

PAZ, CONSUELO J. 1981. A reconstruction of Proto-Philippine phonemes and morphemes. Publication 3 of the Cecilio Lopez Archives of Philippine Languages and the Philippine Linguistics Circle. Diliman, Q.C.: University of the Philippines.

Reviewed by R. David Zorc  
School of Australian Linguistics  
Darwin Community College

This is the first publication to deal exclusively with the reconstruction of Proto Philippine phonology and nearly 400 forms of the PPH lexicon. As the author points out, many scholars have used or discussed Philippine languages in their reconstructions of higher order proto languages, but no one to date has done so for the immediate ancestor of the languages spoken in the Philippine archipelago.

Dra. Paz has done extensive fieldwork on 29 languages spoken throughout the republic, and demonstrates painstaking care in gathering the data and insuring a wide distribution of different speech varieties. She purposely limits herself to synchronic data gathered from and double-checked with informants, and does not refer to dictionaries of the various languages, nor to other attempts to reconstruct Philippine or other Austro-nesian proto languages. This is the first study known to me to apply itself with such rigor; even though the author has struck out alone, her results are generally verifiable by external comparisons (i.e., to other An languages or scholars).

It should be noted from the outset that Philippine languages are quite chaotic, and the organization of data into cognate sets exhibiting regular correspondences is no easy task. Languages frequently show multiple reflexes of a single sound, such as Tag (l, h, ʔ, φ) < PPH \*l, Ilk (r, g) < PPH \*G, Naga (Bikol) (a, u) < PPH \*ə, etc, and not infrequently have unexplained irregularities throughout the lexicon, such as Akl túbi? instead of expected \*\*túbig 'water' or harú instead of expected \*\*hagúk 'kiss'. These problems lead comparativists to different solutions, and it would be unlikely to achieve universal agreement with regard to many reconstructions.

Chapter 1 consists of a discussion of the comparative method, including the "reality" of reconstructed phonemes and the "status" of the reconstructed language (pure language vs. dialect vs. idiolect), and the selection of the 29 languages used. It is here that the author refers to studies that have established Philippine languages as a (single) group.

Chapter 2 reviews the previous literature relating to the reconstruction of PPH. The coverage is ample and the summaries and critiques fair. Although Dra. Paz notes that Charles relied on dictionaries and included languages outside of the Philippines as the basis of his study, she compares rather than condemns his procedures, establishing her study as different from his.

Chapter 3 takes up an inductive reconstruction of the PPH sound system. She details all who assisted in her informant work (a commendable practice ignored by many other scholars), the Lopez list on which she compiled her data base, her methodology in reconstructing PPH (including tables illustrating the correspondences). There is much to

be commended and emulated in these pages. Since Ph languages are generally conservative with regard to 11 sounds, these can be reconstructed for the PPH stage with the same point and manner of articulation as in the current daughter languages (\*p, \*t, \*k, \*b, \*g, \*m, \*n, \*y, \*w, \*i, \*u). This hypothesis is totally reasonable despite the argument among some linguists as to the real versus formulaic nature of proto phonemes. Nine other segments can also be reconstructed which do not have identical reflexes among all the languages, but do follow consistent correspondence rules (\*d, \*s, \*h, \*ʔ, \*ɲ, \*l, \*a, \*ə, \*´ (phonemic accent)). Lastly, four correspondence sets posed a problem based on divergent reflexes and different distributions [\*d, \*g, \*l, \*r]. The choice of diacritics for three of these has introduced a large number of typographical errors which detract from the study to various degrees; the convention of capital letters [\*D, \*G, \*L] or differential symbols [\*ʎ, \*j] would have been preferable, and I shall adapt them hereafter as follows: PPH-P \*ḍ, \*g̣, \*ḷ, \*ṛ = PPH-Z \*D, \*G, \*L, \*j ~ \*r (the latter depending on distribution). She also sets up separate correspondence rules for five diphthongs (\*ay, \*uy, \*əy, \*aw, \*iw), of which \*əy is perhaps the most elusive and difficult to establish.

