

PRONOMINAL REFERENCE IN THE IVATAN NARRATIVE

VIRGINIA LARSON

Summer Institute of Linguistics

(Received August 1, 1971)

0. INTRODUCTION

Ivatan¹ points up a problem of the economy of participant identification. Pronouns are used whenever possible to refer to participants,² yet there is usually enough information in the text that the native speaker has no difficulty in keeping his reference straight even when pronoun reference is potentially ambiguous, as when several characters are all referred to in the third person singular. In fact, overuse of explicit references such as noun phrases would be considered an unnatural style. This paper deals with the principles by which participants are identified when pronouns are used.

First of all, in a narrative one or two, and at the most three, participants are involved in the action at any one point in the story (Grimes ms), remembering that two or more individuals may act in concert as one group participant.

Looking at participants in a single event as the agents, experiencers, patients, or other cases in case grammar (Fillmore 1968) permits a ranking of the participants in an action based on their degree of involvement. From this a *reversal* operation may be applied to help identify the participants. Reversal (Wise and Lowe ms, Grimes ms) changes the ordering of two items so that the one that ranked lower in case in one action becomes the higher ranked and the one which ranked higher becomes the lower in the next. The complete ranking is from high to low involvement: agent, experiencer, source, goal, patient, instrument, noninstigative cause, benefactive, factitive, range, essive, and zero.

¹Ivatan is spoken by approximately 10,000 people living in the province of Batanes in the Philippines to the north of Luzon in the Luzon Strait and separated by the Bashi Channel from the southern tip of Taiwan. It is also spoken by several thousand Ivatans in Manila and in settlements on Mindanao. Reid 1966, Cottle and Cottle 1958, and Hidalgo and Hidalgo 1970 describe lower levels of Ivatan. This description is based on texts gathered by Morris and Shirley Cottle in 1955-56 and 1959-61 and on materials gathered by the author in trips to Batanes since 1967. This analysis was made during a three month workshop in 1971 at Nasuli, Bukidnon, Philippines, partially supported by the National Science Foundation. I am grateful to Joseph E. Grimes, who conducted the workshop, for his help in the preparation of this paper. Informant help was given by Miss Fausta Balinton of Basco, Batanes.

Use has been made of a concordance of 50,000 words of text made on the computer at the University of Oklahoma by the Linguistic Information Retrieval Project of the Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Oklahoma Research Institute, funded by another National Science Foundation grant.

²The pronouns in Ivatan (Reid 1966) are the following: Nontopic subject: *ko* 'I', *mo* 'you', *na* third person singular, *ta* 'we inclusive', *namen* 'we exclusive', *nio* 'you all', *da* third person plural. (The following will appear in the same order): Topic subject: *ako*, *ka*, *sia*~ ϕ , *ta*, *kami*, *kamo*, *sira*~*sa*. Topic nonsubject: *yaken*, *imo*, *sia*, *yaten*, *yamen*, *inio*, *sira*~*sa*. Nontopic associative: *niaken*, *nimo*, *nia*, *niaten*, *niamen*, *ninio*, *nira*. Nontopic object or referent: *diaken*, *dimo*, *dia*, *diaten*, *diamen*, *dinio*, *dira*.

1. REVERSAL BETWEEN CLAUSES

Between consecutive independent clauses within the Ivatan sentence (Larson ms), when reference to two participants is clear in the first clause and one or both are referred to by pronouns in the second, reference is established by the presence or absence of the reversal signal *am* or *amna*, which also conveys surprise, 'and' or 'but'. This is seen in the following examples: *nidichan na ava as no nakakamet na so pakoh naw ni Jose as kalidlid na sia as kapasoysoy na sia AMNA nyeng a mapodid*. (ducked he neg instead gripped he relation-marker shoulder his relation-marker Jose and-then shake he him and-then push he him REVERSAL immediately link topple.) 'He (Tako) did not duck, instead he gripped Jose's shoulder and then he shook him and then he pushed him AND immediately he (Jose) toppled.' Jose is patient up to the last clause and Tako is agent, and agent outranks patient; but the reversal particle *amna* signals that the higher ranked Tako is now lower ranked. Since *podid* 'topple' takes only one case adjunct, an experiencer, this must refer to Jose and the lower ranked Tako is not referred to at all.

