A Theoretically and Comparatively Informed Description of Yogad Morphology

by

Louise Koren

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Linguistics

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario

© 2022
Louise Koren
Abstract

Yogad is an Austronesian language spoken in the Northern Philippines by approximately 16,000 speakers. Previous descriptive work on Yogad follows a nonaprioristic approach, where no categories are imported from other languages. This description makes it difficult to gloss functional morphemes or to discuss Yogad in a cross-linguistic context. In this paper, I reanalyze the morphology of Yogad following a restrictivist approach to language description, particularly the verbal affixes, case marking particles, and personal pronouns. I provide a description of Yogad morphology which does not exoticize the language, is informed by theory, and can contribute to discussions and debate within the language family. I situate Yogad in the larger context of Austronesian languages through a comparative study and a diachronic discussion. I provide two descriptions of Yogad morphology, following the analyses and theories held by the two sides of the Austronesian voice debate.
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0. INTRODUCTION

Yogad is an Austronesian language spoken in the Northern Philippines by approximately 16,000 speakers (Quirante, 2021). Yogad is a relatively understudied language; the only extensive description of the language to date is a grammar and accompanying dictionary (Davis et al., 1997; Davis & Mesa, 1999). The analysis presented in that work follows a nonaprioristic approach to language description, where no pre-assumptions are made about a language and no categories are imported from other languages (Haspelmath, 2014). However, this approach can have the unfortunate side effect of exoticizing a language. As well, this approach makes it difficult to discuss Yogad in a cross-linguistic context, or for the data to contribute to the ongoing debate about the nature of Austronesian morphology.

In this paper, I re-analyze the morphology of Yogad following a restrictivist approach to language description. I compare the morphology of Yogad to that of three related Austronesian languages in order to determine similarities and differences, and to situate Yogad in the wider context of Austronesian languages. I provide a description and glosses of the central morphology of Yogad, which is informed both by theory and by the comparative analyses of related languages. I describe the morphology of Yogad and other Austronesian languages in two ways, following one of the two central analyses of the Austronesian voice debate. This is an ongoing debate in Austronesian linguistics on how the morphology of these languages should be described and categorized. I do not argue for either side of the debate in this work; I simply provide an analysis of Yogad with an understanding of both approaches to the description of Austronesian languages, acknowledging that there are advantages to both.

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 1 provides background information relevant to the current work, including a discussion of two different approaches to language
description, a language background of Yogad, a description of the Austronesian voice debate, and a description of Yogad as it is analyzed by Davis et al. (1997). Section 2 introduces my approach to a description of Yogad morphology, how it differs from Davis et al. (1997), and an overview of my comparative typological study. Sections 3 and 4 describe and discuss the uses of the Yogad verbal morphology and nominal morphology, respectively. These sections compare the Yogad verbal affixes, case marking particles, and personal pronouns to those of three other related languages. In addition, section 3 provides further data and discussion from my own work with Yogad language consultant Corie Mesa Lareza Quirante on the verbal morphology. Section 5 outlines my proposed revised description of the central morphology of Yogad, summarizing and expanding upon the information provided in sections 3 and 4. This serves as the results of my comparative study and research into the Austronesian voice debate, for Yogad. Section 6 discusses reconstructions of the case marking particles in Proto-Austronesian, and how the Yogad particle set may have arisen diachronically. Section 7 concludes.
1. BACKGROUND

In this section, I give a background on a variety of topics that are useful for the present description of Yogad morphology. First, I describe two competing approaches to language description, and state which one I follow in this work. Next, I describe the Austronesian voice debate, an ongoing debate in the field of Austronesian linguistics which is important for a theoretically informed description of any Austronesian language. Following this, I give a language background on Yogad and the language family. Finally, I present the analysis of Yogad morphology provided in the Davis et al. (1997) language grammar, the only extensive description of the language to date.

1.1 NONAPRIORISTIC VS RESTRICTIVIST APPROACH TO LANGUAGE DESCRIPTION

The two main ways of doing language description are the nonaprioristic approach and the restrictivist approach. I take as my basis for this discussion Haspelmath (2014), who provides a clear description of both sides. I use the terminology from that work.

In the nonaprioristic approach, no pre-assumptions are made about a language before or during the study of it, and no categories are imported from other languages. In this approach, linguists are to describe languages on their own terms (Boas, 1911). However, when languages are indeed similar, Haspelmath (2014) allows that they can be described in similar terms, though not in a way that might “constrain the description” (p. 492). This means using similar terms for similar categories, but not changing the analysis or description of the language to fit another language’s mould. When comparing languages in this approach, “the basic principle is […] that languages can be readily compared only with respect to meanings and sounds/gestures, but not
with respect to their categories, because only meanings and sounds, but not categories, are universal” (Haspelmath, 2014, p.495).

In the restrictivist, or formal approach, languages are assumed to be more similar than they are different. This is Chomsky’s Uniformity Principle, which states that “in the absence of compelling evidence to the contrary, assume languages to be uniform, with variety restricted to easily detectable properties of utterances” (Chomsky, 2001, p. 2). It is thus assumed that, barring clear evidence to the contrary, languages may be described on the same level using the same terminology and assumptions. The restrictivist approach allows comparison between languages, even languages that are not related, beyond its sounds or gestures. The example given by Haspelmath (2014) is that, in this approach, it would be assumed that Japanese has a subject and an object in the same way that English does (p. 494).

Both approaches have advantages, as outlined above, but both also have disadvantages. The nonaprioristic approach may make it difficult to compare languages, even languages that are closely related. As well, this approach occasionally has the unfortunate natural side effect of exoticizing a language, thus unnecessarily treating it as an outlier. The restrictivist approach has the disadvantage of having to make many assumptions about language in general and the concept of a universal grammar, in addition to the language under study. These pre-assumptions can often be strongly influenced by the linguist’s own language and academic background, often making a language look more Indo-European than it is. The nonaprioristic approach is helpful in maintaining the variety of language and reducing such biases.

Haspelmath (2014) ultimately concludes that the nonaprioristic approach is more beneficial to comparative syntax and language description. The nonaprioristic approach is also the approach taken by Davis et al. (1997)’s grammar of Yogad. However, in this paper I take a
restrictivist and formal approach to describing Yogad. I endeavour to provide a description and
glosses that are informed by both theory and related languages so as to situate Yogad more
clearly in the context of the Austronesian language family, and to make it possible to compare it
to related languages. While the nonaprioristic approach has many benefits for language
description, as discussed above, the restrictivist approach is more useful for the aim of
comparing Yogad to related languages and to discussing Yogad in the context of the
Austronesian voice debate.

1.2 AUSTRONESIAN VOICE DEBATE

There is an ongoing debate in Austronesian linguistics about the nature of certain
morphology in Austronesian languages, and how it may be analyzed and described. This debate
is often called the Austronesian voice debate, and is outlined here. In order to give a description
of Yogad—or any other Austronesian language—which is couched in theory, this debate and its
two competing analyses must be taken into account. Yogad is a Philippine-type language and as
such, that language type will be the focus here, though this debate spans other Austronesian
subfamilies and categories.

Philippine-type languages have a fixed word order with case marking particles and verbal
affixes. These particles precede nouns/noun phrases, indicating their role in the sentence. One
particle, or particle set, marks what may be called the privileged argument. The privileged
argument is what the sentence is about; the most important part of the utterance. The affixes
which attach to the verb are linked to the particles and give additional meaning to the sentence
(Chen & McDonnell, 2019). This is demonstrated in the pair of examples below from Yogad
(Cox & Quirante, 2020), where the sentence is not seen as complete without the particle which
marks the privileged argument.
The marker *ju* is glossed here as *PIV* for the syntactic pivot, as opposed to the marker *ja* glossed as *LINK*, which is a particle that links modifiers and the item they modify, such as adjectives and their nouns. Example 1 translates to the phrase ‘the big dog’, but not a complete sentence, with the language consultant explaining that “you have to add something to make it a complete sentence” (Cox & Quirante, 2020). On the other hand, example 2 is a full sentence as it is, since it has a privileged argument that is correctly preceded by the pivot marker *ju*. The verbal affix is optional in many environments, and one is not required to attach to *dakal* ‘big’ here, the sentence is complete without one.

One side of the Austronesian voice debate holds that Austronesian languages show simple ergative-absolutive alignment, while the other side holds that these languages exhibit something different and exclusive to Austronesian languages, where there is a four-way voice distinction and obligatory topic/pivot marking. Although many terms have been used to describe each side of this debate, I will be generally referring to the former as the ergative-absolutive analysis, and the latter as the Austronesian voice analysis. Glossed examples illustrating the differences in these analyses are presented in the following sections.

The following outline and description of the sides of this debate is constructed from the following sources: Aldridge (2021), Beguš (2016), Chen & Fukada (2016), Chen & McDonnell (2019), and Erlewine et al. (2017). Aldridge (2021) argues directly for the ergative-absolutive analysis. Beguš (2016) aims for a more neutral approach, but makes assumptions that align more

1.2.1 Austronesian voice analysis

In the Austronesian voice analysis there is a four-way voice distinction with obligatory topic marking of the privileged argument. In the literature, this argument has been referred to as a topic, focus, and pivot. Here I will refer to it as the pivot, following Chen & McDonnell (2019), Chen & Fukada (2016), and Erlewine et al. (2017). Each full sentence in Yogad, and other Philippine-type languages, has one and only one pivot. The other particles are analyzed as simple case markers, which are used preceding arguments other than the pivot. The cases which are specified by these particles differ from language to language but may include: the nominative, locative, and oblique cases.

The verbal affixes in this analysis are taken to be voice markers, which indicate the underlying case of the pivot. The variety and scope of these voice marking verbal affixes differs by language, but the central four are: actor voice, goal voice, instrument voice, and locative voice. As an example, if the pivot of a sentence is the subject, the verb will be marked with the actor voice. If the pivot is the object, the verb will be marked with goal voice. If the pivot is an instrument, the verb will be marked with instrument voice. If the pivot is a location, the verb will be marked with locative voice. This system can be thought of in the following way: the pivot marking particle overrides the underlying case marking particle. The case, or role, of that argument is then indicated by the morphology on the verb, since that distinction is lost when the
argument is marked as the pivot. Underlyingly, in this analysis, these languages are analyzed as having nominative-accusative alignment, with the pivot marker obfuscating this slightly.

The basis of this analysis is demonstrated below with the following four sentences from Ivatan, an Austronesian language related to Yogad (Reid, 1966). These types of sets of sentences are common in linguistic work on Philippine-type Austronesian languages, where the only thing that changes between each sentence is the pivot. The sentences below all translate to ‘the man is frightening a child with a snake in the house’. I have adapted the orthography of Ivatan here and throughout this paper following Heye & Hidalgo (1967). Glosses come partially from Reid (1966) and are partially my own in order to bring this description in line with my own analysis and the terminology I use throughout this paper. The pivot marker and verbal affix in each example is in bold.

(3) Ivatan voice examples

a. **man**-amuʔmu
   AV-frighten
   ?u=tau
   PIV=man
   su=mutdǝh
   OBL=child
   nu=budaj
   NOM=snake
   du=vahaj
   LOC=house

b. ?amuʔmu-**han**
   NOM=man
   frighten-GV
   ?u=mutdǝh
   PIV=child
   nu=budaj
   NOM=snake
   du=vahaj
   LOC=house

c. **pipa**-amuʔmu
   IV-frighten
   NOM=man
   ?u=mutdǝh
   PIV=child
   ?u=budaj
   NOM=snake
   du=vahaj
   LOC=house

d. **pan**-amuʔmu-**an**
   NOM=man
   OBL=child
   LV-frighten-LV
   ?u=vahaj
   NOM=snake
   PIV=house

The word order stays the same in each of these sentences. The only things that changes are the verbal affixes and the placement of the pivot marker. In 3a, *tau* ‘man’ is interpreted as being the privileged argument as it is preceded by the Ivatan pivot marker *ʔu*. Alongside this, an actor voice affix attaches to the verb. These two are linked together. An actor voice affix cannot be present if any argument other than the subject, in this case *tau* ‘man’, is marked as the pivot.
In 3b, it is mutdəh ‘child’ which is the pivot. Since mutdəh ‘child’ is the sentence’s object, a goal voice affix is attached to the verb. In 3c, it is budaj ‘snake’ which is the pivot. Since budaj ‘snake’ is, in this case, an instrument, an instrument voice affix attaches to the verb. In 3d, it is vahaj ‘house’ which is the pivot marker. Since vahaj ‘house’ is a location, a locative voice affix is attached to the verb.

The form of the pivot marker stays the same in every sentence. As well, when not the pivot, the case markers which precede each argument also stay the same, no matter the sentence’s voice. That means the nominative marker for tau, the oblique marker for mutdəh, and the locative marker for vahaj. The instrumental meaning is included in the nominative marker in Ivatan, and is only differentiated through context. This is true of Ivatan and other related languages. As such, budaj is also preceded by the nominative marker.

In addition to this set of four sentences, Reid (1966) also provides a fifth sentence where the benefactive ‘his friend’ is the privileged argument.

(3) Ivatan voice examples, continued

e. ʔipag-‐amuʔmu nu=tau su=mutdəh nu=budaj du=vahaj ʔu=kajvana
   IV=frighten NOM=man OBL=child NOM=snake LOC=house PIV=friend
   ‘the man is frightening a child with a snake in the house for his friend’

The verb in this sentence takes the same prefix as the instrument voice prefix in 3c. The instrumental or benefactive meaning is distinguished through context. Therefore, despite these being the central four voices in Austronesian languages, they are not the only options.

1.2.2 Ergative-‐Absolutive Analysis

In the competing analysis, Austronesian languages are taken to be simple ergative-absolutive languages. In the ergative-absolutive analysis, the privileged argument is the
absolutive. Depending on the language, the other case marking particles may mark: the ergative, oblique, and locative cases. In this analysis, the verbal affixes mark transitivity or applicatives.

When the object is marked as the absolutive, the verb is affixed with a transitive marker, as expected in a simple transitive sentence in an ergative-absolutive language. In this case, the agent would be marked with the ergative. However, when the absolutive argument is the subject, the sentence must be intransitive, and the verb is affixed with an intransitive marker. In much of the literature on this analysis and debate, this intransitive affix is also referred to as an antipassive marker. In this situation, the object is demoted and is marked with the oblique case and the subject take the absolutive case, as the only core case remaining. This is expected in an intransitive, or antipassive, sentence. In the case where an instrument, location, benefactive, or other non-core argument is the privileged argument and is absolutive, an applicative marker attaches to the verb. These promote an external argument to a core argument, which then takes the absolutive case. The subject then takes the ergative case, and any objects, if present, take the oblique, unless they are a location and the language has a dedicated locative marker. In which case, any location that is not promoted through an applied is marked with the locative case marker instead of the oblique.

The basis of this argument is demonstrated below with four sentences from the language Paiwan, an Austronesian language related to Yogad (Ferrell, 1979). As with the set of four sentences from Ivatan presented in the previous section, these sentences all translate to the same thing in English, with the only difference between each sentence being the absolutive. These sentences each translate to ‘the man hunts wild pigs in the mountains with a spear’. As Ferrell (1979) does not follow the ergative-absolutive analysis in his work, glosses of function morphemes are my own, while the glosses of content words remain unchanged.
(4) Paiwan transitivity examples

a. ʔ<INSTR> alup  a=tsautsau  tua=vavuj  tua=gadu  tua=vulu?
    <INSTR>hunt  ABS=man  OBL=pig  OBL=mountain  OBL=spear

b. ʔalup-an  nua=tsautsau  a=vavuj  tua=gadu  tua=vulu?
    hunt-TR  ERG=man  ABS=pig  OBL=mountain  OBL=spear

c. ʔalup-an  nua=tsautsau  tua=vavuj  a=gadu  tua=vulu?
    hunt-APPL  ERG=man  OBL=pig  ABS=mountain  OBL=spear

d. si-ʔalup  nua=tsautsau  tua=vavuj  tua=gadu  a=vulu?
    APPL-hunt  ERG=man  OBL=pig  OBL=mountain  ABS=spear

As with the Ivatan examples, the word order stays the same in each of these sentences.

The only things that change are the verbal affixes and the case marking particles. In 4a, tsautsau ‘man’ is the privileged argument and is preceded by the absolutive marker. The absolutive only occurs in subject position in intransitive sentences in an ergative-absolutive language. Therefore, this sentence must have been intransitivized, or made antipassive. Therefore, the verb takes an intransitive marker, and all other arguments are in the oblique case. In 4b, it is vavuj ‘pig’ that is absolutive. Since this is the object of the sentence, a transitive marker attaches to the verb, and the agent is marked as ergative. In 4c, it is gadu ‘mountain’ which is absolutive. Since this is a non-core argument, an applicative affix attaches to the verb, thus promoting this non-core argument and demoting all other arguments, save the subject which takes ergative case, to the oblique case. In 4d, it is vulu? ‘spear’ which is absolutive. This is the same situation as in 4c where the applicative affix on the verb promotes this argument to a core argument. The applicative affix given in 4c is only used when a location is the absolutive, and the applicative affix in 4d is only used when an instrument is the absolutive.
1.3 **YOGAD LANGUAGE BACKGROUND**

Yogad is an Austronesian language spoken in the northern Philippines, specifically in and around Echague, in the province of Isabela. It is spoken by an estimated 16,000 speakers, as of a 1990 census (Quirante, 2021).

