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1. Control in Ilokano.*

This paper deals with the syntactic expression of lack of control in Ilokano, an Austronesian language of the Philippines. The sentences below differ from each other in an interesting respect. The a and b sentences have the implication that the agent performed the action in an intentional or deliberate manner. The c sentences, on the other hand, imply that the agent performed the action unintentionally, accidentally, non-volitionally, or coincidentally. The verbs in the c sentences are prefixed with ma- , a marker of uncontrolled action in Ilokano.  (cf § 3)

This dichotomy of semantic implication will be referred to here with the notion of control. That is, the agents in the a and b sentences are performing controlled actions, while the agents in c are acting in situations which are out of their control.

1. a. Nag panúnot ni Eva iti aramíßen na.¹
   pst act think Det O-Det doing 3G
   'Eva concentrated on what to do.'
   b. P in - ø - anúnot ni Eva ti aramíßen na.
   pst - pas think Det Det doing 3G
   'What to do was concentrated on by Eva.'
   c. Na - ø - panúnot ni Eva ti aramíßen na.
   pst-unc - pas think Det Det doing 3G
   'Eva flashed on what to do.' / 'What to do came to Eva.'

2. a. Nag tippóg ni Irwin ka-dagiti bótelya.
   pst act - knock over Det O- Det bottle
   'Irwin knocked over the bottles.' [on purpose]
   pst - pas - knock over Det Det bottle
   'The bottles were knocked over by Irwin.' [on purpose]
   c. Na - ø - tippóg ni Irwin dagiti bótelya.
   pst -unc - pas -knock over Det Det bottle
   'The bottles were knocked over by Irwin.' [accidentally]

3. a. Nag itéd ti ubíŋg iti kuárta ka-dagiti birkóg.
   pst act - give Det child O-Det money O-Det thief
   'The child [deliberately] gave the money to the thieves.'
b. In - ted - án ti ubîn̄g iti kuârta dagiti birkôg.  
pst - give - adv Det child O-Det money Det thief  
'The thieves were given the money by the child.' [deliberate]
c. Na - ited - án ti ubîn̄g iti kuârta dagiti birkôg.  
pst-unc-give -adv Det child O-Det money Det thief  
'The child [unintentionally] gave the money to the thieves.'/
'The thieves were given the money by the child.' [unintentional]

Arguing within the theory of relational grammar, 2 I present the following analysis of the above sentences:
The a sentences, which will be referred to as ag- sentences, are active and can be represented in a monostratal relational network, such as the network for sentence 3a in 4:

4. ag- sentences [active]

![Network Diagram]

The b and c sentences in 1 and 2, referred to here as φ - sentences, are passive and can be represented in a bistratal relational network, such as the network for 2b in 5:

5. φ - sentences [passive]

![Network Diagram]

Passive sentences are characterized by an advancement of the direct object to subject placing the initial subject en chômage. The b and c sentences in 3, referred to as -an sentences, are clauses with indirect object advancement. Sentence 3b can be represented by a bistratal network as in 6, where the initial indirect object has advanced to subject, placing the initial subject en chômage.

6. -an sentences [3 -1]

![Network Diagram]

I will be referring to passive and indirect object advancement collectively as advancements. 3
It is significant to note in the data above that, while clauses with controlled actions (the a and b sentences above) can be either active or advancement clauses, initially transitive clauses with uncontrolled actions (the c sentences above) cannot occur as active clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>controlled</th>
<th>uncontrolled (ma-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>a sentences</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advancement</td>
<td>b sentences</td>
<td>c sentences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, initially transitive clauses expressing uncontrolled actions in Ilokano have two features in common. First, their verbs are prefixed with ma-, a marker of uncontrolled action. Second, their initial subjects have been placed en chômage by the advancement of another NP to subject. 4

2. Arguments for an advancement analysis.

In this section, I argue for an advancement analysis of the b and c sentences in section 1 on the basis of pronominal case, relative clause formation, and cleft constructions. Bell (to appear) has given analogous arguments in greater detail for an advancement analysis in Cebuano. She argues convincingly that an analysis within a theory of language which formulates rules in terms of grammatical relations captures significant generalizations, contrary to an assertion in the literature that a relation such as subject is not a viable construct in Philippine languages. 5

To contrast a non-advancement analysis with an advancement analysis in Ilokano, I will formulate rules for the above phenomena in both analyses. In describing the data, I will use the following terminology: agent denotes the nominal which performs the action; patient denotes the nominal on which the action is performed; recipient denotes the nominal which receives the patient from the agent. 6

In formulating rules, I will refer to the term relations posited for relational grammar: subject, object, and indirect object.

