The grammar of clitics in Maranao

Daniel Kaufman
Cornell University

Howard McKaughan's work on Maranao (1958, 1959, 1962) represents the first published material offering us a structured morphosyntactic description of a Danao language since Juanmartí's nineteenth-century grammar of Maguindanaon (Juanmartí 1892). Since then, works have occasionally appeared on the diachrony and synchrony of this language group but the individual grammars have been left mostly undescribed. One of several aspects of Maranao grammar that has yet to receive a detailed treatment is its clitic syntax. In this paper, I hope to build on McKaughan's earlier description by furthering our understanding of how clitics are positioned within the clause (§2.1), within the nominal phrase (§2.2), and relative to each other within the clitic cluster (§3).

1. The form of Maranao pronominals

The Maranao personal pronouns are shown in table 1, arranged according to person features and case.[1] The pronouns are comprised of both bound and free morphemes. The bound morphemes are enclitics; that is, they are phonologically and syntactically dependent

* Many thanks to Guro Elin Anisha, who patiently explained her language to me and kindly provided many of the examples and judgments herein. Other examples have been adapted from Macaraya & Macaraya (1991). All data were also verified though informant work. Thanks also to Loren Billings who helped compile and analyze pronoun paradigms from several related languages in addition to compiling information on pronoun ordering in Maranao.

[1] The formal features shown in table 1 are those argued for by McKaughan (1959) as [±speaker] and [±hearer]. The traditional labels, however, are used below in the glossing. The orthography differs from that used in McKaughan's early works and follows the general present-day usage (found in McKaughan & Macaraya 1996). The labiovelar glide is consistently represented by <w>; the palatal glide, by <y>; the velar nasal, by <ng>; the high, central, unrounded vowel, by <e>; and the glottal stop, not at all where predictable (that is, between two like vowels and in syllable-onset position) and by an apostrophe in word-final position, where it is phonemic. The bracketed segments in table 1 surface under phonologically conditioned allomorphy which will not be discussed here (but see McKaughan 1958:8; McKaughan & Macaraya 1967:x/1996:3). In addition, the two forms of the 1S.GEN, *ko* and *aken*, appear to be in free variation in all environments (McKaughan 1958:18 fn.7, 48). Finally, the following abbreviations are used in this paper. ABIL: abilitative, ADJ: adjectival, aug: augmented (plural but not including dual), AV: actor voice, BV: beneficiary voice, CLASS: classifier, CMP: complete, CP: complementizer phrase, D: dual, DEIC: deictic, DEP: dependent, DIST: distributive, DP: Determiner Phrase, FUT: future, GEN: genitive, INC: incomplete; IP: inflectional phrase, ITR: iterative, LNK: linker, LV: locative voice, NEG: negative, NOM: nominative case, NONV: nonvolitional, NUM: numeral, OBL: oblique case, OT: Optimality Theory, P: plural, PAN: Proto-Austronesian, PERS: personal, PMP: Proto-Malayo-Polynesian, PRF: perfective, PROG: progressive, PV: patient voice, QM: question marker, RELT: relative marker, S: singular, TOP: topic marker, TP: Tense Phrase. In addition, an equals sign indicates a clitic boundary, an asterisk preceding an italicized form indicates synchronic unacceptability, and an asterisk not followed by italics marks a reconstructed historical form.

Loren Billings & Nelleke Goudswaard (eds.), *Piakandatu ami Dr. Howard P. McKaughan*, 179–204.
Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines and SIL Philippines, 2010.

on the element that precedes them. The free pronouns, on the other hand, do not display any of these dependencies and may stand alone.[2]

Table 1: Maranao pronouns (adapted from McKaughan 1958:8)

PERSON/NUMBER		CASE			
Gloss	Formal features	NOM *clitic*	GEN *clitic*	OBL *free*	NOM *free*
1S	[+1, –2, –aug]	(a)ko	aken ~ ko	raken	saken
1P	[+1, –2, +aug]	kami	(a)mi	rekami	sekami
1,2S	[+1, +2, –aug]	ta	ta	rekta	sekta
1,2P	[+1, +2, +aug]	tano	tano	rektano	sektano
2S	[–1, +2, –aug]	ka	(ng)ka	reka	seka
2P	[–1, +2, +aug]	kano	(n)iyo	rekano	sekano
3S	[–1, –2, –aug]	sekaniyan	(n)iyan	rekaniyan	sekaniyan
3P	[–1, –2, +aug]	siran	(i)ran	kiran	siran

Maranao attests three cases, which we refer to here as nominative, genitive, and oblique. There are two sets of nominative pronouns, a clitic set and a free set. The free set is used when the pronoun is topicalized, clefted, or used on its own as an elliptical answer; the clitic set is used in all other sentential situations. Genitive pronouns, used to express agents of non-agent-voice verbs and possessors (McKaughan 1958, 1962), have only a single, clitic set. Oblique pronouns, on the other hand, are used primarily to express prepositional relations and only have a free set.[3] Clitichood must be lexically specified, as it is not reducible to inherent prosodic weakness. The disyllabic clitics are independently stressed and thus display one of the basic criteria for prosodic-word status; cf. Anderson (2005) for discussion of a similar situation in Tagalog.

The relation between the free and clitic nominative pronouns is straightforward. The free set is prefixed with *s(e)-*, a reflex of the Proto-Malayo-Polynesian personal case marker

[2] Maranao, along with Ilokano, has attracted attention in the literature on grammatical person and number. Thomas (1955) first argued that the traditional classification (into first, second, and third persons, along with the singular, dual, and plural numbers—with an additional distinction of inclusive vs. exclusive) is inadequate for Ilokano because the inclusive has a dual (but no singular), whereas all the other person combinations have a singular (but no dual). This complementarity led Thomas to propose that the inclusive-dual and the singular of the other persons are the same grammatical number, whereas the plurals of each are the same combination of participants plus one or more others. This type of person/number system has come to be known as minimal/augmented; see Corbett (2000:166–169) and Siewierska (2004:84–85) for further discussion. However, Ilokano does not have clear third-person pronouns but Maranao does. McKaughan (1959), building on Thomas (1955) but using the Maranao pronominal system, then formalized the Thomas distinction into the binary features [±speaker] and [±hearer], along with a [±plural] distinction (which is rendered here as [±aug]). Cysouw dubs this the "Maranao-type paradigm" (2003:139).

[3] As we will see later, this is a simplification. Oblique pronouns appear to be in a transitional stage on their way to being fully reinterpreted as clitics. At present there is a good deal of optionality in their placement.

*si (Reid 1978). In the case of the inclusive forms, the original initial *k-* of the pronoun is preserved in the free forms. The 3S.NOM and 3P.NOM clitic forms are identical to their free counterparts and this reflects a deeper ambiguity in their status. As we will see below, third-person pronouns are not required to cliticize phonologically in the same way that the LOCAL (i.e., first- and second-) person pronouns are.

The oblique forms are also built upon the nominative forms and similarly preserve the historical initial *k-*. In this set, the nominative pronouns have been prefixed with the PAN locative-case marker *di (Ross 2006) > Maranao *re* in all except the 3P, an irregularity which is probably the result of avoiding two instances of /r/ in the same word. Note that the use of the *di formative here distinguishes the Danao languages from both Central Philippine and nearby Manobo languages, which employ the historical oblique case markers *kan and *sa for the same function (while usually preserving earlier *di in deictics, cf. Tagalog *dito* 'here', Cebuano *didto* 'there').

The prominence of the formative *aken* in the 1S case paradigm also deserves mention. Two clitic forms of the 1S.GEN *=ko* and *=aken* are apparently in free variation. Maranao attests a rare re-analysis of the historically free *akən form as a second-position clitic. This may have been a relatively recent development since it is absent in the closely related Maguindanaon language, which only shows *=ku* for 1S.GEN. Another Danao language, Iranun of Sabah, also attests *aken* (McKaughan 1999:55). Compare also the Western Subanon second-position clitic 1S.NOM *=akon*, alongside *=u*, but not reported for any of Central/Southern Subanen (Limpuson et al. 1985:30), Northern Subaanen (R. Galorport, p.c., via W. Hall), or Eastern Suban'on (Verstraelen 1973:240). The historical development and function of *akən remains unclear and several analyses exist in the literature. Dahl (1973) reconstructs *aku and *a(N)kən for Proto-Austronesian (PAN) as so-called short and long forms of the 1S. Blust (1977) claims that the only function which can be safely attributed to PAN *akən is that of absolute (predicational) possessive. Reid (1979:265–266) posits two Proto-Philippine pronouns *aku and *akən to have been enclitic and free versions of 1S.NOM and cites the Maranao 1S.OBL (*raken*) and free-1S.NOM (*saken*) as evidence for the NOM case feature of Proto-Philippine *akən. Ross (2006) reconstructs *i-ak-ən as the PAN 1S.ACCUSATIVE and *[y]akən as the Proto-Malayo-Polynesian free-1S.POSSESSIVE. (The square brackets in this reconstruction mean that forms both with and without the bracketed element occur.) This latter PMP reconstruction appears well supported. In Tagalog, for instance, the *akən > *akin* and *ku > *=ko* forms are the independent and clitic forms, respectively, of 1S.GEN: a common pattern to many other Philippine languages. But Reid's observation that *akən serves as the base of the free 1S.NOM forms in Cordilleran, Yami, Agusan and Ilianen Manobo, and Maranao (in addition to Cotabato Manobo and Kagayanen, as observed by Harmon 1979:199) requires explanation, as GEN.pronoun > NOM.pronoun is not a typical analogical extension in Philippine languages. This issue cannot be resolved here and is only noted to show the relevance of the Maranao pronominal paradigm to the reconstruction of the PMP pronouns.

