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Introduction

This volume is dedicated to Dr. Lawrence A. Reid, Researcher Emeritus, Social Science Research Institute and Department of Linguistics, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. All contributors, including Carl and I, would like to express our gratitude to Laurie for his remarkable influence on us in our respective academic careers and/or research on Philippine languages and cultures. We would also like to honor Laurie for his many achievements in Philippine linguistics and anthropology. We hope that Laurie will accept our modest contributions as a token of our appreciation to him. Moreover, we hope that this volume will give readers some ideas about current research on Philippine languages and cultures and result in further exchange of ideas and information toward the growth and development of Philippine linguistics.

The preparation of this Festschrift was stimulated by the launching of two Festschriften for two of my professors at the University of Hawai‘i. The first one was a book launch for a Festschrift in honor of the late Professor Stanley Starosta, which took place at one of the Tuesday Seminar meetings, Department of Linguistics, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa in 2000. The second one was a book launch for a Festschrift in honor of Professor Byron W. Bender, which took place at the 9th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Canberra, January 2002. I was fortunate to be able to participate in both memorable events and the wonderful experiences helped to encourage me to organize a book launch event for my advisor Laurie Reid.

When I learned that the 10th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics will be held in the Philippines, I decided to edit a Festschrift for Laurie because I believe that the Philippines is the most suitable place for us to honor him. Although I was warned by a number of linguists about the difficulties of editing a Festschrift, I was still very determined that I would undertake such an endeavor. Soon after I returned to Honolulu from Canberra, I started collecting contact information of Laurie’s friends, colleagues, and students. Because I had little experience with academic publications, I decided to find a coauthor. I sent e-mails to a couple of linguists and received a positive response from Dr. Carl Rubino on February 23, 2002. After Carl agreed to serve as the coeditor of the volume, I was even more confident that we would be able to produce a wonderful volume for Laurie.

Understanding how busy academics are, Carl and I solicited contributions for the volume as soon as we could. On March 14, 2002, we sent the first call for papers to a variety of relevant scholars. Initially, more than 30 scholars accepted our invitation to contribute an article to the volume, but only 24 of them made it at the end. A number of Laurie’s friends had to turn down our invitation because their research interests were not on Philippine languages and/or cultures. We regret that we had to limit the focus of the Festschrift on Philippine linguistics and anthropology because of marketing concerns. Because Festschriften typically include papers with diverse and sometimes unrelated topics, they seldom fare well commercially. Consequently, many academic presses are not willing to publish Festschriften at all. To ensure that we would be able to find a publisher for the Festschrift, we chose Laurie’s main research area, Philippine linguistics and anthropology, as the theme of the volume.

In preparing this Festschrift, I have received help from a number of individuals. I sincerely thank Byron W. Bender, Ken Rehg, Paul Jen-kuei Li, Howard McKaughan, Tish Bautista, Ginny Larson, and Joel Bradshaw for providing me with some information that we needed for the book. I would also like to thank Hiro Kitano, Mike Pangilinan,
and the following SIL members, Lou Hohulin, Rudy Barlaan, and Claudia Whittle, for checking the data that appeared in some papers for us. I would also like to express my gratitude to R. David Zorc, Nikolaus Himmelmann, and Ron Himes for commenting on some of the papers that tied in to their realm of expertise.

I am especially grateful to the following SIL members for their help in publishing this book. First, my deepest gratitude goes to Steve Quakenbush, who kindly offered to present our book proposal to the members of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines Executive Board at the February 2004 LSP Board Meeting. Without his help, we would probably still be trying to procure a publisher now. Second, I would like to acknowledge Sue McQuay, the former Academic Publications Manager of SIL Philippines, for laying out general matters related to book publishing for us. Third, I would like to thank Rex Johnson for typesetting the volume for us. It has been a great experience for me to work with Rex on this project. Finally, I would also like to thank Dave Moldez, the graphic designer of SIL Philippines, for designing the beautiful book cover for us, which is a product of several design ideas and iterations.

My deepest appreciation and gratitude go to the following two individuals. I am grateful to Br. Andrew Gonzalez, FSC, for being very supportive to the book project and for inviting me to join the faculty of the Department of English and Applied Linguistics, De La Salle University—Manila. Being physically present in Manila makes the communication between Rex and me a lot easier. I am really thankful to the coeditor of this special publication, Carl Rubino, for sharing the editor burden with me. Carl has been a wonderful partner to work with and also a good friend who has helped me on various occasions since we started working on this special project together.

Last but not least, I would like to acknowledge the Summer Institute of Linguistics and the Linguistic Society of the Philippines for publishing this Festschrift. Without SIL and LSP, the publication of this volume would not have been possible.

Hsiu-chuan Liao

廖秀娟

September 30, 2005
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Laurie Reid’s Importance to the Tasaday Controversy

Robin Hemley  
University of Iowa

The following is excerpted from the book, INVENTED EDEN: The Elusive, Disputed History of the Tasaday (Farrar, Straus, and Giroux 2003). The Tasaday were a band of 26 forest dwellers “discovered” living in the rain forest of Southern Mindanao in 1971. Brought to the world’s attention by a Marcos government minister, Manuel Elizalde, a playboy and scion of one of the Philippines’ richest families, the Tasaday were soon heralded in the press worldwide as a “Stone Age” tribe that lived in caves with no knowledge of the outside world, no cloth, no metal. They had lived in total isolation for a thousand years or more. Most remarkably in light of the conflict raging in Vietnam at the time, the Tasaday were said to have no word for war or enemy. Visited by such celebrities as Charles Lindbergh and Italian actress Gina Lollabrigida, the Tasaday were embraced by the world media, but the studies conducted by various social scientists were inconclusive and ambiguous. In the mid-seventies, Marcos and Elizalde closed off the Tasaday’s 45,000 acre Reserve to further visitors and the group faded from public view. Then in 1986, a Swiss reporter acting on a tip hiked into the forest on the heels of the Marcos government’s ouster and was allegedly told by the Tasaday through a translator that they were really farmers whom Elizalde had coerced into dressing in leaves and living in caves. This revelation ignited a world-wide furor among journalists and academics alike. Far from the ethnographic find of the century, the Tasaday were now ridiculed as another Piltdown hoax. But was it that simple? Enter Lawrence Reid at the 1988 International Congress on Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences in Zagreb. Over the next ten years, Reid became the only scholar willing and able to take on the controversy in a way that combined open-mindedness, fieldwork with the Tasaday, and his unparalleled knowledge of Austronesian languages to get to the bottom of the Tasaday mystery.

The Zagreb conference was not entirely devoted to the Tasaday issue as the U.P. conference had been. The Tasaday controversy was a small part of the conference, where 2000 anthropologists, linguists, and others were in attendance, among them Lawrence Reid and Thomas Headland. Headland is both missionary and anthropologist, a fact that doesn’t sit well with some anthropologists, many of whom who are ambivalent at best towards missionaries. His home institution, the Summer Institute of Linguistics, was founded in 1934 by American missionary-linguist, William Cameron Townsend, based on the “realist humanitarian philosophy” that Christianity, introduced through native languages is the best way to help “the needy and oppressed”
tribal peoples of the world (Bodley 1990:186). SIL’s translation of the New Testament into various tribal languages has also produced numerous lexicons in the most obscure tongues, an invaluable resource for future researchers, especially as speakers of the smaller languages die out.

Headland’s main role at the ICAES in Zagreb was as the chair of a symposium he’d put together, titled “Deculturation and Survival Among Southeast Asian Negritos — What Can Be Done.” But he was also presenting three papers at the conference, including one on the Tasaday, “What Did the Tasaday Eat?”

He roomed with his long-time friend, Lawrence Reid, a former member of SIL, and Professor of Linguistics at the University of Hawai’i. Headland considered Reid “the leading expert on Philippine Austronesian linguistics,” and the two were working together on several papers.

Reid, for his part, found himself seated next to ABC reporter Judith Moses (who had produced a documentary titled “The Tribe That Never Was” for ABC’s 20/20) at a dinner the night before the Tasaday session hosted by Mario Zamora. The Tasaday came up in conversation and Moses whispered into his ear, “It’s really terrible the way these people have been exploited. It’s all a hoax, you know.” She proceeded to tell her side of the story in whispered tones. This piqued Reid’s interest and he decided to attend the Tasaday session.

The session began at 8:30 the next morning. The BBC was filming and their presence didn’t help. The participants played to the camera with less ease and certainly less goodwill than the Tasaday. In the BBC production we see hoax proponent and UC-Berkeley anthropologist Gerald Berreman telling the room of anthropologists that the people who went down to see the Tasaday tended to go down there with an “idée fixe as to what they were going to see, and they tended to see it.”

“Berreman had gone on for oh, about an hour,” Headland says, “on and on trying to read this whole long thing.” People tried to interrupt him, Nance in particular, but Berreman forged ahead, simply holding up his hand like someone was going to hit him.

Finally, Headland stood and said, “I beg your pardon. Sir, I just have one question Jerry. Are the rest of the people going to be allowed to speak today? Is this a filibuster? Are the people on the other side even going to be allowed to say anything today? I’ve come several thousand miles to hear this. This is an important symposium to me and I would like to hear the other speakers.”

Berreman stopped not long after that and Judith Moses got up to speak. “I’m going to tell you what I really want to tell you, and it’s going to be no holds barred, but you have to understand that I don’t have to go back to the Philippines and live, and that’s the difference between me and my colleagues.”

“John,” she said, addressing Nance, who was taking notes on the proceedings for a book of his own. “If you did know about the hoax, then shame on you. And if you didn’t know, double shame on you. Because nobody had access like you had. Nobody could have had their questions answered.”

Passing around a photo of a corpse on a slab with its head sewn back on, Moses claimed that he had been killed by an associate of Elizalde. But waving around the gruesome photo proved nothing about the Tasaday. Violence was part of the everyday landscape of Southern Mindanao.

Lawrence Reid was intrigued by all the politics in the room in Zagreb:

It seemed to me that there was one line of evidence that had not been explored. If a hoax was involved, surely it would be apparent in the linguistic data that was gathered by the linguists and anthropologists during the initial contacts that had been made with them in the early 70’s. T’boli is not a
Manobo language, in fact it is as different from Manobo languages as perhaps English is from Russian .... It would be interesting, I thought, to critically examine the responses that were recorded to questions posed by the first investigators, for signs of linguistic hanky-panky, or at least for evidence that there was an educated T'boli masquerading as a primitive stone age-cave dweller (Reid 1993:2).

Reid also wondered why, if the Tasaday were a hoax, Elizalde would have recruited a deaf mute couple and a sickly albino child for the original group. It couldn’t have been easy to send them running to the caves in advance of Elizalde’s chopper. After Moses had finished her admonishments, someone suggested that they gather again that afternoon so that the other side could respond. Headland was tapped to lead the afternoon session since both sides seemed willing to listen to him. Headland was reluctant at first, but finally agreed. A consummate organizer, he gave everyone a set amount of time for their remarks. Everything ran smoothly after that. No one interrupted and no one shouted. And most importantly, TV cameras were banned.

It’s fitting, perhaps, that the BBC filming in Zagreb had turned the proceedings into a circus. Never before have images been so crucial to a supposedly scientific inquiry. In February of 1990, in the pages of *Anthropology Today*, Judith Moses ridiculed BBC producer Bettina Lerner’s methods for coming to a conclusion different from her own. Moses writes:

[She] is the only reporter who traveled to the Philippines and never bothered to go to Mindanao .... Of what use is an armchair report? I find such an attitude somewhat arrogant at the very least. (Moses 1990:22)

Lerner responded with her own broadside in the June issue:

Although she sees me as an armchair journalist, I deliberately chose not to go down to Mindanao to interview the Tasaday ... journalists, as opposed to anthropologists, will never find out the truth about the Tasaday from the Tasaday themselves. The Tasaday have changed their story for every journalist who has been down to see them....If there is any ‘arrogance’ in this issue it is shown by journalists like Ms. Moses, who pop down to Mindanao for a couple of days and triumphantly return with the definitive ‘truth....’ Rather than attacking me, it might be more pertinent to question the many ‘armchair’ anthropologists involved in this story (Lerner 1990:21).

Years later, Laurie Reid invited me to his condo to listen to the original surreptitiously-recorded tapes made in 1972 by Elizalde. The tapes had been lost for over twenty years, further fueling the skepticism of the hoax proponents, who doubted the tapes’ very existence. We listened to them over a couple of Steinlager beers (as a New Zealander, he’s loyal to the home product and will keep no other brand in his refrigerator). He also had agreed to show me a stone tool one of the Tasaday, Belayem, gave him — *if* he could find it. It might be packed away, he said, in preparation for forthcoming scholarly appointments and conferences in France and Japan that would keep him out of the country for the next sixteen months. The tool turned up after a quick search and he brought it over for me to inspect.

My initial feelings about the Tasaday stone tool were merely acquisitive. I simply wished I had one. Only later, after I returned home, did it occur to me that I should have taken a picture of it. Laurie was amenable to the idea of having the tool photographed, but it would have to wait for at least sixteen months and his return to Hawai’i. Typical of Elizalde, he had sent all three of the Tasaday tools that were found and examined by
National Museum staff in those first days (the scraper National Museum anthropologist Jesus Peralta found, a hafted stone hammer, and another hafted tool) to Imelda Marcos as a “political gesture” (Peralta 1992:158). The tools had not been seen since. The Tasaday hastily crafted other tools for their frequent visitors, of which some had been displayed at PANAMIN’s museum. Judith Moses had sent photographs of the existing stone tools to Robert Carniero, Curator of South American Ethnology at the American Museum of Natural History in New York, who had pronounced them fake. The supporters of authenticity saw such tools as “demonstration tools.” The other tools, the ones the Tasaday said were used by their ancestors, and which were of better quality, were referred to as “heirloom tools.”

Here in Laurie Reid’s apartment were two of the very things whose loss the hoax supporters had bemoaned, even ridiculed—the tapes and a stone tool, apparently one that had actually been used before Elizalde’s arrival. Laurie fetched a small boom box and popped in a copy of one of the Tasaday cave tapes—the rise and fall chirping of thousands of insects blanketed the small living room. He expressed his doubts that such a recording could have been concocted. This felt as close as I could get to time travel, if not to the Stone Age, at least to 1972. Shouts and exclamations, long pauses, and then bursts of language, and over it all, incessantly, the sound of bugs.

Like the stone tools the tapes were lost, or rather, misplaced, and Elizalde’s laissez-faire attitude only deepened suspicions against him. As of 1992, and Berreman’s article in Thomas Headland’s AAA volume on the controversy, the tapes had not been located. “The loss of the tapes,” Berreman crowed, “especially combined with the loss of irreplaceable evidence for other exciting discoveries in various of Elizalde’s enterprises, suggests a pattern amounting to a rain forest ‘Watergate.’”

Elizalde handed over three of the cave tapes to Laurie in 1993, a mere twenty years after anthropologist Frank Lynch asked for them. Reid’s expertise in Austronesian languages qualified him to analyze the tapes in a way that few others could, and Elizalde recognized this. By this time, Reid says, Elizalde was probably convinced that Laurie wouldn’t add to the hoax stories by manipulating the data on the tapes. Perhaps Elizalde had indeed misplaced the tapes all those years as he claimed, or maybe he had simply not wanted to bother with the people asking for them, some of whom doubted the tape’s existence. Regardless, Reid had succeeded where others hadn’t, and he had since transcribed and translated the tapes. He read me several passages:

The words of Big Uncle Master of the Tasaday [Elizalde], the words of Brother Short-One [Mai Tuan]. Your rattan. Don’t give them away. Your rattan. Don’t deplete it. Your yams, don’t deplete them. Your palm starch, don’t deplete it. Don’t distribute your palm starch to other people.

“This is Belayem,” Reid told me. “He’s reporting on things that cannot be shared with other people. And he says, Everything is for Big Uncle Master of the Tasaday, the palm starch, the tadpoles, the frogs, the crabs, the monkeys...”

“Not the gold,” Laurie added and we laughed. “This is their [the hoax proponents’] interpretation.”

All of the fish, all of the little fish of the Tasaday. The little things that are eaten here...yams...especially the palm starch. There is none that can be given away.

“You read this stuff through and this was spontaneous,” said Reid. “It wasn’t set up.”
Elizalde constantly admonished the Tasaday to protect their forest, not to give any of it away. This seems to be the most eloquent argument against the hoax, and it is buttressed by the fact that so long as Elizalde was alive, the Reserve stayed more or less intact and protected. If Elizalde had had designs on it, he could have exploited its resources quite easily during the decade or so that the Tasaday vanished from the public consciousness. It was always outsiders, loggers, miners, and settlers, who wanted the Reserve opened up. “Had Elizalde or Marcos not declared it a Reserve ...” I said.

“Oh, it would have gone,” Reid declared. “...I think that Elizalde’s heart was in the right place, but sometimes he made moves which were not in the best interests of the people he was trying to protect. He was trying to establish areas which were tribal areas where people would be able to maintain their traditional ways of life. He really was convinced that it would be good for people to maintain the original ways they had and not to be engulfed with the lowland cultures which were moving in. And this was part of the reason why he told them to continue to wear your old clothes. This comes out, of course, on the tapes where Elizalde supposedly tells them, ‘Don’t let people come in there and take your things.’”

At the D.C. conference, Reid presented his initial findings, based largely on the word lists made by Fox, Peralta, Llamzon, Molony, and Elkins, as well as a tape that Carol Molony had made at the caves in 1972 (but before the reappearance of the tapes mentioned by Nance). A year later, in 1990, he was in the Philippines conducting five months research with several of the Negrito groups of Northern Luzon. Responding to pleas for assistance from the tribes, Reid called then-Under-Secretary for Agriculture in charge of special projects, Carlos Fernandez, to see if any aid could be made available. In discussing Reid’s request, Fernandez surprised him by asking if he’d like to see the Tasaday.

Fernandez had just returned from the Tasaday area — some of the Tasaday had ventured into T’boli to complain of incursions by loggers into the Tasaday Reserve, and he had gone to investigate. Fernandez told him that if he wanted to conduct some research, this would be an excellent opportunity for him to do so in the relative comfort of T’boli township, as opposed to the arduous hike into the Tasaday area. “He said all expenses would be taken care of. A hasty meeting was arranged with Elizalde, whom I had never met before.” (Reid 1993:4)

When he met Elizalde, he said he would be “completely objective” about his findings and warned Elizalde not to expect that he would come up and say the Tasaday were not a hoax if he found them to be so. Elizalde told him he had no trouble with that. Reid found Elizalde to be friendly and non-confrontational. In fact, Elizalde welcomed his research.

Reid had applied for outside funding from the National Geographic Society to support a three-year research project on the Tasaday, and he asked if Elizalde would be interested in funding the project if the National Geographic turned down the proposal.

---

1 The Gentle Tasaday was published in 1975. Between 1976 and 1986, virtually nothing was heard about the Tasaday or their Reserve. But if Elizalde and Marcos had wanted the Reserve’s resources, as they’ve been accused, neither would have had to resort to creating a fake tribe to protect. There were much easier ways during the Marcos regime to grab land. Elizalde, who was rich, powerful and influential with the Marcoses, could have found a way to get what he wanted. The Marcoses bought a number of businesses via offers that couldn’t be refused.
Elizalde said he would. Reid talked to a couple of the committee members from the National Geographic, and they were enthusiastic about the project, but then he received a letter of rejection. “Apparently, they decided not to continue getting involved in this on-going controversy, just to disassociate themselves from it,” says Reid.

Reid doubts he could have done any research without Elizalde’s backing, so he went in telling Elizalde that he would brook no interference. Elizalde, in turn, asked Reid to sign a form saying he wouldn’t disclose in print where his funding came from. “He just didn’t want to be involved with anything to do with the Tasaday at that point. He wanted to be disassociated with the Tasaday, from the Tasaday problems.”

After an initial ten-day foray, Reid did three more periods of extensive fieldwork with the Tasaday: two months between February and July 1994, a second trip during the summer of 1995, and a third trip during the summer of 1996.

The first trip was “hellish.” He didn’t realize how difficult it was going to be. It took him two days of hiking twelve hours a day, starting at Lake Sebu. The trails were muddy and overgrown, and the hiking was over steep hillsides. He only wore tennis shoes and they became so slippery, he couldn’t keep them on his feet, and he wound up walking barefoot even though his feet weren’t accustomed to such hiking. The hike became even more hellish when he stuck his foot against a rotten log and splinters lodged in his nail. By the beginning of the second day he was getting stiff. By nightfall, they were still hiking across the final ridge, in the darkness, down a rock-studded river — a gorge leading into the Tasaday area. Laurie had to be supported by two of his guides as he staggered along. He wasn’t able to walk for four days afterwards.

When he arrived, he stayed in the house of Dul and her husband Udelen — this was on a ridge in the little settlement the Tasaday call Magtu Inilingan, literally “New Learning.” Here, to Reid’s surprise, he found another Westerner living among the Tasaday, a Belgian in his late twenties or early thirties named Pascal Lays, a member of the London-based organization Survival International. Lays, for his part, was not happy to see another foreigner and acted coolly towards Reid, though he agreed to help him with his initial research. Lays had been living with the Tasaday for a couple of years and was fluent in the language, so for a time he acted as an interpreter for Laurie. Lays told Reid that the lingua franca the Tasaday used these days among themselves and to outsiders was Blit Manobo. The Tasaday had been finding wives in Blit since 1972 when Belayem married Sindii. Lays, trained as a pharmacologist, was gathering an extensive number of plants from the rainforest, and Reid describes him as a “self-educated academic” who hoped to use his research to earn a Ph.D.

One day, Reid discovered that Lays was excavating large shards of pottery from one of the hillsides. The presence of pottery implies that people had been in the area for quite a long time, but the fragments could be from people who passed through centuries ago. Lays, who jealously guarded his notes and materials, kept the discovery to himself at first and by the time Reid found out about the fragments, Lays had collected the best examples for himself.

“He’s of course completely convinced about the authenticity [of the Tasaday],” Reid says of Lays. “He thinks they came from the Kulaman Valley area [and] he is strongly pro-Tasaday as a group ...”

Reid agrees. “The last time I was there ... one of the things I did was to spend some time in Blit with Belayem and his family, and then I went up to Cotabato City, took a

---

2 The pottery was discovered by one of the Tasaday while farming a field. Dul was convinced the shards were magical and didn’t want them taken away.
boat along the Southern coast to a place called Lebak. I went up into the Kulaman area... I got an informant, brought him back down to Lebak with me and worked with him for about ten days or so going through materials I had collected with the Tasaday to see if he recognized stuff." The theory, which had been espoused even in the earliest days, was that the Tasaday had escaped into the forest to avoid a fugu or smallpox plague. Apparently, they had come from the Kulaman Valley and migrated to their present location.

Reid asked his Kulaman Valley informant specifically about some of the forms unique to the Tasaday that are not known at all by the Blit, common words like kumundom "to eat," and dumontot "to drink."

Reid would ask, "Do you know what the word dumontot means?"

"Oh yeah, dumontot," the man replied. "I think that means 'drink.'"

"Do you use this term?" Reid asked.

"I don't know where I heard that word," the man said. "I don't know....There's a dialect that uses dumondot for drink."

But he knew the word. The same was true for the form "to eat." The man recognized the word and others like it that only the Tasaday used, not the Blit from whom they had supposedly been recruited, according to the hoax busters. But they weren't his normal words. There was a lot, however, that he didn't recognize or didn't know.

Eventually, Reid asked about numerals. The Tasaday, when they were first "discovered," had several different ways of counting. Lobo used to count by giving each number the name of a bird. When Reid first went to the Tasaday area and Lobo showed up, Laurie asked him about these bird names. Yes, Lobo told him, he could still count that way. Reid asked him to demonstrate and Lobo recited the ten bird names in the correct order. The other Tasaday said, "Oh, that's Lobo's way of counting. It's his unique system." There was another method that looked like "funny numerals," with some similarity to numbers, but like "play numbers." The Blit didn't use any of these. Reid's informant from the Kulaman Valley when asked if he knew of any special ways to count, apart from the normal one, two, three, said no at first. Reid told him the Tasaday have a special way of counting and gave the man the first two numbers.

"Oh!" the man told him, "When I was young I used to use those words."

"Do you know the rest of them?" Reid asked.

The man started counting, and he gave Reid the same ten numbers, not exactly the way the Tasaday used them, but so close that it was obviously the same sequence, with one or two numbers reversed.

Before long, Reid concluded that the period of the Tasaday's separation was not in the order of hundreds of years, but no more than five or six generations, maybe 100–150 years (Reid 1992:189–190). The original estimations of the Tasaday's "separation" had been wrong, but did this constitute a hoax? Reid writes:

The result of this examination of the data was that I became pretty much convinced that the hoax proponents were themselves the hoax makers. There seemed to be no evidence whatsoever that there had been any linguistic shenanigans going on. In fact, the types of responses given and the differences apparent in the lists of different investigators, seemed to me to be clear evidence of the linguistically unsophisticated nature of the Tasaday.... (Reid 1993:2)
Of course, linguistic evidence, while at times as convincing as archaeological artifacts, is not foolproof, hence the downward revision of the Tasaday’s relative “isolation.” Sometimes the evidence is inconclusive and sometimes even contradictory. Of Carol Molony’s assertion that Tasaday had no Spanish borrowings, Reid found at first several possible borrowings, though at least one he believed to have been picked up by Belayem relatively recently. He also thought he found some T’boli influences (Reid 1997:192). And, perhaps most damning of all, he caught Belayem coining new Tasaday words. Of all this he writes:

The data ... appear to be of two different kinds and lead to two different conclusions. A person who is skeptical of the authenticity of the Tasaday would focus on one set and surely jump to the conclusion that here is the evidence that is needed to settle the case...Such a conclusion would have to disregard the other set...

What then is the explanation for the first set? There is no doubt that much of the data that Belayem gave me were indeed made up for the occasion....

At the root of the apparent obfuscation is the obviously deep-rooted sense of identity that the Tasaday (not only Belayem) have of themselves. In the twenty-three years since their first publicized meeting with outsiders, not a single member of the original Tasaday group has ‘recanted,’ even though the supposed motivation for their formation as a group, the all-powerful influence of Elizalde, has long since faded. The group lives in poverty, and has no reason to continue the charade, if indeed there was one. Time and again, Belayem and other members of the group expressed frustration and anger over the questions that have been raised about their authenticity. (Reid 1997:192)

Actually, several of them had recanted, at various times: Lobo, Bilangan, and most famously Dula. But it’s also true that the ones who had said they weren’t Tasaday later claimed they had been coerced and bribed into saying so by Joey Lozano and George Tanedo.

But Reid was essentially correct. The Tasaday had not benefited at all from the “charade” if there was one. Why would they continue if they had nothing to gain?

Seated at his kitchen counter, Laurie started to translate a transcript from his interviews with Belayem. I have always been a sucker for origin stories — they carry a kind of cultural force more imaginatively potent than any other kind. And this was a good one — I was quickly mesmerized as Laurie did his spot translation:

This has always been the origin of the caves. I have already told this story to Momo’ Dakel in the tape recorder before. Exactly the same. There were no other people here except Bibang. He came from there carrying his place...on his back...that place....he was holding under his arm. There was an ax, a stone ax he was holding under his arm...He went walking along the trail...suddenly

---

3 Reid now believes there was only one possible borrowing of a Spanish term, the widespread term from Spanish jepe, but that may be a coincidental similarity.
he arrived here, the place of the Tasaday. He said, ‘This is my cave. I will leave it here. I will follow the barking of my dog....

From a far place, this dog could be heard far away. Following the trail of Bibang. Suddenly, he saw Bibang crossing the stream on the other side. He had a huge head, a wide chest. The size of his chest was the length of his arm. So Bibang wanted to pass over this river. The spirit won’t let him pass.

It was a nice tale, but like everything else, it was full of contradictions. In the story, the Tasaday’s ancestor, Bibang, was out hunting with his dog, and the dog was baying after his quarry, a wild pig. The only problem is that the Tasaday supposedly didn’t have dogs before they were “discovered;” they wouldn’t be able to survive in the rain forest. So how could a dog be following Bibang around?

Laurie asked Belayem about this. “I thought you didn’t have any dogs.”

“It wasn’t a dog,” Belayem said. “We call it a dog today; it was a wild cat.” It seemed to Laurie a convenient explanation, but not a very good one since cats don’t bay after wild pigs.

Laurie mentioned this to Elizalde one day, and he said, “Do you really believe that these stories remain unchanged, that they aren’t adapted to modern things that they know, that they introduce to their stories, aspects of modern life, assuming that they were part of old life?”

And of course, that was true. It was something Laurie hadn’t thought of — he had similar tales from the Mountain Province of ancient times, in which the customs and objects from the Spanish times had been incorporated. Still, it was a puzzle.

“Well, this is the way the story goes,” Laurie tells me. “But the point is, he dropped the caves from under his arm, this guy Bibang.”

One of Reid’s colleagues at the University of Hawai’i is Rebecca Cann, a renowned pioneer in DNA research. Cann was working on an NSF project for research on Pacific peoples and their relationship to Asian mainland populations when Reid approached her and asked if she could include some Tasaday samples in the study. “You go get the hair,” she told him. “I’ll get the DNA analysis done.” The reason he wanted to do this was because of the claims that some of the Tasaday are actually genealogically related to people in the Blit area. With Elizalde’s blessing Reid traveled to the Tasaday area in November of ’96. He spent five days getting forty or so hair samples. People would come to meet him and he would try to persuade them to let him pull out three or four hairs from their head, sealing them in envelopes with data about who he got it from, and the person’s genealogical data. Some, like Lobo, refused.

In his office, Laurie shows me Cann’s preliminary report with the names of the subjects and the initial analysis. “These are the names of the people from whom I got hair,” he says. “A lot of them are Tasadays, a lot of them are Blits.”

He points to his own name. “Lawrence Reid, New Zealander. I put my name—they suggested I do that so they would be able to make sure there was no contamination. ‘Place of birth. Paternal kin group. Approximate date of birth.’ They were able to extract DNA from some of this stuff, but not from all of it. Here’s Lef, the daughter of Mafalu who gave me hair. They got DNA from her. But not apparently from Mafalu himself....”

---

4 Belayem told this story to Reid in the 1990’s. By this time, they’d presumably seen many dogs. Nance had even reported in The Gentle Tasaday that Dafal had given them a dog, but it had died. The word that they used for dog was most certainly the word the Monobo Blit use.

5 Pascal Lays, in his hometown newspaper in Belgium, recounts the same story, more or less, that Laurie Reid elicited from Belayem about the origins of the caves.
According to Zeus Salazar’s data, Mafalu, the son of Datu’ Dudim, the chief of Blit, is the half-brother of Dul, another of Datu’ Dudim’s progeny. If this were so, then that makes Dul the aunt of Mafalu’s daughter, Lef.

If Elizalde had set up the Tasaday as a charade with the knowledge that the Tasaday and the Blit were relatives, he would have been crazy to authorize a study that would once-and-for-all uncover this bald hoax. The DNA analysis would be at least as elucidating as examining the midden outside the caves to see if the Tasaday had indeed lived in them. On the other hand, it’s hard not to be uncomfortable with all of this—the Tasaday have suffered so much already, maybe it’s best to simply leave them alone and let everyone think whatever they so choose.

In 2000, Laurie Reid put portions of the long-lost 1972 cave tapes on the Internet, allowing others to analyze the linguistic evidence. Tom Headland asked several linguists, all speakers of Cotabato Manobo, independently of one another, to do just that. None of the four scholars (Clay Johnston, Ross Errington, Douglas Fraiser, and Meg Fraiser) collaborated with one another. All four agreed that what they heard was a close dialect of Cotabato Manobo. Errington felt that “our Cotabato Manobo neighbors would... understand most of the oral text, although they would probably say that it has variations and is not ‘pure’ or ‘good’ Manobo.” Douglas Fraiser, a “community development specialist” with SIL, seemed to agree that while some word usage and definitions differed slightly from Cotabato dialects he knew, the majority of Tasaday words were either “identical or closely related” to Cotabato Manobo words. He added that in 1990, “some of the Manobo [people] we know visited the Tasaday people and got to talk with them for a short while. Some felt they had a hard time communicating. My impression from the Manobo men’s reactions to meeting the Tasaday, and from what I have seen of the Tasaday language, is that they were having no more trouble understanding Tasaday than I once had understanding certain British dialects.”

When Elkins reviewed the transcripts posted on the Internet, he wrote, “Virtually none of the inflections of the verbs look anything at all like Tboli,” and he, too felt that the language reflected in the transcripts was “virtually identical to Cotabato Manobo.”

“Case closed,” Headland wrote in an e-mail to me after Elkins’ comments.

Not quite, I thought. While this testimony demolished the notion that these were people whose first language was T’boli, but who pretended to be Manobos (one should note Reid’s contention that such speakers, even if fluent in Manobo, would invariably borrow from T’boli, their first language — not to mention the fact that their inflections would be different), there was still the notion of tigtu kagi, or the Tasaday’s true language, to be considered. By 1972, the time of the tape recordings, the Tasaday had been in frequent contact with their Blit neighbors. For instance, the widely reported word for “good” or “beautiful,” mafion, was metelol in tigtu kagi, as I had been told on my second visit and then corroborated with Laurie Reid. Likewise, plant names like dalikan and seyal had matched up with the names unique to the Tasaday recorded by Yen thirty years earlier. This suggests that the Tasaday rapidly learned many words from their neighbors in Blit, much as Carlos Fernandez and David Baradas quickly learned Tasaday words within only a week of contact. As Reid (1992:183) suggested in Headland’s book, the dialect of their neighbors would have had a higher status to the Tasaday than their own, but regardless of why or how long they had been speaking the dialect of their neighbors, one couldn’t assume that the speech of the Tasaday recorded in 1972 was what they would have spoken prior to 1971.

Thomas Headland, e-mail to the author, 23 February, 2001.

I needed to make one more trip — to Hawai‘i. I e-mailed Laurie Reid to ask him if he’d seen results from Rebecca Cann’s DNA research. He hadn’t heard anything in quite a while, so he called and made an appointment for us to meet her. I was experiencing a new feeling about my research; let’s call it dread. I had come pretty certainly to the conclusion by now that the Tasaday were no hoax, as such, and that the real hoax had been perpetrated by some of the very same people who decried the Tasaday as fake. But DNA — that was incontrovertible, wasn’t it? I felt confident the DNA would show that Mafalo and Dul were not related, but what if they were? Why should I care one way or the other? But I did. What could I do about my biases at this point besides admit them?

Laurie and I met with Rebecca Cann in her office. The news was disappointing — not because the DNA proved Salazar correct, but because, as Dr. Cann patiently explained to us, to prove the relationship of two people, one would need a much larger sampling of DNA from the population of Blit. Laurie had collected upwards of fifty samples from the Tasaday and the people of Blit, but the sample wasn’t large enough to be conclusive.

When we returned to Laurie’s office, I told him about my map, the one from the early fifties showing human structures of some kind relatively nearby the Tasaday caves. We spread the map on his desk and he studied it. I expressed some regret that I had even found the map.

“You can’t hold anything back,” Laurie said, looking up at me.

“No, of course not,” I said.

Like Tom Headland, with whom I’d previously shared the discovery, Laurie thought the map indeed had significance. He wondered if it would be possible to match the arrival of Dafal’s father, Mindal, to the approximate date of the maps.

Laurie popped one of the cave tapes from 1972 in his tape deck and turned it on. The small office filled with the echoing sound of the caves and the ever-present cacophony of bugs. For ten minutes at least we listened to that tape, neither of us saying a word.
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PART ONE:

OVERVIEW
Philippine Linguistics from an SIL Perspective—
Trends and Prospects

J. Stephen Quakenbush
Summer Institute of Linguistics

1. Introduction

This paper considers the development of Philippine linguistics from an SIL perspective. More specifically, it reviews certain historical trends in linguistic research as practiced by SIL linguists in the Philippines, especially as evidenced through academic publications. The broader context of Philippine linguistics from the early 1900s to the present is sketched very briefly, and a few closing observations and suggestions for future work are offered.

The term “Philippine linguistics” rightfully refers to any research on or about the structure and/or use of languages spoken in the Philippines. Such a definition includes research done inside or outside the Philippines, by Filipino scholars or others. Hence, a more ambitious review of Philippine linguistics would certainly devote more coverage and analysis to the work of Lawrence Reid and his students and colleagues from the University of Hawai’i. The present paper, however, apart from some very brief and general details, focuses out of necessity on research done by SIL linguists, usually from within the Philippines. Such an admittedly limited overview is offered here in appreciation and honor of a noted linguist who began his linguistics career in the Philippines under the auspices of SIL. It is offered here with hope that, in the tradition of Reid, it will foster further exchange of ideas and information toward the growth and development of Philippine linguistics more broadly.

SIL International, formerly known as the Summer Institute of Linguistics, is an international non-government organization whose purpose is “to work with language communities worldwide to facilitate language-based development through research,

---

1 An earlier version of this paper was delivered as the Annual Lecture for the Andrew Gonzalez, FSC Distinguished Professorial Chair in Linguistics and Language Teaching, 27 July 2002, at De La Salle University in Manila, and published in the June 2003 issue of Philippine Journal of Linguistics 34 (1).

2 I note here that there are over 6,000 other possible “SIL perspectives,” one for each SIL member. In preparing this paper I have benefited from interacting with numerous SIL colleagues, including Myra Lou Barnard, Sherri Brainard, Dick Elkins, Jan Forster, Hella Goschnick, JoAnn Gault, Bill Hall, Alan and Phyllis Healey, Lou Hohulin, Allan Johnson, Rex Johnson, Paul Kroeger, Rundell Maree, Howard McKaughan, Sue McQuay, Tom Payne, Carol Pebley, David Thomas, Anne West, Elmer Wolfenden, and Chuck Walton. I gratefully acknowledge the help of the following non-SIL linguists who responded to requests for information: Mark Donohue, William Foley, Malcolm Ross, Stan Starosta, Robert Van Valin, and Fay Wouk. Josephine Daguman provided a helpful exchange of ideas. Thanks to Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista, and especially to Hsiu-chuan Liao, both of whom offered substantive suggestions and persistent encouragement. Shortcomings remain my own.
translation and literacy.” (www.sil.org) Since 1953, SIL has been active in the Philippines through a working agreement with the Department of Education, enjoying productive affiliations through the years with the Institute of National Language, the University of the Philippines, the Linguistic Society of the Philippines, and the Translators Association of the Philippines (TAP). Over the past fifty years, SIL has done at least preliminary research in over ninety Philippine languages, and is currently active in some forty language projects around the country. The “typical” completed SIL language project has yielded phonological and grammatical descriptions, text collections, word lists or dictionaries, and varying amounts and types of vernacular literature, including translated portions of the Bible.

2. Linguistics as a Discipline in the Philippines

The early history of linguistics as an academic discipline in the Philippines has been summarized by others (e.g., Reid 1981a, Gonzalez 1986). Prior to the twentieth century, a number of Spanish priests produced grammars and word lists of Philippine languages for the purpose of teaching fellow missionaries these languages. These written grammars naturally followed a Latin model for grammatical analysis. National hero Jose Rizal, whose death by firing squad at the end of the nineteenth century prefigured the end of the Spanish era, may be considered the first Filipino linguist. Rizal produced a grammar of Tagalog and a series of short essays on Philippine cultural groups. But Rizal was a man of many interests and talents, and basically worked alone in his linguistic pursuits, without the benefit of a group of similarly minded scholars. The field of linguistics was formally established in the Philippines with the founding of the Department of Linguistics at the University of the Philippines (UP) in 1924 under the leadership of Otto Scheerer, a German businessman, coffee planter and scholar. Cecilio Lopez, a student of Scheerer's, completed his Ph.D. in 1928 under Otto Dempwolff at the University of Hamburg with a contrastive analysis of Ilocano and Tagalog. Lopez returned to a long and successful linguistics career at UP as the first Filipino professional linguist. The tradition of Lopez was carried forward through The Archives, a journal devoted to the study of Philippine languages and dialects, as well as through the activities of the Diliman Linguistics Circle. The most massive dictionary project ever undertaken on Philippine languages is surely that of one of Lopez's students, the now retired Ernesto Constantino.

In spite of the foundational developments at UP during the first half of the twentieth century, there was no widespread interest in linguistics as a field of study elsewhere in the Philippines. Gonzalez (1986:81) notes that the establishment of linguistics as a discipline came largely as a post-World War II phenomenon, through the efforts of a number of Filipino scholars returning from studies in the US in applied linguistics in the 1950s. Significant milestones that followed were the founding of the Philippine Center for Language Study in 1957 (which became the Language Study Center of the Philippine Normal College in 1965) and the Linguistic Society of the

3 Rubrico 1998 details a number of linguistic and Philippine language publications during the Spanish era (1565–1898), beginning with Doctrina Cristiana in 1593. A more extensive bibliography can be found in Ward 1971.

4 According to its preface, Constantino's 1999 An English-Filipino Dictionary was originally meant "to serve as the 'mother dictionary' of more than 100 English to Philippine language bilingual dictionaries" begun in 1986.
Philippines, along with its journal, in 1969. A later development was the formation of a consortium of universities in Manila which offered a Ph.D. program in linguistics.

SIL has participated in the development of linguistics as a discipline in the Philippines by several means. From 1953, SIL served in advisory capacities to the Institute of National Language, which provided SIL’s first office space and published some of its earliest analytical works. SIL also helped provide teaching personnel for the M.A. program in linguistics at the University of the Philippines as early as 1954, and regularly provided staff in the 1960s and early 1970s through an agreement of affiliation with the UP College of Education. With a member on the board of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines since its founding in 1969, SIL has participated in numerous workshops and conferences with the broader academic community, and is a regular contributor to the Society’s *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. SIL and LSP jointly established two series of publications: *Special Monographs* and *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* (now *Studies in Philippine Languages and Cultures*). From 1976 to 1986, in cooperation with the Department of Education, SIL provided teaching staff for an M.A. program in Applied Linguistics at the Baguio Vacation Normal School. More recently, SIL has worked in close partnership with the Translators Association of the Philippines, often through joint participation in linguistic workshops and, in several cases, assigning personnel to joint language projects. SIL has also provided teaching staff for TAP training programs in conjunction with Philippine Normal University and Alliance Biblical Seminary in Manila.

3. Philippine Linguistics Outside the Philippines

As far as the development of Philippine linguistics outside the country, one must first acknowledge the historically significant work of Otto Dempwolff in Germany during the first half of the twentieth century. The father of comparative Austronesian studies, Dempwolff, laid the foundation for further historical and comparative studies on the phonology and lexicon of Proto-Austronesian. As mentioned above, it was under Dempwolff that Filipino linguist Cecilio Lopez wrote his dissertation on Ilocano and Tagalog. Frank Blake’s 1906 ‘Expression of case by the verb in Tagalog’ was one of the first articles published in the US on a Philippine language. Leonard Bloomfield’s 1917 detailed grammatical analysis of a collection of Tagalog texts later became a basic reference for future descriptive grammars of Philippine languages. Two more recent foundational works produced through the cooperation of US and Philippine researchers, both published in 1972, were Schachter and Otanes’ *Tagalog Reference Grammar* and John Wolff’s *Dictionary of Cebuano Visayan*. Reid’s significant contributions to Philippine linguistics, beginning in the 1960s, come as the result of research on a wide variety of languages, often dealing with comparative and diachronic matters of morphosyntax. His most intensive fieldwork has been on Cordilleran, Negrito and Manobo languages.

The study of foreign languages in general took on added impetus in the US after World War II, and this included the study of Asian and Pacific languages. Several universities developed programs in linguistics and instruction in Philippine and other Austronesian languages, the most extensive course offerings being at the University of Hawai’i. Strong programs in Southeast Asian Studies, which include Philippine

---


6 Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835) also did some descriptive work on Tagalog preparatory to his grammar of Kawi, a Javanese language. For details, see Percival 1974.
language offerings, also developed at Cornell, the University of Michigan and elsewhere. A separate locus of research for Asian and Pacific languages arose in Australia, most notably at the Australian National University in Canberra. Internationally, a number of other universities currently offer courses in Austronesian languages and linguistics. Since 1974, the International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (ICAL) has met at three- to four-year intervals, and is a primary venue for interaction among scholars from Europe, North America, Asia and the Pacific who do research on Austronesian languages.

4. SIL in Philippine Linguistics

4.1 Major research questions

SIL has addressed two primary research questions in the Philippines from the start, both of which have stemmed from a desire to serve among the lesser known language groups known nationally as “cultural communities.” These two questions are:

- What Philippine languages are there?
- What are these languages like?

It is noteworthy that the primary questions addressed by SIL overlapped with, but were not identical to, the primary interests of many of the Filipino linguists who were returning from study abroad to establish the discipline of linguistics in their own country in the 1950s and 1960s. These scholars were often more interested in the pressing matters of developing a national language and teaching an international language than with documenting and analyzing the many local languages. With the exception of a few linguists at the University of the Philippines who continued in the tradition of Cecilio Lopez, research on the majority of Philippine languages largely became the purview of foreign scholars.

The desire to answer the question “What Philippine languages are there?” assured that SIL would be concerned with matters of comparative linguistics and dialectology, and in particular with the issue of dialect and language boundaries. The motivating question underlying this research was a practical one, namely: “How many distinct translation or language development projects does the linguistic diversity warrant?” Early language survey work concentrated on collecting word lists and making systematic comparisons among cognate forms in different dialects. This type of comparative linguistics was much like that used by historical linguists for reconstructing proto-forms and positing genetic relationships among language families. By 1969, SIL Philippines began to employ a method developed by SIL Mexico for testing aural comprehension of tape-recorded texts, a procedure documented in Casad’s 1974 *Dialect Intelligibility Testing*. This method was found to be a helpful means of augmenting measures of lexical similarity, as it was a more direct measure of comprehension as opposed to comparisons of word lists. These types of language surveys — accompanied by an academic interest in matters of comparative linguistics, linguistic diversity and language contact — led to such publications as Walton’s (1979) ‘A Philippine language tree,’ Gallman’s (1979) *Proto-South-East Mindanao and its internal relationships*, Elkins’ *

---

7 For a listing of libraries with significant Austronesian collections, and universities with related home pages, see (http://rspas.anu.edu.au/linguistics/AustLing/anhmpg.htm).

8 The 10th ICAL is scheduled for January 2006 in the Philippines, to be hosted jointly by the Linguistic Society of the Philippines and SIL International.
(1974) ‘A Proto Manobo Word List’ and Pallesen’s (1985) *Culture contact and language convergence*. Pallesen’s work highlighted the complexities involved in analyzing similarities between languages and positing the origin of those similarities. In later years, as the importance of sociolinguistic factors and their impact on the viability of language development projects became more evident, language survey work began explicitly to address such issues as language attitudes, language maintenance and shift, and varying roles for and levels of proficiency in second languages throughout a community. As SIL involvement in new language projects declined through the 1990s, so too did related research in language survey and comparative studies. A notable exception came in the publication of Casad’s *Windows on bilingualism* (1992), which consists of selected proceedings of an international conference on language survey held in Baguio in 1987.

The current state of affairs regarding the number of Philippine languages reported or recognized is an interesting one, with varying estimates from different sources. One of the earlier well-documented sources, Reid 1971 stated that there were “more than 80” Philippine languages (Reid 1971:vii). McFarland 1980 listed 118, while McFarland 1994 listed only 110. Constantino 2000 stated there were “maybe about 110.” Reid 2000 lists 150, whereas the 2002 *Ethnologue* lists 163 living Austronesian languages spoken natively in the Philippines (including Chavacano). Some of the differences in these estimates result from different groupings of dialect clusters or language complexes. Other differences no doubt come from differing access to and acceptance of sources of information.

The second major question of “What are Philippine languages like?” opens up wide areas for research, analysis and interpretation. From the perspective of a language development project there are certain issues that must be addressed. Initially, if a linguist from outside the language community wishes to learn the language, there are the questions of phonetics and how the language is pronounced. Where literacy in the language is a goal, an immediate concern becomes how the language can be written adequately. Designing a suitable alphabet presupposes valid conclusions on the distinctive sounds of the language in terms of its phonemic inventory. Actually settling on an alphabet that is acceptable to a cross-section of a community involves many other questions of attitudes and preferences, as well. In order to speak, or to encourage the production of literature in a given language, a linguist from outside the community must also have a good understanding of how that language combines words to form phrases, phrases to form sentences, and sentences to form stretches of discourse. The quest for this sort of understanding has spurred linguistic analysis for centuries, and has the potential for doing so for centuries more.

### 4.2 SIL academic publications

A review of SIL’s academic publications on Philippine languages and linguistics reveals areas of particular interest and relevance for SIL. Such areas of concentration with at least fifteen publications over the past fifty years include: comparative linguistics, sociolinguistics (including language survey), dictionaries and word lists, overall grammatical sketches or analyses, texts and text collections, general language

---

9 Quakenbush 1989 is an example of a language survey that focuses on sociolinguistic issues.

10 The 2002 *Ethnologue* (ed. by Barbara F. Grimes) actually lists 172 languages for the Philippines, 169 of which are ‘living languages’. Of these, six are not Austronesian, including English, Spanish, and varieties of Chinese.
and linguistic concerns, phonology, discourse, semantics and translation, literacy related topics, and morphosyntax.

Table 1: SIL Philippines academic publications arranged by topic (1952–2002).

The numbers of SIL academic publications over the course of fifty years arranged into twelve categories is summarized in Table 1.\footnote{I thank Rex Johnson for making this information available to me in varying formats from the database of an SIL Philippines bibliography currently in process. Included are works by SIL Philippines members on a broad range of concerns as well as books and articles on Philippine languages by other SIL members.}

4.2.1 Morphosyntax

One category in Table 1 stands out above all others and deserves special comment here-Morphosyntax. The disproportionate number of publications in this area of linguistics reflects at least two factors. First of all, clause or sentence-level analysis generally preoccupied much of linguistic theory in the latter half of the twentieth century, as generative grammar and other models took the sentence as the basic unit of analysis. More important than the general preoccupation with the sentence as a unit of analysis, however, the number of SIL publications on morphosyntax reflects the complexity and controversy surrounding the analysis of the ‘voice’ or ‘focus’ phenomena of Philippine languages. Indeed, it is this complex system of verbal affixation and the relationship it bears with a selected nominal per clause that has become the defining characteristic of ‘Philippine-type languages.’ What to call this system of verbal affixation and the selected nominal to which it corresponds has remained controversial over the past fifty years.

In 1917, Bloomfield analyzed Tagalog as having three passive constructions: direct passive, with -in; instrumental passive, with -i; and local passive, with -an.\footnote{Blust 2002 states that Bloomfield’s analysis is a continuation of a Dutch tradition established by van der Tuuk and first applied to Philippine-type languages by Adriani 1893. Blake 1906 may be the first analysis of Tagalog in English.}
publication on a Philippine language authored by SIL members, McKaughan and Forster 1952 followed Bloomfield in the use of the term ‘voice’ in their grammar of Ilocano. But by 1958, several SIL members were using the term ‘focus’ to describe the same sort of phenomena (cf. Dean 1958, Healey 1958, and Thomas 1958).\textsuperscript{13} The motivation behind the choice of a distinct term was to convey that this system had some characteristic differences from how ‘voice’ had come to be used for Indo-European languages. The primary difference was the mere existence of multiple ‘passive’ forms. A secondary difference was the fact that these so-called ‘passive’ forms were actually more frequent and less ‘marked’ than the so-called ‘active’ forms. The ‘focus system’ then, became the way to refer to the system whereby verbal affixation signaled the semantic role of a selected nominal per clause.

What to call this selected nominal, marked in Tagalog by \textit{ang}, was also problematic. In many ways, it corresponded to the ‘subject’ of Indo-European languages. But since the selection of this ‘subject’ seemed to be made on a different basis than the subject in English, for instance, some early SIL linguists in the Philippines felt a need for another term. McKaughan 1962 introduced the term ‘topic’ for the nominal in Maranao which bore the ‘primary’ relation to the verb, introduced by \textit{so}. Many other linguists have since followed suit for many other Philippine languages. ‘Topic’ has the advantage of being similar in meaning to ‘subject’ in everyday English, as in the essentially equivalent expressions: ‘the topic of conversation’ and ‘the subject of conversation.’ ‘Topic’ also helps capture the essential ‘Comment-Topic’ structure of sentences.\textsuperscript{14} Like ‘focus,’ it conveys a distinctness to Philippine languages. The debate on whether this special nominal should be called subject or topic has continued to the present, with SIL linguists taking both sides (and sometimes switching from one side to the other, as McKaughan did in 1973).\textsuperscript{15} Schachter and Otanes 1972 referred to the ‘topic’ as the ‘focused NP,’ in agreement with the established Philippinist sense of these terms at that time. Schachter 1976 concluded that properties held by ‘subjects’ in other languages were actually split in Tagalog between the ‘topic’ NP and ‘actor’ NP.

Unfortunately for the fate of both terms, ‘topic’ and ‘focus’ have been used elsewhere in the world of linguistics with different, and varying, senses. For some, ‘topic’ came to refer to ‘given information’ that was previously mentioned or assumed in a discourse.\textsuperscript{16} For others, it became a noun phrase fronted to the beginning of a sentence through a syntactic process called ‘topicalization.’ ‘Focus,’ on the other hand, generally came to refer to heightened emphasis for particular purposes, as in an element given ‘contrastive focus.’ While linguists working on Philippine languages have usually understood each other’s use of these terms, there has been persistent misunderstanding, along with consistent objections, from linguists outside the Philippinist or Austronesian tradition. There has likewise been discontent from those within such a tradition who

\textsuperscript{13} Dick Elkins (pers. comm.) states that it was Dick Pittman who first promoted the use of the term ‘focus’ among SIL members in the Philippines, and that Elkins used it in an unpublished paper in 1955. Phyllis Healey (in press) reports that the term first came into being during a discussion among Pittman, Alan Healey, and Wilf Douglas in early 1954 at a linguistics course in Melbourne, Australia.

\textsuperscript{14} See Forster 1964 for an early, elegant discussion of how ‘topic’ and ‘focus’ work in Dibabawon.

\textsuperscript{15} See McKaughan 1973 for a switch in terminology, and Kroeger 1993b and Brainard 1996 for differing viewpoints on what the ‘subject’ is in Philippine languages.

\textsuperscript{16} This is the sense in which ‘topic’ is used by Bresnan and Mchombo 1987, quoted by Kroeger 1993b.
argue that these special terms mask similarities between Philippine languages and languages of other parts of the world.

Some linguists have maintained that Philippine languages are indeed very similar to other languages of the world, namely those which are classified as ergative languages.\(^\text{17}\) For these linguists, \textit{ang} marks the absolutive case. Under such an analysis, transitive-like ‘actor focus constructions’ are analyzed as ‘antipassives.’ An ergative analysis seems to work more easily for some Philippine languages than for others.\(^\text{18}\) Tagalog, for instance, in the words of Foley and Van Valin (1984:138), “defies simple classification as either accusative or ergative.” One general problem with an ergative analysis for Philippine languages is that it remains to be shown conclusively that the ‘actor focus constructions’ are in fact intransitive, which in turn presupposes an as of yet unagreed upon “cross-linguistically valid definition of ‘transitive’ and ‘intransitive’” (Ross 2002:24). An additional problem some find with an ergative analysis is that there is no specific marking on the verb in Tagalog, for instance, that exclusively marks the antipassive construction. What does occur is an affix that also occurs in certain other clearly intransitive expressions.\(^\text{19}\)

4.2.2 Discourse

Another category of SIL academic publications from Table 1 which deserves comment is that of Discourse. If the Text Collection category is merged with the Discourse category — a reasonable grouping due to the latter being entirely dependent on the former — Discourse becomes the area with the greatest number of publications. An emphasis on language patterns “beyond the sentence” was given impetus through SIL workshops in the Philippines led by Pike in 1963 and Longacre in 1967 and 1968. For field linguists whose motivation included the natural and meaningful translation of textual material, discourse analysis was as practical as it was appealing. The numerous studies resulting from these workshops helped to refine and promote insights into discourse analysis from a tagmemic perspective.\(^\text{20}\) This sort of analysis is based on the categorization of texts into distinct genres, and then the analysis of those texts into smaller chunks or tagmemes. The four most common genres are Narrative, Procedural, Hortatory and Expository. Each genre is further subclassified into types according to the presence or absence of certain nuclear tagmemes. The tagmemes of a Narrative discourse, for example, may include aperture, episode, denouement, anti-denouement, closure and finis. These tagmemes are filled by constructions from different levels of the grammatical hierarchy extending upward from morpheme, through stem, word, phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph and discourse. The crucial characteristic of a Narrative discourse is a chronological orientation of accomplished time. Procedural

\(^{17}\) See Payne 1982 for a comparison between Yup’ik and Tagalog. For ergative analyses of other specific Philippine languages, see Walton 1986 (Sama Pangutaran), Gault 1992 and 1999 (Sama Bangingi), and Brainard 1994a, 1994b (Karao).

\(^{18}\) Sherri Brainard (pers. comm.) has pointed out that the situation is actually more complex than whether a given language is ‘ergative’ or not, and that many Philippine languages display split patterns of ergativity on both the morphological (case marking of S versus P) and syntactic levels (dealing with patterns of coreferential noun phrase deletion). See Wouk 1996:363 for two definitions of ergativity on the discourse level.

\(^{19}\) This ‘additional problem’ some linguists have with an ergative analysis for Philippine languages was pointed out to me by Tom Payne (pers. comm.). It is not generally agreed upon that the lack of an affix exclusively marking antipassive constitutes a compelling or even valid objection to an ergative analysis.

\(^{20}\) For a readable introduction to the basic concepts of tagmemics, see Pike 1982.
discourse also involves chronological sequence, but in projected time. The primary purpose of an Expository discourse is to explain something, while the primary purpose of a Hortatory discourse is to influence behavior.\textsuperscript{21}

Discourse studies in the tagmemic tradition have sought, among other things, to characterize the shape grammatical constructions typically take in different discourse types or genres, and in different sections of those types. One expects to find differences in verb forms, for example, in a narrative peak, where they may occur without affixation to convey heightened immediacy or drama. Noun phrases are more likely to be fully expanded in the ‘aperture’ of a narrative, where participants are introduced, than they are in the sequential narrative episodes where activity takes precedence over explanation or background information.

Although discourse studies by SIL linguists have been done primarily in a tagmemic tradition, some work has been done from other perspectives. Participant identification and tracking of information through a discourse, one of the hallmarks of discourse analysis in a Givonian tradition, represent one area where there has been some productive overlap between perspectives.\textsuperscript{22} At least one study of formal speech events has been done from a more sociolinguistic or interactional perspective.\textsuperscript{23} And several works have analyzed and documented the genius of storytellers and their ‘oral narratives’ in traditional Philippine communities from more of an anthropological perspective.\textsuperscript{24} Two notable discourse publications that were first completed as M.A. theses at De La Salle University were Benn 1991 and Goschnick 1989.

Texts accompanied by interlinear glossing and free translations were among the very first publications of SIL linguists in the Philippines. Collections of texts began to be published in earnest in 1977 with the establishment of the joint LSP-SIL series, Studies in Philippine Linguistics (now Studies in Philippine Languages and Cultures). These text collections not only provide data for linguists, anthropologists and others interested in learning more about the cultural communities, they also can provide an outlet for the commentary and philosophy of members of the cultural communities on matters of importance to individual and societal life.\textsuperscript{25}

4.2.3 Lexicography

A third category of SIL academic publications which deserves additional comment is that of Lexicography—dictionaries and dictionary-making. The number of publications to date under this category do not adequately reflect its importance in a language development project. Beginning with the early word lists compiled as part of language surveys, the analysis and documentation of Philippine language lexicons,

\textsuperscript{21} See Longacre 1968 for further elaboration of Philippine language material, and Longacre 1983 for a more developed theoretical discussion. Longacre 1983 distinguishes the four “notional” types of discourse based on two criteria: contingent succession and agent orientation.

\textsuperscript{22} Pebley 1999 deals with participant reference in Kagayanen. See Brainard and Vander Molen (this volume) for a study of word order inverse phenomenon in Obo Manobo as related to topic continuity and referential distance. Quakenbush 1992 points out some of the weaknesses of topic continuity studies for expository discourse, and illustrates the importance of a consideration of discourse type when analyzing basic word order.

\textsuperscript{23} See Hall 1987 for a study of formal speech behavior in a Western Subanon setting.

\textsuperscript{24} See Wrigglesworth 1991, Wrigglesworth and Mengsenggilid 1993, and Wrigglesworth and Ampalid 2004 for three such examples.

\textsuperscript{25} See Polenda 1989 for an outstanding example of this sort of discourse material.
along with studies on the art and science of lexicography in general, have grown in sophistication and breadth.

Abrams and Svelmo 1955 and Forsberg and Lindquist 1955, in Mansaka and Tagabili, respectively, were among the first published attempts by SIL linguists to begin recording the lexicons of Philippine languages. Thomas and Thomas (1964) documents early investigation toward a language-wide semantic structure of Mansaka, which yielded a ‘thesaurus.’ Investigation along these lines spread from SIL in the Philippines to Vietnam and Thailand, and has since yielded a number of small thesauruses in minority languages of mainland Southeast Asia.26

The success of the First Asia International Lexicography Conference in Manila in 1992 demonstrated the importance and relevance of dictionary-making among linguists and language communities throughout the broader geographical region.27 Dictionaries of Philippine languages currently being produced by SIL linguists range from more ‘popular’ varieties, whose primary user audience is the local language community, to ‘academic’ varieties, which include more information specifically of interest to linguists and members of the international academic community.28 Philippine language dictionaries produced to date have largely been ‘bilingual’ in nature, often with English as the second language of reference. The most recently published dictionary by an SIL member is Behrens’ 2002 Yakan-English dictionary, intended to be part of a three-volume series on that language, including separate grammar and text collection volumes, as well.29 Newell 1995 stands as SIL Philippines’ most significant single contribution to the art and science of lexicography in general. His 1993 landmark Batad Ifugao dictionary with ethnographic notes is soon to be followed by a dictionary of Romblomanon, a language of the Visayas.

4.3 Endangered languages

In each of these three categories — syntax, discourse and lexicography — SIL linguists have concentrated on the ‘smaller’ languages of the cultural communities. This has not been exclusively the case, since SIL linguists have authored several publications on Ilocano, Tagalog and Hiligaynon.30 But with other linguists and institutions more focused on the ‘major’ languages, SIL naturally has concentrated its efforts on the ‘minor’ languages to which its personnel have been assigned. Each of these minor languages could be considered an ‘endangered language.’

Just what constitutes an endangered language is not always clear. Krauss (1992:7) has argued that “the coming century will see either the death or the doom of 90% of mankind’s languages” and that only those languages with either official state support or a “very large number of speakers” can be considered safe from extinction. The manifesto of the Foundation for Endangered Languages (2002) states that “There is agreement among linguists who have considered the situation that over half of the world’s languages are moribund, i.e. not effectively being passed on to the next generation. We and our children, then, are living at the point in human history where, within perhaps two generations, most languages in the world will die out.” The
manifesto lists three courses of action to lessen the damage that will accompany the loss of so many languages: (1) document the languages as much as possible; (2) emphasize particular benefits of the diversity still remaining; (3) promote literacy and language maintenance programs. SIL has been involved in each of these activities, particularly the first and third. Goals for typical SIL language projects in the Philippines include published grammatical descriptions, text collections, and dictionaries, as well as communities literate in the vernacular. Since the Philippines ranks tenth in the world in terms of numbers of indigenous languages, what happens with endangered languages of the Philippines is of global significance.

4.4 SIL vernacular publications

The present review of SIL academic publications (in English) on Philippine linguistics would be incomplete without a comparison to 'vernacular' publications in Philippine languages. Table 2 shows that the overall number of academic publications constitutes only about one fourth of SIL’s total publications over the past fifty years. Literacy- and translation-related publications in the vernacular account for three-fourths of SIL’s publications. Literacy-related publications include a wide range of educational materials, as do translated publications, which include portions of the Bible.

Table 2: SIL Philippines publications by type (1952–2002).

Table 3 shows a breakdown of publication types by decade. It is clear that vernacular publications have outnumbered linguistic publications in every decade, sometimes dramatically so. Translated publications were fewer in number in the

---

31 This statistic is from Krauss (1992:6, citing the 1988 Ethnologue).
32 For purposes of the comparison in Table 2 only, all publications in English (whether dealing with linguistics, anthropology, translation, literacy or other related topics), are grouped under the broader 'academic' category. ‘Translation’ and ‘Literacy’ then become vernacular language only categories.
33 The Literacy and Translation categories in Table 3 overwhelmingly reflect vernacular language publications, although they include a few academically-related publications in English. The Linguistics publications are solely in English.
1950s and 1960s, about equal to linguistic publications in the 1970s, and have outnumbered linguistic publications since.

Table 3: SIL Philippines publications by type (1950s to 1990s, and 2000–2002).

4.5 Observations

The picture that emerges from this overview of SIL’s participation in Philippine linguistics is a multi-faceted one. It is clear overall that there has been a great deal about Philippine languages to capture the interest of linguists, particularly in the realms of morphosyntax and discourse. From the decrease in number of academic publications since the 1970s and 1980s shown in Table 3, it also appears that this interest is currently in a state of decline.

The 1970s stands out as the most productive decade for SIL linguistic publications. What factors were behind the steady growth from the 1950s through the 1970s, and the decrease thereafter? Several factors had their impact. As mentioned earlier, SIL appeared in the Philippines at a time of increased interest and growth in the field of linguistics. From the influence of Cecilio Lopez and others at the University of the Philippines, from a growing number of applied linguists returning from studies abroad, from an Institute of National Language and a government interested in programs that would benefit the nation’s diverse cultural communities, from the founding of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines and departments of linguistics at additional notable universities—from all these sources there proceeded an environment that nurtured research and development of the discipline of linguistics in the Philippines. Other factors were more internal to SIL. From 1953 on, the leadership of SIL put a high priority on academic research and publication.34 Beginning in the 1960s, SIL took

34 The influence of Dick Pittman, in particular, on the first SIL members in the Philippines to do and publish research of excellence was a recurring theme in dialogue with several of these individuals.
intentional measures to involve its members in linguistic production workshops, first of all by bringing in leading linguists from abroad, such as Pike and Longacre, and secondarily by training a group of locally-based consultants. The series now called Studies in Philippine Languages and Cultures was initiated in 1977 in order to provide an additional publication outlet for SIL research. SIL as an organization in the Philippines grew in membership and numbers of language projects until the 1980s. The 1990s, in contrast, was a decade when a number of language projects were completed, and no new ones were taken on. While the completion of language projects should certainly be interpreted as progress, fewer language projects also inevitably meant fewer linguistic publications. The absence of newer work particularly impacted linguistic publications, since new projects typically had yielded phonemic and grammatical analyses of a preliminary nature in fairly quick succession.

The decline in SIL linguistic production is somewhat greater than can be accounted for solely by a decrease in personnel. Table 3 also indicates a shift in emphasis away from linguistics and toward literacy and translation publications. The decrease in linguistic production after a period of intense activity reflects what has happened in Philippine linguistics on a national level as well. Gonzalez 1998 pointed out that although the foundation and infrastructure are currently in place for the practice of linguistics as a discipline, what is lacking are linguists with the time and leisure to do the needed research. He called for a “steady stream of scholars” and concluded that “We should now direct our efforts, with the resources possible, to renew our ranks so that linguists may find a home in all the major institutions of learning in our country, for one cannot study human beings in all their dimensions without looking at their expressive creations and sign systems” (1998:142).

5. Recommendations

Taking the optimistic view that the ranks of practicing linguists in the Philippines (and elsewhere in the world, for that matter) can indeed be renewed, the question then becomes “What questions shall these Philippine linguists address?” I suggest that the major research questions SIL has addressed over the past fifty years are still valid, namely:

1) What Philippine languages are there?
2) What are these Philippine languages like?

5.1 What Philippine languages are there?

The first question of what Philippine languages there are still needs a more definitive answer. With leading scholars quoting numbers not far above a hundred, yet with 163 living Austronesian languages listed under the Philippines in the 2002 Ethnologue, there is clearly room for further research and debate. While there may never be complete agreement over which language varieties constitute dialects of others, and which are distinct languages, our current understanding would almost certainly be advanced by a careful comparison of already published data in an attempt to determine which, if any, of the 163 varieties listed in the Ethnologue are not considered to be distinct languages by some linguists. The results of such a comparison would no doubt lead to more specific questions to be answered for different language areas around the country. Such research, continuing in the tradition of Reid’s own careful work, would help clarify the actual Philippine language situation, and may also yield further insights into the general issue of the identification of dialects versus languages. In addition to
careful comparison of already published sources, additional field work would be in order for areas of the country that are less well documented.

5.2 What are these languages like?

As noted above, the second question of what Philippine languages are like takes on greater importance in light of the fact that some have already ceased to exist, and others will surely follow. A minimum documentation goal for all Philippine languages might consist of a basic phonological statement, grammar sketch, word list and simple text collection. In communities where speakers are interested in promoting the use of their own language variety, orthography and literature production would become additional local issues. Although it has been clear from the start that there is considerable variety among Philippine languages, it has too often been assumed in the linguistic literature that one (or a few) of the better known languages adequately represent(s) Philippine languages overall. Such studies as Reid 1971 and McFarland 1980 represented significant advances in our knowledge of the variety characterizing the Philippine language situation. They have long been waiting to be expanded and refined. Reid and Liao (2004a) represents an important and welcome step in this direction.

Earlier comparative linguistic studies dealt almost exclusively with phonology and lexicon. Reid’s work stands out for its consideration of the morphosyntax of Philippine and Austronesian languages. Further comparison of how languages from different parts of the Philippines handle specific morphosyntactic or discourse matters may provide additional evidence for the most natural groupings of Philippine languages, as well as for how they have impacted each other in contact situations. Such studies would surely further our understanding of the grammatical phenomena in and of themselves. In order to achieve greater understanding among the broadest possible community, the linguist must use terminology that is understood as widely and as well as possible. This consideration leads to a reevaluation of certain terms that have become current in Philippine linguistics.

5.3 A terminological aside

The special Philippinist senses of ‘focus’ and ‘topic’ as described in the section of morphosyntax above both trace their origins to ‘Philippine linguistics from an SIL perspective.’ These terms served to highlight distinctives of Philippine languages and, for the most part, have enabled Philippine linguists to communicate well with each other. Because of the level of confusion generated by both terms among a wider linguistic audience, however, it would seem beneficial at this point to discontinue the use of both. In the case of ‘focus,’ I suggest a return to the prior terminology of ‘voice.’ While ‘voice’ may have previously implied a close correspondence to the active/passive construction in English and other Indo-European languages, such is no longer the case. More recent analyses have broadened the use of the term ‘voice’ to refer to active/antipassive alternations in ergative languages as well as other types of alternations that involve “a realignment in syntactic pivots and semantic roles” (Himmelmann 2002:12). Given this broadened understanding of ‘voice,’ the special term ‘focus’ is no longer necessary.

35 The 2002 Ethnologue lists three Philippine languages as ‘extinct.’
36 See, for example, Reid 1978, 1979a, 1979b, 1979c, 1981b. Reid and Liao 2004a, 2004b provide a syntactic typology for Philippine languages that is likely the most complete of its kind.
In the case of ‘topic,’ a return to prior terminology is more problematic. The term ‘subject’ is not an ideal candidate since it is not used uniformly across the linguistic world. To many linguists it presupposes a range of properties that are not shared by any single nominal in a Tagalog clause. At present, the best options for referring to the nominal marked by *ang* in a Tagalog verbal clause (and corresponding nominals in other Philippine-type languages) seem to be the case labels ‘absolutive’ or ‘nominative.’ For a number of linguists who analyze Philippine-type languages as ergative, ‘absolutive’ remains the most natural and revealing term. For those who see Philippine-type languages as something other than ergative, or who desire a term that could be used in a broader sense for describing Austronesian languages that are not argued to be ergative, the term ‘nominative’ can be pressed into service in a broadened sense. Such a broadened sense of ‘nominative’ includes the more specific term ‘absolutive,’ and refers to the nominal in a clause with a special syntactic status, whose semantic role is cross-referenced by affixation in the verb, and which is typically introduced by a unique marker such as the Tagalog *ang*. We have seen that as our understanding of voice phenomena grew, so did the range of phenomena that could be covered by the term ‘voice,’ such that a special Philippinist use of the term ‘focus’ was no longer required. A parallel development accompanied by a broadened use of the traditional case term ‘nominative’ could also obviate the need for a special Philippinist use of the term ‘topic’.

6. Summary

This paper has presented an overview of “Philippine linguistics” from an SIL perspective. After briefly considering the historical development of linguistics as an academic discipline in the Philippines, and noting a few landmarks in the study of Philippine languages by selected scholars outside the Philippines, it concentrated on SIL’s participation in Philippine linguistics. Two basic research questions were seen to have guided the academic production of SIL: (1) What Philippine languages are there? and (2) What are these languages like? These questions were also offered as valid ones for guiding continued research in Philippine linguistics. An analysis of SIL’s academic publications over the past fifty years revealed special areas of concentration in morphosyntax, discourse analysis, and lexicography. It was noted that the special Philippinist senses of ‘focus’ and ‘topic’ came about historically from an “SIL perspective.” A desire to communicate adequately certain distinctives about Philippine languages that SIL linguists found led them to use these terms in novel ways. Although these innovations served their purpose, it was also suggested that these terms could now be discontinued. Expansion in the areas of meaning of more traditional terms such as ‘voice’ and ‘nominative’ make the special Philippinist terms no longer necessary.

Although the focus of this paper was on SIL linguistic production, it became clear that Philippine linguistics and the career of Lawrence Reid intersect at a number of strategic points. An interest and involvement in Philippine linguistics, begun under the auspices of SIL, engendered Reid’s early academic career. That interest and

---

38 Other terms which have been used for the phrase marked by the absolutive/nominal case include ‘pivot’ (as in Himmelmann 2002:12 above) and ‘trigger.’ Wouk (1986:392, and elsewhere) employs the latter term, attributing its first use to an unpublished manuscript by Fox (1982).
39 See Reid and Liao (2004a) for an example of the use of the term ‘nominative’ in this broader sense by linguists who analyze Philippine-type languages as ergative.
involvement have continued to shape his academic endeavors over the past decades. As a result, Reid has enriched Philippine linguistics with many insights and publications, especially in the documentation and comparative analyses of a broad range of Philippine languages. Reid’s scholarship, which runs both broad and deep, will continue to shape the field of Philippine linguistics for those who follow in his footsteps in the decades to come.
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PART TWO:

SOCIAL, CULTURAL, AND HISTORICAL ASPECTS OF PHILIPPINE LANGUAGES
The Linguistic Macrohistory of the Philippines: Some Speculations

Robert Blust
University of Hawai‘i

1. History and Macrohistory in Language Change

Historical linguistics is normally concerned with details of form-meaning pairing in particular languages as these relate to issues of reconstruction, change, subgrouping, borrowing and the like. Its focus is thus the history of individual language communities, a topic that can conveniently be called ‘linguistic microhistory’. But there are larger issues of linguistic prehistory which can be approached entirely without reference to such details. The geographical distribution of language families and major subgroups, for example, provides information about the relative age of language groups in a given region, centers of dispersal (‘homelands’), and prehistoric episodes of language extinction. Following Blust (1992) historical inferences founded upon these types of observations can conveniently be grouped together under the general rubric of ‘linguistic macrohistory’.

Blust (1992) adopted a distributional approach in outlining the linguistic macrohistory of mainland Southeast Asia, where five distinct language families are historically attested: 1. Austroasiatic (AA), 2. Sino-Tibetan (ST), 3. Austronesian (AN), 4. Tai-Kadai (TK), and 5. Hmong-Mien (HM). Documentary evidence tells us that Hmong-Mien (in earlier literature ‘Miao-Yao’) languages are newcomers which arrived from Guizhou in southern China during the past four or five hundred years, and that Thai and its closest relatives (Shan, Lao, etc.) moved south from Yunnan no earlier than the thirteenth century (Çoedes 1968:189ff). The historical evidence for the arrival of Austronesian speakers in mainland Southeast Asia is more sketchy, but the Indianized state of Champa (under the name ‘Lin-yi’) was recognized in Chinese dynastic records as early as 192, with oblique references to the same ethnic group dating back to 137 AD.

---

1 In the summer of 1966 an eager young undergraduate who had just been released from the U.S. Army and was relishing his newfound freedom enrolled in an introductory linguistics course at the University of Hawai‘i taught by a brand-new Ph.D. This proved to be the start of a long and productive relationship. I want to thank Laurie for giving me my foundation in linguistics, and for his continuing valuable feedback as a colleague over these four decades, a period of time that has passed so quickly that it is difficult for either of us (young-at-heart as we both are) to believe or accept.

2 Nichols (1992), who speaks of ‘macroareas’ and ‘macrogender’, but not of ‘macrohistory’, illustrates a typologically-oriented approach to issues of the kind addressed here. The variables with which she works are language families, typological features, geographical distributions and the like. At this level of abstraction linguistic forms — the basic material of the standard comparativist — hardly enter the picture at all. An earlier and rather different approach to issues of linguistic macrohistory which also is concerned primarily with explanations for the geographical distribution of diversity is seen in Sapir (1968 [1916]).
Moreover, the evidence for a Malayo-Chamic subgroup of Austronesian languages allows us to infer that Chamic speakers probably reached mainland Southeast Asia through a major population movement out of southwest Borneo in the period 2,000–2,300 BP, with subsequent migrations to Hainan island and northern Sumatra following the fall of the northern Cham capital of Indrapura to the Vietnamese in 982 AD (Blust 1992, Thurgood 1999).

The relative antiquity of the two remaining language families in mainland Southeast Asia lies beyond the reach of historical documentation. Here methods appropriate to linguistic macrohistory take precedence. The following observations are relevant:

1. AA languages have a wide east-west extent from eastern India to the South China sea, the interior of the Malay peninsula, and the Nicobar islands.
2. The distribution of these languages is patchy, with many AA languages separated from their relatives by Tai-Kadai or ST speakers.
3. The westernmost (Munda) languages are only distantly related to those further east (Mon-Khmer).
4. Apart from a few islands of Mon (AA) within the territory of the Karen, an intrusive wedge of Shan (TK) speakers in upper Burma, and Garo (ST), which lies just east of the great bend of the Brahmaputra river in a region dominated by Assamese (Indo-Aryan) speakers, the ST languages of Southeast Asia occupy a more-or-less continuous geographical block, reaching from the Chittagong, Chin and Naga hills of eastern India, through Burma and southward to the upper quadrant of the Malay peninsula. Their east-west extent is far more restricted than that of the AA languages.
5. Many ST languages are spoken in the Himalayas and throughout China, while few AA languages reach as far north as southern China.

Together these observations support an inference that AA languages were in mainland Southeast Asia earliest, and that ST (or, more particularly, Tibeto-Burman) languages arrived in this area as a result of later migrations southward from the eastern Himalayas, presumably following the main river valleys. In so doing they split the AA territory into discontinuous eastern and western segments. Major population movements such as the splitting migration implied by the present distribution of TB languages in relation to AA languages would almost certainly have had dislocating consequences for some smaller or weaker groups. Benedict (1990) cites the puzzling case of Lai, a small isolated AA language currently spoken in Guangxi, but apparently having an ancestry further west in Guizhou and southern Yunnan. Apart from the expected Chinese loans, this language shows numerous TB loanwords. Some of these are quite basic (‘sky/rain’, ‘ox/cattle’, ‘fowl’, ‘head’, ‘needle’, ‘run’), and most appear to have been borrowed very early, rather than more recently from the Lolo-Burmese languages with which the Lai are presently in contact. Although Benedict does not draw this conclusion, these observations are consistent with a scenario in which TB languages, expanding into Southeast Asia from the eastern Himalayas via the Irrawaddy drainage, displaced some AA groups southward into the Malay peninsula and the Nicobar islands, and scattered others northward and eastward as far as Guangxi at a fairly early time. The Lai appear to be the descendants of just such a fugitive group.
2. Resetting The Clock: Language Extinction and Its Distributional Consequences

Language change appears to be a more or less continuous process. As a result of change and separation language communities diverge over time until eventually the very fact of relationship can no longer be established with certainty. In general, greater separation time translates into greater divergence, although there is evidence that rates of change in basic vocabulary may vary significantly.

Diamond (1992) has coined the apt expression ‘resetting the clock’ for episodes of linguistic extinction which initiate a new cycle of linguistic differentiation with shallower time depth than would have been the case had extinction never occurred. A well-known example of this process is seen in the Italian peninsula, where about 2,500 years ago Etruscan, Latin, Faliscan, Sabellian, Oscan, Umbrian, and perhaps other languages were spoken within a fairly confined region of what is now central Italy. As a result of the political and military success of the Roman Empire the use of Latin expanded at the expense of the other languages of this area and beyond (Gaul, Iberia). Today, none of the five (or more) languages which were contemporaries of Latin circa 500 BC has left any descendants: apart from recent immigrant communities and some overlapping of German or South Slavic dialects in northern border areas, only Italian dialects or closely related languages are spoken in the Italian peninsula. In effect, then, the spread of Latin reset the linguistic clock in Italy, since without this event we would expect the present linguistic diversity of this part of Europe to be much greater than it is, given its known diversity some 2,500 years ago.

The development of Latin to the Romance languages is sometimes cited as a precious control on linguistic reconstruction, since it provides us with the rare opportunity of comparing a language inferred by use of the Comparative Method with historical records of the same language (recognizing, of course, that the two may represent different social registers). Less often appreciated is the fact that the linguistic macrohistory of the Italian peninsula also provides us with an invaluable model of how language distributions may be skewed by episodes of extinction — a model which can be applied to other areas of the world where historical documentation is far more scanty, or is lacking entirely.

As noted in Blust (2000b), the distribution of Austronesian languages on Sumatra shows a major discrepancy between expectation and observation. Voorhoeve (1955) recognized 25 languages for the island, which fall into eleven conservatively-defined microgroups: 1. Acehnese, 2. Gayö, 3. Batak, 4. Malay and Minangkabau, 5. Rejang, 6. Lampung, 7. Islands east of Sumatra, 8. Simalur, 9. Nias-Sichule, 10. Mentawai, and 11. Enggano. Of these groups 1 (Acehnese) and 7 (Orang Laut, Orang Lom, Lonchong, Belitung Malay) form a larger subgroup with Malay and Minangkabau. The greatest linguistic diversity in Sumatra is thus found in the mountainous interior (Gayö, Batak, Rejang) and in the chain of Barrier Islands (Simalur, Nias, Mentawai, Enggano) which lies west of the Sumatran mainland. By contrast, large tracts of southern and eastern Sumatra are peopled by speakers of various forms of Malay or closely related languages (Minangkabau, Kerinci, Kubu, and the various ‘Middle Malay’ dialects such as Besemah and Seraway).

Most scholars today believe that Proto-Austronesian was spoken in Taiwan. If so, the general direction of the Austronesian expansion must have been southward into the Philippines, and then westward into Borneo, mainland Southeast Asia, Sumatra, and eventually Madagascar on the one hand, and eastward into Sulawesi, the Moluccas and the Pacific, on the other. Given this larger trajectory it is hardly likely that Sumatra was settled from the west, and it is clearly impossible that interior or
highland portions of the island could have been settled before coastal or lowland regions. The pattern of linguistic diversity in Sumatra is thus contrary to expectation: if this area had been settled from Borneo, Java or the Malay peninsula, we would expect greater diversity in the lowlands and coastal areas of the south and east than in the Barrier islands and the interior highlands of the main island. As in the case of the Italian peninsula, where we have documentary controls, such discrepancies between expectation and observation can provide important clues to linguistic macrohistory. In the present case what the geographical distribution of diversity in Sumatra appears to reflect is not primary settlement history at all, but rather residual conservativeness. Stated differently, the most diverse areas are not the areas which have been settled longest, but rather those which have been least affected by secondary leveling: the diversity which should have been produced by earliest settlement in the coastal and lowland areas of southern Sumatra apparently has been eliminated by language extinction. Since virtually all lowland communities in the southern half of Sumatra north of the Lampung districts speak dialects of Malay or closely related languages, the most reasonable inference is that the linguistic clock in this area was reset by the expansion of Malayic speakers, who now occupy territories which were once occupied by speakers of other, unknown Austronesian languages. Similar inferences have been made for the history of Chinese. Since both archaeology and the earliest documentary attestation of the Chinese writing system point to an origin in the Yellow River valley, we would expect northern China to show the deepest splits within Sinitic, but in fact the greatest diversity is found south of the Yangzi River, in areas that were not settled by Han Chinese until about 2,000 years ago (Norman 1988:183ff). Again, the most plausible explanation for this discrepancy is linguistic leveling — in this case the expansion of an early form of Mandarin at the expense of other Sinitic languages which presumably were once spoken in northern China.

A hypothesis of linguistic leveling in Sumatra is also consistent with observations from neighboring areas. Nearly a century ago Skeat and Blagden (1906) observed that many of the Aslian (AA) languages of the Malay peninsula contain apparent Austronesian loanwords which cannot be attributed to borrowing from Malay. In some cases plausible cognates of these presumptive loanwords can be found in languages of Borneo. These observations suggested to Skeat and Blagden that the Malays may have been preceded by other Austronesian speakers in the Malay peninsula. Given the pattern of language distribution in Sumatra this would not be surprising: if an earlier linguistic diversity had been leveled by the expansion of Malayic speakers into southeast Sumatra, there is no obvious reason why the Malay peninsula should not show a parallel history. Similar examples of expansion and extinction can be cited from Borneo, albeit on a smaller scale, as with the expansion of the Kayan and later the Iban into the basin of the Rejang river of Sarawak during the nineteenth century, leading to the extinction of the Seru Dayaks and the decimation of other groups, such as the Ukit, and Bekatan.

The purpose of these prefatory remarks has been to sketch the kinds of assumptions and methods of inference that will be used in the remainder of the paper. The problem which I wish to address using these methods is the linguistic macrohistory of the Philippines.

3. The Evidence for Proto-Philippines

Since the pioneering studies of Blake (1906), Scheerer (1908), and Conant (1910), impressionistic claims have been made for a Philippine subgroup of Austronesian
Thomas and Healey (1962) were among the first scholars who tried to support this impression with evidence (in the form of lexicostatistical percentages). Although they left open the possibility that some of the languages of Borneo, Sulawesi, western Micronesia, or Taiwan might be members of their ‘Philippine Superstock’, and although the Sama-Bajaw languages are inexplicably omitted from their classification, the domain of comparison was essentially defined by geography: for them, the term ‘Philippine languages’ was understood to mean ‘all and only the languages of the Philippine archipelago’.

A Philippine subgroup which includes Yami, spoken on Botel Tobago, or Orchid island off the southeast coast of Taiwan, the Sangiric, Minahasan and Gorontalic languages of northern Sulawesi, and all languages of the Philippines apart from the Samalan (Sama-Bajaw) group, was first proposed by Zorc (1986). Blust (1991) suggested that this collection of more than 180 languages be divided into at least nine microgroups, as shown in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Microgroup</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bashiic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cordilleran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Central Luzon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kalamian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GCP</td>
<td>Central Philippines, South Mangyan, Palawanic, Manobo, Danaw, Subanun, Gorontalic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bilic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sangiric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Minahasan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zorc presented 98 proposed lexical innovations in support of Proto-Philippines. External cognates have since been found for 12 of these (Appendix 1). However, more lexical evidence supporting Proto-Philippines is now available. Appendix 2 lists 241 lexical, morphological and semantic innovations not in Zorc (1986) which appear to be confined to members of the proposed Philippine group. Together, Zorc’s list and the material in Appendix 2 thus come to an impressive 327 items. It should be noted, moreover that the material in Appendix 2 is drawn from Blust (1999), a resource which is only about 25% complete. Maximum search efficiency required that reconstructions that begin with a vowel, *h, *q or *S be done at the same time. As a result, certain sections of

3 Earlier writers, such as Kern (1917 [1882]) do not appear to use the terms ‘Philippine group’, or ‘Philippine language’, but refer to the languages of the Philippines simply as ‘Malayo-Polynesian’.

4 Dyen (1965) recognized a lexicostatistically-defined subgroup which he called the ‘Philippine Hesion’. However, his classification includes the Dusunic and Murutic languages of Sabah, and at least one Sama-Bajaw language (Yakan) within the Philippine group, and leaves Ilongot unclassified. Problems of either overinclusion, or underinclusion (or both) are also found in the classifications of Charles (1974) and Walton (1979). As argued in Blust (1998), despite their general typological similarity to Philippine languages and the presence of a number of Greater Central Philippine loanwords in their vocabularies, the languages of Sabah do not appear to belong to this group.
the dictionary (\*a, \*b, \*e, \*h, \*i, \*q, \*S, \*u and \*w) have been worked quite thoroughly, while others have hardly been touched. The coverage is therefore very uneven, and many innovations that are confined to Philippine languages do not show up in the list given here. If the material analyzed so far is representative, however, the completed dictionary should contain around 241 x 4 + 86, or about 1,050 'Philippine-only' cognate sets.

The sheer quantity of this material probably is sufficient to dispel doubts as to the reality of a Philippine subgroup, but questions might be raised about its quality. In assessing the value of proposed lexical innovations the notion of 'replacement innovation' is critical. In ordinary innovations the semantic category associated with a novel form is not clearly associated with any reconstructed form of greater antiquity; rather, novel forms are associated with novel meanings. Thus, PPH \*bigláq 'suddenly' appears to be a lexical innovation, but since no higher-level reconstruction is available for this meaning the matter is unclear. In replacement innovations, on the other hand, a form-meaning pairing which can be assigned to a given proto-language is replaced by a different but equivalent form-meaning pairing in a language descended from it, as with PMP \*ñeRab or \*niRab 'yesterday' (with reflexes extending from Sabah to Fiji), but PPH \*ka-Rabiqi 'yesterday'. In these cases novel forms are paired with familiar meanings, and the etymon confined to the lower-level genetic grouping is a replacement innovation. Other examples include the paired semantic shift of PMP \*Rumaq 'domicile, residential unit' to the meaning 'sheath of a knife', and of PMP \*balay 'meeting hall, guest house' to 'domicile'. These changes occur with the distribution shown in Table 2, where + marks evidence for the innovation, 0 marks a non-cognate morpheme (or a loanword), and ? marks lack of evidence. There are no cases (-) in which \*balay and \*Rumaq are reflected with their PMP meanings; numbers of Philippine microgroups follow Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Microgroup</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*balay</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rumaq</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These innovations are not evenly attested over all proposed Philippine microgroups, but both are widely distributed: the first is found in all microgroups except Inati, for which we have only one rather limited source (Pennoyer 1986/87). The second is found in Greater Central Philippines, Bilic, Sangiric and Minahasan languages, but has not been identified further north (Botolan Sambal gumat? 'sheath' shows phonological changes which mark it as a likely Tagalog loanword). Although many languages outside the Philippines also reflect \*balay in the meaning 'house', there are few parallels to the semantic change seen in \*Rumaq, and the combination of both changes is highly distinctive for members of the Philippine group of languages.\(^5\)

\(^5\) As noted by Blust (1989a) in some South Sulawesi languages reflexes of \*banua 'inhabited territory' acquired the meaning 'house', and then through metaphor 'sheath'. A similar repetition of semantic history is seen in Bontok baley 'home, shelter; spiderweb; placenta; sheath of a bolo.' These examples shows the same conceptual processes at work, but with different morphological material.
Finally, a striking morphological innovation is seen in the historically double layer of suffixation found in PMP *qamih-an > Casiguran Dumagat amiyan ‘northeast monsoon’: k-amiyan-an ‘northeast’, Ilokano amián ‘north wind’, Kapampangan amian ‘winter, cold season’: amian-an ‘north’, Bikol amihan ‘northeast wind’: amihan-an ‘direction of the northeast wind’, Aklanon amihan ‘northeast wind’: amihán-an ‘north’, Hiligaynon aminh-an (met.) ‘north’, Cebuano amihan ‘north wind’: amihán-an ‘north, northern’, and Maranao amian ‘north wind’: amihán-an ‘north’. Here languages representing the Cordilleran, Central Luzon and Central Philippines groups reflect a historically suffixed disyllable (PMP *qamih-an) as a reanalyzed trisyllable (*qamihan), with resuffixation of the reanalyzed base (*qamihan-an). Although this change is not found in the Sangiric and Minahasan languages (which reflect *qamihan, but not *qamihan-an) its distribution is most simply explained by the reconstruction of PPH *qamihan ‘north wind’, *qamihan-an ‘north’ (= location/direction of the north wind).\[^6\]

Together with the 327 cognate sets in Zorc (1986) and Appendix 2, these replacement innovations leave little doubt that there is a Philippine subgroup of Austronesian languages. However, while there may be a certain satisfaction in establishing sizeable subgroups of some time-depth in a given language family, the recognition of a Philippine subgroup raises conceptual problems which have hardly been acknowledged. If Taiwan was settled before any other area historically occupied by speakers of Austronesian languages, and the direction of movement out of Taiwan was southward into insular Southeast Asia and the Pacific, the Philippines would be the second longest-settled area in the Austronesian world. If so, why should there be a Proto-Philippines? Given the archaeological evidence for the arrival of Neolithic cultures in the Cagayan Valley by at least 4,500 BP, we would expect the languages of the Philippines to belong to several primary branches of Malayo-Polynesian, just as the Formosan languages belong to several primary branches of the Austronesian family as a whole. The fact that we do not find such an order of linguistic diversity, but rather a single linguistic subgroup plus an intrusive population of sea nomads and their settled relatives, provides an important clue to the linguistic macrohistory of the Philippines. Since the second major linguistic extinction in the Philippines has already been documented in some detail and so provides a model for the first extinction, it will be best to begin with it.

4. The Second Extinction: The Expansion of Proto-Greater Central Philippines

As noted in Blust (1991), the Philippine archipelago can be divided into three regions of roughly equal size, northern, central, and southern, which differ markedly in their patterns of linguistic diversity. The northern region contains three flourishing microgroups: Bashiic, Cordilleran, and Central Luzon. The southern region (which extends into northern Sulawesi) contains a number of others (Central Philippines, Manobo, Danaw, Subanun) that are subsumed under Greater Central Philippines, along with Bilic, Sangiric, Minahasan, and the non-Philippine languages of the Samal group. Both the northern and southern regions of the Philippines are thus areas of

\[^6\] Since neither *qamihan nor *qamihan-an is attested in any Cordilleran language except Ilokano it might be argued that *qamihan-an is a Greater Central Philippines innovation which has spread to a few other languages in more accessible (lowland) areas. However, it is difficult to see why words that mean ‘north’ or ‘north wind’ would be borrowed by more northerly languages from those spoken further to the south.
substantial linguistic diversity. By contrast, in southern Luzon, the Bisayas, Palawan, and northern Mindanao Central Philippine languages predominate to the almost total exclusion of others. It is true that three primary branches of the Philippine subgroup are represented by languages spoken in the central region, but Microgroup 4 contains a single language, Inati, spoken by a nomadic population of some 900–1,000 persons (Pennoyer 1986/87), and Microgroup 5 contains just three languages, Kalamian Tagbanwa, Central/Aborlan Tagbanwa, and Agutaynen, spoken by a total of perhaps 25,000 persons (Grimes 2000). In sharp contrast with the linguistic situation in the northern or southern regions, almost the entire central region of the Bisayas and southern Luzon constitutes an extended dialect network with roughly 45 million first-language speakers of Tagalog, Bikol and intergrading varieties of Bisayan. The distribution of phylogenetic complexity in the central Philippines can be compared to that in southeast Sumatra: in both cases areas that have been settled by Austronesian speakers long enough for us to expect considerable linguistic diversity show a surprisingly high degree of homogeneity. There is only one way to interpret this contradiction, namely, that in addition to the usual processes of language split and diversification over time the linguistic history of the central Philippines included a major episode of linguistic expansion/extinction.

Blust (1991) gave the name ‘Proto-Greater Central Philippines’ to the hypothetical language which brought about this linguistic leveling in the Bisayas and southern Luzon. Given the relatively close genetic relationship of all GCP languages it was inferred that the extinction event occurred no earlier than about 500 BC. To recapitulate the argument, the principal pieces of evidence for the GCP expansion are:

1. the unexpectedly low level of linguistic diversity in southern Luzon, the Bisayas and northeast Mindanao, given the higher levels of diversity in other parts of the Philippines or northern Sulawesi, and the known radiocarbon dates for the introduction of Neolithic cultures into the central Philippines by at least 4,000 BP (Bellwood 1997:219ff).

2. the evidence for a discontinuously distributed linguistic subgroup, linking the Gorontalic languages of northern Sulawesi with the languages of the central Philippines and much of Mindanao, but skipping the intervening Bilic languages of southern Mindanao and the Sangiric and Minahasan languages of northern Sulawesi.

3. the presence of what Conant (1910) called ‘the stereotyped g’ in Philippine languages, referring to sporadic instances of *R > g in languages which normally reflect PPH *R as some other phoneme. This development suggests that contact with GCP languages, in which *R > g was regular, reached as far north as northwest Luzon, and as far south as central Sulawesi, although some instances of this development in Ilokano and Central Cordilleran languages could be due to borrowing from Northern Cordilleran languages in which *R > g is regular (Reid 1973), and some instances in central Sulawesi could be due to borrowing from Tomini languages in which the same change has occurred (Himmelmann 2001).

4. a few examples of *R > r for expected g in Molbog of Balabac island (a Palawanic language), and in Bonggi of Banggi island between Sabah and Palawan (a Sabahan language). These instances of what might be called ‘stereotyped r’ suggest the former presence of a substrate language or languages in this area. Since *R is reflected as a liquid (l or r) in both Kalamian Tagbanwa to the north of Palawan, and in the Bilic languages of...
southern Mindanao, either the Kalamian microgroup, the Bilic microgroup (or both) may have extended to Balabac and Banggi islands before the GCP expansion.

5. The First Extinction: The Expansion of Proto-Philippines

The Greater Central Philippines hypothesis shows that several superficially disparate observations regarding modern Philippine languages are the expected consequences of a single prehistoric event, which may have taken some generations to complete. At the same time it provides a cautionary reminder that the history of related languages is not always a uniform process of differentiation and divergence, but may be punctuated by important episodes of extinction. The linguistic leveling in the central Philippines which apparently resulted from the GCP expansion is hardly unique. Something rather similar happened in the early recorded history of the Italian peninsula, and must have taken place in southeast Sumatra, and perhaps in the Malay peninsula as a result of the Malayo-Chamic expansion out of southwest Borneo (Blust 1992). As it happens, all of these events evidently took place within the past 2,000–2,500 years. But if linguistic leveling has occurred within the past two and one half millennia in such places as the Italian peninsula, the central Philippines, southeast Sumatra and the Malay peninsula, there is no reason why similar expansion/extinction events could not have taken place even earlier. As noted already, a priori logic would suggest that a number of primary branches of Malayo-Polynesian should be found in the Philippines. However, this is not the case: there is persuasive evidence that all languages of the Philippines apart from Sama-Bajaw belong to a single subgroup. If the GCP hypothesis is valid as an explanation for the greater-than-expected linguistic homogeneity of the central Philippines, then, the same type of argument should be valid as an explanation for the greater-than-expected linguistic homogeneity of the Philippines as a whole.

The time-depth of Proto-Philippines is contentious, but clearly must exceed that of Proto-Greater Central Philippines by some centuries. Greater Central Philippines languages are, at least impressionistically, somewhat more divergent than groups like Romance or Polynesian, which have a time-depth of roughly two millennia, and it therefore seems unlikely that Proto-Greater Central Philippines was spoken less than 2,300–2,500 years BP. Since the earliest radiocarbon dates that are generally accepted for a Neolithic presence in the Philippines cluster around 4,500 BP we are able to bracket the break-up of Proto-Philippines between roughly 2,500 and 4,500 BP. The earlier of these two dates is associated with the initial Austronesian settlement of the Philippines and so cannot be associated with Proto-Philippines. If we place the break-up of Proto-Philippines roughly midway between these two chronological points of reference, then, we arrive at a provisional date of about 3,500 BP. The assumption of a time-depth of about 3,500 years for the separation of the Philippine languages seems reasonable in the light of both radiocarbon chronologies and degrees of linguistic difference relative to other parts of the Austronesian world. But it clearly implies that at least a millennium of previous linguistic differentiation in the Philippines was wiped clean by the expansion of a single prehistoric language early in the Neolithic settlement history of the archipelago. The how and why of such an expansion probably will never be known. However, much the same is true of historically more recent expansions in the Austronesian world which produced linguistic leveling on a smaller scale. Sutlive (1978:20ff) considers both demographic and cultural explanations for the dramatic nineteenth-century Iban migrations, which led to the eventual extinction of the Seru
Dayaks (already weakened through depredations by the Kayan) and the decimation of other groups in southern Sarawak and neighboring parts of Kalimantan. Whether the need for new lands was driven by population growth, or whether population growth was a consequence of the acquisition of new lands can be argued tediously to no conclusion. In any case a significant territorial expansion accompanied by linguistic leveling on small scale did take place, and is well-documented for this group. Although we lack documentary evidence for the early history of the Philippines, the clear discrepancy between radiocarbon chronologies for the beginning of the Neolithic and the less-than-expected degree of linguistic differentiation points unambiguously to a similar episode of territorial expansion and linguistic leveling. The principal difference is one of scale: whereas the Iban migration out of the upper Kapuas basin covered an area of roughly 325 miles from south to north in the span of three or four generations and led to the complete elimination of only one known language, the Proto-Philippine territorial expansion that is hypothesized here apparently covered a greater territory and led to more widespread linguistic leveling.

As noted in Blust (2000a:104ff), the hypothesis that Proto-Philippines expanded around 3,500 BP at the expense of other descendants of Proto-Malayo-Polynesian which were present in the Philippine archipelago at that time is supported by more than one line of evidence. First, there is the evidence considered here, which suggests that at some point after the initial Austronesian colonization of the Philippine islands the linguistic clock was ‘reset’, and divergence began anew from a single founding community. Second, there is evidence in the form of language displacement. Historically documented cases of language expansion such as that of Latin are accompanied by language extinction, and this is clearly one major consequence of such historical events. However, given the right circumstances language expansion can also lead to the displacement of dominated groups, either by driving them into refugia where the competition for land is less intense, as with the Ainu in Japan, or by forcing them to take flight to some fairly distant location, as with the Austronesian-speaking Lai of southern China. There is compelling evidence that pre-Chamorro speakers reached the Marianas islands around 3,500 BP, directly from some part of the Philippines north of Mindanao. Yet there is no evidence that Chamorro subgroups with the languages of the Philippines. The conjunction of these observations presents us with a potentially fruitful contradiction: if pre-Chamorro speakers left the Philippines around 3,500 BP but Chamorro is not descended from Proto-Philippines, the Philippine islands at 3,500 BP must have been home to various descendants of Proto-Malayo-Polynesian, of which only Proto-Philippines survived in situ. At the time of the Proto-Philippines expansion Austronesian languages presumably would have been thinly distributed throughout the Philippine islands, and it is difficult to conceive of a demographic or economic advantage by which one group would have succeeded in expanding at the expense of all others. Nonetheless, this inference follows from the evidence for Proto-Philippines, and what it suggests is that Austronesian languages in the Philippines circa 3,500 BP were confined to a fairly narrow range of environments, including only the coastal zones of the larger islands.

In this connection it might be asked how the pre-Neolithic Negrito populations were affected by the expansion of Proto-Philippines. The answer is ‘probably little at all.’ Reid (1987, 1989, 1991, 1994a) has done pioneering work in unraveling the linguistic history of Philippine Negritos. What is clear is that this population once spoke languages unrelated to those of the incoming Austronesians, but eventually adopted Austronesian languages as a result of contact, and that this happened throughout the Philippine archipelago. When this contact began on a meaningful scale is difficult to determine (and probably varied from area-to-area), but the expansion of Proto-
Philippines would have been essentially a competition between agricultural populations for the same territory, and it is doubtful that the foraging Negrito populations of remote mountain areas would have been affected by it. Since all documented Negrito groups in the Philippines today speak Philippine languages, however, it appears that the ‘early switch’ in language affiliation by these groups postdated the expansion of Proto-Philippines around 3,500 BP. If this were not the case, we would expect some Negrito languages in the Philippines to be Austronesian, but not descendants of Proto-Philippines.

6. The Position of the Samalan Languages

In general, the geographical distribution of Philippine languages corresponds to the boundaries of the Philippine archipelago. There are, however, three exceptions. First, Yami, a Bashiic language, is spoken on Botel Tobago island within the political boundaries of Taiwan. Second, the Sangiric, Minahasan, and Gorontalic languages of northern Sulawesi subgroup with languages in the Philippines, not with other languages in Sulawesi. Finally, one set of languages spoken within the Philippines is not a member of the Philippine group. This is the collection of diverse dialects or closely related languages known as Sama (an endonym), Bajaw (an exonym, apparently from Buginese), Sama-Bajaw, or Samalan (linguistic creations which I will use interchangeably).

McFarland (1980:106) was willing to say only that ‘The relationship of the Sama languages to the other languages of the Philippines is not clear.’ Zorc (1986:156), however, firmly excludes them from the Philippine group: ‘The number of exclusively shared lexical innovations that I have gathered thus far suggests that the languages of the Philippine archipelago (exclusive of the Sama-Bajaw group) form a single AN subgroup.’ The exclusion of the Samalan languages is perhaps the most surprising exception to the general correlation of linguistic subgrouping boundaries with major geographical features in the Philippines. Yami is simply an extension of the Bashiic languages along an island chain which happens to cross a modern political boundary, and the Sangiric, Minahasan, and Gorontalic languages represent expansions of Philippine languages slightly beyond the Philippine archipelago into neighboring parts of Indonesia. But the Sama-Bajaw languages present a problem of a different order: they do not belong to the Philippine group, and to date no one has been able to establish their linguistic position. What, then, is the origin of this seemingly extraneous group of languages?

The first two peculiarities of the Samalan languages which are likely to raise questions about their inclusion in a Philippine group have nothing to do with language. Unlike most Austronesian speakers in the Philippines and elsewhere, many speakers of Samalan languages live on boats rather than on the land, and they are consequently known in the popular literature as ‘sea nomads’ or ‘sea gypsies’. This is not to say that there are no sedentary speakers of Samalan languages. Such groups as the Jama Mapun of Cagayan de Sulu and the Yakan of Basilan island are traditional agriculturalists, but many other Samalan speakers are boat nomads, and this clearly is connected with the second non-linguistic peculiarity of Samalan languages: their wide geographical range. In mapping the distribution of Samalan languages Pallesen (1985:2) shows groups in the Philippines from Capul island, near the southeastern tip of Luzon (Abaknon), to the southernmost part of the Sulu archipelago (Southern Sama), in western and eastern Sabah, various parts of northern and eastern Sulawesi, the island of Kayoa off the west coast of Halmahera, and on Roti and the western end of Timor in the Lesser Sunda chain. In addition, Pallesen (1985:44) speculates ‘It is possible that an SB language is still spoken in the Anambas or Natuna Islands, northeast of Singapore, and that some of the Orang Laut languages spoken.
in the Java Sea (Riouw, Lingga, Bangka and Billiton (Belitung) island groups) will prove to be closely affiliated with PSB, enabling the reconstruction of a protolanguage for a greater time depth. Several communities described as Bajaws have been reported in coastal Pattani Province, on the east coast of South Thailand (Kenneth Smith, pers. comm., 1976), but no linguistic data are yet available on this group.’

These remarks almost certainly go too far. Wherever linguistic data are available for ‘Orang Laut’ populations in the South China Sea or Strait of Malacca, they show that the languages used by these peoples are either dialects of Malay, or Moken (in the Mergui archipelago), and are therefore linguistically very distinct from Samalan languages.7 The Sama-Bajaw communities of the Lesser Sunda islands are known to be historically late arrivals, first appearing in the area around the beginning of the eighteenth century, at which time they were closely associated with the Buginese and Makasarese of south Sulawesi as suppliers of sea cucumbers for the Chinese market (Fox 1977). Excluding these late expansions, then, most Sama-Bajaw communities are confined to the southern Philippines, northern Borneo, and northern Sulawesi, where they are regarded by the sedentary populations as outsiders who subsist by fishing, trade, and in some cases piracy.

When the mobile boat-dwelling orientation of the Sama-Bajaw peoples began is an open question. According to Pallesen (1985:245ff), who is concerned primarily with contact-induced linguistic convergence between Tausug and one subset of Samalan languages, Proto-Samalan probably was spoken in the southern Zamboanga-Basilan area of southern Mindanao about 800 CE, and all Samalan languages except Abaknon, Yakan, and Sama Batuan ‘were a single subgroup prior to 1,000 A.D., with the division into distinct subdialects becoming clear about the time of the TSG-SLU contact’ (contact between Tausug, and the core group of sea-based Samalan languages in the southern Philippines). This suggests that Proto-Samalan speakers were mobile maritime traders and fishermen who arrived in the southern Philippines some 1,200 years ago, and began to interact with the local populations in a kind of economic symbiosis, which has continued for at least some groups up to the present.

With regard to the origin of the Sama-Bajaw, Pallesen suggests (1985:245) ‘an Indonesian origin rather than any close relationship to the Central Philippine languages with which many SB daughter languages are currently in geographical proximity.’ Collins, Collins, and Hashim (2001), in the Introduction to their Mapun-English dictionary, venture a little further: ‘The Mapun language is the language of the Jama Mapun, or ‘People of Mapun’ whose origins are said to have been somewhere on the island of Borneo.’ No linguistic evidence is presented to support this statement, which presumably reflects the oral traditions of the people themselves. Casiño (1976:8) notes that Antonio Pigafetta, the Italian chronicler of the Magellan expedition which was in the Philippines in 1520 remarked of the Jama Mapun that they ‘are Moros and were banished from an island called Burue.’ For at least some Sama-Bajaw peoples, then, the tradition of a Bornean origin goes back some five centuries or more.

If Proto-Samalan was spoken in the Zamboanga-Basilan area of southern Mindanao about 800 CE, as Pallesen proposes, the overwhelming probability is that the Sama-Bajaw reached the Philippines from either Borneo or Sulawesi. An examination of

---

7 For the language situation among the sea nomads of the Riau-Lingga archipelago and the islands of Bangka and Billiton cf. Kähler (1946-49, 1960). For the Urak Lawoi’ of peninsular Thailand cf. Hogan (1988), and for the Moken cf. Larish (1999). Dahl (1991:92ff) also assumes incorrectly that the languages of all sea nomads in insular Southeast Asia form a subgroup, apparently in part because they are widely known in the area by various forms of the name ‘Bajau’, given to them by the Buginese.
both phonological and lexical evidence strongly favors Borneo, and so is consistent with
the oral traditions of at least some Samalan speakers. Oral traditions, however, must be
treated with care. All attested Sama-Bajaw peoples are Moslems, and Islam was
introduced into the southern Philippines by Brunei Malays no more than 150–200 years
before Pigafetta’s observations were made in 1520. For this reason it is conceivable that
Sama-Bajaw traditions of a Bornean origin postdate the arrival of Islam, and reflect the
importance of Brunei as a formative element in the syncretic Samalan cultures we now
find rather than an orally preserved record of a pre-Philippine ‘homeland’.

