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The grammar written in Latin, in 1668, by the Jesuit missionary Father Diego Luis de Sanvitores (1627-1672) is the oldest description we have of Chamorro, a language spoken on the Mariana islands. The grammar received a number of bad reviews and as a consequence has become neglected and almost forgotten. The main point of criticism has been that Sanvitores used the Latin grammatical framework to explain a language that in many ways does not fit this framework. In this thesis it is argued instead that Sanvitores had remarkable insight in the linguistic structure of Chamorro. It is shown how Sanvitores and his contemporary missionaries working in this ‘Philippine area’ in fact adapted the Latin framework to make it suitable for explaining the grammars of these native Philippine languages and how they redefined Latin grammatical terminology in order to make it applicable to their newly adopted pragmalinguistic method.

The pragmalinguistic method of these missionaries was astonishingly innovative and even in some linguistic matters which are still subject of debate today among linguists they take clear and convincing stands. Furthermore, Sanvitores’ grammar is a rich source of information about the Chamorro language as it was 300 years ago and sheds new light on the complex system of affixes.
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1. Introduction

The gradual trial-and-error creation of a new ... vocabulary ... is not a discovery about how old vocabularies fit together... The proper analogy is with the invention of new tools to take the place of old tools...

His new vocabulary ... is a tool for doing something which could not have been envisaged prior to the development of a particular set of descriptions, those which it itself helps to provide.

(Richard Rorty (1931-2007), Contingency, Irony and Solidarity, 12-13)

1.1 Prologue

Some years ago Otto Zwartjes sent me a transcribed and typed edition of a grammar written in Latin by the Jesuit Priest Diego Luis de Sanvitores (1627–1672). It was a grammar of Chamorro, a language spoken on the Mariana islands. He asked me to give my first impression of it. If at that time I had decided to first find some more information and had read one of the (scarce) reviews on the text, I probably would have decided not to pay much attention to it and follow these reviewers in rejecting it as a sorry attempt of someone who tries to explain a language without understanding the basics of it.

At first, Sanvitores’ explanations of the Chamorro language didn’t make sense to me at all, just as it didn’t make sense to these earlier readers of his text either. However, at the same time it triggered me because it could not have made sense to his contemporary readers as well, nor even to himself and considering that Sanvitores was an educated man, he must have meant it, I thought, differently from what an obvious and superficial translation suggests.

The next phase was one of trial and error. I simply attempted a few alternative ways to produce a translation that would make a bit more sense and I am afraid I have to confess that it was not by some sort of stroke of genius, but just a matter of blind chance that I tried to translate some sentences using the pragmatal term ‘Topic’ as a translation of the Latin case name ‘nominative’ and suddenly pieces of the puzzle began to fall into place.

As a result I can now proudly present my findings – which were published in separate papers in the course of the past years that I have been able to work very intermittently on this subject – combined into a Ph.D. thesis. I hope to show the
reader that my research has lifted a tip of a veil that has hidden an important development in linguistic theory for centuries.

1.2 Sanvitores’ grammar of Chamorro

In 1668 the Jesuit Father Luis de Sanvitores (1627–1672) wrote a brief grammar of the language spoken on the Mariana Islands, a group of islands in the Pacific ocean, roughly 1500 miles east of the Philippines and the same distance southwards from Japan. He added a long letter addressed to his sponsors, the Spanish court, about the islands and the origin of the natives and the need to send more missionaries to the islands.

The expedition by Sanvitores to Guam was one of the many expeditions undertaken mostly in the 16th and 17th century from Europe to other areas in Asia, Africa and South America in order to convert as many as possible to the Christian faith. To facilitate these conversion activities the missionaries wrote grammars, dictionaries, catechisms etc. in the various vernaculars. All these authors worked individually but often knew texts of other missionaries who worked or had worked in the same area; they copied methods of analysis and structures of their texts from predecessors, and many of them, when using linguistic terms, leaned on definitions taken from authorities like the influential Spanish grammarian Antonio de Nebrija (1441–1522). All these grammars, dictionaries etc. are a source that adds to the picture of how the languages involved have changed through time, and provide insight into the linguistic viewpoints, terminology and methods in these ages, not as they were defined in theoretical definitions and concepts but as they were applied in daily practice.

Sanvitores’ grammar, including the introductory letter, was copied in neat handwriting in Manila at the headquarters of the Society of Jesus and eventually shipped to Rome, where it is now stored in the Vatican archives of the Catholic church (opp. NN 352). The part of the manuscript that contains the grammar consists of 10 folios (9 fully written on both sides and the tenth with only the three last lines on the backside) of actual explanation of the grammatical structure of the language (f. 26r – 35v), followed by two blank folios and then 16 folios of Doctrinal texts translated into Chamorro (f. 38r – 45v), meant as practical exercises. In 1954, this grammar (including the Doctrinal texts) was transcribed by E.J. Burrus, who recognized its importance in that it presents the grammar and catechism in Chamorro in its earliest written form; he suggests –
without giving any judgment on the quality of Sanvitores’ work or giving any linguistic comments himself – that it may be of use to students of linguistics.¹

However, in the course of the almost 350 years since its completion as manuscript, only a few linguists have taken the opportunity to look into the grammar, very superficially. Again and again they rashly concluded that Sanvitores could not possibly have understood how Chamorro really works and put the manuscript back on the shelve quickly, without undertaking any real effort in trying to truly understand his analyses of the language structure of Chamorro.² But who can blame them? First of all, the text is written in Latin, and secondly, and more importantly, the application of Latin case names – Chamorro has no case inflection – would immediately have struck every one of these linguists. And indeed, in all the evaluations of Sanvitores’ grammar this application of Latin cases was simply considered an erroneous coercing of the language into a non fitting Latin framework, which has been the very reason to reject this grammar and not read any further or more closely.

1.3 The comparative status of Sanvitores’ work with respect to later studies of Chamorro

The most authoritative critic of Sanvitores’ work, in the sense that he really has studied Chamorro in depth and has done invaluable work in writing a complete reference grammar and in compiling a dictionary of Chamorro, is Donald Topping. His publications on the language date from the second half of the former century.³ In the 300 years since Sanvitores’ first description of Chamorro until 1969, when Topping published his grammar, only a small number of works on Chamorro have been published. Until about 1900 “only three relevant works saw the light of day” (Stolz 2011b: 201), of which Sanvitores’ grammar is one, the other two being a grammar meant to enable Chamorro speakers to learn Spanish and a Spanish–Chamorro dictionary by Ibáñez de Carmen (1865a, 1865b). After this date the number of studies of Chamorro is also meagre. Topping and Dungca criticize these works for various reasons. Safford (1903–1905) is an extensive description of the language and is a remarkable achievement for someone who is not a linguist and who has only spent one year on Guam as an assistant of the American governor. However, as Topping and

¹ Cf. Burrus (1954: 940)
² These negative reviews are named and described briefly or more extensively in the papers included in this thesis.
³ Topping (1969; 1975) and Topping and Dungca (1973)
Dungca (1973: 5) observe, it uses a Latin framework and labels long lists of regular words as irregular because they don’t fit into this framework. The works of Fritz (1903), Callistus (1910) en Kats (1917) are restatements of Safford in German and Dutch and “do not contribute anything new” (Topping and Dungca 1973: 5). In his overview of German and Dutch contributions to Chamorro Studies – focusing, however, almost entirely on the phonological descriptions in these sources – Thomas Stolz informs us that the brief grammar by Fritz follows the set-up of a traditional German school grammar and pays no attention to syntax (Stolz 2011b: 206). The work of Kats (1917) on Chamorro is not in the first place a description of the Chamorro language as such. The central ambition of the author is to provide a linguistic comparison between various Austronesian languages. Von Preissig includes a very brief grammar in his English–Chamorro dictionary (Preissig 1918), which is acknowledged to be that of Safford. His “misunderstanding of the complex system of affixation in Chamorro led to incorrect arrangement and classification of many words” (Stolz 2011b: 206).

Finally, Costenoble’s voluminous grammar published in 1940, is considered to be “the first truly linguistic description of Chamorro” and is even credited with “providing a much richer exemplification and explanation than do his successors” (Stolz et al. 2011: 237). However, it is also observed that many of his examples of Chamorro sentences are ungrammatical (Topping and Dungca 1973: 6) and that his treatment of word classes is inadequate and inconsistent (Stolz e.a 2011: 239; Dewein 2013: 183).

Of these linguistic sources on Chamorro the only one who has taken the time to at least take a brief look at Sanvitores’ grammar, seems to be Topping. He very briefly describes it as “of considerable interest to the comparative or historical linguist”, adding, however, that it “follows the pattern of most other grammars of the seventeenth century” and “takes such a word as taotao ‘man’ and puts it through the genitive, dative and accusative cases, even though the word remains as taotao with no change” (Topping and Dungca 1973: 4,5).

In recent years, next to the already mentioned German scholar Thomas Stolz, Sandra Chung has done invaluable work in analyzing and describing the syntactic intricacies and pragmatic value of word order in Chamorro. Stolz very occasionally refers to Sanvitores’ work, but only to what he says about phonological matters, and Chung does not refer to him at all. However, as I will demonstrate in the present thesis, Sanvitores – though not referred to and thus ‘uninvited’ by any of these two or other scholars – involves himself in current linguistic debate. His choice for a pragmatic linguistic method in describing Chamorro, links his analyses directly to theories not only related to the dynamics of Chamorro, describing for instance the pragmatic function of
Topic/Focus as an organizational function in Chamorro, but also to current linguistic debates on for instance the applicability of word classes or of the term ‘passive’ in Philippine languages. In fact, in a number of these Chamorro-related or more general linguistic matters, he appears to take a clear stand, takes sides in these debates and also provides new insights and arguments.

1.4 How it all started...

When I began browsing the grammar of Sanvitores I was just as surprised as other linguists glancing at this text for the first time, by Sanvitores’ application of Latin case names. However, instead of dismissing it rightaway, I tried to do a close reading of a part of the text, starting with the initial paragraph of the grammar (f. 27v), where he tells us that he uses the same division into parts of speech as in Latin, followed by the listings of nouns and pronouns (f.27v– 28r). In both paragraphs, the puzzling aspect that struck me was not that he puts nouns and pronouns through the nominative, genitive and other cases – many if not all of the abovementioned critics of this grammar probably stopped reading the manuscript already at this point –, but that he does this while at the same time – that is, in the same passage – explaining to his readers that Chamorro has no case inflection at all. It is this very paradox, the fact that Sanvitores clearly expresses his awareness of the lack of case inflection in Chamorro and at the same time puts words through all these cases, that challenged me to try to understand what Sanvitores may really have meant when using these case names and to try to get a picture of the true level of understanding Sanvitores had of this language.

Sanvitores starts his actual grammar course of Chamorro with listings of Chamorro nouns and pronouns. These listings didn’t enlighten his theoretical assumptions and his motivation to use case names in describing a language without case inflection. So I read on, hoping to find a piece of text in which he would use these case names not directly attributed to Chamorro words, but on a more theoretical and abstract level. I passed by a section where Sanvitores seems to inform us about tenses in Chamorro, a passage which, if any of the earlier commentators on this text would have gotten far enough to read it, would have strengthened them in their judgment of the text, since Chamorro is actually tense-less. However, then again they would have been misled by their first-glance-judgments. As I will demonstrate in chapter 5, Sanvitores had a good understanding of the tense-less, aspectual verbal system in Chamorro.
Sanvitores uses the case names in a manner which gives us a first hint of what he really means:

**Fragment 1: f.29v**

Construitur ... quasi Latine, persona agens in nominativo, persona cui datur in dativo, res quae datur in accusativo absque praepositione.

(The active voice) is construed as in Latin, with the Agent in the nominative, the person—to—which in the dative, the object that is given in the accusative, without preposition.

In this sentence the case names are not directly attributed to concrete Chamorro nouns, nor directly linked to any concrete case marker on a noun or to prepositions with nouns. In this sentence cases are defined on a semantic level. Sanvitores uses the nominative for a specific semantic function, the Agent, the dative for another one, the Beneficiary, and the accusative for again another one, the Object or Patient.

However, this first explanation of how to build a sentence in Chamorro again seems to confirm that Sanvitores didn’t understand the basic characteristics of Chamorro. The problematic point here is that Chamorro does not ‘work’ according to the nominative/accusative system of Latin and Spanish, but follows the rules of ergative/absolutive languages, in which the ergative is used for the Agent and the absolutive can be used for Subject – always in the nominative case in Latin – as well as for Object – generally expressed by the accusative in Latin.

All in all, this first acquaintance with Sanvitores’ grammar left me with a big question mark. It almost felt unreal to read a text written by a well educated man – who could even understand and speak Tagalog, a related Philippine language – describing the Chamorro language in such a poor manner, while telling us in the introductory paragraph of this grammar that he has decided to publish it because it had helped him and his fellow missionaries so much in their first conversion attempts. The only solution must be, as I thought then, that Sanvitores had used terms taken from the Latin grammar in a different way.

---

5 “eas mittere extra nostras Marianas insulas” (sending the text out from our Marian islands) is the actual formulation Sanvitores uses for what I have liberally translated as ‘publish’. He means to send it to Manila in order to have it copied neatly, and from there have it sent to Rome, to enable other Jesuits in Manila and Rome to read it and learn from it (cf. Burrus 1954:937).

6 In the introductory letter Sanvitores claims that with the help of this grammar and doctrinal texts he had been able, in the first days of his arrival, to receive already sixteen adults and thirty-four children into the Faith (f.1v; cf. Burrus 1954:936).
This is where it all started, the beginning of my research. I found out that Sanvitores disassociated Latin case names from the notion of concrete case markers that signal these cases and applied them to express semantic-pragmatic notions. Or to put it in the terminology of the pragmatist philosopher Richard Rorty who I quoted at the beginning of this chapter: Sanvitores – together with other missionaries working in this Philippine area – created a new ‘vocabulary’, by transforming terms from Latin grammar into effective ‘tools’ that provided new descriptions.

This inspired me to analyze more of this grammar. As a result the present thesis will show that the entire grammar is worthy of being analyzed closely, for several reasons:

- For what it tells us about the Chamorro language as it was 300 years ago and how it developed in the course of time.
- For the new light it sheds on the meaning and origin of some of the verbal affixes in Chamorro.
- For the prominent place that its innovative approach deserves in the handbooks of the history of linguistics in its own right.
- For its significance in current linguistic debate.

These four arguments indicating the relevance of analyzing Sanvitores’ grammar, together form the leitmotiv that runs through the papers that I have published about the grammar and that are included in the present thesis. In the following paragraphs I will present the specific subject or subjects dealt with in each of the papers.

1.5 Translating Father Sanvitores’ Lingua Mariana (2013)

The first paper taken up in this thesis is not chronologically the first one I wrote about Sanvitores’ grammar. Logically speaking, however, it is the paper to start with. It briefly describes who Sanvitores is, how his mission to the Marianas came about, what the state of the manuscript is, how it was preserved, what the contents is of the texts he left us – and more specifically of course, of the grammar he wrote of Chamorro – and why it is worth analyzing the grammar in depth.
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The paper focuses on the matter of the two manuscript versions, the one stored in the Vatican archives – of which a copy on microfilm is stored in the libraries of the Anthropos Institute in Fribourg (Switzerland) – and the second version in the form of the transcription of this manuscript, made by Burrus. The Vatican manuscript – of which I was able to buy a perfectly scanned copy from the librarians of the Vatican archives – is actually a copy of the text as written by Sanvitores. This copy was probably made in Manila. Closer analysis of this Vatican manuscript, combined with a comparison of Burrus’ transcription of it, reveals that the copyist must have made mistakes in transcribing the original version, that Burrus has not noticed all of these mistakes and that he has added some mistakes himself by misreading or misunderstanding the text.

Next to this manuscript matter the paper sheds more light on the attitude of Sanvitores (and so probably as well on the attitude of missionaries in general in these missions) to the people he wanted to evangelize. His goals were not to teach the people to speak Spanish (or Latin) at the cost of their native language, to subordinate the vernacular to Spanish and eventually to subordinate the people to the Spanish court, motives that have been suggested by some scholars. On the contrary, he tried painstakingly to learn to speak the vernacular, to understand it on a fundamental level, and he is clearly annoyed by the variable pronunciation of his Chamorro interpreter, making it hard for him to explain the phonetics of Chamorro accurately to his readers. Actually, the only, and far more modest, ambition Sanvitores speaks of in this respect is that he wishes to teach them to use Latin characters, since they have no written sign system of their own yet, and teaching them these characters would make it easier to teach them the Latin Doctrinal texts.

To illustrate the value of Sanvitores’ grammar, in terms of the cultural and historio-linguistic information it provides, the paper also treats fragments of the grammar in more detail. I have transcribed and translated the section on the pronunciation and introduce a number of fragments in which he shows a remarkable understanding of the language and displays his innovative method of analysis. In the subsequent papers included in this thesis, these fragments are dealt with in more detail and also in the context of the analysis of more and larger text blocks.

7 Stored in the Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (ARSI) as Opp. NN. 352.
8 Burrus (1954), Anthropos, International Journal of Ethnology and Linguistics, Volume 49, pp. 934-960, Fribourg, Switzerland. The microfilm is also available through the Anthropos Institute, as nr. 14 in the series of microfilms they possess.
9 For instance Rafael (1988), discussed in this paper. For other advocates of this theory, cf. Bandia (2014: 12f.).

Chronologically, this paper is the first one I wrote. As I have described above, the blocks of the grammar which I had read didn’t make much sense to me, but more importantly, couldn’t have been very instructive to its readers either. In fragment 1, I already gave an example of a sentence that seems to be copied directly from a Latin school-grammar book and seems to miss the ergative nature of the language completely. And it even gets worse when one reads on. In the following fragment – about one page further – Sanvitores introduces the passive in Chamorro. Again, this is seen by scholars who argue that Philippine languages have no passive, as yet another illustration of his poor understanding of the language. However, in this paper I have not yet examined his use of the term ‘passive’¹⁰, but have focused solely on Sanvitores’ application of cases. This in itself is already very problematic, as a literal translation of the following fragment illustrates, with the cases taken in their traditional school-grammar meaning:

Fragment 2: f. 30r

*Passiva fit per in loco um activae collocandum, construiturque cum nominativo rei et genitivo personae agentis, dativoque personae cui, quae etiam nonnunquam ponitur in nominativo et tunc res, si mavis, potest dici esse in accusativo, qui demum non distinguitur a nominativo.*

• The passive voice is made by placing -in- instead of -um- of the active and is construed with the nominative for the Object and a genitive for the Agent and a dative for the person-to-whom. The person-to-whom can also figure as nominative and in that case the Object, if you wish to say so, figures as accusative, which ultimately is not distinguished from the nominative.

This literal translation of fragment 1 is problematic considering the ergative nature of Chamorro and the lack of case markers, but still to some extent ‘makes sense’, for case names are linked one to one to semantic functions. However, the literal translation of fragment 2 seems devoid of logical coherence, because in this fragment the same case names are linked to multiple semantic functions in a

¹⁰ Cf. Reid (2012: 146f), who quotes Seidenadel (1909) who argues that all the grammars of Philippine languages before his own should be ignored because of suggesting passive construction forms while these languages actually have none. Reid agrees with Seidenadel, but, as I have shown in Winkler (2011; chapter 4 in this thesis), Reid and others have misinterpreted that Sanvitores and his fellow missionaries in this area had given a different meaning to the term ‘passive’. Also see section 1.7 below in this introduction.
very confusing way. A nominative case can signify an Agent but also a beneficiary, a genitive can apparently also signify an Agent and the Object can take a nominative case as well as an accusative. Furthermore, in example 1, we were already confronted with the unresolved matter of how to distinguish these cases in a Chamorro sentence, and now Sanvitores confirms – once again actually, because he told us so already in one of the first paragraphs of his grammar11 – that different cases in Chamorro cannot be distinguished from each other by morphological markers.

Fragment 2 forms the nucleus for this paper. I have argued that Sanvitores explained the rules of the language in terms of their functionality with respect to how they are used, or, in other words, in terms denoting semantic-pragmatic functions. The nominal element that performs the pragmatic function of Topic or Focus is the central element of an utterance and other nominal elements in the utterance are described in semantic and pragmatic terms to clarify what role they play in the utterance, how they affect or are affected by the Topic. The picture of Sanvitores’ understanding that hence emerges from this interpretation of what he says is not only that his application of cases makes perfect sense. He also implicitly demonstrates us that by taking the pragmatic notion of Topic as the starting point of linguistic analyses it becomes irrelevant whether a language is ergative or accusative (or somewhere in-between), which is in line with linguistic observations in recent years. However, what first and foremost comes to light is that he has not squeezed a language into a non-fitting Latin framework, but instead:

- Adapted the Latin framework to this language.
- In this process of adapting the framework developed a new linguistic approach that is remarkably similar to the modern theory of Functional Grammar.

If I say ‘adapting the framework’, I mean the following. The Latin grammatical framework provided Sanvitores with a set of tools, like the cases, the terms ‘passive’ and ‘active’ and the parts of speech. Some of these tools appeared not effective in helping him to describe a language in terms of its functionality. Therefore he adapted these tools by reducing the number of parts of speech and by redefining these terms, and thereby developed an at that time new set of linguistic tools and in this sense a new linguistic vocabulary.

11 [f.28r]. See paragraph 1 above.
In this paper I have tried to corroborate my findings about the pragmatic approach of Sanvitores by looking into other grammars from missionaries working in this area. I have found a number of fragments that indicate that Sanvitores is not on his own. My esteemed colleague in this field, Emilio Ridruejo (2004), has shown that the missionaries working in this area knew each other’s works, influenced each other’s methods and – to some extent or wholly – copied the linguistic approach initiated by missionaries working in this area before them. This also seems to be the case with regard to the pragmalinguistic method used by Sanvitores. They all seem to have taken this approach and applied – while retaining the classic case names – semantic-pragmatic notions like Topic, Focus, Goal, Oblique Agent, Instrumental etc. 300 years before Simon Dik (1940–1995) and other protagonists of functional theories of grammar would do the same. This means that part of the history of linguistics needs rewriting, as these functional methods of linguistic analysis did not first arise in the course of the twentieth century, but in the course of the seventeenth century from the efforts of a group of missionaries working in the Philippine area, who needed new tools for effective linguistic analyses of the languages involved. Therefore this group can be considered as the ‘Austronesian school’ or ‘Philippine school’12 of missionary linguistics. And it is this school, to phrase it as I have done once before an audience of adherents of Functional Grammar, that deserves a distinct chapter in its own right in the history of linguistics as the ‘Founding Fathers of Functional Grammar’.

1.7 Subject, Topic, passive and perspective in Functional (Discourse) Grammar and in Philippine Missionary Grammar (2011)

In this paper I have described in more depth the functional approach of this Austronesian school of missionary linguists. I treat a number of fragments from different members of this school to show not only that often the analyses of these missionaries are remarkably similar to modern theories, but also that concerning two current matters of dispute among scholars, the missionaries take a clear (and convincing) stand: the concept of the passive in Philippine languages and the applicability of the syntactic Subject function.

In the descriptions of Philippine languages by other missionaries, it immediately becomes clear that they too cannot have used the Latin case names in their

12 In my paper I have used both terms. Concerning these terms and the current linguistic debate about the scope and applicability of these terms, see chapter 3.
traditional meaning. The Dominican friar Andrés López, author of a grammar of Pangasinan (1690), for instance, says:

Fragment 3: López (1690: f. 13r)

Ytem es de saber que el nominativo ... sirve para otros casos...

In a literal translation this would be:

*One should also know that the nominative ... serves for other cases

This, of course, would not make sense to the author himself nor to his readers. A translation in functional terms, as given in this paper, is perfectly clear:

One should also know that the constituent that has pragmatic Topic/Focus\(^\text{14}\) status [nominativo] ... can have different semantic functions

This not only is intelligible to us and to his readers at that time, it also, as I have shown in this paper, agrees with present-day state of the art findings. In Philippine languages like Tagalog and Pangasinan, for instance, constituents that have semantic functions like Agent, Goal, Locative, Instrumental or Benefactive can all be in Focus position (marked as such by a Focus affix).

In this paper I also argue that the missionaries applied perspective – referring to notions of movement, foregrounding and backgrounding – as a central pragmatic notion in their linguistic explanations. Just as in Functional Grammar – and its follow up, Functional Discourse Grammar – Topic and Focus are considered to have an organizational function, in the sense that they highlight a certain constituent of the sentence, and thereby move other constituents away from the center of attention. However, the missionaries did not only use perspective to explain the organizational function of Topic/Focus. They applied this notion far more widely, to such an extent even that Latin case names as well as the terms ‘active’ and ‘passive’ were stripped of their syntactic notions and used entirely on a semantic-pragmatic level, with meanings in which perspective is the fundamental notion. The following fragment, included in this paper, illustrates this:

---

\(^{13}\) For the full quote (and further analysis of course), see chapter 4.

\(^{14}\) I have decided to use the term Pragmatic Topic/Focus (shortened to PTF) for this central constituent in the functional analyses of the missionaries. In Functional Grammar a formal distinction is made between the terms Topic and Focus. However, the missionaries used this one term ‘nominative’ and did not make this formal distinction (just as, as is discussed in this paper, many modern scholars do not make this distinction either).
Fragment 4: Coronel (1621: f. 10v)
De la pasiva de y se ha de usar cuando se significa alguna cosa que va de las persona que hace (la qual se pone en genitivo) a otra parte, y ha de estar en nominativo...

The passive with ‘y’ must be used when one wants to express that a thing goes from the Agent (which becomes the Oblique Agent [genitivo]) to another party, which has to become Topic/Focus [nominativo].

Other fragments given in this paper corroborate my thesis that the missionaries worked from this notion of perspective as the fundamental concept of their grammar. In doing so they attributed meanings to case names entirely different from the meanings given by Antonio de Nebrija (1441–1522). This Spanish scholar is generally considered to be the authoritative source for all the grammars of the missionaries. Even though this may be the case with missionary grammars written elsewhere in the world, it surely was not used as a prescriptive framework in ‘Philippine Missionary Grammar’, the name I have given in this paper to the linguistic method used by these missionaries. Instead of Nebrija’s descriptions of the meanings of the Latin cases, these missionaries went back to the original perspectival meanings of the cases and consciously left out, also contrary to Nebrija, the ablative case because of the syncretism of three semantic-pragmatic functions in the ablative.15

The choice of the missionaries to apply perspective as the fundamental concept in their analyses, also explains why they retained the terms ‘active’ and ‘passive’ and did not use the term Subject. I have demonstrated in this paper that in both these matters the missionaries take a stand in a still ongoing debate. Just as with the case names, the missionaries did not use the terms ‘active’ and ‘passive’ in a syntactic sense but in a pragmatic and perspectival meaning, where the term ‘active’ refers to sentences in which Focus is on the Actor – where the constituent representing the Actor is in Topic/Focus position (nominative) – and the term ‘passive’ refers to sentences where another constituent than the Actor is in Topic/Focus position. With these concepts of Actor-Focus versus non-Actor-Focus constructions in Philippine languages the missionaries not only refute yet another point of critique with regard to their linguistic work. One can even say that they already recognized that these languages had no syntactic active and passive constructions and used

15 Further evidence discovered in later research strongly supported my conclusion in this paper that Nebrija has not been the only linguistic source for these missionaries. In Winkler (2015; chapter 5 in this thesis) I have shown that the missionaries adopted terminology from the so-called Grammaticae Proverbiandi.
morphological markers to distinguish between Actor and non-Actor-Focus, a distinction more widely accepted only in the course of the twentieth century.

With regard to current debates about whether or not Subject is a term applicable in ergative languages, or a relevant concept in pragmatic analyses, our missionaries again take a clear and remarkably modern stand. They discarded the term Subject and just like modern linguists have started doing some decades ago, they already decided to decompose it into two distinct functions, on two different levels: the pragmatic notion of Topic/Focus and the semantic notion of Actor.

The missionaries’ application of perspective in the way as described in this paper is remarkable and in many aspects far ahead of their time. The missionaries however did not provide some sort of definition of any of the concepts and terms they worked with. Even today, perspective is an ill-defined concept. However, these missionaries show quite convincingly that working with this concept as a basis for explaining the dynamics of a language can be very fruitful. In that respect, they again present themselves as worthy and effective champions of Functional (Discourse) Grammar. However, their analyses do at times also challenge the validity of certain concepts and definitions in this linguistic method and also point to a lack of consistent definitions of pragmatic concepts. As this paper illustrates, the achievements of these missionaries are a serious call upon functionalists of today to improve, formalize and define more precisely their fundamental terms and concepts.

1.8 The Chamorro verb according to Father Diego Luis de Sanvitores (2015)

Close reading analyses of entire missionary grammars or chapters have so far not been done. The previous papers in the series that form my thesis also contain analyses of fragments, mostly grouped thematically, for instance to show how the missionaries used a case name like the nominative, or the term ‘passive’. In this fourth paper it was my ambition to show how worthwhile detailed analyses of larger text units of the missionary grammars can prove to be. Focusing again on Sanvitores, I analyzed the longest chapter of his grammar, about the verb. In this close-reading analysis of a large text unit the validity of the reasons to read these grammars meticulously come forward prominently.

The detailed analysis as provided in this paper is a rich source of information about the language before the process of hispanization started and provides an
in-depth understanding of his level of insight in the Chamorro language in
general and in particular of his intelligence of the intricacies of the verbal root
combination with all kinds of affixes. As shown in this paper, close analysis of
Sanvitores’ text also proves valuable in solving today’s questions concerning the
polysemy of certain affixes. And just like in the previous papers, the analyses in
this paper again show the timeliness of the missionary grammars and their
relevance to current linguistic debate.

In this respect the paper especially pays attention to the aspect of tense in the
Chamorro verbal system and to the (non-)applicability of the parts-of-speech
framework in Chamorro. Sanvitores uses terms like present tense and perfect
tense when he runs through a number of Chamorro sentences whereby he seems
to consider Chamorro to have some sort of temporal system. However, the Latin
terms we nowadays translate as ‘present tense’ or ‘perfect tense’ were originally
used to express a durative/non-durative opposition instead of different tenses.
Sanvitores uses these Latin terms referring to this distinction between durative
and non-durative and thereby implicitly agrees with modern scholars who
consider Chamorro as a tenseless language. Also, in recent literature there has
been debate about whether or not Chamorro can be treated and explained as a
language consisting of nouns, verbs and modifiers, the fundamental three
building blocks of the parts-of-speech system. Sanvitores does so explicitly. In
his first paragraph on the grammar of Chamorro he starts rightaway with telling
his readers that he will explain the language according to the classical parts-of-
speech system. No doubt this also, next to his application of cases, must have
led to the criticism I already described above that he coerced the language into a
non-fitting framework. However, also in this respect the critics appear to be
seriously mistaken. First of all, instead of coercing everything into this
framework, Sanvitores regroups the participle, including it in the verb; in other
words, he adjusts the framework to the language instead of the other way
around. Secondly, and more importantly, he shows us just as convincingly as the
Chamorro expert Sandra Chung has done in recent research (Chung 2012), that
the classical parts-of-speech system works perfectly fine for Chamorro too and
that the process called ‘conversion’ (from noun to verb to adjective etc.) is a
fundamental key to explaining the dynamics of Chamorro.

In Winkler (2011; see paragraph 1.7 above) I have already called into question
the influence of Nebrija in the works of these missionaries in the Philippine area.
In this paper another explicit source for their linguistic analyses comes forward:
the so-called Grammaticae Proverbiandi, popular works published in Spain
meant to make learning Latin easier.
1.9 Limitations and ambitions

The Focus of my research has been on analyzing the level of insight into the language of Chamorro demonstrated by Sanvitores in his grammar and on the linguistic method he used for explaining the structure of the language. To corroborate some of my findings, I have consulted grammars from missionaries working in the same area but consulted them only fragmentarily and very specifically related to these findings. This means that further research is needed. In the opening section of this introductory chapter I wrote that my research has lifted a tip of a veil that has hidden an important development in linguistic theory for centuries. I have used ‘tip of a veil’ not as a cliché expression of modesty. My research also aims at inspiring and exhorting others to read and reread the works of these missionaries closely in order to completely unveil this hidden period of linguistic theoretical advancement. And I do hope that somehow I will have the opportunity myself to contribute to this research. Furthermore, I have tried to show how valuable, for a number of linguistic and historical and cultural reasons, a fully annotated transcription and translation of Sanvitores’ Lingua Mariana can be. I sincerely hope that fate and circumstances will allow me to continue my research and produce this transcription and translation.

1.10 Papers included in this thesis

The following papers are included in the present thesis. Some typing errors here and there have been corrected, as well as a few inaccuracies which were exposed in the course of time by progressive insight. Also I have included a number of scans of the manuscript fragments I discuss, that couldn’t be included in the papers because of size limits. I give the data of the respective papers in the order in which they are included in this thesis, preceded by the corresponding chapter numbers.


**Chapter 4**

**Chapter 5**
Missionary Pragmalinguistics
2. Translating Father Sanvitores’ *Lingua Mariana*

2.1 Abstract

Father Sanvitores’ *Lingua Mariana*, written in Latin in 1668, consists of a long introductory letter and a separate section with Chamorro language instructions, forming the first description of Chamorro. The *Lingua Mariana* is preserved in the form of a copy of the manuscript. It has never been translated. Only a Latin transcription of the second section, the grammar and catechism, of the manuscript has been made. This transcription, however, contains quite a number of errors. The fact that the *Lingua Mariana* has never been translated is probably due to a combination of three factors: the complexity of the Latin text and a linguistic terminology of which the meaning is often not instantly clear; secondly, the faults in the Latin text made by the copyist; thirdly, the unjust depreciation of the linguistic insight that the missionaries working in the Philippine area had in the languages they described. However, the entire *Lingua Mariana* contains lots of information about the culture of the inhabitants of the Marianas, about the notion Sanvitores and his companions had of the people and their culture, about the innovative linguistic method he used for describing Chamorro and linguistic information about this language before the Hispanic influence. All of this makes the *Lingua Mariana* an important cultural-historical and historical-linguistic document, worthy of being transcribed and translated fully.

2.2 Introduction

In section 2.3 of this chapter I will briefly describe the history of Sanvitores’ mission in the Mariana islands in the context of the general nature of missions in the Philippine area. Section 2.4 summarizes the structure and content of the *Lingua Mariana*. In section 2.5, I will discuss the Latin used by Sanvitores, especially concerning his style of writing and the fact that the manuscript we have is actually a copy. In section 2.6, I will take a closer look at the introductory text to the actual grammar, to illustrate the complexity of the Latin text, the faults the copyist has made and the errors made in the transcription of this text. In sections 2.7 and 2.8 the nature and content of the actual grammar and of the catechism, as well as the linguistic method Sanvitores used for
Missionary Pragmalinguistics describing the language, are illustrated by a translation of a number of fragments. All through the sections of this chapter the cultural-historical relevance of the Lingua Mariana will also be illustrated, mainly by letting the texts of Sanvitores speak for themselves.

2.3 The Mission

The Jesuit missionary Father Diego Luis de Sanvitores anchored his ship in Guam for the first time in 1662, on his way from Mexico to the Philippines. During this short visit, meant for obtaining fresh supplies (in exchange for knives, fishing gear, etc.), he learned that no one had yet tried to convert the islanders to the Christian faith, so he decided to try to come back again.1 After five years of working in the Philippines – and learning Tagalog there perfectly, as the legend goes – he returned to Mexico to try to raise funds for the expedition to the Marianas. Having successfully done so, he set sail, on March 23, 1668. He reached the island of Guam on the 16th of June.2

From the very start, the numerous expeditions and missions in the area didn’t pass peacefully at all. Missionary zeal and colonization objectives often went hand in hand, and both missionaries and the soldiers accompanying them were frequently confronted with resistance from the islanders. Ferdinand Magellan (1480–1521), the Portuguese explorer who was the first European to anchor in the Mariana Islands, in 1521, immediately got involved in a serious conflict with the islanders. Antonio Pigafetta (1491–1534), one of the survivors of Magellan’s expedition around the world, describes it as follows:

...on the 6th of March, 1521, they fetched two islands inhabited by many people, and they anchored at one of them, which is in twelve degrees north; and the inhabitants are people of little truth, and they did not take precautions against them until they saw that they were taking away the skiff

---

1 Cf. Viana (2004), Santos (1994)
2 The story of how the mission came to be, the adventures, successes and losses, including the violent death of Sanvitores in 1672, have been described by other missionaries, such as Francisco García (2005[1683]), translated in Italian by Ortiz (1686) and Fr. Peter Coomans (taken up as document 1673L1 in Levesque (1994-2003, Vol.6), and translated by him in Coomans (2000). More recent sources relating about the mission of Sanvitores are for instance Barrett (1975) Burrus (1954), and Viana (2004 and 2011). For a good analysis of the interwoveness of political and religious goals of the expeditions in the Philippine area, see Rafael (1993). However, for some serious objections against one of the theories of Rafael, see 3.5. Many missionaries and their companions were killed, but the consequences for the islanders, in terms of the death toll because of the spreading of new diseases, were far more dramatic. See for instance the Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) documents of the U.S. Department of the Navy, esp. Vol. 2, Chapter 12.
of the flagship, and they cut the rope with which it was made fast, and took it ashore without their being able to prevent it. They gave this island the name of Thieves’ Island. [...] Fernando de Magellan, seeing that the skiff was lost, set sail, as it was already night, tacking about until the next day; as soon as it was morning they anchored at the place where they had seen the skiff carried off to, and he ordered two boats to be got ready with a matter of fifty or sixty men, and he went ashore in person, and burned the whole village, and they killed seven or eight persons, between men and women, and recovered the skiff, and retired to the ships.  

Sanvitores and his group also, just like the European ‘visitors’ of the islands before him, had to deal with all sorts of conflicts and hostilities, such as cultural conflicts about the caste system, ancestor worship and the selling or renting out of young women by their parents. Rivalries between native villages complicated the expedition as well, as did the allegations of a Chinese castaway, named Choco, who blamed the missionaries for using poisonous oil and water in their baptism rituals. Already in the second month after their arrival, two members of the group (a young boy and a seaman) were killed and two priests severely wounded, and in 1670 Fr. Luis de Medina (1637-1670) was killed in Saipan, together with his assistant from the Philippines. April 2, 1672, Sanvitores himself was murdered by the father of a girl he wanted to baptize.  

2.4 Structure of the Lingua Mariana  

The document Lingua Mariana, a codex of 150 x 205 mm, is kept in the Jesuit archives in Rome, archived as Opp. NN 352, one of the Opera Nostrorum, works by Jesuit authors. It also is available on microfilm.  

It consists of two parts. The grammar and exercises form the last part of this document. They are  

---

1 Translation: Alderley (1884). In a note, Lord Alderley adds: ‘Some writers remark that Magellan gave to those islands the name of ‘Islands of Sails’, on account of the many vessels with sails he observed in the neighbourhood, but they continued to commonly be called Ladrones.’ Sanvitores likewise tells us that the islands were once called ‘of the sails’ and later ‘of thieves’, but adds that he himself had succeeded in renaming the islands ‘Mariana Islands’. See fragment 4 in this paper. He chose this name in honor of Mariana, regent of Spain during the minority of Charles II.  

2 Cf. Viana (2004), a very informative piece about the problems Sanvitores and his companions encountered and about the composition of several groups of people joining the expedition (soldiers, Filipino islanders, laymen, priests, etc.). For a longer description of the violent death of Fr. Medina, and of Sanvitores himself, see Coomans (2000). For more information about the fate of the successive missionaries on the island, see Viana (2011).  

3 The original manuscript is stored in the Vatican under the following title: Diego Luis de Sanvitores, Lingua Mariana, ARSJ, opp. NN. 352. The microfilm is kept in Freiburg under the name: Diego Luis de Sanvitores, Lingua Mariana, Micro-Biblioteca Anthropos, Vol. 14. Posteius prope Friburgum Helvetiorum, 1954.
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preceded by a long letter Sanvitores added to this grammar, addressed to his colleagues in Manila and Rome. In this letter he starts off by saying that the grammar is still far from perfect, but that considering his success with it in converting islanders he had decided to publish it anyway, hoping that other missionaries could benefit from it as much as he did. He then continues describing the history of the islands, geographical details and the possible origin of the islanders.

The archivist in Rome of the Lingua Mariana has inserted a notice in the document that very briefly summarizes its content. In a later stage, someone else has added in handwriting some comments and corrections. I will briefly discuss this notice now, in two parts (the translations of the handwritten comments are bracketed.)

Fragment 1 – part 1

In the Roman Archive of the Society of Jesus we have a codex, bound in leather (‘leather’ (Latin: corio) is struck through and corrected to ‘cloth’), with the following title in gold on the back: Lingua Mariana. 150x250mm. Handwritten manuscript. 44 folios and one folio inserted (namely nr. 13). In total 45 folios.

These are the chapters:
I About the Marian language grammar instructions. Folios 1-3
II Name and origin of those islands. Folios 3-9
Translating Father Sanvitores’ *Lingua Mariana* 35

III Request to the Roman fathers, especially of the Society of Jesus. Folios 10-17

IV Extra arguments which show the truth of the story of the same prophecy that the origin of the Ladrones is Egyptian, outside of their own area. Folios 17-25

This part (I-IV) has the following closure:
From the city Agaña, which is named after San Ignacio, on the island Guam, which now is named after San Juan in these Marians, 18 June 1668, under the name of the Marian Mission itself and Ladrones Mission, the very unworthy servant Diego Luis Sanvitores [by the hand of Father Luis de Morales; born 1644].

The handwritten addition *manu P. Aloysii Morales (n. 1644)* refers to Father Luis de Morales, one of the priests accompanying Sanvitores (cf. Albalá 2005: 1623). Morales was murdered by islanders in 1668, along with two soldiers, less than two months after the arrival of Sanvitores and his group (cf. Viana 2004: 21).

The last part of the *Lingua Mariana*, the grammar, bears the title: *Grammaticae Institutiones Marianae Linguae* (Marian language grammar instructions). It consists of two sections, the actual grammar and a number of ‘exercises’ (*exercitationes*), in which texts of the Christian catechism are translated into Chamorro. Together they form the first written description of Chamorro. This second part of the manuscript is available in a more accessible form thanks to the transcription of it made by E.J. Burrus (1954). However, as I will show in section 5 of this chapter, this transcription of the second part of the manuscript is not entirely flawless.

