

# Review Essay on *Perspectives on Philippine Languages: Five Centuries of Philippine Scholarship*

Lawrence A. REID  
Researcher Emeritus, University of Hawai'i

## Abstract

This critical review essay is a chapter-by-chapter evaluation of a book that examines the writings of Europeans about Philippine languages from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century. It cites the book's strengths, supplies counterarguments, provides clarifications, and offers background information and additional literature. The essay speaks highly of the book's merits; it provides archival materials that many scholars 'would otherwise have had no access to' and offers an invaluable study on the nature, if not history, of Philippine languages. Despite the book's many merits, the essay notes several problems with some of its claims and offers recommendations as to how it could have been improved.

Keywords: Philippine linguistics, Austronesian languages, Malayo-Polynesian languages

## Introduction

MARLIES S. SALAZAR'S *Perspectives on Philippine Languages: Five Centuries of Philippine Scholarship* is a very welcome addition to scholarly publications on Philippine languages and linguistics by Marlies S. Salazar, a Filipina who has spent many years delving into European libraries and archives to uncover as many as possible the writings of Europeans about the Philippines, particularly their comments about

Philippine languages. The work explicitly excludes work by Spanish and non-European (read American and English) authors, although she does mention the work of a New Zealander, who wrote his dissertation on Ilokano in German in 1904; she also cites the publications of some European authors, such as Scheerer, Conant, Vanoverbergh, Lambrecht, Himmelmann, Adelaar, and Postma, who wrote in English. She excludes the work of some European scholars who published in English such as Carl Wilhelm Seidenadel (see Section 6). For many of the scholars whose work she refers to, Salazar abstracts and translates into English relevant sections related to the Philippines.

In addition to a Preface that describes how the book developed out of a Ph.D. dissertation, an Introduction outlines the motivation for presenting the work as an overview of the studies that have been written by non-Spanish and non-English authors, and for putting them in their historical contexts. Also, Salazar distinguishes and briefly discusses five periods, defined partly by their chronology and partly by the primary focus that the writers had. Unfortunately, the five chapters in the book are not coterminous with the five periods. The first period was ‘The Age of Discovery’ (16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries), and is covered in the first part of Chapter 1. The second was ‘The Age of Enlightenment’ (18<sup>th</sup> century) and previews publications that are discussed in the second part of Chapter 1. The third period, covering the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, is characterized as ‘The Rise of Historical Comparative Linguistics’ and foreshadows the material in Chapter 2. The fourth period primarily deals with published reports of various European travelers who visited the Philippines during the last third of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and is covered in Chapter 3, ‘The Nineteenth Century: An Age of Intensified Contacts with the Philippines.’ The fifth period spans the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the first half of which saw research that focused on Philippine languages as part of the Austronesian language family; the second half saw a decline in interest in historical linguistics as such and a rise in descriptive and ethnolinguistic studies (xiii). This period is covered in two chapters, Chapter 4, ‘Austronesian Linguistics and Their [sic] Influence in the

Philippines’, and Chapter 5, ‘Recent Developments in Philippine Linguistics in Europe.’ The work concludes with an Appendix in which the author enumerates some of the word lists of Philippine languages that appeared in the early publications she examined (details of which are described in the following sections); the Appendix also includes an index and a bibliography. In the following sections, I shall briefly mention the various individuals whose work is covered in each of the chapters, and provide an evaluation of the work.

### **The Age of Discovery**

The first report from the Philippines was that of Antonio Pigafetta, an Italian who accompanied Magellan around the world and survived the massacre in Mactan in 1521 when Magellan was killed. His report contains a list of 160 words, of which Salazar identifies 90 forms still found in Cebuano and related languages. While she indicates that the complete word list is given in the original language in Appendix 1 (3), only the 90 items (with supplied English and Cebuano equivalents that she was able to identify) are given.

This chapter first reviews the contributions of various missionaries (European, not Spanish) who came to the Philippines during this period, including a number of German Jesuits. These include Paul Klein, who arrived in Manila in 1678; he was a prolific writer in Tagalog and contributor to the Tagalog dictionary that was eventually published by Juan de Noceda and Pedro de San Lucar (1754). After the expulsion of the Jesuits from the Philippines in 1767, many of them went to Italy, where the Spanish Jesuit priest Lorenzo Hervas y Pandura included information that they, his fellow Jesuits, provided in his extensive work comparing known languages and their relationships (1785). Portions of this work are provided in translation by Salazar. She notes that this is the first work to define the geographical extent of what we now refer to as the Malayo-Polynesian languages (8). Hervas discusses the similarities among languages from Easter Island to the Marianas, Palau, Malay, Philippines,