Altogether, 24 PPH phonemes have been reconstructed (including accent). But scholars would not agree on all of these: two correspondence sets may be missing (\*q – as different from \*ʔ – and \*ñ)<sup>1</sup>; two may ultimately be dismissed (\*L and \*D) pending further research into morphophonemics and inter-language influences; one does not consistently account for positional variants and deviant reflexes (\*r vs. \*j); and one (word accent) could be defended on the basis of stronger evidence than statistical frequency, since it can be demonstrated that some languages have lost and regularized an original phonemic accent to either the ultima (e.g., Pangasinan)<sup>2</sup> or the penult (e.g., Tausug),<sup>3</sup> while many others (e.g., Tagalog, Ilokano, Sebuano, Waray, Bikol, Bontok, etc.) reflect and retain the original PPH accent patterns. However, 80% of her work stands solid, and should not be overshadowed by my pedantic comments here and below.

Chapter 4 is a deductive approach to non-automatic changes, accounting for irregularities of sequence or sound confronting any Philippinologist in the data observed. The decisiveness of any solution in such cases ranges from near universally-accepted changes (metathesis, assimilation, dissimilation, etc.) to the setting up of additional correspondence sets (which she wisely avoids), and from over-reliance on the principle of economy to an act of faith in a particular reconciliation of divergent forms (can one reconstruction do? or should doublets or different reconstructions be made?). While ʔ, h, and y do appear sporadically on some forms (witness Waray ʔ amáy, Sebuano, ʔ amah-án, Tausug ʔ áma? ‘father’), they should not plausibly replace any PPH consonant, but can be stipulated under certain specific conditions (original vocative endings as Blust has suggested),<sup>4</sup> or because of incomplete sound shifts (\*h retained versus \*h > φ via ʔ), or borrowings (\*G > Tag g, but also y or l due to loans from Kapampangan or Pangasinan respectively). But this is precisely where the act of faith comes in: Scholars can offer alternative solutions, and those that seem the most economical *and* reasonable should be the most believable. My own (perhaps overly conservative) approach would be to reconstruct synonyms such as \*galapúŋ and \*tápuŋ ‘rice-flour’ (rather than reconcile the latter from the former, #133). Similarly I would prefer a PPH-Z \*dáGaq and PSP-Z \*duGúq ‘blood’ (rather than PPH-P \*daGúʔ, #100, which solution is reasonable within the context of Ph languages alone),<sup>5</sup> or PPH-Z \*qəpá[h] ‘rice-chaff’ and PSP-Z \*ʔ úkap ‘bagasse’ (rather than PPH-P \*ʔ əpák, #127), or PPH-Z \*qahlu ‘pestle’ and \*ləsúŋ ‘mortar’ (rather than PPH-P \*hákLuŋ ‘pestle’, #166, and \*Lasúŋ ‘mortar’, #245). However, these observations should not disparage much of the reasoning that has gone into

this chapter, nor the summary of changes found in Chapter 5 and the sample reconstructions in Chapter 6. For, as the author notes in her final chapter, "[t]his study demonstrated how the comparative method is applicable to data taken solely from speakers of contemporary Philippine languages". Her discipline has not allowed her to use external languages or higher-level reconstructions as a mold into which Philippine material must be poured or by which it should be measured. Even where one might disagree with elements of a reconstruction, one can see from the complexity of the data that the author has sought to represent the proto language in as economical and reasonable a profile as possible.

