

## Philippine Linguistics: The State of the Art: 1970-1980\*

### 1. Introduction

In 1971, two articles appeared (McKaughan 1971, and Constantino 1971c) which together summarized the state of the art of Philippine linguistics until that time. Another decade has passed and it seems an appropriate time to review what has been accomplished in the last ten years, to see how the field has developed and to suggest directions for the future.

The first section of this chapter provides an informal overview of the settings within which the study of Philippine languages is taking place. This section primarily discusses the main organizations, and some of the individuals, that have made major contributions to the field in the seventies.

The following section begins with an overview of the grammars and dictionaries that have appeared in the last decade. It then discusses the main contributions that have been made within each of the four major subfields in the discipline: phonology; morphology and syntax; discourse studies (including sentence and paragraph); and comparative-historical linguistics. The concluding section assesses the significance for the field, of current events in the Philippines, and suggests possible responses.

The bibliography provides a guide to the publications of the last ten years. It is not a complete list for it contains primarily references to the publications related to the core areas discussed in this chapter. It generally does not cover

---

\* Originally published as: Philippine linguistics: The state of the art: 1970-1980. In *Philippine studies: Political science, economics, and linguistics*, ed. by Donn V. Hart, 212-273. Occasional Paper No. 8. DeKalb: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois University. (1981). An abbreviated form of this chapter was presented at the First International Philippine Studies Conference in Kalamazoo, Michigan (June 1980), and appears in its Proceedings as Philippine Linguistics Today. I am grateful to Michael Forman for drawing my attention to references I have overlooked and to Lou Hohulin and Larry Allen of the Summer Institute of Linguistics for sending me current information about that organization. In writing this chapter, one risks offending those who feel that their papers should have been mentioned. It has been possible only to discuss the major subfields in the discipline, with the result that many excellent references have been omitted.

materials appearing before 1970 and contains only a few references to the multiplicity of works dealing with more peripheral areas.

The most recent comprehensive bibliography of Philippine linguistics (Ward 1971) covers materials published through 1969. Most of the accessible works were briefly annotated by Ward. The Summer Institute of Linguistics, Philippines, periodically has published bibliographies of the materials produced by its members. The most recent bibliography in this series is Kilgour (1978).

The major holdings of Philippine linguistic materials in the United States are in the Newberry Library, University of Chicago, Cornell University Library, and the Asia Collection of the University of Hawai'i. In the Philippines, the libraries of the Summer Institute of Linguistics at Nasuli, Malaybalay, Bukidnon and in Manila have comprehensive collections of recent works. Older works may be found in libraries of the major universities in Manila and Quezon City.

## **2. The Setting**

The largest body of research on Philippines languages over the last decade has been conducted in the Philippines. However, there is a growing body of scholars outside of the Philippine whose research interests have led them to study Philippine languages, aided by the always available and ever helpful Filipino emigré as research assistant.

### **2.1. The Summer Institute of Linguistics, Philippines**

The one organization that probably has been most effective in developing linguistic research in the Philippines over the last 27 years is the Philippine Branch of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL). At the present time, members of this organization are working in over 50 Philippine languages, from Ivatan in the north to Sama in the south. The primary goal of SIL is translation of the New Testament, but a necessary subsidiary goal is a detailed linguistic analysis of the speech variety under study. The continuing volume of SIL's published research provides a highly reliable and therefore invaluable database for others whose interests are purely theoretical.

Prior to 1970, linguistic research by SIL members was tagmemically oriented, stimulated by Kenneth L. Pike and Robert Longacre. It was directed towards the analysis of phonemic systems and "lower" levels of the grammatical hierarchy—word, phrase and clause. This decade has seen a move away

from preoccupation with tagmemics to a more heterogeneous theoretical approach with papers appearing using the transformational-generative framework, generative semantics, and case grammar of one sort or another.

This change in theoretical orientation probably can be traced to the influence of Austin Hale whose substantial help in the preparation of SIL's research papers in recent years is reflected in the considerable number in which he appears as co-author. The cross-fertilization of ideas from theoretical positions other than tagmemics has been valuable, and will be discussed in the following sections of this chapter.

Basic linguistic research continues to be done on word, phrase and clause structures by SIL members. However, there has been a change in emphasis, begun in the late sixties and continuing into the seventies, to the analysis and description of "higher" levels of the grammatical hierarchy—sentence, paragraph and discourse.

For people involved in the translation of the New Testament—one of the most difficult of translation tasks—there can be no question regarding the relevance of the study of discourse. It is essential. To some linguists, the study of discourse is outside the pale; to SIL linguists, it is a prerequisite to effective translation.

In addition to research, SIL probably conducts the largest linguistic training program in the Philippines. Since 1976, they have been working under a cooperative agreement with the Ministry of Education and Culture in a summer program in Baguio City. Successful completion of four summers of study enables a student to get an M.A. in Functional Literacy. In the summer of 1980, there were 78 students involved in this program. Around 20 of the participants have joined an organization called the Translators' Committee of the Philippines, a sister organization to SIL, and work in cooperation with regular SIL members in their projects. Although the majority of these Filipinos are involved in literacy programs, several have written and published linguistic articles of worth, some of which will be referred to in this chapter.

Another aspect of SIL's work which should be mentioned is their dialect survey department. The problems of determining language boundaries are great in areas where dialect chaining exists. Although the results of some of

these surveys have been published (Headland 1975, Walrod 1978), the great bulk of information is still in SIL's files.

## **2.2. The Ateneo-PNC Consortium**

About ten years ago, linguists from the Ateneo de Manila University and the Philippine Normal College, decided to pool their resources. They developed a consortium program which offered a Ph.D. in Linguistics. To attract quality students, a number of full scholarships were made available by The Asia Foundation. The Ford Foundation and SIL each supported one scholar. Nine Ph.D.s have been earned since the inception of the program. Three more candidates are currently writing their dissertations.

Because of the small demand for Ph.D.s in Linguistics in the Philippine job market, the drying up of scholarship money, and the general change in emphasis in Philippine linguistics in recent years, the Ph.D. in Linguistics consortium is now officially terminated and a new consortium has been developed. This is for a Ph.D. in Bilingual Education with the Philippine Normal College as the home institution and Ateneo de Manila and De La Salle University as cooperating institutions.

The value of the Ateneo-PNC linguistics consortium cannot be overestimated. The students were generally of a very high caliber and are now the emerging leaders in the field in the Philippines. Dr. Gloria Chan, the first graduate, is now Chairwoman of the Department of Language and Linguistics at Ateneo de Manila; Dr. Ma. Lourdes Bautista is Director of Research at De La Salle; and Dr. Casilda Luzares is head of the M.A. program in Language Education at the same University. Dr. Teresita Rafael, another graduate of this program, is Academic Coordinator for the U.N. sponsored, English as a Second Language program for the thousands of boat people in the refugee camp in Bataan.

Some of the dissertations written by Ateneo-PNC consortium graduates were on pure linguistic topics, such as a case analysis of Cebuano verb morphology, and a study of the subcategorizational and selectional restrictions on English verbs. Other dissertations were on more applied linguistic topics, such as an analysis of Hokkien Chinese borrowings in Tagalog, a sociolinguistic study of Bahasa Indonesia, the elaboration of a technical lexicon for Pilipino, a compo-

site dictionary of Philippine Creole Spanish, and the developing of a model of a Filipino's bilingual competence based on Tagalog-English code switching.

### **2.3. The Linguistic Society of the Philippines (LSP)**

The LSP was formed in 1969 and has continued to provide a focus for the activities of linguists and language teachers in the Philippines through the subsequent decade. Initial membership has climbed to approximately 170, the majority of whom are teachers of English or Pilipino. The society not only sponsors an annual conference, but holds seminars at various times during the year when linguists who have something to offer happen to be in Manila.

The LSP has provided one of the major publication outlets for articles on Philippine linguists through its *Journal of Philippine Linguistics*, now in its eleventh year of publication. The President of the Society and Editor of the *Journal* is Bro. Andrew Gonzales F.S.C., President of De La Salle University, and one of the most productive Filipino linguists on the scene today. The LSP also publishes a monograph series. Subsidies for these endeavors have come from various sources, including The Asia Foundation. SIL continues to subsidize partially the *Journal*, and fully subsidizes monographs authored by its members.

SIL and the LSP also publish a series called *Studies in Philippine Linguistics*, now in its third year of production. Co-edited by Austin Hale of SIL and Casilda Luzares of De La Salle, the series is primarily an outlet for data-oriented papers, and supplements a *Data Paper* series in Linguistics. The latter, published from SIL headquarters in Austin, Texas, has also been an outlet for a number of monographs on Philippine languages.

### **2.4. Diliman Linguistics Circle**

Linguists at the University of the Philippines have their own Society—the Diliman Linguistics Circle—and a periodical known as *The Archive* which primarily presents the results of their research. Current information on the research of Professors Ernesto Constantino and Ernesto Cubar, two prominent linguists in UP, is unavailable. To them passed the cloak of Cecilio Lopez, the first great Filipino linguist, who at the time of his passing in September 1979, was Professor Emeritus in the Linguistics Department at the University of the Philippines. Without the vision and scholarship of Professor Lopez, Philippine linguistics would not be as productive as it is today.

## 2.5. Pambansang Samahan ng Linggwistikang Pilipino

This association, the National Society of Pilipino Linguistics, through its office at the Philippine Normal College, publishes a journal called *Linggwistikang Pilipino* (volume 1, 1971). It is primarily written in Pilipino and deals with National Language issues.

## 2.6. Philippine Linguistics Outside of the Philippines

The major center for Philippine linguistic studies outside of the Philippines has been the University of Hawai'i. Over the last ten years, its graduates have written seven dissertations on Philippine languages. Courses and seminars in Philippine linguistics, dealing both with the structure of the languages as well as with comparative historical problems, are offered on a regular basis. Supplementing these efforts in the Department of Linguistics are strong four-year programs in both Tagalog and Ilokano languages, as well as courses on Philippine literature, offered by the Department of Indo-Pacific Languages. The University Press of Hawai'i, under the general editorship of Howard P. McKaughan, has published dictionaries, pedagogical grammars and language learning materials (the PALI series), in most of the major Philippine languages.

Outside of the University of Hawai'i, at other universities in the United States and abroad, there are a number of linguists who continue to publish on Philippine linguistics. Some of the more prominent among them are David Zorc in Australia, Yukihiro Yamada and Curtis McFarland in Japan, Sarah Bell at the University of British Columbia, Joseph Kess at the University of Victoria, Resty M. Ceña in Alberta, Canada, Vladimir Makarenko at Moscow State University, and John Wolff at Cornell University.

The major publication outlets for these scholars, excluding those already listed, have been *Oceanic Linguistics* (George W. Grace, ed.), published by the University Press of Hawai'i, and *Pacific Linguistics*, published by the Australian National University. The latter has two series in which Philippine linguistics articles appear, *Papers in Philippine Linguistics* and *South-East Asian Linguistic Studies* (Nguyen Dang Liem, ed.).

The following section discusses linguistic research from 1970 to 1980 under the following categories: grammars and dictionaries; phonology, morphology and syntax; sentence, paragraph, and discourse; and comparative-historical.

### 3. Grammars and Dictionaries

A fairly substantial number of works have appeared in the last decade, which because of their title (if not because of their scope), can be cited as grammars of Philippine languages. Probably the most important, in terms of its quality and impact on scholars outside the field, is Schachter and Otnes' grammar of Tagalog (1972). Since this book is a reference source, not a polemic for a theoretical position, it has been widely used and often quoted in the literature. A number of other grammars of Tagalog have also been published. Two of them, written as dissertations at the University of Hawai'i, are case grammars. Ramos (1974) uses an eclectic case model, while De Guzman (1978a) is pure Lexicase. Both of these works will be referred to again with reference to their treatment of verb classification. Chan-Yap and Palo (1979) is a pedagogically oriented transformational-generative analysis. Llamzon (1976) uses Martinet's function-structure approach in his book.

