Interpreting clitic adverb combinations in Tagalog

Henrison Hsieh[1] and Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine[2]

AFLA 30, Lund University, October 2023

1 Introduction

Tagalog has a number of second-position clitic adverbs (Schachter and Otanes, 1972, Kaufman, 2010, a.o.). When two such clitic adverbs cooccur, the combined effect sometimes appears to be semantically transparent, but other times less so:

(1) a. Context: The parents already ate breakfast. How about the kids?

K<um>ain **na** **rin** sila ng almusal.
<AV>eat(PFV) already also 3PL.NOM GEN breakfast

'They have also already eaten breakfast.' semantically transparent

b. Context: I thought the guests would take a shower.

K<um>ain **na** **lang** sila ng almusal.
<AV>eat(PFV) already only 3PL.NOM GEN breakfast

'They ate breakfast instead.' not so transparent

Today We discuss the semantics of such clitic adverb combinations in Tagalog, with a focus on the less transparent cases:

- *pa* 'still' + *lang* 'only' ⇝ low progress
- *na* 'already' + *lang* 'only' ⇝ 'instead'
- *pa* 'still' + *rin* 'also' ⇝ 'still' (despite threat to plan)
- *man* 'even' + *lang* 'only' ⇝ NPI 'even'
- *na* 'already' + *naman* topic change (AnderBois, 2016) ⇝ 'again'

Roadmap

- Background on Tagalog second position clitics
- The individual ingredients
- The combinations

[1] The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, henrison.hsieh@polyu.edu.hk
[2] University of Helsinki / National University of Singapore, mitcho@nus.edu.sg

2 Background

Second-position clitics in Tagalog can be pronominals or adverbs. Their defining property is that they appear linearly after the "first element" in the clause:

(2) a. Bi~bigy-an **ka** **na** **rin** **daw** **nila** ng regalo.
FUT~give-LV 2SG.NOM already also EVID 3PL.GEN GEN gift
'They will now also give you a gift (reportedly).'

b. Hindi **ka** **na** **rin** **daw** **nila** bi~bigy-an ng regalo.
NEG 2SG.NOM already also EVID 3PL.GEN AV.IPFV~give-LV GEN gift
'They will also no longer give you a gift (reportedly).'

► The order of multiple clitics within a cluster is (mostly) fixed, based on their type (pronoun vs adverbial) and phonological shape.

(3) **The order of Tagalog second-position clitics:**
1σ pronouns < 1σ adverbs < $2{+}\sigma$ adverbs < 2σ pronouns
See e.g. Schachter 1973, Schachter and Otanes 1972: pp. 411–414, Anderson 2009.

(4) a. Umi~inom **lang** **ako** ng tsaa. * ... **ako lang** ...
AV.IPFV~drink only 1SG.NOM GEN tea
'I'm only drinking tea.'

b. Umi~inom **ka** **lang** ng tsaa. * ... **lang ka** ...
AV.IPFV~drink 2SG.NOM only GEN tea
'You're only drinking tea.'

► The linear order of two clitic adverbs does *not* directly indicate their semantic scope.

For example, *din* 'also' and *lang* 'only' always contribute "*only* > *also*" scope:

(5) Nag-i~English {**lang din** / ?**din lang**} si Mary.
AV-IPFV~English only also also only NOM Mary

a. ✓ Context: John speaks only$_{F1}$ [English]$_{F1}$.
'[Mary]$_{F2}$ also$_{F2}$ speaks only$_{F1}$ [English]$_{F1}$.' (also > only)

b. * Context: Everyone here speaks Tagalog.
'Only$_{F1}$ [Mary]$_{F1}$ also$_{F2}$ speaks [English]$_{F2}$.' (only > also)

This accords with approaches where the linear positions of clitics are determined postsyntactically (see e.g. Richards, 2003; Anderson, 2009; Kaufman, 2010), but runs counter to the predictions of purely syntactic accounts for clitic adverb placement such as Tanenbaum 2020a,b.