and Madagascar. Blust (2009 [2013]), however, claims that as early as 1603, de Houtman had recognized the connection between Malay and Malagasy, and that Reland had identified a “common language” from Madagascar to western Polynesia by 1708. One wonders also whether Hervas had seen Georg Forster’s (1777) report of his *Journey around the World* with Captain James Cook (or the German publication of the work that appeared in 1783), which listed lexical comparisons between Philippine and other Malayo-Polynesian languages. Hervas believed that Malays were the first to occupy the Philippines, and that Philippine languages are developed from Malay, a myth that is still current today among many Filipinos. Hervas summarized much of the information that had been provided to him about the current state of knowledge of the languages of Luzon, the Visayas, and Mindanao, including references to various Negrito groups and their languages. He was himself an ‘encyclopedist,’ the title Salazar gives to her next section where she discusses the contributions of individuals who attempted to collect what was known about all existing languages in the world. Some of these people were explorers; others were philologists. Of the former, she examines the writings of Georg Forster and Peter Simon Pallas. Of the latter, she discusses Franz Carl Alter and Johann Christoph Adelung.

Each of these four writers included information about various Philippine languages. The author does us the service of listing in her appendices the approximately fifty terms in Forster’s comparative table that have possible Tagalog and Pampangan equivalents with languages that were spoken in places he had visited during his journey. (He did not collect these terms himself; Salazar tells us that he got them from two of the early vocabularies that had been published on these languages). She correctly notes that it is a sketchy and unreliable word list because there is “no word for ‘moon’ in Tagalog” (the list itself, however, provides no word in Pampangan but does give one for Tagalog), and because it notes various “misreadings” of the Spanish sources, including the variants *dalova* and *dalava* for “two.” Both are of interest because of the switch of the medial vowel from *o* to *a* that was apparently still underway when the

Spanish first arrived in the Tagalog region. She also provides us with transliterated (from Cyrillic) and translated lists of the 285 Philippine language terms appearing in Pallas's (1789) volume for Tagalog, Pampangan, and Magindanao. The great majority of these terms are for Magindanao, all of which were collected from "travelers." Salazar has done a careful analysis of the sources of Alter's word list of Tagalog included in the Appendix (236–238), and of the forms themselves; she notes that Alter's lack of knowledge of Spanish resulted in mistaken readings of various Spanish letters. Adelung's contribution came in the form of grammatical notes on Tagalog and Bisayan extracted from Spanish (and other) materials that were available to him (listed and commented on by Salazar). Adelung also did a grammatical analysis of three different versions of the Lord's Prayer in Tagalog. One of these versions was based on a copy translated into German by Hervas. Adelung did the same for Bisayan.

Salazar surveys the key figures who contributed to the development of the field now known as Historical-Comparative Linguistics, including William Jones, Francis Schlegel, Wilhelm von Humboldt, Franz Bopp, Rasmus Rask, Jacob Grimm, August Pott, August Schleicher, Friedrich Diez, Johann Zeuss, Franz von Miklosich, Karl Brugmann and Berhold Delbrück. Of these, she focuses on von Humboldt (40–79) and discusses his extensive contributions to the then-current understanding of the structure of Tagalog and its position in relation to other related languages. Salazar claims that his work is of great importance for the history of linguistics "because it is the first complete scientific treatment of the Malayo-Polynesian language family" (74). It should be noted that 'Malayo-Polynesian' is a term that Humboldt didn't use, preferring the name 'Malayan' (it was Bopp who first used the name 'maleisch-polynesisch' in 1841). While it is true that Humboldt compared the sounds and structures of languages as far apart as Malagasy and Polynesian, he had not grasped the importance of discovering recurrent sound change (or 'sound laws') as the basis for determining the relationship between languages. Typological similarities between grammatical structures, although a by-product of the relationship, can never be used as a basis for establishing the relationship, since such similarities can and do arise

completely independently in different families. Moreover, Humboldt was apparently under the impression that a protolanguage, a ‘primitive’ or earliest form, could still be spoken. He considered Tagalog to be the ‘origin’ and ‘purest’ form of all the ‘Malayan’ languages. While it is true that Tagalog retains many conservative features of its parent language, Proto-Malayo-Polynesian in today’s terms, it has undergone exactly the same number of years of change as any of the other languages in the family. As such, it cannot therefore be considered to be ‘older’ or ‘purer’ than any of the others. Humboldt was also apparently bound by the writing conventions of Spanish grammarians who represented the velar nasal by an *ng* digraph, and considered the ligature in forms such as *iyong* (from *iyon*) as simply the addition of the ‘letter *g*’ (60). It is somewhat surprising that Humboldt considered that Tagalog was the only ‘Malayan’ language that had a ligature, since early Spanish descriptions of Ilokano, Kapampangan, and other Philippine languages in which ligatures are also commonly found would have been available to him.

