomic phonemic terms. Semantic information usually consists of a simple English "equivalent".)

(1) a. S
   /   \
  MOD        PROP
  /     \     
[PAST] V    AC      AC
 /  \     /  \  /  \  
P  NP    P    NP

b. [__ +A+N] suruguun pinggan
   hugas "maid" "plate"
   "wash"

The "Case Spread" convention then assigns the case features from the verb to the actants following it.

(2)

S
/   \
MOD        PROP
/     \     
[PAST] V    AC      AC
 / \   \   / /   /
[__ +A+N] [+AGT$] [+NEUT]
 hugas suruguun pinggan

$It is suggested that the reader refer to the Table of Contents of Section II, Chapter 3 to familiarize himself with the deep cases proposed and their abbreviations.
2.2. Derived Function Information

Ignoring for a moment the causative actant complications, the application of the situation assignment T's (several lexical feature assignment rules and one situation spread convention—cf. Section II, Chapter 5) converts the previous tree into the following one.

(3) a.

```
   S
  / \  /
MOD  PROP
  /  /
[PAST] V [+AGT] [+NEUT]
     /     /
  [+A  +N]  [+ACT]  [+OBJ]
     \    /  \
        [+A --> +ACT]  [+N --> +OBJ]
    hugas  suruguqun  pinggan
```

b. Naghugas an suruguqun han pinggan.
"The maid washed the plates."

If a causative actant is present, however, the derived functions are not the same. Now, if the causative actant is considered a case on the PROP, one simply states the situation assignment rules so as to assign the correct function and the T operates within the cycle. An idiosyncracy of the CAUS actant being present is its registration on the verb. I.e., we must add +CAUS to the verb and this becomes /pa/- on the affix lookup. The following tree illustrates this view.
(4) a. S
   MOD
   [PAST]
   PROP
   [ +CAUS ]
   V
   [ +ACT ]
   [ +OBJ ]
   [ +A --> +OBJ ]
   [ +N --> +OBJ ]
   [ +C --> +ACT ]
   hugas
   suruguqun
   pinggan
   Maria

b. Nagpahugas ha suruguqun han pinggan hi Maria.
   "Mary had the maid wash the plates."

On the other hand, if one assumes the causative actant to come
from a higher sentence and that situation assignment operates within
the cycle, situation assignment must sometimes change assignments
made in lower sentences. Thus, the assignments given in (3) would be
changed to those in (4) when the S having the causative pro-verb is
reached.

A third possibility is to assume that the causative actant comes
from a higher S and that situation assignment operates post-cyclically.
Thus, after all embeddings have taken place (in particular, the causative
pro-verb is squashed onto the lower main verb), derived functions are
assigned to all actants in every PROP.

In deciding between these three options, one must take into
account the evidence we will bring up in the next section that some
T's depend on the knowledge of derived functions. Despite the many
T's within the cycle in English which depend on the notion "subject",
it does not appear to be the case that any of the T's depending on
derived functions in Waray need be within the cycle. For example, equi-NP deletion in sentential complements is based on topicalization and case information rather than on derived function. However, it does appear to be the case that one would want the derived function transformation to operate within the cycle for the following reason: some cyclic T's will delete actants. Since derived functions are predicated on the cases initially present in the structure rather than on those present in the surface structure, it would facilitate a statement of the structural index of the derived function T if it operated before some actants were deleted. The same argument holds for permutation of actants. We thus choose either the first or the second of the options above, depending on our decision regarding the source of causative actants. A non-formal sketch of the derived function T is given in a succeeding section.

2.3. Topicalization

As mentioned above, verb affixation and article and pronoun shape require knowledge of both derived functions and topicalization. Let us now discuss the place of topicalization in Waray.

Topicalization has significance for both semantics and syntax. The topic and comment functions provide the following semantic information. Constituents functioning as topic will receive the semantic reading: information assumed by the speaker to be shared by the hearer. Those functioning as comment will have the reading: information assumed by the speaker not to be shared by the hearer.

$\text{The term "topic is used here to avoid the unfortunate confusion which is attached to the use of "focus". Writers on Philippine languages}$
have generally used "topic" and "focus" in parallel when considering the
"presumed known" item in the sentence. The comment made about the item
in "focus" or "topicalized" is sometimes called the "predicate" and could
be called the "comment". Recently in regard to English, some writers
have used the term "focus" to refer to the new information, i.e., the
"comment", and use the term "presupposition" to refer to the known
information, i.e., the "topic". Thus, "focus" and "topic" have been
used as opposites. In chart form the usage is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Waray</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>known</td>
<td>topic (focus)</td>
<td>topic (presupposition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>predicate (comment)</td>
<td>comment (focus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One can speculate that this switch in the use of "focus" came about
because Waray specializes in marking the known item (verb affixation
plus a unique article) while English specializes in marking the un-
known item (stress, clefting, preposing). The item in "focus" is
thus just the opposite for English and Waray.

Moore (1967) has shown the syntactic relevance of the topic and
comment functions for such transformations in English as the passive
(one of the case placement rules from the CG viewpoint), cleft, and
pseudo-cleft. Preposing and stress also appear to be based on topic-
comment information to some degree. We shall show that knowledge of
topic and comment information is essential in Waray to prediction of
verb morphology and article and pronoun choice. We shall assume the
presence of a topic-comment component which operates after the PS rules
but before the T rules. The relationship to the lexicon is overlooked.
Among the functions of the topic-comment component are the following:
(a) choice and marking of some one category in the highest S as topic
 [+TOPIC], and (b) assignment of topic and comment markers to categories
in embedded S's. Moore's proposal is to copy topics down into embedded
sentences. This requires lexical insertion to follow topic marking and
to be cyclical (top to bottom or vice versa is irrelevant).

Many constraints on the choice of the matrix actant as topic appear to be matters of discourse and possibly style. They are beyond the scope of this investigation. We simply assume a feature [+TOPIC] is inserted on relevant nodes by this mechanism.

Applying topic assignment to the tree in (4) produces the next tree.

\[
(5) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{MOD} \\
\text{[PAST]} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{+[CAUS]} \\
\text{+[AGT]} \\
\text{+[OBJ]} \\
\text{+[AGT]} \\
\text{+[OBJ]} \\
\text{+[CAUS]} \\
\text{+[ACT]} \\
\text{+[TOPIC]} \\
\hugas \\
suruguqun \\
pinggan \\
\text{Maria}
\end{array}
\]

2.4. **Case Penetration**

At this point, the "case penetration" convention, which is downward bounded by S, moves the information in feature form on the AC's downward in the actant. The result is a tree such as the next one.

\[
(6) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{MOD} \\
\text{[PAST]} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{+[CAUS]} \\
\text{+[AGT]} \\
\text{+[OBJ]} \\
\text{+[CAUS]} \\
\text{+[ACT]} \\
\text{+[TOPIC]} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{+[AGT]} \\
\text{+[OBJ]} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{+[NEUT]} \\
\text{+[OBJ]} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{+[CAUS]} \\
\text{+[ACT]} \\
\text{+[TOPIC]} \\
\hugas \\
suruguqun \\
pinggan \\
\text{Maria}
\end{array}
\]
2.5. Case-Situation Registration

Finally, the "case-situation registration" convention registers on the verb the case and derived function of the actant chosen as topic. The relevant features are thus present on the verb for the second lexical lookup for affixes. All of the information necessary for the choice of articles and pronouns is already on the tree. The result is as follows.

(7)

\[ S \quad \text{PROP} \]
\[ \text{MOD} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{AC} \quad \text{AC} \]
\[ [\text{PAST}] \quad \text{[+CAUS}} \quad \text{[+AGT]} \quad \text{[+NEUT]} \quad \text{[+CAUS}} \quad \text{[+ACT]} \quad \text{[+TOPIC]} \]
\[ \text{Nagpahugas} \quad \text{ha suruguqun} \quad \text{han pinggan} \quad \text{hi Maria} \]

3.0 EVIDENCE FOR DERIVED FUNCTIONAL CONSTRUCTS

Three areas in which derived functions have been found to be useful follow: (a) predicting verb affixation, (b) predicting case form (of articles and pronouns), and (c) interpreting number agreement. It will be shown that utilizing the derived functions in each of these areas allows a generalization which would be lost without the situation constructs. The same contexts must be repeated as conditions for each of the areas if derived constructs are not posited. It is expected that additional evidence for the derived functions will arise as other areas of Waray syntax are explored (just as a great variety of evidence is available in English for the derived construct "subject").

3.1. Predicting verb affixation

There are five sets of verbal affixes which reflect the five possible derived functions of the actant which has been made topic.
They are charted below by their distinguishing features. Cf. the charts in (5.1) of this chapter for their fuller forms.

1. a. ACTOR: /mag-/, /-um/, /ma-/, /mang-/  
b. OBJECT: /-un/, /-a/  
c. REFERENT: /-an/, /-i/  
d. ASSOCIATE: /i-/, /-an/  
e. REF-ASSOC: /i- -an/, /i- -i/

There are many modifications which can be made by additional affixes but those given above are the result of the derived function of the actant which is made topic.

Note now the value of having these affixes predicted by the derived function (rather than by the underlying case and its co-occurrence). Using only case information, one must say that when GOAL occurs with AGT and the GOAL is topic, the verb affix is as in (1c); when without AGT, as in (1a). E.g.,

(2) a. Ginpadadgan hin surat (N) ni Nanding (A-S) an iya nanay (G).  
    "Nanding sent a letter to his mother."

b. Kinmarawat hi Nanding (G) hin surat (N) tikang kan iya nanay (S).  
    "Nanding received a letter from his mother."

Similarly, when AGT occurs with CAUS and the AGT is topic, the verb affix is as in (1b); when without CAUS, as in (1a). E.g.,

(3) a. Ginpatawag ni Maria (C) hi Nene (A) ha iya bguotuq (G).  
    "Mary had Nene call her sibling."

b. Nagtawag hi Nene (A) ha iya bguotuq (G).  
    "Nene called her sibling."

If one has assigned the derived functions from the case information and lexical features (for irregular stems), the verb affixes are directly predictable.
3.2. Predicting Case Form

In Waray both ART’s and FN’s reflect their derived function. Looking first at non-topic ART's and in particular at the NAME articles, the statement in terms of case information is as follows. When GOAL occurs with AGT, the ART of GOAL is /kan/; when without AGT, /ni/. E.g.,

(4) a. Ginlabug ni Benito (A) an bula (N) kan Pedro (G). "Ben threw the ball to Peter."

b. Nakarawat ni Pedro (G) an kwarta (N) ha subri (L). "Peter received the money in an envelope."

When AGT occurs with CAUS, the ART of AGT is /kan/; when without CAUS, /ni/.

(5) a. Nagpatawag ni Maria (C) kan Nene (A) ha iya bugtuq (G). "Mary had Nene call her sibling."

b. Gintawag ni Nene (A) an iya bugtuq (G). "Nene called her sibling."

A much more general statement can be made using derived functions. Actants functioning as ACTOR are marked by /ni/, but non-topic actants in all other derived functions are marked by /kan/. Cf. (5.2) of this chapter.

Similarly in pronouns, there are two non-topic sets divided by the derived function of the actant they occur in. The /nakun/ set occurs in the ACTOR function while the /akun/ set occurs in the other functions. Cf. (5.3) of this chapter for a full listing of the pronominal forms.

3.3. Interpreting Number Agreement

Derived functions are also of import for determining number agreement between actants and the verb. Unlike English, where number agreement is always between the subject and the verb, in Waray number agreement appears to be lexically marked as to which derived function the
agreement is with. That is, some verbs have agreement with their ACTOR and others with their GOAL, etc. This requires features on the verb stems containing information about the derived function constructs. (Note that features which refer to derived functions are also essential in English. The CG by Stockwell et al. has features of this type to provide for raising subject to object, subject to subject, and object to subject. Further study of embedding may find parallel raising features are needed in Waray also, which would be an additional confirmation of the derived functions posited.) Let us look more closely at number agreement in Waray.

Number agreement between the actant and the verb is an entirely optional matter. There is no obligatory correspondence between plural actants and the verb as there is in English. Viz.,

(6) a. Naglanguy hiya (A) hin maqupay (MANH). "He swims well."

b. Naglalanguy hira (A) hin maqupay (MANH). "They swim well."

It is possible, however, to indicate on the verb the plurality of an accompanying actant. There are at least four different markers of plurality used on verbs: /MaN-/, /-n-/, /-ng-/, and /Magpa-/. The first three are used in the non-POTENTIAL mood while the last is found in the POTENTIAL mood. Most verbs have plurality connections with an actant in only one of the derived functions. Others allow the plural marker to refer to actants in more than one function. In the latter case, one of the actants itself must be marked for plurality for unambiguousness. A few examples follow of various cases appearing in the ACTOR function and allowing a plurality marker on the verb. The plural affix on the verb is underlined.
MaN-  (7) a. Nangaquh hira (A) han sayuti (N).
   "The ate the 'sayote'."
   b. Nangarawat an mga bataq (G) han ira malun (N)
      hadtun usa ka simana (T).
      "The children received their part last week."
   c. Nandaku an mga prutas (N).
      "The fruit got bigger."

-n-  (8) Nanngagat an mga ayam (A) han tawu (N).
      "The dogs bit the man."

-nga- (9) a. Nangagpupurut hiya (A) hin isdaq (N).
      "They are picking up the fish with their hands."
   b. Nangaglubud an mga badu (N).
      "The dresses faded."
   c. Nangagbaligaq an mga tindira (A-S) han munggu (N)
      ha amun (G).
      "The saleslady sold the mongo beans to us."

Magpa  (10) Magpapakapalit kamu (A) hin Toyota (N).
      "You will be able to buy a Toyota."

The next examples illustrate some of the same cases being present
but plurality being connected with the actant functioning as OBJECT.
Only one example from each conjugation is shown for brevity.

(11) a. Nanalbug aku (A) han mga batu (N).
     "I threw the stones."
   b. Nangamting hiya (A) han mga lingganay (N).
     "He rang the church bells."
   c. Nangaglutuq hiya (A) han mga isdaq (N).
     "She cooked the fish."
   d. Magpapakawat hiya (A) hin mga pabutu (N).
     "He can steal some fire-crackers."

The necessity for derived function constructs might be looked upon
as indicating a deficiency in case grammar. That is, since the case
information itself is not sufficient to predict without loss of gener-
ality the surface forms, one could deprecate the value of a case analysis.
This assessment need not follow in my opinion since case grammar has been proposed as a replacement of the deep structure constructs of Chomsky's (1965) approach, not a replacement of the entire deep and surface metatheory. The need for derived functions in Waray only parallels the obvious need for derived constructs in English regardless of whether a case grammar approach is used or not. Cf. Stockwell et al. (1968).

4.0 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DEEP AND DERIVED FUNCTIONS

The five derived functions are in a many-many relationship to the deep case relations. That is, each derived function is mapped into by many underlying cases and conversely, many underlying cases map into more than one derived function. The cross-cutting is so complex that a diagram is of little value. In this section, the various relationships will be taken up holding the derived functions as primary. Cf. the next chapter for the opposite approach.

The phonological correlates of the derived functions are given in section (5.0) of this chapter. The derived functions normally do not have semantic significance.

4.1. ACTOR (ACT)

There are at least five cases which can occur in the derived function ACTOR: AGT, AGT-GOAL (A-G), AGT-SOURCE (A-S), NEUT, and GOAL. If the causative construction is considered to have a separate case CAUS, then it also appears in the ACT function. If it comes from a higher S, then it is another AGT case. The ACTOR set of verbal affixes is considerably more complex than the affixes associated with the other derived functions since there is an overt distinction in the ACTOR
function between four major verb conjugations. That is, when an ACTOR becomes topic, depending on the verb it is with and in part on the case relation it has, one out of four verb conjugations must be chosen: /mag-/ /um-/ /ma-/ and /maN-/ Since there is only partial correlation between the case and the conjugation, the semantic correlates of the verb conjugations do not match entirely the definitions of the cases. There is at least one fairly close parallel, however, which tempts one to set up a marking convention relation. For example, one might say that an unmarked ACTOR which is AGT requires the /mag-/ conjugation. The /um-/ and /ma- conjugations seem indistinguishable in terms of underlying cases.

Some examples follow of the use of each of the cases as ACTOR. The reader is referred to section (5.0) to note the complex interaction of conjugations and cases. The non-topic ACTOR is illustrated (and underlined) in the (a) examples and the topic ACTOR is in the (b) examples.

AGT (1) a. Ginsumat niya (A) ha akun (G) an iya dyip (REL). "He told me about his jeep."

b. Nagsumat hiya (A) ha akun (G) tungud han iya dyip (REL).

A-G (2) a. Ginpalt niya (A-G) an pyanu (N). "She bought the piano."


A-S (3) a. Ginhastag niya (A-S) an pisu (N) ha iya inanak (G). "He gave a peso to his godchild."

b. Naghatag hiya (A-S) hin piso (N) ha iya inanak (G). Ditto.

NEUT (4) a. Ginlubaran han badu (N) an sarampayan (L). "The dress faded on the clothesline."

b. Limmubad an badu (N) ha sarampayan (L). Ditto.
GOAL (5) a. Nakarawat ni Pedro (G) an kwarta (N) ha subri (L).
"Peter received the money in an envelope."

b. Nakakarawat hi Pedro (G) han kwarta (N) ha subri (L).
Ditto.

CAUS (6) a. Ginpakuyuy nira Benito ngan ni Maria (C) hi Juan (A)
ha ira (G).
"Ben and Mary asked John to live with them."

b. Nagpakuyuy hira Benito ngan hi Maria (C) kan Juan (A)
ha ira (G). Ditto.

4.2. OBJECT (OBJ)

There are five underlying cases which can appear in the derived
function OBJECT: AGT, NEUT, A-G, RELational, and FACTitive. We give
some examples in the same format as previously. AGT and A-G can only
function as OBJ when a CAUS actant is present. The other cases are
unaffected by CAUS.

AGT (7) a. Nagpakadtu hiya (C) kan Juan (A) ha Tacloban (G).
"He had John go to Tacloban."

b. Ginpakadtu niya (C) hi Juan (A) ha Tacloban (G). Ditto.

A-G (8) a. Napabungul ha akun (A-G) it imu guliqat (C).
"Your shouting made me deaf."


NEUT (9) a. Pirmalit hiya (A) han bayabas (N).
"He bought the guavas."

b. Ginpalit niya (A) an bayabas (N). Ditto.

FAC (10) a. Nagsurat hi Intoy (A) han halabag nga surat (F).
"Intoy wrote a long letter."

b. Ginsurat hi Intoy (A) an halabag nga surat (F). Ditto.

REL (11) a. Nagqisturya hira (A) tungud han ira prublima (REL).
"They talked over their problem."

b. Ginqisturya nira (A) an ira prublima (REL). Ditto.

INST also shows up in the OBJECT function on occasion.
4.3. REFERENT (REF)

An even greater variety of case relations can be found under the derived function REFERENT. NEUT, LOC, SO, GOAL, BEN, REPL, and RESV all with one verb or another can be topicalized with REF set of affixes. An example of each follows.

NEUT (13) a. Nagjarut hiya (A) han buhuk ni Felix (N).
   "He cut Felix's hair."

   b. Ginarutan niya (A) an buhuk ni Felix (N). Ditto.

LOC (14) a. Naglutuq aku (A) han isdaq (N) ha karahaq (L).
   "I cooked the fish in a pan."

   b. Gnlutuqan ku (A) an karahaq (L) han isdaq (N). Ditto.

SO (15) a. Nangaruq hiya (A) hin papil (N) ha lalaki (S).
   "He asked the boy for some paper."

   b. Inaruqan niya (A) hin papil (N) an lalaki (S). Ditto.

GOAL (16) a. Nagqaqampuq hiya (A) ha Dios (G).
   "He prays to God."

   b. Gmqampuqan niya (A) an Dios (G). Ditto.

BEN (17) a. Nagbalay hi Ed (A) para han iya tamsi (B).
   "Ed built a house for his birds."

   b. Gmbalayan ni Ed (A) an iya tamsi (B). Ditto.

REPL (18) a. Ginbutuq ku (A) an sintas (N) para han bataq (REPL).
   "I tied the shoes for the child."

   b. Ginbutukan ku (A) han sintas (N) an bataq (REPL). Ditto.

   "I bought a dress for the child."

   b. Gimpalitan ku (A) an bataq (RESV) hin badu (N). Ditto.

Not surprisingly, there are a number of sentences which taken in isolation can be given a variety of interpretations when the REF is topic.
Examples of this are provided in Section II, Chapter 3 under many of the case section.

4.4. ASSOCIATE (ASSOC)

The following cases can assume the derived function ASSOC when topic: NEUT, TIME, BEN, REPL, RESV, INST, and REL. Some examples follow.

NEUT (20) a. Nagbalik hiya (A) han libru (N).
"He brought/took back the book."

b. Iginbalik niya (A) an libru (N). Ditto.

TM (21) a. Naglalaba hiya (A) han kamisita (N) ha udtu (T).
"He washes the t-shirt in the morning."

b. An udtu (T) amu an iginlalaba niya (A) han kamisita (N). Ditto.

BEN (22) a. Magsusugba hi Nene (A) hin isdaq (N) para kan Jose (B).
"Nene will broil some fish for Joe."

b. Igsusugba ni Nene (A) hi Jose (B) hin isdaq (N).

REPL (23) a. Palitun mu (A) para ha akun (REPL) an bayabas (N).
"Buy the guavas for me."

b. Igpalit mu (A) aku (REPL) han bayabas (N). Ditto.

RESV (24) a. Nagpalitan hiya (A) han pipinu (N) para kan Maria (RESV).
"He bought the cucumbers for Mary."

b. Iginpalit niya (A) han pipinu (N) hi Maria (RESV). Ditto.

INST (25) a. Naglalaba hiya (A) han kamisita (N) hin "Tide" (I).
"He is washing the t-shirt with Tide."

b. An Tide (I) an iginlalaba niya (A) han kamisita (N). Ditto.

REL (26) a. Surat han Nanay(G) tungud kan Felix (REL).
"Write mother a letter about Felix."

b. Hi Felix (REL) it igsurat han Nanay (G). Ditto.
There is a great deal less ambiguity possible with the cases in
the ASSOC function. TIME is distinctive in that it often is filled by
a restricted set of temporal words. INST is practically always inanimate,
while the benefactive cases are practically always animate. NEUT and
REL are mixed inanimate and animate so about half the time are dis-
tinctive. There being little ambiguity possible, a great many verbs
allow several of these cases to be topicalized by ASSOC. In the follow-
ing sentence, any of the last three actants can be topicalized with the
same verbal affix (chosen from the ASSOC set).

(27) Naglaban iya (A) han kamsita (N) hin Tide (I) ha udtu
(T) para ha iya nanay (B).
"He is washing the t-shirt with Tide this morning for
his mother."

Similarly, /base/ "read" allows both BEN and INST to be topicalized
with verbal affixes being chosen from the ASSOC set. Both actants
require fronting when topicalized for "normalness".

(28) Nagbasa iya (A) han libru (N) ha lintig (I) para kan
Pedro (B).
"He read the book with a magnifying glass for Peter."

4.5. REF-ASSOC

With verbs which have actants which can have both the REF and
ASSOC derived functions, it is possible to utilize a combination of the
two. That is, the ASSOC prefixes combine with the REF suffixes. The
REF part of the derived function seems dominant since the actant
topicalized can also be topicalized simply with the REF affixes. The
function of the REF-ASSOC affixation is apparently to make explicit
that there are two obligatory actants, namely, the topicalized REF
actant and the non-topic ASSOC actant. The cases which can be topical-
ized with the REF-ASSOC derived function are the following:
GOAL (29) a. Ginguliq namun (A) an lapis (N) kan Nene (G).
"We returned the pencil to Nene."

b. Iginquliqan namun (A) hi Nene (G) han lapis (N).
Ditto.

RESV (30) a. Tinaguq niya (A) an balun (N) para kan Pedro (RESV).
"She kept the lunch for Peter."

b. Igintagagqan niya (A) han balun (N) hi Pedro (RESV).
Ditto.

Perhaps a word is in order about the possibility of NEUT appearing in a number of different derived functions. First, where a single derived function is possible with a particular verb, the situation is much like that in English where a rule feature is required to correctly predict the derived function of a particular actant. That is, just as in English "fill" in Stockwell et al. is marked [+LOC --> SUBJ], so in Waray /bayaq/ "leave behind" is marked [+NEUT --> REF]. Underlying case information is not enough to predict derived function in verbs of this sort.

Second, where more than one derived function is possible with a verb for a particular case, the situation is much like the possibility in English of a case appearing either as subject or object. And as in English, there is sometimes some slight semantic difference depending on the choice of derived function. Verbs whose NEUT actant can be semantically divisible and which take both OBJ and REF derived functions, generally have a reading "V a part of NEUT" with the REF function and "V the whole NEUT" with the OBJ function. E.g.,

(31) a. Gingisiq niya (A) an papil (N).
"He tore the paper up."

b. Gingisiqan niya (A) an papil (N).
"He tore the paper."
Other verbs which permit both OBJ and ASSOC functions for the NEUT actant do not have such an obvious semantic distinction. The choice rests on factors presently unknown much like the active--passive choice in English for many verbs. In instances such as these, the derived functions are not completely predictable from the underlying cases.

Similar comments apply to other cases such as the benefactive ones.

5.0 SURFACE MARKERS OF DERIVED FUNCTIONS

5.1. Verbal Affixation

The derived function of a topicalized actant is marked solely by the verb affixes. The tables immediately following indicate the most significant primary affixes. The secondary affixes (not given in this analysis) are those which are practically invariable and which are added onto those in the tables. The BASIC affixes are used in sentential embeddings; the INDICative and INTentional affixes in declarative sentences; the QIND affixes in questions, imperatives, negatives, and after deictics; and the ABStrect affixes in sentential embeddings (nominalizations). The plural and potential forms are omitted since they are not sufficiently pertinent to warrant the extra complication. The labels FUT, PRES, and PAST are actually cover symbols for complexes of the aspeccual features BEGun and FINished (terms indicating the state or action indicated by the verb). FUT represents [-BEG, -FIN], PRES stands for [+BEG, -FIN], and PAST covers [+BEG, +FIN]. The symbol R indicates a reduplication of the following syllable. N is a morphophoneme which is realized as /m/, /n/, or /ng/ depending on the following consonant. Cf. Section II, Chapter 1 (5.2) for more details on its surface form. The symbol V indicates a limited case of vowel harmony, the vowel of
"rV" being identical to the vowel of the following syllable. The symbol D indicates reduplication of the entire verb stem. The affixes presented fall into four conjugations (/mag-/ /-um-/ /ma-/ and /maN-/). Some verbs are restricted to one of the conjugations. Others can appear in more than one. Verb senses are sometimes restricted to particular conjugations. As noted above, action type verbs generally allow /mag-/ and sometimes /-um-/ while verbs indicating states generally utilize the /ma-/ and /-um-/ conjugations.

The prediction of /mag-/ vs. /-um-/ in terms of co-occurring factors has so far defied linguistics. Various proposals have been made which hold true to greater or lesser extents but each fails in some way.

First, it has been proposed that transitivity can be correlated with the conjugations. Thus, /mag-/ is used with transitive verbs and /-um-/ is used with intransitives. A great number of verbs support this contention. Viz.,

(1) a. Nagkaqun hiya (A) han tangkung (N). "He ate the 'tangkung'."
    b. Kinmaqun hiya (A). "He ate."

(2) a. Nagkarigguq an suruguqun (A) han bataq (N). "The maid bathed the child."
    b. Kinmarigguq an suruguqun (A). "The maid bathed."

Other verbs which work this way are: /kaput/ "hold (on)", /gawas/ "go out", /lubad/ "fade".

But counter-examples are not hard to find. /Bádu/ "dress" can be used intransitively with /mag-/.

Viz.,
(3) Nagbadu hiya (A-G).
"He got dressed."

And /kuha/ "take" can be used transitively with /-um-/.
Viz.,

(4) Kinmuha hiya (A-G) hin kwarta (N).
"He took the money."

Second, it has been proposed that case relations can be correlated with the conjugations. Thus, /mag-/ reflects an underlying AGT, while /-um-/ reflects an underlying AGT-GOAL (or DAT). Again many verbs seem to support this hypothesis.

(5) a. Nagbayu hiya (A) han palay (N).
"He pounded the rice."

b. Naghugas an babyi (A) han ripulyu (N).
"The girl washed the cabbage."

c. Naglutu hiya (A) han karni (N).
"She cooked the meat."

d. Nagquatud hiya (A) han papil (N).
"He cut the paper."

(6) a. Kinmarawat hiya (G) hin surat (N).
"He received a letter."

b. Himmuram hiya (A-G) hin libru (N).
"He borrowed a book."

c. Kumaturug hi Maria (?) ha banig (L).
"Mary slept on the mat."

d. Pinmalit hiya (A-G) hin mansanas (N).
"He bought an apple."

This hypothesis is quite easily defaul ted on the /-um-/ side but finding /mag-/'s with the A-G relationship is more difficult. The following are candidates for /mag-/- with A-G and /-um-/ with AGT.

"He got dressed."

"He borrowed a book."
c. Nagpalit (A-G) hiya hin mansanas (N).
   "He bought an apple."

(8) a. Kimmagat an ayam (A) hin tawu (N).
   "The dog bit the man."

b. Kumugus hi Tatay (A) han bataq (N).
   "Father carried the child."

c. Kumuh akyu (A) hin kwarta (N) ha aparadur (S).
   "I took the money from the cabinet."

d. Himuyup hiya (A) hin lubu (N).
   "He blew up the balloon."

Third, it has been proposed that /mag-/ can be tied to "deliberateness" or "intentional, purposeful" action, while /-um-/ is used when "unintentional" or "non-deliberate" actions are involved. In favor of such an analysis are verbs such as those used in the following examples.

(9) a. Nagqasin hiya (A) han isdaq (N).
   "She salted the fish."

b. Nagqaway hira Ben ngan hi Ed (A) tungud han mulayan (REL).
   "Ben and Ed are fighting over the toy."

c. Nagbakyaq hiya (A) para kan tetay (BEN).
   "He put on his sandals for Father."

d. Nagbantay hi Carlos (A) han dulsi (N) para kan nanay (BEN).
   "Carl guarded the candy for Mother."

(10) a. Kumarawat hiya (G) han surat (N) kan Maria (S).
    "He received the letter from Mary."

b. Nakaturug hi Maria (A).
    "Mary is sleeping."

c. Dumakuchan hugaw ha mantil (L)>(N).
    "The spot on the tablecloth grew larger."

d. Lumabaw an imu kamisun (N).
    "Your slip is showing."

But against the analysis are verbs like those in the following
sentences. The unintentional /mag-/ verbs are followed by the deliberate /-um-/ verbs.

(11) a. Nagbunga an abukadu (N) hin mga ulurun nga bunga (FAC).
    "The avocado bore wormy fruit."

b. Nagkinahanlan hiya (A) hin asawa (N).
    "He needs a wife."

c. Magahagkut an silya (N) buwas (T).
    "The chair will be cold tomorrow."

d. Nagpinup hiya (A) hin maraqt (nga inup) (FAC).
    "He had a bad dream."

(12) a. Umasbut hiya (A) ha alas kwatru (TM) para masayu (PURP).
    "He arrived at 4 o'clock in order to be early."

b. Bumuhat hi Ed (A) ha lingkyran (L) hin hinayhinay (MANN).
    "Ed slowly got up from the chair."

c. Kinmagat an ayam (A) han tawu (N) ha iya bitiqis (L).
    "The dog bit the man on his leg."

d. Kumuhha hiya (A-G) hin kwarta (N) ha aparadur (S).
    "He took the money from the cabinet."
### Table 1: ACTOR TOPIC, NON-PLURAL, NON-POTENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/mag-/</th>
<th>/-um-/</th>
<th>/ma-/</th>
<th>/maN-/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASIC</td>
<td>mag-</td>
<td>-um-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>maN-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>mag-R-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>ma-R-</td>
<td>maN-R-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>nag-R-</td>
<td>na-</td>
<td>na-R-</td>
<td>naN-R-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>nag</td>
<td>-in-,</td>
<td>na-</td>
<td>naN-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-in-,</td>
<td>-i-,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-um-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>tipag--rV-</td>
<td>ti--rV-</td>
<td>tika--rV-</td>
<td>tipaN--rV-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-FIN</td>
<td>pag-R-</td>
<td>R-</td>
<td>ka-R-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+FIN</td>
<td>pag-</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ka-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>-FIN</td>
<td>pag-R-</td>
<td>ka-R-</td>
<td>paN-R-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+FIN</td>
<td>pag-</td>
<td>ka-</td>
<td>paN-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: OBJECT TOPIC, NON-PLURAL, NON-POTENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/mag-/</th>
<th>/-um-/</th>
<th>/ma-/</th>
<th>/maN-/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BASIC</td>
<td>pag-</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>pag-R-</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>R-</td>
<td>-un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>gin-R-</td>
<td>-in-R-</td>
<td></td>
<td>paN-R-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>gin-</td>
<td>-in-</td>
<td></td>
<td>paN-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-FIN</td>
<td>pag-R-</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>R-</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+FIN</td>
<td>pag-</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td></td>
<td>paN-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>-FIN</td>
<td>pag-R-</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>paN-R-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+FIN</td>
<td>pag-</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>paN-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: REFERENT TOPIC, NON-PLURAL, NON-POTENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/mag-/</th>
<th>/-um-/</th>
<th>/ma-/</th>
<th>/maN-/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pag- -an</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>ma- -an</td>
<td>paN- -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUT</strong></td>
<td>pag-R- -an</td>
<td>R- -an</td>
<td>ma-R- -an</td>
<td>paN-R- -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRES</strong></td>
<td>gin-R- -an</td>
<td>-in-R- -an</td>
<td>na-R- -an</td>
<td>ginpaN-R- -an, pinaN-R- -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAST</strong></td>
<td>gin- -an</td>
<td>-in- -an</td>
<td>na- -an</td>
<td>ginpaN- -an, pinaN- -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INT</strong></td>
<td>D- -an</td>
<td>D- -an</td>
<td></td>
<td>paN-D- -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QIND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-FIN</strong></td>
<td>pag-R- -i</td>
<td>R- -i</td>
<td></td>
<td>paN-R- -i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>+FIN</strong></td>
<td>pag- -i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td></td>
<td>paN- -i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-FIN</strong></td>
<td>pag-R- -i</td>
<td>pag-R- -i</td>
<td>ka-R- -i</td>
<td>paN-R- -i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>+FIN</strong></td>
<td>pag- -i</td>
<td>pag- -i</td>
<td>ka- -i</td>
<td>paN- -i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: ASSOCIATIVE TOPIC, NON-PLURAL, NON-POTENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>/mag-/</th>
<th>/-um-/</th>
<th>/ma-/</th>
<th>/naN-/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BASIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ig-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUT</strong></td>
<td>ig-R-</td>
<td>i-R</td>
<td></td>
<td>ipaN-R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRES</strong></td>
<td>igin-R-</td>
<td>i- -in-R-</td>
<td></td>
<td>ipinaN-R-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAST</strong></td>
<td>igin-</td>
<td>i- -in-</td>
<td></td>
<td>ipinaN-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INT</strong></td>
<td>i-D-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ipaN-D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QIND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-FIN</strong></td>
<td>ig- -R-</td>
<td>i-R-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>+FIN</strong></td>
<td>pag- -R- -an</td>
<td>R- -an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-FIN</strong></td>
<td>pag- -R- -an</td>
<td>pag- -R- -an</td>
<td></td>
<td>paN-R- -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>+FIN</strong></td>
<td>pag- -an</td>
<td>pag- -an</td>
<td></td>
<td>paN- -an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASIC</td>
<td>/mag-/</td>
<td>/-um-/</td>
<td>/ma-/</td>
<td>/maN-/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>ig-R--an</td>
<td>i-R--an</td>
<td>ipaN-R--an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>igin-R--an</td>
<td>i--in-R--an</td>
<td>ipinaN-R--an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>igin--an</td>
<td>i--in--an</td>
<td>ipinaN--an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ipaN--an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-FIN</td>
<td>ig-R--i</td>
<td>i-R--i</td>
<td>ipaN-R--i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+FIN</td>
<td>ig--i</td>
<td>i--i</td>
<td>ipaN--i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-FIN</td>
<td>pag-R--i</td>
<td>pag--R--i</td>
<td>paN-R--i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+FIN</td>
<td>pag--i</td>
<td>pag--i</td>
<td>paN--i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2. Article Shape

Actants in all derived functions which are topic are marked by the same set of articles, namely, /an/, /it/, /in/, and /hi/. But when the actants are non-topic, the articles associated with them are in part dependent on the derived function of the actant. In particular, the derived function ACTOR splits the articles into three sets. /Ni/ can only occur with a non-topic ACTOR. /Kan/ and /ha/ can only occur with a non-topic non-ACTOR. /Han/, /hit/, and /hin/ have no compoundings about ACTOR's occurring freely both with ACTOR's and non-ACTOR's. The following chart illustrates the significant parameters.

```
(13)  hi  an  it  in  ni  kan  han  hit  hin  ha

TOPIC  +  +  +  +  -  -  -  -  -  -
ACTOR  0  0  0  0  +  -  0  0  0  -
NAME   +  -  -  -  +  +  -  -  -  -
FINISHED 0  +  -  +  +  -  -  -  -
GENERIC  -  0  -  -  -  -  -  0  -
DEFINITE +  +  -  -  +  +  -  -  -
```

The TOPIC and ACTOR features and specifications are placed on the deep structure ART node by Topic Assignment and Situation Assignment. The NAME and FINISHED features are placed on the ART by agreement transfer transformations. NAME is copied from the head noun the ART accompanied. (As a rough approximation NAME nouns may be thought of as proper nouns.) The feature FINISHED, which refers to the state or action of the verb, is copied from the verb. The second lexical lookup obeys the non-distinctness criterion when checking these already present feature specifications.
The zeros indicate that the feature and its specification are irrelevant to the particular lexical item. The blank places indicate areas which need further investigation. Either no good evidence has been found one way or another or contradictory evidence has come up. It is not thought that many of these areas are crucial to a case analysis.

5.3. Pronoun Shape

The derived function ACTOR is significant for the shape of non-topic pronouns also. A non-topic animate actant which is +ACTOR or un-marked for ACTOR is pronominalized by a pronoun of the /nakun/ class. (Inanimates are pro-ed by deictics.) An animate -ACTOR which is non-topic is pro-ed by a pronoun of the /akun/ class. This set of pronouns is preceeded by the prep /ha/ unless used in the verbal preposed position.

Both the /akun/ and /nakun/ pronoun sets are also used as possessives with a head noun, the former being preposed and the latter postposed.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
(14) & \text{TOPIC} & \text{NON-TOPIC} \\
\hline
\text{SG: 1} & \text{aku, ak} & \text{nakun, nak, ku} & \text{akun, ak}
\ \ & \text{2} & \text{ikaw, ka} & \text{nimu, nim, mu} & \text{imu, im}
\ \ & \text{3} & \text{hiya} & \text{niya} & \text{iya}
\ \ & \text{PL: 1 & 3} & \text{kami} & \text{namun, nam} & \text{amun, am}
\ \ & \text{1, 2, (3)} & \text{kita, kit} & \text{natun, nat, ta} & \text{atun, at}
\ \ & \text{2} & \text{kamu} & \text{niyu} & \text{iyu}
\ \ & \text{3} & \text{hira} & \text{nira} & \text{ira}
\end{array}
\]
Chapter 3: DEEP FUNCTIONAL RELATIONS (CASES)
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2.0 FUNCTIONAL RELATIONS CONSIDERED AS CASE RELATIONS
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2.5 Beginning (BEG)
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2.12 End (END)
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2.15 Goal (GO) (G)

2.16 Instrument (INST) (I)
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2.18 Manner (MANN)

2.19 Means (MNS)
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2.21 Neutral (NEUT) (N)

2.22 Office (OFF)
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3.0 FUNCTIONAL RELATIONS CONSIDERED AS QUASI-CASE RELATIONS
3.1 Contentive (CONT)
3.2 Partitive (PART)

4.0 ACTANT RELATIONSHIPS ELSEWHERE SUGGESTED AS CASES BUT REJECTED HERE
4.1 Abessive
4.2 Absolutive
4.3 Ablative
4.4 Accusative
4.5 Circumstantial
4.6 Comitative
4.7 Comparative
4.8 Dative
4.9 Descriptive
4.10 Exceptive
4.11 Inclinational
4.12 Introductive
1.0 INTRODUCTION

The set of functional relationships considered here interact with several syntactic phenomena. First, most of the actant relationships may occur with either a verb or noun as head, others occur with one but not the other, and some appear to have neither verb nor noun as head. Second, in a few relationships all actants may undergo topicalization, in other relationships only some actants may be topicalized, and in still other relationships no actants may be topicalized. Third, the internal structure of the actants in some relationships may be either sentential or non-sentential, while other relationships require their internal structure to be one or the other. Fourth, some actant relationships may be marked lexically as obligatorily present or absent while others appear to be lexically unrestricted. Fifth, some actant relationships undergo left dislocation with no modification, others require minor modification (marked switching), and still others disallow left dislocation. Sixth, some relationships may appear more than once within a single PROP or NOM (apparently without being derived by reduction from a sentential source) while others are restricted to a single occurrence. Seventh, deictics, articles, and pro-forms are restricted to various actant relationships. There are also a great number of other syntactic correlates to the case relationships, some of which have been pointed out for particular actant relationships. The import of the correlates mentioned comes with the fact that they are generally cross-classifying. Since this is so, the decision as to which relationships are to be considered as "nuclear" (having a source within the PROP or NOM) and which are "peripheral" (having a source
outside the PROP or NOM) must be based on an arbitrary choice of one of the above syntactic correlates as definitive. Considering such a decision highly un-motivated, I have chosen to live with the complexity of considering all functional relationships under the PROP or NOM. The differences between relationships which have previously been suggested as hinging upon their phrase structure source differences are now handled by lexical constructs.

Despite the fact that we concluded in Section I (2.1.4) that Case Grammar might profitably be revised to become a Case Feature Complex Grammar, the following description of Waray will for the most part follow the approach utilized by Fillmore (1968). There are primarily two reasons for this. First, the greater part of the study of Waray was made prior to considering the feature complex possibility and a re-analysis would require time and informants not presently available. Second, the case feature approach presently is quite tentative and the obvious points of difference between it and the case primitive approach are not very numerous. Thus, a description in feature complex terms without a great deal of theoretical investigation would be practically a notational equivalent of the case primitive description.

One of the contributions of this description is meant to be an expansion of the inventory of cases. The term "expansion" is in one way inappropriate since most of the case labels used are found either in Fillmore (1968) or in Blake (1930). The study is an expansion, however, in that here-to-fore many relationships have been defined simply by giving one or two examples. A much more complete study of the "new" cases is made here.
A number of the "new" cases allow a sentential internal structure and have previously been considered examples of subordinate structures or subjoining. We have incorporated these subjoined clauses into the present framework while explicitly rejecting conjoined structures (whether co-ordinate, antithetical, or alternative). Direct and indirect quotation as well as the embedding of questions is also omitted.

For most of the functional relationships discussed below, comments have been divided into two parts: those concerning actants related to a verb as head and those concerning actants having nouns as heads. There is a disproportionate weight placed on the former investigation. The several factors motivating this emphasis include the greater vagueness inherent in many actants attached to nouns, the inability to resolve the relative clause reduction paraphrase problem, and the fact that investigation of noun head relationships began quite late in this study.

Comments on actants related to verbs usually fall into two fields: those having to do with the non-topic realization of the actant and those concerning the topicalized forms. Subdivisions are also made on the basis of sentential vs. non-sentential internal structure. The possibility of left dislocation is also explored.

The consideration of actants with nouns as head is qualified in the following ways. First, adjectives, partitives, and classifiers are not considered cases on a head noun. The latter two are taken up in section 3. Second, of the possible noun-actant relationships on the surface, this study considers only a few to unambiguously have a case relationship source. A great number of actant relationships can be
assumed to derive from REL REDUCTION. Depending on one's views about the predicate of equational sentences, one might be forced back into considering these actants as having nouns as heads. E.g., (1) might have (2) as source.

(1) The man at the window is my father.

(2) The man #the man is a man at the window# is my father. However, leaving aside this problem as undecidable presently, we shall consider as cases on head nouns those actants which do not permit a relative clause paraphrase. The greater part of the head nouns which do not permit the relative clause paraphrase are of the form of "derived nominals".

Unlike the actants having a verb as head, actants within NOM do not interact with topicalization. I.e., all of the cases having noun as head are non-topic. Thus the surface evidence for derived functions is greatly reduced. I.e., the head noun is in no way affixed to indicate the relationship of a particular actant since topicalization is not available. Derived function does show up in the ART's marking the actants however. As in the PROP, /ni/ is limited to cases functioning as ACTOR, while /ha/ and /kan/ can only co-occur with cases functioning as non-ACTOR.

As in the PROP, there is the possibility of left dislocating one or another of the cases to a position in front of the head. The idiosyncracies of this transformation will be pointed out for each case as it is taken up.

The definitions of cases with nouns as head are parallel to those for verbs, but are generally not given explicitly.
2.0 FUNCTIONAL RELATIONS CONSIDERED AS CASE RELATIONS

2.1. Additional (ADD)

The underlined actants in (1) were suggested by Blake (1930) to be in the ADDITIONAL case.

(1) a. four besides the man (ad-nominal)

b. he gave him a large sum of money besides the cattle (ad-verbal)

In a footnote he noted the questionableness of considering the case to be ad-verbal but reaffirmed the validity of the ad-nominal analysis. We shall argue that none of the corresponding structures in Waray are ad-nominal. In fact, if they are case relations at all, they are ad-verbal only but do not reflect a simple case relation as Blake conceived of it.

EVIDENCE AGAINST ADDITIONAL BEING A SIMPLE CASE RELATIONSHIP

In Waray the ADD case is introduced by /labut/ "as well as" or "in addition to". It is invariably followed by an NP. That NP, however, may consist of a single actant in a case relationship or more than one actant or a nominalized PROP (having some or no deletions). The examples which follow illustrate the constructions having simple NP's in the ADD phrase.

(2) Tinagan hiya (G) hin kwarta (N)<labut pa han baka (N)> (ADD).
"He received some money as well as the cow."

(3) Iginsurat niya (A) an balpin (I)<labut han lapis (I)> (ADD).
"He wrote with a pen as well as with a pencil."

