



Internal and External Relationships of the Mangyan Languages

R. David Zorc

Oceanic Linguistics, Vol. 13, No. 1/2, Papers of the First International Conference on Comparative Austronesian Linguistics, 1974: Proto-Austronesian and Western Austronesian. (Summer - Winter, 1974), pp. 561-600.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0029-8115%28197422%2F24%2913%3A1%2F2%3C561%3AIAEROT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-H>

Oceanic Linguistics is currently published by University of Hawai'i Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/uhp.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS
OF THE MANGYAN LANGUAGES*

1. INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS. The application of the term Mangyan is useful only insofar as it refers to the indigenous mountain groups on the island of Mindoro, Philippines. An example in English of an equally general term would be "lowlander," grouping together the linguistically and culturally diverse Tagalogs, Ilokanos, and Bisayans who have poured into Mindoro since prehispanic times.

Little comparative work has been done on these languages, the first being Schneider (1912) and the most recent is Tweddell (1970). This latter article contains the best map to date showing the distribution of the various Mangyan languages. Consult Ward (1971:522) for other articles on individual Mangyan languages.

This paper is concerned with subgrouping five Mangyan languages: Hanunoo, Buhid, Tadyawan, Alangan, and Iraya. I was able to gather data on these languages during fieldwork in the central Philippines in 1972.¹ Datagnon, another language of Mangyans, is clearly in a subgroup with other West Bisayan dialects, and is most closely related to Kuyo and Semirara;² it is thus not immediately coordinate with languages of the other Mangyan groups. That is, if Dtg is a Bis dialect, we may

discuss the degree of relationship of Bis to Hanunoo (or the subgroup into which Han falls), and only in this way discuss the relationship between Dtg and Han, or Dtg and any other Mangyan language.

In this paper the principle is adhered to that one must have good criteria for subgrouping languages together before treating features of those languages as common innovations. Without such subgrouping, there is no reason to expect that shared features are not retentions from an early protolanguage, rather than innovations of a more immediate shared mesolanguage, ancestor to just the members of the posited group.

2. RELATIONSHIPS WITHIN MINDORO.

2.1. *Lexicostatistical evidence.* The following chart gives the scores for the five Mangyan languages based on the Swadesh 100 meaning list.

Han					
59	Buh				
46	41	Tdy			
47	43	63	Aln		
41	37	47	66	Iry	

The percentages are evidence for concluding that Hanunoo and Buhid are closely related, and that Tadyawan, Alangan, and Iraya are in a chain, with Alangan acting as an intermediate link between Tadyawan and Iraya. The low score between Iraya and Tadyawan is very striking. The sharp cut off in scores between Han-Buh and Tdy suggests a clear break between the two groups. The following are results from those of Dyen's comparison with a 196 meaning list. Although the scores differ the resultant subgrouping is the same:

Han - Buh	59.6%
Tdy - Aln	49.7%
Aln - Iry	52.5%

Thus the lexicostatistical evidence indicates, as Dyen concluded,³ that there is a Hanunoic group (including Hanunoo and Buhid) and an Irayic group (including Iraya, Alangan, and Tadyawan). For our purposes they can be called South Mangyan (SM = Hanunoic) and North Mangyan (NM = Irayic).

2.2. *Lexical evidence.* My data base includes a list of approximately 500 lexical items gathered in the field. My comparison is based on the agreement of forms among the Mangyan languages when such forms are not obviously Philippine. That is *mata 'eye', *di:laq 'tongue', *(q)ungaq 'child', *(q)anwang 'carabao', *ka-heyag 'ashamed', *manuk 'bird', and so on, are excluded. In some cases, these agreements may represent common innovations within Mindoro, such as *yangaw 'wood' (Tdy-Aln), *dasqug 'to arrive' (Han-Buh), but in many cases these agreements probably reflect retentions from an earlier Philippine mesolanguage, such as *kit 'to see' or *tu(g)kaw 'to sit', etc. In some cases I consider as significant the shape of a form if it reflects an unusual phonological shift (see C-4) or a potentially innovative morphological formative (see C-16 and C-27). I have checked the agreement of vocabulary with all possible configurations of two, three, or four of these five Mindoro languages.

The results of a two-language comparison tally nicely with the results of the lexicostatistical comparison. The greatest number of agreements in shared lexical items (the most common idiomatic form elicited in response to a particular meaning) indicate the same kind of subgrouping of North and South Mangyan languages as indicated by the results of the comparison with the Swadesh lists.

Han					
12	Buh				
0	3	Tdy			
1	0	27	Aln		
1	1	3	24	Iry	
A	B	C	D		

HANUNOO-BUHID

- A-1 'to arrive' Han dasqug, Buh dasug.
A-2 'day' Han, Buh siráng. (cf., W. B. Manobo sirang
'blinding (light)').
A-3 'daily' Han, Buh siráng-siráng.
A-4 'dry' Han, Buh layúng.
A-5 'fear' Han agka-dálaq, Buh ka-dala.
A-6 'finished' Han, Buh tabú.
A-7 'green' Han, Buh latúy.
A-8 'hungry' Han lunqus, Buh lunus.
A-9 'leaf' Han, Buh labúng.
A-10 'meat/flesh' Han paknul, Buh faknul.
A-11 'shoulder' Han, Buh lábáy.
A-12 'star' Han panggasan, Buh fanggasan.

HANUNOO-ALANGAN

- A-13 'to go' Han tábug, Aln tabuy.

HANUNOO-IRAYA

- A-14 'to give' Han pakáqun, Iry pakan.

BUHID-TADYAWAN

- B-1 'all' Buh fagayu, Tdy pagaleq.
B-2 'blood' Buh fulut, Tdy pilit (?) (Note. Euphemism
from PAN *pulut 'sticky (substance); sap'.)
B-3 'to see/meet' Buh-lag, lumag, Tdy pa-lumay.

BUHID-IRAYA

- B-4 'in-law' Buh tagyaw (sister-in-law), Iry agyaw
(brother-in-law).

TADYAWAN-ALANGAN

- C-1 'ashes' Aln buris, Tdy bulis.
C-2 'afternoon' Aln, Tdy bayapun. (cf. CPH *hápun)
C-3 'black' Aln magsengen, Tdy kasnengen.
C-4 'full' Aln, Tdy maknuq. (Dissimilation of *-pnuq.)
C-5 'to cut' Tdy dureq, Aln duduq.
C-6 'to come from' Aln, Tdy batang.
C-7 'to go ahead' Aln, Tdy tukaw.
C-8 'to hold' Aln yatang, Tdy gatang.
C-9 'how much?' Aln angkaruq, Tdy angkaluq.
C-10 'hungry' Aln yawes, Tdy ka-yawes.
C-11 'to lie on back' Aln pa-tarataq, Tdy mi-talataq.
C-12 'liver' Aln apruq, Tdy apluq. (Semantic shift from PPH
*qapeju 'gall'.)
C-13 'meat' Aln galem, Tdy layem.

Relationships of Mangyan

- C-14 'to see' Aln, Tdy ngit-an. (cf. *kit [T-2].)
C-15 'shame' Aln ka-rikuy, Tdy ka-likuy.
C-16 'sibling' Aln tay-ari-an, Tdy tay-ali-an. (Note tay
--an circumfix.)
C-17 'to sing' Aln baren, Tdy balen.
C-18 'to sleep' Aln, Tdy esek.
C-19 'smoke' Aln, Tdy elep.
C-20 'to stand' Aln, Tdy taydek.
C-21 'sun' Aln ibeng, Tdy ma-ybeng. (cf. Aln, Iry ma-qibeng
'hot'.)
C-22 'testicles' Aln, Tdy laklak.
C-23 'two' Aln duwayi, Tdy diwiq, juiq, jiq. (cf. Wbm duwey
'second wife'.)
C-24 'uncle' Aln, Tdy akiq.
C-25 'white' Aln ma-bugsiq, Tdy ka-buksiq.
C-26 'wood' Aln yangaw, 'firewood' Tdy yangaw.
C-27 'yesterday' Aln, Tdy kapuniq. (Note formative -iq.)