3 Ingredients

We briefly introduce the individual semantics for a few clitic adverbs, before discussing their combinations.

Note: We treat propositions as world and time dependent; where composition necessitates, we type-shift using Intensional Functional Application (Heim and Kratzer, 1998) or similar (more in §6). Where not specified, expressions are interpreted with respect to the actual world w^* and actual time t^*.

3.1 Temporal adverbs

- Tagalog *pa* 'still' and *na* 'already' parallel well-studied temporal particles in other languages, such as German *noch* and *schon* as well as Mandarin adverb *hái* and sentence-final *le*; see e.g. Löbner 1989; Krifka 2000; Soh and Gao 2008; Zhang and Ling 2016.
- Schachter and Otanes (1972) describe a number of uses of *pa* and *na*, but here we take their "phase quantification" (à la Löbner) uses to be their core.

(6) $pa(p)(t^*)$

a. at-issue: $p(t^*)$ true

b. presupposes: $\exists$ salient time $t' < t^*$, $p(t')$ **true** (with no interruption)

c. possible implicature: p will be false $> t^*$ (following Beck 2020, citing Wolfgang Klein)

(7) Context: I was cooking a while ago.

Naglu~luto **pa** ako.
AV.IPFV~cook still 1SG.NOM

'I'm still cooking.' (progressive)

(8) $na(p)(t^*)$

a. at-issue: $p(t^*)$ true

b. presupposes: $\exists$ salient time $t' < t^*$, $p(t')$ **false**

(9) Context: I didn't cook before.

Naglu~luto **na** ako.
AV.IPFV~cook already 1SG.NOM

'I cook now.' (habitual)

In addition, *na* can introduce an 'earlier than expected' inference (and *pa*, 'later than expected'). We discuss this briefly in section 5 below.

3.2 *lang*

Lang (and its variant *lamang*) is a focus particle with both **exclusive** (10) and **scalar** (11) uses, similar to English *only* (Schachter and Otanes, 1972). *Lang* prefers (but does not require) its associate to be fronted or a cleft pivot (Richards, 2019).

(10) a. [Si Christine]$_F$ **lang** ang k<um>a~kain ng gulay.
NOM.P Christine only NOM AV.IPFV~eat GEN vegetable
'Only [Christine]$_F$ eats vegetables.' ⇒ nobody else eats vegetables

b. K<um>a~kain **lang** si Christine [ng gulay]$_F$.
AV.IPFV~eat only NOM.P Christine GEN vegetable
'Christine only eats [vegetables]$_F$.' ⇒ they don't eat other things

(11) Context: Various kinds of people compete together in this race. There is a unique winner.
{ [Di-kilalang tao]$_F$ / #[Magaling na atleta]$_F$ } **lang** iyong nanalo sa karera.
unknown person skillful LK athlete only NOM won OBL race
≈ 'The winner of the race was merely [an unknown person]$_F$.' (scalar / #exclusive)

The felicitous use of *lang* in this context, and its compatibility with 'an unknown person' but not with 'a skilled athlete,' indicates the possibility of purely scalar uses of *lang*, which plays a role in our discussion below.

- We adopt from Coppock and Beaver 2014 a unified account of exclusive and scalar uses of *only*-like particles:

(12) $lang_C(p)(w^*)$

a. at-issue: $\neg\exists q \in C[q(w^*) \wedge q >_C p]$
no true alternative in C is stronger than p

b. presupposes: $\exists q \in C[q(w^*) \wedge q \geq_C p]$
some true alternative in C is at least as strong as p

Exclusive uses involve an ordering $>_C$ based on logical strength, whereas scalar uses involve another contextually specified ordering.

4 Low progress *pa lang*

Combining *pa* 'still' and *lang* 'only' results in a low progress meaning that is reminiscent of German *erst* (Löbner, 1989). Both *pa* and *lang* are required for the low progress reading.

