

**SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS  
PUBLICATIONS IN LINGUISTICS  
Publication Number 73**

**EDITORS**

Desmond C. Derbyshire  
Summer Institute of  
Linguistics--Dallas

Virgil L. Poulter  
University of Texas  
at Arlington

**ASSISTANT EDITORS**

Alan C. Wares

Iris M. Wares

**CONSULTING EDITORS**

Doris A. Bartholomew  
Pamela M. Bendor-Samuel  
Robert Dooley  
Jerold A. Edmondson  
Austin Hale

Phyllis Healey  
Robert E. Longacre  
Eugene E. Loos  
William R. Merrifield  
Kenneth L. Pike

Viola G. Waterhouse

# **PRAGMATICS IN NON-WESTERN PERSPECTIVE**

**GEORGE HUTTAR**

**KENNETH GREGERSON**

**Editors**

**A Publication of**

**The Summer Institute of Linguistics  
and**

**The University of Texas at Arlington**

**1986**

© 1986 by the Summer Institute of Linguistics  
Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 85-050100  
ISBN 0-88312-001-1

Copies of this and other publications of the  
Summer Institute of Linguistics may be obtained  
from

The Bookstore  
Summer Institute of Linguistics  
7500 W. Camp Wisdom Road  
Dallas, TX 75236

## CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Social Rank and Tunebo Requests Paul Headland	1
The Use of Reported Speech in Saramaccan Discourse Naomi Glock	35
An Analysis of Illocutionary Verbs in Walmatjari Joyce Hudson	63
Please Be Specific: A Functional Description of Noun-marking Particles in Limos Kalinga Hartmut Wiens	85
Self-Correction in Capanahua Narration Betty Hall Loos	99
Being Negative Can Be Positive Ger P. Reesink	115
Outline of a Practical Frame of Reference for a Sociolinguistic Analysis in an African Context Suzanne Lafage	143
Social Context and Mampruli Greetings Anthony Naden	161

## PREFACE

As a new field of inquiry develops, it is efficient and therefore fitting to use the most readily available data to test hypotheses, suggest new ones, and build up models of the phenomena under study. Relatively rapid progress can be made simply by virtue of the fact that the data against which an idea must be tested are ready to hand.

Linguistics has in this respect been no exception. Early in this century, when the task of descriptive linguistics was coming to be seen more and more as the uncovering of the varieties of human language structure, it was natural, for example, that linguists resident in North America investigated languages spoken in the same area. Later, when linguistic fashion focused attention on a native competence not directly perceivable, and affirmed that the nature of language could be investigated by examination of any one language, it was nearly inevitable that generative linguistics developed primarily through study of the languages spoken natively by trained linguists--e.g., English, French, Dutch.

Even sociolinguistics and the sociology of language, although receiving their predominant initial impetus from the problems of multilingual developing nations in different parts of the world, developed more rapidly when researchers turned to similar problems within their own borders throughout North America and Europe.

Likewise the field of linguistic pragmatics owes almost all its progress of the last two decades to scholars looking at language use in the communities of which they are native members--usually communities of speakers of English or other European languages.

Having developed our hypotheses, models, and metaphors of language through intense study of the materials we know best--our native languages--we cannot be content to continue within such limits. If our models resemble human language in general, and not only, say, (Indo-)European languages, then they should be readily confirmed in confrontation with phenomena from other families. If they are partly contradicted thereby, then we have an opportunity to correct our models--an opportunity which study of a narrower range of languages failed to provide. In the process, our encounter with the other languages may resolve problems and suggest

answers to enlarge our models in areas where the study of our own languages brought nothing to mind.

For these reasons, then--for confirmation, correction, and expansion of our current models of language and languages as used--we have striven to bring together in this volume descriptions of languages in use in a variety of non-Western societies in different parts of the world. At the same time, we have encouraged a wide range of topics by making little attempt to clearly delimit "pragmatics" from sociolinguistics, semantics, or other areas from which it could for some purposes be usefully distinguished.