Yogad is in the Philippine subfamily of the Austronesian languages. It is one of many languages which are often called Philippine-type languages. This refers to how the language behaves morpho-syntactically, and not necessarily that it is spoken in the Philippines or is of the Philippine subfamily. Philippine-type languages may include “languages spoken in Taiwan, the Philippines, northern Borneo, and northern Sulawesi, as well as in Malagasy (Madagascar) and Chamorro (Guam)” (Chen & McDonnell, 2019, p. 176). This categorization is in contrast to Indonesian-type languages which have a different morpho-syntactic system where the privileged argument is indicated through movement, and there are no case marking particles (Chen & McDonnell, 2019; Chen & Fukada, 2016; Li, 2006). The Philippine-type system is the focus of this paper, as it is the group to which Yogad belongs. In this system, there are particles which precede nouns/noun phrases, with one marking the sentence’s privileged argument, of which any full sentence must have one and only one. The privileged argument may be marked in other ways, such as demonstratives or the existential phrase marker, but for the purposes of this paper I will focus mainly on the nominal particles and verbal affixes. As I am following a restrictivist approach to describing Yogad and related languages, I use formal terms in my description. I refer to the privileged argument as either the absolutive or the pivot, depending on the adopted approach and formalism. In formalism-neutral environments, I use the term “privileged argument”. For example, in Ivatan, the particle ʔu marks the privileged argument. Following the Austronesian voice analysis, this is the pivot marker. Following the ergative-absolutive analysis,
this is the absolutive marker. Affixes on the verb, or verb-like item, link to the particles and correspond to what may be the privileged argument in a given sentence. Yogad, and other related languages, do not have a strict distinction between lexical categories. In this work, I use the terms noun, verb, and adjective to describe their distribution in a given utterance. Therefore, a verb is an item that appears in the position of verb; it occurs sentence-initially and is usually accompanied by one of the so-called verbal affixes. A noun is an item that appears in the position of a noun; it occurs following the verb and is preceded by one of the case marking particles. These distributions are broad generalizations, and do not capture the entire range of distributions possible to a morphological item.

Sentences and data from Yogad that are presented in this work come from the available dictionary and grammar of Yogad (Davis & Mesa, 1999; Davis et al., 1997). Sentences and data also come from Carleton University’s *Field Methods* course led by Dr. Christopher Cox (Cox & Quirante, 2020) and my own language consultation (Koren & Quirante, 2022), both with Yogad language consultant Corie Mesa Lareza Quirante. Glosses, unless otherwise indicated, are my own.

1.4 **Davies et al. Description of Yogad**

As previously stated, there has been one language grammar written on Yogad (Davis et al., 1997), alongside an accompanying dictionary (Davis & Mesa, 1999). The analysis of Yogad presented in the grammar uses familiar terms like person, number, and tense, but otherwise describes phenomenon using novel terminology and graphics, which are difficult to relate to contemporary theory and takes a nonaprioristic approach that is separate from the analysis of related languages. In this section, I summarize the analysis provided in Davies et al. (1997), beginning with the verbal affixes and followed by the nominal particles. I refer to these particles
as case marking particles elsewhere in this work. However, these particles are not analyzed as case markers in Davis et al. (1997), but as determiners on a scale of focus. Therefore, I refer to them as nominal particles in this section in order not to add additional analyses to the one presented in Davis et al. (1997).

1.4.1 Verbal affixes

The verbal affixes in Davis et al. (1997) are not described using general terms that are common in formal linguistic description. For example, the verbal affixes <in>, na-, ma-, and -an are described as “pervasive”, “crucial”, “proximate”, and “limit” respectively (Davis et al., 1997, p. 204), all of which are exclusive to the analysis presented in this grammar. The verbal affixes are also described in terms of their perceived proximity to an event’s origin, midpoint, or endpoint, and how relatively close to each of these each affix is thought to be. This is illustrated with a diagram similar to the one presented below, where I have collated some of the visual descriptions of the verbal affixes which Davis et al. (1997) provides. I have done this for only a portion of the language’s verbal affixes, particularly the non-past set of the most common Yogad affixes, which will be discussed in the most detail in the present work: <um>, man-, mag-, ma-, i-, -an, and pag-.
The Yogad verbal affixes are also described by Davis et al. (1997) in terms of the distinctions internal/external, and whether the event causes a change of state. For two of the three affixes that are used when the privileged argument is the object (goal voice in the Austronesian voice analysis, or transitive marker in the ergative-absolutive analysis), the affix *i*- is described as creating a change of state in an utterance, while *-an* has no change of state. For the three verbal affixes used when the privileged argument is the subject (actor voice or intransitive marker), both *<um>* and *mag*- are described as being used with an internal meaning, the former expressing no change of state, and the latter expressing a change of state. The third affix of this set, *mag*-, is described as being used with an external meaning, as opposed to the other two. With *mag*- the event must have an external effect or motivation.

### 1.4.2 Nominal particles

Davis et al. (1997) describes the nominal particles as determiners, and categorizes them as being ordered on a continuum from focused to diffused. This continuum is illustrated below:

#### Figure 2: Davis et al. (1997) analysis of the Yogad nominal particles

\[ ju/si \rightarrow nu/ni \rightarrow tu \rightarrow ja \]

**FOCUSED** → **DIFFUSED**
The particles that appear here in pairs give the same meaning, with the only difference between them being the types of arguments they can modify. Of those that appear in pairs, the first of the pair can occur with common nouns, and the second can occur with personal names. Those which do not appear in a pair may modify either type of argument. See Davis et al. (1997, pp.11–80) for a more complete discussion of the Yogad particles under this analysis.

In terms of this continuum of focus, it is logical to put ju/si on the most focused end, as equivalent particles in related languages are often described as focus or topic markers. It marks the privileged argument in an utterance, thus putting a ‘focus’ on that argument. In addition, it is reasonable to put ja on the most diffused or least focused side of the scale, as this particle does not have the same level of grammatical meaning that the others do, as it is less of a case marker and more of a linking particle, which appears between modifiers and the item they modify.

The particles nu/ni and tu are illustrated on this scale as being ordered, but are described by the grammar as being less focused than the particle pair ju/si. The only difference given by the grammar between the particles nu/ni and tu is that the former can “determine eruptive participants” while the latter cannot (Davis & al., 1997, p. 77). This novel term appears to be related to whether the affix can be used alongside the subject of the sentence, with nu/ni having this ability while tu does not. As such, it is logical to describe nu/ni and tu as less focused than the ‘focus marking’ ju/si and as more focused than the linker ja.
2. RESEARCH QUESTION: TOWARDS A RESTRICTIVIST DESCRIPTION OF YOGAD MORPHOLOGY

In this section, I outline the focus of my research. I describe the nonaprioristic approach taken in Davis et al. (1997) and how I describe Yogad morphology using a restrictivist approach to language description. In addition, I outline the methodology I use in the comparative typological study undertaken for this work, alongside a background of the three related Austronesian languages under study.

2.1 DISCUSSION OF DAVIS ET AL. (1997)

This section discusses Davis et al. (1997)’s description of Yogad, and how I build upon it with my own analysis. I argue against some of the categories given by Davis et al. (1997) and explain how this analysis differs from my own, especially based on the two different approaches to language description outlined in section 1.1.

I begin by arguing against the focused/diffused continuum Davis et al. describes for the nominal particles. Yogad appears to show a dichotomy, and not a continuum, with only two categories: focused and not focused. The focus markers *ju/si* are always used to mark the privileged argument of a sentence, while the other particles, *nu/ni* and *tu*, are not focused and can never mark the privileged argument of a sentence. This description of a particle being “focused” can be described as the privileged argument, following terminology in contemporary use and the formalism-neutral term I use here. The particle *ja* does not fit on the same scale, as it holds a different type of grammatical meaning than the other particles on that continuum.

I also argue against using the eruptive and not eruptive (also called post-eruptive) dichotomy used by the grammar, as it does not use contemporary terminology that is used cross-
linguistically. As well, this description on its own is unable to capture the use of *nu/ni* with a

genitive meaning, in addition to its use with the sentence’s subject.

Davis et al. (1997) gives a good description of Yogad, but it is very language-specific,
taking a nonaprioristic approach to language description. This is a useful approach to avoid
adding undue biases, but Haspelmath (2014) warns that a natural side effect of this type of
description is exoticizing the language. This is the case with the Davis et al. (1997) work, where
Yogad is treated as an outlier to its language family by not using familiar terminology or
analyses, as this was not a goal of their work.

Due to the visual descriptions and extensive written descriptions that accompanied them,
it is impossible to gloss these functional morphemes. In fact, Davis et al. (1997) does not present
functional glosses in any of their examples with interlinear glosses. For the verbal affixes, in
place of an explanatory gloss, the underlying form of the verbal affix is repeated in majuscule
letters where the gloss would typically be. For the nominal particles appearing in interlinear
glosses, the space under them is simply left blank. This works well for the description in Davis et
al., where it is not necessary to distill these descriptions down into concise grammatical glosses,
and allows the language to stand on its own, as is the goal in a nonaprioristic approach. However,
this approach makes it difficult to compare Yogad to other languages for the purposes of
typology or for finding patterns. Without clear descriptions or glosses, Yogad is left out of cross-
linguistic discussions. Therefore, I take as one of the goals of this work to provide a description
that doesn’t exoticize Yogad, which is informed by the theory surrounding Austronesian
languages and may contribute to discussions and debate within the language family.
2.2 **Comparative Study**

In order to determine how similar or different Yogad might be from related languages and whether it should indeed be treated as an outlier, I present a comparative study of three related Austronesian languages. The three Austronesian languages discussed here alongside Yogad are: Hiligaynon, Ivatan, and Paiwan. These languages were selected randomly, based mainly on the availability of materials.

Yogad is a Philippine language, spoken in the northern Philippines (Quirante, 2021). The sources for the Yogad data are as follows: Cox & Quirante (2020); Davis et al. (1997); Davis & Mesa (1999); and Koren & Quirante (2022).

Both Hiligaynon and Ivatan are Philippine languages. The former is spoken in the central Philippines, and the latter is spoken in the Batanes islands, north of the Philippine mainland. The sources for the Hiligaynon data are as follows: Motus (1971); Wolfenden (1971). The sources for the Ivatan data are as follows: Heye & Hidalgo (1967); Hidalgo & Hidalgo (1970); Hidalgo & Hidalgo (1971); and Reid (1966). The phonological analysis in Heye & Hidalgo (1967) is used throughout in order to standardize the phonology and IPA of the Ivatan data from the different sources.

Paiwan is an Austronesian language of the Formosan subfamily and is spoken in Taiwan (Chang, 2006). Of the Austronesian languages in this comparative study, it is the least closely related to Yogad. As such, it shows more differences in some areas, but still some quite striking similarities in other areas. As with other Formosan languages (with some exceptions), it still falls under the category of a Philippine-type language, as opposed to an Indonesian-type language, a category based on how these languages behave morpho-syntactically (Chen & McDonnell, 2019; Li, 2006; Ross, 2006). The source for the Paiwan data is Chang (2006).
There are differences between languages and language sources in terms of the orthographic conventions that are applied. Sources tend to use the Latin alphabet to present data and, as such, often differ in how phonemes that do not have an equivalent are presented. In this paper, I have translated the data from each source into fairly broad IPA using the phonetic descriptions that appear in the majority of these language sources. I have done this so that it is easier to compare forms between languages, and even compare disparate sources for the same language. In some cases, this was as simple as translating every ng grapheme into /ŋ/, and every q grapheme into /ʔ/. But in other cases this proved more complicated, as is the case with palatalization, for example, which is indicated in three different ways across sources. The broad IPA transcriptions I provide may not match the most narrow transcription for each language, but providing a narrow phonetic transcription of each language is not the object of this work. Where sources differ or may be unclear, that is noted.
3. TYPOLOGICAL COMPARISON OF VERBAL MORPHOLOGY

In this section, I describe and compare the verbal affixes in Yogad as compared to the three related languages. Presented in table 1 are some of the most commonly used verbal affixes from Yogad, Hiligaynon, Ivatan, and Paiwan. This is not an exhaustive list of affixes for any of the languages. There is a second form of each affix given here. The forms presented here are the irrealis/non-past forms of the affixes, with the realis/past form not given. This is due to the fact that the past forms are often formed from the non-past forms with a predictable phonological change of /m/ to /n/, or an addition of /in/. There is disagreement between languages and language sources whether these two sets should have a realis/irrealis or past/non-past difference. Since the language consultant I worked with explained and understood the verbal affix pairs in terms of tense, I will be using the past/non-past terms here. The terminology of “past/non-past” may not be the most accurate to be applied to all Austronesian languages, but that is beyond the scope of this work. The past forms, for the most part, show the same pattern demonstrated clearly in the non-past forms. A chart with both the past forms alongside their non-past equivalents for all four languages is given in the appendix. In glosses, tense will only be noted for the past forms. In addition, there are other less frequently used verbal affixes in Yogad, and the other languages as well. For example, there is an affix in Yogad which is used exclusively when the privileged argument is comitative (i.e. it would be translated into English using ‘with’ or ‘alongside’). There are also many ways that verbal affixes may be combined to form new meanings. For example, in Yogad, the affixes -i- and -an combine for use when the privileged argument is benefactive (Davis et al. 1997; Koren & Quirante, 2022). Some of these additional Yogad verbal affixes will be presented in section 3.3.3.
3.1 **Austronesian Voice Analysis**

The affixes in table 1 below are presented with the glosses from each of the languages’ sources: Motus (1971) and Wolfenden (1971) for Hiligaynon; Hidalgo & Hidalgo (1970, 1971) for Ivatan, with some additional confirmations from Reid (1966); and Chang (2006) for Paiwan. The exception to this is Yogad, with forms from Davis et al. (1997) and glosses that are my own. The labels proposed as glosses for Yogad are based on the analysis of the three other languages presented here and on discussions of the Austronesian voice analysis presented in section 1.2. These labels were applied to the Yogad forms based on the uses of each affix in example sentences provided in Davis et al. (1997) and Davis & Mesa (1999).

As a note, there is some disagreement between the sources for the Ivatan data; data from Reid (1966) is not given in this section, but will be present in later sections. As well, Chang (2006) gives the form <in> for Paiwan, while Ferrell (1979) gives -ən in its place. Chang (2006) lists the form -ən as the past equivalent of <in>. Ferrell (1979) provides the affix forms in example sentences and not tables or lists, therefore it is not clear whether this is a true difference in data or whether the past/non-past distinction was simply something that was overlooked in Ferrell (1979).
**TABLE 1:** Typological comparison, verbal affixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOGAD</th>
<th>HILIGAYNON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>actor voice 1</td>
<td>&lt;um&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor voice 2</td>
<td>maŋ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor voice 3</td>
<td>mag-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal voice 1</td>
<td>ma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal voice 2</td>
<td>i-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal voice 3</td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrument voice</td>
<td>pag-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrument focus</td>
<td>-on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goal focus</td>
<td>paga-...-(h)on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accessory focus</td>
<td>i-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referent focus</td>
<td>-(h)an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IVATAN</th>
<th>PAIWAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject focus</td>
<td>&lt;um&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject focus</td>
<td>ma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject focus + transitivizer</td>
<td>maŋ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object focus</td>
<td>-(h)an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative focus</td>
<td>i-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative focus</td>
<td>ipa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associative focus</td>
<td>itsa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object/referent focus</td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking first to the three languages besides Yogad, it can be seen that, even though each source appears to be following the Austronesian voice analysis, the terminology used is still different for each. This shows how much disagreement and debate is still ongoing, even within one side of the debate. As each source is using terminology associated with the Austronesian voice analysis, that is how the four languages will be discussed preliminarily in this section. The ergative-absolutive analysis of the verbal affixes will be discussed in section 3.2. Actor voice, actor focus, and subject voice all refer to the same thing. Goal voice, goal focus, and object focus all refer to the same thing. Instrument voice, accessory focus, and associative focus all refer to the same thing. Finally, locative voice and referent focus both refer to the same thing. The actor voice is used when the privileged argument is the subject. The goal voice is used when the privileged argument is the object. The instrument voice is used when the privileged argument is an instrument, or other non-core arguments like the benefactive (see section 1.2.1), which is dependant on language. The locative voice is used when the privileged argument is a location.

There are multiple forms of each voice affix type in three of the four languages. For example, there are four different actor focus (or actor voices) in Hiligaynon. Some verbs may only take one specific actor voice or goal voice affix, while some verbs may be able to take different actor or goal voice affixes, each with a difference in aspect or mood. This is the case for Hiligaynon, Ivatan, and Yogad. We can also see that in Paiwan, this variety is not present. While Paiwan is still a related language which uses the same basic configuration of morphology, it is also a part of a different subfamily (Formosan), where there appears to be only one form for each voice and these aspect/mood distinctions are not expressed through portmanteau, as in the Philippine languages, if they are expressed at all.
Alongside the Yogad verbal affixes, I have proposed my own glosses following the Austronesian voice analysis, just as with the other languages’ sources. I have used the specific terms actor voice, goal voice, etc., and not the terms that use focus or subject/object instead. This is for the sake of clarity and in following the practices of other literature (Chang, 2006; Chen & Fukada, 2016; Chen & McDonnell, 2019; Erlewine et al., 2017). I have determined the glosses for Yogad based on the uses of each affix in the example sentences given in the grammar and dictionary of Yogad (Davis et al., 1997; Davis & Mesa, 1999), as well as from my own study and coursework with a consultant of the language (Cox & Quirante, 2020). For example, in Yogad sentences with -an appearing on the verb, it is always the object which is preceded by one of the pivot markers ju or si. Therefore, I label -an as a goal voice affix.

In this section, I have numbered each of the different actor voices and goal voices, to differentiate them from each other. The specific aspect/mood differences between each are discussed in more depth in section 3.3, which contains the data and analysis of my work with a language consultant (Koren & Quirante, 2022). That section gives further information on the distinctions that can be made between each of the Yogad verbal affixes presented above and what conditions the choice between the three actor voice affixes and the three goal voice affixes.

I will now discuss each of the Yogad verbal affixes presented above. Connections can be drawn between every one of these Yogad affixes and at least one affix in only these three related languages.

