

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University · Loyola Heights, Quezon City · 1108 Philippines

Cebuano Bisaya: Analysis of the Syntax and the System of Affixes in the Bisaya' Language from Cebu

Review Author: Howard P. McKaughan

Philippine Studies vol. 8, no. 3 (1960): 648—655

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 30 13:30:20 2008

come to know to what extent and how well the main emphasis of the PACD Program — “the promotion of the organized efforts of the people in the barrios, villages, and municipalities, to help themselves in discovering and acting upon their common interests, needs, and problems” — has actually been realized.

JUAN E. MONTENEGRO

CEBUANO BISAYA

ANALYSIS OF THE SYNTAX AND THE SYSTEM OF AFFIXES IN THE BISAYA' LANGUAGE FROM CEBU. By J. D. v. d. Berg, M. S. C. Translated by G. Trienekens, M. S. C. [Mimeographed for private circulation by the Sacred Heart Fathers, Surigao]. 1958. 174p.

The author in his introduction indicates that this monograph is the result of the analysis of some 4000 lines of Bisaya' text which were taken from issues of the magazine BISAYA in 1953. The purpose of the monograph is “to help our young priests, giving them a *first introduction* into a foreign language so utterly strange to them.” The author has added other examples given by fellow missionaries of the Sacred Heart. The Reverend G. Trienekens, M. S. C. translated the Dutch text. We owe a debt of gratitude to the author, his translator and their fellow missionaries for a much needed analysis of Cebuano.

Primarily the reviewer would like to commend the author for his careful analysis in terms of the Cebuano itself rather than in the traditional terms of European language structure so often used by those describing Philippine languages. The analysis clearly demonstrates the Cebuano to have a structure quite different from Indo-European languages. Hence in order to describe it, one must at times use “terms made *ad hoc*”. However, “modern linguistic terms and symbols...have been avoided as much as possible.” Perhaps a few modern linguistic terms would have been helpful in clearing up difficult points.

Basically the material is divided into two parts; syntax and morphology. A thirteen-page introduction gives a general definition of terms, outlines and illustrates the phonemes of the language, and indicates something of the syllable structure of word bases. A three-vowel system of *a*, *i*, and *u* is indicated with the suggestion that each of the vowels is composed of various allophones. An indication of what these allophones are and their distribution would be helpful.

Perhaps examples showing the oppositions between phonetically similar consonants would also have been advisable. For example, *balây* (house) — *palây* (rice) cited under the *b* phoneme are excellent examples. *Gayud* (true) — *bayud* (rotten before it is ripe) (p. 8) were given under the phoneme *g*. Perhaps a minimal or close contrast with *k* would have been better.

I find the treatment of the semivowels a bit vague (pp. 10, 11). "The *y* is consonantal mostly, therefore the *y* of 'huge' and not that of 'yes'. The *y* is a vowel but non-syllabic in *babaye* (woman)..." (p. 10). Hence the semivowels are treated as a consonant in forms like *yuta* (earth, ground), *wali* (sermon), but as a vowel in *babaye* (woman), *dyutay* (small), and *gwapo* (handsome face). In *nawong* (face) the *w* "is a spelling-symbol only for the diphthong 'au'" (p. 10).

Perhaps this treatment is as good as any. The non-syllabic high vocoids *w* and *y* have been treated as consonants, as semivowels, as semi-consonants, and as vowels (and so written) by analysts of different Philippine languages.¹ Writers on Tagalog phonemes have treated the non-syllabic high vocoids as consonants except that following a consonant and preceding a vowel the non-syllabic high vocoid would be a vowel and a consonant,² thus [*gwapo*] would be phonemized as /*guwapo*/. Further a sequence of high vowels such as *ua*, *ui* or *ia*, *io* and *iu* would be phonemically interpreted as /*uwa*/, /*ɥwi*/, /*iya*/, /*iyu*/, /*iyu*/.³ This latter is no doubt the interpretation involved in the author's mention of the use of *w* between *a-u* as a spelling-symbol.

Pages 14-67 deal with the part of grammar which the author refers to as "conjunctions". We quote:

The sentence consists of word groups, word groups consist of words. The first and most important means of conjunction is the melody of the sentence, because by this the sentence becomes a unit. The parts of the sentence, however, are still joined together by other means. These are the Bis.: accent units, forms of dependency, loose conjunctions (word arrangement), particles with binding function: ligatures and relation indicators, and conjunction words.

