

## Book Reviews

Loren Billings and Nelleke Goudswaard, eds. 2010. *Piakandatu ami Dr. Howard P. McKaughan*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines and SIL Philippines, xvi + 317 pp. + CD attached. ISBN 978-971-780-026-4. \$17.50, paper.

According to the SIL synopsis, *Piakandatu ami*—in honor of—*Dr. Howard P. McKaughan* is a collection of 42 papers celebrating McKaughan's distinguished career as a linguist, covering time spent in Mexico, the Philippines, Hawai'i, Papua New Guinea, Vietnam, Thailand, and Sabah, Malaysia, as well as the establishment of linguistic departments at the University of Hawai'i and Payap University in Thailand. The volume includes both full analytical papers and short vignettes from many who have been influenced by McKaughan ([http://www.sil.org/asia/philippines/piakandatu\\_hpm.html](http://www.sil.org/asia/philippines/piakandatu_hpm.html)).

Altogether, there are 47 authors, representing a veritable *who's who* or *who's new* in Philippine (or Austronesian) linguistics or in the language world at large.<sup>1</sup> I sincerely take my hat off to the editors for casting such a wide net. It is truly admirable to see a festschrift with so many contributors from such a variety of arenas in the peripatetic life of Howard McKaughan.

Because of the breadth and outreach of all of these articles combined, there is probably no one who could do this kind of review justice. While I do not consider myself in any sense a provincial linguist—having dabbled in facets of the phonology, morphology, syntax, and discourse of Philippine, Australian Aboriginal, Armenian, Cushitic, and Bantu languages, taught English as a second language, and even researched language death—some of these gems are beyond my ken. Therefore, I am approaching this task with a careful mix of humility and admiration.

The majority of these articles are (at least in part) in the realm of “congratulatoria,” and inform the reader what a marvelous person, teacher, researcher, and administrator McKaughan has been and is. More than half (24) are four pages or less; seven are from five to nine pages in length; six are twelve to nineteen pages; and five are above twenty pages (22 to 27).

The Preface follows the Table of Contents and outlines the theme of the book (*linguistic connections across an ocean*). While many of the articles admirably chronicle and emulate Howard McKaughan's multifaceted research and output, and the editors briefly summarize the honoree's career, no basic biographical information is presented.<sup>2</sup> The editors also elucidate the choice and meaning of the title and background information about

---

1. The only Philippinologists I am aware of having been omitted were myself and John Wolff. Had I been invited to contribute back in 2007, I would have had to decline due to pressing duties at work prior to my retirement. I am therefore most pleased to have the opportunity to review this tribute to such a great person and linguist. Personally, I owe Prof. McKaughan for his belated yet perceptive review (1982) of the published version of my dissertation on Bisayan (Zorc 1977). Should I have the opportunity to revise that publication, I intend to address each and every one of the shortcomings he so astutely laid bare.

whence the project sprang. Then they say that “in the call for contributions we invited linguists—broadly defined—whose work has been influenced by the honoree. We called for both short contributions and full analytical papers” (vii). There are 42 separate articles presented in alphabetical order by the surname of the contributor. This placement in and of itself was a wise choice, avoiding any possibility of being misconstrued as some kind of ranking or pecking order.

A table then presents 21 wide-ranging areas covered by the authors.<sup>3</sup> I would beg to differ with the juxtaposition of *syntax and typology*. For me, *syntax* is a broader term for what was traditionally called grammar, but *typology* has to do with the classification of languages, sometimes but certainly not always based on syntactic phenomena (such as word order, or polysynthesis). In its broadest sense, a typological subclassification could include phonological criteria (for example, fricativeless languages), morphology for example, infixation, gender, noun classes), discourse phenomena (word-order switching for emphasis, an abundance of discourse particles), or even culture (hunting-gathering, agricultural, industrial). Numerous as these are, I would revise the table of areas covered by the authors to include the following (bringing the total to twenty-five):

- (18) syntax/grammar (Billings, Donohue, Kaufman, Kroeger, Sommer);
- (22) computer use (Hsu, Rose);
- (23) congratulatoria (Bender, Elkins, Himes, Kess, Lincoln, Loving, Lynip, Newell, Pallesen, Pike, Rensch, Schütz);
- (24) discourse (Franklin, Kaufman, Kroeger);
- (25) typology (Billings, Donohue, Franklin, Kaufman, Kroeger, Reid).

