

WORKING PAPERS

IN

LINGUISTICS

The notes and articles in this series are progress reports on work being carried on by students and faculty in the Department. Because these papers are not finished products, readers are asked not to cite from them without noting their preliminary nature. The authors welcome any comments and suggestions that readers might offer.

Volume 49(5)
2018
(November)

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA
HONOLULU 96822

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS FACULTY

2018

Victoria B. Anderson
Andrea Berez-Kroeker (Graduate Chair)
Robert A. Blust
Lyle Campbell (Adjunct)
James N. Collins
Kenneth W. Cook (Adjunct)
Kamil Deen (Chair)
Patricia J. Donegan (Adjunct)
Katie K. Drager
Michael L. Forman (Emeritus)
Gary Holton
Bradley McDonnell
William O’Grady
Yuko Otsuka (Adjunct)
Ann Marie Peters (Emeritus)
Kenneth L. Rehg (Adjunct)
Lawrence A. Reid (Emeritus)
Amy J. Schafer
Albert J. Schütz, (Emeritus, Editor)
Rory Turnbull
James Woodward Jr. (Adjunct)

THE KAPAMPANGAN CASE-MARKING SYSTEM FROM A DIACHRONIC PERSPECTIVE

KEVIN BAETSCHER

This paper presents a detailed description of the morphology involved in the Kapampangan case-marking system, investigating its history through internal reconstruction and cross-linguistic comparison. Eventually, this paper suggests that the traditional paradigm of Philippine case markers is not entirely appropriate for Kapampangan, as this language combines a small number of grammatical markers fairly transparently to cover every syntactic function necessary for an Austronesian-type alignment system, with the help of systematic head marking. The re-analysis presented in the paper raises the question to what degree Kapampangan reduced its case-marking morphology, and to what degree the case-marking system reconstructed for Proto-Philippines, or even Proto-Austronesian, consisted of a smaller number of independent elements that freely combined with each other, rather than a full-fledged paradigm. The Kapampangan system may be a key in the larger question of why Austronesian languages differ so greatly in their case-marking paradigms.

1. INTRODUCTION. Philippine languages are renowned for their complex voice-marking system, which involves head-marking by means of affixation on the predicate, and dependent-marking by means of proclitics to the arguments, i.e., case marking. Typically, Philippine languages have three sets of case markers: nominative, genitive, and oblique, where nominative markers are used to mark the subject; genitive markers are used to mark a possessor, but are usually also employed to mark a non-subject agent; and oblique markers are used for such non-core arguments as locations, times, and indefinite referents.¹ Each of these cases commonly features distinct forms for common and personal referents, further distinguishing singular and plural forms for personal referents, creating a matrix of twelve forms.^{2,3} Examples of such paradigms are presented in table 1.

Kapampangan, a major Philippine language of the Central-Luzon branch with some two million speakers, has the same syntactic functions, but differs from this common pattern significantly in terms of morphology. Its case marking system has been described by Bergaño (1736:5–8) and Forman (1971:52), though both sources have their shortcomings: Bergaño redundantly presents the system in terms of Latin grammatical categories (*Nominativo, Genitivo, Dativo, Acusativo, Vocativo, Ablativo*), while Forman partly conflates case markers with demonstratives and pronominal clitics (see below). The paradigm presented in table 2 represents the essence of these previous descriptions in a more consistent way. It is fashioned after the categories recognized for other Philippine languages (table 1) but does not necessarily reflect directly the Kapampangan morphological system, as shall be seen in the following sections. All the following data have been provided by Kapampangan native speaker and language expert Michael Raymon M. Pangilinan from Magalang, Pampanga.

¹ Many linguists are reluctant to use the notion of “subject” in the description of Philippine languages, but I follow Kroeger 1993 in identifying the so-called *pivot*, which agrees with the predicate in thematic role (and optionally number), as the subject. This means that the single argument of an intransitive clause is a subject, and any likewise marked argument in a transitive clause is a subject, as well.

² A minority of languages, e.g., Ivatan, have an additional distinct set of locative markers, but Kapampangan is not one of those.

³ The distinction between *common* and *personal* does not match the *common* vs. *proper* distinction in English, as the personal forms are also used for pronouns (cf. section 7), but not, e.g., for place names. These case markers specify *referent types*, as opposed to *noun phrases*, because the existence of a noun class in Kapampangan (and other Philippine languages) is doubtful. This is apparent in that the predicate itself may be specified by a nominative marker, as in *Ing mámulaî ia ing mapanáko* ‘NOM running 3s.NOM NOM thief’, i.e., ‘The one who’s running is the thief.’ (The *ia ing* is usually syncopated to *iang*.)