Salazar expresses astonishment that Humboldt calls *ang* an article, but *nang* and *sa* only particles (89), despite the fact that many modern analyses of Tagalog show that *ang* only marks definiteness of the following NP (noted also by Humboldt), and is not a ‘nominative’ case marker (Reid 2002). While *ng* (today’s orthographic convention for representing /naŋ) and *sa* are forms that mark the case of the NPs they are associated with, they certainly have functions in the language distinct from *ang*, and cannot be labeled with the same term.

Blust provides a different evaluation of von Humboldt’s contributions to historical-comparative linguistics, summarizing them in the following way:

His colossal work of scholarship... was a major contribution to the study of Old Javanese with an excursus into comparative Austronesian linguistics.... In over 1,800 pages of text and tables he laid out the most complete synthesis of descriptive and comparative knowledge about the AN [Austronesian] languages available in his time... There

is no question that von Humboldt's treatise was a landmark of scholarship in several areas. However, with regard to the comparative study of the AN languages it seems fair to say that he stood on the very brink of the scientific era, but had not yet crossed into it. His philosophical treatise on the relationship of language to thought was far ahead of its time, but his approach to comparative issues in linguistics was in many ways no more advanced than that of Reland [1708] 130 years before him. (Blust 2009 [2013], 518–519)

Salazar concludes her section on Humboldt by briefly reviewing the contributions of Franz Bopp and Friedrich Müller. She notes that they contributed little to the work of Humboldt who “has really written the basic work on Malayo-Polynesian languages, and that he has the great merit of having put Tagalog in its proper place” (83). One appreciates the sentiments expressed by the author, who is herself a Tagalog, but the place of Tagalog in the family is certainly not the one that Humboldt envisioned: as the origin of all the ‘Malayan’ languages, including those of the South Seas, or Polynesia. Tagalog is just one of the scores of Philippine languages that share their ancestral parent, Proto-Malayo-Polynesian. Although it maintains much of the verbal structure of that language, as do other Philippine languages, Tagalog has itself undergone many grammatical changes during the thousands of years of its development, as have all the other members of the family. She briefly reviews comments on Philippine languages by Hans Conon von de Gabelentz and his son Hans-Georg von de Gabelentz before moving into the next chapter.

### **The Nineteenth Century—An Age of Intensified Contacts with the Philippines**

Salazar divides her discussion in this chapter between scholars who either lived in the Philippines or were sent by government-financed expeditions to the Philippines, and those who did not visit the country. In the former category are Paul de la Gironière, Jean Mallat, Carl Semper, Charles de Montblanc, Fedor Jagor, Adolph Meyer, Alexander

Schadenberg, Joseph Montana, and Hans Meyer. In the latter are Armand de Quatrefages de Bréau, Aristide Marre, Hendrik Kern, Jan Brandes, Johann Jonker, and Ferdinand Blumentritt. For each of these authors, Salazar details relevant biographical information, outlining the context in which they became interested in Philippine languages and how they acquired the data that they used in their publications.

Of those who actually spent time in the Philippines and gathered linguistic data during their stay, one of the most prominent was Meyer. Salazar includes in her Appendix some of the lists that he published. These include Tiruray and Magindanao forms that were apparently given to Meyer by an unnamed Jesuit priest who claimed to speak the languages. The priest apparently wrote out the forms for Meyer as they are listed in Spanish orthography, while the Sulu language lists, and the Negrito language material that he may have elicited himself, are not given using Spanish orthographic conventions. Salazar states that after hunting for possibly similar forms in Schlegel's (1971) Tiruray lexicon and in Aldave-Yap's (1997) comparative study, she found "only one word in five" that resembled modern Tiruray and that therefore the list is not very reliable (99). She apparently did not consult Schlegel's dictionary because most of the forms given by Mayer are found in his lexicon. Perhaps she could have benefited from a deeper evaluation of Aldave-Yap's data in that it clearly misrepresents the phonology of the language. In the list given from Aldave-Yap, the letter *i* is used in all forms that have a central vowel represented in Schlegel and in Meyer's list by the letter *e*, an orthographic convention commonly still found today in languages, such as Ilokano and Pangasinan, that retain the original central vowel pronunciation. The spelling in Aldave-Yap appears to be a printer's substitution for what was probably an 'i-bar' (/i/) in the original (printer substitution errors are a major problem throughout the book in question). Thus, the Tiruray word for "fire" is not *afiy* as cited by Salazar from Aldave-Yap, but *afey*, as given in Schlegel, which he lists as synonymous with *ferayag*, the term given by Meyer as *frayague*. Similarly, the word given for "water" is not *riguwas*, but *reguwas*, which Schlegel defines as "a poetical term for water." Schlegel