A further point of interest in the paradigm is the replacement of PMP *mu 2S.GEN with *ngka*. This form derives from the genitive personal marker plus the 2S.NOM form, *ni=ka > *=nka > *=ŋka*; cf. Maguindanaon *neŋka* (Sullivan 1986:17). This is a curious innovation as it is difficult to see what kind of analogical pressure could have led to it, as the base pattern of the analogy, *ni* + NOM clitic is not transparent in the rest of the paradigm.

Danao languages are also all distinguished by the *-nu formative in all inclusive pronouns. This could easily have been an innovation based on analogy with the more historically conservative distinction between *=ka* 2S.NOM and *=kano* 2P.NOM, from PMP *=ka(hu) and *=kamu, respectively (Ross 2002, 2006), thus reanalyzing *-nu as a plural marker. The distinction between 1,2S and 1,2P is also marked with a frozen suffix on the 1,2P forms in several Manobo languages and, through contact, Tagakaulo and Kaagan of the East

Mindanao subgroup of Central Philippine (Burton 2003; Lee 2004:32, 65, 121—both citing DuBois 1976).

Another way in which the Danao languages differ from their immediate neighbors—in particular, the Manobo group—is in the general structure of the pronoun inventory. Maranao and the other Danao languages are similar to Tagalog in having a nominative and genitive clitic set in addition to free oblique and nominative sets. Although Harmon (1979) also constructs the same basic paradigm for Proto-Manobo, many of the present-day languages, in addition to the pronoun sets mentioned, also attest a free-genitive set (e.g., Ilianen, Obo, and Cotabato Manobo). Other Manobo languages have replaced the inherited free-nominative set with the free-oblique set (Ata and Agusan Manobo), make use of the inherited free-nominative pronouns as both a free nominative and free genitive set (Binukid), or treat the inherited oblique set as a neutral case (Dibabawon, as analyzed by Liao 2004:500–503).

It has been shown in this section that Maranao—or more generally, the Danao group—displays several innovations in pronoun form that set it apart from its neighbors. At the same time, the general paradigmatic structure of the pronominal inventory is more conservative than those of neighboring non-Danao languages. All of the features discussed here should prove to be useful for the further classification and reconstruction of these languages as pronominals are so often key in historical work.

2. Clitic position within sentential and nominal domains

As in the majority of Philippine languages, pronominal clitics in Maranao are placed in second position. Second position, however, is not defined uniformly across Philippine languages (Billings & Kaufman 2004). In Maranao, the domain of second position is bounded by complementizers, conditionals, and the question marker (i.e., the CP) in the predicational domain, as well as by classifiers within the nominal domain. In this section, we take a closer look at pronominal-clitic positioning within these two syntactic environments.

2.1 Sentential contexts

In a canonical predicate-initial sentence, the first full word of the predicate acts as the clitic host. In (1) and (2), the verb is initial and thus hosts the subject clitic; attachment to a following prepositional phrase, in (1), or genitive agent phrase, in (2), is ungrammatical.[4]

(1) S<om>ong[=*tano*] sa iskwela[*=*tano*].
<AV>go=1,2P.NOM OBL school
'Let's go to school.'

(2) I-ni-m-bina[=*ako*] o dato[*=*ako*].
BV-PRF-DIST-greet=1S.NOM GEN datu
'The datu greeted me.'

Clitics attach to several functional elements to the left of the verb (and also outside the clause proper—i.e., the IP/TP of the syntactic literature). In (3a), the clitic must attach to the aspectual marker *dii*, and cannot adjoin to the verb as in the examples above.

[4] Square brackets indicate potential clitic positions within a given example. The notation X[*Y*] Z[*Y*] means that the element is grammatical in either the first or the second position (but not both simultaneously). A notation such as X[=*Y*] Z[*=*Y*] means that the clitic *Y* is grammatical only in the first indicated position attached to constituent X. The morphological glossing has not yet been brought to a completely satisfactory state. See fn. 1 above for the complete list of abbreviations.

(3) a. Dii[=*ako*] dii ma-matiya[*=*ako*] sa kitab.
PROG=1S.NOM PROG AV-read OBL book
'I'm reading a book.'

b. Dii [**so wata'*] ma-matiya [*so wata'*] sa kitab.
PROG AV-read NOM child OBL book
'The child is reading a book.'

Note as well that obligatory doubling of *dii* occurs in (3a). If the NOM element is not a clitic, as in (3b), then the PROG marker is not doubled and the nonclitic nominal cannot immediately follow *dii*. Negation also obligatorily hosts clitics if it is the initial element in the clause, as in (4). The same holds for the oblique/adjunct interrogatives (e.g., 'where', 'when', 'how', and 'why') as in (5).

(4) De'[=*ako*] ma-dakep[*=*ako*].
NEG=1S.NOM PV.NONV-catch
'I didn't get caught.'

(5) Ande[=*ka*] m<iy>a-dakep[*=*ka*]?
where=2S.NOM <PRF>PV.NONV-catch
'Where were you caught?'

In the case of oblique/adjunct interrogatives co-occurring with negation, the clitic must attach to the leftmost element—i.e., the interrogative—as in (6) and (7).

(6) Ande[=*ka*] de'[*=*ka*] ma-dakep?
where=2S.NOM NEG PV.NONV-catch
'Where have you not been caught?'

(7) Ino=*ngka*=*ini* di' soa-a?
why=2S.GEN=this NEG do-PV.DEP
'Why don't you do this?' (McKaughan 1958:20)

By contrast, clitics co-occurring with the nominal interrogatives *antonaa* 'what' and *antawaa* 'who' do not attach to the interrogative. This is because non-oblique NP interrogatives must be in a cleft-like construction that necessarily involves a CP (possibly DP) boundary between the interrogative and the predicate. Pronominal clitics cannot cross this boundary and are thus forced to remain with the first legitimate host in the phrase containing the predicate. This is shown in (8), where the verb is the first potential host in the relative clause (headed by *i*).

(8) Antonaa[*=*ka*] i pe-ma-masa-an[=*ka*]?
what RELT DIST-FUT-buy-LV=2S.GEN
'What are you going to buy?' (Lit. 'What is it that you are going to buy?')

Yes-or-no questions often contain the monosyllabic question marker *ba*.[5] It occurs in the left edge of the clause and hosts clitics in this position, as shown in (9) and (10).

[5] This question marker, reconstructed by Dempwolff (1938:17) as *ba?, displays various syntactic behavior in different languages. Reflexes are prosodic second-position clitics in Standard Tagalog (Schachter & Otanes 1972), a syntactic second-position clitic in Malagasy (Paul 2001), and clause-initial elements in Maranao and Kulawi (Kaili-Pamona, Central Sulawesi). In Kulawi, *ba* is

(9) Ba=*ka* pag-inom sa kakola o kapi?
QM=2S.NOM AV-drink OBL Coca-cola or coffee
'Would you like to drink Coke or coffee?' (based on Macaraya & Macaraya 1991:30)

(10) Ba=*ako*=*ngka* di' ka-taw-i?
QM=1S.NOM=2S.GEN NEG NONV-know-DEP.LV
'Am I not known to you?' (McKaughan 1958:22)

If a subordinator or complementizer is present, the clitic attaches to it and skips over any other potential host to the right.[6] This is seen in (11) through (13).

(11) Kaan=*ka* maka-inom.
so.that=2S.NOM AV.ABIL-drink
'So that you can drink.' (Macaraya & Macaraya 1991:29)

(12) Kaan=*ta* di' pe-ketey.
so.that=1,2S.NOM NEG FUT-delay
'So that we shall not be delayed.'

(13) Oba=*ngka* kebaya-i na kowa-a=*ngka*=*den*.
if=2S.GEN like-LV.DEP LNK take-PV.DEP=2S.GEN=CMP
'If you like it, you just take it.' (Macaraya & Macaraya 1991:97)

On the other hand, other subordinators such as *ka* 'because' and *na* 'then' do not host clitics. When these elements are present, clitics simply attach to the next possible host, as in (14) and (15).