TABLE 1. Case-marking paradigms in three Philippine languages
(common / personal / plural personal referents)

	Hiligaynon ⁴	Subanon ⁵	Pangasinan ⁶
Nominative ⁷	ang / si / sanday	og / si / silo?	so / si / di
Genitive ⁸	sang / ni / nanday	nog / ni / nilo?	na / nen / di
Oblique	sa / kay / kanday	sog / diani / dianilo?	ed / kinen / ed kindi

TABLE 2. Tentative Kapampangan Case Marking Paradigm

	Common		Personal	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
Nominative	ing	ding	i	di
Genitive	(PRO +) ning	(PRO +) ding	(PRO + =ng)	(PRO +) di
Oblique	king	karing	kang	kari

The different categories in table 2 are exemplified in the phrases and clauses in (1). Note that /d/ has an intervocalic allophone [r].

(1) Example sentences of Kapampangan case markers

- a. Referential phrases:
- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|
| <i>ing=ásu(=na)</i> | <i>ning=anak</i> |
| NOM=dog(=3s.GEN) | GEN=child |
| ‘the child’s dog’ | |
| <i>ing=ásu=ra</i> | <i>ring=ának</i> |
| NOM=dog=3p.GEN | PL=children |
| ‘the children’s dog’ | |
| <i>ding=ásu(=na)</i> | <i>ning=anak</i> |
| PL=dog(=3s.GEN) | GEN=child |
| ‘the child’s dogs’ | |
| <i>ding=ásu=ra</i> | <i>ring=ának</i> |
| PL=dog=3p.GEN | PL=children |
| ‘the children’s dogs’ | |
| <i>ing=ásu=na=ng</i> | <i>Baiang</i> |
| NOM=dog=3s.GEN=LIG | Mary |
| ‘Mary’s dog’ | |
| <i>ing=ásu=ra</i> | <i>ri=Baiang</i> |
| NOM=dog=3p.GEN | PL=Mary |
| ‘Mary and company’s dog’ | |

⁴ Cf. Wolfenden 1971:62–67.

⁵ Many thanks/Salamat to native speaker Sharon Joy Bulalang for providing these data. They represent the Western dialect.

⁶ Cf. Benton 1971:47–58. Like Forman, Benton included some additional forms from the demonstrative paradigm in his case-marker paradigm.

⁷ Also labelled “pivot/subject/topic/focus/equational/absolute” in the literature.

⁸ Also labelled “ergative” in the literature.

- b. Intransitive clauses:⁹ *Mátudtud=ia ing=ásu king=múla.*
 sleeping=3s.NOM NOM=dog OBL=garden
 ‘The dog is sleeping in the garden.’
Mátudtud=la ring=ásu king=múla.
 sleeping=3p.NOM PL=dog OBL=garden
 ‘The dogs are sleeping in the garden.’
Mátudtud=ia i=Baiang king=múla.
 sleeping=3s.NOM NOM=Mary OBL=garden
 ‘Mary is sleeping in the garden.’
Mátudtud=la ri=Baiang king=múla.
 sleeping=3p.NOM NOM=Mary OBL=garden
 ‘Mary and company are sleeping in the garden.’
- c. Transitive clauses: *Íkit=né ning=anak ing=ásu.*
 seen=3s.GEN>3s.NOM GEN=child NOM=dog
 ‘The child saw the dog.’
Íkit=nó ning=anak ding=ásu.
 seen=3s.GEN>3p.NOM GEN=child PL=dog
 ‘The child saw the dogs.’
Íkit=dé ring=ának ing=ásu.
 seen=3p.GEN>3s.NOM PL=children NOM=dog
 ‘The children saw the dog.’
Íkit=dó ring=ának ding=ásu.
 seen=3p.GEN>3p.NOM PL=children PL=dog
 ‘The children saw the dogs.’
Íkit=né=ng Baiang ing=ásu.
 seen=3s.GEN>3s.NOM=LIG Mary NOM=dog
 ‘Mary saw the dog.’
Íkit=né ning=ásu i=Baiang.
 seen=3s.GEN>3s.NOM GEN=child NOM=Mary
 ‘The dog saw Mary.’
Íkit=né=ng Iru? i=Baiang.
 seen=3s.GEN>3s.NOM=LIG Peter NOM=Mary
 ‘Peter saw Mary.’
Íkit=dé ri=Iru? i=Baiang
 seen=3s.GEN>3s.NOM PL=Peter NOM=Mary
 ‘Peter and company saw Mary.’