The PALI Series of grammars and dictionaries appeared in 1971. These were commissioned originally by the Peace Corps to accompany sets of teaching materials for each of the major languages. The languages for which materials were published are: Tagalog (Ramos 1971a, 1971b), Bikol (Mintz 1971a, 1971b), Cebuano (Bunye and Yap 1971a, 1971b), Hiligaynon (Motus 1971, and Wolfenden 1971), Ilokano (Constantino 1971a, 1971b), Kapampangan (Forman 1971a, 1971b), and Pangasinan (Benton 1971a, 1971b).

Mirikitani (1972) and Gonzalez (1972) both describe the syntax of Kapampangan. Mirikitani's book is a transformational-generative treatment, with notions of case introduced as prepositional phrases. Gonzalez's publication exemplifies Chafe's version of generative semantics.

Two tagmemically oriented grammars have appeared. One (Hidalgo and Hidalgo 1971) is a detailed treatment of Ivatan. The other (Wolfenden 1975) attempts to combine deep structure into the specifications of a tagmeme in the description of Hiligaynon. Grammatical descriptions (some of which are admittedly brief) have also appeared for the following languages: Botolan Sambal (Antworth 1979), Balangaw (Shetler 1976), Mangyan languages (Barbian 1977a), Sarangani Manobo (DuBois 1976), Mansaka (Svelmoe and Svelmoe 1974), Mamanwa (Miller and Miller 1976), Tboli (Porter 1977), and Palawano (Revel-McDonald 1979).

Chabacano, the Philippine Creole Spanish, continues to be studied, with Forman's (1972) grammatical analysis, and other studies (Frake 1971, Ing 1972, 1976, and Riego de Dios 1976, 1978) which focus on phonological or lexical features of the language.

A number of extensive dictionaries also have appeared in the last ten years, the largest being Panganiban's Filipino-English thesaurus (1972) and Wolff's Cebuano dictionary (1972). Dictionaries and lexicons of a number of other languages have been published, including Schlegel (1971) for Tiruray, Manuel (1971) for Tayabas Tagalog, Vanoverbergh (1972) for Isneg, Headland and Headland (1974) for Casiguran Dumagat, Hassan *et al.* (1975) for Tausug, Reid (1976) for Bontok, and Lambrecht (1978) for Kiangnan Ifugaw. In addition, there are the dictionaries which appeared in the PALI series.

Comparative lexical material is now available in several published sources, including Reid (1971), Lopez (1974), Yamada (1975), Yap (1977), and Barbican (1977b) for Mangyan languages. McFarland (1977) is also an excellent source for lexical and grammatical material from the Northern Philippine languages.

A number of substantial unpublished dictionaries in the files of the Summer Institute of Linguistics in Manila have now been microfiched and copies are available from the Ateneo de Manila University Libraries. The languages include: Batak (Mayer and Rodda), Umiray Dumaget (MacLeod), Inibaloi (Ballard), Ata Manobo (Austin), Dibabawon Manobo (Barnard and Forster), Sarangani Manobo (DuBois), Mansaka (Svelmoe and Svelmoe), Abaknon Sama (Pallesen and Paz), Sama-Bajaw (Pallesen), and Mapun Sama (R. Forman).

#### **4. Phonology**

Much is known about the phonological systems of Philippine languages, primarily because of the basic work done by SIL researchers. Prior to 1970, structuralist descriptions (i.e., traditional phonemic and morphophonemic statements) had appeared for a wide variety of Philippine languages. Since 1970, additional descriptions of various aspects of the phonological systems of a number of languages have been written. These sources include five papers on Central Cordilleran languages, Guinaang Kalinga (Gieser 1970, 1972b), Limos Kalinga (Wiens 1976), Southern (Mallango) Kalinga (Grayden 1979), and Batad Ifugao (Newell 1970); a Southern Cordilleran language, Keley-i Kallahan (Ho-

hulin and Kenstowicz 1979)); two south Palawan languages, Molbog (Thiessen 1977) and Tagbanwa (Green and Hale 1977); a Manobo language, Tigwa (Strong 1979); an East Mindanao language, Kaagan Kalagan (Wendel 1978); a Danaw language, Maguindanao (Eck 1974); Sarangani Sangiré (Maryott 1977b); and three Sama-Bajaw languages, Bangingi (Gault 1979). Pangutaran (Walton 1979c), and Sibutu (Allison 1979b).

Most, if not all, of the above works are structuralist in their orientation. There are, however, a few papers which have been written by SIL members from the standpoint of more recent work in generative phonological theory. Two papers by Allen (1975, 1977) present the systematic phonemes of Kankanaay and argue for cyclical rules to account for the interaction of phonological processes with reduplication in that language.

The problem of providing an adequate account of the interaction of reduplication and other morphological processes in Philippine languages, such as infixation, with phonological rules such as vowel syncope, and nasal assimilation and deletion has been referred to in a number of papers. Anderson (1974, 1975), citing Tagalog and Cebuano among other languages, suggests the possibility of establishing a more highly articulated typology of rule types, but without placing order restrictions on them. This, in effect, allows the interspersing of morphological and phonological rules, a solution which Allen (1975 and 1977) seems to favor.

Two other proposals purporting to account for the interaction of morphological and phonological rules in some Philippine languages are those of Wilbur (1973) citing Tagalog and Agta, and Carrier (1975) dealing only with Tagalog. Both proposals attempt to formulate solutions which would continue to allow for the application of all morphological rules prior to phonological rules in a grammar. Wilbur proposes the over-application or exceptional application, of phonological rules to original or reduplicated segments which do not meet the structural description of the rule. This is to maintain identity between the original and the copied segments. Carrier proposes instead that infixes be prefixed by a morphological rule, then repositioned into the word by a phonological process. Reduplication is also considered by Carrier to be a morphological rule, but one which assigns a feature that later triggers an automatic phonological rule.

Ceña (1975), responding to Wilbur's analysis of Tagalog reduplication (1973), suggests a solution similar to that proposed by Allen for Kankanay (1977). He would have all phonological rules applying in a block, allowing morphological rules to either precede or follow the phonological rules. If a morphological rule follows, it initiates a new cycle of phonological rules.

Wilbur's explanation of irregularity of the reduplicative affixes as over-application of phonological rules to maintain identity is challenged also by Latta (1976). He suggests diachronic processes, such as analogical leveling, to account for some of the apparently irregular phonological developments associated with reduplication in Tagalog. Other possible explanations of the problem also exist, such as the listing of reduplicated forms in the lexicon. This whole area is one that still needs close examination.

There are at least four kinds of effects that are produced by the sequence nasal plus consonant across a morpheme boundary in Tagalog. De Guzman (1978b) claims that to account adequately for these processes, phonological rules must be able to refer to category features, such as Verb and Adjective, as well as to semantic features, such as adversative and instrumental.

Tagalog has also been used as a language to support the claim that a sequence of coronal-noncoronal segments is a marked sequence universally. Blust (1971) uses this claim to account for the fact that derived noncontinuant sequences of this sort in Tagalog undergo what otherwise appears to be sporadic metathesis. Furthermore, it is only derived, coronal-noncoronal sequences, in which one of the segments is a nasal, which allow nasal assimilation rules to operate, apparently as an unmarking strategy.

Philippine languages generally have been considered to have relatively simple phonological systems. Yet there are some languages in the Philippines, such as those in the Cordilleran group, which are an unexplored gold mine for an aspiring phonologist.

Reference has been made in the literature (Ballard 1974:183, Reid 1974:514) to the complexities of Inibaloi phonological processes. This is a subject which, if thoroughly explored, would throw considerable light on the historical development of all of the Cordilleran languages. Similar processes occur in most of the Central Cordilleran languages and have been described in a superficial way in descriptions of these languages. Yet an explanatory account

of why syllable initial underlying voiced stops become phonetically dissimilar stridents has not been attempted, nor has anyone explained why in some languages (e.g., Barlig Bontok), these stridents are palatalized before a low vowel /a/, but not before front vowels.

## 5. Morphology and Syntax

There is one, and probably only one, undisputed fact about the morphology and syntax of Philippine languages, namely that they are complex and notoriously difficult to describe adequately. Philippine languages present grammatical systems unlike those found elsewhere in the world except for some genetically related languages which have “Philippine-type” syntax in Formosa, northern Borneo and northern Sulawesi (Celebes).

This statement is not meant to imply the complete uniqueness of these Philippine systems. Obviously there are other languages of the world which share specific features of their syntax. The apparent uniqueness of Philippine languages is in having a focus system, whereby one of the nominal complements in a verbal sentence is said to bear a special relationship to the verb. This nominal complement has been variously labeled, subject, topic, the focused item, or the focus complement. The special relationship has been called a focus relationship or a voice relationship. Its function has been described as highlighting, emphasizing, bringing into focus, or foregrounding, this specially marked complement. Occurring on the verb is one of a set of prefixes, infixes and suffixes which have been variously labeled as voice-marking, case-marking, or focus affixes. They have this label since their function is said to mark the voice, case or focus of the complement mentioned above.

The terminological problem is a real one, but this is not the place to discuss it in detail. (See McKaughan 1973, Thomas 1977, and Kess 1979 for discussions of the terminological problems.) Schachter (1976) and Schwarz (1976) come to completely opposite conclusions as to whether or not the focused complement is the subject of the sentence. Schwarz claims that subject is a universal category. Schachter disputes this conclusion and also claims that Philippine languages do not have subjects. He believes that the properties which characterize subjects in other languages, such as ability to float quantifiers, control reflexivization and equi-NP deletion, become relativized, etc., are not

associated with a single complement in Philippine languages, but are distributed between two complements, Agent and Topic.

Schachter (1977) characterizes these two sets of properties as being “reference-related” and “role-related.” This distinction is in the process of being developed into a full-fledged theoretical model for the description of language by Van Valin and Foley (1980). They believe that the notion of subject is an ad hoc device, bequeathed to linguists by the Greeks and traditional logicians which is of no theoretical value (Foley and Van Valin 1979). To relational grammarians, however, subject is a primary term in the theory, and its description figures large in their work on Philippine languages. Bell's (1976) dissertation examined the notion of subject in Cebuano from both transformational-generative and relational grammar points of view. She concluded that from the former standpoint it would be necessary to analyze Cebuano as having no subject. From the latter, she concluded that the Actor nominal is the initial subject and that the nominative nominal (i.e., Schachter's topic) is the final subject.

In this aspect of the analysis, Bell's treatment of Cebuano was similar to the analysis of Otanes (1970), Llamzon (1973) and others. They wrote as transformational-grammarians, treating the actor focus construction as primary, and verbal sentences having other than actor focus as being transformationally derived, like passives, from it.

Bell's analysis of Cebuano showed that Relational Grammar as originally proposed needed to be revised. The earlier version had required that relation changing rules such as those that advanced various nominals to subject, had to be ordered before feature-changing rules. Bell showed that certain of these rules needed to refer to initial grammatical relations. The result was a major revision in the theory.

Dryer (1978) suggested that Bell's revised version was wanting, for it failed to account for sentences in which there was no subject nominal. He questioned Bell's treatment of active sentences as basic. Dryer suggested the possibility of a non-relational solution which would use a topicalization rule to produce the appropriate focus of a sentence. This solution was equivalent to case grammar analyses such as that of Ramos (1974) where subjectivalization was a late transformational rule.

