

McFARLAND, CURTIS D. 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 Gaikokugo Daigaku. Pp. xii, 136.

Reviewed by VIDEA P. DE GUZMAN, The University of Calgary

This monograph, as the author titled it, is a tentative catalogue of 439 Tagalog verbs (the last six entries being derived adjectives), selected from a large amount of current, printed data and classified according to the focus-affixes, corresponding to the actor, object, and directional focus, that each verb takes. CDM's approach is largely based on the system of verbal classification found in Schachter and Otnes' *Tagalog Reference Grammar* (1972). Even with the use of this system, CDM observes difficulty in determining 'where particular verbs fit' (v) because of so much irregularity and idiosyncratic behavior displayed by Tagalog verbs. He decided that the only way to show the general patterns of focus-inflection as well as the exceptions was to collect a large amount of data. As a list, therefore, of focus-inflected verb forms, this work will serve as a particularly useful reference for learners of Tagalog. For the linguist who is interested in this area, the book offers: (a) a resource of organized data which can be utilized for further investigation, and (b) some insightful comments and interesting observations such as: (1) the (non-focus) objective complement may be expressed by the genitive and oblique forms in storable environments (6-8); (2) the actor-focus form has a very low frequency compared to the non-actor-focus form (29); (3) identifying a complement as either object or directional was not always straightforward for a number of reasons (29); and (4) the suggestion that *mag* (AF)/*ipag*-(OF) and *maN*-(AF)/*ipaN*-(OF) can be combined such that the affixes *pag*- and *paN*- are taken as part of the base (32).¹

The book is divided into two parts. Part I gives an outline of Tagalog syntax (1-27) treating such topics as types of sentences, reference expressions and complements, predicates and predicators, verbal inflections, and contextual constraints. CDM admits that this section is intended merely to introduce the terminology used in the succeeding sections. At this point, the practice of using new terms in place of time-honored, serviceable ones may be questioned. Certainly, there is no gain in calling an identificational sentence 'coreferential' or an equational sentence 'pseudo-basic'. And to classify nominal expressions or common noun phrases, in particular, into 'relativized referent CRE, relativized event CRE, and abstract predicate CRE' (CRE standing for common referent expression) (4), when common nouns, nominalized predicates, gerunds or nominal clauses are more easily comprehensible and comparable, places an unnecessary load on the reader. Furthermore, it creates confusion to use 'coordinate CRE' to refer to complex noun phrases such as:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|
| (1) | ang bahay
house | na
linker | malaki
big | 'the big house' |
| (2) | ang lalaki-ng
man-liner | nakita
saw | ko
I | 'the man I saw' |

¹Cf. De Guzman (1978:149-51) where *m-* is posited as the active focus affix which is assimilated by verb stems with the prefix *pag-*, *paN-*, or *paki-* giving the forms *mag-*, *maN-* and *maki-*, respectively.

where the structure is analyzed as 'CRE article-predicate-linker-predicate' (5). This kind of analysis completely obliterates the attributional relation of one constituent to the head of the construction, as a consequence of reducing the major categories to just one function, i.e. the predicate. In like manner, the section on predicate and predicators has been saddled with additional terms that tend to obscure relatively common and simple grammatical categories. In my judgment, the most lucid and commendable section is that on verbal inflection because of its systematic and straightforward presentation.

Part II describes the method CDM employed in cataloguing his data, the observations he arrived at in the process, and some selected examples showing certain decided difficulties. One reason given for the difficulty arising in determining what a non-actor complement is that (5) some verbs, such as *makinig* 'to listen' can have either an object or a directional complement, with no difference in meaning' (29). This statement, to my mind, is questionable and misleading. Evidently, CDM subscribes to Schachter and Otnes' (1972:295) analysis of *makinig* as having either an object or a directional complement as in the following examples:

- (3) *nakinig kami ng talumpati* 'We listened to a speech'
 (4) *nakinig kami sa talumpati* 'We listened to the speech'