Another example from the same narrative: *as kapayplot na sia di Tako AMNA nivalat na* (and-then beat he him relation-marker Tako REVERSAL blocked he) 'and then he (Jose) beat at Tako with it BUT he (Tako) blocked it'. The same thing happens between adjacent embedded clauses that are at the same level of embedding: *ta do vata na am³ maypisa o solto di Tako AMNA makaycheh* (because relation-marker think he link once relation-marker strike relation-marker Tako REVERSAL sleep) 'because what he thought was that one strike at Tako AND he (Tako) will sleep.'

Within sentences other conjunctions indicate that no reversal occurs. These connect clauses in a chaining effect (Thurman ms) in that the subject is predicted to be the same as the subject of the last clause. Conjunctions of this nature are (1) *as* 'and', which connects independent clauses in coordinate sentences, (2) *as ka-* 'and then', which connects independent clauses in sequence sentences with regard to the order in which they happen, and (3) *as 'so'*, which links a circumstance with the resulting action in circumstance-result sentences.⁴ *as* 'and' is illustrated in the following example: *Do nakapayhojihoji na am navoya da no anak na sa aya no maytakekey aya AS payayaman da sia*. (When moved he link saw they relation-marker child his they this relation-marker farmer this AND play they he) 'When it moved, this farmer's children saw it AND they played with it.' *as 'so'* and *as ka-* 'and then' are both seen in the following example: *Chinasi na aya no maytakekey aya AS inahap na AS Kapesek na sia do bolsa na*. (Pitied he this relation-marker farmer this SO got he AND-THEN put-in he him relation-marker pocket he.) 'This farmer pitied it SO he took it AND THEN he put it into his pocket.'

2. REVERSAL BETWEEN SENTENCES

Reversal without the reversal particle *am*, *amna* operates in two ways between sentences within the paragraph. The first is with the use of a linking clause (Thurman ms). When a dependent linking clause beginning with *do* 'when' repeats some of the information given in the previous sentence, the following independent clause manifests a change in

³*am*, homophonous with the reversal signal that operates between independent clauses, expresses a link without reversal between dependent sentence margins and independent sentence nuclei.

⁴These categories of Ivatan sentences are distinguished in Larson ms.

subject, or reversal. Both participants must appear in the linking clause. They may or may not be identified fully. This is illustrated in the following example: . . . *as payayam da sia. Do kapayayam DA aya SIA NO ANAK SA AYA NO MAYTAKETAKEY AYA am ichakey NA SA a sonyiten.* (. . . and play they he. While play THEY this HE RELATION-MARKER CHILD THEY THIS RELATION-MARKER FARMER THIS link want HE THEY link bite) ‘. . . and they played with it. While THIS FARMER’S CHILDREN played with IT, IT wanted to bite THEM.’ The agent ‘they’ of the linking clause, because it is in a linking clause, goes to secondary rank in the main clause that follows it, where ‘he’ is the agent. An example of a linking clause in which the participants are not identified fully is the following: . . . *nakavoya so asa ka mavaheng do rarahan. Do nakavoya NA aya SIA am mayhojijohi ava* (. . . saw relation-marker one relation-marker black relation-marker road. When saw HE this HIM link move neg) ‘. . . he saw one black thing on the road. When HE saw IT, IT did not move’. This illustrates that with reversal, an explicit pronoun may not even be needed.