<um>, actor voice 1

In Hiligaynon and Ivatan, the related infix is <um>, showing a one-to-one relationship with form. In Paiwan, there is an infix <əm>, which is quite similar in form and as such is most likely also related. All of these are actor voice affixes.
**maŋ- , actor voice 2**

This prefix relates directly to the actor voice prefix maŋ- in Ivatan. In Hiligaynon, it is likely related to the actor voice prefix maŋin-, which may also take the form magiŋ- depending on phonological differences (Wolfenden, 1971, p.152). This second form of the Hiligaynon prefix looks like it might relate to the following Yogad prefix mag- due to its identical first syllable, but there is also a prefix in Hiligaynon with the form mag-.

**mag- , actor voice 3**

This prefix relates directly to the actor voice prefix mag- in Hiligaynon.

The situation with the actor voices appears to be the most clear cut and the most stable category cross-linguistically. All three of the Yogad actor voices, <um>, maŋ- and mag-, can be linked to actor voices in the three other languages.

**ma- , goal voice 1**

This prefix relates directly to the prefix ma- in both Hiligaynon and Ivatan. In Hiligaynon ma- is glossed as a stative goal voice (a goal voice marker used only in stative contexts), and in Ivatan it is glossed as an actor voice (called subject focus in the source). In Yogad, the prefix ma- can be used in Yogad when the pivot is the object of the sentence, and is therefore glossed as a goal voice affix here. Though the situation with ma- may be more complicated, which will be discussed in section 3.3.

In Yogad, the prefix ma- appears to have a meaning that relates to a state rather than an event, and possibly a change of state (Davis et al. 1997), just as with Hiligaynon. See the example below from Cox & Quirante (2020):

(5) ma-kasta ja paŋŋanan
    STATE-beautiful LINK restaurant
    ‘a beautiful restaurant’
In this sentence, there is no object as a pivot, nor any pivot at all for *ma*- to link to. However, *ma*- still appears in this context and others like it, alongside a stative meaning. This affix could especially use further research done on it, not only in Yogad but cross-linguistically, as it appears to show some variation in its use.

*i-, goal voice 2*

This prefix relates directly to the prefix *i*- in both Hiligaynon and Ivatan. In Hiligaynon, *i*- is glossed as an accessory focus, and in Ivatan as an associative focus. In both of these cases, to use the terminology I use throughout this paper, these terms mean that this affix may be the instrument voice, among other things (e.g. in Ivatan, *i*- may be used when the pivot is an instrument, comitative, or causal). It is also possible that the instrument voice prefix *si-* in Paiwan may historically be related to this set. This affix in Yogad is used for objects, but may be used for arguments that, when translated into English, may appear instrument-like. However, it has no overlap with the arguments that may be selected by the instrument voice affix *pag-*.. This distinction is discussed further in section 3.3, particularly with example sentence 9.

Again, the situation of this prefix *i-* isn’t as clear, but may be referred to as a goal voice, as that appears to be its central role in the language, based on the data from Davis et al. (1997), where it is used in sentences where an object is the privileged argument.

*-an , goal voice 3*

This suffix relates directly to the suffix -*an* in both Ivatan and Paiwan. It likely also relates to the suffix -*han* in Hiligaynon which has an initial /h/ only when following a vowel, but otherwise shares a form with the Yogad suffix.

In Hiligaynon, -*han* is glossed as a referent focus. In Ivatan, -*an* is glossed as an object/referent focus. And in Paiwan, -*an* is glossed as a locative voice marker. In all of these
cases, this has to do with the location or locative as the sentence’s pivot. Yogad doesn’t have a specific voice used exclusively for when the privileged argument is a location, unlike many related languages and all three of the related languages studied here. However, due to the similarity in form between the locative voices in the three other languages, and the affix in Yogad, a link can certainly be hypothesized between these. It seems likely that the affix -an in Yogad, which now is used for many forms of the object, may have historically been Yogad’s locative voice, before this distinction was lost in the language. It’s worth noting as well that Yogad does not have a specific particle used to mark the locative, while Hiligaynon and Ivatan both do. See section 6.3 as well as Blust (2015) and Ross (2005; 2006) for further discussion on the locative case and other distinctions that were likely present historically but have been variably lost in some modern Austronesian languages.

*pag-*, **instrument voice**

The prefix *pag-* in Yogad is used exclusively when the pivot is an instrument, therefore it is an instrument voice marker under this analysis. This prefix is less clear in how it relates to affixes in the three other languages studied here. The specific form of this affix seems less common in related languages than many of the other affixes, based on the data from the three related languages studied here. A link can be drawn between it and the circumfix *paga-*(h)on in Hiligaynon, which is made up of the goal voice suffix -(h)on, and an unknown prefix *paga-*. In Hiligaynon, the affix *paga-* may attach with other affixes but its meaning does not appear to be clear when standing on its own. It is likely to be related to the Yogad prefix *pag-* due to its similarity in form, especially as in some contexts the Hiligaynon *paga-* affix may lose its final *a*. Hiligaynon is the only one of the three languages compared here which has a possible link to the prefix *pag-* in Yogad. As such, there is no one-to-one comparison available with this affix.
For more typological information on the Yogad prefix *pag-* we can look beyond the three languages here. Ilocano is an Austronesian language which, like Yogad, is spoken in the Northern Philippines and is a closely related language to it. It was not one of the languages studied in depth here, but a verbal prefix *pag-* does appear in the language (Rubino, 1997). In Ilocano, this prefix can also be analyzed as an instrument voice marker, just as with Yogad. In addition, there is also a circumfix *pag-*...-*on* in Ilocano, very similar to the one seen in Hiligaynon. That Ilocano circumfix may be analyzed as a locative voice marker, while the Hiligaynon one is a goal focus (goal voice).

### 3.2 Ergative-absolutive analysis

In the previous section, I proposed glosses for the non-past forms of seven of the most used verbal affixes in Yogad following the Austronesian voice analysis, as that was the analysis held by the other languages’ sources. In this section, I propose glosses for the same set of Yogad verbal affixes, now following the ergative-absolutive analysis of Austronesian languages. Following literature and discussions on this debate (Aldridge, 2021; Chen & Fukada, 2016; Chen & McDonnell, 2019; Erlewine et al., 2017), I have glossed the same set of Yogad affixes below following this analysis. This same pattern can also be applied to the glosses of the three other languages in the Austronesian voice analysis above for their conversion into an ergative-absolutive analysis.
### TABLE 2: Ergative-absolutive analysis of Yogad verbal affixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Affix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intransitive 1</td>
<td>&lt;um&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intransitive 2</td>
<td>maŋ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intransitive 3</td>
<td>mag-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transitive 1</td>
<td>ma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transitive 2</td>
<td>i-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transitive 3</td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applicative</td>
<td>pag-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this analysis, what were described as actor voices, are here glossed as intransitive markers. What were glossed as the goal voices are glossed here as simple transitive markers. What was glossed as the instrument voice, is now analyzed as an applicative.

Intransitive markers are used when the subject is the privileged argument, analyzed as the absolutive in this analysis. The intransitive markers are also often analyzed as antipassive markers which, for the purposes of this paper and analysis, can be thought of in the same way: the object, if present, is demoted to a non-core argument, and the subject takes the absolutive as the only remaining core argument, thus making the sentence into an intransitive. An applicative marker promotes a non-core argument to the position of the privileged argument and it takes the absolutive marker, while the subject takes the ergative and the object, if present, gets demoted to an external argument and takes the oblique. For the other languages that have a locative voice marker, this would be analyzed as an applicative as well.
3.3 **YOGAD VERBAL AFFIX DIFFERENCES**

In this section, I provide a preliminary discussion of the differences between the Yogad verbal affixes, as my glosses above only differentiated them with numbers. The data in this section comes from both Davis et al. (1997) and my own language consultation with Yogad speaker Corie Mesa Lareza Quirante (Koren & Quirante, 2022). In our consultation session, I provided sets of sentences in Yogad to the consultant. The majority of these sentences are collected from the work in Davis et al. (1997), with the rest being possibly grammatical sentences that I constructed building off of the Davis et al. sentences. There are some minor changes to how the sentences are presented below. Most notably the shift towards a consistent transcription style, as I have done with the other languages as well so that they can be compared more easily. If a sentence has undergone more significant changes, this is noted. For my consultation session, I followed the best practices laid out by Matthewson (2004) for linguistic fieldwork methodology. I provided discourse contexts in English to avoid unnecessary ambiguity. I only asked the consultant about complete sentences and only asked for translations of sentences that were grammatical. As well, I only ever asked the consultant for translations and other information available to a non-linguist speaker, and never for analysis.

The sets of sentences I presented to the consultant followed two main formats, with some variation. For the first type, I presented identical sentences, where the only difference was the verbal affix. For these, I asked the consultant whether all of the sentences were grammatical, what they meant in English, whether one sounded better than the other, and whether there were situations where she would use one over the other. The second type of sentence sets that I provided had different arguments in each sentence, in addition to different verbal affixes. Davis et al. (1997) claims that the verbal affixes in these sentences are not interchangeable and that the
types of arguments constrain the type of verbal affixes that can appear alongside them, and vice versa. For these sentences, I asked the consultant what each sentence meant in English. Then I switched the verbal affixes and asked the consultant about these new sentences.

Out of the different sets of verbal affixes, such as the group of three actor voice affixes, Davis et al. (1997) suggests that some words can only take one of the verbal affixes in a set and not the others. This system is analyzed in Davis et al. (1997) as a system similar to word class. Meanwhile, Davis et al. suggests that other words can take more than one of the verbal affixes in a set, or any of the verbal affixes in a set, with different meanings for each. From my work with a language consultant, this system does not appear as strictly and easily divisible as Davis et al. (1997) suggests. The data presented in Davis et al. (1997) comes from only one speaker of Yogad. Similarly, my own language consultation work is thanks to a single a speaker. As such, it is not surprising that there are differences and variation between the two sets of data. I found some significant differences in grammaticality judgements, translations, pronunciation, and the number and type of required arguments. After my language consultation and subsequent analysis of that data, it is still not a simple task to provide clear and distinguishing glosses for each of the verbal affixes. However, I provide a discussion about some of the differences between them. It is my hope that this discussion will be helpful for future work on the verbal affixes of Yogad, as there are still many unanswered questions.

In this section, I use terminology from the Austronesian voice analysis, as opposed to the ergative-absolutive analysis, for the discussion in this section, as that has been the analysis provided in the majority of my sources. In this section, I present Yogad sentences from Davis et al. (1997) or built upon sentences from that source which I presented to my consultant, alongside comments and changes made by my consultant. I do not present every sentence discussed in our
consultation session, only the ones that showed interesting variation for the purpose of the current study. That is, pairs of sentences where the consultant provided evidence for a difference in the verbal affixes, either in the translation or in follow-up discussions.

The following sentences include both past and non-past forms of the verbal affixes, while only the non-past forms have been discussed thus far. The past and non-past forms of the verbal affixes for Yogad, and the three other studied languages, is presented in the appendix. Both forms of the Yogad verbal affixes are also presented in section 5.1, alongside revised glosses. The verbal affixes under study in each section, along with their past forms, are listed at the start of each section.

Any sentences with letters a, b, etc., come from Davis et al. (1997) or were sentences I produced, building off of the data from Davis et al. (1997). Any sentences with letters that have a subscript 1, a1, b1, etc., are sentences volunteered by my language consultant (Koren & Quirante, 2022). Translations are my consultant’s when a full translation was provided and it differed from that provided in Davis et al. (1997), otherwise the translation provided in Davis et al. (1997) is used. All glosses in this section are my own.

I first present Yogad sentences with the goal voice and instrument voice affixes, followed by sentences with the actor voice affixes. I then present additional meanings conveyed through verbal affixes. Finally, I summarize and discuss my findings from this section and the revisions I can make to my descriptions of the Yogad verbal affixes based on the data from this section.

### 3.3.1 Goal voice and instrument voice affixes

The focus of this section is on sentences with the goal voice affixes or the instrument voice affix: ma- (past form na-), i- (past form ni-), -an (past form <in>), and the instrument voice pag- (past form p<in>ag-).
(6) a. pitik-an ku ju=dindin\textsuperscript{j}
flick-GV3 1SG PIV.CN=wall
‘I’ll flick the wall’
b. i-pitik ku ju=holen
   GV2-flick 1SG PIV.CN=marble
   ‘I’ll flick the marble’

Davis et al. (1997, p.141) translated the above sentences as ‘I’ll thump the wall’ and ‘I’ll shoot the marble’, respectively. My consultant translated the verb in both cases as ‘flick’, as such that is the translation used here. Davis et al. analyzed the difference between *pitik-an* and *i-pitik* being that the former is used when the item that is flicked does not move, whereas the latter is used when the item is affected by the action of flicking and does move. Both sentences 6a and 6b were found grammatical by my consultant, with the caveat that sentence 6b would sound better if it was specified to where the speaker was flicking the marble, such as into a hole. For sentence 6b, *pitik-an* is also grammatical in that environment. However, for sentence 6a, replacing *pitik-an* with *i-pitik* is not grammatical. This shows an uneven distribution of the verbal affixes, where *pitik-an* is acceptable in both sentences, but *i-pitik* is only acceptable for use with the marble, 6b, and not the wall.

(7) a. talj-an ku ju=burasi
   change-GV3 1SG PIV.CN=clothes
   ‘I’ll change the clothes’

   b. i-tali ku ju=burasi
   GV2-change 1SG PIV.CN=clothes
   ‘I’ll exchange the clothes’

The source of these sentences is Davis et al. (1997, p. 146), however my consultant provided very different translations, which are the translations given above. Davis et al. (1997) translates sentence 7a as ‘I’ll exchange the clothes’ and sentence 7b as ‘I’ll change the clothes’. However, my consultant translated these with the opposite meanings, sentence 7a meaning ‘I’ll change clothes’ and sentence 7b meaning ‘I’ll exchange the clothes’. This complete switch in meanings between consultants is interesting, and could use further research. My consultant stated
that sentence 7a would be clearer if it was specified whose clothes the speaker changed, either

*burasi-ku* ‘my clothes’, *burasi-m* ‘your clothes’, or something else.

(8)  

a. *i-patu nu=danum ju=afuj

\[\text{a1. } i\text{-patu-}m \quad tu=afuj \quad ju=\text{danum} \quad \text{GV2-heat-2SG OBL=fire PIV.CN=water} \]

‘heat (IMP) the fire with water’

b. *pap-patu nu=danum ju=afuj

\[\text{b1. } \text{pap-patu } nu=afuj \quad ju=\text{danum} \quad \text{IV-heat NOM.CN=fire PIV.CN=water} \]

‘the fire will heat the water’

c. maŋ-i-patu ka tu=danum

\[\text{c1. } \text{AV2-GV2-heat 2SG.PIV OBL=water} \]

‘heat (IMP) the water’

Both sentences given in Davis et al. (1997, p. 154) were deemed ungrammatical by my consultant. About sentence a, my consultant said, “the water cannot do it […] no one is doing it”. As such, this sentence needs a doer. In addition to a personal pronoun, the corrected sentence provided in 8a1 also involves a change in the order of the arguments, and a change of the pivot to *danum* ‘water’ in place of *afuj* ‘fire’. The argument *tu=afuj* ‘fire’ is optional in this sentence. Sentence 8c1 was provided as an alternative to 8a1. They translate to the same imperative sentence in English, but in this sentence, it is the subject that is the pivot, instead of the object. Sentence 8b was corrected to 8b1 by my consultant. The order of the arguments, as well as the pivot is changed in this version of the sentence. My consultant explained this change as “it’s the fire who is creating heat to the water […] it’s the fire who’s doing it”. As such, another argument is not necessary in this sentence like it was in sentence 8a.

(9)  

a. pinta-n ku ju=binalaj tu=lasaŋ ja pinta

\[\text{paint-GV3 1SG PIV.CN=house OBL=red LINK paint} \]

‘I’ll paint the house with red paint’
b. i-pinta ku ju=lasan ja pinta tu=binalaj
GV2-paint 1SG PIV.CN=red LINK paint OBL=house
‘I’ll use the red paint to paint the house’

c. pap-pinta ku ju=brotja tu=binalaj
IV-paint 1SG PIV.CN=brush OBL=house
‘I’ll use the brush to paint the house’

d.1. pap-pinta ku ju=kamat-ku tu=dindinj
IV-paint 1SG PIV.CN=hand-1SG.POSS OBL=wall
‘I’ll use my hands to paint the wall’

The source for these sentences is Davis et al. (1997, p. 138). My consultant explained that in 9b “you’re talking about the colour of the paint”, while in sentence 9c “now you’re talking about the brush”. This follows from the use of ‘red paint’ as the pivot in 9b and ‘brush’ as the pivot in 9c. Sentence 9d has the same format as sentence 9c and was given to show that other arguments can be used in this construction as the argument that is doing the painting, as my consultant was not familiar with the word brotja used for ‘brush’. In sentence 9b, when I replaced i-pinta with pap-pinta, it was understandable but didn’t sound as good as i-pinta. In sentence c, when I replaced pap-pinta with pint-an, the consultant translated the sentence to “you’re painting the brush with a house”, an infelicitous sentence. Using i-pinta for sentence 9c yields a similar result.

(10) a. daget-an ku ju=burasi tu=tanud annu binola
sew-GV3 1SG PIV.CN=clothes obl=needle and thread
‘I’ll sew the dress with a needle and thread’

b. i-daget ku ju=batunis tu=burasi
GV2-sew 1SG PIV.CN=button OBL=clothes
‘I’ll sew the button on the dress’

c. pad-daget ku ju=tanud annu binola
IV-sew 1SG PIV.CN=needle and thread
‘I’ll sew with a needle and thread’
d. i-pad-daget ku ju=tanud annu binola tu=burasi
gV2-IV-sew 1SG PIV.CN=needle and thread OBL= clothes
‘I’ll sew the dress with a needle and thread’

The source for these sentences is Davis et al. (1997, pp. 137–138, p. 148). All four of these sentences were deemed grammatical, with the minor addition of annu binola ‘and thread’ to 10d, as “tanud and binola should go together”. The original sentence presented in Davis et al. (1997) only had tanud ‘needle’, but lacked annu binola ‘and thread’.