(4) Nagsurat hiya (A) hin madagmit (MANN)<labut hin malimpyu (MANN)> (ADD).
"He wrote quickly as well as neatly."
(5) Kinmandatsu hiya (A) kamayur (OFF)<labut hin pagsagubirnordur (OFF)>(ADD).
"He was a candidate for Mayor as well as for Governor."

(6) Nagtratrabahu hiya (A) hin Hwibis (TM)<labut hin Sabadu (T)>)(ADD).
"He worked on Thursday as well as on Saturday."

The next sentences show clearly that the NP inside the ADD case has a case structure of its own.

(7) Pinadadgan ni Ric (A) hin rusas (N) hi Susan (G)<labut ha kan Maria (G)>)(ADD).
"Rick sent some roses to Susan as well as to Mary."

(8) Nakarawat hiya (G) hin surat (N) tikang kan Sally (S)<labut (tikang) kan Netay (S)>)(ADD).
"He got a letter from Sally as well as from Nettie."

(9) Maghahatag hiya (A) hin pabur (N) para ha istranghiru (B)<labut (para) hin sangkay (B)>)(ADD).
"She will do a favor for a stranger as well as for a friend."

And the next set of examples show how more than a single actant can be present in an ADD phrase.

(10) Ginhulug niya (A) an surat (N) para kan Ana (REPL)<labut han pakiti (N) (para) kan Sam (REPL)>)(ADD).
"She mailed the letters for Anna as well as the package for Sam."

(11) Ginpadala niya (A) hi Kilda (G) hin kwarta (N)<labut han pakiti (N) kan Susan (G)>)(ADD).
"He sent Nilda some money as well as Susan a package."

Finally, the sentential NP's are illustrated using both means of nominalization, ABS affixation and BASIC affixation.

(12) Ginbaligyaq nira (A) an ripriddyirtur (N)<labut han pagbaligyaq (nira) han aparadur>(ADD).
"They sold their refrigerator in addition to selling their chest of drawers."

(13) Madagmit hiya(A) magsurat<labut nga malimpyu>(ADD).
"He wrote quickly as well as neatly." (Lit. "He was quick to write as well as neat.")
(14) Nasisina hiya (A) labut pa diri nakahulat (ADD).
"He was angry as well as impatient (not being able to wait)."

(15) Naruyag aku (A) ha iya (G) nga baltuk (N) labut hin/nga mahusay (ADD).
"I want her to be intelligent as well as pretty."

OTHER CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ADDITIONAL ACTANTS

The interpretation of the simple ADD actant is often times ambiguous. i.e., the ART's and semantic requirements of cases (such as animacy) are sometimes not sufficient to force the ADD case to be connected to a single co-occurring actant. Viz.,

(16) Ginsurat ni Ed (A) an supirisur (G) labut kan Felix (A/G) (ADD).
"Ed wrote the supervisor as well as Felix."

When the ADD actant is preposed, disambiguation is usually achieved by moving the associated NP to a position immediately following the ADD phrase. Viz.,

(17) a. Labut kan Felix (A) (ADD), hi Ed (A) nagsurat ha suprisur (G).
"In addition to Felix, Ed wrote the supervisor."

b. Labut kan Felix (G) (ADD), an suprisur (G) ginsurat ni Ed (A).
"In addition to Felix, the supervisor was written by Ed."

As the previous sentences illustrate, the ADD actants may undergo left dislocation. It is not possible to topicalize an ADD actant though.

DEEP STRUCTURE SOURCE OF THE ADDITIONAL ACTANTS

So far we have argued that the ADD relationship is not a simple case relationship. It is possible, however, that it is indeed a case relation but complex in the following way. Perhaps all ADD actants begin life containing complete sentences, some of which undergo drastic
deletion. The following tree structure illustrates this thesis.

(18) a. 

```
  S
 /  \
| MOD |
  V
 /   \  
| AC   | AC |
  TNS [+AGT] [+ADD]
 \     [TOP]
PAST   AC [+NEUT]
P     +OBJ
|   +TOP |
P    |
```

```
ginpalit niya an karumata labut palit hiya han karabaw
"bought" "he" "the" "cart" "as well as""buy""he""the""carabao"
```

b. Ginpalit niya an karumata labut han karabaw.
"He bought the cart as well as the carabao."

Some of the evidence for this deep structure source has been presented above. E.g., (a) multiple constituents and (b) nominalized sentences are possible in the ADD phrase. In addition note that the paraphrase having a V in the ADD phrase is possible in every instance of its use.

The analysis requires several extensions of the grammar however. First, it requires modification of the conjunction reduction schema to operate on the dominating and subjoined sentences to effect the possible deletions in the ADD phrase. And second, it requires the provision for more than one ADD case under any particular PROP. Note that two ADD cases in the following sentence are certainly interpretable and in my opinion grammatical if not felicitous.
A second viable source would be a type of sentence conjunction with the various possibilities of surface structure arrived at by conjunction reduction. The underlying tree corresponding to that in (18) follows.

An apparent drawback to this proposal is the need to tie the linker /labut/ more closely to one of the S's than to the other (commutability not being possible without a change in meaning).

Although neither proposal is in an implementable state, the reduction mechanism being lacking, we have chosen to highlight the subjoined character to the ADD actant by considering it to be in a case relationship.
ADDITIONAL AND EXCEPTIVE

The ADD and EXCEPT actants (cf. this chapter, section 4.10) are marked by the same morpheme, /labut/. Ambiguity between the two is extremely rare, however, because in addition to contextual disambiguating factors there are strong syntactic constraints on the EXCEPT construction. As will be brought out in more detail under EXCEPT, it requires the presence of a POST constituent and in particular a constituent describing the totality of a universe of discourse, i.e., "all", "every" or "none", etc. ADD is much less restricted so the only instances where ambiguity is possible are in the constrained environment meeting the EXCEPT requirements. An example follows.

(21) Gindagkut an (A) an ngatan nga sugaq (N)<labut hini nga usa (N)>EXC)/? (ADD). "I turned on all the lights except/? in addition to this one."

As the semantic gloss indicates, the reading as ADD is forced. It is strange to add to an existing totality. Thus, the semantic fields of the ADD and EXCEPT relationships are in complementary distribution and the use of a single lexical marker for both causes no communication problems. The more suitable means of expressing (21) to which the ADD interpretation is closest uses /pati/ "including".

(22) Gindagkut an (A) an ngatan nga sugaq (N)<pati hini nga usa (N)>INC). "I turned on all the lights including this one.

ADDITIONAL AND SUBSTITUTIVE

The ADD case is much like the SUB relationship (cf. this chapter, section 2.32) in that it requires its NP to be sentential in the deep structure and allows full scale deletion of constituents identical to
those in the matrix. The two differ in that \text{SUB} is unique in its appearance in any one \text{PROP} (S) while \text{ADD} may apparently occur more than once in a \text{PROP} (S).

2.2. \textbf{Agentive (AGT)} (A)

2.2.1. AGT with V as Head

Fillmore (1968, p. 24) defines the AGT as "the typically animate instigator of the action identified by the verb". In a preprint version the definition was slightly different, viz., "the animate responsible source of the action...". Neither of these wordings capture the nature of AGT as it will be used here. The second definition is faulty in that it links animacy obligatorily. The arguments given in SECTION I (2.1.5) are considered sufficient to require some AGT's to be inanimate. The first definition seems worded too strongly in that not all AGT's seem to be "instigators". Note that the causative construction makes it very clear that the AGT of the embedded verb is not the "instigator" of the action.

(1) John made Mary wash the dishes.

Thus, it appears that the AGT is the object or being which carries out the action identified by the verb. This definition (a) allows the AGT to be either animate or inanimate, (b) allows the AGT to be acted upon by another AGT (cf. the causative construction), and (c) allows permissive and non-volitional type AGT's. The drawbacks of such a position are discussed in SECTION I (2.1.5).

2.2.1.1. AGT as \textsc{Actor}

When \textsc{CAUS} is not present, AGT functions on the surface as \textsc{Actor}. When AGT is non-topic, its \textsc{Art} is one of /hin/, /hit/, /han/, or /ni/.
See Section II, Chapter 2 (5.2) for the parameters determining the choice between these four. No PREP is possible. When AGT is topicalized, it is marked on the verb by the ACTOR set of affixes. (Cf. Table 1 in Chap. 2 (5.1)) Apparently all four conjugations can be used to mark an AGT, but the conjugations generally correspond to different types of AGT's.

**AGT with the /mag-/ conjugation**

When an AGT is marked by the /mag-/ conjugation, the AGT is generally acting solely as the performer of the action. He is not thought of as affected as well by his action. Some examples follow.

(2) a. Nagbalhin an mga sangkay ku (A) han balay (N). "My friends moved the house."

b. Ginbalhin han mga sangkay ku (A) an balay (N). Ditto.

(3) a. Nagkanta hi Carlos (A) kan Maria (G). "Carl sang to Mary."

b. Ginkantahan ni Carlos (A) hi Maria (G). Ditto.

In Waray as in English some verbs require their AGT to be not only animate but also human. /Hadluk/ is one of these.

(4) a. Naghadluk hi Ben (A) kan Mila (N). "Ben frightened Mila."

b. *Naghadluk an ayam (A) kan Nita; (N). "The dog frightened Nita."

**AGT with the /-um-/ Conjugation**

A smaller class of verbs allows the /-um-/ conjugation with an AGT.

(5) a. Sumaka hi Fidel (A) han abukadu (N). "Fidel climbed the avocado tress."

b. Ginsakgan ni Fidel (A) an abukadu (N). Ditto.

(6) a. Kinmagat an namuk (A) kan Pedro (N). "The mosquito bit Peter."
b. Kinaqat han namuk (A) hi Pedro (N). Ditto.

Others in this class are: /kugus/ "carry, hold", /huyup/ "blow", and /sulud/ "go in".

**AGT with the /ma-/ conjugation**

An even smaller class of verbs allows the /ma-/ conjugation with AGT.

(7) Matitima na aku (A) han libru (N).
"I will finish the book now."

(8) a. Nasina hi Nanay (A) ha manghud ku (N).
"Mother scolded my younger sibling."

b. Nasinahan ni Nanay (A) an manghud ku (N). Ditto.

Most verbs of the /ma-/ conjugation require the AGT to be affected by the action. Hence, most of them fall under the section AGT-GOAL which follows.

**AGT with the /mang-/ conjugation**

Although most verbs using the /mang-/ conjugation have AGT's which are affected by the action (cf. AGT-GOAL section), a few appear to use simple AGT's.

(9) a. Nangagat an ayam (A) hin tawu (N).
"The dog bit the man."

b. Pinangagat han ayam (A) an tawu (N). Ditto.

(10) a. Nanganak hiya (A) kan Maria (N) ha iya pabunyag (REL).
"He sponsored Mary in her baptism."

b. Pinanganak niya (A) hi Maria (N) ha iya pabunyag (REL). Ditto.

**Verbs having AGT's and several conjugation possibilities**

Most verbs allow at least two conjugations and some three. Although no simple correlation can be given between underlying cases and surface conjugations, some trends can be noted. When /mag-/ is used it usually
reflects an underlying AGT or AGT-SO. When /-um-/ is used the case tends to be AGT or AGT-GOAL. Both /ma-/ and /mang-/ for the most part reflect an AGT-GOAL actant. Let me stress that these are simply guidelines and counter-examples abound. The system is complicated by the 15 possible combinations of the four conjugations as well as by the fact that the verbal affixes are not in a one to one correspondence to underlying case relationships any more than the ART's are. An illustration of the /mag-/ vs /-um-/ interpretation follows.

(11) a. Nagsaka hiya (A) han pagkaqun (N).
    "He took the food up."

b. Sumaka hiya (A) han pagkaqun (N).
    "He went up to eat."

2.2.1.2 AGT as OBJECT

When CAUS is present, AGT functions as OBJ. Thus, when such an AGT is topicalized it is marked in the verb by the OBJ set of affixes. (Cf. Table 2 in Chap. 2 (5.1)) When non-topic, its ART is either /ha/ or /kan/. (Depending on whether its head noun is [-NAME] or [+NAME] respectively.) No PREP is possible. In the following examples, AGT shows up on the surface as OBJ. The /pa-/ affix on the verb merely indicates that there is a CAUS actant in the PROP.

(12) a. Nagpasahgas ha surugoqun (A) han pinggan (N) hi Nanay (C). "Mother had the maid wash the plates."

b. Ginpasahgas an surugoqun (A) han pinggan (N) ni Nanay (C). Ditto.

(13) a. Nagpasakay kan Pedro (A) ha barutu (L) hiya (C).
    "He had Peter ride in the boat."

b. Ginpasakay hi Pedro (A) ha barutu (L) niya (C). Ditto.

Since an indefinite AGT is deleted when a CAUS is present, ambiguities arise between AGT and other cases. E.g.,
(14) Nagpabalay hi Ed (C) ha saqup (A/B).
   a. "Ed had a house built for the tenant."
   b. "Ed had the tenant build the house."

2.2.2 AGT with noun as head

Actants following a head noun (cf. Section II, Chap. 3 (1.0) above) which are in the AGT relationship are marked when non-NAME by the ART's /han/, /hit/, and /hin/. (Cf. Section II, Chap. 2 (5.2) for the factors determining which of these three ART's is used.) When the actant is NAME, it is invariably marked by /ni/.

(15) An pagqabut niya (A) ... "his arrival"

(16) An pagqakusar han babayi (A/G) ...
    "the accusation of the girl"

(17) An pagqabut ni Juan (A)... "the arrival of John"

Although preposing of some AGT actants is possible, there are a number of restrictions to be met. Non-NAME actants can not be preposed at all. When a NAME actant is preposed, the ART marking it changes from /ni/ to /kan/. Pronominal forms have a similar shift, changing from the /niya/ class to the /iya/ class. With the pronouns, however, there is the phonological requirement that the /iya/ class be introductory in a phonological phrase (ART being the only item which can precede it). If it is not introductory, the /niya/ class is retained. Viz.,

(18) An iya (A) pagtuqad kan Satanas (G) ... "his belief in Satan"

(19) An kan Prisidinti Marcos (A) pagdumara han atun pamunuqan (B) ...
    "President Marcos' handling of the administration..."

(20) An iya (A) una nga binuhat didaq hit situwaysun (G)... "His first response to the situation..."
2.3. **Agentive-Goal (AGT-GOAL) (A-G)**

Although this description of Waray does not utilize the feature complex alternative of case description to any great degree, this and the following sections do point out the value of considering some relationships as composites of features.

An actant which functions as AGT-GOAL has the intersecting characteristics of both AGT and Goal. That is, it is the object or being which carries out the action of the verb and at the same time it is either the recipient of the action or the object or being toward which the action is directed.

Like simple AGT's, A-G's function as ACTOR in the absence of CAUS and as OBJ when CAUS is present.

**AGT-GOAL as ACTOR**

Non-topic A-G's are marked by the ART's /hin/, /han/, and /ni/. Topic A-G's are marked by the various ACTOR verbal affixes.

A few verbs allow the A-G to be marked by the /mag/- conjugation.

(1) a. Nagkawat hiya (A-G) han pabutu (N).
   "He stole the firecracker."
   

(2) a. Naghuram aku (A-G) hin libru (N) kan Ester (S).
   "I borrowed a book from Ester."
   
   b. Ginhruman ku (A-G) hin libru (N) hi Ester (S). Ditto.

Another verb of this class is /palit/ "buy".

Most verbs taking an A-G actant mark: their ACTOR's by /-um-/.

(3) a. Kumaqn hiya (A-G) hen litsun (N).
   "He ate the roast pork."
   
(4) a. Kumha hiya (A-G) hin kwarta (N) ha aparadur (S).
    "He took the money from the cabinet."

    b. Ginkuha niya (A-G) an kwarta (N) ha aparadur (S).
    Ditto.

Other verbs of this class are: /kariguq/ "take a bath", /huram/
"borrow", and /karawat/ "receive".

The following sentence illustrates an occurrence of /ma-/ and
AGT-GOAL. The actors of /ma-/ verbs are practically all simple GOAL's.

(5) Nahibaru hiya (A-G) han liksyun (N).
    "He learned the lesson."

Examples of /mang-/ and A-G are not plentiful either.

(6) Namatiq hiya (A-G) han magsirista (N).
    "He listened to the guitarist." (from /batig/)

(7) Nangawat hiya (A-G) hin singsing (N).
    "He stole a ring." (from /kawat/)

AGT-GOAL as OBJECT

When a CAUS actant is present, the A-G actant functions on the
surface as an OBJ. It is marked when non-topic most often by /ha/
and /kan/. When topic, the OBJ set of affixes appear on the verb.

Some examples follow.

(8) a. Nagpahuram kami (C) ha suruguqun (A-G) hin baldi (N).
    "We had the maid borrow a bucket."

    b. Ginpahuram namun (C) an suruguqun (A-G) hin baldi (N).
    Ditto.

(9) a. Pinapelit niya (C) ha iya (A-G) an nigu (N).
    "She had him buy the winnowing tray."

    b. Pinapelit niya (C) hiya (A-G) han nigu (N). Ditto.

(10) a. Ginpakuhu namun (C) kan Jaime (A-G) an libru (N)
    han lamisa (S).
    "We asked Jim to take the book off the table."

    b. Ginpakuhu namun (C) hi Jaime (A-G) han libru (N)
    ha lamisa (S), Ditto.
2.4. Agentive-Source (AGT-SO) (A-S)

An actant functioning as AGT-SO has the characteristics of both AGT's and SO's. Thus, it carries out the action identified by the verb and is itself the origin of the action. If a NEUT actant and a verb of motion are present, the NEUT actant is commonly understood as having the AGT-SO as its origin.

When CAUS is present, AGT-SO functions on the surface as OBJ. In the absence of CAUS, AGT-SO functions as ACTOR.

AGT-SO as ACTOR

Like the preceding cases, AGT-SO is marked when non-topic by /hin/, /han/, or /ni/; and when topic, by the ACTOR verbal affixes. AGT-SO may be marked by the /mag-/ conjugation in the following way.

(1) a. Naghatag hiya (A-S) hin pisu (N) ha iya inanak (G).
   "He gave a peso to his godchild."

   b. Ginhatag niya (A-S) an pisu (N) ha iya inanak (G).
      Ditto.

(2) a. Nagbaligyaq hi Maria (A-S) hin tangkung (N)
       kakulup (T).
       "Mary sold some "tangkung" yesterday."

   b. Ginbaligyaq ni Maria (A-S) an tangkung (N)
      kakulup (T). Ditto.

(3) a. Nagsurat an babayi (A-S) ha iya kunswilu (G).
   "The girl wrote to her boyfriend."

   b. Ginsuratan han babayi (A-S) an iya kunswilu (G).
      Ditto.

AGT-SO as OBJ

When non-topic, AGT-SO as OBJ is marked by /ha/ and /kan/.
When topic, it is marked on the verb by the OBJ affixes and on the actant by the TOPIC articles. Viz.,
(5) a. Nagpahatag hiya (C) kan Ben (A-S) hin pisu (N) ngadtu kan Nonoy (G).
"She had Ben give a peso to Nonoy."

b. Pinahatag niya (C) hi Ben (A-S) hin pisu (N) ngadtu kan Nonoy (G). Ditto.

(6) a. Nagpabaligyaq aku (C) ha babayi (A-S) han manuk (N).
"I had the girl sell the chicken."

b. Pinabaligyaq ku (C) an babayi (A-S) han manuk (N).
Ditto.

(7) a. Nagpasurat ha iya (A-S) hi Tatay (C) kan Nanay (G).
"Father had her write a letter to Mother."

b. Pinapagsurat hiya (A-S) ni Tatay (C) kan Nanay (G).
Ditto.
2.5. **Beginning** (BEG)

BEGINNING is but one of three cases proposed to cover the temporal orientation of the PROP. (The other two to be taken up are END and TIME). The three cases are distinct both semantically and syntactically as will be shown in the following sections.

This analysis is quite similar to the one proposed by Blake (1930). Blake observed that the "stative", "ablative", and "terminal" parameters applies to both the temporal and spatial orientations. We agree and have argued above that only a feature complex analysis can express that observation. If one posits simply TIME and LOC with three subdivisions each, the cross-cutting parameters are observed in just the same way they are if one posits STATIVE, ABLATIVE, AND TERMINAL with two subdivisions each. The difficulty is resolved by the use of feature complexes. This is precisely what we intend but have given case labels to the feature composites resulting. Viz.,

(1) | [+STATIVE] | [+ABLATIVE] | [+TERMINAL] |
---|---|---|---|
[+TIME] | TM | BEG | END |
[+LOC] | LOC | SO | GOAL |

Blake's "durational" or "spatial" parameter we consider inseparable from the STATIVE parameter. Seen from this perspective, BEG is one of three temporal relationships and one of two ablative relationships.

Compared to AGT and NEUT, all three temporal relationships are syntactically quite peripheral since: (a) they freely prepose under the left dislocation T, (b) they may be either nominal or sentential in nature, (c) they do not have any sub-categorization restriction with
the head verb, and (d) only an exceedingly small subclass of them can undergo topicalization.

Actants which are in the BEG relationship express the time at which the action or state identified by the verb began. There are two PREP's which are simple morphological variants which are most commonly used to introduce the BEG relationship: /tikang/ and /tumikang/. A third PREP, /gikan/, is a Cebuano loan so is used in the areas into which Cebuano is spreading (i.e., those parts closest to the Western half of Leyte). The ART of a BEG actant is either /han/ or /ha/. (The basis of choosing between the two is not yet clear.) As in English, the actant may be either sentential or non-sentential. Topicalization of BEG actants is not possible.

(2) Nakahit hiya (A) tikang han alas singku (BEG).
    "He has been here since 5 o'clock."

(3) Nagyulqul an iya ngipun (N) tikang ha may alas dus (BEG).
    "His tooth has hurt since about 2 o'clock."

(4) Nahadluk hiya (A) ha mga ayam (N) tikang nagkagat ha iya an ayam (BEG).
    "He has been afraid of dogs since that puppy bit him."

(5) Waray hiya (A) pagmulay hin tinis (N) tikang habuqung an rakit (BEG).
    "She hasn't played tennis since her racket broke."

Left dislocation is possible with both the sentential and non-sentential actants. Characteristic of the transformation, a pause is required after the BEG actant.

(6) Tikang han girra (BEG), nagtratrabahu an akun tatay (A)
    hin pagmikaniku (OFF).
    "Since the war, my father has worked as a mechanic."

(7) Tikang simmulud hiya ha P.C. (BEG), nagsurat hiya (A)
    ha amun (G) hin usa laq (MENS).
    "Since he entered the P.C., he has written us only once."
As in English a BEG actant may incorporate a TM actant, viz.,

(8) a. tikang han antis han alas dus "since before two o'clock"

b. tikang han katima han alas dus "since after two o'clock"

c. tikang yanaq "from now"

The internal structure of these actants is a knotty problem. It would be rather strange to suggest that the structure is that of (9) since nowhere else is such an NP rewrite suggested.

(9)

```
       AC
      /\  \\
     /   \\
   P    NP
  /\    /\ \\
 /   \  /   \ \\
D    PP P    NP
     /\    /\ \\
    /   \  /   \ \\
   D    NOM tikang han antis han alas dus "since before" "hour" "2"
```

On the other hand, it is not clear that the semantic reading is compatible with the structure in (10), which suggests an interpretation parallel to "since the end of 12 o'clock".
2.6. **Benefactive (BEN) (B)**

2.6.1. COMPARISON OF BEN, PREF, REPL, AND RESV

The following description reflects the assumption that there are four quite closely related but separate cases. They are labelled **benefactive**, **preferential**, **replacive**, and **reservational**. In most previous analyses, these have been considered subvarieties of a single benefactive relationship. We shall continue using the uncapitalized term "benefactive" to refer to all four but retain the distinction of the capitalized BEN as a particular one of the four.

**EVIDENCE FOR FOUR SEPARATE CASES**

We shall give semantic and syntactic evidence in this section arguing for the necessity of distinguishing the four from one another. Arguments here will be from both English and Waray. The description following will be solely of Waray.

Semantic evidence for there being four cases is the distinct definitions and paraphrases which can be associated with each case. BEN is the case of the animate being for whose benefit the action identified by the verb is carried out. The paraphrase might be "for the benefit of". PREF is the case of the actant (being, object, quality, etc.) which the actor of the PROP is in favor of. REPL is the case of the animate being in whose place the actor performs the action identified in the verb. The paraphrase might be "in place of". RESV is the case of the typically animate being for whom an object specified in the PROP is intended or reserved. The paraphrase might be "intended or reserved for".
Various types of syntactic evidence distinguishing the four are available. The following kind of co-occurrence differences obtain.

(A) In Waray there is a difference in the PREP's which can accompany the three cases. /Para/ may appear with all four but /liwan/ may accompany only REPL. (B) In both English and Waray, verbs differ in the benefactive case relations they allow. Practically all the permutations of restrictions occur. (C) In both English and Waray it is possible for at least two of the cases (apparently any permutations allowed by the verbs) to co-occur with each other. This possibility alone raises severe problems for a case analysis which allows only a single BEN per PROP and lumps these four cases together. (D) In both English and Waray, RESV apparently requires NEUT to co-occur with it while BEN and REPL allow but do not require NEUT.

(E) In English, the cases have a difference in transformational potential. Thus, RESV is the only one which can be objectivalized. Viz.,

(1) a. I bought a card for Bill. (BEN, REPL, or RESV)
   b. I bought Bill a card. (RESV only)

(2) a. I cut the grass for Bill (BEN or REPL)
   b. *I cut Bill the grass.

(F) In Waray there is a difference in the derived function of some of the benefactive cases. REPL, for example, requires the ASSOC function, while RESV and BEN allow either the REF or ASSOC functions. This difference allows unambiguity between REPL and RESV in some verbs. E.g.,

(3) a. Ginpalitan niya (A) han pipiu (N) hin Maria (RESV). "He bought the cucumber for Mary."
MULTIPLE BENEFACTIVES

In both English and Waray it is possible to have several benefactive type actants within a single PROP. Viz.,

(5) An tagqiya han tunaq (A) an nagpalit han aradu (N)
para kan Carlos (RESV) para han manga saqup (REPL).
(or reversed assignments)
"The landowner bought the plow for Carl for the tenants."

Sentences such as these require special sources for a theory holding that a single BEN case exists and that a single token of each case may appear directly dominated by any one PROP. One such plausible source within those restrictions would employ the RREL embedding. Thus, the first benefactive in (5) would come from a reduced REL on /han aradu/ "the plow". The fact that "Carl" may be objectivalized in English suggests that it is in fact not a reduced RREL.

(6) The landowner bought Carl the plow for the tenants.

A syntactically and semantically more appealing and natural solution is to provide the multiple benefactives by the four distinct cases proposed above (and following). The multiple benefactives seem to reflect obligatorily the different cases proposed. That is, if more than one benefactive is found in a PROP, each of the benefactives has a different semantic reading along the lines of the four cases proposed. Or to put it another way, it is difficult to conceive of the multiple benefactives each having the same semantic relationship to the PROP.

It seems to be the case in Waray as in English that there are ambiguities of order of the different benefactive cases. This is to be expected of course in Waray where the order of cases after the verb
is quite free.

When a REPL actant is one of the multiple benefactives, it is quite easy to make it unambiguous in Waray, since it can be introduced by the PREP /liwan/ instead of /para/. Viz.,

(7) An tagqiya han tunaq (A) an nagpalit han aradu (N) liwan kan Carlos (REPL) para han mga saqup (RESV). "The landowner bought the plow in Carl's place for the tenants."

AMBIGUITY BETWEEN THE BENEFACTIVES

Since many verbs allow more than one of the three benefactive cases proposed and since it is possible to mark all four cases identically, there are many instances when more than one case could be assigned to a surface actant if the sentence is taken in isolation. In context, however, this ambiguity is minimalized.

RESIDUAL PROBLEMS

Some benefactive type actants may not fit well under any of the four cases proposed. One such actant follows.

(8) Nagpakiqana an padi (A) kun hingu an igngangaran han bataq. "The priest asked who the child would be named after/for."

Further, there is no good explanation for the striking "co-inclu-
dence" that all four benefactive cases utilize homophonous markers in both English and Waray ("for" and /para/ respectively).
2.6.2. BEN WITH VERB AS HEAD

BEN indicates the animate being for whose benefit the action identified by the verb is carried out.

BEN AS NON-TOPIC

When BEN is non-topic, it is generally marked by the PREP /para/. When the functional load of the PREP is not great (i.e., when other factors such as minimal case frame possibilities or contextual information let the communicants know the function of the BEN NP), the PREP may be omitted. The ART after /para/ may be any one of /han/, /hin/, /hit/, /ha/, or /kan/.

A small number of verbs allow BEN only.

(9) Iginluraq ni David (A) an butunis (N) para kan Nonoy (B). "David spit out the button of Nonoy."

(10) Mabusyu la hiya (A) para kan Juan(B). "She will only sulk for John."

More verbs allow BEN and REPL only.

(11) Naglabha hiya (A) han kamisita (N) para ha iya nanay (B/REPL). "He washed the shirt for his mother."

(12) Hi Ed (A) an nagbayad han utang (N) kan Nanay (G) para kan Mila (B/REPL). "Ed paid the debt to Mother for Mila."

Others of this class are: /baligyag/ "sell", /kadu/ "go", /tutduq/ "teach", /matay/ "die", /liwat/ "repeat", and /ampuq/ "pray".

Some verbs allow BEN, REPL, and RESV.

(13) Nag بالاay hi Felix (A) para han iya tatay (B/REPL/RESV). "Felix built a house for his father."

(14) An agarun (A) an nagpalit han aradu (N) para kan Carlos (B/REPL/RESV). "The landowner bought a plow for Carl."
No verbs have been found which allow BEN and RESV only, a fact perhaps in favor of collapsing the two into a single relationship. Similarly no verbs seem to permit BEN and PREP only.

BEN AS REFERENT

Some verbs allow a BEN to be topic only in the derived function REF. Viz.,

(15) An iya nanay (B) an kinadtuqan niya (A) ha pamirkadu (PURP).
"Her mother is the one she went to do marketing for."

(16) Hi Tatay (B) an ginbalayan ni Felix (A).
"Father is the one Felix built a house for." (ASSOC is used with NEUT) (Idiolect of L. Olmedo)

(17) Hi Mila (B) an ginbayaran ni Ed (A) han utang (N) kan Nanay (G).
"Mila is the one Ed paid the debt to Mother for." (ASSOC used with NEUT)

BEN AS ASSOCIATE

Another small class of verbs which allow topicalization of a BEN require the case to be in the ASSOC function. Viz.,

(18) Iginbalay ni Enrique (A) an iya tatay (B).
"Henry built a house for his father." (Idiolect of M. Agustin)

(19) Iliwat hitun balak (N) hi Tatay (B).
"Repeat the poem for Father." (REF used with GOAL, OBJ used with NEUT)

BEN IN SEVERAL DERIVED FUNCTIONS WITH THE SAME VERB

The majority of verbs appear to allow a choice of derived functions when a BEN associated with them is topicalized. The choice is always between REF, ASSOC, and REF-ASSOC.

(20) a. Hi Carlos (B) an ginpalitan han agarun (A) han aradu (N).
"Carl was the one the landlord bought the plow for."

b. Hi Carlos (B) an iginpalit han agarun (A) han aradu (N). Ditto.
c. Hi Carlos (B) an iginpalitan han agarun (A) han aradu (N). Ditto.

(21) a. Hi Juan (B) an ginbubusyuhan la niya (A).
"She only sulks for John."
b. Hi Juan (B) an ibinubusyu la niya (A). Ditto.

(22) a. Hi Maria (B) an pinabalunan niya (A) hin damu nga pagkaqun (N).
"It was Mary that she fixed lots of food for."
b. Hi Maria (B) an ipinabalun niya (A) hin damu nga pagkaqun (N).

Another verb like the previous two is /laba/ "wash".

AMBIGUITIES BETWEEN BEN AND LOC

Since both BEN and LOC actants can be topicalized with the REF affixes, ambiguities between the two arise on occasion. E.g.,

(23) Gintratrabahuan ni Mario (A) ha Ico (B/L).
"Mario works for/at Ico."

NON-TOPOCALIZABLE BEN'S

A number of verbs do not allow a BEN actant to be topicalized at all. One apparent reason is that the derived function which BEN would be assigned to has been pre-empted by another case relation. Potential ambiguity is avoided by disallowing the topicalization of BEN. Such reasoning is suspect, however, since other verbs do allow the BEN to be ambiguous with other case relations (as just shown above).

(24) a. Iginluraq ni David (A) an butunis (N) para kan Nonoy (B).
"David spit out the button for Nonoy."
b. Glnluraqan ni David (A) han butunis (N) hi Nonoy (G).
"David spit out the button at Nonoy."

(Para kan Nonoy/ cannot be topicalized at all.)

(25) a. Nagtututduq hiya (A) ha klası (N) para ha iya bugtuq (B).
"She is teaching the class for her sibling."

b. An iya bugtuq (G) an gintututduqan niya (A) ha klası (N).
"She is teaching the class to her sibling."

c. An iya bugtuq (REL) an gintututduq niya (A) ha klası (N).
"She taught the class about her sibling."

(Para ha iya bugtuq/ cannot be topicalized at all.)
2.7. **Causal (CL)**

There seem to be at least two semantically distinct types of causal relations. In the first the causal actant provides the evidence showing why the assertion of the main clause is true. In the second, the causal actant provides the reason why the action or state indicated by the main clause has, is, or will occur. Examples of the first type are in (1) and the second in (2).

(1) a. Atrasadu an kami kay nahalulubung na nga ugsaq kami nga naqabut nganhi ha Tacloban.  
"We were late because (she) was buried before we arrived in Tacloban."

b. Putu an ira gimpalit kay nagpakiana kami ha tinira han ira paglakat.  
"It was ricecake they bought, because we went up and asked the waitress after they left."

(2) a. Naqurhi kami kay an amun triyn nagqabiriya.  
"We were late because our train broke down."

b. Pinmalit hira hin putu kay nagugutum hira.  
"They bought some ricecake because they were hungry."

There does not seem to be any syntactic link to these differing interpretations and in the remainder of the discussion on syntactic characteristics of CAUSAL's, the two semantic types will be intermixed.

CAUSAL actants will be divided on the basis of their internal structure into two sections, those having a sentential structure and those not. In the two sections we shall note that some linkers permit only sentential structures following them. Others permit either sentential or non-sentential structures, and a third group allows only non-sentential structures.
CAUSAL LINKERS WITH SENTENTIAL STRUCTURES

CAUSAL actants introduced by /kay/ invariably have a sentential structure. There are only a few other syntactic restrictions placed on the CL actant. The embedded sentence must be declarative. Equational or verbal sentences are permissible. If the latter is chosen, there do not seem to be any tense restrictions but the INDIC form of the verb is used as in normal matrix declaratives. The CL actant may either follow or precede the matrix sentence.

(3) Kinaqun na la hi Kwintin (A) kay naggqisug na man hi Tatay (CL).
"Quintin ate because Father got angry."

(4) Nakasulud hiya (A) kay nagbuwaq hiya (CL).
"He was able to get in because he lied."

(5) Ginaligyaq niya (A) an balutu (N) kay buhuq naq (CL).
"He sold the boat because it had holes."

(6) Kay mga dunut na an mga kamatis (CL), ginlabug niya (A).
"Because the tomatoes were rotten, he threw them away."

(7) Tikaraqun pa hiya (A) untaq lugaring kay aparadu ka (CL) waray na la hiya (A).
"He wanted to eat but because you were in a hurry he didn't."

(8) Kay nakaturug hiya ha playwud (CL), nagqulqul an iya likud (N) kada adlaw (T).
"Because she sleeps on plywood, she has a backache everyday."

When /bangin/ "perhaps" is used after /kay/, the BASIC form of the verb must be used in the CAUSAL sentence. The English parallel with the linker "lest" is striking.

(9) Ayaw pagguardas a didaq (L) kay bangin it bataq mamangu (CL).
"Don't make noise there lest the child wake up."

(10) Ayaw hiya (G) pagkasinhni ha gawas (MANN) kay bangin ka niya libakun ha imu likud (CL).
"Don't criticize him openly, lest he slander you your back."

A second CL construction which requires a sentential structure is introduced by /bakay (kay)/. As with just /kay/, the sentence linked may be either equational or verbal, and a verbal form is INDIC. The CL actant may either precede or follow the matrix S. As the parentheses indicate, the linker may be either /bakay kay/ or simply /bakay/. Viz.,

(11) Waray hiya (G) aksiptara didaq han ira susiyadad (L) bakay kay nagbinwaq hiya (CL).
"He was not accepted in their society because he kept telling lies."

(12) Diriq hiya (A) nakikiggisturya ha ira (G) bakay suruguqun hiya (CL).
"She wouldn't talk to them because she was a maid."

(13) Bakay kay riku hiya (CL), diriq hiya (A) nakaqun hin bulad (N).
"Because she is rich, she doesn't eat dried fish."

(14) Bakay tisuriru hiya han siyudad (CL), damu nga mga tawu (A) an nagaruq ha iya (S) hin pabur (N).
"Because he is the city treasurer, many people ask favors of him."

A third marker of sentential CL constructions is /tungud kay/. As with the previous markers the linked sentence is declarative and either equational or verbal. Viz.,

(15) Naggiginum hiya (A) hin kuk (N), tungud kay an tubig diriq linasu (CL).
"He is drinking Coke because the water is not clean."

(16) Tungud kay nakapalit hiya hin kalubiyan (CL), diriq hiya (A) nakapalit hin dyipni (N).
"Because she bought a coconut plantation, she can't buy a jeepney."

Fourth, /tungud han/ may be followed by an S but apparently the S is restricted to equational form. Viz.,

(17) Liningkud hiya (A) didaq ha printi (L) tungud han hiya
an prisdinti (CL).
"He sat in the front because he is the president."

(18) Tungud han mahusay hiya (CL), damu it iya kunswilu (N).
"Because she is pretty, she has many boyfriends.

(19) *Mahugaw an iya badu (N) tungud han nalingkud hiya 
hadtun bangku (CL).
"Her dress is dirty because she sat on that bench."

A fifth sentential CL construction utilizes the linker /mahitungud kay/. As in the other uses of /kay/, the sentence following is declarative and either equational or verbal. Viz.,

(20) Nakakuha hiya (A) hit hitaqas nga marka (N) mahitungud kay an iya sinurat pinamakaqpay (CL).
"He scored highest because his term paper was best."

(21) Binutar hiya (A) niya (N) mahitungud kay magsiring hiya nga iya kaqawayun an karaqutan (CL).
"She voted for him because he said he will fight corruption."

(22) Mahitungud kay hiya maqistra (CL), nagqaruq kami (A) 
hin abisu (N).
"Because she is a teacher, we asked her advice."

(23) Mahitungud kay an kabayu nahapakulub (CL), limmakat na la hiya (A).
"Because the horse stumbled, she walked."

Finally, /mahitungud nga/ may also be used to link sentential CL's.

(24) Napyanu hiya (A) mahitungud nga naruyag an iya nanay (CL).
"He played the piano because his mother wanted him to."

(25) Mahitungud nga mahugaw an makiniya (CL), an pagbalyu 
han lasu (N) waray data.
"Because the typewriter is dirty, changing the ribbon 
is useless."

CAUSAL LINKERS WITH NON-SENTENTIAL STRUCTURES

/Tungud han/ is the only one of the linkers above which may also be used to introduce a non-sentential CL construction. Viz.,

(26) Natumba an balay (N) tungud han bagyu (CL).
"The house fell because of the typhoon."
(27) Inmiwas hiya (A) ha pwistu (S) tungud han mga istudianti nga nagdimunstrisyun (CL).  
"He resigned because of the students who demonstrated."

(28) Tungud han upinyun han pulik (CL), ginpaqwas an hipi han pulisya (N).  
"Because of public opinion, the chief of police was dismissed."

(29) Tungud han krisis han kwarta (CL), an pisu gudtiqay na it balur.  
"Because of the monetary crisis, the peso was devalued."

The morpheme /dara/ when used as a CL linker is obligatorily followed by a non-sentential NP.

(30) Nawaraq an humay (N) dara han durun (CL).  
"The rice crop was lost because of the "durun" (k. insect)."

(31) It pirmaninti nga bnuqan (N) pusibli dara hit taqib (CL).  
"A permanent fish trap is possible because of high tides."

(32) Dara han laputi (CL), an mga magququma (N) mayqadaq sistu.  
"Because of the snails, some farmers have schistosomiasis."

(33) Dara han panahum (CL), diri damu it gatus han baka (N).  
"Because of the climate, cows do not give much milk."

One final CL construction consists of the linker /ha/ followed by a nominalized form having the prefix /pag-/ . It corresponds to the English causal phrases introduced by "out of" or "from".

(34) Kinmadtu hiya (A) ha prinsipal (G) ha paghadluk (CL).  
"He went to the principal out of fear."

CAUSAL ACTANTS WHICH CAN BE TOPICALIZED

None of the sentential CL actants can be topicalized. Some non-sentential CL actants may, however. The non-topic linker corresponding to the topic form is either /tungud han/ or /dara/. When topic the CL actant assumes the CL role and is marked on the verb by the CL affixes (characterized by /ka-/). Some examples follow.
(35) An bagyu (CL) an nakatumba han bālay (N). "The typhoon was what caused the house to fall."

(36) An durun (CL) an ikinawaraq han humay (N). "The 'durun' was what caused the loss of the rice."

(37) (I)kinamatayan niya (A-G) an malariya (CL). "Malaria caused him to die."

(38) Ikinabuhiq han prinsisa (A) an haruk han prinsipi (CL). "The kiss of the prince made the princess live."

CAUSAL AND CAUSATIVE

CAUSAL actants are quite distinct from CAUSATIVE actants on both syntactic and semantic grounds. Semantically, CAUSATIVE actants are generally animate beings which initiate an action which is carried out by someone else. They are typically the willful instigators of the action. CAUSAL actants on the other hand indicate the CAUSE of an action but the CAUSE is typically inanimate and may simply be a state of affairs. When the CAUSATIVE actants is inanimate, however, the causal construction (CL) is semantically quite similar to the causative construction (C). Viz.,

(39) a. Nagtuquk hi Nene (A) tungud han asu (CL). "Nene cried because of the smoke."

b. Nagpatuquk kan Nene (A) an asu (C). "The smoke caused Nene to cry."

Syntactically, the two actant relations differ in several ways. The CAUSATIVE actant is invariably marked on the verb by /pa-/ whether topic or not, is invariably non-sentential, and is introduced by simply an ART. The CAUSAL actant is only marked on the verb when topic and then by /ka-/. It may be either sentential or not, and can be introduced by several different PREP's when non-topic. It is significant also that both a causal and a causative phrase may be present in a
single sentence. Viz.,

(40) Ginpaqaway ni Auring (C) an mga bataq (A) tungud han
damu it iya trabahu (CL).
"Auring allowed the children to fight because her
workload was so great."

The reader is referred to the two different sections for additional
illustrative material.

CAUSAL AND RESULT RELATIONSHIPS

In accordance with Thompson's (1969, p. 71 ff) suggestion for
English, the causal and result relationships in Waray appear to be
inverses also. Viz.,

(41) a. Itu nga mga dalan (N) makahadrulk, kay malusak nga
duru (CL).
"These roads are dangerous, because they are
very muddy."

b. Itu nga mga dalan (N) malusak nga duru, intunsis
makahadrulk (RES).
"These roads are very muddy, so they are dangerous."

As in English, only the causal clause can be preposed. Viz.,

(42) a. Kay malusak nga duru itu nga mga dalan (CL),
makahadrulk.
"Because these roads are very muddy, they
are dangerous."

b. #Intunsis makahadrulk itu nga mga dalan (RES),
malusak nga duru.
"So these roads are dangerous, they are very muddy."

CAUSAL ACTANTS AND PHONOLOGICAL PHRASES

CAUSAL actants which are non-sentential are generally part of the
phonological phrase the PROP is within. When CL actants are sentential,
however, they may be either part of the PROP's phrase or a separate
phrase by themselves. The longer the CL actant, the more likely that
it is separate. Viz.,
(43) a. Malakat aku (A) tungud han uran (CL).
   "I am leaving because of the rain."

   b. Malakat aku (A) (,) tungud kay hi Ben malakat
      liwat (CL).
      "I am leaving (,) because Ben is."

   c. Malakat aku (A), kay kun aku maqukay, hi Ben
      maqukay liwat (CL).
      "I am leaving, because if I stay, Ben will stay."
2.8 Causative (CAUS) (c)

If a Waray speaker wishes to place the responsibility for the initiation of an action or state on someone or something other than what would normally be the ACTOR of the sentence, he may employ the causative construction. $ \\

$The causative construction is termed the "indirect-actor construction" in Schachter and Otanes (1970).

We shall shortly discuss two possible deep structure sources for the CAUS construction. Prior to that let us consider the surface structure forms which arise when a causative actant is present.

2.8.1. SURFACE CAUSATIVE FORMS

Derived Functions and Surface Markers

The following sentences are intended to illustrate first, the typical non-causative construction with its characteristic relation markers; second the different relation markers which appear in a causative construction; and third, the relations between relation markers and verbal affixes in sentences with causative actants.

(1) "The man/Peter asked the salesman for some paper for Mary."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>NEUT</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>REPL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Naggarug an tawu /ni Pedro han papil ha tindiru para kan Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. GIngaruq han &quot; &quot; &quot; an &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. GIngaruqan &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; han &quot; an &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Igingaruq &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; ha &quot; hi Maria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(2) "The woman/Mother had the man/Peter ask for some paper."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUS</th>
<th>AGT</th>
<th>NEUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nagpaqaruq</td>
<td>han</td>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni</td>
<td>/ni</td>
<td>nan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/hi</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>papil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha</td>
<td>kan</td>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sentences in (1) are "unnatural" in that they have more than the "normal" number of actants and have not undergone the fronting transformations frequently used. If SO and REPL actants were added to (2) and topicalized, the verbs would become /ginpaqaruqan/ and /iginpaqaruq/ respectively.

Note that when the CAUS actant is present it functions as ACTOR. So when it is non-topic, it is marked by either /hit/, /han/, /hin/, or /ni/. If the CAUS actant is topic, the ART's become /an/ or /hi/ as with all other actants. The verbal affixes come from the ACT set and hence are /mag-/, /-um-, and /ma-/. If the AGT is topicalized it is marked by the GOAL affixes. All other actants follow the general rules of derived function assignment and verbal affixation. Whenever a CAUS actant is present, regardless of the situational affix set employed, the affix /pa-/ is prefixed immediately to the verb root.