There is a factual error (an unedited typo on p. ix): “In fact, McKaughan had a hand in setting up linguistics department at *three* institutions: the University of Hawai‘i (discussed by several authors) and Payap University (Tehan et al.)” Dr. McKaughan and the SIL summary (above) confirm that it was indeed only the *two* listed.<sup>4</sup>

There follows a six page section entitled “The honoree’s publications,” listing 88 publications from 1951 through 2002. Of these, five are actually reviews by other authors. In contrast, the SIL website lists 42 entries by McKaughan and (alas) the Library of Congress is in possession of only nine of his books.<sup>5</sup> The editors are to be commended for the thor-

2. Fortunately, I have this brief summary in answer to an email query to Prof. McKaughan about his birth and early life: “I was born July 5, 1922 in Canoga Park, California. As a side light, it was at home and Mama didn’t realize my twin brother Herbert was on the way too. We were the youngest of five boys and one girl, my beating Herb by 15 minutes, I am told. My younger days were participating as part of a ‘farm’ family covering the years of depression—a period as a youngster, I did not know much about. My father commented that we never went hungry!!” (pers. comm., February 25, 2012).
3. To wit: (1) collaboration, (2) corpora, (3) cultural history, (4) ethnography, (5) establishing and administering institutions, (6) field research, (7) historiography, (8) language change, (9) language documentation and development, (10) mentoring, (11) minority languages, (12) morphology, (13) phonology, (14) poetics, (15) promoting linguistics as a profession, (16) publication, (17) the sociology of language, (18) syntax and typology, (19) teaching languages, (20) translation, (21) vocabulary and lexicography.
4. Note also that he has taught courses at the Summer Institute of Linguistics in Grand Forks, North Dakota (where he also served as director); at SIL Norman, Oklahoma; in Nasuli, Philippines; and at the University of the Philippines.
5. The current Library of Congress catalog lists seven, whereas its old on-line catalog has another two.

oughness of their research, but nowhere is it stated that McKaughan is the *sole* author of 56, *primary* author of 20, and *co-author* of nine. Looking at the chronology of his output, they start in 1951 and proceed through 2002, with only seven fallow years in the three decades between 1951 and 1982. Among these, 1973 alone saw 19 publications! Of course, publication dates prior to use of the internet for immediate dissemination rarely had much to do with the year of authorship, but by any standard McKaughan's productivity is impressive, especially in view of the fact that it was for many years coupled with heavy administrative duties.

A dozen of the selections are reviewed below, following the order in which they appear in the book.

**Maria Lourdes S. Bautista** presents several analyses from the International Corpus of English, comparing and contrasting the Philippine and Singaporean varieties because, while both are colonially derived, the former is based on American English and the latter on British English. When possible, she includes comparisons with other major varieties of English: Indian, Australian, and New Zealand. She looks at (1) the use of the subjunctive, (2) case marking of *wh*-pronouns, and (3) indefinite pronouns in *-body* and *-one*. Several of her findings are indeed noteworthy. Philippine English has tended to be more formal because Filipinos traditionally learned English in the classroom, that is, via the prescriptive approach. There is also the phenomenon of *colonial lag*: "observing the rules rigidly for certain grammatical structures" (21). However, because of media (particularly movies and television) and the internet, "whether there will still be a tendency towards formality in Philippine English, as a result perhaps of the over-observance of prescriptive rules, remains to be seen" (22).

**Loren A. Billings**, based upon Russian scholars' insights, proposes the term *diathesis* (plural: *diatheses*) to replace the use of the terms *voice* or *focus* in the description of this complex area of Austronesian morphosyntax. There can be little doubt that going back to its original Greek sense seems to hit this nail more on the head than other terminologies. Then, too, within this same volume, Kroeger elucidates a *voice*-oriented analysis. Even if we all agreed to follow this convention henceforth, there would still be a large number of articles in print that use one or another of the former frameworks.

**Robert Blust** explores the meaning and cognates of \**datu* in as thorough a fashion as one could hope for and concludes that its basic meaning is far from that of 'chief, ruler' found in southern Philippine and western Indonesian languages. The meaning assigned by Dempwolff—'Sippenhaupt' ('head of a kin group')—"is by no means clear from the supporting evidence he cites" (37). Blust approaches this by comparison and contrast with the etymon \**balian* 'shaman, medium, healer, seer'. Evidence suggests that its minimal semantic components are associated with [male] + [priest]. "PMP \**datu* referred to a priest charged with the guardianship of the sacred paraphernalia of his lineage and of customary law, with the conduct of public rituals and ceremonies, and with the preservation of genealogical knowledge, among other things. This role was filled by a senior male of noble ancestry, and probably was transmitted from father to (perhaps eldest) son. It was clearly distinguished from that of the shaman, who was either male or female, and often a hermaphrodite or transvestite" (47).