also gives the expected term *wayeg* that is clearly the form represented by Meyer's *vayeque*. While Meyer gives *wefurufe* for "air," Schlegel shows *refuruh*, "a wind," as well as *labanen*, "wind," which Salazar cites (from Aldave-Yap) as *labangin*. Meyer's term for "earth," *fantade*, is also found in Schlegel as *fantad*, with a meaning similar to *tuna* that she cites from Aldave-Yap. It is not possible to determine the source of the final letter *e* found on *fantade*, although it is probably the paragogic vowel /e/ that is added to all consonant final words in the Tomini-Tolitoli languages of northern Sulawesi, such as Donde *pantade* "shore, beach" (Himmelman 1991). This is an area south across the Celebes Sea from where Tiruray is spoken; there was surely trade contact between them. It is also found in Meyer's list on *dogote*, "sea"; and the pronouns *beene*, "he,"; *begueye*, "we"; *ocgome*, "you"; and *berrone*, "they." The forms to which the extra vowel is attached can clearly be associated with the current Tiruray forms. One other fact that apparently evaded Salazar was that Meyer apparently misread some original *w* letters as *n* and in one case *m*. So that *telen*, "three" is *telew*; *fiten*, "seven" is *fitew*; *nalem*, "eight" is *walew*; and *sioon*, "nine" is *siyow*. The form for "three," given as *tires* in Aldave-Yap, is not Tiruray; it is clearly a borrowing of Spanish *tres* that she did not recognize.

Meyer also lived among the Negritos of the west coast of Luzon and published copiously on them. Salazar includes in her Appendix Meyer's lists of forms from two of the languages he researched. It is curious, given today's knowledge of the distinct Ayta languages of Zambales, that she states, "Meyer did not see the similarities of the Negrito dialects with Tagalog and Kapampangan. He created the myth of a separate language of the Negritos, which was hotly discussed for a long time" (102). While it is true that the Ayta languages have borrowed from the languages of their Sambalic neighbors, and possibly also from Kapampangan and Tagalog, they are very different from either of these languages in lexicon, syntax, morphology, and phonology. The question was whether their languages were part of the Malayo-Polynesian language family, or not.

Salazar then discusses the contributions of Schadenberg, briefly outlining some of the places where he lived and worked and some of the

research expeditions he made, including the one that took him to ‘Guinaan’ in the ‘Gran Cordillera Central,’ where he collected 700 words. It should be noted that there are two barrios with the name ‘Guinaang,’ one in Lubuagan, Kalinga, the other in Bontoc, Mountain Province (see Reid Ongoing). It is the former that he visited, reaching it from ‘Banao, Abra.’ Salazar provides in her Appendix the lists that Schadenberg took of three Ayta languages, one simply called ‘Negrito’; the others from Caulaman and Dinalupihan in Bataan. She also discusses his work in relation to the wide interest in these peoples among European scholars at the time.

Of those who wrote about the Philippines but never succeeded in traveling there, Salazar focuses on the work of the Dutch scholars Hendrik Kern, his student Brandes, and Blumentritt. Kern was also involved in the discussion raised by Meyer and by Schadenberg about the languages spoken by Negritos. Kern claimed that they were closely related to Tagalog, and were not different languages. He did, however, note that the lexicon, phonology, and grammar showed them to be Malayo-Polynesian languages. So the primary issue, and one that was not made clear either in the original works (or by Salazar), was not whether Negritos had distinct languages, which they clearly did despite their borrowed forms. Rather, it was a question of whether their languages could be shown to be part of the same family (Malayo-Polynesian) to which Tagalog belonged or whether they retained anything of their pre-Malayo-Polynesian tongues. This was an issue that interested Wilhelm Schmidt (see below), and continues to be of interest (Reid 1994).

The role of Brandes and Kern in the development of our understanding of the relationships between the sound systems of Malayo-Polynesian languages goes somewhat beyond the facts given by Salazar. A better summary may be found in Blust (2009[2013], 522–523). One contribution that Brandes made that many modern Philippine linguists should take seriously is that the infix *-in-* is not a marker of a ‘passive’ verb, but is a marker of ‘completed action.’ Although not obvious in Tagalog because of the morphological changes that have taken place with ‘actor voice’ constructions in which it has disappeared (in the case of verbs

with *-um-*) (Reid 1992), or alternates with *m-* (in the case of *ma-*, *mag-* and *mang-* verbs), the presence of *-in-* in the verbs of such constructions in a wide range of other Philippine languages shows that Brandes was right despite Kern's objections. The infix *-in-* is now reconstructed to very early stages of the Austronesian family as a marker of perfective aspect, not as a 'passive' affix.