TADYAWAN-IRAYA

- C-28 'to carry on head' Iry sunung, Tdy ka-sunung-an.
C-29 'to push' Iry degseq, Tdy dukseq.
C-30 'old (person)' Iry, Idu kuyay.

ALANGAN-IRAYA

- D-1 'belly' Aln, Iry buyun. (cf. CPH *buyqun 'paunch, pot-
belly'.)
D-2 'calf (of leg)' Aln, Iry beres.
D-3 'to call' Aln buriyaq, Iry beriya.
D-4 'cold' Aln, Iry ma-dimlaq. (cf. T-1.)
D-5 'dirty' Aln, Iry rames.
D-6 'finger' Aln suluq, Iry sulu. (cf. Mb. *sulu 'finger-
nail'.)
D-7 'flower' Aln, Iry betakan.
D-8 'to give' Aln, Iry tabuy.
D-9 'gray hair' Aln sibuy, Iry sibuy.
D-10 'inside' Aln, Iry galem.
D-11 'knee' Aln, Iry dulang.
D-12 'to land on' (bird) Aln mis-kapet, Iry mi-kapet.
D-13 'to lie down' Aln, Iry palibay.
D-14 'lungs' Aln, Iry daragbayaq. (cf. PAN *baRaQ.)
D-15 'to make' Aln, Iry panaw-en.
D-16 'meat' Aln, Iry ablasen.
D-17 'right(side)' Aln, Iry pamalang.
D-18 'to say' Aln iplaung, Iry giplaung. (cf. SBis
*laquung 'to say'.)
D-19 'to select, pick' Aln qidang, Iry hidang.
D-20 'star' Aln, Iry magirem.
D-21 'thigh' Aln, Iry panubuy.

- D-22 'throat' Aln talaqu, Iry talawuq.
 D-23 'turbid,murky' Aln, Iry ma-rames.
 D-24 'wing' Aln, Iry lagay.

If we make a three-language comparison the largest number of agreements is among the NM group (Tdy-Aln-Iry); all other configurations have only one agreement.

TADYAWAN-ALANGAN-IRAYA

- E-1 'fart' Aln baytuk, Iry, Tdy baytek.
 E-2 'fear,afraid' Aln a-limuw-an, Iry a-limw-an, Tdy ma-limeq.
 E-3 'fire' Aln, Tdy bayaq, Iry baya. (cf. PAN *baRah 'embers'.)
 E-4 'flood' Aln, Tdy, Iry bungkalus.
 E-5 'foot' Aln darapaq, Tdy dalapaq, Iry raprapa. (cf. PPH *Dapa-Dapa 'sole'.)
 E-6 'to lie on stomach' Aln pa-talegeb, Tdy mi-talukeb, Iry i-lukub.
 E-7 'hot' Aln, Iry ma-qibeng, Tdy maybeng.
 E-8 'small' (diminutive suffix) Aln, Tdy, Iry -teq.
 E-9 'to throw' Aln, Tdy, Iry benglay.
 E-10 'today' Aln, Tdy nguna. (cf. Han taynguna.)
 E-11 'tomorrow' Aln guribas, Iry girabas, Tdy ulabas.

HANUNOO-BUHID-TADYAWAN

- F-1 'right(side)' Han sikún, Buhi sihun, Tdy tag-siken.

HANUNOO-BUHID-ALANGAN

None noted.

HANUNOO-BUHID-IRAYA

- F-2 'drown' Han na-limús, Buh in-limus, Iry na-limes. (the i is unexplained, cf. CPH *lemes)

HANUNOO-TADYAWAN-ALANGAN

None noted.

HANUNOO-TADYAWAN-IRAYA

- F-3 "I will not!" Han, Tdy, Iry dayúq.

HANUNOO-ALANGAN-IRAYA

None noted.

BUHID-TADYAWAN-ALANGAN

F-4 'to kill' Buh fahatay, Aln, Tdy pakatay.

BUHID-TADYAWAN-IRAYA

None noted.

BUHID-ALANGAN-IRAYA

F-5 'to wait' Buh fanay-an, Aln panaya-en, Iry panyaq-an.

The larger number of shared items in E(11) compared to the scattered number of shared items in F(5), helps to confirm the grouping of Alangan, Tadyawan, and Iraya together as a North Group, separate from Buhid and Hanunoo.

The question may be raised, however, if the North and South groups can be related. The lexicostatistical results give us no confirmation of a possible unity since there is a gap of no less than 12 points between the closest members of the two different groups (i.e., Han:Buh 59, Han:Aln 47; -12), often the gap is much larger (viz., Iry-Aln 66, Iry-Han 41, -25). In fact, the lexicostatistical results seem to counterindicate any direct genetic relationship between the two groups. However, the gap between Tdy-Iry is itself very large, and connection is indicated on the weight of the Alangan linkage. If we did not have Alangan, we should suppose that Iraya and Tadyawan were independent subgroups. Since this survey includes such languages distant in both the temporal and geographic sense, we are not made aware of the links that may exist between the two groups (such as Tweddell's mention of the Batangan for which I have no data).

It comes as no surprise then, that there are only a few forms shared by four groups. The following have been found:

HANUNOO-BUHID-TADYAWAN-ALANGAN

- G-1 'body' Han bílug, Buh habilugan, Tdy, Aln bilugan.
(cf. U-1)
- G-2 'palm (of hand)' Han, Aln, Tdy dalúkap, Buh daluhap.
(cf. Isg daku:la:p)
- G-3 'to sit' Han, Buh túkaw, Aln, Tdy tugkaw. (cf. Ilk
tugáw, Bik túkaw)
- G-4 'shirt' Han, Buh*, Aln, Tdy balukás.

HANUNOO-TADYAWAN-ALANGAN-IRAYA

- G-5 'intestines' Han, Tdy púnaq, Aln, Iry penaq.
G-6 'to see' Han na-kit-an, Iry a-kit-an, Tdy, Aln ngit-an.
(cf. T-2)
G-7 'today' Han tayngúna, Iry nguna, Aln, Tdy ngunaq.

BUHID-TADYAWAN-ALANGAN-IRAYA

- G-8 'nose' Buh uyung, Tdy ngulung, Aln, Iry urung.
(cf. V-1)
G-9 'to spit' Buh tufay, Aln, Tdy tupay, Iry tepay.
(cf. Ilk tupra, Ifg tukpa, Itb mittiypah, Kellahan
tupga)

Only two forms have been noted that occur in all five languages which cannot (yet) be traced to Proto Philippine. However, each is found outside of Mindoro.

- G-10 'across' Han dípay, Buh difay, Tdy lipay, Aln, Iry ripay. (cf. Mam dipi, Pal, Msk dipaq, also found in Borneo, e.g. Mukah dipah 'opposite bank'.)
G-11 'tall' Han qabuwát, Buh, Tdy, Aln, Iry abwat.
(cf. U-2)

Thus, there is no strong lexical evidence for the hypothesis that all of the Mangyan languages may be direct and sole descendants of a single mesolanguage. We do find confirmation in the general lexicon that there is a North and a South group, but that is about all.

However, it is important to realize that the time depth between these languages and the relative independence of each is such that any evidence of a direct genetic link may be hidden or buried. If lexical evidence is to be given any importance more research must be conducted on a greater number of these languages, and with a much broader data base than that presented here. Nonetheless, the data on hand has agreed with the lexicostatistical findings, and has given a few indications of links between the two Mindoro groups. What cannot be concluded is whether these similarities are due in the main to common inheritance or common inter-influence.