These four sentences are all very similar utterances, with a difference in what is the pivot and some changes in arguments. For daget-an in sentence 10a, the pivot is burasi ‘dress’. For i-daget in sentence 10b, it’s batunis ‘button’. And for both pad-daget and i-pad-daget in sentences 10c and 10d, the pivot is tanud annu binola ‘needle and thread’. Both sentences 10c and 10d were deemed equally grammatical.

(11) a. gafut-an ku ju=mammanok
catch-GV3 1SG PIV.CN=bird
‘I will catch the bird’

b. ma-gafut ku ju=mammanok
GV1-catch 1SG PIV.CN=bird
‘I am able to catch the bird’

The source for these sentences is Davis et al. (1997, p.201). There is a difference in pronunciation here, where the consultant corrected the word mamannok to mammanok, with a geminate /m/ and a single /n/ instead of the opposite.

There is a clear difference in meaning between these two sentences, where gafut-an is a simple statement about the event. Whereas ma-gafut brings into the sentence the ability of the speaker to carry out the action of catching the bird, as if the speaker is assuring someone and saying “I’m brave enough, I can catch the chicken”, as my consultant explained. Therefore,
despite both being goal voice affixes, *ma-* has an additional abilitative meaning, while *-an* does not.

(12) a.  *t<in>*-akaw ju=kwartu

b.  \( t<in>akaw \)  ku ju=kwartu  
    \( \langle GV3.PST\rangle \) steal 1SG PIV.CN=money  
    ‘I stole the money’

c.  na-takaw ju=kwartu
    GV1.PST-steal PIV.CN=money  
    ‘the money was stolen’, ‘somebody took the money’

c\(_1\). takaw ju=kwartu
    steal PIV.CN=money
    ‘the money is stolen’, ‘it is stolen money’

The source for these sentences is Davis et al. (1997, p. 202). My consultant found sentence 12a from Davis et al. to be ungrammatical with the explanation that *t<in>*-akaw requires a subject. This is corrected by my consultant in sentence 12a\(_1\) where *ku*, the first person singular non-pivot pronoun, is added. Sentence 12b with *na-takaw* is grammatical without a subject, and may be translated into English as a passive sentence. Sentence 12c is another way of saying ‘the money is stolen’, or also translated as ‘it’s stolen money’. This more stative sentence does not have any verbal affixes.

The fact that a sentence with *t<in>*-akaw is ungrammatical without the presence of a subject despite it not being the privileged argument is particularly interesting and shows some potential evidence for transitivity being a relevant feature to Yogad. This would add evidence on the side of the ergative-absolutive analysis. It would be useful to look further into the affix *<in>* (non-past form *-an*) to determine if this is always true of this affix, if this is a feature of the verb *takaw*, or some other explanation.
(13) a. ma-gaku ni=jena-ku ju=manok
   GV1-cook NOM.PN=mother-1SG.Poss PIV.CN=chicken
   ‘my mother can cook the chicken’

b. g<in>aku ni=jena-ku ju=manok
   <GV3.PST>cook NOM.PN=mother-1SG.Poss PIV.CN=chicken
   ‘my mother always cooks chicken’

In Davis et al. (1997, p. 206), there was an inconsistency in the data with regards to whether jena ‘mother’ was proceeded by a case marking particle for common nouns or personal names. My consultant corrected this inconsistency towards personal names, saying that using ni or si with jena, as opposed to nu or ju, is more polite and that she preferred it.

Just as with the sentences in 11, ma- gives a meaning that is more about ability, as opposed to <in> (-an in non-past) which forms a simple statement, not taking into account the speaker’s ability. In addition, the sentence with ma- does not require a subject. The consultant translated the infelicitous but grammatical sentence ma-gaku si=jena-ku as ‘my mom can be cooked’, which I produced in error.

(14) a. na-dafuŋ-an ku si=Maria tu=lappaw
   GV1.PST-give-GV3 1SG PIV.PN=Maria OBL=flower
   ‘I gave Maria a flower (accidentally)’

b. d<in>afuŋ-an ku si=Maria tu=lappaw
   GV3.PST-give-GV3 1SG PIV.PN=Maria OBL=flower
   ‘I gave Maria a flower’

c. dafuŋ-an ku si=Maria tu=lappaw
   give-GV3 1SG PIV.PN=Maria OBL=flower
   ‘I will give Maria a flower’

A minor change in these sentences: my consultant preferred Maria over Walter or Mario in these sentences. The sentences were changed accordingly.

Davis et al. (1997, p. 216) translates sentence a as ‘I was able to meet [Maria] with flowers’. My consultant translated it without the speaker’s ability as part of the sentence, unlike
the previous examples in 11 and 13. She also said about this sentence that “na-dafuŋ-an is like maybe it was mistakenly you gave her a flower. Like by accident”. It is for this reason that I translate sentence 14a with the additional meaning of ‘accidentally’. It is unclear at this point whether this meaning of ‘accidentally’ is present with other sentences that have na- and -an, or if it is unique to this sentence here.

(15) a. *ma-paluŋa kaŋ tu=abaŋ
    a1. map-paluŋa kaŋ tu=abaŋ
        AV3-row 1SG.PIV OBL=boat
        ‘I will row the boat’, ‘I am rowing the boat’
    b. ma-paluŋa ku ju=abaŋ
        GV1-row 1SG PIV.CN=boat
        ‘I can row the boat’

Davis et al. (1997, p. 222) translate sentence 15a as ‘I’m always rowing the boat’ and sentence 15b as ‘I can row the boat’. They analyze ma-paluŋa as able to be used with a pivot that is either the subject or the object. Based on the categorizations of these verbal affixes in the Austronesian voice analysis as only used when a specific type of argument is the pivot, this is surprising (Chen & McDonnell, 2019; see discussion in section 1.2). My consultant provided evidence to the contrary, saying that sentence 15b does have the affix ma- with ma-paluŋa, while sentence a should have the affix mag- to form map-paluŋa in order to be grammatical. This follows logically from the analysis of these verbal affixes I provided above, which were informed by typological comparison, where mag- is analyzed as an actor voice affix, and ma- is analyzed as a goal voice affix.

(16) a. *ma-tagu ju=kokot tu=kwartu
    a1. ma-tagu ju=kokot tu=kwartito
        GV1-hide PIV.CN=thief OBL=room
        ‘the thief is hiding in the room’
b. *tagw-an ju=kokot tu=kwartu

b1. tagw-an nu=kokot ju=amu-na
    hide-GV3 NOM.CN=thief PIV.CN=boss-3SG.POSS
    ‘the thief is hiding from his boss’

c. i-tagu nu=kokot ju=kwartu
    GV2-hide NOM.CN=thief PIV.CN=money
    ‘the thief will hide the money’

d1. ni-tagu nu=kokot ju=kwartu tu=kwartito
    GV2.PST-hide NOM.CN=thief PIV.CN=money OBL=room
    ‘the thief hid the money in the room’

Sentence 16a comes from Davis et al. (1997, p. 226). Sentences 16b and 16c are sentences that I created, building off of sentence 16a. Sentence 16a is translated by Davis et al. as ‘the thief always hides money’. My consultant found both sentences 16a and 16b to be ungrammatical, and this meaning of ‘always’ appears to not be present in any of her translations.

This difference between consultants appears to stem from what each verb and affix combination can refer to. For ma-tagu and tagw-an (t<in>agw-an for the past tense of the latter) require that the subject, in this case kokot ‘thief’, is themself hiding, and not hiding another item like kwartu ‘money’. The affix ma- with ma-tagu requires the pivot to be the subject, as an actor voice. While the affix -an with tagw-an requires the pivot to be the object, as a goal voice. In these two sentences, the object is where the person is hiding or who they are hiding from. This is interesting, as Davis et al. (1997, p. 226) presents the above sentence 16a in contrast to another sentence I did not present to my consultant: ma-tagu ju=anak ‘the child always hides’. This sentence and the above 16a contrast in whether it is the subject hiding or the subject hiding something else, while this is not a difference my consultant had with the prefix ma-. For the subject hiding something else and not themself hiding, i-tagu and ni-tagu are acceptable.
3.3.2 Actor voice affixes

In this section, I focus on sentences with actor voice affixes: `<um>` (past form `<inum>`), `maŋ-` (past form `naŋ-`), and `maɡ-` (past form `naɡ-`).

(17) a. nad-daget kan tu=burasi
   AV3.PST-sew 1SG.PIV OBL=clothes
   ‘I sewed the dress’

b. *naŋ-daget kan tu=burasi

c. *naŋ-i-daget kan tu=burasi

c1. naŋ-i-daget kan tu=batunis tu=burasi
   AV2.PST-GV2-sew 1SG.PIV OBL=button OBL=clothes
   ‘I sewed the button to the dress’

The source for these sentences is Davis et al. (1997, pp. 148–149). My consultant stated that sentence 17a is the preferred way to express this meaning, with the subject as the pivot. Sentences 17b and 17c are not grammatical for my consultant. Sentence 17c is incomplete and requires an additional argument for the speaker to specify what they are sewing onto the dress, thus sentence 17c1 is correct with this additional argument. This requirement of an indirect object like ‘button’ is potentially due to the presence of the `i-` affix. Sentence 10b above with `i-daget` has the indirect object `batunis` ‘button’ as its pivot. As such, even though `batunis` ‘button’ is not the pivot here, it, or something like it, is still required.

(18) a. nab-buŋa ju=fun tu=prutas
   AV3.PST-grow PIV.CN=tree OBL=fruit
   ‘the tree grew fruit’

b. *ni-buŋá nu fun yu prútas

The source for these sentences is Davis et al. (1997, pp. 187–188). Some changes that were made to these sentences is the phonetic change of `frutas` to `prutas` for ‘fruit’. As well, the original sentences had `kaju` ‘wood’, where I have `fun` ‘tree’. The word `kaju` refers more to
something like a plank of wood, while fun is the actual tree itself which is able to grow fruit.

Therefore, my consultant found the form with kaju infelicitous.

Davis et al. (1997) analyzed the difference between these sentences as having to with whether the occurrence of growing fruit was a regular and expected occurrence in sentence 18a, or surprising in sentence 18b. My consultant found sentence 18b to be ungrammatical.

\[
(19) \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{nab-busi} \quad \text{kan} \quad \text{tu=} \text{bakaw} \\
& \quad \text{AV}3.\text{PST-thresh} \quad \text{1SG.PIV} \quad \text{OBL=} \text{corn} \\
& \quad \text{‘I threshed the corn’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad ^*\text{nab-busi ju=} \text{bakaw} \\
\text{c}. & \quad \text{mab-busi} \quad \text{kan} \quad \text{tu=} \text{bakaw} \quad \text{nu=} \text{lelaw} \\
& \quad \text{AV}3\text{-thresh} \quad \text{1SG.PIV} \quad \text{OBL=} \text{corn} \quad \text{tomorrow} \\
& \quad \text{‘I will thresh the corn tomorrow’}
\end{align*}
\]

The source for these sentences is Davis et al. (1997, pp. 165–166). As a note, Davis et al. translates busi as ‘to thresh’, which does seem to be the most accurate English translation of this term. My consultant does not provide an English translation of busi, but provides the following explanation of the term: “the act of taking the corn out of the cob”, as well, she states that “you cannot nab-busi other things”. Sentences 19a and 19c₁ are both acceptable sentences, with sentence a in past tense and sentence 19c₁ in non-past, taking a more future meaning with nu=lelaw ‘tomorrow’. Sentence 19b is translated in Davis et al. (1997) as ‘the corn popped’, but is ungrammatical for my consultant because “the corn cannot remove its own thing”.

\[
(20) \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{d<inum>akal} \quad \text{ju=} \text{danum} \\
& \quad <\text{AV1.PST}>\text{big} \quad \text{PIV.CN=} \text{water} \\
& \quad \text{‘the river became big’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{nad-dakal} \quad \text{ju=} \text{danum} \\
& \quad \text{AV3.PST-big} \quad \text{PIV.CN=} \text{water} \\
& \quad \text{‘the river was big’}
\end{align*}
\]
The source for these sentences is Davis et al. (1997, p. 169). In sentence 20a, the water, or river, wasn’t big before, but it became big perhaps due to a significant amount of rain. As such, the <inum> affix (<um> in non-past) carries a meaning similar to the inchoative, or change of state. Sentences 20b and 20c are simply stating that the water is or was big, with no change to this state. Therefore, there is clearly a difference, at least in this context, between nag- and <inum>. This is reflected in my revised glosses in section 5.1.

(21)  

(a)  

num-igaw nu=fugab  
AV1.PST-sun yesterday  
‘it was sunny yesterday’

(b)  

*nag-igaw nu=fugab

(c)  

ma-igaw sawe  
GV1-sun now  
‘it’s sunny now’

(d)  

*na-igaw

Davis et al. (1997, 169–170) analyzed sentence a as being a usual and unremarkable comment or event. Sentence 21b translates to the same thing, but carries an extra meaning that this state of affairs was unusual. Perhaps it was remarkably sunny and there was a danger of heat stroke. My consultant found sentence 21b ungrammatical and said about it: “you don’t use it”. She provided sentence 21c for a non-past meaning with ma-igaw, but said that its pair na-igaw is ungrammatical. This is interesting, as the preference for the past tense is num-igaw, and for non-past it is ma-igaw, while these affixes are not past/non-past verbal affix pairs and at least the past form of ma- is ungrammatical.
(22) a. *b<um>ibbid kan tu=nobela

b. mab-bibbid kan tu=nobela
   AV3-read ISG.PIV OBL=novel
   ‘I will read a novel’, ‘I am reading a novel’

Davis et al. (1997, pp. 171–172) translates sentence 22a as ‘I intend to read a novel’ and sentence 22b as ‘I am reading a novel’, with a difference in intent/likelihood of the event. My consultant translated 22b as able to mean either ‘I will read a novel’ or ‘I am reading a novel’, since it is non-past. My consultant found sentence 22a to be ungrammatical.

(23) a. *maŋ-uɾusi= Santos

b. maŋ-uɾu si=Santos
   AV2-treat PIV.PN=Santos
   ‘Santos is treating someone’

c1. naŋ-uɾu si=Santos tu=anak tu=bariu
   AV2.PST-treat PIV.PN=Santos OBL=child OBL=barrio
   ‘Santos treated a kid in the barrio’

d1. uɾu ni=Santos tu=medisina ju=anak
   treat NOM.PN=Santos OBL=medicine PIV.CN=child
   ‘Santos treats the child with medicine’

Davis et al. (1997, p. 175) translates sentence 23a as Santos treats himself and sentence 23b as ‘Santos treats someone’. My consultant found sentence 23a ungrammatical. Sentence 23c1 was volunteered. It is the past tense equivalent of sentence 23b and shows the ability of maŋ-uɾu or naŋ-uɾu to take additional arguments.

Sentence 23d1 was also volunteered by the consultant and has no verbal affix. In this case, the pivot is the direct object. This is interesting, and the fact that the object is the privileged argument in a transitive sentence with no verbal affixes may be evidence in favour of the ergative-absolutive analysis. Further research would have to be done in order to determine
whether this is the only acceptable configuration of this sentence when there is no verbal affix, and whether this is a set pattern in all cases or if it is exclusive to this sentence.

(24)  
a₁.  \text{in-usip-an} \quad \text{ku} \quad \text{ju=bok-ku}  
\text{GV3.PST-cut-GV3} \quad \text{1SG} \quad \text{PIV.CN=hair-1SG.POSS}  
‘I cut my own hair’

b₁. \text{usip-an} \quad \text{ku} \quad \text{ju=bok-ku}  
\text{cut-GV3} \quad \text{1SG} \quad \text{PIV.CN=hair-1SG.POSS}  
‘I’ll cut my hair’

c₁. \text{usip-an} \quad \text{ku} \quad \text{ju=anak-ku} \quad \text{nu=lelaw}  
\text{cut-GV3} \quad \text{1SG} \quad \text{PIV.CN=child-1SG.POSS} \quad \text{tomorrow}  
‘I’ll cut my child’s hair tomorrow’

Davis et al. (1997, pp. 178–179) provides \textit{nag-usip} and \textit{naŋ-usip} with the meanings ‘I got a haircut’ and ‘I cut someone’s hair’ respectively. To convey those meanings, my consultant constructed and preferred the above sentences with -\textit{an} for both types, regardless of the internal/external distinction where one can only be used with the speaker, and the other can only be used about another person conveyed in Davis et al. (1997). All of the sentences above which were volunteered by the consultant have the direct object as the pivot. The difference between sentences 24a₁ and 24b₁ is that the former is past tense and the latter is non-past. Sentence 24c₁ involves cutting the hair of the speaker’s child, as opposed to the speaker’s own hair. It is interesting to note that sentence 24a₁ appears to have the same goal voice affix twice, once in its past form, and once in its non-past form. It would be interesting to examine whether the final -\textit{an} is required in this case, and what meaning would be derived from the same sentence without it.

The meaning of there being two of the same goal voice affix here is as of yet unclear.

(25)  
a. \text{mat-turat} \quad \text{ju=atap}  
\text{AV3-leak} \quad \text{PIV.CN=roof}  
‘the roof leaks’
b. man-urut ju=atap
   AV2-leak PIV.CN=roof
   ‘the roof is leaking’

Davis et al. (1997, p. 180) gives the meaning of sentence 24a as ‘the roof is leaking’ and that of sentence 24b as ‘the roof leaks’. This appears to be the opposite meanings than what was provided by my consultant. My consultant said sentence a means that ‘the roof leaks’, as in it does so specifically when it rains. Whereas sentence 24b means that it’s leaking at the moment of utterance, that “you can already see that it’s leaking”. As with the sentences in 7, these sentences show a complete switch in meaning between the translations in Davis et al. and my those of my own consultant.

3.3.3 ADDITIONAL VERBAL AFFIX MEANINGS

In this section, I discuss some sentences and additional verbal affixes that weren’t presented as the main affixes of Yogad by Davis et al. (1997), but do still appear in their work and my study. These affixes do not fit well or at all into the above categories of goal voice, instrument voice, or actor voice, though there may be some overlap.

