

Chapter 8

Causative Constructions and Requests

INTRODUCTION AND OUTLINE

Only one causative construction is generally given its due as being both causative as well as important to Cebuano verb morphology—the morphological causative that uses the affix *-pa-*—but this affix is only the tip of the iceberg in the world of Cebuano causatives. It is in part because of the derivative nature of Cebuano, and moreso the nature of language and the things we need to say, that causatives are so important, and it is because of the relatively inflectional nature of the European languages that linguists trained in the European generalities have overlooked what a core role is played in the development of Cebuano vocabulary by causative semantics. Derivation means words are built from words, and this happens in English & Co. too but not very systematically. In Cebuano there are so many systems for deriving “make x do y” by affixation and other means that there is no excuse for studying all these constructions in isolation from each other as has generally been done in the past.

After I “discovered” the Cebuano “emotive causative”, I happened upon a book on Tagalog grammar description¹ that uses the same kind of Causative terminology to describe the same voice construction, with the same kinds of affixes and roots. That’s the difference between learning Tagalog and Cebuano; in terms of those who’ve gone before me, in Cebuano it’s a few big names and a few small names, whereas in Tagalog it’s a whole genre comprising hundreds of books. It’s about time Cebuano stopped being underdescribed, starting with this volume.

Causative Basics

Three Types of Causatives

- periphrastic
- lexical
- morphological

Cebuano Causative Constructions

- periphrastic (verb pairs)
- [lexical \(the \[APB; ac\] conjugation\)](#)
- [emotive \(the \[b3c5\] conjugations\)](#)
- [reflexive \(MAKIG-/MAKI-\)](#)
- morphological (-pa-)
- bound lexical causatives (see>look, learn>teach, etc.)
- [causerless \(-hi-\)](#)
- [clause-based causation](#)

UNIVERSAL CAUSATIVE TYPES: PERIPHRASTIC CAUSATIVE or Px

¹ Cubar, Nelly I & Cubar, Ernesto H. *Writing Filipino Grammar*. Quezon City: New Day, 1994. 158-9.

Periphrastic just means phrase-based, or for short, “wordy”. Two verbs join together in the same clause to form a single meaning “make someone do X” or the like. Since joining two verbs resembles the expression of modalities as outlined in the last chapter, here is a quick review so you can tell them apart:

Comparison of Modal and Causative Predicate Pairs

Modal: The doer of the modality or aspect verb is also the doer of the content verb. There are no participants added by the addition of the modal predicate. Example: *Mosugód siyá sa pagpanday sa bag-ong baláy unyà.* He’ll *start building* the new house soon. (Means almost the same thing as the single-verb version because it has the same participant structure): *Mopanday siyá sa bag-ong baláy unyà.* He’ll *go ahead and build* the new house soon.

Causative: The doer of the causative verb or verb of manipulation meaning “cause, allow, force, challenge, invite, etc.” has a doee complement that is also the doer of the content verb—there are two doers. Example:

Magpasugód akó kaniya sa pagpanday sa bag-ong baláy unyà. I’ll *have him start building* the new house soon.

Still containing the same inceptive aspect combination of the same two verbs, the example of causative has added the morphological causative affix *-pa-* as well as a second doer, in this instance a new subj. Comparison of the two examples will show an additional participant in the causative sentence. Here is the analysis of the clause’s participants:

- *akó*, Causer-doer-subj of the causing event added by *-pa-*.
- *kaniya*, Causee-doe of the causing event as well as doer of the content verb *panday* “build”²
- *sa bag-ong baláy*, doee of the content verb: the thing getting built
 - in causative constructions, this is the SUB-DOEE, to differentiate it from the doee of the Causing event
 - in causativized intransitive verbs, the addition of a Causer increases the total participants to only two; there is still no doee of the main verb event—the content verb—so no Subdoee: *Magpaitóm akó sa ákong sapatos.* I’ll blacken (make black) my shoes. (from *naitóm* “be/come black”, which is intransitive, with only one participant)

In the morphological causative, the causative semantics were added by the affix *-pa-*. But in a periphrastic causative, *-pa-* is not used; instead, a two-verb combination will be used. The construction is exactly like the modal combination of two verbs except that an additional Causer-doer will be added. The verb of manipulation (the one that suggests “cause”) always comes first as the finite verb:

- *Tugoton nakò siyá’g panday sa bag-ong baláy.* I’ll *let him build* the new house.
- *Suholon nakò siyá’g panday sa bag-ong baláy.* I’ll *hire him to build* the new house.
- *Hiphipon nakò siyá’g uyon sa bag-ong baláy.* I’ll *bribe him to approve* the new house.
- *Pugson nakò siyá’g puyô dídto sa bag-ong baláy.* I’ll *force her to live* at the new house.
- *Akó ang mihangyò kaniya’g puyô dídto sa bag-ong baláy.* I’m the one who *asked her to live* in the new house.

² This is an excellent example of the concept that a doer doesn’t have to be a subj, but probably the only time you’ll see an obj serving as a doer in Cebuano. It’s because of the additional participant that such a thing occurs with the *-pa-* causative.

Although *panday* “build”, *uyon* “agree with, approve”, and *puyô* “reside at, live in” are only two-participant (transitive) verbs, these periphrastic causative clauses each have three participants since adding a verb of manipulation adds a Causer to the predication’s role prescription. In each example above, the new causer-doer is *nakò* or in the last one, *akó*. The purpose of this role analysis of causatives is mainly so that you will already know what to do with the third participant when you get to morphological (*-pa-*) causatives; to westerners the extra participant brought in by *-pa-* seems sort of like a third arm that’s in the way, as European languages don’t have a strong causative morphology.

How to mark the three participants? In the periphrastic causative, the finite (causative) verb always marks the Causer-doer and the Causee-doer according to its own prescription, so we know the doers are all used up; so the Sub-doe (doe of the non-finite or content verb) can’t be a subj. And since it’s a doe it can’t be a sub2 (genitive *doer*). And non-finite verbs in the *sa pag-* or *og ø-* pattern always mark their doe as obj, like the MAG- and MO- paradigms they belong to.³ Therefore, the subdoe of a periphrastic causative will always be obj since it is the doe of a non-finite verb. The rules are different when *-pa-* is used, since there is only one verb but two combined verb meanings; that topic will be covered later in this chapter.

