

H. H. Bartlett

THE ARCHIVE

A COLLECTION OF PAPERS PERTAINING TO
PHILIPPINE LINGUISTICS

PAPER Nº 4

1925-'26

THE USE OF *ti* AND *iti* IN ILOKO COMPARED
WITH TAGALOG AND PANGASINAN EQUIVALENTS

A Contribution to Comparative
Philippine Syntax

By

Otto Scheerer and Eusebia Pablo

Seminar in Philippine Linguistics

U. P.

EDITED BY OTTO SCHEERER

MANILA, P. I.

P. O. BOX 659

THE ARCHIVE

PAPER N^o 4

1925-'26

THE USE OF *TI* AND *ITI* IN ILOKO COMPARED WITH TAGALOG AND PANGASINAN EQUIVALENTS

A Contribution To Comparative Philippine Syntax

by

OTTO SCHEERER AND EUSEBIA PABLO (1)

For every thoughtful Filipino one of the most gratifying symptoms of progressive national life in his country is the gradually increasing interest taken by his people in their own long neglected native languages as a subject of popular instruction. Unfortunately, when their use in the public schools is now being advocated, and they are actually made use of in the recently inaugurated campaign against illiteracy, the ill effect is apt to be overlooked which their long exclusion from public instruction has entailed on them, and which consists in a certain unstableness of their spoken and written use. Certainly no language, for highly cultivated as it may be, is free from vacillations, instances of such, however, threaten to gain ground in languages that are not taught at school, lack popular grammars and dictionaries, and live mostly in the mouth of their speakers, the best educated of whom, moreover, prefer to use a foreign language whenever learned or ornate speech is required.

A few years ago, two prominent sons of the Iloko provinces, from a desire to render their native speech more stable, engaged, in the vernacular paper 'Ti Silao' of June and August 1922, in an interesting discussion concerning, among other points, the best use of the articles *ti* and *iti*.

(1) The present thesis, begun by Miss Pablo, had to be discontinued by her on account of protracted illness, and was thereupon developed by the editor himself, tho with less intimate knowledge of the Iloko.

The first of the two debaters, Mr. Marcelino Crisologo, well known poet of the Iloko region, expressed himself in his communication strongly in favor of the establishment of an academy for the Iloko, so as to avoid this language becoming, as he said, "a tower of Babel". He had much to say in favor of Padre Carro (1783 to 1806) and his collaborators of the Order of San Agustín as authors of the well-known "Gramática ilocana" and "Vocabulario iloco-español", but he disagreed with him in the use of *iti* for the nominative. He said (in translation):

"I want it to be used only for the dative, accusative, and ablative, because, if we use it also for the nominative, it will involve much confusion, and it will be hard to distinguish between ablative, dative, accusative, and nominative. The article *ti* should be used for nominative, genitive, and sometimes for the accusative, and *iti* for the dative, accusative, and ablative."

In a later article he returned to the same matter with the remark that in *the unstable use made of ti and iti he saw one of the main defects of the Iloko language*. (1)

These views of the Iloko poet found a reply in the same publication by Professor Panlasigui of the University of the Philippines. Deprecating any intention to do more than consult with Mr. Crisologo, a recognized master of the Iloko language, the professor expressed himself as follows:

"You say in your letter that *ti* should be used for the nominative, genitive, and, sometimes, the accusative. It would be very good if the masses knew these cases; but I think that this scheme of classification is too complicated, for even in English these numerous cases are ignored. In fact, English has not, like Spanish, sprung from Latin, much less has Samtoy [Iloko], and therefore it would not be proper to make the grammar of the latter similar to that of Spanish or Latin. (1). Allow me to ask if it were not better, if you had identified *ti* with what you identified with the nominative, dative, accusative, and ablative, and *iti* only with the genitive, or vice versa? According to your plan we would have:

Nom. *ti* tao

Gen. *ti* tao

Dat. *iti* tao

Acc. *iti* or *ti* tao

Abl. *iti* tao

If, now, we were to say *ti ayat ti tao*, we could not, according to this plan, readily see which is nominative, genitive or accusative, since their articles are all alike. But if we identify *iti* with the genitive only, and *ti* with the nominative, dative, accu-

(1) Italics of the translator.

sative, and ablative, may be the confusion will be less, and scheme be less, and the scheme easier to remember. For example:

Nom. *ti tao*
Gen. *iti tao*
Dat. *ti tao*
Acc. *ti tao*
Abl. *ti tao*

would be a better scheme, because often the dative, accusative, and ablative do not take the article, and yet we can understand their meaning. Now, if we say *ti ayat iti tao*, the meaning is very clear; again in *ti baláy iti tao* we know that *iti tao* is the geni-

tive, and the person is the owner of *ti ayat* and *ti baláy*. Again in *ti tao ayatenna ni Apo Dios*, the accusative *Apo Dios* does not need the article *ti* or *iti*. In *ti tao ayaten ni Apo Dios* the ablative *ni Apo Dios* does not need *ti* or *iti*.

In the following examples in which I apply my scheme of placing the articles, the latter can not be dispensed with: *Ti tao agbangon ti baláy*; here the accusative *ti baláy* is readily recognized even if its article is *ti*, like the nominative *ti tao*. *Ti ubing ikanna ti aso ti inapuy*: the dative *ti aso* and the accusative *ti inapuy* are readily distinguished from the nominative *ti ubing*, and they are even recognized to be different from one another, altho both are preceded by the very same article *ti*. Therefore too many distinctions between *ti* and *iti* are not needed, and I think, Sir, that it would be easier to have only these two distinctions rather than making Samtoy Latin.—Sometimes I feel inclined to think that *iti* can be used before and after an adverb."

The preceding abstracts are translated from the original text in order to establish our subject matter in detail, and to give an idea of the opinions held on it by others. In the following discussion we do not desire to support or contradict either of the debaters; we merely intend to deal with the subject theoretically, that is, we shall try to gain further insight into it by a comparison of the articles in question with those of two other Philippine languages; at the same time, we shall attempt to present the syntactical relations known as 'cases' as naturally accruing from the facts of the language itself. As for the future use of the articles under debate, we know that it must be decided in the last instance thru the usage on which the educated speakers of the language will finally agree: 'Usus arbitrium est, et jus et norma loquendi.'

