

Clitics in Kapampangan

Hiroaki Kitano

Aichi University of Education, Kariya, Japan

ABSTRACT

The present paper attempts, first of all, to review some previous studies on clitics in general, and second, to give an overview of Kapampangan clitics and their behaviors in complex constructions. Then it discusses two relatively distinct topics. The first topic is cases where pronominal clitics are not used due to semantic and syntactic reasons. An interpretation of some structures without pronominal clitics as equational is discussed. The second topic is some transitive constructions that are low in transitivity. The strict clitic order of Kapampangan is discussed to have consequences for the analysis of such transitive constructions.

Keywords: Kapampangan, clitic, clitic order, ergativity, transitivity

1. Introduction

This paper discusses various clitic phenomena in Kapampangan, and some of the implications of clitic behaviors for Kapampangan clause structure. First, in section 2, we give some background of previous studies on clitics. Section 3 gives a general overview of Kapampangan clitics. Section 4 discusses clitic phenomena in complex constructions.

Sections 5 and 6 explore two relatively distinct topics. Section 5 discusses cases where pronominal clitics are not used due to semantic and syntactic reasons. Section

6 takes up some transitive constructions that are low in transitivity, discussing the strict clitic order of Kapampangan and its relation to the transitive constructions in question.

2. Background

Clitics have been attracting a great deal of attention in both descriptive and theoretical linguistics. One of the facts that characterize clitics is that they share some of the properties of independent words on the one hand, and those of affixes on the other. However, Nevis et al. (1994: xiii) argue that the term “clitic” is an umbrella term, not a genuine category in grammatical theory. Since the term *clitics* has been used quite broadly, it could mean quite different things, and behind the term there are various distinct phenomena.

First, there are two distinct basic notions of clitics, originally proposed by Zwicky 1977, namely simple clitics and special clitics. A simple clitic is “an element of some basic word class, which appears in a position relative to the rest of the structure in which the normal rules of the syntax would (or at least could) put it” (Anderson 1992: 200). Typical examples of simple clitic are the English reduced auxiliary verb *'s* (= *is* or *has*), and the reduced pronoun *'em* (as in *Give 'em the works*). These forms can be affected by speech rate, level of formality and such like (Spencer 1991: 376). Simple clitics appear to be clear members of particular word classes, the only respect in which they differ from other lexical items being that they are accent-less (Anderson 1992: 200).

In contrast, a special clitic is one whose position within some phrasal unit is determined by principles other than those of the non-clitic syntax (Anderson 1992: 2001-2). The Latin example Anderson cites is *Senatus populusque Romanus* (“The senate and people of Rome”), in which *-que* conjoins “the senate” and “the people of Rome” but does not appear in the expected, syntactically natural position (i.e. between the two NPs), but appear after the first word of the last of a sequence of conjoined phrases (Anderson 1992: 202). Special clitics are not derived from full form equivalents by phrase phonological reduction processes, and therefore not dependent on factors such as speaking rate (Spencer 1991: 376).

Zwicky and Pullum 1983 and Zwicky 1985 provide a series of tests for distinguishing clitics from inflectional affixes and from independent words.

Klavans 1985 proposes a typology of clitics (or strictly speaking, of special clitics). To give a unified characterization of clitics, she proposes three parameters.

- (1) a. Parameter 1 (Dominance): whether a clitic attaches to the INITIAL or FINAL constituent (i.e. syntactic host) dominated by a specified phrase (i.e. domain of cliticization).
- b. Parameter 2 (Precedence): whether a clitic occurs BEFORE or AFTER the host chosen by Parameter 1.
- c. Parameter 3 (Phonological liaison): whether a clitic attaches phonological to a host (i.e. phonological host) on its left (PROCLITIC) or its right (ENCLITIC).

As we will see, Kapampangan pronominal and adverbial clitics are Wackernagel clitics (second-position clitics), which belong to “Type 3” of Klavans’ classification (Klavans 1985: 103). Second-position clitics attach to the INITIAL constituent dominated by S or NP, the domain of cliticization (Parameter 1). Second-position clitics occur AFTER the host (Parameter 2). For Parameter 3 (phonological liaison), Kapampangan clitics are ENCLITIC, with the leftward phonological attachment evident in such facts as stress placement and internal sandhi processes (Mithun 1994:248-9). However, it must be pointed out that there are some peculiar combinations of clitics with stressed or lengthened syllables (e.g., *daká*, *na:ku*).