**Michael Boutin** elucidates “metathesis in Bonggi,” which involves three alveolars: *r*, *l*, and *n*. Of as much value as his analysis and exposition is the “mea culpa” found in the first footnote, parallel to the humble retraction of McKaughan (1973): “Linguists rarely admit in print that a previous analysis of theirs was wrong” (52). Actually, Boutin was not wrong, as the earlier data and presentation about *r* metathesizing with the following vowel was not erroneous, just incomplete. In his later research, the metathesis of *l* was less apparent “because /l/ changes to [j] after it metathesizes” (52). And finally came his recognition of the metathesis of *n*. The conditions outlined are complex indeed. A less careful linguist might stop at or stumble over the instances of vowel lengthening encountered in the surface form of so many examples. Boutin’s conclusions are worth quoting: “Besides having typical phonological features of western Austronesian languages such as reduplication, nasal assimilation, and nasal substitution, Bonggi also has vowel harmony, neutralization of vowels, CV metathesis of sonorants, and vocalization of /l/” (62). Add to this morphophonemic mayhem the preposition of final nasals in some words, as well as nasal deletion, for a truly complex linguistic situation.

**Jürgen M. Burkhardt** discusses “vowel-height harmony in Lepu’ Aga’ Kenyah and its phonological implications.” He concludes that there is “regressive vowel-height harmony, spreading from the ultima to the penult” (76). Synchronically, this accounts for just four vowel phonemes, with distinctions of [+high] and [-high]. However, in the course of time, “a child growing up in the community would then no longer develop an awareness of a once overt [p]rocess<sup>6</sup> of vowel-height harmony” (76).

**Michael L. Forman** offers us a delightful potpourri of thoughts on “studying unruly languages.” Surely any reader should see a tongue in cheek with regard to the term *unruly*! First he deals with “four strips of talk, caught on the fly” (96). Second comes four instances of his collaboration with Howard McKaughan. Third is a presentation of four examples from Hawaiian Pidgin and Zamboanga Chabacano with misplaced or double negatives. Each of his three major expositions is well-written, humorously titled, and very perceptive, and his purpose is spot on: “there is something to be gained from attending not just to the form of a language but also to what it is to its users” (96). This was a view advocated by Charles Hockett, who taught both Forman and McKaughan.

**Karl J. Franklin** grapples with the concept of “word in Kewa.” This appears to be no easy feat—at least for a linguist, as opposed to a native speaker. He concludes: “Kewa words are recognized and understood by native speakers on the basis of their cultural matrix, as well as by their phonological and grammatical features” (132). From the linguistic standpoint, he outlines eight “main features that mark Kewa words” (133). For anyone grappling with the phenomenon of isolating a word, one should take to heart that a “word is also a cognitive unit that occurs in a cultural setting” (133). I see this as both a justification and a need for all of us to be aware of psycholinguistics and ethnolinguistics in our research work and analysis, far beyond the basics of phonology, morphology, and syntax.

**Hope M. Hurlbut** explicates “Malaysian Sign Language: a phonological statement.” In this regard, it is critical to consult the accompanying CD for the file (Hurlbut\_Photos.pdf). Some linguists might be taken aback by the use of a term associated with phonology, given the silence of signing, until he or she realizes that it “refer[s]

6. There is a typographical error here with the initial *p* missing, which I have added in square brackets.

to the study of how signs are structured and organized” (157). Fascinating information is found throughout this article,<sup>7</sup> including sections on phonological processes (which can be subsumed under morphophonemic changes), such as movement epenthesis, hold deletion, metathesis, assimilation, and weak reduction. There is also a table of sixteen classifiers (figure 26), a grammatical phenomenon so critical to Malay. It is important to note that this form of signing is not mutually intelligible with ASL (American Sign Language), a reasonable expectation given the genetic chasm between Malay and English.

**Daniel Kaufman** discusses “the grammar of clitics in Maranao.” While the bulk of the discussion is centered on pronominals, his last two pages do bring up what I like to call *discourse particles*, which he refers to as *adverbial clitics*. The complexities and hierarchies based on person and case are masterfully described. The phenomenon of *disformation*—“the obligatory use of a free pronoun in place of a clitic if it follows another (clitic) pronoun” (191)—is fascinating and deserves study in other Philippine languages beyond the few samples provided.

