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0. INTRODUCTION

In Charles Fillmore's paper on the features of a universal base, he argues for a universal system of deep-structure cases, the explanatory value of which is of a syntactic nature. He says:

The various permitted arrays of distinct cases occurring in simple sentences express a notion or "sentence type" that may be expected to have universal validity independently of such superficial differences as subject selection. The array of cases defining the sentence types of a language have the effect of imposing a classification of the verbs in the language (according to the sentence type into which they may be inserted), and it is very likely that many aspects of this classification will be universally valid.1

In our study of Ivatan,2 using a tagmemic model, simple sentences (clauses) were typed according to clause expansion features or in Fillmorean terms, according to arrays of cases occurring in simple sentences. It was found out that the different sentence types correlate with various predicative types. Specifically, the different cases in the sentences are related to affixes in the predicative. It was also found out that not all affixes occur with all types of predicatives. The potential affixes in a predicative are restricted by stem type and other occurring affixes. This close relation between syntax (i.e. the array of cases occurring in a simple sentence) and the morphological structure of the predicative underscores the need for a closer scrutiny

*Research on Ivatan (one of the Philippine languages) has been supported in part by grants from the Social Science Research Council, University of the Philippines, the Linguistic Society of the Philippines, and the Rockefeller Foundation. Paper read at the 26 International Congress of Orientalists, Canberra, January, 1971.
of predicative morphology, for a better understanding of Ivatan syntax and, presumably, the syntax of the other Philippine languages. This study of predicative morphology (in consonance with syntax) is especially relevant when we take into consideration the fact that a number of cases or in tagmemic terms clause nuclear tagmemes in Ivatan do not obligatorily occur. Their implicit presence is signalled by a predicative affix. Consider:

1. Naparutung si ina su manuk.
   \[
   \begin{array}{ccc}
   P & S & O \\
   \text{caused-cook} & \text{fm mother} & \text{fm chicken} \\
   \end{array}
   \]
   'Mother caused (someone) to cook chicken.'

2. Ipanutung ya.
   \[
   \begin{array}{ccc}
   P & T/A \\
   \text{cook-with} & \text{dem} \\
   \end{array}
   \]
   '(Someone) cooks with this.'

3. Umuyug u ranum.
   \[
   \begin{array}{ccc}
   P & T/S \\
   \text{flow} & \text{fm water} \\
   \end{array}
   \]
   'Water flows.'

In 1, the indirect object (Y) does not occur overtly. It is known to occur implicitly between speaker and hearer and may occur explicitly because of the causative affix \{pa-\} in the predicative naparutung 'caused-cook'. In the case of 2 and 3 the surface structures appear to be similar (i.e. both sentences consist of two elements, a predicate and a topic), but the underlying structures of the two are quite different. In 2, the structure of the predicative signals that the topic manifested by ya 'this' is associative instrument (\{pa-\}). The predicative also signals the potential occurrence in the sentence of the subject and object functions. In 2, the speaker-hearer knows that these functions implicitly occur. In 3, the focus affix which is also an intransitiviser \{um-\} indicates plainly that no object function can potentially occur.

This paper attempts to present the relation between syntax and the morphological structure of the Ivatan predicative.

1. THE PREDICATIVE STEM

The predicative is a class of words that manifest features such as focus, tense, voice, or aspect (which are absent in the other form classes) and that fill the predicate slot of clauses other than the equational clause. It may, however, manifest non-predicate tagmemes on the
clause level generally manifested by nominals. Except for a few ad-
jectival predicatives, it consists of at least two morphemes - a stem
and an affix and may potentially consist of a stem and layers of affixes,
including the suprasegmental morpheme stress or length.

The predicative stem may be simple or derived. Ivatan has nine types
of simple stems (basically the verb stem, numeral stem, adjective stem,
and common noun stem) which are formally distinctive on the basis of af-
fixational potential. Affixes considered in categorising the simple
stems are those that have bearing on syntax. These include both focus
and voice affixes. Classifying, then, the simple stem types by their
syntactically relevant affixational potential, they are thus categorised
by the potential syntactic constructions into which they may participate.

