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1 Basic geography

• Second-position pronominal and adverbial enclitics are present in every Philippine language to some extent. Their distribution has led to suggestions that such patterns be reconstructed to Proto-Malayo-Polynesian, the ancestor of all Austronesian languages outside of Taiwan.

• Outside the Philippines, we find far greater diversity in clitic types and positions.

• In Sulawesi, the 2P pattern for nominative clitics and adverbs is generally continued but genitive/ergative clitics become verb-adjacent proclitics. In languages of Southeast Sulawesi, more complex agreement patterns develop where both arguments are indexed by verbal morphology.

• In Borneo, the Philippine pattern is continued in northern subgroups like Dusunic but generally lost in other subgroups. Most Bornean languages seem to have lost 2P clitics and many have moved towards a more isolating type of morphology, in contrast to Sulawesi.

• In Sumatra, 2P clitics are rare but we find exactly the same development of genitive/ergative becoming verbal proclitics as seen in Sulawesi.

• Eastern Indonesia/West Papua is a very mixed bag. There are few generalizations that can be made except that they have all moved away from the Philippine system significantly. Overall, 2P pronominal clitics seem to be very rare here. Pronominal clitics have become agreement markers of different types.

2 Phonology

• What is a clitic? Modern thinking on clitics owes much to the work of Arnold Zwicky (Zwicky 1985, 1977) although an enormous amount of work precedes and follows (see Spencer and Luis 2012 and Anderson 2005 for recent reviews).

(1) CLITIC DIAGNOSTICS (Halpern 1995:14)
   a. being lexically stressless/acentless
   b. occupying one of a characteristic set of positions (2P, verb-adjacent, etc.).
The notion that clitics are phonologically dependent led to their common treatment as “prosodic affixes”, e.g.

(2) \textsc{prosodic subcategorization frame (Inkelas 1989, Zec & Inkelas 1990)}

$[\omega \rightarrow \omega]$ 

Philippine languages show very clearly that syntactic dependency is not contingent on prosodic dependency. Most (but not all) disyllabic clitics in Tagalog typically have homophonous non-clitic counterparts.

“While there may be languages for which a phonological account of the non-occurrence of clitics in phrase-initial position is possible, no well supported analyses of this kind have been presented. And in fact it is extremely unlikely that such a prosodically based account will be adequate in general. That is because some special clitics that must be placed post-initially are not prosodically deficient. Tagalog, for instance, has a huge system of clitics, most of which are prosodically autonomous and bear their own stress. There seems no phonological reason why these could not occur initially, and if they do not, that fact must be due to some other constraint.” (Anderson 2005:141)

This can be seen with the following disyllabic clitics \textit{kami} and \textit{sána} in Tagalog.

(3) \begin{align*}
\text{a. Kami ay nag-lútò ng=ampalaya} & \quad \text{b. Nag-lútó=kami ng=ampalaya} \\
1P.NOM & \quad \text{AV.PRF-cook=1P.EX.NOM} \\
\text{TOP} & \quad \text{GEN=bittermelon} \\
\text{‘We cooked bitter melon’} & \quad \text{‘We cooked bitter melon’}
\end{align*}

(4) \begin{align*}
\text{a. Sána ay mag-lútó=sila} & \quad \text{b. Mag-lútó=sána=sila} \\
\text{OPT} & \quad \text{AV-cook=OPT=3P.EX.NOM} \\
\text{TOP} & \quad \text{3P.NOM} \\
\text{‘Hopefully, they will cook.’} & \quad \text{‘Hopefully, they will cook.’}
\end{align*}

- | CLITIC | FREE |
  - | -na | ‘already’ | Ø |
  - | -pa | ‘still’ | Ø |
  - | -din | ‘also’ | Ø |
  - | -man | ‘even’ | Ø |
  - | -naman | ‘switch topic’ | (naman) |
  - | -nga | ‘emphasis’ | Ø |
  - | -lang | ‘only’ | Ø |
  - | -lámang | | lámang |
  - | -talaga | ‘emphasis’ | talaga |
  - | -pò, =hò | ‘politeness’ | Ø |
  - | -pala | ‘surprise’ | Ø |
  - | -yátà | ‘perhaps’ | Ø |
  - | -sána | ‘hopefully’ | sána |
  - | -náwa | ‘hopefully’ | náwa |
  - | -ba | ‘question marker’ | (baga) |
  - | -daw | reported speech | Ø |
Prosodic weakness is often equated with prosodic dependency but this need not be the case. I argue that clitics are prosodic words, but still deficient compared with lexical words. Much like Wackernagel’s (1892) original treatment of the Germanic verb: a phonological/prosodic word but one that had “lost its accent”.