The second expression of reversal between sentences occurs when there is no linkage if the action is such that a typical reaction or result is expected (Ballard et al. 1971). Some typical action-reaction pairs are *Pinaypaket ni Jose Mayet as pagchidan NA DIA so baso. Mapia ta chinaydichan NA . . .* (more-angry relation-marker Jose Strong so throw HE HIM relation-marker glass. Good because ducked HE . . .) ‘Jose the Strong became more angry so HE threw a glass at HIM (Tako). It is good that HE (Tako) ducked . . .’ *Pinanma o MAHAKAY AYA a patahaman do ichan aya. Kwanasaw am mayoran. Makey a mayliliak am makapayliliak ava.* (First topic-marker MAN THIS link taste relation-marker meat this. Later link dizzy. Want link speak link able-to-speak neg.) ‘SHE had THIS MAN taste the (poisoned) meat first. Later HE was dizzy. HE wanted to speak but HE was unable to speak.’ *Nawara as katovatova NA SIA no bako as kano haneng no nyoy. Naypapia as kapakakan NA.* (Arrived and-then give-medicine HE HIM relation-marker tobacco and oil relation-marker coconut. Became-well and-then able-to-eat HE) ‘HE arrived and then HE treated HER with tobacco and coconut oil. SHE became well and then SHE was able to eat.’

This reaction may also be in the form of a non-event (collateral, Grimes 1971) which tells what expected thing did not happen in contrast to what less typical thing did. This is seen in the following example: . . . *pirwan NA somolto SIA. Nidichan NA ava as no nakakamet NA so pakoh naw ni Jose* (. . . again HE strike HIM. Ducked HE neg and relation-marker gripped HE relation-marker shoulder his-that relation-marker Jose) ‘. . . again HE (Jose) struck HIM (Tako). HE (Tako) did not duck; instead HE (Tako) gripped Jose’s shoulder’. The same type of reversal is seen in a dialogue when the speaker is agent in one quotation and the response to him is given by another agent. Response is expected even without the complete quotation formula, and may consist of such words as *engga* ‘no’, *onta* ‘why?’, *oon* ‘yes’, *onas* ‘of course’, etc., and sometimes may be a vocative which gives the name of the person spoken to and eliminates him as the possible speaker (Elkins ms). An example of this is the following: *Kwanasaw do karayi naranaw am vinata na, “ENGGA as na an akmay ibhes mo pa yaken.” “ONTA ang?” kwana.* (Later when far he-now-that link said he, “NO and particle if like stop you yet me.” “WHY what?” he-said.) ‘Later when he (Tako) was far already he (Tako) said, “NO, and suppose you stop teasing me.” “WHY, what?” he (Jose) said.’

3. THEMATIZATION

Thematization is another key to pronominal reference. The theme (Hooker ms, Hohulin ms) of the discourse is developed through the paragraphs and sentences of the

discourse. Clauses also identify their own theme by focus inflections on the verb together with either a topic marker before a noun phrase or with the topic set of pronouns (Reid 1966).

The theme of the paragraph is the participant most often in clause focus. The paragraph theme often is second in case rankings within clauses unless a reversal gives it highest rank. So unless there is reversal, the participant in clause focus is the one who is theme of the paragraph and pronoun reference is not ambiguous.

