

A TAGMEMIC GRAMMAR OF IVATAN, by Cesar A. Hidalgo, and Araceli C. Hidalgo. Special monograph No. 2 of The Linguistic Society of the Philippines, Manila. 1971. xvi + 258 pp.

Reviewed by ELMER WOLFENDEN, Summer Institute of Linguistics

The work under review is a detailed description of the Southern Ivatan dialect presented by means of a modified tagmemic-transformational descriptive model. One who is familiar with the literature immediately asks himself, 'Now what is this tagmemic grammar of an Ivatan dialect able to add to Reid's (1966) tagmemic grammar of the northern dialect?' It sounds like the Hidalgos are simply duplicating his work, even to using the same type of descriptive model. Let's dispel that suspicion right here. Firstly, the Hidalgos, native speakers of Ivatan, display a more extensive knowledge of word structure, especially in the area of affix functions than does Reid. The latter is acknowledged by scholars in the field as the most difficult aspect of Philippine languages. In this area they make a significant contribution. Secondly, their analysis of phrase structure provides a fuller array of phrase constructions than Reid described. In addition, they have handled derivational processes as products of Pike's matrix multiplication theory, which also differs from Reid's presentation. All in all, this work deserves to be recognized in its own right as a valuable contribution to our knowledge of Ivatan, and indirectly, to our understanding of the general pattern of grammatical structure found in the Philippine family of languages. The few critical comments I have to make below should not detract from the overall worth of this book.

The six chapters in the book are divided into parts. An introductory chapter gives the social and linguistic background of the language. Part I consists of Chapter Two, which is a description of the phonological component of the language. In this section, the phonemes and their allophones are described with reference to their distribution in syllables and word patterns. Suprasegmental phenomena of phonemic stress, vowel length, and intonation levels are discussed briefly. It is interesting to note that Southern Ivatan has both phonemic stress and phonemic vowel length in contradistinction to Northern Ivatan (Reid, 1966. 3) which has only phonemic stress.

Part II consists of Chapter Three, a description of the word morphology. Although it is labeled the lexical component, it does not go into the semantic features of roots, but is limited to a description of the permitted combinations of affixes and roots. These combinations exert syntactic influence on the structure of clauses when they manifest the predicates of such clauses. The Hidalgos appear to have covered the affix classes exhaustively, since they include both obligatory and optional affixes for noun, verb, and adjective stems. The features on the verbs which order the syntax of the clauses are considered central to the grammar. [Note: We are informed that Araceli Hidalgo is continuing work on the semantic features of these predicatives, and we will look forward to that piece of native-speaker insight.]

Three major word classes are identified in this section as nominals, predicatives (any word which may fill a predicate slot in a clause), and adjuncts. Each of these is subdivided into minor classes. Nominals are divided into syntactic classes of common nouns, proper nouns, and pronouns, depending on the function markers which precede and introduce them in the syntax. Predicatives are identified by their inflection and stem class, and comprise six major classes. The affix classes are identified on the basis of the inflectional

or derivational functions they signal. Each class, whether stem or affix, is described by a tagmemic formula together with an explanatory paragraph, and generally followed by a set of Ivatan examples. Subsumed under the category of adjunct are the uninflectable particles such as relators, introducers, interjections, and so on.

Part III, the grammatical component, consists of Chapters Four, Five, and Six, dealing with the structure of sentences, clauses, and phrases, respectively. Twelve major and two minor sentence types are described in Chapter Four. One section in this chapter describes the recursive derivation of complex Ivatan sentences in addition to the basic or simple set.

Chapter Five distinguishes clause structure from sentence structure, and describes as the basic set nine independent and three dependent clauses. Other sets of independent clauses are derived from the basic set by the addition of optional affixes to the predicatives which, in turn, varies the grammatical relations between the predicatives and the non-predicative elements in the clauses. The *Hidalgos* describe the derivational processes in this chapter by means of matrix multiplication techniques also. The space relations between the different sets of clauses, therefore, are displayed by means of matrix tables and charts.