In the introductory notice added to the manuscript the archivist gives the following description of the content of this second part of the manuscript. In this second part lots of corrections are made by an unknown editor of the notice. Therefore I will transcribe this part and then give a translation.

---

The Latin word ‘deprecatio’ (*request*) is wrongly typed as two words, probably due to the way this word is written in the manuscript in the title of this section, suggesting a space between the two parts of the word.
Deinde sequitur:
Marianae linguae Institutionum praeludium. Ubi de probatione vocum ff. 26-35
Denique sequitur:
Marianae linguae exercitationes, e quibus et institutiones Catecheticae licebit pro nunc eformari.
Caput 2. 39-42. Exercitatio magis catechetica (ex.gr. Formula interrogandi Baptizandum: Chiro ho: muto hao tumigbini &&) 
Caput 3. 42-43. Formulae aliae verendi (quaerendi?), seu explicandi praeicipua communis Catechismi capita.
Praecepta Decalogi:
Sinangaña Ni Dios adiyim fino na monotay: Adiyim na mina & & f. 44r 
Formula offerenda orationem dominicam & & f. 44v
Formula offerenda saluationem angelicam f.45
Next follows:
Introduction to the Marian language instructions, including the matter of pronunciation. Folios 26-35
Then follows:
The Marian language instruction, from which for now it will be possible also to build catechism instructions.
Chapter 1. 38-39v. Exercise for the first greeting. (for example: Mati hao na umorin: Greetings, sir. Mati hamio manga magarahi: Greetings, leaders. Chapter 2. 39-42. More catechetical exercise (for example: formula of interrogation in order to baptize: Chiro ho: muto hao tumigbini etc.
Caput 3. 42-43. Formulas for fearing (asking?), or explaining the important chapters of the general catechism.
The Ten Commandments:
Sinangaña Ni Dios adyim fino na monotay: Adyim na mina etc. f. 44r
Formula for bringing a prayer to the Lord etc. f. 44v
Formula for bringing an angelic salutation f. 45

There are a few handwritten corrections visible in this text. These corrections – praepositione, the correct ablative form, instead of praepositis and eformari instead of the nonexistent blend word coneformari (blended from conformari and eformari) – are quite obvious. In one instance the archivist himself seems puzzled, suggesting that the word verendi (fearing) should perhaps be replaced with quaerendi (asking). Indeed, in the manuscript itself it looks as if the copyist – and maybe Sanvitores himself as well – has mistakenly written the word verendi. Burrus is probably right in his conjecture that Sanvitores must have meant vertendi (translating).

In this ‘table of contents’ of the actual grammar in the Lingua Mariana the archivist gives a number of sentences in Chamorro, which he copied from the examples Sanvitores gives in the manuscript. The example sentences given here show, as can be expected, similarities as well as striking differences with

---

7 The archivist copied the text literally from the manuscript, including the mistake (probably made by the copyist of the manuscript; see section 2.5) in the word probatione which should be prolatione (pronunciation). This same mistake in the manuscript itself is also noted and corrected by Burrus (1954) in his transcription.
8 The precise title of this section as given in the manuscript is: formula interrogandi baptizandum adultum: formula of interrogation in order to baptize an adult.
9 i.e. a prayer to Mary.
modern Chamorro. For instance, the word *mati* seems to have become obsolete, but *hao* and *hamio* (in modern orthography: *hamyo*) still mean ‘you’ (sg.) and ‘you’ (pl.). The word *adyim* (meaning ‘this’) has been replaced with the Spanish ‘este’. The word *umorin* has been replaced with *chamorri* nowadays, referring to the highest class in pre-Spanish society, but the two words seem not to be related etymologically. The meaning of *na* here is not clear. In his grammatical explanations Sanvitores shows that he is aware of a linking particle *na* and a causative prefix *na*-.. Both still exist in modern Chamorro. However, Sanvitores also refers to the prefixes *na*- and *ma*- used with intransitive verbs. He probably sees these as dialect variations, but nowadays only the prefix *ma*- is used (to create the so-called passive voice). The plural marker *manga* has become *man*- and the word *magarahi* has become *maga‘lahi*.

A detailed analysis of the Chamorro sentences is beyond the scope of this chapter, but the subject of Sanvitores’ description and understanding of the language will be touched upon separately in 2.7 below. A far more extensive and detailed analysis of examples Sanvitores gives can be found in chapter 5 of this thesis.

### 2.5 Latin and the copying of the manuscript

Sanvitores wrote his text in Latin. For his readers this of course was no problem. Latin was still the lingua franca in educated circles, so everyone could read it easily. Furthermore, the grammatical terms he uses, like nominative, accusative, adverb and so on, were the same as those used by the missionaries writing in Spanish. Also, all his readers no doubt knew the Latin catechism texts by heart. However, since all the other extant grammars in the Philippine area are written in Spanish, Sanvitores’ choice to write in Latin is remarkable.

It is not clear why Sanvitores used Latin. It may be because he wanted to give his text some scholarly weight and shine. In his text he doesn’t give an explicit reason for it. However, in a fragment we will discuss in more detail below (fragment 4), he seems to give us a clue. After noting that the islanders had lost the ability to write, he says the following:

> In the mean time we must consider the civilization of the children as easier in such a way that to the benefit of their civilization they themselves will be educated, when God wills it, easier and more profitable in our characters and thereby perhaps as well in our language and our holy texts.
In other words, Sanvitores suggests that because of their lack of knowledge of written signs, it may be easier to teach them the doctrinal texts in the language in which they are written and used (spoken) in church. This may well have been an additional motive for Sanvitores to write his grammar (and later on the introductory letter as well) in Latin. Another motive for writing in Latin, suggested by Albalá (2005: 1623), is that Sanvitores was aware of the fact that the missionaries who would come to join him or come after him would not all come from Spain, but also from countries like Belgium and Italy. They would not be able to understand his grammar if it was written in Spanish.\(^9\)

There is yet another hypothesis which argues that missionaries used Latin, in their usage of grammatical terms and sometimes even in the entire text, because Latin was considered (in form and structure) the language of God (Rafael 1988). However, this seems not very plausible. Firstly because, if this would be a serious motivation for missionaries to write in Latin, we would probably have found more grammars written in this language. Secondly, and more importantly, Sanvitores and other missionaries working in the Philippine area did indeed still use grammatical terms taken from the Latin grammar system, but attributed new functions and meanings to a number of these terms, meanings which deviate from the ‘canonical’ definitions of classical Latin grammar as, for instance, given by Nebrija. In other words, they didn’t try to fit or coerce the system of a language like Chamorro or Tagalog into the ‘divine’ Latin grammatical system but, instead, expanded and altered the definitions of Latin grammatical terms to make the terms themselves more adequate and more effective for describing these languages.\(^11\) A third reason to dismiss this theory can be found in the words of Sanvitores himself. Somewhere in the midst of giving examples of Ordinal texts in Chamorro he interrupts himself and assures the reader that he will make a better version when in the course of time the islanders have learned Spanish and Latin and Sanvitores and his colleagues have learned to speak Chamorro better. This text is treated in full below (see fragment 15); the relevant sentences from this passage for now are:

---

\(^9\) Right at the beginning of the *Lingua Mariana* Sanvitores explains that he has decided to publish this first version of his grammar of Chamorro, because he hoped that a group of other missionaries could be sent to join him and assist in the conversion of the inhabitants of all the islands and that they could make use of this grammar, imperfect as it still was, to learn the basics of the Chamorro language. See fragment 4 below.

\(^11\) The leitmotiv, of course, of this thesis, and a central theme in all the subsequent chapters.
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Fragment 2 [f. 41r]
Cum adest tempus, et opportunitas circumstantiarum, sugerenda sunt item [...] Symbolum Apostolorum et oratio Dominica Latino vel Hispano idioma, cum adiecta explicatione ... possunt tamen suggeri recitandae in tempore pro suscipiendo baptismate et alis occasionibus quo usque vel calleant ipsi nostrum idioma vel ipsorum nos, aut alii Dei gratia et linguae experientia amplius instructi, certo perfectas ac tuto fecerimus Marianas versiones.

When there is time and the circumstances are right, the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's prayer should also be added, either in Latin or in Spanish, together with an explication [...] yet, in time, texts can be added for baptizing and for other occasions until either they get experienced themselves in our language or we or others, by God's grace and by experience, become more educated in their language and we certainly and safely will have made perfect translations in Chamorro.

In other words, Sanvitores has no explicit intention to replace the vernacular with either Latin or Spanish and is willing to learn the language better, explicitly expressing that his level of understanding of Chamorro is still far from sufficient. Rafael (1988: 24-28) argues that Spanish, and Latin as its “proper precursor”, were seen as superior to the various vernaculars of the people they wished to convert:

Latin was thought to stand in such close relation to God’s own language that it still functioned as the special medium for framing God’s laws [...] That Tagalog should be organized around the matrix of Latin is a function of the Spanish belief of the proximity of Latin to the spirit of God’s word. (Rafael 1988: 28)

The missionaries, Rafael argues, were convinced of the possibility to “subordinate a speaker’s language to the structural norms of a second (sc. language)”, in this case Latin or Spanish and thereby to subordinate them also to the Spanish court:

Confronted by the task of dominating the languages of the natives they (sc. the missionaries) wrote and read grammar books and dictionaries that would provide them with the means of communicating the authority of God and king. (Rafael 1988: 26)
However, Potet (1992: 189) rightly says in his review of Rafael’s book that:

for all the success of conversion, that of translation did not take place, for the Spanish missionaries did not propagate their faith in Castilian, but in the native languages of the Philippines, which they painstakingly learned and helped keep alive while making them known worldwide among linguists.

Potet’s view is confirmed by Sanvitore’s own words given in fragment 2. Potet correctly concludes that there is not a parallel between translation and conversion, as Rafael argues. It is the military conquest of the Philippines by the Spanish that resulted in a takeover of the native languages. Also the suggestion by Rafael that they organized their grammars of the vernaculars “around the matrix of Latin” – a verdict that one can find also in many reviews of these missionary grammars - does no justice to the efforts of these missionaries to appreciate the vernaculars as languages organized around their own specific linguistic matrices.

Using Latin did not restrain Sanvitore, unfortunately for us, from writing in the style that was very popular in those days with Spanish writers. They all were very fond of “long, complex and at times nearly hopelessly entangled sentences” (Barrett 1975: 10). In Levesque’s translation of the Belgian Father Coomans’ History of the mission in the Mariana islands – a translation of the original document written in 1673 – one can see that this style was not only popular with Spanish writers. Levesque has made a very literal translation of Coomans’ text, which frequently results in sentences in which the logical coherence seems absent. The following example of Levesque’s translation provides a good example of this style and concomitant apparent lack of coherence:

I, finding an opportunity of forced leisure, or rather of not yet being permitted to go out for apostolic works in this so much awaited, so much sought-after mission, I have been thinking that I could make my spare time valuable if I were to treat under almost a single aspect and in the unfinished style of a certain narrative the things which are part of the annual letter everywhere, just as the events were then presenting themselves, they would have been related in writing, I, anticipating that the result from it would not be objectionable if... (etc.) .

---

12 An overview of these reviews, especially related to Sanvitore’s grammar is already given in the introductory chapter. The supposed coercion of languages into the Latin framework is also subject of discussion in the subsequent chapters.

Since we may assume that Coomans (1638-1685), Sanvitores and other writers using this style wanted to convey logically coherent information, the challenge for us is not to translate these documents literally, but to translate them in such a way that these entangled sentences are transformed into sentences that make sense to us and at the same time accurately and fully reflect what the writer wants to convey.

Another complicating factor in delivering a proper transcription as well as a correct translation, is that the entire Lingua Mariana as stored in the Jesuit archives is a copy, made, according to the inserted notice, by Morales (see section 2.3).

Burrus, however, assumes that the original manuscript was not copied by Morales because Morales would not have made the mistakes present in the copied text, like the faulty division in three words in de linea bamus instead of the correct delineabamus or laudem instead of the correct laudent in a scriptural passage the copyist would surely have known by heart. Therefore Burrus assumes that the manuscript was first sent to Manila and copied there by an anonymous Jesuit who was, as Burrus puts it, “not very familiar with Latin”. I will now go into this matter in more detail.

In the Jesuit archives in Rome I discovered what at first seemed to be a second letter of Sanvitores, also written in Latin, which, considering the at times very sloppy handwriting, seems not to be copied. This text is taken up in a volume entitled Philippica 13, archived in Rome as Opp. N.N. 353 (the number following the number 352 of the codex with the grammar). This volume contains some other letters from Sanvitores as well, written in Spanish. Closer inspection revealed that this letter in Latin, dated 16 may 1669, is actually the continuation of the introductory letter taken up in the Lingua Mariana. In the first lines given here below (with some corrections in my transcription, which are underlined) Sanvitores explains why he had not been able to send the letter in its entirety to Manila:
Dedimus superiore anno 1668 ad tuam Paternitatem epistolae, seu libelli supplicii pro his miseris Latronibus feliciter iam Marianis, partem, omissa altera, quam bona ex malae manus commentario praednavium festinatione exscribere non potuit. Hanc damus nunc bona guidem manus transcriptam, sed ex eadem primo in ipsa navigatione ad has insulas scripto, et admodum imperfecto, quod vix relegi et exigua additio complevi permisit urgentissima occupationum et excursionum pro Marianis nostris a Daemonum latrociniis aeternoque interitu cum Divina gratia vindicandis per totum annum continuato; de cuius primi anni Nostrae Missionis eventibus, quia nec annua solita breviorem adhuc summam, quam separatam litteris ad tuam Paternitatem alia via scribemus, hic transcribere vacat, dabimus hac via brevissimam saltem notitiam, inserentes hic aliud scriptum, quod...

In 1668 we have given to your Paternity [title used for the Superior General of the Society of Jesus] part of a letter or booklet with supplications for these pitiable 'Thieves', fortunately now already [sc. named] 'Marians', omitting the second part, which at that time, because of the speed of the ships, a good handwriting could not write out from the draft of a bad

---

Sanvitores (1669a: 9v).
handwriting. This part we give you now, transcribed by a good handwriting, but based on this same first text version written during the boat trip to the islands and still not perfected, because the very burdening continuation the whole year through of occupations and attacks for the sake of rescuing with the help of God our Marians from the robberies by devils and the eternal destruction did hardly allow us to reread it and complete it by a small addition; since it was impossible here to copy in the usual year a shorter summary thus far about the events of this first year, a summary which we [will] write in a separate letter to your Paternity in another way, we will give by this way a very short notice at least, inserting here another text, which...

This fragment illustrates a number of things related to Burrus’ arguments for stating that the Vatican codex of the *Lingua Mariana* is a copy of the original and was made in Manila. Sanvitores speaks of the exscribere (to copy or to work out/elaborate) of a *commentarium* (paper or draft version or sketch) by a *manus bona* (good hand or good handwriting). This all makes it ambiguous whether he means ‘copied’ or ‘worked out’ and ‘in a good handwriting’ or ‘by someone else in a good handwriting’. Considering the still very sloppy handwriting at times in this continuation of the introductory letter, with lots of corrections and words crossed out, it seems unlikely that Sanvitores meant here that it was copied by someone else. This implies that Sanvitores explains to us here that he wrote the grammar and the entire letter on board of the ship in a draft version, was able to make a neater and more elaborated, though still far from perfect, version of the grammar and of the first part of the letter while still on the boat and that only a year later he could finally write out more neatly the remaining part of the letter.

This also suggests that Burrus is probably right in assuming that the text of the *Lingua Mariana*, the codex including the grammar (Opp. NN. 352), is a copy made in Manila and indeed not made by Father Morales. It remains unclear then why the notice contains this handwritten addition telling that it was copied by Morales. It may be that Morales made a copy of Sanvitores’ text right after Sanvitores had finished it, but there is no decisive proof for this assumption. What becomes clear from the introductory passage of his letter (see fragment 4) is that he wrote this passage on the third day after his arrival and after already having written the rest of the letter and the grammar. In this passage he says that he plans to send the letter and grammar rightaway because of his success in conversion these very first days of his arrival, and the date of the letter, noted at the end, is June 18, 1668, so indeed on the third day after his arrival. This makes it less likely, but still not unthinkable, that Morales had made a copy first before sending it to Manila. However, Burrus’ argumentation that faulty spacings and ungrammaticalities in the text of the codex show that the copying...
was done by someone not very familiar with Latin, seems to be denied by the presence of similar mistakes in the second part of the letter (Opp. NN. 353). As can be seen in the fragment above, this second part of the introductory letter lacks accuracy as well in putting spaces between words (as in faeliciter and iam and pertotum annum instead of per totum annum), contains spelling errors (misseris instead of miseris), is confusing in the punctuation (e.g. a semicolon between transcriptam and sed, where a comma would be more appropriate and less confusing) and also seems to contain a grammatical error (present tense scribimus instead of the more appropriate future tense scribemus). These same types of mistakes can be found as well in the Lingua Mariana; I will come back to this when discussing fragment 4.

These errors made by Sanvitores or made by the copyist complicate making a proper transcription of the text. As I will illustrate below, Burrus has corrected some of the mistakes made by Sanvitores or the copyist, but has overlooked some other mistakes and unfortunately has added a few himself. The errors in the manuscript, together with the lengthy and “hopelessly entangled” sentences and the complexity of the matter described – especially, but not only in the grammar part – also make it an arduous undertaking sometimes to understand and translate Sanvitores’ words correctly. This can be illustrated by giving the very first paragraph of the preserved copy of the manuscript of the Lingua Mariana, followed by my transcription and translation. In the transcription I have underlined the corrections I have made in the manuscript text as rendered by the copyist.

Fragment 4: f.1r

\begin{figure}
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\caption{Fragment 4: f.1r}
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Fragment 4 (continued)

1. Non erat animus cum has rudes institutiones
delineabamus, eas mitere extra nostras Maria-
nas insulas, quousque saltem intra eas diuturna expe-
rientia et conversatione Ministrorum apud hos indige-
nas probarentur et perficerentur, sed cum iam felici-
ter pervenerimus, et ipsa Stella maris, quae nostro affla-
rit itineri, eo caelestis gratiae per ipsam a Domino Nos-
tro Jesuchristo impetrate influxu Nostre Missionis
fructus, ita ut vidimus tam exiguo trium dierum spa-
tio, maturoverit, videamusque eamdem felicitatem eisdem
auspicis sperandam esse in reliquis finitimis insulis
dummodo copia adsit Ministrorum quorum tanta nunc
est inopia, ut pro quinquaginta. Millibus animarum,
quae in hac insula Guan [?] S. Joannis supputantur
et reliquirum insularum innumeris incolis tres omni-
o hic moneamus sacerdotes, quos et oporteret non nisi
bimos saltem per singulas insulas dispersi. Messis er-
go multa. Cum sunt operarii autem pauci, quid faciendus,
nisi quod Dominus Noster Jesus suas discipulos docuit:
Rogate, scilicet Dominum messis, ut mittat operarios
in messem suam et annuere sociis qui sunt in alis
navibus.

When we sketched out these unpolished instructions, we had no intention
of sending it outside of our islands until at least we could, within these
islands, test and perfect these instructions by the conversation of our
servants with these islanders. But since we have been so successful already
and Mary, who has blown a favourable wind on our travel and who has
obtained power through herself by our Jesus Christ, has ripened the fruit of
our mission to such an extent in such a short period of three days, we hope to see the same success, under the same auspices on the rest of the islands nearby, provided that the amount of servants we lack now, about fifty, can join us. For the thousands of souls who are supposed to live on this island Guan [?] St. John and the countless inhabitants on the rest of the islands we are here three priests in total, a number which also should be spread for a period of at least two years over each single island. So, the number of souls to be converted is great. However, when there are few workers, what should be done, except what Our Lord Jesus has taught us: ask, to the Lord of the harvest of course, to send workers to his harvest field and allow brothers who are on other ships to join us.

Indeed the copyist has made (or left in) some obvious mistakes in line 2 (de linea bamus instead of the correct delineabamus) and in line 13 (in opia instead of the correct inopia). However, also Sanvitores himself could have made these errors, as illustrated in fragment 3, and then the copyist simply transcribed these without interpreting. Sometimes also the handwriting of the copyist, though generally speaking very consistent, complicates a correct interpretation. In line 14, for instance, there is a word unreadable to me, between Guan (Guam) and S. Ioannis (St. John, San Juan), which is probably meant to associate both names. Elsewhere in the letter Sanvitores says a couple of times that Guam is named San Juan now, using the words iam vocata (now named), which are clearly not used here. In a letter written in Spanish Sanvitores sums up all the islands and their new names, in the following way: “Guam ya se llama S. Juan, Zarpana ya Santa Ana, Saypan ya San Joseph” etc. Since the first two letters of this 15 Coomans (2000:5) reports that in these first days “23 were baptized among the young children”. Sanvitores himself claims on the subsequent page (f.1v) of his letter that with the help of this grammar and doctrinal texts he had been able to receive already sixteen adults and thirty-four children into the Faith.

16 In a separate letter which I haven’t seen yet myself, Sanvitores estimates that there are forty thousand inhabitants on the Mariana islands. According to Viana (2011) “it was highly likely that Fr. Sanvitores exaggerated the population of the Marianas to justify additional subsidies for the mission.” In the second part of the introductory letter Sanvitores claims that in the period from his arrival, June 16, 1668, until April 21, 1669 – so in less than a year – he and his companions had succeeded in baptizing 13,089 islanders (!).

17 This number is a bit confusing. Coomans (2000) records that Sanvitores had, including himself, six priests, one of whom was still unordained. In a letter of 1665 to Queen regent Maria Ana Sanvitores himself sums up a number of five priests, including himself (cf. Viana 2011: 383). To make the number here correspond with this we must assume that Sanvitores did not include himself nor the still unordained priest in this number of three priests.

18 Sanvitores paraphrases Matthew 9:37-38 here: “Tunc dicit discipulis suis messis quidem multa operarii autem pauci. Rogate ergo dominum messis ut eiciat operarios in messem suam.” (Then he (sc. Jesus) said to his disciples, “The harvest is plentiful but the workers are few. Ask the Lord of the harvest, therefore, to send out workers into his harvest field.”

19 Sanvitores (1669b)
unreadable word (or word group) in line 14 above seem to be ya (now) it may well be that Sanvitores accidentally weaved some Spanish here in his Latin text. However, it then still remains a puzzle what the letters following ya are and what they mean. A more complex mistake or combination of mistakes can be found in lines 17-19. Instead of keeping the sentence Cum sunt operariorum pauci, nisi quod Dominus Noster Jesus suos discipulos docuit: ... together, punctuation is inserted wrongly and cum sunt is altered in cumsit (a nonexistent word) and added to the previous sentence. However, as we have seen already, the confusing punctuation can also be found in the second part of the manuscript (see fragment 3), so this liberal insertion of comma’s and semicolons may also have been a habit of Sanvitores himself and must have been a cause of confusion more than once for the copyist.

In the margin of the text some comments are inserted here and there by someone else. According to Burrus (1954:940) they are meant to be corrections. In some cases they are indeed corrections of wrongly spelled words and other faults. However, sometimes they are clearly inserted as very brief summaries of the text. Next to fragment 4 given above, for instance, two comments are inserted: Animarum multitudo and Operariorum penuria (large number of souls and lack of workers), which together form indeed a very brief summary of what Sanvitores wants to tell his brothers in Rome and Manila.

2.6 The introduction to the grammar

As already mentioned above, the Lingua Mariana hasn’t been translated and so far only a transcription is made of the grammar and catechism part, by E.J. Burrus. However, in making this transcription Burrus overlooked mistakes made by the copyist and made incorrect modifications himself, undoubtedly due to the problematic aspects of the manuscript I’ve summed up in the previous section. I will give three examples (fragments 5-7) taken from the introduction to the grammar and then my transcription, followed by my translation. In the manuscript fragments I have encircled some problematic words, word groups and matters concerning punctuation, and underlined these in my transcription.

30 Splitting up ‘cumsit’ into two words must be right as such, since ‘cumsit’ simply isn’t an existent word in Latin. My correction, however, of ‘sit’ in ‘sunt’ goes quite a step further. The first argument for making this rather drastic correction is that it is very unlikely that Sanvitores himself wrote a verb in third person singular followed almost directly by the subject in plural. The copyist probably altered ‘sunt’ in ‘sit’ because he wrongly thought that ‘multa’ is the subject in the meaning of ‘many things’ (in Latin neuter plural subjects have a predicate in 3rd p. singular).
1. Insularum gentes, quae olim De Las Velas,
2. hactenus Latronum iamque optima forte seu potius
3. restitutione Marianorum usurpavere nomen, ex Japo-
4. nia finitima regione profectae ut tradit ex Patre Joanne
5. Roderico Pater Franciscus Colin in sua India Sacra lib. 3,
6. num. 104, ita “ex communionis et commercii cum poli-
7. toribus defectu degeneri cultu in barbaros abiere”, id
8. est in incultos; etenim dum accedat cultura, spes est ha-
9. ud infirma (firmam nonnihil Japoniorum indolem
10. divina confirmante gratia) Japonici in his resurrecturi
11. ingeni et ex ipsis (o utinam) in Japonia Christiana re-
12. surrecturae fidei; ita demum cum politia omnis apud eos
13. populos obsolet liberalis ars ut etiam scriptionis vel
14. notorum quorumvis illis deficiat usus, qui sane defectus
15. abundantia bonitatis illius, qui etiam bene fact ex ma-
16. lis, forsan proficiet nunc in novae huiusce Marianorum cultu-
17. rae facilius incrementum. Neque enim desiderabunt in cul-
18. toribus eam characterem peritiam, quam nec de facie no-
19. runt ipsi, quamque importune satis desiderant exculti
20. Japones aut Sinae et ad quam excelsiorem eorum gustu
21. bonum desideratur. Tempus bene interea ponendum vo-
22. lente Deo in facilius et colle parvorum cultura
23. pro qua et nostros characteres et cum illis forsan et nostras
24. voces divinaque verba facilius et utilius docebuntur ipsi.

The people of the islands who once had used the name De Las Velas and thus far the name Ladrones, but now, by excellent fate or rather by rehabilitation use the name Marians, had departed from the very near region of Japan and, as Father Franciscus Colin, following Father Joannus Rodericus, tells us in his India Sacra, vol. 3, no. 104: ‘degenerated, because of lack of social intercourse and trade with more civilized people, into barbarians’, which means: into uncivilized people. Therefore, if only the level of civilization would rise, hope is far from weak – the Japanese do have rather strong inborn qualities thanks to the favor of God – that in them the

21 ‘Of the Sails’. See note 3.
22 ‘Of Thiefs’. See note 3 and the words of Pigafetta quoted in section 2.3.
24 Very unlikely to be true. The probable origin of the people is Malayo-Polynesian. Cf. Cunningham (2001). For a concise text, written by Lawrence Reid, about the possible origin of the people and their language, see Reid (2014). For a more in-depth analysis of the Austronesian origin of Chamorro, see Reid (2002). The other references to a ‘Christian Japan’ and pressure from Japan to become more ‘civili-
24 zed’ are also very unlikely, since already early in the 17th century Japan started to banish all Christians out of its territory. Cf. Paramore (2009). About direct relations with Chinese nothing, to my knowledge, is known. Probably all of these references are taken up by Sanvitores to make his text more colourful and exotic for his readers.
25 Francisco Colin S.J. (1592-1660) worked in the Philippines, author of the ‘Labor Evangelica’ – about the Philippines and the achievements of the missionaries there – and the book quoted here, the ‘India Sacra’, in which he tried to use new information about Asia in order to clarify passages from the Old Testament.
inborn Japanese capacities will come to life again and that, I pray, they themselves will restore faith in Christian Japan. Together with the civilization, all art and science eventually decayed to such an extent that even the usage of a script or of whatever sort of written characters is slipping away from them. But it is truly this lack of writing abilities that, thanks to the abundance of goodness of Him, who even creates good things out of bad situations, perhaps will help in creating an easier growth of this new civilization of the Marians. For they will certainly not miss in the priests this knowledge of written signs which they have not seen themselves and which the civilized Japanese or Chinese quite rudely desire of them and to the cultivation of which to their taste virtue is lacking. Meanwhile time must be spent well, when God wills it, on the easier civilization of this kind of the children, to the benefit of which they themselves will be taught more easily and more profitably our letters and thereby perhaps as well our language and our holy texts.

As I have already illustrated in the manuscript fragment in the previous section (fragment 1), punctuation in the manuscript is not always accurate. In fragment 5 we can see two examples of wrong punctuation that easily lead to misinterpretation of the text. In line 14 the copyist writes notarum, quarumvis, probably because he wrongly understands quarumvis to belong to a supposed subordinate clause (quarumvis ... usus). Burrus (1954: 941) seems to agree, since he maintains the comma. However, the entire subordinate clause already starts with ut etiam and then goes on till usus, and notarum quarumvis should be taken together: “whatever sort of written characters”.

Burrus’ correction of et enim in etenim (line 4) is very likely to be right, because et enim is incorrect Latin when ‘for’, ‘since’ or ‘therefore’ is meant. Also, inserting a full stop or, as Burrus (1954: 941) did, a semicolon before etenim, instead of the comma in the manuscript, makes sense, although Sanvitores, considering the style prevalent in these days as mentioned above (section 2.4) of lengthy and entangled sentences, may indeed have placed a comma himself or even no punctuation at all.

In line 2 the copyist writes optimo furto (by excellent theft), probably because he associates it with Latronum (of thieves) also in line 2. Burrus (1954: 941) maintains this. However, the sentence then suggests that the island got its new name (Marianas) thanks to ‘excellent theft’, which doesn’t make sense. So, it is far more likely that Sanvitores himself wrote optima forte (by excellent fate; very fortunately).
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The word in line 15 benefacere (to do good) exists in ecclesiastical Latin (not in classical Latin), but is considered less correct. More proper is bene facere, and this occurs, also in ecclesiastical texts, far more frequently. Furthermore, bene facere can mean the same as benefacere, but can also refer to ‘to do well’ in the sense of ‘to produce good things or deeds’ and this latter meaning makes perfect sense in conjunction with ex malis: to create good things out of bad things (situations).

In line 17 and 21 Burrus also made mistakes in the punctuation. In the manuscript a comma or full stop is clearly visible between incrementum and neque but Burrus (1954: 941) leaves it out, while the sentence starting with neque is a subordinate clause or a new sentence and therefore should be distinguished as such by either a comma or a full stop: Neque enim desiderabunt ...

The comma clearly visible in the manuscript between tempus and bene is also problematic. Burrus omits it but then the meaning of the ongoing sentence becomes unclear. I have conjectured that a full stop after desideratur expresses most clearly what Sanvitores probably means to say here: ... ad quam ...

Sanvitores touched the shores of Guam in 1668, but as we know he wrote the grammar and Ordinal texts already before his arrival, in the course of the three months travel it took him and his companions to cross the seas from Mexico to the Marianas. In the next paragraph of the introduction to his grammar (following the lines 1-24 given above in fragment 5) Sanvitores explains how he managed to do so. Problematic words are encircled in the manuscript fragment and underlined in my transcription:

---

26 Like in pulchrum est bene facere rei publicae (it is honorable to do good things for the republic); discite bene facere (learn to do good things). Cf. Lewis and Short (1879), s.v. bene.

27 The Latin word ‘bonum’, literally ‘the good’, can refer to for instance the moral good, or a good quality, or virtue or prosperity. I conjecture from the context – the civilized (exculti) Japanese seem to have a low opinion of the Chamorro people – that virtue or maybe prosperity is meant here.
25. Ore ergo dumtaxat ex ipsis eorum
26. idioma interea accipiendum est, et nunc temporis quo haec
27. scribuntur in navi ex ore transmissum in os cuiusdam in-
28. terpretis, natione et lingua Tagali ingenio quidem et
29. loquellq haud rudis sed nostris etiam scribendi caracte-
30. ribus prorsus ignari, quo tamen e fortunato eo Marianis
31. Insulis naufragio navis ab immaculata Conceptione appel-
32. latae ibi relictq decemque et septem annos cum eorum in-
33. sularum indigenis conversato pro magno Dei et beatissi-
34. mae Virginis munere nunc utemur interprete.

So the only way to learn their language is orally from themselves and at the very moment that these words are written aboard ship they are orally translated by some interpreter who is Tagalan by nationality and language, not at all unintelligent nor unpractised in expressing himself but also completely unable to write in even our characters. In spite of this we now use him as our interpreter and he is a great gift from God and the holy Virgin, for after having luckily survived this shipwreck at the Mariana Islands
of the ship ‘Conception’, named after immaculate Conception, he has stayed there and lived there with the islanders for seventeen years.²⁸

Burrus (1954: 941) made some useful corrections in the punctuation of this sentence. The comma between *appellatae* and *ibi* in the manuscript (line 32) is misleading, since the whole part from *quo tamen* (line 30) until *conversato* forms one subordinate clause.²⁹ The comma between *decemque* and *et septem* is of course a very obvious mistake. Also the comma between *Dei* (God) and *et* (and) in line 33 is clearly wrong (and rightly removed by Burrus), because the entire part from *pro* until *munere* (as... a gift) forms one unit.

More conspicuous in this fragment is the Spanish influence. Sanvitores writes *idioma* (line 26), instead of a Latin word like *lingua*. In line 29/30 the manuscript gives the word *caracteribus*. Burrus (1954: 941) corrects this into *characteribus*. This indeed is the correct Latin spelling. However, not only the copyist but also Sanvitores himself, may well have written *caracteribus*, since both spellings, *character* and *character*, were used in those days. Also Burrus’ correction of *loquella* in the manuscript into *loquela* seems unnecessary, since both spellings are allowed.

With fragment 6 the true introductory part of the introduction ends. Sanvitores immediately goes on by starting to explain the pronunciation of the language. As appears in the following fragment, he is quite uncertain about the proper pronunciation, because his Tagalog interpreter is so inconsistent in the way he pronounces words that he even gets the impression sometimes that islanders on various islands speak different languages. This uncertainty and the fact that he noticed so accurately that his interpreter wasn’t very consistent in his pronunciation, show how seriously Sanvitores took his task of learning to understand and speak the language.

²⁸ Sanvitores mentions only one interpreter here. Viana (2004: 20) reports that there were nineteen ‘devout Indios’ from the Philippines (Tagalogs, Visayans and Pampangos), of whom two served as interpreters, Francisco de Mendoza and Estevan Diaz, both survivors of the shipwreck of the Concepcion. Proof of this, according to Viana, can be found in two document both taken up in Levesque (1993): *AGI Fil. 82-2-29, Memorial of Fr. Sanvitores to the Queen, July 1667*, cited as Document 1667H, and 11 RAH (Real Academia de Historia, Madrid) 9/2676 Doc. No. 5, Letter from Fr. Pedro Casanova to Fr. Gabriel Guillen, San Juan, Marianas, 17 June 1668, cited as Document No. 1668 J3.

²⁹ A so-called ‘ablativus absolutus’ construction in which the verb gets the form of a present or perfect participle, in the ablative, and the subject belonging to this verb is also placed in the ablative. E.g. *‘signo dato’ (after the signal was given; after having given the signal).*
Out of the varying pronunciation of words by either our interpreter or by the natives on the various islands (otherwise all speak, he says, the same language) will come forth a double or uncertain pronunciation which one can see and indicate on first acquaintance with this language by the following words.

Burrus’ transcription of this fragment 7 also contains a few errors. The manuscript renders the nominative or ablative form *lingua* (language) and Burrus (1954: 941) maintains this (line 37). However, this should be *linguam*, since it has the grammatical function of the Object (accusative, together with *eandem*: the same language). In line 39/40 Burrus renders a less correct Latin form *huisce* where the manuscript clearly gives the more correct form *huiusce,* which is the genitive of the emphatic form of the demonstrative pronoun *hic*. The genitive form *huisce* can be found as well in medieval Latin, but this in itself does not seem to be a valid reason to change the correct form *huiusce* in the manuscript. As a genitive it belongs to *linguae* in line 40 (this language). The future tense in the verb *proveniet*, also maintained by Burrus, may seem strange but no doubt refers to what to the reader will become clear when he reads the treatise following this introduction.

---

30 Burrus seems not to have made a typing error, since he changes the correct form ‘huiusce’; as given in the manuscript, into this incorrect form ‘huisce’ several times in his transcription.
Sanvito then goes on to inform us about the pronunciation of the language and the orthography he uses to denote the pronunciation. And as he has said in the previous lines, he does indeed indicate very often that he isn’t sure yet about the proper pronunciation. The text in the manuscript is divided here into two columns. Sanvito uses examples from Latin, Spanish and Tagalog to make clear how words should be pronounced. In explaining, for instance, how to pronounce aspirated or guttural sounds, he says the following:

**Fragment 8: f. 26v**

| A seu ha vel ah. | Littera H videtur proferenda seu scribenda pro densiori aspiratione, plane ut proferunt Hispani in Provincia Baetica, ubi H paene non discrepat a J Hispano, quare hanc litteram J hic non scribemus. |
| Cha seu sa. | G autem solum scribetur pro leni dictione etiam ante E et I, unde Ge et Gi proferuntur ut Galatinum. |
| Chi seu si. | Est et g. quam vocamus lingua Tagala gutturalem quia gutture plusquam in aliis vocibus laborante profertur; quam exprimemus hic ut in Tagalo hac nota ģ. |
| Ta seu pa. | U profertus saepius ut syllaba per se non discrepans fere a Gu, et hoc indicatur item hac nota ŋ. |
| Man seu Mang. | |
| Midyo seu Myo. | |
| Na seu Nja. | |
| Ohi sue ahi. | |
| Vay seu guay. | |
| Bigas seu bugas. | |
| *Et Universim:* E et I: O et U plerumque ad invicem commutantur variatione significatus." |
| *Littera H videtur proferenda seu scribenda pro densiori aspiratione, plane ut proferunt Hispani in Provincia Baetica, ubi H paene non discrepat a J Hispano, quare hanc litteram J hic non scribemus.* |
| G autem solum scribetur pro leni dictione etiam ante E et I, unde Ge et Gi proferuntur ut Galatinum. |
| Est et g. quam vocamus lingua Tagala gutturalem quia gutture plusquam in aliis vocibus laborante profertur; quam exprimemus hic ut in Tagalo hac nota ģ. |
| U profertus saepius ut syllaba per se non discrepans fere a Gu, et hoc indicatur item hac nota ŋ. |

| A or ha or ah. | The letter H seems to be spoken or written to express a rather coarse aspiration, very much like the Spanish in the province of Baetica, where H hardly differs from the Spanish J, |
| Cha or sa. | |
| Chi or si. | |
| Ta or pa. | |

"From now on, having given sufficient examples of the manuscript itself and its problematic aspects, I will only give my own Latin transcription and translation. Of course it will be noted where my transcription differs from Burrus’ transcription.

"Burrus: *significati*. The manuscript also seems to render *significati*. Burrus overlooked that this is a mistake, by the copyist or Sanvito himself. Either one of them, or both, probably thought that, as with most words ending on *-us*, the nominative *significatus* has a genitive *significati*. The genitive of *significatus*, however, is also spelled *significati*.
What Sanvitores knows and thinks about the culture of the islanders is mainly described in the introductory letter. Sometimes, however, Sanvitores mixes up his linguistic explanations in this grammar section with cultural information about the islanders, as in the left column of the following fragment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item plerumque</th>
<th>I quotienscumque est consonans seu feriens aut diphthongi pars scribetur ut Graecum Y.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sonat ut R lene, praesertim in medio dictionis.</td>
<td>Accentus cum fuerit in penultima, quae Latine dicitur penultima producta vel cum vox fuerit monosyllaba, nulla significabitur nota, cum autem fuerit in antepenultima vel in ultima signabitur hac virgula (').</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R autem asperum exprimunt fortiter ut duplex R Latinum, ut in ferro, quod in huismodi gente</td>
<td>Monosyllaba quaelia sunt genitivi(^{35}) pronomini faciunt incliticam(^{36}) cum antecedenti dictione</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{33}\) Burrus (1954: note 21) gives the following comment on Sanvitores notation ţ: “This has become gu in modern orthography, e.g. guaho, where Sanvitores has ţaho. The author wrote down the words as he heard them from the interpreter; syllable follows upon syllable with little attempt to distinguish words.” The latter remark does no justice to Sanvitores. I will come back to this in the analysis of a fragment taken from the catechism (fragment 14).

\(^{34}\) Burrus: huismodi. Here, again, Burrus alters the correct ‘huismodi’, as given in the manuscript, in ‘huaismodi’, and again there is no reason to do so.

\(^{35}\) Burrus: genitivi. The manuscript gives ‘genitivi’. ‘genitivi’, Burrus’ correction is in accordance with the correct Latin spelling of the word. However, in later occurrences of the word (see for instance fragment 10 given below) the spelling with ‘i’ is also found, but Burrus does not apply this correction there. Furthermore, it seems that in late Latin the spelling with an ‘i’ was quite common (cf. Nebrija 1996[1488]).
Also D often sounds as a smooth R, especially in the middle of a word. The grating R they express with force, as the double R in Latin, like in ferro, a sound which can be sustained without any suspicion by prorsus abstemia vinumque et quacumque ebrietatis materiam respuente, absque omni suspicione sustineri potest.

Every time I is used as a consonant or when it is stressed or as part of a diphthongue, it will be notated as the Greek Υ.

When the stress will have rested on the penultimate syllable, which in Latin is called the stressed penultimate, or when the word will have been a monosyllable, no notation of the stress will be given. However, when the stress will have rested on the antepenultimate or on the last syllable, it will be notated with this accentual mark: ′.

The monosyllables such as the genitives of the

---

36 The manuscript renders ‘inclyticam’, an incorrect spelling probably because of the association with more familiar words like ‘inclytus’ (famous) and ‘encyclicus’ (circular or universal). ‘Incliticus’, however, is formed from the Greek ἐγκλιτικός, so the correction of Burrus of ‘γ’ in ‘ι’ is right. Even more correct would be ‘encliticam’.

37 Instead of ‘finita’ (ended), ‘finiente’ (ending) would be more correct. However, since changing ‘finita’ in ‘finiente’ would mean a rather radical correction, it may well be that Sanvitores himself has written this not entirely correct sentence.