We would like to thank Carol and Neil Brinneman and Lynn Frank for their contribution in translating the article by Suzanne Lafage, although we must accept responsibility for the final form of the English version. We thank Prof. G. Manessey, Directeur de Centre d'Etude des Plurilinguismes (IDERIC), and the publishing company L'Harmattan for permission to publish an English version of this paper, which appeared originally in 1979 in Plurilinguisme: Normes, situations, stratégies, edited by G. Manessey and P. Wald, under the title "Esquisse d'un cadre de référence pragmatique pour une analyse sociolinguistique en contexte africain."

Dallas, Texas  
January, 1984

George Huttar  
Kenneth Gregerson

**PLEASE BE SPECIFIC:**  
**A Functional Description of Noun-marking Particles in**  
**Limos Kalinga**  
Hartmut Wiens

## **0 Introduction**

Many Philippine<sup>1</sup> languages have rather complex sets of noun-marking particles. Typically, these particles are used to mark nouns or noun phrases occurring in one of at least three possible syntactic relationships between the predicate of a clause and its nominal complements. These are typified in Tagalog, for example, by the markers **ang**, **nang**, and **sa**. However, in many Philippine languages the semantic and pragmatic functions of these particles add considerably more complexity than a purely syntactic account would reveal.<sup>2</sup>

This paper presents an analysis of the relatively complex system of noun-marking particles in Limos Kalinga.<sup>3</sup>

## **1 Theoretical assumptions**

The theoretical assumptions underlying this description are basically stratificational, based loosely on Fleming's (1977) 'Stratified Communication Model'. In this model, language is viewed in terms of its communicative function. It recognizes the importance of pragmatics, or the communication situation for language, and integrates it into the model by assigning it a separate stratal status along with semantics, morphemics (grammar), and the expression level, which includes the phonemic, graphic, kinesic, and gestemic strata. Although the communication situation stands outside of language, it has a direct influence on the choices made in the lower level strata of language.

Implicit in this model is the assumption that, although language is a form-meaning composite, it is useful for the purposes of linguistic analysis and description to handle form and meaning, or function, separately.

The presentation in this paper is only loosely stratificational in that it avoids using formalisms of the theory, in order to make the presentation easier to follow for those who may be unfamiliar with this theory. It also departs from a strict stratificational approach by combining the various strata into two levels simply as deep and surface structure. Elements of meaning and function (i.e., semantic and communication situation strata in stratificational theory) are, as may be expected, treated (handled) in the deep structure, while elements of form are handled in the surface structure. The approach is broadly stratificational then in orientation, primarily by its recognition of different levels of structure in language and by the attempt to integrate pragmatics into the description of linguistic phenomena.

## 2 Surface structure

A basic distinction is made in Limos Kalinga between two types of noun-marking particles, which are referred to here as personal and nonpersonal. In this section the surface structure of these two types of particles is presented separately.

### 2.1 Personal noun-marking particles

The personal noun-marking particles are shown in Table 1, where their singular and plural forms are distinguished in four separate **CATEGORIES** (C1-C4) according to their phonological shape, position in a clause, and substitution potential:

	C 1	C 2	C 3	C 4
singular	si	-N (ud)	si	kan
plural	sada	-N da	da	kan da

Table 1. Personal Noun-marking Particles

The brackets in C2 indicate that the *ud* is optional. (This is discussed further in section 3.) Also in C2 the *-N* is a morphophonemic feature indicating that when the preceding form ends in a vowel an *-n* must be added to it before particles of that category, as shown in example 1:

1. Imbaga-n            ud    Pedro...  
   said pers.-C2 -sing. Pedro  
   'Pedro said...'



## 2.2 Nonpersonal noun-marking particles

The nonpersonal noun-marking particles are considerably more complex in structure and function than the personal particles. Their surface structure composition is represented by the following tactic formula:

$$\text{Nonpersonal particles} = \text{P1: } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{sa-} \\ \text{-N (di)} \\ \emptyset \\ \text{si-} \end{array} \right\} + \text{P2: } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \emptyset \\ \text{da} \end{array} \right\} + \text{P3: } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{tu-} \\ \text{nat} \\ \text{di-} \end{array} \right\} + \text{P4: } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{-t} \\ \text{-N} \end{array} \right\}$$

In this formula, P stands for any position in the construction, and the numbers show the relative order of the positions (thus P1, P2, etc.). The colon means, 'is filled by'. Braces are used to indicate an either-or relationship among the items they enclose, and round brackets indicate that the item enclosed is optionally included in the surface structure.