To pursue the question of Sama-Bajaw origins further we need to consider
linguistic evidence. Until recently this was difficult, as little lexical information was
publicly available for any Samalan language. That situation has now changed
dramatically with the appearance of two splendid dictionaries, one for Mapun (Collins,
Collins, and Hashim 2001), and the other for Yakan (Behrens 2002). I will use these
sources below, together with the more limited data in Reid (1971), which comes from
the barrios of Sisangat and Siganggang, Siasi municipality, a dialect region that
Pallesen (1985:19) assigns to Central Sulu (hereafter: CS). Unless otherwise indicated,
material from Barito languages is taken from Hudson (1967).

The historical phonology of the Samalan languages is explored in greater depth in
Blust (To appear), and the present discussion will be limited to a summary of the major
claims of that paper and some of the evidence supporting them. Without entering into
details here, the first thing to note is that the vocabulary of Samalan languages can be
native material. As demonstrated by Pallesen (1985), most Philippine loanwords in the
Zamboanga-Sulu region come from Tausug. Abaknon, located between northern Samar
and Masbate presumably has been more strongly influenced by Waray or Masbatenyo,
although little material is available to determine the facts. Pallesen (1985:6) notes in
passing that ‘there has been prolonged contact between SB languages and Malay, early
phases of which probably predate Arab and Chinese contacts, and perhaps predate the
arrival of speakers of SB languages in the Philippines.’ Given his focus on
Tausug-Samalan contact and convergence, Pallesen did not follow up these preliminary
remarks, but his first impressions were certainly correct: if anything, borrowing from
Malay in the Samalan languages of the Zamboanga-Sulu region has been even heavier
than borrowing from Tausug, and there are intriguing indications that some Malay
loans entered the Samalan languages before the arrival of Islam. There is some
phonological evidence which supports the view that the Samalan languages have a
Bornean origin, but it cannot completely rule out other areas in western Indonesia as
possible places of origin. For this reason I will confine myself here to lexical evidence,
with comments on the phonology of individual forms as the need arises.

The following inferences are advanced:

1. the Samalan languages originated in Borneo,
2. the specific ‘homeland’ of the Sama-Bajaw peoples is the area which
today forms the basin of the Barito river and its tributaries — the same
area from which the Malagasy derive,
3. the Samalan languages apparently belong to Hudson’s (1967) ‘Barito
Family’, but do not subgroup closely with any of the modern Barito
languages, including Malagasy,
4. the Samalan languages contain probable loanwords from early Southeast
   Barito languages,
5. some loanwords suggest that early Samalan speakers were located further inland than early Southeast Barito speakers,

6. loanwords in both Samalan and Southeast Barito languages show that Sriwijayan Malays ancestral to the modern Banjarese community were trading preserved fish to the native peoples before AD 800, probably in return for jungle products such as dammar, rattan, wax and the like,

7. through these trade contacts some speakers of Barito languages were drawn into a large-scale Malay trade network centered on spices which connected eastern and western Indonesia with the outside world.

Inference 1: The Samalan languages originated in Borneo

As noted earlier, this claim evidently is part of the oral tradition of at least some Sama-Bajaw groups in the Philippines, in particular the Jama Mapun. However, concrete linguistic evidence for a Bornean origin had never previously been presented. Lexical items that appear to be shared exclusively by one or more Samalan languages with languages throughout much of Borneo include the following:


3. PAN *sapaw ‘field hut’ > Mapun sapaw, Yakan sapew, Kelabit apo, Bintulu, Ngaju Dayak sapaw ‘roof’, Highland Kenyah, Mukah Melanau sapaw ‘roof; thatch’, replacing reflexes of PMP *qatep ‘roof, thatch’.


The first three cognate sets are clear replacement innovations for PMP *uRsa ‘sambhur deer’, *kawil ‘fishhook’, and *qatep ‘roof, thatch’ respectively, and point unambiguously to a Sama-Bajaw derivation from Borneo. The fourth may also be a replacement innovation, but this is dependent upon its gloss (cf. PMP *hipaR ‘sibling-in-law’, and *ma-tuqah ‘parent-in-law’, but PMP terms for ‘child-in-law,’ or ‘in-law’ are unknown). The wide and distinctive distribution of these forms in Borneo indicates a Bornean origin for the Sama-Bajaw, but it does not pinpoint a particular area.

---

8 Beech (1908:71) notes that Malay air payau means ‘brackish, of water’, and speculates that the name of the sambhur deer in Borneo may derive from its habit of obtaining salt from brackish water: ‘Curiously enough the Tidongs always say that deer are passionately fond of the brackish water that is often to be found in the inland swamps of Borneo, and such places are the favourite hunting grounds for natives who wish to obtain these animals. Perhaps air payau = ‘water such as the deer loves.’ This is an interesting observation, but it suggests no reason why the sambhur would be singled out from other deer, and provides no evidence that *payaw is a word of any antiquity in the meaning ‘brackish.’
Inference 2: The Samalan languages originated in southeast Kalimantan

Additional lexical comparisons help to narrow the possibilities for a Samalan homeland region in Borneo. Surprisingly, these point to a connection between Sama-Bajaw and the languages of southeast Kalimantan that Hudson (1967) called the ‘Barito Family.’ Most of these innovations single out the branch that Hudson called ‘Southeast Barito’, which includes Ma’anyan and Malagasy, but not Ngaju Dayak. Although other kinds of evidence for a Samalan-Southeast Barito connection are discussed in Blust (To appear), the following seven linguistic comparisons plus a few others that will be included in the discussion of borrowing should be sufficient to establish the case:

5. PMP *ma-qudip replaced by *belum ‘living, alive’: Mapun allum/llum ‘alive, living’, Yakan ellum ‘living, alive (of animate beings)’, Ba’amang, Katingan belum, Taboyan, Lawangan bolum, Paku wolum, Ma’ananyan, Samihim, Dusun Witu, Dusun Malang welum, Malagasy velona ‘living, alive’. This innovation is very distinctive, as it is known only from languages of the Barito group (Ray 1913), Malagasy, and Sama-Bajaw.

6. PMP *kamu/kamuyu replaced by *ka’am ‘2pl’: Mapun ka’am ‘You. Second person plural emphatic actor focus. Also second person plural non-focus patient, goal, beneficiary in the core of the clause’, Yakan ka’am ‘You. Second person plural absolutive and oblique’, CS ka’am ‘2sg’, Tunjung kaam, Lawangan kam ‘2pl’. Again, a striking replacement innovation. In this case the form is shared with a Northeast Barito language (Lawangan), and with Tunjung, a language which Hudson (1967) regarded as forming a primary branch of the Barito Family. If forms such as Uma Juman Kayan, Katingan, Murung, Tamuan ikam ‘2pl; ye’ are admitted under an analysis i-kam the collection of languages reflecting this innovation will be larger. However, a disyllabic base without i- has been reported so far only for Sama-Bajaw and Barito languages.

7. PMP *ma-piaq replaced by *ma-halap ‘good’: Mapun ma-hap ‘good; pretty, beautiful’, Yakan halap/hap ‘good (quality of things and moral character); nice, pretty, beautiful’, CS haap/halap ‘good’, Kapuas (Hudson 1967) bahalap ‘good’, Ngaju Dayak (Hardeland 1859) ba-halap ‘good, honest, prosperous; favorable, friendly’, ha-halap, hala-halap ‘suitable, good’. Possibly a chance resemblance, as Hudson (1967:89) gives this form only for Kapuas (of the other two ‘Ngaju Dayak’ groups Ba’amang has the Malay loanword baik, and Katingan the unrelated form lamus).

8. PMP *tuduq ‘drip, leak (as roof)’ replaced by *petak ‘a drop; to drip’: Yakan pettak ‘a drop’, mag-pettak ‘to drip’, Ma’ananyan (Ray 1913:122) petak ‘drip’.

9. PMP *sempit replaced by *kiput ‘narrow’: Mapun kiput ‘narrow (limited in space or size)’, Yakan kiput ‘narrow, small (of openings or long objects,

---

9 The Barito Family has three primary branches: 1) Barito-Mahakam, with one language (Tunjung), 2) West Barito, with two subdivisions, Northwest Barito (Dohoi, Murung-1, Murung-2, Siang), and Southwest Barito (Ba’amang, Kapuas, Katingan), 3) East Barito with three subdivisions, Northeast Barito (Taboyan, Lawangan), Central East Barito (Dusun Deyah), and Southeast Barito (Dusun Malang, Dusun Witu, Paku, Ma’ananyan, Samihim). Traditionally, Northwest and Southwest Barito have been called ‘Ot Danum’, and ‘Ngaju Dayak’ respectively. As shown by Dahl (1951, 1977) East Barito also includes Malagasy.
e.g. road’), CS *kiput ‘narrow (of space)’, Samihim *kiput ‘narrow’. This comparison is somewhat shaky, since a known Bornean reflex of *kiput ‘narrow’ is found only in Samihim.

10. PMP *ini ‘this (1st person deictic)’ replaced by *itu ‘that (2nd person deictic)’: Mapun *itu ‘a discourse particle that is used for emphasis when referring back to a specific topic that has already been discussed, or a topic that has already been in the mind of the speaker. The topic is very close to the speaker’, Yakan *itu ‘this (close to speaker, may be far from hearer)’, CS *itu ‘this’, Paku, Dusun Deyah, Ba’amang *itu ‘this’.

11. PMP *ina ‘that’ replaced by *idu ‘that (3rd person deictic)’: Yakan *lu ‘there, that (the person or object spoken to or about is somewhat removed from the speaker)’, CS *ilu ‘there (2nd person)’, Taboyan, Dusun *iro, *iru ‘that’. Comparisons 10) and 11) must be considered together. The PMP demonstrative system included at least *ini, *itu, and *ina, all of which incorporated the generic locative marker *i ‘in, at, on’, and so might be written *i-ni, etc. Each of these terms probably was associated with a degree of personal reference (first, second, and third person respectively), but there is evidence for additional terms such as *idi, which cannot easily be glossed within the parameters of the semantic system assumed here. What is significant about comparisons 10) and 11) is that there was a double innovation in the deictic system of both Samalan and Southeast Barito languages: the second person deictic *itu moved into first person semantic space, and the third person deictic *ina was replaced by an apparent lexical innovation, *idu. The first of these innovations is found in a number of Philippine languages but the second is not, and the combination of the two must be given some importance as evidence of exclusively shared history.

Inference 3: The Samalan languages form a primary branch of the Barito Family

Most of the innovations shared exclusively by Sama-Bajaw and Barito languages favor the Southeast Barito group. This includes comparisons 8), 9), 11), and as will be explained below, comparisons 3) and 13). Yet there is little evidence for including the Samalan languages even as a primary branch of the East Barito group. Cognate percentages between Samalan and East Barito languages do not appear to be high, and the historical phonology of the two groups diverges in a number of respects. This contrasts sharply with the similarities linking Malagasy and Barito languages, which can be derived in a fairly straightforward manner from a reconstructed Proto-East Barito.

So, where does this leave us? As will be seen, some of the innovations shared only by Samalan and East Barito languages almost certainly are loanwords. However, others probably are not. In particular, it is unlikely that a language would borrow personal or demonstrative pronouns from another language which has the same type and level of culture. Minimally, then, we can assume that reflexes of *ka?am ‘2pl’ and *idu ‘that (3rd person)’ are directly inherited. Reflexes of the former are found in Samalan languages, Tunjung (Barito-Mahakam), and Lawangan (Northeast Barito). Reflexes of the latter are found in Samalan, Northeast Barito (Taboyan), and Southeast Barito languages (the rest). Given the fragmentary nature of the evidence and the lack of any clear directionality in subgrouping, the default hypothesis would appear to be that the Samalan languages form a primary branch of the Barito Family, which can now be reformulated as in Table 3:
Table 3. The ‘Extended Barito Family’ of southeast Borneo

1. Barito-Mahakam: Tunjung
2. West Barito: Ot Danum and Ngaju Dayak
3. East Barito: Lawangan, Ma’ananyan, Malagasy, etc.
4. Samalan: languages of the Sama-Bajaw

Inference 4: Proto-Sama-Bajaw borrowed from early East Barito languages

Because the historical phonology of Samalan languages is discussed in detail elsewhere (Blust to appear), irregularities in phonological development have been largely ignored. However, one form which clearly involves an irregularity is Mapun iwan ‘son-in-law, daughter-in-law’. In all Samalan languages for which published data is available PMP *b is reflected as b: *balabaw > Mapun, CS babaw ‘rat’, *batu > Mapun, Yakan batu ‘stone’, CS batu ‘coral rock’, *bulan > Mapun buwan, Yakan, CS bulan ‘moon’, *qabu > Mapun, Yakan, CS abu ‘ash’, *labuq > Mapun labu’, Yakan labo’, CS labu (error for labu?) ‘fall, drop’. The only known exceptions to this statement are reflexes of Proto-Barito (PB) *belum ‘living, alive’, *iban ‘affinal relative’, PMP *babuy (> Mapun, Yakan, CS bawi ‘pig’), and one or two other forms. The phonological development *belum > Mapun allum/lllum, Yakan ellum ‘living, alive’ is irregular, but not unparalleled (cf. *besuR > Mapun asso, Yakan esso ‘full from eating, satiated’). It nonetheless remains puzzling, since a directly inherited reflex of *belum should have b-, and a loanword from an early East Barito language apparently should have w-. Irregularities in reflexes of *iban ‘in-law’ are more tractable. Since all known Barito reflexes of *iban ‘affinal relative’ contain -w-, the irregular change in Mapun iwan finds a natural explanation as a borrowing from an ancestral Barito source. A similar explanation may apply to Mapun, Yakan, CS bawi ‘pig’ in light of Kapuas bawuy, Taboyan bawi ‘pig’, although this is less certain.

Inference 5: Proto-Sama-Bajaw was inland from early Southeast Barito languages

Another comparison supports the inference that Proto-Sama-Bajaw speakers borrowed from early Southeast Barito languages, and also sheds light on the relative geographical positions of the two language communities. Since PMP *s is normally reflected as a sibilant in Samalan languages (*hasaq > Mapun, Yakan asa ‘whet, sharpen’, *asiq > Mapun, Yakan ase ‘pity; love; favor; mercy; kindness’, *isi > Mapun, Yakan isi ‘flesh of any human or animal’, *kasaw ‘rafter’ > Mapun kasaw ‘purlin’, Yakan kasew ‘supports in a roof for tying the shingles on’), the change *s > h in *tasik > Yakan, CS tahik ‘sea, saltwater’ must be regarded as irregular. In Ma’ananyan, on the other hand, PMP *s became s or h (Dahl 1951:69), and the same appears to be true of all other languages in the Southeast Barito group (Hudson 1967). Without a larger context reflexes of PMP *tasik ‘sea, saltwater’ in Sama-Bajaw would simply appear to show an unexplained change. Given Ma’ananyan, Paku, Dusun Witu, Dusun Malang tahik ‘sea’, however, Proto-Sama-Bajaw *tahik has the expected shape for a loanword from an early

---

10 This depends on the reflex of *w- in directly inherited forms, which are few in number, and often difficult to distinguish from Philippine loanwords. *walu > Mapun, Yakan, CS walu ‘eight’ shows *w- > w-, but the unexplained glottal stop raises questions about its history.
Southeast Barito source. This comparison serves to narrow the range of potential donors, as the medial consonant of *tasik is preserved as a sibilant in other Barito languages, including Malagasy (where it means 'lake', and may be a loan from Malay tasék, which shows the same semantic change). The adoption of a word for 'sea, saltwater' from an early Southeast Barito source can signify only one thing: speakers of Proto-Sama-Bajaw must have been located further inland than the languages from which they borrowed this word.

This inference raises an important point. Ras (1968:194) has drawn attention to the fact that the geomorphology of southeast Borneo has changed significantly over the past millennium. The present basin of the Barito river and its tributaries for nearly 200 miles into the interior (almost as far as Muara Tewe in what is now the middle course of the Barito) has formed from silts deposited at very rapid rate to form coastal mud flats which over time became low-lying swampy interior forest. Prior to AD 800, when Pallesen believes the Sama-Bajaw arrived in the southern Philippines, the present basin of the Barito river was a vast bay at least 80 miles wide at the mouth, bounded on the east by a 200-mile long headland or peninsula formed by the Meratus mountains, and on the west by the foothills of the Schwaner range. To say that the ancestral Sama-Bajaw lived inland from speakers of early Southeast Barito languages therefore does not imply that they were located in the remote interior of Borneo. What is now the territory of the East Barito languages between the Barito river and the western flank of the Meratus range was then located on the eastern shore of this bay. Central-East and Northeast Barito speakers probably inhabited territory around the head of the bay and northward into the interior, and West Barito speakers were at some remove along the western shore. The pattern of Barito loanwords in Samalan languages suggests that the ancestral Sama-Bajaw were in close contact with early Southeast Barito languages, but not with West Barito languages, and that they were away from the sea in relation to Southeast Barito speakers. By a process of elimination this would place them either on the western flank of the Meratus mountains facing the bay (with Southeast Barito speakers between), or further north in the broken hill country near the terminus of the Meratus range, around modern Tanjung.

It may seem strange that a people who have been known to history as 'sea nomads' have borrowed the word for 'sea' from the language of an interior riverine people (Hudson 1972). But Southeast Barito speakers live on alluvial lands that have only formed within the past millennium, and these lands almost certainly were at the eastern shore of the great bay of the Barito estuary at the time the Sama-Bajaw departed. In relative terms, then, early Southeast Barito speakers were more familiar with the sea than the early Sama-Bajaw. More enigmatically, after they reached the southern Philippines Samalan speakers borrowed the word for 'sea' again, this time from Malay, as seen in Mapun dilawut 'sea, ocean', Yakan dil'a'ut/diya'ut 'the sea as spoken about from a distance; also when at the shore, further out is diya'ut', CS kaut/kalaut 'sea' (from Malay laut, with the 'adhesive locative' noted in Blust 1989b). It is noteworthy that no reported Samalan language has borrowed the Central Philippine form dagat 'sea'. This difference in the semantic fields from which loanwords are drawn undoubtedly reflects significant differences in attitudes toward the speakers of the lending languages. To the Sama-Bajaw the Tausug were landlubbers who gained their familiarity with the sea through contact with the sea nomads. On the other hand, the Malays, as will be seen below, probably were viewed as masters of maritime commerce, and in some sense models for the Sama-Bajaw themselves.
Inference 6: Sriwijayan Malays were trading preserved fish with early Barito speakers

Two other linguistic comparisons are important for different reasons, but both serve to demonstrate that Sriwijayan Malays ancestral to the modern Banjarese must have been trading with speakers of early Southeast Barito languages before the ancestral Sama-Bajaw reached the southern Philippines.\textsuperscript{11} Each of these comparisons requires a somewhat lengthy discussion. The first is a word for ‘animal’. No term with this meaning can be reconstructed for early Austronesian proto-languages, and the word for ‘animal’ in the modern languages is thus either innovated or borrowed (Blust 2002).

12. Mapun \textit{sattuwa} ‘any kind of creature, beast or animal (domesticated or not)’, Yakan \textit{sattuwa/settuwa} ‘creature (if the name is unknown, esp. of big ones)’, Taboyan, Lawangan \textit{setua}, Ma’anayn, Paku, Dusun Witu \textit{sattuwa}, Banjarese \textit{satua} ‘animal’.

For Mapun Collins, Collins, and Hashim (2001) also give \textit{binatang} (‘Mal.’). An animal. Often used when distinguishing between animals that are permissible (\textit{halal}) to eat and those that are forbidden (\textit{haram}), and \textit{hayop} ‘animal (usually domesticated, as water buffalo, cattle, chickens, goats, dogs, etc.).’ For Yakan Behrens (2002) gives similar terms, including \textit{binatang} ‘animal; esp. meat (of animals, as carabao, cow, goat, or chicken)’, \textit{hayep} ‘animal (esp. large ones, domestic and wild)’, and \textit{da’at} ‘a destructive animal (like wild pig, rat, monkey, rice bird)’. What lends special interest to comparison 12) is that it derives from Sanskrit \textit{sattva-} ‘creature, animal.’ Gonda (1973) mentions this word in connection with six languages: Javanese \textit{sato} ‘animal’, Old Javanese \textit{sato/sattwa} ‘living being; creature; animal’, Balinese \textit{sato} ‘animate being, animal, esp. wild beast’, Sasak \textit{sato/sesato} ‘creature; animal; character’, Malay \textit{setua} ‘wild beast; monster’, Toba Batak \textit{santua} ([sattua]) ‘mouse, rat’. The Balinese and Sasak forms are transparent loans from Javanese, which acquired them through direct contact with Sanskrit. The remaining words raise an interesting point. It is clear that all Sanskrit loanwords in languages of Borneo and the Philippines were acquired through the medium of Malay, as there is no historical or archaeological evidence of direct Indianization of any of these areas, apart from fragmentary inscriptions suggestive of casual contact or abortive colonization. It is also clear that Malay has simplified consonant clusters, including geminate consonants, which it once had in Sanskrit loanwords. Some of these survived long enough to be transmitted to Philippine languages which preserved them after they were lost in the lending language, as with Malay \textit{muka}, but Tagalog \textit{mukhá} ‘face’, Skt. \textit{mukha} ‘face’. Taboyan, Lawangan \textit{setua},

\textsuperscript{11} The modern city of Banjarmasin is near the mouth of the Barito river, and forms the nucleus of the language community using Banjarese, usually described as a dialect of Malay (Ras 1968:8ff), but lexically no closer to standard Malay than is Iban, which is usually regarded as a different language (Blust 1988). No one knows with certainty how long Banjarese Malay has been used in Borneo. The one certainty is that, unlike the Malayic Dayak languages spoken over much of south and southwest Borneo it is not native to the area. Ras (1968:8) suggests that ‘The Malay linguistic community in South-East Borneo may in fact have had its beginning in a small Malay colony founded in the time of the empire of Sri-Wijaya.’ Its \textit{raison d’être} was trade ‘for Borneo’s traditional forest produce of wood, rattan, dammar, wax, \textit{kaju putih} and ... gold’ (Ras 1968:189). Although the early Banjarese/Sriwijayan Malays appear to have had their most intensive linguistic contacts with speakers of Southeast Barito languages, in more recent centuries (following the merger of *e and *a) the locus of primary contact has shifted to Southwest Barito (Dempwolff 1937, Dyen 1956).
Ma’anany, Paku, Dusun Witu \textit{satua’} ‘animal’ must, then, have been acquired from Malay, and the same is true of the related words in Samalan languages. But \textit{setua} is an archaic word in Malay, used more in literary than in colloquial contexts, and this apparently has been the case for some centuries. The ordinary spoken word for ‘animal’ in Malay is \textit{binatang}, and this word has been borrowed, probably from Brunei Malay, into a number of the coastal languages of Sarawak and Sabah (Bintulu, Narum \textit{binatang}, Mukah Melanau \textit{benaténg}, Limbang Bisaya \textit{benatang} ‘animal’), into languages of the southern Philippines (Maranao, Tausug \textit{binatang} ‘animal’, Tiruray \textit{binatang} ‘all four-legged, warm-blooded animals, including monkeys’, Western Bukidnon Manobo \textit{binatang} ‘to have no shame, as an animal has no shame’), and into a few Barito languages (Tunjung, Ba’amang \textit{binatang} ‘animal’).

Most language communities which have borrowed Malay \textit{binatang} are Islamic, and although this word is not an Arabic loan, the gloss for Mapun \textit{binatang} makes it very clear that this word is associated with Islamic dietary regulations. It is thus a reasonable inference that \textit{binatang} was the common colloquial term for ‘animal’ from the time that Brunei Malays began to actively spread Islam in coastal regions of Borneo and the southern Philippines, a process that is usually assumed to have begun between 1,350 and 1,400 CE (Saleeby 1963:42ff). Given the association of \textit{binatang} ‘animal’ with the post-Islamic Malay world, it seems likely that Malay \textit{setua} was last used as a colloquial term during the pre-Islamic period. It follows that the words for ‘animal’ which are traceable to Sanskrit \textit{sattva-} in both Barito and Samalan languages almost certainly were borrowed from the Sriwijayan Malays who settled in southeast Borneo and gave rise to modern Banjarese. This inference is further supported by the observation that the geminate consonant of the Sanskrit word has been lost in both standard Malay \textit{setua} and in Banjarese \textit{satua}, but is preserved in the other languages.\footnote{Banjarese shows some Javanese linguistic influence, but this cannot account for the occurrence of \textit{sattuwa} in Samalan languages for two reasons: 1. Javanese contact with Banjarmasin began long after the Sama-Bajaw had left southeast Borneo, and 2. as a result of regular ‘guna assimilation’ in the history of Javanese, by late Old Javanese times the form of the word had already become \textit{sato}.}

This brings us to the second comparison which can be used as evidence that Sriwijayan Malays ancestral to the modern Banjarese must have been trading with speakers of early Southeast Barito languages before the ancestral Sama-Bajaw reached the southern Philippines. Comparison 13), which requires the most extensive discussion, shows that PMP \textit{*hikan} was replaced by \textit{*kenah} ‘fish’:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Yakan} \textit{kenna} ‘fish (generic)’
  \item \textbf{Ma’anany, Samihin, Paku, Dusun Witu, Dusun Malang} \textit{kenah} ‘fish’
  \item \textbf{Merina Malagasy} (Richardson 1885:249) \textit{hena} ‘beef; flesh meat’\footnote{Also used in names of fish, as \textit{hena lasa}, or \textit{hena lasa}, both given as ‘k.o. fish.’}
  \item \textbf{Ta‘ala Malagasy} (Beaujard 1998:317) \textit{hèna} ‘fish; meat’.
\end{itemize}

This is a particularly striking innovation which is both complicated and enriched by two considerations: 1) the shared innovation is semantic, not lexical, and 2) the agreement between Yakan and Southeast Barito languages clearly is a product of borrowing. First, \textit{*kenas} can be attributed to Proto-Malayo-Polynesian in the meaning ‘preserved meat or fish’ (Blust 1999). The following glosses illustrate: (WMP) Kadazan Dusun \textit{kanas} ‘food taken with rice dishes (fish, meat, vegetables, etc.)’, Iban \textit{kenas} ‘fish (ikan) preserved by steeping or parboiling to remove bones, salting and smoke-curing in bamboo’, Malay \textit{kenas} ‘shellfish, salted and mixed with rice, sago and other ingredients for preservation as food’, Old Javanese \textit{kenas} ‘small game, in particular deer’, Sangir
kina? ‘fish (first element in many fish names); flesh in general; prey, victim’, (CMP) Manggarai kenas ‘roasted meat which is preserved in a bamboo container’. Reflexes of *kenas have undergone a semantic change to ‘fish (generic)’ in five cases which appear at first to be historically independent: 1) Yakan, and presumably other Samalan languages for which published data is not available, 2) all languages in the Southeast Barito group, 3) Soboyo (Sula archipelago, central Moluccas) kena, 4) Bolongan (northeast Borneo) kenas, and 5) Proto-Sangiric *kinas.

Because it is somewhat different from the other cases, we can consider Proto-Sangiric *kinas first. Sneddon (1984:87) gives Sangir kina? ‘fish; meat (general term)’, but also Sangir, Sangil kinas-e ‘be eaten (of meat)’. Sangiric reflexes of *kenas thus appear to have a wider signification than ‘fish’. In Yakan, Soboyo, and so far as we can tell from the limited lexical source materials in Southeast Barito languages, the related word is the generic term for ‘fish’, and nothing more. These semantic innovations initially appear to provide evidence for a parallel change with no historical connection, but closer attention to detail shows that this probably is not true. Yakan should reflect *kenas with a final sibilant, as in *Ratus > hatus ‘hundred’, *nipis > nipis ‘thin, as paper’, *tanjis > tangis ‘cry, weep’, or *beRas > buwas ‘rice (pounded and/or cooked)’. As already seen, in Ma’anayan and other Southeast Barito languages, on the other hand, PMP *s became s or h, and most commonly -h in final position. Malay loanwords that end in -h are borrowed without the final fricative in Samalan languages (*lebiq > Malay lebih, Mapun, Yakan labi ‘excess’, *susaq > Malay susah, Mapun susa, Yakan suse ‘sad, worried’), and -h from *R in native words disappeared after lowering a preceding high vowel. It may be assumed, then, that loanwords with -h from any source would be borrowed without the final fricative. If so, the absence of -s in Yakan kenna ‘fish’ has a simple explanation: this word is a regular continuation of kenhah, which was borrowed from an early Southeast Barito source. Intriguingly, Soboyo kena ‘fish’ is also irregular (expected **kona), but in its vocalism, not the loss of *-s. Since both this phonological irregularity and the shared semantic change can be accounted for by borrowing from a Sama-Bajaw source, it seems likely that Soboyo kena is a loan from one of the Sama-Bajaw communities of the northern Moluccas. The initial impression that reflexes of *kenas show five independent changes from ‘preserved fish’ to ‘fish’ is thus reduced as three independent changes, of which one appears to cover a broader range.

But why would a semantic change from ‘preserved fish’ to ‘fish (generic)’ take place in the first place? What this comparison suggests is that some form of preserved fish was an important trade item at the time of the Sama-Bajaw migrations to the Philippines. While the Sama-Bajaw may have played a part in conducting this trade they could hardly have initiated it, since they themselves evidently borrowed the word kenhah from an early Southeast Barito source. What, then, might have motivated a semantic change of this kind in the Southeast Barito languages themselves? If preserved fish came to be more important in the daily diet than fish freshly caught, the word for ‘preserved fish’ might well come to replace the inherited reflex of PMP *hikan ‘fish’. To gain perspective on how this might happen we need to widen our view. Several of the West Barito languages also have an innovative word for ‘fish’, seen in Kapuas, Katingan lauk, Ba’amang lau?. This word is cognate with, and apparently borrowed from Malay lauk ‘solid food (fish or flesh) to be eaten with rice’; etym. of fish-food ... and often used in that sense, esp. in Minangkabau; lauk pada ‘small fish pickled in brine’; lauk pauk ‘curried fish and meat of all sorts’; cry of the fish-sellers (Minangkabau)’ PMP *lahuk ‘to mix (types of food)’. Revealingly, Mapun and Central Sulu Sama have another apparently borrowed word for ‘fish’: Mapun daying ‘fish (generic)’, CS daing ‘fish’. These words exhibit phonological irregularities which indicate borrowing, almost certainly
from Malay *daéng/dahing* ‘slicing into thin strips and drying in the sun. Esp. of fish preserved (*ikan daéng*) after being cut in two along the line of the vertebrae.’ With this set of etymologies, then, we see a word that means ‘preserved fish’ in the lending language borrowed as the generic term for ‘fish’ in the receiving language. Given this context it would not be surprising if *kenah* in Southeast Barito languages were also an early borrowing of Malay *kenas*.

**Inference 7: Trade drew both the Malagasy and the Sama-Bajaw out of southeast Borneo**

The linguistic comparisons presented here force us to conclude that the Sama-Bajaw originated in what is now the basin of the Barito river. Along with some speakers of early Southeast Barito languages, they were drawn into trade with Sriwijayan Malays, and eventually became sea nomads centered in the southern Philippines. The parallels with the Malagasy migration from the Barito basin to Madagascar can hardly escape notice, nor can these parallels simply be an accident. Adelaar (1989) has pointed out the crucial role of Sriwijayan Malays in making the Malagasy migration possible, since the ancestral Malagasy would have been riverine people, while the Malays of Sriwijaya traded widely throughout insular Southeast Asia, and were skilled sailors. One important piece of evidence that Adelaar uses to illustrate the dependence of the early Malagasy on Malay seafarers is the terminological system for wind directions, critical to sailing, which he argues were borrowed from Sriwijayan Malay into Malagasy. Virtually the same eight-point system has been borrowed from Malay into Samalan languages (Collins, Collins and Hashim 2001:87). If we are to draw inferences from the linguistic data, then, it would appear that both the ancestral Malagasy and the ancestral Sama-Bajaw were schooled in sailing by Sriwijayan Malays. In fact, it may not be too extreme to suggest that were it not for Sriwijayan Malay contact with southeast Borneo neither the Malagasy nor the Sama-Bajaw would have come into existence.

From this point we have little linguistic data to guide us, but it does seem possible to venture a few speculations that are not entirely groundless. First, why would Sriwijayan Malays have been interested in southeast Borneo rather than in other parts of Borneo that are closer to southern Sumatra? The answer appears to be topography. As noted above, in the late first millennium A.D. what is now the Barito river basin was an enormous bay, sheltered on the southeast by the Meratus mountains, which formed a 200-mile long peninsula, and on the west by the peaks and foothills of the Schwaner range. According to Hall (1985:78) ‘The state of Sriwijaya dominated maritime commerce passing through Southeast Asia between A.D. 670 and 1025.’ Commerce in an insular environment obviously depends on shipping, and the success of shipping depends on good anchorage, an association which is amply demonstrated through the repeated rise of commercial centers large and small in locations with sheltered waters. Examples in insular Southeast Asia include Manila Bay, where Fukienese merchants had established important trade connections with the local Filipinos before the advent of the Manila Galleon, Brunei Bay, which fostered the Brunei sultanate, and Ambon harbor, the most important collection point for the spice trade in eastern Indonesia. In enlarging their trade contacts Malays, who were excellent sailors, would certainly have sought that part of the Borneo coast which provided the best anchorage and shelter

---

14 Modern Banjaranese has merged PMP *e* and *a*, but this is a change which presumably took place after a number of Sriwijayan Malay loanwords had already entered early Southeast Barito languages.
from the annual monsoons. The unnamed bay in the Barito basin provided an ideal location for vessels to load jungle products from the Bornean hinterland, as the waters were shallow, and were protected on both sides (but especially on the east) by mountain barriers. In time some of these Sumatran Malays established a permanent colony near the mouth of the Barito river, the ancestor of the modern Banjarese. It is a matter of speculation when this trade began and when a Malay-speaking colony was established. However, if Pallesen is correct in placing the arrival of the Sama-Bajaw in the Zamboanga-Sulu area by about AD 800, it would be reasonable to place the onset of Sriwijayan contact with southeast Borneo in the period 670–800 AD. Dahl (1991:49ff) argues that the Kota Kapur stone inscription from the island of Bangka, which carries the date 686 AD contains one line of Old Ma’anyan text, suggesting that Sriwijayan Malays were already in contact with southeast Borneo at that time.

Although Sriwijayan trade may have been multifaceted, one key element for many centuries clearly was the shipment of cloves and nutmeg from the tiny islands of eastern Indonesia where they were produced, to the vicinity of the Malay-controlled Strait of Malacca, where they could be exported to external markets. So far as I know, the connection has never been explicitly drawn, but the distribution of Malay dialects outside the Malay ‘homeland’ of southwest Borneo, the Malay peninsula and southern Sumatra, has left a linguistic trail showing the routes by which spices were shipped from Moluccan producers to Sumatran Malay distributors (always under the control of Malay speakers). The northern route is marked by Ambonese Malay, Manado Malay, and Brunei Malay, the southern route by Kupang Malay, Larantuka Malay, and Jakarta Malay. Why did the ancestral Sama-Bajaw move north, while the Malagasy moved west? In many ways the motivation for the better-known Malagasy migration is more difficult to fathom than that for the movement of the Sama-Bajaw. The early Sama-Bajaw may well have been drawn into the southern Philippines by the Malay-dominated spice trade. A location in the southern Zamboanga-Sulu area would have placed them almost midway between Manado and Brunei, and the heavy influx of Malay loanwords into Samalan languages attests to their continuing intense contact with Malay speakers over a period of several centuries. For reasons that remain obscure, the Malagasy left this lucrative intra-archipelagic network to seek their fortune elsewhere, but the Sama-Bajaw may have continued to participate in it until Malay control was lost to the incoming European powers in the latter part of the sixteenth century.

7. The Proto-Philippines Homeland

The last topic I would like to touch on, however briefly, is the location of Proto-Philippines. Radiocarbon dates associated with plain or red slipped pottery and with small, square, double-walled houses which contain interior hearths, show that Neolithic cultures were established in the Cagayan Valley of northern Luzon by 4,800 B.P. (Bellwood 1997:220, Spriggs 1989:593).\(^\text{15}\) As noted already, however, these remains mark the earliest known presence of Neolithic cultures in the Philippines, and it is unlikely that Proto-Philippines began to differentiate until perhaps a millennium later. Sometime around 3,500 B.P., then, Proto-Philippines speakers began a territorial expansion that effectively eliminated other early Austronesian languages in the Philippines either through absorption, or through flight. A priori this scenario seems

---

\(^{15}\) According to Peter Bellwood (pers. comm., December 17, 2002) these dates are not to be trusted, and the oldest reliable dates from the Cagayan Valley probably are no earlier than 4,000 B.P.
implausible, as it is difficult to imagine how one Austronesian-speaking community would be able to secure such a decisive advantage over others at a similar stage of culture. Latin replaced all other ancient languages of the Italian peninsula, but this was through its role as the language of a vast military, political, economic, and cultural empire. Clearly, whatever conditions were conducive to language expansion and extinction in the early Philippines must have differed substantially from those which favored the spread of Latin.

What would the population distribution have been like in the prehistoric Philippines circa 3,500 B.P.? First, speakers of Proto-Malayo-Polynesian had a rich vocabulary relating to the sea and its economic products. This marine orientation was fundamental to early Austronesian societies, and is reflected in all parts of the Austronesian world by evidence that coastal zones were preferred over inland areas until some time after the initial period of colonization. We are probably safe in assuming, then, that 3,500 years ago the mountainous interior regions of the Philippines were the exclusive preserve of the pre-Neolithic Negrito populations, and that wherever possible Austronesian-speaking groups continued to maintain contact with the sea and its rich inventory of economically useful products. At the same time, these Austronesian speakers were growing rice and millet, as shown by widespread cognate sets relating to grain agriculture in general, and to rice in particular (Blust 1995). By 3,500 B.P. the Austronesian languages of the Philippines had been diverging from one another for a millennium or more, and the situation we might expect during this period is a collection of several dozen closely related but distinct languages, spread around the coastal zones of the major islands.

Bellwood (1995) has argued that the Austronesian expansion was driven by rice agriculture. The cultivation of grain crops encouraged territorial expansion for two reasons. First, in the beginning at least, it almost certainly was based on swiddening, and so required frequent shifting of the area put under cultivation. Second, rice agriculture permits greater population densities than are found in foraging or horticultural societies, even with swidden agriculture. With wet rice soils are not exhausted so quickly, but population densities increase much more rapidly, putting pressure on local resources and encouraging migration. Historically, the ‘rice granary’ of the Philippines has been the volcanically-enriched Central Plain stretching from Lingayen Gulf in the north to Manila Bay in the south, and from the Zambales mountains in the west to the southern Cordillera in the east. Once early Austronesian speakers reached this area the opportunities for population expansion would have increased dramatically. Linguistic evidence does not permit us to determine with any degree of certainty the antiquity of wet rice agriculture in the Philippines (Reid 1994b), but either through swiddening or wetfield rice cultivation the language group that arrived in this area first probably would have had opportunities for rapid population growth that greatly exceeded those of other areas. While the territorial expansion of Latin was due to political and military factors, then, the territorial expansion of Proto-Philippines may have been due to a kind of geographical determinism: linguistic groups that reached an advantageous location first were most likely to expand at the expense of others.

Wernstedt and Spencer (1967:368ff) nonetheless make it clear that the agricultural productivity of the Central Plain is a relatively recent phenomenon. In 1571, when the Spaniard Martin de Goiti quickly pacified central Luzon, the interior regions of the Central Plain in the present provinces of Tarlac and Nueva Ecija were heavily forested, and almost unpopulated. However, in Lower Pampanga Province, within about 10 miles of Manila Bay the population density increased dramatically, and a similar pattern on a lesser scale was observed within about 10 miles of Lingayen Gulf.
The economy of early Philippine societies thus depended on striking a balance between exploiting the resources of the sea and those of the land: rice farmers needed good rice lands, but never far from the coast. Since this presumably was true throughout the archipelago, the richer rice lands surrounding Manila Bay would have provided a relative abundance of food, and consequent opportunities for rapid population growth in relation to other areas. Considering all of the relevant facts, then, it seems likely that the Proto-Philippines expansion began from the region of central Luzon surrounding Manila Bay. Moreover, the attested distribution of primary subgroups of Philippine languages is consistent with this view: Bashiic, Cordilleran, and most of Central Luzon to the north, Inati and Kalamian slightly to the south, and GCP, Bilic, Sangiric and Minahasan further to the south, with a possibility that Sangiric and Minahasan share a common node under Proto-Philippines.

Many questions naturally remain unanswered. Does the extreme southern region of the Central Plain of Luzon just to the north of Manila Bay offer sufficiently great agricultural advantages in itself to support the inference I make, or is it necessary to assume without the benefit of any known supporting evidence that wet rice agriculture was first practiced in this area, and that this supplied the needed demographic advantage for expansion? Why did the Proto-Philippines expansion stop at the geographical boundaries of the Philippines, while the GCP expansion leaped beyond to northern Sulawesi, and produced a major loan influence in Sabah? How could all earlier Austronesian languages in the Philippines, including those that must have begun to diverge very early in the Cagayan valley, have been replaced by a single expanding population speaking Proto-Philippines? These and other questions undoubtedly will continue to nag us, but we cannot ignore the observations which led us to ask them in the first place. Much of what happened in the past is lost to us forever, but more than is commonly appreciated can be retrieved by resourceful use of the available evidence. In historical linguistics this need not be limited to the traditional use of the Comparative Method, but as I hope to have shown here, much can also be gained from a consideration of the large-scale distributional observations that form the basis for inferences relating to ‘macrohistory.’
Appendix 1

Proto-Philippine lexical innovations proposed in Zorc (1986) for which external evidence has since been found.

2. PPH *lújan ‘ride; load’. BUT: Mandar ruray, Makasarese luray ‘load, cargo’, Bugotu lu-luja ‘cargo’, Nggela lunda ‘load a canoe or ship with cargo; embark passengers; cargo’, Arosi ruta ‘load a canoe; carry (s.t.) to canoe and stow’.
3. PPH *púnas ‘to wipe’. BUT: Iban punas ‘barren, childless, with no direct heirs; died out, having no survivors; wipe out, destroy’, Chamorro funas ‘eradicate, erase, wipe out, put an end to’. All known Philippine reflexes of *punas mean ‘to wipe away (dirt, crumbs), take a sponge bath’ and the like. Given the semantic agreement of the Iban and Chamorro forms it appears that PPH *púnas ‘to wipe’ may contain a semantic innovation.
4. PPH *sujud ‘fine-toothed comb’. BUT: Bintulu surud, Nias suxu ‘comb’.
5. PPH *a-núh ‘what?’. BUT: Murik ano? ‘which, which one?; thing mentioned’, Bintulu anew ineh ‘what?’, Moken ano-ŋ ‘what?’
6. PPH *?udu ‘medicine’. BUT: Rungus Dusun uru ‘medicine’, Minangkabau uduah ‘incantation; k.o. basket with cooked rice, sugar and grated coconut, set in the field during rice-planting to guard against calamity’, Pamona uru ‘ taboo sign or charm used to protect fruit trees, temporary shelters, etc. from thieves’. Since Rungus Dusun uru may be a GCP loanword, it might be argued that PPH *?udu ‘medicine’ shows a semantic innovation. However, Sangir uro ‘charm, spell (against thieves of fruit in plantation)’, Tontemboan uru? ‘charm, spell concealed on a fruit tree to prevent theft of fruit’, Bolaang Mongondow uyu? ‘charm used to safeguard one’s property, but also used to inflict harm on others’ suggests that the change of meaning to ‘medicine’ postdated the break-up of PPH.
8. PPH *buqél ‘leg joint (knee, ankle, etc.)’. BUT: Buli pu-puo ‘knee’.
9. PPH *keRá ‘scab’. BUT: Kavalan keran ‘scab’. These forms are etymologically discrepant with respect to the final nasal.
10. PPH *ma- ‘one unit’ (10, 100, 1,000). BUT: *ma-Ratus > Long Semadoh me-ratu ‘100’, me-ribu ‘1,000’, Bintulu matus (Ray 1913), Miri ma-rataw ‘100’, ma-ribuh ‘1,000’, Kiput ma-lataw ‘100’, ma-libo ‘1,000’
11. PPH *n-atáy ‘dead’. BUT: Kelabit n-ate ‘was killed’.

David Zorc offered useful comments on an earlier version of this appendix. I am much indebted to him, and am immensely gladdened by his return to the field of Austronesian linguistics.
Appendix 2

Additional innovations which can be attributed to Proto-Philippines (subgroup distribution is indicated by numerical code, where 1 = Bashic, 2 = Cordilleran, 3 = Central Luzon, 4 = Inati, 5 = Kalamian, 6 = Greater Central Philippines, 7 = Biloc, 8 = Sangiric, 9 = Minahasan; for supporting evidence cf. Blust 1999).

1. PPH *aba (PMP *baba) ‘carry pick-a-back’ (26)
2. PPH *abag ‘join forces, cooperate in working’ (26)
3. PPH *abal-abal ‘beetle species’ (27)
4. PPH *abat ‘spirit that causes sickness’ (26)
5. PPH *abij ‘to copulate’ (26)
6. PPH *abijay ‘to sling over the shoulder’ (26)
7. PPH *abuR ‘to chase, drive away’ (26)
8. PPH *alinaw (PMP *qaninu) ‘shadow’ (26)
9. PPH *ma-anay ‘termite-infested’ (36)
10. PPH *aŋal ‘groan, cry of pain’ (26)
11. PPH *paŋ-ampu ‘descendants’ (26)
12. PPH *ampu-ampu ‘forefathers, ancestors’ (26)
13. PPH *apúy ‘to break out in boils’ (26)
14. PPH *ka-asu ‘canine companion’ (29)
15. PPH *asúd ‘to pound rice in tandem’ (26)
16. PPH *atá ‘expression of displeasure or surprise’ (26)
17. PPH *atá ‘flood tide’ (236)
18. PPH *antábay ‘to stay with, accompany’ (26)
19. PPH *atáŋ ‘a sacrifice to the spirits’ (26)
20. PPH *átan-átan ‘poisonous arthropod’ (26)
21. PPH *ántiŋ ‘to hear at a distance’ (26)
22. PPH *ayáw ‘to depart, separate from’ (26)
23. PPH *bábad ‘to soak’ (26)
24. PPH *balalaj ‘sandpiper, snipe’ (28)
25. PPH *balaqi ‘co-parent-in-law’ (367)
26. PPH *bala(R)baR ‘crosswise, athwart’ (267)
27. PPH *balát ‘sea cucumber’ (26)
28. PPH *balatuŋ ‘mung bean’ (26)
29. PPH *baláw ‘negative marker’ (26)
30. PPH *balaw ‘small shrimp sp.’ (26)
31. PPH *baláyaŋ ‘banana sp.’ (26)
32. PPH *báli ‘join, participate in, accompany’ (269)
33. PPH *balikes ‘encircle, wrap around’ (26)
34. PPH *baliketád ‘reverse, turn around’ (26)
35. PPH *balikid ‘reverse, turn over or around’ (26)
36. PPH *balikis ‘tie around; belt’ (26)
37. PPH *balikutkút ‘to bend, curl up’ (26)
38. PPH *balilit ‘edible snail sp.’ (26)
39. PPH *balisúsu ‘kingfisher’ (26)
40. PPH *balítiq ‘banyan, strangler fig’ (1236)
41. PPH *balníw ‘to rinse, rinse off’ (26)
42. PPH *balúla ‘large open-work basket’ (26)
43. PPH *balútu ‘dugout canoe’ (26)
44. PPH *banabá ‘a tree: Lagerstroemia speciosa’ (236)
45. PPH *banér ‘to bruise, raise welts’ (26)
46. PPH *banhéd ‘numb, as a limb’ (26)
47. PPH *banikutkút ‘to bend, curl up’ (26)
48. PPH *banug/banür ‘hawk, eagle’ (26)
49. PPH *banútan ‘tree sp.’ (26)
50. PPH *bara gay (dbl. *bara gay) ‘communal boat’ (26)
51. PPH *baranbán ‘small marine fish’ (26)
52. PPH *beték ‘bundle of rice stalks’ (26)
53. PPH *pa-betu ‘make an exploding sound’ (67)
54. PPH *bijaw ‘winnowing basket’ (26)
55. PPH *bi kit ‘joined along the length’ (567)
56. PPH *bisqáw ‘chasm, precipice’ (26)
57. PPH *beqát ‘to collide, of hard objects’ (26)
58. PPH *beqát ‘to meet’ (16)
59. PPH *beqát ‘to state, express in words’ (26)
60. PPH *beqát ‘moustache, whiskers’ (67)
61. PPH *beqát ‘fishhook’ (26)
62. PPH *beqát ‘relapse’ (26)
63. PPH *berták ‘to open, of a flower in bloom’ (26)
64. PPH *beqát ‘to collide, of hard objects’ (26)
65. PPH *beqát ‘to state, express in words’ (26)
66. PPH *beqát ‘moustache, whiskers’ (67)
67. PPH *beqát ‘fishhook’ (26)
68. PPH *beqát ‘relapse’ (26)
69. PPH *beqát ‘satiated’ (26)
70. PPH *beqát ‘satiated’ (26)
71. PPH *beqát ‘satiated’ (26)
72. PPH *beqát ‘satiated’ (26)
73. PPH *biklát ‘scar’ (26)
74. PPH *ma-bíla ‘countable’ (36)
75. PPH *bílu ‘blackened’ (26)
76. PPH *binuña ‘a tree: Macaranga tanarius’ (68)
77. PPH *bisíbis ‘sprinkle water on something’ (26)
78. PPH *bitay ‘to hang’ (267)
79. PPH *bítek ‘intestinal worm’ (679)
80. PPH *bitin ‘to hang, suspect’ (23678)
81. PPH *bítu ‘hole, cavern, pitfall trap’ (126)
82. PPH *biu ‘tree sp.’ (26)
83. PPH *buág/buíal ‘uproot a tree’ (267)
84. PPH *búa ‘tomorrow’ (26)
85. PPH *maka-bíta ‘become blind’ (68)
86. PPH *búgaq ‘pumice’ (236)
87. PPH *bugrís ‘diarrhoea’ (26)
88. PPH *bugtún ‘alone, single’ (26)
89. PPH *bujas ‘to pluck, as fruit’ (12)
90. PPH *bujiq ‘fish eggs, roe’ (267)
91. PPH *buklad ‘unfold, open up, blossom’ (16)
92. PPH *buknúl ‘knot, lump’ (26)
93. PPH *buktút ‘bulge, as hunchback’ (236)
94. PPH *bulág (dbl. PMP *bulaR) ‘ocular cataract’ (2378)
95. PPH *bulalákaw ‘spoiled coconut’ (26)
96. PPH *bulalákaw ‘meteor, shooting star’ (2368)
97. PPH *bulilít ‘dwarfish, small (of people)’ (26)
98. PPH *bulínaw ‘anchovy: Stolephorus spp.’ (26)
99. PPH *bulud ‘to borrow, lend’ (12)
100. PPH *bunal ‘to beat up, bruise someone’ (68)
101. PPH *búnuq ‘edible mushroom sp.’ (26)
102. PPH *bunjájaq ‘to open the mouth wide’ (68)
103. PPH *bunjaw ‘scrotum, testicles’ (26)
104. PPH *bunjí ‘stench, bad odor’ (12)
105. PPH *buquetís ‘pregnant; pregnant woman’ (26)
106. PPH *búqu ‘broken, shattered’ (26)
107. PPH *busiq/busiqsiq ‘split, rip open’ (26)
108. PPH *busuán ‘strong free flow of water’ (126)
109. PPH *butakál ‘male pig, boar’ (26)
110. PPH *butí ‘swine disease; pockmarks’ (268)
111. PPH *butik ‘spotted, dappled, speckled’ (236)
112. PPH *butikíq ‘house lizard, gecko’ (26)
113. PPH *bútil ‘satiated’ (26)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>PPH</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td><em>butíq</em></td>
<td>(doublet <em>beRtiq</em>) 'popped rice'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td><em>butúy</em></td>
<td>'swollen, of the flesh'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td><em>buybuy</em></td>
<td>'silk cotton tree: <em>Ceiba pentandra</em>'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td><em>buyug</em></td>
<td>'bumblebee'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td><em>buyúk</em></td>
<td>'rotten, stinking'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td><em>dayaw</em></td>
<td>'fame, glory; praise'</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td><em>dalág</em></td>
<td>'freshwater mudfish'</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td><em>dúdun</em></td>
<td>'grasshopper, locust'</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td><em>edeg</em></td>
<td>'back of humans or animals'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td><em>enép</em></td>
<td>'conceal one’s feelings'</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td><em>enus</em></td>
<td>'to sniffle, pant'</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td><em>epit</em></td>
<td>'fibers at base of coconut frond'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td><em>maka-esá</em></td>
<td>'once'</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td><em>eták</em></td>
<td>'bush knife, machete'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td><em>hábas</em></td>
<td>'tumor in the mouth of an animal'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td><em>hajek-an</em></td>
<td>'to kiss'</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td><em>hambúg</em></td>
<td>'proud, boastful'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td><em>hañút</em></td>
<td>'to chew or gnaw on'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td><em>hampak</em></td>
<td>'to slap, to smack'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td><em>haprus/hapRus</em></td>
<td>'to rub, massage'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td><em>hápun</em></td>
<td>'to roost, of fowls; time of roosting'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td><em>háyep</em></td>
<td>'animal'</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td><em>hebás</em></td>
<td>'to evaporate, dry up'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td><em>hendék</em></td>
<td>'to moan, to groan'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td><em>hediq</em></td>
<td>(dbl. PMP <em>hadiq</em>) 'no, not'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td><em>helék</em></td>
<td>'to sleep'</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td><em>henaq</em></td>
<td>'to think, consider; thought, idea'</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td><em>hideRáq</em></td>
<td>'to lie down'</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td><em>higpít</em></td>
<td>'to pinch or squeeze'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td><em>hikñat</em></td>
<td>'to stretch'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td><em>hiláw</em></td>
<td>'raw, unripe'</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td><em>híli</em></td>
<td>'village, town'</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td><em>hilít</em></td>
<td>'outskirts, edge of settlement'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td><em>hílut</em></td>
<td>'to massage, set bones'</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td><em>himatún</em></td>
<td>'to notice, observe'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td><em>hínam</em></td>
<td>'to crave, desire intensely'</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td><em>híñak</em></td>
<td>'sound of rushing air or water'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td><em>hipuq</em></td>
<td>'to feel, touch'</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td><em>hírig</em></td>
<td>'to lean, incline'</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td><em>hírud</em></td>
<td>'to scrape or rub off'</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
154. PPH *hiRét ‘to tighten; constriction’ (26)
155. PPH *hiuım ‘to close the lips; smile’ (26)
156. PPH *hubád ‘to untie, unravel’ (26)
157. PPH *i-huluR ‘to lower, drop’ (26)
158. PPH *huñat ‘to stretch, straighten out’ (26)
159. PPH *huyáp ‘to count, enumerate’ (26)
160. PPH *iba ‘bad, evil’ (267)
161. PPH *íbun ‘bird sp.’ (26)
162. PPH *ígat ‘eel’ (26)
163. PPH *ínúguk ‘deep throaty sound’ (26)
164. PPH *íkamen ‘woven mat’ (26)
165. PPH *íliw ‘homesick; yearn for something’ (26)
166. PPH *imún ‘jealous, envious’ (26)
167. PPH *ímut ‘stingy, selfish’ (236)
168. PPH *ínqiiñ ‘shrill sound’ (26)
169. PPH *ipa- ‘verb prefix: 3rd p. causative-command’ (26)
170. PPH *ipil-ipil ‘a shrub: Leucaena glauca’ (267)
171. PPH *ípun ‘rice variety’ (27)
172. PPH *íriñ ‘similar; to imitate’ (267)
173. PPH *ísip ‘thinking, thought, opinion’ (236)
174. PPH *isul ‘to retreat, move backward’ (26)
175. PPH *íwas ‘to avoid, evade (as people)’ (26)
176. PPH *íwik ‘to squeal’ (26)
177. PPH *íwit ‘rear part’ (26)
178. PPH *pala pala ‘temporary shed’ (26)
179. PPH *palakaq ‘frog’ (16)
180. PPH *p-al-ikpik ‘fin of a fish’ (26)
181. PPH *pális ‘animal sacrifice’ (26)
182. PPH *palit ‘to change, exchange’ (26)
183. PPH *panúqus ‘stench, sour smell’ (26)
184. PPH *paqliñ ‘visible defect of the eyes’ (26)
185. PPH *páRbu ‘one of the four principal rafters’ (26)
186. PPH *p-al-ukpuk ‘sound of bubbling, knocking’ (26)
187. PPH *p-al-R-utput ‘gaseous defecation’ (26)
188. PPH *pulpul ‘blunt, lacking a point’ (26)
189. PPH *alik-qabuk ‘dust’ (26)
190. PPH *qabut ‘to overtake, catch up with’ (256)
191. PPH *qambijay ‘carry slung over the shoulder’ (26)
192. PPH *qamih-an-an ‘north; rainy season’ (26)
193. PPH *paŋ-qanup ‘hunting dog’ (26)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Word and Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>194.</td>
<td>PPH *qaŋesú ‘stench of urine’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195.</td>
<td>PPH *qaŋetéj ‘stench of burning hair’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196.</td>
<td>PPH *qasawa-en ‘to marry, take a spouse’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197.</td>
<td>PPH *qelad ‘sheet; flat, wide object’  (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198.</td>
<td>PPH *qemel ‘squeeze into a ball’  (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199.</td>
<td>PPH *qenqen ‘whining sound’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.</td>
<td>PPH *qepés ‘deflated, shrunken’  (256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.</td>
<td>PPH *maR-queti ‘to lower, of water level’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.</td>
<td>PPH *qimún ‘sexual jealousy’  (256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203.</td>
<td>PPH *qinut ‘use sparingly’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204.</td>
<td>PPH *man-quetay ‘to gather rattan’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205.</td>
<td>PPH *quhay ‘rice panicle’  (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206.</td>
<td>PPH *quhut ‘sheaf of rice grains’  (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.</td>
<td>PPH *quRis ‘unusually white; albino’  (568)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208.</td>
<td>PPH *ipa-qútaŋ ‘to lend, give a loan to someone’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209.</td>
<td>PPH *quyag ‘living, alive’  (567)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210.</td>
<td>PPH *sigpít ‘clamp, clasp; tongs’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211.</td>
<td>PPH *simsim ‘to taste, sip something’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212.</td>
<td>PPH *si-nuh ‘who?’  (1236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213.</td>
<td>PPH *siqit ‘fish bone, spine’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214.</td>
<td>PPH *tampipiŋ ‘telescoping basket’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215.</td>
<td>PPH *túkud ‘to sound, fathom; guess’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216.</td>
<td>PPH *i-uliq ‘to take something home’  (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217.</td>
<td>PPH *úlit ‘to repeat’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218.</td>
<td>PPH *ulitau ‘bachelor, young unmarried man’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219.</td>
<td>PPH *unah-án ‘first’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.</td>
<td>PPH *uŋaq ‘child’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221.</td>
<td>PPH *uŋur ‘to moan, growl’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222.</td>
<td>PPH *uRtuh ‘zenith; noon’  (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223.</td>
<td>PPH *wákát ‘to scatter, strew about’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224.</td>
<td>PPH *waksi ‘to shake, flick off’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225.</td>
<td>PPH *walinj-walín ‘orchid sp.’  (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.</td>
<td>PPH *walwálwalwáR ‘work from side to side’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227.</td>
<td>PPH *waŋáwaŋ/waŋwan ‘wide open space’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228.</td>
<td>PPH *warak ‘to scatter, strew’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229.</td>
<td>PPH *wáras ‘to distribute, deal out’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230.</td>
<td>PPH *wasay-wasay ‘insect sp.’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231.</td>
<td>PPH *wasiwas ‘wave back and forth (hand, flag)’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232.</td>
<td>PPH *waswás ‘rinse clothes by shaking in water’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.</td>
<td>PPH *waswás ‘tear apart, undo something made’  (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>PPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>*watnág</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>*wáwaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>*waywáy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>*wigwíg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>*wíqwiq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>*witwít</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>*witwít</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>*wiwí</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Philippine Languages and the Determination of PAN Syllable Structure
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Professor Lawrence Reid has made important contributions to our understanding of the history of the languages of the Philippines. It is fitting for a paper which points out the role of the Philippine languages in establishing the Proto-Austronesian (PAN) phonology to be included in a group of papers dedicated to him. In this paper I propose to reexamine forms, many of which have been discussed previously in the literature, and show how the Philippine languages show reflexes which provide crucial evidence for certain areas of PAN phonology that have heretofore gone unrecognized. Specifically, they provide evidence for the syllable structure of PAN roots and the kinds of vowel sequences that occurred in the PAN root. This matter is discussed in Section 1. A study that reconstructs vowel sequences should at the same time examine consonant sequences, for the question of whether or not consonant clusters existed in PAN also impinges on the issue of the kinds of vowel sequences which occurred. Section 1 discusses the vowel sequences and Section 2 presents the data which indicate that consonant clusters did not exist.

1. Syllables Beginning in a Vowel

Dempwolff and most historians of the AN languages after him reconstructed almost no vowel sequences in PAN roots. However, the Philippine languages provide evidence for the reconstruction of vowel sequences in many roots, even though the majority of AN languages show single vowels. This evidence comes from the development of a glottal stop to separate an original Pre-Philippine vowel sequence. This development of the glottal stop is probably not a Proto-Philippine process. It took place at a later point and continued as an on-going change over a period of time. It covers a wide

---

1 The term ‘Philippine languages’ refers to a group which evidently includes languages outside of the Philippines as well as all of those (or at least all but a very few) in the Philippines. The facts here discussed characterize the languages of Northern Sulawesi as well as the Philippines, but they do not characterize all of them (see footnote 3). Nevertheless, in this paper I will talk of the Philippine languages in discussing these facts even though they are not relevant for all the languages of the group. I use the abbreviations: Tg for Tagalog, Cb for Cebuano, Ilk for Iloko, Ml for Malay, AN for Austronesian, and PAN for Proto-Austronesian.

2 The term ‘Pre-Philippine’ refers a stage between PAN and the contemporary Philippine languages. ‘Pre-Philippine’ may be contemporary with but is probably later than ‘Proto-Philippine’. An innovation is said to characterize ‘Proto-Philippine’ if it is reflected in all languages of the group. An innovation is ‘Pre-Philippine’ if it began in Proto-Philippine times but has not spread enough to be reflected in all of the current daughter languages.
geographical range of languages in the Philippines but not all of them. Before we continue with the development of the glottal stop, we need to provide the evidence for the existence of vowel sequences, for it is not immediately obvious that these existed and in which kinds of roots these occurred.

1.1 Evidence for the existence of a vowel sequence

There are two kinds of roots in which vowel sequences have been posited: disyllabic and trisyllabic. Disyllabic roots are of the type exemplified by the root ‘eat’, which is widely reconstructed as *kaen, on the theory that forms reflecting *kan result from a contraction of *kaen (Robert Blust, pers. comm.). Even though reflexes of *kan are much more widespread than those of *kaen, forms which have the appearance of reflexes of *kaen are found in languages of Taiwan (specifically Bunun and Amis) and also in the Philippines, that is, in languages which are related only by being descendents of PAN, and not in a later subgroup. The argument is that this shared feature must be characteristic of PAN. However, I argue that the development of *kaen is the product of independent innovations in languages of Taiwan and the Philippines. In the case of *kan and other roots like it, I argue that these were not disyllabic roots in PAN but rather that they were monosyllabic roots in PAN, and that the disyllabic forms are the product of the process of syllable-internal lengthening which took place independently and repeatedly in post-PAN times throughout the range of the AN languages (Wolff 1999). My argument is supported by the fact that the process of creating the disyllabic reflexes of monosyllabic roots is found throughout the range of the AN languages and proceeded in a variety of different ways. In fact, one language may reflect one and the same AN root in a number of ways. Specifically, *kan took many forms, one of which was lengthening of the vowel, and even the process of syllable internal lengthening was different in different languages: the disyllabic reflexes do not uniquely reflect *kaen. Tg reflects ká?in, showing a lengthened root vowel raised in the second mora with a glottal stop intercalated; Tondano and other languages of northern Sulawesi reflect ka?an, developing an intercalated glottal stop, but not raising the second mora; Bunun and Amis on Taiwan raise the second mora like Tg, and Bunun intercalates a glottal stop ka?un, whereas Amis simply has hiatus kaen. In short, the process of disyllabization in these languages was independent, as was the process of glottal stop insertion in the languages that undergo this process. In other words there is no evidence for a PAN vowel sequence in the roots which can be reconstructed as monosyllabics.

1.1.1 More on lengthened monosyllabic roots

PAN *kan is not the only monosyllabic root which shows lengthening in the Philippine languages. Here are some other examples:

* cuk ‘be inside’ Cb su?uk ‘inside space’, Tg páso? ‘enter, insert’
* dañ ‘old’ Cb dá?an ‘old, not new’, Atayal raram ‘old’
* kañ ‘legs apart’ Cb ka?ang ‘walking with the legs apart’, MI terkangkang ‘with legs flung wide apart’
* luk ‘curved’ Tg lú?ok ‘bay’, MI teluk ‘bay’, peluk ‘embrace’
* pan ‘bait’ Tg pâ?in ‘bait’, Paiwan pan ‘bait’, Proto-Oceanic *pan-i ‘to bait’

The following languages are among those which do not seem to develop a glottal stop in between two vowels: Itbayatan, Ivatan, Dumagat, Pangasinan, and in the south: Kadazan, Gorontalo.
1.2 The glottal stop in the Philippines as the reflex of earlier hiatus

My view that glottal stop insertion is a late process in Tg is further supported by the fact that Tg and other Philippine languages inserted glottal stop in forms which developed a vowel sequence in their post-Proto-Philippine history. This is exemplified by a sporadic reflex of *l with Tg /ʔ/?, where the *l is lost and a glottal stop is inserted to separate the vowel sequence which developed, e.g., *quleg 'worm' > /ʔuʔód/ 'worm'. In summary, these monosyllabic roots show that the occurrence of a glottal stop in Philippine languages reflects an earlier hiatus that developed from the addition of a mora to a root vowel.4

Philippine /ʔ/ has another source as well: PAN *q becomes /ʔ/ in languages which develop this intervocalic /ʔ/?. Thus, there are cases where /ʔ/? reflects *q and cases where it does not reflect *q. I hypothesize that in the cases where the Philippine languages show a glottal stop where other languages do not reflect *q, there was an earlier hiatus (by which I mean a sequence of unlike vowels or a single vowel of two morae).5 In addition to the monosyllabic roots which developed vowel sequences by stretching the nucleus cited in §1.1ff. above, there are roots of more than one syllable in which a glottal stop is reflected where no *q can be reconstructed (that is, no reflex of *q is reflected in AN languages which show a reflex of *q other than /ʔ/?). In some cases this [ʔ?] occurs between two vowels in the Philippine languages, but in other cases it occurs in a consonant cluster. In no cases of glottal stop insertion is there motivation for the development of hiatus in post-PAN times. That is, no process of syllable lengthening can be documented for any roots other than monosyllabic roots (cf. §1.5). The conclusion is that these Philippine glottal stops reflect a feature of the PAN phonology. Examples are given in §1.3. In cases where the glottal stop appears in Philippine languages intervocally not from *q, we may hypothesize that the Pre-Philippine etymon contained a vowel sequence and had the same number of syllables as there are in the attested forms. In cases where the glottal stop occurs pre- or post-consonantally and not from *q, we hypothesize that the Pre-Philippine etymon was trisyllabic. That is, we assume an earlier occurrence of a short (unstressed) vowel between the consonant and the [ʔ?]. The short vowel was subsequently lost by syncope (a normal development of medial short vowels in trisyllabic roots). The evidence which supports the hypothesis of a trisyllabic root is presented in footnote 7.

The hypothesis of glottal stop insertion between two vowels is given further support by developments in root-initial position: in root initial position in the

---

4 This sporadic loss of a reflex of *l is probably due to dialect mixture. Further, not only Tg /ʔ/ is intercalated in vowel sequences but also Tg /h/: e.g. a variant of the reflex of *quleg 'worm' /ʔuʔód/ 'worm' is /ʔuʔód/. Other examples: *balay 'hall' > báhay 'house'. Further, other vowel sequences which develop sporadically get separated by /ʔ/?: *bayi 'woman' > babá'e (with reduplication of the first syllable), *taw 'man' > tâʔo 'man'. The intercalation of /h/ does not happen in root-initial position. It is a sporadic process medially and at the end of a root, but in some languages (e.g. Tg) intercalation of [h] is what normally happens to the exclusion of the insertion of [ʔ?] at the end of a root before the addition of a vowel-initial suffix.

5 The Philippine languages only reflect hiatus. If we compare cognates from languages in Taiwan, we must conclude that a laryngeal was lost in Proto-Philippine (or possibly individually in all the Philippine languages) — cf. §1.4, below.
Philippine languages, the insertion of [ʔ] is automatic. That means, these languages show initial glottal stop in roots which had PAN *q- and also in those roots which began with a vowel. In short, the insertion of intervocalic glottal stop is a further example of the same process which took place in word-initial position.

To summarize, syllable-initial vowel is reconstructed for Pre-Philippine when the Philippine languages manifest [ʔ] corresponding to syllable-initial vowel in languages that reflect *q in contrast with its absence. This means that syllable-initial vowel is reconstructed not only root initially but also in the middle of a root when Philippine languages manifest V?C corresponding to VC in other languages and also when they manifest C?V corresponding to CV in other languages.

1.3 Examples of intercalation of glottal stop

The most widespread examples of vowel-initial syllables are at the beginning of roots. Medially, the examples are limited. The following forms are identified as having non-initial syllables beginning in a vowel (that is, internal vowel sequences not separated by a consonant): *bacueq ‘wash’, *beveq ‘heavy’, *bitiec ‘calves’, *buene ‘ringworm’, *yabi ‘night’, *isewab ‘yawn’, *kanuec ‘squid’, *kaewit ‘hook’, *kua ‘what’, *lawen ‘long (time)’, *tieyeb ‘belch’, *tinuen ‘weave’ (<*tuen + *-in-; *tuen < *tun).6

As we say above, it is the occurrence of a glottal stop in the Philippine languages as opposed to the absence of any reflex of *q in other languages which enables us to identify these roots. An example of Philippine /ʔ/ from *q as opposed to Philippine /ʔ/ from hiatus are the following two forms, the first of which exemplifies the reconstruction with syllable-initial *q- and another which exemplifies reconstruction with syllable-initial [ʔ]; in Cb bagʔu ‘new’ the /ʔ/ reflects *q and we can reconstruct *q because other languages also show reflexes of *q (e.g., Bunun vaqlu ‘new’, Tongan foʔou ‘new’, etc.). However, for Cb bügʔat the cognates in other languages do not reflect *q (e.g., Tongan mam-fa ‘heavy’ without the /ʔ/ which appeared in the word for ‘new’; Old Javanese weat ‘heavy’ — Old Javanese reflects *q with /h/, but here there is no /h/; Moken beat ‘heavy’ — where Moken reflects *q with /k/, etc.). We conclude that the Cb form bügʔat is from an earlier *bugeʔát (by a rule of syncope which applies in the unaccented penults of trisyllabics in Cb and many other languages).7 This form *bugeʔat in turn is from *beveʔat which developed from an earlier *beveat when a [ʔ]

---

6 *tun is widely reflected. *tinuen is in fact derived from a root *tun which has been disyllabized by lengthening the nucleus (> *tuen to which -i- has been added). Evidence for *tuen is Cb túʔun ‘be directed toward a focus’. Evidence for *tun is Tg tunton ‘give guidance/direction’, Tondano tonton ‘lower on rope’, Old Javanese tuun ‘rope for guiding animal’. *tun can be reconstructed to mean ‘lead on rope, thread’ and *tinuen ‘weave’ is derivative of the meaning ‘thing lead on thread’. This etymology was first proposed by Blust (1976) and quoted by Mahdi (1988: 104). However, Mahdi and Blust propose *teun, presumably on the basis of forms like Bunun tinʔun ‘weave’. I propose that *tun became *tuen by lengthening the nucleus, with the off-glide at the end of the nucleus rather than the beginning, for in all other cases of lengthened vowels it is the second mora which glides upward, not the first.

7 Trisyllabics with short penult in PA had stress on the final syllable. The evidence for this is threefold: (1) various languages located across the board from Taiwan to Oceania manifest apocope of the first syllable, which is inconsistent with stress on first syllable of the root; (2) many Philippine languages have stress on the final syllable in roots derived from trisyllabics with a short medial vowel; (3) evidence in Taiwan languages of the reflex of *t in reduplicated monosyllabics, the details of which cannot be discussed here.
was automatically inserted between two adjacent vowels. The same process of glottal stop insertion and syncope explains the reflexes of *kaewit: Cb kawit, Tg káwit ‘hook’, Ml kait ‘connect’ (where *q would have produced /h/ in Ml); and *bueni ‘ringworm’: Cb bun’it ‘ringworm’, Tg búnì ‘shingles’, and Proto-Polynesian *pune (where a /l/ would have occurred if there had been a *q in PAN).

In the case of *lawen, there was no syncope as there were only two syllables, but a vowel sequence developed when *we became monophthongized. MI and Muna retain vowel sequences, but the Philippine languages develop /l/ between the two vowels: Cb la’un ‘aged, matured’, MI laun ‘long time’, Muna lao ‘long (of the dry season)’. The vowel sequence which developed in MI and Muna reflexes of *lawen can be compared with the *q reconstructed in *taqweñ ‘year’, where the Philippine languages develop /h/ and MI and Muna clearly reflect PAN *q (MI manifests /h/ and Muna manifests /u/): Tg ta’un, MI tahun, Muna tayu ‘year’.

In the case of *bítieć ‘calf’: Cb bátìis ‘calf’, and *yabíi ‘night’: Cb gabíi ‘night’, a stressed penult is reconstructed, and there was no syncope in Cb (but there was in Samareño and dialectal Tg gabíi ‘night’). A glottal stop was inserted between the vowel of the penult and the beginning of the final syllable. There is no evidence of a PAN *q in either of these roots.

In the case of *tíuen ‘weave’, there are no reflexes in the languages of the Philippines which reflect hiatus with an inserted glottal stop. However, some languages of Taiwan which sporadically insert [?] in vowel sequences reflect /h/: Atayalic, Pazeh, Sai siat, Bunun, and Amis, but not between like vowels. Between like vowels there is hiatus in Amis and in Rukai (Budai dialect), and contraction in the other languages. There are two possible interpretations: (1) that the /h/ developed in these languages as a transitional phenomenon; (2) that the /h/ reflects a PAN phoneme *h which was lost in the other AN languages of Taiwan and also in the languages outside of Taiwan (with contraction

1.4 Was there hiatus or were there PAN laryngeal phonemes?

Corresponding to the hiatus Pre-Philippines (or /l/ not reflecting PAN *q) the following languages from Taiwan reflect /h/: Atayalic, Pazeh, Sai siat, Bunun, and Amis, but not between like vowels. Between like vowels there is hiatus in Amis and in Rukai (Budai dialect), and contraction in the other languages. There are two possible interpretations: (1) that the /h/ developed in these languages as a transitional phenomenon; (2) that the /h/ reflects a PAN phoneme *h which was lost in the other AN languages of Taiwan and also in the languages outside of Taiwan (with contraction

---

We reconstruct *beyeat rather than **beeyat, both of which would develop into Cb bug/at. (The contrast between /I/C/ and /C/I/ is lost in Cb.) I reconstruct *beyeat on the hypothesis that Tg reflects a contrast between /I/C/ and /C/I/. The /l/ is lost in most dialects of Tagalog, but there is compensatory lengthening of the vowel preceding the /l/ when the /l/ is lost. However, there is no compensatory lengthening when a /l/ following a C is lost: e.g. kānin ‘rice’ (< *kañen < *ka?enên) as opposed to pusūn ‘lower abdomen’ (< *pusu?un < *pusu?un). Thus, Tg bigåt ‘heavy’ indicates earlier *big?at (< *beye/át) rather than **bi?gat. Similarly, we reconstruct *kaewit, rather than **kawaiit on the basis of Tg káwit ‘hook’ (< *ka?wit) and *bueni rather than **bueini on the basis of Tg búnì ‘shingles’ (< *bu?ni).

I assume a general rule which affects a large number of languages across the board, that the sequences *we and *ew in almost all positions become /u/. Except for certain metrical environments (whose nature I have not yet managed to determine) *ew > /u/ almost everywhere except in some of the languages of Northern and Central Taiwan.

Most current MI dialects do not retain /h/ between unlike vowels, but this is a recent development, and we are referring to an older stage of MI reflected in the writing system in which the /h/ is still retained. Indeed there are dialects currently spoken which continue to maintain /h/ between unlike vowels.
taking place in most of them, but not in many of the Philippine languages). It is this second explanation which best fits the facts. Namely, there is general evidence (archaeological as well as linguistic) of the spread of the AN languages from Taiwan southwards and outward (Pawley 2002, §2ff. 256–8). This evidence indicates not only that the extra-Taiwan languages are in a subgroup but also that Atayalic, Pazeh, Saisiat and Amis themselves are the descendants of primary and separate off-shoots from PAN. If this is so, then it should be deduced that intervocalic /h/ is a retention and not an innovation. A second reason for hypothesizing *-h- rather than hiatus is that PAN *h also must be reconstructed in initial and final position (although the Philippine languages provide no evidence for the reconstruction of this phoneme in those positions).

The following forms exemplify PAN *h:

*bahañíy ‘panel’  Bunun banhil ‘cypress’, Amis fahdil ‘cedar’,
Rukai baalhi ‘cypress’, Tg pánig ‘panel’
*buhet ‘squirrel’12  Atayal bhut, Pazeh bhut, Saisiat kabhæt, Amis fohet ‘squirrel’, Tg bú?ot ‘rabbit’,
*láhud ‘seaward’  Pazeh rahut ‘seaward’, Saisiat lehaer ‘downhill’,
Cb lawud ‘sea, seaward’ (*h is replaced by glide between high and low vowels)
*yabíhi ‘night’  Amis lafii ‘midnight’, Cb gabí?i ‘night’.

1.5 Could the reconstructed vowel sequences in fact have been single vowels which were later expanded?

In §1.1, I argue that the roots such as *kan were monosyllabic and not disyllabic *kaen, as others have posited. The analogous question could be asked of the trisyllabic roots, listed in §1.3. These are not attested in languages of Taiwan and provide no evidence for *h. Could these roots be reconstructed as **bacuq, **beat, **buni and so forth; that is, could it be possible to assume that the reconstructed trisyllabic forms which explain the glottal stop in the Philippine languages were in fact developed by a process of lengthening, as in the case of the monosyllabic root? Such a scenario is theoretically possible, but without a phonological motivation for lengthening one of the two syllables (such as in the case of the monosyllabic roots), we must assume that the reconstructed roots indeed had three syllables. This assumption is supported by the fact that we are obliged to reconstruct trisyllabic roots in forms that are not attested in

11 This is essentially the view presented by Zorc (1982). However, Zorc proposed the reconstruction of two laryngeal phonemes. The extra putative phoneme is based on a failure to recognize the PAN reflexes in Saisiat and taking non-contrastive attestations of /h/ and /ʔ/ in Bunun to be contrastive. There is only one set of correspondences involving /ʔ/ in the Philippines and /h/ (or hiatus between like vowels) in these languages of Taiwan.

12 Tsou buhetsi ‘squirrel’ is a borrowing from an unknown source, in which PAN *-h- was reflected as /h/.

13 Or if they had two syllables, one of the two syllables must have been bimoraic. It is probably correct to reconstruct all of these forms as trisyllabic and not disyllabic with one bimoraic syllable. In Cb and other Philippine languages, the vowel sequences in this kind of root are treated differently from the vowel sequences which developed from monosyllabic roots which became disyllabic by developing a bimoraic root vowel. The best example is the word for ‘calf’, which I reconstruct as *betíes (Cb manifests batí?is where the final *e is assimilated to the preceding *i, whereas *pit is reflected as pl?ut ‘narrow, not affording enough space’, developed from a bimoraic *piet without assimilation). Not all Philippine languages treat the two types differently. For example, Mongondow manifests bosi?ot ‘calf’ with no assimilation.
current languages with vowel sequences (§2). Inasmuch as roots with /ʔ/ not from *q in the Philippines correspond to /h/ < PAN *h in languages of Taiwan, we should assume that the roots with glottal stop not from *q ultimately derive from roots with *-h- at an earlier stage, even though no attestations in languages from Taiwan have been found.

1.6 Were glides contrastive in vowel sequences consisting of high and low vowels?

The evidence that a vowel sequence containing a high vowel contrasted with a sequence broken by a semi-vowel, *y or *w, is slender. That is, there is only very little evidence for a contrast between *ua and *uwa, *ia, and *iya, etc. The Philippine languages manifest /uwa/ which presumably reflects *uwa, as in the following forms:

*banuwa 'continent' Cb banwa 'forest'
*binuwaŋ 'k.o. tree' Cb binuwang 'k.o. tree (Macaranga tanarius)'
*buwaq 'fruit' Cb buwa? 'endosperm of germinating coconut', Ilk bowa 'betel palm and nut', Ml buah 'fruit' (never with medial /h/)
*quway 'rattan' Cb ?uway 'rattan', Ilk way 'rattan'

However, the evidence that a sequence /uʔa/ in the Philippine languages reflects PAN *ua is slender. There is only one form in which Philippine languages manifest /uʔa/ and which are possibly cognate with forms that cannot reflect PAN *q. This correspondence indicates a sequence *ua. There is one other form that may possibly provide further evidence:

*kua 'say' Cb kuʔan ‘filler word’, Old Javanese kwa ‘like this’ (without /-h-/ < PAN *q)
*γuǎng ‘hole, depression’ Tg guʔang ‘hollow, empty inside’,14 Old Javanese rong ‘hole’ (not directly inherited, but not reflecting *-q-), Ml ruang ‘hollow space’ (never with /-h-/)

There is practically no evidence for a similar contrast in other sequences. If there was indeed a contrast between *uwa and *ua then surely the corresponding contrast between *iya and *ia must have existed, but I have found only one form which might possibly provide evidence. This is the following form, where Amis shows that the PAN form did not have *q and Cb shows a glottal stop between the sequence [ia] which developed after metathesis:15

*isewab 'yawn' Cb huyʔab (<*suiab, with metathesis of the first and second syllables), Amis sowab, Rukai ma-sewasewab 'yawn'

Except for this form the Philippine languages reflect /iʔa/ only where there is clear evidence of PAN /*iqa/ and therefore provide no evidence for a contrast. There are forms in the Philippine languages reflecting PAN forms which we reconstruct with *iya,

14 However, Tg is not a reliable witness, for the contrast between /-ʔ-/ and its absence was lost at a certain point of time in Tg dialects. Later the contrast obtained again in all dialects, and /-ʔ-/ was introduced in environments in which it etymologically had never occurred.

15 I hypothesize that Amis initial syllables with /ʔV/ from *qV do not get lost. The loss of the initial syllable in Amis indicates that the root had a vowel initial.
but these could as well be reconstructed with *ia.\textsuperscript{16} There are no PAN forms which could be reconstructed with *ai or *ayi, or with *au or *awu.

The Philippine languages provide no evidence for a contrast between *iu and *iyu. Forms which can be reconstructed with one or the other of these sequences reflect *iyu (sometime syncopated to *yu) in the Philippines. Bunun, Amis, and Puyuma from Taiwan show two reflexes for the forms which reflect *i followed by *u, i.e., indicate that PAN possibly had a contrast between *iyu and *iu, but the evidence is not unequivocal.\textsuperscript{17} Two forms seem to reflect *iyu:

- *bayiyus ‘storm’
  - Amis \textit{faliyos} ‘typhoon’, Puyuma \textit{vayiw} ‘typhoon’, Bunun \textit{balivus} ‘storm’,\textsuperscript{18} Tg \textit{bagyo} ‘typhoon’ (with syncope)
- *qiyut ‘sexual intercourse’
  - Bunun \textit{paquit} (with metathesis prior to the development of the /w/ between the *i and *u), Puyuma \textit{maha-hiyut}, Cb \textit{tiyut}, Tg \textit{tiyot}, Ilk \textit{yut} ‘have intercourse’

One form seems to reflect *iu:

- *lius ‘turn around’
  - Tongan \textit{liliu} ‘turn around’, Amis \textit{maliun} ‘revolve’, Puyuma \textit{mulius} ‘turn around’, Cb \textit{liyu} ‘circle around’, \textit{saylu} (sa-\textit{lyu} with syncope and metathesis) ‘pass by’

\section*{2. Syllables Ending in a Consonant and Trisyllabic Roots with Short Medial Vowels}

In PAN root-final position any consonant is free to occur. However, in a root internal syllable no final codas occurred.\textsuperscript{19} This proposition is based on the assumption that PAN had trisyllabic roots with unstressed *e as the vowel of the penult (or had unstressed [u] before [w] and unstressed [i] before [y]). This penultimate vowel in some cases later became lost by syncopation. The Philippine languages mostly show syncopation when the penult is short (not stressed), and the evidence for the existence of trisyllabic roots in PAN, rather than consonant sequences in between which an epenthetic vowel developed, comes from the fact that there were two ways in which these roots were disyllabized: in some languages these roots were disyllabized by loss of the initial syllable, whereas in others they were disyllabized by syncope of the medial syllable. For example, we reconstruct *qapegu ‘gall, bile’ rather than **qapgu; *tuqelañ ‘bone’ rather than **tuqlañ. The form *qapegu is disyllabized in Tg by syncope of the

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{16} For example, I reconstruct *iya in the following forms, but these might as well have been with *ia: (i) *iya ‘he, she’: Cb s-\textit{iyu} ‘he, she’, Ml \textit{ia} ‘he, she’ (never with /-h-/); (ii) *iyak ‘shout’: Tg \textit{tiyak} ‘cry’, Ml \textit{ter-\text{iak} ‘shout’ (never with /-h-/)}; (iii) *tiyañ ‘belly’: Cb \textit{tiyan} ‘belly’, Ml \textit{tiyan} ‘womb’ (never with /-h-/).

\textsuperscript{17} The evidence is only from three forms. Authors transcribe Amis and Puyuma forms some with /iu/ and others with /iyu/, but this may well be an inconsistency in transcription and not reflect a phonemic distinction in these languages. Furthermore, as the data show, not only do we have to assume that there is a contrast between /iu/ and /iyu/ in these languages, but there are other assumptions as well that must be made to explain two different transcriptions.

\textsuperscript{18} I am assuming that PAN *iyu > Bunun /ivu/. In Bunun, post-vocalic *w > /v/.

\textsuperscript{19} Prefixes ending in a consonant are reconstructed. In other words, within a word consonant clusters occurred, but not within a root.
medial syllable - ‘apdo ‘gall’; in Toba Batak, with loss of the initial syllable - pagu ‘gall’. There is further support in the case of *qapegu and other reconstructed roots which are reflected with a consonant cluster in some attested languages, in that not all languages disyllabize the root. Some languages still manifest a trisyllabic root. For example, *qapegu is reflected with Mi hamperu, Paiwan qapedu, Western Bukidnon Manobo epegu ‘gall’, etc. In the case of *tuqelañ, there are no examples of loss of the first syllable, but there are trisyllabic forms that are reflected in attested languages which otherwise have consonant clusters, e.g., Paiwan tsuqelay ‘bone’. There are many forms which like *qapegu provide evidence from loss of the first syllable in the occurring reflexes that the PAN form was trisyllabic, and there are cases like *tuqelañ for which the existence of trisyllabic reflexes, even in languages which have consonant clusters, is the only evidence.

Weakening of the first syllable, i.e., centralization of the first vowel of the root (similar to loss, described immediately above), also provides evidence that the attested form reflects a trisyllabic root. For example, in the case of *banuwa ‘land’, a trisyllabic root must be reconstructed to account for Mi benua ‘continent’, although the Philippine languages show syncope of the penult, e.g., Tg banwa ‘village’. Another example is found in *baqeyuh ‘new’. Here there is evidence for a trisyllabic root in the occurrence of reflexes with weakened first syllable in many languages, e.g., Tondano weru ‘new’, and also in the occurrence of trisyllabic roots over a wide range of languages, e.g., Mi beharu (dialectic), Tongan foqou, Sa’a haalu ‘new’.

However, root-internal nasal clusters, excepting clusters with *ñ, can be reconstructed for PAN. The only form with root internal *ñ which is reflected in an attested language as part of a cluster with a following consonant is the form *qañegaw ‘day, sun’, which cannot be reconstructed as **qañgaw. The initial syllable is lost and the medial vowel is retained in some languages of Indonesia: Bugis esso ‘sun, day’, Tondano édo ‘sun’, Manggarai leso ‘sun, day’, Ratahan law ‘day’ all reflect *negaw with loss of the initial *qa-. In other languages this root becomes disyllabic by loss of the medial vowel: e.g., Ngaju Dayak andaw ‘day’, Cb *adlaw ‘sun, day’.

In the case of doubled monosyllabic elements (C₁V₁C₂C₁V₁C₂), it is assumed that such forms were actually a case of doubled monosyllabic roots, and in those cases C₂ was any consonant. There is some evidence that doubled monosyllabic roots were in fact trisyllabic; that is, an epenthetic vowel developed between the two monosyllabic elements if they ended in a C. For example, in Mi doubled roots with /a/ are reflected

---

20 It is the fact that the first syllable is lost in some languages that constrains us to reconstruct a trisyllabic root, not the occurrence of a trisyllabic root in some of the currently attested languages, for it could well be that the vowel of the middle syllable in those cases was inserted by a process of epenthesis. However, loss of the first syllable implies the existence of a previous trisyllabic root. Loss of the first syllable is sporadic and scattered and in no way defines a subgroup. In short, there must have been a trisyllabic precursor for all cases manifesting weakening or loss of the first syllable. Furthermore, roots which have no reflexes other than those with medial consonant clusters can well have developed from trisyllabic forms, even if no trisyllabic form or form reflecting loss of the first syllable is attested in the current languages. In short, it is not possible to reconstruct consonant clusters for PAN.

21 This is not an especial characteristic of the Philippine languages. In fact, this sort of evidence comes largely from languages outside of the Philippines, and the Philippine languages provide only a few examples.

22 *ñ was very likely not a nasal but rather a lateral. The reason for this is not only that its reflexes are laterals in most languages of Taiwan, but also they are laterals in some environments in languages outside of Taiwan (Wolff 1993).
with an /e/ in the first syllable: *tactac ‘rent, cut through’ > Ml tetas ‘cut through’. The /e/ of the first syllable developed by a rule that the vowel of the antepenult is weakened. The Ml development must have been *tac > *tactac > *tacetá > *tesetás > tetas. Similarly, *dap > *dàdap ‘Erythrina sp.’ > dedap ‘Erythrina sp.’ In fact this is the case of all examples of reduplicated monosyllabic elements with a vowel nucleus in *a in Ml (but not those with high vowel nuclei). The Philippine languages support the assumption of the existence of the epenthetic vowel indirectly. There were two root stress patterns in PAN: final stress and penultimate stress. In some cases the reduplicated root developed penultimate stress. Furthermore, trisyllabic roots with stress on the final syllable (cf. footnote 7) are syncopated in the Philippines, but not those with penultimate stress. Examples are as follows:

*bic ‘sprinkle’ Ilk, Pangasinan, Cb bisibis ‘sprinkle with water’ (< *bicébic) and also Tg balisibisá ‘gutter, rain-trough’ (<*bicubic)

*ŋuc ‘growl’ Bikol ngusngus (<*ŋucénuc), Ilk ngusúngus ‘growl’ (<*ŋucénuc)

*sap ‘gropes’ Paiwan sapsap ‘dig, scratch surface’, Amis sapsap ‘feel with hands’ (< *sapesáp), Samar-Leyte hapúhap ‘look for by probing’, Bikol hapíhap ‘gropes in dark’, Cb hapúhap ‘stroke’ (< *sapesap)

Thus, the existence of reduplicated monosyllabic roots with a stressed epenthetic vowel between them is further support for a theory that says PAN roots which consisted of a monosyllabic root that had been doubled were made trisyllabic with an epenthetic vowel between the two monosyllables.23

In the case of roots with a medial *γ or *w, that is, roots with a consonant preceded by a *γ or followed by a *w, usually there is no evidence in the attested reflexes for the reconstruction of a trisyllabic root. Nevertheless, no cluster is reconstructed, i.e., we reconstruct medial *Cuw (rather than medial **Cw) and medial *yeC (rather than medial **γC). One reason to support this is that [γ] and [w] in articulatory terms do not share a characteristic which no other sound has. But more important, there are cases where evidence for PAN medial *Cuw or medial *yeC exists. That is, we must reconstruct *banuwa on the basis of Ml benua ‘continent’ (see above), and we must reconstruct *sayejan ‘ladder’ on the basis of Ngaju Dayak rejan ‘ladder’ (with apocope of the initial syllable). That means that other attested roots with a medial consonant followed by a *w or a medial *γ followed by a consonant must be reflexes of trisyllabics

23 I do not assume the reconstructed proto-language to be an invariant language spoken at a single point in time. I believe it is necessary to assume that the PAN forms which reflect currently attested forms may indeed have occurred as variants (that is, have been part of an on-going change), have come from different points in time, or have existed as dialectal variants in the proto-language. The fact that the first vowel is weakened in Ml in the case of doubled monosyllabic roots with /a/ but not in roots with the high vowels *i and *u indicates that the development of this epenthetic vowel was an on-going process.
even in cases where there is no evidence for that in the attested reflexes. There are very few examples of forms for which no evidence for a trisyllabic root in PAN appears in one or another attested language. Some examples are *beyecay ‘oar’, *buynay ‘Antidesima bunius’, *dasuwen ‘leaf’, *qayuwac ‘k.o. mullet’.

The alternative would be to assert that there was a contrast between medial sequences (a) *γeC and (b) *γC, and between (a) *Cuw and (b) *Cw. Such an assertion is contradicted, however, for a medial vowel must be reconstructed in some cases of (a), but nothing requires the reconstruction of (b); there is no evidence against (a) in any root. In fact, there is evidence for a trisyllabic root (a), in the case of the vast majority of roots with medial *γ and *w, but the language or languages which provides the evidence are different for each root. For example, in the case of *beyekc ‘bundle’, Bunun ma-luk ‘tie up’ (with loss of initial syllable) provides the evidence for case (a). In the case of *beycqac ‘molar’, the evidence comes from Kelabit bera’ang ‘molar’, whereas Bunun manifests a syncopated reflex dalqam ‘molar’, and so forth.
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1. Introduction

In “The Alta languages of the Philippines” (1991), Dr. Lawrence A. Reid clarified the relationships of various Cordilleran languages of northern Luzon. The two Alta languages, Northern Alta (AltN) and Southern Alta (AltS), are spoken by groups of Negritos in Nueva Ecija, Bulacan and Aurora Provinces. The two languages are not mutually intelligible, and they appear to be only distantly related to each other. Together, their closest affiliation is with the Central and Southern Cordilleran languages, rather than with other languages with which they are in more intimate contact today, such as Casiguran Dumagat, Umiray Dumaget and Tagalog.

The Central Cordilleran (CC) and Southern Cordilleran (SC) languages of northern Luzon are descended from a common parent, Proto-South Central Cordilleran (PSCC), a language coordinate with the Alta languages. Together, Alta and PSCC are descended from Proto-Meso Cordilleran (PMC), itself a branch of Cordilleran coordinate with Ilokano, Arta and the Northern Cordilleran subgroup (Reid 1989). Figure 1 diagrams these relationships. Thus, non-borrowed language characteristics shared by Alta and a SCC language may be assigned to the level of PMC, and those not found in Alta but shared by CC and SC may be attributed to PSCC.

Reid presented compelling phonological, morphological and lexical evidence for this classification. Offered here is additional lexical evidence for PMC and PSCC. Further phonological, morphological and semantic innovations that are shared among these languages will be dealt with elsewhere.

2. Proto-Meso-Cordilleran

Reid (1991) reconstructed a limited number of items assignable to PMC as exclusively shared by Alta and PSCC:

1 Most of the data used in this paper were collected in the field during the years 1962–64, 1966–68, 1977, 1981, 1989, 1999 and 2001. Additional data are taken from Headland and Headland (1974), Lambrecht (1978), McFarland (1977), Reid (1971, 1976), Scott (1957), Tharp and Natividad (1976), Vanoverbergh (1933, 1956, 1972), and Yap (1977). Additional data on the languages of eastern Luzon, on Arta and on Alta were generously provided by Dr. Thomas Headland and by Dr. Laurie Reid.

2 An item which is widespread within a language and/or is reported in the literature is referred to simply as Ibl, KnkS, etc. Otherwise its distribution is indicated by the municipality or barangay where it occurs (in parentheses). For an explanation of regional variation within CC and SC languages see Himes 1989, 1994, 1996 and 1998.
Three of these reconstructions can be raised to higher levels. *tik[nd]ag should be raised to the level of Proto-Cordilleran (PC), since reflexes are found in Northern Cordilleran languages: Isneg taʔnag, Itawis tuʔnag, Kasiguranin natiknag, and Eastern Luzon Agta mata:kdig, tikdeg ‘to fall.’ Since Arta has sibu ‘to blow,’ the item *siʔbuk should also be raised to PC, unless of course Arta borrowed the item from AltN or Ilongot. The reconstruction *pa:giw can be raised to an even higher level, since reflexes of it are found in the Ayta languages Mag-anchi and Mag-indi of the Sambalic family, pa:gaw, po:gaw, ‘chest.’

---

**Figure 1. Internal relationships of the Cordilleran languages**
**g/al/umut**  

**lipi[kt]**  
Kar lipik, ?iyalpik, AltN lipit, nalpit ‘wet’

**linas**  
Ifg li:nah ‘level,’ Ifg (Banawe), Kln (Keley-i) li:nah ‘smooth,’ AltS mollenas ‘clean’

**pigsil**  
Bon pidsil, AltN pigma ‘to squeeze.’ Cf. Bon, KnkN, Kla pisol ‘to squeeze.’ Cf. also PHF(Z) *pesél ‘to squeeze’

**[st]ubil**  
Bon, KnkN, KnkS, Ibl, Kar sobil, Blw, Ifg, Kln hu:bil, Kla su:bil, Isi su:vil, AltN tubil ‘lip’

**tipa**  
KnkN tomópá, AltS toppa, tinumpa ‘to hit, box’

**tim?uy**  
Ifg tim?uy, AltS timoy ‘buttocks’

### 3. Alta

Lexical innovations shared exclusively by AltN and AltS are relatively few, indicating the remoteness of their relationship. Reid (1991:286) identified the following forms as similar enough to be shared cognates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AltS</th>
<th>AltN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bitlay</td>
<td>bitlayin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dakol</td>
<td>da:ᵊɪl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kocyug</td>
<td>kuyug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mopnay</td>
<td>panay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muynul</td>
<td>muynul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minaybut</td>
<td>?i:but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?i:bbudin</td>
<td>budin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lu:tit</td>
<td>lu:tit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dalam</td>
<td>dalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puládd</td>
<td>po:lid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la:nis</td>
<td>la:nis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of these items, also, can be raised to the level of PC, since they have cognates in the Northern Cordilleran group of languages. Isneg has ba:ïl ‘carry on the shoulder.’ The item meaning ‘flood’ has cognates in Ibanag nadakal and in Itawis dumakal. And Paranan and Kasiguranin have me:but, mine:but ‘lost, to lose.’

Two items may be added to the list of shared Alta vocabulary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AltS</th>
<th>AltN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?i: e</td>
<td>?i:en</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AltS</th>
<th>AltN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mudúy</td>
<td>mudóy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Proto-South-Central Cordilleran

A substantial number of items have been reconstructed for the CC and for the SC languages (Reid 1974, 1979, Himes 1988, 1989, 1990, 1994, 1998). Figures 2 and 3 show the internal relationships of these two subgroups.
There is a large body of lexemes that appear to be shared exclusively by CC and SC languages. Many of these items are cognate because they were innovated at the PSCC level and are retained in the daughter languages. Others are undoubtedly local innovations in one of the two major branches that spread into the other. Apparent cognates occurring only in contiguous communities—especially in Nuclear Central Cordilleran and Nuclear Southern Cordilleran—are particularly suspect.

4.1. Relatively secure lexical innovations

Lexical items that have a wide distribution in both CC and SC languages are assigned to the level of PSCC with confidence. These include lexemes which occur in both branches of the family in non-contiguous areas.³

³ Reconstructions that were originally suggested by Reid are marked with (R).
*?aguba  Kla ?agubba, Ilt ?agu:bi 'short, low'
*?agum  Bon ?a:gom 'to be gathered in preparation for going to listen for bird omens, of a men's ward,' KnkN ?a:gom 'to gather together,' Ilt ?aguman 'a gathering of men for decision making'
*?alibujit  Bon ?alibujit 'pitch black,' Png kaliburitan 'dark'
*?[ii]buk  Kla ?ibukan, Kln (Kehang) manbuk 'to stab'
*?id  KnkN, KnkS ?id 'to/at (marker of distance),' Png ?id 'to/at (marker, both near and far)'
*?ibbiŋ  KnkS, Kln ?ibbiŋ, Itg ?ibbiŋ, Isi ?ibboŋ 'to throw away'
*?ugtan  Bon yo:gtan, KnkN yo:gtan, yo:gtan, KnkS yo:gtan, Png yo:gtan 'younger sibling'
*b/al/a?:uk  Bon (Maligcong) bal:a:ok, Bon (Dallikan), KnkN ba?:ok, Png bala?uk 'ladle, spatula'
*ba(n)ti:lid  KnkN (Luba), Kla (Masadiit) banti:lid, Kla bate:led, Ilt bisi:lid 'mountain'
*boli*\it\footnote{Bon, KnkN, KnkS boli*\it, Ifg (Cababuyan), Kla buliyot, Ibl ?amboli*\it, Kä *\it onboli*\it, Kln ?amboliyet ‘dark, black’}

*dalag*\footnote{KnkN da:*\it ag ‘to bring near,’ Ilt di*\it ag, di*\it ag ‘near,’ Bon, Kla dal*\it ag, Ilt kadi*\it yag ‘neighbor’ (Cf. Bon dal*\it ay ‘a working group’)}

*dilsig*\footnote{Bon dilsig ‘to split small pieces off a log,’ Bon dolsig, Kln dal*\it hig ‘to split’}

*dikit*\footnote{Bon madkit, Ifg dik*\it it ‘girls’ beauty, prettiness,’ Png marikit ‘young woman.’ Cf. Bon maggit ‘young woman, unmarried woman’}

*di: nut*\footnote{Bon di:*\it not, Png mari*\it nut ‘dirty’}

*gatud*\footnote{Bon, KnkN ga*\it tod ‘rooster’s tail feathers,’ Ifg katud, Ilt g*\it tuda ‘back (of person)’}

*gaya*\footnote{Kla gayagaya, Isi mangayha*\it ya, Kln magaya ‘happy’ (Cf. Png gayaga ‘happy’)}

*kal?it*\footnote{Kla (Pinukpuk) nakait, Kln k*\it ait ‘sour,’ Kln ma*\it kal?it ‘bitter’}

*kalab*\footnote{Bon, KnkN, KnkS, Ifg, Ilt, Kla, Png kal*\it ab, KnkN ka*\it ab, kommah, Isi *\it eyav, Ibl, Kar, Kln ka:*\it lab ‘to climb’}

*ka?yab*\footnote{KnkS kai*\it ab, Ilt kai*\it ab ‘to climb’}

*kidim*\footnote{Bon, KnkN, KnkS, Ilt, Ilt kidim, Ifg kodom, Isi *\it orom, Kln kedem ‘eyelash’ (Cf. Isneg kaddam ‘to close one’s eyes’)}

*kila*\footnote{Bon, Ilt kil*\it ay, KnkN ki*\it ay, Ifg, Kla kol*\it ay, Ibl kid*\it ay ‘earthworm, intestinal worm,’ Kln kela*\it y, kal*\it ay ‘intestinal worm’}

*kitiw*\footnote{Isi padi*\it wan, Ibl pak*\it tiw ‘bamboo water container’}

*ku:bu*\footnote{KnkN kobo ‘to fence in,’ Ifg ku*\it bu ‘house lot,’ Ilt ku*\it bu ‘space-under-house’}

*ku[m]pap*\footnote{Bon, KnkN kopap*\it iy, kopkopap*\it iy, Bon kopap*\it iy, Ifg *\it pappoy, Kla kappa*\it poy, kop*\it poy, Png kumpa*\it poy ‘butterfly’}

*ku?ku*\footnote{Bon kok*\it o ‘to dig out a root,’ Kln, Ilt ku*\it ku ‘to dig’}

*kVspag*\footnote{Bon kispag ‘to eat rice without a side dish,’ KnkN nakaspa*\it kan ‘left over,’ Bon mayospag, Kln mayahpag, kah*\it pag ‘breakfast’}

*labaw*\footnote{Kla labaw, Ibl davaw ‘to float’}

*latug*\footnote{KnkN latog ‘to swell (of the eyes),’ Png latug ‘to swell’}

*litig*\footnote{Bon, KnkN litig, Ifg log*\it o, Isi loto*\it x, Ibl, Kar ditig, Kln lit*\it ig ‘straight’}

*nalu:tuy*\footnote{Bon yalo*\it toy, Ifg yalu*\it toy ‘slippery,’ Bon yalo*\it toy, KnkS ya*\it o:toy, Blw, Kla yalu*\it tuy, Ibl *\it inyaloto*\it y, Kär *\it ohyaloto*\it y, Kln yalut*\it uy, *\it ohyaluttuy ‘smooth’}

*ni:dil*\footnote{Kla yiddol, Ibl, Kar giril ‘dull’}

*ni:lu[d]*\footnote{KnkN yil*\it o ‘badly done, ill-made,’ Blw, Ifg, Kla ni*\it lu, Kln (Ahin) nagi*\it lu, Kln (Kayapa) nagi*\it lud, Ilt gil*\it ud ‘dull’}
4.2. Shared lexical innovations, with a possibility of borrowing

Among those items occurring with more limited distribution some may well be shared developments from PSCC. The most likely candidates are the following:

* ?ala:giy
  KnKs ?ala:giy, Png alagi, KlN ?algii ‘to stand’

* ?ilwaŋ

* ?itiŋ
Bon *pi*tîy ‘to mature,’ KnkN *pi*tîy ‘adult,’ Ifg *oto*y ‘to be full grown’

*?i:muk  
Bon, Ibl *ćımok, Isi *ćimu?, Kln *ćimuk ‘mosquito’

*bagi:lat  
Bon, KnkN, bagi:lat, Blw bagi:lat, Ibl bagi:lat, Kar bagi:lat, Kln bagi:lat ‘lightning’

*ba:lal  

*ba:ŋul  
Bon ba:ŋul ‘kind of animal or bird (arch.),’ KnkN, KnkS ba:ŋo, Ibl, Kar ba:ŋol ‘wild pig,’ Ifg ba:ŋul ‘boar (wild or domestic)’

*bilig  
Bon, KnkN bilig ‘slug,’ Ifg (Hapaw) be:og, Ibl, Kln bilig ‘earthworm’

*bu?lu  

*bu:tug  
Bon, KnkN bo:tog, Ibl botbotog ‘pig’

*duntug  
Bon, KnkN, KnkS dontog, Ifg, Kln duntug, Ibl, Kar èntog ‘mountain, hill’

*ga:wa  

*gitap  
Bon gitap ‘to add extra covers,’ Ibl, Kar kitap, Kln gatap, gitap ‘blanket’ (Cf. KnkN gitap ‘skirt’)

*ka?:siŋ  
Bon, KnkN, KnkS, Ibl, Kar ka?:siŋ, Kln ka?:siŋ ‘co-parents-in-law’

*ka?:ut  
Bon ka?:ot ‘to make a new pondfield,’ KnkN, KnkS ?i:ka?:ot, Ifg, Kla ka?:ut, Ibl ka?:ot, Kln ka?:ut ‘to dig, to bury’

*li:yik  

*lu:big  
Bon lo:big ‘poor quality soft iron, as a blade, which will not hold a sharp edge,’ KnkN lo:big, Kar ?ido:gil ‘dull, blunt’

*piltan  
Ifg piltan, Isi pe:tan, Kar piltan, Kln piltan, piltan ‘rooster’ (Cf. Bon pil:it ‘to copulate, of birds and chickens,’ KnkN minpit ‘to copulate,’ Ifg polot ‘sexual organ of male animals’)

*pi:siŋ  
KnkN, KnkS, Ibl, Kar pi:siŋ, Ifg, Kln pi:siŋ ‘taro (esp. leaves and stems),’ Ibl pi:siŋ ‘taro plant, above the ground’) (R)

*sigid  
Bon sigid ‘to waid, as for instructions,’ KnkN sigid ‘to wait long for,’ Ibl, Kar sikid, Kln higid, heged ‘to wait’
5. Conclusion

At some point in the past, perhaps thousands of years ago, a Cordilleran-speaking population separated from other speakers of this language geographically, socially, or both. This population’s language developed, in relative isolation from others, into Meso-Cordilleran. Speakers of MC eventually encountered groups of Negritos, possibly on the eastern and southern slopes of the Cordillera Central, who adopted the speech of their new neighbors. The interaction between the two groups must have been intense and intimate enough for the Negritos to have substituted MC for whatever language they previously spoke. Nevertheless, direct contact between the Negrito and non-Negrito speakers of MC ceased for whatever reasons (except perhaps between AltN and Ilt, a SC language), as indicated by the wide divergence between Alta and SCC languages today. Subsequently both AltN and AltS have been lexically influenced by quite a few other languages (Reid 1987).

The large number of linguistic innovations, including the lexical ones presented here, that can be assigned to the level of PSCC provides solid testimony to the long shared history of the speakers of the Central and Southern Cordilleran languages. Equally, the substantial number of doubtful items underscores the continuing contact of Cordilleran peoples subsequent to the splitting of the language into the two subgroups. That some of the reconstructions offered here will be raised to higher levels, and that many items will be added to this list, is not unexpected. Of particular interest is the ultimate understanding of the time depth of the split between Alta and PSCC, which will provide some idea of the demographic changes and geographical movements of Cordilleran peoples prior to the age of written records.
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AltN</th>
<th>Northern Alta</th>
<th>Knk</th>
<th>Kankanaey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AltS</td>
<td>Southern Alta</td>
<td>KnkN</td>
<td>Northern Kankanaey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blw</td>
<td>Balangaw</td>
<td>KnkS</td>
<td>Southern Kankanaey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon</td>
<td>Bontok</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Proto-Cordilleran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Central Cordilleran</td>
<td>PHF</td>
<td>Proto-Hesperonesian and Formosan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibl</td>
<td>Ibaloy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ifg</td>
<td>Ifugaw</td>
<td>PMC</td>
<td>Proto-Meso Cordilleran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilt</td>
<td>Ilongot (Bugkalut)</td>
<td>Png</td>
<td>Pangasinan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isi</td>
<td>Isinai</td>
<td>PSCC</td>
<td>Proto-South-Central Cordilleran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itg</td>
<td>Itneg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kar</td>
<td>Karaw</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Southern Cordilleran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kla</td>
<td>Kalinga</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>South-Central Cordilleran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knl</td>
<td>Kalanguya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Contemporary Filipino (Tagalog) and Kapampangan: Two Philippine Languages in Contact

Andrew Gonzalez, FSC
De La Salle University

1. Introduction

This contribution to a Festschrift in honor of Professor Lawrence A. Reid of the University of Hawai’i, edited by his former associates Carl Rubino and Hsiu-chuan Liao, is a pleasure for me to write. I have known Professor Reid since my days as a young linguist and admire his work on Philippine languages and other Austronesian languages. His analyses of many Philippine languages especially those of the North have contributed immensely to our study of the genetic tree of Philippine-type languages. The later part of his research, always based on impeccable and persevering field work, has moved into the area of comparative linguistics and given us insights into the earlier structures of these languages and their putative reconstructions. Together with the work of Professor Stanley Starosta and Professor Andrew Pawley (1982), their efforts at grammatical reconstruction have yielded insights into the grammatical structure of Proto-Austronesian, going beyond the reconstructed sound system and lexicon of Dempwolff (1938). They have done for Austronesian what the great Indo-European comparativists especially Antoine Meillet and Paul Brugmann did for Proto-Indo-European. This modest contribution to the comparison of two Philippine languages, Filipino/Tagalog and Kapampangan, which belong to two different branches of the Philippine genetic tree takes its inspiration from their work, but focuses on the more contemporary state of these languages which have been in contact for centuries and attempts to arrive at some insights into languages in contact in the special social environment of two contemporary Philippine languages (cf. Weinreich 1966).