38 In modern Chamorro the word tafañocho, composed of ta (us) and fan – which is the (plural) marker of the irrealis and as such used to express future tense, the imperative form and the finals function) – and chocho (eat), means ‘let’s eat’. The proper Latin translation then indeed is the subjunctive (irrealis) form manducemus, which in Latin conveys these same (optative) future and irrealis functions. Sanvitores repeats this example elsewhere (f. 32r) when explaining the word ta and then dissects the word entirely correctly in the same way as I have described in the first sentence of this note. However, although he correctly uses the Latin subjunctive mode here in his translation, it is only the plural aspect of fan– which he describes explicitly, not the future/irrealis aspect. Furthermore, in another paragraph he says that the subjunctive (the irrealis form) is expressed in Chamorro by adding the word cum (modern komus), not by some sort of conjugation of the verb, and that the ‘optative’ is expressed by the imperative mode. For a more extensive analysis of Sanvitores’ view on subjunctive and optative in Chamorro and on the prefix fan- and the word cum, see chapter 5.

39 The term penultima producta (abbreviated sometimes to P.P.) is used to indicate that the penultimate syllable is stressed, while penultima corriga (P.C.) indicates that the stressed syllable is the last one (cf. Rebeca Fernández (2009: 261))
these people, who are completely abstaining from alcoholic drinks and disapprove of any source of drunkenness.

pronouns: Ho, ma, ña, ta, yo are enclitic with the previous word when it ends with a vowel, like in the Latin marique, e.g. Inaho (my Father) and sometimes with a following word, e.g. Tafanocho (Let’s eat).

2.7 The grammar

After the introduction Sanvitores starts a new section with the title: *partes orationis linguae Marianae* (the parts of speech of the Marian language). He sums them all up in the introductory sentences of this section, but adds that he has included the participle in the verb (thereby reducing the classical eight parts to seven parts of speech): noun, pronoun, verb (including the participle), preposition, adverb, interjection and conjunction. This grammar is of interest for several reasons. Firstly, it is of historio-linguistic interest, since it is the first written grammar of Chamorro and can thus provide information about differences between Chamorro in the seventeenth century and modern Chamorro. Secondly, it gives us a picture of the linguistic method Sanvitores used in learning and explaining the language. And thirdly, it shows us what level of insight Sanvitores had into specific phenomena of the language, for instance concerning cases and concepts of modes. Burrus says regarding the method used by Sanvitores that it was a “sound method in acquiring a new language: a native instructor to give him the correct pronunciation and vocabulary; a systematic study of the language accompanied by a comparison with a similar one.”

Contrary to this positive judgment, his level of insight has often been depreciated, for instance because Sanvitores used Latin case names in explaining a language that doesn’t have these case-inflections. However, Sanvitores himself indicates that he is very well aware of this:

---

40 The fact that Sanvitores reduces the parts of speech from eight to seven is an example of the non-dogmatic way in which he uses the Latin grammatical framework. Sanvitores explicitly speaks of “the parts of speech of the Marian language”, i.e. the parts of speech that are effective in explaining this specific language. This will be further discussed in chapter 5.

41 Burrus (1954: 935, note 4).

Itaque in omnibus appellativis nullum est discrimen nominativi a genitivo, nec plerumque ab accusativo rei, dativusque et ablativus semper assimilantur praepositione sa vel a, quae etiam praeponitur accusativo loci quo postea in adverbio. Discrimen igitur similium casuum, praesertim genitivi a nominativo, dignoscetur ex orationis sensu vel ex disiunctis pronominibus.

So, in all nouns there is no distinction between nominative and genitive, nor, mostly, between nominative and ablative, and the dative and ablative are equally represented by the preposition sa or a, which also is placed before an accusative of place, about which we will say more in the section about the adverb. Therefore, the different case-functions of nouns, having the same form, especially genitive and nominative, can only be recognized by the meaning of the utterance of the discourse or by separate pronouns.

Apparently, Sanvitores recognizes on his first acquaintance with the language that Chamorro doesn’t have case inflections, just as, as he must have known already, Tagalog and, of course, his own mother tongue, Spanish. Nevertheless, the fact that Sanvitores still uses case names in explaining linguistic phenomena has led to much confusion and as a consequence a negative judgment about the quality of his grammar. However, as I will show in the next chapter, Sanvitores adopted – inspired by the work of Father Blancas (1560-1614), a missionary in the Philippines, and other fellow missionaries in the area43 – a new functional or pragmatic linguistic method in which the classical case names were given a functional meaning. This also, of course, means that the Lingua Mariana, especially the grammar part, should be understood and translated with these new meanings of the cases in mind. Translating, for instance, the following fragment about the active voice with the infix um in the traditional way would make no sense at all, not to us, but not to Sanvitores and his readers either, for as we have seen above, Sanvitores is well aware that there are no case inflections in Chamorro:

Construitur ... quasi Latine, persona agens in nominativo, persona cui datur in dativo, res quae datur in accusativo absque praepositione.

43 Blancas (1997[1610]) and for instance Coronel (1621) and Lopez (1690). Ridruejo (2004) and Sueiro Justel (2005) show that it was common practice in this area to use previous descriptions of a language as study material.
*(The active voice) is construed as in Latin, with the Agent in the nominative, the person-to-whom in the dative, the Object that is given in the accusative, without preposition.

Instead, a proper translation of fragment 11, one that indeed recognizes that Sanvites is aware of the lack of case-inflections in Chamorro and uses the Latin case names in a functional, discourse-related way, would be:

*(The active voice) is construed as in Latin, with the Agent as Topic/Focus, a Beneficiary and a Goal-Object, without preposition.

Likewise, a traditional translation of the following fragment, about the passive realized by the infix in, isn’t intelligible for anyone:

Fragment 12: f. 30r
Passiva fit per in loco um activae collocandum, constructurque cum nominativo rei et genitivo personae agentis, dativo personae cui, quae etiam nonnunquam ponitur in nominativo et tunc res, si movis, potest dici esse in accusativo, qui demum non distinguitur a nominativo.

* The passive voice is made by placing -in- instead of -um- of the active voice and is construed with the nominative for the Object and a genitive for the Agent and a dative for the person-to-whom. The person-to-whom can also figure as nominative and in that case the Object, if you wish to say so, figures as accusative, which ultimately is not distinguished from the nominative.

Instead, translating it in a functional way, makes a lot more sense:

The passive voice is made by placing -in- instead of -um- and is construed with a Goal-Subject as Topic/Focus (‘nominativo rei’), with an Oblique Agent (‘genitivo personae agentis’) and with a Beneficiary (‘dativo personae cui’). The Beneficiary can also have the function of Subject as Topic/Focus (‘nominativo’) and in that case the constituent that was Goal-Subject (‘res’) gets the function of Object (‘accusativo’), which ultimately is not marked to distinguish it from the Goal-Subject (‘nominativo’).

In chapter 4 I will show that Sanvites didn’t use the terms active and passive in the sense of syntactic structures, but in a pragmatic sense, describing two different perspectives: Actor-Focus and Goal-Focus and that in this respect he agrees with state-of-the-art linguistic theory. In the same chapter I will also argue that the term term Goal is preferable over Goal-Subject used here. Interpreting at this stage already the terms ‘passive’ and ‘active’ and omitting the term ‘Subject’ as done in chapter 4, would be confusing and would obscure the line of reasoning in this chapter.
2.8 The catechism

The last part of the *Lingua Mariana* bears the title: *Marianae linguae exercitaciones e quibus et institutiones Catecheticae licebit pro nunc eformari* (Exercises in the Marian Language from which for now it will be possible also to build up teachings in the catechism). Sanvitores starts right away with giving a number of short sentences like:

**Fragment 13: f. 38r**

An faharon hamio guini sa mirón mami: ingredimini in hanc nostram navem.

You (2.p. pl.) enter this ship of ours.

The modern word *halom* (enter) can easily be recognized, just as *hamyo* (you pl.), and sometimes modern and old Chamorro are even identical, as in *guini* (here) and *mami* (our, ours). This, however, is not the case with *mirón*, which cannot have any relationship with the modern Chamorro word *mirón*, since this word means *inattentive*. A modern word for ship that comes most close to *mirón* is *modong*, but so far it remains uncertain whether or not these two words are related. Concerning *an fa* and *sa* in this fragment, only an entire translation and analysis of the grammar and catechism part can provide an adequate answer with regard to the exact meanings and functions Sanvitores attributed to these and other affixes.

Almost all of the sentences Sanvitores gives have to do with the Christian faith. Sometimes he adds some cultural information about the islanders as well, as in:

**Fragment 14: f. 38v**

Guah andii hamio adyim atota mami nacaran sandagáng masatoni midyo: Ecce! Videte hanc pretiosam imaginem, ut sunt in pretio apud vos imagines rerum quas amatis. Habent et ipsi imagines, quibus repraesentant suos parentes vel alias personas ipsís caras quas tamen non adorant nec aliquo alió afficiunt sive cultu sive superstitione, quam sciamus, sed quibusdam tantum signis amoris et delectationis.

---

45 See section 2.4 above, where the distinct sections of this part are also given.
46 The manuscript renders *aliquo* (some, any), but Burrus altered this into *aliquot* (several), which makes no sense here.
Behold, you (2.p.pl) see here this precious image, just as you have yourselves images you consider precious, of things you love. (They also have images themselves that represent their ancestors or other persons dear to them; however, they do not worship them nor use them for some other cult or superstition, as far as we know, but only because they love these images and these images give them delight.)

This fragment provides a good example of the complexity of analyzing the Chamorro sentences Sanvitores gives, due to changes in the language in the course of time, inconsistencies in the spelling of words and no doubt also Sanvitores’ still very elementary level of knowledge of the language, a shortcoming he admits himself.47 The word guah, for instance, which, as Sanvitores has explained in an earlier section, means ‘look!’, ‘observe!’, may have become obsolete. Closest in modern Chamorro comes the word egga′ (with a glottal stop), but decisive proof of a relationship can, if at all, only be given after a fuller analysis of Sanvitores’ text and comparison with other sources. The word andii still exists in modern Chamorro, but the meaning has changed. In Sanvitores’ days it apparently meant ‘see’, nowadays it means ‘show off’. The word hamio is clear – in modern orthography hamyo: ‘you’ (pl.) – but the word adyim can’t be found anymore in modern Chamorro. To find equivalents one has to consult older sources. Safford renders it as ayen and says the following about this word:

The demonstrative adjective ‘this’ is rendered into Chamorro ‘ayen’ if placed before the predicate, and ‘yini’ or ‘ini’ if placed after the predicate of a sentence: ‘Ayen na patgon tumatangis gi paenge’, This child cried last night; ‘Hulalatde yini (or ini) na famalaoan’, I blamed these women [...] The Spanish este (‘this’) is fast taking the place of ‘ayen’ and ‘ini’.48

Topping and Dungca (1973: 112) confirm that indeed este has almost completely replaced the older Chamorro demonstratives and that ini “parallels the modern Chamorro locative guini”. This process of hispanicization is probably also the reason that the word atota used in this Chamorro sentence in fragment 14, which Sanvitores translates as ‘image’, has become obsolete. The modern Chamorro word for image is the Spanish ‘imagen’. However, whether this word really is spelled as atota is not certain. At the end of this sentence it seems to appear again, but then written as atoni. In what is spelled as nacaran we can recognize the modern Chamorro word kalan, meaning ‘just as’, probably

---

47 See fragment 5, where he tells us that he actually had not intended to publish this grammar until he had been able to improve his knowledge of and proficiency in the language.

48 Safford (1903, v.5, no.3:524).
connecting the two word groups atota mami (‘image’? ‘ours’) and atoni midyo (‘image’? ‘yours’)”. If so, then we are confronted with yet another complicating factor, the incorrect grouping of words and syllables. As a result of all this, we can to some extent relate the words in this sentence to equivalents in modern Chamorro but still a lot of questions remain, for instance, where a word meaning ‘precious’, or ‘costly’, is hidden somewhere in the remaining group of syllables san - da - gáng - mas. No doubt a full analysis and translation of the grammar and catechism will give more answers and give us more insight into what this language looked like before the process of hispanicization had started.

The criticism that Sanvitores writes down syllable after syllable “with little attempt to distinguish words” (Burrus 1954: note 21) does not do justice to his achievements nor to his efforts. Here and all through the rest of the grammar Sanvitores tries painstakingly to distinguish words and even within these words tries to distinguish roots from suffixes, prefixes and infixes, and in fact succeeds in dissecting roots and affixes very accurately. The fact that he sometimes, as in fragment 14, fails to do so correctly is quite understandable, since it is his first acquaintance with the language and since there were no written texts available and Sanvitores had to learn the language entirely by listening to his interpreter. Considering all this, it is actually quite amazing – in both meanings of the word: astonishing and truly admirable – what Sanvitores has been able to achieve.

Large parts of the Catechism are only given in Chamorro, because the Latin counterparts were easily available in other books which the missionaries carried with them, or because, as we may assume, the missionaries knew them by heart. In one instance Sanvitores explicitly refers to the Manuale Romanum, better known as the Rituale Romanum (the handbook of Christian rituals), where the reader can find the corresponding texts in Latin. He also indicates repeatedly that when he will have more time he will add more examples in Latin or Spanish with proper explanations and will further elaborate and improve this first version of his grammar and exercises, as in the following fragment:

Fragment 15: f. 41r
Cum adest tempus et opportunitas circumstantiarum suggerenda sunt item eiusmodi adulto privatim etiam baptizando in necessitate Symbolum Apostolorum et oratio Dominica Latino vel Hispano idiomate cum adiecta explicatione, quae apponitur infra ad Symbolum et ad orationem Dominicam

midyo is spelled as miyu in modern orthography.

See chapter 5.
Translating Father Sanvitores’ *Lingua Mariana*

recitarique expediet ab ipso baptizando modo quo possit.  

Quamvis enim iuxta supradicta in praefatione nondum expediat tradere eorum memoriae mandandas rudes has nostras versiones Symboli et orationum communium, possunt tamen suggeri recitandae in tempore pro suscipiendo baptismate et aliis occasionibus quousque vel calleant ipsi nostrum idioma vel ipsorum nos aut alii Dei gratia et linguae experientia amplius instructi certo perfectas ac tuto fecerimus Marianas versiones.

When there is more time and when the circumstances create an opportunity, also must be added, for private emergency baptism, the Apostles’ creed and the Lord’s prayer in Latin or Spanish together with an explanation, which is added below to the creed and to the Lord’s prayer and which will expedite the recitation by the baptized himself as much as possible. For although what is just said above doesn’t make it possible for them to memorize these rude translations of the creed and the communal prayers, yet, in time, texts can be added for baptizing and for other occasions until either they get experienced themselves in our language or we or others, by God’s grace and by experience, become more educated in their language and we certainly and safely will have made perfect translations in Chamorro.

Here again, just as in the introduction to his grammar (see section 2.5), Sanvitores indicates that successful conversion requires a mutual effort, from the islanders as well as from the missionaries, in learning and understanding each other’s language. And maybe indeed Sanvitores eventually would have come so far in learning Chamorro that he could have made “perfect translations”.

Unfortunately, as we know, his violent death hasn’t given him the opportunity to perfect both his grammar and his translations of ordinal texts. Nonetheless, by leaving us this document about the Chamorro language and about the culture at that time, as perceived by him and his companions, Sanvitores has left us a document of great cultural-historical and historio-linguistic interest, which deserves to be analyzed, transcribed and translated fully.

---

51 In the manuscript there is a full stop noted after ‘possit’. Burrus renders a comma. However, as one can see in the translation, it is far more logical to start a new sentence beginning with ‘Quamvis’.

52 Maybe Sanvitores adds ‘safely’ because of the turbulent situation he had to work in, as described in section 2.3.

53 Burrus (1954: 955) adds in a note to this fragment: “In the nearly three years that Sanvitores was able to devote to ministry in the Marianas, he no doubt composed several of such prayers in the native language, which do not, however, seem to have survived.”
Missionary Pragmalinguistics
3. The birth of Functional Grammar in the ‘Austronesian school’ of missionary linguistics

3.1 Abstract

The functional view on language contends that syntax, semantics and pragmatics are connected in such a way that changes on one of these levels generally lead to changes on one or both of the other levels as well. Hence, language utterances should be studied within the actual context of use, the pragmatic context, and context-specific concepts as Topic and Focus should play an important role in the describing and explaining of patterns and structures of languages. This functional theory of language is generally thought to have come into existence somewhere in the second half of the twentieth century, as a critical reaction to the theory of Transformational Grammar. In this chapter it is argued that the ‘birth’ of Functional Grammar has taken place roughly 400 years earlier, and probably within the ‘Austronesian linguistic school’ of the missionaries working in that area.

3.2 Structure of this chapter

In section 3.3 I will give a short overview of the criticism regarding the supposed inability of missionary linguists to explain syntactic language phenomena alien to the Latin grammatical model they worked from. In section 3.4 I will challenge this criticism by analyzing some fragments of one of the grammars of the Austronesian languages, written in Latin by Father Sanvitores. In section 3.5 I will try to corroborate my findings about the truly modern way in which Sanvitores explains syntactic language phenomena by analyzing other fragments of missionaries working in the same area. Finally, in section 3.6, I will give a number of conclusions.

3.3 Missionaries at the turning point from ‘old’ to ‘modern’ linguistics

The history of linguistics tells us something about the evolution of linguistics in the course of time, about changes and developments in our way of thinking about rules and mechanisms that structure languages. Generally speaking, the
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‘way of thinking’ reflected in the missionary grammars has often been depreciated quite explicitly. The missionaries supposedly didn’t really understand the language phenomena that seemed to be so alien to the Latin-Spanish model they knew and hence their descriptions and explanations of these phenomena were incorrect. Because these missionaries supposedly ‘blindly’ followed the Latin-Spanish model, they were unable to describe a language adequately that did not conform to this model. Simply said, the ‘verdict’ one often encounters in regard to missionary grammars is: you need modern theories to describe language adequately, and the missionaries just didn’t have these theories. Bloomfield (1933:6[1984:7]), for instance, is very explicit in his judgment regarding missionary linguistic works:

Those works can be used only with caution, for the authors, untrained in the recognition of foreign speech sounds, could make no accurate record, and knowing only the terminology of Latin grammar, distorted their exposition by fitting it into this frame.

Equally critical, for instance, is Rowe (1974: 364f.):

Non-European languages were studied by missionaries whose aim was to “reduce” them [...] to the pattern of Latin grammar. [...] In general, sixteenth and seventeenth century grammarians felt obliged to find correspondences to the parts of speech of Latin [...] A grammarian of the present day, trying to use the early works [...] may be blocked [...] by the fact that some forms and constructions alien to Latin are not given at all.

Topping, in his reference grammar of Chamorro, one of the languages in the area I will focus on in this chapter, seems somewhat milder in his comment on the grammar of Sanvitores (see following sections), but his judgment regarding the missionaries’ use of the Latin model is very similar:

This work, of considerable interest to the comparative or historical linguist, doubtless bears the distinction to be the first grammar of any Micronesian language. Written in Latin, it follows the pattern of most other grammars of the seventeenth century. For example, the author takes such a word as taotao ‘man’ and puts it through the nominative, genitive, dative and accusative cases, even though the word remains as taotao, with no change, throughout the declension. (Topping 1973: 17)

However, in the following sections I will show that, at least regarding morphosyntax, the missionaries working in the Philippine area did not use the
Latin grammatical model as a frame into which, one way or another, all language phenomena in other languages should be fitted, as Bloomfield puts it (see quote above), nor misunderstood specific non-European language phenomena because of their usage of classical Latin grammar (Rowe, Topping; see quotes above). Instead, there seems to be sound evidence that these missionaries, in describing syntactic phenomena alien to Indo-European languages, developed fundamental basics of modern Functional Grammar theory. So, indeed, as Topping (1973) says, the work of Sanvitores, and other missionaries, is of “considerable interest to the historical linguist”, though for other reasons than Topping may have thought. In fact, the findings presented in this chapter show that Topping, and many others, are seriously mistaken regarding their judgment about the level of linguistic insight of the missionaries working in the Austronesian area.

One indeed needs modern linguistic approaches to explain certain language phenomena, but the fact is that a group of missionaries, in the seventeenth century, already made a start in developing one of these approaches. As a consequence, the history of linguistics should be rewritten regarding the birth of ‘modern’ linguistics.

### 3.4 Pragmalinguistics in the Chamorro grammar of Sanvitores

The Chamorro language, the language of the inhabitants of the Mariana Islands, belongs to the family of Austronesian languages. Though the origin of the language is not clear, as is the origin of the people, Topping (1973: 3) concludes, based on the amount of similarities in grammatical phenomena found in for instance Tagalog that Chamorro is a “Philippine-type language”. However, Chung (1998: 10) argues that it is not related to Philippine languages and “probably belongs to the Western branch of the Austronesian family.” Stolz (2015: 502) notes that the Philippine language Tagalog “displays striking similarities and at the same time also considerable dissimilarities with Chamorro” and agrees with Reid (2014) that Chamorro is an Austronesian language and “an isolate within the Western Malayo-Polynesian branch of the Austronesian macrophyllum” (Stolz 2015: 465). This discussion is outside the scope of my research. Sanvitores considered the Chamorro language closely
related to Tagalog and regularly emphasizes the similarities between the two languages.¹

Indeed, as Topping says (see quote in section 3.3), Sanvitores uses terms like nominative and accusative and therefore, at first sight, seems to use the Latin nominative/accusative system to describe the (possibly) ergative/absolutive system of Chamorro.² This of course is problematic, because the Latin nominative is used for Subject/Agent in transitive sentences as well as for the Subject in intransitive sentences and the Latin accusative is used for the syntactic Object in a sentence, whereas the ergative is used for the Agent and the absolutive is used for the Subject (in intransitive sentences) as well as for the Object (in transitive sentences).

At first, when Sanvitores starts describing the verb – *Caput III: de verbo*: f. 29r - f. 32r – he indeed, as Topping suggests, doesn’t seem to be aware of any difference in this respect between Latin and Chamorro. About the active voice, construed with the infix *um*, he simply says:

(1)
*Construitur ... quasi Latine, persona agens in nominativo, persona cui datur in dativo, res quae datur in accusativo absque praepositione. (Sanvitores:f. 29v)*

(The active voice) is construed as in Latin, with the Agent in the nominative, the person-to-whom in the dative, the Object that is given in the accusative, without preposition.

As an example Sanvitores gives a number of simple sentences, like:

(2)
*uaho numay agón a hamio
ego do cibum vobis (Sanvitores:f. 29v)*

I give food to you

Or:

---

¹ About this subject related to my usage of both the terms ‘Austronesian’ and ‘Philippine’, see the footnote in section 3.5.

² There is a still ongoing discussion whether or not or to what extent Chamorro can be labeled as an ergative, a split-ergative or an accusative language. Cf. the observations on this subject in, for instance, Cooreman (1987), Givón (1997), Chung (1998), Takanori (2006), Aldridge (2006), Stolz (2015).
(3)
Si Pedro numanay nigah agón a taotao
Petrus dabat heri cibum homini (Sanvitores:f. 29v)

Peter gave food to a man yesterday

This reminds us, at least all of those who have had Latin in secondary school, of sentences in school grammar, such as:

Marcus donum puellae dabat

Marcus the (Agent, hence nominative) gave a gift (the Object-given/Patient, hence accusative) to the girl the (person-to-whom/beneficiary, hence dative)

Now, let us assume that Sanvitores indeed uses the Latin nominative/accusative system as such to explain syntactic phenomena of Chamorro. In that case, describing the passive in Chamorro seems to become a lot more complicated. To illustrate this, I give the sentence in which Sanvitores describes the in-passive (the passive realised by the infix in):

(4)
Passiva fit per in loco um activae collocandum, construiturque cum nominativo rei et genitivo personae agentis, dativoque personae cui, quae etiam nonnunquam ponitur in nominativo et tunc res, si mavis, potest dici esse in accusativo, qui demum non distinguetur a nominativo. (Sanvitores:f. 30r)

A translation using the terms nominative and accusative in the traditional sense would be:

*The passive voice is made by placing -in- instead of -um- of the active voice and is construed with the nominative for the Object/Patients and a genitive for the Agent and a dative for the person-to-whom/beneficiary. The person-to-whom/beneficiary can also figure as nominative/Subject and in that case

---

1 The Latin word res can mean several things, e.g. subject, object, thing, situation, and context. The choice for translating it as object is based on the general awareness Sanvitores must have shared that the Subject in a passive sentence is the Patiens and as such the object of the action presented by the predicate. Furthermore, the choice for this translation is grounded upon the fact that he uses the word res also in the meaning of object when he describes, shortly before this description of the passive, the accusative as being the declension for the ‘res qua datur’, ‘object that is given’ (see first quote).
the Object/Patient, if you wish to say so, figures as accusative/Object, which ultimately is not distinguished from the nominative/Subject.

The Latin text, if translated in this way, isn’t easily, if at all, intelligible. Not for us, but more importantly, not for Sanvitores or his readers either. However, the Latin sentence can be a lot more intelligible, to us, to Sanvitores and to his readers if we assume that Sanvitores used terms like nominative and accusative not only in the traditional syntactic/semantic meanings of Subject, Object, Agent and Patient, but also, and even predominantly, gave them semantic/pragmatical meanings. Which means that he used these terms predominantly in the meaning of Goal, Agent, Beneficiary and in the meaning of Topic and Focus, where Topic is defined as “the constituent about which the predication predicates something” and Focus is defined as “the constituent that gives the most salient information” (Dik 1981: 19).

To give some examples of analyzing sentences in this manner, compare the following English sentences (in which the Focus, the most salient information, is given in capitals):

4

JOHN (Ag Subj Top Foc) gave the book (Go Obj) to Bill (Ben)
John (Ag Subj Top) gave the book (Go Obj) to BILL (Ben Foc)
The BOOK (Go Subj Top Foc) was given to Bill (Ben) by JOHN (Obl-Ag)
Bill (Ben Subj Top) was given the book (Go) by JOHN (Obl-Ag Foc)

Now if we understand the quote in (4) from the text of Sanvitores in a similar way, the translations is as follows:

The passive voice is made by placing -in- instead of -um- of the active voice and is construed with a Goal-Subject as Topic/Focus, with an Oblique Agent and with a Beneficiary. The Beneficiary can also have the function of Subject as Topic/Focus and in that case the constituent that was Goal-Subject gets the function of Object, which ultimately is not marked to distinguish it from the Goal-Subject.5

---

5 For these examples cf. Dik (1981). Dik distinguishes 4 pragmatic notions: Topic, Focus, Theme, Rheme. In this paper the research is limited to the notions Topic and focus.

5 As already noted in the previous chapter, I will show in chapter 4 that Sanvitores didn’t use the terms active and passive in the sense of syntactic structures, but in a pragmatic sense, describing two different perspectives: Actor-Focus and Goal-Focus and that in this respect he agrees with state-of-the-art linguistic theory. In the same chapter I will also argue that the term term Goal is preferable over Goal-Subject used here. Interpreting at this stage already the terms ‘passive’ and ‘active’ and omitting the term Subject as I have done in chapter 4, would be confusing since it obscures the line of reasoning in this chapter.
This translation does make sense. It actually tries, very consciously, to explain the shift in Focus that takes place when infix -um- is replaced with -in-. In the same way we can make the quote (1) meaningful as well, by the following translation:

(The active voice) is construed as in Latin, with the Agent as Topic/Focus, a Beneficiary and a Goal-Object, without preposition.

Sanvitores’ description here of the um-infíx as placing Focus on the Agent is confirmed in recent research by Cooreman (1987:42).

If both these translations are correct, Sanvitores has given the Latin case names the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic functions shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>Oblique Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Oblique Agent</td>
<td>Topic/Focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic/Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

In these translations of Sanvitores’ texts we can see a lot of similarities with the English example sentences given above, which were taken mostly from Dik. If we compare the translation and the table distilled from it to Dik’s treatment of ergativity in relation to Functional Grammar, this comparison suggests even more strongly that Sanvitores was far ahead of his time. Compare Dik’s words (1981:160) about the nominative/accusative system and the overview of possible functions of Agent and Object in the ergative/absolutive system (where X presents some semantic function other than Agent):⁶

In the nominative system, case-assignment is straightforwardly determined by the syntactic functions Subj and Obj of the arguments. Ergative systems, however, cannot be thought to be so directly determined by the semantic or syntactic functions … Indeed, we get the following groupings: (Table 2)

---

⁶ On p.60 Dik (1981), referring to research by Schachter (1972), sums up the different semantic functions that can have Subject status in Tagalog: Agent, Goal, Recipient, Beneficiary, Instrumental, Locative, Temporal.
Or compare Sanvitores’ use of pragmatic functions with the examples Cooreman (1987:18) gives, describing modern Chamorro, about semantic roles in different syntactic positions:

The book was given to me by the man
(Patients Object in Subject position)

I was given the book by the man
(Dative Object in Subject position)

Or compare it with Cooreman’s characterization (1987:57) of the in-passive in Chamorro:

...The IN-passive codes transitive propositions in which the Object is syntactic Subject and the Agent, when present, is backgrounded into oblique position.

Or, as a final example, consider the striking similarities with the following text from Cooreman (1987:19):

...there are propositions in which both a Patient and a Dative-Beneficiary are candidates to become ... the Subject of a passive one [sc. sentence]. The choice of one over the other to become either direct Object or Subject in the clause depends on the relative importance which the speaker attaches to each. The two participants then are rivals for the status of ... primary Topic (i.e. Subject) in passives.

Sanvitores seemed to be aware of the fact that, as Dik (1981: 160) puts it, “ergative systems cannot be thought to be so directly determined by semantic or syntactic functions”. This does not mean that Sanvitores was aware, consciously or unconsciously, of the phenomenon of ergativity. Considering, however, how he explains the dynamics of the language related to the active/passive diathesis, how he describes the effects of the infixes -um- and -in-, it is most probable that
if he had known of the current debate on whether or not Chamorro is ergative, he would have considered this discussion irrelevant because he considers it as a linguistic universal that the Topic/Focus constituent has an organizational function, in ergative and absolutive languages, in the sense that it highlights a certain constituent of the sentence, and thereby moves other constituents away from the center of attention. In this respect, Sanvitores would agree with Chung (1998: 111), who argues that Chamorro is not ergative and that all languages are highly similar in their syntactic design. He would agree even more with Cooreman (1987: 4) who argues:

... one is led to conclude that the different syntactic coding systems, ergative vs. nominative-accusative, are motivated by the same functional properties. A plausible candidate for the glue that holds this system together can be found in the discourse context [...] there is considerable evidence in Chamorro that the different syntactic coding devices are related to the degree of Topicality of the major arguments...

Furthermore, the fact that Sanvitores does and can use terms like nominative, accusative etc. in the semantic and pragmatical sense given in this translation, suggests that the mental concepts behind these terms, the implicit definitions of these terms, were a lot wider or, to put it differently, more flexible and a lot more ‘modern’ than one might gather from a ‘conventional’ translation of his texts, the kind of translations that have led so many modern scholars to a deprecative judgment of the linguistic quality of missionary language descriptions (see section 3.3).

Thus far, I have combined the two notions Topic and Focus, though the four examples above of English sentences make clear that they can be separately attributed to different constituents in a predication. Furthermore, I haven’t given any evidence yet that Sanvitores was somehow conscious of the notion of Focus as something different from Topic. Thirdly, there is no indication in the given 1Likewise, Givón (1997: 30) supports Sanvitores’ pragmatic analysis, arguing that: “...word order is rather insensitive to the difference between nominative and ergative grammatical organization. Thus, in SOV-ordered ergative languages [...] both the ergative subject of the transitive and the absolutive subject of the intransitive occupy the same clause-initial position. Similarly, in VSO-ordered ergative languages such as [...] Chamorro [...], both ergative and absolute subjects claim the post-verbal position. [...] Put another way, word order [...] tends to follow the pragmatics of Topicality rather than the semantics of transitivity.” Note, however, that Sanvitores is not discussing word order here but the difference between active and passive, which, as Sanvitores explains, has all to do with Topicalization of constituents. This implies that the concepts of both these terms that Sanvitores implicitly uses must also be of an entirely pragmatic nature. This will be discussed further in the next chapter.
Missionary Pragmalinguistics

quotes that he may have used the notion of Topic in the specific definition above given by Dik. He may have understood the notion of Topic simply as equivalent to syntactic Subject, or as meaning something like ‘important’ or as ‘the subject of talk’. In fact, these kinds of definitions, merging as it were the notions of Topic and Focus, we find even today in linguistic literature (see, for instance, Givón 1995). In the following section I will try to find justification for the thesis that Sanvitores was indeed aware of both notions, and even in the distinct meanings given by Dik in his Functional Grammar theory.

3.5 Pragmalinguistics in ‘the Austronesian school’ of missionary linguistics

As we have seen, Chamorro bears resemblances to Tagalog. It makes sense therefore to compare, as a first step, Sanvitores’ grammar with a Tagalog grammar. This comparison becomes even more appealing when we look at the ‘educational background’ of Sanvitores and the situation in which he had learned Chamorro.

In 1640, at the age of 13, Sanvitores entered the Jesuit Order in Villarejo de Fuentes (a village in the Spanish province Cuenca). Twenty years later he successfully volunteered for the Philippine mission set up by the Jesuits. At a stop at the Mariana Islands he discovered that no one had yet tried to evangelize the natives there and decided to come back himself whenever the possibility of returning would occur.

For six years he stayed at the Philippines and record has it that he succeeded in mastering Tagalog perfectly. In 1668 he returned to the Marianas. While on the boat, so before having actually spoken with natives, he wrote his grammar, translated ordinal texts and even wrote hymns in Chamorro. As he records himself, he was able to do this because he had taken a Tagalan with him as a companion, who had been living in the Marianas for seventeen years. At his arrival he had mastered Chamorro so well that he could start evangelizing right away, and, again as record has it, quite successfully too.8

So Sanvitores learned Chamorro from a native Tagalan. Since this Tagalan, as Sanvitores writes himself, didn’t speak a word of Spanish, he must have taught Chamorro to Sanvitores by using example phrases in Tagalog. In fact, at times

Sanvitores uses Tagalog examples in his grammar to illustrate similar phenomena in Chamorro.

In 1610, so about 50 years before the arrival of Sanvitores in the Philippines, Father Francisco de San José Blancas published his elaborate grammar of Tagalog. In this grammar we find a couple of interesting fragments which are comparable in content to Sanvitores’ text.

Although I have not found any explicit evidence for it, it seems very likely that Sanvitores actually knew the Tagalog grammar of Blancas. According to Burrus (1954), Ambrosio Ortiz writes in his Italian version of the description of the Mariana mission (Ortiz 1686) that Sanvitores had acquired knowledge of Tagalog with the help of a native instructor and a “systematic study of the language accompanied by a comparison with a similar one.” This systematic study may well have been done with help of the grammar of Blancas, since it was common practice to use previous descriptions of a language as study material (Ridruejo 2004; Sueiro Justel 2005).

Furthermore, the brevity of Sanvitores’ grammar – in total only eleven pages⁹ – also seems to indicate that he expected the ‘students’ reading his work to be on at least ‘intermediate level’ with respect to their knowledge of Philippine languages. In other words, he may well have expected that his readers too had already studied the description of Tagalog by Blancas before reading his language course of Chamorro.

Right at the beginning of his chapter about the three passives (Capitulo Segundo, De las tres passivas) – speaking about the three passives in general¹⁰ – Blancas gives an interesting definition of the nominative with the function of Goal:

(5)

La cosa que podece y acerca de quien se ha de exercitar lo que el verbo dize, se pone en nominativo y la que haze en genitivo; ysualt ni Pedro yto: esto sea escrito de Pedro. (Blancas 1997[1610]: 47)

---

⁹ The actual grammar takes up only folios 26r-35v of the manuscript, in Burrus’ edition eleven A4 pages.

¹⁰ The use of the term ‘passive’ by the missionaries has led to a lot of misunderstanding and unjustified criticism. As already discussed in this chapter, the missionaries used this term, and the term ‘active’, in a entirely pragmatic meaning. This will be discussed further in chapter 4.
The thing that undergoes and about which the predicate predicates something, is placed in nominative and the Agent is placed in genitive: ysulat ni Pedro yto: this is written by Peter.

The translation of acerca...dize as ‘about which the predicate predicates something’ is fully acceptable. Whatever other translation one might choose, the fact remains that Blancas is really trying to define the notion of Topic and in doing so produces a sentence which completely covers the definition of Topic by Dik (1981:19). In other words, Blancas redefines the term nominative by saying that it carries the pragmatic function of Topic, and then defines the notion of Topic in a manner that is completely in accordance with modern Functional Grammar theory.

The syntactic, semantic and pragmatic functions Blancas attributes to nominative and genitive in quote 5 are summed up in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject-Goal</td>
<td>Oblique Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic/Focus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

This first fragment from the grammar of Blancas doesn’t tell us whether he made a distinction between Topic and Focus, the latter being defined by Dik (1981: 19) as “the most salient information in a given setting”. However, somewhat later, still in the same chapter about the three passives, Blancas seems to be conscious of the pragmatic function Focus as well, without distinguishing the two. Here he uses the same term nominativo and we may assume that he uses it again in the definition of something ‘about which the predicate predicates something’, in short: as Topic. But he seems to introduce a new aspect of the nominative by contrasting two sentence constructions in the following quote. This may indicate that he indeed is aware of both pragmatic notions Topic and Focus, though merging the two into one pragmatic function labeled as ‘nominative’:

(6)  
si se habla del instrumento y se pone en nominativo, el verbo ha de yr por la de y. Pero si [se habla] de la cosa hecha o herida con instrumento, y ella se pone en nominativo, ha de yr por la de yn y entonces el instrumento (si lo expressaremos) sin jamas faltar ha de ponerse en accusativo con nang o otro tal, v.g. yto ang ybaril mo facaniya: con este le tira (Blancas 1997[1610]: 60)
If the subject of talk is about the instrument and this is placed in nominative, the predicate is formed with $y$. But if the subject of talk is about the thing done or affected with the instrument and this is in nominative, the predicate is formed with $yn$ and then the instrument (if expressed) must always be placed in accusative with nang or another word like $nang$, for instance: $yto\text{ ang } ybaril mo\text{ facaniya}$: with this one shoots it.

Blancas says here that in passive sentences where ‘the X with which Y is affected’ has Focus function, the passivization of the verb takes place with $y$, while if ‘the Y affected’ has Focus function, the passivization of the verb takes place with $yn$. In that case, the X (the thing with which) has the function of Instrumental. As an illustration compare:

- ‘WITH THAT STICK (Focus) the dog was hit.’
- ‘THE DOG (Focus) was hit with that stick (Instrumental)’

The various functions attributed to nominative and accusative by Blancas in this fragment are summed up in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject-Agent</td>
<td>Subject-Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

The quote above (“si se habla …”) seems to indicate that Blancas, while explaining Tagalog syntax, fused both notions of Topic and Focus, two of the fundamental notions in modern Functional Grammar theory, into the term ‘nominative’, though without systematically separating the two. Further evidence that there was an awareness among missionaries of the influence of Focus – in the sense of ‘most salient information’ – on syntax and that they tried to explain syntax from a functional pragmatic perspective, can be found in a fragment from the grammar of Pampango by Francisco Coronel (?–1630), quoted by Ridruejo (2004:188):
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(7) [la activa se usa] quando se habla de alguna cosa en general con modo non determinado ... Pero al revés, de la pasiva se usa cuando se habla de alguna cosa señalada y con modo determinado... (Coronel 1621: 8v.)

[The active voice is used when the subject of talk is about something in general and in a non-specific manner... But, in return, the passive voice must be used when the subject of talk is about something in particular and in a specific manner...]

In the same paper Ridruejo (2004: 188) gives another interesting fragment from Coronel’s grammar:

(8) De la pasiva de y se ha de usar cuando se significa alguna cosa que va de la persona que hace (la cual se pone en genitivo) a otra parte, y ha de estar en nominativo... (Coronel 1621: 10v)

[The passive with y must be used when one wants to express that a thing goes from the Agent (which is placed in genitive) to another party, which has to be placed in nominative.]

Again we must conclude that if we translate genitive and nominative in this fragment in the traditional syntactic-semantic sense, the translation doesn’t convey the full meaning of the terms as Coronel wants us to understand them. A semantic-pragmatic translation, with genitive as Oblique Agent and nominative as Topic/Focus, makes much more sense:

The passive with y must be used when an Oblique Agent affects the Topic/Focus constituent.

Such a translation also acknowledges the truly modern approach Coronel and his contemporaries in this region had already developed.

Sueiro Justel (2005: 261) explicitly refers to a Focus function in his explanation of a fragment from the grammar by Andrés López (? – 1683) of the Philippine language Pangasinan (which was published seven years after his death): “El nominativo colocado al principio también tiene la finalidad de focalizar otros elementos funcionales de la oración.” (The nominative placed at the beginning also has the function to focalize other functional elements of the sentence.) Then, as an illustration he quotes the following fragment:
(9)  
Ytem es de saver que el nominativo puesto al principio de la oración sirve para otros casos, V.G. Say cavallo nan sulat si Pedro, acerca del caballo escribe Pedro. (López 1690: 13r)

One should also know that the nominative placed at the beginning of a sentence is used for other cases, for instance Say cavallo nan sulat si Pedro, about the horse Peter writes.

Here again it is clear that the missionaries gave the term nominative a new and predominantly functional, pragmatic meaning. Therefore, a better translation than the one given, one that acknowledges the level of insight that these missionaries had already developed, would be:

One should also know that the constituent which has Topic/Focus status, placed at the beginning of a sentence, can have different syntactic-semantic functions, for instance Say cavallo nan sulat si Pedro, about the horse Peter writes.

Sueiro Justel gives this fragment as an example of “focalización o Topicalización”, so without making the distinction between the notions of Topic and Focus as is done by Dik in his Functional Grammar theory. And he may well be right in this respect that the missionaries didn’t separate the two concepts systematically either. But on the basis of the five examples given above (quote 5-9), we may conclude that they were conscious of both concepts and their influence on syntax. Furthermore, the merging and mixing of both concepts isn’t a ‘fault’ as a consequence of the immature stage of development of the theory. As we have seen above, even today both concepts often are not treated as distinct. The missionaries’ awareness, however, of the key role of Focus as an organizational function in Philippine languages must have inspired them to use perspective as a central pragmatic concept in their analysis. This will be illustrated in the next chapter.

As I have mentioned before, Subject status can be assigned to various semantic functions in the sentence. Dixon (1994: 57f.), in his work on ergativity, says that in many languages other cases like genitive and accusative can also perform a variety of functions, e.g. locative, instrumental and so on. Blancas also seems to be aware of this. In the following example, for instance, he seems to be aware of the locative function and the restriction this locative has on the form of the passive when the locative has Topic/Focus value:
(11)
Todo lo que es lugar o como lugar, poniéndose en nominativo, pide la passiva de an. (Blancas 1997[1610]: 51)

Everything that is place or like place, placing it in Topic/Focus position, needs the passive with an.

