Interpreting clitic adverb combinations in Tagalog

Henrison Hsieh[1] (joint work with Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine)

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. <u>Context:</u> 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 <u>also already</u> eaten breakfast.'   semantically transparent

    b. <u>Context:</u> 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 <u>instead</u>.'   not so transparent

Today Discuss the semantics of such clitic adverb combinations in Tagalog, presenting a few of 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
- Some combinations: *na lang* and *pa lang*
- Future work: *pa rin*, *man lang*, *na naman*

---

[1] The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, `henrison.hsieh@polyu.edu.hk`

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+σ adverbs < 2σ pronouns

See e.g. Schachter 1973, Schachter and Otanes 1972: pp. 411–414, Anderson 2009.

(4) a. Umi~inom   <u>**lang ako**</u>   ng tsaa.   * … **ako lang** …
AV.IPFV~drink only 1SG.NOM GEN tea

'I'm only drinking tea.'

    b. Umi~inom   **ka**   <u>**lang**</u> ng tsaa.   * … **lang ka** …
AV.IPFV~drink 2SG.NOM only GEN tea

'You're only drinking tea.'

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

With other operators   *Na* 'already' always scopes over sentential negation *hindi*:

(5) **Hindi** ka   **na**   b<in>igy-an ng regalo.
NEG   2SG.NOM already <PFV>give-LV GEN gift

a. ✓ You weren't given a gift anymore.   (already > not)

b. *You weren't already given a gift.   (not > already)

Between clitics *Din* 'also' and *lang* 'only' always contribute "*also > only*" scope:

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

    a. $^\checkmark$ 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. 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.

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

    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)

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

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

'I'm still cooking.' (progressive)

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

    a. <u>at-issue:</u> $p(t^*)$ true

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

(10) <u>Context:</u> 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'). I discuss this briefly in section 5 below.

3.2 *lang*

Lang (and its variant *lamang*) is a focus particle with both **exclusive** (11) and **scalar** (12) 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).

(11) 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

(12) <u>Context:</u> 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:

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

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

    b. <u>presupposes:</u> $\exists q \in C[q(w^*) \wedge q \geq_C p]$
       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).

(14) 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 <u>only</u> read three books <u>(so far)</u>.'

                            (patterned after Neeleman and van de Koot, 2021)

▶ Both *pa* and *lang* are required for the low progress reading.

(15) a. #Tatlo=ng libro **pa** ang naba~basa ni Paula.
       three=LK book still NOM IPFV.NVOL~read[PV] GEN.P Paula

       'Paula is <u>still/even</u> able to read three books.'

    b. #Tatlo=ng libro **lang** ang naba~basa ni Paula.
       three=LK book only NOM IPFV.NVOL~read[PV] GEN.P Paula

       'Paula is <u>only</u> able to read three books.'

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

(16) Nasa [bahay]_F **pa lang** ako.   (17) Nasa bahay **pa** ako.
     PRED.OBL house still only 1SG.NOM   PRED.OBL house still 1SG.NOM

     ≈ 'I'm still/only at [home]_F (so far).'   'I'm still at home.'

(18) <u>Contexts:</u> 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 <u>home</u>.   #low prog. **(16)** ✓'still' **(17)**

    b. I came from <u>work</u>, but I had to go <u>home</u> first.   ✓low prog. **(16)** #'still' **(17)**

(19) a. Isa=ng litro **pa lang** ang tubig.
          one=LK liter still only NOM water

          'The water is only one liter so far.'

      b. Kulang   **pa *(lang)** ang tubig.
          insufficient still   only NOM water

          'The water is still insufficient *(so far).'

The state of having one liter of water is naturally preceded by earlier states (e.g., no water, 0.5 liters, etc.). By contrast, "insufficiency" has no previous state, so must necessarily be the starting state.

Analysis We propose that low progress *pa lang* can be derived compositionally as *pa > lang*.

We first discuss the case of context (18b), where we go to dinner leaving from work:

(20) $lang_C(\text{home})$:

      a. Alternatives in C are ordered by expected progression:

          $C = \{\text{work} < \text{home} < \text{train} < \text{dinner}\}$ where home etc. stand in for propositions

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

      c. <u>presupposes:</u> I am at least as far as being at home, i.e. $\text{home} \vee \text{train} \vee \text{dinner}$

   ▶ *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_s refer to the start state time. $\text{work}(t_s)$ is in the Common Ground or easily accommodated.