UNIVERSAL CAUSATIVE TYPES: LEXICAL CAUSATIVE

Lexical causatives are verbs that are completely unique from a corresponding non-causative with the same basic semantic content, which will be a different word with a different root. Lexical causatives and their corresponding non-causative are not built morphologically from a root of the same meaning, they are a unique word unto themselves. For example, in English, “teach” and “learn” are unrelated words—not from the same root—but “teach” means “cause to learn”. “Kill” means “cause to die,” etc.

Lexical causative is the simplest causative to deal with as there is nothing to do; you don’t even have to know it’s a causative. The reason is that the causative semantic element is built into the verb meaning.

By the way—and this applies to all types of causatives—sometimes when you expect to see an added participant there won’t be one expressed in the sentence, for one of these reasons:

- A participant is assumed, known, not needed, thus ELLIPSED or not expressed for whatever reason.
 - “teach”: doer-causer causes someone to learn something (3 participants)
 - “He taught them the subject well.” (all 3 roles expressed by lexical causative—one verb)
 - “He taught the subject well.” (“them” is ellipsed)
 - “He taught them well.” (“the subject” is ellipsed)
 - “He got them to learn the subject well.” (all 3 roles expressed by periphrastic causative—two verbs, “got” and “learn”)
- Two participants are expressed by the same nominal.
 - *Magpatahóm silá.* They made themselves beautiful. (Since there’s only one verb it’s convenient to not mention the same nominal twice. This intransitive is made transitive and causative by *-pa-*. The longer (more obviously transitive) version would be *Magpatahóm silá sa kaugalingon.*)

³ Sometimes *pag-* verbs will have a doer but it will not be a subj because verbs marked *pag-* are participles or gerunds so will be marked as nouns instead of like MAG- verbs: *Sa pagkakitâ niya sa mgá tawo...* Upon his seeing the people... The doer *niya* is literally a possessive adjective, not a Grammatical Relation at all, just as in the English translation.

- Milugos ko'g iskwela bisa'g gihilantan ko. I forced myself to attend school even though I had a fever. wf (The first clause has two verbs linked by *og* but only one participant mentioned since the two participants—I and myself—are the same person. This is a periphrastic causative.)
- The corresponding non-causative word (a different root) is intransitive so the lexical causative word comes across as just a normal transitive verb.
 - Namatáy ang irô. The dog died. (intransitive; not causative)
 - Gipatáy níya ang iróng buang. He killed the mad dog. (transitive; as a periphrastic causative in English: “He made the mad dog die.”)

This table shows some pairs of words with the same semantic content, one causative and the other not. They are always going to be separate, unique words from different roots. Try to construct a similar chart in Cebuano using an English-Cebuano dictionary.⁴

CAUSE	+ CONTENT VERB	= LEXICAL CAUSATIVE	EQUIVALENT PERIPHRASTIC
cause	+ be aware	= find out	I caused myself to be aware of it.
cause	+ be aware	= take note, pay attention	I made myself be aware of it.
cause	+ be certain	= make sure, ascertain	I caused myself to be certain of it.
cause	+ be different	= change	I caused it to be different.
cause	+ be located	= situate	I caused it to be located there.
cause	+ believe	= convert, convince	I caused him to believe it.
cause	+ eat	= feed	I caused them to eat it.
cause	+ fall	= fell, cut/knock/take down	I caused him to fall.
cause	+ feel pain	= hurt	I caused him to feel pain.
cause	+ heal (up)	= cure	I caused him to heal up.
cause	+ hear	= listen to/for	I caused myself to hear it.
cause	+ know	= learn	I caused myself to know it.
cause	+ learn	= teach, inform, point out	I caused him to learn it.
cause	+ lie	= lay	I made him lie down.
cause	+ rise	= raise	I made him rise.
cause	+ ride	= board	I caused him to ride the kabaw.
cause	+ see	= show	I caused them to see it.
cause	+ see	= look at, watch	I caused myself to see it.
cause	+ sink	= sink (the boat)	I caused it to sink.
cause	+ sit	= seat	I caused them to sit.
cause	+ take	= send	I caused it to be taken.
cause	+ be a role	= appoint	He made him the bad guy.
cause	+ be known	= identify	He made it known.

⁴ While *matáy* “die” and *patáy* “kill” obviously came from the same root in antiquity, they are now used as roots themselves, not stems from a single root. They are lexically unrelated in modern Cebuano.

UNIVERSAL CAUSATIVE TYPES: MORPHOLOGICAL CAUSATIVE

We will briefly describe the several affixation schemes that add causative meaning, along with their lexical mapping or grammatical case markings to link the Grammatical Relations—subj, sub2 and obj—to the appropriate Semantic Roles, and finally we'll return to *-pa-* for the final word on the case markings of the participants of a verb made causative by *-pa-*. From here to the end of this chapter you will find information that is not available elsewhere! This will also be our opportunity to re-introduce lexical mapping which will be taken up in earnest in the next chapter. Without the information that follows, your Cebuano will not stand a chance.

First to review the most important facts that you have to understand before you can appreciate any causative construction.

Verbs from all classes come together in this one verb class, “Causative Verb” as soon as they take on morphological (Mx) or periphrastic (Px) causative construction. (Lexical causatives (Lx) belong to non-causative verb classes, for example, “kill”—which means “cause to die”—is in the same verb class as other verbs which change someone’s physical condition very permanently. The causativity of Lx is grammatically unimportant.)