Anderson (1992: chapter 8) points out substantial similarities between the principles governing the placement of clitics and those governing the placement of affixes. Phenomena of affixes are word-level, whereas those of clitics are phrase-level. Prefixes and suffixes correspond to initial and final clitics. Likewise, infixes correspond to second-position clitics, among others.

Turning to Austronesian clitics (see Billings and Kaufman 2004 for references), there is a good deal of literature on Tagalog clitics (Schachter 1974, McFarland 2001, Billings and Konopasky 2002, Anderson in press), but also some recent works on Northern Philippine languages (Reid 2001, Liao 2004).

3. Overview of Kapampangan clitics

In this section, we will briefly overview the Kapampangan clitics, and discuss some details.¹

3.1. Types of clitics

Kapampangan has both types of clitics distinguished by Zwicky 1977. Special clitics in Kapampangan, which are second-position clitics, are pronominal and adverbial clitics (3.2 and 3.3). There is at least one instance of simple clitic in

¹ Kapampangan examples throughout the present paper are either from my fieldnotes or safely constructed from my own knowledge of the language. Spontaneous examples are indicated as [spon].

word,” and give as examples the English articles *a* and *the* (Nevis et al. 1994: xvii-xviii).

However, in natural spoken discourse, at least in Kapampangan, determiners are not always phonologically independent, since they can appear in isolation. And this is also the case for the English articles. The following example is cited from a database of natural spoken discourse.

- (5) *agyang ding,*
 even.though DET.ABS.PL
ding barku malati=la mu’,
 DET.ABS.PL ship small=ABS.3PLonly
 ‘even though the ships are small,’ [spon]

3.2. Pronominal clitics

In this section, we will give an overview of pronominal clitics³ in Kapampangan. The following table shows two series of pronominal clitics, ergative (genitive) and absolutive (nominative, topic). There are two other series of pronouns not shown here, which are not clitics; independent absolutives and obliques.

Table 1: Kapampangan pronominal clitics

	ERGATIVE	ABSOLUTIVE
1SG	<i>ku</i>	<i>ku</i>
2SG	<i>mu</i>	<i>ka</i>
3SG	<i>na</i>	<i>ya</i>
1DU.IN	<i>ta</i>	<i>kata</i>
1PL.IN	<i>ta:mu, ta:</i>	<i>kata:mu, ta:mu, kata:, ta:</i>
1EX	<i>mi</i>	<i>kami, ke</i>
2PL	<i>yu</i>	<i>kayu, ko</i>
3PL	<i>da/ra</i>	<i>la</i>

Here are some examples of pronominal clitics.

- (6) *Ala=na=kami=ng dalanan keng bale.*
 NEG.EXSTL=already/now=ABS.1EX=LK space DET.OBL.SG house
 ‘We have no more space in the house.’

³ Throughout this paper, we use the equal sign “=” to indicate the presence of a boundary between a pronominal (and adverbial) clitic and a preceding element, although these clitics are normally written separately.

(7) *Basan=yu=ne* *ine?*
 read=ERG.2PL=already/now+ABS.3SG ABS.this
 ‘Would you all read this?’

(8) *atiu=kayu* *Las Vegas,*
 EXSTL=ABS.2PL Las Vegas
 ‘You were in Las Vegas,’ [spon]

(9) *retratuan=da=katamu* *kanu.*
 take.picture.of=ERG.3PL=ABS.1PL.IN HRSY
 ‘they are taking pictures of us,’ [spon]

Unlike Tagalog clitics, ordering of which is based on prosodic factors, Kapampangan clitics are ordered strictly as ERG > ABS.

3.3. Adverbial clitics

It is less known that Kapampangan has at least one non-pronominal second-position clitic, i.e., the adverbial *na* (‘already, now’), and its less frequent variant *ne*.

(10) *e=ra=na=ta* *huri,*
 NEG=ERG.3PL=already/now=ABS.1PL.IN like
 ‘they don’t like us any more.’ [spon]

(11) *Mabsi=na=la.*
 full=already/now=ABS.3PL
 ‘They are already full.’