### **Austronesian Linguistics and their [sic] Influence in the Philippines**

Of the range of scholars discussed in this chapter by Salazar, some never visited the Philippines, such as Wilhelm Schmidt, Renward Brandstetter, Rudolph Kern, Jan Gonda, and Otto Dempwolff. Of those who visited or lived in the Philippines, she discusses the missionary priests who lived in the country, Morice Vanoverbergh and Francis Lambrecht; the visitors Otto Scheerer and Hermann Costenoble; and finally, the Filipino scholar Cecilio Lopez, who studied under Dempwolff in Germany and became the leading linguist in the Philippines on his return.

Schmidt, although not contributing anything directly to the study of Philippine languages, did help raise our understanding of the relationship among the various branches of the Austronesian languages and also of the Austroasiatic languages of mainland Southeast Asia and India. As Salazar notes, he was the first one to propose the terms commonly used now for these two language families. His attention to the Philippines was motivated primarily, it seems, by his interest in the languages of the Negrito peoples, a pursuit that connected him with Vanoverbergh, his fellow SVD (Society of the Divine Word) priest. Vanoverbergh published copiously on the Northern Luzon languages during his eighty-year residence in the Philippines and with whom this reviewer was closely connected during the publication of his *Isneg Vocabulary* (Vanoverbergh 1972). Schmidt noted that Philippine Negritos did not have their own language but spoke the languages of their neighbors (148). This again misrepresented the languages of the Negritos. Although it is possible to

relate most of them to the same subgroup that their neighbors' languages belong to, they are distinct from them in many ways.

Brandstetter, without ever visiting any region where an Austronesian language was spoken, made major contributions to the state of knowledge of Austronesian languages and their relationships. Salazar indicates these accomplishments in her fourteen-page discussion of his writings. Her summary of his general contributions are useful, but in accord with the purpose of her research, she focuses on Brandstetter's writings in relation to Philippine languages, especially the essay in which he compared Malagasy and Tagalog. This article and several of his others are available in English translation, as Salazar notes (see Brandstetter 1916). An excellent evaluation of Brandstetter's contributions to the field of Austronesian linguistics is available in Blust (2009 [2013], 523–528, see also Blust and Schneider 2012). Careless copying or poor editing mars the material that is taken from the original sources that Salazar provides. Thus, the claim that Brandstetter always wrote 'n' for 'ng' is very misleading (158), because he actually wrote 'ñ' for 'ng'. Likewise, for the phonetic system of Original Indonesian (162), Brandstetter shows the final 'e' of the six vowels as 'ë'[ə], (Blagden's translation of Brandstetter [1916] gives 'ě'); the velar 'ñ' is 'n' [ŋ]; the palatal 'n' is ñ; and the line that contains 'y, l, r' is missing the bilabial semivowel w.

Several pages are devoted to the publications of Rudolph Kern on certain morphological features of Philippine languages. These include another misguided attempt to prove that the perfective infix *-in-* is a passive affix, and a summary of the functions of the *ka-* prefix, to which he added "*ka* is sometimes added to the imperative to give it some urgency: *Lakad ka na?* 'Go now!'" This is cited by Salazar, but she doesn't note that Kern failed to recognize that this particular *ka* is a second person singular pronoun, or that imperatives in Austronesian languages typically encode the agent, unlike European languages. Gonda's contributions, especially in the area of Tagalog terms that apparently have their source in Sanskrit, are summarized by Salazar with the note that "[l]ike most Sanskrit scholars, Gonda has a tendency to emphasize the influence of Sanskrit on other languages and cultures" (177).

The major European linguist of this era who utilized data from Philippine languages in his comparison of Austronesian languages was Otto Dempwolff. His contributions are discussed and evaluated by Salazar (177–185), who credits his work as being “unequaled in its scholarly and thorough approach. It has been the starting point of all later research in this area” (184). This, of course, is very true in comparison with preceding work, and his publications have provided the foundation upon which subsequent scholars such as Dahl, Dyen, Wolff, Zorc, and Blust have built their careers. But his work was not without problems, as Blust notes in his extensive examination of Dempwolff’s work (2009[2013], 528–543). Salazar, noting that Dempwolff’s major work is an “extremely useful source for research in comparative Austronesian linguistics” (185), lists the English translations that have appeared in the Philippines over the years. But Blust notes, “[u]nfortunately, no good English translation of Dempwolff’s major work exists to date... A full (uncredited) translation of VLAW was issued in mimeographed form by the Ateneo de Manila University in 1971, but this is so riddled with errors that the beginning student is best advised to avoid it” (2009[2013], 542). It would have also been useful to acknowledge that even though Dempwolff had reconstructed over 2000 lexical items to his “Uraustronesisch,” or what today is called Proto-Malayo-Polynesian, Blust reconstructed twice as many additional forms, a large number of which are cited with reflexes in Philippine languages (Blust and Trussel Ongoing). Finally, the problems that were noted above with the representation of Brandstetter’s Original Indonesian are replicated in the listing of Dempwolff’s Proto-Indonesian (181). Thus, the vowels are missing  $\text{ə}$  (schwa); the laryngeals show ‘c’ for the ‘spiritus asper’ or light glottal closure that Dempwolff represented with the superscript  $\text{c}$ ; the (misaligned) retroflex symbols ‘d’, ‘t’, and ‘l’, should all have subscript periods,  $\text{d}_.$ ,  $\text{t}_.$ , and  $\text{l}_.$ , respectively; of the palatals, ‘g’ and ‘k’ are misaligned and  $n$  is missing its accent mark,  $\acute{n}$ ; the velar  $\eta$  is also given as ‘n’; and the velar fricative  $\chi$  is shown as ‘j’. Similar problems exist in the listing of the twelve homorganic nasal combinations, and Salazar does not list the four diphthongs that Dempwolff considered to be part of the sound system.