In a non-advancement analysis, only a single level of structure is posited for the ag-, ð, and -an sentences, as in 8.

8. Non-advancement analysis.
The nominals in 8 bear the same grammatical relations at both initial and final level. [The agent is both the initial and final subject. Likewise, the patient and recipient are object and indirect object respectively at both the initial and final level.] Therefore, rules in a non-advancement analysis will be written without regard to level.

In contrast, rules in an advancement analysis need to distinguish initial from final grammatical relations. In ag- sentences (cf 4), there are no advancements and the initial terms are the final terms. However, in Ø - sentences (cf 5), the initial object (the patient) is the final subject and the initial subject (the agent) is a final subject chômeur in a passive construction. In -an sentences (cf 6), the initial indirect object (the recipient) is the final subject and the initial subject is en chômage due to indirect object advancement.

2.1 Pronominal case.

The first argument for an advancement analysis is based on the formulation of rules for case assignment for pronouns in Ilokano. There are three sets of non-emphatic pronouns in Ilokano; a partial list is given here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Oblique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>ak</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>kanyak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>mo</td>
<td>kenka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>kenkuana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the third person nominal agents in the sentences above were replaced by 1st person pronominals as in 10 and 11, a consistent difference appears: the ag- sentences have nominative pronouns; the Ø - sentences and the -an sentences have genitive pronouns.

10. a. Nag - panúnot ak iti aramíde - k.
   pst act- think IN O-Det doing 1G
   'I concentrated on what to do.'

   b. P - in - Ø - anúnot ko ti aramíde - k.
   pst - pas - think 1G Det doing 1G
   'What to do was concentrated on by me.'

   c. Na - Ø - panúnot ko ti aramíde - k.
   pst-unc -pas- think 1G Det doing 1G
   'I flashed on what to do.'

11. a. Nag - itéd ak iti kuárta ka-dagiti birkóg.
    pst act-give IN O-Det money O-Det thief
    'I [deliberately] gave the money to the thieves.'
b. In - ted - án ko iti kuárta dagiti birkög.
pst - give - adv 1G O-Det money Det thief
'The thieves were given the money by me.' [deliberate]
c. Na - ited - án ko iti kuárta dagiti birkög.
pst-unc- give - adv 1G O-Det money Det thief
'The thieves were given the money by me.' [unintentional]

Furthermore, a 1st person patient in a Ø - sentence is expressed by a nominative pronoun:

pst pas push 3G 1N Det
'I was pushed by John.' [deliberate]

Similarly, a 1st person recipient in -an sentences is expressed by a nominative pronoun:

13. In - ted - án n - ak ti ubfìng iti kuárta.
pst - give - adv 3G 1N Det child O-Det money
'I was given the money by the child.' [intentional]

To account for the pronominal morphology in 10-13, a non-advancement analysis would have to posit the following rules:

14. a. Pronominal subjects in ag- sentences, objects in Ø - sentences, and indirect objects in -an sentences are nominative.
b. Pronominal subjects in Ø - sentences and -an sentences are genitive.

In an advancement analysis, a much simpler rule for pronominal case can be given:

15. a. Final subjects are nominative.
b. Final subject chômeurs are genitive.

Thus, the data on pronominal morphology provives evidence for an analysis with passive and indirect object advancement.

2.2 Relative clause formation.
A second argument for an advancement analysis comes from relative clause formation. In an ag- sentence, such as 16a, the agent ('the child') can relativize, as in 16b. However, the patient ('the money') and the recipient ('the thieves') cannot relativize, as is seen in 16c and d.

16. a. (= 3a) Nag - itéd ti ubfìng iti kuárta ka-dagiti birkög.
pst act- give Det child O-Det money O-Det thief
'The child gave the money to the thieves.'
b. **ti ubľng nga nag-itéd iti kuártaka-dagiti birkóg**
   child lnk give money thief
   'the child who gave the money to the thieves'

c. *iti kuárt nga nag-itéd ti ubľng ka-dagiti birkóg*
   money lnk give child thief
   *'the money that the child gave to the thieves'*

d. *(ka)dagiti birkóg nga nag-itéd ti ubľng iti kuártaka-dagiti birkóg*
   thief lnk give child money
   *'the thieves who the child gave the money to'*
   *'the thieves who gave the child money'*

In 16d, 'the thieves' can only be interpreted as agent.

In Ø - sentences, the facts are different. In 17b, it is the patient noun ('the money') that can relativize. As is seen in 17c and d, the agent and recipient nouns cannot relativize.