Causatives, Conjunction Types, and Moods

It was mentioned above that all four major conjugation types enter into the CAUS construction. Some examples of that in the non-Potential mood follow. The ACT topic forms are given in (3)-(5) and the OBJ topic forms in (6)-(8).

mag: FUT (mag + R + pa-), PRES (nag + R + pa-); PAST (nag + pa-)

(3) a. Nagpaqasin hi Nanay (C) ha iya (A) hin isdaq (N).
    "Mother had her salt the fish."
b. Nagpabalay hi tatay (C) ha tawu (A).
"Father had the man build a house."

um: FUT (ma + pa-), PRES (na + pa-), PAST (na + pa-)

(4) a. Mapagutum ha akun (G) an litsun (C).
"The roost pig will make me hungry."

b. Napakanta hi Nanay (C) kan Maria (A).
"Mother is asking/asked Mary to sing."

ma: FUT (ma + R + pa-), PRES (na + R + pa-), PAST (na + pa-)

(5) a. Mapapamingaw hiya (C) ha akun (G).
"He will make me lonely."

b. Napalipay hiya (C) ha iya (G).
"She made him happy."

mag: (6) a. Pinaggasin ni Nanay (C) hiya (A) hin isdaq (N).
"Mother had him salt the fish."

b. Pinagbalay ni Tatay (C) an tawu (A).
"Father had the man build a house."

um: (7) a. Papagutumun aku (G) han litsun (C).
"The litsun will make me hungry."

b. Pinakanta ni Nanay (C) hi Maria (A).
"Mother is asking/asked Mary to sing."

ma: (8) a. Papamingawun niya (C) aku (G).
"He will make me lonely."

b. Pinalipay niya (C) hiya (G).
"She made him happy."

In verbs which allow /ma-/ with the meaning "become V" and /mag-/ with the meaning "make V", the causative construction overlaps in function with the /mag-/ set of affixes. Viz.,

(9) Nabungul aku (G). "I became deaf."

(10) Nepabungul ha akun (G) hi Juan (C).
"John made me deaf."
(11) Nagbungul ha akun (G) hi Juan (A).
"John made me deaf."

Going one step further we see that the causative construction used
with the /mag-/ affixes is equivalent semantically to a dual causative
with the /ma-/ affixes. Viz.,

(12) a. Napabungul hi Juan (C₁) kan Maria (C₂) ha akun (G).
"John had Mary make me deaf."

b. Napabungul hi Juan (C) kan Maria (A) ha akun (G).
Ditto.

Causatives also appear in the Potential mood. Viz.,

(13) a. Nakakapagutum it litsun (C) ha akun (G).
"The roast can make me hungry."

b. Nakapaluya ha iya (G) an pagquinaqinaq (C).
"Exertion weakened him."

Causatives and Animacy

In general CAUS actants may be either animate or inanimate. Viz.,

(14) a. Pinaluksu hiya (A) ni Andres (C).
"Andy made him jump."

b. Pinaluksu hiya (A) han aspiri (C).
"The pin made him jump."

(15) a. Napahulug hiya (A) ni Juan (C).
"John made him fall."

b. Napahulug hiya (A) han malita (C).
"The suitcase made him fall."

With /gutum/ "be or make hungry", however, it is a curious fact that if
the CAUS actant is the topic, it must be inanimate. But if the CAUS
actant is non-topic, it must be animate. Viz.,

(16) a. Nagpagutum ha akun (G) an litsun/*hi Nono (C).
"The roast pig/Nono made me hungry."

b. Ginpagutum(an) aku (G) ni Nono/*han litsun (C).
"Nono/*the roast pig made me hungry."
Lexical vs. Syntactic Causatives

There are many verbs in Waray which might be thought of as lexical causatives, i.e., the semantic relationship of the AGT includes causation but there is no morphological evidence. Viz.,

(17) Ginqabrihan niya (A) an pwirta (N).
"He opened the door."

As in English, to permit the causative reading, it might be possible with some verbs to posit an underlying intransitive verb but with others one must posit an underlying adjectival relationship. E.g.,

(18) a. Ginqabrihan niya (A) an pwirta (N).
"He opened the door."

b. CAUS niya (A) # naqabri (V) an pwirta (A) #.
"He caused #the door opened#." 

(19) a. Ginlimpyuhan niya (A) an awtu (N).
"He cleaned the car."

b. CAUS niya (A) #malimpyu (ADJ) it awtu (N)#.
"He caused #the car is clean#." 

Most (all?) of these verbs can be used in a syntactic causative construction, i.e., the prefix /pa-/ is added to the verb and an actant is present which has the relationship "object or being responsible for initiating (allowing, causing, requesting) the action or state expressed by the verb." E.g.,

(20) a. Pinaqabrihan ni Ben (C) ha iya (A) an pwirta (N).
"Ben had him open the door."

b. Pinalimpyuhan ni Ben (C) ha iya (A) an awtu (N).
"Ben had him clean the car."

A few verbs appear to be historically derived from the syntactic causative construction in that they have a /pa-/ prefixed to the root morpheme and the possibility of interpreting their AGT as causative (if both the verb and the adjective underlying sources are allowed).
The verbs are clearly no longer syntactic causatives since (a) they can not appear without the /pa-/ , and (b) the varying range of meaning of syntactic causatives is not present. E.g.,

(21) a. Nagpakalas aku (A) ha iya (G). "I startled him."
   b. *Nagkalas...

(22) a. Nagpagana it budu (N) ha iya (G). "The salted fish gave him an appetite."
   b. *Naggana...

Other verbs like these are: /palandung/ "remember", /pahuway/ "rest", /pasalamat/ "thank", /pasayluq/ "forgive".

When these morphological causatives are used as syntactic causatives, they do not allow an additional /pa-/. They may thus have an ambiguous character at times reflecting their morphological and syntactic natures. Some examples follow.

   b. Ginpahuway ku (C) hiya (A). "I had him rest."

(24) a. Nagpalandung aku (A) ha imu (N). "I remembered you."
   b. Ginpalandung ku (C/A) hiya (A/N) hitu (N/CA). "I had him remember that."
      "I remembered him for that."

These verbs are considered then to be simply lexical causatives with the additional idiosyncracy of having a stem-forming prefix /pa-/.

Some verb stems can appear either with or without the stem-forming affix /pa-/ and the syntactic causative prefix /pa-/. Viz.,

(25) a. Nagtakas hira (A) hin sayaw (N). "They enjoyed the dance."
   b. Nagpatakas aku (A) hin kaqun (N). "I enjoyed the food."
Sometimes there are distinct meanings depending on the presence or absence of the prefix. Viz.,

(26) a. Naglanat kami (A) ha ira (N). "We followed them."
    b. Nagpalanat kami (A). "We raced each other."
    c. Ginpalanat ku (C) hira (A).
       "I asked them to race."
       "I asked them to follow someone."

A few stems lend themselves to different translations in English depending on the presence or absence of /pa-/ but appear to be simply syntactic causatives in Waray (when with /pa-/) without a change in the basic sense. Viz.,

(27) a. Natapud aku (A) kan Ben (G). "I trusted Ben."
    b. Nagpatapud aku (C) nga dadadqun ku an libru (N).
       "I assured someone that I would bring the book."

(28) a. Nasabut aku (A) nga pinmasal hiya (N).
       "I know that he passed."
    b. Nagpasabut aku (C) ha iya (A) han igbabatun(N).
       "I notified him of the answer."

Multiple Causatives

As in English, the syntactic causative construction in Waray can be recursive, allowing more than one causative actant in a single sentence.

    b. Ginpalakat ni Nonoy (C) an kabayuq (A).
       "Nonoy walked the horse." (Lit. had the horse walk)
    c. Nagpalakat an tagqiya (C₁) kan Nonoy (C₂) han kabayuq (A).
       "The owner had Nonoy have the horse walk."
    d. Ginpalakat han tagqiya (C₁) hi Nonoy (C₂) han kabayuq (A).
b. Ginpabalay hin saqup (C) hi Ric (A).
   "A tenant had Rick build a house."
c. Nagbalay hi Tatay (C) ha saqup (C) kan Ric (A).
   "Father had the tenant have Rick build a house."
d. *Ginpabalay ni Tatay (C) an saqup (C) kan Ric (A).
e. Ginpabalay ni Tatay (C) ha saqup (C) hi Ric (A).
   "Father had the tenant have Rick build a house."

Although either one of the causative actants may be topicalized, whichever one is topicalized is considered the logically primary causative.

Cf. (29 c,d) and (30 c,d). Just as in the single causative construction, the logically primary CAUS actant invariably functions as ACTOR. Thus, its non-topic ART's are /hit/, /hin/, /han/, or /ni/. A secondary CAUS actant is marked by /ha/ or /kan/.

An upper limit of two CAUS actants per sentence apparently holds. That is, informants generally reject sentences with more than two CAUS actants. The English equivalent is not particularly felicitious either. Viz.,

(31) John had Mary have Bill have the man walk the horse.

It seems most likely that the limitation is a performance constraint due to memory limitations and the desire to avoid confusion in semantic interpretation.

Causatives and the Preposing Transformations

Causative actants may undergo the fronting transformations (e.g., SECONDARY TOPICALIZATION, LEFT DISLOCATION, etc.) and in many sentences
fronting of the causative is practically obligatory (possibly a stylistic surface structure condition). An example follows.

(32) a. *Nagpabalay hin madigqun (F) ha mga tawu (A) an bagyu (C).
    "Storms make people build strong houses."

    b. An bagyu (C) an nagpabalay ha mga tawu (A) hin madigqun (F). Ditto.

Deletable Causatives

When the CAUS actant is [+N, +PRO, +TOPIC] it is deletable. Viz.,

(33) Nakapabaraka ha akun (A) han imu pagluksu (REL).
    "I was caused (by something) to worry about your jump."

The absent topic is understood to be in the causative relationship.

2.8.2. DEEP STRUCTURE SOURCES FOR CAUSATIVES

The causative construction can be analyzed in two quite different ways. In one analysis it is represented directly in the deep structure as a case on the head V. In the other, it results from an AGT case in a higher sentence.

Causative Case Analysis

The first causative analysis requires the addition of a new case called CAUS (C). CAUS refers to the object or being responsible for initiating the action or state expressed by the verb. The deep structure of (34) under the case analysis is (35).

(34) Nagqarag kan Pedro (A) hin papil (N) ha tindiru (S)
    para kan Maria (REPL) hi Nanay (C).
    "Mother had Peter ask the salesman for some paper for Mary."
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The situational assignment rules make the CAUS actant the ACTOR, the AGT becomes OBJ, NEUT is made OBJ, SO becomes REF, and REPL is labelled ASSOC. The result is the following tree.

The assignment of the cases to various situational functions is essential for verbal affixation as the topicalization varies. The ACTOR situation affects the choice of ART's. Note that the non-ACT actants such as AGT in (37) may be marked by any semantically correct ART to which [-ACT] is not distinctive.

(37) Nagpabalay hin magigqun (F) ha/han/hin mga tawu (A) an bagyu (C).
    a. ha--"Storms make men build strong houses."
    b. han--"The storm made the men build strong houses."
    c. hin--"The storm made some men build strong houses."

Causative Verb Analysis

A second analysis considers the CAUS actant as AGT of a matrix sentence which has a CAUS pro-verb with its NEUT actant being a sentence. Under this analysis the sentence in (38) has the deep
structure of (39). (It is assumed that the "Case Spread" convention has already applied. Cf. Chap. 2 (2.1.).)

(38) Nagpaqaruq xan Pedro (A) hin papil (N) ha tindiru (S) hi Nanay (C).
    "Mother had Peter ask the salesman for some paper."

(39)

\[ S_1 \]
- MOD
- PROP
  - PAST
  - V
    - AC [+N]
    - [+]A

\[ S_2 \]
- MOD
- PROP
  - PAST
  - V
    - AC [+N]
    - AC [+S]
    - AC [+A]
  - [+]V
  - +CAUS
    - aruq
    - papil
    - tindiru
    - Pedro
    - Nanay

This analysis claims that the causer, /Nanay/, is an AGT (the performer of the action "causing"), that she causes a whole proposition, and that /Pedro/ is the AGT of the action /qaruq/ "ask for". Among the transformations required to convert this P-marker to a surface P-marker are the following.

First, the situational assignment transformation applies to \( S_2 \) and labels all its actants appropriately. Then topic assignment applies to \( S_2 \) (in this example vacuously since in the CAUS transformation topic assignment of \( S_1 \) will overrule the assignment in \( S_2 \)). It might be argued that topic assignment follows the CAUS T but that opens a bag of ordering problems avoided by having topic assignment precede all cyclic transformations. Finally, the "case-function registration" convention copies into the verb the fact that there is an AGT type
ACTOR functioning as topic. The resultant tree follows.

Moving up then to $S_1$, situation assignment makes the AGT ACTOR and the NEUT case OBJ. Then topic assignment applies again making the ACT of $S_1$ topic. If Case-Function Registration operates, it is vacuous in the case of a CAUS pro-verb since the CAUS T ignores it. The result of these operations on $S_1$ is the following tree.
The CAUS transformation operates next combining \( S_1 \) and \( S_2 \). The CAUS pro-verb is incorporated into the V of \( S_2 \) as the prefix /pa-/.

The case-function feature of the non-causative V is retained. The AGT of \( S_1 \) maintains its position as ACT and TOPIC while the AGT of \( S_2 \) is revised to GOAL and loses its topic position. (If NEUT of \( S_1 \) had been chosen as topic, then the topicalized actant in \( S_2 \) would have been retained as topic. The situational relabelling occurs independently, however, so the CAUS AGT is always ACT while the ACT of the non-causative V becomes OBJ.) (42) results from the CAUS T operating on (41).

\[
\text{(42)}
\]
Multiple causatives are provided for quite simply by stacking higher S's with CAUS pro-verbs. The normal restrictions on higher S orderings must be handled as well as restricting topicalization in some way to the highest and lowest PROP's in a multiple causative construction since intermediate AGT's may not end up as the topicalized actant.

The Causative Case Analysis vs. the Causative Verb Analysis

The decision between a CAUS case and a CAUS verb source for the causative construction is not a simple one. There is evidence both for and against both positions.

First, the causer need not be animate and thus doesn't fit the general nature of the AGT case. This suggests that AGT will not suffice as the deep structure case behind the surface causative. The argument is shaky, however, since we have contended above that AGT is not obligatorily animate. These inanimate causatives are idiosyncratic, however, since they can not be put through the topic paradigm. The causer must always remain in topic relation.

Second, there are apparently languages in which the causative actant makes grammatical PROP's which would not be well-formed in its absence. Robert Terry (personal communication) has advised me of this situation existing in Hausa, where some inanimates are used as actors when accompanied by a causer but not without. I have not found such a situation in Waray.

Third, other languages (such as English) use causative verbs to express what Waray handles by verbal affixation. Viz.,

(43) John had Bill light the burner.
If one had to choose a single means of introducing causative constructions, it would appear that the metatheory with causative pro-verbs would be best suited for handling both English and Waray. The English structures would require some radical rules if derived from a CAUS case in the metatheory, but if a causative verb analysis is assumed Waray requires only a pro-verb where English has surface lexical items. The provision of two sources of causatives in a metatheory seems quite natural, however, so neither analysis can be argued for on a metatheoretical level. Note the parallel situation with the INST case and instrumental verbs.

Fourth, multiple causatives in a single S can be provided naturally within the pro-V source, since it has no structural limitation on the number of higher S's which can be present. Cases on the other hand have generally been considered to be limited to one per S. The pro-V source has the inherent drawback of course of requiring some restriction on the number of causative pro-verbs it permits. Perhaps its restriction lies in a theory of performance.

Fifth, all three major conjugation affix sets (i.e., /-um-, mag-, and ma-/ ) may be employed with causatives as topic. This means that the general prediction of /mag-/ vs. /-um-, ma-/ would not rest solely on what actant is employed as ACTOR, since when C is present the actant employed as OBJ would have to be scrutinized to tell what ACT affix could be used.

(44) Nagpakadtu hiya (C-ACT) kan Juan (A-OBJ) ha Tacloban (L). "He had John go to Tacloban."
/mag-/ used based on fact that /Juan/ is A.

(45) Napabungul ha akun (G-OBJ) it nga imu guliqat (C-ACT). "Your shouting made me deaf."
/ma-/ used based on fact that /akun/ is G.

Tending toward the complex S source of the causative, let us hasten to recall that we argued against a causative pro-verb as underlying AGT. If such a position were taken the pro-V causative analysis would be considerably more complex (having another level of higher S's). Note that Fillmore (1967, p.37-8) opted for a complex S source of causatives also.
2.9 Concessive (CON)

A sentence having a CON case expresses an action or state which is contrary to expectations (of the speaker, the hearer, or society). The CON case indicates the reason why one would expect the action identified by the verb not to be carried out or the state identified by the verb not to exist (even though the sentence asserts that it does).

There are several different syntactic constructions which indicate CONCESSION. They are all alike in that they have sentential internal structures. They are different in the introductory linkers used. The most common linker is /bisan/. Other possible linkers are /bisan kun/ and /ngaran/. The appropriate English translations include "although", "even though", "even if", "in spite of the fact that", etc. "In spite of" and "despite" are semantically appropriate as well but syntactically different in that they require non-sentential structures following them.

CON clauses introduced by /bisan/ are declarative in type and utilize the INDIC set of affixes when verbal. There are obviously tense restrictions between the CON and the main clause but these have not been worked out here. The CON clause may appear either before or after the verb.

1. Kimmadtu kami (A) ha Tacloban (G) bisan nagqiqinuran (CON). "We went to Tacloban even though (it was) raining."

2. Pinalit hiya (A) hin Toyota (N) bisan mahal an iya prisyu (CON). "He bought a Toyota even though the price was high."

3. Iliputayan han mga babayi (A) an ira mga saya (N) bisan dirig naruruyag an ira mga kagqanak (CON). "The girls shortened their skirts even though their parents disapproved."
(4) Hininhayhinay hiya (A) an pagtrabahu **bisan** nahibaru nga masisina an iya agarun (CON).
"She was slow in working even though she knew that her boss was getting angry."

(5) **Bisan** trinta anyus na hiya (CON), nagawi la gihap hiya (A) parihu hin bataq (MANN).
"Even though he is 30 years old, he still acts like a child."

(6) **Bisan** waray suraq (CON), nakaqun hiya (A) hin maqupay. (MANN).
"Although there is no viand, he eats well."

(7) **Bisan** hiya nahuhubya (CON), nagsilhig hiya (A) han salug (N).
"Although she is lazy, she swept the floor."

(8) **Bisan** hiya nagsasakraisyu hin duru (CON), diriq hiya (A) nabulag ha iya asawa (N).
"Even though she suffered greatly, she did not leave her husband."

When /kun/ is used in connection with /bisan/, the basic affix may be used in addition to the INDIC aspect markers in the CON clause. Cf. 9. When the basic affix is used, the aspectual significance is contributed by the context.

(9) Hinuram hiya (A) hin kwarta (N) ha akun (S), **bisan** kun diriq kami magsangkay (CON).
"He borrowed some money from me even though we are not friends."

(10) Diriq pa hiya (A) nakakatukar han pyisa (N), **bisan kun** naggagaram hiya kada adlaw. (CON).
"She can not play the piece even though she practices every day."

(11) **Bisan kun** tagdaramu hiya kumaquin (CON), diriq hiya matambuk.
"Although she eats a lot, she is not fat."

(12) **Bisan pa kun** nagtatrabuhu hiya hit bugqus nga adlaw (CON), pubri la gihapun hiya.
Even though he works the whole day, he is still poor."

A third linker used in CON constructions is /ngaran/. Like the others either an equational or verbal declarative sentence may follow it.
Some examples follow:

(13) Nakqaqun hiya hin karubasa ngaran diriq hiya naruyag. "He eats squash even though he doesn't like it."

(14) Hi Simon nahapakulub ha kahun ngaran nakasabut hiya nga adaq didaq. "Simon tripped on the box even though he knew it was there.

(15) Ngaran an abugadu hiya duha ka tuwig, diriq pa hiya siguradu ha iya lawas. "Although he was a lawyer for 2 years, he was unsure of himself."

(16) Ngaran hiya dimaku hiya ha hurun, nahadluk hiya hin halas. "Although he grew up on a farm, he is terrified of snakes."

(17) Iginhatag niya (A) in "5 points preventive measures" (N) ngaran waray hini maski usa nga masakit didaq ha Tacloban (CON). "He gave the "5 points preventive measures" even though there was not even one who was sick in Tacloban."

Antithetical-Concessive Relationships

As Thompson (1969, p. 71ff) has pointed out for English, some uses of antithetical and concessive clauses in Waray appear to be inverses of each other. Viz.,

(18) a. Diriq hiya nakaqabut hit bumbilya, bisan hiya hitaqs nga duru. "He could not reach the lightbulb, even though he was very tall."

b. Hitaqs hiya nga duru, piru diriq hiya nakaqabut hit bumbilya. "He was very tall, but he could not reach the lightbulb."

And also parallel to English, only the concessive (bisan) clause may be preposed. Viz.,

(19) a. Bisan hiya hitaqs nga duru, diriq hiya makaqabut hit bumbilya. "Even though he was very tall, he could not reach the lightbulb."
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b. *Piru diriq hiya nakaqabut hit bumbilya, hitaqas hiya nga duru.
"But he could not reach the lightbulb, he was very tall."

The concessive clause may be placed after a preposed actant if the actant is "heavy" enough. A full NP is acceptable, while a pronoun is not. Viz.,

(20) An tawu nga ginbisita nimu kakulup, _bisan_ waray hiya mangumpisal (CON), nagkumyunyan.
"The man you visited yesterday, even though he had not confessed, took communion."

(21) *Diriq hiya, _bisan_ hiya hitaqas nga duru (CON), nakaqabut hit bumbilya.
"He, even though he was very tall, could not reach the lightbulb."
2.10 **Conditional (COND)**

An actant bearing the COND relationship indicates that condition on which the activity or state identified by the verb in the main clause would be, is, or will be carried out. The COND clause is invariably sentential and anaphoric possibilities are similar to those in English. Several different linkers may be used with the COND clauses, among them /basta/, /kun/, /nganiq/, and archaically /abi/. No COND clauses may undergo topicalization. There are two primary kinds of COND clauses, those which present a simple condition to a still live option, and those which are contrary-to-fact with the option the condition allowed now dead as a result. There are both syntactic and semantic differences which will be brought out as each is considered.

**SIMPLE CONDITIONALS**

The factual COND allows the condition either to be met or not. If it is met then the main clause follows.

/Kun/ introduces both affirmative and negative simple COND's.

Looking first at the affirmative sentences note the variety of affixes that can occur: BASIC as well as INDIC. The aspect sequences have yet to be worked out.

BAS: (1) *Kun magyakan hi Jaime (COND) kuruta!*  
"If Jim speaks, pinch him!"

BAS: (2) *Tatagan ku (A) ikaw (G) masingku pisus (N) kun hiya magdaqug han iliksyunis (COND).*  
"I will give you 5 pesos if he won the election."

FUT: (3) *Kun hiya magsusurat han una nga parti han libru (COND), mababaligyaq hin damu (N).*  
"If he will write the first part of the book, many (books) will sell."
PRES: (4) Kargaha hiya (N), kun hiya nalingkud ha lusek (COND). "Pick him up, if he is sitting in the mud."

PAST: (5) Kun hiya nakabuqung hin butang (COND), makåkuha hiya (A) han lamba (N). "If he broke something, he will get a spanking."

Turning next to the negative clauses, we note that either of the two negatives, /diriq/ or /waray/, may be used. /Diriq/ is used when the aspect of the main verb is non-FIN and /waray/ is used when the aspect is FIN. And independently of conditionality, the verb affixes associated with /waray/ are QIND.

(6) Malakat aku (A) kun diriq ka makaqun hin maqpay (COND). "I will leave if you don’t eat well."

(7) Kun diriq nimu ihahatag itu nga bula (COND), magtutuquk lugud aku (A). "If you don’t give me that ball, I will cry."

(8) Kun waray pa hiya kaqun (COND), pwidi hiya (A) kumaqun ha amun (G). "If he hasn’t eaten yet, he can eat with us."

(9) Kun waray pa hiya magparihistu (COND), diriq hiya (A) makabutu. "If he didn’t register yet, he won’t be able to vote."

/Basta/ may also be used to link simple COND clauses. E.g.,

(10) Basta magtququn ka la hin duru (COND), maggragradwuit ka (A) hin pagkakum lawdi (OFF). "If you study hard, you will graduate ‘cum laude’."

(11) Basta mangaruq ka;hin pasayluq (COND), siguradu nga papasayluqun ka (N) niya (A). "If you apologize, he will surely forgive you."

Note that the BASIC set of affixes appear on the verb in the COND actant. /Nganiq/ is a third marker of the COND relationship. It is a postpositive, following the first "word" of its clause.

(12) Lumabay nganiq hi Jaime (COND), tawaga. "If Jim goes by, call him."
(13) Naruyag ka nganiq hin bulig (COND), sidnga la it padi (g). "If you need help, just ask the priest."
The pronoun /ka/ being an enclitic, it does not count as a "word" so /nganiq/ follows it as well as the verb.

Although /basta/ and /kun/ may individually mark both COND and TIME actants, when they are used together with /nganiq/ they unambiguously mark a COND. Since /basta/ counts as a "word", /nganiq/ follows it immediately. /Kun/ does not have "word" status so /nganiq/ follows the first "word" after /kun/.

(14) a. Basta nganiq makanhi hiya (COND), tatagan niya (A) aku (G) hin kwarta (N).
"If he comes, he will give me money."

b. Kun makanhi nganiq hiya (COND), tatagan niya (A) aku (G) hin kwarta (N). Ditto.

(15) a. Padadqi aku (G) hin tiligrama (N) basta nganiq ka (A) diriq makaquiliq hit sunud nga bulan (T).
"Send me a telegram if you won't be able to return next month."

b. Padadqi aku (G) hin tiligrama (N) kun diriq ka (A) nganiq makaquiliq hit sunud nga bulan (COND). Ditto.

(16) a. Ipapakuha namun (A) ikaw (G) basta nganiq diriq maqupay it kamutangan ni Nangay (COND).
"We will send for you if it looks like Mother is getting worse." (lit. if Mother's appearance is not good.)

b. Ipapakuha namun (A) ikaw (G) kun diriq nganiq maqupay it kamutangan ni Nangay (COND). Ditto.

CONTRARY-TO-FACT CONDITIONALS

The contrary-to-fact COND asserts that the COND was not met but gives the option which would have followed had the COND been met. The time of the COND clause must invariably be PAST although the INDIC affixes used may be either past (FIN) or pres (non-FIN). The action of the main verb must be non-BEG in any case. Only the INDIC affixes
may be used. /Untaq/ is used in the following affirmative examples
to make it unambiguous that the conditional is of the contrary-to-fact
type. Of the several linkers, only /kun/ and /basta nganiq/ may occur.

(17) Basta nganiq hiya nagdaqug han iliksyunis (COND), untaq
matatagan kun (A) ikaw (G) hin singku pisus (W).
"If he had won the election, I would have given you ¥5."

(18) Kun nagtuqun la hiya hin maqupay (COND), untaq
maggagradwit hiya (A) para kum laudi (OFF).
"If he had studied harder, he would have graduated 'cum laude'."

The negative contrary-to-fact COND's use only /waray/ as negative.

(19) Pinatay na siguruh hi Juan (A) kun waray pa hiya
naggisul (COND).
"John would surely have been killed if he had not moved."

(20) Kun waray ka kanhi han alas dus. (COND), malakat na
untaq aku (A).
"If you had not come by 2 o'clock, I would have gone."

(21) Kun minimurya nimu an imu mga linya (COND), maqupay
untaq an pagpaggawa han drama (W).
"If you would have memorized your lines, the play would
have gone better."

CONDITIONALS AND DOMINANCE RELATIONS

Since all COND's are sentential, it is possible to have a variety
of cases dominated by a COND relationship. Viz.,

CAUS (22) a. Kun kumanhi ka tungud kay sangkay ka niya (CL) (COND),
pvidi ka umistær.
"If you came because you are his friend, you can
stay here."

PURP b. Kum imu ginsiring itu para magqisturbu ha akun (PURP)
(COND), nagdaqug ka.
"If you said that to disturb me, you succeeded."

COND c. Kun nagdisidar hiya nga umukuy kun umuran (COND)
(COND), pagbasahe hiya (A) hini nga libru (W).
"If he decides to stay if it rains, have him read
this book."

COND's may also be dominated by a variety of relationships which can be
sentential. Viz.,

CAUS (23) a. *Tungud kay hi Jose diriq malakat kun aku diriq malakat (COND), malakat na laq aku (A).
"Because Joe will not leave if I don't, I am going now."

CONC b. *Bisan naruyag hiya na aku diriq lumakat kun pwidi (COND) (CONC), malakat aku (A).
"Even though he wants me to stay if I can, I'm going to leave."

COND's may appear apparently syntactically unrestricted in the same 
PROP with any other case relation. And unlike English, there do not 
seem to be similar preferred orderings among the cases which follow 
the verb. Just as there is relative freedom of ordering of the nuclear 
cases, so too the peripheral cases are free. Some examples follow.

(24) a. *Tungud kay ikaw sangkay niya (CL), pwidi ka umistar kun naruyag ka (COND).
"Because you are his friend, you may stay if you wish."

b. *Pwidi ka umistar kun naruyag ka (COND) tungud kay ikaw sangkay niya (CL).
"You may stay if you wish because you are his friend."

c. *Pwidi ka umistar tungud kay ikaw sangkay niya (CL) kun naruyag ka (COND).
"?You may stay because you are his friend if you wish."

Each of the three dominance relations illustrated in (22)-(24) is 
handled quite easily by assuming just one COND relationship under each 
PROP. The structures underlying the three types are only two. (25a) 
provides for the examples in both (22) and (24). (25b) underlies the 
examples in (23).
There are instances of apparent multiple use of COND's within a single PROP, however, which would not be accounted for within this framework.

(26) Malakat aku (A) hin alas singku (T), kun pwidi (COND), kun diriq ka masina (COND).
"I'll leave at 5 o'clock if I can if you won't be offended."

These may possibly be results of optional deletion of a co-ordinate conjunction. The paraphrase relationships hold and the sentence with the overt conjunction is fine. Another alternative is possible in Waray since /kun/ can be interpreted as linking a TM phrase. The latter interpretation is natural for a sentence like the following.

(27) Diriq aku (A) makakakaturug kun maraqt an nutisya (COND) kun tumawag an akun asawa (TM).
"I won't be able to sleep if the news is bad when my wife calls."

We shall assume that true cases of multiple COND's are derived from a conjoined source of both co-ordinate and sequential nature with optional deletion of the conjunction.
2.11 **Corresondive** (COR)

There are two CORRESPONDIVE markers: /sugad/ and /alagad/, the latter being less used by the younger speakers. They both occur with NP's only and although semantic and syntactic differences are expected none have been found as yet. The COR actant indicates the inanimate source of information or authority upon which the activity or state indicated by the remainder of the PROP is predicated. With either linker the COR actant may either precede or follow the main clause. In the examples which follow, /sugad/ and /alagad/ are freely interchangeable.

1. **Alagad** han siring han babayi nga kungriswuman (COR), itu nga "carp fingerlings" (N) mananagdag dayun (T).
   "According to the report of the Congresswoman, those carp fingerlings will quickly grow big."

2. **Sugad** han yakan ni Marcos (COR), magkakaqadaq kita (G) difirinsyal (N) yanaq (T).
   "According to what Marcos says, we'll be given our differential now."

3. **Alagad** han kustumbri (COR), nagkaqadaq hira (A) hin daku nga kasal (N) ha simbahan (L).
   "According to custom, they had a large wedding in a church."

4. An Sweet Grace (ESS) an gimaququpayi nga sarakyan (N) yanaq (T), sugad han advirtismint han radyu (COR).
   "The best means of transportation now is the Sweet Grace, according to the advertisement on the radio."

5. Nagtanum hiya (A) hin balatun (N) inbis han humay (SUB), sugad han siring han iya agarun (COR).
   "He planted beans instead of rice in accordance with the instructions of his landowner."

6. Nagsulutqut hiya (A) hin busag nga badu (N) alagad han sirimunya (COR).
   "She wore a white dress according to the ritual."

COR is clearly a peripheral relationship since it does not topicalize, is unrestricted in regard to left dislocation, and does not have
any co-occurrence restrictions with the verb.
2.12 End (END)

The END relationship characterizes an actant which expresses the time at which the action or state identified by the verb terminates. The END actant may be either sentential or non-sentential. The PREP's /tubtub/ and /hasta/ may be used to introduce both types of actants. Thus with the PREP present it is possible to have a non-sentential actant with the internal structure as follows: PREP deictic ART NOM. When the relationship of the actant is predictable from features other than the PREP, the PREP may be omitted. The deictic is invariably retained and is generally either /ngadaq/ or /ngadtu/. Thus, non-sentential actants may also have the structure: Deictic ART NOM.

We now consider the PREP forms first and the non-PREP forms follow.

When /tubtub/ introduces non-sentential constructions, any sort of NP is possible, i.e., it may have a deictic, it may have any of the non-NAMe ART's, it may contain a demonstrative, etc.

1. Nakachi hiya (A) tubtub han alas tris (END).
   "He was here until 3 o'clock."

2. Nagginhawa hiya (A) tubtub ha may tiqurudtu (END).
   "He breathed until about noon."

3. Tubtub ngadaq han akun pagqabut (END), maghuhuluhiya (A).
   "Until my arrival, she will wait."

4. Tubtub ngadtu/didtu (END), magmantinir kita (A) hin napulu ka gantas nga bugas (N).
   "Until then, we must get along with ten gantas of rice."

When a sentential construction is introduced by /tubtub/, it may be either equational or verbal and the INDIC affixes are used in the latter case.
(5) Dimmalagan hiya (A) tubtub nakaqabut hiya ha plasa (END).  
"He ran until he reached the plaza."

(6) Tubtub sidgunu aku ni Simon (END), diriq aku (A) matuqd hitun (N).  
"Until Simon tells me himself, I will not believe it."

The Spanish loan /hasta/ also introduces NP's of every shape and kind.

(7) Nagqaradu hiya (A) hasta pagaqabut han iya asawa (END).  
"He plowed until his wife's arrival."

(8) Hasta han iya panganak (END), naglaqum hiya (A) hin karuha (N).  
"Until her delivery, she expected to have twins."

(9) Hasta ngadtu han akun panganak hin lalaki (END), waray aku (A) makaqintyindi kun anu an imu karuyag (N).  
"Until the birth of my son, I never really understood what you meant."

(10) Nagqaradu hiya (A) hasta ngaduq han pagaqabqi (END).  
"He plowed until evening."

(11) Magqaqaradu hiya (A) hasta ngaduq hit pagaqabut hit iya asawa (END.)  
"He will plow until his wife's arrival."

(12) Magqaqaradu hiya (A) hasta ngaduq maqabut it iya asawa (END).  
"He will plow until (the time for) his wife to arrive."

/Hasta/ also introduces sentential END's, of both equational and verbal structures. Viz.,

(13) Nagkulur hiya (A) han libru (N) hasta naqubus an crayula (END.)  
"He colored the book until the crayon was gone."

(14) Hasta aku nagkadu ha States (END), waray aku (A) idiya (N) kun anu an kadaku hit States.  
"Until I went to the States, I had no idea how big it was."

When /hasta/ is followed by the linker /nga/, the END actant can only be sentential. Viz.,
(16) Nagqaradu hiya (A) hasta nga namatay an iya karabaw (END).
"He plowed until his carabao died."

(17) Hasta nga hiya inmiwas dinhi nga balay (END), natuqud hiya (A-G) ha akun mga siring (N).
"Until she moved out of this house, she believed what I said."

(18) Maggaqaradu hiya (A) hasta nga mamamatay an iya karabaw (END).
"He will plow until his carabao dies."

(19) Hasta nga hiya maqiwas dinhi nga balay (END), natuqud hiya (A-G) ha akun mga siring (N).
"Until she moves out of this house, she will believe what I say."

As a quick perusal of the preceding sentential examples will show, the END relationship is restricted (semantically) to the past and the future. Note also the co-occurrence constraints between the main verb and the verb within the END actant in regard to ASPECT. They must agree as to whether they are non-FIN or non-BEG.

The next examples illustrate the occurrence of END without a PREP. A deictic and an ART are the sole markers of the case relationship. An ART accompanying the deictic agrees in ASPECT with the verb. (cf. Section II, Chapter 2 (5.2) for comments on FIN and articles.) Thus, when END refers to a time in the past, the ART must be /han/. When END refers to a time in the future, the ART is /hin/ or /hit/.

(20) Pinmalit hiya (A) hin mangga (N) ngadaq han kaqubus han iya kwarta (END).
"He bought mangoes until his money was gone."
(lit. ...until the end of his money.)

(21) Mapalit hiya (A) hin mangga (N) ngadaq hit kaqubus han iya kwarta (END).
"He will buy mangoes until his money is gone."

(22) Nagmumulay hiya (A) ngadtu hin pagkaqulqul (END).
"He will play until tired."
(23) Ngadaq hin pagqabut han surat (END), maghuhulat kami (A).
"Until the arrival of the letter, we will just wait."

Significantly, none of the END actants (even the non-sentential ones)
may be topicalized. As we have illustrated, however, left dislocation
is permissible.

As with BEG, END may occur with an expanded TIME NOM having /antis/,
/ugsa/, or /katima/ as head noun. These constructions are expressed
in English by "until before" and "until after". Viz.,

(24) a. Nagpapadalangan hiya (A) han dyip (N) hasta ugsa
magqaksidinti (END).
"He was driving the jeep until just before the
accident."

b. Waray hiya (A) mahanumdum han iya asawa (N) tubtub
antis han aksidinti (END).
"He couldn't remember his wife until long after
the accident."

The same problem of internal structure is present as with the BEG case
(2.5).

The simultaneous occurrence of BEG and END with a single PROP
parallels SO and GOAL. Viz.,

(25) Nagmuley kami (A) hin buling (N) tikang ha alas
syiti (BEG) tubtub han alas dusi (END).
"We bowled from 7 o'clock to 12 o'clock."

(26) Kimmaturg hiya (A) tikang han alas dusi (BEG) ngadaq ha
alas kwatrul (END).
"He slept from 2 until 4."
2.13 **Essive (ESS)**

In some analyses of Philippine languages (Bowen (1965), Wolff (1967)) equational sentences have been considered quite parallel to verbal sentences. A predicate-topic relationship was present in both. Thus a predicate could be either a verb together with non-topic actants, an adjective with non-topic actants, a noun phrase, or a prepositional phrase. When the predicate involved an adjective, a noun phrase, or a prep phrase, the sentence was considered "equational". Examples of these types follow. The topic is underlined and the remainder is predicate.

(1) Iniqinum (V) **it kapi** (N) hit mga bataq (A).
"Children drink coffee."

(2) Matamqis (ADJ) **it birdi nga mangga.**
"Green mangoes are sweet."

(3) Mga utanun (NP) **it ripulyu nga pitsay.**
"Cabbage and pétsey are vegetables."

The UCLA Air Force English Syntax Project (1966-8) developed several options for handling these three types of sentences in English within a Case Grammar framework. We review here those options applying them to our particular formulation of rules. Arguments having to do with English are given first. The problems arising in Waray will be considered for a subset of the possibilities. The analyses will progress from the simplest to the complex.

The first analysis, proposed in an effort to maximize the X-bar convention\(^\S\) parallelism, has V, A, and N as "predicates". Viz.,
The X-bar convention was proposed by Chomsky (1970, p. 210f) to capture parallelism in structures dominated by NP and S. The parallelism he proposed is shown below. Cf. comments in a similar structure in Section I (3.0)

(a) \[ S \prec N \prec V \]
\[ [\text{Spec, } \bar{V}] \prec V \]
John PAST prove the theorem

(b) \[ \text{NP=}\bar{N} \]
\[ [\text{Spec, } \bar{N}] \prec \bar{N} \]
John's prove the theorem

Stockwell et al. (1968) adopted the notion and argued that Fillmore's CG deep structure was more suitable for representing the parallelism. Viz.,

(c) \[ S = \bar{V} \]
\[ \text{MOD = Spec } \prec \text{PROP = } \bar{V} \]
PAST prove John the theorem

(d) \[ \text{NP = } \bar{N} \]
\[ \text{D = Spec } \prec \text{NOM = } \bar{N} \]
prove John the theorem

(h)
\[ S \]
\[ \text{MOD} \]
\[ \{ \text{V} \} \]
\[ \{ \text{A} \} \]
\[ \text{PROP} \]
\[ \bar{N} \]
\[ \text{AC}^n \]

There are numerous difficulties with this proposal. First, there is no source for sentences like the following which have verbs such as "look", "taste", "sound", and "feel".
(5) a. John looks healthy.
   b. Mary feels tired today.

Second, there is no source for DET's and actants and RREL's on the predicate nominals. E.g.,

(6) a. Sam is the man.
   b. Los Angeles is a city in southern California.
   c. Harry is the one who promised to eat the raw egg.

Third, the X-bar convention does not ring true since AUX becomes the SPEC of NP, AP, and VP.

A second analysis finds NOM$ in place of N. Viz.,

$NOM is used in Stockwell et al. (1968) as a node intermediate in dominance between NP and N. Various arguments in its favor are given. The immediate benefits of NOM here are the ability to include ADJ's, RREL's, and actants having a head N under the item in the predicate slot.

(7)

```
S
  MOD
PROP
  {V
    A
    NOM
  AC^n
```

It is better than the first only in that it provides a source for actants and RREL's on the predicate nominal.

A third analysis reflects the decision by Bowen and Wolff and others to have V, A, and NP parallel.
This proposal has the following factors in its favor. First, it provides for both DET's and post-modifiers on the noun. Second, it allows verbs, adjectives, and NP's to take identical case relationships which have identical transformational potentials. Some examples follow.

(9) a. This problem is familiar to me.
    b. I am familiar with this problem.

(10) a. Water filled the pool.
    b. The pool filled with water.

(11) a. John is the owner of the house.
    b. John owns the house.

Third, insertion of BE is accomplished identically for adjectives and noun phrases, i.e., by transformation.

But the analysis has definite drawbacks as well. Most significant is the fact that there is no provision for predicates which are nominal but have the structure of prep phrases. E.g.,

(12) a. The book is on the table.
    b. The candy is for Linda.

The fourth analysis remedies the defect just mentioned by permitting the predicate to be any of V, A, NP, or PP. Viz.,
Some arguments against the proposal still remain however. First, it too lacks a source for sentences having "look", etc. preceding an ADJ. Second, any possibility of maintaining the parallelism of an X-bar convention is completely lost. But most important, there is no provision for the case relationships which the predicate nominals have. In the following examples the underlined actants represent the cases unaccounted for in this proposal.

(14) a. Karpintiru (N) an iya tatay.
   "His father is a carpenter."

b. Liwan han nawaraq nga singasing (SUB) ini.
   "This is in place of the lost ring."

c. Tikang ha Pransya (S) ini nga binu.
   "This wine is from France."

d. Para han irpurt (PURP) an impurtanti nga aragway.
   "The main battle was for the airport."

e. Aadaq katima hit alas unsi (T) an gimaqupayi nga uras pagharana.
   "The best time to serenade is after 11 o'clock."

f. Para kan Nonoy (RESV) an payung.
   "The umbrella is for Nonoy."

g. Adaq hitu nga arina (L) it mga ulud.
   "Insects are in the flour."

h. Para kan Kokoy (PREF) hi Mrs. Cinco.
   "Mrs. Cinco is for Kokoy."

Attempting to retain this proposal in the face of the third defect just
mentioned, one might suggest that the case remaining in the predicate position is the residue after deletion of its head noun. Thus, (15a) comes from (15b) by deletion across the copula.

(15) a. The book is for Mary (RESV).
     b. The book is a book for Mary (RESV).

This "solution" is quite limited since many predicate actants do not occur felicitously with a head noun. Viz.,

(16) a. *Mrs. Cinco is a Mrs. Cinco for Kokoy.
     b. *Insects are insects in the flour.
     c. *His father is a father a carpenter.

The fifth analysis then allows for these predicate cases by having the allowable predicate cases parallel to the V and A. Viz.,

(17) \[
S \\
  \text{MOD} \\
  \text{PROP} \\
  \{ \text{V} \}
\]

The difficulties with "look", etc., and the X-bar convention still remain. And a new major difficulty arises. Namely, how can one block the unacceptable co-occurrence possibilities of the predicate cases and the cases following them?

The next batch of analyses are radically different in that deep structures proposed are not parallel to the surface structures. I.e., various types of transformations are required.

The sixth analysis is similar to the "patch up" of the fourth
in that the cases in the predicate originate as cases on head nouns. This analysis differs in that the head noun is moved into the "subject" position instead of being deleted and the verb BE is provided in the PS rules. (19) derives from (18).

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{(18)} & \\
S & \\
\text{MOD} & \text{PROP} \\
V & \text{NEUT} \\
D & \text{NOM} \\
\text{is} & \text{the} & \text{book} & \text{for} & \text{Mary}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{(19)} & \\
S & \\
\text{NP} & \text{MOD} & \text{PROP} \\
V & \text{RESV} \\
\text{the book} & \text{is} & \text{for Mary}
\end{align*} \]

The limitations mentioned in regard to the patch-up of the fourth analysis also apply here. And in addition this analysis forces a rather complex movement statement. (Higher nodes are moved leaving lower nodes behind.)

The next two analyses are similar in that they both require the introduction of an ESSIVE (ESS) case. This case approaches the NEUT case in definitional qualities but is clearly separate from NEUT since it must co-occur with it.
In the seventh analysis ESS dominates either an NP or an AP. It occurs only with an existential verb which in English takes one of the forms of BE and in Waray does not have any surface realization at all. The ESS actant becomes the surface predicate adjective or nominal. A deep structure tree follows.

(20)

The following factors are in favor of this analysis. First, the source of BE is uniform for both ADJ's and NP's, i.e., BE enters solely by lexical insertion. Second, the parallelism between predicate adjectives and predicate nominals can be carried into the lexicon for ADJ's and N's. E.g.,

(21) John is a fool — John is foolish.

Third, there is a natural source for sentences containing "taste, feel, look, turn, become", etc. with predicates.