§ 1.—The discussion, of which abstracts are given above, turns mainly around the proper use of the articles *ti* and *iti* for indicating certain relations in which the Iloko noun may stand

to some other part of the sentence. Incidentally hereto, Professor Panlasigui suggests the propriety of abandoning, as alien to Iloko grammar, the Latin nomenclature for these relations, and to establish the latter according to the facts furnished by the Iloko language itself. It is to be regretted that the professor did not carry out his idea, but built up his scheme with the same five Latin cases used by his partner in the debate. His insinuation is, however, clearly fundamental to the whole discussion, and being, moreover, of interest for the preparation of grammars of Philippine languages in general, we shall occupy ourselves with it in the first line.

§ 2.—The Latin term 'casus', English 'case', is a translation of the Greek term 'ptosis', meaning 'fall'. The latter was used by Aristotle to designate the particular form which a word may adopt in the sentence under given circumstances, and it was chosen probably as a simile taken from the dice which, in falling, presents now this, now that other aspect. The restriction of its use to the inflected forms precisely of the noun, participle, article, and pronoun, goes back to the Stoics, to whose school is due also the distinction of the nominative as what the Romans called 'casus rectus', or 'straight case', from the other cases as 'casus obliqui', or oblique cases, again a simile taken from some such idea as that of a peg standing either straight or at different angles inclined on a level basis. (1)

Used thus originally mainly for the variable inflectional terminations of the Latin noun, etc., the term 'casus', 'case', was later used to denote generally the syntactical relations of substantial parts of the sentence even in those languages that do not, or only incompletely, inflect their nouns and rely, for the indication of case relations, mainly or solely, on auxiliary words (prepositions, postpositions) or on a certain order of words. (2) Bearing this in mind, one is inclined to agree with Panlasigui in disapproving the indiscriminate application of the Latin case system to languages of such fundamentally different structure

(1) Cf. Delbrueck, B.—'Einleitung in das Studium der indogermanischen Sprachen (Leipzig, 5 Aufl., 1908) and other authors.

(2) The essence of a 'case' being, then, the indication of a syntactical relation, it is clear that the vocative can not properly be called a case, as it stands outside the interdependence of the words forming a sentence.

as those of the Philippines. The proper proceeding would be to investigate the latter upon the number and nature of the corresponding relations naturally contained in them, and to record these under appropriate terms. It requires, indeed, but little reflection to convince one's self that, just as the Latin case system reflected facts peculiar to that ancient language, and as English grammarians have set up such other cases as they deemed befitting the particular forms of their language, so also should the relations of the quite differently formed Philippine languages be established in conformity with their typical structure. For a beginning we may well ask how the Latin cases were originally introduced into the grammars of Philippine languages.

§ 3.—One answer to this question is given in very plain terms by P. Francisco Lopez († about 1631), the original author of the 'Arte de la lengua iloca' (first edition of 1627), a work which was later (in 1793) edited by the same P. Carro whom Mr. Crisologo justly praises. P. Lopez says in the prologue to his work:

"Aunque el idioma de estas lenguas es muy diferente de el de la lengua latina: con todo eso, en cuanto fuere posible, nos conformaremos con el método de el Arte de Antonio de Nebrija, por ser él por donde los más de los Religiosos que vienen a estas Islas han estudiado el latin. Y así hallarán mas claridad y facilidad en aprender esta lengua." (Third ed., Malabon 1895, p. XIII).

This shows that a presentation of the Iloko language according to the model of the Latin grammar was even in those ancient times felt by this excellent exponent of Iloko to be improper, and to require a justification thru the statement that it was considered best adapted to the understanding of the Latin-bred Spanish missionaries for whom the work in question was written. Since then, and for similar and other reasons, the Latin model has been holding sway in Philippine grammars in general until the advent of the Americans, when the influence of English grammar began to make itself felt. Thus, for instance, Mamerto Paglinawan in his 'Gramatikang Tagalog' (Maynila 1910) establishes the three cases *Pangtukoy*, *Pang-ari*, and *Panglayon*, terms corresponding in meaning with the nominative, possessive, and objective of English grammar.

§ 4.—As already indicated above, the natural way to register the syntactical relations formed with *ti* and *iti* would be to order them in accordance with Iloko sentence construction itself. To avoid, however, in so doing an unnecessary and confusing particularization, and to proceed with carefully attention to the common grammatical outline of the whole closely connected family of Philippine languages, we institute a comparison with at least two sister languages, Tagalog and Pangasinán. This comparison will bring out more clearly the facts of the Iloko language and will enable us to recognize them either as peculiar to the latter, or as typical also of other members of the family. We do not pretend to deal in this brief survey with every grammatical question involved, nor with all syntactical relations to be found in Iloko and congeners, but attempt only to bring together for comparison the main features bearing on the use of *ti* and *iti*.

THE RELATION OF THE SUBJECT AND PREDICATE

§ 5.—In Tagalog, the subject of the simple declarative sentence may, generally speaking and subject to rhetorical reasons such as emphasis, either precede or follow the predicate, two possible positions which, representing 'subject' by S and 'predicate' by P, we shall hereafter briefly refer to by the symbols SP and PS respectively. The statement 'My house is small' can take in Tagalog either the form:

Ang bahay koy maliit (SP) or: Maliit ang bahay ko (PS).

'My friend is a soldier' may be

Ang kaybigan koy sundalo (SP) or: Sundalo ang kaybigan ko (PS).