2.3. *MORPHOLOGICAL EVIDENCE.* One generally thinks of functors as forming or belonging to a more closed system than contentives, considerably less open to

borrowing, and requiring considerable time depth for any significant change. One notes that the pronouns are by and large less fragile than the deictics, but even here there is an ordering, so that the closer a form is in meaning to the first person, the less fragile it tends to be. Thus *aku 'I' persists, and *sira 'they' is often found to have been replaced; *ini 'this near me' is widespread as a deictic base, while the forms for 'that yonder' proliferate.

2.3.1 Pronouns. The disparity among the Mangyan languages can be seen in the pronominal system, as outlined below in H-1 and H-2.

In the topic system alone several points of difference can be noted. Hanunoo seems to be the most conservative language. Alangan has also been conservative, showing only an innovative -u in the third person forms, possibly on the analogy of the final u in the forms aku, kaqu, and kamu. Buhid shows encroachment of the oblique third person forms into the topic system, complicated further by the falling together of the reflexes of *kaniya and *kanida into a single Buhid hanya. In Iraya, all of the plural topic forms are identical with (and probably derived from) the oblique system, particularly the forms yamen, kuyu, and kura. Even iya may be suspect as an oblique form moved into topic function, later replaced in the oblique by kunin.

The Tadyawan data show the greatest amount of innovation. The long forms are least preferred and have, in most cases, a final -a replacing an original -i or -u (cf. kawa, kama, tama). The third person form kangen (like the Buhid) shows no distinction in number, and the second person plural tawa is apparently an innovation based on no constructable analogy known to me. The enclitic system has a very high frequency in Tadyawan texts, yet is very unusual from the point of view of the other Mangyan languages. The y- in the first person forms may be related to a similar feature found only in Iraya yamen, which may represent the full form from which Tdy -yam was derived. This may offer evidence for a competing *i- (non-syllabic *y-) set, as found in the Kalamian and Ivatan languages, Subanon and also in Pampango. This may be an alternate explanation for Iraya iya as well.

In the oblique system, Hanunoo appears as the most conservative, with Alangan again differing only in the

PRONOUNS--TOPIC

	HANUNOO	BUHID	TADYAWAN	ALANGAN	IRAYA		
H-1 1-sg.	akú	ahu	aku/-yak	aku	aku	*aku	+ 1
2-sg.	káwu	haw	kawa/-ka	kaqu	kawu	*kaØu	+ 1
3-sg.	siyá	hanya	kangen/-Ø	siyu	iya	*(s)iya	+ 4
1-pl.	kamí	hami	kama/-yam	kami	yamen	*kami	+ 2
1+2-sg.	kitá		/-ta	kita	kita	*kita	+ 1
1+2-pl.	kitám	tam	tama/-tam	kitam	tamu	*kitam(u)	+ 3
2-pl.	kámu	ham	tawa/-kam	kamu	kuyu	*kamu	+ 3
3-pl.	sidá	hanya	kangen/-Ø	siyu	kura	*si-Da	+ 4
	0	3	7 4	2	5	(number of differences)	

OBLIQUE PRONOUNS

H-2 1-sg.	kangku	angku	kangay/-yak	kangay	naqay	*kangku, kangay	
2-sg.	knamu	hiamu	kamu/-mu	kaymu	kumu	*kanmu, kaymu	
3-sg.	kanya	hanya	kangen/-ngen	kansiyu	kunin	*kanya	
1-pl.	kanmi	hiami	kanyam/-yam	kanyam	yamen	*kanmi, kanyam(en)	
1+2-sg.	kanta		kita/-ta	kanta	kita	*kanta	
1+2-pl.	kantam	antam	kantam/-tam	kantam	tamu	*kantam(u)	
2-pl.	kanyu	hayu	kanyu/-yu	kanyu	kuyu	*kanyu	
3-pl.	kanda	hanya	kangen/-ngen	kansiru	kura	*kanDa	
	0	3	4	2	8	(number of differences)	

formation of the third person forms using the marker *kan-* before the full forms *siyu* and *siru*. The Buhid forms generally parallel the Hanunoo set. We can presume that *hiamu* and *hiami* are from a **kaymu* and **kaymi*, with metathesis of the diphthong (**kyamu*, **kyami*). Buhid *hayu* reflects either the loss of *n* (if from **kanyu*) or of a geminate *y* (if from **kay-yu*). By a regular sound shift found in Buhid (**D* → *y*), **kanya* **kanDa* have fallen together, as Buhid *hanya*.

Tadyawan parallels the Alangan oblique forms, except for the second person singular (*kamu*), the loss of distinction between singular and plural in the third person and the innovational *kangen*, and the use of *kita* (which is normally a topic form) in the oblique.

The Iraya oblique set shows the greatest number of differences, although some of them can be resolved as the result of an innovational analogy within Iraya alone. If we allow for *ku-* as a replacive element for the original **kay-* or **kan-* formatives, then *ku-mu*, *ku-yu*, and *ku-ra* follow the patterns found in Hanunoo and Alangan. Possibly *kunin* is similarly analyzed as *ku-nin*, with *nin* itself being an innovational third person singular oblique form. We are still left with the unmarked forms *yamen*, *kita*, *naqay*, and *tamu*. It is possible that these are remnants of a now lost enclitic set parallel to that found in Tadyawan, so that the entire oblique Iraya set is actually a mixture of both preclitic and enclitic forms, which are now exclusively used in preclitic position. For example, the form *naqay* may be an enclitic form related to the *Aln* and *Tdy* preclitic *kangay*.

It is interesting to note that with the exception of some forms in Tadyawan, the Mangyan languages have lost the short enclitic set of pronouns reconstructable for Proto Philippine (**ku*, **mu*, **na*, **mi*, **ta*, **yu*, **Da*). Hanunoo is the only language in Mindoro that has innovated a full enclitic genitive set, based on the formative **ni-* (viz., *niku*, *nimu*, *niya*, *nimi*, *nita*, *nitam*, *niyu*, *nida*). Buhid, Alangan, and Iraya do not have an enclitic genitive set; in the genitive function the oblique pronouns are used preclitically.

Based on the evidence from Hanunoo and Alangan, we can reconstruct a topic pronoun system identical for the North and South Mangyan groups (see H-1). However, there seem to be two important differences between the two groups in the oblique pronouns.

	SOUTH	NORTH
'my'	kangku	kangay
'ours' (ex)	kanmi	kanyam(en)

We cannot place any importance on the difference between kan-mu and kay-mu because the *kan- and *kay-formative alternation appears to be quite old.⁵ Otherwise, the other oblique pronouns tend to agree.

Again, we find evidence for the splitting of the Mangyan languages into two distinct groups. The agreement of the topic pronominal system, even the forms *ka \emptyset u 'thou' and *kitam 'we-all', does not give sufficient support to a hypothesis that these languages are directly related to a common genetic ancestor.

2.3.2. Deictics. A study of the demonstrative and locative deictics also shows the great diversity among the languages of Mindoro.

