

IN THE NAME OF THE BLESSED LORD JESUS CHRIST. AMEN.

# GRAMMAR OF THE KAPAMPANGAN LANGUAGE

## CHAPTER 1 THE DECLENSIONS OF NOUNS

The declensions of nouns are not five ( I mean in this language), because in all of them, the word remains unchanged; for example, *guino*, lord; because here you don't have that *dominus, domini, domino*; but *guino* and more *guino* in all cases, like *genu, genu, genu*; and even for all the numbers, because the same word can be both singular and plural. In spite of this, this language has its own distinction and variation of cases; because, just like *genu* in the singular, being one and the same word unchanged for all the cases, there is a nominative, genitive, dative, etc., depending on the preposition or article which is placed before it; the same is also true with the nouns of this language, which vary according to the cases, depending on the article which precedes. [The phrase *depending on the preposition or article which is placed before it* is presented here as referring to the Latin grammatical construction, but it should refer to the Kapampangan.]. The articles with which the cases of the proper nouns vary are the following:

### Section 1

#### Declension of Proper Nouns

##### Singular

Nominative .....	<i>y Pedro</i> .....	Pedro
Genitive .....	<i>nan Pedro</i> or <i>can</i> (sup[pletive]) <i>Pedro</i> .....	of Pedro
Dative .....	<i>can Pedro</i> .....	to or for Pedro
Accusative .....	<i>can Pedro</i> .....	to Pedro, against Pedro, towards Pedro, etc.
Vocative .....	<i>Pedro</i> .....	Pedro, hi! Pedro
Ablative .....	<i>can Pedro</i> .....	with Pedro, from, etc.

You already know that proper nouns have no plural, that is why, if you want to say Pedros, you take the articles of the appellatives, or you say it by circumlocution; for example, this sentence “the saint from whom the *Pedros* got their name was the first head of Christianity” is translated as *ing santong pequila guioan da ding* (this is the article of the appellatives) *Pedro* or by circumlocution, *ding milaguioan Pedro* or *ding mipalaguioan Pedro*, etc., *yapin ing camumulang a pun o buntuc ning cabinyagan*.

Going now to a related point, the plural which follows means *Pedro and those of his family, followers or confreres*. Now you translate their cases respectively corresponding to the singular, because you are no longer a child to need to have everything written here.

### [Plural]

Nominative .....	<i>di Pedro</i> .....	Pedro and his group
Genitive .....	<i>di Pedro</i> or <i>cari (sup.)</i>	
	<i>Pedro</i> .....	of Pedro and his group; to, for, against, etc.

The difference between the two articles of the genitive is this general rule: The suppletive is always placed before the noun, if it is a genitive of possession; if it is of the person who does, it is placed before the verb; the proper noun is always placed after; for example, *what you have to learn*. If I have to say this sentence by the suppletive, I will say: *ing QUECANG pagaralan*; where you see the *QUECA*, which is suppletive, placed before the verb; if by the proper noun, *ing pagaralan MO*, placed after. Another: what Pedro has to learn: by the suppletive, *ing CAN Pedrong pagaralan*; by the proper, *ing pagaralaNANG Pedro*.

Another example of when it is a genitive of possession: your hat, *ing QUECANG copia* or *ing copia MO*; Pedro's hat, *ing CAN Pedrong copia* or *ing copia NAN Pedro*.

The reason for placing the suppletive before is this: if you would say, for example, *ing copia CAN Pedro*, since *CAN*, which is suppletive, serves also for the rest of the cases, the sentence would be ambiguous, there being without any reason to make it genitive rather than dative, etc., *the hat is of Pedro*, etc. But when there is no ambiguity, the genitive specifically of possession can be placed before the noun, for example, *e CO bandi ita*, and the genitive of the person who does the verb, for example, *e CO buring ibiye ngeni, pota CO ibiyai*. If the genitive *na* precedes the article *nan*, it is enough to add an *n*, for example, *nganaN San Agustin, calugurana con Pedro*, etc. The vocative does not have any article and so you just simply say *Pedro, Juan*, etc. If you call only one and the verb is in the plural, for example, *Pedro ngayo queni* means that you are referring not only to the one whose name is expressed, but also to those who accompany him; and so I want to say: *Pedro and you who are with him, come here*.

Note: with the above-mentioned articles, we decline not only all the proper names of men and women but also their surnames; for example, for singular, *Y Quilala*, for plural *DI Quilala*, etc., although they be otherwise appellatives, like about *Francisco Bondoc*, talking about his surname, you will say: *Y Bondoc*, *Di Bondoc*, etc., although otherwise, *bondoc*, mountain, is appellative. And the same is true with the nicknames which are given to animals; for example, *y Bucefalo*, the horse of Alexander the Great.

The same privilege is enjoyed by this noun *cayi*, when it is used to say “whatever his name is”. *Y cayi*, *NAN cayi*, *CAN cayi*, but to say “what ever you call it”, the appellatives are used; for example, *cuan me ing cayi*, etc. The following also vary with the articles of the proper nouns, singular and plural: *ibpa*, father; *inda*, mother; *tata*, father (the genitive of the singular of the first two is *nibpa*, *nindo* and the third *nin tata*); *caca*, elder brother or sister. But these: *nono*, grandfather or grandmother; *bapa*, uncle or stepfather, *dara*, aunt or stepmother; and those of *teuagan*, are changed with the proper and with the appellatives; taking note that *DI dara co*, for example, means my aunt and her companions; but *DING dara co* means my aunts. You will notice this in the remaining cases.

## Section 2

### Declension of the Appellatives

Before saying how they are declined, I call your attention to this, that the suppletive article serves not only as dative and accusative, but also as ablative. I say so because I have noticed that, for some people, when the sentence is in the active, e.g. *susulat co QUING calatas*; *babatbat co CARING anac*, they do not remember except the accusative, and so they construct them saying: *I write the paper*; *I am whipping the boys*, and they err, because *quing* is ablative “in”; and the *caring*, “from”, as you will see in the use of the active. What we say about these two suppletive articles is understood for all the remaining ones.

#### Singular

Nominative .....	ing pusa .....	the cat
Genitive .....	ning or quing(sup.) pusa .....	of the cat
Dative .....	quing pusa .....	to, for the cat
Accusative .....	quing pusa .....	to, against, towards, etc.
Ablative .....	quing pusa .....	with, from, in, etc.

#### Plural

Nominative .....	ding pusa .....	the cats
Genitive .....	ding or caring (sup.) pusa ....	of the cats

Our particles *he, they, the*, etc. can be wedded to the articles *ing, ding* and the pronoun *iya, ila*, etc., because we rarely or never find any of the former which does not correspond to any among the latter. And if there are those who would oppose the marriage, it is certain that there is no need for a divorce because, even if it is difficult to make them agree, there is no impediment to the principal end [of the marriage, so to speak], namely, to determine precisely the **THING** to which they are attached in order to be able to use the passive.

It cannot be denied that, in this language, we construct the passive out of all the sentences which speak of a **THING** without any specific inconsistency with our own, like the singular; for example, *God, Christ, this man* and all the demonstratives; *Pedro* and all the proper nouns and surnames; *thou, I*, and all the primitive and derivative pronouns *my, thine*, etc. Question: To use the passive, do we need to follow this rigid rule? Certainly not, as the common practice teaches us, and as we know, that which our particles give to the thing to which they are attached is enough, and this is what is being sought, call it what you want to call it. Because, what is the big deal? Frankly, I don't know.

You already saw that for the vocative of the proper nouns, there is no article. Neither for these, which are simply expressed as they are, for example, *banua, nanuta, ininan*; but in the plural they admit *mañga*; for example, *MAÑGA ana co, MAÑGA capatad co*, etc.

Those which in Spanish do not have plural do not have it in this language either; for example, *guinto*, gold, *pilac*, silver, *atac*, iron; and if they say *DING guinto co, DING atac co*, etc., they talk about them as having been made pieces, like earrings. There are others which do not have a plural but have a plural in Spanish, for example, the commandments (los preceptos) is not *DING otos*, but *ING otos*; the words *ING amanu*, the truths, *ING catotoan*, and also my eyes, *ING mata co*, my ears, *ING balugbug co*; and those which are one *per continuationem* [taken as a sum total] and are conceived by them as such; for example, *ING dayat co*, my irrigated land; and the same with days, weeks, months, years, etc.

### Section 3 Declension of the Primitive Pronouns

Knowing that a multiplicity of articles of the genitive can be boring, I decided to omit all those with two distinguishing vowels: but recognizing that in reality each one of them has two distinct functions, corresponding to the diversity of their pronunciation, sometimes with a short accent, at other times with a long accent, as will be mentioned when the time comes.

## Singular

Nominative .....	<i>aco</i> or <i>co</i> .....	I
Genitive .....	<i>co, que, da, canaco</i> or <i>caco</i> (sup.) .....	of me, to, for, against, with, etc.

This pronoun has three plurals. The first one consists of only two persons, which are *I and thou* or *thou and I*.

## First Plural

Nominative .....	<i>icata, cata</i> or <i>ta</i> .....	we two, thou and I
Genitive .....	<i>ta, te, to, or quecata</i> (sup.).....	of us two, to, against, with, etc.

Take note that whenever this dual comes ahead, you must use these articles, but the presence of any of these articles does not always mean that there is a dual ahead of them, because they are meant to signify only one; for example, *nung manutang CATANG maralas, saca ala CATANG pamayad, marine CATA pota*; that is, if one person borrows money many times, *one person* has no money to pay, then *one person* feels ashamed. In this sense, you will hear a penitent say, referring to himself alone: *maralas CATANG micasala maralas, CATANG mañumpa: one* sins many times, etc.

## Second Plural

Nominative .....	<i>itamo, ita, catamo, cata,</i> <i>tamo</i> or <i>ta</i> .....	we (including everyone)
Genitive .....	<i>tamo, ta, quecatamo,</i> <i>quecata</i> (sup) .....	of us all, to, for, against, with, etc.

Note: All the articles of the second plural which are similar to those of the first plural are so pronounced that *ta* is long in the second and short in the first. You will hear the indio say: *ngata na*, short; at other times, *ngata na*, the *ta* long. The first one means “let us go, the two of us”; the second one “let us all go”, because the first *ta* is dual, while the second *ta* belongs to the second plural. Thus also, *calugurana CATA ning Dios*: if you pronounce *ta* short, it means *God loves the two of us*; if long, *God loves all of us*. Another example: *ing quecatang imalan, ta* short, (it is the dress of the two of us); long, (it is the dress of all of us). This second plural includes all of those to whom we speak, as distinct from the third, which excludes them.



## Pronouns of the Second Person

To the articles of this singular which end in *a*, they usually add an *o*; *ica*o, *queca*o, *ca*o, to end the clause; for example, *tano maragul na CAO*, etc.

### Singular

Nominative ..... *ica, ca* ..... thou  
Genitive ..... *mo, me, queca* (sup) ..... of thee, for, against,  
with, etc.

### Plural

Nominative ..... *icayo, ico, cayo, co* ..... you  
Genitive ..... *yo, ye, quecayo, queco* (sup)... of you, to, for,  
against, with etc.

If you hear a plural of these primitive pronouns being used to refer to a singular subject, do not get surprised, because it is a discrete and respectful manner, like when an indio tells a minister, e.g., *icayo*. They also use it to say: we the bishop, *icami*, etc.

To say *nostras, nostratis*, [of our country; of our native something] they use the suppletives of the above-mentioned, three plurals, each one retaining its respective use, although well-mannered people, when they write to someone belonging to another town, they do not say, *ding QUECAMI*, in order not to exclude him; but *ding QUECATAMU mayap la ngang, lugud ning DIOS. Vestras* [of your country; of your native something] is rendered as *quecayo* or *queco*, e.g., *subli co caring QUECAYO*, if to their own, *caring CARELA*, etc.

## Pronouns of the Third Person

This pronoun is very much akin to the Latin pronoun he, she, it, and so it has a masculine, a feminine and a neuter. Although it is true that it is not so accurate to make that observation, because in this language all are common to the two. The only one where I see a distinction is between *mas maris*, the male, and *femina, feminae*, the female; the former is *lalaqui*, and the latter is *babay*; and concerning uncle and stepfather, aunt and stepmother, the former are *bapa*, and the latter *dara*. There are many common to both. Take these: *caca, uali, capatad*, and *pisan, pengari, asaua, nono*, etc. These are the only genders of this language. Let the difficult ones (*duras*) go with the easy ones (*maduras*) and have courage to do this work (*trabajo*), so you can climb the hill which you are now about to reach, because it is quiet arduous (*trabajosa*) [i.e. *cuesta*].

## Singular

Nominative ..... *iya, ya, na, ne* ..... he, she, it, him, her, it  
Genitive ..... *na, ne, no, quea* (sup) ..... of him, to, for, against,  
with, etc.

## Plural

Nominative ..... *ila, la, no* ..... they, the, them  
Genitive ..... *da, de, do, carela* (sup) ..... of them, to, for, against,  
with, etc.

Each of these pronouns has an equivalent Spanish particle as you see. One serves to distinguish the cases, and is usually confused with the Spanish which was placed with the appellatives. The other takes the place of pronouns, but both of them determine the thing. [This paragraph is difficult to understand.]

We now reach the hill which is the use and construction of some nominatives and many genitives of all these pronouns. Let us begin ascending by the easier one: *iya, ila*, are placed before. Their use is, for example, *Juan says that you are a pig*; you answer: *he is the pig. IYANG babi*. To the child who wants to learn and begins to play, *IYANG anak a anti queca ing bisang magaral?* This is also true for *ila, la*, and all the rest are placed after. There remain four articles of the noun: three singular, which are: *ya, na, ne*, and one plural, which is *no*. You already know that there are nouns which have a plural and you know what is a singular. You also know that there are nouns which do not have a plural, for example, *water, wine, oil, vinegar*, etc, and others which this language has, for example, *canan, otos, casalanan*, etc, and those which have an ambiguous meaning referring to what has been mentioned and those which have a vague or imprecise number, for example, *mata, balugbug, gamat*, etc. Given this backdrop:

## YA

This is used when the nominative or noun to which it refers is singular and specific, for example, *Pedro is brave, matapang YA y Pedro*; this cup is hot, *mapali YA ining suliao*; that jar is cold, *marimla Ya itang tapayan*, etc. It is also used when two species of a genus are placed against each other, for example, the pork in the genus food is hot, the beef is cold; *mapali YA ing babi; marimla YA ing vaca*; the watermelon is cold, the mango is hot, *marimla YA ing pacuan, mapali YA ing manga; marimla YA ing amian, mapali YA ing abagat, etc.*

When the nominative is among those which do not have a plural, it is more general and surer not to use the *YA*, for example, *marimla ining danum, mapali iyang chocolate*; this fish of mine is cooked with vinegar, yours no; *ing canacung asan maslam, ing queca ali maslam, etc.*

In spite of this, I am sure that when there is this relation or contrast especially if the thing referred to is among those which have a plural, *YA* is used rightly not only placing it in the nominative, and this is very strict, e.g., *ining sapa malinao YA danum, itang ilug malabug YA danum*, and this is a good refuge if you doubt whether to place *YA* or not; but also putting “water” etc., in the nominative.

## NA

This one is never used when the noun to which it refers is singular, but only when it has no plural and it always includes the Spanish *ya* [already] whether it be in the active or in the passive; for example, is that water *already* cold? *marimla NA itang danum?* If it is not cold, you will answer (responderas): *e pa po marimla*; and if it already is, he will say (dira): *marimla NA po*. This is most certain, although perhaps it does not exactly correspond to our *ya* [already]; for example, *ining danum a matabang ngeni, paquimique NA quing dayat malat, cumalat NA*; this fresh water now, as soon as it enters the sea, it becomes salty. The same is true with those examples given by books: *talampacan mo ing masugat*, etc. in the passive, for example, leave it alone already, *paburian mo NA*; say it already, *sabian mo NA*. Whenever the sentence expresses the consummation of the act, the Kapampangan uses it, although we do not; for example, *carry it* or *carry it completely* or *carry it once and for all*, etc. the Kapampangan says: *carry it already, dalan mo NA*.

## NE

This is used only if the nominative is singular and it always includes the Spanish *ya* like the Kapampangan *na*. If the nominative to which it refers is expressed, its accent is short, otherwise it is long; for example, did Pedro come already? *Dinatang NE i Pedro?* If he has not yet arrived, you will say: *e ya pa po dinatang*; but if he has already arrived, you will answer: *dinatang NE po*. Passive, for example, *carry this letter*; if you like to say that when he goes he should bring it, do not use *NE*, but if it is the same as *bring it once and for all* or *carry it already*, you will say: *dalan mu NE iyang sulat*, etc.

## NO

This one has the same use and structure, with the only difference that the nominative has to be in the plural; for example, did those men come *already*? *dinatang NO detang tauo?* If they have not come, *e la pa po dinatang*; if they came already, *dinatang NO po*. Another: will the Fathers come? *datang la ding Padre?* they will come, *datang la po*. They will already come, *datang NO po*. Passive: call those men *already*, *ausan mo NO detang tauo*; I will call them *already*, *ausan co NO po*. When these two are at the end of the sentence; for the former, you

will say *ne ya*, for example, *con mo NE YA*, get it already; for the latter, *na la*, for example, *ausan co NA LA*.

We now pass to the use and construction of the genitives of all these pronouns where there is a difficulty and we omit those where there is none. I already said when discussing the pronoun *aco* that it would supply with the accent the genitive of two letters, like what I have just done with the nominatives *ne* and *no*. I separate the genitive *da* as it is ambiguous: For example, *caluguran da ka*, you are loved. By whom? It can be *by me*, *by them*, and *by us*. The context will say it.

Given this backdrop, the first article of every genitive of these five pronouns *aco*, *ica*, *icayo*, *iya*, *ila*, is *co*, *mo*, *yo*, *na*, *da*; all of them are short and they are used only: the first when the nominative of the person who receives the action is plural; for example, the chicken were bought by me *or* by thee *or* by you *or* by him *or* by them; *saliuan CO* or *MO* or *YO* or *NA* or *DA ding sisi*, etc.; the second, when the nominative is among those which do not have a plural; for example, *saliuan CO* or *MO* or *YO* or *NA* or *DA ing palay*. Exceptions to this are the nouns for which these pronoun are used, although they do not lack plural, as can be heard everyday; for example, *caluguran da ca*, *caluguran da la*, *yo ya*, etc.

The second article of each genitive of the above mentioned and that of the dual is *que*, *me*, *ye*, *ne*, *de*, *te*; all with short accent, and they function differently from those discussed earlier, because they always explicitly include the nominative of the singular; for example, May God be loved by me, by thee, by you, by him, by them; *caluguran QUE, ME, YE, NE, DE, TE ing Dios*.

Take note carefully that if the nominative which lacks plural, for example, *alac*, *gatas*, etc. is individuated, as when it is only one glass, one bowl, one pitcher, one jar, etc., with comparison or contrast, as already said, you should not use those antecedents, but these ones instead; because if you have two glasses of wine, and you want to say *drink this* and you use *mo*, which is one of the five antecedents, saying *inuman MO iyang*, he will drink both; and so you have to individualize with the genitive *me*, saying: *inuman ME iyang*, drink this, and not this other one. This contrast is what individualizes here; and so do not feel content with only an article or demonstrative, because this alone is not enough. Because even if there is only one glass of wine and he determines it or shows it while saying *iyang*, I will not use *me* to say *drink it*, but *mo* instead, *inuman MO yang*. If you hear *me*, it means the glass or the mixture, for example, stone of Gaspar, Anton etc.

Belonging here is the genitive *no* of the pronoun *iya*, which follows these, but since it alone requires the nominative plural, it is placed as an embellishment, for example, *patawaran NO ding masama queya*, perdona a sus enemigos; do not say, *he forgives already*, because the genitives do not include *ya*; for this you would have to say *patawara NA NO*, etc.

What remain now are those which have two functions, and for this reason, they are written with two letters (some might disagree with this); now I supply the accent [the diacritical mark for *mabilis* of the present day Tagalog] and just in case the printer

eats it, I inform you that they all have a long accent. There are twelve genitives, two for each of the following six pronouns:

From	—	aco	—	que	—	co
From	—	ica	—	me	—	mo
From	—	icayo	—	ye	—	yo
From	—	icata	—	te	—	to
From	—	iya	—	ne	—	no
From	—	ila	—	de	—	do

The special thing about these is that each one is equivalent to two; so that being only genitive, they serve as genitive and nominative. The former is always expressed, the latter is always implicit and it is always an article of the nominative singular or plural of the pronoun *iya* as can be inferred from its use, whatever it connotes; and therefore, the sentences of the former are resolved by the latter.

This being so, I say: *that when we use our pronouns, he, they, him, or a possessive, my, thine, etc, to confirm or deny what has been said about an expressed noun, we use these genitives.* The six which end in *e* refer to the nominative singular; the other six of *o* refer to the nominative plural. Example: *Is Pedro your brother?* He answers: he is, *capatad QUE po*; he is thine brother, *capatad ME pin*; he is your brother, *capatad YE pin*; he is thy and my brother, *capatad TE pin*; he is his brother, *capatad NE pin*; he is the brother of them, *capatad RE po*: as if to say *capatad CO YA, MO YA, YO YA, TE YA, NE YA, etc.* Another example: *carry the letter.* I answer: *I will carry it, thou wilt carry it, etc, dalan QUE po, dalan ME pin, YE pin, TE pin, etc,* if they are the end of the sentence, *dalan MO YA, CO YA, NE YA, etc.*

Examples of those which end in *o*: *Are these thy brothers?* I answer: *They are mine, thine, yours, thine and mine, etc., capatad CO po, MO po, YO po, TO po, NO po, DO po, etc.* Another: *carry the letters; I will carry them, thou wilt carry them, etc.; dalan CO po, MO po, etc.;* And take note, for all cases, that although *dalan CO po and dalan CO LA* are the same, it does not mean that you will always have to use them interchangeably. Instead, use that which sounds better. If, just as you placed *po* after *co*, you placed it before, you would say: *ua po, dalan CO LA, etc.*

## Section 4

### Demonstrative Pronouns

These are: *ini, iti, iyang, ita*. The three come from the particles of place, *ni, ti, ta* about which we will discuss when we touch [the Latin] I am, he is, I was. They are followed by *iyang*. *Ini* indicates that the thing is in the place of only the one pointing, for example, *INING pluma*, this pen with which I write; *iti* indicates that the thing is in the place common to both the one pointing and the one to whom it is pointed; for example, if both of us get ink from the same ink-well, *ITING tintero*; *iyang* says that the thing is near you; *ita* says that the thing is farther away; that is, over there; and so their accusative singulars are used as adverbs of place, each one indicating the distance which pertains to it, according to its pronoun, and they are *queni, queti, queyang, queta*.

#### Singular

Nominative ..... *ini* ..... this  
Genitive ..... *nini, canini, queni* (sup) ..... of this, to, for,  
against, with, etc.

#### Plural

Nominative ..... *deni* ..... these  
Genitive ..... *deni, careni* (sup) ..... of these, to, for,  
against, with, etc.

#### Singular

Nominative ..... *iti* ..... this  
Genitive ..... *niti, caniti, queti* (sup) ..... of this, to, for, against,  
with, etc.

#### Plural

Nominative ..... *deti* ..... these  
Genitive ..... *deti, careti* (sup) ..... of these, to, for,  
against, with, etc.

## Singular

Nominative .....	<i>iyang</i> .....	that
Genitive .....	<i>niyang, caniyang,</i> <i>queyang</i> (sup) .....	of that, to, for, against, with, etc.

## Plural

Nominative .....	<i>dean</i> .....	those
Genitive .....	<i>dean, carean</i> (sup) .....	of those, to, for, against, with, etc.

## Singular

Nominative .....	<i>ita</i> .....	that
Genitive .....	<i>nita, canita, queta</i> (sup) .....	of those, to, for against, with, etc.

## Plural

Nominative .....	<i>deta</i> .....	those
Genitive .....	<i>deta, careta</i> (sup.) .....	of those, to, for, against, with, etc.

To add more elegance in using these pronouns, they generally add *nan* to the end of each article if it ends in *i*; *in* or *nin* or *ninan*, if it ends in *a*, *in* or *ininan* if it ends in *n*; for example, *iniNAN*, *itaIN* or *itaNIN* or *itaNINAN*, *iyanIN* or *iyanINAN*. They also attach the adverb *pin*; for example, *iniPIN*; but this also is joined, unabbreviated, to the primitives, with the meaning retained; for example, *aco PIN egomet*, and to many other things. When they are doubled, they indicate more energy; for example, *iyapin-iyapin*; and if you include the thing spoken of, better; for example, *ita pin TAUO ita*; and take note that even though the first one, is placed in the accusative, that which is placed at the end has to be in the nominative; for example, *queta pin aldao a ITA*, that very very same day, etc.

## Section 5

### Interrogative Pronouns

These are: *nino*, *insa*, *nanu*, and take note that if the article attached to the nominative singular [e.g. *nino*] is plural [e.g. *deta*], it is also taken as plural; for example, *nino, insanu deta? Nanu la deta?* etc.

## Singular

Nominative ..... *nino* ..... who  
Genitive ..... *nino, canino, queno* (sup) ..... of whom, to, for,  
against, with, etc.

## Plural

Nominative ..... *dinino, deno* (more often used)  
*careno* (sup.) ..... of whom, to, for, against,  
with, etc.

The genitive singular *nino* is generally used only in the passive, e.g. *ngana nino*, in order not to confuse it with the nominative *nino*.

## Singular

Nominative ..... *insa* or *insano* ..... which  
Genitive ..... *ningsa* or *ningsano; quingsa*  
or *quingsano; caningsano* .... of which, to, for, against,  
with, etc.

## Plural

Nominative ..... *dingsa* or *dingsano* ..... which ones, to, for,  
against, with, etc.  
Genitive ..... *dingsa* or *dingsano; caringsa*  
or *caringsano* ..... of which ones, to for,  
against, with, etc.

## Singular

Nominative ..... *nanu* ..... what thing  
Genitive ..... *ningnanu*  
or *quingnanu* (sup.) ..... of what thing, to, for,  
against, with, etc.

## IT HAS NO PLURAL

When the adverb *man* is joined to these pronouns, they are not interrogatives, but affirmatives; e.g. *ninuman, qui cunque* [whoever]; *insanuman, qualiscunque* [whatever kind]; *nanuman, quodlibet* [whatever], and more elegantly *ninut-ninu, insanut- insanu, nanut- nanu*, etc.

## Section 6

### The Non-use and Use of the Article *NING*, the Union of Nouns and Pronouns, and Other Uses of These

This article is not used when the Spanish *de* [of] indicates the material out of which something is made, and reasonably so; because that Spanish version indicates not genitive, but adjective, as it appears in Latin; for example, house of stone, *domus lapidea*; the same when it is joined to a thing native to a given nation; for example, wine of Castille, *vinum Castellarum*, or of that kind of people; for example, cloth of the king, cloth of the Father; *vestis regia*, or *religiosa*; customs of beasts, *mores ferini*.

Concerning these adjectives, when the Spanish *de* [of] refers to the material, connect the material to the adjective by using *a*, if the material ends in a diphthong or a consonant, for example; if it ends in a vowel, connect them by using *ng*; for example, *bale A bato*, *caliz A pilac*, *calix argenteus*; *cabang A bulaun*, etc; if in a vowel, with *ng*, e.g. *murenula aurea*, *tingaNG guinto*, *bucayoNG santol*, etc.

When it does not denote the material, but the ownership or use, they are not connected, if it [the material] ends in a consonant; for example, *imalan ari*, *imalan Pare*, *dase sanglay*, [this example does not belong here, because *dase* does not end in a consonant] *alac castila*, *asal ayup*; if it ends in a vowel, they are connected with *NG*, e.g. *amanuNG castila*, *amanuNG capampangan*, *natione Gallaicus*, *tauo ya Galicia*, or *Betis*; *capitan Baculud*, *ucum capampangan*, etc.

At other times, the Spanish *de* [of] is ambiguous; for example, when we say *a jar of oil*, that is, either *it already contains oil* or *is used to put oil in*; if the former, you say: *tapayan a yalac*, joined by *a*, because it is a consonant; otherwise, by *ng*; for example, *bañgaNG danum*. If the latter: if it ends in a consonant, they are not joined; for example, *tapayan alac*; if in a vowel, they are joined; for example, *frascong laro*, etc. If it is confusing, say: *itang frascong maquilaro*.

Lastly, the Spanish *de* [of] has another meaning, a very ordinary one, and it is said without any ligature, in the sense which the examples will say: for example, *masaquit co buntuc*, *bitis* or *ipan*, I have a headache, my legs are aching, I have a toothache; *mayap ya pañgatabas*, *mabaca* [macaba?] *dan*; and this way in all the predications similar to those of the poet; *ruber crine*, *niger ore*, *brevis pede*, *lumine laesus*, etc. Marcial cured a man sick in the head for being a look-alike of Narcissus, calling him, a man with red hair (*hombre de cabello rubio*...), black mouth, short leg, injured eyes, in order not to say "one-eyed." Here, you cannot translate the Spanish *de* [of] as *nin* and so you say *bulanggao ya buac*, *matuling ya asbuc*, *macuyad ya bitis ampon duling ya mata*.

This article *ning* is also used whenever an appellative is joined to another appellative or to a primitive pronoun; for example, the dog and the cat, *itang aso* *ila NING pusa*; thou and thine carabao, *ico NING damulag mo*; I and my wife, *ique*

*NING asaua co.*

You will say: what is that pronoun *ila* doing near the genitive *ning pusa*, and the other two, *ICO ning damulag*, *IQUE ning asaua*? Because, in Spanish, there is no “they” nor “you” nor “we” used that way. Your observation is well-taken, but you know that, even if these pronouns are not expressed in Spanish for brevity’s sake, they mean the same as if we were saying: those, the dog and the cat; you, thou and thine carabao; we, I and my wife: and so you have to understand this union of nouns and pronouns in order that you will explicitly say the corresponding pronoun when speaking Kapampangan.

Yes, when dealing with a plural, the *ning* is dropped and the *ding* genitive plural is used; e.g., the cat and the dogs, *ing pusa ila DING aso*; the cats and the dogs, *ding pusa ila DING aso*.

This being the case, I will now discuss the union of the proper nouns, and you will see with your own eyes how they are joined; something which is easier to hear (and) shorter than giving rules. I and Pedro, *iqueN Pedro*; thou and Juan, *icoN Juan*; Pedro and Pablo; *Pedro ILAN Pablo*; I, Pedro and his group, *ique di Pedro*; Pedro and his group, Juan and his group; *di Pedro ILA di Juan*; we and Pedro, *icami AT y Pedro* or *itamu or icata*, according to the context; thou and Pedro, go to Manila, *icon Pedro nune co Manila*; *icami NAN Juan ume caring*, I and Juan will go, etc.; this *nan* seems to be limitative. If what is connected to the proper is correlative, it is connected with *ng*, e.g. Pedro and his brother. *Pedro ilaN micapatad*. See the correlative *mi*.

When I treated these pronouns, to avoid confusion, I reserved other uses of some of them for this section. The first is that they use the articles of nouns of the four demonstrative pronouns in the exclusive sense, as the examples will say; taking note that when they are in the nominative, they are short; but when they include this exclusion, the accent is long and spacious (The same with the pronouns *ni*, *ti*, *ta*. See *ibid.*)

Now, the examples. You insist that you have not done such a thing; I insist that no one but you did it, and so I tell you; *ica pin*, with a long *ca*, you alone, etc. In this sense, we say; *ICA pin ing maquianac can Jesucristo*; that is, you alone and no other woman had the blessing, etc.

And so, whenever in Spanish we emphatically insist in excluding another, the indio uses the long-accented articles which are placed before: *ico pin*, *ique pin*, *iya pin*, *ila pin*, etc. They also use those which are placed after, in the exclusive sense, depending on the context. These are *co*, *ca*, *coó*, *ya*, *na*; for example, *mine co queting mialong* simply says *I have to come to enjoy myself*; but if the *co* is long, the meaning changes and it becomes *it is only in order to enjoy myself that I came*; for this reason, if the teacher asks a boy, *why did Pedro strike you?* he answers, *binasa co YA mo* (long *ya*), meaning, *only because I read*.

Do not argue that it consists in the *mo*, which is also limitative, because this one is added so that it will sound better and in order to confirm the said meaning of *ya*,

an ordinary thing in this language; but even if it is not added, it has the same meaning; for example, *metung YA po, metung YA mo*. Another: *danum YA catauan ning tauo*. If you mean *the body of man is water*, with short *ya*, you are mistaken, because what it says is that the body of man is nothing but water as if saying *danum MONG catauan ning tauo*.

Among the negatives, it appears clearer; for example, *e NA la peñgan at pinlutac no pa*, he not only ate them, but he even stepped on them; for example, the *sinabud*; where if you make that *na* short, you get the opposite of what the indio says. *And the same with the rest*. The *na* is not only exclusive as those mentioned, when it is an article; for example, *ya NA, ya Na mo, atlo NA, atlo Na mo*; but also when it is not; for example, *ica NAN bala, ica NAN ume caring*, etc., and it has other uses which they do not have.

First: to express the Spanish word for *already*; for example, I am going *already*, I am returning *already*; *maco NA co, muli NA co*; it is *already* getting broken, *mabalbal NA ya*, etc. Second: to exaggerate; for example, *catutua NANG catutuan, gigote NANG gigote, tatua NA cang tatua*, you insist and insist (it is here although it is coated with breadcrumbs). To avoid confusing it with the limitative, consider the context well. If there is no thing that remains to be told, the indio says: *angga NA po caring*; this is the limitative. But if he speaks weighing something, *angga NA caring ing lugud ning Dios, etc.*, it is exaggerative.

The third one is to supplicate; for example, help me, I ask you, *saupan mu NA co* or *saupan mu NA co sa dugo*. Do not confuse this with the *na* meaning *already* because if he commands, he will also say: *saupan mu NA co*, help me *already*; *di NA po* or *diana NA po* or *din mu NA co po queyang polvos mo*, could you please give me powder; *baldugana NA po*, could you please throw me something; and so, *dinan mayumo dugo, balduganan maman, parianan danum*, etc. I refer you to the discussion on the adverbs of *precandi* [request]. The *ya NA sa*, *amen*, is also a supplication. The fourth is to say the future: *bucas NA*, it will be tomorrow, without adding the hour. Another: *ca lacolaco cu NA*, I will go when it's time for me to go; it says, I would like, but when and at what time, etc.

The fifth, to exaggerate surprise at something we did not expect, as when, for example, we sip the broth and we get burned, we say: ouch! It's hot! The Kapampangan says: *mapali NA!* with a surprised tone and not as nonchalantly as when he says *mapali na*, it is already hot. The same with *Maparas NA! Matapang NA!* etc. If the nominative is not among those which lack the plural, but it is singular, we use *ne* with the same meaning and surprised tone or disbelief; for example, Pedro, a coward, threatens a person, I will say *matapang NE y Pedro!* Wow! how brave Pedro is! You can very well translate it in Spanish another way, but be sure it retains the same meaning.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE SUBSTANTIVE VERB

#### Section 1

#### The Concept of TO BE (SER)

Since I am following as closely as possible the grammar of the Latin language, after discussing the nominatives, I will now treat the verb I am, he is, I was; and leaving behind questions for the sake of brevity, I say that in this language, there is no word that would say I am, he is, I was, nor any which would fill in specifically for it but, instead, just like in Latin, not a few times, it is understood without it being expressed, as in these words of the apostle: *Nos infirmi, vos autem fortes* [We sick, but you strong] etc., where given the subject *nos* [we] and the predicate *infirmi* [sick], *vos* [you] and *fortes* [strong], you understand the *sumus* [are] and *estis* [are]. The same in Kapampangan; for example, where given the predicate *masanting* and the subject *ya, masanting ya*, the *he* is understood (that one is handsome); and the same with manner and time, given all the remaining parts of the sentence right away the verb I am, he is, I was is understood. The examples will make this clearer: thou art a slave, *alipan ca ñgeni*; thou wert a slave yesterday, *alipan ca napon*, thou shalt be a slave tomorrow or another day, *alipan ca pog*; before you got married, you already had been a slave, *bayo ca mequiasawa, alipan na ca*; if I were a slave, etc., *nun alipan co sa; alipan ca sa*, you were a servant. This way with the remaining tenses, as you will see in the conjugations.

#### Section 2

#### The Concept of TO BE (ESTAR)

Now let us discuss the ESTAR concept, which is equivalent to the SER; for example, he is sick, *est infirmus*. Now I speak of the concept of *to be in place*; for example, *est Romae*, he is in Rome; for which this language has three defective roots or verbs, which are *ni, ti, ta*, whose meaning is found in the demonstratives *ini, iti, ita*. These roots or verbs vary with the persons, as you will see in the examples.

But before that, it is important to bear in mind, in order not to make a mistake, that, certainly, this defective verb *ni* and the adverb *queni* only denote the *place proper to the one pointing*; it infallibly follows that only the first person singular and the first of the plural, which is *I*, and *we*, show their proper place when saying *ni* and *queni*; for all the rest, it is necessary to add the *place proper only to the one pointing*; and so, when he says: here thou art, *nica queni*, understood, (I will place this example, *written in this book which I already have in*

*my hand, and the same with the rest, except when the thing or place pointed to is not less proper to my addressee than it is to me, as you will see.*

## NI Singular

First: I. *Nico, anico, nico*, here I am, for example, when my name is read; we say in Latin *ADSUM*, *aninaco* or *ninaco*, I am already here. Has Pedro not come yet? He who hears it answers: *anina co* or *ninaco*, I am already here. If they quarrel with me because I am not in line in the procession, *aninaco, aninaco talatag*, I am already in line or I will already be in line.

Second. Thou. You will notice the same thing with the second person, thou, with only this difference that when I say, for example, *anica, nica*, etc., it is understood that I mean here in the census or list which I am reading, etc.

Third. That. *Niyo* or *aniyo*, he is here, for example, in my place or the place proper to me; *nine* or *ninayo*, he is already here, as when he already appeared; here, they say, *ecce* [Latin word], *niyo*; and take note that where there is this *ni*, singular and plural, it is well to add *queni*, even when it sounds well without it.

## Plural

First. We. *Nique queni, anique queni, aninaque queni, or ninaque queni*. Observe the use of each one, as we mentioned in the first person singular.

Second. You. *Nico queni, anico queni, ninaco queni, or aninaco queni*. Observe what we said about the second person singular.

Third. Those. *Nilo, anilo*, here they are: *nino* or *ninalo, anino* or *aninalo*, they are already here, as we said about the third [person] singular. I have already said that you can add *queni* to all.

## TI

This is more universal and more difficult, because it admits as adverbs of place in its territory the accusative of the four pronouns, which are: *queni, queti, queyang* and *queta*: and the first two have their respective jurisdictional boundaries. It also admits the adverb *caring*, because it is the brother of *queta*.

You already know that these four sons are like their parents *in the way they signify*. *Queni*, where I am, or near me, or with respect to only me; even if it is a stone's throw away, as when they say *meco QUENI paroba*. When I call somebody, even if there are others with me, we also use this: *ñgamu QUENI*, come here, to me who am calling you.

*Queti*, here, that is, where we are, I and to whom I am talking, for example; *QUETI quing silid*, *QUETI quing convento*, *QUETI quing balayan*, *QUETI capampangan*, etc., presuming that I and the one I am talking to are in those places; but if I exclude the one who is talking to me, I will say *queni*; for example, the indio sees me as he passes by my window and asks me: *o cata po macasaot?* Where is your residence? If he asks me about the convent where I live, I will answer *queni*; if in the town where I am, but not in the convent where I am, and he is not, *queti*.

In spite of this distinction, which is certain, if what is pointed to is a particular thing or a particular place, with no less respect to thee, with whom I speak, than to me who am pointing, as I already said, sons, parents and grand parents do mix up. I mean: *queni* and *queti*, *ini* and *iti*, *ni* and *ti*, as your careful study will notice in the examples.

### Singular

First. I. *Tico* or *atico*, here I am; for example, talking to you, and in such case you can add *queti* not *queni* (unless I am in another room when you say *tico*; then *queni* (not *queti*), *tico* or *atico QUETI queca*. If I hear my name, as was said regarding *ni*, *tico* or *atico QUENI* (not *queti*), I am here, *tico* or *atico*, I am there, for example, quean *qing lista* or census; *tico* o *atico QUETA* o *CARING*, I was there, for example, in Bacolor when you arrived; *ati na co* or *tinaco*, I am already, e.g., with you, as when you ask me to hurry up; or I am already here, *tinaco QUETI*, not *queni*.

Second. Thou. *Tica* or *atica*, thou art here with me, for example, *queti*, not *queni*; but if I say: you are here in the list or census, *tica* or *atica QUETI* or *QUENI*, because one and the other is true, etc. *Atinaca* or *tinaca*, thou art here already, as when I see that you have arrived, and it is understood to be *queti*, not *queni*. For the *queyan*, *queta* and *carin*, as was mentioned earlier; for example, *tica QUEYAN quin libro*, *tica QUETA* or *CARING*, *iñang miras co*, etc.

Third. That. *Tiyo* or *atiyo*, it is here *caco* or *queca*, for example as when they ask about you, who are with me, I will say: *tiyo caco* or *tiyo queti*, or *queni caco*; if with you, *tiyo queca* or *queyan queca*; if with that one, *queta* or *carin queya*. Also, they say around here, *ecce, tiyo*, remembering its difference from *niyo*; *atine* or *tinayo*, he is already here; as was said earlier. *Atine sususlat*, he is already writing.

### Plural

First. We. *Tique* or *atique*, we are here, for example, with you, *QUETI queca*. If they call us, *tique* or *atique QUENI*, not *queti*, we are here; *tinaque queti*, we are here already, for example, what do you like from us?

Second. You. *atico*, *tico* or *atinaco*. Observe what was said.

Third. Those. *Tilo*, *atilo*, they are here; for example, *TILO, queca na la*, take

them, here they are; if, for example, on the table, it is understood to be *queti*; if from my hand to yours, *queni*. *Tilo* or *atilo*, they are, for example, those whom you asked me to see whether they were at home or downtown; it is understood to be *caring*. In *queyan* and *queta*, there is no difficulty. *Tino* or *tinalo*, *atino* or *atinalo*, they are already, *queni*, *queti*, *queta* or *caring*, as has been said.

You are already aware of the confusion between *queni* and *queti*; the same there is between *ini* and *iti*. But here is a way out. When they are joined to show one and the same thing, if you use *ini* or *queni*, you are excluding the addressee; if *iti* or *queti*, you are including the addressee. You will not get confused even if they occur.

## TA

We already said in the two preceding discussions what the equivalent of [the Latin] *ecce* is here; for this we say [the Spanish] *en* [English: *in*], which connotes more distance than *ecce*; and even if it is placed in the third person, *niyo*, *tiyo*, *tayo*; it is because it is the most ordinary, and not because they can be used under all circumstances.

## Singular

First. I. *Taco*. I am there, for example, in the roster which was read or in the mirror where I look at myself. *Tanaco*, I am already there, for example, in the list or in the raffle wheel. *TACO panaya na*, he is waiting there for me; *TACO lalaua na*, he is looking at me there, for example, while I am near the window and he out in the patio, or my image in the mirror which seems to look at me. *TACO mamangan*, I am eating there. And take note that this way of putting it seems to be preposterous, because if I am here talking to you, how do you reconcile my eating there? But if you reflect, this way of speaking is not lacking in our language; for example, you called, I left the food which I had started eating, I go to where you are, and I say to you: *someone is eating and you call him*; and yet (while I am saying this), I am neither eating nor are you calling me. This way of expressing it explains *I am there eating*. In the imperfect tense, it is clearer; for example, what were doing a while ago? *TACO mamangan*. I was eating.

*Taco queni* (another word which also dances well) means *I am there*, in this raffle wheel, for example, or written in this book, etc. *Tanaco*, I am already there, meaning that even if they did not put me in the list, I presume that they have already put me, *tanaco misulat*; you already know which corresponds to *queta* and *caring*.

Second. Thou. *Taca*, for example, I call the boy, and seeing that he is coming grudgingly, I tell him: *TACA mamangan?* Are you eating? (as already said) or *TANACA mamangan?* Are you already eating?

Another: I did not call you because [I knew that] you were eating, *uling TACA mamangan*, [and I did not like to disturb you]. It follows the past tense in everything. *TACA queni* [Come here] (It has stopped raining). [*TACA queni*] *quing libro* or *quing padron*. [You are listed in the book or in the census]. [Translator's note: I rearranged this paragraph because the original did not seem to make sense.]

Third. That. *TAYO queta* or *caring*, there it is; *TAYO po inaus da*. The Spanish is: they already went there to call him. *TAYO queni, queti* or *queyan* (and this is, oh, so easy!). You are looking for someone, and I use one of these forms to tell you where he is: *tane* or *tanayo*; for example, *TANE mecao* or *tanayo*, he already left; *TANE mamacao*, he is about to leave. I will say more about this form later.

## Plural

First. We. *TAQUE queta* or *caring*, we are there, for example, *TAQUE caring macapadron Baculud*, etc. Follow here the same pattern as that of the first person I.

Second. You. *taco* or *tanaco*. The same.

Third. Those. *Talo, tano* or *tanalo*. The same as the third, singular.

With these three modes, we express what in Spanish we say, I am about to, I was about to, etc., as the examples will show. You come to visit me, and I am putting on my black habit; if you ask me, what is that? I will tell you with the first two, *NICO* or *TICO maco na*, I am on my way out; and the same with all the grammatical persons with which we use the Spanish expression; for example, *TIQUE* or *NINAQUE maco na*. And so *NINE* or *TINE maco na ing Padre*, the Father is on his way out; *TINE macao* or *mamacao*. *Et sic de reliquis*. (And the same with the remaining ones.)

And the same is true about eating, about writing, about reading, etc., *NICO* or *TICO mañga na, sumulat na* or *masa na*. If around here you want to say I am already writing, etc., change the future to the present; and place the *na* which is at the last, close to *ni* or *ti*; for example, *tico sumulat na*, I am about to write; *tiNAco susulat*, I am already writing, etc.

To say *I was about to*, use this *ta*; for example, as soon as you saw me with the habit, you went back; if they ask you why the visit lasted too short, you will say *uling TANE maco na, because he was already about to leave*. If they ask me: *Why did you say goodbye right away?*, I will say *uling TACO maco na, because I was already about to leave*. Another: I did not enter your house *because you were already about to eat, uling itang datang co TACO mañgana*, etc. Now, if I want to say according to the style of the preceding sentences, for example, *because when I arrived, you were already eating*, I will say *uling itang datang co TANACO* [should be TANACA] *mamangan; et sic de reliquis* (and the same with the rest). To conclude these discussions, I tell you, firstly, that if you just want to indicate simply the place where someone is, use the adverbs mentioned: *queni, queti, queyang*,

*queta, caring*, and follow the variation of the persons. I will give you some examples: *I place a chair near the stage to see the comedy afterwards*, I will say *queti* or *queni co lucluc pota*: you have to be there; for example, without leaving, *quean ca lucluc*; be here, you, restless fellow, for example, near me, *queni* or *queti ca, caring ca*, be there; and the same with the rest of the persons.

The second: the same thing said about the four pronouns in making limitatives, if they are pronounced with a long accent is also true with all of these, so that *tiyo, tilo, talo*, etc. with a short accent mean *to be* as has been said, but with a long accent, it means *they are still*; *tiyo caring* or *tayo caring* says only *it is there*; but *tiyo* or *tayo* with a long accent means *it is still there*.

Up to here we have only treated how to say ESTAR (to be). What remains to know is how to say *not to be*. So, I say that in this case, we use the defective verb *ala*, which also varies with all the persons. It takes little to know this, because inasmuch as *contrariorum eadem est ratio* (opposite concepts follow the same logic), and *ala* signifies *not to be*. When it is joined to the adverb of place and the person of whom we speak, as mentioned earlier, the contrary is said, because we deny with it all what the above affirms: *nica queni*, you are here, for example, in the list; but *ALA ca queni* says *you are not here*.

Take note further that the Spanish present, for example, *estoy* [I am], the Latin *adsum* [I am present], *nico*, can never be denied, because if you yourself say here and now, *ala co*, it is the same as that which the other said: *I am not home*. The Spanish *I was not here*, etc. fits in, for example, with *ALA co queni quing libro ÑANG ilicas mo ding bautismo*; and also this one: *I was not here when you arrived*; *ALA co queti ÑANG miras ca. Et sic de reliquis* [and this way with the rest]

### Section 3 The Concept of TO HAVE (HABER) or TO HAVE (TENER)

For this, you can use the defective verb *tin* or *atin*; for example, is there rice there? *TIN pale caring?* He answers: there is, *atin*. The syntax and construction in personal sentences demand that you join to it (so that, otherwise, only adverbs can mediate) the verb or noun, and that you always put the person who does or has, in the genitive and use the passive. Examples of verbs: is *there* a man killed by you? *TIN cayang pete MONG tauo?* To answer this, always use *atin*; for example, there is a man killed by me, *ATIN pete CONG tauo*. Examples of nouns: does your brother have a hat? *ATIN copia NING capatad mo?* *Di Antonio ATIN baro*, Antonio and his companions have a shirt. Another: do you have a dress? *ATIN imalan MO?* And in case you hear *atin MONG imalan?* you see at once that the noun is not *atin*, and so it must have another meaning, because that *mo* is an adverb which means *still*, and so the sentence means *Is there still a dress?*

The negative of *haber* and *tener* is done with *ala*; in the first example, *ALAN pale caring?* Is there no rice there? The personal sentences are done not only according to the *atin*, that is, join to *ala* the thing which is had and then the genitive of the one who has it; for example, do you not have dress? *ALAN imalan mo?* but also by joining to *ala* the person who has in the nominative, and then the thing which he has. Connect them with *n* because the thing is indeterminate; for example, don't you have a dress? *Ala caN imalan?* If the Spanish version speaks of something definite; for example, do you have that horse? it does not belong to this section, but to the preceding one; because for this language, it is the same as saying *Is that horse with you?*

For the verbs, it is shorter to give you examples than rules: *there is no man put to death by me*, *ALA pete CONG tauo*, or *ALA CONG tauo petay*, *ALA CONG petay a tauo*; and they also say, for example, *I have many things to do*, without the *atin*; *dacal cu dapat*; you have many pigs, *dacal ca babi*, etc. Take this as true for the rest.

## CHAPTER 3

# THE SIMPLE VERB AND ITS CONJUGATIONS

Before going into the conjugation of verbs and their formation, I want to give you the conjugation of tenses. This language conjugates only three tenses, namely, the present, the past and the future. The root of these verbs and the various particles are used to form all the moods and tenses which correspond to our Spanish, both in the active and in the passive; and this should not surprise nor confuse you.

Something new: because our language totally lacks the Latin form of all passive verbs, and we supply it with the word, for example, *loved (amado)*, which is the participle, and I am, he is, I was, (*sum, est, fui*); we say: I am loved, I was loved, he will be loved. Do not get confused if you see that one and only one Kapampangan tense corresponds to two or more Spanish tenses, because we also encounter cases where three Spanish forms correspond to only one Latin form; for example, the Latin *legeres* is equivalent to the three Spanish forms *yo leyerá, leería* or *leyese* [I would read, I would read, I would read] and yet you do not get mixed up. But if you still find the above difficult, comfort yourself with the shortcut of not needing to change the ending of the verb as you conjugate, saying *scribo, scribis, scribimus* [I write, you write, we write], etc., but instead all you have to do is to change the persons; for example, *you escribe, tu escribe, nosotros escribe* [I write, you write, we write]. [The correct one though is *yo escribo, tu escribes, nosotros escribimos*]. Let one be taken for the other. And presuming that you have not forgotten the preliminary observation, I give you the example *sulat*. I want to tell you how to form the present, the past and the future, so you will understand better the variation of tenses.

### Root: *Sulat*

If between s and u, you insert um, it will be *sUMulat ycata*, that is the future. If instead of that *um*, you insert *in*, it will be *sINulat* and this is the past. But if you double the first syllable of *sulat*, it will be *SUSulat*, is it not? Well, this is the present. Now, observe how I conjugate them and I will give you all the tenses and moods of the Latin grammar.

# Section 1

## The Conjugation and Variation of Tenses

### Indicative Mood

#### Present Tense

##### Singular

I write:           acong susulat or susulat cu.  
Thou writest:   icang susulat or susulat ca.  
He writes:       iyang susulat or susulat ya.

##### Plural

We write:       iqueng susulat or susulat cami.  
You write:      icong susulat or susulat cayo.  
They write:     ilang susulat or susulat la.

To express the present more clearly, they usually place the adverb *salocoyan* or *casalocoyan*; *SALOCOYAN* or *CASALOCOYAN* *cong susulat*. In the passive *SALOCOYAN* or *CASALOCOYAN* *queng isusulat iti*. Notice that this Spanish I write, I give, I eat, I wash, I receive, etc., which for us is present, for this language, when it is not the same as I am, I go writing, giving, eating, etc. are ordinarily in the future: what I mean is that, many times, the Kapampangan expresses them by using the future, active; and more times, the passive; although it uses the present to express that which is done many times even if at the moment it is not being done; for example, *susuca ya, susulat ya, sasala ya*; he is vomiting, writing, failing, etc. See the section about the simple future.

#### The Imperfect Tense

This is done with the voice of the present [sic] in the active and in the passive, and rightly so, because *escribia cuando me llamaste* [I was writing when you called me] is the same as *estaba escribiendo* [I was writing]. To explain the imperfection of the work, which this tense expresses, you add *sa* or *sana*. In all the tenses, I will give an example only of the first person, because in all of them, it is the same, and because this grammar was not written for children.

##### Singular

I was writing [yo escribia] or I was writing [estaba escribiendo] *susulat co sa* or *sana*; passive: *isusulat co sa* or *sana ini*.

## PRETERITE PERFECT

You already know that this has two variations in Spanish: yo escribi [I wrote] or yo he escrito [I have written]. The first one many times only says that I undertook or started to do the work, and in that case, it is done with the simple past; at other times it means I already, for example, or I perfected the work, as the second Spanish variation, and so we say, either with the same simple past adding *na*, which means *already*, or with the *maca* of perfection or active (of which I will speak in due time) and the root with *na* also or without it. Also, the preterite is done with the imperfect future. See there.

### Singular

I wrote:	<i>acong sinulat</i> or <i>sinulat co</i>
Passive:	<i>sinulat co ita</i>
I have written:	<i>sinulat co na</i> or <i>mecasulat co</i>
Passive:	<i>sinulat co na</i> or <i>asulat quita</i>

## PLUPERFECT

If, in the preceding tense, the two forms rightly express the act as finished, because it is perfect, here they express it more, because it is more than perfect.

### Singular

I had written (yo habia escrito):	<i>acon mecasulat</i> or <i>mecasulat co</i> or <i>mecasulat na co</i> or <i>sinulat na co</i> [sic]
Passive:	<i>sinulat na co</i> [sic] or <i>asulat co na</i> , etc.

It can also be said some other ways; for example, I had written when you arrived. *IBAT na cung SINULAT* or *MEARI nacung SINULAT*, etc.

## IMPERFECT FUTURE

For this one, you don't need to look for something to borrow, because it is one of the three tenses which this language has, as I already said.

### Singular

I will write (yo escribire):	<i>acong sumulat</i> or <i>sumulat co</i>
Passive:	<i>isulat quita</i> , etc.

When the future says an indefinite time, because nobody knows when or at what time, for example, you will write, you will die, etc., it is all right to add the adverb *pog*, *de quo postea* [about this later]: *sumulat ca POG*, *mate ca POG*, etc.

Also, the particle or adverb *na* usually indicates an indeterminate future, for example, today there is no place; tomorrow yes; *bucas NA*. *Calaco-laco cu NA*, I will go I don't know when.

## Observations

The first thing that I call your attention to is that this language often says with the future what we say with the present. I mean, to express the present, it uses the voice of the future, both in the active and in the passive, and regularly this happens when our Spanish present, *doy* [I give], *recibo* [I receive], *llueve* [it rains], *comes* [you eat], *lavo* [I wash], etc., is not the same as *estoy dando* [I am giving], I am receiving, it is raining, you are eating, I am washing, etc.

If you argue that the first Spanish expression is the same as the second Spanish expression, I answer that, let it be for you whatever you like; what is certain is that for the indio it is not the same thing very many times, and especially when you make or conceive the act, not as *permanent*, but as *transient*; not as something which *lasts*, but as something which *passes later*; not as something which *is being done*, but as something which *is done*. [Following the logic of the first two phrases, this third one was probably meant to be “not something which *is done*, but as something which *is being done*.”]

Let us go to the practice. An indio sees another indio eating meat on Friday and getting surprised about it, he tells him: *MASAN ca pala ñgening bulbul a bago Viernes?* Do you eat meat [grammatically, will you eat meat] even if it is Friday today? No sooner does the indio see that it begins to rain than he says: *muran*, it rains; *mayun*, there is an earthquake [grammatically, it will rain, there will be an earthquake]; *MUYAS ca ñgeni?* do you wash today? if he sees him wash on a fiesta or on Maundy Thursday; and so, *me voy*, *me vuelvo*, *me despido* [I go, I return, I say goodbye], etc. In many of these futures, which serve as present, I have observed that their accent is somewhat longer, as distinct from the future which are fast.

But in the passive, I do not see this difference although I hear it used every day; and so, you will hardly find a minister who will not say with the voice of the future *I give you these arras*, and ask using the same future voice *do you accept?* And I have not heard any indio answer *I receive it* using the voice of the present, but with the voice of the future: *TANGAPAN co ya*. [grammatically, *I will accept it*, but meaning *I accept it*]. To say that everybody is mistaken is an invalid argument.

The second point. To express a habit or what one usually does, for example, *como carne* [I eat meat], I do not drink wine, I miss mass, I fight, I curse, etc., they sometimes use the voice of the present; for example, *SASALA co*, *DARAMDAM co*, *SUSUMPA co*; and sometimes that of the future, *maralas cong SUMALA*, *MASAN*

*cong bulbulan*; and at other times, either of the two; *bebes vino*, [you drink wine], for example, (you drink wine), *MIMINUM* or *MINUM* or *MACAINUM can alac*, etc.

When it is better to use the present than the future, and when either one will do, I do not dare to determine. What seems to me is that usually when they use the voice of the present, they mean a *repetition of acts*, more than when they use that of the future, although both one and the other expresses a habit or custom.

## Future Perfect

I could not at first understand why this [future perfect] should not admit the *maca* of perfection, while the preterite perfect and the pluperfect, as I told you, admit it [that is, the *maca* of perfection.]. The thing ultimately became clear to me when I heard it [the future] joined with it [the *maca*], not however in the preterite, but in the future imperfect; and in reality, it means the same, because the Kapampangan says, for example, *before you come, I will finish* and what else does *before you come, I will have finished* say? And so, this tense has two varieties; one like the Spanish *antes que* [before something happens], etc. and this is its own.

To express our own [Spanish] variety, the Kapampangan uses the preterite with the defective verb *ibat* or *meyari*, both of which mean that the *act* we are talking about *has already been completed*; and I will place examples of both, in the active and passive, always assuming that this tense [future perfect] is preceded by the sentence in the future tense the Kapampangan style *antes que* [before something happens], etc., and our own style *cuando* [when something happens] for example, *cuando llegues* [when you arrive].

## Singular

I will have written (Yo habre escrito): *macasulat co* or *macasulat na co*  
Passive: *asulat co* or *asulat co na*

Yo habre escrito

I will have written (Yo habre escrito): *ibat* or *meyari na cong sinulat*  
Passive: *ibat co nang asulat* or *sinulat ita* or *ayari co nang asulat* or *sinulat ita*

## Imperative

It is formed by using the future, active and passive, and to speak with more efficacy and intention, by using the present: *PUPULAY ca, e ca TATANGIS*, run, run, run, do not cry at all.

## Singular

Write:	<i>sumulat ca</i>
Passive:	<i>isulat mo iyang</i>

## Optative or Subjunctive

### Present

We use the optative, either in expressing a desire, for example, *I wish*, or *if only*, etc., or with those of asking; for example, *sa, sana, uari*, etc.; these ones can serve not only for all the tenses of the subjunctive, but also for the future and the imperative, as the case may be. Let us go to this present, which is formed by using the future, as you hear it everyday, for example, *iñgatana ca or saupana ca ning Dios*, etc.

### Singular

I would write (yo escriba) .....	<i>acong sumulat or sumulat co,</i>
Passive .....	<i>isulat co ita, for example.</i>

### Preterite Imperfect

I would write, (yo escribiera, escribiría, escribiese), *sumulat co sa*

I have already told you not to get confused at seeing one and the same tense for different moods; because the mood in which they speak is distinguishes very clear. This is done with the future, active and passive. Example: I would write if they would pay me, *SUMULAT co SA nun upan da co*; and better if you add *ngeta*; e.g. *sumulat co sa NGETA*. In the passive: *isulat co sa NGETA*, etc., and also with adverbs of desire. The other Spanish form: *yo estuviera, estairá and estuviese escribiendo* [I would be writing] is constructed better by using the present indicative: *SUSULAT co SA*, etc.

### Preterite Perfect

I would have written, (yo haya escrito) ..... *sinulat na co*

This is usually formed by using the preterite perfect. Is well to attach to it the particle *na*, which means already. It is also formed with *meca* and its passive. The Spanish will guide you. Example: I am happy that you have written, *matula co*

quiring *SINULAT NA ca* or *quiring mecasulat na ca*. In the passive: *matula co quing sinulat mo na ya*, or *quiring ASULAT mo NA itaninan*, for example, etc.

## Pluperfect

I would have written

(yo hubiera, habria, hubiese escrito) ..... *aco san sinulat* or  
*sinulat co sa* or *sana*

This is formed by using the preterite perfect in the active and passive, and the particle *sa* or *sana*; for example, if I had written, he would not have laughed at me; *non aco SAN SINULAT* or *non SINULAT co SANA* or *non SINULAT co SA*, etc. In the passive: *non SINULAT co SA* or *SANA ita*, for example, e *na co SA QUEILIAN*.

## CONDITIONAL FUTURE (FUTURO TANTO)

Notice that this one has two forms in Spanish: *yo escribiere* (I would write) or *hubiere escrito* (I would have written). The first one is constructed by using the imperfect future, active and passive; the second one, by using the preterite perfect, active and passive, and also with its passive perfect; and the appropriate word to use here is *uari*. Examples: if he would write, pay him, *nun UARING SUMULAT ya*, etc. In the passive: *nun UARING ISULAT na ita, upan mo ya*. If he had written, whip him; *nun UARING SINULAT ya*, etc. In the passive: *nun UARING SINULAT neta* or *ASULAT na ita, batbatan mo ya*.

## Infinitive Present

You already know that the infinitive always carries a determining verb, and as long as the determining verb is not preterite, the determined verb is put in the future; for example, I desire to write [Determining verb: I desire. Determined verb: to write]. *Malsinta cong SUMULAT*; he will judge again, *subli ya queting MOCOM*, etc. Passive: the same; for example, *palsintan cong ISULAT ita; sublia non OCOMAN ding mabiay*, etc.

If the determining verb is preterite, you have to look if the determined verb is also such; that is, if what is said is a past thing, etc., he came to write; if he already wrote, it is the same as *he came he wrote*. Another: you decided to meet somebody; if you met him, you can say *you decided to meet him* or *you decided you met him*, and the meaning is the same; and so, you will say to them in the preterite: *dinatang yang SINULAT, sinari cang sinalubung*, etc. Another: he did not like to write, *e bisang*

*SINULAT*, because it already happened. Passive: the same. If what he says is not a past thing, you use the future. For example, *I came to take a bath*; if I have not yet taken a bath, or I am still taking a bath, it is not a past thing and so I will say; *dinatang cong MANDILO*, etc. This is the ordinary, even if perhaps, in cases where there can be no ambiguity, you will hear them talking of a past event, sometimes in the preterite, sometimes in the future.

### PLUPERFECT

To have written (haber escrito) ..... *sinulat* or *mecasulat*

This is constructed in the active and the passive, using the preterite, and when considering its being perfect, better with *maca* and the root; and in the passive, with the same root and *a* placed at the beginning, which more appropriately indicates that the work is perfected and completed. As to which of these two moods fits in better, the meaning of the sentence will determine and so you have to reflect; for example, I am happy to have written, *matula cong SINULAT* or *matula cong MECASULAT*. Passive: *matula cong ASULAT que ita* or *sinulat*, etc.

### FUTURE

To have to write (haber de escribir) ..... *sumulat*

This one, since it is so imperfect, needs adhesive plasters; for example, to have to write, I would have written, *nun sumulat co sa*. etc. Passive: *nun isulat co sa ita*, for example.

### Second Circumlocution

That I should write or that I should have to write (que escribiera o hubiera de escribir) ..... *sumulat*

This is constructed almost the same way that you would construct using the future. Examples; he who should write or should have to write, *ing sumulat sa*; that which should be written or should have to be written, *ing isulat sa*.

### Gerunds

It is shorter and easier to give you hard facts than to give you so many rules; for example:

Genitive ..... it is time to write ..... *panaon a sumulat*  
 Passive ..... *panaon a isulat ita* ..... for example

Dative ..... This is put in Spanish the way we do it in Latin *Non sum solvendo* [I cannot pay]

### Examples

No estoy para escribir  
I am not ready to write ..... *e co macasulat*  
Passive ..... *asulat*  
Accusative ..... I am going to write ..... *ume cong sumulat*  
Passive ..... I am going to be written ..... *ume cong isulat*  
Ablative ..... by writing, you will know.... *nun susulat ca mabiasa ca*  
Another ..... I am tired of writing ..... *mapagal na cong susulat*  
If he already wrote ..... *mepagal na cong sinulat*

### SUPINE

to write (a escribir) ..... *sumulat*  
Passive: to be written (a ser escrito) ..... *isulat*

Now you know how to form the future, active and passive. For this second one, I will give an example: *manauang yang ISULAT ini*, this is an ugly thing to write

### Present Participle

These are formed with *ing, quing*, because the participle includes pronoun and relative: see the

### Examples

He who writes ..... *ing susulat*  
He who was writing ..... *ing sinulat* or *susulat*

### Passive

That which is being written ... ..... *ing isusulat*  
That which was being written ..... *ing isusulat*

## Past Participle

The paper on which was written ..... *ing silatan*

That which was written ..... *ing sinulat*

## Future Participle

He who has or has something

to write ..... *ing sumulat*

That which has to be written ..... *ing isulat*

The verbal in the active voice is formed with *pa*, the verbal passion [passive voice] with *pañga*, as you will see in each one; for the latter, *pamañulat* and *pañgasulat*, etc; and the same thing for the rest of the simple verbs.

This is the variation of tenses; for their use, the most ordinary particles are *non* or *cum*; they mean *when*, and they serve for all the tenses, present and future. *Iñang* or *queta*, also mean *when* and they serve as preterite imperfect of the indicative, and for the preterite perfect of the indicative and for preterite, although they come close to the future imperfect. *Ngeni* and *queni* mean *hic et nunc* [here and now]; they serve as preterite, present and future. I do not put examples, because the Grammar is full of them.

## Section 2

### The Regular Conjugations of the Active Voice

After you have conjugated the root *sulat* in all the tenses, so that in imitation of them, you will be able to do the same thing with any other verb, I now move to give you the conjugations of the rest, in their three tenses and roots; for which it is presumed that there is rarely any root which is not conjugated as simple, or at least compound, although it is in its simple form that it is a noun, an adverb, etc. and you know that just as [the Latin] grammar reduces all its regular active verbs to the four conjugations; so also this language reduces them to three; with the difference that, in the former what is considered is with what letters the verb end, to know to what conjugation it belongs; in the latter, you look for the letters with which it begins.

## First Conjugation

To this belong the roots which begin with a vowel. The future is formed by adding *m* before the first vowel; and then by doubling the first syllable of the future, you will form the present.

