Old Bikol -um- vs. mag- and the Loss of a Morphological Paradigm

Jason William Lobel

Old Bikol *-um-* vs. *mag-* and the Loss of a Morphological Paradigm

Jason William Lobel

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I

A semantic contrast between verbs taking the *-um-* paradigm and those taking the *mag-* paradigm is known to exist in Tagalog and Waray-Waray but is virtually absent in all varieties of Bikol and most Bisayan languages. Evidence is presented from Fr. Marcos de Lisboa's seventeenth-century *Vocabulario de la Lengua Bicol* that many Old Bikol verbs had contrasting *-um-* and *mag-* conjugations. The *-um-* and *mag-* conjugations of Old Bikol are compared with those of Waray-Waray, Southern Tagalog, and Rinconada Bikol. After a discussion of the categories of semantic contrast between *-um-* and *mag-* verbs in Old Bikol, and how these contrasts were restructured in Modern Bikol, a progression of stages is proposed to explain how the *-um-* vs. *mag-* contrast has been lost in Bikol and other Central Philippine languages.

1. BACKGROUND.[1] The distinction between "*-um-* verbs" and "*mag-* verbs" has long been a topic of inquiry, mainly in Tagalog, because nearly all other Central Philippine languages have lost most if not all of the contrasts between these two verbal paradigms. Pittman (1966) and Ramos (1974) contain two of the most comprehensive studies of the real semantic distinction in Tagalog between verbs taking these two affixes, with Pittman concentrating solely on the Actor Focus (AF) forms, and Ramos including the corresponding forms in other focuses as well.

The term "*-um-* verb" refers to the verbal paradigm in which the infinitive is formed with the infix *-um-*, as in Tagalog *kumúha* 'to get', while the term "*mag-* verb" likewise refers to the paradigm in which the infinitive is formed with the prefix *mag-*, as in

Tagalog *magbigáy* 'to give'. Depending on each language's system of tense/aspect conjugation, these affixes may also be employed in other tenses/aspects as well. In Standard Tagalog, the affix *-um-* appears in the infinitive, past, and present conjugations of the *-um-* paradigm, while the affix *mag-* occurs in the infinitive and future conjugations of the *mag-* paradigm,[2] as shown in table 1.

Furthermore, in a language like Tagalog, each verb inherently selects one paradigm or the other based on its semantic features; thus, we get *kumúha* 'to get', not ****magkúha*,[3] and likewise *magbigáy* 'to give', not ****bumigáy*.[4] Some roots can take either affix, but almost always with a difference in meaning: *bumilí* 'to buy' vs. *magbilí* 'to sell', *umabót* 'to reach for' vs. *mag-abót* 'to hand over';[5] *bumíhis* 'to dress someone up' vs. *magbíhis* 'to get dressed'; and *lumákad* 'to walk' vs. *maglákad* 'to walk something (like a dog)'. As both *-um-* and *mag-* mark Actor Focus, the contrast between these two is not so much grammatical as semantic, although there may also be grammatical repercussions, such as singular actor vs. plural actor (see section 5).

Both the *-um-* and *mag-* affixes are inherited, the former from PAN *<um> and the latter from PMP *maR-. Cognates of both are found in the Formosan languages to the north (Zeitoun et al. 1996, Blust 2003), as well as in languages to the south of the Philippines. Liao (2004) includes a comprehensive discussion of the reflexes of both affixes.

2. THE SITUATION IN BIKOL. Having lost the *-um-* paradigm at some point in its history, Modern Bikol has no such semantic contrast comparable to that of Tagalog.

TABLE 1. STANDARD TAGALOG -UM- AND MAG- CONJUGATIONS

	-um- VERBS	*mag-* VERBS
INFINITIVE	-um-	mag-
PAST	-um-	nag-
PRESENT	-um-R-	nag-R-
FUTURE	R-	mag-R-

2. The affix *mag-* may also be said to occur in the past and present conjugations, as the affix *nag-* is often analyzed as deriving from **minag-* < *mag-* + *-in-*.

3. Reconstructions are marked with a single asterisk (*), and nonoccurring forms—including forms that are nonoccurring for a given meaning—are marked with two asterisks (**).

4. The form *bumigáy* does occur, but with the meaning of 'to give in (as in when under pressure)', not simply 'to give'. The basic meaning of the root *bigáy* is clearly 'to give', as seen in the various focus forms: *magbigáy* 'to give' (Actor Focus), *ibigáy* 'to give something' (Object Focus), and *bigyán* 'to give to somebody' (Location Focus). *Pagbigyán* 'to give in to someone; to let someone have their way', the Location Focus form of *bumigáy* 'to give in', is more complex morphologically. Therefore, *bumigáy* is clearly a secondary semantic extension of the meaning of the root *bigáy* 'to give', which derives from PAN *beRay 'to give'.

5. In this paper an adaptation of the standard Tagalog, Bikol, and Bisayan orthographies is used, whereby a hyphen before or after a consonant represents a glottal stop, an acute accent mark on a vowel represents stress, a grave accent mark represents word-final glottal stop, and a circumflex accent mark represents the combination of a word-final glottal stop and stress on the ultima. Furthermore, the spellings of entries from Lisboa (1865) are regularized, with <ng> for Lisboa's "gn", <k> corresponding to Lisboa's "qu" and "c" when representing /k/, <i> where Lisboa used "y" to represent the vowel /i/, and <w> and <y> where Lisboa used "u" and "i," respectively, to represent semivowels. Stress is indicated on the Old Bikol entries according to the guidelines described by Zorc (1991).

Nearly all Modern Bikol verbs are found in the *mag-* paradigm with their basic indicative meaning, except for a small number that follow some other paradigm instead (e.g., *maki-*, *ma-*, *maN-*, *magpa-*). However, an analysis of the oldest written record of Bikol, Fr. Marcos de Lisboa's Bikol-Spanish dictionary entitled *Vocabulario de la Lengua Bicol* (1865) quite clearly shows that Old Bikol had both an -*um-* and a *mag-* paradigm, and that there was a semantic contrast between the two for a considerable number of roots.[6] The evidence for this contrast consists of both affixed subentries and sentence examples, and has not previously been discussed in the literature, most likely due to the dearth of scholars who have utilized Lisboa's *Vocabulario*. In fact, the only scholars who to my knowledge have cited data from it have been native Bikolano historian Danilo Madrid Gerona (2000, 2001), mainly in his research on ancient Bikol history and society; Bikolano scholar Fr. Wilmer J. S. Tria (1998a,b, 1999a,b, 2000), who produced a series of short articles on Old Bikol vocabulary in the Bikol-based journal *Hingowa*; and linguist Malcolm Mintz, who as of this writing is finishing a dictionary (Mintz, to appear) that combines a revised version of Mintz and Britanico (1985) with a translation of the entries from Lisboa (1865). However, Mintz (2000) does not note the distinction between -*um-* and *mag-* in Old Bikol in his presentation of verbs from Lisboa (1865), where he gives the root *bakál* 'buy' as taking the prefix *mag-* for both centripetal ('to buy') and centrifugal ('to sell') meanings:

> bakál ... MAG-, -ON to buy s/t by exchanging foodstuffs such as rice, coconuts; to barter for s/t ... MAG-, IPAG- to sell s/t in exchange for foodstuffs (Mintz 2000:16)

Lisboa (1865) does not present the affixes in this way, however. The original entry clearly gives a different affix for each meaning (English translations from this point forward are mine; I have also regularized the orthography [see fn. 5]):

> BACAL ... pc ... *Nabacàl*, comprar algo con cosas de comer como arroz, coco, ú otras cosas semejantes ... *Nagbabacàl*, vender lo que asi se compra con otras cosas ... (Lisboa 1865:40) (BAKÁL ... unstressed penult ... *Nabakál*, to buy something by trading things to eat like rice, coconuts, or other similar things. *Nagbabakál*, to sell something which is bought with other things in this way.)

As can be seen from this example, Lisboa gives two different meanings for the root *bakál*, each with a different affix, 'to buy (Sp. *comprar*)' with *na-*, and 'to sell (Sp. *vender*)' with *nag-R-*. These correspond to what Spanish-era authors like Lisboa (1865) and San Agustin (1879) refer to as the "1st conjugation (*primera conjugacion*)" and "2nd conjugation (*segunda conjugacion*)," the first referring to the -*um-* paradigm, and the second to the *mag-* paradigm. Lisboa's citation form for affixed

---

6. Lisboa, who died in 1622, was stationed in the Philippines during the first two decades of the seventeenth century (Danilo Gerona, pers. comm.). His dictionary was not published until 1754, but was mentioned "in an anonymous manuscript of 1649" (Mintz 2000:1). Data for the present study were taken from the 1865 edition of the *Vocabulario*. As Lisboa was based in modern-day Naga City, this "Old Bikol" is the direct ancestor of the Naga dialect of Northern Bikol, but not directly ancestral to any of the other three languages found in the Bikol Region, including Southern Bikol, whose Rinconada dialect is discussed in section 8. All references to the "Bikol language" in this article refer to the Naga dialect, except where "Rinconada" is clearly identified.

Old Bikol subentries is the present/progressive, and even non–Actor Focus forms are presented in what can easily be identified as present/progressive by those familiar with other Central Philippine languages. The only form foreign to Modern Bikol, *na-*, is actually described as the present tense of the "first conjugation" (i.e., the *-um-* paradigm) in its own entry:

> *NA*. With this prefix, the present of the indicative of the first conjugation is formed, signifying action, or a small amount of time spent on it, or that only one person has done the action, e.g., *Nagúhit ako*, I am writing. *Nabása,* reading. *Nakakán*, eating, etc. (Lisboa 1865:248)

Similarly, Lisboa describes the following affixes in entries of their own: *mina-* 'the second present and past progressive of the first active conjugation' (245); *ma-* 'the future of the first active conjugation' (239); *mag-* 'imperative of the second active conjugation, as well as the future when the first syllable of the root word is reduplicated' (239–40); and *nag-* 'the past of the second active conjugation, as well as the present when the first syllable of the root is reduplicated' (248). In spite of the fact that the *Vocabulario* does not include entries for infixes like *-um-* and *-imin-*, the *-um-* form is actually referred to as the "infinitive" in the entries for *ánay* and *nasí*, in the latter of which the *-um-* infinitive is placed side-by-side with the *mag-* infinitive.

> *ÁNAY*. This particle, preceding the infinitive, creates the past; e.g., *ánay dumtóng akó, naghálè siyá*, 'When I arrived, he left.' Also combines with the adverb *asó*, e.g., *ánay asó kumháng akó* 'when I went' (24)

> *NASÍ*. Adverb of past time. Has the meaning of 'then, at that time' when together with the present or infinitive. With the present, the meaning becomes past progressive, and with the infinitive, the meaning becomes past perfect: *Nasí nagugúhit*, 'then, when he was writing', *Nasí gumúhit ~ maggúhit* 'then, when he wrote, or had finished writing' (251).

Note that the infinitives *dumtóng, kumháng,* and *gumúhit* are cited in the present tense with the affix *na-* in their dictionary subentries: *nadatóng* (121), *nakaháng* (86), and *nagúhit* (150), respectively.