The comitative is a grammatical case which gives the meaning of ‘with’ or ‘alongside’ to an argument. Davis et al. (1997) provides the verbal affix *kiɡ*- for use when the privileged argument (that marked with *ju* or *si*) is comitative. As such, we can refer to it as the comitative voice. A distinct form for the comitative voice is typologically unusual, as the verbal affix used to give a comitative meaning to the pivot in the three other languages studied here do not have an exclusive comitative voice marker. In these three other languages, the comitative meaning is included with another verbal affix, such as with one of the instrument voice affixes. However, the situation in Yogad may not be as clear. See sentence 26a below from Davis et al. (1997, p. 140), and sentence 26b₁ which was volunteered.
Sentence 26a is a simple comitative, using the comitative voice marker provided in Davis et al. (1997). However, my consultant deemed it ungrammatical. When asked how to say ‘I’m looking with Mario’ in Yogad, she provided sentence 26b1 with a completely different construction with the goal voice affix ma- attaching to the verb instead. This new elicited sentence does not contain the comitative voice prefix kib- which poses an interesting question of whether that affix is falling out of use with speakers. As well, an object is required for the thing that they are looking for in this sentence. The comitative would be an interesting area of further study, both in Yogad and other Austronesian languages to determine whether there is a pattern across languages in how it is expressed.

When the benefactive is the privileged argument in Yogad, Davis et al. (1997) states that the verb may take both affixes i- and -an as a sort of circumfix, for the non-past form. For the past tense, they give the similar constructed affix ni-...-an. In the three other languages of this study, this benefactive voice meaning is included in another one of the affixes. The locative voice marker -(h)an for Hiligaynon, the instrument voice marker ipa- for Ivatan, and the instrument voice marker si- for Paiwan. See the two sentences below for examples of the so called benefactive voice in Yogad from Davis et al. (1997, p. 149).

(27)  

a. i-pad-daget ku si=Maria tu=burasi
   GV2-IV-sew 1SG PIV.PN=Maria OBL=clothes
   ‘I’ll sew a dress for Maria’

b. i-daget-an ku si=Maria tu=burasi
   GV2-sew-GV3 1SG PIV.PN=Maria OBL=clothes
   ‘I’ll sew a dress for Maria’
In sentence 27b, the benefactive voice is indicated with the affixes *i*-...-*an*, just as stated by Davis et al. (1997, pp. 251–252). The benefactive is the pivot in sentence 27a as well, and is equally as acceptable. However, the verbal affixes in this sentence do not include -*an*, but instead include *pag*-, the instrument voice affix, alongside *i*-.. As such, there appears to be multiple ways of expressing the benefactive in Yogad, beyond simply *i*-...-*an* or *ni*-...-*an*. As this study did not focus on the combination of multiple affixes, this is only a preliminary look at what may be called the benefactive voice. In a more in depth analysis, the verbal affixes may be analyzed as a circumfix where both parts are required and interconnected with each, in which case they could be glossed as a single circumfix indicating the benefactive voice, instead of separate goal voice or instrument voice affixes.

One or more verbal affixes can also give habitual meanings. As such, it is worth discussing here alongside the uses of the verbal affixes. There are two types of habitual sentences I will outline here. The first of which is an action that is repeated frequently. See the sentence below from Davis et al. (1997, p. 206).

(28) a.  m<in>ag-gaku si=jena-ku tu=manok  
<GV3.PST>AV3-cook  PIV.PN=mother-1SG.Poss  OBL=chicken  
‘my mother always cooks chicken’

This is another combination of two affixes, in this case *<in>* (-*an* in non-past) and *mag*-.. The second type of habitual is clear in the sentence below volunteered by my consultant.

(29) a₁.  man-<usip> kan  
AV2-cut  1SG.PIV  
‘I’m a barber’, ‘I’m a hairdresser’

This is a different type of habitual and a different way of expressing it. The use of *man*- in this environment is how to convey that someone does something habitually in the context of employment. Therefore, *man-<usip> kan* means ‘I’m a barber’ or a hairdresser, and *man-gaku kan*
doesn’t only mean that the speaker cooks frequently but in fact means that they do so for their job: they are a chef (Davis et al., 1997).

There appear to be multiple ways of indicating the imperative in Yogad, and it may simply be expressed through context. See the sentences below from Davis et al. (1997, p. 146).

(30)  a.  akkat-an  nu  ju=libru
move-GV3  2SG  PIV.CN=book
‘move the book (IMP)’

b.  i-akkat  nu  ju=libru
GV2-move  2SG  PIV.CN=book
‘move the book (IMP)’

Both of the above sentences are ways of telling someone to move a book, but both have a different connotation. For sentence 30a, “you’re telling someone to do it now”, whereas with sentence 30b, “it’s okay to do it tomorrow”. The former is expressed simply with the affix -an and the latter is expressed simply with the affix i-. These two affixes, when used to mean the imperative, show different degrees. The sentences in 8 presented above show yet another way of expressing the imperative. The relevant sentences from 8 are repeated below for ease of reference.

(8)  a1.  i-patu-m  tu=afuj  ju=danum
GV2-heat-2SG  OBL=fire  PIV.CN=water
‘heat (IMP) the fire with water’

  c1.  man-j-patu  ka  tu=danum
AV2-GV2-heat  2SG.PIV  OBL=water
‘heat (IMP) the water’

In sentence 8a1, the imperative is expressed with the affix i- again, and in sentence 8c1 with the affixes man-j-. For the latter, the pivot is the subject, instead of the object in these other cases. As the imperative can seemingly be indicated in a multitude of ways, it would certainly benefit from further research. Perhaps these single affixes or combinations of affixes would be better suited to
be glossed as IMP, but the full extent of that category is not known here. In addition, it is unclear which part of the sentence, especially the sentences with two verbal affixes, supplies the imperative meaning. As such, the glosses are left here without the imperative meaning indicated in the glosses themselves.

3.3.4 Analysis and Summary of Verbal Affix Differences

For the Yogad verbal affixes *i*- and *-an*, both are used when the privileged argument is an object. Davis et al. (1997) analyzes *-an* as closer to the event itself, while *i*- is more external to the event. This analysis aligns with my own. I analyze *-an* as a direct object voice marker, and *i*- as an indirect object voice marker, or applicative voice marker, as it promotes an external argument, creating an applied argument and applicative construction (Pylkkänen, 2008). As such, a sentence with *i*- attaching to the verb requires an external argument other than the direct object. One example that demonstrates this is with the sentence ‘I’ll sew the button on the dress’.

This example is presented in sentence 10b, which I repeat here.

(10) b.  
  i-daget ku ju=batunis tu=burasi  
  GV2-sew 1SG PIV.CN=button OBL=clothes  
  ‘I’ll sew the button on the dress’

In this sentence, the action that is being performed is sewing a dress, as such, ‘dress’ is the direct object and ‘button’ is an indirect object. Therefore, if ‘dress’ is the privileged argument, *-an* must be the affix on the verb. Whereas if ‘button’ is the privileged argument, *i*- must be the affix on the verb, creating an applicative construction. The same is true of the sentence ‘I’ll paint the house with red paint’, seen in sentences 9a and 9b above. This set is repeated below for further discussion.

(9) a.  
  pinta-n ku ju=binalaj tu=lasaŋ ja pinta  
  paint-GV3 1SG PIV.CN=house OBL=paint LINK paint  
  ‘I’ll paint the house with red paint’
b. i-pinta ku ju=lasaŋ ja pinta tu=binalaj
   GV2-paint 1SG PIV.CN=red LINK paint OBL=house
   ‘I’ll use the red paint to paint the house’

c. pap-pinta ku ju=brota tu=binalaj
   IV-paint 1SG PIV.CN=brush OBL=house
   ‘I’ll use the brush to paint the house’

d1. pap-pinta ku ju=kamat-ku tu=dindinj
   IV-paint 1SG PIV.CN=hand-1SG.POSS OBL=wall
   ‘I’ll use my hands to paint the wall’

It is the ‘house’ which is the direct object of the verb, and the ‘red paint’ which is the indirect object or applied argument. This differs from the instrumental, in 9c and 9d1 where pag- attaches to the verb ‘paint’ to form pap-pinta. This requires a tool to be the privileged argument, such as a brush or a hand, and not an additional object like ‘red paint’. It is unknown whether, underlyingly, the affix or the pivot marker is attached first, and in which direction agreement occurs. As such, I offer this explanation starting with the verbal affixes for this example. For this sentence, when it is -an that attaches to the verb pinta ‘to paint’, the privileged argument must be binalaj ‘house’, whereas when it is i- that attaches to the verb, the privileged argument must be lasaŋ ja pinta ‘red paint’. In this second case, the indirect object ‘red paint’ is promoted to a core argument of the verb, and the word order shifts to reflect that, moving ‘red paint’ forward in the sentence. Therefore, a literal translation of 9b would be something along the lines of ‘I’ll paint red the house’. Its English translation complicated somewhat by the double use of the word paint as both a noun and a verb, since ‘I’ll paint red-paint the house’ sounds strange. This difference between i- and -an clearly follows a systematic and predictable pattern in Yogad. Due to this evidence, I reanalyze -an as marking the direct object voice in the Austronesian voice analysis, and i- as marking the indirect object voice. Following this, I change the definition of the third goal voice ma- to object voice, to match this analysis. This is not cross-linguistically unusual, as
the grammar of Ivatan (Hidalgo & Hidalgo, 1970; 1971) refers to this group of verbal affixes as “object focus”. In the ergative-absolutive analysis, I reanalyze i- as an applicative, as the privileged argument in sentences with i- is not a core argument of the verb. The revised description of Yogad verbal morphology is presented in full in section 5.1.

The verbal affix ma- (na- in past tense) appears to have two central uses in Yogad. The first of which is as a goal voice, or object voice following the revised terminology above. In these sentences, it conveys an additional meaning that puts focus on the subject’s ability to do the action. Two examples of this is na-gafut ku ju=mammanok ‘I am able to catch the bird’ from sentence 11b, and ma-paluga ku ju=abay ‘I can row the boat’ from sentence 15b. Note the use of ‘can’ and ‘able to’ in the English translations, alongside the object as the privileged argument. The second use of ma- is with a stative meaning, where the privileged argument is the subject. Two examples of this are: ma-barak si=Mario ‘Mario is looking’, and ma-tagu ju=kokot tu=kwartito ‘the thief is hiding in the room’ (kokot ‘thief’, kwartito ‘room’). Additionally, the affix ma- (na- in past tense) has the ability to be used with no expressed subject, whereas an object voice affix like -an (<in> in past tense) cannot, and requires a subject. For example, t<in>akaw ku ju=kwartu ‘I stole the money’ requires the subject pronoun ku ‘I’ and is ungrammatical without it. Whereas na-takaw ju=kwartu ‘the money was stolen’ is perfectly grammatical without a subject. The relationship between these two distinct uses of ma- is as of yet unclear.

The verbal affix pag- is used only when the privileged argument is an instrument, such as ‘brush’ in sentence 9c ‘I’ll use the brush to paint the house’, or ‘needle and thread’ in sentence 10c ‘I’ll sew with a needle and thread’.
The verbal affixes <um>, mag-, and maŋ-, are all actor voice affixes. However, the distinctions between them is less clear than the object voice affixes presented above. The infix <um> (past tense form <inum> or num-) appears to have a stative meaning in some environments, such as num-igaw nu=fugab ‘it was sunny yesterday’. It also has a change of state meaning, or an inchoative aspect meaning of ‘becoming’ in some environments, such as d<inum>akal ju=danum ‘the river rose/the river became big’. Davis et al. (1997) provides many examples where ma- (or na-) provide an inchoative meaning to the utterance. The affix <um> in Hiligaynon, which is likely related to the affix with the same form in Yogad, is similarly used as an actor voice marker with a meaning of ‘to become’ (Hidalgo & Hidalgo, 1970; 1971). Further evidence for the use of <um> with a stative meaning can be found with sentence pairs comparing <um> and mag-, where one was deemed ungrammatical. With the sentences num-igaw nu=fugab ‘it was sunny yesterday’ and *nag-igaw nu=fugab, this sentence expresses a state, therefore <um> is acceptable and mag- is not. Whereas with the sentences *b<um>ibbid kan tu=nobela and mab-ibbid kan tu nobela ‘I am reading a novel’ or ‘I will read a novel’, this sentence does not express a state, therefore <um> is unacceptable and mag- is acceptable.

Therefore, I expand my description of the affix <um> to include its stative and inchoative meanings. The precise difference between <um> and ma- is unclear, as they both appear to select the subject as the privileged argument and are used in a stative context.

The difference between the affixes mag- and maŋ- is analyzed in Davis et al. (1997) as an internal/external distinction, with the former having a more internal meaning, or a meaning in closer proximity to the event. While the latter gives the sentence a meaning of external effect or motivation. I have no evidence for this distinction in my data, and have very minimal data comparing these two verbal affixes. This is due to the fact that in many sentence pairs comparing
these affixes, one of the forms was rejected, such as with \textit{mag-uru si=Santos} and \textit{maŋ-uru si=Santos} ‘Santos is treating someone’. The same is true with sentence pairs given with the goal of comparing to the other actor voice affix \textit{<um>}. In cases where both sentences in a pair were deemed grammatical, a difference between the two sentences was not expressed in the translation or subsequent discussion. In my own data, I only have one sentence pair with \textit{mag-} and \textit{maŋ-} where my consultant both produced a form with either affix and expressed a difference between them. This was in the sentences \textit{mat-turut ju=atap} ‘the roof leaks’ and \textit{maŋ-urut ju=atap} ‘the roof is leaking’. These translations were provided by my consultant with the meaning of the former being that the roof leaks whenever it rains, and the meaning of the latter being that the roof is observably leaking at the moment of the utterance. This pair does not seem to align with the internal/external analysis provided in Davis et al. (1997). In addition, the translations provided by my consultant are the exact opposite of those provided in Davis et al. It is not possible to predict a pattern from only one data point, especially one that shows such significant disagreement between consultants. However, the difference between these two appears to be between stage-level and individual-level predicates (Kratzer, 1989). In the case where the roof leaks whenever it rains, this is an individual-level predicate, or property of the roof. In the case where the roof is leaking at the moment of the utterance, this is a stage-level predicate, or a state that the roof is in. As there is very minimal information on whether this is an accurate analysis for the difference between \textit{mag-} and \textit{maŋ-}, as well as which of these affixes gives which meaning, my definitions given for these two actor voice affixes remains unchanged, with only a number distinguishing them.

One possible explanation for the difference between \textit{mag-} and \textit{maŋ-} is that they are allomorphs appearing in different phonological environments. In my data (Koren & Quirante,
2022), *mag-* seems to appear overwhelmingly preceding consonants, and *maŋ-* preceding vowels. Sentences with *mag-* or *maŋ-* in the opposite environment were often deemed ungrammatical, such as with *nal-aŋ wufugab*, *mag-uru si= Santos*, and *nal-aŋ-daget kan tu= burasi*. The only exception to this in my data is the sentences in 25 above, where both *mag-* and *maŋ-* appear able to attach to *turut* ‘leak’, or possibly ‘drip’, as the dictionary by Davis & Mesa (1999) give *turu* ‘leak’ and *turut* ‘drip’, while the grammar by Davis et al. (1997) glosses *turut* as ‘leak’.

However, when *maŋ-* attaches to *turut*, there is a deletion of the initial /u/, to form *maŋurut*. This theory is not supported by Davis et al. (1997), as all of these above sentences were given as grammatical. Future work on Yogad morphology could certainly benefit from further research into the difference between these two affixes. My revised analysis of the Yogad verbal affixes is presented in section 5.1.
4. TYPOLOGICAL COMPARISON OF NOMINAL MORPHOLOGY

In this section, I compare the nominal morphology in Yogad to that in Hiligaynon, Ivatan, and Paiwan, in order to determine how similar Yogad is to these related languages and to inform the analysis of Yogad. I first discuss the case marking particles, for which I give a description following both the Austronesian voice analysis and the ergative-absolutive analysis. I then discuss the personal pronouns of the four languages.

4.1 CASE MARKING PARTICLES

In this section, I discuss the case marking particles of Yogad and the three related languages of Hiligaynon, Ivatan, and Paiwan. These particles are short morphemes which precede nouns/noun phrases to indicate their role or case in the sentence. In Austronesian languages, often there will be particle pairs or sets, where one form is used before common nouns, and the other before personal names. For example, in Yogad, the particle nu would precede ‘child’ or ‘house’, while ni would precede ‘Maria’. Some Austronesian languages also have a difference in number reflected in their particles. Yogad has no grammaticalized number distinction in the particles or nearly anywhere else in the language, save the personal pronouns. The case marking particles which precede common nouns are presented first, followed by those for personal names. These are presented following the Austronesian voice analysis, as this is the analysis held by the language sources. In the following section, I present the glosses for the Yogad particles following the ergative-absolutive analysis.

4.1.1 PARTICLES FOR COMMON NOUNS

Similarities can easily be drawn between the case marking particles in Yogad and those in Hiligaynon, Ivatan, and Paiwan, as shown below.
**TABLE 3: Typological comparison, case marking particles for common nouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yogad</th>
<th>Hiligaynon</th>
<th>Ivatan</th>
<th>Paiwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIVOT</td>
<td>ju</td>
<td>?ay</td>
<td>?ay maŋa</td>
<td>?a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM/GEN</td>
<td>nu</td>
<td>siŋ</td>
<td>siŋ maŋa</td>
<td>nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>sa maŋa</td>
<td>su</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>du</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The particles in Yogad show some similarities between the particles in Hiligaynon, Ivatan, and Paiwan. However, there is much more variety between all four languages, especially in the distribution of each paradigm. For example, Hiligaynon and Ivatan have a distinct form of the locative marker, whereas Yogad and Paiwan use the oblique marker to give locative meaning in context. However, Paiwan does have a marker/preposition *i* which seems to behave similarly to a locative marker, but does so differently than the one in Hiligaynon or Ivatan. This particle may precede noun phrases to denote them as a location, either preceding the noun itself or the noun’s case marking particle. I present two sentences below from Chang (2006), with glosses from that source, but updated to follow the terminology I use here.