When the adjectival predicate takes the intensifying (or exclamatory) prefix *ka-*, the pronominal must be ergative, not absolutive.

(12) *Kabsi=ra=na.*
 so.full=ERG.3PL=already/now
 ‘They are already too full.’

It is clear from the above examples that the adverbial *na* follows an ergative clitic, and precedes an absolutive clitic (ERG > *na* > ABS).

There are several other adverbials, all of which follow absolute clitics.

- (13) *naman* (*na+man*) also, really
namu' (*na+muq*) simply, just, instead
man also, too
mu' only, just, merely
pa still, yet
pin certainly, truly
pu' ma'am, sir (respect, politeness)
ta' perhaps

Some examples follow.

- (14) *masyado=ya=pin* *malaut* *ing* *bale=ra*,
too.much=ABS.3SG=certainly far DET.ABS.SG house=ERG.3PL
'their house is very far,' [spon]

- (15) *magtango=ne=naman* *i* *koya*,
tango=already/now+ABS.3SG=also DET.ABS.SG elder.brother
'Coya will dance tango again,' [spon]

However, it is not certain that all of these adverbials are clitics. Although they do not appear sentence-initially, they appear toward the end of a second-position clitic cluster. Thus it is not easy to decide whether they are part of a clitic cluster or independent adverbs. The following example may suggest that *naman* is not a clitic, since a linker connects *naman* and its preceding clitic *ku*.

- (16) *puede=ku=ng* *naman=ng* *muli* *yaku=ng* *dili'*,
possible=ABS.1SG=LK really=LK come.home ABS.1SG=LK self
'I can come home alone by myself.' [spon]

3.4. Fused forms

Kapampangan has a rich inventory of fused clitic combinations. The following table shows combinations of various ergative forms and third-person absolute forms. Note that there are non-fused forms in this table.

Table 2: Kapampangan fused clitic combinations

ERGATIVE	+ ABSOLUTIVE.3SG (<i>ya</i>)	+ ABSOLUTIVE.3PL (<i>la</i>)
1SG (<i>ku</i>)	<i>ke, kya</i>	<i>ko, kula</i>
2SG (<i>mu</i>)	<i>me, mya</i>	<i>mo, mula</i>
3SG (<i>na</i>)	<i>ne, nya</i>	<i>no, nala</i>
1DU.IN (<i>ta</i>)	<i>te, tya</i>	<i>to, tala</i>
1PL.IN (<i>ta:</i>)	<i>ta:ya</i>	<i>ta:la</i>
1EX (<i>mi</i>)	<i>mya, miya</i>	<i>mila</i>
2PL (<i>yu</i>)	<i>ye, ya</i>	<i>yo, yula</i>
3PL (<i>da/ra</i>)	<i>de/re, dya/rya</i>	<i>do/ro, dala/rala</i>

Here are some examples of fused clitics.

(17) *kabit=mya=mu'* *keng* *oven,*
 put=ERG.2SG+ABS.3SG=only DET.OBL.SG oven
 'just put it in the oven,' [spon]

(18) *Luglugan=ko* *reta=ng* *pinipi=ku.*
 rinse=ERG.1SG+ABS.3PL ABS.those=LK washed=ERG.1SG
 'I am going to rinse what I washed (the clothes I washed).'

Fusion can occur not just between pronominal clitics, but between an adverbial and a pronominal clitics.

(19) *e=mu=ne* *akit kanyan,*
 NEG=ERG.2SG=already/now+ABS.3SG see OBL.that
 'you will not see her any more,' [spon]

(20) *Lako=mu=no* *ryan!*
 remove=ERG.2SG=already/now+ABS.3PL ABS.those
 'Will you remove those?'

(21) *minie=no=ng* *dinalan.*
 gave=already/now+ABS.3PL=LK hundred
 'they already gave \$100.' [spon]

3.5. Obligatoriness of pronominal clitics

Kapampangan makes almost obligatory use of pronominal clitics. Pronominal clitics are present whether the predicate is verbal, adjectival, or nominal, as in (22) below. Here, the pronominal clitic functions as a cross-referencing (agreement) marker; it agrees with *i Juan*, the argument, and the other constituent is the predicate.