H-4 DEMONSTRATIVE DEICTICS

	HANUNOO	BUHID	TADYAWAN	ALANGAN	IRAYA
this-nearby	inda	ituy	inda	anda	tiyaq
that-near	tunda	tunya	akay, ngi	ina	nabah
that-yonder	tida	tiya, ca	ata, adda	ati	nataq

H-5 LOCATIVE DEICTICS

here-nearby	sitáy	istay	n	⁶	tuwaq		
	átay					atay	
there-near	siyún	sinya	o			sabah	
	ásan						asi-na
there-yonder	siti	asa	e				sataq
	áti						

The Hanunoo and Buhid deictics are the most closely matched. The demonstratives have a reconstructable formative *-Da, and the only discrepancy is that the most proximate form has the base *in(i) in Hanunoo, but *itu in Buhid. This may be the result of the reduction of an original four way distinction, as is also found in some Bis and Bik dialects [where, in that case, *ni is in competition with *di]. If this is so, then we can reconstruct the Proto South Mangyan pronominal deictic system:

H-6	this-nearest	* ^f in-Da
	this-near	*itu-Da
	that-near	* ^t ún-Da
	that-yonder	* ^t í-Da

The Hanunoo and Buhid locatives reveal the formative *si-, while the Hanunoo and Alangan evidence suggests another formative *a-. There is clear evidence for a proximate base *tay, and, with the evidence of the demonstrative forms, a distant *ti. We may therefore safely reconstruct only two PSM locatives:

H-7	here-nearest	*si-táy	* ^a tay
	there-yonder	*si-tí	* ^a ti

Without relying on evidence from outside Mindoro we cannot identify the etyma of Han siyun and asan (cf. 3.3.4) or Buh sinya, except by inference. Even then, the three forms do not agree.

Keeping the reconstructions of the South Mangyan group in mind, we can untangle some of the northern forms. Tdy inda and perhaps Aln anda are related to PSM *inda, if we allow for assimilation in the Alangan form. The Alangan ati must be related to the base *ti found in PSM. However, the Tdy ata and the Iry nataq suggest that North Mangyan had a competing base *ta(q), which is also found in the Alangan locative ista (< *si-ta). The second person forms in Tdy (akay, ngi), in Aln (ina), and in Iry (nabah) do not agree in any way, and suggest no single etymon for the Northern group. Likewise, the first person form in Iraya (tiyaq) appears to be without precedent in Mindoro (cf. 3.3.3); it even disagrees with regard to the na- formative found in the other two demonstratives in Iraya

The Alangan locative atay agrees with the alternate Hanunoo form. The form ista agrees with the base in Tdy ata and Iry sataq, so that we can reconstruct something of the Proto North Mangyan deictic systems:

H-8	this-nearest	*inDa	here-nearest	*atay
	that-yonder	*ata(q)	there-yonder	*s(i)ta(q)

Thus the Mangyan languages appear to agree on the formation of the most proximate deictics, and possibly on a base for the most remote (*ti). However, the

Northern group has, in general, undergone a number of innovative changes among its own members, so that we cannot be certain from internal evidence what the original PNM deictic system was. The Iraya system in particular seems either to have undergone an innovative overhaul, or else it may underscore an original dialect diversity separating it from other dialects of its immediate mesolanguage.⁷

2.3.3. Verb Inflection. I am aware of the many possibilities of affix combinations in getting across the concept of tense or aspect in Philippine languages. I am further aware of the number of exceptions that occur in actual discourse, such as the use of what is normally described as a "past" form to denote the historical present in a narrative, or the reduction of the distinction between "present progressive" and "future" in many instances of actual speech. In Iraya, for example, the future can be expressed by future preverb *batay* and the past form of the verb. I am here operating on the premise that these languages have a maximum number of basic distinctions. It is in this case that the North and South groups do not agree, and this may be an important factor in the ultimate consideration of whether or not they share an immediate genetic ancestor.

Without the help of preverb particles the basic inflectional mechanisms of the North Mangyan verb system cannot express a distinction between a present (progressive) and a future action. There is simply the distinction between past and nonpast, and, in at least the passive voice, an additional distinction of imperative. The South Mangyan languages, on the other hand, make--or can make--a three way aspectual distinction, past, progressive (present), and future, plus a separate imperative form. (See table.) As the table H-9 on the next page illustrates, the Mangyan languages are sharply divided into two groups. Of particular interest is the fact that Buh and Han form the active future with *-um-*, while Tdy, Aln, and Iry agree on having *-um-* appear as an alternate with \emptyset in the active past. The passive forms of the three northern languages may be derived from a PNM **pinag-*⁸ giving the Alangan *piyag-*, Tdy *pag-* (with syncope), and Iry *nag-* (with aphaesis).⁹ The NM languages reserve *-en* for only the imperative while the SM group uses *-un* (its cognate) for the future. We shall

consider these verb affixes further when we discuss outside languages in the next section.

H-9	HANUNOO	BUHID	TADYAWAN	ALANGAN	IRAYA
ACTIVE					
past	-inm-/nag-	in-/na-	∅ ~ -um-	∅ ~ -um-	∅ ~ -um-
present	ag-/mag-	+g#/ig-			
future	-um-/mag-	-um-/m(a)-	ag-	ag-	ag-
command	ki-/pag-	∅	-um-	-um-	-um-
PASSIVE					
past	-in-	na-	-i(y)-	-i(y)-	-in-
present	pag--un	+g -un			
future	-un	-un	pag-	piyag-	nag-
command	-a	-an/-un	-en	-en	-en
LOCAL					
past	-in--an	nag--an	-i(y)--an	-i(y)--an	-in--an
present	pag--an	+g -an			
future	-an	-an	pag--an	piyag--an	nag--an
command	-i	-an	-an	-an	-an

Notes. The forms cited for Han and Buh where separated by a / depend on the verb class used. The forms in Tdy, Aln, and Iry are in apparent free variation and are not conditioned by verb classes. The Buhid +g# symbolizes a form that is enclitic to a preceding pronoun or negative rather than an affix on the verb stem itself, e.g. ahu-g fasan hayu 'I am carrying wood.' My data conflict on the form of the passive command. It is possible that the Buh suffix is conditioned by the verb class, although I get a predominant number of -an where Han (and the CPH languages) would normally have *-en, as in tabu-an kam ibulun 'Finish your work!' [Tag tapus-*in*, Han tabuh-*un*], fusaqan ka afuy 'Put out the fire!' [Hil palu:ng-*un* and Han tigbak-*un*], haw fulaw-an angku 'Wake me up!' [Akl puka:w-*un* and Han pulaw-*un*], etc. It is quite possible that Buhid, like the Northern Mangyan languages has generalized many verbs into one simple conjugation, where other Philippine languages known have three separate conjugations (such as direct passive, portative, and partative verb roots). However, in this case Buhid has settled on -an while the NM languages have used -en.

2.3.4. A Syntactic Paradigm. It would be helpful if we looked at parallel examples of several focus types in the five different languages.

I-1 'This is the child that will eat the fish.'

Han	inda	ti	anak	pag	mag-kaqun	∅	isdaq.
Buh	tuy	ka	anak	fag	k-um-uwan	∅	uyang.
Tdy	inda	∅	unqaq	pag	ag-kamangan	∅	isdaq.
Aln	anda	in	budang	pag	ag-pamangan	∅	isdaq.
Iry	tiyaq	da	unqaq	pag	batay mangan	∅	isdaq.
	this	topic	child	link	will - eat	object	fish

I-2 'This is the fish which will be eaten by the child.'

Han	inda	ti	isdaq	pag	kanq-un	∅	anak.
Buh	tuy	ka	uyang	fag	han-un	∅	anak.
Tdy	inda	∅	isdaq	pag	pag-kamangan ni pag	unqaq.	
Aln	anda	in	isdaq	pag	piyag-kuman	in	budang.
Iry	tiyaq	da	isdaq	pag	batay namangan	ag	unqaq.
	this	topic	fish	link	will - be eaten	agent	child

I-3 'This is the knife which will (be used to) cut the fish.'

Han	inda	ti	siyaw	pag	i-gurut	(sa)	isdaq.
Buh	tuy	ka	siyaw	fag	fan-lifung	∅	uyang.
Tdy	inda	∅	pisaw	pag	pan-dureq	∅	isdaq.
Aln	anda	in	pisaw	pag	piyag-pa-duduq	(sa)	isdaq.
Iry	tiyaq	da	pisaw	pag	batay pang-durus	∅	isdaq.
	this	topic	knife	link	will - use to cut	object	fish

I-4 'This is the room which the child will enter.'

