

## EDITOR'S NOTE

FRANZ CARL ALTER'S book on the Tagalog language published in Vienna in 1803 consists of six sections with the following headings: VORREDE (Preface), UEBER DIE TAGALISCHE SPRACHE VERGLICHEN MIT EINIGEN ASIATISCHEN SPRACHEN (On the Tagalog Language as Compared with Some Asian Languages), ZAHLWÖRTER (Numerals), VIERTER NACHTRAG ZUM VEZEICHNISSE DER VON FRANZ CARL ALTER PROFESSOR DER GRIECHISCHEN SPRACHE HERAUSGEGEBENEN WERKE UND VERSCHIEDENER AUFSÄTZE MIT ANMERKUNGEN), (Fourth Supplement to the Published Works and Various Articles with Annotations of Franz Carl Alter Professor of the Greek Language), DRUCKFEHLER (Printer's Errors), and NACHERINNERUNG (Reminder). All these sections, except for the section containing the fourth supplement to the published works and articles of Alter, are reprinted in this publication with parallel English translation.

We would like to thank Professor Marlies Spiecker-Salazar for making available to us a xerographic copy of Alter's book together with her English translation. Professor Salazar also prepared an introduction to the book and identified some of the languages used in the comparison.

We would like also to thank Professor Pedro A. Guasa, Jr. for preparing the Appendix of this publication availing of the list of languages earlier prepared by Professor Salazar. Professor Guasa, Jr. also cut and ran the stencils and collated the pages with extreme competence and care.

Finally, we would like to thank Mr. Conrado Calma and Mr. Luis Manalo of the University of the Philippines Press for the printing of the cover and the binding of this book. --EC

FRANZ CARL ALTER (1749-1804) was an Austrian Jesuit. A Doctor of Philosophy, he taught Greek at the University of Vienna, while serving as chief librarian of its library. Before getting interested in Tagalog, his studies and publications centered mainly on the Greek, Sanskrit and Slavonic languages. Quite naturally, his sources for the new area of philological exercise that Tagalog opened up for him were quite sparse, but they were quite well-known to linguistic scholars of the 18th century. PETER SIMON PALLAS (1741-1811) was a German scientist and explorer whose compilation of words from some 200 languages spoken in Europe and Asia for his country-woman Catherine the Great of Russia (Vocabularium catharinae, St. Petersburg, 1787-1789, 2 vols.) just continued to exploit the vein that Pigafetta had exposed more than two-and-a-half centuries earlier with his word lists. LORENZO HERVAS (1735-1809) was a Spanish Jesuit who is considered by some to be the "father" of comparative philology. In 1785, he published Idea del Universo, in 1786 Aritmetica delle Nazioni and between 1800 and 1802 his Catálogo de las lenguas conocidas in 3 volumes. As for the Archeologia Britannica, it was just as popular with scholars as the travel accounts of Forrest and Keate were in keeping with an epoch which enjoyed vicariously the voyages of Cook, La Pérouse or Le Gentil.

ALTER'S originality lies in his use of a manuscript as a base for comparison. Whatever the value of this comparison, the manuscript is of import to the history of Philippine linguistics. Its provenance and authorship should therefore be clarified. It is just possible that its former owner, the prelate Diego Denar W., was a Jesuit exile and that it was a Jesuit manuscript. If this is so, then Alter's Vocabularium could

be an early draft of Noceda y San Lucar's Tagalog vocabulary (Juan de Noceda, 1681-1747; S. J. and Pedro de San Lucar, 1707- ? S. J., Vocabulario de la lengua tagala), whose first edition was published in 1754 by the Imprenta de la Compañía de Iesvs in Manila with the Filipino Nicolas de la Cruz Bagay as printer. A copy of this edition exists in the National Library (no. 1553 in L. R. Medina's Filipiniana Materials in the National Library, Quezon City: U. P. Press, 1972).

Noceda y San Lucar's dictionary itself does not however appear to be the source of Alter's list. For instance, "diós" is simply "bathala" in Noceda y San Lucar, whereas Alter defines the term more elaborately (cf. item No. 1). For "plough" (item 165), one finds in Alter "Arada (sic) no le tenian," whereas in Noceda y San Lucar the Spanish Arado corresponds in Tagalog to both "sodsod" and "araro" (sudsod has been understood since at least the time of Serrano Laktaw to mean "plow point" or reja). In the same way, "bread" is simply "tinapay" in Noceda y San Lucar, whereas Alter elaborates after "tinapay" with "no lo avia entre ellos sino unas tortillas de arroz llamadas Pinais" from the Vocabularium. Neither Noceda y San Lucar's vocabulary nor any of its immediate manuscript drafts can obviously be considered as ancestral to Alter's manuscript source.