2. Social and Historical Aspects of Filipino (Tagalog) and Kapampangan

Filipino, which is Tagalog-based and has been selected to be the national language of the Philippines since the 1987 Constitution of the country, belongs to the Central Philippine branch of the Philippine language tree (see Dyen 1965, Zorc 1977, McFarland 1981), while Kapampangan belongs to the Northern group of Philippine languages.

It is theorized that the Philippine groups of languages were brought to different parts of the archipelago in migrations originally from South China (see Beyer 1935, Jocano 1975) and more recently from 2,500 B.C. on from Formosa (see Bellwood 1985). The Northern Cordilleran languages were spoken by migrants who settled in the highlands, while the lowlands were occupied by language speakers of the North, such as the Ilokanos, who moved further north along the coast, crossed over to the eastern side of Luzon and mingled with the other Northern Philippine languages speaking groups,
such as the Ibanags on the east coast and the mountain cultural communities in the Cordilleras, where Ilokano has become the lingua franca. The Kapampangans (like Tagalog, the term means the area near the river bank, *pampang*, in Kapampangan, and those from the river, *Taga-ilog*) settled in the central plains but were gradually displaced and pushed further north to what is now Pampanga, Tarlac, parts of Bataan, and adjacent areas in Nueva Ecija. The Tagalogs, putatively inferred as coming from the Eastern Visayas together with the other Central Philippine speakers, settled in the Bicol Peninsula and moved further north to the mouth of the Pasig River, displaced the Kapampangans, and settled not only in the Central Plain of Luzon but as far north as Southern Tarlac, adjacent Mariveles and Bataan, Nueva Ecija, and of course the Tagalog provinces of Batangas, Laguna, and Bulacan.

The dating of these various movements is still a matter of debate but field linguists putatively state that the migration from Formosa going into Northern Luzon, took place beginning in 2,500 BC (Bellwood 1985:108) and the separation of the Philippine languages began to take place about the beginning of the first millennium (Zorc 1979, 1981, 1982, 1985; see also Blust 2005). Certainly when the Spaniards came to Manila Bay in 1565 under Miguel Lopez de Legazpi, the Kapampangans had already moved north to what is now Pampanga or the area of the Kapampangans which in those times included Pampanga, Tarlac, parts of Bataan, and Nueva Ecija, and that there was a clearly defined location for the Tagalogs who had displaced the Kapampangans on the riverine banks of the Pasig, with some remnants of Kapampangan chieftains in names such as Lakandula and Soliman who negotiated with Miguel Lopez de Legazpi in 1565. Since that period, the Kapampangans have lost more territory to the Tagalogs, so that Tarlac and Nueva Ecija are trilingual, speaking Ilokano, Kapampangan, and Tagalog.

Tagalog and Kapampangan have existed in a stable bilingual social situation the past four hundred years in such language contact areas as Calumpit in Bulacan on the southern side of the Rio Grande de Pampanga and Apalit (Kapampangan) on the northern side. The communities by now are bilingual with no sign of pidginization. Other border areas in what is now officially Kapampangan territory defined by the local government are the Bataan-Pampanga-Tarlac area, the towns of Orani and Dinalupihan, the towns of Concepcion and Paniqui in Tarlac, the towns of Gapan and Cabiao in Nueva Ecija (see Map I).

The borders are found in McFarland (1981) and are confirmed by field work and language testing for comprehension by McFarland based on the methods of SIL for measuring linguistic mutual intelligibility (Cassad 1974) and confirmed for the Tarlac border areas by Santos (1984). The author is a native of Apalit and lived intermittently there during his boyhood and childhood and can confirm the stable bilingual situation in Calumpit and Apalit, where children learn the first language of the town usually (Kapampangan in Apalit and Tagalog in Calumpit) and then the other language through the community and through playmates.

By now, however, with the spread of the national language since 1937 when Tagalog was chosen as the basis of the national language and systematically propagated through the school system since 1940 (fourth year high school) and all grades since 1946 and as a medium of instruction for social studies since 1974, and largely through the mass media and internal migration from non-Tagalog to Tagalog speaking areas, Filipino is estimated to have a speaking population (at the basic interactive communication level) of 35% of the sampled national households, approximately 10% of the total population (National Statistics Office 2000). Even if Tagalog is not the
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dominant language in households, it is spoken almost universally as a second language, the latest informal estimate being 85% of the population. The language-in-contact situation is clearly in favor of Filipino as dominant with Kapampangan maintaining its status as the language of the home and the language of the immediate community.

From a sociolinguistic viewpoint, what is interesting about the bilingual situation in the border areas of Kapampangan and Filipino-speaking communities is its seeming stability in spite of the dominance of Filipino. The languages in contact should be examined more systematically to see what loans are being brought to each of the languages by the other (if any), in which direction, and to see if there are emergent mixtures happening which might lead to a Philippine-language pidgin as seems to have happened in Masbate (Wolfenden, n.d.), and in Bago in North Eastern Luzon, the first a mixture of Bisayan and Bikol, the other one a mixture of Ilokano and a Northern language such as Ibanag.

From the comparative analysis of phonological systems, lexicon, morphology and syntax, one may draw insights for a theory of language mixture and language change and for a theory of language contact.

3. Analyses of Tagalog and Kapampangan

3.1. Phonological systems

The phonology of Tagalog and Kapampangan has been amply studied in numerous modern grammars using different models (Schachter and Otanes 1972, Llamzon 1975, Bowen 1965, among others, for Tagalog; Gonzalez 1972, 1981, Clardy 1959, Richards 1971, Forman 1971a, 1971b, among others, for Kapampangan).

The vowel systems of Tagalog and Kapampangan are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th>Kapampangan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both languages originally had a quadrivocalic system; they are now trivocalic. Tagalog now has contrasting e and o as a result of loanwords from Spanish. On the other hand, aside from loanwords from Spanish, Kapampangan has e and o as monophthongs from Proto-Austronesian ay and aw. Neither language has retained Proto-Austronesian pëpët, the reflex in Tagalog being usually i and in Kapampangan usually a, but morphophonemically, the reflexes of the pëpët clearly alters to the vowel at an earlier stage.
The consonantal systems of Tagalog and Kapampangan are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th>Kapampangan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η</td>
<td>η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tagalog has the glottal stop ? and the glottal fricative h; it has r as an allophone of intervocalic d and in loanwords from Spanish and English. Tagalog k also has the fricative allophone [kx].

Kapampangan has the reflex of final glottal stop, but has no distinctive glottal stop at the beginning and certainly none in the middle based on the evidence from morphophonemics. In some lexical items, there is a final glottal stop, most likely a borrowing or an influence of Tagalog. Moreover, it has no r sound except in borrowings from Tagalog, Spanish, and English, the reflex for Proto-Austronesian *r being l, and in allophones -r- for -d- in intervocalic position. It has no h, the reflex of Proto-Austronesian *h being o, and has a far richer morphophonemic subsystem than Tagalog especially in the phonological changes of pronominal clitics that follow the verb (See section 3.2.2 for discussion). These proto-phonemes are important since the reflexes will be either predictable reflexes coming from the original mother language or may be borrowings from each language through anomalies in the expected reflexes when these were borrowed.

Both Tagalog and Kapampangan accent are best explained by the length of the vowel, although phonetically length is accompanied by stress (loudness) and higher pitch in Tagalog (see González 1970); the most prominent phonetic realization of accent in Kapampangan is vowel length.

Both languages are syllable-timed and give more or less full value to the vowel.

Both languages have a distinctive intonation in the form of raising the tone for Wh-questions as well as yes-no questions.

Kapampangan has distinct allophones of fricatives for velar k and g, being x and y, which immediately characterizes what is called a Kapampangan ‘accent’ or punto (Tagalog), literally ‘point’, as well as the lack of h; sometimes h is overused as a result of hypercorrection; the lenis allophones of the bilabial and labiovelar stops can result in allophonic φ (heard as [f]) or β (heard as [v]) and give the impression to others that Kapampangans mistake p for f.

The phonological reflexes give clues as to borrowing from either side as the lexicon will indicate.

### 3.2 Morphological system and syntax

The basic underlying structure of the Philippine-type languages of the Austronesian family may be summarized as consisting of the following:
The underlying structure of the Philippine-type languages which constitutes the basic sentential structure typically consists of a verb-like formative root with its accompanying affixes which modify the verb-like root for further derivation and modification of meaning, including plural marking if the accompanying subject is plural and an affix indicating which of the accompanying nouns will be marked subject by a nominative case-marker. The case of the noun to be marked nominative dictates the other nouns to be marked for genitive and benefactive (or location, or instrument).

The derived verb is inflected for aspect. Clitics follow the derived verb modifying the verb in terms of illocutionary markers of mood, aspect, respect markers, and pronominal clitics. The nominal phrases are marked for case and for number and the nominals may themselves be derived words.

Depending on the rhetorical intention, with the whole utterance in mind, the subject is selected and corresponding nonsubjects are marked as genitive or benefactive (or location, or instrument) and may be reordered further for emphasis, focus, or theme arrangement.

In the case of Tagalog and Kapampangan, the main differences between the two languages is that while many of their derivational affixes, usually CV, CVC, or CVCV and -VC, are in common with other Austronesian languages (some of these have been reconstructed by Starosta, Pawley, and Reid 1982, and earlier by Codrington 1885), the marking of inflectional affixes for aspect is slightly different for each language.
Note that sentences like the following have no nominative-marked noun, but their subject (the agent) is assumed to be definite.

(1) [Tagalog]
   \[\text{Kaʔáʔálís=}\text{pa=}\text{lāmaŋ nay máma?!}\]
   'The man just left.' (nay 'Genitive')

(2) [Kapampangan]
   \[\text{Kalakółakó=}\text{na=}\text{pa=}\text{mu niŋ táu.}\]
   'The man just left.' (niŋ 'Genitive')

An alternative form for the Kapampangan recent past is plain ka- without the root duplication; perhaps the initial syllable duplication is derived from Tagalog where this initial CV duplication seems to have been early in the language (seeBlancas de San Joseph 1610 and Bergaño 1916).

### 3.2.1 Morphology

By and large, the morphology of Kapampangan and Tagalog are similar in the functions of their affixes (derivative and inflectional) although the phonological realizations of these formatives can be different. Various attempts at reconstruction for the Philippine languages (as early as Codrington 1885, more recently Reid 1971, Zorc 1974, Wolff 1991) show cognacy between these elements but in various combinations.

The derivational affixes of the verb in both Kapampangan and Tagalog are similar in function though not always in phonological realization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kapampangan</th>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>'full of'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maN-</td>
<td>maN-</td>
<td>'agent marker'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mapag-</td>
<td>mapag-</td>
<td>'inclined to'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mapaga-</td>
<td>mapaga-</td>
<td>'causative'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-um-</td>
<td>-um-</td>
<td>'active verb marker'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me-</td>
<td>napa-</td>
<td>'accidental marker'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makipag-</td>
<td>makipag-</td>
<td>'associative marker'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The topic markers for the verb agreeing with the subject are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kapampangan</th>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i)-Root</td>
<td>i-Root</td>
<td>'patient topic'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ø</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>'agent topic'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>'location/destination topic'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-in</td>
<td>'patient topic'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ipag)-Root</td>
<td>ipag-Root</td>
<td>'beneficiary topic'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paN-root</td>
<td>ipaN-Root</td>
<td>'instrumental topic'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aspect inflectional markers are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kapampangan</th>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root</td>
<td>Root</td>
<td>'imperative'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root</td>
<td>CV-Root</td>
<td>'not yet begun, future'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-in-, or change a-Root to e-Root</td>
<td>-um-, or change m-Root to n-Root</td>
<td>'completed, perfective'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV-Root</td>
<td>C-um-V-Root</td>
<td>'actual, on-going'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka-Root-Root</td>
<td>ka-CV-Root</td>
<td>'recently completed'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.2 Syntax

The determiners themselves have more or less the same function but are phonologically different case markings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Benefactive/Location/Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>common</td>
<td>proper</td>
<td>common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>qaŋ</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>naŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapampangan</td>
<td>ig</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>niŋ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A minor difference between Tagalog and Kapampangan is that while genitive is always indefinite in Tagalog and demands naŋ and ni, it can take the surface structure form zero in Kapampangan and does not have to be definite. As shown in (4), without a genitive case-marker, the definiteness of the noun is not marked in Kapampangan, it may be some mango, a mango or just plain mango in the way one would say that somebody ‘had pudding for lunch’.
Another difference between Kapampangan and Tagalog is that in the instance of dative (locative or direction) case-marked nouns of proper names of places, the determiner may be dropped in Kapampangan (cf. (5) vs. (9)), but not in Tagalog.

As already stated, the dative determiner of the proper locative noun Ménîla in Kapampangan may be dropped, as in (9).
Combinations of clitics (adverbial clitics for illocutionary force, pronominalization or copying of noun phrases in the nominative and genitive cases [realized by case-marked pronouns]) follow morphophonemic rules which can be stated (see Gonzalez 1970).

The accompanying noun phrases of the verb phrase may be in the nominative, genitive, or dative (oblique) cases; the dative case-marked noun phrases are not copied.

There is no evidence of this copying rule in Tagalog and there is no evidence that the rule is disappearing in Kapampangan; in spite of the contact, the two subsystems are intact with no sign of erosion on either side.

The loss of nominative case-marking for the agent in recent past verbs, being in the genitive in both Tagalog and Kapampangan, demands further examination as it is not clear where the innovation came from and in which direction (Kapampangan to Tagalog or Tagalog to Kapampangan).

3.3 Lexicon

The lexicon of any language seems to be the one most vulnerable to borrowing or loanwords. When languages are in contact, borrowing usually goes both ways. What is interesting is which language borrows more, in this case, Kapampangan or Tagalog. My initial working hypothesis was that since the Tagalogs emerged before Spanish colonization as the more aggressive and dominant ethnic community, one would expect more borrowings from Tagalog to Kapampangan rather than the other way around. Dyen (1963) in his lexicostatistic study reported a 39.2% shared vocabulary between Kapampangan and Tagalog. On looking at the 3,919 etyma reconstructed by Zorc (1979, 1981, 1982, 1985), one counts 32 Kapampangan words borrowed by Tagalog or .0081 of the list, whereas Kapampangan borrowed 37 lexical items from Tagalog or .0094. Initially, by semantic field inspection, there might be a pattern of borrowings by semantic fields. It turns out that no clear pattern emerges. While Tagalog borrows Kapampangan terms, the direction as expected is more on the side of Kapampangan borrowing from Tagalog (See Appendix 2 for the list).

The method used to identify which direction the borrowing went was by expected correspondences based on the usual phonological reflexes of PAN or PMP in Zorc’s list or somewhat later the expected correspondences in Kapampangan and Tagalog for Proto-Philippines as reconstructed by Zorc (1977) but questioned by Reid (1982). Reid does not question the reality of a Philippine-type group of languages, but these languages are not all found in the Philippines and some non-Philippine-type languages exist in the language potpourri that Mindanao is. It is not the correspondences that are under question, but the reality of a group of languages specific to the Philippines that could be reconstructed as ‘Proto-Philippine’. Thus, Reid’s reservations are not germane.
to the comparison of borrowings between the two languages. In any case, with Blust’s (2005) establishment of the ‘first Philippine extinction’, Proto-Philippine is what is left after the original genetic diversity was wiped out (Zorc, pers. comm.). Appendix 1 contains the expected and more or less regular sound correspondences in Kapampangan and in Tagalog and the reconstructions of PAN by Dempwolff (1938) and subsequent comparativists (Dyen 1963, 1965, Dahl 1976, Wolff 1991, Charles 1974, McFarland 1993 and Zorc 1977). If the unexpected form is actually used in current Tagalog and Kapampangan and is not the regular reflex of the one in Appendix 1, then it would not be unreasonable that the common word is a borrowing (it is of course possible that the word for both is a borrowing from a third language) if it follows the sound correspondences of one language (see Appendix 2 for the list) because of their long association.

Hence, while Kapampangan contributes to some of the contemporary Sprachgut (vocabulary) of the now more dominant Tagalog, more unexpected forms in Kapampangan are from Tagalog, rather than Kapampangan lending more lexical items to Tagalog. Given the dominance at present of Tagalog, pushing the frontiers of the Tagalogs further north and pushing or reducing the territory of Kapampangan (see Santos 1984 for the latest frontiers), one is not surprised. At one time, however, Kapampangan might have had lexical items which the Tagalogs borrowed from the Kapampangans.

4. Conclusion

Contemporary Kapampangan and Tagalog have continued to exist side by side for centuries with the split between the Central Philippine Languages (one of them being Tagalog) and the Northern languages (one of them being Kapampangan) probably at the beginning of the current era (Zorc, pers. comm.).

What makes the case of these two languages in contact interesting is that while they have been existing side by side and while Kapampangan has been losing territory to the dominant Tagalogs, Kapampangans and Tagalogs living in bilingual areas have managed to keep the identity of each one separate, with no evidence of language mixing, although the territory of Kapampangan has become smaller.

The sound systems are distinct, and the grammar intact except for a few morphological items; the only area where extensive borrowing takes place is in the lexicon.

The amount of borrowings from a small sample, using sound correspondences as guides, is that the range of the borrowing is from .0081 to .0094 with more borrowing of Tagalog into Kampampangan. In actual words, however, based on the sample, 37 words have been borrowed from Tagalog to Kapampangan and 32 words from Kapampangan to Tagalog. One would expect more given the dominance of Tagalog at present.

However, Zorc (pers. comm.) states: ‘The distinctive impression I have gotten throughout my work is that there was initially an enormous number of borrowing from Kapampangan into Tagalog. More recently, of course, with the rise of Tagalog via Pilipino and Filipino as the national language and the flood of media newspaper and comics publications, radio, and broadcasts) into nearby Tarlac and other Kapampangan provinces, borrowing has been almost exclusively from Tagalog into Kapampangan’. Zorc is careful to state that the loanwords discovered by his collection of etyma are partial as there are many more borrowings: ‘Suffice it to say there are hundreds (not just dozens) in both directions’.
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Zorc concludes: ‘The replacement of PSP *hulas ‘sweat, perspiration’ by an earlier loan *pawes (Kapampangan pawas, Tagalog pawis), indicates the way Kapampangan once had penetrated into the basic vocabulary of Tagalog. Many other loans indicate the dominance of professions by Kapampangan speakers (karáyom ‘needle’ from *ka-daRum for ‘tailoring’, dayami ‘rice straw’ from *daRami for ‘agriculture’, katám from *keTen for ‘carpenter’s plainer’, darak from *dēdak ‘powdered food from husk of rice’ for ‘agriculture’). Hence, Tagalogs have been enormously dependent upon the Kapampangans until they established themselves in Southern Luzon; this only makes sense for an incoming social group.

In case study of the two languages in contact may be looked upon theoretically as a case study of stable coexisting language systems with no mixture or signs of pidginization, with boundaries of the languages intact even if the geographical areas for resident speakers are changing. The bilingual areas should be monitored to see how long the stability will last even as Kapampangans learn Tagalog and even as their territory decreases. The numbers are not dwindling but the number of Kapampangans likewise learning Tagalog is increasing.

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Research by Dahl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akl</td>
<td>Aklanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik</td>
<td>Bikol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bs</td>
<td>Bisayan group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPH</td>
<td>Central Philippine subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Research by Dempwolff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fil</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hova</td>
<td>Malagasy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ib</td>
<td>Iban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilk</td>
<td>Ilokano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jv</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kal</td>
<td>Kalamian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kpm</td>
<td>Kapampangan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Maranao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Malay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPH</td>
<td>Northern Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>Proto-Austronesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP</td>
<td>Proto-Central Philippine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>Philippine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHF</td>
<td>Proto-Hesperonesian and Formosan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td>Proto-Hesperonesian (= Western Austronesian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMJ</td>
<td>Proto-Malayo-Javanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Png</td>
<td>Pangasinan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>Proto-Philippine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPN</td>
<td>Proto-Polynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>Proto-Southern Philippine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWI</td>
<td>Proto-West Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKT</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLZ</td>
<td>Southern Luzon subgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Research by Tsuchida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBM</td>
<td>Western Bukidnon Manobo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Research by Dyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Research by Zorc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1

**Table 1. Development of Kapampangan and Tagalog sounds from Proto-Austronesian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kapampangan</th>
<th>Current Tagalog</th>
<th>Proto Philippine</th>
<th>Proto Hesperonesian</th>
<th>Proto Austronesian</th>
<th>Some Example Correspondences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>usually a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>i(e); u/u</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*[D *a]</td>
<td>Bs u; Png, Ilk e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i (e)</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>usually i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>u (o)</td>
<td>*u</td>
<td>*u</td>
<td>*u</td>
<td>usually u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>*p</td>
<td>*p</td>
<td>*p</td>
<td>usually p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*[C (TY) *T [D *t]]</td>
<td>Ml, Jv, Formosan t Formosan ts Jv t (retroflex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td>usually k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>*b</td>
<td>*b</td>
<td>*b</td>
<td>usually b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-r-d</td>
<td>d-r-d</td>
<td>*d</td>
<td>*d</td>
<td>*d</td>
<td>Ml, Jv d-d-t Formosan t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-l-d</td>
<td>d-l-d</td>
<td>*D</td>
<td>*D</td>
<td>*D</td>
<td>Jv r, d; Ml d-d-r Formosan t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td>usually m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>*n</td>
<td>*n</td>
<td>*n (ATY)</td>
<td>Formosan t; Phi n Ml, Ilb n Formosan t; Pkm y-ny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>*ŋ</td>
<td>*ŋ</td>
<td>*ŋ</td>
<td>usually y Formosan t; Hova Formosan t; Phi s Ml, Ilb c, Phi s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>usually s Formosan t; Hova s Formosan t; Phi s Ml, Ilb c, Phi s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>l/h, o</td>
<td>*l</td>
<td>*l</td>
<td>*l</td>
<td>Formosan t; Phi l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>*w</td>
<td>*w</td>
<td>*w [D *v]</td>
<td>usually w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>*y</td>
<td>*y</td>
<td>*y[D *j]</td>
<td>usually y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>*q</td>
<td>*q</td>
<td>*q</td>
<td>Kal k; Ml h Formosan s/h Cph l; Ib -?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>*h</td>
<td>*h</td>
<td>*h</td>
<td>Formosan s; Cph h Formosan, Cph h; Ib -?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reconstructions and their transcriptions are based on Zorc 1977, 1979, 1981, 1982, 1985. Where an accent is reconstructible, this is indicated. Only actual forms in contemporary Kapampangan and Tagalog are marked for accent.

The treatment here is far from more complex and illustrates doubletting over time. Kapampangan shows the regular reflexes of the schwa (*ege > agay). From this same etymon, Tagalog regularly has igit 'humming sound.' While Kapampangan borrowed from early Tagalog *ege, Tagalog borrowed back this form as a specializing meaning 'buzzing of bees.' The top line in the table with the arrow point left (Kpm agay < Tag igit, the expected form). The second line Tag agay comes from Kpm agay 'make a continuous sound' (Zorc, pers. comm.)
Table 3. Lexicon comparison: b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Etymon</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Kapampangan</th>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td>*bekás 'remnant, vestige, track'</td>
<td>bakás</td>
<td>bakás</td>
<td>bikas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHF</td>
<td>*báGáq 'lungs'</td>
<td>báyá</td>
<td>bagá?</td>
<td>bagá?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>*báGqan 'molar tooth'</td>
<td>báyáy</td>
<td>bágyáy</td>
<td>bagáy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>*baléGen 'vine'</td>
<td>balayáy</td>
<td>bágyáy</td>
<td>bagáy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td>*baGiUS &gt; *beGyu(h) 'storm'</td>
<td>bayu</td>
<td>bagýáu</td>
<td>bagóy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td>*baháG 'loin-cloth, G-string'</td>
<td>bay</td>
<td>baág</td>
<td>bahág</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP</td>
<td>*bayé'ek 'mumps'</td>
<td>bayak</td>
<td>bayki</td>
<td>bayikí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>*baweG 'bamboo pole (for snail trap)'</td>
<td>baway</td>
<td>báway</td>
<td>bawig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?PAN</td>
<td>*baRání 'hero'</td>
<td>bayani</td>
<td>bayâni</td>
<td>bagâni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP</td>
<td>*bedu 'funny'</td>
<td>baru</td>
<td>biru</td>
<td>biró?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>*búGew~búGaw 'chase away'</td>
<td>buya(w) &gt; báyo</td>
<td>bugâ</td>
<td>báugaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>*bulud 'hill'</td>
<td>bulud</td>
<td>bárud</td>
<td>bulud</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another form *buGá(h) > Tag bugd might have crept in here. (Zorc, pers. comm.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Etymon</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Kapampangan</th>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kapampangan</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>*kabég ‘fruit bat’</td>
<td>kabag</td>
<td>kabág</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>*kelepenit ‘small bat’</td>
<td>kalapanit</td>
<td>kalapnít</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>*kaméliG ‘barn house’</td>
<td>kamaliy</td>
<td>kamálig</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHF</td>
<td>*kêNá ‘readied, set in place’</td>
<td>kana</td>
<td>kaná?</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>*kepal ‘thick’</td>
<td>kapal</td>
<td>kiplal</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHP</td>
<td>*kapes ‘cotton’</td>
<td>kapas</td>
<td>kápas</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>*katúday ‘Sesbania granuferia’</td>
<td>katúre</td>
<td>katúray</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>*kaGud ‘grate, scrape’</td>
<td>kayod</td>
<td>káyod</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td>*kedut ‘stinging pain’</td>
<td>karut</td>
<td>kirút</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP</td>
<td>*kasáw ‘movement under water’</td>
<td>kasaw</td>
<td>kisáw-kísó</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>*kiwel ‘snake-like movement’</td>
<td>kíwal</td>
<td>kíwil</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>*káRaw ‘germ(s)’</td>
<td>kayaw &gt; kayo</td>
<td>kagó</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Lexicon comparison: $d$, $g$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Etyma</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Kapampangan</th>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td>‘DegDeg’</td>
<td>dagdag</td>
<td>dagdag</td>
<td>digdig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHF</td>
<td>‘DaRin’</td>
<td>dayit</td>
<td>dayit</td>
<td>dagit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>‘DemDem’</td>
<td>damdam</td>
<td>damdam</td>
<td>dimdim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>‘dâRumun’</td>
<td>dayumun</td>
<td>dimùn</td>
<td>digumun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Lexicon comparison: $i$ - $l$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Etyma</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Kapampangan</th>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>‘ibeG’</td>
<td>ibay</td>
<td>ibay</td>
<td>ibig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>‘alaňhjian’</td>
<td>alayikan</td>
<td>alayikan</td>
<td>ikayitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td>‘iluG’</td>
<td>iluy</td>
<td>iluy</td>
<td>ilig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>‘inép’</td>
<td>inap ‘boredom; impatience’</td>
<td>inap</td>
<td>inip ‘boredom, cf. dream’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>‘lekas’</td>
<td>lakas</td>
<td>lakás</td>
<td>likas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>‘lembut’</td>
<td>lambut</td>
<td>lambut</td>
<td>limbut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td>‘léñép’</td>
<td>lanyap</td>
<td>landp</td>
<td>linep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHN</td>
<td>‘landaG’</td>
<td>landay &gt; ‘shallowness of concavity or convexity’</td>
<td>landé</td>
<td>landag</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7. Lexicon comparison: G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Etyma</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Kapampangan</th>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>ḫa 대하여</td>
<td>aliya</td>
<td>algi</td>
<td>halgi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>ḡūṣir</td>
<td>usiy</td>
<td>úṣig</td>
<td>úṣig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>ḫa ḫayrat</td>
<td>abayat</td>
<td>abēgat</td>
<td>habogat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8. Lexicon comparison: q - r

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Etyma</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Kapampangan</th>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>ḫa ḫarnat</td>
<td>baynat</td>
<td>bēnat</td>
<td>bignat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>ḫu ḫurq</td>
<td>puyu</td>
<td>pūgu</td>
<td>pūgoʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>ḫa ḫagān</td>
<td>taggay</td>
<td>taggay</td>
<td>taggay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>ḫa ḫalhīq</td>
<td>bani</td>
<td>bīnī</td>
<td>bīnīʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>ḫa ḫa ḫayrami</td>
<td>dayami</td>
<td>dayāmi</td>
<td>dagami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>ḫa ḫa ḫubāq</td>
<td>lubuk</td>
<td>buluk</td>
<td>lubʔuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP</td>
<td>ḫa ḫa ḫunqas</td>
<td>panas</td>
<td>panīs</td>
<td>panʔis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPH</td>
<td>ḫa ḫa ḫilūr</td>
<td>biluy</td>
<td>bilug</td>
<td>bilug</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The form is not from Zorc’s Core etymological dictionary of Filipino. “If there is such a form, then it again illustrates a loan with real pēpē & pēpē, and then a reborrowing by Tagalog after the shift of *e > a in Kapampangan and *e > i in Tagalog.”

(Zorc, pers. comm.)

Table 9. Lexicon comparison: s - t

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Etyma</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Kapampangan</th>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>*cārīta</td>
<td>salīta</td>
<td>salīta?</td>
<td>sālīta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>*sābūR</td>
<td>sābuy</td>
<td>sābug</td>
<td>sābug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>*salāR</td>
<td>salay</td>
<td>sālē</td>
<td>salag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>*bāRsaiy</td>
<td>bāsay</td>
<td>bāgsay</td>
<td>bāgsay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML PAN</td>
<td>*LaR_tuk</td>
<td>lay_tuk</td>
<td>lagutōk</td>
<td>lag-tuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>*bāʔak</td>
<td>ba(y)ak</td>
<td>biyāk</td>
<td>bi(c’)ak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?CPh PHS</td>
<td>*bās(μ)ʔak</td>
<td>basak</td>
<td>sibāk</td>
<td>bisak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(metathesis)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(metathesis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>*pāsīk</td>
<td>pasīk</td>
<td>pāsīk</td>
<td>pāsīk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPH</td>
<td>*paRāʔ</td>
<td>pāya</td>
<td>pīgāʔ</td>
<td>pīgāʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>*pātaR</td>
<td>pātay</td>
<td>pātag</td>
<td>pātag</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
References


Gonzalez, Andrew, FSC. 1969. On reconstructing common Philippine phonology and basic vocabulary. MS.


Zorc, David. 1982. Core etymological dictionary of Filipino, Fascicle 3:d, g, and h.

Whisper of the Palms: Etic and Emic Perspectives in Comparative Linguistics
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1. Introduction

In his book titled *Inuman Pinoy* (Philippine drink), Alegre, a Filipino folk culture specialist, reported on the local alcoholic beverage and drinking culture in the Philippine Archipelago and briefly discussed the palm wine industry in the Philippine Islands (Alegre 1992). Because of his excellent notes, we learned of the distilled alcohol made from palm wine and the aging process of palm wine practiced in the Philippine Archipelago. However, his description may lead us to suppose that all Filipinos in the islands make and enjoy palm wine and its distilled brandy. It is, of course, not the case. To my understanding, there exist regional differences in palm wine production.

In the present essay, I have two objectives. One is to propose an establishment of two distinct palm wine cultures in the Philippines. To do this, I would like to employ data that I obtained during my fieldwork and also historical records written by early Spanish colonial officers. Another objective of this essay is to reconsider the role of Austronesian historical linguistics, which can greatly contribute to Southeast Asian studies.

2. Tuba?

In the Philippines, palm wine is generally called *tuba*. The first record of coconut wine was seen in Magellan’s travel to the islands in 1521. He drank coconut wine as well as distilled variety. After Magellan, many colonial personnel wrote about it. For example, Loarca, a high officer assigned to Panay Island in 1582, gave a detailed account as follows:

In all these islands are great number of cocoa palms. They drew a great quantity of wine from the palm-trees; one Indian can in one forenoon obtain two arrobas of sap from the palm trees that he cultivates. It is sweet and good, and is used in making great quantities of brandy, excellent vinegar, and delicious honey (Blair and Robertson 1906, vol.5:169).

Antonio de Morga, once acting Governor, noted in 1609:

Their drink is a wine made from the tops of cocoa and nipa palm, of which there is a great abundance. They are grown and tended like vineyards. Drawing tuba, they distil it, using for alembics their own little furnaces and utensils, to a greater or less strength, and it becomes brandy. This is drunk throughout the islands. It is a wine of the clarity of water, but strong and dry. Mixed with Spanish wine, it makes a mild liquor, and one very palatable and healthful (Blair and Robertson 1906, vol. 16:80).
Although the Spanish appreciated palm wine in the Philippine Archipelago, they economically did not pay attention to it. Rather, the coir from the coconut husk was an important commodity for the Spanish Galleon ships, because high quality rope was made from the coir. Coconut only became commercially important in the late 19th century when coconut oil became a source of soap.

American biologists, on the other hand, first paid attention to the economic importance of palm wine. In the beginning of the American regime, Gibbs (1911) studied the productivity of several palms and reached the conclusion that coconut palm (*Cocos nucifera*), *nipa* palm (*Nypa fruticans*), sugar palm (*Arenga pinnata*), and *buri* palm (*Corypha utan* Lam.) yield high productivity.

In those days, those four palms may have been used for sap collection throughout the Philippine Archipelago. However, to my understanding, presently, coconut palm is mostly used for wine producing purposes. *Nipa* palm may rank the second most utilized palm in the Philippines for sap collection (Evangelista 1973).

### 3. Tapping Tuba?

The method of tapping is an old practice that requires considerable skill and courage. Pigafetta, while in Cebu with Magellan, described the process of *tuba*? making as follows (Jocano 1975:23):

> They bore a hole into the heart of the said [coconut] palm at the top called *palamito*, from which distils a liquor which resembles white mist. That liquor is sweet but somewhat tart, and [is gathered] in canes [of bamboo] as thick as the leg and thicker. They fasten the bamboo to the tree at evening for the morning, and in the morning for the evening.

This method has not changed and it is still practiced. In the Philippines, the sap tapper is a distinct occupation that requires special techniques. It is considered a good job, because few other jobs provide a daily income as large.

To understand the tapping process, it is necessary to be familiar with inflorescence. The fully opened bud, *piton* (Seb) or *puso* (Tag), consists of a central stalk from which branch out smaller stalks that bear the male and female flowers. At an earlier stage when the inflorescence is not yet open, the entire cluster of flowers and stalks is found tightly packed within an enclosing spathe and the whole band is called the spadix. The dimensions of the spadix are 3/4 to 2 meters long and 8 to 13 centimeters at maximum girth.

The first stage is training the bud or the unopened spadix to go in the proper direction, so that the tip points slightly downwards. This may be done by tying a cord around it with the other end attached to one of the leaves below. By slowly tightening this cord the spadix bends. To prevent it from opening, the spadix is tightly bound with fiber; often the fibrous bark of the petiole is used. Training takes nearly a week.

Then the end of the spadix is cut off about 5 to 7 centimeters from the tip and the exposed tissues are gently scratched or pounded. The lower 60 centimeters are then bound tightly with cord to prevent the flowers bursting through. A thin slice is cut off each morning and evening, and within a day or so juice begins to flow. The juice, dropping from the cut surface, is collected, usually in a section of giant bamboo. It is usually about 10 centimeters in diameter and 40 centimeters long.

---

1 In the present paper the following abbreviations are employed: Seb for Sebuano, Tag for Tagalog, DUP for duplication.
The object of the training is to prevent the juice from running back into the spadix, where it would encourage rotting. Sap is generally collected in the morning, and sometimes twice a day, depending on the tree. The tree has to be shaved twice a day in order to prevent the surface from drying out. In Tagalog, collecting the sap in the morning is called *maninigis* and this is normally practiced around 6 to 7 am. Shaving in the afternoon is called *maghahapon* and is done around 4 to 5 pm.

The flow of juice gradually increases for about 2 weeks and then decreases. According to Piggot, a good palm may produce up to 8 pints (1 gallon) a day, but 5 pints (0.625 gallon) is a good average. The volume varies with the season, usually being higher in wet periods (Piggot 1964:85).

A skillful tapper can, by careful paring and tapping, keep a spadix going for thirty days or more. It depends on how long the spadix is and how thin every slice is. A well-organized tapper prepares for a second spadix during production, when the current spadix becomes short and produces little. It is possible to tap up to 3 spadices on one palm. It appears that tapping can be continued indefinitely per tree as long as the rainfall is satisfactory.

### 4. A Comparison of *Tuba*-related Terms

To produce *tuba*?, a sap tapper or a *tuba*? gatherer needs a sharp knife or sickle for cutting the bud. In Tagalog, *karit* is the word for the scythe used in shaving slices from the inflorescence for sap tapping. There exist two interrelated terms to *karit*, which are essential to *tuba*? production. *Karitan* refers to the coconut tree where the bud is tapped. *Mangangarit* is the term designated to refer to a sap tapper.

A look at Tagalog morphology provides a key to understanding the relationship among these words. *Karitan* is derived from the root *karit*. The Tagalog suffix -*an* has various functions. According to Vicassan’s Dictionary (Santos 1978:53), it derives a noun that means place of action, as in *tanghalan* ‘stage’, *dula*?-*an* ‘theater’, *limbagan* ‘printing house’, *tahi*?-*an* ‘tailor shop’. Thus the word *karitan* is understood as a *karit*-ing place where sap tappers slice the bud. The term *mangangarit* may be decoded as *maN*-DUP-*karit*, where DUP is read as reduplication of the first open syllable of the stem *mangarit*.

Let me compare the *tuba*?-related Tagalog morphology with that of the Sebuano morphology. In Sebuano, scythe is called *sanggut* and a tree for sap production is called *sanggut*?-*an*. The relationship between *sanggut* and *sanggut*?-*an* is parallel to what I have just observed in the Tagalog example above.

Sebuano also has the [maN- DUP] form to indicate occupation, trade or habit: *mamalamad* ‘fortune teller’ < maN- DUP *palad* ‘fate’, *mananambal* ‘doctor’ < maN- DUP *tambal* ‘treat, cure’, *mangangahuy* ‘wood gatherer’ < maN- DUP *kahuy* ‘wood’. If Sebuano morphology supports my supposition, a term for *tuba*? gatherer in Sebuano would be *manananggut*. Unfortunately, it does not seem to be the case. The most common Sebuano term for the *tuba*? gatherer is either *mananggiti* or *manangguwete*. These words are probably derived from *sanggut* but they have no reduplication of the first syllable of the stem *mananggut*. This clearly violates the rule. Also, they underwent vowel shifts.

---

2 The symbol *N*- represents a prefixed nasal assimilates in various ways with the initial phoneme of the root. Preceding /k/, *N*- assimilates to the point of articulation of the initial consonant and that consonant is deleted: the stem *mangarit* are derived from maN-*karit* where *N*- assimilates to /ng/ and the initial /k/is deleted.
Interestingly, the action of tapping the coconut is referred to as *mananggut* by those who call *tuba*? gatherer *mananggiti* or *manangguvete*. In addition, the Bohol dialect of Sebuano refers to a sap tapper as *mananggut*. This form still violates my supposition because no reduplication is employed. However, it is clear that *mananggut* is derived from *sanggut*. Finally, in the Dumaguete dialect, *manananggut* refers to a *tuba*? gatherer, which is the same as one would expect.

Table 1 shows derivatives on *tuba*?-related terms in both Tagalog and Sebuano. Notice that the rule of word formation in the two languages is identical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th>Sebuano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘sickle’</td>
<td>karit</td>
<td>sanggut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘sap producing tree’</td>
<td>karitan</td>
<td>sanggutan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘<em>tuba</em>? gatherer’</td>
<td>mangangarit</td>
<td><em>manananggut</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beyond the surface level, there exists a common basic linguistic similarity among the Luzon and Visayan *tuba*? cultures. Based on this fact, Whorfian linguists would claim that there is a common *tuba*? culture in the Philippine Archipelago. Even though both languages share the same morphology for the *tuba*?-making terminology, there are vast differences in drinking practices as seen in the next section.

**5. Luzon-type and Visayan-type *Tuba*? Culture**

To my understanding, there are two kinds of alcoholic beverages made from coconut palm in the Philippines. One is fermented sap and another is its distilled form. In Tagalog, the former is called *tuba*? and the latter *lambanog*.

In Southern Luzon, it is common to drink *lambanog*, while *tuba*? is seldom drunk. The Bisayans, on the other hand, prefer raw *tuba*?: To the best of my knowledge, the distilled palm alcohol cannot be found in any places in the Visayan Islands except in Surigao, Northeastern Mindanao where there exists a distilled *nipa* palm wine called *sum*, *soy* or *laksoy* (Alegre 1992). Since I am not familiar with the distilled *nipa* wine, the following discussion will be limited to *tuba*? in Southern Luzon and the Visayan regions.

Based on my fieldwork in the Philippine Islands, I presuppose that there exist two distinct coconut wine cultures in the Philippines from the viewpoint of drinking customs. Southern Luzon consists of one *tuba*? culture where *tuba*? is often distilled. Another *tuba*? culture is observed in the Visayan Islands where *tuba*? is not distilled. For the sake of brevity, I will label the former type of distilled *tuba*? drinking culture the Luzon-type and the latter the Visayan type. I will describe the details of the Visayan-type culture below (see Sevidal (1975) for the Tagalog *lambanog* drinking customs).

**6. Bahalina**

In some parts of the Visayan Islands, palm sap could be classified into four stages: *lina*, *tuba*?, *bahal*, and *bahalina*. *Folk Culture of the Central Visayas*, edited by the Ministry
of Education, describes *lina* as the fresh and sweet sap of coconuts, which is preferred by children because of its sweetness (Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports 1986:62). The book also notes older people like the day-old bitter-sour *tuba*? or *bahal*. If it is kept for two weeks or more and allowed to ferment in a tightly covered container, it turns into *bahalina*.

I have never encountered *lina* during my fieldwork. Because *Folk Culture of the Central Visayas* did not describe the particulars about the places, unfortunately I am not able to confirm the description of *lina*. Therefore, I will describe three stages in fermented sap commonly classified in the Visayan Islands. For example, in Tanauan, Leyte, there is a clear distinction among coconut wine regarding aging (or “daying”) and the price reflects the aging. A Japanese microbiologist, Kozaki, once described *tuba*? as a one-month fermented wine. Two to three month fermentation sap is called *bahal* and more than three months is called *bahalina*. The longer wine is fermented, the better quality it gains and the more expensive it becomes (Kozaki 1990).

As far as I surveyed, *bahalina* is limited to Leyte Island. Bisayans in other islands usually know that *bahalina* is an aged strong *tuba*?; but few have experienced it. Outside of Leyte, thus, there are only two stages of *tuba*? available. Among them, *tuba*? generally refers to the newly fermented coconut wine that is drunk on the same day as collected. *Bahal* is an at least one-day old *tuba*?, which tastes stronger and much sour than *tuba*?.

### 7. Tungog

The Visayan *tuba*? is reddish in color. This is because of the bark of the trees called *tungog* or *balok* (or *baruk*). The words refer to the name of the tree (*Ceripos* sp.) as well as the powdered products made of *tungog* trees.4

The tree grows in mangrove forests. Mangrove is a rank and salt tolerant forest ecosystem of tropical and subtropical regions of the world. Mangroves include trees, shrubs, vines, and palms growing in coastal areas reached by seawater at high tide. Useful products from mangroves include quality firewood, charcoal, tannin, dye, and construction materials. Aside from these, mangrove forests aid in natural land reclamation.

The tannin in *tungog* provides the coloring effect. This is one of the motivations to employ *tungog in tuba*? in the Visayan Islands. Locally, *tungog* is believed to give a flavoring effect. The copy on the Dragon brand *tungog* package, one of the major powdered *tungog* packing companies in Cebu, expresses the character of *tungog*, saying: “*Tungog* is not merely for coloring but is also a flavoring to make the native wine a wholesome appetizer and palatable stimulant.” There are other local beliefs on *tungog*. If one drinks *tuba*? without *tungog*, he or she may have loose bowels. In fact, others claim that *tungog* works as laxative. Another belief is that *tungog* functions as a medicine for intestinal disorders.

Scientists agree with the functions of *tungog* in the following two points. First, the tannin precipitates the proteins in *tuba*? and thus the tannins help to clear the *tuba*? from albuminous impurities (Banzon and Velasco 1982:318). Second, the *tungog* helps the wine yeast *Saccharomyces* become active, while it makes various bacteria and wild yeast inactive (Kozaki 1990).

There are several brands of *tungog* in the Visayan Islands: “Dragon”, “Banana”, “LPC”, “TCC”, and “YTC” in Cebu; “Lubi”, “King”, and “Eagle” in Iloilo; “Sunshine” in

---

4 Some Philippine languages call this species *tangal*, while *tungog* is most common in the Visayan Islands and Mindanao.
Bacolod; “Tuba” and “Vinta” in Zamboanga; “NFT” and “TKC” in Tacloban; and “UTC” in Tagbilaran. It costs 2 to 3 pesos for 100 to 200 grams. Those brands are simply repackagers because they buy powdered mangrove bark from the dealers in Zamboanga.

There are at least four dealers of tungog in Zamboanga (as of June 1993). Only one of them is run by a pure Sebuano family, but others are “mestizos” of Sebuano and Chinese mixture. They illegally import dried barks from Sabah, East Malaysia because mangrove cannot be cut without permission both in the Philippines and Malaysia. Muslim merchants play an important role in smuggling the bark (See de la Peña (2000) for life-stories of tungog collectors and traders).

Dried bark is made into powder in factories in Zamboanga and exported, in sacks, to Cebu, Iloilo, Davao, and other major cities in the Visayan Islands. According to a tungog dealer in Zamboanga, Cebu is the largest market for tungog and Davao ranks next.

The tungog dealers in Zamboanga classify two kinds of bark: tungog and bakawan, though powdered final products are simply called tungog. In some other Philippine languages, tungog is identical to tangal, which refers to the Ceriops species. Either bakaw or bakawan often refers to the Rhizophora species.

The tungog packers sometimes mix tungog and bakawan in a package. Tungog is locally evaluated better than bakawan. There is, however, less supply of tungog than that of bakawan. Tungog was, in 1993, imported at 3.5 pesos per kilogram, while it was exported at 7 to 8 pesos per kilogram. The price of bakawan varied between a range of 2.5 to 3 pesos per kilogram depending on the thickness of the bark. Thicker bark is preferred because it is easier to ground than the thin bark.

Once, there used to be found good and thick bark in Tawi-Tawi, Jolo, Basilan, and even around Zamboanga. Unfortunately, there are few supplies from Mindanao or Sulu at present. One of the dealers in Zamboanga explained that the mangrove swamps are in danger of extinction because rapid development of fishponds for prawns or shrimps prevails. He commented since mangroves grow well on their own, it does not harm the ecological systems as long as cutting is limited to tungog production and personal use. It is the fishpond industry that destroys the ecology.

Forest clearing to make way for housing and industrial development, small port development, fishponds and saltponds, and the indiscriminate harvesting of mangroves to meet the increasing demand for firewood and domestic fuel have led to the large scale destruction of mangroves. And, of course, the tungog industry is one of the harmful activities.

8. Towards a Dynamic Comparative Linguistics

There are external differences in drinking practices between the Luzon type and the Visayan type. However, beyond the surface level, there is a common cognitive thread running through the two cultures.

It is not that the Bisayans never knew how to make brandy. As seen in Loarca and Morga’s description (Blair and Robertson 1906, vol. 16:80; vol. 5:169), the Bisayans used distilled palm wine for palm brandy. Today, among the Bisayan peoples, only the Suriganons make palm brandy from nipa palm. As for tungog being added to tuba?, my encounter of the earliest document is written by Francisco Colins, S. J. in 1663. He noted that “the bark of certain trees which give (tuba?) color, heat, and bite” (Blair and Robertson 1906, vol. 40:66). Even from his account, it is not clear whether adding tungog was widely observed in the Philippine Archipelago.

Thus, one question must be answered is why the Bisayans stopped distilling tuba?? One thing clear is that the degree of alcohol plays an important role in differentiating
the drinking patterns between the two types. Tubā?'s low alcohol (5 to 7 percent) allows the Bisayans to drink even in the morning. They believe that tubā? is good for their health. Some elite Filipinos might think that tubā? is simply a substitute for expensive beer for the poor. If the Bisayans like to get drunk, they would go for the hard liquor such as locally made gin or rum. We need to look for another reason why there are so many tubā? lovers.

It is interesting to be reminded of a function of drinking. Drinking is the symbolic announcer of friendship, peace, and agreement, in personal as well as in business or political relations. Thus, Magellan and the datu (a local chief) enjoyed the togetherness of drinking.

Another interesting question is “Are the Filipinos a drinking nation?” Antonio de Morga (Blair and Robertson 1906, vol. 16:80–81) recorded this comment:

In the assemblies, marriages and feasts of the natives of these islands, the chief thing consists in drinking this wine [tubā?], without ceasing, when the turn of each comes, some singing and other drinking. As a consequence, they generally become intoxicated without this vice being regarded as a dishonor or disagreement.

Pigafetta also noted that people in Limasawa drank too much (Jocano 1975:53). However, on the other hand, Loarca (Blair and Robertson 1096, vol. 5:117) interestingly observed that the Filipinos seldom quarrel over drinking. He wrote:

They are greatly addicted to the use of a kind of wine which they make from rice and the palm tree, and which is good. Very rarely do they become angry when drunk, for their drunkenness passes off in jests or in sleep.

A possible interpretation is that there may be a difference in drinking patterns between tubā? and other alcoholic beverages. As far as I experienced, as Loarca noted, there is no case of quarrel while drinking tubā?. Tubā?an is a term for the place of tubā? sellers. Most tuba?an allow people to drink tuba? by the glass. Men often enjoy talking as well as drinking tuba? at the tuba?an.

How to define tuba? is difficult because it contains both etic and emic problems. Etically speaking, tuba? is, no doubt, an alcoholic beverage. In this sense, Tryon’s (1995) Comparative Austronesian Dictionary listed tuba? as a fermented drink. However, tuba? refers to unfermented fresh sap as well. It is a cover term for palm sap from the unfermented to the fermented stages.

In this regard, which kinds of palm could be tuba.? As mentioned earlier, among the 3,000 palm species, only five palms such as coconut palm, nipā palm, sugar palm, buri palm, and palmyra palm (Borassus flabellifer) are common palms used in Southeast Asia for sap collection.

Sap from nipā, grown in mangrove swamps, is often exploited and surely called tuba.? (Evangelista 1973). No data on sugar palm and palmyra palm exploitation in the Philippines are available to me. Sugar palm favors sunny but not dry places. It is abundant in the Philippine Archipelago and its fruit is often used for sweets called ka’on. Palmyra palm, on the other hand, grows in dry land, and I suspect that it is seldom seen in the Philippine Islands. Buri palm also prefers dry land and it is rarely used for sap collection. I have only one example of buri palm exploitation in the Philippine Islands. In Dumaguete City, Negros Oriental, palm wine out of buri is exclusively called gohan. The newly gathered sap from buri is as sweet as that of coconut, but buri produces much more sap than coconut. However, people of Dumaguete prefer coconut wine to gohan. Gohan is thought a substitute for coconut
wine. They would rather make vinegar from gohan. Tuba?, thus, is probably an exclusive term for palm sap used for drinking in the Philippines.

Tryon (1995) listed tuak as a fermented drink. What is the relation between tuba? and tuak? Two points are understood from his elaborated Dictionary. First, both terms refer exclusively to palm wine. Second, they seem to be complementarily distributed: the former in the Philippine Islands and the latter in the Indonesian islands.

I suspect that these two terms may be cognate words. This is explained by sound similarities and syllabic equation. Indonesian tuak is probably realized as /tuʔak/, /tuʔaʔ/, /tuwak/, or /tuwaʔ/, which is similar to Philippine tuba?. Regardless of the sounds, both words have a CV.CVC structure. Costenoble, who made a great contribution to Philippine linguistics, once reconstructed *tuʔak or *tuvak as fermented drink and tuba? as palm wine (Costenoble 1943[1979]:297, 298). In my opinion, both fermented drink and palm wine should be the same and the word is most probably reconstructed as *tuba?. In addition, *tuba? has to be a general term for palm sap that ranges from fresh to fermented sap.

Although Tryon did not give us detailed information on palm species, how the palms are exploited is interesting. For example, Northern Sulawesi and Maluku in Indonesia are famous for sugar palm exploitation. People there call the tuak made from sugar palm suguer. Similarly, Makassarese exclusively call sap from palmyra palm ballo?. Each community in Southeast Asia may have developed a culture based on palm exploitation in accordance with its ecological environment. What is needed for linguists is an etic comparative view and emic insights into the real society and culture.
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Aklanon Tag- and Extra-Systemic Linguistic Phenomena

R. David Zorc
McNeil Technologies Language Research Center

I am most pleased to have this opportunity to dedicate an article to Laurie Reid. Unbeknownst to him at the time (1967), he inspired my choice of a career in linguistics as he lectured a dozen or so starry-eyed Peace Corps Volunteers on comparative Philippine. Years later in 1973, he was enormously supportive of my work under Professor Dyen at Yale encouraging me to present two papers at the First Austronesian Conference in Honolulu. Furthermore, we both share an avid interest in morphology and syntax, as well as in language families other than Austronesian. While the majority of my writings in the Austronesian arena are assumed by some to have been in the historical-comparative sphere, there are many in applied linguistics and hence some forays into language theory. My initial work with the Peace Corps involved two dialog books for Peace Corps Volunteers, an Aklanon grammar (Zorc and de la Cruz 1968) and a dictionary (Zorc, Salas, et al. 1969). My daily work at McNeil Technologies Language Research Center often involves putting together grammatical sketches for our Newspaper Reader Series: Cebuano (Zorc 1987), Ilokano (Moguet and Zorc 1988), Tagalog (Sarra and Zorc 1990), Hiligaynon (Sunio and Zorc 1992), Bikol (Belchez and Moguet 1992), Kapampangan (Davidson and Pineda 1992) — and even more full-blown treatments outside Austronesian: Somali (Zorc and Issa 1990), Armenian (Zorc and Baghdasarian 1995), Oromo (Tucho, Zorc, and Barna 1996), Sotho (Zorc and Mokabe 1998), and Rwanda-Rundi (Zorc and Nibagwire, In Preparation). As has been Laurie’s case too, I have been blessed with a multi-faceted linguistic career that has taken me into the Austronesian, Australian, Cushitic, Bantu, and Indo-European families. This article represents a merging of two “loves” of my life: a synchronic theoretical overview, based upon a perspective of language which has evolved through the years, with some historically-relevant notes about a closed but productive system in Aklanon. I trust Laurie and others will enjoy reading it as much as I did researching and writing it.

1. Overview of Language Systems According to Zorc

Through time, I have noted that there are some paradoxes in linguistics and language study. The first can be noted between a linguist (who strives for abstractions, logic, scientific-systemization, elegance), and a speaker or language-learner (who strives for understanding, communication, rapport). Linguists often have the frustrating job of looking for logic that may not always be there: true DUALITY OF PATTERNING! But the second is more significant and disappointing: many linguists, who profess to deal
with some aspect of language, often fail to write in a manner that will communicate
with language students, who, of all potential readers or users, are most in need of
understanding what they are writing about. The excessive use of jargon and the
proselytizing of a given linguistic theory become insurmountable obstacles for the vast
majority of language learners. In well-researched and well-known languages there is no
harm done, but in the arena of less commonly taught languages with precious few if any
resources, the consequences are no less than tragic.

As a personal and relevant example, in 1998 I was learning Xhosa in order to
produce a Xhosa Newspaper Reader. I was wearing the hat of a learner, rather than one of
a linguist. In looking for references, I had assumed that a 417 page Xhosa Syntax (Du
Plessis and Visser 1992) would serve me better than a 60 page manual (Einhorn and
Siyengo 1990). Alas, the syntax turned out to be a transformational grammar of the
language – while replete with diagrams for specific sentence constructions, it did not
contain a single table of noun classes, agreement forms, pronouns, deictics, or verb
inflections. One must read through the entire tome to come to grips with the overall
language structure, drawing one’s own tables (and conclusions) along the way.
Meanwhile, the brief manual was replete with tables of noun classes, agreement forms,
adjectives, verb conjugations, relative constructions, etc., and it presents in a
readily-accessible graphic form exactly what I need to know.

I propose that we linguists should be dealing with and describing seven systems (or
levels of abstraction) for any given language (see Table 1). These form the basic
machinery of human speech and include:

1. PHONOLOGICAL - the SOUND SYSTEM which contains the various sounds
used to build up words. Anyone who has learned a different language
knows how difficult this can be. People who do not master the sound
system often speak with a heavy accent. Regional variations within a
language represent dialects that almost always have a different
pronunciation characterizing that locale.

2. MORPHOLOGICAL - the system involved with WORD BUILDING.

3. SYNTACTIC - the grammatical system that determines the ORDER AND
SHAPE OF WORDS in any given sentence.

4. LEXICAL - the WORD SYSTEM, specific for each language community,
where forms are made to conform with the daily needs of the speakers.

5. SEMANTIC - the MEANING SYSTEM, where words and expressions get both
their basic meaning and special overtones.

6. PRAGMATIC - the DISCOURSE SYSTEM, where appropriate words and
patterns are selected for the specific situation at hand. Pronouns, both
personal and demonstrative, which were traditionally taught as part of
the grammar, are always discourse sensitive and governed by
language-specific pragmatics.

7. ETHNOLOGICAL - the CULTURAL OR SOCIOLOGICAL SYSTEM within which
language fits.

Each of these systems are both independent and interdependent. The
independence of some has been well attested in linguistic studies that have dealt with,
say, just the phonology of a language, its morphology and syntax, or its lexicon (i.e., a
dictionary). The other levels have also received attention, to varying degrees, in the
literature, such as the burgeoning field of pragmatics. Meanwhile, ethnological
phenomena have been limited to specialties such as sociolinguistics, anthropology, or psycholinguistics.

Their interdependence, however, has not received a great deal of attention, and it is here that I have recognized phenomena that have “slipped through the cracks” of one linguistic theory or another. True, when elements at the morphological and phonological levels intercept, there is the concept of MORPHOPHONEME. Within semantics, there has been discussion of the denotation (actual meaning) and connotation (implications) of words, but I would propose that what is happening in the case of a word like ‘piss’ is that besides its semantic characteristic (urine) it carries a culturally-imposed overtone of {rude}, i.e., its full explanation is ETHNOSEMANTIC. There is no linguistic study or textbook (to my knowledge) that has treated the three click sounds of English (bilabial, alveolar, and retroflex), probably because they are consonantal phones that do not combine with vowels. Nevertheless, at the ethnolinguistic level, we can and do express sympathy or irritation with an alveolar click (spelled tsk), cowboys urge horses on with the retroflex click, and rude standers-by express appreciation of a woman’s beauty with the bilabial click (kiss). I call these ETHNOPHONES, because they are sounds triggered by and in response to a specific cultural situation.

Sometimes a given phenomenon is located within a single system, such as the {causative} pa- in Philippine and other Austronesian languages, -is- in Bantu languages, -i in Somali, -ts’nel in Armenian. Such languages have a single morphological causative construction. Sometimes, it may be spread across a single system, as in Oromo, where a series of lexically-determined suffixes (-s-, -eess-, -is-, -sis-, -siis-) are involved. But it can also be spread across several systems, and therefore be less readily apparent, as the case is in English where {causative} can be:

- MORPHOLOGICAL (the prefix en- as in enlarge or the suffix -en as in sweeten),
- THEMATIC (as with boil, cool, run which constitute intransitive-transitive pairs),
- LEXICAL (die vs. kill),
- SYNTACTIC (using an auxiliary like cause someone to verb), or
- PRAGMATIC (where let implies willingness on the part of the caused actor / unwillingness on the part of the causer, while make implies willingness on the part of the causer / unwillingness on the part of the caused actor).

If one proposes that {causative} is an element of universal grammar, then it is MORPHOLOGICAL in languages like Aklanon, Tagalog, Somali, Sotho, Xhosa, and Oromo, but POLYSYSTEMIC in English.

There are also instances where a grammatical element is EXTRASYSTEMIC. That is, while there may be a full paradigm of forms which may be considered regular, there can be one or a few elements that are not part of this system. They are usually IRREGULAR, SECONDARY, and DEFECTIVE, i.e., they do not inflect according to the canons of the primary system. This is where Aklanon tag- fits into the scheme of things.

2. Aklanon Tag-

Aklanon is a member of the western Bisayan subgroup (along with Kinaray-a and Kuyonon) (Zorc 1972). Its higher-order sister-languages include Cebuano, Hiligaynon, and Waray, which are all in a macro-subgroup with Tagalog and Bikol (at the Central Philippine level) (Zorc 1977). Data presented here either come from the Aklanon Dictionary (Zorc, Salas, et al. 1969) or from my wife, Maria Nellie Reyes Prado Zorc.
Aklanon tag- is a productive derivational morpheme with the meaning ‘feel like.’ It was described in Zorc and de la Cruz (1968:128f) as a ‘stative verb qualifier,’ taking only the na- (real) and ma- (unreal) prefixes. What I have come to realize since, is that it is EXTRASYSTEMIC precisely because it is used with so few members of the verb conjugation (just three: na- PRESENT or PAST, ma- FUTURE, and -un DEPENDENT, see Table 2 for the standard full verb paradigm).

(1)  
\[ \text{Natan} \text{dihú}? \ ? \text{akú} \ ? \text{it} \ \text{dú:ru.} \]  
PRES.feel.excrete I OBJ very much  
‘I really have to go to the bathroom!’

(2)  
\[ \text{Ka?ínah} \ \text{Natan} \text{dihú}? \ ? \text{akú} \ ? \text{it} \ \text{dú:ru.} \]  
earlier PAST.feel.excrete I OBJ very much  
‘A while ago, I really had to go to the bathroom!’

(3)  
\[ \text{Ayâw} \ ? \text{it} \ \text{súksuk} \ ? \text{it} \ \text{háyhil}, \ \text{bá:sí?} \]  
NEG:IMP OBJ wear OBJ highheel, maybe  
\[ \text{matag} \text{sa?út} \ \text{ka} \ \text{sa} \ \text{báyli.} \]  
FUT.feel.dance you LOC dance  
‘Don’t wear high heels, you might feel like dancing at the party.’ (sá:?út ‘dance’)

(4)  
\[ \text{Kun} \ \text{imnún} \ \text{mu} \ \text{tanán}, \ \text{gústu} \ \text{mu} \]  
if drink.DEP you all, want you  
\[ \text{tag} \text{??ihi?ún} \ \text{ka} \ \text{sa} \ \text{dá:Ean?} \]  
feel.urinate.DEP you LOC road  
‘If you drink it all, do you want to have to urinate while on the road?’

Unlike most verbal forms, which preserve the original accent pattern of the root, tag- may alternatively have a word-final effect on the accent pattern of any derivation with an open penult (regardless of where the accent originally falls). While exemplified correctly, but not recognized explicitly in Zorc and de la Cruz, this and other morphologically-determined accent patterns were described in Zorc 1977:64-69. Although some doubleting may occur, note in the following examples how accent may fall on the ultima, even if the root has a long penult, yielding a rightward accent pattern:

(5)  
\[ \text{Nata} \text{g?ihi?ún} \ \text{? feel like urinating’ (jëhi?ún ‘urine; urinate’)} \]  
\[ \text{Nata} \text{g?i} \text{tangís} \sim \text{Nata} \text{g?i} \text{tángis} \ \text{‘feel like crying’ (tángis ‘cry’)} \]  
\[ \text{Nata} \text{g?i} \text{pá:naw} \ \text{‘feel like leaving’ (pá:naw ‘go away, leave on a trip’) [long penult only]} \]  
\[ \text{Nata} \text{g?i} \text{halín} \ \text{‘feel like leaving’ (halín ‘leave, go somewhere else’)} \]  
\[ \text{Nata} \text{g?i} \text{hibayág} \ \text{‘feel like laughing’ (hibayág ‘laugh’)} \]  

Although the examples immediately above are intransitive and take the usual topic or subject pronouns (akó ‘I,’ ikáw ‘you,’ imáw ‘he/she,’ etc.), the prefix can be used with verbs that take objects as well, e.g.,

(6)  
\[ \text{Nata} \text{g?i} \text{ínúm} \ \text{akó} \ ? \text{it} \ \text{Tandú?ay.} \]  
PRES.feel.drink I OBJ Tanduay(Rum)  
‘I feel like drinking Tanduay (Rum).’ (?ínúm ‘drink’).
(7)  \text{nata\textipa{\textk}}\textipa{\textun} – \text{nata\textipa{\textg}}\textipa{\textk}\textipa{\textun} \text{ak}\textipa{\textó} \ ?\text{it} \ \text{mángga}.
\text{PRES.feel.eat} \text{PRES.feel.eat} \text{I} \ \text{OBJ} \ \text{mango}

'I feel like eating mangoes.' (\text{k}\textipa{\textá} \text{un} ‘eat’).

(8)  \text{nata\textipa{\textg}}\textipa{\textb} \text{ak}\textipa{\textó} \ ?\text{it} \ \text{?åwto}.
\text{PAST.feel.buy} \text{I} \ \text{OBJ} \ \text{car}

'I felt like buying a car.' (\text{bak}\textipa{\textd} \text{E} ‘buy’)

According to the phonotactic rules of Aklanon (and other Bisayan dialects), if the penult has a closed syllable, the accent always falls on the penult (Zorc 1977:243f). Hence no other accent pattern is possible on the following:

(9)  \text{nata\textipa{\textg}}\textipa{\textá} \text{dtuh} \ \text{ak}\textipa{\textó} \ \text{sa} \ \text{båyli}.
\text{PRES.feel.go} \text{I} \ \text{LOC} \ \text{dance}

'I feel like going to the dance.' (\text{?ådtuh} ‘go’)

(10) \text{nata\textipa{\textg}}\textipa{\texts} \text{simbah} \ \text{ak}\textipa{\textó}.
\text{PRES.feel.worship} \text{I}

'I feel like going to church.' (\text{simbah} ‘worship’)

Dozens more examples could be given. This affix is productive. It has one lexically-determined allomorph \text{ta\textipa{\textN}}- in the form: \text{nata\textipa{\textg}dhi\textipa{\textú}}? ‘feel like defecating’ (reduction of \text{pa\textipa{\textd}hi\textipa{\textu}? ‘excrement (human)’ [N]; ‘to excrete’ [V]). However, this derivation is strictly limited to sentient/control verbs. It is decidedly excluded from all meteorological verbs, thus:

(11) **\text{nata\textipa{\textg}u\textipa{\textÉ\textn}} [incorrect] ‘feel like raining’

**\text{nata\textipa{\textg}h\textipa{\textg}n\textipa{\textin}} [incorrect] ‘feel like being windy’

However, there is a noun derivation with a \text{ta\textipa{\textg}}- prefix yielding \text{SEASON NOUNS}, which does not affect the accent pattern, i.e., the accent pattern of the root is maintained:

(12) \text{ta\textipa{\textg}?\text{u\textE\textn}} \ ‘rainy season’ (\text{?\textE\textn} ‘rain’ [N, V])
\text{ta\textipa{\textg}?\text{\textE\textn\textit{\textn}}} \ ‘hot season’ (\text{?\textE\textn\textit{\textn}} ‘heat’ [N, V])
\text{ta\textipa{\textg}?\text{\texth\textá\textnung\textin}} \ ‘windy season’ (\text{\texth\textá\textnung\textin} ‘wind’ [N])

3. Some Possible Historical Connections

Mintz (1994) describes what I see as a cognate prefix in Malay and Indonesian thus: “\text{Ter}- is a verbal and adjectival affix used to indicate a final or completed state. How this state is reached, whether intentionally or unintentionally, actively or passively, is not considered significant when this affix is used.”

---

1 The capital E is an unrounded back semivowel which the Aklanons spell with “e.” Hence this orthographic symbol has two values: in vowel position, CV(C), it is pronounced as the front mid vowel in Spanish loanwords, e.g., \text{pwede}; in consonant position, it is the unrounded back semivowel. It was originally interpreted as a voiced velar fricative (Blake, early Zorc), but it lacks friction. The IPA symbol for the semivowel is Greek omega, while for the consonant it is a small Greek gamma.
With adjectives it “indicates a superlative or an intensive state” (Ibid.), e.g., terbagus ‘best, very best (at s.t.)’; terbaik ‘best, highest in quality’; terbesar ‘largest’.

With verbs, “the resultant meaning is most commonly a final or completed state with no particular consideration as to how that state was reached” (Op. cit., p.178), e.g., terdapat ‘be found’; terletak ‘be located’.

Such verbs are semantically passive, but not morphologically so (since di- is the morphological passive). However, if the verb is semantically active, then agentialness, unintentionality or minimal agent responsibility is implied (Op. cit., p.180; Phillip Thomas, pers. comm.), e.g., terlihat ‘accidentally saw’; tertidur ‘dozed off, happened to fall asleep’; terrasa marah ‘felt sudden rage’. Thus, depending on context, Malay terbuka can mean ‘OBJECT is open’ or ‘AGENT accidentally opened (something).’

There is clearly a significant distance between Aklanon taghibayág ‘feel like laughing’ and Malay tertawa ‘burst into laughter.’ Nevertheless, along the lines deduced by Mintz, I see a semantic thread of {CURRENT RELEVANCE} connecting the disparate meanings and functions of this prefix. This is an aspect of the “perfective” verbal morphology I have encountered in Cushitic (e.g., Oromo) and Bantu (e.g., Swahili and Sotho) languages. While the literal translation of many verbs with this special inflection might seem to be ‘have VERBed,’ it implies that the action has current relevance, e.g., ‘has arrived (and is still here)’ or ‘is hungry (= has become hungry and is still so).’ The Aklanon verbal affix, while translationally equivalent to English ‘feel like’ can be seen to have evolved from ‘VERB is currently relevant,’ just as the Aklanon season nouns from ‘NOUN is currently relevant.’

Rasoloson and Rubino (2005) contrast two Malagasy RESULTATIVES (voa- and tafa-), where tafa- marks actions with more control than voa-. Neither “inflect for IMPERATIVE mode or PAST TENSE” (and are hence EXTRASYSTEMIC). Their description reads as follows:

Tafa-resultatives often encode a coincidental or unexpected state of affairs. The subject of tafa-resultatives exercises more control to bring about the resultant state than the subject of a voa-formative.

(13)  Tafavèrina tèto Antananarivo ny Filòha Zafy.
RES.return PAST.PRX.VIS Antananarivo DEF NR.head Zafy

‘President Zafy happened to return to Antananarivo.’

Keenan (1998:590) notes that “voa- may be used with reduplicated roots, while tafa- may not, e.g., voolasalàza ‘said a bit’; tafavèrina ‘returned’, but not *tavèrinamèreina.”

Etymologically, this prefix probably derives from either *ta-pa- or *taR-pa-, since Malagasy lost PAN *R in inherited forms. While they do not inflect for the past, the do indicate result or {accidental state achieved}. This is partially reminiscent of some of the functions of Malay ter-.

I suspect there is a common thread in adjective derivations with this prefix in Malay and other Austronesian languages (attributive state achieved), accidental senses (action or state achieved), all the way to stative nouns in some languages (e.g., ‘age’ or ‘fat’-state, even ‘expertise’ achieved). The existence of *taR- in the morphology of PAN would appear to be justified, but as is the case in Aklanon and Malay, it probably was not paradigmatic or systemic (e.g., within the verbal inflectional system of *-um-, *-en, *Si-, *an, *in-, etc.) and hence could shift to specialized functions and senses, such as {excessive} or {superlative}. Since other verb paradigms were available for standard
stative expressions, i.e., *na-, *ma-, special senses of {accidentally-so} or {overtaken by} could evolve.

Since *taR- was non-systemic, it would have been far more fragile and subject to loss. Thus, Tagalog does not have an equivalent verbal prefix to Aklanon, but it has been preserved as a season marker (tagūlan ‘rainy season,’ tagdlım ‘period of the new moon,’ taggtōm ‘famine, period of starvation,’ etc. It has been lost in the verbal morphology of Tagalog, but not in Aklanon (a near genetic relative). In Tausug, a member of the South Bisayan branch, taga- (with a fricative) has an innovative existential attributive or quasi-possessive function, e.g., tagalayag ‘having sails’ or tagabu’aya ‘having crocodiles.’

Alternatively, there may have been several (possibly different) affixes, or even an entire affix system: *t-, *ta-, *taR-, *taRā-, *tara-, all of which may have been etymologically related. One might propose that forms analyzable with a prefix *tara- are a combination of a prefix *ta- + the infix *<ar>. The central Philippine evidence (e.g., Aklanon tag-) along with Malay ter- rather clearly points to a Western Austronesian *taR-, which could be *ta- + *R- DURATIVE VERB, much like *maR- may have been *ma- + *R-. The widespread central Philippine prefix taga- ‘hailing from’ (Tagalog, Aklanon, Cebuano, etc.), e.g., tagaMaynila? ‘native of Manila,’ tagaBisáya? ‘Bisayan,’ may further derive from *ta- + *R- + *a- PROGRESSIVE, IMPERFECTIVE. There is also, for example, the derivation of Rukai locative and/or time nouns, e.g., takanian ‘eating place = table’ or tatubian ‘crying place or time,’ (Li 1973:292), which is reminiscent of the Aklanon and Tagalog season marker tag-. Since most dialects of Rukai have lost PAN *R (i.e., *R > zero) it could be further evidence for *taR- in that function, or ambiguously for a separate (reduced) prefix *ta-. The latter appears to be contained in a widespread reconstruction such as PAN *talikūd ‘turn one’s back on’ > Aklanon, Tagalog talikód ‘turn one’s back to,’ Fijian talikura ‘warm oneself by the fire,’ (Dempwolff 1938:96) Kanakanabu t<ar>a?iku/iiku ‘look back,’ Paiwan tjailukuz ‘more to the rear.’ This same prefix appears to be frozen on several Aklanon verbs, e.g., takuróng ‘put a crown on,’ takilíd ‘turn the side to,’ talíwan ‘pass by, go by,’ talibág ‘be out of order’ (Zorc and de la Cruz 1968:115).

Considerably more problematic is the kinship prefix PAN *t-, found on etymologies such as PAN *tama ‘father’ > Fijian tama, Tongan tama/?, Samoan tama; Futuna tama/na, Bunun tama?, Takituduh tamah, Saisiyat tamesh [ref], PAN*tina ‘mother’ > Malay be/tina ‘mother animal,’ Fijian, Samoan tina, Tongan tsina, Futuna tsina/na, Takituduh tináh, Saisiyat tineh [ref], PMP *tumpu ‘ancestor, forebear,’ PMP *tu[h]aji ‘younger sibling.’ If at all related, it could be the result of syncope, or it could also be a reshaping of *ta- to a single consonant kin-term marker. In a society where paternal uncles and maternal aunts took on the responsibility of raising orphaned relatives, the application of (currently relevant) mother or father is not far-fetched.

To return to my overview of language, Aklanon tag- and PAN *taR- are (and were) extra-systemic morphemes, and, as such have “slipped through the cracks.” Thus far there is only a small amount of serious evidence for the reconstruction of an elusive PAN affix, *taR-. However, fuller details of the morphology of Austronesian languages are slowly coming to light. I hope to have explained its rather limited function in Aklanon and trust this will spur similar studies. Evidence for this affix could be lurking throughout the family.
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONTIN</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td>PAN</td>
<td>Proto-Austronesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definite</td>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>dependent tense</td>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>Proto-Malayo-Polynesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future tense</td>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative mood</td>
<td>PROGRES</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
<td>ref</td>
<td>referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>RES</td>
<td>resultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
<td>PRX</td>
<td>proximate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>object</td>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1

Table 1. Language systems or levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple Term</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Abstraction</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sound</td>
<td>phonology</td>
<td>phone</td>
<td>/p/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word building</td>
<td>morphology</td>
<td>morpheme</td>
<td>re-, un-, -ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammar</td>
<td>syntax</td>
<td>grammon, part of speech</td>
<td>noun, verb, word order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexicon</td>
<td>lexicography</td>
<td>lexeme, word</td>
<td>&quot;gander&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaning</td>
<td>semantics</td>
<td>sememe</td>
<td>{male + goose}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discourse</td>
<td>pragmatics</td>
<td>texteme</td>
<td>he did ( = John ate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture</td>
<td>ethnology</td>
<td>ethneme</td>
<td>body language; rude vs. polite speech levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: There are mixtures of levels, e.g.,

MORPHOPHONEME - wives = wayFS, different from fifes and hives

ETHNOPHONEME - the click sounds of English (e.g., tsk to express disapproval)

ETHNOSEMEME - the vulgar connotation of some words disallows their use in polite society or mixed company, yet scientific synonyms are acceptable.
Table 2. Aklanon verb conjugation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Progres.</th>
<th>Contin.</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Command</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual</td>
<td>-um-</td>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>-um-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>#- (zero)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durative</td>
<td>nag-</td>
<td>naga-</td>
<td>mag-</td>
<td>maga-</td>
<td>pag-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>naN-</td>
<td>nagapaN-</td>
<td>maN-</td>
<td>magapaN-</td>
<td>magpaN-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>naka-</td>
<td>naka-</td>
<td>maka-</td>
<td>maka-</td>
<td>[none]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Passive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual</td>
<td>-in-</td>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durative</td>
<td>gin-</td>
<td>gina-</td>
<td>pag-</td>
<td>paga-</td>
<td>pag- -a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>ginpaN-</td>
<td>ginapaN-</td>
<td>paN-</td>
<td>paN-</td>
<td>paN- -un</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>na-</td>
<td>na-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>[none]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual</td>
<td>-in-</td>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>-án</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durative</td>
<td>gin-</td>
<td>gina-</td>
<td>ig-</td>
<td>iga-</td>
<td>i(pag)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>ginpaN-</td>
<td>ginapaN-</td>
<td>ipaN-</td>
<td>ipaN-</td>
<td>ipaN-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>nai-</td>
<td>nai-</td>
<td>mai-</td>
<td>mai-</td>
<td>[none]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(alternate)</td>
<td>kina-</td>
<td>kina-</td>
<td>ika-</td>
<td>ika-</td>
<td>[none]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Passive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual</td>
<td>-in- -an</td>
<td>[none]</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durative</td>
<td>gin- -an</td>
<td>gina- -an</td>
<td>pag- -an</td>
<td>paga- -an</td>
<td>pag- -i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>ginpaN- -an</td>
<td>ginapaN- -an</td>
<td>paN- -an</td>
<td>paN- -an</td>
<td>paN- -i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential</td>
<td>na- -an</td>
<td>na- -an</td>
<td>ma- -an</td>
<td>ma- -an</td>
<td>[none]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction

A major feature of the Philippine language situation is its diversity. The Filipino bilingual lives in a multilingual & multicultural environment. The Filipino bilingual of today possesses a strong national identity but needs to seek to render it more functional for the purposes of national well-being in the modern world. Filipino rather than English can better serve as a medium to express the Filipino’s cultural traditions, values, beliefs, and national aspirations. However, there are certain sociolinguistic realities that challenge the Filipino bilingual. One is that it is through bilingual education, that we can hope to equip the Filipino bilingual such that he/she will be better prepared to examine the nature of change in this modern world, including its speech and dimensions, and also to enable him/her to understand better the distinctions that must be made between change in the past and that which is on-going. His/her competence in English will equip him/her to handle modern technological developments and to keep up with the rapidity of technological change. The role of English may be diminishing on the national level, but certainly for globalization and information technology, it is the language of wider communication in the international level.

This paper will present the profile of the Filipino bilingual in terms of identity, sociolinguistic competence including language use, attitudes, motivations, and proficiency within a multilingual and multicultural setting.

2. Language Attitudes and Motivations

Most of the research on language learning motivation in the 70’s have indicated an instrumental motivation for learning English and an integrative one for learning Filipino (Otanes and Sibayan 1969, Feenstra and Castillo 1970, Gaston 1978, Bangalan 1979). Respondents want to study English to communicate better, to show that they are educated and to attain socio-economic success. They want to learn Filipino to show that they are nationalistic and to understand the Filipino cultural heritage. One interesting variation of the findings in Castillo’s study (1972) revealed that patterns may be instrumentally or integratively motivated or both in choosing English for their children. It is also noted that the desire to learn English does not necessarily mean an identification with Americans or their way of life, but rather with educated Filipinos.

With the implementation of the Bilingual Policy, a change in language learning motivations has been noted. College students, both Tagalogs and non-Tagalogs, are now instrumentally motivated to learn both Filipino and English. The use of Filipino as medium of instruction in certain subjects at all academic levels has perhaps instilled in the minds of the students the idea that Filipino has now become a tool for understanding and expressing ideas inside the classroom, and that learning this tool
and further sharpening it are necessary to be able to participate in classroom discussions (Pascasio 1979).

Motivation is a necessary factor for successfully acquiring a second language and is related to second language learning achievement (Castillo 1969, 1972) as well as to attitude (Samonte 1981). Birthplace or language background also influences the degree of motivation to learn a particular language. Understandably, non-Tagalogs have a stronger motivation to study Filipino than English, compared with Tagalogs (Pascasio 1979). On the other hand, Tagalogs do not show indication of a strong motivational intensity to further improve their Filipino, since they are already native speakers of it (Castillo and Chan-Yap 1977).

Social and political events seem to play a vital role in the changing attitude of the Filipino bilingual towards the different languages being used in his/her milieu. A trend seems to be noticeable in attitudes towards English, Filipino, and the local vernacular as media of instruction.

For instance, in the late sixties (Otanes and Sibayan 1969), the preference for English as the language of instruction at all academic levels—primary, secondary, and tertiary—was reported. The early seventies, marked by activism and nationalistic fervor among the youth, sparked a change among the younger generation (even the young elites as shown by the findings of an attitude survey (Castillo and Chan-Yap 1977) where there was a desire to replace English with Filipino as medium of instruction. However, the promulgation and implementation of the Bilingual Education Policy in 1974 led to another attitudinal direction. As a result of the problems and limitations encountered in actual classroom interactions, the college students, although supportive of the policy, do not favor the replacement of English with Filipino in those subjects where English was used as the language of instruction (Pascasio 1979). Parents of varied socio-economic classes and language background in Metro Manila prefer to limit the use of Filipino to the elementary level as medium of instruction. At the secondary and the tertiary levels, English is preferred as the medium of instruction. Interestingly, parents with higher educational attainment (at least ‘college graduate’) are more liberal in accepting Filipino as a language of instruction, while those with the least educational background trace the deterioration of education to the inclusion of Filipino as a medium of instruction in the schools (Cruz 1980).

Among non-Tagalog respondents residing in non-Tagalog speaking communities, the desire to maintain English and Filipino as languages of instruction but with certain concessions is indicated. There is a desire for Filipino and English as media of instruction for courses like law, medicine, etc. but for vocational courses, the local vernacular is preferred (Mendoza 1978). In a Chinese high school in Bacolod where the students are predominantly Chinese speakers who also speak the local vernacular (Hiligaynon), the use of English and Filipino as media of instruction is highly endorsed. Their teachers are the ones who are resistant to the use of Filipino as the medium of instruction in the subjects specified by the Bilingual Policy (Gaston 1977).

Proficiency affects attitude to both English and Filipino. Although both the fluent and the non-fluent speakers of English and Filipino exhibit positive attitude to English, those who are more proficient in English have stronger favorable attitude to English and Filipino than those who are less proficient. On the other hand, those who are less proficient in Filipino have stronger favorable attitude to English and Filipino than those who are more proficient. Among the non-Tagalogs, those who are not proficient in Filipino have favorable attitude to English and Filipino (Pascasio 1979).

Mass media exposure also influences attitude to both languages, English and Filipino. Those who watch Filipino and English TV programs have a more favorable attitude to Filipino than those who do not (Pascasio 1979).
In my recent research on College Freshmen attitudes toward Filipino and English before entering the Ateneo, they tended to have higher scores in the Filipino Language Proficiency Test (FLPT) scores. Just as well, students with less favorable attitudes toward English upon entering the Ateneo received higher FLPT scores. The two variables were related such that students who had favorable attitude toward Filipino tended to have less favorable attitude toward English (G= -.20, p<.05). Regression analysis shows, however, that having favorable attitudes toward Filipino (beta=.29 for reading and .35 for writing, p<.001) and having unfavorable attitudes toward English (beta= -.18 for reading and -.23 for writing, p<0.01) exercised independent effects on FLPT performance.

In another more recent study conducted by Fuentes and Mojica (1999) where the respondents come from outside of Metro Manila, the northern Luzon area, of lower and middle social class the findings are in general, the R’s attitude toward English more favorable than their attitude toward Filipino. When given the option to choose both English and Filipino as media of instruction, the majority showed a positive attitude toward the use of the two languages. Filipino should be used in certain subjects offered at the tertiary level. English should not be replaced by Filipino as medium of instruction. This indicated the R’s positive attitude toward bilingualism, regardless of their gender and socioeconomic status.

The responses also showed that the students felt more motivated to study English. One reason could be the fact that they were aware of the need to study the language for instrumental purposes. This supports the earlier studies. The R’s desire to use Filipino hand in hand with English must have been influenced by their spirit of nationalism and their awareness to maintain their identity as Filipino. Also this could be attributed to the rising popularity of Filipino in print and broadcast media. Another reason could be their thinking that Filipino facilitates their learning of concepts in certain subjects. This was supported by their claim that they exerted less effort and time when studying in Filipino. The over-all results seemed to favor the country’s aim of making the Philippines, a bilingual nation whose people can speak both the mother tongue and the second language with fluency. The findings of a 1998 study among the Cebuanos showed that some changes in the students’ attitudes have taken place. Their perceived proficiency in Filipino has greatly improved and their perceptions and attitudes towards Filipino and learning Filipino have become more positive. Majority are of the opinion that Filipino should be taught to all students as a subject in college (79%). The spread of Filipino to various domains other than formal education may have contributed to their acquisition of Filipino. It also appears that the Rs are relatively more motivated to study Filipino. As for their reasons for learning Filipino, the positive attitude to learning the language seem to stem from a sense of nationalism or an awareness of their historical and cultural heritage. The results of this study hint at the impact of the Bilingual Education Policy (Kobari 1999).

Furthermore, these findings have been supported as a result of the consultative forums conducted by the members of the Executive Board Committee on Language and Translation of the National Commission for Culture and the Arts (NCCA) as reported by Clemencia Espiritu in her paper (1999). The NCCA committee seems to have succeeded in convincing the Cebuanos that the regional language will not vanish with the growth of Filipino as a national language. The Cebuanos are now willing to be counted in the tremendous task of developing Filipino to make it the language of academic and other controlling domains such as government, judiciary, business, etc. Given the chance, all Filipinos, whatever their ethnolinguistic group wish to take part in building their country and also to co-exist in shaping their future.
3. Language Use and Socialization Patterns

DOMAIN and ROLE RELATIONSHIP are the significant variables that affect language use, as shown in most of the Philippine studies. The choice of language to use varies in context, and it is affected more by whether one is speaking to a parent, teacher, police officer, priest, friend or vendor rather than by whether one is discussing how to manage one’s finances or how to solve a family problem or whether one is arguing, requesting or complimenting.

The language surveys found the vernacular to dominate in the home, neighborhood and community. ‘Official talk’ in school was generally the domain of English, followed by Filipino. At the workplace, the vernacular was used with co-workers, while English, sometimes Filipino was used with the boss. In general for the work domain and other domains, the professionals and semi-professionals used more English and Filipino or the code-switching variety, using these two languages, while the non-professionals used more Filipino and the vernaculars and a little of English.

Language preference for both business and education placed English first, followed by Filipino and then by the vernacular.

In one of my earlier studies, the findings showed that Filipino bilinguals use English in school when interacting with people of higher status and talking about formal topics such as historical events or scientific concepts. At home when interacting with family members and in the community with peers and subordinates, the local vernacular or Filipino or code-switching variety is used for talking about informal topics.

In my recent research on what factors correlate with language proficiency in English and Filipino, the findings showed that there were significant differences. Nine variables correlated with the English reading proficiency. These are gender, birthplace, and I.Q. for the personal characteristics. For language use, the home with high status person and self talk correlated with English reading proficiency. Socioeconomic status in terms of social class position and household amenities were significant correlates. For media exposure, it is the print media. As for writing proficiency, there are four variables, namely: I.Q., birthplace, self talk, and print media. With regard to Filipino language reading proficiency, six correlates are statistically significant. These are language attitudes toward Filipino and English. The language use indicators are with high status persons and when praying. Socioeconomic status in terms of household amenities and for media exposure, it is the Filipino print. For Filipino language writing proficiency, seven correlates are statistically significant. These are household amenities, attitudes toward Filipino and English when conversing and praying.

Regarding media exposure, English and Filipino print are statistically significant. This study showed that LANGUAGE USE and POSITIVE ATTITUDE are important in achieving language proficiency.

Another interesting finding is that English is perceived to be the appropriate language for formal situations, while Filipino and the vernacular are for informal situations. The Filipino bilingual will continue to use his/her vernacular at home and in the neighborhood for his/her daily activities, to gain functional literacy, to preserve and enhance his/her cultural and literary heritage within his/her ethnic group. S/he will use Filipino, the national language, as the lingua franca for unity and national identity, as well as for education and government. He will maintain English as language for wider communication, for economic purposes, for global cooperation, and for international diplomacy.

Value orientations also affect language use besides social relationship. Since the Filipino bilingual is more status and person oriented, he/she stresses the values of social acceptance, smooth interpersonal relationship (SIR), segmentation and ranking. For
instance, a lower status person when requesting or asking a favor from one of higher status, he must go through a long feeler first before the request is made to avoid the embarrassment (hiya) in case it gets denied. In a correction or complaint pattern as well as negative comments or bad news, euphemisms, complimentary close or the use of a go-between are resorted to preserve smooth interrelationship and social acceptance. For the Filipino bilingual who is operating in a personalistic system he would rank the values of friendliness and ingroup loyalty higher as reflected in his/her use of the language whether Filipino or English.

4. Code Switching and Philippine Bilingualism

Code Switching is one of the by-products of Philippine bilingualism. It occurs mostly when speaking in informal situations. In my research where the respondents are bilingually competent in English and Filipino, they code-switch for a number of conversational functions among which are to establish rapport, to simplify or emphasize a message, to qualify or further explain a previous statement, to make inquiries as well as give information, instructions, or directions for verification or clarification, and to express politeness.

Participants who do a lot of code-switching are professionals, students, and employers although some employees code switch after their boss initiates the code-switching or when the topic of conversation is about a business report or a contract which is in English. In sports such as golf, tennis, or basketball, one finds code-switching occurring frequently because the English terms used in these games are retained. In schools most of the concepts learned especially at the tertiary level or postgraduate level are in English; but in the process of explaining or clarifying, a great deal of code switching from English to Filipino occurs. For instance, in the office when the boss calls the attention of his subordinate regarding some clarification of a business report submitted, code-switching in the discourse occurs, although the topic is in English. Another reason for code-switching is when the boss decides to ease the tension that may have arisen during a correction. The correction is conducted in English, but then the boss switches to Filipino to neutralize the tension during the correction when he asks about the welfare of the family. This switch to a personal topic indicates the boss’ concern for maintaining Smooth Interpersonal Relations (SIR) between him and his subordinate, just in case the latter interpreted the correction as a reprimand.

In the broadcast media Bautista’s study (1979) grouped the code-switching patterns into six categories: address forms and five specific acts—greetings, apologies, compliments, directives and probes. In Gonzalez’ study (1982) of stylistic underdifferentiation of written Philippine English of the mass media, his findings support my findings where he contends that the code-switching variety is used by well-educated Filipinos who have mastered both English (in its formal style) and Filipino (in its formal, informal, and familiar style) and that it is used in the mass media (spoken and written) for a very distinct purpose: to establish rapport with an audience and an atmosphere of informality, perhaps unconsciously excluding a native speaker of English who is familiar with only one code, and likewise perhaps, unconsciously establishing one’s credentials as a nationalist, albeit Westernized. It is now widely used in talk shows in the mass media and even in class, when the teacher wishes to establish his/her credentials as being “with it” and in order to “break the ice” in class.

In a recent study of Bautista where her data consist of e-mail messages, the Filipino bilingual resorts to code switching for it provides the easiest, fastest, most effective, or most colorful way of saying something, i.e. for communicative efficiency. The bilingual switches to the code that facilitates the best expression of
the content he/she has in mind, and the switching can involve a word or phrase, a pre-packaged idiom or expression, a clause, a sentence and therefore CS occurs intrasententially or intersententially. No one sociolinguistic variable stands out as the overriding factor determining code-switching. However, the research studies conducted have confirmed the importance of recognized setting, topic, role relationship and domain as interdependent factors in code-switching among Filipino bilinguals. Clearly, code switching among Filipino bilinguals carries social meaning, and can be accounted for, at least to a certain extent, in terms of social function. A mere knowledge of both languages is not enough. If two participants wish to interpret 'switched' sentences, a knowledge of grammar is not sufficient. It must be accompanied by shared knowledge and shared assumptions about the Filipino’s social life. Evidence has shown that code-switching among the Filipino bilinguals is not random but it is highly patterned.

5. Language and Identity

In my study of language and identity, the six set of factors related to national identity are: demographic factors, socioeconomic factors, R’s and parents language background, mass media exposure, and ethnic identity. These set of factors covered 36 separate variables.

Ethnic identity was measured according to instrumental and sentimental attachments instead of instrumental and integrative motivations. 95% of the R’s indicated the need of a national language to have national identity. However, sentimental attachments to the Filipino language are expressed in the language ability to express the Filipino bilingual’s needs, feelings, sentiments, and aspirations in perpetuating the cultural heritage; and in becoming an effective Filipino leader. In contrast, sentimental attachments to English are expressed in the ability of the language to impress others, to show status, to impose control/authority. Instrumental attachments also vary by language. Instrumental attachments to English lie in the way knowledge of English hastens material success, modernization, and advancement; serves as the primary link to the rest of the world; and increases one’s ability to think critically. On the other hand, instrumental attachments to Filipino are expressed as a means of national unity (69% of the Rs said that Filipino should be the official language of the country), as the medium of instruction in the lower grades and as a mode of communication to get things accomplished.

In the Philippine language situation, both sentimental and instrumental considerations are likely to reinforce one another. Filipino, the national language, draws both instrumental and sentimental attachments.

6. Personal Background Characteristics and National Identity

Six personal background characteristics were found to be significantly related to national identity, namely: sample site (residence of R), place of birth, religious affiliation, R’s employment status, mother’s employment status and type of high school. SAMPLE SITE appears to be a crucial determinant of national identity. It also appears that a different set of correlates of national identity may appear for each site. Thus what contributes to a strong sense of national identity may depend upon the community of origin, i.e. whether the community is Metro Manila based and predominantly Tagalog-speaking or one that is distant from Metro Manila and non-Tagalog speaking.
7. Language Background and National Identity

The relationship between national identity and language background has also been considered here. Language background covers several aspects: LANGUAGE SOCIALIZATION which includes L1 learned by the respondent and his/her spouse, parents and relatives; the language dominantly used at home and with peers, the extent Filipino is used at home and with peers, the extent Filipino is used for inner speaking, mass media exposure in English and Filipino, and language proficiency in English, Filipino, and the local vernacular.

8. Mass Media Exposure

Does exposure to mass media in English and Filipino contribute to a sense of national identity? High mass media exposure in English highly correlated with national identity. In contrast, there is no significant difference between exposure to mass media in Filipino and national identity.

9. Language Use and National Identity

Language use in three categories of situations: (a) domain (home, school, community), (b) role relationship (high status, peer, low), and (c) activity (conversing, asking requesting, persuading and arguing) findings show that regardless of situation, levels of language use are not associated with national identity. Except for school and high status addressee, national identity scores are higher for those who have higher levels of language use in Filipino. There were no statistically significant differences in national identity by generation. However, generational differences are more prominent in language use patterns.

Although studies in the Philippines have shown that language is an important factor in ethnic identification, there is no one-to-one relation between language and ethnicity. A person can shift his ethnic identity especially if he is multilingual; a parent can continue to think of himself as belonging to an ethnic group while allowing his children to shift to the dominant language of the community; the children can make claims to various identities (Gonzalez and Bautista 1986).

On the other hand, in Metro Manila, parents feel that the native or ethnic language is very important and should be the first language that should be learned by children. Parents with higher educational attainment tend to be more accepting of the ethnic language (Cruz 1980).

Sibayan and Segovia’s study 1984 shows that ethnic languages will be maintained and not abandoned, if one is to judge from the fact that speakers are proud to be identified with their native language. However, while the non-Tagalog have been proven to be identified with their native language, there is no guarantee that they will perpetuate it through their children. The prediction is that with the third generation of those who come to the Metro Manila area, the ethnic language will have been abandoned in favor of Filipino, the national language. Furthermore there is now an additive consciousness of the average Filipino that he is a member of a larger polity and nation, that in addition to being Ilocano, Bisayan, or Bicolano, he is also a Filipino.

10. Conclusion

The Filipino’s languages are thus in complementary distribution and will remain so for a while. For as long as he does not uproot himself from his origin, then his local
vernacular is assured of its place and its domain. He loses this vernacular only in the process of de-ethnicization that inevitably follows migration and urbanization. His use of Filipino, the national language (as mandated by the 1987 Constitution), will serve not only as a vehicle for achieving the goal of national identity and unity but also for facilitating communication and understanding as well as promoting the Filipino people’s collective participation in nation building. His competence in English will be maintained for as long as economic and social mobility, more opportunities for pursuing higher and better quality of education, more involvement in international affairs, are perceived as advantages and as long as rewards are assured.

The maintenance of English is not incompatible with a genuinely nationalistic bilingual education in the Philippines.

There is a need, therefore, to frame an appropriate language policy which can materially assist in social and national integration and economic upliftment of Filipinos as members of Philippine society and maintaining a balance between internal needs and external necessities in the modern world.
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PART THREE:

THE LEXICON
The Angry Register of the Bikol Languages
of the Philippines

Jason William Lobel
University of Hawai‘i

This paper offers an overview of the angry speech register in three of the languages of the Bikol Region of the Philippines, including its usage, its historical development and reconstructibility, and the processes by which its forms were derived.

1. Register and Bikol

Register, or speech register, refers to “situationally-defined varieties” of a language (Biber 1995:7), as opposed to dialects, which are defined by geographical areas or social groups of speakers. Biber (ibid.) quotes both Ure and Ferguson in his Dimensions of Register Variation: “The register of a language comprises the range of social situations recognized and controlled by its speakers-situations for which appropriate patterns are available (Ure 1982:5). Register variation is the linguistic difference that correlates with different occasions of use (Ferguson 1994:16).” In the case of the Bikol languages, one of these “social situations” or “occasions of use” is the situation of being angry.

A considerable amount of work has been done about register in English, and work has also been done on other languages like Korean and Somali (Biber 1995). However, little if any literature is readily available on the kind of speech register that concerns us here, i.e., a speech register defined by the speaker’s emotional state.

This rather peculiar feature of the languages of the Bikol Region-absent from their closest relatives like Tagalog and Cebuano-consists of a parallel strata of synonyms for over 100 nouns, verbs, and modifiers, a sample of which is illustrated in Table 1 below.

---

1 I am honored to have this opportunity to dedicate this article to Dr. Laurie Reid, whose contribution to our knowledge of Philippine languages and cultures has set a standard that future generations can only hope to achieve. Many thanks are due to the following people for their invaluable help in the writing of this paper: Grace Bucad Lobel, Manay Glen Newhall, Esting Jacob, Cheryl Mercado, Michelle B. Bigueja, and Dr. Dominga Portugal, who provided data; Dr. R. David Zorc, Dr. Hsiu-chuan Liao, Dr. Carl Rubino, and Chris Sundita, who provided helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

2 This usage of “register” should not be confused with the completely different usage for many Mon-Khmer languages and even Austronesian languages like Western Cham, in which “voice register” or just “register” is used to describe phonemic differences in vowel pitch, breathiness, and tongue height (cf. Headley 1991 and Gregerson 1976, among others).

3 See Appendix 1 at the end of this paper for a full list of meanings that are represented in the angry register.
Table 1. Some angry words and their normal register equivalents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Naga</th>
<th>Nabua</th>
<th>Buhi</th>
<th>Bulan</th>
<th>Old Bikol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'cat'</td>
<td>(normal) ikós</td>
<td>opós</td>
<td>ongaw</td>
<td>kutíng</td>
<td>ikós⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(angry) kurasmág</td>
<td>kurasmág</td>
<td>kurasmág</td>
<td>kusmág</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'dog'</td>
<td>(normal) áyam</td>
<td>ayám</td>
<td>áyam</td>
<td>áyam</td>
<td>áyam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(angry) damayô</td>
<td>dayô</td>
<td>dayô</td>
<td>asbû</td>
<td>ngarabngáb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'eat'</td>
<td>(normal) kakán</td>
<td>kaón</td>
<td>kaín</td>
<td>káon</td>
<td>kakán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(angry) hablô</td>
<td>ablô</td>
<td>ablô</td>
<td>lamon</td>
<td>sóngay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gutôk</td>
<td>amîl</td>
<td>amîl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>habháb</td>
<td>abô</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'hungry'</td>
<td>(normal) gútom</td>
<td>alóp</td>
<td>ponáw</td>
<td>gútom</td>
<td>gútom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(angry) guslôk</td>
<td>gulsôk</td>
<td>gôlsîk</td>
<td>guslôk</td>
<td>golsôk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gustôk</td>
<td></td>
<td>gotôk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'woman'</td>
<td>(normal) babáye</td>
<td>babayî</td>
<td>babayî</td>
<td>babáye</td>
<td>babáye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(angry) babaknít</td>
<td>babaknît</td>
<td>babaknît</td>
<td>babaknît</td>
<td>babaknît</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>siknît</td>
<td>siknît</td>
<td>siknît</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*these two forms are from the dialect of Sorsogon town, not Bulan

---

4 To avoid confusion and facilitate reading, the spellings of Old Bikol entries have been regularized to follow modern Bikol spelling. However, I have not altered the spellings of the graphemes <a, e, i, o, u> when used to represent vowel phonemes, even though Lisboa uses both <e> and <i> to represent /i/ and both <o> and <u> to represent <u>.

5 Following a convention used by many Philippine linguists, a circumflex accent mark on an orthographically word-final vowel indicates the combination of final syllable stress and a word-final glottal stop; a grave accent mark on an orthographically word-final vowel indicates a word-final glottal stop without final syllable stress; and a hyphen is used to indicate a glottal stop before or after another consonant. Furthermore, the orthographic vowel <ә> represents an unrounded high central vowel /i/ with both tense and lax allophones.
As can be observed in Table 1, the angry register forms are not generally predictable from the normal register forms, although there may at times be a slight resemblance between the two. Indeed, they would be incomprehensible to a nonnative speaker who had only learned the normal register of the language.

Although previously mentioned in passing in other publications, Mintz (1991) was the first to publish a description of this angry register. Mintz (1991) concentrates on the Northern Bikol language, covering both the modern language and the 17th-century Old Bikol recorded in Lisboa (1865). Mintz (1991:231) describes “about fifty words used only in anger”, only thirty of which are from modern Bikol. It is notable that Mintz (ibid.) does not acknowledge a difference between modern Bikol and Old Bikol, simply marking “words which are no longer current” (232) with the code [MDL]. However, current research on the structure of Old Bikol (Lobel 2004 and forthcoming) justifies the positing of a sharper distinction between the modern language and that of Lisboa’s time (i.e., around 1610). Furthermore, the present study includes 114 meanings as compared to the “about fifty” reported in Mintz (1991:231). Similarly, while Mintz (ibid.) concentrates only on the Northern Bikol language, data for the present study has been collected from native speakers of three Bikol languages: (i) Northern Bikol as spoken in Naga City,6 the variety used in Lisboa (1865) and Mintz and Britanico (1985); (ii) the Rinconada dialect of Southern Bikol as spoken in the municipality of Nabua, Camarines Sur, closely related to Buhi-non as illustrated in Portugal (2000); and (iii) the Southern Sorsoganon dialect of Sorsoganon-Masbateño, as spoken in the town of Bulan. Due to my lack of access to speakers, no data from a fourth Bikol language, the remote Northern Catanduanes Bikol, will be included in this paper.

Besides Mintz (1991), only three publications have made even a passing mention of this angry register. Fr. Marcos de Lisboa’s (1865) Vocabulario de la Lengua Bicol, a Bikol-Spanish dictionary compiled around 1610 but first published in 1754 (Danílo Gerona, pers.comm.), contains at least 47 entries described by Lisboa with notes like hablando con enojo ‘speaking with anger’. Mintz and Britanico’s (1985) Bikol-English Dictionary mentions in at least 36 entries that the given word is “said in anger”. Most recently, Portugal’s (2000) Buhi Dialect (Boîn “n) cites 108 forms in Buhi-non (a Southern Bikol dialect) covering 71 meanings in a section entitled “synonyms”, marking the angry words with an asterisk and explaining that they are “substandard forms, vulgar or lacking in refinement, spoken in anger or in a cursing manner.” (78)

This angry register is not only an apparent oddity among the languages of the world, but also an object of curiosity among Bikol speakers themselves. This curiosity is reflected by the fact that a number of Bikolanos have asked me as a linguist why words in their language like ngúsò ‘face’ and ikós ‘cat’ change into ngurápak and kurasmág, respectively, when the speaker is angry.

1.1 A note on LISBOA (1865)

Lisboa (1865) presents a glimpse of the Northern Bikol language as spoken at the beginning of the 1600s. As Lisboa was stationed in modern-day Naga City, this “Old Bikol” — referred to as such because it represents the oldest written record of the Bikol language — is the direct ancestor of the Naga dialect of Northern Bikol, and not directly ancestral to any of the other three Bikol languages. Most importantly, however, Lisboa’s rare dictionary reinforces comparative evidence (and on occasion contributes to it) with

---

first-hand documentation that an angry register existed in the Northern Bikol language at least four centuries ago. Specifically, the Vocabulario contains at least 47 entries whose definitions include notes like ‘cuando hablan con enojo’ ‘when they speak with anger’ and ‘dicen cuando están enojados’ ‘spoken when they are angry’. The following is a typical angry-register entry in Lisboa:

**ASQUET.** pc. Llaman así al muchacho cuando están enojados, lo mismo que aquí; ut, Alodo yca yning asquet na yni, ő que ruido hace este muchacho. (1865:54)

(ASKÉT. What they call a child when they are angry, the same as akì. Alodoy kaining asket na ini. ‘How noisy this child is!’)

The above entry illustrates the general format of the angry register entries in Lisboa’s Vocabulario. First, the root word (in the above example, asquet /askít/ ‘child, said in anger’) is given, along with an abbreviation indicating the placement of stress (“pp.” indicating penult stress, or “pc.” indicating ultima stress), followed by the definition, including the note that the word is used in anger, noting its synonym in the normal register (in the above example, aquí /áki?/ ‘child’), often supplemented by a sentence example and its translation. Sentences (1)–(4) below, from Lisboa (1865), are representative of Old Bikol utterances in the angry register, with angry register words in boldface.

(1) Kiisáy na **dayô** iní? (p. 113)
who.OBL LIG domestic.animal this.NOM

‘Whose pet is this?’

(2) Kiisáy na **ngarabngáb** iní? (p. 153)
who.OBL LIG dog this.NOM

‘Whose dog is this?’

(3) Hahaén an kakánon digdí tigbák na
where NOM food here.OBL dead LIG
akón gostók? (p. 149)
1SG.OBL.LIG hungry

‘Where is the food here? I’m dying of hunger.’

(4) Kaisáy na **dungháb** ining kiminagát
who.PL.OBL LIG animal this.LIG bite<AF.PAST>
ninsi sakóng manók? (p. 129)
GEN.REF 1SG.OBL.LIG chicken

‘Whose animal is it that bit my chicken?’

As we will see in Section 1.3, these angry register sentences are identical in all respects to normal register sentences except for the substitution of applicable angry register words for certain normal register words.

### 1.2 The angry register in context

The usage of this register does not require the use of curse words or other vulgarities, although such curse words and vulgarities do exist and may be used
independently of this register. In general, however, lexical items from the normal register are simply replaced by synonymous words from the angry register, and the sentences remain syntactically and morphologically identical to normal register sentences. Examples (5)–(8) below, in the Nabua dialect of Rinconada (Southern Bikol), illustrate the similarity in syntax between normal register sentences and synonymous sentences in the angry register. Notice that the grammatical words, affixes, and many other elements remain the same, and the angry register words (in bold type) simply replace their synonyms from the normal register.

(5) Normal: Inomón mo tubíg.  
Angry: \{Lablabón\} mo katbág.  
\{Til-abón\} drink.OF-INF 2SG.GEN water

‘Drink the water!’

(6) Normal: Isáy nagkaón ku manók ko?  
Angry: Isáy naggutók ku maltók ko?  
who AF.PAST.eat GEN chicken 1SG.GEN

‘Who ate my chicken?’

(7) Normal: Dî iká magtangís tá sampalingon  
Angry: Dî iká magngakngák tá \{sapuyugón\} \{dumpawón\}  
NEG 2SG.NOM AF.INF.cry or spank.OF.INF

tá’ka.  
tá’ka.  
1SG.GEN + 2SG.NOM

‘Don’t cry or I’ll spank you (sg.!)’

Angry: Matusmág ná ‘ka ta gabsók na.  
AF.INF.sleep now 2SG.NOM because night now

‘Go to sleep; it’s getting late!’

Examples (5)–(8) also illustrate the morphological similarity of the normal register and angry register words. The angry words behave the same as the normal register words, including taking the same affixes for verbal focus and aspect. Table 2 compares the affixed aspect forms of the normal words and angry words for ‘eat’ in the Naga dialect of Northern Bikol, and the Rinconada and Buhi-non dialects of Southern Bikol.
Table 2. Conjugations of ‘to eat’ in the normal and angry registers of three Bikol languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Northern Bikol (Naga)</th>
<th>Southern Bikol (Buhi-non)</th>
<th>Southern Bikol (Rinconada)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Root</td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>kakán</td>
<td>kaṣín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>angry</td>
<td>hablô</td>
<td>ablô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>magkakán</td>
<td>magkaṣín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>angry</td>
<td>maghablô</td>
<td>mag-ablô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>nagkakán</td>
<td>nagkaṣín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>angry</td>
<td>naghablô</td>
<td>nag-ablô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>nagkakakán</td>
<td>nagikaṣín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>angry</td>
<td>naghabablô</td>
<td>nagiaablô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>mákakán</td>
<td>miablô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>angry</td>
<td>máhablô</td>
<td>miablô</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, the angry register is generally used only among same-age speakers or by older speakers to younger listeners, as usage by younger speakers in addressing their elders would constitute great disrespect. On occasion, the angry register is used in sarcasm or humor, but the majority of its usage is in anger.