But again there are a number of considerations against this analysis. First, ESS becomes the only case to dominate an adjective phrase (AP). Second, parallel case relationships between verbs as head and nouns or adjectives as head are only indirectly shown. Examples illustrating this follow.
(22) a. John is the owner of the house. -- John owns the house.

        b. This problem is familiar to me. -- I am familiar with this problem.

        c. Water filled the pool. -- The pool filled with water.

And third, this analysis as stated provides no source for the prep phrases which can appear in the predicate since the ESS case has generally been thought of as the predicate. If the ESS case becomes the subject (in English) by subjectivalization the problem disappears. The prep phrases in the predicate are simply the normal shapes of the cases, which haven't been moved.

In the eighth and final analysis to be considered, the analysis adopted in this description, verbs and adjectives are treated in a parallel manner. Lakoff's (1965) proposal that they are a single category is accepted and they are assumed differentiated by a lexical feature. The following base tree illustrates this position.

(23)

```
S
   MOD
   /   \
|    |
|    |
PROP

V
[s[[+V, -A] [V, +A] [+V, +EXIS]]]

AC^n
```

To account for the fact that the AGT relationship does not seem appropriate to existential sentences and to account for sentences like the following ones which seem to have two neutral actants, the ESS case is proposed especially as the ACTOR in Waray (the subject in English) of existential sentences.
(24) a. John is a drunkard.
   b. The pistol is a toy.
   c. The book is a dictionary.

Under this analysis the PROP rewrite remains the same for the equational and non-equational sentences. An existential verb is used in "predicate nominal" sentences which is realized phonologically in English as a form of BE and which has no phonological shape at all in Waray. Co-occurrence possibilities of cases in equational sentences are restricted by having the case frame features allow only the correct occurrences.

In English the normal subject placement rules can move the ESS case to subject position. In Waray ESS is topicalized and another actant is moved into the predicate position. A sample derivation follows.

(25)

(26)
(27) Ha Babatngon ba hi Juan?
The EXISTENTIAL transformation moves the LOC actant into the predicate
position and marks the ESS actant as topic. ENCLITIC PLACEMENT moves
the question marker /ba/ to follow the LOC phrase and the surface string
in (27) results.

Fronting transformations can later apply to the ESS actant providing
strings like the following.

(28) It atun iskwilahan (ESS) amu it Rizal Community School
(N).
"It is Rizal Community School that is our school."

This analysis has the advantage (in addition to those mentioned
above) of showing the parallels between verbs and adjectives in regard
to case relationships quite nicely. Viz.,

(29) a. He fears the dark.
    b. He is afraid of the dark.

It has the disadvantages of (a) providing no source for the "look ADJ"
sentences and (b) providing different sources for the surface structure
BE forms in English for adjectives and nominals (T insertion vs. lexical
insertion respectively). Considering all the factors involved however,
this final analysis is opted for as having the least serious problems.
2.14 Factive (FAC) (F)

Fillmore (1968, p. 25) suggested that a case FACTITIVE be used to capture the special relationship of cognate objects, i.e., constructions with a high selectivity between the verb and its "object". The FAC case marks "the object or being resulting from the action or state identified by the verb." I have found no instances of FAC being a "being" so perhaps the definition can be revised accordingly.

FAC apparently functions on the surface solely as OBJECT. When non-topic, its ART is one of /hin/, /han/, or /hit/. Not being animate the NAME ART's are never used. No PREP is used with FAC actants. Whenever FAC is topic, it is marked by the OBJ set of verbal affixes. Viz.,

(1) a. Namung a an abukadu (N) hin mga ulurun (nga bunga) (F). "The avocado tree bore wormy fruit."

b. An mga ulurun (F) an gimbunga han abukadu (N). Ditto.

(2) a. Nagbabalay hi Enrique (A) hin daku (F). "Henry is building a large house."

b. Ginbabalay ni Enrique (A) an daku (nga balay) (F). Ditto.

c. Daku (F) an ginbabalay ni Enrique (A). Ditto.

In the first example, the inanimacy of /abukadu/ suggests that it is NEUT. /Manga ulurun nga bunga/ accords well with the defining characteristics of the FAC case since it depicts the object resulting from the action of the verb. Following Fillmore's suggestion for English, we can say that /bunga/ "bear fruit" had the N-representative /bunga/ "fruit" associated with it in the lexicon and that its case frame includes FAC optionally. If FAC is chosen in the PS rule, the N-representative is copied into FAC.
The presence of adjectives on FAC presents no special problem for the insertion of the N-representative since relativization (and adjetivalization) will block if the N's don't match. (Alternatively one could require lexical insertion from the top down and heads of relative clauses are copied into the lower S). The following tree illustrates the deep structure necessary for the sentences in (1). (Cf. Section II, Chapter 1 for comments on the PS rewrites used in (3).)

(3)

Assuming FAC copying can be formulated, relativization occurs, then adjetivalization, and finally anaphora so that /bunga/ is deleted optionally as a N.

Other verbs, all of the /mag-/ conjugation, allowing FAC together with their N-representatives follow.
(4) a. balay "build a house": balay "house"
b. surat "write a letter": surat "letter"
c. inup "dream": inup "dream"

Several verbs allow at least two N-representatives which are apparently synonyms. /Amq/ and /ngadiq/ "pray" may take either /ampuqan/ or /pangadiqun/ "prayer". /Isturya/ and /sumat/ "tell a story" may take either /isturya/ or /surumatun/ "story".

More troublesome are verb-noun combinations such as those in (5) which operate syntactically much like FAC but have a slightly different semantic relationship.

(5) a. bakyqaq "put on sandals": bakyqaq "sandals"
b. badu "put on clothes": badu "clothes"

Note that the "clothes" are not the result of "putting on clothes". /Badu/ furthermore has a wide range of N-representatives which may occur with it—practically any item of clothing.

Verbs which incorporate an NP which is not cognate to the verb present a special problem. Two such verbs are /arut/ "cut hair" and /baklu/ "cut nails". If they are treated as having a FAC case, it is difficult to handle the non-deleted items which are purportedly part of the FAC case. That is, assuming the (6) and (7) have the cases indicated, there is the nasty problem of a source for the items labelled FAC.

(6) a. Naggarut hiya (A) han tawu (F).
    "He cut the man's hair."
b. Naggarut hiya (A) kan Pedro (F).
    "He cut Peter's hair."
(7) Nagbaklu hiya (A) han kamut ni Pedro (F).
"He cut Peter's fingernails." (lit. the nails on Peter's hands)

One might assume a genitival relationship between the overt elements and the deleted FAC head, but this would require deletion of the understood head N only if the non-Name genitives were post-posed (cf. (8)), while the NAME genitives would allow deletion only if preposed (cf. (9)).

(8) a. Naggarut hiya (A) han buhuk han tawu (F).
    b. Naggarut hiya (A) han kanan tawu buhuk (F).

(9) a. Naggarut hiya (A) han buhuk ni Pedro (F).
    b. Naggarut hiya (A) han kan Pedro buhuk (F).

Perhaps a better solution would be the assumption that these verbs do not take FAC. The obvious difficulty then is determining the case they do require. There are two points in favor of NEUT. First, NEUT does not co-occur with these actants. And second, NEUT is the case for NP's having idiosyncratic semantic relationships to the verb. The ART's are typical of NEUT since they are normally /hin/, /han/, /hit/, and /kan/ when non-topic and the OBJ verbal affix set is used when topic. Under the NEUT analysis then, the sentences of (6) and (7) would have the literal translations of (10) and (11) respectively.

(10) a. He hair-cut the man.
    b. He hair-cut Peter.

(11) He nail-cut Peter's hands.
2.15 Goal (G)

2.15.1 JUSTIFICATION OF GOAL VS LOC AND SO

It is assumed in this analysis that there are three different cases having to do with the spatial orientation of the action or state identified by the verb, i.e., LOC, SO, and GOAL. In justifying this assumption, let us first consider some facts which might be taken as apparent evidence for having a single case and then note some facts which argue for the three cases proposed.

First, the pro-forms for LOC, SO, and GOAL are identical. For the place names the /ditu/ class of deictics is used for all three.

(1) a. Tikang pa laq kami (A) dît (S).
   "We just came from there."

   b. Nakakarawat aku (G) hin surat (N) tikang N.Y. (S) ngan nakakarawat hiya (G) liwat tikang dít (S).
   "I received a letter from N.Y. and she got one from there too."

(2) a. Kinañtu kami (A) liwat ditu (G).
   "We went there too."

   b. Ginpadara ku (A) an akun prutas (N) <ha mirkádu/ha Tacloban (L)> (G) ngan ginpadara niya (A) liwat an iya (N) ditu (G).
   "I sent my fruit to market in Tacloban and she sent hers there too."

(3) a. Nañkáñy kami (A) liwat ditu (L).
   "We live there too."

   b. Naglalaba aku (A) didaq nga sapaq (L) ngan naglalaba hiya (A) liwat didaq (L).
   "I wash on the river and she washes there too."

With animate beings as the spatial orientation, the pro-forms are simple pronouns as in English and are the same for all three cases. Assuming the three case analysis one can simply observe that, since all three cases admittedly indicate the spatial orientation of the PROP, it is
not surprising that identical proforms are used.

Second, the non-topic ART's which are possible are the same for all three cases, viz., /ha/, /hin/, /han/, /hit/, and /kan/. This argument is vitiated by the fact that several other cases allow these same ART's (cf. the four benefactive cases and INST).

Third, the topicalization markers on the verb are the same for all three cases, viz., the REF affix set. Again this argument is weakened by the fact that the benefactive cases and NEUT also allow REF affixes when topicalized.

Fourth, some verbs choose between LOC, SO, and GOAL in their case frames. Thus, the three could be collapsed into one and the verb could contribute the special semantic information allowing the interpretation to be either LOC, SO, or GOAL. Viz.,

(4) a. /karawat/ "receive" takes SO
   b. /padara/ "send" takes GOAL
   c. /qukuy/ "stay, live" takes LOC

This argument is invalidated by the fact that combinations of the cases are possible with a great many verbs. Viz.,

(5) Sinakay kami (A) han 'ferryboat' (N) tikang ha Cebu (S)
    ngadtu ha Mactan (G).
    "We took a ferry from Cebu to Mactan."

(6) Nabangga kami (A) ngadtu han kahuy (G) didtu ha kurba (L).
    "We crashed into the tree at the curve."

(7) Nakarawat namun (G) an postkard (N) tikang ha balay (S)
    ha Roma (L).
    "We received a postcard from home in Rome."

(8) a. Makakadrayb ka (A) tikang ha murti (S) ngadaq ha
    sur (G) hin usa ka adlaw (T) ha Texas (L).
    "You can drive from North to South a whole day in Texas."
b. Nagpadara hiya (A) hin tawu (N) tikang ha L.A. (S) ngadaq ha N.Y. (G) didaq hin DC-8 (L).
"He sent the man from L.A. to N.Y. in a DC-8."

The following considerations are in favor of there being three separate cases. First, the deictics accompanying GOAL (not replacing GOAL as a pro-form) are mutually exclusive with those used with LOC and SO. The GOAL case employs the /ngadtu/ set and the other two cases the /ditu/ set. Cf. examples in the following three sections.

Second, the internal structure of the cases is considerably different with LOC having a much greater diversity of structure. Cf. the sections following for expansion on this point.

Third, as noted in the fourth point above, combinations of the three cases can occur in a single sentence. This argument may not be as strong as it appears since it will be shown below that several TIME actants can also appear in a single PROP.

Fourth, the PREP's which accompany the three cases are mutually exclusive. Cf. each section for those characteristic of that case.

2.15.2 GOAL WITH VERB AS HEAD

A GOAL relationship is attributed to an actant which indicates either (a) the object, being, or place toward which the action or state identified by the verb is directed, or (b) the actual recipient of the action indicated by the verb. An actant functioning as GOAL in the deep structure may function either as ACTOR, OBJECT, or REFERENT in the surface.

GOAL AS ACTOR

GOAL most frequently functions as ACT in conjunction with AGT. See section 2.2 titled AGT-GOAL for a discussion of that usage. But
GOAL also functions all alone as ACTOR. When ACT and topic, GOAL is naturally marked on the verb by the ACT set of affixes. When non-topic, the ACT set of ART's is used, i.e., /han/, /hin/, /hit/, and /ni/.

Only a single verb has been found to date.

(9) a. Kimmarawat hi Maria (G) hin surat (N) kakulup (T). "Mary received a letter yesterday."

b. Ginkarawat ni Maria (G) an surat (N) kakulup (T). Ditto.

The semantic significance of this example is that the actant labelled G is not the "performer" (or "instigator" or "responsible source") of the action (hence not an AGT) but he is the one to whom the action is directed.

GOAL AS OBJECT

There are a few verbs which appear to allow an actant functioning in the GOAL relationship to be topicalized by the OBJ set of affixes. Viz.,

(10) a. Naghadluk an kawatan (A) ha tikilyira (G) hin pusil (I).
    "The thief frightened the teller with a gun."

b. Ginhadluk han kawatan (A) an tikilyira (G) hin pusil (I). Ditto.

It is possible, however, that the actant labelled GOAL may be in the NEUT case. This would require a special provision for the /ha/ DET on the NEUT case for this particular verb.

(11) a. Naglabay hiya (A) han batu (N) ha higanti (G).
    "He threw the stone at the giant."

b. Ginlabay niya (A) han batu (N) an higanti (G). Ditto.

c. Ginlabay niya (A) an batu (N) ha higanti (G). Ditto.
d. Ginlabayan niya (A) han batu (N) an higanti (G).
"He threw the stone to/at the giant."

Again the case relations might be revised so that /batu/ would be in the INST case and /higanti/ in the NEUT case. This would require a special provision for /labay/ to allow its INST case to be topicalized in the OBJ function. Also, as with /hadluk/, a provision for the DET of a NEUT case being /ha/ would have to be made.

GOAL AS REFERENT

When GOAL functions as REF and is topic, it is marked on the verb by the REF set of affixes. Cf. Table 3 in Section II, Chapter 2 (5.1).

When it is non-topic, it can be marked by both a deictic and an ART or simply by an ART. If a deictic is used it is of the /ngadtu/ class. The ART following a deictic can be any one of /hin/, /han/, /hit/, /ha/, or /kan/. When no deictic is used, the ART must generally be either /ha/ or /kan/. If unambiguousness may be maintained by case frame characteristics, any of the ART's normally found after the deictic can be used. The first five examples involve non-motion verbs and so the GOAL actants in other analyses have been labelled DAT. Cf. Section II, Chapter 3 (4.9) following labelled Dative for arguments justifying the elimination of the dative case. The final two examples involve motion verbs and the GOAL actants have in other analyses been considered GOAL, LOC, or DIR.

(12) a. Aku (A) nanhatag han libru (N) han mga kabatagan (G).
"I gave the book to the kids."

b. An mga kabatagan (G) ginhagagan ku (A) han libru (N).
Ditto.

(13) a. Nagbayad hi Juan (A) ha bangku (G).
"John paid the bank."
(14) a. Magkakanta kita (A) ha ira (G).
    "We will sing to them."

b. Kakantahan natun (A) hira (G). Ditto.

(15) a. Nagqampuq hi Nita (A) kan Buddha (G).
    "Nita prayed to Buddha."

b. Ginqampuqan ni Nita (A) hi Buddha (G). Ditto.

(16) a. Naglabay hiya (A) ngadtu han usa nga higanti (G)
    han batu (N).
    "He threw a stone to/at one of the giants."

b. Ginlabayan niya (A) an usa nga higanti (G) han
    batu (N). Ditto.

(17) a. Makadtu kita (A) han patrun (G).
    "We will go to the town fiesta."

b. Ginkadtuqan namun (A) an patrun (G). Ditto.

(18) a. Makadtu hiya (A) ngadtu ha Tacloban (G).
    "He went to Tacloban."

b. An Tacloban (G) an ginkadtuqan niya (A). Ditto.

There are some verbs which clearly take a NEUT case and in addition a
case which is topicalized in the REF function and can be taken as
GOAL, but which unfortunately do not have a suitable English equivalent
which requires a GOAL actant. /Diriq/ "refuse" is one such verb. Viz.,

(19) a. Nagdiriq hi Julio (A) han iya bugtu (G) pagkadtu
    ha sini (N).
    "Julio didn't allow his sibling to go to the movies."

b. Gindidqan ni Julio (A) an iya bugtu (G) pagkadtu
    ha sini (N). Ditto.

AMBIGUITIES BETWEEN GOAL AND OTHER CASES

Since GOAL and INST may both be marked by /ha/ when non-topic,
ambiguities arise between the two. Viz.,
(20) Ginlabug ni Ricardo (A) an bula (N) han iya wala nga kamut (G/I).

The above sentence may have either of the meanings in (21).

(21) a. Richard threw the ball into his left hand.
    b. Richard threw the ball with his left hand.

By use of the deictics it is possible to disambiguate the sentence since GOAL utilizes the /ngadtu/ class and INST utilizes the /ditud/ class. Viz.,

(22) Ginlabut ni Ricardo (A) an bula (N) didtu han iya wala nga kamut (I).

(23) Ginlabug ni Ricardo (A) an bula (N) ngadtu han iya wala nga kamut (G).

WAYS OF EXPRESSING SUBTLE DISTINCTIONS IN THE GOAL RELATIONSHIP

Not having the wide choice of PREP's afforded in English, Waray sometimes uses different verb forms to express subtle distinctions regarding GOAL expressed by PREP's in English. Viz.,

(24) a. Tikadtu hiya (A) ha Tacloban (G).
    "He went toward Tacloban."

    b. Kimmadtu hiya (A) ha Tacloban (G).
    "He went to Tacloban."

GOAL and LOC are sometimes distinguished when non-topic solely by a deictic of the /ngadtu/ class which can accompany GOAL's. Viz.,

(25) a. Simmakta hiya (A) ngadtu han abukadu (G).
    "He climbed up to the avocado tree."

    b. Simmaka hiya (A) han abukadu (L).
    "He climbed in/on/onto the avocado tree."

Only the LOC relationship is present when the actant is topic, however.

(26) Ginsakgan niya (A) an abukadu (L).
    "He climbed in/on/onto the avocado tree."
2.15.3 GOAL WITH NOUN AS HEAD

POSTPOSED GOALS

When actants in a GOAL relationship have N as head (cf. the comments on head nouns in Section 1.0 of this chapter), they are marked when NAME by /kan/ and when non-NAME by any one of /han/, /hin/, /hit/, or /ha/. As with the actants having V as head, /ha/ is most common without a deictic being present.

(27) An iya pagtuquq kan Satanæs (G)...
"His belief in Satan..."

(28) An pagqakusar ha/han babayi (G)...
"The accusation of the girl..."

(29) Itun dalan ngadtu ha Tacloban (G) batuqun.
"The road to Tacloban is rocky."

(30) An pagbalhin han tuluquhan (N) ngadtu hin kakristyanu (G)
"The changing of the beliefs to Christianity..."

PREPOSED GOALS

It is possible to place most GOAL actants before their head nouns (example (29) is an exception) but actants without deictics require either /ha/ or /kan/. With deictics, no restriction is made on the ART.

(31) Ginqisturbu ku (A)<an kan Satana (G) pagtuqud niya>(N).
"I disturbed his belief in Satan."

(32) <An ngadtu hin kakristyanu (G) pagbalhin han tuluquhan> (N) amu an pagqabut han mga Katsilaq.
"A changing of the beliefs to Christianity came with the arrival of the Spanish."

(33) An ha kakristyanu (G) pagbalhin ... Ditto.

It is presently uncertain whether the preposing of GOAL is limited to its use with the /pag/ nominals, since the amount of data collected is quite small.
2.16 **Instrumental** (INST) (I)

The INST case marks the actant which expresses the object or being which is used as an instrument in carrying out the action or state identified by the verb. Cf. Section I (2.1.5) for arguments regarding the correlation of INANIMATE with INST.

**NON-TOPICAL INST's:**

INST's are marked in non-topic position by any of the semantically relevant non-NAME articles (i.e., /hin, hit, han/ or /ha/), and by /kan/ if NAME. No PREP can be used. Some examples follow.

**hin:**
(1) Nagpukpuk hi Kruschev (A) han lamisa (N) hin sapatus (I).
"Kruschev pounded the table with a shoe."

**ha:**
(2) Nagkudak hi Juan (A) ha akun kamira (I).
"John took a picture with my camera."

**ha:**
(3) Naginhawa kita (A) ha irung (I).
"We breathe with our noses."

**hin:**
(4) Ginhadluk han kawatan (A) an tikilyira (G) hin pusil (I).
"The thief frightened the teller with a gun."

**kan:**
(5) Bimiqung ni James Bond (A) an bintana (N) kan Felix (I).
"James Bond broke the window with Felix."

**INST as ASSOCIATE:**

When an INST is topicalized it assumes the ASSOC derived function.

The INST is most generally fronted, either by left dislocation or by secondary topicalization. (Cf. Section II, Chapter 5 (11) and (12))

**kan:**
(6) An kutsilyu (I) iginutud niya (A) hin kiyk (N).
"The knife was what he cut the cake with."

**kan:**
(7) An pusil (I) (an) iginhadluk han kawatan (A) ha tikilyira (G).
"The gun was what the thief frightened the teller with."

**kan:**
(8) An akun kamira (I) an iginkudak ni Juan (A).
"My camera was what John took the picture with."
NON-CASE INSTRUMENTALS

Instrumentals may also be expressed in two other non-case ways. First, the speaker may employ /gamit/ "use" with an object and a nominalized sentence in a PURP relationship. Viz.,

(9) Gingamit ni Jose (A) an tinidur (N) ha pagkaquin (PURP).
"Joe used a fork to eat."

Second, since a huge number of roots function both as noun and verb (including adjective) stems, many concrete nouns which can be used in instrumental NP's may also be used as stems of verbs. These verbs then carry an instrumental meaning. Viz.,

(10) Nagkamut hiya (A) pagkaquin hin inasal (N).
"He used his hands to eat the roast pig."
(/kamut/ "hand")

(11) Ginpana ni Carlos (A) an kanding (N).
"Carl shot the goat with a bow and arrow."
(/pana/ "arrow")

(12) Ginsundang ni Pedro (A) an sirinu (N).
"Peter cut the guard with a large knife."
(/sundang/ "large knife")
2.17 **Locative** (LOC) (L)

2.17.1 LOC with Verb as Head

An actant in the LOC case indicates the spatial orientation of the action or state identified by the verb. It makes no indication regarding motion. The LOC case undergoes primary topicalization with a great number of verbs but a few do not permit it. The factors determining the possibilities of topicalization will be taken up in detail. When a LOC case is topicalized, it invariably assumes the REF function on the surface. Thus we shall provide both the topic and non-topic forms together in the examples.

The internal structure of LOC actants appears complex since expanded NOM's which have a locative N as head are commonplace. The structure is simply one expansion of the non-sentential NP rule, however. We survey the possible structures next.

**SIMPLEX NP's**

The simplest type of non-topic LOC actant is made up of a relation marker followed by a simple noun. The relation marker may be either simply /ha/ if the noun is non-NAME or /(ha) kan/ if the noun is NAME or a combination of a deictic of the /didtu/ class with an ART, in which case /ha/, /hin/, /han/, /hit/, or /kan/ may be used. The /didtu/ deictic signals that a LOC follows so the broader range of ART's is permissible. When no deictic is used, the /ha/ which appears is somewhat difficult to categorize. When used with non-NAME nouns, it looks like an ART but when used with NAME nouns it looks like a PREP.

The following examples illustrate the above facts as well as the use of the REF set of affixes when the LOC actant is topic.
(1) a. Ginsablay niya (A) an badu (N) ha hangir (L).
"She hung the dress on a hanger."

b. Ginsablayan niya (A) han badu (N) an hangir. Ditto.

(2) a. Naruruyag hiya (A) hin asukar (N) hit iya kapi (L).
"He likes sugar in his coffee."

b. Cannot topicalize the LOC actant.

(3) a. Maninihapun kami (A) didtu kanda Felix (L) buwas (T).
"We will eat supper at Felix's house tomorrow."

b. Hira Felix (L) an paninihapunan namun (A) buwas (T).
"Felix's is where we will eat supper tomorrow."

(4) a. Nagpuspus hiya (A) han kultsun (N) (didtu) ha bungsaran (L).
"He beat the cushion (there) in the yard."

b. An bungsaran (L) an ginpuspusan niya (A) han kultsun (N).
"It was in the yard that he beat the cushion."

(5) a. Nagbayu hiya (A) han palay (N) (didaq) ha daku nga lusung (L).
"He pounded the rice in a big mortar."

b. An daku nga lusung (L) an ginbayuhan niya (A) han palay (N).
"The big mortar is what he pounded the rice in."

(6) a. Nagbutang hiya (A) han malita (N) didaq han timbang an (L).
"He put the suitcase on the scales."

b. Ginbutangan niya (A) han malita (N) an timbang an (L). Ditto.

LOC nouns are generally inanimate (all the examples so far) but may also be animate. Viz.,

(7) a. Nasabutan namun (A) an langaw (N) didaq kan Mila (L).
"We noticed a fly on Mila."

b. The LOC actant can not be topicalized.
REF T is used with NEUT.
(8) a. Ginyunal niya (A) an ankla (N) ha kan Benito (L).
   "He tattooed an anchor on Ben."

   b. Ginyunalan niya (A) hi Benito (L) hin ankla (N).
   Ditto.

(9) a. An tagutuq (N) iginbutang ha kan Ed (L).
   "A lizard was put on Ed."

   b. Ginbutangan hi Ed (L) hin tagutuq (N). Ditto.

If one wishes to retain the deictic marking LOC and still topicalize
the actant, the verb form is changed as previously but the actant itself
remains unchanged. I.e., the deictics do not co-occur with the topic
ART's. When the deictics remain they are generally preposed by the
secondary topicalization transformation.

(10) a. Didtu ha bungsaran (L) an ginpuspusan niya (A) han
   kultsun (N).
   "There in the yard was where he beat the cushion."

   b. Didaq ha daku nga lusung (L) an ginhayuhan niya (A)
   han palay (N). "There in the big mortar was where he
   pounded the rice."

   c. Didtu kanda Felix (L) an paninihapunan namun (A)
   buwas (T).
   "There at Felix's is where we will eat supper
tomorrow."

EXPANDED NP's

A second LOC construction utilizes a DET followed by an expanded
NOM, the head of which particularizes the locale. This construction
corresponds to the use of complex PREP's in English (e.g., "beside",
"inside", "under", "on top of", "throughout", etc.). The head N
(underlined below) has the meaning of the English PREP and the NP in
case relationship to it expresses the locative part of the English
LOC phrase. Viz.,
(11) a. Iginbutang niya (A) an lapis (N) ha sakub han kahun (L).
"He put the pencil inside the box." (lit. on the inside of the box)

b. An sakub han kahun (L) an ginbutangan niya (A) han lapis (N).

(12) a. Gintabug niya (A) an ayam (N) ha gawas han purta (L).
"He drove the dog out(side) the door."

b. An gawas han purta (L) an gintabugan niya (A) han ayam (N).

(13) a. Iginlabug niya (A) an bula (N) didtu ha bawbaw han atup (L).
"He threw the ball on top of the roof."

b. An bawbaw han atup (L) an ginlabugan niya (A) han bula (N).

(14) a. Ginsuntuk niya (A) hiya (N) didaq han igbaw han mata (L).
"He hit him above the eyes."

b. An igbaw han iya mata (L) an ginsuntukan niya (A).

(15) a. Iginpapelit niya (A) an tsyuwing gum (N) ha ilarum han silya (L).
"He stuck the chewing gum under the chair."

b. An ilarum han silya (L) ginpapiltan niya (A) han tsyuwing gum (N).

(16) a. Ginpusil niya (A) hi Juan (N) han butnga han mata (L).
"He shot John in the centers of his eyes."

b. An butnga han mata ni Juan (L) an ginpusilan niya (A).
Ditto.

(17) Liningkud hiya (A) ha butnga han kababayinan (L).
"He sat among the girls."

(18) Nagpatay aku (A) hin langaw (N) han butnga han duha nga lapis (L).
"I killed the fly between the two pencils."

(19) Naghimu hiya (A) han buku (N) ha butnga han kahuy (L).
"He made a notch in the middle of the stick."
(20) Nakuwuy hiya (A) ha tabuk hit TEIPCO (L).
"He lives opposite TEIPCO."

(21) Iginbutang niya (A) an basu (N) didaq han ligid han pitsil (L).
"He put the glass beside the pitcher."

(22) Linkingkud an akun mga kagqanak (A) dinhi/ didtu nga ligid han singbahan (L).
"My parents sat on this/that side of the church."

(23) Linkingkud hira (A) didtu ha (may) tuqu/wala han awtu (L).
"They sat on the right/left side of the car."

(24) Linkingkud kami (A) ha atubangan han hadi (L).
"We sat across from the king."

(25) Linkingkud hira (A) ha atubangan/frinti ha amun (L).
"They sat in front of us."

(26) Linkingkud an pulis (A) ha luyu han tawu (L).
"The policeman sat behind the man."

(27) Nagpintar hiya (A) ha hirani hit mayk (L).
"He painted near the microphone."

Each of the examples in (17)-(27) may have the LOC actant topicalized in a manner similar to those in (11)-(16).

A third LOC construction, consisting simply of the expanded NOM part of the preceding construction, is considered derived from the preceding construction by deletion of the non-topic DET preceding the head N. Practically all the preceding examples allow this deletion although there is some dispute between informants regarding the grammaticality of a few examples. (It is notable that this deletion is a feature not found in Tagalog.) If the LOC actant is TOPIC the DET is not deletable.

(29) a. Iginbutang niya (A) an lapis (N) daplin han balpin (L).
"He put the pencil beside the pen."

b. Iginbutangan niya (A) han lapis (N) an daplin han balpin (L). Ditto.
(30) a. Liningkud hira (A) atubang ha amun (L).
    "They sat facing us."

    b. Liningkuran nira (A) an atubang ha amun (L). Ditto.

(31) a. Limmakat hiya (A) tulu ka mitrus luyu han babayi (L).
    "He sat three meters behind the girl."

    b. Linaktan niya (A) an tulu ka mitrus luyu han babayi (L). Ditto.

(32) a. Ginaribi niya (A) an asukar (N) palibut han karanqu (L).
    "He sprinkled sugar around the cake."

    b. Ginaribigan niya (A) han asukar (N) an palibut han karanqu (L). Ditto.

At least one head noun requires the deletion of the DET. Viz.,

(33) Ginbutang niya (A) an lamisa (N) (#ha) kuntra han bungbong (L).
    "He put the table against the wall."

In an alternative analysis one might consider the head noun a
PREP. But this has at least two drawbacks. First, it would entail
considering almost all of the lexical items as having two syntactic
categorizations (N and PREP). Second, the presence of /tulu ka mitrus/
with the PREP in (31) would be unaccounted for.

AMBIGUITIES BETWEEN GOAL AND LOC

Since GOAL and LOC are both marked by the REF affixes when topic,
it is possible for ambiguities to arise between them. Viz.,

(34) Ginsuratan ni Julio (A-S) hi Juan (G/L).

    a. "Julius wrote a letter to John."
    b. "Julius wrote a letter on John."

LOC ACTANTS WHICH CAN NOT BE TOPICALIZED

As mentioned above, some LOC phrases can not be topicalized. The
apparent reason is that there is another actant which utilizes the REF
affixes and to avoid ambiguity only the other actant can be topicalized. This "explanation" is suspect however since some verbs permit the LOC phrase to be topicalized in the face of ambiguity.

In the following examples REL supercedes LOC.

(35) a. Naghimangraw kami (A) ha tilipunu (L).
"We were talking on the telephone."

b. Ginhimangrawan namun (A) an tilipunu (REL).
"We were talking about the telephone."

c. *Ginhimangrawan namun (A) an tilipunu (L).

MULTIPLE LOCATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

In Waray as in English, it is possible to have sentences with multiple locative constructions. And a number of sources can be postulated for them. Consider the example in (36).

(36) Kimmadtu kami (A) ha sini (G) ha Tacloban (L)
kagabqi (T).
"We went to a movie in Tacloban last night."

One can differentiate into separate cases some actants which might be lumped together as "locatives". We have taken this approach in distinguishing GOAL, SOURCE, and LOCATIVE. Thus the "locative" actants in (36) are provided for by having two cases, namely, GOAL and LOC. It is possible to take the LOC phrase as a case on the V or on the preceding N.

Consider next the underlined phrases in (37).

(37) Diddtu ha White Beach (TM) liningkud kami (A) ha kahuy (L)
    ha tunaq (L).
"At White Beach, we sat on a box in the sand."

Taking the distinct case approach, one could contend that the phrase /diddtu ha White Beach/ is a TIME actant, being a reduction from "while at White Beach". Alternatively, one might posit cases attached to the
PROP (i.e., sentential cases) as distinct from the cases attached to the V (i.e., propositional cases). Thus, the phrase /dītu ha White Beach/ might be construed as a LOC case attached to PROF rather than to V.

The next underlined phrase /ha kahuy/ is best suited for qualification as a case on the head V. The final underlined phrase, /ha tanaq/, could be considered to be a LOC case on the head noun /kahuy/. Or it could be considered derived from a RREL source with reduction.

A possible argument for the phrase /ha Tacloban/ in (36) being only on the preceding noun is that fact that /ha sini/ and /ha sini ha Tacloban/ can be topicalized but not /ha Tacloban/. Viz.,

\[(38) \begin{align*}
a. & \text{ An sini (G) an ginkadtuqan namun (A) ha Tacloban (L) kagabqi (T).} \\
b. & \text{ An sini (G) ha Tacloban (L) an ginkadtuqan namun (A) kagabqi (T).} \\
c. & \ast \text{An Tacloban (L) an ginkadtuqan namun (A) ha sini (G) kagabqi (T).}
\end{align*}\]

But this data can also be interpreted as follows. When GOAL is present with /kādu/, it supercedes LOC in topicalization and so LOC can not be topicalized alone.

Consider now the sentence in (39).

\[(39) \text{Naqukuy kami (A) hin balay ha Blak l (L) ha hawsing pradyik (L) gawas ha Tacloban (L).} \]

"We live in a house in Block 1 in the housing project outside Tacloban."

One might assume that LOC has a special iterative property if greater specificity is attained by narrowing down the referent with increasingly general locative phrases. How this property could be allowed concurrent with its necessary restrictions is outside present
knowledge. The following phrases also exemplify this kind of locative construction.

(40) a. Hi Salas magigin "Guest Speaker" didtu (L) ha Boy Scouts Building (L) ha Magsaysay Boulevard (L) hitun Tacloban (L).
"Salas will be the guest speaker there in the Boy Scouts building on Magsaysay Boulevard in Tacloban."

b. dinhi (L) hini nga lugar (L) "here is this place"

Rather than provide a special rule of iteration for LOC's (and TM's) it seems much more natural to derive the LOC's in these examples either by RREL reduction or by each succeeding actant being a case attached to the preceding noun. The main problem then which remains is the restriction of the LOC ordering by class inclusion properties.

To recapitulate, we have suggested five sources for the multiple locative constructions: (1) an increased number of locative cases, (2) a piling up of locative cases in which each succeeding case has the preceding NOM as head, (3) a similar pile up coming from relativization with reduction, (4) an attachment of identical LOC cases to head verbs and head PROP's, and (5) a special rule of iteration of the LOC relationship. The first two sources appear to provide all the versatility needed and so the later three are rejected as unnecessarily complicating.

2.17.2 LOC with N as Head

Unlike AGT and NEUT, which occur with de-verbal nouns as cases which can not be paraphrased by a RREL, LOC does not seem to be required by any de-verbal nouns. The examples which follow then are of two types. First, LOC's with de-adjectival head nouns and inherently nominal head nouns which do not permit a RREL interpretation. And second, LOC's on head nouns which can have a RREL interpretation.
These latter examples are not conclusive evidence that some LOC cases originate on a head N but illustrate other possible instances of LOC's on head nouns.

It will be seen that the relation markers are exactly the same as those for LOC's with V as head. The major difference being of course that no topicalization of LOC is possible with a N as head. Preposing of LOC actants is not permitted.

EXAMPLES WITHOUT RREL PARAPHRASES

(41) a. an pagkawaresy dampug ha irpurt (L) ...
"the lack of clouds at the airport..."

b. an pagkakusug han sugaq (N) ha iya tinikangan (L)...
"the intensity of the light at its source..."

(42) a. an panahun ha Tacloban (L)...
"the weather in Tacloban..."

b. an timpuratura ha kwartu (L)...
"the temperature in the room..."

c. an kundisyun han pagpatrabahu (N) ha Ico (L)...
"the working conditions at Ico..."

EXAMPLES HAVING RREL PARAPHRASES

(43) a. An mga badu ha kutay (L) mga timasa laq.
"The dresses on the clothesline are only house dresses."

b. It balay didaq ha kantu (L) kanda Cernal.
"The house on the corner belongs to the Cernals."

c. An kahuy didaq hit ligid hit nga balay (L) abukadu.
"The tree beside the house is an avocado."

d. An libru ha bavbaw hit lamisa (L) mayqadaq laq usa ka gatus ka paypay.
"The book on top of the table has only 100 pages."

e. An dalan (ha) dapit ha may kanal (L) ginhimu hadtun mil wibi syintus singkwinta.
"The road along the canal was built in 1950."
f. An aragiyan (ha) tabuk han hagna (L) punu hin harupay.
"The path across the field is full of 'harupay'
(k. of weed)."

g. An primiru nga balay gawas hit hawsing (L) kanda Balentong.
"The first house outside 'Housing' belong to Balentong's."

The RREL paraphrase for (43b), for example, follows in (44a). (44b) indicates the embedded sentence which underwent relativization.

(44) a. It balay nga diadq ha kantu kanda Cernal.
"The house which is on the corner belongs to the Cernals."

b. Didaq ha kantu an balay.
"The house is on the corner."

(45) a. Bumagis kamu (A)<han amu nga batun ha sakub han alad (L)> (N).
"Underline the correct answer within the parentheses."

b. Bagisi<an amu nga batun ha sakub han alad (L)> (N).
Ditto.

c. *Bagisi han amu nga batun (N) an sakub han alad (L).

(46) a. Nakabatiq hiya (A)<han tamsi ha gawas han bintana (L)> (N).
"He heard the bird outside the window."

b. Nabiqtiqan niya (A)<an tamsi ha gawas han bintana (L)> (N).
Ditto.

c. *Nabiqtiqan niya (A) han tamsi (N) an gawas han bintana (L).
2.18 Manner (MANN)

Actants in the MANN relationship indicate the manner in which the activity (or state) identified by the verb is, was, or will be carried out (or exist). In general, the MANN actants considered below are translateable by single word adverbs in English. Those adverbial phrases which might be considered MANN in English (e.g., "He speaks like he has authority", "He walks as if he owns the world") are considered under the heading SIMILITATIVE. Semantically those phrases and MANN are much the same but syntactically they are quite different.

NON-TOPICT  MANN ACTANTS

The MANN actants are for the most part non-sentential. They are invariably inanimate and non-NAME. They are introduced most often by /hin/ and sometimes by /ha/. Some examples follow.

(1) Nagbabasa hiya (A) hin madagmit/kadagmitan (MANN). "He reads quickly." (lit. with quickness)

(2) Naghavan hiya (A) han gardin (N) ha tinuqdetuqud (MANN). "He cleaned the garden conscientiously."

(3) Nahangaturug ka (A) hin maqupay (MANN)? "Did you sleep well?"

(4) Nagyakan hiya (A) hin masayud (MANN) para makabatiq ngatanan (PURP). "He spoke distinctly so everyone could hear."

(5) Nagtratrabahu hiya (A) hin hinahinay (MANN). "He is working slowly."

It is possible that verbals may sometimes be linked to a sentence by /nga/ and have a MANN interpretation. Viz.,

(6) Kimmadtu hiya (A) ha prinsipal (G) nga nahahadluk (MANN). "He went to the principal fearfully."

(7) Dimmalagan hiya (A) kan iya nanay (G) nga nagtatangis (MANN) "She tearfully ran to her mother."
The relationship of these constructions to the CIRCUMSTANTIAL actants discussed in (4.5) is uncertain. The latter are not considered case related actants at all and possibly the above phrases should fall into that category. It is also possible that the /nga.../ phrases in (6)-(7) are temporal in nature. Note the following example.

(8) Waray kalu hiya (A) nga lumakat (T).
"He was hatless when he left."

SEMI-TOPICALIZED MANN ACTANTS

Some MANN actants undergo a variant of left dislocation which operates on a semi-topicalized actant. The verb is affixed as if the actant were topic, using the ASSOC derived function, but the actant itself is not marked in any way as being the topic. Under left dislocation the actant is preposed and either retains its ART, or has it changed to /ha/, or has it deleted. Compare the LOC constructions with deictics which undergo a similar fronting. (But secondary topicalization is used there.)

(9) a. Linnmakat hiya (A) hin waray kalu (MANN).
"He left without a hat."

b. (Hin/ha) waray kalu (MANN) iginlakat niya (A). Ditto.

NON-CASE MANNER EXPRESSIONS

Two non-case means of expressing MANNER have been put in here simply because they have no syntactic parallels in English. The first construction uses the root expressing manner as a verb in a verbal sentence or as an adjective in an equational sentence. The second verbal is nominalized with the ABS set of affixes. Viz.,
(10) Upaya it pagpahid hit mga lingkuran.  
"Dust the furniture well."  
(lit. Do well the dusting of the furniture.)

(11) Duru it iya pagtrabahu ngan kinapuy hiya dayun.  
"He worked hard and was quickly tired out."  
(lit. "Hard was his working and he tired out quickly." )

(12) Madaliq it iya pagdaqug kay daku hiya nga duru.  
"He won quickly because he was much bigger."  
(lit. "Quick was his winning because he was much bigger." )

A second construction uses the MANN stem as adjective but puts the main verb in the basic form.  Viz.,

(13) Madagmit hiya (A) magsurat labut nga malimpyu.  
"He wrote quickly as well as neatly."  
(lit. "He was quick in writing as well as neat." )

(14) Daku ngan malanuy an ayam umusig.  
"The dog barked loudly and plaintively."  
(lit. "Loud and plaintive was the dog in barking." )
2.19 **Means** (MNS)

The MNS relationship characterizes those actants which indicate the means by which the action or state identified by the verb was/is/will be carried out or arrived at. Actants in the MNS case are not marked by any PREP. They can not be topicalized. The ART which accompanies them may be any one of /hin, han, hit/ or /ha/, whichever is semantically appropriate. Some examples follow.

1. Inmabut hiya (A) ha taksi (MNS/L/G).
   "He arrived by/in/at the taxi."

2. Nagdaqug hiya (A) han mulay (N) hin panlilimbung (MNS).
   "He won the game by repeatedly cheating."

3. Binatun niya (A) an ira pakiqana (N)<ha pagsurat ha tunaq>(MNS).
   "He answered their question by writing in the sand."

4. Nakasalud hiya (A) ha pagbuwaq (MNS/CAUS).
   "He was able to get in by lying/because of lying."

The fact that MNS is non-topicalizable is shown nicely by making /ha taksi/ in (1) topic. Viz.,

5. Inabutan niya (A) an taksi (L/G).

This can only have the LOC and GOAL interpretations. I.e., "He arrived in the taxi" and "He arrived at the taxi" (He overtook the taxi).

Note that when MNS is a nominalized sentence there is equi-NP deletion optionally applying between the subjects of the matrix and MNS sentences. Viz.,

6. Hi Samuel (A) magpaquridu kan Monica (G) ha pagsiqistar (niya) ha gawas hin bilarum nga gabiq (MNS).
   "Sam worried Monica by staying out late."

7. Hi Fidel (G) nakakawat hin damu nga publisidad (N) han iya pagparitratu upud kan Susan Roces (MNS).
   "Fidel received lots of publicity by his being photographed with Susan Roces."
2.20 Mensural (MENS)

As the term implies, an actant in the MENS case indicates the extent or amount of the activity identified by the verb.

NON-TOPIK USES OF MENS

When non-topic, MENS is marked by any one of the non-NAME ART's which is semantically appropriate, i.e., /hit/, /hin/, /han/, or /ha/.

A deictic of the /ngadtu/ class can also be used preceding the ART.

(1) Naglakat hiya (A) hin usa ka kilumitru (MENS).
"He walked a kilometer."

(2) Nahangaturug hiya (A) hin usa ka uras (MENS).
"He slept for an hour."

(3) Binmalur an libru (N) hin dusì pisus (MENS).
"The book is valued at 12 pesos."

Note that the relationship is clearly separate from NEUT since it can co-occur with it.

(4) Ginlabug niya (A) an batu (N) ngadtu ha may usa ka gatus ka mitrus (MENS).
"He threw the stone about 100 meters."

(5) Gipadalagan niya (A) an dyip (N) hin singkwinta kilumitrus kada usa ka uras (MENS).
"He drove the jeep 50 kilometers per hour."

Perhaps it should be pointed out that the MENS case covers extent over periods of time (duration), over physical space (distance), and over whatever other functions yield themselves to measurement, e.g., price and speed.

MENS AS REFERENT

Most verbs require the derived function REF for a topicalized MENS actant. That is, when the MENS actant is topicalized the REF set of verbal affixes is used.
(6) Linabugan niya (A) han batu (N) an usa ka gatus ka mitrus (MENS).
"He threw the stone 100 meters."

(7) Usa ka uras (MENS) an iya (A) nahangaturugan.
"He slept for an hour."

(8) Dusi pisus (MENS) an ginbaluran han libru (N).
"12 pesos is what the book is valued at."

(9) Singkwinta kilumitrus (MENS) an ginpadalaganan niya (A) han dyip (N) kada usa ka uras.
"Fifty kilometers per hour was what he drove the jeep."

Examples (7) through (9) illustrate the fact that the MENS case can undergo secondary topicalization. It can also be noted that when topics are fronted which contain a postpositive cardinal number, the topic marker is generally deleted.

MENS IN OTHER FUNCTIONS WHEN TOPIC
At least one verb allows MENS to be topicalized in either the OBJ or the REF function. Viz.,

(10) a. Ginlakat niya (A) an usa ka kilumitrus (MENS).
"He walked a kilometer."

b. Ginlaktan niya (A) an usa ka kilumitrus (MENS). Ditto.
2.21 Neutral (NEUT) (N)

2.21.1 NEUT WITH VERB AS HEAD

An actant "whose role in the action or state identified by the verb is identified in the semantic interpretation of the verb itself" is considered to be in the NEUTRAL case (Fillmore, 1968, p. 25). All of the NEUT actants which follow are non-sentential in nature. This reflects an arbitrary decision to restrict the field of discussion enormously, since the ramifications of sentential complements are quite complex. Aside from a variety of surface structures to be explained (involving several linkers and complex conditions of deletion) the issue of lexicalist vs. transformationalist positions in nominalization must be decided.

