

Appendix 2

Cebuano: when DOM evidence is inconclusive

Classifying Cebuano case marking with regard to DOM is not straightforward for three reasons. First, the structure of the case marking paradigms for common nouns is different from those for personal names and pronouns. Second, there are different marking options for dative case, resulting in different possible DOM classifications. Third, common nouns are generally marked for specificity in most grammatical functions, which easily leads to confusions as DOM often also involves specificity differences. We start with the last point.

In Cebuano, common nouns in non-subject functions are marked by either *ug* or *sa*, as seen in examples (1)a and (1)b where *ug* marks a non-specific core argument, and *sa* a specific one. Importantly, however, *ug* and *sa* do not only occur with non-subject *undergoer* arguments but with all types of non-subject core arguments, including agents, experiencers, and instruments. They also are used to mark specificity with regard to possessors: *nanay sa bata'* (mother OBL.SPEC child) ‘mother of the child’ vs. *anak ug hari'* (offspring OBL.NSPEC king) ‘offspring of a king/kingly offspring’ (Himmelman 2005: 145). Given this distribution, the differences between these two proclitics per se do not constitute a case of DOM. Rather, they are similar to case-marked (in)definite articles: in German, for example, direct objects can occur with either a definite or an indefinite article in the accusative, a constellation that is generally not considered to be an instance of DOM. DOM proper involves the use of different cases for the same grammatical relation. Cebuano *ug* and *sa* mark the same case, i.e. oblique.¹ Personal names and pronouns, in turn, distinguish genitive and dative case forms, and use dative for non-subject undergoers (cp. (1)c and (1)d).

(1) CEBUANO, no DOM

- a. *Mag-luto'* *ang* *babaye* *ug* *bugas* *sa* *lata.*
 AV-cook NOM woman OBL.NSPEC **rice** OBL can
 ‘The woman will cook rice in the can.’ (Bell 1976: 7)
- b. *Mag-luto'* *ang* *babaye* *sa* *bugas* *sa* *lata.*
 AV-cook NOM woman OBL.SPEC **rice** OBL can
 ‘The woman will cook the rice in the can.’ (Bell 1976: 54)
- c. *Ning-sugo'* *ako* *kang* *Rosa* *sa* *pagdagang.*
 AV.RLS-order 1SG.NOM DAT PN OBL running
 ‘I ordered Rosa to run.’ (Bell 1976: 42)

¹ This is how *ug* and *sa* are generally analysed in the literature, but other options have also been proposed. Evaluating these alternatives would require a study of its own.

- d. *sige=ko-g pangita' kanimō*
 ASP=1SG.NOM-LK AV:find 2SG.DAT
 'I have been looking for you.' (Tanangkingsing 2009: 58)

As illustrated by Table 1, in Cebuano the case forms for common nouns, on the one hand, and personal names and pronouns, on the other, are not isomorphic. Hence, it is not possible to claim that dative marks specific non-subject undergoers, while genitive is used for non-specific ones (as in the case of Tagalog and the other languages discussed so far). On the basis of the marking options shown in Table 5, the conclusion would be that there is no DOM in Cebuano, even though there are obvious similarities to the Tagalog state of affairs.

	TAGALOG			CEBUANO		
	Genitive	Dative	DOM	Genitive	Dative	DOM
Common nouns	<i>ng</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>ng/sa</i>	<i>ug</i> (NSPEC)		-
				<i>sa</i> (SPEC)		
Personal names	<i>ni</i>	<i>kay</i>	<i>kay</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>kang</i>	
Pronouns (1SG)	<i>=ko</i>	<i>sa akin</i>	<i>sa akin</i>	<i>=ko/nako'</i>	<i>kanako'</i>	

Table 1. DOM-related case marking in Tagalog and Cebuano, non-isomorphic variant.

A further complication arises because three different dative forms exist for pronouns, and two for personal names.² For pronouns, one alternative for marking dative involves the proclitic *sa* plus the oblique stem form of the pronoun, i.e. *sa ako'* instead of *kanako'*, as illustrated in example (2).

(2) CEBUANO, alternative dative form for personal pronouns

- kung na'a=y mo-invite sa ako'*
 if EXIST=NEUT AV-invite DAT 1SG.OBL
 'If (somebody) invites me, ...' (Tanangkingsing 2009: 108)

If we entered this dative form into Table 1, replacing *kanako'* in the dative column, the overall structure of the paradigm would not change, as the forms for pronouns would still be isomorphic with the ones for personal names, and not the one for common nouns. But,

² The available literature does not provide an account of the factors that govern the use of the alternative dative forms. An exception is Wolff (1965) who characterizes pronominal datives with *sa* as "dialectal", occurring mostly in Cebu City. There are also various disagreements in the literature on the distribution of the different case forms. It is thus clear that more research is needed to fully understand how case marking and DOM work in Cebuano, and that our discussion here is of a preliminary nature. For the purposes of our discussion, we simply assume that the variation is primarily dialectal.

superficially at least, the system would look more similar to a standard Type I system in that, among other things, the same formative *sa* marks specific common noun and pronominal non-subject undergoers.

Turning to the other option for marking datives, which applies to both personal names and pronouns, the overall picture changes more radically. In this option, the forms labelled genitive in Table 1 are generalized to all non-subject core argument functions, including non-subject undergoers, as illustrated in example (3)a-c.

(3) CEBUANO, with generalized oblique non-subject arguments

- a. *sige=ko-g pangita' nimo*
 ASP=1SG.NOM-LK AV-find 2SG.OBL
 'I have been looking for you.' (Tanangkingsing 2009: 58)
- b. *ning-sa'ad=ko=nimo nga tabang-an=tika ani*
 AV-promise=1SG.NOM=2SG.OBL COMP help=LV=1SG.GEN:2SG.NOM this
 'I promised to you that I'd help you (with) this.' (Tanangkingsing 2009: 58)
- c. *na-anad=na=mi ni Petra*
 ST-get.used.to=already=1PL.EXCL.NOM OBL PN
 'We have gotten used to Petra.' (Tanangkingsing 2009: 58)

In this variant, then, the distribution of case markers for personal names and pronouns is identical to the one for common nouns (Table 2). This, in turn, leads to an overall isomorphic paradigm. The conclusion regarding DOM, however, does not change. In this variant as well, Cebuano would not show DOM because there is no marking that is only found with non-subject undergoer arguments.

	TAGALOG			CEBUANO	
	Genitive	Dative	DOM	Oblique	DOM
Common nouns	<i>ng</i>	<i>sa</i>	<i>ng/sa</i>	<i>ug</i> (NSPEC)	-
				<i>sa</i> (SPEC)	
Personal names	<i>ni</i>	<i>kay</i>	<i>kay</i>	<i>ni</i>	
Pronouns (1SG)	<i>=ko</i>	<i>sa akin</i>	<i>sa akin</i>	<i>nako'</i>	

Table2. Tagalog and Cebuano paradigm in comparison.

While the conclusion 'no DOM' holds for all variants of the Cebuano system, the preceding discussion illustrates once more the importance of the precise shape of the case-marking formatives and the structure of the paradigms these formatives belong to for diagnosing DOM.

References

Bell, Sarah Johanna. 1976. *Cebuano subjects in two frameworks*. PhD Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2005. The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar: Typological characteristics. In Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelman (eds.), *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 110–181. London and New York: Routledge.

Tanangkingsing, Michael. 2009. *A Functional Reference Grammar of Cebuano*. Taipei: National Taiwan University dissertation.

Wolff, John Ulrich. 1965. *Cebuano Visayan Syntax*. New Haven, CT: Yale University dissertation.