This statement is in accordance with an example Dik (1981:83) gives about Subject assignment to a locative (with Focus status) in the Philippine language Kapampangan:

\[\text{pisulatanan ne ning lalaki ing blackboard king chalk}\]

the blackboard is written on by the boy with chalk

The functions Blancas and the other missionaries quoted above apparently attribute to the nominative are summed up in Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject-Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic/Focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Sueiro Justel (2005: 256) notes that López, influenced rather strongly by the work of Blancas (“Sin citar a ningún autor en concreto, encontramos la huella de Blancas en más de una ocasión” (without referring to any author in specific, we find the source of Blancas in more than one occasion), also is aware of the variety of functions the cases can have and he makes a valuable remark about it in the context of Topicalization:

\[\text{En la descripción de cada afijo va señalando qué complementos de la oración se Topicalizan o se convierten en argumento verbal, el Actor, el objeto, la dirección, el instrumento, el beneficiario de la acción, el complemento locativo, o la razón o causa de la acción. (Sueiro Justel 2005: 263)}\]

In the description of every affix it is noted which other constituents of the sentence are Topicalized or are converted into verbal argument, Actor,
object, direction, instrument, beneficiary, locative or the reason or cause of the action.

All in all we can say that our missionaries didn’t blindly follow the Latin grammatical model, as is suggested by many linguists in past and modern times. They did use the classical grammatical terminology but adapted this model to make it suitable for explaining non Indo-European languages. And in explaining these languages they chose a predominantly pragmatic approach and developed fundamental notions of what we nowadays call pragmalinguistics or Functional Grammar.

In the title of this section I have used the word ‘school’. Now, of course, this group of missionaries didn’t form a school in the sense of a movement or group of people working concurrently and exchanging texts and ideas. On the other hand, they can be called a school in the sense of a group of people who shared the same ideas about how to explain the structures of Austronesian languages and in doing so, together, though not concurrently, shaped basic concepts of a new linguistic approach and applied them in their analyses.

Regarding this pragmatic approach, Sueiro Justel (2005) makes the following remark, which I wholeheartedly support (taken from the English abstract preceding his actual paper): “López established linguistic rules that reflect a speaker’s use of the language, rather than a standard form.” This is exactly what Sanvitores and Blancas and other missionaries of, if we may say so, the ‘Austronesian linguistic school’ have done as well. Also, it is exactly what pragmalinguistics is all about: analyzing a language within the context in which it is used. To quote Dik (1981: 2), explaining the principles of Functional Grammar:

A theory of language should not be content to display the rules of language for their own sake, but should try, wherever possible, to explain these rules

---

11 An ‘Austronesian school’ in the sense of a group of linguists working within the area of Austronesian languages and using the same approach or method. In the paper which is taken up in this thesis as chapter 4 I have labeled this group ‘Philippine missionaries’ and I am aware of the fact that this may be a bit confusing. However, there is a still ongoing debate about the appropriate labeling of some languages within this wider Austronesian area as ‘Philippine’, or ‘Philippine-type’ or ‘Austronesian’, ‘Proto-Malayan’ etc. This discussion is outside the scope of this thesis. The term ‘Austronesian’ which I have chosen here may be a bit on the safe side, leaving the possibility open that also missionaries working in this area who have described non-Philippine languages will appear to have been members of this school, while the term ‘Philippine’ seems not entirely correct from what we know now of the languages analyzed by the missionaries mentioned in this thesis, since it is questionable if Chamorro is a Philippine language (see section 3.4). However, the missionaries we speak of in this thesis considered the languages they analyzed related to each other and from this perspective the term ‘Philippine school’ is not inappropriate.
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in terms of their functionality with respect to the ways they are used and to the ultimate purposes of their uses.

These missionaries were already very conscious of the value of this fundamental principle of Functional Grammar. And acted accordingly.

3.6 Conclusions

In this exploration of pragmalinguistic notions present in missionary grammars, I have tried to show that missionaries, at least the ‘members of the Austronesian school’, were very well aware of the need to describe a language from a pragmatic-functional perspective. Confronted with languages that don’t fit into the Latin nominative-accusative model they gave new meanings to the Latin case names and these meanings are predominantly semantic-pragmatic instead of syntactic-semantic. By doing so, they developed a remarkably modern insight into the linguistic phenomena of the Austronesian languages:

1. Blancas defined the notion of Topic in almost literally the same way as Simon Dik did in his Functional Grammar theory almost 400 years after him. Sanvitores and other missionaries working in the same area also used this concept of Topic in explaining language phenomena, like the active-passive diathesis in ergative languages.

2. The concept of Focus as defined in Functional Grammar and the awareness of the influence of Focus on syntax and semantics, is already present in the linguistic descriptions of these ‘Austronesian missionaries’.

3. Not only did these missionaries develop the Functional Grammar notions of Topic and Focus. In need of a pragmatic approach for explaining linguistic phenomena they redefined all kinds of syntactic and semantic notions taken from the Latin grammatical system and thus developed all kinds of semantic notions which nowadays belong to the standard idiom of modern pragmalinguistics, like Locative, Goal, Oblique Agent, Instrumental etc.

The history of linguistics should in this respect be rewritten: Functional Grammar is not a theory invented in the twentieth century. Fundamental notions of this grammar theory were actually developed, defined and used already by missionaries in the seventeenth century to explain language phenomena.
4. **Subject, Topic, passive and perspective in Functional (Discourse) Grammar and in Philippine Missionary Grammar**

4.1 **Abstract**

The missionaries in the Philippine area developed a functional linguistic method similar to modern Functional Grammar. Given this at the time new approach, it is puzzling why they kept using Latin case names and didn’t invent new terms. It will be argued that they defined the meanings of case names (and of the passive as well) in a new way in which the pragmatic notion of perspective plays a fundamental role. Furthermore, it will be argued that they considered the syntactic level of Subject-Object irrelevant in their analyses of agentive sentences and that there is good reason for today’s functionalists to follow the missionaries in this respect. Fourthly, it will be argued that in the discussion about the passives in Philippine-type languages it may be fruitful to consider that the main pragmatic function of passives is not Agent-demotion (downgrading of the Agent), but predicate-promotion. Finally, it will be argued that the linguistic analyses of the group of missionaries mentioned in this chapter deserve a distinct place in the history of linguistic analyses of Philippine-type languages.

4.2 **Terminology**

As the title already suggests, the key terms in this chapter are Subject, Topic, Focus, passive and perspective. I will be comparing the ways these notions are used by a group of missionaries working in the Philippine area with the usage of these terms by the adherents of Functional Grammar (FG) and others who use a comparable pragmatic approach to explain linguistic phenomena. In this chapter the term ‘Subject’ is used in the meaning already given by Nebrija of a syntactic category of the constituent that is in nominative case and agrees in number and person with the predicate (cf. Ridruejo 2007: 240-241).

The term ‘perspective’ is not used explicitly by our missionaries. However, as I will show in this chapter, they did use the pragmatic
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function of perspective, in the sense of movement, foregrounding and backgrounding, to explain syntactic choices of a speaker. In FG we can recognize the same approach: the term ‘perspective’ is used now and then to explain syntactic choices, but is not formally defined.¹

The terms Topic and Focus play a central role in FG as two distinct notions. Topic is defined as “the constituent about which the predicate predicates something”, Focus as “the constituent that gives the most salient information” (Dik 1981: 31). These definitions are in content and meaning identical to those given in Dik (1997: 310) but in this later edition they are a bit more ‘loosely’ defined, for instance as “characterizing the things we talk about” (Topic) and “characterizing the most important or salient parts of what we say about the Topical things” (Focus). In Functional Discourse Grammar (see the end of next section) these basic notions are defined by contrast: Topic has an organizational function by distinguishing itself from the rest of an utterance, which is called Comment, Focus has an organizational function as opposed to the notion of Background. So the basic function of Topic, according to Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008: 89f.), is relating the communicated content to existing information, while Focus signals the speaker’s “strategic selection” of new information.

However, the usage of both terms in recent literature by functionalists as well as non-functionalists is confusing, and quite often, Topic and Focus are used on the pragmatic level indiscriminately.² Furthermore, other

¹ See section 4.3.
² “Of course, there is a notorious lack of consensus among linguists as to how the term Topic should be defined” (Kroeger 1993b: 57f.). Ridureau (2007: 234f.) makes the same distinction as Dik between Topic and Focus, but adds that other scholars use Focus instead of Topic. This confusion in terminology is also noted by Barlaan (1999: 3). Schachter (1976) describes Topic as “the centre of attention”, which is actually a description of Focus. Brainard (1994), discussing voice as a means of signalling pragmatic perspective in Karao refers to the focus-system of Philippine languages, however without making clear whether she means syntactic or pragmatic prominence (see Liao 2004: 257, discussed in the next section), and uses ‘Topic’ and ‘Topicality’ without defining these terms. Kroeger (1993a) defines Topic and Focus not altogether correctly, at least from a pragmatic point of view, in saying that Topic is “salient old information” and Focus is “crucial new information”; ‘pragmatic salience’ is typically an attribute of Focus. Akamine (1996) is another example of confusion in terminology. He gives examples of the diverse functions of the Topic constituent in Manuk Mangkaw Sinama, which he considers to be a “Philippine-type language” (to which Himmelmann 2002 objects). When giving these examples, Akamine says that he prefers to use the term Subject, giving the following argument: “the term Subject is employed in lieu of Schachter’s Topic, because Topic to me is another syntactic process of putting a NP in a prominent position, i.e. in the beginning of the sentence. However, I have stayed with the term Focus as used by Schachter and Otanes (1972) to refer to the feature of a verbal predicate that determines the semantic relationship between a predicate verb and its subject” (Akamine 1996: 495).
scholars, mainly the linguists belonging to the ‘classical period’, have adopted the term Focus in their analyses of Philippine-type languages, but, as Liao (2004: 157) points out, all of them used Focus in a non-pragmatic sense. The term Focus, in their analyses, refers to the syntactically most prominent NP. Liao rightly concludes that “this unique use of the terms ‘Focus’ and ‘Topic’ to refer to constructions and/or elements that are not pragmatically salient creates unnecessary terminological confusion in typological literature” (Liao 2004: 158).

The languages the Spanish missionaries described are Kapampangan (Pampango), Tagalog, Pangasinan, Bisayan, Sambal, Bikol, Ilokano and Chamorro. As far as I have been able to gather from literature available to me, all of these languages are considered Philippine languages, except for, perhaps, Chamorro (cf. Adelaar and Himmelmann 2005). However, since there seems to be no consensus yet about whether Chamorro is a Philippine language or not, I have chosen to use the term Philippine-type languages. Philippine-type languages have a ‘Focus system’.

The so-called focus-system is characterized by the use of various verbal affixes to indicate the thematic role of the NP bearing the nominative case in a sentence. It is found in virtually all Philippine languages, in many of the Formosan languages, in the languages spoken in Sabah, northern Sarawak, and northern Sulawesi, in Malagasy, in Palauan and in Chamorro (Liao 2004: 88).

Donohue (2002: 86) speaks of a “Philippine-style voice system”, referring to a wider group of Austronesian languages, “characterized by a case marking system that monitors the degree of pragmatic salience of an argument rather than its syntactic role”. Our missionaries held the same pragmatic view.

---

1 Liao (2004) distinguishes three periods in the history of linguistic analysis of Philippine-type languages: the ‘traditional period’, the ‘classical period’ and the ‘modern period’. Liao’s ‘traditional period’ includes in its time span the analyses of the missionaries, but unfortunately Liao omits these. As I will argue, the works of the missionaries deserve to be separated from the traditional period, forming a distinct (fourth) period of analysis of Philippine-type languages.

2 Barlaan (1999: 1) comes to the same conclusion.

3 Also see Barlaan (1999: 6f.) for a description of the grammatical, semantic and pragmatic views with regard to the Focus system in Philippine languages.

4 Concerning the similarity between Philippine and other Austronesian languages, see also Reid and Liao (2004).
The missionaries did not make a distinction between the pragmatic functions Topic and Focus. They used the term ‘nominativo’ in the meaning of both Topic and Focus, in a pragmatic sense, referring to the constituent that a speaker wants to place in the ‘centre of attention’. However, considering the present confusion existing in the usage of these terms and to avoid getting involved in a discussion that, first of all, shouldn’t be there, and, secondly, is beyond the scope of this chapter, I will use the term Pragmatic Topic/Focus (PTF) as a translation of the missionaries’ term ‘nominativo’. PTF refers to the constituent that is the subject of talk and as such forms the reference point or perspective from which the action is viewed. PTF does not refer to what is generally called ‘Topicality’ or ‘discourse Topic’. In other words, PTF has nothing to do with findings based on quantitative analyses.

Passive is nowadays generally described in terms of Subject/Object or Agent/Patient assignment, and the differences in this respect with active sentences, on a syntactic or a pragmatic level. However, as I will argue in this chapter, the missionaries in the Philippine area discarded the syntactic level and used the term ‘passive’ in a fully pragmatic meaning, describing the differences between active and passive sentences as different choices in perspective over a state of affairs (SoA). Perspective itself, is a term not yet defined properly. I will discuss this below. In this chapter the term ‘perspective’ will be used as referring to the ‘picture’ of a SoA, involving such notions as backgrounding, foregrounding and movement.

---

7 See chapter 3 and section 4.3 and 4.6 below.
8 The lack of consensus in the definition of the terms Topic and Focus doesn’t, of course, contribute to making progress in this field of linguistic research. Moreover, it has led to very understandable criticism of ‘unscientificness’ of functionalist approaches. Cf. Seuren (1998: 129.).
9 As far as we can gather from the texts of the missionaries, they didn’t use quantitative analyses. Quite often, nowadays quantitative methods are used to find out which constituent in a text is Topic (see for instance Givón 1994; Brainard 1994; Cooreman 1987; Kroeger 1993b). However, as Bolkestein (1985: 5f.) clearly points out, the frequency of a Topic in a text does not at all exclude the occurrence of other constituents as Topic or Focus in the very same text. In other words, if one wants to say anything about the possible influence of pragmatic Topic or Focus on syntactic choices, quantitative analyses of only ‘Topic persistence’ or frequency of a Topic in a given text, are always inadequate. Furthermore, Bolkestein also provides very clear and convincing arguments that it is not the Topic constituent that accounts for syntactic choices (e.g. the choice between active and passive), but the pragmatic Focus constituent. However, the missionaries did not distinguish systematically Topic from Focus and saw the one pragmatic function of Topic/Focus as a highlighting and as an organizational function. See also section 4.6.
4.3 Introduction

In chapter 3, I have shown that there are, to say the least, strong indications that missionaries working in the Philippine area developed a functional or pragmatic method in explaining linguistic phenomena, a method very similar to the modern method that goes by the name of Functional Grammar (FG).

In this chapter the method of this group of missionaries will be referred to as ‘Philippine Missionary Grammar’ (PMG). One reason for this is that using PMG next to FG makes one of the objects of this chapter more clear, namely the comparison of both methods. Another reason is that these missionaries indeed can be called a group or, as I have called them in the previous chapter, a ‘school of missionary linguistics’. They were a school, not in the sense that they worked together and simultaneously in developing new linguistic insights, but in the sense that they to some degree knew each other’s works and in the sense that they all, in describing their own linguistic analyses, followed the method and the linguistic terminology as written down by Father Blancas.

This school of missionaries working in the Philippine area explained rules of language “in terms of their functionality with respect to the ways they are used”, to quote Dik (1981: 18), one of the founders of Functional Grammar theory. In fact, as can be seen in fragment (1) below, one of these missionaries defined the basic concept of Topic in the same way as Dik (1981: 13) does in his Functional Grammar more than three hundred years later: “A Topic presents the entity about which the predicate predicates something in the given setting.”

Regarding the terms the missionaries used in explaining language phenomena from a functional sentence perspective, I have come to the following conclusions:

11 See Ridruejo (2004) for evidence of the exchange of knowledge within this group of missionary linguists. See also Zimmermann (2004) who gives a list of reasons to distinguish missionary linguistics in general from other linguistic research activities. Among other factors in this list, he mentions the fact that the missionaries did their own field work rather than using data collected earlier, and the fact that their research and writings were not meant for some community of linguists in general, but only for the missionaries themselves.

12 I am very grateful that my esteemed colleague in this field, Wolf Dietrich, agrees with my conclusion that the Latin case names indeed are used in a semantic-pragmatic meaning; he writes that the argumentation I have used in Winkler (2007; chapter 3 in this thesis) for the translation of Latin cases as such is “absolutely convincing” (Dietrich 2008: 439-45).
They used the term nominative to refer to PTF (without, as I mentioned earlier, systematically making a distinction between Topic and Focus).

They used other Latin case names (Accusative, Genitive, etc.) predominantly to indicate a semantic role (Agent, Patient, Beneficiary, etc.) and not for describing morphosyntactic aspects.

The following quotations make clear that the Latin case names are used functionally rather than formally:

13 (1) La cosa que padece y acerca de quien se ha de exercitar lo que el verbo dize, se pone en nominativo y la que haze en genitivo: ysulat ni Pedro yto: esto sea escrito de Pedro. (Blancas 1997[1610]: 47)

The thing that undergoes and about which the predicate predicates something, is PTF [nominativo] and the Agent becomes oblique [genitivo]: this is written by Peter.

(2) De la pasiva de y se ha de usar cuando se significa alguna cosa que va de la persona que hace (la cual se pone en genitivo) a otra parte, y ha de estar en nominativo... (Coronel 1621: 10v)

The passive with y must be used when one wants to express that a thing goes from the Agent (which becomes the Oblique Agent [genitivo]) to another party, which has to become PTF [nominativo].

The following fragments (3) and (4) clearly show that the missionaries used case names not in a morphosyntactic sense – one of the main mistaken assumptions on the basis of which their linguistic analyses have unjustly been neglected and even explicitly been depreciated – but predominantly in a semantic sense and that they used the case name Nominative in the pragmatic sense of PTF:

---

13 For a more elaborate discussion of these and other examples, see chapter 3.
14 For some quotes from linguists in which they express this depreciation, see chapter 3. Also see the criticism in Seidenadel (1909), specifically with respect to the missionaries’ use of the term ‘passive’, described in Reid (2011).
(3) Ytem es de saver que el nominativo puesto al principio de la oración sirve para otros casos, V.G. Say cavallo nan sulat si Pedro, acerca del caballo escribe Pedro. (López 1690: 13r)

One should also know that the constituent which has PTF status [nominativo], placed at the beginning of a sentence, can have different semantic functions, for instance Say cavallo nan sulat si Pedro, About the horse Peter writes.

(4) Todo lo que es lugar o como lugar, poniendose en nominativo, pide la passiva de an. (Blancas 1997: 51)

Everything that is place or like place and is PTF [nominativo], needs the passive with an.

As for example (3) above, the concordance with modern findings is again striking. The PTF constituent indeed, as López already concludes in 1690, can have different semantic functions, as can be seen in the following examples of Tagalog taken from Liao (2004) (Focus and the ‘Focus-affixes’ are boldfaced):

(5) Actor Focus

\[\text{sumúslát siýå} \text{ ng liham}\]
He is writing a letter/letters

(6) Goal Focus

\[\text{sinúlát niyå ang liham}\]
He wrote the letter

Focus-affixes are also called ‘case marking affixes’ or ‘agreement marking affixes’. Other terms are also in use. For further details, see Liao (2004: 154f.). Liao takes these examples from Bloomfield (1917). Later in her work she emphasizes that Bloomfield, like others after him, use Focus here as indicating ‘syntactic prominence’, so not in a pragmatic sense. However, other scholars, like Akamine (1996), Donohue (2002), Cooreman (1984), Givón (1997) and Barlaan (1999) argue, just as the missionaries did, that this Focus system is pragmatically motivated. Barlaan (1999: 28f.) gives several examples in Isnag of pragmatically focused NP’s as agents, goals, instruments, beneficiaries and locations. Zobel (2005: 639) also says that pragmatic factors are involved in voice selection and that if there are ‘highly Topical arguments, such as an instrument, beneficiary or goal’, the syntactic rule that the Actor voice is used when the Patient is indefinite is overruled by this pragmatic factor of ‘high Topicality’. Zobel seems to refer with ‘highly Topical’ to what is more properly called ‘pragmatically most salient’ or Focus in the definition of Dik (1981). If so, Zobel’s conclusion is very comparable with mine in Winkler (1985), that pragmatic motivation for the choice of a passive instead of an active construction (and vice versa) can (and frequently does) overrule syntactic rules and even rules concerning the maintaining of a discourse Topic. See also note 9 for the reference to Bolkestein (1985) who corroborates this conclusion with evidence from Latin.
It seems obvious to assume, as in fact I have done until now, that these missionaries retained, within their pragmatic definition of the term ‘nominative’, the syntactic notion of Subject as well. For instance, because the constituent that is PTF very often also is Subject, and because the term Subject was quite well established in those days, as being the constituent to which the predicate refers (cf. Ridruejo 2007: 240-241). However, as Ridruejo (2007) has shown, they used the term Subject (suppositum, supuesto) only with a specific kind of sentence, while with all other sentence constructions they didn’t use this term. They used the term Subject only with non-agentive sentences – ‘existential’ or equative or identifying sentences – but didn’t use it when explaining agentive sentences, i.e. sentences which “contain a typically animate instigator of the action identified by the verb” (Primus 2009: 263). In other words, in agentive sentences they explained linguistic phenomena on a pragmatic level and a semantic level, but systematically left out the syntactic level.

Therefore, we can now draw a third conclusion:

– While the notion of Subject was already well established in those days, the missionaries working in the Philippine area systematically discarded this syntactic level of analysis in explaining agentive sentence structures.

These three conclusions give rise to the following questions:
Why did they retain the ‘old’ Latin case name terminology and didn’t introduce at least one new term for the pragmatic level of Topic/Focus instead of the case name Nominative?

Why didn’t they use the syntactic level of Subject in analyzing agentive sentences?

There are, however, two other issues also relevant in the context of this chapter. Firstly, the missionaries’ use of the term ‘passive’ for all sentences in which a constituent other than the Actor is Subject. This use of the passive has been severely criticized by some scholars. However, the question of whether Philippine languages truly have a passive or not is still the subject of ongoing debate today. Secondly, examples (1) to (4) seem to suggest that the missionaries used changes in perspective to explain linguistic phenomena, a method also used in FG, as I will show below. For this reason, it is relevant to take a closer look at the role that perspective plays in FG and in PMG.

This leads to two additional questions to be dealt with in this chapter:

- Why did the missionaries choose to label all sentences with a PTF other than Actor as passive?
- To what extent did the missionaries use the notion of perspective to explain linguistic phenomena?

In 2008, Kees Hengeveld and Lachlan Mackenzie published a book in which a new theory is presented: Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG). The fundamental starting point is that:

Functional Discourse Grammar is so called because it adheres to the principle of linguistic functionalism and takes the Discourse Act as its basic unit of analysis. (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 25)

In the preface to their book, Hengeveld and Mackenzie emphasize that FDG diverges from FG in so many ways that it should not be regarded as a successor to FG, but as a theory in its own right. Where it is relevant to the subject of this chapter, for instance when this new theory of FDG explains or defines terms and notions adopted from FG substantially differently, I will refer specifically to this work.

---

For both the critique on the missionaries’ use of the term ‘passive’ and the question in general of the applicability of this term in Philippine languages, see section 4.6 and 4.7.
4.4 Structure of this chapter

In this chapter I will try to find answers to the four questions given above. Since I have argued that Spanish missionaries working in the Philippines used a method of explaining language phenomena that is comparable to the method used in Functional Grammar, I will take a closer look at the notions of Topic, Focus and perspective and how they are related to Subject in FG. This will be discussed in section 4.5. In section 4.6, I discuss the examples of passive sentences given in section 4.5 and further consider the role that perspective plays in order to make clear that the most important function of the passive is not demotion of the Agent or promotion of the Patient, but promotion of the predicate, making the action contained in the verb the central point of perspective. In section 4.7, I compare the fundamentals of the theory of FG with the theory developed by the missionaries, viz. PMG. Also, I will briefly deal with the question of whether PMG may have been inspired by earlier sources, such as Nebrija (1996 [1488]). In section 4.8, I deal with the use of the term ‘passive’ as a perspectival function in PMG. In section 4.9, I discuss why the term Subject is systematically left out of the analyses of agentive sentences in PMG. Section 4.10, finally, provides an overview of my conclusions.

4.5 Subject, Topic, Focus and Perspective in FG

The fundamental starting point of FG (and FDG) is that a speaker constructs an utterance in such a way that the speaker effects some sort of change in the addressee. These changes may involve the addition of new information, but also a change in attitude or other mental aspects. To achieve this change, the speaker gives pragmatic information in a certain way, taking into account the information he thinks the addressee already has that is related to the subject of talk. Pragmatic information may consist of factual knowledge, but also includes all kinds of social and psychological aspects such as opinions, perceptions, etc (cf. Dik 1997: 10f.). Furthermore, linguistic expressions are seen as characterized by functional relations on three different levels (cf. Dik 1997: 26f.):

1 Pragmatic functions (Topic, Focus)
2 Semantic functions (Agent, Goal, Recipient, etc.)
3 Syntactic functions (Subject and Object)
The numbers here indicate a hierarchy. In analyzing a speaker’s utterance one should first look at the pragmatic information (the type of change a speaker wants to realize in the addressee), and then one should analyze how this desired pragmatic information is further effectuated in the semantic and syntactic choices the speaker makes. Dik describes this hierarchy in the following manner:

...in the functional paradigm the relation between the different components of linguistic organization is viewed in such a way that pragmatics is seen as the all-encompassing framework within which semantics and syntax must be studied. Semantics is regarded as instrumental with respect to pragmatics, and syntax as instrumental with respect to semantics. [...] syntax is there for people to be able to form complex expressions for conveying complex meanings, and such meanings are there for people to be able to communicate in subtle and differentiated ways (Dik 1997: 8). 17

Topic is defined as “the constituent about which the predicate predicates something”, Focus as “the constituent that gives the most salient information”. Topic and Focus may coincide, but this is not always the case. Compare the following syntactically identical sentences with the same Topic, but with a different Focus:

(10) John (Top, Foc) gave the book to Bill

(11) John (Top) gave the book to Bill (Foc)

17 Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008: 1) describe this hierarchy very briefly: “FDG starts with the speaker’s intention and then works down to articulation.” Hengeveld and Mackenzie, however, have decided to rename the first two levels mentioned here: pragmatic level has become interpersonal level in FDG, semantic level has been renamed representational level. The syntactic level has been broadened a little and is now called the morphosyntactic level.

18 Dik (1981: 31). The definitions given here are identical in content and meaning to those given in Dik (1997), but in this later edition they are a bit more ‘loosely’ defined, for instance as ‘characterizing the things we talk about’ (Topic) and ‘characterizing the most important or salient parts of what we say about a Topical thing’ (Focus). In FDG these basic notions are ‘defined’ by contrast: Topic has an organizational function by distinguishing itself from the rest of an utterance, which is called ‘Comment’; Focus has an organizational function as opposed to the notion of Background. So the basic function of Topic, according to Hengeveld and Mackenzie, is relating the communicated content to existing information, while Focus signals the speaker’s “strategic selection” of new information (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 89f.). Likewise, Barlaan (1999: 67f.) describes Topic as the constituent that is either old or presupposed and Focus as the constituent that is new and/or asserted.
Sentence (10) gives answer to the question: ‘who gave the book to Bill?’, whereas sentence (11) gives answer to the question: ‘to whom was the book given by John?’.

Now, it is easy to understand that semantics and pragmatics are characterized by functional relationships and thereby influence a speaker’s linguistic choices with respect to these two levels. However, this is less obvious at the level of the syntactic functions Subject and Object. Dik is actually quite confusing – and mistaken, as we will see – in his arguments for retaining this level in FG. I will go into this in more detail because it is also very relevant with regard to the linguistic analyses of our missionaries.

The first reason Dik gives for retaining this level is:

...to avoid unnecessary departure from traditional terminology: the concepts of Subject and Object are used to capture such oppositions as that between active and passive constructions, and these oppositions are usually described in terms of syntactic or grammatical relations. (Dik 1997: 26)

However, a more important reason according to Dik is that:

Subject and Object determine an additional level of SoA [State of Affairs] organization, which languages may possess... (Dik 1997: 256)

The question, however, still remains to what extent and in what way this level of Subject and Object has a functional meaning. According to Dik, Subject and Object have to be redefined in order to play a functional role and this role is:

...defining different perspective over the State of Affairs designated by the predication. For that reason, ‘perspectival functions’ might be a better term to cover their essential nature. (Dik 1997: 27)

As an example of this ‘perspectival function’ Dik (1997: 252) gives the following two sentences:

(12) The police removed the demonstrators from the platform
(13) The demonstrators were removed from the platform by the police.

According to Dik, the difference in perspective can be compared to different photographs taken of the same event. In (12), for instance, the picture represents the event from the viewpoint of the police, whereas (13) tells a somewhat different story, since the event here is represented from the viewpoint of the demonstrators. However, as Dik (1997: 254) says, a full theory of perspective still has to be developed.

The reasons for choosing between different perspectives concerned with active sentences and their passive alternatives can be, according to Dik (1997: 252f.):

- Empathy or identification. In the given examples the speaker places himself in the role of the Agent (12) or places himself in the role of the demonstrators (13).
- Preference for making the Given Topic Subject rather than making a New Topic Subject.
- The Agent is unknown, considered by the Speaker to be unimportant, or the speaker consciously wishes to leave the Agent unspecified.
- Ungrammaticality of the active sentence.
- Politeness conventions.

As one can easily see in this list of possible reasons for making the Object in the active sentence Subject in the passive alternative, there are quite a lot of terms used in this list – ‘empathy’, ‘identification’, ‘considered unimportant’, ‘consciously leave the Agent unspecified’, ‘politeness’ – which suggest a strong pragmatic motivation. Without explicitly agreeing that these terms are highly pragmatic, Dik seems to admit that this indeed creates a problem. He tries to solve it as follows (Dik 1997: 255):

More complicated is the question about the relationship between Subj/Obj function and pragmatic functions, specifically Topic. We define the Subj as specifying the vantage point from which the SoA is presented in the predication, and the (Given) Topic as that entity about which the clause predicates something in the given setting. Subj has to do with the presentation of the SoA, Topic with the contextual embedding of the information transmitted by the clause.
However, why is the question ‘specifically’ complicated regarding Topic? It is, in fact, equally complicated regarding Focus. If any term, by its meaning, is instinctively associated with the term ‘perspective’, it is Focus. As an illustration, consider the following examples (14) and (15) that Dik gives to illustrate the meaning of and difference between Topic and Focus. In both examples it is the Focus constituent that has the ‘perspectival function’, not the Subject. In (14) the event is presented from the viewpoint of the receiver, in (15) the event is presented from the viewpoint of the giver.

(14) This book (SUBJ-TOP) was given to ME (FOC) by John

(15) This book (SUBJ-TOP) was given to me BY JOHN (FOC)

Now, these examples indicate that Dik, by not giving up the traditional syntactic notions of Subject and Object and, instead, redefining them as he did, has caused himself severe problems. By retaining this syntactic level he actually attributes pragmatic meaning to a level which he has distinguished himself as non-pragmatic and by doing so he blurs his own hierarchic distinction between pragmatic, semantic and syntactic levels. Therefore, in a truly functional grammar, it makes much more sense to consider the syntactic level of Subject and Object irrelevant. It may be influenced by, but does not contribute to the pragmatic presentation of a SoA. The simple examples (14) and (15) from Dik himself, make clear that Subject and Object define syntactic relations and that functions of perspective are not the essential nature of the concepts of Subject and Object. As these examples clearly show, the description of an event can be given from different perspectives, the viewpoint of the Subject, the Object or any other constituent, within one and the same syntactic construction using exactly the same words, and exactly the same Subject.

Using FG as a structural basis Hengeveld developed the theory of FDG, as laid down in Hengeveld and Mackenzie (2008). However, the viewpoint in FDG concerning the relevance of Subject/Object doesn’t seem to be consistent either. FDG is even more outspoken than FG in placing syntactics on the lowest step of the hierarchy of levels on which the structure of an utterance is composed, without, however, discarding it completely. FDG on the one hand recognizes that the morphosyntactic level “cannot add or subtract semantic or pragmatic meaning” (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 282) but Hengeveld and Mackenzie still allow for the syntactic level of Subject/Object to play a role in the
speaker’s functional choice between a set of possible syntactic constructions, in three ways. The syntactic pair of Subject/Object can be relevant, they argue, with respect to the structural choices of the speaker, when the speaker’s motivations on the interpersonal and representational levels are ‘neutral’, in the sense that on these levels the speaker doesn’t feel urged to make a functional choice between a set of possible syntactic constructions (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2007: 324). The second path FDG leaves open for Subject and Object to exert influence on the structuring process of an utterance, still appears to be the perspectival function of both, though now it is not expressed so explicitly as in the works of Dik and earlier works of Hengeveld.\footnote{In those cases in which the organization of morphosyntactic units cannot be reduced to the pragmatic and semantic categories and functions underlying them, syntactic functions become relevant. [...] In cases such as these, where there is neutralization of semantic and pragmatic oppositions that are otherwise relevant in the language, the neutralized behaviour of morphosyntactic constituents may be described in terms of their syntactic function, which, depending on the type of neutralization, may be either Subject or Object.” (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 324-325).}

Locative function will also permit Subject to be assigned to Undergoer but the reverse implication does not hold [...] The validity of the hierarchy may be understood in terms of the anthropocentricity of language: if Subject assignment is a matter of perspective-taking, speakers as active human beings will most naturally take the vantage point of the Actor; seeing a State-of-Affairs from the viewpoint of an Undergoer, and then of a Locative requires ever greater effort. (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2007: 35f.)

A third reason why choices on the syntactic level can still be of influence on the structure of the utterance, is that Subject and Object can be compared to a considerable extent with the pragmatic pair of Topic and Comment. In this respect Hengeveld and Mackenzie refer to research by Bolkestein (1985), who argues that the key factor in choosing Subject and Object is “cohesiveness, which concerns the extent to which referents have already been invoked in the preceding discourse or can be inferred from it.” (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 2008: 331).

This all seriously blurs the lines that FDG draws between the morphosyntactic, representational and interpersonal levels and weakens its theoretical foundations. The destabilization of its own rules seems to start with accepting the possibility of neutrality on the pragmatic level.

\footnote{In Groot and Hengeveld (2005: 473) Subject is still explicitly labeled as a ‘perspectival function’.}
One may object by arguing, for instance, that if a speaker’s intentions are neutral, this as well is a pragmatic choice, or that if syntactic constructions do express pragmatic meaning, a really neutral standpoint is impossible to express. The acceptance of neutrality also seems to contradict the fundamental basis of FG and FDG, as mentioned above, namely that a speaker constructs an utterance in such a way that the speaker effects some sort of change in the addressee. Furthermore, this fundamental assumption in F(D)G also means that if the syntactic level indeed cannot add or subtract pragmatic information, it should not play any role in functional linguistic analyses.

4.6 Predicate promotion as the main pragmatic function of passives

Quite often, two main functions of the passive are distinguished: Patient-promotion and Agent-demotion (downgrading of the Agent). In the list Dik gives of pragmatic functions (see previous section) one can also recognize these main functions: what he calls ‘empathy or identification’ clearly is, in the case of example (13), a pragmatic effect of Patient-promotion, and the Agent being considered irrelevant or better not mentioned can be seen as pragmatic motivations for Agent-demotion. Many others have also distinguished these two functions of the passive, or Focus mainly on the function of Agent-demotion. However, one can also find, though less frequently, descriptions of predicate-promotion as

21 In my own research on the pragmatics of passive constructions (Winkler 1985), I haven’t found any instance of true neutrality.

22 Cf. Shibatani (2009: 326f.), who argues that in passive sentences where the Actor is still overtly encoded or understood from the context, the pragmatic motivation is downgrading the discourse relevance of the participant in question. Shibatani (1985) also argues that Agent-demotion (“Agent defocussing”) is the main function of the passive. Givón (2001: 125) holds a similar view: “the prototypical passive voice is used primarily for A-suppression or de-Topicalization. The fact that a non-Agent argument – most commonly the Patient – is then Topicalized is but a default consequence of Agent suppression”. Coulter (2005) mentions Patient-promotion and Agent-demotion as distinct functions of a passive: “First, the passive can be used when it is advantageous for the patient of the action to be the grammatical subject… Secondly, a speaker can use the passive to avoid naming the Agent, because it is so obvious as to be unnecessary, or because it is unknown, or even to obfuscate the responsibility for an action.” Marín Arrese (1997: 203), following Givón (1994) also distinguishes these two functions: “voice is a fundamentally pragmatic notion, for it allows for the construal of the same semantically transitive event from two discourse pragmatic perspectives.” Malchukov (2006) seems to combine both processes of Agent-demotion and Patient-promotion (without using these terms explicitly) into one term: “Perhaps, more usually, non-volitionality licenses the use of an “experiencer-anticausative construction”.


a function of the passive.23 This may well be considered not only indeed a third main function of the passive, but in fact the most frequently occurring motivation for choosing a passive construction. I will go into this a little more deeply, because it is very relevant for a proper evaluation of the linguistic approach used in PMG, and perhaps too for a proper judgment concerning the existence or non-existence of true passives in Philippine-type languages.24 After having illustrated this phenomenon of predicate-promotion by giving a number of examples, I will come back to this at the end of this section.

I define predicate-promotion as focusing on the predicate, as a consequence of which the predication, i.e. the verb and the arguments it needs (like Subject and Object) plus possible other lexical satellites that together present a SoA, is shown from the perspective of the action itself.25 When there is predicate-promotion, the predicate is the nucleus from which, by adding constituents, the picture the speaker wants to give is built up. So, for instance, in the sentence ‘Peter writes’ the Focus can be on the predicate ‘writes’, just as in ‘Peter is writing a letter carefully’, where, from the focused perspective of the action of writing other constituents are added to create the picture of the action taking place.

23 For predicate Focus in general, see Van Valin (2009), Wickboldt (2000), Winkler (1985). Klamer (2005: 724f.) argues that the same pragmatic effect, which she calls “emphasis on the predicate” can be found in Kambera: “The accusative S appears when the predicate is emphasized, and S is subsequently backgrounded.” Lambrecht (1994) and Van Valin and LaPolla (1997) distinguish three pragmatically motivated Focus types, ‘sentence Focus’, ‘narrow Focus’ and ‘predicate Focus’. The latter means that the Focus lies on the constituents that function as a comment on the Topic of the sentence. ‘Sentence Focus’ means that all the information given in the sentence is regarded as equally new, and narrow Focus means that there is Focus on only one specific constituent. Dery (2007) argues that the term ‘predicate Focus’, as defined by Lambrecht (1994) is not applicable in Tagalog and should be replaced by ‘multiple Focus’. This discussion is somewhat beyond the scope of my research. In the distinction of three Focus types by Lambrecht (1994) one can find some overlap with the distinctions used in this paper between Agent-demotion and Patient-promotion (both considered as ‘narrow focus’). My definition of predicate-promotion, however, is essentially different from Lambrecht’s predicate Focus (see the next paragraph). Himmelmann (2005: 367) notes that pragmatic factors for the choice among different voices are “still poorly understood” and the overview of Kazenin (2001) of diverse views on the function of the passive shows that treatises on this function of predicate-promotion or predicate Focus, in whatever way defined, are still not very common, though, as he rightly says: “voice is a verbal category, so it would not be natural for it to have demotion or promotion of an argument, rather than marking of some characteristic of the event or the event in general, as its core meaning” (Kazenin 2001: 907).

24 See Reid and Liao (2004) and Liao (2004). They are both discussed further on in this section.

25 My definition of predicate-promotion is essentially different from the definition of ‘predicate-focus’ by Lambrecht (1994; see note 26). The main difference is that in Lambrecht’s definition, the Topic constituent is the nucleus and in my definition the predicate is the nucleus from which the picture is built up. My definition fits in with Kazenin’s view (see note 26) that it would be natural for voice itself to have a marking of some characteristic of the event in general as its core meaning.
 Predicate-promotion by means of a passive construction can be used to emphasize the reality, the factual truth or the logicality of the action itself. Because of this pragmatic effect, the passive construction is quite often chosen to add a tone of formality or rationality to the message, or to add vividness or dramatic effect to the picture of the event itself. Predicate-promotion may also be used to form a so-called impersonal passive, in which case it can be used as an imperative. In the vast majority of cases predicate-promotion is the main reason for a speaker to choose the passive construction.\(^{26}\)

So, in (13) above, the example given by Dik, Focus can indeed be on either the Agent or the Patient, depending on the context and the effect the speaker wants to realise, but it can also be on the predicate. Focus on the predicate means that the speaker wishes to present the SoA mainly from the perspective of what is actually happening without making either Agent or Patient too prominent. Compare this with Dutch sentences like:

\(\begin{align*}
(14) & \quad \text{Dit wordt nooit gedaan.} \\
& \quad \text{(This is never being done.)}
\end{align*}\)

\(\begin{align*}
(15) & \quad \text{Er wordt nu geslapen!} \\
& \quad \text{(There be slept now!)}
\end{align*}\)

\(\begin{align*}
(16) & \quad \text{Ik wil geen geklets meer! Er wordt vanaf nu alleen nog maar} \\
& \quad \text{geluisterd. Is dat duidelijk?!} \\
& \quad \text{(I don’t want any talking anymore! From now on, there be only} \\
& \quad \text{listened. Is that clear?!)}^{27}
\end{align*}\)

In all three examples Agent and Patient are completely left out of the picture, in order to Focus maximally on the predicate. Another illustration of this perspectival effect is a fragment in Virgil’s Aeneid, in which he describes the hasty preparations on the shore by Aeneas and his men in order to leave as quickly as possible, seen through the eyes of Dido (the passive verb is boldfaced):

\(\begin{align*}
(17) & \quad \text{quis tibi tum, Dido, cernenti talia sensus,} \\
& \quad \text{quosve dabus gemitus, cum litora fervere late}
\end{align*}\)

\(^{26}\) Winkler (1985), in which extensive research in Dutch (written and spoken) and Latin texts indicates that in the majority of cases the passive is chosen to promote the predicate.