- (22) a. *Mumuli=ya* *i* *Juan.*
going.home=ABS.3SG DET.ABS.SG Juan
'Juan is going home.'
- b. *Matwa=ya* *i* *Juan.*
old=ABS.3SG DET.ABS.SG Juan
'Juan is old.'
- c. *Estudyante=ya* *i* *Juan.*
student=ABS.3SG DET.ABS.SG Juan
'Juan is a student.'

However, there are cases in which a pronominal clitic does not appear when its coreferential full NP is present. Mithun (1994: 251, 253) shows that indefinite entities in a presentative construction, mass entities, and abstract entities are not cross-referenced by a pronominal clitic. In the example from Mithun (1994: 253) below, the absolutive *ing pamangan*, which is a mass entity, is not cross-referenced (her glosses with minor changes).

- (23) *among makasawa* *ing* *pamangan.*
and lack.variety DET.ABS.SG food
'and the food lacks variety.' (Mithun 1994: 253)

Quotative constructions, which are used frequently in story-telling, are another instance where a pronominal clitic does not appear. Here, the absolutive pronominal argument of the predicate *sinabi* ('said') is not expressed, since it is abstract ('what he said').

- (24) *sinabi=na* *ikit=ke* *pu*,⁴
said=ERG.3SG saw=ERG.1SG+ABS.2SG ma'am
'he said, "I saw her ma'am,"' [spon]

⁴ This type of constructions may also be interpreted as an equational one (Section 5).

There are some semantic factors conditioning the use of cross-referencing pronominal clitics. Compare the following examples. The absolutive *ing danum* is cross-referenced when a “particular” water is referred to, as in (25a), but it is not when “all” the water that one can find at the moment is referred to, as in (25b).

(25) a. *Marimla=ya ing danum.*
 cold=ABS.3SG DET.ABS.SG water
 ‘The water is cold.’

b. *Marimla ing danum.*
 cold DET.ABS.SG water
 ‘The water is cold.’

Thus, semantic factors such as animacy and definiteness seem to be crucial for the presence or absence of cross-referencing pronominal clitics.

4. Clitics in complex constructions

In this section, we will see how clitics appear in complex constructions. The behaviors of clitics in complex constructions are not well-understood. Our discussion below will center on the problem of what qualifies as a host.

4.1. Sentential coordination

First, let us consider the cases of sentential coordination. The following is an example of sentential coordination without any explicit coordinator. In this clause-chaining structure describing sequential actions, the predicate is the host for its clitic argument in each clause.

(26) *meko=la kanu=ng a las tres miras=la=ng a las nueve,*
 departed=ABS.3PL HRSY=LK at three reach=ABS.3PL=LK at nine
 ‘they left at 3 o'clock, arrived there at 9 o'clock,’ [spon]

The next example is similar to the above, but the actions described are not sequentially ordered. The act of bringing food is semantically subordinate to the act of coming. There is no coordinator, and each predicate functions as the host for its clitic argument.

(27) *dinatang=ya i Kumareng Baby*
 came=ABS.3SG DET.ABS.SG Kumareng Baby
magdala=ya=ng asan ampong balasenas,
 bringing=ABS.3SG=LK fish and eggplant
 ‘Kumareng Baby came bringing fish and eggplants,’ [spon]

There are some coordinators in Kapampangan. Let us compare two coordinators *at* and *atsaka*, analyzable as *at saka*, and how they differ in sentential coordination.

- (28) a. *kingwa=tamu ing karga at migcheckout=tamu,*
 took=ABS.1PL.IN DET.ABS.SG baggage and checked.out=ABS.1PL.IN
 ‘we took out our things from the room and we checked out,’ [spon]
- b. *migpotluck=la atsaka=la memiyalung,*
 had.potluck=ABS.3PL and.then=ABS.3PL played
 ‘they had a potluck and they played (poker),’ [spon]

As is clear from the above pair of examples, *atsaka* can serve as a host for clitics, but *at* cannot. Note that whether a word can serve as a host does not depend on the length of that word; the negative marker *e* always functions as a host.

