

# SOME SOUND CORRESPONDENCES IN SIX PHILIPPINE LANGUAGES

By LEN NEWELL

SUMMER INSTITUTE OF LINGUISTICS  
University of North Dakota, 1953

1. Introduction. This paper is an attempt to present some rather familiar data on Philippine languages in a format which, it is hoped, may reveal at once the rigor and beauty of the comparative method in at least one of its aspects. The material has been organized so as to give as transparent as possible a presentation of data on a few Philippine languages for the purpose of illustrating the regularity of sound correspondences required to demonstrate a common parental phoneme. Vertical lines have been drawn to make the correspondences apparent at a glance, and in cases where irregular reflexes occur they have been boxed off to make them stand out. The lay reader may need to be reminded that the proto-phonemes chosen to represent the etymology of the correspondences should not be regarded as phonetic symbols but rather as formulae to indicate that the reflexes of the correspondences had a common origin.

2. Correspondences and their Proto-phonemes.

2.1. Vowel reflexes of proto-phoneme \*e. The following are a few cognates which illustrate the reflexes of what is commonly known as the "pepet" vowel.<sup>1</sup>

	<i>winnow</i>	<i>stand, erect</i>	<i>point, tip</i>	<i>sip, suck</i>	<i>starting pole</i>
Tag. <sup>2</sup>	tah   i   p	tind   í   g	t   i   n   i   k	s   i   ps   í   p	t   i   k   í   n
Ceb.	tah   ó   p	tind   o   g	t   u   n   ó   k	s   u   ps   o   p	t   o   k   ó   n
Ilk.	ta   e   p	tind   é   g	t   e   nn   é   k	s   e   ps   é   p	t   e   kk   é   n
Png.	ta   é   p	talind   é   g	t   e   n   é   k	s   e   ps   e   p	t   e   k   é   n
Han.	tah   ú   p	tind   ú   g	—   —   —   —   —	s   u   ps   ú   p	—   —   —   —   —
B Igt.	—   —   —	—   —   —	—   —   —   —   —	—   —   —   —   —	—   —   —   —   —

(1) See Conant, *The Pepet Law and "F" and "V" in Philippine Languages*, *Filippiniana* vol. 2, pg. 136f (Manila, 1938). We have not attempted to modify Dempwolff's conclusions in this paper. For more extensive data on some of the words cited, see his *Vergleichende Lautlehre des Australonesischen Wortschatzes* (Berlin 1938).

(2) The Sources of data for this comparison are:  
Tag. (Tagalog), J. P. Enriquez and M. O. Guzman, *English-Tagalog, Tagalog-English Vocabulary* (Manila, 1949); Institute of National Language, *A National Language-English Vocabulary* (Manila 1950).

	<i>burst</i>			<i>stick, adbere</i>			<i>bear</i>			<i>fatbom</i>			<i>six</i>				
Tag.	1	i	ták	d	i	k í t	d	i	ñg	í	g	d	i	pá	an	i	m
Ceb.	1	u	ták	d	u	k o t	d	u	ñg	o	g	d	u	pa	un	o	m
Ilk.	1	e	tták	d	e	kk é t	d	e	ñgñg	é	g	d	e	ppá	inn	é	m
Png.	1	e	ták	d	e	k e t	d	e	ñg	e	l	d	e	pá	an	é	m
Han.	—	—	—	d	u	k u t	d	u	n	ú	g	d	u	pá	—	—	—
B Igt.	—	—	—	—	—	—	ch	e	ng	e	k	—	—	—	—	—	—

	<i>recompense</i>			<i>plant</i>			<i>slave</i>			<i>brain</i>		
Tag.	bal	í	s	tan	í	m	alip	í	n	ut	a	k
Ceb.	bal	o	s	tan	o	m	ulip	o	n	ut	o	k
Ilk.	bal	e	s	tan	é	m	adip	e	n	ut	é	k
Png.	bal	é	s	tan	é	m	arip	é	n	ut	e	k
Han.	—	—	—	tan	ú	m	?alip	í	n	ut	u	k
B Igt.	—	—	—	itan	i	mko	—	—	—	ot	e	k

Attention is drawn to the fact that the reflexes are in descending order, *i, o*, (or *u*), *e, e, u, e*. It is this regularity of alternation in many different words which establishes these reflexes as descendants of a common parent phoneme (the *o/u* contrast in Cebuano is assumed—without proof—to be sub-phonemic). Since no phonemic analysis of Bontok Igorot was available for this study, it is impossible to state with confidence that the presence of *i* where *e* should normally have occurred in *itanimko* 'plant' is an irregular reflex. Phonemic analysis may prove the *i/e* contrast to be sub-phonemic. (On the other hand, it may be suggested that the irregular reflex *i* in Hanunoo ?*alipin* 'slave' is due to regressive assimilation to *i* of the preceding syllable.)