\(^{27}\) Example (15) and (16) illustrate as well the aforementioned use of the impersonal passive as an imperative construction.
prospiceres arce ex summa, totumque videres
misceri ante oculos tantis clamoribus aequor!²⁸

(What did you feel, Dido, when you saw such things, how did you
sigh, when from the top of the fortress you saw before your eyes the
beach aglow far and wide, and the whole main being filled (lit.:
‘being mixed’) with loud cries!)

Virgil is using the passive to let his readers concentrate on the picture (as
a whole) of Aeneas’ hasty flight, the picture of people rushing to make
the ship ready, of loud noises and people shouting commands at each
other, without focussing on any of the participants in particular. In other
words, there is Focus on the passive misceri: the perspective from which
the information is presented is the actual misceri (mixing) of things and
people and emotions.²⁹

These pragmatic functions of the passive and especially the main
function of predicate promotion may well shed a different light on the
passives in Philippine-type languages. Reid and Liao (2004) argue that
one of the conditions for labeling a sentence as passive is that the
Agent is downgraded.³⁰ However, the main pragmatic reason for choosing a
passive, at least in languages like Dutch and Latin is not to downgrade
the Agent, but to upgrade the predicate. As a result of which the Agent
may be downgraded, but in the majority of cases this downgrading is not

²⁸ Virgil, Aeneid IV, 409-411. Translation is mine.
²⁹ Mithun (1994: 256) gives an interesting example of a sentence in which this pragmatic
function of emphasis on the predicate may be present for very much the same pragmatic reasons
(vividness, dramatic effect) as in Virgil’s picture of the hasty preparations of Aeneas and his
men. In comparing “George is cooking the turkey” and “George is cooking”, she says that the
first sentence “highlights the immediate involvement of the turkey, while in the second the
involvement of the turkey is bypassed in order to highlight that of George, scurrying around the
kitchen.” However, she concludes that a speaker’s choice between these two sentences only has
to do with the participant he sees as most directly involved in the action, so in this case George
or the turkey. As I have tried to make clear by giving this text fragment of Virgil (and examples
14 to 16), a speaker’s motivation for choosing a sentence construction is not restricted to
highlighting the Object (‘the turkey’) or the Subject (‘George’), but can also lie in his wish to
highlight the action itself (‘scurrying around the kitchen’).
³⁰ They consider the term passive only justified in the case of ‘stative verbs’, because “they are
intransitive, there exists a clear derivational relationship between them and transitive verbs, and
their Actors are typically not expressed.” (Reid and Liao 2004: 462)
the primary motivation to choose a passive.\textsuperscript{31} Also, the argument of Liao (2004: 149) that “passives are far more frequent than would be expected if they were true passives”, does not necessarily imply that we need to reject the practice of calling all the non-Actor voices passives.\textsuperscript{32} Reasons for a higher frequency of passives and even for the lower frequency or absence of related active counterparts\textsuperscript{33} may well be found, for instance, in cultural differences: different ways of looking at things, different rules concerning how to say things – for instance in a formal, non-formal or polite way – differences in the ways people are expected to interact, differences in what is seen as a neat or eloquent way of saying things, and so on. It needs further investigation if, and to what extent, these kinds of differences can account for the higher frequency of passives in Philippine-type languages, or as Kroeger formulates it, for “the pragmatic preference for Patients” in Subject selection.\textsuperscript{34}

4.7 Perspective and cases in PMG

The pragmatic and perspective reasons for choosing a passive construction given in the previous two sections are very relevant for a proper evaluation of the linguistic approach used in PMG, and not only concerning the passive. When using the term ‘perspective’ in several passages in his book, Dik often associates the term with foregrounding, backgrounding, direction, movement and, of course, Focus.\textsuperscript{35} All these general notions of backgrounding and so forth associated with

\textsuperscript{31} Liao (2004, 150) argues that in Philippine-type languages Agents are typically obligatory in these so-called passive constructions, while cross-linguistically passives typically lack an overt Agent. Kroeger (1993b: 50) also notes this difference, recognizing it as “a seemingly unique fact about the Philippine voice system”. However, passives in languages like Dutch and Latin allow for an explicit mentioning of the Agent as well, and the lacking of an overt Agent is not as typically present as Liao suggests. Furthermore, if downgrading of the Agent is involved, then most of the time this downgrading is not the primary motivation for the passive but a direct consequence of the upgrading of the predicate (cf. Winkler, 1985).

\textsuperscript{32} Cf. Reid and Liao (2004). See also Reid (2011). For an overview of those scholars who, as the missionaries, do consider them passives, see Liao (2004).

\textsuperscript{33} Liao (2004: 152). The higher frequency of passives was already explicitly noted by Totanes in 1865, quoted by Kess (1979).

\textsuperscript{34} The quote is taken from Kroeger (1993b: 55). Liao (2004: 151f.) rejects politeness as a possible factor for the higher frequency because the passives also occur in imperative sentences and these sentences do not by any means express politeness. However, passive imperatives also are used in Dutch and not necessarily for politeness reasons; while in other contexts, passive sentences in Dutch are used for reasons of politeness. Furthermore, politeness is a pragmatic effect related to Agent-demotion, not to predicate-promotion, while passive imperatives are related to predicate-promotion (cf. Winkler 1985).

\textsuperscript{35} Cf. Dik (1997), see under Perspective.
Perspective appear to play an important role in the pragmatic linguistic analyses of the missionaries.

As I have said above, in PMG the term ‘nominative’ is used pragmatically, in the meaning of PTF, and Nominative and the other cases are used in the semantic meaning of Agent, Patient, Beneficiary, Oblique Agent, Locative and Instrumental. However, looking more closely at the texts written by the missionaries, there seems a good reason to add another dimension of analysis to these pragmatic and semantic roles attributed to case names, namely the perspectival dimension. This not only becomes clear from the perspective function of the nominative as PTF. In fact, if this were the only evidence of the use of perspective in PMG, it would be rather meagre proof, for nominative and Topic and Focus all are easily, in fact even quite naturally, associated with the notion of perspective as being the ‘thing we talk about’, ‘the centre of attention’, ‘the most salient information’. All these and other definitions or descriptions one can give of these terms immediately suggest some sort of perspective. In other words, the fact that the missionaries used the term ‘nominative’ in the way they did, can by itself hardly be considered to be proof that they used perspective as a functional or pragmatic concept in their linguistic analyses.

However, more substantial proof of the thesis that PMG uses perspective as a linguistic concept can be found in the way the missionaries explain the use of other case names. For instance, in example (2) given above, the missionary speaks of a thing that ‘goes from the Agent (which becomes the Oblique Agent, expressed by the genitive) to another party, which has to become PTF (expressed by the nominative). In examples (3) and (4) the linguistic analysis is based on the attribution of a locative function, which in itself has a semantic but also a perspective function (as being the place where, the place from, or the thing or situation about). Other fragments as well indicate strongly that the missionaries explicitly used the perspective function to explain linguistic phenomena. Some examples:

(18) La partícula en ... significa ser hecha la cosa ad intra como atrayéndolo assi, a diferencia de y, que significa ser hecha la cosa ad extra, como echándolo hazia fuera..., a diferencia de an, que significa lugar... (Anonymous 1601: 96)
The particle *en* means that the thing is done inwardly directed, as attracting it to itself, different from the article *y*, which signifies that the thing is done outwardly directed, as throwing it away..., different from the article *an*, which signifies place...

(19) *De esta segunda pasiva de y se usar para cosas que dicen echar hacia fuera la cosa que va de la persona que hace a otra parte; que estas acciones son las que llamamos adextra* (San Agustín 1795 [1647]: 134)

‘This second passive with *y* is used for other things which express throwing away the thing that goes from the person who acts to another party; these actions we call outwardly directed.’

(20) *...digo que no se significa por esta composicion en sino al término a quo de la accion...porque el término ad quem ...* (López 1690: 165. Underlining is mine)

‘I say that this construction with *en* distinguishes itself by the notion from where the action..., because the notion to whom...’

The examples (1) through (4) and (18) through (20) strongly suggest that the missionaries attributed a perspective function to the passive. I will come back to this in the next section. In examples (18) through (20), this notion of perspective is expressed in terms of foregrounding and backgrounding, distance and movement.\(^{36}\) Examples (1) through (4), however, indicate that they used perspective as an even more fundamental starting point in their analyses, by using the case names in their original senses of perspective and from there on attributing specific semantic and pragmatic meanings to case names, using the following process:

---

\(^{36}\) The concept of movement as an important linguistic factor – expressed by the missionaries in examples (1)-(4) and (18)-(20) – is also recognized in Localist Case Grammar. This model assumes that every clause expresses a locative relation (physically or metaphorically), that there are three core semantic roles (Agent, Theme and Loc) and that other semantic roles, like Beneficiary and Instrument, are nonnuclear Themes or Locs. This way of working with the concept of movement goes a step further than the way the missionaries used movement to explain linguistic phenomena and is outside the scope of the present research. For attempts to use Localist Case Grammar in Philippine linguistics, see Brainard (1994).
Subject, Topic, Passive and Perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Perspective meaning</th>
<th>PMG function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>‘Centre of attention’, ‘Subject of talk’, ‘Starting point of a sentence’, etc.</td>
<td><em>Hence its meaning in PMG: PTF.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>‘belonging to’, ‘by whom the action is undertaken’.</td>
<td><em>Hence in PMG: Oblique Agent (backgrounded Agent).</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>‘to whom it is given’.</td>
<td><em>The same function (beneficiary) in PMG</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>‘place where’, ‘from where’, ‘about what’.</td>
<td><em>The same functions in PMG.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1** Semantic and pragmatic meaning of cases in PMG

The given perspective meaning of the genitive as ‘by whom the action is undertaken’, the meaning the missionaries used to attribute the function of Oblique Agent, can be found in Latin as well, for instance:

\[(21)\] Adventus hostium populum terrebat.
The coming of the enemies terrified the people.\[38\]

Latin examples of the perspective meaning of the accusative which the missionaries used to attribute the Goal functions to this case can easily be found and don’t need further explanation where Goal refers to the Object in a sentence. Examples the missionaries may have used to attribute the movement or direction function – which is also an aspect

---

\[37\] Thus far, I haven’t found examples of temporal constructions in the texts of the missionaries working in the Philippines. However, from this overview of perspective functions, it may be expected that if examples of temporal constituents are found, they will be attributed the accusative case.

\[38\] Hengeveld and Mackenzie give other examples from Turkish of this function of the genitive as denoting the Agent (2008: 359f.). Different, however, from the missionaries, they attribute the Subject function to this use of the genitive, while in PMG the term Subject is not considered applicable (see section 4.9).
inherent to the semantic function Goal – and the temporal function to the accusative case can easily be found as well in Latin, for instance:

(22) *Romam*  
to Rome

(23) *totam hiemem*  
during the whole winter season

The attribution in PMG of the instrumental function to the accusative may seem a little bit more puzzling. In Latin, one can find examples of the instrumental meaning of the accusative, in the sense of ‘in the capacity of’ or ‘with the task of’, in sentences like:

(24) *senilem aetatem onerare tantos dolores*  
to burden his old age with such grief

(25) *Ciceronem consulem creaverunt*  
they made Cicero consul

Moreover, the original meaning of the accusative in Latin is one of causality and instrumentality. Ernout and Thomas explain in their work on Latin syntax, that the Latin term ‘accusativus’ is actually a wrong translation by Roman grammarians of the Greek ἀἰτιατικὴ πτῶσις, which actually means ‘cause’ or ‘effective case’. Compare this with the adjective ἀἰτιατός, which means ‘produced by a cause’. As Ernout and Thomas show, Priscian was aware of this causal/instrumental origin of the term accusative and so, instead of using the term ‘accusativus’, he uses the term ‘causativus casus’ (cf. Ernout and Thomas 1953: 17f.).

So, Priscian – or one of the later grammarians who followed the descriptions of Priscian39 – may well have been the source for the missionaries to attribute the instrumental function to the accusative. Nebrija, however, certainly has not been a primary source altogether with respect to the perspective function of cases, as we can gather from the list below (Table 2) of Nebrija’s description of why cases have their respective Latin names. Esparza Torres (2007) argues that all the missionary linguists of the 16th and 17th century accepted the authority of Nebrija’s Latin grammar. However, his research only covered texts

39 The traditional Latin school grammars of Donatus (~350 A.D.) and Priscian (~500 A.D) “dominated Western linguistic thought for more than a millennium” (Bossong 2007: 136)
from missionaries working in Mexico. Calvo Pérez (2000: 126) rightly says that Nebrija’s grammar inspired all the grammatical studies of the ‘new world’. Indeed, his inspiration or authority may have been substantial in the linguistic descriptions of languages of the ‘new world’ (the Americas), but is less tangible in the analyses of linguistic works of Philippine languages discussed here.

Most of the differences in usage of the case names by Nebrija compared with the way they are used in PMG speak clearly for themselves. However, the ablative, locative and accusative, and the ‘effective case’ which Nebrija takes up in his list, need special attention. Let me first give the list of descriptions as given by Nebrija (1996 [1488]: 105f.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Nominativus | *Quia per eum nominamur.*  
Because by this [i.e. case] we are named. |
| Genitivus  | *Quia per eum nominamur cuius sumus filii.*  
Because by this we are named of whom we are the sons. |
| Dativus    | *Quia in eo casu ponimus eum cui aliquid damus.*  
Because in this case we place him to whom we give something. |
| Accusativus| *Quia in eo casu ponimus eum quem accusamus.*  
Because in this case we place him who we accuse. |
| Ablativus  | *Quia in eo casu ponimus eum a quo aliquid auferemus.*  
Because in this case we place him of whom we take something away. |
| Effectivus | *Quia in eo casu ponimus instrumentum quo aliquid efficitur.*  
Because in this case we place the instrument by which something is effected. |

Table 2 *Meanings of cases given by Nebrija*

The missionaries used the ablative case very infrequently. Blancas, for instance, uses it when he explains the use of a preposition *sa* which, in some cases conveys a meaning equivalent to Latin prepositions that are always followed by an ablative; these are, he explains, prepositions with the meaning of “place or like place” (cf. quote (4) where he uses the same words referring to a semantic function of a constituent in a sentence). He immediately adds, however, that this *sa* is mostly followed
by an accusative because it more often conveys meanings comparable with Latin prepositions like *ad* (to, towards), *apud* (with, at, near) and *adversum* (toward, in front of) which take the accusative:

... *en algunos aquel* *sa* *hace* *ablativo* *lo cual* *se* *conoce* *porque* *les* *corresponden* *en* *Latín* *las* *preposiciones* *de* *Ablativo* *pero* *en* *otras* *llanamente* *se* *vee* *que* *es* *Accusativo* *pues* *les* *corresponden* *las* *de* *Accusativo: ad, apud, ante, adversum, etc. (Blancas 1997[1610]: 6)

... in some cases this *sa* makes an ablative which is recognized because they correspond with the Latin prepositions that take the ablative but in other cases it is simple to see that it is the accusative since they [sc. the meanings of *sa*] correspond with the Latin prepositions that take the accusative.

On the page previous to the one from which this quote is taken he explains that the prepositions that take the ablative convey a meaning related to ‘place’. They are “lugar or como lugar” (place or like place) he says, using the same expression as in quote (4) above.

Sanvitores uses the term ‘ablative’ only once, when he explains the meaning of the preposition *sa* or *a*, and he also adds something very similar to the words of Blancas, namely that these prepositions are also used with a Goal (‘accusativus loci’):

*Itaque in omnibus appellativis nullum est discrimen nominativi a genitivo, nec plerumque ab accusativo rei, dativusque et ablativus semper assimilantur praepositione *sa* *vel a*, quae etiam praeponitur accusativo loci ...* (Sanvitores 1668: 28r)

So, in all nouns there is no distinction between Topic (nominativus) and Oblique (genitivus), nor, mostly, between Topic (nominativus) and Patient (accusativus); Benefactive (dativus) and ablative are equally represented by the preposition *sa* or *a*, which also is placed before Goal (accusativus loci)

Sanvitores distinguishes explicitly an ‘accusativus rei’ (Patient) and an ‘accusativus loci’ (Goal) in his analyses of semantic functions. He does not use a separate locative case, so we may assume that he included this locative function in the term ‘accusativus loci’ (which would probably be

---

40 This fragment is discussed also in chapter 5.6.
expressed in Spanish as ‘accusativo de lugar’). Other Philippine missionaries do not (to my knowledge) use this term, but distinguish ‘accusativo’ (Patient) and ‘lugar’ (Locative) without combining them. Moreover, as illustrated above, ‘lugar’ is associated with the ablative in Blancas’ grammar of Tagalog. However, since these missionaries do distinguish a locative case, describing it by using the word ‘lugar’, I have included the Locative in the list given above of cases used by the missionaries for semantic and pragmatic functions.

The low frequency of the application of the ablative case and also the way in which it is used by the missionaries – not for describing a semantic or pragmatic function of a noun and always in combination with another case to explain the diversity of meanings of a preposition – seems to corroborate my thesis that they went back to the original perspective meanings of the case names, since the ablative is a syncretistic case of three functions: ‘point of departure’, combined with instrumental and locative (Palmer 1961: 299). A case with such diverse functions probably was considered inadequate to explain clearly and consistently the perspectives which in PMG form the basis of the analysis of various sentence constructions.

Nebrija has added a seventh case, which he calls the effectivus, which is actually identical to the instrumental case I discussed before. Apparently, Nebrija himself also realized that the syncretism of three functions in one ablative case would be a bit confusing (in the list given above, he actually attributes only one of the functions to the ablative). However, Nebrija didn’t follow Priscian in restoring the original instrumental/causal value of the accusative. So, in this respect as well the missionaries did not follow Nebrija’s model.

41 The locative is not a distinct case in the Latin grammar we know, and therefore not mentioned by Nebrija, but it was a distinct case in “historical times”, according to Ernout and Thomas (1953: 96-99), who illustrate that traces of this case are still present in classical Latin in forms like domi (at home) and Athenis (in Athens).

42 In the list I give of Nebrija’s cases the attentive reader may have counted six cases. I have left out the vocative case because it is not a subject of discussion in this paper.

43 It is noted by Sueiro Justel (2005: 262) that López (1690) in his grammar of the Philippine language Pangasinan also adapts Nebrija’s model to make it more effective for explaining how this language works: “A la descripción del verbo López dedica los libros tercero y cuarto y parte de quinto. Parte del paradigma de las Introducciones Latinae de Nebrija, pero en este caso tal paradigma se ve desbordado inmediatamente.” (López dedicates the third, fourth and part of the fifth book to the description of the verb. He starts from the paradigm provided by Nebrija’s Introducciones Latinae but in this case he immediately exceeds the limits of this paradigm).
4.8 Passive as a perspective function in PMG

The missionaries labeled all the sentences in which the Actor is not PTF as passives. Reid (2011) describes (and endorses) the criticism of Seidenadel (1909) in his grammar of Bontok Igorot with respect to the labeling of these sentences as passives. Seidenadel and Reid may be right in rejecting as passives all ‘non-Actor voice’ constructions in Philippine languages. However, this does not justify Seidenadel’s criticism of the missionaries’ use of this term. The examples given in the introduction of this chapter and the description in the previous section of the way the missionaries used case names, all make abundantly clear that they didn’t use the term ‘passive’ in a syntactic sense. Just as with the case names, the missionaries moved the term ‘passive’ to the pragmatic and perspective level. The choice between passive and active, in their view, is a conscious, pragmatically motivated choice of a speaker in order to present a state of affairs from a different perspective.

This view of the missionaries is completely in concordance with the pragmatic view of the passive as described in section 4. It even goes a step further. By defining case names on a perspective level and moving the term passive also to this level, they appear to have abandoned the syntactic level almost entirely in their linguistic analyses. I will go into this with respect to their use of the term Subject in the next section.

4.9 Subject in PMG

As it appears, the missionaries didn’t need the syntactic level of Subject/Object, being well aware that, contrary to Dik’s thesis, perspective is not the essential nature of this syntactic pair but the essential nature of cases. However, this does not fully explain why they used the term ‘Subject’ with non-agentive sentences but didn’t use it with agentive sentences.

A possible reason, given by Ridruejo (2007), may be that in agentive sentences there are almost always other constituents involved, for which they used case names such as genitive and accusative, and in concordance with this they also used the term ‘nominative’, instead of Subject. In non-agentive sentences they could simply use the term Subject for the Topic of the sentence.

*44* However, see the discussion in section 4.6.
Another possible motive may be that non-agentive sentences are very static, so they may have thought that using terms to which they had given a predominantly pragmatic, semantic and perspective function would be inappropriate and even confusing.

However, the more plausible reason may well be that they were aware of the fact that Subject isn’t a valid concept in ergative languages. Schachter (1976), for instance, argues quite convincingly that Subject is a composite of Topic and Actor, and in fact, the missionaries may well have fully agreed with this view. In full conformity with Schachter they also ‘decomposed’ the notion of Subject into the two distinct functions of Topic – or more accurately, also in the case of Schachter: PTF and Actor. Compare also Falk:

Schachter (1976) argues that the familiar notion of Subject is an amalgam of two distinct functions. A similar suggestion has been made on the basis of ergative languages (e.g. Dixon 1979; 1994). One function, which Schachter calls Topic and Dixon calls Pivot, is (roughly) a discourse function. The other, which Schachter calls Actor and Dixon Subject, is linked to semantics and argument structure. In nominative-accusative languages, the same nominal has both functions.

Or compare Starosta:

Languages need some way to distinguish Actor from Patient so that the hearer knows who is performing the action and who or what is being affected. The mechanism that accomplishes this is the case form Nominative. Nominative is like a show window that highlights either Patient or Actor...

Compare this with a final example taken from Sanvitores’ description of Chamorro:

---

45 Cf. e.g. Schachter (1976), Starosta (2001). Dik (1997), however, doesn’t agree with their view and says that Subject and Object are also valid concepts in ergative languages, but on the condition that these terms are redefined as perspective functions. Earlier in this paper I have already argued why he is mistaken in this respect.
46 See note 2. Schachter (1976) describes Topic as ‘the center of attention’, which is actually a description of Focus.
(26) Passiva fit per in loco um activae colloquandum, construiturque cum nominativo rei et genitivo personae agentis, dativoque personae cui, quae etiam nonnunquam ponitur in nominativo et tum res, si mavis, potest dici esse in accusativo, qui demum non distinguetur a nominativo.

'The passive voice is made by placing -in- instead of -um- of the active voice and is construed with a Goal as PTF [nominativo], with the Actor as Oblique Agent [genitivo] and with a Beneficiary [dativo]. The Beneficiary can also be made PTF and in that case the constituent that was Patient (res), if you wish to say so, figures as the Goal (accusativus), which ultimately is not marked to distinguish it from the Topic (nominativo).'

In PMG we recognize a view of the Philippine languages that is remarkably similar to the modern view of for instance Schachter and Starosta. The missionaries did indeed make a distinction between Actor and Topic, they defined Topic as a pragmatic discourse function (PTF) and neatly placed Actor on the semantic level (together with other semantic functions), and they regarded nominative as being a 'highlighting show window'. Furthermore, in conformity with Dik, they argued that nominative, in its definition of PTF, can have all kinds of semantic functions, not only Actor and Patient.

---

49 Sanvitores (1954 [1668], f. 30r). For a discussion of this fragment see chapter 3. Sanvitores also describes the active in a fully functional way (Sanvitores, f. 29v): "Construitur … quasi Latine, persona agens in nominativo, persona cui datur in dativo, res quae datur in accusativo absque praepositione." (The active voice is construed as in Latin, with the Agent as PTF, a Beneficiary and a Goal-Object, without preposition). Sanvitores’ description here of the um-infix as placing Focus on the Agent is confirmed in recent research by Cooreman (1987: 42). For further discussion of this fragment, see Winkler (2007).

50 The rejection of the term Focus, as being misleading or inappropriate, by Himmelmann (2005, 2002) and Shirano (2005) is based on the use of the term Focus in the ‘classical period’ (for this term see note 3), where it refers to syntactic prominence, in which case it would be better to replace it with Subject. Focus, however, in the sense of pragmatic salience, is a universally applicable concept, so also in Philippine-type languages. Starosta’s notion of ‘highlighting’ is very comparable with the pragmatic term Focus.
4.10 Conclusions

- In PMG case names are used to refer to semantic and perspective functions.
- Perspective in PMG is used as a pragmatic linguistic concept, reflecting the way a speaker wants to present a SoA in terms of foregrounding, backgrounding, movement, Topic, Focus, direction, contrast, etc.
- Different from the missionary linguists in the Americas, the Philippine missionaries who developed PMG did not follow Nebrija’s *Introductiones Latinae* as a reference model regarding the use of case names. They developed their own method of explaining linguistic phenomena and defined cases in a different way from the case descriptions found in Nebrija. With respect to the instrumental function they attributed to the accusative, they may have been inspired by Priscian’s definition of the accusative.
- In PMG the syntactic notion Subject is considered inapplicable in agentive sentences.
- In FG and FDG the level of Subject (and Object) should be considered inapplicable or irrelevant as well, in the sense that it does not contribute to the pragmatic presentation of a SoA. FDG lacks formal precision in this matter, on the one hand referring to the perspective and the discourse function of Subject and allowing for the level of Subject/Object to become relevant in the structural choices of a speaker and on the other hand arguing that the syntactic level neither adds nor subtracts pragmatic or semantic information.
- The definition of Subject and Object in FG and (implicitly) in FDG as having a perspective function, is mistaken.
- In the still ongoing discussion about whether Subject or Topic is a more applicable term in the linguistic analyses of Philippine languages, the missionaries appear to have prefigured the view of modern linguists like Schachter in preferring to use the term Topic.
- The missionaries used the term ‘passive’ not in the sense of a syntactic structure different from the active. They used the term ‘passive’ to describe pragmatic variations in perspective.
- The PMG method of moving the term ‘passive’ (and ‘active’) to the pragmatic level of linguistic analysis, and taking into account that the most frequently occurring pragmatic motivation for using a passive construction in languages like Dutch and Latin is not Patient-promotion nor Agent-demotion, but
promotion of the predicate, may well lead to different conclusions in the current debate concerning whether or not Philippine-type languages have passives.

- As the missionaries already understood, perspective is a powerful pragmatic function (or group of pragmatic functions). Perspective deserves to be more accurately described and more extensively applied in modern functional or pragmatic linguistic theories like FG and FDG.

- To the three periods of linguistic analysis of Philippine-type languages that Liao (2004) distinguishes, a fourth period should be added. This period, actually the first one chronologically, during which the missionaries made the first analyses of Philippine-type languages, may well be called the ‘pioneer period’. For in all kinds of ways pioneers is what they were. Confronted with languages that were not known before and that didn’t fit the classical syntax and grammar system they knew, they maintained classical terms but redefined them and developed an, at that time, new method of analysis, which we now call a functional or pragmatic method. By doing this they were actually three hundred years ahead of their time.
5. The Chamorro verb according to Diego Luis de Sanvitores (1627-1672)

5.1 Introduction

In 1668, Father Sanvitores, S.J. wrote the first grammar, in Latin, of Chamorro, a Western Malayo-Polynesian language found in the Philippines, and doing so also gave us its very first description in history. An analysis of this grammar, brief as it is, is of great historio-linguistic interest, for several reasons:

- It shows us the Chamorro language that at that stage was not yet at all infused with Spanish influences, as it has evolved in the course of more than 300 years.
- It adds to the picture of the surprisingly modern linguistic methods and the accurate insights the missionaries working in the Philippine area had developed and thus contributes to giving these missionaries their proper place in the history of linguistics.
- It may also inspire us to reflect upon the value of linguistic choices and assumptions we nowadays tend to take for granted.

This chapter will specifically pay attention to the verbal system, as described by Sanvitores and compare Sanvitores’ descriptions and examples of Chamorro, his underlying views and opinions, with the ideas of scholars nowadays. The analysis will bring to light that Sanvitores has an overall, accurate understanding of the Chamorro verb, is conscious of the central role of the root, which can figure in multiple syntactic positions, is aware of the verbalizing functions along with pragmatic effects of affixes, makes a clear and entirely correct distinction between durative and non-durative aspects – implicitly explaining to his readers that Chamorro is essentially tense-less – regroups the participle in a new way to align the classical parts-of-speech system more in accord with this language, recognizes the antipassive, and implements meanings and concepts of classical Latin grammatical terminology and thinking in an untraditional way, reasoning not from what he had learned at school from the classical tradition of Latin grammars, but from what this particular language tells him about its characteristics in its own right. In this respect I will also show that Sanvitores did not adhere to the
grammatical definitions of the authoritative grammar of Antonio de Nebrija (1441/44?–1522), but rather tapped concepts and terms from contemporary sources. Furthermore, this chapter will pay considerable attention, not only to the historio-linguistic information the examples of Chamorro words and sentences give us with respect to the changes in form and meaning of words, but also, by closely analyzing what Sanvitores tells us about his examples and how he dissect words into roots and affixes, to the clues he provides us with, concerning the very complex – and nowadays to some extent still not fully understood – system of verbal affixes.

5.2 Structure of this chapter

The structure of this chapter is as follows:

- In section 5.3 I will briefly describe how the mission to the Mariana islands came about and provide details and background of the manuscript of the grammar written by Sanvitores;
- In section 5.4 I will put the grammar in its historical context, concerning the Hellenistic and medieval tradition Sanvitores leaned upon as well as the history of linguistic descriptions of Chamorro from Sanvitores till the modern day. Also the criticism of later authors on Sanvitores, his contemporaries and later scholars are briefly described;
- Section 5.5 will present the current debate about the applicability of diverse word-class theories and compare modern ideas with the standpoint in this matter of Sanvitores;
- Section 5.6 will unfold, as an introductory step up to the core subject of this chapter (the verb) the structure Sanvitores has chosen for his grammar and introduces the surprisingly modern pragmatic method he applies in analyzing and explaining the language. As an illustration I will very briefly show the way he describes Chamorro nouns and pronouns;
- Section 5.7 is devoted to the verb. Because of the length of Sanvitores’ treatise on the verb, section 5.7 is split up in a number of subsections:
  - Impersonal verbs (5.7.1);
  - The root and the Actor-Focus with -um- (5.7.2);
  - Tenses, moods and aspects (5.7.3);
  - The non-Actor-Focus with -in- and ergativity (5.7.4);
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- Modes to be added (5.7.5);
- The Actor-Focus with \((m)(f)an\)- and the antipassive (5.7.6);
- The non-Actor-Focus with \(a\)- and the antipassive (5.7.7);
- Various particles (5.7.8).

Finally, section 5.8 concludes.

5.3 Sanvitores’ Mission and the tradition of the manuscript

Diego Luis de Sanvitores was born in Burgos in 1627 as a child of aristocratic and highly respected parents. Already at a very young age, thirteen years old, he decided, against the wishes of his father, to become a Jesuit and later, again despite his father’s strong objections, to become a missionary. In 1662, on his way from Mexico to the Philippines, he set foot on the island of Guam, the largest of the group of islands that were at the time still known as “the islands of thieves” because the islanders had managed to steal a skiff from the flagship of the first expedition that anchored at Guam in 1521. After five years of working in the Philippines he went back to Mexico to raise funds for his mission to the Marianas and anchored his ship in Guam again on the 16th of June 1668. At that time Sanvitores had already decided that the islands should be renamed Marian islands, in honor of Mariana (1634-1696), regent of Spain while Charles II (1661-1700) was still too young to become king.

Just as many other missions in the area, this one also did not run smoothly and peacefully. The missionaries were often confronted with hostilities from the side of the islanders, who saw them as unwelcome intruders and occupiers of their territory, which in fact they were to some extent as religious mission and colonization often went hand in hand. Sanvitores and his group had to deal with all sorts of conflicts and acts of aggression. Already in the second month after their arrival, two members of the group were killed and two priests severely wounded; in 1670 Fr. Luis de Medina (1637-1670) was killed in Saipan and on April 2nd,
1672, Sanvitores himself was violently murdered by the father of a girl he intended to baptize.\footnote{\textit{Cf.} Viana (2004, Part 4.19-20); Barrett (1975: 5-6); Burrus (1954: 936). For a longer description of the violent death of Fr. Medina (killed by a rain of spears when entering a house), and of Sanvitores himself, see Coomans (2000). For more information about the fate of the successive missionaries on the island, see Viana (2011).}

The document entitled \textit{Lingua Mariana} is preserved – in the Jesuit archives in Rome. It also is available on microfilm. It consists of two parts. The first part is a long letter Sanvitores added to his grammar, addressed to his colleagues in Manila and Rome, telling them that he had decided, despite the unfinished and imperfect character of it, to publish his grammar anyway, after which he continues with an elaborate description of the history of the islands, its geographical details and the possible origin of the islanders. The last part of the \textit{Lingua Mariana} bears the title: \textit{Grammaticae Institutiones Marianae Linguae} (“Marian language grammar instructions”). It consists of two sections, the actual grammar and texts taken from the Christian catechism translated into Chamorro, meant as practical examples of how to say things in Chamorro. Together it forms the first written description of Chamorro.

Sanvitores wrote the grammar while on board of the ship bringing him from Mexico to Guam, so in less than three months. In the five years of his stay in the Philippines Sanvitores had, so the legend goes, learned to speak the Tagalog language perfectly (Barrett 1975: 5). Sanvitores considers himself very fortunate therefore – as he describes himself in the introduction to his grammar – to have found a Tagalog who had spent seventeen years in the Marianas (after surviving a shipwreck in 1638) to accompany him on the journey to the Marianas and meanwhile teach him Chamorro.

The entire \textit{Lingua Mariana} as stored in the Jesuit archives is actually a transcription of the manuscript made in Manila (see chapter 2). The \textit{Lingua Mariana} has never been translated. Only a modestly annotated transcription of the actual grammar and exercises, preceded by an English introduction to the manuscript, was published by Burrus (1954). As demonstrated in Winkler (2013; chapter 2) by means of a number of examples of text fragments, the transcription of the original text contains mistakes and subsequently Burrus added some unfortunate errors in his transcription.
Although Latin was still the lingua franca in those days, it was unusual for a missionary in this area to write in Latin. With some exceptions, such as the Librong, a grammar of Castilian written in Tagalog, all other extant grammars in the Philippine area are written in Spanish. In chapter 2 the diverse possible reasons for Sanvitores to publish in Latin have been discussed, and the most plausible motivation to do so seems to have been that Sanvitores knew that at least some missionaries after him would come from other countries than Spain, like Belgium and Italy, and would not be able to understand a grammar written in Spanish. A second reason may be Sanvitores’ viewpoint – expressed in the introduction to his grammar – that the islanders, who didn’t have a system of written signs yet, could better and more easily learn the ordinal texts directly in the language in which they were actually spoken in church.

5.4 Sanvitores’ grammar from a historical and present-day perspective

More than 300 years lie between the first grammar of Chamorro, written by Father Sanvitores in 1668 and the until now most recent grammar, Topping’s Chamorro Reference Grammar, published in 1973 (Topping and Dungca 1973). In between, the number of works on the Chamorro language is quite meagre. From the start of the colonization of the Marianas by Spain (1565, when admiral Miguel López de Legazpi (1502-1572) occupied Guam, till the end of it (1898, when the USA took possession of Guam and Spain subsequently sold the rest of the islands to Germany) “only three relevant works saw the light of day” (Stolz 2011b: 201), of which Sanvitores’ work is one. The other two works are the Gramática Chamorra – contrary to what the title may suggest, a book meant to enable the Chamorro speakers to learn Spanish – and the Diccionario español-chamorro, both by the Augustinian priest Aniceto Ibáñez del Carmen (1828-1892; see Stolz, ibid.). Besides these works, there is a list of 60 Chamorro words, written in 1565 (examined in Rodríguez-Ponga 2013) and a list of 183 words (published in Kerr 2009) drafted in 1817 by the German poet and botanist Adelbert von Chamisso (born as Louis Charles Adélaïde de Chamisso, 1781-1838).

---

2 Melchor de Oyanguren de Santa Inés (1688-1747) wrote a part of his grammar of Tagalog (Tagalismo elucidado) first in Latin, but it was not a success (“no fue bien recibida”; cf. Zwartjes 2010: 27)
The official site of the island of Guam (www.guampedia.com) describes the language policy on the islands in the first decades of the 20th century. From its beginning, as a result of the political objective of both the Americans and Germans wishing to halt further Spanish cultural influence and therefore reluctant to (learn to) speak Spanish – the only foreign language the islanders knew –, the colonial administrations in this period intensified studies of the Chamorro language. As a result, the American William E. Safford (1859-1926) wrote a grammar of Chamorro in the form of articles (published in 1903-1905) and German-born Edward R. von Preissig (1871-?) wrote a brief grammar together with a dictionary (1918). Four years later, all editions of the Preissig Dictionary available on the islands were ordered by the US governor Althouse to be burned because many islanders persisted in speaking Chamorro instead of English. From the German side, Georg Fritz (1865-1944) published a Chamorro dictionary in 1904 and a grammar in 1909 and Father Callistus Lopinot (1876-1966) published one in 1910. In 1940, the German Hermann Costenoble (1893-1943) published his grammar. And somewhere in between the appearance of these works, the Dutchman Jacob Kats (1875-1945) published his grammar (1917).

Topping and Dungca (1973: 4-6) review all these grammars critically. On Safford (1903-1905), they argue:

[He] set up a Latin grammar framework and discussed the features of Chamorro grammar that would fit into the framework. He includes long lists of “irregular” forms of verbs and nouns, but they were irregular only because Safford did not see the regularity of the patterns since he was looking at them from the point of view of a Latin grammar.

As for the grammars of Fritz, Kats and Callistus their judgment is not milder (“Neither of them contributed anything new”), while Preissig’s very brief grammar shows a “misunderstanding of the complex system of affixation in Chamorro” leading to “incorrect arrangement and classification of many words” and, finally, about Costenoble’s work, the last of the German grammarians who worked on Chamorro, they report that “many of his examples are rejected by Chamorro speakers because they are ungrammatical”.

The criticism concerning the usage of inapplicable terms and concepts has led to harsh judgments of scholars with respect to the works of
Sanvitores and his colleague missionaries. The general verdict was that they simply did not understand the nature of the languages they were describing. So, for instance, Bloomfield (1933: 6 [1984: 7]) wrote:

Those works can be used only with caution, for the authors, untrained in the recognition of foreign speech sounds, could make no accurate record, and knowing only the terminology of Latin grammar, distorted their exposition by fitting it into this frame.

And Rowe (1974: 364) noted:

Non-European languages were studied by missionaries whose aim was to ‘reduce’ them [...] to the pattern of Latin grammar. [...] In general, sixteenth and seventeenth century grammarians felt obliged to find correspondences to the parts of speech of Latin [...]. A grammarian of the present day, trying to use the early works [...] may be blocked [...] by the fact that some forms and constructions alien to Latin are not given at all.

However, they seem to have studied these grammars but superficially, and probably did not look at Sanvitores’ work at all, because understanding Latin – certainly when it is of the complex nature in style and content as in Sanvitores’ work – is too high a threshold for most linguists. Topping and Dungca (1973: 17) seem a bit milder in their way of formulating their criticism but they also do not pretend to have really studied Sanvitores’ grammar, and secondly, their criticism is equally devastating (and, probably needless to say, equally unjustified):

This work, of considerable interest to the comparative or historical linguist, doubtless bears the distinction to be the first grammar of any Micronesian language. Written in Latin, it follows the pattern of most other grammars of the seventeenth century. For example, the author takes such a word as ‘taotao’ ‘man’ and puts it through the nominative, genitive, dative and accusative cases, even though the word remains as ‘taotao’, with no change, throughout the declension.

However, as I have shown in the previous chapters – I will touch upon these findings later on – Sanvitores and his colleague missionaries in the Philippine area, had developed a strikingly modern and effective
Missionary Pragmalinguistics approach and method of analyzing and describing the languages at hand, which does not in the least deserve the kind of discredit quoted above.

In recent decades there has been a renewed interest in Chamorro, resulting in several works that can boast of a solid linguistic foundation. Here, the grammars and dictionary made by Topping (1969, 1975; Topping and Dungca 1973) – helped by a number of natives – are indispensable to any aspirant speaker of Chamorro and form the basis for every linguist who wants to study the idiosyncrasies of the language. Furthermore, Chung (1994, 1998, 2012) has done (and is still doing) invaluable work in revealing the intricacies of Chamorro. And finally, Stolz (2003, 2011a, b; 2013, 2015) has published a number of works on the Chamorro language and has even been able to set up a project group dedicated to the study of Chamorro linguistics, which has, during the years of its existence, produced a number of publications by other scholars (most of these are included in Fischer 2013).

If we compare the grammar of Sanvitores with what still today is regarded as the standard grammar of Chamorro, the Chamorro Reference Grammar by Topping and Dungca (1973), we can see, of course, obvious differences. Sanvitores’ grammar is only a first and rudimentary version of what the author had planned to elaborate in a more detailed and more accurate description of the structure and dynamics of the language, an ambition thwarted by his untimely death. He also had to finish this first version in less than two months’ time, even before having been able to really speak with any Chamorro native. He wrote the entire grammar, including exercises in the form of translations of ordinal texts, on the boat bringing him to the Marianas, learning the language from a Filipino and at the same time composing his grammar without any written resources at his disposal. Topping (1929-2003) has written a full grammar of Chamorro, discussing all aspects and linguistic idiosyncracies that a learner of Chamorro should be aware of in order to be able to speak and write the language correctly. In this manner, writing not only a complete grammar but also by compiling an extensive Chamorro-English dictionary (Topping, Ogo and Dungca 1975), Topping has done invaluable work for the preservation of this, according to Stolz (2015: 465) “moderately endangered”, language.

There are also linguistic differences. A major difference is the model used as a starting point for describing the language. Topping and Dungca choose to deviate from the classical parts-of-speech model (noun,
adverb, verb, etc.) – which they consider not suitable for Chamorro (see their criticism quoted above) – and instead propagate a model of three word classes. Sanvitores uses two frameworks to help him describe and explain the language. He uses the Latin case names of nouns to explain the functional value of nominal constituents in a sentence. So, for instance, he – just like his colleagues working in the Philippine area – uses the term ‘nominative’ for what we now call ‘Topic’ or ‘Focus’. I have dealt with this in extenso in previous papers (Winkler 2007, 2011; see chapter 3 and 4 respectively), and I will summarize my findings briefly in section 5.6. Encompassing this framework of cases, Sanvitores uses the classical parts of speech also as a framework, not so much in order to categorize distinct Chamorro words as noun or verb or adjective etc., but in order to show how one and the same word or root of a word can have various parts-of-speech functions. In the following section I will dwell further on the differences between this parts-of-speech model and the concept of word classes.