(13) Tatlo=ng libro **pa** **lang** ang naba~basa ni Paula.
three=LK book still only NOM IPFV.NVOL~read[PV] GEN.P Paula
'Paula has only read three books (so far).'
(patterned after Neeleman and van de Koot, 2021)

► Low progress *pa lang* requires non-zero progress:

(14) Nasa [bahay]$_F$ **pa** **lang** ako.
PRED.OBL house still only 1SG.NOM
≈ 'I'm still/only at [home]$_F$ (so far).'

(15) Nasa bahay **pa** ako.
PRED.OBL house still 1SG.NOM
'I'm still at home.'

(16) Contexts: I'm meeting friends for dinner. I'm running late so they ask me where I am...

a. It's the weekend so I'm leaving from home. #low prog. **(14)** ✓'still' **(15)**

b. I came from work, but I had to go home first. ✓low prog. **(14)** **#**'still' **(15)**

Analysis We propose that low progress *pa lang* can be derived compositionally as *pa* > *lang*. We first discuss the case of context (16b), where we start from work:

(17) $lang_C(\texttt{home})$:

a. Alternatives in C are ordered by expected progression:
$C = \{\texttt{work} < \texttt{home} < \texttt{train} < \texttt{dinner}\}$ where home etc. stand in for propositions

b. at-issue: I am not further along than being at home, i.e. $\neg\texttt{train} \wedge \neg\texttt{dinner}$

c. presupposes: I am at least as far as being at home, i.e. $\texttt{home} \vee \texttt{train} \vee \texttt{dinner}$

► *Lang* can't take the strongest alternative as its prejacent, as the result will be vacuous. This ensures that *pa lang* conveys a non-final state.

Let the salient time t' refer to the start state time. $\texttt{work}(t')$ is in the Common Ground or easily accommodated.

(18) $pa(lang_C(\texttt{home}))(t^*)$:

a. at-issue: (17b) $\neg\texttt{train} \wedge \neg\texttt{dinner}$ is true at t^*

b. presupposes: (17c); (17b) $\neg\texttt{train} \wedge \neg\texttt{dinner}$ was true at t'

c. possible implicature: (17b) $\neg\texttt{train} \wedge \neg\texttt{dinner}$ will be false sometime > t^*

► The implicature in (18c) (following Beck 2020) conveys that continued progress is expected in the future.

If instead, we use *pa* alone:

(19) $pa(\texttt{home})(t^*)$:

a. at-issue: home is true at t^*

b. presupposes: home was true at t'

predicts *felicity* in (16a), where it is known we start at home;

predicts *infelicity* in (16b), where it is known we start at work (unless another, earlier at-home time is made salient).

c. possible implicature: `home` will be false sometime $> t^*$

Furthermore, in context (16a), the addition of *lang* is vacuous in (18), and therefore its use would violate a Non-Vacuity condition on particle insertion (see e.g. Crnič, 2011a,b; Alxatib, 2020; Erlewine and New, 2021).

► This derives *pa lang*'s requirement of non-zero progress.

Summary Where alternatives describe an expected temporal progression, *pa lang* expresses...

- being in a non-final state in a progression,
- being in an earlier state before, and
- a cancelable expectation of future continued progress.

5 Change of plan *na lang*

The combination of *na* and *lang* can be used in contexts where it invites the English translation 'instead.' Both *na* and *lang* are required for this use.

(20) a. Context: I was originally planning to [eat out]$_F$ tomorrow.

[Mag-lu~luto]$_F$ **na** **lang** ako bukas
AV-FUT~cook already only 1SG.NOM tomorrow
'I will [cook]$_F$ tomorrow instead.' (e.g. instead of eating out)

b. [Bukas]$_F$ **na** **lang** ako mag-lu~luto.
tomorrow already only 1SG AV-FUT~cook
'I will cook [tomorrow]$_F$' + *na lang*

Assuming some compositionality, *na* conveys that something was false before and became true.

► What changed in (20a,b) is a *plan* about the future.

– Informally, PLAN('I cook tomorrow') was false before, and is true now.

– The relevant change that licenses *na* is *not* about 'tomorrow' vs an earlier time (even though it may appear that way in (20b)).