How about the earlier vocabularies upon which Noceda y San Lucar's work is based? In his introduction, San Lucar claims that the vocabulary had been started by the Dominican Francisco (Blancas) de San Joseph and continued by his fellow Dominicans Father Miguel Ruiz up to the letter D and Father Tomás de los Reyes up to the letter O, before it was finished by the Jesuit fathers Pablo Clain, Francisco Jansens and José Hernandez, who enriched the work with four thousand words. It was this final manuscript that Noceda corrected and polished before he died, leaving the task of publishing it to San Lucar (cf. the introduction to Noceda y San Lucar, Vocabulario, Manila: Imprenta de Ramirez y Giraudier, 1860; also Carlos Sanz, Bibliografía descriptiva y crítica de libros filipinos de Don Antonio Graiño, Manila: Instituto Nacional de Historia, 1976,

pp. 228-229). In this sense, is Alter's Vocabularium any one of these early drafts or a copy of them, particularly those by Clain, Jansens and Hernandez?

The "very short mutilated Tagalog-Spanish vocabulary up to Tayo, nosotros, on 7 pages" that Alter's manuscript source supposedly contains could have been the earliest Jesuit addition, that of Clain. Clain, whose name is the hispanized form of the German "Klein," was from Bohemia, then a part of Austria. Circumstantially, Clain could be the author of the Vocabularium. Our access to the contents of this manuscript is however limited only to its Spanish-Tagalog part which Alter used in conjunction with a probably traditional list (similar to modern ones like the Swadesh inventory) of Latin terms whose equivalents in Tagalog he sought out through Spanish. Now, as we have seen earlier, the definitions of this Spanish-Tagalog part cannot be matched with those in Noceda y San Lucar. Therefore, if Clain and the other Jesuits had really anything to do with Alter's Vocabularium, it could only be in relation to its Tagalog-Spanish part. About this part, however, we have nothing concrete from Alter.

The Spanish-Tagalog part, on the other hand, can be identified through Alter's list. It appears in fact to be closely related to (if not just a copy of) the corresponding part of Francisco Blancas de San Joseph's manuscript dictionary found in the Département des Manuscrits of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris and catalogued as Fond Malayo-Polynésien 244. A microfilm copy of this work, whose Spanish-Tagalog portion (folios. 22a - 490a) is the one entitled "Vocabulario de la lengua tagala compuesto por el Padre Fr. Francisco de S. Joseph de la Orden de S. Domingo," exists in the U.P. Main Library (MCF 4681). In 1979, Dr. Zeus A. Salazar of the U.P. Department of History was able to persuade the U.S.T. director of archives to allow the U.P. Library to microfilm an almost identical manuscript which had then recently been brought to light in the Dominican archives in Manila. This microfilm copy

seems to have disappeared, however, and could not be used for the present Note.

That the Paris manuscript is very close to Alter's source is evident from the very first item in his work, deus, whose Spanish equivalent "diós" is explained in San Joseph as "El mismo. Ellos llamauan antiguam. te bathâla alq dezian que era gran señor. Dioses de los gentiles. Ve. Ydolos." Alter obviously replaced "el mismo" (the same) with "Dios, like the Spaniards" and looking up the word Ydolo, took from San Joseph's "Laravan nang balang manang ynaarin Dios nang manga tauong di binyagan na di nacacaalam nang Dios na totoo" (Image of each of the accepted gods of the pagans who do not know the true God) just the incomplete phrase "Laravan, nang balang manang ynariin (sic)." For item 171 Urbs (German: Stadt; English Town, City), for which Spanish has "ciudad," "villa", and "pueblo", Alter actually looked up only the first term, misreading "camahalan" as "camahabang". San Joseph's definition runs thus: "Bayang mahal na may manga camahalang asal na valan gayo saybang maraming bayan. Ciudadanos. Ang manga tauong namamayan doon sa ciudada o manga taong macababayan sa. V.g. langit. ciudadanos del cielo." At the turn of the 17th century, "mahal" had more the sense of "precious, high quality" than "expensive" (cf. San Joseph, mahal: "Cosa preciosa y de estima y en nobleca muy honrosa. nag/mamahal hacerse o tener se por muy de estimar; namamahal ang laco. encarecerse") and apparently did not possess the present meaning of "love". Villa is defined in San Joseph as "Ang bayang casiyahan sa castilla na dile mahal at dacquilang lubha, at dile naman hamac na lubha," where "kasiyahan" still has the etymological meaning of "just right" (cf. kasiya "fitting"; siya nga, ano? "that's right (true)"). Pueblo of course simply "bayan", since barrio was the equivalent of "barangay". Alter's Arada (sic) no le tenian for item 165 (ARATRUM) is actually San Joseph's "No le tienen. Diran panorsor sacastilla. may pinagsasaca nang saca manacabubuqagqag nang lupa. Ve. arar". Arar is defined thus: "La tierra — sursur. mag. La tierra in. Ve. Arado". Magsursur thus meant "to plow", together