17. a. In - *- téd ti ubľng ti kuártaka-dagiti birkóg.
   pst-pas - give Det child Det money O-Det thief
   'The money was given to the thieves by the child.'

b. **iti kuárt nga in-téd ti ubľng ka-dagiti birkóg**
   money lnk give child thief
   'the money that was given to the thieves by the child'

c. *iti kuárt nga na-itéd ti ubľng ti kuártakadagiti birkóg
   child lnk give money thief
   *'the child who was given to the thieves by the money'*
   *'the child who gave the money to the thieves'*
   *'the child who the money was given to the thieves by'*

d. *iti kuárt nga na-itéd ti ubľng ti kuártaka-dagiti birkóg
   thief lnk give child money
   *'the thieves who were given to the money by the child'*
   *'the thieves who the money was given to by the child'*

In 17c, 'the child' can only be interpreted as patient.

Likewise, in Ø - sentences with the prefix ma-, only the patient noun can relativize, as in 18.

18. a. Na - *- itéd ti ubľng ti kuártaka-dagiti birkóg.
   pst-ux-pass - give Det child Det money O-Det thief
   'The money was given to the thieves by the child.' [unintentional]

b. **iti kuárt nga na-itéd ti ubľng ka-dagiti birkóg**
   money lnk give child thief
   'the money that was given to the thieves by the child'

c. *iti ubľng nga na-itéd ti kuártaka-dagiti birkóg

d. *(ka)dagiti birkóg nga na-itéd ti ubľng ti kuártaka
On the other hand, in -an sentences, only the recipient can relativize, as is seen in 19.

19. a. (3b) In -ted- án ti ubíng iti kuártá dagiti birkóg
   pst - give - adv Det child O-Det money Det thief
   'the thieves were given the money by the child.'
   b. dagiti birkóg nga intedán ti ubíng iti kuártá
      thief lnk give child money
      'the thieves who were given the money by the child'
   c. ti ubíng nga intedán iti kuártá dagiti birkóg
      child lnk give money thief
      'the child who was given the money by the thieves'
      *'the child who the thieves were given the money by'
   d. *iti kuártá nga intedán ti ubíng dagiti birkóg
      money lnk give child thief
      *'the money that was given the thieves by the child'

Likewise, only the recipient can relativize in -an sentences prefixed with ma-:

20. a. (3c) Na- ited - án ti ubíng iti kuártá dagiti birkóg.
    pst-unc - give - adv Det child O-Det money Det thief
    'The thieves were given the money by the child.' [unintentional]
    b. dagiti birkóg nga naitedán ti ubíng iti kuártá
       thief lnk give child money
       'the thieves who were given the money by the child'
    c. *ti ubíng nga naitedán iti kuártá dagiti birkóg
    d. *iti kuártá nga naitedán ti ubíng dagiti birkóg

A non-advancement analysis would find it necessary to posit the following rule to account for the relativization data:

21. a. In ag- sentences, only subjects relativize.
    b. In φ - sentences, only objects relativize.
    c. In -an sentences, only indirect objects relativize.

An advancement analysis, however, can capture the relevant generalization by means of a single rule:

22. Only final subjects relativize.

Furthermore, as Bell (to appear) has pointed out for Cebuano, a rule such as 22 is compatible with the predictions made by Keenan and Comrie (1977) concerning the accessibility of nominals to relativization. Specifically, the Accessibility Hierarchy would predict that if only one nominal of a clause can relativize, that nominal must be the subject. While that prediction would be borne out in an analysis with advancement and rule 22, a statement like that found in 21 would violate this claim.
2.3 Cleft Constructions.

Data involving cleft constructions give a third argument for an advancement analysis in Ilokano. Cleft constructions, which contrast or emphasize an NP, are formed by placing a nominal before the verb and following it with the determiner ti, as in 23, the clefted form of 3a.

23. Ti_ubîng ti nag - itêd iti kuártâ ka-dagiti bîrkôg.
Det child Det pst act-give O-Det money O-Det thief
'The child was the one who gave the money to the thieves.'

As we see in 23, agents can be clefted in ag- sentences. However, patients and recipients cannot be.

Det money Det pst act-give Det child O-Det thief
'the money was what the child gave to the thieves.'

24. b. *ka-dagiti bîrkôg ti nag - itêd ti ubîng iti kuártà.
O-Det thief Det pst act-give Det child O-Det money
'The thieves were the ones whom the child gave the money to.'

As we see in 23, agents can be clefted in ag- sentences. However, patients and recipients cannot be.

25. a. (cf 17a) Ti kuártà ti in - Ø - têd ti ubîng ka-dagiti bîrkôg.
Det money Det pst-pas-give Det child O-Det thief
'The money was what was given to the child by the thieves.'