⁹ Here and below, the internal morphology of the predicate (and other phrase heads) is not glossed. The reasons for this are threefold: (1) Kapampangan morphology has lexicalized to such a degree that many forms are only relatable from a historical perspective, but need to be considered suppletive from a synchronic perspective; (2) The standard terminology assumes a distinct verb class using the term “voice” and/or identifies the subject as the focus, both problematic views in my opinion; (3) I prefer to avoid distracting clustering in the gloss and save space. For readers familiar with the traditional analysis of Austronesian syntax, the glosses for the predicates provided here are: *má-tudtud* ‘AV.PRG-sleep’ (cf. prospective aspect *ma-tudtud* without vowel length), *íkit* ‘UV.PFV.see’ (cf. prospective aspect *ákit* without umlaut historically derived from the infix **<in>*), *b<in>ié* ‘<UV.PFV>give’ (cf. prospective aspect *bié*).

<i>É=nó</i>	<i>pinsína=ng</i>	<i>Baiang</i>	<i>di=Iru?</i>
NEG=3s.GEN>3p.NOM	notice=LIG	Mary	NOM=Peter
‘Mary did not mind Peter and company.’			
<i>Binié=né</i>	<i>ning=matying</i>	<i>kang=Iru?</i>	<i>ing=ságin.</i>
given=3s.GEN>3s.NOM	GEN=monkey	OBL=Peter	NOM=banana
‘The monkey gave the banana to Peter.’			
<i>Binié=ró</i>	<i>ring=bábái</i>	<i>karing=ípus</i>	<i>ding=sundang.</i>
given=3p.GEN>3p.NOM	PL=women	OBL=slave	PL=dagger
‘The women gave the slaves the daggers.’			
<i>Binié=né=ng</i>	<i>Béng</i>	<i>ing=bíngut</i>	<i>king=kambing.</i>
given=3s.GEN>3s.NOM=LIG	B.	NOM=baby	OBL=goat
‘Beng gave the baby to the goat.’			

As the examples show, Kapampangan exhibits pronominal agreement, i.e., cross-referenced number- and case-sensitive clitics for core arguments (i.e., nominative- and genitive-marked agents) are always required. This feature has been documented in the two reference works on Kapampangan grammar to date, Bergaño 1736 and Forman 1971, and forms the crux of Mithun’s 1994 treatment of syntactic alignment in Kapampangan. Phonological fusion in clitic clusters obscures the presence of the cross-reference clitics somewhat, but this process is entirely regular: relevant for the examples discussed in this paper is that the nominative forms *ia* (sg) and *la* (pl) surface as a shift in the vowel of a preceding clitic to *-e* and *-o*, respectively.¹⁰ This paper presents a detailed description of the morphology involved in the Kapampangan case-marking system, investigating its history through internal reconstruction and cross-linguistic comparison. I suggest that the traditional paradigm of Philippine case markers is not entirely appropriate for Kapampangan, as this language combines a small number of grammatical markers in a fairly transparent manner to cover the various syntactic functions, rather than having distinct forms for each box in the paradigm.

2. PLURAL MARKING. In contrast to most other Philippine languages, Kapampangan case marking distinguishes number not only for personal referents, but also for common referents. All plural forms contain an element *di*, with the /d/ appearing as its intervocalic allophone /r/ in the oblique forms. This element in its bare form corresponds to the personal nominative form. Since the corresponding singular form is simply *i*, this suggests that *di* is derived from the singular form by a pluralizing prefix *d-*.

This *d-* is certainly related to the 3p genitive form *da*, considering the singular counterparts *ia* (nominative) and *na* (genitive). It is not immediately obvious whether a morpheme *d-* is present in the pronominal form or whether the *d-* is a truncated version of the latter. The forms *king* and *ning* (cf. sections 5 and 6, respectively) show that /ai/ can coalesce to /i/ in Kapampangan, but these forms require coalescence to avoid a consonant cluster in coda position.¹¹ The demonstrative paradigm, on the other hand, shows pluralized forms with a shift from /i/ to /e/, which is clearly indicative of *da-*. Thus, a presumed *da-i* would regularly be reflected as **de*, rather than the attested *di*, favoring the former hypothesis. Furthermore, it would be unclear why the genitive pronominal form would be incorporated into the plural forms, rather than the corresponding nominative form *la*. Thus, it is more likely that *d-* is an independent pluralizing morpheme, which occurs also in the pronominal enclitic *=da*.

This pluralizing element is older than Kapampangan, as we find it also in other Philippine languages. First, note the plural marker *di* in Pangasinan (table 1), which has the same function as in Kapampangan. Further, we find the same plural element in 3p pronominal forms in various languages, including Hiligaynon

¹⁰ Forman (1971) misidentified some fused clitic clusters (as well as demonstratives) as case markers, leading to an inflated case-marking paradigm with extensive unexplained allomorphy.