(29) *E=ku masaya.*
 NEG=ABS.1SG happy
 ‘I am not happy.’

4.2. Subordinators

In this section, we will examine some Kapampangan subordinators, and see how they differ in terms of their “hosthood.” Most of the subordinators taken here do not work as a host. Consider the examples below. The adverbial subordinators *nung* (‘if’), *uling* (‘because’), *angga* (‘until’), and the complementizer *nung* do not qualify as a host.

(30) *nung bisa=kayu=ng muli atad=da=kayu,⁵*
 if want=ABS.2PL=LK come.home escort=ERG1SG=ABS.2PL
 ‘if you want to come home, I will take you home, [spon]

⁵ *Kayu* (ABS.2PL) here is used as ABS.2SG polite pronominal.

(31) *Dinatang=ya=ng tauli uling mitutundo=ya.*
 came=ABS.3SG=LK late because sleepy=ABS.3SG
 ‘He came late because he was sleepy.’

(32) *Manaya=ku keka angga pota=ng datang=ka.*
 wait=ABS.1SG OBL.2SG until later=LK come=ABS.2SG
 ‘I will wait for you until you come.’

(33) *ta-balu nung no=ne kebit,*
 NEG-know COMP where=ERG.3SG+ABS.3SG put
 ‘I don’t know where she put it,’ [spon]

There are, however, at least two subordinators that can serve as a host for clitics, *bang* (‘so that’) and *bayu* (‘before’), as shown in the examples below.

(34) *Panayan=da=ka⁶ bang=da=ka=ng akit.*
 waiting=ERG.1SG=ABS.2SG so.that=ERG.1SG=ABS.2SG=LK see
 ‘I’m waiting to see you. (lit. I’m waiting for you so that I see you.)’

(35) *Misip=ka=pa=mu’ bayu=ka kimut.*
 think=ABS.2SG=still/yes=only before=ABS.2SG move
 ‘Always think before you move.’

From the discussions of this and preceding sections, we may suggest that, since the coordinator *atsaka*, and the subordinators *bang* and *bayu* qualify as a host, they may be called “domain-internal” elements, i.e., they are “part of the clause”. The other coordinator and subordinators are, as it were, “out of the clause”

5. Absence of clitics and equational structure

In section 3.5, we have seen some semantic conditions under which pronominal clitics are not employed. In this section, we will consider syntactic factors. We will look at some constructions in which clitic pronouns are not used, i.e., question-word questions.

Normally, questions employing *nanu* (‘what’), *ninu* (‘who’), and *isanu* (‘which one’) do not contain a cross-referencing pronominal clitic. Consider the following examples.

⁶ *Da ka* is the irregular combination of ERG.1SG and ABS.2SG.

- (36) a. *Nanu ing biklat=mu?*
 what DET.ABS.SG opened=ERG.2SG
 ‘What did you open?’
- b. *Ninu=ng ginawa kanita?*
 who=DET.ABS.SG made OBL.that
 ‘Who made (=cooked) that?’ [spon]
- c. *Isanu=ng pinili=mu?*
 which.one=DET.ABS.SG selected=ERG.2SG
 ‘Which one did you select?’ [spon]

If the equational construction is understood primarily as a structure based on the relations of two appositive NPs, these clauses above, with two NPs and without a pronominal clitic, would be prototypical examples of equational structure. Of the *ing*-marked NP and the question-word, it is difficult to determine which is the argument and which is the predicate. This is partly because the clauses are interrogative, but also because there is no cross-referencing pronominal. In contrast, in (22c), repeated below as (37), the pronominal clitic cross-references the argument, *i Juan*, and the rest of the clause, *estudyante*, is the predicate. These two NPs cannot be regarded as appositive NPs.

- (37) *Estudyante=ya i Juan.*
 student=ABS.3SG DET.ABS.SG Juan
 ‘Juan is a student.’

Mirikitani 1972 gives two pairs of constructions, cited in (38) and (39) below (my glosses). One of each pair is an equational construction employing *ninu* (‘who’), (38a) and (39a), whereas the other is non-equational, employing *kaninu* (‘to whom’), (38b), which is the oblique form of *ninu*, and *para kaninu* ‘for whom’, (39b). Note that cross-referencing pronominal clitics do not appear in the equational constructions.