Ceña (1979b), using Tagalog, demonstrated that Philippine languages did not fit the analyses which treated active sentences and agent nominals as primary. Keenan and Comrie (1977) had proposed a universal called the Accessibility Hierarchy which expressed the relative accessibility to relativization of NP positions in simple sentences. The claim was, that if an NP lower in the hierarchy could be relativized, then every NP above it in the hierarchy was also accessible to relativization. The hierarchy had the following terms in the following order (from highest to lowest): Subject, Direct Object, Indirect Object, Oblique, Genitive, and Object of Comparison.

Ceña showed that in Tagalog, while Direct Object, Indirect Object, and some Oblique NPs such as Benefactive, Locative, Instrumental and Causative were not accessible to relativization, the Comitative (another Oblique NP), Genitive, and Object of Comparison could be relativized upon. In a paper written after the preparation of his 1979b publication, Ceña (1977) showed that by treating the Patient, rather than the Agent, as primary, i.e., as initial subject in relational grammar terms, Tagalog would no longer be a counter-example to the accessibility hierarchy nor to other “laws” in the theory which had been problematic, such as the so-called Relational Annihilation Law.

De Guzman (1979) provided further evidence to support the analysis of Patient as primary subject in Tagalog. While Ceña’s evidence was primarily syntactic, De Guzman presented morphological evidence. De Guzman probably was the first to state in print what the implication of this analysis is for Tagalog, and by extension for other Philippine languages. She comments (1979) that “Tagalog, manifesting verb roots that take either agent or patient as subject as well as verb roots that take only patient as subject, is synchronically a mixed accusative-ergative system.” This is a restatement of the position taken in her excellent monograph on the syntactic derivation of Tagalog verbs (De Guzman 1978a, in which verb roots are marked as either ergative or non-ergative).

Ergative roots, as defined by De Guzman, are those which do not allow a co-occurring Agent or Instrument to be realized in the Nominative case form. In other words, ergative roots choose Patient as subject. A non-ergative root, on the other hand, is one whose subject choice follows the Fillmorean hierarchy of Agent-Dative-Instrument-Object (De Guzman 1978:199). Ilokano is also treated

as a mixed accusative-ergative language in Reid and Espiritu (1980) , and in current work by Gerdt (1980) within the relational grammar framework.

Defining the nature of the syntactic relation which holds between the Nominative NP and the verb is one thing. Writing a description which provides an explanation for it is another. A series of articles by Kess (1972, 1975, 1976, 1978, 1979) have attempted to chart the history of the various approaches that have been taken to the problem. Kess has tried to characterize the kind of verbal classification system which a grammar would need to account for the facts of the case.

A number of works have appeared which have moved in the directions that Kess has suggested. He has noted, as have others, that it is completely inadequate to classify verbs according to the affix set which the verb allows. Such a classification treats only surface features of the verbal syntax. It does not begin to account for the more elusive semantic distinctions that are involved in the choice of one verbal affix over another. Kess's position is that the verbal affixes related to subject choice mark only surface cases and should be referred to as Case affixes rather than by other terms which have been used.

The term "case," however, should not be restricted to only the surface forms of a language. It also has been applied, at least since Fillmore (1968), to the underlying relations which a nominal holds with a verb. McFarland (1976) describes the problem in his classification of Tagalog verbs. He writes:

Tagalog verbs are indeed confusing. When I first studied the language, I learned that *i-* verbs were in either benefactive or instrumental focus; it later turned out that there are *i-* object-focus verbs, *i-* causal-focus verbs, and other *i-* verbs whose focus is hard to determine. I learned that *-an* verbs were in locative or directional focus; it later turned out that there are *-an* object-focus verbs, *-an* benefactive-focus verbs, *-an* intransitive verbs. *-In-* verbs, it seems, are not only object focus, but also directional focus, and intransitive. *Mag-* verbs are always actor focus, but may also express additional elements of meaning, such as intensity or reciprocity. It's all very confusing. (McFarland 1976:v)

The semantics of focus has been the topic of papers by Ballard (1974) for Inibaloi, Miller (1973) for Mamanwa, West (1973) for Amganad Ifugao, and Wiens (1979) for Limos Kalinga. Each has discussed the semantic implications of focus affixation on verbs. Maryott (1977a) treats the subject for Sangihé, but in the context of a description of Sangihé narrative discourse.

Various studies concerned with the classification of verb stems have appeared since 1970. These include Wolff (1970) for Cebuano, MacLeod (1972) for Umiray Dumaget, Rhea (1972) for Sarangani Bilaan, Johnston (1975) for Cotabato Manobo, Ruch (1974) for Kalamian, Barlaan (1975) for Isnag, and Chandler (1974) for Northern Kankanay.

Several classifications have been made of Tagalog verb stems, including Schachter and Otones (1972), McFarland (1976), Ramos (1974), and De Guzman (1978a). Ramos, as mentioned earlier, used a case grammar approach, treating the verb as central to the syntax. Her verbs are classified not only by their distinctive case frames, but also by their inherent semantic features, with the latter triggering the former. De Guzman's approach was to subcategorize the verbs using syntactic, semantic and morphological features of the verb. Her theoretical position is Lexicase, a model which requires that lexical items be fully specified in the lexicon for such features as category, case, context and semantics.

Luzares' (1977, 1978) analysis of Cebuano verb morphology and verb classification uses a case grammar approach of the Fillmorean variety, but treats cases (all 21 of them) as verbal features in the lexicon rather than assigning them by phrase structure rules as had been proposed by Fillmore. Luzares' analysis underlines the problem of having an open-ended case system. Case relations are not purely semantic. Since every verb is semantically distinct from every other, the semantic relations which obtain between it and its associated nominals must be unique.

Theoretically the number of purely semantic case relations need only be constrained by the analyst's skill at labeling them. Neither are case relations the same as *dramatis personae*. The *dramatis personae* remain unchanged, regardless of one's perception of an event. But the reporting of that event is actually the reporting of one's perception of it. A linguistic description should therefore be concerned with how one's perception of the event is related to the structures used to describe it. For example, given a situation in which a man is seen forking hay onto a truck, the event might be described by one person as "The man is loading hay onto the truck" but by another as "The man is loading the truck with hay." A case description which tries to link its cases with *dramatis personae* would treat "truck" as location in both sentences, and "hay" as goal, or

patient, in both sentences. Considering only the linguistic events, however, it is clear that the case relation of “truck” is different in each sentence (locus in the first, and patient in the second). This is also true for the case relation of “hay” (patient in the first, and means in the second). So not only semantic, but morphological and syntactic criteria are necessary for determining case relations.

The Lexicase model (Starosta 1978), adopted by De Guzman (1978a), uses a restricted and possibly universal set of case relations, established on the basis of meaning and morpho-syntactic consequences. The Lexicase model is a highly restrained, empirically based and falsifiable generative model which does not appeal to abstract deep structures nor to transformational rules. Lexicase therefore has the potential for providing Philippine linguists with a suitable model for the systematic comparison of Philippine grammatical systems.

It has been noted from the time of Bloomfield (1917) that subjects in Philippine languages are more highly referential than in a language such as English. This is one of the reasons that the term Topic is so often used for this NP. McFarland (1978b), discussing the notions of definiteness and indefiniteness in Tagalog and Bikol, states “as a general rule, an object complement with definite reference cannot occur in immediate construction with an unrelativized verb.” The evidence is sound. Accusatively marked nominals (Tagalog *ng*, Cebuano *ug*, etc.,) are invariably indefinite in unrelativized constructions. There are no Accusative markers for personal nouns, nor are there any Accusative personal pronoun sets in Philippine languages. Yet one finds articles such as Rafael (1978a) and Bell (1978) which claim that definite objects do occur, in Tagalog as well in Cebuano.

The problem is once again one of incompatible terminology. The term object is ambiguous as referring to a case form (Accusative) and a case relation (Patient). It would be good if descriptions completely forsook the term object in favor of the latter terms which are much less susceptible to misinterpretation. There are, of course, verbs in Philippine languages which have what can be translated in English as a definite Patient, and in which the agent is Nominative or subject. Invariably, the nominal which is translated in such sentences into English as a definite Patient, appears in the Locative case form.

The question then is whether the sentence in question is transitive or not, and whether the morpho-syntactic evidence supports the interpretation of that

nominal as Patient, or as some other relation such as Locus. The fact that semantically the nominal in question appears to be a goal can be misleading. Even in English, “He loved her” and “He showed love to her” can describe precisely the same situation, but the goal of the affection is a Patient in the first sentence and a Locus in the second.

Space does not permit detailed treatment of the numerous works which describe other aspects of the morphology and syntax of Philippine languages within the last decade, such as those on Aspect (Sawyer 1975, Naylor 1978, Green 1979). Only cursory mention can be made of other descriptions of theoretical interest. E. L. Hohulin (1971) is a generative semantics treatment of Keley-i verbal predicates. Gonzalez (1971) uses a Chafean generative semantics model to argue that the various forms of the Tagalog nasal ligature (including *nang*) are not generated by base rules but transformationally in the “shallow structure.” Chan-Yap and Palo (1978) discuss the unique syntactic characteristics of Tagalog “pseudo-verbs.” There are also various analyses of Tagalog existential constructions by McFarland (1978a) and Ramos and Ceña (1979), both coming from completely different theoretical perspectives, yet claiming that possessive, locative and existential sentences are merely separate instances of a single sentence type.

## **6. Sentence, Paragraph and Discourse**

In 1967 and 1968, Robert Longacre of the Summer Institute of Linguistics conducted a series of workshops where he introduced the members of SIL, Philippines, to his theory of the structure of hierarchical units larger than the single clause. This theory, articulated within the general framework of tagmemics, was the starting point for the systematic analysis of 25 languages by some 32 SIL participants in the workshops.

A number of the papers written at that time, summarized in Longacre’s (1968) project report to the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, have appeared in various publications. They provide an immense bounty of fascinating textual data, for the most part carefully analyzed and translated by their respective authors, and presented within a single, fairly coherent and illuminating theoretical model. The model is unabashedly taxonomic and hierarchic and is consequently studiously ignored by many lin-

guists. Yet it is still one of the few models with a set of analytical tools and a descriptive apparatus comprehensive enough to cope with linguistic structure from the word to the discourse. Its ability to handle recursion, or nesting, of higher units within structures lower on the hierarchy has enabled systematic description to be made of complex structures in which, for example, a whole discourse may appear embedded as the quote of a direct quote sentence type, or in which an explanatory paragraph may appear embedded in a narrative paragraph. One of the advantages of these studies is that repeatedly, various adverbial particles or lexical items appear as structural clues to boundaries between these higher level units and cannot be properly described unless their paragraph or discourse functions are admitted into the grammar.

Characteristic of the descriptions of sentence, paragraph and discourse which were written in the Longacre workshops are those by Reid (1970) for Central Bontok, McLachlin and Blackburn (1971) for Sarangani Bilaan, Wrigglesworth (1971) for Ilianen Manobo, Whittle (1971) for Atta, C. Walton (1971) for Binongan Itneg, Ashley (1971) for Tausug, Elkins (1971) for Western Bukidnon Manobo, and Hall (1973-1974) for Siocon Subanon.

Two articles on Inibaloi by Ballard, Conrad, and Longacre (1971a, 1971b) go beyond the taxonomic descriptions of the kind found in the articles just mentioned. They state not only “surface structure” patterns, but also characterize “deep structure” patterns, and specify the relations existing between the two. “Deep structure,” as used here, refers to possibly universal semantic patterns that can be verified as pertinent to the language under analysis by the occurrence of a unique set of surface “encodings.” For example, various kinds of Paraphrase “deep structure” occur, including identity-equivalence, generic-specific, specific-generic, statement-specification and negated antonym. Each of these semantically distinct variants of paraphrase is “encoded” into a variety of surface structures. For example, a negated antonym “deep structure” (in English, “It’s not a cat, but a dog”) may be expressed in Inibaloi by a surface structure paraphrase, simultaneous, coordinate or alternative sentence type.