  Furthermore, the usage of *-um-* (or its allomorph *-im-*, cf. 4.1) as the infinitive, and *-imin-* as the past, is also unmistakable from a number of Lisboa's (1865) sentence examples, including (1)–(3) for the infinitive form and (4)–(6) for the past form.

(1) Boót kang   kumúyog   sakô?
     want   2SG.NOM.LIG   accompany<AF.INF>   1SG.OBL
     'Do you (SG) want to accompany me?'   (p. 15)

(2) Boót kang   kumán?
     want   2SG.NOM.LIG   eat<AF.INF>
     'Do you (SG) want to eat?'   (34)

(3) Daí akó   nakakahóna-hónang   gimíbo   kaiyán.
     NEG   1SG.NOM   AF.ABIL.PRES.think.LIG   do<AF.INF>   GEN.that
     'I didn't think of doing that.'   (189)

(4) Si   koyán patín si   koyán   an   **giminí**bo kaiyán.
    NOM so.and.so and   NOM so.and.so NOM do<AF.PAST> GEN.that

'So-and-so and so-and-so are the ones who did that.'   (282)

(5) **Kimin**án   na.
    eat<AF.PAST> already

'I've already eaten.'   (85)

(6) Indá   kun anó tà daí siyá   **kimin**aág.
    I.don't.know if why   NEG 3SG.NOM go<AF.PAST>

'I don't know why he didn't come.'   (107)

Mintz (2000) was therefore correct in presenting the second, centrifugal meaning of 'to sell' as belonging to the *mag-* paradigm, but not in assigning the first, centripetal meaning 'to buy' to the same paradigm. Instead, it should have been assigned to the *-um-* paradigm, had he acknowledged its existence in Old Bikol. In all fairness, the article was about social practices, not morphology, and this detail was of little importance to the topic being discussed.

However, the root *bakál* is far from being the only root for which Lisboa (1865) recorded such a contrast between the *-um-* and *mag-* paradigms, as can be seen in examples (7)–(11).

(7) *kakán.* **nakakán** 'to eat ordinary food'; **nagkakakán** 'to eat something for entertainment, not ordinary food' [7]   (85)

(8) *gadán.* 'dead or defunct'. **nagadán** 'to kill someone'. **naggagadán** 'to kill an animal'   (132)

(9) *hegdâ.* **nahegdâ** 'to lie down'. **naghehegdâ** 'to spend the night'. *Saén ka/kamó* **hehegdâ?** 'Where are you going to lie down?' *Saén ka/kamó* **paghehegdâ?** 'Where are you going to spend the night?'   (173)

(10) *inóm.* **nainóm** 'to drink, whether water, some kind of liquor, or some other liquid'. **nag-iinóm** 'to drink a lot of wine or other drink as in when there is a drinking spree; to drink (plural)'   (201)

(11) *kítà.* 'the act of seeing something'. **nakítà** 'to search for something, looking to see where it is'. **nagkikítà** 'to see; to encounter each other; to search for something carefully'   (299)

Finally, it should be noted that although Lisboa's default citation form for Old Bikol entries is the present/progressive, his definitions are usually infinitival clauses.

3. PITTMAN (1966) AND RAMOS (1974) ON *-UM-* VS. *MAG-* IN TAGALOG.

Pittman (1966) outlines six categories of verbs that can take *-um-* and *mag-* in contrasting meanings, twelve categories that can take only *-um-* or only *mag-*, and one category that can take *-um-* and *mag-* together. Of primary relevance to the present study are those verbs that have both *-um-* and *mag-* forms with a semantic contrast between the

---

7. This is likely to be in reference to the custom still widespread in the Philippines in which a peculiar variety of food is eaten during drinking sprees, most of which would not be eaten under other circumstances. Note the correspondence of this *mag-* form for 'to eat' with the *mag-* form for *inóm* 'to drink' in (10).

two. Pittman categorizes these contrasts as: (a) nonreflexive *-um-* vs. reflexive *mag-*: *umáhit* 'to shave another person' vs. *mag-áhit* 'to shave oneself'; (b) noncausative *-um-* vs. causative *mag-*: *umalís* 'to leave' vs. *mag-alís* 'to remove'; (c) centripetal *-um-* vs. centrifugal *mag-*: *bumilí* 'to buy' vs. *magbilí* 'to sell', *umabót* 'to reach for' vs. *mag-abót* 'to hand over'; (d) nondual and nonreciprocal *-um-* vs. dual or reciprocal *mag-*: *sumálo* 'to join (in eating or drinking)' vs. *magsálo* 'to share; to eat or enjoy something together', *kumamáy* 'to shake somebody's hand' vs. *magkamáy* 'to shake each other's hands'; (e) nonrepetitive *-um-* vs. repetitive *mag-*: *bumása* 'to read' vs. *magbasá* 'to study; to read much or intently', *sumúlat* 'to write' vs. *magsulát* 'to write much, continuously or intently'; (f) intrinsic color change *-um-* vs. external color change *mag-*: *pumulá* 'to turn red' vs. *magpulá* 'to wear red'. However, his assignment of roots to each category is in a few cases problematic: in his "reflexive vs. nonreflexive" category, he includes two verbs that would more appropriately be assigned to the category "nonrepetitive vs. repetitive", one being *gumupít* 'to cut with a pair of scissors' vs. *maggupít* 'to do cutting work with a pair of scissors', the other being *umísip* 'to think' vs. *mag-isíp* 'to think intensively' (which should actually be compared with *mag-ísip* 'to think out, to plan', without the change in stress, as opposed to *mag-isíp,* which has an additional contrast in stress).

Ramos (1974) uses Fillmore's case-grammar model to analyze the motivation behind affix selection in Tagalog. Although a full treatment of her findings is beyond the scope of this paper, they may be summarized as follows: *mag-* is used for (a) centrifugal transitive verbs such as *magbilí* 'to sell' or *mag-abót* 'to hand over', or (b) reflexive verbs such as *magbaríl* 'to shoot oneself' or *magbítay* 'to hang oneself'. In contrast, *-um-* is used for (a) centripetal transitive verbs, like *humíram* 'to borrow' and *uminóm* 'to drink'; (b) intransitive verbs, such as *pumuntá* 'to go' or *bumagsák* 'to fall'; (c) nontransient verbs indicating a change of state, such as *lumakí* 'to grow' or *gumandá* 'to become beautiful'; and (d) verbs of natural force like *umulán* 'to rain'. Many of these categories are not of direct relevance to the present study, as Old Bikol only had a contrast between *-um-* and *mag-* on certain categories of roots, which will be discussed in section 5. While it was probably true that in an earlier stage of the language the majority of Old Bikol verbs selected for one or the other paradigm (just as modern Tagalog verbs still do), in Old Bikol there was free variation between the two paradigms for most verbs, such as Old Bikol *nagtataó ~ nataó* 'to give', which as a centrifugal action would be expected to have belonged to the *mag-* paradigm only. This free variation is similar to the current state of Rinconada Bikol (see section 8),[8] and was probably the first stage in the loss of the *-um-* conjugation in Northern Bikol (see section 9).

---

8. For purposes of cross-referencing with McFarland (1974, 1980) and Grimes (2000) (who draws on the work of McFarland), my "Northern Bikol" is roughly equivalent to McFarland's "Coastal Dialects"; my "Southern Bikol" to his "Inland Dialects"; and my "Rinconada" to his "Iriga." The term "Rinconada" is used by the residents of this area for both their language and the geographic area in which it is spoken, and derives from the Spanish-era name for the area, *Partido de Rinconada* (Danilo Gerona, pers. comm.). It also avoids the use of a single municipality (like Iriga) in naming the dialect, especially because the subdialect of Iriga City is considered by most Rinconada speakers (including residents of Iriga itself) to be the least "standard" among the subdialects of Rinconada.

In addition to these two studies, DeGuzman (1978:391) also briefly discusses the difference between *mag-* and *-um-* on the Tagalog root *bilí*: "Otanes analyzes the two verbs *magbili* 'sell' and *bumili* 'buy' as sharing the base *bili* 'transaction', and attributes the difference in their meanings to the difference in their affixes, *mag-* and *-um-*, respectively. ... It may be mentioned, however, that the base *bili* when used as a nominal always expresses 'buying', e.g., *mahal ang bili ko nito* (Lit. 'My buying of this is expensive.'). This may suggest that the basic form is the verb stem *bili* 'buy' and that *magbili* (*pagbili*) with its semantic modification is derived from the former."

4. THE *-UM-* AND *MAG-* PARADIGMS IN OLD BIKOL. The *Vocabulario*, being a dictionary and not a grammar, does not contain a discussion or analysis of *-um-* and *mag-* verbs, but as shown in section 2, an analysis of the various sentence examples included throughout the *Vocabulario* makes it possible to determine the full conjugation patterns for these two verb paradigms. Such an analysis is possible both by considering the Spanish translations of the Old Bikol example sentences, and by looking for clues internal to the Old Bikol sentences themselves.

Old Bikol verbs could be conjugated in six possible forms: infinitive, past, present/progressive, future, past subjunctive, and future subjunctive. The present/progressive form refers to habitual actions, actions ongoing at present, and actions that were ongoing in the past. The past subjunctive is used in certain constructions requiring the subjunctive, when referring to past time. The future subjunctive is used in constructions requiring the subjunctive when referring to future time. Lisboa (1865:253) contrasts the difference in usage between the future and the future subjunctive, as illustrated in (12)–(14).

(12) a. **Maghá**hálè   akó   nusarô.
      AF.FUT.leave   1SG.NOM   day.after.tomorrow

   b. Nusarô   akó   **pagha**hálè.
      day.after.tomorrow 1SG.NOM   AF.FUT.SBJ.leave
      'I will leave the day after tomorrow.'

(13) a. **Tata-wán**   taká   nurayô.
      LF.FUT.give   1SG.GEN+2SG.NOM   within.a.few.days

   b. Nurayô   taká   **ta**ta-**wé.**
      within.a.few.days 1SG.GEN+2SG.NOM   LF.FUT.SBJ.give
      'I will give you (SG) some within a few days.'

(14) a. **Hahampakón**   taká   nusarô.
      OF.FUT.beat   1SG.GEN+2SG.NOM   day.after.tomorrow

   b. Nusarô   taká   **ha**hampaká.
      day.after.tomorrow 1SG.GEN+2SG.NOM   OF.FUT.SBJ.beat
      'I will beat you (SG) the day after tomorrow.'   (253)

A parallel distinction can be demonstrated between the past and past subjunctive forms, as in (15)–(16).

(15) a. **Hin**ampák akó   tà   daí akó   iminabót.
      OF.PAST.beat 1SG.NOM because NEG 1SG.NOM AF.PAST.arrive
      'I was beaten because I didn't arrive.'   (363)

b. Soarín   ká   hampaká.
   PAST.when 2SG.NOM OF.PAST.SBJ.beat
   'When were you (SG) beaten?'   (350)

(16) a. **Dimin**tóng na   palán   si   koyán.
        AF.PAST.arrive already REALIZATION NOM so.and.so
        'Oh, so-and-so has already arrived.'(273)

   b. Subanggé pa datóng.
      last.night   still (AF.PAST.SBJ).arrive
      'He arrived last night.'   (358)

It is important to note that in the sentence examples in Lisboa (1865), the subjunctive
and nonsubjunctive forms are in complementary distribution, with no cases of over-
lap in environment. Such subjunctive forms also exist in many Waray-Waray dia-
lects, in Asi/Bantoanon, in Rinconada Bikol, and in Northern Catanduanes Bikol,
although the subjunctive forms are only optionally used in these modern languages.