'My child is writing' is:

Ang anak koy sumusulat (SP) or: Sumusulat ang anak ko (PS) (1)

In these sentences the subject is seen preceded, in either position, by the particle *ang*, with the particularity, however, that in the SP construction the subject is followed by a particle which, in the examples, appears after vowels as an enclitic *y*, while after

(1) In order to be concise, we shall not dwell here, or hereafter, on the precise rhetorical difference between the two types of construction.

consonants it has, with certain exceptions, the fuller form *ay*. This particle, which coincides in position with the English and Spanish copulas, may be compared, in its effect, to these asserting links; it furnishes, at the same time, a mark distinguishing the anteposed subject from the predicate. Such a distinction does not appear very essential in sentences like those given above, where the subject is set off in a natural way from the predicate by the indefinite sense of the descriptive terms used as predicates. (1) The importance of *ay* for the service indicated becomes, however, more marked in sentences in which subject and predicate are equally definite, or nearly so. This is seen if, using the property of *ang* to give objectivity to the term to which it is anteposed, we convert the predicates of the examples already used into definite expressions, thus:

SP

PS

Ang bahay koy ang maliit	Ang maliit ang bahay ko
Ang kaybigan koy ang sundalo	Ang sundalo ang kaybigan ko
Ang anak koy ang sumusulat	Ang sumusulat ang anak ko

meaning 'My house is the small one', 'My friend is the soldier', and 'My child is the one writing' (or 'the writer'). In the SP group of these examples the particle *y* (*ay*) after the first member of the sentence indicates this as the subject, while in the PS group its absence after that member betrays this as the anteposed predicate. Summing up, we have, then, *ang* followed after the noun by *ay* as signs of the anteposed subject, and *ang* without that addition marking the postponed subject, as also the definite predicative in any position. For the rest it must be remarked that the reversing of the positions of subjects and predicate is possible whenever an indefinite predicative is used, but not necessarily always with a definite one.

§ 6.—The construction of the simple declarative sentence in Pangasinan shows, with certain modifications, the same fundamental traits just found in Tagalog, namely, first, the possibi-

(1) *Sumusulat* is not a finite verb like English 'writes' but may be compared to a participial form. By 'predicative' is to be understood the term forming the kernel of the predication apart from any other element making up the predicate.

lity of placing the subject before or after the predicate, an alternative existing in Pangasinán, however, only if the predicative is indefinite; and second, the special characterization of the anteponed subject. To show this in detail, the same three sentences already used for Tagalog may do service here again:

PS

Say abúng ko, mœlág (1)
Say kaarok, sundalo
Say anák ko, mansulat

PS

Mœlág so abúng ko
Sundaloy kaarok
Mansulat so anák ko

It is seen that, while the Tagalog anteponed subject was emphasized with *ang* and following *ay*, Pangasinán uses for the same object the single particle *say*, apparently a combination of the general Philippine demonstrative *sa* with *y* (1). There is, besides, between subject and predicate, a more or less perceptible break in the voice, which is indicated above by a comma. The postponed subject is seen pointed out by a particle which, when following a consonant, is *so*, when following a vowel, an enclitic *y*; (2) of these two particles *so* is recognized as a demonstrative by comparison of its occurrence in other Philippine languages, while enclitic *y* is evidently identical with the second element of the compound particle *say* just analyzed, a compound which thus appears as an emphatic strengthening of simple *y*.

§ 7.—After the example of Tagalog, which uses the definite predicative preceded by *ang* as well before as after the subject (cf. § 5), one might expect to find the same also in Pangasinán. This is, however, only partly the case: Pangasinán uses the two particles *so* and *y* just mentioned also before definite predicatives, but predicates so formed can only stand after the subject, not, as in Tagalog, before it. Pangasinán says:

Say abúng koy mœlág
Say kaarok so sundalo
Say anák ko so mansulat

My house is the small one
My friend is the soldier
My child is the one writing

(1) The symbol œ is used to denote a sound resembling the mixed vowel in Ferman 'Toechter', French 'peur', approximately the 'u' in English 'fur'.

(2) After vowels also *so* is sometimes used, while after consonants *so* alone is permissible. 'Enclitic' is a short unstressed word joined to a preceding word.

but the definite predicatives preceded by *so* or *y* can not take the first place. An exchange of position would mean the formation of a new sentence in which the former predicate becomes the subject: *Say moelág so abúng ko*, etc. We have thus in Pangasinán *say* as the distinctive sign of the anteposed subject, and *so* and *y* as particles pointing out both the postponed subject and the definite predicative which follows the subject.

§ 8.—If the fundamental traits of sentence construction in Tagalog are found modified to a certain extent in Pangasinán in colloquial Iloko they present a difference which would seem to be caused by the abandonment of a former, theoretically more perfect construction. In translating into this language the same three sentences that have served all along as examples, we follow that colloquial usage which appears to be the prevailing one to-day, and in which also the two debaters quoted in the introduction fully agree, namely the use of *ti* for the 'nominative'

SP

Ti baláy ko, bassít
Ti gayyém ko, soldado
Ti anák ko, agsurat (1)

PS

Bassít ti baláy ko
Soldado ti gayyém ko
Agsurat ti anák ko

There is seen here the same reversibility of subject and indefinite predicate as in Tagalog and Pangasinán, likewise the more or less perceptible break in the voice which in Pangasinán separates the anteposed subject from that predicate. On the other hand, we miss the distinction of the anteposed subject by a special particle which characterizes those other two languages. This distinction is lost in the Iloko sentences given above by the uniform use of the particle *ti* before both anteposed and postponed subjects.

§ 9.—To judge from ancient works written in and on the Iloko, the shortcoming just pointed out has not always been found in this language. From such sources it would appear that *ti* was formerly used for the subject only when in postposition, while in anteposition it was preceded by *ití*, a demonstrative of

(1) Another construction which places the particle *ket* between subject and predicate: *Ti baláy ko ket bassít*, is mentioned by us here but in passing as being only of limited use.

greater emphasis than simple *ti* on which it is built with *i*, similarly as Pangasinán *say* is built on *i* with *sa*. (To Ilk. *iti* is to be compared Pampanga *iti*, this.) We support our statement regarding the former general distinction of the anteposed subject by *iti* with a quotation from P. Lopez' 'Arte de la lengua iloca' a work first published in 1627 and to which "the most and the best" was contributed, on the author's own testimony, by the blind Don Pedro Bukaneg, the first Iloko poet and linguist known to history. From page 3 of the third edition (Malabón, 1895) we translate:

"As is seen from the preceding declension, the article *iti* or *ti* etc. is the equivalent of our article 'el, la, lo' etc. What is to be noted regarding the difference of using *iti* or *ti* in the nominative of the singular, and of *daguti* or *ti* in the same case of the plural, is that *iti*, *daguti*, serve for being anteposed to the noun, and *ti* of both numbers for being postponed. Example: *Iti tao ti nangrona nga inaramid ti Dios iti rabáo ti dagó*, Man is the chief work of God on the surface of the earth... The anteposed *iti*, *daguti*, do not signify any more than 'el, la, los, las'. But the postponed *ti* includes the substantive verb [English 'to be'], so that in this sentence: *siac ti nangicabil*, I am he who put it, the *ti* signifies: 'am he who'... *ti* serving as much for the singular as for the plural."