2.1 Prosodization of clitics

- A number of phonological phenomena (vowel lowering, glottal deletion, tapping) support a prosodic structure as in Figure 1.
- Monosyllabic and disyllabic clitics are adjuncts to prosodic words and prosodic phrases.
- Enclitics form a single prosodic phrase with their host but proclitics adjoin to the left edge of the prosodic phrase.
- There thus exists a prosodic phrase boundary between proclitics and their hosts.

![Figure 1: Prosodization of clitics in Tagalog](image)
• It is no coincidence that proclitics are *syntactic heads* of phrases (e.g. case markers, complementizers, etc.), unlike enclitics, which express adverbial and inflectional features.

(5) a. \[\text{CaseP}\{\text{an}=\text{NP}\{\text{guːroʔ}\}\}\text{nom}=\text{teacher}\]  
   ‘the teacher’

b. \[\text{CP}\{\text{kuŋ}=\text{IP}\{\text{umalis...}\}\}\text{cond}=\text{left}\]  
   ‘if SUBJ left’

• The basic mapping between syntax phrases and prosodic phrases can be handled by a constraint/algorithm such as (7).

(6) \text{ALIGN} (XP L,R; PPh L,R)

For every overtly headed syntactic phrase, there exists a prosodic phrase such that the L and R edges of the prosodic phrase are aligned with the L and R edges of the syntactic phrase.

• Monosyllabic words are thus not parsed into prosodic words. They are parsed directly at the prosodic phrase level. The phonology of monosyllabic proclitics is thus different from monosyllabic lexical words (loans).

  – Schachter and Otanes (1982:15) state: “Monosyllabic words of native Tagalog origin – e.g. the markers ang, sa, si, etc. – never have inherently long vowels. The vowels of monosyllabic loan-words from English and Spanish, on the other hand, are always inherently long.”

• The prosodic status of proclitics vs. enclitics has consequences in the segmental phonology, e.g. in tapping:

(7) \text{TAGALOG TAPPING}  
\[d \rightarrow r / V\_V\]

• (8) and (9) shows how a /d/-initial word cannot be tapped after a case marker but must be tapped root internally.

• (9) additionally shows that /d/-initial function words, which are not prosodic word heads, allow tapping as long as the function word is not initial in the prosodic phrase. When the function word is initial in the prosodic phrase, as in (10), tapping is blocked.

(8) \[\varphi[\text{cl}=\varphi[\omega[\text{host}]=\text{cl}=\text{cl}]]\]  
\[\text{sa datti pa rin} \quad \text{cf. } *\text{sa ratti pa rin}\]  
\[\text{sta-live=}3\text{p.nom here}\]  
\[\text{Here they live.}\]

(9) \[\varphi[\omega[\text{host}]=\text{cl}=\text{cl}=\text{func}]\]  
\[\text{nakatira sila riːtɔ} \quad \text{cf. } \text{nakatira sila diːtu}\]  
\[\text{diːtu=sila} \text{here}\]  
\[\text{They live here.}\]

(10) \[\varphi[\text{comp ip}][\text{func} ...] \varphi\]  
\[\text{hindiːkɔ alam=na diːtu sila nakatira}\]  
\[\text{hindiʔ=ku neg=1s.gen know=comp here=}3\text{p.nom sta-live}\]  
\[\text{I didn’t know they live here.}\]
2.2 Intonation

• How does the prosodic structure posited earlier effect intonation?

• Initial edge tones are anchored to the left edge of either a maximal or embedded prosodic phrase. Final edge tones are anchored to the right edge of the maximal prosodic phrase. When a phrase begins with functional heads (case markers, determiners, plural markers) there is some flexibility as to where the initial edge tones dock.

• The following example shows how an initial PPh edge tone docks to the plural marker maŋa rather than the following lexical word. (This seems to be a significant difference with at least English.)

(11) [maŋa baːtaːŋaː palasila]
/maŋa=baːtaʔ=ŋaʔ=pala=sila/
PL=child=EMPH=MIRA=3P,NOM
‘They are really children!’