5.5 Word-class theories and the parts of speech of Sanvitores

Sanvitores uses the classical list of parts of speech in his exegesis of Chamorro. Topping and Dungca (1973: 76-77) claim that this system of parts of speech is not reflected in the linguistic structure of Chamorro. The main reason is the multifunctionality of words. All content words in Chamorro, they assert, can function as a verb, noun and modifier (adjective or adverb), so to label a word only as a noun or a verb or adjective does not fit the language. Instead, they propose a classification into three word classes (I, II and III), the first two of these being the major ones, the third one a residual category (Topping and Dungca 1973: 76-82). This rubrication is also adhered to by Stolz (2015: 466). Word-class words of type I are by and large the equivalent of all the transitive verbs in English. They can be passivized by the prefix ma- or the infix -in-. The main reason, according to Topping and Dungca (1973: 78), for not labeling them simply as “verbs” is that there are also verbs belonging to class II that do not follow the same grammatical rules as class I words. The class II group consists of all the words that can form a predicate of a sentence with the yo’-type pronoun as the Subject.\(^3\) Stolz

\(^3\) Chamorro employs different sets of pronouns. Cf. Topping and Dungca (1973: 106-111; Chung (2012: 10).
(2015: 466) states that the class I words are “equivalent to intransitive verbs and nouns and adjectives in English” and Chung (2012: 27) in a similar vein argues that Topping and Dungca, with respect to his rubrication in two major word classes, “draw a line between transitive verbs and intransitive predicates”. The class III group of words can be considered a minor group, containing a far smaller number of words arbitrarily put together simply because they don’t match the definitions of the major classes I and II. They are, however, seen as “major words, because they all seem to act like verbs” (Topping and Dungca 1973: 80-81). Stolz (2012: 466) describes the class III group of words as “a heterogeneous collection of so-called irregular verbs which fit into neither of the other two classes”.

Chung (2012) challenges Topping’s word-class theory. She quite convincingly shows, step by step, that Topping’s reasons for replacing the parts-of-speech classification with these three word classes are invalid. Her main argument is that the phenomenon of content words functioning in one context as verbs and in others as nouns or adjectives, does not necessitate a new word-class system and is not typical for Chamorro, but simply is the result of a process called ‘conversion’, a process that changes “a word’s syntactic category word without any concomitant change of form” (Chung 2012: 31), a process seen in many languages (e.g., a bottle and bottle the wine, a cook and cook the dinner etc). Thus, Chung calls on us to stick to the ‘old’ parts-of-speech system in which, as she says, the lexical categories verb, noun and adjective form the “basic building blocks” (Chung 2012: 2).

Croft and van Lier (2012), reviewing Chung (2012) contend that verb, noun and adjective are prototypical results of three more abstract and more universal concepts (predication, reference and modification). All in all, there appear to be two opposing camps: one, led by Topping and, implicitly, Stolz, arguing that applying the three major word classes noun, verb and modifier as labels or parts of speech to Chamorro words does not work, the other, headed by Chung and, implicitly, by Croft and van Lier, that these labels are applicable not only to English, French and Latin (to name a few) but also to Chamorro. As I will show, Sanvitores would have agreed with Chung, by taking the roots of content words as a

---

4 Chung refers to Topping only, no doubt because he is the source of this theory of word classes, which he already put forward, though less elaborated, in his earlier grammar of Chamorro (Topping: 1969).
starting point and showing how this root, by conversion, can function as verb, noun and modifier.

5.6 Sanvitores’ view on parts of speech, cases, context and perspective
Sanvitores starts with describing the pronunciation of Chamorro and some orthographic choices he makes. Then he continues to describe the grammar of the language in seven chapters. The following fragment contains the very brief introduction to these chapters.

Fragment 1: f. 28v

**Partes orationis Marianae Linguae**
Constitit haec quoque rudis grammatica suis octo vel septem orationis partibus, quales apud Latinos sunt: nomen, pronomen, verbum (a quo nihil hic differt participium), praeposition, adverbium, interiectio et conjunctio, quae septem capitis, qua possimus brevitate et claritate explicare conabimur.

The parts of speech of the Marian Language
Even this rough grammar will consist of eight or seven parts of speech, following the Latin grammarians: noun, pronoun, verb (in this language the participle is not different from the verb), preposition, adverb, interjection and conjunction. These parts we
will try to explain in seven chapters, with as much brevity and clarity as we can.

Sanvitores follows the tradition of “the Latin grammarians”, but tells us rightaway that he has decided to include the participle in his analysis of the verb, because the participle has no distinct morphology “in this language” (i.e., Chamorro), or in other words, because the build-up of the language does not justify a rubrication into eight parts of speech. He therefore titled this brief introductory paragraph “the parts of speech of the Marian language”, implying that he does not aim to coerce the language into the traditional framework but instead adapts the framework in order to be applicable to this language.

Sanvitores does not name a specific source, so it is really a matter of speculation to whom he may refer, if indeed he does refer to anyone in specific. Below I will show that Sanvitores used the so-called grammaticae proverbiandi as a source for his grammatical terms. This may be the case here too, since these grammars also use the division in the same eight parts of speech (cf. Esparza Torres and Calvo Fernández 1993: 171).

Sanvitores starts off with a treatise on the noun and distinguishes cases and case markers. He seems to use the Latin cases in their traditional ‘school grammar’ meanings, for instance nominative for Subject, accusative for Object and so on. However, as demonstrated in Winkler (2007, 2011; chapter 3 and 4 respectively in this thesis), Sanvitores did not use the Latin case names in these traditional meanings in his section about the verb. Instead, wanting to explain the syntax and dynamics of the language as it was used in practice, he, as well as his fellow missionaries working in the Philippine area, attributed new, pragmatic meanings to these case names, which shows remarkably modern linguistic insights:

- The term ‘nominative’ stands for ‘Topic’ or ‘Focus’. The missionaries didn’t make a systematic distinction between these two terms (see chapter 4). ‘Nominative’ refers to the word or word group that is the ‘centre of attention’, is ‘subject of talk’ or ‘starting point of a sentence’;
- The term ‘accusative’ refers to ‘movement’, ‘direction’, ‘goal’, ‘cause’, ‘instrumental’ and ‘space’ or ‘time’. Sanvitores makes a
distinction between ‘accusativus rei’: ‘Patient’ and ‘accusativus loci’ ‘Goal’;

− The ‘dative’ has the semantic/pragmatic meaning of ‘Benefactive’;
− The ‘genitive’ carries the traditional possessive meaning of ‘belonging to’, but can also mean ‘by whom the action is undertaken’, i.e. ‘Oblique Agent’.

The Latin ablative case is only once referred to by Sanvitores. In the previous chapter I have argued that the Philippine missionaries did not consider the ablative case very instructive in their pragmatic analyses, and therefore rarely applied it, because it is a syncretistic case of several semantic functions (‘point of departure’ combined with instrumental and locative).

Directly following his treatise of pragmatic functions of nouns and examples of how they are expressed in Chamorro, Sanvitores emphasizes that Chamorro has no case inflection and that often the syntactic function of a noun can only be determined by an analysis of the meaning of the utterance. Note that already here, at the very beginning of his grammar, Sanvitores disqualifies his later critics for using case names in a language that has no cases. As I have said in section 5.4, they must have formed a judgment about Sanvitores’ work without having really understood his text. He also states that Chamorro lacks variety in gender but that they use *rahi* for the word ‘man’ and *paraũam* for the word ‘woman’. Safford (1903, 5: 300) describes this aspect of Chamorro in a similar way. “Gender may be indicated by distinct words or by the prefixes *lahe* (‘male’) or *palaoan* (‘female’).”

---

5 In the works of other ‘Philippine missionaries’ the locative can also be found as a separate case (cf. chapter 4).
Itaque in omnibus appellativis nullum est discrimen nominativi a genitivo, nec plerumque ab accusativo rei, dativusque et ablative semper assimilantur praepositione *sa* vel *a*, quae etiam praeponitur accusativo loci de quo postea in adverbio. Discrimen igitur similium casuum, praesertim genitivi a nominativo, dignoscetur ex orationis sensu vel ex disiunctis pronominibus. Generum varietate carent, sed marem vocant *rahi* et *foeminam* paraũam. De comparativis, superlativis, numeralibus etc., vide infra cap. 5 de adverbio.

So, in all nouns there is no distinction between Topic (nominativus) and Oblique (genitivus), nor, mostly, between Topic (nominativus) and Patient (accusativus rei); Benefactive (dativus) and ablative are equally represented by the preposition *sa* or *a*, which also is placed before Goal (accusativus loci), about which we will say more in the section about the adverb. Therefore, the different case-functions of nouns, having the same form, especially Oblique (genitivus) and Topic (nominativus), can only be recognized by the meaning of the utterance or by separate pronouns.
They lack variety in gender, but ‘man’ they call *rahi* and ‘woman’ *paraũam*.6

About comparatives, superlatives, numerals etc., see below chapter 7 about the adverb.

In the next chapter (*Caput 2, De Pronomine*) Sanvitores describes the Chamorro pronoun. This chapter adds to the picture of how Sanvitores uses these case names in an innovative way. At first sight it seems rather clumsy to use case names related to pronouns, and this may easily have led the linguists quoted in section 5.4 to conclude that Sanvitores did not understand how this language works. However, closer reading does reveal that again he uses these case names in a fully pragmatic way. The term ‘nominative’ is attributed to the personal pronoun in Topic position, while with the term ‘genitive’ the possessive pronoun is meant. Other semantic functions, like the Benefactive (*dativus*) or Goal (*accusativus loci*), except — as Sanvitores already made clear in the section about the noun (see above) — when the personal pronoun has the function of Patient (*accusativus rei*), in which case it has the same form as the personal pronoun in nominative function, is not preceded by a preposition and can only be recognized as Patient by understanding the meaning of the utterance, i.e. by gathering from the context what the semantic functions of the constituents are.

This way of using Latin cases to describe pragmatic functions of nouns and pronouns also illustrates Sanvitores’ application of notions of perspective — in the sense of foregrounding and backgrounding, direction and movement — in his explanations of how the Chamorro language works. This employment of perspective in the grammars of Sanvitores and his colleagues has been analyzed in chapter 4 and will be illustrated in section 5.7 on the verb.

A detailed treatise of the sections in the grammar on the noun and pronoun has been left out of this chapter because of space restrictions as well as the Focus of this chapter (and this entire thesis) on the verb and the pragmalinguistic descriptions of sentence structures. For a brief description of the chapter on phonology in Sanvitores grammar, see chapter 2.

---

6 Cf. Safford (5: 300): “Gender may be indicated by distinct words or by the prefixes lahe (*‘male’*) or palaoan (*‘female’*).”
5.7 The verb

Sanvitores’ section about the verb covers seven folia, forming by far the largest chapter of the ones devoted to the parts of speech. The chapter on the noun takes up a little more than one folia, the pronoun almost two, the preposition less than half a folia, the adverbs of all kinds cover almost three and a half folia, the interjection again less than half and, finally, the conjunction a bit more than one folia. Given the size of this chapter on the verb, I have split the analysis up into subsections here.

5.7.1 Impersonal verbs

Sanvitores starts with the defective verb-pair guay and toya. He explains that it is comparable with the Latin impersonal use of est (3.p.sg. of esse, ‘to be’) when it means ‘have’, like in est mihi (dat.) cibus (nom.), which literally means ‘there is food to me’ (hence, of course, the usual translation: ‘I have food’). However, Sanvitores immediately adds that contrary to the rules of Latin syntax, this guay is combined with a double nominative, i.e., with two words having equal Topic status. I will go into this in more detail below, following the transcription and translation of this subsection. Then, after briefly explaining toya as the opposite of guay (the Latin deest: ‘there is not’, ‘not have’), Sanvitores ends this subsection about the verb ‘to be’ with saying that as a copula it does not exist in Chamorro.

Fragment 3: f. 29r
Caput 3 De Verbo

Guay invariabile ad omnes personas et tempora: [est] cum signifi
cat habere vel adesse, v.g. Guay taotao guini?: [suntne homines hic?]

Guay ũaho\(^7\): [est mihi cibus]. Construitur cum duplici nominativo personae scilicet, et rei, quae habetur: nigab guay sisi hago?: [heri erat vel fuit tibi cultellus?] Resp.: hoo: [utique vel etiam],

Hisp. [Si]).

Toya: [Deest], invariabile sicut guay ad omnes personas et tempora.
Utuntur Toya quando respondent unico verbo: [deest], v.g. Guay agon?: [estne cibus?] Resp.: Toya: [deest] vel Ohi: [non]. Quando addunt rem, quae deest, exprimitur sic: Toya agon: [deest cibus].

Sum, es, fui, prout accipitur substantive (esse hoc vel illud) exprimitur ab illis per substantivum et adjectivum iuxta apposita, v.g. Jesús María maui maui: [Jesus et Maria est quid optimum].

Guay is invariable with respect to all grammatical persons and tenses and is identical to the Latin est when it means ‘to have’ or ‘to be

---

\(^7\) Burrus gives a full stop after est, which is not present in the manuscript, but cum is also written in the manuscript with a capital C, so Burrus may be misled by this. However, splitting the sentence Guay ... adesse up in two makes no sense.

\(^8\) ũaho in the manuscript, taken over by Burrus. In the previous section, about pronouns, Sanvitores writes ūaho as the pronoun meaning ‘I’. The ũ is the notation Sanvitores uses, as he describes in the introductory section about pronunciation, for a sound that is very similar to the letter /g/ in for instance ‘Galatinum’. The mistake in writing ũaho here so shortly after explaining that it should be written as ũaho – in modern orthography written as guahu – seems more likely to be a fault of the copyist than of Sanvitores himself.

\(^9\) Ågon in modern orthography, referring to staple food like rice.
there’, for instance: *Guay taotao guini?: ‘Are there any people here?’, *Guay ũaho agon: ‘I have food’. It is construed with a double Topic, of the person, of course, and of the thing one has: *Nigob guay sisi hago?: ‘Did you have a small knife yesterday?’. The answer is: *ho: ‘Certainly’ or ‘Yes, indeed’ (Spanish: ‘Sí’).

Toya is identical to the Latin word *deest (*‘there isn’t’) and is invariable like *guay, with respect to all persons” and tenses. They use *toya when they answer with only one word, like the Latin word *deest. For instance: *Guay agon?: ‘Is there food?’. The answer is: *Toya: ‘There isn’t’ or *Ohi: ‘No’. When they add a thing that is missing, they express it like this: *Tay agon: ‘There is no food’.

I am, you are, I have been, when understood as a noun (*‘the being this or that’) are expressed by them by a noun together with an adjective, for instance *Jesús María mauri mauri: ‘Jesus and Mary are the best’.

Sanvitores’ interpretation of *guay seems to be quite different from Topping and Dungca. Sanvitores argues that *guay goes with two nouns that both have an equal status as Topic. He treats it as an intransitive word, just like the Latin word *esse (*to be, to exist). Topping and Dungca (1973: 230) argue that *guaha and its negative counterpart *taya’ are “defective verbs” that must be considered as transitive verbs when they mean ‘to have (not)’, but also, a few pages later (p. 239), tell us that they are “irregular verbs” used in “existential sentences”, while in both of these paragraphs on both pages they present the very same example (*guaha salape’-hu). This seems to be quite inconsistent. It is far more plausible that *guaha and *taya’ have, as Sanvitores tells us, the basic meaning of ‘to be there’ or ‘to exist’ (which implies that they are intransitive) and can signify, in combination with a person and a thing, the possession of the thing by the person. In fact, in the precursor to Topping and Dungca (1973), Topping (1969: 27), Topping indeed indicates that *guaha essentially means ‘exist’ and that sentences like *guaha familia-mu: in a literal translation mean ‘does there exist your family?’. Chung (1998: 269) likewise defines them as “existential verbs”.

In modern Chamorro there are three defective verbs with a similar meaning: *guaha, *gai and *gaige, with their negative counterparts *taya’,

---

10 Of course, grammatical persons (1 p.sg., 2 p.sg. etc.) are meant here.
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11 The translations by Topping and Dungca (1973: 87-90) of these words – which they less correctly call “irregular verbs” and which they consider “probably related” – are not entirely consistent. They translate guaha as “have, exist”, gaige as “be, exist” and gai as “have”, while in the explanation that follows they translate them all in a similar way, with the primary meaning “(not) exist”. However, Chung (1998: 93;384f) makes a clear distinction in the meanings of these three word couples, saying that guāha/taya’ mean “(not) exist”, gāi/tāi mean “(not) have” and gaigi/taigui mean “(not) be in a location”. Sanvitores discusses guay versus toya, but also refers to a word tay (see also below). The couple gaige/taigue is not mentioned, either consciously left out by Sanvitores for the sake of brevity or in order not to make it too complex, or maybe overlooked by his interpreter. Considering that he does refer to tay but not to its counterpart gay, it seems more a matter of hasty inaccuracy than a conscious choice for omitting words.

Topping and Dungca (1973: 89-90) state that the couples guahaltaya’ and gaitai must be seen as different word pairs because they require different sentence structures: tai and gai go with the personal pronoun yo, while taya and guaha take the personal pronoun hu and the first pair can take the plural marking prefix -man, while the latter pair doesn’t. These rules may have been valid also in old Chamorro, but if so, Sanvitores (and perhaps his interpreter as well), didn’t know of these subtle differences. Of course, considering Topping and Dungca’s argument that tai and gai go with the personal pronoun yo, we must probably assume that the Spanish pronoun yo has replaced a true Chamorro pronoun.

Both gai and guaha in the meaning of ‘to have’ are in modern Chamorro combined with a noun and a personal pronoun agglutinated to the noun. Topping and Dungca (1973: 88) provide the following example:

\[
\begin{align*}
guaha & \quad salape’-hu \\
\text{exists} & \quad \text{money-my} \\
'i' & \text{have money}'
\end{align*}
\]

Sanvitores uses, in the first Chamorro example he gives in this fragment, the word guini, translating it as ‘here’ (hic). In modern Chamorro the

word for ‘over there’ is guihi, while for ‘over here’ the expression is guini magi. In old Chamorro, it seems, the simple oppositional pair guini – guihi also existed. Safford (1905: 7: 306) indeed gives this pair (in the meaning of ‘here’ and ‘yonder’), and argues that guihi (guihe in his spelling) and guini are “abbreviations of phrases composed of the demonstrative pronouns preceded by the preposition gi, at or to”. He goes on to explain, that guini is composed of gi and yini, guihi is composed of gi and yuhe. In the Online Chamorro Dictionary yini is given as an “old form of ini” which itself is translated as “this” (demonstrative pronoun) and classified as an “archaic form now mostly replaced by este.” The word yuhe or yuhi, meaning ‘that there’, is still a common word in modern Chamorro (Topping, Ogo and Dungca 1975, s.v. yuhi).

The Chamorro sentence given by Sanvitores in the first paragraph of this fragment – nigab guay sisi hago? – would be in modern orthography: nigap guaha sese hagu? The word hagu is used nowadays as an emphatic form of ‘you’, used in Actor-Focus constructions (Topping 1969: 262). The non-emphatic form in modern Chamorro is mu, which is affixed to the noun, like in: Guaha dangkolo chinina-mu? (‘Do you have a big shirt?’).

Hoo has in modern Chamorro become ha’a or hu’u, which is short for hunggan, and does indeed mean ‘certainly’ or ‘yes, indeed’. The glottal stop between the two vowels is always present when pronouncing two vowels separately after one another. In Chamorro this glottal stop is meaningful — Topping and Dungca (1973: 30) give baba ‘bad’ vs. ba’ba’ ‘spank’ as an example — just as in other Philippine languages (cf. Fernández Rodríguez 2009: 268-269), so his Tagalog interpreter — having lived in the Marianas for so many years — must have recognized it in Chamorro, and Sanvitores, knowing Tagalog so well, would surely have mentioned it in his grammar. Since he does not — not here nor in his treatment of the phonology of Chamorro (cf. Chapter 2) — we must assume that his interpreter in giving his crash course of Chamorro did not pay attention to it.

In the last sentence Sanvitores explains that in Chamorro nominal and adjectival predicates are expressed without an overt copula. Indeed, in Chamorro, there is no copula (Chung 1998: 53). Sanvitores starts this sentence with the forms sum, es, fui, a number of forms of the Latin word esse (‘to be’), as is usual in missionary grammars of this period: ‘I am,
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you are, I have been’, meaning, of course, all forms of the Latin word *esse*. The word *mauri* has become *maolek* in modern Chamorro. In Chamisso’s glossary it is spelled as *mauli* (Kerr 2009: 28).

5.7.2 The root and the Actor-Focus with -um-

In the next subsection Sanvitores starts with informing the reader that the root of the verb is meaningful in itself and that it can be ‘made active’ and can be ‘conjugated’ by affixes. As an example he uses the Chamorro word *nay* and tells us that it means ‘give’, which it still means nowadays, spelled as *na’e* (Topping 1969) and *na’i* (Topping, Ogo and Dungca 1975; Chung 1998).

Fragment 4: f29r-30v

[Nay radix (do, as) Activa: um
Ipsa radix, id est, simplicissima verbi vox, quae aliarum vocum adiectione coniugatur, deser- [30v]vit plurimum ad vulgares et breviatas locutiones et sonat passive ut videbitur infra; fit autem activa (in hoc valde communi exemplari, de aliis autem dicetur postea) cum accedat particula um, quae frequenter interponitur post...]

[29r] Nay radix (do, as) Activa: um
Ipsa radix, id est, simplicissima verbi vox, quae aliarum vocum adiectione coniugatur, deserit plurimum ad vulgares et breviatas locutiones et sonat passive ut videbitur infra; fit autem activa (in hoc valde communi exemplari, de aliis autem dicetur postea) cum accedat particula um, quae frequentur interponitur post...
primam radicis litteram\footnote{Spelled as litteram in the manuscript. In late Latin the spelling of double or single consonants is rather inconsistent. The correct spelling would be litteram, hence the correction, also in other instances (without further comment).} consonantem. Construitur autem quasi Latine, persona agens in nominativo, persona cui datur in dativo, res quae datur in accusativo absque praepositione.

[29r] Nay root (‘I give’, ‘you give’). Actor-Focus: um
This very root, the most noncompound form of a verb, which can be conjugated by the addition of other sorts of words, [30v] serves mostly for colloquial and short ways of saying things and sounds passive as will be shown below. It becomes active (in this very general example, but about other examples I will talk later on) when the particle um is added, which frequently is infixed after the first consonant of the root. This apart, the active voice is construed just as in Latin, with the Agent as Topic, a Beneficiary and a Goal-Object without a preposition.

Sanvitores gives do (1p. sg.) followed by as, which stands for the ending of the 2p.sg. of the Latin verb dare (‘to give’; do, das: ‘I give, you give’); a common way for missionaries to indicate the conjugation of a verb.

The terms ‘passive’ and ‘active’ should not be taken here in a syntactic sense, as if the root is a passive voice of a verb, changing to the active voice when -um- is inserted. Sanvitores distinguishes the two infixes -um- and -in- as a pair, of which the first one creates Focus on the Agent (or the Agent acting), while the second creates a ‘non-Actor-Focus’, i.e. a Focus on either the verb itself (the act being done) or the Oblique Agent. I will go into this more in detail in section 5.7.4 when analyzing Sanvitores’ treatise of the -in- infix. For now, it should be emphasized that by saying in this fragment that the root “sounds passive”, Sanvitores refers to the pragmatic perspective function of the verbal root being used to focus on the verb itself or on an Oblique Agent. And indeed, as he says here (“as will be shown below”), he will give examples of it at the end of the section on the non-Actor-Focus infix -in-, to which he adds two ways of using the root itself without any affix: the passive imperative and the passive infinitive (see section 5.7.4).

It is interesting to compare Sanvitores’ explanation of the function of the -um- infix with Topping and Dungca’s exegesis. Topping and Dungca
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(1973: 184-186) distinguish between the ‘verbalizing infix’ -um- and an ‘Actor-Focus infix’ -um-. However, after explaining the two, they add:

*It is very probable that the two infixes listed above are actually one and the same. [...] It is possible to consider both of the infixes an 'action' infix, or something like that, because whenever it is used the emphasis is on the Actor or the action.*

Sanvitores apparently sees -um- as one verbalizing-Actor-Focus infix, describing the -um- infix as the infix that makes ‘inactive’ roots ‘active’. Compare in this respect examples given by Topping (1969: 45), like *eskuela* (‘school’) and *umeskuela* (‘go to school’) and by Topping and Dungca (1973: 117): *halom* (‘inside’) and *humalom gue* (‘he went inside’).

Topping (1969: 48) notes that the -um- infix “is always inserted in the word immediately preceding the first vowel”. Sanvitores actually tells us the same but, as it were, in two steps because later on he adds that -um- is not inserted but placed before the entire root when the root starts with a vowel, as a prefix (see fragment 7, [f. 30v]). Topping also states that the -um- infix is a verbalizing infix that generates intransitive clauses. Cooreman (1987: 43) applies the label ‘ergative infix’ to this -um-. Sanvitores seems to be aware of the pragmatic Focus effect of this infix. It is not sure whether he is aware of ergativity. However, his pragmatic, perspectival method of analysis makes it irrelevant for his presentation of the organization of the language. I will pay more attention to this in section 5.7.4.


*Verba nunc generaliter accipi volo, nam duplex eorum intellectus est; alter, qui omnia per quae sermo nectitur significat, [...] alter, in quo est una pars orationis, lego, scribo. Quam vitantes ambiguitatem quidam dicere maluerunt voces, locutiones, dictiones.*

One must understand now that I use the word ‘verbum’ in a general sense, for it has a double meaning: the one covers every possible
word … the other in which it refers to one part of speech, like ‘I read, I write’ [sc. the verb], which has led some authors, trying to avoid this ambiguity, to prefer to speak of ‘vox’, ‘locutio’ or ‘dictio’. (My translation).

Therefore, one has to be careful in choosing the right translation every time the word occurs, since the meaning can differ not only in the various linguistic works in medieval and late Latin (cf. Hyman 2005), but also in a single text of one author, as here for instance, when Sanvitores uses the word vox in one sentence in two slightly different meanings: simplicissima verbi vox, quae aliarum vocum adiectione conjugatur (“the most noncompound form of a verb, which can be conjugated by the addition of other wordforms”). I have chosen here to translate the linguistic term ‘vox simplex’ as ‘noncompound word’ or, when a class of words is specified – as here by verbi; ‘of the verb’) – as ‘noncompound form’ (of…), taking ‘noncompound’ in its broadest sense (i.e., without other words or stems added and without derivational affixes, infixes or suffixes), following Quintilian (I, V, 65) in this respect in defining ‘voces simplices’ as voces suæ naturæ “words in their essential nature”, as opposed to ‘compositae voces’ (‘compound words’), in which ‘voces simplices’ are combined with one or more affixes or other lexemes.

It is not entirely clear whether Sanvitores uses the Latin verb conjugare in the general meaning of ‘to combine’ or in the grammatical meaning of ‘conjugate’ (conjugating a verb, as for instance also used in this sense by Priscian VIII, 17.93). However, the word ‘conjugate’ should be taken here in a broad sense, i.e. of the modification, by means of affixes, of a verbal root or stem in order to use it adequately in an utterance.

5.7.3 Tenses, moods and aspects
The next subsection in Sanvitores’ treatise of Chamorro deals with the tenses. It must be noted that Chamorro verbs are essentially tense-less. Chamorro works with moods – realis and irrealis (or indicative and subjunctive) – to distinguish between expressing things that are or were really happening – whether they took place in the present or past becomes evident from the context – and things that might happen, in other words events possibly, undoubtedly or inevitably taking place in the future. However, tenses can be expressed more explicitly by addition of a number of markers immediately preceding the predicate. The most
frequently used markers for tense are *pära*, to express (uncertain) future, and *ginin* to express both imperfect and pluperfect.\(^{13}\)

Furthermore, Chamorro verbs are aspectual. The aspect of continuity is marked by reduplication, while the absence of reduplication signals non-continuity. Whether the action, continuing or non-continuing, takes place in present, past, or future, is either expressed by some sort of marker or must be gathered from the context.\(^{14}\)

Sanvitores describes his perception of this system of tenses, moods and aspects as follows in fragment 7 and 8. In fragment 9 Sanvitores adds as a sort of footnote that *-um-* must be prefixed sometimes instead of infixed. I will include my analysis of this fragment also in this section, directly following the analyses of 7 and 8. I have translated the present perfect and past perfect tenses used by Sanvitores very literally, so with ‘has’ and ‘had’; translating them as simple past tenses would have been more correct sometimes with respect to the tense system in English but then would have obscured what Sanvitores means to explain here.

**Fragment 5: f. 30v**

---

\(^{13}\) Cf. Chung (1998: 20) and Chamorro (2012). My very brief outline here of the complex tense-mood system of Chamorro adheres to the theory of these sources. Topping and Dungca (1973) state that Chamorro does have a tense system distinguishing between future and non-future tense. The debate about whether it is more appropriate to label the Chamorro tense system as realis/irrealis or future/non-future is not relevant for the scope and purpose of this investigation.\(^{14}\) Topping and Dungca (1973: 258) label this aspectual pair ‘continuative/discontinuative’, (Cooreman 1987: 54) uses the terms ‘imperfective/perfective’, and ‘progressive/stative’ is applied by Chung (1998: 54-55). These different terms are listed also by Stolz (2015) in his description of these two aspects.
Fragment 5: f. 30v (continued)

Praesens, praeteritum imperfectum et futurum duplicant primam syllabam radicis in quovis verbo, tam vocis activae quam passivae, eademque vox ei triplex tempore fere comminente deservit addendo pro discrimine aliquod adverbium temporis cum aliunde non determinatur orationis sensus, exempli gratia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praesens</td>
<td>Numanay deservit cuvis modo, numero et personae, exprimendo pronomina, v.g. ūaho numanay a hamio: [ego do cibum vobis]. Si Pedro numanay nigob agón a taotao: [Petrus dabat heri cibum homini].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praeteritum Imperfectum</td>
<td>Numanay hago numay nigob agón cay Mendasay: [tu dedisti heri cibum Mendozae]. Numay hamio agón quini sa taotao nagororó: [date cibum huic homini esurienti]. Mauri numay agón sa taotao nagororó: [Bonum est dare cibum huic homini esurienti].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They duplicate a syllable of the root in any verb in the present, simple past and future tense, in non-Actor-Focus as well as Actor-Focus.

---

15 The manuscript renders numay, which is taken over by Burrus. This, however, must be a writing error by the copyist (or, less likely, Sanvitores himself), because Sanvitores clearly distinguishes the reduplicated (durative) form from the non-reduplicated (non-durative) form.
Focus sentences. The same root serves for the three tenses jointly, with addition of some sort of temporal adverb to distinguish between these tenses when it doesn’t otherwise become clear from the meaning of the utterance. For instance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Simple Past</th>
<th>Numanay serves for every mood, number and person, by expressing pronouns, for instance: ũaho numanay agón a hamio: “I give food to you (pl)”. Si Pedro numanay nigab agón a taotao: “Peter gave food to a person yesterday”.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Perfect Past Perfect Imperative Infinitive</td>
<td>Numay: hago numay nigab agón cay Mendasay: “Yesterday you have given food to Mendozae”, Numay hamio agón guini sa taotao nagororó: “Give (imp. pl) food to this hungry person”. Mauri numay agón sa taotao nagororó: “It is good to give food to this hungry person”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sanvitores uses the term ‘vox activa’ and ‘vox passiva’ here, which I have translated as ‘Actor-Focus’ and ‘non-Actor-Focus’ respectively. because, as demonstrated in chapter 4, Sanvitores (and his colleague missionaries in the Philippine area) have upgraded both terms from a syntactic level to a pragmatic-perspectival level. I will go more deeply into his usage of active and passive below, in section 5.7.4. However, the core subject in this fragment is the tense-system of Chamorro. The table I have used here in my transcription and translation properly represents the way Sanvitores, by using indentation after the two groups of tenses, distinguishes between the two groups of tenses. Nebrija (1996 [c.1488]: 111) defines ‘praesens’, ‘praeteritum imperfectum’ and ‘futurum’, as respectively describing “what is happening”, “what was happening and was not yet finished” and “what will be happening”. All three tenses have a strong connotation of ‘progressiveness’, of something that is going on (cf. Ernout and Thomas 1953: 220-230). Palmer (1954: 306-309) qualifies them as “durative” tenses as opposed to “perfect” tenses. This distinction between ‘durative’ and ‘non-durative’ in the Latin tense system is important for understanding Sanvitores here properly. Reduplication, Sanvitores explains, is used in Chamorro to express continuity. As we have seen above, this is still so in modern Chamorro. Cf. Topping (1969: 45):
Its purpose [sc. of the reduplication] is to indicate that the action is continuous, or at least not completed [...] The Chamorro speaker uses this reduplicated form when the activity is habitual, continuative, or taking place at the moment of speaking. When the action is considered completed or finished, the Chamorro speaker uses the non-reduplicated form.

The same distinction between durative and non-durative is also present in Tagalog (cf. Schachter 1972: 66-67). No doubt, Sanvitores’ knowledge of the similar distinction in tenses in Latin as well as in Tagalog must have helped him in understanding this phenomenon in Chamorro, and the familiarity of his readers with Latin must have enabled them to understand Sanvitores’ exegesis of this phenomenon, brief as it is, quite easily.

The sentences Sanvitores uses here to exemplify his description are in modern Chamorro orthography:

- Guahu numana’i ågon [a] hamyo: ‘I give food to you (pl.)’;
- Si Pedro numana’i nigap ågon [a] taotao: ‘Peter gave food to a person yesterday’;
- Hagu numa’i nigap ågon [cay] Mandasay: ‘Yesterday you have given food to Mendozae’;
- Numa’i hamyo ågon guini [sa] taotao [nagororo]: ‘Give (imp. pl.) food to this hungry person’;
- Mauri numa’i ågon [sa] taotao [nagororo]: ‘It is good to give food to this hungry person’;

The prepositions a, sa and cay, which Sanvitores already mentioned in his treatise of the pronoun, are bracketed here (and elsewhere in this chapter in transcriptions into modern Chamorro). These prepositions (or equivalents) are not used in modern Chamorro in constructions with na’i. They may have existed in old Chamorro, but it may be the case that Sanvitores is confused with Tagalog, in which at least sa and cay figure as pronouns (cay indeed before persons (nowadays written as kay)). Cooreman (1987: 137) notes that in modern Chamorro na’i, as a ‘bitransitive’ verb, takes the direct Object marked as Oblique (by ni) and the beneficiary marked as a syntactic direct Object (by i). For instance, Ha na’i i patgon ni leche: ‘he gave milk to the child’ (cf. Cooreman 1978: 137)
The word \textit{nagororó} seems not to have survived in any form in modern Chamorro and I haven’t found it in any of the older dictionaries either. The modern word for ‘hungry’ is \textit{ñalang} (or \textit{ambre}). The word may consist of the prefix \textit{na-}, which is both a causative prefix and a ‘food classifier’, the prefix \textit{ga-}, meaning ‘to prefer’ or ‘like’, but then a (possibly reduplicated) root \textit{roro} remains, for which I haven’t found an equivalent in modern Chamorro. In Tagalog the word for ‘hungry’ is \textit{nagugutom}. This may be related to \textit{nagororó}, but it seems a bit too speculative to link both words.

Sanvitores gives examples of three different verbal moods here: indicative, imperative, and infinitive. Nebrija (1996 [1488]: 110) distinguishes five \textit{modi verborum} (‘verbal moods’), with the subjunctive and optative next to these three, although in Latin there is no separate optative mood. In Latin the optative mood is expressed by the subjunctive, which in general can be considered as the mood for expressing the irrealis (in the sense of unrealistic, possible (now or in the future), hoped for, etc.). Sanvitores does not mention a specific subjunctive or irrealis mode. That is to say, in the section about \textit{modi suppleandi} (‘modes to be added’) Sanvitores does describe a way to express the subjunctive by using the word \textit{cum} (\textit{komu} in modern Chamorro), but this section is entirely devoted to linguistic phenomena that exist – as morphologically marked entities – in Latin but actually (according to Sanvitores) can’t be found as such in Chamorro (see section 5.7.5 below).

Imperatives – in English as well – can sometimes have an Actor-Focus, provided the Actor is explicitly expressed – and maybe Sanvitores means to point out this Actor-Focus effect in his example \textit{Numay hamio}, which literally means ‘you (pl.) give’. In fragment 7 he gives another example of the imperative mode, again with a personal pronoun (\textit{umagof hao}: ‘you (sg.) be good’). Infinitives are typically modes in which the Focus is on the action, and the example given – \textit{Mauri numay agón} – may be intended to display this effect. However, in fragment 7 below, he gives an example of an infinitive consisting of only the root (\textit{arinğan}: ‘speak’ (inf.)) next to another imperative form with \textit{um-} (\textit{umaringán hao}: ‘you (sg.) speak’ (imp.)). So, all in all, it seems more likely that he has added both imperative as well as infinitive here as examples of verbal forms where the \textit{-um-} infix ‘activates’ the root, creating pragmatic Focus on either the Actor or the activity/action. Later on, when explaining the non-
Actor-Focus infix -in-, he presents the root itself, so without any affix, as the form for the ‘passive imperative’ or ‘passive infinitive’, that is to say, as the form in which the pragmatic Focus is not on the Agent or the Agent acting, but on the Oblique Agent or the act-being-done (see section 5.7.4). He tells us the same again when explaining verbal forms with the non-Actor-Focus prefix a-: “The imperative and infinitive which are also expressed by only the root itself have a non-Actor-Focus and imperative meaning, and agree with either one or more persons or things.” (See section 5.7.7).

Fragment 6: f. 30v-30r

Perfecta autem omnino actio temporis plusquam perfecti significatur in quovis verbo tam vocis activae quam passivae addendo praeteriti perfecti voci hanc particulam ha: iam, v. g. numay ha agón üaho cay Pedro: [dedi iam cibum Petro], vel: [dederam iam].

16 The manuscript renders: ‘... voci. Haece particula’ (nom.sg.). Burrus: ‘... voci hanc particulam’ (acc. sg.). Burrus’ correction makes sense. The copyist obviously did not understand the meaning of it all and inserted a full stop after voci and altered the accusative hanc particulam into the nominative haec particula.
Futurum. *Numanay:* Si Pedro *numanay agón* a hago agupá: [Petrus dabit tibi	extsuperscript{17} cibum crastino	extsuperscript{18} die]. Fit etiam futurum nonnihil distinctius a praesenti detrahendo ab hoc particulum um [30r] et relinquendo repetititionem primae syllabae radicis, nempe sic: nanay si Pedro agón a hago, ubi absque alio adiuncto significatur futuritio. Sed haec etiam vox accommodatur agenti iam in praesens seu iam acturo, v. g. ùaho nanay agón: [dabo iamiam], vel: [volo iam dare].

[The fully completed action of the past perfect tense is indicated – in every verb, in the active as well as the passive voice – by adding the following particle as a form of the past perfect tense: ha 'already'. For instance: *numay ha agón ùaho cay* Pedro: 'I have already given food to Peter', or 'I had given already'.

Future: *Numanay:* Si Pedro *numanay agón* a hago agupá: 'Peter will give food to you tomorrow.' A future somewhat different from the form of the present also occurs by removing the particle um from it and leaving out the repetition of the first syllable of the root, thus: *nanay si Pedro agón a hago*, where the future is indicated without anything else added. But this form is also fit for expressing what is happening already or what is about to happen, for instance: ùaho nanay agón: 'I will give now' or 'I want to give now'.]

A word or suffix like ha to indicate a perfect or pluperfect tense (or aspect) is not present in modern Chamorro. Safford (1904, 6: 510) says that "time fully past is expressed by hagas, 'formerly', or the English 'used to'…". The latter translation suggests that Safford sees this word as related to the prefix ha- (meaning "usually"). According to Topping and Dungca (1973: 154) hagas "comes from a form of the Spanish word hacer". This is unlikely to be a valid explanation for hagas as a past tense marker in Chamorro, not only because in Spanish hagas as a form of hacer is 2 p. sg. present subjunctive, but also in the light of what Safford says and what Sanvitores says here. The word ha that Sanvitores gives may well be closely related to the prefix ha- as well as hagas. With hagas, the sentence in modern Chamorro orthography would be: *numa'i hagas ðgon guahu [cay] Pedro*. For the probably Tagalog origin of cay, see section 5.7.3.

\textsuperscript{17} Ms: *mibi* ('me’ dat.sg.). Burnus: *tibi* ('you’ dat.sg.). Right, since hago (*hagu* in modern Chamorro orthography) means 'you'.

\textsuperscript{18} Ms: *Christiano* (*Christian*). Burnus: *crastino*. Correct, since agupa means tomorrow. In modern Chamorro orthography the glottal stop at the end of the word is marked (so: *agupa’*).
Zwartjes (2000: 224) reports the use of the Spanish word *futurición* by the Jesuit Luis de Valdivia (1560-1642), but otherwise this word or its Latin counterpart *futuritio*, as used by Sanvitores, is a word almost only found in theological works in Ecclesiastical Latin. In the Catholic Encyclopedia Dégert (1910) says the following about the need as well as the “decadent” tendency these days to make up new words in theological writings:

> Whereas the major part of these expressions were legitimate, were necessary and successful – *transsubstantio, forma, materia, individuum, accidens, appetitus* – there are only too many that show a wordy and empty formalism, a deplorable indifference for the sobriety of expression and for the purity of the Latin tongue – *aseitas, futuritio, beatificativum, terminatio, actualitas, haecceitas*... (Boldfacing is mine)

However, Sanvitores seems not to use this word here simply for stylistic embellishment and as an equivalent of *futurum*, but to indicate an event happening in the very near future, while with *futurum* he means an event further away in the future. The addition of *iam in praesens seu iam acturo* (‘now already/very shortly or about to happen’) clarifies this difference. There is, as Sanvitores tries to explain to the reader, a future form expressed by the form of the present combined with the addition of a temporal adverb, referring to a ‘future-further-away’, and there is a ‘future-very-near’, expressed by reduplication and without the action infix -*um*-

According to Safford (1904, 6: 113-114) reduplication serves to “make indefinite the time of completion of a verb’s action”. By reduplication, Safford argues, Chamorro distinguishes between a “definite and indefinite imperative” and between a “definite and indefinite future”. As an example of the former he gives, like Sanvitores, *nana’e* (‘eat!’), as opposed to *na’e* which would mean: ‘eat now!’). However, by arguing that this reduplicated form indicates an indefinite future, his interpretation clearly differs from that of Sanvitores.