Especially fine is the author's treatment of relation indicators (p. 46-59). The reviewer would refer in this connection also to the author's statement regarding subject indicators (p. 15). Nominal subjects with proper names are indicated by the particle *si* and with

¹ In "Phonemes of Kalagan", OCEANIA LINGUISTIC MONOGRAPHS, No. 3, 1958, p. 48f, Dawson treated the non-syllabic vocoids as consonants. The Meiklejohns treated them as semivowels in "Accentuation in Sarangani Manobo", p. 2 of the same monograph, and the reviewer treated them as allophones of the syllabic vocoids in THE INFLECTION AND SYNTAX OF MARANAO VERBS, Bureau of Printing, 1958, Manila, p. 3. Ernest W. Lee has treated the Maguindanao non-syllabic vocoids in a similar way to my own treatment in an unpublished manuscript "On Non-syllabic High Vocoids in Maguindanao", Summer Institute of Linguistics.

² See the treatment presented by Wolfenden in THE INTENSIVE TAGALOG COURSE, Summer Institute of Linguistics and Institute of National Language, Manila, 1957. Note also Richard Gieser's "The Phonemes of Kalinga", OCEANIA LINGUISTIC MONOGRAPHS, op. cit., p. 12.

³ In "Guiding Principles for a Nationally Uniform Orthography of All Philippine Languages and Dialects", Institute of National Language, 1936, p. 33, it is suggested that "diphthongs" with initial *w* or *i* be interrupted by *w* and *y* respectively.

non-proper names by the particle *ang*. Pronominal subject is indicated by certain sets of personal and demonstrative pronouns listed on page 16.

Father Bergh mentions case (p. 2) as indicating the relation of a word to other words of the word group or sentence. "When a non-process-word is unchangeable, there are no cases but values of cases only. Thus it is in Bisaya'" (p. 2). Further, in Bisaya' the particles *ni* and *sa*, the *n-* forms of personal pronouns and the *ni-* forms of the demonstrative pronouns indicate "some variety of 'to belong to',... with the values of possession (his house), part of a whole (his hand), locative (in the house) and temporal (that morning) relations." The writer goes on to say "consequently these indicators have the same function as the cases and prepositions in Indo-Eur. languages" (p. 47).

I have been very pleased to find these comments. The noting of certain case-like relations parallels closely my own analysis for Maranao.⁴ Since inflections or different sets of pronouns indicate case relations, I believe it possible to extend the term to those relations indicated by the particles. In Bisaya' *si* for proper names and *ang* for non-proper names and the pronouns *ako*, *ikaw*, *siya*, *kami*, *kita*, *kamo* and *sila* indicate the subject. (I have called this in Maranao the "topic".) The particles *ni* for proper names and *sa* for non-proper names; the pronouns *nako'*, *nimo*, *niya*, *namo'*, *nato'*, *ninyo*, *nila* (as well as demonstrative pronouns with *ni-*) mark the same case-like relations marked in Maranao by particle *o* (as well as a particular set of pronouns), and those case-like relations marked in Tagalog by *nang* (usually written *ng*). The relations indicated by these particles or sets of pronouns are (1) a type of possession, location, or intimate association when related to noun-like centers of a construction, but (2) agent when related to the central verb. Father Bergh refers to the subject relation as the first relation of the process word or predicate, the agent as the second relation, and all other relations to the verb as third relations (p. 49). In Maranao the first relation is marked by particle *so*, the second relation by particle *o*, and third relations by particles *sa* and *ko*, giving a four-way opposition. In Tagalog the first relation is marked by *ang*, the second relation by *ng*, and third relations by *ng* or *sa*, giving a three-way opposition. In Bisaya' *ang* marks first relation, *sa* marks second and third relations; a two-way opposition (p. 174). The relation indicator with proper names and the pronouns in Bisaya' mark out a three-way opposition (these relations pertain only to the predicate). *Si* for proper names is the first relation indicator, *ni* the second relation indicator and *kang* the indicator for third relations. Three different sets of pronouns indicate the same relations. Three pronoun sets in Ilocano mark similar relations. For common names the particles *ti*

⁴THE INFLECTION AND SYNTAX OF MARANAO VERBS, p. 11, 12-13.

and *iti* (where *iti* is often shortened to *ti*) have to serve for all three functions.