25. b. ! ! Ti ubîng ti in- Ø - têd ti kuártà ka-dagiti bîrkôg.
Det child Det pst-pas-give Det money O-Det thief
'!'The child was the one that was given to the thieves by the money.'

O-Det thief Det pst-pas-give Det child Det money
'*The thieves were the ones that the money was given to by the child.'

In Ø - sentences, patients can be clefted while agents and recipients cannot be.

26. a. (cf 18a) Ti kuártà ti na- Ø - itêd ti ubîng ka-dagiti bîrkôg.
Det money Det pst-unc-pas-give Det child O-Det thief
'The money was what was given to the thieves by the child.'

[unintentional]
b. !! Ti ubỳg ti na - ø - itéd ti kuártia ka-dagiti birkòg.
   Det child Det pst-unc-pas-give Det money O-Det thief
   !! 'The child was the one that was given to the thieves by
   the money.' [unintentional]
   *'The child was the one that the money was given to the
   thieves by.' [unintentional]
   
   c. *Ka-dagiti birkòg ti na - ø - itéd ti ubỳg ti kuártia.
      O-Det thief Det pst-unc-pas-give Det child Det money
   *'The thieves were the ones who were given the money
      by the child.' [unintentional]

   In contrast, only the recipient can be clefted in -an sentences
   and in -an sentences with ma-.

27. a. (cf 19a) Dagiti birkòg ti in-ted - án ti ubỳg iti kuártia.
   Det thief Det pst-give-adv Det child O-Det money
   'The thieves were the ones who were given the money by the
   child.'
   b. *Ti ubỳg ti in-ted-ân iti kuártia dagiti birkòg.
      Det child Det pst-give-adv O-Det money Det thief
   *'The child was the one who the thieves were given the
      money to by.'
   c. *Iti kuártia ti in - ted - án ti ubỳg dagiti birkòg.
      O-Det money Det pst-give-adv Det child Det thief
   *'The money was what the thieves were given by the child.'

28. a. (cf 20a) Dagiti birkòg ti na - ited - án ti ubỳg iti kuártia.
   Det thief Det pst-unc-give-adv Det child O-Det money
   'The thieves were the ones who were given the money by the
   child.' [unintentional]
   b. *Ti ubỳg ti na - ited -ân iti kuártia dagiti birkòg.
      Det child Det pst-unc-give-adv O-Det money Det thief
   *'The child was the one who the thieves were given the
      money to by.' [unintentional]
   c. *Iti kuártia ti na - ited - án ti ubỳg dagiti birkòg.
      O-Det money Det pst-unc-give-adv Det child Det thief
   *'The money was what the thieves were given by the child.'
      [unintentional]

   To account for this data, a non-advancement analysis would
   posit the following rules:

29. a. Only subjects can be clefted in ag- sentences.
   b. Only objects can be clefted in ø - sentences.
   c. Only indirect objects can be clefted in -an sentences.
However, an advancement analysis can state the following generalization:

30. Only final subjects can be clefted.

The data on cleft constructions, then, provides evidence for an advancement analysis.

3. **ma-** as an out-of-control marker.

In the previous section, I have argued on the basis of pronominal case, relative clause formation, and cleft constructions that the _b_ and _c_ sentences in section 1 are best handled by an advancement analysis. As noted in section 1, the _b_ and _c_ sentences differ from each other in an interesting respect: 1-3c are prefixed with **ma-** and have the implication that the action was performed without control; 1-3b lack this prefix and have control implications. This difference leads to the supposition that **ma-** is a morphological marking for uncontrolled actions.

The sentences with verbs prefixed with **ma-** given above have all been examples of initially transitive clauses. In addition, **ma-** may be prefixed to verbs in initially intransitive clauses. Certain intransitive verbs whose subjects lack control over their actions are prefixed with **ma-**, as in 31.

31. a. Ma-tennág ti danúm. 'The water falls'
   b. Na-regrèg ni John iti kayó. 'John fell from the tree.'
   c. Na-turóg ak. 'I fell asleep.'

In Ilokano, there are relatively few intransitive verbs of this type, and most of these verbs allow other affixes which contrast in meaning to **ma-**, as in 32.

32. a. ag-tennág 'fall [intentionally]' [like a stunt man]
   b. ag-regrèg 'drop'
   c. Nag-turóg ak. 'I went to sleep.'

A major class of intransitives which prefix **ma-** are the stative verbs, as in 33.

33. a. Na-sakít ak. 'I was sick.'
   b. Na-ládao ak. 'I was late.'
   c. Na-bannóg ak. 'I am tired.'

Subjects of stative verbs, I claim, are also characterized by lack of control over the state they are in.