(31) Ivatan locative

a. i-vavua ti=Zepul  
   LOC-field PIV.PN.SG=Zepul  
   ‘Zepul is in the field’

b. pi-vavaw-u i-tua=tskui a=za=sunat^j^  
   put-top-IMP LOC-OBL.CN=desk PIV=that=book  
   ‘put that book on top of the desk!’
Ferrell (1979) describes the particle *i* as looking similar to the other case marking particles. However, its use introducing locative noun phrases is optional. Ferrell (1979) states that this particle “may either co-occur with the [case marker] or may result in the deletion of the latter” (p. 202). This means that preceding a location noun phrase may be either *tua, i-tua, or simply i*. Another difference in the above paradigms is that Hiligaynon always makes a singular/plural distinction, whereas none of the other languages do with the particles for common nouns. As well, in Hiligaynon, subjects and objects which are not the privileged argument are marked with the same nominative particle, while this is differentiated in the other three languages. This will always be glossed as the nominative as the language appears to make no difference between non-pivot arguments with the exception of the locative. Another peculiarity of Hiligaynon particles is that there is a difference in definiteness not seen in any of the other languages. This feature only appears in the particles in the nominative forms for common nouns. The definite form is given in the chart. The form of the indefinite is the same but replaces *siŋ* with *saŋ* in both the singular and plural.

In all four languages, the nominative markers are also used as genitive markers preceding the possessor. This is most often presented as a secondary use in language sources. In glosses, despite this particle having an identical form for both nominative and genitive uses, it will be glossed as either **GEN** or **NOM** (**GEN** or **ERG** in the ergative-absolutive analysis) depending on its use in that particular utterance. This is due to the fact that the distribution is different between the nominative and genitive uses of the particle. Following are examples from two of the four languages which clearly show this particle used with a genitive meaning. Other examples from all four languages are presented after table 4.
Ivatan genitive (Reid, 1966)

\[ \text{ʔu} \quad \text{ʧitu} \quad \text{nu}=\text{tau} \]
\[ \text{PIV-CN dog} \quad \text{GEN-CN}=\text{man} \]
\[ \text{‘the man’s dog’} \]

Yogad genitive (Cox & Quirante, 2020)

\[ \text{ju} \quad \text{kasta} \quad \text{nu}=\text{tjempo} \]
\[ \text{PIV-CN beauty} \quad \text{GEN-CN}=\text{season} \]
\[ \text{‘the beauty of the seasons’} \]

The use of the particle pair \textit{nu/ni} within a noun phrase occurs not only with statements of possession, but also with prepositions. See the following sentence from Cox & Quirante (2020):

\[ \text{war} \quad \text{mansanas} \quad \text{tu}=\text{alikud} \quad \text{nu}=\text{kartun} \]
\[ \text{EXIS apple} \quad \text{OBL}=\text{behind} \quad \text{GEN}=\text{box} \]
\[ \text{‘there is an apple behind the box’} \]

In this sentence, \textit{nu} is clearly not marking a possessor, but a prepositional object. This construction appears commonly with a variety of prepositions in Yogad. Prepositional objects being marked necessarily with the genitive is not unusual cross-linguistically.

Below, I discuss each of the Yogad particles used with common nouns, drawing connections between particles in the other three languages.

\textit{ju}, pivot

Although there is no one-to-one link with the Yogad particle \textit{ju} and any particle in the three other languages, there are still potential links here. There is the Ivatan particle \textit{ʔu}, which may come from the same source historically due to the similarity in form, though this is not clear. Cross-linguistically, it does seem like the most common form for this place in the paradigm to be filled by is a single vowel, as can be seen in Paiwan with the particle \textit{a}, or a single vowel preceded by a glottal stop, as can be seen in Paiwan. This is true of many Austronesian languages, not just the ones presented here (Blust, 2015).
nu, nominative

In Ivatan there is the particle *nu*. In Paiwan, there is the particle *nuu*, which due to the surrounding phonology may occasionally have the form *nua* instead. Both of these likely share a common ancestor with the Yogad particle *nuu*.

tu, oblique

It is a little more difficult to relate this particle *tu* to the forms in the three languages here. In Paiwan, there is the particle *tu* which, depending on phonological context, may also appear as *tua* or *ta*. In Ivatan, there is the particle *du*, which may be linked historically to the Yogad particle *tu*, not only based on similarity of form, but also due to the overlap they show in some of their uses.

ja, linker

There is another particle in Yogad: *ja*. This particle does not fit in the chart presented as it has a different grammatical function than the case marking particles above. It is what may be called a linking particle. The particle *ja* links related items together, most commonly modifiers and the item they modify, as seen in sentence 35 below, and some previous example sentences. It adds no new information itself to the meaning of the utterance and will simply be called a linker in this work.

(35) Yogad linker (Cox & Quirante, 2020)

a. lasang *ja* pinta
   red *LINK* paint
   ‘a beautiful restaurant’

b. lima *ja* ilug
   five *LINK* egg
   ‘five eggs’
The linking particles in the other three languages are as follows: for Hiligaynon, \( \eta a \) and \( ka \); for Ivatan, \( ka \); for Paiwan, \( a \). The two forms presented for Hiligaynon differ in their uses; \( \eta a \) is used the same as the example gloss above, linking ‘beautiful’ and ‘restaurant’. The particle \( ka \) is used similarly, but instead of a general linking particle, is used specifically as a counting linker. It is used to link a number and the item it is counting, such as ‘five’ and ‘eggs’ in 35b above, whereas in Yogad \( ja \) performs both of these functions. The linkers in all four languages thus contain the vowel \( a \), showing that it is possible that they are all related, despite the fact that their forms differ beyond that. As such, they are likely related.

### 4.1.2 Particles for Personal Names

As stated in previous sections, there is some disagreement between the sources Hidalgo & Hidalgo (1970; 1971) and Reid (1966) for the language Ivatan. There is no disagreement with the particles for the common nouns, but there is disagreement that must be discussed in terms of the particles for personal names. Reid (1966) shows much more variety in the paradigm, while Hidalgo & Hidalgo (1970; 1971) shows nearly none. The latter source gives only the particles \( ?u \), \( nu \), \( su \), and \( du \), with no difference in number, or difference between use with common nouns or personal names. These are identical to the set for common nouns in Reid (1966), with the set for personal names in Reid (1966) being exclusive to that source. As such, only the paradigm from Reid is presented below.
Table 4: Typological comparison, case marking particles for personal names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yogad</th>
<th>Hiligaynon</th>
<th>Ivatan</th>
<th>Paiwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIVOT</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>sandaj</td>
<td>si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM/GEN</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>nandaj</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>kaj</td>
<td>kandaj</td>
<td></td>
<td>di</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All languages besides Yogad make a singular/plural distinction in all cases. Though again, the Hidalgo & Hidalgo (1970; 1971) sources for Ivatan show no number distinction anywhere in the paradigm. While the Hiligaynon particles for common nouns were easily divisible into the particle for case and the plural marker, that is less the case here as only the initial consonant appears to remain unchanged between numbers.

Again, the nominative particles for the personal names are used also with a genitive meaning when occurring within a noun phrase. Examples of this from all four of the studied languages is presented below.

(36) Paiwan genitive (Chang, 2006)

alak \(ni\)=Zepul
child \(GEN.PN.SG\)=Zepul
‘Zepul’s child’

(37) Ivatan genitive (Reid, 1966)

\(?u\) \(tfitu\) \(da\)=Juan
PIV.CN dog \(GEN.PN.PL\)=Juan
‘Juan’s family’s dog’
(38) Hiligaynon genitive (Motus, 1971)

\[ \text{iluj} \quad \text{sja} \quad \text{ni}=\text{Maria} \]
\[
\text{mother} \quad 3\text{SG.PIV} \quad \text{GEN.PN}=\text{Maria}
\]

‘she is Maria’s mother’

(39) Yogad genitive (Cox & Quirante, 2020)

\[ \text{atu-na} \quad \text{ni}=\text{Diana} \]
\[
\text{dog-3SG.PIV} \quad \text{GEN.PN}=\text{Diana}
\]

‘Diana’s dog’

Below, I will discuss each of the Yogad particles for personal names, drawing connections between particles in the other languages studied here. The oblique particle and the linker have the same form regardless of whether they occur with a personal name or a common noun, and as such are not repeated here.

\textit{si}, pivot

It is even more likely for the Ivatan particle ʔu to be related to the Yogad particle ju as, the Ivatan equivalent for personal names is si, just as in Yogad. The Yogad particle si shares a form with the Ivatan particle, and thus likely comes from the same source. Additionally, there is a particle si in Hiligaynon, also used for personal names.

\textit{ni}, nominative

In all three languages compared here, there is the particle ni. In Hiligaynon ni appears for personal names, but without a pair nu for common nouns. In Ivatan, the particle ni for personal names appears alongside the particle nu as its equivalent for common nouns. In Paiwan, there is both the particles ni and nia, both of which are likely related to the Yogad particle. These two forms have a difference in number, which is a distinction that Yogad does not express in its particles.
4.1.3 **ERGATIVE-ABSOLUTIVE ANALYSIS**

In the ergative-absolutive analysis of the Yogad particles, the privileged argument is analyzed as the absolutive case. As such, the Yogad particle pair *ju/si* are analyzed as absolutive markers, since they mark the privileged argument of the sentence. The Yogad particle pair *nu/ni* are analyzed as ergative markers, as they mark core arguments other than the absolutive. The Yogad particle *tu* is analyzed as the oblique marker, just as with the voice analysis, as it marks every other argument. Again, Yogad has no number distinctions in its particles. This is summarized in the table below.

**Table 5:** Ergative-absolutive analysis of Yogad case marking particles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Common</th>
<th>Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolutive</td>
<td><em>ju</em></td>
<td><em>si</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergative/genitive</td>
<td><em>nu</em></td>
<td><em>ni</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique</td>
<td><em>tu</em></td>
<td><em>tu</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 **PERSONAL PRONOUNS**

In this section, the personal pronouns of Yogad and the three languages Hiligaynon, Ivatan, and Paiwan, are presented. The definitions of these pronouns are not as debated as those of the verbal affixes and case marking particles, since they are clearly personal pronouns and are used in a way that is typologically common. Because of this, unlike the previous two sections, I will not be presenting glosses following both analyses of Austronesian morphology, as there is much less difference between these two analyses in the pronouns. In the tables presented here, terminology more familiar to the Austronesian voice analysis will be used. How these are
translated into the ergative-absolutive analysis is the same as with the particles presented above and will be stated throughout this section.

Again, there is some disagreement between the two Ivatan sources. However, not as much as in previous sections. As such, the Ivatan pronoun paradigm presented here represents a merging of these two sources. A more detailed explanation of where these sources diverge is presented following the table.

As has been the case throughout this paper, I translate the different orthographic standards from each source into a broad IPA transcription. I note this again, as the personal pronouns across languages tend to be longer words and show more phonetic variety than either the verbal affixes or case marking particles presented previously. As such, there may be some errors in translating these orthographies into a more consistent IPA. However, any potential errors are not likely to greatly impact the results of the typological comparison, as the items that were the most often unclear in the orthographies were simple, more phonetic differences. These include, for example, the presence or absence of schwa or whether a phoneme is marked as palatalized or is followed by a separate /j/ phoneme.

4.2.1 PIVOT FORMS OF THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS

I separate the four languages’ pronouns in this section into two separate tables. This is so that it is easier to compare forms between languages. The first table of pronouns gives only the pronouns which are used when they are standing in for the utterance’s privileged argument. For example, these are the pronouns that would replace or stand in for arguments that would be preceded by the Yogad particles *ju* or *si*. In the Austronesian voice analysis, these are the pivot pronouns, and in the ergative-absolutive analysis, these are the absolutive pronouns.
First of all, there is much more diversity in the pronouns between languages than has been seen in some of the previous areas of discussion. The complete set of personal pronouns in Yogad doesn’t have a one-to-one relationship with any of the other pronoun paradigms. The other languages’ pronoun paradigms don’t look exactly like each other either, and so there appears to be more variation in the personal pronouns cross-linguistically. Despite this, there are still a multitude of similarities. Alongside the fact of greater variation, I also make more allowances for phonological differences here than in the other sections, such as: the presence or absence of a glottal stop before an initial vowel, the presence of schwa, the presence of a lateral like /l/ as opposed to a tap /ɾ/, etc.

Looking to the broadest differences, it can be noted that Paiwan has two forms of pronouns for all but the third person. In all other numbers, the first is the independent pronoun,
and the second is the clitic form of the pronoun. I present the clitic pronouns in addition to the independent pronouns, as the independent pronouns, for the most part, only have a *ti-* that is not present in the forms of the clitic pronouns. And as such, looking at the clitic pronouns without that initial syllable, it is occasionally easier to see similarities between the forms in Paiwan and those of the other languages.

Ivatan is the only language here which has more than one grammatical type of pivot pronouns: state and non-state. This distinction between stative sentences and otherwise is also present in some sets of verbal affixes, as discussed previously. This is one area where the two sources differ, as the stative forms appear only in Reid (1966), and not in Hidalgo & Hidalgo (1970; 1971). The two sources differ in a few other ways, which I will briefly outline here. In Hidalgo & Hidalgo (1970; 1971) there is no glottal stop before initial vowels, whereas in Reid (1966) there always is. In Hidalgo & Hidalgo (1970; 1971) the third person plural form doesn’t have the second option of *sa*, only the form *sira*. Lastly, Hidalgo & Hidalgo (1970; 1971) has *sja* in the third singular where Reid (1966) has *sia*. This is a difference in orthography, as with the presence of an initial glottal stop, and are likely pronounced the same. As well, there is this same disagreement between the two sources for Hiligaynon, despite the fact that that pair of sources are made to stand together: *sia* in Wolfenden (1971), and *sja* in Rotus (1971).

In addition, Yogad is the only language of these four which has the inclusive singular. The term “inclusive singular” is used here to mean only the speaker and the addressee are included, while the inclusive plural includes additional people. This follows the features for person that are proposed in Cowper & Hall (2019), where there is a four-way distinction for person that is possible in language: the inclusive, exclusive, second, and third person. Davis et al. (1997) described *kita* in Yogad as the first person inclusive dual, and gave the first person
exclusive dual as *kami*, the same form as the plural equivalent. Analyzing these forms as the dual is a valid option, but it is strange for it to only be able to be used with the first person. As well, the other three languages here have the inclusive plural already. Therefore the inclusive as a feature appears to be common cross-linguistically, while the dual does not. As such, I’ve analyzed Yogad as having the inclusive person in both the singular and plural, with no dual number at all, which fits in better cross-linguistically.

Below, I list each Yogad personal pronoun in the above chart, as I have for each previous section, and draw relationships between them and the forms in the other languages.

**kan, first person singular**

In Paiwan, the clitic form of the first person singular is *-akən*, and in Ivatan the (non-stative) first singular form is *jakən*. These clearly show similarities to each other, and are likely related to the Yogad form *kan*.

**kita, inclusive singular**

In Hiligaynon, there is the pronoun *kita*, which is for the inclusive as well, but for the inclusive plural. As none of the other three languages here have inclusive singular, there are no direct links between the Yogad form and any others in both form and meaning.

**ka, second person singular**

In both Hiligaynon and the Ivatan stative forms, there is the pronoun *ka* for the second person singular, constituting two direct links to the Yogad pronoun.

**ja baggina, third person singular**

There are no links to this pronoun at all, as it is formed in a different way than the other pronouns, both in Yogad and otherwise. In Yogad, *ja* is the linking particle, *bagg* is ‘body’, and *-na* is the third person singular possessive morpheme (Davis & Mesa, 1999; Cox & Quirante,
As such, to express a singular third person, a speaker is saying, literally translated, ‘his/her/its/body’ in the singular, as opposed to simply ‘him/her/it/them’. The anaphoric pronouns in Yogad (translating to ‘myself’, ‘yourself’, ‘themselves’, etc.) is constructed in a similar way. The anaphoric pronouns in Yogad are formed with *ju* and *baggi*, and the possessive morpheme of the relevant person and number. An example of this from Cox & Quirante (2020) is given below.

(40) neta ku *ju=baggi-ku* tu=esperho
na-ita ku *ju=baggi-ku* tu=esperho
GV1.PST.see 1SG PIV=body-1SG.POSS OBL=mirror

‘I saw myself in a mirror’

It is interesting to note that none of the other languages here construct any of their pronouns in this way, though the situation is not known for the anaphoric pronouns of the other languages.

**kami, first person plural**

In both Hiligaynon and the Ivatan stative forms, there is the pronoun *kami* for the first person plural.

**kitam, inclusive plural**

There is no direct link for this pronoun. The closest link is the Hiligaynon pronoun *kita*, which is for the inclusive plural, but does already share a form with the Yogad inclusive singular pronoun *kita*. It may be related to this pronoun historically, along with the inclusive singular. The origin and relationship of the Yogad pronoun *kitam* is not entirely clear.

**kam, second person plural**

This pronoun is likely related to the Hiligaynon pronoun *kamo* and the Ivatan stative pronoun *kamu*, both for the second person plural.
This pronoun, or something similar appears for every third person plural pronoun here save Paiwan, which has the least amount of similarities with Yogad of any of the languages, only showing a link in form and in the first person singular. In Hiligaynon, there is *sila*. In Ivatan, for both stative and non-stative, there is *sira*.

### 4.2.2 Non-pivot forms of the personal pronouns

I now present a table with the remaining personal pronouns in the four languages. These are the pronouns used when not the privileged argument. Yogad has only one non-pivot form of the pronoun, while the three other languages studied have at least two.