The Bisaya' use of the particle *ug* as a relation indicator overlaps *sa* in that *ug* may mark agent in eventives or object in non-eventives⁵ (p. 56-59). *Ug* may be also a coordinating conjunction, or a subordinating conjunction, as well as a relation indicator: "As a relation-indicator *ug* is used in contrast with *sa* to mark explicitly non-singularity" (p. 56). However, the analysis seems to indicate that *ug* could also be a subject relation marker: "*ug* may be subject-indicator with *bases* only" (p. 57)). The phrase "Humàñ nilag binày-loày *ug* katahuran..." (After they had exchanged greetings,...) seems to be cited as an illustration of this usage. *Ug katahuran* in this case seems to me to be related to *binayloay* in a *sa* grammatical type relationship but certainly not the *ang* relationship. *Binayloay* seems to be the center of the construction *binayloay ug katahuran* (exchange of greetings). In a footnote (1) of page 56 *nang* (*ng*) of Tagalog is paralleled to *ug*. Tagalog *ng* indicates agent in Father Bergh's "eventive" type sentence, and may indicate object in "non-eventive" type sentences: *Kinakain (ng bata) ang mais*, '(The child) ate corn'—agent relation; *Nagtanim ako (ng mais)*, 'I planted (corn)'—object-relation.

On pages 74-76 the author gives a table of affixes depicting the scope of the "verbal classes and modal aspect system". These charts represent excellent insight into Bisaya'. Students of Philippine languages will welcome sincerely not only the charts but the careful and fairly detailed treatment of the affixes given on pages 77 through 162.

The analyst divides the system between singularity and non-singularity. "A process belongs to the *singularity-class*, when in all respects, the process is definite in its individuality, viz. in the respect of process (occurrence), agent and patient. When one of these is non-singularity the process may, and sometimes must, be categorized in the non-singularity class" (p. 77). Singularity class is marked by *zero*, and non-singularity by *paN*—.

The verb system is further divided into two voices, the "eventive" and the "non-eventive". The reviewer would like to again express genuine appreciation for the clear-cut way that Father Bergh has avoided the use of the terms active and passive, and has pointed out clearly that English active and passive only partially can be paralleled to the voices in Bisaya'.

"*Eventive* means: something happens to a substance, something befalls the substance" (p. 5). Hence in the eventive voice the sub-

⁵The Meiklejohns in "Notes on Cebuano Syntax", FOLKLORE STUDIES, vol. 2, Tokyo, 1953, cite *sa*, *ni* and *ug* as marking "secondary and tertiary connections". They do not indicate what these connections are and give only two examples of the particle *ug*. In these two examples they seem to suggest that *ug* marks a secondary relationship: *Nganong nagkaon (ug karne) sa tawo?* "Why did you eat (the meat) for the man?"

ject does not initiate the action. In a non-eventive process "the initiative proceeds from the agent" and therefore the subject and agent are the same. Further "in the eventive three categories are found" (p. 77). These three categories are (a) a process "entirely pertaining" to the subject only, (b) a process entirely pertaining to the subject but also pertaining to something else, and (c) a process not entirely pertaining to the subject. Verb affixes characterizing these categories are *ka-* and *zero*, *i-*, and *-an*, respectively.

Two aspects are distinguished for eventive forms in each category. These are "merely-eventive" and "eventive as a result of a person's will." Non-eventive forms are divided between "punctual" and "non-punctual" or "linear". Three modes are set up for the voices in the singularity class and in the non-singularity class. These are named non-factual, factual and dependent.