Salazar next summarizes Scheerer's two German articles (most of his articles were written in English), one of which was concerned with the Aklan phoneme /l/, which is pronounced as a vowel and written as *e* in Aklanon orthography in certain positions in a word. She then outlines the contributions of the Filipino scholar Cecilio Lopez whom she appropriately characterizes as the "father of Philippine Linguistics" (190). She noted that "he was highly respected by students and scholars alike and he helped them whenever he could" (190), as he did with the current reviewer who met with him on his first arrival in the Philippines in 1959. Lopez was also the person with whom Costenoble left his German materials on comparative Philippine linguistics before his death, and which Lopez translated into English and published.

### **Recent Developments in Philippine Linguistics in Europe**

In this chapter, Salazar reviews the work of a wide range of European scholars whose studies in the second half of the twentieth century include Philippine language materials. They include the comparativists Andre-George Haudricourt (France), Hans Mohring (Germany), and Otto Christian Dahl (Norway). She then groups together linguists from separate European countries: Russia: Sergey Bulich, Evgeny Polivanov, Natalya Alieva, Vladimir Makarenko, Ivan Podberezskij, Lina Shkarban, Grennady Rachkov, Maria Stanyukovich; France: Maurice Coyaud, Jean-Paul Potet, François Dell, and Nicole Revel; Germany: Heinrich Kelz, Werner Drossard, Nikolaus Himmelmann, Agnes Kolmer, and Ursula Wegmüller; and finally Holland: Karl Alexander Adelaar and Antoon Postma. Many of these scholars visited the Philippines for various periods, and many of them, especially those from Russia, were primarily interested in Tagalog. Others such as Revel, widely known for her work on Palawan; Stanyukovich for her work on the *hudhud* epic genre of Ifugao; and Postma for his studies on Hanunóo and its pre-Spanish writing system, have spent extended periods in remote places in the Philippines and have contributed greatly to our understanding of otherwise little-known languages.

## Conclusion

Salazar has done an invaluable service to all linguists interested in Philippine languages by utilizing her skills as a polyglot and translator to reveal to us material that many of us would otherwise have had no access to. Of keen interest to this reviewer, for example, are the comments interspersed throughout the book on early views about who the Negritos are and the nature of the languages that they speak, and the lists of Negrito forms given in the Appendix that were taken by Meyer and by Schadenberg. This is material that could have been referred to in Reid (2013), but which were unavailable to me. But the frequent use by Salazar of the term ‘dialect’ for ‘language’ especially when it refers to a language spoken by Negritos (85, 93, 149, etc.) was, for me, problematic.

While at various points Salazar indicates where modern scholarship provides a different analysis or provides explanations for phenomena that puzzled early European researchers, these are scattered and incomplete. The work would have been greatly improved if she had been more careful to evaluate the contributions of writers in the light of modern scholarship. For example, while Brandstetter (and others) discussed the widespread presence of what have been referred to as monosyllabic ‘roots’ in Austronesian languages, she does not mention Blust (1980), who examined the nature of the phenomenon, critically evaluated Brandstetter’s methods, and reconstructed some 230 roots based on 2,560 tokens in 117 Austronesian languages, of which 32 are Philippine languages.

Another area in which Salazar could have provided some evaluative comments is the commonly occurring reference to what were called “passives” in Philippine languages, and which today are typically referred to as syntactically transitive constructions with different “focus” or “voice” marking on the verb. It is striking that even though she (123) cited a very relevant passage from Marre’s (1901) *Grammar of Tagalog*, which discussed the nature of Tagalog ‘passives,’ she did not associate the statement with

what today is widely understood as the basis for the difference between the accusativity of European languages and the ergativity of Philippine languages.