So we have all kinds of different types of verbs living together under the new verb class “Causative” as soon as we add *-pa-* or any other morphology to change the verb into a causative. The thing that distinguishes one verb class from another is the verb’s SUBCLASSIFICATION which in this study we call its ROLE PRESCRIPTION: the kinds of Semantic Roles that a particular verb expects to see in a sentence, some required and some optional. With the new semantic verb class “Causative” we need a new role prescription. Here again are the Semantic Roles that a causatively grammaticized verbal clause expects to see:

1. Causer, an added doer role not part of the content verb’s original role prescription. Causer adds transitivity, and is the doer of the “causing event” whether it’s imported by a separate verb like *pugós* “force” or an affix like *-pa-*. In “I made her give it to me,” *I* is the causer.
2. Causee, the doer of the content verb, is also the doee of the causing predication. In “I made her give it to me,” *her* is the Causee. Don’t forget, Causee is both a doer and a doee.
3. Subdoee is the doee of the content verb, so if the content verb is intransitive (single participant), the causative version will have only two participants and no subdoee. In “I made her give it to me,” *it* is the subdoee.
4. Fourth participant, if there is one, is specific to the content verb only, like the subdoee. In our example, “I made her give it to me,” *to me* is the fourth participant, which in Cebuano could be marked in a variety of ways depending on voice.

As suggested just now, the voice alternations of Cebuano have a big effect on how these 2, 3, or 4 participants are marked by case to indicate whether they are subj, obj, sub2, or adjunct. Before we tackle this topic of lexical mapping with *-pa-* verbs, we’ll explain the simpler N-/M-/P- and other causatives.

MAKIG- (<): REFLEXIVE CAUSATIVE

Reflexive is when a referent (the real person or thing that a word names) is the same person or thing twice in fulfilling the verb’s role prescription. For example, in “He dressed himself,” there are two participants

semantically but they are both references to the same person. That is REFLEXIVE. The doer acts on himself, so the doer and doee are the same referent. But they are commonly mentioned twice, such as “he” and “himself”.

The N-/M-/P- affix MAKIG- (<) consists of the usual *na-/ma-/pa-* alternation as well as the element *-kig-* that contributes the reflexive content. Sometimes the *na-/ma-* is left off leaving only *kig-* or sometimes *tig-* with no mode marked.

Since this is an N-/M-/P- verb and two of its participants are used twice but expressed only once, it comes out like a normal two-participant verb with a doer-subj that is always the causer. So it is very easy to use. The p- form *-pakig-* is regular, that is, in step with its *n/m* cohorts, having the same sort of reflexive causative meanings when forming an imperative in the doer voice or a stem to which voicing affixes (-AN only) can be added.

But what does it *mean*? It’s easy:

Subj gets obj to do X with subj. A two-nominal clause, the second “subj” is not expressed. Like the other reflexive N-/M-/P- affixes, the (<) indicates that stress is usually on the penult, even if the root has final stress, once this affix is added. Some examples:

Nakig-away ang batà sa íyang manghod. The child got his younger sibling to fight with him.

Dilì makiggira and Pilipinas sa dakóng mgá nasod. The Philippines doesn’t go to war with big countries.

Makigdulà si SaySay ni Cyrus. SaySay will get Cyrus to play with her.

Ayáw’g pakigdulà ni Cyrus. Don’t get Cyrus to play with you. (The “you” is not expressed in an imperative when it is the singular “you”.)

Ayáw pakigkità níya’g usáb. Don’t see her again. (*níya* is short for *kaniya*. *og usáb* is the adverbial form, the adverb of manner which is a predicate modifier with *og* as predicate linker.)

Mapakigdulaan ni SaySay si Cyrus, apán nasukô siyá. SaySay would get Cyrus to play with her, but she’s angry. (The -p- form is used with added *ma-...-an* which is the potential of -AN. In this way potential modality and reflexive causative can be used in the same verb.)

Gipakigbungólan nakò siyá arón dilì pa siyá mangayo’g kwarta. I got him to shun me so he wouldn’t ask for any more money. (*-pakig-* combines with -AN only, not -ON or I-)

In comparison with the reflexive affix MAG- (<), this is causative but MAG- (<) is not. MAKIG- (<) has a causer and causee as separate nominals while MAG- usually has a single doer-subj that is plural in some sense since it comprises both parties involved in the doing-together. MAKIG- is volitional and comitative; MAG- (<) is just comitative:

- Nakigtambang siyá kaniya. He got her to help him.
- Nagtambang silá. They helped each other. (This would be less ambiguous, because of the non-reflexive meanings of MAG-, if it were):
- Nagtambangay silá. They helped each other.

IKA-: EMOTIVE CAUSATIVE

The affix *ika-* is the K potential form of I- but the affix set *-AN* can also be used. Here too the K potential is preferred but in any case, the N/M/M potential forms can be substituted, and occasionally you'll see the non-potential forms used for the same thing.

The paradigm for emotive causative then looks like this:⁵

MODALITY AFFIXES	FINITE		NON-FINITE
	Realis	Irrealis	(Surrealis)
-AN	gi-...-an	-an	-i
K (inchoative/potential)	gika-...-an	ka-...-an	ka-...-i
N/M/M (inchoative/potential)	na-...-an	ma-...-an	ma-...-i
I-	gi-	i-	i-
K (inchoative/potential)	gika-	ika-	ika-
N/M/M (inchoative/potential)	na-	ma-	ma-

What is emotive causative?

Did you ever feel an emotion and almost instinctively want to say, “X made me feel this anger/envy/jealousy/sadness/joy/etc.”? That is the purpose of emotive causative: to say “You made me happy.” “He made her jealous.” “They made them belligerent.” “That job made him bored.”

The lexical mapping is unique, a pattern found nowhere else in Cebuano. This is another good example of the truism that, *Grammatical Relations are not Semantic Roles; in Cebuano a subj can be any Semantic Role depending on the voice and a doer can be any Grammatical Relation depending on the voice*. In this construction only, the sub2 Grammatical Relation is not a doer. The sub2 is a doer-experiencer (in other voices, the experiencer is a doer role) and the doer-stimulus is the subj; various portions of the above affixation paradigm are favored by different roots (see below for the meaning of the codes following each example):

Gikalipay nakò ikáw. You made me happy. [c5 = I-]
 Gikasinahan nakò ikáw. You made me envious. [b3(1) = -AN potential only]
 Gisilosan nakò ikáw. You made me jealous. [b3 = -AN]
 Gisubô nakò ikáw. You made me sad. [c5 = I-]

To be fair, we must admit that according to how you translate/analyze this construction, the sub2 can be seen as a doer-experiencer and the subj can be seen as a Semantic Role “Reason”...