   Both the infinitive and the past subjunctive are used in commands, as is illustrated
in (17a,b):

(17) a. **Pag**matá.   b. **Mag**matá   ka.
        AF.PAST.SBJ.wake.up   AF.INF.wake.up 2SG.NOM
        'Wake up!'   'Wake up!'   (244)

Note that syntactically, as in many modern Central Philippine languages, the past
subjunctive, when used as a command form, is not followed by the pronoun *ka*
'2SG.NOM', while the infinitive is.

4.1 THE -*UM*- PARADIGM. Old Bikol *-um-* verbs were formed by *-um-* in the
infinitive, *-imin-* in the past, *na-* ~ *mina-* in the present/progressive,[9] *ma-* in the future,
∅- in the past subjunctive, and CV reduplication in the future subjunctive. Examples
(18)–(23) demonstrate the uses of the various tenses.

(18) INFINITIVE -um-:
   a. Garó iníng   bagyó   **dumal**ágan.
      seem this.LIG storm   run<AF.INF>
      'He runs like a typhoon.'   (43)

   b. Namomoót akóng   **kumak**án ngunyán tà   may sirâ.
      AF.PRES.want 1SG.NOM.LIG eat<AF.INF> now   because have fish
      'I want to eat because there's fish.'   (76)

   c. **Kum**án   kamó   ngo-ná, dángan kamó   padigdí.
      eat<AF.INF> 2PL.NOM first   then   2PL.NOM come.here
      'Eat first, and then come here.'   (155)

   d. Daí máyong gíok-gíok sa   banwáan nasí **dum**tóng akó.
      NEG none.LIG noise   OBL town   when AF.INF.arrive 1SG.NOM
      'There wasn't any noise in town when I arrived.'   (143)

---

9. Lisboa's orthography does not indicate vowel length, but there is evidence from Modern Bikol
   ma:- 'AF.FUT', Southern Tagalog *na:-* 'AF.PRES' (*-um-* conjugation), and similar affixes with
   length in Bisayan languages (Zorc 1977) that the Old Bikol affixes *na-* and *ma-* are likely to
   have had long vowels. However, lacking any direct evidence, I leave these vowels unmarked.

(19) PAST -imin-:

  a. **Imin**ági   lámang sa   gorondóm ko.
    pass\<AF.PAST>just   OBL   thoughts   1SG.GEN
    'It just passed through my mind.'   (15)

  b. Átè tà   ikáng   **kimin**úa.
    suspect   2SG.NOM.LIG   get\<AF.PAST>
    'I suspect that you (SG) are the one who took it.'   (35)

  c. Kaisáy na dungháb iníng **kimin**agát ninsí sakúyang manúk?
    whose.PL LNK dog.ANGRY this.LIG bite\<AF.PAST> GEN.REF 1SG.OBL.LIG chicken
    'Whose dog is this that bit my chicken?' (said in anger)   (248)

  d. Ta-dáw tà daí ka   **simin**imbá?
    why   NEG 2SG.NOM go.to.Mass\<AF.PAST>
    'Why didn't you (SG) come to Mass?'   (367)

(20) PRESENT/PROGRESSIVE na-:

  a. **Na**gúhit   akó.
    AF.PRES.write 1SG.NOM
    'I'm writing.'   (248)

  b. Garó nanonokâ si   koyán kun **na**kakán.
    seems AF.PRES.peck NOM so.and.so when AF.PRES.eat
    'So-and-so eats little-by-little.'
    (Lit., 'So-and-so is like a bird pecking when he eats.')   (398)

  c. Namomómo ka   tà,   daí ka   **na**simbág.
    AF.PRES.mute 2SG.NOM QUESTION NEG   2SG.NOM AF.PRES.answer
    'Are you mute, you don't answer?'   (246)

  d. Iká   sanáng daí **na**tábang.
    2SG.NOM only.LIG NEG AF.PRES.help
    'You're (SG) the only one who doesn't help.'   (397)

(21) FUTURE ma-:

  a. **Ma**pulê   na   akó.
    AF.FUT.go.home now 1SG.NOM
    'I'm going to go back home now.'   (34)

  b. Óhò, **ma**kúyog akó, alágad tà daí akó   **ma**sakát.
    yes AF.FUT.go.with 1SG.NOM however NEG 1SG.NOM AF.FUT.climb
    'Yes, I'll go along, but I'm not going to go up.'   (257)

  c. **Ma**iráya   pa akó.
    AF.FUT.go.upstream still 1SG.NOM
    'I will go first to the upper village.'   (266)

  d. **Ma**-nó   ka   tà   dumán?
    AF.FUT.do.what 2SG.NOM QUESTION there.(far)
    'What are you (SG) going to do there?'   (363)

(22) PAST SUBJUNCTIVE Ø-:

  a. Subanggé pa   datóng.[10]
    last.night   still   (AF.PAST.SBJ).arrive
    'He arrived last night.'   (358)

b. Dumán   ka   túkaw.
   there.(far) 2SG.NOM   (AF.PAST.SBJ).sit
   'Sit there.'   (129)

(23) FUTURE SUBJUNCTIVE CV-:
   a. Saén   ka   **he**hegdâ?
      where 2SG.NOM   AF.FUT.SBJ.lie.down
      'Where are you (SG) going to lie down?' (cf. [29b])   (173)

   b. Nusarô   kitá   **ka**kaág.
      day.after.tomorrow 1INCL.NOM   AF.FUT.SBJ.go
      'We'll go the day after tomorrow.'   (253)

   c. Nuarín   ka   **gi**gíbo?
      FUT.when 2SG.NOM   AF.FUT.SBJ.do
      'When will you (SG) do it?'   (253)

   d. Dángan na   rogáring akó   **ka**kakán   kun magótom akó.
      after   LNK perhaps 1SG.NOM AF.FUT.SBJ.eat if hungry   1SG.NOM
      'I'll probably just eat when I get hungry.'   (110)

Note two rules that applied to Old Bikol verbs. First, according to numerous exam-
ples in Lisboa (1865), the infinitive infix *-um-* had an allomorph *-im-* when the vowel
in the following syllable was *i:*[11] OBIK *gimíbo* 'to do <AF.INF>' (165), OBIK *iminóm*
'to drink <AF.INF>' (127), and OBIK *simimbá* 'to go to church <AF.INF>' (122). The
past tense infix *-imin-* is actually a product of this same process of vowel assimila-
tion, with the *u* of *-um-* assimilating to the *i* of *-in-.*[12]

   The second rule affected roots with an initial *b* or *p* when infixed with *-um-* or
-imin-. In these cases, the first syllable of the infixed form was dropped, as in OBIK
máyad 'to pay <AF.INF>' (Lisboa 1865:248) < *bumáyad, OBIK *mulê* 'to go home
<AF.INF>' < *pumulê (50). The same rule also applied to forms infixed with *-imin-*,
e.g., OBIK *minangóg* 'stink like dung <AF.PAST>' < *biminangóg (44), OBIK *min-*

---

10. While it may not be immediately apparent that the verb in this sentence is not simply a root, Lisboa
    (1865:350) also includes sentences with parallel constructions in object focus (e.g., [i]) and loca-
    tion focus (e.g., [ii] and [iii]), in which the verb form is more obviously not a root.

    (i)   Soarín   ka   hampaká?
          PAST.when   2SG.NOM   OF.PAST.SBJ.beat
          'When did they beat you (SG)?'

    (ii) Soarín   ka   agáwe?
          PAST.when   2SG.NOM   LF.PAST.SBJ.rob
          'When were you (SG) robbed?'

    (iii) Soarín   mo   buybuyé?
          PAST.when   2SG.GEN   LF.PAST.SBJ.tell
          'When will you (SG) tell him?'

11. This rule is not present in Modern Bikol, although according to San Agustin (1879:61), it was not
    uncommon in the late nineteenth century: "*si la primera vocal fuere* **i** *la partícula que se ha de inter-
    poner es* **im***: inum, beber, forma* **iminum ca***, bebe tú:* **hilig***: bajar, baja tú,* **himilig ca***. Algunos usan el*
    um *aun para estos verbos, y muchas veces se verá* **uminum ca***, bebe tú:* **humilig ca***: baja tú.*"
12. This same process of assimilation is also documented in San Josef (1832) for Old Tagalog,
    and attested in Waray-Waray which has *-inm- ~ -imn- ~ -in-*, although these may be from
    *-inum- and not *-umin- (Reid, pers. comm.). For a thorough discussion of the historical der-
    ivations of combinations of *-um- and *-in- in various Philippine languages, see Reid (1992).

lód 'cut down trees <AF.PAST>' < ***pimin**alód (274), OBIK *minirít* 'crowded together (said of ants) <AF.PAST>' < ***pimin**irít (286–87), and OBIK *minatâ* 'acquired the stench of something dead or rotten <AF.PAST>' < ***bimin**atâ (60).

Crespo, in San Agustin (1879),[13] also notes that authors in "ancient" times had written that infinitives with *-um-* and past forms with *-imin-* also dropped their first syllables, yielding forms like *mírit* 'force <AF.INF>' < ***pum**írit, *minîlì* 'chose <AF.PAST>' < ***pimin**îlì and *minása* 'read <AF.PAST>' < ***bimin**ása, but states that such contracted forms were archaic by his time, and that the usage current in his time was the full form, e.g., *piminîlì* 'chose <AF.PAST>' and *biminása* 'read' <AF.PAST> (60–61).

4.2 THE *MAG*- PARADIGM. The affixes used in the various conjugations of the Old Bikol *mag*- paradigm varied much less from one another than did those in the Old Bikol *-um-* paradigm. The infinitive was formed with *mag-*, the past with *nag-*, the present with *nag-* plus CV reduplication, the future with *mag-* plus CV reduplication, the past subjunctive with *pag-*, and the future subjunctive with *pag-* plus CV reduplication. Examples (24)–(29) illustrate the *mag-* conjugations.

(24) INFINITIVE mag-:

a. Kíwaw na **mag**tarám.
awkward LNK AF.INF.speak

'(He) speaks awkwardly.' (300)

b. **Mag**matá ka.
AF.INF.wake.up 2SG.NOM

'Wake up!' (244)

(25) PAST nag-:
Nagdamógo na iníng áyam.
AF.PAST.big already this.LIG dog

'How big this dog has gotten!' (116)

(26) PRESENT/PROGRESSIVE nagCV-:
Ta-dáw tà **nag**tatángis ka?
why AF.PRES.cry 2SG.NOM

'Why are you (SG) crying?' (34)

(27) FUTURE magCV-:
Maghahálè akó nusarô.
AF.FUT.leave 1SG.NOM day.after.tomorrow

'I'm going to leave the day after tomorrow.' (cf. [29a]) (253)

---

13. Although credited to Fr. Andrés de San Agustin, who died in 1649, San Agustin (1879) is actually a rewrite by Manuel Maria Crespo, who revised San Agustin's original work and commented throughout on parts of the grammar that had changed between the early seventeenth and late nineteenth centuries. Prior to Crespo's version, San Agustin's *Arte de la Lengua Bicol* had been published in 1647, 1739, and 1795.