with sursurin "to be plowed", i.e. sursurin ang lupa; magsursur ng lupa), in contrast to the present magbungkal, bungkalin. Arado was thus panorsor (i.e. "the instrument for plowing") in Tagalog. In any case, what Alter got was just the first sentence in San Joseph's definition of "arado".

Alter was in fact either quite careless or not very knowledgeable in Spanish, if at all. In fact, it would appear that he relied heavily on his Latin to identify the equivalent Spanish words. For instance, he identified item 105 Lutum ("dirt") with Spanish luto instead of with suciedad and thus got the correct Tagalog equivalent for luto, which is locsa, modern spelling "luksa". The word "trahello" that Alter gives after locsa is actually a misreading of traherlo (i.e., traerlo "to wear it"). The complete definition in San Joseph is: "Locsa. Traherlo: nanlolocsa, por. q. ypinan lolocsa. Y tambien pinanlolocsaan" (Mourning. To mourn, nanluluksa. For whom: ipinanluluksa. And also: pinanluluksaan; mourning, mourning for, being mourned for). If items 26 ("Cheeks") and 28 ("throat") do not exist for Alter in the Vocabulario, it is probably because the corresponding Spanish terms ("carrillo" and "gargueno", respectively) are too far away from Latin genae and guttur for Alter to guess at them. In fact, San Joseph carries both Tagalog pisngi and lalamonan as the equivalents, respectively, of "carrillo" and "gargueno".

For item 94 Hyems ("Winter"), Alter obviously sought Spanish verno and thus got its correct Tagalog equivalent manugang ("son-in-law" or "daughter-in-law"). Had he looked for invierno ("winter"), he would have found San Joseph's explanation that this was a "Panahon nang ginao o caginauang arao o caginauang taon" (cold times, days, or year). The term taglamig ("winter") did not exist as yet (or if it did, San Joseph missed it); but tag-araw ("summer") did, although Alter gives the word tagarao as the equivalent of item 92 Ver ("spring"), after observing that the Tagalog equivalent of "summer" (item 91 Aestas) was "not in the Vocabulario." The reason

for both errors seems to be that Alter incorrectly identified Ver with the Spanish verano ("summer") and could simply not find a Spanish word in the Vocabulario which could be matched with Aestas.

Alter also mistook "l" for a "c", as in item 9 Vir ("Man") Tavong Calacqui, the latter corresponding in fact to San Joseph's tavong lalacqui, which defines Spanish varon ("male"). It was evidently varon that Alter looked up and not hombre "man") which San Joseph defines as "lalacqui". Alter likewise misread "Y" (items 56. Streptus, Noise, Tagalog Gn̄gai; 228. Bibere, to drink, Tag. Gnum; 160 Ovum, egg, Tagalog Stlog) and "y" (item 252. Vos, you, Tagalog Gago). In fact, in at least two instances, he mistook a Spanish phrase for a Tagalog word. In item 96 Tempus "time", Tagalog Noloay is simply "No lo ay". The FH text in San Joseph is "Noloay asi en comun. Dicen lo muchas veces por arao. V.g. buen tiempo hace — magaling ang arao" (Commonly, there is no such word. They express it generally with araw. For instance, the weather is fine: magaling ang araw). Item 83 also has Tagalog Noloay "Grando. Hail," which is granizo in Spanish. Alter actually found only granicar ("to hail"), but San Joseph's full text runs thus: "Noloay. De olan que es lluvia se puede decir; nonolan ..." (There is none. From ulan which is rain, one can say; umuulan ...).

From the internal evidence, one can thus easily see that Alter's manuscript source is quite close to San Joseph's Vocabulario, at least to its Spanish-Tagalog part. In fact, both are entitled Vocabulario de la lengua tagala. Both likewise refer in their pages to a Tagalog grammar. This is manifestly Francisco Blancas de San Joseph's Arte y reglas de la lengua, printed in Bataan by Thomas Pinpin in 1610, of which the U. P. Main Library has a microfilm the Bodleian Library copy in Oxford (MCF 4526).