- (38) a. *Ninu ing sulatanan=mu?*
 who DET.ABS.SG write.to=ERG.2SG
 ‘Who is the one to whom you will write?’ (Mirikitani 1972: 181)

b. *Kaninu=ka sumulat?*
 OBL.who=ABS.2SG write
 ‘To whom are you going to write?’ (Mirikitani 1972: 181)

(39) a. *Ninu ing pinyali=mu=ng malan?*
 who DET.ABS.SG bought.for=ERG.2SG=LK clothes
 ‘Who is the one for whom you bought clothes?’ (Mirikitani 1972: 181)

b. *Para kaninu=ka sinali=ng malan?*
 for OBL.who=ABS.2SG bought.intr=LK clothes
 ‘For whom did you buy clothes?’ (Mirikitani 1972: 181)

We have considered the clauses beginning with question-words *nanu*, *ninu*, and *isanu*. Question-word questions can be characterized as a straightforward equational structure, since they consist of two appositive NPs, both of which are absolutes, and there is no cross-referencing pronominal.

6. Transitive constructions of low transitivity and strict clitic order

In the preceding section, we have discussed cases of pronominal clitics being absent. In this section, we will examine transitive constructions. Examples of intransitive constructions are seen in (22), where the predicates of intransitive constructions are either verbal, adjectival, or nominal. On the other hand, predicates of transitive constructions are supposed to be verbal. It seems very unlikely that adjectival or nominal predicates denote transitive actions.

In Kapampangan, there are some constructions with both ergative and absolutive arguments, in which the predicate looks, at least semantically, nominal.

(40) *A-maestru=ke i Mrs. Diaz.*
 APT-teacher=ERG.1SG+ABS.3SG DET.ABS.SG Mrs. Diaz
 ‘Mrs. Diaz was my teacher.’

The aptative prefix *a-* indicates abilitative, accidental or coincidental actions (Kitano 2001). *A-maestru* means ‘to (happen to) become someone’s teacher.’ A similar example is *a-estudyante* (‘to become someone’s student’). Note that the same aptative prefix can produce more verb-like predicates, such as *a-pate* (‘to kill someone unintentionally’), and thus is regarded as a verb-forming affix.

Clearly, these predicates are far from prototypical as a transitive predicate. For one thing, the ergative argument is not agent-like, nor is the absolutive argument

patient-like. Semantically, there is no action involved, going across from the agent to the patient. There is no patient being affected by an action.

Another example below is taken from spontaneous conversation among Kapampangans. Note that *kasing idad* means ‘be of the same age’ in Tagalog, not in Kapampangan, and thus this example may not be appropriate for the discussion of Kapampangan clause structure.⁷

- (41) *nung kasing idad=ke balu=ke.*
 if same age=ERG.1SG+ABS.3SG know=ERG.1SG+ABS.3SG
 ‘if he is of my age, I should know him.’ [spon]

The predicate of the *nung* clause, *kasing idad*, again, is not a prototypical transitive one, but it has both ergative and absolutive arguments.

These predicates denote relations, not actions, and therefore they are low in transitivity. In this respect, they are similar to nominal predicates denoting relations, such as below. In this example, the absolutive argument *ing husband=ku* is topicalized, appearing in clause-initial position.

- (42) *ing husband=ku kabalen=ke,*
 DET.ABS.SG husband=ERG.1SG townmate=ERG.1SG+ABS.3SG
 ‘my husband, he was my townmate,’ [spon]

The difference between the predicates *a-maestru=ku* and *kabalen=ku*, although both being relational, is that the former is a verbal predicate, and the latter is a nominal predicate; the latter is an NP, but the former is not.

In Kapampangan, the order of pronominal clitics is strictly ERG > ABS. This ordering seems to be prevailing in Philippine languages, especially in Central Luzon subgroup, where it is categorial (Billings and Kaufman 2004). This strict clitic order of Kapampangan has some consequences for the analysis of relational predicates.