The NEUT relationship appears in all four major derived functions. The ACT function is totally predictable since it only occurs when there is no CAUS or agentive type case present. Factors allowing the prediction of the other three derived functions have not been found. A majority of the actants appear to be in the OBJ function when topicalized, a considerable number appear in the ASSOC function and a few in the REF. The recourse to lexical features, undesirable as it is, is required.

NEUT AS ACTOR

In the absence of CAUS and agentive-type cases, NEUT functions as ACT. When non-topic, it is marked by /hin/, /hit/, /han/, or /ni/. No PREF is possible. When topic, NEUT is marked on the verb by the ACT set of affixes. The conjugation is usually /-um-/. Some examples follow.
(1) a. Dimmaku an hugaw (N).
   "The spot grew larger."

   b. Dimmaku hi Nene (N) ha Pilipinas (L).
   "Nene grew larger in the Philippines."

(2) a. Limmubad an badu (N) ha sarampayan (L).
   "The dress faded on the clothesline."

   b. Ginlubaran han badu (N) an sarampayan (L). Ditto.

(3) Binmunga an abukadu (N).
   "The avocado tree bore fruit."

(4) Ginqulqul an tiyan ni Juan (N).
   "John's stomach ached."

There are a few verbs which allow the /mag-/ set of prefixes when
NEUT is ACTOR. Viz.,

(5) Naghagkut an silya (N).
   "The chair was cold."

(6) Nagbunga an abukadu (N).
   "The avocado tree bore fruit."

(7) Nagqulqul an tiyan ni Juan (N).
   "John's stomach ached."

NEUT AS OBJECT

When NEUT actants co-occur with CAUS and/or agentive-type cases,
some function as OBJ. Thus, when topic they are marked by the OBJ set
of affixes on the verb. When non-topic, they are marked by /hin/, /hit/,
/han/, or /kan/. The employment of these ART's and the exclusion of
/ha/ is a characteristic of the underlying NEUT case which opposes it
to GOAL and LOC which characteristically use /ha/. No PREP is used with
NEUT as OBJ.

Some NEUT actants as OBJ are ordinarily animate, others are
ordinarily inanimate, and still others may be either. These three
possibilities are illustrated respectively in (8)-(10) below.
(8) a. Nagpatay hi Juan (A) hin manuk (N).  
"John killed a chicken."

b. Ginpatay ni Juan (A) an manuk (N). Ditto.

(9) a. Nagbasan ni Felix (A) hin libru (N).  
"Felix read a book."

b. Ginbasan ni Felix (A) an libru (N). Ditto.

(10) a. Nagbalbag hi Juan (A) hin kulsun/ kan Rudy (N).  
"John beat a cusion/Rudy."

b. Ginbalbag ni Juan (A) an kulsun/ hi Rudy (N). Ditto.

The term "ordinarily" was used above instead of "obligatorily" since Waray like English allows "metaphorical" use of verbs like /patay/ "kill" and /basa/ "read". Cf. "The president killed the bill." and "Felix read her like an open book."

NEUT AS REFERENT

Some NEUT actants function only as REF, so the REF verbal affix set appears when the NEUT actant is topicalized. When non-topic, the NEUT actant is marked by the ART's /hin/, /hit/, /han/, or /kan/. No PREP is possible. The idiosyncracies regarding animateness are present also in the REF situation. Some examples follow.

(11) a. Nagkarigug an suruguqun (A) han bataq (N).  
"The maid bathed the child."

b. Ginkarigugun han suruguqun (A) an bataq (N). Ditto.

(12) a. Nahibaru hiya (A) han siday (N).  
"He learned the poem."

b. Gin(hi)baruqun niya (A) an siday (N). Ditto.

(13) a. Bimayaq hi Gina (A) hin pakiti/kan Maria (N).  
"Gina left the package/Mary behind."

b. Ginbayaqan ni Gina (A) an pakiti/hi Maria (N). Ditto.
NEUT AS ASSOCIATIVE

Some NEUT's co-occurring with one or more CAUS or agentive-type case function as ASSOC. As such they are marked when topic by the ASSOC set of verbal affixes. When non-topic they are marked by the normal NEUT non-ACTOR ART's, i.e., /hin/, /hit/, /han/, or /kan/. No PREP is possible. Viz.,

(14) a. Nagbutang hiya (A) han lapis (N) didaq han kahun (L).
    "He put the pencil in the box."
    
    b. Iginbutang niya (A) an lapis (N) didaq han kahun (L).
       Ditto.

(15) a. Nagpapilit hiya (A) han tsyuwing gum (N) ha ilarum han silya (L).
    "He stuck the chewing gum under the chair."
    
    b. Iginpapilit niya (A) an tsyuwing gum (N) ha ilarum han silya (L). Ditto.

(16) a. Naglabug hiya (A) han bula (N) didtu ha bawbaw han atup (L).
    "He threw the ball on top of the roof."
    
    b. Iginlabug niya (A) an bula (N) didtu ha bawbaw han atup (L). Ditto.

VERBS ALLOWING NEUT IN MORE THAN ONE SITUATIONAL RELATION

Some verbs allow NEUT to function either as OBJ or REF.

(17) a. Nagsira an ulitawu (A) han purtahan (N).
    "The bachelor closed the door."
    
    b. Sinira han ulitawu (A) an purtahan (N). Ditto.
    
    c. Sinirahan han ulitawu (A) an purtahan (N). Ditto.

Two other verbs that allow this are /abri/ "open" and /kita/ "see".

Other verbs allow NEUT to function either as OBJ or ASSOC.

(18) a. Dimmalagan hiya (A) ha tindahan (G) han midisina (N).
    "He ran (with) the medicine to the store."
    
    b. An midisina (N) an gindalagan niya (A) ngadtu
ha tindahan (G).

c. An midisina (N) an igindalagan niya (A) ngadtu ha tindahan (G).

Other verbs of this type are /kadtu/ "take NP to" and /balik/ "bring or take back".

2.21.2 NEUT WITH NOUN AS HEAD

POSTPOSED

When postposed and non-NAME, NEUT is marked for a majority of the de-verbal nouns by the ART's /hin/, /han/, and /hit/. Viz.,

(19) Ha paglabay hin duha ka bulan (N)... "After the passing of two months..."

(20) An nutisya han pagdaug (N)... "The news of the victory..."

(21) An iya (A) pagdinar han tinhak (N)... "His denial of the truth..."

(22) An pahibaru hit iya pagqiwas (N)... "The appraisal of his dismissal..."

Some nouns allow the NEUT article to be either /han/ or /ha/, the choice presently unexplainable. Viz.,

(23) An iya paglibak han/ha iya mga sangkay (N)... "Her betrayal of her friends..."

(24) An pagpasabut han/ha iya dirig nga pagtrabahu dinhi (N)... "The notification of his not working here..."

When the ART is NAME, it is /kan/.

(25) An pagpakilala kan Juan (N)... "The introduction of John..."

PREPOSED

When an actant in the NEUT relationship is preposed, its ART is either /ha/, /hit/, or /kan/. Those postposed actants introduced by /han/ or /hin/ are marked by /ha/ when preposed. Viz.,
(26) An ha tuluquhan han mga tuminungnung (N) pagbalhin...
"The changing of the beliefs of the aborigines..."

(27) An ha iya mga butang (N) pagkuha...
"The seizure of his things..."

(28) An ha pagayakan (N) pagliwat...
"The repetition of the speech..."

(29) An hit iya pagqiwas (N) pahibaru...
"The notification of his dismissal..."

(30) An kan Juan (N) pagpakilala...
"The introduction of John..."

In some instances the fronting of a NEUT actant will bring an added ambiguity. Thus in the following example, /ha Roma/ can be taken either as a LOC or a NEUT phrase, but in its postposed position where only /han/ is used it is unambiguously NEUT.

(31) An ha Roma (N/L) pagdistrunka...
"The destruction of/in Rome..."
2.22  **Office (OFF)**

The actant relationships presently collected under the label OFF are not homogeneous and may quite possibly fit under other case relations with further study. They do however bear the semantic similarity of having to do with positions, titles, and offices that the ACTOR holds, held, or is seeking.

There are two different markers for the OFF case, the second apparently derived from the first: /ha pagka-/ and /ka-/ . The actant itself is apparently limited in structure to a noun following the linker. Some examples follow.

(1) Kinmandîdatu hi Reyes kuntra kan Veloso (ha pag) kadiputadu. "Reyes ran against Veloso for congressman."

(2) Gimmumraham hiya kabisi-alkaldi. "He was nominated for vice-mayor."

(3) Nahukasan hiya ha pagkasinadur ngan gînbutusan hiya kabisi-prisidinti. "He was impeached as a Senator and then voted in as Vice-president."

(4) Damu an iya nabuhat han iya pagkagubirnadur, piru yanaq nagpupultri na la hiya. "He accomplished a lot while governor but now he simply raises chickens."

(5) Nakakilala aku hin tawu nga diriq hambug labut hin daku nga pagkatawu kakulup. "I met a man yesterday who was humble as well as important." (lit. I met a man who was not proud as well as big among his peers yesterday.)

(6) Akun umangkun an bataq nga nagbadu hin pagkaklawn. "The child who is dressed as a clown is my cousin."

(7) Nahimu an bataq (N) ngadtu hin kagawang (OFF). "The child was changed into a witch."

(8) Nahimu an magraqut nga mga anghil (N) ngadtu kapanulay (OFF). "The bad angels were changed into devils."
A few of the actants in question are amenable to a temporal interpretation. Cf. /ha pagkasinadur/ in (3) and /ha iya pagkagubinadur/ in (4). OFFICE is generally unsatisfactory and hopefully a more extensive study of nominalization will turn up a more general account of the various interpretations of actants introduced by /(ha pag)ka-/.
2.23 **Oppositional** (OPP)

OPP WITH VERB AS HEAD

Blake (1930) proposed an OPPOSITIONAL case to account for the relationship of actants such as the one underlined in (1).

(1) The little army advanced against the enemy.

One can define OPP as the case of the object (or being) against which (or whom) the action or state identified by the verb is being directed.

The OPP case is indicated in Waray by the PREP /kuntra/ "against". A few speakers in isolated regions and those retaining older language forms also allow /tipa/ as an alternative to /kuntra/. The ART's marking non-NAME OPP NP's are /han/, /hin/, /hit/, and /ha/, while the ART for NAME NP's is /kan/. The OPP case can not be topicalized. Some examples follow.

(2) Kinmadtu hiya (A) ha Manila (G) kuntra han tugud han iya nanay (OPP).
"She went to Manila against the advice of her mother."

(3) Nagyakan hi Juan (A) kuntra hin paghatag hin kwarta ha mga pubri (OPP).
"John spoke against giving money to the poor."

(4) Waray magprarpranka magsurat kuntra hit pagkaqadaq hin daku nga familiya (OPP).
"No one can openly write against having large families."

(5) Nagyakan hiya (A) kuntra ha iya labaw (OPP).
"He talked against his supervisors."

(6) Nagsurat hiya (A) hin diskursu (N) kuntra kan Marcos (OPP)
"He wrote a speech against Marcos."

(7) Igsasalawad niya (A) in asunta (N) kuntra hitun prubinsya (OPP).
"He will file a complaint against the province."

(8) Nagbutus hiya (A) tipa kan Marcos (OPP).
"He voted against Marcos."
OPP with N as HEAD

No clear cut cases have been found in which an OPP case is attached
to a head noun which could not have been derived from an underlying
RREL clause. Hence we give just a few uses of the OPP on a head N
(an obviously necessary derived structure). The linkers /kuntra/ and
/tipa/ are used as they were with V as head.

(9) Iginhatag niya (A)<in tinataway nga "5 points
preventive measures" kuntra hitun sakit nga Taypus
(OPP)>N).
"He gave the so-called five points preventive measures
against the disease Typhus."

(10) An kasalanan kuntra ha bungtu (OPP)...
"a crime against the city..."

(11) An yanak kuntra kan Marcos (OPP)...
"a statement against Marcos"

(12) Gingisig niya (A)<an pustir kuntra han pagbutang hin
plurayd ha tubig (OPP)>N).
"He tore down the poster against floridation of water."

The OPP actant in its prep phrase structure can not precede the
head noun. If the RREL linker /nga/ is used, however, the OPP actant
may appear either preceding or following the head noun. Viz.,

(13) An kuntra ha bungtu nga kasalanan...
"an against the city crime..."

(14) an ásuy nga kuntra kan Villegas
"a speech against Villegas"
2.24 Preferential (PREF)

The PREF actant indicates a being, object, or quality which the ACTOR is in favor of. The actant is introduced by /para/ whether used predicatively, with a verb as head, or with a noun as head. The DET following /para/ is unrestricted syntactically except that it must be non-topic.

PREF WITH V AS HEAD

PREF actants with intransitive verbs most clearly have the V as head. The following examples show the non-topic use of the PREF actants.

(1) Nagmayakan hiya (A) para kan Marcos (PREF) duha ka bisis (MENS) hin usa ka simina (T).
   "He speaks for Marcos two times a week."

(2) Nagkumpanya hiya (A) para ha kuntrul hin panganganak (PREF).
   "He campaigned in favor of birth control"

(3) Nagsurat hiya (A)<para hit bulang hin Dumingu (T)> (PREF).
   "He wrote in favor of a cockfight on Sunday."

None of the three examples given allow the PREF actant to be topic.

/Batu/ "vote", however, allows its PREF actant to topicalize in the ASSOC situation.

(4) a. Bimmutu hiya (A) para kan Cinco (PREF).
   "He voted for Cinco."

   b. Hi Cinco (PREF) an iya (A) ibinutu. Ditto.

THE PREDICATE USE OF PREF

The PREF actant may be used in either position in an equational sentence.

(5) a. Para kan Marcos (PREF) hi Nonoy (ESS).
   "Nonoy is for Marcos."

   b. Hi Nonoy (ESS) para kan Marcos (PREF). Ditto.
It is assumed that the second is derived from the first by a preposing T. 

The predicative use of PREF finds it invariably non-topic. The apparent counterexample in (6) is actually an occurrence of PREF with a noun as head, the noun being deleted in the surface structure.

(6) Hiya (ESS)<an para kan Marcos (PREF)>(N). "He is the one in favor of Marcos."

PREF with N as Head

The PREF and RESERV benefactives can be used nominally (at least they can appear in the derived structure with nouns as head) while the BEN and REPL benefactives are restricted to PROpositional use. This is borne out not only by semantic observation but also by the syntactic restrictions on /liwan/, the linker for the REPL case only, which can not occur with a noun as head.

/Para/ is used to mark the PREF case on N's as it is on V's. Any ART semantically appropriate may be used. The PREF case always follows the head noun. It has not been possible to show that PREF does not have an ultimate source as a predicate case, REL reduction having produced the derived structures seen in the following examples. So the RREL paraphrase is possible in all the following.

(7) Nakapanginanu hiya (A)<han pustir (N) para kan Marcos (PREF)>(N). "He noticed a poster for Marcos on the wall."

(8) Naghatag hiya (A)<hin pulung para hit pemumunit (PREF)>(N). "He gave a speech in favor of abortion."

It is a syntactic curiosity that the head of a PREF phrase can be separated from the PREF phrase associated with it.
(9) An pustir (N) an ginkitqan niya (A) para kan Marcos (PREF).
"The poster is what he noticed in favor of Marcos."

Semantically it is quite clear that the PREF case still modifies the head noun /pustir/. It is also possible of course to front the entire NP including the PREF actant. Viz.,

(10) <An pustir para kan Marcos (PREF)> (N) an iya (A) ginkitqan.
"The poster in favor of Marcos is what he noticed."

The mechanism of separation might be either the secondary topicalization T operating only on the head noun or an extraposition T operating on the preposed actant.
2.25 **Purposive (PURP) (P)**

The PURP actant indicates the object or state or action which resulted, is resulting, or is expected to result from the activity identified by the verb and hence is the motivating factor behind performing that activity. The semantic difference between an object as the purpose and a state/action as the purpose is reflected syntactically as well. Purposive objects are non-sentential NP's and are introduced by /para/ "for". Purposive states and actions are described by sentences and are introduced by either /para/ or /basiq/ "so that", "in order to". Only the purposive objects may be topicalized and then only rarely.

**PURPOSIVE ACTANTS WITH SENTENTIAL STRUCTURE**

When /basiq/ is used to introduce a PURP construction, it may be followed by a declarative sentence, either equational or verbal. If verbal, the verb affixes are chosen from the BASIC set of affixes. The ACTOR of the S within the PURP clause may be either identical or non-identical to an actant in the main clause. If identical, it may optionally be deleted.

**Equi-NP with Deletion**

1. Tutduq hiya (G) kada gabqi (T), basi mahiharu (PURP). "Teach him every evening so that he will learn."

2. Kimmadtu kami (A) ha Dulag (G) basi ipakilala hi Susan ha amun kagganak (PURP). "We went to Dulag to introduce Susan to our parents."

**Equi-NP with Pronominalization**

3. Timmapun hi Auring (A) ha States (G), basi hiya
makasapurta han iya pamilya ha Pilipinas (PURP).
"Auring moved to the States so that she could support her family in the Philippines."

(4) Basig hi Juan diriq magbayad han buwis (PURP), diriq niya (A) ginpasabut an iya swidu (N).
"So that John would not have to pay taxes, he did not divulge his salary."

Non-equ NP

(5) Diriq hiya (A) maqaringasa, basig diri kami mahamangnu (PURP).
"She was not noisy, so that we would not wake up."

(6) Nagsurat kami (A) kada adlaw (T), basig hira diriq mabaraka (PURP).
"We wrote every day so that would not worry."

(7) Basig diri kami makakita ha iya (PURP), waray hiya (A) pagbilin.
"So that we couldn't find him, he left nothing."

/Para/ may also be used to introduce sentential PURP actants. As with /basig/ the various possibilities of equi-NP deletion and pronominalization hold.

Equi-NP with Deletion

(8) Kinmanhi kami (A) hin sayu (TM) para makabulig magpriparar han lamisa (PURP).
"We arrived early to help prepare the table."

(9) Nagdara hiya (A) hin payung (N) para diriq mahulus han uran.
"She brought an umbrella so that she won't get wet in the rain."

Equi-NP with Pronominalization

(10) Palit hit maqupay (N) para diriq ka na magripir (PURP).
"Buy a good (one) so you won't have to repair (it)."

(11) Kimmuha kami (A) hin tagabantsay hin bataq (N) para makakadtu kami ha sindhan (PURP).
"We got a babysitter so that we could go to the movie."
Non-equi-NP

(12) Nagyakan hiya (A) hin masayud (MANN) para makabatiq ngatanan (PURP).
"He spoke distinctly so that everyone could hear."

(13) Naruyag hiya (A) hin baka (N) para magkaaqadaq kita hin prisku nga gatas (PURP).
"He wanted a cow so that we could have fresh milk."

(14) Immuna aku (A) para diriq hiya mahadluk (PURP).
"I went first so that he would not be afraid."

A third linker used with sentential PURP actants is /nga/. The PURP interpretation is based on the matrix verb and the affixation of the verb in the PURP clause. The verb in the PURP clause is marked by the BASIC set of affixes and quite often by the ability ones as well. For those verbs which do not permit a sentential NEUT case, it is clear that a /nga .../ phrase occurring with them is not in the NEUT case, a viable alternative for the many verbs which do permit a sentential NEUT. For these latter verbs, the BASIC set of affixes provides the clue for some verbs that a PURP actant is under consideration. Semantic considerations seem essential for deciding between NEUT and PURP with those verbs which allow the BASIC affixes with /nga .../ phrases which may be either NEUT or PURP. Note that a somewhat parallel situation exists in English.

(15) He asked that he be replaced (so) that he need not expose his ignorance.

The simpler occurrences of sentential PURP actants are illustrated in the following examples.

Equi-NP with Deletion

(16) Naglusung hiya (A) ha tubig (L) nga makaqiskiyp nga diriq masabatan (PURP).
"He waded upstream to escape undetected."
(17) Minakinilya niya (A) livat an iya papil (N) nga siguradu nga malimpyu (PURP).  
"He retyped the paper to make sure it was neat."

(18) Limingkud hiya (A) harani han kalayu (L) nga matuyuq an iya midyas (PURP).  
"She sat by the fire so her socks would dry out."

(19) Nagbantay hiya (A) nga diriq an balay makawatan (PURP).  
"He kept watch so that the house would not be robbed."

### PURPOSE ACTANTS WITH NON-SENTENTIAL STRUCTURES

Non-sentential purposive actants may be either derived nominals or inherent nominals. Let us look first at the derived nominals.

/bgasiq/ may introduce derived PURP nominals, in which case it is followed by /ha/ and a verb affixed with the ABS set of affixes. Viz.,

(20) Limmakat hiya (A) han waray sulud nga balay (L) bgasiq ha pagprubar nga diriq hiya nahadluk (PURP).  
"He walked through the empty house to prove he wasn't afraid."

(21) Damu it suruguqun nga nakadtu ha Manila bgasiq ha pagkuha hin daku nga swildu.  
"Many are the maids who go to Manila to get higher wages."

(22) Nagqabugadu hiya (A) bgasiq ha paglipay ha iya taytay.  
"She became a lawyer so that her father would be happy."

/parah/ may also link derived nominals in the PURP relationship.

(23) Namumulay kami (A) hin barahah (N) parah pagpalipas hin panahan (PURP).  
"We played cards to pass the time away."

(24) Kinnadtu hira (A) ha gawas (L) parah han pagkitaq han bulan (PURP).  
"They went outside to look at the moon."

/parah/, but not /bgasiq/, may also be used to introduce PURP actants which are inherently nominal.

(25) Lilimpyuhan niya (A) an awtu (N) parah usa ka pisu (PURP).  
"He will wash the car for a peso."
(26) Dimmalagan hiya (A) ha tindahan (G) para hin midisina (PURP).
"He ran to the store for some medicine."

(27) Kinmadtu hiya (A) ha Tacloban (G) para hini nga isdaq (PURP).
"She went to Tacloban for this fish."

(28) Naruryag hiya (A) hin lumpya (N) para han patrun (PURP).
"He wanted some 'lumpia' for the fiesta."

PURPOSIVE ACTANTS AS TOPIC

Of the non-sentential PURP actants, a few can be made the topic of the sentence. In some of the examples so far elicited, the REF or REF-ASSOC affixes are used on the verb, in others the ASSOC affixes are used. Viz.,

(29) Ini nga isdaq (PURP) an iya (A) (i)ginkadtuqan ha Tacloban (G).
"This fish was what she went to Tacloban for."

(30) An pagkitaq han bulan (PURP) amu an ira (A) kinadtuqan/ ikinaadtuqan ha gawas (L).
"They went outside to look at the moon."

(31) An pagpalabay hin panahun (PURP) amu an iginmmulay namun (A) han baraha (N).
"We play cards to pass the time."

DOMINANCE RELATIONSHIPS OF PURPOSIVE ACTANTS AND OTHER CASES

Those PURP actants which are sentential may quite naturally dominate a variety of other cases. There are no apparent syntactic restrictions.

(32) Nagpamarka kita (A) ha atun kamut (N)<para makabalik kita kun maruyag kita (COND)>(PURP).
"Let's have our hands stamped, so that we can return if we want to."

(33) Ayaw kita (A) pagpamarka ha atun kamut (N),<para diriq kita makabalik bisan maruyag kita (COND)>(PUR).
"Let's not have our hands stamped, so that we can't return even if we want to."
Other PURP actants, whether sentential or not, may appear syntactically unrestricted on a parallel level with other cases and dominated by other cases. Viz.,

(34) Linmakat hiya (A) hin timpranu (T) para hiya makakaturug (PURP) tungud kay magtratrabahu hiya buwas hit aga (CL).
"She left early so that she could go to bed because she has to work tomorrow morning."

(35) <Kun ginsiring niya itun para maharluk (PURP)> (COND), diriq itu pwidi.
"If he said that to frighten us, it didn't do it."
2.26 Relational (REL)

2.26.1 REL WITH VERB AS HEAD

A REL actant indicates the object or being which the action or state identified by the verb is expressed to be in relation or reference to. The REL actant is generally introduced in English by "about" and sometimes by "over." It seems to be a fact in both English and Waray that the REL case does not co-occur under a PROP with NEUT, FAC, GOAL, or SO. There does not seem to be a restriction on the other cases.

REL AS NON-TOPE

When non-topic, the REL case is introduced by a PREP and one of the ART's. The PREP may be either /bahir/, /tungud/ or /hikunung/. /Tungud/ has two morphological variants, /mahitungud/ and /matungud/. No semantic or syntactic restrictions on the use of the variants has been found. The ART, if non-NAME, has no restrictions beyond semantic appropriateness. If NAME, the ART must be /kan/. Some examples follow.

(1) Nagsurat hiya (A) tungud han mga Negro (REL). "He wrote about the Negroes."

(2) Nagqaway hira Ben ngan hi Ed (A) bahin han mulayan (REL). "Ben and Ed fought over the toy."

(3) Nagtuqk hi Nene (A) bahin kan Edwardo (REL). "Nene cried about Ed."

(4) Nabarakhi Jose (A) tungud ha kwarta (REL). "Joe was worried about money."

(5) Nagbasa hiya (A) hikunung han iya mga ginikanan (REL). "She read about her ancestors."

(6) Nahasubhihiya (A) hikunung han situwasyun han kwarta (REL). "He was depressed about the financial situation."
REL AS OBJECT

A small set of verbs allow REL to be topicalized as OBJECT. Viz.,

(7) Ginpakiqana ku (A) ha bataq (S) an liksyun (REL).
    "I asked the child about the lesson."

(8) Ginpakiqana ku (A) ha iya (S) an iya kahintang (REL).
    "I asked him about his background."

The REF and REF-ASSOC functions are used when a SO is topicalized.
The ASSOC function is used when the NEUT case is topic. Viz.,

(9) Iginpakiqana ku (A) ha bataq (S) an liksyun (N).
    "I asked the child the lesson, i.e., what the lesson
    was/is."

(10) Ginpakiqanhan ku (A) an bataq (S) tungud han liksyun (REL).
    "I asked the child about the lesson."

This semantic distinction is good evidence for REL being separate from
NEUT. Some syntactic evidence is present in the fact that the REL
actant can only be "topicalized" with the ASSOC function when it is in
fact a case on an indefinite head noun (which is deleted) which is in
the NEUT case. Viz.,

(11)  

```
      S
     /
    MOD
   /  \
  PROP
 /     \
V      ACT
      /
     SO     NEUT
      /
     NP     \
    /  \
  D     NOM
 /     \
N     REL
     /  \
  Iginpakiqana ku asked I
  ha bataq the child
  ang ø
  tungud han liksyun.
  the thing about the lesson
```
REL AS ASSOCIATE

A few other verbs allow REL to be topicalized only in the ASSOC situation.

(12) An iya bugtug (REL) an igintutduq niya (A) ha klası (L). "She taught about her sibling in the class." (OBJ is used with NEUT, REF is used with LOC)

(13) Iginsurat niya (A) an mga Negro (REL). "She wrote about the Negroes." (OBJ used with NEUT, REF used with GOAL)

REL APPEARING IN SEVERAL DERIVED FUNCTIONS WITH A SINGLE VERB

Most verbs allow the REL case to appear in several different derived functions when topicalized. Unambiguosness is preserved either by the fact that certain cases can not co-occur with the verb or by distinguishing semantic correlates of the cases used.

/Usa/ "be surprised" allows the REL actant in either the OBJ or the REF function.

(14) a. Ginqusa ku (A-G) an iya kamanamung (REL). "I was surprised about his ability." (OBJ function)

b. Ginqusahan ku (A-G) an iya kamanamung (REL). Ditto. (REF function)

/Sumat/ "tell" allows its REL actant to assume either the OBJ or the ASSOC function. REF and REF-ASSOC are used with GOAL actants.

(15) a. Ginsumat niya (A) ha akun (G) an iya dyip (REL). "He told me about his jeep." (OBJ function)

b. Iginsumat niya (A) ha akun (G) an iya dyip (REL). Ditto. (ASSOC function)

/Away/ "fight" allows the REL case to be topicalized in either the REF or REF-ASSOC function. OBJ is used with a NEUT actant, while ASSOC is used with the INST case.
(16) a. Ginangaway ni Ben (A) kan Jose (G) an mulayan (REL).
    "Ben fought Joe over the toy." (REF function)

    b. Igingangaway ni Ben (A) kan Jose (G) an mulayan (REL).
    Ditto. (REF-ASSOC function)

And /tuquk/ "cry" allows any derived function for the REL actant when topicalized. Viz.,

(17) a. Gintuquk niya (A) an pagkamatay han iya Lola (REL).
    "She cried about the death of her grandmother."

    b. Gintuqukan niya (A) an pagkamatay han iya Lola (REL).
    Ditto.

c. Igintuqukan .... Ditto.

d. Igintuquk .... Ditto.

REL'S RELATIONSHIP TO CAUSAL

Since REL and CL actants can both be introduced by /tungud/, they are at times ambiguous (cf. (18)) and at other times only subtly distinct semantically (cf. (19)).

(18) Nabuwaq hiya (A) tungud ha iya asawa (REL/CL).
    "He told a lie about/because of his wife."

(19) Nagtuquk hi Nene (A) tungud han asu (REL/CL).
    "Nene cried about/because of the smoke."

Syntactically there are at least three factors calling for their separation. First, REL but not CL have a variety of possible derived functions in topicalization. Second, the two cases occur with overlapping but distinct sets of verbs. REL occurs mainly with verbs expressing feelings and verbs of communication. Verbs of action, such as /labug/ "throw", allow only CL. And third, it is possible to employ both REL and CL actants in the same PROP, and in fact, with the same PREP.
2.26.2 REL WITH NOUN AS HEAD

REL actants are introduced with N's as in the PROP. /Tungud/, /bahin/, or /hiquunung/ may be followed by any of the non-NAME ART's and by /kan/ when NAME. The following examples permit (with some strain) the RREL paraphrase so may possibly be predicative in source.

(21) An isturiya tungud han gira (REL) nga ginhawa ku didaq ha piriwudiku...
"The story about the war which I read in the paper..."

(22) An isturiya tungud kan Juan (REL) nga ginhawa ku...
"The story about John which I read..."

(23) Itun imurtanti nga manga himangrawun hiquunung hitun manga bitirana (REL)...
"The important things to be said about the veterans..."
2.27 Replacive (REPL)

A REPL actant indicates the animate being in whose place the actor performs the action identified by the verb.

REPL AS NON-TOPIC

When non-topic, REPL is marked by either of two PREP's, /liwan/ or /para/. The ART following the PREP may be any one of /han/, /hit/, /hin/, /ha/, or /kan/ as dictated by the associated NP and context.

The following sentences contain verbs which allow, of the benefactive cases, only REPL.

(1) Nagquatindir hiya (A) han miting (N) liwan han iya nanay (REPL).
   "He attended the meeting for his mother."

(2) Pinirmahan niya (A) an papil (N) para kan Tatay (REPL).
   "He signed the paper for Father."

Other verbs of this class are: /haruk/ "kiss", /kumusta/ "say hello", and /babay/ "say goodbye".

A few verbs allow only REPL and RESV interpretations of a "benefactive" actant. Viz.,

(3) Naggaruaq hiya (A) hin papil (N) para kan Maria (REPL/RESV).
   "He asked for some paper for Mary."

(4) Ginpalit namun (A) ini nga libru (N) para kan Nonoy (REPL/RESV).
   "We bought this book for Nonoy."

For those verbs which allow REPL and BEN only, as well as REPL, BEN, and RESV, see the examples under the BEN section (2.6.2).

REPL AS ASSOCIATE

Apparently all REPL actants which can be topicalized assume the ASSOC function when topic. Viz.,
(5) Ibabay la aku (REPL) ha iya (G).
"Say good-bye to him for me."

(6) Iharuk na la aku (REPL) ha iya (G).
"Kiss her for me."

(7) Ipínirun niya (A) ha papil (N) hi Tatay (REPL).
"He signed the paper for Father."

(8) Igınaruq niya (A) han papil (N) hi Maria (REPL).
"He asked for the paper for Mary."

Other verbs requiring the ASSOC function are: /kumusta/ "say hello",
/atindir/ "attend", and /kuhaq/ "get".

NON-TOPICALIZABLE REPLACIVES

There are a few verbs which can take a non-topic REPL which do not allow that actant to be topicalized. E.g.,

(9) a. Kinnmatu biya (A) ha tindahan (G) para ha akun (REPL/PURP).
"She went to the store for me."

b. Aku (PURP) an (i)kinadtuqan niya (A) ha tindahan (G).
"I was what she went to the store for."

c. Aku (N) an ikinadtu niya (A) ha tindahan (G).
"I was what she took to the store."

REPLACIVE AND SUBSTITUTIVE

The case relation REPL is much more restricted than in SUB. We have indicated in the definition that the REPL actant must be animate. This is not true for SUB, which has no restriction on animacy or even abstractness. Further, the REPL actant indicates the being in whose place the ACT is performing the action. The SUB phrase is exceedingly more general in that the actant which "replaces" it may be in any case relationship and may even be a non-actant and a non-constituent.

Despite such radical syntactic differences, however, the REPL and SUB cases do have semantic similarity. They both indicate an actant replaced.
2.28 **Reservational** (RESV)

2.28.1 RESV WITH V AS HEAD

An actant in the RESV case is the typically animate being for whom an object specified in the PROP is intended or reserved. As the definition implies, this case appears only when NEUT or ESS is present. In verbal sentences, the NEUT case normally accompanies an AGT. In equational sentences, the ESS and RESV cases are generally alone.

**RESV AS NON-TOPIC**

When non-topic, RESV is introduced by the prep /para/. The ART accompanying the NP may be any one of /hin/, /hit/, /han/, /ha/, or /kan/ which is appropriate to the NP and the context. I have not been able to find a verb requiring the RESV case interpretation of a /para/ phrase. Some verbs allow its interpretation along with the REPL reading. See the REPL section for examples. Other verbs allow the RESV, REPL, and BEN readings. See the BEN section for examples. When used as "predicate", the /para/ phrase is generally interpreted as RESV when the ESS phrase is inanimate (but the PREF interpretation is also possible). Viz.,

(1) Para kan Nonoy (RESV) ini nga libru (ESS).
   "This book is for Nonoy."

When the ESS phrase is animate, the /para/ phrase is usually interpreted as PREF but again the RESV interpretation is possible. Viz.,

(2) Para kan Quintin (PREF) hi Maria (ESS).
   "Mary is for Quintin."

The BEN and REPL readings of a /para/ phrase are not possible in the predicate position.
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RESV AS REFERENT

When topic, RESV is required by a few verbs to assume the REF derived function. Thus the REF set of affixes appear on the verb. One such verb follows.

(3) An iya anak (RESV) an iya (A) gindrawingan hin ritratu (N).
    "His child is who he drew a picture for."

RESV AS ASSOCIATE

Other verbs, of which /aruq/ "ask for" is one, require the ASSOC set of affixes on the verb when an accompanying RESV case is topicalized.

(4) Igingaruq niya (A) hin papil (N) hi Maria (RESV).
    "He asked for some paper for Mary."
    (The REF affixes are used exclusively for the SO actant)

RESV WITH SEVERAL DERIVED FUNCTIONS

Many verbs allow a choice of derived functions for the topicalized RESV actant. Viz.,

/Balay/ "build a house" and /palit/ "buy" allow both the REF and the ASSOC derived functions. Viz.,

(5) a. Ginbalayan ni Enrique (A) an iya nanay (RESV).
    "Henry built a house for his mother."

    b. Iginbalay ni Enrique (A) an iya nanay (RESV). Ditto.

(6) a. Ginpalitan niya (A) han pipinu (N) hi Maria (RESV).
    "He bought the cucumbers for Mary."

    b. Iginpalit niya (A) han pipinu (N) hi Maria (RESV).
    Ditto.

/Risirba/ "reserve" allows an even wider choice of derived functions, having no restrictions at all apparently.

(7) a. An iya mga sangkay (RESV) an iya (A) ginrisurba hin tulu nga lingkuran (N).
    "His friends are who he reserved 3 seats for."
b. ...ginrisurbahan… Ditto.
c. ...ginrisurba… Ditto.
d. ...ginrisurbahan… Ditto.

2.26.2 RESV with N as Head

The RESV case when used with N's is introduced by /para/ as in the PROP. It naturally does not undergo topicalization. Again, examples having unambiguous non-RREL sources have not been found. It may be true that all RESV actants are PROPositional and that the ones appearing to have N as head are actually structures derived from REL REDUCTION. Some examples are given anyway.

(8) Nakitqan ku (A)<an riratru para kan imu nanay (RESV)>(N) didtu ha Highway Commercial (L).
    "I saw the picture for your mother in Highway Commercial."

(9) <It surat para kan Enrique (RESV)>(N) didaq ha dyiniral dilibir ng a bintana (L).
    "A letter for Henry is at the general delivery window."

(10) Ginputus niya (A)<an rigalu para kan Gina (RESV)>(N) kagabq (T).
     "She wrapped up the present for Gina last night."

(11) <An lumpya para ha patrun (RESV)>(N) magraragut kun ibutang natun didaq ha tunaq (COND).
     "The lumpia for the fiesta will spoil if we put it on the ground."
2.29 **Result** (RES)

The RES actant expresses the consequence of the action or state indicated in the main clause. RES actants invariably follow the main clause. As a consequence of our single-sentence-based grammar, the actants expressing RES which follow immediately a main clause to which they are semantically attached, will be assumed syntactically subjoined as well. Those RES actants which express the consequence of a preceding state expressed in a series of sentences are considered syntactically separate. In an optimal grammar, a unified account of the RES relation as well as other relations which are found both within and between sentences must be developed. With admission of oversimplification, we ignore the discourse use of the "case" relations.

Several linkers are used to indicate a RES actant: /salit/, /sanglit/, /busa/, and /intunsis/. The first two are apparently simply morphophonemic variants of each other. All RES actants are sentential in internal structure. The INDIC affixes are used with the verbal predicates. Time restrictions require the action or state of the RES clause to be subsequent to the action or state of the main clause.

The immediately following examples illustrate the use of /salit/.

(/Sanglit/ is completely interchangeable)

1. Hiya it mayqadaq karabaw, salit hiya it magqagaradu (RES). "He is the one who has the carabao, so he is the one who will plow."

2. Pinalit hiya (A) hin dyip (N), salit sinakay kami na iya (RES). "He bought a jeep, so we rode with him."

3. Diriq aku (A) nakakaqabut hin tsikus (N), salit natungtung aku (RES). "I can't reach the chicos, so I'm standing on something."
(4) Ginugutmum aku (A), salit kinaqun aku (RES).
    "I was hungry, so I ate."

(5) Pinapasugan aku (A), sanglit kinariguq aku (RES).
    "I was hot, so I took a bath."

The use of /busa/ as a linker for RES clauses is restricted both geographically and diachronically. The less accessible speech communities and older speakers are more likely to use it. Several of my informants say flatly that they do not use the form.

(6) An iya kunsinsya (N) nagqisturbu ha iya (G), busa nangumpisal hiya (RES).
    "His conscience bothered him so he went to confession."

(7) Baga aku (A) nakabatiq hin ihalas nga babuy (N), busa andama it imu pusil (RES).
    "I think I hear a wild pig so keep your gun ready."

(8) Limmakat kami (A) han alas singku (TM), busa immabut kami dayun (RES).
    "We left at 5 o'clock so we got there too soon."

Speakers who are in the social stratum that knows Spanish sometimes use /intunris/ to introduce RES clauses.

(9) Mayqadaq hiya (A) sipun (N), intunris diriq hiya makakadu hit punsyun (RES).
    "He has a cold so he won't come to the party."

(10) An putu (N) diriq maqupay, intunris naghihimu hiya han litsi plan (RES).
    "The cake was a flop so she is making some 'leche flan' (milk custard)."

(11) Makahnhi hira (A) han Hwibis (TM), intunris adaq hiya hamiting han 'Rotary' (RES).
    "They are coming on Thursday so he'll be at the Rotary meeting."
2.30 *Similative* (SIM)

Blake (1930) suggests the SIM case to account for the actants of the following sort with the various head relationships indicated.

(1) a. He barked *like a dog* (ad-verbal)
    b. an animal *like a pig* (ad-nominal)
    c. red *as blood*, soft *like a pillow* (ad-adjetival)
    d. as sweetly *as a bird*, harshly *like a crow* (ad-adverbial)

An alternative proposal, also compatible with SIM as a case, claims that the SIM actant is invariably sentential and that identical constituents are deleted in the SIM phrase. For those SIM's which appear to be on head nouns, one simply posits the VP identity deletion before REL Reduction. In favor of such source are the paraphrases of (1) which follow.

(2) a. He barked like a dog (barks).
    b. an animal (which is) like a pig (is).
    c. (His head is) soft like a pillow (is soft).
    d. (She sang) harshly like a crow (sings harshly).

(The claim that "Standard English" requires "as" or "the way that" when the VP is retained is ignored.) The reason the entire VP is considered identical is that the interpretation of sentences such as the following seem to demand it.

(3) He shot the elephant like a professional (shoots elephants).

We shall assume this source and note the ramifications as we proceed.
CHARACTERISTICS OF SIM LINKERS IN NON-SUBJOINED CONSTRUCTIONS

There are at least four morphemes used in SIM relationships: /baga/, /parihu/, /sugad/, and /para/ Let us consider first the pseudo-verb use of these morphemes, i.e., their use as unaffixed propositional heads. Their subjoining functions will be taken up later. The following examples exhibit the ways in which the morphemes differ in transitivity, reflexivity, and symmetricity.

The first set of examples shows that all four morphemes are acceptable when the topicalization pattern has one actant as topic and the other marked by /kan/ if NAME and by /hin/, /han/, /hit/ if non-NAMe. The case relations are not obvious but we opt for NEUT and GOAL respectively. All four actants can thus be used transitively.

(4) a. Baga hi Ben (N) kan Rosa/hin amuq (G).
"Ben is like Rose/ a monkey."
b. Parihu hi Ben (N) kan Rosa/hin amuq (G).
c. Sugad hi Ben (N) kan Rosa/hin amuq (G).
d. Para hi Ben (N) kan Rosa/ hin amuq (G).

The next example shows that none of the morphemes allow the non-topic actant to be marked by /ni/ when NAME. This point is striking since three of the corresponding linkers in Tagalog allow the /ni/ marker and only one allows /kay/ (corresponding to /kan/).

(5) *Baga/parihu/sugad/para hi Ben ni Rosa.

The construction following illustrates the reflexive nature of /parihu/ and /sugad/, which allow a single actant if it is plural or conjoined. A singular actant is disallowed by all four linkers.

(6) a. *Baga hi Ben ngan hi Rosa.
b. Parihu hi Ben ngan hi Rosa (N).
"Ben and Rose are similar."

c. Sugad hi Ben ngan hi Rosa (N). Ditto.

d. *Para hi Ben ngan hi Rosa.

The next construction shows that all four morphemes can be used as pseudo-verbs with a sentential actant. The syntactic disparity reflected in the English glosses does not show up in the surface structure of Waray.

(7) a. Baga hira nga nagqiskip nga nagbaktas.
"It appears that they escaped on foot."

b. Parihu hira nga nagqiskip nga nagbaktas.
"They are similar in that they escaped on foot."

c. Sugad hira nga nagqiskip nga nagbaktas.
"It appears that they escaped on foot."

d. Para hira nga nagqiskip nga nagbaktas.
"It appears that they escaped on foot."

The following construction, which has two actants both of which are marked as topics, can be analyzed in either of two ways. First, /baga/ and /para/ may be considered "sentence adverbs" attached to an equational sentence. Or second, maintaining the pseudo-verb status of the morphemes, the dual topics can be taken as reflecting an embedded equational sentence. Of course, if sentence adverbs are taken as higher predicates in the deep structure, the two positions become one.

(8) a. Baga hi Ben ngan hi Rosa (N) hira (ESS).
"It seems that they are Ben and Rose."

b. *Parihu hi Ben ngan hi Rosa hira.

c. *Sugad hi Ben ngan hi Rosa hira.

d. *Para hi Ben ngan hi Rosa (N) hira (ESS). Ditto.

(9) Baga itun (N) an akun badu (ESS).
"That appears to be my dress."
Next we see that /parihu/ is idiosyncratic in two ways. First, it is alone in allowing the /magka-/ verbalization of its root. And second, it alone allows an actant specifying the point of similarity (the case relation of this actant is questionable but possibly NEUT).

(10)  a. *Magkabaga hi Ben ngan hi Rosa.
    b. Magkarihunu hi Ben ngan hi Rosa. "Ben and Rosa resemble each other."
    c. *Magkasugad hi Ben ngan hi Rosa.
    d. *Magkapara hi Ben ngan hi Rosa.

    b. Parihu hira (A) hin badu (N). "They resemble each other in dress."
    c. *Sugad hira hin badu.
    d. *Para hira hin badu.

NON-SENTENTIAL SIMILATIVE ACTANTS

Now let us note the Waray parallels to the sentences proposed by Blake. Cf. (1) above.

(12)  a. Nagkusig hiya (A) baga/parihu/sugad/para hin ayam (SIM) "He barked like a dog."
    b. Nakaqun kami (A) hin usa ka hayup (N) parihu/ baga/ sugad hin babuy (SIM) "We ate an animal like a pig."
    c. Iya (A) itun (N) ginpahumuk parihu hin ulunan (SIM). "He made it soft like a pillow."
    d. Nagyakan hiya (A) hin madagmit (MANN) baga hin pikuy (SIM). "She spoke quickly like a 'pikoy' (k. of bird)."

(1lc, d) parallel (11a) in that the SIM actants "modify" the rest of the PROP, while in (11b) the SIM actant is connected with the NEUT actant. As shown, all four SIM linkers can be used in the first two examples.
We will note shortly that extreme complexity arises since the four are not simply substitutable for each other in all situations. I have chosen to consider the (as...as) construction found in two of Blake's examples as part of the COMPARATIVE phenomenon and separate from the SIM relationship.

Before considering some of the more difficult surface phenomena connected with SIM, let me put in a caveat. This section has turned out for the most part to be a review of the SIM problem rather than a proposed solution. The time required for resolution of the problem is presently unavailable and my intuitions about semantic relations of various SIM structures is presently extremely limited. As a result of these factors I've been content to present some of the observed facts. Hopefully the investigation of other areas (e.g., COMPARATIVES and MANNER) will shed light on this area.

