

## A Description of Yogad Morphology

Louise Koren – Carleton University

**Background:** Yogad is an Austronesian language spoken in the Northern Philippines by approximately 16,000 people as of a 1990 census (Quirante, 2021). In the one published grammar of the language (Davis et al., 1997), morphological analysis was done without involving a view of related languages or couched in contemporary morphological theory. As a result, Yogad was treated as exceptional.

**Topic:** In this paper, I re-analyze Yogad morphology with theory in mind. As well, I place it alongside previous analyses of related languages and the family (Chen & McDonnell, 2019; Chen & Fukada, 2016; Blust, 2015) to show that Yogad is not an outlier among Austronesian languages, but nevertheless shows interesting variation.

**Argument:** Firstly, Davis et al. (1997) describes the verbal affixes in Yogad in terms of their proximity to the action or event, and not with the word classes and voice system common of analyses of Austronesian languages. Yogad shares these systems, but tends to exhibit more variety in its verbal morphology than related languages. In Paiwan (Chang, 2006), another Austronesian language, there are four main verbal affixes that select or identify the role of the sentence's topic. These are used mainly when the topic is the sentence's Actor, Goal (called "Patient" in other work), Instrument, or Locative, respectively. Yogad, on the other hand, has more than four main verbal affixes. For example, Yogad has a pair of verbal affixes that mark the topic as a beneficiary, whereas in Paiwan, the Instrument Voice affix would be used and the difference in meaning would come only from context. There is also a specific verbal affix in Yogad used when the topic is comitative, which is unusual in related languages. Even with the Actor Voice and Patient Voice in Yogad, multiple verbal affixes may be used. Some are lexically determined by the word's class, as in other related languages, but others alter meaning. For example, in Yogad there is an Actor Voice affix that gives a meaning of "becoming" or a change of state, and a Patient Voice affix that adds a meaning of "able to" to the action. As well, completed and uncompleted actions typically warrant a difference in the verbal affix's form in Yogad (compare: *nang-* & *mang-*), but in languages like Paiwan, these meanings are added agglutinatively with a separate morpheme.

Secondly, Davis et al. (1997) describes the particles in Yogad as being ordered on a scale from focused to diffused, with a myriad of uses for each. They use novel terminology in their description, such as describing the particle I have identified as the nominative marker as "able to determine eruptive participants". In fact, Yogad's particle system is fairly common across related languages, though there is still less variety in its nominal morphology than in some others. Besides the topic marker, there are only two particles: one used to mark both the subject and possessor, and one for everything else. These are both described as "less focused" or "more diffuse" determiners by Davis et al (1997). This system may be compared to Ivatan (Reid, 1966), a closely related language, which has an additional locative marking particle. As such, Ivatan has three non-topic particles, whereas Yogad only has two. As well, the system in Ivatan may have been closer to the system held historically (Blust, 2015).

**Conclusion:** Contra the analysis presented in Davis et al. (1997), Yogad looks remarkably similar to other Philippine-type Austronesian languages. At the same time, however, Yogad exhibits a number of differences from these other systems of morphology. The decrease in variety of nominal morphology and increase in verbal morphology, as compared to related languages, is particularly note-worthy, especially in a system where they are so closely linked.

## References

- Blust, R. (2015). The Case-Markers of Proto-Austronesian. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 54(2), 436–491. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ol.2015.0024>
- Chang, A.H. (2006). *A Reference Grammar of Paiwan*. [Doctoral dissertation, Australian National University].
- Chen, V. & Fukada, S. (2016). “Absolutive” marks agreement, not Case: against the syntactic ergative analysis for the Austronesian-type voice system. *Proceedings of the 46<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistics Society (NELS 46)*, (1), 201–211.
- Chen, V. & McDonnell, B. (2019). Western Austronesian Voice. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 5, 173–195. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011718-011731>
- Davis, P.W., Baker, J.W., Spitz, W.L., & Baek, M. (1997). *The Grammar of Yogad: A functional explanation*.
- Davis, P.W. & Mesa, A. (1999). *A Dictionary of Yogad*.
- Gundel, J.K. & Fretheim, T. (2008). Topic and Focus. *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, 175-196.
- Quirante, C. (2021). *Yogad kan*. Retrieved from [www.yogadkan.com](http://www.yogadkan.com)
- Reid, L.A. (1966). *An Ivatan Syntax*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii].