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Much research has been done on the Audiencia, but there is no study of the Manila cabildo. The actas (minutes) of the Manila cabildo’s meetings for the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are preserved in the National Archives. This cedulario may stimulate someone to this neglected area of Filipino life.

It may be worthwhile quoting the abstract of the second royal decree in the collection.

*Cedula de 21. de Junio de 1574. por la cual manda S. M. que esta Ciudad se titule insigne M. N. y S. L. C. de Manila.*

Apparently it is not only present day Filipinos who delight in abbreviations. M. N. and S. L. C. surely could not mean anything but muy noble and siempre leal ciudad. Muy noble does not appear in the text of the decree. Another interesting item is the variant Yo el Rei in the text for Yo el Rey. The latter is incorporated in the Seal of the Bureau of Records Management (National Archives) of the Philippines.

The editors provide compelling reasons for reprinting the cedulario. The scarcity of the printed version. The almost total absence of any other collection of laws for the Philippines. This small collection of laws provides an epitome of social and civic legislation. While there is disparity between the law and its observance, the legislation provides a touchstone for judging the basic attitudes of the lawmakers. But more important than the study of these laws, taken with the complete corpus of Philippine colonial legislation,

is the determination of if and how these laws were fulfilled and the degree of their impact on Philippine society. Spanish legislation was a key factor in the destruction or transformation of pre-hispanic Philippine society. If for no other reason it is worthy of meticulous investigation.

V. L. Badiillo
authors correctly predict that, although their work is based on the most modern techniques and theories of scientific linguistics, it is possible that within a decade or two, it may in its turn become "obsolete"—such is the rapidity of progress in linguistic theory today.

This book is important for two reasons: (a) it is based on the most modern techniques of grammatical analysis, i.e. the transformational model, as this was elaborated by Noam Chomsky in his 1965 book *Aspects of a Theory of Syntax*, and as this model was applied to English structure by Jacobs and Rosenbaum in their book *English Transformational Grammar* (1968); and (b) it is written entirely in Tagalog, thus providing the classroom teacher with the necessary scientific terms that they need to explain the complexities of Tagalog in Tagalog. Let me discuss both these points in greater detail.

The book is divided into two parts: Part A — Phrase Structure Rules, and Part B — Transformational Rules. The first part gives the phrase structure rules of Tagalog, using the Functional-Structural Approach of the Linguistic School of Prague. Essentially, the phrase-structural rules of a language furnish structural descriptions to the various utterances of a language. These rules, in other words, identify the constituent parts of the utterances of a language and describe their relationships in terms of the whole. They specify whether the utterance is well-formed or not. They are, therefore, usually stated in the form of equations with three parts: (1) a symbol on the left to signify the whole; (2) an equation symbol in the middle (Chomsky uses an arrow, while MB uses the equals sign); and (3) symbol(s) on the right to indicate the constituent parts of the symbol(s) on the left. Let us take an example: *John saw a movie*. This sentence would be analyzed as follows by Chomsky and by the authors of the MB:

**Chomsky**

\[
\begin{align*}
S & \rightarrow NP + VP \\
NP & \rightarrow VP + NP \\
NP & \rightarrow Det + N \\
NP & \rightarrow John \\
VB & \rightarrow saw \\
Det & \rightarrow a \\
N & \rightarrow movie
\end{align*}
\]

**Makabagong Balarila**

\[
\begin{align*}
P & = NP * VP * NP \\
NP & = John \\
VP & = saw \\
NP & = Det * N \\
Det & = a \\
N & = movie
\end{align*}
\]

It is evident that the Phrase-Structure rules of Chomsky and MB are essentially identical, although there are differences in their terms and symbols. Thus, Chomsky uses the following: *S* 'sentence', *NP* 'noun phrase', *VP* 'verb phrase', *Det* 'determiner', *N* 'noun', *VB* 'verbal'. The MB, on the other hand, uses the same terms except for *P* 'period', and does not use *S* or *VB* (at least for the sentence given above).