Subsequent SIL workshops focusing on the analysis and description of discourse have produced published papers which built upon earlier studies, e.g., Macabuhay and Goschnick (1979) and Benn (1979) for Central Bontok. But a characteristic of the more recent works on discourse has been a shift from pro-

viding a rough taxonomic description of various discourse genre to the examination of specific features of a given genre.

The study of discourse factors which affect subject choice has been an ongoing concern among linguists working with Philippine languages since Pike (1964:11) underlined the necessity of knowing the “discourse potential” of constructions for them to be adequately described. Recently a number of authors have begun to describe these factors, and to characterize the significance for a number of different discourse genre of the shifting patterns of focus, or subject choice, in their languages. These studies include Porter and Hale (1977) for Tboli, Maryott (1977a) for Sangihé, and Hale and Gieser (1977) for Kalinga.

Typical of the kinds of functions that focus patterns may have are those listed by Hale and Gieser:

... focus patterns can have the following kinds of functions in discourse: 1) they provide internal coherence to sections of non-conflict text by keeping a single participant grouping in focus throughout the section, 2) they provide clues to grouping by a shift of the predominant focus from one participant group to another, and 3) they provide evidence for the identification of the climax and of conflict passages whenever a non-shifting pattern, one which consistently focuses upon a single participant grouping is replaced by a shifting pattern in which the focus oscillates among or between conflicting groups of participants on a crowded stage. In texts in which the discourse type does not call for a climax, the shifting pattern may reinforce tension in a way that contributes to the focal content structure of the discourse (1977:139).

Other studies examine various grammatical devices which provide cohesion within discourse, such as conjunction, deletion, and pronominalization. Among these publications are those by Larson (1972) for Ivatan, Diane Persons (1979) and Gary Persons (1979) for Bolinao, and Titrud (1979) for Caluyanen. The function of tense patterns within discourse has also been addressed in a number of papers such as those by Reid (1972) comparing Bontok and Keley-i Kallahan, Wallace (1977) for Northern Kankanay, Errington (1979) for Cotabato Manobo, and Forfia (1979) for Ga'dang. Formal differences between factual narrative and fictional narrative in Isnag are discussed by Barlaan (1977).

Typical of the structuralist orientation of much of the work done by SIL members is a continuing emphasis on grammar discovery procedures. This has resulted in a number of papers (some titles have already been mentioned in other contexts) which either tell the beginning linguist how to do a discourse

analysis (Hale 1977) or which describe the step-by-step procedures that an analyst took to arrive at the analysis presented (Allison 1977, Wallace 1977). Other substantial studies of discourse are those for Sangihé by Maryott (1977a) which deviates from the majority of the works mentioned above by being a stratificational analysis, and Ga'dang by Walrod (1979) which combines features of tagmemic and stratificational theories in his analysis.

Although discourse studies have received considerable emphasis during recent years in SIL, there have been several substantial descriptions of sentence, i.e., clause-clause combinations. These include studies by Elkins (1971) for Western Bukidnon Manobo, Janice Walton (1975) for Binongan-Itneg, Maryott (1979) for Sangihé, and Ramiscal and Goschnick (1979) for Tina Sambal. Sentence descriptions also appear in Shetler's (1976) Balangao grammar, Svelmoes' (1974) Mansaka grammar (which also includes a brief section on paragraph structure), and in the Millers' (1976) grammar of Mamanwa. The last study also contains some discussion of paragraph and discourse structure.

This section should not be concluded without mentioning two works which examine Tagalog data in relation to discourse. Naylor (1975) discusses how context limits subject choice and controls the semantic interrelationship of consecutive sentences. Hopper and Thompson (1980) explore the apparent correlation in narrative discourse of foregrounding—that material which supplies the main points of a discourse—and goal focus constructions, those which in Hopper and Thompsons' terms are “maximally transitive.”

## **7. Comparative-Historical**

Studies which have focused on the historical development of Philippine languages over the past ten years have generally been based on good data and careful attention to methodological detail. Yet the more that is discovered about earlier stages of Philippine languages, the more questions arise to be answered. The first issue of the *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* contained an article by Dyen (1970) demonstrating the value of using qualitative evidence (innovations in phonology, morphology and syntax) to substantiate a subgrouping hypothesis formulated on the basis of quantitative evidence such as lexicostatistical percentages. Prior to 1970, a number of studies had been done relying solely on lexicostatistics. Subsequent studies have shown a judicious

mix of both quantitative and qualitative evidence with the former being treated with the caution it deserves.

There is no consensus on which languages really reflect a Proto-Philippines. Earlier studies had suggested that the languages of north Borneo, the Minahasan languages of northern Sulawesi, as well as Chamorro in the Marianas are “Philippine-type” languages, and therefore form part of the Philippine group. Charles (1974) assumes at least the inclusion of the first two groups in his reconstruction of a Proto-Philippine phonology. There seems to be no qualitative evidence that can support the inclusion of Chamorro, although studies still remain to be done to clarify the position of this language in the Austronesian family. Blust (1974b) proposed that most of the languages of north Borneo (i.e., those that have Philippine-type syntax) subgroup more closely with the languages of Sarawak rather than with the southern languages of the Philippines. He claims that they all show evidence of the addition of a phonological rule deleting vowels which occurred between the reflexes of Proto-Austronesian voiced obstruents and a following \*S. (See also Blust 1973.)

Certain aberrant languages in the Philippines have been suggested at one time or another not to be a part of the Philippine subgroup. These languages include Ivatan, Ilongot, the Bilic subgroup (Blaan and Tboli) as well as Tiruray, Bagobo, and Sama-Bajaw. At the present, Ilongot is the only one of these languages which can with any assurance be subgrouped within an accepted Philippine subgroup--Southern Cordilleran (Reid 1979a), also called Pangasinic (Zorc 1979b).

Various proposals have been made to subgroup Philippine languages into a coherent family. Llamzon and Martin (1976) attempt a subgrouping based on “exclusively shared innovations” with glottochronology being used to calculate time depth of the proposed subgroups. Walton (1979a) proposes a subgrouping which interprets lexicostatistical cognate percentages in a unique way. He proposes that a tree based on the lowest undistorted cognate percentages between language groups is less subject to alternation to bring it in line with subgroupings suggested by qualitative subgrouping procedures, than is a tree based on either the highest undistorted percentage or the average of undistorted percentages, methods which were used by Dyen (1962a, 1962b). Zorc (1977, 1979b) and McFarland (1980) both propose subgroupings which take into account the

findings of the various studies to be discussed below which deal with regional subgroupings in the Philippines.

Despite the uncertainties as to the constituency of the Philippine subgroup, a number of studies have reconstructed various aspects of a Proto-Philippines (PPH). Charles (1974) reconstructs a relatively simple phonological system which shows, among other things, a falling together of PAN \*z, \*Z, \*d, \*D, as PPH \*d. Blust (1974a) however, in discussing the development of Tagalog *dalawa* 'two,' proposes that in Proto-Tagalic, the reflexes of \*D differed from those of \*d, \*z and \*Z in word medial position, the former falling together with the reflex of \*j and \*r to become \*r, the latter becoming \*d. These developments are by no means exceptionless, and other interpretations of the data (such as borrowing from Malay) are possible.

The status of \*r and \*g in PPH is problematic. Charles (1974) states that he can find no clear evidence for the reconstruction of either sound. Wolff (1974, 1976) also throws doubt on the reconstruction of PPH \*r by showing that its reconstruction for PAN is unsound.

One fact has become clear, amply documented by Wolff (1976), Philippine languages have been extensively influenced by borrowings from Malay and possibly other languages to the south. Unless the influence of Malay culture is taken into consideration, reconstruction of earlier forms of Philippine languages will remain suspect. Pallesen (1977) is an excellent case study of the effects of culture contact resulting in the convergence of two languages, Tausug and Sama-Bajaw in the south of the Philippines. He suggests that the influence of Sama-Bajaw traders has been felt by many languages in eastern Mindanao. It seems reasonable as well to look for the influence of these nomadic sea people in areas further north. Pallesen has shown that they established temporary settlements along the east of Mindanao and in various places in the Bisayas. But there seems little reason to doubt that they did not also trade as far north as Manila and the Ilocos coast.

Three studies by Zorc (1972, 1978, 1978b) have succeeded in reconstructing contrastive word accent, or stress, for Proto-Philippines and possibly Proto-Hesperonesian. He also clearly documents the loss of stress in Pangasinan, and the factors resulting in its redevelopment in that language. The multiple reflexes of \*R in Philippine languages have been the subject of at least two papers.

Tharp (1974a) examines the *r* and *g* reflexes in Ilokano. Reid (1973b) discusses the conditioning factors which resulted in multiple reflexes for \*R and \*l in Kankanay.

Other papers which examine the reflexes of reconstructed phonemes include Schumacher and Schumacher (1978) which discusses the various reflexes of Proto-Manobo \*l in various Manobo languages, especially Agusan, and Maryott (1978) who treats the multiple reflexes of Pre-Sangir \*r, \*l, and \*d in the Sangihé language of Northern Sulawesi and the southeast Philippines.

Reid (1973a) describes the diachronic development of the vowel systems of over 50 Philippine languages. Pallesen (1979) discusses the conditions under which pepet (\*ə) developed three different reflexes in Sama-Bajaw.

A major data source for some of the lexical and phonological comparisons has been Reid (1971) who presents a carefully compiled and edited list of approximately 400 items in 43 of the lesser known languages of the Philippines. The majority of the lists initially were prepared by SIL members for the languages in which they were working at that time.

Little research has been done on the reconstruction of a Proto-Philippine syntax because of the inherent difficulty in syntactic reconstruction and also because the syntax of Proto-Austronesian (PAN) is only now becoming clear. One of the basic questions that must be answered is whether Philippine languages with their verb-initial syntax, noun phrases marked for case by prepositional determiners, and complex focusing and correlated verbal syntax reflect a similar system in PAN, or whether PAN had a different type of system (either similar to, or different from that of Oceanic languages) from which Philippine languages developed. Various answers to this question have appeared. Foley (1976) proposes a development from an Oceanic type syntax. Wolff (1973, 1979) proposes a Proto-Austronesian with syntax and verbal morphology similar to Philippine languages. Pawley and Reid (1979) suggest a kind of syntax intermediate between the Oceanic and Philippine systems. A more developed statement of the last position is given by Starosta, Pawley and Reid (1978, 1981). They claim that PAN was probably an ergative language with primarily unmarked verbs and a highly developed nominal derivation system. The affixes which constitute the verbal focus system of Philippine languages

(such as *-um-*, *i-*, *-en*, and *-an*) are reflexes not of a verbal focus system in the parent language but of the PAN noun-deriving affixes.

Some reconstruction has been done on aspects of the syntax of Proto-Philippines. Reid (1978) discusses the difficulty of reconstructing construction markers such as determiners, ligatures, and topic markers because of the great variability which occurs in the form of these markers in even closely related languages. Some of the factors which brought about this variability are described and some reconstruction of the forms is suggested. Reid (1979b, 1979c, and 1981) further discusses the reconstruction of Genitive and Nominative determiners for Proto-Philippines and Proto-Austronesian.

There have been a number of studies in recent years which have helped to establish various subgroups within the Philippine family. Tharp (1974b) reconstructs the phonological, pronominal and case marking systems for Northern Cordilleran. Reid (1974) similarly reconstructs a Proto-Central Cordilleran. Reid (1979a) also assembles evidence from northern, central and southern Cordilleran languages in a reconstruction of the pronominal systems of their parent, Proto-Cordilleran.

Following on the study by Tweddel (1970), Zorc (1974a) proposes a subgrouping of the languages of Mindoro, commonly referred to as Mangyan. He proposes two subgroups, a northern group (Iraya, Alangan, and Tadjawan) which possibly subgroups with the Pampangan subgroup in Central Luzon, and a southern group (Hanunoo and Buhid) with possible connections to the languages of Palawan. Recently Zorc's subgrouping has been expanded by Pennoyer (1979). He claims that Buhid forms an immediate subgroup with Taubuid rather than with Hanunoo.