There is only one point on which I would venture a suggestion, and that pertains to the voice system. On page 77 the writer indicates that "neither voice has an element characteristic for the voice as such." One is left seemingly, then, with meaning as the only criteria for distinguishing between voices. Hence, with a sentence such as *Nakadawat akò sa iyang sulat*, (I received his letter) (p. 132), the analyst concludes that since *akò*, the subject, does not initiate the action, the process expressed in *nakadawat* is eventive. "Such circumstances happen to me, that I received his letter..." Father Bergh calls this an "eventivity of situation". In contrast (p. 132) we have the sentence *Nadawat ko ang iyang sulat*, (I received his letter; I get hold of his letter). "The process 'dawat' (to receive) happened to the letter..." Compare in turn a "non-eventive" sentence like *Molingkud siyà sa siya*, (He will sit down in the chair.) In this case "it is said of the subject that it has a relation to the process that is something different from an event happening to the subject" (p. 115). The formal characteristics found in the sentence beginning with *Molingkud* and that beginning with *Nakadawat*, however, are the same. Neither sentence will permit an "agent" other than the subject. Eventive forms do not require the presence of an agent but in all cases (the reviewer would like to say) they permit such to occur. Hence, *maka-*forms, where the subject is so related to the process that no other agent is permitted, should, it seems to me, be classed as non-eventive rather than eventive.

It also seems to me that the particular relationship obtaining between subject and process should be used as a definition of voice. This, of course, is what the author of the monograph has done. However I would take the analysis one step further and suggest four voices instead of two. The three categories outlined in the eventive voice would therefore be considered three separate voices since there is a different relationship between

subject and verb in each case. The affixes *-on*,⁶ *-an*, and *i-* could be then considered voice markers. Note that *-on* could be considered to alternate with *zero*, the latter occurring with factual markers and with accidental (merely-eventive) aspect. The non-eventive or subjective voice has a characteristic *m-* which may possibly be analyzable as this voice marker.

In Maranao I was able to distinguish what I called five aspects. These include general, aptative (ability), distributive, causative and aptative-causative. The affixes characterizing the aptative in Maranao seem to parallel the *ma-* of the merely-eventive in Bisaya'. "ALL non-factual forms in both voices implicitly have the value of 'to be able to..., to be allowed to..., can, may, might...'" (p. 80). I am wondering also if it might not be possible that the *paN-* forms in Bisaya' parallel the distributive aspect of the Maranao. Maranao uses the same affix with various alternants. Causative *pa-* in Bisaya' also may parallel causative *paka-* or *paki-* in Maranao. Might it not be possible that the indicators of non-singularity (distributive), causative and ability occur with all voices, and therefore should be made part of the mode-aspect system rather than setting up singularity versus non-singularity? It seems to me also that some of the non-systematic affixes with *pa-* causative could thus be drawn into the system.

However, I am not sufficiently acquainted with Bisaya' to do more than suggest parallels to the Maranao. One statement along these lines stimulates me to further investigation. Father Bergh has done a more complete analysis of the static words for Bisaya' than I have done for Maranao, and hence probably has a better feel for combinations of forms than I have yet been able to obtain. On page 78 he writes:

The aspects of the eventive voice and those of the non-eventive do not form a contrast. Hence the possibility to connect a secondary base that is an eventive form, with a prefix of the non-eventive. So e.g.: *magka-* and *maghi-* forms. The first prefix of the formation determines the voice to which the derivative belongs.

In Maranao it is not possible to have a combination of the characteristic voice markers. Some form of the voice marker must be present. All other affixes relate to what I have called mode, aspect or tense. Obligatory mode in Maranao parallels the dependent mood described by Father Bergh. Aspects in Maranao parallel the merely-eventive, the non-singularity and the causative described in the Bisaya'. In Maranao, as in Bisaya', the aspects do not form a contrast across voice categories. This leads me to suggest that affixes which purely mark voice even for Bisaya' (*-on*, *-an*, *i-* and possibly *m-*) are mutually exclusive. When affixes indicating that the subject performs the

⁶I prefer *-on* to *ka-* or *zero* suggested by Fr. Bergh since *-on* characteristically occurs in these forms if we consider the possible alternation with *zero*. This parallels the *-an* and *i-* of the other categories.

action expressed by the base occur with forms such as *-an* or *-on*, the latter seem to be non-voice markers. Note paragraph 128, page 126 where the suffix *-an* occurs with *mag-* and *pag-* and alone, but with "a different function from the function of *-an* with the eventives." In a footnote it is suggested that this *-an* may be quite a different element or morpheme from the *-an* of the partial eventive.