The past is formed by inserting *in* between *m* and the first vowel of the future, as you will see in the

### Examples of this first conjugation

Root	<i>abal</i>	<i>ilut</i>	<i>orod</i>	<i>uma</i>	<i>yi</i>
Meaning	to weave	to assist as a midwife	to shave	to kiss	to urinate
Future	<i>mabal</i>	<i>milut</i>	<i>morod</i>	<i>muma</i>	<i>miyi</i>
Present	<i>mamabal</i>	<i>mimilut</i>	<i>momorod</i>	<i>mumuma</i>	<i>mimiyi</i>
Past	<i>minabal</i>	<i>minilut</i>	<i>minorod</i>	<i>minuma</i>	<i>miniyi</i>

## Second Conjugation

Belonging to this are the roots that begin with *b*, *p*, *m*. The present is formed by doubling the first syllable of the root; the future by changing *b* or *p* to *m*; if it starts with *m*, there is no need to change, because the root is the future. You have formed the present and the future. The past, for you to avoid committing an error, needs some rules which have exceptions. Do not get surprised. Remember the many things which you studied in the Latin preterite.

### First Rule

The roots which have more than two syllables, and even if they only have two, if they have two consonants after the first vowel, to form the preterite, which is formed from the future, change the first vowel of the latter to *e* or *i*, depending on which sounds better; if the first vowel of the future is *I*, it is left as it is, or you will do what I will tell you about the exceptions to this rule.

### Second Rule

I said in the preceding, *even if they are made up of only two syllables, if they have two consonants after the first vowel*, because if it does not have them, you will form the preterite by inserting *in* between *m* and the first vowel of the future; that is, if it does not lack exceptions (*si bien no carece de excepciones*). Let me now give you, under each letter, examples of all the varieties of verbs.

## Examples of the Second Conjugation

### B

Root	<i>balictad</i>	<i>busñgi</i>	<i>basa</i>
Meaning	to turn upside down	to open	to read
Present	<i>babalictad</i>	<i>bubusñgi</i>	<i>babasa</i>
Future	<i>malictad</i>	<i>musñgi</i>	<i>masa</i>
Past	<i>melictad</i>	<i>misñgi</i>	<i>minasa</i>

### P

Root	<i>palacol</i>	<i>panday</i>	<i>pilit</i>
Meaning	to cut with an axe	to work a metal	to force
Present	<i>papalacol</i>	<i>papanday</i>	<i>pipilit</i>
Future	<i>malacol</i>	<i>manday</i>	<i>milit</i>
Past	<i>melacol</i>	<i>minday</i>	<i>minilit</i>

### M

Root	<i>mulagat</i>	<i>molmol</i>	<i>mulat</i>
Meaning	to open one's eyes	to rinse one's mouth	to open one's eyes
Present	<i>mumulagat</i>	<i>momolmol</i>	<i>mumulat</i>
Future	<i>mulagat</i>	<i>molmol</i>	<i>mulat</i>
Past	<i>milagat</i>	<i>milmol</i>	<i>minulat</i>

## Exceptions

Regarding the rule that those which have more than two syllables must form the preterite by changing the first vowel of the future to *e* or *i*, I do not find them among the roots which begin with *b* or *m*; because even if they could be found among those which begin with *bi* or *mi*, there are few of them which are trisyllabic.

In *p* I find that *pintacasi* inserted *in* between *m* and the first vowel of the future. Preterite, *minintacasi*, to distinguish it from the future; not so with *piraya*, whose preterite and future is *miraya*. Among those with two syllables, which have two consonants after the first vowel, I find that, in the case of *bingcas*, to open by extending, its preterite is *mINingcas*; *bintang*, accuse falsely, preterite *mINintang*; but *bindang*, to break to pieces; *binlit*, to remove wrinkles from the present like the future *mindang*, *minlit*; in those with *p*, the same thing happens with *pildis*, to twist as with a spindle; preterite *minildis*.

## B

The second rule has many exceptions, because there are many which have two syllables and begin with *b* and *p*, which do not insert *in* in the preterite: take these which form the preterite by changing the first vowel to *e* or *i*; *babat*, to girdle; *bacam*, to break wind; *bagac*, to work, as in timber-cutting; *bait*, to manifest; *baril*, to gun down; *basa*, to wet; *bata*, to smell bad like meat; *bating*, to spread the net; *basac*, to drip; *bobo*, to turn upside down, as a jar; *bucal*, to boil; *bulung*, to grunt; *bono*, to hit; *busa*, to toast rice; *butas*, to determine; *bicang*, to divide; and *bilad*, to air. Their preterite is like the future, *micang*, *milad*, etc.

*Baba*, to lower; its past, *mEba*; *baba*, to carry; its past, *mEba*; *bayo*, to renew; past, *miNayo*; *bayo*, to thresh; past, *MEbayo*; *bacas*, to rake; it has no past; if it has to be used, say *MEMacas*; *bucbuc*, to nourish woodworms; past, *micbuc* or *miNucbuc*; *buat*, past, *miuat*.

## P

*Pagal*, to get tired; *pait*, to make bitter; *palis*, to sweep; *pamon*, to say goodbye; *pañgo*, to entrap; *panic*, to go up; *pari*, to separate with a wedge; *pasag*, to flounder anxiously; *patac*, to drip; *patad*, to snap, as a rope; *patay*, to die or to kill; *pulad*, to adorn an arrow with feathers; *pulas*, to return; *poloc*, for a cock to get irritated; *puput*, to suffocate; *purul*, to become blunt; *pusan*, to carry on the shoulder; *pusit*, to squeeze; *putal*, to pull the rope; *putao*, to make something short or deficient; *puti*, to whiten; all their past tenses change the first vowel of the future to *e* or *i*; *pili*, to choose; past, *MEmili*; *pilig*, to shake, past and future, *milig*; *puc*, past, *MIpuc*, to destine.

## M

Concerning this, I do not find any exception to this rule. The good thing about it is that almost all the roots have various compositions, which you will find one by one in the *Dictionary*.

### Third Conjugation

Belonging to this are the remaining consonants, namely, *c*, *d*, *y*, *l*, *n*, *ng*, *q*, *s*, *t*, *v*, but this last one, as I told you in its place, does not adhere. For each of them I will give you an example, so that, from it, you will learn how to form words from the remaining roots. You know that in all of them the present is formed by doubling the first syllable of the root; the past, by inserting *in* to the root after the first consonant.

To form the future, take note of the following. First, *concerning the roots which have more than two syllables, or even those with only two, if there are two consonants after the first vowel, its future is the root itself.* Second, *those with only one syllable (which are many) form the future by inserting um after the first consonant.* Third observation: *concerning those which have two syllables but do not have two consonants after the first vowel, some admit um, while, in some others, the root serves as the future.*

### EXAMPLES OF THIS CONJUGATION

Root	<i>cutang</i>	<i>dalaquit</i>	<i>gaga</i>	<i>yaus</i>
Meaning	to ask	to cross	to quarrel	to call
Present	<i>cucutang</i>	<i>daralaquit</i>	<i>gagaga</i>	<i>yayaus</i>
Past	<i>quinutang</i>	<i>dinalaquit</i>	<i>guinaga</i>	<i>ynaus</i>
Future	<i>cutang</i>	<i>dalaquit</i>	<i>gumaga</i>	<i>yumaus</i>

Note. In case you hear, *yaus, yauad*, also follow those which begin with a vowel: *maus, maurus, minaus; mauad, mamauad, minauad.*

Root	<i>lud</i>	<i>nabo</i>	<i>ngatba</i>
Meaning	to complete	to bring down	to be even with
Present	<i>lulud</i>	<i>nanabo</i>	<i>ngangatba</i>
Past	<i>linud</i>	<i>ninabo</i>	<i>nginatba</i>
Future	none	<i>numabo</i>	<i>ngatba</i>

Root	<i>quiput</i>	<i>sac</i>	<i>tila</i>	<i>viguig</i>
Meaning	to narrow	to thicken	to stop raining	to sprinkle
Present	<i>quiquiput</i>	<i>sasac</i>	<i>titila</i>	<i>viviguig</i>
Past	<i>quiniput</i>	<i>sinac</i>	<i>tinila</i>	<i>viniguig</i>
Future	<i>cumiput</i>	<i>sumac</i>	<i>tumila</i>	<i>viguig</i>

I do not doubt that you want to know which ones, among so many having only two syllables, admit *um* in the future and which ones do not, but you know well that people more intelligent than I have not been able to find a rule; perhaps because there is no general rule; but, just the same, take these, which can give you some kind of relief. First, *a verb which admits in for the first passive preterite usually admits um in the future.* Second, *it is very rare to find a root with an acute accent which admits um in the future;* and so you will take note of what I place in the Vocabulary under this letter (A).

## The Irregular Conjugation of the Active Voice

Notice that most of these irregulars follow the formation which you saw in those which begin with a vowel, and in such cases are irregular.

### First Irregular

Belonging to this are many of the disyllabic roots which begin with *a* and have two consonants following it, or have two vowels after the first consonant. The present is formed by merely placing at the start of the root its first consonant; that is, another like it; for example, *agtal*, present *Gagtal*, and from it we form the preterite and the future; for the former we change the first vowel to *in*, for the latter to *un*; and notice that both *in* and *un*, if they are followed by *i*, are changed to *ñi*.

### Examples of This Conjugation

Root	<i>agtal</i>	<i>atua</i>	<i>albay</i>	<i>asias</i>	<i>aduang</i>
Meaning	to pick	to argue	to watch	to harden	to give [to pass]
Present	<i>gagtal</i>	<i>tatua</i>	<i>lalbay</i>	<i>sasias</i>	<i>aduang</i>
Past	<i>guintal</i>	<i>tinua</i>	<i>limbay</i>	<i>sinias</i>	<i>inuang</i>
Future	<i>guntal</i>	<i>tunua</i>	<i>lumbay</i>	<i>sunias</i>	<i>dunuang</i>

Note: I said that there are many which admit this conjugation and not all because those which have *n* or *m* after the first *a* (even if it does not immediately follow *a*), or have *ng* after *a*, do not admit it; although *angsad*, to emit an underarm odor; *angsul*, boredom, have *MASangsad* and *MASangsal*. Neither are they admitted (except perhaps rarely) by *absic*, immature; *abtac*, crack; *abpang*, sticks for nipas; *acbag*, noise; *aclug*, to roar; *agnan*, on equal terms; *agsap*, to end, *albut*, to pick out; *alduc*, to sip; *abnoc*, to stoop; there are others which have only the present, like *Babual* from *abual*, to lever up; *abli*, to pay; *abnus*, to draw lots for; *apiac*, to close one's eyes; others also admit the preterite, like *apda*, present, *Papda*, preterite, *PINda*, and it means to extinguish; *apsay*, extend, like the hand, present, *Papsay*; preterite, *MINsay*; *asdo*, for a dress to be tight, *Sasdo*, *SINdo*; *aspa*, to throw into the mouth, *Saspa*, *SINpa*, etc. There are others which do not admit it, nor do they admit the regular; but in their construction, they imitate it; for example, *ablus* has *MIBablus*, to replace; *abno*, to meet, *MIBabuo*; *alda*, the multitude, *MALalda*; *alpa*, to overwater the rice being cooked, *MALapa*, etc. Later we will treat them. There are others like them which I will content myself with listing, so that you can see their irregularity in the Dictionary; for example, *acua*, to take; *abyay*, to give; *ablas*, to reciprocate; *aptas*, to bind; *abpa*, to rest, like a bird; *apsao*, to recover from fever; *agli*, to conceive; *atbud*, to rot.

## Second Irregular Conjugation

With this, we conjugate many dissyllabic roots which begin with *a*, and we form the abstract by putting *c* or *di* before them. They are adjectives of *ma*, where we change *m* to *c*. Those which admit this conjugation are: *caba* length; *cayan*, lasciviousness; *cayap*, goodness; *calat*, saltiness; *calbag*, swelling; *cauo*, thirst; *capia*, richness; *caplas*, burning pain; *casac*, thickness; *cascup*, narrowness; *casdan*, fright; *casias*, hardness; *casnoc*, anger; *casñgao*, usefulness; *cati*, low tide; *catas*, height; *catlac*, deafness. Coming close to these are *camin*, to be consumed; *camog*, to get wet; *capno*, to fill; *catmo*, the same; *caslam*, to turn sour; *casna*, to fill up, and some other such thing; and their meaning is expressed neutrally and intransitively. To form the present, double the first syllable; the future, insert *um* between *c* and *a*; the preterite, *in*.

### Examples of This Conjugation

Root	<i>ayap</i>	<i>amin</i>	<i>asias</i>	<i>aslam</i>
Meaning	to improve	to be consumed	to harden	to turn sour
Present	<i>cacayap</i>	<i>cacamin</i>	<i>cacasias</i>	<i>cacaslam</i>
Preterite	<i>quinayap</i>	<i>quinamin</i>	<i>quinasias</i>	<i>quinaslam</i>
Future	<i>cumayap</i>	<i>cumamin</i>	<i>cumasias</i>	<i>cumaslam</i>

Note: This conjugation is not admitted by those roots which in their regular conjugation are active or signify *transitive movement*, because those of this conjugation connote something immanent. Note further that some of these roots admit all the other conjugations and compositions of which they are capable, although not always with the same meaning; for example, *aslam* admits *SASlam*, *SINlam*, *SUNlam* and its compound *masaslam*, etc. and they both mean the same as *cacaslam*; but in the regular conjugation, *mamaslam*, *minaslam*, *maslam*, means to pour vinegar on the food. Which conjugations admit this and which do not, the Dictionary will tell you.

### Third Irregular Conjugation

There are few under this heading. They mean the same as the preceding conjugation. They are dissyllabic and begin with the vowel *i*. To form the present, double the *i* which does not adhere to the other, as I said in the observations. For the preterite, put *in* before; for the future, insert *um* after *i*; for example, *imut*, root, to be stingy; present, *Iimut*; preterite, *INimut*; future, *IUMimut*; here *y* is attached to *u*, as I also said; but since the roots which belong here are defective, copy them; look them up in the *Dictionary*.

## List of the Roots

*yiac*, to shout; *ina*, to get weak; *ingay*, to make noise; *inguis*, to be stingy; *intac*, *insac*, to get smaller; *ingpis*, to grow thin; *iring*, to be playful; *iri*, to make a face. I don't remember the rest.

### Section 3

#### The Regular Passives and Their Formation

Do not think that a root has only one passive as *lego* [I read], which has only *legor* [I am read], etc.; here, there can be more, although some admit only two, others only one, because its meaning does not give place to more. They take their name from their distinguishing particle. The first is known as the *i*-passive, because it is formed by placing this letter *i* before it; the second one the *an*, because this letter *an* is placed after it; the third is known as the *anan*, for the same reason, although *an* is in place of *anan*. I will call them the *first*, *second* and *third*.

To form the tenses of the first, if the root begins with a vowel, place *i* before it and you will have the future; bearing in mind that if the vowel is not *i*, you will pronounce this *i* which you add as a consonant; having formed the future, double its first syllable, and place another vowel *i* before it and you will have the present; the preterite is formed from the root by placing *in* before it.

Among the roots that begin with a consonant, all the tenses are formed from the root; the future, merely by placing *i* before it; the present by placing the same *i* before it, but doubling the first syllable of the root; the preterite requires a separate explanation.

#### First

Among those with only one syllable, insert it right after the first consonant.

#### Second

Among those with three syllables, change the first vowel to *e* or *i*; among those with two syllables, where the first vowel is followed by two consonants, or the first consonant is followed by two vowels, insert *in*; but if they are purely dissyllabic, for example, *sulat*, *sulut*, insert *in* or not for the preterite the same way with *um* for the future active. I only know that most of those which have *um* in the future insert *in* to form this preterite. The others at times insert *in* and at times change the first vowel to *e* or *i*. There is no other remedy than to examine them one by one, or to go see the *Dictionary*.

Note: In this first passive, we never place *i* before [the root] to form the preterite, and even the present and the future usually drop it, especially if they have more than two syllables.

## Exmaples of This First Passive

Root	<i>aral</i>	<i>salicut</i>	<i>irid</i>	<i>sulat</i>	<i>sulut</i>	<i>tun</i>
Meaning	to teach	to hide	to rub	to write	to open	to cook
Future	<i>yaral</i>	<i>isalicut</i>	<i>Iyrid</i>	<i>isulat</i>	<i>isulut</i>	<i>itun</i>
Present	<i>iyayaral</i>	<i>isasalicut</i>	<i>Iyirid</i>	<i>isusulat</i>	<i>isusulut</i>	<i>itutun</i>
Preterite	<i>inaral</i>	<i>selicut</i>	<i>Inirid</i>	<i>sinulat</i>	<i>silut</i>	<i>tinun</i>

I have already said that even if *i* adheres to the *a* and the *o*, it does not adhere to the *i*, and in the present of *irid*, pronounce three vowels, and in the future two, aside from the last *i*.

Note: Concerning the trisyllabic and the dissyllabic which have two consonants after the first vowel and begin with *i*, to distinguish the preterite from the future, perhaps they admit *in*, like *lindayog*, to be hesitant, preterite, *linindayog*; *sitsit*, to whisper, preterite, *sinitsit*; *simpan* to keep safe, preterite, *sinimpan*, something which is kept safe; but *tiltil*, to touch lightly, and *liualas*, to widen, preterite *liualas*, *tiniltit*; and this way for the others. See the Dictionary.

Concerning the dissyllabic, which have two vowels after the first consonant, I find that they do not insert *in*: *buat*, lift; *lual*, go out; *sui*, do violence; *tuag*, to empty by turning upside down, like a jar; but only *i*: preterite *biuat*, *liual*, *siui*, *tinag*; *tayi*, to sew, preterite *teyi*; *layi*, preterite *leyi*.

## Second Passive

All the verbs form their tenses like the first [passive] by dropping the *i*, which is the beginning, and placing *an*, which is its distinctive particle, at the end; but they drop it in the preterite; except *labul*, to ignite, *abli*, to pay what is bought; *bayad*, to pay a debt; *tauad*, to haggle; *dagang*, to buy whole sale; *utang*, to borrow, and some others; *sali*, to buy, has also *seliuan*, but more commonly the preterite *seli*, etc. *Anac* has one and the other, like *sali*, *babi*, etc.

Among the roots which end in *a*, usually it is enough to add *n*; for example, *uma*, second passive *uman*, the one kissed; although some roots which end in *a* are not contented with *n* only; for example, *asa*, to trust; *asaan*, to intercede. I note this in order not to forget *miralitan*, which means to sing, and *miralitaan*, which is to suffer.

Others insert *n*, like *quilala*; for example, *quilalanan*; *tanda*, remember, *tandan*, *salpantayanan*, *casalanan*; others insert *u* before *an*; like *saliuan* (not *salian*), what is bought, and its compounds. *Tabili*, let fall from one's hands, *tabiliuan*; *bali*, to cancel; *baliuan*; *lili*, take note of a defect, *liliuan*, e tc.

In place of this *u*, others insert *n*. *Pili*, to choose; *pilinan*; *alili*, to exchange, *alilinan* or *alinlan*; *tibay*, to strengthen, becomes *tibian*; *libay*, to barter, *libian*; *lauay*, to look at, *lauan*; *babay*. Look at their composition. They are in the Vocabulary.

### Example[s] of This Second Passive

Root	<i>agtal</i>	<i>tacal</i>	<i>sui</i>	<i>dapat</i>	<i>patay</i>
Meaning	to catch	to measure	to force	to make	to kill
Future	<i>agtalan</i>	<i>tacalan</i>	<i>suiyan</i>	<i>daptan</i>	<i>patayn</i>
Present	<i>yayagtalan</i>	<i>tatacalan</i>	<i>susuiyan</i>	<i>daraptan</i>	<i>papatayan</i>
Preterite	<i>inagtal</i>	<i>tinacal</i>	<i>siui</i>	<i>depat</i>	<i>petay</i>

### Third Passive

Its formation is like that of the second, except that sometimes it ends in *an*, and sometimes in *anan*. The preterite always has *an* or *anan*; among those which begin with a vowel, *in* is added before; in all the rest, its first vowel is changed to *e* or *i*, although, in the case of some, to distinguish the preterite from the future, they admit *in*, [as you will find] in the *Dictionary*.

### Examples of This Third Passive

Root	<i>agcas</i>	<i>sulat</i>	<i>tacal</i>	<i>siclaud</i>
Meaning	to say	to write	to measure	to kneel
Present	<i>yayagcasanan</i>	<i>susulatanan</i>	<i>tatacalanan</i>	<i>sisiclauran</i>
Future	<i>agcasanan</i>	<i>sulatan</i>	<i>tacalanan</i>	<i>siclauran</i>
Preterite	<i>inagcasanan</i>	<i>silatan</i>	<i>tecalanan</i>	<i>siniclauran</i>

## Section 4

### The Irregular Third Passives [sic. Three?]

Go over the irregular conjugation of the dissyllabic roots which begin with *a* and have two consonants after it, or two vowels after the first consonant; those ones admit another irregular in these passives.

### First Passive

Take the present of the irregular active (about which alone I speak now), put *i* before it, and you get the present; the preterite is the same as that of the active without *i* before it; for the future, change the first *a* to *i*. This is its first passive.

## Second Passive

The present is that of the active with *an* at the end; the preterite that of the active without *an*; the future that of the active with *an* at the end.

## Third Passive

Take note that if something in the active changes *b* or *p* to *m*, here it does not change. Its present and preterite with *anan*; its future, the root with *anan*.

## Examples of These Three Passives

### First Passive

Root	<i>agtal</i>	<i>aduang</i>	<i>assuit</i>	<i>aptas</i>
Meaning	to gather	to give	to open	to bind
Present <sup>i</sup>	<i>gagtal</i>	<i>idaduang</i>	<i>isasuit</i>	<i>ipaptas</i>
Preterite	<i>guintal</i>	<i>dinuang</i>	<i>siñuit</i>	<i>pintas</i>
Future	<i>igtal</i>	<i>iduang</i>	<i>isuit</i>	<i>iptas</i>

### Second Passive

Present	<i>gagtalan</i>	<i>daduañguan</i>	<i>sasuitan</i>	<i>paptasan</i>
Preterite	<i>guintal in</i>	<i>aduañg</i>	<i>siñuit</i>	<i>pintas</i> or <i>inaptas</i>
Future	<i>agtalan</i>	<i>aduañgan</i>	<i>asuitan</i>	<i>aptasan</i>

### Third Passive

Present	<i>gagtalanan</i>	<i>daduañganan</i>	<i>sasuitanan</i>	<i>paptasanan</i>
Preterite	<i>guintalanan</i>	<i>inaduañganan</i>	<i>siñuitanan</i>	<i>pintasanan</i>
Future	<i>agtalanan</i>	<i>aduañganan</i>	<i>asuitanan</i>	<i>aptasanan</i>

Not all the roots which begin with *a* and have two consonants after it or two vowels after the first consonant admit these passives. There are many irregular: Take this copy and look them up in the *Dictionary*. Why will you make me tired transferring here what you have there?

## LIST

*Agtas*, to clear by opening a road; *atdas*, to burst; *atbus*, to rescue; *atbi*, to crack a nut; *assiad*, to bite; *aslat*, to wedge in; *atbac*, to pierce; *atdac*, to thrust

a stick in the ground; *apiac*, to close one's eyes; *apsay*, to extend, like an arm; *albay*, to watch; *alua*, to throw out of the mouth; *abiai*, to give; *asdap*, to find out ahead of time; *atbay*, to flood; *atñga*, to raise and incline a bit; *abual*, to pull; *Aspa* [either this is a wrong spelling or the ancient word for the present *apsa*], to throw out of the mouth; *asdo*, to pack tight clothes; *agcat*, to invite; *altao*, to surface; *aclis*, to shout; and more which you will find.

## CHAPTER 4

### The Use of the Active and the Passive in General and of the Three Passives in Particular

These two principles are the two firm foundations on which the aesthetic structure of this language rests. They are the two axles in which the whole machine moves. And so, after having discussed *what a noun is, what a verb is, what active is, what passive is, how many there are and how they are formed* [These last two clauses are not italicized in the Spanish original]; I found it convenient, if not necessary, to put this chapter next; because, to want to put into practice what has been said, without understanding it, would be more a guesswork or a recitation from rote memory than saying things intelligently.

I suppose that you have not yet forgotten that the first sentence of the active is made up of *the nominative of the person who does, the verb and the accusative of the person who receives the action*. The same is true in Kapampangan; and that the first sentence of the passive is made up of *the nominative of the person who receives the action, the verb and the ablative of the person who does*. Change the ablative to genitive and try doing that in this language. You will find here many examples of one and the other.

### Section 1

#### When to Speak in the Active and When in the Passive

#### First Rule

But before putting this rule and the others that follow, since we have the good fortune of having our Spanish as a blind man's guide in all that is essential among them, it is important for you to be very aware of how our language expresses things, to see whether to explain or not *the nominative of the person who does*.

It is certain that in simple sentences, it usually does not express it, but implies or includes it in the verb; and so we say: *Call Juan*, not *You, call Juan* The same way: write (*escribid*) [understood: *vosotros, you*], we read (*leemos*) [understood: *nosotros, we*], etc. and if such sentences express the nominative of the person who does, it is the same as when they do not express it, because it does not add anything to its meaning; because these two mean the same: *Call Juan* and *You, call Juan*.

Notice that this is true with the second, third and fourth rules, and the use of the nominatives or articles that are placed at the end, as distinct from the use of those which are placed at the beginning, as you will observe as you go along.

Sentences which are not simple refer explicitly to the person who does the action. The explicit reference is sometimes done by pointing to the definite doer of each thing, for example, *You have to write the letters; thou hast to sweep the room; I will pray the rosary* etc. Sometimes, the sentence searches for the doer

or asks who he is; for example, who killed that man? Did you kill him? Sometimes it insists and empathically affirms that he and not another one was the doer; for example, you killed him. Sometimes the person is given emphasis or stress, as when the teacher tells his student: Yes you understand it more than I; and the same if it includes surprise or a mystery; for example, in these two sentences: You will wash my feet! *Ego autem dico vobis* [but I say unto you], etc. Lastly, the sentence begins with a proper name or a definite thing.

In all the above-mentioned sentences, our language never implies in the verb the *person who does*, but instead necessarily expresses it, and corresponding to that, the Kapampangan language necessarily includes the use of the nominative or articles which are placed before; and from this comes this.

### First Rule [sic.]

Whenever the Spanish sentence begins by expressing the nominative of the person who acts, the Kapampangan active is properly used by starting with the corresponding nominative. From here we infer that all the following sentences and those similar to them are well said in the active.

- First: He who steals little things today will become a thief tomorrow.  
*Ing GAGAMIT ngenin ditac, bucas manaco ya.*
- Second: Pedro will look for people. *Y Pedro MANINTUN yan tauo.*
- Third: I will call the Father. *Acon YUMAUS quing Pare*
- Fourth: You seize the horses. *Ican MANYACAP caring cabayo.*
- Fifth: You bring the chairs down. *Icon MITIPA caring siya.*
- Sixth: The sick repents of his sins. *Ing salunan SUMISI ya quing casalanan na.*
- Seventh: I am the one who should hear his confession. *Aco ing PAPAGCOMPISAL queya.*
- Eight: He is the one who has to ring the bell. *Ita ing TIGTIG quing campana.*

From the rule, we further infer, and with more reason (*a fortiori*) that the active is very appropriate, whenever the sentences are interrogative, admirative or emphatic; for example, Who sold Christ? *ninon MIBAYAD can Cristo?* Which of the soldiers pierced him? *Ingsa cay CARING soldados ing tinandus queya?* You, Lord, will wash my feet? *Ica pun MUYAS quing bitis co Guinu co?* Does the disciple resist the master? *Ing alagad LUMABAN ya pala quing maestro na?* etc. You must have noticed that this rule covers all verbs, be they simple or complex, be they about something definite or indefinite. Now, you might ask whether, in sentences falling under this first rule, we can also use the passive. My answer is that even if, in these sentences, the active is more commonly used and more elegant and safer from

errors, nevertheless, excepting those which refer to an **indefinite thing**, like the first two, all the rest can also be put in the passive, because they **retain the same meaning**. I will give some examples for you to serve as models in **constructing** the rest.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| First: <i>Acon yumaus quing Pare</i>             | Passive: <i>AcoYAUSAN que ing Pare.</i>  |
| Second: <i>Icon mitipa carin sia</i>             | Passive: <i>Icayo ITIPA yo ding sia.</i>   |
| Third: <i>Aco ing papagcompesal a<br/>co ya.</i> | Passive: <i>Aco ing quey<br/>PAPAGCOMPESALAN</i>   |
| Fourth: <i>Nino mibayad can Cristo?</i>          | Passive: <i>Nino ing PIBAYAD ney<br/>Cristo?</i>   |
| Fifth: <i>Ica pon muyas quing bitis co?</i>      | Passive: <i>Ica po ing UASAN mo co<br/>bitis? or UASAN mo ing<br/>bitis co, Guinu co? etc.</i> |

## Second Rule

But there is no point in giving this rule unless you first recall what was said earlier about nominatives which are placed after, and unless I explain to you what I mean by an *absolutely indefinite thing* which you will see in this rule.

I therefore say that an *absolutely indefinite thing* is that which, in our Spanish is in the accusative, being the receiver of the action, and is left in the air absolutely naked of any particle that can make it definite, as you will see in the examples.

Given this backdrop, I now state the rule. When a Spanish sentence begins by implying the nominative of the person who does the action, if it refers to an *absolutely indefinite thing*, the active is used, and not the passive. From this, we can infer that the following sentences and others like them sound well in the active, but sound bad in the passive.

Bring water, *CUMA can danum*; go up get nuts, *MUQUIAT can luyus*; look for a plank, *MANINTUN can tablero*; eat meat, *MASAN con bulbulan*; I cannot find chicks, *e co MACAQUIT sisi*; call a sacristan, *YUMAUS can catauung sacristan* or *YUMAUS can sacristan* or *YUMAUS can metong sacristan*; he who insists in putting them in the passive will prove that he does not know the language.

This rule is very certain and very general. There are two exceptions, namely, these two adverbs, *atin* and *ala*, there is, there is none, with which the sentences referring to indefinite things are also made passive, e. g. *MECAMATE can tauo?* Have you put people to death? Passive, *ATIN PETE mong tauo?* He answers: *e co MECAMATE tauo*. Passive, *ALA con PETAY a tauo*, I have not put any man to death, there is no man put by me to death.

Also exceptions to this rule (and even to the most general rule which teaches that we must put in the genitive the person who does the action in a passive construction) are these adjectives, *dacal*, *ditac*, many, few, whose norm is to put the person who does the action in the nominative; for example, you killed many people, active: *mecamate*

*CANDACAL a tauo*; passive, *DACAL CA petay a tauo*. The same with these: we ate little, *DITAC QUE pangan*; *DACAL ya inuman*, he drinks a lot etc.

The same norm covers these adjectives: *matas, mababa, marayo, malapit*, etc.; for example, I am showing somebody to somebody else and he does not see him; I tell him: how can you see him if you are looking down? *nun MABABA CA lalauan?* etc. He answers: *MATAS na CO lalauan*, I am now looking up, etc.

### Third Rule

Because this rule, as you will see, is the exact opposite of the preceding, I will prepare you to understand it by a preliminary explanation. And so, leaving behind irrelevant reflections and useless objections, I say *that we are talking of an absolutely definite thing, whenever our Spanish uses a singular to refer to the person who receives the action*. For example, God, Christ, *hic homo* [this man] and any of the demonstratives: *Pedro*, for example, and any of the proper nouns and surnames: *thou, I*, and any of the primitive pronouns; *mine, thine*, and any of the possessives; lastly, any thing which goes with some of our particles, *el, los, las, la* [equivalent to only one English word: the], etc. is *absolutely definite*, for which the passive is used, this being the only thing we are looking for here. Given this backdrop, here is the rule.

Whenever the Spanish sentence begins by implying the nominative of the person who does the action, if it refers to an absolutely definite thing, the passive is appropriately used. In this rule, I see no difficulty, nor do I find any exception, nor any danger of committing an error. But to be able to know when the sentences covered by it can also be put in the active the way they are easily put in the passive, *hoc opus, hic labor est* [this is the work, this is the labor].

This difficulty will be laughed at by one who makes no distinction between the use of the articles which are placed after and those which are placed before, but does not realize that in using the former you don't meet the set back that you might meet in the first rule. And when we use the latter, there are many (as will be seen in this rule) in which I would prefer to hear the other.

In the first place, I suppose that it is indubitable that these sentences and those like them can never be put in the active.

- First: Call the Priest. *AUSAN me ing Pare*  
[sic; the same as the first example below]
- Second: Close that door. *ICABAT me itang pasbul.*
- Third: Catch the thief. *DACPAN me ing mapanacao*
- Fourth: Throw this inkstand. *YUGSE me iyang tintero*

And that these ones and all those like them can be put in the active; but in that case, they have a different meaning from that of the passive.

- First: Call the priest. *AUSAN me ing Pare*  
[sic; the same as the first example above]
- Second: Close those doors. *ICABAT mo detang pasbul.*
- Third: Catch those thieves. *DACPAN mo detang mapanacao.*
- Fourth: Whip this boy. *BATBATAN me iyang anac* or these boys  
*deang anac.*
- Fifth: I cannot read those books. *e co ABASA detang libro.*
- Sixth: Eat this chicken. *ASAN me iyang manoc.*

I also suppose that, with the neutral verbs, to speak in the active is the same as to speak in the passive; for example, *LUMAPIT ca can Pedro* or *LAPITAN me y Pedro*; *LISIA ca quing dalan* or *LISIAN me ing dalan*; *TATACUT CO queca*, I am afraid of you; *TACUTAN da ca*, the same, etc.; and even if they are active, they look at the person (who receives the action) merely as a pure term or object or motive. *Tuqui or musi ca caco*, come with me; *tuquian or usian mo co*, the same; sow on this land, *SALBAG ca queyang gabun* or *SALBAGAN*; *TATANGIS co can ibpa co* or *TATANGISAN que*, etc. *LUMABAN ca carela* or *LABANAN mo la*.

And this is not only among those which require the third passive, but also among those of the first; for example, I cry over my father, *ITANGIS que ibpa co* or *TUMANGIS co can ibpa co*; *GUMALANG ca caring matua queca* or *igalang* etc. *GAUA can chocolate canaco* or *IGAUAN mo con chocolate*, etc.

Given this backdrop, and such variety, I say first of all, that the surer way is to put all of them in the passive, although among the neutral verbs, I find no danger of making a mistake, whether they are in the active or in the passive.

Among those active verbs which look at the person (who receives the action) as *merely a term, an object, or a motive*, it is usual (even though not surer) to speak in the active; among the verbs which are more properly active, because they look at the person who receives the action as one who receives the action, you never refer to an individual in the active; and when they are in the plural or when the action is divisible, they have their own active and passive, but they do not fall under this rule, but under the next one.

#### Fourth Rule

*Whenever a Spanish sentence begins by implying the nominative of the person who does the action, if it refers to a thing which is definite as a whole and to an indefinite part of it, the active is appropriately used and, never the first passive nor the second, but yes, the third passive, anan or ananan.*

To understand this rule, I presume something which cannot be denied, namely that, in our language, there is a very common way of saying something where the whole is definite, but not the part; for example:

- First: Take *some from those* pesos.  
 Second: Drink *some from this* bottle.  
 Third: Pour *some of this* water.  
 Fourth: Do not take *from that*.  
 Fifth: Take *from this*.  
 Here, as you see , the whole is definite, but not the part.  
 More clearly tell a sick person:  
 Sixth: Eat some *from this* chicken.

The chicken is the whole and becomes definite because of the demonstrative *from this*; the part remains indefinite because you do not specify whether it is the breast or the leg, etc.

This way of speaking, actually a wider way, is also found in this language, and so here, whenever the whole is definite, and not the part, the active is well used and in that case, its articles do not have the function of the accusative (where many make a mistake), but of the ablative *ex* or *de* [from], and for this reason this active also leads to the third passive of *anan* or *ananan*, which does not specify the part which it removes, implying, however, that where that part is removed, something remains. Here are the examples

- First: *CUMA ca caretang pesos*; Passive: *CUANANAN mo detang pesos*  
 Second: *MINUM ca canining frasco*; *INUMANAN me ining frasco*  
 Third: *MIBATING ca queyang danum*; *BATINGANAN mo iyang danum*  
 Fourth: *E ca CUMA canian*; *e me CUCUANAN iyan*  
 Fifth: *CUMA na ca canini*; *CUANANAN mo na ini*  
 Sixth: *MASAN ca queyan capon*; *ASANAN me iyan capon*  
 Seventh: *Bibite ex hoc omnes* [*All of you, drink from this*]; *PASIINUM co ngan canini*.

*INUMAN na yo ngan ini*, etc. *DACAP ca caretang manacao*, catch some of them, *DACPANAN mo*; *BATBATAN mo*; *CABATANAN mo*, etc.

None of these sentences can be put in the passive, whether the first or the second, unless you have recourse to the poor man's pan, *atin*, *ala*, there is, there is none; the reason is clear, because if it could be put that way, it would have to be by placing the oblique case [that is, the non-nominative case] in the nominative of the person who receives the action and giving it the passive which corresponds to it; for example. Let us suppose that the sentence "take from this" *cuma ca canini*," is put in the second passive, which is what corresponds to it; you would have to say *cuan mo ini*, and this one does not mean "take from *this*," which is what it should be, but

“take *this*,” which is what it should not be. That nominative *ini* does not refer to a definite whole and an indefinite portion, which is what this clause *take from this* means precisely, but it only refers to an absolutely definite thing: *take this*, which totally changes the meaning; you will just be insisting that *drink from this cask* is the same as *drink this cask*, etc.

In order to show how these three rules conform to our above-mentioned three manners of speaking and how those who confuse them will mess up everything, I will summarize them for you on the chess board

- First. If you want to play, for example, *bring a chessboard*  
Second. For example, *with which we usually play*.  
Third. If the chessboard, for example, breaks into pieces and we ask some from them, we say; *bring from that chessboard*.

The first model corresponds to the second rule, which refers to an absolutely indefinite thing, *CUMA can tablero*, in the active only; the second corresponds to the third, which refers to the absolutely definite thing, *CUAN me itang tablero*, in the passive only; the third corresponds to this fourth rule, referring to a definite whole and an indefinite part: *CUMA ca quetang tablero* in the active; *CUANANAN me itang tablero* in the passive etc. *Et sic de reliquis* [And the same with the rest.]

A last point. If you hear *SUMUGAT* e.g., or *MATBAT ca queyang anac*, do not think that it is the same as saying *SUGTAN* or *BATBATAN me iyang anac*, whip or hurt that boy (as somebody thought); because, as I already said, with those active verbs, you do not construct sentences about an absolutely definite thing in the active. What it says is “you (you also), hurt or whip” and so the indio usually adds *naman* to it, and for us it is as when we say “you (you also), try and see, you (you also), wet it. So, this manner of speaking is not absolute; it always presupposes that somebody else or others are already doing the same thing; for example, *si cuando en toro muerto todos mojan, tu tambien mojas tu carranza*, [when you see everybody pouring water after a bull is killed, you also pour water], *sinuldul NA ca MAN queya*; and in the passive it retains *naman*; for example, *sugtan mu NE MAN*; *batbatanan mo NE MAN*; *sindulanan mu NEMAN*; etc. If the receiver of the action is in the plural, it also admits this meaning and that mentioned in this rule.

## Last Rule

[In Latin, the nominative case is also called “right” as in “right angle,” while each of the rest is called “oblique” as in “oblique angle,” namely, genitive, dative, accusative, ablative and vocative, because when listed on paper, the nominative, which is the first, is like a horizontal line forming a right angle with the vertical line (left margin) from which all of them begin, while the others form slanting lines or oblique angles. *Casus rectus. Casus obliquus.*]

Whenever a Spanish sentence begins with an oblique case, the passive is appropriately well used; for example, *whom* are you looking for? *Ninon PANINTUNAN mo?*, I am looking for *you*, *Ican PANINTUNAN co*; are you washing *my feet*? *Acon uyan mo po bitis?* and *Judas* also, *y Judas pa naman UYASAN co bitis*, etc. [The direct objects or receivers of the action are said to be in the accusative case].

I already hear you say under your breath: it would be clearer and better if the rule would say whenever it starts with the person who receives the action, as in the examples given and in these: What are you doing? What are you thinking about? *Nanun daraptan mu? Nanung isipan mo? etc.* without referring to oblique cases.

I ask: and when the Spanish sentence begins with a dative or an ablative, etc. whom we do not refer to as the person who receives the action, how can this be understood using your rule? Because it is certain that, even then, the passive is used; for example, *for whom* do you make chocolate? *Ninon IGAUA mon chocolate?* I am making *for Pedro IGAUA que y Pedro*. *With what* do you write? *Nanun ISULAT mo?* With the pen, *ing pluma iyang ISULAT co*; With which learning aid do you study? *Nanun PIPAGARALANMO?* The grammar book, *Ing Arte ing pipagaralan co* etc. [These examples are in the ablative.]

## Section 2

### The Use of the Three Passives

#### First Passive of *I*

## Y

Since there is so little to say about vague or indefinite things, the remaining set of innumerable external ways with which the soul expresses its concepts are summarized by this language in only three passives.

The first refers to *all that is moved or moves*; the second refers to *all that is attracted or is changed*; the third, refers to *the place, object or end of all actions*. And take note that in all of them, when I say *agente* [doer], I speak of the person who does something in the sentence, which has to be always in the genitive. By *cosa* [thing], I mean *the receiver of the action*, be it stone, man, plant, etc. and this has to be always in the nominative. This having been said.

#### First Rule

When you put in the nominative any thing which the doer moves, especially outward, you have to use this passive. This means that if you put in the nomina-

tive the habit, which a person takes or moves to wear, or the morsel which you take or move towards your mouth or that of somebody else, I must say *ISULUD me ing habito*, wear the habit; *ISUBU mo ing canan* etc. So also, close your eyes, *IPIAC mong mata mo*; open them, *IMULAT mo*; extend your arm or your leg, *IAPSE me ing bitis* or *tacde* [sic, not respectively]; withdraw them, *ICLONG mo la*, etc.; remove that, *ILACO mo yan*, etc.

I said *especially outward* because even if this rule is about movement properly or not properly so called, outward movement is more common; and so when you put the following in the nominative, namely, that which is thrown, shot, sown, scattered, poured, put somewhere, spat out, mixed with another thing, and anything that is given, use this passive, because, in all these ways of speaking, there is movement; for example, throw that dagger, *YUGSE me iyang sundang*; put that sword down, *IBILI me iyang calis*. etc.

### Observations

First, when you refer to the doer as moving something, this is not taken so strictly as to require that it be perceived by any external sense the way, for example, you perceive *the palay which you sow* or *the blood that you vomit*. It is enough that you think of it as being moved in some aspect; for example, when the minister says *I will solemnize your marriage*, he neither moves nor pushes nor expels the one who is getting married, but because it is conceived that in some way he influences and moves him from being unmarried to being married, it falls under this rule; for example, I will solemnize your marriage, *IPAQUIASUA ra ca*.

This way, when, for example, *I am asking about you*, I certainly do not throw you out of my mouth, but because in some way you go out of my mouth through the word which means *you*, I will say *ICUCUTANG DA CA*, and so, you say: *answer for me*, *IPAQUIBAT mo co*; and everything that is asked and answered, etc.

Secondly, if you do not like to get confused many times when you want to know if there is this movement, do not mind so much our way of talking as that of the indio, for example, in this sentence, *teach the boys*, we do not consider this as a movement, but the indio does, because, from his habit of using the verb *TURO* this way, he says that, in teaching them, he moves them outward, *ITURO mo deang anac*. Also, he sees movement and we do not when, for example, when he asks forgiveness from somebody, and he usually says: I kneel down in your presence carrying my sins, *ISICLAUD co po quecang casalanan co*; and the other answers, for example, *nga mo na quing dios mo ISICLAUD* or *ISISI mo queng G.n.t.* [Guinu tang] *DIOS*, etc. This is a general practice.

Notice also that many verbs, due to their way of signifying, can use not only this passive, since they signify *movement*, but also the second and third, because they also refer to *changelessness* or *place*, etc., for example, *sabi*. Because the

thing that is said goes out, it admits *isabi*; and because it is related or unchanged. it admits the second: *sabian*, *tungcos*, that the thing is moved in packing it, *itungcos*: from the point of view that it refers to a place or cloth. *Tungcusan*. Third etc.

Lastly, remember that, when the doer and the receiver of the action are in the same area, only the doer expresses this passive; for example, hasten your pace, *ilacad mo*; force yourself to eat, *ipangan mo*; lay your legs, *iquera mo*, *itudtud mo*, etc.

## INSTRUMENT

This rule covers all that which serves as an instrument, strictly or broadly speaking, because it is understood that in order to work with it, one has to move it; and do not be limited by the Spanish *con que* [with which], because many times, we also use *para* [for] and even the Spanish *de* [of]; for example, This is the knife *de* [to be used for] sharpening pens, *para* [to be used for] sharpening pens, *con que se cortan* [with which we sharpen] pens, *ini ing campit a IPANILOS or IPANLAYI or PANASA carin pluma*; bring the razor, *para, de, con que* [for shaving], *cun meng labasas a IPANURUD*; Lord give me the grace or spirit *to serve you*, *luguran mo co*, *Guinu cun gracia* or *lub a ISUYU co queca*, etc.

The same is true even when the only acceptable Spanish is with which; for example, the pen *with which I am writing*, *ing plumang ISULAT co*; this is the knife *with which I wounded you*, *ini ing iuang INIUANA queca* [The Spanish original *heri* means *I wounded*, while the Kapampangan *iniunana queca* means *he wounded*, which in Spanish is *hirio*]; the carabao *with which my brother plows*, I also *plow with*, *ing damulag a ISASAROL ning capatad co, iya na man ISASAROL co*; these are the stones or pieces of wood *with which you have to make your house*, *ila denin calap a IGAUA mo queng bale mo*.

## SECOND RULE MOTIVE

*This passive is also used when the motive for which or for whom something is done is put in the nominative*; for example, *Why are you working?* *Nanong IGAGALO mo?*; for the money, *ing salaping IGAGALO co*; *Why did they whip you?*, *nanung BITBAT da queca?*, for example. It is true of course that these ways of speaking are ambiguous, because they can mean *with what* do you work, *with what* did they whip you? And aside from that, one can ask using the adverb *inta* and get the answer using the adverb *uli*; but sometimes, they are precise, and when they are a compelling and ultimate motive, the construction is this and the third. I will give you an example: *In the name of Jesus*, every knee bows, *ING LAGUIONG jesus ISICLAURA ngan*, etc.; in everything that you do, *have God for your motive*, *IYAN IPUN mong DIOS queng sablan daptan mo*; if *you do it for him*, he will undoubtedly reward you; *nun IYAN IRAPAT mo* or *DAPTANAN mo, ablasanan queca*

*alan sala; why are you crying? NINON ITATANGIS mo? or TATANGISAN mo?; ibca co, etc.*

This second rule covers the following Spanish idiomatic expressions: *in behalf of whom or for whom*; for example, *IGAUA mo CON chocolate; ICUA mu CON api, danum or maman, etc.* Bring him sweets *in my behalf*, *ICUA mo CON mayumo queya*; write him *in my behalf*, *ISULAT mo CO quea*; pray or say mass *in my behalf*, *IPANALANGIN or IPAGMISA mo CO*; ask him how he is or kiss his hand *in my behalf*, *IPAGMANANO mo CO or YUMA MO CO gamat queya*; etc.

## TIME

I give a separate rule for this, even if the Kapampangan conceives or comprehends such sentences under the concepts of *con* [with] or *para* [for], as was said of the instrument: and so, the time “in which” or “of” is not constructed with this passive, if at least it does not conceive of an immanent action as it does not conceive in “the day someone dies or is conceived, etc. but neither must this rule be restricted to only the time, which we explained with the Spanish “in which,” because it admits other Spanish forms, as you will see.

## THIRD RULE

*This passive is used when the time in which, of, for doing something, for example, is in the nominative.* The explanation of this rule, together with other things which it covers, can be given through the examples that follow.

*Time in which:* Today, Thursday, is the day *on which I write this, ing aldao ngenin Jueves ISUSULAT co queni*; Thursday was the day *on which I was writing this, Jueves ing aldao a SINULAT co queni*. Under this concept, continue: On Friday, I will fast. On Saturday, I will give alms. On Sunday, I will hear mass. On Monday, I will arrive in Mandaloya [Mandaluyong]. *Ing Viernes IPAGYUNAL co. Ing Sabado IPANLIMUS co. Ing Domingo IPAQUIRAMDAM con misa. Ing Lunes IRAS co Mandaloya.* May God grant you time *within which you will be converted or will repent or will take care of your soul or will confess. Lugurana ca ning Dios aldao a IBALIC ning lub mo or ISISI mo or ISISI mo quing caladua mo or IPAGCONPESAL mo.*

*Time of, etc.* Here we can very well translate what is said by Ecclesiasticus [should be Ecclesiastes, 3:4] *tempus flendi et tempus ridendi [a time to weep, and a time to laugh]* etc; for example, time to weep, *panaon a IPANANGIS*; time to laugh, *panaon a IAILI*, etc; day to work, *aldao a IGALO*, day of rest, *aldao a IPIALONG*; day marked for an audience, *aldo a IPANIC quing seņoria*; time for the trees to bear fruit and for flowers to bloom; *panaon a IPAMUNGA ra*

*ding dutung* or *IPAMULACLAC da ding sampaga*; Lent is a time to confess and to fast, *ing cuaresma panaon a IPAGCOMFESAR manga IPAGYUNAL*, etc.

You now realize that this way of speaking is in the gerund of the genitive; if the sentence is in the future or preterite, the appropriate Spanish phrase is *en que* [in which]; for example, the time will come *in which you will cry*, *datang pog ing panaun a IPANANGIS mo*, or *IAILI mo*; that time *in which you cried or laughed*; *itang panaun a PENANGIS mo* or *INAILI mo*; *por el mes* [during the month] or *en el mes* [in the month] of May, the flowers bloom, bloomed or will bloom, *ing bulan a Mayo iyan IPAMULACLAC* or *PEMULACLAC da ding sampaga* etc. *Et sic de reliquis* [and the same with the rest.]

*Time of or for*. For example, during the day, I work during; the night, I sleep, *ing aldao IGAGALO co*, *ing bengi ITUTUDTUD co*; the day is *for working*, the night *for resting*; *ing aldao IGALAO*, *ing bengi IPAINAUA*. This last pattern includes that for which a thing is intended or which corresponds to a thing; for example, the carabao is *for plowing*, the dog *for hunting*; *ing damulag ISARUL ya*, *ing aso IPANGASO ya*, sin is *that for which one kneels*, the body is *for punishing* or *for being punished*; *ing casalanan ISICLAUD*, *ing catauan ISUT quing pangosap*, etc.

*Point or moment to do something*. For example, the moment he arrives, he lies down *CARATANG na IQUERA na*; the instant my father turns away or as soon as my father turns away, or is out of sight, I prostrate myself. *PANGAGULUT*, *PANGAPANPANA nibpa co ISUBSUB co*; to arrive and to continue were the same, or at the moment he arrived, he continued, *CARAS NA BELAUS na carin*.

This time or way of speaking is also true of the verbals; for example, *PANGARATANG na iyan PANGAQUERA co*; *PANGAPANPANA iyan PANGASUBSUB co*; *PAMANGAMANO mo iyan PANGATUDTUD co*.

### **Section 3**

#### **The Second Passive of AN**

The principal concept of this second passive is the exact opposite of the principal concept of the first: that of the former is Scotist; that of the latter is Thomistic [The reference is to John Duns Scotus (1265-1308) and St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274). Thomas fused reason and faith-- philosophy and theology. Scotus later drove a wedge between reason and faith--between philosophy and theology.]; because while the former serves for all that the doer releases, the latter for all that it grabs, as is shown by the [first rule].

## FIRST RULE

*When put in the nominative, that which is taken, is received, is asked, is removed, is bought, is sought (even if it be by hunting or by fishing), is called, is requested, is coaxed, is eaten, is drunk and finally everything which the doer draws to himself, tries to or manages to acquire, if the attraction is the first concept of the sentence, as it is in these verbs,-all of them-fall under this passive an; and it is not necessary that it be so material an attraction that it can always be seized by the hand; it is enough that it be conceived as an attraction, and therefore, this rule extends to what is thought, considered, imagined, pondered, understood, and including anything that is looked at, except *acquit* which falls under the first passive and is irregular.*

### Examples

Let us begin with *sañgap*, which means to draw to oneself by breathing; for example, draw that mosquito with your breath, *SANGAPAN me itang yamoc; cunlutan*, etc.; attract or pull that to yourself, *CUNLUTAN* or *GUNLUTAN mo queca ita*, draw or pull that door to yourself, *CABIRAN me iyang pasbul*. Following this are to get or to receive: for example, *CUAN co*, or *ADUANGAN co*, or *TANGGAPN co ining babie mo*, etc. Try to attract sleep, *ALAPAN mi ing mipalilu ca*.

Following this are *sali*, to buy; *manintun*, to seek; *aro*, to coax; *mangan* to eat; *inum*, to drink; *isip*, to think; *lauay*, to look at, because all this is to attract, etc. The last in my list is *yaus*, which means to call and therefore falls under this second passive; for example, call Pedro, *yausan me y Pedro*; but if you hear *YUMAUS ca quing, G. n. t. Dios*, do not be deceived into thinking that it means to call him like calling Pedro; it means to cry out to God. That which the person *cries out for* or *beseches by crying out*, first passive, *iyaus*, etc. and *to whom one cries out that way*, third passive; for example, I cried out to God about that suffering, or while undergoing that suffering, *INAUS co quing Dios itang casaquitan, ing Dios iyan PIYAUSAN co quetang casaquitan*, not *inausan*, etc.

### Second Rule

*When put in the nominative, any thing which is received or which is changed due to the action of the verb, falls under this passive. From this rule, it follows that whatever is done or undone, is composed or destroyed, is improved or is ruined, is cut, wounded, whipped, beaten, hurt, broken, erased, extinguished, burned, killed, annihilated, etc. should be put in this passive, because it always indicates a situation where something is received or an intrinsic change of a thing, at least broadly speaking.*

Let us begin with *facio* [make]; for example, God made heaven and earth *GUEGUA na ning Dios ing banua't labuad*; make the house where you have to live, *GAGUAN meng bale a pacasautan mo*, etc. Also, *dapat*: exert effort; for example, to acquire holiness, *pagcasipagan mong DAPTAN ing cabanalan*; do repent of your sins promptly, *danunan mong DAPTAN ing pamanisi mong casalanan*, etc. To translate what we say, for example, make breeches out of this cloth, etc., this language does it by making a verb of the thing which a person is asked to make and putting in the nominative the raw material *out of which*; for example, make breeches out of this cloth, *SALUALAN me ining pano*; make *tapis* out of this piece of cloth, *TAPISAN me ining cabulus*; make wine out of these flowers, *ALACAN mo deang sampaga*; make a bonnet out of this linen, *BONITIAN mo ining lienzo*; and what the other says to the onion, *PERDISAN da ca*, I will make you a partridge. [?]. [The original Spanish is *Hago te perdiz*. *Perdiz*, from the Latin *Perdix*, refers to the bird *Partridge*.] Also, *SALAPIAN co* or *PALAYAN co caya itang utang co queca*, I will make palay or money what I owe you, meaning, *I will pay you in palay or in cash*, etc.

Take note that if the thing about which you are talking has already been made, then this passive refers to *the use of it*; for example, *BONITIAN me ining boniti co*; *CULUMBUAN me ining culumbu co*, use my bonnet, or my mosquito net. At other times, it is only from the context that some of these sentences can be understood; *PALACOLAN me ining atac*, can mean *make an axe* out of this iron, or *axe* this iron; the context will show it. This is a given: to find out whether the thing is already made or not, see the context; for example, *SUNDANGAN me ining sundang*, etc. When you are not sure about these sentences, get it from the beggar's paten; for example, *GAUAN men palacol ining atac*; *GAUAN men boniti ining lienzo*, etc., make a house out of this wood or stone, etc. See the third passive.

## Section 4

### The Third Passive of ANAN AN, ANAN or ANANAN Compared

It seems that it would be enough to say that the rule for this passive is only the observation that whatever is not covered by the first and second, should be constructed according to it, but for greater clarity, and in order to follow the ordinary procedure, I will give the rule.

#### The Only Rule

When put in the nominative, any thing which is, in the strict or broad sense, a place, an end or an object of the action, falls under this passive.

## Examples

PLACE PROPERLY SO CALLED, for example, from what town do you come? *insang balayan ing IBATAN mo?* By which road did you pass? *Insang dalam a DELANAN mo?*; *ing cabunducan LECARAN co*; up to which town will you go? *Insang balayan ing PAINTURUAN mo?* sow palay in that land, *SALBAGAN o SALBAGANAN mon palay itang labuad*; plant rice in my garden *TAMNAN mong palay itang mula co*, etc.

PLACE IN THE BROAD SENSE, for example, *ARALAN mo deang anac*, these children are the *quasi-place* where your teaching will go or end; *ican PENACAUANAN con salapi*, you are the *quasi-place* where I stole the money; *TABASANAN men baru ining bilusan*, cut a dress out of this piece, or let this piece be *quasi-place* from where, you will cut a dress; *LIMUSAN mo deang salanta*, let these poor people be the *quasi-place* of your alms; *LAPITAN me y Pedro*, let Pedro be the place, in the broad sense, or the end where you will arrive, etc.

OBJECT OR END-POINT, for example, *SASAMBAN co ding santos*, the saints are the object or end-point of my adoration; *PALSINTAN co ing sampat banua*, the beauty of heaven is the object of my love; *INUSIAN cong utang co*, the objective or motive of my having gone with him, for example, was my debt, meaning, the hope of having it written off; *TATANGISAN que ibpa co*, my father is the object or end point or end of my crying. But even though these sentences expressing an object fall under this passive, they belong more properly to the compound verbs, as you will see.

This is the Kapampangan way of what we would put in the second passive; for example, make a house of stone or wood, *DUTUNGAN or BATUAN meng bale mo*, and the same about a courtyard of bricks, *LARIUAN mo ing patio*; about a street of sand, or make it a street made of sand, *BALASAN mong minangon, lansangan, dalan*, etc; place capis on the window, *CAPISAN mo ing auang*; as when they say, give me light or give me shade, *SULUGUIAN mo co*; place a candle before the Lord, *CANDILAN me ing Guino*, or *ing altar*; trace the cross on your forehead, *CRUSAN mong canuan mo*, etc. They also say: *e mo PANASAN iyang mayumo*, meaning, do not let ants reach this sweet; there is no more Spanish example to give, etc.

You will say: when I give Pedro a spear wound by thrusting the spear into him, Pedro is the place or *quasi-place* where the spear will stop; if Pedro is in the nominative, I will have to say *TANDUSAN que y Pedro*, which is the second passive, and not *tandusan* [sic], nor *tandusanan*, third; and so it is wrong to say that, when the place is in the nominative, it should be put in the third passive.

This is an irksome argument which touches all the passives, and since its solution presupposes a knowledge of what the formal concept of each one is, and since there are various considerations, I will explain these various points. If anyone considers them worthless, he does not have to read them.

In the rule which I gave you for the second passive, I told you what I am again telling you now, namely, that whenever the doer (by force of the verb's way of signifying) intends merely to change the subject, which is in the nominative, as happens in the example of the reply given above, the second passive should be used, because this is its formal concept or formal object; it shows that we can say in Spanish *the place where he will stop*, a sentence in the second passive, which looks at the nominative as the receiver, because its action is like practical, while that of the third is speculative, because it looks at its nominative merely as an end point.

And so that you will understand me, change the verb *tandusan* to *luguran*: *LUGURAN que y Pedro*, and you will find out that because the doer (by force of the meaning of the verb *luguran*) looks at Pedro merely as an end point of his goodwill and *Pedro* is nominative of the third passive; whether Pedro is changed or not, the verb, *luguran* does not say.

More clearly: change the verb *luguran* to *itulac*: *ITULA que y Pedro*, and you will have the same Pedro of the first passive, because the doer, by force of the meaning of the verb *itulac* intends to move him; whether Pedro is changed or is a place where the push ends is not indicated by the verb *itulac*, with respect to which the change and the place is a secondary consideration. On the other hand, if you should say from which place I have to push him or throw him, then the place is the primary consideration (*se habet de formali*); and the action of throwing out is a secondary consideration (*de materiali*); and so I have to speak in the third passive and not in the first, *insang PITULACAN CO?*

I already understand this, because the very way by which the verb gives the meaning helps me know which passive corresponds to the nominative [which passive corresponds to the doer], but when one and the same verb admits all the three passives, including the final *an* of the second and third, as happens for example with *lub*, first, and *lub, luban*, second; *luban*, third; and where there is the same way of signifying, how can we understand each other?

Your question is well taken, but let us go slowly, change to low gear. Remember that *with one and the same meaning* is not the same as *with one and the same way of expressing the meaning*. Look at it and think of it well. It is true that the verb *ilub* of the first, *luban* of the second, *luban* of the third always have one and the same meaning, namely, to enter; and the verb *ilapit* of the first, *lapitan* of the second, *lapitan* of the third, also have always one and the same meaning, namely, to arrive; but every passive has its own way of expressing the meaning.

Now here is my answer to the question: To know how you can make yourself understood, you must look at the rules placed for each passive, and this is the truth. In the first, you will find that, to express what comes out of the doer, we use the passive *i*; that way, you will know that *ilub, ilapit*, do not only mean to enter, to go nearer, but also that its way of giving the meaning is moving *in recto* [straight] or outward.

In the second, you will see another rule, which says that all that the doer draws to himself must be put in the second passive, and so *luban* and *lapitan*, second

passive, do not only mean to enter and to arrive; but also its own particular way; to enter to get something.

As explained a while ago, all that is considered place or end point, belongs here; and so in this concept *luban*, we mean to enter in a certain place, or to look at the subject as the end point of one's entry; *lapitan* is the place or like a place where one arrives or the terminus where one ends his action of arriving.

If you hear people speak, there is no other rule to distinguish the second from the third, than those that come before and those that come after; because one will necessarily make a mistake if one simply hears without giving attention to the context, and also if one speaks without attention to the general rules; because, even if it is certain, that if the nominative is a place properly so called, it can end in *an* without making a mistake, because with it, they do not admit the second passive; but it is wrong to believe that with the nominative of place in the broad sense, they do not admit the third *an* and also the second; and so it is inevitable to make a mistake.

*PULAYIAN me ing pisamban* is third passive only, but *PULAYIAN me y Pedro* is third and second. The same with these, *SUBLIAN* or *ULIAN me ing asaua mo*, for example, in all of which, if you hear them, there is no way to understand them other than the context, because they are ambiguous; to make them, it is necessarily to go back to the general rules; and so for example if I talk to Pedro, who divorced his wife, and I like to tell him to go back to her, I will say, *ULIAN me ing asaua mo*, which is the third passive, because it looks at her as the end point *ad quem* [to whom]; but if he has come only to confess, for example, and I want to tell him that he should go back to his wife so that they would come together, I will also say *ULIAN me ing asaua mo*, second passive, because it is like attracting. The same is true with similar cases. I have no doubt about this.

## DIFFERENCE

### BETWEEN THE *AN* OF THE SECOND PASSIVE AND THE *AN*, *ANAN* and *ANANAN* OF THIS

This is as much important as irksome a point to those who are satisfied with careless speech, and so they usually despise these reflections as useless, although in reality, they are very necessary. And if not, tell me: How will you understand an indio when you hear him speak of a place properly or improperly so called using the second passive, if these belong to the third? For example, when they say *SARULAN mo itang labuad*, plow that land, which is a place properly so called; throw stone at Pedro, *BASIBASAN me y Pedro* which is a place in the broad sense? And if you believe that you understand him, tell me what will you think when you hear those sentences in the third passive, e. g. *SARULANAN mo itang labuad*; *BASIBASANAN me y Pedro*, etc.

You will answer, and you will answer correctly, that the first two sentences belong to the second passive, because, even though the nominative of the person who receives the action in them is a place, it is not a place as an end-point, but a place as the receiver; when we say that a place or a quasi-place is constructed in the third passive, we imply that the doer, by force of the meaning of the verb, looks at it as a place where the action ends or stops; not when he sees it as a principal recipient of it, as was already explained.

About the two other sentences, you will say that you already know them to be among those active verbs which express the *definite whole* and *indefinite part*, of which way of speaking you will find many examples in the fourth rule on the use of the active and the passive. Having said that, let us now see the use of the *an* of the third passive.

### AN

This should be used when in the sentence there is nothing except a doer and a receiver; for example, teach me, *aralAN mo co*, sow on the land, *salbagAN mo iyang labuad*; go up and be with the sick person, *panicAN meng salonan*; throw me, *baldugAN mu co*; open it for me, *busngiAN mo co* etc.

### ANAN

This should be used when the sentence adds a thing to the doer and the receiver; for example, go up bring money to the sick, *panicANAN meng salapi ing salonan*; sow palay in this land, *salbagANAN mon palay iyang labuad*; open a capis for me, *busngiANAN mo con capis*; open for me a vein or another part of the body, meaning bleed me, *abarANAN mo co* or *abarANAN mo con oyat*; and so this *anan* is always connected to something or to a place or the remaining ones, etc.

You might say: everyday I hear them say *salbagAN* or *salbagANAN con palay ining labuad*; *baldugAN* or *baldugANAN mo con tabaco*, etc.; and so, even though a thing is added to the doer and the receiver of the action, they say it with *an* and *anan* interchangeably; therefore, concerning the use of *an* and *anan*, there is no difference between them when something is added to the doer and the receiver.

I agree that they also say it that way, although less properly; but not even this is a general rule, because it is proper only with active verbs whose concepts outside of relations include a thing or an instrument; but not among verbs whose third passives only express the place, like the neuters, with which, when a thing is added, we cannot use the third passive *an*; for example, *panican*, *luban*, which expresses only the place or quasi-place *to which* one goes up or enters, and the place *through which* one enters or goes up. And if you should say *panicAN mo con salapi*, for example, the indio would understand it as, come up to me through the stair of money; *lubAN mo con sundang*, enter into me through a knife; and so one has to say *panicANAN mo*

*con salapi; lubANAN mo con sundang.*

They are also different in that the *an* refers to the place or end-point, etc.; while *anan* refers not only to the place or the end-point, but also to the thing one is talking about; and when the verbs do not admit the third of *an*, as in the case of all those under the fourth rule on the use of the actives and the passives, *anan* always means *an indefinite thing* and the place *from where* it is removed or taken; for example, *sarolANAN mo itang labuad* refers to the unspecified portion which has to be plowed and the rest of the land; *basibasANAN quen lu yus y Pedro*, where *anan* means that there is another place aside from that where I took the luyos or luyos which I threw to him. None of these uses is admissible in the passive of *an*. From this, it follows that there is a great difference between them.

## ANANAN

This one is different from *anan*, first in that it never refers to *a definite thing*; and so in the sentence *salbagANAN mon palay iayng labuad*, you cannot say *salbagANANAN*, because in that case, the sentence will not mean *sow palay in that land*, but *sow palay in a part of that land. And the same with the rest.*

What remains now is to give the difference between this *anan* which does not specify and the *ananan* which can never be used to specify; and this most certainly consists in that *ananan* says less than *anan*, for example, *inumANAN mo iyang alac*, *batbatANAN mo deang anac* [Bergaño presumably meant this second sentence to be part of the next example] *only* means *drink from that wine*, without saying whether little or much, as long as it is not the whole; and also in this, *whip some from among these boys* [this is where that example belongs]; and when it ends in *ananan*, for example, *inumANANAN*, *batbatANANAN*, it is never the intention of the one speaking that you drink much or you whip many, but some part, someone or some, etc.