Han	inda	ti	suludsulud	pag	sululdan	∅	anak.
Buh	tuy	ka	sakbawan	fag	sakbaw-an	∅	anak.
Tdy	inda	∅	seled	pag	pag-gesek-an ni pag	unqaq.	
Aln	anda	in	kwartu	pag	piyag-pa-suruy-an	in	budang.
Iry	tiyaq	da	galem	pag	(pag)-seledan	ag	unqaq.
	this	topic	room	link	will - be entered	agent	child

The most obvious agreement among these languages is in the word order which, however, does not differ from that of other Philippine languages. One striking agreement is the use of *pag as a linking particle at the clause level. At the phrase level, Iraya differs in that ka is used as the linker, while the other languages still use *pag.

I-5	'beautiful house'			
Han	mayad	pag	balay	
Buh	kafiqaqun	fag	balay	
Tdy	maganda	pag	balay	
Aln	magalen	pag	balay	
Iry	piya	ka	balay	
	beautiful	link	house	

The languages also agree in not having an oblique marker before the object of the verb. This is only significant in contrast with all of the CPH and MPH languages outside of Mindoro, where some kind of object marker is obligatory, such as Tag nang, Ceb qug, Kin kang, Kuy iq, Pal-Abr it, Pam king, keng, Agy-Kal ta, Bik nin, Hil sing, etc.

Elements of the verb morphology (discussed already in 2.3.3) separate the two southern from the three northern languages.

Two interrelated features of verb morphology may be relevant to subgrouping, although it cannot be determined from the data on hand whether they are a matter of frequency or of total replacement.

The first feature is the apparent loss of the instrumental prefix *i-. Nowhere in my data of Buh, Tdy, Aln, or Iry do I have an example of the use of *i-, although the alternate pang- is used, as in I-3. Tweddell's Iraya grammar (1958:101) contains three examples, i-takleb 'use to cover', i-sandig '(used to) lean on', and i-dalagan 'cause to run'. Because the form occurs in Iraya, the issue may be one of frequency of usage. However, if it is frozen and therefore unproductive, it would change the picture significantly. That is, although *pang- is preferred, it may not have totally replaced *i-. I am not sure what the situation is in the other languages; I simply was unable to elicit an i- instrumental form.

The second feature is significant if compared to other languages of the Philippine type. According to the Philippine focus mechanism, one of three voices is used to highlight the semantic goal or object of a verb. Thus certain verbs throughout the Philippines, whether the forms are cognate or not, take one of three inflections: direct passive ('buy', 'drink', 'take', 'bring', 'kill', etc.), instrumental or

associative passive--usually in a portative meaning ('sell', 'exchange', 'give', 'put', 'throw', 'plant', etc.), or the local/referential passive--usually in an ablative meaning ('wash', 'rinse', 'pay for', 'laugh at', etc.).

The North Mangyan languages have reduced this complex three-voice system into one. For example, if we center our attention on the portative bases, we find that the usual Philippine affix type is *i-. Whether the bases are cognate or not, the form will be inflected as i-{sell}, i-{trade}, i-{put}, i-{give}, i-{plant}, i-{throw}, and so on, in Ilokano, Pangasinan, Pampango, Tagalog, Bikol, Bisayan, Tausug, Palawano, Kalamian, etc. It is only on Mindoro that we find an exception to this otherwise widespread rule. Hanunoo follows the pattern of the other Philippine languages, Buhid seems to have simplified the pattern (at least in the imperative) to *-an, while the North Mangyan languages all use *-en, which is the direct passive in all other Philippine languages. Section I-6 illustrates the pattern of inflection of seven portative verb bases in the five Mindoro languages, and in nine other Philippine languages. It seems clear that the loss of *i- in the inflection of these verbs is a significant NM innovation.

The pattern for such loss may be seen in the inflection of a few ablative verbs, such as Tdy bayar-en 'pay', atang-en 'hold', linis-en 'wash', Aln ugas-en 'wash', banlaw-en 'rinse', alik-en 'kiss', Iry pakan-en 'give to', sabun-en 'soap', sukang-en 'open'. These verbs would normally take an *-an ablative inflection, but an analogy generalizing all passives into *-en seems to be operating in these northern languages. However, not all of the NM languages agree; see, for example, Iry uyas-an, Aln ugas-en 'wash!', Iry hanlaw-an, Aln banlaw-en 'rinse!', Iry bayad-an, Tdy bayar-en, Aln alik-en, Iry ark-an 'kiss'. Whether these inconsistencies are a matter of mixed analogies within the different languages, or possibly the product of a recent Tagalog overlay, they seem to apply only to *-an verbs. The treatment of *i- verbs seems rather clear, so that *i- as a portative verb affix seems to have been lost, and it may have led to the general loss of the *i- instrumental as well, so that *pang- is now the only affix used to express the instrumental passive.

It seems that this kind of change in idiom must have been effected during a long period of isolation of the NM languages from all other Philippine languages, including the SM group. It sets the NM group apart as a cohesive subgroup wherein such an innovation could have developed and spread.

The Buhid data are not cognate with the NM. It appears that Buhid has innovated on an analogy of its own, although much more research is needed before any solid generalization could be made. The Buhid forms may reflect the *-an instrumental passive suffix, or they may reflect the *-an local passive suffix. [In Bisayan these two suffixes are kept apart by differences of accent.] The treatment of passive verbs in Buhid is a requisite study, since I had difficulty in eliciting certain passive versions of my sentences. I am not sure if this is a phenomenon of Buhid (that some verbs may not have a passive) or of an inadequate technique for elicitation on my part.¹⁰ In this case, Buhid cannot be grouped with Hanunoo, unless it can be established beyond a reasonable doubt that Buhid -an is an instrumental (and, hence, portative) imperative passive morpheme.

2.3.5. Summary of functors shared by Mangyan languages. The following is a list of morphological and inflectional features, including forms of high frequency in discourse, that are shared by two or more of the Mangyan languages. Forms shared by at least one member of each of the two posited subgroups (NM and SM) are considered to have been in a mutually shared mesolanguage.

ALL FIVE LANGUAGES

- J-1 *kaøu 'thou'. Han, Iry kawu, Buh haw, Tdy kaw, Aln kaqu.
- J-2 *kitam(u) 'we (inclusive, plural)'. Han, Aln kitam, Buh tam, Tdy tama, Iry tamu.
- J-3 *kantam(u) 'our (inclusive, plural)'. Han, Tdy, Aln kantam, Buh antam, Iry tamu.
- J-4 *pag linking marker. Han, Tdy, Aln pag, Buh fag, Iry pag (at clause level), ka (at phrase level).

FOUR LANGUAGES

- J-5 *ti remote deictic category. Han ti-da, Buh ti-ya, ca 'that yonder'; Aln, Tdy a-ti 'that yonder'; Han qa-ti 'there yonder'.

I-6 Portative Verbs in Philippine languages, generally requiring *i-.