Figure 2: Enclitics and intonation

3 Morphology: cluster-internal ordering

• All Philippine languages allow clustering of pronominal and adverbial clitics (although almost all languages impose some restrictions on what pronominal clitics can co-occur).
• Every imaginable factor can play a role in determining the order of clitics within a clitic cluster.

• Syllable count is the primary factor in Tagalog. Within the 1σ and 2σ domains, case and scope determine ordering.

• Figure 3 shows the ordering of adverbial clitics in the clitic cluster.

Figure 3: Cluster-internal clitic ordering in Tagalog

• The mere role of phonology in determining clitic order contravenes the fundamental premise of “late-insertion” models of morphology.

• That this is an active constraint in the grammar is clear from the positioning of new adverbial clitics, which are also positioned according to syllable count, e.g. (12).

(12) hindiː=ŋaː=sila=siguːro d<um>atîŋ
NEG=EMPH=3P.NOM=maybe <AV>arrive
‘Maybe they really didn’t arrive.’

• A major question with regard to scope: Do all 2P clitic clusters respect scope relations in a left-to-right manner?

• Garifuna, a VSO Arawak language, shows identical ordering of clitic functions, e.g.

TENSE< EVIDENTIAL< SPEECH ACT

(13) Ka=ba=funa=san a-yanu-ha Garifuna n-uma?
who=FUT=SPEC=QM vrb-speak-vrb Garifuna 1s.G-with
‘(I wonder) who will speak Garifuna with me?’ (Andy Palacio, Amunegu)

• When case comes into play in clitic ordering, it always positions genitive clitics before nominative ones, reflecting the unmarked order of arguments in conservative MP languages.

• This case-based ordering principle can also be interpreted as Agent> Patient, even though it applies more widely (experiencers, possessors, etc.). In certain Formosan languages, thematic
role can be teased apart from case and it appears to be the former which determines ordering (Billings and Kaufman 2004).

- In other Philippine languages (mostly of Mindanao), it is a person hierarchy that determines order, as in Maranao:

(14) **MARANAO CLIC ORDERING**
.ba=ako=ŋka  diʔ ka-taw-i?
QM=1S.NOM=2S.GEN NEG NONV=KNOW=DEP.LV
‘Am I not known to you?’ (McKaughan 1958:22, Kaufman 2010a)

(15) a. HOST=ako=ŋka  b. HOST=ŋka=siran  c. HOST=iran sekaniyan
   =1S.NOM=2S.GEN =2S.GEN=3P.NOM =3P.GEN 3S.NOM

- The same type of ordering is shown in the Manobo languages, as shown in (16) with Sarangani Manobo (DuBois 1976:48)

   <PV.PRF>see=1S.GEN=3P.NOM
   ‘I saw them.’
   b. K<in>ità=a=dan.
   <PV.PRF>see=1S.NOM=3P.GEN
   ‘They saw me.’

- In many cases where the genitive agent pronoun precedes the nominative pronoun, the latter can only appear in its free form. The clitic is blocked. (This is infelicitously referred to as ‘disformation’ in Billings and Kaufman 2004 and a few other places).

- However, at least in Maranao, the free form in this case can still the regular (2P) position of clitics, as in (17). (No full argument can go between negation and the verb in Maranao and Philippine languages more generally.)

- I would consider this a case of coercion of a free form into a clitic position, a wider phenomenon that has been described by Billings 2005 and Kaufman 2010b, chap.2.

(17) Di=ko sekə pe-leka-an
   NEG=1S.GEN 2S.NOM FUT-open-LV
   ‘I will not open it for you.’ (McKaughan 1958:18)

- In other related languages, there are no constraints on which argument cliticizes but only one argument can do so:

(18) **OBO MANOOB** (Brainard & Vander Molen 2005)
   a. Od suntuk-on=du siyak
      IRR hit-PV=2S.GEN 1S.NOM
      ‘You hit me.’
   b. Od suntuk-on=a nikkow
      IRR hit-PV=1S.NOM 2S.GEN
      ‘You hit me.’
   c. *Od suntuk-on=a=du
      IRR hit-PV=1S.NOM=2S.GEN
   d. *Od suntuk-on=du=a
      IRR hit-PV=2S.GEN=1S.NOM
4 Syntax: positioning clitics within the clause

- As mentioned earlier, genitive/ergative clitics make their way from 2P to the verb in a wide range of Austronesian languages.