But since it is very general among the verbs to admit this *anan* and *ananan*, and hard to know which aspect they refer to in their various ways of giving the meaning, I will give you two examples, in order that, from them, you will draw out the rest. First: *uquiat* and I am referring to the definite *anan*; for example, *uquiatANAN men lario itang babao*; I say *definite* because it expressed; that it has to be bricks; and let us move to the two concepts which this verb can say using this pattern; for example, *uquiatANAN mo deang luyos* means *climb up bringing some from these luyos*; that is, *bring up part of them*, not all: *uquiatANANAN mo deang* diminishes, means *bring up some or a few of these luyos*.

If the one who speaks is upstairs, he will say *uquiatANAN mo con lario*, that is, *bring up to me some bricks*, not all, or *uquiatANANAN mo con lario*, meaning *bring up to me some brick or a few ones*. Another: if there is a brave gamecock, for example, they say *sabungANAN* or *sabungANANAN ya*, meaning, *let us have it fight ours*; in the first, not with all, in the second with some or more or less from those

of ours. If I say *sabungANAN ta la*, I mean *let us fight some from among their gamecocks*; *sabungANANAN ta la*, with one or the other. From these, construct other examples.

## LAST SECTION

### Section 5

#### All-encompassing Notes on Which Passive Admits Which Kind of Verbs

##### FIRST

Verbs which express movement, like *lacao*, *ugasay*, *salbag* etc. admit the first passive referring to *the thing*, the third referring to *the place* or to *the remaining parts*; for example, first passive, *ILACO me IYANG PLUMA can Pedro*; third, *LACAUANAN mo DING PLUMA nan Pedro*; *ISALBAG mo ITANG PALAY*, first; *SALBAGANAN mon pale ING PATIO*, third. And the same with the rest.

##### SECOND

The verbs which express working with an instrument, for example, to cut, to wound, to hunt, etc., admit the first passive referring to *the instrument*; for example, *IBARIL me ITANG PISTOLA*; the second referring to *a change*; for example, *BARILAN mo YA*. Verbs which express getting, taking or removing one thing from another admit the first passive referring to *in behalf of whom* or *the motive*; for example, *ICUA mo CON tabaco*; second passive, *the thing*; for example, *CUAN mo ITANG TABACO*; third, *what remains* or *what remain*; for example, *CUANANAN mo ITANG TABACO*, take some from those cigars, and also *the place*.

##### THIRD

Verbs that express counting or measuring also admit the three. First, *what is counted* or *measured* in order to hand over; for example, *IBILANG or ITACAL mo ITANG ADUANG CABAN can Pedro*; third, *the end point* or *what remains*; for example, *BILANGANAN or TACALANAN me y Pedro quetang aduang caban a palay*; *BILANGANANAN or TACALANANAN aduang caban a pale*; that is, out of the heap.

##### FOURTH

Verbs expressing *intransitive movement*, for example, *uquiat*, *lub*, *panic*, also admit all the three. First *what is moved* or *in behalf of whom*; for example,

*ILUB me itang pesos CANACO*; second, referring to *the attraction*; for example, *LUBAN meng silid na*, enter his room; and also *LUBANAN* or *LUBANANAN mo detang pesos na*; *the definite whole and the indefinite part*.

Above all, there is no better guide to know which verbs admit which passives than to see the way they signify, and to see the rules given for the passives. The most general rule which can be given is for the third passive, because it is admitted by all the verbs of all kinds.

While we explain what still needs to be understood, entertain yourself by finding out which third passive covers these words: *pitacutan, pitacasan, tulacan, pitulacan, pitulacanan; pitacalan, pitacalanan; pilarinan, cabaldugan, pibalduganan; pibangisan, caluguran*, because each one has each own mode of signifying. Look them up for your own good; you know that to avoid saying things the wrong way, you have to do your homework.

## CHAPTER 5

### THE PROTOCOMPOUNDS

After we treated the simple verb in the previous chapter, we will now treat the compound verb, starting from the first composition which it admits, to be referred to as *protocompound*, the way Saint Stephen is called *protomartyr* because he was the first martyr; and since in this language we cannot apply that rule *compositum simplexque modo vairantur eodem* [the compound and the simple vary the same way], the first section will be

#### SECTION 1

##### The Variation of the Protocompounds

Our Coronel says that there is one particle to express *multiplicity*, namely, *man* in the active, *pan* in the passive. This particle, attached to the root, is most properly the *proto*, as is clear from its way of signifying, about which I will talk afterwards. That way, one can understand better the soul of this composition, whose pattern is followed by the Tagalog, Ilocano and Pangasinan grammars.

To form it among roots that begin with a vowel, *l, n, ng*, all you have to do is to attach it to them, for example, *aral, MANaral; lucas, MANlucas; namas, MANamas; ngangas, MANngangas*; no problem about not saying *MANnamas, MANngangas*; one *n* will do for the particle and the verb, as in *caluguraNA*, where one *n* will do for the verb and the pronoun; and the rule in this language is that when two letters, different only in number, meet, one of them is dropped; and, parenthetically, among verbs which begin with *n, ng*, there are very few protocompounds, because they might be mistaken for the neutral verbs of *ma*.

Among those of *b, p, m*, change *b* and *p* to *m*, and drop the *n* of the particle *man*, like *batbat, proto MAMatbat; paco, MAMa co*; some among the *m* admit the whole particle *man*; for example, *molmol, MANmolmol; malmal, MANmalmal*, which confirm what was said.

Among the verbs which begin with *g, c, q*, the *n* of *man* is joined to these first letters and the pronunciation becomes nasal; for example, *gaga, MANGaga; calus, MANGalus; quilabut, MANGilabut*, or say that *c, q*, are changed to *g*. Among those which begin with *y* as consonant, the *n* is also joined to them and it results in *ñy*, as in *yaus, MAÑYaus*, etc. Among those of *d* and *s*, the *n* is also joined to them; *d* and *s* are changed to *y*; for example, *doloc, MAÑYOloc, sulat, MAÑYulat*.

But these ones of *d* and *s* have some exceptions, because there are those of *d* which admit the particle without change; for example, *dali, MANDali; dilo, MANDilo; dayo, MANDayo*, etc., and there many which drop the first letter, which is then replaced by *n*; for example, *dalao, MANalao; dugarug, MANUgarug*, etc.

For all the rest which drop the first letter, both those of *d* and those of *s*, take this rule, which is very general: *whenever the root has another d or s, aside from the first letter, the first is dropped and is replaced by N*; for example, *daldac*, *MANaldac*; *dalumdum*, *MANalum dum*; *dara*, *MANara* (except *dacurac*, which becomes *MANñYacurac*). The same is true with those of *s*, like *sadsad*, *MANadsad*; *sacsi*, *MANacsi*, etc. All of those beginning with *t* drop *t* and its place is taken by *n*; for example, *tulac* *MANulac*.

The conjugation of the protocompound is easy, because there is only one for all the letters, and because the future is the same word as the present, although the pronunciation is different; because in the case of the present, the stress is on the *a* of the particle; in the case of the future, the stress is on second to the last syllable of the verb; for example, *aral*, present *MANaral*; [Bergaño does not give the future *manAral*.]. In the simple past, the *a* of the particle is always changed to *e* or *i*, because it then sounds better, for example, *MENaral*, *MINaral*.

The verbal action of these is constructed like that of all the rest; that is, by placing the particle *pa* before; for example, from *manaral*, to preach, *Pamanaral*, the act; bear in mind that these same verbals, without any distinction, are also applicable to the simple verbs, which is the only defect I find in this language; although this is no cause for great surprise, because we see in our own and even in Latin, that with only one word, for example, *leccion* [reading], we express, the verbal active and the verbal passive.

These same verbals are also used to express, first, *the manner*; for example, *itang PAMANLACAD mo ing atuan co*, that *manner of walking* of yours is what I call attention to. Another: *your manner of walking* is like *the manner of walking* which Pedro has, *ing PAMANLACAD mo PAMANLACAD nan Pedro*, etc.

Notice that, instead of *pamanlacad*, you will hear, *panlacad*, without the *m*, and with *pan* pronounced long, like also, *pamanlacao* or *panlacao*, *pamañyang* or *panyatang* and others. And take note along the way that when the verbals are intransitive or neuter, since they can express not only the receiver of the action but also the doer, they are constructed with *pa* or *panga*; for example, *Pamiñgay* or *PANGAcay*; *Pamanlacao* or *PANGAlacao*, the departure; *agli*, its verbal, *PANGagli* or *Pamangagli*, both active; and so to refer to the Conception of Our Lady, for example, you will say *ing PAMAÑGAGLI* or *PANÑGAGLI CAN Nuan a Virgen*, and you will not say, *ning nuan a Virgen*.

Secondly, they use these verbals to express *the moment* or *time of the action*, for example, the moment or time of his entry, he fell, *PAMANLUB na iyang pangaragsa na*. You will find some examples of these in the first passive of time and in the explanation of the particle *pañga*, which is its sister in these two functions.

The passive verbals of the protocompounds are also made like the rest; namely, by placing the particle *panga* before, and here it is not mistaken for the simple, where that particle is attached to the root; nor is it mistaken for the rest of

the compounds because, even if it is also placed before them, they differ in the composition.

But those which admit passive verbals are few, and even among these, it is hard to know the genitive of the receiver of the action, because in some it refers to the thing; for example, *ing pañgapanaral NING EVANGELIO*, the preaching of the gospel; *ing pañgapanagcas NING AMANU*; *ing pañgapanunggue NING PAÑGADYI*. Among these which belong to this group, if you are not sure, say them with *panga* and the root; for example, *ing PAÑGASABI ning balita*, the reporting of the news.

In others, it refers to the instrument; for example, *ing pañgapañyulat NING PLUMA*, *ing pañgapanurud NING LABASAS*; *ing pañgapañgunting NING GUNTING*. In case of doubt as to whether it admits it, look also at the simple; for example, *ing PAÑGABARIL ding ayup*.

In others, it refers directly to the person or thing that receives the action of the verb; for example, *ing pañgapanansaquit co* or *ing pamanasaquit co*; *ing pañgapanilut MO* the strong message which they gave you. The extension here is less certain than in *panga* and the root. Others will be mentioned in their places.

### Examples of the Conjugation of the Protocompounds

Root	<i>aral</i>	<i>ilut</i>	<i>orod</i>	<i>lucas</i>	<i>molmol</i>
Meaning	to teach	to massage	to shave	to untie	to rinse
Present & Future	<i>manaral</i>	<i>manilut</i>	<i>manorod</i>	<i>manlucas</i>	<i>manmolmol</i>
Preterite	<i>menaral</i>	<i>menilut</i>	<i>menorod</i>	<i>minlucas</i>	<i>minmolmol</i>
Root	<i>uañgis</i>	<i>batbat</i>	<i>pasiag</i>	<i>cutang</i>	<i>gaga</i>
Meaning	to conform	to whip	to manifest	to ask	to quarrel
Present & Future	<i>manuañgis</i>	<i>mamatbat</i>	<i>mamasiag</i>	<i>mañgutang</i>	<i>mañgaga</i>
Preterite	<i>minuañgis</i>	<i>mematbat</i>	<i>memasiag</i>	<i>meñgutang</i>	<i>meñgaga</i>
Root	<i>quilis</i>	<i>namas</i>	<i>dalpac</i>	<i>damdam</i>	<i>samba</i>
Meaning	to sway	to endow	to trample	to feel	to adore
Present and Future	<i>mañgilis</i>	<i>manamas</i>	<i>mañyalpac</i>	<i>manamdám</i>	<i>mañyamba</i>
Preterite	<i>meñgilis</i>	<i>menamas</i>	<i>miñyalpac</i>	<i>menamdám</i>	<i>miñyamba</i>
Root	<i>sesay</i>	<i>tugtug</i>	<i>ngatñgat</i>	<i>yaus</i>	
Meaning	to take care	to water	to gnaw	to call	
Present and Future	<i>manesay</i>	<i>manugtug</i>	<i>manñgatngat</i>	<i>mañyaus</i>	
Preterite	<i>menesay</i>	<i>menugtug</i>	<i>minñgatngat</i>	<i>miñyaus</i>	

And you should not think that people violate the rule of this conjugation if you hear them say, for example, *mamanaral*, *mamanolo*, etc., because this is not the present. See the frequentatives.

The passives are equally easy, because for all the tenses, all you have to do is to change *m* to *p*. Passive: present, *IPANaral*; future, *IPANaral*; preterite, *PENaral*. Second passive: present, *PAMatbatAN*; future, *PAMatbatAN*; preterite, *PEMatbat*. Third: present, *PAMasiagANAN*; future, *PAMasiagANAN*; preterite, *PEMasiagANAN*.

Notice that there are verbs which, even though they follow this manner of conjugating, are not protocompound, even if they seem to be; and belonging to this kind are; *mañgulugui*, *manalañgin*, *manimalang* and *mañyumpa*. A proof of this is, for example, *PINYUMPAN cu ya* carries the meaning of a simple verb, because it is correct to say that *I cursed* him, even though I did so only once; and if it were a protocompound, it would always mean to curse many times; and if one wants to give that meaning, he will construct it like the protocompound verbs which begin with *m*, which is a clear proof that the said particle is what makes it protocompound; and so, to say I curse him many times, they will not say *PAN̄YUMPAN*, but *PAMAN̄YUMPAN cu ya*.

Now that we have discussed how the *proto* differs from that of the simple, I like you get interested in their manner of expressing such meaning, because if you succeed in grasping it well, you will clearly see that the many rules which this chapter elaborates are not new, but are corollaries flowing from the principle just discussed.

## Section 2

### The Meaning of the Protocompounds

There is no doubt that the meaning expressed by a *proto* extends wider than that of a simple verb, because, to the meaning which it has in itself, we add the particle *man*, which multiplies it; and, undoubtedly, the number becomes bigger if it is multiplied than if it remains a simple number. That having been said, I say, *that the difference between a simple verb and a proto consists in that the simple verb expresses only one act; the proto expresses acts the number of which can in no way be ascertained, but only indicates a plurality of the act expressed by the simple verb.* What make the rules clearer are the

### Examples

I tell somebody to write and I do so using the simple verb: *sumulat ca*. He sits down, and after writing only once, even if it is only one word, he will correctly say: *sinulat na co*, I already wrote; because the simple verb means only *to write* and does not mean *to write many times*; but if I say *MAN̄ULAT ca*, using the *proto*, and

if, having written only one word or only once, he stands up and tells me: *MIÑULAT na co*, he tells a lie, because neither the act of writing one word, nor of writing only once is expressed by the *proto*.

In the passive, it is the same. For example, I talk to you, employing simple verbs; I tell you *batbatan mo iya, tampaliñgan mo ya, palucan mo ya*; if he scourged the other person once only, slapped him once, beat him once, he will correctly answer: *bitbat co ya, timpaling cu ya, peluca co ya*, because these sentences with simple verbs do not require the act of whipping, slapping, beating to be many; and if I want to tell him to do many such acts, I must use the protocompound, *pamatbatan, panampaliñgan, pamalucan*. The same is true with all the tenses and all the passives.

And so, when the act meant by the verb has to be multiplied by doing distinct individual acts, you have to use the *proto*, not only when they are done to one thing, like one blow and another blow on the same receiver, but also to different things, for example, *close those doors*. The right sentence is *PANĜABAT mo detang pasbol*, because we multiply the act meant by the simple verb, for which it is enough to close one door.

Always look at the meaning of the simple verb and even if it signifies many, the *proto* comes in to signify more, for example, *ilut*, to massage; it is not enough to put your hand on and withdraw it for the simple verb, because *to massage* means more. If I give the cloth, for example, to be used for an ordinary massage, I will say *IYLUT me ining paño*; but if I say *ipanilut*, it has to be either more than an ordinary massage, or a massage done many times and this is why they call a midwife *manilut*.

Because of this, we usually say that protocompounds are more appropriately translated with our words that end in *or*, as in *mamuno, apuñeteador* [boxer]; *manaral, enseñador* [teacher]; *manilut, sobador* [masseur]; *mamipi, labador* [laundry person]; *mañgaso, cazador* [hunter], etc. This is certain, but if you make this a general rule, because these look well, you will find yourself entangled many times, because there are many protocompounds which do not mean any of our words ending in *or*.

The function of the simple verb and of the *proto* consists in this that, if the verb, according to what it signifies, can have one or another action and also many, that one should be done by that, this one by this. I told you at the beginning that if you understand this point well, it will save you many rules, which, if well-considered, are nothing but the consequences of this antecedent. One rule is that, *when the root expresses an instrument, the proto expresses the use of it*. Another, that *if the root expresses a function, the proto expresses the exercise*.

I ask: these instruments and these functions, do they become simple verbs? There is no doubt, because *sarul* has *sarulan, bilango bilangoan, panday pandayan*. And these simple verbs, do they not express the use of the instrument and the exercise of the function? Who can deny it? So, does the simple verb express the same thing as

what the *proto* expresses? The same thing, but in different ways, because the simple refers to the use of it one time or another, the exercise of it one time or another; but the *proto* refers to the use many times and the exercise many times; and what else do *sumulat* and *mañyulat* indicate? And so, that general rule is enough.

I say the same thing about the rule concerning the roots, which signify *quantity*, for example, *big, small, narrow, wide*, etc., because their protocompounds express things according to the general rule.

It was said that if the root, according to what it signifies, can express action (because it is clear that there are many terms which do not signify action, but thing) and those ones either will not admit the *proto* or, if they admit it, remember that as general rule it will always continue to signify a multiplicity of what is implied in the root to which it is connected; and in that case, it signifies the immediate use which that thing more commonly has for people, or that which expresses a multiplicity of the thing.

The examples will make this clear. What is the most immediate and most general use of the *banca*? To ride in it. Well then, this signifies its *proto*, *mamangca*. *Balay*, house, protocompound *mamalay*, he who governs or takes care of, as the landlord or steward; *iyang PAMALERA ding miasaua*. *Balayan*, town; *mamalayan*, the inhabitants, or those who govern it, like the heads.

From this rule follows what is usually said, namely, that when talking of things which are sought for human life, the *proto* is *to seek them*. So it signifies the more general use of those things; and from this follows that you must not always translate it into Spanish *to seek*, but into what is appropriate to every root, which many times is rendered into a Spanish that is worse than Vizacayan. *Mañgaso* does not mean to look for dogs, but to hunt with them, which is the most general use. Along this line, you will philosophize in relation to the rest; for example, *bulaon*, molave, *mamulaon*, to go cut them and carry them; *compay*, hay, *mañgumpay*, look for it; *talaba*, large oysters, *manalaba*, to go fishing for them; *biabas*, guavas, *mamayabas*, to gather them; *tuba*, *manuba*; *liab*, *manliab*, to extract these liquors. This is the reason why I told you that it is not *to seek* but the most common use, manner, or exercise relating to that thing; and so among the roots which mean food, the protocompound is to make it; those which mean fish, to go fishing for it; among fruits, to gather them; firewood, go get some, etc.

I said *or that which primarily expresses multiplicity relating to the thing*, for example, *tulud*, shoot, *manulud*, for the shoots to sprout; and the same for all those belonging to this kind: *butul*, bone, *mamutul*, to separate the meat from the bone or leave behind the *taguiang*, rib, *managuiang*, to remove the meat of the ribs, or for the ribs to be lean, etc.

There are others whose meaning is hard to determine exactly, even if they follow the rule given, for example, *dalumdum*, *manalum dum*, to look for, like a fruit in a leafy tree, and also to inquire; *locloc*, to sit, *manalocloc*, for a hen to sit in different places, sometimes here, sometimes there, as when it wants to rest; not to lay on the

eggs, because this is *lolocloc*. It also means to be expecting, like a hunter or somebody who everybody says never feels at home anywhere.

In relation to illnesses, like *pio*, gout; *gatal*, itch, *gutli*, scabies, the protocompound signifies to have any of them; *mamio*, *mañgatal*. It is very necessary to understand well the first and most general use of a thing, in order to understand how and when to use the protocompound, not only among those which we have just explained, but also in order not to get surprised, as strange, at what is very much in agreement with the rules. For example, they ask why, in *pugay*, which means to remove the hat, if you remove the hat from another's head, you have to use the simple, but if you remove it from your own head, you have to use the protocompound. The same goes with *putung*, to crown, and *cucu*, to cut the fingernails, etc.

Let me ask you this. What does the general rule say? The simple composition indicates doing once or twice what the root says, while the protocompound indicates doing it many times. Now let us see what a man does in connection with removing the hat. Does he not usually remove the hat from his head out of the courtesy, unless he is rude? Of course! What about removing somebody else's hat, is it not true that we seldom do that? Oh yes! When we slap somebody hard, if ever, or when we take part in some games. And so, if the act of removing one's own hat is done many times, why should one get surprised if we use the protocompound in relation to one's own self, and the simple composition in relation to somebody else, because this rarely happens? The same goes with *putung*, which means to tie a handkerchief around one's head or to cover one's forehead with it; the same also goes with *cucu*. However, in spite of this, if there comes a need to express doing many times what the root says, there should be no objection to using the transitive protocompound; for example, remove the nails of these horses. *PANGUCUAN mo deang cabayos*, etc. Bear this point in mind because it is true with many roots.

With verbs expressing in *transitive movements*, the protocompound indicates plurality of subjects; for example *MENACAS la ding discipulos*, etc. The same goes with *lacad*, *uli*, *albay*, *dating*, *lacao* and all their brothers.

### Section 3 The Various Compounds

Some of the roots which begin with vowels admit *manga* to form the protocompound; like *ablad*, to fear; *mangablad*, to get scared; *aco*, *mangaco*; *acua*, *mangacua*; and since it has an irregular form, *mangua*, to gather a lot; *manicua*, also to collect many things, but with an instrument; which is *panicua*; *ulila*, orphan; *mangulila*, solitary; passive verbal *pangapangulila*; and they admit it sometimes, although it otherwise has an ordinary protocompound; like *amanu* which has *mangamanu*, to squabble; *uling*, coal *manuling*, to blacken; *manguling*, to draw a portrait with charcoal; *alipan*, *manalipan*, and *mangalipan*; *uoad*, sprout has *manuoad*,

to sprout or to imitate; but *manginuad*, to gather or harvest the new growth; *pangapanginuad*, what is harvested.

*Anyaya*, to harm; *manganyaya*, to cause great harm; *pangapanganiaya co*, the great harm that I suffered, passive, Others admit *mana* and they usually become like future active; for example, *uyut* to flatter; *manamuyut*; *uili*, *manauili* or *managauli*, to attract; *ula*, decoration; *managaula*, to decorate lavishly, like a ship with pennants or with well-decorated statues, etc.

It is also attached to those with *m*, like *mulin*, *manamulin* to steer the ship; the *mang* is admitted by some of those beginning with *n*, like *nabo*, *mangnabo*, and *l*, like *luai*, *mangluai*; *lualo*, *manglualo*. Others form the *mani* protocompound and they come close to the simple future; for example, *palad*, fortune *manimalad*, to look for it or to foretell it by palmistry; *putla*, *pale*; *manimutla*, to become such as when one is scared; *puyasao*, *manimuyasao*; the same with *puti*, *mamuti*, to become very white; but *manimuti*, to become white or pale, as when one suddenly gets *angry*; *calma*, good fortune, *maningalma*, to become lucky (*audaces fortuna juvat*) [luck favors the resourceful].

It also has *mangalma*, which is regular, to look for it, *muna* and *manimuna* is to be absolutely the first to go.

## Mañyali

Some use this particle, which usually expresses anxiety or force associated with the action of the root to which it is attached; for example, *mañyalimana*, to anxiously desire to have a share in the inheritance, either because one has a right to it or out of avarice. *Mañyaliguinto*, *pilac*, *mutya*, *bandi*, etc., one is anxious to acquire these things, either by legal means, like by purchasing it, or by some other way, etc.; *mañyalimura*, to insult vehemently; *mañyaliagap*, to desire strongly, like that which is hard and one wants to so away with the pain, he keeps invoking this male saint and that female saint; *mañyalipagal*, to think about the work very seriously.

Its passives follow the general rules. First passive, that which one is given for gold, for example; or the motive. For the gold, or the motive. Third, *whom* or *the object*; for example, PAÑYALIGUINTOANA *ngan ing sabla*, he wants to turn everything to gold, he wants everything in gold; PAÑYALIPAGALANA *ngan ing sabla*, he considers everything as tiresome; PAÑYALIPAGALAN *da co*, they make me do a lot of work without compensation, etc. This and *mura* admit verbal passives, for example, *pangapañyali*, *mura*, the person insulted is made to work a lot, etc.

## Section 4

### The Frequentatives and Their Mode of Signifying

The *proto-compounds* become frequentatives in various ways. The first is by adding MA at the beginning; for example, from *manolo*, *mamanolo*; from *mangutang*, *MAmangutang*; from *mamabat* *MAma mabat*. The middle is short. Those of b, p and m have three *ma*.

The second mode is done by doubling what remains of the proto-compound *a parte post* [the one that comes after], and if there are two syllables, both are doubled, for example, from *mañgutang*, *mañgutang-ñgutang*, from *manolo*, *manolo-nolo*; from *mamono*, *mamono-mono*, etc. If there are three, the first is doubled; for example, from *manalastas*, *mananalastas*, *mananampalasan*, *mananaguri*, etc.

Those of *b*, *p*, *m* are somewhat irregular in this second mood, because not only those with three syllables, but also some of those with two, sometimes change, sometimes repeat, for example, from *mamalacol*, *mamalamalacol*; *mamayamayabas*, *mamalimalita*, *mamulpucmulpuc*. I will not tarry in such a ridiculous thing.

It is not possible to spell out clearly the meaning of these two modes of the frequentative. I will tell you something, and be alert. Well, I say that one or the other ordinarily indicates more *plurality of the acts* than does the ordinary *proto*, but those acts are more imperfect and insignificant. I also say that the second mode indicates an even greater insignificance and imperfection than does the first, although in some, it is hard to distinguish them.

I say lastly that in those which signify function, they express *this occupation* and they usually double the first, even if they have two syllables; afterwards, they move farther to signify more; for example, *manutang*, to borrow more things or from many, *prescinding* from whether they trust him or not; *mamanutang*, to borrow money sometime here, sometimes there; some give him, others no; *manutang-utang*, to borrow here and there. I presume the regular *proto* and I will move ahead.

*Mamanolo*, going around healing, here and there, as one who knows something; and perhaps it refers to a good physician; *manolo-nolo*, this one knows less, he does not cure many and does it with fear, and perhaps clandestinely; *mamasa*, to go on reading, at times here, at times there; *mamasamasa*, to read, now opening, now closing, like in order to see which is better or because he does not feel like reading.

*Mamanacao*, to go on stealing; *manacao-nacao*, to steal, now a little here, now a little there; and when they take advantage of the split-second in their hand, they say, *MANACAO-NACAO lang mamangca*; *mamanungi*, to go on stringing now in this house, now in the other; *manuñgi-nuñgi*, those who earn *upa* for stringing to baccos when they gather them; and if you ask someone who is sewing, she will answer

*MANUÑGI-NUÑGI* *co*; *mamañiñgil*, to go on collecting, *mañyñgil-ñyñgil*, to collect payment of small debts; *mananasa*, *manunugas*, *manunuba*, to exercise these jobs. They are there for you.

The last one is well-known. It is done by changing the second *m* to *p*; like, from *mamañyumpa*, *maPañyumpa*, and if you are not pleased, insert *pa* in the proto, like, from *manaral*, *maPAnaral*; it is an adjective and exaggerative, a great doer of what the root expresses and this is the most commonly used frequentative.

# CHAPTER 6

## THE PARTICLE MAG

### Section 1

#### Its Conjugation and Some Uses

#### MAG: To Make Verbs

This particle is the favorite help in expressing what is at the tip of one's tongue. Even the indio, when not knowing how to say in his own language what we say in ours, he uses it and says something like this: *MAGentremete*, *MAGnegocio*, *MAGpresenta*, etc.

Its conjugation is *mag*, present and future; *mig*, preterite; its verbal is with *pa*, *pamag*. For all the verbals of *pa*, if the verb expresses an *immanent* act, this *pa* always leaves, it in its way of expressing the meaning. For the passive, change *m* to *p*; for example, *pagdirila*. Its frequentatives will be discussed later.

Its most general job is to accommodate itself with that which is convenient to every root or noun to which it is attached, as you will see. Remember that when we reach many of our words which have no equivalent in this language, it serves only to make the verbs; for example, *MAGpenitencia*, to do penance; *MAGayunal*, to fast; *MAGmisa*, to say mass; *MAGchocolate*, to make chocolate; *MAGlamesa*, to set the table etc.

The passives of these are, first, *in behalf of whom or the motive or the time*; for example, *ipagpenitencia* or *IPAGPENITENCIA ing casalanan co*, or *ing utus*, or *ing viernes* etc; *IPAGYUNAL mo CO*, fast for my sake; etc. the third, for example, *pagpenitencian*, *pagyunalan* means either that which is done as penance or that from which one fasts; for example, *ing pamibabata* or *ing pamibatbat*; in fasting, meat or wine. Among the rest, the third passive is the passive of *the place*; for example, *pagchocolatian* or *pipagchocolatian*, the chocolate pot, etc.

Given this backdrop, this particle is joined to the names of things which are used for human life, its proper meaning is to use them, for example, *magsalual*, wear breeches; *magtapis*, wear *tapis*; *magcopia*, wear a hat; and the same with *sandata*, *tandus*, *sundang*, *singsing*, *tinga*, *baril*, *catana*.

And this composition is as general as the multitude of things which serve for our use; you can use it confidently with the following roots: *banca*, *cabayo*, *sabung*, *asan*, *dayat*, *samat*, *tabaco*, *sutla*, *mutya*, *asin*, *atbo*, and the like.

We associate this composition with the Spanish concept of *using* because its passives, which are the third, have the same meaning as that which we said regarding the use of the second passive, namely, that they become passive when the thing which has already been made is put in the nominative; the thing made already was in the nominative; that is, they express the *act of using it*; and there we placed the example

*BONETIAN mo ining boniti co*, because the sentence literally means the same as *PAGBONETEAN mo ining bonete co*; *PAGTABACOAN mo ining tabaco co*, use this hat of mine, use this cigar of mine. *And the same is true with all the rest.* From here you will conclude that this composition of *mag* is the active of the former and of the latter in expressing the concept of using; for example, *MAGCABAYO ca queyang cabayo co*; in the passive, *CABAYOUAN* or *PAGCABAYOUAN mo ining cabayo co*; and even though we said there that they were in the second passive, I now feel more certain, due to what has just been said here, and because all have *an* in the past, that they are third.

With the corresponding adjective, *ma* also means the use of a color; for example. *magmaputi*, *magmaluto*, *magmatuling*, use or wear white, black, red etc. Its first passive is, *that which*.

This composition corresponds to what we say, *to behave*, *to represent*, etc., because in reality, it consists in using in general, for example, *magbabayi*, for a man to use a woman's dress or costume, or to play her role; *maglalaqui* (this one belongs also to another composition), for a woman to dress like a man etc; *magcapanpañgan*, *magcastila*, to use the dress or language of the Capampangan or of Castilla; for example, *PAGCAPAÑGPANGANAN* or *PAGCASTILAN mo co*, speak Spanish to me, etc.

### **MAG: To Use (Function)**

This second composition or second mode of signifying is the way with which the *protos* express things when they refer to the *exercise* or *function*; and so the frequentatives are also expressed by using it, as you will see; and even though it extends to other things, as I will say momentarily, its principal point is that you don't have to do anything except to double the first syllable in all of the things which we said about the preceding composition, to be used for human life, as long as there can be exercise or function regarding them.

Let us go to the practical: *magcabayo*, to use a horse; *magcacabayo*, to buy and sell horses; *magtabaco*, to use tobacco; *magtatabaco*, to buy and sell tobacco; *magmutia*, to use precious stones; *magmumutia*, lapidary; *magsutla*, to use silk; *magsusutla*, to deal in it; *magabias*; *magyayabias*, rice industry; and the same with *bangca*, *atbo*, *cabyo*, *asin*, *samat*, *asan*, *sabung*, *dayat*, *dutung*, *layag* etc. The preterite tense follows a similar pattern; for example, *migdurugtung*, *miglalayag* etc.

When it is extended to the other roots or verbs, if the syllable is not doubled, even though in some of them it signifies like the *proto*, it does not say as much as when the first syllable is doubled; for example, *maglacad*, to walk a lot, *maglalacad*, to have it as a job, as a walking postman; *magligao*, to fish a lot, *magliligao*, to have it as a job, fisherman; *magcapitan*, to perform the role of captain one or another year; *magcacapitan*, to do so almost for life, like *magari*; *magculam*, to be a witch one

time or another; *magcuculam*, to have it as one's job. The same is true with, *magcucusin*, *magcucutud*, *manggagauay*.

Included here are *magdirila*, to dispute hotly; its passives, first, *the motive* or *that which*; third, *the kind* or *object*, etc. Because not everything that follows is as clear as what was said, before moving further, bear in mind, to help you understand, that by its nature, this particle never expresses a *transitive* act, but *immanent* [that is, no direct object]; and so, it does not go with verbs which are properly active; and if it goes with them, it is in order to remove from them the transition which they express; and even though *magdala* expresses a transition, it is regular and it falls under the transitive *mi*.

Bear in mind, secondly, that generally, by its nature, it goes only with roots and verbs which express actions which fall under human activity or free will; and for this reason it connotes either doing something *intentionally* or doing *on purpose* or *in fact* what the action expresses. From here it follows that when it speaks of some natural properties or natural passions, it sounds fictitious with them. You can go on observing all of this.

### **MAG: Reflexive**

If it is joined with verbs which are properly active, it makes them reflexive, if they express actions which are usually done, either in themselves, or in another thing; for example, *lusay*, to stretch; *maglusay*, to extend itself; *sinup*, to cover as holes; *magsinup*, to cover oneself; to take shelter; *sub*, to give steam; *magsub*, to take it; *culub*, to cover, as a jar; *magculub*, to cover oneself in bed; *duyan*, to put in the cradle; *magduyan*, to put oneself in it (only the root is *to use*); *susi*, to close; *magsusi*, to close oneself; *aral*, to teach, *magaral*, to teach oneself, etc. Its passives: first, *the motive*; third, *the place*; *pagaralan* is that which one teaches oneself or applies oneself to learn.

### **MAG: Intent**

Although, as I already told you this particle remains in its mode of signifying to do *truly* or *intentionally* that which the action says, it also appropriately expresses an *intent*; *maglolao*, to stroll, which is what we intend when we leave every afternoon. And even if we encounter a root which, with its simple verbs, seems to do it *intentionally*, even then, we cannot deny that when what the root or verb says is only intended, this *mag* comes automatically; and otherwise there would not be actions which are not done except intentionally; for example, fall down *MAGDAGSA ca*; *MAGPULID ca*, tumble; *MAGBILAD ca*, stay in the sun; *MAGSACAB ca*, prostrate intentionally. This can be clearly observed in one who tells a lie, because of whose intention of deceiving, this is expressed with *mag*; *maglaram*, better than with the simple verb, which happens with one who says a

falsehood without the intention of lying, but never *mag*, if he does not have the intention of deceiving.

This *mag* is used in all roots which express any posture of the body; for example, *cañian*, *talacad*, *tiñyacad*, *ticad*, *timocmoc*, *talungcu*, *alelay*, *talindiwing*, *quera*, *tudtud*, *talindata*, *tuag*, *yungyung*, *salampac*, *ñgaña*, and others which can say the same thing; for example, *lambut*, *tindayag*, *buntalag*, *buntaga*, *tanto*, and all those which can be done intentionally, even if they belong also to another composition. Its passives, first and third.

### **MAG: To Put Oneself**

When attached to roots and verbs which refer to a place, it signifies *to be* or *to put oneself in it*; for example, *maguacas*, to put oneself or to be in the end of a town, for example, as a sentinel; *magsiduan*, to put oneself in a principal place; *maghual*, to put oneself or to be outside; *magsulud*, to be or to put oneself even only in a sack; *maghulan*, to put oneself or to be even in a box or *baña*; and if the place is appropriate for one to be in for a long time, even for life, people here say, for example, *magbalay*, to be in the house; *mag baleyang magbalay*, to be always in the house, what we [Spaniards] say *he does not leave the house*; *MAGSILID* *cang MAGSILID*, do not leave the room etc. Belonging to this composition are *bantay*, *tanud*, *abang*, *abong*, *abat*, etc. Also, *carin*, *sulmuc*, *culung*, *cubo*, *catre*, *papag*, *talumpac*, *babao*, *sulip* *dasay*, *dapoc*, *daton*, *pasbul*, *cabat*, *susi*, and they can be passives of *intent*.

### **MAG: To Pass by**

With other names of places where people usually pass by, it means to pass by them for a certain purpose, for example, because the road is bad or dangerous; it is like the preceding composition, although this one is about passing; for example, *magsabana*, to pass by the savannah; *ipagsabana*, the motive; *pagsabanan*, the savannah.

These ones also: *lansaňgan*; *minaňgon*, *maranglay*, *masucal*, *batas*, *liput*, *liclic*, *danuman*, *mamala*, *bundoc*, *caqueuan*, *lacbay*, etc.

### **MAG: To Become**

With roots of qualities that can be acquired, it means to act so as to acquire them, for example, *MAGASAL* *ca angel* *quing calinisan*, act like an angel due to your purity, make yourself an angel by having it; *MAGBANAL* *ca*, do acts of virtues, become a saint; *MAGTIMTIMAN* *cayo*, act like prudent people, be prudent; *MAGANŃYO* *can santo*, let your movements or actions or behavior be like those of a saint; *MAGOUICAN* *ca*, he is so scrupulous and cautious that he notices every movement that is less modest, for example. Here belongs *balit cayo*. *Magdauac*, to do bad things,

to become bad; *magmulang*, to do mischief, to become mischievous, etc. Its passive, in those verbs which admit passives, are third: *pagasalan*, *pagañyouan*, for example, *ing cabanalan*; *pagdauacan*, *pamulañgan*, for example, the object; *ding macaquit*; or the first passive, the vice, *nanu tang PIGDAUA co* or *PIGMULANG co queca*? Belonging to this composition are *magpadre*, *magmonja*, *magcardenal*, to become such, etc.

## MAG: To Do

With all those which follow, it means to do what the root says: bearing in mind that in all the roots it means, to do *intentionally*, *truly* or *efficiently*. In roots which are verbals, it adds more to what the simple says than to those which it makes verbs, which will go first; for example, *magpusung*, to make *pusung*, meaning, to jest; *salbat*, *magsalbat*, is not to cause but to suffer the affliction, like *maglunus*, *magmaľun*; *magmola*, to start; *magcusa*, to take the initiative; *magdusa* is not to cause grief, but to bear it; *magtingquis*, to prepare oneself or to arm oneself. Its passive: *first* and *third*.

Examples of the second; *pipilit*, to force or insist; *magpilit*, tenaciously; for example, *MAGPILIT cang magaral*; *sisipag*, to work diligently; *magsipag*, more diligently; *daramot*, to humble oneself; *magdamut*, to humble oneself more, to be very modest; *iimut*, to be miserable, *magimut*, to be more miserable or intentionally; and finally, *mag* always adds either *intensity* or *truth* or *intention*; in those which express its *intensity* with the composition *mi*, it usually adds only the *intent* or *intention*.

## MAG: Intensification

With those which are adjectives in themselves or in composition with *ma*, although they otherwise do not admit *mag* in their simple form, for example, *lago*, *tapang*, etc., to insert *ca* between *mag* and the root does not only indicate that the action has a greater intensity than a previous one, but it also indicates that such action is done very intentionally, more purposely (*magCaula*, *magCalago*, to make oneself very presentable, as a woman who prepares to attend a fiesta.); and you can confidently use this composition with the following words, maintaining the way each one expresses the idea: *ľunus*, *tingquis*, *pipit*, *sipag*, *inut*, *lalaqui*, *banal*, *bañgis*, *lasing*, *mata*, *puyat*, *dugal*, *mal*, *matas*, *ľub*, *mababa*, *imbut*, *saya*, *datna*, *dauac*, *ayap*, *ľungcut*, *sindac*, *gula*, *santing*, *sampat*, *bayat*, *ľuca*, *ľambat*, *magcasaquit* (expresses *intensity*, but not the *intention*) [The original “dice intension, pero no intento” is I n the singular], and all the adjectives of *ma*, which express passions, like *maragul ľub*, weakness (without *intention*), fortitude, sadness, happiness, bravery, etc. and the like. Its passives, first *the motive*;

third *the object*. If you still want to delve deeper into this composition, insert the particle *paca*; for example, *magPACAlago*, *magPACAsanting*, etc. *Magcamali*, *magcasala*, *magcaupaya*, *magculang* connote happening by chance.

### **MAG: To Make Oneself Appear Like**

When attached to the verbs of *ma*, it means *to appear what the adjective says*, whether the subject is such or not; for example, *magmatapang*, to show oneself brave, either because he is or in order that he will be feared by those who want to kill him, for example; *magmaratna*, to appear well-behaved, either because he is, or because, although he is not, he has a reason to appear such before his superiors, for example; *magmalasing*, to show oneself drunk, like for fun, but if he is drunk, *MALASING ya*, without *mag*. This is true with all the adjectives of *ma*. Its passives, first *the motive*, third *the object*.

If you double the *ma* of this composition, it goes higher and it comes to mean appearing more than what one is. *MAGMAMALUNCUT ya*, the first *ma* is long in all, he shows more sadness than what he has; *MAGMAMALUCA ya*, he shows himself poorer than he is; he is not as poor as he shows himself to be; *MAGMAMAINA ya*, he shows himself weaker than he is, he is not in such bad shape as he thinks; *MAGMAMABABA* [should be *MAGMAMABABA*] *lub*, he is not as humble as he shows, etc.

When we encounter adjectives which express an increase in quality, it also expresses *to show oneself*, but it is equivalent to arrogance or presumption; for example, *MAGMAMATAPANG ya*, he shows, or presumes to have, the bravery of a Bernardo; *MAGMAMARATNA ya*, he shows, or presumes to have, the modesty of a Saint Bernard; *MAGMAMATUNUD ya*, he shows or presumes to have the maturity of a Seneca. *Et sic de reliquis* [And so with the rest], like *malago*, *masampat*, *masanting*, *masaya*, etc. Its passives: first *the motive*, third *the object*.

## **Section 2**

### **MAG of Fiction and Appearance/Frequentatives**

When it is joined to roots whose action or passion is not in the hand of any man to have whenever he likes to, the *mag* is *of intention* and smells *of fiction*; for example, *MAGLUNGCUT ca*, be sad; *MAGSALUN ca*, make yourself sick; and the same with *tapang*, *saya*, *lumbay*, *licsi*, *tunud*, *pilo*, etc. First passive, *the motive*; third *the object*. Its frequentatives, by doubling the root, *maglungcutlungcut*, and they are diminutives. [A clarification: *action* means *I see*; *passion* means *I am seen*; for example].

## APPEARANCE

If in this composition you double the root or its first syllable and add *an*, you will say *maglungcut-lungcutan* or *maglulungcutan*, and its means to do something *in appearance* and not in reality, to be sad not in reality, but in appearance; *magbanal-banalan* or *magbabanalan*, to perform acts of apparent but not real virtue, like the hypocrite, and this is to pretend to be holy; *magsalon-salonan* or *magsasalonan*, to show oneself sick, but being so only in appearance, for example, in order to avoid working, and this is to simulate sickness; *magmate-matayan* or *magmamatayan*, to play dead, to pretend to be such, like the fox, which is dead only in appearance. This is true with those which follow: *tapang*, *saya*, *lumbay*, *licsi*, *tunud*, *anac*, *sulat*, *mulang*, *lasing*, and all the like.

To make your understanding of this composition more solid, take note of another pattern which this language has, principally regarding nouns. It is done by doubling the root and adding *an* at the end; for example, *tauo*, *tauo tauoan*, and it means the appearance of what the noun, without such composition, signifies in reality, like the example given, which in the compound means, *homini caco*, or a painted man. Such is *api*, true fire, *api-apian*, fire in appearance, or fire of that place compared to that of hell; it is enough that in comparing, it shows as very much reduced the nature of the thing or the appearance of it; for example, *baril*, gun, *baril-barilan*, toy gun like one made of cane; *balay*, house, *bale-balayan*, tiny hut or toy house which children make; *caba-cabayoan*, tiny wooden horse painted, etc; *gaud*, oar, *gaud-gauran*; small oar; and even a thin paddle is referred to in *GAUD-GAURAN mo*, and it does not deserve to be called a paddle.

They construct verbs using this composition of nouns with *mag*; and so, when they refer to I do not know what things, which they see at night, they say: *magpusa-pusaan*, *magdarapuan*, *magcacambiñgan*, etc. which have the appearance of cats, crocodiles, or goats. This composition does not express real beings but simulated or apparent, as you see; and its way of expressing is not different from that of the preceding. Its passive, in those [verbs] which are capable of them [passives] are the first, the *with which*; for example, *ala con IPAGBALE-BALAYAN* or *IPAGBARIL-BARILAN*, I have no material with which to make a toy house nor a toy gun, like one made of cane, to go into a make-believe war; third, *the object*; for example, *e mo co PAGBANAL-BANALAN*, I will not buy your holiness, your virtue is fake. *Et sic de reliquis*. [And the same with the rest].

## FREQUENTATIVES

Rare is the composition of this particle *mag* which does not admit its frequentatives, like the *protos* or by doubling the *ma*, as in *magaral*, *mamagaral*, *mamagcapitan*. The first expresses *frequency*, and so does the second, and those which are capable, like these two, also express *plurality of subjects*, as was said

about the neutral verbs in the *protos* where we placed, as an example, *MENACAS la ding discipulos*.

The second frequentative is made by doubling the root or the first syllable, depending on which sounds better; for example, *magaral-aral* or *magaral-garal*. And take note that the first one means to go on teaching another, the second to go on teaching oneself; *maguañgis-uañgis*, *maglupa-lupa* express *diminution*; *magbibiasa*, bachelor of the stomach, *maglaram-laram*, to go around deceiving people, *maglalaraman*, the same. This is true with the rest.

The compositions of *maca* [should presumably be *magca*] also admit frequentatives; for example, *mamagcasanting* and *magcacasanting*; *magpaca* does not admit frequentatives.

The frequentative adjective, for example, learner, liar, etc. is done in all by inserting *pag*; for example, *maPAGaral*, *maPAGlaram*, *maPAGcaula*, etc.

## CHAPTER 7

# THE PARTICLE MI AND ITS FORMATION

This is the most popular particle of this language, and because of this, it is also the most difficult; but its formation is very easy, because for all the tenses in the active, it is *mi* and in the passive *pi*; in the present, active and passive, it is attached to the present; for the future and the preterite, to the root; bearing in mind that both *mi* and *pi* of the preterite have a long accent; for example, *sulat*, present active, *MISUsulat*; passive, *PISUsulat*; future active, *MIsulat*, passive *PIsulat*.

If the future to which it is attached begins with *y*, for example, *ynum*, it is retained; for example, future *miynum*. Its verbal action, always by placing *pa* before it; for example, *pami*, and this *m* of the verbal is never changed to *p*; that of the particle, if it is recomposed, is changed to *p*; and so you will not say *macaMicasala*, but *macaPicasala*; not *paMilarinan*, but *paPilarinan*. And it is a general rule that, if *m* is to be recomposed, it is changed to *p*, unless otherwise noted.

### Section 1

#### TRANSITIVE MI

In order to see the great extent to which this *mi* fills the vacuum in the language of Pampanga, I will first uncover its holes. There are many sentences which should be put in the active, and for all, there is a lack of active verbs, not only among those which belong to the neutral verbs, for example, to go down, to go up, to enter, to go out, etc. which, being intransitive actions, clearly cannot serve as active; but also those which belong to very many active verbs, because they have two concepts and they have only active for one; for example, *larin*, which means to repair what is destroyed, and also to put something in a safe place; to say the first, the simple will do; to say the second, for example, *tu pondras este Arte a recado* [you will keep this grammar safe] the simple will not do, and so it has no active.

*Batbat* also has two concepts: the first, for example, *to whip*; the second to shove and for this, it has no active. *Bilang* and *tacal* mean two things; to measure and to count, and also to measure or to count in order to deliver, and for this last one, the simple verbs will not do; because if you say, for example, who counted those pesos in order to deliver them? *Ninon MINILANG caretang pesos?* using the simple, you leave the delivery on the writing desk.

The same thing happens with all those which mean *to work with an instrument*. To talk of the instrument, for example, *Juan shot with my gun*, the simple will not do; and in the others, for example *to drink water with sweets*, *accompany with milk*, the same thing happens, because there is no verb to talk about the sweet and the milk. In one word: to speak of things in the active which

if done in the passive, belong to the first passive of *movement*, active verbs are lacking in this language, except those which in themselves express movement.

And having said this, I say that *this transitive mi, together with the simple, fills in for and serves as, active in all of them, and that all such sentences should be said with it, because this is the active which corresponds to them*; for example, did you bring that chair upstairs? *Ican MIPANIC quetang sia?*; passive *PENIC me caya itang sia?* Will you keep this grammar safe? *Ican MILARIN quening Arte?* Passive, *ILARIN me ining Arte?*; I pushed Pedro, *acon MIBATBAT can Pedro*; Juan is counting the pesos to deliver them, *y Juan iyang MIBIBILANG caring pesos*; Passive: *IBIBILANG non Juan ding pesos*; Juan shot with my gun, *y Juan MIBARIL quetang baril co*; passive: *BERIL nen Juan itang baril ko*; do you want to drink water with this candy? *Bisa can MIYNUM danum quening caramelo?* Passive: *Buri men IYNUM danum ining caramelo?* I will accompany with this milk; *acon MIULAM quening gatas*; passive, *IULA co ining gatas, etc.*

I said above that *with the exception of verbs which in themselves indicate movement*, because with such ones, there is no need always to resort to the transitive *mi*, because, since this one is essentially the active of the first passive, and those verbs independently have almost the same capability not being irregular, like *lacao, dayao*, etc. To speak of using the simple is the same as to speak using of the *mi*; for example, *acon MINUGSAY quetang libro* is the same as *acon MIUGSAY quetang libro*; *ican TINABI* is the same as *ican MITABI quetang cabayo*; *ican SINALBAG* is the same as *ican MISALBAG quetang palay*, etc. Also, because the simple verbs do not lack passive, but active, there is no need of going to the passive *pi* to have the passive; but to get hold of the passive *i* which they autonomously have, as you saw in the examples.

This transitive *mi* also serves to put in the active the sentences of the passive *MI of company*; for example, who made them quarrel? *Ninon MIGAGA carela?* etc; then, the passive that corresponds to it is that of *MI of company*; for example, you made them make peace, *ican MIAGA carela*; passive *PIAGA mo la*, etc; and although in the active they are usually made protocompound, for example, *mamiaga*, in order to express *multiciplicity*, as in *mamiasaua*, the priest who solemnizes the wedding of many; and this protocompound is not used in the passive to avoid confusion; it is filled in for, when speaking of many, by doubling the root; for example, *acon MEMIASAUA quecayo*; *PIASAUA-SAUANAN da cayo*, etc.

The receiver of the action in all the sentences of the above-mentioned composition must be in the passive *mi* as a neutral verb, because they all presuppose the transitive *mi* or active *mi*, which imprints in them the movement or action; for example, *acon MITIPA quetang sia*. If you want to say, using the neutral verb, that that chair *se paro bajada* [stopped in the completed step of giving been brought down], you can never use the neutral verb *ma*, saying *METIPA ya itang sia*; but specifically, the neutral verb *mi* (*MITIPA ya itang siya*, that chair stopped in the completed step of having been brought down), which I call, as already said, the passive *mi*, because

it is the effect of the transitive or active, and to distinguish it from other neutral verbs of *mi*, which I will discuss.

The same can be said of *acon MIASAUA quecayo*, for example. You are the *passive mi*, *miasaua*, because in this case, that *mi* is the effect; it is passive with respect to the *transitive mi*, without this being a hindrance to composing the *mi of company*, as you will see in it. The same is true with this sentence, *acon MIYNUM quetang caramelo*, I drank water with that candy; the candy *stopped as such*; you should say: *MIYNUM ya itang caramelo*, etc.

This *passive MI* has its corresponding intransitive protocompound to express *plurality*, for example, where you said *miynum ya*, because there was only one candy; if they were many, you would say *meñgainum*; the chair *mitipa ya*, if they were many *MENGATIPA la*; the *baril mibaril ya*; if they were many, *MENGABARIIa*; *ing libro*, for example, *miugse ya*, the books *MENGAUGSE la*; *ing paco mipaco ya*; the nails, *MENGAPACOLA*. I find no reason to doubt any of the things I have said up to here.

## Section 2

### The Passives of Place with *PI* and *AN* at the End

I am placing this very important section immediately after the transitive *mi* because it plays the principal role in these passives. We commonly say that the *place in which* is expressed with *pi* and *an*; for example, *PilurAN*, *PliyAN*, the *place in which* a person spits or urinates. I now ask: *luran*, *iyan*, are they not also the *place in which* a person spits, urinates? No doubt about it. I ask further: *baldugan* or *balduganan*, are they not the place in which, an object is thrown? And so, what is the use of *pibaldugan* and *pibalduganan*? and if *pi* and *an* always express what in Spanish is the *place in which* the expression the *place from where or through where*, which many times cannot be expressed except with *pi* and *an*, will be confused with the *place in which*.

I would like to hear the explanation of this from somebody else, rather than give it myself. Anyway, I am willing to say what I am capable of. And so I say that *pi* and *an*, by their very nature, are generally meant to express the place of an action, be it the *place in which*, *to which*, *through which*, or whatever the Spanish would like to indicate. What I mean is that this passive has to be used whenever the speaker wants to specify or identify the place in relation to which an action was done *actively* or is presumed to have been done. And so, it cannot be used if it does not precede or presuppose the exercise of a verb, active or passive.

Let me explain. I presuppose that Our Lord Jesus Christ was flogged. If you ask me to specify or identify the place of that action, I have to put that place in the nominative and I have to use *pi* and *an*; for example, the house of Pilate is the *place where they scourged* Christ, *ING BALE nan Pilato ing PIBATBATAN da quing Guinu tang Jesu Cristo*. Another: I presuppose that He was nailed. If I

want to identify the place of that action, I will say: *ING CRUZ ing PIPACUAN da queya*. We also know that He was sold. If I am to identify the *quasi-place* in relation to which the sale took place, I will say, for example, “The Jews were the people to whom Judas Iscariot sold Him. *DING JUDIOS ila pin PIBAYARANANAN Judas*. If one is to identify the place properly so called where they sold Him, it is the same, for example, *carin bale nan Caifas ing PIBAYARANANA*, etc.

You might say: these examples clearly demonstrate the use of *pi* and *an*, because they make you know that the action preceded and the format identifies the place of the action. But what about the future and the imperative? How do you make us understand that *pi* and *an* indicate the place of a consummated action if that action is yet to be done? Because even if they say; for example, referring to the future, *PISALBAGAN co ining lahuerta*, and as an imperative, *PISACULAN mo iyang mola*, etc., this does not indicate any difference in the tenses; it only indicates that the *pi* and *an* in that future and that imperative are meant to introduce nouns related to what the *pi* and *an* say; for example, in the first example, *this field will be my rice paddy*; in the second, *this land will be your cane field*; etc. It follows from this that *pi* and *an* as verb has only a past tense, where alone the action is presupposed to have been done.

It cannot be denied that in the above-mentioned examples and in very many others that can be given, the *pi* and *an* combination is also used to signify that the place being talked about is a thing intended or marked for that which the word expresses; like also, for example, *PIPAMADUASAN que ining busto*, in the present tense, means I intend to use this basket for the fishes which I will catch with the help of hooks; if these nouns do not indicate *frequency of acts*, the root is not doubled, as in *piluran*, *piiyan*, *pipatayan*, etc.

If they indicate *frequency*, they are doubled; for example, *piPAPAtayan*, *slaughterhouse*; *piSUSUlatan*, desk, where one writes many times; if you only mean that on which you usually write, it is enough to say *pisulatan*; and the same with *pibabatatan*, *pibabatiñgan*, *piyayañgoan*, *pilululanan*, *pisasablayan*, *pitutunan*, *pibebeuan*, *pipamiñyagan*, *pipandiluan*, *piyayapian*, *pilulutuan*., etc., and whatever can be called a place where it is appropriate to do what the verb signifies.

None of this prevents *pi* and *an* from having different tenses when the action is presupposed, even if it is not exercised. From this as from a root comes the above-mentioned composition of nouns. When these nouns (take note of this very carefully) do not express *frequency of acts*, they are constructed as future, but with a very different pronunciation. The word is pronounced short and fast as if in a hurry to reach the end: but when it is future, it is pronounced slowly, and this difference of tenses among the nouns is very common in this language; for example, *canan*, food, because it is a noun, has short accents, but *canan* future has long and is pronounced more slowly.

You will notice the same thing when the root is doubled, as distinct for the present indicative which is pronounced somewhat slowly; for example, *pisasaclouan danum*,

noun, is pronounced with all the accents short, but when it refers to the *place where* you actually get water, you pronounce it slowly. Listen to the indio patiently and carefully, and you will find that there most certainly is such a difference.

Let us now see how action is presupposed in the future and imperative. It will take less time and it will be clearer to give examples than to give rules. Examples: *Sow this rice*. You will answer: *where will I sow it?* Here, the action of sowing is presupposed and you are asking me to tell you the place where you have to sow, and this is in the future. It is necessary to use *pi* and *an*, and to say, *ingsan PISALBAGANAN co?* Another: suppose you like to whip the servant. If I ask you to tell me the room or place in which you have to whip, I have to use *pi* and *an*. *Ingsang silid ing PIBATBATAN mo queya?* You can also answer using the future. *Ing silid mon PIBATBATAN co*, I will whip him in your room.

The same is true with the imperative; for example, *I have nowhere to pour this water* starts already with *pi* and *an*, because this Spanish sentence presupposes the act of pouring it and speaks of the place which presupposes that act, you will say: *ala cong PIBATINGAN*. Now the imperative: pour it down this window or down this opening, *PIBATINGAN me iyang aslat* or *auang*. Another: I see you bringing the cane back because, you say, you cannot find a place where to sow it, I tell you: sow it here in my garden, *PISACULAN mo iyang mula co*, etc.

Present: *where is Pedro fetching water?* This way of speaking presupposes the action, and so I will say: *Ingsan PISASACLAUANAN* [sic, spelled CLA] *danum Pedro?* If he is fetching water in the river, *Ing ilug iyang PISASACLOUANA* [sic, spelled CLO]. And so, *ing mula co iyang PISASALBAGANAN palay, PITATAMNANAN ubi, PIYUYUSDANANAN gandus*.

You might say: there is nothing wrong in saying *ing mula co*, for example, *ing SASALBAGANAN palay, TATAMNANAN, YUYUSDANAN gandus*, etc., and so, in talking about a place, the simple is the same as the combination of *pi* and *an*. In such sentences, it is the same *materialiter* and *per accidens*; but the concept of *pi* and *an* is always different; as when, for example, you tell somebody *wrap these pesos in the cloth*, directing your attention to the cloth which is the place, whose concept belongs to the third passive: *TUNGCUSAN ME ITANG PAÑO caretang pesos*, and because the sentence is *materially* or *per accidens* the same as this next one, he changes the focus of attention and directs it principally to the pesos, and he answers you, *ITUNGCOS co pin DETING PESOS quetang paño*. This does not infer, however, that the first passive is the same as the third; neither is *pisalbaganan* formally the same as *salbagan*, *tungcusan* as *pitungcusan*, etc.,

The difference between the third passives of the simple and the passive of *pi* and *an* is as follows: The passive of the simple expresses only the place where the action of the verb ends (if one can call action that which is not done *actively*): *SASALBAGANAN mon palay ining mula co*, for example, only says that the garden is sown or is affected by the act of sowing, which is not considered as an action

that does, but as an action which is going to end in the place; just as the process whereby a shower [an apparatus] which wets the place where it falls seems to be an action.

The passives of *pi* and *an* also express the place, but not the place unqualified, the way the other passives do. They instead always indicate the place, in relation to which or *in which* an action properly so called was done; and so it always includes two passives, that of the place referred to and that of the action which was done or is presupposed, which is the first passive regularly, because you can rarely find a verb which does not admit this passive, whose active is always the transitive *mi*; and this is the concept behind the above-mentioned passives, *pisalbagan*, *pitatamnan*, *piyuyusdanan*; as if *pi* would say at one time, *isalbag*, *salbagan*; *itanam*, *tamnan*; *yusad*, *usdanan*, *that which* and *such place*; or as if you use *pi* instead of the *i* of the first passive, saying *Ipisalbaganan*, *Ipitatamnan*, *Ipiyuyusdanan*; and since in the above-mentioned sentences, you put or join *per accidens* the land which is presupposed to have been sown and the land in relation to which there is the transitive *mi* or the first passive, it seems that some passives have the same meaning as others, even if they are very diverse.

And so, when the simple passives do not express more action than what they express in themselves, even if we mention a thousand times the place where those actions were done, we can never use *pi* and *y* in them; for example, *SILBAGANAN* or *TIMNANAN*, *INUSDANAN mo napon ing mula*. I now ask you to identify to me the garden in which you did those actions (if they must be called such): *ingsa cayang mula ing SIILBAÑGANAN*, *TIMNANAN*, *INUSDANAN mo napon?*; never with *pi* and *an* even if we mention the place of those actions done a hundred times, but instead we add the action of the transitive *mi* or first passive; for example, *ican misalbag napon palay? Et sic de reliquis [And the same with the rest.]*

I said that generally the passive *i* is the one which always corresponds to the transitive *mi*; for example, *with which*, *ining caramelo IYNUM quen danum*; *din mu con danum a PIYNUMAN co quening caramelo*. *Of instrument*: *ing baril co iyan IBARIL mo quetang usa*; *itang usa PIBARILAN mo quing baril co*. *On behalf of whom*: *ILIUAT mo con alac quetang frasco*; *itang frascong PILIUATAN mong alac caco*. *Of movement*, aside from those mentioned: *ican MIQUE queni queang libro*; *ique Me queni iyang libro*; *queni ing PICAYAN mo queyang libro*; *ican MILUB caco quing silid mo etc.*; *ing silid mo PILUBAN mo caco*; *ILIPAT mo co cañgatba*; *cañgatba ing PILIPATAN mo caco*, etc.

With the verbs of *intransitive movement*, such as *lub*, *lipat*, *lual*, *uquiat*, etc., the *pi* and *an* combination has *per se* [by itself] something in which it exercises the action, because it flows from the transitive *mi* as you saw in *piluban* and *pilipatan*; but if, *per accidens* [by way of exception], it does not have the thing, the action stays in the doer himself; for example, get out of there. You answer: I do not have a place through which, *ala con PILUALAN*, as if saying *ala con ilual-lualan* or *pilualan quing catauan co*.

Among the verbs of *intransitive movement*, the combination *pi* and *an* also presupposes *per se* [in itself] the action of the first passive or its active, because it flows from the transitive *mi*, as you saw in *piluban* and *pilipatan*; *per accidens* [but by way of exception], it can lack that thing, and in that case, it does not lack the passive of *i* either, and the action remains in the doer himself; otherwise, these verbs would not be able to admit *pi* and *an*. To express the place in itself only, always use the simple; for example, *ala con PANICAN, TIPAN or UQUIATAN*, as we said about *salbagananan, tamnanan*, etc., namely, simply the place like the stairs or the tree where one climbs.

With *pi* and *an*, the first passive presupposes the movement of one's own body and identifies the place *through which* or *to where*, etc.; for example, I want to enter or to go out; the door is closed; I would say *ala con PILUALAN or PILUBAN or PITACASAN*. And this last one also indicates the place *to where*, as a mountain to which his body fled. At other times, although what was mentioned about *pi* and *an* is enough, we see the point better because here we add the concept of the doer to the concept of the action; for example, *ala con PIPANICAN or TIPAN queca quening mua co* or *quening tula co*, I don't have a place *through which* to bring up or to bring down my happiness or my anger towards you; *ala con PIUQUIATAN*, for example, I have no place *through which* to bring my body up; it also always connotes turning one's attention towards the space to which one is walking. Construct other examples based on this.

When the *pi* and *an* [combination] does not presuppose the action of the first passive or its active, it usually presupposes the action of the second passive or its active; and in all the rest, the same procedure is followed; for example, bring us a glass *en que beba agua* [from which to drink water], *cuma can bubug a PIYNUMAN mi*; here we presuppose the act of drinking water and indicate the place *en donde* [in which]. Another: from what tree will you harvest? (I am presuming that you are going to): *insang pun ing PIPUPULAN mo? Ing dalandan*, for example, *ing PIPUPULAN co*. Another: in what house are they whipping those boys? *Insang balay PIBABATBATAN da caretang anac?* They whipped them in the school, *quing escuela ing PIBATBATAN da carela*.

I said *ordinarily*, because inasmuch as the third passives of an indefinite thing come from active verbs, they can also indicate true action; and, assuming that point, we also use *pi* and *an* to indicate the place; for example, *ican matbat careteng anac* or *batbatan mo detang anac*, whip one or some of those boys. *En donde* [Where?] *Insang silid ing PIBATBATANAN co carela? Quing pisamban ing PIBATBATANAN mo*; where did they catch each of those thieves? *Nu carin ing PIRACPANANAN da caretang mapanacao? And the same with the rest*.

Up to here, we have treated the actions which the *pi*-and-*an* combination regularly presupposes. But none of this goes against the following point, namely that, if the actions are expressed by the compound verbs, the *pi*-and-*an* is also used to indicate the place of those actions; for example, *pipanganan* or *pipacanan*, the places

where the people ate or fed the animals, etc. In all these, the *pi* of the past is always pronounced long, as was mentioned at the beginning; and if you are wondering why I am not giving the reason for the endings *an*, *anan* or *ananan*, look at the use of the third passive which is also the same as that of *pi* and *an*.

As a complement of this *pi* and *an*, I will add a last point. It is something which is associated with it, namely, that when the verbs include in their meaning the concept of waste, of broken into pieces or left-overs of the principal action, these are expressed with *pi* and *an*, and bear in mind that this one is usually the third passive of *place*: *tabas*, to cut a cloth in pieces, *pitabasan*, shreds and also the place; *pialacan*, dregs; *pipalutan*, the straws that remain after the harvest; *pilagarian*, sawdust and the place in which one saws; *picuturan*, if you add *cauayan*, you will mean the pieces that remain after you cut the bamboo. Be attentive to the context of the conversation so you will not make a mistake.

### SECTION 3

#### Neutral *MI* and *MI* with *AN*

Rare is the root which expresses movement, in the strict or in a broad sense, to which this *mi* is not attached; and since it is not active with any of these roots, it is called *neuter*; and in order to clarify what function it has in all the verbs and what specific function it has with some, we can reduce them to three groups, although this is not an essential division.

The first group covers those verbs which by their way of signifying imply principally the concept of *by chance*; for example, *sumpung*, *taquid*, to bump against, to trip; *sagquil*, *sagcul*, knock against; *subsub*, *suñgasong*, to fall flat on one's face; *tagco*, to have a bad luck; and following these are *sacab*, to lie on one's face; *talindata*, to lie on one's back; and all those which express any posture of the body, which, if with *mag*, indicate done on purpose, as we said.

The second group covers the verbs of *intransitive local movement*; for example, *lapit*, *dayo*, *lacad*, *urung*, *sulung*, *dasug*, *dasig*, *das*, *tipa*, *panic*, *locloc*, etc.

The third group covers all those verbs which admit the passive *mi* because they flow from the transitive *mi* and from the passive of *i*; for example, *misalbag*, *miugsay*, etc., that which is sown, thrown, etc.; and here they belong to this neutral *mi*, because with those verbs, it has the same meaning as when with the rest, except that the verbs to which they are joined do not signify *ad hoc* [meaning "specific"] intransitive action.