Gikalipayan nakò ikáw. I got happy because of you.

...but in favor of the “emotive causative” analysis, the “reason = subj” description is less useful because it:

⁵ There is a definite tendency for the pot-inc affixes to be used all the time with emotive roots, whatever the voice may be. This is true of all experiencer verbs, sensory verbs, conceptual verbs, etc. and has more to do with the state-related usage (inchoative aspect) than the potential modalities which are called out of the same affixes by the dynamic, action-oriented roots.

- makes the analysis dependent upon a two-clause translation with a dependent (adjunct) clause (“X happened...because of Y”)
- fails to take into account the causative verbal nature of the construction so it becomes an isolated factling, a construction seemingly unrelated to other constructions
- doesn’t account for the fact that only emotive roots assign subj to a “Reason” Semantic Role; the only dynamic roots that use it are ones that refer to such acts as laughing at something, making fun of someone, arguing about something, etc.—events with emotion at their core

We can still call the sub2 a doer, but we should not forget to mention the other facts: it is an experiencer, and the construction as a whole is a causative. Causatives should be kept together for the purpose of comparison. If it’s all about something causing something, it’s a causative and should be treated as one. Here are some more examples:

- Kay gikasilagan akó sa íyang amahan. For I made her father seethe with anger. apasumpay
- Ang pirmi nílang kagubtan maó ang kwarta. What always makes them argue is money. wf
- Ug sa daghang mgá katuigan, kiníng pamihag sa mgá Moros maó’y gikalisangan sa daghang mgá balangayng dapít sa kabaybayonan sa tibuók Mindanao. And for many years, this kidnapping by the Moros was what made many barangays situated on the coast of all Mindanao afraid. dbk7.1

An inspection of a good Cebuano dictionary will reveal more about emotive causative and other emotion-related predication schemes than can be detailed in a grammar book, since each root will have its own morphological habits. Especially recommended is the Wolff dictionary since it treats affixation patterns exhaustively for each root. In so doing it is also impossible for a dictionary to achieve perfection, especially since languages change from time to time and from place to place and the dictionary was published in 1972, but Professor Wolff, who later became Professor Emeritus in the linguistics department at Cornell University, spent several years in the field with a tape recorder and over 100 native informants, and the 1164 pages of his dictionary are by far the best investment you can make as a student of Cebuano when canvassing rare book shops for useful reference books on Cebuano.⁶

In the affix coding scheme used by Wolff, for example, a root that uses -AN to mark emotive causatives will be coded “b3” or “b3(1)” and a root that uses I- to mark emotive causatives will be coded “c5”. This sort of thing can be invaluable to the kind of student who really wants to get at the heart of Cebuano. A cursory examination of emotive roots of all kinds will reveal a strong preference on the part of these roots to admit affixes of the inchoative-potential persuasion. This goes along with the attraction of the secondary affix *-ka-* to roots that refer to states and conditions. What Prof. Wolff and others call “potential”, we in this study call “inchoative-potential” since stative roots call out the inchoative aspect of affixes containing or replacing *-ka-* but dynamic roots call out the potential modality of the same affixes.

A chapter in the theoretical section of this study will explore the affixation patterns of emotive roots more thoroughly. The importance of acquiring complete knowledge of how different verb classes interact with the available affixation schemes can’t be stressed enough.

-HI-: CAUSERLESS CAUSATIVE

⁶ The dictionary is also available on Cornell’s website for free use on the internet.

Here is a secondary affix with several forms that all have the same effect on the root, with the exception of some frozen forms and isolated phenomena such as motion verbs where *-hi-* sometimes seems to have no effect.⁷

The description “causerless causative” came about when this author couldn’t make sense of the way these obviously related affixes were being taught as isolated factlings:

-hi-, *-ha-*, *-hing-*, *-hang-*, *-hig-*, *-hag-* (and the same affixes combined with various affixes such as *-AN*)

In my search for a common thread “always true” of these affixes, once again it was causativity that came to the rescue, but in a very unexpected way.

Other authors have called *-hi-* an “accidental” modality or a “casual” modality as in “it just so happened...” and these descriptions are useful but not close enough. The observation has been made that “passivization” seems to take place, but this doesn’t happen with all roots so it can’t be the stopping place in trying to develop a description.

It was the word *hibilin* “get left behind” formed from the root *bilin* “leave behind” that confused this author sufficiently to shut off his brain completely just long enough to let the light find its own way in:

The affix *-hi-* is a causative construction whose added “causer” doer role is *definitely implied by adding this affix, but not explicitly named*. And since no causer is explicitly named, the grammar doesn’t reflect its existence.

What could be the use of that?

Haven’t you ever heard of the Fickle Finger of Fate? The Devil Made Me Do It?⁸ If you aren’t a student of 1960s American humor, let me clue you in: when we speak to each other, there is often a tendency to want to—kind of subliminally—hint around that the disaster at issue was caused by bad luck, circumstance, an unnamed entity, a man dressed in black...anything but to blame Yours Truly or anyone else...especially in the Philippines where it is rude to point the finger. Adding *-hi-* to a verb root makes it possible to say, in one syllable, “I didn’t do it, nor did you, but something made it happen.” Whether it’s “true” or not. Quickly glossing over whose fault it might be is very adaptable social behavior in the Philippines. The fact that the Causer is not mentioned in the sentence doesn’t make this easy to spot as a causative construction, but the way this affix is used is consistent once you know what the common thread is. Until you know the common thread that connects all its usages, you can only get lost trying to figure it out.

A few examples should make the meaning of *-hi-* obvious. As for the fact that *-hi-* is often used with motion verbs with little or no apparent added meaning, we’ll just make some tentative statements at this point:

⁷ But we’ll try to dream one up since we hate to be without a working hypothesis. We might mention as well that our attempts to use *nahiabót* have all been rejected by our informant in favor of *naabót*. His explanation is that *nahiabót* should only be used in reference to some kind of “calamity”. This fits the causerless causative description.