In modern Chamorro the Spanish words *para* and *bai* (from the Spanish *voy*, meaning: ‘I go’) are most often used to express future tense. Stolz (2003: 275-276) argues that also before these Spanish borrowings were introduced, Chamorro already had a fully functional future construction, given the fact that the pronouns *u* and *un* are still in use as future markers
for the second and third person singular. These pronominal future markers, however, are not mentioned by Sanvitores, nor does he mention one of the preverbal markers of tense, *parä* and *ginin* (see section 5.7.3). Instead, he refers only to the same *-um-* infix he already described as a verbalizing or ‘activating’ infix (see section 5.7.2), adding now that it can be used to indicate present as well as future tense. It seems likely that if indeed Chamorro did have a fully functional future construction at the time of Sanvitores’ writing, he would have given some description of it here. Sanvitores’ exegesis of the verb supports the hypothesis, advocated by Chung (1998: 25-26) and Chamorro (2012), that Chamorro is tense-less.

In the following fragment, Sanvitores rounds off this paragraph about the verbalizing *-um-* infix, which, as he explains now, can also be prefixed:

*Fragment 7: f. 30r*

*Praedicta particula *um* non insertur sed anteponitur toti radici quando prima radicis littera fuerit vocalis, v. g. aringān: [loqui]; umaringān hao: [loquere]. Consonans quoque, quae interposita *um* cacophoniam faceret, ut littera *m*, respuit eam interpositionem, tuncque coniugatur, vel nihil addito ab extra sola repetitione eaque quandoque duplici primae syllabae radicis pro praesenti et futuro, ut*
The particle *um* mentioned above is not infixed but prefixed to the entire root when the first letter of the root is a vowel, for instance: *aring an*: ‘speak’ (inf.); *umaring an hao*: ‘you speak’. Also a consonant that would sound bad when *um* would be infixed, as the letter *m*, ejects this insertion, and then the verb is conjugated either without any addition – except a single repetition now and then of the first syllable of the root – for the present and the future tense, like: *mayra*: ‘to come’; *mamayra ūaho*: ‘I come’, or only *u* is prefixed: *magof*: ‘good’; *umagof hao*: ‘be good’. The roots mentioned above, as well as others that don’t allow *um*, are conjugated by prefixing *an* or another of the particles listed below.

As a translation of *aring an* Sanvitores gives the Latin infinitive *loqui* (speak) as the most simple form of the word. The words *umaring an hao* he translates as *loquere* (‘you speak’ (imp.)). In Topping’s dictionary of modern Chamorro *adingan* is given as the word for ‘speak’, and he also gives a similar example with -um- indeed as prefix: *umadingan yo* (‘I conversed’). *Hao*, meaning ‘you’ (2 p.sg.), is unaltered in modern Chamorro, and spelled in the same way. It is part of the so-called ‘yo-type pronouns’ (the Chamorro language has different sets of personal pronouns at its disposal; cf. Topping and Dungca 1973: 105-109).

The modern orthographies of *mayra* and *mamayra* are *maila’* and *mamaila’*. Safford (1904 6: 534) – who spells these words without glottal stop, but sometimes with a circumflex to indicate that the vowel is long –, sees the latter as a reduplicated form of the “primitive form” *maila’*. He also suggests (5: 305) that *maila’* may be “connected in some way with the particle *magi*” (meaning: ‘here’, toward or in the direction of the speaker) and refers to a word *mai* which doesn’t exist in Philippine

---

59 *Loqui* is a so-called deponent verb, meaning that it occurs only in the passive form but has an active meaning. *Loquere* is a form which actually in Latin is used for three different modes and tenses (passive indicative future 2.p.sg.; passive imperative present 2.p.sg.; passive indicative present 2.p.sg.). Since the pairing of an infinitive of a verb with an imperative of the same verb is repeated likewise in this same section with the example: *good; umagof hao: be good;* and is mirrored as well in a previous set of examples in fragment 6 – *Numay hamio agón guini sa tuotuo nagororó*: “Give (imp. pl.) food to this hungry person”; *Mauri numay agón sa tuotuo nagororó*: “It is good to give food to this hungry person” – it seems most likely that Sanvitores means the imperative form in this example: *umaringan hao*. 

languages but occurs in Polynesian languages like Hawaiian and Samoan (meaning: ‘here’). According to Sanvitores the absence of the verbalizing infix -um- has to do with the “bad sound” it would make in combination with the first consonant. Safford, however, suggests that maila’ is one of the few words in Chamorro that can be considered “essentially verbs in their primitive form” (6: 105). Topping and Dungca (1973: 196) argue that “maila’ ‘to come’ presents a special case by itself. […] The initial ma is not a verbalizer […] Neither is the initial ma of mamaila’ the reduplicated syllable.” Sanvitores does not add any comment on the reduplicated or non-reduplicated form. As I will show in section 5.8, he seems a bit confused about the frequent occurrences in different functions of the ma- prefix and doesn’t want to pay any attention to it now.

The prefix -an has become -fan in modern Chamorro. Later on (see section 5.7.5) Sanvitores says that it was occasionally pronounced as -fan, thus prefiguring the later development. See the accompanying annotations to this section about -an.

5.7.4 The non-Actor-Focus with -in- and ergativity

As I already mentioned above, the terms ‘passive’ and ‘active’ should not be understood in a syntactic sense. Instead, Sanvitores attributes, just like his colleagues in the Philippine area, pragmatic meanings to this pair of terms (see section 5.7.2 and chapter 4). In the following section Sanvitores starts off with pointing out this method and in the very same sentence clarifies even better — to us modern readers at least; his contemporary readers must have understood him perfectly from the start – the pragmatic meanings he attributes to the Latin cases, and tries to explain the ergative nature of the language.
Passiva IN
Passiva fit per in loco um activae collocandum, construiturque cum nominativo rei et genitivo personae agentis, dativoque personae cui, quae etiam nonnumquam ponitur in nominativo et tunc res, si mavis, potest dici esse in accusativo, qui demum non distinguitur a nominativo.

Praes. Ninanay: Adyim na agón ninanay ni Dios a hago: [hic cibus a Deo tibi datur].
The Chamorro verb according to Sanvitores

Imperf. Ninanay mami nigab adyim rugrug a hamio: [datur a nobis heri hoc ferrum vobis].
Praet. perf. Ninay: Migay ūaha ninay mo cay Pedro: [multa dona dedisti Petro].
Fut. Ninanay: Migay ūaha ninanay ha agupa a hamio: [multa dona dabuntur a me crastino die vobis].
Imperat.21 Nay: nay ūaha agón: [detur mihi cibus]. Nay yo agón adyim taotao: [detur a vobis cibus his hominibus].
Infinit.22 Mauri nay agón sa taotao nagororó: [bonum est dari cibum homini esurienti].

[Non-Actor-Focus (passiva): in]
The non-Actor-Focus is created by placing -in- instead of -um- of the active voice and is construed with a Goal as Topic/Focus (nominativo), with the Actor as Oblique Agent (genitivo) and with a Beneficiary (dativo). The Beneficiary can also be placed in Topic/Focus position (nominativo) and in that case the constituent that was Patient (res), if you wish to say so, figures as the Goal (accusativus), which ultimately is not marked to distinguish it from the Topic (nominativo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present tense</th>
<th>Ninanay</th>
<th>Adyim na agón ninanay ni Dios a hago</th>
<th>This food is given to you by God</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple past tense</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ninanay mami nigab adyim rugrug a hamio</td>
<td>Yesterday this iron was given to you (pl.) by us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Perfect tense</td>
<td>Ninay</td>
<td>Migay ūaha ninay mo cay Pedro</td>
<td>You (sg.) have given many presents to Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future tense</td>
<td>Ninanay</td>
<td>Migay ūaha ninanay ho agupa a hamio</td>
<td>Many presents will be given by me tomorrow to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 Ms: Chrastino.
21 Ms: Impat.
22 This caption (infinitive) is evidently left out in the manuscript, as already noted by Burrus.
The introductory sentence of this subsection is complicated. Sanvitores compares the following sentence constructions in this sentence:

- I (Agent as Topic/Focus) gave John (Beneficiary) a present (Goal);
- The present (Goal as Topic/Focus) is given by me (Oblique Agent) to John (Beneficiary);
- John (Beneficiary as Topic/Focus) is given the present (Goal) by me (Oblique Agent).

Sanvitores correctly distinguishes between an Actor-Focus construction with -um- (see above) and a non-Actor-Focus construction with -in- (cf. Topping and Dungca (1973: 245-246). He uses the term ‘passive’ for these Goal-Focus constructions; in this respect, Sanvitores seems at first sight to agree with, for instance, Von Preissig (1918: 20), Costenoble (1940: 312) and Chung (1998: 245-246). Topping and Dungca (1973: 245-246) reject the use of the term ‘passive’ in Chamorro, just like Reid (2011: 147-151). However, with the term ‘passive’, as shown in chapter 4, Sanvitores refers not to a syntactic construction but to a perspective function, in the sense that by opting for active or passive a speaker makes clear that he wants to present a State of Affairs (SoA) differently. In other words, Sanvitores doesn’t use the term ‘passive’ in the same way as Von Preissig, Costenoble and Chung (and many others) as a syntactic construction type, but as a pragmatic device enabling a speaker to change from Actor-Focus to non-Actor-Focus. Therefore, to avoid confusion, I have explicitly translated the Latin word passiva as ‘non-Actor-Focus’ – similarly I already translated the Latin activa as ‘Actor-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>you (pl.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Nay</td>
<td>Nay ōoho agón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Let the food be given to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nay yo agón</td>
<td>adyim taotao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Let the food be given by you (pl.) to these people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td>Maurí nay agón</td>
<td>sa taotao nagororó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is good that food is given to a hungry person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The introductory sentence of this subsection is complicated. Sanvitores compares the following sentence constructions in this sentence:

- I (Agent as Topic/Focus) gave John (Beneficiary) a present (Goal);
- The present (Goal as Topic/Focus) is given by me (Oblique Agent) to John (Beneficiary);
- John (Beneficiary as Topic/Focus) is given the present (Goal) by me (Oblique Agent).

Sanvitores correctly distinguishes between an Actor-Focus construction with -um- (see above) and a non-Actor-Focus construction with -in- (cf. Topping and Dungca (1973: 245-246). He uses the term ‘passive’ for these Goal-Focus constructions; in this respect, Sanvitores seems at first sight to agree with, for instance, Von Preissig (1918: 20), Costenoble (1940: 312) and Chung (1998: 245-246). Topping and Dungca (1973: 245-246) reject the use of the term ‘passive’ in Chamorro, just like Reid (2011: 147-151). However, with the term ‘passive’, as shown in chapter 4, Sanvitores refers not to a syntactic construction but to a perspective function, in the sense that by opting for active or passive a speaker makes clear that he wants to present a State of Affairs (SoA) differently. In other words, Sanvitores doesn’t use the term ‘passive’ in the same way as Von Preissig, Costenoble and Chung (and many others) as a syntactic construction type, but as a pragmatic device enabling a speaker to change from Actor-Focus to non-Actor-Focus. Therefore, to avoid confusion, I have explicitly translated the Latin word passiva as ‘non-Actor-Focus’ – similarly I already translated the Latin activa as ‘Actor-
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Focus’ – to distinguish it from the syntactic terms ‘active’ and ‘passive’ or ‘active voice’ and ‘passive voice’.

In the same sentence, so it seems, Sanvitores also tries to describe the phenomenon of ergativity, related to the active/passive diathesis. However, there is not enough evidence that Sanvitores is really conscious of this phenomenon and its differences compared with the nominative/accusative system of Spanish and Latin. More important, however, is that Sanvitores’ method of analysis goes past this matter by his explaining the organization of the language in a specific way, different from many other linguists. Chung (1998: 27) defines ergativity as follows:

An ergative language is a language in which direct objects and subjects of intransitive clauses pattern together, and differently from subjects. Direct objects and intransitive subjects in this kind of system are called absolutes; transitive subjects are called ergatives.

Sanvitores seems to agree with for instance Dik (1981: 60) that not only the Agent but other semantic functions as well can be in Subject position. and that in ergative languages any semantic function in Subject position can be in the ergative case, and any semantic function in Subject as well as Object position can be in the absolutive case, whereas in nominative/accusative languages case assignment is straightforwardly determined by the syntactic functions of Subject and Object. Cooreman (1987: 19-20) connects the syntactic function of Subject directly with its pragmatic value, in a way remarkably similar, so it seems, to Sanvitores, by using pragmatic and perspectival terms to reveal the dynamics of the language:

There are propositions in which both a Patient and a Dative-Beneficiary are candidates to become the direct object of a transitive active sentence or the subject of a passive one. The choice of one over the other to become either direct object or subject in the clause depends on the relative importance which the speaker attaches to each. The two participants then are rivals for the status of secondary Topic (i.e. direct object) in active clauses and primary Topic (i.e. Subject) in passives.

There is, however, a major difference in Sanvitores’ viewpoint on this matter of ergativity in Chamorro compared with the way it is described
by Cooreman and Chung and others. This is that Sanvitores considers the syntactic level of Subject/Object irrelevant; his explanations of the dynamics of the language take place on the semantic and pragmatic levels. Instead of, for instance, saying that ‘a Locative can occupy Subject position’ he would say ‘a Locative can occupy Topic position’. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, Sanvitores does not apply the term Subject in his analyses of agentive sentences because he considers it not suitable for explaining the organization of this language.

Topping and Dungca (1973: 256-258) argue that there is a true passive marker in Chamorro, the prefix ma-, used only, however, with plural Actors. Stolz (2015: 479) calls this the ma-2 prefix, as distinct from the ma-1 prefix, which is used for the personal pronoun ‘they’. In the chapter about diverse particles Sanvitores mentions a prefix ma- used for ‘verba neutra’. I will discuss this further in section 5.8.

The example Sanvitores gives above, Adyim na agón ninanay ni Dios a hago, is in modern orthography: Ayen na ågon ninana’i ni Dios [a] hagu. The word adyim Is rendered as ayen by Safford:

The demonstrative adjective ‘this’ is rendered into Chamorro ayen if placed before the predicate, and yini or ini if placed after the predicate of a sentence: Ayen na patgon tumatangis gi paenge: This child cried last night; Hulalatde yini (or ini) na famalaoan: I blamed these women […] The Spanish este (‘this’) is fast taking the place of ayen and ini. (Safford 1903, 5: 524)

Topping and Dungca (1973: 112) confirm that indeed este has almost completely replaced the older Chamorro demonstratives and that ini “parallels the modern Chamorro locative guini”. In modern Chamorro, na is a particle used to link together different words, like nouns with modifiers and nouns with demonstratives (as here), or to link a complement clause with a main clause (Topping and Dungca 1973: 138-141). The same source (Topping and Dungca 1973: 246) reports that the articles si (for names) and i (for all other nouns) are “tied in with the Goal-Focus -in-” used to mark the Goal. Sanvitores either did not know this or, contrary to Topping and Dungca, considered these simply as definite articles and not specifically ‘tied in’ with Goal-Focus sentences.

---

23 This particle, in its meaning of a preposition or marker of the benefactive, cannot be found as such in modern Chamorro. Hence bracketed here. See my comment on other examples of sentences with [a], [sa] and [cay] in section 5.7.3.
Ridruejo (2005: 240) argues that also missionaries describing Tagalog sometimes saw linking particles as definite articles.

Ninanay mami nigab adyim rugrug a hamio is in modern orthography: ninana’i mami nigap ayen lulok [a] hamyo. The word lulok, spelled as rugrug by Sanvitores, appears as lulu in Chamisso’s dictionary of 1817 (published in Kerr 2004). Topping and Dungca qualify mami as one of the possessive pronouns agglutinated to the preceding word, adding, however, that they function as Subject pronouns with “certain verbs”.24 Concerning this latter aspect in combination with these verbs, Safford (1903, 5: 513), who spells mame instead of mami, speaks of “possessive suffixes”. He gives as one of his examples ilegname (‘we said’, or more literally: ‘our saying’). Likewise, Topping and Dungca give the example ilek-hu (‘I said’, or more literally: ‘my saying’). In his section about the pronouns Sanvitores does give mami as the ‘genitive’ of the pronoun we, in other words, as the form used for possessor and for Oblique Agent (see section 5). As appears in this section here, in old Chamorro this possessive/oblique meaning of mami may also have been used with Goal-Focus constructions (‘ours being given’, ‘given by us’) and not only involving the category of ‘certain verbs’ that both Topping and Dungca and Safford mention. This seems to be confirmed in the next sentence example: Migay ūaha ninay mo cay Pedro, which, in modern orthography is: Meggai guaha nina’i-mu [cay] Pedro. The construction nina’i-mu (‘yours being given’, ‘given by you’) confirms that the pronouns with a possessive/oblique meaning were also used with Goal-Focus constructions (see previous paragraph). Note that Sanvitores here doesn’t translate the sentence into Latin with a passive construction (which would be multa dona data sunt Petro). This confirms that he did not use the term ‘passive’ to indicate a syntactic construction, but indeed to indicate a certain perspective.

The word guaha in modern Chamorro is a defective verb meaning ‘have’ or ‘exist’ (see section 5.7.1). The word nina’i in modern Chamorro (from the verb na’i ‘to give’) means ‘gift’ (‘the given’). In modern orthography the sentence would be: Meggai guaha ninana’i-hu agupa’ [a] hamyo. If we take guaha in a substantivized meaning, the translation would be: ‘many have/havings/things being-given-by-me tomorrow to you (pl.)’.

---

24 “For example, the words of Class IIIC” (Topping and Dungca 1973: 109). They do not tell us, however, what the defining characteristics of this Subclass of words are.
As the last verbal forms in his account of non-Actor-Focus infix \(-in\)-, he lists the imperative and infinitive. Both are, however, apparently expressed by the root itself, without the infix \(-in\)-, or any other affixes. This is in accordance with his previous remark that the root by itself, used without any affixes, “sounds passive” – in other words: sounds like an act in which the Actor is not focused. And being part of a pragmatic group of non-Actor focused verbal forms, imperative and infinitive are listed here together with the verbal forms with \(-in\)-. Earlier on, Sanvitores already announced that he would give examples of the root serving “for colloquial and short ways of saying things” (Section 5.7.2, fragment 6), and indeed these must be the examples he promised to give. He gives a similar explanation using similar examples also in the section about the non-Actor-Focus prefix \(a\)- (see 6.7.7 below).

In modern Chamorro the imperative is expressed “by using the same form of the verb that occurs in the future tense” (Topping and Dungca 1973: 264). This is most often the same form as the root of the verb, so Sanvitores (and his Tagalog interpreter as well) may have missed this grammatical difference. However, the situation regarding possible ways of expressing the imperative seems to be more complex than Sanvitores had learned. He probably is mistaken here in presenting the root by itself as a verbal form to express the non-Actor-Focus imperative or the non-Actor-Focus infinitive, for, in modern Chamorro at least, the latter is expressed by the prefix \(ma\)- and a passive imperative or non-Actor-Focus imperative – either with the non-Actor-Focus infix \(-in\)- or some other affix, or without any affix at all – does not exist (Chung 1998: 42). Topping and Dungca (1973: 256-257) and Stolz (2015: 479) argue that the \(ma\)- prefix is used for passive sentences without an Agent explicitly expressed, while the \(-in\)- infix is used in Goal-Focus construction with the Agent expressed(cf. also Cooreman 1987). I will come back to this in section 5.8 when analyzing Sanvitores’ exposition of the \(ma\)- prefix.

5.7.5 Modes to be added

The term \(modi supplendi\) (modes to be added) is rare. Sanvitores’ source probably has been \(El \ arte \ de \ Prisciano \ y \ Castellana\) (written ca. 1500), or one of the other works belonging to the group of \(Grammaticae Proverbiandi\) (“Grammatical exercises in translating from Spanish into Latin”), popular works meant to make learning Latin easier (cf. Calvo Fernández 1992). In these works the term \(suppletio\) (or \(suppletio\)) is used for the circumlocution of a word or term or construction which does not exist in the language described, or – the other way around – does not
exist in Latin. In the following quote from one of the *grammaticae proverbiandi* the meaning of the term *supletio* is clarified:

Supletio est alicuius diccionis nobis deficientis per novam diccionem vel plures dicciones idem significantem vel significantes facta circumlocutio. Vel alter suplecio est loco alicuius diccionis deficientis accepcio alterius diccionis vel plurium idem significantis vel significantium.

Supletio is a circumlocution of a certain wordform that is lacking, by a new word or several words that mean the same. Or, put differently, a supletio is the accepting of a different word or words with the same meaning instead of a certain wordform lacking.

In the following fragment Sanvitores unfolds which modes are not marked as such, and therefore as distinct ‘wordforms’ do not exist in Chamorro and should be ‘added’ by a circumlocution.

Fragment 9: f. 31v

---

24 Ms. 8950 in the Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, analyzed in Calvo Fernández (1993). Translation is mine: PW.
Modi Suppleundi
Subiunctivum fit in quavis ex praedictis verbi vocibus activis seu passivis anteposita solum particula cum, quae etiam significacione Latina [cum] assimilatur et [quando] et [si], v. g. cum agas ninay mo cay Pedro agón, agas ruigi numay si Pedro a ūaho: [si dedisses mature Petro cibum, mature quoque dedisset Petrus mihi].
Optativum nihil differt ab imperativo activae vel passivae: nay hago ni Dios gof na ani: [detur tibi a Deo optimus dies]; vel: si Dios numay a hago gof na ani: [Deus det tibi optimum diem].
Participii vox suppletur etiam per communes verbi voces cuiusvis temporis eo modo quo apud grammaticos Latinos exponitur participium ‘per orationem de relativo’, v. g. taotao na numanay agón : [homo dans cibum vel qui dat cibum].
Gerundia item supina et quaevis aliae voces, quae in Latinis coniugationibus variantur, recidunt hic in supra positas et frequentius in ipsam simplicem radicem, v. g. vato hao nay agón vel numay in hao sa taotao: [vade ad dandum vel datum cibum istis hominibus].

26 Ms and Burrus: gofna. See running text.
Modes to be added

The subjunctive is made in any of the active or passive forms of the verbs mentioned above by prefixing only *cum*, which has the same meaning as the Latin *cum* in the meaning of ‘when’ as well as ‘if’. For instance: *cum agas ninay mo cay Pedro agón, agas ruigi numay si Pedro a ũaho*: ‘If you had given fresh food to Peter, Peter would also have given fresh food to me.’

The optative differs in nothing from the imperative active or passive: *nay hago ni Dios gofna ani*: ‘Let a very good day be given to you by God’. Or: *si Dios numay a hago gofna ani*: ‘Let God give you a very good day.’

The participle is also realised by ordinary forms of the verb in any tense, in the way which the Latin grammarians explain ‘the participle by means of a relative clause’, for instance: *taotao na numanay agón*: ‘a person giving food or who gives food’.

Gerunds and supines and all other verb forms which are expressed in Latin by varying conjugations are expressed by the forms mentioned above, and most frequently by this simple root itself, for instance: *vato hao nay agón or numay in hao sa taotao*: ‘Go in order to give food to these people’.

By using the term *modi supplendi* Sanvitores clearly wants to indicate that the phenomena dealt with here – subjunctive, optative, participle, gerund and the supine – do not exist in Chamorro in the same way as in Latin. For instance, the Latin subjunctive, Sanvitores explains, is not expressed in Chamorro by a separate conjugated form of the verb as in Latin, but only by adding the adverb *cum*, meaning ‘when’ or ‘if’. In one of the *Grammaticae Proverbiandi* we can find a very similar explanation:

*Nota quod quando participium deficit, si venerit per modum ablativi absoluti non est suplendum per quis vel qui, sed est suplendum per ipsa adverbia, scilicet: cum vel postquam, resolvendo substantivum in nominativo et participium in verbo eiusdem temporis cuius est participium deficiens, verbi gratia: el rey venido, fuira(n) los ladrones, fit sic: postquam rex venit, fugient latrones.*

Note that when the participle is lacking, if it expresses a condition or temporal relation (ablativus absolutus construction), it should not be circumlocuted by using ‘who’, but by actual adverbs, namely ‘when’ or ‘after’, by restructuring (resolvendo) the noun in nominative and
the participle in a verb in the same tense as the lacking participle would have been, for instance: the king having come, the thieves will flee, becomes: after the King has come, the thieves will flee. Cum has become komu or komu in modern Chamorro, meaning ‘in case’, ‘if’, ‘provided that’. However, Sanvitores attributes a conditional as well as a temporal meaning (as in ‘when he scored, the crowd went wild’) to this word. This strictly temporal meaning seems not to be present (anymore) in the modern komu.

The manuscript reads gofna, written as one word. Actually it is a combination of two words, the intensifier gof (‘very’, ‘extremely’) and the linking particle na (used “to connect a noun with its modifier” (Topping, Ogo and Dungca 1975, s.v. na). Sanvitores writes the particle as a separate word in his section about ‘various particles’ (see section 5.8), and correctly uses it as a linking particle between modifier (inhao: ‘these’) and noun (manga umorin: ‘leaders’) when he gives the following example: napanharon midyo inhao na manga umorin: ‘make that these leaders enter’ (see section 5.8). Sanvitores does not give any explanation of this particle na specifically, but the same linking particle, with the same function, also exists in Tagalog, so it is likely that he and his readers were familiar with it and recognized it as such in Chamorro as well.

I haven’t found the expression participium per orationem de relativo nor the term oratio de relativo in texts of Latin grammarians. Furthermore, the Latin itself is incorrect and is obviously inspired by the Spanish term oracion de relativo (relative clause). Calvo Fernández (1993: 268), in his treatise on the Arte de Prisciano y Castellana, gives in his own words the following example of a form of the modi supplendi: “una oración de relativo, por el participio de un verbo que carece de esta categoría gramatical.” (a relative clause instead of the participle of a verb that does not have this grammatical category). And in the manuscript itself of this Arte de Prisciano y Castellana, one can find the following:

Sy venerit sine sensu ablativi absoluti, supletur per quis vel qui et per verbum sui temporis.

---

If it (sc. the participle) does not express a temporal or conditional relation, it is circumlocuted by who and by the verb in the appropriate tense. (My translation)

Instead of saying it in the same simple manner (supletur per quis vel qui: it is circumlocuted by who), Sanvitores chooses to say that it is expressed by a relative clause, but combines Latin (participium per orationem) with Spanish (de relativo) here.

Sanvitores describes two Latin constructions here: the ‘gerund’ (a substantivized and declinable form of the verb, often used to express a Goal one wants to realize – like in vade ad dandum (‘go in order to give’) – and the so-called ‘supine I’, a quite rarely used verb form in Latin also used to express a desired goal – like in vade datum (‘go in order to give’). The word vato is probably the imperative form fatto in modern Chamorro (cf. Topping, Ogo and Dungca 1975 s.v. fatto).

5.7.6 The Actor-Focus with (m)(f)an- and the antipassive

Fragment 10: f. 31r
Activa: an
Eadem radix, quae coniugatur per um, coniugatur item aeque frequenter per an (vel m antepositum vel \( f \)). Quae quidem an non inseritur sed anteponitur toti radici. Significatio autem manet eadem, nisi quod proprius deservit an cum multae sunt personae quae agunt vel circa quas agitur. Habet autem haec coniugatio an totidem voces ad eademque tempora ac coniugatio um, quae sane in duas omnino recidunt voces distinctas solum repetitione primae syllabae radicis in voce quae deservit praesenti, praeterito imperfecto et futuro, scilicet \( \text{annanay}^{28} \), et tali repetitione omissa in voce, quae deservit praet. perf., plusq. perf., imperat. et infinit. scilicet \( \text{annay}^{29} \).

Actor-Focus: an
The same root which is conjugated by \( um \) is also just as often conjugated by \( an \) (with \( m \) or \( f \) placed before it). This \( an \) however is not infixed but prefixed to the entire root. The meaning however stays the same, except that \( an \) is used in particular when the Actor is plural or when the verb argument in oblique case is plural. This conjugation \( an \) however has the same number of forms for the same tenses as the conjugation \( um \). These forms indeed boil down to only two distinct forms: with the repetition of a syllable of the root in the form which serves for the present continuous, past continuous and the future, namely \( \text{annanay} \), and with this repetition left out in the form which serves for the perfect tense, past perfect tense, imperative and infinitive, namely \( \text{annay} \).

Arguing that \( an- \) is used with plural Actors or with ‘the verb argument in oblique case’ in plural form, Sanvitores indicates here that this prefix is

---

28 Ms: vel am antepositum vel \( F \). Burrus likewise, but with the capital \( F \) as a lower case \( f \).

29 Ms: \( \text{annay} \), maintained by Burrus. Sanvitores uses the same word \( nay \) (\( na’i \) in modern orthography, meaning 'give') earlier, when he introduces the phenomenon of reduplication in Chamorro to his readers (see fragment ?). It is therefore highly unlikely that in this sentence – explaining that in non-continuative tenses part of the root is reduplicated, while in non-continuative tenses there is no reduplication – he would give the same word ‘\( \text{annay} \)’ twice (as rendered by Morales and as maintained by Burrus). The copyist must have misread Sanvitores’ handwriting.
used both in Actor-Focus sentences with a plural Agent and in sentences with a plural ‘affected NP’. In modern Chamorro two types of man-/fan- prefixes on the verb are distinguished. Stolz (2015: 481-483) states that man-/fan-1 are markers of the antipassive and man-/fan-2 are plural verbalizing prefixes in absolutive constructions. Topping and Dungca (1973: 186) formulate it differently: man-/fan- are either prefixes required on intransitive verbs when the Subject is plural or prefixes on transitive verbs when the Object is indefinite (e.g., ‘a book’, or ‘books’ vs. ‘the book’). Both verbal prefixes can occur together when the Subject is plural and the Object is indefinite, as in the following example given by Topping and Dungca, where both are prefixed to the verb li’e, ‘see’:

\[
\text{manmanli’e siha guma’ saw they house ‘they saw a house’}
\]

Sanvitores seems also to make a distinction (though implicitly) between two types of man-/fan- but he formulates it differently, saying that there is a man-/fan- type used when the Agent (personae quae agunt. Lit.: ‘grammatical person of the Agent’) is plural and a man-/fan- type used for sentences in which the ‘thing/person acted upon’ (personae circa quas agitur, Lit.: ‘grammatical person of what/who (pl.) is acted upon’) is plural. With this latter description of man-/fan- Sanvitores no doubt refers to the antipassive, in which, in the description given by Chung (1998: 38) “the argument that the transitive verb would link to direct Object position is … realized as a syntactic oblique.” Note, however, that all modern sources I have consulted allow this antipassive also with non-plural oblique arguments. Cooreman (1987: 134) gives the following concise example of this antipassive, where ‘the man’ is placed in oblique case by using the particle nu:

\[
\text{manhongge yo’ nu i taotao believe I (Obl.) the man ‘I believe the man’}
\]

In the following section Sanvitores continues his contemplations on the antipassive, where he will appear to get somewhat entangled in the complexity of it, probably caused by the oblique position of the Object following the particle nu.
The difference between *man-* and *fan-* is that the first is used in realis, the second in irrealis mode (Stolz 2015: 481-482). Sanvitores either did not recognize this difference or didn’t have time or chose not to treat this in his first rudimentary version of his grammar. Another aspect of this pair is its Focus-function. Sanvitores recognizes that it has, just like, *um*, an Actor-Focus function.30

Sanvitores apparently understood from the lessons of his interpreter that there is a prefix *an-* which is arbitrarily preceded by *f* or *m*. In current literature, and in older works like that of Safford, *man-*/*fan-* are not described as composites or having originated from a prefix *an-*. The fact that Sanvitores argues that there is a pair of affixes *an-* and *a-*, next to *um-* and *-in-*, to create an Actor-Focus and a non-Actor-Focus construction respectively (with *m* or *f* placed before *an-* and maybe also *a-*) may well shed light on the matter of the supposed but still unclarified relationship between the prefixes *man-/fan-* (in their several functions) and the verbalizing prefixes *ma-* and *fa’-*. The fact that Sanvitores’ names the two prefixes *an-* and *a-*, makes it plausible that these are the original verbalizing prefixes used for Actor-Focus and non-Actor-Focus, with *m(a)-* added to denote plurality/indefiniteness and *f(a)-* to denote future/irrealis. We then get the following picture:

- The prefix *man-* combines the notions of plurality/indefiniteness/Actor-Focus;
- The prefix *ma-* combines the notions of plurality/indefiniteness/non-Actor-Focus;
- The prefix *fan-* combines the notions of future/irrealis/Actor-Focus;
- The prefix *fa-* combines the notions of future/irrealis/non-Actor-Focus.

Also Topping and Dungca’s treatise on *ma-* as a passive voice marker (1973: 192-193) indicates that this prefix is used to create non-Actor-Focus. Topping and Dungca conjecture that the pronoun *ma* (meaning ‘they’, in a very non-specific and impersonal sense) may actually be the same as the passive prefix *ma-*, which in turn can be the same as the verbalizer *ma-*, but they still treat them as three distinct entities.

30 Cf. Topping and Dungca (1973: 243-244). Cooreman (1987), however, argues that the *man-/fan-* pair in antipassives is not used to Focus on the Actor, but on the activity expressed in the predicate. Interesting, because she is the only source I have found who makes this distinction. Concerning these two forms of focus, see above, section 5.7.2. Also see Winkler (1985) and chapter 4 in this thesis, where the two forms of focus, on the Actor and on the predicate, are discussed related to examples given in Philippine missionary grammars.
However, gathering from what Sanvitores tells us, it makes more sense to consider them all as one and the same impersonalizing, non-Actor-Focus particle or prefix, which as such can serve both as an impersonal Subject and as a verbalizer used in sentences in which the Focus is not on the Actor or the Actor is not specifically named.

The prefix *ma-* is also listed in the section about ‘various particles’ (see section 5.8). In this section Sanvitores tells us that the prefix *ma-* is used to create intransitive sentences. This of course seems pretty much in harmony with Topping and Dungca’s assertion that *ma-* is a passive voice marker. I shall go into this more in detail in section 5.8.

Finally, in his description of the verbal forms *annanay* and *annay*, Sanvitores neatly describes the difference between continuative and non-continuative aspect expressed by respectively inserting and leaving out the reduplication of part of the root of a verb, just as he did earlier in his treatise of the infixes *-um-* and *-in-*.

In modern Chamorro orthography both words would be (with an *m* added): *manana’i* and *manna’i*.

### 5.7.7 The non-Actor-Focus with *a-* and the antipassive

In the following fragment Sanvitores presents the second element of the verbalizing pair *an/-a*.

He explains again here, and even more clearly than before, that the root itself can be used as infinitive and imperative and then has non-Actor-Focus. Furthermore, he introduces a new infix, but seems to be somewhat puzzled now by the phenomenon of the antipassive.

---

31 About this pair of Focus markers and its relationship with the modern prefixes *man-* and *ma-*, see previous section.
Passiva
A.

Ars autem altius aedificari, sicut etiam
va. A loco in non inveniendum, sed anteposse
claram Vice in radice, reddita, suas duas voces, plurales
distinctas; repertione syllabae, scilicet annandae, convexae,
tertii imperfecto, captato, et unius pro pluribus posse, et
plurum, posse. Imperex est ostendi, quisus etiam reddita
sub eoque radia sola significata passiva, et imperativa cons
cordateaque, sive cum una, sive cum pluribus personis, aut
rebus.

Non nunquam loco perditus, particula A, non
passiva, anteposse radice; sub particula, qua, vel ipsum
et additum quad aequo illi discrimine est primum
rum, explicandum quoque ut ea eis sensiva personarum
ent, qui competet sibi activum, vel eis ceteris.

Datum solutum anteposse A loco A, qui vitet non
passivam locutionem. Nuhv, scilicet, cum autem post ponitur in radice
situm; non vitet non loco, loci, sed loci post.

...
Passiva A

Huic autem activae an correspondet sua passiva a loco in, non inserendum sed anteponendum item toti radici redditque suas duas voces solum distinctas repetitione syllabae, scilicet ananay, pro praesenti, imperfecta et futuro et anay pro praeterito perfecto et plus quam perfecto. Imperativus et infinitivus, quibus etiam redditur ipsa radix sola, significat passive et imperative concordatque sive cum una sive cum pluribus personis aut rebus. Nonnunquam loco praedictae particulae a vocis passivae antepositur radici haec particula: ana vel ipsum an activum quod absque illo discrimine fit etiam passivum, dignoscendumque erit ex ipso genitivo personae agentis qui competit voci activae vel ex aliis circumstantiis. Item solet anteponi i loco a, quae videtur passiva Tagalae linguae. Cum autem postponitur toti radici illud i non videtur nota vocis passivae sed varia prolatio seu dialectus eiusdem radicis; additur enim tam in activa quam in passiva, v. g. numanay alias numanayi; ninay alias ninayi, hocque in quovis tempore et multis aliis verbis. Itaque per nihil postpositum radici variatur coniugatio. Ceterum particula an postposita solet denotare locum ubi aliquid est vel agitur, v. g. gongon: coniungi; pangongonan: locus ubi coniunguntur seu quo conveniunt multi.

[Non-Actor-Focus: a]

To this Actor-Focus construction with an corresponds its non-Actor-Focus construction with a instead of in. Just like an, a is not inserted but prefixed before the entire root and renders its two distinct tenses only by repetition of a syllable, namely ananay for present continuous, imperfect and future tense and anay for perfect and past perfect. The imperative and infinitive which are also expressed by only the root itself have a non-Actor-Focus and imperative meaning and agree with either one or more persons or things. Sometimes, instead of the particle a of the non-Actor-Focus construction mentioned above also the following particle is prefixed to the root: ana or this very an of the Actor-Focus, which also, without this distinction, makes a non-Actor-Focus construction and can be discerned by either the oblique position of the Agent that

\[52\] Ms. ananay, retained by Burrus. However, since Sanvitores accurately tries to describe the difference between the two prefixes an- and a- it is unlikely that he himself wrote a double n here followed by a single n in the non-reduplicated anay.

\[53\] Ms: significans, maintained by Burrus. However, maintaining significans and concordatque or concordatque (see following note) would make the sentence grammatically incorrect.

\[54\] Ms: concordatque. Burrus: concordatque. Also see previous note.
agrees with the Agent in the active construction, or by other contextual information. Also i is regularly prefixed instead of a, which resembles the non-Actor-Focus form in Tagalog. However, when this i is suffixed to the entire root it seems not to be a signal of non-Actor-Focus but a matter of varying pronunciation or a dialect of this root. For it is suffixed in Actor-Focus as well as non-Actor-Focus constructions, for instance numanay and elsewhere numanayi, ninay and elsewhere ninayi, and this in any tense and in many other verbs. In other words, the conjugation is not changed by suffixing something to the root. For the rest this particle an as a suffix is commonly used to indicate the place where something is or where something is done. For instance gongon: ‘to be united’; pangongonan: ‘place where many people are united or come together’.

Sanvitores seems puzzled here. The prefix ana- is not found in modern Chamorro, nor in older sources. However, he seems confused not so much by the complexity of the affix system in Chamorro as by the phenomenon of the antipassive in his attempt to explain the verbal affixes according to the functional distinction between Actor-Focus and non-Actor-Focus. In the previous paragraph he introduced the prefix an- (or man- or fan-) as Actor-Focus prefix. However, in antipassive constructions the oblique noun is often preceded by the oblique marker ni or nu, and these same particles can be translated as ‘by’ in passive constructions. Compare the passive (with the ‘passive’ infix -in- in the verb li’e, ‘see’):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{lini’e'} & \quad \text{si Pete} & \text{nu i patgon} \\
\text{was seen} & \quad \text{Pete} & \text{by the child}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Pete was seen by the child’

with the antipassive:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{lini’e'} & \quad \text{nu i patgon} \\
\text{was seen} & \quad \text{by the child}
\end{align*}
\]
The Chamorro verb according to Sanvitores

*manhongge yo’ nu i taotao*

believe I (Obl.) the man

‘I believe the man’

where ‘the man’ is placed in oblique case by using this very same particle *nu*. In the first example there is, as Sanvitores has explained, non-Actor-Focus created by the *-in-* infix, in the second there is Actor-Focus created by the *man-* prefix, explained as well by Sanvitores, but this second sentence also gives a ‘non-Actor-Focus impression’ because of *nu* (because of the Agent in oblique position). This is exactly the problematic, puzzling aspect for Sanvitores, which he describes here. Note that, considering the ambiguity in his exegesis, of which he himself must have been aware too, Sanvitores probably is the first among his colleague missionaries working in this area who recognizes the antipassive, describing it as a voice somewhere inbetween active and passive.

According to Sanvitores this suffix *-i* seems to be not a real suffix. However, it is far more likely that this *-i* (or *-yi*) is identical to what Topping and Dungca (1973: 249-254) call the referential Focus marker suffix, or the suffix for the benefactive Focus (*-iyi*). Since Sanvitores mentions only one suffix, and considering the substantial pragmatic overlap between referential and benefactive Focus, it may well be that other forms of this referential suffix (Topping and Dungca mention *-yi* and *gui-* as ‘allomorphs’) as well as the benefactive *-iyi* are all later developments in Chamorro and that the supposed distinction between referential and benefactive as described by Topping and Dungca was not expressed by different suffixes.

The word *gongon* or possible later related forms cannot be found in Topping’s dictionary. However, Safford (5: 311 [1903]) gives *mañgongone* in the meaning of ‘bring hither’ and in the Chamorro Bible one can find *manmangongone* (Matthew 9:2) also in the meaning of ‘bring’. Possibly, the suffix *-an* Sanvitores describes as a locative particle has nowadays become what Topping and Dungca (1973: 180) refer to as the “attributive suffix” *-an*, denoting a condition, quality or aspect of a noun. More likely, however, the prefix *pan-* together with the suffix *-an*, form the “discontinuous affix” or “discontinuous morpheme”,

---

36 Thus far, I haven’t found a description of the antipassive in texts of other missionaries.
37 The bible in Chamorro is available online (http://chamorrobible.tripod.com). This verbal form is found in Matthew 9:2.
as Topping and Dungca (1973: 180) call it, which nowadays is spelled as fan-... -an and bears the meaning of ‘place where’, the same meaning Sanvitores gives. Sanvitores may have missed the fact that the effect described is caused by the two affixes together. In the following chapter (on ‘various particles’) Sanvitores describes pan- only as a separate prefix (see below).