Permutations from 'normal' order within a clause are described as processes distinct from the derivational processes, and apply to both basic and derived clauses. The last section of this chapter identifies the surface exponents of the clause-level tagmemes, i.e., the phrases which manifest the elements within a clause. A fold-out chart of the relations holding between the pure function markers and the pronouns, which are impure function markers, is especially helpful for revealing the substitution possibilities between the various markers and the pronouns.

The sixth, and last chapter, describes the seven major types of phrases. These are grouped into three general categories: (1) single-centered phrases, (2) double-centered phrases, and (3) relator-axis phrases, and displayed in a composite chart. Each type is identified by means of the usual tagmeme formula, explanatory paragraph in prose, and sets of Ivatan examples.

A brief appendix contains a list of the symbols used in the formulas. The bibliography of references is quite full although three works (*McKaughan*, 1958 and 1971; *Fillmore*, 1968) have been omitted, and six others are mentioned in footnotes in the first chapter but not included in the bibliography. However, that is a relatively minor oversight in view of the fifty-seven entries put into the bibliography.

In view of the thoroughgoing description of the grammar of Southern Ivatan as presented in this work by *Cesar* and *Araceli Hidalgo*, it is not surprising that only a few critical comments can be mustered.

There was one section in the description which gave me trouble. My difficulty lies in not understanding clearly the distinction between the two processes, identification-emphasis and topicalization. The authors first introduce the discussion in a footnote on page 52. No examples are given there, but they give a fuller discussion, with examples, beginning on page 210, Section 5.2.3, titled: Set T8, the Emphasis Clauses. (A reference to this section in the earlier footnote would aid the reader.)

My difficulty can be illustrated from the following examples taken from the discussion in Section 5.2.3. The following two clauses are said to have structurally different subject-predicate (S + P) order although they have the same structural sequence of an unmarked NP plus a *u*-marked NP. (I will keep the authors' sentence numbering system.)

1. *Chitu u nayayu.* 'It is a dog that ran.'

dog the ran

NP		u-NP
S	+	P

4. *Mahakay u kakteh ku.* 'My sibling is a boy.'

boy the sibling my

NP		u-NP
P	+	S

The first illustration is said to be an identification-emphasis clause. It is assigned the order S + P. Illustration No. 4 has the same grammatical structure, a sequence of NP + u-NP, but this is said to be an indicative equational clause. It is assigned the order P + S.

On the other hand, the grammatical structure of examples No. 3 and No. 6 (given below) contrast with each other, but are described as having the same S + P order because they are both emphasis clauses.

3. *U chitu am nayayu.* 'As for the dog, it ran.'

the dog conn ran

u-NP	C	Vb
S	+	P

6. *U chitu u nayayu.* 'It is the dog that ran.'

the dog the ran

u-NP		u-NP
S	+	P

By reference to these examples I can now specify more exactly my difficulty. The first NP of examples No. 1 and No. 6 are said to be the emphasized (and therefore the subject) elements. The authors reach that decision by attributing a semantic feature of identification-emphasis to those NP's. The second NP in each of those constructions is then identified as the predicate. It is here that I question the analysis. Are semantic criteria, not supported by distinct structural signals, acceptable evidence for deducing structural categories? Clearly, the structural evidence as described by the authors is ambiguous since example No. 1 is paralleled by example No. 4 which has the same grammatical structure but a different subject-predicate assignment, and the internal structure of example No. 6 is ambiguous since both NP's are marked alike. It appears that the authors are forced to appeal to semantic criteria to resolve the ambiguity. Since this problem occurs in many other Philippine languages, I would like to suggest an alternate solution.