(14) Ka ke-ori=*ako* sa iskwila.
because NONV-late=1S.NOM OBL school
'Because I'll be late for school.' (based on Macaraya & Macaraya 1991:31)

(15) Na panik=*kano*.
Then ascend=2P.NOM
'Then come up!' (Macaraya & Macaraya 1991:36)

The pronoun must similarly remain in a lower position in sentences like (16), where the nominative pronoun is an argument of a lower predicate (in this case, the interrogative *antawaa* 'who'). Compare (17), where the nominative pronoun is a direct argument of the verbal predicate and thus may attach to negation, as it is within in the same clause.

(16) Di'=*ran* katawan antawaa=*ako*.
NEG=3P.GEN know who=1S.NOM
'They don't know who I am.'

---

not a legitimate host for clitics, whereas in Maranao it is. This indicates that there is no syllabic minimality requirement on hosts in Maranao, as there is in Tagalog.

6 The inclusion of complementizers in the clitic domain is also found in some Sama languages and, to a lesser extent, Tausug (Billings & Kaufman 2004). In Tagalog the only element of this class which is attested as hosting clitics is *kaya* 'for that reason'.

(17) Di'=*ako*=*iran* katawan.
NEG=1S.NOM=3P.GEN know
'They don't know me.'

Adjuncts which are fronted for pragmatic focus obligatorily host clitics; cf. Kaufman (2005) for Tagalog. In (18), the deictic *roo* 'there' is fronted to a peripheral focus position from which it must host the nominative clitic. (Here and below, in the free translations, pragmatic focus in indicated by small-majuscule type.)

(18) Roo=*ako* m<iy>aka-torog.
there=1S.NOM <PRF>AV.NONV-sleep
'I slept THERE.'

When the focus phrase is complex, the clitic generally follows the entire fronted constituent, as in (19), but orders such as (20) are also attested with locatives.[7]

(19) Roo sa Marawi=*ako* m<iy>aka-torog.
there OBL Marawi=1S.NOM <PRF>AV.NONV-sleep
'I slept THERE IN MARAWI.'

(20) Roo=*tano*=*baden* sa Marawi maka-torog!
there=1,2P.NOM=instead OBL Marawi AV.NONV-sleep
'Let's sleep THERE IN MARAWI instead!'

Complex focus-fronted temporal adjuncts behave similarly. In (21), the nominative pronouns follow the entire complex phrases *kagai ko gagawii* 'yesterday at night' and *mapita ko kapipita* 'tomorrow in the morning'.[8]

(21) Kagai ko gagawii=*ako* l<om-iy>alakaw, ago mapita
yesterday OBL night=1S.NOM <AV-PRF>go and tomorrow
ko kapipita=*ako* paka-oma.
OBL morning=1S.NOM AV.ABL-arrive
'I left YESTERDAY AT NIGHT, and I'll arrive TOMORROW IN THE MORNING.'

When an NP is fronted as part of a larger oblique phrase, the clitic can either precede or follow the entire NP, but intrusion is categorically ungrammatical. This is shown in (22), where an NP *lokes a mama* 'old LNK man' is contained within a focus-fronted oblique phrase. The subject clitic can be positioned after the sentence-initial deictic *sii* or it may follow the

---

[7] Compare the Tagalog, in (i), where the clitics may optionally interrupt the fronted focus phrase, *doon sa Manila* 'there in Manila'. Another example of this sort in the literature is given in (ii).

(i) Doon[=*na*=*lang*=*ako*] sa Manila[=*na*=*lang*=*ako*] ma-tulog. *Tagalog*
there=CMP=only=1S.NOM OBL Manila=CMP=only=1S.NOM NONV-sleep
'I'll just sleep THERE IN MANILA.'

(ii) Bukas[=*ba*] ng gabi'y sasayaw=sila [...]? *Tagalog*
tomorrow=QM GEN night=TOPIC FUT-dance=NOM.3S
'Will they dance [...] TOMORROW NIGHT?' (Schachter & Otanes 1972:429)

[8] In (21) *kagai ko gagawii* and *mapita ko kapipita* are not the neutral ways of saying 'last night' and 'tomorrow morning' (or 'in the morning'). I purposely use complex temporal phrases in order to check where the clitic is positioned.

entire fronted phrase, as in the third bracketed position. Intrusion into the NP, as in the second bracketed position, is ungrammatical.

(22) Sii[=*ka*] ibo' ko lokes[*=*ka*] a mama[=*ka*] pem-begay sa
DEIC only OBL old LNK man=2S.NOM AV-give OBL
pirak.
money
'Its only to OLD MEN that you give money.'

Similarly, in (23), the clitic may follow either the fronted deictic or the entire fronted adjunct, but it may not intervene between the adjective and the noun.

(23) Sii[=*ako*] ko ma-ito[*=*ako*] a kwarto[=*ako*] pagiga.
here=1S.NOM OBL ADJ-small LNK room=1S.NOM sleep
'I will sleep HERE IN THE SMALL ROOM.'

In accordance with a strong cross-linguistic tendency, argument clitics are restricted from attaching to fronted topics. This is illustrated by (24), in which the proper-name subject *Si Abas* is fronted to a topic position and followed by the topic marker *na*. The argument clitic *aken* 1S.GEN must remain within the immediate domain of the predicate and cannot cross over into the preverbal position.

(24) Si Abas[*=*aken*] na[*=*aken*] m<iy>a-ilay[=*aken*] kagiya.
PERS.NOM Abas TOP <PRF>PV.NONV-see=1S.GEN earlier
'Abas, I saw earlier.'

It is a much-discussed fact about second-position clitics that, in some languages, they have the ability to interrupt syntactic constituents which otherwise do not allow discontiguities. This is also true of Maranao. For instance, an adjective phrase containing an intensifier and an adjective maintains its contiguity when combined with a full NP subject. This is shown in (25) with the subject *so wata'* 'the child', which must follow the entire adjectival predicate.

(25) Tanto [**so wata'*] a ma-piya i adet [*so wata'*].
very LNK ADJ-good RELT manner NOM child
'The child is very well mannered.'

A clitic subject, however, must attach to the intensifier, thus creating a discontiguity in the adjective phrase (26).

(26) Tanto[=*ka*] a ma-piya i adet[*=*ka*].
very=2S.NOM LNK ADJ-good RELT manners
'You are very well mannered.'

Similarly, complex nominal predicates are broken up by clitics when the first element is a legitimate host. For instance, a predicate composed of a noun modified by a preceding adjective will be split as in (27).

(27) Ma-pasang[=*ka*] a wata'[*=*ka*].
ADJ-smart=2S.NOM LNK child
'You're a smart child.'

Note that the clitic position in (27) contrasts with that seen above in (22), where the noun phrase was contained within a focus-fronted oblique phrase. Whereas phrases focused in this manner may not be intruded upon, this is clearly not the case with predicate constituents, which are obligatorily broken up by clitics, if present.[9]

Third-person pronouns behave somewhat differently from first- and second-person pronouns in that they may be placed outside of second position, that is, similarly to full noun phrase arguments as follows.

(28) Ma-pasang[=*sekaniyan*] a wata' [*sekaniyan*].
ADJ-intelligent=3S.NOM LNK child 3S.NOM
'She's a smart child.'

(29) M<iy>a-ilay=*aken*[=*sekaniyan*] sa inged [*sekaniyan*].
<PRF>PV.NONV-see=1S.GEN=3S.NOM OBL village 3S.NOM
'I saw him in the village.'

This nonclitic positioning is understood here to indicate optional use of the free forms, which in the case of the third-person pronouns is homophonous with the clitic forms.[10] Under normal circumstances, clitic positioning is still preferred for third-person pronouns. Note, however, that use of unclustered local-person free forms in the postpredicate position is completely ungrammatical, as (30) and (31) show.[11]

(30) Ma-pasang[=*ka*] a wata' [**seka*].
ADJ-intelligent=2S.NOM LNK child
'You're a smart child.'

(31) S<om-iy>ong[=*ako*] sa inged [**saken*].
<AV-PRF>go=1S.NOM OBL village
'I went to the village.'

In addition to the nominative pronouns that obligatorily take second position, as discussed above, pronouns of the oblique set optionally take second position. Similar to third-person pronouns, oblique pronouns can be positioned in the same manner as full noun phrases. This is shown in (32), where the oblique pronoun is positioned as a clitic in the first bracketed position but as a full noun phrase in the second one. Examples from texts are also given by McKaughan (1958), listed in (33) and (34).

(32) Di'=*ako*[=*kiran*] ma-ba-baling [*kiran*].
NEG=1S.NOM=3P.OBL AV-PROG-stay 3P.OBL
'I'm not staying with them.' (based on Macaraya & Macaraya 1991:41)

(33) Di'=*ko*=*reka* sembi-in [...]
NEG=1S.GEN=2S.OBL trade-PV
'I won't trade (him) for you [...]' (McKaughan 1958:54)

---

9 Similar facts prompt Kroeger (1993, 1998) to analyze the Tagalog IP as noncon- figurational.

10 Historically, it is probably the case that the third-person pronouns had no clitic forms and that they are just now in the process of taking up clitic position. Other languages of the Greater Central Philippine group, most notably in the Manobo subgroup, lack dedicated clitic forms for the 3S.NOM pronoun.