**Lawrence A. Reid** does a thorough and insightful survey of Negrito groups as hunter-gatherers<sup>8</sup>. Most of these call themselves by a reflex of \*qaRta(q)<sup>9</sup>—for example, *agta*, *alta*, *arta*, *ayta*—which, in such a context, meant “dark-skinned person, Negrito.” The question might well arise as to who owned this word: was it Aboriginal or Austronesian? Could the case be made that this is an early loanword into Malayo-Polynesian, since Negritos were the first occupants of areas such as Luzon and Mindanao? He grapples with the “time depth of first interaction between Negrito and non-Negrito groups” (238). He then runs through four contact scenarios (relatively-recent, remote, continual, cyclic) which would explain the detailed pidginization and creolization of these aboriginal languages in favor of that of immigrating Austronesian farmers. There is also the possibility that some societies could have had early contact with one linguistic group of immigrants and, at a later date, with a completely different one. The inclusion of Sinauna Tagalog in 3.4.1 is very welcome. The only error is a reference to Himes “this volume” (242), which is detailed correctly in his reference section.

**Louis Rose** summarizes “teaching computer skills cross-culturally: a case study from Malaysia.” Twenty Begak students from near Tungku, Sabah, aged 15 to 50 were involved in this eighteen-month course, which was requested in the summer of 2002 and completed in February 2004. There were linguistic and cultural problems with the Malay language computer manual, so the author and Ken (a pseudonym) successfully improvised other tactics for detailed hands-on teaching.

**Bruce A. Sommer** has worked on Australian Aboriginal languages, many of which typologically have no passive, so this is his first published foray into the Austronesian, especially Philippine-type, focus system. His is a very detailed look at the Bantoanon

7. My only previous exposure to a signed language was in Aboriginal Australia, especially that of the Northern Territory, where initiates are not allowed to speak during sacred ceremonies. For example, a request for a cigarette is made by passing one’s fingers from left to right near the exposed teeth (itself a symbol of striking a match).

8. A more recent and thorough survey by Laura C. Robinson and Jason William Lobel, “The Northeastern Luzon subgroup of Philippine languages,” is to appear in *Oceanic Linguistics*. They acknowledge this pioneering work done by Reid.

9. What evidence there is for a final consonant seems to indicate a final glottal stop, not \*q: that is, \*qaRta?.

suffix pairs *-an/-on*, which he treats as an “elusive suffix” (singular). However, the first of these (*-an*) is more traditionally associated with locative or beneficiary focus, while the second is direct object focus. But focus actually involves an unparadigmatic triad: there is also the instrument or partitive focus prefix *i-*. Although he cites Zorc (1977), wherein the verbal affix system of Bantoanon is summarized in tables 27–32 (1977:133–38) alongside other Bisayan speech varieties, his analysis, while intricate, neglects the prefixal element involved in Philippine-type passivization and the collapse of this triad when a causative (*pa-*) construction is used: all direct objects or goals are simply focused with the prefix *i-* (Zorc 1977:142). Nevertheless, the examples are a worthwhile presentation of the complexities of this little-documented language.

The publishers have generally done an excellent job of layout and formatting, with a minimum of typographical errors. I believe, however, that page numbers belong on every page—at the bottom if it is the first page of an article. For example, pp. 219 through 223 appear to be unnumbered, making it difficult to find the articles listed in the contents by such pages. It turns out that the bottom of most introductory pages is dedicated to the appropriate bibliographic reference including the page(s) dedicated to each specific article in this book. It is there that one finds the first page number.

My advice in compendia of this type (publisher willing) would be to have a single bibliography rather than references after each article. There are an enormous number of duplications from author to author (especially, but not exclusively, involving McKaughan) and, with the desire to keep printed books limited in pagination, this would serve a positive purpose.

There is a CD attached on the inside of the back cover (the main directory of which is curiously entitled “My Disc”) which includes two subdirectories: “Book Contents” containing one PDF file for each of the forty-two papers arranged alphabetically by the author’s surname, plus a Frontmatter.pdf file “Photo Appendices” enriching the articles by Hurlbut (Hurlbut Photos.pdf) and Pugh (Pugh Photos.pdf).

All in all, this is among the best festschrifts I have seen. The variety of topics, the number of authors, and the abundance of data are a true tribute to Prof. McKaughan.

R. DAVID ZORC  
Wheaton, MD

## REFERENCES

- Blust, Robert. 1979. Proto-Western Malayo-Polynesian vocatives. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 135:205–51.
- McKaughan, Howard P. 1973. Subject versus topic. In *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez: Essays in honor of Cecilio Lopez on his seventy-fifth birthday*, ed. by Andrew B. Gonzalez, 206–13. Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph 4. Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- . 1982. Review of *The Bisayan dialects of the Philippines: Subgrouping and reconstruction*, by David P. Zorc. *Forum Linguisticum* 6(3):270–79.
- Zorc, R. David P. 1977. *The Bisayan dialects of the Philippines: Subgrouping and reconstruction*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