The upper case -N in the choice of fillers for P1 and P4 is a morphophonemic feature indicating that when the preceding form ends in a vowel the consonant -n is affixed to it. Otherwise the morphophonemic -N has no surface realization. The symbol  $\emptyset$  represents a morpheme that has zero realization in the surface structure even though it represents a deep structure function.

The composition of nonpersonal noun-marking particles is illustrated in example 2:

2.    **Sa-                    di                    -t abeng                    Ali...**  
       P1:sa-+P2: $\emptyset$ +P3:di-+P4:-t child-pers.-C2-sing. King  
       'The child of the King...'

The morpheme **si** in the choice of fillers for P1 has a variant **ut**, which has frequently been observed in both oral and written data. The factors influencing the choice between these two variants are not yet fully understood, but there is a preference for using **si-** after consonants and **ut-** after vowels, where it is normally contracted to **-t** and affixed to the preceding form. So the choice seems to be largely phonologically determined, although there is not complete consistency in this choice. Examples 3 and 4 taken from the same text illustrate this choice. Example 4 also illustrates the morphophonemic -N in P4 following a consonant.

3. following a consonant

**Dumatong man si- t boloy,...**  
 arrive-he sequence P1:si-+P2:Ø+P3:(di-)+P4:-t house  
 'When he arrived at the house,...

4. following a vowel

**Sa- da- nat man'ala- t nat**  
 P1:sa-+P2:da+P3:nat+P4:-N get -P1:(u)t+P2:Ø+P3:nat+P4:-N  
**pagoy...**  
 rice  
 'Those who get some of the rice...'

Example 3 illustrates another point that should be noted about the surface structure of these particles. The form -t as a filler of P4 may only be chosen when di- has been chosen as a filler of P3. Since this results in redundant marking in the surface structure, the morpheme di- is frequently deleted when -t is chosen at P4. Thus in example 3, di- has been chosen at P3, and may be made overt, though in the surface structure here, it has been deleted.

It should also be noted that when -N is chosen at P1 without the optional di and when it follows another form ending in a consonant, the resulting surface form would be identical to the form resulting from the choice of Ø at P1, even though their functions would be distinct. This is illustrated in example 5:

5a. **Sumungbat tu -n anak.**  
 will-answer P1:Ø+P2:Ø+P3:tu-+P4:-N child  
 'This child will answer.'

5b. **I-sungbat tu -n anak...**  
 will-answer P1:-N+P2:Ø+P3:tu-+P4:-N child  
 'This child will answer....'

When -N (di) or si are chosen at P1, it is possible to delete the rest of the formula, although not without affecting the function of the resulting forms. This is discussed further in section 3, where the functions of these particles are described. Here it should be noted, however, that when si is chosen at P1 and the rest of the formula is deleted, the resulting form is identical in surface structure to the si of the personal noun-marking particles except that the variant ut does not exist.

The surface forms of the nonpersonal noun-marking particles can be distinguished from deictics and demonstrative pronouns only by the choice of fillers at P4. In the case of demonstrative pronouns there is nothing following P3, while for deictics P4 would be filled by the morphophonemic -A, which is realized in the surface

structure as **-wa**, **-a**, and **-ya** following **tu-**, **nat**, and **di-** respectively.

### 3 Deep structure

A distinction can be made between singular and plural nominals<sup>4</sup> by the choice of either the singular or plural form of the personal noun-marking particles or by the choice of either  $\emptyset$  or **da** at P2 in the nonpersonal particles.

The basic difference between the personal and nonpersonal noun-marking particles is, as expected, that the personal particles indicate that the following nominal is being used as the name of a person. These particles may be used with conventional names of people, with kinship terms or, in mythology, with almost any noun to indicate that the item is being referred to as if it were a person. Sentences 6-8 are illustrative:

6. **Sada**                      **Juan kan Pedro mansunud**                      **da.**  
pers.-C1-pl Juan and Pedro related-as-siblings they  
'Juan and Pedro are brothers.'
7. **Siya pay piyaon**                      **Inan**                      **iyal'allalim**  
that also like-pers.-C2-sing. mother-link relate  
**kan dikami.**  
to us  
'That is also what mother liked to relate to us.'
8. **Imbaun na**                      **da**                      **-t suldadu na**  
sent he P1: $\emptyset$ +P2:da+P3:(di-)+P4:-t soldiers his  
**kan**                      **Init.**  
pers.-C4-sing. sun  
'He sent his soldiers to Mr. Sun.'