11 As discussed below (in §3), a disformed second-person free pronoun optionally appears in nonclitic position if it co-occurs in a clause with a first-person clitic pronoun.

(34) Di'=*ka*=*raken* maka-onot.
NEG=2S.NOM=1S.OBL AV.ABL-follow
'You can't go along with me.' (McKaughan 1958:58)

An analysis of available texts in addition to elicitation of speaker judgments indicates, however, that the clitic position is also preferred for oblique pronouns and even more so for deictics such as *ron* 'there', as (35) shows.[12]

(35) Ana ma-regen oba=*ko*[=*ron*] maka-baling[ʔ=*ron*].
oh ADJ-difficult if=1S.NOM=there AV.NONV-stay
'Oh, its hard for me to stay there.' (based on Macaraya & Macaraya 1991:41)

2.2 Nonsentential contexts

The positioning of genitive pronouns in complex nominals follows similar principles, although some of the judgments concerning genitives are less categorical than those concerning nominative pronouns. A rough-grained schema of the elements of the nominal domain in what might be called their canonical order is found in (36). The bracketed constituent represents the domain of clisis for possessor (genitive) pronouns.

(36) CASE DEM P NUM [CLASS ADJ NOUN]*clitic domain*

Elements such as demonstratives and numerals are outside of this domain, as data like the following show.[13]

(37) engkaya[*=*aken*] ma-roni[=*aken*] a mga wata'[=*aken*]
those ADJ-many=1S.GEN LNK P child=1S.GEN
'those many children of mine' (based on Macaraya & Macaraya 1991:47)

(38) so dowa[*=*aken*] a wata'[=*aken*]
NOM two LNK child=1S.GEN
'those two children of mine'

---

[12] Unlike the oblique pronominals, *ron* 'there' must be enclitic on a preceding host and cannot stand alone. This also differentiates *ron* from other deictics, such as *san* 'there' (different usage).

[13] Although not attested in Tagalog, the inability of the numeral phrase to host clitics may be common among other Philippine languages. Ilokano, for instance, shows the same constraint in (i).

(i) dagiti duwa[ʔ/*=*ko*] nga annak[=*ko*] *Ilokano*
these two=1S.GEN LNK P.child=1S.GEN
'these two children of mine'

In Tagalog, both positions are possible, with a consistent preference for attachment to the numeral. For the phrase in (ii), a Google search revealed 139 instances of attachment to the numeral (as opposed to 88 instances of attachment to the noun). Replacing the pronoun yielded similar figures (e.g., 295 vs. 81 for *niya* 3S.GEN and 91 vs. 47 for *nila* 3P.GEN).

(ii) ang dalawa[=*ko*]=ng anak[=*ko*] *Tagalog*
NOM two=1S.GEN=LNK child=1S.GEN
'my two children'

Case markers and plural markers also precede the head noun but neither may host the genitive clitic since they are outside the proper domain, as (39) shows.[14]

(39) sa[*=*aken*] mga[*=*aken*] kwarto[=*aken*]
OBL P room=1S.GEN
'for my rooms' (based on Macaraya & Macaraya 1991:50)

A genitive clitic modifying an adjective + noun constituent can attach either to the adjective or to the head noun with a slight preference for the latter.

(40) so ma-pasang[?=*aken*] a tenged[=*aken*]
NOM ADJ-smart LNK cousin=1S.GEN
'my smart cousin'

Nominal domains such as (40) contrast with clausal ones such as *Ma-pasang*[ka] *a wata'*[*ka]. 'You are a smart kid.' Here NOM.2S *ka* must attach to the initial adjective. In (40) there is an option, with the later attachment preferred. Genitive clitics thus show more flexibility than nominative clitics in the same environment, which must attach to the adjective. A modifying adjective may also follow its head noun in Maranao. In this configuration, the genitive clitic must attach to the noun and cannot follow the entire phrase.

(41) so tenged[=*aken*] a ma-pasang[*=*aken*]
NOM cousin=1S.GEN LNK ADJ-smart
'my smart cousin'

The distribution in (40) and (41) can be interpreted as the result of two disjunctive requirements on the positioning of genitive clitics. The first is that genitive clitics attach to the first legitimate host within the noun phrase. The second requirement is that they attach to the head of the nominal expression (i.e., the noun). This accounts for the variation in (40). In the clitic's leftmost position, it attaches to the first available host, whereas in the second position it attaches to the head of the phrase. In (41), when the noun is also the first host, attachment to the following adjective is ruled out, as it disobeys both requirements. The same principle holds for larger noun phrases. In (42), we find an NP containing a numeral (*dowa* 'two'), a classifier (*timan* 'piece'), an adjective (*mariga* 'red'), and a head noun (*kamisita* 'shirt'). The genitive clitic in such a configuration must either follow the first possible host, which in this case is the classifier, or the head noun. Attachment to the adjective satisfies neither requirement and is judged ungrammatical.

(42) so dowa timan[=*aken*] a ma-riga[*=*ken*] a kamisita[=*ken*]
NOM two CL=1S.GEN LNK ADJ-red LNK shirt=1S.GEN
'my two red shirts'

Turning our attention now to relative clauses, these constructions appear formally similar to complex noun phrases; the relative clause is connected to the nominal head by the same linker that connects modifiers to their heads. The boundary between heads and relative clauses, however, is stronger than the one between nouns and adjectives. This is manifested by the

[14] Additionally, it is possible that these markers themselves are proclitic on the noun phrase and that this renders them unable to host enclitics. This is an analysis offered for similar facts in Tagalog but it is unclear if it can carry through in Maranao, which allows monosyllabic (and thus clitic-like) elements such as QM *ba* in (9) and (10) above to host enclitics.

inability of genitive clitics to take second position in a noun phrase when this would involve crossing a relative-clause boundary. For instance, in (43), the genitive clitic originates with the verb, as its agent argument. Unlike the structure with an ADJ + NOUN constituent in which a genitive clitic can follow the adjective, here, the clitic can only follow the verb.

(43) so walay[*=*aken*] a ka-tareg-an[=*aken*]
NOM house LNK ABIL-live-LV=1S.GEN
'the house which I can live in' (based on Macaraya & Macaraya 1991:40)

Similarly, in a head-final relative, a genitive clitic originating with the verb must remain with the verb and cannot follow the entire phrase, as shown in (44).

(44) so ka-tareg-an[=*aken*] a walay[*=*aken*]
NOM ABL-live-LV=1S.GEN LNK house
'the house which I can live in'

We have seen in this section that pronominal clitics in Maranao are placed in second position within a syntactically delimited domain. Within this domain, clitics can generally be said to attach to the right edge of the first morphological word. The contiguity of certain syntactic constituents, such as focus-fronted oblique phrases, is always respected and therefore, in this case, clitics appear to follow an entire phrase rather than a single word. We have also observed differences between sentential and nominal domains as regards clitic positioning. In the latter, second position can optionally be foregone in favor of attachment to the noun (i.e., the head of the phrase). There is also considerably more material beyond the left edge of the clitic domain in nominal structures (e.g., case markers, demonstratives, the plural marker, and numeral modifiers). In the next section, we will examine the principles determining the relative order of clitics when they co-occur.

3. Cluster-internal ordering

When multiple clitics occur within a single domain, they cluster together and are rigidly ordered relative to each other. Philippine languages employ several strategies for ordering pronominal clitics within the clitic cluster. Prosodic weight, case, and the person hierarchy are all attested as relevant factors in the cluster-internal syntax of these languages (Billings & Kaufman 2004). Maranao primarily employs the person hierarchy.[15] However, if the two clitics tie on this hierarchy (as with two third-person pronouns), then the clitics are ordered with a genitive short clitic form followed by a nominative free form.[16] The relevant person hierarchy is shown in (45).

(45) first person > second person > third person

The principles in (45) are exemplified by the orderings in (46). In (46a), the nominative argument is the 1S pronoun and the genitive argument is the 2S. Because first person

[15] The person hierarchy was first noted to be active in ordering all clitic pronouns differing in person features by Weaver & Weaver (1964) for Agusan Manobo. The person constraints in the Manobo and Danao languages are essentially the same. The role of the person hierarchy in Maranao clusters of first- and second-person pronouns is also recognized by McKaughan (1958:22 fn.8).