Now observe some of the complexities which arise in other sentences containing SIM actants. Consider the ambiguities which are present in the translations of the simple sentence in (13a).

(13) a. He spoke to a man like Hector.

b. He spoke to a man like Hector (spoke to a man).

c. He spoke to a man (who was) like Hector (is).

As the parenthesized items indicate, the ambiguity may be resolved by postulating identical VP deletion (13b) and RREL reduction (13c).

The same ambiguity is present in Waray and will be shown by underlying structures which correspond to (13b and c). The linker /para/ is not acceptable with the SIM actant in these constructions. But /sugad/ and /baga/ are interchangeable with /parihu/ in all of the sentences
in (14) and (15) except for (15a) which inexplicably does not allow
/baga/. The DET associated with "Hector" can be either of two forms:
/kan/ or /ni/. Under the identical VP deletion interpretation, both
the /kan/ and /ni/ surface structures are derived from the same deep
structure. I.e., (14b) is simply an intermediate step between (14a)
and (15b) (derived by Left Dislocation of Non-topic Actants—cf. Section
II, Chapter 5 (11.3)). The /kan/ and /ni/ structures in the reduced
RREL interpretation are assumed to have distinct deep structures. In
each of the following examples, (a) represents the surface form cor-
responding to (13a), (b) the underlying form corresponding to (13b),
and (c) the underlying form corresponding to (13c). We omit therefore
the translations.

(14) a. Nagyakan hiya (A) ha tawu (G) parihu kan
    Hector (SIM).

b. Nagyakan hiya (A) ha tawu (G)<parihu kan Hector
    pagyakan ha tawu>(SIM)/(MANN).

c. Nagyakan hiya (A)<ha tawu nga parihu kan Hector>(G).

(15) a. Nagyakan hiya (A) ha tawu (G) parihu ni Hector (SIM).

b. Nagyakan hiya (A) ha tawu (G)<parihu pagyakan ni
    Hector ha tawu>(SIM)/(MANN).

c. Nagyakan hiya (A)<ha tawu nga parihu ni Hector>(G).

SENTENTIAL SIMILATIVE ACTANTS

Sentential SIM actants indicate the manner in which an action is
performed or that a state exists by allowing a comparison of the main
verb to the proposition expressed by the SIM actant. All four linkers
given above, i.e., /baga/, /para/, /parihu/, and /sugad/, are used to
introduce sentential SIM actants. Not all are appropriate in every
sentence but there are some sentences—e.g., (18)—where the four are
interchangeable. The embedded S may be either equational or verbal, but is always declarative. The INDIC affix forms are used if the sentence is verbal. Viz.,

(16) Nagqaraduq hiya (A) baga/para hin may mga dimunyu nga nasulud ha iya (SIM).
"He plowed like there were devils who were following him."

The truth value of the proposition in the SIM actant is ambiguous, i.e., it may be either contrary to fact or factual. As in English, supra-segmental features aid in identifying which the speaker assumed to be the case. Viz.,

(17) Nagyakan hiya (A)<baga hiya may awturidad>(SIM).
"He speaks like he has authority."
(Ambiguous as to whether the speaker thinks he really does or not)

Sometimes the contrary to fact nature of the SIM clause is forced by beliefs about the real world. Viz.,

(18) Napasu hiya (A)<baga hiya nakataggqiya han kalibutan>(SIM).
"He walks as if he owns the world."

THE DEEP STRUCTURE SOURCE OF SIMILATIVE ACTANTS

Since actants which appear to have N as head can be posited to have come from an underlying RREL clause with REL Reduction, it is proposed here that the SIM actant is present in the PROP only. (We assume for the moment that cases in the predicate of an equational sentence are on the verb and not on a deleted head noun.)

SIMILATIVE AND COMPARATIVE

The actants we have discussed as representative of SIM have much in common semantically with the COMPARATIVE constructions and on the surface they do appear to be similar syntactically also. Viz.,
(19) a. He barked like a dog (barks).

   b. He barked louder than a dog (barks).

Blake apparently accepted their identity (at least for the as...as comparatives). Note however that the deep structure for COMPARATIVES suggested by Lees (1961) shows that the structures are quite different. (19b) has a deep structure similar to that in (20). There is no parallel structure possible for (19a).

(20) He barked THAT (more than) loud + a dog barks THAT loud.

The major point of distinction is the fact that comparison usually involves an adjective while the SIM construction does not.

SIMILATIVE AND MANNER

The SIM actants which can not be taken as part of a RREL clause are semantically very much like MANN actants. Viz.,

(21) Malanguy hiya (A) sugad/parihu/baga/para han isdaq (SIM).
   "She swims like the fish (swim)."

Both SIM and MANN actants contain some comment indicating how an action is performed. Perhaps some of the actants here described as SIM should in fact be considered under the MANN label.

SIM and DIS-SIMILATIVE

Examples such as those in (22) might suggest that a case antithetical to SIM be set up, i.e., a DIS-SIMILATIVE case.

(22) a. hin hayup nga waray sugad han akun mga nakitaq
    "an animal completely unlike any I had ever seen."

   b. Diriq sugad han iba, hi Juan nagtatrabahu tubtub
      ha gabqi.
      "Unlike everyone else, John worked late."

But note that gradation is possible between the two poles.

307
(23) Nasabatan niya (A) dayun an alimangu na parihu nga duru han iya naruyagan nga alimangu (N).
"He noticed especially the crabs which were very much like his pet crab."

It seems preferable to have a single case SIM and allow its negation and qualification.
2.3.1 **Source (SO) (S)**

2.3.1.1 SO with V as Head

An actant having the case relationship SO expresses the object, being, or place which is the origin of the action or state identified by the verb. Since SO can be an object or person as well as a place, SO functions sometimes as ACTOR and other times as REFERENT when topicalized.

**SO WHEN NON-TOPIC**

When SO is non-topic, three different types of markers may precede it. First in linear order may be the PREP /tikang/ or its variant /tumikang/. The PREP is optional and is generally used to dispel ambiguity. Second is a deictic of the /didiu/ class. It is also optional and follows the PREP if one is present. The third marker is an obligatory ART which must immediately precede the NOM. When a deictic is used, the ART may be any one of /ha/, /han/, /hin/, /hit/, or /kan/. Without the deictic, the ART is generally either /ha/, or /kan/. The other simple ART's may be used if the verb case frame permits unambiguousness as to the identity of the case. Some examples follow.

1. Pinmalit aku (A-G) hin mansasas (N) ha tindiru (S).
   "I bought some apples from the storekeeper."

2. Nanggaruq hira (A) hin tubig (N) han mga kabalayan (S).
   "They asked for some water from the neighbors."

3. Amu ini an baga kinikitaq kakulup (T) tumikang hin pagsumatan ni Riprisintanti Salud V. Pareno (S).
   "This is what was learned yesterday from the news release of Representative Salud V. Pareno."

4. Nangawat hiya (A) hin singsing (N) tikang kan Miling (S).
   "She stole a ring from Miling."
When a NAME SO is used, it is possible to employ either /kan/ or /ha kan/ as an indicator of the case.

(5) Nangawat hiya (A) hin singsing (N)(ha) kan Miling (S).
"She stole a ring from Miling."

The source of the /ha/ is obviously not prepositional since it can follow a PREP.

(6) Nangawat hiya (A) hin singsing (N) (tikang) (ha) kan Miling (S). Ditto 5.

SO AS ACTOR

Since SO apparently functions as ACTOR only when a part of the composite case ACT-SO, the reader is referred to the section dealing with that case (2.4).

SO AS REFERENT

When an actant other than SO ends up as ACTOR, SO functions as REF when it is topicalized. Hence it is marked on the verb by the REF set of affixes. Some examples follow.

(7) An tindiru (S) an akun (A-G) pinalitan hin mansanas (N).
"The shopkeeper is who I bought the apples from."

(8) Inaruqan niya (A) hin tubig (N) an mga kabalayan (S).
"They asked for some water from the neighbors."

(9) Hi Miling (S) an ginkawatan niya (A) hin singsing (N).
"Miling is who she stole a ring from."

AMBIGUITIES BETWEEN SOURCE AND OTHER CASES

When topic, since SO and RESV are both marked by the REF set of affixes, ambiguities can arise as to whether SO or RESV is the intended case. E.g.,

(10) Pinalitan ku (A) hin rilu (N) itu nga tawu (S/RESV).
"I bought a watch from/for that man."
When non-topic, if SO is not marked by a PREP or deictic, it is ambiguous with GOAL. Viz.,

(11) Inabut an surat (N) kan Nene (S/G).
    b. "The letter arrived from Nene."

The addition of either a PREP or a deictic dispels the ambiguity however.

(12) a. Inabut an surat (N) tikang kan Nene (S).
    "The letter arrived from Nene."
    b. Inabut an surat (N) ngadtu kan Nene (S).
    "The letter reached Nene."

SOURCE SEPARATE FROM GOAL

The previous example illustrated the two different meanings a single sentence can have reflecting the two different underlying case relations GOAL and SOURCE.

The distinction between SO and GOAL is also evident in sentences containing both actants. Viz.,

(13) Tikang (didtu) ha Carigara (S) nakadtu hiya (A) (ngadtu) ha Babatngon (G).
    "From Carigara he went to Babatngon."

In this sentence only the GOAL actant can be topicalized. Viz.,

(14) a. An Babatngon (G) an ginkadtuqan niya (A) tikang ha Carigara (S).
    b. *An Carigara (S) an ginkadtuqan niya (A) ngadtu ha Babatngon (G).

2.31.2 SO with N as Head

SO actants which have a N as head are marked in the same way that SO actants on V's are. Since it is difficult to find examples which disallow a RREL paraphrase, some examples which are given may be derived from RREL's by reduction. Only those which can not are clear.
cut evidence for SO being within the NOM as well as in the PROP.

(15) ha paglabay hin duha ka bulan (N) tikang magqanak an nanay (S).  
"after the passing of two months from mother’s delivery"

(16) 〈An paplanatay tikang ha bintana (S)〉(N) pinanguluhan han gidadakuqi nga bataq (A).  
"The rush away from the window was led by the biggest child."

(17) 〈An ataki tikang ha ligid ha kalsada (S)〉(N) nahipaquisahan namun (G).  
"The attack from the side of the street surprised me."

(18) Nakabatiq aku (A)hin aringasa tikang ha gawas (S)〉(N).  
"I heard a sound from outside."
2.32 **Substitutive** (SUB)

Blake (1930) introduced a case called **SUBSTITUTIVE** which was used to account for the underlined actants in (1).

(1) a. a dog *instead of a lion* (ad-nominal)

    b. He gave me promises *instead of money*. (ad-verbal)

The evidence, both syntactic and semantic, is quite clear, however, that although such a construction is a case relationship, it is not the simple case relation Blake implies.

**EVIDENCE AGAINST SUBSTITUTIVE BEING A SIMPLE CASE**

Considering first **SUB** phrases consisting of a single non-sentential actant, two striking observations can be made. First, the **SUB** phrase contains an actant in a case relationship. And second, that case relationship is identical to the relationship of the actant to which the **SUB** phrase is linked. This is easily seen in English when the case relationship is other than AGT or NEUT. Viz.,

(2) He gave the cufflinks to Bill (G)<*instead of* to Sam (G)> (SUB).

Semantically, the case relations are seen to be identical, and syntactically, the normal structure of an actant is present (i.e., PREP NP). Thus, "*instead of*" can not be a PREP attached to the following NP.

Exactly these same observations hold for the corresponding constructions in Waray. The **SUB** linker is generally /inbis/ or /liwat/ but a few speakers also use /untaq/. Some examples follow.

(3) An mayur (A)<*liwat han bisi-mayur* (A)> (SUB) an nagqutud han ribun (N).

    "The mayor instead of the vice-mayor cut the ribbon."

(4) Pinalit hiya (A) han mangga (N)<*liwat han papaya* (N)> (SUB).

    "He bought the mango instead of the papaya."
(5) a. Hi Maria (G) an nakarawat han surat (N)<inbis kan Susan (G)>(SUB).
"Mary received the letter instead of Susan."

b. Hinatag ni Juan (A) an pakiti (N) kan Boy (G)<inbis (ha) kan Felix (G)>(SUB).
"John gave the package to Boy instead of to Felix."

(6) Ginpalit niya (A) an tikang (N) para kan Ed (REV)<inbis (para) kan Fred (REV)>(SUB).
"He bought the ticket for Ed instead of for Fred."

(7) Ginpalit niya (A) tikang kan Auring (S)<inbis (tikang) kan Jose (S)>(SUB).
"He bought it from Auring instead of from Joe."

(8) Nagsurat hiya (A) hin pluma (I)<inbis hit lapis (I)>(SUB).
"He wrote with a pen instead of with a pencil."

ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBSTITUTIVE RELATIONSHIP

SUB phrases also consist of nominalized sentences with deleted actants. In most cases these SUB's are not "linked" to another actant but to the PROP as a whole. The following constructions consist of the SUB linker followed by an ART and the verbal proposition which has been nominalized with the ABS affixes.

(9) Magtitinawa ka (A) untaq inbis hin pagtunuuk (SUB).
"You should laugh instead of crying."

(10) Nagprinrinta hiya (A) liwat hin pagsurat (SUB).
"He is printing instead of writing."

(11) Nagbabasa aku (A) hin surat (N) inbis hin pagmumulay hin madyung (SUB).
"I was reading the letter instead of playing majong."

(12) Inbis hin pagkukuy (SUB), nagmulay hiya (A) hin duru (MANN).
"Instead of giving up, he played harder."

A second construction consists of the SUB linker followed by /nga/ and a sentence minus its ACTOR. I.e., equi-NP deletion holds between the ACTOR's of the matrix and subjoined sentences.
(13) Anu nga hiya (A) nagayakan inbis nga mamamatiq (SUB)? "Why is he talking instead of listening?"

(14) Naghugas hiya (A) han iya buhuk (N) inbis nga nagpakurung (SUB). "She washed her hair instead of having it curled."

(15) Simmakay hiya (A) hin barku (N) ngadtu ha Cebu (G) inbis nga sumakay hin iruplanu ngadtu ha Mactan (SUB). "He sailed to Cebu instead of flying to Mactan."

(16) Inbis nga magbalansi hiya ha tulay (SUB), linmuksu hiya (A) ha tubig (G). "Instead of balancing on the bridge, he jumped into the water."

Unlike English which allows only the PROG verb form in its nominalized SUB phrase, Waray allows either of the two nominalizing patterns shown above.

The following examples demonstrate the possibility of having an even greater variety of structures inside the SUB phrase, e.g., full propositions, truncated propositions, non-constituents, and single constituents.

(17) Hi Vincenti (A) kinmadtu ha P.C. (G) inbis nga hi Petra kumadtu ha N.B.I. (SUB). "Vincent went to the P.C. instead of Petra going to the N.B.I."

(18) Hi Nanding (A) nagsulay hin silhig (N) inbis nga magpala hin buhangin (SUB). "Nanding played with the broom instead of shoveling the sand."

(19) Nagpadara hi Berting (A) hin tiligrama (N) kan Sally (G) inbis nga surat ha iya bugtu (SUB). "Bert sent a telegram to Sally instead of a letter to his sibling."

(20) Nakakarawat hi Claro (G) hin tawag ha tilipunu (N) inbis nga surat tikang kan iya tatay (SUB). "Claro received a call instead of a letter from his Dad."

The position of the SUB phrase in the sentence is relatively free. It may be preposed by the left dislocation transformation (provided
that the sentence is not interrogative). And following the verb, it may assume practically any position but is normally placed following the constituent(s) it gives the "substituted" reading for. Some examples showing different positions follow.

(21) Inbis kan Nene (SUB), hi Maria (N) an pinangasawa. "Instead of Nene, Mary was the one married."

(22) Inbis han pangariguq (SUB), nakitaq hiya (A) ha sini (G). "Instead of swimming, they watched a movie."

(23) Inbis nga masingba hiya (SUB), kinadtu hiya (A) lugud ha galyira (G). "Instead of attending church, he went to the cockfight."

(24) Naghatag hi Sam (A) kan Hector (G) han nutisya (N) inbis kan Berting (SUB). "Sam slipped Hector a note instead of Bert."

(25) Naghatag hi Bella (A) hin pakiti (N) inbis hin surat (SUB) kan Fred (G). "Bella gave Fred the package instead of the letter."

As in English, the relative freedom of positioning of the SUB phrase permits some ambiguity. Much ambiguity is dispelled by restrictions cases place on their NP's. E.g., in (25) the SUB phrase can only be interpreted as being "substituted for" by the NEUT actant. Unlike English, ambiguities can not be dispelled by placing heavy stress (indicated by underline in the following examples) on the constituent which "substitutes" for the SUB phrase. Rather, the DET (by derived function and topic characteristics) sometimes serves to disambiguate the relationships. Viz.,

(26) a. Inbis nga hi Berting (SUB), naghatag hi Sam (A) kan Hector (G) han nutisya (N). "Instead of Bert, Sam slipped Hector the note."

b. Inbis kan Berting (SUB), naghatag hi Sam (A) kan Hector (G) han nutisya (N). "Instead of Bert, Sam slipped Hector the note."
It is most common to aid in the disambiguation by preposing the associated actant to a position immediately following the SUB phrase if it is initial. Thus the preferred ordering of (26) is as follows.

(27) a. Inbis nga hi Berting (SUB), hi Sam (A) naghatag kan Hector (G) han nutisya (N).

   b. Inbis kan Berting (SUB), kan Hector (G) naghatag hi Sam (A) han nutisya (N).

The fact that the SUB phrase is a part of the PROP (or S) only is demonstrated by its single occurrence in any one PROP (S). Viz.,

(28) a. *Instead of playing with Billy, Ted instead of Joe ran away from him.

   b. Instead of coaxing him, she forced him to eat the stew instead of the cookie.

THE DEEP STRUCTURE SOURCE OF THE SUBSTITUTIVE ACTANTS

We have seen the variety of internal structures which the SUB actant can have. Believing that the diversity can and should be handled by a single underlying source, an analysis should fall within the following framework.

SUB phrases are surface vertigies of underlying sentences. One such actant is allowed per sentence. The actant is obligatorily sentential though dominated by an NP and eventually nominalized (if a V remains). The content of the SUB sentence is unrestricted either syntactically or semantically. If the sentence is compatible with the PROP to which it is attached (i.e., having parallel structure and identical morphemes, etc.) deletion of identical constituents may occur. Deletion with the SUB phrase may involve either a single constituent or contiguous constituents not themselves a single constituent (i.e., so-called "non-constituents" in conjunction reduction.
Several points remain to be resolved within this framework, however. First, what is the exact nature of the attachment of the SUB sentence which is later reduced? Is it subjoined as a case related sentential actant or is it conjoined? Second, how is the anaphoric operation reducing the SUB phrase to be formalized? Third, if a subjoining case relationship is chosen, what is the exact place of attachment of the sentential actant?

Considering these questions in reverse order, it is hard to find a good motivation for the place of attachment of the SUB phrase. SUB could be either a daughter of PROP or a right sister of PROP. The fact that it occurs but once in an S argues that a higher S source not be proposed. Having chosen to place all previous actants under the PROP, we make the same choice here. Special attention is called to the fact that SUB is a different sort of relation than most other cases in that it can be sentential only and allows identity deletion on an expanded scale.

A sample tree is provided illustrating this analysis.

(29) a. 

```
S
  |  __MOD__
  |  |  |  |
  |  |  |  |__PROP__
  |  |  |  |__TNS__  |__V__
  |  |  |  |  |  |  |__AGT__
  |  |  |  |  |  |  |__LOC__
  |  |  |  |  |  |  |__SUB__
  |  |  |  |  |  |__PAST__  |
  |  |  |  |  |  |__P__  |
  |  |  |  |  |  |__NP__
  |  |  |  |  |  |  |__PN__
  |  |  |  |  |  |__D__
  |  |  |  |  |  |__N__
  |  |  |  |  |__MOD__
  |  |  |  |__PROP__
  |  |  |__TNS__
  |  |__V__
  |__AGT__
  |__LOC__

Sinmakay | hiya | ha traysikal inbis | Ø | ha dyip
```
b. "They rode on a tricycle instead of in the jeep."

Returning to the second point, there are again several options open for handling the reduction. One could hope that a conjunction reduction schema, such as that proposed in Stockwell et al. (1968) could apply to these sentences regardless of the coordinate or subjoined nature of their relationship. Or one could propose a new deletion schema operating on parallel structures which might cover in a single blow the surface structures associated with constituent and non-constituent conjunction, gapping, and the structures seen here in the SUB phrase and earlier in the ADD section. This latter alternative is a tall order to fill and nothing substantive is suggested here. Arguments have been given against such a deletion operation in Stockwell et al.

Finally, in the choice between subjoining and conjoining sources, the subjoining analysis is chosen for the following relatively unsubstantial motivations. First, a single SUB can occur with any one PROP. This is characteristic of the cases proposed above and generally not the case for conjunction. Second, commutability of the sentences without change in meaning is not possible with a SUB linker, which suggests that the linker be tied more closely to one of the sentences than to the other.
2.33 **Time (TM) (T)**

TIME indicates the relationship of an NP expressing the stative temporal orientation of the action or state identified by the verb. It is in opposition to two other temporal cases, namely, BEG and END. The cases TM, BEG, and END correspond respectively to LOC, SO, and GO.

2.33.1 **TM as NON-TOPOC**

An actant is identified as being in a TM relationship in a variety of ways. Some actants consist of lexical items which are inherently temporal in nature. Many of these need not have any ART, PREP, or other indicator of their relationship. Other actants occur with ART's. In one situation or another, all four non-NAME ART's can be used, i.e., /hin/, /hit/, /han/, and /ha/. (Being inanimate, the TM actants are always non-NAME.) Demonstratives and deictics also serve as markers of TM. And there are a number of PREP's which indicate an actant is in the TM relationship. Some of these relation markers introduce both nominals and embedded sentences. Others allow nominals only and some allow only embedded sentences.

**NON-SENTENTIAL TM ACTANTS**

**Lexical Items Inherently TM**

A partial list follows of those lexical entries which are inherently temporal and which can appear without any relation marker.

(1) a. kanina "earlier today"
    kagabqi "last night"
    kakulup "yesterday"
    kasanggabqi "night before last"
    kasangkulup "day before yesterday"
    kasangyadtu "two days ago"
    anay "sometime ago"
b. niyan "now, later today"
   unina "later today"
   buwas "tomorrow"
   isangbuwas "day after tomorrow"
   isangyadu "two days from now"

c. kanunay "always"
   danay "sometimes"

d. bisan kakanqu "ever since"
   bisan sanqu "any more"

A few examples of the use of the inherently TM entries follow.

(2) a. Makanhi hiya (A) isang buwas (T).
    "He will come the day after tomorrow."

   b. Nagyakan hiya (A) ha iya (G) kagabqi (T).
    "She spoke to him last night."

   c. Waray gud hiya (A) pakakanhi bisan kakanqu (T).
    "He has not returned ever since."

   d. Diriq na gud hiya (A) makanhi bisan sanqu (T).
    "He will not return any more."

NP Structures

Temporal words are commonly introduced by an ART. The choice of
ART depends in part on the aspect of the main verb. When it is FIN,
/han/ or /ha/ is used. When it is non-FIN, /hit/ or /hin/ is used.

(3) Naglakat hiya (A) han Biyirnis nga adlaw (T).
    "He left on Friday."

(4) Napalit hiya (A) hin dulsi (N) hit aga (T).
    "He buys candy in the morning."

(5) Naglabo hiya (A) han kamilita (N) ha udtu (T).
    "She washed the shirt at noon."

When the POST constituent /kada/ "every" is used with a temporal,
the ART is deleted. Viz.,

(6) Tutduqan hiya (N) kada gabqi (T) basi mahibaru (PURP).
    "Teach him every evening so that he will learn."

Demonstratives are also used to introduce TM NP's. Like ART's the
DEMON chosen depends on the aspect of the main verb. /Hit(u)/ and /hin(i)/ are used with non-FIN aspect, while /hadtu-hat/ and /had(i)/ are used with FIN aspect.

(7) Hat nga bulan (T) namatay an manghud ni Miling (N). "That month Miling's younger sister died."

(8) Hitu nga panahun (T) naglilitsun kami (A) kada kulup (T). "During that time we will roast a pig every afternoon."

Deictics may also accompany the normal NP structure. /Ngadaq/ is used with a non-FIN aspect on the main verb, while /didaq/ may accompany a verb in any aspect.

(9) Nakasal hira (A) didaq ha may alas singku (T). "They were married at about 5 o'clock."

(10) Magkikitaq hira (A) ngadaq/didaq han pangiklup (T). "They will meet each other at supper time."

Additional study is needed to provide a general account of the relation between aspects and demonstratives and deictics.

Prep Phrase Structures

The various types of NP's just described can also be introduced by PREP's.

"Before" may be expressed by either /ugsa/ or /antis/. The latter is simply a phonological-semantic borrowing from Spanish "antes" which has incorporated the syntactic characteristics of /ugsa/.

(11) It kanqun (N) kinahanglan malutu ugsa hituñ karni (T). "The rice should be cooked before the meat."

(12) It paniqudtuhun (N) lulutuqun antis han alas dusi (T). "Dinner will be cooked before 12 o'clock."

"After" is expressed by /kahuman/, /katima/, or /(ka)taliwan/.

(13) Nagquyag an bataq (A) katima han risis (T). "The child played after recess."
(14) Kahuman han mulay (T) inmukuy kami (A) para hin ayskrim (PURP).
"After the game we stopped for some ice cream."

(15) Dirig ka (A) makafulung nganhi (L) (ka)taliwan hit alas tris (T).
"You can not get in here after 3 o’clock."

"During" is expressed by /duranti/, an obvious loan from Spanish "durante". Its acceptance and use reflects its origin since it appears most often in the speech of those who have had more extensive training in Spanish. Several of my informants deny the use of it altogether in production though it is perfectly acceptable to them in perception.

/Duranti/ introduces only nominals (inherent or derived).

(16) Naggasal hiya (A) hin manuk (N) duranti han patrun (T).
"He roasted a chicken during the town fiesta."

(17) Damu it patrun (N) duranti hit bulan hit Mayu (T).
"There are many town fiestas during the month of May."
(lit. Many are the town fiestas during the month of May.)

NOMINALIZED TIME ACTANTS

In both the NP and Prep Phrase structures illustrated above it is possible to have a nominalized internal constituent. The characteristic of nominalization is the ABS set of affixes on the stem and the non-occurrence of a topicalized actant.

In NP structures the nominal may be introduced by an ART, a DEMON, a deictic, or by nothing at all. The semantic significance of these options has so far escaped me.

(18) Nagsusudlay aku (A) han akun buhuk (N) han pagqabut niya (T).
"I was combing my hair when he arrived."

(19) Hinipagqabut namun ha Manila (T), mapalit aku (A) hin Magnolia (N).
"Upon our arrival in Manila, I will buy some Magnolia."
(20) Didaq han paglimpyu han babuy (T), ginqaqahitan it dilaq (N).
"In the cleaning of the pig, its tongue is skinned."

(21) Ngadaq hit amun pagqabut ha Manila (T), makadtu kami (A) ha sini (G).
"Upon our arrival in Manila, we will go to a show."

(22) Pagqabut namun ha Manila (T), bibisitahun namun (A) ha Luneta (G).
"Upon our arrival in Manila, we will visit the Luneta."

Each of the PREP's illustrated in the preceding section may be used with a derived nominal. Viz.,

(23) Ugsa han iya pagpaqwas (T), maqisug hiya (A).
"Before his dismissal, he was quite rebellious."

(24) Kinanhi hiya (A) kataliwan han amun lakat (T).
"He came after our leaving."

(25) Duranti han paglimpyu han babuy (T), ginqaqahitan it dilaq (N).
"During the cleaning of the pig, its tongue is skinned."

SENTENTIAL TIME ACTANTS

It is a syntactic curiosity in Waray that sentential TM actants identical to independent sentences in affixation and topicalization, etc., can be introduced by the ART's, DEMON's, and deictics characteristic of NP's. That is, it is possible to have "nominalization" without affecting the "nominalized" sentence in any way. The following sentences illustrate this possibility.

(26) Tipagsarayaw na hira (A) han umabut an iya nanay (T).
"They were about to dance when his mother arrived."

(27) Hadtu nga mamatay hi adtun Otil (T), nakadtu kami (A) ha Manila (G).
"When the late Otil died, we were in Manila."

(28) Didaq han nakadtu kami ha mirkadu (T), ginhatag ku (A) an libru (N) kan Ben (G).
"When we were in the market, I gave the book to Ben."
The characteristics of TM phrases involving the negatives in sentences which can be translated by "when it was not yet S" are sufficiently idiosyncratic to warrant an expansion on them. As in COND actants and elsewhere, the negative /waray/ is restricted to PROP's with verbs in the FIN aspect. And as before, the verb following /waray/ must be affixed from the QIND set. The ART connecting the TM case is optional but if present it must be /han/. Viz.,

(29) Linmakat kami (A) (han) waray pa hiya aqabut (T).
"We left before he arrived."

(30) Linmakat kami (A) (han) waray pa alas dusi (T).
"We left before it was 12 o'clock."

Unlike its use in COND actants, the negative /diriq/ may be used with verbs regardless of their marking for the FIN aspect. However, the ART connecting the TM actant must be /han/ if the main verb is FIN and /hit/ if it is non-FIN. The verb following /diriq/ is affixed from the INDIC set.

(31) Linmakat kami (A) (han) diriq pa hiya maqabut (T).
"We left before he arrived."

(32) Malakat kami (A) (hit) diriq pa hiya maqabut (T).
"We will leave before he arrives."

Sentences introduced by some PREP's also require particular verbal affixes. Thus, verbs following /ugsa/ and /antis/ must be affixed from the BASIC set. Viz.,

(33) Gingurut niya (A) an' litsi plan (N) antis aku makayakan ha iya (T).
"He cut the 'leche flan' before I could talk to him."

Verbs following /katima/ on the other hand utilize the QIND affix set.

(34) Naggihuq hiya (A) katima namun pagsiring nga pakaqunun namun hiya hin pangiklup (T).
"He removed the grass after we agreed to feed him supper."
There are a number of PREP's we have not encountered before which can link only sentential actants. Among them are /myintras/, /nganiq/, /bisan sanqu/, and /basta/. The two embedded sentence linkers /kun/ and /nga/ may also be used to introduce sentential TM actants.

/myintras/ may in some dialects be followed immediately by /nga/ as well as the sentence in the INDIC.

35) Kimmadtu kami (A) ha sini (G) myintras (nga) nakadtu kami ha Cebu (T).
   "We went to a movie while we were in Cebu."

36) An iya asawa (A) naglutu han karanqu (N) myintras nga nakaturug hiya (T).
   "His wife baked a cake while he was sleeping."

The postpositive /nganiq/ occurs after the first "word" of the sentence it embeds. If the TM phrase is verbal, the INDIC set of affixes appear on the verb and it agrees in aspect with the verb of the matrix sentence.

37) Natswag nganiq aku (T), ginbubutang niya (A) an tilipunu (N).
    "Whenever I call, he hangs up the phone."

38) Nagmimurut nganiq hiya (T), nabulug it iya antiyuhus (N)
    didaq hit iya irung (L).
    "Whenever he frowned his glasses slipped down his nose."

/bisan/ followed by the temporal relative pronoun /sanqu/ can be used to link sentential TM actants with the resulting translation "whenever S". The verb in the TM actant agrees in aspect with the verb of the matrix sentence.

39) Makadtu aku (A) bis(an) sanqu ka kakadtu (T).
    "I will go whenever you go."

40) Bisan sanqu hiya nakaqun hin karanqu (T), naqinum hiya (A) hin tubig (N).
    "Whenever he eats cake, he drinks water."
/Basta/ also serves to link TM actants which can be translated by "whenever S". Again the INDIC affixes are used with a verbal following /basta/.

(41) Basta (nganiq) hiya nanginahanglan hin kwarta (T), nangaruq hiya (A) ha iya tatay (S). "Whenever he needs money, he asks his father for some."

(42) Ginubutang niya (A) an tilipunu (N) basta natawag aku (T). "He hangs up the telephone whenever I call."

/Kun/, a linker used with sentential embeddings in indirect discourse and conditionals, may also be used to link TM actants. Viz.,

(43) Diriq hiya (A) nabatun kun tinatawag ku hiya (T). "He doesn't answer when I call him."

(44) Lumuksu hiya (A) kun akun ginlabtan (T). "She jumped when I touched her."

Some equational sentences following /kun/ turn out on the surface to be simply NP's since in Waray there is no equivalent of "it" or "is". Viz.,

(45) Makanhi ba kita (A) ha iskwilahan (G) kun Dumingu (T)? "Should we come to school when (it is) Sunday?"

(46) Tugut ba an pagguliq ha balay (N) kun risis (T)? "Is going home when it is recess approved?"

/Nga/, another indicator of embedded sentences (REL's and sentential actors and objects), also introduces sentences in a TM relationship.

(47) Tikatirima na hiya (A) han pagkaqun (N) nga umabut aku (T). "He was about to finish eating when I arrived."

(48) Ginhatag ku (A-S) an libru (N) kan Ben (G) nga nakadu kami ha minkadu (T). "I gave the book to Ben when we were in the market."

2.32.2 TM as TOPIC

Topicalization is quite restricted with TM actants. Some dialects
attribute only border-line grammaticality to sentences having TM
topicalized with INDIC affixes. Other dialects disallow them completely.
The few TM actants that can be topicalized assume the derived functions
ASSOC or REF-ASSOC. These actants are invariably non-sentential. The
secondary topicalization T which nominalizes the remainder of the PROP
is generally correlated with topicalization of the TM actant. Viz.,

(49) An aga (T) amu an iginpalit niya (A) hin dulsi (N).
"In the morning is when he buys candy."

(50) Myirkulis (T) an diriq niya (A) iginatrabahuan nga
adlaw (T).
"Wednesday is when he doesn't work."

(51) An risis (T) an iginquyuag han bataq (A).
"Recess is when the child plays."

When a PREP linker is used to introduce the TM phrase, on rare
occasions that phrase may be topicalized and preposed also. Most
informants feel extremely uncomfortable about such sentences taken out
of a discourse context.

(52) Katima han risis (T) amu an iginquyuag han bataq (A).
"After recess was when the child played."

A widely acceptable means of emphasizing the TM actant places
it in predicate position and a PROP nominalized with use of the ABS
affixes in the topic position of an equational sentence. Viz.,

(53) Kun kafi brik (T) an iya panlibak (ESS).
"During coffee break is when she gossips."

(54) Ugsa han panimahaw (T) an iya pagtawag (ESS).
"Before breakfast was when she called."

2.32.3 MULTIPLE TIME ACTANTS

Some of the same remarks made about multiple locatives can be
repeated here in regard to multiple temporals. Some multiples are
derived from the choice of two or more different temporal cases, while others are the result of reduction of RREL's having temporal predicates. There are still other examples, however, which do not have a suitable source under either of those proposals. The following sentences illustrate the greater specificity (or generality) phenomenon noted in the LOC section, where it is possible to pile up a number of TM actants each adding more detail and being more inclusive than the previous one. Unlike the LOC examples, the TM phrases do not have a suitable RREL paraphrase and the REL REDUCTION source is not felicitous.

(55) Nanihepun kami (A) ha may alas says (T) hit gabqi (T) kun Sabadu (T). "We eat supper about 6 o'clock in the evening on Saturdays."

(56) Kakulup (T) katima han painqujtu (T)... "Yesterday after dinner..."

These actants do appear to require a recursive property on the TM relationship. Recall the problems raised in the LOC section in trying to provide such a property.

2.32.4 THE STATUS OF TIME AS A CASE RELATIONSHIP

We have noted that TM actants do not have co-occurrence restrictions with a head verb; they may be either sentential or non-sentential; only a few may undergo topicalization; left-dislocation is unrestricted; and multiple TM constructions are common. All of these characteristics distinguish TM as a peripheral relationship (in comparison to AGT and NEUT). See Section I (2.2.2.4) entitled "What is the Head of an Actant Relationship" and also Section II, Chapter 3 (1.0) entitled "Introduction" for a discussion of such peripheral relationships.
3.0 FUNCTIONAL RELATIONS CONSIDERED AS QUASI-CASE RELATIONS

The following two functional relations are considered only quasi-case-like for several reasons. Unlike most case relations, they appear solely on head nouns. And neither appears parallel to other cases on a head noun. I.e., they are not one of a string of actants associated with a head noun. But, like other cases, they have a PREP + NP structure and can be introduced in the rewrite of the NOM rule in a position parallel to the other AC's.
3.1 Contentive (CONT)

In both English and Waray there are a number of nouns which express a quantitative measure over other nouns. That is, some nouns limit, bound, or measure the amount of the noun they are linked to. For example, in English, in "a cup of water" and "a bundle of sticks", "cup" and "bundle" describe the amount of "water" and "sticks" the speaker is concerned with. Some examples of equivalent structures in Waray follow.

(1) a. hin usa ka busa nga gatas "a glass of milk"
   b. han tulu ka simana nga bakasyun "a three week vacation"
   c. han usa ka bulan nga bayad "a month's pay"
   d. han usa ka baldi hitun tubig "a bucket of that water"
   e. han usa ka butuk hit imu pisiq "a bundle of your rope"

There are several ways of looking at such constructions.

Blake (1930) chose to make the measuring word the head of the construction and put the item measured in a CONTENTIVE relationship to it. Putting such a view into a tree structure and concerning ourselves with the structure of Waray in particular, we can posit the following.

(2) a. NP
       D
       L
    ART POST CARD NOM CONT NP
   hin "a" usa "one" ka pidasu "piece" nga "of" "chewing gum"

b. "a piece of chewing gum"
Drawbacks to this proposal are not difficult to find. First, it makes extraordinarily complex the optional transformation needed to obtain the following awkward but grammatical ordering (which looks a whole lot like a reduced relative construction with /tsyuwing gum/ the head noun).

(3) hin tsysuwing gum nga use ka pidasu

Second, it requires a special condition relaxing the restriction normally holding between ART and CARD co-occurrences. And lastly, selectional constraints would need to be stated between the head of the CONT constituent and the verb rather than between the head of the dominating NP and the verb (as in all other actants).

A second analysis avoids the deficiencies pointed out for the first proposal but it raises significant problems of its own. In this proposal the item measured is the head of the construction and the measuring noun can be thought of as in a GROUPING relationship to it. The GRP actant is part of the DET on the head noun. Viz.,

(4) a. NP
   /\                      /\                     /\
  DET  NOM   ART  POST  GRP
     /\   /\     /\     /\   /\   /\   /\   /\
   D/L NP NOM P NP   D/L NOM N
   hin "a" duha "two" ka litru nga "liters" "of" duguq "blood"

b. hin duha ka litru nga duguq "two liters of blood"
The co-occurrence possibility of GRP (i.e., only with a POST constituent) is handled naturally by stating the relevant PS rule as follows.

(5) $\text{DET} \rightarrow \text{ART (POST (GRP))}$

Against this proposal is first, the need for a complicated transformation rule postponing the GRP phrase. Note that not only the GRP node must be moved but also the POST node.

A second problem involves the linker /ka/. Is it a DET on the GRP phrase or simply a linker of some sort (perhaps transformationally inserted)? In favor of its being a DET on the GRP phrase is the fact that it does not appear in a simple NP like the following.

(6) hin duha nga libru "two books"

Against its being tied to the GRP phrase is its use in phrases such as the following which do not use a GRP phrase.

(7) hin duha ka tasa nga pula "two red cups"

Hopefully a more detailed analysis of the occurrences of /ka/ will permit a general statement of its use and a conclusion as to its source. But, whether it is considered a DET or not, a special constraint must be placed on the DET of the GRP phrase, i.e., either it is only /ka/ or else it is zero.

And thirdly, there is no way to provide for a DET structure on the head noun, i.e., the item measured. Cf. (1d and 1e) for the need for DET's in that position.

A third analysis also avoids the problems raised by the first proposal by making the item measured the head and in addition avoids the movement problem of the second analysis by attaching the GRP actant to the head noun. The relevant PS rule for the third analysis would be
as follows.

\[(8) \text{NOM} \rightarrow N \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{AC}^n \\ (\text{GRP}) \end{array} \right. \]

The tree structure resulting is as in (9) (after preposing of the GRP actant).

\[(9) \text{a.} \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{DET} \\
\text{ART} \\
\text{POST} \\
\text{CARD} \\
\text{hin} \\
\text{"a"} \\
\text{usa} \\
\text{"one"} \\
\text{ka} \\
\text{"cup"} \\
\text{tasa} \\
\text{ nga} \\
\text{"of"} \\
\text{tubig} \\
\text{"water"} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{b. hin usa ka tasa nga tubig "a cup of water"}\]

The alternative ordering of (10) can be considered the deep structure and a simple optional transformation moves the entire GRP actant to precede the N.

\[(10) \text{hin tubig nga usa ka tasa}\]

The mirror image characteristic of the rule is notable (i.e., the NP and N pivot around the P) but not idiosyncratic. (The RREL movement and ADJ movement work the same way.) Since the CARD and the ART are under different DET's, there is no problem about their co-occurrence. The first ART is used quite naturally as the DET for the head N,
solving the ad hoc restriction needed in the first analysis.

A number of arguments can be brought against this analysis, however. The fact that a POST constituent must occur with the GRP phrase requires a special condition on the rewrite of GRP. And in regard to the quasi-case nature of the GRP actant, one might point out the lack of obligatory constraints with any head nouns and the lack of parallelism with the PROP. In view of the fact that a number of other cases have been posited which have both of these characteristics, these are not severe defects. More serious is the inability to provide a DET structure for the head noun. And the final blow to both the second and third proposals is the behavior of measuring nouns when part of a PARTITIVE actant. Note the string in (11a) and the surface structure for it under the first proposal (11b) and the third proposal (11c).

(11) a. anu hit mga pidasu nga dulsi
     "which of the pieces of candy"

b. 

\[ \text{NP} \]
\[ \text{D} \quad \text{NOM} \]
\[ \text{N} \quad \text{PART} \]
\[ \text{P} \quad \text{NP} \]
\[ \text{D} \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{CONT} \]
\[ \text{NP} \]
\[ \text{anu (nga) pidasu} \quad \text{hit mga pidasu nga dulsi} \]
\[ \text{which piece of the pieces of candy} \]
Note that the deleted head of the PART actant is identical to the measuring noun, not to the item measured. Thus only under the first analysis is the deleted noun identical to the head noun of the PART actant, a characteristic of all PART actants not having a GRP actant present.

In light of these considerations, analysis one seems the best choice. The most damaging of the arguments against it, the complication on stating selectional restrictions, can be answered in part by noting that the CONT case may only dominate inanimate nouns. Thus, any selectional constraints dealing with the ANIMACY feature apply equally as well to the head "measuring" noun as to the NP within the CONT case.

The decision as to how CONT is to relate to the other cases is a difficult one. Note the English phrase in (12) which seems ambiguous in the two ways illustrated in the trees following.
(12) a. the last shipload of arms from the U.S.

b. 

```
NP
  D
    ART POST N CONT
      P
        NP
          D NOM
            N SO
          arms from the U.S.
  the last shipload of
```

c. 

```
NP
  D
    ART POST NOM SO
      N CONT
        P NP
```

The third possible source (shown next) does not reflect the more immediate tie between the CONT case and its head and the more distant relation between the SO actant and its composite head. A reduced relative clause source is assumed for the SO actant in (12c).
Thus the following PS rule is proposed for the contentive relationship.

\[(14) \quad \text{NOM} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{NOM} \quad S \\ \text{N} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{AC}^n \\ (\text{CONT}) \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right\} \]

A special constraint must also apparently be placed on CONT to prohibit it dominating a PART case. Note the semantic incompatibility of such a dominance relationship.

\[(15) \quad *? \text{ a bucket of some of the water} \]
3.2 **Partitive (PART)**

Blake has posited PART as an ad-pronominal case to account for the underlined actants in the following examples.

(1) a. which of the men, who of you

   b. two of these boxes

   c. the third of these rules

   d. some of them, many of you

A case source would have a deep structure like the following.

(2) 

```
NP
  |   DET
  |   NOM
  |   N
  |   P
  |   NP
     DET   NOM
     two    (boxes)
    of  these
    boxes
```

A number of arguments have been raised in Stockwell et al. (1968, pp. 163-4) against considering PART one of the cases on a head noun (or pronoun). First, there are no nouns which have co-occurrence constraints with the PART actant. This is not a particularly significant problem since other relationships we have proposed have the same characteristic.

Second, it is quite difficult to state the identity conditions for deletion of the head noun to which PART is attached. Unfortunately, this same problem exists with any non-case source which is proposed.

Third, it would be necessary to insure the identity of all cases dominated by the PART node with the cases accompanying the PART node.
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and have deletion not only of the head noun but also of its accompanying cases. I.e., strings such as (3b) must be blocked.

(3) a. two spacewalks near the moon by the US astronauts of the spacewalks near the moon by the US astronauts (PART)

b. *two by the US astronauts of the spacewalks near the moon

This constraints can be handled naturally in a quasi-case analysis by having PART disjunctive with all other cases. The constraint requires an ad hoc device in a non-case source.

Fourth, PART is not used with a verb as head. This is not a particularly strong argument either since there are other cases having verbs as head but not nouns.

Fifth, if PART is considered a case, there is no natural way to constrain its appearance with POST constituents. Although this is perhaps the best argument against the case source, it is not correct as it stands since the English examples above and the Waray examples to follow show that POST is not a requirement for the PART construction. Cf. the question words and demonstratives as heads.

As an alternative to a case source, Stockwell et al. (1968) proposed the following.

(4)  

```
NP
  | DET
  | ART
  | POST
  | CARD
  | P
  | NP
  | DET
  | NOM
  | N
  | two
  | of
  | the
  | boxes
  | boxes
```
The DET rule was as in (5) to account for the supposed restriction of PART to NP's containing a POST constituent.

\[(5) \text{DET} \rightarrow \text{ART} (\text{POST} (\text{PART}))\]

The drawbacks of such a proposal include the following. First, a special rule of PART POSTPOSING is needed to permute the PART actant to follow the head N. Second, as noted above, an ad hoc restriction must be made to the effect that when a PART is present, the cases it can dominate must be identical to those which are present on the head noun. Third, also noted above, the obligatory POST constraint is incorrect since PART may sometimes appear without a POST constituent.