¹¹ The vowels /i/ and /u/ are realized as glides when they precede /a/.

silá (< *sira* < *si-d-a*, cf. 3s *siya* < *si-a*), Ilokano enclitic =*da*, or Inati *iræ* (< *i-d-æ*, cf. 3s *iyæ* < *i-æ*). These forms confirm that the pluralizing element *d-* is a separate morpheme, as the *-a* is also present in the singular forms.

3. THE PERSONAL MARKER. Even though almost all forms of the Kapampangan case-marking paradigm contain an element *i*, this marker in its basic form is used to mark a singular personal referent, which includes personal names, but also kinship terms, pronouns, and demonstratives (cf. section 7). According to Ross 2006 and Blust 2015, this element historically served as a marker for personal referents, but its usage was evidently extended to the common forms not only in Kapampangan, but in various other languages; as well, notably Ilokano and Pangasinan, two neighboring languages. Perhaps surprisingly, the *i* does not occur in the genitive and oblique functions for personal singular referents. The reason for this may be that *i* – only in its bare form! – was re-analyzed as a nominative marker and excluded from non-subject functions.

Across various Philippine languages, many case markers for personal referents contain an element *i*, which however does not appear in its bare form, but only bound. The Kapampangan form is crucial in that it demonstrates that this element can be used independently. The most common personal singular nominative form in the Philippines is *si*, as exemplified in table 1, and even reflected as *hi* in the Sambal language, a closer relative of Kapampangan in the Central Luzon subgroup (Antworth 1979). The most common genitive form corresponding to *si* is *ni*, encountered in Greater Central Philippines languages, as well as in Sambal.¹² No *i* is present in the common case markers of Tagalog or Hiligaynon. Note that the Pangasinan genitive marker *nen* starts with an *n-* like *ni*, but has a different ending, suggesting that the *n-* and the *i* are separable. Finally, the element *i* is present also in the oblique form *kay* (e.g., Hiligaynon and Tagalog), where it combines with the oblique marker *ka-* (cf. section 5). The same *i* also occurs in many denotations for ethnic groups especially in the northern Philippines, e.g., *i-lokano* (< *look* ‘cave’ with the Spanish adjectival suffix), *i-banag* (< *bannag* ‘river’), *i-gorot* (< *gorot* ‘mountain range’), etc. Thus, the *i* does not appear to be restricted to any syntactic function, but rather appears consistently with personal referents across Philippine languages. As noted in section 2, its corresponding plural form is *di*. In Kapampangan, these forms which once marked personal referents spread throughout the entire case-marking paradigm, as the common-personal distinction was secondarily re-established by the ligature =*ng* (cf. section 4).

4. A LIGATURE FOR COMMON ARGUMENTS. All common markers end in =*ng*, and if this element is deleted, the resulting form is the corresponding personal marker in most cases. This suggests that the common forms are derived from the personal forms by addition of =*ng*. Furthermore, the form of this element is identical to the ligature, which is used in Philippine languages to link dependents to their heads. The phrases in (2) show the usage of this ligature in Kapampangan.

(2) Ligature linking head and dependent¹³

- a. Single-word modifiers:
- | | |
|------------------|----------------|
| <i>i=bápa=ng</i> | <i>Iru?</i> |
| NOM=uncle=LIG | Peter |
| ‘uncle Peter’ | |
| <i>batu=ng</i> | <i>maputi?</i> |
| stone=LIG | white |
| ‘a white stone’ | |

¹² Given the prevalence of *si* as the personal singular nominative marker, one may be tempted to derive the Kapampangan form *i* from that form, but this association fails to follow the regular sound changes, as Kapampangan regularly retains PAN **s* as /s/.

¹³ Following the reasoning in footnote 9, the internal structure of the predicates (and other phrase heads) is not represented in the glosses. In traditional notation, the predicates given here would be glossed: *ka-saya?* ‘UV.STAT-happy’, *mán-dakap* ‘AV.PRG-catch’, *mé-ket* ‘PASS.PFV-bite’ (derived from the prospective form *ma-ket* by umlaut caused by the perfective infix <*in*>).