These Phrase Structure rules can be represented in the form of a tree diagram as follows by the two authors:
From these illustrations, it is clear that the Phrase-Structure rules of both Chomsky and MB are essentially identical.

The second part gives the transformational rules of Tagalog. This part uses Chomsky's 1965 model, which assumes that every utterance in the language has an "underlying (or deep) structure" and a "superficial (or surface) structure". The "deep structure" (henceforth DS) of an utterance specifies the meanings of "surface structures" (SS). The SS of utterances are what we hear the speakers say, while the DS is what the speakers meant to say. An example of this is given by MB: the SS *ikinuha ni Pedro ang bata ng Coke* has a DS *kumuha si Pedro ng Coke para sa bata*. The same SS may have different DS if the utterance is ambiguous; thus MB gives the example:

SS lumipad ang eroplano sa Maynila can have the following DS's:
1. lumipad ang eroplano *patungo sa* Maynila
2. lumipad ang eroplano *galing sa* Maynila
3. lumipad ang eroplano *paikot sa* Maynila
4. *dumaan ang eroplano sa* Maynila

Where do the transformational rules come in? They come in to relate the DS to the SS. If an SS has several DS's, then there are as many transformational rules. This is the case in the example given above.

It is about time that a grammar of Tagalog be written with such transformational rules, for to date we do not have any other device for explaining the ambiguities, synonymies, and anomalies (e.g. *colorless green ideas sleep furiously*) in the language. By following Chomsky's model of a grammar with DS and SS together with transformational rules which relate the DS to the SS of the utterances of the language, we have a "powerful device" — in the sense that it has greater "explanatory power" — for solving the complexities of the language; in this case, Tagalog.

The transformational analysis of Tagalog utterances by the authors of MB are modeled on that of Jacobs and Rosenbaum's analysis of English structure. However, they differ on several points, as for example, in the analysis of the verb structure (MB reduces the various focuses of the Tagalog verb to four, i.e. MAG/UM, (H)IN, (H)AN and I, and points out that the (H)AN and I are multi-ways ambiguous), and in their analysis of the verb aspects.

This combination of the use of the functional-structural approach for the Phrase-Structure rules and that of Chomsky's model for the transforma-
tional rule is not really an innovation. Robert Longacre has done this by using Tagmemics for the Phrase-Structure rules and Chomsky's transformational model for showing the relationships between the utterances of the language. As pointed out above, the Phrase-Structure rules essentially provide the structural descriptions of the utterances of the language, while the transformational rules provide the means of relating one type of utterance to the other. Chomsky, himself, borrowed Roulon Wells' "structural approach" for his transformational grammar.

The second important contribution of MB is the use of Tagalog itself in its explanation and description of Tagalog structure. This, in itself, is a big aid to teachers of Tagalog, who are looking for the appropriate terms in Tagalog for terms used in modern linguistics. Hopefully, this book can help standardize the terms used in modern linguistics. A proliferation of new terms will only lead to confusion.

There is a great need at present to construct materials in the National Language, if we want to hasten the adoption and acceptance of Tagalog as a National Language basis, and if we want to propagate the National Language as quickly as possible.

On the negative side, the book MB is rather too complicated for high school use. Even college students will find it difficult. Perhaps answers to the problems in the sections on drills, which follow regularly after each section, would be helpful. Apparently, the authors intended this book for the teachers of Tagalog Structure, and left its adaptation to the lower grades to the teachers themselves. If I am correct, then I suggest the authors organize seminars to train the teachers in the proper use of MB.

Finally, I suggest the Ateneo University Press keep the price of this book down. The listed price is P14.00. The prospective users of the book can hardly afford to pay more than that price for a textbook.

Fe Aldave-Yap


This is no ordinary life of saint. Nor is it an ordinary biography. It is one of those products of a lifetime of scholarship which one can call definitive without fear of being proved wrong. From 1918 until his death in 1971 at the age of 89 Father Schurhammer dedicated himself to the most painstaking and exhaustive research into all sources in every language to establish the facts not only of Xavier's life but of the European and Asian world in which Xavier spent his extraordinary life. This first of four