Although the author has based her study on established theory, there are some areas where the structure of her work is weak: (1) subgrouping (which she puts aside), (2) the reconstruction of meanings (which she shies away from), (3) the importance of basic vocabulary in determining a language's regular reflexes (she generally assigns equal weight for each lexical item's evidence), and (4) unification of data under a single formula (see her #9, 20, 49, 60, 79, 122, 131, 145, 156, 166, 207, 212, 230, 239, 240, 267, 364, 396) as opposed to the reconstruction of synonyms (which she does establish, see #18+26, 20+41, 40+217, 77+85, 97+173, 127+128, 152+205). In the light of the conservative nature of most Ph languages, one would expect most of the daughter languages to reflect the proto-form phoneme for phoneme without significant deviation(s).

Whereas she reviews and cites Dyen (1971), he established there that "subgrouping and reconstruction should be carried on simultaneously" (p. 49), yet the author does not elaborate on her assumption that all of the languages treated form a single genetic subgroup. For if it turns out that even one of the languages is not a direct and immediate genetic relative of all the others, then the reconstructed proto language will be of a higher level than PPH. This is almost certain to be the case of Yakan, a Sama member of an Indonesian sub-family which is intrusive to the Philippines. However, I have noted that Yakan influenced only three reconstructions [#29 (PPH-P \*? ántut, more probably PPH-Z \*qetút 'flatulence'), #125 (PPH-P \*? ámpat, more probably PPH-Z \*? épát 'four'), and #299 (PPH-P \*púnsəg, more probably PPH-Z \*púsəj 'navel')], so that any actual distortion is, in effect, minor.

Having had the courage to unify some rather diverse forms under a single reconstruction (e.g., Png básis, Ilongot básit, Agt bákən, Akl baha? ón, Ilk ba? án, ba? áŋ < PPH-P \*baksán, (# 49), where two reconstructions might be posited, PPH-Z \*baheqán and a separate south Cordilleran \*básis 'sneeze'), her reluctance to pursue the reconstruction of proto-meanings appears overly conservative. One simply assigns semantics components to a reconstruction in much the same way that one posits phonological symbol. However, again, in the majority of instances the meanings cited are most probably those of PPH, and do not distort her results. The vast majority of data-groups show a straightforward semantic connection.

Dyen (1956:87) pointed out the importance of basic vocabulary in determining the correspondence system of a language, since borrowings can confuse the results. In Table 2 and on page 36, the reflex of PPH \*k is shown to be [k] in Agutaynon. While this is true of doubled monosyllables, note the following:<sup>6</sup> Agt yu? 'I' < \*i+akú (#13), Agt ?aná? 'child' < \*?aná? (#25), Agt buwá (?) 'hair' < \*buhək (#87), Agt dəp 'catch' < \*dakáp (#103), Agt dəən < \*dəkán (#112) 'braided rattan underlayer', Agt də(ə)t 'stick-to' < \*dəkát (#114), Agt yami 'we (exclusive)' < \*i+kamí (#199), Agt yamu? 'you' < \*i+kamú (#200), Agt ?ayu(?) 'wood' < \*káy(u) (#209), Agt lalí(?) 'man, male' < \*laláki (226), Agt namú?

mosquito' < \*namúk ( 303), Agt siñ 'sick' < \*sakiñ (#307), Agt syu(?) 'elbow' > \*si'ku (#322). Such evidence points to a shift of PPH \*k > Agt φ (realized as glottal stop in initial and final position in accord with phonotactic rules for this language). It would then appear that forms with Agt (k) < PPH \*k are suspect and need further analysis.