#### 3.1 Case marking function of noun-marking particles

In addition to marking the distinction between singular and plural, both personal and nonpersonal noun-marking particles also distinguish four categories that are involved in determining the case (role) of the nominals with which the particles occur. Noun-marking particles alone do not indicate the precise case of the nominals. This is determined, rather, by a combination of the semantics of the verb with its affixation and the particular form of the noun-marking particle. The contribution of each of the four categories to the determination of case relationships is the same for both personal and nonpersonal particles, as I discuss next.

##### 3.1.1 Function of C1

Category C1 is marked in the surface structure by personal noun-marking particles from column C1 in Table 1 (i.e., **si** or

sada) or by nonpersonal particles, of which **sa-** is chosen at P1 in the formula for nonpersonal particles.

Noun-marking particles specified for C1 indicate that the nominal complement so marked is functioning as the topic of the clause or larger grammatical unit in which it occurs. Nominals marked for this category always occur initially in the clause or chain in which they occur. The function of the C1 category is illustrated in examples 4 and 6 above and in examples 9 and 10 below:

9. **Si**                      **Lakay**    **Kutu umnoy man'ay'ay'ayaw...**  
 pers.-C1-sing. old-man Kutu went visiting  
 'Old man Kutu went visiting....'
10.    **Sa**    -    **di-**        **t uma**                      -**n**    **da**                      -**t**  
 P1:sa+P2:Ø+P3:di-+P4:-t swidden-P1:-N+P2:da+P3:(di-)+P4:-t  
**abeng, bang'og...**  
 child small  
 'The children's swidden was small....'

### 3.1.2 Function of C2

Category C2 is marked in the surface structure by personal noun-marking particles from column C2 in Table 1 (i.e., **-N (ud)** or **-N da**) or by nonpersonal particles, of which **-N (di)** is chosen at P1 in the formula for nonpersonal particles.

Noun-marking particles specified for C2 indicate that the nominal complement so marked is in a primary role function (e.g., AGENT, ACTOR, EXPERIENCER, etc.) with respect to its predicate. The precise case (role) depends on the semantics of the verb. These particles can only occur with verbal affixation calling for focus on something other than the primary role participant. C2 category is illustrated in examples 1 and 7 above and 11 and 12 below:

11. **Kingwa-n**                      **Gammelayan**                      **di**                      -**t**  
 did-pers.-C2-sing. Gammelayan P1:Ø+P2:Ø+P3:di-+P4:-t  
**pinakwa**                      **na.**  
 caused-to-do his  
 'Gammelayan did what he told her to do.'
12. **Imbaga -n**                      **da**                      -**t suldadu kan**  
 said-P1:-N+P2:da-+P3:(di-)+P4:-t soldier pers.-C4-sing.  
**Bayogbog...**  
 wind  
 'The soldiers said to Mr. Wind....'

In addition to their use as markers of nominal complements in a clause, C2 particles are also used in noun phrases to mark such functions as OWNER in an Ownership Construction, WHOLE in a Part-whole construction, or the higher ranking participant in Kinship or Social relationship. Examples of these uses of C2 particles are found in examples 2 and 10 above and 13 and 14 below:

13. **Sadiya ima, ima -n di alan.**  
 that hand hand-P1:-N di spirit  
 'That hand was the hand of a spirit.'
14. **Iningaw si Luwang si - di -n**  
 stayed pers.-C3-sing. Carabao P1:si+P2:Ø+P3:di-+P4:-N  
**paway ud Donglayan.**  
 yard pers.-C2-sing. Donglayan  
 'Mr. Carabao stayed in Donglayan's yard.'

### 3.1.3 Function of C3

The category C3 is marked in the surface structure by personal noun-marking particles from column C3 in Table 1 (i.e., **si** or **da**) or by nonpersonal particles, of which Ø is chosen at P1 in the formula (see 2.2).