Since the authenticity of this quotation might be doubted on account of the repeated editing which the source from which it is taken has experienced, we add another example taken from the same author's 'Doctrina cristiana' of the year 1621, generally known as 'el Belarmino del P. Lopez', a work which had likewise the cooperation of a Bukaneg, and is of indubitable legitimacy for having been handed down in the form of the same ancient Tagalog characters in which it was first printed. From the reproduction of this text to be found in Villamor 'La antigua escritura filipina' (Manila 1922) we quote: "*Iti apo a Dios adda kenka*" (p. 47), The Lord God is with thee. To show also the use for the postponed subject of *ti* from the same sources, we cite:

"Sadi Manila ti dinaclác", Manila is the place where I grew up,
(Arte, p. 179)

"Bendita met ti bunga ti tian mo" Blessed also is the fruit of thy
womb (Belarmino, *ibid.* p. 47)

§ 10.—In treating of the Tagalog sentence it was already pointed out (§ 5) that the importance of having a special particle for the anteposed subject is felt not so much in sentences with indefinite predicatives, since the subject, representing always something special, is thereby naturally set off from the indefinite sense of the descriptive terms used as predicatives, but that such special sign for the anteposed subject showed its value in cases where subject and predicate are more or less equally determinate. This was most clearly seen in Pangasinán, where a sentence like: *Say kaarok so sundalo*, 'My friend is the soldier', can, thru the difference between *say* and *so*, leave no doubt whatever about which is the subject, which the predicate. Modern colloquial Iloko is in this regard less discriminating. Applying the particle *ti*, already treated in the preceding paragraphs, also to a definite predicative in the three examples used in § 8, a type of sentence arises which if, the sense depended solely upon the particles employed—which is, of course, not the case—would fall very much short of the clear-cut Pangasinán construction just illustrated:

Ti baláy ko ti bassít

Ti gayyém ko ti soldado (same meanings as given before in § 7)

Ti ának ko ti agsurat

Examples of colloquial Iloko built after this pattern may be found in the 'Gramatica hispano-ilocana' by P. José Naves (sec. ed., Tambobong, 1892) a work that served as a basis for 'A study of the Iloko language's by Henry Swift, Major and Chaplain, 13th U. S. Infantry, (Washington 1909); we quote:

"Asin ti manaoat iti arac? Quien pide vino?—Ti cocinero ti nanaoat; Lo pidió el cocinero" (p. 147) (1)

"Adu ti aglaco iti capas iti ili itoy? Hay muchos vendedores de algodón en este pueblo?"—Ti adda ditoy, ti adu a managsugsugal; Lo que hay aquí son muchos jugadores" (p. 388)

"Asin ti agsurat? Quién (las) escribe?—Ti ubingco ti agsurat; (Las) escribe mi muchacho" (p. 368).

P. Naves gives the Iloko equivalent of the Spanish articles

(1) For *manaoat* and *nanaoat* the correct forms are *dumawat*, and *dimmawat*.

"el, la, lo," as "*iti, ó ti*". A careful study of his examples, the greater part of which are from the conversational language, would indicate that *iti* is mostly used when the subject is not only anteposed but receives an emphasis thru denoting somebody or something that is singled out from among a number, class, or generality of persons or objects; e. g.

"Adinno cadaguitoy ti cal-logongmo?" Which of these is your hat?—"Iti purao nga adda iti rabao ti lamisaan, The white one that is on the table. (p.84)

"Asinodanto?" Who will they be?—Iti maysa ti anac ti capitan pasado a ni Don Antonio; iti maysa ti anac ni balo a ni Doña Maria. The one is the child of ex-Capitan Don Antonio; the other is the child of the widow Doña María. (p. 381).

A similar explanation holds good for the employment of *iti* at the head of sentences beginning in English with 'He who' or 'That which':

Iti nagagét, rumang-ay, He who is diligent will prosper
Iti saan mo a kanen, baybay-aam a lutuen, That which
you are not going to eat, need not trouble you cooking
it.

§ 11.—Turning now our attention more especially to the form which sentences with definite predicatives take in the literary language, we believe we can distinguish two different types of which we take up in the first line that which appears to be the older one. There exists in Iloko an ancient work the precise age of which we are unable to give, but which, thru the beauty and wealth no less than thru the solemnity of its language, is to this day the delight of every Iloko who still preserves regard and affection for his mother-tongue; this is the 'Biag da Apotayo Jesus' or 'Pasió', a poem based on a Tagalog text and translated into Iloko by an unnamed native of the town of Baták in Ilokos Norte; it gives the history of the passion of Christ, and is sung, the same as corresponding versions in almost all provinces of the Philippines, in the homes of all good catholics during Lent. The Tagalog original is the vastly popular *Kasaysayan nang pasióng mahál*, or, briefly, 'Pasió', which had its beginning in a poem published in 1704 by Don Gaspar

Aguino de Belén (cf. 'Literatura tagala' by Epifanio de los Santos, Madrid 1909, p. 11 and 16). In the Iloko version mentioned (edition of 1920, Manila) we find such sentences as:

"Iti Dios ti nagbalicas" (p. 8), The Lord has spoken

"Iti Dios ti agaluad quenca" (p. 19), The Lord will protect you

"Iti esposom a napaypayso ti Dios Espiritu Santo" (p. 19),
Thy true spouse is the Holy Ghost

which, thru the difference of the particle *iti*, introducing the subject, from *ti*, marking the predicative, are no less explicit than the Pangasinán constructions with *say* and *so* above mentioned. Occasionally the subject is found still further set off from the predicate by an added demonstrative particle of predicative force, *isú*, thus:

"Iti Dios Ama isu ti palungo" (p. 7), The God Father is the head (1)