We start with the concept of markedness, and say that the unmarked member of a set is the basic member; the marked members are the non-basic members. Thus, in the examples above only example No. 3 is marked for *am*, a specific connector. The other three examples are alike in that they all are unmarked for *am*. From information given elsewhere in this book, and from Reid (1966:128ff) we can now postulate an unmarked variant of 3, as 3a. Thus,

- 3a. *Nayayu u chitu.* 'The dog ran.'

ran the dog

Vb		u-NP
P	+	S

On the other hand, extensive examples in Reid (1966) persuade me to postulate that examples No. 1, No. 4, and No. 6 above also have alternate forms which are marked for *am*, as shown below.

- 1a. *U nayayu am chitu.*
 4a. *U kakteh ku am mahakay.*
 6a. *U nayayu am u chitu.*

If this is correct, and the function marker *am* signals the topicalization permutation as described by the Hídalgo, then it can be seen that the unmarked forms of the clauses must have the same general P + S order for that permutation rule to operate. If this conclusion is logical, then examples No. 1, No. 3a, No. 4, and No. 6 above have the same P + S order, and examples No. 1a, No. 3, No. 4a, and No. 6a all have the marked topicalization order of S + *am* + P. Example No. 6 can still be described as an identification – emphasis clause, but it is a semantic classification and does not involve a change in the order of P + S. My solution must remain hypothetical for this description of Southern Ivatan, however, pending response from the authors, since the connector *am* is not exhaustively described in their work. It is possible that *am* has a slightly different distribution in the South from that found in Northern Ivatan.

In passing, we should warn readers of a large typographical misprint in the form of an unfinished and redundant sentence in the middle of the text on p. 210. A few other typographical errors appear – inevitable in a highly complex technical study such as this. Therefore, I will only mention a few which I consider crucial to understanding the authors' description.

On page 23, /h/ has an allophone x which is said to occur in word-final position. One of the examples given, however, is *maxma* 'soft', which indicates that the distributional statement should probably read 'syllable-final position'. On page 24, the allophone h of phoneme /h/ is said to occur in word-initial position after a consonant. In the example *hapen* 'get', however, h does not follow a consonant.

In the formula at the top of p. 48, I suspect that the label *ref af* should be *red af* as in the other formulas on that page. On page 51, I am confused by the arrangement of the plus and minus symbols in the formula for pn (pronoun). I would expect (from the similar formula for nouns on p. 48) that \pm nuc should be + nuc. On page 61, where does footnote 5 come in the text?

On page 75, line 2 up from the bottom of the page, the causative voice affix is said to be obligatorily absent if either of two other affixes is present. I could not find that information symbolized in the accompanying formula (No. 1 on page 75). On page 80, it is not clear that *Cont asp* or *Incept asp* are obligatory in formula No. 7. On page 85, plus-minus symbols are needed in formula No. 2 before and after the label Fo_{asso}. On page 149, the word Concretive which introduces the formulas should be Generative, I think. On page 151, the label (ConsBase) should probably be (ConcBase).

In the last paragraph at the bottom of page 205, there is the statement, 'Clauses in the latter five values are considered transformations of indicative clauses, although there seems to be no *a priori* reason for considering the indicative clauses more basic than the others.' In an article to appear later in this journal, I propose that tagmemic theory be enriched by incorporating a specific type of deep structure. If the addition of a deep, or underlying, structure to tagmemic theory is valid, then there is an inherent reason for

considering the indicative clauses more basic than others in Philippine languages. The reason is that the indicative clauses (= simplest) are the first full constructions derived from the underlying patterns in the deep structure. Since all later, more complex, clause derivations pass through the indicative set, the description of the derivation can be abbreviated by only going back to the indicative instead of all the way back to the deep structure.

On page 212, the translation accompanying illustration No. 4 does not agree with that given in the text. The word *mahakay* probably means 'boy', not 'brother'.

Finally, under the bibliographic entries for Postal, page 258, the date for the first entry is 1764, but should be 1964; and the date for the second entry is 1667, and should be 1966.