The most extensive study of a comparative-historical nature that has been done for any group of Philippine languages is Zorc (1977). His thorough examination of the phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicon of 36 speech varieties spoken in the central and southern Philippines establishes them as belonging to the Bisayan subgroup of Central Philippine languages. Rafael (1976) provides us with a diachronic study of the development of negatives within this subgroup. Zorc postulates five branches within the Bisayan group: West, Banton, Central, Cebuan, and South Bisayan. The constituency of the last group has been challenged by Pallesen (1977, 1978). He believes that southern Bisayan

also includes the languages of the east coast of Mindanao. These are languages Zorc believes are coordinate with the Bisayan group, as are Tagalog and Bikol.

At issue in this dispute is the relative weight given to evidence from functors such as pronouns, determiners, numerals and other high frequency morphemes vis-à-vis evidence from basic lexical items. Zorc (1974b, 1979a) believes that the former evidence is stronger in that functors have a low probability of replacement. Pallesen contends, on the other hand, that functors are generally less, not more, stable than basic lexical items. This is especially true in bilingual contexts in which functors are particularly susceptible to borrowing.

The East Mindanao subgroup, according to Pallesen (1977), consists of three language groups--North-East Mindanao (which includes Mamanwa, Surigao-non, Butuanon and Tausug), Central-East Mindanao (including Kamayu and Davawenyo) and South-East Mindanao (including the various Mandaya, Mansaka and Kalagan languages). A careful reconstruction of Proto-South-East Mindanao has been done by Gallman (1979).

The Manobo subgroup has been the subject of several studies. Elkins (1974) reconstructs a Proto-Manobo phonological system and discusses the developments in 16 Manobo languages. The subgrouping he proposed is fairly well-supported by Harmon (1977) who provides ineluctable evidence to include Kaganayan in the Manobo subgroup. This is a language spoken on an island in the Sulu Sea as well as on Palawan. Harmon (1979) adds to our knowledge of Proto-Manobo by reconstructing pronouns and case-marking particles for that group. The parent language of the Danaw group (Maranaw, Magindanaw and Ilanun) has been reconstructed by Allison (1979a). However, its position in relation to other Philippine languages remains unclear.

Pallesen's (1977) reconstruction of Proto-Sama-Bajaw has been mentioned. It will be published as a special monograph by the *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. A list of his Sama-Bajaw reconstructed lexical items is to appear in a forthcoming issue of *Pacific Linguistics*.

The discussion in the preceding section has proceeded on the assumption that all Philippine languages form part of a single genetic subgroup, descended from a parent language referred to as Proto-Philippines. No evidence has ever been produced to establish such a subgroup within Austronesian. Specialists in Philippine languages are becoming increasingly aware that the term Proto-

Philippines is merely a convenient, fictional label for whatever proto-language was the closest immediate ancestor of the languages of the Philippines.

Reid (1981) discusses evidence that suggests that the northern languages of the Philippines do not form a part, as has usually been believed, of the Malayo-Polynesian subgroup of Austronesian languages. (Malayo-Polynesian is the term which in recent years has been applied to all Austronesian languages outside Formosa.) He believes that the development of word medial nasal clusters is an innovation which is found in Malayo-Polynesian languages but is not found in the northern languages of the Philippines, or in the Austronesian languages of Formosa. This suggests that the innovation took place after the separation of the parent of the northern Philippine languages from the parent of the other extra-Formosan languages. In effect, this means that languages such as Tagalog and Cebuano are more closely related to Indonesian and Oceanic languages than they are to Ilokano, Ivatan and other northern Philippine languages. By this analysis, the surface similarities between Philippine languages are largely the result of some 5,000 years or more of development in close geographic proximity. There has been extensive borrowing between genetically related languages producing the effects of what has come to be called indirect inheritance.

## **8. Related Areas**

In the preceding sections, the discussion has been restricted to various core areas of linguistics. This chapter would leave a false impression of the state of Philippine linguistics were no mention made of the great bulk of work done in some of the more peripheral areas of linguistics. It is in these areas that most Filipino linguists are doing their research. They are working not on the structure of Philippine languages, but in areas such as dialectology (Pelaez-Soberano 1977), bilingualism (Pascasio 1977, Bautista 1974, 1977), first and second language acquisition (Segalowitz and Galang 1978, Castillo 1972), and language planning and language use (Constantino, Sikat and Cruz 1974, Sibayan and Gonzales 1977, Gonzalez 1980).

Reference is made to ongoing research in some of these areas in Rafael (1978b). The leadership of Bonafacio Sibayan and Bro. Andrew Gonzalez in the fields of language planning and language use is internationally recognized. To

discuss their published research in each of these areas would require another lengthy bibliography and a second lengthy chapter.

## 9. Prospects for the Future

Most Filipino linguists today are occupied with other than “pure” linguistic research. To a great extent this emphasis is a function of their society. The dictates of the New Constitution require that a new national language called Filipino (as distinct from Pilipino) be developed.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore the radical changes which resulted from the 1974 decision to institute a bilingual policy (English and Pilipino) from the primary through the tertiary educational system have required a commitment from linguists to meet the problems that these changes have brought. There are few rewards for a Filipino linguist who wants only to teach linguistics and to do descriptive and theoretical linguistics.

As a result, the number of Filipino linguists who have published descriptive material on some language other than their mother tongue within the last decade is extremely small. One wonders whether having a small cadre of practicing native linguists is a luxury that a developing nation cannot afford. Yet considering the exigencies of the present situation in the Philippines, with the new national language (Filipino) required by the Constitution to be based on some unspecified number of Philippine languages, it would seem that the nation must have a group of highly skilled linguists involved in a systematic comparison of Philippine languages. This comparison should be concerned not only with the lexicons of Philippine languages, a task which is not particularly difficult, but with the far more difficult task of systematic syntactic comparison.

The purpose of this comparison should not be the discovery of a “universal abstract base” which would then somehow become the base of the proposed language. Its purpose would be to discover to what extent surface structures are comparable from language to language. When a speaker of one language makes a linguistic reaction to another language, he is not comparing his intui-

---

<sup>1</sup> Pilipino, the present national language, is based on Tagalog. The 1973 constitution requires a new national language, one that would be based on a number of Philippine languages and which will be called “Filipino.”

tions against the intuitions of the other person, he is reacting on a more surface level. He reacts to the *parole*, not to the *langue*. He reacts to intonations, to pronunciations, to choice of affixes for particular verbs, and so on.

As noted in this chapter, a great deal of descriptive work has been done on Philippine languages. Most of this research has been done by non-Filipinos, primarily by SIL member. However, there has been relatively little sophisticated cross-linguistic description of the kind that Zorc (1977) has done for the Bisayan languages. He used his comparison primarily for genetic subgrouping and reconstruction. But the data will be of immense value when decisions need to be made about the form of Filipino. Admittedly these decisions, if and when they are made, will primarily be political decisions. Yet the country must make certain that such decisions are made on the basis of solid linguistic research. They cannot be made on the whims of linguistically unsophisticated politicians.

There are a number of linguistic tasks requiring urgent attention. The order of their presentation reflects the general outline of this chapter. It is not an order of priority.

## **10. Dictionaries**

The continuing development of bilingual Philippine language-English dictionaries is of immense importance to linguists, especially those involved in comparative-historical studies. Yet probably a more urgent task is the preparation of a major monolingual Pilipino dictionary. Such a dictionary does not exist for any Philippine language. In fact, there are relatively few such dictionaries for other Austronesian languages. (A monolingual dictionary of Fijian is in preparation.) Writing such a dictionary is a far more difficult task than writing a bilingual dictionary. Yet its publication would greatly strengthen the cause of Philippine nationalism.

A concurrent task should be the preparation of bilingual dictionaries (not simply word lists) of selected languages such as Ilokano and Cebuano with definitions in Pilipino rather than in English. These would serve to strengthen the development of Pilipino on the one hand and foster renewed interest in the regional languages by native speakers of Tagalog on the other.

Courses in lexicography should be developed in the linguistics programs of all the major universities in Manila to train young scholars in the art of dictio-

nary-making. With the development at the University of Hawai'i of sophisticated computer programs for dictionary preparation, a tool has become available which could be of great assistance to Philippine lexicographers.

## **11. Grammars**

Detailed reference grammars exist for relatively few Philippine languages. The PALI series grammars mentioned early in this chapter are inadequate for language comparison. They were prepared as guides for teachers of beginning language students and generally provide an account of only the gross grammatical features of the languages. Of particular value would be systematic studies of relative clause structure and nominalization. It is well-known that the form of embedded sentences frequently differs from the form of their matrix sentences. Moreover, archaic features of a language often are preserved in embedded structures, yet few grammars fully describe these structures.

Languages which are in urgent need of grammatical description are those which may be characterized as aberrant, e.g., Tiruray and Bagobo. Blaauw and Tboli have both been described in some detail by SIL linguists, but because of their unique position in relation to other Philippine languages they should be given particular attention. Ilongot and the Dumagat languages of eastern Luzon are also poorly described, although some information on Casiguran Dumagat is available in Headland and Headland (1974).

The mention of these languages is not meant to imply that the other Philippine languages are fully described since none are. Tagalog, for example, the most extensively described Philippine language, requires further description.

## **12. Phonology**

Mention was made in the phonology section of this chapter of specific areas where further study is necessary. In addition to these areas, the Philippines is an ideal testing ground for theories of phonological change. The following phonological processes in Philippine languages have not been adequately accounted for in the literature: nasal substitution of voiceless obstruents but not of the phonetically more similar voiced obstruents; consonant gemination following the pepet vowel; and metathesis of glottal stop-consonant clusters. Acoustic studies of some of these processes may provide additional insight into their nature and role in language change.

### **13. Morphology and Syntax**

Probably all major descriptions of Philippine languages in the past have taken account in one way or another of verbal affixation and associated syntax, what is generally referred to as the focus system. Yet every focus affix also occurs as a noun-deriving affix. There has been relatively little attempt to describe these nominalizing functions, probably because they are perceived by analysts as secondary functions. Nonetheless, some “focus” affixes, for example, instrument, time and location, occur in some languages almost exclusively in nominal constructions or in relative clauses. Careful textual analysis is required to determine the extent to which focus affixes are used on nominal forms. Such analyses may provide further evidence for the claim that the nominal functions were historically prior to the verbal functions.

### **14. Discourse**

The study of discourse over the last ten years has produced volumes of text and textual analysis, excellent data for morphological and grammatical analysis at all levels. However, care must be exercised that future discourse analyses do something more than provide us with just another set of texts and a repetitive statement about characteristics of narrative or hortatory discourse. There are volumes still to be written on the textual interplay of tense and aspect, of the relationship between referentiality and focus in context, of the discourse functions of the adverbial particles which permeate Philippine languages when spoken spontaneously, and so forth. A computerized study of some of these features, in one of the major languages for which large bodies of discourse are available, would be immensely productive.

### **15. Comparative-Historical**

Linguists are moving into a period when the historical study of Philippine languages will undergo substantial changes. The major phonological developments are known. What is not known is the extent to which the languages of the Philippines have been influenced by secondary migrations. Thousands of years of development in close geographic proximity have indelibly affected both the phonological and grammatical structures of Philippine languages. Sorting out these areas of influence, determining what is inherited, what is innovated, and what is borrowed is the immediate task of comparativists. The

results of these studies may profoundly alter our understanding of the internal and external relationships of Philippine languages. Some major steps have already been taken, but these are just the beginning. As more explicit grammatical descriptions and fuller lexicons become available, comparative and historical studies will be greatly enriched.