**Table 7:** Typological comparison, pronouns, non-pivot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yogad</th>
<th>Hiligaynon</th>
<th>Ivatan</th>
<th>Paiwan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>else</strong></td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td><em>ku</em></td>
<td><em>nakon, ko</em></td>
<td><em>ku</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL.SG</td>
<td><em>ta</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td><em>nu, m</em></td>
<td><em>nimo, mo</em></td>
<td><em>mu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td><em>na</em></td>
<td><em>ʔija</em></td>
<td><em>na</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td><em>mi</em></td>
<td><em>ʔamon</em></td>
<td><em>ni</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL.PL</td>
<td><em>tam</em></td>
<td><em>ʔaton</em></td>
<td><em>ta</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td><em>maw</em></td>
<td><em>ʔinjo</em></td>
<td><em>ɲu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td><em>da, ra</em></td>
<td><em>ʔila</em></td>
<td><em>da</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of Yogad, every non-pivot meaning may be expressed by this form of the pronoun. Therefore, these forms of the pronoun may stand in for any noun phrase that would
have been preceded either by the nominative particle pair *nu/ni* or by the oblique particle *tu*. As such, this set of personal pronouns may be called the elsewhere form. For Ivatan and Paiwan, if the pronoun is standing in for a location, the locative meaning is expressed by the oblique. This is unsurprising for Paiwan, as this is identical to the situation with its case marking particles. However, Ivatan shows a distinction between oblique and locative in its particles. Therefore, just as with Yogad, a case distinction held in the particles is not maintained in the pronouns. In Hiligaynon, the locative is the only case that gets a specialized form, while non-pivot objects are included with the nominative, just as with the case marking particles. Ivatan is the only language to have a separate instrumental form of the pronoun, which is quite interesting since, barring the instrument voice verbal affixes, the instrumental is not something that is ever distinguished in Ivatan or any of the three other languages outside of instrument voice affixes.

There are once again differences between the two sources for Ivatan. The first of which is that the instrumental forms which are so notable only appear in Reid (1966), and not Hidalgo & Hidalgo (1970; 1971). In addition, the orthography of the source is unclear for the instrumental forms *nimu, niju, and nira*, which possibly have an initial palatal nasal /ɲ/ like the rest of the instrumental forms. Another difference is that Hidalgo & Hidalgo (1970; 1971) has no specialized inclusive plural form listed, with it and the first person plural exclusive sharing the form *namən*. This would mean that this source has no inclusive forms at all in the nominative forms of the pronouns.

The nominative pronouns here are also used for possessive pronouns in these languages, just as I demonstrated with the nominative marking particles. This is why there are shorter forms for some of the nominative pronouns. This is especially obvious in Paiwan. In Yogad, these pronouns suffix onto the noun that is being possessed, such as *binalaj-ku* ‘my house’.
As in previous sections, I now present each of the Yogad non-pivot personal pronouns in order to draw links and relationships between them and those of the other three languages. The non-pivot pronouns in Yogad, despite being able to stand in for any non-pivot argument, may have diachronically come from the set of nominative pronouns, due to the amount of similarities between them and the nominative pronouns of the other languages, and the lack of similarities between any of the other cases sets from these languages.

**ku, first person singular**

In Ivatan, the nominative first person singular pronoun is *ku*. The same is true of Paiwan for the clitic form of the nominative pronoun with *ku*-

**ta, inclusive singular**

In Ivatan, there is the nominative pronoun *ta*, but this is for the inclusive plural, not the singular. This Ivatan form only appears in one of the two sources as given above. Paiwan also has a similar pronoun form *taja-* for nominative inclusive plural which may be related to the Yogad pronoun as well as the Ivatan pronoun.

**nu, m, second person singular**

Although there are no exact matches for either form of this pronoun, many of the other languages’ second person singular forms certainly look related. Many of them include a nasal, often /m/ followed by a single vowel, often /u/ or /o/, which may underlyingly both be /u/, based on phonological discussions in the sources.

**na, third person singular**

In Ivatan, the nominative third person singular pronoun has the form *na*. 
mi, first person plural

As with the second person singular pronouns in Yogad, there are no exact matches in form here. But there is likely still a link historically to the forms in the other languages as there are a lot of bilabial nasals /m/ appearing in the first person plural pronouns throughout.

tam, inclusive plural

There are some inclusive plural forms with a /t/ followed by a vowel, but no close relationships between the Yogad pronoun tam and the other languages.

maw, second person plural

There are no second person plural morphemes in the three other languages which are similar to the Yogad pronoun maw.

da, ra, third person plural

The two forms of the Yogad third person plural pronoun is based on the phonology of the preceding segment, the language consultant in Cox & Quirante (2020) saying that the choice was made on whichever sounds better. In Ivatan, the nominative third person plural pronoun shares the form da. It is perhaps surprising that not more of the languages show a similarity here, as the ra form of the pronoun appears to be related to the equivalent pivot pronoun sira. This pronoun showed a direct link to every other third person plural pronoun in that chart, with the exception of Paiwan.
5. SUMMARY OF YOGAD MORPHOLOGY

From the comparison of the forms of the verbal affixes, case marking particles, and pronouns in Yogad to the forms in Hiligaynon, Ivatan, and Paiwan, it is plainly obvious that Yogad looks remarkably similar to these and that it fits in quite easily with these three related languages. As such, Yogad is not an exotic language and should not be treated as an outlier in its language family.

Because of this, it is possible to describe the morphology of the language using terminology and glosses familiar to related languages. In this section, I provide a clear summary of the Yogad morphology discussed up until this point, glossing each item following both the Austronesian voice analysis and the ergative-absolutive analysis. This is done in order to provide a complete and concise reference of the central morphology of Yogad which is the subject of this work.

The Austronesian voice analysis and the ergative-absolutive analysis claim different aspects to be important in Yogad and other Austronesian languages. The Austronesian voice analysis claims that these languages have no difference for transitivity, and that a sentence’s verb should not be changed, regardless of the number of arguments. Therefore, transitivity or number of arguments should not be of consequence to these languages. The ergative-absolutive analysis claims that a sentence shows no difference in the importance of arguments; the role of the argument is indicated, but not its importance like with the voice analysis. Therefore, the difference in otherwise identical sentences, such as the sets of four sentences in section 1.3 above, is not which argument is most important to the speaker and the utterance, but how many core arguments there are and what type they are. These two analyses, therefore, make different claims about the properties of Yogad and other Austronesian languages.
In this section, I present summaries of the Yogad verbal affixes, case marking particles, and personal pronouns, alongside other relevant information for the description of these morphemes.

5.1 **YOGAD VERBAL AFFIXES**

First, I present the Yogad verbal affixes. This table includes both the past and non-past forms of the affixes.

**Table 8: Yogad verbal affixes with revised glosses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>voice analysis</th>
<th>past</th>
<th>non-past</th>
<th>ergative analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>actor voice (inchoative, stative)</td>
<td>&lt;inum&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;um&gt;</td>
<td>intransitive (inchoative, stative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor voice 2</td>
<td>nan-</td>
<td>man-</td>
<td>intransitive 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor voice 3</td>
<td>nag-</td>
<td>mag-</td>
<td>intransitive 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object voice (abilitative);</td>
<td>na-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>transitive (abilitative);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor voice (stative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>intransitive (stative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indirect object voice</td>
<td>ni-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct object voice</td>
<td>&lt;in&gt;</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrument voice</td>
<td>p&lt;in&gt;ag-</td>
<td>pag-</td>
<td>applicative (instrumental)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have revised the description of the above affixes from how I present them in sections 3.1 and 3.2 above. These changes reflect the data and discussion I present in my analysis of the data from my language consultant in section 3.3. That work was done in order to distinguish each affix from each other. The distinctions between the actor voices are still not clear. However, my proposed glosses now reflect the distinctions between the three goal voice affixes, now called object voice affixes. The affix *ma-* appears to have two separate uses: either with an abilitative
meaning with the object as the privileged argument, or in stative environments with the subject/agent as the privileged argument. The situation with ma- is interesting, as it has these two seemingly opposite uses. Therefore, the question arises of whether ma- was historically two different morphemes which merged, or whether it was one morpheme with only one of these meaning, that picked up an additional meaning at some point. One way in which one could find evidence for either of these theories is to look at related languages in order to see whether these two uses are indicated by different forms in these languages. In the Austronesian voice analysis, a verb with ma- or na- can either have the subject or object as the pivot of the sentence with different meanings. In the ergative-absolutive analysis, a verb with ma- or na- can either be transitive or intransitive with a different number of arguments and a difference in meaning. Neither of these analyses make the description of these two different uses with one form more straightforward, or are able to collapse the two descriptions into a single cohesive description.

The affix -an is only used when the direct object is the privileged argument, and in contrast i- is only used when the indirect object is the privileged argument. As such, this distinction is reflected in both analyses. In the ergative-absolutive analysis, its description changes to that of an applicative, as its privileged argument is the indirect object, and thus a non-core argument. As well, the affix <um> appears to give an inchoative meaning in some environments, and stative in other environments, similar to ma-. This information is added to the above chart.

Many of these affixes undergo phonological changes depending on the surrounding segments. I outline those here. For the affixes <inum> and <um>, these are infixed following the first consonant of the root. For example, bibbid ‘read’ becomes bumibbid. However, when
the root is vowel initial, these affixes instead prefix to the root with the forms num- and um-
respectively.

When attaching to a root that begins with a consonant, all prefixes with a final-\(g\) change
that phoneme to match the following consonant exactly, creating a geminate consonant. For
example, \(bu\ñ\)a ‘fruit’ becomes \(nabbu\ñ\)a, and \(luk\)ag ‘wake’ becomes n\(l\)ul\(ka\)g. The only
environment where the final-\(g\) remains unchanged is with vowel-initial roots. For example, usip
‘cut’ becomes nagusip.

With the suffix -an, the a is deleted when attaching to a root with a final-\(/a/\), as with pinta
‘paint’, which becomes pintan. The vowel in -en also occasionally deletes following some
vowels, but the specific environment where this change happens is as of yet unclear. As well,
when the root ends in the vowel \(u\), the suffix -an remains unchanged but the final-\(u\) becomes a
glide \(w\), as with talobu ‘grow’, which becomes talobwan. A similar process changes a final-\(/i/\)
into the glide \(j\), as with tali ‘tie’ which becomes taljan. Another change which makes the
phonological production more economical is that of the prefix na- and ma-, where there may be a
change in the vowel when prefixing directly onto another vowel. For example, in casual speech,
na- and ita ‘see’ become neta and one syllable, rather than naita and two syllables (Cox &
Quirante, 2020).

5.2 **Yogad case marking particles**

In this section, I present the case marking particles in Yogad following both the
Austronesian voice analysis and the ergative-absolutive analysis. As Yogad never has a number
distinction in its particle set, unlike the other three studied languages, that distinction is absent
from the table below.
The particle pair *nu/ni* may precede a complete noun phrase to indicate its role as either nominative or ergative depending on the analysis, or it may occur within a noun phrase to indicate the following argument as a possessor, thus functioning as a genitive marker in this circumstance.

### 5.3 Yogad personal pronouns

In this section I present the personal pronouns of Yogad. The only difference between the Austronesian voice analysis and the ergative-absolutive analysis of the pronouns is whether the pronoun which stands in for the privileged argument is referred to as the pivot or the absolutive. As such, there are no separate sections to this table for either analysis. Unlike the three other studied languages, Yogad has only two forms of the personal pronouns: the form used for the privileged argument, and the form used in every other environment.

**Table 9: Yogad case marking particles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>voice analysis</th>
<th>common</th>
<th>personal</th>
<th>ergative analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pivot</td>
<td><em>ju</em></td>
<td><em>si</em></td>
<td>absolutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominative, genitive</td>
<td><em>nu</em></td>
<td><em>ni</em></td>
<td>ergative, genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oblique</td>
<td><em>tu</em></td>
<td><em>tu</em></td>
<td>oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linker</td>
<td><em>ja</em></td>
<td><em>ja</em></td>
<td>linker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 10:** Yogad personal pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>pivot/absolutive</th>
<th>elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td><em>kan</em></td>
<td><em>ku</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL.SG</td>
<td><em>kita</em></td>
<td><em>ta</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td><em>ka</em></td>
<td><em>nu, m</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td><em>ja baggina</em></td>
<td><em>na</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td><em>kami</em></td>
<td><em>mi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCL.PL</td>
<td><em>kitam</em></td>
<td><em>tam</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td><em>kam</em></td>
<td><em>maw</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td><em>sira</em></td>
<td><em>da, ra</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The elsewhere forms of the personal pronouns stand in for any argument that is not the privileged argument, including the possessor. In this case, the pronoun suffixes to the item it is possessing. This use of the pronoun is optional when the possessing argument is otherwise explicitly stated. See the examples below:

(41) Yogad possessor pronoun (Cox & Quirante, 2020)

a. atu-na  
   dog-3SG.POSS  
   ni=Diana  
   ‘Diana’s dog’

b. atu  
   dog  
   ni=Diana  
   ‘Diana’s dog’

With this pair of sentences, either sentence is equally acceptable, with or without the presence of the personal pronoun.
For the third person plural elsewhere pronoun, the alternation between *da* and *ra* is based on the preceding phonology, the language consultant stating that the choice is made based on whichever sounds better (Cox & Quirante, 2020). The exact rules that govern this change is currently unclear in my work.

The form of the third person singular pivot pronoun, *ja baggina*, is formed of multiple morphemes. The morpheme *ja* is the linking particle, *baggi* translates to ‘body’ or perhaps ‘self’, and -*na* is the third person singular possessive morpheme. All of these morphemes together form the third person singular pivot pronoun.

### 5.4 Revised Glosses

To sum up my description of Yogad morphology, I provide Yogad sentences with morpheme-by-morpheme glosses below. I have developed these glosses throughout this work. For each sentence, I provide two lines of glossing: the first of which (i) follows the Austronesian voice analysis, and the second of which (ii) follows the ergative-absolutive analysis. This is done in order to compare the revised glosses that I propose for both analyses, and how they differ in a full sentence of Yogad.

When translated into English, the first two sentences I provide, 42 and 43, are both translated the same: ‘my child will pick a flower’. These two sentences are the same in English, but are different in Yogad with regards to which argument is the privileged argument. These sentences are modified from sentences that appear in Davis et al. (1997, p. 41) and confirmed with my Yogad language consultant.

(42) manj-ampat ju=anak-ku tu=lapaw
    i. AV2-pick.up PIV.CN=child-1SG.POSS OBL=flower
    ii. INTR2-pick.up ABS.CN=child-1SG.POSS OBL=flower
    ‘my child will pick a flower’
In sentence 42, it is the subject/agent ‘my child’ which is the privileged argument. In the Austronesian voice analysis, the sentence is analyzed as being in the actor voice. This can be thought of as the pivot marker overriding the underlying case marker (which in this case would be nu). The verbal prefix *maŋ-* then points to the pivot indicating that that argument in this case is the subject. The object, *lapaw* ‘the flower’, is preceded by the oblique marker *tu*, which is used for every argument that isn’t the pivot or the subject in Yogad.

In the ergative-absolutive analysis, this sentence is analyzed as being an intransitive—or antipassive—sentence, which allows the subject to be the absolutive. In this case, the object becomes a non-core argument and is therefore marked with the oblique case.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(43)} & \quad \text{ampat-an} & \quad \text{nu=anak-ku} & \quad \text{ju=lapaw} \\
\text{i.} & \quad \text{pick.up-DOV} & \quad \text{NOM.CN=child-1SG.POSS} & \quad \text{PIV.CN=flower} \\
\text{ii.} & \quad \text{pick.up-TR} & \quad \text{ERG.CN=child-1SG.POSS} & \quad \text{ABS.CN=flower} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘my child will pick a flower’

In sentence 43, it is the object ‘the flower’ which is the privileged argument. In the Austronesian voice analysis, this sentence is analyzed as being in the direct object voice, which I have revised from my earlier gloss of it as goal voice 3. Therefore, the voice marking suffix -*an* is pointing to the argument marked as the pivot and indicating that it is the object of the sentence, while its usual particle of *tu* has been overridden by *ju*. The subject, *anak-ku* ‘my child’, is preceded by *nu*, which is the particle that precedes all non-pivot subjects.

In the ergative-absolutive analysis, this sentence is analyzed as a simple transitive sentence, and gets a verbal affix to indicate its transitivity. The agent is ergative and the object is absolutive, exactly as expected in a transitive sentence in a typical ergative-absolutive language.
6. **DIACHRONIC DISCUSSION OF THE CASE MARKING PARTICLES**

In this section, I discuss the reconstructions of the Proto-Austronesian case marking particles presented in Blust (2015) and Ross (2006), as they relate to the Yogad particle system. I also make some reference to the Austronesian Comparative Dictionary (Blust & Trussel, 2020). This is done with the aim of providing possible analyses for how the reconstructed particle set resulted in the modern Yogad particle system, to further situate Yogad in the broader context of Austronesian languages. This section is not intended to provide definitive answers and in fact leaves many questions without satisfactory solutions. It is instead intended to begin discussion on the possible routes these particles may have taken historically from Proto-Austronesian towards Yogad.

The reconstructions of Proto-Austronesian particle sets in Blust (2015) and Ross (2006) differ in some interesting ways. Both sources typically give three-term systems of particles, with Ross (2006) deviating from this in some cases. This means that for each particle case, there is a set of three forms which differ based on what kind of argument they can modify: common nouns, singular personal names, and plural personal names. Particle sets in modern Austronesian languages are often reduced from the three-term set, as is seen with Yogad’s two-term system with \textit{ju/si} and \textit{nu/ni} instead of the historically reconstructed three-term system. In some languages, there is potentially a four-term system, as appears to be the case with the Hiligaynon particle system which shows a number distinction both with common nouns and personal names. However, the three-term system does appear to be the most common cross-linguistically.