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| | <i>balé=ng</i> | <i>batu</i> |
| | house=LIG | stone |
| | ‘a house made out of stone’ | |
| b. Relative clauses: | <i>ing=ikit=ku=ng</i> | <i>balé</i> |
| | NOM=seen=1s.GEN=LIG | house |
| | ‘the house that I saw’ | |
| c. Complement clauses: | <i>Kasaya?=ku=ng</i> | <i>ikit=daka.</i> |
| | happy=1s.GEN=LIG | seen=1s.NOM>2s.NOM |
| | ‘I’m happy that I saw you.’ | |
| d. Indefinite arguments: | <i>Mándakap=ia=ng</i> | <i>tugak i=Iru?</i> |
| | catching=3s.NOM=LIG | frog NOM=Peter |
| | ‘Peter is catching frogs.’ | |
| | <i>Méket=ia=ng</i> | <i>ásu i=Baiang.</i> |
| | bitten=3s.NOM=LIG | dog NOM=Mary |
| | ‘Mary was bitten by a dog.’ | |

Despite this phonological congruence, though, the reason why the ligature would be used to mark common arguments remains unclear.

Note further that the same element *-ng* is also marginally used in the personal paradigm, namely in the two forms that lack the personal marker *i*. This is likely no coincidence, but its significance is not yet clear to me.

Case markers in *-ng* are not so common in Philippine languages, even though they appear in the large group of Greater-Central Philippine languages like Tagalog or Visayan languages. There, however, they have not occupied the entire common paradigm. Whether the *-ng* in these languages has the same origin as the one in Kapampangan is an open question.

5. THE OBLIQUE MARKER. All oblique forms in Kapampangan start with *ka-*, with the exception of *king*. However, this form can be shown by analogy to contain the same oblique marker: the oblique plural forms *kari* and *karing* are evidently derived from the non-oblique forms by addition of *ka-*, and adding *ka-* to the singular form *ing* leads to a form *ka-ing*, which coalesced to *king*.¹⁴ This process parallels the formation of *ning* (cf. section 6). Thus, all oblique markers are directly derived from their nominative counterparts with the addition of the oblique marker *ka-*, except for the personal singular form *kang*, which is unusual in that it does not contain the personal marker *i* discussed in section 3. (The expected form would be *kai*, as in Tagalog or Hiligaynon, which would surface as *ke* in modern standard Kapampangan.) Instead, it appears that the oblique marker *ka-* combined with the ligature *=ng* in this form (cf. section 4).

The same oblique marker can be found also in other Philippine languages, e.g., in the Tagalog/Hiligaynon personal singular form *kay* (combined with the personal marker *i*; cf. section 3), or in the Ilokano personal plural form *kada* (where the *-da* is the 3p pronominal enclitic).

6. GENITIVE BY APPPOSITION. Kapampangan generally requires head marking, which manifests itself at the referential-phrase level in terms of genitive enclitics on the phrase head (3a), and at the clause level in the

¹⁴ One might expect that *ka-ing* would have become *kéng*, as Kapampangan monophthongized /ai/ and /au/ to /e/ and /o/, respectively. Indeed, such a form exists in modern Kapampangan, but it represents the locative demonstrative *ken* with the clitic ligature (cf. section 4). However, this form is of recent origin, not mentioned in Bergaño, but derived from *kian*, (documented in Bergaño as <queyang> on p. 3, representing a stage of Kapampangan where [e] was still an allophone of /i/ and showing the demonstrating Spanish speakers’ difficulty to distinguish final nasals). The form *kian~kian* is still retained as such in some lowland dialects of Kapampangan that have not undergone monophthongization. The true case marker *king*, on the other hand, is old.

form of cross-reference clitics for core arguments of the predicate (3b). Note that genitive enclitics are only used for definite referents (3c-d).

(3) Head marking on Kapampangan referential phrase heads and predicates¹⁵

- a. *ing=gauá(=na)* *ning=mágáral*
 NOM=product(=3s.GEN) GEN=learning
 ‘the product of the student’
ing=gauá=na=ng *Bérung*
 NOM=product=3s.GEN=LIG Oliver
 ‘Oliver’s product’
ing=gauá=ra *ring=mágáral*
 NOM=product=3p.GEN PL=learning
 ‘the product of the students’
ing=gauá=ra *ri=Bérung*
 NOM=product=3p.GEN PL=Oliver
 ‘the product of Oliver and company’
- b. *gauá=né* *ning=mágáral* *ian*
 product=3s.GEN>3s.NOM GEN=learning that.NOM
 ‘That is the product of the student.’
gauá=né=ng *Bérung* *ian*
 NOM=product=3s.GEN>3s.NOM=LIG Oliver that.NOM
 ‘That is Oliver’s product.’
Gagáuan=né *ning=mágáral* *ing=parul*
 being.produced=3s.GEN>3s.NOM GEN=learning NOM=lantern
 ‘The student is making the parol lantern.’
Gagáuan=né=ng *Bérung* *ing=parul*
 being.produced=3s.GEN>3s.NOM=LIG Oliver NOM=lantern
 ‘Oliver is making the parol lantern.’
Gagáuan=dé *ring=mágáral* *ing=parul*
 being.produced=3p.GEN>3s.NOM PL=learning NOM=lantern
 ‘The students are making the parol lantern.’
Gagáuan=dé *ri=Bérung* *ing=parul*
 being.produced=3p.GEN>3s.NOM PL=Oliver NOM=lantern
 ‘Oliver is making the parol lantern.’
- c. *ing=gaua=ng* *mágáral*
 NOM=product=LIG learning
 ‘the product of a student / of students’
- d. *Gágauá=ia=ng* *parul* *ing=mágáral*.
 making=3s.NOM=LIG lantern NOM=learning
 ‘The student makes parol lanterns.’