§ 12.—The second of the two types of literary construction mentioned above, while it makes use of the one particle *ti* for both subject and predicate, yet distinguishes the former by the particle *isú* just mentioned, placing it after the subject as Tagalog does with the particle *ay*. (*Isú*, also written *isó*, is clearly a combination of the two demonstratives *i* and *so*, the latter identical with Pangasinán *so*; *isú* is a pronominal particle with predicative force and stands for such expressions as 'that is', 'he is', etc). This type of construction which represents the best modern use, we illustrate by examples taken from an important work of which the courtesy of the author has placed a copy in our hands. We quote from Santiago A. Fonacier's translation into Iloko of J. Rizal's 'Noli me tangere' ('La Lucha', Manila) the following sentences which we accompany with the corresponding Spanish version of Rizal's original:

"Ti San Diego iso ti ili a kaayayuna unay" (I, p. 36), San Diego era el pueblo favorito suyo

"Ti panagbayad iso ti nangnangruna" (I, p. 44), Pagar es lo primero

(1) The correct form of *palungo* is stated to be *pangulo*.

"Di dakkal mo iso ti kababaknangan iti pangukuman" (I, p. 28), Tu padre era el mas rico de la provincia

"Di pirak na iso ti mangilualo ken kuana" (I, p. 37), Su oro oraba por él (1)

§ 13.—The placing of the definite predicate before the subject, as found in Tagalog (cf. § 5), seems to be as little possible in Iloko as in Pangasinán. Like the latter language, Iloko can, of course, form a sentence in which the two parts exchange, with their places, also their roles as subject and predicate.

THE ASSOCIATIVE RELATION

§ 14.—When modifying the sense of a common noun by another such noun, the Tagalog places the determining word as a rule after the one to be determined; if the first ends in a vowel, an *n* or a glottal stop, the two words are connected, in each case in a certain way, by a connective particle or so-called 'ligature', the velar nasal *ng*. Thus from *pintô* 'door' and *simbahan* 'church' is formed the compound word *pintóng simbahan* 'church door'. If the two nouns are not to picture one individual object, as in the example just quoted, but are to be associated so as to represent the contents of each noun as subsisting substantially by itself, in that case the place of the connective *ng* is taken by the particle *nang*, giving, in the case cited, the phrase *pinto nang simbahan*, 'door of a church' (or: 'of the church'). The characteristic formal features of this association of two nouns are, then, the position of the determining noun after the more general term, and their connection by intervening *nang* (2).

§ 15.—Upon examination of a greater number of similar cases of employment of *nang*, the relation established by it is found as of such vague and comprehensive significance that

(1) The weaker form *dí* for *tí* indicates past time; *dí amám*, thy late father; *isó tí* often becomes *isót*.

(2) This combination is termed here only tentatively 'the associative relation'. For the moment we are not so much concerned with the names as with the nature and extension of the syntactical relations investigated, and may leave it to future more comprehensive studies to bestow upon them the most appropriate terms.

within its generally associative scope there can be distinguished a variety of special categories of meaning; these latter do not, however, arise from any special particle or word-form employed, but from the intrinsic meaning of the associated nouns themselves. The following table gives a view of a number of such special classes of meaning in the form of some Tagalog phrases taken mainly from Rizal's translation of Schiller's 'Tell':

1. Ang tahanan nang empera- dór	The emperor's palace
2. Ang lahi nang dragón	The dragon's brood
3. Ang bitwin nang matá	The pupil ('star') of the eye
4. Ang ginawa nang amá	The work done by the father
5. Ang nagnakaw nang aking mana	The robber of my heritage (1)
6. Lumayó nang malayò	Remove far away

From the first five of these examples can be gathered the following facts: a) the relation between the terms of each pair of words is characterized by two features, namely, by the postposition of the determining word to the one to be determined, and by the interposition of the connecting particle *nang*; b) this outward arrangement, which is exactly the same in all examples, comprehends the following special categories which arise thru the intrinsic meaning of each pair of words:

1. the relation of the thing possessed to the possessor
2. that of the offspring to the generator
3. that of the part to the whole
4. that of the object to the agent
5. that of the agent to the object

and, sixthly, a relation which, in English, is that of the verb to the adverb, while Tagalog treats the complement of the indefinite verbal form *lumayó* like any of the other nouns. For the rest it should be remarked that the relation between *lumayó* and *nang malayò* is a less close one than that of the other examples on account of the possibility to refer the indefinite expression

(1) Or: 'The one who has robbed my heritage'.

lumáyó first, by noun or pronoun, to an agent, as for instance in: *Lumáyó kayó nang malayó*, Remove you far away.

§ 16.—In Pangasinán the examples just quoted take the following form:

- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Say palasyoy emperadór | 4. Say ginaway amá |
| 2. Say kapututan na dragon | 5. Say nantakœw na tawir ko |
| 3. Say ugaw-ugaw na matá | 6. Alis kayoy arawi |

It is seen here that also in Pangasinán the associative relation is characterized by the postposition of the determining noun, and that it includes the same variety of special categories of meaning just found in Tagalog. The relational particle, however, is not the same in all cases; when following a consonant it is *na*, a group of sounds containing, like Tagalog *nang*, the initial sound *n*, a general Indonesian connective particle characteristic of the genitival relation, and recurring in such Tagalog words as *ni*, *nina*, *namin*, *natin*, *ninyo*, *nito*, associative forms of *si*, *sina*, *amin*, *atin*, *inyo*, *ito*. Where, on the other hand, the first term of the phrase ends in a vowel, this connective sound is absent and the relational particle is the same enclitic *y* (*i*) which was seen in § 6 to point out, likewise after vowels, the postponed subject and the definite predicative.