If one had to give the reason for this curious difference, one could find it in two completely opposed points of view, from which the action expressed by the verb is considered. In the European languages the action is seen in relation to the person who does it, whereas the Malayo-Polynesian languages consider the action in relation to the person or the thing that receives or undergoes it. (Marre 1901, 573)

Related to this issue, Drossard's (1984) argumentation that all the forms called "passive" must be considered "active" and that *ma-* verbs are "stative" is dismissed by Salazar (219) by the comment, "[i]n one stroke he had eliminated all the difficult passives of Tagalog, at least for himself." But this view had long been held by some linguists, such as Seidenadel (1906, reviewed in Reid 2011) who, probably before anyone else, rejected the concept of "passive" for the syntactically transitive verbs of Philippine languages. Seidenadel considered them to be "active." He also used the term "stative" for (one class of) *ma-*verbs. The use of the term "active" or the equivalent term "dynamic" is commonly held now by a number of Philippine linguists, such as Tanangkingsing (Tanangkingsing and Huang 2007), who prefers to reserve the term "passive" for *ma-* verbs in Cebuano. While most modern linguists no longer consider Philippine transitive verbs to be passives, Pierre Winkler (2011) defends the early Spanish use of the term, claiming that the Spanish missionaries foreshadowed modern Functional Grammar in their semantic-pragmatic usage of terms that today typically carry syntactic meanings.

One more case that Salazar could have provided some perspective on is in relation to the commonly referred to RGH- and RLD-laws that were credited to van der Tuuk and were discussed by Conant in relation to Philippine languages and referred to by Scheerer. These are still appealed to by some Filipino linguistic students when discussing the historical



development of Philippine languages. However, these laws have long been evaluated and shown to be inadequate explanations of the reflexes of the various reconstructed proto-phonemes that they were first proposed to show. They are now reconstructed as Proto-Austronesian and Proto-Malayo-Polynesian \*R and \*j.

The book under review, while very valuable in many respects, is unfortunately flawed by a large number of errors, including missing, misplaced and misspelled words, many of them clearly inadvertent and a number of which were mentioned in Section 4 above. However, in the interest of providing an objective evaluation of the work, it is necessary to indicate more of these problems.

One would expect that Salazar, as a linguist, would have been more careful in her citation of the Cebuano forms listed in Appendix 1 that are the modern equivalents of the forms given by Pigafetta. Although these are taken from Yap and Bunye (1971), they are not cited with stress marks indicating length and glottal stop as given in this work and other dictionaries of the language, such as the much more complete dictionary of Cebuano Visayan by Wolff (1972). We find *buto* for *bútù*, *luya* for *luy-a*, *suka* for *sukà*, *iro* for *irù*, *isda* for *isdà*, etc. Such diacritical marks were possibly removed by the printer but should have been corrected during the proofing stage.

There are a number of inaccuracies in listing the languages cited by Alter (26), inaccuracies that may have been in the original but were simply copied by Salazar without comment. She inadvertently reinforces the common Filipino belief that Philippine languages developed from Malay; she classifies Philippine languages, including Magindanao, Tagalog, and Pampango in her 'Indonesian' group, among which she also includes Palau, which is also not an Indonesian language, either geographically or linguistically. It would have been better to label the same group of languages as 'Western Malayo-Polynesian,' which clearly distinguishes them from the Oceanic languages cited under 'Melanesian' and 'Polynesian' headings. In the same list, it would have been better had Salazar used the

modern names of the countries where languages are spoken, such as Vanuatu for ‘New Hebrides’ and Sulawesi for ‘Celebes.’ Her ‘Mangaray’ (now called Manggarai) is spoken not ‘near Celebes,’ but in the west of the island of Flores in Indonesia. Similarly, Nias is spoken not ‘near Sumatra’ but in two islands off the north coast of Sumatra and are part of Sumatra. Palau is not ‘near the Carolines,’ but is part of the northern chain of Caroline Islands. ‘Achenese’ is more properly spelled Acehnese, and ‘Battak’ is Batak. ‘Malicolo (New Hebrides)’ refers to the island of Malecula in Vanuatu, where a number of different languages are spoken (Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2014). Similarly, she gives ‘Babobo’ for Bagobo (107), ‘Austroasian’ for Austroasiatic (131), ‘Ranks Islands’ for Banks Islands, ‘Anlitum’ for Ancitum (now Ancityum), ‘Oraged’ for Graged (182), ‘Miao-yao’ for Miao-Yao, now commonly referred to as Hmong-Mien (212), ‘Siraraya’ for Siraya (222). etc.