The way all of them signify consists in saying that the nominative *stops* doing or receiving the action signified by the verb to which it is attached; for example, *susumpung ya*, he is tripping; *MISUSUMPUNG ya*, he stops tripping; *sinubsub ya*, he fell flat on his face; *MISUBSUB ya*, he stopped falling flat on his face; *lalapit ya*, he is arriving; *MILALAPIT ya*, he is stopping the process, having

arrived; *minurung ya*, he retreated; *MIURUNG ya*, he stopped the process, having retreated; *MIYUYUGSE ya*, *it is stopping the process*, having been thrown; *MISALBAG na ing palay*, the palay already *stopped* the process, having sown; *MITACAL na*, *it will end being measured*. *And the same with the rest.*

To be able to use the simple and the *mi* respectively, remember that in all the verbs (except those of the *mi, n, p*), the simple is like *to be* and the *mi* is like *to remain*; and so as Our Father Saint Augustine says, one has to be in a place first before one remains in it, *prius est esse alicubi quam manere* [*being somewhere comes before remaining in it*], so also you first have the simple which only signifies action as *transient* and not complete enough, before you get *mi*, which expresses it as completed; and since it is as inseparable from the simple as the shadow is from the body, the simple verb consequently always comes ahead to express the meaning of the verb, and *mi* follows to signify that *it is stopping* the process of having been completed, etc.

All the verbs having this composition, without any exception, admit their *proto* to signify *plurality* with the nominative, and it is constructed with *mañga*; for example, *MAÑGASACAB la*, they (because they are many) *stop* the process that ends in their lying flat on their face; *MENĜALAPIT la*, they stopped, having arrived; *MENGAYUGSE la*, they stopped, having been thrown.

All those which refer to some posture of the body admit *pa* between *mi* and the root; and that way they signify that the subject did the action which the verb expresses without knowing what was being done; for example, *MILOCLOC co*, *I ended up seated*; but *MIPALOCLOC co*, *I sat down without being aware of it*; *mitod co*, *I ended up standing*; but *MIPATOD co*, *I stood up without being aware of what I was doing*, because I got frightened by a noise, for example, and this is true with the rest.

All of these and those like them also admit *ca* inserted between *mi* and *pa*; *miCapa*, and in that case they signify that the thing happened to him many times; for examples, *MICAPALUCLUC co*, *MICAPATICDO co*, *I sit or stand many times without being aware of it*. *And the same with the rest.*

It also admits this *mi* with all the above-mentioned verbs expressing posture (belonging to the construction of *maca* related to *being* [estando]), where *PACA* is inserted between *mi* and the root; for example, *miPACAloloc ya*, he finishes doing the process of sitting, as the Italian who does not get bored *per niente*; *miPACAsacab ya*, he completes the process of prostrating, he is in that position; and so *miPACAtalindata* and all in its group. You can extend this *mi* to all those which admit *maca* related to *being* [estando]. *Vide ibi* [Look it up there].

When the above-mentioned verbs only admit *pa*, for example, *miPaloloc*, they are followed (in the same way of signifying) by those of *movement* belonging to the second group; for example, *miPatipa*, *miPalapit*, etc.; and to be listed with these are *lucsu*, *cay*, *ñgisi*, *siguc*, *guiguit*, *mulagat*, *culisac*, *tañgis*, *cullyao*, *baliquid*, *tudtud*, *nigla*, *tacla*, *mipaaili*, or *mipacaili*, etc.: *mipalatut*, *mipaliyi*, these two with *pal*.

*Mipacañian, mipacayap, mipacarauac, mipacamal*, refers to someone who ended up that way, either luckily or unluckily; *mipalaot* refers to what drifted to the open sea, for example because one did not know how to swim or the banca was not well directed or because the waves pushed it or the sea is wide; and those which went with it are also *mipalaut*. *Mipacarauac, mipatiueuay* is one who finished doing the act of double-dealing. And with this, let us leave their actives, and let us go to their passives.

The verbs belonging to the first group which when with *mi* always connote *by chance*, like to trip, to fall, to fall flat on one's face, etc., use the third passive, and the place is in the nominative; and since this passive we are talking about is not for the simple verb, but for its *MI* which expresses completion of the act, it must always use *ca* and *an*; for example, *misumpung co quetang dutung*, I completed the unintentional act of bumping against that wood; its passive, *QUESUMPUNGAN que itang dutung*. Another: I completed the act of bumping into you, *mitataquid co queca, CATATAQUIRAN da ca*; and so *quesacban, queragsan*, etc.

Like the passives of *pi* and *an*, the form of the present also serves to express names of places destined for doing something actively (remember we said this earlier); and so, in these, if they use the form of the present, pronouncing it fast, the latter signifies the place where something happens *by chance*, which is the point here; for example, *casusumpungan, catataquiran*, stumbling block; *catatyaban*, sandbank, as Scyla [should be Scylla]; *casasayaran*, dry dock, etc.

Those belonging to the first group which we said signify the posture of the body also admit this passive; for example, *QUETALINDIQUINGAN que ing ulunan*.

Among those belonging to the second group, it seems that only those which include distance admit it, and these are: *lapit, dayo, dasig, dasung, urung, sulung*, and similar ones, and the distance is in the nominative; for example, in two hours the ship ended the processes of becoming six leagues far away, *lub ning aduang horas mirayu yang daung anan* [sic] *a leguas*; *ANAN* [sic] *A LEGUAS ing QUERAYOUANA ning daung lub ning aduang horas*. Another: I completed the act of retreating from you or moving towards you four yards *APAT A VARAS ing CAYUYURUNGAN* or *CALALAPITAN co queca*, etc.

All those of the third group, which are those of the passive neuter *mi*, admit it and in all it connotes *by chance*; for example, *MIUGSE co quing patio*, I completed undergoing the process of being thrown in the courtyard; *quing patio ing QUEYUGSEYAN* or *QUEBINDUNGAN* or *QUETAPUNAN* or *QUEBALUGSEYAN co*, etc.

All the passives *by chance* are very well constructed by placing *a* to the future of *ca* and *an*, for it and for the preterite, or to the root of the simple; for example, *ACASUSUMPUNGAN da ca*, or *ASUSUMPUNGAN da ca*, I complete bumping into you many times. Another: I completed bumping into my father, *ACATAQUIRAN* or *ATAQUIRA que ibpaco*. Another: if you complete bumping

against me, I have to whip you, *nun uarin ASAGQUILAN* or *ACASAGQUILAN mo co, batbatan da ca*, etc. You now see how I refer to Spanish for the purpose of making you realize that many times we express with the action of the transient verb what for the language is *to stop and complete*. See the neuters of *ma* and their passives.

### **MI with AN**

You can use this composition with the verbs of the preceding one, because when you put in the nominative the place or *quasi-place* to which the action or movement refers, all admit this pattern (except *lagco* which does not imply place); for example, if I bumped against you, you are *mitaquiran*; if you put yourself face down over the chair, the chair is *misacban*; if Pedro approached Juan, Juan is *milapitan*; if the banca is rocked, the place is *milingguian*; if they throw you in the road, the road is *miugseyan*, etc.; and also all with their *mañga* expressing plurality, to indicate the places; for example, *meñgaugsay*, as we already said, are the things thrown; but the places *in which* are *meñgaugsayan*; *mengatubu*, the trees, for example, grown or sprouted; *mengatubuan*, the places *in which*; but notice here that, in both compositions, if the subject or nominative is singular, for example, *mengasabit* or *mengasumpung YA*, it indicates that either he bumped against many parts or he tipped in many places, etc.

Those of the passive *mi*, if the nominative is singular, it is used only with *an*, in which it agrees with all the rest; for example, *MENGASALBAGAN* or *MENGASAMBULATAN ya*, the one who would be *like a place in which* many things *fall*, like the Father whom people fill with flowers on Palm Sunday; *MENGASABITAN ya*, like a maiden adorned with many jewels; and so, the first one, *mengasumpung*, *mengasabit*, for example, is one who bumped against many people, or who hang many things; the second, *mengasumpuñgan*, *meñgasabitan ya* is one against whom many people bumped or in where many things are hung, as when they adorn the banca to make *salubung*.

I omitted all this in the preceding composition, because this way, it can be better understood and also because that one is only one branch of this, as it has many others; and so that we will not be dealing with branches, we will deal with the trunk, and explain the root in which this composition principally consists, namely that particle which is placed at the end.

### **AN**

I am certain that this particle is the *an* which constitutes the third passive of place, and so, in all the nouns and verbs to which it is attached, it expresses the place or *quasi-place*. The noun is where the action reaches. If its verb is neutral, which is always *mi* with *an*, it points to the place or *quasi-place*, which is about to be

reached or was reached or will be reached; because, just as the subject or nominative of the person who receives the action in the second passive has its neutral verbs *ma* to express the completion of the given act; so also the place or *quasi-place* has this neutral verb of *mi* with *an* to get the same result.

This having been said, you now understand better that *mitaquiran*, for example, is the place or *quasi-place* reached by the act of stumbling; as if while passing, I stumble over your foot either for fun, which is *tequiran*, or *by accident*, which is *acaTAQUIRAN* or *QUETAQUIRAN que ining bitis mo*; always your foot is *mi* with *an*; *MITAQUIRAN* or *MITATAQUIRAN yan bitis mo*; and if you approach me, I am the place or *quasi-place* reached by your movement, *MILAPITAN co*; like if they throw you in the street, the street is the place or *quasi-place* reached by your being thrown, *iyang MIUGSAYAN*. If the place is not appropriate for the verb, then it will be a place *per accidens* [that is, by way of exception].

Let us go back to the particle *an* which constitutes the third passive of place and which therefore is almost always admitted when with its *mi* to express the place or *quasi-place* where such act is completed; for example, *liban den diablos y cay*; *cay MILUBAYAN diablos*.

The same is true with *misaldacan*, *misandulian*, *mipungpungan*, *mibungbungan*, *miyablasan*, *mibatoan*, and with a thousand others. To avoid making a mistake about them, take *mituran*, *mituliran* as a model. Example: the mass was assigned to you and the sermon was assigned to me, *ican MITULIRAN quing misa*, *acon MITURAN quing aral*. Even if the Spanish varies because of the variety of the roots, the *mi* and *an* never changes this meaning.

But you must take note very carefully that, even though it has this primary or principal concept, (*su concepto formal y constitutivo*), it very often expresses the situation of the receiver as its additional or secondary concept (*materialiter o identice*); for example, for *mialdauan* or *mialdauanan* to be true, it is enough that the sun touches one, and this is the point of the *an*; that a being gets hurt by this, like a horse that is harnessed, is extrinsic and secondary (*de materiali y extrinseco*) to this composition. It is therefore in this sense that you must understand *mibulanan*, *miañginan*, *miambonan*, when one is talking about illnesses: for example, *misasalunan misalunan*, to be a victim of that situation which is the process of receiving; and the same with *saquit*, *bulutung*, *bilig*, *baclao*, *buni*, *gutli*, *baya*, *tigsa*, *paltus*, etc., whose composition is like that of *bulbul*, *alimpuyo*, *gumi*, *guti*, etc.

And in this regard, *mebulbulan* is the same as *mibatoan*, because the fact that one is natural and the other artificial, is beside the point. And so that I will not forget, I will inform you here that even if a house made of stone is referred to as *bale a bato*, a house made of wood is not referred to as *bale a dutung*; but with the third passive, *bale a DITUNGAN*; and if it is made of wood (tabla), *bale a DELIGAN*; windows made of capis, *auang a QUEPISAN*; these and all similar to them admit *mi* with *an*.

So that you will see how certain it is that, just as the neutral verb of *ma* corresponds to the second passive, so this verb of *mi* with *an* always corresponds to a place as a receiver of something, and it is the third passive. If it expresses the process of receiving, it is very improperly so conceived because it is not a place properly speaking. Take note of the difference between the two when they are joined together in one verb; for example, *mesalaing*, *misalaiñgan*; *mepaluca*, *mipalucan*; *mebatbat*, *mibatbatan*; *mebaril*, *mibarilan*.

*Mesalaing* is connected to the second passive *selaingan*; for example, the candle which you lighted on the altar; this candle is *misalaing by chance*, and as a place in which the fire arrives, it is *misalaingan*; for this reason, they usually say *macabulad*, *misalaing* [the first vowel is i] or *misalaingan ya*; and you will never hear them say *macabulad*, *mesalaing* [the first vowel is e] *ya*. Take note of this well when dealing with some verbs which admit *an* in the preterite second passive, and also admit *ma* and *mi*.

We said above that the place of the neutral passive *mi* and of the passive *by chance* is done with *mi* and *an*, *miugsayan*; and so when someone gets burned, he is the place of *mi*: *misalaingan*, *misulsulan*, *milablaban*; and he is also the third passive of *ca* and *an* of *by chance*.

*Mebaril*, *mebatbat* correspond to the second passive; *mibarilan*, *mibatbatan* correspond to the third passive *ca*, which connotes *by chance*; for example, *MIPALUCAN ca* means that, because you clubbed somebody, I club you; that is, the club is the passive *mi*, *mipaluca*, and the place to which it is *per accidens* directed, or in which it fell was you: *ican MIPALUCAN*; you will philosophize the same way with *mebaril* and *mibarilan*; *mebatbat* and *mibatbatan* and all those similar to them; because those of that group, if they somehow connote receiving the action, it is always *per accidens*, inadvertently, and always with the *an* of the third passive; for example, if you were coming close to me while I was bending a stick and without my intending it, the stick broke loose and hit you, you are said to be *mibalantican* and *mibatbatan*; because here, the stick was the passive *mi* and you are the place to which it moved, etc. So it should be clear now that it never becomes a second passive, and if it connotes receiving the action, it is *per accidens* or, moreover, not possible; because if the sentence uses a neutral verb, you use it, because you must not use *ma*. [In this context, *per accidens* means *inadvertently, unintentionally*.]

I forgot to put a fourth group of neutral verbs, and although it is included in those words of the beginning, you can hardly find a root expressing movement strictly or broadly so called to which this *mi* etc. is not attached. Nevertheless, because this fourth group of neutral verbs is often cited in the Dictionary, the way the other three are, even if any further discussion of the neutral verb and of the *mi* will not add any special thing to those already discussed, I will say something about them in particular.

I therefore say that there are many neutral verbs in which there is no other movement than that which is enough to admit the first passive *of thing* and the third

passive of *place*; and this is also sufficient for them to be part of the *mi* and not of *ma*; for example, *lablab*, as a candle; *dalacdac*, as fire; *dicat*, to stick; *sauaua*, *lomas*, *catauan*, to be part of; *dalan*, to pass, and all similar to them, with which the neutral *mi* signifies *the completion of the thing being referred to*, as has been said about the rest.

And the place or *quasi-place* also admits its third passive *ca* and *an*, but it does not belong to this case; for example, *calablaban*, *quelablaban*, that which catches fire, like grass; *caricatan*, that in which one gets attached (even though it means emotionally); *capadtan*, *quepadtan*, like a bird tied; *caralanan*, as a quarrel or a work, and all admit *mi* with *an*, as was said about the rest.

I suppose that they all have *MAÑGA* of *plurality* or of *intensity*, as each verb requires; for example, *MENGAGUTLIAN ya*, *MEÑGAGUTLIAN la*, many parts of the body or many people itching, etc. and that those which express the receiving of the action or as if receiving, even though only as secondary concepts (*identice* or *per accidens*) all of them make the verbal by putting *panga* in place of *mi*; for example, *pañgataquiran*, *pañgapauasan*, *pañgagutlian*, *pañgauranan*, *pañgatuluan*, *pañgayaldauan*, *pañgabulanan*, *pañgayalimoman*, *pañgayambonan*, *pañgayandalian*, *pañgabayaran*, *pañgacayan*, etc.

And lastly, I say that, with the future of the third passive (if the root is a verb), and (if the root is a noun), putting the particle *an*; they become adjective nouns, which express the place or *quasi-place* where that thing is done; for example *pandilouan*, bathroom; *ligauan*, fishing-ground; *dulañgan*, mine, etc. *almonan*, throat, etc.

Nouns; *pindangan*, place where they make *pindang*; *liaban*, where they make rice cake; etc. and with the names of illnesses; for example, *gutlian*, sick with scabies; *pionan*, gouty; *gumian*, hairy; *bunian*, nettle-rash; *butulan*, skinny, etc.

## Section 4 The Active MI and the Frequentatives

The neutral *mi* has a restful job, because all it does is *to stop*; the job of this one is more tiresome because it always expresses *action*, whether somebody else's or its own, depending on what the roots require; for example, *mibaya*, to make live coals or to heat up, like an iron; *micaunay*, to extract, as when you make a belt out of leather; *migaua*, to pretend, as in lying; *micudta*, to invent or compose the history or novel; *mitula*, to compose verses; *mialung*, to play, *etiam cum membro* [*even with one's organ*]; *mialit*, to device, as a trick; *mibata*, to suffer. This composition includes the following: *dapal*, *lagaua*, *saguli*, *casi*, *galing*, *ganaca*, *aco*, *añyo*, *asal*; for example, behave like a saint, *PIASALAN mong asal banal*. Also: *ucul*, *gani*, *tangca*, *dangca*, *adia*, *saddia*, *tanara*, *tagana*, *talaga*, etc.

*Micubu*, *miralungdung*, *milamo*, to do these or [other] things as if borrowing them because they are meant to last a short time; *picubuan*, *piralungdungan*,

*pilamuan*, the place, or for what they are meant: for example, *PICUBUAN mo ding maiz*, etc. They also connote *combination* since they put together the materials out of which are made. [The grammatical technical term is *de compañía*, of company.]

And the same is true with the roots which require immanent act; for example, *miligaya*, to enjoy oneself; *mitula*, to be happy; *milasa*, to taste; and the same with *saya*, *sigla*, *saquit*, *ganaca*, etc.; but bear in mind that none of them admits *an* in the preterite. It is possible that inasmuch as they refer to an action, they are second passives: *lungcut* has *an* in the preterite; also *mimua*, *micasbo*, *mitubud*.

### MI: Intensification

With the following, it connotes intensification, and they are: *mibañgis mibagsi* (with *an* and without it in the preterite), *micaluco*, *milablab*, *miralacdac* (these three, when the nominative is non-living, belong to the neutral *mi*), *misañgil*, *mirañgin*, *mirañga* with *an* and without it; the preterite *mitacut* always has *an*, as also *misama*, *milugud*. See the particle *ma*.

All of the above admit frequentatives, although pronounced differently from the present, because this one is pronounced fast, but the frequentative is pronounced as if staying a little in the first syllable of the verb; for example, *miligaya*; and some usually use it only, like: *sañgit*, *ñgalip*, *buri*, *yassa*, *biasa*, *pibibiasnan*, etc.

### MI: To Make Fun Of

When this *mi* is joined to roots or verbs whose meaning somehow refers to ridiculing, making fun of, fooling about, they become frequentatives which connote this kind of fooling about or mockery, which consists in either praising as good what is bad, or always and intentionally doing the opposite out of fun; for example. I ask you to hand me the inkstand and you give me the *salvadera*. I ask you again and you give me the pen; you are that frequentative, *misalasala*.

Another: you ask me, for example, what the meaning of tinapay is, and I tell you that it means a squash; you ask me again, and I answer you camote: I am *misalasala*, because intentionally, I mess up and you are *pisalasala*, because all of them have this passive.

*Misasaria* is, for example, the servant who, precisely because I order him to stay in the house, intentionally, on purpose, in order to do the opposite, goes out; I am *pisasaria*. Someone does a foolish thing and I, to make fun of him, tell him that what he did was admirable: I am *misono-sono*, *mitaro-taro*; and the same is true with *misudsud-sudsud*, *mitatalindua*, etc.

## MI: Thwarted Action [and MI: Desire]

This composition is the same, but the meaning is different and more general. It is principally connected with verbs which express *action, prevention, disposition, etc.*, and its way of signifying consists in that, after having been started, the action is thwarted because it lacked the end for which it was started, for example, *I prepared the food because I expected you to eat and you did not come*; I will say *MISADIA-SADIA con canan e ca dinatang*; *PISADIA-SADIA ra can canan, etc.*

This way of speaking usually goes with a second sentence in order to express that, inasmuch as the action was begun, just so that not everything will be in vain, I will do this or that, for example, *MITIPATIPA na co pin man papagcompesal quetang salonan, ngeni 't mete na ya, MANALO na co mo*, since I was not able to go down and hear the confession of the sick person, I will just at least go visit the altars. Another: you come to me borrowing ten pesos; I don't give you, and I tell you: take one if you want, so that you will not leave with your intent completely unrealized, *MISASARIA ca casi ngeta, niyo ining pesos*. Belonging to this composition are *miaqueacay, lacad, gani, tangas, dangca, tangca, adyia, tubud, talaga*, and all those like them.

From here comes a very ordinary way of speaking which we explain by saying: *you are full of plans, but you never put them into action*; it is expressed with the frequentative; for example, to someone who keeps on preparing to go to confession but never does, *PIGANI-GANI mo mong PIGANI-GANI ing pamagcompisal mo*; the active, *MIGANI-GANI cang MIGANI-GANING magcompisal, etc.*; and the same with someone who always answers that he will do *miagad* and he never arrives, *MIAGAD-AGAD cang MIAGAD-AGAD*; *PIAGAD-AGAD mo mong PIAGAD-AGAD ing pamaquialang mo quing pamagcompesal mo*; to the painter who never comes up with the painting, in spite of repeatedly showing that he is preparing to do so, *MIUCUL-UCUL ca mong miucul-ucul*, you have nothing but plans. *And the same with the rest*. And bear in mind that even if you hear this composition reconstructed by using the *MACA of perfection*, the meaning does not change at all.

## MI: Frequentatives

Aside from the frequentatives which we have already discussed, you can use them with all the composition of *mi*, and it means to keep on doing what the root expresses; for example, in all those of the transitive and passive *mi*, *mibalag-balag*, keep on allowing things to fall, and that which you keep on allowing to fall, like plates; *misui-sui*, like a father to a single girl, that she get married, and also that single girl, because it is the passive *mi*; *mitaquid-taquid*, and all those of the neutral *mi*; *micudta-cudta*, its passive, *picudta-cudta*, which belong to the active *mi*; *mitali-lati, miyorod-*

*orod, milabon-labon*, of the reflexive *mi*; and the *with which*, like a razor, *piyorod-orod, piulas-ulas*, etc. I don't see any reason for anyone to make a mistake if one follows the respective rules and ways of signifying of each composition.

## Section 5 The Reflexive MI and the Correlative MI

This one also expresses *action*, so covetous an action that wherever it is attached, in whatever way it can do, it appropriates it. And so, when attached to verbs whose meaning can appropriately be applied, whether to someone else, or to oneself, the action always remains in the doer and becomes reflexive, corresponding literally to our reflexive, *me (myself), te (thyself), se (himself, herself)*, for example, *ulo*, to cure someone; *miyolo*, to cure one's own self (*medice, cura teipsum; physician, cure thyself*); *sampat*, to beautify; *misampat*, to beautify oneself; *orod*, to shave; *miorod*, to shave one's own self, even if it is by another's hand.

Belonging to this composition are *labon, batbat, omalid, ontay, suclay, ulas, imalan, dasay, dalayap, lara, asin, aslam*; but do not think that with *mi* they mean *to put salt on your self* or *to pour vinegar on yourself* but *to take salt* or *vinegar*, for your food. All those mentioned require the first passive with *pi*; for example, *PIOROD que ini*, this is the razor with which I shaved myself; *PIBATBAT que ita*, that is the whip or lash with which I flagellated myself.

Also this, *PIOLO mo ini*, cure yourself with this medicine; *PIIMALAN co iyan*; *PIULAS yo ita*; *PIASIN mo ining asin*. If you eat without a plate, I will tell you: *MIPINGAN ca, PIPINGAN me ining pingan co*, etc.; *pibayad, pisali, pilibay* are not reflexive, but transitive and irregular.

Also belonging to the same composition, although they do not admit the same passive, but they admit the *paca* of intensity, are *larin, sinup, tiñyao, napnap*; for example, *larin*, to repair another thing; *milarin*, to fix one's own self; *mipacalarin*, to fix oneself perfectly well, etc.; and when they admit *paca*, they are followed by *santing, lago, sampat, bayat, banal, lalai, lasing, saua, angsul, asnoc* and *micapacañyaman*, to relish or lick it again and again with great pleasure; *bangon, tali*; *guising* does not admit *paca*.

### MI: To Acquire

When joined to root-nouns which for the most part signify things which can be possessed or acquired, they also use the subject or nominative to signify that they acquire and that, consequently, they possess them; for example, *MISALAPI co ngening datang yang daung*, when the ship arrives, I will receive money; the same with *MISICAPAT CO*, I received money, etc. Belonging to this composition are *guinto, bacsao, singsing, alipan, tapis, bandi, sandata, dayat, cabayo, calma, palad, nuan, salap, dangal, puri, pala, damla, usa*, like in the mountains; *daguis*, like in *longlong*; *asan*, like in the lake; *dapo*,

like in the river; *bunga* like on the tree, etc.

Also pertaining to this composition of acquiring, even though they are materially equivalent to other Spanish words, are those expressions which were added to the correlative *mi*; for example, *miyanac* is to beget children and *mialipan*, to acquire slaves, like *mimanuyang*, to acquire a daughter-in-law or son-in-law; so now, *biasa yang MIMANUYANG* means he knows how to acquire a son-in-law; that is, he knows how to choose one; *mapagal pala ing MIANAC or MIALIPAN*, it is tiresome to acquire children or slaves; because when they come to you, and consequently you have them, you have more people to take care of.

The passives of this composition are the third of *pi* and *an*, that *from where* it came (although not all can admit that something); for example, *ing pamagcapitana iyang PISALAPI na; ing pamangalona iyan PISALAPIANA*, etc.

### MI: Correlation

The function of this one consists in that, when joined to a relative noun, it refers to its correlative without necessarily expressing them; but, as the saying goes, *posito fundamento relations, resultat relatio*, [if you give the basis of the relationship, the correlate automatically follows]; and so, in the same way, if you express this *mi* with some relative noun, you implicitly include its correlative; for example, *ibpa* is a relative noun, because it implies relationship with a son; and the same happens with *anac*, which implies relationship with a father; now if you join *mi* with any of them, you not only mention the relative noun which it expresses, but also the correlative which corresponds to it; for example, *miibpa* does not only express father, but father and son; *mianac* does not only express the son, but the son and the father; in such a way that to express one term is the same as expressing the other, because every term includes its correlative; although if you want to put it in Spanish, you have to start with that which is expressed, for example, *miibpa*, father and son; *mianac*, son and father.

Grandfather: To whom is it related? To the grandson; and so, *minono*, grandfather and grandson; *apo*, grandson; *miapo*, grandson and grandfather. The same is true with father-in-law and son-in-law, brother-in-law and brother-in-law. If the children or grandchildren, etc., are many, double the *anac* and *apo*; for example, *mianac-anac; miapo-apo*; the children and the father, the grandchildren and the grandfather.

Up to here, you have only said father and son, son and father. And the same is true with *miindo*, mother and son or daughter; but if you want to call any of them by their proper name, you must not attach *mi* to the proper name, but to its correlative. Let us suppose that the name of the son is Martin; you will say: *Martin ilang MIINDO*, Martin and his mother; if I want to say Antonia and her father-in-law, I will say *Antonia ilang MICATUYANGAN*; Jesus and his mother, *Jesus ilang MIINDO*; and the same with uncle and nephew, grandfather and grandson, etc.

In others, this difficulty is not found because the term is the same in the two correlatives: *micapatad*, two brothers; *mipisan*, cousins; *miasaua*, spouses, *mibilas*, brothers-in-law. Do you want to say Pedro and his brother? Well say: *Pedro ilang MICAPATAD* and if there are many brothers, *Pedro ilang MICACAPATAD* or *di Pedro ilang MICACAPATAD*. The same is true with the rest. Also belonging here are *miguino*, master and servant; and the same with *miprior*, *mivicario*, *mibilango*, *misabuat*, *micabangca*, *micuyog*, etc.

## Section 6 MI of Company

We now reach the famous composition of *mi* of company. It is called of *company* because it signifies works and things in which there has to be two, at least; for example, *bono*, to beat; *mibono* one beating another; present *mibobono*; preterite, *mibono*; the concept of quarreling indicates that it proceeds from both with a mutual and simultaneous relation of one action to another; or if it is passive, the things which are nominative of the person who receives the activity, also signify mutual and simultaneous relation in the reception of the action, etc. so that the two actions or passions *are considered to be one*. Before going any further, notice that *mibobono* refers to an encounter between two and no more; if they are many, to specify it, double the whole root: *mibono-bono*. You will now say: which present tense has to double the root even if there are two syllables? Look, if they are two, the first syllable is doubled to get the present; if they are many, the whole root is doubled; for example, *misaup*, help each other, *misasaup*, present; but if they are many, say *misaup-saup*; and the same with the passive *pisasaupan* if two; *pisaup-saupan*, if many; even if you will also hear them using the structure of the present tense.

The verbal, according to how it comes out of the two, is with *pa*, *pamisaup*; if they are more, *pamisaup-saup*. To express the action, according to how it comes out of one, *pamaqui*; and in order to express the companion in these actions; for example, the sparring partner, the working partner, I must inform you that there is one particle *ca* which is generally equivalent to our Spanish *con* [*with, co-*]; for example, *condiscipulo* [classmate], *conovicio* [co-novice], *concolega* [colleague]. This having been said, since in these actions there is always a companion, it is called of *company*. Each of the protagonists is formed with *ca* and the root; for example, Pedro and Juan quarrel, *MIGAGA di Pedro ilang Juan*; now, Pedro is the *cagaga* of Juan and Juan is the *cagaga* of Pedro; and this is true with all. See the particle *ca*.

This composition has two varieties. The first one is what we have just discussed; namely, that when the action proceeds from two or more; but it has to be an action of *company*; what I mean is that the action of one must express precisely a relation to the action of the other, because otherwise they would be partial actions, like those of the rowers, where the action of one is not shown to be related to the action of the other

and so we never say, for example, *MIGAUDGAUD la*, of company, but *gagaud la*, using the simple; and this should also be observed in the second variety which we will discuss, under pain of not being able to be the *mi* of company, if such relation is not there.

This having been said, going back to the first variety, as distinct from the second, it consists in that the action of *company* comes from the nominative; for example, Pedro and Juan quarrel, *MIGAGA la di Pedro ilang Juan*; Francisco and Antonio help each other, *MISASAUP la di Francisco ilan Antonio*; do not quarrel, *e co MIYAMANO*; the *mapias* argue stubbornly, *MIYATUA-YATUA la ding mangapia*; it is always understood, for example, that they quarrel with each other, that they help each other, that they fight each other, etc.

These above-mentioned actions always have a motive for *what* or *over what* or *in what*, and also *that which*. This last one, when put in the nominative, is always expressed with the third passive; for example, *ING COPIA PIGAGANDA di Pedro ilang Juan*; *ING BALE a PISAUPAN dang tinali di Francisco ilang Antonio*; *ING DAYAT dan piyamanuan da*; *ING NUNINONG MAGCAPITAN, iyan PIATUAN-ATUAN da ding mañgapia*; *misamac la ding santos quing cabanalan da*; *ING CABANALAN ding santos PISASAMACAN da* or *PISAMAC-SAMACAN da, etc.*

Exceptions to what was discussed because they are irregular are *pilibay-libay*, *pibayad-bayad*, as a slave or a prisoner, which is always of *company*, and always with the first passive; *pisali-sali* is frequentative; *that which is bought and has no use* belongs to the thwarted action.

The second variety of this composition consists ordinarily in making it passive; it is always the second passive, because the action comes from a different doer, which in the active is the transitive *mi*; for example. *PIASAUANAN mo la*; active, *ican MIASAUUA carela*; make them quarrel, that is, one against another, *PIGAGAN mo la*; *ican MIGAGA carela*; *PILAPITAN mo detang caban*, put those boxes near each other; *ican MILAPIT caretang caban*; put these chairs one in front of the other, *PITULIRAN mo deang sia*, etc.

In this consideration, the *mi* of company which results, for example, *MIASAUUA*, *MITULID la ding sia*, etc. is the passive *mi* because they are where the actions or movements of the transitive *mi* are received. The following are very appropriate for this composition of *company*: *lupa*, *anas*, *para*, *alas*, *ascay*, *uangis*, *asal*, *sucad*, *asbuc*, *pantay*, *abay*, etc. See the particle *sang*.

## Section 7

### The MI of Alternation and of Competition

Earlier I referred to this as the *mi ad invicem* [*mi for each other*], and it indeed is, because the *ad invicem* is the class to which the *mi* of company and this one belong, just like animal covering man and horse. The difference consists in

that the former is *for each other simultaneously* and the latter is *for each other successively or alternately*; so that *MISASAUP la* is *for each other*, the action of the two occurring at the same time; *MISASAUPAN la* is *for each other*, the action of the two occurring not at the same time but alternately; today by me, tomorrow by you; you trim my beard, I will trim your hair; to give what the other gives; *carry the burden of each other*; *MIRALITAAN cayo*. And this same thing is very applicable to good spouses who bear with each other's limitation, because, for example, the husband is in bad mood in the morning, and the wife tolerates; she is in a worse mood in the afternoon, and the husband bears with her, *MIRALITAAN la*; and do not say *miralitan la*, because this one means that he sings popular songs and she listens; she sings and he listens. You see now that this is alternating, just like *MIYUYUMALIRAN la*, literally, they clean each other alternately; figuratively, *MIUMALIRAN cata*, keep silent and we will keep silent. The opposite *MISUSUMBUNGAN*, the *mesqueros quarrel*, and the bars of cheese are discovered; *MIQUIQUIBUSAN la*, they alternate like the altar boys who alternate with the *orimon*, etc.

So also, because there is this alternation, Pedro, for example, sold a slave to Juan, the latter sold him back to Pedro, you will say: *di Pedro ilang Juan MIBABAYARAN lan alipan*, because one and the other alternate in being the buyer and seller, etc. And the same with *miyoyotosan*, *mipapatauaran*, *miyuyutañgan*, *miiyuaran*, bearing in mind that, in all of them, the first syllable of the verb is pronounced long, and the rest short until you reach the end.

The passives of this composition are always the third, like those of the first variety of company; and in order to distinguish them, one must look at the difference which distinguish one from the other; for example. In this sentence: What is that which they passed from hand to hand? *Nanu re tang PIRADUANG-ADUANGAN da?* If this passive is that of *MI of company*, the actions which look at the nominative of the person who receives the action must be considered as one with respect to it; and this means that the thing is passed from the hand of Juan to that of Pedro and that of the latter to that of Antonio, and that these correlative actions become only one action; if it is of the *MI of alternation*, it signifies that the thing is passed, for example, from the hand of Juan to that of Pedro and from that of Pedro back to that of Juan, and from there to that of Antonio, and this thing goes back to that of Juan or Pedro, like a ball, etc. Here you see that the action of one is not considered as one (no se tiene *per modum unius*) with respect to the action of the other.

This having been said, if I say: *this is the sword with which they wounded each other*, I will say: *iti pin ing espadang PISUSUGATAN da*; that is the club with which they clubbed each other; *tayong palucang PIPAPALUCAN da*; and the same goes with the rest belonging to this composition, so distinct from that of *company*, because the actions do not connote company, but *as alternating*; one action has no connection with the other, or the action of one with respect to that of the other.

## COMPETITION

This composition which I label *COMPETITION* connotes rivalry in all the verbs appropriate to it; for example, we run a race, damned be the last, *MIPULAIYAN* or *MITAGALAN cata*; let us see who is faster, *MILICSIAN cata*; *MISALUSUAN cata*; let us try the *bancas* and see which runs faster; *MITUTURANAN la*, they vie with each other, they compete, to see who hits the mark, etc.

When the verb can be applied either to *alternation* or to *competition*, for example, *mibabataan*, *mibabasibasan*, *mibabarilan la*, *mipapanan la*, which can mean alternating in shooting a gun or an arrow, and also competing to see who shoots better; to find out what they signify, all that you have to do is to find out if those actions carry an extraneous object; and if they do carry, for example, *MIBABARILAN la*, *MIPAPANAN la quetang ayup*, it is one of *competition*; otherwise, it is one of *alternation*. And take note that the competition between the contenders, like for an office or a woman, is not expressed with this composition but with the *MI of company* and the verb *aslat*; for example, *MISASLAT la quetang babay* or *quetang oficio*, etc. The passives are like those of *alternation* except that these ones do not indicate *competition* and those of *competition* always indicate it.

And so, both in the *MI of alternation* and in the *MI of competition*, the verbal action is with *pa*, always retaining the *an*; for example, ing *PAMISAUPAN da*, ing *PAMIBACALAN da*, etc. To express the action of one, use *pa* and *maqui*; for example, ing *pamaquisaupana*; ing *pamaquibarilana*. The companion is expressed with *ca*, retaining *an* also; for example, *casaupan*, *cabarilan*, etc.

Which are the ones that admit the neutral verb of *mi* with *an*? Or do all admit it? [We are asking these questions] even though we already said much about this point when we said that the candle which is lighted is *mi* with *an*; and regarding the lighted candle on the altar, we said, for example, that, considering it as a neutral verb of *ma*: *masalaing*, *mesalaing*, it cannot be *misalaingan* [*sic*, same as the next], in spite of the fact that it is also *misalaingan* [*sic* same as the previous one], like the cloth which is accidentally burned. We will reserve the explanation of one and the other of these for our forthcoming discussion of when the neutral verb of *ma* means to stop and when not.

### Section 8

#### The Verbal and Nominal MICA

I call it *verbal* because its first use is to make verbs. You pronounce it by attaching *ca* to *mi*, as if the two were only one word separated from the verb, hyphenating it after the *ca*; for example, *mica-metong*; the present doubles the *ca* and attaches the two *ca* to *mi*, hyphenating it after the second: *micaca-metong*. If there are more than two, you pronounce the two *ca* such that the first goes with *mi*, the second with the root; for example, *mica-cametong*. The verbal, if it has

two, *pamica-metong*; if it has more, *pamica-cametong*. To express the action as one coming out of someone, *maquica-metong*; its verbal *pamaquica-metong*. Concerning the comparisons, we will say something later.

Its way of signifying in all the verbs to which it is attached is easily the same as the *mica-metong*; that is, the two or more which carry the connotation of *mica* agree about one operation; for example, *MICACA BURI la*, they agree on loving each other; *MICACA-SAMA la*, they agree on despising each other; they equally love each other and equally despise each other. Their passives are either second, or third *of object*. In these two examples, it is not possible to have passives, because they are immanent actions and have no other object than the doers themselves, who also become the receivers of each other's actions; but if you add an object to them, they can admit the third; for example, they agree in wanting this thing and also in despising it, *iyang PICACA-BURIAN da mañga PICACA-SAMAN da*, etc.

If you want to make it second passive, use the structure of the *MI of company* with an extraneous doer; for example, *acon MICABURI* or *MICASAMA carela*, I will make them agree on loving each other; passive, the second *of company*: *PICACABURIAN*, *PICABURIAN*, *PICABURI cula*, etc. So also *MICACALUGUD la*, they are having an illicit affair; this [esta] cannot admit an object, as the Spanish itself shows; but, yes, second passive, like the past ones, by adding a third one of the devil, and it will then be; *ing MICALUGUD carela*, *PICALUGURAN*, *PICALUGUD na la*; the same also with *micasangil*, *micasangit*, *picamua*. It admits the third passive of *the object*, and the second *of company* with the doer, which is always transitive *mi*.

With these verbs *micayari-metong*, *bitasa*, *sungdo* and their brothers, it admits the second passive *of company*, not only with an extraneous doer, as those mentioned, but also when you put in the nominative the thing which the action intends; for example, *PICACA-METONGAN*, *PICAMETONGAN*, *PICAMETONG* or *PICACASUNGDUAN*, *PICASONGDOAN*, *PICASUNGDO ra ing lub da*; and the same with *PICABITASA ra ing piamanuan*, *PICAYARI rang pamitango ra*.

And bear in mind that even without an extraneous doer (with which all those of this composition admit the second passive), when we say that they admit the third *of object*, if that object is the motive of the action, it becomes the third passive and the doer; for example, if they are angry with or despise Juana, she is *picasaman*, *picamuan*, and she is also the *MICAMUA* and the *MICASAMA carela*; as if in that sentence of the *MI of company*, *MIGAGA la quetang copia*, *PIGAGAN de itang copia*, we would say: *ing copia yang MIGAGA carela*, it would be well said; and so you will be able to observe it in that composition and in this, whenever the object which the third passive looks at is *the motive*; and it also goes with the second *of company* like a true doer; for example, *PIGAGAN* or *PIGAGA* or *APIGAGANO ning cupia detang migaga*; *PICACASAMAN*, *PICASAMAN*, *PICASAMA* or *APICASAMA non Juana detang micasama*.

When this composition touches the verb *lugud*, since with the root it does not signify to love, but with *caluguran*; to refer to *those who agree on loving each other*, you do not say *micalugud*, because as we already said, it is a lascivious love, but *micaluguran* with its third passive *the object*; and although some verbs, like: *sungsung*, *balaus*, *langpus*, *lutas* and some others, not only admit the second passive of *company*, like *yari*, *metong*, etc.; but also the third, *picalutasan*, *picasungsungan*, etc.; it is not in the sense that doers are *micasungsung*, *micalutas*, etc. but in the sense that they are *micalutasan*, *micasungsungan*, *micabalaus*, *micalangpusan*; so that materially one variety is the same as the other, although they are looked at from different aspects; like every lighted candle is *misalaing* and is distinguished from itself in that it is *misalaingan*. See the neutral verbs of *ma*.

In case you hear *micasalusuan*, *micagaliñgan*, *micalicsian la*, do not confuse them with these ones because they are *competence* together with the passives of *ca* and *an* which connote excess as you will see in the passives of *ma*.

## NOMINAL MICA

All those which we have said are made verbs by this particle are also made nouns without modifying anything except that they are pronounced differently and they make use of the future, for example, *mica-buri*, when *ca* is pronounced long, it is a verb; *the two who agree on loving or wanting each other*; but *micacaburi*, all syllables pronounced fast, refers to *the two lovers*; like *mica-lugud*, carry on an illicit affair; *micacalugud*, the two pronounced fast, the woman and the man, as distinct from those who are not having an illicit affair, where the *ca* is pronounced long and the structure used is the future. The same with *mica-cametong*, the two agree on one thing; *micametong*, pronounced fast is the noun of two companions in the union. And that way with all the rest.

When the two companions in this composition are more than two, the structure used is the present, but with a distinct pronunciation; for example, *micaca-lutas*, the two *ca* are joined to *mi*, and as if one lingers a bit in the second, it is the present of the two who agree to finish the business; and if they are more than two, the first one is pronounced with the *mi* and the second with the root; for example, *mica-calutas*, present tense of many verbs; and this one also serves to indicate the companions who exceed two.

There are other companions who seem to belong to this particle but do not; they belong instead to the *MI of company*, where, as we said, the companion in the quarrel of two in *migaga* is *cagaga*; this is one of them; to refer to the two, attach the *mi*, because one and the other is *cagaga*, and you will say *micagaga*, the two protagonists quarrelling; *micalo* comes from *milo*, the two companions in helping each other, even if they are fourteen; from *miinum* and *misulo*, those who eat or drink jointly, *macainum*, *micasulo* the companions, etc.; *micalatic*, *micasuman*, *micasantol*, etc., the special partners. (los compadres)

## Last Section

### Section 9

#### MICA of Novelty/Plurals

First point. This composition joined to the roots of things which happen from time to time, or outside of what is expected, signifies this novelty, as a thing which regularly surprises people; and to indicate frequency, double the *ca*, for example, *micadurun*, to have locusts; *micacadurun*, it is repeated every short while; and the same goes with these roots, *bungo*, *salot*, *salon*, *doloc*, *silab*, *saquit*, *danup*, *salat*, *loui*, *bulutung*, etc. In all of them, one speaks without a subject nor a nominative.

Those which follow are always predicated of the second subject or nominative, with the same way of signifying; for example, *MICARAPO yening ilog*, this river has crocodiles and it never had them before. If you are afraid of crossing a certain stream which I know does not have crocodiles, I will tell you: *ining sapa ali ya MICACARAPO*, this stream never had them, or there was never any in it; *MICAYUSA ya ining bundoc*; *MICAYASAN ya ining ilog*; *MICABUNGA ining dutung*; *MICAPILAC ining daung*, *this ship carries a lot of money*; it is a novelty because it was hardly expected. Belonging to this composition are *guinto*, *palay*, *bandi* and all those which signify ordinary and obtainable things.

Those which are predicated of an inanimate thing admit the third passive of the place or thing *from where*: *nanong PICARAPOANA ining ilug?* From where did this river have crocodiles? *ing bundoc* or *ing bolos iyan PICARAPOANA*, from the mountain or from the flood. Those which have subject in the nominative also admit the third passive *from where*, *nanung PICAGUINTOAN* or *PICABANDIAN mo? ing dulungan* or *ing dayat iyan PICAGUINTOAN* or *PICABANDIAN co*; and also the first passive *of motive* or *of movement*; for example, *nanu tang PICAPALE mo? ing sipag cong galao* or *ing linibe co iyan PICAPALE co*. And if the *from where* is the same as *the motive*, it will admit the first and the third; for example, *dening bayabas ding PICAYABIAS co* or *PICAYABIASAN co*; these guavas which I bartered, for example, *were the motive why I got clean rice* and also that *from where I got clean rice*; or put in the nominative the person *from whom* or *from where* he got them, and always in the third; for example, *PICAYABIASAN co detang anac carering bayabas*, from those boys, I got clean rice through these guavas, etc.

Following this composition are *gutli*, *alimpuyu*, *tigsa*, *tamu*, *cutu*, *lugmu*, *lungcut*, *gula*, *tula*, *tacot*, *sucal lub*, *dinay*, *puri*, *damla*, *micacamal*, *micamura*, like what happens one day, then the next day, in the Parian [Chinatown, where the price of commodities is high one day, and low another day]; with its first and third passive.

It also goes with the following roots although its way of signifying is different, and it is impossible to give the exact Spanish equivalent. *Micasala*, to fall or to commit a fault; *micautang*, to fall into debts or to contract them; *micautang*, to fall or to get into an obligation to pay, not what one bought, but what one broke or lost; *micatiban*, to fall into an error; for example, you think that today is Wednesday, a holyday, and so you came Thursday; *micatiban ca*; if you came on Wednesday, the agreed day and by some accident you moved it to Friday, *ing miercoles* or *ing aldao iyan MICATIBAN queca*. Try to put that in Spanish, which must never be in the transitive. If you want to return and it is a holyday, I will tell you: do not go, uling MICAPANAON ngeni, because now the time has come for you to enjoy yourself; if you answer me *that there will be an occasion or time*, you will say: MICA PANAON pug. Belonging to this composition are *tagun*, *libay*, *pali*, *dimla*, etc. The passives, like the preceding ones, are the first and the third.

Second point. When this *mica* is joined to some verbs of intransitive actions, it expresses *plurality of acts*, which are mostly done out of confusion; for example, *micapulai*, to run from one place to another, like someone who does not know to whom to run; *micaculisac*, to run shouting here and there, like a woman rattled because her house is being robbed; *micalañgutngut*, to gnash the teeth, as one who is asleep or as a result of pain, like the damned; *micasalobong*, he who bumps into somebody many times; *micabalatong*, to err many times, either because one is in a hurry, or because, for example, he does not know the lesson; the same with *baliñgus*, *balaquid*, *subsub*, *baligao*, *balinas*, *sagouil*, *pulpuc*, *pungcul*, *sumpung*; and to this also belong *lagusgus*, *langutac*, *dabibil*, *dabulbul*, the continuous strokes of flowing water.

Also belonging to this composition are all those of *micapa*, like *micapaticdao*, *micapalucluc*, without the *pa*, and they all admit the first passive, either *of motive*, for example, *ing PICACULISAC na*, etc., or *of movement*, although it is difficult to understand it; for example, *PICABALINAS* or *PICASALUBONG co ya*, etc.

Lastly, belonging to this composition are the adjectives of *ma* which, when with *mag*, indicate *to show*; when with *magca*, indicate *intent* and *intensity*; and when with *mañga*, indicate *plurality*. In this composition, change *m* to *c*, and attach *mi*, and you get the plural; for example, from *maratna*, *micaratna*; from *maputi*, *micaputi*; from *malasing*, *micalasing*, etc. The difference between these and those of *mañga* is that *mañga* expresses plural as a mass, *mica* distributes, for example, *mangatapang* means *the brave ones, like the beggar's pan where everything enters*; but *micatapang* means *the brave ones, taking each one distributively*, as if saying that each one of them is a Bernardo.

Now you will be noticing the frequentatives and their way of signifying in every member of the body of this composition. Those of the first, like *micadurun*, *micabungo*, *micaalimpuyo*, *micabulutung*, *micasalapi*, *micapalay*, *micadapo*, etc. are constructed by doubling the root; if it has three syllables, the first one; for example, *micadurun durum*, *micadaporapo*. Its way of signifying is that, when

that which the root expresses comes, it comes full blast or without end; for example, *MICADURUNDURUN* *ngeni e na piyayangganan*; the locusts came late, but now that they came, they came all at once; *MICADARAPO* *yang ilog, e la pabilang*; there were no crocodiles then, but now that they came, they are so many that you cannot count them; *MICASALAPI* *ya itang tauo*; as if to say: *that person never knew what a real was, and when he got one, it was such that he did not know what he had, etc.*

The same is true with *micabubulutung*, *micabungo-bungo*, *micasalot-salot*, *micasalon-salon*. But bear in mind that when they are predicated of a subject in whom they indicate physical ugliness, they use this way of speaking either to exaggerate the appearance or to praise it more; for example, you quarrel with your sister, who has smallpox, and to revenge, you call attention to this ugliness, exaggerating it, even if she does not have many marks, *inyapin MICABUBULUTUNG ca* or *MICABULAG-BULAG ca*, although she is only blind in one eye. And, the opposite, if she is somewhat sickly, for example, for having worked for her brothers, you stress the illness to praise her, you say: *MICASALON-SALONA ca quing pamilyñgon mo carela*; either in favor or against, depending on the root and the context.

Somewhat belonging to this construction are those of the second member, although some roots vary somehow, for example, *micacasala* connotes frequency only; *MICAUTANG-UTANG* *ya y Pedro*, following the constructions given above; that is, he never borrowed anything but once he started, there is no dog nor cat to whom he does not owe something. It admits another mode: for example, *MICAUTANG-UTANG lan apolon pesos* or *MICAUTANG-UTANG cong apulong pesos?* *as if saying*: what kind of debt is that of ten pesos? It is nothing. Or what kind of respectable man is one who owes ten pesos when he is ready to pay a thousand? *Micacautang* is *the thwarted action*; for example, he borrowed so he could go into business, and he did not go into business, *micatiban-tiban* or *micacatiban*; this one only signifies as a frequentative; *micapanaun* is like *micasasalapi*; and so with *micapali-pali*, *micarimla-rimla*, etc.

Those of plurality like *micapulayi*, *micabalatung*, *micabaligao*, etc., whose first syllable is doubled are purely frequentative; the plurals, when the root can have an action, cease to be plural when the root is doubled and they signify like the first ones; for example, about one who *never used even to smell wine* is now very drunk, *MICALASING-LASING* *ya ngeni*; and the same with *tapang*, *datna*, *sampat*, *puti*, *tuling* and their brothers. This composition is equivalent to what in Spanish we say that we have more than enough; for example, we needed a certain thing, and we could not have it: but now we get more of it than we need, *ngeni MICALALO-LALO na*, *MICABIGLIA-BIGLA na*, etc.

## CHAPTER 8

### THE PARTICLE MAQUI

This particle has four functions: *to introduce oneself, to procure, to enter and to have*. In this last function, it is invariable. In the other three, its conjugation in the present tense uses *maqui*, the *ma* pronounced somewhat long; in the future tense *maqui* is pronounced fast; in the preterite tense *mequi*. In the passive, you change *m* to *p* in all the tenses. The verbal with *pa, pamaqui*, which is the future, the action is fast. This having been said, let us see its first function, which is the most general.

#### Section 1

#### MAQUI: To Introduce Oneself

I don't think there is anything that intrudes more than this *maqui*. You find it wherever it can share something, even if only figuratively, and what is more, even if it is a matter of distributing daggers and clubs. First, let us look at the verbs of *MI of company*; and take note of it well, because it is not enough that the root be among those which admit this *mi* for *maqui* to be used where there is no *mi*; for example, *gaga*; if you want to say *quarrel with him*, you must not use *maqui*: *MAQUIGAGA ca queya*; nor *PAQUIGAGAN mo ya*; but *GAGAN mo ya*. In order that those verbs can use the *mi*, it has to presuppose reciprocity, as when we say: *quarrel with him*; then it is all right to say *MAQUIGAGA ca queya*; *PAQUIGAGAN mo ya*, because it presupposes *MIGAGA*, and it enters at the middle or part of the action.

Given this backdrop, whenever there is the *MI of company* or *of alternation* or *of competition* or the verbal *MICA*, this *maqui* always enters to express that part of the action which is its turn as one of many; and so, in all the above-mentioned compositions, I said that the composition, since it comes out from one, has to be said with *maqui*; for example, of company: *MIGAGA ilan Pedro ilan Juan*; *y Pedro MEQUIGAGA ya can Juan*; *y Juan MAQUIGAGA ya can Pedro*; bearing in mind that when those compositions have passives, they have *maqui*; and even if they do not have passives, as in this example, there are passives for it; for example, *PAQUIGAGA nen Pedro y Juan* or *PAQUIGAGA nen Juan y Pedro*; they are third passives.

We also said that when the *MI of company* expresses the nominative of the quarrel, for example, *migaga lang PEDRO ILAN JUAN can Antonia*, Pedro and Juan quarrel over Antonia, the motive is placed in the nominative and it requires the third passive: *Y ANTONIAN PIGAGAN di Pedro ilan Juan*. The same composition admits the *maqui* in connection with the action of each one: *y Antonian PAQUIGAGA nan Juan can Pedro*; *iyen PAQUIGAGA nan Pedro can Juan*.

The same is true with *MI of alternation*; for example, *MITABACAN la di Francisco ilan Pablo*; *y Francisco MAQUITABACAN ya can Pablo*; *y Pablo MAQUITABACAN ya can Francisco*. The action *pamaquitabacan* [sic], if it is of the

two: *pamaquitabacan* [sic]. Passive: *PAQUITABACAN nen Francisco y Pablo; PAQUITABACAN nen Pablo y Francisco*. If the motive, for example, were those pesos, put it in the nominative because the action comes from the two, you will say: *DETANG PESOS ding PITABACAN di Francisco ilang Pablo*; considered as coming from one, *PAQUITABACANEN Francisco y Pablo caretang pesos* or *detang pesos ding PEQUITABACAN Pablo can Francisco*; and the same with all the rest; and with them they can admit the first passive of movement; for example, *e mo co IPAQUIGAGA* or *PAQUITABACAN can cay*, etc.

The same rule is followed by *maqui*, whatever way it is introduced; for example, you join the children in their games, *MAQUIALONG ca caring anac*; *PAQUIALONGAN mo ding anac*, third; you bring him to play with the other children, *IPAQUIALONG me caring aliuang anac*. Another one: you went to wash clothes with those who were washing clothes, *MAQUIPAMIPI ca caring mamipi*; if you washed that cloth with them, *PAQUIPAMIPIAN mo carela itang imalan*; which you will notice in the above-mentioned ones of company, and I tell you that you should not judge that, just because the examples given are of motive, it is not the same as in any other thing; for example, when the principal *pinggan* are joined with the plates, *mibilang la caring pinggan*; *PIBILANGAN do ding pinggan*; the *maqui* and *paqui* come in; for example, *ding pinggan PAQUIBILANGAN na ning metong quetang metong*, etc.

Neither is there anything special about *maquitolong*; for example, *MEQUITOLONG co queya*; *PEQUITOLONGAN co ya*; and if I helped with one ganta of rice, *meto pating abias ing PEQUITOLONGAN co queya*; the same with *MAQUIAPUS co queya* or *quing cabanalana na*; *PEQUIAPUSAN co ing cabanalana*. *Maquiupa* and *maquisugo* do not indicate a relationship to companions, even if they have, but the one who pays the *opa* or the boss of the work; *mequiupa co* or *mequisugo co CAN PEDRO*; *pequisuguan* or *pequiupan que y Pedro*, I received *opa* from Pedro or I worked for Pedro for pay; and as *opa* he gave me a carabao, *PEQUIUPAN co neman itang damulag*. The first passive, those carried for this; *PEQUISUGO* or *PEQUIUPA co la can Pedro*; *PEQUIUPA queng damulag*, first passive, I had my carabao rented, etc.

I now move to the more difficult point. When there is an inclusion, and if this has to finish in the passive, what corresponds to those among which another thing is included? For example, let us suppose that somebody is washing clothes to which the second passive corresponds: *pipian co ining imalan*; I mean that I wash the piece of cloth with that bundle of clothes or while washing these. Should I say *PAQUIPIAN* [sic] or *PAQUIPIPI mo ining paño*?

So that you can understand this, take as a general rule that there is never a second passive in this way of speaking, because the first thing that is found in such ways is *the movement* and application of what is introduced to what is introduced; and this, if you know how to distinguish it from *that of complement*, will never fail you because it is always first passive and so you must say: *PAQUIPIPI me ining paño*, with

such force that the same thing happens even in the finest second passives; for example, you buy a horse and a pig and I tell you: *buy this hat also*, I must say: *PAQUISALI me ing cupia; ausan me y Pedro y Francisco*; also call Diego, *PAQUIYAUS me y Diego; cuan mo iti; cuan mo ita; PAQUICUAN mo ini*, and you will not miss it, even if it is ff [*facere facere, facere fieri*, see chapter 12] you will say: *paqipainum* (first [passive]), also give him water to drink, and if this *paqui* has such a force that what at first glance should be second passive becomes first passive, much better, and there is no reason to doubt that it will conserve the first where it finds it; for example, suppose that you ask someone to carry some letters and say *patad co* or *pabal co dening surat*, which first passive; now I say *ask them to carry this one also*; I must say, using also the first passive, *PAQUIPATAD* or *PABAL me ini*; there is no doubt about this at all.

Another thing that needs to be understood well, when *paqui* comes with what is assumed to be in the third passive; for example, if you write a letter and I tell you *write also*, you might doubt whether it is *paquisulat* or *paquisulatan*. About this difficulty, what you should take as certain is that whenever the third passive of *anan* comes before, the *paqui* can follow, as you can see in the following examples: send Pedro, send Juan, *patdanan me y Pedro, patdanan me y Juan*; also send Francisco, *PAQUIPATDANAN ME y Francisco; daptanan meng mayap y Pedro, daptanan meng mayap y Juan; PAQUIDAPTANAN meng mayap y Francisco*. In this rule, I don't see why one should err, and this one, even if it is among those of *MI* or *AN ad invicem* [*for each other*]; for example, *mipatdanan*, which means to send to each other, like if you send him chocolate and he reciprocates to you with cacao or some other thing, *paquipatdanan*; and the same with *miabiyayan, paquiabiyayan*.

You will always notice this same thing and whenever the nominative of *paqui* is conceived as *purely an end-point* to where something is going to stop, even if the third passive ends in *an*; for example, *pabalan me y Pedro*, etc., *PAQUIPABALAN me y Juan*; but if it is conceived not as purely an end-point, but as something that has to be introduced, and as applied by the doer to the other who is doing, it follows the rule of *movement*, that is, use the first passive.

This having been said, my answer to the difficulty is that you must say *PAQUISULAT mo ini* and not *paquisulatan*, because it is conceived as a movement and an application of the paper which it introduces.

Concerning the active voice of this *maqui*, you have to know that in some verbs, it is ambiguous. I will give you two examples, which I think will be enough for you to understand me: *maquisilu* can be active and neuter, because if one comes to place traps with others who are also putting them, it will be active; if he passes and falls in the trap, it is neuter. *Maquibatbat*, to come and whip, and also to bring them among those who are whipped; the same thing will happen in *maquiroloc* (there is no *maquimaruloc*), although this one more commonly expresses neutrality: *to be burned with somebody else*.

When this *maqui* is joined to nouns, it retains the same concept of *introducing oneself to be part of the way it fits in the root*; for example, *maquisiuala*, introduce oneself to take part in the voice of the other, that is to say, to speak or sing like him, imitate or mimic his voice; *maquiquisiuala*, to do this often; *maquialipan*, to introduce oneself among slaves, to deal with or communicate with them; *maquiquialipan*, to do this frequently; *maquipugut* or *maquipugot-pugot*, with Aetas; *maquitauro-tauro*, *maquianac-anac*, a boy who meddles with elders, or a man who meddles with boys; one who is inferior in age or quality who introduces himself and deals with those who are above him, is metaphorically referred to as *MAQUIGUSI-GUSI ya e tampayac man*, the little cruet tries hard to become a large earthenware jar.

This composition admits frequentatives the same way as the protocompounds, either by doubling the first syllable of the particle or the second; for example, *MAMAquiapus* or *maQUQUIapus*, *MAMAquisugo*, *MAMAquiupa* or *MAQUIQUIupa*, *MAMAquigaga* or *maQUIQUIgaga*, etc. The first one indicates frequency, the second one indicates diminution, either in the action, in the objects, with their passives like the rest.

## Section 2

### MAQUI: TO TRY TO

When attached to those roots which in some way express a direction or a tendency towards any thing it signifies trying to get it. Let the model be *ungquit*, which means *to try or to aim at* like a jewel, and for greater energy, it admits this *maqui*; for example, the devils try hard to make us become part of their group, *MAQUIUNGQUIT la ding diablos quing miqueque carela*. Another one: Do not induce abortion, *e ca MAQUIPAQUICUAN*. Another: I will try to get him or to know him through the voice, *acon MAQUISIUALA queya*, etc.

It is ordinarily heard as passive, where the thing which is attempted is put in the nominative, and it is in the third passive, for example, try to gain the indulgences, *PAQUIABUTAN mo ING CAPATAUARAN*; *PAQUIABUTAN co ING CATULIRAN co*, I will try to obtain my right; I will try to to attain the glory *PAQUIRASNGAN co ing BANUA*; try to know it or to ascertain it, or to clarify it, *PAQUIBALUAN* or *PAQUISUGIRAN* or *PAQUIUSTAN mo*, etc.

## SECTION 3

### MAQUI: To Complete

This way of signifying consists in making the doer join what remains to be done to what has already been done so that, given what is presupposed and what is joined to it, the work becomes complete and finished. It is more often in the passive, that is,

the third, where the thing which is being completed is in the nominative. As a model example, take *maquiyari*, which means to finish perfectly. I have started working. I still need to perform some more strokes to finish it; if then, for example, they call me, I will say: wait, I will just finish this work which I am doing *ali ca pa PAQUIYARIAN co pa ininan*. Another example: one is cutting a tree and he wants to leave it half-done; well, I tell him *PAQUIPUNGCAN me pa iyang dutung*, finish cutting it by adding what is lacking to that which is already done. It is for this way of speaking that this composition was constructed.

In this sense, you can confidently use the following: *lasac, titi, asuay, sira*, and according to some, also *sulat, sarol, doloc*; but if you want to remove all doubts, if you are not sure if it is correct to use it, see any of the following: *paquiarian, paquilutasan, paquiluran, paquilangpusan, paquiganapanan*, and this way you will avoid being misunderstood for using what should not be used.

## SECTION 4

### MAQUI: To Have/To Own

This *maqui* is invariable and always has the accent in the *i*: *maquí*. It indicates that the subject or nominative has what is expressed by the root to which it is attached, and principally that he has it as the owner, master or author; for example, *maquibalay*, he who has the house as its owner; God is Lord and Maker of all things, *ing G.n.t.* [guinu tang] *Dios ing MAQUIDAPAT quing sablang nano*; Calderon is the author of this stage play, *y Calderon iyang ing MAQUIRAPAT queting comedia*. This format is applicable to the rest; for example, *maquiiqui*, to have a tail; *maquibalu*, to have certitude; *maqi catubaran*, to have partial deafness, to be partially deaf; and so *maqui guinto, maqui palay, maqui pilac, maqui casalanan*, etc.

## CHAPTER 9 THE PARTICLE MA

### Section 1 Neutral Verbs of MA and Their Formation

Starting with this, the general rule is that to form the present of all the verbs, place *ma* in place of the first *i* of the present of the first passive; for example, in this root *aral*, the present of its first passive is *iyayaral*; put *ma* in place of the first *i* and you get *MAYayaral*, which is the present of *ma*, and this is true with all the rest; for example, *MAYuyuma*, *MAtutula*, *MApapno*, *MAgagtal*, *MABalbal*, etc. To form the preterite of those which begin with a vowel, attach the particle to the root, but change *a* to *e*; for example, *tula*, preterite *MEtula*; and so, *MEsucul*, *MEruluc*, etc. If the root begins with a vowel, insert *y* between the particle and the root; for example, *aral*, preterite *meYaral*; *agtal*, preterite *meYagtal*; *orod*, preterite *meYorod*. The preterite of some irregulars changes the first vowel to *i* and attaches only the *m* of the particle to it; for example, *apno*, preterite *MIpno*; *aslam*, preterite *MIslam*; *asias*, preterite *MIsias*, etc.

To form the future of all the roots which do not begin with a vowel, just attach *ma* to the root; for example, *balbal*, future *MABalbal*; *saul*, future *MAsaul*; *doloc*, future *MARoloc*, etc. If the root begins with a vowel and it has a future, insert *y* between the *a* of the particle and the first letter of the root; for example, *aral*, future *maYaral*; from *uma*, future *maYuma*; from *orod*, future *maYurud*; from *albay*, future *maYalbay*; from *agtal*, future *maYagtal*, etc. I said if it has a future, because no root which is an abstract noun begins with a vowel like *ayap*, *asias*, *aslam*, or with a consonant like *lago*, *santing* and about all the remaining abstracts, I say that none of them has a future of *ma* because with *ma* they are adjectives.

To proceed with more clarity in the explanation of the uses of these neutral verbs of *ma*, I will separate them from those compositions where this particle adds something to what the simple root signifies; and now I will treat only the verbs where the *ma* does not add anything to the simple, but only signifies that the subject or nominative stops only at what is predicated of it by the connotation of the root to which it is attached.

Although the neutral verbs of *ma* properly as such, about which we are now talking, have different origins, because some presuppose the simple neutral verb, like *madurunut* which presupposes *durunut*; others presuppose the active verb, like *mebatbat*, which presupposes *bitbat*; others which the *ma* converts into verbs, like *mebina*, *mebenat*, *mabenus*, *mebanal*, etc; nevertheless, all these neutral verbs of *ma*, as such, are the same in that they indicate passion or quality which is attached to the subject; for example, *to become cold, hot, dry, wet, white, black, ugly, handsome, good, bad, wounded, corrupt, hurt, happy, sad*, etc.

This having been said, the greater difficulty consists in finding out when to use the simple neuter or the *ma*, because our Spanish does not distinguish them, because it looks properly only at the simple; for example, for these two Kapampangan verbs, *bisa ca* and *mebisa ca*, we only say *you wanted*; and for these: *durunut* and *marurunut*, we only say *to get rotten*; and so, *lulunao* and *malulunao*, to get used to, etc. I already answered this difficulty when I explained the use of the neutral verb and that of *mi*. I therefore say that when you speak of a *transient* function or exercise, or its *hic et nunc* [*here and now*], then you should use the simple.

That of *ma* presupposes this exercise or transition of the simple and explains the meaning more perfectly saying that *it stops as such*; for example for this Spanish, *you wanted*, if you speak *here and now* in which you gave your “yes” (in other words, your wanted), you have to use the simple, *BISA ca*; if you speak of that yes, already given and therefore *you have stopped the act of wanting*, you will use the *ma*: *MEBISA ca*; and since in the preterite, one and the other is verified, each one retaining its concept, you can use both. Also, to refer to that actual and transient progression of the thing, for example, that it is rotten, you use the simple *DURUNUT ya*; if you don’t speak of that progression as *transient*, but of what inseparably follows from it, which is *to finish or go on getting rotten or go taking advantage of the corruption*, you will say *madurunut*; and this is true with all the remaining neutral verbs and of *ma*.