§ 17.—The combination of nouns treated in the preceding two paragraphs for Tagalog and Pangasinán is in Iloko as unsettled in form as is the subject-predicate relation. Reserving the treatment of a divergent construction for the next paragraph, we begin by rendering the examples already used in a certain form of colloquial Iloko:

- | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Ti palasyo ti emperadór | 4. Ti inaramid ti amá |
| 2. Ti kapututan ti dragón | 5. Ti nagtakaw ti tawid ko |
| 3. Ti tao-tao ti matá | 6. Umadayo ti adayo |

The first thing in this table to strike the attention is the fact that a certain indifference towards the characteristic connective particle *n* shown for Pangasinán in the last paragraph is carried here to the point of entirely dispensing with this connective, and having in its stead recourse to the same demonstrative particle *ti* which was shown to do service in the subject—predi-

cate relation. The only distinctive feature of the associative relation in this table that is shared by Iloko with the two other languages compared is the postposition of the determining noun. The abandonment of *n* by Iloko in the present case is the more notable as this connective sound enters to a considerable extent into the formation of the genitival relation in the mountain dialects bordering on Iloko in the east, as well as in Ibanag, Batán, and Philippine languages elsewhere. True that also Iloko has preserved it in the form *ni* of the personal article *si*, tho here again with disregard of its connective character, since *ni* is used in Iloko also as personal article in the nominative.

§ 18.—The most notable divergence from the syntactical arrangement shown in above table is that which retains *ti* for the examples No. 1 to 4, but replaces it in No. 5 and 6 by *iti*. A study of the best sources accessible to us leads us to believe that the resultant construction, viz. *Ti nagtakaw iti tawid ko* and *Umadayo iti adayo* (for *ti tawid ko* and *ti adayo* respectively), rather than a vacillation in the use of the particle concerned, is really the regular observance of a grammatical distinction presently to be explained, a distinction not made in Tagalog, where *nang* was found used in all examples, nor in Pangasinán, where *na* is changed to *y* only in observance of a phonetic rule.

In § 9 there was already cited the associative phrase from Belarmino "*ti bunga ti tian mo*", the fruit of thy womb; we quote further:

- "saan á aramid ti tao", not work of man (Pasi6n, p. 19)
- "angel ti Dios", the angel of God (ibid., p. 19)
- "iti basol ti sangalubungan", the world's sin (ibid., p. 19)
- "ti kaawan ti anak", the lack of children (Fonacier, Noli, p. 45)
- "ukis ti lasona", skin of onion (ibid., p. 46)
- "ti aldaw ti pammati", the days of faith (ibid., p. 19)

In these examples, to which could be added similar ones from P. Lopez grammar, *ti* is used to form the associative relation after ordinary nouns. From the same sources the use of this *ti* can be shown also after those verbal nouns which the opportunism of the old Spanish grammars used to call 'pasivas', and of which there occurs in our table the one example *ti inaramid ti*

amá, 'the finished work of the father'. In exchange, the construction with *iti* is in those sources reserved to verbal forms having an active signification, such as precisely to derivatives with *ag*—(perfect *nag*—) and *um*—(perfect *imm*—) of which examples are given in No. 5 and 6 of the table. We quote:

"*ta agbuybuyat iti mulmula*", to contemplate the plants (Pasi6n, p. 11)

"*Apaya a dica pumuros a mangala iti bunga?*", Why don't you reach forth to pick a fruit? (ibid., p. 11)

"*Bimalikaskay iti maysa a sao a nangriing iti gagar ko*", Vd. ha pronunciado una palabra que llama todo mi inter6s (Fonacier, Noli, p. 13)

"*Iti agarámid iti naimbag a arámid*", El que hace buenas obras (Lopez, Gr., p. 35)

"*Asin ti agluto iti canén?*", Qui6n cuece la comida? (Naves, p. 103)

Referring again to our examples 5 and 6, it would thus seem that in their construction with the emphatically pointing *iti* instead of simple *ti* not only is the complement of *umadayo* looked upon—and very plausibly—as the direction in which the removing takes place, but also the complement of *ti nagtakaw*, viz. the direct object, as the aim of the stealer. Accepting this view, those two examples, as in general the construction represented by them, would have to be assigned to the demonstrative relation to be treated by us in the next chapter. If, on the other hand, that use of the language were to prevail which employs the particle *ti* for the case in question, then the two examples would stay with the first four under the associative relation. Merely for the sake of greater clearness, we shall follow in our exposition this latter plan. (1) For the rest, the fact that Iloko should have in use

(1) *Umadayo* in Ilk., like the corresponding indefinite terms in Tag. and Fang., can first be referred to a person, as for instance in *Umadayo ni Juan ti* (or: *iti*) *adayo*. 'John is removing far away'. Note also that derivatives with *ag*—, as those with *um*—, may designate not only a person executing the action indicated by the radical word or stem, and thus be 'nomina agentis', but also the action itself, being then 'nomina actionis'. Compare: "*Asin ti agsurat kadaguiti sursuratmo?* Quien escribe tus cartas?" (Naves, Gr., p. 104) with: "*Napaguél unay a arámid ti agsurat*, Trabajosa obra es el escribir" (Lopez, Gr., p. 5) where *ti agsurat* means first 'the writer' and then 'the act of writing'. In either case it is followed by either *iti* or *ti*.

two constructions to express what is really the same relation, tho looked at under different angles, namely the employment by some speakers of *ti* by others of *iti* for connecting the complement with the preceding active verbal form, finds its counterpart in a similar phenomenon in Tagalog syntax; in this language possession is most often expressed with the help, as was seen, of associative *nang*, as for instance in *ang bahay nang kapitán*, 'the kapitán's house', while at the same time possession is expressed quite as correctly, tho less frequently, by the use of demonstrative *sa* and connective *ng*, thus: *ang sa kapitáng bahay*. The serious difference is, of course, that, while the whole scheme of syntactical relations is in Tagalog singularly clear, thanks to the greater variety of the particles employed in it, in Iloko the grammatical rule which we believe to have laid bare above, coincides with the general confusion regarding the use of the two particles *ti* and *iti*.