⁸ The Fickle Finger of Fate: “Rowan and Martin’s Laugh-In”; The Devil Made Me Do It: Flip Wilson; the man dressed in black: Bill Cosby

- *Nahiabót* means “showed up = just happened to arrive” whereas plain *naabót* just means “arrived/was able to reach”.
- You can’t add *-hi-* to any motion verb just whenever. This supports the notion that it is used for a specific purpose, even with motion verbs where it supposedly doesn’t mean anything. The context always means something in Cebuano, so it’s the context of a motion verb with a “meaningless” *-hi-* verb that has to be explored in order to root out its exact purpose.
- Motions can be the tacit result of other motions; for example, the verb *abót* “arrive” which often takes *-hi-* is regularly the result of (caused by) going someplace.

EXAMPLES OF CAUSERLESS CAUSATIVE

- Si Bebe *naghimuta’g* (*nagpahimuta’g*) *lingkod* sa silya. Bebe *got situated* sitting in the chair. wf
- Ang unà, nakapalangyaw kanakò ngadto sa layóng dapit diin buot ko na lang untà tudloan ang ákong kasingkasing sa *paghikalimot* kang Fe. The earlier time had made me distance myself to the far-off place where I hoped at least to teach my heart *to somehow forget* Fe. *apasumpay/navarra* (the heart is being influenced to do something somehow, a causative event)
- *Hipuyokán* ko sa ákong anák maóng milugwa'g ákong diyison. My son said something to me such that I had to fork over ten pesos. wf (The verbs *puyók* and *lugwà* match each other as well as the affix *-hi-*, with all three referring to a causative situation, someone being manipulated to do something.)
- *Mahigugma* si Divine kay Alison. Divine is in love with Alison. lblb (They say that the root *gugma* “love” when used as a verb cannot occur without *-hi-*. Doesn’t that just prove our point about *-hi-*? SOMETHING (GOD KNOWS WHAT) made her love him.)
- *Paghidailos* sa palad ni Asyong sa balighot nga gihimò niining timaan, nagpasabót nga mitugkad na ang batobato sa pasól nga íyang gihulog. When the knot that he made as a marker *slid past* Asyong’s palm, it let him know that the sinker of the fishing line that he’d cast had reached the bottom. usll (*-hi-* occurs in the first word of a short story, with a motion verb, to add the sense that the reader has broken in on the middle of an event that is the result of another event.)

-hi...-an (incidental)	(na)(hi)...-an, (na)(hing)...-an, (na)(ha)...-an (>)	(ma)(hi)...-an, (ma)(hing)...-an, (ma)(ha)...-an (>)	(ma)(hi)...-i, (ma)(hing)...-i (>)
---	--	--	---------------------------------------

Combination with *-AN* is shown above; also combines with *I-* (potential) and *MA-* (active). Also uses *hig-*, *hag-* with some roots such as *mata>higmata* “get woken up”. Occurrence with *MA-*, *-AN*, *I-* is determined by the individual habits of each root. Occurs with (>) shift to final stress unless penultimate syllable is closed by a consonant.

This affix has plenty of variations including:

- the omission of *na-/ma-*, with the Realis use of *hi-...-an* cluing its ethereal presence
- the omission of *-hi-* itself, with the retention of (>) cluing its ethereal presence
- alternate spellings
 - *-hing-*, *-hig-*, *-hi-* (usually depending on the root which has a form it prefers)
 - alternation *-i-* or *-a-* but *-a-* is not used in non-finite verbs

-PA- MORPHOLOGICAL CAUSATIVES

Ang mgá katuigan nga giagaw sa lawód sa íyang kinabuhi nakapahimò kaniyang usá ka igmat nga mananagát nga tugób sa kasinatian. The years that were stolen by the deep sea from his life had caused him to become a clever fisherman rich in experience. usl7-10

By omitting extra description, this sentence simplifies to:

Ang mgá katuigan nakapahimò kaniya nga usá ka igmat nga mananagát. The years had caused him to become a clever fisherman.

- *kaniya*, Causee, thus does of the semantic element *-pa-* “cause” and doer-experiencer of the root semantic element *himò* “become”
- *nga usá ka igmat*, Becoment of *himò*, the thing that *kaniya* became, marked *nga* which indicates not quite a Grammatical Relation but the “same thing” or appositive of *kaniya*
- *nakapahimò*, from inchoative predicate *himò* “become”, so *naka-himò* is perfect aspect “had become” and *-pa-* adds the Semantic Role “Causer”; final meaning “had/have caused to become”⁹
- *Ang nakapahimò kaniya nga X...* What had made him become X...
- *nakapa-/makapa-* is three separate affixes and means “cause to become, have caused to become, had caused to become” with stative roots (like this one) or with dynamic roots, “cause/allow to be able to”

Here are some things you should know about *-pa-* morphological causatives:

- A useful device for understanding how this affix works—it adds a Causer to the verb’s role prescription—is to look at these English sentences:
 - “She flew the kite.” (normal English non-causative clause with one verb and one doer)
 - “He let her fly the kite.” (normal English “periphrastic” causative, with two verbs and two doers; notice the change in grammatical case of the doer of “fly”, from “she” to “her”)
 - *”He let-fly her the kite.” (as if English causative were morphological (an affix); “he” is added as Causer-doer of “let”.)
 - Compare “*Her flew the kite,” which is wrong till you add the causative verb “let” with its own doer: “He let her fly the kite.” “Her” is now “flying the kite” grammatically.
- Many attributive verbs—any verb that isn’t from a dynamic or action-oriented root—tend to become causative automatically (or MIGHT do this, depending on the habits of the individual root), whenever any affix other than MA- is used with them: *matulog* “be asleep”¹⁰ but *magtulog* “put to sleep”. So if you use *magpatulog* it doesn’t change the meaning from *magtulog*. These seeming irregularities have to be tolerated, such is the nature of language, which is only human. It is easier to digest and incorporate irregularities if you understand the reason for

⁹ *nahimò* alone means “become” in the Realis mode but *nakahimò* adds perfect aspect which is an inherently relative tense, that is, it carries a dual time sense “have become” or from within a context of past time sense, “had become”.

