

# Editor's Notes

This regular issue of *The Archive* features current and relevant Philippine linguistic research projects, representing the current institutional agenda and mandate of the Department of Linguistics, University of the Philippines (UP), during its first century of existence. This issue contains three original research articles titled “The Aspect Systems of Some Philippine Languages—Developments from Proto-Austronesian” by Honeylet Dumoran, “Multiple Motivations for Preposing in Selected Philippine Languages” by Michael Wilson Rosero, and “Nominalization in Surigaonon: Beyond Forming Noun Phrases” by Ava A. Villareal. It also archives the Itneg Inlaud Wordlist elicited by Ryn Jean Fe V. Gonzales, Nick B. Bringas, Jhony C. Azada, and Marites F. Remos. Also featured is a commentary titled “Beyond Linguistic Empowerment: Language Revitalization Through Social Justice” written by Maria Kristina Gallego and Jesus Federico Hernandez.

Dumoran's paper is a reexamination of the aspect system found in Philippine languages as compared with the putative ancestral morphology in Proto-Austronesian and Proto-Extra-Formosan. Tracing the historical development of this morphological feature, the author was able

to engage in the scholarly discourse with Philippine historical linguists and Austronesianists, capitalizing on the morphosyntactic behaviors of aspectual systems observed among selected Philippine languages. Dumoran infers, based on the data collected and analyzed, that there may be three ways by which the aspect systems developed from Proto-Austronesian, undergoing innovative and retentive developments resulting in their current forms as observed in the Philippine languages under study. Finally, using the methods of historical linguistics, this paper is able to explain how the forms of aspectual system have developed similarly or differently among these Philippine languages that represent disparate microgroups and are located in various geographic locations in the country.

By showcasing how a Cebuano dialect called Kana fares in comparison with select Philippine languages such as Chavacano, Ilokano, Tagalog, and Waray, Rosero's paper offers a fresh look at the analysis of word order in Philippine-type languages. He takes particular look at preposing, a pragmatically marked construction where non-predicate arguments are placed in front of the sentence for pragmatic reasons, thereby altering the canonical word order widely considered to be common among Philippine-type languages. The paper arrives at several inferences by employing statistical frequency analysis and scaffolded by concepts used in functional linguistics and pragmatics. Whereas Chavacano, Ilokano, and Tagalog represent the canonical predicate-initial word order among Philippine-type languages, Kana and Waray, on the other hand, favor pronominal preposing as evidenced by the high frequency of occurrence of preposed constructions, which is found to be even higher than the basic postposed construction.

Meanwhile, Villareal's article describes a grammatical process called nominalization and how this forms certain derived grammatical structures in Surigaonon. Using the generative grammar approach, she enumerates the syntactic processes and semantic/lexical bases of Surigaonon nominalization and how it contributes to the modification of basic sentences and the formation of complex sentences. By relating the nominalization processes vis-à-vis the formation of complex sentences observed in the said language, the author is able to contribute to the ongoing dialogue on the syntax of complex sentences among Bisayan languages—to where Surigaonon belongs—in particular, and among Philippine languages in general. Finally, the paper aims to utilize this linguistic theoretical knowledge to more applied uses such as pedagogy, community-based language documentation and description, and Philippine comparative linguistic research.

This issue of *The Archive* also includes a valuable wordlist of Itneg Inlaud, prepared by Gonzales, Bringas, Azada, and Remos, based on their extensive field work for language and culture documentation of the said language, spoken in the valleys of northern Luzon. This data set, which encapsulates the cultural and societal realities of the speech community, is also notable because of its use of latest technological advancements available to the researchers, as a response to the limitations of current linguistic field research brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic. This wordlist is all the more important not only because it documents the core vocabulary of Itneg Inlaud, a critically endangered language, but also because it offers various alternative and effective methods in eliciting linguistic data that remain within the context of the current situation and sociocultural experiences in the Philippines.

The commentary written by Gallego and Hernandez puts forward a more engaged and militant approach to the agenda relating to language documentation and, more importantly, revitalization—an approach that is aware of and guided by a wider social justice framework, resulting in a more proper way to address the issue of language endangerment. Their commentary is a call to conducting linguistic research that is conscientious about the current plight especially of the minority and minoritized ethnolinguistic groups, by citing their own experiences in and observations on language revitalization efforts of Ibatan, spoken in the island of Babuyan Claro. They argue that languages need not be pit against each other and furthermore, multilingualism is never a hindrance to maintaining the rich linguistic repertoires of speakers. Finally, they cite the importance of looking at extra-linguistic factors that contribute to the collective experience of the marginalized community and, by addressing them, true empowerment and hence a more effective language revitalization will be achieved.

Since its founding in 1922, the Department of Linguistics at UP has endeavored to conduct linguistic research on Philippine languages and disseminate the results of these research projects through various means such as this journal. The essays and data set featured in this issue are a reflection of the mandate and research agenda of the institution: Philippine diachronic, comparative, and structural linguistics; Philippine language documentation and description; and application of theoretical linguistic knowledge to contributing to solving various linguistic issues in the country.

To the editorial team, authors, contributors, and reviewers of this second revival issue of *The Archive*, I wish to express my deepest gratitude. We hope that the articles, data set, and commentary featured in this regular issue serve as a continuation or takeoff point for further scholarly discussions on Philippine linguistics in the years to come.

**Jem R. Javier**  
Editor-in-Chief