Crespo comments several times on the difference between the Old Bikol and Middle Bikol conjugations of bilabial-initial roots: *"Mas si la primera consonante es **p** ó **b** estas letras si convierten en **min**- y forma este tiempo, v. gr. pili, escoger, forma **min-ilî**. Esta forma es anticuada hoy es de uso general la primera forma **piminilî**"* (60); *"yo he leido ya, **minasa na acò**: el uso moderno dice **biminasa na acò**"* (60); *"Algunos autores antiguos en los verbos que principian con **b** ó **p** convierten estos letras en **m** para formar este tiempo: **pirit**, obligar, forzar, fuerzale tú, **mirit ca saiya**: el uso moderno sigue la regla general"* (61).

(28) PAST SUBJUNCTIVE pag-:
    a. Dángan **pag**hálè   asó   daí   pa   akó.
        then   AF.PAST.SBJ.leave   when   NEG   yet   ISG.NOM
        'Then he left, while I wasn't there yet.'   (110)
    b. **Pag**matá.
        AF.PAST.SBJ.wake.up
        'Wake up!'   (244)

(29) FUTURE SUBJUNCTIVE pagCV-:
    a. Nusarô   akó   **pagha**hálè.
        day.after.tomorrow   ISG.NOM   AF.FUT.SBJ.leave
        'I'm going to leave the day after tomorrow.' (cf. [27])   (253)
    b. Saén ka   **paghe**hegdâ?
        where   2SG.NOM   AF.FUT.SBJ.lie.down
        'Where are you (SG) going to spend the night?' (cf. [23a])   (173)

The full conjugations of the Old Bikol -*um*- and *mag*- paradigms are illustrated in table 2.

4.3 WARAY AND SOUTHERN TAGALOG VERB PARADIGMS. It is noteworthy that the Old Bikol (OBIK) -*um*- and *mag*- conjugations are almost identical to those of Modern Waray and of some varieties of Southern Tagalog (STAG),[14] the two Central Philippine languages that preserve a full -*um*- conjugation, as seen in table 3. The Waray and Old Bikol conjugations differ only in the reduced Waray -*inm*- ~ -*imn*- ~ -*i(:)n*- (see fn. 12) corresponding to Old Bikol -*imin*-, and the lack of a Waray allomorph **-*im*- for -*um*- when preceding a high front vowel, although such an allomorph did exist in Old Waray forms such as *simiring* 'to say', *simikad* 'to kick', *imisol* 'to go back', *imiway* 'to separate from or avoid' (Ezguerra 1747). Southern Tagalog, which like other Tagalog dialects lacks any subjunctive form, exhibits similarities in the *na:*- present/progressive and *ma:*- future affixes in the -*um*- paradigm, and differs

TABLE 2. OLD BIKOL -UM- AND MAG- CONJUGATIONS

	-*um*- VERBS	*mag*- VERBS
INFINITIVE	-um- ~ -im-	mag-
PAST	-imin-	nag-
PRESENT/PROGRESSIVE	na- ~ mina-	nag-R-
FUTURE	ma-	mag-R-
PAST SUBJUNCTIVE	Ø-	pag-
FUTURE SUBJUNCTIVE	R-	pag-R-

14. While very little has been published about Tagalog dialectology, there is evidence that the Tagalog dialects south of Manila can be grouped together vis-à-vis those of Manila and northward. "Southern Tagalog" therefore refers to the dialects spoken in Cavite, Batangas, Quezon, western Camarines Norte, Mindoro, and Marinduque, which share certain grammatical similarities not found in "standard" Tagalog. While rarely referred to in the literature, these grammatical differences are evident enough to be the subject of disdain by teachers towards the speakers whose speech contains these "nonstandard" forms. "Standard Tagalog" refers to the so-called standard dialect of Tagalog spoken on news programs and taught in schools (sometimes referred to as "Educated Manila Tagalog" and called "Filipino" in Philippine schools).

only in the -*um*- affix in the past form, although historical documents from as early as the sixteenth century until as late as the early twentieth century indicate that this is a reduction of an earlier -*ungm*- past form that derives historically from *-umin-, thus sharing the same origin as Old Bikol -*imin*- and a similar historical development as Modern Waray -*inm*- ~ -*imn*- ~ -*in*-. The past -*ungm*- affix would remain at least dialectally in Tagalog until the early twentieth century, but all known modern dialects of Tagalog have reduced it to -*um*-, homophonous with the infinitive form.

The similarity between the conjugations in the two verbal paradigms in Modern Waray, Southern Tagalog, and Old Bikol are striking considering that these three languages do not form an immediate subgroup together, and other languages more closely related to each of these three languages have less similar conjugation patterns. Nonetheless, the similarity exists, and may represent either a system reconstructable for Proto–Central Philippines, or possibly, influence of one language on the other. The latter option becomes less likely when we consider that Lisboa's Old Bikol data were collected in what is now Naga City, which is one of the Bikol-speaking areas furthest from Waray-speaking Samar and Leyte Islands, and was likewise distant from Tagalog-speaking areas that at the time probably did not include western Camarines Norte (which was settled by Tagalogs only in more recent times).

4.4 MODERN BIKOL VERB PARADIGMS. Modern Bikol, which has only the *mag*- paradigm,[15] has taken elements of each of Old Bikol's two verbal paradigms for its sole *mag*- conjugation, illustrated in table 4, along with the conjugations from San Agustin (1879) for late-nineteenth-century Bikol. Note that there are no past or future subjunctive forms in Middle or Modern Bikol, in which verbs in postadverb position are identical to those in preadverb position.

5. CATEGORIZATION OF OLD BIKOL -*UM*- VS. *MAG*- CONTRASTS. The contrasts between the meanings of -*um*- verbs and the meanings of *mag*- verbs in Old Bikol can be classified into six categories: (i) nonreflexive vs. reflexive, (ii) centripetal vs. centrifugal, (iii) singular vs. dual, plural, or reciprocal, (iv) singulative vs. distributive, (v) punctual vs. durative, and (vi) general vs. special circumstance.

5.1 NONREFLEXIVE VS. REFLEXIVE. On many semantically transitive roots dealing mainly with hygiene or wearing pieces of clothing or accessories, a distinction was made between nonreflexive -*um*- actions and reflexive *mag*- actions, as exemplified in (30)–(37).

---

15. Reflexes of the Old Bikol -*um*- paradigm exist in scattered uses in Modern Bikol, but these forms have various nuances of meaning or environmental constraints and do not form a coherent paradigm. Modern Bikol -*um*- occurs as an alternate command form and in dependent clauses after a small set of conjunctions, like *kun* 'if' or *ta-ngáni* 'in order to; so that'. The infix -*umin*- (with the initial *u* no longer assimilating to the *i* in the following syllable) occurs as a stylistic alternate to *nag*- but can also be used to indicate an action that took place as the result of some other action or circumstance. *mina*- is used optionally to indicate habitual or impending actions, or as a stylistic alternative to *nag-R*-. The form *mag-R*- occurs in early Modern Bikol literature (1930s–1950s), while *ma:*- is used exclusively in the modern language and in contemporary literature. In the modern language, these forms are infrequent, and native speakers of Modern Bikol would not propose these forms to be the past, present, and future conjugations of a single paradigm.

(30) a. *alimónmon*, *-um-* 'to cover someone with a cloak'
      b. *alimónmon*, *mag-* 'to cover oneself with a cloak or go around wearing
          a cloak'   (19)

(31) a. *habáy*, *-um-* 'to tie the belt or strap on another woman's skirt'
      b. *habáy*, *mag-* 'to tie the belt or strap on one's own skirt
          (cf. *habáy* 'belt or strap that women use to tie their skirts')   (156)

(32) a. *matá*, *-um-* 'to make or put the eyes in something like a statue or image'
      b. *matá*, *mag-* 'to be awake;[16] to wake someone up'   (244)

TABLE 3. OLD BIKOL, WARAY, AND SOUTHERN TAGALOG CONJUGATIONS

		OBIK	WARAY	STAG
-UM-	INFINITIVE	-um- ~ -im-	-um-	-um-
	PAST	-imin-	-inm- ~ -imn- ~ -in- ~ -i:n-[†]	-um-
	PRESENT	na- ~ mina-	na:-	na:-
	FUTURE	ma-	ma:-	R-; ma:-
	PAST SBJ	ø-	ø-	—
	FUTURE SBJ	R-	R-	—
MAG-	INFINITIVE	mag-	mag-	mag-
	PAST	nag-	nag-	nag-
	PRESENT	nag-R-	nag-R-	nag-R-
	FUTURE	mag-R-	mag-R-	mag-R-
	PAST SBJ	pag-	pag-	—
	FUTURE SBJ	pag-R-	pag-R-	—

† -in- ~ -i:n- < -inn- < -inm- < *-inum- or *-imin- (see fn. 12). Ezguerra (1747) documents three allo-
  morphs of the past tense -um- conjugation in Old Waray circa 1663: -in-, -inn-, and -inm-. No dialect
  of modern Waray-Waray has a reflex with the geminate consonant for AF past in the -um- paradigm,
  although a plethora of other forms are found (-inm-, -imn-, -in-, -i:n-, and min-). Note that no dialect
  of modern Waray appears to allow morpheme-internal geminate consonants.

TABLE 4. OLD BIKOL VS. MODERN BIKOL CONJUGATIONS[†]

	Old Bikol (c. 1610)		Middle Bikol (c. 1879)		Modern Bikol
PARADIGM	-UM-	MAG-	-UM-	MAG-	MAG-
INFINITIVE	-um- ~ -im-	mag-	-um- ~ -im-	mag-	mag-
PAST	-imin-	nag-	-imin- ~ -umin-	nag-	nag-
PRESENT	na- ~ mina-	nag-R-	mina-	nag-R-	nag-R-
FUTURE	ma-	mag-R-	ma-	mag-R-	ma:-
PAST SBJ.	ø-	pag-	—	—	—
FUTURE SBJ.	R-	pag-R-	—	—	—

† Based on Lisboa (1865) and San Agustin (1879).

---

16. The first meaning given in (32b) is probably a metaphorical extension of 'putting eyes on one-
    self' (David Zorc, pers. comm.)

(33) a. *otó, -um-* 'to put an *otó* on somebody else'
      b. *otó, mag-* 'to wear an *otó* or carry something on it' (cf. *otó* 'a cloth worn
         on the head to prevent injury when carrying heavy things')   (265)

(34) a. *salmíng, -um-* 'to put glasses on someone'
      b. *salmíng, mag-* 'to wear glasses'   (330)

(35) a. *sonód, -um-* 'to put a shirt or tunic on someone'
      b. *sonód, mag-* 'to wear a shirt or tunic'   (356)

(36) a. *tamóng, -um-* 'to cover someone with a blanket'
      b. *tamóng, mag-* 'to cover oneself with a blanket'   (378)

(37) a. *túbas, -um-* 'for a native priestess to bathe someone in order to heal him'
      b. *túbas, mag-* 'to bathe oneself'   (409)

A large number of roots signifying various other pieces of clothing or accessories
are also identified as having this same contrast, including *habitán* 'type of sash'
(157), *hinapón* 'type of gold chain' (180), *hinóyot* 'type of gold chain' (181), *imbót*
'type of gold chain' (200), *sakbód* 'type of cloth for covering the head' (319), *sali-
hóy* 'type of sash' (330), and so forth.