The unifying characteristic of all the examples of clauses with **ma-** is that the subjects of those clauses lack control over their actions. On this basis, I propose that **ma-** is a morphological
marking for actions which are out of control.

4. Conclusion.

In Ilokano, there is a means for indicating that the initial subject of a clause is performing an action that is out of control. Ma-, a morphological marker for uncontrolled actions, is prefixed to the verbs of such clauses. Thus, there is a morphological categorization of clauses into those with uncontrolled actions, with verbs prefixed with ma-, and those with controlled actions, lacking a ma- prefix.

A second phenomenon, which I suggest is unrelated, is the advancement of another NP to subject in initially transitive clauses where the initial subject lacks control. I propose that this reflects a constraint in Ilokano stating that transitive agents which lack control can never surface as final subject.

Thus, two features, the prefix ma- and the advancement of another NP to subject, characterize initially transitive clauses whose initial subjects are out of control in Ilokano.
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The following abbreviations are used in this paper:

- pst = completed action
- act = active marker
- pas = passive marker
- adv = advancement marker
- unc = uncontrolled action marker
- Det = Determiner
- N = Nominative
- G = Genitive
- O = Oblique

1. The data become more transparent if you keep the following phonological processes in mind:

a. -in- the completive marker is affixed before the first vowel of the stem. When -in- is affixed in certain prefixes, the first syllable of the resulting form is lost:
   - in ag → nag
   - pst act
   - m in a → na
   - pst unc

b. 1st and 2nd person genitive pronouns (ko and mo) lose their
vowel when encliticized to a vowel final stem.

c. A stem final n is deleted before the 1st person genitive
pronoun: aramiden ko → aramidek
'doing' 1G 'my doing'

d. Vowel drop deletes root-initial ! when it follows a consonant:
in - itéd → intéd
pst 'give'

2. For definitions of the terms and for explanation of the
networks used in the relational grammar framework, cf Perlmutter
and Postal (1977) and Bell (to appear).

3. As in Cebuano (cf Bell), there are advancements of various
obliques to subject in Ilokano. The generalizations I make con­
cerning advancements hold for these constructions as well, but
for lack of space I will not argue for this here.

4. cf f.n. 9
5. E.g., Schachter (1976).

6. I am using 'agent', 'patient', and 'recipient' as an expedient
means for introducing the data in a way that is not biased towards
my solution. I make no claims as to the usefulness or definability of
such notions.

7. I am starring English clauses that are not acceptable
glosses for the Ilokano clause.

8. In fact, ma- as a stative marker is reconstructable for
Proto-Philippine and probably for Proto-Austronesian. It is easy
to see how a marker of stativity could come to be used as a marker
of lack of control. In a system that distinguishes stative from
active, a clause such as 'John accidentally fell from the tree.'
would not clearly fit into either category. I claim that in Ilokano,
such out-of-control actions were categorized with stative verbs
rather than active verbs.

9. In this discussion of ma- I am ignoring two other occur­
rences of that prefix in Ilokano.

First, ma-, which is the passive form of maka-, marks
potential action or ability. This prefix is also used to indicate
that the initial subject 'succeeded' or 'managed to' perform an
action, notions which perhaps should be categorized as the 'limited
control' of the subject. At this point, I prefer to analyze this as a
distinct morpheme from ma-, the marker of uncontrolled action.

Second, initially transitive clauses with unspecified agents
advance another NP to subject and prefix the verb with ma- as
in i. below. As is seen in ii, clauses with advancements but
without ma- cannot have initially unspecified agents.
i. Na - Ø - tipp6g dagiti bot6lya.  
    pst - pas- knock over Det bottle
    'The bottles were knocked over.'

ii. *T - in - Ø - ipp6g dagiti bot6lya.  
    pst pas

I propose that this use of ma- developed as an extension of the use of ma- as a stative marker (cf f.n. 8). I argue that stative sentences such as iii. were optionally reanalyzed as passive sentences with unspecified agents as in iv.

iii. Na - dagäs ak.  
    pst-unc-pick up 1N
    'I am already picked up.'

iv. Na - Ø - dagäs ak.  
    pst - pas -pick up 1N [by someone].'

This reanalysis was possible for several reasons. First, the morphological marking for passive is Ø. Second, pronominal case is determined by final termhood (cf 15). In addition, the passive without ma- does not allow initially unspecified subjects (as in ii.).

Thus, ma- indicates an unspecified initial subject in sentences like i. and iv. rather than lack of control. In any given case, it is clear whether the initial subject is unspecified or out of control; an unspecified subject never surfaces but an out-of-control subject always surfaces as a chômeur.
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