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It is our contention that the Philippine evidence provides many of the missing clues on how the Philippine “focus” system may have evolved into the Indonesian and Oceanic types. The evidence consists of the following: (a) an ergative case and voice system in almost all Philippine languages; (b) aside from this, a clitic coreferencing system in some languages like Kapampangan, the Sambal languages, Ilokano (to a certain extent) and T’boli; (c) a set of semantic, pragmatic and discourse motivations in accounting for a Philippine speaker’s choice of voice, case and constituent order; (d) definite markers for ‘non-focused’ or oblique patients exemplified in the Mindanao-wide Manobo languages; (e) an impoverished but still ergative voice and case marking system found in T’boli, Teduray and Blaan; and (f) unequivocal anti-passive constructions in Ilokano, Karao, Pangasinian and Yakan. The conclusions that the evidence appears to warrant are that: (1) PAN was most probably ergative in its morphosyntax; (2) the motivations for speaker’s choice of voice, case and word order in the Philippine system likewise apply to Indonesian- and Oceanic-type speakers (but not to the same degree); and (3) the changes in morphosyntax from the original ergative PAN to the not-so-ergative Indonesian- and Oceanic-types represent functional changes related to the semantic, pragmatic and discourse motivations mentioned above in (c) and in (2).
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