The Philippines, with its wealth of languages and strong core of young, expertly trained linguists, is desperately in need of a few dedicated scholars, who, in the tradition of Cecilio Lopez, will commit themselves to the task of drawing together the multitude of hanging strands, and weaving the ultimate comparative description of the family.

### References

- Allen, Lawrence P. 1975. Distinctive features in Kankanay. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 6(2):23-30.
- Allen, Lawrence P. 1977. Reduplication and cyclical rule ordering in Kankanay morphophonemics. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(2):280-295.
- Allison, E. Joe. 1977. Discourse analysis of a Southern Samal text. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(2):143-169.
- Allison, E. Joe. 1979a. Proto-Danaw: A comparative study of Maranaw, Magindanaw, and Iranun. In *Papers in Philippine Linguistics* No. 10, ed. by S. A. Wurm, 53-112. Pacific Linguistics A-55. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Allison, E. Joe. 1979b. The phonology of Sibutu Sama: A language of the Southern Philippines. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(2):63-104.
- Anderson, Stephen R. 1974. On the typology of phonological rules. In *Papers from the Parasession on Natural Phonology*, ed. by Anthony Bruck, Robert A. Fox, and Michael W. La Galy, 1-11. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.
- Anderson, Stephen R. 1975. On the interaction of phonological rule types. *Journal of Linguistics* 11:39-62.
- Antworth, Evan L. 1979. *A grammatical sketch of Botolan Sambal*. Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph No. 8. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Ashley, Seymour, and Lois Ashley. 1971. Outline of sentence types of Tausug. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 2(1):44-91.

- Austin, Virginia M. 1970? Ata Manobo dictionary. Microfiche 499.2842. Ateneo de Manila Library.
- Ballard, D. Lee, Jr. 1974. The semantics of Inibaloi verbal affixes. *Lingua* 34:181-218.
- Ballard, D. Lee, Jr. 1975? Ibaloi-English dictionary, English-Ibaloi Gloss. Microfiche 499.238. Ateneo de Manila Library.
- Ballard, D. Lee, Robert J. Conrad, and Robert E. Longacre. 1971a. The deep and surface grammar of interclausal relations. *Foundations of Language* 7:70-118.
- Ballard, D. Lee, Robert J. Conrad, and Robert E. Longacre. 1971b. *More on the deep and surface grammar of interclausal relations*. Language Data, Asian-Pacific Series, No. 1. Huntington Beach, California: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Barbian, Karl-Josef. 1977a. *The Mangyan languages of Mindoro*. Cebu City: University of San Carlos.
- Barbian, Karl-Josef. 1977b. *English-Mangyan vocabulary*. Cebu City: University of San Carlos.
- Barlaan, Rodolfo. 1975. Isneg verbal clauses, stem classes and affixes. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 6(1):90-127.
- Barlaan, Rodolfo. 1977. Fact and fiction in Isneg narrative discourse. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(2):110-142.
- Barnard, Myra Lou, and Jannette Forster. 1970? Dibabawon-English dictionary, English-Dibabawon index. Microfiche 499.282. Ateneo de Manila Library.
- Bautista, Ma. Lourdes S. 1974. The Filipino bilingual's competence: A model based on an analysis of Tagalog-English code switching. Ph.D. dissertation, Ateneo de Manila-Philippine Normal College Consortium.
- Bautista, Ma. Lourdes S. 1977. The Noun Phrase in Tagalog-English code switching. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(1):1-16.
- Bell, Sarah J. 1976. Cebuano subjects in two frameworks. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Bell, Sarah J. 1978. Two differences in definiteness in Cebuano and Tagalog. *Oceanic Linguistics* 17(1):1-10.
- Benn, Keith. 1979. Hortatory discourse in Central Bontoc with a justification theme. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(2):1-19.

- Benton, Richard A. 1971a. *Pangasinan reference grammar*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Benton, Richard A. 1971b. *Pangasinan dictionary*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1917. *Tagalog texts with grammatical analysis*. University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois.
- Blust, Robert A. 1971. A Tagalog consonant cluster conspiracy. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 2(2):38-47.
- Blust, Robert A. 1973. The origins of Bintulu b', d'. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 35:603-620.
- Blust, Robert A. 1974a. The Proto-Austronesian word for "two": A second look. In Papers of the First International Conference on Comparative Austronesian Linguistics, Honolulu, 1974, Part 2. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13:123-162.
- Blust, Robert A. 1974b. Proto-North Sarawak vowel deletion hypothesis. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawai'i.
- Brichoux, Robert, and Austin Hale. 1977. Some characteristics of hortatory strategy in Subanun. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(1):75-92.
- Bunye, Maria V. R., and Elsa P. Yap. 1971a. *Cebuano grammar notes*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Bunye, Maria V. R., and Elsa P. Yap. 1971b. *Cebuano-Visayan dictionary*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Carrier, Jill. 1975. The interaction of reduplication and infixation with phonology in Tagalog. Ms.
- Castillo, Emma S. 1972. Motivational variables in second language acquisition. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 3(2):94-124.
- Ceña, R. M. 1975. The cycle revisited: Data from Tagalog. Ms.
- Ceña, R. M. 1977. Patient primacy in Tagalog. Paper read at the Winter Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Chicago, Illinois.
- Ceña, R. M. 1979a. On resurrecting buried agents in certain Tagalog verbs. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(1):112-118.
- Ceña, R. M. 1979b. Tagalog counter-examples to the Accessibility Hierarchy. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(1): 119-124.

- Ceña, R. M. 1979c. Double representations for some loan words in Tagalog. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(1):125-137.
- Chan-Yap, Gloria, and Teresita M. Palo. 1978. The pseudo-verbal predicate in Tagalog. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 9:51-59.
- Chan-Yap, Gloria, and Teresita M. Palo. 1979. *A modern Pilipino grammar for teachers*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University.
- Chandler, Donna Hettick. 1974. Verb stem classes in Northern Kankanay. In *Papers in Philippine Linguistics* No. 5:1-21. Pacific Linguistics A-41. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Charles, Mathew. 1974. Problems in the reconstruction of Proto-Philippine phonology and the subgrouping of the Philippine languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13:457-510.
- Constantino, Ernesto. 1971a. *Ilokano reference grammar*. PALI Language Text: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Constantino, Ernesto. 1971b. *Ilokano dictionary*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu, University of Hawai'i Press.
- Constantino, Ernesto. 1971c. Tagalog and other major languages of the Philippines. In *Linguistics in Oceania. Current Trends in Linguistics* 8, ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok, 112-154. The Hague: Mouton.
- Constantino, Ernesto, Rogelio Sikat, and Pamela Cruz, eds. 1977. *Filipino o Pilipino?* Manila: Rex Book Store.
- De Guzman, Videia P. 1978a. *Syntactic derivation of Tagalog verbs*. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication, No. 16. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- De Guzman, Videia P. 1978b. A case for non-phonological constraints on nasal substitution. *Calgary Working Papers in Linguistics, Logos* 4:51-63.
- De Guzman, Videia P. 1979. Morphological evidence for primacy of patient as subject in Tagalog. Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Los Angeles, California.
- Diller, Timothy Clair. 1971. Case grammar and its application to Waray, a Philippine language. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles.
- Dryer, Matthew. 1978. Some theoretical implications of grammatical relations in Cebuano. In *University of Michigan Papers in Linguistics* 2(4):1-43.

- DuBois, Carl. 1976. *Sarangani Manobo: An introductory guide*. Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph, No. 6. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- DuBois, Carl, and Loretta DuBois. 1968. Sarangani Manobo to English dictionary. Microfiche 499.289. Ateneo de Manila Library.
- Dyen, Isidore. 1962a. The lexicostatistical classification of the Malayo-Polynesian languages. *Language* 38:38-46.
- Dyen, Isidore. 1962b. The lexicostatistically determined relationship of a language group. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 28:153-161.
- Dyen, Isidore. 1970. Qualitative confirmation of a subgrouping hypothesis. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 1(1):1-11.
- Eck, Jerome. 1974. Magindanao penultimate vowels. *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics of North Dakota* 18:125-131.
- Elkins, Richard E. 1971. Western Bukidnon Manobo sentence structure. *Lingua* 27:216-262.
- Elkins, Richard E. 1974. A Proto-Manobo wordlist. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13:601-642.
- Errington, Ross. 1979. Discourse types and tense patterns in Cotabato Manobo. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(2):218-222.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1968. The case for case. In *Universals in linguistic theory*, ed. by Emmon Bach and Robert T. Harms, 1-88. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Foley, William A. 1976. Comparative syntax in Austronesian. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.
- Foley, William A., and Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. 1979. On the viability of the notion of subject in universal grammar. Ms.
- Forfia, Kathleen. 1979. Nonpast tense in Ga'dang narrative discourse. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(1):10-16.
- Forman, Michael. 1971a. *Kapampangan grammar notes*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Forman, Michael. 1971b. *Kapampangan dictionary*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Forman, Michael. 1972. Zamboangueno texts with grammatical analysis: A study of Philippine creole Spanish. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.

- Forman, Robin. 1975? Dictionary of Mapun, Cagayan de Sulu. Microfiche 499.2962. Ateneo de Manila Library.
- Frake, Charles O. 1971. Lexical origins and semantic structure in Philippine creole Spanish. In *Pidginization and creolization of languages*, ed. by Dell Hymes, 223-242. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gallman, Andrew F. 1979. Proto-South-East Mindanao and its internal relationships. In *Papers in Philippine Linguistics*, No. 10, ed. by S.A. Wurm, 1-52. Pacific Linguistics A-55. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Gault, Jo Ann. 1979. Phonemics and morphophonemics of Sama Balangingi. In *Papers in Philippine Linguistics*, No. 9. S.A. Wurm, ed:49-67. Pacific Linguistics A-50. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Gertds, Donna B. 1980. Towards an ergative analysis of Ilokano. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Linguistic Association, Montreal.
- Gieser, C. Richard. 1970. The morphophonemic system of Guininaang (Kalinga). *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 1(2):52-68.
- Gieser, C. Richard. 1972a. Kalinga sequential discourse. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 3(1):15-34.
- Gieser, C. Richard. 1972b. Phonemic and morphemic efficiency in Kalinga. *Phonetica* 25:216-46.
- Gonzales, Andrew B., F.S.C. 1971. The Tagalog nasal ligature: a reinterpretation. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 2(1):28-43.
- Gonzales, Andrew B., F.S.C. 1972. *Pampangan: Outline of a generative semantic description*. Manila: De La Salle College.
- Gonzales, Andrew B., F.S.C. 1980. *Language and nationalism, the Philippine experience thus far*. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Grayden, Bruce. 1979. The Southern Kalinga /l/. In *Papers in Philippine Linguistics* No. 9, ed. by S. A. Wurm, 91-99. Pacific Linguistics A-50. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Green, Peter. 1979. Coexistent aspect marking phenomena in Tagbanwa of Palawan Island. In *Papers in Philippine Linguistics* No. 9. Pacific Linguistics A-50. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Green, Peter, and Austin Hale. 1977. The interpretation of semivowels in Tagbanua of Palawan Island. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 8(1-2):25-30.