¹⁰ I use *tulog* and *hulog* a lot in this study because they are words heard so often in typical Filipino homes where children are prevalent, sleeping a lot is expected, and holes and “trip hazards” exists absolutely everywhere so nobody ever falls in them. Filipinos have a third eye that watches their feet as it is part of their culture that nothing and nobody is in the way, so they never trip over anything or fall in holes or drainage canals like I do. Their style of sharing the road with other drivers also reflects the concept that they don’t consider each other to be in the way.

them to exist. In this case, *-pa-* doesn't change the meaning because attributive roots are eager to be made causative, so non-stative verbal affixes tend to stimulate their inherent need to be caused: it's just more *verbal*. Whereas *matulog* "is asleep" is almost an adjective. Put another way, in a world where you need to say "get hot", you are also going to need to say "get it hot". In such cases, *-pa-* is often optional. But with dynamic verbs, *-pa-* has to be used to make causation explicit.

- Adding *-pa-* to a root takes the root out of its native environment by giving it a new verb class to belong to, "Causative verb". Its new role prescription is always going to be [doer-causer, doee-causee-doer, subdoee], unless the root is intransitive (one-participant) in which case there is no subdoee.
- All *-pa-* causative verbs are volitional to some degree,¹¹ and the degree is interpreted in the light of context. In English the three degrees of volitionality use three different periphrastic causative constructions, with the corresponding Cebuano versions shown as suggestions only for this context:
 - definite volitionality: I'll make you pay for that. *Ikáw ang ákong papalitón nianà.*
 - indefinite volitionality: I'll have you pay for that. *Magpapalit ko anà nímo.*
 - permissive volitionality: I'll let you pay for that. *Ipapalit ko nímo kanâ.*

RE-INTRODUCING LEXICAL MAPPING AND THE RELATIONAL HIERARCHY

I like to call the end result of this process THE PREFERARCHY because it is a short list of rules arranged as a hierarchy of preferences determined by the affix set interacting with the verb class. It has only one purpose, and that is to answer the question: What gets to be made subj of the sentence?

For questions of this nature I like to separate the affix selection process from the selection of a subject so there is less to think about. So in the discussion below, assume that the affix set has already been chosen unless it comes up in the discussion; we're now going to talk about how to know which Semantic Role gets to be subj, which is obj, etc. The rules change from verb class to verb class because the role prescription changes; for example, verbs of doing have a Semantic Role "Act" that maybe no other verb class has. For now we will limit the discussion to Causative verbs, that is, verbs that have added *-pa-* and therefore have traded in their usual role prescription for this one: CAUSATIVE VERB [causer-doer, causee-doee-doer, sub-doee].

Let's say that a verb meaning "remove" has been used with the affix *-AN*, and being beginners we don't know what to make subject:

I'll let you remove the paint from this aparador.

There is a general rule to remember before worrying about relational hierarchies: if there is only one participant, usually it is going to be obvious what the subj is. Either

- the one participant is subj, as in a passive clause with no sub2: *Unyà nâ dalahón.* Soon it will be taken.
- the subj is ellipsed, because it is obvious, already stated, etc.: *Siyá ang naghatag og kwarta sa pubri ug [ellipsed subj] nagpakaon sa mgá batà.* He is the one who gave money to the poor and [he] fed the children.

¹¹ Which may explain in part why there is a separate morphological causative affix for emotive causative and causerless causative; both have decreased volitionality.

- this is a subjectless verb such as the Impersonal Voice: *Nahitabò* [subjectless] *nga...* It happened that... (“It” here is the English “dummy subject”¹² which has no meaning; Cebuano doesn’t use dummy subjects.)

A hierarchy of choices isn’t needed when there is only one choice. But once you are working with two or three participants (four are possible but one should be ellipsed if possible), if you are a beginner you need specific instructions on how to proceed.¹³ Before I learned about the Preferarchy, trying to say...

I’ll let you remove the paint from this aparador.

...would give me trouble, although it isn’t that difficult. Plenty of other sentences are a lot harder. What about this one:

That is what I’ll have you do to the fish.

Based on the descriptions I had at my disposal, which were the best available, I couldn’t tell whether to assign subj to “that”, “I”, “you” or “fish”; adding *-pa-* to any sentence just about gave me an attack of “high blood”. So we’ll proceed now to give simple directions and then we’ll make some real sentences. Every verb class has its own prefererchy rules; #1 and 2 below apply to all *-pa-* verbs and #3 are the preferarchy rules that apply to *-pa-* verbs with doer voice (*-ON/-AN/I-* affixes). In general, the preferarchy rules do not apply to doer voice verbs since doer is always marked subj which leaves the other choices obvious (objects and adjuncts are marked dative).

1. If there is only one participant, it’s usually the subj.
2. The Causer is always the main doer role of all causative sentences, which eliminates it from the controversy:
 - a. If the affix used is doer voice, the Causer is subj.
 - b. If the affix is doee voice, the Causer is sub2.
3. With doee voice, the three main affix sets each have their own rules for assigning a subj to a Semantic Role:
 - a. *-ON*
 - i. CAUSEE outranks SUBDOEE
 - b. *-AN*
 - i. PLACON outranks CAUSEE
 - ii. CAUSEE outranks SUBDOEE
 - c. *I-*
 - i. CAUSEE outranks SUBDOEE

To me, this looks obvious now, because I have used it and it solved my dizzy spell problem. But until I could get all my choices laid out this way I was lost.

Now we can try to make our sentences.

I’ll let you remove the paint from this aparador.
That is what I’ll have you do to the fish.

¹² English sentences generally have to have a subject, even if it is only a placeholder.

¹³ Prior descriptions failed to address this by, for example, calling *I-* the “instrumental focus”; what if *I-* is used but there is no instrument, and you have three participants?

Since the causative verb is really a verb from another class imported into the causative structure, we might start by asking ourselves, what are the original Semantic Roles that the verb required before *-pa-* was added? Because we have a choice between *-ON/-AN/I-*, this is still going to be the deciding factor between subj and obj assignments, after Causer has been given over to sub2.