¹⁵ Following the reasoning in footnote 6, the internal structure of the predicates (and other phrase heads) is not represented in the glosses. In traditional notation, the predicate *gagáuan*, which is a contracted form of *ga-gáua?-an*, would be glossed ‘PRG-produce-UV’ (derived from the semantically stative-resultative root *gaua?* ‘produced/product’). Note that the undergoer and locative voice suffixes PAN **-en* and **-an* have regularly merged to the latter form in Kapampangan. The predicate *mé-ket* would be glossed ‘PASS.PFV-bite’.

Méket=ia=ng *ásu* *i=Baiang.*
 bitten=3s.NOM=LIG dog NOM=Mary
 ‘Mary was bitten by a dog.’

While possession is always marked on the head, the dependent (i.e., the possessor) is largely unmarked for syntactic function. Note that plural possessors are marked by the general plural forms *di* and *ding*, which are not restricted to any syntactic function but appear in the whole paradigm (table 2). Only the singular forms appear at first sight to be overtly marked, by *ning* and *=ng*, for common and personal possessors respectively. However, the *=ng* apparent in the genitive function actually appears only after vowels (4), and thus some supposedly genitive-marked arguments are morphologically unmarked.

(4) Usage of the ligature with two unmarked arguments

- a. *Dinínan=ne=ng* *Irú=ng* *lámak* *i=Baiang.*
 given.to=3s.GEN+3s.NOM=LIG Peter=LIG present NOM=Mary
 ‘Peter gave Mary a present.’
- b. *Dinínan=ne=ng* *lámak* *Iru?* *i=Baiang.*
 given.to=3s.GEN+3s.NOM=LIG present Peter NOM=Mary
 ‘Peter gave Mary a present.’

Hence, the *=ng* is more likely to be identified with the ligature (cf. section 4) and does not function as a case marker.

As for common singular possessors, we would expect, by analogy to the construction with other types of possessors, a cross-reference clitic *=na*, along with the corresponding nominative proclitic *ing*. Quite certainly, *ning* represents a fused form of these two markers, which parallels the fusion in the form *king*, from *ka-* and *ing*.¹⁶ This explains why common singular possessors are the only type of possessors that do not require an additional genitive pronominal clitic – because it is already included in *ning*.¹⁷ Quite possibly, the reason why some speakers add one nonetheless is because the fused form *ning* has become opaque to them and they do not recognize the pronominal clitic anymore. Such re-analysis parallels the usage of the forms *kilub* ‘inside’ and *kilual*, ‘outside’, which have fused with the oblique marker *king* (cf. Tagalog *loob* ‘inside’ and Ilokano *ruar* ‘outside’): some speakers use an additional *king* preceding these forms, not recognizing its presence in the fused form, while other speakers consider that superfluous.

This analysis entails that all possessor phrases are in fact unmarked for syntactic function, because if they are marked at all, it is by a form that is also used in the subject function. This observation agrees with the discussion in sections 2 and 3, which revealed that the subject function has no distinctive formal element and is thus unmarked. Here, we notice that the genitive function, as well, has no overt marker that would explicitly identify it as such: instead, possession is marked by head marking, while possessors are simply juxtaposed to their heads.

Other Philippine languages usually have overt genitive markers, which most commonly start with *n-*, (e.g., Tagalog *nang* and *ni*, Pangasinan *na* and *nen*). Probably, the 3s form *=na* is the only morpheme in Kapampangan that directly preserves this genitive marker and then introduced it secondarily to all singular (but not plural!) genitive forms. However, other Philippine languages lack head marking; hence it makes sense that Kapampangan could afford to abandon its genitive marking on arguments without syntactic consequences because of the coding on the head.

¹⁶ Notably, there is no allomorph *neng* that which would replace *ning* in the forms in (3a), which proves that /ai/ really fused to /i/, as opposed to /e/. The form *neng* recognized by Forman 1971 is in fact a combination of the portmanteau clitic form *=né* (a fusion of *=na* and *=ya*) and the ligature, as apparent in (3b).