5.2 CENTRIPETAL VS. CENTRIFUGAL. On at least a handful of roots
referring to trade or commerce, a distinction was made between centripetal *-um-*
actions and centrifugal *mag-* actions, as in (38)–(44).

(38) a. *bakál, -um-* 'to buy by trading food items like rice, coconuts, or the like'
      b. *bakál, mag-* 'to sell something which is bought with other things in
         this way'   (40)

(39) a. *baháy, -um-* 'to buy something with gold or silver'
      b. *baháy, mag-* 'to sell something for gold or silver'   (46)

(40) a. *bilí, -um-* 'to buy'[17]
      b. *bilí, mag-* 'to sell'   (65)

(41) a. *bótong, -um-* 'to buy a lot for a lot, e.g., a *ganta* of rice for coconuts'
      b. *bótong, mag-* 'to sell a lot for a lot, in this manner'   (79)

(42) a. *gátang, -um-* 'to buy property such as land or houses'
      b. *gátang, mag-* 'to sell property such as land or houses'   (139)

(43) a. *salíw, -um-* 'to buy a slave, dog, or vehicle'
      b. *salíw, mag-* 'to sell a slave, dog, or vehicle'   (329)

(44) a. *tolós, -um-* 'to buy a woven blanket in exchange for twice as much
         abaca to be woven'
      b. *tolós, mag-* 'to sell a woven blanket in exchange for abaca'   (403)

---

17. The root *bilí* is no longer found in Modern Bikol but does exist in Tagalog, in which there was
    at least until late in the past century the same distinction between *bumilí* 'to buy' and *magbilí*
    'to sell'. For many speakers of Manila Tagalog, however, the form *magbilí* 'to sell' no longer
    exists and has been replaced by forms such as *magbénta* or *magtínda*, both Spanish loans. Yet
    many Southern Tagalog dialects still retain the *bumilí* vs. *magbilí* dichotomy. Old Waray also
    had similar distinctions, as Ezguerra (1747) states that roots that have meanings of 'to buy'
    and 'to sell' take the meaning 'to sell' when affixed with *nag-* and *mag-*, citing such roots as
    palít 'to buy/sell (rice)', *bakál* 'to buy/sell', and *botong* 'to buy/sell slaves'.

The Old Bikol centripetal vs. centrifugal distinction appears to have been confined to verbs of commerce, a narrower set of roots than the same distinction in modern Tagalog (Ramos 1974, Pittman 1966). At an earlier stage, however, such a distinction probably existed for verbs of other semantic categories.

5.3 SINGULAR VS. DUAL, PLURAL, OR RECIPROCAL.

A number of Old Bikol verbs made a distinction between single-actor *-um-* forms and *mag-* forms that involved dual, plural, or mutually affected actors. Example (45) involves a distinction between single actor and plural actors.

(45) a. *hegdâ, -um-* 'to lie down'
      b. *hegdâ, mag-* 'to lie down (plural)' (cf. [74a,b])   (173)

More commonly, however, this distinction was between single actors and mutually affected actors, as in examples (46)–(56).

(46) a. *hinghíng, -um-* 'to speak to someone in secret'
      b. *hinghíng, mag-* 'for two to speak in secret'   (181)

(47) a. *íwal, -um-* 'to fight or attack'
      b. *íwal, mag-* 'to fight each other'   (204)

(48) a. *lában, -um-* 'for one town to fight another'
      b. *lában, mag-* 'for two towns or armies to fight'   (206)

(49) a. *sabát, -um-* 'to go out to meet someone who has arrived'
      b. *sabát, mag-* 'for two to meet each other in the street or some other place' (also 'to receive many guests')   (318)

(50) a. *samá, -um-* 'to eat with another from the same plate'
      b. *samá, mag-* 'for two to eat from the same plate, in friendship' (332)

(51) a. *sanggawád, -um-* 'to help someone in doing housework or similar work, not used for work in the fields'
      b. *sanggawád, mag-* 'for two to help each other in doing housework or similar work'   (334)

(52) a. *sangnán, -um-* 'for one to call another by the name of something that one gave to another, or that they ate, e.g., if it was a pig (*oríg*), to call someone *kaoríg*'
      b. *sangnán, mag-* 'for two to call each other by this name that they took'   (336)

(53) a. *songô, -um-* 'to combine one's rice with another's rice in order to cook it'
      b. *songô, mag-* 'to come together and combine food'   (352)

(54) a. *súbong, -um-* 'to buy a quantity of wine for an equal quantity of rice'
      b. *súbong, mag-* 'for two people to buy and sell in this manner'   (359)

(55) a. *susî, -um-* 'to fight with someone over something'
      b. *susî, mag-* 'for two to fight over something'   (362)

(56) a. *tábang, -um-* 'to help someone in some work'
      b. *tábang, mag-* 'to help each other in doing something'   (364)

Other similar verbs denote a distinction between the positioning of one person with regard to another, and what might best be called mutual positioning, as in examples (57)–(64).

(57) a. *áyon, -um-* 'to live with someone else, or in some place'
    b. *áyon, mag-* 'to live together like husband and wife'   (16)

(58) a. *híping, -um-* 'to live with another person in his house, as in renting'
    b. *híping, mag-* 'for two to live together in a house'   (182)

(59) a. *oyón, -um-* 'to seat oneself with another person on a boat or on a seat'
    b. *oyón, mag-* 'for two people to sit beside each other'   (258)

(60) a. *onóng, -um-* 'to live in somebody else's house'
    b. *onóng, mag-* 'for two people to live together, for a long time' (261)

(61) a. *salíhid, -um-* 'to take the place or be in the place of another'
    b. *salíhid, mag-* 'for two to exchange places'   (330)

(62) a. *sónò, -um-* 'to live or be together with another person, or in his house, or to lie down with another covering oneself with the other's blanket'
    b. *sónò, mag-* 'for two to live or be together in the same house, or cover themselves with the same blanket'   (356)

(63) a. *songô, -um-* 'for one to lie down head-to-head with another'
    b. *songô, mag-* 'for two to lie down head-to-head with each other' (353)

(64) a. *táed, -um-* 'to place oneself or be at the side of another'
    b. *táed, mag-* 'for two to be positioned one at the side of the other' (368)

Another similar distinction was that of *-um-* verbs whose actions affect a single object vs. *mag-* verbs affecting dual or mutually affected objects, as in examples (65)–(68).

(65) a. *ábay, -um-* 'to place a boat paired with another'
    b. *ábay, mag-* 'to pair two things together in this way'   (8)

(66) a. *áyon, -um-* 'to join one thing with another thing'
    b. *áyon, mag-* 'to join two or more things together' (cf. [57a,b])   (16)

(67) a. *áliw, -um-* 'to compare one thing with another to see which is better or worse'
    b. *áliw, mag-* 'to compare two things to see which is better or worse' (19)

(68) a. *sabúg, -um-* 'to mix as wine with water or with another wine or liquor'
    b. *sabúg, mag-* 'to mix two liquors'   (319)

This distinction is similar to Pittman's (1966) "nondual and nonreciprocal vs. dual or reciprocal," except that Pittman recognizes only actors and not objects in the distinction.

5.4 SINGULATIVE VS. DISTRIBUTIVE.

Some Old Bikol verbs made a distinction between a singulative *-um-* meaning and a distributive *mag-* meaning, as in (69)–(72).

(69) a. *bárè, -um-* 'to break something, like reed or wood'
    b. *bárè, mag-* 'to break many things'   (58)

(70) a. *hadók, -um-* 'to kiss somebody or something'
    b. *hadók, mag-* 'to kiss someone a lot' (also 'for two people to kiss each other')   (158)

(71) a. *potól, -um-* 'to cut something'
      b. *potól, mag-* 'to cut many things'   (294)

(72) a. *todók, -um-* 'to sprout or grow from the earth'
      b. *todók, mag-* 'to grow a lot of grass'   (391)

5.5 PUNCTUAL VS. DURATIVE.
Another contrast found in Old Bikol verbs was between punctual *-um-* forms and durative *mag-* forms, as illustrated in (73)–(76).

(73) a. *ákab, -um-* 'for a dog, cat, or bird of prey to catch or seize something with the mouth, like a piece of meat, etc.'
      b. *ákab, mag-* 'for a dog, cat, or bird of prey to carry something held in the mouth'   (9)

(74) a. *hegdâ, -um-* 'to lie down'
      b. *hegdâ, mag-* 'to lie down for a long time; to spend the night in some place' (cf. [45a,b])   (173)

(75) a. *sakáy, -um-* 'to embark on a vehicle in order to navigate it'
      b. *sakáy, mag-* 'to navigate a vehicle'   (319)

(76) a. *talikód, -um-* 'to turn one's back to something'
      b. *talikód, mag-* 'to be standing with the back to something'   (375)

5.6 GENERAL VS. SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE.
Several verbs had a distinction between an *-um-* form that indicates some basic meaning, contrasting with a *mag-* form that involves some special circumstance of doing the action, as in (77)–(83).

(77) a. *bonô, -um-* 'to kill or wound a person or an irrational animal'
      b. *bonô, mag-* 'to kill an animal to be eaten'   (75)

(78) a. *kakán, -um-* 'to eat ordinary food'[18]
      b. *kakán, mag-* 'to eat something for entertainment purposes, not said of ordinary food'   (85)

(79) a. *gadán, -um-* 'to kill someone'
      b. *gadán, mag-* 'to kill an animal'[19]   (132)

(80) a. *inóm, -um-* 'to drink'
      b. *inóm, mag-* 'to drink large amounts of alcohol, as in a drinking spree'   (201)

(81) a. *kítà, -um-* 'to search for something to see where it is'
      b. *kítà, mag-* 'to look for something with much care'   (299)

(82) a. *tabíg, -um-* 'to break partially'
      b. *tabíg, mag-* 'to break in two'   (365)

(83) a. *tigbák, -um-* 'for one person or rooster to kill another'
      b. *tigbák, mag-* 'to inflict a mortal wound on another'   (391)

---

18. Lisboa (1865) records both the full *kumakán* and the syncopated *kumán* for the infinitive of *kakán* 'eat', while the past form appears only as the syncopated *kiminán*.

19. Ramos (1974:140) mentions an identical distinction between Tagalog *pumatáy* 'to kill (human beings)' and ***mag**patáy* 'to slaughter or kill (nonhuman beings)'.

6. BEYOND ACTOR FOCUS. While we have so far concentrated solely on Actor Focus verbs, Lisboa (1865) recorded many of the same distinctions in the nonactor focuses, as demonstrated in (84)–(88).