I'll let you remove the paint from this *aparador*.

role prescription for a Verb of Applying & Removing:

- doer is Conveyor (the one that applies or removes)
- doee is Theme (the thing that is applied or removed)
- adjunct is Placon (the place or thing that something is applied to or removed from)

That is what I'll have you do to the fish.

role prescription for a Verb of Doing:

- doer is Agent (the one who does)
- doee 1 is Patient (the one that is done to—affected or changed in some way)
- doee 2 is Act (the thing that is done)

Let's choose *I-* for the first sentence and *-ON* for the second. (The affix selection process is carried out first, and separately, from the assignment of Grammatical Relations. The assignment of Grammatical Relations is not influenced by how or why the affix was chosen, except insofar as each verb class has its own rules for assigning them.) We need to look at the preferarchy rules for the two verb classes, and then apply the preferarchy rules for Causative Verbs as well. This is where, faced with too many choices, the only choice is to look at a bunch of real sentences spoken by native speakers; and that is exactly how the preferarchy rules were composed. Verbs of Doing especially could not be guessed at, since they are inherently three-participant (DITRANSITIVE) verbs but the usual "special use roles" such as Placon and Instrument did not begin to describe the Semantic Role that turned out to be easily identifiable as an ACT.

Removing & Applying verbs (CONVEYOR, THEME, PLACON):

- ON THEME outranks PLACON
- AN PLACON outranks THEME
- I- INSTRUMENT outranks THEME
- THEME outranks PLACON

Doing verbs (AGENT, PATIENT, ACT, (INSTRUMENT, BENEFICIARY)):

- ON INSTRUMENT outranks BENEFICIARY
- INSTRUMENT outranks PATIENT
- ACT outranks PATIENT
- AN BENEFICIARY outranks ACT
- PATIENT outranks ACT
- I- not used with doing verbs
- a root with *I-* is a verb of Making with *I-* assigning subj to the Instrument
- see *-ON* in this verb class which is used for Instrument subjects
- see *-AN* in this verb class which is used for Beneficiary subjects

You should recognize that the Semantic Roles "Instrument" and "Beneficiary" are mentioned in the preferarchy rules for Doing verbs but they parenthesized in the role prescription. That's because they are adjunct to the role prescription of Doing verbs, which can be upgraded to subj. They are SPURs or

special use roles. On the other hand, Placon in the Removing & Applying verbs is part of what the verb routinely expects, so it is listed in the role prescription. Looking again at Doing verbs, you'll see that -ON uses Instrument as a SPUR and as such it outranks both Act and Patient which are both native to the prescription. Based on what has previously been published about Cebuano, this was a most unexpected event which is why the preferarchy rules are so sorely needed. Each verb class makes its own rules.

Starting with the first sentence, which will be easy:

I'll let you remove the paint from this *aparador*.

role prescription for a Verb of Applying & Removing:

- doer is Conveyor (the one that applies or removes)
- doee is Theme (the thing that is applied or removed)
- adjunct is Placon (the place or thing that something is applied to or removed from)

As it turns out, there isn't a verb exactly equal in all senses to the English "remove". That's to be expected, as any two languages draw their semantic lines in different semantic places. We could use *kuhà* with -AN to say "remove some of subj" but that's better for harvesting eggplant or sharing someone's cake than removing paint. Settling for verbs that mean scrape, we find *kagis* "scrape carefully to remove something; shave" or *kiskis* "scrape to remove, smooth, or get scrapings". Either one will work but what's interesting is that the affix code (in Wolff's dictionary) is exactly the same for these two different verbs, which suggests there is some truth to the assertion of this study that two verbs from a given verb class will generally behave the same way in relation to selecting affixes and thus to assigning Grammatical Relations to Semantic Roles.

The affix code is [A; ab]. "A" means that the verbs can use the dynamic affixes of the doer voice: MO-, MAG-, and MAK- . "ab" refers to the doee voices, and it means that -ON and -AN each assign subj to a different doee. Well that's interesting but Wolff doesn't give enough examples to clarify the storm of questions he has just spurred, so we have to look at the collection of verbs we have put together as found in native sentences that refer to removing and applying. Here's what we find. The preferarchy rules say the same thing, but more explicitly, not requiring the hours of research that went into my first attempt to figure out what "ab" was supposed to mean. Looking again at the preferarchy rules, we see that...

-ON THEME outranks PLACON
-AN PLACON outranks THEME

...and that's exactly what "ab" means in this case: the two different affixes assign *subj* to a different kind of doee. Here is a perfect example:

- Hapawón ko *ang sibu* sa sabáw. I will skim *the fat* off the soup. wf (-ON: subj is Theme; obj is Placon)
- Hilimasawi si *Junior* sa sabón. Rinse the soap *off of Junior*. wf (-AN: subj is Placon; obj is Theme)

Never mind for now why these affixes were chosen; our concern is that we're getting ready to add a participant by adding *-pa-* to a verb like these, and we want a sure knowledge of how to assign subj. But yes, the "focus system" would have answered this question a lot faster. So how about the next sentence? With -ON preferring to assign subj to Instrument over and above the two doees prescribed by these verbs, the focus system was U-S-E-L-E-S-S!

Now the first sentence should be easy to make since we have all our ducks in a row:

“I’ll let you scrape the paint off of this *aparador*.” The roles are:

- I, Causer and main doer of sentence
- you, Causee, doee of “cause” and doer of “scrape”
- paint, Subdoee-Theme
- aparador, Subdoee-Placon

verb, *kagis* “scrape” *-pakagis* “cause to scrape”

Regarding preferarchy rules for subj assignment:

- affix chosen is -ON, therefore as subj, “Theme outranks Placon”
- and since it’s also a Causative verb, “Causee outranks Subdoee”
- The two rules listed above are in conflict! Since this is now a causative verb, the second rule listed supercedes the rule for Removing & Applying verbs, so it’s “Causee outranks Subdoee”

As it turns out, because it’s causative, both Subdoees have to be marked dative (as objects or adjuncts) since -ON wants to assign subj to Causee:

Pakagison nakò ikáw sa pintora sa aparador. I’ll have you scrape the paint off this aparador.

or more fluently,

Pakagison tikáw sa pintora sa aparador.

but without *-pa-*,

Kagison nímò ang pintora sa aparador. You’ll scrape the paint off the aparador.

Now for the second sentence.