¹⁷ One could think that *ning* derives from an older genitive form *ni*. Such a form is of course found in other Philippine languages, but is unattested for Kapampangan, even in the oldest sources. Thus, this hypothesis is not impossible, but not supported by the language-internal evidence.

7. CASE MARKING IN THE PRONOMINAL AND DEMONSTRATIVE PARADIGMS. The elements discussed in the previous sections are also used in pronouns and demonstratives, whose paradigms are given in tables 3 and 4, respectively.

TABLE 3. Kapampangan pronoun paradigm

	Nominative	Genitive	Oblique
1s	<i>i-áku</i> / =ku	=ku	kanáku / káku (< ka-aku)
2s	<i>í-ka</i> / =ka	=mu	kéka (< ka-i.ka)
3s	<i>i-a</i> / =ia	=na	ka-i.a
1di	<i>í-kata</i> / =(ka)ta	=ta	kékata (< ka-i.kata)
1pi	<i>í-támu</i> / =tá(mu)	=tá(mu)	kékatámu (< ka-i.katámu)
1pe	<i>í-kami</i> / =kami / =ke	=mi	kékami (< ka-i.kami) / keke
2p	<i>í-kayu</i> / =kayu / =ko	=yu	kékayu (< ka-ikayu) / keko
3p	<i>í-la</i> / =la	=da	ka-réla (< ka-da-i-la)

TABLE 4. Kapampangan demonstrative paradigm¹⁸

		Nominative	Genitive	Oblique	Locative
DM1: + speaker – addressee	sg	<i>i-ni</i>	nini	kaníni	kéni
	pl	déni (< da-i-ni)	da-réni	karéni	
DM12: + speaker + addressee	sg	<i>i-ti</i>	niti	kaníti	kéti
	pl	déti (< da-i-ti)	da-réti	karéti	
DM2: – speaker + addressee	sg	<i>i-an</i>	nian	kanian	kian, kén
	pl	dén (< da-i-an)	da-rén	karian, karén	
DM3: – speaker – addressee	sg	<i>i-ta</i>	nita	kaníta	kéta
	pl	déta (< da-i-ta)	da-réta	karéta	

The personal marker *i* is used not only in all nominative forms, but in virtually all full forms, excluding the clitic forms (nominative and genitive). The only forms that lack the *i* are the 1s oblique pronominal forms *kanáku* and *káku*, which might be the result of disambiguation between the first singular and second singular forms, as *ka-i-áku* would coalesce to *kéka*, already occupied by the 2s form.

The plural marker *d-* is employed in the pronominal paradigm only in the 3p form, while the other persons use suppletive forms to mark plurality. This 3p pronominal stem *da* appears to have taken preference over the simple plural marker *d-* in the demonstrative paradigm, which is apparent in the vowel quality /e/ arising from coalescence of the personal marker and the low vowel in the pronominal form *da*. (Had the simple plural prefix *d-* been used, the resulting forms would be **dini*, **diti*, **dian*, **dita*.) Curiously, the plural forms reflect the genitive pronoun *da*, as opposed to its nominative counterpart *la*, the motivation for which remains a mystery.

The genitive pronominal clitics are doubtlessly historically related to the full nominative or base forms, but this relation appears to be deeper, and for the scope of this paper, they are considered suppletive. The genitive demonstrative forms, on the other hand, show the familiar picture of head marking (cf. section 6),

¹⁸ Cf. also Forman's pronoun paradigm (1971:99), where he lists the same forms (incl. allophonic *d~r* alternation) but assigns different values for closeness to the speaker and addressee for the categories, which according to my consultant Michael Pangilinan are incorrect.

while the clitic *na* has fused in all singular forms with the initial personal marker *i*, just as it has in the common case marker *ning*.

All oblique forms are marked by the oblique marker *ka-* (cf. section 5). The basis for the oblique forms is the nominative forms in the pronouns, while it is the genitive forms in the demonstratives, except that the demonstrative plural forms do not exhibit the double marking described above. Note, however, that the locative forms are formed with the oblique marker *ka-* on the bare nominative forms. Two exceptional forms are 1p *kékatámu* (expected: *kétámu*), which must have formed in analogy to the 1d form *kékata*, and 3p *karéla* (expected: *kéla*), which features an extra 3p genitive pronominal *da*.

8. CONCLUSION. This paper started with the common assumption that Philippine languages are syntactically congruent, differing only in morphology. However, Kapampangan case marking presents a system that is morphologically very transparent and consistent, one that makes use of few morphemes, but relies more on syntactic construction. I argue that Kapampangan case marking does not lend itself to presentation in a paradigm, because any such paradigm will be highly redundant and at the same time incomplete due to the importance of head marking. In particular, any case paradigm would overlap with the pronominal paradigm, as is directly evident in Forman’s 1971 account (cf. footnote 10).