(84) a. *nabakál* 'to buy something by trading things to eat like rice, coco-
        nuts, or other similar things' (AF)
      binabakál 'to buy something, etc.' (OF)
      binabakalán ~ binabaklán 'to buy from someone or from some-
        where' (LF)
      ibinabakál 'to buy by means of something, or the time or reason for
        buying' (IF)
   b. *nagbabakál* 'to sell something which is bought with other things in
        this way' (AF)
      pinagbabaklán 'to sell to someone or at some place' (LF)
      ipinagbabakál 'to sell something in trade for something else, or the
        time or reason for selling' (OF and IF)   (40)

(85) a. *nabilí* 'to buy' (AF)
      binibilí 'to buy something' (OF)
      binibilihán 'to buy from someone or at some place' (LF)
      ibinibilí 'to buy by means of something, or the time or reason for
        buying' (IF)
   b. *nagbibilí* 'to sell' (AF)
      pinagbibilihán 'to sell to someone, or at some place' (LF)
      ipinagbibilí 'to sell something, or the time or reason for selling' (OF
        and IF)   (65)

(86) a. *nakakán* 'to eat' (AF)
      kinakakán 'to eat something' (OF)
      kinakanán 'to eat somewhere, or on some plate or table' (LF)
      ikinakán 'to eat with the hands, an instrument, or the time or place
        of eating' (IF)
   b. *nagkakán* 'to eat for entertainment, not said of ordinary food' (AF)
      pinagkakakán 'to eat something in this way' (OF)
      pinagkakakanán 'to eat somewhere for entertainment' (LF)
      ipinagkakakán 'to eat with the teeth, or the time or place of eating'
        (IF)   (85)

(87) a. *nagadán* 'to kill a person' (AF)
      ginagadán 'to kill someone' (OF)
      iginagadán ~ ipinaggagadán 'to kill with something' (IF)
   b. *naggagadán* 'to kill an animal' (AF)
      pinaggagadán 'to kill an animal' (OF)
      iginagadán ~ ipinaggagadán 'to kill with something' (IF)   (132)

(88) a. *nahegdâ* 'to lie down' (AF)
      hinihegdaán 'to lie down somewhere' (LF)
      ihinihegdâ ~ ipinaghehegdâ 'the shoulders, or the time or place' (IF)
   b. *naghehegdâ* 'to spend the night' (AF)
      pinaghehegdaán 'to spend the night somewhere' (LF)
      ipinaghehegdâ 'the time or place of lying down' (IF)   (173)

Table 5 illustrates the non–Actor Focus conjugations for verbs in the -*um*- and *mag*-paradigms. Non–Actor Focus verbs corresponding to the AF *mag*- paradigm are characterized by the presence of the prefix *pag*- in addition to the other applicable affixes marking focus and tense. Non–Actor Focus verbs corresponding to the -*um*- paradigm, in contrast, do not have the *pag*- prefix, but share the same focus and tense affixes.

7. FROM OLD BIKOL TO MODERN BIKOL.

With nearly 400 years having passed since Lisboa compiled the *Vocabulario*, it would be expected that a number of changes have taken place in the Bikol language. Many of these changes were already in place by the late nineteenth century when Crespo revised San Agustin's seventeenth-century *Arte de la Lengua Bicol*. First, we will take a brief look at Crespo's observations on the differences between verbs in seventeenth-century and nineteenth-century Bikol, before analyzing how the meanings of Old Bikol verbs were restructured into Modern Bikol.

7.1 NINETEENTH-CENTURY BIKOL.

San Agustin (1879) contains very little on the difference in meaning between the -*um*- and *mag*- paradigms. Only two semantic contrasts are noted for *mag*- vs. -*um*-: (a) that verbs indicating reciprocity of action between two or more people take the *mag*- conjugation, as with *nag-iíwal* 'fighting with each other' and *nag-iibá* 'going together' (cf. 5.3), and (b) that verbs indicating dressing or cleaning oneself also follow the *mag*- paradigm, as with *nagbobolós ~ naggugúbing akó* 'I am getting dressed' (91), the latter of which can be shown to contrast with *minagúbing akó kainíng ákì* 'I am dressing this child' (54). Otherwise, no

TABLE 5. OLD BIKOL NON–ACTOR FOCUS CONJUGATIONS

		-*um*- VERBS	*mag*- VERBS
-on	INFINITIVE	-on	pag-...-on
	PAST	-in-	pinag-
	PRESENT	-in-R-	pinag-R-
	FUTURE	R-...-on	pag-R-...-on
	PAST SBJ	-a	pag-...-a
	FUTURE SBJ	R-...-a	pag-R-...-a
-an	INFINITIVE	-an	pag-...-an
	PAST	-in-...-an	pinag-...-an
	PRESENT	-in-R-...-an	pinag-R-...-an
	FUTURE	R-...-an	pag-R-...-an
	PAST SBJ	-i	pag-...-i
	FUTURE SBJ	R-...-i	pag-R-...-i
i-	INFINITIVE	i-	ipag-
	PAST	i-...-in-	ipinag-
	PRESENT	i-...-in-R-	ipinag-R-
	FUTURE	i-R-	ipag-R-
	PAST SBJ	-an	pag-...-an
	FUTURE SBJ	R-...-an	pag-R-...-an

other semantic contrasts are noted. On the contrary, it is noted that by the late nineteenth century, the meaning of 'selling' was no longer conveyed by OBIK *nagbabakál* but instead by the causative *nagpapabákal* (90), just as in Modern Bikol. Elsewhere, it is indicated that the meaning of 'buying' could be conveyed with either the *-um-* or *mag-* paradigm, with both *minabakál* and *nagbabakál* meaning 'buying', and both *mabakál* and *magbabakál* meaning 'will buy' (199).

In addition to the partial neutralization of the semantic contrasts between the *mag-* and *-um-* paradigms, the past and future subjunctive conjugations had also been lost. In place of the past subjunctive of Old Bikol, as in (89), the regular past was in use, as in (90).

(89) Subanggé pa datóng.
      last.night   still   (AF.PAST.SBJ).arrive
      'He arrived last night.'   (Lisboa 1865:358)

(90) Suarín   ka   **dimin**tóng?
      PAST.when   2SG.NOM   AF.PAST.arrive
      'When did you (SG) arrive?'   (San Agustin 1879:207)

Likewise, instead of the future subjunctive of Old Bikol, as in (91), the regular future was in use, as in (92).

(91) Nuarín   ka   **gi**gíbo?
      FUT.when   2SG.NOM   AF.FUT.SBJ.do
      'When will you (SG) do it?'   (Lisboa 1865:252)

(92) Nuarín   ka   **ma**pulî?
      FUT.when   2SG.NOM   AF.FUT.go.home
      'When will you (SG) go home?'   (San Agustin 1879:207)

7.2 SEMANTIC REASSIGNMENT FROM OLD BIKOL TO MODERN BIKOL.

Having lost the *-um-* paradigm, which for many verbs carried the basic indicative meaning, its semantic content generally transferred to the *mag-* paradigm, displacing the contrastive meanings that *mag-* marked for many verbs, in turn requiring the former semantic content of the *mag-* paradigm to be indicated with other affixes.

The Old Bikol nonreflexive vs. reflexive contrast illustrated in (30)–(37) has virtually disappeared in Modern Bikol, evidenced in forms like *magbulós* 'to get dressed; to dress someone' and *maggúbing* 'to put on or wear a particular garment; to dress someone', which can be either reflexive or nonreflexive. For the root *matá* 'eye', the Modern Bikol verb *magmatá* retains only the metaphorical meaning 'to wake up'; for the meaning 'to put eyes on something like a statue or an image' expressed in Old Bikol with the *-um-* paradigm (cf. [32]), Modern Bikol would use a phrase like *magbugták nin matá* 'to put eyes (on)'.

As noted by Crespo in San Agustin (1879), the centripetal *-um-* vs. centrifugal *mag-* contrast in Old Bikol verbs of commerce as illustrated in (38)–(44) has been restructured as centripetal *mag-* vs. centrifugal *magpa-* for Modern Bikol's generic verb of commerce, *bakál*, e.g., *magbakál* 'to buy' vs. *magpabákal* 'to sell' (cf. [38] and [40]).

The singular-actor *-um-* vs. plural-actor *mag-* contrast illustrated in (45) has been reassigned to singular-actor *mag-* vs. plural-actor *mag- … -Vr-*, as in *maghigdâ* 'to lie

down (singular or dual)' vs. *maghirigdâ* 'to lie down (plural)'. Note that Old Bikol also had plural-actor infixes *-Vr-* and *-ang-*, so the usage in (45) may have been idiomatic.

Reciprocal action, illustrated for Old Bikol in (46)–(64), is marked in Modern Bikol by *magka-*, as in *magkasarô* 'to be roommates or housemates; to live in the same house' (cf. [57], [58], [60], and [62]), but is also marked idiomatically for some verbs by *mag-*, as in *mag-íwal* 'to fight (reciprocal)' (cf. [47], [48], and [55]). In both instances, the corresponding verb denoting the individual actor engaging in the reciprocal action is marked by the social affix *maki-*, as in *makisarô* 'to live or stay in another person's house' and *makiíwal* 'to fight with someone'.

The Old Bikol contrast between singular object and plural object illustrated in (65)–(68) has been lost in Modern Bikol, cf. *mag-agíd* 'to compare one thing to others, or to compare two or more things to each other', *magtumbás* 'to compare one thing to another', *magkumpára* 'to compare (whether single or plural objects)'.

The Old Bikol singulative *-um-* vs. distributive *mag-* contrast illustrated in (69)–(72) has been reassigned in Modern Bikol to *mag-* and *maN-*, respectively: *magbárì* 'to break (as a stick); to fracture' vs. *mamárì* (< *maN-* + *bárì*) 'to break or fracture many things' (cf. [69a,b]); *magputól* 'to cut or chop', vs. *mamutól* (< *maN-* + *putól*) 'to cut or chop many things' (cf. [71a,b]).

The punctual vs. durative contrast illustrated in (73)–(76) has been lost in Modern Bikol, the closest available meaning being that of the affix *-para-* 'repetitive action', as in *maghilíng* 'to look' vs. *magparahíling* 'to keep looking and looking; to stare'; *maghápot* 'to ask' vs. *magparahápot* 'to keep asking and asking'.

Many of the "special circumstance" meanings marked by *mag-* in Old Bikol have either disappeared or are now denoted by a different root: Modern Bikol *maggadán* 'to kill a person' vs. *magbunô* 'to kill an animal' (cf. [77] and [79]); Modern Bikol *magkakán* 'to eat', which can refer to ordinary food or food eaten at a party or drinking spree (cf. [78]); Modern Bikol *mag-inóm* 'to drink', which can refer to alcoholic as well as nonalcoholic beverages, whether drunk at a drinking party or under normal circumstances (cf. [80]); and Modern Bikol *maghánap* 'to search for something', regardless if the searching is done haphazardly or with care (cf. [81]).

8. *-UM-* VS. *MAG-* FORMS IN OTHER BIKOL LANGUAGES: THE CASE OF RINCONADA.

While no modern Bikol language or dialect preserves a semantic contrast between *-um-* and *mag-* verbs to the extent of Old Bikol or Modern Tagalog, the Southern Bikol dialect of Rinconada (spoken in the towns of Baao, Bula, Nabua, Bato, Iriga, and Balatan in Camarines Sur Province) stands out as being the last Bikol dialect to retain a full *-um-* paradigm. Note that while Old Bikol and Rinconada both descended from a common ancestor, they are not in a direct linear relationship with each other. Table 6 illustrates the conjugations of the Rinconada *-um-* and *mag-* paradigms, compared with those of Old Bikol.