A noun-marking particle specified for category C3 indicates that the nominal following it is the focused participant in the clause in which it appears. In a clause whose predicate is affixed to indicate that the primary function participant is in focus (i.e., **man-**, **maN-**, or **-um-** type affixes), the nominal introduced by a C3 particle will be a primary function participant (e.g., AGENT, ACTOR, etc.), whereas if the predicate is affixed to indicate that a nonprimary function participant is in focus, the nominal introduced by the C3 particle will be in a nonprimary function case (role) (e.g., GOAL, PATIENT, RECIPIENT, INSTRUMENT, etc.).

In addition to their use in verbal clauses, particles of category C3 are also used in identificational constructions, which have sometimes been referred to by Philippine linguists as nonverbal clauses. Actually these constructions are chains consisting of a noun phrase, pronoun, adjective, existential, etc., followed by another nominal, which is always introduced by a C3 noun-marking particle.

In the surface structure of the nonpersonal particles C3 category is actually the unmarked category, since it calls for the choice of Ø at P2. The use of C3 particles is illustrated in examples 5, 8, 11, and 14-16. Example 15 illustrates its use in a verbal clause, and 16 shows how it functions in a chain, in both cases the representation being Ø at P1.

15. **Summungbat**                      **di**        **-t anak na-n Gammelayan**  
 answered P1:Ø+P2:Ø+P3:di-+P4:-t child his-Lk Gammelayan  
 un,...  
 quote  
 'His child Gammelayan answered, "...."'
16. **Siyanat**                      **nat**                      **piyaok.**  
 that        P1:Ø+P2:Ø+P3:nat+P4:-N like-I  
 'That is what I like.'

### 3.1.4 Function of C4

Category C4 is marked in the surface structure by personal noun-marking particles from column 4 in Table 1 (i.e., **kan** or **kan da**) or by nonpersonal particles, of which **si** or **ut** is chosen at P1 in the formula for nonpersonal particles (see 2.2).

Particles specified for C4 indicate that the following nominal is neither the focused participant nor a primary function participant. Their use is illustrated in examples 3, 4, 8, 12, and 14.

An exception must be noted to the statement made above that C4 particles mark the following nominal as a nonprimary function participant. This statement holds true except in the case of a special passive-like construction, where C4 particles are used to mark the nonfocused primary function participant following a special set of focus pronouns.

17. **Nangatuw-ak un tagu**        **yoong salinan-ak kan**                      **Bunot.**  
 high-I        lk person but        block-me        pers.-C4-sing. Cloud  
 'I am a high person but I am blocked by Mr. Cloud.'
18. **Uwayon dika-t**                      **da-**        **nat**                      **bulun nu.**  
 wait        you-P1:ut+P2:da+P3:nat+P4:-N companion your  
 'You are being awaited by your companions.'

### 3.2 Specification function of noun-marking particles

Both the personal and nonpersonal noun-marking particles have the same function in terms of helping to specify the case (role) of the nominal they introduce, and in this function they do not differ greatly from the function of noun-marking particles in many other Philippine languages. Both also distinguish singular and plural number. However, the existence of the choices at P3 and P4 in the surface structure composition of the nonpersonal particles requires a number of deep structure distinctions that are not possible for the personal noun-marking particles. It is, indeed, the functions of the choices at P3 and P4 that make the noun-marking particles of Limos Kalinga unique among the Philippine languages of which the writer is aware.

The basic function of the three choices at P3 is to signal relative distance of the referent from the communicator and audience. The surface forms here are identical to the forms of the relative pronouns, with *tu* indicating relative proximity to the communicator, *nat* relative proximity to the audience, and *di* indicating that the referent is distant from both communicator and audience.

The question may be raised here whether Limos Kalinga may not merely be using deictics as substitutes for regular noun-marking particles, since in some Philippine languages it is common to find a deictic used in place of the regular noun-marking particle, as, for example, *iyong* in Tagalog, as in 19 below:

19. **Nasaan ang lapis? or Nasaan iyong lapis?**  
'Where is the pencil?'

However, as pointed out in section 2, there is a clear difference in form between the deictics and noun-marking particles in Limos Kalinga, although both are used to specify relative distance. Also, whereas languages like Tagalog always have the option of being noncommittal about the relative location of the referent, this is not so for Limos Kalinga.