- Hale, Austin. 1977. Comments on the Thurman chart (band analysis): A technique for seeing how various kinds of information are marked in discourse. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(1):50-52.
- Hale, Austin, and C. Richard Geiser. 1977. Approaches to an explanatory discourse of Guinaang Kalinga. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(1):133-147.
- Hall, William C. 1973-1974. An outline of Siocon Subanon sentence structure. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 4-5:1-22.
- Harmon, Carol W. 1977. Kagayanen and the Manobo subgroup of Philippine languages. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawai'i.
- Harmon, Carol W. 1979. Reconstructions of Proto-Manobo pronouns and case marking particles. In *Papers in Philippine linguistics* No. 10, ed. by S. A. Wurm, 113-133. Pacific Linguistics A-55. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Hassan, Irene, Nurhadan Halud, Seymour Ashley, and Lois Ashley. 1975. *Tausug-English dictionary*. Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics. Also, Sulu Studies No. 4. Sulu: Notre Dame de Jolo College.
- Headland, Thomas N. 1975. Report of Eastern Luzon language survey. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 6(2):47-54.
- Headland, Thomas N., and Janet D. Headland. 1974. *A Dumagat (Casiguran) dictionary*. Pacific Linguistics C-28. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Hidalgo, Araceli C. 1970. Focus in Philippine languages. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 1:25-32.
- Hidalgo, Cesar A. 1974. On morphological and syntactic relations in a Southeast Asian language. In *South-East Asian linguistic studies*, ed. by Nguyen Dang Liem, 25-40. Pacific Linguistics C-31. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Hidalgo, Cesar A., and Araceli C. Hidalgo. 1971. *A tagmemic grammar of Ivatan*. Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph, No. 2. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56:251-299.
- Hohulin, Dick, and Austin Hale. 1977. Physical, temporal, and cognitive location in Keley-i demonstratives. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(2):209-230.

- Hohulin, E. Lou. 1971. Complex predicates in Keley-i Kallahan. In *Papers in Philippine Linguistics* No. 4:19-32. Pacific Linguistics A-32. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Hohulin, E. Lou, and Austin Hale. 1977. Notes on Keley-i relational grammar—I. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(2):231-263.
- Hohulin, E. Lou and Michael Kenstowicz. 1979. Keley-i phonology and morphophonemics. In Nguyen Dang Liem (ed.), *South-east Asian linguistic studies* 4, 241-54. Pacific Linguistics C-49. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Ing, Roseller. 1972. A study of the phonetic changes of Spanish elements in Chabacano. Mimeograph. National Taiwan Normal University.
- Ing, Roseller. 1976. Sources and variants of Chabacano consonants. *Studies in English Literature and Linguistics*, 17-22. Taipei: National Taiwan Normal University
- Jacobson, Marc R. 1979. Phones in Philippine languages. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(1):138-164.
- Johnston, E. Clay. 1975. Verbal affixation of Cotabato Manobo. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 6(1):25-50.
- Johnston, E. Clay. 1979. Cotabato Manobo first person narrative: major features of discourse and paragraph. In *Papers in Philippine Linguistics* No. 9:1-17. Pacific Linguistics A-50. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Keenan, E., and Bernard Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63-99.
- Kess, Joseph S. 1972. The utility of focus. *Kivung* 5(3):184-91.
- Kess, Joseph S. 1975. On the semantics of focus. *Anthropological Linguistics* 17:353-62.
- Kess, Joseph S. 1976. Reconsidering the notion of focus in the description of Tagalog. In *South-East Asian linguistic studies* 2, ed. by Nguyen Dang Liem, 173-186. Pacific Linguistic C-42. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Kess, Joseph S. 1978. A psycholinguistic frame of reference for focus and topic in Philippine languages. In *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings, Fascicle 1*, ed. by S. A. Wurm and Lois Carrington, 443-461. Pacific Linguistics C-61. Canberra: Australian National University.

- Kess, Joseph S. 1979. Focus, topic and case in the Philippine verbal paradigm. In *South-East Asian linguistic studies* 3, ed. by Nguyen Dang Liem, 213-239. Pacific Linguistics C-45. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Kilgour, Heather J. 1978. *Bibliography of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1953-1978*. Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Lambrecht, Frans Hubert. 1978. *Ifugaw-English dictionary*. Baguio City: The Catholic Vicar Apostolic of the Mountain Province.
- Larson, Virginia. 1972. Pronominal reference in the Ivatan narrative. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 3(2):37-42.
- Latta, F. Christian. 1976. Reflections on 'The phonology of reduplication.' Ms. Ohio State University.
- Llamzon, Teodoro A. 1973. The four focus transformations of Tagalog. In *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez: Essays in honor of Cecilio Lopez on his seventy-fifth birthday*, ed. by Andrew B. Gonzales, F.S.C., 168-183. Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph, No. 4. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Llamzon, Teodoro A. 1976. *Modern Tagalog: A functional-structural description*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Llamzon, Teodoro A., and Ma. Teresita Martin. 1976. A subgrouping of 100 Philippine languages. In *South-East Asian linguistic studies* 2, ed. by Nguyen Dang Liem, 141-172.
- Longacre, Robert E., ed. 1971. *Philippine discourse and paragraph studies in memory of Betty McLachlin*. Pacific Linguistics C-22. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Lopez, Cecilio. 1974. *A comparative Philippine word-list*. The Archive Special Monograph, No. 1. Quezon City: The University of the Philippines.
- Luzares, Casilda E. 1977. Cebuano verb morphology, an application of case grammar, part 1. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(2):73-109.
- Luzares, Casilda E. 1978. Cebuano verb morphology, an application of case grammar, part 2. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 2(1):49-72.
- Macabuhay, Perry, and Hella E. Goshnick. 1979. A central Bontoc procedural discourse. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(1):86-111.
- MacLeod, Thomas R. 1972. Verb stem classification in Umiray Dumagat. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 3(2):43-74.

- MacLeod, Thomas R. 1973? Umiray Dumagat dictionary. Microfiche 499.2151. Ateneo de Manila Library.
- Manuel, E. Arsenio. 1971. *A Lexicographic study of Tayabas Tagalog*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines.
- Mayer, Audrey, and Rosemary Rodda. 1968? Batak-English dictionary. Microfiche 499.268. Ateneo de Manila Library.
- Maryott, Kenneth R. 1977a. The semantics of focus in Sangihé. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(1):93-132.
- Maryott, Kenneth R. 1977b. The phonemes of Sarangani Sangiré. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(2):264-279.
- Maryott, Kenneth R. 1978. Pre-Sangir \*l, \*d, \*r and associated phonemes, Part 1. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 2(1):115-138.
- Maryott, Kenneth R. 1979. The sentence in Sangihé. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(1):179-231.
- McFarland, Curtis. 1974. The dialects of the Bikol area. Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University.
- McFarland, Curtis. 1976. *A provisional classification of Tagalog verbs*. Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa Monograph Series, No. 8. Tokyo: Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- McFarland, Curtis. 1977. *Northern Philippine linguistics geography*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- McFarland, Curtis. 1978a. Tagalog existentials. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 9:1-13.
- McFarland, Curtis. 1978b. Definite objects and subject selection in Philippine languages. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 2(1):139-182.
- McFarland, Curtis. 1980. *Linguistic atlas of the Philippines*. Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa Monograph Series, No. 10. Tokyo: Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- McKaughan, Howard P. 1971. Minor languages of the Philippines. In *Linguistics in Oceania*, ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok, 155-167. *Current Trends in Linguistics Vol. 8*. The Hague: Mouton.
- McKaughan, Howard P. 1973. Subject vs. topic. In *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez: Essays in honor of Cecilio Lopez on his seventy-fifth birthday*, ed. by Andrew B.

- Gonzalez, F.S.C., 206-213. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph*, No. 4. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- McLachlin, Betty, and Barbara Blackburn. 1971. An outline of Sarangani Bilaan discourse and paragraph structure. In *Philippine discourse and paragraph studies in memory of Betty McLachlin*, ed. by Robert E. Longacre, 1-84. Pacific Linguistics C-22. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Miller, Jeanne. 1973. Semantic structure of Mamanwa verbs. *Linguistics* 110:74-81.
- Miller, Jeanne, and Helen Miller. 1976. *Mamanwa grammar*. Language Data, Asian Pacific Series No. 8. Huntington Beach, California: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Mintz, Malcolm W. 1971a. *Bikol grammar notes*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Mintz, Malcolm W. 1971b. *Bikol dictionary*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Mirikitani, Leatrice T. 1972. *Kapampangan syntax*. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication, No. 10. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Motus, Cecile L. 1971. *Hiligaynon dictionary*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Naylor, Paz Buenaventura. 1975. Topic, focus and emphasis in the Tagalog verbal clause. *Oceanic Linguistics* 14:12-79.
- Naylor, Paz Buenaventura. 1978. Expressions of irrealis in some Philippine languages. *University of Michigan Papers in Linguistics* 2(4):131-143.
- Naylor, Paz Buenaventura. 1979. Linking, relation-marking, and Tagalog syntax. In *Austronesian studies: Papers from the Second Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages*, ed. by Paz B. Naylor, 33-50. Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia, No. 15. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Newell, Leonard E. 1970. The phonology of Batad Ifugao. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 1:101-117.
- Otanes, Fe T. 197. Some transformation rules for noun derivation in Tagalog. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 1(1):33-73.
- Pallesen, A. Kemp. 1976? Sama-Bajaw vocabulary and finder list. Microfiche 499.296. Ateneo de Manila Library.

- Pallesen, A. Kemp. 1977. Culture and language convergence. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.
- Pallesen, A. Kemp. 1978. Review of "The Bisayan dialects of the Philippines: subgrouping and reconstruction," by R. David Zorc. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 9:90-95.
- Pallesen, A. Kemp. 1979. The pepet in Sama-Bajaw. In *South-East Asian linguistic studies* 3, ed. by Nguyen Dang Liem, 115-142. Pacific Linguistic C-45. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Pallesen, Kemp and Thelma Paz. 1975? Abaknon (Capul) lexicon. Microfiche 499.2964. Ateneo de Manila Library.
- Panganiban, Jose Villa. 1972. *Diksyunaryo-Tesauro Pilipino-Inglis*. Quezon City: Manlapaz Publishing Company.
- Pascasio, Emy M. 1977. *The Filipino bilingual*. Manila: Ateneo de Manila Press.
- Pawley, Andrew, and Lawrence A. Reid. 1979. The evolution of transitive constructions in Austronesian. In *Austronesian studies: Papers from the Second Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages*, ed. by Paz B. Naylor, 103-130. Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia, No. 15. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Pelaez-Soberano, Rosa. 1977. The dialects of Marinduque Tagalog. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(1):53-74.
- Penoyer III, F. Douglas. 1979. Buhid and Taubuid: A new subgroup in Mindoro, Philippines. In *Austronesian studies: Papers from the Second Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages*, ed. by Paz B. Naylor, 265-272. Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia, No. 15. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Persons, Diane L. 1979. Cohesive and coordinating conjunctions in Bolinao narrative discourse. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(1):1-9.
- Persons, Gary C. 1979. Cohesion by means of participant identification in Bolinao narrative discourse. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(1):24-57.
- Pike, Kenneth L. 1964. Discourse analysis and tagmeme matrices. *Oceanic Linguistics* 3:5-25.
- Porter, Doris. 1977. *A Tboli grammar*. Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph Series, No. 7. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

- Porter, Doris, and Austin Hale. 1977. Focus ranking in Tboli grammar—I. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(2):170-208.
- Rafael, Teresita C. 1976. Negativization in the Bisayan languages: A case study of the evolution of a subsystem. Ph.D. dissertation, Ateneo de Manila University.
- Rafael, Teresita C. 1978a. Topic in Tagalog revisited. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 2(1):36-48.
- Rafael, Teresita C. 1978b. Sociolinguistic research in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 9:86-89.
- Ramiscal, Priscilla, and Hella Goshnick. 1979. Interclausal relationships in Tina Sambal. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(1):58-85.
- Ramos, Teresita V. 1971a. *Tagalog structures*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Ramos, Teresita V. 1971b. *Tagalog dictionary*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Ramos, Teresita V. 1974. *The case system of Tagalog verbs*. Pacific Linguistics B-27. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Ramos, Teresita V., and Resty M. Ceña. 1979. Existential, locative and possessive in Tagalog. Paper presented to the Summer Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Salzburg, Austria.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1970. *Central Bontoc: Sentence, paragraph and discourse*. Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields, No. 27. Santa Ana, California: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1971. *Philippine minor languages: Wordlists and phonologies*. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication, No. 8. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1972. Tense sequence in procedural discourse. *The Archive* 2(2):15-43.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1973a. Diachronic typology of Philippine vowel systems. In *Diachronic, Areal and Typological Linguistics*, ed. by Henry M. Hoenigswald and Robert E. Longacre, 485-505. *Current Trends in Linguistics*, Vol. 11. Thomas A. Sebeok, gen. ed. The Hague: Mouton.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1973b. The problem \*R and \*l reflexes in Kankanay. In *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez on his seventy-fifth birthday*, ed. by Andrew B.