Moreover, if indeed the ‘circumfix’ fan-...-an is the same as the ‘circumfix’ pan-...-an which Sanvitores describes, then perhaps – and this is not unlikely – a shift in pronunciation from p to f took place in the course of time (as in the shift between the Latin pater and the English father, Latin pedis and German fuss, and, of course, dozens of similar examples). If so – more investigation is needed to corroborate this claim – this may form an explanation for the complex number of ma, fa, man, fan affixes nowadays. The shift between p and f in these affixes is confirmed by closer analysis of the following fragment, the first part of the section on the various particles, where Sanvitores reveals some more historico-phonological clues.

5.7.8 Various particles

The last section in Sanvitores’ chapter on the verb is devoted to what he calls “various particles” and is of considerable length (ca. 1½ folia). I will analyze this section split up in three parts (fragments 12-14 below).

---

38 The terms ‘discontinuous affix’ and ‘discontinuous morpheme’ used by Topping and Dungca are somewhat misleading, since it seems more appropriate to distinguish a prefix and an affix which together carry a Locative function. Hence the term ‘circumfix’.
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Variae Particulae

Fiunt et alii vari coniugandi anteponendo radici alias particulas, quales sunt: no, nam, mam, nag, mag, pa vel fa, pan, pag; vel etiam binae ut: napag, nagpa, napam, mapan, mapag, magpa, ypaq, ipan, ipa, quae omnes forsae sunt adscitae ex lingua Tagala, quam videntur etiam imitari quoad vim et significacionem, ita ut in plurimum na et ma reddant in compositione significacionem verbi, quod vocant neutrum, nag, mag, et pag innuant multitidinem agentium vel patientium seu rerum circa quas, nam, man, pan multitidinem actionum discretarum, nempe et aliquo officio vel consuetudine: pa et item pan (vel napa et napan, ut innuant etiam...

---

38 Ms and Burrus: multitudine. Since there is no predicate in this sentence, the one from the previous sentence (innuant) should be implied here and then ‘multitudinem’ is the grammatically correct form.

39 Ms and Burrus note a semicolon here instead of a colon. The punctuation in the manuscript is often very inaccurate but only ‘mildly disturbing’. However, in this case the semicolon is misleading and obviously Burrus is indeed misled by it, since he maintains the semicolon – while pa ... neutrum form part of this sentence --, maintains also multitudine (see previous note), changes the capital of Combinatio (a word also incorrectly preceded by a semi-colon) in lower case and apparently is confused himself about where sentences start and end here.
verbum neutrum. Combinatio\textsuperscript{41} enim duplicis particulae combinationem etiam significatus\textsuperscript{42} solet innuere). Pa igitur et quandoque pan denotant motum etiam oris in loquendo et positionem seu situm remanentem ex motu, \textsuperscript{43} motionem etiam imperii seu facere, ut faciant, prout loquimur in grammatica Tagala, ad quod etiam utuntur Mariani\textsuperscript{44} nostri particula na, v. g. napanharon midyo inhao na manga umorin : [facite ut ingrediantur isti principales], nempe ex ma, pan et haron [intro].

Various particles
Also various other conjugations occur by prefixing other particles to the root, like: na, nam, mam, nag, mag, pa or fa, pan, pag; or also double particles like: napag, nagpa, napam, mapan, mapag, magpa, ypag, ipan, ipa, which all perhaps are adopted from Tagalog, a language which they seem to imitate in dynamics and meaning, such that in general combinations with na and ma create a so-called intransitive verb, nag, mag and pag indicate a multitude of Agents or Patients or things involved, nam, man, pan indicate a multitude of separate actions, as certainly also do, based upon some grammatical rule or upon common usage, pa and also pan (or napa and napan, to indicate also the intransitive verb; for the combination of a double particle normally indicates a combination also of meaning). So, pa and sometimes pan are used [sc. combined with na or ma] for a facial expression when speaking, for the state or place remaining after a movement and also for a motion-on-command or ‘to cause to do’, as we say in Tagalan grammar, for which our Marians use the particle na as well, for instance napanharon midyo inhao na manga umorin : ‘make that these leaders enter’, indeed from ma, pan and haron ‘to enter’.

Even more than in previous paragraphs, the “rough” and unfinished character of this grammar (“rudis grammatica”, as Sanvitores himself calls it; see section 1) shines through. This paragraph seems mostly to be a list of reminders of what he wishes to describe more fully after having had time to learn more about the language and/or more time to spend on elaborating his grammar. At this stage, the primary reason why

\textsuperscript{41} Ms: Combinatio, Burrus: combinatio. However, clearly a new sentence starts here so the capital in the manuscript is correct.

\textsuperscript{42} Ms and Burrus: significati.

\textsuperscript{43} The manuscript seems to give a semicolon after motu and Burrus maintains it. The sentence, however, continues and motionem is Object of denotant, so a semicolon isn’t appropriate here.

\textsuperscript{44} Ms. Mariam. Burrus: Mariani.
Sanvitores gives this whole array of particles is to show his readers two things: that in most of them one can find the ‘core particles’ *na, ma, pa* and *fa* and, secondly, that Chamorro and Tagalog are closely related. On these core particles he focuses next and tries to very briefly explain their meanings.

The close family ties between Tagalog and Chamorro are confirmed by scholars today (cf. Stolz 2015: 488; Topping and Dungca 1973: 5). In this ‘reminder list’ of affixes, Sanvitores has taken up quite a few which at first seem to be entirely Tagalog and do not exist in modern Chamorro. However, it is unlikely that the Filipino who Sanvitores is using as his teacher, after having lived in the Marianas for seventeen years (see section 2), would still use words and prefixes that did not exist in Chamorro, so we may assume that *nag, mag, pag*, which are still spelled as such in Tagalog, were used at that time in Chamorro as well. In that case, they have become *na’* and *ma’* and *fa’*, so with a glottal stop developed from this /g/, in the so-called process of ‘glottalization’ or ‘debuccalization’ (Fallon 2013: 123-135) in the language of today. The double particles *napam, mapan, mapag* and *magpa* must then have become *na + fan, ma + fan, ma + fa’* and *ma’ + fa*. Probably Sanvitores gives the first and the latter two of these double particles as pairs because he is uncertain about the right pronunciation or because he considers them dialect variations. For the same reason Sanvitores probably gives *nam* and *mam* as alternatives for *man*. The double particles *ypag, ipan, ipa* then would in modern Chamorro have become *y + fa’, i + fan* and *i + fa*, but I haven’t found examples yet of these combinations in modern Chamorro.

Latin grammarians often made a distinction between active, passive and ‘neuter verbs’. With this latter category – the Latin word *neuter* literally means ‘neither of both’ – they referred to intransitive verbs or, more precisely, to verbs that can occur without an Object in the accusative case. They were also called *verba substantiva* (‘verbs that stand by themselves’). So, for instance, Perottus (1541: 115-116; my translation):

Unde dicitur neutrum? Quia haec verba neutra sunt, id est, nec activa nec passiva ... Ut ego amo, id est amans sum: legebam, id est, legens eram.
Why is it called neuter? Because these verbs are neither active nor passive ... For instance: I love, in the meaning of I am loving, or I read in the meaning of I am reading.

However, the group of verba neutra is generally understood to comprise more than only these verbs. In one of the grammaticae proverbiandi, works that were, as I have shown above, a source of linguistic theory and terminology for Sanvitores (see section 5.7.5), a distinction is made between verba neutra transitiva, with an Object in the genitive, dative, or ablative, and verba neutra absoluta, which have no Object in any form, like ‘to cry’, ‘to sleep’ (cf. Calvo Fernández 1992: 254). Probably Sanvitores refers to this distinction, explaining that the affixes nag, mag and pag are used with verba neutra intransitiva, intransitive verbs that have an Object in another case than the accusative – resembling the antipassive construction in Chamorro (see sections 5.7.6 and 5.7.7) – while nam, man, and pan are used with verba neutra absoluta, verbs which have no Object in any form.

The prefix ma- is, according to Topping and Dungca (1973: 192), “used to mark the true passive voice in Chamorro”. They distinguish three types of constructions: Actor-Focus, Goal-Focus and passive constructions, of which the last one is marked by the prefix ma- and contains no Agent. For instance: Manimalalatde i famagu’on (‘The children were scolded’), where man- is the plural prefix followed by the passive prefix ma-.

It is remarkable that Sanvitores makes a similar distinction between Actor-Focus, Goal-Focus and ‘intransitive’, the latter in the meaning of ‘standing by itself’ or ‘not needing an Object’ (or, in a Goal-Focus construction, ‘not needing an Oblique Agent’). In modern Chamorro, as observed by Topping and Dungca (1973: 247, 257-259) ma- is also used to denote the third person plural (the plural pronoun they) and is used as plural Goal-Focus marker. They also conclude (1973: 258), though conjecturing that there is only one morpheme ma, that the occurrences of this same ma in different meanings or functions provide us with “riddles” that “perhaps someday can be answered”.

However, Sanvitores seems to give us a clue as to how to solve these riddles. He tells us that ma- serves only as a prefix for intransitive sentences, while for sentences with plural subjects he lists nag, mag and

---

45 Cf. Topping and Dungca (1973: 257-258) where they compare the ‘goal-Focus infix’ -in- with the ‘passive prefix’ ma-. However, as I will discuss below, it may not be correct to see the ma- prefix as a “true passive marker”.

Missionary Pragmalinguistics
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pag and nam, man, pan (na’, ma’, fa’ and nam, man, fan in modern Chamorro). This seems to indicate that the modern polysemous ma- (for passive Agentless constructions as well as for plural Goal-Focus sentences and sentences with unspecific, non-referential second person plural subjects) is a prefix in which the original ma-, man- and mag- have merged. Cooreman (1987: 181-182), though implicitly, confirms this hypothesis. She argues that the ma- passive, compared to the -in-passive, is “the more prototypical passive of the two” because the Agent is suppressed; she continues, though seemingly subconsciously, with merging the pronoun ma – meaning ‘they’ in a very vague, impersonal sense – with the ma- passive prefix, in arguing:

The fact that it is the ma- passive which is used as an Agentless passive should not be surprising given the fact that plural referents are not always uniquely identifiable and not as Topical as singular referents. ... In English third person plural subjects often serve the function of impersonal constructions as well in which the subject referent is not really referential (e.g. “they say that...”).

The prefix na- is listed by Topping and Dungca (1973: 228) as a verb-forming affix, without any further clarification. Sanvitores apparently sees na- and ma- as dialect variations, identical in meaning. The combination of pa and na. Sanvitores tells us, also conveys “a facial expression”. Probably Sanvitores is mistaken here. It is very likely that Sanvitores actually refers to the word fana’ (‘face’) – which apparently was pronounced as pana in those days – and it seems not very plausible that this word really is built on a contraction of the two particles pa and na.

The double prefix nap can convey the meaning of a state or place remaining after a movement. Sanvitores gives the example sentence si Jesús napapahipa sa cruz at the end of the following paragraph (see fragment 13 below and the analysis following this fragment). He also refers to a causative prefix na-. In modern Chamorro, as noted by Topping and Dungca (1973: 247-249), na’- can indeed be used as a causative prefix. As becomes clear in this sentence, to Sanvitores na and ma as prefixes creating an intransitive verb are (dialect) variations in pronunciation and the same and identical in function and meaning. He may have concluded this because the same particles ma and na are described in a similar way by Blancas in his grammar of Tagalog: “With this particle ma, and na, the neuter verbs are formed” (Blancas 1997...
Sanvitores probably had studied this grammar and knew it well (and, of course, was a fluent speaker of Tagalog).  

The final example Sanvitores gives in this paragraph – *napanharon midyō inhao na manga umorin* (‘make that these leaders enter’) – is in modern Chamorro as follows: *na’fanhalom miyu na manchamorri*. However, this does not imply that the word *Umorin* has become *Chamorri* in modern Chamorro. Safford (5: 291 [1903]) tells us: “The word Chamorro is derived from Chamorri or Chamoli, the ancient name for Chief.” This *chamorri* or *chamoli* is still far removed from Sanvitores’ *umorin*, for which I haven’t found a parallel in later sources nor in modern Chamorro. Moreover, the word *chamorro* or *chamor* existed already in Sanvitores’ days, be it that originally it did not mean ‘chief’ but ‘friend’, as revealed in the oldest word list (1565) of the language by Esteban Rodríguez (cf. Rodríguez-Ponga 2013: 32-34).

The *na* before *manga* is probably the so-called linking particle placed between modifier and noun and between demonstrative and noun (Topping and Dungca 1973: 138-139); also see section 5.7.4 where this particle was noted already. Sanvitores writes this particle apparently without recognizing it as such.

---

*Fragment 13: f. 32r*

[Image of handwritten text]

---

46 See section 5.3 above. Concerning Blancas as a source of linguistic information for missionaries working in the Philippines, cf. Ridruejo (2007) and Chapters 4 and 5.
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Fragment 13: f. 32r (continued)

Praeponi etiam verbo solet haec particula ta, sed quae ut desumpta ex pronomine hita deservit solum primae personae plurali, v. g. tafanocho hita: mandecemus, ex ta et fan et socho. De quibus particulis et eorum exemplis agetur commodius in vocabulario. Quod audece attinet est advertere quod quando accedunt verbo praedictae particulae dissyllabae, repetitio quae facienda erat in prima syllaba radicis pro praesenti et futuro, solet fieri in secunda syllaba particulae componentis, non repetita vel repetita etiam quandoque prima syllaba radicis, v. g. si Jesus napapahipa sa cruz: Jesus iacet seu pendet extensus in cruce. Praefatis particulis addi etiam vel inseri solent supradictae aliae frequentiores um et an pro activa, et in et a pro passiva, sine quibus item fiunt activa et passiva cum suprapositis particulis, sed fere discerni non potest quando est activa aut passiva, nisi ex adiuncto genitivo personae agentis, qui denotat passivam, vel ex alis circumstantiis locutionis.

Also the following particle is regularly used as a verbal prefix: ta. However, since it is taken from hita it serves only for the first person plural, for instance: tafanocho hita: [let’s eat], ex ta et fan et socho. It will be easier to treat these particles with accompanying examples in the vocabulary. What is relevant now is to observe that when the dissyllabic particles mentioned above are added to the verb, the reduplication that had to be made in the first syllable of the root for the present and future, normally takes place in the second syllable.

---

47 Ms: ‘pluralis’. Burrus: ‘plurali’
48 Spanish word. A proper Latin word would be glossarium.
49 Burrus: tenus in cruce. However, extensus in cruce, can be found equally if not more frequently in other sources, so there is no reason to correct the manuscript text.
of the composed particle, with a repeated or also sometimes not repeated first syllable of the root, for instance: *si Jesús napapahipa sa cruz*; ‘Jesus lies or hangs stretched on the cross’. The other and more frequent particles *um* and *an* for Actor-Focus and *in* and *a* for Goal-Focus are generally added to or inserted with the particles mentioned above. Actor-Focus and Goal-Focus constructions occur also without *in, a, um* and *an* together with the particles mentioned above, but then it can hardly be discerned whether there is Actor- or Goal-Focus, except from an added oblique Agent which indicates Goal-Focus, or from other contextual information.

This is the first time Sanvitores makes mention of a vocabulary, which he probably still had to write. It may also be that with this word he is only referring to the ‘exercises’ (examples of translated ordinal texts) following the actual grammar. If he indeed had time to write a vocabulary, it is probably lost.

Sanvitores dissects the word *tafanocho* entirely correctly. The word *socho*, however, is spelled as *chocho* in modern Chamorro. The *ch*-sound is pronounced as ‘*ts*’, as in the English word *flirts* (Topping 1969: xxvi). The pronunciation of the first letter may have shifted from *s* to *ts* in the course of time. It is not likely that Sanvitores would not have heard the first letter correctly, for in the next paragraph he distinguishes ‘*s*’ and ‘*ts*’ clearly, when he gives *siro* next to *chiro* as an example. Therefore, it is more likely that his interpreter isn’t consistent in his pronunciation. In the first section of his grammar (folia 27v, not treated in the present chapter) about the correct pronunciation, Sanvitores makes a remark about this inconsistency of his interpreter, as a result of which he often gives two or more alternatives for pronouncing sounds. As an example Sanvitores gives *Cha seu sa* and *Chi seu si* (‘*Cha or sa*’ and ‘*Chi or si*’).

The root of the verb *napapahipa* must then be *hipa*, which in modern Chamorro has become *apo*’, meaning ‘lean against’ or ‘rest in a recumbent position’. The full word given here would then be in modern orthography: *mafafa+apo* or *nafafa+apo*. Reduplication does not necessarily take place in the root of the verb but can also take place in the stressed syllable, so the form here may be correct, but I haven’t found it in modern sources. As Sanvitores explained in the previous paragraph, the ‘double prefix’ *napa* can indicate a state or place remaining after a movement, and this then is an example of the function of *napa*. 
Furthermore, under the influence of these combined particles often the first syllable of the root varies and loses a letter or is changed in form by the last letter of the combined particle, for instance: *siro* or *chiro*: brother; *sumiro hita*: let us be brothers, you and me; *manumiro hita na ladyam*: let us all be brothers, indeed from *man* and *sumiro*.

50 Ms and Burrus: *additur*, which is unlikely to be correct, since in meaning (‘being added’) it overlaps completely with the word ‘*adjecto*’ and therefore makes no sense.
Also a compound verb can occur, when two noncompound words together form one unit of meaning, for instance: hinaron: ‘heart’; gof: ‘good’ and with the addition of ma it also includes: ‘goodness’. From these comes: magof hinaron, having a loving heart, to which root um as well as an is added and which root is conjugated, for instance: Umagof hinaron hao sayna mami na si Dios: ‘be [imp. sg.] with a loving heart towards God our Father’.

The word siro or chiro has become che’lu in modern Chamorro. It is remarkable that in the two sentences he gives as illustrations Sanvitores uses a subjunctive form (with optative meaning) of the Latin verb esse (‘to be’), while in a previous section Sanvitores explained that an optative is expressed in Chamorro by the imperative form (see section 5.7.5). Also, Sanvitores explicitely explained to his readers that the infix -um-, inserted here in the root siro, is a verbalizer, not an infix of mood. So, possibly, the copyist has twice changed the indicative form sumus into the subjunctive form simus. Considering that it would be quite a major alteration to change both such clearly written instances of simus into the indicative sumus, written also by a copyist who had a perfect understanding of the difference between simus and sumus, I conjecture that Sanvitores wanted to show to his colleagues that if one wants to express a wish, one can, by lack of a true and marked optative mode, use the indicative mode instead as well, next to the imperative mode. As we have already seen, he wasn’t aware of the irrealis (i.e., subjunctive/optative/future) function of the prefix fan–.

The word ladyam in the sentence manumiro hita na ladyam has become lahyan or layan in modern Chamorro. However, it is not used anymore in the meaning of ‘all’, but nowadays means ‘many’ or ‘much’. ‘All’ is expressed by the Spanish word todo (already in Ibáñez’ dictionary of 1865). The linking particle na in this same sentence was noted earlier in this chapter (see section 5.7.4).

The last paragraph (Fit quoque…nostrum deum) is quite complicated. Sanvitores argues that two ‘noncompound words’ – to use his own definition of the word radix as given in his description of nay (see section 5.7.2) – can be combined to form a verbum compositum, which can refer to either ‘compound verb’ or ‘compound word’. Since this is still the section about verbs (Caput 3: de Verbo), Sanvitores means ‘compound verb’ here, consisting of two elements which together form
one meaning (in unam [sc. significationem] coeunte). Sanvitores gave both the words magof and gof in earlier examples, in the meaning of ‘good’ as well as ‘very good’ (see section 5.7.3), without any further explanation. This time he (very implicitly) argues that magof is composed of gof and the prefix ma-, which, as he explained above, is a prefix creating intransitive and stative verbs. So, according to Sanvitores, gof means ‘good’ or ‘very good’ and magof ‘being good’ or ‘having the quality of goodness’. The combination with hinaron results then in ‘having a very good heart’.

In Topping’s dictionary the word gof is translated as ‘very’, ‘extremely’ and magof as ‘happy’. Safford, however, gives the following description of gof and its counterpart chat:

These two prefixes are used with many words as contrasts to each other. Gof [or gef, or ges] express a good quality; chat expresses a bad quality. As prefixes to adjectives gof is also frequently used to indicate the superlative/absolute and chat to indicate the imperfection of a quality. (Safford 5: 516 [1903])

This seems to indicate that the original meaning of gof was indeed, as Sanvitores says, ‘good’ as well as ‘very good’. It should be noted, however, that though Sanvitores uses the Latin superlative form optimus he does not see gof nor magof as true superlatives. In the section about the adverb he explains that Chamorro has no special superlative form and that the superlative is expressed by adding an adverb.

The last example given of a Chamorro sentence would be in modern orthography: Umagof hinalom hao saina-mami na si Dios. The word hinaron is given by Safford as hinalom, in the meaning of ‘the inside’ or ‘heart’, as a combination of halom (‘inside’) with the nominalizing infix -in-. In Topping’s dictionary, however, hinalom is not included. Similar words like hatalom and sanhalom are given, but only in the meaning of ‘inside’, not in the meaning of ‘heart’. Probably in Safford’s days the word hinalom in this latter meaning had still survived next to the Spanish corazon, while nowadays hinalom has become obsolete. The Spanish

51 For in unam coeunte in this meaning, cf. M. Devarius, Liber de Graecae Linguae Particulis (1588): “…in unam significationem coeunt […] ut εἰ meaning ‘if’, while εἰ μὴ means ‘except’…]

52 With ‘a very good heart’ (the most literal translation of ‘optimum cor’) Sanvitores means ‘loving heart’. Cf. Gottfried of Ammond (d.1165), Homiliae Dominicales, 195 “cor optimum cor mollitum per amoris gratiam” ([an optimum cor is a heart softened by the grace of love’).
equivalent was already taken up by Ibáñez in his Chamorro dictionary of 1865 as the Chamorro word for ‘heart’.

5.8 Conclusion

The close reading analysis of Sanvitores’ treatise on the verb reveals a lot about his pragmatic method in explaining the intricacies of the Chamorro verbal system and of the language in general. He clearly distinguishes roots and affixes and is aware of the fact that a root can function as a noun as well as a verb and can be combined with a series of affixes that create Actor-Focus, non-Actor-Focus, intransitive and stative verbs, actively applying notions of perspective to illustrate these pragmatic effects of the affixes. Also, he describes the durative vs. non-durative aspect system accurately, in agreement with modern scholars that Chamorro is tense-less; he is aware of the ergative nature of the language and even describes the phenomenon of the antipassive. In fact, contrary to the negative verdict made throughout the ages with respect to his analyses – mainly caused by a first-sight-misjudgment of his usage of Latin cases – he shows a remarkably high level of linguistic understanding.

Furthermore, the analyses of the text fragments show that the manuscript is actually a gold mine for the (historical) linguist in general and for Chamorro linguists in particular. In general, because it contributes substantially to a complete and accurate picture of the level of insight available in the 16th and 17th centuries and may thus contribute as well to a re-evaluation and new insights concerning other linguistic material in, for instance, Spain and New Spain, from missionaries or other sources. In particular, because the present analysis sheds new light on the linguistic sources of the Philippine missionaries. Sanvitores appears to make conscious choices in his use of terms and in structuring his grammar and deviates now and then from the classical doctrine, for instance regarding parts of speech and of course in his innovative way of using Latin grammatical terminology. Also, his grammar reflects direct influence from the Grammaticae Proverbiandi, instead of the grammar of Nebrija.

Finally, Sanvitores’ grammar is a document of great value for both the modern and the historical linguist working on Chamorro. For modern linguists, since it provides all kinds of clues regarding the nature and true meaning of and ‘family ties’ between the great number of affixes and
particles in Chamorro. For historical linguists because the grammar provides lots of new insights into the state of the language in pre-Spanish times and the development of the language through the ages.
6. Conclusions

Sanvitores wrote his grammar of Chamorro already on board of the ship bringing him to Guam, the largest of the Mariana islands, helped by a Tagalan interpreter who had lived there for 17 years. He also wrote part of the introductory letter that he planned to finish before sending it to Manila but when he arrived at Guam, he was so occupied in evangelizing and dealing with other affairs that he had to postpone his writing till the following year. Considering his success in conversion, with the help of this grammar, he decided to send this grammar and the first part of the introductory letter to Manila, where it was copied neatly and sent to Rome. There it is stored in the archives of the Vatican.

The copied manuscript as stored in the Vatican archives contains a number of errors. Thus far only a transcription has been made of the grammar, by E.J. Burrus in 1954. In this transcription some of the mistakes made by the copyist are corrected but others are overlooked and sometimes Burrus added new mistakes himself. The second part of the letter, which Sanvitores wrote in the following year, has not been transcribed, but is preserved in the Vatican archives too. The entire introductory letter (part one and two) deserves a proper annotated transcription and translation in its own right.

Sanvitores wrote his grammar in Latin, other missionaries in this area wrote theirs in Spanish. The theory that the missionaries tried to replace the vernacular with Spanish (and/or Latin) in order to subordinate the islanders to the Spanish court, is erroneous. Instead, the missionaries tried painstakingly to learn the vernacular themselves, striving even to learn it to perfection, hoping thereby to convert as many people as possible. The theory that Sanvitores wrote his grammar in Latin because it was considered the ‘language of God’ and superior to the vernacular and a language he wanted to teach to the islanders as a replacement for the vernacular, is incorrect. His goal was to benefit from the fact that they had no system of written signs yet, by teaching them to use the Latin characters for their writing, for the sole reason that it would make it easier for him to let them read and learn Ordinal texts.

All the general verdicts on the supposed poor quality of Sanvitores’ grammar are seriously mistaken and are the result of a complete misunderstanding of the remarkable level of insight Sanvitores had into the Chamorro language. Firstly, contrary to what Burrus’ concluded
(1954: 942; n. 21) that Sanvitores wrote down the Chamorro words syllable after syllable as he heard them from his interpreter with little attempt to distinguish words, Sanvitores in fact clearly and correctly distinguishes roots from affixes; he rightly concludes that the roots can function as nouns as well and accurately explains how these affixes create Actor-Focus, non-Actor-Focus and intransitive and stative verbs. The low appreciation of his work is also a result of a misunderstanding of the innovative linguistic method he applied. This linguistic method can be recognized as well in works of other missionaries working in the Philippine area, starting with the grammar of Tagalog by Father Francisco Blancas de San José (1560–1614; Blancas, 1997 [1610]). Because it was a group of missionary linguists, who were influenced by each other’s works and used the same method of analysis, they can be seen as the Philippine school of missionary linguistics. Moreover, the method of this Philippine school shows great similarities with the pragmalinguistic method known as Functional Grammar and its follow-up, Functional Discourse Grammar, to such an extent that it would do them justice, though they never intended to coin a new linguistic method, to consider them the founding fathers of Functional Grammar. Sanvitores and the other members of this Philippine school of linguistics form a distinct chapter in their own right in the history of linguistics and are entitled to be treated as such in the handbooks of the history of linguistics.

The Philippine missionaries used case names in a meaning different from the definitions given by Nebrija. They went back to the original perspectival meanings of the cases (location, direction, movement, etc.) and gave a prominent role to the nominative, redefined as the pragmatic function of Topic/Focus. Blancas, one of the missionaries, even defines this function in exactly the same way as Simon Dik would do roughly 300 years later. The missionaries left out the ablative case in their analyses because it is a syncretistic (and hence ‘multiperspectival’) case and as such not suitable for explaining the organization of a language with the help of distinct perspectival notions.

This school of Philippine missionary linguists also clearly takes sides in current points of discussion in linguistics. Concerning the term Subject, they illustrate convincingly that it is not applicable in agentive sentences and that the syntactic level of Subject/Object is not relevant in functional analyses because it has no Perspectival function and does not contribute in any way to the pragmatic presentation of a State of Affairs (SoA). The
missionaries prefigured the view of modern linguists that in linguistic analyses of Philippine-type languages it is more proper to use the term Topic instead of Subject. A similar conclusion can be drawn with respect to the supposed ergativity or non-ergativity of Philippine languages: there is no clear evidence that the missionaries were aware of the phenomenon but they show that by explaining a language on a purely semantic-pragmatic level, the matter of whether the language is ergative or not, becomes irrelevant too. Regarding the debate on the suitability of the classical parts of speech to distinguish word classes in Philippine languages, Sanvitores demonstrates convincingly that this word-class rubrication works fine in Chamorro too, explaining that roots of a word can shift from one class to another by a process called conversion. In the case of the ongoing debate on the validity of the term ‘passive’ in Philippine languages, the missionaries show that it can be applied in Philippine languages as well if it is used on a pragmatic level because it reflects a change in Perspective. As the works of the missionaries illustrate convincingly, perspective is a powerful pragmatic function (or group of functions) and deserves to be more accurately described and more extensively applied in modern functional or pragmatic linguistic theories.

Sanvitores also correctly applies the Latin tense terminology in describing the durative vs. non-durative aspect system of Chamorro, completely in agreement with modern scholars that Chamorro is tenseless. And finally, in this listing of modern linguistic debates in which Sanvitores and his colleagues take sides or even provide new insights, Sanvitores takes a clear stand in the discussion whether or not the lexical categories in the classical parts of speech are applicable to Philippine-type languages. He fully agrees with Chung (2012) that it is indeed applicable, that noun, verb and modifier are the basic building blocks of the parts of speech and that a constituent can turn from noun into verb and into modifier and vice versa by a process known as conversion.

Perspective is one of the linguistic fundamentals of the pragmatic approach of the Philippine missionary school: explaining the structure and dynamics of a language by using perspective – in terms of backgrounding, foregrounding, contrast, movement and direction, Topic and Focus – as a fundamental concept. The term ‘perspective’ is used now and then in Functional (Discourse) Grammar but is not formally defined. Using perspective as a pragmalinguistic function not only
helped the missionaries to explain vividly the picture created by an utterance in the language at hand. They also used perspective as a fundamental linguistic notion that led them to attribute pragmatic meanings to case names and redefine the terms passive and active. The results these missionaries achieved in using perspective as a pragmatic linguistic concept should seriously urge today’s functionalists to try to define perspective formally and test extensively its applicability as a fundamental pragmatic concept in their grammars. That being said, we must also conclude that in one instance, in the case of antipassive sentences, Sanvitores seems not to have succeeded in describing it adequately with the help of his semantic-pragmatic tools, apparently confused by the complex combination of focuses or perspectives in one and the same type of sentences.

Antonio de Nebrija’s works on Latin grammar are generally considered to be the authoritative linguistic source for the missionaries. This may be true for missionaries working elsewhere in the world but does not hold, at least in some quite fundamental aspects, for a number of the Philippine missionaries. More specifically, Sanvitores’ treatise of grammatical subjects shows that he has tapped concepts and terminology from the Grammaticae Proverbiandi.

Sanvitores’ grammar and catechism are an important source for Chamorro historical linguistics. It provides information concerning the diachronic changes taking place in the language and sheds new light on questions thus far unanswered with respect to the complex system of affixes in Chamorro. Close reading analysis of a larger part of Sanvitores’ grammar and the analysis of fragments in the grammars of other missionaries working in this area have shown that these texts can be of great value for historical as well as modern linguistics and all deserve to be analyzed in depth.
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Summary
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Father Diego Luis de Sanvitores’ grammar (1668) within the tradition of Philippine grammars

In the introductory chapter of this thesis I have quoted the philosopher Richard Rorty, who argues that people who create new insights or perspectives, who advance our understanding of ourselves or the world around us, succeed in doing so by developing a new vocabulary. This new vocabulary works as a set of tools that creates something new, provides new insights which could not have been seen or understood before this new vocabulary came into existence. The missionaries who in the seventeenth century undertook serious efforts to learn the languages of the Philippines – including Chamorro, which they also saw as a Philippine-type language – did succeed in developing a new set of tools which created a new linguistic method, a method that could not have been envisaged without this vocabulary.

The missionaries were not scientists, did not have the intention to develop a new linguistic theory and still stood firmly rooted in the tradition of the framework and concepts of Latin grammar. Therefore, they didn’t feel the urge to develop an entirely new vocabulary in the sense of a new set of terms. They used terms from Latin grammar but attributed new meanings to these terms deviant from the ones current in those days as described and defined in the authoritative Latin grammars of that time. These new meanings give expression to a predominantly pragmatic linguistic approach. In these Philippine-type languages the missionaries recognized that the internal organization, the morphosyntactic structure, is strongly determined by the element that the speaker wishes to present as the most prominent, the element that determines the perspective from which the speaker wants to present a State of Affairs, in short, the element which functions as Topic or Focus. By taking this function of Topic/Focus – the missionaries did not distinguish systematically between the two – as a starting point in explaining the
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structure and dynamics of the languages concerned, they developed a linguistic method with concomitant terminology which shows striking resemblances with what today is called pragmalinguistics or Functional Grammar. They continued using Latin case names and other Latin grammatical terms but used these terms with a semantic-pragmatic meaning. The term ‘nominative’ was used to refer to the function of Topic/Focus, the ‘genitive’ was used for the Oblique Agent, ‘dative’ meant Beneficiary and ‘accusative’ was linked to instrumental and locative functions. The terms ‘active’ and ‘passive’ were also given new pragmatic meanings – Actor-Focus and non-Actor-Focus respectively – and the syntactic level of Subject and Object was considered irrelevant for displaying the dynamics of agentive sentences in the languages involved and was hence consistently discarded in linguistic analyses of these sentences.

This thesis shows that these missionaries have been criticized unjustly throughout the subsequent ages in not having understood the languages they described. It is argued here that, instead, their approach was astonishingly innovative; that in fact they were roughly three hundred years ahead of their time in developing a pragmalinguistic method of analysis; and that even in some linguistic matters which are still subject of debate today among linguists they take clear and convincing stands.

In this thesis the grammar of one of these ‘Philippine missionaries’ takes centre stage: the grammar of Chamorro – a language spoken on the Mariana islands – written in 1668, in Latin, by the Jesuit Luis de Sanvitores (1627–1672) – and archived in the libraries of the Vatican in a codex entitled Lingua Mariana. The findings from the analysis of this grammar are put in a broader context by showing the use of a similar method of analysis and a similar use of Latin grammatical terms in grammars of other missionaries working in the Philippines in the seventeenth century. These missionaries all practised the same linguistic approach, and in doing so created this new functional method of analysis. From the analysis of Sanvitores’ work it emerges that, thanks to this new semantic-pragmatic vocabulary, he acquired a surprisingly high level of insight into the fundamental characteristics of Chamorro, for instance the central function of the Focus-element, the system of roots and affixes with its pragmatic functions, the durative/non-durative aspect system and the ergativity of the language. The analysis also makes evident that Sanvitores (and other ‘Philippine missionaries’) took the liberty to deviate from the grammatical model of the authoritative
Spanish grammarian Antonio de Nebrija and instead took inspiration and terminology from popular grammars of those days known as *Grammaticae Proverbiandi*, grammars in which Latin was explained with the aid of examples in the vernacular (e.g. Catalan).

The thesis also demonstrates that an integral translation of the Lingua Mariana – including the introductory letter that precedes the actual grammar – will be of cultural-historical interest and that, more specifically, a translation and thorough and detailed analysis of Sanvitores’ grammar will prove to be invaluable. This full and in-depth analysis will not only complete the picture of the extent of his linguistic insights but will also provide a description of the language of Chamorro before the process of Hispanicization started; furthermore it will give us more adequate understanding of how the complex system of affixes in Chamorro works and has come into existence.

The linguistic achievements of Sanvitores and his colleagues in this area have been criticized unjustly and neglected for ages. This thesis shows that they deserve a distinct and prominent place in their own right in the descriptions of the history of linguistics. They developed a linguistic method of analysis more than three hundred years before this linguistic method was formally described, and by applying this method they achieved astonishingly modern insights.

**Samenvatting**

**Missionaire Pragmalinguistiek**

*De grammatica uit 1668 van pater Diego Luis de Sanvitores in de traditie van Filippijnse grammatica’s*

*De geleidelijke, met vallen en opstaan gepaard gaande, creatie van een nieuw ... vocabulaire ... is niet de ontdekking van hoe oude vocabulaires ineen passen ... De juiste vergelijking is die met de uitvinding van gereedschappen die de plaats innemen van oude gereedschappen ... Zijn vocabulaire ... is een gereedschap om iets te doen wat niet gezien kon worden voordat een bepaalde set beschrijvingen ontwikkeld was, namelijk die beschrijvingen die het gereedschap zelf levert.*
In bovenstaand citaat (waarmee dit boek in hoofdstuk 1 begint) geeft de filosoof Richard Rorty een beeld van een uitvinder of dichter of ‘maker van iets nieuws’ die in staat is om iets nieuws te creëren doordat hij nieuw gereedschap maakt (of bestaand gereedschap op een geheel nieuwe manier gebruikt). De nieuwe manier van werken, het nieuwe gereedschap of het nieuwe vocabulaire leiden tot nieuwe inzichten die zonder dat nieuwe gereedschap niet in beeld waren en ook niet in beeld konden komen. De missionarissen die zich in de 17e eeuw inspanden om talen die op de Filipijnen gesproken werden te beschrijven (inclusief het Chamorro, dat ze ook als Filippijns taal zagen), hebben ook ‘werkenderwijs’ nieuw gereedschap, een nieuw vocabulaire ontwikkeld waarmee ze een taalkundige aanpak konden realiseren die zonder dat vocabulaire niet in beeld kon komen.

Deze missionarissen waren geen wetenschappers, hadden niet de intentie om een nieuwe taalkundige methode te ontwikkelen en stonden met minimaal één been nog stevig geworteld in de traditie van het raamwerk van de Latijnse grammatica. Ze voelden daarom niet de behoefte om een in letterlijke zin geheel nieuw vocabulaire te ontwikkelen. Ze gebruikten termen uit de Latijnse grammatica, maar gaven aan die termen wel betekenissen die afwijken van die welke in die tijd gangbaar waren, zoals ze beschreven waren in de gezaghebbende Latijnse grammatica’s in die tijd. De betekenissen die de missionarissen gaven aan termen uit de Latijnse grammatica gaven uitdrukking aan een taalkundige benadering die sterk pragmatisch was. Ze herkenden in de talen waar ze mee te maken hadden dat de interne organisatie van de talen, de morfop-syntactische structuur, sterk bepaald wordt door welk element door de spreker het meest centraal wordt gesteld, welk element het perspectief bepaalt vanwaaruit de handeling gepresenteerd wordt, kortom, welk element Topic of Focus is. Door deze functie van Topic/Focus – ze maakten geen systematisch onderscheid tussen beide – als uitgangspunt te nemen bij hun uitleg van de structuur van de talen ontwikkelden ze een methode met bijbehorend vocabulaire die sterk vergelijkbaar is met wat tegenwoordig ‘pragmalinguistiek’ of ‘Functionele Grammatica’ wordt genoemd. Ze bleven de Latijnse naamvallen en andere grammaticale termen gebruiken, maar gebruikten deze termen in semantisch-pragmatische zin. Zo kreeg de naamval ‘nominativus’ de

Dit proefschrift laat zien dat het werk van deze missionarissen ten onrechte door de eeuwen heen de kritiek heeft gekregen dat de schrijvers de talen waarover ze schreven niet begrepen en toont aan dat ze in hun aanpak juist bijzonder vernieuwend waren en in feite hun tijd ruim driehonderd jaar vooruit en dat ze zelfs inzake een aantal taalkundige kwesties die hedentendage nog onderwerp van discussie zijn duidelijke en overtuigende standpunten innemen.

In dit proefschrift staat de analyse van de grammatica van één van deze ‘Filippijnse’ missionarissen centraal: de grammatica van het Chamorro – een taal gesproken op de Mariana eilanden – in 1668 geschreven, in het Latijn, door de jezuïet Luis de Sanvitores (1627 - 1672) en bewaard gebleven in de archieven van het Vaticaan onder de naam Lingua Mariana (inclusief een lange brief over onder andere de oorsprong van de bewoners). De bevindingen uit deze analyse worden in een breder kader geplaatst door overeenkomsten te zoeken in grammatica’s van andere missionarissen in de 17e eeuw uit dit gebied, die elkaars werken bestudeerden en die op die manier gezamenlijk deze functionele taalkundige benadering vorm en inhoud gaven. Uit de analyse van het werk van Sanvitores blijkt dat hij met behulp van het nieuw ontwikkelde semantisch-pragmatische vocabulaire een verrassend goed inzicht toont in fundamentele kenmerken van het Chamorro, zoals de centrale functie van het Focus-element, het systeem van woordstammen en affixen met hun pragmatische functies, het duratief–non-duratieve aspectsysteem en de ergativiteit van de taal. Uit de analyse blijkt ook dat Sanvitores (en andere missionarissen) de vrijheid namen om af te wijken van het grammaticale model van de gezaghebbende Spaanse grammaticus Antonio de Nebrija en in plaats daarvan inspiratie en termen ontleenden uit de in hun tijd populaire Grammaticae Proverbiandi, grammatica’s waarin het Latijn werd uitgelegd met behulp van voorbeelden in de landstaal (bijv. Catalaans).
In dit proefschrift wordt ook gedemonstreerd dat een integrale vertaling van de *Lingua Mariana* in cultuur-historisch opzicht waardevol kan zijn, maar vooral ook dat een vertaling en grondige analyse van Sanvitores’ grammatica van onschatbare taalkundige waarde zal zijn. Een dergelijke analyse zal niet alleen het beeld van de taalkundige inzichten van Sanvitores verder completeren, maar zal ook een beschrijving opleveren van het Chamorro vóór de hispanisering van de taal. Sanvitores’ grammatica is immers de enige overgeleverde beschrijving van de taal uit die ‘pre-Spaanse’ periode. Tenslotte zal deze analyse ook meer inzicht verschaffen in het tot op vandaag deels nog onbegrepen systeem van affixen.

De taalkundige prestaties van Sanvitores en zijn collega’s in dit gebied zijn ten onrechte bekritiseerd en terzijde geschoven. Dit proefschrift laat zien dat zij een eigen plaats verdienen in de beschrijvingen van de geschiedenis van de taalkunde, omdat zij een functionele, pragmatische taalkundige analysemethode hebben ontwikkeld en toegepast – met verbluffend moderne inzichten als resultaat – meer dan driehonderd jaar voordat dergelijke methodes formeel beschreven en uitgewerkt zouden worden.
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