- I argue in Kaufman 2009 that this has to do with the development of a canonical verb from something that looks more like a historical nominalization. Subject/Agent agreement is far more common on bona fide verbal categories than nominalizations.

- The first hints of verbal attraction can already be seen in certain Philippine languages, e.g. Agutaynen:

  (19) Agutaynen
  a. I-tabid=ami nandia
     irr:pv-accompany=1p.nom 3s Obl
     ‘S/He will include us’ (Quakenbush 2005)
  b. Indi=ami i-tabid=na
     neg=1p.nom irr:pv-accompany=3s.gen
     ‘S/He will not include us.’ (Quakenbush 2005)
  c. Indi=o=ra=lamang i-tabid=mo!
     neg=1s.nom=already=just irr:pv-accompany=2s.gen
     ‘Just don’t include me!’ (Quakenbush & Ruch 2006:9)

- The person hierarchy also comes into play in determining the position of clitics within the clause.

- The gradual move from 2P enclisis to proclisis in the languages of Indonesia follow a strict 1<2<3 hierarchy. This is true for both Sumatra and Sulawesi, where intermediate stages can be seen best.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old Malay</th>
<th>Karo Batak</th>
<th>Gayo</th>
<th>Clas. Malay</th>
<th>Minangkabau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG.</td>
<td>ni-V-(ŋ)ku</td>
<td>ku-V</td>
<td>ku-V</td>
<td>den-V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG.</td>
<td>(ni-V-māmu)</td>
<td>i-V-ŋkō</td>
<td>i-V-kō</td>
<td>kau-V</td>
<td>anj-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.</td>
<td>ni-V-ŋa</td>
<td>i-V-na</td>
<td>i-V-é</td>
<td>di-V-ŋa</td>
<td>iño-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EXCL</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>i-V-kami</td>
<td>kami-V</td>
<td>kami-V</td>
<td>kami-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.INCL</td>
<td>ni-V-(n)ta</td>
<td>si-V</td>
<td>kitō-V</td>
<td>kita-V</td>
<td>kito-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL.</td>
<td>ni-V-māmu</td>
<td>i-V-kam</td>
<td>i-V-kam</td>
<td>kamu-V</td>
<td>kau-V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL.</td>
<td>ni-V-(n)da</td>
<td>i-V-na</td>
<td>i-V-é</td>
<td>di-V-mereka</td>
<td>iño-V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Person marking in the patient voice (Kaufman 2014)

- In Old Malay, all transitive agent pronouns were enclitic (or suffixal), as in Philippine languages.
(20) **Old Malay**

\[\text{a.} \quad \text{ni-galar-ku} \]
PV-title-1SG.GEN
\'
It titled (him).’ (Karang Brahi r.9, 14-15, Kota Kapur r. 4,8)

\[\text{b.} \quad \text{ni-minuŋ-ña} \]
PV-drink-3SG.GEN
\’He drank (it).’ (Talang Tuwo r. 5)

- In an interesting case of degrammaticalization, the proclitic agent was reanalyzed as an independent syntactic position.

- Kaufman 2014 argues that the “wedge” in this case was the use of kin titles in place of pronouns for politeness. Eventually, these titles were modified to further increase deference (e.g. ‘slave’s master’ for 2nd person) and at this point there was little evidence that the titles occupied a verb-adjacent clitic position.

(21) \[\text{telah hamba}^{[1]}=\text{ampun-i=lah} \quad \text{dosa dan ke-salah-an} \quad \text{meréka itu} \]
already slave=forgive-APPL=EMPH sin and NMLZ-WRONG-NMLZ 3PL
\’I (slave) have already forgiven their sins and errors.’
(Bayan Budiman 214:27)

(22) \[\text{Hamba}^{[1]}=\text{lah bayan yang tuan hamba}^{[2]}=\text{pelihara-kan dahulu itu} \]
slave=EMPH parrot RELT master slave=care.for-APPL earlier that
\’It was I (slave) who was the parrot you (slave’s master) cared for at the time.’
(Bayan Budiman 14:26)

- In more formal registers of Indonesian, there is still a robust 1/2 vs. 3 distinction in the use of titles. These can only refer to 1st and 2nd persons.