2. On the Historical Development of the Angry Register

It is unclear whether the angry register of the Bikol languages is an innovation unique to these languages or a retention from Proto Central Philippine (PCPh). Lisboa’s (1865) documentation of the Old Bikol angry register is proof that it was a part of the Northern Bikol language at least 400 years ago. However, far from being a recent introduction in 1610, it appears on the basis of comparative evidence that this register was present in Proto-Bikol, and at least 33 forms (as in 9–41) can be reconstructed at this level:

(9) *alimanták ‘head (angry)’ > Nab, Buh, Bln alimanták, Buh alinták
(10) *babakit ‘woman (angry)’ > Nag, Nab, Buh, Bln babaknit (probably from PCPh *baknit, note Akl bágnit ‘woman (slang)’)
(11) *dayśi ‘domesticated animal (angry)’ > OBik dayô ‘domesticated animal (angry)’, Nag, Nab dayô, Buh dayś ~ damayś, Nag damayô ‘dog (angry)’
(12) *dunág ‘rain (angry)’ > Nag, Nab, Buh dunág
(13) *gabsók ‘night (angry)’ > Nag, Nab, Bln gabsók, Buh gabsok, Nab labsók
(14) *gadyáñ ‘carabao (angry)’ > Nag, Nab, Buh gadyáñ (also OBik, Tag ‘elephant’; originally a loan from Malay)
Yet in spite of the above 33 reconstructions, interviews with speakers of a dozen Central and Northern Philippine languages — including Tagalog, Cebuano,
Kapampangan, and Ilokano — have failed to find any such register in any of these languages.7 A considerable amount of materials on Philippine languages, and Austronesian linguistics in general, have also been consulted, and not even a passing mention of such a register in any other language has been found. Coupled with the fact that written records of Philippine languages are non-existent prior to the late 1500s, we can say that there is currently no available evidence supporting reconstruction of this angry register for even Proto Central Philippine. Dr. R. David Zorc (pers. comm.) concurs, conjecturing that this angry register is “an areal feature” and “an innovation within the language family.” Only further research will reveal whether or not other related languages have such a register, and if so, whether its forms will allow us to unambiguously reconstruct angry register lexicon for an earlier proto-language.

3. Derivation of Angry Lexicon

While we cannot answer the question of where and when the angry register developed, we can attempt to answer the question of how it developed. Even at first glance, a number of the angry register items look similar in some way to their normal-register synonyms. A more thorough analysis of these items reveals that many can be explained as either morphologically-derived coinages, semantic shift, register shift, or even combinations thereof. Considering that many of the normal lexical items have been reconstructed for proto-languages at various stages as far back as Proto-Austronesian, we can assume that the normal-register equivalents predate their angry counterparts. Thus, our task becomes how to explain the derivation of the angry words from the normal words. This section will explore the processes by which some of these words may have been derived.

3.1 Coinage by morphological processes

The proposition that much of the angry lexicon was derived via morphological processes is far from without justification in Austronesian languages. It has already been established that many words in Austronesian languages were formed by affixing, reduplicating, or combining monosyllabic roots or radicals (see Blust 1988, Zorc 1990, Nothofer 1991, and Potet 1995, among others). It has also been shown in French (1988) and Zorc and San Miguel (1997) that speakers of Central Philippine languages like Tagalog play word games in which they similarly affix, reduplicate, or combine already existing words. Zorc and San Miguel (1997:xvii) comment that such word games involve “the rearrangement of sounds” and “may involve dropping or adding sounds or syllables to words”, or metathesis, which “involves switching sounds within a word, either by the inversion of syllables or by a complex rearrangement of the letters”. Similar is a phenomenon described in Botne and Davis (2000:321):

In opposition to transposition games in which various constituents (usually syllables) are moved about in the word, insertion games disguise words by adding specified segments to the word at a fixed point. Such games fall into one of three types: syllable prefixing, syllable suffixing, or syllable infixing.

7 Carl Rubino (pers. comm.) reports eliciting two angry words from a Tausug informant, darahalan ‘meal’ and banglus ‘mouth’. Without further data, however, this remains but a tantalizing hint of what may or may not be a fuller register similar to that of Bikol, and is certainly in need of further research.
3.1.1 Infexion

One example of Botne and Davis's insertion in the angry register is the infixation of -s- into otherwise unmodified lexical items, e.g. Nag basdô ‘clothes (angry)’ < badô; Nag tasgo ‘hide (angry)’ < tago; and Nab gusbát ‘heavy (angry)’ < gubát. More complex infixation is found in Nab samarigwâl, Nab, Buh sarigwâl ‘pants (angry)’ < Nab sarwâl, Buh saruwâl ‘pants’. The most common infix in the angry register is -am-, which has been found in 12 angry words across three Bikol dialects:

(42) Nag damayô, Buh damayô ‘dog’ (< PBik *dayô?)
(43) Nag kamarig ‘pig’ (< orig)
(44) Buh lamagyông ‘umbrella’ (< lagyông < páyong)
(45) Buh lamaknit ‘clothes’ (unknown etymology)
(46) Nag lasmadók ‘vagina’ (unknown etymology)
(47) Nag lasmadô ‘priest’ (< ladsô < padô < Spn padre)
(48) Nag, Buh lasmasgâs ‘rice’ (< lasgâs < PBik *bogâs)
(49) Buh ramoksrâk ‘palay’ (< rôkrâk)
(50) Buh samagrák ‘money’ (< sagrák < pirâk, probably a loanword of Khmer origin)
(51) Nab samarigwâl ‘pants’ (< sarwâl < Persian)
(52) Nag, Nab, Buh samingkîl ‘foot’ (< OBik singkîl ‘to kick with the toes’)
(53) Nab samonsamón ‘gather’ (< sunsón)

3.1.2 Partial replacement

Additionally, many of the angry words appear to have been derived via a process that might best be described as “partial replacement”, or the replacement of part of an already existing word by a new phonological sequence, as in examples (54)–(58) from Rinconada.

(54) lasgâs ‘rice (angry)’ < bugâs ‘rice’
(55) loskid ‘mountain (angry)’ < bukid ‘mountain’
(56) babaknit ‘woman (angry)’ < babayî ‘woman’
(57) gabsók ‘night (angry)’ < gab-î ‘night’
(58) ngipngip ‘teeth (angry)’ < ngipôn ‘teeth’

Note that the replaced segment may be an initial syllable as in (54)–(55), or a final syllable as in (56)–(58), and as Zorc and San Miguel (1997:xv) note, although the coined angry word is based on the original non-angry word, “the new form is barely recognizable”.

Several of the angry register replacement syllables appear in two or more lexical items, and in three or even all four of the dialects surveyed. The following segments can be identified as occurring more than once in the data:
Replacement by full syllable reduplication, 5 occurrences
(59) Nag galgáł ‘gamble’ (< sugál < Spn jugar)
(60) Nab gumágà, Buh muga-gá ‘land’ (< ragá)\(^8\)
(61) Buh Ldláb ‘midnight’ (< lawád)
(62) Buh mágmág ‘wet’ (< sámág)
(63) Nab, Buh ngipngíp ‘tooth’ (< ngipón ~ ngipín)

-sók/-sók, 5 occurrences
(64) Nab, Bln gabsók, Nab labsók, Buh gabsók ‘night’ (< gab-í ~ ga-bí)
(65) Nag gulsók, Nab gulsók ‘hungry’ (< gutom)
(66) Nab malsók, Buh malsók, Bln matalsók ‘eye’ (< matá)
(67) Nab tapsók, Buh tapsók ~ oripsók ‘servant’ (< tabang, orípón)
(68) Nab tipsók, Buh tipsók ‘sleep’ (unknown etymology, but note also Nab tiplá ‘sleep (angry)’)

lás/-lus-, 4 occurrences
(69) Nag, Nab, Buh lusbót ‘hole; butt’ (< lubót)
(70) Nab luskíd ‘mountain’ (< bukid)
(71) Nag, Nab lasngóg, Buh lasngóg ‘deaf’ (< bungóg ~ bängóg)
(72) Nag lusrát ‘drunk’ (< burát)

las-, 3 occurrences
(73) Nag lasdí ~ lamasdí ‘priest’ (< padí)
(74) Nab, Buh lasgás, Nag, Buh lamasgás, Nag lasugas ‘rice’ (< Nag bagás, Nab bugás, Buh bagás < PBik *bagás)
(75) Nab lasrát, Nag lasngáw ~ lasngás ‘drunk’ (< burat, bangág)

-ltok, 3 occurrences
(76) Bln hultók ‘drunk’ (unknown etymology)
(77) Nab maltók, Buh galtók ‘chicken’ (< manók)
(78) Nab sultók ‘lamp’ (< suló)

In addition to the above segments which are found in more than one dialect of Bikol, the segment mil- is found in at least two words in the Buhi-non dialect only: milpis ‘skirt’ (< tapís ‘skirt’), and milbíg ‘water’ (< túbíg ‘water’).

---
\(^8\) Attribution of Rinc gumágà and Buh muga-gá to repetition of the final syllable of ragá is supported by (1) the retention of the glottal stop in medial position in the Buhi-non form, and (2) the obligatory lengthening of the penult in the Rinconada form to compensate for the reduction of the *?C cluster from earlier *ga?ga?. The frozen prefix mu- in the Buhi-non form appears to correspond to Rinc -um-. Note that the related Coastal Miraya dialect of Southern Bikol (spoken in Jovellar, Albay, and Donsol, Sorsogon) attests both an infinitive -um- infix and a future mu- prefix.
3.1.3 Phoneme replacement

Another method by which a few angry words were derived is the replacement of one phoneme, in particular the word-initial phoneme, a process found in three dialects although only in a handful of items.

(79) Buh bawag ‘call’ (< tawag, with /t/ > /b/)
(80) Nag layág ‘testicles’ (< bayág, with /b/ > /l/) (also note Ceb lagáy ‘testicles’)
(81) Nab lugtô ‘break’ (< bugtô, with /b/ > /l/)

Note that both (80) and (81) have replaced /b/ with /l/, but without additional similar examples, it is impossible to determine whether this was the result of a specific phonological rule or simply a coincidence.

3.1.4 Morphological processes in Old Bikol

A similar analysis can be made of the angry lexicon in Old Bikol. Four angry words in Lisboa (1865) were derived from their nonangry counterparts via partial replacement by (C)tok, as in (82)–(85):

(82) gostok ~ gotôk ‘hungry’ (< gutom + -(s)tok)
(83) sigtôk ‘fish’ (< sirâ + -(g)tok)
(84) tokrig ‘pig’ (< orig + tok-)
(85) wogtok ‘to have lost something’ (< warâ + -(g)tok)

Six Old Bikol angry words appear to have been derived from nonangry words via syllable reduplication, as in (86)–(90).

(86) kokô ‘earthenware cooking pot’ (< koron + R-)
(87) ngosngós ‘mouth’ (< ngusò + R-)
(88) rakrák ‘broken’ (cf. Bik rasák ‘the sound of breaking crockery’)
(89) yamyám ‘annoying’ (< oyam + R-)
(90) babá ‘broken’ (cf. Bik gabá ‘destroyed’, Tag gibá, Hil, Ceb gubá ‘broken; destroyed’, War rubá ‘broken’, War gubá ‘destroyed’)
(91) rírit ‘broken’ (cf. Bik barí ‘to break, as a bone’)

Four additional forms with repeating syllables existed in Old Bikol, but unlike (86)–(91), these do not resemble any known nonangry Bikol root:

(92) balbdí ‘to steal’ (cf. Ceb, War bála ‘carry on shoulder’)
(93) gadgád ‘pull something off with force’ (possibly < guyód ‘pull, drag’, gudgód ‘drag’; cf. Ilk guyód ‘pull’, Hil, Ceb guyód ‘drag’)
(94) pospos ‘bolo knife’ (cf. Bik, Hil, Ceb, War puspós ‘heavy stroke’)
(95) tibtíb ‘bolo knife’ (cf. Tag tibtíb ‘sugarcane tip used for planting’)

3.2 Semantic shift

In addition to the items that have been derived morphologically from preexisting words, a large number of the angry register vocabulary are the result of semantic shift

---

9 The occurrence of a /g/ reflex for the PPh *D of *waDa[ ], however uncommon, is not unique. Note Tag hagkán “kiss (s.o.)” < *halikán < PPh *haDek + -an ‘location focus suffix’.
or register shift with some generalization of the meaning. Some exist in both angry and nonangry meanings in the same dialect, in which case the angry register usage can be attributed to a register shift accompanied by a semantic shift, e.g. Nag ụgbón ‘child, said in anger’ < ụgbón ‘offspring of animal like pigs’, Nag damulág ‘big, said in anger’ < damulág ‘water buffalo’.

Others are traceable to a nonangry word in Old Bikol but have angry register usage in modern Bikol dialects, such as items (96)–(100).

(96)  
Nag, Buh tí-lab, Nab tíl-ab ‘drink, said in anger’ < OBik tilháb ‘great thirst, as if rabid’

(97)  
Nag hablò, Nab, Buh ablò ‘eat, said in anger’ < OBik hablò ‘swallow whole without eating’

(98)  
Nag, Nab, Buh, Bln sibá ‘eat, said in anger’ < OBik sibá ‘to catch and carry in jaws like a crocodile’

(99)  
Nag, Nab lumpát ‘jump, said in anger’ < OBik lumpát ‘for a fish to jump into the water’

(100)  
Nab, Buh kolbó ‘run, said in anger’ < OBik kolbó ‘to take flight (said of some types of birds)’

Still others exist in the angry register of one Bikol language or dialect but in the normal register of another Bikol language or dialect, like (101)–(104). This may indicate some past register shift, probably from the normal register to the angry register. As in items (96)–(100), there is a shift from a specialized meaning to a more generalized one.

(101)  
Nab, Buh amíl ‘eat, said in anger’, Nag hamíl ‘to swallow something that has not been completely chewed’

(102)  
Nab ungós, Buh ingós ‘mouth, said in anger’, Nag ungós ‘the snout or nose of animals’

(103)  
Nag baktín ‘pig, said in anger’, Rinc baktín ‘pig’

(104)  
Nag sikí ‘foot, said in anger’, Rinc sikí ‘foot’ (cf. OBik sikí ‘the feet or hands of livestock’)

Finally, some angry words in the Bikol languages like (105)–(107) have possible cognates in other Central Philippine languages.

(105)  
Nag, Buh gadyâ ‘animal’, OTag, OBik gadyá ‘elephant’

(106)  
Nag, Buh, Bln kuspád ‘lice’, cf. Ceb kuspág ‘for the hair to be in disarray’ and Ceb kuslád ‘host of lice and nits’

(107)  
Nag, Nab, Buh, Bln kamulmóg ‘hand’, cf. Tag bulbóg ‘to bruise’, Tag bugbóg ‘pounding; a very hard blow’

At least one lexical item, Nag, Nab, Buh siknít ‘woman’, appears to be an innovation, although the related babaknít which exists in the same Bikol dialects points to two possibilities: 1) the preexistence of the innovation siknít from which babaknít was coined, or 2) the preexistence of babaknít from which siknít was coined via syllable replacement. It is noteworthy that Aklanon slang has bagnít ‘woman’, which is possible evidence for a Proto-Central Philippine *baknít from which the forms in Bikol and Aklanon derive.

A final word deserves special mention, Nab, Buh bogtô ‘sibling’, which parallels the Tagalog kapatíd in that both Rinc, Buh bogtô and Tag patíd mean ‘split off, broken’
and both root words are prefixed with *ka*- to produce the meaning ‘sibling’. Yet while the derivational process and underlying semantics are the same, Rinc, Buh *kabogtô* is only used in the angry register, while its normal register equivalent is Rinc *ngood*, Buh *ipatngôd* ‘sibling’.

4. Conclusion

The data in this paper shows that an angry register exists in at least three of the languages of the Bikol Region, and existed in the Bikol language at least as far back as the opening decades of the 17th Century. While at present no similar register is known to exist in any other Philippine language, some of its forms have been shown to be reconstructible for Proto-Bikol, and it will be interesting to find out if such a register indeed exists in any other Philippine language. Also, the existence of angry register lexicon cognate with lexicon of other Central Philippine languages, if pointing to contact between these Central Philippine languages, may someday reveal the attitudes the early Bikolanos had towards their neighbors and even the possible sociolinguistic reasons for them.
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>1st person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>2nd person singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>Actor Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akl</td>
<td>Aklanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik</td>
<td>Northern Bikol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bln</td>
<td>Southern Sorsoganon dialect of Sorsoganon-Masbateño, as spoken in Bulan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buh</td>
<td>Buhi-non dialect of Southern Bikol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceb</td>
<td>Cebuano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genitive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hil</td>
<td>Hiligaynon/Ilonggo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inf</td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>dialect of Libon, Albay (Southern Bikol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lig</td>
<td>Ligature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>Nominative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nab</td>
<td>Rinconada dialect of Southern Bikol as spoken in Nabua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nag</td>
<td>Northern Bikol as spoken in Naga City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Oblique case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBik</td>
<td>Old Bikol, as recorded in Lisboa (1865)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of</td>
<td>Object Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTag</td>
<td>Old Tagalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBik</td>
<td>Proto Bikol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCPh</td>
<td>Proto Central Philippine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-</td>
<td>Reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rinc</td>
<td>Rinconada dialect of Southern Bikol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sor</td>
<td>Central Sorsoganon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spn</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>Waray-Waray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 1

**Table 3.** The 114 meanings represented in the angry register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>animal</th>
<th>fish</th>
<th>pants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td>flow</td>
<td>pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bite</td>
<td>fold</td>
<td>pinch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blind</td>
<td>food</td>
<td>plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bolo</td>
<td>foot</td>
<td>priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>box/punch (v.)</td>
<td>force</td>
<td>rain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>break</td>
<td>frowning</td>
<td>rice, husked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burn</td>
<td>full</td>
<td>rice, unhusked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bury</td>
<td>gamble</td>
<td>run</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butt/anus; hole</td>
<td>gather</td>
<td>saliva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>call</td>
<td>get</td>
<td>salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carabao</td>
<td>go down</td>
<td>scrotum; testicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>careless</td>
<td>gossip</td>
<td>search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cat</td>
<td>greedy</td>
<td>see/watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chew</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chicken</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>shoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>horse</td>
<td>shout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chop</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>sibling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clothes</td>
<td>hungry</td>
<td>skirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cough</td>
<td>jump</td>
<td>sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crumple</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td>slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crush</td>
<td>lame</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cry</td>
<td>lamp</td>
<td>spank/slap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cut</td>
<td>land</td>
<td>steal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deaf</td>
<td>laugh</td>
<td>stomach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destroy</td>
<td>lazy</td>
<td>stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dirty</td>
<td>lice</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dog</td>
<td>lie down</td>
<td>talkative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drink</td>
<td>look</td>
<td>tear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drive away</td>
<td>midnight</td>
<td>teeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drunk</td>
<td>money</td>
<td>throw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ear</td>
<td>mountain</td>
<td>umbrella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eat</td>
<td>mouth</td>
<td>vagina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eye</td>
<td>move</td>
<td>vulgar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>false</td>
<td>mucus</td>
<td>water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feed</td>
<td>mute</td>
<td>wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fight</td>
<td>night</td>
<td>whip/lash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fire</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>woman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Terms of Religious Adaptation: The Introduction of Christianity to the Bikol Region of the Philippines
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The early religion of the Philippines was to change dramatically with the arrival of the Spanish and the Catholic missionaries. From an animist religion where worship of ancestors played a central role and where the center of religious life was often a priestess, the Philippines was to be introduced to Catholicism and many of its people converted over a relatively short period of time. The missionaries of the Catholic religious orders in the Philippines did not preach in Spanish, nor did they expect their new converts to learn that language. The missionaries learned the local languages, albeit to varying degrees, and used these languages for religious instruction.

This paper looks at how the language of one of the regions, Bikol, was adapted to carry a Christian message. It looks at both the redefinition and extension of existing words, and the introduction of loan words from Spanish.

1. The Bikol Region

Bikol is a Philippine language spoken by approximately five million people on the island of Luzon, south of the Tagalog speaking areas around Manila. The six Bikol speaking provinces of the Philippines are Camarines Norte, Camarines Sur, Albay, Sorsogon, Catanduanes and Masbate.

The Spanish first arrived in the Bikol region on the island of Masbate in 1567 sailing from Leyte. There they discovered gold mines which were to bring them back to the island two years later (Gerona 1988:38).

A subsequent expedition left from Manila, crossed overland from Laguna to the Pacific coast of Luzon near Mauban, and then traveled by boat to what is now Camarines Norte, reaching the gold mines of Paracale in 1571.

From 1572 the Spanish began to spread their rule over the Bikol provinces, setting up the first permanent settlement in the Bikol River basin in Camarines Sur at Libon in 1573, and moving on to dominate the remaining Bikol provinces of Albay, Sorsogon and Catanduanes in 1574.

In 1579, Naga in the Bikol river basin was chosen as the Spanish headquarters and renamed Ciudad de Cáreres (Nueva Cáceres).

2. Arrival of the Religious Orders

The Spanish Crown and Catholic Church were interdependent. The Church had granted to the Spanish monarchs powers over administration of Church’s revenues and
the selection of ecclesiastical personnel in the Indies. In return the Crown undertook conversion of the newly subjugated peoples to Christianity (Phelan 1959:6).

On the return to Masbate in 1569, the leader of the Spanish expedition was accompanied by an Augustinian priest, Fray Alonso Jimenez. Early conversions and baptisms were made on the islands of Masbate, Ticao and Burias, and on the adjacent mainland of Luzon in what is now Sorsogon, Albay and Camarines Sur at Nabua (Colección de documentos inéditos 1864–1884:Tomo II, 213 as cited in Gerona 1988:39; Perez 1901:109 as cited in Gerona 1988:49).

The Franciscans arrived in the region in 1577 answering a request to send more priests to the region. Subsequent evangelization of the region was turned over to the Franciscans, the Augustinians retaining the area where they did their first baptisms on Masbate, Ticao and Burias.

In 1583 a policy called reducción ‘reduction’ was begun. Bikolanos, who lived in widely dispersed areas, were required to resettle in towns where their conversion to Christianity could be more closely monitored. Eleven villages were established, called doctrinas. From 1585 the development of these doctrinas began to increase as did conversions. By the end of the 16th century there were 50 Franciscan mission houses with 97 priests and 23 lay brothers (Gerona 1988:54; also Entrada 1895:10–13; Phelan 1959:46; Salazar 1588 in Blair & Robertson 1903–1909:Vol 7, 40–42; Blair & Robertson 1903–1909: Vol 10, 181 & 273).

3. The Encomienda System

The encomienda system was a system of rewards given by the Spanish Crown to the colonizers of a new area. They were given an area of newly conquered territory, along with its inhabitants. In return for the labor and tributes of these people, the encomenderos were expected to protect them from outside aggression and instruct them in the Catholic faith, that is, teach them Catholic doctrine and administer the sacraments (Phelan 1959:10). Specifically this meant preparing them for baptism by teaching them the Pater Noster, the Ave Maria, the Credo and the Ten Commandments. This trust was often, however, violated and the priests found themselves stepping in as intermediaries to protect the people on these estates (Rada 1574 in Christianization 1965:347–349).

There were two types of encomiendas: royal, owned by the crown, and private, owned by individuals. The earliest encomiendas assigned on Luzon were in the Bikol region on the island of Masbate in February 1571. By 1593 there were 36 encomiendas in the region (Gerona 1988:60; also Loarca 1582: Chapter 4 in Blair & Robertson 1903–1909: Vol 5, 93–101). The encomienda system was abolished by the end of the 17th century.

4. Marcos de Lisboa & the Vocabulario de la lengue Bicol

Among the Franciscan friars to go to Bikol was Father Marcos de Lisboa who remained in the region from 1602 until 1611. During this time he compiled the Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol, probably the finest early dictionary of any Philippine language. The data for this paper come primarily from this dictionary.

Father Marcos de Lisboa was born in Lisbon and joined the Franciscan order in 1582 in Malacca. He was the Definidory Ministro of the Bikol town of Nabua in 1602, administrator of the town of Oas in 1605, and Vicario Provincial of the Province of Camarines from 1609 to 1611 (Platero 1880:53 as cited in Calleja-Reyes 1968:323). Lisboa remained in the Philippines until 1618 when he left for Mexico. He later
returned to Madrid in 1622. The date of his death is generally given as 1628. Mention is made of an unpublished work by Lisboa in an anonymous manuscript of 1649 (Entrada 1895:51). This is presumably his dictionary which remained unpublished until 1754.

Lisboa’s Vocabulario was intended for use by Spanish priests. In addition to traditional meanings, we begin to see new meanings added, primarily in example sentences, to enable priests to run Christian religious services and carry out conversions.

It is unclear whether Lisboa incorporated usage in example sentences which was already evident through 35 years of missionary activity when he arrived in the Bikol region, or whether he introduced to Bikol new usage for existing terms which he felt would be helpful to priests in carrying out their mission in the region. It is likely that the Vocabulario reflects both of these possibilities.

Some priests were fluent in Philippine languages. Others made do with the basic vocabulary of confession and the celebration of the mass. Some of the same sentences included in the Lisboa dictionary may have been included for use by just such priests.

New vocabulary is generally added in three ways: by giving completely new meanings to traditional words, by extending the meaning of traditional words, and by introducing loan words from another language. Bikol shows all of these changes, although Lisboa only has loan words in example sentences, not as headwords. These, however, later become accepted as Bikol words.

New vocabulary is often introduced when an existing word which might possibly be extended is too loaded with traditional meaning to serve a new purpose. For example, traditional words for altar and god were too closely associated with early religious beliefs to be comfortably adapted to Christianity. The general policy was, in fact, to introduce new vocabulary for Christian terms to avoid any association with earlier religions considered pagan (Ricard 1933:72–75 as cited in Phelan 1959:185).

Change did not end with Lisboa. Some of the terms used in unique ways by Lisboa continue to be used in modern Bikol. Other terms which he recorded or extended with new meanings have disappeared. Still others were introduced after Lisboa, many in the subsequent publication of the Doctrina Christiana (San Agustin 1647). Examples of all of these developments may be seen in this paper.

The paper begins with a brief discussion of the religious beliefs in the region when the Spanish arrived. Examined are ancestral spirits, religious leaders, rituals, and some of the supernatural creatures which were believed to inhabit the area. The paper then goes on to the introduction of Christianity. The concepts which are discussed, along with the vocabulary for such concepts, are baptism, communion and confession, sins and sinners, heaven, hell and the devil, exorcism and salvation, God, Christ, the saints and priests, death and resurrection, prayer, homage and supplication, sermons and religious teachings, the church and mass, religious observations and celebrations, altars and religious objects, and the construction and decoration of the church.

Entries which are found only in Lisboa’s Vocabulario are marked [MDL]. Entries in which the usage in Lisboa and modern usage are basically the same are marked [+MDL]. Those in which some part of the modern meaning is shared, but there is an additional component of meaning in Lisboa are also marked [+MDL: ] with the additional component of meaning shown after the colon. Other abbreviations used in the dictionary entries are as follows: s/t [something], s/o [someone], o/s [oneself] and (fig-) [figurative].

Stress is shown on all modern Bikol entries, and those entries from Lisboa where stress can be determined; for example, bunyág ‘baptism’. Where stress cannot be determined, words are shown with no stress marking; for example, bubob ‘rice flour’.
5. Early Religious Beliefs

What type of religion did the Spanish find when they arrived in the Bikol region at the end of the 16th century? Firstly they would have found that the various communities they encountered had women as their religious heads. These were called the *balyán* and it was to these leaders that the community turned for help and guidance during times of birth, illness or death. Assisting the *balyán* was the *asóg*, described as effeminate males imitating women in actions and dress, and not usually marrying. There was not just one *balyán* associated with a community, but as many as could claim to having religious and healing powers (Chirino 1969: Chapter 21).

The *balyán* would be called on to perform particular rituals if one were ill. These included general rituals such as *ulad* and *uli’*, and more specific rituals such as bathing the ill, called *tubas*, fanning them with a hand fan, called *paypáy*, squeezing the liquid of moistened lemon or lime leaves into their eyes, called *pusaw*, chanting over them, *tigay*, or treating them by touching them on the head with a chewed betel nut mixture, *hidhíd*. A person lying in a coma could be restored to consciousness by performance of the ritual called *sakóm*. Here the *balyán* called the soul which had escaped from the body and carried it back in *bánay* leaves (the topmost fronds of the *anahaw* palm) which she then shook over the body of the one who lay unconscious.

In death, all classes of society would also turn to the *balyán*. She could communicate with the dead through a ritual called *binangónan*. The time after death could be eased by the removal of any evil harbored in the body. This was done by the *balyán* using young citrus branches moistened in water to strike some article of gold removed from the body of the dead at the time of internment. Upon the death of a chief or other important person in the village, the *balyán* would be called upon to offer up a sacrifice so that the *aswáng* would not devour the entrails of the newly deceased. A favorite slave would be killed and his entrails offered to the *aswáng* in a ceremony called *hugót*.

There were other rituals as well performed by the *balyán* central to life of the early Bikolanos. A young child could be put under the care of ancestral spirits by the *balyán* carrying it to various parts of the house in a ritual called *yúkod*. There were also general chants, called *suragi*, and prayers which the congregation would acknowledge with the expression *ahom*.

The early Bikolanos worshiped their ancestors, collectively called *aníto* (also see Chirino 1969: Chapters 21–22). A variety of statues, generally of wood, sometimes of stone, would be made in worship of these ancestors, such as *tango*, *tatáwo*, *parangpán* as well as *ladáwan*. A particular statue used in sacrifices by the *balyán* was called *lagdóng*. There were other terms for these ancestral spirits as well, such as *diwáta’*, and more specific terms such as *bathála’* referring to an *aníto* which brings good fortune to those it accompanies. These last two terms come ultimately from Sanskrit, probably through Malay or other languages to the south of the Philippines in what is now Malaysia and Indonesia.

Worship of one’s ancestors was carried out with various ceremonies. One of these, called *átang*, involved a ceremonial offering of food set out, most likely, on a bamboo altar called *salangat*, and then later consumed by those attending the ceremony. Another ceremonial feast was called *gamit*, generally held for someone in the family, such as a child.

Ceremonies along with prayers were held in a small hut called *guláng-gúlang*. This was a common location for ancestor worship (Chirino 1969: Chapter 21). Later sources also refer to *mu’óg* as a house for the worship of *aníto* built either in the branches of a
tree or in the open field, although to Lisboa this was simply a tree house or a platform built in the upper reaches of a tree (Espinas 1968:186).

An anto was generally seen as a good influence and charms comprising a bit of shell roughly carved into the image of a particularly admired anto, called kabal, could serve to protect one from harm. There were, however, also anto who were not so kind and could be used to maintain order in a society. Women of high status in a community or those recognized for their beauty who fell ill when visiting agricultural fields or other specific locations, something called da’ay, were seen to have fallen under the influence of a particular anto.

If we look at what the early Bikolanos were afraid of we find many creatures lurking in the imaginary environment to keep them from straying too far. There was, and still is, the aswang, a type of supernatural creature, modeled probably on the bat, which attacked humans who were most vulnerable, the ill, the dying, the pregnant, the newly born, and even the dead. These were creatures that reveled in the eating of human flesh and the drinking of human blood. They came in many types and were capable of a variety of different types of damage. Starting with the more innocuous we had an aswang which became mildly intoxicated by the bad smell of something dirty, and sought out the same smell again, called sinasa’bán. Among the more frightening was the andudunó, an aswang that found delight and nourishment in inhaling the odor and sucking the blood of a woman in labor, the sick and the dying. No less frightening was the silagán, an aswang that could see the entrails through the body of the living, and proceeded to tear into the body, feeding on the entrails and liver, causing the victim to die. There was also the aswang called anananggal, which was capable of detaching its upper portion from the waist, the upper portion then flying about in search of saliva to drink and human flesh to feast on (Espinas 1968:188–189; Placencia 1589 in Blair & Robertson 1903–1909: Vol 7, 193).

But there was more than the aswang to be afraid of. There were numerous other creatures inhabiting the riverbanks, mountains and forests, places you would go at great personal risk, and creatures lurking in the shadows or coming out at dusk and moving about in the night when you had best be home and in bed.

Inhabiting the mountains was a creature with the feet and mane of a goat and the face of a man called láki or ungló’; along the river banks was the angungulú’ol, an animal similar to a large ape which, when coming across a person, embraced them and did not let go until they died; and in the forest was a creature no doubt based upon stories of the tiger, the sarimáw, described as fierce and brutal, tearing those it came across apart with its sharp claws. There were other creatures as well, such as those whose eyes flashed fire, called bunggó, and more innocent creatures, such as the ápo’, described as small and human-like, living in little earth mounds and possessing magical powers capable of turning people into animals such as toads and snakes.

This was the early religious world of the Bikol region when the Spanish friars came upon it during the last quarter of the 16th century, and which they were to change forever with the introduction of Christianity. It was not an instant change, but change that probably took the better part of the first 150 years of Spanish colonization. As the new religion was gradually established, and came to be more central to the lives of the Bikolanos, support for the older religion gradually gave way, and what was central and important became marginal and less significant.

The balyán did not immediately disappear from society as a religious leader, but as the new religion became more dominant, Bikolanos turned less to her for comfort and cure during times of death and illness, and so her role in society was diminished. There was an immediate attempt by priests to destroy the symbols of early religion in the
Philippines. Sacred groves were cut down, stone idols were smashed, and wooden idols, altars and amulets burned (Chirino 1969: Chapter 55; Phelan 1959:53–54). These were seen as symbols of a pagan past which had to be eliminated so that the new religion could flourish. The Bikol region was lucky to have had a representative of the Church such as Fr. Marcos de Lisboa who recorded without prejudicial comment both the early and changing circumstances of late 16th and early 17th century Bikol society.

6. The Introduction of Christianity

6.1 Baptism

Baptism signaled conversion to Christianity, and while this had a slow start in the Philippines, by the time Lisboa arrived in the Bikol region, baptisms throughout the Philippines numbered close to 300,000 (Phelan 1959: 56). Baptisms were not supposed to be performed on those who knew nothing of the Christian religion. Minimally, converts should have been able to recite the Pater Noster [Our Father who art in heaven ...], the Credo [I believe in God the Father Almighty ...], the Ave Maria [Hail Mary, full of grace ...] and the Ten Commandments. The encomenderos, who preceded the Spanish missionaries to the Philippines, were entrusted with the task of preparing those working on their estates with such early religious education. Some did, but others simply took advantage and used the labor of their charges while giving little in return.

Baptism and conversion to Christianity could be facilitated by particular fortuitous events, in particular recovery from disease (see Chirino 1969: Chapters 49, 55, 56 for examples). It was also advantageous to baptize a leader of the community so that the rest of the community would follow by example (Chirino 1969: Chapter 20). Where leaders were reluctant to embrace a new religion, some would allow their children to be baptized, the family thereby benefiting in case the new religion turned out to be as miraculous as promised. This would also serve as an example to the community and could draw new converts (Phelan 1959:55). Baptism, however, could also be delayed by the early Bikolanos continued adherence to certain traditional customs, such as divorce, drunkenness (see Sections 6.3, 6.14) and usury which were against the teachings of the Church (Placencia 1589 in Blair & Robertson 1903–1909: Vol 7, 180).

The term for baptism in Bikol is bunyág. Lisboa notes that this term originally meant ‘to sprinkle with water’, but also goes on to say that this meaning was no longer used in Bikol. This probably indicates that bunyág was already well established with the meaning ‘baptism’ by 1602. An additional meaning indicated by Lisboa is associated with the blessing of rice, as well as certain of the symbols associated with the mass, such as palm fronds and candles.

*bunyág* baptism, christening; MAG- to perform a baptism; MAG-, -AN to baptize or christen s/o; *an binunyagán* the baptized child; MANG- to perform baptisms; MANG-, PANG- -AN to baptize many people; MAGPA-, PA- -AN to have s/o baptized [+ MDL: MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to baptize s/o; to bless s/t (as rice to produce a bountiful crop; palms and candles, probably as part of the mass); a brief note is also given indicating that the original meaning of this word was ‘to sprinkle with water’, but that this is a meaning no longer associated with Bikol]

Baptism was gradually made more central to the lives of early Bikolanos by relating it to existing institutions. Gift-giving associated with the marriage dowry, was
extended to gifts given to those being baptized. The term for this, **dapon**, is no longer current in any of its meanings in modern Bikol.

**dapon** a contribution to a gift or offering; the share of a dowry (**púrong**) to be given to the bride contributed by relatives of the bridegroom; ⇒ a gift to one being baptized or one being given a particular honor; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to make a particular contribution to a dowry, gift or offering; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to gather such contributions on behalf of one getting married, one being baptized, or one being given a particular honor; to gather together all contributions in one place [MDL]

Just as words have fallen out of use, new words have been introduced which were not anticipated by Lisboa. The assistant to the sponsor at a baptism, one who holds the child, is now called **abit**, a word which originally referred to the carrying of child in a sash or cloth.

**abit** assistant to the sponsor at a baptism; MAG-, -ON to carry or hold the child during a baptism [MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG-ON to carry s/t or s/o, such as a child, in a sash or cloth slung in front of the body; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to cradle a child in a sash or cloth; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to use a sash or cloth for this purpose]

As for the implements associated with baptism, we had the saltwater shell, **tanggulong**, used for holding the water, also no longer used, and for a comment on the state of baptisms in a particular area, we have the following example sentence.

**Pisan lámang an bunyág dumán** ‘There are few who are baptized there.’

### 6.2 Confession and communion

Once accepted as Christians through baptism, instruction in the Christian faith continued with the catechism, a study of basic religious principles in summary form. The *Doctrina Christiana* was published in various of the Philippine languages, not for distribution to the general populace, but for use by the missionary priests or the secular clergy who served as intermediaries between the people and the priests. The first *Doctrina Christiana* was published in Tagalog in 1593 (Phelan 1959:57). The first *Doctrina* in Bikol was that of Fr. Andrés de San Agustin published in 1647, followed by that of Fr. Domingo Martínez, a second edition of which was published in 1708.

The *Doctrina* added to the religious knowledge expected for baptism. To the *Pater Noster*, the *Credo*, the *Ave Maria* and the Ten Commandments were added the *Salve Maria*, the 14 articles of Faith, the seven sacraments, the seven capital sins, the 14 works of mercy, the five commandments of the Church and the act of general confession (Phelan 1959:57).

Confession was not readily accepted by the early Filipinos. They would have been reluctant to convey delicate and personal information to someone who might very well use such knowledge against them, and there were particular sacraments which they did not uphold. Divorce and remarriage, for example, were quite common (Phelan 1959:61; Chirino 1969: Chapter 30).

Priests or their representatives often used question booklets called *confesionarios* which phrased similar questions in different ways in an attempt to get at the truth. These books were also useful for priests who did not have a great deal of fluency in
Philippine languages (Phelan 1959:64). The confessionario for Bikol was the Tratado de Comunión y de Confesión by P. Fr. San Juan del Espíritu Santo, probably published around the same time as the Doctrina Christiana by Fr. Andrés de San Agustín in 1647 (Entrada 1895:51).

In modern Bikol the popular term for confession is buybóy, a term which in Lisboa’s time referred to abundance of talk.

**buybóy** MAG-, I- to confess sins; to recant [MDL: MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to say s/t; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to say s/t to s/o; MANG-, IPANG- to go around saying things; MANG-, PANG- -AN to go around saying things to people; MAKI- -ON: makibuyboyón a gossip, tattler; -AN: bubuybóyan the person receiving all the gossip]

The most common word for confession, *kumpisál*, is a loan word from Spanish, *confesar*. While this is not a headword entry for Lisboa, it is clear from example sentences associated with a variety of headword entries, that this was the word introduced for the concept of confession. The following are examples.

**Manárig ta’ nagoconfesal akó, da’í dihán si Pádre** ‘Even though I went to confess, the priest wasn’t there.’

**Da’í ka pa nagoconfesar?** ‘Haven’t you gone to confession yet?’

**Umag confesalon** ‘To be ready to take confession.’

**Maráy kon harintók an pagconfesál mo** ‘It’s better if you confess often.’

In certain instances, reference to confession was made almost idiomatically, as in the expression **Da’í máyo’** ‘Nothing to confess’ or ‘Nothing to repent for’. Máyo’ is simply a negative for existential or possessive sentences.

A similar example may be seen in the full entry for *lá’om* dealing with hopes and expectations. There is nothing in the older meaning of this word which indicates that it should be associated with confession. It is simply one of the words, most likely chosen by Lisboa, although possibly reflecting the earlier usage by priests, to carry the message of confession.

**lá’om** MAG-, -AN to expect or anticipate s/t; to aspire to s/t; to hope, wish or yearn for s/t; to have the heart set on s/t; *an naglalá’om* aspirant; -ON to be expected to do s/t; PAG- hopes, expectations, aspirations; *dakúlang paglalá’om* high expectations; *mawara’án kan paglalá’om* to become desperate, disillusioned [+MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to hope, wish or yearn for s/t; *lyóng paglalá’om an pagkagadán* ‘Death comes to all of us’; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to hope for s/t from s/o; MAG- to rely on one another; MAG-, PAG- -ON to rely on another for s/t; also indicates: to prepare for confession: ⇒ *Naglalá’om akó ngunyán* ‘I am now ready for confession’; *Naglalá’om akó so-kaidtó* ‘I was ready for confession the other day’; *Naglalá’om akó ngápít* ‘I’ll soon be ready for confession’]

Also recorded or extended by Lisboa was the causative meaning of the word *tuytóy* ‘to encourage someone to cross a river or stream by bridge’. The idea of encouragement
was extended to mean ‘to encourage someone to confess or say what they have done’. Neither this, nor the extended meaning for lá’om above, exist any longer in modern Bikol.

**tuytóy** MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to cross a river or stream by means of a bridge; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to cross for a particular reason or to get s/t; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to use s/t such a plank or log as a bridge; MAGPA-, PA- -ON to encourage s/o to cross; to talk s/o across; also: ⇒ to encourage s/o to say or confess s/t they have done; MAPA-, IPA- to say s/t in encouragement so s/o will cross; -AN: a bridge; also: a go-between [MDL]

Communion was given rather infrequently. This was because there were not enough priests in the Philippines, particularly outside of the more populated areas, resulting in it being given mainly during Lent or to the dying. Another reason was that there were relatively few Filipinos who had achieved a sufficient level of understanding of Christianity to receive communion (Phelan 1959:69).

The modern Bikol word for Holy Communion is the Spanish loan, *komunión*. *Comulgar* is the term used in the *Doctrina Christiana*, but this never was really incorporated into Bikol. Communion as a rite is never referred to by Lisboa and so neither this term nor any alternative ever appears in his example sentences. That there was communion can be seen by the terms referring to communion wafers. Since there was no wheat grown in the Philippines, communion wafers were made from rice flour, *bubob*. The box for holding communion wafers was called *ka’ob* and the action of closing the box by fitting the lid over the top, *sukad*. None of these terms referred exclusively to a box for communion wafers, and none of them have survived into modern Bikol.

**bubob** rice flour, ⇒ used in making bread and communion wafers; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to grind rice into flour [MDL]

**ka’ob** ⇒ lid or cover of a chest or communion wafer box; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to close s/t with a cover or lid; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to use s/t as a cover or lid for closing s/t; MAG-, PAG- -ON to close s/t by bringing two parts together (as in closing a book) [MDL]

**sukad** a tightly fitting cap, cover or lid (such as that on a container or a cut section of bamboo); MA-, -AN: *skarden* or MAG-, PAG- -AN: *pagsukarden* to cap or cover s/t; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to use s/t as a cap, lid; to place a lid on s/t; MAG-, PAG- -ON ⇒ to encase s/t; to cover one thing with another (such as a box holding communion wafers with its lid); to place one thing inside another; *magsuró-sukad* to place a number of things, one inside the other (such as links of gold (*garis*) on the chains *kamagi* and *hinapón*); (fig-) *Da’i surukad an bu’ót kaining mga táwo* ‘These people do not fit well together’ (indicating disagreement or discord) [MDL]

### 6.3 Sins and sinners

The concept of wrong, as well as crime and punishment, certainly existed in the early Bikol society. Lisboa has many entries dealing with what appears to be a rather detailed system of justice for crimes against individuals, and a system of punishment including whipping, imprisonment, and confinement in the stocks or pillory. It was
rather easy to expand the meaning of wrong to that of sin. Much newer were the concepts of avoiding the temptation to sin, including in the concept of sin everyday occurrences such as drunkenness and adultery, and involving a supreme being in the forgiveness of particular sins committed. Also new were the concepts of desecration and the cleansing of the spirit. This was not an unattractive idea to the early Filipinos, and confession of one’s sins, particularly in times of illness, served to draw them closer to the church (Chirino 1969: Chapter 41).

The concept of sin is represented by *sála’* which is the common word for error, fault and guilt. We can see in Lisboa’s *Vocabulario* an attempt to distinguish types of sin, with *sála’* reserved for sins of the flesh, although generalized to all types of sin in the confessional. Original sin was introduced with reference to the sin of Adam, as can be seen in the entry below.

*sála’* an error, fault, miscalculation, mistake; a flaw, blunder; *Sála’ mo* ‘It’s your fault’; *maga’tó nin sála’* sa to accuse or condemn s/o; MAG-, -ON to admonish, censure, reprimand, reprove or rebuke s/o; MAGKA- to sin; KA- -AN: *kasa’lán* sin; fault; guilt, offense; MAKA- -AN: *makasa’lán* unholy; PAGKA- -AN: *pagsa’lán* failure, mistake; *may kasa’lán* culpable, guilty; *máyong pagsa’lán* infallible; [+MDL: *Sála’ iyán* ‘That’s wrong’; ⇒ *sála’ sa Diós* contrary to God; *sála’ sa Pádre* against the priests; *sála’ sa húkom* wrong in the eyes of the law; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to tell s/o they are wrong; MAGKA- to sin, used primarily to refer to sins of the flesh; in the confessional it is used more generally, but not outside the confessional: *Nagkasála’ akó*; *nalango akó* ‘I have sinned; I have been drunk’; *Nagkasála’ akó*; *mahubón akó* ‘I have sinned; I have been stealing’; MAGKA-, PAGKA- -AN to sin against so; to sin against God; MAGKA-, IPAGKA- to perpetrate a particular sin; PARAKA- a sinner; MANG-, PANG- -ON to blame s/o; to accuse s/o of wrongdoing; PANG- accusation; MAPANG- an accuser]

Other references to sin occur in example sentences, or are cited as figurative. The first entry below is related to a similar entry for *dá’an* (not shown), which refers to things done in the past, or in anticipation of an impending consequence of one’s actions.

*dá’an* to reflect on or ponder one’s actions: *Dá’an ta’wán ko* ‘I don’t know why I gave it to him’; ⇒ *Dá’an magkasála’ akó* ‘So I might have sinned (who hasn’t?)’; *Dá’an maghampák akó saíya* or *Dá’an paghampakón ko* ‘So I might have whipped her (who hasn’t?)’; *Dá’an man ha’bón akó* ‘I can’t explain why I stole it’ [MDL]

The second example is more interesting in that it actually draws on a term associated with earlier religious practices, something which was generally avoided.

*sakóm* an ancient rite performed by the *balyán* on one who lies in a coma; she calls the soul which has escaped from the body and carries it back in *bánay* leaves which she then shakes over the body of the one who lies ill; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to call the escaped soul; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to recite particular incantations as part of this ritual; (fig-) *Sakóm na táwo si kuyán sa pananáwon* ‘That person is very attentive to guests’; ⇒ *Nanakóm ka nang kasa’lán kaining gáwi’ mo* ‘You have committed many sins with your actions’ [MDL]

There are also references warning people to watch out for the temptation to commit sin (also see Section 6.4).
sikwál MAG-, I- to sweep things aside with the hand; to drive or chase s/t away; to disown, ostracize, renounce or shun s/o [+MDL: MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to brush s/t aside; to brush s/t away; (fig.) ⇒ to resist temptation: Isikwál mo túlós kon pasabngán kang mard’ot ‘Immediately cast it aside (turn away) if you find yourself being tempted by evil thoughts’

Those who have committed sins are encouraged to turn over a new leaf, perhaps starting anew with a Christian life, or to confess and have such sins absolved.

talikód MAG- to turn around; to about-face; MAG-, -AN to turn the back on s/o or s/t; (fig-) to waive s/t (as one’s rights); to jilt s/o [+MDL: MA-, -AN to turn the back on s/o or s/t; MA-, I- to turn the back; MAG- to stand back-to-back (two people); MAG-, PAG- -AN to turn the back on s/o or s/t; MAG-, PAG- -ON to turn two things back to back; MAG-, IPAG- to turn the backs to one another; ⇒ Talikodán mo na si mga kasa’lán mo ‘Turn your back on your sins’ (Meaning: Turn over a new leaf)

nonóho’ MA- to come to pass; MA- -AN: ⇒ manonohó’an to come to see the evil of one’s ways; IKA- to see the evil of one’s ways; KA- -AN: Kanonohó’an ka lugód ‘May you come to see the evil of your ways’ [MDL]

There are also specific references to the Christian practice of absolving one’s sins through confession and repentance, and the subsequent cleansing of the spirit.

pára’ MAG-, -ON to erase s/t; MAG-, -AN to erase s/t from; MAKA-, MA- to get erased; PANG-: pamára’ eraser [+MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to erase s/t; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to erase s/t from; ⇒ also means: to be forgiven for one’s sins: Pinapára’ nin Diós an kasa’lán nin táwo kon ikinaconfesal ‘A person’s sins will be forgiven by God if he confesses’]

Na doy dimina’i ‘To be absolved of one’s sins’

línig MA- clean; MA- -ON immaculate; MAG-, -AN to clean s/t; to purify s/t [+MDL: MA- smooth, clean; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON / MAHING-, HING- -ON or MAGHING-, PAGHING- -ON: to smooth s/t out; to clean s/t; Abong línig kainí ‘How clean this is’; ⇒ Pakalinígon nindó an saíndóng bu’ót ‘Cleanse your spirit’]

There are many instances in Lisboa of punishment meted out for various crimes, generally by whipping. The two examples below refer specifically to punishment for sins. The second relates to punishment for confessed sins, and came into use after Lisboa.

húli’: húli’ kan, húli’ sa or húli’ ta’ because, because of; over; nin húli’ ta’ because of, owing to, due to, for that reason [+MDL: Hinampák akó húli’ saímo ‘I was whipped because of you’; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to assign blame for s/t that happens; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to blame s/o for causing s/t which has occurred; MA- ⇒ to suffer the blame for particular sins or excesses]
silot MAG-, -AN ⇒ to punish s/o (as for a sin); to exact retribution from s/o (as after a confession); to make s/o bear the consequences of their actions; to penalize s/o (as after losing a game); PAG- consequence, punishment, retribution [MDL: MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to make s/o bear a particular punishment for a sin or wrongdoing; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to impose a particular fine or punishment; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to undergo a particular punishment for a sin or crime]

6.4 Heaven, hell and the devil

Related to the concept of sin are the concepts of hell and the devil. There was no concept of heaven or hell in early Bikol. As for the devil, Bikolanos had enough of their own frightening creatures to keep them in check and hardly needed another to be added to this pantheon (also see Morga 1971:278–279). Nevertheless, while there seems to be an attempt in Lisboa to identify the devil with one of the creatures existing in Bikol mythology, it was really through a Spanish loan that this concept came to be recognized.

The term lángit, ‘sky’, came to be used as well for heaven, and it is this term which appears in all prayers and religious references. The abstract idea of heaven as a place of solace and contentment is adapted from the term muráway which embraced these sentiments in an earthly life. These particular uses all still exist in modern Bikol.

lángit sky, heavens; KA- -AN the heavens; -NON: langitnón heavenly, celestial [MDL: tagá lángit celestial]

Kamó da’í mapapalángit kon da’í kamó tumubód sa Diós ‘You won’t go to heaven if you don’t believe in God.’

muráway MA- blissful, contented, peaceful; PAGKA- peace, glory; KA- -AN peace, glory, bliss, contentment; ⇒ the heavens; also murá’way [MDL: murá’way MA- to be contented, blissful; to be in heaven; MA- -AN to comfort, calm; KA- -AN heaven; syn- mayang]

The concept of hell was also introduced with Christianity, and with it the Spanish term, infierno. There must have been some attempt to find an equivalent term from Bikol mythology, and reference is made in Espinas to gagambán as the traditional hell (Espinas 1968:185). Based on the meaning for gangób ‘forge’, this whole concept of hell associated with brimstone and fire is very Christian, and it is likely that the term was a later creation. Lisboa makes no reference to this, and it is the Spanish loan which is used in old and modern reference.

gangób MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to purify or refine gold by heating it in a forge; to expose other materials to the heat of a forge; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to remove dross or slag in this process; -AN: gagangbán forge; crucible; also see gagambán [MDL]

gagambán hell [BIK MYT]; see gangób

Hell was associated with the traditional warning against misbehaving and Lisboa has a number of example sentences in which this is made explicit.
Da’i buhi’ na da’i mapaimpiérno an parakasála’ ‘The sinful will not escape from going to hell.’

Ngápit kon magaddán kamó, ihuhúlog kamó sa impiérno ‘Then, when you die you will be dropped into hell.’

Pagpeniténcia kamó ngáni’; da’i kamó ngáni’ mapaInfierno ‘You had better do your penance so that you won’t go to hell.’

Also introduced was the concept of the world coming to an end, with its implied consequences for both sinners and nonsinners.

No-ánoy kon matápos iníng kina’bán … ‘In the future when this world comes to an end …’

The only reference to the devil using a native Bikol word is ungló’. It is speculation, but there is a possibility that this reference in Lisboa is to an association made by earlier priests to the region. All example sentences in Lisboa’s Vocabulario in which the devil is referred to, use the Spanish loan, demónio. This, along with another Spanish loan, diáblo, are used in Modern Bikol.

The full entry for ungló’ is presented below. The far more detailed entry, labeled Bikol Mythology [BIK MYT], is from Espinas (1968: 182) and must have had a source different from Lisboa.

ungló’ a supernatural creature with the hoofs and mane of a horse and the face of a repulsive man with wide protruding lips which completely cover its face when it laughs; brushing against the invisible ungló’ or simply being near it, especially in the early morning, could produce rashes curable by whipping the affected part with the long strand of a woman’s hair; same as láki [BIK MYT] [MDL: ⇒ black men, large and ugly like savages; now used to refer to the devil]

As would be expected from a Christian perspective, the devil was described as a frightening tempter who should be avoided at all costs.

Makagiram-giram na an demónio ‘The devil is terrifying.’

Mahuróp sa pagsugót an demónio sa táwo ‘The devil is good at tempting humans.’

Sinulang ko túlos idtóng sugót nin demónio ‘I immediately put a stop to the temptations of the devil.’

Dapít sa demóniong gáwi ‘Regarding the work of the devil.’

Reference to Adam and Eve and their encounter with the serpent in the Garden of Eden was no doubt intended with the following entry.

máliw MA- or MAG- to change in color; to change in external appearance (as a chicken when it matures and its feathers change in color); to transform o/s; I(PAG)- to change to a new color; (fig-) ⇒ Nagmáliw an demónio na naníhálas
'The devil turned itself into a serpent'; PAG- change in color; transformation; syn- *mali* [MDL]

There are also other entries where the devil is described as a trickster who confuses people, causing them to lose their way. The extension to the meaning for *ribong* would have reminded Bikolanos at some point in time of the mischief of the *tambaluslós*. This is not an entry in Lisboa, although it is known and referred to in modern Bikol.

**ribong** MA- bewildering, confounding, confusing, disorienting, perplexing; complex, complicated, intricate; MAG-, ON to baffle, bewilder, confuse, disorient, fluster, muddle or perplex s/o; MAKA-, MA- to become confused, perplexed; to panic; PAGKA- chaos, confusion, turmoil, pandemonium [+MDL: MA-, MA- -AN to be confused or bewildered about s/t; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to trick or deceive s/o (as with figures or accounts during a transaction); ⇒ to lead s/o astray (as the devil who blinds people when traveling, causing them to take the wrong trail and end up in the forest)]

**tambaluslós** a small, mythological forest creature said to lead people astray; when it laughs, its lips open to cover its whole face

### 6.5 Exorcism and salvation

There are two terms which refer to exorcism, and one to saving one from evil. All three terms are used in modern Bikol. None of these were used in Lisboa’s time with these meanings, although it is clear from where these terms originate. Why did these terms become current after Lisboa’s time in the Philippines? We can only speculate. Perhaps for a population that was just being converted to Christianity, entry into that religion through baptism was what was required to bring about salvation. The early priests recorded cases where people recovered from illness through baptism (see Section 6.1). Exorcism would have come about later in the Philippines when it was necessary to treat people who were already Christians.

The origin of the first term, *basbás*, is clearly from one of the rituals performed by the *balyán*. The full entry is presented below, including that from Espinas (1968:185) shown in the section [*BIK MYT*].

**basbás** MAG-, -AN to exorcize s/o; MAGPA-, PA- -ON to have oneself exorcized by a *parabáwi*, see *báwi* [*BIK MYT*: a rite performed by the *balyán* in which the body of the dead is washed with the water-softened leaves of the *lukbán* as part of a purification rite; MAG-, -AN to perform this ritual on s/o] [MDL an ancient rite in which the *balyán* uses young citrus branches moistened in water to strike some article of gold removed from the body of the dead at the time of internment in an attempt to remove any evil which might be harbored in the body; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to remove harbored evil in this way; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to strike an article of gold for this purpose]

The second term was developed from the basic meaning of ‘to take back’ or ‘to retrieve’. This is the only meaning it had in Lisboa’s Vocabulario and it is by far the dominant meaning in modern Bikol as well.

**báwi** MAG-, -ON to take back what you give or go back on what you say; to abrogate, annul, countermand, recall, reclaim, repeal, rescind, retract, retrieve,
revoke, void; to reverse (as a decision): *Da’ī ka magbáwi’ kan sinábi mo* ‘Don’t go back on your word’ (lit: Don’t take back what you said); MAG-, -AN to dispossess s/o; to take s/t back from s/o; MAKA-, MA- to recoup, regain, recover: *Da’ī ka makakabáwi’ kan ginastó mo* ‘You won’t be able to recover what you spent’; (fig-) -AN to die: *Binawi’an siyá kan búhay* ‘She died’ (lit: Life was taken back from her); PAG- repeal, retraction, revocation [+MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to take back s/t which has been lent or stolen; to take back what has been said: *Bawi’’on mo idtóng pagtarám mong da’ī totó’o* ‘Take back the untruths that you said’; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to take s/t back from s/o]

*báwi’* MAG-, -ON to exorcize s/o; to drive evil spirits out of s/o; MAGPA-, PA- -ON to go to s/o to be exorcized; PARA- exorcist, referring to anyone who drives evil spirits out of the body so that the good spirits may return

The final term, ágaw, is used in modern Bikol in the religious sense of ‘to deliver someone from evil’. The two entries presented below are a single entry in Lisboa. The basic meaning presented in the first entry is ‘to snatch away or to jostle’. In the second entry is the more figurative meaning from old Bikol, ‘to cure someone of a disease’.

ágaw MAG- to snatch things from one another; MAG-, -ON to snatch s/t; MAG-, -AN to snatch s/t from s/o; MANG- to go around snatching things; MAKI- to jostle; to push your way ahead; to scramble for s/t; MA+KA- to push your way ahead of s/o [+MDL: MAG- to grab things away from one another; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to snatch s/t; to grab s/t away; to save s/o from danger; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to grub s/t away from s/o; to save s/o from a particular danger; (fig-) MAG- to take advantage of a particular occasion: *Agáwa ining linaw* ‘Take advantage of the good weather’; *Nagarágaw na an giginhawáhon* to be unable to catch one’s breath; *Nagarágaw naaagíhan* ‘This sick person is drawing his last breath’; *nagágaw naaagíhan* to degenerate into a quarrel

ágaw MAG-, -ON to deliver s/o (as from evil); MAG-, -AN to deliver s/o from evil; *magágaw an bu’ót* to have one’s soul in turmoil [+MDL: MAG-, PAG- -ON to cure a person of a disease; MAG-, IPAG- to cure a disease with a particular treatment]

6.6 God

We now come to the concept of a unitary God, and in the sections following this to Christ, the saints and priests. While concepts central to Christianity, such as a unitary God, were to be kept in the original Spanish there are a number of Philippine languages, both major and minor, in which the term *batála’* or *bathála’* was used to mean God due to its possible interpretation as a Supreme Being. The term comes originally from Sanskrit, and while it was probably not far enough removed from other terms for ancestor worship to make its adoption acceptable to the missionary priests, in many regions of the Philippines this was the term applied to the new Christian God (Anonymous 1572 in Christianization 1965:363; Chirino 1969: Chapter 21; Placencia 1589 in Blair & Robertson 1903–1909: Vol 7, 186). This was not the case in Bikol. *Bathála’* was clearly a type of *aníto*, a representation of one’s ancestors, and therefore
not acceptable. This term has disappeared from modern Bikol, and familiarity with it would most likely be due to a person’s familiarity with Tagalog or Cebuano.

**batála**' special gods or aníto who watch over a particular family or settlement [BIK MYT] [MDL: bathála'] ⇒ an aníto which brings good fortune to those it accompanies; -AN a man of good fortune believed to be accompanied by such an aníto; Kabathalá’an mo doy; da’í ka máyo’ na iigó’ ‘How lucky you are; everything thrown at you misses’)

In Bikol the only alternative was to introduce the Spanish term Diós for this meaning. There are numerous references to Diós in the example sentences which accompany other entries in the dictionary. It doesn’t take much imagination to see how many of these utterances could have been used in a sermon accompanying mass, or in the confessional.

*Latap an hírak nin Diós sa mga táwo gabós* ‘God’s mercy is spread among all the people.’

*Áwot pang mungmóng napaggurumdóm sa Diós* ‘Who cannot fail to be fulfilled with thoughts of God.’

*Udók an pagtubód sa Diós* ‘To have a deep faith in God.’

*An tinutugmarán nin totó’ong pagkaCristiano iní nang gáyod an marigon na pagtubód sa Kagurangnán tang Diós* ‘The basis of true Christianity is a strong belief in the Lord our God.’

*Nakakatanong an da’í tibá’ad digdí sa dagá’ kan paggurumdóm ta sa Diós* ‘The transitory things of earth stand in the way of our thoughts of God.’

*Da’í mo pasibógon an saímong pagtubód sa Diós, mínsan pagaanhón ka man* ‘Do not waver from your belief in God, even though from time to time you may be tested.’

*Hapaw an pagtubód nindó sa Diós* ‘You are remiss in your faith in God.’

*Malúya an pagtubód nindó sa Diós* ‘Your belief in God is weak.’

*Tugák na gáyo an bu’ót nindó sa Diós* ‘Your belief in God is very weak.’

The concept of divinity could easily be expressed using the grammatical resources available in Bikol.

*An dapít sa Diós* ‘with regard to God; divine, Godly’

*An pagkaDiós* ‘divine, Godly’

The concept of God may have been brought closer to the lives of the early Bikolanos by associating certain references to popular beliefs. An extension of the word bagsik would remind Bikolanos of the abilities conveyed by particular charms and
amulets, and a particular fortunate discovery, as of gold, might also remind them of the beneficial spirits inhabiting their pre-Christian world.

*bagsik* MA- swift; strong, powerful, mighty; healthy, invigorated; MAG- to grow strong, powerful; to become invigorated, healthy; to become swift; MAKA- to strengthen, invigorate; MA- to feel strengthened, invigorated, healthy, strong; KA- -AN swiftness; strength, power, might; authority; vitality; *buháy bagsik* health [+MDL: MA- or MAG- to become stronger, swifter; MAPAKA-, PAKA- -ON to have s/o do s/t briskly or with agility; to empower s/o; ⇒ to give s/o the power to do s/t (as empowering a god); MAPAKA-, IPAKA- to have s/t done with speed, agility]

tugá MA- or MAG- to appear suddenly and unexpectedly; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to present s/t that is unexpected; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to appear unexpectedly before s/o; to appear suddenly at a particular location; ⇒ *Itinugá sakó nin Dios ining buláwan* ‘God has presented me with this gold’; -AN tugáhan lucky, fortunate; referring to s/o who always has what they need when they need it; var- tungá [MDL]

Reference to God as the Lord or the Almighty is based on the root *guráng* ‘old’. The term *kagurangnán* ‘the Lord’ is modern, and we can see in Lisboa that it once served as the title Mr or Mrs. While Lisboa does not specifically give the meaning of the Lord to this entry, it is clear from subsequent entries where it is used (see Section 6.7) that this was one of its intended meanings.

*guráng* old (humans, animals); aged, elderly: *Guráng na akó* ‘I’m already old’; MAG- to grow old; an mga magúrang parents; sagugúrang conservative, traditional; out of date; also used to refer to the stories told by old people; KA- -AN old age; KA- -NAN: ⇒ *kagurangnán* the Lord; the Almighty [+MDL: MA- old; MA- -ON very old; MA- or MAG- to grow old; MAKA- to cause s/t to age; to cause s/t to endure; MAGKA- to be long-lasting; to last forever, endure; magkaguráng man forever; MAGKA-, PAGKA- -ON to persist or persevere in doing s/t; PAGKA- age; KA- -NAN: *kagurangnán* Mr, Mrs; MAGKA- -NANAN: magkagurangnánan to call s/o Mr or Mrs; MANG- -NAN, PANG- -NANAN: mangagurangnánan to serve a particular master as a servant or slave]

Reference to God’s creation of the world is based on the term *laláng* which in Lisboa’s time simply had the meaning of creative. In modern Bikol the term has only a religious reference.

*laláng* MAG-, -ON to create the world and its creatures (God); PAG- the creation of the world; an linaláng creatures (as in ‘All God’s Creatures’) [MDL: MA- creative, inventive; one who is good at planning and carrying things out; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to plan s/t; to design a plan or system; also see *dahan*]

### 6.7 Christ and the Apostles

If the concept of a unitary God was difficult for early Bikolanos to understand, the concept of a human representative of God in the form of Christ should have been even more so. Lisboa has either used or recorded earlier use of particular grammatical
devices in Bikol to try to convey this concept. We have, using the verbal affix mani-, just such an attempt which must have been successful since it is still used in modern Bikol.

**mani-** verbal affix, infinitive-command form meaning ‘to be’ or ‘to become’; a possible combination of the prefixes mang- and án-: BASE táwo man, woman, human; INFINITIVE-COMMAND manitáwo to become human; PAST nanitáwo; PROGRESSIVE naninitáwo; FUTURE maninitáwo; ⇒ Si Krísto nanitáwo ‘Christ took human form’ [+MDL: ⇒ Naniniháwak nin táwo ‘taking human form’ (a God in Christ); Naninisíuka’ an árak ‘The wine turned to vinegar’; Naniniutak si iniros ‘From steel we get a knife’; Kon ibá an maniagóm mo, da’i taká tatatagán ‘If you change husbands (implying divorce and remarriage), I will disinhereit you’; Maninianó daw si kuyán kaiyán paghílang niyá ‘I don’t know what’s happening to that person because of her illness’; the causative forms are: mapakani- and pakani- -on: Napakakaniutak akó kaining iniros ‘I’m making a knife from this steel’; Pinakakaniutak an iniros ‘The steel is being used to make a knife’]

Christ as the protector was introduced using a particularly interesting extension of **langán** ‘sandals’, an extension which did not survive into modern Bikol. Christ as the Redeemer or Savior, however, has a modern Bikol reference which was developed after Lisboa’s time based on the root, **tubós**, which was used in financial transactions or for the exchange of prisoners.

**langán** sandals; MAG- to wear sandals [+MDL: sandals (typ- worn when on a hunt to protect the feet from thorns); MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to cover s/t in order to protect it; to protect s/t with a covering; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to use s/t as an outer covering for protection; PAG- ⇒ protection; and by extension: to protect, save: Sí Jesucrísto, Kagurángnan ta, nagadán langán satúya’ ‘Jesus Christ, our Lord, died for us’]

**tubós** MAG-, -ON to redeem s/t; to ransom s/o; MAG-, -AN to ransom or redeem s/t from s/o; MAG-, I- to pay s/t as a ransom; PARA- ⇒ redeemer, savior [+MDL: MA-, -ON to recover one’s bond or what one has left for surety; to ransom s/o; MA-, -AN to recover one’s bond from s/o; to ransom s/o from s/o; MA-, I- to make a particular payment to recover one’s bond or surety; to pay a particular ransom; MAG- to exchange captives, prisoners; MAG-, IPAG- to exchange one captive for another; MAG-, PAG- -AN to ransom one captive with the exchange of another]

The Lisboa *Vocabulario* also has a number of references to Christ’s teachings in example sentences (see Section 6.9).

... kon si Jesucristo, Kagurángnan ta ... ‘as said by Jesus Christ, our Lord.’

An úlay ni Jesucristo, Kagurángnan ta: An makuyóg ngayá kan túgon ni amá’, iyó kon iná’, iyó kon tugang iyán ..... ‘Jesus Christ, our Lord, said: Those who honor their father, their mother and their fellow humans ....’

*Sumála’ pa idtóng úlay ni Jesucristo, Kagurángnan ta* ‘And the words of Jesus Christ, Our Lord, will come to pass.’
Reference to the Apostles in Lisboa is made in an entry showing how information may be passed by word of mouth from generation to generation. The Apostle’s Creed is a modern Bikol adaptation based on the term, tubód ‘to have faith’.

litó MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to pass s/t from person to person (information, things); to hand s/t down from generation to generation; MA-, -AN: litwán or MAG-, PAG- -AN: paglitwán to eventually be passed on to s/o (after a chain of intermediaries); ⇒ An húlit ni Jesucrísto, Kagurangnán ta, ilinitó’ sató’ nin mga Apóstoles ‘The teachings of Jesus Christ, Our Lord, have come down to us via the Apostles’; also see turon [MDL]

tubód MAG-, -ON to believe in or have faith in s/o; to follow s/o’s wishes; to heed or obey s/o; to regard s/t (as advice); MAKAPA-/-ON to believe in s/t; to have faith in or trust s/o; tutubdón to test s/o’s faith in s/t; MANG- to have too much faith in s/o; to trust s/o too easily (as in giving credit); PAG- belief, faith; trust; an pagtubód ‘I’ll never trust you’; Tubód mo doy ‘How quickly you trust s/o; How easily you are taken in’; -AN / -ON + -NON: turubdánon trusted, well-respected; one who is obeyed due to fear, respect or the ability to help others]

6.8 Death and resurrection

Along with a belief in Christ we also have the concept of death and resurrection which did not exist in early Bikol society. Also introduced into the death ritual was the priest, perhaps in an attempt to usurp the traditional position of the balyán, and the more Christian concepts of the human body returning to the dust from which it came, and the liberation of the soul.

The concept of resurrection was exemplified using words for ‘again’, liwát in both old and modern Bikol and ótro in modern Bikol alone, or words for ‘return’, balik or ulí’. Examples are found associated with a number of headword entries.

liwát again; re-: ⇒ liwát na pagkabúhay rebirth, reincarnation, resurrection; MAG-, -ON to redo s/t; to do s/t again; to repeat s/t; to iterate or reiterate s/t; PAG- repetition, recurrence [+MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to redo or repeat s/t; to come back to change s/t; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to return to add to s/t; MAPAKA-, PAKA--ON to repair or refurbish s/t; to improve on s/t; (fig-) Pakaliwatón mo an bu’ót mong mará’ot ‘Improve your unacceptable behavior’]

táwo man or woman; an individual, a person, human being; people; a creature (human); an mga táwo mankind, humanity, folk; the populace, population; MA- crowded; heavily populated, populous; sadíring táwo immediate family; MAGMA-, MA- -ON to sustain s/o’s life; to not be involved in the killing of s/o; garó táwo man-like, humanoid; pagkanitáwo manhood,
humankind; ⇒ ótrong pagkanitáwo reincarnation, resurrection; -AN a tenant; (sl-) bodyguard; tumatáwo a caretaker; ⇒ tawong alpóg (lit-) men of this world (lit: men of dust); tawong lipód a general term for invisible mythological creatures including giants and elves [+MDL: duwá katáwo two people; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to spare the life of s/o or s/t; MAKA- to be able to sustain life: Túbig lámang nakakatáwo sakó ‘Only water is keeping me alive’; (fig-) da’í nakakatáwo nin kaláyo to be unable to light a fire; MA- to be alive; to live, germinate; to light (a fire): Natáwo na si tinanóm ko ‘My plants have germinated’; ⇒ natáwo nagbalík to be resurrected; to live again; IKA- to sustain life (as food); (fig-) ikatáwo fresh, vibrant; MA- -AN to be carrying a child, off-spring; PAGKA- humanity; the ability to revive, grow s/t; MAMA-, MA- -ON or MAGMA-, PAGMA- -ON to sustain the life of s/o or s/t; to not kill an animal; MAMA-,IMA- or MAGMA-, IPAGMA- to give food as sustenance to keep s/o or s/t alive; ⇒ an pagkatáwó liwát resurrection; An pagkatáwó liwát nin mga táwo gabós ‘The resurrection of all of us’

mundág born; mundág na gadán stillborn; MAG-, I- to give birth to a child; MA- to be born; MA- -AN to be born in a particular place; dagáng namundágan birthplace, homeland; PAGKA- birth; ⇒ pagkamundág úli’ or liwát na pagkamundág reincarnation, rebirth, resurrection [+MDL]

The reference to humans as tawong alpóg (see the example in táwo above) referring to the transitory nature of life was not in Lisboa, but is used in modern Bikol. Lisboa, however, does have references to the human body returning to the dust of the earth, and to the soul being separated from the body upon death.

kabo-kabo dust; MAG- to be dusty; to be covered with dust; Nagkabo-kabo na iníng bádo’ mo ‘Those clothes of yours are very dusty’; MANI- ⇒ to become dust; Maninikabo-kabo an háwak nin táwo ‘The human body turns to dust’ [MDL]

dagá’ soil, earth; ground, land, terrain; property, premises; puéde sa tábig, puéde sa dagá’ amphibious; MAG-, -AN to cover s/t with soil; MAG-, I- to dig up soil; MAGPA-, PA- -AN to fill s/t in with earth; NASA ashore; dagáng namundágan homeland; dagáng panugá’ promised land [+MDL: MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to throw soil on s/t; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to cover s/t with soil; MAG- or MANI- ⇒ to return to the soil; to become dust; -ON: dinagá’ a dirt road; -IMIN- to fall to the ground: Diminagá’ na iníng guayauas ‘Many guavas have fallen to the ground’; Garó na ing dagá’ iníng uuránin ‘This cloud is like the earth’ (Said when there is a dark cloud in the sky); sangdagá’ very numerous (numerous as the grains of soil)]

utás MAG-, -ON to detach, remove or separate s/t; MAG-, -AN to detach or separate s/t from s/t else; MAKA-, MA- to come off; to become detached; MAKA-, MA- -AN to come off from s/t; to become detached or come off from s/t [+MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to cut s/t completely off; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to cut s/t completely off from where it is attached; MA- to come completely apart; to become completely detached; ⇒ to separate from one’s body (the soul); to end (one’s life); MA- -AN to die (to be
separated from one’s life): *Nautsán na* ‘She’s dead’; PAGKA-: *an pagkautsi* way of dying.

The Spanish priests may have felt a need to emphasize this return to the earth of the physical body since in the pre-Christian tradition the dead were shrouded and often left in specially built huts to decompose, or in the case of the rich, in their own homes which were then abandoned. Subsequent rituals of bone washing and storage would then also take place in certain regions of the Philippines (see Chirino 1969: Chapter 33).

There is no time in this paper to go into detail regarding the death rituals found in Lisboa’s *Vocabulario*. The few entries below should give the reader some idea of the differences between pre-Christian funerals, and the burials introduced by the priests.

**biray** the house or residence of a leading member of the community which serves as a place of confinement after death; the house with the coffin and body is then left to decay or collapse; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to confine the dead in such a way; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to confine the dead to such a house; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to use a house for such a purpose; (fig-) *Nagsulóm na ining biray* ‘This house is very dark’ (Said when annoyed or angry) [MDL]

**kalang** a small hut or shelter in which the caskets of influential people of a town are placed; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to place the dead in such a hut or shelter; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN / MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to use a hut or shelter for such a purpose [MDL]

**haya’** (arc-) MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to place the bodies of the dead in a seated position near one another, as if they were still alive, so that they may be viewed or eulogized; -AN: *hahaya’an* a place where such viewing or eulogizing takes place; (fig-) *Anó ta’ pinaghahaya’ iní digdí ho?* ‘Why is this left where everyone can see it?’ (Said in annoyance about s/t that should have been put away) [MDL]

**hutang** MAPA-, PA- -ON to arrange the body of the dead, laying it out in the middle of a room; MAPA-, PA- -AN to lay out the dead in the middle of a room [MDL]

**badyó’** cloth (typ- woven with colors and figures, used only for covering the bodies of the dead); also see *bulos* [MDL]

**babayógan** bier for carrying the dead; see *bayóg* [MDL]

There was some adaptation of pre-Christian practices to the Christian burial. A eulogy for the dead was a somewhat minor extension of the traditional term for mourners orcriers, and the thud of something falling from a height was taken as the sounding of a toll for the dead.

**aráng** MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to eulogize the dead; to cry in grief over the dead; (arc-) PARA- mourners, criers [MDL]

**rukat** thud, thump; the sound of s/t falling from high up; also ⇒ the sound of the toll for the dead which is rung on Good Friday to mark the hour of Christ’s
death; MA- or MAG- to make this sound; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to sound
the toll for the dead; Nagruk na ‘What a thud’ [MDL]

In modern Bikol we have a further adaptation of a traditional word for the role of
priests in escorting the dead to a place of burial. There is a festive note to this
adaptation which might very well have been intended, although it is not clear when this
term comes into modern Bikol and how extant the original meaning was at the time.

dápit MAG-, -ON ⇒ to escort the dead (priests) [MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON
to call on s/o for the purpose of inviting them to the house for a meal, a drink or
discussion; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to announce an invitation by passing
through an area playing a musical instrument, such as the kudyapi’ or subing,
or striking the sticks called kalótan; to invite those who live out of town
(resident there due to unacceptable social or criminal behavior); -ON: an
darapíton one invited many times or by many people; Garó na ing dápit ‘She’s
decked out like an invited guest’ (Said when one is very dressed up, as when
going to a wedding])

6.9 Sermons and teachings

The modern word for bible is the Spanish loan biblía. The word for testament, as in
the New Testament and Old Testament, is típan. Lisboa does not make use of the word
biblía in his Vocabulario, nor is típan used in a religious sense.

típan covenant, testament; Ba’góng Típan New Testament; Dá’an na Típan Old
Testament [MDL: a vow or pledge; MA-, I- to make a vow or promise to do s/t; to
pledge s/t; to take an oath; MA-, -AN to make a vow or promise to s/o; to form a
co venant with s/o; MAG- to take a vow (a number of people); MAG-, PAG- -AN
to take a vow about s/t; to make a pledge to many people; MAG-, IPAG- to utter
a particular vow]

Lisboa clearly uses the word húlit to convey the more immediate concept of
‘religious teachings’, compared to the written word of the bible, and there are numerous
references to this. The underlying meaning of húlit must have been ‘to teach someone
how to behave’ as can be seen in the example below, but the dominant meaning in
Lisboa, either reflecting earlier usage or presaging later usage, was religious.

húlit homily, doctrine, teaching; sermon; MAG-, I- to preach about s/t; to give
particular instructions on how to behave; MAG-, -AN to preach to s/o; to deliver
a sermon to s/o; PARA- preacher; da’ing húlit spoiled, undisciplined [+MDL:
MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to teach s/o; to indoctrinate s/o; to scold s/o who
has done wrong; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to teach a particular lesson or doctrine;
to teach the correct way to behave; (fig-) Masuháy na gáyo si kuyán; maraháy kon hulítan ‘That person is very disobedient; it would be good to teach him
how to behave’ (Implying: By giving him a good whipping)]

Paa’anóng maghúlit kaiyán na naniraw-niraw na lámang an táwo sa simbáhan
‘How can one give a sermon to the handful of people remaining in church?’

Gíkan sa Diós ining húlit ‘This teaching comes from God.’
Rimposá nindó iníng hulit sa bu’ót nindó ‘Keep these teachings close to your heart.’

Tungkosá nindó sa bu’ót an húlit nin Diós ‘Remember God’s teachings.’

Ta’ daw ta’ da’i tinatadmán nin húlit an saímon g bu’ót? ‘Why is it that the teachings have no effect on you?’

Daí máyo’ akó nakakasarapód kaining ipinaghuhúlit sakó’ ‘I don’t quite understand what is being taught to me.’

There is no specific reference to the Ten Commandments in Lisboa, but modern usage draws on the word túgon for the concept of ‘commandment’ and it is likely that Lisboa would have used it in this way. The Doctrina Christiana of 1708 by Domingo Martínez, uses túgon for ‘commandment’, and it is probable that an earlier version, a translation into Bikol by Fr. Andrés de San Agustin in 1647 of the Belarmino Doctrina Christiana, used this as well. While I have not seen a copy of this Doctrina, Fr. San Agustin uses túgon in this way in his Arte de la lengua Bicol, also published in 1647.

túgon a request to get s/t; MAG-, -ON to request s/o get s/t; MAG-, I- to request s/t be gotten; KA- -AN a request, wish; ⇒ commandment [MDL: order, command; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to order s/o to do s/t; to instruct s/o according to one’s wishes; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to give a particular instruction or order; tugón-túgon MANG- to go around giving orders]

6.10 Prayer

The common word for prayer was and is adyí’. This is a loanword from Malay, coming originally from Arabic, and it was an acceptable term for use in a Christian context since it possibly had few if any connotations with the traditional religious life of the early Bikolanos. The variant affixation possibilities may indicate that there was some uncertainty in adapting this term to the Bikol sound system. Lisboa gave adyí’ a very specific reference to Christian doctrine, as can be seen in the entry which follows.

adyí’ MANG- to pray; MAG-, IPANG- or MAGPANG-, IPAGPANG- to pray for s/t; MAG-, PANG- -AN or MAGPANG-, PAPANG- -AN to pray to s/o; MAG-, PANG- -ON or MAGPANG-, PAPANG- -ON to recite particular prayers; PANG- or PAPANG- praying; PARAPANG- one who prays; PANG- -ON prayer; PANG- -AN prayer book [MDL: MANG-, PANG- -AN ⇒ to recite the Benedictus - Blessed be the Lord, God of Israel / Blessed be he who cometh in the name of the Lord; to recite the rosary; to pray to a particular saint; PARAPANG- those who come to pray on the Sabbath] [MALAY kaji to learn to recite the Koran, from ARABIC]

Pisan lámgan an tata’óng mangadyí’ ‘It’s rare to find s/o who knows how to pray.’

Lisboa includes example sentences related to praying in the definitions for a number of entries.

tábi’ please: Atrás tábi’ ‘Please move back’; MAKI- to excuse o/s (as when moving through a crowd of people); MAGPA-, PA- -ON to pardon or excuse s/o (by
letting them pass); tabí’-tábi’ MAG- to excuse o/s when passing among people [+MDL: please, with permission; ⇒ to place the hands together, as when praying; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to say thank you for s/t; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to thank s/o; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to say s/t in appreciation or thanks; syn- salámat]

súno’ MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON ⇒ to repeat exactly s/t one has heard to another (as a prayer one has memorized); to follow, stepping in the footsteps of the one walking in front) [MDL]

laktás MA- describing s/t which contains many omissions; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN ⇒ to miss, omit, skip over, leave s/t out (as when reciting prayers when one omits a number of verses)

kimót-kimót MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON ⇒ to move the lips (as when reading to o/s or saying one’s prayers) [MDL]

For the closing of a prayer, Lisboa presents a word based on the concept of wishing or hoping that something will come about, áwot pa. An equivalent term used in ceremonies by the balyán, ahom, was avoided.

áwot pa ⇒ amen; may it be: Áwot pang iliqtás kita’ ‘May we be saved!’ [MDL: ⇒ God grant, amen; an expression equivalent to the English ‘Oh if’ or ‘Oh that’, as used in the following contexts: Áwot pa naggugúhit na lugód akó na iyó iyán ‘Oh if only I were writing that now’; Áwot pa maggúhit lugód akó na iyó iyán ‘Oh if I could only write that now’; Áwot pa si maggugúhit na iyó iyán ‘Oh if only someone were to write that’; Áwot pa maraháy na lugód ‘Oh that it may all turn out for the best’; Áwot pang buláwan ‘If only it were gold’]

ahom expression of affirmation spoken by the congregation to the balyán as she recites her prayers; MA- or MAG- to utter this expression; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to assent to s/t; to express acceptance of s/t with such an expression; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to respond to the balyán in such a way [MDL]

The Lord’s Prayer, the Pater Noster or Our Father, was given a literal translation in Bikol as it was in other Philippine languages.

amá’ father; MAG- father and child; MAG-, -ON to call s/o father (a natural father or a guardian); makó-amá’ nephew; pakó-ama’ón uncle; ⇒ Amá’ Níámo’ The Lord’s Prayer (lit: Our Father) [+MDL: the variation between amá and amá’ is found in different towns; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to call s/o father (a natural father or guardian)]

Reference is also made in Lisboa to the time for reciting of the Ave Maria and to the brebiário, a book listing the prayers suitable for reciting at particular times of the day which is still used in modern Bikol.

sinárom twilight; dusk; ⇒ a time shortly after reciting the evening’s Ave Maria

MAG- to fall (the night); to begin to grow dark (the day)
kapót MAG-, -AN; kapotán or kaptán to hold s/t in the hand; MANG-, PANG- -AN to clasp, clutch, grasp or grip s/t; to cling to s/t; to latch on to s/t; to get a hold of s/t; -AN: kakkaptán handle [+MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to hold s/t in the hands; ⇒ Kaptí mo na iníng Breviario ‘Hold this breviary’; Garó na ing da’i kinaptán ‘It looks as if this is untouched’ (Said when s/t is very clean, such as s/t one has sewn)]

brebiário breviary, a book containing the hymns, offices, and prayers for the canonical hours (special prayers recited at specified times during the day) [SP-breviario]

6.11 Homage and supplication

Related to prayer are expressions of homage, praise and supplication. Included in this section are those expressions in which certain requests are made of God.

There are some interesting comparisons to be made between the present and the past. Lisboa had already selected quite a number of words and extended their meaning to include the above ideas. Modern Bikol, however, has gone further and it is interesting to see the origin of these later adaptations.

The central meaning of the first example, mi’bi’, was ‘to implore or to entreat’. We have this term given a religious meaning in Lisboa which is still used in modern Bikol.

mi’bi’ MANG-, PANG- -ON to pray for s/t; to supplicate; PANG-: pami’bi’ prayer; supplication, entreaty [+MDL: mibi’ MANG-, PANG- -AN or MAGPANG-, PAGPANG- -AN ⇒ to pray to God or the saints; to implore, entreat or beseech s/o; MANG-, PANG- -ON or MAGPANG-, PAGPANG- -ON to pray for s/t]

Other terms for beseeching or imploring which were used in Lisboa’s time and are still current are ngayó’-ngáyo’ and agaghá’.

ngayó’-ngáyo’ MAG-, -AN ⇒ to beseech or implore s/o; MAG-, -ON to plead or beg for s/o [+MDL: ma’ MANG-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to plead for s/t; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to beseech or implore s/o]

agaghá’ (lit-) wail; supplication; MAG- to wail; ⇒ to beseech, implore; MAG-, -AN to wail over s/o; to ask for s/t in supplication [+MDL: agagá MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to wail over s/t; to lament s/t]

Modern usage has given aráng a more religious sense than in the past.

aráng MAG-, -ON to pray to s/o; MAG-, I ⇒ to pray for s/t; to aspire to or hope for s/t; PAG- hope [MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to ask for help, assistance or aid from s/o; to implore s/o]

Lisboa has two further interesting entries dealing with the idea of praying for something. While the Tagalog cognate of darangin (dalángin) is used in that language to mean ‘to pray’, darangin in Bikol is no longer used. Perhaps its contradictory interpretation of both good and bad left it too ambiguous to deliver a clear positive message. Karoy is an interesting attempt to move a word associated with a general benefit gained from one’s actions to religion, but that too did not survive.
darangin MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN ⇒ to pray for s/o’s well being; to curse s/o; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to praise or curse s/o by saying s/t; for example: Sawá’ ka di’ ka gagadán ‘May you be struck down’; ⇒ Pakaráháyon ka lugód nin Diós ‘May God bring you well-being’; MANG-, PANG- -AN to pray to God or the saints; MANG-, IPANG- to pray for s/t; also see sawa’ [MDL]

karoy benefit or gain which one hopes to achieve by carrying out particular actions; ⇒ a return on an investment of time, prayer (such as when s/o goes to church to pray for a reward or remuneration they hope to receive); MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to do s/t so that a later benefit or return will be realized; to consider how s/t can be used to further one's aims: Anóng karoy mo kaiyán? ‘What do you hope to gain by that?’; Anóng kinakaroy mo sakúya’ na urípon? ‘What do you hope to get from me, a slave?’ [MDL]

We can also see in Lisboa how other words were used to convey the sense of protection that could be available if one were only to pray.

sulóm MAG- to be dark, obscure (as a house without lights); PAG- darkness, obscurity; Nagsulóm na iníng hárong ‘This house is dark’; Nagsulóm na kitá; pagsuló daw kamó ‘We are in the dark; let’s have some light’; ⇒ Si makuríng pagsulóm ta iní kainíng pagkada’íng salong ‘We are surrounded by darkness because we have no torch’ (Implying: Protect us Lord in our hour of darkness) [MDL]

The next group of words look at terms for praise. Modern usage for úmaw is as it was during Lisboa’s time. Sambá had already been adapted by Lisboa, but its original meaning was ‘to take an oath or to swear allegiance’. Rukyáw is interesting for its modern usage has come quite a way from its original use in battle. The final entry, arak, did not survive into modern Bikol even though its original meaning seemed particularly well suited to religious adaptation.

úmaw MAG-, -ON to acclaim, esteem, extol, honor, laud, praise or venerate s/o; to dignify s/t; to commemorate s/t; MAG-, I- to praise or honor s/o for s/t; umáwon da’íng lí’at eternal praise; everlasting praise [+MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to praise, extol or exalt s/o; Magkasi naguúmaw ‘Both are worthy of praise’]

sambá MAG-, -ON to venerate or worship s/t; to adore s/o (religious context); -AN place of worship [+MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to adore or worship s/o or s/t]

rukyáw hommage, praise, tribute; MAG-, -ON to praise or pay homage to s/o; to extol s/o [MDL: cry of victory; MA- or MAG- to shout in victory; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to shout in victory over those who have been defeated (the victor)]

arak MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to praise or admire s/t (for its beauty, excellent quality or large quantity); to marvel at s/t; to be in awe of s/t; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to say s/t in praise of s/t or s/o; MAKI- -ON describing one who marvels at or is in awe of s/t; awestruck; -IMIN- to be in praise of s/t; Da’il máyong da’i
iminarak ‘There is nothing that person doesn’t admire’; MAHING- -AN to be carried away or be overcome in praise of s/t; MAKAHING- to be worthy of high praise or admiration; IKAHING- to be praised to the highest or to the extreme; Súkat ta ikahihingarak an pagkakurí nin Diós ‘We should extol the greatness of the Lord’ [MDL.]

The next set of words are terms for compassion, pity and grace. The most common of these is hírak which has changed little over the centuries. With its central meaning of compassion, it was not difficult to add the concept of God to this. The same is true for úgay. The meaning of compassion attributed to máyo’ did not reach modern Bikol.

hírak compassion, pity, woe; mercy, clemency; hírak sa difficult for; hard on; MAKA- pitiful, pitiable, touching; MA- ... SA to pity; to take pity on s/o; to feel sorry for s/o; MA- -AN to be pitied; MAKI+MA- to ask for mercy; to supplicate o/s; MA- -ON: mahihírakon pitiful, pathetic, wretched; PAGKA- mercy, pity; da’ing pagkahírak merciless, pitiless; unfeeling, hard-hearted; PAKI+MA-supplication; KA- -I: kahiráki ⇒ an expression equivalent to the English, ‘God have mercy’; hírak-hírak mercy, pity; MAKIMA- abject; da’ing hírak-hírak merciless, pitiless, unfeeling, hard-hearted [+MDL: MA-, MA- -AN to pity s/o; to feel sorry for s/o; MA-, IKA- to feel sorry for s/o for a particular reason; MAGMA-, PAGMA- -ON to show outward signs of compassion toward s/o (as by saying Hírak kaiyán ‘How pitiful’); MAKIMA-, PAKIMA- -ON to ask for pity, compassion; MAKIMA-, PAKIMA- -AN to ask for pity or compassion from s/o; MAKIMA-, IPAKIMA- to ask for pity or compassion for a particular reason; hírak-hírak MAKA-: Makahírak-hírak na ‘What a terrible pity’ or ‘What a shame’; syn- máyo’ only when affixed with MAKIMA-, PAKIMA-

úgay (lit-) compassion; grace; MA- compassionate; ⇒ full of grace [+MDL: MA- or MA- -ON compassionate; ⇒ pious, godly; PAGKA- compassion; piety, godliness; KA- friend, servant; úgay ko what a pity, how sad; an expression of sympathy or compassion: Úgay ko iká ‘Poor you’; Úgay ko siyá ‘Poor her’; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to be distressed about s/t; to feel pain or compassion for s/o (as s/o affected by a death); MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to voice an expression of sympathy or compassion out loud]

máyo’ there is not; without, devoid of; to not have or possess; naught, nil, no, none: Máyong lápis diyán ‘There is no pencil there’; Máyo’ siyáng probléma ‘He doesn’t have a problem’; [+MDL: always used with da’i: Da’i máyo’ ‘Nothing to confess, nothing to repent for’; Da’i máyong táwo ‘No one is here’; Da’i na máyó’ ‘There is no more’; MAKI-: ⇒ makimáyo’ to ask for pity, compassion; syn- hírak

The modern usage of grace and blessing come from Bikol words dealing with generosity or sharing. These did not have a religious meaning in Lisboa’s Vocabulario.

biyáya grace, blessing [MDL: MA- generous; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to show generosity toward s/o; to give gifts to guests or visitors; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to give s/t as a gift or as a sign of generosity; syn- tawala’, yagayag]
wáras grace, pity (used in prayers); MAG-, -AN to shower s/o with grace or pity
[+MDL: MA-, -AN to divide s/t; to give s/o a share of s/t; MA-, I- to allot or give s/t as a share; MAG-, PAG- -ON to divide s/t in two; MAG-, PAG- -AN to share s/t among yourselves; KA- s/t which is divided and shared]

The bowing action when showing reverence to God when praying was associated with words with similar meaning in Bikol. Súkol is only given a religious meaning in Lisboa, an attempt no doubt to give this more general action a very specific association which exists today in modern Bikol.

dukó’ MAG- to bend over; to bow, lean over, stoop; to crouch, hunch; to double-over; to duck; to cover oneself so as to avoid boxing blows [+MDL: MA- or MAG- to bow the head, as when praying; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON ⇒ to bow the head in homage or prayer; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to bow the head to s/o]

sukó'l MAG- to bow the head; MAG-, -ON to bow the head in prayer, homage; MAG-, -AN to bow the head to s/o [+MDL: MA- or MAG- ⇒ to bow the head, as when reciting the Gloria Patri ‘Glory to the Father’; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to bow the head in homage or prayer; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to bow the head to s/o]

6.12 Saints, spirits and priests

The ancestor worship in practice when the Spanish arrived in the Philippines had to be eliminated for the new religion to gain dominance. Also to be eliminated were all associations with such worship, including the female religious leaders, the balyán. With the introduction of Christianity, we have the introduction of a series of saints with their images, which must have in some ways reminded Bikolanos of the worship of their ancestors in the form of an aníto. We have a number of references to the saints and sainthood in example sentences.

Sinanglítan an pagkasánto ‘Sainthood is exalted.’

... kon si San Páblo ... ‘as said by Saint Paul.’

Pintakasíhon mo si Sánta María ‘Ask Saint Mary to intercede on your behalf.’

Quite conveniently, the Christian saints were also represented by images. Unusually, the term chosen for images of the saints was ladáwan which was associated with the image of an aníto. This is the term still used in modern Bikol. The term for dressing oneself up was also applied to the decoration of saintly images. This term is not used in modern Bikol in any of its meanings.

ladáwan image at a church altar; icon; MAG-, -AN to make an image or carve an idol of s/o or s/t; MAG-, I- to describe or portray s/t; to visualize s/t [BIK MYT: idols or images of the aníto, usually made of stone or wood] [MDL: image; MA- or MAG- to make an image; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN ⇒ to represent a particular saint with an image; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to make an image of a particular saint]
sayong MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to dress s/o up in their finest; to adorn a person, image or effigy; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- ⇒ to adorn s/o with fine clothes or jewelry [MDL]

Early Bikolanos were certainly familiar with the concept of guardian spirits for they either carried an image of a particularly beneficial aníto around with them (see Section 5), or they wore charms or amulets that served to protect them from harm. The term for guardian spirit was apparently falling into disuse during Lisboa’s time, as can be seen in the entry for alagad.

alagad MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to be in the constant company of s/o; to serve s/o; PARA- constant companion; servant (the meaning of 'servant' developed subsequent to the traditional meaning of 'companion'); ⇒ also once signified a household or guardian spirit: Si kuyán may paraalagad ‘That person has a guardian spirit’ [MDL]

For the same concept, modern Bikol uses a different term, also based on the concept of close association. These earlier meanings have disappeared in modern usage.

tambáy KA- guardian, spirits who watch over an individual; MÁGIN KA- to become a guardian spirit; ⇒ anghél na katambáy guardian angel; also see var-
tangbáy

tangbáy MAG- to do s/t together; to arrive at the same time; to be born on the same day; MAG-, PAG- -ON to make a matching pair; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to make one thing match another; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to match one thing with another; Katangbáy ko si Juán ‘Juan is the same age as me or Juan arrived at the same time as me’; (fig-) Tangbáy an bu’ót kaining áki’ or Tinatangbayán nin bu’ót iníng áki’ ‘This child has always shown common sense’; tangbáy na úlay a basic tenet (an opinion which one has always held); also see var- tambáy [MDL]

We also have the introduction of the leaders of the new religion, priests. There are numerous references to priests. Some introductory references are presented below. Further examples appear in subsequent sections.

Mála’ ngápít kundi’ taká ibubuybóy sa Pádre ‘Do what you want but I’ll tell the priest.’

Sa pádeng úlay ‘The priest’s words.’

In answer to a new convert’s question about the role of the balyán in Christianity, it is possible to imagine the following answer being given:

Su’ánøy asó da’i pang pádre ‘It was before there were priests.’

There are few examples which give some insight into the personalities of the priests. A priest, for example, could be too strict. Such a priest could find himself rejected by the community. He could find himself imbibing from a poisoned well, or he could wake up in the morning to find that he is suddenly alone, his converts having
abandoned him for the mountains (Phelan 1959:54). To converts who once encountered such a priest we might get the utterance in the entry below spoken in reassurance.

\[\text{tíu̠rot MA-}, -\text{AN or MAG-}, \text{PAG- AN} \text{to allow slack in a line; to loosen (a tie, knot); (fig-) -IMIN- to give in or yield after repeated requests; to soften one's attitude or stand: } \Rightarrow \text{Timinúrot na an bu'ót nin pádre} \text{‘The priest has softened his attitude to things’; also see } \text{tíu̠ros [MDL]}\]

The early priests were fully dependent upon the goodwill of the people to feed them, and they would go through the community asking for such support. In modern Bikol the Spanish loan \text{alabado} 'praised' has come to mean \text{beggar} no doubt because of these particular actions.

\[\text{alabádo} \text{beggar, mendicant; MAGIN to become a beggar; MANG- to beg; [SP- alabado: praised, the word probably came to mean beggar by association with priests asking for alms for the church]}\]

6.13 The church and mass

Going to church and the celebration of the mass were often equated. The most general term for this was and is \text{símba}. While we might assume that a very early meaning of \text{símba}, no longer extant when Lisboa was writing his \text{Vocabulario}, was ‘to pray to one’s ancestors’, and an early meaning of the locative form, \text{simbáhan}, the location of such prayers, there is no record of this for Bikol. These are, however, the early meanings attributed to such a term for Tagalog (Placencia 1589 in Blair and Robertson 1903–1909: Vol 7, 185).

\[\text{símba MAG- to worship; MAG- AN to go to church; to attend mass or religious services; MAG-, -ON to attend church for a particular reason; MAG-, I- to take s/t to church; -AN church, synagogue, temple [ +MDL: MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to go to church; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to go to church to hear mass or for another reason]}\]

The various example sentences which Lisboa uses in his \text{Vocabulario} give some idea of the challenge which the early priests must have faced in getting people to church. The more neutral examples are presented first, followed by those representing various difficulties or excuses for not attending.

\[\text{Nagsisímba pa siyá} \text{‘She’s still in church.’}\]

\[\text{Masímba pa akó} \text{‘I’ll still go to church or I’ve yet to go to church.’}\]

\[\text{Magsímba kitá} \text{‘Let’s go to church.’}\]

\[\text{Ta’ daw ta’ da’i ka siminímá? - Ta’ daw ta’?} \text{‘Why aren’t you going to mass? - Why, is it now?’}\]

\[\text{Ta’ daw ta’ da’i ka simíná} - \text{Da’i rugáring} \text{‘How come you didn’t go to church? - It wasn’t possible.’}\]
Dihán simimbá si kuyán, dihán da’í ‘Sometimes that person goes to church, sometimes not.’

Da’í nang gayód kitá makakasímba an naghîhîlang ‘It is improbable that we who are sick will be able to go to church.’

Ta’wí akóng gûhit. Darahón ko sa Pádre mi. Gi’ana da’í akó simimbá ‘Give me a letter. I’ll take it to our priest. He’ll think I haven’t been going to church.’

Sa lúba’ ko iníng pagsimba nindo pírit lámang, ngáning sabáli’ ‘Except for some of you, I think your going to church is because you are forced to.’

Ngutumpáng hinampák ka ta’ da’í ka palán simimbá ‘The reason why you were whipped was because you don’t go to church.’

While going to church and hearing mass were usually equated, we do get the introduction of the Spanish loan word misa into Bikol specifically for this meaning.

Nagmimísa na ‘(I’m) about to say mass.’

Nagmimísa pa ‘(He’s) still saying mass.’

Nagmimísa pa saná ‘(He’s) just started saying mass.’

Da’í ko nakít a idtóng Pádre n a nagmimísa / naghuhúlit ‘I didn’t see the Priest who was saying mass / preaching.’

Ta’ón-ta’onón ko na rugáring an Mísa ‘I’m just in time for the mass.’

We have in modern Bikol a term for the Consecration Mass which came after Lisboa’s time. The Vocabulario only defines this term as ‘to lift or raise something high up’. The raising of the Host during mass was associated with another term, tú’ón, which did not survive into modern Bikol.

Báyaw ⇒ Consecration Mass; MAG- to conduct such a mass [MDL: báyaw MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to raise or lift s/t high up; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to lift s/t up onto s/t else]

tú’on MAG-, I- to lift or raise s/t up; to elevate s/t; to boost s/t [+MDL: MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- ⇒ to raise or lift s/t up, and then lower it again (as the Host during mass); to hand s/t to one who is above you; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to hand or give s/t to s/o]

The use of chanting and singing in the church service was said to be very successful (Phelan 1959:75). This was probably due to the widespread use of singing, both in the religious life and ordinary working life of the early Bikolanos. Presented below are some examples of these songs.

nganan MANG- or MAGPANG- ⇒ to lead responsive singing (as when rowing, praying in a church); PANG- -AN or PAGPANG- -AN to respond in responsive
singing; IPANG-, IPAGPANG- to sing s/t responsively; PARAPANG- the leader of responsive singing [MDL]

dagaw MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to respond in verse to one who is singing [MDL]

hal-lía a ritual held on the nights of the full moon in honor of the gugúrang; bamboo or hollowed tree trunks are beaten to scare away the bakunáwa who would otherwise swallow the moon [BIK MYT] [MDL: a pastime of women who chant responsively on the nights of the full moon, one group saying hal-lía, and the other responding in the same way]

uhuya a way of singing in which the refrain uhuya is repeated many times; MAG- to sing in such a way; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to sing s/t in such a way; to lull a child to sleep by such singing; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to use the voice in such a way [MDL]

ambáhan song (typ- sung as a lullaby, during times of leisure or when rowing); MA- or MAG- to sing an ambáhan; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to sing an ambáhan to s/o [MDL]

hila’ a work song sung when pulling or hauling s/t, or when rowing; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to pull or haul s/t, or row while singing [MDL]

hulo song (typ- sung when rowing, or when pulling or hauling s/t); MA- or MAG- to sing this type of song; also see humulo [MDL]

humulo song (typ- sung when setting out to sea or when hauling s/t heavy); MA- or MAG- to sing in this way; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to sing a particular song when working in this way; also see hulo [MDL]

daniw MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to sing verses, as when drinking, not raising the voice; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to sing verses in this way to s/o [MDL]

guya’ MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to sing couplets; to sing a ballad; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to sing couplets or ballads to s/o [MDL]

6.14 Religious observations and celebrations

Along with the introduction of a new religion came the introduction of new religious celebrations. Many of these were associated with Easter and its spectacle of crucifixion and flagellation, although there is some reference as well to other celebrations which are discussed in this section.

Specific reference to Christian teachings, observances and practices came with publication of the Doctrina Christiana in Bikol by San Agustin and Martínez after Lisboa’s departure from the region. These Doctrina were translations of the standard Belarmino version and used Spanish for all of significant religious references so that these new concepts would not be tainted by those of an earlier religion. The Spanish references to religious observations which are not in Lisboa’s Vocabulario but are part of modern Bikol, come from citations in the Doctrina. Not all of these references, however, did become part of Bikol. Many remain strictly ecclesiastical with little use outside of
the religious community. The focus in this paper is primarily words for religious concepts which appear first in the Lisboa Vocabulario.

On a general level, we have the concept of church offerings which comes originally from the serving of food by laying it out on a table. The adaptation in Lisboa is still used in modern Bikol, although more generally to cover the concept of donation.

*dúlot* gift, donation; MAG-, IPAG- to donate, offer or impart s/t; PAG- donation; KAG- donor [MDL: MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to serve or place food on a table; ⇒ to take food to church as an offering; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to set a table with food; to make an offering of food to s/o; PARA- servers, those who take food to a table]

The concept of religious abstinence was associated in Lisboa with a general term. This is no longer used. Used in modern Bikol is the Spanish loan *abstinénsia*.

*lihi’* MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to abstain from s/t (not eating s/t or not doing s/t); PAG- abstinence; also ⇒ a day of abstinence [MDL]

*abstinénsia* abstinence; MAG- to abstain; MAG-, -AN to abstain from (usually from eating meat) [SP- abstinencia]

There is no direct reference to Christmas in Lisboa. There are many references to Easter, Lent, the crucifixion and to the Resurrection (see Section 6.8). The concept of flagellation coincided with the main instrument of punishment in early Bikol society and seemed, at least at first, to be readily accepted.

For reference to Lent, we only have the Spanish loan introduced by Lisboa in one of the example sentences in his Vocabulario, *Cuasema*, and this remains the term in modern Bikol as well.

*Da’i pa akó nagoconfesal kaining Cuasema* ’I have not yet gone to confession for Lent.’

*Kuarésma* Lent, the forty days preceding Easter, beginning on Ash Wednesday, seen as a time of penitence [SP- Cuasema]

For Ash Wednesday, there is no reference in Lisboa. Modern Bikol uses either of two phrases borrowed directly from Spanish.

*Miérkoles* Wednesday; *muró-Miérkoles* or *káda Miérkoles* every Wednesday; *kon Miérkoles* on Wednesday; ⇒ *Miérkoles de Sinisa* Ash Wednesday [SP- miércoles Wednesday; ceniza ash]

*kurús* MAG-, -AN to draw a cross on; MANG- or MAGPANG- to cross oneself; to make the sign of the cross; PANG-: ⇒ *Pangúrus* Ash Wednesday [SP- cruz]; also see *krus*

There are, however, references to the spectacle of Lent with Lisboa recording a term for the marking of revelers with ash, a term no longer used in that way in modern Bikol.
**buríng** referring to any animal with grayish stripes [MDL: ⇒ ground charcoal, soot, or mud used by revelers to mark themselves during the three carnival days preceding Lent; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to mark s/o with charcoal; **buríng-buríng** MAG- to walk around marking one another in this way]

As with Ash Wednesday, Lisboa had no formal reference to Holy or Maundy Thursday which is in modern Bikol a direct loan from Spanish. He does, however, have a reference to one of the rituals of that holy day.

**Huébes** Thursday; **káda Huébes** or **huró-Huébes** every Thursday; **kon Huébes** on Thursdays; ⇒ **Huébes Sánto** Holy Thursday, Maundy Thursday; the Thursday before Easter, commemorating the Last Supper [SP- *jueves*]

**busog** MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to pour water or another liquid from one container into another; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to fill one container with water poured from another; ⇒ used on Holy Thursday as part of the Maundy Thursday Mass [MDL]

Also occurring on the three days before Easter, beginning with Maundy Thursday, is the ritual of flagellation. Whipping was the common form of punishment in early Bikol society. The idea of whipping yourself as self-punishment was new, but it is a concept that did catch on in the Philippines and is very much in existence today. Phelan (1959:74) indicates that flagellation was at first embraced because of its novelty, but was not readily practiced. The set of four entries below exemplify the rite of flagellation.

**hampák** MAG-, -ON to lash or whip s/o; to flagellate; -AN the rite on Holy Thursday when penitents lash or whip themselves; PAG-: **paghahampák** flagellation; PARA- flagellant [±MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to whip s/o; MAG- -AN ⇒ to flagellate o/s (as on Holy Thursday); IPAG- -AN the rite of flagellation]

**líbod** MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN ⇒ to walk around town (as in procession or when following behind and flagellating s/o); MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to walk through the streets with s/o (as one you are flagellating); also see **líbot** [MDL]

**lisag** the sound of whipping or lashing; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON ⇒ to make this sound when whipping s/o (as during tenebrae, the last three days of Holy Week); (PAG-)AN to emanate from a particular place (such a sound); (fig-) **Muda pa ining pinaglisag na kitá panlapdosá** ‘What a sound of whipping when we lash one another’ [MDL]

**tunók** a thorn, barb, prickle; MA- thorny, prickly, barbed; MAG-, -ON to stick s/o with a thorn; MAG-, -AN to stick a thorn in a particular part of the body; MAKA-, MA- to get stuck with a thorn (a person); MAKA-, MA- -AN to get stuck with a thorn (a particular part of the body) [±MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON ⇒ to place thorns or barbs on a whip; KA- -AN: **katunokán** or **katungkán** an area of thorns; the wound caused when one is stuck by a thorn]
There is no formal term included by Lisboa in his Vocabulario for Easter. In the Doctrina Christiana of Martínez, Easter is referred to as Pascua, short for Pasco de la Resurrección. This term never did become popular in Bikol with reference to Easter, but became quite fixed with reference to Christmas. In modern Bikol the reference to Easter is based on the word mahál ‘love’.