(21) $pa(lang_C(\text{home}))(t^*)$:

      a. <u>at-issue:</u> (20b) $\neg\text{train} \wedge \neg\text{dinner}$ is true at t^*

      b. <u>presupposes:</u> (20c) + (20b) $\neg\text{train} \wedge \neg\text{dinner}$ was true at t_s

      c. <u>possible implicature:</u> (20b) $\neg\text{train} \wedge \neg\text{dinner}$ will be false sometime $> t^*$

   ▶ The implicature in (21c) (following Beck 2020) conveys that **continued progress** is expected in the future.

What happens if we use *pa* alone?

(22) $pa(\text{home})(t^*)$:

    a. <u>at-issue:</u> home is true at t^*

    b. <u>presupposes:</u> home was true at t_s

       predicts *infelicity* in (18b), where it is known we start at work;

       predicts *felicity* in (18a), where it is known we start at home.

    c. <u>possible implicature:</u> home will be false sometime $> t^*$

Furthermore, in context (18a), the addition of *lang* as in (21) is vacuous, 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).

   ▶ The vacuity of including *lang* in (18a) 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 cancellable 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.

(23) a. <u>Context:</u> 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 (23a,b) is a *plan* about the future.

7

- 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 (23b)).

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

(24) <u>Context:</u> 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:

(25) 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, $\Box_{MP,t}$ (or simply, $\Box$).[2]

► To interpret claims of metaphysical necessity in the future, we use Copley's (2009) notion of a *plan*. Formally, for $t_1 < t_2$, $\Box_{MP,t1}(p_{t2}) = \text{PLAN}_{d,t1}(p_{t2})$ where d is the plan's *director*.[3]

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

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

e. <u>presupposes:</u> a TA or someone ranked higher is planned to teach,
    i.e. $\Box\ \texttt{TA} \lor \Box\ \texttt{prof}$

---

[2] 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.

[3] 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."

(27) $na(lang_C(\Box\, \text{TA}))(t^*)$:

    a. <u>at-issue:</u> (26d) $\neg\,\Box_{t^*}\,\text{prof}$ is true

    b. <u>presupposes:</u> (26e) $\Box_{t^*}\,\text{TA} \vee \Box_{t^*}\,\text{prof}$

                             (26d) $\neg\,\Box_{t'}\,\text{prof}$ false $\Rightarrow\,\Box_{t'}\text{prof}$ true (where $t' < t^*$)

Summary Together, *na lang* $> \Box$ 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* $> \Box$ 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 $\Box$ operator exist; see Appendix. In such examples, *na* always takes scope over *lang*.)

- Here we assumed *lang* $> \Box$ scope, but their relative scope is not clear.[4]

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

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

(23b) [Bukas]$_\text{F}$ **na** **lang** ako mag-lu~luto.
      tomorrow already only 1SG AV-FUT~cook
      'I will cook [tomorrow]$_\text{F}$' + *na lang*

(29) <u>Contexts:</u>

    a. I was originally planning to cook <u>today</u>...   # 'already' **(28)**   ✓ 'tomorrow instead' **(23b)**

    b. I was originally planning to cook <u>next week</u>...   ✓ 'already' **(28)**   ✓ 'tomorrow instead' **(23b)**

▶ 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.[5]

    – For (28), 'tomorrow' describes the event time which *na* comments on: $na(\text{cook})(t_\text{tomorrow})$. We indeed expect a change over time from $\neg\text{cook}$ to cook, so the 'earlier than expected' inference arises.

    – For (23b), 'tomorrow' is under $\Box$ and *na* describes the plan time: $na(lang_C(\Box\text{cook}_{t_\text{tomorrow}}))(t^*)$. There is no expected change from $\neg lang_C(\Box\text{cook}_{t_\text{tomorrow}})$ to $lang_C(\Box\text{cook}_{t_\text{tomorrow}})$, so the 'earlier than expected' inference does not arise.