On the other hand, nonfocused items also retain their relative rankings unless there is reversal, and a change of orientation (Wise 1968) comes only with explicit reference to the participant who takes over highest rank unless there is reversal indicated. Thus in a paragraph, in looking at the events, pronouns tend to refer to the participants in the rankings they assumed at the beginning of the paragraph unless this is changed by reversal or explicit reference without change of setting. An example of this is in a stretch of speech where Jose has been established already as topic for the stretch. *Sinopit na o lagaw naw ni Jose as kapseh na sia. Iangay da sa a paysiayen am akma konoy asiro o kakakamay na saw as napakaro da ava. Arava o mapaparin na asna no rida na am tominwaw dana ta akma danay nadiman. Pinayanitan narana ipamhes . . .* (Squeezed he relation-marker neck his-that relation-marker Jose and-then choke he him. Went they them link separate reversal like reportedly steel relation-marker fingers his they-that and able-to-remove they neg. Nothing relation-marker able-to-do he and relation-marker tongue his link stuck-out now because like now dead. Voluntarily he-now let-go . . .) 'He (Tako) squeezed Jose's neck and then he (Tako) choked him (Jose). They went to separate them but his (Tako's) fingers were reportedly like steel and they were not able to do so. There was nothing he (Jose) could do and his (Jose's) tongue stuck out because he (Jose) was like dead. Voluntarily he (Tako) released (Jose) . . .' This paragraph has Jose as theme; all the action is toward him until the reversal. Tako continues to be the initiator of actions throughout except for *da* 'they-in-general' in the second sentence. ('They' is not a major participant (Stennes 1969) and may come into the discourse or be dismissed without formal notice.) *Na* 'he' in the last sentence refers to the agent Tako, but is not marked as a reversal. Possibly the information in 'voluntarily' is enough to establish an orientation change in a manner similar to the action-response discussed earlier, since the point was just made that Jose was not in a position to do anything voluntarily. In this same paragraph, all non-events refer to Jose, the theme of the paragraph: *Arava o mapaparin na . . .* 'There was nothing he (Jose) could do . . .'

Topicalization is the function of two *do* 'when' clauses in which theme rather than linkage is established. Not a repetition but new information is given in these *do* dependent clauses. In the first example below the *do* clause consists of one participant in the matrix clause and an embedded clause. This participant in the matrix clause is also the participant in the following independent clause and theme of the paragraph. Thus no reversal occurs after the *do* clause but the *do* clause itself is a device for bringing about a change in participant orientation. *No ina na aya no mavakes aya am ichaddaw na ava ta mian o sivog na a ichakey a pakakovotan sia a matarek a mahakay. Do kavoya sia NO MAHAKAY aya o kadi na aya somangan NIA ni ina na aya am mangsah . . .* (Relation-marker mother her this relation-marker girl this link love she neg because existential relation-marker usual she link wants link cause-to-marry her link different link man. When saw he RELATION-MARKER MAN this relation-marker neg she this pay-attention-to HIM relation-marker mother her this link sad . . .) 'This girl's mother, she did not love him because there was

another man she wanted her to marry. When this MAN saw that her mother did not pay attention to HIM, HE was sad . . .’

A similar means of topicalization contains only one participant in a sentence initial *do* ‘when’ clause, the participant being the lower ranked one in the preceding independent clause. This is a device for not only thematizing the participant in the dependent clause, but also preparing the way for bringing into the discourse a new participant as agent of the independent clause that follows the *do* clause. The participant in the *do* clause is always a low ranked participant in the independent clause that follows and is established as theme of the paragraph. . . . *as kananaya na sia o kapayhojijohi NA. Do nakapayhojijohi NA am navoya da no anak na sa aya no maytaketakey aya as payayaman da SIA.* (. . . and wait he relation-marker move HE. When moved HE link saw they relation-marker child his they this relation-marker farmer this and played they IT.) ‘. . . and he waited for IT to move. When IT moved, this farmer’s children saw IT and they played with IT.’

Sentence topicalization, which puts a part of the sentence in front of the verb, is another way of indicating paragraph⁵ theme. It may set the participant that is the sentence topic as theme for the following sentences until a new theme is established, perhaps as soon as the following sentence. An example of sentence topicalization is seen in the following example: *SI JOSE MAYET AYA amna midiw ano chinasnekan as isitnan NA a maypesa do paydakawan aw. Pabhehbesan da am arava o adngeyen NA. Nawri vatahen NA . . .* (TOPIC-MARKER JOSE STRONG THIS link crazy when shamed so begin HE link break relation-marker store that. Stop they reversal nothing relation-marker listen HE. That say HE . . .) ‘THIS JOSE THE STRONG, HE is crazy when HE is shamed so HE began to break things in that store. They tried to stop HIM but HE listened to nothing. That is when HE said . . .’