**Paskó** Christmas; Easter; MAG- or MANG- to celebrate Christmas [SP- pasco]

mahál a loved one; dear; mahál kong my dear (used as a heading in a letter); MAG-, -ON to adore, cherish, love or revere s/o; MAKAPA-, MAPA- to endear o/s; KA- -AN adoration, love, reverence; majesty; An Saindóng Kamahálan Your Highness, Your Majesty; ⇒ Aldáw nin Kamahálan Easter [MDL: loved, cherished; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to esteem or cherish s/o; Mahál na gáyo ‘Wonderful’]

While the crucifixion is not formally referred to in Lisboa, there is reference to the carrying of the cross during Easter, and to the crowing of the rooster with reference to the Passion.

gásang a jagged stone; broken bits of stone or shell chips [+MDL: ⇒ coral (tightly branching, growing like small trees from the seabed, pieces of which are usually placed under the feet of those carrying the cross during Easter); also refers to rough or sharp stones]

babaló’ sound of a rooster crowing; MAG- to crow [+MDL: ⇒ used in the Gospels when recited in the Pasión; in common use is tukturá’ok]

**Pasión** Passion, a chanted hymn narrating the life of Christ from the Last Supper up to and including the Crucifixion, usually sung during Easter week with sections commonly acted out by the community; MAG- to sing or chant the Passion [SP-]

The modern Bikol terms for crucifixion and the removal of Christ from the cross, as well as the image of the dead Christ, are presented below. These are not references made by Lisboa, although they may very well have been used in light of the performance of the Passion indicated in the entries above.

páko’ a nail (carpentry); MAG-, I- to drive in a nail; to hit a nail; MAG-, -AN to drive a nail into s/t; to nail s/t; ⇒ ipáko’ sa krus to crucify s/o; an pagpáko’ sa krus crucifixion [+MDL: MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to nail s/t; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to drive in a nail]

tanggál MAG-, -ON to detach or disconnect s/t; to pull s/t out (as a plug from the wall, a nail from a board); MAKARA-, MA- to come off or come out; to become detached; PAG- ⇒ an pagtanggál the ceremony of removing Jesus Christ from the cross, celebrated on Good Friday; also the second part of the Pasión depicting the crucifixion [+MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to pull s/t out; to detach s/t; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to pull s/t out or detach s/t from somewhere]
Early Filipinos lived near their fields, and the attempt to bring them into denser communities where they could be more easily proselytized, was not always successful. The attraction of the fiesta would draw Filipinos to the town. There were three main fiestas through the year: Easter, Corpus Christi, and the celebration of the town’s patron saint (Phelan 1959:74). Lisboa makes references to the fiesta, introducing this word which is very much part of the modern vocabulary.

*Rimóng-rimóng na an bagtingón sa Nága; nagfiésta gayód* ‘The sound of the bells is resonating from Naga; it must be fiesta.’

*Pinauswág iníng fiesta* ‘The fiesta was postponed.’

*piésta* fiesta, feast, festival; holiday; a festival or holiday celebrated in honor of a particular saint; MANG-, MAKI- or MAKIPANG- to attend a fiesta; KA- -AN fiesta day; *Piésta de Presépto* Day of Obligation (religious) [SP- fiesta]

The association of food with religious ritual would not have been new to the early Bikolanos. There are a number of examples where food was used initially as a religious offering, later to be consumed by those attending the ceremony (see Placencia 1589 in Blair & Robertson 1903–1909: Vol 7, 186 & 190 for examples for the Tagalog region). Some of the terms, such as *húmay*, are still current.

*dízang* a sacrifice offered to the *gugírang* as a sign of thanksgiving consisting of one-tenth of the harvest, later eaten by the participants in the ritual [Bik Mty] [MDL: (arc-) ⇒ ceremonial offering of food to the *aníto*, later consumed by those attending the ceremony; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to offer food as part of such a ceremony; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to make a ceremonial offering to an *aníto]*

*sukob* (arc-) an ancient ritual or ceremony in which a pig is killed, and after being cut up and cooked, is distributed in a large bowl to be eaten by those present; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to divide up and distribute a pig in this way [MDL]

*bagit* a pig, fattened from the time a child is born into the owner’s family, and then killed when the child is grown; the butchered pig is then eaten at a feast called *karinga*; MA- or MAG- to grow and mature (this type of pig); MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to celebrate the growth of a child with the slaughter of this type of pig [MDL]

*gamit* (arc-) ceremonial feast in honor of the *aníto*; MA- or MAG- to organize such a feast; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to serve particular foods at such a feast; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to hold such a feast for a child; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to hold such a feast for a particular reason [MDL]
**húmay** MAG-, -ON to prepare a dish eaten on festive occasions in which seasoned fish or meat and rice are placed into segments of bamboo, left to age and then cooked; -ON: hinúmay the dish prepared in this way [+MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to prepare hinuhúmay; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to fill segments of bamboo with the ingredients for this dish; -ON: hinuhúmay the dish prepared in this way]

The festival in honor of all of the saints in modern Bikol is a direct borrowing from Spanish, but the celebration on the eve of that day, Halloween, is based on a native Bikol word, kalág, adopted quite freely for the meaning of soul or spirit and used in the *Doctrina*. These do not appear in Lisboa.

**Tódos los Sántos** All Saint’s Day; the festival on November 1st in honor of all the saints [SP-]

**kalág** soul, spirit; apparition, ghost, specter; MAG-, -ON to haunt s/o; MAKA-, MA- or MAKA-, MA- -AN to be haunted; MANG-, PANG- -ON to go around for ‘trick or treat’; to take things on Halloween; máyong kalág inconsiderate; ⇒ *Piésta nin mga Kalág* Halloween; *Paggirumdóm sa mga Kalág* All Souls’ Day; a day of prayer on November 2nd for the souls of those in Purgatory [MDL: the spirit or soul which gives us life]

Biblical references appear from time to time in Lisboa’s example sentences.

**baliw** -ON to be converted or changed into s/t else: ⇒ *Binabaliw idtóng agóm ni Loth nanigapóng asín* ‘Lot’s wife was changed into a pillar of salt’; MA-, MA- -AN to change (a person, from speaking a familiar language to speaking one that is foreign; the odor originally emanating from a cooking pot to another odor); MAKA- to cause or bring about such a change [MDL]

**sapak** a grouping of a large number or great variety of different species, ⇒ such as the animals on Noah’s ark, gold of different carats or qualities, people from different towns or regions; MA- -AN to be gathered in a particular place (a great variety or number of people, animals, things); *Sapak an mga táwo sa Manila* ‘There are many different types of people in Manila’; *Sapak iníng buláwan, iyó kagugutang* ‘This gold is of very many different types, and because of that will split if worked’ [MDL]

The celebration of marriage, one of the sacraments of Christianity, is also mentioned by Lisboa in association with the church. Marriage was a more transitory concept in early Bikol, and divorce and remarriage was common, as was adultery (Legazpi 1569 in Blair & Robertson 1903–1909: Vol 3, 61). Presented below are just a few of the entries in Lisboa’s *Vocabulario* which deal with divorce and extramarital affairs.

**ado’** referring to a man who takes the wife of another; MAG-, PAG- -AN ⇒ to take or marry a woman already married to another man; MAG- two men who have been married to the same woman, one having taken her from the other; two women living with or married to the same man; *Garó na kamó magado* ‘It is as
if you two have once been married to the same wife' (Said when two men are always arguing) [MDL]

ánab MA- usurper, describing s/o who always wants more of s/t; maánab-ánab na táwo a usurper; one who wants to take everything; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to usurp s/t; to take all of s/t for o/s; to always want more of s/t; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to usurp or take s/t from s/o; (fig-) ⇒ Naánab ka pa namán sa ibáng babáyi ‘You have a wife, and yet you still go with other women’ [MDL]

angag MAG- or MAGKA- ⇒ to argue or quarrel over a woman (two men, both of whom have a relationship with her); MAGKA-, PAGKA- -AN to quarrel over a particular woman [MDL]

dakóp MAG-, -ON to apprehend, catch or capture s/o; to collar s/o; to arrest or take s/o into custody; MAKA-, MA- to get caught [+MDL: MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to seize or grasp s/t; to capture s/o; MA-, -AN: dakpán or MAG-, PAG- -AN: pagdakpán to seize s/t from s/o; to capture s/o from a particular place or remove him from a particular family; MAKA-, MA- to be able to capture s/o; ⇒ to catch another man with your wife; MAKA-, MA- -AN to catch one’s wife with another man]

darayhát inconsistent, changeable; MA- or MAG- to be inconsistent; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to be inconsistent or changeable with regard to things, first liking one thing, then another; (PAG-)-AN to be unable to make up one’s mind regarding a choice between various items: Dinadarayhátán ka kaining dakól na babakalón ‘You are overwhelmed by all the things that are available for sale, and you can’t make up your mind’; -ON one who is inconsistent, uncertain; also: ⇒ a woman with many lovers [MDL]

ayáw MAG- ⇒ to divorce one another; MAG-, IPAG- or MAG-, PAG- -AN to get divorced for a particular reason; MAKI-, PAKI(PAG)- -AN to divorce s/o [MDL]

It was important to the missionary priests that Bikolanos marry only once, and stay married to one person. By bringing marriage into the church and associating it with the life of a practicing Christian, the priests hoped to achieve just such an aim. They were, for the most part, quite successful, even though in the short term the lack of divorce led to an increase in requests for religious annulments (Phelan 1959:61–63).

táwag MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to give notice in church of an intended marriage; to publish the banns of marriage; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to announce in church or notify the public of an impending marriage [MDL]

In the second example we also have the concept of extending the family through the concept of Godparents. In the Philippines, with its kin based system of association, such an extension of the family through marriage, as well as through baptism, was welcomed and quickly accepted (Phelan 1959:77–78).

tá’id MAGPA-, PAGPA- -ON to accompany the bride and groom, sitting next to them and drinking with them as part of the celebrations (see tágay); AN MAGPA- ⇒ those who accompany the couple at their wedding celebration,
being seated with them and drinking with them; the modern equivalent would be Godparents; syn- \textit{langláng} [MDL]

6.15 Construction and decoration of the church

It was the intention of the Spanish friars to make the church the center of village life in the areas of the Philippines converted to Christianity. The resettlement of the early populace into larger communities within earshot of the church bells was referred to as the Reduction.

We can see by the substantial number of example sentences in Lisboa referring to the construction of churches that this must have been given some priority. The following is just one example.

\textit{Anó na an simbáhan nindó? - Da’í pa dúgay} ‘How’s the construction of your church coming along? - It’s still a long way off.’

There is also some attempt to adapt the vocabulary of traditional architecture to the architecture of the church.

\textit{sibay} ⇒ nave of a church; covered walkway added along the outside of a house; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to add a nave to a church, a covered walkway to a house; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to make such an addition [MDL]

Lisboa makes many references to the decoration of the church with native plants and flowers. A notation is added in his \textit{Vocabulario} to those plants which are suitable for such decoration. These are presented below along with some of the verb forms to show how they are to be used.

\textit{gara’dat} small tree (typ- possessing flowers are ⇒ used to decorate churches) [MDL]

\textit{palango’} plant (typ- growing in the forest, very fragrant; ⇒ used in decorating churches); MANG- to collect this plant [MDL]

\textit{daragangan} shrub (typ- with stiff leaves ⇒ used to decorate churches) [MDL]

\textit{hágol} palm tree (typ- found in the mountains, producing a wood good for use in making ducts or guttering, and flooring for houses) [MDL: ⇒ the fronds are used to decorate churches during fiestas]

\textit{ungkarip} fruiting stem of the betel palm (búnga); ⇒ the bunches of flowers hanging from this stem are commonly hung in churches during fiesta [MDL]

\textit{sagipi’} a type of trinket or decoration made from palm leaves woven together into a lattice-like square; ⇒ used in decorating churches; MAG-, to weave such lattice-like squares [MDL]

\textit{sagaksák} MAG-, -ON to cut the leaves of palm fronds ⇒ (to be scattered about in church); MAG-, -AN to cut the leaves from palm fronds [MDL]
gisí’ a tear; torn; MAG-, -ON to tear, rip; MAG-, -AN to rip or tear from; MAKA-, MA- to get torn, ripped [+MDL: MAG- to be torn in two; MAG-, PAG- -ON ⇒ to tear in two (many things, such as palm fronds to decorate the church)]

taputap MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- ⇒ to scatter s/t with the hand (as when scattering flowers or palm fronds in church); MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to scatter s/t over a particular area [MDL]

wákay MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to scatter or spread s/t; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to scatter or spread s/t over a particular area; MAKA- to be scattered, spread: ⇒ Wákay na iyán búrak dihán sa simbáhan ‘The flowers are scattered at the church’ [MDL]

We also have the traditional torch used for lighting in churches.

sarangsáng length of bamboo split in many places, used for digging; also used as a base for resin torches or lamps to keep them from falling over ⇒ (used to light churches); MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG- -ON to dig s/t up with bamboo split in this way; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to dig in a particular area; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to use a sarangsáng for digging; -ON: sinarangsáng such a digging tool or torch holder [MDL]

6.16 The altar and religious objects

As for the contents of a church, and the various implements associated with Christianity, a number of terms were introduced and others were adapted from Bikol words with essentially different meanings.

For altar the Spanish term was used. Any native term (see Section 5) would have had too close an association with worship of the aníto. For the canopy of the altar, Lisboa uses the same word as for ‘the white of an egg’. The image is probably that of the cooked white of an egg cut in half.

Atúbang kamó sa altár ‘Face the altar.’

Sa man altár ‘near the altar’

langit-lángit white of an egg; ⇒ canopy of a bed or altar [MDL]

There were occasions when converts were denounced in front of the congregation. This might be, for example, for excessive drinking, something which the priests were eager to stamp out due to its association with pre-Christian religious practices associated with marriage, funerals, and a host of other occasions (Phelan 1959:76; also see Chirino 1969: Chapter 34). An angry priest might have occasion to strike the pulpit, and this is also referred to by Lisboa.

karandól bumping sound; MAG- to make this type of sound [MDL: ⇒ deep, hollow sound such as that made by the thud of a boat, the striking of a pulpit; MA- or MAG- to make this sound; Karandól na ‘What a deep, hollow sound’]
As for other religious objects, Lisboa has a number of references: to the painting of an altar piece, an embroidered covering for the chalice, and a shell for the holding of holy water.

**daran** MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN ⇒ to paint s/t in color (such as an altar piece); MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to use particular colors; to add color to particular figures, designs; -AN: *dinadaranan* s/t painted in color; *dinaran* plate (typ-painted in color); *daran na* painted [MDL]

**bugták** embroidery (typ- sewn along the edges and in the middle of a piece of cloth), ⇒ similar to that found on cloth used to cover the chalice during religious services; sometimes used as a head covering (*pudóng*); MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to embroider such cloth; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to embroider cloth with a particular thread; -AN: *bugtakán* cloth with such embroidery [MDL]

**tilang** clam (typ- saltwater; ⇒ the shell is used in some areas for holding holy water in the church) [MDL]

There are also references to particular actions carried out with these objects, each being the extension of a native Bikol word. Only the last is still used in modern Bikol.

**diwdíw** MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- ⇒ to moisten the fingertips (as when dipping them in holy water); to moisten the whip used to discipline s/o; syn- *dawdáw* [MDL]

**wirík** MAG- to shake dry (as a dog); MAG-, I- to sprinkle water; MAG-, -AN to sprinkle water on s/t [MDL: MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- ⇒ to sprinkle water with the hand or an aspergill (a container for holy water); MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to sprinkle s/t with water]

**láhid** MAG-, I- to spread s/t (as butter on bread); to coat with s/t; to anoint with s/t; MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to spread s/t on s/t else, to coat s/t; to cover s/t with a thin layer; ⇒ to anoint; to rub s/o with oil, ointment; -AN: *an linahídan* the anointed ones [+MDL: MA-, -AN or MAG-, PAG- -AN to rub s/o with oil, balm, an ointment]

7. Conclusion

The dominant religion in the Bikol region, as it was in most of the Philippines and Southeast Asia outside the influence of Islam, was animist. Bikolanos worshiped their ancestors and carved statues to represent those they wished to venerate. Their religious leaders were women, and these women retained their power through the ability to heal the sick, comfort the dying, and ensure the survival of the young. The arrival of the Spanish and with them priests and Christianity was to challenge this established order. The priests brought with them another set of beliefs which was to prove more enduring and powerful.

The spread of Christianity was forceful and relentless. Eventually the lure of the Church and the benefits it provided, propelled by coercion and the destruction of the visual images of animist worship, allowed Christianity to dominate and spread throughout the region. There were still places to run to if one wanted to avoid the Church and the rule of the Spanish, but these places became more distant and
increasingly more isolated from the changing mainstream of society. Those who fled would eventually return to the towns and the inevitable domination of the Church.

This paper has examined some of the early linguistic changes which took place in the Bikol language to accommodate the introduction of Christianity. Many of these changes involved extending the meaning of an existing word to accommodate a Christian message. Other changes involved the introduction of Spanish loan words to represent new religious concepts.

Change did not begin nor end with Lisboa. Lisboa undoubtedly recorded usage which was introduced by the Franciscan priests who came before him. He must have also extended the meaning of words to serve as a model for priests who were to come after him. Change also continued long after Lisboa. Modern Bikol has both added and adapted words, as well as leaving words to fall into disuse and eventually disappear.

In some cases the original meaning of words was completely replaced. *Bunyág* ‘baptism’, for example, once meant ‘to sprinkle with water’, a meaning which ceased to exist. *Símba*, which probably meant ‘to pray to one’s ancestors’, came to mean exclusively, ‘to go to church’.

In other cases words underwent only minor change with the addition of small nuances of meaning. *To sála* ‘fault, error’, was added the concept of *sin*, and to titles of address, such as *kagurangnán* ‘Mr, Mrs’ we get the addition of *the Lord* when used to address God.

We also get new meanings added to words which exist along with traditional meanings. *Báwi*, for example, still means ‘to take back what is given’ in addition to its new meaning, ‘to exorcize’. *Tanggál* ‘to detach, to remove’, now carries the additional meaning ‘the removal of Christ from the cross’ in the nominal form of *an pagtanggál*.

Loan words were added to introduce new concepts which did not exist in early Bikol society. *Hell* and the *devil* were introduced with Christianity along with the Spanish loan words, *impiérno* and *demónio*. For *confession*, *kumpisál* was introduced, and for saints and priests, *sánto* and *pádi’*.

Loan words were also introduced to replace native words which were considered to be too closely associated with early religious practices. For *altar*, for example, we get *altár* and not the native *salángat* associated with worship of the *aníto*, and for *God* we get *Diós* and not *bathála’* which was also tainted by its association with ancestor worship.

Not all of the new religious vocabulary was successfully integrated into Bikol. There are numerous examples where an attempt to adapt traditional vocabulary to the new religion was unsuccessful. *Pára* ‘to erase’, for example, was given the additional meaning ‘to forgive one for their sins’, and *karoy*, related to a particular benefit or gain one would receive from one’s deeds, was associated with prayer. Neither of these survive in modern Bikol.

In like manner, not all of the Spanish loan words were accepted into Bikol in spite of their clear dominance in a religious context. The *Doctrina Christiana* of 1708 is filled with Spanish loan words for Christian concepts such as *baptismo* ‘baptism’, *comulgar* ‘communion’, and *Pasco* ‘Easter’ which were never to become part of the Bikol language.

In many areas of Spanish colonization, Spanish became the principal language of communication. Local languages were gradually overwhelmed, losing speakers and dominance. This was not the case in the Philippines where Spanish was primarily the language of government and spoken by the upper classes of society. At no time did Spanish speakers number more than 10 percent of the population. As a result it was the local Philippine languages that had to adapt to carry the message of a new regime and a new religion. This paper has examined some of the changes in Bikol. Other Philippine languages would have come under similar pressures and undergone similar changes.
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Bridging Cultures with a Bilingual Dictionary

Leonard E. Newell
Summer Institute of Linguistics

A carefully compiled bilingual dictionary is a linguistic and cultural bridge between two languages. It opens an avenue for the comprehension of concepts expressed in a target language by people of a source language or for people of the source language to compose concepts in the target language.\(^1\)

The potential use and usefulness of a bilingual dictionary varies greatly depending in part on the nature of the two languages involved. An English-German or German-English dictionary, for example, would probably be of primary use to students of either English or German or researchers working in one of these languages with which they are only partially familiar.

A bilingual dictionary such as an Ifugao-English dictionary on the other hand would have a different potential for use and,\(^2\) in fact, would have significant restrictions on its use and usefulness. It might, of course, be used by students of the Ifugao language and culture, though this would be a limited use since those investigating Ifugao are few in number. It could be used by an Ifugao learning English though, for this purpose, it would have limited usefulness. Better would be an English-Ifugao dictionary that would describe the lexicon of English in a language most familiar to the Ifugao student. This is precisely what an Ifugao needs for both comprehension of English and composition of oral and/or written material in English. Lexicographers have said repeatedly that it is impractical, and I would say probably impossible, to describe both languages simultaneously in a bilingual dictionary. An Ifugao-English dictionary would undoubtedly be of value as a repository for at least some of the Ifugao language and culture. And certainly such a purpose is important for posterity, to preserve valuable and, eventually in some cases, irretrievable information.

But can a volume such as an Ifugao-English dictionary have practical value in the everyday lives of an average native speaker? To answer this question we need to know precisely what kind of languages and cultures are involved and what happens when they come together in a way in which one influences the other or they influence each other. English is what we might term a cosmopolitan language. By that is meant that in its developmental history, through extensive contact with many other languages and cultures, it has developed into a composite language reflecting a conglomerate culture. And not only has it borrowed from other languages and cultures but it has participated in multicultural development in which it, simultaneous with many other cultures in

\(^1\) The target language is the language being described in the dictionary. Lexical items of that language in an alphabetically-arranged standard dictionary appear nearest the lefthand margin of the page. The language used to describe the lexical items is the source language.

\(^2\) Ifugao is a language in north-central Luzon, Philippines with about 10,000 speakers. It is just emerging from a pre-literate stage. The New Testament scriptures *Nan Maphod an Ulgud Jesu Kristu* was published in 1977 and a bilingual dictionary, *The Batad Ifugao Dictionary with Ethnographic Notes*, was published in 1993. Other publications are forthcoming.
Europe, America and elsewhere, has developed what might be called a super culture. The term “super” is not intended to imply “superior” but simply “composite” in that it includes cultural features of many societies. For convenience of reference we refer to the language and culture of such a group as cosmopolitan. In marked contrast are groups such as Ifugao which we designate as having folk languages and cultures. These are languages with a history of relative geographic and/or cultural isolation. Many, but by no means all, have taken on some of the superficial trappings of super cultures, some aspects of outside material culture such as clothing or electronic gadgetry, but are distinguished by the fact that basically they adhere to cultural values and mores of their ancestral heritage.

So when two such languages become juxtaposed, especially through mass media, the folk society will inevitably begin taking on features of the cosmopolitan culture despite any possible attempts of purists within the folk culture or crusaders from the outside to prevent or minimize it. Usually such acquisitions are taken on willy-nilly. They are unplanned and uncontrolled with a tendency to primarily adopt features of the super culture that have a negative impact on the folk culture. The result is all too often cultural stagnation with people living a dead-end existence within a cultural “living death” milieu. In some cases it results in cultural disintegration and death.

It is here that a bilingual dictionary can assist in developing some order to an otherwise chaotic situation. A folk language-cosmopolitan language dictionary carefully compiled with both linguistic and ethnographic information can provide a major tool for allowing carefully selected and wholesome aspects of the cosmopolitan language and culture to be shared in a way that fits the cultural context of the folk language and culture. This would result in the controlled cosmopolitan development of the folk culture. It would have the aim of enriching, rather than supplanting, the culture with, hopefully, minimal negative impact.

A folk language-cosmopolitan language dictionary could be designed basically as a translator's dictionary. It would contain a carefully selected vocabulary designed to cover the translation of written materials in the cosmopolitan language. This would be restricted to material of “high moral and patriotic value.” It would also contain ethnographic information especially relevant to the anticipated areas that might be translated and this would aid in vocabulary selection. It could also be designed to include the preparation of materials using other media as well as, for example, a video media. Selection of multi-media materials would be by responsible nationals who are sensitive to needs of a folk culture, probably with the help of outsiders who know best what appropriate materials are available.

In compiling a folk language-cosmopolitan language dictionary, the compiler should have a detailed list of possible materials for translation. Though much vocabulary would be compiled into the dictionary during the course of translation projects, the compiler should be well aware of the material to be translated and include as much relevant vocabulary as possible into the dictionary before translation is begun. It would be more difficult to anticipate the need for the dictionary’s use in preparing for projects using other media. Lacking vocabulary would need to be added immediately preceding and during the development of such projects.

The final question is, who would be the principal user of a folk language-cosmopolitan language dictionary? The answer to some extent involves the extent to which native speakers are able to take concepts in the cosmopolitan language and

---

3 This term is commonly used in statements of intent in the translation of materials by the Summer Institute of Linguistics for various cultural communities worldwide.
adequately translate them into the folk language. For some languages, major input is necessary by someone from outside the language, commonly a linguist. This might be someone with the same national background as people of the folk culture, or it might be someone from another country. There are some folk languages, however, for which native speakers are or can be adequately trained to be the primary users of the dictionary to translate materials into their own languages, usually with some help from outsiders. In this case, the dictionary would be used primarily to understand and translate concepts originating in the cosmopolitan language. Access to such concepts would be through an extensive cosmopolitan language index which would key cosmopolitan language concepts into the folk language.

For many folk-language projects a cosmopolitan language-folk language dictionary would be most ideal. It would provide a tool to aid members of the folk culture in comprehending and selecting concepts in the cosmopolitan culture and preparing them for use in the folk society. It has, however, one major drawback: it would be largely a single-purpose dictionary. A folk language-cosmopolitan language dictionary on the other hand could serve several purposes. It would provide a major tool for non-native speakers to help in the process of transferring concepts into the folk language. It could be used by students and researchers with an interest in the folk culture. It would help establish the folk language, struggling for a place in a multi-cultural context, to be established as a bona fide language. And it would be a major linguistic and cultural treasury for the folk language.

Bilingual dictionaries, carefully prepared with extensive cultural notes can and should aid folk cultures to selectively adopt wholesome features of contiguous cosmopolitan cultures.
Similes in Itbayat, Philippines

Yukihiro Yamada  
*Himeji Dokkyo University*

This article presents a list of similes, more exactly metarisons in Itbayat which are minus common features (i.e. item C) recognized as shared between things. Universal as the expression of comparison is, a particular culture reveals its uniqueness in positing an analogous feature between things otherwise dissimilar. A rat, scientifically the same mammal the world over, for instance, may differ in use when comparing with somebody or something. The analogous feature of a rat is often betrayal in English, cleverness in Japanese, restlessness in Itbayat, and others. The uniqueness of the Itbayat culture may be reflected in the expressions below.

Itbayat, or Dichbayat as called by the people, is the northernmost inhabited island of the Philippines. The language spoken there is Itbayat or Ichbayaten which belongs to the Bashiic subgroup of the Austronesian family of languages.¹

The oral literary expression in the Itbayat language may include folk tales (*kavvataahen*), indigenous folk songs (*raji*), foreign or modern influenced songs (*kanta*), proverbs (*ivvatah, ichchiriñ, haliñbaawa*), riddles (*kalelleengan*), comparisons (*kapharit*), similes (*pannaxataxaan*), metaphors (*kapanrara’nes*), beliefs (*pannovilan*), taboos (*laagen*), metatheses (*pivilyen a chiriiñ*), tongue twisters (*manvalilih so rila*), idiomatic expressions (*panhichonan*), jokes (*sisyavak*), teasing (*ippasorih*), cursing (*kapangavay*), antiphrases (*patolisan, tomok*), and others. Some examples of the types of the Itbayat oral literature have been published and refer to the references.

Comparison is a general term covering several types of expressions made in connection with analogy. According to Kamei, et al. (1996), there are four types of comparison: 1. comparison (a. comparison of equality, b. comparison of inferiority, and c. comparison of superiority), 2. simile, 3. metarison, and 4. metaphor. Patterns and samples of comparison are as in the following.

1a. A is as C as B.  
Herod is as despotic as Caesar.

1b. A is not so C as B.  
Herod is not so despotic as Caesar.

1c. A is more C than B.  
Herod is more despotic than Caesar.

2. A is C like B.  
Herod is despotic like Caesar.

3. A is like B.  
Herod is like Caesar.

4. A is B.  
Herod is Caesar.

When items A and B, which are essentially unlike each other, are compared, expressions exhibited above may be possible. Although the items are unlike each other,

---

¹ I would like to express my gratitude to Angelito P. Castro, Teofredo A. Gaza, Faustina A. Cano, Erlinda A. Pommet, Francisco Garcia, Celerina M. Navarro, and other people of Itbayat for furnishing me the expressions listed in the following and for rechecking the data.
they are comparable as to a certain common characteristics C which A and B may
supposedly share with.

The expressions of comparison treated in this paper belong to metarison according
to the types above which lacks the item C. However, the more general and familiar term
simile (pannaxataxaan < taxa: imitation, similarity) is adopted in the title of this paper.
The form of the comparison in Itbayat is akma (A) i B, ‘(A) is like B’, in which A is
optional and C is not expressed but is to be inferable from the commonly known
characteristics of B. The item A, the subject of the sentence, is often unmentioned as in
the form akma i B. It is probably because the expression is well used and understood in
the society and may behave as idiomatic.

An example (cf. No. 43 below) will show the structure and meaning of this type of
comparison. Akma ako i pnalo a tona [like (Predicate)-I (Topic / Subject)-[linker after
akma]-beaten-[linker]-eel] (I am like a beaten eel). This is an example of metarison.
The unexpressed item C, that is, the intended meaning in the phrase, is marijat ‘dead
tired’, or matatalakak ‘lazy’, and the meaning of the whole phrase Akma ako i pnalo a tona
is ‘I am dead tired like a beaten eel’. Eels are usually unmoving, quiet, or still when
they are heavily beaten. The topic or subject (ako in this case), which is the item A, may
be unexpressed in the following list.

The expression of comparison may be used with a personal pronoun plus a
negative particle (ah). The expression akma i nidlwan a nahaw (No. 44) ‘Like the
nahaw-shell animal poured with hot water’ may be in the negative like akma ka a h i
nidlwan a nahaw ‘Don’t be like the nahaw-shell animal poured with hot water’. The
intended meaning of the former is ‘changing suddenly, easy-going, or showy’.

Expressions of comparison in this paper will be exhibited in the following manner:
the expression in the Itbayat language on the first line, its English translation on the
second line, the intended meaning of the expression on the third line, and some notes on
words and others on the fourth line. They are arranged according to the kind of item B
in the order of astronomy and physiography, humanity, faunae, florae, things, and
matters. The most popular B items, which are compared to in the expressions below, are
faunae and florae.

The phonemes (units of sounds) of the language are /p t k ch k b d j g (f) v s r h x m n
ñ ng l w y i e a o/. The symbols ch, j, and ñ are a voiceless palatal affricate (ch as in
English church), a voiced palatal affricate (j as in English jam), and a palatal nasal (ñ as
in Spanish señor) respectively. The symbol ng is a velar nasal (ng as in English singer), ‘is
a glottal stop (- as in Tagalog mag-ama), x is a voiced velar fricative (g as in Spanish
agwa), and e is a higher-mid central vowel (ir as in British English bird). The f may occur
in loan words.

(1) Akma i kamatoxoren (a voxan).
‘Like a full moon.’
‘Wide-eyed as when a child is wide awake even after it is put to sleep; protruding
eyes; big eyes; shining brightly.’
[kamatoxoren (< toxod ‘full moon’); voxan ‘moon’. Cf. Akma i kamatoxoren a voxan so
mata. ‘It is one whose eyes are like a full moon.’ mata ‘eye’]

(2) Akma i na’kas a vitwen.
‘Like a plunging star; like a shooting star.’
‘To drop something very swiftly from a higher place (to put it down).’
[na’kas (< a’kas ‘to drop’); vitwen ‘star’]
(3) Akma ta i nandep so rawang.
   ‘We are like those who entered a subterranean cave.’
   ‘To enter a dark place; entirely dark.’
   [ta ‘we (inclusive)'; nandep (< asdep ‘to enter’); so ‘grammatical accusative marker’;
    rawang ‘subterranean or underground cave’]

(4) Akma ka i volaw.
   ‘You are like volaw.’
   ‘Announcement or omen of good things to come.’
   [ka ‘you (singular)’; so ‘grammatical accusative marker’; volaw ‘a place-name; banging
    of waves; place from which echoing of voice is heard, such sound or voice as waves’.
   The phrase is expressed when people are noisy. Mamnaw dana anti iya ta atoh makbokbot do volaw
   ‘The weather will be clearing up or calming down because the waves are making sounds
   as when produced in drumming.’ Mamnaw ‘to be clear’; dana ‘already’; anti ‘later’; iya ‘this’; ta ‘because’; atoh ‘being present’;
    makbokbot (< akbot ‘sound produced by drumming’); do ‘grammatical locative marker’]

(5) Akma i nakavoraw a mataya’nak.
   ‘Like a freed baby-sitter.’
   ‘Very happy to be unburdened or freed from a responsibility.’
   [nakavoraw (< voraw ‘wild, getting loose (of fish, animal)’) ‘freed, got wild’;
    mataya’nak (Cf. anak: one’s own child) ‘baby-sitter’. Cf. No. 29.]

(6) Akma ka i kaanakan a a’bo so lalawsan.
   ‘You are like a young person without an anus.’
   ‘Empty-headed; simpleton.’
   [ka ‘you (singular)’; kaanakan ( < anak ‘one’s own child’); a’bo ‘none’; so ‘grammatical
    accusative marker’; lalawsan ( < lawos ‘anus’). In size you are just growing bigger
    without an anus. You have no plan in your life. You don’t know anything. You grow
    big with no knowledge. Cf. Nos. 50 and 71.]

(7) Akma ka sawen i makatachi an kaavahavayat.
   ‘So you are like one defecating during the west wind.’
   ‘In a half-sitting posture; ready to make a quick leaving the place; one who squats and
   seems to be going in a hurry.’
   [ka ‘you (singular)’; sawen ‘really’; makatachi (< tachi ‘excreta’) ‘to defecate’; an ‘if, when’;
    kaavahavayat (< havayat ‘west wind, monsoon’). Havayat brings sudden rainfall
    which people can hardly evade. If you can quickly stand up straight, you may be able
    to escape the rainfall on your back. People hate the rainfall on the back but they don’t
    mind if it falls on the head.]

(8) Akma i manongtongdo a iposox.
   ‘Like a Posox dweller who is repeatedly pointing at something.’
   ‘One who is wondering and pointing almost everywhere; one who points everywhere
   repeatedly from a higher place like in the pasture land; only managing or instructing
   people but does not work himself; no definite thing to point.’
   [manongtongdo (< tongdo ‘to point’); iposox (< posox ‘a place-name’) ‘residents at
    Posox’.]
(9) Akma i michatawotawo o madngey cho.
‘As if I can hear people talk.’
‘Very silent; very calm and quiet; too silent for comfort.’
[michatawotawo (<tawo ‘person’) ‘people talking to each other’; madngey (<adngey ‘to hear’); cho ‘variant of ko (‘I’). You don’t hear any sign of other people in the field. There is not any sign of a person around you.]

(10) Akma ka ah i pnaralinan.
‘Be not like one who is (falsely) blamed. Don’t be ashamed.’
‘Hesitant to go or move.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; pnaralinan (< ralin ‘to pass the blame’) ‘to be falsely accused’]

(11) Akma kamo i va’yo a makaawat.
‘You are like a new swimmer.’
‘To disperse or scatter without any orderly manner (like an unskillful swimmer in the sea).’
[kamo ‘you (plural)’; va’yo ‘new’; makaawat (<awaat ‘to swim’) ‘swimming, moving confusingly one’s hands and feet’]

(12) Akma ka i paxapaxad.
‘You are like a spirit.’
‘Very thin; malnourished; skeletal.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; paxapaxad (<paxad ‘soul, spirit’). It is believed that the spirit of man is thin like skeleton.]

(13) Akma (ka na) i kalyen a karam.
‘(You are already) like a rat that is being dug out.’
‘To be very tense; fidgety; restless; watching for a chance.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; na ‘now, already’; kalyen (< kali ‘to dig’); karam ‘rat’. A rat in a hole dug is eager to get out of the hole and flee. It was uttered to me when I was anxious to leave Itbayat Island by any means for I was about to consume the days scheduled on the island (due to a typhoon).]

(14) Akma i naxta a karam.
‘Like a rotten rat.’
‘Big-eyed; something very odorous.’
[naxta (<axta ‘being rotten, decaying’); karam ‘rat, mouse’]

(15) Akma ka i kattalyahen a kadiñ.
‘You are like a jumping goat.’
‘Flirting; very energetic; hyperactive.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; kattalyahen (<talyah ‘inducing to play’); kadiñ ‘goats’. Goats jump. Girls play or jump to attract boys’ attention.]

(16) Akma ka i nahari a bolaasan.
‘You are like a male-goat, hair of which has not been trimmed for a long time.’
‘Untrimmed look; unkempt; boys who have long hair.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; nahari (<hari ‘to neglect, forgetting’) ‘male goat’]
(17) Akma ka i tootohod no pananakey a bolaasan.
‘You are like the knees of bolaasan-goat kept in the field.’
‘Dirty, spoiled.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; tootohod (<tohod ‘knees’); no ‘grammatical genitive marker’;
pananakey (<takey ‘field, space other than village on Itbayat Island’); bolaasan ‘male
goat (of multi-colors)”]

(18) Akma ka ah i nisiprota n kabaayo.
‘Don’t be like a whipped horse.’
‘Running very fast; to be too fast.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; nisiprota (<sprot ‘to whip or lash’); kabaayo ‘horse’. Cf. No. 52.]

(19) Akma ka i nixamon no volay.
‘You are like one swallowed by a snake.’
‘To be neat, well combed, well groomed.’
[nixamon (xamon ‘to swallow’) ‘swallowed’; no ‘grammatical genitive marker’; volay
‘snake’. The phrase is used when someone’s hair is well combed or, on the contrary,
the hair is loose or unkempt (antiphrasis). When a bird is swallowed by a snake,
the plumage is found well-combed when the belly of the snake is cut open.]

(20) Akma ka sawen i pnapnanawyan.
‘So you are like one victimized by a manawi-bird.’
‘One who is very lean and weak; lean person; very thin.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; sawen ‘really’; pnapnanawyan (<sawi ‘act of grabbing’) ‘left-over
of eagles, skins and bones are only left after the eagle eats its catch’; eagles are called
oyod a kangkang or manawi ‘one which grabs; a hawk species’ which eat goats, sheep,
small pigs; tayakoyab ‘a notorious bird as chick-getter’; sichep is more notorious than
tayakoyab. The words ka sawen may be omitted.]

(21) Akma ka ah i ni’i’sanan a posak.
‘Don’t be like a cat which is left behind while the family are working in the field.’
‘Too eager for attention; to miss someone so much as to want to be very close to
him/her; touching or rubbing someone.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; ni’i’sanan (<i’san ‘to stay overnight in the field’); posak ‘cat’. Cf.
No. 22.]

(22) Akma ka ah i mañirihid a posak.
‘Don’t be like a cat touching or rubbing against persons.’
‘Longing, lonesome.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; mañirihid (<irihid ‘to brush off against something’) posak ‘cat’. Cf.
No. 21.]

(23) Akma ka ah i voraw a posak.
‘Don’t be like a wild cat.’
‘Untamed.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; voraw ‘wild’; posak ‘cat’. A cat in the field quickly flees.]

(24) Akma ka ah i tito.
‘Don’t be like a dog.’
‘Discourteous; to give no respect; no greeting.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; tito ‘dog’. It is uttered to one who does not greet. Akma ka i tito
‘You are like a dog.’]
Akma ka i nipaso a tito.
‘Like a roasted dog.’
‘Very ugly.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; nipaso (<paso ‘to roast’); tito ‘dog’]

Akma kamo i nakkavoraw do pasto.
‘You are like stray animals in the pasture land.’
‘To be wild; to scatter in all directions.’

Akma ka i lipliptan.
‘You are like a pig being killed.’
‘Crying very hard; too complaining; too loud/noisy.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; lipliptan (<lipet ‘to kill, butcher’). ‘crying of pigs when butchered’]

Akma i nachtahiwawa a atay.
‘Like a separated liver.’
‘One who secludes himself from the rest (of the group).’
[nachtahiwawa (< tahiwawa ‘separated’); atay ‘liver’. Liver sometimes has a part separate from the whole. Atay contains bile or gall (apdo) which is bitter (makpahad). Therefore, it is carefully cut separate. If it is carelessly cut, other part of the meat is spoiled (gets bitter). The apdo of pigs is particularly bitter, though apdo of cows and goats is not so bitter and edible. The phrase is uttered to encourage to join the group when someone is shy and alone in a group.]

Akma i nipavoraw a kangkang.
‘Like a released bird.’
‘To be free, happy.’
[nipavoraw (<voraw ‘stray, astray’) ‘was made released’; kangkang ‘bird in general’. Cf. No. 5.]

Akma ka i tarisiñ.
‘You are like a tarisiñ-bird.’
‘To trespass or occupy someone else’s place without permission.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; tarisiñ ‘a sp. of bird; hermit crab’. When a dove is out of its nest, tarisiñ-bird comes in and lays eggs. Cf. No. 46.]

Akma ka i ittoooxoh.
‘You are like an owl.’
‘One with big eyes; one who cannot sleep at night; insomniac.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; ittoooxoh ‘owl which has big eyes, nocturnal bird’]

Akma ka i natbex a tarokok.
‘You are like a soaked tarokok-bird (in the rain).’
‘To feel cold; to crouch; to squat down doing nothing; to be completely wet.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; natbex (<atbex ‘to be wet, soaked by rain’); tarokok ‘a sp. of bird which is brown and large’. Tarokok in the rain crouches with its feather hanging down.]
Akma ka i nipasaropang a vakag.

‘You are like a vakag-bird turning to face someone.’
‘Unruly hair; unkempt (of hair); loose hair which is awkward to look at.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; nipasaropang (<saropang ‘face, front’); vakag ‘a sp. of bird, Strix seloputo wiepkeni’. The bird is active from twilight to night to catch mice on the ground. The feather of the vakag-bird is rough and unkempt. Cf. Nos. 34 and 35.]

Akma ka i namarogan a vakag.

‘You are like a vakag-bird which went towards the east.’
‘Unkempt, uncombed, not combed.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; namarogan (<varogan ‘east’) ‘went eastward’; vakag ‘a sp. of bird, Strix seloputo wiepkeni’. The bird’s feather gets loose in the east wind. They are like going toward the east. Children go afar off (probably eastwards) when they are sulky. Cf. Nos. 33 and 35.]

Akma ka ah i nakraw a vakag.

‘Be not like a driven-away vakag-bird.’
‘To run away; untamed; wild.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; nakraw (<akraw ‘to drive away’); vakag ‘a sp. of bird, Strix seloputo wiepkeni’, that has big eyes and is similar to an owl. The vakag-bird flies or runs away whenever you get close to catch it. The phrase is uttered to one who hides himself once he sees a certain person. Cf. Nos. 33 and 34.]

Akma i manannavex a piiyek.

‘Like a piiyek-bird hunting tavex-snails.’
‘Very curious and looking for something.’
[mannannavex (<tavex ‘a sp. of land snail’) ‘to gather or catch tavex’; piiyek ‘a sp. of bird which looks around restlessly under the fallen leaves and gathers snails’]

Akma i homayam a paato.

‘Like a walking duck.’
‘One who walks very slowly; to foppishly walk; to flauntingly walk.’
[homayam (<hayam ‘to walk’); paato ‘duck’. Cf. No. 48.]

Akma ka ah i nawtan a manok.

‘Don’t be like a disappeared or unseen chicken.’
‘You should be near or around your house.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; nawtan (<atan ‘to disappear’) ‘extermination’; manok ‘chicken’]

Akma ka i nivohitan a siwsiw.

‘You are like a blown chick.’
‘To walk unsteadily.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; nivohitan (<vohit ‘to blow’); siwsiw ‘chicks’. Chicks are hard of walking in the strong wind.]

Akma i nakxa a tiiyak.

‘Like a thirsty ricebird.’
‘Very thirsty.’
[nakxa (<akxa ‘very thirsty’); tiiyak ‘ricebird which is a very common bird in Itbayat and people are familiar with its habits. Perhaps the bird is often seen drinking water.’]
(41) Akma ka i di makapsa so ittiiyoy.
‘You should be very careful when carrying eggs in order not to break.’
‘Walking slowly; cunning; pretending to be well-behaved; very good looking but bad immoral thought in the heart.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; di ‘not’; makapsa (<apsa ‘to break’) so ‘grammatical accusative marker’; ittiiyoy ‘eggs of chickens and birds’]

(42) Akma ka antayi i hangtay no kangkang a ichaskex da rana a pirohaen a ittiiyoyan.
‘You will be like a nest of birds in which they don’t like or refuse to lay eggs any more.’
‘To be discriminated against; old nests are not used.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; antayi ‘later, in the future’; hangtay ‘nest’; no ‘grammatical genitive marker’; kangkang ‘bird in general’; ichaskex (<askek ‘dislike’) da ‘they’; rana ‘now, already, a variant of dana’; pirohaen (<doha ‘two’) ‘again’; ittiiyoyan (<ittiiyoy ‘egg’). It was actually said to a woman who bore an illegitimate child.]

(43) Akma i pnalo a tona.
‘Like a beaten eel.’
‘Dead tired, lazy doing nothing, too tired to do anything.’
[pnalo (<palo ‘to strike’); pnalo ‘contracted form of pinalo which is the past tense of palo’. Pinalo is possible but less idiomatic. Eels become unmovable when beaten.]

(44) Akma i nidlwana nahaw.
‘Like the nahaw-shell animal poured with hot water.’
‘To change suddenly, to drop the old customs too fast for new ones as in chinamanilaan (influenced by social trend in Manila), showy, easy-going.’
[nidlwan (<adlo ‘to boil water’); nahaw ‘a sp. of seashell animal.’ The shell animal quickly comes out when poured with hot water.]

(45) Akma i toyohen a poxok.
‘Like the poxok-fish that are driven away.’
‘To evade responsibility; running away and don’t mind the order, disobedient.’
[toyohen (<toyoh ‘to drive away’); poxok ‘a sp. of fish’. The poxok fish quickly runs away. An pachrawatan kamo an akma kamo i toyohen a poxok ‘When you are sent on for an errand you must be like driven-poxok’ an ‘if, when’; pachrawatan ‘hired helper, servant’; kamo ‘you (plural)’]

(46) Akma (ka sawen) i tarisiñ.
‘(So you are) like a tarisiñ-hermit crab.’
‘One who stays at someone else’s house; homeless person; one who habitually borrows something from others.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; sawen ‘really’; tarisiñ ‘edible hermit crab at the seashore which uses seashells for its home. It is larger than omang which has the same habit’. Cf. No. 30.]

(47) Akma i nitohoy a mata no among.
‘Like pierced eyes of (many) fish.’
‘One opinion; united; in good harmony; people or family having the same opinion, same direction.’
[nitohay (<tohoy ‘to pierce or prick through something, chain of beads’), mata ‘eyes’; no ‘grammatical genitive marker’; among ‘fish’. Cf. No. 58.]
(48) Akma ka ah i tagpepeng.
‘Don’t be like a tagpepeng-snail.’
‘Very slow.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; tagpepeng ‘a kind of sayih-snail (small brown flat snail) which walks very slowly’. They say that the tagpepeng-snail which starts climbing a tree (e.g. nato) with no flower yet reaches the top when the tree bears its fruit. Cf. No. 37.]

(49) Akma kamo i niptaran a karwarway.
‘You are like thrown or dispersed fireflies.’
‘To disperse; to get away.’
[kamo ‘you (plural)’; niptaran (< aptad ‘to throw, to stone’); karwarway ‘fireflies’. It is uttered as when you just leave the place after eating. Cf. No. 73.]

(50) Akma ka ah i towed awi.
‘Don’t be like a cut stump.’
‘Hard headed; just sitting; to be still, just standing or sitting around when everybody is busy.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; towed ‘stump’; awi ‘the, that’. Cf. Nos. 6 and 71.]

(51) Akma ka i a’si no kava’ywan a wakay.
‘You are like the first crop of sweet potato.’
‘To appear to be brand-new or fresh; to be good; good for the first time; not so good for the second or third time.’
[ka ‘you (singular)’; a’si ‘fruit, meat, flesh’; no ‘grammatical genitive marker’; kava’ywan (< va’yo ‘new’); wakay ‘sweet potato’. The first crop of sweet potato is always good but ones after the first are not so good (i.e. smaller).]

(52) Akma ka i maarosod a xoyit.
‘You are like the sheath of areca nut palm on which things slide down.’
‘To be too in a hurry; to do something or walk very fast.’
[maarosod (< arosod ‘to slide down’); xoyit ‘sheath of voowa (areca nut tree)’. The phrase is expressed as when one wants to marry somebody immediately. Akma ka ah anti i maarosod a xoyit ‘Don’t be in a hurry like the sheath of voowa.’ maarosod ‘past form of maarosod’. Even if you really want to marry her immediately, don’t express your feeling easily, and be patient for a while. Don’t be impetuous, hotheaded, or impatient. Cf. No. 18.]

(53) Akma i tohor no kawayan.
‘Like a new shoot of bamboo tree.’
‘It grows very fast.’
[tohor ‘shoots, sprouts’; no ‘grammatical genitive marker’; kawayan ‘bamboo’. Cf. No. 70.]

(54) Akma i maslaslah so kawayan.
‘Like splitting a bamboo.’
‘To laugh loudly; one who laughs very loud.’
[maslaslah (< aslah ‘to split’) ‘sound made when splitting a bamboo’; so ‘grammatical accusative marker’; kawayan ‘bamboo’. Cf. Akma ka i naslaslah a kawayan ‘You are like a split bamboo’. ka ‘you (singular)’; naslaslah ‘past form of maslaslah’. Akma ka ah anti aslaslahen a kawayan ‘You should not laugh loudly.’ ah ‘negative particle’; anti ‘later’; aslaslahen (< aslah ‘to split’).]
(55) Akma i chawi.
‘Like a chawi-fruit.’
‘Very sweet or sugary; very tasty.’
[chawi ‘a sp. of tree, Pometia pinnatifida Forst. The fruit is very sugary’. The phrase is used when the food or something to eat is very tasty, sweet, or sour.]

(56) Akma i nawaray a snasah.
‘Like an untied reeds; like scattered reeds.’
‘To go in different directions; to scatter; to be in disorder.’
[nawaray (<waray ‘to unfurl (of folded cloth, flag, etc.), untie, loosen’); snasah (<sasah ‘to cut reeds for use’) ‘reeds taken for use’. When the bundle is broken or untied, they (reeds) slip off and will be in disorder. Cf. No. 26.]

(57) Akma i nixarih a kamaya.
‘Like a well-rubbed kamaya-fruit.’
‘One who appears to be very red as a child from outside where it is very hot.’
[nixarih (<xarih ‘to rub or scrub’) ‘rubbed’; kamaya ‘a kind of fruit like persimmon with hair on surface. It gets reddish when rubbed or affected constantly by the wind for a long time.’ Cf. No. 65.]

(58) Akma i ni’leb a siiva.
‘Like an evenly cut siiva.’
‘Very trim or trimmed; united in opinion; thing/part that is very even and equal. All are of the same characteristics.’
[ni’leb or inleb (<a’leb ‘equal in height’) ‘cut evenly, made even’; siiva ‘a sp. of medicinal plant’. Siiva is usually trimmed evenly. The pods of the plant have many papula which are of the same height. Cf. No. 47.]

(59) Akma i ni’si a varit.
‘Like a peeled rattan fruit.’
‘Too many eyes looking; so many eyes. Many are looking (at me).’
[ni’si (<a’si ‘meat, fruit’) ‘removed the meat of something’; varit ‘a rattan species’. When the skin of the seeds of the rattan fruit is removed, shiny seeds look like staring at you, and look like gamot (horsefly).]

(60) Akma i ja aya a saxawngi no nixbak a varit.
‘Like something that cannot be noosed by means of split rattan.’
‘Untamed; wild; to come few by few (like ants).’
[ja ‘not’; aya ‘this’; saxawngi (<saxawong ‘a trap made of split rattan’); no ‘grammatical genitive marker’; nixbak (<axbak ‘to split’) ‘split’; varit ‘rattan family’. The noose is used by pulling a string to catch a game. Cf. Akma aya i ja saxawngi no nixbak a varit which expresses the same meaning.]

(61) Akma i pnanoxagan a voyavoy.
‘Like a voyavoy-plant the top portion of which was cut off.’
‘Wet to the bone and just keeping standing still; useless person; useless standing post; senseless person.’
[pnanoxagan (<soxag ‘edible tender interior part of trunk and leaves of coconut, etc.’); voyavoy ‘Phoenix philippinensis [Philippine date palm] whose tender part (soxag) of the upper trunk is edible’. Once it is eaten, the plant becomes only a useless standing post. Cf. No. 67.]
(62) Akma i pnanareng a abngay.

‘Like black wood leaning against something.’
‘Dark skinned.’

[\textit{pnanareng} (\textless \textit{nareng} ‘to lean against’); \textit{abngay} ‘hard black part of tree-trunk’. It is uttered by one who stepped on a person squatting down in the dark.]

(63) Akma i kavaka no niyoy so mata.

‘Eyes like a halved coconut shell.’
‘One whose eyes are like a halved coconut shell; big eyes; protruding eyes.’

[\textit{kavaka} (\textless \textit{vaka} ‘to cut into half’); \textit{niyoy} ‘coconut’; \textit{mata} ‘eye’]

(64) Akma (ka sawen) i hañinen a taratid.

‘(So you are) like a taratid-bamboo affected by typhoon.’

‘Swaying or rocking from side to side when walking (due to tallness of stature).’

[\textit{ka} ‘you (singular)’; \textit{sawen} ‘really’; \textit{hañinen} (\textless \textit{hañin} ‘typhoon’); \textit{taratid} ‘a type of bamboo with thorns’]

(65) Akma (ka sawen) i chariwachiw.

‘(So you are) like a saxbang-flower.’
‘Very red; red face affected by heat under the sun or due to drinking.’

[\textit{ka} ‘you (singular)’; \textit{sawen} ‘really’; \textit{chariwachiw} ‘variant of kariwachiw (which is the flower of saxbang tree). The flower is very red.’ Cf. No. 57.]

(66) Akma i mintaxataxam do mavokay a soli.

‘Like being used to tasting taro somewhat dried when cooked.’
‘To look for something absent; yearning for better; used to something good.’

[\textit{mintaxataxam} (\textless \textit{taxam} ‘to taste something’) ‘used to taste’; \textit{do} ‘grammatical locative marker’; \textit{mavokay} (\textless \textit{vokay} ‘somewhat dried or hard due to less water or other reasons when cooked’); \textit{soli} ‘taro (root crop), Araceae Colocasia esculenta’. This kind of root crop is very tasty. When you get accustomed to something good, you would ask for something still better.]

(67) Akma i pinapexpex a akdas.

‘Like something made stuck on by throwing.’
‘Idle; having nothing to do.’

[\textit{pinapexpex} (\textless \textit{pexpex} ‘overlaying with plaster and the like such as mud, cement’) ‘made it stuck as when wet mud or soft banana is thrown at something’; \textit{akdas} ‘decorticating the bark of tree, which causes the trunk of trees (such as vayo, xangtak, xaso) to produce sticky sap’. Cf. No. 61.]

(68) Akma i chinteb a xosongen.

‘Like a piece of cut lumber which is made into a mortar.’
‘One who is short and very fat.’

[\textit{chinteb} (\textless \textit{akteb} ‘to cut crosswise’); \textit{xosongen} (\textless \textit{xonsong} ‘mortar’) ‘trunk to be made into a mortar’]

(69) Akma i initem a kalah.

‘Like a tight kalah-container (of clothes).’
‘Always closed-mouthed; one who does not talk at all.’

[\textit{initem} (\textless \textit{item} ‘tight’); \textit{kalah} ‘a kind of vírivod (finely made basket) for containing treasure or clothes, the lid and the mouth of which fit tightly; giant clam (kono) which closes its shells very tight.’]
(70) Akma ka i nivorine'net a lastiko.
   ‘You are like an elastic rubber band.’
   ‘To grow very fast.’
   [ka ‘you (singular)’; nivorine’net (<vorine’net ‘elastic’); lastiko ‘rubber band’. Cf. No. 53.]

(71) Akma ka i laata a’bo so miyanmiyan.
   ‘You are like a can without content.’
   ‘Empty headed; a dull person; a noisy but shallow person.’
   [ka ‘you (singular)’; laata ‘a can, a container’; a’bo ‘none, nothing’; so ‘grammatical accusative marker’; miyanmiyan (<miyan ‘presence, there is’) ‘content’. Cf. Nos. 6 and 50.]

(72) Akma ka i xavyang.
   ‘You are like a basket for cooked sweet potato or yam.’
   ‘Messy look; facial dirt of food particles (morid) especially around the mouth.’
   [ka ‘you (singular)’; xavyang ‘a basket on which food, particularly root crops, is placed. The basket is made of rattan (ahway).’ When finished eating, the xavyang basket is usually dirty with particles of cooked root crops.]

(73) Akma i nawsep a kalabobo.
   ‘Like a deflated bubble; like bubbles disappearing without any traces.’
   ‘To suddenly disappear without telling anybody; something that ends quickly; passing phenomenon; being fickle or capricious.’
   [nawsep (<osep ‘puff or put off/out’); kalabobo ‘bubble’. Cf. Akma ka i nawsep a kalabobo di chadpilan aya ‘It is like a deflated bubble in this western side’. There is a similar expression with do varogan aya (in this eastern side) instead of di chadpilan aya (in this western side). A negative example with a personal pronoun is akma ka ah i nawsep a kalabobo ‘Don’t be like a bubble that could never be seen again.’ ka ‘you (singular)’; ah ‘negative particle’. It is also used when they don’t want to see something or somebody again. Cf. No. 49.]

(74) Akma i may do prosisyon.
   ‘Like going to a procession.’
   ‘A group of people walking very slowly.’
   [may ‘to go’; do ‘grammatical locative marker’; prosisyon ‘funeral procession’]

(75) Akma ka ah i homayam do prosisyon an bibbirnis santo.
   ‘Don’t walk like the procession on the Holy Friday.’
   ‘To walk too slowly.’
   [ka ‘you (singular)’; homayam (<hayam ‘to walk’); do ‘grammatical locative marker’; prosisyon ‘procession’; an ‘if, when’; bibbirnis santo ‘Holy Friday’]

(76) Akma i a’bo i napaapariñ.
   ‘As if nothing has happened.’
   ‘Feigned ignorance; to play innocent, as if one knew nothing about it.’
   [a’bo ‘non-existence, nothing’; napaapariñ (<pariñ ‘to do or make’). Said as when a typhoon which gave much damage left and calm weather came back.]
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1. Introduction

Laurie Reid has devoted much of his career to the study of the languages of Northern Luzon. His various studies of Bontok (1963, 1964, 1970, 1992) including his Bontok-English dictionary (1975), his analysis of Kankanay (1973), his researches on Atta (Reid, Lusted, and Whittle 1964), Arta (1989) and Alta (1991) as well as his continuing delimitation of a Cordilleran subgroup (1974, 1979, 1989) all point to an abiding theoretical interest in this critical group of Philippine languages. As a tribute to his fundamental research and to him personally for his contributions to the study of Austronesian languages, I offer this anthropological analysis of the available evidence on the relationship terminologies of the Northern Luzon. This paper examines the structural variation in these northern Philippine relationship terminologies.

The Northern Philippines or Cordilleran language group consists of a large number of diverse languages for which there is considerable, reliable linguistic and ethnographic documentation. Reid (1989:57) includes twenty-four separate languages in his revised classification of this group. Well-documented and reasonably reliable relationship terminologies have been recorded for eighteen of these languages, representing most of its various internal divisions.

An analysis of these terminologies offers exceptional possibilities for comparison, particularly within the wider context of a comparative study of Austronesian relationship terminologies in general. In the expansion of the Austronesian populations southward from Taiwan, the northern Philippines is the initial region in which a distinct group of languages can be defined as Malayo-Polynesian. A study of these relationship terminologies thus looks in two directions: (i) to the terminologies of the Formosan languages, and (ii) to those of other Malayo-Polynesian languages — in particular, the western Malayo-Polynesian languages.

In 1908, A. L. Kroeber wrote a brief paper setting forth eight “principles” that underlie all relationship terminologies. These “principles” are 1) generation (the difference between persons of the same and separate generations), 2) laterality (the difference between a lineal and collateral relationship), 3) relative age (the difference of age within one generation), 4) gender (sex of relative), 5) sex of speaker, 6) affinity (the difference between consanguineal relatives and those relatives related by marriage), 7) the condition of (connecting) relative,

---

1 This paper forms part of a more comprehensive comparative study of contemporary Austronesian relationship terminologies. This larger study is intended as a systematic examination of a representative sample of approximately five hundred complete terminologies drawn, as far as possible, from all of the purported subgroups of the Austronesian language family.
and 8) the sex of connecting relative. All of these principles are relevant to the study of Austronesian relationship terminologies, although principle 8 would be more appropriate if it were modified to include 'status' as well as 'sex' of the connecting relative. All eight principles are also relevant to the terminologies of the Cordilleran languages.

All the Cordilleran relationship terminologies are structured according to generation and distinguish between consanguineal and affinal relationships. These two principles set the parameters within which other principles, such as relative age, gender, sex of speaker and so on, are variably applied. This paper will focus specifically on the consanguineal and affinal dimensions of two generations: the first ascending generation (G+1) and Ego’s generation (G+0). The first descending (G–1) generation will also be considered briefly. The analysis is concerned to identify the common features of these terminologies while at the same time noting the variable elements that differentiate them. As a methodological and also as an expository means of proceeding, I will endeavor to examine the basic configurations in these terminologies beginning in each case with the simplest in a formal sense. In providing examples of these configurations, I will try to represent, as far as possible, the range of Cordilleran terminologies.

2. The Cordilleran Languages

Following Reid’s (1989) classification of the group of Cordilleran languages, I have grouped these eighteen terminologies in relation to one another as follows:

I. Northern Cordilleran

1. Cagayan Valley [A]

   (a) Atta
   (b) Isnag
   (c) Ga’dang

2 It is worth noting that in 1919, Kroeber published an analysis entitled “Kinship in the Philippines” in which one can recognize his application of these principles of relationship to Philippine terminologies. The data he had to work with was limited and his reconstruction of an “ancient system” is tentative at best. While his specific observations are often pertinent, it is particularly interesting to observe that he gave little attention to the varied affinal dimensions of Philippine terminological systems (See Fox 1988 for a further discussion of Kroeber’s model.)

3 It should be emphasized that this is a formal analysis, not a historical linguistic analysis. That this formal analysis is directed to a group of terminologies that share relatively close historical relationships is, however, a critical factor underlying the analysis and therefore historical connections among these terminologies are relevant to an overall discussion. The terminologies that I have relied on for this analysis are drawn from a variety of sources. Chief among these sources is the compendium on Philippine kinship compiled by Elkins and Hendrickson on the basis of data supplied by linguists of the Summer Institute of Linguistics. I have also drawn on information in Handbook of Philippine language groups as well as the analyses of specific terminologies by anthropologists and linguists (Fred Eggan, Ronald Himes, Henry Lewis, and Michelle Rosaldo). All of these sources are cited in the References. I am also grateful for additional information supplied by the editors of this volume and by Ronald Himes who commented on an earlier draft of the paper.

4 I have designated each of the subgroups within this classification with a letter [Aâ€”F] as a simple way of representing these subgroups for comparative purposes.
2. Northeastern Luzon [B]

(f) Dumagat (Casiguran)
(g) [Dumagat (Umiray)]

II. South Central Cordilleran

3. Central Cordilleran

3.1 Nuclear Cordilleran [C]

(h) Ifugao (Amganad)
(i) Balangao
(j) Bontok
(k) Kankanay (Northern)/Sagada Igorot

3.2 Itneg-Kalinga [D]

(l) Itneg (Binongan)
(m) Kalinga

4. Southern Cordilleran [E]

(n) Ilongot
(o) Kallahan (Keley-i)
(p) Ibaloi [Karao] 
(q) Pangasinan

III. Ilocano [F]

(r) Ilocano

It is important to note that although Reid included Dumagat (Umiray) in his 1989 classification of Cordilleran languages, by 1994, he was able to offer evidence that Umiray Dumagat did not belong within this group of languages. He had earlier communicated this possibility, which was accepted (see Blust 1991). Now further evidence to support this view has been provided by Himes (2002). In this paper, I have purposely retained Umiray Dumagat. It is clearly the most divergent terminology within the group and thus, from a different basis, supports the view that this language

---

Information on the Karao/Karau terminology from Ronald Himes' fieldnotes indicates that in terms of reference, Karao is remarkably similar to Ibaloi. For the purposes of this paper, I refer to the published data on the Ibaloi.
does not belong among the Cordilleran subset of languages. The evidence of this divergence is worth presenting.

3. First Ascending Generation: Consanguineal Relations

All of the Cordilleran relationship terminologies have a broadly similar cognatic or bilateral structure. Thus, in the first ascending generation, FB is not distinguished from MB nor is FZ distinguished from MZ.\(^6\)

Of the eighteen Cordilleran terminologies, only one, Bontok, makes no distinction between F, FB, MB on the male side and M, FZ and MZ on the female side. In Bontok, only gender is applied to distinguish relatives in this generation.

**Bontok**

\begin{align*}
\text{ama} & \quad \text{F, FB, MB [male, G +1]} \\
\text{ina} & \quad \text{M, MZ, FZ [female, G +1]}
\end{align*}

In formal terms, this configuration can be represented as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{F/FB/MB} & \text{M/MZ/FZ} \\
\end{array}
\]

Other Cordilleran terminologies have, in addition to terms for F and M, terms for designating FB/MB and FZ/MZ, a configuration that can be represented as follows.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{PSb m} & \text{F} & \text{M} & \text{PSb f} \\
\end{array}
\]

Many of these terminologies are, in fact, not markedly different from the Bontok case in that they use variants of the term for father (ama) and mother (ina) to designate FB/MB and FZ/MZ. In addition, they continue to use terms for father and mother in addressing FB/MB or FZ/MZ. The Kalinga provide an example of this pattern.

**Kalinga (Southern Tanudan) [E]**

\begin{align*}
\text{ama} & \quad \text{F, FB, MB [Address: amaq/papa]} \\
\text{amaqon} & \quad \text{FB, MB} \\
\text{inaq} & \quad \text{M, MZ, FZ [Address: inaq/mama]} \\
\text{inaqon} & \quad \text{FZ, MZ}
\end{align*}

Similarly, Kallahan, Ibaloi and Pangasinan all use terms derived from ama and ina to designate FB/MB and FZ/MZ as indicated in this example from Ibaloi.

**Ibaloi [E]**

\begin{align*}
\text{ama} & \quad \text{F [Address: ama, tatang, dadi]} \\
\text{ina} & \quad \text{M [Address: ina, nanang, mami]}
\end{align*}

\(^6\) In the following discussion, I rely on standard specifications for kin terms: P = Parent, F = Father, M = Mother, B = Brother, D = Daughter, Z = Sister, S = Son, Sb = Sibling, Sp = Spouse, W = Wife, H = Husband, C = Child, e = elder, y = younger, f = female, m = male, m.s. = man-speaking, w.s. = woman-speaking. Thus, for example, FB is father’s brother, MB is mother’s brother, CC is child’s child or grandchild, BW (w.s.) is brother’s wife (woman-speaking).
Other Cordilleran terminologies refer to FB/MB and FZ/MZ by separate terms. Some examples of this pattern are:

**Atta [A]**
- ammonq/yama: F
- innoq/yena: M
- ulitak: FB, MB: PSb (m)
- ikiq: FZ, MZ: PSb (f)

**Balangao [C]**
- ama: F (FB, MB)
- ina: M (MZ, FZ)
- oletég, oletao: FB, MB [Address: ama]
- iket: MZ, FZ [Address: ina]

**Itneg (Binongan) [D]**
- ama: F [Address: ammang]
- ina: M [Address: innang]
- uliteg: FB, MB [Address: ama]
- ikit: MZ, FZ [Address: ina]

**Ilongot [E]**
- ‘ama: F, FB, MB, MBW, FBW [honorific address]
- ‘ina: M, MZ, FZ, MZH, FZH
- ta’u: FB, MB [optional]
- ‘ikit: MZ, FZ [optional]

**Ilocano [F]**
- ama(ng)/tata(ng): F [Address: ama, tatang, tata]
- ina(ng)/nana(ng): M [Address: ina, mamang, nana]
- uliteg: FB, MB
- ikit: MZ, FZ

The fact that in all of these examples the terms for FB/MB (ulitak, oléteg, uliteg) and FZ/MZ (ikiq, iket, ikit, ‘ikit) are cognates gives a sense of seeming similarity to these terminologies. More significantly, the optional use of separate terms for FB/MB and FZ/MZ, as in the case of Ilongot, and the continued use of ama/ina in address for FB/MB and FZ/MZ in the case of the Balangao and Itneg are indications that these...
terminologies are not greatly dissimilar to the structurally simple Bontok configuration. In its simplified form, Ilongot is exactly like Bontok in this regard.

A number of other Cordilleran terminologies are, as it were, in some kind of ‘transitional state’ between these two configurations. Thus Dumagat (Casiguran), for example, has a variant of the term ‘ama for FB/MB but a separate term for FZ/MZ.

**Dumagat (Casiguran) [B]**

- ‘ama F [Address: améng, ‘maméng]
- amay FB, MB
- ‘ina M [Address: inéng, ‘nanéng]
- ‘dada MZ, FZ

Kankanay has two terms for FB/MB, one of which is a variant of ama.

**Kankanay (Northern) [C]**

- ama F
- ina M
- pangamaqen, alitaqo FB, MB [Address: ama]
- ikit MZ, FZ

Ifugao, by contrast, uses a variant of ama for FB/MB and a variant of ina for FZ/MZ but in addition has another separate term for FB/MB.

**Ifugao (Amganad) [C]**

- ama F
- ina M
- amaon, ulitaon FB, MB
- inaon FZ, MZ

Rather than posing a contrast between two possible configurations, it would seem more appropriate to recognize the possible gradations between these two patterns. It is possible to trace these gradations from (1) the Bontok case to that of (2) the Ilongot, where separate terms are optional, to the cases of (3) the Kalinga, Kallahan, Ibaloi and Pangasinan where terms for parents’ siblings are variants of the terms for father and mother, to (4) the Ifugao and Dumagat (Casiguran) cases where a separate term for FB/MB exists along with a variant term for F, to (5) Kankanay where there are two separate terms plus an additional variant (of the term for father), to cases such as those of (6) the Balangao and Itneg that have separate terms for FB/MB and FZ/MZ but maintain variants of F and M as address terms to the (7) Ga’dang and Ilocano where separate terms for FB/MB and FZ/MZ are used for both reference and address. One could see this as a possible historical transformation but given all the gradation in this schema, one could imagine ‘transformations’ in both directions. In other words, over

---

8 In this generation, Ifugao also displays another not-uncommon feature of Austronesian relationship terminologies. Terms of reference to relatives in this senior generation are changed when the relative dies. Thus *ama* becomes *amandi* ‘late or deceased father’, *ina* becomes *inandi*, *amaon* becomes *amaondi*, *ulitaon* becomes *ulitaondi*, and *inaon* becomes *inaondi*.
time one could envisage the possibilities of the loss of options and the simplification of systems as well as their further development.9

In all of this the Dumagat (Umiray) stand out as exceptional by their thorough-going differentiation according to relative age. Thus parents’ siblings (male and female) are distinguished by separate terms according to age.

**Dumagat (Umiray)**

- *ama* F
- *ina* M
- *wawa* e (FB, MB) [Sbm]
- *mama* y (FB, MB)
- *teti* e (MZ, FZ) [Sbf]
- *nangnang* y (MZ, FZ)

Among Malayo-Polynesian terminologies in general, this is a relatively rare configuration.10

4. Ego’s Generation: Sibling Terms

There are evident similarities in the patterning of terms used in ego’s generation among all the Cordilleran terminologies with various gradations in this patterning. The simplest of these patterns is reported among the Ga’dang and Kalinga who have a single term for sibling and among the Ifugao who have two alternative terms for sibling/cousin.

**Ga’dang [A]**

- *kolak* Sb (B, Z)

**Ifugao (Amganad) [C]**

- *iba, agi* Sb (B, Z), PSbCx [Syn]

**Kalinga [D]**

- *sunud* Sb (B, Z) [agi: ‘relative’]

Cognates of the term *agi* used to refer to siblings, occur in many of the terminologies. This term is commonly used along with relative age terms as is the case in the following examples:

**Atta [A]**

- *wagi* Sb (B, Z)
- *kaka* e (B, Z, PSbC)
- *urian* y (B, Z, PSbC)

---

9. A crude model for this might be the following: Bontok <> Ilongot <> [Kalinga, Kallahan, Ibaloi, Pangasinan] <> [Ifugao, Dumagat (Casiguran)] <> Kankanay <> [Balangao, Itneg] <> [Ga’dang, Ilocano].

10. It is perhaps worth noting that Himes in his paper argues that many of the features Dumagat (Umiray) have are the result of very early contact between a non-Austronesian speaking population and speakers of a language that would now be classified among Central Philippine languages (2002).
Ibanag [A]

- *wagi*  
  Sb
- *kaka*  
  e (B, Z)
- *urrian*  
  y (B, Z)

Balangao [B]

- *agi, sonod, iba*  
  Sb (B, Z), PSbC
- *pangolowan*  
  e (Sb, PSbC)
- *enawdi*  
  y (Sb, PSbC)

Bontok [C]

- *agi*  
  Sb
- *iyonqa*  
  e (Sb, PSbC)
- *inaqodi*  
  y (Sb, PSbC)

Ilongot [E]

- *katan'agi*  
  Sb (B, Z, PSbC)
- *'eka*  
  e (B, Z, PSbC)
- *'agi*  
  y (B, Z, PSbC)

Kallahan (Keley-i) [E]

- *agi*  
  Sb, PSbC
- *peppengngulwan*  
  e (Sb, PSbC) [Address: *agi*]
- *udidyan*  
  y (SB, PSbC) [Address: *agi*]

Ibaloi [E]

- *agi*  
  Sb
- *pangadowan*  
  e (Sb) [Address: *manong*: eB; *manang*: eZ]
- *orishiyan*  
  y (Sb) [Address: *ading*]

Pangasinan [E]

- *agi*  
  Sb, PSbC
- *panguluwan*  
  e (Sb, PSbC) [Address: *kuya*: eB; *aqsi*: eZ]
- *yugtan*  
  y (Sb, PSbC) [Address: *name*]

Similar patterning is observable among the Kankanay (among whom *agi* is the general term for ‘cousin’ or ‘relative’) and among the Ilocano.

Thus most Cordilleran terminologies have the following configuration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>elder</th>
<th>younger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For both Dumagat groups, however, only relative age terms are reported in use to refer to siblings and cousins.
4.1 Manong/manang transformations

The use of the terms manong for elder male and manang for elder female siblings, cousins (and, in some instances, affines) is an interesting feature of a number of Cordilleran terminologies. The Ilocano, for example, use manong and manang as terms of reference as well as address. They thereby add a further discrimination by gender to the elder sibling and cousin categories. Some Kankanay-speaking groups (but not the Sagada Igorot) are reported to have borrowed these terms from the Ilocano and use them, as do the Ilocano, as terms of address for elder male and female siblings and cousins. The Ibaloi have done the same but have also adopted the term ading as a designation of address for the younger sibling who is still referred to as orishiyan. The Itneg appear to have developed further along these same lines. They have no separate term for elder sibling but instead use manong/manang for elder male and female siblings and have two synonymous terms (inaqodi, ading) for younger sibling (compare: Ilocano: inaqodi/adi(ng): y (Sb)). The Itneg usage is as follows:

Itneg [D]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sonod</td>
<td>Sb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manong</td>
<td>e (B, PSbS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manang</td>
<td>e (Z, PSbD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inaqodi, ading</td>
<td>y (Sb, PSbC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This patterning of sibling terms among the Itneg produces another distinctive configuration, which has the following format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e male</th>
<th>e female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>y sibling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This configuration occurs almost as commonly among Austronesian-speaking populations as does the configuration that differentiates siblings by relative age only. It is interesting therefore to see how among a group where differentiation by relative age is the predominant configuration, this alternative configuration can develop.

The Dumagat (Umiray) are also distinctive in their use of address terms for siblings. Although they are similar to the Dumagat (Casiguran) in using only relative age categories among siblings, they resemble the Ilocano and other Cordilleran groups in addressing elder siblings by terms that distinguish gender. These address terms, yaya: for elder (B, PSbS) and ait for elder (Z, PSbD) derive from the Chinese, possibly by way of Tagalog terms kuya/ate. They are unrelated to manong/manang.

Information on this derivation comes from Ronald Himes (pers. comm.).
5. Ego’s Generation: Cousin Terms

Two groups — Bontok and Ilongot — have a single term for all cousins. The Ilongot term encompasses both siblings and cousins, whereas Bontok have a separate term for cousins.

**Bontok [C]**

kayong  
PSbC [Address: e or y]

**Ilongot [E]**

katan’agi  
Sb, PSbC

All of the other Cordilleran terminologies share a similar patterning for cousin terms, a configuration that can be described as one of ‘numeric laterality’. Cousins are reckoned to extend laterally by degrees from a sibling set, with each degree given a numeric designation. This is a characteristic pattern of many cognatic systems of kin reckoning, including that of English, which designates ‘first’, ‘second’ and even ‘third’ cousins. Examples of this among the Cordilleran terminologies are as follows:

**Isnag [A]**

kapinsan  
1st cousin [Address: pinsan]

kapidduwa  
2nd cousin [Address: pinsan]

kapiqlu  
3rd cousin [Address: pinsan]

**Dumagat (Casiguran) [B]**

‘pensan-’buu  
1st cousin

‘pensan ikaduwa  
2nd cousin

‘pensan ikatelo  
3rd cousin

partidu  
“distant cousin”

**Balangao [C]**

apenghan  
1st cousin [Address: name or e/y]

kapegwa  
2nd cousin [Address: name or e/y]

kapetlo  
3rd cousin [Address: name or e/y]

**Itneg (Binongan) [D]**

kasinsin  
1st cousin

kapidowa  
2nd cousin

kapitlo  
3rd cousin

**Pangasinan [E]**

kapinsán  
1st cousin

kapidua  
2nd cousin

kapitlu  
3rd cousin

**Ilocano**

kasinsin  
PSbC [Address: manong: e male; manang: e female]

kapidua  
2nd cousin
This system of ‘numeric laterality’ for designating cousins occurs in virtually all Cordilleran terminologies. Most groups extend this laterality by three degrees to the third cousin. The Sagada Igorot, however, like the Ilocano, are reported to extend this laterality by five degrees to the fifth cousin.

6. First Descending Generation (G-1): Consanguineal Terms

Virtually all Cordilleran terminologies make a fundamental distinction in the first descending generation, that between child and sibling’s child. The term for sibling’s child may also be extended to spouse’s sibling’s children. Thus all these terminologies distinguish the children within the nuclear family from those of other families. In a majority of cases, the term for sibling’s child is a ‘variant’ of the term for child. Several examples of this across all Cordilleran groups are:

**Atta [A]**

- **anaq/abbing**[^12] C
- **kanakan** SbC, SpSbC

**Dumagat (Casiguran) [B]**

- **anak** C [Address: ‘duduy’]
- **anéng** SbC

**Balangao [C]**

- **anaq** C [Address: name or **anaqo**]
- **amonaén** SbC, SpSbC [Address: name or **anaqo**]

**Kalinga [D]**

- **anak** C
- **amunakon** SbC

**Ibaloi [E]**

- **anak** C
- **kaqanakan** SbC

**Ilocano [F]**

- **anak[^13]** C
- **kaqanakan** SbC, SpSbC

This is a common and consistent configuration not just in Cordilleran languages but in a majority of Malayo-Polynesian terminologies.

[^12]: *Anaq* is reported as the term for offspring, but *abbing* is the more usual term for child (Claudia White, pers. comm.)

[^13]: *Anak* is the unmarked term for child in Ilocano; men can use another term, *putot*, for a child they have fathered (Carl Rubino, pers. comm.).
7. First Ascending and First Descending Cross-Generational Affinal Terms

Most of the Cordilleran relationship terminologies have a single term for spouse’s parent and another term for child’s spouse. This mutual familiar relationship crosses generations. In the relationship, the spouse’s parents are generally addressed by terms for father and mother and the child’s spouse by the term for child. The term used for spouse’s parent may be extended to spouse’s parents’ siblings who are often addressed by consanguineal terms.

Examples of these paired terms are:

**Ga’dang [A]**
- *katuwang* SpP, SpPSb [Address: ama/ina/utitag/titti]*
- *manuwang* CSP

**Ibanag [B]**
- *katugangan* SpP
- *mammanugang* CSP

**Balangao [C]**
- *atoganga* SpP, SpPSb [Address: ama/ina]
- *mangugang* CSP [Address: name or anaqo]

**Bontok [C]**
- *katogangan* SpP [Address: ama/ina]
- *innapo* CSP

**Itneg [D]**
- *katogangan* SpP
- *manogang* CSP

**Pangasinan [E]**
- *katulangan* SpP [Address: ama/ina]
- *manugan* CSP [Address: name]

**Ilocano [F]**
- *katugangan* SpP [Address: tata(ng), nana(ng)]
- *manugang* CSP [Address: anakko]

Although this affinal pattern is the most common configuration that occurs among Cordilleran groups, there are variations on this pattern.

The Ifugao use the terms for father and mother in conjunction with the 1st person plural (‘our’) to refer to father-in-law and mother-in-law. For child’s spouse, they use the term, *inapu*.

---

14 *Among the Ga’dang, when a spouse dies, the change in this affinal relationship is marked by a change in terms: the term, *kafalwan* replaces *katuwang*.***
Ifugao [C]

ama  F, WF, HF [1st per. pl. in reference to SpF]
ina  M, HM, WM [1st per. pl. in reference to SpM]
inapu CSp ['all relatives related to ego by marriage']

The Ilongot have a single reciprocal term for this relationship SpP/CSp. This is reported to be the same term as that for 'grandparent': 'apu. However, this may only be a resemblance, since the two appear to have separate derivations. Ilongot 'apu (SpP/CSp) may be related to Bontok innapo, Kalinga inapu, and Ibaloi ineo, all of which are used to refer to CSp.

Ilongot [E]

'apu PP, SpP, CSp (DH, SW)

Like the Ilongot, the Dumagat (Casiguran) also have a single term for this mutual relationship.

Dumagat (Casiguran) [B]

manugen  SpP, CSp

8. Ego’s Generation: Affinal Terms

8.1 The category of spouse

The category of ‘spouse’ is a linking affinal term. In all the Cordilleran terminologies, this category is denoted by a single term, which is cognate among many groups. Thus all of the populations of the Cagayan Valley (Atta, Isnag, Ga’dang, Itawes, and Ibanag) have atawa; Dumagat (Casiguran) has asawa, and Balangao, ahawa, whereas Bontok, Kankanay, Isnag and Kalinga also have asawa as do Pangasinan and Ilocano; Kallahan has ahwa and Ibaloi asewa. As Kroeber (1919:80) observed in his early paper, asawa is the most common term for spouse, not just in Cordilleran languages but throughout the Philippines. Among many of these populations, husband and wife are personally addressed by the use of terms for ‘male’ and ‘female’ as for example among the Ga’dang.

Ga’dang [A]

atawa  Sp [Address: lakay (H), bakat (W)]

This usage is also reported for the Dumagat (Casiguran), Kankanay, Itneg and Ilocano.

Although possessing a single term for spouse, three Cordilleran terminologies have a term unrelated to asawa. The Ifugao use inayn, the Ilongot be’yek, and the Dumagat (Umiray) bebi.

As in other features of its terminology, the Dumagat (Umiray) appear different from other Cordilleran groups in the elaboration of address terms depending upon the ‘condition’ of the spouse. The Dumagat (Umiray) thus address both spouses by different terms, if the wife is pregnant, if a child dies, or after the birth of the first child and after child-bearing. This pattern of address is remarkable both for its elaboration and its distinctiveness in comparative terms.

Dumagat (Umiray) [B]

bebi  Sp
8.2 Affines and the affines of affines

In the anthropological literature, there are few established conventions for comparing different configurations of affinal terms. As a minimal convention, one can proceed by differentiating between terminologies that have one, two, three or more terms for categorizing affines.

Only three Cordilleran groups are reported to have a single term for all affines. They are the Ifugao, Kallahan and Kalinga.

**Ifugao [C]**

wu

**Kallahan [E]**

wu [Address: agi]

**Kalinga [D]**

sinunud

The remaining terminologies make a fundamental distinction between immediate affines who consist of spouse’s siblings and siblings’ spouses (SpSb, SbSp) on the one hand and the affines of affines, namely spouse’s sibling’s spouses (SpSbSp).

The Dumagat (Casiguran), Ilongot and Ibaloi, for example, make only this distinction and thus have just two terms for affines.

**Dumagat (Casiguran) [B]**

‘kayong SpSb, SbSp

idas SpSbSp

**Ilongot [E]**

‘aum SpSb, SbSp

bidet SpSbSp

**Ibaloi [E]**

bayaw SpSb, (SbSp)

abidat SpSbSp

Among all the Cordilleran groups that possess a term for the affines of an affine, the same cognate form is apparent. Thus in addition to Dumagat (Casiguran) idas and Ilongot bidet, and Ibaloi abidat, the following terms for SpSbSp are: Atta: kabiraq, Isnag: kahirat, Ga’dang: kahirat [Address: birat], Itawes: abirat, Ibanag: abarag, Dumagat (Umiray): bilas, Ifugao: abilat, Kankanay: abilat, Itneg: bilas, Ilocano: abirat.

The Pangasinan present an exception. In addition to the term, irat for SpSbSp, the Pangasinan are reported to use the term balay (abalayan), which is also applied to child’s spouse’s parents (CSP), for SbSbSp.
Most of the Cordilleran terminologies that distinguish between affines and the affines of affines rely on two terms to distinguish among direct affines. Among these terminologies, however, there are significant differences in just how these two affinal terms are applied.

The most common pattern is to distinguish immediate affines simply by gender. Thus among the Cagayan Valley groups, the Atta, Itawes and Ibanag distinguish between male and female affines as do the Kankanay or Sagada Igorot, the Isnag, and Ilocano.

Atta [A]
- kayung: WB, ZH, HB [SpSbm, SbSpm]
- asipak: HZ, BW, WZ [SpSbf, SbSpf]

Kankanay [C]
- kasod: WB, ZH, HB
- aydo: HZ, BW, WZ

Itneg [D]
- kayong: WB, ZH, HB
- ipag: HZ, BW, WZ

Ilocano [F]
- kayong: WB, ZH [Address: manong, if elder] HB, ZH
- ipag: WZ, BW [Address: manang, if elder] HZ, BW

Another pattern is found among the Isnag. Instead of applying the principle of gender to distinguish male and female affines, the terminology uses the principle of sex of speaker as a means of differentiation.

Isnag [A]
- katayug: WB, ZH (m.s.), HZ, BW (w.s.)
- ipag: WZ, BW (m.s.), HB, ZH (w.s.)

The Ga’dang introduce another twist to affinal relationships by combining gender and sex of speaker in applying the term, katayug, thus creating a special relationship between male affines. (Female affines and male affines when referred to by women are categorized as ipag.)

Ga’dang [A]
- katayug, kayung: WB, ZH (m.s.)
- ipag: HZ, BW (w.s.), HB, ZH (w.s.); WZ, BW (m.s.)

The Bontok and the Balangao offer another variant to these affinal relationships. Instead of marking a special relationship between male affines, both the Bontok and the Balangao terminologies mark a special relationship between female affines by a different use of a combination of gender and sex of speaker.
These different patterns are significant and represent, as it were, the exploitation of possibilities inherent in such terminologies.

Another affinal feature of most Cordilleran terminologies is the existence of a separate term for ‘child’s spouse’s parents’ (CSpP). This defines a reciprocal relationship between parents whose children have married. Among most of these languages, the term is a reflex of some form of *balay. Thus Atta has *kabbalay, Isnag *abalay, Ga’dang *kafalay, Dumagat (Casiguran) *balaqi, Dumagat (Umiray) *belaqi, Balangao *abalayan, Itneg *abalay, Kalinga *aboryan, Pangasinan *abalayan, and Ilocano *abalay. Bontok, by contrast, has *aliwid, and Kankanay and Ibaloi have *kaqising and Kallahan *kaqthing. No such category, however, is reported for Ifugao and Ilongot.

The variable distribution — even among closely related populations — of the CSpP category makes it of special significance (see Fox 2002). Rather than defining any positive rule of marriage, CSpP designates a post-facto relationship between members of the same generation. Although CSpP occurs frequently in cognatic relationship terminologies, it is not a distinguishing feature of such systems because it does not occur in all cognatic terminologies. It thus represents an interesting optionally occurring relationship. The Cordilleran terminologies are a good illustration of this pattern.

9. Comparative Considerations

This analysis of Cordilleran terminologies is part of a wider analysis of Austronesian relationship terminologies. For a study of Malayo-Polynesian relationship terminologies, in particular, Northern Luzon offers a strategic vantage point to advance this comparative endeavor. Northern Luzon represents a large area into which early Austronesians began to migrate and radiate out. It is an area of long settlement and complex interaction among related populations who have both diverged and intermingled.15

What this analysis highlights is the remarkable variety among these Cordilleran terminologies. Table 1 is a matrix of equations and distinctions for the Cordilleran terminologies considered in this paper. As Table 1 indicates, a minimum of twenty-four relational distinctions are required to encompass the variety of possibilities among Cordilleran groups. No two relational terminologies make the same set of distinctions.16 Interestingly in those cases where the consanguineal distinctions are similar, affinal distinctions are quite distinct. Thus even the appearance of similarity masks remarkable diversity.

Much of the variety in western Malayo-Polynesian terminologies can already be seen in these Cordilleran terminologies. All of the ‘principles’ that Kroeber defined for terminologies in general can be identified in the Cordilleran terminologies. These terminologies are structured in terms of generations and there is a clear development of

15 Although the Bashic languages (Yami and Ivatan) constitute a separate subgroup, Bashic relationship terminologies have many of the features of Cordilleran terminologies: partial laterality in the 1st ascending generation, relative age for siblings, numeric laterality (Yami) in ego’s generation, and a differentiation between child and sibling’s child in the 1st descending generation. By contrast, there is virtually no elaboration of the affinal dimension of these terminologies. Ivatan is reported to have a single term for all affines of ego’s generation. For Yami, there is even less evidence of affinal recognition.

16 Information is insufficient for Itawes and Ibanag to make an adequate comparison.
both the consanguineal and the affinal dimensions of these terminologies. Gender, laterality, and relative age are utilized in ways that are recognizable among numerous other Malayo-Polynesian languages. Condition of (connecting) relative is also utilized to a limited extent in the case of deceased relatives. On the other hand, sex of speaker and sex of connecting relative are barely utilized and only in a specific affinal context. In other Malayo-Polynesian terminologies, these principles are given far greater elaboration and indeed become critical in the overall structuring of some terminologies.

Most significantly, from a comparative point of view, there is no development of lineality in any of these terminologies, neither in the first ascending generation nor in ego’s generation. Since lineality is indeed a critical feature of various terminologies in different parts of the Malayo-Polynesian speaking world, this feature may have been developed more than once. This development, however, is not evident in any terminology from the Philippines, Borneo or Sulawesi. Interestingly, where lineality exists and has been elaborated to a greater or lesser extent, as in Sumatra, Madagascar, eastern Indonesia and Oceania, terminologies that rely on laterality can also be found. The development of lineality thus appears as one possibility in a repertoire of possibilities. The same may be said of various other structural principles, such as relative age or sex of speaker, which have also been elaborated by particular Malayo-Polynesian populations. As a group, the Cordilleran languages have particularly developed laterality, gender, relative age and a variety of affinal possibilities. The analysis of these terminologies provides an essential building block for a general understanding of Austronesian kinship.
Table 1. Matrix of equations and distinctions among Cordilleran relationship terminologies

|       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
|-------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Atta  |   | x |   |   |   | x |   |   |   | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Isnag |   | x | ? |   |   | x | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Gadang|   | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Itawes|   | x | ? | ? | x | x | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Ibanag|   | x | x | x | ? | ? | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Dum (Cas)| x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Dum (Um)| x | x | x | x | x | x | ? | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Ifugao|   | (x) | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Balangao| x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Bontok|   | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Kankanay| x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Itneg|   | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Kaling|   | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Ilongot| x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Kallahan| x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Ibaloi|   | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Pangasinan| x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
| Ilocano|   | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  | x  |
Kin Coda

1. $F = FB = MB$
2. $F < PSb$ (m) $M < PSb$ (f) [< related: thus ama $<$ amaon, ina $< inaon$]
3. $F \neq PSb$ (m) $M < PSb$ (f)
4. $F < PSb$ (m) $M \neq PSb$ (f)
5. $F \neq PSb$ (m) $M \neq PSb$ (f)
6. $F \neq e/y PSb$ (m) $M \neq e/yPSb$ (f)
7. $Sb$ [Sibling only]
8. $eSb + ySb$
9. $Sb + eSb/ySb$
10. $Sb + eSb(m)/eSb(f) + y$
11. $PSbC$
12. $PSbC: 1, 2, 3...$
13. $C \neq SbC$
14. $SpP$ (F/M) = P (F/M)
15. $SpP = CSp$ (Reciprocal)
16. $SpP \neq CSp$
17. $SpSbSp$ [Separate term for SpSbSp]
18. $SpSbSp \neq SbSpSb$ [2 terms for affines of affines]
19. $SpSb = SbSp$ [1 term for all same generation affines]
20. $SpSb(m) = SbSp(m) \neq SpSb(f) = SbSp(f)$ [2 terms by gender only]
21. $WB/ZH/HZ/BW \neq WZ/BW/HB/ZH$ [2 terms by gender and sex of speaker]
22. $WB/ZH$ (m.s.) $\neq HZ/BW/WZ/BW/HB/ZH$ [Special term between male affines]
23. $HZ/BW$ (w.s.) $\neq HB/ZH/WZ/BW/WB/ZH$ [Special term between female affines]
24. $CSpP$
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Lexical Variations in the Batanic Language Group: Male and Female Urination

Tsunekazu Moriguchi
Shizuoka University

This paper discusses the peculiar opposition between opis ‘female urination’ and peteg or otod ‘male urination’ among the Ivatan people in the Philippines. It examines the social and linguistic backgrounds for such lexical variation.

1. How is Male and Female Urination Expressed in the Ivatan Language?

In the dialects of the Ivatan language, i.e. Ivasayen and Isamorongen, female urination and male urination are expressed by different words. Female urination is expressed by the form opis, whereas male urination is expressed by either the form peteg or the form otod. When the actor (of urination) is male, peteg or otod is selected for expressing urination; when the actor (of urination) is female, the form opis is selected. The form otod is heard only in the Sabtang subdialect of Isamorongen, but the form peteg is observed in all the dialects of the Ivatan language. In the dialects where the generic term for urination is NOT observed, special attention is paid to the actor of urination. In other words, the use of these forms does NOT reflect the speaker’s gender, NOR does it reflect the gender of the object of the sentence. Both male and female speakers can use these forms. This suggests that the use of such forms does NOT reflect the difference between male and female speech, but the gender of the actor (of urination).

In Ivatan, when parents command their daughter(s) to urinate, the form opis must be used, as in (1a). The use of peteg is unacceptable, as in (1b).

(1a) Makaopis ka do sivog a pakaopisan.
urinate you at right.place LNK urination
‘You must urinate at the right place (for urination).’

(1b) *Makapeteg ka do sivog a paka(pet(e)gan.
urinate you at right.place LNK urination
‘You must urinate at the right place (for urination).’

---

1 This paper is based on the fieldwork supported by a grant in Aid for Scientific Researches from the Ministry of Education and Science, Japan in 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999 and 2000. I would like to express my deep gratitude to Teofredo A. Gaza, Alex and Zea Antas, Pelagia V. Antas in Itbayat and Dominga Fagar, Ben and Henry Cariso, Felix Cariso and Jhog Cariso in Batanes and Orland Thomas in Babuyan Claro for their kind assistance and cooperation.

2 The prefix i- indicates ‘location’; the suffix -en indicates ‘language’.
When a female actor expresses that she wants to urinate, the form opis must be used, as in (2a). The use of peteg is unacceptable, as in (2b).

(2a) Makaopis ako.
    urinate I
    ‘I urinate.’

(2b) *Makapeteg ako.
    urinate I
    ‘I urinate.’

On the contrary, when a male actor expresses that he wants to urinate, the form peteg or otod must be used, as in (3a). The use of opis is unacceptable, as in (3b).

(3a) Makapeteg ako.
    Makaotod ako.
    urinate I
    ‘I urinate.’

(3b) *Makapeteg ako.
    urinate I
    ‘I urinate.’

When the actor of the verb is a female, the form opis must be employed, as in (4a). The use of peteg is unacceptable, as in (4b).

(4a) Nakaopis si Linda do dichod no vahay nila.
    urinated Linda at back of house their
    ‘Linda urinated at the back of their house.’

(4b) *Nakapeteg si Linda do dichod no vahay nila.
    urinated Linda at back of house their
    ‘Linda urinated at the back of their house.’

2. Distribution of Male and Female Urination Opposition in the Batanic or Vasayic Languages

The Ivatan language belongs to the Batanic or Vasayic subgroup in the Philippine group of the Austronesian language family. The language subgroup is composed of Yami in Taiwan and Itbayaten, Ivatan, and Ibatan/Babuyan-Claro in the Philippines. The Ivatan language is again divided into two dialects, i.e., Ivasayen and Isamorongen. The languages and dialects are spoken on the islands between Taiwan and the Philippines. Although the phonological correspondence among the group is very systematic, many discrepancies are observed in the vocabularies. The discrepancies are conspicuous especially between Yami and other Batanic or Vasayic languages.

The Yamis, who are said to be fishermen who had migrated from Batanes in the Philippines to the island of Lan-yu in Taiwan, have two sets of vocabularies: one of

---

3 Ivatan belongs to the Bashic or Bashic group in Yamada’s (1974) classification, or the Vasayic Group in Moriguchi’s (1983) classification.
which is for songs and oral histories and the other is for the ordinary daily life. As fishermen, the Yamis are afraid of spirits and devils in the sea and the mountains. Consequently, they change their vocabularies for the ordinary register into the special register upon boarding a ship. Similar kind of changes in vocabulary to suit the environment is also observed in the Bununs, who are hunters in central Taiwan. However, the lexical difference between male and female urination is not observed in either the Yamis or the Bununs. Such opposition is only observed in Ivasayen and Isamorogen, and is not detected in other languages (such as Yami, Itbayaten, and Ibatan/Babuyan Claro) in the Vasayic group. Even the Yamis, who code-switch between the vocabulary on land and the vocabulary in the sea, do not share these rules.

3. Vocabularies for Male and Female Urination in the Batanic or Vasayic Languages

The variations of vocabularies for urination in the Batanic/Vasayic language group are shown in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yami</td>
<td>Ibatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itbayaten</td>
<td>Ivatan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivasayen</td>
<td>Isamorogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isamorogen</td>
<td>Sabtang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isamorogen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibatan/ Babuyan-Claro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tachi</td>
<td>opis (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opis</td>
<td>opis (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peteg(m)</td>
<td>peteg (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peteg(m)/ otod (m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows the distribution of the words for urination in the Batanic/Vasayic language group.

The form *tachi, which means ‘excretions’, has cognates all over the Philippines: tachi, tak(k)i, or ta?i. In Yami, the form tachi is used for ‘urination’ (rather than for ‘excretions’). As for ‘excretions’, the form obot is used. The form obot originally means ‘to go out to the seashore’ or ‘to go out to the seashore to get seawater for cooking’. The seashore is the water closet or bathroom for the Yamis. When expressing ‘going to the beach for excretions’, the Yamis will use the word makaobot, which means ‘to go out to beach (to fetch seawater)’. The meaning of the
form *tachi* is changed from its original meaning ‘excretions’ to ‘urination’ as a result of the prohibition from uttering taboo words.\(^9\)

In the Itbayat language, no lexical variation between male and female urination is made, and there is only one generic term, *opis*, for urination. As for Ibatan/Babuyan Claro, it is also indifferent to such a distinction; however, it uses the form *peteg* (rather than *opis*) as a generic term for urination. What interests us is that the form *opis*, which denotes female urination in Ivatan, is used as a generic term for urination in Itbayat, whereas the form *peteg*, which denotes male urination in Ivatan, is used as a generic term for urination in Ibatan/Babuyan Claro.

The Ivatan language can be divided into two dialects, Ivasayen and Isamorongen. The dialect Isamorongen can be further divided into two groups: Isamorongen Proper and Sabtang Isamorongen. All the dialects and subdialects of Ivatan keep the male/female distinction for urination. In Sabtang Isamorongen, in addition to *peteg*, some people also use the form *otod* for ‘male urination’.

### 4. Languages and Dialects of the Batanic or Vasayic Languages

Phonological comparisons and oral histories reveal that the Yamis, the Itbayats, and the Ibatans are **NOT** original inhabitants of the islands where they live now. They are said to have come from some parts of the Ivatan-speaking area of Batanes.

Nobody knows exactly where the people who keep the Ivasay dialect have come from. The term *Vasay*, which was an old name from some time before the invasion of the Spaniards, is the only place name whose original meaning cannot be deciphered in the Batanic or Vasayic languages. The Ivatans still use this name, although the Spaniards named the town Basco or Sto. Domingo de Basco. After the settlement of the migrants in Vasay from outside the Bashiic area a long time before the arrival of the Spaniards, the Itbayats seemed to have left Vasay for the Itbayat island first, and then the Isamorongs left the central town and went to the other side of the island, spreading along the seacoast and crossed the sea to the island called Sabtang now. After the dispersion of the Ivatan people in the Batanes area, some people living in the Isamorongan-speaking area left for the north and arrived in a small island abounding in water and foods called Lan-Yu now, and became the Yamis. After the migration of the Yamis to the north, some fishermen in Sabtang headed their boats south arriving in an island called Babuyan Claro now.

The linguistic comparisons and oral histories vividly clarify the dispersion of the Ivatan people in this area. The following is a diagram of the migrations of the Ivatans and the linguistic evidence that supports the proposed movements.

---

\(^9\) The form *opis* (e.g., *miopio opis*) is observed in Yami songs. However, it means ‘to get wet’ rather than ‘to urinate’.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ivasayen</th>
<th>→</th>
<th>→</th>
<th>→</th>
<th>→</th>
<th>Ivasayen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>Isamorongen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>Sabtang Isamorongen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>Ibatan/Babuyan Claro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>Yami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>Itbayaten</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Comparative list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ivasayen</th>
<th>Itbayaten</th>
<th>Isamorongen</th>
<th>Sabtang</th>
<th>Yami</th>
<th>Babuyan Claro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘water’</td>
<td>danom</td>
<td>ranom</td>
<td>ranom</td>
<td>ranom</td>
<td>ranom</td>
<td>ranom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘dog’</td>
<td>tito</td>
<td>chito</td>
<td>chito</td>
<td>chito</td>
<td>chito</td>
<td>chito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘rain’</td>
<td>timoy</td>
<td>timoy</td>
<td>chimoy</td>
<td>chimoy</td>
<td>chimoy</td>
<td>chimoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘beautiful’</td>
<td>mavid</td>
<td>mavij</td>
<td>mavid</td>
<td>mavid/</td>
<td>avig</td>
<td>maganay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maganay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘delicious’</td>
<td>masdep</td>
<td>maslep</td>
<td>masdep</td>
<td>masdep/</td>
<td>maganay</td>
<td>maganay/maginam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maganay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘good’</td>
<td>mapiya</td>
<td>mapiya</td>
<td>mapiya</td>
<td>mapiya/</td>
<td>mapiya</td>
<td>mapiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maganay</td>
<td></td>
<td>maganay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Land Register and Fishermen’s Register

In modern Sabtang Isamorongen, the word *mavid* is used for ‘beautiful’, *masdep* for ‘delicious’, and *mapiya* for ‘good’. However, it is said that when the Sabtang Isamorongs went out for fishing in the ocean, they were prohibited from speaking the land register or the ordinary register. Instead, they usually had conversations in the fisherman’s special register on the boats. The word *maganay*, which denotes ‘delicious’, ‘beautiful’, and ‘good’ at the same time, is such a word.

According to the old people in Babuyan Claro, most of their ancestors were fishermen who came from Ivatan. They got accustomed to chatting in the fishermen’s register in the sea and on the remoter islands. This particular language style is preserved in Yami, Sabtang Isamorongen, and Isamorongen Proper.

In Isamorongen Proper, a very queer usage of the negative marker *ji* is observed. In (5a), (6a), and (7a), the form oyod ‘really’ is an adverb modifying the adjective *makohat*

---

10 cf. Moriguchi (1983)
‘hot’, mavoyok ‘smelly’, or makoris ‘dirty’, and it puts some emphasis on these adjectives. The emphatic adverb oyd ‘really’ can be replaced by the negative marker ji. As shown in (5b), (6b) and (7b), the form ji is used as an emphatic marker of the adjectives makohat ‘hot’, mavoyok ‘smelly’, or makoris ‘dirty’.

(5a) **oyod** a makohat
    really    linker    hot
    ‘really hot’

(5b) ji a kohat.
    negative    linker    hot
    ‘really hot’

(6a) **oyod** a mavoyok
    really    linker    smelly
    ‘very smelly’

(6b) ji a voyok
    negative    linker    smelly
    ‘very smelly’

(7a) **oyod** a makoris
    really    linker    dirty
    ‘very dirty’

(7b) ji a koris
    negative    linker    dirty
    ‘very dirty’

According to some old speakers, the negative marker ji is observed only in these types of phrases. Aside from this usage, the negative marker is no longer active in the contemporary Ivatan language.

The negative ji can be traced back to the old Philippine negative marker *di. The emphatic usage of the negative marker is only observed in the Batanic or Vasayic language group and in Bunun, but not in any other Formosan or Philippine language.

The literal meaning of ji a kohat is ‘not hot’, but its actual meaning is ‘very hot’ or ‘how hot!’. The Isamorongs do not know why they have this kind of expression in their language. This might be one of the expressions uttered by the fishermen on the sea. Because they do not like their real feeling to be perceived by the evil spirits or devils, they prefer to use the opposite/counter or negative expressions.

This type of expression is only observed in Sabtang, Ibatan/Babuyan Claro, and Yami. It is not detected in other languages and dialects in the Batanic or Vasayic group.

Another expression that often struck linguists’ ears during their stay in Batanes is the use of the word kateng to mean ‘I do not know’. The word kateng ‘I do not know’ seems to be derivationally related to the word tuneng or teneng, which means ‘to know’.

The use of the form kateng for ‘I do not know’ is often heard as answers to questions that the addressee has no idea at all.
"kateng" 'I do not know':
Isamorongen, Ibatan, Yami, Itbayaten, Ivasayen

toneng, teneng, teng 'know':
Isamorongen: toneng 'know'
Yami: katengan 'understand', tenngi 'know', teneng
'understand', mateneng 'eldest, the one who knows
well', makatenngan 'understand'
Ibatan/Babuyan Claro: toneng 'know, eldest'

The words toneng, teneng, and tenngen seem to be derived from the root word teng.
The infixation of the root word teng with -en/-in- derives the form toneng.

In the Batanic or Vasayic languages, the word teng is used with contradictory meanings; that is, it means both 'know' and 'do not know'. This can be considered as another strong piece of evidence for the existence of the fishermen’s register. In reality, fishermen ‘do not know’; however, their expression in answering questions while they were in the sea must be ‘know’. They would like to avoid being entrapped into disaster by the spirits following them and straining their ears in the sea. When the evil spirits listened to the words they uttered, they might take advantage of their innocence. Thus, the fishermen would prefer to use the opposite or counter expressions.

The discussion in section 4 and this section makes it clear that Yami, Isamorongen, and Ibatan/Babuyan Claro DO have vocabularies invented for the fishermen’s register. In other words, the Yamis, Isamorongs, and the Ibatans/Babuyan Claros have been using two types of vocabularies depending on whether they are in the sea or not. However, such a system of counter expressions has been gradually lost. The negative emphasis and the counter expressions are two strong pieces of evidence that supports the existence of the fishermen’s register.11

6. Urination and ‘knee’ and ‘navel’

The variation of the words for ‘urination’ is based on the cultural or ethnological background, rather than originating from biological or genital differences.

The lexical variation is observed only in Ivatan. Moreover, the word opis is used in Itbayaten as the generic term for ‘urination’, whereas in Ibatan/Babuyan Claro, it is peteg that serves this function.

As discussed in section 5, most of the people on Babuyan Claro island came from Sabtang and most of them were fishermen. Thus, it was concluded that people in the Isamorong area, including Sabtang, have maintained the two styles of register — Land Register and Fishermen’s Register. Even after the fishermen and their family have migrated to the south and settled there, they still kept the fishermen’s register peteg for the generic term for ‘urination’. Consequently, lexical variations reveal that opis belongs to the land register, whereas peteg belongs to the fisherman’s register, which is still retained in Ibatan/Babuyan Claro.

The origin of the word peteg seems to be very old. In Sabtang Isamorongen, in addition to peteg or makapeteg, the form otof or maka-otod is also used for ‘male urination’. The root word for maka-otod is otof, which seems to have the meaning of ‘knee’. However, in Sabtang Isamorongen, the contemporary word for ‘knee’ is tod.

11 As of today, no syntactic differences have been reported between these two styles of register. The switching between the two systems can only be detected through the use of vocabularies.
(Yami: *otod, attod, Itbayaten: *tohod, Ivatan: *to:od). Only in Yami, the form *otod or *attod is attested for ‘knee’.

In Yami, the genital parts were compared to knee. When the Yamis bear a baby, usually the word *mianak (*mi- * anak ‘child’) is employed. However, they have another term for it: *miatod/*miotod (*mi- * atod / *otod ‘knee’). The fishermen in Sabtang still use *maka-*otod for ‘urination in the sea’ or ‘male urination’.

Table 3. The term ‘knee’ in contemporary Batanic languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yami</th>
<th>Itbayaten</th>
<th>Ivasayen</th>
<th>Isamorongen</th>
<th>Sabtang</th>
<th>Babuyan Claro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘knee’</td>
<td>*otod/attod</td>
<td>*tohod</td>
<td>*to:od</td>
<td>*to:od</td>
<td>*to:od</td>
<td>*to:od</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term for ‘male urination’ in the Sabtang Isamorongen dialect is *peteg (*maka-*peteg) or *otod (*maka-*otod). However, as shown above, the root word *otod is only observed in Yami, which suggests that this language keeps the old Ivatan vocabulary for special meaning.