[16] Lee (2004) and Chen & Hung (to appear) demonstrate that the possibility of a NOM > GEN constraint might also have to be admitted for related languages within Greater Central Philippine (Blust 1991). Following Billings & Kaufman (2004), these seemingly contradictory constraints can be reconciled by treating GEN > NOM as the result of an Actor-first constraint, and NOM > GEN as the result of a Subject-first constraint.

outranks second person according to the hierarchy in (45), the first-person clitic will precede the second-person one in the clitic cluster. When the nominative argument is third-person and the genitive argument is second-person, the genitive clitic will precede the nominative clitic, as in (46b). In (46c) the clitics are tied on the person hierarchy.[17]

(46) a. HOST=*ako*=*ngka* =1S.NOM=2S.GEN
b. HOST=*ngka*=*siran* =2S.GEN=3P.NOM
c. HOST=*iran* =3P.GEN *sekaniyan* 3S.NOM

Grammatical number does not turn out to be a factor in ordering two pronouns. Billings & Kaufman (2004:17) briefly address this issue regarding Austronesian pronoun systems.

Another basic element of cluster-internal syntax is the phenomenon of disformation (Peng & Billings, 2008): the obligatory use of a free pronoun in place of a clitic if it follows another (clitic) pronoun. In Maranao this occurs only when a genitive pronoun precedes a nominative pronoun. Instead of employing both the genitive and nominative clitic forms, the nominative clitic form is replaced by the free pronoun. Thus, in place of expected (47a) we find (47b); likewise with (48a–b), respectively.[18]

(47) a. *HOST=*mi*=*kano* =1P.GEN=2P.NOM
b. HOST = *mi* = 1P.GEN *sekano* 2P.NOM

(48) a. *HOST=*ko*=*ka* =1S.GEN=2S.NOM
b. HOST=*ko* =1S.GEN *seka* 2S.NOM

What could be responsible for disformation? Similar processes are crosslinguistically commonplace in clitic syntax (cf. Gerlach 2002 for examples from Romance and Billings & Kaufman 2004 for Philippine languages) and are triggered by a variety of phonological and morphological configurations. In the case of Maranao, it appears that there is a constraint requiring pronominal clitics to be adjacent to their hosts (Woolford 2001). This constraint would be violated whenever two pronominal clitics co-occur, since the outer (or latter) clitic cannot be directly adjacent to the host. But this violation need not be incurred by a nominative clitic because nominative pronouns also have a free set from which a pronoun can substitute for the clitic form, as in (47b) and (48b) above. Thus, the free form is recruited in order to avoid having a clitic which is non-adjacent to its host. Barring such extenuating circumstances, cliticization is still preferred when adjacency to the host is possible, as shown by the ungrammatical (49a) and grammatical (49b).

(49) a. *HOST *seka* 2S.NOM
b. HOST=*ka* =2S.NOM

But what prevents disformation of the nominative pronoun in cases like (50), repeated from (46a)? If the nominative pronoun is expressed as a free pronoun, then the genitive clitic can satisfy the adjacency requirement as in (50b), but this is not attested.

(50) a. HOST=*ako*=*ngka* =1S.NOM=2S.GEN
b. *HOST=*ngka* =2S.GEN *saken* 1S.NOM

[17] How the order of the two pronouns in (46c) is achieved, as well as the absence of the equals sign before the second pronoun in that sequence, is considerably more complex. This is discussed in the appendix.

[18] Disformation applies vacuously to the third-person NOM pronouns, which have no distinct clitic form.

Following the current line of analysis, the answer lies in the fact that (50b) violates the person hierarchy. In the ungrammatical (50b), there are no non-adjacent clitics, but the second-person pronoun precedes the first-person pronoun, in violation of the person hierarchy as shown in (45) above. We can deduce from this that satisfying the person constraint is more highly valued than satisfying the adjacency constraint.

Related to this, we can ask how a third-person pronoun can cliticize, as in (51a), when it can just as well be represented by a free form, in (51b).

(51) a. HOST=*ngka*=*siran*
=2S.GEN=3P.NOM

b. HOST=*ngka* *siran*
=2S.GEN 3P.NOM

As mentioned above, 3.NOM pronouns have no dedicated clitic forms. Thus, there is no phonological evidence for whether or not the forms *sekaniyan* 3S.NOM and *siran* 3P.NOM are actually clitics when they are seemingly positioned as such in the syntax. There is, however, additional syntactic evidence. As will be discussed below, pronominal clitics are closest to the host within the clitic cluster and are then followed by adverbial clitics of various sorts, if present. We can thus take these adverbial clitics as marking the edge of the clitic cluster proper. Third-person pronouns in addition to disformed (free) pronouns may either be positioned before the adverbial clitics, as in (52a) and (53a), or after them, in (52b) and (53b)—with a slight preference for the cluster-internal position with local persons. This can be taken to signal inclusion or exclusion in the clitic cluster, respectively.

(52) a. HOST=*aken*=*siran*=*den*
=1S.GEN=3P.NOM=CMP

b. HOST=*aken*=*den* *siran*
=1S.GEN=CMP 3P.NOM

(53) a. HOST=*aken*=*seka*=*den*
HOST=1S.GEN=2S.NOM=CMP

b. ?HOST=*aken*=*den* *seka*
=1S.GEN=CMP 2S.NOM

A published sentence exemplifying (53a) is as follows.[19]

(54) M-bono-on=*aken*=*seka*=*den*.
DIST-kill-PV=1S.GEN=2S.NOM=CMP
'I'll surely kill you.' (McKaughan 1958:13)

Additional evidence that disformed pronouns can be clitics comes from structures like (55), in which disformation co-occurs with negation (from §2.1), that if the verb is non-initial, then any clitics must precede the verb.

(55) Di=*ko*=*seka* pe-leka-an.
NEG=1S.GEN=2S.NOM FUT-OPEN-LV
'I will not open it for you.' (McKaughan 1958:18)

The literature lists several more examples like (55), but mostly with the disformed pronoun in the third person. Only one example, to my knowledge, is listed with a postverbal disformed pronoun separated from the preverbal GEN clitic pronoun (McKaughan & Macaraya 1967:212/1996:172–173); it uses a 3SG disformed pronoun.[20] The acceptability of (52a) and even preferred status of (53a)/(54) and (55) suggest that NOM pronouns, which

[19] Maranao marks DIST using homo-organic prenasalization: [m-] before bilabials, as in (2) above and (54); [n-] before alveolars (e.g., *nditar* 'clothe' from McKaughan 1958:40); and [ŋ-] before velars.

[20] Without listing an example, McKaughan (1963:82) reports that a second-person disformed NOM pronoun can be postverbal (along with a preverbal first-person GEN clitic pronoun in the clause).

possess homophonous free and clitic forms, can be positioned as bona fide clitics. Consequently, the requirement for 3.NOM and other disformed pronouns to be adjacent to their host must not be as strong as it is for what might be called the dedicated pronominal clitics, as non-adjacent clisis is permitted here.

We have seen that the basic asymmetry in disformation may offer an explanation based on the lexical asymmetry between nominative and genitive pronouns. Whereas nominative clitics can be replaced by nominative free forms, there are no such equivalent free forms for the genitive pronouns and thus non-adjacency of the genitive pronoun is forced in the configuration HOST=NOM=GEN whenever the nominative pronoun is higher on the person hierarchy. An explicit analysis of these facts is found in the appendix.

The full range of pronoun co-occurrences is shown in table 2. Genitive clitics are emboldened, nominative clitics are plain, and free pronouns are italicized. The upper member of each cell represents the first pronoun and the bottom member represents the second pronoun within the cluster. As seen in this table, the pronoun higher in the person hierarchy always appears initially in the cluster.[21] When both arguments are third-person, as in the bottom, right-hand part of table 2, the genitive argument cliticizes and the nominative argument undergoes disformation.

It is worth noting here the difference between Maranao and some closely related languages in the Manobo and Subanun groups that have been described in the literature.[22] Binukid (Manobo), as analyzed by Peng & Billings (2008), is similar to Maranao in showing person-based clitic ordering and disformation. But unlike Maranao, disformation in Binukid can take place with both nominative and genitive pronouns, which then each surface as free *oblique* forms.[23] Thus, the basic pattern is the same as Maranao, except that multiple pronominal clisis is never attested. The pronoun highest on the person hierarchy cliticizes and the second pronoun surfaces as a free oblique form.

It is also similar to Maranao in its differential treatment of third-person nominative pronouns. (The 3S.NOM in Binukid is not expressed at all overtly and has no clitic form.) The 3P.NOM *siran* is unique among the pronouns in not being subject to disformation. Whereas all other overt second-position pronouns in a clitic cluster must appear in the oblique, the 3P surfaces in its nominative form, as shown by (56).