In addition, *na lang* can also apply to reports of what actually happened:

(21) Context: We had originally planned to go someplace special to eat.

K<um>ain **na** **lang** kami sa [ma-lapit]$_F$.
<AV>eat(PFV) already only 1PL.EXCL.NOM OBL ADJ-near
'We ate [nearby]$_F$ instead.'

What licenses the use of *lang*?

► The prejacent of *na lang* is less desirable than the original plan or expectation:

(22) Assuming stereotypical (but perhaps not universal) expectations regarding the relative desirability of professor- versus TA-taught classes:

Ang { [TA]$_F$ / #[propesor]$_F$ } **na** **lang** ang mag-tu~turo ng klaseng ito.
NOM TA professor already only NOM AV-FUT~teach GEN class this

a. ✓ '[The professor was supposed to teach this class, but now...] the TA will teach it instead.'

b. #'[The TA was supposed to teach this class, but now...] the professor will teach it instead.'

Analysis We can derive the 'instead' use from *na* > *lang*, scoping over a *metaphysical necessity modal* evaluated at a particular time, $\Box_{\text{MP},t}$ (or simply, $\Box$).[3]

► To interpret claims of metaphysical necessity in the future, we use Copley's (2009) notion of a *plan*. Formally, for $t_1 < t_2$, $\Box_{\text{MP},t1}(p_{t2}) = \text{PLAN}_{d,t1}(p_{t2})$ where d is the plan's *director*.[4]

(23) $lang_C(\Box\ \texttt{TA})$:

a. Let propositions such as TA stand for 'the TA teaches the class at t_{class}'; $t^* < t_{\text{class}}$

b. Assume propositions ranked by desirability: student < TA < prof

c. ...with a corresponding ranking of plans: $C = \{\Box\ \texttt{student} < \Box\ \texttt{TA} < \Box\ \texttt{prof}\}$

d. at-issue: no one ranked higher than a TA is planned to teach, i.e. $\neg \Box\ \texttt{prof}$

e. presupposes: a TA or someone ranked higher is planned to teach, i.e. $\Box\ \texttt{TA} \vee \Box\ \texttt{prof}$

(24) $na(lang_C(\Box\ \texttt{TA}))(t^*)$:

a. at-issue: (23d) $\neg \Box_{t^*}$ prof is true

b. presupposes: (23e) $\Box_{t^*}$ TA $\vee \Box_{t^*}$ prof; (23d) $\neg \Box_{t'}$ prof false $\Rightarrow \Box_{t'}$prof true

[3] Following discussion in Copley 2009 (ch. 1), a "metaphysical" modal base refers to what Kratzer (1991 *et seq*) calls a "totally realistic circumstantial" modal base, which includes all propositions that are true in the actual world w^* at that time.

[4] The *director* is the entity responsible for a *plan*. Copley (2009) proposes that $\text{PLAN}_d(p)$ presupposes that "the director has the ability to ensure that a p-eventuality happens" and asserts that "the director is committed to a p-eventuality happening."

Summary Together, *na lang* > □ expresses that there was a prior plan (at t'), but now (at t^*) there is a contrasting plan, which is less preferred.

- Without *lang*, *na* > □ would simply convey the current plan, which did not exist before; *lang* ensures that there already was *some* contrasting plan, and clarifies the precise point of change. (Note that *na lang* combinations which do *not* involve a covert □ operator exist; see Appendix. In such examples, *na* always takes scope over *lang*.)
- Here we assumed *lang* > □ scope, but their relative scope is not clear.[5]

On expectations *Na* often raises 'earlier than expected' inferences, but *na lang* does not:

(25) Mag-lu~luto **na** ako bukas.
AV-FUT~cook already 1SG tomorrow
'I will cook tomorrow' + *na*

(20b) [Bukas]$_F$ **na** **lang** ako mag-lu~luto.
tomorrow already only 1SG AV-FUT~cook
'I will cook [tomorrow]$_F$' + *na lang*