However, Dra. Paz correctly identifies the correspondence of Agt (k) with ? in her other witnesses, and sets this up under the formula PPH-P \*? (which I will here symbolize as PPH-Z \*q, in order to free the symbol \*? for a different correspondence set). Note then: Agt kábu 'ashes' < PPH \*qabú (#5), Agt kábut 'arrive' < PPH \*qabút ( 6), Agt kaní nu? 'shadow' < PPH \*qaninu(h) ( 26), Agt kata'wa? 'spouse' < PPH \*qasáwa ( 38), Agt kátəp 'roof' < PPH \*qatəp ( 42), Agt bá? lu? 'new' (with shift of k > ? before another consonant) < PPH \*baqGu(h) ( 51), Agt bitúkun 'star' < PPH-Z \*bitúqən ( 86), Agt buqayá? 'crocodile' < PPH \*buqaya ( 88), Agt dilák 'tongue' < PPH \*dilaq ( 115), Agt námak 'pus' < PPH-Z \*nánaq ( 121), Agt likel 'neck' < PPH \*liqəG ( 233), Agt luúk 'tears' < PPH-Z \*luheq ( 248), Agt lutuk 'cook' < PPH \*lútuq ( 252), Agt panák 'bow (and arrow)' < PPH \*pánaq ( 270), Agt tam-pulúk 'ten' < PPH \*púluq ( 272), Agt peték 'hatch, crack-open' < PPH \*pasáq (#293), Agt tulúk 'torch' < PPH \*sulúq ( 328), Agt kúban 'gray-hair' < PPH \*qúban ( 361), Agt kwáy 'spike of palay' < PPH-Z \*quháy ( 367), Agt kúran 'rain' < PPH-Z \*qudán (#377), Agt kúran 'rain' < PPH-Z \*qudan (#377), Agt kúriñ 'charcoal' < PPH \*qujin (# 378), Agt kuwáy 'rattan' < PPH \*quwáy (#382).

In contrast to this, when Agt does not show this [k], but rather φ or [?], one might then establish a PPH \*?, as in: Agt ?ənám 'six' < PPH \*? a+?ənám (#14), Agt ?anáy 'termites' < PPH-Z \*? anáy (#24), Agt bisñ, Tausug bí? tis, Akl batí? is 'calf (of leg)' < PPH-Z \*bətí? əs (#63), Agt belát, Akl bú? at, Kap bayát 'heavy' < PPH \*bəG? at (#78), Agt man-dámut, Ilk díram? ús, Png dilámús, Akl hilám? us 'wash the face' < PPH-Z \*-da? mus (#117), Agt digú? , War rígu? , Kap dílu? , Tag lígu? 'bath' < PPH-Z \*diGu? (#123, as doublet), Agt labí? , Akl gabí? i(h), Ilk rabí? i 'night' < PPH-Z \*Gabi? i[h] (#156), Agt ?əə, Tausug hu? un, Ilk wen 'yes' < PPH \*hú? ə(n) (#183), Agt lan'ka(?), Tag, Iba lan'ká? 'jackfruit' < PPH \*lan'ká? (#228), Agt nitú? , Akl, Tag nitú? , Ilk, Ibg nitú?[fem] < PPH-Z \*nítu? (#266), Agt palú(?), Tag, Nag palú? 'beat, strike' < PPH-Z \*palú? (#276), Agt, Tag sipún, Akl sip'un, Ibg sifún 'cold,' catarrh' < PPH \*sip'un (#320), Agt ? amít, Tag tamís, Ilk sam? ít 'sweet' PPH \*ta?mis (#332).

Many of the author's reconstructions show a great deal of ingenuity in trying to accommodate language deviations under a single formula. Perhaps the best illustrations of this are the handling of doubled monosyllables, which other scholars have set up as doublets (\*səpsəp, \*sipsip, \*supsup). Dra. Paz takes up all variations from one reconstruction [\*supsáp 'suck' (#329); similarly: \*dəkdúk 'pound' (#111), \*gitgét 'tight' (#147), \*kəmkúm 'hold in clenched fist' (#210), \*nəník 'tiny insect with stinging bite' (#259), \*ŋəsŋís 'giggle' (#264), \*pakpik 'wing' (#277), \*pakpúk 'rap' (#278), \*yətyug 'shaking' (#396)]. Such reconstructions must be formulaic, since none of the daughter languages reflects the proposed proto-form unchanged. Nevertheless, there are scholars who would endorse such a procedure.

Perhaps less defensible are the instances where a single language (or an isolated subgroup) shows some differences as compared with all the other witnesses, yet such