§ 19.—In order to form a judgment regarding the applicability of the Spanish case system, together with its Latin nomenclature, to the associative relation established in the foregoing for three Philippine languages, we compare the vernacular versions of our examples with their renderings in Spanish. Professor Panlasigui was perfectly right in pointing out the error of believing that Spanish and Philippine languages differ only in lexicon, and that their grammars can be covered by one and the same system. Still, the circumstance that Spanish, while it has taken over the case denominations originally attaching to the varying inflectional terminations of the Latin noun, was not born from this classical Latin, but from the so-called 'lingua latina rustica' which was already substituting prepositions to those terminations, this circumstance, we say, has brought it about that Spanish, similar to Philippine languages, uses for its case distinctions prepositional particles, with the frequent—tho not constant—exception of the accusative, the case of the direct object of action. In making now the proposed comparison, we find that the Spanish versions of the first three of our examples, viz. 'el palacio del emperadór', 'la casta del dragón', and 'la niña del ojo' use the genitival particle 'de', contracted with the article 'el', in a similar manner as the three Philippine languages use their *nang*, *na* (*y*) and *ti* respectively. Due to the nominal nature

of their verb forms, these languages continue the use of the same particles also in the three last examples, maintaining thus the identical syntactical relation where Spanish may vary its cases in accordance with the precise rendering chosen. The fourth example we may translate with 'la obra del padre', using again a genitival turn, or with 'lo hecho por el padre', employing the ablative, a case which, as we shall see in the next chapter, is not distinguished in the Philippine languages. A comparative examination of the vernacular for example No. 5 'The stealer of my heritage' gives this result: whether we use in the translation of the Philippine expressions the substantival form 'el estafador' or the more verbal one 'el que estafó', obtaining in the first case the genitival phrase 'el estafador de mi herencia', and in the second the accusative one 'el que estafó mi herencia', the Philippine languages have for these Spanish cases one single equivalent, viz. the associative relation:

Tag. Ang nagnakaw nang aking mana

Pang. Say nantakœw na tawir ko

Ilk. Ti nagtakaw ti tawid ko

a relation which remains the same if the verbal noun is used in its indefinite form in such sentences as:

Tag. Nagnakaw si Juan nang bigás

Pang. Nantakœw si Juan na bœlås

Ilk. Nagtakaw ni Juan ti bagás

John has stolen rice

(Past-stealer John
of rice)

The sixth example finds an almost literal rendering in Spanish by 'Apartese á lo lejos!' with the difference that the corresponding Philippine verbal forms, Tag. *lumayó*, Pang. *alis*, Ilk. *umadayo*, are not finite verbs, that is, do not, like Spanish 'apartese', express a grammatical person, but are more of the character of participles. The Spanish adverbial locution 'á lo lejos', on the other hand, accords with the Philippine equivalents thru its substantival treatment of the adverb 'lejos', far, and more especially with the Iloko phrase *iti adayo*, an instance of the demonstrative relation which we are now going to discuss.

THE DEMONSTRATIVE RELATION

§ 20.—In discussing the associative relation it was pointed out that Tagalog, and for a part also Pangasinán, form this relation with connective particles, while Pangasinán for another part, and Iloko use for it demonstratives. Under the title chosen for this paper we have to discuss yet a third relation for which all three languages compared employ pointing particles, and which we shall accordingly call the demonstrative relation, a term that has already been used for the identical relation in Tagalog by I. Evangelista in his 'Balarilang Pilipino' (Maynila, 1923) in the form of 'Pagtuturó'. We are, however, making again only a tentative use of this designation until more comprehensive comparative studies of Philippine syntax will justify the adoption of a definite terminology.

§ 21.—In the last group of examples of the preceding chapter, beginning with Tag. *Nagnakaw si Juan nang bigás*, the direct object of action (Tag. *bigás*, rice) is connected with the verbal form (Tag. *nagnakaw*, has-been-stealer) by the particle *nang* in Tag., *na* in Pang., and *ti* in Ilk. Another determinant of the action, not as essential as the direct object and standing thus in a wider relation to the verbal form, is added by pointing out the place of the occurrence, thus:

Tag. <i>Nagnakaw si Juan nang bigás sa talipapâ</i>	} John has stolen rice on the market
Pang. <i>Nantakœw si Juan na boelás œed tindaan</i>	
Ilk. <i>Nagtakaw ni Juan ti bagás ití tindaan</i>	

in which examples Tagalog and Pangasinán use for this local relation the special particles *sa* and *œed* respectively, of which the latter appears after vowels as an enclitic 'd', while Iloko has recourse to the same compound demonstrative *ití* with which the older language emphasized the anteposed subject and which is also to-day so used by a part of the speakers.

§ 22.—The particles forming this demonstrative relation are not restricted to pointing to a place. In § 18 the possible

existence in *Ilk.* of a rule was mentioned according to which the direct object of that action which is expressed by certain 'nomina agentis' or 'nomina actionis' is pointed out with the help of the demonstrative *iti*. Of other uses there may be mentioned that which makes them indicate time, as in:

Tag. buhat sa lunes hanggang sa sabado	}	from Monday un- til Saturday
Pang. manlapú'd lunes angga'd sabado		
Ilk. manipud ití lunes manungpal ití sabado		
bado		

or indicate the indirect object of action, as in:

Tag. Ibinigay ko sa batà	}	I gave it to the child ('Given-object mine to the child')
Pang. Intéd ko'd ugaw		
Ilk. Intéd ko ití ubing		

§ 23.—When sentences containing these particles are translated into Spanish, it is found that one single Philippine particle covers the sense of a number of Spanish prepositions varying in significance, and varying also in the cases which they stand for. If we compare, for instance,:

Tag. Ang paparoon sa bahay	}	with: 'El que va á una casa'
Pang. Say onla'd abúng		
Ilk. Ti mapán ití baláy		
Tag. Ang nanggaling sa bahay	}	with: 'El que ha venido de casa'
Pang. Say nanlapu'd abúng		
Ilk. Ti naggapó ití baláy		
Tag. Ang tumitirá sa bahay	}	with: 'El que vive en una casa'
Pang. Say manaayam æd abúng		
Ilk. Ti mapán ití baláy		

it can be seen that Tag. *sa*, Pang. *æd*, and Ilk. *iti* comprehend each the meaning of the three Spanish prepositions 'á, de, en'. By multiplying the examples it can be shown that the same Philippine particles, due to their comprehensiveness, represent likewise such other Spanish prepositions as 'para, por, con' etc. Since, now, Spanish 'á' in above example, and so also 'para', stand for the dative, while 'de, en' as used above, and further 'por, con', etc. always precede the ablative, it becomes clear that those two Span-

ish cases, dative and ablative, are not distinguished in the Philippine languages compared, but are represented by one single relation, called here by us the demonstrative relation.