Explicit reference with a noun phrase rather than a pronoun is used to establish participant orientation at the beginning of a new paragraph along with a shift in time, setting, or scene. Explicit noun phrases also appear within the paragraph at times to allow a shuffling of case rankings when this is not brought about by a reversal, or, when no reversal is involved, to refer to a participant who has been uninvolved for a time. Minor participants may be referred to as ‘his wife’ or ‘this farmer’s children’ rather than by naming them explicitly and thus establishing an independent reference for them that would change the orientation. Major participants are usually established in the introduction of the discourse, and often named as Maria, Jose, Juan or given a title: ‘the blind one’, ‘the farmer’, ‘the snake’ etc.

Anaphoric text reference (Hooker ms) seems to operate within the clause to specify participants from their earlier appearance in the text: *na aya* (he this) ‘this one referred to earlier’ in contrast to another one, or within some sentences to refer to ‘that one’ *naw* (he-that) and ‘this one’ *na aya*, defined not situationally but textually. This has not yet been fully studied and no clear cut reference rules have been found.

⁵ It is not completely clear whether the paragraph is the unit of thematization here, or whether the thematic span begun by topicalizing a sentence is only loosely connected with paragraphing, or even whether the paragraph as such is needed as a unit in Ivatan.

REFERENCES

- VIRGINIA AUSTIN. 1966. Attention, Emphasis, and Focus in Ata Manobo. Hartford Studies in Linguistics No. 20.
- D. LEE BALLARD, ROBERT J. CONRAD, and ROBERT E. LONGACRE. 1971. "The Deep and Surface Grammar of Interclausal Relations". *Foundations of Language* 7:1.70-118.
- ALTON F. BECKER. 1965. "A Tagmemic Approach to Paragraph Analysis", *College Composition and Communication* 16:5.237-242.
- RICHARD E. ELKINS. ms. "Pronominalization in Western Bukidnon Manobo Folktales Discourse".
- CHARLES J. FILLMORE. 1968. "The Case for Case", *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, ed. by Emmon Bach and Robert Harms, 1-88. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- JOSEPH E. GRIMES. 1971. "Kinds of Information in Discourse". To appear in *Kivung*.
 _____ ms. "Participant Orientation".
- CESAR A. HIDALGO and ARACELI C. HIDALGO. 1970. "Ivatan Morphology: The Predicatives". *The Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 1.9-51.
- RICHARD H. HOHULIN. ms. "Cohesive Organization in Kallahan Keley-i".
- BETTY HOOKER. ms. "Cohesion in Ivatan".
- GEORGE LAKOFF. ms. "Pronouns and Reference".
- VIRGINIA LARSON. ms. "Sentence in Ivatan".
- ROBERT E. LONGACRE. 1968. *Discourse, Paragraph and Sentence Structure in Selected Philippine Languages*, Vol. 1. Santa Ana: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- LAWRENCE A. REID. 1966. *An Ivatan Syntax*. Honolulu, Hawaii: Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 2.
- MARGARET SHEFFLER. ms. "Munduruku Discourse".
- LESLIE HERMAN STENNES. 1969. *The Identification of Participants in Adamawa Fulani*. Hartford Studies in Linguistics No. 24.
- ROBERT C. THURMAN. ms. "Chuave Medial Verbs".
- JAMES WHEATLEY. ms. "Pronouns and Nominal Elements in Bacairi Discourse". To appear in *Linguistics*.
- MARY RUTH WISE. 1968. *Identification of Participants in Discourse: a Study of Aspects of Form and Meaning in Nomatsiguenga*. University of Michigan doctoral dissertation.
- MARY RUTH WISE and IVAN LOWE. ms. "Permutation Groups in Discourse".