There are some differences between the two manuscripts, however. Some words are apparently defined in

a different manner in both. The most important of these is Spanish milagro ("miracle" in item 125, which is defined in San Joseph as "Gawang dacquilang sariling P.D. na di magawa nang Yba, cundi siya lamang ang macagágawâ niñon nang sarili niyang ba. Tambien se dice: dacquilang gawang cababalaghan" (Great act done by God the Father himself which cannot be done by others but only himself can do it by his power. One also says: great marvelous act). The definition from Alter's sources is phrased differently thus: "Cagilagilalas nagaua, gauang y capagcaca mamanghan" (Astounding act, act which can be marveled at). Item 146 Musca "fly" has the strange Tagalog phrase ocaña gatla (untranslatable), whereas San Joseph gives for Mosca "Langao. mosca grande omoscardon: bangao..." (Fly. Big fly bangaw...).

The major difference lies in the constitution of each dictionary. Alter's manuscript source is composed of a Tagalog-Spanish (Vocabularium Tagalico-Hispanicum) of seven folio leaves apparently without any title, followed immediately by a Spanish-Tagalog vocabulary on 335 leaves or pages (Blätter) whose title is: Vocabulario de lengua Tagala. At the end is an essay on the Adverbios de lengua Tagala of 5 folio pages. As for the Paris manuscript, it begins with a non-titled Tagalog-Spanish vocabulary of 206 folio pages (i. e. 412 normal pages), followed from folio 207a to 222a by an essay on Tagalog particles and from folio 225a (folios 223-224 are blank) to folio 490a by the Spanish-Tagalog list entitled Vocabulario de la lengua tagala. At the end, from folio 493a to folio 504a, there is a "Tratado delas ligazones. dela lengua Tagala, o Ata/duras depalabras."

The core of both manuscripts, it would seem, is the Spanish-Tagalog vocabulary entitled Vocabulario de (la) lengua Tagala. In the manuscript of the Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris, it is this portion which is specifically "compuesto por el Padre Fr. Francisco de S. Ioseph de la Orden de S. Domingo." It may be assumed, therefore, that Alter's source is a copy (or a copy of a copy) of the Paris manuscript or its original or copies. In fact, Alter's Vocabularium, the Paris Vocabulario and the



recently discovered U. S. T. manuscript can be assumed to belong together. It is possible that other manuscripts of the same kind were in circulation in the Philippines and in Europe, among missionaries as well as among collectors from the time Blancas de San Joseph finished his Vocabulario until at least the publication of the first edition of Noceda y San Lucar's dictionary.

This latter work, for all intents and purposes, should be considered a completely different dictionary, San Lucar's claim notwithstanding. It is, in any case, certainly distant from the Paris manuscript — in terms of both the Vocabulario de la lengua tagala and the Tagalog-Spanish part, as any cursory comparison will show. This being the case, what should one think of the Tagalog-Spanish part of the Paris manuscript? For the moment, all that one can say is that it is written in the same hand as the Vocabulario de la lengua tagala and is therefore as old as the latter. In the task of dating the entire document, both the U. S. T. manuscript and, if found, Alter's manuscript source would be of great help. This philological work is of extreme urgency, particularly because of the cultural data that the Paris manuscript contains.

At least in helping to show the interrelationship of these documents, Alter's work contributes towards the elucidation of the context of Blancas de San Joseph's unique endeavor. Alter is likewise important from the point of view of both Philippine and Austronesian linguistics. In his study, a Philippine language is taken for the first time as a focal point of linguistic comparison, if only from a still simple philological vantage point. Likewise for the first time a relatively wide variety of Austronesian languages were compared — that is, if Chinese were to be excluded (although present Austronesian research cannot do this a priori, since the Austronesians are believed to have started their peregrinations from a South China homeland). Aside from Tagalog, Alter considered Magindanao, Pampango, Malay, Nias, Savu, at least four Sumatran languages

(Acheh, Batak, Lampong, and Rejang), Manggarai (Flores), Macassar, the Micronesian Palau, the Polynesian Tahiti, and even Malagasy! Whatever the later scientific validity of his work, Alter was starting the comparative study of Austronesian languages. When Alter's little book was published in 1803, Humboldt's Ueber die Kawi Sprache was still thirty-five years away in the future, von der Gabelentz' Die Melanesischen Sprachen some sixty years, and H. Kern's De Fidjitaal even eighty years away. In fact, in 1803 Indo-European linguistics was just being born. Despite all his all too evident amateurism, Alter was in many ways a predecessor of sorts in the domain of Austronesian linguistics.