In the light of these arguments against the non-case source and the (in my opinion) lesser problems with the quasi-case source, the PART structures in the following Waray examples are assumed to come from a tree structure like the one in (2) and from a PS rule like the following one.

\[(6) \text{NOM} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{NOM} \\
\text{S} \\
\{ \text{N} \} \\
\{ \text{AC^n} \} \\
\{ \text{(PART)} \} \\
\{ \text{(CONT)} \} 
\end{array} \right\}\]

\[(7) \]
\[\text{a. Haqin han mga tawu (PART) an gima kkusugi?} \]
"Which of the men is the strongest?"

\[\text{b. Hinqu ha iyu (PART) it maqaram hit batun (N)?} \]
"Who of you knows the answer?"

\[(8) \]
\[\text{a. Magkalaqin an mga hayup han Australia ngan hit han Filipinas.} \]
"The animals of Australia and those of the Philippines are different."

\[\text{b. Parihu an kanan Intsik litsun ngan hitun} \]
kanan mga Pilipino.
"The roast pig of the Chinese and that of the Filipinos is similar."

(9) Duha hini nga kahun (PART) an punu hin bugas (N).
"Two of the boxes are full of rice."

(10) An ikatulu hini nga mga lalaki (PART) nagkawat han rilu (N).
"The third of the boys stole the watch."

(11) a. An pira/damuq ha ira (PART) nakapamahaw na.
"Some/ many of them ate lunch already."

b. Ginhatag ku (A)ha iba ha ira (PART)>(G).
"I gave to some of them."

(12) Hiya an gimacuqupayi han ngatanan han mga iskwila (PART)
"He is the best of all the students."

It is assumed that in all occurrences of PART with other cases the
other cases are dominated by the PART actant. This avoids the problem
raised above of having cases appear in both places (i.e., under the
PART and contiguous with the PART actant). The structure in (13)
illustrates the co-occurrence of PART and other cases.

```
(13)  NP
       DET  NOM
           N  PART
              P  NP
                  DET  NOM
                      N  AC
                                      [+LOC]
                                      P  NP
                                          DET  NOM
                                              N

  tulu (lalaki)  ha mga lalaki  ha platafurma
three (men) of the men on the platform
```
Obviously this source of PART and cases requires PART deletion to be dependent only on identity of the head noun in the PART actant.
4.0 ACTANT RELATIONSHIPS ELSEWHERE SUGGESTED AS CASES BUT REJECTED HERE

A number of case relationships have been suggested by Blake (1930) which turn out to have characteristics which argue against their being considered cases. The same can be said for a few cases proposed by Matthews (n.d.).

4.1 Abessive

Blake (1930) proposed the ABESSIVE case to account for the underlined actants in the following examples.

(1) a. He wants coffee without sugar. (ad-nominal)
   b. He went without his hat. (ad-verbal)

The ad-nominal constructions are invariably translated by a RREL construction in Waray where an ABESSIVE case seems inappropriate. Viz.,

(2) a. Karuyag hiya (A) hin kapi nga waray asukar (N).
   "He want coffee which does not have sugar."
   b. Pubri hin duru (DEG) an tawu nga waray nasyun (N).
   "A man without a country is miserable."
   c. An misay nga waray ikug (N) damu hin duru (DEG) ha Pilipinas (L).
   "Cats which do not have tails are plentiful in the Philippines."

The ad-verbal constructions are problematical since it is possible to translate them with either the embedded sentence linker /nga/ or with the "case" marker /hin/. Viz.,

(3) a. Limmakat hiya (A) nga waray kalu.
   "He left not having a hat."
   b. Limmakat hiya (A) hin waray kalu (?)
   "He left without a hat."

Perhaps the latter construction could fall under the MANN case. The former construction is similar to those taken up under the CIRCUM-
STANTIAL section which follows.
4.2 Absolutive

Matthews (n.d.) proposed an ABSOLUTIVE case to refer to an NP which is acted upon but not affected. This is in contrast to the DAT case in which the NP is affected in some way by the action of the verb. As far as I can tell, the ABSOLUTIVE case is meant to cover one type of relationship which falls under the NEUT case. We accept the more general analysis.

4.3 Ablative

A second case Matthews proposed is ABLATIVE. Although not defined, ABLATIVE apparently is equivalent to what in this grammar is called SOURCE. See section (2.31) for a consideration of the characteristics of SOURCE.

4.4 Accusative

The ACCUSATIVE case which Blake proposed had four subdivisions as follows.

(1) a. He cut his hand. (direct affective)
   b. He put the book on the table. (direct positional)
   c. He saw the parade. (indirect affective)
   d. He struck him a heavy blow. (cognate or intensive)

The first three are taken in this analysis to be subparts of the NEUT case. The fourth is handled by the FACTITIVE case.
4.5 Circumstantial

The CIRCUMSTANTIAL case which Blake proposes is found only in
the appositive use of cases. It accounts for the underlined actants
following.

(1) a. He acted as king.
    b. He arrived safe.
    c. He, relying upon his strength, rushed forward.
    d. We saw him weeping.

We have treated actants similar to the one in (1a) as representa-
tive of the case OFFICE.

Actants which correspond to those in (1b) have been considered
under the MANN section, the Waray correspondent being an NP.

The example in (1d) is considered an example of the gerundive
RREL construction, not taken up in this thesis.

We consider here actants of the type found in (1c). Let us
restrict our attention for the moment to English. If actants such as
these are to be considered "appositive", it is well to contrast them
with the structures others have placed under the label "non-restrictive"
(appositive) relative clauses" (NRREL's). Thompson (1969) has sug-
gested two types of NRREL's, exemplified by the following examples.

(2) a. John, (who is) the student with the short hair,
    is a non-conformist.
    b. Sam, who has great artistic talent, is just lazy.

(3) a. She stood on the highchair, which is a foolish
    thing to do.
    b. She went directly to her father, which few girls
do now.
The "appositives" to be considered in this section are of a quite
different nature from those just illustrated. They have no relative
pronoun and they invariably have a PROG or PERF participle. In this
respect they are similar to the gerundive RREL's which have undergone
REL REDUCTION.

(4) The people owning this apartment seldom come here.
They are different from RREL's, and more like NRREL's, in that they
are set off by comma's, may have a proper noun or pronoun as "head",
and do not semantically "restrict" an actant but simply add information.
One final observation: the semantic relation of the phrase to the rest
of the sentence appears to be similar to that of the MANN actants.

Waray has a construction which is quite parallel to these. The
English participle is paralleled by an "affixless stem" or a verb in
the PRES or PAST aspect. No relative pronoun is possible. And the
semantic interpretation is not "restrictive". The following examples
illustrate this.

(6) a. Inmabut an iya mga patud (A) hin Hwibis (T),
tumikang ha hurun.
"His cousins all arrived on Thursday, coming from
the farms."

b. Nagbaktas hira (A) (nga) kinarga nira an ira mga
butang.
"They left on foot, holding all their possessions
in their hands."

c. Simmakay hiya (A) ha awtu (L) (nga) inipit an
pakiti ha ilarum han iya buktun.
"He got in the car, carrying a package under his arm."

d. Inmabut hira (A) ha awtu (L) (nga) dara/dinara in
mga manuk.
"They came in the car, bringing some chickens
with them."
Note now the parallel structure of the following sentence, normally considered to contain an actant in the COMITATIVE case.

(7) Limmakat hiya (A) hin timpranu (T) (nga) upud/umupud an iya nanay.
    "He left early, taking along his mother."
    ("He left early with his mother.")

It will be argued here that the analysis of the structures in (6) is identical to the analysis of the COMITATIVE structure and that neither has a case construction as source. Since COM has been proposed as a case by various linguists (Blake among them), we shall devote considerably more attention to it than to the structures in (6). We argue that COM actants are but one subclass of the CIRC actants and that the proposal for COM applies as well to the remainder of the CIRC actants.

Blake (1930) suggests the COMITATIVE case to account for the underlined phrases in the following examples.

(8) a. He came with his father. (ad-verbal)
    b. the man with the dog (ad-nominal)
    c. The boy is with his father. (predicative)

We consider first the "ad-verbal" construction. Sentence (8a) may be translated into Waray using /upud/ in either of the following ways.

(9) a. Kinmanhi hiya (A) upud han iya tatay (COM).
    b. Kinmanhi hiya (A) upud an iya tatay (COM).
The semantic distinction between the two is reflected in the respective sentences in (10).

(10) a. He came, brought along by his father.
    b. He came, bringing along his father.
A couple of other examples of /upud/ clauses with "intransitives" follow.

(11) a. Nammasku hira (A) upud hi Jaime (COM).
       "They went carolling, taking Jim along."

       b. Kimadtu hi Auring (A) ha mirkadu (G) upud
       an suruguquq (COM).
       "Auring went to the market, taking along her maid."

The construction in Waray appears to be derived from a sentential source for the following reasons. First, it is possible to place the linker /nga/ between the COM phrase and the remainder of the sentence. /Nga/ is a common signal for embedded sentences (e.g., RREL's and COMP's). Second, if one assumes the sentential source and includes the equi-NP in the embedded sentence, the native speaker has only a feeling of "redundancy" about its inclusion. These two facts are illustrated in (12).

(12) a. Kinmanhi hiya (A) nga upud (hiya) han iya tatay (COM).

       b. Kammanhi hiya (A) nga upud (niya) an iya tatay (COM).

Third, the underlying embedded sentences posited are grammatical when standing alone and have a parallel interpretation with the corresponding topicalization. Viz.,

(13) a. Upud hiya (N) han iya tatay (A).
       "Father took him along."

       b. Upud niya (A) an iya tatay (N).
       "He took Father along."

The (pseudo) verb /upud/ is idiosyncratic in that it is not affixed to indicate topicalization and the person taken along (the NEUT actant) must always be topic.

Parenthetically, note that /upud/ may also be used as a regular verb stem, in which case the topic may be any of the actants which can normally topicalize. E.g.,
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(14) a. Maqupud hi Maria (A) kan Tatay (G).
   "Mary will take Father along."

   b. Uqupdan ni Maria (A) hi Tatay (G). Ditto.

We conclude then that the /upud/ structures so far given are
basically sentential. Let us next look at the "ad-nominal" structures
and evidence bearing on their source.

In the examples which follow it will be seen that /upud/ is
usually used to link two NP's identical as to animacy. Viz.,

(15) a. An libru (N)<upud han barasahun (N)>(COM) nahulus
   ha uran (L).
   "The book together with the magazine got soaked
   in the rain."

   b. Ginsuka niya (A) an iya pamahaw (N)<upud han butunis
   (N)>(COM). "He spit up his breakfast with the button."

(16) a. Hi Juan (A) kimmadtu ha sinihan (G)<upud hi Isabelo
   (A)>(COM).
   "John went to the show with Bill."

   b. Nekita namun (A) hi Carlos (N)<upud hi Lourdes
   (N)>(COM).
   "We saw Carl with Lourdes."

It is also possible to put together an animate and an inanimate with
the COM relationship on occasion. Not all examples of this sort are
equally acceptable for semantic reasons not now understood.

(17) a. Nahulug hi Juan (A) upud han lingkuran (COM).
   "John fell down with the chair." (the chair broke
   and fell down and John was taken along with it)

   b. Nahulug hi Juan (A) upud an lingkuran (COM).
   "John fell down with the chair." (John tipped over
   and took the chair along with him when he fell)

Recalling the sentential nature proposed above for the "ad-verbal"
construction, is it now possible to propose a parallel character for
the "ad-nominal" constructions? Clearly, the glosses employing "take
along" do not fit a paraphrase of the inanimate COM's. But the problem
is simply one of translation. For the Waray speaker, the sentences following parallel those in (15) just as the sentences in (12) parallel those in (9).

(18) a. An libru (N) nga upud (an libru) han barasahun (COM) nahulus ha uran (L).

b. Ginsuka niya (A) an pamahaw (N) nga upud (an pamahaw) han butunis (COM).

We conclude then that a sentential source is always present and that that sentence is tied to a particular actant in the matrix sentence through deletion of an identical actant in the embedded S. In the "intransitive" sentences, the actant with which it is associated is obvious. In the "transitive" sentences, selectional restrictions dictate which actant the COM actant can be associated with. (E.g., we know that raw eggs do not swallow or spit up buttons. Cf. (15c) and (16c).)

Some additional comments on the characteristics of /upud/ phrases follow. It is possible to negate the /upud/ clause with /diriq/. The semantic reading is parallel to other instances of negation of particular actants. Viz.,

(19) a. Limmakat hiya (A) diriq upud an iya asawa (COM). "He left not taking along his wife."

b. Nagqatindir hiya (A) han prugrama (N) diriq upud hi Maria. "He attended the program without Mary."

A contrast in implication is significant in the choice between /diriq upud/ and /gawas/. (A discussion of the use of /gawas/ is left for a future study. It does not appear to operate like /upud/. ) Note the following sentences.
(20) a. Ginbaligyaq niya (A) an karabaw (N) diriq upud an karumata.  
"He sold the carabao but not the cart."

b. Ginbaligyaq niya (A) an karabaw (N) gawas an karumata.  
"He sold the carabao separate from the cart."

The difference in implication indicated by the English glosses is not 
present in other uses of the two linkers. Viz.,

(21) a. Naruyag hiya (A) nga an bayad han subra nga uras niya (N) diriq upud didaq han rigular nga bayad niya.  

b. Naruyag hiya (A) nga an bayad han subra nga uras niya (N) gawas didaq han rigular nga bayad niya.

Both sentences mean that he wants both regular and overtime pay, so the gloss in (22) suffices.

(22) He wants his overtime pay to be separate from his regular pay.

It is generally the case that /upud/ indicates a spatial associa-
tion. When inanimates are in view, they are acted upon while spatially conjoined. When animates are involved, they perform an action when spatially conjoined. Thus, verbs of motion, which inherently involve spatial relations, are quite compatible with the animate /upud/ clauses. However, some animates conjoined by /upud/ which function as agents merely imply that the actant following /upud/ assists in the action identified by the verb. E.g.,

(23) Hi Susan (A) nagbayuq hin humay (N) upud hi Miling (COM).  
"Susan pounded the rice with Miling."
(they worked together)

As a parenthetic comment on COM and "with" phrases in English, note that there are a number of "with" phrases which are not COMITATIVE in nature and which are not translatable by /upud/ in Waray. The first "with" phrase which might be confused with COM is one indicating
possession.

(24) He suspected the man with the hat.

A literal translation of this sentence into Waray using /upud/ results is nonsense since the COM relationship is not present. Waray employs a RREL clause with "have" to express the meaning in (24). Viz.,

(25) Nagtahap hiya (A) han tawu nga may kalu (N).
    "He suspected the man that has a hat."

Thus, there is no ambiguity in Waray between COM and possessive phrases as there is in English with the "with" phrases.

Second, the reciprocal use of "with" must be distinguished from the COM use. In Waray they are unambiguous since reciprocity is indicated by verbal affixation. Viz.,

(26) Naghimangrawun hira Sam ngan hi Harry (A).
    "Sam talked with Harry."

Third, the instrumental use of "with", which is clearly semantically distinct in English, is also syntactically distinct in Waray. Thus, there is simply an ART with the INST actant, while /upud/ is present with the COM actant.

There is a fourth set of "with" phrases in English which do seem to have the COM relationship which can not be expressed by a COM actant in Waray. Waray expresses the meaning in (27) with a CAUS construction. Cf. (28).

(27) I sent the records with Harry.

(28) Gimpadara ku (C) an rikurds (N) kan Harry (A).
    (lit. I had Harry take along the records.)

Let us now investigate what sort of relationship the COM actant in particular and the CIRC actants in general have with the actants to which they are tied.
The COM relationship does not seem to have a RREL source even though it seems semantically appropriate on occasions. A syntactic peculiarity of relativization in Philippine languages is that the equi-NP in the embedded S must be topic. Obviously this does not hold for the COM clause. Viz.,

(29) Nagtahap hiya (A) han tawu (N) nga upud it ayam (COM).
"He suspected the man with the dog."

The deleted /han tawu/ in (29) is non-topic.

A second possibility, that COM actants are in a case relationship to head nouns, is conceivable but not well-motivated. Note that one would have to restrict the case relationship of the head noun considerably since it appears that only those cases which can become ACTOR and OBJECT can be the heads. More important, /upud/ is but one of a number of lexical items which can appear with the syntactic characteristics noted above. Cf. the examples in (16).

Third, the COM relationship with /upud/ is certainly on the surface not one of conjunction. Semantically, there is quite a difference if the "conjuncts" are reversed. Syntactically, the topicalization of the two "conjuncts" may be different, a situation intolerable in "true" conjunction.

(30) a. Nagtahap hiya (A) han tawu (N) upud an daraga (COM).
"He suspected the man with the young lady."

b. Nagtahap hiya (A) han tawu ngan han daraga (N).
"He suspected the man with the young lady."

Nevertheless, a deep structure conjunction source most naturally explains the fact that the two sentences do not have a particular linkage relationship. We conclude then that COM actants in particular and
CIRC actants in general are derived from a double sentence source having an NP in common. Cf. Thompson (1969) for a proposal along these lines for NRREL's and also RREL's. To implement such a proposal, we need a transformation deleting the identical NP, assuring the affixless state of the verb, and optionally deleting the /nga/ linker.
4.6 Comitative

The COMITATIVE relationship is considered a part of the preceding CIRCUMSTANTIAL construction. See that section (4.5) for a full discussion of the COMITATIVE relationship.

4.7 Comparative

Blake proposed the COMPARATIVE case on adjectives and adverbs to provide for the underlined phrases which follow.

(1) a. redder than blood (ad-adjectival)
   b. more sweetly than an angel (ad-adverbal)

Although this grammar has not provided a source for comparatives in Waray, the position taken is (a) that a deep structure sentence is reflected in the comparative structure found in the surface, and (b) that the deep structure sentence is not so obviously in a case relationship. Some comments on comparative-like structures have been made under the SIMILATIVE section (2.30) but for the most part this is a section not yet accounted for.
4.8 Dative

In Section I (2.1.5) we questioned the obligatory link of animacy to DAT. In this section we question the necessity of the DAT case. It will be argued that what has formerly been considered DAT may be incorporated into a more comprehensive case labelled GOAL.

Let's recall first the definition of DAT provided by Fillmore (1968, p. 24). DAT is "the case of the animate being affected by the state or action identified by the verb." Now note the definition we propose for GOAL. Goal is the case of the object, being, or place toward which the action or state identified by the verb is directed. The definition is meant to apply regardless of whether the action reaches the GOAL or not.

Since it is going to be argued that DAT must be included into a more encompassing case, let us characterize the other part of that case. It might be called DIRECTIONAL and would be defined as follows. DIR is the case of the place toward which the action identified by the verb is directed. (DIR is separated here from LOC to provide for the later merger of DAT and DIR into GOAL. For justification of the division, see Section II, Chapter 3 (2.15).)

We now note some apparent arguments for keeping DAT separate from DIR.

First, it can be argued that DAT is always animate and DIR is always inanimate and represents a place. The reader is referred to Section I (2.1.5) above which answers the first part of the statement. In regard to DIR being inanimate and a place, note the following sentences.
(1) a. He went to John (DIR) when he got in trouble.
   b. He threw the stone at Bill (DIR).
   c. He shot at the tiger (DIR).
   d. He travelled by bus to his fiancee (DIR).

   Second, it might be contended that the pro-forms for DAT and DIR are different. Looking at the question pro-forms, note the following differences in English.

   (2) He went to Tacloban (DIR). \{ \textit{Where did he go?} \}
       \{ **\textit{To whom did he go?} \}

   (3) He gave the money to Bill (DAT).
       \{ **\textit{Where did he give the money?} \}
       \{ \textit{To whom did he give the money?} \}

   Turning next to the declarative pro-forms a similar difference is found.

   (4) He went to Tacloban (DIR) and she went \{ \textit{there} \} too.
       \{ **\textit{to it} \}

   (5) He gave some money to Bill (DAT) and she gave

       some \{ **\textit{there} \} too.
       \{ \textit{to him} \}

   We have so far assumed that DAT is obligatorily animate and DIR is inanimate. However, if the animacy restriction is removed, then the argument from pro-form differences can be maintained but must be expanded to show that the feature animate as well as the case is involved. We return to the question pro-forms.

   (6) He went to John and Bill (DIR). \{ \textit{Where did he go?} \}
       \{ \textit{To whom did he go?} \}

   (7) He gave the money to the new foundation. (DAT)
       \{ \textit{Where did he give the money?} \}
       \{ \textit{To whom did he give the money?} \}
So, in question pro-forms, the pro-form can either reflect the unmarked specification of the animacy feature tied to the case or if the feature is marked, then the pro-form may reflect the marked specification. I.e., DAT is normally animate so "to whom" can invariably appear. When the DAT NP is inanimate, the speaker has the option of choosing the inanimate pro-form "where" also. With DIR, just the opposite is the case. Thus, question pro-forms, regardless of the restriction one places regarding animacy on the cases, argue for DAT and DIR being separate.

Similarly in declarative sentences, although the pro-form always follows the animacy of the case it replaces, the case relation (DAT vs. DIR) is also relevant. Viz.,

(8) He went to John (DIR) and I went \{"there" \} too.
    \{to him\}

(9) He gave some money to the foundation (DAT) and I
gave some \{"there" \} too.
    \{to it \}

If DAT is equivalent to DIR, then the pro-forms of (4) and (9) should be identical. Since they are not, either (a) DAT is not equivalent to DIR, or (b) GOAL, i.e., DAT-DIR, must be subcategorized for [animate] and [place] qualities. Assuming the latter choice, in the above examples "foundation" could be [-animate] and [-place], while "Tacloban" could be [-animate] and [+place]. Accompanying various verbs, certain nouns could be taken as [a-place] allowing either "to it/him/her" or "there", e.g., "ship" and "Bill". The latter choice permits avoiding the link between the case and animacy. The set up would be that shown in (10).
(10) GOAL \{+animate\} \{+place\}

A third argument one might raise for separating DAT and DIR has
to do with their apparent transformational potentials. From the
examples in (11) and (12), it appears that DAT is subjectivizable as a
passive while DIR is not.

(11) a. The pastor gave a book to John (DAT).
   b. John was given a book by his pastor.

(12) a. The Barrio Captain went to that bank (DIR).
   b. *That bank was gone to by the Barrio Captain.

It seems clear from other verbs, however, that the passive subject
potential is verb dependent. That is, the passive subjectivization
can only work if an actant has been objectivized first and some DAT's
can not be, just as "that bank" in (12b) could not be. Viz.,

(13) a. He explained things to me.
   b. *He explained me things.
   c. *I was explained things by him.

As a parenthesis, note that passive subjectivization does seem to be
case dependent (at least in my dialect) with some cases though. Viz.,

(14) a. He bought the book for John.
   b. He bought John (RESV) the book.
   c. *John (RESV) was bought the book by him.

Similarly the objectivization potential seems to be verb dependent
and not solely a matter of case. Viz.,

(15) a. I told a lie to the man who has on the red sweater.
   b. I told the man a lie.
(16) a. I said that to the other man.
   b. *I said the other man that I would leave at noon.
   c. I said to the other man that I would leave at noon.

A fourth argument for separating DAT and DIR, i.e., their co-
occurrence, is valid only if DIR and LOC are taken as a single case,
a position we have argued against in Section II, Chapter 3 (2.15).

(17) I gave Bill (DAT) the book (N) in the library (LOC-DIR).

It is extremely difficult to find examples of DAT and a clear DIR co-
occurring. One which has been suggested is the following.

(18) I gave out food to the people (DAT) up to Bill (DIR).

The sentence itself is questionable for me in grammaticality and the
assignment of the last actant to DIR is not certain either.

In favor of merging DAT and DIR into a single case, GOAL, are the
following considerations.

First, both DAT and DIR appear to be both animate and inanimate.
Cf. the examples above and following.

(19) a. He gave Bill (DAT) a kick.
   b. He gave the radiator (?) a kick.

(20) a. He went to the circus (DIR).
   b. He went to the business manager (?)

Second, DAT like DIR appears to be either a goal toward which
action is directed or a recipient of the action. That is, many DAT's
are not very clearly "affected" by the action identified by the verb.
Cf. comments in Section I (2.1.5) and the following examples.

(21) a. She attributed her pleasing disposition to her
     father (DAT).
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b. Sam (DAT) likes ice cream better than strawberry pie.

c. Do they (DAT) want a written statement?

Third, DAT appears not to co-occur with DIR (cf. above), hence, both could appear under the single label "GOAL".

Fourth, in Waray, both DAT and DIR allow the /ngadtu/ class deictics.

Admittedly the evidence is not overwhelming for replacing DAT with the more inclusive GOAL. However, the approach avoids the animacy link with its special problems while at the same time being more general without losing descriptive power.
4.9 Descriptive

The case was proposed by Blake (1930) to characterize the underlined actants in the following examples.

(1) a. a man of the sea (ad-nominal)
   b. an adverb of time
   c. a lesson in swimming
(2) a. he of England (ad-pronominal)
   b. animals of the sea and those of the land
(3) a. John, the carpenter (appositive)
   b. we, the people of the United States
(4) a. The lesson is in swimming. (predicative)
   b. John is a carpenter.

As was pointed out in Section I (2.1.1), in the ad-nominal and ad-pronominal uses of the DESCRIPTIVE case, it is so ill-defined both syntactically and semantically that its usefulness is negligible. There are many actants which one might want to say are functioning in a DESCRIPTIVE manner but they seem equally well to fit under one of the other relationships Blake has proposed, such as RELATIONAL, QUALITATIVE, and POSSESSIONAL. Some additional examples follow.

(5) a. an mga prisyu han mga peralitun
   "the prices of things bought"
   b. han duranti hit kasamukan
   "the duration of the war"
   c. tikang didaq ha siyudad hit Tacloban
   "from the city of Tacloban"
   d. an sakit han iya kasingkasing
   "the weakness of his heart"
e. han kadamuq han iya trabahu
   "the large amount of his work"

f. an kahalabaq han kahuy
   "the length of the log"

g. ha sakub han kahun
   "the inside of the box"

h. han iya adlaw han tapus
   "on the day of her 'tapus'"

A case solution to the actants underlined in the preceding examples may be possible but the addition of a label which has no feature, either syntactic or semantic, characterizing it is certainly not a step in that direction. NEUT case being what it is, it seems preferable to add these actants to it.

In regard to the appositive use of the DESC case, an underlying copulative sentence is assumed in which the appositive phrase functions as predicate. This removes the need for positing an additional case relationship to account for the appositive structures. It should be pointed out that although some predicate case relationships are not particularly felicitous, they are all acceptable as inputs to the apposition transformation. Note the use of equational sentences with a prep phrase in the predicate as source for the appositives in the following sentences.

(6) a. His wife, in India now, is British.
   b. The book, for John's friend, is on the table.
   c. This palace, the king's, is nearly covered with ivy.
   d. The primary battle, for the citadel, was short but bloody.

The predicative examples of DESC are considered in the section above entitled ESSIVE (2.13).
4.10 **Exceptive (EX)**

Blake (1930, p. 42) tentatively proposed an ad-verbal case called **EXCEPTIVE** to account for the underlined actant in the following sentence.

(1) No man ever enters the covent except the bishop.

In a footnote he admits that the case may not be "strictly adverbial" but contends that it is certainly adnominal. The ad-nominal example he provides is the following.

(2) every man except the king himself

We shall show here that not only is there no such case ad-verbally but neither is there one ad-nominally. What looks like an ad-nominal case is in fact a phrase within a subordinate linking of one case to an identical one.

Let us show first that there are two identical cases linked together by a particle (either /labut/ or /pwira/+).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGT</th>
<th>Ngatanan (A) labut kan Nonoy (A) (EX) nahulug ha ikasmin (N).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Everyone flunked the exam except Nonoy.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEUT</th>
<th>Ginlitsun ni Nanding (A) ngatanan nga babuy (N) labut hin usa (N) (EX).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Nanding roasted all the pigs except one.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GO</th>
<th>Nagpadara hiya (A) hin surat (N) ha ngatanan nga istudyanti (G) labut kan Ester (G)(EX).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;He sent a letter to all the students except (to) Ester.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SO</th>
<th>Hi Ben (G) nakakuha han &quot;A&quot; (N) ha ngatanan han iya titsir (S) labut (ha) kan Nelson (S)(EX).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Ben got an &quot;A&quot; from all his teachers except (from) Nelson.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESV</th>
<th>Ginpalit niya (A-G) para ha ngatanan (RESV) labut (para) kan Auring (RESV)(EX).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;He bought one for everyone except (for) Auring.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As the above examples show, the two cases linked by /labut/ must be identical. This suggests that the EX phrase be introduced as subordinate to the identical case. Thus, the downward spread of the case features could naturally mark the AC of the EX phrase identically with the case dominating it.

There is some question as to whether the case to which the phrase is linked must be semantically compatible. In English, it must indicate an entire class or a null class so that the EX phrase can indicate the exception(s) to that class. Thus the sentence in (10) is semantically deviant.

(10) *I voted against some of the candidates except Ben.

The Waray translation in (11), however, is acceptable to at least one of my informants and is also ambiguous. Viz.,

(11) Nagbutar aku (A) kuntra han iba nga kandidatu (OPP) labut kan Ben (OPP)(EX).
    a. "I voted against some of the candidates but not against Ben."
    b. "I voted against some of the candidates in addition to Ben."

If a semantic restriction holds for Waray as it does for English, the EX phrase should be introduced so that co-occurrence restrictions with the QUANT of the higher NP can be stated easily.

It is also necessary to allow the EX phrase to occur either with or without the PART phrase. The following source, meeting these requirements is proposed.
An EX POSTPOSING transformation is required, which is practically identical to the PART POSTPOSING T of Stockwell et al. (1968, p. 169), to permute the EX phrase to the end. After the PART reduction transformation has applied, the string in (12) becomes (13).

(13) ha ngatanan han iya titsir labut ha kan Nelson. "from all his teachers except Nelson"

/labut/ and /pwira/ can not be used with a sentential structure following them. The restriction seems to be a semantic one based on the POST constituent required by the EX actant. The equivalent sentences in English seem odd if not ungrammatical. Viz.,

(14) a. ?He painted the whole room except he missed a spot on the ceiling.
b. He was for the most part eager to meet her except he was afraid that they might not hit it off.

If informants are asked to repeat such sentences they almost invariably use the adversative conjunction "but" instead of "except".

Several other linkers may be used with approximately the same semantic interpretation as for /labut/: /kun di(ri) laq/, /gawas/, and /diri upud/. The literal translation of the first is "if/when not only", the second "outside", and the third "not accompanying". The linkers are by no means equivalent since in other constructions they are mutually exclusive. /Upud/ without the negative /diri/ is used in the COM relationship (cf. CIRC above). Some examples of their use as EX follow.

(15) Waray (A) sinmakub han kumbintu (N) kun diri laq it ubispu (EX). "No one entered the convent except the bishop."

(16) Ginkaqun nira (A) ngatanan (N) gawas han litsun (EX). "They ate everything except the roasted pig."

(17) Ginkaqun nira (A) ngatanan (N) diri upud an litsun (EX). "They ate everything except the roasted pig."
4.11 Inclinalional

Blake proposed the INCLINATIONAL case to account for the underlined actants in the following phrases, both considered to be ad-adjecital.

(1) a. suitable for travel
   b. kind to the poor

The former example is considered in this analysis to be an example of the PURP case relationship and the latter falls under the GOAL relationship. We have not found a need for an INCLINATIONAL case.

4.12 Introductive

INTRODUCTIVE was one of two independent cases proposed by Blake. He notes that this case, usually called the nominative absolute, stands in relation to the whole sentence and does not modify any special word. The example he gives follows.

(1) This man (as for this man), nothing can be done for him. Examples of this type of construction are considered to be examples of the result of a left dislocation transformation involving pronominalization. It should be noted that the dislocated element can be in practically any case relationship which itself is an argument against providing it with an additional case relation. Viz.,

(2) a. Sam, he (AGT) gives me ulcers.
   b. Sam, John saw him (N) yesterday.
   c. Sam, I got him (RESV) a watch.
   d. Sam, she sold him (G) some cufflinks.
4.13 Objective

Blake proposed the OBJECTIVE case to account for the underlined actant which follows.

(1) love of (towards) a father

Having assumed a case capability on head nouns, it is a simple matter to account for such actants as exemplary of the GOAL relationship. The OBJECTIVE case is not used therefore.
4.14 Possessive

Possessive has not been considered a case for several reasons, foremost among them the fact that if a characterization of a possessive case is given, the actants falling within its scope appear to have various case relationship interpretations. That is, the possessive relationship seems to be a surface phenomenon. Cf. Section I (2.1.3) for a lengthy discussion on the relationships of preposed genitives to their head nouns in English.

We content ourselves here with showing that Waray, like English, allows a great variety of actant-head noun relationships which are marked formally by the same linkers.

Postposed genitives in Waray are marked when non-NNAME by /han/, /hin/, or /hit/. Cf. Section II, Chapter 2 (5.2) for comments on when each of these is chosen.

1. a. han inuqyukan han higanti
   "the home of the giant"

b. it idad hit bataq
   "the age of the child"

c. an sikritiryu han prisidinti
   "the secretary of/to the president"

d. an nga transaksyunis nga dagku han nammumunuqan
   "the large transactions of the administrative heads"

When the non-NNAME actants are preposed, they are linked to the head noun by /nga/. /Ha/ is used as the DET on the preposed actant.

2. a. It ha bataq nga idad "the age of the child"

b. an ha prisidinti nga sikritiryu
   "the secretary to the president"

c. an ha nammumunuqan nga mga transaksyunis nga dagku
   "the large transactions of the administrative heads"
Postposed genitives which are NAME genitives are marked by /ni/.

(3) a. han balay ni Ben "the house of Ben", "Ben's house"
    c. han irung ni Juan "the nose of John", "John's nose"

When preposed, NAME genitives are marked by /kan/ and linked by /nga/ unless the head noun is an inalienable in which case /nga/ is omitted.

(4) a. han kan Ben nga balay "Ben's house"
    c. han kan Juan irung "John's nose"
4.15 Qualitative

Blake has suggested the label QUALITATIVE for a few actants. Viz.,

(1) a man of handsome mien (ad-nominal)

(2) the messenger was of handsome appearance (predicative)

Remarks made above in regard to the DESC case apply here as well. There are no particularly distinguishing semantic or syntactic characteristics which can be gleaned from these examples to distinguish them from other case relations such as NEUT. Actants of this sort will be assumed to fall under the more general NEUT relationship.
4.16 Relational

The RELATIONAL case was proposed by Blake to account for a variety of actants, among them the following.

(1) a. a man in stature (ad-nominal)
   b. a man with respect to age

(2) a. different from any man (ad-pronominal)
   b. other than this

(3) a. rich in this world's goods (ad-jectival)
   b. full of water

(4) He talked to me about your prospects. (ad-verbal)

(5) He advanced boldly with respect to his outward appearance. (ad-adverbial)

The same comments made about the ad-nominal and ad-pronominal uses of the DESCRIPTIVE case apply to REL. The REL concept is not well defined in the ad-nominal relationship.

The ad-jectival use of a REL case is possible as the following example shows.

(6) Riku hi Sam (A) hin kalibutanun (REL).
   "Sam is rich in worldly things."

These are included in this grammar with the ad-verbal use of a REL case. (cf. 2.26)

The example in (5) is marginal and practically uninterpretable in my dialect. There being no morphological "adverbs" in Waray anyway, an ad-adverbial use of the case is impossible.
4.17 Resultant

Blake suggests the label RESULTANT for the "appositive" (or "objective complement") actants underlined in the following example.

(1) a. The father named his son John.
    b. They elected him governor.
    c. She made him jealous.

In Waray (1a) remains an unsolved problem for case assignment, one example in favor of a case label such as RES. Hopeful of finding a better solution the RES case is not proposed. The structure is unfortunately not the same as that given for (1b) which follows the format of the OFF case proposed above (2.22). The Waray translations of (1a) and (1b) follow.

(2) a. Ginngaran han tatay (A) an iya anak (N) hin Juan (?)
    b. Ginbutar nira (A) hiya (N) hin pagkagubirnadur (OFF)

The third example (1c) requires a verbal use of the stem meaning "jealous" and employs the CAUS construction. Viz.,

(3) Ginpaqawaq niya (C) hiya (G).

In sum then, only (1a) remains as evidence for the RES case and so we consider it a non-case and search for a solution to the problem example.
Blake suggested a SIMPLE predicative case to account for the underlined actants in the following sentences.

(1)  a. His father is a carpenter.
    b. It is he.
    c. It is mine.
    d. My advice is this.
    e. What is this?
    f. This is the same.
    g. All good things are three.
    h. He was the first.

The viewpoint expressed above under ESSIVE (2.13) which espouses an ESS case is quite similar to Blake's proposal. The term ESS practically substitutes for SIMPLE.
4.19 Subjective

The SUBJECTIVE case was proposed by Blake to account for the underlined actants following.

(1) a. The man ate his dinner.  (independent)

b. The dinner having been eaten, he got up and left the room.  (subordinate)

Now that we have the concept of deep structure and a transformational relation to a surface configuration, it is a simple matter to subsume the subjective "case" under the other cases which have been proposed which can be "subjectivalized" in English. Had Waray been the language of primary consideration for Blake, he would probably not have distinguished a subjective case separate from an AGT or NEUT case since there is no corresponding movement transformation which removes a PREP from an AGT case.
4.20 **Substantial**

Blake (1930) suggested the SUBSTANTIAL case to account for the underlined phrases below.

(1) a. Their knives are made of *stone*. (ad-verbal)
   b. This ring is *of iron*. (predicative)
   c. The rod of *iron* (ad-nominal)

Translations of the first two examples result in constructions utilizing the SOURCE relationship. Viz.,

(2) a. An *ira kutsilyu* (N) *hinimuq tikang ha batu* (S).
   b. Ininga *singsing* (ESS) *tikang ha puthaw* (S).

Constructions in English similar to that in (1c) are translated into Waray by a syntactic construction which is indistinguishable on the surface from the attributive adjectival constructions. Viz.,

(3) a. *hin usa ka tasa nga tunaq* "a cup of clay", "a clay cup", "a cup which is clay"
   b. *hin usa ka tasa nga pula* "a red cup", "a cup which is red"

The source for /tunaq/ in (3a), however, is considered to be a SOURCE case inside a RREL which underwent REL reduction. The adjective in (3b) also has a RREL source but is verbal rather than nominal.

(The phrase "rod of iron" is translated by the simple noun /puthaw/ in Waray so no case relation is reflected.)

Note that the surface structure of (3a) is identical to that of the CONTENTIVE structure. And the ambiguity of (3a) reflects the two different sources. Viz.,

(4) a. "a cupful of clay" -- **CONT**
   b. "a clay cup" -- **ADJ**
4.21 Theme

The comments which follow point out the bias within which this study of Waray was undertaken. This analysis of Waray did not have at its forefront a consideration of the classification of verbs by categories such as "action", "motional", "positional", etc. Cases were identified by qualifications inherent in the relation between them and verbs rather than by semantic characteristics of the verbs they accompany. Hence, a case such as THEME, described by Gruber (1965, p. 27-29) as the entity which is in motion with motional verbs, did not receive the investigation it warrants. When and if a set of semantic characteristics of verb classes can be arrived at, the whole matter of case relations must be restudied taking that information into account. Having taken the position on definition of cases we did, THEME has no place in the lineup since most of its tokens fall into the NEUT case with a few others being sprinkled in other cases.
4.22 Vocative

One of the independent cases introduced by Blake (1930) was the VOCATIVE. His example (p. 37) follows.

(1) John, close the door.

This relationship is not considered a case relationship for the simple reason that the actant bears little resemblance to the other relations accepted as cases. It does not appear to have a verb or noun as head, the whole sentence following being the item it is connected to and calling attention to. It does not have subcategorial or selectional restrictions with any verbs. It does not seem to have co-occurrence restrictions with any other case. It never appears with a PREP.
Chapter 4: PHRASE STRUCTURE RULES

The phrase structure (PS) rules incorporated in this partial description are derived in part from those proposed for English by Fillmore (1968), Stockwell et al. (1968), and Matthews (n.d.) and in part from exigencies of Waray. They follow immediately with comments on each rule coming after.

(1) a. S(entence) → M(odal) PROP(osition)

b. PROP → V(erb) AC(tant)^n

c. \{AC
\{PART(itive)
\{CONT(entive)
\} \} \} → P(reposition) N(oun) P(hrase)

d. NP → \{D(eterminer) NOM(inal) \}

e. D → ART(icle) (POST(article) (EX(ceptive)))

f. NOM → N(oun) \{\{AC^n \} \}

\{\{PART \} \}

g. EX → L(inker) AC

Structures I have not attempted to handle have not been provided for in the PS rules. Some things which would have to be added for a complete description would be conjunction, relativization (both restrictive and non-restrictive), questions, imperatives, and the internal structure of POST.

The following comments are intended to provide clarification, comparison, and defense of the above rules.

PS rule (1a):

(i) Modal

No expansion of MOD is provided since (a) its contents do not
directly concern the main thrust of this grammar, i.e., case considerations, and (b) there is little evidence for its internal structure. The node will provide a place for the introduction of features and categories such as aspect, tense, sentence type, and negation and when such features are occasionally used they are assumed to have this source.

(ii) it

Matthews (n.d.) proposes the following as the first rule of the PS component.

\[ (2) \; S \rightarrow \text{Mod} \; \text{it} \; \text{Aux} \; \text{Prop} \; (\text{Man}) \; (\text{Ben}) \; (\text{Loc}) \; (\text{Tim}) \]

The node "it" functions as a marker of the subject position and is normally replaced by a fronted NP. The proposal is unashamedly English specific. Having the avowed purpose of seeing how applicable Case Grammar can be to an Austronesian language, we choose Fillmore's earlier proposal which does not use "it".

(iii) Adverbials outside PROP

In discussing adverbial phrases, Matthews makes the point that some adverbs of a particular kind seem to be tied directly to a verb while others of the same kind seem to modify the Prop as a whole. Thus, his initial rewrite rule has Man, Ben, Loc, and Tim adverbials outside the Prop, adjacent to it (cf (2)), and the later Prop rewrite rule provides for the same relations to appear under Prop. This is to provide apparently for the difference in permutability of full adverbial NP's and pro-adverbs.

\[ (3) \; a. \; \text{The student (Nom) put his book (Abs) on the desk (Loc).} \]
\[ b. \; \text{The student (Nom) put his book (Abs) away (Loc).} \]
(4) a. The student (Nom) put on the desk (Loc) his book (Abs).

b. The student (Nom) put away (Loc) his book (Abs).

Apparently one of the Loc actants is thought to come from inside the Prop and the other from outside. If this is the point, it is a weak one since permutability seems to be length-dependent rather than dependent on structural configuration. (4a) is perfectly acceptable if the Abs phrase is "long" and "heavy" enough. Viz.,

(5) The student put on the desk the four volume tome which he had spent the last four years laboriously translating.

Another argument for placing some adverbials outside the PROP is the "stacking" of BEN, LOC, and TIME actants. I.e., more than one can appear in a single sentence in connection with a single verb. This characteristic has been handled for the most part in the present by splitting the BEN, LOC, and TIME cases into several cases.

The presence of MANN outside the PROP might be argued for on the grounds of its peripheral nature as seen in lack of co-occurrence restrictions with the verb, etc. Fillmore, accepting such arguments, suggests that a number of case relationships might be introduced under the MOD. We have chosen the opposite course and introduce all case relationships under PROP, regardless of now "nuclear" or "peripheral" they may be. Cf. Section II, Chapter 3 (1.0) for a fuller discussion of this decision.

PS rule (1b):

(i) Equational Sentences

This phrase structure rule reflects the decision to utilize an ESSIVE case to account for equational sentences. Cf. Section II, Chap-
ter 3 (2.13). In this analysis the verb is lexically empty and one of the cases other than ESS is moved into the position of the verb. The result is a simplified phrase structure rule at the (perhaps exorbitant) cost of complicating the transformational component.

(ii) AC

Matthews' concept of the PROP being a V followed by a string of NP's or ADV's, (6), is only slightly modified.

(6) \[ \text{Prop} \rightarrow V \left( \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{NP} \\ \text{Adv} \end{array} \right\} \cdots \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{NP} \\ \text{Adv} \end{array} \right\} \right) \]

We have chosen to use AC rather than NP to allow for the incorporation of PREP and NP together under a single node. The most significant point in common in the formulations is the relegation of case relations to the lexicon. Compare the proposal by Stockwell et al. (1968) for the PROP rewrite, where case information is introduced in the PS rules.

(7) \[ \text{PROP} \rightarrow V (\text{ESS}) (\text{NEUT}) (\text{DAT}) (\text{LOC}) (\text{INS}) (\text{AGT}) \]

The case information in the present description (as in Matthews) is supplied from the lexicon and associated by convention with each actant following the verb. Cf. the Case Spread Convention in Section II, Chapter 2 (2.1).

(iii) AC^n

The superscript "n" notation is used to collapse into one rule an infinite set of rules each having a different number of AC's following V (from none to infinity). Naturally in the actual description of the language the number of actants needed is usually less than five. However, the restriction on number is made a lexical matter and all trees produced which have more AC's than the lexical choice permits are simply discards. The superscript notation does not differ in
substance from Matthews' inclusional bracketing.

PS rule (1c):

(i) AC, PART, and CONT

PART and CONT like AC rewrite as PREP followed by an NP. The PART and CONT nodes are generated in rule (1f) as an optional rewrite of NOM. Cf. Section II, Chapter 3 (3.1 & 2) for arguments why these nodes are parallel to but not one of the case related actants.

(ii) Preposition

Matthews proposes that there are two different kinds of PREP's. One kind, "adverbial preps", arise as a rewrite of NP. These have an inherent meaning they contribute. Case marking PREP's, those having only a "syntactic" meaning, are introduced by a Chomsky-adjunction transformation and function only to indicate which case relationship the following NP is in.

Warsay has no PREP's of the second kind, so I choose to introduce the "adverbial preps" outside the NP.

PS rule (1d):

(i) Sentence

Sentential complements are considered to be invariably dominated by an NP. These are provided for by this rule which rewrites an NP as S under one option. Very little has been said in this description about either complementation or nominalization but it is shown that both are necessary in a great number of case relationships. Special restrictions are required in some case relationships to insure that the rewrite is invariably sentential and in others to insure it is non-sentential (or at least nominalized if sentential).
(ii) NOMinal

The node NOM is included in anticipation of the insertion of a mechanism to handle restrictive relativization (if not in the deep structure at least in the derived trees). Its value for present transformations is marginal.