7. The Origin of Male and Female Urination in the History of the Batanic or Vasayic Languages

There arises a problem concerning the etymology of ‘knee’.

In northern Philippines, the distribution of ‘knee’ can be grouped into four types: *tu:hod, pu:wog, *tu:meng, and *?utud.

[knee]

1. **Northern Luzon**
   - Isneg: *?utud
   - Itawis: *?utud
   - Ibanag: *?atug

2. **Central-northern Luzon**
   - Ilocano: *tu:meng
   - Manabo: *pu:wog
   - Pangasinan: *pweg
   - Isinai: *puawog

3. **Southern Luzon and South**
   - Sambal: *tu:*ur
   - Kapampangan: *tud
   - Tagalog: *tchod
   - Cebuano: *tchud

The Proto-Philippine form for ‘knee’ is generally thought to be *[t]uhud, which is very similar to *tohod in Itbayaten and *to:od in Ivatan. This suggests that the old form for ‘knee’ might have been *tohod, and that it is the Yamis and the Sabtangs who have invented a new word for ‘knee’ through metathesis. However, the languages in the northern part of Luzon exhibit cognates of *attud or *otud, which brings forth a counterargument. Among the northern Luzon languages, Ivatan is the only language that has *tohod or *to:od. The word *tohod or *to:od is sporadically observed in the Ivatan-speaking area.
The word *otod* or *attod* has a close relationship to the forms found in the languages in the north. Hence, it might be suggested that the word *otod*, which is found in Ivatan, is NOT directly derived from the word *tohod* in Yami and Sabtang Isamorongen because the word *tohod* is not found in most of the northern Luzon languages. In northern Luzon, only *otod* is observed. The derivation of *otod* can be traced geographically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Cordillera</th>
<th>North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tu:hud</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>tu:ud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>→</td>
<td>atug/atu:ud/utud</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be concluded that *otod* is an old Ivatan word, whereas the word *tohod* or *to:od* sporadically arrived in the Batanes afterwards. This means that *tohod* or *to:od* is a borrowing from the southern area, as it is only observed in the languages of the southern part of Luzon (such as Tagalog).

Now, let us turn to the origin of the word *peteg*. Where does the word *peteg* come from? Except the meaning of male urination, this word is not found in the contemporary Batanic languages. In Sabtang Isamorongen, in addition to *peteg*, the word *otod* ‘knee’ is also employed to denote ‘male urination’. If the word belongs to a fisherman’s term for urination, the term is much related to the body part that is very close to the genital organs. Formally, this word seems to be very similar to ‘navel’.

In the contemporary Batanic languages, the word for ‘navel’ is *posed* or *pesed*, as shown in table 4.

**Table 4.** The term ‘navel’ in contemporary Batanic languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yami</th>
<th>Itbayaten</th>
<th>Ivasayen</th>
<th>Isamorongen</th>
<th>Sabtang</th>
<th>Babuyan Claro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘navel’</td>
<td>pesed</td>
<td>posed</td>
<td>posed</td>
<td>posed/pesed</td>
<td>posed/pesed</td>
<td>posed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, other northern Philippine languages, such as Ilocano, Ibanag, etc., show the following distribution for the word for ‘navel’:

[navel]

**Northern Luzon and Cordillera**

Ibanag:  
Isneg:  
Ilocano:  
Gaddang:  
Kankanay:  
Isinai:  

**Language of Central and Southern Luzon and south, on the other hand, show cognates of pu:sod.**

Sambal:  
Kapampangan:  
Botolan:  
Tagalog:  
Cebuano:  

The derivation of *peteg* is very systematic geographically.
The word *pusej* is also found in regions that are very far from Batanes. The area from Manila and southward is the place where the word *pusej* is prevailing. Hence, the word *pusej*, too, is also a borrowing from the southern Luzon languages.

This reveals that just like the old Ivatan word for ‘knee’ is *otod*/*tutod*, the word *peteg* is also an old form for ‘navel’ in the northern part of Luzon. And just like *otod*, the meaning of *peteg* was frozen as ‘male urination’. The word *pusod* or *posed* was first borrowed from the southern Luzon languages, and then it replaced *peteg* and became the general term for ‘navel’. On the other hand, the form *peteg* was retained only for ‘male urination in the sea’.

According to McFarland (1977), the distribution of *pusod* and *tohod* is very limited: they are found from Sambal or places near the Tagalog-speaking area down to the south. These places are very remote from the Batanic language speaking area. If the words were spread geographically, they should have looked like Ilocano: *pu:seg* and *tu:meng*; Itneg: *pewig* and *pu:seg*; or Ibanag: *fu:teg* and *atu*.

The Ivatan language is the only language that has *posed* and *tohod/to:od* in the north, and it is not a direct descendant of Tagalog or other central and southern Luzon languages. The distribution of these words indicates that the Batanic area is like an isolated patch on ‘navel’ and ‘knee’. If the isolated patch is taken into consideration, the possibility of borrowing must be postulated.

In the Batanic languages, it is reasonable to consider that *pusod* vs. *peteg* and *tohod* vs. *otod* are acquired as follows:

| *pusej* → *pusod* → *pu:seg* → *pu:seg* → *peteg* → *pu:seg* | (Natural Change) | *pu:seg* → *pu:seg* → *pu:seg* → *pu:seg* → *pu:seg* | (Borrowing) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *tohod* → *tu:hod* → *to:od* → *to:od* → *otod* → *otod* | (Natural Change) | *to:od* → *to:od* → *to:od* → *to:od* → *to:od* | (Borrowing) |

In Dempwolff (1938), the reconstructed PAN form for ‘navel’ is *put?eg?*, but Dyen and McFarland (1971) proposes that *pusej* is the proto form for ‘navel’. Moreover, both references suggest that ‘knee’ is **[t]u?ud*. However, other scholars, such as Lopez (1978), did not mention any proto form for ‘navel’. It is not certain whether Dempwolff’s reconstructed form *pu?teg* is correct or not.

The changes above are natural ones. The Ivatans kept these words and knew how to use them properly: original meanings are used on land, but ‘male urination’ in the sea. However, because the number of fishermen decreased and also they became less dependent on the sea for their livelihood, they became unaware of the differences. As time went by, they forgot the original meanings and the fishermen’ register started to...
denote ‘male urination’ only because the fishermen were all males. Because people in Batanes have often commuted between Vasay and Manila for quite some time and had direct contacts with the metropolis, the Tagalog words *pusod* and *tuhod* for ‘navel’ and ‘knee’ respectively. As for the form *opis*, which had the meaning for urination in the land register, started to have the meaning of ‘female urination’ in opposition to *peteg* ‘male urination’.

8. Conclusion

In the old days, there were two styles of register in Batanes: the land register and the fishermen’s register. Counter expressions, metaphors, and other linguistic devices were used in order to avoid the malicious spirits from understanding what they thought. And as one of the metaphorical expressions, instead of directly pointing the genital organs, the vocabularies in the vicinities were chosen. Thus, *peteg*, which meant ‘navel’, or *otod*, which meant ‘knee’, were used for ‘urination’. If fishermen wanted to urinate in the sea, they uttered either ‘to do navel or to navel’ or ‘to do knee or to knee’. However, when they landed, they switched back to *opis*. Later, because the number of fishermen became less and less and also because they became remote from the life depending on the sea, they became unaware of the differences. Consequently, the word *peteg* or *otod*, which used to denote only ‘urination in the sea’, became to denote ‘male urination’ because all fishermen were men. Moreover, the land register *opis* became to denote ‘female urination’.

At the beginning, they used both words in their original meanings. Gradually, the original meanings disappeared. After a while, the borrowed words *pusod* and *tuhod* were introduced to replace the old words for these.

---

13 In relation to the two different styles of register, the word for ‘house’ shows very interesting distribution.

[house]
Yami: *waʔay*, Itbayaten: *vaʔay*, Ivatan: *vaʔay*, Ibatan/Babuyan Claro: *bahay*
[‘house’ in songs]
Yami: *vaʔay* (in other languages except Itbayaten: *vaʔay*, and in Itbayaten *vaʔay* means ‘do/make’).
[house only with a roof and poles; shanty]
Yami: *vaʔag*, Itbayaten: *vaʔag*, (*kavaʔag* ‘kite’), Ivatan: *vaʔadag* (*kavaʔadag* ‘kite’).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Register</th>
<th>Fishermen’s Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( opis )</td>
<td>( peteg )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘urination’</td>
<td>‘navel’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( otod )</td>
<td>( peteg )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘knee’</td>
<td>( otod )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rightarrow ‘urination’ )</td>
<td>( \leftrightarrow ‘navel’ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rightarrow ‘knee’ )</td>
<td>( \leftrightarrow ‘knee’ )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \downarrow )</td>
<td>( \downarrow )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \downarrow )</td>
<td>borrowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \downarrow )</td>
<td>borrowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \downarrow )</td>
<td>( \downarrow )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \downarrow )</td>
<td>( \downarrow )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( opis )</td>
<td>( posed/pesed )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(female</td>
<td>tohod ( \downarrow )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urination)</td>
<td>( peteg )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(navel)</td>
<td>( otod )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(knee)</td>
<td>( male )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(knee)</td>
<td>( male )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \rightarrow [Ivatan] )</td>
<td>( \rightarrow [Sabtang] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( otod/attod: )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( [Yami] )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Problems and Solutions in Documenting
Local Plant Names in the Philippines

Domingo A. Madulid
National Museum, Philippines

The Philippines is a mine of information on local plant names (represented by more than 8,000 species of flowering plants and 7,000 species of lower plants and fungi) as spoken in more than 100 ethnolinguistic groups in the country. Local plant names have many uses and applications such as in scientific studies (e.g. plant taxonomy, ethnobotany, phytogeography, anthropology, biology, pharmacology, etc.) and in the fields of linguistics, education, culture and historical studies (Madulid 1991). Other applications of vernacular names are the following: (1) Use in floristic and ecological studies, and identification of plants (Merrill 1923–26); (2) Use in etymological studies of plants (Bartlett 1939; van Steenis 1950); (3) Use in tracing origin of cultivated crops such as corn (Berket-Smith 1943), coconut (Merrill 1936), pandans (Stone 1963), and other crops (Quisumbing 1965; Heiser 1969; Haskell 1963); (4) Use in explaining cultural links between peoples during early civilization (Merrill 1946); (5) Use in understanding the relationship of native peoples and their natural environment (e.g. Fox 1953; Jocano 1973; Conklin 1954; Quisumbing 1951); (5) Use in tracing origin and history of place names (Roces 1976; Chamberlain 1959; Gruezo 1999); (6) Use in tracing migration route of people and prehistoric influences of foreign cultures in a country (Chowning 1963); (7) Use in documenting disappearing languages (Handricourt 1963; Camel 1701); (8) Use in understanding or reconstructing the system of plant classification of indigenous people (Williams 1990); and many other uses (Martin 1995; Schopf 1976; Strother 1977).

Given the many uses of vernacular plant names they should be given due recognition as an important information resource (Madulid 1991). Lexicographers, ethnobotanists and other researchers involved or interested in recording local plant names and their scientific equivalents can get information from many sources:

1. Botanists, agriculturists, horticulturists, foresters, and other plant scientists.
2. Plant hobbyists, nursery men, and garden shop owners.
3. Local farmers, villagers, forest products gatherers, herbolarios, etc.
4. Indigenous people — Many of these people, especially the forest dwellers or those who gather forest products often have extensive knowledge of the plants around them and are therefore rich source of data for local plant names.
5. Publications, reports, thesis, manuscripts, etc. — Books and scientific articles dealing with taxonomy, floristics, ethnobotany, ethnopharmacology, and related fields in the Philippines contain many local names and scientific names of plants. Thesis and research reports are also rich source of plant names.

7. Herbarium specimens — Labels from herbarium specimens usually contain information about the plants including its scientific names, local names and the dialects where the names originate.

8. Questionnaires, survey sheets, etc. — Researchers may distribute questionnaires or survey sheets to resource persons to record local plant names of a particular locality. Students and researchers in ethnobotany, ethnopharmacology, pharmacy, etc. usually do this kind of inquiry.

9. Computerized database through the internet — Local plant names are now compiled in electronic databases and made available to interested users around the world through the internet. Examples of these databases are NAPRALET (for medicinal plants around the world), Southeast Asia Botanical Collections Information Network (for plants in the Malesian region), and ASEAN Regional Centre for Biodiversity Conservation (for some plants in Southeast Asia). The Philippine National Herbarium, through its website (http://www.pnh.com.ph), will soon make available in the internet the local names of Philippine plants.

Whether the local plant names are derived from primary or secondary sources of information, it is important for researchers to exercise caution to minimize committing errors in the recording, transcription and documentation processes (Steiner 1975). Among the common sources of error are the following:

1. Lack of taxonomic knowledge of plants — Persons recording local plant names are usually not taxonomists and identification of the plants can become a problem. A good practice is to prepare voucher specimens of the plants whose local names are being recorded so these can be identified or verified by taxonomists.

2. Unfamiliarity with the dialects and languages of the locality — In some cases the persons recording local plant names are not native to the locality. Because of unfamiliarity with the language, the recorder can make mistakes especially in the spelling of the local plant names. This was particularly true during the early colonial period in the Philippines when several Spanish and American botanists and lexicographers tried to record the economic plants of the archipelago. Fr. Manuel Blanco’s (1837) *Flora de Filipinas*, and Merrill’s *A Dictionary of the Native Plant Names of the Philippine Island* (1903) and *An Enumeration of Philippine Flowering Plants* (1923–26) contained several misspelled plant names and some words that are not actually plant names mainly due to the recorders’ unfamiliarity to the local languages.

3. Unreliability of resource persons — In some cases, informants from the locality, when asked about local plant names, tend to invent or coin local names for plants that are not familiar to them in order to create a good impression or to avoid reprimand. Invented names or coined names may not be easy to detect and can be recorded in publications. Local informants should, therefore, be asked to be honest and admit if they do not know the names of the plants.

4. Failure in verifying authenticity of plant names — In some cases, different informants give different names for the same species of plant and
recorders of plant names should be able to detect this early and apply remedial measures. A good practice in ethnobotanical survey is to ask two or more informants and compare and analyze the names they provide. Varying names for a particular plant species should be regarded as unreliable and subject to verification.

5. Unfamiliarity with phonetic symbols of plant names recorded in reports, herbarium labels, etc. — Herbarium labels of some local plant names are written with phonetic symbols. This is the practice of some linguists and anthropologists who are particularly interested in the way words are spoken by the local people. Many of Harold Conklin’s herbarium labels from Mindoro (Conklin 1954) and Robert Fox’s plants from Zambales (Fox 1953) for example, are written with phonetic symbols. These names can be wrongly transcribed by recorders who are not familiar with phonetic symbols.

To avoid erroneous recording of plant names, the following are recommended:

1. Familiarize yourself with the plants being studied by referring to publications, herbarium specimens, guidebooks, etc. (Martin 1995)

2. Familiarize yourself with the language of the place where the plant names are being recorded. A researcher will be able to get more reliable data if he is knowledgeable with the language that the people speak in the area (Barbosa 1995).

3. Get reliable resource persons. As much as possible one should get honest and reliable resource persons or informants in the locality. Ask the head or officials of the village, barangay or municipality to help recommend people who could be relied upon as informants for local plant names. To verify the authenticity of local plant names, it is recommended that several persons from the locality are interviewed.

4. Knowledge of phonetic symbols — Plant names taken from labels of herbarium specimens must be transcribed with caution as they may be written with phonetic symbols which are not easily understood by the laymen. These phonetic symbols serve the purposes of linguists but these should be modified to conform to the standard spellings of common names.

5. Consult lexicons or dictionaries of local plant names. Several references provide comprehensive data on local plant names (see above discussion) and these should be consulted by researchers for accuracy and verification of both local and scientific names of plants.

6. Compile local names in computerized database. It is now a common practice of lexicographers and dictionary makers to record plant names in computerized databases. This method of data entry provides easy checking of errors in spelling of botanical and local plant names and provides a more systematic organization of data.

It is clear from the above that local plant names provide many uses and is a rich information resource. Nevertheless, one should be very careful in recording these names as there could be many sources of errors. My experience in compiling *A Dictionary of Philippine Plant Names* for more than twenty five years has made me realize the need for a keen eye for spotting erroneous plant names derived from primary and secondary sources and the ability to detect authentic versus invented local plant names provided by informants from various places in the country.
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PART FOUR:

GRAMMATICAL SYSTEMS
Geminates in Guinaang Bontok:
Sonority Hierarchy and Phonetic Realization

Katsura Aoyama
Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center

In Guinaang Bontok, consonants of all manners of articulation (stops, fricatives, nasals, liquids and glides) can appear as short and long (Reid 1963), which is not very common among the world’s languages. First, contrasts between short and long consonants are not as common as contrasts between short and long vowels (Ladefoged 2001). Second, not all consonants can appear as long even in the languages that have length contrasts in consonants. It was hypothesized that the cross-linguistically less common length contrasts, such as the length contrasts in glides, were phonetically less clear than the more common ones, such as contrasts between short and long stop and nasal consonants. In order to test this hypothesis, production data of different consonants in Guinaang Bontok were collected experimentally and an acoustic analysis of short and long consonants was conducted. The results suggest that the contrast between short and long glides is indeed phonetically less clear than the cross-linguistically more common contrast, such as the contrast in stop and nasal consonants.

1. Introduction

Bontok is one of the Central Cordilleran languages spoken in the municipality of Bontoc, Mountain Province in the northern Philippines (Reid 1976). This paper reports an acoustical analysis of single and geminate consonants in Guinaang Bontok. Guinaang Bontok is a dialect of Bontok that is spoken in Guinaang, a community of over 2,000 residents located in Mountain Province of northern Luzon.

Consonant phonemes of Guinaang Bontok are /p t k ? b d g m n l s w y/, and all of these consonants can appear as geminates phonologically (Reid 1963, 1973; E.

---

1 Versions of this paper were presented at a linguistic colloquium at California State University, Chico in February 2003, at the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistic Association (AFLA X) in Honolulu, HI in March 2003, and at the Acoustical Society of America in Austin, TX in November 2003. A short summary of the presentation at AFLA X was published as Aoyama (2003). I sincerely thank Lawrence Reid, who helped me in constructing the word list in Guinaang Bontok, finding the participants, and instructing them. He was also a guide, a teacher and an interpreter during our trip to the Philippines. My thanks also go to the Catay family in the Guinaang village in the Philippines for their hospitality. I was inspired by Graham Thurgood's 1993 paper, and discussions with Elzbieta Thurgood and Graham Thurgood have always been encouraging. I thank Sarai Granados and Lacey Decker for their assistance. Financial support was provided by the Arts and Sciences Advisory Council of the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. All errors are my own.
Of these consonants, /p t k m n l s w y/ appear as phonetically long consonants (e.g., [p:], [k:]). The voiced geminate stops are phonetically a sequence of two different consonants because the voiced stops (/b d g/) occur as [f], [ts] and [ks] in the syllable initial position in Guinaang Bontok (Reid 1963, 1973).

Phonetically long consonants may be analyzed as a cluster of identical consonants phonologically (Lehiste 1970; G. Thurgood 1993), as in the case in Guinaang Bontok (Reid 1963). Phonologically geminate consonants consist of the final consonant of the preceding syllable and the initial consonant of the following syllable (Hayes 1989; G. Thurgood 1993), regardless of their phonetic nature. The phonological analysis of phonetically long consonants varied in different languages reviewed in this paper.

In order to avoid lengthy discussions on phonology of each individual language, the terms short/single and long/geminate will be used interchangeably. The discussions will be limited to phonological geminates (or clusters) that are phonetically long consonant in Guinaang Bontok and other languages.

The phonological contrast between short and long segments may be phonetically realized differently in various languages. For instance, it was found that the distinction between short and long nasals was clearer in Finnish than in Japanese (Aoyama 2001). Finnish allows more consonants to appear as long compared to Japanese (Sulkala and Karjalainen 1992; Vance 1987). In addition, it was found that long sounds occur more frequently in Finnish than in Japanese (Aoyama 2001). It appears that these frequency factors are related to how the contrast between short and long consonants are phonetically realized in each language.

The phonological contrast between short and long segments may also be realized differently depending on the segment. For short and long vowels, it was approximately 1:2 in languages such as Japanese (Han 1962), Danish, Finnish and Estonian (Lehiste 1970:34). In Swedish, it was reported that, on average, long vowels were just 55% longer than the short vowels (McAllister, Flege, and Piske 1999). For short and long consonants, Esposito and Di Benedetto (1999) reported approximately 1:2 ratio between short and long voiceless stops (/p t k/) in Italian. The ratio was much larger in Finnish; the ratio between short and long /t/ was 1:2.7 (Richardson 1998: 150). Finally, according to E. Thurgood (2001), the durational ratio between the short and long affricates in Polish ([tʃ] vs. [tʃ:]) ranged from 1:1.6 to 1:1.8, which was smaller than ratios in stop consonants in Italian and Finnish.

Sato (1998) studied short and long contrasts in vowels, nasals, fricatives and stops in Japanese. The ranges of durational ratios between short and long segments were 1:1.56 – 1:1.9 for vowels, 1:2.04 – 1:2.83 for nasals, 1:1.79 – 1:1.82 for fricatives, and 1:2.03 to 1:2.44 for stops. As demonstrated in the Sato (1998) study and in the review of other studies, it appears that there is a cross-linguistic tendency in the duration of short and long consonants. The duration ratio between short and long segments is comparatively small for vowels, fricatives and affricates, ranging from 1:1.55 to 1:2, whereas long nasals and stops are twice or three times as long as their short

---

2 [r] appears as an allophone of /l/. /l/ occurs when it is adjacent to a front vowel, following an alveolar consonant, or following any other consonant preceded by a front vowel (Reid 1963, 1973). /y/ stands for palatal approximant ([j] in IPA). I will use /y/ for the sake of consistency with other publications on Guinaang Bontok.

3 In some other Cordilleran languages, such as Ilocano, voiced stops appear as geminates phonologically and as long consonants phonetically (Rubino 2000).

4 For example, phonetically long segments in Japanese are analyzed as mora consonants and the initial consonant of the following syllable, not as geminates (Vance 1987).
countersparts. In other words, long vowels, fricatives and affricates do not need to be as twice as long as their short counterparts in order to be phonologically long. Long stops and nasals, on the other hand, seem to be at least twice as long as the phonologically short stops and nasals.

Cross-linguistically, it is not very common that nearly all consonant phonemes can appear as long consonants as in Guinaang Bontok. First, contrasts between short and long consonants are not as common as contrasts between short and long vowels (Ladefoged 2001). Second, not all consonants can appear as long even in the languages that have length contrasts. For instance, stops, fricatives, nasals and liquids can appear as both short and long in Finnish, but glides do not (Sulkala and Karjalainen 1992). In Japanese, phonetically long consonants are limited to nasals and voiceless obstruents (e.g., [p t k s]) with some exceptions (Vance 1987).

Furthermore, geminate consonants tend to occur in a highly restricted phonetic environment even in the languages that allow geminate consonants. The most favored environment is intervocalic, following a short stressed vowel, and preceding another short vowel (G. Thurgood 1993). In addition, G. Thurgood (1993) proposed preferences for the place of articulation for geminates to occur based on cross-linguistic examination of geminate consonants. His study shows that there is a strong preference for alveolar consonants to appear as geminates regardless of their manner of articulation.

A similar kind of preference seems to exist for the manner of articulation. Cross-linguistically, it appears that long or geminate consonants are allowed usually for less sonorous consonants (e.g., stops) than more sonorous ones. In Thurgood's study (1993), there are only four languages in which glide geminates can occur whereas there are many languages in which stop and nasal geminates can occur. The sonority scale, an index of sonority among different sounds, is shown in (1) (from Spencer 1996). It appears that, cross-linguistically, there is a preference for consonants of low sonority to appear as long.\footnote{Counterexamples for the cross-linguistic preferences proposed here were brought to my attention by some people. Blevins (2004) states that there are different ways for geminates to evolve and that no absolute universals can be expected in geminate inventory or distribution. The cross-linguistic preferences or tendencies mentioned here are not to be taken as absolute universals, and counterexamples to the preferences should not be problematic.}

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\hline
category & example of sounds \\
\hline
vowels & a, i, u \\
glides & y, w \\
liquids & r, l \\
nasals & n, m \\
fricatives/affricates & s, v, z, tʃ \\
stops & p, t, k \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Sonority hierarchy (from Spencer 1996: 90)}
\end{table}

This study investigated whether the cross-linguistically less common length contrasts, such as length contrasts in glides, were phonetically less clear than the more common ones, such as contrasts between short and long stop consonants. Based on the cross-linguistic observations of geminate consonants, it was hypothesized that the difference between short and long sounds are the largest among sounds such as /p/, /t/
and /k/, and smaller in sounds such as /y/ and /w/. An experiment was conducted in Guinaang Bontok since it has length contrasts in sounds in every category on the sonority hierarchy.

2. Method

2.1. Materials

A list of 96 Guinaang Bontok words was prepared for this experiment. The list consisted of pairs or triplets of words that contrasted by the length of the word-medial consonant. The medial consonants that contrasted in length were voiceless stops ([p t k ʔ]), 27 words), nasals ([m n ɲ], 25 words), a fricative ([s], 7 words), liquids ([l] and [r], 16 words) and glides ([w y], 21 words). Seventy-eight of the words were existing words in Guinaang Bontok. Eighteen made-up words were used in order to create pairs or triplets contrasting by the length of the medial consonants, because it was difficult to find several pairs or triplets of existing words in all places and manners of articulation. The made-up words were created on the basis of an existing form, and they were all phonotactically well-formed in Guinaang Bontok. The participants did not seem to have difficulty with the made-up words.

Frame sentences were also prepared. When the initial consonant of the target word was a stop or an affricate, (a) Apedna kinwániyen (the target word) “He just said (the target word)” was used. When the initial consonant of the target word was a liquid, a nasal or a fricative, (b) Nan kinwániina ket (the target word) “What he said was the target word” was used. For names and some of the made-up words, (c) Si (the target word) nan inayákhana “The target word is the one he called” was used.

2.2. Data collection and data analysis

The participants were four native speakers of Guinaang Bontok (2 males, 2 females). They were all residents of the Guinaang village in Mountain Province in the northern Philippines. Two male participants and one female participant were in their late 40s and early 50s. The other female participant was 15 years old. The data collection was done in a participant’s house in the village, using a cassette tape recorder with a microphone.

The materials were orthographically presented to the participants. The words and frame sentences were written on a notebook using the local orthography. The words were randomized so that the words in the pairs or triplets did not appear one after the other. The participants were asked to say each word in isolation first, and then to repeat the word in the frame sentence twice. Thus, three tokens (one in isolation and two in the frame sentence) were collected for each target word from each participant.

Of the 96 words, 35 words were selected and acoustically analyzed (see Appendix). An effort was made to select words that (1) consisted of two syllables, (2) had a stress on the first syllable when there is a stress in the word, and (3) were produced in the frame sentence (a). There were few exceptions for each criterion. Eighteen words included

---

6 Note that they may not minimally contrast by the length of the medial consonant.
7 A glottal stop precedes all vowels word-initially in Guinaang Bontok (Reid 1963 and pers. comm.).
8 In the local orthography, r is used for the [r] allophone of /l/, and ch is used for the [ts] allophone of /t/. 
single consonants and the other seventeen words included geminate consonants. The
target single or geminate consonants always appeared intervocalically.

The recordings were digitized at 22.05 kHz, and the data was analyzed
acoustically using the program Pitchworks. Wide-band spectrograms were produced for
each target word and the durations of single and geminate consonants were measured
in milliseconds. For stop consonants, voice-onset time (VOT) was included as a part of
the consonant for both singleton and geminates. A total of 420 tokens (35 words x 3
repetitions x 4 participants) were analyzed.

3. Results

Table 1 summarizes the overall results. The duration values of the tokens produced
in isolation and in the frame sentences were averaged because the values of the
productions in isolation and in the frame sentences were highly correlated in all 4
subjects (r > .71, p < 0.01). The durations of the consonants in the last repetition were
significantly shorter than the ones produced in isolation for 3 out of the 4 participants
(paired t-test, t(34) = 2.2 to 3.1, p < 0.05). This is probably due to a faster speaking rate
toward the end of three repetitions, rather than a difference between productions in
isolation and in a frame sentence. The values from the second repetition (with a frame
sentence) did not differ significantly from the ones in isolation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singleton mean (in ms.) (SD)</th>
<th>geminate mean (in ms.) (SD)</th>
<th>Ratio single: geminate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>glide</td>
<td>90 (16)</td>
<td>140 (25)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liquid</td>
<td>79 (13)</td>
<td>150 (28)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasal</td>
<td>78 (16)</td>
<td>162 (28)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fricative</td>
<td>122 (14)</td>
<td>204 (33)</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stop</td>
<td>94 (22)</td>
<td>176 (34)</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Average durations for fricatives are based on 24 tokens (2 words x 3
repetitions x 4 speakers) for singleton, and 12 tokens (1 word x 3 repetitions x 4
speakers) for geminates. For all others, each average duration is based on 48 tokens (4
words x 3 repetitions x 4 speakers).

As expected, the average durations of geminate consonants were significantly
longer than those of singletons in all consonant categories (for /s/, t(11) = 9.7, for other
consonants t(47) = 14.0 to 17.9, p < 0.01, see Table 1 and Figure 1). The durational
contrast between single and geminate consonants was the largest in nasals (mean 78 vs.
162 ms., ratio 1:2.08). The contrast in stops and liquids was the second largest (mean 94
vs. 176 ms. for stops, 79 vs. 150 ms. for liquids). It was smaller for fricatives (mean 122
vs. 204 ms., ratio 1:1.67) and the smallest for glides (mean 90 vs. 140 ms., ratio 1:1.56).
The average duration of short glides was 90 ms., which was about 10 ms. longer than
the average durations of short nasals and liquids (78 and 79 ms. respectively). The
The average duration of geminate glides was also the shortest (140 ms.) compared to the average durations of other geminates (stops 176 ms., fricatives, 204 ms., nasals 162 ms., liquids 150 ms.).

Figure 1. Overall average duration of single and geminate consonants

Note: Average durations for fricatives are based on 24 tokens (2 words x 3 repetitions x 4 speakers) for singletons, and 12 tokens (1 word x 3 repetitions x 4 speakers) for geminates. For all others, each average duration is based on 48 tokens (4 words x 3 repetitions x 4 speakers).

Figure 2 shows the distribution of duration values for stops, nasals and glides. The values of short stops ranged from 53 to 138 ms., and those of nasals ranged from 51 to 116 ms. The shortest token of single glide consonants was 63 ms., which was 10 ms. longer than the shortest stop and nasal consonants (53 and 51 ms. respectively). The duration range for geminate glides was narrower and shorter in absolute duration, 100–205 ms., than the range for geminate stops and nasals (120–247 ms. and 113–234 ms. respectively).

Table 2 shows the range of duration values for single and geminate consonants grouped by the manners of articulation. It also shows the number of singleton tokens that were longer than the shortest geminate consonant in that category, and the number of geminate tokens that were shorter than the longest single consonant in that category. For instance, there were 5 tokens of single stop consonants that were longer than 120 ms., which was the shortest among the geminate stop tokens. Similarly, there were 3 tokens of geminate stops that were shorter than 138 ms., which was the duration of the longest single stop consonant.
Note: Each average duration is based on 48 tokens (4 words x 3 repetitions x 4 speakers).

Table 2. Ranges of duration values (in milliseconds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>range-singleton (in ms.)</th>
<th>range-geminates (in ms.)</th>
<th>N of singleton in the geminate range</th>
<th>N of geminate in the singleton range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>glide</td>
<td>63–136</td>
<td>100–205</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liquid</td>
<td>55–109</td>
<td>100–219</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasal</td>
<td>51–116</td>
<td>113–234</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fricative</td>
<td>96–152</td>
<td>148–276</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stop</td>
<td>53–138</td>
<td>120–247</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Average durations for fricatives are based on 24 tokens (2 words x 3 repetitions x 4 speakers) for singleton, and 12 tokens (1 word x 3 repetitions x 4 speakers) for geminates. For all others, each average duration is based on 48 tokens (4 words x 3 repetitions x 4 speakers).

It can be seen from Table 2 that there was a large overlap in duration values between single and geminate glides. There were 11 tokens of single glides that were...
longer than the shortest geminate glide (100 ms.), and there were 23 tokens of geminate glides that were shorter than 136 ms., the duration of the longest single glide. The numbers of singleton tokens that were longer than the shortest geminate single glide were less than 5 in all the other categories. Similarly, the numbers of geminate tokens that were shorter than the longest singleton token were less than 3 in all the other categories.

4. Summary and Discussion

The experimental data from Guinaang Bontok suggest that all geminate consonants were clearly differentiated from single consonants in duration. Nonetheless, the phonologically binary length contrast was phonetically realized differently for consonants of different manners of articulation. The contrast between single and geminate consonants was the largest in nasals, and the smallest in glides. In addition, the average duration of phonologically short and long consonants varied considerably; the average duration of phonologically short consonants ranged from 78 ms. (nasals) to 122 ms. (fricative), and the average duration of phonologically 'long' consonants ranged from 140 ms. (glides) to 204 ms. (fricatives).

The phonetic contrast between short and long consonants in Guinaang Bontok appears to be somewhat smaller compared to other languages. For stop consonants in Italian, Esposito and Di Benedetto (1999) reported duration of single /p t k/ to be approximately 100 ms., and geminate /pp tt kk/ to be approximately 200 ms. In Japanese, the average duration of single stop consonants was 70 ms. and the average duration of geminate stop consonants was 157 ms. in Sato’s study (1998). Han’s data on Japanese stop consonants showed similar values as in Sato (1998) (79 ms. vs. 198 ms., Han 1994). In Richardson (1998), Finnish adults’ production showed much larger values, 118 ms. vs. 319 ms. This was probably because the adult participants in Richardson (1998) were instructed to produce the target words in a manner in which they would ask children to imitate. In any case, the durational ratios between single and geminate stops ranged from 1:2 (Italian; Esposito and Di Benedetto 1999) to 1:2.7 (Finnish; Richardson 1998), and were larger than the ratio between short and long stops in Guinaang Bontok (1:1.87).

The durational ratio in nasals in Guinaang Bontok was also smaller than those in other languages. In Guinaang Bontok, the average duration of single nasals was 78 ms. and the average duration of geminate nasals was 162 ms (ratio 1:2.08). In Japanese, the average duration of short nasals was 50 ms. and the average duration of long nasals was 125 ms. in Sato (1998), and they were 68 ms. and 178 ms. respectively in Aoyama (2001). The Finnish contrast seems to be the largest for nasal consonants as well as for stop consonants; the average duration of short nasals was 62 ms. and the average duration of long nasals was 178 ms. (Aoyama 2001). In summary, the ratios between short and long nasal consonants were over 1:2.5 in both Finnish and Japanese (Sato 1998; Aoyama 2001). The durational ratio in Guinaang Bontok (1:2.08) was smaller than the similar contrasts in Finnish and Japanese, although the contrast in nasals was larger than those in other consonants in Guinaang Bontok.

---

9 The values can only be read from the figure (Figure 7, Esposito and Di Benedetto 1999).
10 Han (1994) and Sato (1998) reported the average duration of each test word, and I averaged the duration of each consonant. Voice onset time (VOT) was included as a part of consonant in both cases.
The contrast in fricatives seemed to be realized differently from length contrasts in other consonants. The contrast between single and geminate fricatives was rather small on average (122 ms. vs. 204 ms., ratio 1:1.67, see Table 1), but the range and overlap analysis suggested that the single and geminate fricatives were differentiated clearly. The boundary between short and long fricative geminates was approximately 150 ms.; all single fricative tokens were shorter than 150 ms. except for one, and all but one geminate fricative tokens were longer than 150 ms. Sato (1998) also reported a smaller durational ratio between short and long fricatives (103 ms. vs. 185 ms., ratio 1:1.80) compared to short and long stops and nasals. There was also no overlap in absolute durations of tokens (Sato 1998). Fricatives are intrinsically longer than stops, nasals and liquids (Lehiste 1970; Edwards 1997), thus the phonologically short fricatives are inevitably longer than the other short segments. The contrast seems to be well-maintained because the long fricatives are also longer (mean 204 ms.) than the other long segments, such as nasals (mean 162 ms.) and stops (mean 176 ms.). In the current study, fewer fricative tokens were analyzed compared to other consonants. More analysis needs to be conducted on fricatives tokens to confirm this finding.

It is known that place of articulation influences the intrinsic duration of consonants (Lehiste 1970). Han (1962) found that geminate /pp/ is generally 10% longer than geminate /kk/, and Espoisto and Di Benedetto (1999) showed differences among single and geminate /p t k/.

The ratios and absolute durations in the current dataset may not be an accurate representation of consonants of different manners of articulation because some manners of articulation were represented by three consonants and others were examined by fewer consonants (see Appendix).

In summary, the acoustic analysis of single and geminate consonants in Bontok suggested that the phonological length contrast is more clearly realized in stops, nasals, and liquids than in glides. It seems that the phonetic properties of contrasts between single and geminate contrasts in Guinaang Bontok match with the cross-linguistic tendencies; the results suggest that the length contrasts are phonetically larger in more commonly found length contrasts (stops and nasals) than less commonly found contrasts (glides) in a language which has length contrasts in consonants of all manners of articulation.
Appendix: The list of words and frame sentences

The word list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target word</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Frame sentence used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ípit</td>
<td>squeeze</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ippit</td>
<td>a nonsense word</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kópot</td>
<td>a nonsense word</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koppot</td>
<td>a kind of mushroom</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kákak</td>
<td>a kind of bird</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kakkak</td>
<td>a clacking sound</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ókip</td>
<td>pack</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okkip</td>
<td>a nonsense word</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lisíng</td>
<td>a nonsense word</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lísing</td>
<td>a nonsense word</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lissing</td>
<td>a kind of beetle</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amá</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amma</td>
<td>do something gently</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anák</td>
<td>child</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an-annak</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iná</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inna</td>
<td>a nonsense word</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tónga</td>
<td>a nonsense word</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tongnga</td>
<td>an ear of corn</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ilang</td>
<td>a portion of fresh meat</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illang</td>
<td>name of a place</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>aling</strong></td>
<td>a nonsense word</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>alling</strong></td>
<td>earring</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>árang</strong></td>
<td>rice granary</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>arrang</strong></td>
<td>bagasse</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>arók</strong></td>
<td>urge</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>arrok</strong></td>
<td>a simple-minded person</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Glide**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>kháwa</strong></td>
<td>center</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>khawwa</strong></td>
<td>middle finger</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cháya</strong></td>
<td>sky</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>chayya</strong></td>
<td>a name</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cháyon</strong></td>
<td>swing</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>chayyong</strong></td>
<td>a kind of rice</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>káyang</strong></td>
<td>play with water</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kayyang</strong></td>
<td>a kind of wine jar</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frame sentences**

(a) *Apedna kinwániyen* (the target word).
   “He just said ____.”

(b) *Nan kinwánina ket* (the target word)
   “What he said was ____’.

(c) *Sî* (the target word) *nan ínayákhana*.
   “____ is the one he called.”
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1. Introduction

In the face of a variety of sometimes conflicting proposals for a theory of morphology (notably, Aronoff 1994; Anderson 1992; Lieber 1983, 1992; Carstairs-McCarthy 1992; Botha 1984; Selkirk 1982), the nature of Tagalog compounding is explored in this study. It attempts to determine the syntactic, morphological, semantic and pragmatic aspects of this process and determines how best to account for compound words in Tagalog, a major language of the Philippines. The approach used is a lexicalist one in the sense of locating morphological and semantic rules of compounding in the lexicon component of the grammar, where both derivational and inflectional rules are also contained (See De Guzman 1991). The view taken here is that the lexicon contains the set of lexical items that speakers know. New items borrowed or created may be added any time.

It will show that Tagalog compound words have different structures. Like most compound words in other languages, they are typically made up of two words (roots or stems) of the same or different lexical categories, some combinations being more productive than others, and some combinations being rare or even non-occurent. Similar to French where some compounds show de joining the two words, another frequent form of compounds in Tagalog consists of two words with a linker -ng between them. It will be interesting to find out what triggers these types of prejudices in category combinations as well as their differences in form and meaning.

Despite the claimed lack or absence of syntactic categories in Tagalog, but for words and particles (Gil 1993; Himmelmann 1991; Bloomfield 1917), I will proceed using the three major or open class lexical categories N(oun), V(erb) and A(djective) argued on the basis of semantic and morphological grounds (see De Guzman 1996) not on their syntactic distribution. There appears to be no other systematic and fruitful way of describing the structure of compound words and the relations that exist between their constituents, and even of other complex words for that matter, without referring to such categories. It seems to be nonsensical to say that any two words can combine to form a new compound word, when there are differing relations that exist between the constituents of varying combinations. Moreover, how are the more productive word combinations to be distinguished from those that are less productive. In addition, the meanings of the individual members that carryover to the compound words cannot be generalized accordingly without considering their word classes, not to mention the strict order in which the words combine.

2. In Defense of Lexical Categories

Tagalog is claimed to have no syntactic categories (Gil 1993; Himmelmann 1991; Bloomfield 1917) because any word, which have been traditionally identified as a Noun, a Verb, or an Adjective, may generally occur with each of the identified particles. Thus, the only two classes to be distinguished are words and particles. This claim,
however, does not clearly point out that the same word when used after the major syntactic particles *ang*, *ng* (pronounced *nang*) or *sa* always takes on the meaning of a nominal. To illustrate: an action word such as *takbo* ‘run’ when used as a command to someone or as a predicate means ‘Run!’ which in no uncertain terms is telling someone to perform an action. On the other hand, when it appears after the particle *ang*, it now refers to ‘someone’s or something’s running’. For example:

(i) masamá? *ang* takbó *ng* kotse/aso  
    bad run car/dog  
    ‘The way the car/dog runs is bad.’ (Lit., ‘The running of the car/dog is bad.’)

A typical complex form of the same word, *tumakbó* ‘run; ran’, with the active voice verb affix -um-, may also occur after the above-mentioned particles, but in such constructions it refers to ‘the person/thing that runs/ran’. For a descriptive word such as *payát* ‘thin’ which typically occurs in either the predicative or the modifier position means ‘the thin one’ when it appears after the particles above. For example:

(ii) itapon mo *ang* payát  
    throw.away you thin  
    ‘Throw away the thin one.’

If the meaning of a word, independent of such particles, is affected by its occurrence after these particles, it is not at all convincing that the word has not changed its syntactic function. To ignore these observed differences in meaning and function does not help in making an adequate account of word categories.

Considering a non-distributional or non-syntactic way of classifying words, De Guzman (1996) shows the viability of maintaining at least the three major classes of words, namely, N(oun), V(erb) and A(djective). Support for the distinctions comes from their semantic and morphological properties. Following Croft’s (1991:53ff) cross-linguistic characterization of the major syntactic categories, the semantic classes Object, Action and Property correlate with the categories N, V and A, respectively. Morphologically, these three categories may occur in either root or complex forms. They undergo morphological processes such as affixation, reduplication, stress shift or a combination of these. Ns are usually simple roots. In complex forms, they have the affixes (a) -an referring to a place for N, e.g. *bigás* ‘rice’ > *bigás-an* ‘rice bin’; (b) *ka* -an referring to some abstract notion pertaining to N, e.g. *buhay* ‘life’ > *ka-buhay-an* ‘livelihood’. There is a whole host of complex Ns that are derived from Vs as well as As (See Schachter and Otanes 1972 for a comprehensive listing of derivations). In contrast, Vs, both roots and stems, typically occur with the voice affixes -um-, -m-, -in, -i- and -an, indicating which cooccurring complement of the verb is marked with the *ang* particle in a verbal clause structure. They also form paradigms expressing three aspects. For example, for *takbó*, we have the active, non-finite form *tumakbó*. Its finite forms expressing aspect are: *tumakbó* ‘completed’, *tumatakbo* ‘incompleted’, *tatakbo* ‘contemplated’. And this is true for the other verb forms with the other voice affixes. The V form with the voice affix -an, in contrast to the Ns with the same affix form, has the syntactic consequence of having a cooccurring locative nominal as the *ang* phrase. To illustrate:

(iii) pupunta *há*n ng doktó*r *ang* pasyente  
    will.go.locative doctor patient  
    ‘The doctor will go (see) the patient.’ (Lit., ‘The patient will be gone to by the doctor.’)
It may also be pointed out that some of these forms may also be derived into Ns, sometimes with a stress shift, and be associated with a location or place where something is V-ed. For example:

(iv) saan ang puntáhan ng mga tao kung Sabado o Linggo?
or Sunday

'What place do the people frequent on Saturday or Sunday?' (Lit., 'where is the going-place of the people on Saturday or Sunday?')

There are other morphological processes that certain classes of Vs may undergo to express reiteration or repetition of what the V denotes, which processes do not apply to Ns and As. Other forms reflect plurality of the agent performing the action or they may be associated with the meaning 'intensive'. What is interesting is that these processes also apply to denominal and deadjectival Vs.

Descriptive or property words categorized as A may also be either roots or complex words. The most common affix is ma- attached generally to abstract Ns to mean having or characterized by what is expressed by N. For example: payát 'thin; slim', tuyó? 'dry'; ma-gandá 'pretty', ma-tapang 'brave, courageous'. It is significant that certain unaffixed As have V or N correspondences that are identical in form, except for the difference in their stress pattern. For example: Vs with penultimate stress basag 'break', ayos 'arrange', gamit 'use' correspond, respectively, to As with ultimate stress baság 'broken', ayós 'arranged', gamít 'used'; Ns with penultimate stress buhay 'life', gutóm 'hunger', galít 'anger' correspond to As with ultimate stress buháy 'alive', gutóm 'hungry', galít 'angry', respectively. Another important distinguishing feature of As is the ability to express differing degrees or intensities of the property denoted by the root or stem through affixation, reduplication or the occurrence of specific particles. For example: payát 'thin', mapayát-payát 'moderately thin', kaysingpayát-payát/napakapayát 'very thin', kasingpayát 'as thin as', pinakapayát 'thinnest'. For a more comprehensive account of the semantic and morphological distinctions among N, V, A and their derivations, the reader is directed to De Guzman 1996.

Having established these three major lexical categories and having referred to the linker =ng above, whose meaning is equivalent to that of the relative particle na or the possessive particle ng, we cannot overlook another particle that may also occur in compound words. It is the conjunctive particle at ‘and’ often appearing as a cliticized =t. We can now refer to these lexical categories to describe the nature of compounding in Tagalog.

3. The Nature of Tagalog Compounding

A compound word is defined here as a word, which bears a lexical category, that consists typically of two or more words. A word is a lexical entry that is either a root or a stem (a root plus affix(es)). The meaning of a compound word usually derives from the meanings of its constituents, drawn from the semantic and/or pragmatic relations that exist between them. Certain compounds created unsystematically may bear meanings beyond the meanings of their constituents. Tagalog exhibits compound expressions of varying combinations using the major categories N, A and V. It will be noted that there are also those where a linker (abbreviated in the examples below as LKR) or a conjunctive particle between the two constituents has to be present.
3.1 Types of compound words

Four types of compounds are identified in the following subsections, namely, endocentric, exocentric, synthetic and copulative.

3.1.1 Endocentric (or headed) compounds

Between the two words that usually form a compound word, one is said to function as the head and the other the non-head. Tagalog is typically left-headed (Cf. Williams 1981 and Lieber 1983, 1992); the category of the new compound word is typically the same as that of its head. Depending on the category of the head, the function of the non-head in relation to its head can be determined, and given this relation, the meaning of the whole compound can typically be drawn. With a N as head, the non-head is usually a modifier or qualifier which restricts the reference of the head N. It can also function as the head’s complement. Given the three lexical categories that may logically combine, the possible combinations with a N resulting in N compounds are: N + N, N + A, and N + V. Of these, N + V is non-occurrent; N + N is the most productive of all possible combinations (as observed in other languages as well) and N + A is moderately productive, contrary to what is observed in English whose analogue is A + N. The examples below (as well as in the succeeding subclasses) are given with some indication of their productivity as shown by the number of items listed under each pattern.

(1) N + N

(a) tubig + ulan
   water + rain
   ‘rain water’

(b) tanod + bayan
    guard + town
    ‘policeman’

(c) bunga=ng + kahoy
    fruit=LKR + tree/wood
    ‘fruit (from trees)’

(d) bata=ng + lansangan
    youngster=LKR + street
    ‘street kid’

(e) suka=ng + Iloko
    vinegar=LKR + Iloko
    ‘Iloko vinegar’

From the combination of two Ns, we can draw different kinds of meanings reflected in the compounds. One of them is a N that is modified or specified by the following N. In 1(a), for instance, tubig-ulan ‘rain water’ indicates what kind of water it is, i.e. tubig ng ulan ‘water of/from the rain’. Examples 1(b) and 1(c) express some kind of

---

1 This identity is attributed to what Lieber (1983) labels feature percolation principle. Not only the category feature but also the argument features of the head, if any, percolate up to the complex word.
possessive attribution equivalent to the phrasal expressions *tanod ng bayan* ‘guard of the town’ and *bunga ng (puno=ng) kahoy* ‘fruit of trees’, respectively.\(^2\) Another relation expressed in both \(l(d)\) and \(l(e)\) is that of location or source. In \(l(d)\), *bata=ng lansangan* ‘street kid’ defines the child/youngster as coming from or frequenting/living on the streets. It could be understood, too, as ‘child belonging to the street’, hence, depicting a possessive relation. Expressed syntactically, this compound may be delivered as either *bata ng lansangan* ‘child of the streets’ or *bata sa lansangan* ‘child on the streets’. The last compound, \(l(e)\) *suka=ng Iloko* ‘Iloko vinegar’ gives the source or place of origin of the head N. Along with this meaning is the implicit connotation that it is the best kind of vinegar.\(^3\) Thus, it also means *suka ng Iloko* ‘Iloko’s vinegar’ or *suka sa Iloko* ‘vinegar from Iloko’.

At this juncture, it may be instructive to point out that when the first element of a compound as an independent word ends with a vowel or, more accurately, ends in final /h/, a glottal stop, /ʔ/, or the dental nasal /n/, it is linked to the following constituent with the connector =ng, which is equivalent in function to the relator form na. The phonological outcome is the deletion of these final consonants and the attachment of the linker.

Another source of N + N compounds shows one member as a complex form. For example, *pa-aral-an*[N =ng]LKR + *bayan*[N ‘public school’; *ka-bunggu?-an*[N =ng]LKR + *balikat*[N ‘a close acquaintance’ (Lit., ‘a person that one rubs shoulders with’). What these complex forms reveal is the capacity of one category to be derived into the same or another category, in these cases through affixation. The root or base in the examples are the Vs *aral* ‘to study’ in the first and *bunggu*? ‘to hit; to slam’ in the second. The derived N words get related semantically to some other words of the same category and form compounds that are suitable for use in given situations.

\[(2)\quad N + A\]N

(a) \(\text{buhay} + \text{mayaman}\)
   \begin{itemize}
   \item life
   \item wealthy
   \end{itemize}
   \begin{itemize}
   \item ‘life of leisure; rich life’
   \end{itemize}

(b) \(\text{bató}=\text{ng} + \text{buháy}\)
   \begin{itemize}
   \item stone=LKR
   \item alive
   \end{itemize}
   \begin{itemize}
   \item ‘smooth, hard stone; livingstone’
   \end{itemize}

(c) \(\text{dugó}=\text{ng} + \text{mahál}\)
   \begin{itemize}
   \item blood=LKR
   \item dear/expensive
   \end{itemize}
   \begin{itemize}
   \item ‘royal blood’
   \end{itemize}

The second subclass consisting of N + A is clearly of the descriptive type. Having an A that specifies the kind of N in the compound, \(2(a)\) *buhay-mayaman* ‘wealthy/rich life’ expresses ‘a kind of life (style)’. Thus, this pattern can be further seen in: *buhay-mahirap* ‘life of poverty; poor life’; *buhay-masagana*? ‘life of prosperity’, etc. The same is found in \(2(b)\) *bató=ng buháy* ‘a very smooth kind of hard stone; livingstone’ where the stone is

\(^2\) Note that *kahoy* in the compound *bungang-kahoy* is an abbreviation of the compound *puno=ng kahoy* ‘tree’.

\(^3\) This is similar to English compounds such as Idaho potatoes, Alberta beef, Washington apples, etc.
described as being alive equivalent to the phrase *buháy na bató*. In 2(c), *dugó* = *ng mahál* ‘royal blood’ also describes what kind of blood, where the *A mahál* conveys not just ordinary blood, but being ‘dear, expensive’, it must be of a superior type or class, thus of royal stature. Compared with its syntactic analogue, the expression is usually of the form *marangál na pamilya* or *pamilya* = *ng marangál* ‘honorable/noble/respectable family’. It may be instructive to remember that whereas the order of the head and its modifier is usually freer or reversible in syntax, it is always fixed in compound words.

An interesting form consisting of N + A, whose meaning can be deduced from the meaning of its members, does not bear the category of its head. Semantically, the compounds are descriptive expressions, hence, they belong to the category A.

(d)  
isp + matandá?
  mind/thought old/adult
  ‘mature’ (Lit., ‘mind of an adult’)

(e)  
isp + bata?
  mind/thought young/child
  ‘immature’ (Lit., ‘mind of a child’)

Such examples confirm the existence of compounds whose category does not derive from the supposed left-hand head. In other words, the syntactic feature of the head fails to percolate to the compound word. It appears that it is the category of the non-head which is acquired by the compound.

The next category of compounds based on the possible combinations of the three major categories is that headed by A. The combination *A + A* is extremely rare.4 The only observable pattern is *A + N*. The other very rare combination is *A + V*; rare because similar to the pattern *N + V*, V is neither a typical modifier or specifier nor a complement.5 With *A* as the left-hand member of the compound, it appears to be the modifier of the following *N*. Unless this non-head *N* is taken as the *A*’s complement, the resulting compound cannot be a legitimate compound bearing the category *A*. Based on their meaning, however, there is no question about their being categorized as *A*. Consider the following examples with *A + N* combination:

(3)  
   A + N]

(a)  
kapós + palad
  short.of palm.of.hand/fate
  ‘unfortunate’

(b)  
ligib + dusa
  full/laden grief/suffering
  ‘grievous’

---

4 This pattern will be discussed later under the type called copulative compounds.

5 It has been suggested in Lieber (1983) via the argument-linking principle that *N + V* and *A + V* are non-occurrence because the non-head element *V* cannot be the head’s specifier. There is a good chance, however, that *V* may be lexically derived into another category say *N* or *A*. The rare compound *A + V* noted here will be treated under the heading exocentric compounds.
(c) mababa-ng + loób
    low=LKR    interior/will
    ‘humble’

With the compounds 3(a)–(c), their syntactic correspondence with approximately identical meanings are: kapós ng/sa palad ‘lacking in fate/fortune’, tigib ng/sa dusa ‘laden with grief/suffering’, mababa-ng(na) loób ‘will that is low; humble or meek’.

Compare the above examples with the following items which are taken from Schachter and Otanes (1972:111) categorized as compound As (without any category label for each constituent) and cited in Lieber (1992:46) in which these are analyzed as consisting of A + N/A:

(d) amóy + isdá?
    smell/odor    fish
    ‘fishy smelling’ (‘fish odor’)

(e) lasa=ng + isdá?
    taste=LKR    fish
    ‘fishy tasting’ (‘fish taste’)

It may be argued that the first words in these two examples are both Ns and not As, as indicated by the gloss I provided in parentheses. These meanings indicate that the non-head N on the right specifies the head, for 3(d) ‘having the odor of fish’ and for 3(e) ‘having the taste of fish’. In both, the kind of ‘odor’ and ‘taste’ are specified as being that of ‘fish’. It may be said that these Ns take the following N as their complement. In syntactic terms, the compounds in 3(d) and 3(e) run parallel to amóy ng isdá? ‘smell of fish’ and lasa ng isdá? ‘taste of fish’, respectively, keeping the relation of possession intact. These forms can productively be expanded by substituting different Ns in the second constituent whose semantic features are congruent with those of the given heads, e.g. amóy surot/suka?pawis ‘bedbug/vinegar/sweat odor’; lasa-ng kapé/pâtís/tuyó ‘coffee/fish sauce/dried-fish taste’.

Some other compound words which are unarguably A + N come from expressions denoting time of day. For example:

(f) madalí=ng + araw
    quick=LKR    sun/day
    ‘dawn; early morning’ (Lit., ‘quick day’)

(g) hati=ng + gabí
    half=LKR    evening/night
    ‘midnight’

(h) dapít + hapon
    over.there/late    afternoon
    ‘twilight; late afternoon’

Both amóy ‘odor’ and lasa ‘taste’ are also categorized as Ns in Diksyunaryo-Tesauro Pilipino-Ingles by J. V. Panganiban (1972).
In 3(f)–(h) the right component \( N \) is modified by the first element \( A \) and refers to a particular point in time and with this meaning, the compound can only be categorized as \( N \). For 3(f), \textit{madalí} \((\text{na lang}) \text{ at araw na} \) ‘soon (already) and it’ll be day’ is a good paraphrase that refers to the point in time labeled ‘dawn’. On the other hand, 3(g) \textit{hating-gabi} ‘midnight’ is marked by ‘being half of the evening/night’, equivalent to the phrase \textit{kalahati ng gabi} ‘one-half of the night’. In 3(h) the first constituent \( A \) is virtually obsolete, except in this context. Contrary to the prediction of Lieber’s Licensing Conditions for Tagalog and her claim that “Tagalog in fact has no compounds which are either syntactically or semantically right-headed” (Lieber 1992:43, 47), this last set of examples, in addition to those cited previously, shows that the right element can also function as head.

When the head is a \( V \), the cooccurring non-head is usually its complement. This is to be expected because each lexical entry \( V \) in the lexicon, if transitive, would be specified as requiring a cooccurring complement \( N \). Thus, the pattern \( V + N \) is quite a productive form of compound, unlike its analogue \( N + V \) in English. But \( V + A \) is non-existent, the reason having been mentioned above that \( A \) is not a typical complement of \( V \). The pattern \( V + V \) will be discussed along with \( A + A \), both patterns considered as falling under the copulative type of compound. Below are examples of the common \( V \) compounds:

(4) \( V + N\mid V \)

(a) alsal + balutan
    lift/raise baggage
    ‘to evacuate or move out suddenly’

(b) magdalá=ng + hiyá?
    carry=LKR shame
    ‘to be embarrassed’ (Lit, ‘to carry/bear shame’)

(c) magdalá=ng + tao
    carry=LKR person/human being
    ‘to be pregnant’ (Lit., ‘to carry/bear a human being’)

(d) magbigáy + galang
    give respect
    ‘to show respect’

(e) magbigáy + pugay
    give praise
    ‘to offer praise’

(f) magbango(n)=ng + puri
    stand.up/lift=LKR honor
    ‘to redeem one’s honor’

It will be noted from the above examples that the \( V \) constituent may be a simple root or a complex form — a stem marked by a voice affix. The complement \( N \) usually functions as the object of the \( V \) and the corresponding phrasal structure would have the typical \( ng \) particle before the object complement in the same order when the verb is
marked with the active voice affix m- attached to a pag- stem of the V. Thus, *magbigáy ng salu-salo* ‘to give a feast/party’, *magdalá ng pagkain* ‘to take some food’, etc. Note, however, that these syntactic phrases do not have corresponding compound words. It could be because these are such commonplace expressions, there is no need to formulate new (compound) words in their place.

The various combinations of compounds attested by the examples above show that they differ in structure from the corresponding syntactic phrases that express generally the same meanings. When the meaning of the compound is no longer transparent and hence, unpredictable from the meanings of its constituents, we are now dealing with the type of compounds labeled *exocentric*.

### 3.1.2 Exocentric (headless) compounds

The exocentric type of compound has forms identical to the endocentric ones. Syntactically, most combinations appear to have a head and a modifier or a complement, but the functional relation between the constituents do not necessarily carry over to the semantic interpretation of the whole compound. For example, a V + N form such as *hanap* ‘search’ + *buhay* ‘life’ does not in any way mean ‘to look for life’ but rather it is a nominal meaning ‘occupation; job’. In this instance, we see that the category of the supposed left head does not percolate to the compound. It may be suggested that this N compound takes after the category of the following complement since we have seen in previous examples that the category of a complement may be the same as the category of the compound. However, a closer analysis of the individual meanings of the two constituents together brings out the semantic content of the whole compound. Literally, the compound means ‘to search or look for life’. The purpose of this search is actually ‘to sustain life’ and in order to accomplish it one has to work and earn a livelihood. Thus, one’s *hanap-buhay* is that person’s answer to his/her search for life’s sustenance. This indicates that with this type of compounds the semantic content transcends what the individual meanings of the constituents denote. Rather, in most cases, the meaning can usually be gleaned from what the first word asserts and its pragmatic relation to the meaning or to a particular characteristic embodied in the meaning of the second member. Typically, the modifier or complement element contributes its connotative more than its denotative meaning, and the category the compound takes depends on its composite meaning. Other exocentric compounds, on the extreme end of the scale, have meanings that are completely unpredictable, better described as lexicalized. Such properties explain why exocentric compounds are referred to in general as semantically as well as syntactically headless. Let us look at some examples following the identical structures given under the endocentric type. Note, however, that the category of some of the resulting compounds in each pattern is based on their meanings.7

(5)  

\[ \text{N + N]}\text{N} \]

(a)  

| dalaga=ng + bukid |
| maiden=LKR | farm |

‘red snapper’ (Lit., ‘farm maiden’8)

---

7 The category label of the compounds have some morphological implications as well which have not been shown here due to certain limitations.

8 The literal meaning is the other meaning of this ambiguous compound, i.e., ‘a maiden who grew up in the farm’. 
In the first case, 5(a) is a lexical item which should be distinguished from the identical endocentric compound that means ‘a maiden of/from the farm’. It may be suggested though that the pretty color of this fish makes it just as attractive as many beautiful farm maidens. The following two examples, 5(b) and 5(c), show the relation of complementation and possession, yet the meaning of the second element cannot be a direct guide in determining the relevant meaning of each compound. 5(b) requires an insight into the nature of ‘rig-drivers’ who, being on the road practically all day long, are in contact with a variety of passengers ranging from simple common folks with lots of stories of all kinds to tell-tales or gossipers. In view of this, whatever he hears and later relates to someone else is second-hand information or plain hearsay, and therefore unreliable and is not usually taken seriously. In 5(c) the implicit understanding that ‘child’ here refers to an ‘unborn baby’ provides the appropriate interpretation of ‘house’. Once again, this is another instance of the unsystematic nature of exocentric compounds when it comes to interpreting them. The speaker somehow knows which semantic and pragmatic features are paramount in treating the relation between the elements.

(6)  N + N|A

(a)  asal + hayop
    behavior animal
    ‘rude; ill-mannered’

(b)  balát + sibuyas
    skin onion
    ‘sensitive’

(c)  bibíg + anghél
    mouth angel
    ‘prophetic’

(d)  isip + lamók
    mind/thought mosquito
    ‘stupid’

(e)  boSES + ipis
    voice cockroach
    ‘soft-voiced’

(f)  matá=ng + lawín
    eye=LKR eagle
    ‘sharp-eyed’
In the first two examples, the discernible relation between the constituents is that of modification or specification. 6(a) speaks of ‘a kind of behavior’ and 6(b) ‘a kind of skin’. Even in this relation, the more common usage of these compounds is with the meaning carried by them as exocentric compounds. Pragmatically, the characteristic of the second N that is being addressed by the first N is implicit. For example, in ‘animal’, it is its being ‘wild’ that is prominent rather than its usefulness, its size, strength or capabilities; in ‘onion’, its being smooth, thin or delicate not its taste, shape, or effect on one’s eyes when being sliced. As such though, 6(a) is used to describe a person who is very rude, whose behavior is no less than despicable, and 6(b) to one who is ‘sensitive; whose feelings get hurt easily’ in contrast to its opposite, someone who is balá’t-kalábáw ‘insensitive; Lit., skin of a carabao (thus, thick-skinned)’. On the other hand, even with the obvious possessive relation obtaining in 6(c) corresponding syntactically to bibíg ng anghel ‘mouth of an angel’ and 6(d) to isip ng lamók ‘mind of a mosquito’, these meanings have to be reinterpreted further. From the speaker’s pragmatic knowledge, reference to ‘angels’ or ‘mosquitoes’ relative to the heads ‘mouth’ and ‘mind’, respectively, the meaning drawn is that in 6(c) whoever displays ‘prophetic’ prowess is described as being bibíg-anghel. It is believed that angels only speak the truth or what is surely to come. In 6(d), the mosquito’s being tiny and insignificant is considered the primary, relevant feature that contributes to the meaning ‘mind/thought’ which must not count much. The fact that it can be pesky or that its bite can be the cause of some serious illness does not even figure in the semantic interpretation. Thus, the meaning associated with the compound isip-lamók is that of the A ‘stupid; having very little gray matter, if at all’. Similarly, the compounds in 6(e) and 6(f) require knowledge of the precise features of the N possessor that characterize its relation with the first N. Thus, in the former, one knows to pick out the quiet, undetectable movement of cockroaches whereas in the latter, it is the eagle’s keen vision, not its powerful wings.

(7) A + N]N

(a) bago=ng + taón
new=LKR year
‘New Year’

(b) hulí=ng + habilin
last=LKR request
‘last will’

(c) patáy + gutom
dead hunger
‘a vagabond’

(d) kusa=ng + loób
voluntary=LKR inside
‘initiative’

In all of the above examples, the left-hand element A modifies the following N. Given their exocentric reading, the first two have each a specific referent, with 7(a) referring to ‘New Year’s day’ and 7(b), to the ‘last will’ of a person before or near death. As endocentric compounds and syntactic phrases (with the same strict order required), 7(a) refers to any or an entire ‘new year’ and 7(b), any ‘final request’ made among others not necessarily by a dying person. In 7(c) the person addressed as patáy-gutom
could not be gleaned directly from the equivalent phrase patay (na) ng/sa gutom ‘(almost) dead because of hunger’ or its endocentric reading as A ‘dying of hunger’, which can, of course, be attributed to anyone who may have simply missed a meal or two. The situation of a ‘vagabond’ is, however, always characterized as ‘dead hungry’. In 7(d) a person’s ability to act without being told is somewhat related to the first constituent, but instead of being muddled by the following N, it becomes more emphatically connected, i.e. the volition comes from within. No syntactic phrase corresponds to this compound.

(8)  
A + V|A
(a) bago=ng + ahon
   get.on.shore/land
   ‘ignorant’ (Lit., ‘newly landed’)

This pattern is quite a rare combination and occurs only as A. The literal meaning given above is seen to have been demoted to a negative status. Replacing the V with the V datíng ‘to arrive’ will not be perceived as a similar compound as 8(a); it has the interpretation ‘newly arrived’ said of someone who has just arrived. Yet, the borrowed Spanish words alsá ‘lift; rise’ or saltá ‘to disembark; to land’ are acceptable substitutes with exactly the same meaning.

The following pattern is just as productive as its endocentric counterpart. The meaning observed, however, which is associated with each compound is uniquely nominal.

(9)  
V + N|N
(a) basag + ulo
   to.break head
   ‘a fight/brawl’
(b) hanap + buhay
   to.search.for life
   ‘occupation; job’
(c) buká=ng + bibíg
   to.open=mouth
   ‘sayings; common expression’
(d) hampás + lupa
   to.strike ground
   ‘a vagabond; a tramp’
(e) pasá(n)=ng + krus
   to.carry.on.one’s.back=Krus
   ‘a heavy burden, usually referring to some deep personal concern’

Some of the meanings of the examples above may appear to be not too far removed from the combined meanings of the members of the compound if and when their connotations are accessed or appealed to in each case. These examples do not have corresponding parallels as endocentric compounds.
Considering (9) and (10), it remains to be a puzzle that Tagalog compounds consisting of V + N, quite productively, function more as Ns (also observed in Mandarin Chinese, Anderson 1985:47–48) or even as As rather than as Vs, again contrary to the prediction of the Percolation Principle (Lieber 1983:252–253). This situation, especially frequent in excentric compounds, is not considered a violation of the principle of headedness, but an exception. Williams (1981:250) simply charges that to headlessness. However, if we take the semantics of each constituent and their relation against the background of how they are reinterpreted by the speakers’ familiarity, belief or attitude towards specific features of one or both members and even the use of the expressions in specific situations, they can provide a clearer explanation for their formation and semantic interpretation.

3.1.3 Synthetic compounds

One source of a good number of compounds is from what is called synthetic compounds. These are forms in which one of the constituents is a deverbal N. Unlike in English synthetic compounds where the deverbal element is usually the second element, e.g. truckdriver]N, hand-written]A, God-fearing]A, etc., the deverbal in Tagalog synthetic compounds may occur on either the left or right side of the compound. One of the common deverbalizing affixes in Tagalog is pang- which derives V bases into instrumental Ns, thus, rendering the derived N with the meaning ‘used for V-ing’. For example:

(12)  pang- V]N + NJN

(a)  pang- patay (=pamatay)  +  lamok
  used.for.killing  mosquito
  ‘something for killing/getting rid of mosquitoes’

(b)  pang- patid (=pamatid)  +  uhaw
  used.for.cutting  thirst
  ‘thirst quencher’

9 The velar nasal in the prefix pang- undergoes assimilation according to the following consonant.
pang-pasak (=pam-pasak) + butas
used for patching or covering hole
‘a person who, without prior notice, is used to substitute for another; a gap-filler’

It will be noted that the compounds in the above forms may either be endocentric, as in 12(a) and 12(b) or exocentric, 12(c), but all are of the category N. The right-hand N which functions as the complement of the left-hand deverbal N is also viewed as the complement of the base V. As mentioned previously, there is no question that the syntactic and semantic features required by each V, as specified in each lexical entry, play a role in both sentence and compound word formations.

Another productive affix that derives Ns from Vs is the locative suffix -an which results in the meaning ‘place for V-ing’. To illustrate:

(13) \[ N + V-an[N]N \]

(a) hapáŋ + kain-án
table eating place
‘dining table’

(b) silíd + aral-án
room place for studying
‘study-room’

(c) bahay + álíw-án
house amusement place
‘a red-house’ (Lit., ‘house to amuse one’s self in’)

As in the preceding examples, the first two compounds in (13) are transparently endocentric while the third is exocentric. In this combination, the deverbal N modifies, directly or indirectly based on their meaning, the first N identifying ‘the kind of N it is’. Given the pattern exemplified in 13(a) and 13(b), many more compounds are formed by substituting V-an forms that can be related to the given first N constituent, e.g. sulat-án ‘writing-place’, gáwá?-án ‘working-place’, etc. for the former and tulug-án ‘sleeping-place’, lárá?-án ‘place for playing’, tanggap-án ‘receiving (visitors)-place’, etc. for the latter. In addition, other Ns may occupy the first position in the compound, for instance, 13(a) and 13(b) may be interchanged, e.g. silíd-kainán ‘dining room’ and hapáŋ/mesa-ng aralan ‘study-table; desk’ because the two elements are compatible in making clear their referents. As long as the relevant relationship existing in the combination is maintained, more compounds can be expected to be formed.

A third affix which derives deverbal Ns is -in. It is less productive than the first two affixes. The meaning attached to this class of derived Ns is ‘something to V’. With the suffix ending in a dental nasal, the N form requires the linker =ng before the following N, which relates as location or as goal (intended user) of what is expressed by the deverbal N.

---

10 The form hapáŋ is an older form. The current form especially in the urban areas is the Spanish borrowing mesa, thus, mesa-ng kainán.
Since Tagalog synthetic compounds do not present a problem of structural analysis, unlike the contrasting accounts for similar compounds in English, they obviously do not need a separate subclassification.

### 3.1.4 Copulative compounds

When two related words of identical categories form a compound in which not one is head and their joint meanings comprise its composite meaning, the result is known as a copulative compound. Some forms of this type are allied to the exocentric type in terms of the unpredictability of their derived meaning. Compare 15(a), whose constituent meanings may be said to represent ‘sweetness and deliciousness’ which characterize the event referred to as ‘honeymoon’, with 15(b) which refers to the resulting mixture of the two kinds of liquid specified by the constituent elements of the compound. Similar to 15(b), the compound in 16(a) with the cliticized coordinate conjunction between the Ns expresses clearly a physical state, hence, an A.

(14) \( V-inJN + N\mid N \)

(a) \( \text{aral-i}(n)=ng + \text{bahay} \)

study.material=LKR house/home

‘homework’

(b) \( \text{babasah-i}(n)=ng + \text{pam-bata} \)

reading.material=LKR for.children

‘children’s reader(s)’

(c) \( \text{gawa-i}(n)=ng + \text{bahay} \)

work=LKR house

‘house chores’

In the following rare combination of A + A, 17(a) specifically refers to a shape that may be described as falling between the shapes represented by the individual constituents of the compound. Even this single illustration reminds us that given a possible categorial combination, there is no assurance of its productivity nor of its systematic semantic representation.
(17) A + A

(a) biló(g) + habá?
round long
‘oblong’

It will be observed in the succeeding groups of V + V combinations that the interaction between the actions represented by the elements in the compound is more transparent. Both actions are involved individually such that the more common form and meaning is like that found in (20) as V compounds, although the N in (18) is necessarily characterized as being engaged in the actions depicted by the two member Vs, similar to the descriptive meaning found in the A compound in (19).

(18) V + V

(a) bantáy + salakay
to.guard to.attack
‘opportunist; one who does an inside-job’

(19) V + V

(a) urong + sulong
to.retreat to.advance
‘ambivalent; indecisive’

(20) V + V

(a) balík + aral
return study
‘to review past or previous lessons’

(b) akyát + pana’og
go.up go.down
‘to go up and down (the stairs)’

(c) lumubóg + lunitáw
to.sink to.appear
‘to bob up and down’

(d) paróó(n)=(a)t + parito
to.go.there=and to.come.here
‘to go back and forth’

(e) labás + pasok
go.out come.in
‘to go in and out (of a room)’

3.2 Phrasal compounds

Unlike in English where phrasal compounds such as those cited in Lieber (1992: 11), e.g. ‘over the fence gossip’, ‘off the rack dress’, ‘a pleasant to read book’, etc., are
frequently occurring, Tagalog does not exhibit similar compound structures. At best, one form observed is of the type:

(21)  \( \text{Neg} \) + \( V \) + N]A

(a) \( (\text{hin})\text{di?} + \text{mahapaya}(n)=\text{ng} + \text{gatang}^{11} \)
not can.be.leveled/toppled cup

‘boastful; showy’ (Lit., ‘a cup that cannot be toppled’)

(b) \( (\text{hin})\text{di?} + \text{mahulug}(n)=\text{ng} + \text{karayom} \)
not can.be.dropped.in needle

‘crowded with people’ (Lit., ‘cannot drop a needle in’)

(c) \( (\text{hin})\text{di?} + \text{malipar}á(n)=\text{ng} + \text{uwák} \)
not can.be.flown.over crow

‘unusually large expanse’ (Lit., ‘cannot be flown over by a crow’)

The particle \( \text{hindi} \) or \( \text{di} \), for short, negates what is expressed by the following V, which is usually made up of the prefix \( \text{ma-} \) ‘abilitative’ and the verb stem with the voice affix -an to indicate the prominence of an object as in (a) or a location as in (b) and (c). Evidently, from the meanings of the above examples they belong to the exocentric type of compounds. With the category A, however, the intensive form will merely duplicate the negative particle in its full form rather than the whole compound. Thus,

(21') \( \text{hindi}=\text{ng} \) \( \text{hindi} \) \text{mahapaya}-gatang si Pedro mula nang
tumama sa loto tumama sa loto
\text{boastful} Pedro \text{since} when won lottery

‘Pedro could not really stop being boastful ever since he won the lottery.’

Further study on phrasal compounds may reveal other interesting constraints.

4. The Role of Semantics and Pragmatics in Tagalog Compounding

It has been shown above that Tagalog compounds cannot be generally and adequately characterized in terms of absolute constraints on category features. If the syntactic rules for compounding as proposed by Selkirk (1982:47) for English is followed here, we will have contradictions in terms of headedness and productivity. (Productivity as used here refers basically to the number of instances observed and the potential of formulating analogously similar forms.) Based on the empirical data given previously, the following lexical rules are supposed to account for forming the productive and moderately productive endocentric compounds:

(22) \( N \rightarrow N \) + \( \{ \begin{array}{c} N \\ A \end{array} \} \) (productive)
\( A \rightarrow A \) + N (moderately productive)
\( V \rightarrow V \) + N (moderately productive)

11 \text{gatang} ‘a unit of measure equal to about a small cup’
Note that in terms of headedness, Lieber's (1983) Percolation Principle and later on, her Licensing Conditions (1992) work as far as this type of compounds are concerned, i.e. the left-hand head category is also the category of the whole compound and the non-head on the right is the modifier or complement of the head. In terms of productivity, the question remains to be why the patterns N + N]{N} and V + N]{V} are the only productive rules.

Compared with the forms of exocentric compounds below, most of the rules contradict the predictions contained above, both in terms of headedness and productivity:

(23) \[\begin{align*}
N & \rightarrow \{N, A\} + N \\
A & \rightarrow N + \{N, A\} \\
V & \rightarrow N + \{N, A\}
\end{align*}\]

Why would V + N]{N} and N + N]{A} patterns in this type be more productive than the rest of the patterns?

For the so-called synthetic compounds, all the deverbal Ns combine with N resulting in Ns, thus, this set is to a large extent similar to those already accounted for both in rules (22) and (23) above. Finally, with respect to the copulative compounds, only the following are worth generalizing:

(24) \[\begin{align*}
N & \rightarrow N + N \\
V & \rightarrow V + V
\end{align*}\]

The other copulative patterns A + A]{A}, V + V]{N}, and V + V]{A} are all rare.

Analyzing the productive patterns above, we can be impressed with the N + N and the V + N compounds, the former resulting in either N or A categories and the latter producing either V or N categories. Also of interest are the moderately productive patterns N + A and A + N that may both be either N or A, based on the word meaning of the resulting compound. Let us take the unlikely N + A]{A} and A + N]{N} patterns cited previously:

(25) \[A + N]{A}/N\]

patáy + gutom

dead + hunger

‘famished]A; vagabond]N’ (Lit., ‘dead/dying of hunger’)  

This compound is ambiguous. As an A, the left-head A is complemented by the right-nonhead N. Its compositional meaning ‘dead (dying) of hunger’ corresponds to that of the syntactic phrase patáy ng/sa gutom. To show that this compound is an A, we can put it to a test for the category A. Intensification of meaning can be done through reduplication of the A with the particle na/=ng joining the two elements. Thus,

(a) patáy-gutom na patáy-gutom ang mga bata? nang dumating galing sa laró?

‘The children were extremely famished when they arrived from the game.’
Reduplicating only the first constituent and not the whole compound as follows results in an ungrammatical form, which confirms the cohesiveness of the two elements as a word:

(b) *patay na patay-gutom

Compared with the compound’s lexicalized meaning ‘a vagabond’ which is a N, the A meaning still characterizes the life style of the person referred to, i.e. a bum, and considering what he does NOT do, he must always be suffering from extreme hunger.\(^\text{12}\) It appears that lexicalization does not have to single out one of the number of possible relations that may hold between the constituents as Downing (1977:819) suggests, but it can merely rely completely on the compound’s meaning itself to form the major and essential semantic features of the lexicalized form.

(c) nahuli na ang patáy-gutom na nagnakaw
was.caught already the vagabond that broke.in
sa amin
at our.(place)

‘The vagabond who broke into our place has been caught.’

Consider the next pattern with the corresponding example in its intensive form below:

(26) N + A\(\text{A}\)

\[
isip + \text{matandá?}
\]

mind/thought old/adult

‘mature’ (Lit., ‘old/adult mind’)

(a) malíít pa si Teddy ay isip-matandá=ng isip-matandá? na
small yet Teddy very.mature already

‘While Teddy was still (small) young, he was already quite mature.’

It is conceivable that the compound in (26), exemplified in (26)a in the intensive or iterative form of an A, also means ‘a mature mind’ which then fits the category N. However, usage further confirms that as a N, as in the following example, it is unacceptable:

(b) *may isip-matandá? si Teddy
have mature.mind Teddy

It appears that in this compound the A element is semantically more dominant, especially when it is contrasted with the opposite compound \(\text{isip-bata}\)? ‘immature’ where the second element does not refer to ‘child’ per se but to being ‘young’ as opposed to being old.\(^\text{13}\)

\(^\text{12}\) Owing to the remarkable interderivational possibilities existing between lexical categories in Tagalog, the N category reflected in this compound could have been derived by conversion from the A form.

\(^\text{13}\) The word \(\text{bata}\)? is ambiguous. Basically, it refers to ‘child’, a N. The other meaning is ‘young’. When compared to another ambiguous word, \(\text{magulang}\) ‘N[parent; \text{A}[mature; of age’ , a potential form such as \(\text{isip-magulang}\) will more likely be interpreted as ‘having a mature mind’, analogous to \(\text{isip-matandá}\)?, rather than ‘having a parent’s mind’. This is true especially in rural areas where \(\text{magulang}\) continues to be used independently with the meaning as above. In the same vein, it is reasonable to consider the adjectival meaning of \(\text{bata}\)? ‘young’. 
Based on the preceding, the left-head principle fails on a number of sets of patterns. To account for those compounds that contradict this principle as exceptions can not be that convincing because of the observed frequency of such formations. It is suggested that the combinations and their resulting categories are more motivated by the types of semantic relations that may exist between two words, the situations that trigger their formation, and how the resulting compounds are used. Following a compound rule, as given above, two items put together at random may not form a compound due to a lack of semantic connection that may be established between them for a given situation. And this is true for compounds of any type discussed above. For example, given N + N, a productive combination, it is not easy to explain why *sundalo-ng kanin* ‘cowardly/weak soldier’ (Lit., ‘soldier that is (like) cooked rice’) is possible but not *sundalo-ng kamote* (Lit., ‘soldier that is (like) sweet potatoes’) or *sundalo-ng damo* (Lit., ‘soldier that is (like) grass’), taking ‘cooked rice’ and ‘cooked sweet potatoes’ are comparable food stuffs, or even considering ‘grass’ which is a tender kind of object. An explanation that may be ventured is that ‘cooked rice’, the staple food in the country, is certainly not enough by itself to maintain strong, robust soldiers. If a soldier turns out to be weak or cowardly, then it may be blamed on his non-nutritious diet of mostly ‘cooked rice’. It may also be that the physical or emotional constitution of the soldier is compared with ‘rice’, which may be viewed as either common, soft, bland, nothing much to boast about. Given the context of soldiers, expected to fight enemies in order to win, the complement may portray weakness/cowardice on the one hand or unusual strength/courage on the other. Thus, it is more likely to find an emergent form such as *sundalo-ng kamagóng* (Lit., ‘soldier that is (like) kamagong — a popular hardy type of tree’) to refer to ‘a strong/courageous soldier’ than say *sundalo-ng niyóg* (Lit., ‘soldier like coconut (a common native fruit with a hard shell)’).

Turning to the set of copulative compounds in which the pattern V + V | V is the most frequent, the choice of the constituent Vs is again semantically significant in terms of their being largely opposite in direction, e.g. *paník-pana*?og ‘to go up and go down (the stairs)’, *lumubóg-lumítaw* ‘to bob in and out of the water’, etc. Even in the rare formation of the category A, as in *urong-sulong* ‘ambivalent/indecisive’ (Lit., ‘to retreat and to advance’) the Vs have to be contradictory in order to convey the desired resultant meaning. A potential form could be: *tumayo-unupo* (Lit., ‘to stand up and to sit down’) which depicts what one does when he/she is restless or worried over something. As a V, this can be put to test via reiteration which reduplicates the compound V with the particle *nang* between them. Yet, a form such as *tumayo-kumain* (Lit., ‘to stand up and to eat’) are two actions that do not seem to make up a related unit that makes sense to be useful, and thus, is marked unacceptable.

I contend that each compound is formed on the basis of some semantic and pragmatic relations that can tie or bind the two elements together as a composite unit, be it endocentric or exocentric in type. The former type, undeniably, is transparent in meaning and generally by analogy similar forms can be constructed. For example, given the compound form *silíd-kainán* ‘dining/eating room’ indicating the location for eating (in the house), the other room-labels expressing the activity done in each easily follow. Thus, *silíd-tulugán* ‘sleeping room/bedroom’, *silíd-tanggapan* ‘reception/receiving room’, etc. In like manner, *sukang Iloko* ‘Iloco vinegar’ readily falls within identical relations existing in: *kapé-ng Batangas* ‘Batangas coffee’, *ripolyong Baguio* ‘Baguio cabbage’, *pansít Canton* ‘Cantonese noodles’, to identify the items as being the best kind because they come from their respective places of origin. Any similar pair of Ns that does not convey this specific meaning relation does not come into existence. There is a different kind of noodles made from rice sticks which is usually boiled and has a special sauce that goes
with it. The general term that refers to it is *pansít luglóg* ‘rice noodles dipped and shaken (in boiling water)’. But compared with *pansit Malabón* which is a brand of *pansit luglog* prepared in the town of Malabon, anyone who is familiar with both terms will certainly prefer to savor the latter. Sometimes, we find meanings extended or generalized as in the case of *sabóng-Intsík* (Lit., ‘Chinese soap’) which is used specifically for laundry. Later, any kind of ‘laundry soap’ manufactured in the country is called by that name. In this manner, an identical form may begin to deviate from its original semantic content and develop its own unique meaning based on its pragmatic function.

Even with the synthetic type of compounds discussed in the previous section, the prominence of the semantic relations existing between the deverbal N constituent and its cooccurring N cannot be ignored and left to chance. Some forms have constituents that are especially tied together and do not allow any substitution or expansion. Given *pamatíd-uhaw* ‘thirst quencher’ (Lit., ‘used for cutting thirst’), we do not find *pamatíd-gutom* but rather *pantawíd-gutom* ‘something that appeases hunger’ (Lit., ‘used for bridging hunger’) (Schachter and Otanes 1972:109). In contrast, we can have *damít* ‘clothing; dress’ as the first N and append a deverbal N that means ‘used to V in or for Ving’, e.g. *damít-pangkasál* ‘wedding dress’ (Lit., ‘dress to wed in’), *damít-pantrabaho* ‘work clothes’ (Lit., ‘clothes to work in’), *damít-pansimbá* ‘Sunday clothes’ (Lit., ‘dress to worship in’), etc. Depending on the various occasions that one has to wear an appropriate attire, corresponding compounds can potentially be formed.

One interesting case of compounding which illustrates how speakers could use a variety of criteria for creating identical forms is exhibited in pet names of individuals. There is this guy known in our community as *Lilo=ng kabayo* (Lit., ‘Lilo who is a horse’). Because he is known to be in the business of selling horses, no one thinks of him as ‘being a horse’ or ‘looking like a horse’, which is a legitimate interpretation when this name is encountered for the first time. And what would you predict his son to be called? It is *Berto=ng bisiro* (Lit., ‘Lito who is a colt’), of course, not because he deals with ‘colts’ but simply being the offspring of someone whose appellation is ‘horse’. With the identical pattern in these two examples, notice that the interpretation depends largely on the particular circumstances surrounding the formation. This special type of compounding is very common particularly in the rural areas. It is popularly used to identify people readily. And the different relations people associate with individuals generally range from their occupation or expertise, physical feature, attitude, a disability, an unusual characteristic, and the like. For example, *Enyo=ng pulís* ‘Enyo, the policeman’, *Leoncia=ng panót* ‘Leoncia, the bald (one)’, *Regina=ng daldál* ‘Regina, the talkative (one)/gossip’, *Juan=(n)g tamád* ‘Lazy Juan’, etc. It may be added that there are also similar names in which the order of the head and its attribute is reversed such as *Mestra=ng Fidela* ‘Fidela, the teacher’, *Pilosopo=ng Tasyo* ‘Tasyo, the philosopher’, *(ma)Tandá=ng Sora* ‘Sora, the old one’.

With the explanations provided thus far to show the inadequacies of following solely a syntactic account, it is undeniable that both the semantic and pragmatic aspects of compounding must be pursued. Much like an underived word whose category and subcategory features are dictated to a large extent by its meaning, compound words as lexical items are also assigned these syntactic features based on their corresponding meaning. This meaning usually reflects some clear semantic features that carry over from both constituents to the whole compound, even when it is associated with a ‘third’ meaning as in certain exocentric compounds. Pragmatics has a lot to contribute to the semantic interpretation of a given compound and this is no better expressed than in knowing and believing which of the specified feature or features in an element plays a paramount role in a given combination. The resulting compound as a new lexical item
also carries certain features all its own in addition to those contributed by each component.

5. Conclusion

From the preceding exposition of the various aspects of compounding in Tagalog, it may be concluded that in Tagalog:

(a) Compounds are formed not because the categories are free nor constrained by their subcategorizational features. In fact, not any combination of two categories allowed by the “syntactic” rules as shown in section 3 is a potentially acceptable form. Each form of any type is constructed as an individual lexical item expressing a sensible relationship between two words, each constituent bearing its own significant identifying semantic features. Its formation may be triggered not only by the convenience of using just a word rather than a phrase but also by a desire to create a more expressive, colorful, metaphorical construction needed for a given situation;

(b) Many compounds, especially of the endocentric type, are formed extensively by analogy, and each one of these enters the lexicon, as do all other words, as soon as it gets constructed; as a lexical entry, a compound may be subject to other forms of lexical derivation;

(c) More compounds of the categories N and A, as indicated by their meanings, are formed most likely because of their naming and subclassifying, rather than asserting, functions;

(d) Even with a meaning which is viewed as unpredictable from the compositional meanings of its constituents, an exocentric compound is also not often completely free from the influence of some semantic and/or pragmatic features associated with one or both elements; and finally,

(e) If only the formation of endocentric compounds is taken into account because they conform to the principle of headedness, despite some counter-examples presented, we will be leaving out many, no doubt too many, of the other types of compound formation.

---

14 The semantic relationships, more often observed in endocentric compounds, although not exclusively, are also found in syntactic phrases.
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Utudnon, an Undescribed Language of Leyte

Carl Rubino

It is my pleasure to honor Laurie Reid with a concise comparative description of a hitherto undescribed language spoken in five small villages in Central Leyte: Utúd, Gábas, Kilím, Pátag, and Pangasúgan. The variety reflected here represents the speech of Myrna Gamiao from the barangay of Utúd (also called Guadalupe), and will therefore be referred to as Utudnon in this paper for lack of a conventionalized name. Like Surigaonon, it is pejoratively called ‘Waya’Waya’ by outsiders, following the pronunciation of its equivalent for the negative existential walá’. The nearest urban center to the Utudnon-speaking areas is the town of Baybay, the site of the Leyte State University, formerly VISCA. The inhabitants of the town of Baybay speak a variety of Bisaya, mutually intelligible with standard Cebuano, referred to in this paper as Leyteño.1

1. Phonology

The phonemes of Utudnon are those of Standard Cebuano with the addition of the alveopalatal affricate [j]. Both languages exhibit a three vowel system /i, a, u/ with phrase-final vowel lowering usually reflected in their orthographies, e.g. /u/ > [o]_; /i/ > [e]_.

The consonantal system differs only in the palatal region where the voiced palatal affricate is a single phoneme in Utudnon, but an allophone of a palatalized t in standard Cebuano.

Cebuano and Utudnon Consonantal Phonemes:

| Bilabial | p, b, m |
| Dental   | t, d, s, n, l, r |
| Palatal  | j (Utudnon), y |
| Velar    | k, g, ng (velar nasal), w |
| Glottal  | - (glottal stop), h |

1 The dialect of Leyteño spoken in the Baybay area should not be confused with the southern Leyteño dialect which is closely related to Boholano and has also been referred to as Leyteño in the literature. I would like to extend my gratitude to Hsiu-chuan Liao and to R. David Zorc for their insightful comments on a previous version of this paper and to Glenn Veloso for providing me with the standard Cebuano renditions of the Utudnon. I am very grateful to Jason Lobel for his insights and for the Waray, Abuyog, Asi, Bantayanon and Romblomanon data and to Myrna Gamiao for her graciousness and patience in sharing her language with me.
A salient feature of the Utudnon language is that its phonological innovations closely resemble those of the Surigaonon dialects of Mindanao. Proto-Bisayan *l after a vowel often changes to \( y \), and Proto-Bisayan *j becomes \( j \) except word-finally.\(^2\)

(1) Nahúyog\(^{iii}\) sa\(^{iv}\) dangyóg\(^{v}\) nga sayyóg\(^{vi}\) an tuyó\(^{i}\) ka palijá\(^{ii}\) kakuyó\(^{vii}\). (UW)
Nahúg sa danglog nga sulog ang tulo ka paliyá gahápon. (Ceb)
Nahúg sa dangog nga sawg ang tuto: ka palinya gahápon. (Cebu City)
‘Three\(^i\) bittermelons\(^{ii}\) fell\(^{ii}\) on\(^{iv}\) the slippery\(^{v}\) floor\(^{v}\) yesterday\(^{vii}\).’

(2) Hajáhay\(^{v}\) gefód\(^{iii}\) an ákon\(^{i}\) ubrá\(^{ii}\) didís\(^{vi}\) pero\(^{vi}\) ajáw\(^{vii}\) isiling\(^{viii}\) kan Marta. (UW)
Hayáhay gayód ang akong trabaho dinhi apán ayáw isulit kang Marta. (Ceb)
‘My\(^i\) work\(^{ii}\) is really\(^{iii}\) easy\(^{iv}\) here\(^{v}\) but\(^{vi}\) don’t\(^{vii}\) tell\(^{viii}\) Marta’.

Examples of words with the \( l > y \) change include (note that for many of the Cebuano forms given the intervocalic \( l \) is lost, reflecting modern speech):

- **alimpúyas** ‘whirlwind’ (Ceb alimpulos)
- **alimpuyó** ‘cowllick’ (Ceb alimpó)
- **áya** ‘fence’ (Ceb alad, sikat)
- **ayang-an’g** ‘step’ (Ceb ang-ang)
- **ayáng-ayáng’** ‘hesitation’ (Ceb ang-ang)
- **ayap-áp’** ‘skin disease’ (Ceb alap-alap)
- **ayugbáti’** ‘spinach’ (Ceb alugbáti)
- **áyum’** ‘mole’ (Ceb alum)
- **baguybágo’** ‘scalp’ (Ceb bagulbagol)
- **baguybóy’** ‘mumble’ (Ceb bagulbol)
- **bayat-ang’** ‘hips’ (Ceb bat-ang)
- **básay’** ‘regret; blame; hairy caterpillar’ (Ceb basul)
- **bayahíbu’** ‘body hair’ (Ceb dalihu)
- **bayá’** ‘sand’ (Ceb balas)
- **bayáton’** ‘string beans (Ceb batung)
- **bayá’** ‘house’ (Ceb balay)
- **bayá’** ‘wave’ (Ceb baud, balúd)
- **báyon’** ‘provisions’ (Ceb balon)
- **bungóy’** ‘defae’ (Ceb bungó)
- **buyá’** ‘bubble’ (Ceb bulá)
- **buyák’** ‘flower’ (Ceb bulak)
- **buyán’** ‘moon’ (Ceb bulan)
- **buybóy’** ‘pubic hair’ (Ceb bulbul)
- **buyúy’** ‘stutterer’ (Ceb bulúl)
- **dangyúg’** ‘slippery’ (Ceb dangtug)
- **dayágá’** ‘bachelorette’ (Ceb dalaga)
- **dayágan’** ‘run’ (Ceb da’gán)
- **dáyán’** ‘road’ (Ceb daan)
- **dayudág’** ‘thunder’ (Ceb dalugdug, dawgdug)

\(^2\) The \( *l > y \) change also occurs in Asi/Bantaono, Romblomanon and Kawayan Hiligaynon. The \( *l > y \) change took place before the \( *y > j \) change, which also occurs in Southern Leyte and Boholano (Jason Lobel, pers. comm.).
puyú ‘island’ (Ceb púlu)       tambáy ‘medicine’ (Ceb tambál)
púyot ‘pick up’ (Ceb pulot)    tayúng ‘eggplant’ (Ceb tatúng)
santóy ‘santol fruit’ (Ceb santól)    tinúya ‘chicken stew’ (Ceb tinula)
saydá ‘transgression’ (Ceb sala)    tubóy ‘hard bowls’ (Ceb tubol)
sáyom ‘dive’ (Ceb sálom)    tuyód ‘push’ (Ceb tu:d)
suíy ‘stomach pain’ (Ceb suiúl)    tuyóg ‘sleep’ (Ceb tu:g, tulog)
suyát ‘write’ (Ceb sulát)    tuyúnga’n ‘school’ (Ceb tūnga:nán)
suyód ‘inside’ (Ceb sucd)    úyat ‘scar’ (Ceb ylar; Ley yawat)
suyóm ‘black ant’ (Ceb tulúm)    úyod ‘worm’ (Ceb ud, úlod)

The l to y change is also present in the context of the high back upper vowel where modern Cebuano or Leyteño has lost the l and inserted the glide w:

buyád ‘dry; dried fish’ (Ceb buvád)           say-á ‘catch it (Ceb saw-a /sa(l)ua/)
duyá ‘play’ (Ceb duvád)                    suyáng ‘chin’ (Ceb suváng)
guyáng ‘old’ (Ceb guváng)                  suyáw ‘glare from light’ (Ceb suváng)
huyám ‘borrow’ (Ceb hvam)             tuyák ‘stop raining (Ley tukwak)
huyát ‘wait’ (Ceb huwat, hulat)       tuyáw ‘sex urge’ (Ceb uvág)
limbáyot ‘bristle; goosebumps’ (Ceb limbáwot) uyák ‘crow (Ceb uwik)
luyá ‘saliva; spit’ (Ceb lvád)          uyat ‘scar’ (Ceb ylar, Ley yawat)


In the presence of the voiced coronal consonant d, the change is less likely to have occurred, e.g. tudling ‘row of plants’, túdlo ‘point’, bálíto ‘maim’, adláw ‘day’, badlí ‘smear’, budyá ‘tiresome’, budló ‘protruding’, budpó ‘bulging eyes’, sudlúy ‘comb; harrow’, kidláp ‘flash’.

With other coronals consonants, the change from l to y is more sporadic.

**l-retaining words:**
gásöl ‘famished’, kísápl ‘sparkle’, banl Áw ‘rinse’, búnlát ‘pull with force’

**l > y words:**
tusyók ‘prick’ (Ceb tuslok), túsyo ‘dip in liquid’ (Ceb tuslo), tusyód ‘submerge’ (Ceb tuslo), asyóm ‘sour’ (Ceb aslom), kúoyo ‘cut off tops, pluck’ (Ceb kúito), busyót ‘hole’ (Ceb buslot), húsyo ‘take off shoes’ (Ceb húslo), husyót ‘take off ring’ (Ceb huslot), gutyá ‘slip’ (Ceb gutlab), unyód ‘sink’ (Ceb unlód), tisyaúb ‘fall flat’ (Ceb tísloáb).

Like the Surigaonon dialects of Mindanao, the y to j change in all positions except word-finally is also widespread. This phonological change even applies to some Spanish loanwords, e.g. *sibúyas ‘onions’ (Ceb *sibuyas); *díjos ‘god’ (Ceb *díyos); *pinjá ‘pineapple’ (Ceb *pinjá), *jáwi ‘key’ (Ceb *yáwi).

Other examples of the y to j sound change include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utudnon</th>
<th>Cebuano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bagjó ‘storm’ (Ceb bagyó)</td>
<td>kapjás ‘papaya’ (Ceb kapayás)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balantijóng ‘bottle gourd’ (Ceb balantyóng)</td>
<td>kaj-ág ‘mess up’ (Ceb kay-ag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bajáw ‘sibling-in-law’ (Ceb bayáw)</td>
<td>kájá ‘copulation’ (Ceb káyät)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bájot, bajutón ‘gay, effeminate’ (Ceb báyut, bayutún)</td>
<td>kújáp ‘faint’ (Ceb kuyáp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bajáw ‘frightening’ (Ceb kuyáw)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bujog ‘bumblebee’ (Ceb buyóg)</td>
<td>langajá ‘procrastinator’ (Ceb langayán)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buwája ‘crocodile’ (Ceb buwáya)</td>
<td>luj-á ‘ginger’ (Ceb luy-á)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daungan ‘lift together’ (Ceb dayungan)</td>
<td>làjá ‘weak’ (Ceb líyá)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gajó ‘really’ (Ceb gayód)</td>
<td>níjá ‘his/her’ (Ceb níyá)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hajág ‘bright’ (Ceb hayág)</td>
<td>nínjó ‘your pl.(gen.)’ (Ceb nínýo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hajáháy ‘easy’ (Ceb hayáhay)</td>
<td>pajág ‘hut’ (Ceb payág)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ilajá ‘upland from sea’ (Ley ilayá)</td>
<td>palijá ‘bumblebee’ (Ceb paliyá)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jabó ‘pour’ (Ceb yabó)</td>
<td>putjúkan ‘honeybee’ (Ceb putyúkan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ja’jí ‘untidy; slack’ (Ceb ya’ya’)</td>
<td>sajó ‘early’ (Ceb sayó)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jakmó ‘long chin’ (Ceb yakmó’)</td>
<td>sápjot ‘flat buttocks’ (Ceb sapyot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jamóg ‘dew’ (Ceb yamóg)</td>
<td>tíján ‘stomach’ (Ceb tiyán)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jáwá ‘hut’ (Ceb yáwa’)</td>
<td>tójok ‘spin’ (Ceb tójok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jungít ‘speech defect’ (Ceb yungít)</td>
<td>tujóm ‘black sea urchin’ (Ceb tuyóm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>júta ‘land’ (Ceb yúta’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Word-final j does not occur, as *y is preserved in this position; morpheme-final -y becomes j before a suffix. This phenomenon can be captured by the following two ordered rules. 1) Proto-Cebuano *y > j; 2) Utudnon j > y / _#.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utudnon</th>
<th>Cebuano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ka- + kahuy + -an</td>
<td>kakahuján</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baybay + -un</td>
<td>baybájon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka- + bayay + -an</td>
<td>kabayaján</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taytay + -an</td>
<td>taytájan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subay + -a ini</td>
<td>subája ini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buguy + -un</td>
<td>bugújún</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tambay + -an</td>
<td>tambájan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tubuy + -un</td>
<td>tubújun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likay + -i sija</td>
<td>likáji sija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanday + -an</td>
<td>tandaján</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu- + subay</td>
<td>musubay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other noteworthy consonantal alternations between Utudnon and Standard Cebuano include the following. It should be noted that the r ~ l and d ~ r alternations are also present in Waray.
Glottal stop and fricative alternation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pangadi’á</td>
<td>paariha, pangariha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dáyha ngadi</td>
<td>dad’a diri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pangatu’á</td>
<td>paadtuha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sinulti’án</td>
<td>sinultihan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vowel changes (non-predictable):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lándong</td>
<td>lándong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lisáy</td>
<td>lisáy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hámut</td>
<td>humút</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuyúnggu</td>
<td>kulunggu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bitíis</td>
<td>batíis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kindíng-kindíng</td>
<td>kindang-kindang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dariyót</td>
<td>diriyót</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tíngkág</td>
<td>tangkág</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A peculiar change from \( r \) to \( d \) occurs with \( pare \) ‘godfather of speaker’s child, chum’ which becomes \( padíng \) before a name, e.g. Padíng Celso.
Certain words that metathesize in Cebu City Cebuano do not metathesize in Utudnon, e.g. *inum* + -a ‘drink’ = *inná* (Cebu), but *inná* (UW); *tanum* + -i ‘plant’ = *tamni* (Ceb) but *tanumí* (UW); however, *bilin* + -i ‘leave’ = *bílin* or *bíliní* (UW).

2. Morphosyntax

Although much of the lexicon of Utudnon is strikingly similar to the Bisayan dialect spoken in the nearby town of Baybay, referred to as Leyteño in this paper, there are enough divergent morpho-syntactic features in Utudnon to classify it as a separate language. Utudnon must have originally been a Warayan language that took on a Cebuano lexicon and verb structure over time but kept several vestiges from the indigenous language. This pattern of Cebuano language dominance can also be seen in the Porohanon language spoken to the west on the Camotes Islands (Wolff 1967).

In this section, I will outline a number of Warayan grammatical features in Utudnon, contrasting them to their equivalents in standard Cebuano, the most closely related language to modern Utudnon.

2.1 Pronouns

Utudnon pronouns are given in Table 1, where pronouns that differ from their equivalents in Standard Cebuano are listed in bold.

(3) Dúro’ gajód nga tayúng in *ija* gilibud. (UW)
many really LIG eggplant NOM 3s.GEN REAL.sold
Daghán gyúng talúng ang iyáng gibalígyá’. (Ceb)
‘S/he sure sold a lot of eggplants.’

(4) Pamílingá an *ija* bayáy. (UW)
look.for NOM 3s.GEN house
Pangitaá ang iyáng baláy. (Ceb)
‘Look for his house.’

(5) Kapuyós ba sin *ímo* báyon. (UW)
tasteless EMPH GEN 2s.GEN provision
Kaway-lamí’ ba sa ímong báon. (Ceb)
‘Your provisions are no good (tasteless).’

---

For a more thorough overview of the Cebuano pronominal system, see Bunye and Yap 1971:25–31.
Table 1. Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Preposed Gen</th>
<th>Postposed Gen</th>
<th>Oblique*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UW</td>
<td>Ceb</td>
<td>UW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s</td>
<td>akú, =ku</td>
<td>ákon</td>
<td>ako’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s</td>
<td>ikáw, =ka</td>
<td>ímo</td>
<td>nímo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s</td>
<td>síja</td>
<td>síya</td>
<td>íja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p. exc</td>
<td>kamí, =mi**</td>
<td>ámon</td>
<td>ámo’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p. inc</td>
<td>kitá, =ta**</td>
<td>áton</td>
<td>áto’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>kamó, =mo**</td>
<td>ínju</td>
<td>ínyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>silá</td>
<td>ñla</td>
<td>níla</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Oblique pronouns in Cebuano may also be formed with sa followed by the preposed genitive form, the preferred way of forming oblique pronouns in Utudnon, e.g. sa ákon = kanakun ‘to me’.

**The Cebuano shortened nominative forms =mi, =ta and =mu from kamí, kitá, and kamó are not used in Utudnon.

***The first person genitive pronoun is ta when it represents an agentive referent before the enclitic =ka.

(6) Íja gisiling sa ákon. (UW)  
3s REAL:say OBL 1s  
‘She told me’.

(7) Átun putuy-putujón an bayáni sín sayád. (UW)  
1p.INCL cut-RED.PAT NOM banana.stem GEN knife  
‘We’ll cut the banana stem with the knife.’

(8) Upud-upód lámang dida’ sa ímo bugto’. (UW)  
accompany-RED just there OBL 2s GEN sibling  
‘Just keep tagging along there with your sibling.’

(9) Gipadayá na nákon an sayapi’ sa íja  
REAL:PA.T.CAUS.send already 1s.NOM NOM money OBL 3s  
kakuyúp. (UW)  
yesterday  
‘I already sent the money to him yesterday.’
(10) Damóy suyóm sa iláyom sin ámon bayáy. (UW)
many=INDEF ant OBL under GEN 1p.EXCL GEN house
Dagháng hulmígas sa ilawm sa ámong ba:y. (Ceb)
‘There are lots of ants under our house.’

(11) Mas nangísog síja kay sa ákon. (UW)
more upset 3s.NOM than OBL 1s
Mas naglágot siya kay kanáko’. (Ceb)
‘S/he is more upset than I am.’

Like standard Cebuano, the first person genitive nako’ does not appear before the second person singular enclitic pronoun =ka. Ta is used in its place.

(12) Gisungyóg ta da ka. (UW)
REAL:PAT.tease 1s.NOM just 2s.NOM
Gisúngog taga ka. (Ceb)
‘I’m just teasing you.’

(13) Bijáan ta ka kun dili’ ko nimom aburusán. (UW)
leave.DIR 1s.GEN 2s.NOM if NEG 1s.GOM 2s.GEN
impregnate
Biyáan taga ug/kung dili’ ko nimo mapamabdusan. (Ceb)
‘I’ll leave you if you don’t get me pregnant.’

2.2 Ligature

The general ligature in Utudnon is nga regardless of phonetic environment, and the numerative ligature is ka. No ligature is used between independent nominative pronouns and numbers, e.g. kami tuyu ‘the three of us’ (Ceb kaming tulo). The ligature -n is employed after the nominative deictics, e.g. ila adton bayáy ‘their house’, inín buyák ‘this flower’.

(14) Updi an buyóy nga bají / dúro nga isdá’ (UW)
accompany.IMP NOM stammer LIG girl / many LIG fish
Ubani ang bulól nga babayi / dagháng isdá’ (Ceb)
‘Go with the stammering girl.’ vs. ‘lots of fish’

(15) Sa suyód sin tuyó ka adláw. (UW)
OBL within GEN three LIG day
Sa sulód sa tuló ka adlaw. (Ceb)
‘within three days’

2.3 Deictics

Deictics are given in Table 2, illustrating a closer affinity to the Warayan dialects of Leyte and Samar than to Cebuano. Utudnon does not seem to have a distinction between the two proximal categories. The column Prox1 in the table denotes the area closest to the speaker and Prox2 denotes an orientation near both the speaker and addressee. The nominative forms take the linker -n before nouns, the equivalent of the Cebuano -ng after vowels, e.g. Utudnon Gayáma ini idú’ ‘Take care of this dog’ (cf. Ceb Galma kining irú’). Non-Utudnon data in Table 2 are from Zorc (1977:78–79).
Table 2. Deixis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nom</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Obl</th>
<th>Existential</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prox1</td>
<td>UW</td>
<td>ini</td>
<td>siní</td>
<td>didí</td>
<td>ádi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceb</td>
<td>kirí</td>
<td>niari</td>
<td>dirí</td>
<td>dia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>War</td>
<td>adí</td>
<td>hadí</td>
<td>didí</td>
<td>ádi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>zarí</td>
<td>sari</td>
<td>dirí</td>
<td>ári</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prox2</td>
<td>UW</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceb</td>
<td>kiní</td>
<td>níni</td>
<td>dínhí</td>
<td>nía</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>War</td>
<td>ini</td>
<td>hini</td>
<td>dínhí</td>
<td>ánhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>ini</td>
<td>sin(i)</td>
<td>dínhí</td>
<td>ánhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>UW</td>
<td>na’</td>
<td>sitó</td>
<td>dídá’</td>
<td>áda’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceb</td>
<td>itón</td>
<td>niána’</td>
<td>dínhá’</td>
<td>na’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>War</td>
<td>kana</td>
<td>hiton</td>
<td>dídá’</td>
<td>áda’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>ito(n)</td>
<td>haná’</td>
<td>dídá’</td>
<td>ára’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distal</td>
<td>UW</td>
<td>ádto</td>
<td>sádto</td>
<td>dídto</td>
<td>ádto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceb</td>
<td>kádto</td>
<td>niádto</td>
<td>dídto</td>
<td>tua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>War</td>
<td>ádto</td>
<td>hádto</td>
<td>dídto</td>
<td>ádto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>zádto</td>
<td>sádto</td>
<td>dídto</td>
<td>ádto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloss</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘this; that’</td>
<td>‘of this; of that’</td>
<td>‘here; there’</td>
<td>‘is here; is there’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nominative:

(16) Áno da adto? (UW)
what just that
Unsa ra to? (Ceb)
‘What is that?’