It is the choice available at P4 which distinguishes the noun-marking particles from deictics in Limos Kalinga. Perhaps the best way to describe the difference in function between the two choices available at P4 for the nonpersonal noun-marking particles is in terms of exophoric and endophoric reference. A communication is viewed as taking place in a certain context of time and space, which includes all uncompleted events, real and known places, referents which belong to or are considered to be a part of the communicator and audience, or referents that are being looked at or handled by the communicator and audience. If a referent is considered to be within (i.e., endophoric to) this context, **-N** must be chosen at P4, along with the choice of the appropriate form at P3 depending on the relative proximity of the referent to the communicator or his audience. If a referent is considered to be external to this context (i.e., exophoric), **di-** is chosen at P3 and **-t** at P4 in the formula in sec. 2.2.

Most referents in narrative discourse are exophoric, either because they refer to completed events or because they are fictitious, have ceased to exist, or are simply not present for the communicator and audience to observe. However, when the narrator refers to specific, known places or reports the speech of participants, he switches to endophoric reference. So, for example, in a certain folktale about a monkey and a turtle, the narrator represents the referents as exophoric, using the **dit** form, but when referred to by one of the participants, the same referents become endophoric. When the monkey and turtle find a banana plant,

the narrator refers to it by the exophoric **dit**, but when the turtle later asks the monkey to climb the same plant he refers to it by the endophoric **din**. From the point of view of the monkey and turtle the plant is real and visible, even though for the narrator the whole story may be fictitious, or at least the events he relates are not taking place at the time he is telling about them. And, of course, the narrator has already established these referents by earlier mention of them.

In another narrative, which is an autobiographical account, the narrator represents most of the referents as exophoric, because they are either past events, things which no longer exist, such as the house where the narrator grew up, or things that are not in view at the time of the narration, such as his parents. However, when he refers to an actual illness he has at the time of the narration, he refers to it as **si-tu-n sakit ku** (P1:si-+P2:Ø+P3:tu-+P4:-N sickness + my) 'my sickness'.

When referring to actual places, known to exist, one of the endophoric forms must be used, whether or not the place is visible. The narrator is forced to position himself at the time of his narration with respect to specific places he refers to. The choice of the form at P3 depends on the relative proximity of the location with respect to other places referred to in the immediate context. So, for example, in one story the narrator first refers to a particular river in the vicinity of his village as **tun Saltan** because it is in the context of other, more distant rivers. A little later he refers to the same river as **din Saltan**, because now it is in the context of another stream even closer to him, which is now referred to as **tun Sulung Babattuwan**.

The exophoric nonpersonal noun-marking particle, when it is used with names of people, indicates that the person is deceased, as in 20:

20.    **Sa-           di           -t Wandaga, ossaana nasuyop**  
       P1:sa-+P2:Ø+P3:di-+P4:-t Wandaga alone-Lk slept  
       **si                           -t boloy da.**  
       P1:si-+P2:Ø+P3:(di-)+P4:-t house their  
       'The late Wandaga was asleep alone in their house.'

The narrator frequently uses the endophoric form **tun** where the exophoric **dit** would otherwise be expected in constructions introduced by **awad kad**, a standard formula roughly translated in English by 'as for'. This construction is frequently used to introduce participants or to draw special attention to a referent. So it is used in one story to draw attention to the blood of the murdered heroine as it turns into a crow. **Awad kad tu-n natab'unana dala...** (As for P1:Ø+P2:Ø+P3:tu-+P4:-N covered blood) 'As for the covered blood....'



When participants are introduced, the **tun** form may be used, whether or not it is introduced by this formula. So in one story the main characters are introduced as, **Awad kad da-tu-n duwa-n mansunud-a unila-n babai** (As for P1:Ø+P2:da+P3:tu-+P4:-N two-1k sibling-1k orphan-1k female) 'As for these two orphaned sisters' and, **di-tu-n osa-n tagallan** (P1:-N di+P2:Ø+P3:tu-+P4:-N one-1k young man) 'this one young man'. However, throughout the rest of the story they are referred to either by name or with the exophoric form **dit**.