	'give'	'sell'	'trade'	'throw'	'plant'	'put'	'bury'
Ilokano	i-téd	i-láko	i-sóbor	i-belléng	i-múla	i-dúlin	i-tanéñ
Pangasinan	i-tér	i-láko	i-salát	i-tópak	i-tanéñ	i-yán	i-kutkút
Pampango	i-byé	+i-salíq	i-pag-libé	+i-ugsé	+i-tanáñ	i-bilí	i-kutkút
Tagalog	i-bigáy	i-pag-bilí	i-palít	i-tápon	i-tanáñ	i-lagáy	i-libíng
Cebuano	i-hátag	i-balígyaq	i-báylu	i-lábay	i-tanáñ	i-butáng	i-lubúñg
Bikol	i-taqú	i-pa-bákal	i-balyú	i-qapón	i-tanáñ	i-bugták	i-lubúñg
Tausug	hi-dihíl	hi-pag-biih	hi-pag-sambiq	hi-búgit	hi-tanáñ	hi-butáng	hi-lubúñg
Palawano	i-gbey	i-pa-gelen	i-sambiq	i-timbag	i-luak	i-btang	i-lbeng
Kalamian	i-paqdul	i-pa-alang	i-bakal	i-langgid	i-tanem	i-betang	i-lebeng
Hanunoo	i-pakáqum	i-pa-bilí	i-bályu	i-yamút	i-tanáñ	i-butáng	i-lbung
Buhid	disag-an	fa-saliw-an	baliw-an	ukas-an	tanum-an	butang-an	lubgub-an
Tadyawan	bagi-(e)n	pa-bili-en	palit-en	bunglay-en	tanem-en	pa-lagay-en	lubuq-en
Alangan	tabuy-en	pa-bili-en	pa-palit-en	benglay-en	tugdaq-en	pa-balay-en	sangat-en
Iraya	tabuy-en	pag-biri-en	palit-en	benglay-en	tanem-en	pa-lagiy-en	lebeng-en

THREE LANGUAGES

- J-6 *anDa 'this'. Han, Tdy inda, Aln anda.
J-7 *Dapu 'first' (patience particle, Tag mu:na). Han, Iry
dapu, Buh yap.
J-8 *wa- 'now; yet' (completive particle, Tag na). Tdy, Aln
wa, Buh wan.

TWO LANGUAGES

- J-9 *atay 'here'. Han atay, Aln atay.
J-10 *pagtaØu 'who?' Buh fagtaw, Aln pagtaqu. [Iraya
tawa (?)]
J-11 *idua 'none'. Buh idua 'none', Aln idua 'no longer'.
J-12 *ka marking particle (different from enumerative *ka).
Buh ka topic marking particle; Iry ka linker at phrase
level.

SOUTHERN MANGYAN

- K-1 *si-tay 'here'. Han sitay, Buh istay.
K-2 *tun-Da 'that nearby'. Han tunda, Buh tunya.
K-3 *aw interrogative particle. Han, Buh aw.
K-4 *kaNku 'my'. Han kangku, Buh angku.

NORTHERN MANGYAN (all three languages)

- L-1 *i-, *-en > *-en. Tdy, Aln, Iry -en (generalized
passive)
L-2 *ta(q) 'there yonder'. Tdy a-ta, Aln is-ta, Iry sa-taq.
L-3 *(k)aDeR 'earlier' (recent perfective). Aln karay, Tdy
kaliq, Iry aray.
L-4 *sa(kg)teq 'later on' (proximate future). Aln, Tdy
sakteq, Iry sagteq.
L-5 *dapuq 'none' (negative existential). Aln, Tdy dapuq,
Iry dapu.
L-6 *(y)angen 'maybe' (possibility particle). Tdy yangen,
Aln yangun, Iry angen. (However, see Bontoc ngen)
L-7 *mana 'really' (particle of surprise or discovery). Tdy
maná, Aln, Iry mána.

(Alangan and Iraya)

- M-1 Aln, Iry nakay 'what?'
M-2 Aln wakay, Iry akay 'also, too' (answer particle)
M-3 Aln yewud, Iry nawed 'not so' (predicative negative)
(cf. Inibaloi qiwed, Bontoc maqiwed 'none')

(Alangan and Tadyawan)

- N-1 Aln, Tdy -i(y)- past passive.
N-2 Tdy nges, Aln nanges 'hopefully' (optative particle).

- N-3 Tdy, Aln saken 'I don't know' (ignorance particle).
- N-4 Tdy, Aln kay 'still, yet' (durative particle). (cf. Bontoc -kay interrogative particle)
- N-5 Tdy, Aln tayteq past time marker, 'ago'.
- N-6 Aln in, Tdy ni-pag oblique agent marker.
- N-7 Aln, Tdy apuq 'there is' (existential particle).
- N-8 Tdy angkarugay, Aln angkadugay 'when?'

2.3.6. Conclusions. The sharpest feature of the Mangyan languages is the difference between them. The topic marker, for example, differs from language to language, with no etymon traceable to a common meso-language. Where similarities occur, they point to a bipartite split, the North Group (Iraya, Alangan, Tadyawan) (I-6, H-9), as opposed to the South Group (Buhid and Hanunoo). This split is particularly reinforced by the verb morphology (H-9), the first person oblique pronoun forms (H-3), and the differences in the remote deictic category (H-7: SM *siti; H-8: NM *sita[q]).

3. POSSIBLE RELATIONSHIPS OUTSIDE OF MINDORO.

3.1. *Lexicostatistical evidence.* Table 1 gives the percentages of a comparison with the Swadesh 100 list for the languages of Mindoro and several language groups surrounding Mindoro: on Palawan, Panay, and southern Luzon. The name of each language followed by the name of its immediate subgroup is given. The higher figures clearly indicate the most proximate genetic ties of each language. The question can be raised if the next series of high figures also indicates genetic ties of an earlier order. One must weigh the possibility of secondary contacts, which could have raised the figures. One must also consider if the difference between any two figures is significant, since a difference of five or more percentage points must be allowed for error in the computation or for undetected borrowings.

Table 2 is more helpful in showing the relationships of each language to any other which scores 41% or more with it. Primary genetic relationships come out clearly to the left of the diagonal line. The highest percentages justify the establishment of seven subgroups for the thirteen languages.

North Mangyan:	Iraya, Alangan, Tadyawan (chain)
South Mangyan:	Hanunoo, Buhid

TABLE 2: Lexicostatistical distance of Mangyan languages from surrounding Central Philippine Languages

	+ 70	68	66	64	62	60	58	56	54	52	50	48	46	44	42	
Buhid								Han					Tag	AIn	Abr	Tdy
Hanunoo							Buh		Abr Tag Btk AkI		Agy Ntg	PaI	AIn	Tdy	Pam	Iry
Tadyawan				AIn									Iry	Han	Tag	Abr Buh Ntg Pam
Alangan			Iry	Tdy							Tag	Han	Btk Ntg AkI	Buh	Abr Agy	
Iraya			AIn							Tag	AkI	Tdy	Abr	Ntg	Btk	Han Pam
Agutaynen	Ntg				Btk AkI	Abr		Tag	PaI	Han						AIn
Northern Tagbanwa	Agy				Abr Btk AkI	Tag		PaI		Han			AIn	Iry	Tdy	
Batak	Abr				Ntg Agy	PaI		Han	AkI	Tag			AIn	Iry		
Aborlan	Btk PaI				Ntg	Agy	Tag AkI	Han					Iry	Pam	Buh Tdy	
Palawano	Abr					Btk	Tag AkI	Ntg	Agy		Han					
Pampango									Tag				Abr	AkI Han	Iry Tdy Btk	
Tagalog					AkI		PaI Abr Ntg	Agy	Han	Pam	Btk Iry	AIn	Buh	Tdy		

Kalamian:	Agutaynen, Northern Tagbanwa
Palawan:	Palawano, Aborlan, Batak (chain)
Pampango:	Kapampangan
Tagalog:	Tagalog
Bisayan:	Aklanon

The next highest series of figures suggests a higher order subgrouping:¹¹

Palawanic:	Kalamian + Palawan groups
Tagalic:	Tagalog + Bisayan groups

Thus far these conclusions do not differ drastically from Dyen's statements about what he calls Sulic and Mesophilippine in his lexicostatistical classification (1965).