(23) **“IMPOSTER” PROCLISIS PARADIGM**

\[\text{a.} \quad \text{Mana yang akan bapak}^{[2]}=\text{pilih?} \]
which RELT FUTURE father=choose
\’What will sir/father (you) choose?’

\[\text{b.} \quad \text{Mana yang akan bapak}^{[1]}=\text{pilih?} \]
which RELT FUTURE father=choose
\’What will sir/father (I) choose?’

\[\text{c.} \quad \text{Mana yang akan di-pilih bapak?} \]
which RELT FUTURE PV-choose father
\’What will sir/father (he) choose?’

- More exotic clitic positions are attested in eastern Indonesia. One of the most bizarre is found in Manggarai, an SVO language with clause-final pronominal clitics that double the subject! (Possibly the grammaticalization of a right-dislocated subject.)
Manggarai

a. Hia pa’u eta mai bubuŋ mbaru hitu=i
   3s fall above from top.roof house that=3s.nom
   ‘(S)he fell down from the top roof of that house.’ (Arka & Kosmas 2005:90)

b. Latuŋ hitu cero l=aku=i
   corn that fry by=1s=3s.nom
   ‘The corn is (being) fried by me’ (Arka & Kosmas 2005:95)

5 Theoretical considerations

- Three interesting theoretical topics:
  - Clitic coercion: Full phrases that are dragged into clitic positions (and vice versa).
  - Defining 2P: What counts as the host? A prosodic word? A syntactic phrase?

- The idea that clitics and phrasal syntax belong to two different worlds (e.g. morphology and syntax) cannot be correct, as there is plenty evidence for significant interaction.

- In the following types of sentences, a clitic appears in an unambiguous clitic position (in this case, between negation and the verb) but is coordinated or modified by a phrase. Not all such examples are judged as perfectly grammatical but I have collected many naturally occurring examples, many of which are judged so.

(25) hindi [=ko at naŋ=maŋa=kasamahan=ko=ŋ Filipina] kailanman s<in>irà
    NEG=1s.gen and GEN=pl=colleague=1s.gen=lnk Filipina ever
    <pv.prf>destroy
    naŋ=tiŋin nom=
    naŋ=iba gen=other
    sa=ámin obl=1p.gen
    ‘Neither I nor my Filipina colleagues ever destroyed the view of others towards us.’ (Kaufman 2010b:26)

(26) Saan [=kayo=ŋ lima] nag-tuloy matápos kayo=ŋ maka-babà
    where=2p.nom=lnk 5 av.beg-continue after 2p.nom=lnk av.nvl-descend
    naŋ=Bus?
    GEN=bus
    ‘Where did you five continue to after getting off the bus?’ (Kaufman 2010b:34)

- As has now been discussed by several authors (Spencer and Luís 2012; Anderson 2005), different types of clitics may define 2P differently within a single language:

  “The abiding impression is that Tagalog clitics are sensitive to very specific aspects of specific grammatical constructions. It may well be, of course, that with sufficient ingenuity we might unearth a small set of simple, abstract principles governing such behaviour, but it is rather more likely that systems such as this are irreducibly idiosyncratic and require
direct reference to specific constructions or to a relatively unstructured list of component grammatical properties.” (Spencer and Luis 2012:176)

(27) [Bukas=ba naŋ=gabi] ay [sa~sayaw=silə naŋ=pandango]? tomorrow=QM GEN=night TOP AV=INCM~dance=3P.NOM GEN=fandango ‘Tomorrow night, will they dance a fandango?’ (Schachter and Otanes 1982:429)

• In fact, it’s not as terrible as Spencer and Luis (2012) make it out to be. The scope of the clitic (e.g. phrase, clause, sentence) determines its placement and...
• the clitic must be visible to the constituent in which its positioned. That is, it can’t be embedded in a sub-constituent, as in (28-b), where =ka is embedded within a fronted oblique phrase.
• This may not be too different from how adverbs with clausal scope are positioned in languages like English, as shown in (29).

(28) determining 2P in Tagalog: predicates vs. fronted focus phrases
a. kaníno=ka=ŋ anak?
obl.who=2s.nom=lnk child
‘Whose child are you?’
b. kaníno[*=ka]=ŋ anak[=ka] nag-bigay naŋ=pérà?
obl.who=2s.nom=lnk child=2s.nom av.beg-give GEN=money
‘To whose child did you give money?’

(29) IP[(Perhaps) we (✓) will (✓) buy (✓) DP[another (*) fancy (*) pair (*) of (*) shoes]] (✓).