Historically, Blust (2015) reconstructs four sets of particles for Proto-Austronesian, one set of three particles for each of the nominative, genitive, oblique, and locative. The three forms
of each particle relate to the kind of noun they modify, whether it be a common noun, a singular personal name, or a plural personal name. Ross (2006) does not have a three-term system for every particle case. Ross reconstructs these particles based solely on the daughter languages, while Blust reconstructs three-term particle sets for each of these four grammatical cases from daughter languages as well as on analogy from the other sets. In addition to the set of cases reconstructed in Blust (2015), Ross (2006) also reconstructs a neutral and an accusative set. Blust (2015) argues against the likelihood of the neutral particle set in particular and does not present an equivalent of the accusative set.

In this section, the synchronic data from Yogad and other related languages is presented following the Austronesian voice analysis. This analysis is easier to compare more directly to the reconstructions, since Proto-Austronesian is typically reconstructed as having nominative-accusative alignment. I discuss two reconstructed particle sets that do not easily link to a Yogad set, as well as each of the Yogad particle sets individually.

6.1 Yogad ju/si & ja, and reconstructed nominative & oblique forms

In this section, I discuss the Yogad pivot marking particle set ju/si and the linker ja as it has a similarity in form to ju, and may be related. Alongside them, I discuss the reconstructed Proto-Austronesian forms of the nominative and oblique particle sets, as it is unclear how they may link to the Yogad particle sets.

The two reconstructed particle sets *ku/ki/ka and *su/si/sa from Blust (2015) and Ross (2006) are presented together in this section as the two sources differ significantly in their treatment and analysis. This is the area of most significant disagreement between the sources, as Blust (2015) reconstructs the /k/-initial set as the oblique and the /s/-initial set as the nominative, whereas Ross (2006) reconstructs them in the exact opposite way with the /k/-initial set as the
nominative, and the /s/-initial set—with only the two forms, *su/sa for Ross (2006)—as the oblique. As such, the two sources have the same sets of particles, with one less form for Ross (2006), but with reversed meanings.

For all of the three-term sets of particles I present here, the first form with /u/ is used with common nouns, the second with /i/ is used with singular personal names, and the third with /a/ is used with plural personal names.

6.1 RECONSTRUCTED *ku/ki/ka

Regardless of what the /s/-initial or /k/-initial set of particles marked historically, it is difficult to account for the absence of the /k/-initial set in Yogad, as no particles in the language begin with a velar. However, many of the personal pronouns in Yogad do in fact resemble this set and begin with a velar stop. It is unclear whether this is an unrelated coincidence or whether the Yogad personal pronouns originally arose from this particle set, which may have been either the nominative or the oblique set. However, the Austronesian Comparative Dictionary (Blust & Trussel, 2020) lists the Proto-Austronesian oblique particle *ku and the first singular pronominal form *-ku as having separate, unrelated etymology.

Furthermore, of the three other Austronesian languages studied in this work—Hiligaynon, Ivatan, and Paiwan—only the locative particles for personal names in Hiligaynon have a /k/ in any environment, with the forms kaj and kandaj. This is a small sample of only four languages, but the lack of data for a /k/-initial set in these languages, may indicate why there is such a significant disagreement between Blust (2015) and Ross (2006) for the /k/-initial set.

6.1.2 RECONSTRUCTED *su/si/sa

Comparing Yogad to the reconstructed /s/-initial particle set, there is the particle si in Yogad, the pivot marker for personal names. Since Yogad shows hardly any grammaticalized
number distinction, it is logical for a neutralization of the singular and plural to have occurred historically between the forms *(si) and *(sa), the two forms used with personal names. As the synchronic form in Yogad is *si, that suggests that *(sa) would have fallen out of use and *(si) would then be used with all personal names, showing no number distinction.

The Yogad pivot marker *si is used with personal names, while the pivot marker *ju is used with common nouns as its pair. It is difficult to hypothesize that *ju came from the same source as *si, as I have not seen any evidence of a change from /s/ to /j/ in Yogad or other Austronesian languages by looking to the Austronesian Comparative Dictionary (Blust & Trussel, 2020). In the data provided throughout Blust (2015) and Ross (2006), there are many examples of daughter languages with a different initial consonant of a particle from the form reconstructed for Proto-Austronesian. Whatever source *ju originated from, it may be possible that *ja originated from the same source as well, since they are the only glide-initial particles in Yogad, and they show two of the three vowels common in reconstructed sets of particles. However, this hypothesis offers no explanation as to how or why *ja would have so drastically changed in use and meaning, shifting from a case marker preceding noun phrases to a linker occurring within noun phrases.

Historically, the particle *si must have shifted use and meaning away from a nominative marker and towards a pivot marker, if its origin is indeed the reconstructed /s/-initial set. It is unclear when or how this shift might have happened. If the Austronesian voice analysis is an accurate analysis of contemporary Austronesian languages, this shift may have been caused by the emergence of this voice system. Reconstructions of Proto-Austronesian most often show a simple nominative-accusative system absent of any of the standard features seen in these languages today. I provide one hypothesis for the emergence of the Austronesian voice system. This follows from the analysis of the particle set *su/si/sa as the origin of the pivot markers, and
the analysis of this set as nominative markers historically. It is possible that the Austronesian voice system began historically by marking the privileged argument of the sentence as the subject, similar to the passive voice in other languages where the object moves to the position of the subject and receives nominative marking. In this hypothesis, this process would become standardized and the use of the nominative marker would shift into that of a dedicated pivot marker. Under the ergative-absolutive analysis, these language systems historically would have taken a different path. Aldridge (2021) provides a detailed hypothesis as to how the historically nominative-accusative system reconstructed in Proto-Austronesian became an ergative-absolutive system in Austronesian languages today.

6.1.3 **Yogad ju/si and ja**

Ross (2005) reconstructs the Proto-Malayo-Polynesian linker (called a ligature here and in other sources) as *a*, which is identical in form to the linker in Paiwan. Further description of the Malayo-Polynesian subfamily and its reconstructed proto-language is given below in section 6.3. By adding only an initial glide, this results in the form of the Yogad linker *ja* as well. All of the forms of the linker from the four studied languages in this work have the vowel /a/, with varying initial consonants.

Both Blust (2015) and Ross (2006) reconstruct a potential fifth set of particles for Proto-Austronesian. In both sources, this set is only the familiar vowel set form with no initial consonant: *u/i/a*. Blust does not believe there is strong enough evidence to describe their use in Proto-Austronesian, and thus lists them only as a historical possibility, keeping this set separate from the other four sets of reconstructed particles. Ross (2006) refers to this particle set as the neutral set. This set which has no clear meaning is a compelling source for the origin of the pivot markers in Austronesian languages, as synchronically they tend to be single vowels which may
or may not be preceded by glottal stops cross-linguistically. This aligns with the form of the pivot marker for common nouns in both Ivatan and Paiwan, with ṭu and a respectively, as these are both single vowels that match the vowel types hypothesized by Blust (2015) and Ross (2006). This is a tempting hypothesis for the origin of the glide-initial pivot marker ju, and perhaps also the linker ja. However, there is no other evidence that I have found for an inserted glide across Yogad.

This hypothesis, like the hypothesis in 6.1.2, does not explain how the pair ju/si came together. Sets of particles tend to show similarity in form, especially in their initial consonants or lack thereof. This difference in form between the pivot marker for common nouns vs personal names, is not exclusive to Yogad. The Paiwan set is a/ti/tia, and the Ivatan set is ṭu/si/sa. Ivatan shows the three vowel qualities typical of the reconstructed particle sets and forms similar to the Yogad pivot particle set. The fact that the differing initial consonants in the Ivatan and Yogad pivot particle sets appear to be unusual diachronically and synchronically, is further proof that the pivot markers may have taken an unusual path to formation. This is especially likely when compared to the simpler diachronic route the other particle sets appear to have taken. This may also explain why reconstructions of this neutral set of particles, as well as the reconstruction of both nominative and oblique forms, is less clear.

6.2 Yogad nu/ni

Both Blust (2015) and Ross (2006) reconstruct an /n/-initial set of particles as the genitive markers, which show clear similarities with the Yogad nominative/genitive particle pair nu/ni. The use of these /n/-initial particles as genitive markers will be discussed first, with a discussion of the Yogad particles nu/ni as nominative markers following.
Blust (2015) reconstructs *nu/ni/na, where *nu is used with common nouns, just as with the Yogad form nu. The other two particles are both used with personal names, with *ni used with singular personal names, and *na used with plural personal names. Ross (2006) reconstructs a four-particle set for the genitive markers with an additional fourth particle form *nia. The Ross (2006) analysis suggests that the particles *nu and *na are both used with common nouns, differing from the analysis by Blust (2015). The difference between the reconstructed particles *nu and *na in Ross (2006) is unclear. In his analysis, *ni is used with singular personal names, and *nia with plural personal names. While a link to this fourth particle is not found in Yogad, one can easily be found in Paiwan. The nominative/genitive particle in Paiwan used with plural personal names also has the form nia.

We can assume that the singular/plural distinction between particles was lost in Yogad, as this occurs frequently in many other Austronesian languages (Blust, 2015). There is a strong argument for losing this feature in Yogad specifically, as number is almost never grammaticalized in the language, with the exception of the personal pronouns. Following the particle set and uses provided by Blust (2015), this analysis would suggest *ni was extended to use with all personal names and *na fell out of use. At the same time, the use of *nu remained more or less unchanged. This process would produce the Yogad particle set nu/ni with a difference in what they modify only, and not in number.

### 6.2.1 The Nominative

Based on these reconstructions of the Proto-Austronesian particles, the genitive use of nu/ni may account for this particle set’s historical origins. However, the /n/-initial set of particles is used as nominative markers in Yogad and the three other languages studied in this work. Historically, it is unclear when this shift or broadening in meaning might have occurred. If nu/ni
are to be traced back historically to genitive markers, this analysis would require the particles to shift in meaning to mark the non-pivot subject of a phrase, while still maintaining their use as genitive markers in other environments.

If the particle set *su/si/sa are the original nominative marking set as Blust (2015) argues, they must have historically fallen out of use in Yogad or have become the language’s pivot markers. If they became pivot markers, then the genitive set *nu/ni/na may have taken on the role of nominative markers to replace them. If instead the particle set *ki/ka/ku are the original nominative markers as Ross (2006) argues, then *nu/ni/na may have likewise become nominative markers to replace them after they became the base of the pronoun set or disappeared in another way. Blust (2015)’s argument of *si/sa/su as the original nominative marking set is more compelling, as the change to a different type of particles—pivot marking particles—would cause a more motivated shift in meaning with the /n/-initial set being used with nominative meaning in addition to its other uses.

6.3 YOGAD tu

The historical origin of the Yogad particle tu poses some interesting questions for discussion. For the Proto-Austronesian locative marker, Blust (2015) reconstructs *du/di/da, while Ross (2006) reconstructs only one form in this set: *da. Blust (2015) and Ross (2006) both suggest that the meaning of these locative markers has shifted in many modern Austronesian languages from locative case markers to oblique case markers. As such, this is a likely origin for the oblique marking particle tu in Yogad. However, if that is the case, then an explanation is needed for the change from /d/ to /t/. There is no proof of a regular phonological change devoicing /d/ from Proto-Austronesian to Yogad; the Yogad word for water is danum (Davis & Mesa, 1999), while the reconstructed Proto-Austronesian word for water is *daNum and the
Proto-Malayo-Polynesian word for water is similarly *danum (Blust & Trussel, 2020). This example provides evidence that there was no regular phonological shift from /d/ to /t/ in Yogad or other languages.

Therefore, another possible explanation for the origin of Yogad *tu is that a new form arose and took the place of the reconstructed /d/-initial set. Blust (2015) does not make reference to any case marking particles with an initial /t/ in his work. However, Ross (2005) reconstructs *ta and *tu as part of the oblique series in Proto-Malayo-Polynesian. Ross (2005) describes the subfamily of Malayo-Polynesian as including any Austronesian language spoken outside of Taiwan, including those spoken in the Philippines. As an Austronesian language spoken in the norther Philippines, Yogad falls under this subfamily. As such, it is logical for the reconstructed forms of Proto-Malayo-Polynesian to be more similar to those of Yogad, as this reconstructed subfamily is diachronically closer to Yogad than Proto-Austronesian. Ross (2006) also lists locative particles from other modern Austronesian languages that have a devoiced initial consonant, such as the languages Thao and Siraya whose locative markers both have the form *tu (p.529), just as with Yogad and the /t/-initial particles found in Paiwan (Chang, 2006). In addition, if the analysis of a /t/-initial set replacing the /d/-initial set is accurate, the fact that Ross (2005) reconstructs Proto-Malayo-Polynesian *ta and *tu as oblique markers fits with the analysis in both Blust (2015) and Ross (2006) that the /d/-initial set historically were locative markers that later shifted to oblique markers. As well, this shift towards an oblique meaning as opposed to only a locative one, aligns with the broad meaning that can be captured by this particle in Yogad.

It is not unusual that Yogad has a single particle form for the oblique, instead of Blust (2015)’s reconstructed three-term set, as Blust (2015) provides evidence from many languages
where this is the case, and Ross (2006) reconstructs only the single particle *da for the locative. Blust (2015) cites only Ivatan as synchronically maintaining a three-term particle set in the locative that still contrasts common nouns, singular personal names, and plural personal names, with the forms du/di/da (Reid, 1966). However, this three-term-system may be falling out of use, as only a one-term system with du for the locative and all other Ivatan particles is given in Hidalgo & Hidalgo (1970; 1971).

Given this evidence, the diachronic processes that led to the Yogad form tu can be hypothesized as follows. The set of locative particles in Proto-Austronesian, *du/di/da, was replaced at some point by a /t/-initial set, perhaps with the split of Proto-Malayo-Polynesian. The meaning of this particle set would have also extended its use from exclusively the locative to all objects as the oblique marker. This may have happened alongside the introduction of the /t/-initial set, or later. This change may have been motivated by or the cause of the disappearance of the oblique set, whether the oblique set was /k/-initial or /s/-initial. Regardless of whether this was a two- or three-term set at this point, Yogad lost all forms used for the personal names, maintaining only the form with /u/ used with common nouns, and extending its use to personal names as well.

In Yogad, any argument that is not the pivot or the subject is preceded by the particle tu; this includes locative arguments. Yogad has completely lost the locative distinction across the language, as there is synchronically no exclusively locative marking particle, nor a unique verbal affix for the locative voice. It is typologically interesting that it is the locative voice in particular which has been lost in Yogad and not the instrument voice, since the instrumental distinction appears to be less grammaticalized cross-linguistically, seen through the lack of instrumental marking particles either synchronically or in reconstructions. However, Yogad has instead
maintained the instrument voice, and has lost the locative voice, alongside the typologically regular loss of the exclusively locative marking particle.
7. CONCLUSION

In this work, I have provided a background on relevant concepts to the study of Yogad morphology and the language family. I have analyzed and discussed the Yogad verbal affixes, case marking particles, and personal pronouns, and how they compare to three related Austronesian languages: Hiligaynon, Ivatan, and Paiwan. I have presented and analyzed data from my work with Yogad language consultant Corie Mesa Lareza Quirante, with the aim of providing more depth into my analysis of the Yogad verbal affixes, and how they are differentiated within the language. Following my consultation, I revised and refined my proposed glosses, and summarized my analysis of Yogad morphology. I have also presented a diachronic discussion of the Yogad case marking particles, comparing the forms in Yogad with two different reconstructed particle sets in Proto-Austronesian.

I provide evidence that Yogad is a typical Philippine-type Austronesian language, and not an outlier in its language family. I take a restrictivist approach to language description in this work, using both my comparative analysis and diachronic discussion to situate Yogad in the broader context of the Austronesian language family. My analysis builds upon the data and analysis provided in Davis et al. (1997). Through my research into relevant theory, my comparative study, and my work with Yogad language consultant Corie Mesa Lareza Quirante, I propose novel glosses for the central features of Yogad morphology. These glosses are proposed based both on analyses of related languages and the language family, making note especially of the Austronesian voice debate. I propose two sets of glosses, one which follows the Austronesian voice analysis, and the other which follows the ergative-absolutive analysis. My description is informed both by theory, and by comparative analysis.
It is my hope that this work will lead to further research on the Yogad language, as there are still many unanswered questions. One possible area for further research is the differences between the verbal affixes. I provide an initial analysis of the differences between each verbal affix, but many of these distinction are still not quite clear. This is especially true of the actor voice affixes/intransitive markers. Another area of interest for future research is the way in which the verbal affixes can combine in a given sentence to express a novel meaning. In this work, I focus on the meanings of single verbal affixes and not combinations, though I provide a few examples from my data and the work of Davis et al. (1997). One such example is the benefactive voice/benefactive applicate formed with affixes -i- and -an used in combination. Despite the fact that only a few affix combinations are presented here, it is clear that there are many ways in which affixes can combine to form new meanings. Another direction for future research is that there are words in Yogad other than the particle pair ju/si which can mark the privileged argument. One example of this is with wara 'there is', the existential clause marker, an example of which can be seen in sentence 34 wara mansanas tu=alikud nu=kartun 'there is an apple behind the box', which has no apparent pivot/absolutive marker besides wara. This appears to be true of the demonstrative as well, which were not covered in this work. These are simply three examples of outstanding questions about Yogad and areas for further research; there are many aspects of the language that still call for further study.
### APPENDIX

**Table 11:** Past and non-past verbal affixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOGAD</th>
<th>HILIGAYNON</th>
<th>IVATAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;inum&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;um&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;um&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nag-</td>
<td>naga-</td>
<td>maga-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nag-</td>
<td>nag-</td>
<td>mag-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>naŋin-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>naka-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;in&gt;</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>na-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p&lt;in&gt;ag-</td>
<td>pag-</td>
<td>gin-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gina-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gin-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gin-</td>
<td>-(h)ən</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paiwan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>past</th>
<th>non-past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>na-...&lt;əm&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;əm&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-in</td>
<td>&lt;in&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s&lt;in&gt;i-</td>
<td>si-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;in&gt;...-an</td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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