The main concern, however, is how the languages of Mindoro fit into the picture. As was noted in the previous section, the time depths involved have separated these languages from one another; more so from any outside languages. Since Buhid shows only distant relationships with all languages by Hanunoo, it is necessary to rely on Hanunoo for evidence of subgrouping SM with any outside language. In particular, it is Aborlan, Hanunoo, and Iraya that show the largest number of possible links. Hanunoo, for example, consistently shows higher scores with members of Palawanic before any of the North Mangyan languages. Supporting this is Aborlan's significantly higher score with Hanunoo (54%) before any of the NM languages (Iraya - 46%). This is borne out in the pattern of all the Palawanic languages; they all score higher with Han than with any of the other Mindoro languages. Conversely, however, it should be noted that the NM languages (especially Alangan and Tadyawan) show a relationship to Hanunoo higher by a few percentage points than their relationship to any other language, with the exception of Tagalog (these scores may be explained as influence due to borrowing).

3.2. *Phonological evidence: the treatment of *R.* Although the merging of proto phonemes is generally poor evidence for subgrouping, there are only a small number of languages in the Philippines that reflect the merging of *R and *y. Besides those of Mindoro (to be discussed presently), there are Pampango, Sambal, and Ivatan-Itbayaten. The possibility exists

that this merger, backed by other evidence, may serve as a criterion for subgrouping these languages together.

The problem arises, however, if [y] is the reflex of *R throughout Mindoro. Examples P-1 to P-5 illustrate [y] as the reflex of *R in the five Mangyan languages discussed herein. Although the words are drawn from basic vocabulary, they are the only five forms that could be found from all the data on hand.

More numerous are the cases where [y] is the reflex of *R in the North group, while [g] is the reflex in the South group (Q-1 through Q-12). Although only twelve examples could be found represented as cognate sets in most of these languages, these forms come from the core vocabulary of each language, and cannot readily be dismissed as borrowings. Further evidence along these lines includes:

- 0-1 *Rinhawa 'breath'. Iry inawa 'to breathe'; Han ginháwa 'body, health'.
- 0-2 *linuR 'earthquake'. Iry luni (metathesis), Han, Buh línug.
- 0-3 *qitluR 'egg'. Iry utluy; Han itlug, Aln itlug*.
- 0-4 *huRas 'to wash off'. Iry uyas, Aln*, Han úgas, Tdy hugas*.
- 0-5 *buRaw 'to chase away'. Aln buyaw, Han búgaw.
- 0-6 *liRiw 'to run'. Buh lagyu, Han lagiw.
- 0-7 *Ramut 'root'. Han gámut.
- 0-8 *kaRaw 'to scratch'. Aln gayaw, Han kágaw.
- 0-9 *qabaRa 'shoulder'. Iry abaya.

It may be argued in the case of Hanunoo that an earlier y-form could have been replaced by a g-form after prolonged contact with the more prestigious Central Philippine languages (Tagalog, Kuyonon, Hiligaynon, Kinaray-a, etc.), but this explanation is not so readily available to the far-removed and often isolated Buhid communities that also reflect [g]. These examples may be taken as good evidence of a split between NM (with *R > y) and SM (with *R > g).

R-1 through R-7 offer only weak evidence of [g] as the reflex of *R throughout Mindoro. All of the items, with the possible exception of 'molar tooth', can readily be explained as culture borrowings, as replacements, or as examples of Conant's stereotyped

		HANUNOO	BUHID	TADYAWAN	ALANGAN	IRAYA	PPH
P-1	heavy	ma-buyát	ma-biyat	mabyat	ma-biyat	ma-byat	*beRqat
P-2	night	yabi	yabi	yabiq	yabiq		*RabiØi
P-3	other-side	dípay	difay	lipay	ripay	ripay	*DipaR
P-4	arm	takyay	takyay	takyay	takyay		*takyar
P-5	rib	tagyang		tadyang	tagyang		*tak(e)Rang
Q-1	bite	kagát	-hagat	kayat	kayat	kayat	*kaRat
Q-2	earth	dagáq	daga	dyaq	diya		*deRaq
Q-3	fire, embers _†	bága _†	baga _†	bayaq	bayaq	baya	*baRah
Q-4	hear	dungúg	-dug	-lingy-an	ka-rengey	ka-rngey	*DengeR
Q-5	G-string	baqáq	bag	abay	abay	baqay	*bahaR
Q-6	lips, mouth _†	bibíg _†	bibig _†	bibiq	bibiq	bibi	*bibiR
Q-7	neck	líqug _†	liyug _†		lequy	leqey	*liqeR
Q-8	new	bagqu	bagu		bayuq	bayu	*bagRu
Q-9	satisfied	busúg	na-psug	ma-gsuy	busug*	ma-bsuy	*besuR
Q-10	tail	íkug	ihug	ikuy	ikuy		*ØikuR
Q-11	vein	ugát-ugát	ugat	iyat	uyat	eyat	*ØuRat
Q-12	blood	dugúq			dayaq	dayag	*DuRuq/*DaRaq
R-1	coconut	niyúg	niyug	niyug	niyug	niyug	*niyuR
R-2	lime	ápug	afug	apug	apug		*qapuR
R-3	milled-rice	binugás	binugas	bigas	begas	begas	*beRas
R-4	NW wind	abágat	abagat	abagat	abagat	abagat	*habaRat
R-5	molar	bagqang	bagang	bagang	bagang		*baRqang
R-6	soot(y)	ágiw			aguy	agiw-en	*ØaRiw
R-7	sea	dágat	dagat	dagat	dagat	dagat	*DaRat

Philippine g (1911:82-83). Other such irregularities among the Northern Mangyan languages include:

- S-1 *beyaR 'alive'. Iry biyag*, Buh buyag.
- S-2 *Rabet 'to pull out'. Iry yabet, Aln gabet*, Han gabút.
- S-3 *ke-DaRum 'needle'. Iry kadayum, Aln kurayum, Tdy dagum*, Han dáyum*/dágum.

Note also Aln busug 'full, satisfied' < *besuR (Q-9), Aln galem 'meat' < laRem (C-13), Tdy gatang < Ratang 'to hold' (C-8).

Doublets in g and y apparently do not exist in the same language. The Han word for 'needle' (S-3) is the only doublet I found, and it is insignificant when one realizes that the same doublet exists among the nearby Bisayan dialects¹² (such as Romblon: dáyom, dágon).

Until more is known about the duration, type, and intimacy of the contacts between the Hanunoo, the Buhid, and the Bisayans, it can be safely assumed that [g] is the SM reflex of *R, with a few unexplained [y]'s, while [y] is the NM reflex of *R, with a few suspect [g]'s. While it is possible that the SM forms are replacements, adequate information is not available at this time to show why or how this must be so. In addition, SM reflects another merger which happens to have occurred in many surrounding Bis dialects, namely the falling together of *e and *u.¹³ This may be further evidence of the influence of Bis over SM, or it may have been an independent sound shift within SM.

Even if the NM group reflects *R > y and the SM reflects *R > g, this does not preclude the possibility of subgrouping them together at a higher order mesolanguage, since within Palawan, the Kalamian group reflects *R > l, while the Palawan group reflects *R > g. The evidence of relationship is drawn from qualitative features of the syntax or lexicon.

3.3. *Shared elements of morphology.* Since the amount of diversity within Mindoro is itself very great, it is likely that we will find only a few features of morphology that appear to be directly related to these Mangyan languages. The problem is then introduced of weighing those features to see which are more significant. There are four outside language

groups with which any of the Mangyan languages have something in common.

3.3.1. Pampango. Pampango has an *i- marked topic pronominal system, with an alternate set of clitic forms without this *i-. The dual inclusive forms are itamu and tamu, which match the Iraya tamu. The other Mangyan languages have the topic form kitam and the genitive kantam, which might be related to tamu, but they are obviously not the same. If a final vowel were lost, there is no way of knowing what it was. There is the Palawan form tami (Abr, Btk) in both the topic and enclitic genitive forms. Thus the final vowel, if lost, could have been i or u.

Iraya, Pampango (and Ivatan, see 3.3.3 below) have the topic third person singular form iya, which is significant in that it does not have the *s- found in most CPH and MPH languages.