Morphologically, there are four differences between the Rinconada conjugations and those of Old Bikol: (i) the reduced Rinconada *-inn-* infix (derived historically from either *-imin-*, itself from earlier *-umin-*, or from *-inum-*) corresponds to Old Bikol's *-imin-* for the Rinconada *-um-* paradigm past form; (ii) the present/progressive of the

-*um*- paradigm is marked by -*inn*- plus CV reduplication, as opposed to Old Bikol's *na*-;
(iii) the future -*um*- conjugation in Rinconada is marked by -*um*- plus CV reduplication
along with the obligatory shift of stress to the penult, regardless of the phonological
shape of the root word, corresponding to Old Bikol's *ma*-; and (iv) the future and future
subjunctive conjugations for the *mag*- paradigm (*mig*- and *pig*-, respectively) are
marked by the change of the vowel in the affix to *i*,[20] as opposed to Old Bikol where
they were marked by CV reduplication (*mag-R*- and *pag-R*-, respectively).

In the Bikol Region, it is Rinconada that preserves the very last vestiges of the old
mag- vs. -*um*- contrasts. However, these remnants are so specific and incomplete that
they would appear as little more than semantic curiosities outside of the context of the
present discussion. Generally speaking, the -*um*- and *mag*- conjugations of Rinconada
are in almost complete free variation, with only a few exceptions, but it is in these excep-
tions that we find remnants of the old *mag*- vs. -*um*- contrasts. We can see in examples
(93)–(96) that forms in both the -*um*- and *mag*- paradigms may be used in many cases.

TABLE 6. RINCONADA AND OLD BIKOL CONJUGATIONS

		RINCONADA	OLD BIKOL
-um-	INFINITIVE	-um-	-um- ~ -im-
	PAST	-inn-	-imin-
	PRESENT	-inn-R-	na-
	FUTURE	-um-R-[†]	ma-
	PAST SBJ	Ø-	Ø-
	FUTURE SBJ	R-[†]	R-
mag-	INFINITIVE	mag-	mag-
	PAST	nag-	nag-
	PRESENT	nag-R-	nag-R-
	FUTURE	mig-	mag-R-
	PAST SBJ	pag-	pag-
	FUTURE SBJ	pig-	pag-R-

† Both the future and future subjunctive conjugations of the Rinconada
-*um*- paradigm are accompanied by obligatory stress on the penult,
even on roots with a closed penult, where stress would not normally
be allowed.

20. While synchronically the contrast is between the vowels *a* in *mag*- and *i* in *mig*-, the latter may have
developed diachronically from *mag*- + -*i*-, as three other closely-related Southern Bikol dialects
have present and/or future tense forms with -*i*- (Lobel and Tria 2000:137). Following are Actor
Focus and Object Focus conjugations for Rinconada and three related dialects for comparison:

		RINCONADA	BUHI-NON	POLANGUI	OAS
AF	INFINITIVE	mag-	mag-	mag-	mag-
	PAST	nag-	nag-	nag-	nag-
	PRESENT	nag-R-	nagi- ~ ni-	nay- ~ ni-	nagi-
	FUTURE	mig-	magi-...-ən ~ mi-	may- ~ mi-	magi-
OF	INFINITIVE	-on	-ən	-ən	-ən
	PAST	pinag-	pinag- ~ -in-	-in-	-in-
	PRESENT	pinag-R-	pinagi- ~ -pi-	pay- ~ pi-	Ř- ~ -in-R-
	FUTURE	pig-R- -on	pagi-...-ən	R-...-ən	R-...-ən

Thus it is likely that Rinconada *mig*- developed historically from *magi- with vowel assimila-
tion to *migi- and finally the dropping of the vowel /i/ in the second syllable of the prefix.

(93) a. Siisáy   a   **nag**kopyâ ka   igín?
      b. Siisáy   a   **kinn**opyâ ka   igín?
          who.NOM NOM AF.PAST.hat GEN.REF child
          'Who put a hat on the child?'

(94) a. Iká   na   saná a   **mag**salída ka   igín.
      b. Iká   na   saná a   **sum**alída   ka   igín.
          2SG.NOM now just NOM AF.INF.dress GEN.REF child
          'You (SG) be the one to dress the child.'

(95) a. **Nag**-itóm   na   a   mga batág.
      b. **Inn**itóm   na   a   mga batág.
          AF.PAST.black already NOM PL   banana
          'The bananas have turned black.'

(96) a. **Mig**putî iká   kin dî iká   migluwás   sa   agkó aldów.
      b. **Pum**pútì iká   kin dî iká   migluwás   sa   agkó aldów.
          AF.FUT.white 2SG.NOM if   NEG 2SG.NOM AF.FUT.go.out OBL exist sun
          'You'll (SG) turn white if you (SG) don't go out in the sun.'

However, in sentences (97)–(100), only *mag-* forms may be used.

(97) a. **Mag**kopyâ   iká.
      b. ****Kum**opyâ iká.
          AF.INF.hat   2SG.NOM
          'Put on a hat.'

(98) a. Sábi   mo   **nag**salída 'ka.
      b. ******Sábi mo   **sinn**alída 'ka.
          said   2SG.GEN AF.PAST.dress 2SG.NOM
          'You (SG) said you (SG) got dressed.'

(99) a. **Nag**-itóm   akó   kusubágo.
      b. ****Inn**itóm akó   kusubágo.
          AF.PAST.black 1SG.NOM earlier
          'I wore black earlier.'

(100) a. **Mig**putî nanggád iká   udmâ?
      b. ****Pum**pútì nanggád iká   udmâ?
          AF.FUT.white again   2SG.NOM tomorrow
          'Are you (SG) going to wear white again tomorrow?'

Sections 8.1 to 8.3 outline the semantic categories in which there are constraints on the usage of the *-um-* paradigm in Rinconada.

8.1 NONREFLEXIVE VS. REFLEXIVE. While nonreflexive verbs can occur in either the *-um-* or the *mag-* paradigm in Rinconada, reflexive verbs must take the *mag-* paradigm, as illustrated in (101)–(104).

(101) a. *mag*salída ~ *sum*alída 'to dress someone'
      b. *mag*salída (not ***sum*alída) 'to dress oneself'

(102) a. *mag*kopyâ ~ *kum*opyâ 'to put a hat on someone'
      b. *mag*kopyâ (not ****kum**opyâ) 'to put a hat on oneself'

(103) a. **mag**sapátos ~ **sum**apátos 'to put shoes on someone'
b. **mag**sapátos (not ****sum**apátos) 'to put shoes on oneself'

(104) a. **mag**payíd ~ **pum**ayíd 'to wipe someone or something off'
b. **mag**payíd (not ****pum**ayíd) 'to wipe oneself off'

Note that distinctions between nonreflexive -um- verbs and reflexive mag- verbs are found in both Tagalog and Old Bikol (as discussed in sections 3 and 5.1, respectively).

8.2 INTRINSIC COLOR CHANGE VS. EXTERNAL COLOR CHANGE.
While verbs in Rinconada that have the sense of 'intrinsic color change' as defined by Pittman (1966) can occur in either the -um- or the mag- paradigm, verbs that have the sense of 'external color change' can only occur in the mag- paradigm, as illustrated in (105) and (106).

(105) a. **mag**pulá ~ **pum**ulá 'to turn red or become red'
b. **mag**pulá (not ****pum**ulá) 'to wear red'

(106) a. **mag**-itóm ~ **um**itóm 'to turn black or become black'
b. **mag**-itóm (not ****um**itóm) 'to wear black'

Considering that Tagalog has a distinction between -um- verbs of intrinsic color change and mag- verbs of external color change, it is likely that an earlier stage of Rinconada allowed only -um- for the verbs of intrinsic color change.

8.3 SPECIAL PLURAL-RECIPROCAL ACTION.
Some roots with meanings like 'fight' and 'converse', for which the mag- forms are exclusively plural-reciprocal in Tagalog and Northern Bikol, behave the same way in Rinconada and do not allow -um- forms. Furthermore, as is true for Tagalog and Northern Bikol, the single-actor equivalents in Rinconada are formed with the social mode affix maki-.

(107) a. **mag**rabóng 'to fight each other' (****rum**abóng), cf. TAG **mag**-áway, BIK **mag**-íwal 'to fight each other'
b. **maki**rabóng 'to fight someone; to pick a fight' (****mag**rabóng, ****rum**abóng), cf. TAG **makipag**-áway, BIK **maki**íwal 'to fight someone; to pick a fight'

(108) a. **mag**-úsip 'to converse with each other' (****um**úsip), cf. TAG **mag**-úsap, BIKNG **mag**-ólay, BIKLG **mag**hóron 'to converse with each other'
b. **makipag**-úsip 'to talk to someone' (****mag**-úsip, ****um**úsip), cf. TAG **makipag**-úsap, BIKNG **makipag**-ólay, BIKLG **makipag**hóron 'to talk to someone'

9. THE LOSS OF THE -UM- PARADIGM.
Analysis of Rinconada data—data including both elicited translations and narratives collected from Rinconada speakers in each of the Rinconada-speaking towns—also reveals that there is in most instances a strong preference for the mag- forms over the -um- forms, and in a considerable number of instances a complete absence of -um- forms, pointing to the possibility that for a significant number of speakers, the -um- paradigm has already fallen out of use. The likelihood of this being true increases if we reinterpret the "exceptions" listed in 8.1–8.3 and instead state that while there are a small number of cases where the -um- para-

digm cannot be used to express a given meaning, there are no known cases where the *mag-* paradigm cannot occur but the *-um-* paradigm can.

Furthermore, with such a limited number of selectional rules for *mag-* vs. *-um-* as outlined in sections 8.1–8.3, it seems likely that if the *-um-* paradigm has not disappeared from Rinconada within a few generations, it will be in free variation with the *mag-* paradigm for all verb roots. This, along with the preference for the *mag-* forms by most speakers, may be the final stage of a battle that the *-um-* paradigm has already lost in every other language in the Bikol region. Far from being unique to Bikol, however, the loss of the *-um-* conjugation is widespread throughout the Central Philippines, where only Tagalog, Cebuano, Waray-Waray, Tausug, and Rinconada preserve a full *-um-* conjugation. This coincides with Robert Blust's observation that the *-um-* paradigm seems to have a tendency to lose out to reflexes of *maR- (in the Philippines) or *maN- (as in languages like Malagasy, Kenyah, and Malay) in the battle for speaker preference (pers. comm.).

The data we have been discussing on *mag-* vs. *-um-* in Old Bikol, along with the data from other Central Philippine languages, provide an insight that has heretofore been lacking as to the progression of developments through which some elements of Philippine verbal morphology have become lost or simplified over time. This progression seems to have occurred in at least four stages, outlined in 9.1–9.4.

9.1 STAGE ONE: FULL SEPARATION OF *-UM-* AND *MAG-* PARADIGMS.
Each verb root at this stage inherently selects for either the *-um-* or *mag-* paradigm for its basic indicative meaning, based on semantic principles such as those outlined in Ramos (1974) and Pittman (1966). Some roots can take both paradigms, with a clear semantic contrast between the *-um-* forms and *mag-* forms. However, not all verbs can take both paradigms, and this is perhaps the key structural detail that tends to cause these languages to move toward simplifying the system. Modern Tagalog is still at stage 1, although there is evidence that the original system is being eroded (see fn. 17).