## 2.2. Consonant reflexes of Proto-phoneme \**h*.

	<i>shrimp</i>		<i>gulf</i>		<i>king</i>		<i>pestle</i>		<i>post</i>		<i>ladder</i>	
Tag.	h	ipon	h	igop	h	ari?	h	alo	h	aligi	h	agdán
Ceb.	h	ipon	h	igop	h	ari?	?al	h o	h	aligi	h	agdan
Ilk.	?	ipon	?	igop	?	ari	?al	? o	?	adigi	?	agdán
Png.	?	ipon	?	ilóp	?	ari	?	alo	—	—	—	—
Han.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
B Igt.	—	—	—	—	?	ali	?	alo	?	aliki	—	—

Ceb. (Cebuano), J. P. Enriquez, Jose A. Bautista and Francis J. Jamalangué Jr., *English-Tagalog-Visayan (Cebuano Ilongo) Vocabulary* (Manila 1949).

Ilk. (Ilocano), J. P. Enriquez and J. B. Quimba, *English-Tagalog, Ilocano Vocabulary* (Manila 1949).

PNG. (Pangasinan), P. J. Enriquez and J. F. Llamas, *English-Tagalog-Spanish, Pangasinan Vocabulary* (Manila, 1952).

Han. (Hanunoo), H. C. Conklin, *Hanunoo-English Vocabulary* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1953).

B. Igt. (Bontok Igorot), Rev. W. C. Clapp, *A Vocabulary of the Igorot Language as spoken by the Bontok Igorots* (Manila, 1908).

Data was also obtained for Tag., Ceb., Ilk., and Png. from the following source: Institute of National Language, *Preliminary Studies on the Lexicography of the Philippine Languages*, Vol. 1, Nos. 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 11.

	<i>wash</i>	<i>winnow</i>	<i>hair</i>	<i>seed</i>
Tag.	h   ugas	ta   h   ip	bu   h   ok	bin   h   i <sup>?</sup>
Ceb.	h   ugas	ta   h   op	bu   h   ok	bin   h   i <sup>?</sup>
Ilk.	?   ugos	ta   ?   ep	bu   ?   ok	bin   #   i
Png.	?   uros	ta   ?   ep	bw   #   ek <sup>3</sup>	bin   #   i
Han.	—   —	ta   h   up	bu   h   úk	bin   h   i
B Igt.	—   —	—   —   —	fo   ?   ok	—   —   —

The consistency of the reflex patterns set off by vertical lines in the first eight words above, clearly indicates that they have resulted from a common proto-phoneme in a parent language. The apparent inconsistency, however, in Pangasinan *bwek* 'hair' and *bini* 'seed' and in Ilocano *bini* 'seed' in which no phoneme occurs where glottal stop is the normal reflex, requires suspended judgment in considering the reflexes of these two words as descendants of proto-phoneme *b\** until some definitive factor can be found to explain the apparent inconsistency.

	<i>new</i>	<i>hair</i>	<i>moon, month</i>	<i>pig</i>	<i>husked rice</i>
Tag.	b   ago	b   uhok	b   wan	b   a   b   oy	b   igas
Ceb.	b   ag <sup>?</sup> o	b   uhok	b   ulan	b   a   b   oy	b   ugás
Ilk.	b   aro	b   uók	b   ulan	b   a   b   oy	b   agás
Png.	b   alo	b   wek	b   ulán	b   a   b   uy	b   elás
Han.	b   ág <sup>?</sup> u	b   uhúk	b   úlan	b   á   b   uy	b   ugás
B Igt.	f   alo	f   ook	f   uan	f   a   f   ui	<u>b</u>   agás

Note that the failure of reflex *f* to appear in Bontok Igorot *bagas* 'husked rice' either weakens the case for regarding the initial *b* in this word as descended from the same proto-phoneme as *f* in *fafui* 'pig,' or else makes it probable that its present form is a more recent borrowing.

3. Reconstructed Forms. On the basis of the above analysis it is now possible to reconstruct a few proto-morphemes with considerable assurance. Proto-phonemes used in the words below not found discussed in section 2. of this paper represent cases where no sound shifting occurs, i.e., the corresponding phoneme of each cognate is identical in all the languages.

\**tahep* 'winnow'; \**bales* 'recompense'; \**sepsep* 'sip, suck'; \**hipon* 'shrimp'; \**hagdan* 'ladder.'

(3) # indicates the absence of a phoneme.