But concerning the future tenses, take note first that no abstract, of which we will treat later, has a future of *ma*; and so, if you want to say, for example, *it will become white* or *it will end up becoming white, black, beautiful, brave*, etc., you must always use the simple: *mutya, tuling ya, santing ya, tumapang ya*, etc. Secondly, when the root is an adjective, you must not use the simple, but the *ma*; for example, suffer in order that you will become or end up being just, *mibata ca’t ba can MABANAL*, not *ba can banal*; step on it so that it will get rotten, *DAPACAN mo ya’t ba yan marunut*, not *ba yan dunut*; *biasa*, adjective: [not] *magaral ca’t ba can biasa*, but *ba can mabiasa*; because the roots which are adjectives cannot be used as future; but the root, (the simple is neither an adjective, nor a compound with *ma*,) uses the simple and the *ma*; for example, *ba can lumao* or *ba can malumao*, each one retaining its concept.

When the roots need precisely the *ma* for them to become verbs, like *mabenat, mabina, mabenus*, etc., it is necessary to use the neutral verb of *ma*, because there is no other choice; the same thing *quasi* happens with the active verbs, which with *ma* are always neutral; for example, *mabatbat, masucul, masugat*, etc.; where there is no other choice either. I said this because, inasmuch as with *ma* they are passive, one can perhaps doubt if belong to the simple passive or the passive of *ma*; for example, in this Spanish sentence, *he was whipped*, whether to say *BITBAT ya* or *MEBATBAT ya*. These doubts can be resolved by bearing in mind what we have said about the use of the simple and of *ma*, as in *BISA ca* and *MEBISA ca*.

Before placing the proto-compounds which the verbs of this composition admit, I will place its passives, not one by one, which would never end, because there are innumerable verbs which it includes, but some examples of every kind.

The first kind has a few verbs, which are those whose roots do not become adjectives with *ma*; for example, *marunut*, *masilim*, *mabeñgi*, *malumao*, *malutas*, *mapno* and *matay*, etc.; and assuming that here we are not dealing with the passive of *ica*, but only with the third passive of *ca* and *an*, which is the proper passive of the neutral verbs of *ma*; I say that the general rule is that one should consider carefully each neutral verb of *ma*, what it says or can say about any reference to another; because if it does not say such a reference, it will not admit any passive, and if it expresses one, two, three references or concepts, it will admit the passive of *ca* and *an* that number of times.

Given that backdrop, *marunut* only indicates the reception of a thing without reference to another; it is then not capable of a passive. *Masilim* and *mabengi* refer to those included in the neutral verb *ma*; for example, *MEBENGI* or *MEBENGI cami*; and so, if you put the receiver in the nominative, use the third passive of *ca* and *an*, *CACABENGINAN*, *CABENGIAN*, *QUEBENGIAN cami*, depending on the time one is talking about; and the same with *casiliman*, etc. *Malumao* refers to a thing to which one gets used; and so when put in the nominative, it admits that act of receiving. You will say: *QUELUMAUAN co*, for example, *ing pamagyunal*. *Mapno* and *matmo* are irregular, and are also such in referring to an action, for example, *CATMOAN* or *CAPNOAN mo detang banga*; *ing carunutan* or *calutasan*, *pangarunut* or *pangalutas* are not third passives.

*Matay* refers first of all to the place, like *matudtud*; for example, *ing cruz a QUEMATAYAN ning G. n. t. Jesu Cristo*; *ing dase a CATUDTURAN co*, etc. and given the object, as a place where or from whom, they also admit it; for example, I die of laughter at you, *MAMAMATE cong maili queca: CAMAMATAYAN da CANG cailian*, like saying, you are AT WHOM I die of laughing or who causes me to die of laughter; or who makes me die of laughter. *CAMAMATAYAN da CANG cailian*. It also indicates something about the interested one in two ways; for example, the horse which you lent me died for you, not for me, *mete ya QUECA*, not *CACO*; *ICAN QUEMATAYA na, ali ACO*, etc. And this pattern is also applied to *quematayan CO*, although it does not admit an active; it is like saying: *mete ya CACO*, *mesira* or *melaui ya CACO*; *quesiran* or *quelauian CO*; although they also usually put the interested in the nominative; for example, *malau CO*, *quelauian CO*. Here they conceive the subject of the *ma*, the subject as the place from where, the same way that in the *mi* the same subject is like a place from where; for example, *miluluual* or *milulual* or *milalagay* or *mibabait CACO*; *quelualan* or *quelegayan* or *quebaitan CO*; like *mirarasug QUECA*, *ICAN cararasuga na*, etc.

The second variety embraces many. Count if you can the adjectives of *ma*, to which so many neutral verbs belong, and see the various points to which they refer, either in which, or from where or to whom, etc., some more, others less, and because of this, it is not easy to look for the passives. For example, this first point: these third passives, *calalagoan*, *calagoan*, *quelagoan* (comes out of the neutral verb of *ma*: *malalago*, *malago*, *melago*), this one makes reference for example to

the person for whom she is *malago*. Let me give this example: *MALAGO CACO ing lago ning ana co, e man MALAGO QUECA*, the mother says: she is beautiful to me, even though she is not to you; you now see that *ma* is related to the *caco* and the *queca*; put them in the nominative and give them this third passive: *CALALAGOAN CO quing lago na, e CA man CALALAGOAN queya*; you now see that this *malago* is not a word in the future tense as future, but an adjective, which is enough for it to have a passive, as you will also see later. These passives include *quebangloan, queparasan, quesantingan, quepaitan*, and others which indicate such references.

The second point. They also admit *calagoan, quelagoan*. The *calagoan* by its mode of signifying, is like present and future; it comes from the neutral verb of *ma*, *malalago, melago*, to finish the act of admiring the beauty, and the passive expresses the aspect where that being admired or that beauty is; for example, *ing calagoana tiyo quing MATA na*; in other words, *ing MATA na iyang quelagoana* and it is here in this part if you compare it to another; for example, *ing QUELAGOANA quea ing MATA na*, the beauty where she excels are her eyes.

You will rarely or never find an adjective of *ma* which does not admit these two concepts, namely, the *where* or in what part do you find that which the root expresses, and *the excess*; for example, *ing BANUA nan QUETUA na*, his years are in which his old age is found; *apat a BANUA ing QUETUA na cacu*, he is four years older than I; *MEBANAL ya quing PAMAGYUNAL na; ing PAMAGYUNAL nan QUEBANALA na*, his fasting is where his virtue is; *MEBANAL ya caco quing PAMAGYUNAL; ing PAMAGYUNAL QUEBANALANA caco*, the virtue of fasting is where he is ahead of me; *liman TALIRI ing QUECABA na caco*, his height is five fingers; if you add *queca*, it will mean that he is taller than you by five fingers; and this is so in all the rest where you ordinarily speak in the preterite, because ordinarily you speak of the thing *in facto esse* [as something done already].

The verbs of this second variety which do not express quality nor form but passions [emotions, feelings] are easier, because you at once know what experience is referred to by *ma*; for example, *matutula, maliligaya, masasaya*, etc. It is clear that they talk in terms of the *object in which* or *to which* the process of experiencing ends; put this object in the nominative and it admits the third passive; for example, *MALILIGAYA, MELIGAYA*, or *MALIGAYA* (although this one serves as future, it is not, the Spanish considers it as an adjective) *co quing tula banua; ing tula banuang CALILIGAYAN, QUELIGAYAN* or *CALIGAYAN co; catacutan* looks at the object as a *place from where* his fear comes; *carinayan*, looks at it the way he looks at *catulan*, etc.

Those of the third variety which are the ones that express the passions [the process of receiving the action] of the active verbs, for example, *mabalbal, maruloc*, also always express some reference, which is to the companions who remain, or to the owners as interested; for example, *MEBALBAL ya itang banga*, or expresses reference to the owner *mebalbal ya quing MAQUI BANGA*, and he will be the third passive, *QUEBALBALAN YA quetang banga*, or expresses reference to those

remaining; for example, if there were four, one broke, *quebalbalan la DETANG ATLO*; the same with *querolocan*, the owner and the things nearby did not burn.

*Masucul* expresses reference to three points: For example, the debt. *MASUSUCUL co QUETANG UTANG co queca*; *CASUSUCULAN co ITANG UTANG co queca*, as a cause or place from where the imprisonment comes; it also expresses reference to the *place in which he was a prisoner*; *MASUCUL co queta QUING SILID*; *QUESUCULAN que ITANG SILID*; finally, reference to the companions if he has any; for example, *MESUCUL co CARETANG YABE co*; *DING YABE co ilan QUESUCULAN*; that is, *cacon mesucul*; *casugatan* only says reference to the remaining companions, like *capilayan* to the bones which remained healthy; *casaulan* says reference to the remaining ones and is also of *excess*. From these, construct the rest.

### MA: Plurals

All the neutral verbs of this composition admit *manga*. All those of this last variety, which proceed from active verbs, express *multiplicity* corresponding to the nominative; for example, *MENGARULUC ya itang balay* or *detang balay*, that house got burned in many parts, or those houses got burned; the same with *MENGABALBAL ya* and *MENGABALBAL la*; *mengasucula* expresses plurality of the subjects, like *mengasaula*. This is true with those of the first variety according to what is proper to each verb.

Those of the second variety with this *manga*. Most of them express plural, like with *mica*, and they are *ganaca*, *dañga*, *bañgis*, *lasing*, *dauac*, *bilog*, *dagol*, *aba*, *tulid*, *tampa* and all those which speak of qualities, like *tapang*; odours, like *banglo* or *buloc*, or tastes, like *yumo*, *salpac*, etc. with all those that speak of passions, like *dinay*, *tamad*, *sama*, *lugud*, *ligaya*, *uili*, *tacut*, etc., it says *intensity* in the form of protocompound which admits its third passive *the object*. Its way of signifying is like that of the verbals in *ble*, as a thing which is *lovable*, *horrible*, *abominable*, etc. for example, of the lies told by pleasant people they say; *laram a PANGAILIAN*, and to exaggerate, double the *nga*; for example, *PANGANGALUGURAN yang tauong mababa lub*, the humble is lovable; *PANGANGALUNGCUTAN que yang salita mo*; *PANGANGAUILIAN co ing tula banua*, the glory is pleasant to me; *PANGANGASAMAN co ing casalanan*, it is abhorring to me, etc.

*Mangatulid* is plural: *the rights*. Also, *mangatulid* comes from the passive *mi*: *those placed straight*, like the canons, which face the Chinatown; *mañgatuliran* and *meñgatuliran*, the places towards which they look, like the houses there, as was said about *meñgaugsay* and *meñgaugsayan*. Also *mitulid* and *mituliran*, like *mitud* and *mituran*. Also, *mañgatuliran*, *meñgatuliran*, with singular and plural subjects is the *quasi-place*, that or those to which a thing has a right by many titles, as we said about the singular *mitulid* and *mituliran*; and from here proceed *MANGATULIRAN*,

*MENGATULIRAN* *co queca*, which we say, *I have an action, I have a right, I deserve that*; its passive is the third, *PANGATULIRAN, PENGATULIRAN* *co ita*.

## MA: FEASIBILITY

With those that follow, it does not express *to stop or to finish* as it does with the preceding ones, but it indicates that the thing being talked about is *feasible*; and from here it follows that in negative sentences, it is equivalent to *potential*; for example, *MARARAPAT, MERAPAT, MARAPAT* *ing dapat*, whatever thing is being talked about is *actually* feasible, it will be or it was. With negation, even if it is not potential, it is equivalent to; for example, *e MARAPAT ita*, it is not easy to do that; and consequently, it cannot be done. Belonging to this composition are *acut, daclut, dampot, aňgo dala, daquit, bitbit, yaus, salac, guyud, sulut, sagmit, dara, accua, tanggal, dacap* and their brothers. All of them admit *manga* to express *plurality* of the subjects or of the nominatives.

Also, they all admit *ca* or *an*, and in that case, they usually refer to *the number of times of the action*, and those which refer to other viewpoints follow the preceding over in the passives; for example, *caraptan* only says *the number of times* something is done, and if they are two, it will say *adua caraptan*; *dampot* and *daclot* also express the time and what the time includes; like *caralan* and *cayacutan*, the time and what is carried or brought one time; *cayangoan* or *cayangoanan*, the number of times, what is taken and those remaining; like *cayausan*, the number of times, those called and those remaining; but bear in mind that to express those remaining, use the preterite.

*Cagoyoran*, the time, that which is pulled and the people who ordinarily take part in pulling, and if it is *gravel*, there are three hundred *CAGUYORAN lang guijo*; and the gravel that they pull *QUEGUYORAN la*; like *QUEYACCUANAN la, QUEGUYORAN CO, Transiatively*, it is that in which I lost: *MEGUYOD la caco DETANG ATLONG PESOS; QUEGUYORAN con ATLONG PESOS*. If you wrote more letters on one page than I did on two papers, *MEGUYUD con cabulong* or *MEGUYOD ya caco ing cabulong; QUEGUYORAN con cabulong*, etc.

## Section 2 MA of Abundance

First point. When this particle *ma* is attached to roots which imply a place and have their neutral verb of *mi* to express *to stop, to complete*, it indicates that what is signified is an adjective which connotes *very* or *much*; for example, *MAYANAM la ding judios* or *MAYUGSE la*, they are spread or scattered throughout this world: *MAYAGTANG ing cayupaya ning aring castila*, the jurisdiction of the [Spanish] king covers an extensive area, etc. Belonging to this composition are *tilao, langtad, aclat, laganap, talactac, taloctoc, talongtong, suluc, salicut*,

*salingit, cutcut, simpan, salindo, liput, tungcus*, etc.; they admit *manga*; as protocompounds, they fall under the passive *mi*.

Its third passives retain the same concept; for example, *ing CAYANAMAN ding judios*; as if saying: *ing CAYANAMAN dang maragul*. They can also appropriately imply a comparison and express an *excess*, although for more clarity it is better to include *lalo*; for example, *LALO ing CATALUCTUCA ning isip ning banal, quing QUETALUCTUCA ning isip ning magcacalacal*, etc.

By merely adding *an*, this composition also applies that adjective of *abundance* to places; for example, *MAYANAM la ding judios* only says that they are widely spread, without specifying the places; but *MAYANAMAN la ding judios* says that they are wide spread *in relation to the places*, for example, throughout Italy, France and Turkey. It is this way that we distinguish *malacbang* from *malacbañgan*, *magauang* from *magauañgan*, etc.

Belonging here are *maleganapan*, he who is understanding in everything; it is distinguished from *malaganapan*, in which for this to happen, one time is enough; with the preterite, it indicates that he has it as a habit, a custom or an obsession, like *maselan, masibucan, malecaran, magu* [sic in the original; apparently a typographical error], *maguelauan*. The following indicate that they have the vice, and they are: *maomisan, malibacan, masabian*, etc.

When joined with substantive nouns, it most properly indicates that the nominative has an *abundance* of that which the root expresses; for example, *MABANDI ya y Pedro*, Pedro has a lot of property; *MAPILAC ya y Juan*, Juan has a lot of money; *MAPANAS ing mayumo*, the candy has a lot of ants; *MABUNGA or MASAMPAGA ya ing dutung*; the tree has a lot of fruits and flowers; *MABAYABAS ing balayan*; *MARICUT ing sabana*; *MATAUO ya ing baleco*, my house has many guests or visitors; *MARAMULAG or MABABI or MAYUSA, as* mountain; *MAYUNGUT ing mula*; *MARAGUIS ing long long*; *MAYANGIN ing bulan a agosto*; *MAYURAN ing bulan a septiembre*; *mayalon, like sea*, etc., protocompound of *manga*, but it is only in order to use adjectives which signify that they continually have such an abundance.

All those belonging to this composition admit *ca* and *an*; for example, *caguintoan*, and nothing more. It is used in three concepts: the first to express *the time of abundance*, putting the subject or nominative in the genitive; for example, *CASALAPIAN da ngeni DING CASTILA*, now is the time when the Spaniards have a lot of money; *iñang CABANDIAN MO e mo co agaganaca*, when you were having a lot of property you were not remembering me; now is when the rains abound, *CAYURA na ñgeni NING PANAON*; *iñang CATAUOAN MO*, when you had many guests. And the same with the rest.

The second point. It is used to express *the place of abundance as a noun*; for example, *caguintouan*, gold mine; *capilacan*, silver mine; *casaguiñgan*, banana plantation; *capanasan*, ant hill; *cayuñgotan*, coconut plantation; *caricutan*, pasture, and the same with the rest which can have a place like the above-mentioned ones. The third point. It is used to express *the place of the abundance as a verb*, where you

put in the nominative that which is a place or quasi-place. For example, *ING JARDIN iyan CASAMPAGAN*, it is the place which abounds in flowers; *ING LONGLONG iyan CARAGUISAN*, it is the place which abounds in rats; *capanasan ing pungso*; *carapoan ing ilog*; *caramologan ing caqueuan*; *cayusan* or *cababian ing casucalan*, etc.

The present and preterite of this composition have a very different way of signifying, and it consists in expressing that, because one is very busy about or distracted or so focused on what the root expresses, he fails to do what he is supposed to: for example, why doavaricious people seldom commend themselves to God? because they are so engrossed in their properties, *uling MABABANDI la* or *MAGUIGUINTO la* or *uling MAPIPILAC la*. If you are wondering, for example, why Pedro does not take his lunch, I will tell you: Why should he eat when the whole morning he has been chewing puto? *MAPUPUTO* or *MEPUTO ya*; *MADURUMAN* or *MEDUMAN ya*; *MADARALANDAN* or *MERALANDAN ya*, he has been filling his stomach or has filled his stomach with Seville oranges, and this is true with all the rest, for example; this one does not take care of his house because he is preoccupied with watching stage plays *uling MACOCOMEDIA* or *MECOMEDIA ya*, etc.

So , because of the abundance or excess in doing the root, it says that he is prevented from doing the original job, and from here they say that the paddies can no longer be used for planting rice because the carabaos have turned them into marshes, *medamulag ya ing dayat*, etc.

### Section 3

#### The MA of Adjectives and Their Abstracts and Frequentatives

When this particle is joined to an abstract term or noun (so called because we conceive of it as separated from the subject, as if it were in the air, for example, *puti*, whiteness; *tapang*, courage; *lago*, beauty; *dauac*, evil, and many others), it makes them, very appropriately, terms which we call adjectives; for example, *maputi*, white; *matapang*, brave; *malago*, beautiful, *marauac*, bad, etc. I already said before that these *ma*-modified terms admit *maña*, some of them to express *plurality*, others to make them *bilis*-modified verbals, [see chapter 10, section 2] and others to express *intensity*.

And since I am very sure that the abstracts referred to as *ca* and *an* come from this *ma*, which also include the simple abstracts, I find this the most appropriate place to say in what they consist and to explain the difference between the former and the latter; that is why I said before that it is enough to be an adjective to belong to the passive of *ca* or *an*. And since there is nothing else to say regarding the simple because they definitely belong to our abstracts, I will discuss what remains to be said about those of *ca* and *an*.

I say first of all that its composition is that of *ma*, where you change *m* to *c* and

put *an*, which is the passive of *ca* and *an*; and bear in mind that it is future, not as a verb, but as a noun. This having been said: *maputi*, for example, is an adjective which signifies that which is white; and it is white, either his whole body is white, or a part of it; because *caputian* (aside from other concepts) inasmuch as it is a word of the third passive, signifies either the whole body, or that part of it modified by whiteness, as a place of the whiteness; just like *malago* which indicates *beauty*, for example, of the lips, *malago ya LABI* or *malago ing LABI na*; so *ing LABI na iyan CALAGUANA*, her lips are the place caught by her beauty; so, her beauty consists in her lips. And from this flows the point that these abstracts also indicate the essential elements, because they say in what it consists, as when I ask: in what is or in what does the virtue of Pedro consist? *Ingsanu ta in CABANALANAN Pedro*? If you answer: it is or it consists in his humility, you will say *ing CABABAN lub iyan cabanalan na*; and from here it also follows that these abstracts indicate the strength of the essential element in its point; that is, in its maximum, in such a way that there is nothing lacking, no more, no less; for example, *CALAGOANA ning babayi*, the time, the strength, the force of her beauty; in the flower of her youth, *CASAMPATANA ning panaun*, for example, if I wanted to end the mass at the break of dawn and I woke up half way through dawn, *iyang CASAMPATANA ning panaon*. A rod is totally straight and somebody wants to straighten it further; leave it alone, it cannot be made more straight, *catulirana na*, etc.

From here you will conclude how great a distinction there is between this abstract and the simple, because even if it sounds the same as that, because we conceive it as separated; for example, *cabanalan*, virtue; it can never be conceived, however, as something as naked as that, because it includes essentially the concepts of the third passive of *ca* and *an*; and this, even if you always conceive it as abstract; e.g., *caraclan*, *queraclan*, *cacaldan*, *quecaldan*, etc. See the earlier part of the *Vocabulario* and more will be said in the chapter on the particle *ca*.

### MA: Frequentatives

All the above-mentioned adjectives of *ma* admit the *frequentatives* their own way, some exaggerating, and others downplaying or exaggerating; and the first ones do so by doubling the adjective, joining the second to the first with *a*, if it ends with a consonant. For example, *masampat A masampat*, or with *ng*, if it ends with a vowel, as in *malagoNG malago*. Its way of signifying is in the superlative degree; that is, most handsome, most beautiful, and the same with all. If in joining some with the others, you insert *nan*; for example, *masampat NANG masampat*; *malago NANG malago*; they will indicate frequency, which in practice is a nuisance; for example, *masampat NANG masampat*, he who says *masampat* to everyone; like the flatterer, the ignorant or the charlatan; *malago NANG malago*; for example, in the presence of Maria, one says *malago ya*; in the presence of Juana, he or somebody else also says *malago ya*; he who hears so many *malago* gets mad and says: let us change the topic, it should not all be *malago NANG malago*

, without leaving *malago* behind. This expression is like *gigote NANG gigote*; and in this land *sisi NANG sisi*, and like the charlatans *sabi NANG sabi*, etc.

The second variety is done only by doubling the root; for example, *masampat-sampat*, *malago-lago*. This one has two ways of signifying: the first one exaggerating a good point in order to call attention to a bad action; for example, you allowed the prisoner to leave, and so I tell you: *MABILOG-BILOG kang tauo palualan moya*; that is, you are not a half-man but an entire man, to exaggerate the fault. Another: you transferred something from where it was and you broke it; in order to blame you, I will say: *MAYAP-AYAP ya queti*, it was so good it was here. You went to make the water hotter; I get angry and tell you: *MAPALI-PALI YA*, it was hot enough, there was no need to heat it further, etc. The second way downplays; for example, *MASAMPAT-SAMPAT ya*, it is somewhat nice; *MALAGO-LAGO ya*, somewhat beautiful; for example, you ask whether Maria is pretty, and they answer you: *MALAGO-LAGO ya*; *alia malago*; *mapali-pali*, somewhat hot, it has not become *mapali*, etc.

This way of signifying also extends to any substantive noun, even if it is an adverb *ma*; and so it is very general and (in all verbs) it indicates that it lacks something to be able to arrive at the end point which is reached by those of its state, kind or condition or name; for example, *MATAUO-TAUO ya*, this is said with reproach; as if to say that he does not arrive at being a man. Also it is used to say it *looks like a human*; for example, if from afar we doubt if he is a man or a beast, the one who thinks it is a man will say: *MATAUO-TAUO YA*; *MARAUNG-DAUNG*, it does not arrive at being a *daung*; *MABAGUIO-BAGUIO ining angin*, *UALI-UALIN baguio*, it is not completely a typhoon, it is a younger brother, it has not arrived at being a *caca* [elder brother]; *mararamolag*, a reproach, he lacks a little to become a carabao; and this is not said of a little carabao, because even if it is little, it is complete in its species; but one can say: *MABABAINTAUO YA*; *MARURUMALAGA YA*, or *MATATAGAINDO ya*, if it is a female; and the same with any similar thing.

## Last Section

### Section 4

#### The MA of Evaluation and the Passive of ICA

Although the future is ordinarily used to indicate the present, it nevertheless has a conjugation; for example, in the adjective *marauac*, we add *an* to the end, *marauacan*, this is the future; *MAMArauacAN*, present; *MEMarauacAN*, preterite; the verbal, *PAMarauacAN*. Its construction is always passive; the person who does is in the genitive; and that which receives the action is in the nominative. Its way of signifying is to say that the doer *has the thing as described by the adjective*, or *future of ma*, which is clearer, both because there is no future of *ma* which it does not include, and because in this composition, there is no reason to stop and find out whether it is an

adjective of *ma*, or a future. This having been said, all the compositions of *ma* admit this passive, each one retaining its way of signifying.

Starting with the adjectives of *ma*: for example, *MASAMPATAN co ita* or *MAMASAMPATAN*, *MEMASAMPATAN*, I am considering, I will consider, I consider or I considered or I took that as beautiful; *mapaitan*, as bitter; *matapangan*, as brave; *mayaslagan*, as glowing; *masalaingan*, as lighted; *mabulucan*, as rotten, and the same with all the rest.

Those of abundance retain it, for example, *MAMAYANAMAN co ding Judios*, I take them, I consider them to be widely spread; *MALAGANAPAN co ya*, I consider him as a man who is involved in everything; and the same with *mayaclatanan*; *masimpanan*, etc. The same with *MABANDIAN co ya*, I consider him very wealthy; *MAYURANAN co ining panaon*, I consider this time to be very rainy; the same with *maguintoan*, *mamatauoan*; *MEMARAPOAN que ining ilog*, et cetera.

Those which proceed from active verbs vary in their way of signifying; for example, *MAMARUNUTAN*, *MEMARUNUTAN* or *MARUNUTAN co ita* (inasmuch as *dunut* is also active), means *I do not consider it as pounded*, like in the preceding ones; rather it means it seems to me that it can be pounded or ground; like if we argue whether one tobacco leaf, for example, being wet, could be pounded or pulverized; if you are of the opinion that it cannot, you will say: *e que MAMARONOTAN*; having the opposite view, I will say: *MAMARUNUTAN que pin*. It is in this same sense that you must understand all those which come from the active verbs; for example, *MARULOCAN co ining dicut*; *MAMASIRAN que ining bangca*; *MASAULAN que y Juan*; *MAMASUGATAN que y Pedro*; *MABULAGAN*, *MAPILAYAN*, *MABUCUTAN da ca*; *MAMABALDUGAN que ining bato*; *mayañgoan*, *maraptan*, *mayausan*, *masasagmitan*, *maralan*, *mamaguyoran*, etc.

That this *ma* means to *consider* or to *take as such* is clear from the fact that all what has just been said is also said with the irregular verb *amanan*, which is very ordinary, and undoubtedly means the judgment or view or opinion which one has of the thing; for example, *MAPAITAN co ya*, I consider it bitter; the same with *AMANAN cong mapait ya*; and the same with all the rest, each one with its respective concept.

The same idea is expressed by *pa* of *to say*; for example; *PAMATULIRAN co ya*, I say that it is right, because each one speaks according to what he feels or his opinion, when he does not lie; and here, it can very well mean *to approve*; for example, *PAMAYAPAN co ita*, I say that that is good and consequently I approve it as such. The same idea is expressed by the particle *mina*: *MINAMARAUAC* or *MINAMARAUACAN* (with or without *an*) *co ita*, I take or consider or condemn that as bad. If you need to speak in the active: for example, *who was that who approved or disapproved?* You will say: *ino tang PEPAMAYAP* or *PEPAMARAUAC?* And if you need to say, for example, *who ordered you to approve it?*, you add another *pa*; *nino tan PEPAPAMAYAP queca?*

## Passive of ICA

This particle, as you can see from its very appearance, can only serve as a first passive. It is the future; to form the present (if the root or verb is not among those which begin with *ca*, like *cayap*, *caplas*, etc., in all of which the present has two *ca*, *icacayap*, *icacaplas*, etc.), the first syllable of the root is doubled, for example, from *lugud*, future *ICALugud*, present *ICACAlugud*; but bear in mind that the *i* is very often omitted; the preterite is always *que*: preterite, *QUElugud*. Its concept expresses that the thing which is in the nominative is always the cause or the reason why the thing which is in the genitive does or receives that which is expressed by the root or verb to which it is attached.

Although this particle is attached principally to the neutral verbs of *ma* and *mi*, for example, *nanong QUESAUL mo?* what was the cause or the reason why you were *masaul?* *uling atin QUETAQUID co* or *QUERAGSA co*, because there was a cause or a reason why I tripped or fell, that is, I ended up as having been *metaquid* or *meragsa*; and this way you can use this with all the varieties of *mi* and *ma*; but bear in mind that in using it with the *ma* of abundance, you must retain *ma*, even if only disguised because the *m* becomes *c*; for example, *what is the cause or the reason why that person has a lot of gold, property, palay*, etc., you will not say *nano tang ICAMAGUINTOANA?* but *nano tang ICACAGUINTO na?* And take note in passing that, because the *m* changes to *c* and there are two *ca*, they serve as present; and so, *nano tang QUECAPALENA*, *QUECABANDINA*, *QUECACAPPIANA?* etc.

The same is true with the other *ma* of abundance, for example, what is the cause or the reason why the Jews are so widespread? *Nanong QUECAYANAM da ding Judios?* *Ing pamacamate ra quing G.n.t. Jesu Cristo iyan QUECAYUGSE ra*; and the same with the rest. Bear in mind, however, that when *ma* speaks of passions that look at another object, the *ica* does the same; for example, *nano tang ICALUGUD* or *ICABANGIS mo queya?* You must not construct it as *nanong icatacut mo queya?* because this one indicates that the genitive suffers the passion of fear; as if you are saying *nanong quesaul mo cang Pedro?* what was the reason why you were defeated by Pedro? But those two do not say that the genitive receives the action, but that it does the action; *what is the reason why you love him?* *what is the reason why you are angry with him?* And so if the verb to which it is joined speaks of an action, the *ica* is retained; for example, *nanong QUEPANYAUL MO can Pedro?* what was the reason, not *why you were defeated*, but *why you defeated Pedro?* and the same is true with *icapalsinta*, *icamua*, *icasangit*, *icaburi*, etc. This is true with those which speak of receiving the action and with those which speak of doing the action.

Let us now move to see the concept expressed by this *ica* when it is preceded by time, for example, year, month, days, etc., of which there are many examples in Sio, fol. 55. *ALDAO A ICAMATE mo*; *ALDAO A QUERANUP na*; *ALDAO A*

*ICAIABLAS na ning Dios quing dapat mong mayap.* In all these examples, it is most certain that the *ica* does not say that the day is the cause or reason, but it simply indicates the *time* or *the day on which*; as if saying *aldao ning PANGAMATE mo*; or *aldao ning CAMATAYAN mo*; *aldao ning PANGARANUP na*; *aldao a PAMANABLAS ning Dios* or *aldao ning PAMANABLAS na*, and these modes express the same thing as *ica* and none of them express cause or reason. Neither does this: *ALDAO A ICAROLOC ning bale mo*, the day on which your house will burn, although it is as ordered by the judge; as if saying: *aldao a pangaroloc ning bale mo*, etc.

It was cautiously that I said *when it is preceded by time*, and not *when the nominative is the time of ICA*, so that whoever disapproves these ways of speaking will look at them reflectively and not roughly, because in them, not even a thousand leagues will make you reach the *fatum* [destiny]. It will mean that when the time is in the nominative of *ica*, then the time becomes the cause or reason for what happens; for example, those who consider Tuesday as unlucky to travel by banca, because, as they say, it will overturn; and if it happened that somebody had his banca overturned, the superstitious will say: *ing martes a panlaco na IYAN QUECATIAB na* or *IYAN MECATIAB queya* because of the causal *maca*. Whatever might the superstition be, it should always be dismissed; but the poor *ica* and *maca*, what is their fault? The blame should go to those who abuse them.

In case *quetiab* disturbs you because it does not belong to the *ma* of *abundance* and yet it retains *ca*, I will answer you: firstly, one can also say *iyang queyatiab na*; secondly, I already told you at the beginning that those roots that form their abstract with *c*, like from *ayap cayap*, from *apia capia*, from *aplas caplas*, and also, *catas*, *caba*, *casyas*, *casnoc*, *calat*, *caslam*, etc. retain their *ca* with *ica*; and so, in them, the present tense does not double the root; it is also retained in the preterite because *quecasnoc*, for example, is more often used than *queasnoc*; but between *quecaba* and *queaba*, there is a difference. The first one expresses the reason for becoming long; the second, for being late. Among the rest, there are no two concepts.

## CHAPTER 10 THE PARTICLE CA

### Section 1

#### The Companion and the Coequal

First of all, this particle *ca*, as already mentioned in the *MI of company*, *MI of alternation* and *MICA verbal*, serves to indicate a companion; for example, *cayabay* or *cabayabay*, the companion of another which has to be in the genitive; for example, *CAYABE CU ya*; and so *casugal*, *caramay*, *capantoc*, *cainum*, etc. and even if they come from *mi* or *mica*. Here they say regionmate, *calabuad*; boundarymate, *carulon*; co-parishioners, *capañgadyi* or *caprior*; confidant, *catutu*, *cacasi*; counselor, *cacutang*; provincemate, *caprovincia* or *cayocom*; fellow inhabitant, *cabalayan (calicupan)*; twin-fruit, like two pears in one stalk, *casalay*; neighbor-branch, *casapi* or *casanga*; neighbor-trunk, *capun*; half-sibling, if of the same father only, *caibpa*; if of the same mother, *caindo*; if he is your brother having the same father and mother, *CAIBPA*, *CAINDO mo ya*; *cabalayi*, neighbor-post, because it is in front of the other, etc.

With this *ca*, they also refer to their companions, with whom they are united by a special bond which they call *de compadrazco*, that is, those who start a friendship by sharing eating the same thing, for example, a banana, [*saguin*], and each of them thereby becoming *casaguin* of the other and the two taken together are *micasaguin*; if they are more than two, *micacasaguin*; or because in order to start a special friendship (*encompadrar*), one gives the other a flower or a lemon, and if this one takes it, one becomes *casampaga* or *caralayap*; if you become a special friend (*compadrastes*) for having traveled in the same galley (*galera*), he will be your *cagalera* and you also become his *cagalera*; and the two of you will become *micagalera*, etc.

Up to here, we have dealt only with companionship in that which the root expresses, and for this it is enough that it agrees with what the root expresses, even if they are unequal; for example, *CAINUM na ya*, even if one drinks very little and the other drinks a pitcher; but with those that follow which are mostly about accidents or properties or quantities, etc. this particle *ca* expresses equality of comparison.

#### COEQUAL

*Capara*, equal to the other; for example, *CAPARANG (galera) anac co ya*, we are the same or he is my equal in young age; *CALUPANE ning capatad na*, he has the same features as his brother, they are of one face; as if saying, *misang lupa la*; *CARAGUL na caco*, I am as big as he is, I am his coequal in size, we are equal; and the same is true with all the roots of quantity, like *tall*, *low*, *small*, etc. and in qualities such as *beautiful*, *ugly*, *bad*, *good*, etc.; and in features, like *asal*, *anyo*, *anas*, *buac*,

etc; and in the colors and tastes, like *banglo, yumo*, etc. and with these: *linis, linao, tindag, salaing, aslag, ningning, sigla, naua, cascup*, etc.

In order that you will not find the Kapampangan ways of speaking so foreign, see our own Spanish having a similar way, and you will not feel it strange; *the tower of Uaua is co-equal in height to the tower of Bacolod*: This way of speaking is translated in a similar way, *ing torre Uaua CACATAS* or *catas ne ning torre Bacolod*. We express the same thing when we say *the height of the tower of Uaua is like the height of the tower of Bacolod*; this kind of expression is rendered in Kapampangan as *ing torre Uaua PAÑGATAS* or *PAÑGACATAS ne ning torre Bacolod*. We also say the same thing with this Spanish sentence; *the tower of Uaua is as high as the tower of Bacolod*; in his turn, the Kapampangan says: *ing torre Uaua ANTIA CATAS* (or if you would say it is such in height), or *ANTIA PANGATAS quing torre Uaua*; and bear this well in mind because all those belonging to this composition, to which I add for you *anti* and *alimbaua*, can be well translated according to these ways of expressing things.

With those belonging to this composition we form the superlative, such a big word for negative sentences, only by putting the defective verb *ala* before any of them; for example, *ALAN cay anti*; *ALAN cay alimbaua*; *ALAN catulad*; *ALAN cauangis*; *ALAN calupa*; *ALAN cacatas*, etc. *Ba, Virgen a ALAN calinang, ALAN calinis, ALAN calinao, ALAN cauagas, ipnalangin mo cami; iya na sa.*

For the superlative of affirmation of the above-mentioned comparison, which only expresses coequality, or that it is like it, and says that it is its identical, without removing a dot nor comma in what the root expresses, there is nothing to do except to double it, as the examples will show: for example, Christ's features are very similar to those of his mother, *ing G.n.t. Jesucristo CALUPA NA NENG CALUPA Nindo na, indo na CAUANGIS NA NENG CAUANGIS, CAYANIO NA NENG CAYANIO, CATULAD NA NENG CATULAD ning Anac na*, etc.

And the same with *panga*; for example, *PANGALUPA NA NENG PANGALUPA, PANGAYANTI NA NENG PANGAYANTI Nindo na; Indo na PANGAUANGIS NA NENG PANGAUANGIS, PANGAYANIO NA NENG PANGAYANIO, PANGATULAD NA NENG PANGATULAD ning Anac na*. And the same with the rest.

But if instead of exaggerating what the said composition expresses, you want to downplay it, all you have to do is to double the root; for example, *CALUPA-LUPA ne ya*, or *PANGALUPA-LUPA ne ya* means that he somehow looks like him, that there is a resemblance of him in his face; *CASAYA-SAYA, PANGASAYA-SAYA mo co*, you are like me in having a happy disposition, you somehow resemble someone happy; *CALAS-ALAS na can Pedro* or *PANGAYALAS-ALAS na ca*, you are a bit like Pedro; your long legs resembling a stork's are a bit like his; *CACABA CABA na ca* or *PANGABA NGABA* or *PANGACABA-CABA na ca bitis ning tagac*, because *caba* belongs to the irregular abstracts.

I tell you, lastly, that if you want to make a comparison in the roots which express actions the same way that the above-mentioned roots express qualities; just as we also use *panga* for those ones; so for these, we use the active verbal, which being her husband has the same functions as she; for example, Pedro walks like Pablo, *Y Pedro PAMANLACAD neng Pablo*; Andres walks like a show-off, like a Portuguese, *y Andres pamangimbe yan Portugues*; Francisca wears the jewel of Juana, Antonio repents like Francisco; *y Francisca PAMALIAS o PAMAG-IYAS nen Juana, y Antonio PAMANISI nen Francisco*; and the same with *PAMANAGUIO nen cay y cay*; your way of talking is like mine, *PAMANGAMANO ra ca*; *PAMANAGCAS da can amano*; to exaggerate: *PAMIBALIC na nen PAMIBALIC lub: PAMANGAMANO ra na cang PAMANGAMANO or PAMANAGCAS da na cang pamanagcas amano, etc.*

## Section 2

### CA of Just Finished and Verbals of BILIS

To start with, when you join *ca* to any root, you indicate the time in which the genitive finishes doing or receiving the action which the root expresses; but bear in mind that when the root is transitive, it is also neutral, because it admits the neutral verb of *ma* or *mi*; with it, you can express the doing and the receiving of the action. When it is action, it carries the accusative sentence which receives. Also, if the sentence is not transitive, the same can be said either with *panga* or with *ca*; if the sentence is transitive, the corresponding verbal says the same thing as the *ca*; observe everything in the examples, which are many and too time-consuming to repeat.

*CARATANG na pa mo*, or *PANGARATANG na pa mo* or *PAMANYATANG na pa mo* (these verbals have an identical meaning), he has just arrived; *CASALAING da pa mo ding candela or panga*, the candles have just been lighted; *CASALAING da pa mo or PAMANYALAING caring candela*, they have just finished lighting the candles; *CAYARI na pa nitang balay, PANGAYARI na pa nitang balay*, that house has just been finished being finished; [sic, the original is *ahora acaba de acabarse aquella casa*] *CAYARI na pa quetang balay or PAMANYARI ra pa quetang balay*, they have just finished constructing that house, etc.

Double the root if it has two syllables, and double the first syllable if it has three, and you will narrow down the time of the action in all of them; for example, *CABUCLAT-BUCLAT na pa* or *PANGABUCLAT-BUCLAT na pa ning masala*, now, just now, dawn has just come, [the Spanish literally: the starting of the daylight has just ended (*ahora, ahora acaba de amanecer*)]. *CASAGMIT-SAGMIT* or *PAMANYAGMIT-NYAGMIT na pa quetang espada or pluma*, now, just now, he has just taken that sword or pen; and if you push the genitive a bit farther, you will be stretching and exaggerating as far as possible the immediacy of the action; for example, *CALINO-LINO NA pang CALINO-LINO* or *PANGALINO-LINO na pang*

*PANGALINO-LINO ning panaon*; now, just now, at this very moment, at this very instant, the weather has just improved; *CAYAUS-YAUS na pang CAYAUS-YAUS* or *PAMANYAUS-YAUS na pang PAMANYAUS-YAUS na can Pedro*, now, just now, at this very moment, he has just called Pedro, etc.

The above-mentioned composition, together with its varieties, is what very punctually marks the time in which one has to do what is indicated by a second sentence which is usually paired with it, and in such a case, it admits the preterite; for example, *CARATANG na* or *PANGARATANG na, batbatan mo ya*, as soon as he arrives, whip him; this *as soon as* is not so *soon* that between the arrival and the whipping, there is no room to get the box, get some powder and grab the whip. Second: *CARATANG-DATANG na* or *PANGADATANG-DATANG na, batbatan mo ya*, as soon as he arrives, whip him right away; this one is in a hurry because it only gives time, for example, for the grabbing of the whip. Third: *CARATANG-DATANG NANG CARATANG-DATANG* or *PANGARATANG-DATANG NANG PANGADATANG-DATANG, batbatan mo ya*; this one is too much in a hurry, because the arrival and the attack admit no space at all in-between.

Take another variety which is even more in a hurry than any of the above and it is done with the verbal that corresponds to it; for example, *CARATANG na, PAMAMATBATAN mo quea*; meaning that his action of arriving and your action of attacking have to be at the same one moment; at the same time that he arrives without letting him arrive properly, etc. It is of course true that if the genitive of the first sentence is also the genitive of the second, because two actions cannot be done at one and the same time, there is no such precision, although this is what is expressed somewhat by *ca* with exaggeration; for example, *caratang na, caragsa na, pañgaragsa na*.

The same is true in all and in the preterite; for example, *CAYAMANO na* or *QUEYAMANO na, bitbat mo ya*, as soon as he spoke, you attacked him. Second: *CAYAYAMANO* or *QUEYAYAMANO na*, etc.; just right after he started speaking, etc.; *CAYAYAMANO NANG CAYAYAMANO* or *QUEYAYAMANO NANG QUEYAYAMANO, bitbat mo ya*; just precisely at the very moment that he spoke, etc.

With the second variety of the above-mentioned composition, we make three other ways of expressing, all of them different: The first one, as distinguished from the one discussed, absolutely requires that the second sentence is so linked with the first that, given the latter, the former must follow necessarily as its effect. Its way of signifying is to show the *promptness and ease* with which the doer actually does what he intends to; for example, *CASULAT-SULAT na, sinulat na ya*; this statement, if it is not understood, seems to be a truth understood by Pedro Grullo, because it sounds like: *as soon as he wrote, he wrote*; but it has more sense and it can mean two things; either that the doer is so smart that the very first time that he started to write, he knew how to write, or that if he knew how to write and started writing some work or sermon, he wrote without falling under the cross up to the end.

In this sense, you can say, for example, about a smart boy: *CAPAPAGARAL na, mebiasa ya*, he starts to study something, he learns it right away; meaning that whenever he starts studying something, he immediately understands it well; *CARAPAT-DAPAT na macayaria*, whenever he does anything, he does it perfectly well; *CAPAPANINTO na macaquit ya*, whenever he looks for something, he finds it right away; *QUEBARIL BARIL na tira na ya*, whenever he aims, he hits the game; and they also admit verbals of the above-mentioned second variety, etc.

The second, as distinguished from this one, does not infer the second sentence from the first, but from the first, the second, [sic. The original is *El Segundo, a distincion de este, no se infiere la segunda oracion de la primera, sino de la primera, la segunda.*] because it always presupposes the implicit or explicit statement that disposes or facilitates the thing; from this it follows that the doer is prompt and eager to do the action when he feels like doing it, for example: [this concerns] the implicit statement. If you hear them say *CASAQUE-SAQUE ta na*, we can embark when we like to; it presupposes that everything is ready, and that there is therefore no problem; *CATUdTUD-TUdTUD co na*; *CALACO-LACO co na*; I will sleep when I feel like: it is presupposed that the bed is made. I will leave when I feel like doing so; it is presupposed that all the things needed for the travel are already there. Explicit, for example, *ilantang mong catudturan, ba con CATUdTUD-TUdTUD*; *isadia mong sandata, ba con CASAGMIT-SAGMIT*; provide the materials so that when the workers come they will do the work without being delayed, *ba ran CARAPAT-DAPAT ding maestro queang balay*, for example, etc.

The third one very rarely includes the explicit statement and indicates that the action was inconsiderate and done without courtesy, for example, *CALUB A LUB mo queti* or *CARATANG-DATANG mo queti quing silid co*, you enter my room unceremoniously; if you want to express the second statement which corresponds to it, you can say: *ala can marinay*. Another: *QUESULAT-SULAT mo quetang sulatan co*, you wrote something on my paper without my knowledge; if you do not want to treat him rudely, you can add this second statement: *e ca quinutang*, without asking my consent; *QUEDURUP-DURUP na canaco*, he came to my house without previous notice and shamelessly, etc.

This way of expressing also includes *CAYAGCAS-AGCAS na mo*, he speaks without first thinking of it; *CAPAPANARAL na mo*, he starts preaching without first reflecting. During their fiestas if they want to get acquainted with somebody, the one among them who is the least ashamed grabs the hand of the stranger impulsively and for that they describe him as *CAPURI-PURI* or *QUEPURI-PURI na mo*; you understand what they mean. Also from this comes our courteous way which they also use; for example, when we tell a person whom we treat with openness and affection, *you have your house here, you may enter here with liberty as if it were yours*; that is, *without asking permission*, *CARATANG-DATANG mo*, *CAPANIC-PANIC mo* or *CALUB A LUB mo*, etc.

## Summary of These Four Modes

Of these four modes of promptness related to the particle *ca*, the first one expresses promptness of the action between the second and the first with respect to the time; for example, *CASULAT-SULAT na babatan mo ya*. The second expresses promptness of the first sentence with the second with respect to the doer; for example, *CASULAT-SULAT na quetang sermon sinulat ya*. The third one expresses promptness and the feasibility of the action with respect to the first sentence, which it expedites; for example, *Tiyong paniulat, CASULAT-SULAT mo*. The fourth expresses an insignificant promptness of the action with respect to none; for example, *CASULAT-SULAT mo mo quetang sulatan co, mabibigla ca*; and so the Kapampangan explains this fourth mode by saying that the doer is *mabibigla*, etc.

### VERBALS OF BILIS

[Latin, *amaBILIS*. Spanish, *amaBLE*, English: *lovaBLE*.]

The last composition of this section consists in forming nouns which are our verbals, using *bilis*; double the root or the compound if it has two syllables; the first if it has three. *Bilis* is not attached to any of the roots of the previous composition nor is that composition attached to the roots of this one; which only admits those which signify passions or actions which have their origin or effect principally in the soul; and even if this language has more verbals than ours, by looking at those which correspond to ours, we will understand theirs.

This having been said: *capapalsinta*, lovable; *calunus-lunus*, pitiful; this is what is in the nominative; *cagulat-gulat*, horrible (so great for children that they usually get sick); *caquilaquilabut* or *capapangilabut*, that which makes your hair stand on end, *sabian ing carin qung infernos*; *casusumami*, disgusting; and the same with these: *tacut, magsalbat, yasa, saya, malsimi, yoyot, magbitquil, aglas, asag, sindac, yama, magmulala, sambitan, or manyambitan, casdan, cauan*, etc. Those that follow belong to these as verbals of *bilis*, and, aside from that, they also admit the superlative, while the above-mentioned ones do not. They are: *lungcot, lugud, ibug, sanglit, dinay, tula, ligaya, uili, tangis* or *manangis, galimguim*, etc.

The way we construct sentences using one or the other group as verbals of *bilis* is, for example, one feels pity when one considers the situation of a sinner, *CALUNUS-LUNUS isipan* or *pigaganacan* (they take the place of passive sigh) *ing pañgabili nang pacalulu ning palpicasala*; it is pitiful to see him enjoy and laugh, *CALUNGCUT-LUNGCUT albayan ing pangatula na 't pañgaaili na*; it is a joy and an inspiration to contemplate the beauty of a soul in the state of grace, *CATUTULA-TULA manga CAUILI-UILING pigaganacan ing sampat ning caladuang macasaut quing gracia*, etc.

Those which admit the superlative follow the pattern of the passives, for example, you deserve to be wept for (*llorable*), *ican CATANGIS-TANGIS*;

the superlative, *ican CATANGIS-TANGISAN*, you deserve to be wept for to a high degree (*llorabilísimo*). The same is true with sentences like this one: *calungcut-lungcut albayan*, etc. it is extremely saddening to see; *Ba, calugud-luguran a Jesus co!* and *CAULI-UILIAN* are like *casanting-santingan*, as you will see.

### Section 3 CA of the Abstracts

First Point. When this *ca* is joined to certain roots, which are mute and irregular, they become abstract; for example, from *abpa, cabpa*, brace; from *alam, calam*, liberality; from *albag, calbag*, swelling; from *alpit, calpit*, sound; from *anglap, canglap*, suspicion; and the same with *capia*, wealth; *casbo*, anger; *capad*, suitability, as concerning mood; *catlac*, deafness; *catni*, loudness; *caniani* or *calang-alang*, respect; etc. Those among these which admit *an*, for example, *canglapan, calaman, canianian, calang-alangan*, indicate the third passive of *CA of object*; those which admit *ca* and *an* of the abstract, *cayapan, casiasan, cascopan, catlacan*, etc. are distinguished like the simple and compound of which we spoke in the *ma* of adjectives; and for now, take this example: *ding tauong alan pusu alan ibatanda quing CASCOPAN*; that is, *people with no heart are not helpful in difficulties*; where if you say *qing cascop*, it would be as a cold thing and even out of time, because this is difficulty in genere [*in general*], while the difficulty mentioned in the sentence is difficulty *hic et nunc* [*here and now*]; and so, even though it is equivalent to the abstract Spanish, it cannot be removed from the third passive from which it proceeds.

Every abstract must be used when its concept calls for it, without connecting it to the Spanish, because this one expresses only a Kapampangan abstract, and in these about which we are talking, there are three, while there is no more than one Spanish: you have already seen two. Now take a third spade ( and afterwards, you will see more): *tepañgan, sipagan, sintiñgan, legoan, temaran, degolan, licsian, sicanan, bilusan, neuañgan*; there can be a few more of these. Now *santing, sintiñgan, casantingan*, etc. are three and for all the three, there is only one Spanish term, namely, beauty. Each one requires its respective use, because each one has its respective concept, and the first is the only one we understand because it corresponds to our Spanish, that is, for example, *santing*. The second is *sintingan*; this one differs from the first because it refers to beauty adhering to something, and not to beauty as separated: it differs from the third, namely, *casantiñgan*, because it does not include place in its concept the way *casantingan* does.

Those of *ca* and *an* seem to be abstracts of pharmacy, which combines two simple ones into a third. So that you will understand, see what happens to you with the *buyo*; chew it with lime and, in the saliva, there comes a third component which is neither buyo nor lime and it is certain that there is lime and buyo which are two simple components from where it emerges; in this grammatical model, *masanting*, for example, where there are two simple components, *ma* and *santing*, they become

*casantingan*, where you see neither *ma* nor *santing*, and it is certain that the former and the latter are there, because they are the two simple elements from which it emerges; and so *casantingan* essentially indicates the place or quasi-place made or possessed by beauty.

All the above-mentioned abstracts of *ca* and *an* which come from *ma* become superlative when you double the root, as you can see in this example; *CASANTING-SANTINGAN* *ya in Guinu tang Jesucristo caring sablang tauo, e yata capilan ta ya caya aquit itang Jesus a CAYUMO-YUMOAN, CASAMPAT-SAMPATAN, CAYAP-CAYAPAN, CAMAL-CAMALAN, CALUGUD-LUGURAN, CASANTO-SANTOSAN, CABANAL-BANALAN, CALIGA-LIGAYAN, CATULA-TULAN, CASALAN-SALAN, CAPUPUN-PUNAN ning sablang nano, maña CAUILI-UILIANA*, etc.

Here, you have to take note that these superlatives are not only adjectives, but also abstract in the superlative degree; for example, *ing casanto-santos* does not only mean someone very holy, but also the holiness in the superlative degree; for example, *ing CASANTO-SANTOSAN* or *CABANAL-BANALAN nuan a Virgen Maria*, the holiness of the highest degree of Our Lady; and the same is true with all the rest.

Although few, there are some superlative abstracts which, as those given, serve to upgrade; these ones serve to downgrade; their composition retains *ma*; for example, *camamainsacan*, very very small; *camamaulian*, most inferior; *camamababan*, lowest; *camamalatian*, the smallest, and all their brothers; for example, *ing CAMAMAINSACA ning dapat na* or *ing dapat nang CAMAMAINSACAN; CAMAMAINGUITAN de ding sabllang tauo*, the most repulsive person; *dapat a camimistulan*, can be put close to these.

There are other abstracts of *ca* and *an*, very different from those given, not only because those ones indicate passions while these ones indicate actions, but also because of their composition; because those are of the nouns, and these ones are of the verbs and frequentatives. There are two varieties. The first one has only a future tense, *ca* is placed before the verb, *an* at the end; for example, from *magbitquil*, *CApagbitquilAN*; from *magmalun* *CApagmalunAN*; from *maguinaquit*, *CApaguinaquitAN*; from *mibabata*, *CApibabatAN*; and so *CApalsintAN*, *CApagdalitAN*, *CApagdamutAN*, *CApagimbutAN*, *CApagcasaquitAN*, *CApalmorAN*, *CApalsimiAN*, *CApalsisiAN*, *CApialoñgAN*, *CApiacAN*, *CApirayanAN*, *CApilitAN*, etc.

Their way of signifying is to express nouns as verbals of action, and because we do not have the Spanish equivalent word to describe them except as verbal, I will explain by circumlocution; for example, *casaulan* comes from *ma* and means passive defeating without being with *panga*; *capañyaulan*, active defeating, distinct from *pamañyaul*, which is not defeating but the action of defeating; this is its way of signifying with all; and it is in this that these abstracts consist and what they say, although perhaps their doing the act is like receiving the act; for example, *pamibabata*, the act of suffering; *capibabatan*, suffering, etc.

The second mode of these abstracts is constructed with the frequentative adjective; they only have what is like the preterite; *que* is placed before, *m* is changed to *c* and *an* is placed at the end; for example, from *mapañañas*, *QUECapangangasAN*; from *mapamialong*, *QUECapamialongAN*; from *mapagimbut*, *QUECapagimbutAN*; from *mapagpalalo*, *QUECapagpalaloAN*; and the same with all the frequentatives which come from verbs, which can be called *vice* or *excess*, like many of those belonging to the preceding composition. Its way of signifying is to indicate *a given vice* or *distinct characteristic of the subject* which is in the genitive; for example, *ing quecapamialita NA*, or *ing quepamiyalita NA*; because even though all admit *queca*, some usually eat *ca*, if it does not change the meaning; and so instead of *QUECApanacauan*, if one would say *QUEpanacauan*, it would mean like *quelauian*, *quematayan*, etc.

Also, they are used without an article; for example, they don't only say *ING quepañyaria na can Pedro*, but also *quecapañyaria na*; that is, his vice of doing evil; just like talking about the distinct characteristics of the nations which also belong to this composition; they are with or without an article; if they see a Spanish mestizo put on airs, they say *cucul ING quecastilana* or *quecastilana ita*; the way we say Galician [*gallegada*], *quecagallegoan*; to the Vizcayan who is stubborn, *quecavizcainoan*, Vizcayan trait [*vizcainada*]; and so, *quecapañgpanganan*, [*pampangada*], the pride of the Kapampangan (altivez de pampango); *quecatagalogan*, Tagalog-trait, [*tagalada*], that is, the cowardice the Tagalogs, (acobardamiento o cortedad de tagalo) or *quetagalogan*; but not *quepangpanganan*, because that would be referring to the Kapampangan language, like *tegalogan*, the Tagalog language.

Belonging here, indicating masculine and feminine traits, are *quelalaquinan*, *quebabainan*; *quedirilan* means vice of the tongue; also belonging here are *quecapian*, characteristics of the noble; *queaban*, traits of the *timaua*; *quepugotan*, of the black, etc. And take note that although the above-mentioned past-tense constructions ordinarily point to defective traits, they also point to the distinctive characteristics of a given nation or race, even if they are not bad.

## Section 4 CA of Individuation

I will take individuation and unity as interchangeable both because of their connection and also in order to proceed more structurally in this language; and so I will start with the universals or superior degrees, going downward up to the individuals and units. I presuppose the Kapampangan term *bagay*, which is the widest-ranging genus, which transcends all being; *pinduan*, although it is not so general, is also one more widest-ranging genus, because it is generally predicated of all the natures of all things; and each one by itself is *capinduan*, which already individualizes, because if it is predicated of human nature, it distinguishes and

differentiates it from any other nature; then it individuates the nations, each one of which is *capinduan* in relation to the first *capinduan*; then it individuates the races as *black*, *white*, etc; and the same with all the natures or series of things, which are always predicated of genus and species even though they are accidents [a philosophical term: that which inheres in something], like *black* and *white*, and the middle term of the syllogism distinct from the other and is never predicated of the individual. Following these are the immediate genera of each nature; for example, *dicut*, *saguin*, *palay*, etc. which, with this *ca* or *an* become species; for example, *capalayan*, *casaguiñgan*, *caricotan*: *nano caricotan iyan?* To what species of grass does that belong? One will answer; for example, it is the grass of Sta. Maria; and about rice, it is *lacatan*, for example, etc.

About man, you cannot ask to which species he belongs, because there is only one species; but regarding the brute animal, yes; for example, *ayop*, beast in general, and this is predicated of different genera, which are divided into two genera, namely, *flying* and *reptiles* which they call *gagapang*; and any of these genera is *cayayupan*; and each one of its species; for example, *carabaos*, *ravens*, is *cayayupan*; and every individual is also *cayayupan*, and this is how you will analyze all genera, species and individuals. I will give you another example: *bulung*, leaf (*hoja*) in general, even if it is the cutting edge (*hoja*) of a sword; *cabuluñgan*, species; for example, *nano ya CABULUNGAN iyan?* To what species does that leaf belong? You will answer, for example, *bulung yan saguin*; *cabuluñgan* is also the individual; for example, *pilan CABULUNGAN iyang darala mo?* *CABULUNGAN ya mo*, an individual, that is, *one*.

Now you will understand the difference between *cabulung* and *cabuluñgan*, because you have seen that this is one leaf or an individual of that given species; to refer to the human nature, you do not use *an*, because it is *only once* that he is an individual of the given species, because there is only one species of men; and even if they say *nano cata CATAUO-TAUOAN* or *PANGATAUO-TAUO?* it is like saying: what lowest kind or what being of man is yours? You need little to be a beast; it is therefore constructed, like any other individual, with *ca* and the root; *catauo*, one person or individual; and even if they say *catauong-catauo*, it is the same as *catauo*, because this language in referring to individuals, repeats the root for emphasis; and even if *capalayan*, *cabayabasan*, *canasian* means a grain, and in spite of this, they usually say *capalayan a PALAY*, *cabayabasan a BAYABAS*, *canasiam a NASI*.

To exaggerate, or to say that there is only one species or individual, they do it in two ways. The first is by doubling the first syllable, and the second, the root; for example, one species of palay or one grain, *capapalayan* or *capalay-palayan*; only one species, just just one, or only one grain, just just one, *cananasian* or *cananasi-nasian*, *cariricutan* or *cariricut-dicutan*, *cayayasanan* or *cayayasan-asanan*, *carurutuñgan* or *carurutung-dutuñgan*; *cabubulungan* or *cabubulung-buluñgan*; and the same is true with all the rest of species and individuals; *camemetoñgan* or *cametong-metongan* is for the numerals.

The following indicate *unity* and they do not admit *an*; for example, *pun*, foot of the tree or of whatever plant, with *ca* means one; *capun*. If you add *an* to it, they will castrate you; but if you double the root, you can very well add *an*: *capunpunan* or *capunpun-punan*; and this composition does not indicate *unity* but *superlative*, meaning, that which is deeper, the very very first thing of the *pun*. Among those which follow, none admits any other composition than that of *ca*; for example, *calagay*, a thorn; *cabulus*, a piece of cloth; *calublub*, one harvest of the *pilapil* [sown field], *cabuliga*, one square braza [36 square feet]; *cabanata*, one refrain or one stanza of a folk song (*una consonancia o pie de copla*); *casigaro*, one cigarette; and the same with *patac*, *balitang*, *buli*, *balebay*, *cauran*, *calaldao*, *camasa*. These three individualize the time, etc.

With roots that express actions or things which are usually seen, *ca* also individualizes or expresses unity; for example, *calduc* from *alduc*, one gulp; *caramput*, form *damput*, a handful; *caraclot* [sic, does not give the respective root]; from *sanduc*, ladle, *casanduc*, one ladle-full, etc. and of things: *catungi*, from *tungi*, *catungi*, one string; and so *catangcas*, one bundle; from *capit*, *cacapit*, one which is the fifth part of *catangcas*; *cabugong*, one bundle which has ten *catangcas*; *cabalisungsung*, ask one who chews *buyo*.

With *ca* and *an*, in the roots which mostly express artificial things, it indicates *the materials* which are enough for that thing, and also *unity*; for example, *baro*, garment; *cabaroan*, one, and also the cloth which is enough for one *baro*; and so, *catapisan*, *casayan*, *casalaulan*, *casalbagan*; *cabalayanan* does not indicate *one house*, but *the materials* which are enough for one; *cayasinan*, the salt which is enough for one cooking; *cayaslaman*, the vinegar, and also *casangcapan a aslam* or *bauang* or *lasona*, that which is enough for each species of these; and all taken together are *casangcapan* to be used in one cooking; because *casangcapan*, is a *totili mundi* [a whole world]; the pen is also *casangcapan*, and all that falls within the concepts of the root, is *casangcapan*, which we needed to touch here and which we therefore did not reserve for the next composition, where it belongs.

With *ca* and *an*, we also express all that is included in the meaning of the root; for example, *cayacotan*, a cart and all what is loaded on it; for example, fifty stones; *cayapagan*, one meal prepared on the table; *cayapagan*, all the plates and food on one table; *cayapagan*, those who were together in one table; for example, *balang CAYAPAGAN limalang pulu catauo*, or *CAYAPAGAN la pa ding tauong e mengan*, for example; there is yet a second table to serve, *dapot ala nan CAYAPAGAN quetang canan meluma na*, so as not to say *ala na*.

*Caloclocan*, one sitting, like the confessors, *caloclocan*, those who heard confessions in one sitting; *carolocan api*, one burning of the lime and the cavans which were brought out; *catipan a imalan*, a very elaborate dress for going out; *cacalapan*, one-time timber-cutting and the pieces taken from there; *cayaatdanan*, one carrying and what was carried; for example, gifts and those of every house where the plate was brought, *cayatda nano man*; *casubuan*, the one act of making *subu*, one mouthful,

*casamolán*; belonging to this pattern are *casalucan*, the act and the scoop; *causucan*, one stitch; *caralitan*, the singing once and the song; *catigtigan*, the time and the sound; etc.

Belonging to this are *cayarian*, territory of the kingdom and its people; and so *cayocoman*, like *cayarian*, and also the time one judges or passes a sentence; *capriolan* [*caprioran*], *caguinoan*, *capangpangan*, the territory of their province, the people there, each one of them and their language, etc.

None of those belonging to this composition of *ca* which individuates or expresses unity admits a ligature with the numerals, but it is united without it for example; *adua casaguiñgan*, *atlo catauo*, *apat cayapagan*, *lima calagay*, *anam caraclot*, *pitu cabaroan*, *adua la cabalayanan*, *apat cayasinan*, etc.

All what remains now is the *ca* and *an* with the roots of living things aside from what were mentioned; for example, *catauoan* is not only humanity or the human race, but also characteristics of such species; for example, *ing maili* or *mabalatung QUETAUOAN*, to laugh or to err is essential to man or is his specific characteristic. In order to understand that question of the catechism *nino tan QUETAUOANA*? I don't find a way out except that of the neutral verb of *ma*; *matatauo*, *metauo*, *matauo*; and so the indio says: *tambe cong METAUO* (like *tambe cong milliarin tauo*). This neutral verb of *ma* presupposes the material or seed or solidified blood referred to by the neutral verb of *ma* which comes from the root *bitog*; and it indicates man made of that material or seed, which it presupposes.

And even if they say the same thing about the chicken, that is, they say *mebitog* about the egg, the liquid thing solidified or became a body; they are correct in saying it this way the same way they say about the solidified blood or seed (if it is how it is formed, you see, I am not a physician), but to say that a chicken is *metauo*, is incorrect and is transmutational, because strictly speaking that one refers only to man; for example, *ing caduang personas METAUO ya quing atianan nuan a Virgen* (for my part, I always say: *millyarian tauo*). Third passive *ca* and *an*: *ing atianan nuan a Virgen* or *y nuan a Virgen iyan QUETAUOANA*.

This passive does not say the place *in which*, but *from where* or *from whom*, because the active *METAUO ya can indo na* has the same Spanish translation as *MIBAIT ya can indo na*; and the passive does not change the meaning of the active, etc.

*Cayayupan*, *queyayupan* is the species or essence of the brute and its characteristics, like *caramulagan*, *queramulagan* is the animality or species of the carabao and also its characteristics, although they are not specific, because it seems that these people did not consider this distinction: and so they refer to a heavy and weak or disabled man as *damulag yang mabiyay* or *CARAMOLAGAN ita*; *cayasuan*, *queyasuan*, its species and characteristics; they refer to a libidinous person as: *aso yang bitasa*, *malibi ya pan aso quing CAYASOANA*; *cababian*, *quebabian*, its essence and characteristics. Referring to a dirty man or woman, they say: *babi ya*, and about the characteristics of acting like a male pig or female pig, they say: *quebabiana*. This dirtiness is not applicable to the moral, etc.

# CHAPTER 11

## THE PARTICLE MACA

### Section 1

#### The MACA of Perfection, Inadvertence and Apprehension I will refer to the first as MACA of p.

Others call it the MACA of completing (*consumar*); for my part, I could call it the MACA of spending (*consumir*) because I have spent a lot of time on it, having been in fact working on it for the past ten years, and to my limited knowledge, I find the composition more ambiguous and more difficult to understand than any in the entire language, because while it is only one, it admits many and various meanings with the same identical verbs. And so, this one expression, for example, *mecasulat co*, can mean: *I have written, I have completed writing, I have written erroneously*, and also *I have been able to write*. They are four and, if you add the MACA of distrust, they are five.