Instead, the Kapampangan case marking system can be summarized as follows:

(5) Kapampangan case marking

1. Definite referents are marked by *i*, which has the plural form *di*.
2. Common and indefinite arguments are marked by the ligature *=ng*, when preceded by a vowel.
3. Oblique case is indicated by *ka-*.
4. Possession is marked by a genitive enclitic on the head and postposing of the possessor.
5. Phonological rule: /ai/ > /i/ (i.e. *=na i=ng* > *ning*, and *ka-i=ng* > *king*).
6. Exception 1: A personal possessor is marked not by *i*, but by the ligature *=ng* instead.
7. Exception 2: Bare *i* does not combine with *ka-* but is replaced by the ligature *=ng* instead.

The pronominal forms are more opaque with suppletion, and render themselves well to paradigmatic presentation. The demonstrative forms follow (5) closely, so that their paradigm could almost be reduced to the four stems, but it is complicated by the further distinction of locative and oblique (the latter of which is furthermore built on the genitive forms), so that a complete paradigm may be more adequate, even though it does not capture the head marking and is rather repetitive. The advantages of this re-analysis, and its presentation in list form, are that it captures the morphology in a less redundant way, and accounts for the head-marking strategy in possessive marking. An important remaining mystery in the description of Kapampangan is the function of the ligature, which appears in a wide range of different syntactic environments, usually to link a dependent to its head, but in the case-marking paradigm apparently also to mark common referents.

Hence, it becomes apparent that Kapampangan case marking consists of only four distinct morphemes: *i*, *d-*, *ka-*, *=ng*. Only one of these, namely *ka-*, explicitly marks a case function (while *i* shows signs that it may have been re-analyzed as such). The nominative and genitive functions, on the other hand, are not morphologically marked. Nominative as the subject case is commonly unmarked in the world’s languages, but an unmarked genitive is surprising, especially since virtually all Philippine languages agree that genitive is marked by *n-*. However, Kapampangan could evidently afford to abandon its genitive marking on arguments with its alternative strategy of head marking. This re-analysis raises these questions: To what degree has Kapampangan reduced its case-marking morphology, and to what degree did the case marking system reconstructed for Proto-Philippines, or even Proto-Austronesian, consist of a smaller number of independent elements that freely combined with each other, rather than a full-fledged paradigm. The reconstructions in Ross (2006) and Blust (2015) do indeed present very systematic paradigms that lend themselves to the same kind of breakdown that this paper undertook for Kapampangan. Thus, the re-

analysis presented here could shed light on the broader question of why Austronesian languages differ so greatly in their case-marking paradigms.

ABBREVIATIONS

1s	first person singular	LIG	ligature, linking element between head and modifier
1d	first person dual inclusive	NEG	negator
1pi	first person plural inclusive	NOM	nominative
1pe	first person plural exclusive	OBL	oblique
2s	second person singular	PASS	passive
2p	second person plural	PFV	perfective
3s	third person singular	PRG	progressive
3p	third person plural	STAT	stative
AV	agent voice	UV	undergoer voice
GEN	genitive		

REFERENCES

- ANTWORTH, EVAN L. 1979. *Grammatical sketch of Botolan Sambal*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- BENTON, RICHARD A. 1971. *Pangasinan reference grammar*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines Series. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- BERGAÑO, DIEGO. 1736. *Arte de la lengua pampanga*. Sampaloc (Philippines): Convento de Ntra. Sra. de Loreto.
- BLUST, ROBERT. 2015. The case markers of Proto-Austronesian. *Oceanic Linguistics* 54(2):436–91.
- FORMAN, MICHAEL. 1971. *Kapampangan grammar notes*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines Series. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- KROEGER, PAUL R. 1993. Another look at subjecthood in Tagalog. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 24(2):1–16.
- MITHUN, MARIANNE. 1994. The implications of ergativity for a Philippine voice system. In *Voice: Its Form and Function*, ed. by Barbara Fox and Paul Hopper. *Typological Studies in Language* 27:247–77. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's.
- ROSS, MALCOM. 2006. Reconstructing the case-marking and personal pronoun systems of Proto Austronesian. *Streams Converging Into an Ocean: Festschrift in honor of professor Paul Jen-kuei Li on his 70th birthday*, 521–63. Taipei: Academia Sinica, Institute of Linguistics.
- WOLFENDEN, ELMER P. 1971. *Hiligaynon reference grammar*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines Series. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

kbaetsch@hawaii.edu