(17) Kúha dida’ iton ímo sankídoy! (UW)
get.IMP there that 2s.GEN leg
Kuhaa ang imong tiíl diha’. (Ceb)
‘Get your feet off there!’

(18) Ajáw pagduyujá iton ímo bugto’. (UW)
don’t pester that 2s.GEN sibling
Ayáw pagsungúga kanáng ímong igsúon. (Ceb)
‘Don’t pester your sibling.’
Genitive:

(19) Kabayó sija sito; Kabayó sija sitón
know 3s.NOM that.GEN know 3s.NOM that.GEN=1.G

imo gísiling. (UW)
2s.GEN REAL:PAT.say

Kahibalo siya ana’; Kahibalo siya sa imong gisulti. (Ceb)
‘She knows that... She knows what you said.’

(20) Sin-o ba sito an imo bagsók? (UW)
who QUES that.GEN NOM 2s.GEN child

Kinsa ba niána’ ang imong anák? (Ceb)
‘Who of those is your child?’

(21) Ano ba sito an ímo gusto? (UW)
what QUES that.GEN NOM 2s.GEN want/like

Asa ba niána’ ang imong gusto? (Ceb)
‘Which of those do you like?’

Oblique/Locative:

(22) Nakaayó sija mungadá’ didá’. (UW)
STAT.shame 3s.NOM go there

Mauwáw siya muanhá’ dinha. (Ceb)
‘S/he’s ashamed to go there.’

(23) Mukadá’ ko didá’. (UW)
go 1s.NOM there

Muanha’ ko diha. (Ceb)
‘I’m going there.’

(24) Adí da didí; haya’ didá’. (UW)
EXIST:here just here NEG.EXIST there

Niá ra dirí; wa’ dinha. (Ceb)
‘It’s over here; it’s not there.’

Verbal:

(25) Kun dili’ ka mungadtó, ngádí didí. (UW)
if NEG 2s.NOM go.there come here

Kung dili’ ka muadto, anhi dinhi. (Ceb)
‘If you’re not going there, come here.’

(26) Silíng nímo mungadí sijá. (UW)
say 2s.GEN come 3s.NOM

Íngon nímo munganhí siya. (Ceb)
‘You said she is coming (here).’
**Predicative:**

(27) Aduy, **adto** na lát an pagót didto oh.my EXIST.there >> again NOM promiscuous there

sa íja bayáy. (UW)

OBL 3s.GEN house

Naku, tua na sád ang burikát didto sa iyang ba:y. (Ceb)

‘Oh my, the whore is there again at his house.’

(28) **Adto** si Pupuy Inggo sa subá’. (UW)

EXIST.there NOM grandpa Inggo OBL river

Tua si Lolo Inggo sa sapa’. (Ceb)

‘Grandpa Inggo is at the river.’

2.4 Case-marking particles

Like Cebuano and Waray, case marking particles have three cases. The **in** vs **an/sin** vs **san** definiteness distinction in the nominative and genitive cases is a feature that also appears in Waray. Unlike Waray, there is no past/non-past distinction with the definite case marking particles.

(29) Hamót **an/in** ímo buhók. (UW)

fragrant NOM 2s.GEN hair

Humot ang ímong buhók. (Ceb)

‘Your hair smells good.’ (an ’specific’, in ‘generic’)

(30) Maájo gajód **in** mga idú’. (UW)

good really NOM PL dog

Maáyo gayód ang mga irú’. (Ceb)

‘Dogs are really good.’

For common and personal nouns, the nominative category corresponds to the absolutive case, marking single arguments of intransitive predicates and objects of transitive predicates in both languages. Common noun genitive case markers in Utudnon are used to indicate possessors, agents of transitive verbs, and notional patients of intransitive verbs in antipassive constructions, an oblique category.
Table 3. Case marking particles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Marking Particles</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Genitive (UW) / Agentive/Gen (Ceb)</th>
<th>Oblique*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utudnon</td>
<td>Ceb</td>
<td>Utudnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common, sg</td>
<td></td>
<td>an (def)</td>
<td>ang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in (indef)</td>
<td>sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common, pl</td>
<td></td>
<td>an mga</td>
<td>ang mga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in mga</td>
<td>sin mga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal, sg</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal, pl</td>
<td>sila</td>
<td>sila</td>
<td>nila</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The oblique column represents locatives, benefactives, and recipients in Utudnon and Cebuano. The genitive markers are also used for oblique referents that appear as patients in antipassive constructions (see ex. 32).

(31) Sakutí sin ságing an landáng. (UW)  
    add.THM:IMP GEN banana NOM coconut.stew.ball  
    Saguli ug saging ang ginataán. (Ceb)  
    ‘Add banana to the landáng (coconut stew balls).’

(32) Naglibud sija sin damú nga isda’. (UW)  
    ACT:REAL.sell 3s.NOM GEN many LIG fish  
    Nagbalígya’ siya ug daghang isda’. (Ceb)  
    ‘She sells a lot of fish.’

(33) Gái ko sin sayapi’// Gái ko san ímo sayapi’. (UW)  
    give 1s.NOM GEN money // give 1s.NOM GEN 2s.GEN money  
    Tagai kog kuwarta. // Tagai ko sa ímong kuwarta. (Ceb)  
    ‘Give me some money. // Give me your money.’

(34) Gipágud ug gipúybo nga tambubúkag amuy roasted and pulverized LIG flying.lizard IDP=INDEF  
    tambáy sin húbak. Básin ipiktibo, isákot cure GEN asthma so.that effective THM.mix  
    sa pagkáun sin pujá. (UW)  
    OBL food GEN child  
    Gipágod ug gipulbos nga tambuká’ká’ mau ang tambál sa húbak. Arón ipiktibo, iságol sa pagkáun sa báta’. (Ceb)  
    ‘Roasted and pulverized flying lizard is used as a cure for asthma. In order to be effective, it is mixed with children’s food.’
The enclitic linker substituting for the non-specific nominative article in certain circumstances follows the patterns of standard Cebuano.

2.5 Temporals

Many temporal adverbials in Utudnon are quite distinct from their Cebuano counterparts and have closer equivalents in the Warayan dialects of Northern Leyte and Samar (see Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘now’</th>
<th>‘later’</th>
<th>‘tomorrow’</th>
<th>‘earlier’</th>
<th>‘yesterday’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utudnon</td>
<td>sadá’</td>
<td>niján</td>
<td>buwás</td>
<td>ganína</td>
<td>(ka)kuyóp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>yaná’</td>
<td>unína</td>
<td>buwás</td>
<td>kanína</td>
<td>kakulúp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ley</td>
<td>karón</td>
<td>únja’</td>
<td>úgma’</td>
<td>(ka)ganíha</td>
<td>gahápun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceb</td>
<td>karón</td>
<td>únya’</td>
<td>úgma’</td>
<td>ganína</td>
<td>gahápun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boh</td>
<td>karón</td>
<td>únja’</td>
<td>agma’</td>
<td>(ka)ganíha</td>
<td>gahápun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sur</td>
<td>kumán</td>
<td>ngá’jan</td>
<td>silúm</td>
<td>kanína</td>
<td>kahápun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 Interrogatives

The interrogatives in Utudnon share more affinities with Waray and the Surigaonon dialects of Mindanao than with standard Cebuano (see Table 5).

(44) **Áno** ba adá’ an ámon suyá’ niján? (UW)
what QUES EXIST NOM 1p.EXCL.GEN viand later

Unsa ba kahá’ ang among sud-án unya’? (Ceb)
‘What will our viand be later I wonder?’

(45) **Anóy** puyós siní? // Waya’ kay puyós. (UW)
what=INDEF use GEN.this // NEG.EXIST 2s.NOM=INDEF use

Unsáy gámit ani? // Wa’ kang pu:s. (Ceb)
‘What use is this? // You’re useless.’

(46) **Sin-ó/Anó** (an) ímo ngáyan? (UW)
who/what (NOM) 2s.GEN name

Kinsa ang imung pangan? (Ceb)
‘What is your name?’

(47) **Háin** na adá’ adto? (UW)
where now EXIST that

Ása na kahá’ to? (Ceb)
‘Wherever can s/he be?’
Table 5. Interrogatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Utudnon</th>
<th>Ceb</th>
<th>Sur</th>
<th>War</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘What’</td>
<td>anú</td>
<td>únsa</td>
<td>únu</td>
<td>anú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Who’</td>
<td>sin-ó</td>
<td>kínsa</td>
<td>sín-o</td>
<td>hín-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Whose’</td>
<td>kan nin-ó; kan sin-ó</td>
<td>kang kínsa</td>
<td>kanín-o</td>
<td>kanáy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘When (past)’</td>
<td>san-ó</td>
<td>kanús-a</td>
<td>kagán-o</td>
<td>kakán-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘When (future)’</td>
<td>san-ó</td>
<td>anús-a</td>
<td>kún-o</td>
<td>sán-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Where (past)’</td>
<td>diín</td>
<td>diín</td>
<td>diín</td>
<td>diín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Where (future)’</td>
<td>háin</td>
<td>ása</td>
<td>kain</td>
<td>háin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Where (present)’</td>
<td>háin</td>
<td>háin</td>
<td>háin</td>
<td>háin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Where (movement)’</td>
<td>ngain</td>
<td>ása</td>
<td>kain</td>
<td>ngain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘How many’</td>
<td>pilá</td>
<td>pilá</td>
<td>pilá</td>
<td>pirá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘How much’</td>
<td>tagpíla</td>
<td>píla, tagpíla</td>
<td>tagpíla</td>
<td>tagpíra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Why’</td>
<td>ngáno</td>
<td>ngáno</td>
<td>unú man kay anó</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘How + (to do)’</td>
<td>anuón</td>
<td>unsáon</td>
<td>unhon</td>
<td>áánhon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(48) **San-ó** kamó mingadtó? (UW)
 when 2p.NOM REAL:ACT.go
Kanus-a mu ningadtó/miadtdó? (Ceb)
‘When did you go?’

(49) **San-ó** kamó mungadtó? (UW)
 when 2p.NOM ACT.go
Anus-a mo mangadtó/muadtó? (Ceb)
‘When will you go?’

(50) **Ngáin** ngaj-an kamó paduyóng? (UW)
 where really 2p.NOM heading
Asa man gayud mu padung? (Ceb)
‘Where are you really going?’

(51) **Ngáin** ka nagpuyó’? Didí akú naghunóng. (UW)
 where 2s.NOM REAL:ACT.live here 1s.NOM REAL:ACT.stay
Asa ka nagpuyó? Dínhì ko nagpuyó’. (Ceb)
‘Where do you live? I stay here.’
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Anuón man na’ nímo’? (UW)
what do SOFTEN that 2s.GEN
Unsáon man kaná’ nímo’? (Ceb)
‘What are you going to do with that?’

Pila (ka buok) in imo bugto? (UW)
how many (LIG piece) NOM 2s.GEN sibling
Pila ang imong igsuon? (Ceb)
‘How many siblings do you have?’

Pilay presyo sin ímo bayáy? (UW)
how much = INDEF price GEN 2s.GEN house
Pilay presyo sa ímong bayáy? (Ceb)
‘How much is your house?’

Kan sín-o bayáy na’? (UW)
OBL who house that
Kang kinsang bayáy kaná’? (Ceb)
‘Whose house is that?’

Anó kalajuón an simbahán? (UW)
what NML..far NOM church
Unsa kalay-on ang simbahán? (Ceb)
‘How far is the church?’

2.7 Negation

Negation in Utudnon follows the regular patterns found in other Eastern Bisayan languages, with three separate negative particles, shown in Table 6. There is no separate negator for predicate NPs and adjectives (cf. Tausug bukun). Negative particles differ expectedly from their Eastern Bisayan counterparts only in their phonology: *l > y; y > j.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Predicative</th>
<th>Prohibitive</th>
<th>Existential; Perfective Verbs</th>
<th>Nonperfective verbs; statives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utudnon</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>ajáw</td>
<td>haya’, waya’</td>
<td>díli’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebuano</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>ayáw</td>
<td>waláy</td>
<td>díli’, di’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camotes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>azáw</td>
<td>wa’</td>
<td>di’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waray</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>ayáw</td>
<td>waráy</td>
<td>díri’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surigaonon</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>ajáw</td>
<td>haya’</td>
<td>díli’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyteño</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>ajáw</td>
<td>waláy</td>
<td>díli’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tausug</td>
<td>bukun</td>
<td>ayáw</td>
<td>wayruun</td>
<td>di’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8 Existentials and affirmatives

The existential in Utudnon contains deictic reference (see Table 7). Adí is used for proximate referents and ada’ for medial and distal, e.g. Adín kanding sa bayáy ‘There’s a
goat (here) in the house'; *Adi da didi / Ada’ da dida’* an ímo kandíng ‘Your goat is (here/there).’ *Adi kuy iríng / Ada’ akon iríng* ‘I have a cat (with me now)’ vs. *Ada’ kuy iríng* ‘I have a cat.’ As in its sister languages, the existential encodes both existence and possession: *Ada ka ba-y asawa or Ada’ bay ímo asáwa* ‘Do you have a wife?’ *Ada’ ba an ímo asáwa* ‘Is your wife there?’

**Table 7. Eastern Bisayan existentials and affirmatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘There is’ (clitic)</th>
<th>‘There is’ (independent)</th>
<th>‘many’</th>
<th>‘yes’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utudnon</td>
<td>ádi, áda’</td>
<td>áda’</td>
<td>damó’, dúro</td>
<td>ú’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceb</td>
<td>(a)dúna-y</td>
<td>deictic form*</td>
<td>daghán</td>
<td>ú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sur</td>
<td>may</td>
<td>jaún, jaú-y</td>
<td>hamok</td>
<td>ú’u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>may, may-áda’</td>
<td>deictic form*</td>
<td>dámo’</td>
<td>ú’u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cebuano and Waray do not have a generic independent existential particles. Spatial deictic forms are used instead, e.g. Cebuano *dia, nía* ‘here is’ vs. *naa, tua* ‘there is’.

(65) *Áda’* dida’ si Rick? Hayá’ man didí. Adto

EXIST there NOM Rick NEG.EXIST part here EXIST

sía didíto. (UW)

3s.NOM there

Na’a ba si Rick? Walá’ siya dinhi. Tua siya didto. (Ceb)

‘Is Rick there? He’s not here. He’s over there.’

(66) *Damóy* tambarúray naglupad-lúpad sa babáw

many=INDEF dragonfly ACT.fly.REDUP OBL over

sa subá’. (UW)

OBL river

Dagháng alindanaw nga galupád ibabáw sa sapá’. (Ceb)

‘There are many dragonflies flying over the river.’

(67) *Ada’* kay uyáng? (UW)

EXIST 2s.NOM=INDEF shrimp

*Ada’* ka bay uyáng? (UW)

EXIST 2s.NOM QUES=INDEF shrimp

Náa ka bay uwang? (Ley, Ceb)

Aduna ka bay pasáyan? (Ceb)

‘Do you (sg.) have any shrimps?’

(68) *Matagtkí’* ba adá’ o púnggud adton dida’

boil QUES EXIST or pimple EXIST there
2.9 The identificational particle

The identificational particle serves to emphatically point out a referent to the addressee. Because of its contrastive function, it is preclausal and often occurs before deictics. It appears in many Western Bisayan languages such as Aklanon, Romblomanon, and Odionganon as *imáw*, and as *maó* in Cebuano, Boholano, and Leyteño. However, in Utudnon, the particle is *amo*, as it appears in Hiligaynon, Kinaray-a, Masbateño, Porohanan, Surigaonon, and Tausug.

(70) *Amo* ngaj-án naájo an ákon síkdó’ kay
IDP really STAT.well NOM 1s.GEN hiccough because
íja ko gipakudatán. (UW)
3s.GEN 1s.NOM REAL.CAUS.startle.DIREC
Maó diay nga naáyo ang ákong sid-ók kay íya kung gipakuratán. (Ceb)
‘The reason why my hiccoughs are gone is because he startled me.’

(71) *Amo* adto akon gisiling? (UW)
IDP EXIST 1s.GEN REAL:PAT.say
Unsa diay ang iyang gisulti? (Ceb)
‘Is that really what he said?’

(72) *Amo* adto akon gisiling. (UW)
IDP EXIST 1s.GEN REAL:PAT.say
Mao tu ang akong giingún. (Ceb)
‘That’s what I said.’

2.10 Verbal morphology

The morphology of the basic dynamic verb classes is strikingly similar to Cebuano. Unlike Waray Waray, Utudnon does not employ initial reduplication to express the progressive, nor does it employ the realis infix -in- in its full form. However, the infix -um-, which occurs in modern Cebuano as the prefix mu-, is retained for some forms in Utudnon and this infix fuses with the realis infix -in- in its realis form (see Table 8).
Table 8. Verbal morphology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb class</th>
<th>Realis</th>
<th>Irrealis/Infinitive</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mu-</td>
<td>mitängis</td>
<td>mutängis</td>
<td>tängis</td>
<td>‘cry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-um-</td>
<td>timängis</td>
<td>tumängis</td>
<td>tängis</td>
<td>‘cry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mag-</td>
<td>naghuyát</td>
<td>maghuyát</td>
<td>paghuyát</td>
<td>‘wait’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-</td>
<td>gisákut</td>
<td>isákut</td>
<td>sakutí</td>
<td>‘mix’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-un</td>
<td>gipájing</td>
<td>pajúngun</td>
<td>pajúnga</td>
<td>‘turn off’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-an</td>
<td>gitilawan</td>
<td>tilawan</td>
<td>tilawí</td>
<td>‘taste’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Realis forms:**

(73) **Mitängis** an bají’ kay **gihudót**

REAL:ACT.cry NOM female because REAL:PAT.consume

sin ulit nga pujá an ija tanáng uyáng. (UW)

GEN voracious LIG child NOM 3s.GEN all=LIG shrimp

Mihílak ang babayi kay gihurot sa hakóg nga báta’ ang tanán niyang pasáyan. (Ceb)

‘The girl cried because the voracious child ate all her shrimp.’

(74) **Midukót** an buyád sa **kayáha’**. (UW)

REAL:ACT.stick NOM dried.fish OBL pot

Midukot ang bulád sa ká:ha’. (Ceb)

‘The dried fish stuck to the pot.’

(75) **Giğámon** níja an kalibrí kakuyóp. (UW)

REAL:PAT.cook 3s.GEN NOM cassava yesterday

Gilúto’ níya ang kamoteng-kahoy gahápon. (Ceb)

‘She cooked the cassava yesterday.’

(76) **Himúnong** kami sa bayáy ni Rick. (UW)

drop.by(REAL:ACT) 1p.EXCL OBL house GEN Rick

Mihapít mi sa ba:y ni Rick. (Ceb)

‘We dropped by Rick’s place.’

(77) **Nangisog** síja kadá’ **mikatáwa**. (UW)

angry 3s.NOM then ACT.laugh

Nasukó’ síya humán mikatáwa. (Ceb)

‘She got upset and then laughed.’
Irrealis forms:

(78) Básin mutúbo' an ímo mga buyák jab-í sin íhi'. (UW)
so.that ACT.grow NOM 2s.GEN PL flower pour.IMP GEN urine

Arún mutúbo' ang imong mga buwák, yab-í ug íhi'. (Ceb)
'So that your flowers will grow, pour some urine (on them).'

(79) Dayhá didí an ímo báyon kay
bring.IMP here NOM 2s.GEN provision because

akon tilawán an ímo bayátong. (UW)
1s.GEN taste.DIREC NOM 2s.GEN bean

Dad-a dinhí ang imong báon kay akong tilawán ang ímong balátong. (Ceb)
'Bring your food provisions here, I want to taste your beans.'

(80) Tubújon ka gajód kun magkinaún ka sin
hard.bowel.PAT 2s.NOM really if ACT.eat.up 2s.NOM GEN

damó’ nga santóy.
much LIG santol.fruit

Tublon ka g(a)yud ug magkinaún ka ug dagháng santól. (Ceb)
'You'll have hard bowel movements if you eat lots of santol fruit.'

Imperative forms:

(81) Sug-á an ímo gisiling.
repeat.PAT:IMP NOM 2s.GEN REAL:PAT:say

Usba ang imong gisulti’. (Ceb)
'Repeat what you said.'

(82) Pasabsába an kayábaw sa kasutián. (UW)
CAUS.graze.IMP NOM carabao OBL grassy.area

Pasabsába ang ká:baw sa kasagbután. (Ceb)
'Set the water buffalo out to pasture in the grass.'

(83) Ajuí ko sin kalamúnggay. (UW)
ask.for.IMP 1s.NOM GEN horseradish.leaves

Pangayui ko ug kamunggay. (Ceb)
'Ask for some horseradish leaves for me.'

(84) Pagsábud sin humáy sa pilápil. (UW)
IMP:ACT.sow GEN rice.seeds OBL rice.field

Pagsabuag ug humay sa humayán. (Ceb)
'Sow the rice seeds in the rice field.'

Potentive and stative verb paradigms follow those of standard Cebuano.

(85) Natumumán nákon an ímo gisiling. (UW)
POT.remember 1s.GEN NOM 2s.GEN REAL:PAT:say

Nahinumdumán náko’ ang imong gisúlti. (Nakahinumdum ko sa ímong gisulti.) (Ceb)
'I remember what you said.'
2.11 The discourse particle *duy*

A highly salient final particle in Utudnon which does not have an equivalent in standard Cebuano is the sentence final particle *duy*, used by speakers to solicit further interaction or confirmation of their message, much like the Canadian sentence final particle *eh*. *Duy* is realized as *uy* after the intensifier *gajúd/gud* ‘really’.

(86) **Nahúyog** siya kakuyóp sa subá’. (UW)

REAL:POT.fall 3s.NOM yesterday OBL river

*Nahu:g siya kagahapon sa sapa’. (Ceb)*

‘She fell in the river yesterday.’

(87) **Nasangkidoy** ko tungod níja. (UW)

REAL:POT.trip 1s.NOM because 3s.GEN

*Natakilpó’ ko tungod niya. (Ceb)*

‘I tripped because of her.’

(88) Huyum-húyom ánay didá básin ka **mahilisan**. (UW)

soak-REDUP for.while there so.that 2s.NOM POT.digest.POT

*Hulum-húlom lang dínha’ árun ka mahilisan. (Ceb)*

‘Just soak yourself for a while so you’ll digest.’

(89) Dili’ ko **kasabút** kun an kayábaw mukáun

NEG 1s.NOM STAT.know if NOM carabao ACT.eat

sin háyas; an mga buwája sigurádo gajód. (UW)

GEN snake NOM PL crocodile sure really

*Wala’ ko kahibalo ug mukaon ba ang kabaw ug bitín; ang mga buwaya mukáun gayód. (Ceb)*

‘I don’t know if water buffaloes eat snakes, crocodiles certainly do.’

Unsa bay imong ngan? (Ceb)

‘What is your name?’

(91) Ngaín kamó paduyóng **duy**? (UW)

where 2p.NOM heading **duy**

*Asa mo padong? (Ceb)*

‘Where are you going?’

(92) Ajaw **gud uy** siya pagkugnaa. (UW)

don’t really uy 3s.NOM convince

*Ayaw gyud siya pagdaniha. (Ceb)*

‘Don’t you dare convince her, OK?’
3. Lexicon

I will conclude this paper with a sampling of a few words in Utudnon that are divergent from their Standard Cebuano counterparts. I have segregated words relating to insects, animals and genitalia from the others to show how certain lexical fields can be quite distinct in closely related languages.

**Genitalia:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bulí’</td>
<td>‘genitalia’</td>
<td>Ceb kinatawo; War bulí’; Tsg bulí’ = buttocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>búto’</td>
<td>‘scrotum’</td>
<td>Ceb lagáy; Ceb bútu’ = vagina; Sur bútu’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butuón</td>
<td>‘scrotal hernia’</td>
<td>War búyong, putay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giti’</td>
<td>‘vagina’</td>
<td>Ceb buto, bílat; puki; Ley bisóng; Ceb, War pudáy; Sur pipí’, giti, bílat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kigóy</td>
<td>‘lower rump’</td>
<td>Ceb kigól</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lubót</td>
<td>‘buttocks’</td>
<td>Sur kalibangan, labót; Ceb sampot, dapi-dapi’; Ley lubót; Bik lubót</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lagáy</td>
<td>‘penis’</td>
<td>Ceb lúso’, pikóy, utin; Ceb lagáy = testicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pisóy</td>
<td>‘penis’</td>
<td>Ceb lúso’, pikóy; Ceb, War, Sur utin; War búto’, potoy, sili; Hil pitay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>putájon</td>
<td>‘scrotal hernia’</td>
<td>War búyong, putay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Animals and insects:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>antipayó, tipay-o</td>
<td>‘glowworm’</td>
<td>Ceb tipal-o; War urarámag, aninípot, bukátkat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bají-bají</td>
<td>‘praying mantis’</td>
<td>Ceb baying-baying; War ayam-ayam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butó’</td>
<td>‘stud pig’</td>
<td>Ceb barako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hantík</td>
<td>‘big black ant’</td>
<td>Ceb sulóm; War hamtik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hinigtán</td>
<td>‘fighting cock’</td>
<td>Ceb hinkitán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaba’kabá’</td>
<td>‘big black butterfly’</td>
<td>Ceb alibangbang; War rapudapó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Ceban Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuyapnít</td>
<td>‘bat (generic)’</td>
<td>Ceb kwaknit; Ceb kabóg (large bat); War kulalápnít</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lagá</td>
<td>‘red ant’</td>
<td>Ceb. hulmigas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lawá’lawá’</td>
<td>‘spider’</td>
<td>Ceb kaka; Sur, War láva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pikóy</td>
<td>‘parakeet’</td>
<td>Ceb piriko; pikoy = penis; War pikóy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pungák</td>
<td>‘owl’</td>
<td>Ceb ngiwngiw, mingok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sayapáti</td>
<td>‘pigeon’</td>
<td>Ceb pati, sayampati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tambarúray</td>
<td>‘dragonfly’</td>
<td>Ceb handanaw, sandanaw, alindahaw, silisili; War tambubúray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tambubúkag</td>
<td>‘flying lizard’</td>
<td>Ceb tambukáká</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utilód</td>
<td>‘little ant’</td>
<td>Ceb, Ley utitod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uyáng</td>
<td>‘shrimp’</td>
<td>Ceb pasayan; Ley uwáng; War uráng; Sur uyáng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sigbín</td>
<td>‘dog (slang)’</td>
<td>Ceb sigbín = mythological animal; NE Samar sigbín ‘dog (said in anger)’ (Jason Lobel, pers. comm.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Common adverbials and functors:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Ceban Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adá’</td>
<td>‘I wonder’</td>
<td>Ceb kahá’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aduy</td>
<td>‘oh my’</td>
<td>Ceb uy, naku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amo &gt; amo ini</td>
<td>‘contrasting particle; this’</td>
<td>Ceb mao; War amo &gt; Ceb mao kini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aytá</td>
<td>‘believe it or not’</td>
<td>Ceb maú ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basin</td>
<td>‘so that’</td>
<td>Ceb arón; basín = lest; optative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buwás</td>
<td>‘tomorrow’</td>
<td>Ceb úgma’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du:y</td>
<td>‘affirmative sentence-final particle’</td>
<td>Ceb no equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kadá’</td>
<td>‘and then’</td>
<td>Ceb human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kakuyóp</td>
<td>‘yesterday’</td>
<td>Ceb kagahapon; War kakulóp; Ban kakyóp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na lát</td>
<td>‘again’</td>
<td>Ceb na pód, na sád</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngaín</td>
<td>‘where (movement)’</td>
<td>Ceb asa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngaj-án</td>
<td>‘surprise particle; really’</td>
<td>Ceb tinuud (really), diay (surprise); Abg, War ngay-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Cebuano Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niján</td>
<td>‘later’</td>
<td>Ceb ūnya’; War niyān; Sur ngāj-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadá’</td>
<td>‘now’</td>
<td>Ceb karón; Cam zaná’; Sur kumán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadá na</td>
<td>‘hold on’</td>
<td>Ceb karon na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>san-o</td>
<td>‘when’</td>
<td>Ceb kanus-a; War sán-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tagna’</td>
<td>‘I don’t know’</td>
<td>Ceb, War tágna’ = predict, divine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Utudnon words that are divergent from Cebuano:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Cebuano Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alingásag</td>
<td>‘noisy’</td>
<td>Ceb alingugngó; Ley alingása</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayagtáng</td>
<td>‘forehead’</td>
<td>Ceb agtang, buna; Sur baj-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayát</td>
<td>‘salty’</td>
<td>Ceb parát; Mindanao Ceb asgád; War árat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>áyo</td>
<td>‘shame’</td>
<td>Ceb uwáw; áyo = fix, good for; War áló</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; makaaaáyo</td>
<td>‘embarrassing’</td>
<td>&gt; Ceb makauuwaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; makaayó</td>
<td>‘embarrassed’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bagsók</td>
<td>‘child’</td>
<td>Ceb báta’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bají</td>
<td>‘woman’</td>
<td>Ceb, War babaye; Kan, Sur babáji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bálsa</td>
<td>‘ferry boat’</td>
<td>Ceb bángka’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bangá’</td>
<td>‘clay waterpot’</td>
<td>Ceb bánga’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bángaw</td>
<td>‘rainbow’</td>
<td>SL balangáw; Ceb balángaw; Sur bayángaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banjás, badjás</td>
<td>‘drift in water’</td>
<td>Ceb padpád; Ley badláś, banláś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banjós</td>
<td>‘rub on medicine’</td>
<td>Ceb banlos; Ley banyos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banwa</td>
<td>‘thicket’</td>
<td>Ceb kasaghutan; Ceb banwa = city, town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>básong</td>
<td>‘water trough’</td>
<td>Ceb pasungan, bahoganan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bayága’</td>
<td>‘ember’</td>
<td>Ceb bága’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bayasón</td>
<td>‘stupid’</td>
<td>Ceb habol, dumpol, bugók</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bigatlón</td>
<td>‘flirt’</td>
<td>Ceb bigáon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilíng (mamilíng)</td>
<td>‘look for’</td>
<td>Ceb mangita’; War bilíng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bilyón</td>
<td>‘crazy’</td>
<td>Ceb buang, siaw; Abg bilyón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; bilyunón</td>
<td>‘nutty’</td>
<td>&gt; Ceb buangbuang, kuwanggol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binandáy</td>
<td>‘cross legs’</td>
<td>Ceb hinambid; Ley bangdáy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buddbód</td>
<td>‘untangle’</td>
<td>Ceb pitla; buddbud = wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceb</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Tag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'kind of fish'</td>
<td>Ceb budlóng = cornstarch sweet; dig out deep-rooted plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budúś</td>
<td>'pregnant'</td>
<td>Ceb mábdus, sabák; War búrod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bugsók</td>
<td>'pole for ground'</td>
<td>Ceb tukón (supporting prop), tugsók (impale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bugtó’</td>
<td>'sibling'</td>
<td>Ceb igsúon; War bugto’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butídk</td>
<td>'big belly'</td>
<td>Ceb buyú, Ley butírik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buyód</td>
<td>'hill'</td>
<td>Ceb, Sur bungtod; War búbíkid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buyumbún</td>
<td>'fontanel'</td>
<td>Ceb hub ón; War bub ón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buyón</td>
<td>'choke on food'</td>
<td>Ceb tuúk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dagmít</td>
<td>'hurry'</td>
<td>Ceb dalí’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dayágom</td>
<td>‘needle’</td>
<td>Ceb dagom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dughít</td>
<td>‘fruit picking pole’</td>
<td>Tag sungkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dúnot</td>
<td>'spoiled; old; flimsy'</td>
<td>Ceb latá'; Utudnon latá’ = rotten; War dunót ‘rotten (eggs)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duyóm</td>
<td>‘night'</td>
<td>Ceb gabii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duyóy</td>
<td>‘tease; annoy; bother’</td>
<td>Ceb sungóg, sámok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gámon</td>
<td>‘cook starches’</td>
<td>Ceb, Sur War luto'; Utudnon luto’ = cook rice; Ceb lung-ág</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gayasgás</td>
<td>‘scratch’</td>
<td>Ceb garád</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>halí</td>
<td>‘hurry’</td>
<td>Ceb dalí’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hígót</td>
<td>‘rope, leash’</td>
<td>Ceb hikót; War hígót</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hikí’ (hiki’hiki’)</td>
<td>‘smile’ (‘giggle’)</td>
<td>Ceb hiyóm; War ngisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>himají</td>
<td>‘womanizer’</td>
<td>Ceb himamáy; War makibabáyi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hinangáy</td>
<td>‘dilly dally’</td>
<td>Ceb langan-langan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hunóng</td>
<td>‘live; stay’</td>
<td>Ceb puyó (live); húnong = stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>húpit</td>
<td>‘wet’</td>
<td>Ceb basá’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husbák</td>
<td>‘lazy’</td>
<td>Ceb hubýá’, tapulán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huyáw</td>
<td>‘calm weather’</td>
<td>Ceb huwáw = drought; Ceb, War línaw; Akl hueaw ‘let off (a storm)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceb</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ilajá</td>
<td>‘upland (directional)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iláod</td>
<td>‘down to sea level, down to shore’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imburnál</td>
<td>‘canal’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ísuy-ísoy</td>
<td>‘chicken coccyx’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>íwas</td>
<td>‘exit (leave the house)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kabó’</td>
<td>‘fetch water; dipper’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kadá’</td>
<td>‘(and) then’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kága’</td>
<td>‘lie (untruth)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kahímo’</td>
<td>‘face’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kajáw</td>
<td>‘wave’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kajingkíng</td>
<td>‘little finger’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kakahuján</td>
<td>‘forest’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kalibrí</td>
<td>‘cassava’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kan-ón</td>
<td>‘cooked rice’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapuyós</td>
<td>‘ugly; rotten’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karída</td>
<td>‘run’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katumtumán</td>
<td>‘remember’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaupód</td>
<td>‘companion’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kayadkád</td>
<td>‘boil’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kayáha’</td>
<td>‘small pan’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>káyat</td>
<td>‘scatter’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>káyot, kámot</td>
<td>‘scratch’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kíjod</td>
<td>‘copulate’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiláya</td>
<td>‘know’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kugna’</td>
<td>‘persuade’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuyujó’t</td>
<td>‘shriveled up’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lambód</td>
<td>‘knot’</td>
<td>Ceb baligtós, lukót; Utudnon lukót = wrinkled, creased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landáng</td>
<td>‘coconut stew ball, guinataán’</td>
<td>Ceb binignít</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>langkawág</td>
<td>‘tall and lanky’</td>
<td>Ceb wangkíg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>langkáy</td>
<td>‘skinny and flexible’</td>
<td>Ceb langkáy = palm frond; old maid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>langkóy</td>
<td>‘overstretched’</td>
<td>Ceb luyát</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laugán</td>
<td>‘gallivant’</td>
<td>Ceb libodlibod, suroy-suroy, laróylaróy; War sibróng, layawláyaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>líbod</td>
<td>‘peddle’</td>
<td>Ceb suroy-balígya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liti’</td>
<td>‘lightning and thunder’</td>
<td>Ley linti’; Ceb kilat (lightning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lukpít</td>
<td>‘fold a mat’</td>
<td>Ceb pilo’; War likot (roll up mat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lung-ág</td>
<td>‘cook’</td>
<td>Ceb, War luto’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mangadjí’</td>
<td>‘pray’</td>
<td>Ceb ampu’; War mangadi’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matagtíkí’</td>
<td>‘boil with pus’</td>
<td>Ceb, War, Sur hubág; War báos, búrsot; Abg matastíki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maulhí</td>
<td>‘late’</td>
<td>Ceb maulahi; War úrhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mayá</td>
<td>‘dry’</td>
<td>Ceb ugá, Negros malá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muy-ók</td>
<td>‘die’</td>
<td>Ceb patay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nangísog</td>
<td>‘angry’</td>
<td>Ceb nasuka; War isog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngá’ngá’</td>
<td>‘stutter’</td>
<td>Ceb káká’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pagót</td>
<td>&gt; pagutón</td>
<td>‘whore’ &gt; ‘promiscuous’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>págúk</td>
<td>‘livid bruise’</td>
<td>Ceb bun-og; Ley payók</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>památi’</td>
<td>‘listen’</td>
<td>Ceb pamíñaw; Ley památi’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pasiling-síling</td>
<td>‘pretend’</td>
<td>Ceb nagpakaaron-ingnon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pilápil</td>
<td>‘rice field’</td>
<td>Ceb humayán, War tanumán, hagnà; War pilapil = water terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pujá</td>
<td>‘child’</td>
<td>Ceb, Sur, War bata’; Abg, Ban puya; Por puza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punggód</td>
<td>‘pimple’</td>
<td>Ceb bugás; War punggód</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Ceb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>púngko’</td>
<td>‘sit down’</td>
<td>Ceb púngko’ = squat; War pungkúan = chair; Hil púngko’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>púpoy</td>
<td>‘grandparent’</td>
<td>Ceb apohán; War apoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>púso</td>
<td>‘faucet (Sp.)’</td>
<td>Ceb grípo (Sp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puy + Name</td>
<td>‘grandparent (vocative)’</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sabáng</td>
<td>‘brackish water’</td>
<td>Ceb subá’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sabsáb</td>
<td>‘graze; eat voraciously’</td>
<td>Ceb tugwáy (graze); habháb (eat voraciously)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sábod</td>
<td>‘sow rice’</td>
<td>Ceb sabuag, pugás; War sábod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sákol</td>
<td>‘mix, add to’</td>
<td>Ceb ságol; War salakot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sampán</td>
<td>‘flat raft’</td>
<td>Ceb gakit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sangkídoy</td>
<td>‘knee; leg; trip’</td>
<td>Ceb tuhod; tiil (leg); pandól (trip)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sáwang</td>
<td>‘downtown’</td>
<td>Ceb lungsód, dakbayán; Abg sáwang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say-ád</td>
<td>‘hang’</td>
<td>Ceb sab-ong, bitay (hang); sagbóy (hang clothes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sayád, sayáy</td>
<td>‘curved knife’</td>
<td>Ceb sanggót</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saying</td>
<td>‘catch water’</td>
<td>Ceb saod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sáyumsáyum</td>
<td>‘dawn’</td>
<td>Ceb banagbanag, kaadlawon, War balasíbas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sijáb</td>
<td>‘set fire to’</td>
<td>Ceb sílab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sikdó’</td>
<td>‘hiccough’</td>
<td>Ceb sid-ok, síkyo’; Sur síkyo’; War sikló’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silíng</td>
<td>‘say’</td>
<td>Kan laúng; Sur sülti; War siring; Hil silíng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sipóy</td>
<td>‘knife with small blade for cutting rice’</td>
<td>Sur sipóy = knife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sí-ut</td>
<td>‘grass; trash’</td>
<td>Ceb, Sur sagbut; War banwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subá’</td>
<td>‘river’</td>
<td>Ceb sapa’; subá’ = brackish water; War sapsapa; Sur subá’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sudjút</td>
<td>‘sprout’</td>
<td>Ceb, Ley sudlut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sugá’</td>
<td>‘change; repeat’</td>
<td>Ceb ílis (change); usáb (repeat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sukút</td>
<td>‘collect (money)’</td>
<td>Ceb singil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sung-ág</td>
<td>‘cook starches’</td>
<td>Ceb lung-ág</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sungyugón</td>
<td>‘tease’</td>
<td>Ceb sungágon; War súnglog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>English Meaning</td>
<td>Tagalog Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supyút</td>
<td>‘wear’</td>
<td>Ceb sul-ob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suyá‘</td>
<td>‘viand’</td>
<td>Ceb sud-án; Ley suwá’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suyóp</td>
<td>‘dusk’</td>
<td>Ceb saop, salumsom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takúdo</td>
<td>‘taro (grown in dry places)’</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takyúp</td>
<td>‘lid, cover’</td>
<td>Ceb taklób</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tambukaka’</td>
<td>‘sitting idly’</td>
<td>Ceb tambuká’ká’ = flying lizard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangis</td>
<td>‘cry’</td>
<td>Ceb hilak; War tangís; Sur tuwáw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangkóng</td>
<td>‘water spinach’</td>
<td>Ceb kangkóng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasyakán</td>
<td>‘scaredy cat’</td>
<td>Ceb talawán; Ley taslakán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tawtáw</td>
<td>‘pupil of eye’</td>
<td>Ceb kalimutáw; Ley náwutawó; Marupipi War tawutawu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tidók</td>
<td>‘squish louse’</td>
<td>Ceb pislit; Abg idók</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tijáob</td>
<td>‘fall flat’</td>
<td>Ceb tislaob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tínáda’</td>
<td>‘sell (Sp.)’</td>
<td>Ceb, Sur balígya’; War baligyá’; Sur balígja’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tubód</td>
<td>‘leak; spring’</td>
<td>Ceb tu:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tukdú’</td>
<td>‘put on head’</td>
<td>Ceb, Ley lukdu’; War túkdo’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tukób</td>
<td>‘bite’</td>
<td>Ceb paak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tunturugók</td>
<td>‘stupid’</td>
<td>Ceb tonto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>údtong ládok</td>
<td>‘high noon’</td>
<td>Ceb utdong tútok; War adláway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ulít</td>
<td>‘voracious’</td>
<td>Ceb hangúl; War dagkò, hingaón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upód</td>
<td>‘go with’</td>
<td>Ceb ubán; War upód</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utód</td>
<td>‘cut off’</td>
<td>Ceb putul; War utód; Sur híwa’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yaksót</td>
<td>‘ugly’</td>
<td>Ceb ngil-ad, maot; Ley laksot; War mayáot, maráksot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;&gt;</td>
<td>part of a multiword collocation (see next gloss)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIG</td>
<td>ligature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NML</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>patient orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Por</td>
<td>Porohanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT</td>
<td>potentine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUES</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>realis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Ley.</td>
<td>Southern Leyteño</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFTEN</td>
<td>softening particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT</td>
<td>stative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sur</td>
<td>Surigaonon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THM</td>
<td>theme/conveyance orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsg</td>
<td>Tausug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW</td>
<td>Utudnon (Utudnon Waya’ Waya’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>Waray Waray</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction

The clause structure of Philippine languages and other Austronesian languages has been analyzed in various ways, especially in the domain of the “focus” constructions. There are a variety of opinions on the proper characterization of focus alternations in the Philippine languages, e.g., as a nominative/accusative system, an ergative/absolutive system, or a nominal-equational system. Two major views, i.e., the equational analysis and the ergative analysis, are discussed in section 2. In terms of case marking, Kapampangan is clearly an ergative/absolutive language, as exemplified by the presence of cross-referencing enclitic pronouns. In section 3, constructions with no enclitic pronouns are discussed.

2. Philippine Clause Structure

Philippine languages (and more generally western Austronesian languages) exhibit a great variety of focus alternations. There has been a large amount of literature in this area (see Klamer 2002 for a recent review on voice, the status of “subject”, and ergativity in Austronesian languages).

A wide variety of analyses have been proposed for the Philippine focus alternations, which have traditionally been referred to as “focus”, both synchronically and diachronically, and especially for the Tagalog focus system and/or actancy structure. For example, Philippine languages have been claimed either to exhibit (i) a nominative/accusative system (e.g., the traditional works on Tagalog by Bloomfield 1917 and Blake 1925, where one active and three passives are distinguished), or (ii) an ergative/absolutive system. Another position is that (iii) the clause structure of Philippine languages is basically nominal-equational, where the clause structure is based on nominal relations, i.e., two appositive NPs. There are still many other various claims (see Liao 2004 for her review on previous analyses), such as that (iv) Philippine languages cannot be typologized either as accusative, ergative or equational (e.g., Schachter 1976, 1977, 1996, Shibatani 1988), or that (v) Philippine languages are the “symmetrical voice type”, neither the familiar active-passive nor ergative-absolutive type (Foley 1998).

In this section, I will focus on two approaches, which are most relevant to Kapampangan, the equational analysis (e.g., Naylor 1979, 1995, Himmelmann 1991) and the ergative analysis (e.g., De Guzman 1988, Gibson and Starosta 1990, Mithun 1994).

---

I am grateful to Hsiu-chuan Liao and Carl Rubino for their valuable comments and suggestions. I am also grateful to Mike Pangilinan who always shares his deep knowledge of the Kapampangan language with me. All errors are my own.
2.1 Equational analysis
In an equational analysis, the clause structure is based on the relations of two appositive NPs. Let us consider Naylor’s view on Tagalog clause structure:

The syntax of Tagalog predications is based on nominal relations rather than verbal relations and the type of predication is attributive rather than predicational. (Naylor 1995:162)

Naylor identifies the genitive ng, which can mark an actor and a patient, as marking a generalized attributive relation (Naylor 1995: 174). Consider the following Tagalog example and her interpretation (her glosses with minor changes).

(1) (Tagalog) (Naylor 1995:172)
Nag-alis ng sapatos ang babae.
COMPL.AF.remove GEN shoes NOM woman
‘The woman removed (her) shoes.’
(Lit., ‘Removed of shoes (is) the woman.’)

2.2 Ergative analysis

Mithun 1994 states that Kapampangan exhibits an ergative system in terms of pronominal case marking. Ergativity in case marking is especially obvious for Kapampangan, since Kapampangan tends to cross-reference with second-position clitic pronouns (see section 3 for examples where clitic pronouns do not appear). This feature distinguishes Kapampangan from other related Philippine languages, especially Central Philippine languages, many of which employ second-position clitic pronouns but not as agreement markers. For example, let us compare the following Tagalog intransitive clauses (2) and their Kapampangan counterparts (3). In Tagalog, the argument appears either as a full NP ang babae (2a), or as a pronoun siya (2b). (For ease of comparison, I follow the ergative/absolutive glossing for both Tagalog and Kapampangan clauses.)

(2) (Tagalog) (Schachter and Otanes 1972:61)

a. Maganda ang babae.3
beautiful DET.ABS.SG woman.
‘The woman is beautiful.’

b. Maganda siya.
beautiful ABS.3SG
‘She is beautiful.’

2 Reid 2001 and Liao 2004 discuss the pronominal forms functioning as agreement markers in some Cordilleran languages.

3 Note that Reid 2002 proposes an analysis that the pre-nominal monosyllabic forms such as Tagalog ang are not determiners but specifying-nouns meaning ‘the one’ and the heads of their phrases.
In contrast, the pronoun ya in (3) is obligatory whether its coreferential full NP is present (3a) or not (3b). In other words, clitic pronouns in Kapampangan function as agreement markers (see section 3 for a detailed discussion of cases where a clitic pronoun does not appear when its coreferential full NP is present).

(3)  

[Kapampangan]4

a. Malagu ya  babai.
   beautiful ABS.3SG DET.ABS.SG woman
   ‘The woman is beautiful.’

b. Malagu ya.
   beautiful ABS.3SG
   ‘She is beautiful.’

The following pair of Kapampangan clauses clearly shows an ergative system of case marking. The only core argument in a canonical intransitive clause (“S”) (4a) and a more patient-like argument in a transitive clause (“O”) (4b) are marked alike by one form, and a more agent-like argument in a transitive clause (“A”) (4b) are marked by another form. Thus, in Kapampangan, intransitive clauses require a clitic pronoun coreferential with the only argument (absolutive), whereas transitive clauses require two clitic pronouns coreferential with two core arguments (ergative and absolutive).5

Tagalog and some other non-Cordilleran Philippine languages have no coreferential clitic pronouns. (From here on, predicates in Actor Focus constructions are glossed as INTR (intransitive), while those in other Focus constructions (e.g., Patient Focus) are glossed as TR (transitive).)6

(4)  

[Kapampangan]

a. Manaws ya.
   calling.INTR ABS.3SG
   ‘S/he is calling.’

b. Awsan mi ya.
   calling.TR ERG.1EX ABS.3SG
   ‘We (ex.) are calling him/her.’

3. Presence or Absence of Clitic Pronouns

As stated earlier, Kapampangan makes almost obligatory use of clitic pronouns, which clearly demonstrates that Kapampangan is an ergative/absolutive language. Clitic pronouns are present whether the predicate is verbal, adjectival, or nominal, as in (5) below. Constructions with cross-referencing clitic pronouns (i.e., agreement markers) can be handled by the ergative analysis. In (5), the clitic pronoun functions as

---

4 Unless otherwise indicated, all Kapampangan examples are from my own field notes.
5 Some combinations of clitic pronouns (and clitic adverbs) often undergo phonological fusion, appearing as one fused form.
6 It must be pointed out, however, that there are intransitive clauses in Kapampangan that take ergative pronouns (e.g., recent past constructions: Karatangdatang na. ‘He just arrived.’).
an agreement marker; it agrees with *i Juan*, the argument, and the other constituent is the predicate.

(5)  [Kapampangan]

a. Mumuli ya i Juan.
   going.home.INTR ABS.SG DET.ABS.SG Juan
   ‘Juan is going home.’

b. Matwa ya i Juan.
   old ABS.SG DET.ABS.SG Juan
   ‘Juan is old.’

c. Estudyante ya i Juan.
   student ABS.SG DET.ABS.SG Juan
   ‘Juan is a student.’

However, there are cases in which a clitic pronoun does not appear when its coreferential full NP is present, i.e., there is no agreement marking. Mithun (1994: 251, 253) shows that indefinite entities in a presentative construction, mass entities, and abstract entities are not cross-referenced by an enclitic pronoun. Here is an example from Mithun where the absolutive *ing pamangan*, which is a mass entity, is not cross-referenced (her glosses with minor changes).

(6)  [Kapampangan] (Mithun 1994:253)

ampong makasawa ing pamangan.
   and lack.variety DET.ABS.SG food
   ‘and the food lacks variety.’

Use of cross-referencing clitic pronouns may be conditioned by semantic factors. Consider the following pair of examples. The absolutive *ing danum* is cross-referenced when a “particular” water is referred to, as in (7a), but it is not when “all” the water that one can find at the moment is referred to, as in (7b).

(7)  [Kapampangan]

a. Marimla ya ing danum.
   cold ABS.SG DET.ABS.SG water
   ‘The water is cold.’

b. Marimla ing danum.
   cold DET.ABS.SG water
   ‘The water is cold.’

Thus, it is clear that semantic factors, such as definiteness and possibly animacy, are crucial for the presence or absence of cross-referencing clitic pronouns.

In the following, we will consider syntactic factors. We will look at some constructions in which clitic pronouns are not used, i.e., question-word (wh-word) questions.
Normally, questions employing nanu ‘what’, ninu ‘who’, and isanu ‘which one’ do not contain a cross-referencing clitic pronoun. Consider the following examples.\(^7\)

\[(8)\] [Kapampangan]

a. Nanu=ng biklat mu?
   what=DET.ABS.SG opened.TR ERG.2SG
   ‘What did you (sg.) open?’

b. Ninu=ng ginawa kanita?
   who=DET.ABS.SG made.INTR OBL.that
   ‘Who made (=cooked) that?’

c. Isanu=ng pinili mu?
   which.one=DET.ABS.SG selected.TR ERG.2SG
   ‘Which one did you (sg.) select?’

If the equational construction is understood primarily as a structure based on the relations of two appositive NPs, these clauses, with two NPs and without a clitic pronoun, would be prototypical examples of equational structure. Of the ing-marked NP and the question-word, it is difficult to determine which is the argument and which is the predicate. This is partly because the clauses are interrogative, but also because there is no cross-referencing pronoun. In contrast, in (5c) above, the clitic pronoun cross-references the argument, *i Juan*, and the rest of the clause, *estudyante*, is the predicate. These two NPs cannot be regarded as appositive NPs.

Mirikitani 1972 gives two pairs of constructions, cited in (9) and (10) below (my glosses). One of each pair is an equational construction employing ninu ‘who’, (9a) and (10a), whereas the other is non-equational, employing kaninu ‘to whom’, (9b), which is the oblique form of ninu, and para kaninu ‘for whom’, (10b). Note that cross-referencing clitic pronouns do not appear in the equational constructions.

\[(9)\] [Kapampangan] (Mirikitani 1972:181)

a. Ninu ing sulatanan mu?
   who DET.ABS.SG write.to.TR ERG.2SG
   ‘Who is the one to whom you (sg.) will write?’

b. Kaninu ka sumulat?
   OBL.who ABS.2SG write.INTR
   ‘To whom are you (sg.) going to write?’

\[(10)\] [Kapampangan] (Mirikitani 1972:181)

a. Ninu ing pinyali mu=ng malan?
   who DET.ABS.SG bought.for.TR ERG.2SG=LK clothes
   ‘Who is the one for whom you (sg.) bought clothes?’

---

\(^7\) The absolutive singular determiner *ing* is often contracted to =ng and cliticized to the preceding element, especially in spontaneous speech, behaving as an enclitic. Native speakers can easily tell whether an occurrence of =ng is that of the linker or the determiner.
It must be pointed out that in some cases, a clitic pronoun seems to be optional, as in the following example. It is not certain, in such cases, when a clitic pronoun is used and when it is not.

(11)  [Kapampangan]

Nanu (ya) ing mibuklat?
what (ABS.3SG) DET.ABS.SG opened.INTR

‘What opened?’

We have considered the clauses beginning with question-words nanu, ninu, and isanu. Question-word questions can be characterized as a straightforward equational structure, since they are consisted of two appositive NPs, both of which are absolutives.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I have discussed two major views on the clause structure of Philippine languages, i.e., the equational analysis and the ergative analysis. Clearly Kapampangan exhibits an ergative system in terms of pronominal case marking, although there are some constructions with no cross-referencing pronouns. Furthermore, it should be noted that there are semantic factors responsible for the presence and absence of cross-referencing pronouns.

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>absolutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>actor focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPL</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>determinant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIST</td>
<td>existential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTR</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>linker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ERGATIVITY AND EQUATIONAL STRUCTURE


Pronominal Forms in Central Cagayan Agta: Clitics or Agreement Features?¹

Hsiu-chuan Liao

De La Salle University

1. Introduction

The forms of the first and second person singular genitive pronouns exhibit alternation in a number of Austronesian languages, including all but a few of the Cordilleran languages of the Northern Philippines (Dyen 1974; Tharp 1974; Blust 1977; Reid 1978, 1981, 2001; etc.). In general, the alternation is phonologically conditioned: the full forms, typically =ku ‘1S’ and =mu ‘2S’, occur postconsonantally, whereas the short forms =k ‘1S’ and =m ‘2S’ occur postvocically. However, in the Central Cordilleran languages,² as well as in Ilokano, the short forms can also occur on transitive verbs containing a reflex of either *-en or *-an, by replacing the final -n of the verb ending (Reid 2001:235–237).³ In each of these languages (but not in Ilokano), the final -n of a transitive verb is also replaced when the third person singular form =na occurs.

To explain the occurrence of the postvocalic variants on transitive verbs that otherwise would end in a consonant, Reid (2001) reexamines the status of these forms, that is, whether they are full words, clitics, affixes, or none of the above. Applying the cliticoid tests provided by Zwicky and Pullum (1983:503–504), he concludes that the so-called short form first and second person singular “genitive pronouns” as well as the so-called third person singular “genitive pronoun” -na that replace the final -n of transitive verbs are NOT clitics, but agreement features that have been incorporated as a part of transitive verbs.

A similar kind of alternation is observed in Central Cagayan Agta, a Northern Cordilleran language spoken by some 700 to 800 Negritos living in the central region of

¹ This paper is a revised version of a part of Chapter 6 (section 6.3.2.1 and section 6.3.2.5) of my doctoral dissertation (Liao 2004). I would like to thank all of my committee members, Laurie Reid, Bob Blust, Byron W. Bender, Sasha Vovin, and Bion Griffin, for their helpful comments on my dissertation. I am also grateful to Carl Rubino for his comments on an earlier version of this paper. I would also like to thank the Chiang Ching-Kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange (USA) for providing me with a doctoral dissertation fellowship to conduct my dissertation research.

² The Central Cordilleran languages include Bontok, Kankanaey, Balangao, Ifugao (the Nuclear Central Cordilleran languages), Kalinga and Itneg (which together with the Nuclear group constitute North Central Cordilleran) and Isinai (Reid 1974).

³ Rubino (2005:334) notes that “The first and second person ergative enclitics also lose their final vowel after vowels, e.g., adí=m (younger.brother=2S.ERG) ‘your younger brother’, unless they are followed by the adverbial enclitic =e)n ‘now, already’ or follow the monomorphemic functors di ‘negation’ or sa ‘then’, in which case they maintain their full forms” [e.g., Surátemon! ‘Write it!’; ...sá=monto surá-t=en kalpasànna. ‘...then you’ll write it afterwards’].
Cagayan Province in the northern part of the island of Luzon, the Philippines (Reid 1989:57; Mayfield 1987; http://www.ethnologue.com). In Central Cagayan Agta, as in other Cordilleran languages, the alternation in the forms of the first and second person singular genitive pronouns is also phonologically conditioned. That is, the full forms =ku ‘1’S and =mu ‘2’S occur after a consonant-final stem, whereas the short forms =k ‘1’S and =m ‘2’S occur after a vowel-final stem. However, when the second person singular genitive pronoun =mu occurs with stems ending with an alveolar nasal, formal irregularities occur. The morphophonological idiosyncrasies exhibited by the combination of the second person singular genitive pronoun with a stem ending with an alveolar nasal pose the question as to whether all assumed “clitic pronouns” are clitics or agreement features. In this study, I reconsider the morphological status of genitive pronouns (or their probably related forms) and see whether ALL these forms are clitics in Central Cagayan Agta.

2. The Forms and Functions of Genitive Pronouns

Before discussing the morphological status of genitive pronouns, let us first consider their forms and functions.

Like the genitive pronouns in other western Austronesian languages, genitive pronouns are associated with two grammatical functions in Central Cagayan Agta. First, they can function as the attribute (i.e., the possessor) in a possessive construction, as in (1)–(2). Second, they can function as the agent of a dyadic –an clause, the agent of a dyadic –án clause, the agent of a dyadic i- clause, or the agent of a dyadic i- -án clause, as in (1)–(3).⁴

(1) genitive clitic pronoun as the agent of a dyadic –an clause and as the possessor in a possessive construction:

en = ku para sasiriban ya matā = k.⁵
go = GEN.1S yet peek NOM eye = GEN.1S

‘I then went to peek my eyes out of the little window.’ (Agt 10–014)⁶

(2) genitive clitic pronoun as the agent of a dyadic –án clause and as the possessor in a possessive construction:

nagtappan = ák, tinappanán = ku matā = k.
covered = NOM.1S covered = GEN.1S eye = GEN.1S

‘I covered myself, I covered my eyes.’ (Agt 10–013)

---

⁴ The Central Cagayan Agta reflexes of PAN *-um-, PMP *maR-, PMP *maN-, PAN *-en, PAN *Si- (or PMP *hi-) are -um-, mag-, maN-, -an, -án, and i-, respectively.

⁵ The Central Cagayan Agta orthography used here is the same as that used by Mayfield (1987). The symbol a stands for a mid central vowel; ă stands for a low central vowel (represented as a or ã in other publications on this language); ng stands for the velar nasal; and – stands for the glottal stop. Glottal stop is written only in consonant clusters. There are no vowel clusters in Central Cagayan Agta; hence contiguous vowels in text are always pronounced with an intervocalic glottal stop.

⁶ All Central Cagayan Agta data used in this study are taken from the eleven texts in Mayfield (1987). The example reference numbers following the free translation are organized according to the order that they appear in Mayfield’s monograph. For example, Agt 10–014 means that the example is the 14th sentence of Central Cagayan Agta Text 10.
genitive clitic pronoun as the agent of a dyadic i- clause:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{am} & \text{pagikarga} = m \\
\text{if} & \text{load.with} = \text{GEN.2S} \\
\text{ten} & \text{there} \\
\text{ay} & \text{INJ} \\
\text{idagut} & \text{lower.with} = \text{GEN.2S} = \text{already}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ha} \\
\text{again}
\end{array}
\]

‘When you (sg.) have loaded it there, then you (sg.) lower it again,....’ (Agt 11–039)

Moreover, (third person) genitive clitic pronouns sometimes also have a cross-referencing function.\(^7\) As shown in (4)–(5), genitive clitic pronouns, such as =na ‘GEN.3S’ or =da ‘GEN.3P’, can cooccur with the (genitive-marked) agent full NP of a dyadic -an clause or a dyadic –ān clause (or a dyadic i- clause, or a dyadic i- -ān clause) and they agree with the (genitive-marked) agent full NPs in person and number features.

(4) genitive clitic pronoun agrees with the agent of a dyadic –an clause:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{...} & \text{kinagåt} = & \text{na} & \text{hapa} \\
\text{bit} = & \text{GEN.3S} & \text{also} & \text{GEN ant} \text{ NOM rump} \\
\text{ya} & \text{GEN dog} & \text{huli} & \text{na atu}.\(^8\)
\end{array}
\]

‘...the ant bit the rump of the dog.’ (Agt 4–022)

(5) genitive clitic pronoun agrees with the agent of a dyadic –ān clause:

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{...} & \text{go} = & \text{da} & \text{=kami} = & \text{n} & \text{inarihungbungan} \\
\text{in}\text{aribungbung} & \text{=} & \text{Merikåno} & \text{kid=} & \text{en.}
\end{array}
\]

‘...the Americans came and gathered around us (ex.).’ (Agt 10–016)

As noted in (1)–(3), both the first person singular genitive pronoun and the second person singular genitive pronoun have two forms: =ku/=k and =mu/=m, respectively.\(^9\) Generally, the occurrence of the full form clitics (=ku and =mu) and the short form clitics (=k and =m) is phonologically conditioned. That is, the full form genitive pronouns =ku and =mu occur after a consonant-final stem (as in (7) and (8)), whereas the short form singular genitive pronouns =k and =m occur after a vowel-final stem (as in (6) and (9)).

(6) short form genitive clitic =k following a vowel:

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{gafu} & \text{ta} & \text{makakasidug} & \text{=åk} = & \text{na} & \text{pinapäsi} = k \\
\text{since} & \text{LCV} & \text{sleep=} & \text{NOM.1S} = \text{already} & \text{CAUS.die=} & \text{GEN.1S} \text{ NOM radio=} \text{that}
\end{array}
\]

‘And since I became sleepy, I killed/turned off the radio.’ (Agt 10–026)

---

\(^7\) To simplify the discussion, I tentatively consider both short form and full form genitives as clitics, although in some cases these forms might have been grammaticalized as agreement features on the verb. See section 3 for more discussion on these forms.

\(^8\) -in- is the completive form of the dyadic –an verb.

\(^9\) Reid (2001:235–236, footnote 2) comments that “The alternation is found in all of the Central and Southern Cordilleran languages, in both Northern and Southern Alta (Reid 1991), in Ilokano (Rubino 1997), and in the Cagayan Valley languages, but not in the Negrito languages of Northeastern Luzon (Headland and Headland 1974; Reid 1983), nor in Arta, a Negrito language isolate spoken in the Cagayan Valley (Reid 1989). Yogad, one of the Northern Cordilleran languages, has a variant following vowel-final words only for the second singular genitive pronoun (A. Healey 1958).”
(7) full form genitive clitic =ku following a consonant:

yen, ya magbida=yāk te kamuy, anāk=ku ikid ni Enut,....
that NOM talk=NOM.1S LCV.2P child=GEN.1S and GEN Enut

‘The reason that I am talking to you (pl.), my children and Enut....’ (Agt 9–001)

(8) full form genitive clitic =mu following a consonant:

a intu paha ībār=ku teko, Ginyamor, kuman=na
CONJ TOP.3S yet tell=GEN.1S LCV.2S Ginyamor similar=GEN.3S

īwahad=mu minā ya dulay na nonot,....
throw.with=GEN.2S should NOM bad LIG thoughts

‘And another thing I will tell you (sg.), Ginyamor, it is like this, you (sg.) should throw away any bad ideas,....’ (Agt 2–003)

(9) short form genitive clitic =m following a vowel:

ipātām hapa ya māppyta ta agyān minā
CAUS.see+GEN.2S also NOM good LCV place would/should

na babbay anna ipātām ya ngāmin tahabāku=m,....
LIG female and CAUS.see+GEN.2S NOM all work=GEN.2S

(ipātām < i- -ān + pa- + ita + =mu)

‘You (sg.) show good behavior to the girl’s relatives and you (sg.) show all your (sg.) industry....’ (Agt 2–002)

However, when the second person singular genitive pronoun occurs with a dyadic –ān verb, a dyadic –ān verb, or a dyadic i- -ān verb, or other forms ending with the alveolar nasal n (e.g., kūm ‘QUOT + GEN.2S’ < kun ‘QUOT’ + =mu ‘GEN.2S’), irregularities occur. As shown in (9) and (10), when the second person singular genitive pronoun occurs with a dyadic –ān verb (or a dyadic i- -ān verb), the resulting form is either –ān=m or –ām (or i- -ām). The morphophonological idiosyncrasies exhibited by the combination of the second person singular genitive pronoun with stems ending with an alveolar nasal pose the question as to whether the second person singular genitive pronominal forms (and possibly the first person singular genitive form as well as other genitive pronominal forms) are clitics or agreement features.

(10) second person genitive clitics occurring with dyadic –ān verbs:

en=tān, unnanān=māk te
go=GEN.1PI=now/already precede=GEN.2S+NOM.1S because
hilāgām=āk, te matuga=yāk te hiklam=na.
light+GEN.2S=NOM.1S because splinter=NOM.1S because night=already

(=tān < =tām ‘GEN.1PI’ + =na ‘already/now’; =māk ‘GEN.2S + NOM.1S’ < =mu ‘GEN.2S’ + =āk ‘NOM.1S’; hilāgām < hilāgān + =mu ‘GEN.2S’)

‘Let’s go, go ahead of me and shine the light for me because I will puncture my feet because it is night already.’ (Agt 8–051)

In addition to the problem raised by the combination of the second person singular genitive pronoun with a stem ending with an alveolar nasal, one more problem is found
in the data presented in (12)–(13). Recall that short form genitive clitic pronouns occur after a vowel-final stem. However, the seemingly short form first person genitive clitic pronoun appears to occur after a consonant-final stem in (12)–(13). One might consider these to be exceptions to the statement that short form genitive clitic pronouns occur after a vowel-final stem. However, if we examine the data in (12)–(13) carefully, we find that when the first person singular genitive pronoun is followed by a deictic determiner (beginning with a vowel), regardless of the stem ending with a vowel (as in (11)) or with a consonant (as in (12)–(13)), the form \( =k \) occurs. It seems that the seemingly short form first person singular genitive pronoun \( =k \) in (12)–(13) is probably not a true short form genitive pronoun, but a long form genitive pronoun that is reduced to \( =k \) when it is immediately followed by a deictic determiner.

Such an analysis is supported by the data presented in (7) and (12). In these examples, the first person singular genitive pronoun occurs after a consonant-final stem. However, it appears as either \( =ku \) (as in \( anāk = ku \)) or \( =k \) (as in \( anāk = k = en \)). In the first instance, the long form \( =ku \) occurs because it is not followed by a vowel-initial determiner, whereas in the second instance, the seemingly short form \( =k \) occurs because it is followed by a vowel-initial determiner.

(11) short form genitive clitic \( =k \) following a vowel and preceding a vowel-initial clitic determiner:

\[
\ldots \text{te nagtalog i hinā} = k = \text{en.}
\]

because crave=meat NOM mother=GEN.1S=that

‘...because my mother was hungry for meat.’ (Agt 8–097)

(12) seemingly short form genitive clitic \( =k \) following a consonant but preceding a vowel-initial clitic determiner:

\[
\ldots \text{nelubeg na uga} \text{ta} \ anāk = k = \text{en} \quad \text{à} \quad \text{nasi} = \text{n.}....
\]

trod.on GEN deer NOM child=GEN.1S=that CONJ dead=already/now

\((\text{nelubeg} < \text{na-} + \text{i-} + \text{lubeg}; C=k=en < C=ku + =en)\)

‘The deer trod on my child and it’s dead now.’ (Agt 4–013)

(13) seemingly short form genitive clitic \( =k \) following a consonant but preceding a vowel-initial clitic determiner:

a. \[
\ldots \text{te} \quad \text{āmu=muy} \quad \text{hamān} \quad \text{ya} \quad \text{zigāt} = k = \text{in}
\]

because know=GEN.2P SURP NOM hardship=GEN.1S=that

\( \text{nagtugut} \quad \text{tekamuy.} \)

left LCV.2P

\((C=k=in < C=ku + =in)\)

‘...because you (pl.) know how hard it is for me to leave you (pl.).’ (Agt 9–012)

b. \[
\text{bimilag} = āk = \text{na} \quad \text{umange ta} \quad \text{bagetay=en} \quad \text{nagayāyāg}
\]

run=NOM.1S=now go LCV hill=that calling

\( \text{ta} \quad \text{kadakalān} = k = \text{en}. \)

LCV elder=GEN.1S=that

\((C=k=en < C=ku + =en)\)

‘I ran now, going up on the hill calling to my elder companion.’ (Agt 8–039)
3. Clitics or Agreement Features?

Reid (2001:235–237) reports that the so-called first and second person singular genitive pronouns in many Cordilleran languages exhibit alternation in their forms, just like the one described above for Central Cagayan Agta. That is, the full forms, typically =ku ‘1S’ and =mu ‘2S’, occur postconsonantally, whereas the short forms =k ‘1S’ and =m ‘2S’ occur postvocally. In addition to the above environment, he reports that in the Central Cordilleran languages, as well as in Ilokano, the short forms can also occur on transitive verbs containing a reflex of either *-en or *-an, by replacing the final –n of the verb ending (e.g., Guinaang Bontok dalusán ‘you (sg.) clean something’ < dalusám + =m). In each of these languages (but not in Ilokano), the final –n of a transitive verb is also replaced when the third person singular form =na occurs.

To provide an explanation for the occurrence of the postvocalic variants on transitive verbs that otherwise would end in a consonant, he first reexamines the status of these forms, that is, whether they are full words, clitics, affixes, or none of the above. Applying the clitichood tests provided by Zwicky and Pullum (1983:503–504), he concludes that the so-called short form first and second person singular “genitive pronouns” as well as the so-called third person singular “genitive pronoun” –na that replace the final –n of transitive verbs are NOT clitics, but agreement features that have been incorporated as a part of transitive verbs.

Seeing that similar morphophonological irregularities also occur in Central Cagayan Agta (although only for the second person singular form), I apply the same set of clitichood tests to “genitive pronouns” to determine the morphological status of so-called short form “genitive pronouns” in Central Cagayan Agta.

Six clitichood tests are provided by Zwicky and Pullum (1983:503–504) for distinguishing clitics from affixes.

(a) Clitics can exhibit a low degree of selection with respect to their hosts, while affixes exhibit a high degree of selection with respect to their stems.

(b) Arbitrary gaps in the set of combinations are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups.

(c) Morphophonological idiosyncrasies are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups.

(d) Semantic idiosyncrasies are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups.

(e) Syntactic rules can affect affixed words, but cannot affect clitic groups.

(f) Clitics can attach to material already containing clitics, but affixes cannot.

Among the criteria listed above, at least (a), (c), and (d) are applicable to the forms in question.

With respect to criterion (a), the assumed genitive pronominal forms are more CLITIC-LIKE than affix-like in that they exhibit a low degree of selection with respect to their hosts. The genitive pronominal forms are phonologically attached to the head of a
construction. Specifically, in a possessive construction, they are phonologically attached to the head noun of the construction, as in (14)–(15).

(14) (first person singular) genitive pronoun attached to the main predicate (a lexical verb) of the second clause; (first person singular) genitive pronoun attached to the head of a possessive construction:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{nag tappan}=\text{âk}, & \text{tinapan}=\text{ku} \quad \text{mat}=\text{k}.\\
\text{covered}=\text{NOM.1S} & \text{covered}=\text{GEN.1S} \quad \text{eye}=\text{GEN.1S}
\end{array}
\]

'I covered myself, I covered my eyes.' (Agt 10–013)

(15) (first person singular) genitive pronoun following the main predicate (a directional verb) of the clause; (first person singular) genitive pronoun attached to the head of a possessive construction:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{en}=\text{ku} & \text{para sasirban} \quad \text{ya} \quad \text{mat}=\text{k}.\\
g=\text{GEN.1S} & \text{yet peek} \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{eye}=\text{GEN.1S}
\end{array}
\]

'I then went to peek my eyes out of the little window.' (Agt 10–014)

In a verbal clause, like nominative pronouns, they are phonologically attached to the head of a clause, that is, the main predicate (whether auxiliary or lexical) of a clause, as in (14)–(22). Notice that although the first and second person singular genitive pronounal forms have two phonologically conditioned variants, their syntactic distribution does not differ from that of the other genitive pronounal forms (cf., (14)–(15), (18)–(22) vs. (16)–(18), (20)–(22)). That is, they all occur after the possessed noun in a possessive construction or after the main predicate of a clause.

(16) nominative pronoun following the main predicate (an existential verb) of the first clause; genitive pronoun attached to the main predicate (a lexical verb) of the second clause:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{â} & \text{sangaw} \quad \text{itt}=\text{kid}=\text{na}, \\
\text{CONJ} & \text{later} \quad \text{EXIST}=\text{NOM.3P}=\text{already} \quad \text{arrived} \quad \text{with}=\text{GEN.3P}=\text{already}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ya} & \text{gåsa}.\\
\text{NOM} & \text{gong}
\end{array}
\]

\[(\text{nedatdatang} < \text{na-} + \text{i-} + \text{CVC-} + \text{datang})\]

'Later, they were present, and they brought along the gong.' (Agt 1–045)

(17) genitive and nominative pronouns following the main predicate (a directional verb) of the clause:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ay} & \text{en}=\text{da}=\text{kid} \\
\text{INJ} & \text{tinubbatån} \quad \text{ay}.
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{go}=\text{GEN.3P}=\text{NOM.3P} & \text{relieved} \quad \text{INJ}
\end{array}
\]

'So they went and relieved them.' (Agt 1–066)

(18) (first person singular) genitive pronoun following the main predicate (a negative auxiliary) of the main clause; genitive pronoun and nominative pronoun following the main predicate (a negative auxiliary) of the subordinate clause:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{awe}=\text{k} & \text{minå} \quad \text{kinagåt} \quad \text{ya} \quad \text{huli} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{atu} \quad \text{am}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{NEG}=\text{GEN.1S} & \text{would bit} \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{rump} \quad \text{GEN} \quad \text{dog}\end{array}
\]
awe=nák
NEG=GEN.3S+NOM.1S lay.on.top
‘I would not have bitten the dog’s rump if he hadn’t lain down on top of me.’ (Agt 4–024)

(19) (first person singular) genitive pronoun and nominative pronoun following the main predicate (a negative auxiliary) of the main clause:
ara awe=k=kid
INJ NEG=GEN.1S=NOM.3P only/just for.a.moment acknowledge
‘Well, I won’t acknowledge them yet.’ (Agt 1–015)

(20) genitive pronoun following the main predicate (a negative auxiliary) of the main clause; (first person singular) genitive pronoun following the main predicate (a lexical verb) of the main clause:
...awe=muy
NEG=GEN.2P just worry because speak=GEN.1S surprisingly
yan tekamuy....
this LCV.2P
‘Just don’t worry about it because I tell you (pl.) this.’ (Agt 9–004)

(21) (second person singular) genitive pronoun following the main predicate (dyadic -än verb) of a clause:
en=tänan,
go=GEN.1PI=now/already preceding=GEN.2S+NOM.1S because
hílagám=āk,
te matuğa=yāk te
light+GEN.2S=NOM.1S because splinter=NOM.1S because
híklam=na.
night=already
(=tänan’=tän ‘GEN.1PI’ + =na ‘already/now’; =māk ‘GEN.2S+NOM.1S’ < =mu ‘GEN.2S’ + =āk ‘NOM.1S’; hílagám < hílagám + =mu ‘GEN.2S’)
‘Let’s go, go ahead of me and shine the light for me because I will puncture my feet because it is night already.’ (Agt 8–051)

(22) (second person singular) genitive pronoun following the main predicate (a directional verb) of a clause:
a em=ina
CONJ go+GEN.2S=there get INJ because singę=NOM.2S=already/now

(te mangigup=āk....
because/so.that eat.meat=NOM.1S
(em ‘go + GEN.2S’ < en + =mu ‘GEN.2S’)
‘Well, go and get it and singe the hair, because I want to eat some meat....’ (Agt 8–097)
With respect to criterion (c), there are some pieces of evidence suggesting that the assumed second person singular genitive pronoun exhibits morphophonological idiosyncrasies that make it more AFFIX-LIKE than clitic-like.

Like the Central Cordilleran languages, both the first and second person singular genitive pronouns in Central Cagayan Agta have a postconsonantal variant (=ku ‘1S’ and =mu ‘2S’) and a postvocalic variant (=k ‘1S’ and =m ‘2S’). However, unlike the Central Cordilleran languages, the postvocalic variant =m (but NOT =k) can also occur in (verbal as well as nominal) stems ending with an alveolar nasal, by replacing the stem-final –n.10

Consider the first and second singular genitive pronominal forms in examples (23)–(28).

First, let us consider the combination of genitive pronouns with a dyadic –Àn verb. As shown in (23), when the first person singular genitive pronoun occurs with a dyadic –Àn verb, the postconsonantal variant =ku is used, and the resulting form is –Àn=ku.

However, when the second person singular genitive pronoun occurs with a dyadic –Àn verb, irregularities occur. As shown in (24), when the second person singular genitive pronoun occurs with a dyadic –Àn verb, the resulting form is either –Àn=m or –Àm.

(23) first person singular genitive form occurring with a dyadic –Àn verb:

\[
\text{nagtappan}=\text{âk}, \quad \text{tínappan}=\text{ku} \quad \text{mat}=\text{k}.
\]

covered=NOM.1S covered=GEN.1S eye=GEN.1S

‘I covered myself, I covered my eyes.’ (Agt 10–013)

(24) second person singular genitive form occurring with dyadic –Àn verbs:

\[
\text{en}=\text{tánan}, \quad \text{unnan}=\text{mâk} \quad \text{te}
\]

go=GEN.1PI=now/already precede=GEN.2S+NOM.1S because

\[
\text{hilágam}=\text{âk}, \quad \text{te} \quad \text{matu}a=\text{yâk} \quad \text{te}
\]

light+GEN.2S=NOM.1S because splinter=NOM.1S because

\[
\text{hiklam}=\text{na}.
\]

night=already

\[
(=\text{tánan} < \text{=tám} \text{ ‘GEN.1PI’} + \text{=na ‘already/now’}; \text{=mâk ‘GEN.2S + NOM.1S’} < \text{=mu ‘GEN.2S’} + \text{=âk ‘NOM.1S’}; \text{hilágam} < \text{hilágân} + \text{=mu ‘GEN.2S’})
\]

‘Let’s go, go ahead of me and shine the light for me because I will puncture my feet because it is night already.’ (Agt 8–051)

Second, consider the combination of genitive pronouns with a directional verb. As shown in (25), when the first person singular genitive pronoun occurs with the directional verb en ‘go’, the postconsonantal variant =ku is used, and the resulting form

The distribution of the second person singular genitive pronominal forms in Central Cagayan Agta is somewhat different from that of second person singular genitive pronominal forms in Central Cordilleran languages. Reid (2001:237) states that “In the Central Cordilleran languages, as well as in Ilokano, an innovation has produced an additional environment in which the shortened forms are found. On transitive verbs containing a reflex of either *-en or *-an, the short pronominal form replaces the final -n of the verb ending.” In Central Cagayan Agta, the short form =m ‘2S’ replaces not only the final –n of –Àn (a reflex of *-en) or –Àn (a reflex of *-an), but also the final –n of any other verbal stem or nominal stem.
is \( \text{en}= \text{ku} \). However, when the second person singular genitive pronoun occurs with the directional verb \( \text{en} \) ‘go’, the resulting form is \( \text{em} \) (rather than the nonoccurring form \( **\text{en}= \text{mu} ** \)), as shown in (26).\(^{11}\)

(25) **first person singular genitive form occurring with the directional verb \( \text{en} \) ‘go’:**

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{en}=\text{ku} & \text{para sasiriban ya matā}=\text{k.} \\
\text{go}=\text{GEN.1S} & \text{yet peek NOM eye}=\text{GEN.1S}
\end{array}
\]

‘I then went to peek my eyes out of the little window.’ (Agt 10–014)

(26) **second person singular genitive form occurring with the directional verb \( \text{en} \) ‘go’:**

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a } \text{em}=\text{ina alapan ay, te } & \text{maglangan} =\text{ka}=\text{n,}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{CONJ } \text{go}+\text{GEN.2S} & \text{there get INJ because singe}=\text{NOM.2S}=\text{already/now}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
te & \text{mangigup}=\text{āk}..., \\
\text{because/so.that} & \text{eat.meat}=\text{NOM.1S}
\end{array}
\]

\( \text{(em ‘go + GEN.2S’ < en + =mu ‘GEN.2S’)} \)

‘Well, go and get it and singe the hair, because I want to eat some meat....’ (Agt 8–097)

Third, consider the combination of genitive pronouns with a quotative verb. As shown in (27), when the first person singular genitive pronoun occurs with the quotative verb \( \text{kun} \), the postconsonantal variant \( =\text{ku} \) is used, and the resulting form is \( \text{ku}=\text{ku} \). However, when the second person singular genitive pronoun occurs with the quotative verb \( \text{kun} \), again, the formation is irregular. As shown in (28), when the second person singular genitive pronoun occurs with the quotative verb \( \text{kun} \), the resulting form is \( \text{ku}=\text{m} \) (rather than the nonoccurring form \( **\text{ku}=\text{mu} ** \)).

Fourth, consider the combination of genitive pronouns with a possessed noun in a possessive construction. As shown in (27), when the first person singular genitive pronoun occurs with the head noun \( \text{kahulun} \) ‘companion’, the postconsonantal variant \( =\text{ku} \) is used, and the resulting form is \( \text{kahul}=\text{ku} \). However, when the second person singular genitive pronoun occurs with the head noun \( \text{kahulun} \) ‘companion’, again, the formation is irregular. As shown in (28), when the second person singular genitive pronoun occurs with the head noun \( \text{kahulun} \) ‘companion’, the resulting form is \( \text{kahul}=\text{m} \) (rather than the nonoccurring form \( **\text{kahul}=\text{mu} ** \)).

(27) **first person singular genitive form occurring with a quotative verb and with a possessed noun:**

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{awan} & \text{paha o, kun}=\text{ku} \text{ ta kahulun}=\text{ku.}
\end{array}
\]

NEG yet INJ QUOT=GEN.1S LCV companion=GEN.1S

“‘Not yet.’ I say to my companion.’ (Agt 11–028)

\( ^{11} \) It seems that \( \text{em} \) might be analyzed as a combination of the directional verb \( e \) ‘go’ and the second person singular genitive pronominial form \( =\text{mu} \). However, based on the observation that the form \( e \) is ALWAYS immediately followed by a nominative pronoun and the form \( \text{en} \) is ALWAYS immediately followed by a genitive pronoun in all the eleven texts that I examined, I consider \( \text{em} \) as a combination of \( \text{en} \) ‘go’ and \( =\text{mu} \), rather than a combination of \( e \) and \( =\text{mu} \).
second person singular genitive form occurring with a quotative verb and with a
possessed noun:

a am matangad = mu = kid hapa a, “ye=in yan o,
CONJ when look.up = GEN.2S=NOM.3P also CONJ here = this this INJ
bali = da = in,” kum hapa am itta ya
house = GEN.3P = this QUOT + GEN.2S also if EXIST NOM
kahulum. companion + GEN.2S
(kum < kun + = mu; kahulum < kahulan + = mu)

‘And when you (sg.) can look up and see them, you (sg.) say, “Hey, here is their hive,”
if you (sg.) have a companion.’ (Agt 11–008)

In addition to the morphophonological idiosyncrasies exhibited by the second
person singular genitive pronoun, one might also use the following piece of evidence to
argue against the clitichood of genitive pronominal forms.

P. Healey (1960:89) describes the existence of some special combining pronominal
forms, such as =nāk and =dāk,12 as in (29)–(31). However, this cannot be used as a
strong piece of evidence for arguing against the clitichood of genitive pronominal forms
because these combining forms can easily be accounted for by the phonotactics of Agta.
More specifically, Central Cagayan Agta does NOT allow vowel clusters. In order to
satisfy the phonotactics of the language, when a genitive pronoun occurs with a
nominative pronoun, the resulting vowel cluster either has to reduce to a simple vowel
or an intervocalic glottal stop has to be inserted. In this case, vowel reduction, rather
than glottal stop insertion, is chosen.

(29) special combining pronoun form =nāk following a dyadic –ān clause:

nagazāzigit petta atākkun = āk umaŋe unek am
go.along.edge so.that near = NOM.1S go climb if
gavwātān = nāk na ānwaŋ = en....
attack = GEN.3S+NOM.1S GEN water.buffalo = that
(= nāk ‘GEN.3S+NOM.1S’ < = na ‘GEN.3S’ + = āk ‘NOM.1S’)
‘I will continue on along close to the edge, so I will be close to go climb (a tree) if the
water buffalo attacks me.’ (Agt 8–088)

(30) special combining pronoun form =nāk following a directional verb:

en = nāk bínolsūn na kabalay = k = in ta limā
go = GEN.3S+NOM.1S pocketed GEN ASS.house = GEN.1S = this LCV five
pesuk, ā kuman = kami na kwa = en maglelehut ay,
peso CONJ similar = NOM.1PE GEN thing = that circling INJ

12 Unlike Ilokano, the Central Cagayan Agta forms =nāk and =dāk can ONLY mean ‘GEN.3S +
NOM.1S’ and ‘GEN.3P + NOM.1S’ respectively (but CANNOT mean ‘GEN.2S + NOM.1S’ and
‘GEN.2P + NOM.1S’, respectively, as the way that they do in Ilokano).
PRONOMINAL FORMS

\[\text{te} \quad \text{awe} = \text{na} \quad \text{naapag\text{\text{"a}}} \quad \text{ya} \quad \text{blosa} \quad \text{na} \]

because \quad \text{NEG} = \text{GEN.3S} \quad \text{found} \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{pocket} \quad \text{GEN}

\[
\text{saping} = \text{k} = \text{en}.
\text{short.pants} = \text{GEN.1S} = \text{that}
\]

\[= \text{nåk} \quad \text{GEN.3S + NOM.1S} < = \text{na} \quad \text{GEN.3S} + = \text{åk} \quad \text{NOM.1S}']

\text{My kabalay came to put five pesos in my pocket, and it is like we (ex.) were what-you-call-it, going around in circles, because he could not find the pocket of my short pants.' (Agt 1–051)

(31) special combining pronoun form =dåk following a dyadic –än clause:

\[
\text{å} \quad \text{inåyagåän} = \text{dåk} = \text{na} \quad \text{hapa ta} \quad \text{talekud na} \quad \text{bali}
\]

CONJ called =GEN.3P + NOM.1S = already also LCV behind GEN house

\[
i \quad \text{Aleng}
\]

GEN son

\[= \text{dåk} \quad \text{GEN.3P + NOM.1S} < = \text{da} \quad \text{GEN.3P} + = \text{åk} \quad \text{NOM.1S}']

\text{And they called me behind my son’s house.’ (Agt 1–091)

With respect to criterion (d), there are some pieces of evidence suggesting that some genitive pronoun forms (especially the third person singular genitive form) exhibit semantic idiosyncrasies that make them more AFFIX-LIKE than clitic-like.

\text{P. Healey (1960:89) reports the existence of the following special combining forms.}

\[
= \text{måk} \quad \text{GEN.2S + NOM.1S}’ (< = \text{mu} \quad \text{GEN.2S} + = \text{åk} \quad \text{NOM.1S}’)
\]

\[= \text{nåk} \quad \text{GEN.3S + NOM.1S}’ (< = \text{na} \quad \text{GEN.3S} + = \text{åk} \quad \text{NOM.1S}’)
\]

\[= \text{dåk} \quad \text{GEN.3P + NOM.1S}’ (< = \text{da} \quad \text{GEN.3P} + = \text{åk} \quad \text{NOM.1S}’)
\]

\[= \text{taka} \quad \text{GEN.1S + NOM.2S}’ (< = \text{ta} \quad \text{GEN.1D}’ + = \text{ka} \quad \text{NOM.2S}’)
\]

\[= \text{takåm} \quad \text{GEN.1S + NOM.2P}’ (< = \text{ta} \quad \text{GEN.1D}’ + = \text{kåm} \quad \text{NOM.2P}’)
\]

\[= \text{na} \quad \text{(or} = \text{ng}) = \text{kåmi} \quad \text{GEN.2S + NOM.1PE}’ (< = \text{na} \quad \text{GEN.3S}’ + = \text{kåmi} \quad \text{NOM.1PE}’)
\]

\[= \text{nakåmi} \quad \text{GEN.2/3S + NOM.1PE}’ (< = \text{na} \quad \text{GEN.3S}’ + = \text{kåmi} \quad \text{NOM.1PE}’)
\]

\[= \text{dakåmi} \quad \text{GEN.2/3P + NOM.1PE}’ (< = \text{da} \quad \text{GEN.3P}’ + = \text{kåmi} \quad \text{NOM.1PE}’)
\]

These combining forms are not particularly relevant to the discussion here because of the following reasons. The first three forms (=måk, =nåk, and =dåk) are related to morphophonological idiosyncrasies rather than semantic idiosyncrasies. As for the forms =taka and =takåm (as in (32)), as suggested by Reid (pers. comm.), they are probably the old combining forms for ‘GEN.1S + NOM.2S’ and ‘GEN.1S + NOM.2P’, respectively. As for the forms =nakåmi ‘GEN.2/3S + NOM.1PE’ and =dakåmi ‘GEN.2/3P + NOM.1PE’, their meaning matches that of their corresponding forms in Ilokano. They are probably Ilokano borrowings.

(32) special combining form =takåm:

\[
= \text{pakimållåk} = \text{takåm} \quad \text{hapa} \quad \text{ta} \quad \text{intu} \quad \text{minå} \quad \text{i}
\]

CONJ pray.for =GEN.1S + NOM.2P also TA TOP.3S should NOM
Hesus, ya makkāmu tekamuy ta adangan=muy....

Jesus NOM know LCV.2P LCV request=GEN.2P

(=takām ‘GEN.1S + NOM.2P’ < =ta ‘GEN.1D’ + =kām ‘NOM.2P’)

‘I also pray for you (pl.) that he, Jesus, will be the one responsible to you (pl.) in regard to your (pl.) request....’ (Agt 9–015)

The form that is of special interest here is the third person singular genitive form =na. Usually, the third person singular genitive is expressed by the form =na, as in (33); the third person plural genitive is expressed by the form =da, as in (34).

(33)  =na ‘GEN.3S’

...en=na=kami inalāp malat,...
go=GEN.3S=NOM.1PE got certainly

‘...He came and got us (ex.) for sure,...’ (Agt 10–001)

(34)  =da ‘GEN.3P’

...en=da=kami=n inaribungbungān na Merikāno kid=en.
go=GEN.3P=NOM.1PE=already surrounded GEN American PL=that

‘...the Americans came and gathered around us (ex.).’ (Agt 10–016)

However, in some cases, the form =na rather than =da is used to express ‘third person plural’, as in (35)–(37). In (35), the form =na does not cross-reference with any of the NPs in the sentences, one cannot tell whether it refers to a ‘third person singular’ agent or a ‘third person plural’ agent. However, the contextual cues unambiguously point out that =na refers to a ‘third person PLURAL’ agent, rather than a ‘third person SINGULAR’ agent. In the text, (35) describes an event that subsequently happens after the event described in (34). The form =na in (35) refers back to ‘the Americans’ in (34). In (36)–(37), the form =na refers to the nig-marked personal noun phrase in the sentence. The fact that =na can refer to either a third person SINGULAR participant or a third person PLURAL participant, that is, it has lost its plurality feature, makes it more AFFIX-LIKE than clitic-like.

(35)  =na ‘GEN.3’

en=na tīnā-bil ig aboy neuhet ta huplāno=en
go=GEN.3 held NOM.PL daughter exited LCV airplane=that

‘They went and took the little girl and her brothers in their arms out from the airplane.’ (Agt 10–017)

(36)  =na ‘GEN.3’

kuman=en há ta pagtugut=na=n nig aboy=en,
similar=that again LCV leave=GEN.3=already GEN.PL daughter=that

yen ya kuga....

that NOM truly

‘It was that way again when the children and their mother left; that was really....’ (Agt 10–018)
Let me sum up the discussion of clitics and agreement features.

First, the assumed genitive pronominal forms are more clitic-like than affix-like in that they exhibit a relatively low degree of selection with respect to their host. More specifically, they are phonologically attached to the head of a possessive construction and the head of a verbal construction, regardless of whether the head is an auxiliary verb or a lexical verb.

Second, they are more affix-like than clitic-like in that some of them (in particular the second person singular form) exhibit morphophonological idiosyncrasies. The fact that the second person singular genitive pronominal form exhibits morphophonological idiosyncrasies suggests that in some cases it might be an agreement feature rather than a clitic.

Third, they are more affix-like than clitic-like in that at least one of them (the third person singular form) exhibits semantic idiosyncrasies. The fact that the form =na can refer to either a third person singular agent or a third person plural agent suggests that in some cases =na might have become an agreement feature that can alternate with both =na and =da as clitics.

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I have reexamined the status of so-called “genitive pronouns” in Central Cagayan Agta. The application of the cliticoid tests suggests that these forms behave not only like clitic pronouns, but also like agreement features. They are like clitics in that they exhibit a relatively low degree of selection with respect to their host. However, they are also like agreement features in that they exhibit both morphophonological idiosyncrasies and semantic idiosyncrasies.

Moreover, the coexistence of some alternate forms (for example, -an=m alternates with -äm, and =na ‘GEN.3’ alternates with =da ‘GEN.3P’) seems to suggest that the genitive pronominal forms (in particular the singular forms) are in the process of losing their cliticoid status in Central Cagayan Agta.

The observation that the assumed “genitive pronouns” in Central Cagayan Agta might have gradually lost their cliticoid status and developed into agreement features has a broader typological implication. That is, it suggests that the so-called “genitive pronouns” in other Austronesian languages with a similar kind of formal alternation might also have gradually lost their cliticoid status and developed into agreement features. More research needs to be done in order to verify this claim.
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1D</th>
<th>first person dual</th>
<th>EXIST</th>
<th>existential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>first person singular</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PI</td>
<td>first person plural inclusive</td>
<td>INJ</td>
<td>interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PE</td>
<td>first person plural exclusive</td>
<td>LCV</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>second person singular</td>
<td>LIG</td>
<td>ligature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>second person plural</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>third person</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3S</td>
<td>third person singular</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P</td>
<td>third person plural</td>
<td>QUOT</td>
<td>quotative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASS</td>
<td>associate</td>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
<td>SURP</td>
<td>surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix

**Table 1.** Personal pronouns in Central Cagayan Agta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clitics</th>
<th>Free(^{13})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nominative</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1s [+spkr, -addr, -plrl]</td>
<td>(=k_u/=k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2s [-spkr, +addr, -plrl]</td>
<td>(=m_u/=m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3s [-spkr, -addr, -plrl]</td>
<td>(=n_a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d [+spkr, -addr, -plrl]</td>
<td>(=t_a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pi [+spkr, +addr, +plrl]</td>
<td>(=t\tilde{a}m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pe [+spkr, -addr, +plrl]</td>
<td>(=m_i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p [-spkr, +addr, +plrl]</td>
<td>(=m\tilde{u}y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p [-spkr, -addr, +plrl]</td>
<td>(=d_a/(=n_a)^{14})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***special combining forms (GEN + NOM) (P. Healey 1960:89):***

- \(=m\tilde{a}k\) ‘GEN.2S + NOM.1S’ (< \(=m_u\) ‘GEN.2S’ + \(=\tilde{a}k\) ‘NOM.1S’)
- \(=n\tilde{a}k\) ‘GEN.3S + NOM.1S’ (< \(=n_a\) ‘GEN.3S’ + \(=\tilde{a}k\) ‘NOM.1S’)
- \(=d\tilde{a}k\) ‘GEN.3P + NOM.1S’ (< \(=d_a\) ‘GEN.3P’ + \(=\tilde{a}k\) ‘NOM.1S’)
- \(=t\tilde{a}k\tilde{a}\) ‘GEN.1S + NOM.2S’ (< \(=t_a\) ‘GEN.1D’ + \(=k\tilde{a}\) ‘NOM.2S’)
- \(=t\tilde{a}k\tilde{a}m\) ‘GEN.1S + NOM.2P’ (< \(=t_a\) ‘GEN.1D’ + \(=k\tilde{a}m\) ‘NOM.2P’)
- \(=n_a\) (or \(=n_g)\) ‘k\tilde{a}m\) ‘GEN.2S + NOM.1PE’ (< \(=n_a\) ‘GEN.3S’ + \(=k\tilde{a}m\) ‘NOM.1PE’)
- \(=n\tilde{a}k\tilde{a}m\) ‘GEN.2/3S + NOM.1PE’ (< \(=n_a\) ‘GEN.3S’ + \(=k\tilde{a}m\) ‘NOM.1PE’)
- \(=d\tilde{a}k\tilde{a}m\) ‘GEN.2/3P + NOM.1PE’ (< \(=d_a\) ‘GEN.3P’ + \(=k\tilde{a}m\) ‘NOM.1PE’)

***special combining forms (GEN/NOM + aspectual adverb) (Mayfield 1987:16):***

- \(=k\tilde{a}n\tilde{a}n\) ‘NOM.2P + now’ (< \(=k\tilde{a}m\) ‘NOM.2P’ + \(=n_a\) ‘now/already’)
- \(=t\tilde{a}n\tilde{a}n\) ‘GEN.1P + now’ (< \(=t\tilde{a}m\) ‘GEN.1P’ + \(=n_a\) ‘now/already’)
- \(=k\tilde{i}t\tilde{a}n\tilde{a}n\) ‘NOM.1P + now’ (< \(=k\tilde{t}\tilde{a}m\) ‘NOM.1P’ + \(=n_a\) ‘now/already’)
- \(en=t\tilde{a}n\tilde{a}n\) ‘let’s go now’ (< \(en\) ‘go’ + \(=t_a\) ‘GEN.1D’ + \(=n_a\) ‘now’)

\(^{13}\) The “topic/predicate” pronouns and “locative” pronouns are referred to as “emphatic” pronouns and “oblique” pronouns respectively in Mayfield (1987).

\(^{14}\) The genitive pronoun form \(=n_a\) has been considered to be a ‘third person SINGULAR genitive pronoun’ (P. Healey 1960 and Mayfield 1987). However, as already shown in section 3, my textual analysis suggests that \(=n_a\) sometimes refers to a third person PLURAL (rather than a third person SINGULAR) agent.
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Word Order Inverse in Obo Manobo

Sherri Brainard and Ena Vander Molen
Summer Institute of Linguistics

1. Introduction

Until recently, it has been assumed that an essential feature of an inverse construction is that the verb of a transitive clause is morphologically marked when the P argument is a speech act participant (SAP) and the A argument is not (DeLancey 1981:641). In his discussion of voice and inverse, Givón (1994a) has argued that word order may also be a formal means of signaling an inverse and has proposed that the typology of inverse constructions be broadened to include a word order inverse. Taking up this suggestion, T. Payne (1994) has provided evidence that Cebuano, a Central Philippine language, has a word order inverse, an analysis never before proposed for Philippine languages. Specifically, Payne shows that of the two possible word orders for Cebuano transitive clauses, clauses having VPA order consistently correlate with an inverse voice function, and those having VAP order consistently correlate with an active voice function. In light of Payne’s findings for Cebuano, the question arises, do word order inverses occur in other Philippine languages, and if so, what morphosyntactic variations do these constructions exhibit?

As it happens, Obo Manobo, a Southern Philippine language, also has transitive clauses that display VAP and VPA word orders. The Obo Manobo VPA clause is of interest not only because it indicates that word order inverses exist in other Philippine languages, but because the VPA clause is associated with its own unique set of pronouns. That is, Obo Manobo transitive clauses have two word orders, and each word order occurs with a unique set of pronouns for A and P arguments. This is a feature

---

1 In this paper, S is the syntactically required argument of a single-argument clause; A the more agentive, syntactically required argument of a transitive clause; and P the less agentive, syntactically required argument of a transitive clause.

2 Obo Manobo is a language spoken by approximately 50,000 people living on the northern and western slopes of Mt. Apo on the boundary between the provinces of Davao del Sur and Cotabato and several surrounding provinces of southwest Mindanao, Philippines. Obo Manobo is a Southern Philippine language; Walton (1977) classifies it as a member of the Central Manobo subgroup, but Elkins (1974) classifies it as a member of the Western Manobo subgroup. Obo Manobo appears to be most closely related to Western Manobo languages which include Western Bukidnon, Ilianen, and Livunganen. With respect to non-Manobo languages, it is most closely related to Subanon. This study is based on elicited sentences and paradigms, a 3,000-entry dictionary, and 200 pages of natural text gathered by the second author between 1989 and 1997, while working under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics. The second author is the primary researcher. Both authors would like to thank Vera Khor for making available six additional Obo Manobo narrative texts. The authors are also grateful to Miss Trinidad Ansal and Pastor Tano Bayawan for the help they gave in providing and checking Manobo data for this study.
which to our knowledge has not previously been noted for Philippine languages. Examples of the two Obo Manobo transitive clause types are given in (1) and (2).

(1) VAP clause

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Id} & \text{suntuk} & \text{ku} & \text{sikkow}. \\
\text{REAL} & \text{hit} & \text{1SG} & \text{2SG}
\end{array}
\]

‘I hit you.’

(2) VPA clause

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Id} & \text{suntuk} & \text{a} & \text{nikkow}.
\end{array}
\]

‘You hit me.’

In this study, we will argue that the VPA clause in Obo Manobo is a word order inverse. We will support this claim with a range of syntactic, formal, semantic, and functional evidence to show that the Obo Manobo VPA clause has properties similar to inverse constructions in other languages. Specifically, we will show that: 1) the VPA clause is a syntactically transitive clause, 2) the VPA clause is formally distinguished from the VAP clause by word order and pronominal forms of A and P, 3) the VPA clause consistently codes an inverse voice function as defined by Givón (1979, 1983a, 1991), i.e., A and P are both topical, but P is more so, as do traditional inverses, and 4) selection of the VPA clause over the VAP clause is controlled in part by a semantic person hierarchy and in part by a pragmatic topicality hierarchy, hierarchies similar to those governing traditional inverse systems. We will also consider alternate analyses that have been advanced to explain VAP and VPA word orders in Philippine languages.

---

3 It is, however, a pattern predicted by Givón (1994a) in his discussion of inverses. Specifically, Givón hypothesizes that word order inverses diachronically precede pronominal morphological inverses (e.g., Algonquian-type inverses) and that a word order inverse may give rise to a mixed word order and pronominal inverse. With respect to the ‘pronominal’ designation, Obo Manobo and Algonquian-type languages differ in that person and number are marked by affixes on the verb in Algonquian-type languages, but by pronouns only in Obo Manobo.

4 In this study, the following orthography is used for the Obo Manobo data. The consonants are: b [b], d [d], g [g], h [h], k [k], l [l], m [m], n [n], ng [ŋ], r [r], s [s], t [t], v [v], w [w], y [j]. The vowels are: a [œ̈], e [e], i [i], o [œ̄], u [u]. Glottal stop is a phoneme. When it occurs intervocally, it is represented by a hyphen, as in ba-ay [bœʔœj] ‘female’. When it occurs word-initially or word-finally, it is not represented. Length is also phonemic for both vowels and consonants and is represented by a sequence of two identical segments, as in: uvaa [ʔuvŋ] ‘monkey’ and boggoy [bʊgːœj] ‘to give’. The vowels /a/ and /o/ contrast only in the last two syllables of a word. In all other syllables, contrast is neutralized and only /o/ occurs, never /a/.

The following abbreviations are used in this study: A the more agentive, syntactically required argument of a transitive clause, AG agent, ABS absolutive, DEF definite, EMPH emphatic, ERG ergative, EXCL exclusive, GEN genitive, INCL inclusive, IRR irrealis, LINK linker, NM nominal marker, NMR nominalizer, OBL oblique, P the less agentive, syntactically required argument of a transitive clause, PAT patient, PFT perfective, RD referential distance, REAL realis, S the syntactically required argument of a single-argument clause, SAP speech act participant, SP a syntactically required argument of a single-argument clause that corresponds to P of its transitive clause counterpart, TP topic persistence, VAP ‘Verb A argument P argument’ word order, VPA ‘Verb P argument A argument’ word order.
and show that only the inverse analysis provides a single unified explanation that accounts for all the data.

2. Traditional Inverse Systems

Inverse systems were first described for Algonquian languages. (See work on Plains Cree (Wolfart 1973; Dahlstrom 1986, 1991), Menomini (Bloomfield 1962), Delaware (Goddard 1979).) These languages have two transitive clause types: a direct, or an active, construction and an inverse construction. Each construction is distinguished formally by marking on the verb. Selection of direct and inverse constructions is governed in part by a grammaticalized person hierarchy and in part by a pragmatic topicality hierarchy.

The Algonquian person hierarchy can be stated as $2 > 1 > 3$. When $A$ of a transitive clause outranks $P$ on this hierarchy, the direct construction is used; when $P$ outranks $A$, the inverse is used. For some combinations of $A$ and $P$, the person hierarchy is obligatory, although the exact combinations are language specific.

When $A$ and $P$ are 3rd persons and, thus, equal in rank with respect to the person hierarchy, the arguments may be ranked according to their topicality as the center of interest at a particular point in a discourse. Here the more topical participant is the proximate argument and the less topical participant the obviate argument. Proximate and obviate arguments are distinguished by marking on the NP. Again, when $A$ outranks $P$ in topicality, the direct construction is used, but when $P$ outranks $A$, the inverse is used.

3. Givón’s Proposal for a Typology of Inverse Constructions

In his 1994a contribution to his on-going investigation of voice, Givón proposes a preliminary typology of inverse voice constructions. He suggests that in addition to morphological marking, i.e., marking on the verb, inverse constructions may also be distinguished formally by word order. In a word order inverse, $P$ is placed in a more fronted position preceding $A$; the fronted position may or may not precede the verb, depending on the language.

In his inverse typology, Givón lists the following parameters as those along which known inverse constructions vary. He presents the list as preliminary and tentative.

1. Pronominal vs. word order marking of inverse
2. Case-marking of full NPs in the inverse
3. Semantic vs. pragmatic inverse
4. Promotional vs. nonpromotional inverse

---

5 Here topicality is used as a cover term for several interacting parameters. Semantically, a topical participant is typically animate, volitional, and individuated. Pragmatically, it is typically more important locally or globally than other participants and has often been referred to previously in the text.

6 Henceforth the functional equivalent of the direct construction in traditional inverse systems will be referred to as an ‘active construction’.

7 In her discussion of the Tupí-Guaraní inverse, D. Payne (1994:316) notes that in the inverse situation, $P$ needs not be more topical than $A$, but simply more topical than normal.

8 Although a number of inverse systems are controlled exclusively by a person hierarchy, Dryer (1994) suggests that Kutenai has an inverse which is restricted to clauses in which $A$ and $P$ are both 3rd persons and so is controlled exclusively by a topicality hierarchy.
The first parameter has to do with formal marking of the inverse: some inverses are formally distinguished by pronominal verb agreement; others are distinguished by word order. The second parameter has to do with the marking of full NPs: when A and P are full NPs, some languages mark the NPs as proximate and obviate; others do not. The third parameter refers to the selection of the inverse: some inverses are governed by semantic hierarchies (those in which P is an SAP); others by pragmatic topicality hierarchies (those in which A and P are both 3rd persons); and still others by a combination of semantic and pragmatic hierarchies. The fourth parameter refers to syntactic promotion: for some inverses, the proximate P argument is promoted to subject; for others, it is not. Inverse constructions may exhibit a combination of these parameters; e.g., in pronominal inverses, P often moves to a more fronted position preceding A.

4. Concepts Relating to Voice

Underlying our claim that Obo Manobo has an inverse construction are concepts of voice, voice construction, grammatical relation, and voice function, as well as a typology of voice constructions. Following is a brief explanation of each concept.

4.1. Definition of voice

Following Givón (1990, 1994a), voice is defined as a complex functional-structural system in which changes in pragmatic perspective are coded in different voice constructions, e.g., active, passive, antipassive, and inverse. This definition proceeds from the observation that a single, semantically transitive event coded by the same verb, agent, and patient may be viewed from several pragmatic perspectives.

4.2. Definition of voice construction

For this study, a clause type is a voice construction if: it has at least one grammatical relation; it has unique formal properties, i.e., morphology or word order or both, that distinguish it from other clause types; and it consistently codes a unique voice function for the majority of its occurrences in narrative text.

4.3. Definition of grammatical relation

Following Brainard (1994b, 1997), an argument is a grammatical relation if: it controls at least one syntactic process to the exclusion of all other arguments; as the syntactic control, it codes different semantic roles; and it is uniquely coded by at least one formal property.

4.4. Definition of voice function

Following Givón (1990, 1994a), voice function is defined as the relative topicality of the agent (AG) and the patient (PAT) at a particular point in a narrative. This definition is based on Givón’s proposal that voice constructions code pragmatic perspective and that one major component of pragmatic perspective is the relative topicality of the agent and the patient. The proposal assumes that: 1) pragmatic perspective is associated with the more topical referent in a clause, 2) the majority of occurrences of a particular voice construction in narrative text code the same unique configuration of the relative topicality of the agent and the patient, and 3)

---

9 For this discussion, an argument is identified as a syntactic control if it functions as the trigger or the target of a syntactic process.
changes in pragmatic perspective may be signaled by changes in voice constructions.\textsuperscript{10}

4.5. Typology of voice constructions

Each type of voice construction is a unique combination of syntactic, formal, and functional properties. Although the exact details of the formal marking of voice constructions are language-specific, syntactic properties and voice function properties of four commonly attested voice constructions, namely active, inverse, antipassive, and passive, are relatively stable cross-linguistically. These properties are given in the tentative typology in Table 1.

Table 1. Typology of voice constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice construction</th>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>Grammatical relations</th>
<th>Voice function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>A and P</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverse</td>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>A and P</td>
<td>Inverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipassive</td>
<td>Detransitive</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Antipassive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Detransitive</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The typology of voice constructions assumes that each voice construction is distinguished from all others by unique formal coding and unique voice function. An active construction, then, is a transitive clause that has two grammatical relations, $A$ and $P$, and codes an active voice function. An inverse is a transitive clause that has two grammatical relations, $A$ and $P$, and codes an inverse voice function. An antipassive is a detransitive clause in which $P$ of the transitive clause has been demoted or deleted, leaving $A$ as the only grammatical relation. Following demotion or deletion of $P$, the clause becomes a single-argument clause, and $A$ changes to $S$. The detransitive clause codes an antipassive voice function. A passive is a detransitive clause in which $A$ of the transitive clause has been demoted or deleted, leaving $P$ as the only grammatical relation. Again following demotion or deletion of $A$, the clause becomes a single-argument clause, and $P$ changes to $S$. This detransitive clause codes a passive voice function.

5. Theoretical Issues in Philippine Languages

One can hardly discuss any morphosyntactic feature of Philippine languages without running aground on some theoretical issue. Nearly every aspect of the morphosyntax of basic verbal clauses in these languages has been debated at some point. Over the years linguists have disagreed about the identity of the basic transitive clause, the identity of voice constructions, the function of nominal markers, the presence of a subject, and the function of verbal affixes.