Were the object *ng*-phrase and the supposed directional *sa*-phrase contrastive in content, it should have been discernible in the meaning. However, the distinction between (3) and (4) lies only in the permissible choice between an indefinite (3) and a definite (4) *object* complement. There are other cases where the verbs take only an oblique form of complement in what is referred to as the 'basic predicate sentence', but which, from a semantic point of view, strongly indicates a cooccurring object or patient, to use the case grammarian's term. For example, *umasa/asahan* 'to expect someone (s.o.)/ something (s.t.)', *mamahala/pamahalaan* 'to supervise s.o./s.t.', *lumigaw/tigawan* 'to court s.o.', *maniwala/paniwalaan* 'to believe s.o./s.t.', *sumama/samahan* 'to accompany s.o.' are all identified by CDM as actor-focus/directional-focus sets. Likewise, verbs such as *dalawin* 'to visit s.o./s.t.', *harapin* 'to face s.o./s.t.', *mahalin* 'to love s.o./s.t.', *pasukin* 'to enter (to force entry into s.o./s.t.; to accost s.o.)' are also marked directional-focus verbs. Both groups, however, whether they be lexically underived or derived from corresponding intransitive forms, are transitive forms which conceptually take a cooccurring object rather than a directional nominal. In view of the fact that the oblique marking of nominals has been identified with a cooccurring directional complement, Table 3 (33) which displays the resulting focus-inflection patterns, upon a closer semantically-based analysis of complements, may be showing more diversity than there actually exists.

The following two appendices comprise the main body of the book. Appendix I (40-99) contains 106 alphabetically arranged entries of verb roots having the highest frequency of occurrence in the survey, i.e. 30 to 100 verb forms. The format introduces what CDM considers to be the relevant information that should be included in a dictionary. Among others, the focus-affix or affixes are identified for guidance in inflecting the verb for aspect; the basic focus-inflected forms with the corresponding focus label, e.g. AF for actor-focus, OF for object, etc. It is surprising, though, that the sub-entries should include forms which CDM admits as quite regular and predictable, namely, gerunds, aptative, causative and additional meaning verbs such as distributive, intensive, accidental and reciprocal. Undoubtedly, it makes for an easy reference or check for the student, although simple general rules would have sufficiently stated the redundancies. What appears to be an attractive innovation here especially for the uninitiated is the inclusion of related non-verbal forms. A final bonus is the citation of a sentence or two illustrating the use of the given forms. Forms sharing the same root but whose meanings differ are entered separately, thus, clearly exhibiting their respective focus paradigms.

A PROVISIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF TAGALOG VERBS

One notable inadequacy of the list, admittedly attributable to the limitation of the survey, is the presence of gaps in terms of cooccurring complements required by the verb or of a focus-form sub-entry, e.g. 17. II *bigo*, 95. II *tuloy*,/4.II *alam* (AF), 85. II *pagtapos* (OF), 87. II *tawag* (AF).

Appendix II (100-27) lists the 439 verb roots (including those in Appendix I) for which at least five forms occurred in the survey, appearing in their basic focus-affixed forms. They are grouped into focus-alternating classes. Cognizant of the gaps to be filled, and perhaps the focus-forms that need to be re-checked, CDM emphasizes the unfinished status of this project, thereby refraining from drawing any conclusive statements. The most significant observation he makes which may comfort the learner runs: 'In spite of the idiosyncratic behavior, there are nonetheless some very strong inflectional patterns, which apply to large numbers of verb bases and enable us to define affix-alternation classes' (32). He identifies the 6 focus-alternating sets made up of ditransitive and transitive verbs, and the 3 sets of intransitive verbs.

What may appear to be disconcerting is the remaining 38 sets whose membership ranges from 1 to 12 forms. As indicated earlier, a re-analysis of the verb stems considering cooccurring complements on the basis of their conceptual framework or case frame may reveal that some of the seemingly different sets actually fall together. It may be instructive and beneficial to compare the present classification with two major works on Tagalog verb subcategorization (see Ramos 1974 and De Guzman 1978) before the final version of this project is made, if it has not been undertaken yet. Besides case frames, it has been shown that semantic and morphological features coupled with determining the lexical status of the verb stems as either being underived or derived altogether contribute to a clearer understanding and to a more unified account of the complexity of Tagalog verbs.

Finally, Appendix III has been included to provide the list of the sources of the examples cited. At the end of the book is a very useful index of the 332 bases (roots) found in Appendices I and II, each one given an easy guide for its location.

REFERENCES

- DE GUZMAN, VIDEA P. 1978. Syntactic derivation of Tagalog verbs. *Oceanic Linguistics* Special Publication No. 16. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.
- RAMOS, TERESITA V. 1974. The case system of Tagalog verbs. *Pacific Linguistics*, Series B, No. 27. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- SCHACHTER, PAUL and FE OTANES. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.