PS rule (le):

As mentioned above, the POST constituent is merely a place holder in this analysis since its internal structure is completely ignored. It is assumed that an analysis similar to that proposed in Stockwell et al. (1968) will be possible for Waray. The EX node indicates an actant relationship directly dependent on the presence of POST. See Section II, Chapter 3 (4.10) for a detailed explanation of this relationship. PS rule (lg) provides the idiosyncratic rewrite with the EX phrase.

PS rule (lf):

The NOM rewrite rule parallels that of PROP, allowing actants to be case related to N (as they are to V). As with the PROP rewrite, the case relationships are introduced from lexical entries and spread to the AC's.

PART and CONT are two quasi-case relations, being attached to a head noun but excluding all other cases on their head noun, and not having co-occurrence constraints with any particular noun. For arguments justifying this position and a fuller description of these two quasi-cases, see Section II, Chapter 3 (3.1 & 2).
PS rule (lg):

The EX phrase is idiosyncratic in allowing a special linker to precede its actant. It is thus possible to have both the linker and a PREP introducing an NP in the EX relationship.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The set of transformational rules presented here contains but a few of those needed in a full grammar of Waray. The particular ones discussed here were chosen because of their direct link to case and situation assignment, the distinctive features of a case grammar.

Some of the "transformations" presented are on the order of meta-transformations (here called "conventions") because of their wide applicability. (E.g., the Case Spread Convention.) Others are discussed only and not formulated (e.g., topic assignment) because their domain appears to be beyond the sentence. Still others are examples of "normal" transformations which permute and delete constituents, and add features. A few transformations have structure building capability.

Time has not permitted a more thorough investigation of other transformations which likely hinge on the case and situation information. It is expected that a variety of anaphoric transformations effecting deletion of constituents will be crucially based on situation assignment. The area remains almost untouched.
2.0 CASE SPREAD CONVENTION

The Case Spread Convention is needed because case information is considered basically a matter of the lexicon and not of the PS rules. Its function is to transfer case information to the actants in the trees formed by the PS rules. We consider it a convention since it is best thought of as a part of lexical insertion. (I.e., it applies to every tree created and only minimally changes the tree structure.) The convention can be stated as follows.

\[
(1) \text{SD: } X \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{PROP} \\ \text{NOM} \end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c} V \\ \vdots \end{array} \right] \overset{2}{\left[ \begin{array}{c} A \cdots C \cdots C^m \end{array} \right]} X \\
1 \left[ +_{+K^n} (+_{+K^{n+1}} +_{+K^{n+2}} \cdots +_{+K^m}) \right] \\
1 \quad 3_n \quad 3_{n+1} \quad 3_{n+2} \quad 3_m \quad l_n \quad l_{n+1} \quad l_m \quad 5 \\
\]

\[
\text{SC: (a) Add } 3_n \text{ to } l_n \\
\text{ (b) Add } 3_{n+1} \text{ to } l_{n+1} \\
\text{ (c) Continue until } 3_m \text{ is added to } l_m \\
\]

\[
\text{COND: (a) } n = 1 \\
\text{ (b) All 3's are case features like AGT, GOAL, etc.} \\
\text{ (c) Obligatory} \\
\text{ (d) Cyclic} \\
\]

The application of the Case Spread Convention to (2) results in (3).

\[
(2) \quad S \\
\text{MOD \hspace{1cm} PROP} \\
V \quad AC \quad AC \quad AC \quad \text{surat} \\
\quad [\_+_A +N +G -S] \\
(3) \quad S \\
M \quad PROP \\
V \quad AC \quad AC \quad AC \quad AC \quad \text{surat} \\
\quad [+A] \quad [+N] \quad [+G] \\
\quad [\_+_A +N +G -S] \\
\]
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The order of insertion of N's and V's is not crucially affected by this convention. If N insertion precedes V insertion, one simply assigns a deviant reading to an S in which the case feature contradicts a feature of the noun it dominates. And if V insertion precedes N insertion, the same result is possible. The same comments apply to the relationship of PREP and N insertion. To facilitate consideration, however, we choose lexical insertion in the following order: V, Prep, N.
3.0 SITUATION ASSIGNMENT

Depending on the case in question, the collocation of cases, and idiosyncratic features of verbs regarding situation assignment, cases receive various situational assignments. A number of cases may appear in more than one situational assignment. And a number of verbs allow a single case associated with them to appear in more than one situational relation.

One way of formalizing this situation is to predict the most general situational results by redundancy rules and have specified in the lexicon prior to this those situational assignments which deviate from the more general assignments. Having the result of the redundancy rules formally the same as the specification of the idiosyncratic situation assignments, i.e., a feature on the verb, a transformation can be stated which copies the situational information from the verb onto the actants.

3.1 Lexical Feature Assignment

Some case-situation relations are assumed to be idiosyncratic to a verb (or class of verbs). These are indicated in the lexicon by features of the following form. ("K" stands for any case relation and "Σ" for any situational relation.)

\[(1) \quad [+K \rightarrow +Σ]\]

The majority of the case-situation relations may be redundantly specified utilizing inherent and contextual case information about actants. Both types of information are present in the case frame feature assigned to each verb so the situational redundancy rules operate with that feature as input. The redundancy rules obviously
operate after the verb and actant choice is made and add the features needed for specification of surface situational assignment. The rules are assumed to apply only when the case in question is not already marked by an idiosyncratic situation assignment feature.

For clarity, the first redundancy rule is specified in English as well as formally.

(2) a. \([+____...+K...-CAUS...]\)
   \[\downarrow\]
   \([+K \rightarrow +ACT]\), where \(K = AGT, AGT-SO, \) or \(AGT-GO\)

b. \([+____...+K...+CAUS...]\)
   \[\downarrow\]
   \([+K \rightarrow +OBJ]\), where \(K = AGT, AGT-SO, \) or \(AGT-GO\)
(If any one of the cases \(AGT, AGT-SO, \) or \(AGT-GO\) is present and \(CAUS\) is absent, a situational feature is added to the verb which specifies that that agentive type case will function as \(ACTOR\) in the surface structure. If \(CAUS\) is present, the case will function as \(OBJ\).)

(3) a. \([+____...+GOAL ... -AGT ...]\)
   \[\downarrow\]
   \([+GOAL \rightarrow +ACT]\]

b. \([+____...+GOAL ... +AGT ...]\)
   \[\downarrow\]
   \([+GOAL \rightarrow +REF]\]

(4) a. \([+____...+NEUT ... -K ...]\)
   \[\downarrow\]
   \([+NEUT \rightarrow +ACT], \) where \(K = CAUS, AGT, A-S, \) or \(A-G\)

b. \([+____...+NEUT ... +K ...]\)
   \[\downarrow\]
   \([+NEUT \rightarrow +OBJ], \) where \(K = CAUS, AGT, A-S, \) or \(A-G\)

(5) \([+____...+CAUS ...]\)
   \[\downarrow\]
   \([+CAUS \rightarrow +ACT]\)
(This rule is needed of course only if the causative case analysis is accepted.)
(6) [+__ __ __+FAC __ ]
    ↓
    [+FAC $\rightarrow$ +OBJ]

(7) [+__ __ +K __ ]
    ↓
    [+K $\rightarrow$ +REF], where K = BEN, RESV, PREF, LOC, SO, MENS

(8) [+__ __ +K __ ]
    ↓
    [+K $\rightarrow$ +ASSOC], where K = INST, REPL, TM

(9) [+__ __ +CL __ ]
    ↓
    [+CL $\rightarrow$ +CSL]

(Only a few CK actants have been found which topicalize but they seem
to require an idiosyncratic surface situational relation we call +CSL.
The affixation being limited to the appearance of the CL case, the
functional load is not great. However, the affixation pattern extends
throughout most of the verb conjugation paradigms and requires more
research than I've been willing to expend.)

Since the situational roles only have significance for those cases
which can be topicalized, we have not bothered to assign particular
situational roles to those cases which are never topicalized. And a
few other cases have been passed by because of their limited appearance
as topic. (E.g., MANN, PURP.) With more study, situation assignments
can also be added for these.

3.2 Situation Spread Convention

After the redundancy rules have filled in most verbs so that
every verb is specific for a situational role for every case present,
the following rule transfers the situational information to the actants
accompanying the verb. Again "K" stands for any case and "L" for any
situational relation.
(10) SD: $X_{\text{PROP}}[V_{\text{NOM}}]^3XAC7X_{+[K]8}$

1 2 4 5 6 9

SC: (a) Add 5 as a feature to 8
(b) Delete 4 and 5

COND: (a) 2 $\rightarrow$ 7
(b) 4 = 8
(c) Cyclic
(d) Recursive within a cycle
(e) Obligatory

$\text{The symbol } "\rightarrow" \text{ indicates immediate dominance. Thus, } "x \rightarrow y" \text{ is interpreted as } "x \text{ immediately dominates } y."

Since square brackets ("[" & "]") are invariably paired, when only one of a pair appears in a SD, the missing bracket is assumed to be contained in a variable ("x"). The dominance conditions are meant to be sufficient to indicate which variable the absent bracket is in.

The following trees illustrate the result of applying the rule.

(11)

```
                  S
                /    |
               MOD     PROP
                /   |
               PAST    V  AC  AC
                / |    /     /         |
              kariguq [A] suruguqun [N] bataq
                 [+N $\rightarrow$ +REF] "maid" "child"
```
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(12)

```
S
  /\  \
/   \ /
MOD  PROP
    /\      /
   V  AC  AC
      /\        /
     kariguq  suruguqu  bataq
       "bathe"  "maid"  "child"
```

PAST
4.0 TOPIC ASSIGNMENT

As we pointed out in Section II, Chapter 2 (2.3), Topic Assignment is assumed to be a discourse level phenomenon taking into account assumed context as well as preceding sentences. For this reason it is not feasible to present an account of how topic assignment works in detail. In this section, we will merely provide some observations about the syntactic limitations under which topic assignment operates.

First, in many Waray sentences some actants occur which are not eligible for topicalization by virtue of being in a case relationship which never undergoes topicalization. E.g., those actants in a MANNER, PURPOSE, or RESULT relationship. Similar restrictions are present in English on subjectivalization.

Second, some actants which are in case relationships which sometimes undergo topicalization are never topicalized apparently because they have an internal sentential structure. TIME and LOC actants illustrate this restriction.

Third, some actants are restricted lexically from undergoing topicalization. I.e., even if they are in a case relationship which undergoes topicalization with some verbs the particular verb they are associated with does not permit them to be topicalized. E.g.,

(1) a. Ginhatag ku (A) an libru (N) kan Ben (G) didtu ha mirkadu (L). "I gave the book to Ben in the market."

b. *Ginhatagan ku (A) han libru (N) kan Ben (G) an mirkadu (L).

(2) a. Kinmatuturug hiya (A) ha mirkadu (L).
"He slept in the market."

b. Ginkaturugan niya (A) an mirkadu (L). Ditto.
Recall now that the function of the Topic Assignment T is to attach a feature TOPIC to each actant and assign a specification to that feature. So the T must take into account the preceding context and mark the actant focussed upon as +TOPIC while bearing in mind the syntactic restrictions mentioned above. There are several ways of providing the information necessary for effecting the syntactic restrictions.

First, those verbs which idiosyncratically restrict normally eligible actants from becoming topic would have a special inherent feature specifying those cases which can not be topicalized. Then, after the case spread convention, but during lexical insertion, one can distinguish those actants which are in ineligible case relationships by a set of "redundancy topic marking" rules which specify those actants as [-TOPIC]. A subset of these redundancy rules would fill in the fact that certain sentential actants, e.g., those in the sentential TIME and LOC cases, can not be topicalized while sentential NEUT actants can. When topicalization applies, it marks only the actant to become [+TOPIC]. Thus there may remain several actants marked neither [+TOPIC] nor [-TOPIC]. This would permit a retopicalization to take place if a causative verb analysis were chosen. That is, one could revise the specification of [+TOPIC] to only those actants not inherently or redundantly incapable of becoming topic, i.e., only an actant unmarked for TOPIC would be eligible.

Second, one might include the feature TOPIC on each case marker in the lexical case frame. Those cases which are idiosyncratically restricted would have a (-) specification as would those which are
generally restricted. The rest could be unmarked until the time of
the Topic Assignment T which would fill in one as [+TOPIC] and the rest
as [-TOPIC]. This approach seems less desirable since it would require
greater lexical specification.

Third, one might mark all actants redundantly [+TOPIC] except
those special exceptions. Then the general exceptions could be changed
to the (-) specification. The topic assignment T would then have the
option of choosing from the (+) specified actants to allow one to
remain (+) while changing all others (-).

The first of these approaches appears best and is utilized here-
after but hopefully the further study required to state the topic
assignment T will reveal a better way to signal the syntactic restric-
tions.
5.0 CASE PENETRATION CONVENTION

Those features introduced on the AC category by the Case Spread Convention, Situation Assignment, and Topic Assignment are spread downward to the categories dominated by AC. The spread downward is bounded by S and AC however. Since the operation is recursive within a cycle and has but little effect on the shape of the tree, it is considered a convention even though its statement which follows is quite like a transformation.

(1) SD: \[
\begin{array}{c}
1 \{AC\} \\
2 \{X\} \\
3 \{(aF)^m\}
\end{array}
\]

[ X X^n] 4 5

SC: Add the features and specifications of 3 to 4 and 5

COND: (a) 2, 4 and 5 \# S or AC
(b) Cyclic
(c) Recursive until blocked
(d) Obligatory
(e) X = any single node
(f) n \geq 0
(g) m > 0

The convention results in every constituent which is dominated by a set of features being provided with an identical set. The bounding restriction names two exceptions: (a) any S or node dominated by an intervening S, and (b) any AC or node dominated by an intervening AC.

An illustration of the application of the convention is seen in the conversion of (2) to (3).
The case features being spread down the tree allows deviance or compatibility to be based on features of a single node, avoiding the need for features context-sensitive to dominating nodes. E.g., when a
PREP such as "beside" is inserted in a P node which later receives the case label [+AGT], it is sufficient to mark the PREP as [-AGT] and allow the incompatibility to be obvious when the case penetration convention applies. Without the convention it would be necessary to have features on ART's, PREP's, and N's which were context sensitive to features on the nodes which dominated them. (Cf. Weinreich (1966), p. 436ff) for further unrelated arguments for features on dominating nodes.)
6.0 CASE-SITUATION REGISTRATION

Since the verbal affixes are determined in part by which case is topicalized and what its situational assignment is, there is an early transformation which copies the case-situation-topic information from the [+TOPIC] actant onto the verb. The three separate features on AC are combined into a single feature for the verb. The situation and topic features will be represented combined by their first letters (e.g., ACT-TOPIC = AT). The case label will preface both.

The statement of the transformation is highly generalized since it applies to a wide variety of structures and to any combinations of cases ("K") and situational roles ("Ê").

(1) SD: X  x     [ V                    X
       PROP  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
       AC  [+K, +Ê, +TOPIC]  X

SC: Combine 6, 7, and 8 into a single feature and add to 3
COND: 2 // 5

The operation of the transformation is illustrated in the conversion of (2) to (3).

(2)

```
   S
   /\    \
  MOD  PROP
       /\    \
      V    AC
          /\    \
         AC  [+AGT  [+NEUT]]
       [+TOPI]
       [+ACT]
       [+A+N]
```

(3)

```
   S
   /\    \
  MOD  PROP
       /\    \
      V    AC
          /\    \
         AC  [+AGT  [+NEUT]]
       [+TOPI]
       [+ACT]
       [+A+N]
```
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7.0 SCRAMBLING

The scrambling rule which follows permits actants to appear in any order following the verb. But there are at least two constraints on this ordering: style and enclitic placement. The first constraint is ignored here. The second is adhered to by placing the enclitic placement rule after this rule of scrambling. Thus the outcome of the enclitic rule remains fixed and scrambling does not wreck the ordering arrived at by the enclitic rule.

It should be pointed out that there is an inherent advantage in CG over a subject-predicate grammar such as that in Chomsky (1965) in stating the scrambling rule. CG has all the constituents to be scrambled under a single node, the PROP. Moreover in the present CG, all the constituents are uniformly labeled as AC. The subject-predicate grammar requires an extremely more subtle and complex formulation of scrambling since various categories (e.g., NP, PrepPhrase, Time, Place) and various levels in the tree are involved. The rule in the present grammar can be stated roughly as follows.

\[(1) \text{SD: } X \xrightarrow{\text{PROP}} [V (AC)^n AC] X \]

\[\text{SC: } \text{adjoin 4 as right sister of 2} \]

\[\text{COND: } \begin{align*}
(a) & \ 1 // 3 \text{ and 4} \\
(b) & \ \text{optional} \\
(c) & \ \text{cyclic} \\
(d) & \ \text{recursive within a cycle}
\end{align*} \]

A few sample re-orderings follow.
(2) a. Ginbaribhiqan ni Ben (A) an biku (G) hin asukar (N).
   "Ben sprinkled the sweet rice with sugar."

b. Ginbaribhiqan an biku (G) ni Ben (A) hin asukar (N). Ditto.

c. Ginbaribhiqan hin asukar (N) ni Ben (A) an biku (G). Ditto.

d. Ginbaribhiqan ni Ben (A) hin asukar (N) an biku (G). Ditto.
8.0 PREP OMISSION ON TOPICALIZED ACTANTS

Whenever an actant which can have an overt PREP when non-topic is made the topic, that PREP is no longer needed and is generally not allowed. Its omission could be handled in several different ways.

First, there could be a condition on lexical insertion which would not allow PREP's to be inserted into the PREP category if that category is marked as topic.

Second, there could be a PREP Deletion T accompanying the placement of the ART's /an/, /it/, /in/, and /hi/ on actants which are topic. I.e., a deletion T after the second lexical lookup.

The construction which follows appears on the surface to be a problem for both of these proposals since it contains a fronted topic having both a prep and a non-topic ART.

(1) a. Kinmaturug hiya (A) ha ilarum han istasyun (L). "He slept under the station."

b. Ha ilarum han istasyun (L) an kinaturugan niya (A). "Under the station is where he slept."

c. *Kinaturugan niya (A) ha ilarum han istasyun (L).

(1c) shows that the use of a prep with a topic requires its fronting and the nominalization of the PROP. The fact that the following constructions are also possible leads one to conjecture that (1b) is derived by a special rule of deletion from (2b), which has a covert pronominal head governing the LOC phrase.

(2) a. Kinaturugan niya (A) an ha ilarum han istasyun (L). "He slept on the (place) under the station."

b. An ha ilarum han istasyun (L) an kinaturugan niya (A). "The (place) under the station is where he slept."
9.0 NOUN FEATURES TO ART

This transformation effects the copying of the feature NAME and its specification from the head noun to its accompanying ART. It permits the second lexical lookup of ART's to obey the non-distinctness convention. I.e., whatever the specificity of NAME on the head noun turns out to be, this feature spreading rule assures that the ART accompanying it will be compatible with it in regard to this feature. If [+NAME] is copied from the N onto the ART, then in the second lexical lookup an ART having the feature [-NAME] will be incompatible and not inserted. The transformation is formalized as follows.

(1) SD:  \[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
X & \text{NP} & [ & \text{ART} & X & N & X & ] & X \\
& & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 7 \\
& & \text{[aNAME]} & & & & \\
& & 6 & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

SC: Attach 6 as a feature on 3

COND: (a) \( 4 \neq X_{AC}[X \text{ i.e., 5 is head of 2} \)

(b) Obligatory

(c) Cyclic

(d) Recursive

A tree illustration minus some irrelevant information follows.
The reader is referred to Chapter 2, section (5.2) for the various second lexicon ART shapes dependent on this transformation. The rule has no particular ordering in relation to the others proposed here. If pronouns are created under the ART node, the rule will need to apply before deletion of the head noun. Similar comments apply to questioned NP's.
10.0 MOD FEATURES TO ART

The function of this transformation is the copying of a feature relevant to ART's from the MOD node where it is introduced. Waray has the peculiarity of having a few of its ART's shapes determined by the aspectual character of the PROP they are within. We formalize the T as follows.

(1) SD: $X_{\text{MOD}}^{\alpha_{\text{FIN}}} \text{PROP} [X_{\text{AC}}[X_{\text{ART}}X]X]X$

SC: Attach 2 as a feature to 7

COND: (a) $3 \parallel 5$
(b) $6 \neq X_{\text{AC}}[X$ (i.e., 7 is the ART of the head N)
(c) Obligatory
(d) Cyclic
(e) Recursive

A tree illustrating the operation of the rule follows.

(2)

```
S
   \|-- MOD
      \|-- FIN

   \|-- PROP
      \|-- AC
         \|-- AC
            \|-- AC
                \|-- NP
                    \|-- D
                        \|-- ART
                            \|-- NP
                                \|-- D
                                    \|-- ART
                                        \|-- NP
                                            \|-- D
                                                \|-- ART
                                                    \|-- NP
                                                        \|-- D
                                                            \|-- ART
                                                                \|-- NP
                                                                     \|-- D
                                                                          \|-- ART
                                                                              \|-- NP

          ginlagpak
          "squashed"

          han babayi
          "the" "girl"

          an ngamuk
          "a" "mosquito"

          ha lamisa
          "onthe" "table"
```

Cf. Chapter 2, section (5.2) for the ART's dependent on this feature. This transformation precedes the movement T's to assure transfer before the SD as stated above is broken up.
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11.0 LEFT DISLOCATION

We noted above that the basic word order in Waray can be considered to be verb followed by a string of actants. It is not surprising therefore that there are a variety of transformations which involve preposing of actants. For example, the counterparts to the clefting transformations in English appear to be one type of preposing. We have separated out here several related transformations which all have the characteristics we shall associate with "Left Dislocation" transformations. $

A term used by Ross (1967, p. 422, 428) for English counterparts.

In particular, each one moves an actant out of the PROP so that it becomes sentence initial. It is significant that there is no modification of the PROP (other than the loss or pronominalization of the actant moved).

It is possible to distinguish four different Left Dislocation (L.D.) transformations: (a) L.D. of topicalized actants, (b) L.D. of pseudo-topic actants, (c) L.D. of non-topic actants, and (d) L.D. of pseudo-non-topic actants. We shall take up each in turn.
11.1 Left Dislocation of Topic Actants

When an NP is +TOPIC, it may be preposed within its immediate S affecting the sentence only stylistically. The T is formalized as follows.

(1) SD: \( X S \{X \text{ NEG } X\} \text{ PROP } [X \text{ AC } X] \)

\( 1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 5 \ 6 \ 7 \ 8 \ 9 \)

SC: (a) If 1 is NIL or 4 is NIL adjoin 8 as left daughter of 2

(b) If 1 is not NIL and 4 is not NIL add 8 as right sister of 4

(c) Either (i) delete 8 or (ii) add [+PRO] to 8

COND: (a) 2 // 6 and 6 // 8

(b) Optional (or discourse dependent)

(c) Cyclic

A tree derivation follows illustrating the deletion option on a sentence which is not embedded.

(2) \( S \)

\( \text{MOD} \)

\( [+\text{INT}] \)

\( V \)

\( \text{PROP} \)

\( AC \)

\( [+\text{AGT } -\text{TOPIC} [+\text{TOPIC} \text{ +NEUT} \text{ +TOPIC}]] \)

anak

niya

karaslun

karaslun

anak

niya

(3) \( S \)

\( \text{MOD} \)

\( [+\text{INT}] \)

\( V \)

\( AC \)

\( [+\text{AGT } -\text{TOPIC}] \)

The string which results is in (4).

(4) An karaslun (N) srana kun niya (A).
"He intends to sponsor the wedding."

In embedded sentences, when a MOD constituent such as a negative is involved, the preposed NP is placed after the negative. Compare the positions of the negative with the embedded sentence in (5) with the
non-embedded sentence in (6).

(5) a. Nagbantay hiya (A) nga diriq makawatan an balay (N).
   "He kept watch so that the house would not be robbed."

   b. Nagbantay hiya (A) nga diriq an balay (N) makawatan. Ditto.

(6) a. Diriq nasirang an adlaw (N) hit gabqi (T).
   "The sun never shines at night."

   b. An adlaw (N) diriq nasirang hit gabqi (T). Ditto.

Left dislocation is practically unrestricted in terms of actant relations (both derived and deep). The following sentences illustrate the results of this T on a variety of actant relationships.

(7) It paraquama (A) nagqaqaradu hit hagna (N).
   "The farmer is plowing the rice fields."

(8) Hi Maria (G) ginpadadgan ku (A) hin bakud (N).
   "Maria is who I sent the flowers to."

(9) An mga bataq (B) hinimuqan niya (A) hin kik (N).
   "The children are the ones he made the cake for."

(10) a. It dulsi (N) matamqis. "Candy is sweet."

   b. An amarigusu (N) maqupey nga utanun.
   "The amariguso is a good vegetable."

Left dislocation of topics is also possible with pronominalization rather than deletion. That option is illustrated next.

(11)

```
S
  |----------- MOD
  |           |
  |----------- PAST
      |
      V
        |
        AC
          +AGT
            +TOPIC
          +NEUT
            +TOPIC

iginhatag ni Dr. Quintero ini nga mga butang
```

The result of the operation of the T is the following tree and string.
(13) Ini nga mga butang iginhatag ini ni Dr. Quintero. "Dr. Quintero gave these things."

Another example of this process follows.

(14) Itun impurtanti nga mga himangrawun hiquunung hitun mga bitiranu (N) pagkakahimangrawan ini (N) didaq hit kanan usa ka adlaw nga Veterans Assembly (T).
"The important things to be said about the veterans will be discussed throughout the day of the Veterans Assembly."

The pronominalization is invariably effected with one of the following: /ini/, /itu/, or /adtu/. The subtlety necessary for predicting one over the other is not yet in hand. The demonstratives do not have external references so can not follow the normal parameters of NEAR and SPEAKER. (Cf. Chapter 2, section 5.4)

(15b), where /Mila/ logically is attached to the embedded proposition beginning with /nga/, superficially appears to be an exception to condition (a).

(15) a. Nasabutan namun (A)<nga may kunswi (N) hi Mila (A)>=(N).
"We found out that Mila had a boyfriend."

   b. Hi Mila (A) nasabutan namun (A) nga may kunswi (N). 
   Ditto.

The condition need not be revised, however, since the construction is explained by an independently motivated raising transformation which applies to /Mila/ prior to the left dislocation. Note the intermediate
step in the derivation from (15a) to (15b) which appears in (16).

(16) Nasabutan namun (A) hi Mila (A) nga may kunswilu (N).
   "We found out that Mila had a boyfriend."

11.2 Left Dislocation of Pseudo-topic Actants

In some verbal sentences, it is possible to left dislocate a non-
topic actant in doing so to mark it with a topic marking article.
Sentential NEUT actants in particular seem to allow this. Viz.,

(1)  

The transformation fronts the NEUT actant changing its marker to /an/.

(2)  

Enclitic placement and the second lexical lookup provide the following
string.

(3) An panhugas nadiriq gud aku. "I refuse to wash."
In some equational sentences a similar result is possible operating on a different underlying structure. Here it is possible to front an AC which is dominated by another AC. The transformation works with either an adjective or an NP as head of the equational sentence. Viz.,

(4)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S \\
\downarrow \\
\text{MOD} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{PROP} \\
\downarrow \\
V \\
\downarrow \\
\text{+[NEUT]} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{NP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{AC} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{+[LOC]} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{NP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{D} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{N} \\
\end{array}
\]

damu an tubak "ant" han karanqun "cake"

The LOC actant is fronted and its marker is changed to /an/. Viz.,

(5)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S \\
\downarrow \\
\text{AC} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{+[LOC]} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{MOD} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{PROP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{V} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{+[NEUT]} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{NP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{D} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{N} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{D} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{N} \\
\end{array}
\]

an karanqun damu an tubak

And the resulting string follows.
(6) An karanqun damu an tubak.
"There are many ants on the cake."

Other examples of this transformations operation follow.

(7) a. Birdi an kural han dahun.
"The color of the leaves is green."

b. → An dahun birdi an kural. Ditto.

(8) a. Parihu an pustura han duha nga lalaki.
"The appearance of the two men is similar."

b. → An duha nga lalaki parihu an pustura. Ditto.

(9) a. Damu an bunga han kahuy didaq ha gardin.
"The fruit on the tree in the garden is plentiful."

b. → An kahuy didaq ha gardin damu an bunga. Ditto.

(10) a. Hi Mr. Hordemann an prisidinti han D.W.U.
"The president of D.W.U. is Mr. Hordemann."


(11) a. Duha ka tuqiq it idad han bataq.
"The age of the child is two years."

b. → An bataq duha ka tuqiq it idad. Ditto.

(12) a. Tulu ka mitrus an kahalabaq han istik.
"The length of the stick is 3 meters."

b. → An istik tulu ka mitrus an kahalabaq. Ditto.

Since this transformation is not completely general and I have not been able to determine its limitations, no formalized statement is given for it.
11.3 Left Dislocation of Non-topic Actants

It is possible that this transformation could be collapsed with the first left dislocation transformation. But since there is additional syntactic complexity with the fronting of non-topics and since there is a significant semantic distinction, we shall consider them separately.

Semantically the operation of this T causes a special stress to be placed on the fronted actant, i.e., it is emphasized. Assuming all semantic information to be represented in the deep structure, an emphasis marking feature would be appropriate on the actant to be fronted. The T would then be triggered by this marker. Some mechanism for placing the marker on the actant would also be required. If, on the other hand, an interpretive semantic position is taken, a rule of semantic interpretation must observe the output of this rule and mark in the semantic representation the emphasized character of the fronted actant.

The formalization of the T follows.

(1) SD: \[ \begin{array}{ccccccc}
X & S & [ & X & \text{PROP} & [ & X & \text{AC} & X \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7
\end{array} \]

SC: (a) Copy 6 as left-most daughter of 2
    (b) Delete original 6

COND: (a) 2 // 4 and 4 // 6
    (b) Obligatory
    (c) Cyclic

Trees illustrating the operation of this transformation follow.
The surface structure finally resulting from (3) is shown in (4).

(4) Hin sing sing (N) nagbalyuqay kami (A).
"Rings are what we exchanged."

The structure is significant in that it represents a possibility disallowed in Tagalog. A /ng/ phrase in Tagalog can not be fronted without changing it to a /sa/ phrase while its parallel in Waray is permitted with or without the switch in markers. (The change of marker to /ha/ will be taken up shortly.)

The next examples illustrate other case relationships which may undergo emphasis and fronting when non-topic.

(5) He kantin (LOC) ba kita (A) papalit hin karanquin (N)?
"Shall we buy some cake in the canteen?"

(6) Tikang ha Carigara (SO) nakadtu hiya (A) ha Dulag (G).
"From Carigara he went to Dulag."

(7) Ngadtu kan Juan (G) ihatag niya (A-S) an kwarta (N).
"He gave the money to John."

(8) Hi Maria (A) nagsaqad ha iya tatay (G) nga makadtu ha mirkadu (N).
"Mary promised her father to go to the market."

Examples have been found of fronting an AC out of another AC without changing the marker (cf. L.D. of Pseudo-topics above for a
parallel). It is possible whether the sentence is verbal (9) or equational (10).

(9) a. Ginpatay niya (A) an tubak han karanquin (N).
   "He killed the ants (which were) on the cake."

b. Han karanquin ginpatay niya (A) an tubak (N).

(10) a. Kun nakadtu ka (COND), maqupay (ADJ) untaq an pagpagawas han drama (N).
   "If you had come, the going of the play would have been better."

b. Kun nakadtu ka (COND), han drama maqupay untaq an pagpagawas.

A correlate of L. D. with non-topics which is not found with L. D. of topics is the possible shift of specification of ACTOR with some actants. Non-topic NP's which are either [+ACTOR] or unspecified for ACTOR, i.e., those actants which would be marked by /han/, /hin/, /hit/, or /ni/ in the second lexical lookup, may optionally become specified as [-ACTOR] when they are fronted. This means that their markers may become /ha/ or /kan/. The transformation is cyclic so applies on embedded sentences as well as on the topmost S. Some examples follow.

(11) a. Nagqisip aku (A) nga nasina hi Nanay (A) han bataq (N).
   "I thought that Mother scolded the child."

b. Nagqisip aku (A) nga ha bataq (N) nasina hi Nanay (A).
   Ditto.

(12) a. Nagbalyuqay kami (A) hin/*ha singsing (N).
   "We exchanged rings."

b. --> Hin/ha singsing (N) nagbalyuqay kami (A). Ditto.

(13) a. Nagbantay hi Carlos (A) han dulsi (N).
   "Carl watched the candy."

b. --> Han/ha dulsi (N) nagbantay hi Carlos (A). Ditto.

(14) a. Ginkitqan ku (A) [an ginsurat ni Juan (A)] (N).
   "I saw what John wrote."
b. Ginkitqan ku (A) [an kan Juan (A) ginsurat] (N). Ditto.

(15) a. Ginngaranan ni Tatay (A) an iya anak (N) hin Juan (?) 
"Father named his son John."

b. Kan Tatay (A) ginngaranan an iya anak (N) hin Juan (?)

Those NP's which are pronominal exhibit the change in specification of ACTOR also. Potential [ACTOR] pronouns are replaced by their [-ACTOR] counterparts. Thus, /niya/ ----> /iya/, /namun/ ----> /amun/, etc. (Cf. Chapter 2, section 5.3) As with the full NP's, the case relationship of the pronoun is irrelevant. E.g.,

(16) a. Ginpalti niya (A) an bayabas (N) ha tindahan (L). 
"He bought the guavas in the store."

b. Iya (A) ginpalti an bayabas (N) ha tindahan (L). Ditto.

(17) a. An mga Negro (REL) amu an ginsurat niya (A). 
"Negroes are what he wrote about."

b. An mga Negro (REL) amu an iya (A) ginsurat. Ditto.

(18) a. Nagqutud niya (N) hi Carlos (A). 
"Carlos cut him."

b. Iya (N) nagqutud hi Carlos (A). Ditto.

The shift in specification of the pronoun is not optional, however. If the pronoun is first in a phonological phrase, i.e., if it follows a pause, the [-ACTOR] form is used. Otherwise, the [+/o ACTOR] form is retained when the pronoun is preposed. Cf.

(19) a. Ha uring (I), akun (A) iginlutu an karni (N). 
"I used the charcoal tocook the meat."

b. Ha uring (I) ku (A) iginlutu an karni (N). Ditto.

Some surface structures make it appear as though this transformation is recursive within an S and that left dislocation of topics and non-topics may operate on the same sentence. Viz.,
(20) a. Igsurat ni Ben (A) aku (B) kan Nanay (G).
   "Ben wrote Mother a letter for me."

   b. Kan Nanay (G) ni Ben (A) aku (B) igsurat.
   "It was Mother that Ben wrote a letter to for me."

The structure is unusual in that it results in the emphasis of two actants in the same PROP.

Sentential actants may also be fronted and emphasized. Such actants are not limited to the NEUT case. Viz.,

(21) a. Nadiriq aku (A) manhugas (N).
   "I dislike washing things."

   b. Manhugas (N), nadiriq aku (A).
   "Washing things is what I dislike."

(22) a. Nagbantey hiya (A) nga diriq an balay makawatan (PURP)
   "He kept watch so that the house would not be robbed."

   b. Diriq an balay makawatan (PURP), nagbantey hiya (A).
   "So that the house would not be robbed, he guarded it."

(23) a. Nadiriq gud aku (A) panhugas (N).
   "I don't like to wash things."

   b. Panhugas (N), nadiriq gud aku (A).
   "Washing things is what I dislike."

11.4 Left Dislocation of Pseudo-non-topic Actants

The construction under consideration here involves a left dislocated actant which is not marked as topic by its DET but which is the logical topic to match the verbal affixation. (Hence the term "pseudo-non-topic"). Not having a very clear idea of how this construction is arrived at, I posit no transformation formally. Some examples of the construction follow and also some conjectures as to their origin.

(1) Ha aga (T) igparalit niya (A) hin dulsi (N).
   "The morning is when he usually buys candy."
(2) Bahin han iya dyip (REL), (i)ginsumat niya (A) ha akun (G).
   "His jeep is what he told me about."

(3) Bahin han iya kinabuhiq (REL), ginpakiana ku (A) ha iya (G).
   "His background is what I asked him about."

(4) Ha igbaw han lamisa (L) ginbutangan niya (A) han sudlay (N).
   "On top of the table is where he put the comb."

The difficulty lies not in the left dislocation of the actant but in providing for its non-topic marking. Since the DET's final form is assumed to come in the second lexical lookup, it is not a matter of converting one marker to another but of providing the correct collocation of features on the DET of the left dislocated actant. The actant presumably begins with the feature specification [+TOPIC] when it is still following the verb (since the sentences which follow are ungrammatical).

(5) *Igparalit niya (A) hin dulsi (N) ha aga (T).

(6) *(I)ginsumat niya (A) ha akun (G) bahin han iya dyip (REL).

(7) *Ginpakiana ku (A) ha iya (G) bahin han iya kinabuhiq (REL)

(8) *Ginbutangan niya (A) han sudlay (N) ha igbaw han lamisa (L).

But when the actant is left dislocated one has (a) the option (always) of retaining the +TOPIC feature and having a lookup of /an/ or /hi/, or (b) the option (sometimes—cf. (1)-(4)) of changing the specification to [-TOPIC] on the actant. (Case Function Registration has already occurred so the verb receives its correct lookup.) The conditions under which the change in feature specification is allowed is what is not well understood.
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There is another totally different view which can be taken on the
collection. One could posit the introduction of a non-topic phrase
sentence initially whose motivation is the provision of background
information which will allow a new topic to be considered. In the
sentence immediately following the inserted phrase, the identical actant
(which is the topic) is deleted. For example, in (3) there would be a
parenthetical insertion of the non-topic phrase /bahin han iya kina-
buhiq/, after which the sentence follows with that item topicalized
but deleted since immediately recoverable due to the preceding identical
phrase. The claim is that the construction is quite similar to the
following English sentences which utilize pronominalization rather than
deletion.

(9) About that proposal you made yesterday, don't you
think we should hold off on it for a few days?

(10) Women, they sure can complicate life!
The intonational characteristics of the left dislocated phrase present
mixed evidence against this position, however, for not all sentence
initial phrases are necessarily separated from the following proposition
by a pause. The pause, signaled by a comma, is obligatory in (2) and
(3) above, but only optional in (1) and (4).
12.0 SECONDARY TOPICALIZATION

There is a second type of fronting transformation (here called "secondary topicalization") which results in a surface string quite similar to those produced by left dislocation. The structures are fundamentally different, however, since the secondary topicalization transformation produces an equational sentence pattern and the left dislocation transformations do not. In the secondary topicalization transformations, the fronted actant is emphasized and the remainder of the PROP is nominalized. So in terms of topicalization, a PROP now becomes a topic in an equational sentence. And in terms of nominalization, the PROP now has the transformational capabilities of a nominal.

As with left dislocation, there is more than one surface marking of secondary topicalization, but they all have in common the nominalization of the PROP by a definite determiner, either /an/ or /it/. It is significant (and not explained here) that two of the same varieties of surface markings seen in left dislocation also appear in secondary topicalization.

In the discussion which follows, secondary topicalization of topic actants is followed by secondary topicalization of pseudo-non-topic actants.
12.1 Secondary Topicalization of Topic Actants

It is possible to emphasize any topic regardless of its case relationship or pronominal status. The topic is fronted to sentence initial position and the remainder of the PROP is nominalized and marked by /an/. We contend that the PROP becomes dominated by an NP which has the feature [+TOPIC] (hence the term secondary topicalization).

If one wishes to maintain the non-interpretive type of semantics the inclusion of an EMP marker on the topic actant is desirable. Under interpretive semantics the surface structure configuration would be an indication of the emphasis placed on the fronted actant. We shall assume that the feature EMP is placed on the actant by some discourse operation.

The transformation can be stated formally as follows.

(1) SD: $X \rightarrow [X \text{ PROP } [X \text{ AC } X \left[ \text{ [+TOPIC] } \right]] \left[ \text{ [+EMP] } \right]]$

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

SC: (a) Add 6 as left-most daughter of 2
(b) Delete 6
(c) Add NP $\left[ \text{ [+TOPIC] } \right]$ as left-most daughter of the NP $\left[ \text{ [+DEF] } \right]$ created in (c)

(d) Add DEF as left-most daughter of the NP $\left[ \text{ [+DEF] } \right]$ created in (c)

COND: (a) 2 // 4
(b) 4 // 6
(c) obligatory
(d) Cyclic
SC's (c) and (d) are moderately undesirable since they involve structure building. Assuming the simple base we do, they are inescapable however.

Tree structures follow which exemplify the workings of this transformation. (2) is converted into (3).

(2)
```
S
  /   \\  \/  \\
MOD  PROP
  [+]FIN]  V  AC
           [+]ACT
           [+]GOAL
           [+TOPIC]
           [-TOPIC]
           [+]EMP
           daqug  3rd sg  mulay
```

(3)
```
S
  /   \\  \  \nAC  MOD  NP
  [+]TOPIC  [+]TOPIC
  [+]EMP  [+]FIN

3rd sg  daqug  mulay
```

Later transformations change (3) into the string in (4).

(4) Hiya (A) an nagdaqug han mulay (N).
"He is the one who won the game."

The following examples illustrate the variety of case relationships undergoing this transformation.
(5) Hi Biluy (A) amu an natawag ha iya (G).
   "Bill was the one who called her up."

(6) An tagutuq (N) amu an ira (A) nadakup.
   "A house lizard was what they captured."

(7) Hi Benito (G) an ginpadadqan namun (A) han surat (N).
   "Ben is who we sent the letter to."

(8) It salaq (L) it lilimpyuhan natun (A).
   "It was in the living room that we cleaned."

(9) Hi Maria (RSV) it iginpalit(an) namun (A) hin mga rusas (N).
   "Mary is who we bought the roses for."

(10) It lapis (I) amu an iya (A) igimbati han tsakalati (N).
    "It was a pencil that he used to stir the chocolate."

(11) An aga (T) amu an iginpalit niya (A) hin dulsi (N).
    "It was in the morning that he bought the candy."

12.2 Secondary Topicalization of Pseudo-non-topic Actants

As in left dislocation, there are some fronted actants which do not have the normal characteristics of topics but which appear to be in fact functioning as the topic of the sentence.

Those pseudo-non-topics functioning as generics have no marker at all. Viz.,

(1) Dintista (A) it naggagabut hit dunut nga ngipun (N).
   "Dentists are the ones who pull out decayed teeth."

(2) Aga (T) amu an iginpalit niya (A) hin dulsi (N).
   "Mornings is when he buys candy."

Other pseudo-non-topics allow the markers /ha/ and /han/. The precise specification of when one or the other or either can appear eludes me now.

(3) Ha daku nga balay (L) amu an angay nimu (A) ukyan.
   "A big house is what is suitable for you to live in."

(4) Ha/han aga (T) an igkaradtu niya (A).
   "In the morning is when he leaves."
Still other pseudo-nontopics are found with a prep phrase structure on the fronted actant. Viz.,

(5) Bahin han iya kinabuhiq (REL) an iginpakiana ku (A) niya (G). "It was about his background that I questioned him."

The transformation effecting these results appears to be identical to that for topic actants with the exception of the provision for a nontopic feature specification on the fronted actant. Since the conditions under which this is permissible are not well-defined, a formalization is omitted.
13.0 IMPERATIVE DELETION

As in English, one type of imperative construction involves deletion of a second person pronoun. And parallel to English which deletes the derived subject, Waray permits the deletion of the actant in the derived situation ACTOR. That the deletion is dependent on the derived function is evident from the various cases (all of which function as ACTOR) which are deleted in the examples which follow.

The transformation may be formalized as follows.

\[
(1) \quad SD: \quad X \xrightarrow{MOD} [X +IMP \ X] \xrightarrow{PROP} [V \xrightarrow{AC} P \xrightarrow{NP} D \xrightarrow{[+II]} X] X \xrightarrow{\Box} ACTOR \xrightarrow{\Box} 4 \xrightarrow{\Box} 5
\]

SC: Delete 4

COND: (a) 2 // 4

(b) Last cyclic

(c) Obligatory

The result of the application of the T is seen in the conversion of (2) to (3) which eventually ends up as (4). The string changes in (5) and (6) illustrate deletion of other cases.

\[
(2) \quad S
\]

\[
\xrightarrow{MOD} [+IMP]
\]

\[
\xrightarrow{V}
\]

\[
\xrightarrow{AC}
\]

\[
\xrightarrow{AC}
\]

\[
\xrightarrow{\Box}
\]

lutu

"cook"

\[
\xrightarrow{\Box}
\]

"you"

\[
\xrightarrow{\Box}
\]

"supper"
(3) S
  MOD  PROP
  [+IMP] V  AC
        [+]NEUT  [+OBJ]
        lutu "cook" panihapun "supper"

(4) Paglutu hit panihapun (N)! "Cook supper!"

(5) a. 'karawat' 'II, PRO' (G) 'it iya sunud nga nga
ginbabaligyaq (N)''
    b. --> Karawta it iya sunud nga ginbabaligyaq !
       "Accept his next offer."

(6) a. 'Pakani' 'II, PRO' (C) 'III, PRO, PL' (A) 'ha sulud (L)'
    b. --> Pakaniqa hira (A) ha sulud (L)!
       "Have them come inside!"
14.0 FACTITIVE DELETION

FACTITIVE actants permit a unique type of anaphoric deletion when they contain an adjectival. The semantic reading of the FAC actant being perfectly recoverable, its head noun may optionally be deleted. The transformation may be stated as follows.

(1) SD: \[ X \quad \underline{AC} \quad [X \quad \underline{ADJ} \quad \underline{NOM} \quad [N] \quad X ] \]

1 2 3 4 5

SC: Delete 4

COND: (a) 2 dominates 4 without an intervening S or AC
(b) cyclic
(c) follows relativization and adjectivalization
(d) optional

A tree structure illustrating the operation of the transformation follows.

(2) a.

\[ S \quad \underline{MOD} \quad \underline{PROP} \]

\[ [+FIN] \quad V \quad AC \quad AC \quad [+P] \]

\[ [+N] \quad [+F] \quad [+FAC] \quad [+FAC] \rightarrow \]

\[ bunga \quad abukadu \quad hin \quad manga \quad ulurun \quad bunga \]

b.

The string finally resulting from this transformation is in (3)

(3) Namunga an abukadu (N) hin manga ulurun (F).
"The avocado tree bore wormy fruit."
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