(26) Contexts:

a. I was originally planning to cook today... **#** 'already' **(25)** ✓'tomorrow instead' **(20b)**

b. I was originally planning to cook next week... ✓'already' **(25)** ✓'tomorrow instead' **(20b)**

► We propose that $na(p)$ introduces an 'earlier than expected' inference when describing a *progression* à la Neeleman and van de Koot 2021: i.e. where we expect development from $\neg p$ to p over time.[6]

– For (25), 'tomorrow' describes the event time which *na* comments on: $na(\texttt{cook})(t_{\text{tomorrow}})$. We indeed expect a change over time from $\neg\texttt{cook}$ to $\texttt{cook}$, so the 'earlier than expected' inference arises.

– For (20b), 'tomorrow' is under □ and *na* describes the plan time: $na(lang_C(\Box\texttt{cook}_{t_{\text{tomorrow}}}))(t^*)$. There is no expected change from $\neg lang_C(\Box\texttt{cook}_{t_{\text{tomorrow}}})$ to $lang_C(\Box\texttt{cook}_{t_{\text{tomorrow}}})$, so the 'earlier than expected' inference does not arise.

[5] Notably, Copley (2009) shows that under her proposal, where the presuppositions of PLAN holds, "either all the metaphysically accessible worlds are p-worlds, or none are" (p. 32). Therefore PLAN$\neg \equiv \neg$PLAN.

[6] This effect may be conventionalized, due to *na* often (although not always) being used to mark counterexpectational situations. If p is part of a *progression* (expected development from $\neg p$ to p, as with *na*), $p(t^*)$ may convey that p is earlier than expected. (See relevant discussion in Michaelis 1993 and Beck 2020: note 8, and citations there.) Similarly, *pa* can raise a 'taking longer than expected' inference when p to $\neg p$ is an expected *regression*.

6 On *din* and *pa rin*

6.1 *Din/rin* 'also'

Din (*rin* especially after vowels) is an additive particle, akin to English 'also.' We treat *din* as having a simple existential additive presupposition.

(27) (Uma~awit si Linda.) Uma~awit **din** [si Carmen]$_F$.
AV.IPFV~sing NOM.P Linda AV.IPFV~sing also NOM.P Carmen
'(Linda is singing.) [Carmen]$_F$ is singing too.'

(28) $din_C(p)(w^*)$

a. at-issue: $p(w^*)$

b. presupposes: $\exists$ salient $q \in C[p \neq q \wedge q(w^*)]$ (on salience, see e.g. Kripke 1990/2009)

There are also uses of *din* that at first glance are less clearly additive, such as (29). We propose that *din* here associates with the evaluation world(s), as in (30).

(29) Na-tapos **din** natin ang trabaho.
PFV.NVOL-finish[PV] also 1PL.INCL.GEN NOM work
≈ 'We've finally/actually finished the job.'

Specifically, we suggest that (29) is felicitous in a discourse where it is clear that the proposition is true in the speaker or addressee's (counterfactual) ideal world(s), similar to (30).

(30) Sa panaginip ko, na-tapos ko ang trabaho.
OBL dream 1SG.GEN PFV.NVOL-finish 1SG.GEN NOM work

Sa totoo=ng buhay, na-tapos ko **rin** ang trabaho.
OBL real=LK life PFV.NVOL-finish 1SG.GEN also NOM work
'In my dream, I had finished the job. In the real world, I also finished the job.'

6.2 Concessive and threatened plan *pa rin*

Pa can also co-occur with *rin* (allomorph of *din* 'also') to generate the inference of an event happening or persisting despite expectations otherwise.

(31) Context: I wanted to make dinner tonight, but some of my errands took much longer than expected, so I wasn't sure if my plan could push through. In the end, I managed to get home with a bit of time to spare, so...

Nakapag-luto **pa** #(**rin**) ako ng hapunan.
AV.NVOL.PFV-cook still also 1SG.NOM GEN dinner
'I still managed to cook dinner.'