“That is what I’ll have you do to the fish.”

role prescription for a Verb of Doing:

- doer is Agent (the one who does)
- doee 1 is Patient (the one that is done to—affected or changed in some way)
- doee 2 is Act (the thing that is done)

Doing verbs (AGENT, PATIENT, ACT, INSTRUMENT, BENEFICIARY):

-ON INSTRUMENT outranks BENEFICIARY

INSTRUMENT outranks PATIENT

ACT outranks PATIENT

-AN BENEFICIARY outranks ACT

PATIENT outranks ACT

I- not used with doing verbs

a root with I- is a verb of Making with I- assigning subj to the Instrument

see -ON in this verb class which is used for Instrument subjects

see -AN in this verb class which is used for Beneficiary subjects

The nominals and their Semantic Roles are:

- “That is what”, Subdoee-Act
- “I”, Causer
- “you”, Causee, doee of “cause” and doer of “do to”
- “fish”, Subdoee-Patient

The affix chosen is -AN.

The preferarchy rules are:

- for Verbs of Doing: Beneficiary outranks Act
- for Causative Verbs:
 - PLACON (beneficiary) outranks CAUSEE
 - CAUSEE outranks SUBDOEE

It looks like there is no conflict this time; beneficiary is going to be subject. Oops! Where is the beneficiary in this sentence? Well there doesn't have to be one, and if there isn't, then we just go to the next rule, “Causee outranks Subdoee”. But to make sure we haven't missed something, we have to consult our database of example sentences to find out what a Beneficiary is like in a sentence with a Doing verb. The database currently has only four examples of this:

- Nan, dili *tikáw* himoa'g lungag. In that case, I won't make a hole *for you*. apuak12
- Buhatan ta *ka* og fried rice. I will make *you* some fried rice. pj
- Dili ta *ka* buhatan og bangag. I will not make a hole *for you*. pj
- Alayonan *tiká* karón, ug impas na. I'll work *for you* now, and we're all square. wf

Aha, that Placon! This is the Semantic Role “Beneficiary”, the person that something is done for. That's why we have a Placon where none was specified by the role prescription: it's an adjunct Semantic Role. As such we could just call it a Beneficiary since maybe no other type of Placon should occur with this verb. And since “doing something for somebody” is standard business for verbs of doing, we should just go ahead and add Beneficiary to the prescription for this verb class. Well that's how a new grammatical description gets created: one mistake at a time.

Having safely eliminated Placon from our would-be sentence, we can now proceed:

“That is what I'll have you do to the fish.”

For clarification we'll uninvert the English word order to keep my head from swimming:

I (causer)
will have you (causee)
do that (subdoee-act)
to the fish. (subdoee-patient)

Returning to the database of sample sentences with Doing verbs it turns out that no sentence in the collection uses a Patient with -AN; that tells you something about affix selection that we won't go into right now. (Hint: no sentence with -ON uses a Beneficiary...)

So we can construct a sentence with -AN based on the assumption that the person who chose this affix knew something we didn't know, but we'll qualify it with a question mark as a possibly stupid sounding sentence, but leaving out the causative -pa- for now:

?Kanâ ang ímong buhatan sa isdà. “That is what you'll do to the fish.”

A quick check with our informant assures us that this is a bad sentence so we'll plan on making these two sentences instead, based on the correct samples in our collection, and then we'll change them to causatives:

- -AN: Siyá ang ímong buhatan nianà. “For him you will do that.”
- -ON: Kanâ ang ímong buhaton sa isdà. “That is what you'll do to the fish.”

This change in our plans just affirms what we've already said: adding an affix makes a new word; these Cebuano affixes derive new words. *Buhatan* and *buhaton* are different verbs; they mean (among other things, depending on context) “do for” and “do to”.

Now to finish this project. Adding -pa- might, according to our experience with the last sentence, change everything. Repeating the preferarchy rules:

-AN

- for Verbs of Doing: Placon outranks Act
- for Causative Verbs:
 - PLACON outranks CAUSEE
 - CAUSEE outranks SUBDOEE

Siyá ang ákong pabuhatan nianà. It's for him that I will have you do that. (No conflict; placon is subj.)

-ON

- for Verbs of Doing:
 - INSTRUMENT outranks ACT
 - ACT outranks PATIENT
- for Causative Verbs:
 - CAUSEE outranks SUBDOEE

Now there is a conflict. The fact that Act outranks Patient in the Doing Verbs' preferarchy is irrelevant, because the Causative preferarchy supercedes all that by insisting that Causee must be chosen over Subdoee for subj. We'll look for a way to get around that in a minute, but first, we'll go with the program and change the sentence so that we can use -ON:

*Pabuhaton tikáw nianà sa isdà. WRONG per informant, change to:
Magpahimò ko nianà sa ímo og isdà. I'll have you do that to the fish. pj

The informant insists that *pabuhaton* will not work here. *Pabuhaton* with its heavy Patient orientation means “make something” so a sentence with this verb might be “I'll have you make some fish.” After many radical changes to the sentence that I wasn't interested in, he finally came up with this one with a doer voice. Which means, according to the way we see things in this study, that we had failed to

recognize before that the Causer in this sentence is the Least Omittable Participant and should therefore be selected for the subj assignment.

Now in order to make a Subdoee a subj in a causative *-pa-* sentence, the affix I- has to be used. This will be the first in our collection of Doing verbs to use I-, so the informant will have to be consulted:

Kanâ ang âkong ipabuhat kanímo sa isdà. That is what I'll have you do to the fish. pj

Congratulations, we now have one sentence in our database of Do verbs using I- and our informant thinks it's OK.

REQUESTS, the affix MAKI-

palihog, ipa-, hangyò

Palihug ra gud ug pahayag sa inyong opinyon labot sa mga verbo sa mosunod nga mga sentence... (I'll just ask you to) (Please) disclose your opinion about the verbs in the following sentences... jgr

Like ipa-, palihog is a frozen form with affixes and participants left out. It is the verb lihóg which never occurs without pa-. It combines with og forms. It can take affixes but without affixes and participants, it means please and still combines with og forms (non-finite verbs) in modal like pairs.

Compare hangyò.