It is true that the MACA of *p* communicates its own way of signifying, but not referring to that which is usually explained, namely that it only serves to say *the action perfected and finished*, because in reality, this is to take the branch for the leaves, and it would make to do the composition not only more difficult, but also impossible to understand; and from this it follows that some take almost no pity on it, because they deny it all the tenses, except the preterite, against what you hear the indios speak all the time; others give it too much, because they allow it even the present, and it is unintelligible that while the thing is being done, it would be called *perfected and finished*; to which I will add that in these two modes of discussing, it is not possible to explain how to understand the present, which no one denies to the passive.

I therefore say that it is called *MACA of perfection* because its mode of signifying, although it is found in all the verbs which express action, is not to do but to say what it presupposes the doer to do using the exercise of the verb; it always speaks of a thing in the past, and for this reason it is called *MACA of perfection*. It is hard to understand the use of this *maca* and even harder to explain it, because its concept lacks the exact equivalent in Spanish. I will explain it as well as I can; and for this, it is necessary to distinguish the concepts of the verbs; because some express action only, other express the effect of it; for example, *magcabayo*, to ride a horse; *babaril, papana*, to shoot without hitting; *manintun*; to search without finding, etc.; the *maca* has only one function.

When in its mode of signifying, the effect is inseparable from the action, like that of writing from that which is written, that of walking from that which is walked, eating or drinking from what is eaten or drunk, etc.; in that case, it has two functions.

The first consists in saying that whatever thing is exercised by the action of a certain verb *it stops with having exercised it*, and it is more appropriately referred to as agent, or is called agent or exerciser of such action, and for this reason, it is such an infallible consequence as he who runs moves, that he who writes, for example, is *macasulat*; *nun susulat ya, MACASULAT ya*; *nun lalacad ya, MACALADAD ya*; *nun mamañgan ya, MACAPANGAN ya*; *nun miminun ya, MACAINUM ya*; *nun magcabayo ya, MACAPAGCABAYO ya*; *nun babaril ya, MACABARIL ya*, etc.

When the action of the verb carries the effect, just like from writing comes what is written, that as one goes on writing it is being left behind, or becoming done, or ending as something written; the *maca* also indicates that the doer is finishing it as done or written, or that he is described or called doer or agent or finisher of such work or effect; for example, when Pedro is whitewashing the wall, both the Tagalog and Kapampangan say that the wall is nominative of the person who receives the action belonging to that passive verb *puputian*, because of which they say that the wall is becoming white is becoming whitened; and that from this, it results, according the Kapampangan, that the wall is already ending becoming white, or is already nearing whiteness, which is the neutral verb of *ma*, and, according to the Tagalog, that thing's being white is becoming perfected, because the verb *ma* shows the whiteness more perfectly and more as a done deal, for example, so also, looking at the action or the exercise of the verb, this *maca* says two things: the first, that as the doer goes whitening, by force of the verb, the thing also ends up being whitened or the one who whitens is described or is called *macaputi*.

And while the verb expresses that the doer is whitening, it is leaving behind, so to speak, that which is whitened or finished or done. Because one cannot do the act of whitening without at the same time ending up with the effect or with the thing whitened, the *maca* indicates the doer in relation to that which is done, saying that the one who whitens or does or is perfecting the work stops there. In this sense, I will give another example, a clear one although long; for example, you visit your laborers at eight o'clock in the morning, you inspect carefully what they have done; you go back in the afternoon, you find the same thing and you tell them: why don't you work? They answer: We are working. You answer: If you had been working, you would have accomplished more. Take note carefully of what you want to say in Spanish: You would have advanced or you would have done more or you would have improved or you would have been perfecting it or whatever way you want to express this concept, because this is most precisely the way this *maca* signifies: *nun darapat co sa ñgeta, MECARAPAT co sa ngeta*; and so that you can see clearly that this is not different from the *maca of finishing*, like if the officials are at the middle of the work, for example, they need little more to finish it, you would say using this *maca*; if you had been working, you have would finished, *nun darapat co sa ngeta, MECARAPAT co sa ngeta*; and this is how the indio puts it.

Now you will also understand how its present passive signifies; for example, *atalastastas co*; because, since its present active is *MACATALASTAS co*, I am finish-

ing to understand it, I am using the opportunity to take charge, I am completing the act of understanding it, for example; it is clear that its passive, for example, *atalastas co iyan*, also means *I finish taking advantage*, or *I am using the opportunity to understand this*, etc. To understand this completely, see the use of the passive of *pi* and *an*, because both this one and those ones express things in a similar way when presupposing the simple.

In relation to their conjugation, the same thing holds true with both concepts, except the accent of *maca*. About the present, if the verb is simple, it is attached to the root, and the *maca* is pronounced short for the first concept and long for the second, attaching the *ca*; if it is compound, it is attached to the future; the preterite is like the future; except that in the latter it is *meca*, also pronounced long, or short, as described above; for example, from *sulat*, the present and future is *MACAsulat*, preterite *MECAsulat*; from *manalastas*, present and future *MACApanalastas*; preterite, *MECApanalastas*, etc.

In both concepts, it has a habitual future, and in both, the *maca* is pronounced long, and with it, the meaning is either that the doer habitually goes on doing or perfecting a given thing, or that he habitually finishes it completely, or completes it; for example, the Christians are those who know God, *ding cristianos ilan MACAQUILALA quing Dios*. The boy who usually knows his lesson, *ing anac a MACABALO quing lecciona*; he who usually teaches children, *ing MACATURO caring anac*; everyday I write a page, *MACASULAT con capliego aldao aldao*; everytime he finishes one bottle, *MACAMINyan meto frasco balang misan*, etc.

The passive of all the tenses attaches *a* to the beginning; the present doubles the first syllable in the simple and compound (except some protocompounds.). The preterite and future attach it to the root if it is simple; if it is compound, attach it to the structure of the future; for example, present *Asusulat* or *APApañulat*, *APApagdalita*, *APIpibata*, *APAnalastas*, etc., preterite and future, *Asulat*, *Apagdalita*, *APAnalastas*, etc. For you to know when to add and when not to add *an* to the tenses of this composition, here is the rule: when the verb on focus has *an* in the preterite, you have to put it in all the tenses; and when not, do not put it in any. The habitual future has also its future passive, etc.

The above-discussed composition gives rise to the following ways of speaking: insistent beggar gets the alms, *ing salantang miluluat mañyauad MACAPANYAUAD ya*; whatever work you do results in you doing something, *balang darapat MACARAPAT ya*; he who seeks finds, not because he is infallible (it is also said of a person who goes to fleece and ends up being fleeced himself); *ing manintun MACAPANINTUN ya*, etc., with its habitual future.

The second way, which often looks strange, also comes from this composition. It is that of *meril ya*, he shot; *MECABARIL ya*, he hit the mark. We already said above that *MECABARIL ya*, for example, is *maca* of the first concept, which only predicates of the doer the action of completing the act of shooting. In this and in similar verbs, whose effect or end of the action is contingent, it is clear that, when the *maca* of the second concept is predicated of them, it presupposes the certain effect, which the

simple cannot do; because even though, if he hits the mark, for example, with the simple he hits it, since this one only means to shoot, prescinding from whether he hits the mark or not; and so, when it has its effects, it uses this *maca*, which is always certain, if the speaker does not lie; *MECABARIL ya* the simple got its effect, or attained its end; and it is in this way that similar expressions must be understood with their passive.

An exception to this composition is the preterite *MECAMATE ya*, where this *maca* does not indicate that he finished doing, but that he started to die and did in fact die.

### The MACA of Inadvertence

I presume that you are by now familiar with the above concept, that this *maca* is the consequence of the exercise of the verb, because it results from it and looks at the direct intention of the doer who only intends to do what the verb says, not *to finish doing*; it is like prescinding from the intention; and from here it follows that they use it to say that the doer *did inadvertently* what the verb says, or without intending to, or by mistake, or by accident, or against what he was thinking; and this is what I called earlier *MACA of inadvertence*; take note of the examples; and so that you will understand its first concept better, let the model example be the one which you hear every moment, namely, *macapulot*, *mecapulot*, he who finds or runs into something, especially if he was not looking for it, and even if he was looking for it; for example, if I lost something and I say that I will reward whoever finds it or runs into it or hits on it, *ing macapulot* or *macaquit* or *macasumpung* or *macatuclas* or *macadulang*, etc. I will continue with the same composition.

*Macabulad*, *macabalo* or *mecabulad*, *mecabalo*; *y Pedro iyan MECAPULOT* or *MECAQUIT*, etc; without my thinking of it, I fell into the hands of the thieves, *MECABALO* or *MACABALO*, *MECASUMPUNG co caretang mapanacao*. Belonging to this are *MECAYASAN con bulbulan*, I ate meat without being aware that it was Friday; I ate without remembering that it was a day of fasting, *MECAPANGAN co*; I ate without remembering that I was going to receive communion, *MECAINUM co*. Instead of picking my hat, I picked yours, and you ask: who took my hat? you will say: *ninon MECAYACUA* or *MECASAGMIT?*, not *quingua* nor *sinagmit*, because these ones do not signify *mistake*; I will say *acon MECASAGMIT*, I took it believing that it was mine.

And so in whatever action *by chance* or *by accident*, like the one who hits the mark without knowing how to shoot; he who criticizes what is good thinking that it is bad, or the one who gets the opposite of what he was thinking, which is the same concept; for example, I asked you, thinking that you knew, and you did not know, *MECACUTANG co alan balo mo*; I was thinking that you would count or pay one hundred pesos and you counted or paid four, *MECABILANG ca apat la mo* or *MECABILANG BILANG ca*, because these ones admit frequentatives in the present

and preterite; like if I was thinking that the door was open or closed, for example, and I find the opposite, *MACAYAQUIT-AQUIT co* or *MECAYAQUIT-AQUIT co* or *MECABUSNGI BUSNGI co*, etc.

The passives are the ones of the above-mentioned composition, but they are clearer with the frequentative where they are possible; for example, *ACUTNANG-CUTNANG da ca* or *aturan-turan* or *asumpung-sumpungan* or *adamput-damput* or *apapalaran* or *acalman-calman, atagun-tagunan, arapat-dapat, asagmit-sagmit, atutuc-tutucan, abaril-baril*, and from the beggar's pan, which apply to all *apatulusan*, etc.

## The MACA of Apprehension

With the future of the above-mentioned composition in the second concept, we construct the *MACA of apprehension*; for example, *MACABALBAL ca*, you have to end up breaking, or apprehension that you might break it; *MACASULAT ca quing e bala*, you might write what is beside the point; leave me alone, says the ill-tempered, because otherwise... *MACAPALU caco e subli, MACASAGMIT co quecayo, MACAMATE co, MACASUGAT co, MACATABA co, MACASIROL co, MACAPANAMPALING co, MACAYAGCAS con e mayap*, etc. with its future passive.

The *MA of stopping*, for example, *MABALDOG* or *MANABO ca*, you will end up having fallen or you might fall; *MASUGAT ca* is correctly told a child who plays with the knife; *you might end up wounded* or *you might hurt yourself*, etc.

The *MACA of apprehension* is clearer with a peculiar style, for example, *MACABALBAL na ca NGETA*, I judge that you might break, or *MACAPANA CAI, MACABARIL CAI, or MACASUGAT ca POTA* or *APOG o AMPOG MACAMATE ca*, to someone who comes down after having taken a weapon; or *MAGCAN MACASUGAT ca, AMPOG* or *APOG INDA*. It is also one of apprehension or *magcaninda*; it means *you might by this or by that*, etc.

## A

*It might happen that*; for example, to someone who gets married without considering it well: *Asumisi ca bucas, macadua*, you might regret it tomorrow, another day; to someone who puts off doing penance: *A e na ca pota macasisi*, you might not be able to repent afterwards; to someone who takes a bath where there are crocodiles: *Acuna[na] ca ning dapo*, you might be grabbed by the crocodile, *Amibono, migaga cayo*; you might fight; *Apotan panacauanan da ca*; and also *Amacabalbal ca, Amanaboca*, etc.

## Section 2

### The MACA Potential and Other Potentials

Its conjugation in the active and passive is that of *maca of p*, except that this one in the present only indicates *potentiality* [possibility as opposed to impossibility] and not *actuality*; and so it does not have the present of the verb in the active nor in the passive. Its accent is that of the first concept, long; for example, *MACASULAT co*, I can write; *MACASULAT co pota* or *bucas*, *MECASULAT co*, I was able to write; passive: *ATALASTAS co iyan*, I can understand this; *ATALASTAS co pota*, I will be able to understand it afterwards; *ATALASTAS co na*, I could already understand it, etc. As to whether it admits *an* or not, follow what was said about *MACA of perfection*.

It has its future habitual with its passive: for example, *MACASULAT* or *MACAPANULID yan amanun latin*, he has the habit of being able to write and translate from Latin; *MACABUAT yan mabayat*, he has the habit of being able to carry heavy things; *MACAISIP yan mataluctuc*; *MACATALASTAS yan masulit*, etc. Its accent is long, because it is the future habitual of the above-mentioned composition.

It has its frequentatives with respect to the things which express relationship with the energy; for example, *ABUAT-BUAT co iyan*; *API-SALO-SALO co ini*, as a ball; *APIBARIL-BARIL co ya* or *baril-baril*, I can shoot with these ones as easily as I can use a pen.

You will notice that the whole time I discuss the *maca*, I rarely give an example of the active; it is not because it cannot be done, but because the ways of speaking with *maca* are usually with the articles, which are placed at the end; and to speak in the active and passive, you should observe with it the same thing mentioned about all the rest in the rules given for the use of the active and passive.

### SUCAT

It is also *potential* and is the closest to our Spanish *I can, he can*, etc. The reason is that the *maca* only indicates *the proximate and immediate potentiality* [possibility]; and so, about one who does not know how to write, you don't say *he could* with *maca*, because it is a *remote possibility*; but with this, yes: *SUCAT yang sumulat*, because with it one indicates the *proximate and remote possibility*; for example, he who is in jail, *SUCAT yang lumacad, dapot aliya MACALACAD*.

In the realm of *moral possibility* [that is, *being licit*], although it is more ordinary to refer to it by using this, it can also be expressed with *maca*; for example, you tell me if I can do for you something, which is illicit? *e ca MACARAPAT queta ulico?* Or *e mo caya ARAPAT ita uli co?* or *SUCAT mo cayang daptan ita uli co?* It is of course true that we cannot deny that *sucat* is more appropriate, and even then, and even when *maca* is used, *sucat* is more frequent; for example, can

one who is fasting eat two ounces licitly without violating the fast? *SUCAT ya cayang MACAPANGAN ing magyunal adduang onzas e masira pamagyunal?* And the same is true with sentences which do not indicate *moral possibility* [that is, *being licit*], but physical; for example, *SUCAT mo cayang ABUAT ini? SUCAT cang MACASULAT?* Can you write?

## UPAYA

Substantive nouns: *Power (poder)*, as that which is given in writing, or that of the powerful, or that of the justices and also *power (potestad)*, as the power to absolve, etc.; and so, if denied, it closes the door to any remedy; for example, *alan UPAYA; alan PIUPAYAN*, there is no power. there is no remedy at all; *ala con UPAYANG lumacad*, or *ala yan UPAYANG cumayap*, as hopeless; *atin UPAYA nang cumayap; maqui CAYUPAYAN con manlucas casalanan*, I have the power to absolve sin.

## MALLIARI

It is also *potential* [that is, it has *potentiality*]: it means that what is said *can be or it can be done*; for example, if the road is very bad, he will say if he is sent: *nun MALLIARI con lumacad*; that is, if it can be done or if it can be that I walk; and from this, if I can walk; *MALLYARIAN cumayap*, he can improve (*puede hacerse*) or can be made to improve (*puede hacer que mejore*); and from this, he can improve (*puede mejorar*), etc.

## MI and MA

They usually serve as *potentials*, especially with negatives; for example. *MIPANIC co*, I can go up; *MITIPA co*, I can go down; *e co MITIPA* or *MIPANIC* or *MILACAD* or *MIPAMANGAMANO* or *MIBANGON*, etc.; *e MARAPAT ita*, *e MATANGGAL ining paco*, *e MARALA ini quing bayat na*, etc.

## Section 3

### The MACA of Nuisance

I cannot find any Spanish word closer to its meaning. It is pronounced fast and the root is doubled; for example, *MACABILANG-BILANG ya*, the *ca* is long, belongs to the inadvertence; but *MACABILANG-BILANG ya ining pesos*, for example, belongs to this composition; and it means *this peso only serves as a nuisance in the counting*, because it has no value, it is fake or is leaden; *MACALARIN-LARIN ya ining tapis or balay*, to repair this dress or house is to spend time uselessly, because they do not have composition; *MACARAGDAG DAGDAG* or *MACARACAL-DACAL la dening tauo*, these people do nothing except to add to the crowd; they are not needed for the case; the same with *abiyay, sali, simpan, misali*, etc. This composition cannot have a passive.

## Section 4

### The Causal MACA

Its accent is even; it is formed by putting in the nominative the person who is the *cause* or  *motive* and in the accusative the person or thing in which he *causes*. It is conjugated in the present by doubling the first syllable of the root or verb to which it is attached; for the future, if it is a compound, it is attached to the future and if it is not, to the root; for the preterite, it is the same, except that the *a* of *ma* is changed to *e*. It is attached to all the roots or compounds, which are capable of being used in relation to causality, and it signifies receiving the action, even though the accusative expresses doing the *action*.

First Point. It is attached to all the roots which when with *ma* are adjectives or verbs of *ma*; for example, *itang cai iyan MACASASANTING* [present, the same spelling as the future], *MACASANTING* [future, the same spelling as the present], or *MECASANTING*; *MACADURONOT*, *MACARUNOT* or *MECARUNOT*; *MACABABANGIS*, *MACABANGIS* or *MECABANGIS queca*, etc. Also following this rule and variety, it is attached to the roots of substantive nouns which, when with *ma* signify *abundance*; for example, *ing pamañgalao, y Pedro yan MACAGUINTO, PILAC* or *PALAY queca*, etc., he will be the cause or motive for you to have gold, silver, etc.

Also, following the same rule and variety, it is attached to verbal roots, simple or compound, and with all of them it is the best and surest step to insert *pa*; both in order to remove ambiguities and in order to express more vividly the causality and influence; for example, *ing alac iyan MACAPATUdTUD queca; y Pedro iyan MACAPABATBAT caco; ing batbat iyan MECAPABIASA quetang anac; ing tacut na quing infiernos iyan MECAPASISI quetang tauo*, etc. but bear in mind also that what we say about this *maca* is also true with the particle *ica*.

I said at the beginning, *although the accusative expresses action*; for example, *iyen MECAPATIPA caco quing tinipa quetang sia*, he was the cause why I brought the chair down; *ing tacot quing infernos iyan MECASISI caco quing casalanan co; iya naman MECAPIGAGANACA canaco quing camatayan; ican MECAPASULAT caco* or *MECAPABASA*; if it does not say anything else, it means: *you were the cause why they included me in the list or they read it to me*; if it has an accusative, you will say: *you were the cause or you obliged me to write or to read something*, etc.

Lastly, it is attached to all those which with *ca* are verbals of *bilis*; either by doubling the first syllable, for example, *MACATUTULANG albayan*, and so it is hardly distinct from *CATULATULANG albayan*; or by doubling the root, as in *ca*; for example, *MACATULA-TULANG albayan*; and so it is distinct from it in that it expresses *causality*; for example, *CARINE-RINE yang lauan ing tauong lubas* means that it is embarrassing, that is, *TULID yang carinayan*, worthy of being ashamed of; but *MACARINERINE yang aquit ing tauong lubas* means that it is shameful to see or it causes shame, or to say it better, that it is embarrassing to see him. And the same with the rest.

With the future tense or perhaps with the present tense, although it is rarely used, we form nouns which signify that they are accusatives of what the root says: for example, *ining dicut a ini, MACABIYE yan metay, MACABIBIYE ya* or *MACAPALDAN ya*, this herb is healthy or has the property that causes health, and by extension, brings the dead back to life; *ining lasun a ini MACAMATAY*, this poison is deadly or causes death; and so *macasaquit, macasalon, macasican; macapangayan* refers to the herb of Saint Mary, which alleviates, etc.

## Section 5 The MACA and PACA of TO BE [ESTAR]

This one is also pronounced evenly and it has no variation of tenses; it is attached to the simple roots or to the future, if the verbs are compound. The closest Spanish equivalent of its way of signifying is *to be of the mode which the root or verb says*. It is attached principally to those which express *being in some state with respect to a place*; for example, it is far, *MACARAYO ya* or *MACALAPIT ya*, it is near (*malapit ya*, it is near or nearby); *MACALOCLOC ya*, he is seated; and the same with, thrown, hung, on one's feet, thrown far, sown, passed and all similar ones, which are innumerable. You now see that its Spanish is like the past participle. When joined to names of places intended for something to be put in, and it is attached to those places, it means *to be in such a place*; for example, *MACATAPAYAN ita*, that thing is in the jar or jars; and the same with *macacaban, macatopocan, macagusi, macabayong, macapidpid*, etc.

This same Spanish admits others, although they don't indicate relationship to a place; for example, *macasulat*, it is written; *macayotos*, it is commanded; *macayugali*, it is in character; *macapanabilin*, entrusted; *macatanto*, promised, like what is vowed or a child offered to religion; and so *MACAPALAMAN quing santong Sulat*, and all those of this kind; *macapalual*. They constitute the ff [*facere fieri*, see chapter 12].

There are some verbs which, with this *maca*, indicate the doing and the receiving of an action, for example, *ing danum MACATABUN* or *MACASACLAO quing tabun*, the water is deposited in the *tabun*, and also, the active voice, the *tabun* is holding or depositing the water, etc. All of these and the rest which indicate *action* when the case which follows the particle is nominative, admit the passive; for example, *ASASACLONA* or *ATATABUNA NA ning tabun ing danum*, etc.

Given that backdrop, all the sentences which go with this *maca* can also go with *paca*, under one of two conditions: either the nominative is plural, or it refers to plurality of places; for example, *PACALOCLOC la*, or *PACARAYO la, PACAYANAM, PACASALBAG la; pacatapayan, pacagusi, pacacaban, pacabayon*, placed in jars, large jars, or baskets; *ing pagcasulat*, for example, in the old and new testaments; *ing asal a pacayugali*, for example, in various towns; *ing pacayotos*, for example, in various churches, etc.

Among these three modes of expressions; for example, *MACARAYO la*, *PACARAYO la*, *MIPACARAYO la*, as houses, there is this difference: the *maca* simply says that they are separated; the *paca* adds *each one*; the *mi* is neutral, *to stay as it is* in that situation; but remember that all of them refer to the *place of which*, and not in the mutual relation of each to each; if you want to express this last one, you would say *MISICACANDAYO la*; and all these three modes can be used generally in all the verbs which express *being (estar)*; but bear in mind that when the nominative case is not plural and the oblique case is , for example, *asal a MACAYUGALI quing metong at metong a balayan*, in this case, it is no different from *asal a PACAUGALI*, etc.

[About the oblique cases, see chapter 4, section 1, Last Rule, bracketed note.].

## Section 6

### The MACA and PACA of Intensity

This one has a long accent in *ma: maca*; it only admits the imperative. It is joined to the roots whose meaning is adequate to express the *act* with greater or lesser intensity; and in all [verbs] it signifies that the doer does more sincerely, more effectively and more forcefully the acton expressed by the roots; for example, [E]stote viri fortes [*Be strong men*], *MACATAPANG cayo*; *MACALACAD ca*, go on walking; *MACAGALING cayo*, hurry up; *MACAINGAT ca canaco*, take good care of me; *MACAGANACA ca*; *MACAISIP ca*, understand it better; *MACATUNUD ca*, act more maturely; *MACABIASA ca*, show more interest in knowing; *MACAPAGARAL ca*; study more diligently; *MACAPAMINTO ca quing otos ding pun mo*, obey very faithfully what your superiors tell you; etc. *MACALALE ca* or *macalume ca* or *MACACALALE ca* or *MACACALUME ca*, be very careful, as in order not to break or to let something spill. The last two exaggerate.

### PACA

This particle is always passive, and its concept indicates that the doer should do very well what the root expresses; and so *icabat me itang pasbul*, for example, by the regular passive, only says close that door; but *PACACABAT me itang pasbul* gives more intensity to the act, and it means *close it very well* or *close it well closed*. It retains this form in all the passives, simple or compound, to which it is attached, because it is very general. And although any given sentence of *maca* in the passive retains its meaning when in the active, for example, *PACAPAMINTUAN mo ing otos ning pun no*; *PACAINGATAN mo co*, take good care of me; *PACALALAYAN* or *PACALUMEAN mo iyang darala mo*, bring this with great care and that one; what is certain is that *PACAPAGARALAN*, *pacaisipan*, *pacagalingan* and others of this form which seem to be passive counterparts of the actives of the said *maca*, are not;

because even though there were no such *MACA of intensity*, it would just the same be expressed with this *paca*. Well, whatever it be, it is not a reason to object to.

Its preterite is *peca*, usually without *an*; *PECAisip*, *PECApeminto*; the thing, *PECApemintuAN*; the person, *pecalumay*, *pecalalay pecacabat*, *pacarayo*, *pecasalaing*, *pecarayo*, *pecasalaing*, etc. I said usually without *an*, because even though the first and second passives retain it or follow this pattern, the third passive drops *an* in many sentences in the preterite, and retains it in others.

With the roots of the abstracts and with all of those [roots] which refer to an *overdone action*, it is dropped, like *pecasanting*, *pecasampat*, etc. With those which consider simply the endpoint of the action, which always happens whenever one thing is mixed with or is thrown into another, it is dropped (*le pierde*) [sic, probably meant "it is retained," *le guarda*]; for example, *PECALARAN mo ing asan*, you mixed too many peppers with the fish; *PECAEBUNAN mo ing caramelo*, you mixed too many eggs with the candy; and so *PECALaucan*, *pecatugtugan*, *pecayaslaman*, *pecaasinan*, etc., and even with other abstracts if they express a *speculative action* or looks at the thing merely as an endpoint; for example, *pecabangloan*, etc.

I said that this particle is always passive, but this does not prevent it from being restructured, for example, with the transitive *mi*, and with it, it becomes active; *ing Guinutang Dios iyan MIPACASAMPAT*; *ing Dios a MIPACASAMPAT quing caladua ampon MIPACAULA quea*, etc:

## PECA

This particle does not change; although, when it is joined with verbs, it is preterite as it means *in the place of* or *in the midst of*, for example, *PECAMEBATING mo ya*, *PECAMETAY mo ya*, consider him to be among the dead or lost, or count him among the dead; like *ibilang men matay* or *mebating*; *PECAMESAMBUT mo ne ya ing pemaogui mo*, consider that they won over you or that you lost the gift you had given to the woman. And the same with *pecamesira*.

It is also attached to nouns; for example, *PECAYANAC mo ya*, take him as your son, or as a son in place of a son, or count him as a son, as if saying: *ibilang men anac*. And so *ing yoron PECANASI*, *ing bulong saguin PECAPAPPEL*; *ing cubon PECABALAY*; *ing asin PECAYASAN*, *PECASAGUIN*, *PECASISI*, *PECATINAPAY*, etc.

# CHAPTER 12

## THE PARTICLE PA

### Section 1

#### The PA as FF:

The abbreviation FF stands for *facere facere* [to make a doer do something] and *facere fieri* [to make something be done by a doer].

[*Facere facere*: Make Pedro water the plants. *Facere fieri*: Make the plants be watered by Pedro: See to it that the plants are watered by Pedro.]

This famous composition—and I say this not without a strong basis – transcends all the neighboring languages. In Pampanga, its conjugation is present, *papa*; future *pa*; preterite *pepa*, and maybe *pe*. It is attached to all kinds of simple or compound verb-roots and its accent is long; *pa*.

The role (the concept and soul) of this particle is to express an influence, in the strict sense or in the broad sense, positively or negatively, and even if only metaphorically. In using it, we indicate that the person who does (whether the word is in the nominative because it is active or in the genitive because it is passive) is not the one who has to execute what the verb says, but the one who exerts an influence in such a way that the receiver of the action of influencing is the one who executes what the verb says (whether the word is in the accusative because it is active, or nominative because it is passive) without need of expressly using the term or verb which means *to influence, to command, to permit, etc.*, because *pa* plays this role.

In order to show clearly that all what this *pa* expresses is influence *in general* and that to be this mode or the other depends only on the verb to which it is attached or the meaning which here and now, the speaker (basing on the context) wants to give, I will give an example for the active and another one for the passive.

*PABATBAT ca queya*. Here you can say *command him to whip* mentioning who is to be whipped, and you can say *allow yourself to be whipped by him*, you omit the influence of resistance, you influence *negatively*; and you can say *ask him that he whip you*, as I have heard an old man who, as his penance, usually asked his own children to whip him: *PABATBAT ya carela*; and one can also say *he was commanding them*.

The same is true with the passive; for example, sometimes we hear *PALUAL mo la*, sometimes *PALUALAN*: and *pa* is always the same: they differ only in the meaning of what *here and now* is being talked about. Because the first one means *make them leave (arreales o hazles salir)*; the second one can mean *command them to leave (mandales salir)*, and also if they are locked inside *let them go out or permit that they go out (dejales salir o permiteles que salgan)*, etc.

This having been said, the influence meant by *pa* is explained either by *to command* or *to permit* or *to make someone do*, etc.; for example, command Juan

that he write that book, *pasulat ca can Juan quetang libro*; command that *bilango* [policeman] that he catch that thief, *PASUCUL ka quing bilango quetang mapanaco*. Here one can inevitably sound ambiguous, because it can be taken to mean *command the thief that he catch the bilango*. Say it in the passive: *PABILANGO me itang mapanaco quing bilango*.

For the passive, the general and only rule is to see if the nominative of the person who receives the action in the sentence is one who *does something (agit)* or is one *to whom something is done (agitur)*, because this one means *ff* or *facere fieri*. If it is the first, it should always be the passive of *an*; and so you will say: *PASULATAN me y Juan quetang libro*; *PABILANGOAN me ing bilango quetang mapanacao*; because here Juan and the *bilango* are ones who *do something (agunt)*, not ones *to whom something is done (not aguntur)*, that is, *Juan reads, not is read*; *The bilango catches, not is caught*.

If it is the second, it should always be the passive of *i*; and so, if you put the book and the thief in the nominative, you will say: *PABASA me itang libro can Juan*; *PASUCUL me itang mapanacao quing bilango*; because each of them is one *to whom something is done (agitur)*, not one *who does something (not agit)*, that is, *the book is read, not the one which reads*; *the thief is the one who is caught, not the one who catches*. Corollary to this rule is: that, when a non-living thing or one that has no action, *at least a metaphorical one*, is in the nominative, always use the first passive, *because it is one to whom something is done (quia agitur)*, *not one which does something (non agit)*; it is a receiver, not a doer. In the case of living beings, they sometimes use the former, sometimes the latter, not indiscriminately, but observing if in the *here and now* of the sentence, *the living being is considered more as being acted [agatur] than as acting [agat]*, and in that case, they are considered as non-living, that is, they also fall under the passive of *i*, which, for this reason, is called *facere fieri [to make something be made]*, to see to it *that the one mentioned will be done or that something be done in it*.

For this reason, when they tell the doer, *let them leave, make them leave*, they use this passive, *PALUAL mo la*; because it means *make them be thrown out, not make them leave; let something be done to them (agantur) rather than let them do something (agant)*; it is *facere fieri* and not *facere facere*. On the other hand, if you order them simply to leave, it is *facere facere*, to induce them to leave, and not throw them out; do something to make them do something, *potius agant quam agantur*. If you understand this rule, you will very rarely or never fail. We will explain this further.

At other times, this influence is expressed by *to permit, to let, to hope*: *PASAUL ca can Pedro*, let yourself be defeated by Pedro, do not resist, influence *negatively, and the same with the rest*. What passive corresponds to it? the one of *facere facere*, which is the *an*; *PASULATAN me y Pedro*, understood *queca*, because Pedro, which is in the nominative, *does (agit)*, not *is done (not agitur)*, he is the one who defeats, he is not the one who is defeated. [Presumably *PASUCUAN* was meant here, and not *PASULATAN*.]

In this sense, we hear everyday *PASALIUAN moco*, allow me to buy some of your palay; for example, *make me make (fac me facere)*, influence me *negatively* [sic] into buying; *PASACLOAN mo con danum*, allow me to fetch water from your well; *PAYUMAN mo co quing gamat mo*, allow me to kiss your hand, *ff*; but if I say *allow your hand to be kissed by me, facere fieri*; *PAYUMA mong gamat mo canaco*. Having this in mind, you should not get surprised to hear them say *patulan, patangisan, palungcutan*, etc., because the *pa* is concerned only with whether the nominative of the person who receives the act of influencing does the act mentioned by the verb, even if he does so only in a broad sense; and this goes to show that he does an act rather than an act is done to him (*potius agit quam agitur*).

Belonging here are *PALULUTAN me iyan saguin; patilan, pabengian, pagatpanaponan*, etc., all of them *ff* passives of *an* because the action is conceived as coming from the nominative; and the truth is, it is better considered as *that which acts (quod agat)* than as *that which is acted (quod agatur)*.

In the end, what we should do is to move carefully, because there being so many various ways of influencing, it gives rise to varied meanings; for example, *PASAUP ca* can mean *allow yourself to help (dejate ayudar)* as *PAIUAD ca* is *allow yourself to correct (dejate correguir)* and *ask that they help him (y pedir que le ayunden)*. In the first sense, you have *PASAUPAN mo co*, for example, *allow me to help you*; in the second, if you say *PASAUPAN mo ya*, you mean either *allow yourself to be helped by him* or *command him to help*. The same is true with *paturu, payaral*, etc., but if you open your eyes, you will find the rules and principles to be helpful enough, unless you are slow.

It has its frequentatives: *papuri-puri, payaus-yaus, papaquit-paquit, patilip-tilip, palaue-laue, pasilip-silip, patañgal-tañgal, patangdao-tangdao*, etc.

## PA

Just as by knowing what a man is makes you know what he is not, because by knowing what characteristics he has, you can know that a being that does not have those characteristics is not a man; so also, by knowing the properties of *pa* of *ff*, you will know that whatever does not have them is not *pa* of *ff*. Assured by this principle, we come up with the general rule *that a PA which carries a meaning other than pure influence is not PA of FF*. Such are the following.

## TO SAY

First of all, *pa* means *to say* when it is joined to words indicating decisions: good or bad; for example, *pajesus, padios*; (and this is usually a curse), *padiablos, paibpa, paindo, paua, payali*; from *yata*, to doubt, *payata*, to express doubt; *paimburis*, to say more than; *patabalo*, to say that one does not know; and the same is true when it goes with other words, good or bad. Its passive is the third, based on the general rules: *PAJESUSAN mo ya, PAUAN mo co, PEPATABALUANA co, PEPAYALANA*

*cong marinay; payatan, palasingan, payalian* somebody to whom these things are said, etc.

It also has its frequentive; for example: *palasing-lasiñgan*, go on calling someone a drunkard; *PALASING-LASINGAN ya canaco*, *PAYASU-ASU ya*, *PARARAMULAG ya*, *PABABIBABI ya*, *PAYALA-YALAYAN dinay*. The passive is the same: *PALASING-LASINGANA co*, *PAYASU-ASUANA co*, *PARARAMULAGANA co*, *PAYALAN-ALANA cong dinay*; and so, *paibpan-ibpan*, *paindo-indoan*, *papanunu-nunuan*, *parapo-rapoan*, etc.

## TO ASK

Secondly, when, joined to things which usually pass from hand to hand, *pa* means to ask for them; for example, *palimus*, to ask for alms; *PASALAPI ya*, he asks for money; *PAGUINTO ya*, he asks for gold; *PABALAT ya*, like a shoemaker, and if he is a child, *PABALAT ca?* do you want to be whipped? *pagunting*, to ask for scissors (*pagunting ca?* do you want me to cut your hair?), *pamayumo*, sweet; *payasan*, fish; *paculumbo*, etc.

Its passives are the third: but they do not indicate the person from whom one asks, but instead, the person to whom one gives: *PAGUINTUAN da ca*, I will give you gold; *PATABACOAN mo co*, *PABAROAN mo detang lubas*; *PACHOCOLATIAN mo la*; and the same with the rest. They have *paguinto-guintaon*, *payumo-yumoan*, to whom one gives a little at a time, etc. Here belong *patauad*, ask for a discount or forgiveness, *patauaran* is not *from whom one asks*, as I already said, but *to whom one gives*, and its first passive *ipatauad*, according to the general rules. The opposite is *paralampo*, where *paralampoan* is *from whom one asks*, like *pipagdalitan*.

## TO GIVE

Belonging here are many expressions, which are considered *ff*, though they are not; for example, *pacan*, *painum*, *paimalan*, *parusa*, *param*, *pautang*, and similar ones, to which you can add *pabalo*. Its meaning is to give what the root expresses. Its passives, according to the general rules: first *that which* or *in behalf of whom*; third *to whom*. Its protocompounds *mamarusa*, *mamaimalan*, etc. do not indicate one who commands, (*mandador*) which is another proof of what was said, but the one who gives (*dador*): *calulu*, *sayang*, *cauan*, *tubo*. See the Dictionary. Whoever insists that they belong to *ff* shows that he does not understand this. Notice that *pautang naco*, with a long *u*, means *he says that I owe him*, without explaining how.

## Section 2

### Alternative Composition of FACERE FACERE REFACERE FIERI

This alternative composition, which in itself is difficult, has been made more unattractive because of the name given to it, namely *reff*, because they say that *facere* is doubled, resulting in four *facere*, unless you say that two times two is not four; and with this who will fail to see the confusion it causes? Furthermore, none of the examples given to prove this belongs to it; because all of them belong to *ff*, that is, none of them expresses anything but *to make somebody do something*.

Examine them, if you care, since you are looking for the truth anyway.

This having been said, I affirm that, in Kapampangan, there is an alternative composition of *pa*. To understand it, I look at it as a composition of *ff*. Now, making an alternative composition with another *pa* does not result in a double composition, that is, there are no two *ff*, but one and a half, which is *reff*; I call it *refacere fieri* because it is clearer and it is commonly used as passive, and ordinarily it expresses only an influence properly so-called, and that is, to command.

### Examples

*PAYAUS me quing fiscal itang sacristan*, command the fiscal [parish coordinator] to call the sacristan. This one belongs to the preceding composition, because the fiscal is *commanded only* and not the *one commanding*; he is the one who has to call; but *PAPAYAUS me quing fiscal itang sacristan* belongs to this alternative composition, because he is commanded to command, he is *one being commanded* and *one commanding*; it is not that he will call, but that he will command somebody else to call; and so the genitive of the person who does is *facere*; the fiscal is also *facere*, because he commands, and *fieri* follows, which is *that which he commands*; meaning that the sacristan should be called, and this is *refacere fieri* [to make someone make someone else do something].

Here, you notice carefully that, for this alternative composition, it is necessary to have two persons commanding: one the genitive of the person who does; the other whom the genitive commands, which has to be in the accusative, for each one of which there is a *pa* respectively; there should also be a person who receives the action, and he is the one in whom the second command is executed: here it is the sacristan; it is also necessary that there be something that someone is commanded to do, and here it is that the fiscal should command, although this is implicit, it is understood; it is not expressed to avoid confusion. It is undeniable in Kapampangan because of these current expressions; for example, *PAPABUSNGI me quing mayor itang pasbul ning pisamban*; *PAPASULUT me quing mayordomo itang pasbul lalam balay*;

*PAPANGABAT mo deang auang*, etc.

Understood this way, you can use it wherever there is passive, provided it is strictly *ff*, like *papasucul*, *papabilang*, *papasingil*, *papasugat*, *papabalo*, etc. Preterite: *pepapasucul*, *pepapabilang*, *pepapasingil*, *pepapabalo*. [It seems there is an erroneously extra *pa* in each of these four terms.]

If you noticed the necessary requirements of this alternative composition, mentioned by everyone, that it has to have two commands, you will conclude very correctly how inconsequential are the examples which they give to prove the principle and rule which they refer to, because none of them is made of two commands; and this error seems to me to have resulted in their belief that the examples have two *pa*, forgetting that no composition belonging there is strictly *ff*, on which this one is based; and since it has no basis, it cannot exist.

And if not, I ask: is *payalian mo ya*, for example, the same as *PASULATAN mo ya*? *Of course not*, because that one means *tell him "no"*; it is not *ff*; the nominative of the persone who receives is not commanded to do; but *PASULATAN mo ya*, yes, because he commands him to do the act of writing; for that to become *ff* like this one, it needs two *pa*: *PAPAYALIAN mo*, tell him to say no; now it is *ff*. For it to be an alternative composition, in the present tense, it needs three *pa*.

So that you will not make a mistake at every step in this, do not move away from the common principle that the passive of *an* with *pa* of *ff* always indicates *to make somebody do something*; and if there is a passive of *an* with *pa* which does not indicate *to make somebody do something*, it is not *ff*; and so it can never have two persons commanding, nor does it belong to the alternative composition. Besides, you will rarely or never find it with a passive of *an*, but of *i*, and with three *pa* in those verbs.

One will not avoid these errors if he does not distinguish between what passive is of *ff* and what is not; for example, if you say that *PAIMALANAN mo ya* is *ff*, because it means *make him dress up*, you will be very wrong, because this is not what it means; what it really means is give him a dress; *clothe him*, *help him put his clothes on*; like, *PACANAN mo ya*, give him something to eat.

If you want to construct these and similar ones according to the rules of this alternative composition, add another *pa* and use the passive of *i*; for example, command the procurator to command someone to feed the horses, *PAPAPACANAN mo quing mayordomo detang cabayo*; command the zone leader to command someone to give the poor something to wear, *PAPAPAIMALANAN mo quing capitan ding mangaluca*; and the same goes with all those that can have the first passive: *PAPAPABALO me quing mayor ing fiscal*. From these, you can construct others; this is certain, although they are rarely used in the preterite, because the indio chokes. Use the root *otos* if you want to avoid any difficulty.

Even if it does not belong to these verbs and even if it has two *pa*, it does not belong here if there are no two persons commanding, in such a way that one commands the other; for example, you sent that sacristan to follow the priest, *PEPATUQUI me ing Pare quing sacristan*; the sacristan does not come back and

you send another messenger; this one is *PEPAPATUQUI*; and it is the same even if you send ten. This one only says that one command is given after another command, and not that one person commanding commands another, and so it is *ff* and no *reff*.

It has various verbal actions. Starting with *pa*, simple *ff* for example, if I want to say *that commanding of yours* or *that action of yours commanding Juan to write*, I will insert *ma* after *pa*, saying *itang PAMASULAT mo cang Juan*; that is, that influence of yours whereby Juan writes once or twice; and this goes with all similar cases.

To indicate that which follows, you have to know that this *pa* has its protocompound, which is formed like those which begin with *m*, and it indicates plurality like them, maintaining the connotation of *influencing*; for example, *pasucul*, protocompound *mamasucul*, one who influences or commands that many should be arrested; verbal *pamamasucul*, the act of commanding somebody to arrest many. You will notice here that neither its protocompound nor its verbal is mistaken for those protocompounds or verbals of those beginning with *b*, *p*, *m*, where there can be confusion. They are not interchangeable. The protocompound of *batbat* is *mabatbat*, and that of *ff* is *mamabatbat*, leaving the root whole; and consequently, neither the verbal, because the first is *pamamabatbat*, [probably meant to be only with one *ma*] and that of *ff* is *pamamabatbat*, etc.

Neither are they interchangeable in the passive, because *pamatbatan*, preterite *pematbat*, is not the same as that of *ff*, which is *pamabatbat*, *pemabatbat*; nor is this passive, *pamabatbat* of the protocompound interchangeable with the action of *to command someone to whip*, which is also *pamabatbat*, if one bears in mind that the action has no tenses while the protocompound has. The conjugation of protocompounds and verbals is the same in the different significations of *pa*, which is not *ff*, but the meaning is different, as I said there. See those meanings.

Many of them have another verbal, which made me break my head trying to understand, and I pray God not to allow me to make a mistake here. It is *pamapa*; for example, *PAMAPAutang*, *PAMAPAbatbat*, *PAMAPAsucul*, *PAMAPARAñgal*, *PAMAPAtoto*, *PAMAPAbalo*, *PAMAPAsaup*, *PAMAPAyurali*, *PAMAPArusa*, *PAMAPAlasa*, etc., to understand which, you have to know that these protocompounds of *pa* admit frequentatives, like the ordinary procompounds; for example, *pautang*, to lend, protocompound *mamautang*, to lend to many; frequentative, *mamamautang*, go on lending, preterite *memamautang*; passive *pamapautang*, *pemapautang*, because there is no other possible way of distinguishing it from those explained earlier.

Given this backdrop, the verbal of this frequentative is differentiated only from its passive, in that it is considered as a noun, which has no tenses, just as the verbal *pama* is differentiated from the passive of the simple protocompound of *pa*, which is also *pama*, as I said; now, if someone becomes poor due to continuously lending, *PEMAPAUTANG na ing sablang bandi na*, which is preterite, you will say it with the verbal: *meluca ya itang tauo uli ning PAMAPAUTANG na quing sablang bandi na*. You will philosophize this way with the rest, keeping the rules proper to

each one.

Finally, just as the verbals are abbreviated, as we said, for example, *pamanyatang*, *pañyatang*, etc., so here also the simple verbals of *pa* are abbreviated; for example, from *pamacalolo*, *pacalolo*; and the same with others, although not with all.

### Section 3 Other Meanings of the PA

This particle is also used in referring to things of minor importance. First, to indicate a whole year, and it has a future and a preterite; for example, *PABANUA* or *PEPABANUA ca carin*, you will be or you were there for one year: and so *pabulan* or *padomingo* and no more, because to say *one whole day* they use the adverb *patiñgapun*, *pepatiñgapun*, *inapon*; *napon*, the whole day yesterday. Following this pattern, if it is already sunset today and I have not yet eaten, I will say: *INAPON ngeni e co mengán*, the whole day today, I have not eaten.

Also: *paca*, *pepaca* (looks like *paca*) joined to some roots which express time indicates that it is delayed long: for example, *PACABENGI ca carin*, you are there until late at night; *pacatas yang aldao magmisa ing Pari*, when the priest says mass, the sun is already up; they say *PEPACASALACANG minuyao* to one who arrived late in the day to make *bubuyao* when the *denas* are already full; and so *pepacalambat*, *pepacaliuag*, etc.

Also: with a few roots; for example, *tangis*, *aclis*, *saua* become adjectives which mean an insignificant and needy aspect of the root and is applied only to a child; for example, *PATANGIS ya*, he is a cry-baby; *PAYACLIS ya*, he is a bawler; *PASAUA ya*, he is a spoiled brat, *nanu ne CAPATANGISAN a anac ini!* Or *quepatañgisan*: how spoiled this cry-baby is! etc.

Also: flowing from *pa*, although it looks like *pay*, is that Kapampangan pattern which is equivalent to our Spanish *to put oneself* or *to put something* in that which the root says; and also with *pati*; for example, *PAYALDO ca*; *PAYAMBON*, put yourself in the sun or stay in the drizzle, with its preterite *pepa*, and it also admits the passive *facere fieri*, for example, *IPAYALDO* or *IPAYAMBON mitang danum*. And so *patingangin*, breathe clean or fresh air; *patiñgañginan* or *pepatiñgañginan*, the place, like the wharf; and so *patiñgoro*, near the fire; but *patiñguran* or *pepatiñguran* has no passive. *Paintulut*, to allow, first *that which*; third, *with whom*; *paindaton*, to rest, *paindatonan* or *pepaindatonan*, the place; *PAINQUINIAN me queni*, see if he wants to come here; it has a preterite.

Also, it means *more* or *still*; for example, *atin PA?* is there some more? or is there still? *Batbatan me PA* or *itas mo PA*, whip him more or still, or lift it further or still; and from here other patterns of speaking follow; for example, *daratang co pa*, I am still coming; that is, I have just arrived; *cuan me PA ita*, take that first; *muna PANG matay bayo micasala*, death rather than sin; to die first, etc: *nanu PA?* what else? what more? *mamon co PA po*, I will still say goodbye; or better, I

will not yet say goodbye, because with *pa* he says that his departure is not of the smoke, or his coming back that of sardines; and so you will understand *pasangtabi co PA po; lacuan da ca PA po*, etc.

Also: it means what we refer to as extending *until*; for example, even the king kissed the hand of that poor man, *pepasiama la quing gamat na*, for example, *manga PA quing ari*. Another: talking of the crime of *lese-majeste* of the parents, the children and up to the grandchildren share in it, *alimo ilang maua ding anac nun e PA naman ding cacayapoa ra*. Another: the horse, including the chair, cost me, for example, twenty pesos; or better still, including the chair and everything; *manga PA quing sia*, etc.

Lastly, it is equivalent to our Spanish of comparison, *how much less*; for example, you cannot lift that small stone *how much less* that big one? *e me abuat iyang batong mainsac, iyang PANG abuat mitang maragul?* if you cannot bear the insult, *how much less* can you bear the eternal torments? *nun e mo abatang capalmuran, iya PANG abata mong lasang alan angga?* you cannot bear this fire here, *how much less* that of hell? *e mo abata ing api queti sulip, iya PA CASING abata mo ing api quing infernos?* The adverb *casi* is joined to it, but the force of the expression is in *pa*.

Only by following the pattern can you use the particle to say also the equivalent of our Spanish *how much more*; for example, if this small stone defeats your strength, *how much more* will that big one? *nun saul na ca sicanan niyang batong mainsac, ita PA CASING batong maragol a manyaul quing sicanan mo?*; *nun pasaquita na ca ning capalmuran, iya PA CASING e macapasaquit queca ing lasa alan angga? nun palasa na ca ning api queti sulip, iya PANG palasa queca ing api quing infernos? etc.*

With the adverb *cano* placed before the said particle, we also express either of the two Spanish expressions, namely, *how much more*, *how much less*, but it must also indicate always the basis for comparing one with the other. If those bases are placed to express diminution, it expresses *how much less*, if to exaggerate, *how much more*; for example, this road is not dangerous, *how much less* if you are with many people, *alan pangañiban queang daralanan, CANO PA'T dacalang tauong yabe mo*; this road is dangerous, *how much more*, passing by alone, *manganib iyang daralanan CANO PA'T ala can yabay?* Another: for example, I complain about Pedro, because he does not like to lend me even though we are friends, *how much more* considering that I had lent him, *CANO PA'T ibat co neng pepautangan*, etc.

# CHAPTER 13

## THE COMPARATIVES AND SUPERLATIVES AND OTHER PARTICLES RELATED TO THEM

### Section 1

[Erroneously labeled “3” by the original]

**Anti, Tinti, Maguin, Mala, Tela**

This language does not have comparative nouns like [the Latin] *melior* [better], etc. They are formed with the positives, which are adjectives; for example, Pedro is better than you, *MAYAP ya queca y Pedro*; you are worse than he, *MARAUACA queya*; you are more learned than I, *BIASA ca caco*, and the same with the rest; however, for greater emphasis, they usually add the particle *pa* to all of them; for example, Pedro is braver than Pablo, *y Pedro MATAPANG ya PA can Pablo*.

You already know that in Latin the comparatives are also formed by the positives and the adverb *more* (*plus* or *magis*). The same is true with Kapampangan, using these adverbs *lalo* and *lacuas*; for example, *y Pedro LACUAS yang matapang can Pablo* or *LALO yang matapang y Pedro can Pablo*, Pedro is braver than Pablo, and the same with the rest.

### ANTI

The simple comparatives, that is, those which do not mean an excess, but equality or similarity, need more explanation. Starting with an absolute comparison, for example, *he is big like you*, etc., it is formed with the adverb *anti*, which means *like*, which is comparing. Its rule is to put what is compared in the nominative, the one to whom he is compared in the accusative, or nominative, inserting the adverb *mo* between *anti* and the nominative; for example, he is big like you, *maragul yang ANTI queca* or *ANTI MO ica*; you are brave like him, *matapang cang ANTI queya* or *ANTI MO iya*; Pedro is holy like Juan, *banal ya Pedrong ANTI can Juan* or *ANTI MO y Juan*; love your neighbor as yourself; *caluguran meng paramung tauong ANTI MO queca* or *ANTI MO ica*.

When the comparison is made using any of the adjectives of *ma*, which are composed of the abstracts which express qualities and not passions; for example, *beauty*, *bravery*, *fewness*, *greatness*, etc, they are not only formed the way explained here and using the particle *ca* of equality; but also, by starting with *anti* and changing the *m* of the adjective to *c*, using the abstract; for example, he is brave like you, *ANTIA queca CATAPANG*, or *ANTIA que CATAPANG* or *catapañgan* or *tepanan*, etc., because to say *he is brave like you* means the same as to say *the bravery is like you*; and the same with the rest.

## TINTI

When the subject or the nominative, which is compared, is plural, they use the adverb *tinti* instead of *anti*; for example Pedro and Pablo are big like you, *di Pedro ilang Pablo TINTI la queca pangaragol*; those posts are like these ones, *detang asias a deta TINTI la queni*; these inkstands are like those ones, *dening paltintan a deni TINTI la carean*. With this one, you never place in the nominative that to which something is compared, as with *anti*.

## MAGUIN

Comparisons indicating *depth*, for example, *it is as cold as hail*. That one is not said as well said with *anti* as it is with the particle *maguin* (of which we will speak in the next chapter); for example, leave it until it becomes as cold as hail, *manggan MAGUIN lipat ya*; its preterite is *meguin*; for example, white like snow, *meguin ubod*; sweet like honey, *meguin pulot*, and so *meguin atdo*, *meguin tiban*, *meguin baya*, *meguin pantis*, etc.

## MALA

When the comparison is of the shape or features, it is not as well said with *anti* as it is with the particle *mala*; for example, they refer to the shoulder blade as *MALA bagsay*; it has a shape like that of the oar; of the stomach, *MALA tulud bangcal*; of the ankle, *MALA bulacus*; of a certain big earthenware jar, *MALA tapayan*; of a certain crocodile with a shape of a knife, *MALA palang*; of the seeds of hard guavas, *MALA yabbias*; of the soft ones, *MALA nasi*; you are big like a *baral* [?], *MALA yatcan ca*; when the sun is like a *tiquin* [?] high in the west, *MALA yatcan ya*; in the east, *MALAyatcan ya quing aslaga na*; *MALA tacday*, heavy like an arm of that wood, or the arms of those trunks of the guavas.

## TELA

When the comparative *like* expresses a *very remote similarity*, they use the particle *tela*; for example, *like a city*, *like gentlemen*, *like horses*, they celebrated something *like a fiesta*, etc.: *TELA tauo*, like a man, like an appearance of him, *TELA banua*, like the sky, that is the sky as a bell tent *TELA macanano man*; *TELA bundoc*, mountainlike hump on the road, etc.

## Section 2

### The Superlatives

In the particle *ca* of the abstracts, we placed the most elegant and most appropriate superlatives which consist in doubling the root of the abstract, regarding some cases, and, regarding others, in expressing the negation of the defective verb *ala* with the *ca* of *coequal*, for example, *ing Guinu tang Dios iyan CACAYAP CAYAPAN A ALANG CACAYAP* or *CABANAL CABANALAN YANG ALAN CAYANTI ampon CASAMPAT SAMPATAN A ALAN CASAMPAT* or *CATULAD* or *CAYALINBAUA* or *CADUA* or *CALUPA*, most beautiful, no one like him.

You already know that in Latin the superlatives are formed with the positive and the adverbs *very* or *most* (*valde* or *plurimum*); also in this language, with their corresponding adverbs; for example, he is most handsome; *MASAQUIT yan masampat* or *masampat yan BINA*, or *masampat yan E MUNANO* or *masampat yan BINANG BINA*, or *MASAMPAT yan MASAQUIT A MASAQUIT* or *masampat yan masampat*; *MASAQUIT a BINAN masampat* or *masaquit e munano* or *masampat yan dili na*; and this is true with the rest.

## CHAPTER 14

### VARIOUS PARTICLES

#### Section 1

#### MAGUIN

Its present is *maguin*, the *ma* with a somewhat long accent; its future *maguin*, pronounced fast, preterite *meguin*, verbal *pamaguin*. To form the passive, change *m* to *p*; it admits the first, *the motive*; the third, *the object*. It is attached to the roots of nouns and verbs, as you will see in the examples. Its way of signifying consists in saying that the subject or nominative becomes or is converted into that which is expressed by the noun or verb to which it is attached; but such a conversion is never true, but figurative or assumed, as if saying, for example, I wish that this copper inkstand would be changed into gold, *nun MAGUIN guinto ya sa ining paltintan*; from here flow the comparatives that we mentioned; for example, of the one who has a high fever, we say he has become a live coal, *MEGUIN baya ya*, *MEGUIN calang ya*, he has become a live coal or a stove; you now see that this conversion is only metaphorical.

Following this pattern, we say: *MAGUIN tauo ya*; and to exaggerate, *MAGUIGUIN tauo*, it acts as if it were a man; *e ca sa MAGUIGUIN matunud anac*, predatory animal with no hair, do not act as if you were an adult; and so, *MAGUIN masican*, *MAGUIN biasa*, *MAGUIN matapang*; *MAGUIN mua ya*, he appears angry without being so; *MAGUIN e bisa*, it is understood that *bago alan buri nang aliua*, like a maiden who says she does not like to get married, or the physician the tip, or the Mexican, chocolate.

It is formed with *maca*, as said by Sio. *Iyan MECA PAGUIN bato quing caladua mo*, that thing has turned your soul into stone, meaning, it has made it like it in hardness. Its passives, as I already said, the first, *the motive*; for example, *nano PAGUIN* or *PEGUIN matapang mo*? Third, *the object*; for example, *e mo co PAGUIN matapang nan*; *e mu co PAGUIN moan* or *PAGUIN tauo nan* (notice the *n*), do not make me believe that you are brave; do not pretend that you are angry; that you are a man.

It is also formed with *mag*: *magmaguin*; it is the *MAG* of *intent* or *resolve*; for example, *MAGMAGUIN banal ya*, *MAGMAGUIN matula ya*, *MAGMAGUIN malungcut ya*. This last one is like the heir who cries, and the first one like someone who has a lot to hide. The passives are the same: *emo e mo co PAGMAGUIN MALUNGCUTAN*, do not purposely make me believe that you are sad, do not pretend to me that you are sad, because, for example, I know that you are contented like Easter; and the same with the rest.

## Section 2

### PAY

This particle has an intransitive meaning. Present and future *pay*, preterite *pepay*. Its mode of signifying is *ultra facere* [*to do something freely*], that is, to do as one pleases or as one feels like, of one's own accord; for example, *payluca*, *pepayluca*, he who becomes voluntarily poor; *paybaba* or *paycumbaba*, he who humbles himself at heart; and also he who bows or stoops voluntarily. Of Christ our Lord who offered himself to the torturers, *quia ipse voluit* [*because he willed it*], *PEPAYBATBAT ya*, *PEPAYLASA ya*, *PEPAYMURA*, etc., and one can also say without doubt, *PEPAYMATE ya*, he died of his own free will, etc.

And even if this particle is applied to one who is in despair, *PEPAYMATE ya*, *PEPAYBATING ya*, *PEPAYPULID ya*, he killed himself, he threw himself over a cliff because he willed it, and he had this bad choice, what is the problem in saying that about Christ, because he willed it or had the good, the very good desire to do so? Because many barbarians threw themselves into the flames, *PEPAYTANGAB la*, we could say that St. Polonia threw herself into the fire, *PEPAYTANGAB ya*, etc.

Belonging here are some [verbs] of movement, like *payturo*, *paycay*, *payparalaya*, *payparoba*, *paypañgolo*. These four are the four parts of the world: that is, to go towards the east or west, etc. *Paytas*, to ascend, go up.

## Section 3

### SI and PASI

This particle *si* is the same as the Latin *unusquisque* [*everyone*] and the Spanish *cada uno* [*each one*]; with the difference that this one always means plural and the noun to which it is attached is doubled [sic; the examples he gives do not tally with the rule he gives]; for example, *sibabalayan*, every town; *sicacatauo*, each person; *sipipinduan*, each kind, *siisipisip*, *sicacayarian*, every kingdom, *sicacayocoman*, each municipality, etc. It is formed with *mi*: for example, *MISIBABALAYAN la dening mangapia*, these prominent figures belong to different towns respectively; *MISIPIPINDUAN la dening bilusan a imalan*, these pieces are different from one another; *mil[*l*]e hominum species; velle suum cuique est* [*there are so many kinds of people, and so each one differs from others in what he wants*]; *MISISIPINDUAN la ding tauo inya MISISIBURIAN la ngan*.

This composition has passives, but no tenses; for example, *SIBUBURIAN da ing pamañapat da*, each one wants to do things his own way; *ing masulit SIBIBIASNAN, ali PISISICNANGAN*, meaning, *one who understands prefers dexterity to force*; *ing mabayat SISISICNANGAN*, what is heavy is for the one who has strength; *ing pamañapat quing quecaldan, ali SILULUCSUAN*, that is, *to work for the common good, no one should throw his body out*, etc.

## PASI

This is formed by the above-mentioned *si* and the particle *pa* of influence, and becomes *pasi*; preterite *PEpasi* or *PEsi*; verbal *PAMIpasi*; it is always active and refers distributively to all and each one by itself; for example, work, all and each one of you, *PASIDAPAT cayo*; whip, each and every one, *PASIBATBAT cayo*; *omnes vos fugam capietis in hac nocte* [all of you will flee tonight], *PASITACAS co ñgan ñgening beñgi*; *PESITACAS la*; and so, *PASISICLAUD cayo*; *pasipulay*, *pasipañgadi*, etc.

Together with the *vicenales* [words indicating the number of times] and the particle *tolo*, it expresses the number of times the action is done; for example, *PASITOLO MISAN cong mañyiclaud*, all of you, kneel down, each one once; *PASITOLO CALADUA cong matbat quea*, all of you, whip him, each one two times; and the same with the rest. *Magpasimola*, *migpasimola*, be the first to do; for example, *MAGPASIMOLA cang dapat*, be the first one to begin, so that others will follow you; *magpasiona*, *migpasiona*, to go ahead, like a captain or guide; also, it is said of one who goes ahead and confesses his fault to the superior before anybody reports him.

## Section 4

### PAL

This particle is joined to nouns and verbs, and with it, we make adjectives that indicate that the subject has what the root expresses as a *habit* or a *vice*; for example, *palsumpa*, one who swears habitually; *paltangis*, one who cries habitually; *paltacas*, one who escapes habitually; *palinum*, drunkard; *palpaninum*, a heavy drinker; *palpaquiamanu*, quarrelsome; *palpicasala*, sinner; and it is attached to the *MI of company*, for example, *palpiyamanu*, quarrelsome group; *palpigaga*, naggers, like married spouses, who do not love each other; and so, *palpitua*, arguing partners, but it has to be one against the other; *palpacaili*, one who laughs often, etc.

If you want to exaggerate, place *ma of abundance* before the combination, for example, *mapalpaquisabi*; *mapalpaquiamano*; *mapalpaquitua*, etc.; all have *ca* and *an of characteristic*; for example, *capalpaquisabian*; *quepalpaquisabian*; for example, *nano neta*; *QUEPALPAQUIYAMANUAN a tauo iyan!* you translate that yourself in Spanish; *paltudturan*, one who sleeps often; *paltungduan*, one who is habitually sleepy like an old man during the sermon; *palñgeungan*, a cat which meows very often; *palcaungan*, a dog which barks very often; *palsumbuñgan*, a habitual accuser, as a boy in school. Now you see that these frequentatives, which express *passion* or passivity rather than *action* or activity, admit *an* if it is no longer the future of the third passive. [Passion is the process of receiving the action. Action is the process of doing.]

When this particle is attached to nouns expressing things which have a place destined for them, and *an* is attached to the end, or to say it better, when you put it in the future tense of the third passive, they become nouns of place where those things are put; for example, from *asin*, *paliasinan*, salt cruet, *paliaslaman*, vinegar cruet; *palsingsiñgan*, ring finger; *paltintan*, inkstand; and so, *palbunbuñgan*, *palgauran*, *palcarañgan*, *paliabiasan*; *palbebeuan* is a place which they roof over and where they grind rice.

## Section 5

### TALA

This particle is most appropriate to form nouns of occupation, especially when that which the subject is dealing with is not his own, but that of the one whom he serves, as a page, a chaplain, a slave, a laborer or a servant, like a shepherd who does not watch his own sheep, but those of his master. This composition is formed with *tala* and the verb which indicates that thing; bear in mind that, even if it carries the Spanish *de* [English *of*], like shepherd *of* the sheep, etc., the sheep, etc. must always be in the accusative.

If the verb to which it is attached is simple, all what one has to do is attach the particle (*talacumit*, keeper) and say of what (*caring cambing*, of goats), in the accusative, because the genitive of these is infallibly that of the boss whom one serves in them, for example, *ing angeles a TALACUMIT NING Guino tang Dios CARING caladua ding tauo*; so that, if you want to put a word in the genitive, it has to be *the master*, then the verb with its case or the compound; for example, *stevedore*, *talapagdala*. This having been said, remember that all the nouns of office or verbs that express them can be formed into this composition; for example, *talapagmisa*, as the chaplain, *talapanimona*, as a page; *talatauli*, as a servant; *talasungco*, as a *bilango*, and in short, if you keep the meaning of each term, this rule is totally universal; for example, *talapañgan*, idler; *talaralit*, *talasulat*, *talapanorot*, *talasuyo*, and all their relatives.

Attached to nouns, like those referring to weapons, it means to carry them; for example, *talabaryl*, *talatandus*, *talasundang*, etc., and also *talalibro*, *talapaluca*, *talapingan*. All of these become verbs with *mag*: *magtalabaryl*, etc. If you insert *ca* between *tala* and the root, it indicates propensity, inclination, ease; and, well, you will give the Spanish equivalent to each of them, because it is impossible to give them in one stroke; for example, *talacaranup*, often hungry, like a tuberculosis patient, *talacao*, often thirsty, like a tubercular; *talacasalun*, sickly; and the same pattern, *talacarunut*, *talacatagco*, *talacarinay*, *talacalis ya*, *talacamura*, *talacatalusad*, *talacasumbal*, *talacasumpung*, *talacamusing*, *talacapalid*, *talacalilo*, *talacagaga*, *talacasudsuran* (take note of that *n*), *talacalasing*, *talacalili*, etc.

## Section 6

### MELA

This particle indicates a coordination or conspiracy of many to do what is expressed by the root to which it is attached; the root is always doubled, and the subject *in favor of* or *against whom* has to be in the nominative, and the doers in the accusative; for example, *MELASASABI ya caring malda*, he is the talk of the town; *MELAPUPURI ca caring tauo*, everybody praises you; *MELAMAMATA ya*, many people admire him.

Following this pattern, *melayayamanu*, *melacocucu*, *melasusungco*, *melasusugo*, *melapapangan*, *melainum*, *melacacalacal*, *melasasagmit*, *melalauay*, *melagagagtal*, *melagagaga*, *melapapangusap*, etc. Its origin is *mala*, if you want the future.

## Section 7

### SANG

This particle indicates total equality or similarity of the things in that which the root expresses; and it always goes with the *MI of company*, and therefore with another doer. When the roots to which they are attached can be verbs, they admit the second passive; for example, these two statues are the same in beauty, *MISANGSAMPAT la dening aduang larauan*; *PISANSAMPAT no ning maestro*, the master made them equally beautiful; *MISANGCABA cata*, you and I have the same height. You already know that, with the *MI of company*, if there are more than two, it is doubled; for example, *MISASANG ibpa la ngan detang sablang anac*, all of these boys are the children of one father, etc.