• The domain of a clitic is determined both by its semantic scope and syntax. In most Philippine-type languages, genitive clitics are bound within DP, that is, they cannot cross the edge of DP. But in those languages where there is no morphological signal for the DP edge, as in Chavacano, the boundary itself disappears.

(30) CEBUANO Tagalog Chavacano
‘What did they do?’ ‘What did they do?’ ‘What did they do?’

• Much of clitic typology can be summed up in three principles:

(31) Prosodic Asymmetry Generalization
Rightwards prosodic attachment is coerced by direct morphosyntactic constituency.

(32) Edge Asymmetry Generalization
Syntactic displacement of a clitic from the edge of its host only occurs on the host’s left boundary

(33) Syntactic Displacement Constraint (Kaufman 2010:128)
Unambiguous (branching) heads of phrases are never displaced to 2P
• “Ditropic clitics” (Type 1 in Fig. 4), or enclitic prepositions, are borne of a need to begin a prosodic phrase with a prosodic word head (PrWdHd), which is typically associated to a lexical word rather than a functional word.

(34) **Limos Kalinga**

a. Naŋ-anup dadit tagu=t bolok  
   `AV.PRF-hunt PL.NOM person=OBL pig`  
   ‘The people hunted pig.’ (Ferreirinho 1993:12, Kaufman 2010b:154)
Himmelmann (2014) argues convincingly that ditropic clitic behavior stems from:

- **Processing factors**: function words are easily activated and may precede lexical choices, and
- **Discourse factors**: certain types of function words can act as floor-keeping devices.

The items that become ditropic clitics are delimited by Himmelmann thus:

> "The basic idea is that the relevant set of function words has to (i) be preposed and project a specific construction with a specific target that signals the possible syntactic completion of the unit thus projected. Such constructions could be called target-specific constructions." (Himmelmann 2014:931)

Where does this leave “pure” prosodic factors?

It seems to me that pronominal and adverbial clitics could act as excellent floor-keeping devices but they never behave as ditropic 1P clitics. Ditropic clitics are overwhelmingly case markers, prepositions, coordinators and subordinators.

> "Although a change in position may occur in grammaticization processes (e.g. a preposed function word becomes a postposed one), it is generally the case that grammatical elements do not change position relative to their hosts once they have reached the clitic stage. Thus, proclitics usually become prefixes and enclitics usually become suffixes (see also Bybee et al. 1990:3, passim)." (Himmelmann 2014:931)

This is true for branching heads but not true for non-branching heads (pronominal clitics, adverbial clitics), even though pronominal clitics give an excellent preview of a following predication (by telling us how many arguments there are and what features they have).

We still need a division between branching morphosyntactic heads and non-heads. Branching heads are fixed in their position and may become ditropic for the reasons posited by Himmel-
mann (2014) as well as prosodic reasons. But 2P clitics avoid phrase-initial position solely for prosodic reasons and they do this in a different way.

- Finally, how is the class of clitics determined if they are not phonologically dependent? In Philippine languages, they are a functional class defined by their “weak” semantics. This can be seen clearly in mixed languages like Kolehiyala English (Bautista 1996) and Chavacano (Forman 1972).

(35) \textit{Send=you} naman=ako \textit{picture} nina \textit{Jodi} at \textit{Cholo} nun

\textit{send=you=EMPH=1s.NOM} \textit{GEN picture GEN.PR.PL} Jodi and Cholo when

\textit{bata=pa=sila.}

\textit{young=still=3s.NOM}

‘Send me a picture of Jodi and Cholo when they were young.’

(36) \textit{I-pasa=you} naman sa akin yung \textit{novel summary}...

\textit{CV.INF-pass=you=EMPH OBL 1s} that\textit{.NOM.LNK} novel summary

‘Pass to me that novel summary...’

(37) \textit{Call=you} naman=ako

\textit{call=2sG=EMPH=1s.NOM}

‘You call me!’

(38) \textit{Add=mo=me}

\textit{add=2s.GEN=me}

‘Add me!’

6 Summing up

- Austronesian clitics offer a wealth fascinating data with implications for every corner of grammar. Some of the more burning questions involve acquisition, language contact and details of positioning and prosodization, as well as the historical development of the clitic and agreement systems of Indonesia and beyond.

- The variation, which I have not really been able to convey in this talk, is truly massive.
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