9.2 STAGE TWO: PARTIAL SEPARATION OF *-UM-* AND *MAG-* PARADIGMS.
The contrast still exists between *-um-* and *mag-* forms for roots that could take both at stage 1. All other roots are free to follow both the *-um-* and *mag-* forms with no semantic contrast. At the beginning of this stage (i.e., the first few generations), there may be a weakening tendency towards the paradigm that each root followed at stage 1, but an ever-growing number of speakers allow for free variation between the two paradigms on the nonselective roots. This is the stage that Old Bikol was at when Lisboa documented it around 1610, but by Crespo's time (San Agustin 1879), the Bikol language was well on its way to stage 3.

9.3 STAGE THREE: COMPLETE ALLOMORPHY OF *-UM-* AND *MAG-* PARADIGMS.
At this stage, all or nearly all roots can be observed as being conjugated in both the *-um-* paradigm and the *mag-* paradigm with no contrast in meaning. As this stage progresses, it should become clear that one paradigm is becoming preferred over the other, as is currently true for Rinconada. In fact, Rinconada appears to

be quite far into this stage, and judging from present circumstances, it would hardly be surprising if two or three generations from now researchers will find that Rinconada has progressed to the fourth stage described below.

9.4 STAGE FOUR: ESTABLISHMENT OF A SINGLE PARADIGM.
At long last, one paradigm has won out, and is now used with all or nearly all verb roots. The other paradigm is either lost altogether, relegated to a few frozen uses, or— as has happened in modern Northern Bikol—broken up and mixed together with the stronger paradigm to produce a single, revised paradigm. In the Central Philippine languages, when one paradigm has been lost, it has always been the *mag-* paradigm that has remained, and even outside of the Central Philippines, I know of no language where the opposite is true. Modern Bikol and a large number of other Central Philippine languages (e.g., Ilonggo/Hiligaynon, Kinaray-a, Aklanon, Unhan, Romblomanon, Masbatenyo, Northern Catanduanes Bikol, and all Southern Bikol dialects except Rinconada) are at this stage, having lost the old *-um-* paradigm and assigned its basic meanings to the *mag-* paradigm.

10. CONCLUSION.
Table 7 presents a summary of the contrasts set forth in this paper. A number of issues remain unresolved, not the least of which is the reason for the shift from languages that use *-um-* but not *mag-* for Actor Focus (like most of the Formosan languages) to languages that use *mag-* (or *maN-*) but not *-um-*. One likely explanation is that in many Philippine-type languages, most complex affixes (e.g., *magpa-*, *magka-*, *magpaka-*, *magtaga-*, *magpara-*, *mag- ... -an*, *magsi-*, *maghiN-*, etc.) are based on the *mag-* paradigm. As such, *mag-* and related affixes are used for a larger number of functions, and for this reason, its frequency would seem to make it the natural choice over *-um-*. Lawrence Reid (pers. comm.) suggests another explanation: the possibility of a general preference for prefixes over infixes, supported by the fact that even in some languages like Cebuano where a reflex of **-um-* has been retained, it has been metathesized into a prefix *mu-* (for nonbegun aspect),[21] which also appears as the future form in the Donsolanon dialect of Southern Bikol. As more work is done in this area, as more languages are included, and as more trends are recorded, we may be able to determine more of the underlying motivation for this change in morphology.

---

21. Begun aspect for Cebuano Actor Focus verbs is marked by *ni-* ~ *mi-*, possibly from earlier **min-* < **-um-* + **-in-*. Note that the past prefix *min-* is attested in the Waray-Waray dialect spoken in Abuyog, the southernmost Waray-speaking town of Leyte, where the villages are split between Waray-Waray–speaking in the north and Cebuano-speaking in the south.

TABLE 7. SUMMARY OF CONTRASTS

	TAG	OBIK	RINC	BIK
REFLEXIVE VS. NONREFLEXIVE				
Nonreflexive	-um-	-um-	both	mag-
Reflexive	mag-	mag-	mag-	mag-
CENTRIPETAL VS. CENTRIFUGAL				
Centripetal	-um-	-um-	both	mag-
Centrifugal	mag-	mag-	both	mag-
SINGULAR VS. PLURAL, DUAL, OR RECIPROCAL				
Singular	-um-	-um-	both	mag-
Plural, etc.	mag-	mag-	both	mag-
SINGULATIVE VS. DISTRIBUTIVE				
Singulative	-um-	-um-	both	mag-
Distributive	mag-	mag-	both	mag-
PUNCTUAL VS. DURATIVE				
Punctual	-um-	-um-	both	mag-
Durative	mag-	mag-	both	mag-
GENERAL VS. SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCE				
General	-um-	-um-	both	mag-
Special Circumstance	mag-	mag-	both	mag-
INTRINSIC COLOR CHANGE VS. EXTERNAL COLOR CHANGE				
Intrinsic Color Change	-um-	mag-	both	mag-
External Color Change	mag-	mag-	mag-	mag-
SPECIAL PLURAL-RECIPROCAL ACTIONS (TO FIGHT, TO CONVERSE, ETC.)				
	mag-	mag-	mag-	mag-
ALL OTHER VERBS				
	-um- or mag-	both	both	mag-

REFERENCES

Blust, Robert. 2003. *Thao dictionary.* Language and Linguistics Monograph Series. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.

DeGuzman, Videa P. 1978. *Syntactic derivation of Tagalog verbs.* Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 16. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Ezguerra, P. Domingo. 1747. *Arte de la lengua Bisaya de la provincia de Leite.* Manila: Compañia de Jesus.

Gerona, Danilo M. 2000. The colonial construction of Bikolano family: 1578–1795. Paper read at the 21st National Conference on National and Local History, October 26, at Ateneo de Naga University, Naga City, Philippines.

————. 2001. From epic to history: Approaches to the teaching of Bikol history and culture. Paper read at the 1st Seminar-Workshop on Bikol Language, Literature, History and Culture, April, at Aquinas University of Legaspi, Legaspi City, Philippines.

Grimes, Barbara, ed. 2000. *Ethnologue.* 14th ed. Available online: http://www.ethnologue.com

Liao, Hsiu-chuan. 2004. Transitivity and ergativity in Formosan and Philippine languages. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Lisboa, Marcos de. 1865. *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol.* Manila: Establecimiento Tipográfico del Colegio de Santo Tomás.

Lobel, Jason W., and Fr. Wilmer J. S. Tria. 2000. *An satuyang tataramon: A study of the Bikol language.* Naga City: Lobel & Tria Partnership, Co.

McFarland, Curtis D. 1974. The dialects of the Bikol area. Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University.

————. 1980. A linguistic atlas of the Philippines. Monograph Series No. 15. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

Mintz, Malcolm W. 2000. Food in late 16th and early 17th century Bikol society. *Pilipinas* #35, September. Online at: http://sites.uws.edu.au/social/pilipinas/mintz.pdf

——. To appear. Bikol dictionary: Diksionariong Bikol.

Mintz, Malcolm W., and José del Rosario Britanico. 1985. *Bikol–English dictionary (with English–Bikol index)*. Manila: New Day Publishers.

Pittman, Richard. 1966. Tagalog *-um-* and *mag-*: An interim report. Papers in Philippine Linguistics, No. 1, 9–20. Series A-8. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Ramos, Teresita V. 1974. The case system of Tagalog verbs. Series B-27. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Reid, Lawrence A. 1992. On the development of the aspect system in some Philippine languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 31:65–92.

San Agustin, Andrés de. 1879. *Arte de la lengua Bicol para la enseñanza de este idioma*. Manuel Maria Crespo, ed. Manila: Tipographia de Ramírez y Giraudier, á cargo de C. Miralles.

San Josef, Francisco de. 1832. *Arte y reglas de la lengua Tagala*. Manila: Don Jose Maria Dayot.

Tria, Fr. Wilmer J. S. 1998a. Vocabulario kan mga piniling suanoy na tataramon sa Bikol: B [Vocabulary of selected ancient Bikol words, Letter B]. *Hingowa: Journal of the Holy Rosary Minor Seminary* 1(2):137–40. Naga City: Holy Rosary Minor Seminary.

——. 1998b. Bokabularyo kan mga piniling suanoy na tataramon sa Bikol: K [Vocabulary of selected ancient Bikol words, Letter K]. *Hingowa: Journal of the Holy Rosary Minor Seminary* 2(1):127–30. Naga City: Holy Rosary Minor Seminary.

——. 1999a. Bokabularyo kan mga piniling suanoy na tataramon sa Bikol: D [Vocabulary of selected ancient Bikol words, Letter D]. *Hingowa: Journal of the Holy Rosary Minor Seminary* 2(2):139–42. Naga City: Holy Rosary Minor Seminary.

——. 1999b. Bokabularyo kan mga piniling suanoy na tataramon sa Bikol: G [Vocabulary of selected ancient Bikol words, Letter G]. *Hingowa: Journal of the Holy Rosary Minor Seminary* 3(1):137–40. Naga City: Holy Rosary Minor Seminary.

——. 2000. Bokabularyo kan mga piniling suanoy na tataramon sa Bikol: H [Vocabulary of selected ancient Bikol words, Letter H]. *Hingowa: Journal of the Holy Rosary Minor Seminary* 3(2):131–34. Naga City: Holy Rosary Minor Seminary.

Zeitoun, Elizabeth, Lillian M. Huang, Marie M. Yeh, Anna H. Chang, and Joy J. Wu. 1996. The temporal, aspectual, and modal systems of some Formosan languages: A typological perspective. *Oceanic Linguistics* 35:21–56.

Zorc, R. David. 1977. *The Bisayan dialects of the Philippines: Subgrouping and reconstruction*. Pacific Linguistics C-44. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

——. 1991. Tagalog lexicography. In *Wörterbücher-Dictionaries-Dictionaires: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Lexicographie/An international encyclopedia of lexicography/Encyclopédie internationale de lexicographie*, ed. by Franz Josef Hausmann, Oskar Reichmann, Herbert Wiegand, and Ladislav Zgusta, 26:2568–70. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Department of Linguistics
1890 East-West Road
Honolulu, HI 96822-2318
lobel@hawaii.edu

LINKED CITATIONS

- Page 1 of 1 -

You have printed the following article:

Old Bikol -um- vs. mag- and the Loss of a Morphological Paradigm
Jason William Lobel
Oceanic Linguistics, Vol. 43, No. 2. (Dec., 2004), pp. 469-497.
Stable URL:

This article references the following linked citations. If you are trying to access articles from an off-campus location, you may be required to first logon via your library web site to access JSTOR. Please visit your library's website or contact a librarian to learn about options for remote access to JSTOR.

References

On the Development of the Aspect System in Some Philippine Languages
Lawrence A. Reid
Oceanic Linguistics, Vol. 31, No. 1. (Summer, 1992), pp. 65-91.
Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0029-8115%28199222%2931%3A1%3C65%3AOTDOTA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-J

The Temporal, Aspectual, and Modal Systems of Some Formosan Languages: A Typological Perspective
Elizabeth Zeitoun; Lillian M. Huang; Marie M. Yeh; Anna H. Chang; Joy J. Wu
Oceanic Linguistics, Vol. 35, No. 1. (Jun., 1996), pp. 21-56.
Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0029-8115%28199606%2935%3A1%3C21%3ATTAAMS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-E