You already know also that the companions of this *mi* are joined with *ca*; for example, *misang CALAPAD*, things that have in the same breadth; *misang CALUPA*, of the same face. *Misang buri*, those who like the same thing, and those who get married against the will of their parents, does not admit *ca*, but, yes, *micasanglub* and *micasang metung*. To refer to the relationship of only one to another, drop *mi*; for example, *CASANG indo mo ya*, he is like you as regards the mother, that is, he is your brother in the womb, you are of the same mother; and so *casanglapad*; *casangdacal*; *casanglub*, etc. They also admit *maqui*, like the rest of *company*; for example, *MAQUISANGMANA ya quecami*, he has an equal share of our inheritance and the first passive, *IPAQUISANMANA me quecami*, make him share our inheritance, etc.; *IPAQUISANCABA* or *IPAQUISANLAPAD me ini*, etc.

## Section 8 NGAN

This is always attached to the end; it comes after a noun or a pronoun or a verb, and it means *all of it* or *all of them* in all cases; for example, *iquengan*, all of us; *icongan* or *icayongan*, *ilangan* or *ilanangan*, all of them; *mimin ngan*, all is consumed; *miminangan*, like chocolate; *paliuas noNGAN*, all, for example, were traitors; *micasala NONGAN ding tauo, omnes peccaverunt* [all have sinned]; *sumisi TANGAN*; *iya nasa*.

### Last Section

## Section 9 PANGA

This one has important roles. The first is to express the passive aspect of the verbal correlative to the active aspect in all the transitive verbs; for example, *ing pamamatbat quing anac*, the action of whipping the child. The passive aspect is *ing pangabatbat NA*, always in the genitive; *ing PANGABAT quing pasbul*, the action *ing PANGACABAT ning pasbul*; *pangatandus*, *pangacabat*, *pangatabac*, *pangapaluca*, etc. An exemption is *pangagli*, which is always verbal active, the act of conceiving, and so it requires an accusative for the thing conceived, and this is the reason why to say *the Conception of Our Lady*, we say *the action of Saint Anne's conceiving Our Lady*, *ing PANGAGLI NANG Santa Ana CANG nuana a Virgen*.

With all the roots which become neutral verbs of *ma*, it also indicates passivity or passion [the process of receiving the action] prescinding from activity or action [the process of doing the action], for example, *mesira yang bangca*. The process of receiving the action, *ing PANGASIRA na*; and so, *pangarunut*, *pangabuloc*, *pangabilog*, *PANGATUBO ning bulan*; *PANGACATI* or *PANGATI ning danum*; *PANGASLAG*, *PANGALBUG ning aldo*; *pangatula*, *pangaluncot*, etc. With the roots of *immanent acts* [that is, acts with no direct objects], using this *panga* is the same as using the verbal active; for example, *ing PANGATALI co* means the same as *ing PAMITALI* or *PAMANALI co*; *ing PAMANGATNGA co* is the same as *PANGAYATNGA co*; *pamanyatang* or *pangaratang*, *pamanipa* or *pangatipa*; although this last one can also be a passivity.

With all of them, it also means *the way* or *the point* or *as soon as*.

The way: for example, *masampat ya PANGATABAS ining bangca*, this banca is well cut; *macanano ing pangasira na?* in what way or how was it destroyed? But bear in mind that this mode can also indicate the cause: *what was the cause of its destruction?* Another: *nanong PANGARACSA na?* It can mean *how did it fall?* that is, *who was the cause?* and also, *how was its fall?* asking the way he fell, that is, *if he fell feet first or head first*. If he gives the reason why he fell, he will say:

*uling mitaquad ya*, because he stumbled; if he indicates the manner he will say, for example, *macatalindiquing ya*, sidewise or on his side; and the same with the rest; and you will add to the verbal active its correlative, this concept of cause or motive, because, although we said that it indicates the way; for example, *macanano ing PAMAMATBAT na?* we do not ask with the *nano*, *NANO ing PAMAMATBAT na?* what was the cause of his action of whipping?

To indicate *the time* or *the point in which*, you must pronounce *panga* fast; for example: *PANGABUSNGI ning pasbul*, the pronunciation even, means, as we have said, *the passive opening of the door*; but pronounced fast, it means *as soon as*, for example, *PANGABUSNGI ning pasbul, patayan mo ya*; and so, *PANGATI ning danum, maco ta na*; and this pattern applies to the rest.

When it is attached to substantive nouns like *God, angel, man, soul, horse, wood* and *stone*, etc., this particle expresses the essence of that thing, for example, *pangadios*, the essence of God; *pangayangel*, the essence of angel; *pangacaladua*, the essence of soul; *pangatauo*, the essence of man; *pangadamulag*, the essence of carabao; *pangabato, pangadutung, pangaguintu, pangapilac*, etc.; and so *pangaarcangel, pangaserafin, pangacastila, pangaholandes, pangaindio, pangapugot*, etc.

With *pangatauo*, they don't refer only to the essence of man, but also to his quality or nobility, as we hear again and again: *maragul a PANGATAUO*; and no more. Although when I once asked someone *nanong PANGATAUO mo?* meaning *what is your status?* he answered: *I am exempted* [from paying taxes]. In place of *pangadios*, they also say *cadiosan*.

The abstract forms of qualities, like *whiteness, blackness, ugliness, beauty, goodness, wickedness*, etc. do not admit *panga* to refer to those things because, although they admit *panga*, it is in order to express the state of receiving the action or the change of the genitive in what the root says; for example, *tulid*, straightness and the material admit *panga*: *pangatulid*; but it refers to either the mode, for example, how I straightened the rod by turning it, for example, towards the opposite of where it was formerly bent; or it refers to the change of the situation; for example, *ing PANGABUCUT na quetang cay, PANGATULID na mua ngeni*, and the same with the rest.

We now go to the concept of *tulid*. If you *are entitled* to something, like a material thing, you have *catuliran* [the *right* to that something]. This concept does not admit *panga*. But if you talk of essence, if you want to refer to that which makes *tulid* what it is, then you can use *panga*; *pangacatuliran*, the essence of rectitude or of justice. I do not know of any other abstract which admits *panga* in this group.

# CHAPTER 15

## THE ADVERBS

### Section 1

#### Adverbs of Place

Like us, these natives mark the boundaries of lands and point out the areas in relation to the four parts of the world: *paralaya*, east; *paroba*, west; *pangolo*, north; *mauli*, south; and when they use these words in answering any of the interrogative adverbs, for example, *where is it?* they do so with neither an infix nor an article: *nu caring ing sarolan mo?* where is your rice paddy? *caring PARALAYA*, or *MAULI*, etc.

This having been presupposed, the first interrogative adverb of place is *where?* This is expressed with two adverb phrases, which are *o carin* or *no carin*: for example, where is Pedro? *O ya CARIN* or *NO ya CARIN y Pedro?* You notice that the pronoun is inserted between them. I do not know where he is; *tabalo non O ya CARIN* (the *non* is added). *NON O ya CARIN y cai?* and also *NON O ya minay?* They are two ways of saying *where might Dick be* or *where must Dick have gone?* An alternative pattern uses *mag* and *mi*; for example, if you come to my convent and I ask you *nu ca MAGSILID?* or *nu ca MAGCARIN?* in what room will you stay or be? (this is also the way to ask in what room do you live); anywhere, *no man carin*, or wherever you assign me, *nu mo co man icarin* or *IPAGCARIN* or *nu co man MICARIN*; *ing sano man PICARINAN mo canaco*, etc.

If the answer uses the adverbs of place *queni*, *queti*, *queyan*, *queta*, the rule requires the use of the particles *ni*, *ti*, *ta*; if specific names are mentioned, use neither an article nor an infix; for example, they are in Bacolor, *carin ya Bacolod* or *tiyo Bacolod*; the same with these: *balay*, *sulip*, *lalam*, *babao*, *banua*; if with the appellatives because they are specific, say it with *quing*; for example, *carin ya* or *tiyo QUING dayat*, etc. and this rule goes with all adverbs.

When the question is not about the *place*, but about *the thing* or *the person* you miss, you do not say *o* or *no carin*; instead, you follow the pattern illustrated by the examples, for example, I miss the box which I left on the table; I will tell the boy: *NUN TAYO* or *NUN TE itang polvosan?* Where are the other boys? *NUN TALO* or *NUN TO deang anac?* Bear in mind that it is better to start with the abbreviations and finish with those which are not. When the question carries or includes what the Spanish would say *already*, we use *na*, *ne*, *no*; for example, *NON ta NANG canauan mo na capila na?* where now is that enjoyment or the good life, which you had just a few days ago? where now is that beauty of yours? *nunta NETang leguan mo?* where now are your aides? *nun taNO ding talasuyo mo?* to finalize: *nun taNA ya?* *nun ta nun taNAyo?* *Nun taNAla?*

*To where.* This is used like the previous one, but without the *carin*; for example,

where are you going? *O ca umay?* or *nu ca umay?* *payque la Betis*, they will go to **Betis**; or *ume co sulip* or *queni sulip* or *ume co quin dayat* or *carin quing dayat*, etc. *From where?* For example, where have you been? *O ca ibat?* or *nu ca ibat?* **IBAT** *co balay* or *qing balayan*. This *ibat* admits a passive of place in this case; for example, from what town did you come? *ingsanong balayan a IBATAN mo*. I came from Manila, *ibat co Manila* or *carin Menila*; passive: *caring Menilang IBATAN co* or *ing cuidad Menilang IBAT co*, etc.

*Through where*, for example, where did he pass? *O ya dinalan?* or *NO ya dinalan?* I passed by Guagua, *dinalan co Uaua* or *carin Uaua* or *qing dayat* or *carin quing dayat* or *queti* or *queta*; or *dinalan co cari Pedro*, I passed by the house of Pedro and his family; *bucas dumalan ca can Juan*, tomorrow you pass by where Juan is; or *dalanan mu co*, pass by wherever I will be. *Up to where*. This is expressed with either of the two adverbs and the verb *payturo* or *marap* or *payarap*, for example, towards; for example, to what direction did he go? *nu ya PEPAYTURO* or *MINARAP* or *PEPAYARAP?* With its passives: *ingsang PEPAINTURUNA* or *INARAPANA* or *PEPAIARAPANA?* The answer uses different adverbs depending on the place referred to: for example, towards there, **TANGAN** or **NANGAN** *carin*; towards the east, **TANGON** or **NANGON** *paralaya*; towards here, **NANGAN** or **TANGAN** *queni* or *queti*; towards the right, **NANGON** or **TANGON** *uanan*; or *caili*, towards the left; or **QUING** *gulut*, towards the back; or **QUING** *arap*, towards the front; or **QUING** *dayat*, towards the rice paddy, etc.

## Section 2 Adverbs of Time

To begin with, here are some of the above-mentioned adverbs, which are also meant to indicate or point out the time. These are: *queti*, *queni*, *quean*, *queta*, *carin*. The first one indicates the time, in which we are, for example, **QUETING** *aldao a iti*, on this day; for example, Saturday; **QUETING** *domingong iti*, this week in which we are; **QUETING** *bulan a iti*, **QUETING** *banuang iti*, in this month, which is September, and in this year, which is the year thirty-six. [1736].

### QUENI

Referring to *when*, they say **QUENING** *aldao a ini*, which does not mean *on this present day*, but *on the same day*; for example, on the twenty sixth of such month, the galleon leaves; now on this *same day*, the bells will ring, **QUENING** *aldao a ini*, etc.; this is how you should understand *queni*, as distinct from **QUETING** *aldao a iti*.

## QUEAN

To refer to a future time, when something has to be done, they use *queni* and *queyan*; for example, next Monday, *QUENI* or *QUEYAN lunes*; and the same with the week, the month, the year; for example, *QUENI* or *QUEYANG banuang arapan*; *QUENI* or *QUEANG balictaon*, next year; *QUENI* or *QUEYANG capulong banua*, ten years hence, etc.; *QUENI* or *QUEYANG mucom ya ing Guinu tang Jesu Cristo*; *QUENI* or *QUEYANG mate ca*, etc. The *queyan* is also used to refer to a time, which has been mentioned earlier; for example, you talked of Tuesday. etc. *QUEYANG aldao a iyan*, on this same day; and the same with the rest.

## QUETA

It means *at that time*, referred to when you are narrating; for example, *QUETANG cayi, in illo tempore [at that time]*; *QUETANG cañgeñgeanan*, in ancient times; *QUETANG aldao a ita* or *QUETANG bulan a ita*, etc. Hence, it also means *then*; for example, *carin co QUETA*; I was there *then*; and in this, it alternates with *carin*, for example, *QUETANG aldao a ita CARIN ya mecao*; *CARIN pin QUETA depat a ita*; also, without *queta*; for example, *QUENING Lunes* or *QUEYANG Lunes* or *QUENING datang ya*; *CARIN me amanuan* or *CARIN co macao*, then you will scold him, then I will go, etc.

## INYANG

It means *when* in the preterite: *INYANG datang ya*, when he came; *INYANG quetia*, when he was here; *INYANG mate ya indu co*, when my mother died; *INYANG cayi*, at that time; *INYANG macañyan ya*, when he was in that condition; *INYANG mañgari na queta*, etc.

## NON

*When* in the future; for example, *NON datang ya*, when he comes (they usually say *cun datang ya*); this same expression is conditional, because *nun* is also *if*; *NUN datang ya*, if he comes; and this is what it means in these expressions, *NUN wari*, if by chance; *NUN wari man*, and even if given the case; *NUN wari pa man sa*, and even if we would consider it to be the case; *NUN cai* is used to make a distinction, as when you say: *if it is this or it is that*; *NUN nanong daptan*, *NUN quing canaco*, first, *when one does not know what is to be done*; second, *if it is by me or that which is my part*, etc. And although in these expressions *NUN micasala ca pota*, etc., *imolat morin ing mata mo*; *NON e mo pota aquit matalastas, sisian mong casalanan*; *non e ca pota mauili*, etc. *if it is the conditional*, even then, it firmly affirms that the thing mentioned and not another will happen.

## POTA

*Afterwards*; for example: *POTANG gatpanapon* or *POTANG abac*, afterwards in the afternoon, afterwards in the morning; *POTA uaring mauala ya*, is a colloquial expression with which they usually answer when asked about someone; it means, as if he were going to disappear afterwards; *POTA ngeta mayap na ya*, soon afterwards he will already become all right I think; *POTA man uari sang atiyoy't datang nang ala*, this they say when the one whom they have called many times does not come; as if saying: *as if, although he comes, he would bring us all that we lack*. Also: *POTANG e ta isipan caring daratang*, when we do not need it nor we think of it, then it comes; that is, then we remember it; *POTANG caying e ta* or *e te panintunan picasalibad ta* or *ta ya*, when a person is not looking for it or is not looking for him, he finds it, etc. More was said about this in the *maca*.

## NGETA, NANDIN

They mean *a short time back, earlier*, and they usually go together; for example, *ibat ya NGETA NANDIN queti*, he left here a while ago, or *mine ya queti*, he came here. Also: *nandin pota*; this should have happened earlier, it is late afterwards; *NANDING dinatang ya* or *NGETANG dinatang ya, bino na co*, a short time back, when he came, he beat me. Also: *NGETA pa uari*, as if it were now, for example, I remember things I did when I was a child; also, *NGETA mo man maguinabo* says one who is determined to do something and they are holding him back; that is, even if everything turns into ashes; we say: even if we lose more than all. Also: *NGETA pa uari dapat na?* as if it had been only now that he did it. Also, it goes with all the tenses and is affirmative; for example, *non mine co carin, mete na co sa NGETA*, if I had gone there, I undoubtedly would have died; *paqui pota e ca maquiramdang, lumasa na ca NGETA*, since you don't listen to what I tell you, you will undoubtedly pay for it.

## NGENI, NGENINAN. Now.

Now. *Ngeni. ngeni*, now, right now; *NGENING gatpanapun*, now, in the afternoon. Also: it indicates the time *here and now* or the *when* of the present; for example, *NGENING mañyumpa ca* or *NGENING susumpa ca*, at the time of cursing or swearing, etc. Also: given a preceding clause, it means: *and considering*, etc., *NGENI'T pigaganacan co*, etc.

## PAYNAUANDIT and SAMANTA.

For a short while from this moment.

*Samanta* means *while*, taking advantage of the occasion; for example, *SAMANTANG ala luluban ta yang bale ra*, while he is not home, let us enter his house; and to understand it, it is better that the other sentence precede *samanta*, because this one presupposes an opportunity and one takes advantage of it; for example, *manggan ala lo bale ra*, *PAQUISAMANTALANAN tamo*; that absence is the occasion; *dum tempus habemus*, *oPPeremuS bonUM* [should be *oPeremuR bonO*, deponent, subjunctive, followed by dative]. (*while we have time, let us do good*), *dapatan dapat a mayap*, *SAMANTANG maquipanaun*; take advantage of the time, *ing panaun PAQUISAMANTALANAN*. *Samanta* and *samantala* and its passive belong to the same concept.

### CAPILAN? When?

Preterite and future; for example, *CAPILAN ca dinatang* or *datang?* *CAPILANG aldo?* *CAPILANG bulan?* *CAPILAN banua?* what day? what month? what year? *qing bulan a Mayo*, etc. *CAPILAN UARI?* For example, you say: *if I don't repent, I will be condemned*. I answer: *CAPILAN uari*, of course. You complained too much about someone who punished Pedro, and since I approve of his action, I answer you: *CAPILAN uari*, he did not exceed, the man deserved it, etc. Also: *CAPILAN ya pang lalaqui?* when is the heart? [when will this woman's heart throb for a man?] *CAPILAN ca pa sumisi?* when will you repent? *CAPILAN pa, nun e ngeni?* When do you think? Right now, of course! Also: it is equivalent to the Spanish *why?* and this pattern is often used; for example, *CAPILAN e ne patauaran ning Dios ing tauong sisisi?* why would God not forgive someone who repents? *CAPILAN e anti carin?* why will it not be like that?

### PAQUI

For example, *PAQUI dinatang ya* or *datang*, when he arrives, preterite and future; *PAQUI cai*, after that one; *PAQUI galang migulut cacaliñguan mo na*, fear that when you go, you will forget; *PAQUI uari tinatañgis ca e na ca mamayad?* do you think, by crying, you will be excused from paying? *PAQUI pota cacañian ca, mabatbat ca;* *PAQUI balang biñie co sinira mo e ra na ca dianan*, since you destroy everything that I give you, I will not give you anything anymore. Also: it means *being*; for example. *PAQUI indio ya sagan ya*, being an indio, he is weak (*flojo*); *PAQUI capanpangan ya, magmatapang ya*, being a Kapampangan, he is brave (*valiente*); *paqui tagalog ya nun e talaralit, talaterac ya;* being a Tagalog, if he is not fond of singing (*cantarin*), he is fond of dancing (*danzarin*).

### PABLASA

If you interchange the first and second clauses of these examples and use the adverb [sic] *sablasa* or *pablasa*, the respective compound sentences will mean the

same. *Sablasa* and *pablasa* connote congruence and logical consequence. For example, *sagan ya PABLASANG indio ya; talaterac ya PABLASANG tagalog ya; matapang ya PABLASANG castila ya; palyinum ya*, he is a drunkard, *PABLASANG tudesco* [because he is a German]; *maratna ya*, he is modest [*modesto*], *PABLASANG banal ya*, because he is holy; *vidimus gloriam eius* [*we saw his glory*], etc., *aquilala ta nang cacamal-camalanang Guino tamo, PABLASANG anac neng bugtung ning Dios Ibpa, as the only-begotten*, etc. See the enumeration of time.

### Section 3 Asking and Answering Inta, Uli ( gut) [guttural]

*Why? INTANG depat mo itinan? Why did you do this? The immediate answer is with the adverb uli, which means because, affirming; for example, because they ordered me, ULING inutus da caco. Inta is addressed to someone who distrusts, INTA e casi malugud ing Guinutang Dios? INTA caya?, one asks doubting, why would it be so? why will it have been?, the answer that could be given is: ULI INTA caya ñgeti; INTA caya sa; INTA uari; the first refers to a someone who is contented with a certain person whom he did not expect to do such a thing; as someone who says; he might have a reason. INTA caya ngeti? Why would he do that? The second is: why would it be this? For example, what have they done to me? INTA caya sang depat da caquita? The third one says, for example, to the one whom they leave alone to do the work of the group: INTA uari or uari sa bucod co ini? Why will it be this? Is the advantage and the well-being only mine?*

#### INTATA

It is formed with *ta*, which is also for asking; and one asks this way does so not in order to know, but in order to ascertain with the two questions; for example, you do not like to give me money to do business for the two of us, and I ask you: *INTA? Why? In spite of my being trustworthy. INTATA? Why?* If aside from this, you will have the advantage of earning etc. And the same pattern for *INTATA casi*, etc.

#### INTA (pp.)

It means: *get out of here, move out, give place; INTA lisia ca. INTA na*, the mother tells the child who wants to sit on her lap: *move over*, etc.

#### CAYA (gut)

With it, one asks about something one is doubting of, for example, *nino CAYA ita? Who might that one be? Balu mo CAYA ing pañgutang?* The usual answer, and

which also causes anger, although without reason, because it is an expression of the language which to them is all right, even if a son says it to his father, or the *timawa* to the local chieftain, is: *inta pong ali co?* why not, Sir? Why would I not know it? It also means the disjunctive *or*; for example, you *or* Pedro; *ica CAYA o y Pedro CAYA*, either you or Pedro.

## CASI

First, the one who asks a question using this affirms the opposite; for example, *numquid iniquitas apud Deum?* [*is there iniquity in God?*] *tin CASIN cabucuta ning Dios?* Another: do you by chance love your neighbor, if you do not help him in his needs? *caluguran me CASING para moug tauo, nun e me lingunan quing capagcasaquitana?* Can you by chance assure us that you will arrive tomorrow? *sucat mo CASING bitasan quing micabucasan ca?* It is also used for giving reason or excuse; for example, why have you done this? *inutus da co CASI inya depat co*; why do you serve a Chinese? *maluca co CASI po*; why does he cry? *gagagan me CASI*; if you quarrel with him; *buri mo casi* can be that of *being* or that of *asking*; for example, is it possible that you like that? *Buri mo CASI ta?* For example, he gets married to a black woman: *a buri me CASI iyang pugot? ataņgualan co CASI po quea.*

## UALA

It is also used for asking, but implying surprise; for example, have you arrived so promptly? *miras na capin UALA?* if you see someone wearing mourning dress yesterday and today wearing a gala dress, *anti na capin UALA quea!* and are you that lucky? what novelty is this? *tica UALA queti?* you are here? etc.

## BAQUET

It is also used for asking, but as a reprimand or confrontation; for example, *BAQUET tica, e ra ca tiburan?* But why are you here? did I not send you? *baquet e ca maminto? baquet e ca pa mamayad,* etc.

## AYO

It means *and so?* either drawing a conclusion or conscientizing a culprit, for example, if this happens with green wood, *ayo!* what will happen with the dry?; did I not warn you? he answers: yes. *Ayo?*, meaning: well, why did you not watch out? In this sense, it is a good practice to add *BAQUET, AYO, BAQUET e mo iniņgat?* Supposing you call me, *AYO, nanutang buri mo?* Also: to frighten you, I tell you that I will report you to the teacher: *yea?* you answer disappointedly or shamelessly. *Ayo?* and so what? what is the big deal?

## GALANG

It is also used in asking, but expressing doubt, as when the apostles asked: *nunquid ego sum, Domine? is it I, Lord? aco GALANG po ita Guinu co?* Another: I might be the one the police is looking for, *aco GALANG buriran dang dacpan! magca GALANG ica!* or you might be the one; and without asking: *mandilo ca GALANG*, I doubt whether if you will take a bath; *payañgin ca GALANG*, they tell a sick person; *inya GALANG mua ca uli na nita?* Would it be that you are mad because of that? he answers: would I have gotten mad because of that, not because of this? *Iñya GALANG sa mua co uli na nita't, e uli na nini?* Also; *iñya GALANG sa pepautañgan co ya, uling macapamayad ya* says one who cannot collect: *I lent him because I trusted he was going to pay promptly.* Another: I did not call you in order that you would leave me, but in order that you would accompany me. A better style: I called you in order that you would accompany me, and not in order that you would leave me, *inya GALANG sa inaus da ca, ba mo con lacuan at alin ba mo con yabayan?* [Could it not have been that I called you so that you would leave me and not so that you would accompany me?]

With the same, one answers giving an excuse, for example, *ali GALANG sa ing e co matacad; ali GALANG sa ing misalunan co; ali GALANG sa ing matua co*, there was no other reason for my leaving you than that I was sick, I could not walk and my old age, etc; *ali GALANG sa ican lacuas maquibalo queta*, no one knows better than you do, to the one who pretends not to have heard the news.

Also: it is used when, after having seen everything, we compare one with another, weighing the differences: for example, seeing the abundance of rice here, and remembering how expensive it is in our land, we say: *caring GALANG quecami alagang quinto*, it costs silver peso (the indio says gold). On the other hand if we now go to Spain, seeing how expensive rice is, we will remember the Philippines and will say: *caring GALANG Filipinas e la alagang saga*, they give it almost for nothing. And this is so, whatever way, time, place, kind with which you relate the topic where this comparison is made; for example, now there are so many wars; during my time, says the old man, we enjoyed an Octavian peace, *queta GALANG minuna pauang alan piamanuan*, etc.

## O or NO

These two adverbs of place are also interrogative; for example, *O yanti* or *NO yanti casampat* or *caragul*; how beautiful or big is it? and also: *No ta e yanti carin?* why will it not be that way? *NO yanti catas* or *calalam?* how tall? how deep? etc.

## NANAN

It also asks: *NANAN ngeta?* or *NANAN casi?* what can you do? if God wanted it that way? *NANAN ta?* what must a person do? or what must someone do? *NANAN mo co ala co pang pamayad?*, etc.

## NANO

What thing? *NANO pa?* what else? *NANO po?* *NANO sa?* better if they were eggs, what did you think they had to be? *Nano pata*, this is, there is no more, it is finished. *NANO ngeni?* what day is today? like those who will hang (*colgar*) [sic, probably meant *comulgar*, to receive communion] and even if simply: *NANO cano?* What does he say or what do they say? asking, for example, someone who reads or understands them; *NANO caya ngeta pasari ta?* what would a person do in such case? The *balang* can be in any of the tenses; *NANU BALANG?* *NANANU BALANG?* *NUMANU ya ta BALANG queyan?* What can happen to him there? *NINANO ya BALANG?* what thing happened, whatever it be? etc. and also to the root *NANO BALANG co caya?* or *NANO que BALANG?* what does he have to do with me? what do I care about him? *NANO queta balang?* *NANO que uari BALANG?* *Quid mihi et illi?* [What does it have to do with me and with him?] what do I have to do with him? he is not my father, he is not my uncle, he is not my relative, etc.

When formed with *ma* and the adverb *uari*, it means to request, for example, *MANANO UARI po mutus ca*, please let me know what you want me to do; *MANANO UARI po mangan ca*, please eat.

## NANANTA

It is used to answer, giving the reason. For example, how can Christ, being one person, have two natures? *NANAN TANG Dios ya ampon tauo ya*, the reason is that *he is God and man*. Another: why did all men have to be burdened with too much work? *NANANTANG me uala ñgan quing manang casalanan*, the reason is that *they contracted the original sin*; to say *only because of original sin*, answer using *uli*: *ULI ning casalanan a mana ra*.

## YNYA

It means, *therefore*, or *on account of this*; for example, *YNYA e co sinimbaling maquisaquit co*; *YNYA pepailasa ya, ba na catang quinabus*, he suffered for this, to liberate us; and so since *YNYA* means two things, namely, *on account of* and *this*, to show what *this* is, there has always to be a second sentence.

## YNYAPIN

*For this very reason*; for example, because you do not know it, *that is precisely why* I am informing you, *YNYAPIN pabaluan da ca*; *YNYAPIN ya ta*, for this very reason maybe; for example, *YNYAPIN yata minea queti*, maybe that is precisely why he came here; *YNYAPIN yata mimua ya*, I believe, this precisely is why he got mad, etc.

YNYATA or YNYA, NGETA or QUETA This is used to indicate that this or that action is a sign of something, etc.; for example, *there are explosions in Manila at a late hour*, we say: *this is a sign of something new*, YNYATA or YNYA NGETA or YNYA QUETA *merila* [Menila] *tin piglauan*. Another: whenever someone, for example, eats fruit, he contracts fever; he was already all right, and later we see him with fever, we say: *it is a sign that he ate fruits*, INYATA or INYA NGETA or INYA QUETA *malagnat ya meñgan ya buñga*, etc.

### YNYA UARI

YNYA UARI *ñga co, uling, bala cong tutu ita*, I said it because I thought it was certain (*cierto*); YNYA UARI *liguran can biyay ning Dios, ba can micasala?* is this perchance the reason why God gave you life, so that you will sin? better: the end God had for giving you life, was it for you to commit sin? because the concept of *yñya* refers to the end; YNYA UARI *mayap* or YNYA *mayap mine ca queti*, that is: *you came just at the right moment* for the end which we intended, because you, for example, can resolve our doubt. To a thief: INYA MAYAP *tineng capanibalan*, justice came at the right moment to deliver us from this thief, etc.

### YNYA SA (short: SA)

First, it is regular; for example, YNYA SA *depat co quea, ba ya san misip*, the end which I had in doing that to him is for him to repent. Second, it is used to express affectionate complaints, like what Saint Anthony the abbot did to Christ, *iñya sa Jesus co licuan mo co!* how was it possible that you left me, my Jesus! YNYA SA *anti nabqueyang ing amanu mo caco; yñya sa e mo ne pecacalalay bitbat*, says the mother to the father who overspanked the son, etc.

### INTASA or INTACAYASA

They mean the same, but they ask, for example, INTA CAYA SANG *e na ca melugudlugud?* says the same mother; for example, why did you not pity him? INTA SA *e mo co dianan*, why did you not give me? it is all about that is complaining affectionately because of the humble tone of the particle *sa*.

## Section 4 DOUBT AND AFFIRMATION

### YATA

For example, *y Pedro YATA*, I think it is Pedro, I do not affirm it; *atlo la YATA*, I doubt if they are three, etc.; *e yata* is to infer: *according to this*.

## NGETI

For example: is the priest in the room? I think so, *tiyo NGETI; tiyo NGETI Menila; nu yang da NGETI carin itang ana co?* says the mother whose son does not show up. (*Nun misan*) [sic]

## NUN MISAN

It is also about guessing: *NUN MISAN tiyo Baculud*, he must be in Bacolor, I guess. Also: to say *sometimes with reason, at other times with no reason, NUN misan maqui sangcan, NUN MISAN, ala*; it is equivalent to the Latin pattern: *modo vult, modo non vult, sometimes he wants, sometimes, he does not; NUN MISAN bisa ya, NUN MISAN ali ya*; like *ñganang bisa ya, ñganang ali ya; ñganang mitonton co, nganang alico*, sometimes I hit the mark, at other times, I don't.

## AFFIRMING TOTO

*Toto nang toto, catutuan a toto, catutua nang catutuan*, all of them affirm seriously; so much so that they are taken as oath. When they do not presuppose what they affirm, but they foresee it, they put it in the negative; for example, *CATUTUAN nun e ra ca balbalan a buntoc*, truly, if I don't break your head.

## TABANG (A)

*TABANG non e ra ca balbalan a buntuc*; first cousin of the preceding. Also: *TABANG biro man, nun biro biro co*, I certainly am not kidding; and also *TABANG nun e mataba*, they say about a very fat pig; it affirms and seems to deny; *TABANG nan lapasan mong otos ning Dios, mipala ca*, be sure that if you violate God's commandments, you will NOT be happy [*Mipala ca* literally means "you will be happy."].

## PALA

It affirms, but after someone comes to know what he did not know; for example, I presume that you know, and I ask you and I find out that you don't, I will say: *e mo PALA ngeni balo, bala co sang balo mo*, surely you don't know and I thought you did. Another: *magdala ya PALAN sundang ing Pare*, you understand what I mean; very often, it goes with *ngeni*; for example, *melili cata PALA NGENI*, I say this when I realize that we have lost our way; what Alexander said when he found out that he had been wounded, *tauo co PALA NGENI*, now I know for certain that I am a man and not a son of Jupiter. Also joined to it is *pin: ini PIN PALA ngeni*, etc.

## PIN

First of all, it is affirmative; for example, *oua PIN* yes, of course; *iya PIN iyan*, that certainly is he; he is Pedro himself, *y Pedro PIN*; *anti PIN carin*; it has the concept of *itself, same*: *anti na PIN itang sinabi co queca*, it is the very same thing that I told you. Also: *maco ta na PIN ngeni*, presupposing that you are saying it again. Also: when the adverb *naman* is inserted, it means to complete or to do once and for all what was begun; for example, you have not finished what you are doing and you want to leave it; I tell you: finish it once and for all, *balausán mu NA PIN MAN* or *ilud mu NA PIN MAN*. There are two who have not yet confessed, and you are about to stand up; *yarian mu NA PIN MAN*, finish with them once and for all. Also, an opening clause: *abalo mu NA PIN MAN*, now that you already know, etc.; but if it is placed at the end, for example, listen, therefore, so that you will know once and for all, *nun sinabi ra na queca abalo mo NA PIN MAN*; since you want to go, go once and for all, *mena ca PIN MAN*; *ica na pin man*, to someone asking who will do it.

## MO

It affirms, limiting; for example, *danum MO*, water and nothing more; *ya na MO*, nothing else is offered or it is all what is offered; *sisi MONG sisi*, chicks, nothing more; *metung ya MO*, one only; this is like *ali ca pa MO*, *paburian mo pa MO*; *daptan mo pa MO*, etc. Also, with a long accent, it is an abbreviation of *moa*, and it means *also*. See the copulatives.

## DIN

It also affirms and it is about limiting; for example, *iya mo RIN*. You will also hear *iya mo PIN*. The first means *he is, he always* [he is still the one]; the second, *he himself only*; [he is the only one]. and so *din* looks at the action, *pin* looks at the subject: *din* is equivalent to our Spanish *siempre* [still]; for example, *antia RIN carin*, it is always like that; [it is still that way] *antia PIN carin*, it is really that way; *anti mo PIN queta*, like that very same one; *anti mo RIN queta*, it is always like that one; *mate ca RIN*, you will have to die eventually; *mate ca PIN*, certainly you have to die; *sumisi ca RIN*, you will eventually have to repent always; *nun e ca mamangan dumanup ca RIN*, if you don't eat, you have to get hungry of course, etc.

## NANDING or ANDING or NARING or ARING

They serve to affirm; for example, *NANDING e ra ca balo*, as if I did not know you; that is, I know you well; *NANDING e que pepabualan*, as if I had not informed him; that is, I have informed him, etc.

## NANO MAN or AGUIAMAN CASI

They also affirm. The first one means *you are right* or *it is so, but*, etc. For example, it is good to lend Pedro, so that the next time he will lend you. Answer: That is right, certainly, but I have little money, *NANO MAN CASI, dapot...*, etc.; you can start a business to earn money, that's right, but you will encounter many dangers, *NAMO MAN CASI, dapot*, etc. The second one means *even if it is so*; for example, you are a prominent person, and you serve a Chinese mestizo? I answer: *even if it is so*, what must a man do? *AGUIAMAN CASI numano yang tauo?* This one agrees with the point but says that *in spite of this*, etc.; for example, *why do you want to borrow when you have no money to pay?* He answers: *AGUIAMAN CASI poy, paymate ya casing tauo?* in spite of this, will you allow a man to die?

## CAPALAPA. CAPILAN UARI.

It affirms, meaning *of course*; for example, he who is not a prominent person is a *timaua*; *CAPALAPA*, *of course*: it always refers to a true and clear statement: it is a Tagalog word and it is used by the Kapampangans, although they have their own idiomatic expression for it, namely, *capilan uari*.

## Section 5 PRESUPPOSING

### AMPAT

*Presupposing that*; for example, *AMPAT bitasang mate yang tauo danuna nang pamagcaliñgat, na*, knowing full well that a man has to die, he must watch for it promptly; *AMPAT maquiisip ca, mi gaganaca ca*; *AMPAT e mo balo nun capilan*, since you presumably understand, be considerate; since you presumably do not know when it will be; *AMPAT ume ca carin malaus ca carela*, etc. It goes well with *mo*. *AMPAT MON cabalu mo di Pedro nun meca carin, palugud ca carela*, since you presumably know Pedro and his family, etc. *AMPAT MON matanda ca luñgub ca quing pagaralan*, etc. And placed after: for example, *magcapilit ca aldo bengi, ba can alan guli quing pañgamate mo, AMPAT e MO balu nun capilan*, etc.

### IYAMOA

*Since, inasmuch as*; for example, *IYA MO A't e ca biasa paturu ca*, since you do not know, ask someone to teach you; *IYA MO A't biasa ca ituro mo deang anac mo*, etc.

## BAQUET

*Baquet at, baquet sa, baquet sa 't.* The first two mean *over and above that* or *aside from that*, for example, not only did he cuckold him, he also mauled him, *BAQUET* or *BAQUET AT pepaliuasana ya peluca ne pa*; and so, *BAQUET* or *BAQUET AT e ca susulat, mialung ca pa*; *BAQUET* or *BAQUET AT e ca magyunal, masan ca pa naman bulbulan*; *BAQUET* or *BAQUET AT sulat ya, palpaquitua ya pa*, he is not only stupid, he is also stubborn, etc. *BAQUET* might mean *therefore*; for example, I conclude saying: *and so*, certainly, he would not do such a thing, *BAQUET pin mon e na sucat daptan ita*, etc.

*Baquet sa* expresses a reproach in the form of a comparison; for example criticizing a person's ingratitude and disloyalty to God, by alluding to a dog's loyalty to his master; *BAQUET SA ing aso, BAQUET SA ing ayop, BAQUET quing alimbaua ing*, etc; this is how the weakness of the indio is expressed: *e ca sa batoc at BAQUET SA ing panas dasñganang a ya na*, do not be in a hurry, because we see the ant finally arrive wherever it wants to go; etc. Do not confuse this with that of to agree (convenir) or to take charge (hacer cargos) *BAQUET SA mapanigla ca*, etc.; *BAQUET sa 't e ca biasa megaral ca pa sana, BAQUET SA 'T e ca sinulat dinapat ca san aliua*. You already understand it.

## Section 6 Except

First, it is *pa* with *subali*; for example, whip everybody except Pedro, *batbatan mo ngan PASUBALI can Pedro*; or *y Pedro mon PASUBALIAN mo*, Pedro is the only one you should leave out; or *y Pedro mo ing e me batbatan*, the only one you should not whip is Pedro; or *nun e y Pedro alan e mo batbatan*, except Pedro, there is no one whom you will not whip., etc.

## SUBALI, SUBALI PA, SUBALI SA, SUBAT SA

All of them are *but*, because their meaning is that a person has the intention of doing something and he refrains or he does not carry it out or he does the opposite because a *but* enters the picture; for example, I want to do business, *but* I drop the plan, because I foresee the dangers of the sea, *bisa cong migcalacal, SUBALI maralas ing catagcuan quing dayat malat*. Another: I want to ask Pedro about something and I drop my plan, because I find out that he has not studied, *balu mo caya ining icutang co queca? SUBALI e ca magaral canini*. Another: listen, let me share this information with you, *niyo talastasan mo ininan, SUBALI* or *SUBALI PA e mayap abalo mo* or *e mayap queca*, etc.

Belonging to this pattern are the *but* of murmurers: for example, you are praising Juan and a murmurer comments: *SUBALI sang e matas a lub, SUBAT SAN*

*e malaram*; that is, *except that* or *not considering that* or *aside from the fact that* or *if he were not* [*haughty*], *deceitful*; because with *sa*, it should be in the subjunctive; without *sa*, it affirms absolutely; for example, I want to make him a custodian, *SUBALI macapanacao ya*, but no, because he is a thief, etc. and also in the case, for example, where they want to make me travel and I excuse myself and I say: *SUBALI SAN* or *SUBA'T SAN e co marapat*, *SUBALI SAN* or *SUBA'T SAN ali ining dapat co*, if it were not, or but I have something else to do, etc

### DAPOT

It also indicates making an exception; for example, *DAPOT tauo ya*; *DAPOT banal ya*, all men, all saints, with no exception, etc. are universal distributive propositions, which do not admit of an exception: *DAPOT tauo ya bisa yang canauan*, every man desires rest, etc.

### ARING

It is the brother of *naring* or *nanding*, and all mean the same thing and so one can use any of them; this was forgotten in the words of affirmation, but once you know those, you also know this. I will give one example: *NANDING* or *NARING* or *ARING nun manabo ca quing infiernos, sap mo co*, to say to someone who refuses to accept correction, *as if, if you were you to go to hell, I would have to go with you*; he affirms that he alone will go to hell, etc.

## Section 7 SAYING THE OPPOSITE

### DAPOT

*But*: this is well known. I will give you other Spanish equivalents: e.g. *ding tauong alan tacut quing Dios e re gagauan magcanong infiernos*, *DAPOT SAN* or *DAPOT mo SAN dasngan dang buri ra*, people who do not fear God do not care about the pains of hell *just so as, as long as, provided they* get what they want. Another meaning: for example, *DAPOT tauo ya*, every man or *once* he is a man, was already mentioned in the preceding section.

### BAGCUS

It says the contrary: *quinimo*, on the contrary; for example, *e sucat macasira queca*, *BAGCUS pin macapaldan*, on the contrary, *but rather*, it will do you good. Another way of putting it: *ali mo ing e macasira queca, nun e pa naman macapaldan*, etc.

## BAGO or BAYO

They also express the opposite of something, *although in fact*: for example, he says he cannot pay me *when in fact* he has what it takes, *e na co cano abayaranan, BAGO or BAYO tin pamayad na*. Another: *ala yang sicanan, BAYO or BAGO maragol ya catauan*, etc.

## ACAYA

It expresses the opposite. See irony.

## BISTA, MAN, AGUIAN

They all mean *although* (*man* is always placed at the end); for example, although she is ugly, he likes her, *BISTA* or *BISTA MAN* at or *AGUIA MAN manauang ya lupa, calugurane ya*. Another: *calili na co ning Dios, e co MAN catuliran, BISTA MAN* at or *AGUIAMAN e co catuliran*, etc.

## IMBURIS

*Even if*; for example, *IMBURIS patayan da co, dapot dasngan cong buri co; patayan da co MAN: AGUIAN patayan da co, dapot dasngan cong buri co, even if* they kill me or *although* they kill me, as long as I do what I like. Although materially they say the same thing, formally they are very different concepts. Take note: the first one wants to do what he likes, and he despises life; this one says *imburis*; the others embrace death: and that is their difference.

## ALANGALANG

*Why should*; for example, *ALANG ALANG acon sumut* says the offended party; and among the indios, the older one: *why should I humble myself before him; ALANG ALANG lacuan queng asaua co, uling* etc.; *why should* I leave my wife just for this thing or for that; *ALANG ALANG biasa ca caco* says the teacher to his pupil, *it would be beyond reason or contrary to reason or unreasonable to think* that you know more than I do. Another: *ALANG ALANG mapia ca caco*, says the father to his son; the precise meaning is *it is beneath reason*, it fails to reach the ambit of reason, etc.

## TULA

*This would be too much, this is too much, there is no need for this*; for example, when Christ said: *I will go myself to cure him*, someone could answer,

*TULANG ita Guinu co*, that is too much, Lord, there is no need to go to that extent, your word is enough, etc.; this is its precise meaning when the indio says: *TULA casi ta?* what is the need for this when there are other ways and easier ones, etc.

## BALANG

It is not only *quilibet* [whoever]; for example, *BALANG bisa*; *BALANG capulo, decimus quisque* [every tenth]; *BALANG na, sea lo que fuere* (whatever it would be); *BALANG buri mo*, whatever you would like; *e ra ca BALANG cucutngan, intang maquibat ca?* you are not the one they are asking, etc; *e co BALANG catuliran*, inasmuch as I am not worthy of whichever thing etc. It is also equivalent to *bago* or *bayo*; for example, *e na co cano abayaranan, BAGO* or *BAYO tin pamayad na*; *e na co cano abayaranan, maquipamayad ya BALANG*; and so, *BAGO maragul ya catauan, maqui catauan ya BALANG*; here the word *balang* is equivalent to the Spanish *siendo* [being], and the concept of *ser* [to be]. Also, it is equivalent to the Spanish *ninguno* [no one], although it is expressed by the Spanish *pues que* [are you telling me]; for example, *BALANG dalaga maquipantoc?* that is, no maiden fights; but we say: *are you telling me that even maidens fight?* according to this pattern, *BALANG magaral maquialong?* Are you telling me that those who are studying spend the time playing? *BALANG magyunal masan yan bulbulan?* you mean to say that those who fast eat meat also?

## Section 8 Approximating

### BIDSO

Almost; *BIDSO co sa metay quing pangabaldug co*, I almost died or I nearly met my death; *BIDSU na co sa miliarin capitan*, I almost became or I lacked little to have become a captain, etc.

### BAGUIA, LALAT

Hardly; for example, he hardly reaches up to my chin, *BAGUIA* or *LALAT ya miyalas quing baba co*; hardly has he answered me, when he left, *BAGUIA* or *LALAT ya mecapaquibat caco meco na ya*; hardly reaches the lectern, *BAGUIA ya miyayabat*, etc.; *qing BAGUIANG e magcacabira*, for which it hardly has any importance; *BAGUIA na abubuat ing bitis na*, he can hardly raise his feet, etc.

## LASA. Almost

And usually it goes with *man*; for example, *e ne mangamanu MAN LASA*, he almost does not speak; *e pa mitipa MAN LASA* he almost does not leave the house. Also: *e pa mitipa MAN LASA ing banque na maili na ya*, the dead man has almost not been brought down and the heir is already laughing. And so, *baguia na co LASA apaquibatan*, *e mitnga man a lupa LASA quing datna na*, etc.

## MAGUN

It is also about approximating: *MAGUN icabat me iyang pasbul*, close the door a bit; *maguntuliran mo ya*, straighten it a bit; *magun e bisa*; he somehow tends not to like it; *MAGUN bisa ya*, he somehow tends to like it, etc.

## MABNO

This expresses an approximation of resentment; for example, *MABNO cong matdas a salu quing casbu ning lubco*, my chest feels like exploding in anger, *MABNO cong numano*, I feel like something is going to happen to me, etc.

## Section 9

### Requesting and Desiring

## UARI, SA, SANA, NA

They all express a request and are always placed after; for example, *ngamu na UARI* or *SA, SANA*; do this for the life of you; and even clearer in *magdalita ca UARI*, etc. The *na* was discussed in the section about pronouns: *di NA po* or *din mu NA co po queang polvos mo*, please give me some of your powder, etc.; *manano UARI po* has also been discussed as expressing a request.

## NANAN

It has already been said that it means *what else remains to be done?* *NANAN mo pa iyan?* What else do you expect to do about this? that is, there is nothing else to do; and so *NANAN pa iyan?* is there nothing else to be done here? *NANAN pa?* what else needs to be done? that is, nothing else. *NANAN pa ta?* what else do you expect to ask or do? It is finished and complete. All these circumlocations are necessary to be able to understand how these indicate desire, which we, for our part, express as *I wish*; for example, *NANAN pan balo mo ing balo nang Pedro?* what else would you desire to know if you already knew what Pedro knows? and from this, I wish you knew what Pedro knows! *NANAN pa tan y Pedro?* what else can one

expect of Pedro? He is a whole man; and from this, *NANAN pa tan y Pedrong malyarin capitan*; and so, *NANAN pa sa* or *NANAN pa ta sa* or *NANAN pa ta sa na*, etc. I wish that. See the following section.

## Section 10 Interjections and Ironies

In all languages, these forms express the sentiments of the soul and they are more difficult, if not impossible, to translate. I will explain them to the extent that I can.

### AUO

It is an interjection which expresses a reaction to the occurrence of the opposite of what one is expecting; e.g., you are borrowing from me at a time when I am looking for someone who will lend me; I will answer you: *AUO aco na pa sa ngeta*, oh! If I could find someone who would give me in the first place: Another: you are asking me if Juan is a good student, I know that he does nothing but play and that knows practically nothing, I will say: *AUO e na ngeti paninapan man*, oh dear me! don't even dream of it, etc.

### ACAYA

It is composed of *a* and *caya* and serves as an interjection. *Sio. ACAYA e na pin querauac!* My! I hope that what he considered beneficial to him did not do him ill, but good. Now that it has been touched, please know that it is also used when what happens is the opposite of what one is thinking, and it is the same concept, but without interjection and with some kind of irony; for example, you anxiously wait for the servant to come back from where you sent him; I know that he did not go or that he is playing hookey, I tell you sarcastically: *acaya!* that is, *grab his tail*; Another: to a person who says that he will not miss the target while we know that he usually hits the spike once and a hundred times the horseshoe: *acaya! e me turan*, you have it as certainly as you have a fart [sic, Spanish: pedo; Kapampangan: atut] on your hand, etc.

### SALAMAT

It expresses gratitude; for example, *SALAMAT po quing lugud mo*, and to congratulate: *salamat po quing ati ca*.

### BA

It is a greeting: *BA manano ca?* says the person who greets a relative or a friend whom he has not seen for a long time; *BA po, Maria*; also: *BA, bininyagan*; for

example, *iquit yo nang matalastas*; hail, Christians, you have already seen it clearly, etc. Also, it is a supplication: *BA! Dios a Guinu co!* Also, *ba*, did I not tell you? like if I forewarned him that he might fall and he fell.

## AROY

An expression of someone who complains, like of pain or of sorrow: *AROY, inda!* Ouch, mommy! *Ay* is an interjection of someone who is calling: *AY! Babaying mamulang AY!*; *AY, tauoy*; here it is a suffix and a prefix. *Ha* addresses a person of whom somebody laments: e.g. *HA! Tauong bulag a nun balu mo sang carasngan mo!*

## ANONDA

Over whom somebody grieves: *ANONDA calulu na co!* Oh! how unlucky I am! Following this are *ninda! nonda! nanda! nibpa! nobpa! nabpa!* attaching the third person pronoun; also attached there are the primitive pronouns and they are suffixed, for example, *calulu NACONDA* or *NACOBPA!* etc.; and take note that many times, all what remain are *nda, bpa*, and these are joined to the preceding vowel; for example, *UNDA ngeti casampat!* Oh, how beautiful it will be!

## CANONDA SA and CANO NGETA

They express a desire with anxiety. *Angat sa*, feeling of what was done or omitted; *angat sa*, it would be better, etc.

## SEE, DEE, TAYI, AIS, PEE CA, EE, NE

They are all interjections of ridicule, scorn or hatred: so that you can see how they are used in practice, carefully study the following, which is all about mortal sin. *AY! caladua COY! micasala na ca; eyata pisali mo nang banua; marauac nan dang pamamisali! NE! asali mo neng infiernos; masamac NABPA mong pamanyali! Pepagulutan me pala y Jesus at iyan inarapan mo y Satanas! mapala casing pamicalibay! SEE! e yata pala y Satanas ing panginuan! TAYI! PEE CA! I Jesus iyan pagulutan! DEE! nano sa na? nano nan dang cabulagan? AY! nano tang casulatan ing queca! nano NABPA mong cababan-baban ning tauong cristianos! NE! non e ca magbalic at misubli lub a caladua co, maroloc capin pug quing infiernos mangga quing mangga! HA! capamisana ning cayalan palad! HA!*

*ANONDA! calulu na co! angat sa ngetan mete yang tauo macalilibo bayo ya micasala! abalo na CANONDA sa ing carasngana pog uli ning casalanan! aquit na CANO NGETA! asubucana CANO NGETA sa na! bayo ya micasala: non micasala*

ya pota quing Dios a Ibpa nang malugud a alan angga? ali na ya; dapot antiman carin buri naco naman patawaran. HA! sinta na't lugud nan Jesus a alan capara! maliari la CANO NGETA sang ulung alan licat ding mata co, maguin dayatmalat sa ing dayang sumibul panangis co quing capaliuasan co! nun uarin e mo co po lingonan patawaran. AROY! NONDA NGETI casaquit ing lasa't saquit a ipasari ra pog caco ding diablos!

Do not let the language absorb all your attention and prevent your heart from being engrossed in the meaning. Concerning *ne*, bear in mind that, when it does not imply scorn, it is an abbreviation of the adverb *ane*, which means *do you understand?* In other expressions, we don't see the ironies that clearly, because they depend more on the tone than on the words; for example, *nun uari man guincas nang anti queta; maragul cong toto tacut*, laughing at his threats. Another: one says: *palsintan cong bina ing ala ca!* I sorely feel your absence; and one who does not believe it answers: with sarcasm, *capilan uari iniapin inda iyayat cai! EE! E YATA! balo co pin moa, palsintan mo cong bina; e mo abatang e mo co aquit; AY!* etc. I presume the *taro* and *sono*.

# CHAPTER 16

## THE COPULATIVES, THE DISJUNCTIVES AND THE LIGATURES

### Section 1 The Copulatives

To join the parts of a sentence, use the conjunction *ampon* or *manga*, which mean *and*, but bear in mind that when they are many, they alternate; for example, *ding angeles MANGA ding tronos AMPON ding principados MANGA ding serafines AMPON ding querubines*, etc. About the union of nouns and pronouns, we have already said something when we treated them. *Pati* in this language is like the Latin *simul*, *una*, *pariter* [*at the same time, one, equally*]; for example, *sombrero PATI capilla PATI escapulario PATI tocod*, etc.; this *pati* also means the same as *paqui*, after.

The Latin *quoque* [also] is *moa*; for example, you whipped; *ego quoque* [*I also*], *aco moa*; it usually goes with *naman*; for example: you were whipped, I also, *aco NAMAN MOA*; but bear in mind that, very many times, this adverb is inserted here, maintaining the same meaning, but then they don't say *moa* but *mo* accented long. You will constantly find this in *Sio* and the *Memorial*; so that you can find out, consider these examples: *macalma naconda sa nun muli co MO sa banua*; *nanu nanda MO sa ing tula co? non sambutan co MO sa ding salang co anti mo caring minyambut*. Another: *pablasang mepagala ding santos, inyapin MO miablasan lan capainauana alan angga*, etc.

*Naman* is almost the same as *quoque*: *tu quoque, Pater, ora pro me* [*also: you also Father, pray for me*], *ica NAMAN, Pare, panalangin mo co man*. This *naman* adequately belongs to all the primitive pronouns, maintaining the meaning of *also*; for example: God loves everybody, and so he also loves me, *calugurana NA CO MAN, calugurana NA CA MAN; calugurana NE MAN; calugurana NA QUE MAN; calugurana NO MAN; calugurana NA CO MAN*; and the same goes with any sentence belonging to this pattern; for example: you went to Manila, *mine NA CO MAN, mine NE MAN; mine NO MAN, mine NA QUE MAN*, etc.

The conjunction *at* is usually like *ampon*, and whenever the word to whose ending it is attached ends with a vowel, the *a* is dropped; for example, *caladua't catauan*; but ordinarily, it should be used between things which express a relationship between them, either as complementaries or as opposites; for example, *mainsac AT maragul, caladua't catauan, mayap AT marauac* (and also *mayap marauac marimla't mapali* etc.

It usually has another function which is not as a conjunction, but more as an infix and it has a flavour (*sainete*) that is an *I don't know what*; for example, in prayer. *Era picudta ding tauo 'T ding angeles man*. Another: for example, even if there are

medicines, if a person dislikes them, if he does not want to avail himself of them, *non ing tauo 'T e ya bisa*.

Also: it is a causal conjunction and it then means *because*; for example, *e na dela queti ing dase na 't e na pabitasang bina ing malacuan ya queti*, he did not bring his mat because he was not sure if he would stay here.

They also use *at* in a sentence where the second part is left unsaid, leaving the surprised listener guessing what the rest is or what the obstacle is; for example, *mine co carin at...* I had to go there, but...; *ita ninan AT...*; and so it is a connection between what is said and what is the unsaid continuation, and usually implying an opposition.

## Section 2 The Disjunctives

The first one is *caya*; for example, *malacuan ca queti, muli ca CAYA*, either you stay here or you go; the fiscal or the sacristan, *ing fiscal ing mayor CAYA*. This is the Latin *aut* [either-or]; *aut Petrus aut Paulus* [either Pedro or Pablo]. The *sive* [either-or] is *man*; for example, *sive Moises sive Aaron* [either Moses or Aaron], *y Moises MAN, y Aaron MAN*. This is its first concept, but it is also used without being too explicit; for example, *sive vellit sive non* [either he likes or not], *bisa ya MAN, e MAN bisa; vellit, nollit*, whether he likes it or not; because it is equivalent to *quamvis* (even if); *quamvis nollit* [even if he does not like], *e MAN bisa*, etc.

The adversative structure *it is not this but that* is *ali pin iti, NON E pin ita; alia Pedro, NUN E y Juan; aliua y Juan, NUN E y Pedro*, it is not Pedro BUT Juan [sic]. We have another *if not*, and here is how it goes; for example, (if not only for you, I would kill him); *NUN E SA ica, patayan co ya*; or *NUN E SA uli mo or uli ning ica pete co ya*, etc.

## Section 3 The Ligatures

### A

There are three ligatures. The first one is *a*. With it, we usually connect words ending in a consonant or a diphthong; for example, *masanting A tauo; balay A mainsac*; the same goes with these although it is a relative ["pronoun"]: *ing banal A maniti, ing balay A manabo, dayat A laon, caqueuan A malapad, danum A malat, bondoc A mayagta, canan A lutu*

## NG

The second is *ng*. With this one, we usually connect words ending in a vowel; for example, *tauoNG banal*, *babayiNG marauac*, *mapiaNG mamimutmut* and the same goes with the following even though they are relative: for example, *ing dalagaNG magcalago*, *ing tauoNG macasalanan sumisi ya*.

Also: It is a general rule that, when you double a word in order to exaggerate, you should always place this infix; for example, *dacal moNG dacal*, *ditac moNG ditac*, *tauo naNG tauo*, *sabi naNG sabi*, *mialuNG nang mialung*, *guigote naNG guigote*, etc.

## N

The third one is *n* (*hic opus, hic labor*) [here is the work, here is the labor]. This alone requires one long chapter, because it changes according to the variety of the combinations of words. I will say a few things which, together with what you can find elsewhere in this Grammar [*en el Arte*], will enlighten you considerably.

When the word which is joined to a preceding one is totally indeterminate, and it is not a verb nor its modification, we use this infix; for example, *mitipa caN sia*; *sali caN babi*, *cuma caN danum*, and this is so even if, by inserting an adverb, the infix is transposed; for example, *mitipa ca saN sia*; *cuma ca uariN danum*, etc.; and from this will flow like branches from the trunk the explanations which I will give.

I said *if it is not a verb*, because if it is, we should use the second; for example, *magaral caNG masa*; *muli caNG malagaua*; *bitbat deNG pisaquit*; *bitbat yeNG pirangan*; *penaco roNG guisan*; *bildog noNG pitunggal*; etc., and also even if it is transposed, as I said; for example, *magaral ca uariNG masa*; *malagaua ca piNG muli*, etc.

*I said or modification, because it also requires ng to be the link; for example, maco caNG dapal; muli caNG malagaua; daptan moNG mayap; talican meNG masican; muli caNG malagua; and so, mecaNG mirapal queni; or transposed: meca queniNG mirapal; but if what is inserted is not a pronoun, and instead, the mode is near the verb, it is not like that; for example, ing sumuyuN mayap.*

Under this rule, we have *sabla*, which is always attached to *n* indicating its vagueness, that is, it does not specify: for example, *sablaN angeles*; *sablaN tauo*, etc.; and the adverb *masaquit*, which, when following a vowel, is attached to *n*; for example, *nune ca sumisiN masaquit*; *sinta moN masaquit*; *tumulaN masaquit*; *caloloN masaquit*; *siglaN masaquit*; and also the adverb *lalo*: *laloN maragul*, *laloN masanting*, *laloN e manayon*, etc.

For the same reason, the adverb *ala* ordinarily follows this pattern; *alaN tauo*, *alaN biasa*, etc. I said *ordinarily*, because if it is in some way specific, it follows the second; for example, *ala coNG toto queti*, frankly, I was not here then.

Also falling under this rule are the cardinal numbers, from ten, if they end in a vowel: *laloN metung*, *labiN adua*, *mecatloN metung*, *mecalimaN adua*, etc. But since we might never end if we give rules for all cases, take note of the following examples:

When the interrogatives refer to a totally indefinite thing (but one has to examine well if something is indefinite), they are also linked with *n*; for example: *ninu taN menacao?* *ninoN quiningua?* *ninoN mengaan canita?*; who is that shameless person? (here there is a specification *after the infix*), *nino itaNG tampalasan a itain?* *insa ing mayap queta?* or *inisaN mayap queta?*; what pen? *ingsaN pluma?* *ingsa uariNG pluma?*; *nino ta y Manuel quecayo?*, *nino taN Manuel quecayo?*; *nino taNG tauo carela*, among those figures, for example, who is the man? *ninu taN tauong e matay?*, who is the man who will not die?

If a word ending in *n* is followed by another word, *g* is added: *nanu pa man*, be that as it may; but *nanu pa maNG casaqitan*, etc. even if it is not expressed; for example, *nanu pa maNG dumpa quing tauo*, etc.; *ding salanta banquet at yayauad la papaquit da pa namaNG saquit da*; if you change the meaning, you change the infix; for example, *nanan paN lalu cong balu nan Pedro!* I wish I knew what Pedro knows! *nanan PANG cabaluanang mangamanong castila?* what else does he lack if he knows, etc.

Well, one has to be careful, because, in spite of what I have said, the second and the third are used interchangeably more or less frequently. Sometimes if we don't pronounce or spell something as it should be, they say our sentences are very ugly. To give rules for all these is most difficult and most complex, because the word-combinations are innumerable.

## CHAPTER 17

### THE NUMERALS

I have not given these before because they have a variety of compositions which cannot be understood without first understanding the syntax of the verbs. They are divided into cardinal, distributive, vicinal, etc.

#### Section 1

##### The Cardinal Numbers

Those which among these are called *digits* are; 1, *isa*; 2, *adua*; 3, *atlo*; 4, *apat*; 5, *lima*; 6, *anam*; 7, *pito*; 8, *ualo*; 9, *siam*; 10, *apolo*. These are the numeral roots from where all the composites flow; but bear in mind that *isa*, 1 and *apolo*, 10, are used only in counting; on the other hand when individualizing, they say *metong* to mean one and *apolo* to mean ten; for example, one woman, *metong A babayi*; ten men, *apoloNG lalaqui*; and here you now presumably notice that the numerals are linked to the nouns they number with the ligatures *a* or *ng*. See the chapter on the ligatures.

Numbers 11 to 19. Place *labing* before the above-mentioned digits: *labin metong*, 11 (not *labin isa*), *labin adua*, 12; until *labin siam*, 19; *labi [lan] siam*, they are nineteen, etc. [The brackets enclosing *lan* are in the original Spanish].

Now, counting further, know that *apolo* is ten: *dinalan*, 100; *libo*, 1000; *lacsá*, 10,000; *cata-cata* is when you count and count and count, without anything definite; it means innumerable.

But bear in mind that *dinalan* means one hundred, round number; if it is more than that, one hundred is *dalan*. When you count by tens, place digits before *polo* and you will have *aduang polo*, 20, until you reach *siam a polo*, 90; *dinalan*, 100; and if you count by the hundreds, do the same thing with *dalan* and you will have *aduang dalan*, 200; *limang dalan*, 500; until you reach *siam a dalan*, 900; *libo*, 1000. Do the same thing to count by the thousands and tens of thousands until you reach *lacsá* 100,000; *aduang lacsá* 200,000; *atlung lacsá* 300,000, etc.

What is more difficult is to count in between the tens, the hundreds, etc. For the tens, the more common way at present is to place the particle *meca* before the ten that follows, not before the past where you are, and then add the digit; link this with *n* to the ten if it ends in a vowel, and without that link if it ends in a consonant; for example, 21; the ten that follows is *atlong polo*; drop the *polo* and place *meca* before it and you will have *mecatlon metong* until you reach *mecatlong siam*, 29. I want to say 31; the ten that follows is *apat apolo* 40; now, I drop the *apolo* and place *meca* before, and I say *mecapat metong*, 31; *mecapat adua*, 32; *mecapat ualo*, 38, etc. Now, I want to say 91. The ten that follows is *dinalan*, 100; so, with *meca*, *mecarinalan metong*, *mecarinalan adua*, 92, etc. However, they also do it the Spanish way: 21 *aduang*

*polo ampon metong; 53, limang polo ampon atlo; 99, siam a polo ampon siam, etc.*

To count between hundreds, thousands, hundred thousands, etc., they use two particles, *lalo*, *lauit*, which mean *more* or *over*; they place them before the hundred or the thousand, and they add the digits in between, either using the conjunction *ampon* or not; for example, 101, LALON *dalan* or LAUIT *dalan metong*; 111, LALON *dalan labing metong*; 183, LAUIT *dalan ampon mecasiam atlo* [sic], etc. For the thousands: 2020, LAUIT or LALON *aduang libo aduang polo*; 1500, LAUIT *libo limang dalan* or *libo ampon limang dalan* or LALON *libo limang dalan*; 1851, LAUIT *libo, ualong dalan mecanam metong*, o LAUIT *libo 't ualong dalan ampon mecanam metong* [sic]. This year 1736, *iting banuang LAUIT libo 't pitong dalan ampon mecapat anam* [sic]. The digits between tens of thousands follow the same pattern: 20,063, LALON *aduang polong libo 't mecapitong atlo*; 30,904, LAUIT *atlong polong libo siam a dalan ampon apat*, etc.

Bear in mind that they count the digits in between the thousands the same way they count the digits in between tens, as described earlier: For example, 387,000 [sic, presumably meant 38,700], *mecapat ualong libo pitong dalan*; 67,853, *mecapitong pitong libo ualong dalan ampon mecanam atlo*, etc. The same is done with *lacsas* 100,000 [see footnote]; for example, 100,042, *lauit lacsas 't mecalimang adua*; 200,324, *lalon aduang lacsas 't atlong dalan, ampon mecatlong apat*; 425,000, *lauit apat a lacsas 't mecatlong limang libo*; 914,257 [sic, presumably meant 934,257], *lalon siam a lacsas 't mecapat apat a libo at aduang dalan ampon mecanam pito*, etc. Practice will teach you and will make this easier for you.

When they do not specify the number, but indicate just more or less, they do it the way we do: *twenty something, forty something, mecatlong polo*, [sic] *mecalimang polo* [sic], leaving one in doubt of the digit in between; and the same goes with all the rest, like two hundred something, *mecatlong dalan; mecapat apolong libo*, etc, but this is rarely used. To avoid getting mixed up, say: *aduang polo 't nung pilan, aduang dalan nun pilan, apat a polo 't nun pilan* or *nun pilan polo 't non pilan; atlong polong libo 't nun pilan* or *nun pilan dalan at nun pilan*, etc.

### **PICOS. Digits in between Round Numbers.**

You have to know that these people count things differently from us when involving digits in between round numbers, where the things counted include something big and something small, something intact and something defective, for example: while we say (*two men and one woman*), they say *three men becoming, two*, the third one being a woman, MECATLONG *babayi*; two women and one man *mecatlong lalaqui*; two men and one boy, *mecatlong anac*, and so, MECADUANG *ebon damolag*, one old carabao and one young; two big frying pans and one small *mecatlo lang cauali*; *maqui estribo con MECADUANG balbal*, I have one footrest in good condition and one broken; *maquipingan yang MECATLONG sullao*,

he has two plates and one bowl; *mecalabi lang limang bulag or pilay or matlac* means that they are fifteen, including five blind or lame; it does not say whether they are men or beasts, because that is understood; otherwise, one has to say it explicitly.

When they belong to different kinds, it is always made explicit; for example, I have two horses and one carabao, *maqui CABAYO con mecatlong DAMULAG*; I have five pigs and one dog, *maqui BABI con mecanam ASO*. Use this pattern to make other examples.