\textsuperscript{10} A discussion of the typology of voice functions first proposed by Givón (1979, 1983a, 1991) and quantitative text-based methods developed to identify those functions are found in section 11.
5.1. The transitive clause and voice constructions debate

In his 1917 description of Tagalog, Bloomfield identifies the clause type that has traditionally been called the ‘actor-focus’, or ‘actor-topic’, construction (3) as the basic transitive clause, and the ‘goal-focus’, or ‘goal-topic’, construction (4) as a passive clause. This identification is based primarily on morphological evidence rather than syntactic evidence.

(3) Actor-focus construction (Tagalog)

\[
\text{Nagkudkod ng niyog ang babai.}
\]
\[
\text{nag-kudkod ng niyog ang babai}
\]
\[
PFT.AG-grate NM coconut NM woman
\]

‘The woman grated a coconut.’

(4) Goal-focus construction (Tagalog)

\[
\text{Kinudkod ng babai ang niyog.}
\]
\[
kudkod-in- ng babai ang niyog
\]
\[
\text{grate-PFT.PAT NM woman NM coconut}
\]

‘The woman grated the coconut.’

In the 1970s, this early analysis began to be questioned since, cross-linguistically, semantically transitive verbs occur most frequently in transitive clauses in narrative text, and in Tagalog narrative text, such verbs occur most frequently in goal-focus, not actor-focus, constructions. Based on these cross-linguistic patterns and a wider range of semantic, syntactic, and pragmatic evidence, more recent studies have proposed that the goal-focus construction (4) is the basic transitive clause, and that the actor-focus construction (3) is an antipassive when it codes semantically transitive verbs.\(^\text{11}\) (See T. Payne 1982; Cooreman, Fox, Givón 1984; Walton 1986; De Guzman 1988; Gerdts 1988; Mithun 1994; Brainard 1994a, 1994b, 1997.)

5.2. The nominal markers debate

The nominal markers debate developed out of the transitive clause and voice constructions debate. When nominal markers distinguish between A and P in a transitive clause, they function as case markers. Following Comrie’s (1978) and Dixon’s (1979, 1994) descriptions of case-marking patterns, we would expect nominal markers to display either a nominative-accusative pattern (henceforth ‘nominative’) in which S and A are marked the same, and P is marked differently, or an ergative-absolutive pattern (henceforth ‘ergative’) in which S and P are marked the same, and A is marked differently, or a tripartite pattern in which S, A, and P are each marked differently.

Compare the Tagalog sentences in (5)–(7). Sentence (5) has a semantically intransitive verb and is an intransitive clause. Sentences (6) and (7) have a semantically transitive verb: (6) is an actor-focus construction and (7) is a goal-focus construction.

\(^{11}\) When the actor-focus construction codes a semantically intransitive verb, it is an intransitive clause.
5.3. The subject debate

Another debate that arose in the 1970s is the question of whether subject is a universal grammatical relation. The debate defined ‘subject’ as the argument that controls the greatest number of syntactic processes, although not all those participating in the debate adopt that definition.

Two important papers in this discussion (Schachter 1976, 1977) used data from Tagalog to argue the issue. In these papers, NPs in the actor-focus and the goal-focus construction are investigated to determine which one controls certain syntactic processes usually associated with subjects in languages like English. The studies reveal that while syntactic processes in Tagalog are always controlled by the ang-NP (S) in the actor-focus construction, in the goal-focus construction, control is more or less evenly distributed between the ng-NP (A) and the ang-NP (P). Thus, in Tagalog and those Philippine languages that pattern like it, there is no single constituent that corresponds to the category of subject in languages like English. This issue is further complicated by more recent studies which show that in some Philippine languages, e.g. Sama Bangingi’ (Gault 1999) and Yakan (Brainard and Behrens 2002), the vast majority of syntactic processes in the goal-focus construction are controlled exclusively by the NP that is the counterpart of the Tagalog ang-NP (P).

The assignment of A and P are based on the assumption that the goal-focus construction is the basic transitive clause.
The outcome of this debate is that linguists have been unable to agree how best to define clause arguments in Philippine languages, particularly S and P which have traditionally been referred to as the ‘focused NP’, or the ‘topic NP’. Some linguists identify the focused NP as the subject (Blake 1906, 1925; Bloomfield 1917; McKaughan 1973; De Guzman 1992; Kroeger 1993; Gault 1999). Others identify the focused NP as a topic (Schachter 1976, 1977; Shibatani 1988). Carrier-Duncan (1985) identifies the focused NP as a topic and the transitive agent as the subject. Brainard (1994b, 1996, 1997) identifies the A argument as a subject and the P argument, the focused NP, as an object.

5.4. The verb affix debate

One other debate in Philippine linguistics has been the question of the function of verbal affixes. In Philippine clauses, the verb typically occurs with an affix that cross-references one, and only one, syntactically required argument in the clause. This argument is the focused NP; i.e., S and P (assuming that the goal-focus construction is the basic transitive clause).

Some linguists have argued that these verb affixes identify the grammatical relations S and P (McKaughan 1973, Kess 1975). Others have suggested that the affixes identify the semantic role of S and P (Schachter and Otanes 1972, Ramos 1974, De Guzman 1988, Shibatani 1988, Kroeger 1993). Brainard (1994b) has argued that verb affixes have grammatical functions and semantic functions. Specifically, with regard to grammatical functions, verb affixes cross-reference S and P and only these arguments, regardless of their semantic roles, thereby distinguishing S and P from A; they also indicate syntactic transitivity. With regard to semantic function, verb affixes also identify the semantic role of S and P in many Philippine languages.

5.5. Summary of theoretical issues in Philippine languages

While all of these theoretical issues have been worth arguing, there is still little agreement among Philippinists about the conclusion of each debate. This has had unfortunate consequences. For example, it has rendered basic terms such as ‘subject’ nearly useless for discussions of Philippine languages in that one cannot assume any two linguists are referring to the same element when the term is used. In addition, it has hindered the understanding of Philippine languages in that for the past eighty years or so, research in these languages has been unable to advance beyond basic questions such as the identity of clause types and voice constructions and the function of nominal markers and verb affixes. At this point, we will declare our position on these issues for Obo Manobo. Later, arguments will be presented to support our analysis.

First, in Obo Manobo, the goal-focus construction is identified as the basic transitive clause since it has two grammatical relations (A and P), whereas the actor-focus construction has only one grammatical relation (S) (see section 8).

Second, following Dixon (1979, 1994), Obo Manobo nominal markers are identified as case markers since they formally distinguish A from P in transitive clauses.

---

13 Blake (1906) and Bloomfield (1917), and those who follow them, call this function of verb affixes, i.e., identifying the semantic role of the ‘focus NP’, ‘voice’ and describe a change in the semantic role of S and P as a change in voice.

14 In addition to semantic role, verb affixes may also indicate other semantic information, e.g., aspect, mood, intentionality, partial affectedness, and directionality. See Brainard (1994b) for details.
Third, a range of evidence shows that in Obo Manobo, S, A, and P are grammatical relations (see section 8, 9, and 11). Since it is generally agreed that focus and topic are pragmatic notions and that they need not be grammatical relations (Chafe 1976, Li and Thompson 1976), S and P are identified as grammatical relations, rather than topics or focus elements. On the other hand, while S, A, and P are grammatical relations, neither A nor P patterns consistently with S with respect to those grammatical properties usually associated with the notion of subject, and so subject, when defined strictly as the argument that controls a majority of syntactic processes, is not a particularly useful concept for describing grammatical relations in Obo Manobo. For this reason, we have adopted Dixon’s (1994:113) proposal that there are three universal grammatical relations, S, A, and O, and that syntactic rules in all languages are framed in terms of them. For this discussion, we will label these grammatical relations as follows: S, the syntactically required argument of a single-argument clause; A, the more agentive, syntactically required argument of a transitive clause; and P (Dixon’s O), the less agentive, syntactically required argument of a transitive clause.

6. Morphosyntax of Verbal Clauses in Obo Manobo

Obo Manobo displays typical Philippine-type verbal clause structure, which has traditionally been referred to as a ‘focus system’. Specifically, in a basic verbal clause, the verb occurs in the initial clause position, and NPs are preceded by case markers. An affix on the verb cross-references one NP in the clause, S or P, and typically identifies the semantic role of the NP. Verb affixes also signal other types of information, such as syntactic transitivity, dynamism (e.g., dynamic, stative), and mood (e.g., possibility, intention). In transitive clauses, affixes identifying the semantic role of S or P occur mainly on verbs marked for irrealis. The clitic id signals realis, and the clitic od irrealis. Realis indicates that an event is perceived as actually occurring or having occurred; irrealis indicates the opposite.

NPs in Obo Manobo display two case-marking patterns, depending on word order and the form of the nominal, e.g., common noun, personal name, or pronoun. For common nouns and personal names, case marking follows an ergative pattern exclusively in all transitive clauses, regardless of word order. For pronouns in VAP clauses, case marking follows a tripartite pattern for 1st and 2nd persons and an ergative pattern for 3rd persons. For pronouns in VPA clauses, case marking follows an ergative pattern for all persons. Examples of the ergative pattern for common nouns is given in (8)–(11). (Case marking is discussed in detail in section 9.)

(8) id undiyon iddos anak to oweg govon.
REAL go ABS child OBL river yesterday

‘The child went to the river yesterday.’

---

15 This is not to say that topics and focus elements are never grammatical relations, but rather that they need not be grammatical relations.

16 Verb affixes and semantic roles do not have a straightforward one-to-one correlation. Depending on the verb, different affixes may cross-reference the same semantic role; conversely, the same affix may cross-reference different semantic roles. (See Brainard (1994b) for a comprehensive analysis of verbs and verb affixes in Karao, a Northern Philippine language.)
Sentences (14) and (15) are detransitive-1 clauses. Here P of the transitive clause has been demoted to an oblique NP, and only A of the transitive clause remains. Since the sentence is now a single-argument clause, A becomes S. Notice that the verb does not take a semantic role affix in either realis or irrealis mood. The detransitive-1 clause is the candidate for the antipassive.

(14) Id tampo'd iddos tali taddo-to anak govonoi.  
REAL cut ABS rope DEF-ERG child yesterday  
‘The child cut a rope yesterday.’

(15) Od tampo'don iddos tali taddot anak simag.  
od tampo'd-on iddos tali tadda-to anak simag  
IRR cut-PAT ABS rope DEF-ERG child tomorrow  
‘The child will cut a rope tomorrow.’

Evidence for grammatical relations for all clause types is given in section 8, 9, and 11.

See note 28 for a discussion of the optional marker tadda.
Sentences (16)–(19) are detransitive-2 clauses. Here A is obligatorily absent, and only P of the transitive clause remains. Since the sentence has become a single-argument clause, P changes to S. The detransitive-2 clause is the candidate for the passive.\textsuperscript{19}

\begin{verbatim}(16)  Id  notampod  iddos  tali  govoni.  
  id  no-tampod  iddos  tali  govoni  
  REAL  STAT-REAL-cut  ABS  rope  yesterday  
‘The rope was cut yesterday.’
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}(17)  Od  kotampod  iddos  tali  simag.  
  od  ko-tampod  iddos  tali  simag  
  IRR  STAT.IRR-cut  ABS  rope  tomorrow  
‘The rope will be cut tomorrow.’
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}(18)  Id  tampod  iddos  tali  govoni.  
  REAL  cut  ABS  rope  yesterday  
‘The rope was (intentionally) cut yesterday.’
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}(19)  Od  tompoddon  iddos  tali  simag.  
  od  tampod-on  iddos  tali  simag  
  IRR  cut-PAT  ABS  rope  tomorrow  
‘The rope will be cut (intentionally) tomorrow.’
\end{verbatim}

Comparing sentences (16)–(19), notice that the detransitive-2 verb may take stative affixes (16)(17). The detransitive-2 verb may also take the same form it has when it occurs in a VAP or a VPA transitive clause, e.g., no affix (compare (18) with (10) and (12)), or a transitive affix (compare (19) with (11) and (13)).\textsuperscript{20} Although the exact distribution of stative versus transitive verb forms in detransitive-2 clauses remains to be verified, a detransitive-2 clause with stative verb forms appears to be the unmarked form in that it is less restricted semantically; specifically, it is neutral with respect to whether or not the action is intentional. Conversely, a detransitive-2 clause with transitive verb forms appears to be a marked form in that it is more restricted semantically, i.e., it always indicates that the action is intentional. This analysis is further supported by frequency of occurrence in narrative text: 58\% of the detransitive-2 clauses in the available texts occur with stative affixes, but only 41\% occur with transitive affixes.\textsuperscript{21} Assuming that the form occurring most frequently in narrative text is the unmarked form, the detransitive-2 clause with stative affixes is again identified as the unmarked form. Since alternation between stative and transitive affixes appears to signal neutral versus intentional action, a semantic alternation frequently signaled by alternation of verb affixes in Philippine languages, the difference in verb affix does not warrant positing two separate types of detransitive-2 clause.

\textsuperscript{19} For this study, a prototypical passive is assumed to have a semantically transitive verb.

\textsuperscript{20} Some readers might question whether -on is truly a transitive affix; however, -on and -an are the two suffixes that commonly appear on verbs (in irrealis mood) in Obo Manobo transitive clauses. The point here is that Obo Manobo has a passive in which the verb does not take stative morphology, but rather retains the form it has in a transitive clause when the A argument is present.

\textsuperscript{21} A total of 87 detransitive-2 clauses were identified in the available texts: 51 (58.6\%) occurred with stative affixes, and 36 (41.4\%) occurred with the same morphology they take in VAP and VPA transitive clauses.
Therefore, for the purpose of this study, all occurrences of the detransitive-2 clause are assumed to be the same clause type, regardless of verb affix.

Our hypothesis then is that each of the four Obo Manobo clause types is a distinct voice construction. The proposed identification is given in Table 2.

Table 2. Proposed identification of clause types as voice constructions in Obo Manobo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>Proposed voice construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAP transitive</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPA transitive</td>
<td>Inverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detransitive 1</td>
<td>Antipassive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detransitive 2</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Distribution Frequency of Clause Types in Narrative Text

Much of what will be said about voice constructions in general and the inverse in particular in Obo Manobo depends upon the correct identification of the basic transitive clause. So far, we have tentatively identified the VAP clause as the basic transitive clause, and the candidate for the active construction. The VPA clause, another transitive clause, is the candidate for the inverse; the detransitive-1 clause the candidate for the antipassive; and the detransitive-2 clause the candidate for the passive. A simple heuristic means of checking this initial identification is the distribution frequency of these clause types in Obo Manobo narrative text.

Cross-linguistically, semantically transitive verbs occur more often in active constructions than other voice constructions in narrative text. (See Cooreman for Chamorro 1982, 1985, 1987; Dryer for Kutenai 1994; Rude for Sahaptin 1994; Brainard for Karao 1994a, 1994b.) Consequently, if the VAP clause in Obo Manobo is an active construction, we would expect it to code more semantically transitive verbs than all other clause types in narrative text. Table 3 gives overall frequencies for the four clause types in Obo Manobo narrative text.

Table 3. Frequency of clause types in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAP transitive</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPA transitive</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detransitive 1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detransitive 2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in Table 3 show that semantically transitive verbs occur most often in VAP clauses (46%). Thus, with respect to overall frequency of clause types in narrative
text, the VAP clause patterns like active constructions in other languages. This finding is also indirect support for our initial identification of the VPA clause as an inverse in that it confirms that semantically transitive verbs are coded less often in a VPA clause than a VAP clause, just as they occur less often in an inverse than an active construction in traditional inverse systems.

8. Tests of Syntactic Control

If the VAP clause is an active construction and the VPA clause an inverse, as we claim, they should be transitive clauses, and A and P in both clauses should be grammatical relations. Similarly, if the detransitive-1 clause is an antipassive, it should be a single-argument clause, and only S, the argument corresponding to A in the transitive clause counterpart, should be a grammatical relation. If the detransitive-2 clause is a passive, it should also be a single-argument clause, and only P, the argument corresponding to P in the transitive clause counterpart, should be a grammatical relation. In order to confirm these claims, we will verify the number and identity of the grammatical relations in the four clause types. For the sake of comparison, we will also include the same information for the intransitive clause.\footnote{For this discussion, an intransitive clause is defined as a single-argument clause that has a semantically intransitive verb, either a stative verb or a dynamic verb.}

8.1. Equi-NP deletion

Equi-NP deletion is a process in which an argument in a complement clause is coreferential with one in the main clause, and the coreferential argument is deleted. In Obo Manobo, equi-NP deletion follows a nominative pattern of syntactic control: S or A of a complement clause is deleted when it is coreferential with A of the main clause. Since A is the exclusive target for equi-NP deletion in a transitive complement clause, this is evidence that it is a grammatical relation. If the VAP and the VPA clause are both transitive clauses, then A should be the target for equi-NP deletion when either clause type is a complement clause.

In (21), A is a 1st person and so a VAP complement clause is obligatory; in (22), the A argument of the main clause and the VAP complement clause are coreferential, and A of the complement clause is deleted.

(20) \[ \text{Kopi-i ku iddos libru.} \]
\[ \text{want 1SG ABS book} \]
\[ \text{‘I want the book.’} \]

(21) \[ \text{Od tommuwon ku sikkow.} \]
\[ \text{od tommu-on ku sikkow} \]
\[ \text{IRR meet-PAT 1SG 2SG} \]
\[ \text{‘I will meet you.’} \]
(22) Kopi-i ku no od tommuwon sikkow.
kopi-i ku no od tommu-on sikkow
want 1SG LK IRR meet-PAT 2SG
‘I want to meet you.’

In (24), 1st person P outranks 2nd person A. Although both a VAP clause and a VPA clause are possible for this combination in an independent clause, only the VPA clause is possible in a complement clause when A of the complement clause is co-referential with A of the main clause. In (25), A of the VPA complement clause is deleted.

(23) Kopi-i ru iddos libru.
want 2SG ABS book
‘You want the book.’

(24) Od tommuwon a nikkow.
od tommu-on a nikkow
IRR meet-PAT 1SG 2SG
‘You will meet me.’

(25) Kopi-i ru no od tommuwon a.
kopi-i ru no od tommu-on a
want 2SG LK IRR meet-PAT 1SG
‘You want to meet me.’

Sentences (26)–(29) confirm that only A of the complement clause, never P, can be the target of equi-NP deletion.

(26) Kopi-i ku no od tommuwon a nikkow.
kopi-i ku no od tommu-on a nikkow
want 1SG LK IRR meet-PAT 1SG 2SG
‘I want you to meet me.’
[Lit. ‘I want that you will meet me.’]

(27) Kopi-i ku no od tommuwon du/nikkow.23
want 1SG LK IRR meet 2SG
‘I want you to meet me.’

(28) Kopi-i ru no od tommuwon ku sikkow.
kopi-i ru no od tommu-on ku sikkow
want 2SG LK IRR meet-PAT 1SG 2SG
‘You want me to meet you.’
[Lit. ‘You want that I will meet you.’]

In (27), if A of the complement clause is du, the sentence is grammatical, but the meaning is ‘I want you to meet it’. (P is a zero anaphor.) Obo Manobo speakers verify that (27) cannot have the meaning ‘I want you to meet me’. On the other hand, if A of the complement clause is nikkow, the sentence is ungrammatical for all readings.

23
In the preceding sentences, the deleted A argument is an agent. In (31) below, it is a cognizer, verifying that A may code different semantic roles when it is a syntactic control.

(30) Od sompotton ni Huan iddos tavak.
on sampot-on ni Huan iddos tavak
IRR remember-PAT ERG Huan ABS answer
‘Huan will remember the answer.’

(31) Kopi-i ni Huan no od sompotton iddos tavak.
kopi-i ni Huan no od sampot-on iddos tavak
want ERG Huan LK IRR remember-PAT ABS answer
‘Huan wants to remember the answer.’

The S argument of an intransitive complement clause may also be the target of equi-NP deletion; S is an agent in (33) and a patient in (35). Notice that when the complement clause is intransitive, the verb ‘to want’ must occur in its detransitive-1 form, *kopiyan*.

(32) Od sayow a.
IRR dance 1SG
‘I will dance.’

(33) Kopiyan a no od sayow.
want 1SG LK IRR dance
‘I want to dance.’

(34) Od patoy a.
IRR die 1SG
‘I will die.’

(35) Kopiyan a no od patoy.
want 1SG LK IRR die
‘I want to die.’

Briefly, equi-NP deletion shows that when a complement clause is a VAP or a VPA clause, A is the exclusive syntactic control for both clause types. The process also shows that when a complement clause is an intransitive clause, S is the exclusive syntactic control. As the syntactic control for equi-NP deletion, S and A may code different semantic roles.

---

24 Again, in (29), if A of the complement clause is *ku*, the sentence is grammatical, but means ‘You want me to meet it’. (P is a zero anaphor.) Obo Manobo speakers verify that it cannot mean ‘You want me to meet you’. If A of the complement clause is *a*, the sentence is ungrammatical for all readings.
8.2. Clefting

Clefting is a process in which one argument of a clause is moved to a sentence-initial position and the remaining clause is nominalized. In Obo Manobo, clefting has an ergative pattern of syntactic control: only S and P may be the head of a cleft construction. (The nominalized clause is a headless relative clause.) Since P is the exclusive control for clefting in a transitive clause, this is evidence that the argument is a grammatical relation. If the VAP clause and the VPA clause are both transitive clauses, P should be the head NP when either clause type changes to a cleft construction.

In (36)–(38), 1st person A outranks 3rd person P, and a VAP clause is obligatory. Sentence (36) is a VAP clause; (37) is its clefted counterpart, and P is the head NP. Sentence (38) shows that A cannot be the head of the cleft construction (even if a coreferential pronoun is placed in the nominalized clause).

(36) Od tommuwon ku sikandin.
   IRR meet-PAT 1SG 3SG
   ‘I will meet him.’

(37) Sikandin kos od tommuwon ku.
    sikandin kos od tommu-on ku
   3SG NMR IRR meet-PAT 1SG
   ‘He is the one whom I will meet.’

(38) *Siyak kos od tommuwon (ku) sikandin.
    1SG NMR IRR meet 1SG 3SG
    ‘I am the one who will meet him.’

In order for A in (36) to be the head of a cleft construction, the VAP clause must change to its detransitive-1 (i.e., antipassive) counterpart. Since the detransitive-1 clause is a single-argument clause, A becomes S and is now eligible to be the head of the cleft. Sentence (39) is the detransitive-1 counterpart of (36). Sentence (40) is its clefted counterpart, and S (A of (36)) is the head NP. Sentence (41) shows that when the nominalized clause is a detransitive-1 clause, the oblique NP corresponding to P in the transitive clause counterpart cannot be the head of the cleft.

(39) Od tommu a kandin.
    IRR meet 1SG 3SG.OBL
    ‘I will meet him.’

(40) Siyak kos od tommu kandin.
    1SG NMR IRR meet 3SG.OBL
    ‘I am the one who will meet him.’

(41) *Sikandin kos od tommu a.
    3SG NMR IRR meet 1SG
    ‘He is the one whom I will meet.’

In (42)–(44), P, a 1st person pronoun, outranks A, a full NP, and a VPA clause is obligatory. Sentence (42) is a VPA clause; (43) is its clefted counterpart, and P is the head NP; (44) shows that A cannot be the head of the cleft.
(42) Od tommuwon a ni Huan.
od tommu-on a ni Huan
IRR meet-PAT 1SG ERG Huan
‘Huan will meet me.’

(43) Siyak kos od tommuwon ni Huan.
siyak kos od tommu-on ni Huan
1SG NMR IRR meet-PAT ERG Huan
‘I am the one whom Huan will meet.’

(44) *Si Huan kos od tommuwon a (rin).
NM Huan NMR IRR meet 1SG 3SG
‘Huan is the one who will meet me.’

Again, in order for A in (42) to be the head of a cleft construction, the VPA clause must change to its detransitive-1 (i.e., antipassive) counterpart (45). Sentence (46) is its clefted counterpart, and S (A of (42)) is the head NP. Sentence (47) shows that the oblique NP corresponding to P in the transitive clause counterpart cannot be the head of the cleft.

(45) Od tommu si Huan koddi.
IRR meet ABS Huan 1SG.OBL
‘Huan will meet me.’

(46) Si Huan kos od tommu koddi.
NM Huan NMR IRR meet 1SG.OBL
‘Huan is the one who will meet me.’

(47) *Siyak kos od tommu si Huan.
1SG NMR IRR meet ABS Huan
‘I am the one whom Huan will meet.’

In the preceding sentences, P is a patient. The verb bolli ‘to buy’, however, allows a beneficiary (BENEF) to be promoted to P (i.e., promoted to the direct object). Once the beneficiary is promoted to P, it is eligible to be the head of a cleft construction, demonstrating that as the syntactic control, P may code different semantic roles.

In (48)–(53), the verb is bolli ‘to buy’; the patient is gaawan ‘toy’ and the beneficiary is anak ‘child’. In (48), the patient is the P argument and is marked by iddos; the beneficiary is an oblique argument and is marked by atag to. Notice that P is cross-referenced by -on on the verb. Sentence (49) verifies that the patient is P, since it can be the head of the cleft construction. Sentence (50) shows that the oblique beneficiary cannot be the head of the cleft.

(48) Od bolliyon taddot minuvu iddos gaawan atag to anak.
od bolli-on tadda-to minuvu iddos gaawan atag to anak
IRR buy-PAT DEF-ERG person ABS toy for OBL child
‘The person will buy the toy for the child.’

(49) Iddos gaawan kos od bolliyon taddot minuvu atag
iddos gaawan kos od bolli-on tadda-to minuvu atag
NM toy NMR IRR buy-PAT DEF-ERG person for
to anak.
to anak
OBL child

‘The toy is what the person will buy for the child.’

(50) *Iddos anak kos od bolliyan taddot minuvu iddos gaawan.
NM child NMR IRR buy DEF-ERG person ABS toy

‘The child is who the person will buy the toy for.’

In (51), the beneficiary is promoted to P, and the patient is demoted to an oblique argument. The beneficiary is now marked by *iddos, and the patient has moved to the end of the clause and is marked by to. Notice that the beneficiary is cross-referenced by -an on the verb. Sentence (52) shows that the beneficiary is now eligible to be the head of the cleft; (53) shows that the demoted patient cannot be the head of the cleft.

(51) Od bolliyan taddot minuvu iddos anak to gaawan.
od bolli-an tadda-to minuvu iddos anak to gaawan
IRR buy-BENEF DEF-ERG person ABS child OBL toy

‘The person will buy the child a toy.’

(52) Iddos anak kos od bolliyan taddot minuvu to gaawan.
iddos anak kos od bolli-an tadda-to minuvu to gaawan
NM child NMR IRR buy-BENEF DEF-ERG person OBL toy

‘The child is who the person will buy a toy for.’

(53) *Iddos gaawan kos od bolliyan taddot minuvu iddos anak.
NM toy NMR IRR buy DEF-ERG person ABS child.

‘The toy is what the person will buy the child.’

The S argument of an intransitive clause may also be the head of a cleft construction. In (55), S is an agent; in (57), it is a patient.

(54) Od sayow a.
IRR dance 1SG

‘I will dance.’

(55) Siyak kos od sayow.
1SG NMR IRR dance

‘I am the one who will dance.’

(56) Od patoy a.
IRR die 1SG

‘I will die.’

(57) Siyak kos od patoy.
1SG NMR IRR die

‘I am the one who will die.’

Finally, S of the detransitive-2 (i.e., passive) clause may also be the head of a cleft construction. In (59), S is a patient; in (61), it is a beneficiary.
(58) Od bolliyion iddos gaawan atag to anak.
    od bolli-on iddos gaawan atag to anak
    IRR buy-PAT ABS toy for OBL child

‘The toy will be bought for the child.’

(59) Iddos gaawan kos bolliyon atag to anak.
    iddos gaawan kos bolli-on atag to anak
    NM toy NMR buy-PAT for OBL child

‘The toy is what will be bought for the child.’

(60) Od bolliyan iddos anak to gaawan.
    od bolli-an iddos anak to gaawan
    IRR buy-BENEF ABS child OBL toy

‘The child will be bought a toy.’

(61) Iddos anak kos bolliyan to gaawan.
    iddos anak kos bolli-an to gaawan
    NM child NMR buy-BENEF OBL toy

‘The child is who will be bought a toy.’

To review, clefting shows that when a VAP or a VPA clause changes to a cleft construction, P is the exclusive syntactic control for both clause types. Clefting also shows that when a single-argument clause, i.e., an intransitive clause, a detransitive-1 (antipassive) clause, or a detransitive-2 (passive) clause, changes to a cleft construction, S is the exclusive syntactic control. As the syntactic control for clefting, S and P may code different semantic roles.

8.3. Summary of results for syntactic control

The syntactic tests equi-NP deletion and clefting establish that A and P in both the VAP and the VPA clause meet three of the four criteria for grammatical relations, namely syntactic control, exclusion, and multiple semantic role, thus, supporting the claim that both clause types are transitive. In addition, the tests establish that SA of the detransitive-1 clause and SP of the detransitive-2 clause meet these same criteria, supporting the claim that the detransitive-1 clause is an antipassive and the detransitive-2 clause a passive.

9. Formal Coding

Formal coding is a criterion for both grammatical relations and voice constructions. In the VAP and the VPA clause in Obo Manobo, A is formally distinguished from P by word order, cross-referencing on the verb, and case marking.

9.1. Word order

In the VAP clause and the VPA clause, word order formally distinguishes A from P. In the VAP clause, A is positioned closest to the verb (62); in the VPA clause, P is positioned closest (63).
9.2. Verbal cross-referencing

Affixes on Obo Manobo verbs cross-reference one and only one argument of the clause, identifying its semantic role. In the VAP and the VPA clause, the verb affix cross-references P and only P, thereby formally distinguishing P from A (64)(65). In an intransitive clause, the verb affix cross-references S (66). Thus, verb cross-referencing displays an ergative pattern.

9.3. Case marking

Case marking also formally distinguishes A from P. Case markers for common nouns and personal names are given in Table 4; case-marked pronouns are given in Table 5.
Table 4. Obo Manobo case markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absolutive</th>
<th>Ergative</th>
<th>Oblique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td>si</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td>onsi</td>
<td>onni</td>
<td>ongki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonpersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definite</strong></td>
<td>idda (so)²⁵</td>
<td>(tadda) to</td>
<td>(tadda) to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td>ko/do</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific</strong></td>
<td>ko (so)/do (so)</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Obo Manobo pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>VAP</th>
<th>VPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set 1 S</td>
<td>Set 2 A</td>
<td>Set 3 P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>siyak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL INCL</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>siketa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL EXCL</td>
<td>koy</td>
<td>doy/roy²⁶</td>
<td>sikami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>du/ru</td>
<td>sikkow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>kow</td>
<td>dow/row</td>
<td>sikiyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>sikandin</td>
<td>din/rin</td>
<td>sikandin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>sikandan</td>
<td>dan/ran</td>
<td>sikandan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Set 3 pronouns may occur in sentence-initial positions as fronted arguments (67) and as heads of constructions such as cleft constructions (68).

(67) Siyak, waa a id undiyon to Maynila.  
1SG NEG 1SG REAL go OBL Manila  
‘As for me, I did not go to Manila.’

²⁵ Case markers composed of two morphemes often contract in fast speech; i.e., idda so becomes iddos, ko so becomes kos, and tadda to becomes taddot. (The morphemes idda and tadda also function as demonstratives, both meaning ‘there far away’.)

²⁶ Pronouns beginning with /d/ have two allomorphs: a [d]-initial allomorph that follows a consonant and a [r]-initial allomorph that follows a vowel.
(68) Siyak kos id undiyon to Maynila.
1SG NMR REAL go OBL Manila

‘I am the one who went to Manila.’

Set 2 and Set 6 pronouns may function as genitive pronouns: Set 2 pronouns follow the head noun (69); Set 6 pronouns precede it (70).

(69) Ini en kos libru ku.
this EMPH NMR book 1SG.GEN

‘This is my book.’

(70) Ini en kos koddin libru.
inini en en kos koddii-no libru
this EMPH NMR 1SG.GEN-LK book

‘This is my book.’

9.3.1. Common nouns

When A and P are common nouns, case markers display an ergative pattern in both the VAP and the VPA clause. Specifically, S and P are marked the same, and A is marked differently (71)—(73).27

Intransitive

(71) Od usok iddos anak diyon to baoy.
IRR enter ABS child there OBL house

‘The child will enter into the house.’

VAP clause

(72) Od suntukon to ba-ay iddos anak.
od suntuk-on to ba-ay iddos anak
IRR hit-PAT ERG woman ABS child

‘The woman will hit the child.’

27 Since realis and irrealis sentences pattern the same in all ways except verb morphology, only irrealis forms of sentences will be given hereafter. Irrealis forms are chosen because in this mood, certain verbs take an affix that cross-references P, whereas in realis mood, they do not. Thus irrealis verb forms have more morphological marking than realis verbs making them easier to identify.
9.3.2. Personal names

When A and P are personal names, case markers also display an ergative pattern in the VAP and the VPA clause (74)—(76).

Intransitive

(74) Od usok si Huan diyon to baoy.
IRR enter ABS Huan there OBL house
‘Huan will enter into the house.’

VAP clause

(75) Od suntukon ni Pedru si Huan.
IRR hit-PAT ERG Pedru ABS Huan
‘Pedru will hit Huan.’

Although the marker *tadda* is optional, Obo Manobo speakers prefer A to be overtly marked by *tadda* in a VPA clause when A is a common noun, particularly when P is also a common noun. Obo Manobo speakers state that by marking A with *tadda* in a VPA clause, it clarifies that the NP it marks is initiating the action. If A is not marked by *tadda*, the meaning is ambiguous since the morpheme *to* can be either an ergative marker or a genitive marker, as in:

VPA clause

Id suntuk iddos anak to ba-ay.
REAL hit ABS child DEF-ERG woman

Out of context, Obo Manobo speakers give the first meaning of the above sentence as ‘The woman’s child was hit’, although upon further questioning speakers agree that given an appropriate context, the sentence can also mean ‘The woman hit the child’. On the other hand, A in a VAP clause may also be marked by *tadda* as in:

VAP clause

Id tommu tadda anak iddos leeleng din.
REAL meet DEF-ERG child ABS friend 3SG.GEN

‘The child met her friend.’

In the available narrative texts, A in six VPA clauses is marked only by *to*. These A arguments are not mentioned in the three immediately preceding clauses. On the other hand, A in ten VPA clauses are marked by *tadda to*. Five of these A arguments are mentioned in the three immediately preceding clauses, and five are not. This suggests that in a VAP clause, the marker *to* occurs only with A arguments that have not been mentioned recently. Conversely, *tadda to* occurs with A arguments that have been mentioned recently and those that have not.
9.3.3. Pronouns

When A and P are pronouns, the pronouns display two case-marking patterns, depending on word order and person. In VAP clauses, 1st and 2nd person pronouns have a tripartite pattern; that is, S, A, and P are each marked differently. On the other hand, 3rd person pronouns have an ergative pattern.

Sentences (77)–(80) illustrate the tripartite pattern. In the following sentences, a singular 2nd person is *ka* for S (77), *du* for A (79), and *sikkow* for P (80).

**VAP clause**

(76) Od suntukon si Huan ni Pedru.  
od suntuk-on si Huan ni Pedru  
IRR hit-PAT ABS Huan ERG Pedru  
‘Pedru will hit Huan.’

**Intransitive clause**

(77) Od usok ka diyon to baoy.  
IRR enter 2SG there OBL house  
‘You will enter into the house.’

(78) Od usok a diyon to baoy.  
IRR enter 1SG there OBL house  
‘I will enter into the house.’

VAP clause

(79) Od suntukon du siyak.  
od suntuk-on du siyak  
IRR hit-PAT 2SG 1SG  
‘You will hit me.’

(80) Od suntukon ku sikkow.  
od suntuk-on ku sikkow  
IRR hit-PAT 1SG 2SG  
‘I will hit you.’

Sentences (81)–(83) illustrate the ergative pattern. The singular 3rd person is *sikandin* for S (81) and P (82) and *din* for A (83).

**Intransitive clause**

(81) Od usok sikandin diyon to baoy.  
IRR enter 3SG there OBL house  
‘He will enter into the house.’
VAP clause

(82) Od suntukon ku sikandin.  
    od suntuk-on ku sikandin  
    IRR hit-PAT 1SG 3SG  
    ‘I will hit him.’

(83) Od suntukon din sikandan.  
    od suntuk-on din sikandan  
    IRR hit-PAT 3SG 3PL  
    ‘He will hit them.’

In VPA clauses, pronouns display an ergative pattern for all persons, although 3rd person pronominal forms in VPA clauses are not the same as those in VAP clauses.

First, consider the ergative pattern for 1st and 2nd persons in VPA clauses. In the following sentences, a singular 2nd person is ka for S (84) and P (85), and nikkow for A (86).

Intransitive clause

(84) Od usok ka riyon to baoy.  
    IRR enter 2SG there OBL house  
    ‘You will enter into the house.’

VPA clause

(85) Od suntukon ka nikandin.  
    od suntuk-on ka nikandin  
    IRR hit-PAT 2SG 3SG  
    ‘He will hit you.’

(86) Od suntukon a nikkow.  
    od suntuk-on a nikkow  
    IRR hit-PAT 1SG 2SG  
    ‘You will hit me.’

Now consider the ergative pattern for 3rd persons in VPA clauses. The singular 3rd person is sikandin for S (87) and P (88) and nikandin for A (89).

Intransitive clause

(87) Od usok sikandin riyon to baoy.  
    IRR enter 3SG there OBL house  
    ‘He will enter into the house.’

VPA clause

(88) Od suntukon sikandin nikandan.  
    od suntuk-on sikandin nikandan  
    IRR hit-PAT 3SG 3PL  
    ‘They will hit him.’
(89)  Od suntukon a nikandin.
       od suntuk-on a nikandin
       IRR  hit-PAT  1SG  3SG
       ‘He will hit me.’

The following sentences confirm that the VAP clause occurs with only Set 2 and 3 pronouns, and the VPA clause with only Set 4 and 5 pronouns. In (90), a VAP clause occurs with Set 4 and 5 pronouns, and the clause is ungrammatical.

VAP clause

(90)  *Od suntukon nikkow a.
       IRR  hit-PAT  2SG  1SG
       ‘You will hit me.’

In (91), a VPA clause occurs with Set 2 and 3 pronouns, and it is also ungrammatical. 29

VPA clause

(91)  *Od suntukon siyak du.
       IRR  hit-PAT  1SG  2SG
       ‘You will hit me.’

9.3.4. Summary of case marking

Case-marking patterns for common nouns, personal names, and pronouns in Obo Manobo are summarized in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal form</th>
<th>Case-marking pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>Tripartite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common noun</td>
<td>Ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal name</td>
<td>Ergative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When A and P are pronouns, case marking displays two patterns. In a VAP clause, when A and P are 1st or 2nd person pronouns, they display a tripartite pattern, but when A and P are 3rd person pronouns, they display an ergative pattern. In a VPA

---

29 One might wonder if the restrictions on pronoun sets are due to the number of syllables in the A or P pronoun; e.g., a phonologically short pronoun must precede a longer pronoun. This hypothesis is discussed in section 12.
clause, when A and P are pronouns, they display an ergative pattern for all persons.\textsuperscript{30}
When A and P are common nouns or personal names, case marking displays an ergative pattern in both VAP and VPA clauses. Here case markers are identical in both clause types.

\subsection*{9.4. Inverse system or split-ergative system?}

Having noted that the VAP and VPA clauses display two case-marking patterns when A and P are pronouns, one might ask if differences in pronominal forms could not be analyzed simply as a split-ergative system since split-ergative systems also display different case-marking patterns, which in some languages are governed by person or topicality hierarchies. The first difficulty with this hypothesis is that in Obo Manobo a particular case-marking pattern (and a particular set of pronominal forms) are obligatorily associated with a unique word order. In split-ergative systems, a change in case marking does not trigger an obligatory change in word order.

A second difficulty is that in Philippine languages such as Cebuano, change in word order in the transitive clause does not trigger an obligatory change in case marking for any nominal form, e.g., common noun, personal name, or pronoun. For these languages, transitive clauses differ only in word order. At this point in the analysis of VPA clauses in Philippine languages, it is our contention that the Cebuano VPA clause and the Obo Manobo VPA clause are variations of the same type of construction, namely, a word order inverse, since both clause types share certain syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic properties common to traditional inverses.

A third difficulty with the split-ergative hypothesis is that in Cebuano and Obo Manobo, alternations between VAP and VPA clause occur even when A and P are both 3rd persons and are coded by the same nominal form; e.g., A and P are both common nouns, personal names, or pronouns.\textsuperscript{31} Normally splits in case marking in independent clauses are governed by person, tense or aspect, or topicality (e.g., pronoun vs. full NP), but not word order. For these reasons, we conclude that alternations between VAP and VPA clauses in Obo Manobo are not part of a split-ergative system.

\subsection*{9.5. Summary of formal coding}

Unique formal coding is a criterion for distinguishing between arguments that are grammatical relations and a criterion for distinguishing between voice constructions. Regarding grammatical relations in Obo Manobo, word order, verb cross-referencing, and case marking distinguish A from P in the VAP and the VPA clause. Together with the syntactic control, exclusion, and multiple semantic role criteria, formal coding establishes that A and P in these clause types are grammatical relations. This, in turn, establishes that the VAP and the VPA clause are transitive clauses. Regarding voice constructions in Obo Manobo, word order and case marking also distinguish the VAP clause from the VPA clause. This establishes that the VAP and the VPA clause are two separate clause types, and ultimately two different voice constructions.

\textsuperscript{30} Change in word order triggers change in case marking only for pronouns in Obo Manobo; however, for two Northern Philippine languages, Butbut Kalinga (Mijares and Brainard 1996) and Mayoyao Ifugao (Hodder 1999), change in VAP/VPA word order triggers an obligatory change in case marking for all nominal forms.

\textsuperscript{31} On the other hand, not all word order changes in Obo Manobo signal a change in clause type (or voice construction). See section 12 for a comparison of fronted arguments in pre-verb and post-verb positions.
10. Person and Topicality Hierarchy

As is characteristic of inverse systems, not all person combinations for A and P occur in both transitive clauses, i.e., the VAP and the VPA clause. For example, when A is a singular 1st person, the VAP clause is obligatory. On the other hand, when P is a 1st or 2nd person (but not a 3rd person) pronoun and A is a full NP, the VPA clause is obligatory. Furthermore, when A and P are both 3rd persons, many combinations of nominal forms, e.g. pronoun/pronoun or full NP/pronoun, may occur in both a VAP and a VPA clause, but for these combinations, one clause type is always the unmarked choice and the other the marked choice. These patterns suggest that choice of clause is determined in part by a person hierarchy and in part by a topicality hierarchy similar to traditional inverse systems, and this is correct. For Obo Manobo, selection is governed by the person and topicality hierarchy shown in Figure 1.

\[ 1 > 2 > 3 > \text{pronouns} > \text{full NPs} \]

**Figure 1.** Person and topicality hierarchy

### 10.1. Selection of clause type

The general principle for choosing a transitive clause type in Obo Manobo is that when A outranks P on the hierarchy in Figure 1, the VAP clause is chosen, but when P outranks A, the VPA clause is chosen. The details of selection, however, are somewhat more complex. The following discussion presents all possible combinations of A and P, indicating those combinations that may occur in only one clause type, and those that may occur in both, in which case the unmarked choice is identified.\(^{32}\)

#### 10.1.1. A and P are both pronouns and differ in person

When A and P are both pronouns and differ in person, certain combinations of A and P are restricted to one clause type; others may occur in both clause types. Consider first combinations in which A outranks P. When A is a singular 1st person and P is any 2nd person, either singular or plural, a VAP clause is obligatory, as in (92).

(92)  
\[
\text{Od tommuwon ku sikkow.} \\
\text{od tommu-on ku sikkow} \\
\text{IRR meet-PAT 1SG 2SG}
\]

‘I will meet you.’

(93)  
\[
\text{*Od tommuwon sikkow ku.} \\
\text{‘I will meet you.’}
\]

When A is a plural 1st person, however, either the VAP clause (94) or the VPA clause (95) may be selected. The VAP clause is the unmarked choice.

(94)  
\[
\text{Od tommuwon ku sikkow.} \\
\text{od tommu-on ku sikkow} \\
\text{IRR meet-PAT 1SG 2SG}
\]

‘I will meet you.’

(95)  
\[
\text{Od tommuwon sikkow ku.} \\
\text{‘I will meet you.’}
\]

---

See Appendix 1 for a listing of all person combinations of A and P in VAP and VPA transitive clauses. For every combination of A and P listed in Appendix 1, both a VAP and a VPA transitive clause having a semantically transitive verb, such as ‘hit’ as in ‘She hit you’, were shown to an Obo Manobo speaker. The speaker was asked to decide whether the clause types were grammatical. If both clauses were grammatical, then the speaker was asked to decide which was the more common way to say the sentence. This sentence was identified as the unmarked choice.
(94) Od tommuwon doy sikkow.
    od tommu-on doy sikkow
    IRR meet-PAT 1PL.EX 2SG

    ‘We will meet you.’

(95) Od tommuwon ka nikami.
    od tommu-on ka nikami
    IRR meet-PAT 2SG 1PL.EX

    ‘We will meet you.’

When P outranks A in person, both the VAP and the VPA clause are possible, but the VPA clause is the unmarked choice. In the following sentences, 1st person P outranks 2nd person A; the VPA clause is the unmarked choice (96), and the VAP clause the marked choice (97).

(96) Od tommuwon a nikkow.
    od tommu-on a nikkow
    IRR meet-PAT 1SG 2SG

    ‘You will meet me.’

(97) Od tommuwon du siyak.
    od tommu-on du siyak
    IRR meet-PAT 2SG 1SG

    ‘You will meet me.’

This pattern changes slightly for 2nd and 3rd person combinations. When A is any 2nd person, either singular or plural, and P is any 3rd person, the VAP clause is obligatory. In (98), A is a singular 2nd person; in (100), it is a plural 2nd person.

(98) Od tommuwon du sikandin.
    od tommu-on du sikandin
    IRR meet-PAT 2SG 3SG

    ‘You will meet him.’

(99) *Od tommuwon sikandin nikkow.
    IRR meet 3SG 2SG

    ‘You will meet him.’

(100) Od tommuwon dow sikandin.
    od tommu-on dow sikandin
    IRR meet 2PL 3SG

    ‘You will meet him.’

(101) *Od tommuwon sikandin nikiyu.
    IRR meet 3SG 2PL

    ‘You will meet him.’
**10.1.2. A and P are both pronouns and are the same in person**

When A and P are both any 3rd person pronoun, either singular or plural, and thus the same in rank, both word orders are possible; the VAP clause is the unmarked choice (102), and the VPA the marked choice (103).

(102) od tommuwon din sikandin.
    od tommu-on din sikandin
    IRR meet-PAT 3SG 3SG
    ‘She will meet him.’

(103) od tommuwon sikandin nikandin.
    od tommu-on sikandin nikandin
    IRR meet-PAT 3SG 3SG
    ‘She will meet him.’

**10.1.3. A or P is a pronoun, but not both**

When either A or P is a pronoun, and the other argument is a full NP, the pronoun outranks the full NP. If A is any pronoun and P a full NP, word order is obligatorily VAP. In (104), A is a 2nd person pronoun; in (106), it is a 3rd person pronoun.

(104) od tommuwon du iddos anak.
    od tommu-on du iddos anak
    IRR meet-PAT 2SG ABS child
    ‘You will meet the child.’

(105) *od tommuwon iddos anak nikkow.
    IRR meet ABS child 2SG
    ‘You will meet the child.’

(106) od tommuwon din iddos anak.
    od tommu-on din iddos anak
    IRR meet-PAT 3SG ABS child
    ‘He will meet the child.’

(107) *od tommuwon iddos anak nikandin.
    IRR meet ABS child 3SG
    ‘He will meet the child.’

The pattern is slightly more complex when P is the pronoun and A the full NP. If P is a 1st or 2nd person pronoun, word order is obligatorily VPA (108).

(108) od tommuwon ka (tadda) to anak.
    od tommu-on ka tadda to anak
    IRR meet-PAT 2SG DEF ERG child
    ‘The child will meet you.’

(109) *od tommuwon (tadda) to anak sikkow.
    IRR meet DEF ERG child 2SG
    ‘The child will meet you.’
If P is a 3rd person pronoun, both word orders are possible, but here the VAP clause is the unmarked choice (110) and the VPA the marked choice (111).

(110) Od tommuwon (tadda) to anak sikandin.
    od tommu-on tadda to anak sikandin
    IRR meet-PAT DEF ERG child 3SG
    ‘The child will meet her.’

(111) Od tommuwon sikandin (tadda) to anak.
    od tommu-on sikandin tadda to anak
    IRR meet-PAT 3SG DEF ERG child
    ‘The child will meet her.’

10.1.4. A and P are both full NPs

When A and P are both full NPs, both word orders are possible. The VAP clause is the unmarked choice (112) and the VPA clause the marked choice (113).

(112) Od tommuwon (tadda) to minuvu iddos anak.
    od tommu-on tadda to minuvu iddos anak
    IRR meet-PAT DEF ERG person ABS child
    ‘The person will meet the child.’

(113) Od tommuwon iddos anak (tadda) to minuvu.
    od tommu-on iddos anak tadda to minuvu
    IRR meet-PAT ABS child DEF ERG person
    ‘The person will meet the child.’

10.2. Summary of person and topicality hierarchy

Selection of a VAP and a VPA clause is determined by a combined person and topicality hierarchy: 1 > 2 > 3 > pronouns > full NPs. Although person is usually treated as a semantic notion and topicality as a pragmatic notion, Givón (1994a) and D. Payne (1994) point out in discussions of the inverse that person hierarchies and topicality hierarchies share a fundamental unity in that as SAPs, 1st and 2nd persons are assumed to be a more natural center of interest than 3rd persons. In this sense, person hierarchies can be said to be inherent topicality hierarchies.

Third persons coded as pronouns and full NPs also reflect a topicality hierarchy. Specifically, referents that have been mentioned recently are normally coded as pronouns and those that have not are normally coded as full NPs. Assuming that topical referents are mentioned more often and so usually more recently, referents coded as pronouns are likely to be more topical than those coded as full NPs.

If the hierarchy of person, pronouns, and full NPs is governed by a general principle of topicality, then according to Givón’s typology of voice functions which is defined in terms of the relative topicality of agent and patient (which are coded as A and P respectively in a prototypical transitive clause), A in a VAP clause should be more topical than P, displaying an active voice function, and P in a VPA clause should be more topical than A, displaying an inverse voice function. If the VAP clause has an active voice function and the VPA clause an inverse function, this will be final evidence that the VAP clause is an active construction and the VPA clause an inverse.
11. Voice Function

A major criterion of voice constructions is that each voice construction must correlate with a unique voice function. In order to discuss voice function, Givón’s (1979, 1983a, 1991) typology of voice function has been adopted. This typology is based upon the notion that voice is a complex phenomenon, of which one major component is pragmatic perspective. Semantically transitive events can be viewed from the perspective of the agent or the patient, and it is generally assumed that the event will be viewed from the perspective of the more topical referent. When major shifts in pragmatic perspective are reflected in changes in clause morphosyntax, such changes have traditionally been described as alternations in voice constructions.

In his typology, Givón defines voice function in terms of the relative topicality of agent and patient. Table 7 is a schematic representation of the typology.

Table 7. Relative topicality of agent and patient in voice functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice function</th>
<th>Relative topicality of agent and patient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>AG &gt; PAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverse</td>
<td>AG &lt; PAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipassive</td>
<td>AG &gt;&gt; PAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>AG &lt;&lt; PAT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For an active voice function, the agent and the patient are both topical, but the agent is more topical; for an inverse voice function, the agent and the patient are both topical, but the patient is more topical. For an antipassive voice function, agent is topical and patient is very low in topicality; for a passive voice function, patient is topical, and agent is very low in topicality. An argument that is low in topicality may be suppressed by means of demotion or deletion. A deleted argument can have some degree of topicality if its referent has been mentioned previously. Every referent is assumed to have some inherent degree of topicality even upon first mention.

The notion of relative topicality is based on the simple idea that referents that are topical, i.e., central to the development of a story, are mentioned more often than those that are not. Relative topicality correlates with two cognitive dimensions: accessibility and attentional activation. Since a topical referent is likely to be mentioned more often than those that are not, it can be said to be accessible, i.e., easily identified, and attentionally activated, i.e., persistent over a stretch of text.

In order to identify voice functions, Givón has devised several quantitative methods for measuring the relative topicality of agent and patient in narrative text. Although these methods do not measure topicality directly, the expectation is that the measured properties correlate with the two cognitive dimensions of topicality, accessibility and attentional activation. If a clause type is a voice construction, the majority of its occurrences in narrative text will correlate with one voice function. Thus,

---

33 These methods were first developed by Givón (1979, 1983a), and later modified in Wright and Givón (1987) and Givón (1991). Early in the development of the methods, Cooreman (1982) applied Givón’s methods to Chamorro, an ergative language. Her findings have served as benchmarks for comparison with other languages.
a clause type may code different voice functions, but the majority of its occurrences will correlate with the same function. Studies in a variety of languages show these quantitative, text-based methods to be reliable indices of correlations between voice function and voice construction. (See Rude 1986, 1994; Thompson 1989; Cooreman, Fox, and Givón 1984; Shibatani 1985, 1988; Brainard 1994a, 1994b; Dryer 1994; D. Payne, Hamaya, and Jacobs 1994; Storck and Brainard 1996.)

Givón's quantitative methods for identifying voice functions have two particular advantages for analysis. One is that the methods enable topicality to be defined and identified empirically, thereby avoiding definitions that cannot be tested and linguists' intuitions. The other advantage is that the methods provide a structure-independent means of defining voice function. This allows voice constructions to be described by means other than morphosyntax, thereby avoiding circular argument. For Philippine languages, this is particularly important since the complex morphosyntax of these languages has misled more than one linguist.34

Regarding the two cognitive dimensions, accessibility is measured in terms of referential distance, and attentional activation in terms of topic persistence. The findings of these measures are based on 359 independent clauses coding semantically transitive verbs. The clauses are taken from thirteen Obo Manobo narrative texts. A referent is regarded as having been mentioned if it is referred to by an overt nominal or a zero anaphor. Referents include SAPs and 3rd persons.

11.1. Referential distance

Referential distance (RD) measures cognitive accessibility. The test assumes that accessibility correlates with a measure of the distance between the target occurrence of a referent and its last mention in the preceding text. If the antecedent is found in the immediately preceding clause, an RD value of 1 is assigned. If it is found in the second or third clause, an RD value of 2/3 is assigned. If no antecedent occurs in the preceding three clauses or if the target occurrence is a first mention, an RD value of >3 is assigned. Accessible referents have lower RD values; less accessible referents have higher values. For this test, we assume that a referent is cognitively accessible if it has an RD value of 1–3.
Measures of referential distance for the agent and the patient in VAP, VPA, detransitive-1, and detransitive-2 clauses are given in Tables 8-11.\textsuperscript{35}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8. Referential distance for VAP clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VAP clause</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9. Referential distance for VPA clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VPA clause</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10. Referential distance for detransitive-1 clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Detransitive-1 clause</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{35} The tables of referential distance and topic persistence measures are summaries. See Appendix 2 for the full counts for these measures.
Table 11. Referential distance for detransitive-2 clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detransitive-2 clause</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th></th>
<th>PAT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The referential distance measures for the four Obo Manobo clause types display the expected profiles. Based on the claim that the VAP clause is an active construction and the VPA clause an inverse, Givón's voice function typology predicts that the agent and the patient in both clause types should be topical and have a low RD measure, i.e., RD value 1-3. For the VAP clause, 91% of the agents and 74% of the patients have RD values of 1-3. For the VPA clause, 63% of the agents and 100% of the patients have RD values of 1-3. Thus, more than half of the agents and patients in both VAP and the VPA clauses have the low RD values associated with topical arguments. Furthermore, in the VAP clause, more agents than patients have low RD values, indicating that the agent is the more topical referent. Similarly, in the VPA clause, more patients than agents have low RD values, indicating the patient is the more topical referent. Thus, the VAP clause matches the cross-linguistic profile for active constructions, and the VPA clause matches the profile for inverse constructions.

The typology also predicts that the agent should be the more topical referent in the detransitive-1 clause (antipassive), and the patient in the detransitive-2 clause (passive). For the detransitive-1 clause, 81% of the agents, but only 38% of the patients have RD values of 1-3, indicating that the agent is the topical referent. In the detransitive-2 clause, 83% of the patients, but only 36% of the agents have RD values of 1-3, indicating that the patient is the topical referent. So then, the detransitive-1 clause matches the cross-linguistic profile for antipassives, and the detransitive-2 clause the profile for passives.

11.2. Topic persistence

Topic persistence (TP) measures attentional activation. The test assumes that topic persistence correlates with the number of times a referent is mentioned in the 10 clauses following the target occurrence. TP values of 1 to 10 are recorded; e.g., if the target referent is mentioned 7 times in the 10 succeeding clauses, then the TP value is 7. More topically persistent referents have higher TP values; less topically persistent referents have lower ones. For this test, we will assume that a referent is topically persistent if it has a TP value of >2, indicating that it has been mentioned more than 2 times in the following 10 clauses.

Measures of topic persistence for the four Obo Manobo clause types are given in Tables 12-15.
Table 12. Topic persistence for VAP clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAP clause</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>PAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. Topic persistence for VPA clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPA clause</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>PAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Topic persistence for detransitive-1 clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detransitive-1 clause</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>PAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15. Topic persistence for detransitive-2 clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detransitive-2 clause</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>PAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TP measures for the four clause types display the expected profiles. If the VAP clause is an active construction and the VPA an inverse, the typology predicts that the agent and the patient in both clause types will be topical and should have a high TP
value, i.e., TP value >2. Also, the agent should be the more topical referent in the VAP clause and the patient in the VPA clause, and this is what we find. In the VAP clause, more than half of the agents (78%) and the patients (59%) have the high TP values associated with topical referents. In addition, more agents than patients have high TP values, indicating that the agent is the more topical referent. In the VPA clause, again more than half of the agents (65%) and the patients (97%) have high TP values. Here more patients than agents have high TP values, indicating that the patient is the more topical referent. These figures show that the VAP clause matches the cross-linguistic profile for active constructions and the VPA clause the profile for inverses.

Similarly, the typology predicts that the agent will be the topical referent in the detransitive-1 clause (antipassive), and the patient in the detransitive-2 clause (passive). In the detransitive-1 clause, 74% of the agents, but only 46% of the patients have high TP values, indicating that the agent is the topical referent. In the detransitive-2 clause, 57% of the patients, but only 14% of the agents have high TP values, indicating that the patient is the topical referent. Thus, the detransitive-1 clause matches the profile for antipassives, and the detransitive-2 clause the profile for passives.

Taken together, the RD and TP measures show that the VAP clause has the voice function profile of an active construction, the VPA clause the profile of an inverse, the detransitive-1 clause the profile of an antipassive, and the detransitive-2 clause the profile of a passive.

11.3. Summary of voice function

To summarize, the results of quantitative text-based measures of voice function show that in Obo Manobo, each of the four clause types under discussion codes a unique voice function, thereby satisfying the last criterion for voice constructions. The correlations between clause type, voice function, and voice construction are given in Table 16.

Table 16. Correlation between clause type, voice function, and voice construction in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>Voice function</th>
<th>Voice construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAP transitive</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPA transitive</td>
<td>Inverse</td>
<td>Inverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detransitive-1</td>
<td>Antipassive</td>
<td>Antipassive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detransitive-2</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So then, grammatical relations, formal coding, and voice function confirm that each of the four Obo Manobo clause types under discussion is a separate voice construction: the VAP clause is an active construction, the VPA clause an inverse, the detransitive-1 clause an antipassive, and the detransitive-2 clause a passive.

12. Alternate Hypotheses

Other hypotheses have been presented to account for varying orders of the A and the P argument in transitive clauses in Philippine languages, and it is worth examining
the more common of these to see whether or not they can account for the Obo Manobo data and how they compare with the inverse analysis. In Philippine linguistics, the two most common hypotheses are a phonological hypothesis and a morphological hypothesis (see Schachter and Otanes 1972 and Schachter 1973 for Tagalog).

12.1. Phonological hypothesis

The phonological hypothesis states that the order of A and P in a transitive clause is determined by the number of syllables in the pronoun or full NP: the argument having the fewest syllables is positioned closest to the verb. This hypothesis fails for two reasons. First, it does not account for all the data. In Obo Manobo, the shorter phonological argument does not always occur closest to the verb. Consider configurations in which A and P are both 3rd persons. If one argument is a pronoun and the other a full NP, both the VAP and the VPA clause are possible. In the VAP clause in (114), A is a four-syllable full NP and P is a three-syllable pronoun, showing that a phonologically longer A can precede a phonologically shorter P.

(114) Od tommuwon to anak din sikandin.
    od tommu-on to anak din sikandin
    IRR meet-PAT ERG child 3SG.GEN 3SG
    ‘Her child will meet him.’

In the VPA clause in (115), P is a three-syllable pronoun and A is a two-syllable full NP. Here again the phonologically longer argument precedes the shorter one.

(115) Od tommuwon sikandin ni Jun.
    od tommu-on sikandin ni Jun
    IRR meet-PAT 3SG ERG Jun
    ‘Jun will meet him.’

In the VAP clause in (116), A and P are both full NPs; once more the phonologically longer argument precedes the shorter one.

(116) Od tommuwon to anak din si Jun.
    od tommu-on to anak din si Jun
    IRR meet-PAT ERG child 3SG.GEN ABS Jun
    ‘Her child will meet Jun.’

The second reason that the phonological hypothesis fails is that even for those configurations in which a phonologically shorter argument must precede the longer one, namely pronoun/pronoun configurations, the phonological hypothesis overlooks one major point: in Obo Manobo, both A and P have short pronoun sets. Although the phonological hypothesis accounts for word order once a particular short pronoun is selected, it fails to explain why a speaker chooses a short P pronoun when a short A pronoun is also eligible, or the reverse.

12.2. The morphological hypothesis

The morphological hypothesis has been proposed for the order of A and P when one of the arguments is a pronoun and the other a full NP: the pronoun is positioned closest to the verb. This hypothesis fails for three reasons. First, it does not account for all combinations of A and P in transitive clauses in Obo Manobo. Second, it does not account for even all pronoun/full NP configurations in the language. For example,
when P is a 3rd person pronoun, both VAP and VPA word orders are possible, and so a full-NP A argument can, in fact, be positioned closer to the verb than a pronoun P argument, as in (114) above. Third, the hypothesis offers no explanation as to why pronouns rather than full NPs should be positioned closer to the verb; it simply describes the order.

12.3. The phonological and morphological hypotheses versus the inverse analysis

As explanations for varying orders of A and P in Obo Manobo, the phonological hypothesis and the morphological hypothesis have been shown to be inadequate because 1) they do not account for all orders of A and P in transitive clauses in Obo Manobo, 2) the phonological hypothesis does not explain why a short A rather than a short P is positioned closest to the verb (and vice versa) when both are available, and 3) the morphological hypothesis does not explain why a pronoun rather than a full NP is positioned closest to the verb. The inverse analysis, on the other hand, provides a unified explanation that accounts for all orders of A and P in Obo Manobo transitive clauses: the more topical argument is positioned closest to the verb. This, in turn, agrees with the well-known observation that topical referents often occur in a more fronted clause position than less topical referents (Givón 1983a, D. Payne 1987).

Topicality also offers an explanation for the phonological size of an argument in that it is also a well-known observation that topical referents are coded with less phonological material than nontopical referents (Givón 1983a). This explains why the topical A argument in the VAP clause and the topical P argument in the VPA clause are coded by the phonologically shorter pronominal sets.

12.4. The all-fronted-arguments-are-topical hypothesis

Considering other languages in which A and P may be fronted, one might argue that any fronted A argument will display an active voice function profile, and any fronted P argument will display an inverse voice function profile. So, for those languages in which AVP and PVA are possible word orders as well as VAP and VPA, the prediction would be: if A is the more topical argument in the majority of VAP clauses, it will also be the more topical argument in the majority of AVP clauses. Similarly, if P is the more topical argument in the majority of VPA clauses, it will also be the more topical argument in the majority of PVA clauses. Thus, the VPA clause would not be a unique voice construction, namely an inverse. As it turns out, this is not true for Obo Manobo.

Throughout this study, we have been concerned only with the fronting of arguments in a post-verb position, i.e., VAP vs. VPA; however, Obo Manobo also allows arguments to be fronted to a pre-verb position, i.e., AVP and PVA, in which case the fronted argument is always followed by a phonological pause. The two types of fronting are not identical since fronted NPs following the verb are part of the main clause, and those preceding the verb are outside the main clause. On the other hand, Givón (1994a:18) suggests that contrastive-topic, Y-movement, and L-dislocation sentences, i.e., sentence types in which an argument is fronted to a pre-verb position, may be word order inverses when the P argument is fronted. Consequently, it is worth comparing the relative topicality of agents and patients in AVP and PVA clauses to that of agents and patients in VAP and VPA clauses in Obo Manobo.

Of the 359 clauses included in the referential distance and topic persistence measures, the agent or the patient is fronted to a pre-verb position in 52 of them. Table 17 gives the number of pre-verb agents and patients that occur in each clause type.
Table 17. Pre-verb fronted NPs in four clause types in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>Voice construction</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>PAT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAP</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPA</td>
<td>Inverse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detransitive-1</td>
<td>Antipassive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detransitive-2</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the all-fronted-arguments-are-topical hypothesis is true, then we would expect that it will be the more topical referent that is fronted in the pre-verb position for each clause type, just as it is the more topical referent that is fronted in the post-verb position. This is what happens in the detransitive clauses. For the detransitive-2 (passive) clause, the patient is always the fronted NP since agents are obligatorily absent. For the detransitive-1 (antipassive) clause, both the agent and the patient can be fronted to the pre-verb position, but it is nearly always the agent, the topical referent, that is fronted.

The pattern changes, however, when we get to VAP and VPA transitive clauses where both the agent and the patient are topical. For these clause types, both the agent and the patient can be fronted to a pre-verb position; however, for the VAP (active) clause in which the patient is the less topical referent, more than twice as many patients as agents are fronted to the pre-verb position. Similarly, for the VPA (inverse) clause in which the agent is the less topical referent, nearly twice as many agents as patients are fronted to this position.\(^{36}\) This suggests that in Obo Manobo transitive clauses, fronting to a pre-verb position is a means of focusing attention on the less topical referent, although more data are needed to confirm this hypothesis. Taken together, these findings show that contrary to what the all-fronted-NPs hypothesis predicts, fronted NPs are not always the more topical argument.

Thus, in Obo Manobo transitive clauses, different types of fronting are governed by different pragmatic functions. While fronting in the post-verb position is governed by voice function, i.e., topicality, fronting in the pre-verb position is governed by other pragmatic functions. Whether or not this pattern holds true for languages that allow the agent and the patient to be fronted to pre-verb positions within the main clause (as opposed to pre-verb positions outside the main clause) remains to be seen. The point here is that in Obo Manobo, an inverse voice function consistently correlates with the VPA clause and only that clause, verifying that the VPA clause is an inverse construction.

13. Conclusion

Obo Manobo has two types of transitive clause in which the A argument and the P argument differ in word order and in pronoun sets: a VAP clause and a VPA clause. The selection of one clause type over the other is governed by a combined person/topicality hierarchy, a hierarchy similar to those found in traditional inverse

\(^{36}\) The full counts for referential distance and topic persistence for pre-verb fronted agents and patients are given in Appendix 3.
Adopting Givón’s proposal that inverses may be distinguished formally by word order, rather than verb morphology, we have argued that the VPA clause type is a word order inverse. In order to support this claim, we have compared the VPA clause with three other Obo Manobo clause types that also code semantically transitive verbs. Our hypothesis has been that each clause type is a separate voice construction. A range of syntactic, formal, semantic, and functional evidence has been presented to verify that each clause type meets three criteria for voice constructions: 1) each clause type has at least one grammatical relation; 2) each clause type has unique formal coding that distinguishes it from all other clause types; and 3) each clause type consistently codes a unique voice function for the majority of its occurrences in narrative text. The number and identity of grammatical relations in a clause type and the unique voice function associated with that clause type establish the identity of the clause as a particular voice construction.

With respect to the VPA clause, our candidate for a word order inverse, we have shown that the VPA clause has properties similar to traditional inverses: the VPA clause has two grammatical relations, A and P, and so is a transitive clause; it is formally distinguished from other clause types by word order and case-marked pronoun sets; and it codes an inverse voice function for the majority of its occurrences in narrative text. On the basis of these findings, we conclude that the Obo Manobo VPA clause is a word order inverse.

Although the notion of a word order inverse is a relatively new proposal, it provides an account for data that have been largely overlooked in Philippine languages to date, and one supposes in languages in general. A preliminary survey of Philippine languages shows, however, that the VPA word order inverse is not unique to Cebuano and Obo Manobo, but is found in other Central and Southern Philippine languages, including Sarangani Manobo (DuBois 1976), Tagabawa, Matigsalug Manobo, Tagakaulo, Agutaynen, and Kagayanen (Pebley and Brainard 1999). It has also been noted for certain Northern Philippine languages, namely, Butbut Kalinga (Mijares and Brainard 1996), Mayoyao Ifugao (Hodder 1999), and Tuwali Ifugao. For Philippine languages, word order inverses appear to vary along several parameters. For some languages (e.g., Cebuano and Tagakaulo), the VAP active construction and the VPA inverse differ only in word order. For other languages, each word order is associated with a unique case-marking pattern. For some of these languages, only pronouns display unique case marking for each word order (Obo Manobo, Tagabawa, Kagayanen, Agutaynen), but for others, all case-marked nominal forms, i.e., common nouns, personal names, and pronouns, display unique case marking for each word order (Butbut Kalinga and Mayoyao Ifugao). In addition, Philippine inverse languages appear to have undergone different degrees of grammaticalization. In some languages, little grammaticalization has occurred, and a large number of A and P combinations may occur in both a VAP active construction and a VPA inverse. In others, a greater degree of grammaticalization has taken place, and only a few A and P combinations may occur in both voice constructions. At this point, it would be premature to attempt a comprehensive typological survey of the word order inverse in Philippine languages; however, these data suggest directions for further research.

37 Matigsalug Manobo data was supplied by Jeff McGriff, Tagabawa data by Lauretta DuBois, Tagakaulo data by Scott Burton, and Agutaynen data by Steve Quakenbush.
38 Tuwali Ifugao data was supplied by Lou Hohulin.
Appendix 1
Person Combinations for A and P in VAP and VPA Clauses

The following tables include all possible person combinations for A and P in a VAP or a VPA clause. For those combinations that occur in both clause types, the unmarked clause is indicated by a double underline. (A dash indicates combinations which Obo Manobo speakers consider ungrammatical.) Table i gives combinations for A and P when both arguments are personal pronouns.

Table i. Distribution of pronoun combinations for A and P in VAP and VPA clauses in Obo Manobo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>VAP</th>
<th>VPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.IN</td>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.IN</td>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EX</td>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EX</td>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EX</td>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EX</td>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>1PL.EX</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>1PL.EX</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>1PL.IN</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>1PL.EX</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>1PL.IN</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>1PL.EX</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table ii gives combinations for A and P when one or both arguments are full NPs. Full NPs are divided into common nouns (NP) and personal names (name). Person designations with neither ‘NP’ nor ‘name’ following them are pronouns.

**Table ii.** Distribution of pronoun and full NP combinations for A and P in VAP and VPA clauses in Obo Manobo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>VAP</th>
<th>VPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.IN</td>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EX</td>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.IN</td>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EX</td>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>1SG</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>1PL.IN</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>1PL.EX</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>2SG</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>2PL</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>1SG</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>1PL.IN</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>1PL.EX</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>2SG</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>2PL</td>
<td></td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(name)</td>
<td>3(NP)</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Full Counts for Referential Distance and Topic Persistence for Agents and Patients in Four Clause Types

The following are the full counts for measures of referential distance and topic persistence for agents and patients in VAP, VPA, detransitive-1, and detransitive-2 clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text. Table numbers used here are the same as for their summarized counterparts in the body of this paper with the addition of the letter ‘a’ for those tables listed in this appendix. Tables 8a-11a are measures of referential distance; Tables 12a-15a are measures of topic persistence.

Table 8a. Referential distance for VAP clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAP clause</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>PAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9a. Referential distance for VPA clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPA clause</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>PAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10a. Referential distance for detransitive-1 clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detransitive-1 clause</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>PAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11a. Referential distance for detransitive-2 clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detransitive-2 clause</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>PAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12a. Topic persistence for VAP clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAP clause</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>PAT</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13a. Topic persistence for VPA clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPA clause</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>PAT</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14a. Topic persistence for detransitive-1 clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detransitive-1 clause</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th></th>
<th>PAT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15a. Topic persistence for detransitive-2 clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detransitive-2 clause</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th></th>
<th>PAT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3
Referential Distance and Topic Persistence for Agents and Patients Fronted in the Pre-Verb Position

The following tables give the measures of referential distance and topic persistence for agents and patients fronted in the pre-verb position in VAP, VPA, detransitive-1, and detransitive-2 clauses. Percentages are not included since the raw numbers are small. Tables iii-vi are referential distance measures; Tables vii-x are topic persistence measures.

Table \textit{iii}. Referential distance for fronted pre-verb agents and patients in VAP clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAP clause</th>
<th>Pre-verb AG</th>
<th>Pre-verb PAT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table \textit{iv}. Referential distance for fronted pre-verb agents and patients in VPA clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPA clause</th>
<th>Pre-verb AG</th>
<th>Pre-verb PAT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table v. Referential distance for fronted pre-verb agents and patients in detransitive-1 clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detransitive-1 clause</th>
<th>Pre-verb AG</th>
<th>Pre-verb PAT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table vi. Referential distance for fronted pre-verb agents and patients in detransitive-2 clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detransitive-2 clause</th>
<th>Pre-verb AG</th>
<th>Pre-verb PAT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table vii. Topic persistence for fronted pre-verb agents and patients in VAP clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAP clause</th>
<th>Pre-verb AG</th>
<th>Pre-verb PAT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table viii. Topic persistence for fronted pre-verb agents and patients in VPA clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VPA clause</th>
<th>Pre-verb AG</th>
<th>Pre-verb PAT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table ix.** Topic persistence for fronted pre-verb agents and patients in detransitive-1 clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detransitive-1 clause</th>
<th>Pre-verb AG</th>
<th>Pre-verb PAT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table x.** Topic persistence for fronted pre-verb agents and patients in detransitive-2 clauses in Obo Manobo narrative text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detransitive-2 clause</th>
<th>Pre-verb AG</th>
<th>Pre-verb PAT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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On the Stative Predicate: 
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1. Introduction

In Tagalog, a sentence with a predicate adjective would be like the following:

(1)  
\[ \text{Ma-} \text{ganda si Maria.} \]

STATIVE-beauty NOM Maria

‘Maria is beautiful.’

To express possession, we use a construction such as:

(2)  
\[ \text{May} \ \text{pera ang bata.} \]

EXISTENTIAL money NOM child

‘The child has money.’

To express existence in a location, we use the following construction:

(3)  
\[ \text{May} \ \text{tao sa bahay.} \]

EXISTENTIAL person LOC house

‘There is someone in the house.’

Put together like this, the structural parallelism of the three constructions is quite apparent.

(4)  
\[ \text{Stative/Existential Marker + Existent + Location} \]

\[ \text{ma- ganda si Maria} \]

\[ \text{may pera ang bata} \]

\[ \text{may tao sa bahay} \]

The implicative relation between EXISTENCE, BEING, AND STATE SHOULD BE OBVIOUS. The fact that \textit{ma-} is a prefix and \textit{may} is an independent word (particle) does not negate their common syntactic-semantic function.

---

1 In 1977, Lawrence Reid organized an Austronesian Symposium to which he had invited me to be a part of. It was held at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, in conjunction with the Linguistic Society of America Summer Linguistics Institute. This article grew out of that presentation.

2 The form \textit{si} is the nominative marker for personal proper names.

3 This was recently argued in an email discussion of ‘being’ and ‘existence’ in austronesian@yahoogroups.com led by Judd Evans in 2001.
However, in the grammars known to me, these constructions are not thus juxtaposed. Rather, they have been analyzed and described as separate and different predication types. The first is considered a NONVERBAL clause with a PREDICATE ADJECTIVE. The second, known as “the possessive”, has been considered a VERBAL clause with an UNINFLECTABLE verb, presumably due to its translation as ‘the child HAS money.’ The third, known as “the existential”, has been classified as a “SUBJECTLESS construction” with may supposedly functioning also as an UNINFLECTABLE VERB meaning ‘there is’.

There has generally been consensus as to what ma- words do: they form “adjectives” and “adverbs” as well as “stative verbs”, although just what ma-words really ARE has not been sufficiently nor cogently addressed. With may constructions the analyses have neither been unanimous nor clear. For example, Bloomfield (1933) referred to may as an “exocentric attributive” particle; Lopez (1941) referred to may and its negative counterpart wala as “real particles”, and Santos (1940) likens may to ay which he considers a RELATOR, verb-like but uninflectable. Ramos and De Guzman (1971) consider may an “existential particle”.

Schachter (1977:289, footnote) reveals his point of view on the matter as follows:

> According to Clark’s Table 3 (p.12), twenty-four of thirty-one languages use different structures for locatives and existentials. Moreover, one of the seven languages Clark lists as using the SAME structure for locatives and existentials is Tagalog, and this is, as we shall see, incorrect.

I beg to differ, however, from Schachter’s analysis, as well as similar others, of these Tagalog constructions. Most previous analyses have extrapolated from English grammar. Hence:

1. The verb ‘to be’ had been brought into the Tagalog where it does not exist.
2. Due to its VERBAL MEANING, ma- + process word has been viewed as syntactically different from ma- + material object/reified concept; the former is viewed as a verbal predicate and the latter as a nonverbal predicate adjective/adverb.
3. The ang-NP had been equated with subject, leading to the perception of the existential as a “SUBJECTLESS” construction; and this being the case, it is viewed as syntactically different from the possessive and the “stative verb”, both of which have the “topic/subject ang-NP”.
4. may is treated as a verb meaning ‘to have’ or ‘there is’, thus resulting in may predications appearing to be syntactically verbal.

TRANSLATION into their English equivalents in which the English verbs ‘to be’ and ‘to have’ are used and the consequent syntactic analyses, based on what the constituents of the English constructions are, have been misleading. Furthermore, the failure to take

---

4 Carl Rubino (pers. comm.) considers may a proclitic since it comes before the existent; he also informs me that Nikolaus Himmelmann defines may as an “existential modifier”. Obviously “proclitic” refers to morphological form, while “existential modifier” refers to syntactic-semantic function.

5 Due to limitations of space, certain “stative verbs” such as the so-called “abilitative verb” with ma- (+ ka-) will be discussed only enough to demonstrate that they show identical semantic properties and syntactic structure as the other existential constructs.

6 Clark (1970) did a study of existential constructions in 31 languages.
certain details of Tagalog MORPHOLOGY into account, ON ITS OWN TERMS, appear to have obscured the STRUCTURAL ‘SAMENESS’ of all the three Tagalog existential constructions given above. Thus, if we set these within the framework of their basic UNDERLYING semantics as REALIZED in basic Tagalog PREDICATION SYNTAX, it will become clear that they belong to the SAME PARADIGM.

This paper aims to point out certain syntactic and semantic characteristics of the predicate phrase with ma-words and may-phrases and the sort of sentence constructions that they enter into. However, due to space limitations and other constraints, the semantics/pragmatics will only be indicated rather than addressed in detail. It will also be made clear through the illustrative examples of stative predications that ma-words and may-phrases are NOT SYNTACTICALLY VERBAL predicates. Even when the referent of the root word that is prefixed by ma- happens to be a PROCESS, i.e., VERBAL IN MEANING, the resulting predicate is NOT SYNTACTICALLY VERBAL. However, since the notion of PROCESS implies tense and aspect, ma- stative predicates may also inflect for aspect (ma- > na-) or in the case of may stative predicates (i.e., “existential” constructions ‘there is/are’, marked by suppletion). These and other observations lead to the perception of the possessive, existential, qualitative-modifier, and the so-called “stative verb” and “abilitative verb” constructions in Tagalog as having the SAME BASIC SYNTACTIC STRUCTURE and belonging to the SAME SYNTACTICO-SEMANTIC COMPLEX.

2. Tagalog Predication Syntax

The attempt to discuss and argue that the syntactic structure of the stative predicate in isolation is fraught with difficulty, and difficult questions will surely arise. In order to provide some semblance of a syntactic-contextual framework that should illuminate the description of the syntactic structure of the stative predicate, a very brief sketch of Tagalog basic predication syntax is offered at this point.

Without going into detail, I would like to indicate, as other Philippine and Western Austronesian scholars and I have observed or argued elsewhere, that TAGALOG BASIC PREDICATION IS SYNTACTICALLY NOMINAL. This is to say that even SEMANTICALLY VERBAL PREDICATIONS are SYNTACTICALLY NOMINAL. In view of this, Tagalog basic predication syntax appears to be ATTRIBUTIVE rather than predicative in character.

The following sentences clearly illustrate such a characterization of the syntax of the BASIC SENTENCE TYPES of Tagalog:

(5) Titser ang babae.  
   teacher NOM woman  
   ‘The woman (is a) teacher.’

(6) Maganda ang babae.  
   beautiful NOM woman  
   ‘The woman (is) beautiful.’

---

7 This will be discussed and illustrated below.
8 In Naylor (1999, 2001, 2002); Shkarban (1995); Alieva (1978, 1980); Lopez (1928, 1941)
9 Naylor (1976, 1979) discusses the concept of SYNTACTIC ATTRIBUTE/ATTRIBUTION and Naylor (1999, 2001) deals with “Nominal Syntax in Verbal Predications”. Syntactic attribution is comparable to Martinet’s theory of predicate modification referred to as “PREMIER MODIFIANT, etc.” (C. Tchekoff, pers. comm.). Laurie Reid (pers. comm.) states that the syntactic attribute constituent COMES AFTER THE ATTRIBUTE [as the PREMIER MODIFIANT does].
(7) Umalis ang babae.
    left NOM woman

‘The woman left.’

Note that PREDICATE NOUN, PREDICATE ADJECTIVE, and SEMANTICALLY VERBAL predicate are not SYNTAGMATICALLY differentiated; i.e., regardless of the referential meaning of the predicate word, be it NOMINA REI or NOMINA ACTIONIS.

Tagalog basic sentence structure has been described as BIPARTITE, consisting of a “comment” and a “topic” constituent (Ramos and De Guzman 1971) or like an EQUATION (Schachter and Otanes 1972). Naylor (1973, 1975) subscribes to the same bipartite equational structure which fits in with the description of basic Tagalog predication syntax as attributive.

In view of this, Tagalog does not need to use a copula or “copulative verb” whenever the sentence has a predicate noun or a predicate adjective, as the way it does in English and other European languages. Predication by attribution is realized by simple juxtaposition — PARATAXIS.10

As is widely known, Tagalog is a PREDICATE-FIRST language or in Greenbergian terminology, a V-first language. Thus, sentences (5)–(7), with the predicate in the initial position, are examples of the UNMARKED order of clause/sentence constituents.

However, when the marked order is used, with the constituents in the reverse order, the particle ay — a discourse/relation marker in Tagalog,11 is inserted.12 In colloquial speech, instead of ay, a pause is usually used.13

Thus, one can see examples, such as Ang babae ay titser or Ang babae/titser. It is very obvious that due to its occurrence between the topic and the predicate, ay has been thought to be a copula like the English copula ‘is’.

---

10 There has been lively discussion on the role of the VERB ‘to be’ in English, Spanish, and French, and the existential constructions of Tagalog and Anutan (e.g., Evans, Feinberg, and Potet, email 2001). Is it the quintessential vehicle for the expression of existence and is it in fact a verb at all? It was brought out that Tagalog, which has no copula or copulative verb at all, demonstrates that the existential can be expressed without it.

11 The order of “topic/(subject) + predicate” was deemed to be the unmarked order with ay as the copulative verb, presumably originally modeled after Spanish sentence syntax and later after English sentence syntax. To this day, many Tagalog speakers continue to believe that “Tagalog is just like English”. Filipinos were taught in school that, as conventional wisdom had it, ay is a copulative verb — just as in Spanish and English. Yet in his Balartla ‘Grammar’, written in Tagalog, Santos (1940) had pointed out that ay was NOT, strictly speaking, a real verb, but a RELATION MARKER (which included the copulative function). A. Buenaventura (1967) argued that it was NOT a copula; it was an INVERSION MARKER. This analysis has been widely held since among linguists. Potet (pers. comm.) calls it an ANTEPOSER. However, I have argued in print and in unpublished presentations that ay is NOT an inversion marker or an anteposer either; it is a RELATION MARKER, a DISCOURSE NEXUS MARKER.

12 This is demonstrated by the common occurrence of ay in non-inverted order sentences; e.g., Mabuti pa’y umalis tayo nang maaga bukas ‘Better yet that we leave early tomorrow’ to which the interlocutor might reply Ay sinabi mo ‘You said it’. As I recalled that speakers of Cavite Tagalog can respond to the previous discourse with something like Ay bakit naman nagkaganoon ‘(well) why did it end up like that?’ or Ay kung gay’on, huwag na lang! ‘(well) if that is so, better not’. One is even led to wonder if the ubiquitous discourse marker E developed phonetically, [AI > E], from ay. (To my knowledge, hardly any analysis of the discourse markers E, A, and O has been done to date.)

13 Certain dialects of Tagalog, e.g., the Cavite and Bulacan dialects of Tagalog use the ay construction with greater frequency. Idiolectal variation within dialects can also be observed.
3. The Stative Predicate: *Ma-* vs. *May*

It is generally believed that *ma-* is a PA stative prefix;\(^\text{14}\) the particle *may* appears to consist of *ma-* + *i* (the PA locative marker). In the literature on existentials (e.g., Clark 1970, Kuno 1971), it has been shown that there is an entailment relationship between locatives and existentials.

In a nutshell, while both *ma-* and *may* mark existence, *ma-* codes A STATE OF BEING that results from and is defined by the EXISTENCE of the EXISTENT (the referent of the root word to which it is attached) IN A LOCUS (animate or inanimate). *May* directly marks a STATE OF EXISTENCE,\(^\text{15}\) defined by the EXISTENT (the referent of the word or phrase that it is in construction with) IN A LOCUS (animate or inanimate). When BOTH TYPES OF STATIVE PREDICATES are pared down to their least common denominator, we have:

\textit{Exists X} = ‘existent’ in \textit{Y} = ‘locus’.

Certain semantic/pragmatic distinctions between *ma-* versus *may* stative predicates do arise, as illustrated in the following examples:

\begin{enumerate}[\itemindent=1em]
\item \textit{Mabulaklak ang puno.}
\textit{exist}.flower \textit{NOM} tree
\‘The tree (is) flowery/full of flowers.’
\item \textit{May bulaklak ang puno.}\(^\text{16}\)
\textit{exist-there} flower(s) \textit{NOM} tree
\‘The tree has (a) flower(s).’
\item \textit{May bulaklak sa puno.}
\textit{exist-there} flower(s) \textit{DAT/LOC} tree
\‘There is/are flower(s) on the tree.’
\item \textit{Mayaman ang babae.}
wealthy \textit{NOM} woman
\‘The woman (is) wealthy.’
\item \textit{May yaman ang babae.}
\textit{exists-there} wealth \textit{NOM} woman
\‘The woman has wealth.’
\end{enumerate}

\(^\text{14}\) Wouk (pers. comm.) remarked that “PA *ma-*” seems to sometimes or often disappear with [the development] of the focus system. This has not happened in Tagalog where the full-fledged focus system has continued to coexist with the stative predicate system.

\(^\text{15}\) It appears that THE SEMANTICS OF HAVING (possession), “state of existence” in a specified location that *may* codes might imply moveability or change of location from which attribution of an alienable property might be inferred; whereas the SEMANTICS OF BEING (qualification), “state of being” that *ma-* codes which implies non-moveability would seem to code attribution of an inalienable property. Consider and compare sentences (8) and (9) with (11) and (12). Although these sentences seem to amply illustrate the observation just made, further research on this topic is needed.

\(^\text{16}\) Tagalog does not usually mark number. Whether a word is singular or plural is deducible from the context. However, when for pragmatic reasons, plurality must be specified, the plural-marking particle *manga* (written as *mga*) is used before the word to mark plurality.
May (ka-)yaman(-an) sa babae.
exists-there wealth DAT/LOC woman
‘There is wealth in the woman.’

In (8) and (11), what the stative predicate with *ma*- says about the target of predication is that the tree/woman is in a state of being, defined or modified by the existence of flowers/wealth WITHIN them. On the other hand, in (9)/(12) and (10)/(13) what the stative predicate with *may* says about the target of predication is that ‘there exist flowers/wealth in the tree/woman’, as possessor in (9)/(12) but as location in (10)/(13).

3.1 *Ma*-stative predicates

Words prefixed with *ma*- are associated with MODIFIERS (adjectives and adverbs) and what is generally referred to as “STATIVE VERBS”. In combination with the affix *ka* to form *maka-*, *ma*- stative predicates are similarly viewed as verbal predicates and referred to as “abilitative verbs”.

As pointed out earlier, *ma*- codes A STATE OF BEING, defined by the referent of the root word (the EXISTENT) that it is prefixed to and arrived at by the EXISTENCE OF THE EXISTENT in the LOCUS (the TARGET OF PREDICATION). The target of predication UNDERGOES THE STATE OF BEING referred to by the *ma*-stative predicate; it is therefore in the semantic case role of UNDERGOER.

The referent of the root word (the existent) may be: a MATERIAL OBJECT or a REIFIED CONCEPT (quality or process). Thus, we have:

(14) *ma-* + material object:

- *ma-* + tinik ‘thorn/fishbone’ > matinik ‘thorny/bony’
- *ma-* + damo ‘grass’ > madamo ‘grassy’

(15) *ma-* + reified concept (quality)

- *ma-* + ganda ‘beauty’ > maganda ‘beautiful’
- *ma-* + bagal ‘slowness’ > mabagal ‘slow/slowly’

(16) *ma* + reified concept (process)

a. *ma-* + tulog ‘sleep’ > matulog ‘be asleep’
- *ma-* + kita ‘see’ > makita ‘be visible’
- *ma-* + tapos ‘finish’ > matapos ‘be finishable’ (or ‘be able to finish’)
- *ma-* + kain ‘eat’ > makain ‘be edible/eatable (or ‘be able to eat’)

Since *may* predicates code possession or location that carries the implication of potential moveability, this distinction suggests that *may* marks attribution of an alienable property while *ma*- marks attribution of an inalienable property. At this point, however, this suggestion requires further exploration.

Grant (1999) asserts that “adjectives can be construed as a kind of stative verb”. Read in context, it is clear that his use of “verb” is interpretable as “predicate”.

---

17 Since *may* predicates code possession or location that carries the implication of potential moveability, this distinction suggests that *may* marks attribution of an alienable property while *ma*- marks attribution of an inalienable property. At this point, however, this suggestion requires further exploration.

18 Grant (1999) asserts that “adjectives can be construed as a kind of stative verb”. Read in context, it is clear that his use of “verb” is interpretable as “predicate”.
b. \textit{ma-} + \textit{ka-} (inchoative) + reified concept (process)\newline
\textit{ma-} + \textit{ka-} + \textit{tulog} > \textit{makatulog} ‘be able to sleep’\newline
\textit{ma-} + \textit{ka-} + \textit{kita} > \textit{makakita} ‘be able to see’\newline
\textit{ma-} + \textit{ka-} + \textit{tapos} > \textit{makatapos} ‘be able to finish’\newline
\textit{ma-} + \textit{ka-} + \textit{kain} > \textit{makakain} ‘be able to eat’

The following examples will illustrate these different types of \textit{ma-} stative predicates.

\begin{itemize}
\item[17] \textit{Ma-} + material object
\item[a.] Matinik \textit{ang} \textit{isda}.
   bony \textit{NOM} fish
   ‘exists bones in fish’
   (‘The fish is bony.’)
\item[b.] Madamo \textit{ang} \textit{parke}.
   grassy \textit{NOM} park
   ‘exists grass in park’
   (‘The park is grassy.’)
\end{itemize}

In sentence (18a), \textit{maganda} functions as a stative predicate and the construction is generally known in the literature as of the predicate adjective sentence type. In sentence (18b), however, \textit{mabagal} ‘slow/slowly’ is \textit{not} functioning as a stative predicate but as modifier of \textit{lumakad} ‘walk/walked’.

\begin{itemize}
\item[18] \textit{Ma-} + reified concept (quality)
\item[a.] Maganda \textit{ang} \textit{bahay}.
   STATE-beauty \textit{NOM} house
   ‘state-beauty/beauty-exists-in house’
   (‘The house is beautiful.’)
\item[b.] Mabagal \textit{lumakad} \textit{ang} \textit{babae}.
   STATE-slow \textit{walk} \textit{NOM} woman
   ‘state-slow/slowness-exists-in walk woman’
   (‘The woman walks slowly.’)
\end{itemize}

3.1.1 \textit{Ma-} + reified concept (process)

The following \textit{ma-}words are labeled STATIVE VERBS in the literature and accordingly treated and taught as SYNTACTICALLY VERBAL PREDICATES. While the English translations are verbal predications, it must be borne in mind that the Tagalog sentences are not. Note the UNDERLYING SEMANTIC and MORPHOSYNTACTIC parallelism that hold between the “predicate adjectives” given above and the “stative verbs” given below:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{ma-} + \textit{tulog} ‘state of being, defined by sleep’ (‘to sleep’)\newline
\item \textit{ma-} + \textit{gutom} ‘state of being, defined by hunger’ (‘to get hungry’)\newline
\item \textit{ma-} + \textit{takot} ‘state of being, defined by fear’ (‘to be afraid’)\newline
\end{itemize}

These stative predicates are “centripetal” (“intransitive” in English) and do not involve other argument NPs in the process.
Furthermore, ‘to sleep’, ‘to get hungry’, and ‘to be afraid’ are not volitional acts and this is revealed in Tagalog literal rendition as ‘to be in the state of being asleep/hungry/afraid’. As we shall see below, this semantic property of the stative predicate gives rise to rhetorical functions that serve sociocultural modes of communication exceptionally well.

Other stative predicates defined by process words do involve other arguments; i.e., the process is “centrifugal” (“transitive” in English grammar). For example:

*ma- + kita*  ‘state of being, defined by visibility (‘to see’)  
*ma- + dinig*  ‘state of being, defined by audibility (‘to hear’)  

‘To see (something)’ is realized in Tagalog by the string of words that actually mean ‘(something) is “see-able”, i.e., in a visible state’. The same goes for ‘to hear (something)’ is realized in Tagalog as ‘(something) is “hear-able”/in an audible state’.

Similarly, we have:

*ma- + gawa*  ‘state of being doable’ (‘to be able to make/do [something]’)  
*ma- + tapos*  ‘state of being finishable’ (‘to be able to finish [something]’)  
*ma- + basa*  ‘state of being readable’ (‘to be able to read [something]’)  
*ma- + kain*  ‘state of being edible’ (‘to be able to eat [something]’)  

Stative predicates defined by *process* words, as to be expected, are subject to *aspectual* distinctions. The examples of stative predicates given thus far have been in the IRREALIS (not begun) INFINITIVE aspect. It is, however, the REALIS aspect forms, the ONGOING and the COMPLETIVE, that occur most often in usage.

These REALIS aspect forms are coded by the replacement of the IRREALIS marker /m/ in *ma-* with the REALIS marker /n/, as in:

*matulog*  >  *natutulog, natulog*  
*magutom*  >  *nagugutom, nagutom*  
*makita*  >  *nakikita, nakita*  
*marinig*  >  *narinig, marinig*  
*maubos*  >  *nauubos, naubos*  
*mabasa*  >  *nababasa, nabasa*

The following examples illustrate this type of stative predicate:

(19)  

Natulog ang babae.  
**COMPL.STATE**.sleep **NOM** woman  
‘state of sleep (perf) woman’  
(‘The woman slept.’)

(20)  

Nagutom ang babae.  
**COMPL.STATE**.hunger **NOM** woman  
‘state (perf) of hunger woman’  
(‘The woman got hungry.’)
STATIVE PREDICATE

(21) Nakita n(an)g bata ang babae.\textsuperscript{21} COMPL.STATE.see GEN/ATTR child NOM woman

‘visible of/to child (perf) woman’

(‘The child saw the woman.’)

(22) Narinig n(an)g bata ang babae. COMPL.STATE.hear GEN/ATTR child NOM woman

‘audible of/to child (perf) woman’

(‘The child heard the woman.’)

(23) Nainom n(an)g bata ang gamot. COMPL.STATE.drink GEN/ATTR child NOM medicine

‘drinkable of/to child (perf) medicine’

(‘The child drank the medicine.’)

(24) Nabali n(an)g bata ang sanga. COMPL.STATE.break GEN/ATTR child NOM branch

‘breakable of/to child (perf) branch’

(‘The child broke the branch.’)

Stative predicates such as these may also be used with the locative focus suffix -(h)an depending on whether the root word is semantically compatible with the locative focus,\textsuperscript{22} as in (25)–(27).

(25) Nainum an n(an)g bata ang bote. COMPL.STATE.drink.LOC GEN/ATTR child NOM bottle

‘drinkable-from of/to child (perf) bottle’

(26) Nabalian n(an)g bata ang sanga. COMPL.STATE.break.LOC GEN/ATTR child NOM branch

‘breakable-off of/to child (perf) branch’

(27) Nasarapan n(an)g bata ang pansit. COMPL.STATE.delicious.LOC GEN/ATTR child NOM pansit

‘delicious-to of/to child (perf) pansit’

Presenting information that is potentially damaging or embarrassing for the undergoer NP as a process couched in stative-predicate form, i.e., as a RESULTANT STATE (rather than as a deliberate act on someone else’s part) provides the means for not casting any aspersions on anyone. The stative predicate is thus generally used to inform of an adverse state of affairs that has BEFALLEN the undergoer NP and presents the undergoer as victim of circumstances. The following examples clearly demonstrate such a rhetorical/pragmatic function of the stative predicate.

\textsuperscript{21} The orthographic tradition has the genitive particle nang written as ng.

\textsuperscript{22} It is not to be confused with the (semantically) adversative stative predicate.
(28) **Natanggal ang babae.**  
COMPL.STATE.remove NOM woman  
‘state-removed (perf) woman’  
(‘The woman was laid off (not fired).’)

(29) **Natifus ang babae.**  
COMPL.STATE.typhoid NOM woman  
‘state-typhoid (perf) woman’  
(‘The woman got typhoid.’)

It is interesting to note that the locative focus is explicitly marked in sentences (30) and (31).

(30) **Namatayan ang pamilya.**  
COMPL.STATE.death.LOC NOM family  
‘state-death on (perf) family’  
(‘There was a death in the family.’)

(31) **Nasunugan ang pamilya.**  
COMPL.STATE.fire.LOC NOM family  
‘state-fire on (perf) family’  
(‘The family had a fire.’)

As previously mentioned, the semantics/pragmatics of the notion of STATE appears to have given rise to implications of NONVOLITIONAL/INVOLUNTARY/ACCIDENTAL happenings. At the same time, the semantic component of “DO-ABILITY” has given rise to implications of ABILITY to bring about the resultant state of the process named by the root word. As a result, many of these stative predicates could indicate either one of the following two things: (a) The actor was ABLE to accomplish the process named by the stative predicate; (b) The actor UNINTENTIONALLY accomplished the process named by the stative predicate. For example, **nakita** [na.kí.ta] can mean ‘HAPPENED to see’ or ‘was able to see’.23 Similarly, **naring** [na.ri.níɡ] means ‘HAPPENED to hear’ or ‘was able to hear’; **nainom** [na:i.nóːm] means ‘ACCIDENTALLY drank’ or ‘was able to drink’; **nabali** [na:bá.li?] means ‘ACCIDENTALLY broken’ or ‘was able to break’.24

The semantic component of state of “DO-ABILITY” is made explicit by the addition of the affix **ka-** to the stative prefix **ma-** to form the “abilitative” prefix **maka-** in what is known as “abilitative verbs” in Tagalog (e.g., **makatulog, makakita, makakain, makainom, makaalis, makalakad, etc.**).25 The affix **ka** introduces an INCHOATIVE component into the semantic complex of this variety of stative predicate. Thus the closest translation of **makatulog**, for example, is ‘to COME TO BE ABLE to sleep’. The fact that the imperative mode is ruled out for **maka-** predicates indicates that they are in fact

---

23 In some dialects, this meaning is marked by vowel lengthening in **na-** [na:].
24 As with **nakita**, some dialects mark “involuntary” with vowel lengthening in **na-** [na:].
25 Ramos and De Guzman (1971: 583) state that “Unlike the dynamic mag-/um- forms, the **maka-**/**makapag**- forms indicate a POTENTIALITY or STATE of readiness.” They nonetheless consider **maka-**/**makapag**- predicates as verbs.
inchoative. The command/request "Makatulog ka" is unacceptable, but "Matulog ka" ‘Go to sleep’ is.\(^{26}\)

(32) **Nakatulog** ang bata.
    COMPL-STAT-INCHO-ABIL-sleep NOM child.
    ‘state-came-to-be-able-sleep (perf) child’
    (‘The child fell asleep.’)

(33) **Nakakita** n(an)g pera ang bata.
    COMPL-STAT-ABIL-see GEN money NOM child
    ‘state-came-to-be-able-find (perf) money’
    (‘The child found money.’)

The lengthening of the vowel of *na-* or *ka-* in these stative predicates also marks the meaning of NONVOLITIONAL, INVOLUNTARY, ACCIDENTAL processes. Thus, **nakatulog** [na:katú.log] means ‘fell asleep without meaning to’. Similarly, **nakakita** [na:ka.ki.ta]/[na.ka.kí.ta] means ‘found money by chance’.

The use of the “imperfective” form (REALIS, ONGOING aspect) of the above maka-stative predicates expresses ongoing/HABITUAL ability to undergo the process named by the stative predicate, as in (34) and (35).

(34) **Nakakatulog** sa kama ang bata.
    ONGOING-STAT-ABIL-sleep in bed NOM child
    ‘ongoing-stat-abil-sleep in bed child’
    (‘The child is usually able to sleep on the bed.’)

(35) **Nakakakita** n(an)g pera ang bata.
    ONGOING-STAT-ABIL-see GEN-ATTR money NOM child
    ‘ongoing-stat-abil-find money child’
    (‘The child is usually able to find money by chance.’)

### 3.2 May static predicates

Since *may* and its alternative existential marker *mayroon/meron* serve to express the equivalent of English ‘to have’ and the existential phrase ‘there + is’ in Tagalog, it has generally been described and classified as a verbal predicate. The *may* constructions given below will show why such an analysis is not appropriate for the Tagalog stative predicate structure: ‘X is in a state of existence in locus Y’.

#### 3.2.1 May vs. mayroon / meron

It should be borne in mind that *may* and *mayroon* do not belong to the same morphological category in Tagalog. *May* (often pronounced [mê]) is a particle while

\(^{26}\) The occurrence of the affix *ka* in combination with *ma-, mag-, pag-, i-,* etc., appears to imbue the word with INCHOATIVE meaning; e.g., *maka-* ‘to come to be able to’, *magkaroan* is ‘to come to have/to acquire’, *pagkatao* ‘personhood’/dignity/humanity. The fact that maka-predicates cannot be made imperative shows its underlying inchoative meaning; i.e., we cannot command someone to BECOME X (except perhaps on stage). However, as a prefix by itself, *ka-* imbues the word with the idea of “co-______”/reciprocity (e.g., *kalaro* ‘playmate’, *kagailit* ‘enemy’, *kaibigan* ‘friend’).
mayroon is a full word. This means that may can not stand alone and may not be used in isolation, whereas mayroon can do so and it may be used in isolation.

The full word mayroon (may + doon27 'there') and its colloquial form meron may be used in all contexts while the use of the particle may is subject to certain restrictions.

The particle may may only be used when it is immediately followed by a full word (e.g., noun, possessive pronoun, verbal word, modifier, etc.).28

(36)  May pera ang bata.  
STAT-LOC money NOM child 
'exist-there money child' 
('The child has money. ')

(37)  May kanyang sarili ang bata 
STAT-LOC his own NOM child 
'exist-there his (own) child' 
('The child has his own. ')

(38)  May biniling laruan ang bata. 
STAT-LOC bought toy NOM child 
'exist-there bought toy child' 
('The child has a bought toy. ')

(39)  May malaking baril-barilan ang bata. 
STAT-LOC big-LKR/ATTR toy-gun NOM child 
'exist-there big toy gun child' 
('The child has a big toy gun. ')

Whenever another particle or word comes between may and the existent word, mayroon must be used. This happens when the IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING word is a pronoun,29 a particle such as the interrogative marker ba, na ‘already/now’, or a modal such as yata ‘looks like/seems’.

Both mayroon and meron require the use of the “linker” (attributive marker) na. After a vowel or /n/, na changes to the clitic -ng which is attached to the preceding word:

mayroon/meron + na + pera > mayroong/merong pera 
‘has/there is money’

Whenever a word or particle comes between mayroon/meron and the existent word, the clitic =ng (< na) is attached to such a word or particle, as in (40)–(43).

27 It is to be noted that may + doon results in a double locative.
28 Santos (1940:248–9) lists the pluralizer particle manga (written mga) and the locative marker sa- that is used as an adjectivizer prefix among the words that can be used with may. Although they are written as separate words, they and the word preceded by them form a single lexicosemantic entity. This would therefore invalidate their inclusion in the list; they simply belong to the category of FULL WORD (e.g., noun, modifier, etc.).
29 Tagalog pronouns generally show clitic tendencies. When they do not occur in isolation, they immediately follow the predicate word. For example, *Umalis nang maaga ako > Umalis ako nang maaga ‘I left early’.
(40) Mayroon siyang baril.
   (< may baril siya.)
   ‘S/he has a gun.’

(41) Mayroon bang baril ang titser?
   (< may baril ba ang titser?)
   ‘Does the teacher have a gun?’

(42) Mayroon nang baril ang titser.
   (< may baril na ang titser.)
   ‘The teacher already has a gun.’

(43) Mayroon yatang baril ang titser.
   (< may baril yata ang titser.)
   ‘I wonder if the teacher has a gun.’

Yet another instance that the full word mayroon/meron must be used is when it is used in isolation as in a one-word answer to a question, as in (44) and (45).

(44) Q: May pera ba ang bata?
   ‘Does the child have money?’
   A: Oo, mayroon.
   ‘Yes, s/he does.’

(45) Q: May bulaklak ba sa hardin?
   ‘Are there flowers in the garden?’
   A: Oo, mayroon.
   ‘Yes, there are.’

When the quantifier marami ‘many/lots of’ is used to modify the existent word, may or mayroon/meron is usually dropped. Thus, instead of *May/mayroong/merong maraming bulaklak sa hardin, the correct form is as follows.

(46) Maraming bulaklak sa hardin.
   EXIST-many-LKR/ATTR flower(s) LOC garden
   ‘exist-many flowers in garden’
   ‘There are lots of flowers in the garden.’

However, it appears that in semantically possessive sentences may is often retained. Thus, the following sentence is quite acceptable:

As pointed out earlier, something similar happens with mabulaklak ‘full of/has lots of flowers’. Instead of saying Maraming bulaklak ang sampaguita ‘The sampaguita plant has lots of flowers’, one can say Mabulaklak ang sampaguita.
3.3 May existential sentences

The English existential sentence ‘There is X in Y’ is rendered in Tagalog as the existential construction: may + X + locative marker + Y.

Sentences (36)–(44) can be transformed to existential sentences simply by replacing the nominative marker ang of the target of predication/topic NP with the LOCATIVE MARKER sa. Thus, sentence (36) would be:

May pera ang bata.
May pera sa bata.

‘The child has money.’ / ‘There is money with/on/in the child.’

Sentences (38)–(43) can be similarly transformed from semantically possessive to locative existential sentences. It should be borne in mind that the lexical-semantic contrast between nominative and locative case marking is irrelevant to the function of TARGET OF PREDICATION and the semantic case role of UNDERGOER.

3.3.1 May and nasa

The discussion of constructions with may and nasa have usually taken the point of view that they do NOT belong to the same paradigm. Again, this appears to stem from the English translations. Note that the morphosemantics reveals aspectual distinction within the same paradigm:

ma- (irrealis/imperfective) + -i (locative)
na- (realis/perfective) + sa (locative)

The examples usually worked over are:

(48) May libro sa mesa.
STATE-LOC book LOC table
‘exist-there book on table’
(‘On the table there is a book.’)

(49) Nasa mesa ang libro.
STATE-COMPL-LOC table NOM book
‘exist-there table (perf) book’
(‘The book is on the table.’)

In sentence (48) the target of predication is mesa ‘table’, while in sentence (49) the target of predication is libro ‘book’. The fact that mesa is locative and libro is nominative is immaterial to the syntactic structure of the stative predication. As regards the morphosemantics, there appears to be correlation between PERFECTIVITY and DEFINITENESS (Wierbiczka 1972).
3.3.2 *May and wala*

How can *may* and *wala* belong to the same paradigm? Whenever this question has been raised, the answer has been “No, they can’t; they behave differently morphosyntactically” — so the conventional wisdom goes.

However, morphologically, the opposite of *wala* is not *may*; it is *mayroon*. As pointed out earlier, *may* is a particle, while *wala* and *mayroon* are full words. Morphosyntactic differences can be expected to ensue from the difference in category membership between *may* and *wala* but not between *mayroon* and *wala*. *Wala* follows the same rules outlined above for *mayroon*.

**SEMANTICALLY**, however, *wala* ‘nothing(less)’ is in fact the opposite of *may* ‘state/existence’.

4. Coda

The differences of morphological form, “meaning”, and “part of speech” category have obscured the underlying syntactic structure that both *ma*-words and *may* phrases are stative predicates.

The stative prefix *ma-* marks a STATE OF BEING, defined by the EXISTENT (the referent of the root word that it is attached to) and *may* marks a STATE OF EXISTENCE, defined by the EXISTENT (the referent of the root word that it is in construction with — IN A LOCUS, animate or inanimate). As we may have seen from the illustrative sentences given above, however, it is clear that when both these stative predicates are pared down to their least common denominator, we have the basic syntactic structure:

**Existential marker + X = Existent + Y = Locus**

Existence as extralinguistic reality may be perceived as QUALIFICATION in its various forms, POSSESSION, or STATEMENT OF EXISTENCE IN A GIVEN LOCATION.

Presenting an event as a state rather than as an act absolves the participants of any blame or potentially damaging aspersions. The target of predication or the topic NP of the *ma-/may* stative predicate is in the semantic case role of UNDERGOER, not agents, even in process-word predicates. These rhetorical/pragmatic functions are at the heart of stative vs. narrative/dynamic predication. It is remarkable how well certain syntactic constructs of a language can provide the means to articulate certain matters of the basic cultural ethic of its speakers.
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