We might think *din* is licensed by the preceding mention of other errands: the mention of other errands licenses 'also cooking dinner.' But no such mention of other events are necessary:

(32) Context: I never eat out or get delivery for dinner on principle. Even if my schedule is packed for a particular day...

Naglu~luto **pa** #(**rin**) ako ng hapunan.
AV.IPFV~cook still also 1SG.NOM GEN dinner
'I still cook dinner.'

Or an even clearer, "concessive *still*" (cf Michaelis, 1993; Ippolito, 2007) like use:

(33) Context: A man was in a car accident and was taken to the hospital.

T<in>ulung-an nila siya, pero na-matay **pa** #(**rin**) siya.
<PFV>help-LV 3PL.GEN 3SG.NOM but PFV-die still also 3SG.NOM
'They helped him, but he still died.'

Analysis We propose that *din* is licensed by the proposition's truth in belief worlds — under the operator B, where B $p = \forall w \in \text{Dox}\ p_w$ — relative to some belief holder.[7] We then use *pa* to shift this claim into a requirement on *prior* belief worlds.

(34) $din_C(\texttt{died}_{t^*})$

a. $C = \{\texttt{died}_{w^*,t^*}, \text{B}_{t^*}\ \texttt{died}_{t^*}\}$

b. presupposes: $\text{B}_{t^*}\ \texttt{died}_{t^*}$ trivial

(35) $pa(\texttt{died}_{w^*,t^*})$
presupposes: $\exists t' < t^* \texttt{died}_{w^*,t'}$ too strong
(predicts satisfaction by dying earlier, but not helpful here)

(36) $pa(din_C(\texttt{died}_{w^*,t^*}))$

a. *din* presupposes: $\text{B}_{t^*}\ \texttt{died}_{t^*}$ trivial (as above)

b. *pa* presupposes: $\exists t' < t^* \texttt{died}_{w^*,t'}$ too strong (as above)

► We propose Locally Accommodating (LA; Heim, 1991) the presupposition of *din*, so it feeds the semantics of *pa*:

(37) $pa(\text{LA}(din_C(\texttt{died}_{w^*,t^*})))$

a. $\text{LA}(din_C(\texttt{died}_{w^*,t^*})) = \text{B}_{t^*}\ \texttt{died}_{t^*} \wedge \texttt{died}_{w^*,t^*}$

b. To compose with *pa*, we must abstract over *some* time variables:

$\rightsquigarrow \underline{\lambda t}\ .\ \text{B}_{\underline{t}}\ \texttt{died}_{t^*} \wedge \texttt{died}_{w^*,t^*}$

(We shift only the time of the belief worlds, keeping the dying times *de re*.)

c. *pa* presupposes: $\exists \underline{t'} < t^* [\text{B}_{\underline{t'}}\ \texttt{died}_{t^*} \wedge \texttt{died}_{w^*,t^*}]$

[7] In these examples, the relevant beliefs/expectations are likely shared by both the speaker and addressee. Unlike with *na lang* above, we want evaluations of beliefs about the future — i.e. $\text{B}_{t_1}\ p_{t_2}$ for $t_1 < t_2$ — to be about the stereotypical course of events, not tied to any particular plan. For instance, concretely, the man dying after a car accident in (33) may be an expected belief about the future, but not part of any agent's plan.

- ▶ We furthermore hypothesize that *pa rin* requires $B_t\ p$ to be non-constant (at least for $t \in [t', t^*]$), so that the added presupposition introduced by *pa rin* is not trivial.

Summary The combination of *pa* and *din* — with the help of Local Accommodation — holds precisely where:

- we had believed before — at time t' — that p would hold later,
- p *does* hold at t^*, and
- other events occurred in the intervening time, such that we may not have always believed that p would hold.

7 Discussion and future directions

Despite prior work on the fine-graind description and analysis of the meaning of various clitic adverbs in Tagalog (see especially AnderBois, 2016, 2023; Avelino, 2022, 2023), **no prior work has considered the *combined effect* conveyed by clitic adverb combinations** (except for some very brief descriptions in Schachter and Otanes 1972).