The intensely interesting and excellent analysis encourages me to further work on Maranao as well as other Philippine languages. The mimeographed edition of this monograph does not include syntax concerning the word sequences which the author hopes to issue later. The introduction hints that a printed edition is forthcoming. The reviewer would encourage and await such with anticipation.

Certain features in the mimeographed edition are very helpful. These include the numbering of paragraphs or topics and frequent cross-reference to these paragraphs. Another extremely helpful device has been the abundance of examples in Bisaya'. I would make only two minor suggestions regarding the examples: first, it would help the reader if the examples in some cases could omit extraneous material giving a shorter form which includes the point being discussed. For example, on page 91, the "instrumental value, drawing attention to the instrumentality" of the affix *mahi-* is illustrated as follows: "Ug mahimo ugaling, ikuha' mo ako ug sagbut nga mahitambal niining sakita" (If possible, please get me some herbs, with which to cure this illness/that can be used to cure this illness).⁷ A shorter illustration such as *Mahitambal ang sagbut niining sakita*, (The herbs can be used to cure this illness) would have shown *ang sagbut* to be the subject of the process and the instrumental relationship existing between subject and process. In the longer illustration *sagbut* is joined to *mahitambal niining sakita* by ligature *nga* showing that in the particular sentence that which is used to cure this sickness is the same as *sagbut* (herbs), but the grammatical relation is not subject-process, rather an equation; a transformation as suggested above for the particular part of the sentence under consideration would seem to me to illustrate the point better. My second suggestion is that the particular point being illustrated be indicated in some way in all illustrations. Fr. Bergh usually does this by underlining the particular Bisayan form. In the long illustration above parentheses around *sagbut* and *mahitambal* might have been helpful, or underlining both words.

Thanks should also be expressed to the translator for an excellent job on a difficult piece of work. A few typographical errors (*in-*

⁷The explanation given of this illustration is worth quoting in full since it contrasts the three categories of the eventive voice in a very neat way. "Here the idea 'tambal' (treat medically) is entirely pertaining to 'sagbut', but the herb is not cured (this would be an *-on* form), nor is it cured partially or under a certain respect (this would be an *-an* form), but the medical treatment by the herb is directed upon the illness, hence the instrumental value" (p. 91).

consciously for unconsciously, the incorrect division of *fire* /p. 2/, distinct for distinguish /p. 5/, phonems for phonemes /p. 7/, the use of *backer* /p. 7/ to illustrate *a*, etc.) will no doubt be cleared up in printing the material. The same is no doubt true in certain translations which could be made a bit smoother ("some examples yet:" /p. 4/, "not by far all words may occur in all types" /p. 59/, etc.). The manuscript is however, surprisingly clear of such insignificant blemishes.

The charts on pages 74-76 as well as a rather complete index of forms and subjects make it possible for the reader to find his way around in the material in a very efficient way.

No two descriptions of the same language, or languages closely related, will be couched in the same terms, nor will the same system of analysis be used by different analysts. One of the tests of a truly good description is the convertibility of that description to a different set of terms as well as a different analytical approach. The ANALYSIS OF THE SYNTAX AND THE SYSTEM OF AFFIXES IN THE BISAYA' LANGUAGE FROM CEBU is truly a good one. One has no difficulty in applying modern technical terms to the material nor in seeing the similarities in Bisaya' and in other Philippine languages as described by other analysts. Further, I am sure that a transformational approach, immediate constituent approach, relative relevance approach, or a tagmemic approach could all be applied to the materials presented with varying success, but still essentially come out with, in general, similar conclusions. My sincere congratulations for a fine piece of work.

HOWARD P. MCKAUGHAN

THE HEART OF THE MATTER

THE SACRED HEART: a Commentary on Haurietis Aquas. By Alban J. Dachauer, S.J. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1959. 209p. \$4.25.

THE SACRED HEART is, as its subtitle tells us, a commentary on Pius XII's Encyclical Letter, *Haurietis Aquas* [15 May 1956]. Father Dachauer tells us that his book "is an attempt to give the general reader a little more of the Scripture, tradition, theology, spiritual writing and history, which together form the background of [the Encyclical]." The present commentary, he says, "does not pretend to be a learned theological treatise, but merely a popular book writ-