(56) Pamara-i=*nu* {*siran*/**kandan*} ha [...]
tell-LV.DEP=2S.GEN 3P.NOM/3P.OBL LNK
'Tell them that [...]' (Post & Gardner 1992:110, via Peng & Billings, 2008)

Peng & Billings analyze disformation in Binukid as resulting from a constraint on multiple monosyllabic pronominal clitics. The 3P.NOM is exempted since it is the only disyllabic form in the Binukid nominative clitic paradigm. In Maranao, 3.NOM pronouns have also been shown to behave exceptionally, even though they are not differentiated from the other pronouns by weight or syllable count. The Maranao evidence therefore suggests that 3.NOM pronouns may simply not be bona fide clitics despite sharing several positioning properties with clitics. Rather, 3.NOM pronouns are underlyingly free forms that can be placed in

[21] All reflexive combinations (in which both GEN and NOM arguments share a [+1] or [+2] feature) have been omitted in table 2 as they are uncommon and the data concerning their relative ordering is still insufficiently understood. This will be a topic for further research as these combinations are crucial for teasing apart several theoretical approaches to clitic ordering.

[22] Zorc (1986:186), cited by Blust (1991:97), implies that Manobo, Danao, and Subanun are especially closely related within Southern Philippine.

[23] See Quakenbush & Ruch (2008) for similar facts in Kalamianic.

Table 2: Pronoun combinations in Maranao

Nom \ Gen		+1, –2, – aug	+1, –2 +aug	+1, +2 –aug	+1, +2 +aug	–1, +2 –aug	–1, +2 +aug	–1, –2 –aug	–1, –2 +aug
		aken ~ ko	**(a)mi**	**ta**	**tano**	**(ng)ka**	**(n)iyo**	**(n)iyan**	**(i)ran**
+1, –2 –aug	(a)ko					(a)ko **ngka**	(a)ko **niyo**	(a)ko **niyan**	(a)ko **iran**
+1, –2 +aug	kami					kami **ngka**	kami **niyo**	kami **niyan**	kami **ran**
+1, +2 –aug	ta							ta **niyan**	ta **iran**
+1, +2 +aug	tano							tano **niyan**	tano **iran**
–1, +2 –aug	ka	**aken/ko** *seka*	**(a)mi** *seka*					ka **niyan**	ka **iran**
–1, +2 +aug	kano	**aken/ko** *sekano*	**(a)mi** *sekano*					kano **niyan**	kano **iran**
–1, –2 –aug	*sekaniyan*	*aken*/**ko** *sekaniyan*	**(a)mi** *sekaniyan*	**ta** *sekaniyan*	**tano** *sekaniyan*	**(ng)ka** *sekaniyan*	**(n)iyo** *sekaniyan*	**(n)iyan** *sekaniyan*	**(i)ran** *sekaniyan*
–1, –2 +aug	*siran*	**aken/ko** *siran*	**(a)mi** *siran*	**ta** *siran*	**tano** *siran*	**(ng)ka** *siran*	**(n)iyo** *siran*	**(n)iyan** *siran*	**(i)ran** *siran*

second position. Note that in both Maranao and Binukid the 3.NOM pronouns are also exceptional in being positioned after the adverbial clitics within the clitic cluster.

Brainard & Vander Molen (2005) offer relevant data on Obo Manobo. That language possesses clitic and free paradigms of both nominative and genitive pronouns. Whenever two pronouns co-occur, disformation of one pronoun into the corresponding free form of the same case is required. Preferably, the pronoun higher on the person hierarchy cliticizes and

the latter pronoun undergoes disformation. Perhaps due to pragmatic considerations, the person hierarchy can alternatively be subverted in Obo Manobo, in which case the argument lower on the person hierarchy cliticizes and the higher argument is expressed as a free pronoun.

In Sarangani Manobo (DuBois 1976:47–48), the person hierarchy also decides the ordering of pronouns within the clitic cluster. For example, in (57) the first person precedes the third person regardless of case.[24]

(57) a. K<in>ità=*ko*=*dan*.
<PV.PRF>see=1S.GEN=3P.NOM
'I saw them.'

b. B<in>egay-an=*a*=*din* te Libro.
<PV.PRF>give-LV=1S.NOM=3S.GEN NOM book
'He gave me the book.'

Unlike the other languages discussed here, multiple clisis is optionally allowed in =GEN=NOM clusters. For instance, Sarangani Manobo has distinct forms for free and clitic 3P.NOM pronouns: *sikandan* and =*dan*, respectively. However, if the 3P.NOM co-occurs with a genitive pronoun, disformation is not attested, as shown in (58)—although there is also no mention by DuBois that it is categorically ungrammatical.

(58) a. HOST=*no*=*dan*
=2S.GEN=3P.NOM

b. ??HOST=*no* *sikandan*
=2S.GEN 3P.NOM

Note that this is divergent even from other Manobo languages. Ilianen Manobo (Brichoux & Brichoux 1977) requires disformation as shown in (59).

(59) a. *HOST=*no*=*dan*
=2S.GEN=3P.NOM

b. HOST=*no* *sikandan*
=2S.GEN 3P.NOM

Interestingly though, the 3P.NOM in Sarangani Manobo is still aberrant in that it is the only nominative clitic in the language to follow and not precede an aspectual clitic:

(60) Na-sayo=*den*=*dan*.
AV.PRF-leave=CMP=3P.NOM
'They have already left.' (DuBois 1976:56)

This suggests that even a dedicated 3.NOM clitic form may not show all the properties associated with local-person pronouns. The comparative evidence discussed here points to a special status for 3.NOM pronouns as morphologically pseudo-clitic so to speak in the Manobo and Danao languages.[25] To summarize, the two recurring themes in the cluster-internal syntax

[24] DuBois (1976:47–51) does not recognize this generalization in his description of Sarangani Manobo but rather relies on a case-based analysis of clitic ordering. However, his case-based generalization requires stipulations for combinations that can be easily explained as person-based ordering.

[25] If a strong enough case can be made for the exceptionality of 3.NOM pronouns based on their person features, this renders superfluous the syllable-based OCP account of Binukid 3P.NOM *siran* in Peng & Billings (2008), as the facts could be explained without reference to phonological form. Nonetheless, reference to phonology must be permitted by the grammar as languages like Tagalog make clear reference to syllable count in clitic ordering (Schachter & Otanes 1972, Schachter 1973). Billings (p.c.) makes the point that a person-based explanation has to account for the fact that only the nominative pronouns are affected. This could ultimately be related to an inherent difference in frequency and discourse function between genitive and nominative pronouns. Note, for instance, that 3.NOM pronouns in Philippine languages can often be dropped in discourse, whereas 3.GEN ones can be only rarely so.

of the Manobo and Danao languages is (i) the prominence of the person hierarchy in clitic ordering and (ii) the presence of restrictions on multiple-pronoun clisis.

Finally, we briefly turn our attention to the positioning of Maranao adverbial clitics within the cluster. As already mentioned, pronominal clitics always precede adverbial ones. In (61), the completive clitic *=den*, must follow the nominative clitic.

(61)a. *M-baling=*den*=*ako*.

b. M-baling=*ako*=*den*.
AV-leave=1S.NOM=CMP
'I'll leave now.'

Optional clitics, such as the OBL pronouns, can also precede adverbial ones, as in (62).

(62) Ba=*ka*=*rekami*=*den* tareg!
QM=2S.NOM=1P.OBL=CMP stay
'You just stay with us!' (Macaraya & Macaraya 1991:50)

Among the adverbials themselves, some clitics are ordered strictly in relation to each other, whereas others display variable relative ordering. Aspectual adverbs, like *den* CMP and *pen* INC precede mood adverbs such as *bes* SURPRISE in (63), and *nda* 'maybe', in (64).

(63)a. *M<iy>-aor=*ka*=*bes*=*den*!

b. M<iy>-aor=*ka*=*den*=*bes*!
<PRF>PV.NONV-hunger=2S.NOM=CMP=surprise
'You're already hungry!'

(64)a. *M<iy>-aor=*ka*=*nda*=*den*.

b. M<iy>-aor=*ka*=*den*=*nda*.
<PRF>PV.NONV-hunger=2S.NOM=CMP=maybe
'Maybe you're hungry.'

On the other hand, aspectual adverbs may either precede or follow the iterative adverb *peman* 'again' (65).

(65)a. M<iy>-aor=*ka*=*den*=*peman*.
<PRF>PV.NONV-hunger=2S.NOM=CMP=again

b. M<iy>-aor=*ka*=*peman*=*den*.
<PRF>PV.NONV-hunger=2S.NOM=again=CMP
'You're already hungry again.'

Finally, at the right edge of the adverbial clitics we find the vocative clitics *aki* and *ari* which are generally translated as 'friend', shown in (66).

(66) Midya=*bo'*=*aki* sa oras.
half=just=friend OBL hour
'Just half an hour, friend.' (Macaraya & Macaraya 1991:59)

This only scratches the surface of the relative ordering patterns among adverbial clitics.[26] However, the hierarchy (ITERATIVE >) ASPECTUAL > ITERATIVE > MOOD > VOCATIVE agrees with a semantic-scope principle that requires INNER adverbs to compose with a predicate before OUTER ones. In a basic canonical sentence, the adverbs can thus compose with the predicate incrementally (67).