§ 24.—The convenience to reserve in Iloko the particle *iti* for the demonstrative relation, leaving the associative function to *ti*, is shown by the following example. In Spanish a genitival phrase like 'el amor de Dios', taken by itself, is ambiguous, inasmuch as it may mean as well the love of God for us, as also our love for God, for which reason grammarians have distinguished the first meaning as a 'subjective genitive' (God, subject of loving) from the second as an 'objective genitive' (God, object of love.) In this point Philippine languages are, as a rule, more discriminating. In:

Tag. Ang pagibig nang Dios

Pang. Say aróy Dios (or: Say aró na Dios)

we have the associative relation, with Tag. *nang*, Pang. *y* or *na* expressing, in conjunction with postposition of the determining noun, the intimate association of the two thought contents, i. e. the immanence of the love in God, while in:

Tag. Ang pagibig sa Dios

Pang. Say aró'd Dios

the relation appears to be viewed, in comparison to the former, as a wider one, its expression calling not so much for a connective as for a pointing particle: the love directed towards God. The same clear distinction as in these sister languages will subsist in Iloko as long as *ti* and *iti* respectively are used as above indicated, viz.

Ti ayat ti Dios, God's love for us

Ti ayat iti Dios, Our love towards God

but it would disappear, and the same ambiguity as in Spanish would arise, if *iti* were used for both relations.

§ 25.—While Tagalog and Pangasinán employ for the demonstrative relation only the particles *sa* and *ad* respectively, Iloko counts for that object, beside the particle *iti*, with the supplementary *sadi*, a combination of the two widely used demonstratives *sa* (Tag. *sa*!) and *di*. Covering, like *sa*, *ad* and *iti*, the ideas of motion as well as of rest, *sadi* is strictly a locative particle, and mainly used with proper names of countries, towns, points of the compass, etc., as in: *Aditi sadi Manila*, '(He) is in Manila'; *Naggapó sadi Laoag*, '(He) has come from Laoag'; *Napán sadi*

langit, '(He) rose to the sky'. Theoretically considered, it would appear a pity that this eligible particle should not be given a more general use in relief of the sadly overburdened *iti*.

SUMMARY

§ 26.—The groundwork of Philippine syntax as represented in the foregoing discussion by some of the most elementary relations consists chiefly in the systematic grouping of nominal and pronominal forms, to the former of which belong also the verbs inasmuch as these are best compared to participles. The finite verb, the 'life-giving element' of the sentence in European languages, is lacking. (1) The predicative relation, as likewise the relations that arise upon an enlargement of the subject or predicate, are expressed mainly thru position and thru particles which latter may be loose, enclitic or affixed. Of these relations only three have been discussed in the foregoing chapters; another important one has only been touched upon incidentally at the beginning of § 14. (2) The characteristic points of the three relations discussed are summed up thus:

I. The Subject-Predicate Relation. In sentences with indefinite predicatives the order subject-predicate is—perhaps more often than not—reversed for the sake of emphasis. This is not the case in sentences with definite predicative, with the exception of Tagalog, where also predicatives of this latter kind are often transposed. A typical feature of the sentence-construction is the setting up of the anteposed subject by a special particle intended to prominently establish the topic of the following statement. Tho practiced also in Iloko, this principle seems to be partly neglected in the modern colloquial. While the postponed subject, as also the definite predicative, are marked by a monosyllabic particle (Tag. *ang*, Pang. *so* or *y*, Ilk. *ti*), the anteposed subject is raised into prominence either by a compound particle (Pang. *say*, Ilk. *iti*), or by the simple particle first men-

(1) Cf. O. Scheerer 'On the essential difference between the verbs of the European and the Philippine languages'. Sep. fr. Phil. Journ. o. Educ., VII, 4-5, (1924).

(2) This relation is treated in detail for a certain dialect in: O. Scheerer 'The particles of relation of the Isinai language', The Hague, 1918.

tioned, followed, after the noun, by a special particle of predicative force (Tag. *ang* with *ay*, Ilk. *ti* with *isú*).

II. The Associative Relation is marked by postposition of the determining noun, and by the special particle *nang* in Tagalog, and *na* in Pangasinán, the latter being replaced after vowels by *y*. Iloko has no other particle for this relation but the same *ti* (or *ití*) employed for the subject-predicate relation.

III. The Demonstrative Relation is formed in Tagalog with *sa*, in Pangasinan with *ad*, while Iloko has recourse again to *ití*.

§ 27.—It would appear, then, that the cause for the confusion in Iloko syntax denounced by Mr. Crisologo consists in that the number of particles in use by the language is not sufficient for making between its most elementary syntactic relations a similarly clear distinction as is made by Tagalog and Pangasinán thanks to their greater number of special signs. Still, while it is obvious that Iloko is in that respect handicapped in comparison to those two languages, this fact can hardly be considered solely responsible for the prevailing disharmony. When analyzing the sentence taken from the grammar of P. Lopez, approved probably by a Pedro Bukaneg, : "*Ití tao ti nangrona nga inaramid ti Dios ití rabáo ti dagá*", Man is the principal work of God on the face of the earth:

Ití tao: Anteposed subject pointed out by *ití*

ti nangrona nga inaramid: definite predicative introduced by *ti* and represented by two nominal forms connected by *nga*

inaramid ti Dios: associative relation expressed by postposition of the determining noun preceded by *ti*

ití rabáo: demonstrative relation expressed by *ití*

rabáo ti dagá: another instance of the associative relation,

we become inclined to believe that even the short number of particles now in use are sufficient for a clear distinction of the syntactical relations in question, provided they are given a strict and judicious systematic employment. To do away with the present disharmony, there would seem to be no other way than to come to an agreement, in the first line, as to a fixed rule of employment of the particles in question, and, next, the adoption of

that rule by all educated speakers, as well as by all popular and official agencies that are in a position to teach and to make common that standard by their precept and example.

§ 28.—We tender the expression of our gratitude for information given us on sundry specific points of this study to Senator S. Fonacier, as well as to Professor Gabriel Bernardo, Librarian, Professor Nicolas Zafra, Department of History, and Mr. Felizberto Viray, Seminar in Philippine Linguistics, University of the Philippines.