1.1 THE SIMPLE STEM

The nine simple stem types may be labelled as follows: 1) verb stem 1
(vs1) which is generally an inherently transitive verb stem, i.e. it may
take the transitive voice affix {N-}\(^3\) without having to be affixed with
a derivational affix that will then allow the prefixation of {N-};
2) verb stem 2 (vs2) which is generally an inherently intransitive verb
stem; 3) noun stem 1 (ns1) which is a concrete noun such as amung
‘fish’; 4) noun stem 2 (ns2) which is an abstract noun pertaining to an
emotion such as adaw ‘love’, amu ‘fear’; 5) noun stem 3 (ns3) which is a
concrete noun pertaining specifically to meteorological conditions like
chimuy ‘rain’, chidat ‘lightning’; 6) noun stem 4 (ns4) which is an
abstract noun pertaining to a quality such as avid ‘beauty’, pya ‘good-
ness’, karang ‘tallness’; 7) noun stem 5 (ns5) which indicates the
period of the day and which may either be a bound form or a free form,
e.g. –kuyab ‘afternoon’ and ahep ‘night’; 8) numeral stem (nums) such as
pitu ‘seven’, wahu ‘eight’; and 9) adjectival stem (adjs)\(^4\) such as dekey

1.2 THE DERIVED STEM

The derived stem consists of a core manifested by either a ns1, ns3,
or ns4 root and a derivational affix or consists of a ns1 plus a plur-
alariser. The derivational affix is limited to a morphologically func-
tional affix which increases or decreases the focus or voice affixational
potential of the simple stem. Unlike the voice affixes which also in-
crease or decrease the focus affixational potential of the simple stem,
the predicative derivational affix is not syntactically relevant in
signalling potential slots in syntax as the voice affixes do. Consider:
4. adaw 'love' \( \text{madaw} \ (\text{Sf}) \) \hspace{1cm} \text{versus} \hspace{1cm} \text{-adadaw} \hspace{1cm} \text{mangadadaw} \ (\text{Sf}) \\
\text{ichadaw} \ (\text{Af}) \hspace{1cm} \text{adadawen} \ (\text{Of}) \\
\hspace{1cm} \text{ipangadadaw} \ (\text{Af}) \hspace{1cm} \text{pangadadawan} \ (\text{Rf})

This simple noun stem 2, adaw, is inflectible for only two non-predicate focuses: subject and associative and thus the syntactic construction into which adaw as a predicative stem enters are unexpandable beyond the subject and associative slots in terms of nuclear clause tagmemes. The derived stem \(^5-\text{adadaw}\), however, may be inflected for subject, object, associative, and referent focuses so that the syntactic constructions into which -adadaw enters into are more complex in terms of potential clause expansion. For a case of a decrease, consider:

5. avid 'beauty' \( \text{makavid} \ (\text{Sf}) \) \hspace{1cm} \text{versus} \hspace{1cm} \text{-avyavid} \hspace{1cm} \text{mayavyavid} \ (\text{Sf}) \\
\text{kaviren} \ (\text{Of}) \hspace{1cm} \text{ipavyavavid} \ (\text{Af}) \\
\text{ipakavid} \ (\text{Af}) \hspace{1cm} \text{payavyavidan} \ (\text{Rf}) \\
\text{pakaviran} \ (\text{Rf})

In the case of avid, ns4, the derivational affix decreases the affixational potential of the stem. The simple stem avid may be affixed with the augmentative \{ipa-\} or the possessive affix \{ka-\} which makes it possible for the stem to be inflected for object focus and thus allows the predicative to enter into a transitive construction. If avid were affixed with a derivational affix, the resulting stem -avyavid cannot be affixed with \{ipa-\} or \{ka-\} and the predicative with this stem participates only in an intransitive construction. The augmentative affix \{ipa-\} is an inner affix whereas the associative focus affix \{ipa-\} is an outermost affix.

The predicative derivational affix is a reduplicative affix (usually the first or first two syllables of the root are reduplicated). Affixation of the derivational affix to the noun root generally results in a bound form, e.g. -sasalawsaw from salawsaw 'wind'. A case when the non-simple noun stem does not result in a bound form is when a semantic change attends the stem change as in the non-simple stem conveying the diminutive, e.g. vavahay 'playhouse'.

In predicativizing a stem, the affixation of the derivational affix to the noun root results in a meaning different from the predicative the stem of which is simple, e.g. maybaka 'raise cattle' versus maybabaka 'crawl on all fours'. This change in meaning is also evident when a plural noun is predicativised. When kusikusina 'kitchen' is predicativised forming maykusikusina 'do the things related to the kitchen', kusikusina 'kitchen' becomes singular and the notion of plurality is attached to the activities connected with the kitchen. Or