## PROTocompounds

They admit protocompounds; they follow the pattern of *mangadua*, meaning to second; for example, if you drank once, *MANGADUA CA*, you second it or drink a second time. First passive *that which*; third *to whom* or *the thing which*; for example: *PENGADUAN cong serulan ing mula co*; *PANGADUAN meng painuman y Pedro*. Also, it applies to a case where there are two which the action reaches; for example, *cutngan me y Pedro*, ask Pedro; now, secondly, ask Juan, *MANGADUA cang cutang*. First passive: *y Juan PENGADUAN mo cang Pedro*; third: *pangaduan me Pedro can Juan*. More clearly: a philandering married man, *MANGADUA yan babayi*; the one who is not his wife, first passive and his wife, third passive. This pattern is followed by others when applicable, namely, when the digits begin with a vowel.

## MA Neuter

Also, they admit the neuter verb of *ma*, and it indicates that the nominative has reached this or that number indicated by the digit; for example, *metong* is one; *MAMETONG ing lub da*, they have one feeling; *adua*, two; *MEYADUA pin ing lub na*, he has mixed feelings; *nun atlo lang caluguran mo*, *MIATLO naman mo ing lub mo*. How many come for confession? If you answer in the past tense, for example, *MEYADUA la*, *MEANAM la* or *MESIAM*, they are two, six or nine; they, for their part, answer *they have already reached* two, six or nine; and included here are the compounds; for example, *MAPIPITO no caya catauo ding dinatang magcompesal?* *MALALABI no ngeting metong*, they seem to be eleven; *MALIMA no ngeting polo*, fifty. Preterite: *MESIAM nong polo*, ninety; *merinalan*, one hundred, etc.

## CA and AN

Also, they become superlatives (although it is the third passive of *ma*). They are seldom used; for example, *CAMEMETONGAN* or *CAMEMETONG-METONGAN ya ing Guinu tang Dios*, or *CAYAYATLO ATLOAN yang Personas*. These two are common, etc.

## CA and AN without the Preterite

This composition indicates an addition or adjustment to the number mentioned; for example, if you are giving me six reales for one book, I will tell you: make them seven, adjust the price to seven, *CAPITOAN mo la*. Preterite: *QUEPITO mo la*, and also *catloan, queatlo; casiam, quesiam; capoloan, queplo; calabian metong, quelabing metong*, etc.

## PA of Saying

If you attach *ca* to the beginning of these digits and *an* to the end, because it is in the third passive, it will indicate that you are *saying* or *asking for* what the digit expresses, for example, how much do they say this horse costs? or how much do they ask for this horse? *PAMAGCANUAN de iyan cabayo?* He answers: *PACADUAN, PACATLUAN, PACAPATAN, PACASIAMAN deng pesos*, they say that it costs or that their asking price is two, three, four, nine pesos, or *PACALABINENG anam or siam a pesos*.

## FF

If you remove *an* from this composition, it becomes *facere fieri* [make them become]; for example, here are two logs; they are not enough: *PACATLO mo la* or *PACAPAT, PACALIMA, PACAPITO*, etc.; and it has a preterite: *PEPACATLO mo la; PEPACALIMA, PEPACANAM co la*, etc.

## Section 2 The Ordinal Numbers

The above-mentioned digits, when joined to the individualizing *ca*, become ordinals, meaning that they indicate an order, as first, second, third, fourth, fifth, etc; *mona* or *cauonan, cadua, catlo, capat, calima*, etc., and so *capolo, calabin metong, carinalan*, one hundredth; *caduang dalan*, two hundredth; *calibo*, one thousandth, etc. For the digits in between, add the digit for example, twenty fifth *camecatlong lima*; one hundred fourth, *camecaduang dalan apat*, or *ing mecaduang dalan apat*. If you want to say *every fifth, every tenth*, etc., place *balang* before; for example, *BALANG calima batbatan ya; decimus quisque* [every tenth], *BALANG capolo*, etc.

Verbs are formed and conjugated like those beginning with *c*, and they indicate belonging to the place in a sequence expressed by the ordinal; for example, take the second place or put yourself in the second place, *CUMADUA ca*; I am already taking the third place, *CUMACATLO co; y Pedro QUINAPOLO ya*, Pedro took the tenth place; or the third passive; for example, *cumadua ca queya* or *CADUAN mo ya*;

*cumatlo ca carela* or *CATLOAN mo la*; and so, *capatan, caliman, casiam*, etc. Go first, ahead of him or of them, *UNAN mo ya* or *PANIMONAN mo la*, etc. They are also active: for example, who put you in the fourth place or the fourth? *ninon QUINAPAT queca?* I will put you in the fifth, *acon CALIMA queca*. Its passive is the first; past *que*; for example, *icapito me y Juan*; *QUELIMA co ne ya*, I already put him in the fifth. Exemption: *ONA, YONA* or *IPAONA mo ya*, put him in the first, etc.

Bear in mind that the same ordinal also expresses how many times; for example, *cauunan*, the first and the first time; *cadua*, the second and the second time; and the same with the rest; for example, *icatlong pamange mo carin*, your third trip there; *ini ing cadua pamanigtig* this is the second instrumental presentation, or the second time they play the music; the third encounter, he defeated him, *quing catlo sinaul na ya*, etc. To say “another reason” is, for example, *metong queta*; if there is another, say *cadua queta*; to express continuation, for example, *also*, if another reason is added, say *capinduan naman*; to simply repeat the verb, for example, *I enjoin*, just say it with *naman*: *panabilin co NAMAN*, etc.

### Section 3 The Distributives

These ones have two patterns, and they are: *tunggal-tunggal*, active, *one by one*. Passive, which is the third, *to each one one*, for example, *TUNGGAL TUNGGAL lang lalacad*, they walk *one by one*; *TUNGGAL-TUNGGALANAN mon tinapay*, give one bread to each one, or *TIYON-TIYONAN mo la*: they also appear in the second passive, which consists only of a nominative of the person who receives the action and of the verb; for example, *dening anggag mengaso TUNGGAL-TUNGGALAN la* or *TIYON-TIYONAN lang usa*, to each one of all these hunters corresponds one deer; and from this, each one of them all has one deer. Now you will understand *TUNGGAL-TUNGGALAN la* or *TIYON-TIYONAN lan angeles ding sablang tauo*, for every person there is an angel; and from here, each person has a guardian angel; *tidua-tidua lang magmain*, they take a walk two by two. For the passive, you must see if those among whom something is distributed or to whom something corresponds exceed the distributive number; for example, here, if they are more than two; because if they are not, the root is not doubled: *TIDUANAN mon dalandan*, give two Seville oranges to each of these two. If they are more, *TIDUAN-TIDUANAN mon dalandan*, give two Seville oranges to all, that is, to each one of them, whatever be their number. And so, if you talk to each person, you will not say: *TUNGGAL-TUNGGALAN* or *TIYON-TIYONAN lan Angeles*; but *balang catauo TUNGGALAN* or *TIYONAN lan Angeles*, etc. They admit *mi* with *an*.

When the Spanish is, for example, *three, four* or *five* take a walk, do not use *tia* because this one does not correspond to this Spanish; but to the *three by three, four by four*, etc. Going back to the distribution of things, you have to know that, the digits in

between tens from twenty above are expressed in two ways. The first is the way it sounds: for example, give 21 to each person, *tidua-tidua lang polo ampon metong*. The second is: *mecatloan lang metong*. And so, *titlo-titlo lang polo ampon adua, mecacapatan lan adua*; to say, for example, assign to them two and a half cavans, four and a half chicken, say *TIDUA-TIDUANAN lan caban ambon CAPITNGA; TIAPAT-APATAN lang sisi ampon CAPITNGAN* or *mecatloan lang capitngan caban; mecaliman lan capitngan sisi*, etc.

When these two patterns have a doer which either puts them three by three, for example, for the first pattern, or distributes them to so many, for the second pattern; the first one is formed with the transitive *mi* and its passive, which is the third passive, retaining the *pi*, although it is also formed with the simple passive; but this one cannot be used as preterite; for example, who will place them four by four? *nino tan MITIAPATAPAT carela?* I will put them five by five, *acon MITIALIMALIMA; PITITLO-TITLO mo la* or *ITITLO-TITLO*, place them three by three; *PISIAM-SIAM co na la*, I already placed them nine by nine; *PILABI-LABI cong ADUA*; you will place them twenty two by twenty-two, *ican MITIDUA-TIDUA polo ampon adua* or *acon MIBILING mecatlon adua*. There is no other pattern, etc.

Bear in mind that the above mentioned active goes with the two patterns, because *ninon MITIAPOLO-POLO carela?* For example, does not only mean *who placed them ten by ten?* but also *who gave ten to each one?* and the same with the rest; but the passive is different, because this second pattern requires the third passive; for example, *PITIAPOLO-POLO mo la* first passive means place them ten by ten, *PITIAPOLO-POLOAN mo la*, means distribute them, ten to each one, etc.

With the above-mentioned transitive *mi*, but with a different conjugation; it means to separate or to divide something into as many parts as that expressed by the number mentioned: *ninon MITLO caretang salapi?* Who will make three parts or who will divide that money into three parts? Etc. To form the present of those which begin with a vowel (except *apolo*), attach to the beginning of the vowel the same consonant as that which follows it; for example, from *adua, atlo*, the present is *miradua, mitatlo*, and this is also the preterite, but the *mi* is long. For the future, change the first vowel to *i*: *miduan, mitlo*. Among those which do not begin with a vowel and which are followed by *apolo*, the conjugation is regular; the passive, *second*, because it is that of *MI of company*; for example, I am dividing this wood into two, *acon MIRADUA quening dutong*. Passive; *PIRADUAN que dening dutong*. Preterite: *piradua*; future: *piduan*; *ican MILIMA canita*, you will divide it into five. Preterite: I already divided it into seven, *PIPITO co na ya: PIPOLO co ya*, into ten, etc.

## MI of Company

When we use *MI of company*, with the same rule and variation, we indicate that those which the number indicates agree or conspire to do one and the same thing or to go against or in favor of somebody, for example, *MIPAPAT la quetang dapat*,

the four do that as one; PIPAPATAN *detang dapat* or PIPApatan *de ing maquirapat*; PITATLOAN or PITATLO *ra co*, the three of them are or were in favor of or against me, etc.

## Section 4

### How Many Times? And What Proportion?

They are called *vicenales* because with them we express the number of times (*veces*) an act is done. And because they also express by how many times one thing exceeds another, they are called *proporcionales*. That having been said, to ask how many times an act is performed or by how many times one thing exceeds another, say: *macapipilan?* how many times? This *maca* is formed this way: attach to those which begin with a vowel the same consonant which follows it, for example, from *atlo mactatlo*; from *apat*, *macapapat* (except the number *adua* to which *l* is attached); if you double the first syllable of those which do not begin with a vowel (except *apolo* which follows the consonants), you indicate how many times in the future; for example, I will read two times or three or four or five or ten, *masa co* MACALADUA or MACATATLO or MACAPAPAT or MACALILIMA or MACAPOPOLO, etc.

To form the preterite, all you have to do is change *maca* to *meca*; for example, I cursed two times *miñyumpa co* MECALADUA or MECANANAM or MECAPUPULO, etc.; and so, twelve times, *mecalalabing adua*; eleven times, *mecalabing metong*; nineteen times, *mecalabing siam*; twenty times, *mecaladuang polo*; twenty one times, *mecaladuan polo ampon metong*; *mecatlong polo*, thirty times *mecalimang polo ampon apat*, fifty four times; *mecadirinalan*, one hundred times; *mecalilibo*, one thousand times, etc. Five hundred nine [sic, presumably meant five hundred twenty nine] times, *macalilimang dalan ampon mecatlong siam*, etc.

Occasionally, one comes across this composition in the passive; for example, strike him two times, *bonoan men macaladua*; passive: PACALADUAN *meng bonoan*; PECAPAPATANA CO *pinyumpan*, etc. Just take note of it.

With the above-mentioned composition, we indicate proportions. To say, for example, *he exceeds him four times* is the same as saying *he is four times bigger than he*; for example, MACAPAPAT *pinyumpana co mecapat*, *macapat ya maragol queya*; he eats five times more than I, MACALILIMA *ya masican mangan canaco*. They call this *multiple* proportion; and so this is six times longer than that, *ini macaba ya* MACANANAM *canita*, and this is true with whatever quantity, etc.

The proportion which they call *submultiple* is expressed with the ordinals and the particle *si* because it is nothing else than *if you are*, for example, *six times taller than he*, take away the sixth, and you will say that *you are the sixth part of his height*; for example, MACAPAPAT *ca maragol caco*, you are four times taller than I. The same is true with SICAPAT *na co ning dagul mo*, I am fourth part of your height; MACAUUALO *ya malapad ini canita* or SICAUALO *ne nita ini* or *ning*

*lapad na nini*, etc.

The above-mentioned *maca* and its passive can correctly say: God pays one hundred for one, MACARIDINALANE *yayablasan ing metong*; PACARINALANE *ablasan ing metong*; and so, *ovem reddes quadruplum* [you will give back the sheep four times], MACAPAPAT *ne bayaran ing cambing* or PACAPAPATA *ne bayaran* [The Latin *reddes* is in the second person, but Bergaño puts the Kapampangan *ne*, which is in the third person. It should have been *reddet*, third person; *t*, not *s*. Possibly also, the *ne* was a typographical error and was meant to be *me*, which is in the second person. In that case, the Latin would be correct as it stands.]. The reason is that the indio does not say *he will pay one hundred for one*, but *he will pay one hundred times for one*, etc.

Bearing in mind the above-mentioned variation of the digits explained under *maca*, if you place *pasi* before the *submultiple* composition, you indicate that *each one performs an act as many times as what the number says*, because *pasi* (as we said in its place) is distributive; for example, you all, whip him two times each of you, PASICALADUA or PASICATATLO *co matbat quea*, or PASICALADUA or PASICATATLO *ye batbatan*; a clearer and more often used pattern inserts the particle *tolo*, which is also distributive; for example, PASITOLO *caladua ye batbatan*, let him be whipped two times by each one of you; PESITOLO *calilima co pinyumpan*, I cursed them five times, that is, five times each one; or *TOLO calilima co piñyumpan*, the same; PASIMISAN or TOLOMISAN or PASITOLO MISAN *cong pañyclaud*, all of you, kneel down, one time each.

Regarding *macapilan*, which we said at the beginning means *how many times*, bear in mind that they also use it to convey what we say *what is taking him so long* or *what makes it hard for him*: MACAPIPILAN *ita* or MACAPIPILAN *uarita*, etc.; and about one who is fond of talking that way, because he finds no difficulty in anything, they say *e mi bubuyut?*, he is a guy for whom everything is easy and he does nothing, etc.

## Section 5 Monetary Denominations

The biggest monetary denomination of these people and which is their point of reference in counting their money is *toston*, which they call *salaping metong*. With the particle *si* and an ordinal number, they get the eighth part of it, which they call *sicaualo*, because one *toston* has eight parts. We call it half real of silver, (*medio real de plata*).

[Translator's Paraphrase: The word *salapi* means either money in general or *toston* in particular. A *toston* is divided into four parts, each of them called *sicapat*. *Sicapat* in Spanish is *real*. A *sicapat* is divided into two parts, each of them called *sicaualo*.]

As you know, a *toston* is made up of four *reales*, and so, if they want to say one *real*, they express it as a fourth part of a *toston*, *sicapat*. A *real* has twelve parts, and they call each one of them *barilla* [Spelled *BARYA* in Kapampangan. See page 2 of the original Spanish text]. A *barrilla* has two parts, and they call each of them *cunding*. One fourth (*cuartillo*) is referred to by them as *calatio*. Two *reales* (*dos reales de plata*) constitute one *binting*; three *reales*, *atlong bajagui*. When they do not use the term *one toston*, they use only the word *salapi*, which, even if it means money in general, is used by them to mean *toston*.

[Translator's Note: Bergaño can be understood here better if the reader makes a diagram while reading.]

Given that established way, when they want to say five reales, they say *mecaduan sicapat*, that is, out of two *tostons* [*mecadua*], get one *real* (*real* is presupposed here by the use of *meca*, preterite).

Six reales, *mecaduang binting*. Out of two *tostons*, retain the first *toston* and get one *binting* (that is, two reales) from the second *toston*. Four reales (from the first *toston*) and two reales (from the second *toston*) equals six reales.

Seven reales, *mecaduan atlong bajagui*. [One *toston* (that is, four reales) plus one *atlong bajagui* (that is, three reales) equals seven reales] Eight reales, *pesos ya*.

This is how they continue. The particle *meca* is joined to the digit number *atlo*, because two *tostons* are already left behind; and so, for example, *mecatlong sicapat*, *sicaualo*, mean three *tostons* (where the speaker says three but meaning two), plus one and a half *real* [taken from the third *toston*, discarding the rest of it; and so, two *tostons* (four reales plus four reales) plus one and a half *real*] equals nine and a half reales. Continuing further, for example, *mecalimang binting*, eighteen reales, *mecatlong adduang salapi*, twenty two *tostons*, that is, eleven pesos, etc.

To continue, you should assume that all the above-mentioned monetary denominations have their own protocompound based on their first letter; for example, from *salapi manyalapi*; from *cunding, mañgunding*, etc. and this protocompound should be understood according to its respective specification: if the nominative is the money; for example, *MANYALAPI la deti* means that they are *tostons*; *MANYICAUALO la*, they are halves, etc. If we apply this to the goods being exchanged, the number indicates that every measurement or yard costs as much as that number; e.g. *MAMARILLAS ing pati*; *MANGUNDING ing gatang*, every *ganta* costs one *barilla*; every *chupa* costs one *cunding*, etc.

If the nominative is a person, it indicates, in the first place, that the subject deals with, or expects in return, only that expressed by the protocompound; for example, *MANYALAPI ya*, only in exchange for money or only for the sake of money or is interested only in money, as a bad judge or a bad lawyer, who does nothing but spend money; its passive, third, the goods *for which* or the person *of whom*, etc.

Secondly, it is an indication that the nominative is or was entitled to as much as what the protocompound expresses; for example, MANYICAPAT *la*, each one is entitled to one real, etc. This pattern also presupposes the computations explained earlier; for example, *mecaduan sicapat* does not only mean *five reales*, but also *each one is entitled to five reales*; and if the object is in the nominative, it indicates that *it costs that much* or that *it was bought or sold that much*, etc.

This having been said, if you want to ask *how much a given object is*, or to put it better, *how much does each one cost*, use this particle *tia*, which is distributive, together with the root or verb *magcano*; for example, how much does the rice cost? TIA MAGCANO *ing palay?* that is, each cavan? two reales, *maminting*; how much does a chupa of vinegar cost? TIA MAGCANONG *gatang quing aslam?* One barilla, *mamarillas*, etc.

To ask in the passive, say TIAMAGCANON *la?* how many did they give to each? Or how many times did they whip each one of the boys? So, whenever the question is distributive, that is the pattern to follow; and since the answer should conform to the question, the answer should use the distributives, which are the protocompounds; namely *it is worth so much*, *it costs that much*, *he is entitled to that much*, etc.

When the question is not distributive, but is wholesale, so to speak, meaning *not what is each worth nor how is each one valued*, but *how much is it?* for example, *how much is this horse?* only *magcano* is used: MAGCANO *ya iyang cabayo?* MAGCANO *ing palay?* MAGCANO *ing azucal?* It has its neuter verb of *ma*, *mamagcano*, *memagcano*, up to what price; for example, if they are transporting palay, MAMAGCANO *yang palay?* up to what price does this palay reach? or how much is it? *memagno?* up to where did the price reach? that is, *how many cavans did everything amount to?* And with the same, you can say, for example, how is this horse of yours valued or was valued? *Meapulu yang pesos, ten pesos*, etc.

## PA of Saying

This *magcano* is not the only one which admits this *pa*; for example, PAMAGCANOAN or PEPAMAGCANOAN *da ita*, how much do they say or did they say; but also all the protocompounds referring to money; for example, PAPAMESOSAN *da ya*, they say one peso; and so, *papamintingan*, *papangundingan*, etc.

To speak in the plural, distributively, use the same *tia* with the adverb *pilan*; for example, how many *gantas* did they give as *opa?* TIA PILANG *pati ing pamanupa ra?* three *gantas*, each event *titlong pati* or *tiaualo*, eight each event. If you want to ask for example, how much did you give to each of the oarsmen? you should say it in the preterite: *tiamagcanoan la?* because it is not plural; but if you ask how many *cuartillos* did you give to each? TIAPILANAN *lang calatio?* because *pilan* has its passive and neuter verb of *ma*: *mapilan*, etc.

## Transitive Mi

When the sentence is transitive, it is appropriate to join the *MI Transitive* with its *MI passive* and the second passive *of company*; for example, how much did you give to the oarsmen or to each oarsman? PITIAMAGCANO *mo ding babagsay?* One real. You answer with the protocompounds of the money, distributively, for example, I gave them one real each, PIPANYICAPAT *co la*; give one cuartillo to each of these poor people, PIPANGALANTIOAN *mo deang salanta*; I already gave them one *sicaualo* each, PIPANICAUALO *co na la*, and that way with the rest.

Lastly, although we already said that when this particle goes with *pa* and the digits with *ca* and *an* at the end, it indicates the asking price; for example, PACAUALOAN *deng pesos*, they say or they ask eight pesos; I will give you three idiomatic expressions which were not mentioned there; for example, they ask five reales, PACACADUANAN *deng sicapat* (like *mecaduang sicapat*): and so, PACACADUANAN *deng binting*, PACACADUANAN *deng athung bajagui*, and no more. But bear in mind that this just-mentioned pattern, for example, PACALABIAN *deng siam a pesos*, PACATADUANAN *deng polong pesos*, is not applicable to the digits in-between from twenty up; instead, it is PACACADUANAN *deng polong pesos ampon metong*, and the same is true with the other tens, like *pacatloan*, *pacapatan*, etc.

## Section 6 Identifying Portions of Time

Year, *banua*. To number them simply, just use the cardinals: *aduan banua*, two years; ATLU, APAT, LIMANG *banua*, etc. This year, *di ITING banua* [The context of this section does not justify that particle *di*, which is probably an erroneous typographical superfluity.]. And to be more specific, ITING *banuang* ITI. To refer to the past years: last year, *banuang metong* (notice that *banua* loses the last *a* and this happens to it sometimes, although it is not a real diphthong): For the rest, they use the numerals that describe the “some” part, adding *na* at the end; for example, *banuang* SICADUANA, two years ago, *banuang* SICATLONA, three years ago and they hardly pass beyond that. To say *five years ago*, *six years ago*, they use the ordinals more. So, *quetang* CALIMANG *banua*, five years ago etc.; to refer to the subsequent years, *next year*, they usually say: *quening balictaon* (which is a Tagalog word), or *quening banuang* ARAPAN; two years from now, *quening* CADUANG *banua*; three years from now, *queting* CATLONG *banua*, always using the ordinals.

This month, *iting bulan*; but *bulan* means moon and month, just as *banua* means heaven and year. So, for preceding and subsequent months, they use the ordinals, with the respective adverbs; as you see, last month is rendered *quening bulan a*

GUILUTAN; next month, *quening bulan* a ARAPAN; two months ago, ADUANANG *bulan*; three months from now, *quening CATLONG bulan*, etc. The all-encompassing terms both for years and for months are *guilutan*, past, and *arapan*, the coming: *quing capat a banuang* ARAPAN or DATANG, four years from now; the same with *bulan*: *quening calimang bulan* a ARAPAN or *quing CALIMANG bulan*, five months from now; *quing capitong banuang* GUILUTAN or *quetang capitong banuang*, seven years ago.

*Aldao* means sun or day: *ing ALDAO ngeni*, this day; for the preceding ones, yesterday, *napon*; for the rest, use the ordinals with *na* before and another *na* after; for example, *NAcaduaNa* the day before yesterday, and they hardly go beyond that; and so they say *quetang CAPAT a aldao*, *quetang CALIMANG aldao*; four days ago, five days ago, the same way as the years and months; for the days that follow, tomorrow *bucas*; for the rest, they attach *ma* to ordinal numbers; for example, *MAcadua*, the day after tomorrow; *MAcatlo*, three days from now, etc.; and afterwards, they say *quening CALIMANG aldao*, five days from now, *quening CAPITONG aldao*, seven days from now, etc. *Bucas macadua*, tomorrow and the next day; *nacapilana* is a few days ago.

The time *in the morning* is *abac* or *cayabacan*; high noon, *ogtong aldao* or *ogto yang aldao* or *caogtoa ning aldao*; the afternoon, *gatpanapon*; *sisilim*, at nightfall (although the Kapampangans did not know the measurements of the hours, they nevertheless differentiated the time sufficiently well); *galing aldao* MABABO, near daybreak; but *galin aldao* MALALAM, much earlier than daybreak; *muclat sumala*, day break; *malayatcan yan aldao*, when the sun is around ten degrees over the east or west; it is a meticulous thing and any old woman will tell you many more measurements of time.

*Bengi*, night; tonight, *NGENING bengi*, meaning, *that which follows this day*; *last night*, meaning, *that which came before today* is *NAbengi*; but *NAPON SA bengi* is that which came before yesterday; *NACADUANANSA bengi*, that which came before the day before yesterday; and this way, going backwards, etc. For the subsequent ones: *BUCAS bengi*, the night that follows tomorrow; *MACADUAN bengi*, that which follows the day after tomorrow; *cabucas* is the whole night; *quebucas* is the whole night in the past; *CAPITNGAN bengi*, *media noche*, midnight; *cabucasan*, the morning that follows *cabucas*, etc.

As regards questions concerning time, if you ask *how many*, do it with the cardinals; for example, *PILANG banua?* *PILAN bulan?* *PILAN aldao?* that is, how many years, etc. The answers: if past, *pepabanua*, one year; [one day], [sic, the original Spanish is bracketed]. *pepatingapun*, or the whole day, *inapon* is shorter, and so on; if future, drop the *pe*. In other cases, use the cardinals: *ADUANG banua*, two years, etc.

If you ask *when*, be it past or future, do it with *pilan* combined with *ca*, following the pattern of the ordinals: *CAPILAN ca me carin?* Answer: *quening CADUANG bulan*; when will you go there? two months from now; *capilan ca*

*dinatang?* when did you arrive? *quetang CATLONG bulan*, three months ago; *guilutan* and *arapan*, to be more precise; about days: *nacadua na*, the day before yesterday; future: *macatlo, otro dia despues de la mañana*, the day after tomorrow [ sic, should be *de aqui a tres dias*, three days from now].

Our *every year* is *banua-banua*; every month, *balang bulan* or *bulan-bulan magsocorro*, etc; everyday, *balang aldao* or *aldao-aldao*, *bengi-bengi* or *balang bengi*; some day, *balang aldao*; for example, *BALANG ALDO a aganaca mu curin*, you will always remember me someday; those which do not admit the said pattern use the adverb *dat* or *indat*; for example, *DAT Viernes*; *INDAT Domingo*, etc., every Friday, every Sunday, etc. To say *something happens every two days*, use *mipa*, attach it to the beginning of the cardinals; for example, *MIPACADUA ya malalagnat*, he contracts fever every two days; *mipacatlo*, every three days; this *pattern* is true with the rest; from year to year, every year, *mipamanua*; every month, *mipamulan*, *mipanumingo*, etc. See the adverbs of time.

# CHAPTER 18

## ACCENTS, PRONUNCIATION, REDUPLICATION AND OTHER IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS

### Section 1

#### Accents and Pronunciation

Many times, a consonant at the middle of a word is pronounced not by being joined to the vowel that follows but by being joined to the preceding letter and then cutting what follows; for example, *caladua*, *bunyi*, as if they were spelled *calad-dua*, *bun-ñyi*; and among these *cortadillos* [clipped words that is, words having this clipped syllable] are: *quic-cuan*, *sad-dya*, *bag-gya*, *lac-cuay*, *ming-gua*, etc. The same is true with words having two consonants together, like *lag-pac*, *ag-cas*, *bag-say*, *tac-sil*, *sac-si* and all similar to them, which are not few. This is very important, because if you do not do it this way, you might send the wrong message or change the meaning of the words; for example, *quic-cuan*, the aborted fetus; *quicuan*, one whose nails are cut by another person, etc.

Also, it happens many times that the meaning of a word changes depending on whether you pronounce it with a long or short accent: *lúpa* (pp), face, *lupá* (acute), a grass that causes; *gayac*, one's appearance in public, *gáyac* (pp), drag the dress; *bácal* (pp), iron, *bacál* (acute), provisions; *súlat*(pp), written, *sulát* (acute), crazy.

There are three principal accents: some words are accented at the last syllable; for example, *laró* (acute), oil to make candle; others at the second to the last [sic, the original Spanish is *penultima*]; for example: *lubás* (acute), naked; *tacáp* (acute), cover; well, in short, all accents which are on the last or second to the last syllable as found in the Dictionary where they have this label (*acute*): which means acute or short, in contrast to the other one, marked (pp): and this accent appears in two ways: one is like the Spanish, as in *para* (pp) the same, and it is pronounced like the *para* in Spanish. The other is acute and guttural in the last, leaving it fall (pp), like *lasa*, taste; about this last one, there is nothing similar to it in Latin nor in Spanish. [this is the *maragsa* accent of modern Tagalog, with the mark *pakupyâ* or *wedge*].

Outside of this, when the word has three syllables, it usually has one more accent before the second to the last; for example, *talicalá*, *talinduá*, *salimpapaó*, *salúreráy*, *talípapá*, etc. The acute accent also appears in two ways: one is acute and not guttural, as in *lauít*, the tip of a branch or a dangerous ending; *litán*, *latáng*, *licit*, *apí*, fire which is pronounced fast (*corridillo*) the other is acute and guttural, for example, *saya*, liveliness or happiness; *siri*, *sita*, *sira*, *tinga*, weight of half a tael; and the same with innumerable others, which have no equivalent at all in either Spanish or Latin; and so, it is hard to pronounce them, if not impossible.

It is very important to see the difference among these accents, because otherwise, it might happen many times that you intend to say *bread* and you end

up saying *apple* [*peras*, pears, in the original Spanish]. Let us give examples of some roots, each one of which has all the above-mentioned accents with the corresponding resultant meanings; for example,

- Sala (neither guttural nor acute), fault or sin
- Sala (pp. guttural and not acute), light or brightness,  
like that of the sun
- Salá (acute and not guttural), bamboo interwoven like grill
- Salá (acute and not guttural), criticize, like a defect
- Salá (pp., neither guttural nor acute), physical error, to fail, to err
- Salá (acute and guttural), a woman's act of conceiving before *magli*
- Lasa (guttural and not acute), taste
- Lasa (pp. neither guttural nor acute), punishment or torment
- Lasa (pp. guttural and not acute), bamboo to be made an arrow
- Lasá (pp, neither guttural nor acute),  
adverb which means *almost* or *hardly*
- Bala (pp. guttural and not acute), he who is in charge of something
- Balá (acute and not guttural), to get the wrong meaning
- Bala (pp. neither guttural nor acute),  
to ask an advance payment for the harvest
- Balá (guttural and not acute), threaten with words
- Baba (acute and not guttural), carry on one's shoulders
- Babá (guttural and acute), to go down, to humble oneself
- Babá (guttural), the chin, not the beard

You might find it strange that this language has words which have many accents and that any change of the accent changes the meaning of the same word. But in order that you will not think that it is completely new, consider the word *rey*; do not look at the letters with which it is spelled, but the variety of the pronunciation and the respective meaning. First, *rei*, the genitive of *reus* [culprit]; second *rey*, the genitive of *rex*[sic, the genitive of *rex* is not *rey* but *regis*, meaning "of the king;" he probably meant the dative *regi*, "to the king," with the g pronounced as the Tagalog *h*]; third *rei*, *res* [the thing], *rei* [of the thing]; fourth, past tense, *yo rei* [I laughed].

Concerning the gutturals and their pronunciation, this is how it is done: stop a little in the second to the last syllable and let your throat stop there, and this is what is meant by guttural. And bear in mind that when it becomes a verb, and more so in the passive, the accent is changed, for example from *sála* (guttural and not acute), light or brightness, it becomes, for example, *SALÁN me iyang sulú* (acute or short), brighten that light; from *lasa* (neither guttural nor acute), *lasán* (acute or short), to suffer, like a punishment or the torment. On the other hand, the acute is pronounced as if you are throwing it out hurriedly, *corridillo*, and it is used among passive (pp.); for example, from *salá* (acute), to criticize; *sasalan*, preterite *selan*, (pp.); from *babá* (acute), to

carry; the passive is *bábaban*, preterite *beba* (pp), that which is carried.

Bear in mind also that the gutturals must necessarily end in a vowel and it is only in this syllable that they are guttural, because there are no gutturals in the second to the last nor on the third to the last, nor in those which end in a consonant, because those which end in a consonant are the ones which tally with those which are not gutturals.

And in order to know which are and which are not, there is no other rule than the practice; although if you talk of a brief action, the accent must also be brief, guttural or not guttural. And to be able to pronounce this right, you must necessarily learn it from the indios themselves; and to be able to speak correctly and perfectly, I think it is necessary for [the gift] *to descend from the Father of lights* (*descendat a Patre luminum*).

## Section 2 Reduplications

Reduplication is very frequent in this language. In many places, I explained the patterns to you; you must now be familiar with what I said about the compositions and about the adjectives of *ma*. What I will just say here is that, if the simple have two syllables, they are doubled; if three, the second is doubled; and that, when the consonant which comes after the first vowel is followed by another vowel, if this is not *a*, add *a*; for example, *balictad*; the *i* which comes after *l* is not *a*; and so, add it, and it becomes *balabalictad*; *balatong*: here, there is nothing to add: double it and you get *balabalatong*, etc.

This having been said, in order to save time and space, take this general rule: *when the root is repeated or its meaning is lessened or the action is downsized*, for example, *macuyad*, repeat the root and you get *macuyad-cuyad*, somewhat short; *mapait-pait*, somewhat bitter; *mabuluc-buluc*, somewhat rotten; *matamad-tamad*, somewhat lazy; *mabayat-bayat*, somewhat heavy, etc., and the same applies to those which mean to finally become something somehow, for example, *malanat-lanat*, *malanta-lanta*, to finally wither somehow, like leaves; and so also, *mabucut-bucut*, *marunut-dunut*, *malau-lau*, *mabanal-banal*, etc. See the frequentatives of *ma*.

And I say the same thing about the simple verbs, like *abut-abut*, to hardly reach; *sulat-sulat*, to go into detail; *main-main*, to take little steps; *lacad-lacad*, almost the same; *pulapulayi*, to run a bit; *balabalatong*, slight mistakes, as in answering questions; *tala talusad*, sliding a bit; and the same with those expressing actions which can happen more or less, and they are very many. If you put them in the passive, you get the same point; for example, *abut-abutan*, that which you hardly reach; *dagdag-dagdagan*, add a little; *culang-culangan*, take a little; and this is the pattern for the rest.

If aside from doubling the root, you reduplicate the first syllable, the meaning is do it again and again; for example, *quiling-quiling*, to tilt, *quiquiling-quiling*,

keep on doing it some more; and so, *sisingil-singil*; *susungco-sungco*; *yayaus-yaus*, etc. Make other compositions based on these, and it is not hard to do it, and you can construct their passives according to the general rules.

There are idiomatic expressions that use this downplaying pattern; for example, I find my habit spread on the floor and I ask: why is this here? You answer: *quine co neng quinay*, I placed it here without thinking; and this pattern is followed in: *inogse co neng inogsay*, *depat co neng depat*, *linub cu neng linub*, *tidtud ne* [should be *na*] *neng tidtud*, *lintang na neng lintang*, *menic na yang menic*, *sible na nang siblay*, *pinipi na nang pinipi*, *penic na neng penic*, *meco na yang mecao*, that is that he did the act imperfectly, carelessly, thoughtlessly, inadvertently; but this is applicable only when pronouns are inserted in the repetitions as shown by the examples and not when they are simply reduplicated without the pronouns.

### Section 3 The Abbreviated Forms

The most common ones are those which admit some roots that end with a consonant; Their last vowel is *a*. There is no rule to determine which are the ones that admit them, because we see the same ones among the same number of vowels and consonants. Some roots admit the abbreviated forms, and others don't. Only this can be considered as the rule: namely, *that the roots which have two consonants after the second to the last vowel never admit any abbreviated form; while those which admit them do so in the second passive or in the composition of those which end in an, like the abstract forms with ca and an, etc.* I will now give you a very good list of the roots, which admit the abbreviated forms; you add those, which are not here.

#### LIST

ROOT FORM	MEANING	ABBREVIATED WORD	COMPLETE
abal	to weave	ablan	abalan
atad	to carry	atdan	ataran
buyot	difficult	buyotnan	buyotanan
bulad	to speak	buldan	bularan
bugal	a vulgar word	buglan	bugalan
culapad	acidity of the stomach	culapdan	culaparan
cutang	to ask	cutngan	cutangan
dacap	to arrest	dacpan	dacapan
dapat	to do	daptan	dapatan

dacal	many	daclan	dacalan
gatal	itch	gatlan	gatalan
yama	pleasure	yamnan	yamanan
laman	contents	lamnan	lamanan
lubas	to disrobe	lubsan	lubasan
lucas	to untie	lucsan	lucasan
lucad	to scrape up	lucdan	lucaran
uban	white hair	ubnan	ubanan
patad	to cut	patdan	pataran
sulad	to spin	suldan	sularanan
sugat	to wound	sugtan	sugatan
tulad	to imitate	tuldan	tularanan
tangab	to ignite the firewood	tangban	tangaban
tacap	to cover	tacpan	tacapan

However, some roots are not so strict regarding abbreviation that they cannot perhaps be without them, like *sugatan*, *tularan*, *ataran*. And you must have noticed that almost all of them end with a consonant, except *yama*; included here is *biasa*, one who has *acabiasnan* wisdom; and in the composition of *an*, many of those ending in *ng* drop the second to the last syllable; in the third passive of *anan*, they drop the second to the last, but they can also retain it. For example, *paquinabang*, usefulness; *paquinabangan* or *paquinabangnan*; *along*, to play, *alonganan* or *alongnan*; *salobong*, to meet halfway, *salobongan*, *salobongnan* or *salobonganan*.

The compound forms of all of these with *mi*, *pa* and other particles still retain the abbreviated form in the second passive or composition. I already gave you *libay*, to exchange; *tibay*, strength, which have the abbreviated forms, *Libyan* for *libayan*; *tib-byan* for *tibayan* and *lauay*, *lauan* for *lauayan*, etc.

## Section 4

### Configuration and Suppressions of Letters

This section intends to shed light on a peculiar aspect of Kapampangan words to prevent this peculiarity from beclouding the minds of beginners. In this language, it is very common to clip some letters, for example, *canaquita*, instead of *canaco ita*; *tuleta*, instead of *tula ita*; *iyeni*, instead of *ya ini*; *calmaneta*, instead of *calma na ita*; *caluguran MENG Dios*, instead of *ME ING Dios*; *mipaldan YANG caladua co*, instead of *IYA ING*; *ing totiita*, instead of *toto ita* (here they clip two, and in the following examples also) *marauac at sinira mo*, instead of *marauac cat* etc; *NGARING santos*, instead of *NGARA DING*; *NGANING profeta*, instead of *NGANA NING*. You must have noticed that they clip two letters when the second to

the last of the preceding word is distinct only in number from the first letter of the subsequent word.

They also usually clip the *a* of the second passive; for example, *lan*, instead of *lauan*; *con*, instead of *coan*, etc; and what is more, maybe they clip *n*; for example: *non ing PANAYAT cayap alan angga*, instead of *nun ing PANAYAN*, etc. None of what has been said up to here in this present section is precise; it is, instead, abbreviation and elegant style. Regarding the transposition of letters, for example, *libutan*, *calibudtan*; *moasid*, *moasdan*; *dicta*, *dictan*, etc. I refer you to the Dictionary.

## Last Section

### Section 5 How to Translate

I have no doubt that you will miss [a discussion on] poetry here, but I assure you that, although there are people who dislike poetry more than I do, the poetry of Pampanga leaves me quite unsatisfied (*me fastidia tanto*), because the rhythm of their verses appears to me more like prose than true assonance and consonance, and so I omit it here. Instead, I will give you, although briefly, some pointers on how to translate well if you know the language.

Saint Jerome reduces to only one all the rules which a good translator must follow, and I assure you, from the very start, that you will be a good translator if you do not deviate from it. He says: *et haec regula boni interpretis ut idioma alterius linguae suae linguae exprimat proprietate* [and this is the rule for a good translator, namely, that what the other language says in its own style, he must express in his own language according to its style]. Everything that will be said here will be derived from this.

It means that, when we translate something into Kapampangan, be it Hebrew or Latin or Spanish, we must observe two things: first, the Kapampangan version must give the right meaning; second, the said meaning must be expressed the indio way.

Let me explain. You want to translate that idiomatic expression of the Hebrew: *Filius mortis est homo ille* [That man is a son of death]. If you say *anac ne ning camatayan itang tauo*, your translation is wrong and you are violating the rule. The reason is that in Kapampangan, you call son of death someone who deserves death, and this way of expressing it is not the Kapampangan way, but the Hebrew. The correct idiomatic expression in the Kapampangan language is *mañga-tuliran yang matay itang tauong ita*. Now, yes, you are translating correctly and you are following the rule, because this Kapampangan sentence means the same as *Filius est mortis* [he is a son of death], and, besides you are using an idiomatic expression of the indios. Also, if you want to translate this Latin sentence: *Non intres in iudicium cum servo tuo, Domine* [do not enter into judgment with your servant, Lord] and you use

the words *lungub* and *pamanucum*, etc. you are confusing the meaning and you are violating the rule from one language to another, because this expression is the Latin way, and not the Kapampangan. If you want to translate word for word one language to another, your translation will be *caldera*, *calderae*, and you will make an idiot of yourself and the devil understands you.

[Note of the Translator: *Caldera* is a Spanish word meaning “teapot.” If you want to say “of the teapot,” it will be *de la caldera*, the Spanish way. *Porta* is a Latin word meaning “door.” If you want to say “of the door,” you just add *e* and it becomes *portae*, the Latin way. Bergaño shows how ridiculous it is to treat a Spanish word the Latin way.]

*Ex alia in aliam linguam expressa ad verbum translatio sensum operis et velut laeto gramine sata strangulat.* [A word-for-word translation destroys the meaning of the phrases the way you destroy the golden wheat in the paddy], says Saint Jerome.

The Kapampangan sentence equivalent to that Latin is: *e me sapu paquiisipan ining alipan mo*. See how it has the same meaning without need of restricting yourself to translate word for word, which is what a good translator must do, as Horace says: “For you to be a faithful translator, see to it that you don’t do it word for word.” Do not be stuck with the counting of words, but rather, explore their meanings very carefully. Words are meant to be understood, not to be counted, Cicero said.

See how well we translate Latin proverbs to Spanish without us getting restricted by the Latin words. We translate the meaning and express it using the style peculiar to the Castilian tongue; for example, *In silvam ne ligna feras* [do not bring wood to the forest], do not bring iron to Vizcaya or water to the sea; *Annosa vulpes non capitur laqueo* [you don’t catch an old fox with a noose], *a perro viejo no hay tus tus*, etc. [to an old dog, there is no “come baby, jump, jump,” etc.].

See also this expression of ours: *ve por vida tuya* [see for your life’s sake?]. The Kapampangan translation is *ngamona uari*, and there is no mention of *vida* [life], etc., because this is our idiomatic expression, and not the indio’s. And the same with the rest.

According to Saint Jerome, when the word which precisely corresponds to the original does not sound nice, it is not against the rule to choose another word that sounds better, provided you don’t change the meaning. [Translator: Bergaño now quotes Jerome’s Latin original of that sentence.] It is not against the rule either to add particles or adverbs, etc., that will make it sound beautiful. I will not give any example of this, because the entire Sio is full of them. Consult it.

Two things usually restrain a translator. One is to see in the Castilian language or in Latin or in the Sacred Scriptures figures of speech and imageries and an obligation to God to translate everything, without bearing in mind that every language has its own elegant styles which sound revolting to others, as St. Thomas wrote: *Quae*

*pulchre in una lingua dicuntur, non sonant pulchre in alia* [what sounds beautiful in one language does not sound beautiful in another.]. This is aside from the fact that, very many times, to omit them does not adversely affect the meaning; and if they are doctrines like those of the Scriptures, either explain them, starting with the word *alimbaua*, or focus on their symbolic meaning, etc.

The other is that here we find many things which there are no words to refer to, because those things do not exist in this land; for example, eagle, bear, lamb, etc. We should use the Spanish words in these cases and we should not discard them saying that the indios would not understand them anyway, because many times these things elicit sublime concepts in the indios by the mere fact that they do not know what they are. Listen to Pliny: *Nam certe nescio quid magni concipit animus cum haec inusitata verba vel profert vel audit.* [For certainly I do not know what sublime things my mind conceives when I pronounce or hear these almost unheard-of words.] How many words do we read in the Scriptures which move us to devotion and yet we do not understand them?

But do not let this discourage you from searching for words to describe things which are not found here; words which will make it possible for you to explain the doctrines effectively.

I say this because I have seen a translation in which the topic was vine and vine branches, and since there are no vineyards here, they ignored the countryside lands, as if, for this purpose, you would not be able to explain well enough using *tanaman* or *pon* or *sanga*, etc.

Lastly, when the doctrine is judged to be opportune, do not say: what is the use of translating it, if the indio would not understand it anyway? Go translate it just the same. After all, the translator has no obligation to make it easy. For all you know, some indio might find it uplifting and understand it. *Qui potest capere, capiat* [He who can take it, let him take it.].

[Translator's Note: Although Bergaño says that the translator is not obliged to make the translation easy to understand, it is always possible to make it easy to understand. Dont you think so?].

DEO VERO, TRINO ET UNO,  
JESUQUE DEO ET HOMINI  
EJUSQUE VIRGINI MATRI  
LAUS ET GLORIA IN SAECULA. AMEN.

TO THE TRUE GOD, THREE IN ONE  
AND TO JESUS, GOD AND MAN  
AND TO HIS VIRGIN MOTHER  
PRAISE AND GLORY FOREVER. AMEN.

[Translator's Note: Page 225 of the original ends here. Page 226 is blank]

# PROLOGUE TO THE READER

According to our loving Father Saint Augustine, there are two stumbling blocks to studying something: short process and long process. *Laborant hominess in discendo brevia non valent intelligere, et prolixia, non amant legere.* [In their attempt at learning something, people cannot understand if it is short, and they don't like reading if it is long.] [Notice the play of words: *intelligere*, to understand, and *legere*, to read.] Even writers find themselves in danger of capsizing between Scylla and Charybdis, because if they allow their pen to go on and on and on, they find themselves getting bored, and if they decide to be brief, their words will fail to enlighten, because they will stay in the shadow, in the darkness. As Horace affirmed: *Obscurus fio dum brevis esse laboro.* [I become hard to understand when I try to be brief.]

As I think of this brevity, I also think of avoiding the other extreme of being too long. I know that it is in this land, more than in any other, that there is need of avoiding it at all cost, but remembering that there are many zealous ministers who do not hesitate to work and to exercise their calling, I felt inspired to write the Grammar anew (*me anime a escribir el Arte de nuevo*). And I worked indescribably hard to make it stay in the middle, where it will neither be long and consequently boring, nor short and consequently vague.

If, in spite of this, my friend-reader, I fail to give you satisfaction, I hope I will be exonerated in view of my having composed it in the midst of so many duties to fulfil and of continuous headaches.

[page xx] I pray God that my shortcomings will be made up for by your zeal and your effort in studying this as it is your obligation, and I assure you that even if you may have too retentive a memory and even if you keep your ears open, you will not progress without the help of the Grammar.

*“And so, Saint Paul was sad,”* exclaimed Sain Jerome. Why was the apostle sad? *Quia divinorum eloquiorum sensuum Majestatem digno non poerat Graeci eloquii explicare sermone.* [Because he could not explain the sublime message of the divine words with the corresponding beautiful style of the Greek language.] Why so? Did Saint Paul not have the gift of the Greek language together with the other languages? No doubt about it, says the Angelic Doctor [Saint Thomas Aquinas], and he certainly knew it well enough, but he did not have the elegant style which the human art teaches: *Paulus et alii apostoli fuerunt instructi divinitus linguis omnium gentium, quantum requirebatur ad fidei doctrinam, sed quantum ad quaedam quae super adduntur humana Arte adornatum, el elegantiam locutionis, apostolus erat instructus in propria lingua, non*

*autem in aliena.* [Paul and the other apostles were taught by the Lord the languages of all nations, in so far as the doctrine of the faith required it, but as regards those things which are added by human art, and the elegance of speech, the apostle knew those of his own language, but not those of others].

Could it not have been that, although he knew the language well, he was also sad, considering the inadequacy of the human art to transmit the sublime and profound messages? The Great Doctor answers again: He did feel sad. *Tristatur quia organum per quod Christo caneret non habebat.* [He was sad because he did not have a musical instrument with which to sing to Christ.]

And will there be someone who does not have the gift of tongues and who speaks the language only by using notes and by looking at the accents and who, nevertheless, talks about and explains these lofty and sublime doctrines unhesitatingly? What a blind and nonsensical delight! We all think that we already know a lot and that there is no need—that we are not obliged—to work more and more so as to learn the language, as if it could be learned just like that, effortlessly. Take note of the hard time Saint Jerome had with Hebrew: *Quid ibi laboris insumpserim, quid sustinuerim difficul[tatis], quoties desperaverim, quoties cessaverim, et rursus incaeperim, testis est conscientiae, tam mea, qui passus sum, quam eorum qui mecum duxerunt vitam.* [How much effort I exerted, how many difficulties I encountered, how often I despaired, how often I stopped, only to start again: to all of these I have as my witnesses our consciences, both mine (remembering how I suffered in this endeavor) and those of the people who lived with me.].

[page xxi] Let so great a model move you to work. Let the precious reward which you hope for move you to study. Let the strict obligation of your position move you. And, lastly, allow yourself to be moved by Charity—to distribute the Bread to so many poor people—and with Charity, you will find everything easy; and without it, you will find studying the language to be an unbearable burden, and, even if you know it and you speak like an angel, *si linguis hominum loquar et angelorum* [if I speak in the tongues of mortals and of angels], you will not be an organ, but a cowbell or a clapper, *charitatem autem non habeam, factus sum velut aes sonans aut cymbalum tinniens* [but if I do not have love, I am a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal.] [I Cor. 13:1].

# PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS

In order that you will not be confused by the different ways Kapampangans pronounce their letters, I want to give you beforehand some necessary observations. And starting from the letter *d*, you have to know that this language does not have the *r* as hard as that in *rayo*, *carro*, nor will you ever hear it. Neither does it have the *r* as soft as in *caro*, *orar*; and even if you hear it pronounced that way occasionally, you should bear in mind that it is not *r*, but *d*, which has two sounds, because at times it is pronounced as *d*, at other times as *r*, depending on the place where it is spoken. So that you will know when to pronounce it *d* and when *r*, take these rules.

## First

If it is the first letter of a word and is not preceded by a vowel of another word, it is *d*; if it is between two vowels only, it is *r*. Consider this word *dada*, aunt or stepmother, which is pronounced *dara*, and you will see the point about one and the other; the same way that we pronounce *r* hard if it is the first letter, and otherwise soft, in Latin and Spanish, as in *raro*, *rara vez*.

I said *if it is not preceded by a vowel of another word*, because if it is preceded by one, even if it is the first letter, it is *r*; for example, *dinay*, shame, *marinay*, to have it. Also I said *if it is between two vowels only*, as in *dara*, *sari*, because if it is followed by more than one, you have to look, and it will fall under the second rule.

## Second

Given a word where a vowel with a long accent either comes before or comes after *d*; if the former, it is *d*; for example, *sadia*, *adua*, *caladua*; if the latter, pronounce it *r*; for example, *saria*, *lario*. It is correct to pronounce *d* in *pañgadyi* and its compounds, because the first *y* that follows it is a consonant; and this has nothing to do with spelling words with *dd*; for example, *addua caladdua*, etc.

## Third

The third rule is that, if what comes ahead or after is a consonant, it is pronounced *d*; for example, *damdam*, *atdo*.

## Fourth

When it is the last letter, like *lugud*, *malimadmad*, etc., in the mouth of the natives it is between *d* and *r*; but you will be mistaken only a bit if you pronounce it *r*, like *matulid*.

The *e* and the *i* are also one letter in this language; that is why sometimes you hear *e*, sometimes *i*; pronounce it the way that sounds better, because this is the rule, as long as (if it is the first letter) you pronounce it very rarely as *e*, because if there are seven which begin with *e*, they are not more.

The same is true with the *o* and the *u*, which are also one; sometimes you hear *o*, sometimes *u*; but take note that the consonant *u* is never attached to the vowel that follows, but it is always liquid, like *uaua*.

The consonant *y* is attached to the vowels, as in *yaus*, *yotos*, *yumina*, except to the *i*, as in *pulayi*, to run; *balayi*, fellow parent-in-law; *bayi*, ark, etc.; but even if it is not attached, it is pronounced long, because it really has two *yi*. [This language] does not have *ll* like ours; for example, *caballo*, but *y*, *cabayo*; and although we write *mallas*, *mallari*, we have to pronounce and write them as *malyas*, *malyari*, and we would not make two hard *ll*, but one which is attached somehow to the *y*; if you strictly follow the Kapampangan writing, this is not even what corresponds to it, but *maliyas*, *maliyari*; and I also say that we should not write *yñapin* nor *yñyapin*, but *yñiyapin*; this is the way it is written with the Kapampangan characters.

Neither does it have the hard *ña ño*, as in *niña*, *niño*, but *ñya*, where also the *y* is attached, as in *mañyaus*, *mañyauad*; listen to how the indio pronounces *yñiyapin* and you will see how certainly correct is what I am saying.

Concerning the two *gg* which this language has, I needed to reflect for a long time, because it has *g* like that of *manga* and *ng* nasal, and this was difficult to understand; but if you spell the first one with two *gg*, like *mangga*, until, and the second one with *g*, like *mañga*, conjunction *and*, there is no difficulty. If you speak and write a lot, open your eyes and you will see how the following words differ in meaning and pronunciation: *bañga* versus *bangga*, *tiñga* versus *tingga*.

The diphthongs of this language are two: one is *ai*, as in *balai*; the other is *ao*, as in *galao*, *dalao*, *lacao*. Regarding them, bear in mind first of all that their two vowels are considered as one syllable; secondly, that the said syllable, as far as ligatures are concerned, is a consonant; and so, they say *balay a maragul*, and not *balayng maragul*; although they say *babayng masampat*, because it is not a diphthong.

The third thing that you should take note of is that when they are inserted, the two vowels are not pronounced distinctly, but are mixed, like *pamanlacao*. You will not say *pamanlaco mo*, but *pamanlacao mo*; nor *balay mo*, but *bale mo*; and so in the *ay* the *e* is heard more than the *a*, as in *palay*, *pale mo*; and in *ao*, the *o* is heard more, like in *galao*, *pamañgalo mo*. It is difficult for us to pronounce these diphthongs, but this doctrine is indubitable.

Some people are too preoccupied with pinpointing the distinction between those which are diphthongs and those which are not but seem to be such; for example, *balay*, diphthong, versus *balayi*, which is not, etc. Do not think of a difficulty where there is none; because either you hear them or you see them. If you see them, you being certain that the two vowels of the first diphthong do not adhere to *y*, and those of the second do not adhere

to *u*, they are distinguished at first sight; because the diphthong is spelled with only two letters, like *balay*, *lacao*; and that which is not, with three letters, like *balayi*, *cauo*.

The distinction is not less clear if you hear them. Listen to how the indio pronounces *balay*, diphthong, and *balayi*, which is not; *dalao*, diphthong, and *dalauo*, which is not; and you will clearly get the distinction however deaf you are; because those which are diphthongs are pronounced short; those which are not, long. Look at the last part of the Grammar.

Lastly, take note that you will encounter the term *root* many times in the Grammar, and it is another way of saying *simple word*, “naked” of all compositions; for example, *sulat* is called *root* because it is not yet part of a composition, and from it comes as many branches as the compositions it admits, although in itself, in its simplicity, it means *writing*, *something written*, but although it does not mean anything, it is called a *root*; like this word *can* is called a *root*, from which proceed many verbs, active and passive, although in itself it is neither used nor it has a meaning.

# CONTENTS

Preface to this Third Edition .....	xxi
Dedication .....	xxiii
Permissions and Approvals .....	xxiv
Prologue to the Reader .....	xxxix
Preliminary Observations .....	xli
Chapter 1 The Declensions of Nouns .....	1
Section 1 Proper Nouns .....	1
Section 2 Appellatives .....	3
Section 3 Primitive Pronouns .....	4
The Use of YA, NA, NE, NO	
Section 4 Demonstrative Pronouns .....	12
Section 5 Interrogative Pronouns .....	13
Section 6 Other Uses of the Articles .....	15
Chapter 2 The Substantive Verb .....	18
Section 1 The Concept of To Be (Ser) .....	18
Section 2 The Concept of To Be (Estar) NI, TI, TA .....	18
Section 3 The Concept of To Have (Haber) or To Have (Tener) .....	23
Chapter 3 The Simple Verb and Its Conjugations .....	25
Section 1 Conjugation and Variation of Tenses .....	26
Section 2 The Regular Conjugation of the Active Voice .....	34
Section 3 The Regular Passives and their Formation .....	41
Section 4 The Irregular Third [sic. Three?] Passives .....	43
Chapter 4 The Use of the Active and the Passive .....	46
Section 1 When to Speak in the Active and When in the Passive .....	46
Section 2 The Use of the Three Passives First, the Passive of I .....	53
Section 3 The Second Passive of AN .....	57
Section 4 The Third Passive of ANAN AN, ANAN, ANANAN Compared .....	59
Section 5 Notes on Which Passive Admits Which Kind of Verbs .....	65

## Chapter 5 The Protocompounds

Section 1 Their Variation .....	67
Section 2 Their Meaning .....	70
Section 3 Various Protocompounds .....	74
Section 4 Their Frequentatives .....	75

## Chapter 6 The Particle MAG

Section 1 Its Conjugation and Some Uses .....	77
MAG: To Make Verbs .....	77
MAG: To Use .....	78
MAG: Reflexive .....	79
MAG: Intent .....	79
MAG: To Put Oneself .....	80
MAG: To Pass By .....	80
MAG: To Become .....	81
MAG: To Do .....	81
MAG: Intensification .....	81
MAG: To Make Oneself Appear Like .....	82
Section 2 MAG of Fiction and Appearance .....	82
Frequentatives .....	83

## Chapter 7 The Particle MI and its Formation

Section 1 Transitive MI .....	85
Section 2 Passives of PI and AN Its Nouns .....	87
Section 3 MI Neutral and MI with AN	
By chance: MIPA, MICAPA, MIPACA .....	92
MI with AN .....	95
AN and its Nouns .....	96
Section 4 The Active MI and the Frequentatives .....	98
MI: Intensification .....	99
MI: To Make Fun of .....	99
MI: Thwarted Action .....	100
MI: Desire .....	100
MI: Frequentatives .....	100
Section 5 MI: Reflexive .....	101
MI: To Acquire .....	102
MI: Correlation .....	102
Section 6 MI: Company .....	103
Section 7 MI: Alternation .....	105
MI: Competition .....	106
Section 8 Verbal and Nominal MICA .....	107
Section 9 MICA: Novelty/Plurals .....	109

Chapter8	The Particle MAQUI .....	112
	Section 1 MAQUI: To Introduce Oneself .....	112
	Section 2 MAQUI: To Try to .....	115
	Section 3 MAQUI: To Complete .....	115
	Section 4 MAQUI: To Have/To Own .....	116
Chapter9	The Particle MA .....	117
	Section 1 Neutral Verbs of MA and their Formation.....	117
	MA: Plurals .....	121
	MA: Feasibility .....	122
	Section 2 MA of Abundance.....	122
	Section 3 The MA of Adjectives	
	and their Abstracts and Frequentatives .....	124
	MA: Frequentatives .....	125
	Section 4 MA of Evaluation/Passive of ICA .....	126
Chapter10	The Particle CA .....	130
	Section 1 CA: Companion and Coequal .....	130
	Section 2 CA of Just Finished and Verbals of BILIS .....	132
	Section 3 CA of The Abstracts .....	136
	Section 4 CA of Individuation .....	138
Chapter11	The Particle MACA .....	142
	Section 1 The MACA of Perfection, Inadvertence	
	and Apprehension .....	142
	Section 2 The MACA of Potentiality and other Potentials .....	147
	Section 3 The MACA of Nuisance .....	148
	Section 4 The Causal MACA .....	149
	Section 5 The MACA and PACA of To Be [Estar] .....	150
	Section 6 The MACA and PACA of Intensity .....	151
	The Particle PECA .....	152
Chapter12	The Particle PA .....	153
	Section 1 The PA as FF .....	153
	PA: To Say .....	155
	PA: To Ask and To Give .....	156
	Section 2 Alternative Composition	
	of Facere Facere (Refacere Fieri) .....	157
	Section 3 Other Meanings of the PA .....	160

Chapter 13 The Comparatives and Superlatives and other Particles Related to Them .....	162
Section 1 ANTI, TINTI, MAGUIN, MALA, TELA .....	162
Section 2 The Superlatives .....	164
Chapter 14 Various Particles .....	165
Section 1 MAGUIN .....	165
Section 2 PAY .....	166
Section 3 SI and PASI .....	166
Section 4 PAL .....	167
Section 5 TALA .....	168
Section 6 MELA .....	169
Section 7 SANG .....	169
Section 8 NGAN .....	170
Section 9 PANGA .....	170
Chapter 15 The Adverbs .....	172
Section 1 Adverbs of Place .....	172
Section 2 Adverbs of Time .....	173
Section 3 Asking and Answering .....	177
Section 4 Doubt and Affirmation .....	181
Section 5 Presupposing .....	184
Section 6 Except .....	185
Section 7 Saying the Opposite .....	186
Section 8 Approximating .....	188
Section 9 Requesting and Desiring .....	189
Section 10 Interjections and Ironies .....	190
Chapter 16 The Copulatives, The Disjunctives and The Ligatures .....	193
Section 1 The Copulatives .....	193
Section 2 The Disjunctives .....	194
Section 3 The Ligatures .....	194
Chapter 17 The Numerals .....	197
Section 1 The Cardinal Numbers .....	197
Section 2 The Ordinal Numbers .....	200
Section 3 The Distributives .....	201
Section 4 How Many Times? And What Proportions? .....	203
Section 5 Monetary Denominations .....	204
Section 6 Identifying Portions of Time .....	207

Chapter 18 Accents, Pronunciation, Reduplication and Other Important Considerations .....	210
Section 1 Accents and Pronunciation .....	210
Section 2 Reduplications .....	212
Section 3 The Abbreviated Forms .....	213
Section 4 Configuration and Suppression of Letters .....	214
Section 5 How to Translate .....	215

S.D.H. et G.

[Soli Deo Honor et Gloria]

[To God alone be the honor and glory]

[Translator's Note: This Table of Contents is the last part of the original Spanish. It is on pages 227-231.]

# TRANSLATOR'S NOTES

1. A basic feature of Bergaño's *Arte* is the Latin declension. It goes like this:

Nominative:	the case of the Subject	<b>PETRUS</b>
Genitive:	the case of the Possessor	<b>PETRI</b>
Dative:	the case of the Indirect Object	
	the to-or-for case	<b>PETRO</b>
Accusative:	the case of the Direct Object	<b>PETRUM</b>
Ablative:	the by/with/from case	<b>PETRO</b>
Vocative:	the case of the Person Addressed	<b>PETRE</b>

The way each of these cases is used in a sentence is as follows:

Nominative Case:	Pedro bought a book.	<b>Petrus</b> emit librum.
Genitive Case:	I saw the book of Pedro.	Ego vidi librum <b>Petri</b> .
Dative Case:	I gave the book to Pedro.	Ego dedi librum <b>Petro</b> .
Accusative Case:	I saw Pedro.	Ego vidi <b>Petrum</b> .
Ablative Case:	I was seen by Pedro.	Ego visus sum a <b>Petro</b> .
Vocative Case:	Come here, Pedro.	Veni huc, <b>Petre</b> .

The Kapampangan equivalent is the following:

Nominative:	Sinali yang libru Y <b>PEDRU</b> .
Genitive:	Ikit ke ing libru <b>NANG PEDRU</b> .
Dative:	Binie ke ing libru <b>CANG PEDRU</b> .
Accusative:	Ikit ke Y <b>PEDRU</b> .
Ablative:	Ikit <b>NAkuNG PEDRU</b> .
Vocative:	Mekeni, <b>PEDRU</b> . or <b>PEDRO</b> , mekeni.

Now, notice the difference between the declension that corresponds to the above and the declension given by Bergaño in Chapter 1:

	Declension A	Declension B
	Based on the Above:	Bergaño's Chapter 1
Nominative:	Y <b>PEDRU</b>	Y <b>PEDRO</b>
Genitive:	<b>NANG PEDRU</b>	<b>NAN PEDRO</b>
Dative:	<b>CANG PEDRU</b>	<b>CAN PEDRO</b>

Accusative:	Y PEDRU*	CAN PEDRO*
Ablative:	NANG PEDRU*	CAN PEDRO*
Vocative:	PEDRU or PEDRO	PEDRO

They differ in the accusative\* and in the ablative\*. However, that difference did not adversely affect the clarity and accuracy of Beragaño's explanations.

2. Before reading Chapter 3, where Beragaño begins to explain the difference between the active voice and the passive voice, it will be helpful to read and understand the following paragraph taken from Chapter 4.

“I suppose that you have not yet forgotten that the first sentence of the active is made up of *the nominative of the person who does, the verb and the accusative of the person who receives the action*. The same is true in Kapampangan; and that the first sentence of the passive is made up of *the nominative of the person who receives the action, the verb and the ablative of the person who does*. Change the ablative to genitive and try doing that in this language. You will find here many examples of one and the other.”

What he meant was this:

Active: Pedro (nominative) saw (verb) the servant (accusative).

Petrus (nominative) vidit (verb) servum (accusative)

Passive: The servant (nominative) was seen (verb) by Pedro (ablative).

Servus (nominative) visus est (verb) a Petro (ablative)

**Change the ablative to genitive and try doing that in this language.**

What Beragaño meant here, albeit implicitly, were the four steps that follow.

Step 1. CAN PEDRO (ablative) ikit alipan.

Step 2. NAN PEDRO (genitive) ikit alipan.

Step 3. Ikit NAN PEDRO ing alipan.

Step 4. Ikit NENG PEDRO ing alipan.

According to declension B, there was a change from CAN (ablative) to NAN (genitive).

According to declension A, there was no need of changing, because the ablative and the genitive were the same (NAN).

The Spanish priest who were studying Kapampangan had to go through these four steps because they were using the Latin grammar to learn it. But for the native Kapampangan themselves, all that was needed was to be breastfed, as babies, by their mothers who then gave them the language mixed in their milk (the *amanung sisuan*). And then they would simply say, effortlessly: *Ikit neng Pedro ing alipan*.

3. In several portions of this book, Bergaño employs philosophical terms and alludes to philosophical concepts. I do not find the need to mention them here, because those who are familiar with philosophy will easily recognize them in the text. As for those who are not familiar with philosophy, I endeavored to translate (and sometimes annotate) the said passages in such a way that these readers would find them as easy to understand as those which are not philosophical.

4. Before doing this translation, I gave myself the following guidelines: (a) Convey exactly what Bergaño wanted to convey; (b) Express it in impeccable English; (c) Make it easy for the reader to understand.

The first two happen to be the same as the rules given by Bergaño in the last section of the book (as I discovered when I reached that part). The third is mine, as opposed to his opinion expressed there.

5. The many brackets that appear in the text have the same function as the usual endnotes. Enclosed in them are annotations. Also, the page-numbers of the Spanish original.

The following are italicized: (a) Kapampangan texts; (b) English or Spanish words when required by the context; and (c) Latin terms and sentences. An English translation always accompanies the Latin. Finally, the bold-face type is used to highlight important words or passages.

FR. EDILBERTO V. SANTOS

December 16, 2006  
Angeles City