---

[4] 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¬ ≡ ¬PLAN.

[5] 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 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 two quite common particle combinations with limited transparency:

– *pa* 'still' + *lang* 'only' ⤳ low progress

– *na* 'already' + *lang* 'only' ⤳ 'instead'

In future work, we hope to consider other particle combinations with non-obvious combined effects as well, such as the following:

6.1 *Pa rin*: **still (despite threat to plan)**

Din (*rin* especially after vowels) is an additive particle, akin to English 'also.'

(30) (Uma~awit si   Linda.) Uma~awit **din** [si   Carmen]ₐ.
     AV.IPFV~sing NOM.P Linda   AV.IPFV~sing also NOM.P Carmen

     '(Linda is singing.) [Carmen]ₐ is singing too.'

When combined with *pa* 'still', we get the inference that the prejacent holds despite reasons to expect that it would not.

(31) <u>Context:</u> I wanted to make dinner tonight, but some of my errands took much longer than expected, and I didn't get home until 10pm. Even then...

     Nag-luto   **pa** #(**rin**) ako   ng hapunan.
     AV.PFV-cook still   also   1SG.NOM GEN dinner

     'I still cooked dinner.'

(32) <u>Context:</u> Maria has been living in the US for 15 years, but...

     Marunong **pa** #(**rin**) siya=ng   mag-Tagalog.
     know.how still   also   3SG.NOM=LK AV-Tagalog

     'She still knows how to speak Tagalog.'

6.2 *Man lang*: NPI 'even'

The uses of *man* on its own are hard to pin down, but a subset appear to correspond well to English *even*.

(33) Kalabaw **man** ay napa~pagod din.
　　 water.buffalo even TOP IPFV~tire also

　　 '(Even) water buffalos too get tired (although they might not have been expected to).'

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Schachter and Otanes, 1972: 420)

When combined with *lang/lamang* 'only', the result still expresses 'even', but behaves like a Negative Polarity Item.

(34) a. Hindi ka **man lamang** nakapag-almusal.
　　　　 NEG 2SG.NOM even only AV.PFV.NVOL-breakfast

　　　　 'You didn't even get to eat breakfast.'　　　　(Schachter and Otanes, 1972: 419)

　　 b. *Nakapag-almusal ka **man lamang**.
　　　　 AV.PFV.NVOL-breakfast 2SG.NOM even only

　　　　 Intended: 'You even got to eat breakfast.'

6.3 *Na naman*: 'again'

Naman is a discourse particle traditionally described as marking a shift in topic or viewpoint (Schachter and Otanes, 1972; see also AnderBois, 2016 for a formal semantic account).

(35) Nag-a~aral si Linda. Nagla~laro **naman** si Carmen.
　　 AV.IPFV~study NOM.P Linda AV.IPFV~play SWITCH.TOPIC NOM.P Carmen

　　 'Linda is studying. Carmen (on the other hand) is playing.'

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Schachter and Otanes, 1972: 425)

When appearing with *na* 'already', the resulting meaning can be translated to English as '(yet) again'.

(36) 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.'

Interestingly, *na naman* is not possible in all places where other expressions meaning 'again' are.

(37) Labh-an mo {**ulit** / ***na naman**} ito=ng damit.
　　 launder-LV 2SG.GEN again already SWITCH.TOPIC this=LK clothing

　　 'Wash these clothes 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, 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.

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

Kratzer, Angelika. 1991. Modality. In *Semantik: Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung*, ed. Arnim von Stechow and Dieter Wunderlich, HSK, 639–650. Walter de Gruyter.

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.

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.

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*

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

(39) a. <u>Context (last one left):</u> 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.) **# (38)**

      b. <u>Context (first one):</u> 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.) ✓ **(38)**

na vs *lang*

(40) [English]_F **na   lang** ang alam niya.
      English   already only NOM know 3SG.GEN
      'S/he only knows English now.'⁶

(41) a. <u>Context (lost all but one):</u> 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.) ✓ **(40)**

      b. <u>Context (acquired only one):</u> 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.) **# (40)**

---

6 The argument 'English' is clefted here. The judgments in (41) 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.'