One additional problem that I kept on tripping up on are the multiple examples throughout the book of the inappropriate use of the English present perfect tense where a simple past tense is called for. These include, “Huonder has established a list of...” which could have been, “Huonder established a list of...” (4); “In this work, he has proven the effectiveness of his linguistic method” (44) for “In this work, he proved the effectiveness of his linguistic method;” and “She has based her work mostly on the research done and has compiled an atlas of terms related to rice” (212), a sentence that would have been better written as “She based her work mostly on research done and compiled an atlas of terms related to rice,” etc.

While the work has an extensive and very valuable 27-page bibliography section (with English translations of titles in foreign languages), the references have multiple editing problems. For example, the Yap and Bunye (1971) reference is cited without the mention of the second author; similarly, although both Schachter and Otnes are given as the authors of their Tagalog grammar in the references, only Schachter is mentioned as the author on (218). Despite the necessarily critical comments given in this section, they should not hinder anyone from buying the book. It should be added to the shelf of all aspiring young Filipino linguists.

***Perspectives on Philippine Languages: Five Centuries of Philippine Scholarship.*** Marlies S. Salazar, Ateneo de Manila University Press, 2013. ISBN: 978-971-550-649-6, 348 pp.

## References

- Blust, Robert A. 1988. *Austronesian root theory: An essay on the limits of morphology*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Blust, Robert A. 2009 [2013]. *Austronesian languages*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics. [2013 revised edition online at: <http://pacling.anu.edu.au/materials/Blust2013Austronesian.pdf>].
- Blust, Robert A. and Jürg Schneider, eds. 2012. *A world of words: Revisiting the work of Renward Brandstetter (1860-1942) on Lucerne and Austronesia*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Blust, Robert A. and Steve Trussel. Ongoing. *Austronesian comparative dictionary*. <http://www.trussel2.com/acd/>.
- Brandstetter, Renward. 1916. *An introduction to Indonesian linguistics, being four essays by Renward Brandstetter*. Translated by C.O. Blagden. [Royal Asiatic Society Monographs, vol. 15]. London.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 1991. Tomini-Tolitoli sound structures. *NUSA [Linguistic Studies of the Languages of Indonesia]* 33: 49–76.
- Houtman, F. de. 1603. *Spraecck ende woord-boeck, Inde Maleysche ende Madagaskarsche Talen met vele Arabische ende Turcsche woorden*. Amsterdam.
- Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig, eds. 2014. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Seventeenth edition*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com>.
- Marre, Aristide. 1901. *Grammaire Tagalog, composée sur un nouveau plan* [Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land en Volkenkunde 53]. The Hague.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1992. “On the development of the aspect system in some Philippine languages.” *Oceanic Linguistics* 31(1): 65–91.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 1994. “Possible non-Austronesian lexical elements in Philippine Negrito languages.” *Oceanic Linguistics* 33(1): 37–72.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 2002. “Determiners, nouns or what? Problems in the analysis of some commonly occurring forms in Philippine languages.” *Oceanic Linguistics* 41: 295–309.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 2011. “Seidenadel’s grammar of Bontoc Igorot: One hundred years on.” In *Micronesian and Philippine Linguistics before the Advent of Structuralism*, edited by Lawrence Reid, Emilio Ridruejo, and Thomas Stolz, 141–161. Berlin: Academie Verlag.
- Reid, Lawrence A. 2013. “Who are the Philippine Negritos? Evidence from language.” In *Human Biology* 85:1, edited by Phillip Endicott. <http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/humbiol/vol85/iss1/15>.

- Reid, Lawrence A. Ongoing. *Talking dictionary of Khinina-ang Bontok*. <http://htq.minpaku.ac.jp/databases/bontok/>.
- Reland, H. 1708. *Dissertationum miscellanearum partes tres. 3 vols.* Trajecti ad Rhenum.
- Schlegel, Stuart A. 1971. *Tiruray-English lexicon*. [University of California Publications in Linguistics, No. 67]. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tanangkingsing, Michael and Hsuanfan Huang. 2007. "Cebuano passives revisited." *Oceanic Linguistics* 46: 544–583.
- Vanoverbergh, Morice. 1972. *Isneg-English vocabulary*. [Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication, No. 11]. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Winkler, Pierre. 2011. "Subject, topic, passive, and perspective in Functional (Discourse) Grammar and in Philippine Missionary Grammar." In *Micronesian and Philippine Linguistics before the Advent of Structuralism*, edited by Lawrence Reid, Emilio Ridruejo, and Thomas Stolz, 87–115. Berlin: Academic Verlag.
- Wolff, John. 1972. *Dictionary of Cebuano Visayan*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Yap, Elsa P. and Maria V. Bunye. 1971. *Cebuano-Visayan Dictionary* [PALI Languages Texts: Philippines]. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.