First, there is an ‘attributive’ relation between the predicate and the ergative argument, forming a [Predicate + Ergative] base (e.g., ‘my + townmate’). Then, there is a ‘predicative’ relation between the [Predicate + Ergative] base and the absolutive argument (e.g., ‘he’ = ‘my townmate’). This is schematized below.

⁷ My consultant told me that a proper way of saying (41) in Kapampangan is *Nung mising idad=kami kilala=ke.*

(43) Attribution: [Predicate=ERG]

Predication: [[Predicate=ERG]=ABS]

The ergative argument always comes closer to the predicate than the absolutive argument. In terms of both morphosyntax and semantics, the attributive relation is internal, and the predicative relation is external. The ordering of clitics in Kapampangan and other languages is motivated both morphosyntactically and semantically.

7. Conclusions

The present paper has attempted to give an overview of Kapampangan clitics and their behaviors in complex constructions. There are some other morphemes which may be treated as clitics but were not treated. Second, it has tried to discuss interesting cases where pronominal clitics are not used due to semantic and syntactic reasons. A possible syntactic explanation is the presence of equational structure. Another interesting case is transitive constructions of low transitivity. The strict clitic order of Kapampangan has been discussed to have consequences for the analysis of such transitive constructions.

Abbreviations

ABS	absolutive
APT	aptative
COMP	complementizer
DET	determiner
DU	dual
ERG	ergative
EX	exclusive
EXSTL	existential
HRSY	hearsay
IN	inclusive
LK	linker
NEG	negative
OBL	oblique
PL	plural
SG	singular

Acknowledgment

I am grateful to Dave Nepomuceno and Mike Pangilinan for their expertise and knowledge of the language.

References

- Anderson, Stephen R. 1992. *A-morphous morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson, Stephen R. In press. Second position clitics in Tagalog. To appear in *The nature of the word*, ed. by S. Inkelas and K. Hanson. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Billings, Loren, and Daniel Kaufman. 2004. Towards a typology of Austronesian pronominal clitics. In *Proceedings of AFLA 11, ZAS, Berlin 2004*, ed. by Paul Law, 15-29. Berlin: ZAS.
- Billings, Loren, and Abigail Konopasky. 2002. The role of morphology in ordering verb-adjacent clitics: From syntax to prosody in Bulgarian and Tagalog. In *Linguistics in Potsdam 19*: 1-26.
- Forman, Michael L. 1971. *Kapampangan grammar notes*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Kitano, Hiroaki. 2001. Kapampangan. In *Facts about the world's languages: An encyclopedia of the world's major languages, past and present*, edited by Jane Garry and Carl Rubino, 371-375. New York/Dublin: H.W. Wilson Company.
- Klamer, Marian. 1997. Spelling out clitics in Kambara. *Linguistics* 35: 895-927.
- Klavans, Judith L. 1985. The independence of syntax and phonology in cliticization. *Language* 61(1): 95-120.
- Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Liao, Hsiu-chuan. 2004. *Transitivity and ergativity in Formosan and Philippine languages*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawai'i.
- McFarland, Curtis D. 2001. Filipino enclitics. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 32(1): 1-15.
- Mirikitani, Leatrice T. 1972. *Kapampangan syntax*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1994. The implications of ergativity for a Philippine voice system. In *Voice: Form and function*, ed. by Barbara Fox and Paul J. Hopper, 247-277. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Nevis, Joel A., Brian D. Joseph, Dieter Wanner and Arnold M. Zwicky. 1994. *Clitics: A comprehensive bibliography 1892-1991*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Reid, Laurence A. 2001. On the development of agreement markers in some Northern Philippine languages. In *Issues in Austronesian morphology: A focusschrift for Byron W. Bender*, 235-257. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 2002. Determiners, nouns or what? Problems in the analysis of some commonly occurring forms in Philippine languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 41 (2):295-309.
- Schachter, Paul. 1974. Constraints on clitic order in Tagalog. In *UCLA Papers in Syntax* 5, ed. by George Bedell, 96-118. Los Angeles: UCLA.
- Schachter, Paul, and Fe T. Otanes. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Spencer, Andrew. 1991. *Morphological theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1977. *On clitics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1985. Clitics and particles. *Language* 61 (2):283-305.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 1983. Cliticization vs. inflection: English *n't*. *Language* 59 (3):502-513.