(67) [[[[[**PREDICATE**] ASPECT] ITERATIVE] MOOD] VOCATIVE]

See Ernst (2002) for a theory of adverbs along these lines and Kaufman (2006) for an application to Tagalog adverbial clitics.

4. Conclusion

Maranao has been shown to attest second-position clitics of several varieties which are positioned within their domain according to a small set of principles. These principles require clitics to appear leftmost in their positioning domain and adjacent to their syntactic heads. In the clausal domain, only the first principle appears to take effect, whereas in the nominal domain, the second principle emerges and gives rise to variation when the head is not initial in the clitic's domain.

Within the clitic cluster, pronouns are ordered primarily according to a person hierarchy. The person hierarchy has been observed to dictate clitic order in several neighboring languages of Mindanao as well. This is interesting, as these languages represent the northernmost subgroup contained in (western) Malayo-Polynesian to make consistent use of person features in pronominal syntax. Further south, person features play a major role in the alignment of pronominals as verb-adjacent proclitics in the Gayo language, the Sumatran subgroup, the Tomini-Totoli subgroup, and the Kaili-Pamona subgroup; see Himmelmann (1996), van den Berg (1996), and Kaufman (in progress) for further details.[27]

Further research should uncover more patterns in the positioning and relative ordering of adverbial clitics and show how Maranao fits into the larger typology of pronominal and adverbial clisis in Philippine languages.

[26] A fuller account must include the common-focus adverbial clitics *bo'* 'only' and *mambo'* 'also' in addition to many other mood adverbs. This must be left to further research.

[27] This could easily be the result of parallel developments, as the person hierarchy is prominent cross-linguistically in ordering and positioning pronominal clitics (Siewierska 2004:120–172).

Appendix: Optimality-theoretic analysis of cluster-internal clitic ordering

An analysis of the cluster-internal ordering facts is sketched out here using Optimality Theory (Prince & Smolensky 1993/2004). OT, in its purest form, is conceived of as a nonderivational, surface-oriented theory of ranked, violable constraints. A simple explanation of the basic mechanism is as follows. The OT apparatus consists of four basic elements: (i) an input, which contains the underlying forms or morphosemantic features of a given string; (ii) a candidate set, which represents all of the potential outputs for a given input; (iii) an inventory of (violable) constraints, which penalize an output based on its surface characteristics; and (iv) a constraint ranking, which determines the relative importance of surface constraints and thus defines the grammar of a given language. Candidates are generated randomly and evaluated by the constraint ranking. When being evaluated, candidates are compared to each other to determine which one has incurred the least violations of the higher-ranking constraints. More precisely, if a candidate violates the highest-ranked constraint while one of its competitors does not, that candidate is to be immediately excluded from further consideration. If a candidate and one of its competitors tie on the highest-ranking constraint (either by both constraints violating it or both satisfying it), they are then evaluated according to the constraint with the next highest ranking in the same fashion, and so forth. For a thorough overview of OT, the reader is referred to McCarthy (2002).

OT evaluations are typically presented in tableau form, as shown in tableaux 1 through 4 below. In the leftmost column are listed the most plausible output candidates for the input, which is given in the uppermost cell. The constraints are ranked from highest to lowest going from left to right (although in this case, not all constraints are crucially ranked). An asterisk indicates violation of the constraint at the head of that column. An exclamation mark indicates that the constraint violation immediately to its left is fatal. That is, the violation renders the candidate inferior to one of its competitors. The optimal (attested) candidate is indicated by a pointing finger. The constraints employed here are shown below. Note that we are concerned here only with deriving the relative ordering and disformation of pronouns and not their ordering within the clause. Additional constraints are required to derive the positioning of clitics relative to full syntactic constituents.

OT evaluations are typically presented in tableau form. See tableaux 1 through 4 in this appendix. (Not all constraints that appear in tableaux 1 through 4 are crucially ranked. Thus, the ranking offered here is just one of several which can produce the desired results.) In the leftmost column are listed the most plausible output candidates for the input given in the uppermost cell. The constraints are ranked from highest to lowest going from left to right. An asterisk indicates violation of the constraint at the head of that column. An exclamation mark indicates that the constraint violation immediately to its left is fatal. That is, the violation renders the given candidate inferior to one of its competitors in the candidate set. The optimal (attested) candidate is indicated by a pointing finger.

Constraint definitions:

FAITH (morph feature)	A case, person, or number feature in the input has a correspondent in the output
PERSON HIERARCHY	Pronouns are ordered according to the person hierarchy. (This should be taken as shorthand for the fixed ranking subhierarchy: ALIGN-L [+1] >> ALIGN-L [+2])
ALIGN-L (clitic)	Align clitics to the left edge of their domain
*FREE FORM	Violated by free pronominals in the output (a member of the *STRUCTURE family of constraints, cf. Cardinaletti & Starke 1999)

Tableau 1: Simple case

Input: 2S.NOM	FAITH (feature)	PERSON HIERARCHY	ALIGN-L (clitic)	*FREE FORM
a. ☞ =ka =2S.NOM				
b. seka 2S.NOM				*!

Tableau 2: Disformation

Input: 1S.GEN, 2S.NOM	FAITH (feature)	PERSON HIERARCHY	ALIGN-L (clitic)	*FREE FORM
a. =aken=ka =1S.GEN=2S.NOM			*!	
b. =ka=aken =2S.NOM=1S.GEN		*!	*	
c. ☞ =aken seka =1S.GEN 2S.NOM				*
d. =ka saken =2S.NOM 1S.NOM	*!	*		*
e. saken seka 1S.NOM 2S.NOM	*!			**

In simple terms, the analysis here requires that all pronominals surface as clitics in the leftmost possible position. A mitigating constraint however disfavors stacking of multiple clitics such that, if possible, all pronominal clitics are immediately adjacent to their (nonclitic) hosts. The interaction between these two constraints, in addition to an asymmetry in the pronominal inventory, creates an asymmetry in regard to which pronouns are targeted for disformation. Because only nominative pronouns have free variants in Maranao, only pronominal arguments with nominative features can undergo disformation, as in tableau 2. A nominative pronominal argument in the input which is outranked on the person hierarchy

Tableau 3: No disformation

Input: 2S.GEN, 1S.NOM	FAITH (feature)	PERSON HIERARCHY	ALIGN-L (clitic)	*FREE FORM
a. =(ng)ka=ako =2S.GEN=1S.NOM		*!	*	
b. ☞ =ako=ngka =1S.NOM=2S.GEN			*	
c. =ako seka =1S.NOM 2S.NOM	*!			*
d. =(ng)ka saken =2S.GEN 1S.NOM		*!		*
e. saken seka 1S.NOM 2S.NOM	*!			**
f. seka saken 2S.NOM 1S.NOM	*!	*		**
g. saken=ka 1S.NOM=2S.GEN			*	*!

Tableau 4: Co-occurring third-person pronouns

Input: 3P.GEN, 3S.NOM	FAITH (feature)	PERSON HIERARCHY	ALIGN-L (clitic)	*FREE FORM
a. =sekaniyan=iran =3S.NOM=3P.GEN			*!	
b. =(i)ran=sekaniyan =3P.GEN=3S.NOM			*!	
c. ☞ =(i)ran sekaniyan =3P.GEN 3S.NOM				*

by a co-occurring genitive pronominal argument will prefer to surface as a free pronoun rather than as a stacked clitic. But if the genitive pronoun is outranked by the nominative one on the person hierarchy, as in tableau 3, it does not have the option of surfacing as a free form and must thus trigger a violation of the clitic-stacking constraint.

One residual difficulty with this analysis is that there is a strong preference to position disformed (free) pronouns within the clause as if they were clitics, i.e., in second position. The equivalent problem in Tagalog is discussed in Billings (2005); resolving this issue within the OT framework will be taken up in further work.

References

Anderson, Stephen R. 2005. *Aspects of the theory of clitics* (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 11). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Berg, René van den. 1996. The demise of focus and the spread of conjugated verbs in Sulawesi. In Hein Steinhauer (ed.), *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics*, vol. 3 (Pacific Linguistics A–84). Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University. 89–114.

Billings, Loren A. 2005. Ordering clitics and postverbal R-expressions in Tagalog: A unified analysis? In Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley, & Sheila Ann Dooley (eds.), *Verb first: On the syntax of verb-initial languages* (Linguistik Aktuell 73). Amsterdam: Benjamins. 303–339.

Billings, Loren, & Daniel Kaufman. 2004. Towards a typology of Austronesian pronominal clisis. In Paul Law (ed.), *Proceedings of AFLA 11* (ZAS Papers in Linguistics 34). Berlin: Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft. 15–29.

Blust, Robert. 1977. The Proto-Austronesian pronouns and Austronesian subgrouping: A preliminary report. *Working Papers in Linguistics* [Honolulu: Department of Linguistics, University of Hawai'i] 9(2). 1–15.

Blust, Robert. 1991. The Greater Central Philippines hypothesis. *Oceanic Linguistics* 30(2). 73–129.