- ▶ Today, we presented **the first detailed semantic descriptions and our work-in-progress analyses** for three quite common particle combinations with limited transparency:
  - *pa* 'still' + *lang* 'only' ⇝ low progress
  - *na* 'already' + *lang* 'only' ⇝ 'instead'
  - *pa* 'still' + *rin* 'also' ⇝ 'still' (despite threat to plan)

In future work, we hope to consider other particle combinations with non-obvious combined effects as well. These include:

(38) ***man* 'even' + *lang* 'only' ⇝ NPI 'even'**

Hindi ka **man lamang** nakapag-almusal.
NEG 1SG.GEN even only AV.PFV.NVOL-breakfast
'You didn't even get to eat breakfast.' (Schachter and Otanes, 1972: 419)

(39) ***na* 'already' + *naman* SWITCH.TOPIC (AnderBois, 2016) ⇝ 'again'**

La~labh-an ko **na** **naman** ito=ng damit.
FUT~launder-PV 1SG.GEN already SWITCH.TOPIC this[NOM]=LK clothing
'I'm going to wash these clothes (yet) again.'

References

Alxatib, Sam. 2020. *Focus, evaluativity, and antonomy: A study in the semantics of* only *and its interaction with gradable antonyms*. Springer.

AnderBois, Scott. 2016. A QUD-based account of the discourse particle *naman* in Tagalog. In *Proceedings of AFLA 23*, ed. Hiroki Nomoto, Takuya Miyauchi, Asako Shiohara, and Takuya Miyauchi, 20–34. Asia-Pacific Linguistics.

AnderBois, Scott. 2023. Tagalog *pala*: An unsurprising case of mirativity. In *Discourse particles in Asian languages*, ed. Hiroki Nomoto and Elin McCready, volume 2: Southeast Asia, 9–36. Routledge.

Anderson, Stephen R. 2009. Second-position clitics in Tagalog. In *The nature of the word: Studies in honor of Paul Kiparsky*, ed. Kristin Hanson and Sharon Inkelas, 549–566. MIT Press.

Avelino, Gérard. 2022. The Tagalog particle *sana*: Preference modality at the syntax-semantics interface. Manuscript, Rutgers University.

Avelino, Gérard. 2023. Shifty modal meaning in Tagalog embedded clauses. Presented at APLL 15.

Beck, Sigrid. 2020. Readings of scalar particles: *noch/still*. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 43:1–67.

Copley, Bridget. 2009. *The semantics of the future*. Routledge.

Coppock, Elizabeth, and David Beaver. 2014. Principles of the exclusive muddle. *Journal of Semantics* 31:371–432. URL `https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/fft007`.

Crnič, Luka. 2011a. Getting *even*. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Crnič, Luka. 2011b. On the meaning and distribution of concessive scalar particles. In *Proceedings of NELS 41*, ed. Nicholas LaCara, Lena Fainlib, and Yangsook Park, 1–14.

Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka, and Keely New. 2021. A variably exhaustive and scalar focus particle and pragmatic focus concord in Burmese. *Semantics & Pragmatics* 14:1–54.

Heim, Irene. 1991. Artikel und definitheit. In von Stechow and Wunderlich (1991).

Heim, Irene, and Angelika Kratzer. 1998. *Semantics in generative grammar*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell.

Hsieh, Henrison, and Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine. 2023. On the scope and position of Tagalog clitic adverbs. In *Handbook of the 24th meeting of the Japanese Society for Language Sciences*, 109–112.

Ippolito, Michela. 2007. On the meaning of some focus-sensitive particles. *Natural Language Semantics* 15:1–34. URL `https://doi.org/10.1007/s11050-007-9004-0`.

Kaufman, Daniel. 2010. The morphosyntax of Tagalog clitics: A typologically driven approach. Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1991. Modality. In von Stechow and Wunderlich (1991), 639–650.