- Gonzalez, 51-63. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph*, No. 4. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1974. The Central Cordilleran subgroup of Philippine languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13:511-560.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1976. *Bontok-English dictionary, with English Bontok finder list*. Pacific Linguistics C-34. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1978. Problems in the reconstruction of Proto-Philippine construction markers. In *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings, Fascicle I*, ed. by S. A. Wurm and Lois Carrington, 33-66. Pacific Linguistics C-61. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1979a. Towards a reconstruction of the pronominal systems of Proto-Cordilleran, Philippines. In *South-East Asian linguistic studies* 3, ed. by Nguyen Dang Liem, 259-275. Pacific Linguistics C-45. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1979b. PAN genitive alternation: the Philippine evidence. *University of Hawai'i Working Papers in Linguistics* 11(2):45-54.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1979c. Evidence for Proto-Philippine nominative marking. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 10:1-20.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1981a. The demise of Proto-Philippines. Paper presented to the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1981b. Proto-Austronesian genitive determiners. In *Festschrift for Richard Pittman*, ed. by Andrew Gonzalez and David Thomas, 97-105. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics Monograph Series*, No. 11. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Reid, Lawrence A. and Prescila Espiritu. 1980. A reference grammar of Ilokano. Ms.
- Revel-McDonald, Nicole. 1979. *Le Palawan (Philippines): Phonologie, categories, morphologie*. *Langues et Civilisations de l'Asie du Sud-Est et du Monde Insulindien*, No. 4. Paris: SELAF.
- Rhea, Mary. 1972. Prefocus and verbal orientation in Sarangani Bilaan. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 3(1):35-42.
- Riego de Dios, R.V.M., Maria Isabelita O. 1976. The Cotabato Chabacano verb. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 7:48-59.

- Riego de Dios, R.V.M., Maria Isabelita O. 1978. A pilot study on the dialects of Philippine Creole Spanish. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 2(1):77-81.
- Ruch, Edward R. 1974. Role combinations and verb stem classes in Kalamian Tagbanwa. In *Papers in Philippine Linguistics* No. 5, 23-60. Pacific Linguistics A-41. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Sawyer, Louise. 1975. Aspect in Amganad Ifugao. *Anthropological Linguistics* 17(3):107-116.
- Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: topic, actor, actor-topic or none of the above. In *Subject and topic*, ed. by Charles N. Li, 491-518. New York: Academic Press.
- Schachter, Paul. 1977. Reference-related and role-related properties of subject. In *Syntax and semantics* 8, ed. by Peter Cole and Jerrold Sadock, 279-306. New York: Academic Press.
- Schachter, Paul, and Fe Otanes. 1972. *A Tagalog reference grammar*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Schlegel, Stuart A. 1971. *Tiruray-English lexicon*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Schumacher, Ron, and Donna Schumacher. 1978. Proto-Manobo \*1 in Agusan Manobo. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 2(1):183-190.
- Schwartz, Arthur. 1976. On the universality of subjects: the Ilocano case. In *Subject and topic*, ed. by Charles N. Li, 519-544. New York: Academic Press.
- Segalowitz, Norman, and Rosita Galang. 1978. Agent-patient word preference in the acquisition of Tagalog. *Journal of Child Language* 8:47-64.
- Shetler, Joanne. 1976. *Notes on Balangao grammar*. Language Data, Asian-Pacific Series No. 9. Huntington Beach, California: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Sibayan, Bonifacio, P., and Andrew B. Gonzalez, F.S.C., eds. 1977. Language planning and the building of a national language. *Essays in honor of Santiago A. Fonacier on his ninety-second birthday*. Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph, No. 5. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Starosta, Stanley. 1978. The one per cent solution. *Studies in Language Companion Series* 1:459-576. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Starosta, Stanley, Andrew K. Pawley, and Lawrence A. Reid. 1978. The evolution of Philippine focus: out of the \*fry-an PAN and into the \*i-fry. Paper

- presented to the 40<sup>th</sup> Summer Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Starosta, Stanley, Andrew K. Pawley, and Lawrence A. Reid. 1981. The evolution of focus in Austronesian. Paper presented to the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia.
- Strong, Clarice. 1979. The phonemics and morphophonemics of Tigwa Manobo. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(1):165-178.
- Svelmoe, Gordon, and Thelma Svelmoe. 1972? Mansaka-English dictionary, Mansaka thesaurus parts I and II. Microfiche 499.2721. Ateneo de Manila Library.
- Svelmoe, Gordon, and Thelma Svelmoe. 1974. *Notes on Mansaka grammar*. Language Data, Asia-Pacific Series No. 6. Huntington Beach, California: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Tharp, James A. 1974a. Notes on the Ilokano reflexes of Proto-Austronesian \*R. *Department of Linguistics, University of Hawai'i, Working Papers in Linguistics* 6(6):47-52.
- Tharp, James A. 1974b. The Northern Cordilleran subfamily of Philippine languages. *Department of Linguistics, University of Hawai'i, Working Papers in Linguistics* 6(6):53-114.
- Thiessen, Arnold H. 1977. The phonemic consequences of two morphophonemic rules in Molbog. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 2(1):1-26.
- Thomas, David. 1977. Subject/topic terminology and vectors. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(2):55-62.
- Titrud, Kermit. 1979. Participant identification in Caluyanen. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(1):17-23.
- Tweddell, Colin. 1970. The identity and distribution of the Mangyan tribes of Mindoro. *Anthropological Linguistics* 12(6):189-207.
- Van Valin, Robert D., Jr., and William A. Foley. 1980. Role and reference grammar. In *Current Approaches to Syntax*, ed. by Edith Moravcsik and Jessica Wirth, 329-552. New York: Academic Press.
- Vanoverbergh, Morice. 1972. *Isneg-English vocabulary*. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication, No. 11. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Wallace, Judy. 1977. A look at a Northern Kankanay text. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 1(2):27-35.

- Walrod, Michael R. 1976. Case in Ga'dang verbal clauses. In *Papers in Philippine Linguistics* No. 8:21-44. Pacific Linguistics A-46. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Walrod, Michael R. 1978. Three criteria for establishing dialect boundaries. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 2(1):1-35.
- Walrod, Michael R. 1979. *Discourse grammar in Ga'dang*. Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields, No. 62. Huntington Beach, California: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Walton, Charles. 1971. Binongan Itneg paragraph structure. In *Philippine Discourse and Paragraph Studies in Memory of Betty McLachlin*, ed. by Robert E. Longacre, 283-366. Pacific Linguistics C-22. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Walton, Charles. 1979a. A Philippine language tree. *Anthropological Linguistics* 21(2):70-98.
- Walton, Charles. 1979b. Pangutaran (Sama) phonology. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 3(2):189-217.
- Walton, Janice. 1975. *Binongan Itneg sentences*. Pacific Linguistics C-32. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Ward, Jack H. 1971. *A bibliography of Philippine linguistics and minor languages*. Data Paper No. 83, Southeast Asia Program. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University.
- Wendell, Asa and Dag Wendel. 1978. Kaagan-Kalagan phonemic statement. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 2(1):191-203.
- West, Anne. 1973. The semantics of focus in Amganad. *Linguistics* 110:98-121.
- Whittle, Claudia. 1971. Atta discourse and paragraph structure. In *Philippine Discourse and Paragraph Studies in Memory of Betty McLachlin*, ed. by Robert E. Longacre, 195-282. Pacific Linguistics C-22. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Wiens, Hartmut. 1976. Phonological features of Limos Kalinga, with comments on affected speech. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 7:38-47.
- Wiens, Hartmut. 1978. Focus shift and tense shift: highlighting and conflict in Limos Kalinga. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 2(1):103-114.
- Wiens, Hartmut. 1979. The semantic function of focus affixes in Limos Kalinga. In *Papers in Philippine Linguistics* No. 9, 19-47. Pacific Linguistics A-50.

- Wilbur, Ronnie. 1973. The phonology of reduplication. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois. Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington, Indiana.
- Wolfenden, Elmer P. 1971. *Hiligaynon reference grammar*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Wolfenden, Elmer P. 1973. Tagmemic deep structure and Philippine languages. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 4-5:41-47.
- Wolfenden, Elmer P. 1975. *A description of Hiligaynon syntax*. Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields, No. 46. Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics of the University of Oklahoma.
- Wolff, John U. 1970. The classification of Cebuano verb. *Philippine Journal of Linguistic* 1(1):74-94.
- Wolff, John U. 1972. *A dictionary of Cebuano Visayan*. Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph Series, No. 4. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines. Also, Data paper No. 87, Southeast Asia Program, Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University. 2 vols.
- Wolff, John U. 1973. Verbal inflection of Proto-Austronesian. In *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez: Essays presented to Cecilio Lopez on his seventy-fifth birthday*, ed. by Andrew Gonzales, 71-79. Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph No. 4. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Wolff, John U. 1974. Proto-Austronesian \*r and \*d. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13:77-122.
- Wolff, John U. 1976. Malay borrowings in Tagalog. In *Southeast Asian history and historiography: Essays presented to D. G. E. Hall*, ed. by C. D. Cowan and O. W. Walters, 345-367. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- Wolff, John U. 1979. Verbal morphology and verbal sentences in Proto-Austronesian. In *Austronesian studies: Papers from the Second Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages*, ed. by Paz B. Naylor, 153-168. Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia, No. 15. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Wrigglesworth, Hazel. 1971. Discourse and paragraph structure of Ilianen Manobo. In *Philippine paragraph and discourse studies in memory of Betty McLachlin*, ed. by Robert E. Longacre, 85-194. Pacific Linguistics C-22. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

- Yamada, Yukihiro. 1975. *A comparative Philippine vocabulary I*. Research Reports of Kochi University, Vol. 24, Humanities No. 3. Kochi: Kochi University.
- Yap, Fe Aldave. 1977. *A comparative study of Philippine lexicons*. Manila: Institute of National Language.
- Zorc, R. David Paul. 1972. Current and Proto Tagalic stress. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* (3)1:43-58.
- Zorc, R. David Paul. 1974a. Internal and external relationships of the Mangyan languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13:561-600.
- Zorc, R. David Paul. 1974b. Towards a definitive Philippine wordlist—the qualitative use of vocabulary in identifying and classifying languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13:409-456.
- Zorc, R. David Paul. 1977. *The Bisayan dialects of the Philippines: subgrouping and reconstruction*. Pacific Linguistics C-44. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Zorc, R. David Paul. 1978. Proto-Philippine word accent: Innovation or Proto-Hesperonesian retention? In *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings, Fascicle 1*, ed. by S. A. Wurm and Lois Carrington, 67-119. Pacific Linguistics C-61. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Zorc, R. David Paul. 1979a. Functor analysis: a method of quantifying function words for comparing and classifying languages. Ms. Darwin Community College, Australia.
- Zorc, R. David Paul. 1979b. On the development of contrastive word accent: Pangasinan, a case in point. In *South-East Asian linguistic studies* 3, ed. by Nguyen Dang Liem, 241-258. Pacific Linguistics C-45. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.