Brainard, Sherri, & Ena Vander Molen. 2005. Word order inverse in Obo Manobo. In Hsiu-chuan Liao & Carl R. Galvez Rubino (eds.), *Current issues in Philippine linguistics and anthropology: Parangal kay Lawrence A. Reid*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines and SIL Philippines. 364–418.

Brichoux, Robert, & Felicia Brichoux. 1977. A sketch of Ilianen Manobo inflection. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(1). 166–171.

Burton, Scott L. 2003. A case study of lexical borrowing between two language families in the southern Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 34(1). 29–67.

Cardinaletti, Anna, & Michal Starke. 1999. The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns. In Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the languages of Europe* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 20.5). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 145–233.

Chen, David Kuan-nan, & Silvia Yu-ju Hung. To appear. Optimality-theoretic analysis of pronoun-ordering typology. In Hua-li Jian (ed.), Proceedings of the National Conference on Linguistics 2007 (National Cheng Kung University, Tainan City, Taiwan).

Corbett, Greville G. 2000. *Number*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cysouw, Michael. 2003. *The paradigmatic structure of person marking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dahl, Otto Chr. 1973/1977. *Proto-Austronesian* (Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph 15). Lund: Studentlitteratur (2nd edn., London: Curzon).

Dempwolff, Otto. 1938. *Austronesisches Wörterverzeichnis: Vergleichende Lautlehre des austronesischen Wortschatzes 3* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen 19). Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

DuBois [Dubois], Carl D. 1976. *Sarangani Manobo: An introductory guide* (Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph 6). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Ernst, Thomas. 2002/2006. *The syntax of adjuncts* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 96). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gerlach, Birgit. 2002. *Clitics between syntax and lexicon* (Linguistik Aktuell 51). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Harmon, Carol W. 1979. Proto-Manobo pronouns and case marking particles. In *Papers in Philippine Linguistics*, vol. 10 (Pacific Linguistics A–55). Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University. 113–133.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 1996. Person marking and grammatical relations in Sulawesi. In Hein Steinhauer (ed.), *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics*, vol. 3 (Pacific Linguistics A–84). Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University. 115–136.

Juanmartí, Jacinto. 1892 *Gramatica de la lengua de maguindanao, segun se habla en el centro y en costa sur de la Isla de Mindanao*. Manila: Amigos del País.

Kaufman, Daniel. 2005. Aspects of pragmatic focus in Tagalog. In I Wayan Arka & Malcolm Ross (eds.), *The many faces of Austronesian voice systems* (Pacific Linguistics 571). Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University. 175–196.

Kaufman, Daniel. 2006. Rigidity versus relativity in adverbial syntax: Evidence from Tagalog. In Hans-Martin Gärtner, Paul Law, & Joachim Sabel (eds.), *Clause structure and adjuncts in Austronesian languages: Some new empirical studies* (Studies in Generative Grammar 87). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 151–194.

Kaufman, Daniel. In progress. Topics in Austronesian clitic morphosyntax. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University PhD dissertation.

Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Kroeger, Paul. 1998. Clitics and clause structure in Tagalog. In Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista (ed.), *Pagtanáw: Essays on language in honor of Teodoro A. Llamzon*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines. 53–72.

Lee, Celeste Chia-Yen. 2004. The ordering of clitic pronouns in the languages of Southeast Mindanao. Shalu, Taichung County, Taiwan: Providence University MA thesis.

Liao, Hsiu-chuan. 2004. Transitivity and ergativity in Formosan and Philippine languages. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i PhD dissertation.

Limpuson, Melanio, Angelina Taugiag, Melinda Awid, Hermilina Catague, William Hall, Lee Hall, Basilio Promon, Ryan Galorport, Diola Galorport, Robert Brichoux, Felicia Brichoux, Janie Hapalla, Edito Boyombon, & Justino Awid. 1985. *Phrase book: English-Pilipino-Chavacano-Western Subanon-Sindangan Subanun-Southern Subanen*. Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Macaraya, Batua, & Engracia M. Macaraya. 1991. *Maranao words and phrases*. Iligan City: University Research Center.

McCarthy, John J. 2002. *A thematic guide to Optimality Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McKaughan, Howard P. 1958. *The inflection and syntax of Maranao verbs*. Manila: Bureau of Printing.

McKaughan, Howard P. 1959. Semantic components of pronoun systems: Maranao. *Word* 15(1). 101–102.

McKaughan, Howard P. 1962. Overt relation markers in Maranao. *Language* 38(1). 47–51.

McKaughan, Howard P. 1963. Relation markers in Maranao verbs. In Charng Ratanarat (ed.), *Anthropology and social sciences* (Proceedings of the Ninth Pacific Science Congress of the Pacific Science Association 3). Bangkok: Secretariat, Ninth Pacific Science Congress. 81–83.

McKaughan, Howard P. 1999. An introduction to Iranun verb structure. *Sabah Museum Journal* 1(4). 46–91.

McKaughan, Howard P., & Batua A. Macaraya. 1967/1996. *A Maranao dictionary*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press (2nd edn., Manila: De La Salle University Press and Summer Institute of Linguistics).

Paul, Ileana. 2001. *Ve* as a second-position clitic. *Oceanic Linguistics* 40(1). 135–142.

Peng, Adam, & Loren Billings. 2008. Binukid pronominal clisis. In *Studies in Philippine Languages and Cultures: 10-ICAL Pronoun Papers* 17. 179–212.

Post, Ursula, & Mary Jane Gardner. 1992. *Binukid dictionary* (Studies in Philippine Linguistics 9.2). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines and SIL Philippines.

Prince, Alan, & Paul Smolensky. 1993/2004. *Optimality Theory: Constraint interaction in generative grammar*. Malden, MA: Blackwell (previously distributed as Technical report RuCCS–TR–2, Cognitive Science Center, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ; Technical Report CU–CS–696–93, Department of Computer Science, University of Colorado, Boulder, and downloadable as ROA–537 from <roa.rutgers.edu>).

Quakenbush, Stephen J., & Edward Ruch. 2008. Pronoun ordering and marking in Kalamianic. In *Studies in Philippine Languages and Cultures: 10-ICAL Pronoun Papers* 17. 213–234.

Reid, Lawrence A. 1978. Problems in the reconstruction of Proto-Philippine construction markers. In S. A. Wurm & Lois Carrington (eds.), *Western Austronesian: Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings* (Pacific Linguistics C–61.1). Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University. 33–66.

Reid, Lawrence A. 1979. Towards a reconstruction of the pronominal systems of Proto-Cordilleran, Philippines. In Nguyen Dang Liem (ed.), *South-East Asian Linguistic Studies*, vol. 3 (Pacific Linguistics C–45). Canberra: Linguistic Circle of Canberra. 259–275.

Ross, Malcolm. 2002. The history and transitivity of western Austronesian voice and voice-marking. In Fay Wouk & Malcolm Ross (eds.), *The history and typology of western Austronesian voice systems* (Pacific Linguistics 518). Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University. 17–62.

Ross, Malcolm. 2006. Reconstructing the case-marking and personal pronoun systems of Proto-Austronesian. In Henry Y. Chang, Lillian M. Huang, & Dah-an Ho (eds.), *Streams converging into an ocean: Festschrift in honor of Professor Paul Jen-kuei Li on his 70th birthday* (Language and Linguistics Monograph Series W–5). Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica. 521–563.

Schachter, Paul. 1973. Constraints on clitic order in Tagalog. In Andrew B. Gonzalez (ed.), *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez: Essays in honor of Cecilio Lopez on his seventy-fifth birthday* (Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph 4). Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines. 214–231.

Schachter, Paul, & Fe T. Otanes. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sullivan, Robert E. 1986. *A Maguindanaon dictionary*. Cotabato City: Institute of Cotabato Cultures, Notre Dame University.

Thomas, David. 1955. Three analyses of the Ilocano pronoun system. *Word* 11(2). 204–208.

Verstraelen, Eugene. 1973. Some elementary data of the Suban'on language. In Andrew B. Gonzalez (ed.), *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez: Essays in honor of Cecilio Lopez on his seventy-fifth birthday* (Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph 4). Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines. 236–251.

Weaver, Dan, & Marilou Weaver. 1964. Ranking of personal pronouns in Agusan Manobo. *Oceanic Linguistics* 3(1). 161–170.

Woolford, Ellen. 2001/2003. Clitics and agreement in competition: Ergative cross-referencing patterns. In Angela C. Carpenter, Andries W. Coetzee, & Paul de Lacy (eds.), *Papers in Optimality Theory*, vol. 2 (University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 26). Amherst, MA: GLSA Publications. 421–449 (prepublished edition downloadable as ROA–449 from <roa.rutgers.edu>).

Zorc, R. David. 1986. The genetic relationships of Philippine languages. In Paul Geraghty, Lois Carrington, & S. A. Wurm (eds.), *FOCAL II: Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics* (Pacific Linguistics C–94). Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University. 147–173.