As pointed out in section 2, when **-N (di)** or **si/ut** are chosen at P1, it is possible to delete the rest of the formula and avoid the kind of specification indicated by the choices at P3 and P4. These nonspecified forms are used with nonpersonal nominals marked in the surface structure for C2 (i.e., P1:-N (di)) and C4 (i.e., P1:si/ut), when the referent is indefinite or nonspecific.

This nonspecific type of nonpersonal particle is illustrated in examples 13 above and 21 below.

21. **Nangwa Ø si alang...**  
       made he P1:si granary  
       'He made a granary....'

This is the first mention of the granary, so it is still nonspecific. However, in the next reference it is specified as 'the granary he made' and must be referred to by a more specific form of the noun-marking particle.

22. **...adu di -t kanon da-n inyalang**  
       much P1:Ø+P2:Ø+P3:di-+P4:-t food their-1k put-in-granary  
**da- t di -t alang-a tinallikayu-n**  
       they-P1:ut+P2:Ø+P3:di-+P4:-t granary-1k made-of-boards-1k  
**Paman.**  
       Paman  
       '...they had much food which they had stored in the  
       granary that Paman made of boards.'

When particles **sa** or **Ø** are chosen at P1 (i.e., category C1 or C3), it is impossible to avoid the further specification at P3 and P4, because it is impossible to have a nonspecific and indefinite topic, or focused participant, in Limos Kalinga.

#### 4 Conclusion

In this description of Limos Kalinga noun-marking particles it has been demonstrated that noun-marking particles, especially the nonpersonal ones, are complex forms requiring the communicator in Limos Kalinga to make a number of deep structure distinctions that

are optional or even impossible to signal in the surface structures of many other languages. Distinctions such as relative distance of a referent from the communicator and audience and endophoric or exophoric reference are frequently obligatorily marked by noun-marking particles in Limos Kalinga in addition to the obligatory marking of the case (role) function, which is common in Philippine languages.

### NOTES

- 1 Alternatively these have been referred to as determiners or case-marking particles.
- 2 See, for example, the system for Casiguran Dumagat in Headland and Headland (1974:xxx-xxxii).
- 3 Kalinga is an Austronesian language. Thomas and Gieser (1974:66), building on classifications proposed by other linguists and based on independent dialect survey work conducted under the auspices of S.I.L., have developed a decimal classification of Philippine languages. They place Kalinga under the Central Cordilleran group of languages along with Ilocano, Itneg, Bontoc, Kankanay, Ifugao, Inibaloi, and Isinai. There are an estimated seventy to eighty thousand speakers of Kalinga living in the Kalinga part of Kalinga-Apayao Province in the northern part of the island of Luzon, Republic of the Philippines.  
The particular dialect upon which this study is based is Limos Kalinga, or Linimos as it is most often referred to by native speakers. Linimos is spoken by about eight thousand people in some ten barrios along the lower Salitan River in the municipality of Pinokpok.  
The data upon which this study is based consist of several hundred pages of text material collected from various native speakers from the barrios of Limos, Malaap, Asibanglan, and Allaguia between 1974 and 1977 by the author and by Kathleen Bosscher and Carol Porter, all working under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- 4 The term nominal as it is used here includes nouns or noun phrases. Even verbs or clauses can be turned into nominals in Limos Kalinga simply by preposing the appropriate noun-marking particle to the verb and deleting the focused participant following the verb.
- 5 For a more detailed discussion of the function of verb affixes in Limos Kalinga, see Wiens 1979.

### REFERENCES

- Fleming, Ilah. 1977. Field Guide for Communication Situation, Semantic and Morphemic Analysis. Mimeographed. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Headland, Thomas N. and Janet D. Headland. 1974. A Dumagat (Casiguran)-English Dictionary. Pacific Linguistics, Series C, 28. Canberra: Australian National University.

- Larson, Mildred. 1979. The Functions of Reported Speech in Discourse. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Thomas, David and Richard Gieser. 1974. A decimal classification for Philippine languages. In Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez, ed. by Andrew Gonzales, pp. 64-70. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Wiens, Hartmut. 1979. The semantic function of focus affixes in Limos Kalinga. In Papers in Philippine Linguistics, 9. (Pacific Linguistics, Series A, 50), pp. 19-47. Canberra: Australian National University.