Krifka, Manfred. 2000. Alternatives for aspectual particles: Semantics of *still* and *already*. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Sixth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on Aspect*, 401–412.

Kripke, Saul. 1990/2009. Presupposition and anaphora: Remarks on the formulation of the projection problem. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:367–386.

Löbner, Sebastian. 1989. German *schon - erst - noch*: An integrated analysis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12:167–212.

Michaelis, Laura A. 1993. 'Continuity' within three scalar models: The polysemy of adverbial *still*. *Journal of Semantics* 10:193–237.

Neeleman, Ad, and Hans van de Koot. 2021. The interpretation and distribution of temporal focus particles. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* URL `https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-021-09526-x`.

Richards, Norvin. 2003. Why there is an EPP. *Gengo Kenkyu* 123:221–256. URL `https://doi.org/10.11435/gengo1939.2003.123_221`.

Richards, Norvin. 2019. Association with *lang* 'only' in Tagalog. URL `https://www.uwo.ca/linguistics/afla26/abstracts/Richards_AFLA_26_paper_33.pdf`, paper presented at the 26th meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association.

Schachter, Paul. 1973. Constraints on clitic order in Tagalog. In *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez: Essays in honor of Cecilio Lopez on his seventy-fifth birthday*, ed. Andrew B. Gonzalez, number 4 in Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph, 214–231. Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Schachter, Paul, and Fe Otanes. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Soh, Hooi Ling, and Meijia Gao. 2008. Mandarin sentential *-le*, perfect and English *already*. In *Event Structures in Linguistic Form and Interpretation*, ed. Johannes Dölling, Tatjana Heyde-Zybatow, and Martin Schäfer, 447–473. De Gruyter Mouton. URL `https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110925449.447`.

von Stechow, Arnim, and Dieter Wunderlich, ed. 1991. *Semantik: Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung*. HSK. Walter de Gruyter.

Tanenbaum, Russell. 2020a. Order and chaos in the cluster: A typology of pronominal and nonpronominal clitics. Doctoral Dissertation, Stony Brook University.

Tanenbaum, Russell. 2020b. Untangling the Tagalog clitic cluster. In *Proceedings of AFLA 25*, ed. Henry Yung-li Chang and Hui-Chuan J. Huang, 80–96. University of Hawai'i Press.

Zhang, Linmin, and Jia Ling. 2016. Additive particles with a built-in Gricean pragmatics: The semantics of German *noch*, Chinese *hái* and Hungarian *még*. In *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America*, volume 1, 1–15. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/plsa.v1i0.3743`.

Appendix: Transparent scope evidence

Particle scope in more semantically transparent combinations, from Hsieh and Erlewine 2023:

pa vs *lang*

(40) [Ako]$_F$ **pa** **lang** ang nasa party.
1SG.NOM still only NOM PRED.OBL party
'It's only me at the party so far.'

(41) a. Context (last one left): You and your friends went to a party. Because it's getting late, they all went home, leaving you the last one from the group.
(Predicts "*lang* > *pa*" true.) **# (40)**

b. Context (first one): You and your friends planned to go to a party. You arrived early and realized you were the first one there. (Predicts "*pa* > *lang*" true.) ✓ **(40)**

na vs *lang*

(42) [English]$_F$ **na** **lang** ang alam niya.
English already only NOM know 3SG.GEN
'S/he only knows English now.'[8]

(43) a. Context (lost all but one): This person used to speak several languages, but got into an accident and suffered a brain injury. Because of this, they've lost the ability speak all those languages except for English. (Predicts "*na* > *lang*" true.) ✓ **(42)**

b. Context (acquired only one): A child is growing up in a multilingual environment. After some time, they're able to speak English, but not any of the other languages yet. (Predicts "*lang* > *na*" true.) **# (42)**

[8] The argument 'English' is clefted here. The judgments in (43) are the same with 'English' being the predicate itself:

(i) Nag-i~English na lang siya.
AV-IPFV~English already only 3SG.NOM
≈ 'S/he now only [Englishes]$_F$.'