The use of *ti as a base denoting nearness (rather than remoteness, as in Palawanic and SM) is, to my knowledge, only found in Pampango iti 'this', keti 'here', Sambal bayti 'here', and--if cognate--Iraya tiyaq 'this'. Likewise, the use of *ta as a base denoting remoteness is only found in Pampango ita 'that', keta 'there', and Iraya nataq 'that', sataq 'there'.¹⁴

In verb inflection, Pampango has a three tense system (past, progressive, and future) plus an imperative. However, the progressive is formed by the addition of length or CV- reduplication to the future form, such as: sulat 'will write', su:sulat 'is writing', matudtud 'will sleep', ma:tudtud 'is sleeping'. This may be a secondary and recent development within Pam, perhaps due to prolonged contact with Tagalog, where progressive action is also shown by features of length and reduplication. However, the Pam formations differ sharply from the Tag in that the progressive in Tag is formed on the past (nagsumbong 'told on', nagsu:sumbong 'is telling on'), while the Tag future is formed on the dependent form (mag-). In Iraya, the future and the progressive are the same, although the future can be made more explicit with the preverb batay--an independent development within Iraya. Thus, the alignment of tenses progressive-future (vis., nonpast) versus past may well be coordinate in Pam and Iry. However, the formation

of the past in Pam is quite different, falling into as many as six inflectional categories depending on the verb stem classification. The base of the Pam past is -in- or -i/e-. The Iraya past is based on -um- in the active, and simply on -in- in the passive. While the basis of each is rooted in Proto Philippine *-umin- and *-in-, the developments have been different and independent in Iry and Pam.

3.3.2. Sambal. Sambal (Botolan dialect) has a hi- (< *si-) marked topic pronominal system (which gives the appearance of alignment with many languages of northern Luzon). However, the form tamu is found in the genitive set (it is hitamu in the topic set), paralleling the Iry and Pam forms. The use of -ti as a proximate locative base is also found.

3.3.3. Ivatan. Ivatan (and its dialects, Itb and Yami) have an i-marked topic pronominal system, like Pampango, Subanon (Sindangan), and members of the Kalamian group. Thus, this feature must be quite old. In the Ivatan system, it is the enclitic genitive bases that have become the topic bases as well, giving forms like yaken 'I', imuq 'thou', yaten 'we (inclusive)', etc. Two forms match perfectly with Iraya, yamen 'we-exclusive' and i:yaq 'he/she'. The general development of genitive stem → topic stem is also found in Ivt, Itb, and Iry. Tadyawan -yak and -yam may also be related to the Ivt, Itb yaken, yamen.

We cannot be sure of the etymon of the Iraya deictic tiyaq 'this', alongside the locative tuwaq 'here'. Is this a base *-aq with formatives *ti- and *tu-, or are there two bases *ti- and *tu- with a formative *aq? If the former is true, then *ti matches with Pam iti and keti. If the latter, then Iraya tiyaq may match with Itb diiyaq 'here', niyaq 'this' and Ivt diaq 'here', niayaq 'this'. There is no clearcut evidence for either proposition.

3.3.4. Palawan. The use of the oblique third person singular form *kanya in topic position is noted in Aborlan, in Batak, and in Buhid. In the Kalamian dialects the oblique form tanya is also used in topic position. Both Abr and Btk have the first person inclusive form tami. Buhid also has this form in a few constructions, such as: tamig sudsuratan 'we will write to one another'. However, it is not clear if

the final *i* is a retention of an original **tami*, or a Buhid realization of the progressive affix (viz., Buh *ig-*).

The Palawan languages use the marker *qit* (Pal topic marker, Abr, Btk, and Pal oblique marker). This may be related to Han *ti* (topic marker) and to Buhid *it* (adverbial phrase marker, as used in *kayuday it kaqayuqun* 'how far?', or *idua parihu it ugaliq* 'not the same [in] customs').

The deictic base **ti* denoting remoteness is found in all of the Palawan languages (Pal, Abr, Btk, *iti*, Kal, Ntg *atii*, Abr *asii* 'that') and in Aln *ati* Buh *tiya*, *ca*, and Han *tida* 'that', Han *siti* 'there', *ati* 'there'. Of more limited distribution is the deictic **asan* 'there (not far)' in Pal *esen*, Abr *asan*, Agy *atan*, Ntg *asan*, and Hanunoo *asan*.

A striking parallel in verb inflection is found in the Palawan languages, matching the Han and Buh verb paradigm (H-9) in form, function, and distribution.

	HANUNOO	ABORLAN	PALAWANO
ACTIVE			
past	-inm-/nag-	-imn-/nag-	-umin-/neg-
progressive	-um- /mag-	mag-	meg-
future	-um- /mag-	-um-	-um-
imperative	ki- /pag-	∅	∅
PASSIVE			
past	-in-	-in-	-in-
progressive	pag--un	pag--en	pag--en
future	-un	-en	-en
imperative	-a	-a	-aq

Of particular import is the progressive passive form **pag--en* which is not found, to my knowledge, in any other MPH language group. It is apparently based on the analogy whereby the **pag-* abstract prefix (used in temporal constructions) is generalized to a durative function, filling in the paradigm: *mag-* (future), *nag-* (past), *pag-* (progressive). Northern Tagbanwa has precisely this system in the active. This *pag-* (progressive) then was used independently in the passives of these Pal and SM languages, alongside the **-en* (future) and **-in-* (past) affixes.

3.4. *Shared elements of lexicon.* There are only a few distinguishable lexical items that seem to have a distribution that may support the alignment of the Mindoro languages with one or another of the other Philippine languages being discussed.

3.4.1. Pampango.

- T-1 'cold' Pam dimla, Iry, Aln dimlaq.
 T-2 'to see' Pam akit, ikit, Iry, Han kit, Sbl ma-kit.
 (cf. G-6)
 T-3 'bone' Pam bútul, Sbl botqó, Aln bitul*, Han butqul,
 Buh butúl (Note Tag butó Sin, Lub butqu are likely
 to be borrowings)¹⁵
 T-4 'to wait' Buh fanayán, Aln panaya-en, Iry panyaq-an,
 Pam panáyan (Note Ivt nanayahen, Itb mannanayaq,
 nanayaq-en)
 T-5 'needle' Pam karayum, Sbl karayem, Iry kadayum, Aln
 kurayum. (Note *ka-prefix)
 T-6 'dry' Pam ma-langiq, Buh, Han layung (metathesis in
 Pam < *layung → *lañuy, cf. Pam apiq from *()apuy
 'fire')
 T-7 (relationship) Pam tal-asawa 'husband and wife', Han
 tar-qariq 'brother and sister')
 T-8 'sky' Pam, Buh banwa.
 T-9 'raincloud' Pam malulam, Han rurum. (Note Png lurém)
 T-10 'to buy' Buh sali, saliw-un, Pam saliq, saliw-an
 T-11 'hand' Pam, Buh gamat. (But note Bot-Sbl gamét)

3.4.2. Palawan.

- U-1 'body' Btk, Abr, Pal bilug, Han bilug, Buh habilugan,
 Aln, Tdy bilugan (cf. G-1)
 U-2 Abr abwatay, Btk abuat, Pal m-ebwat, Agy, Kal, Ntg
 abwat 'long'; Han abuwat, Buh abuat, Aln, Tdy, Iry
 abwat 'tall'. (cf. G-11)
 U-3 'to know (fact)' Btk tawan, Aln, Tdy tawan. (cf.
 Bontoc tewqan 'I don't know', tewa [discourse particle
 meaning 'I know what you said but have forgotten it'])
 U-4 'to lie down' Btk, Han igyaq, Buh igya-n.
 U-5 'thigh' Han, Buh, Btk balangbang.

3.4.3. *Contrasting evidence.* There are a few lexical items that are so widespread that they define large Philippine subgroups. For example, the form *qijung 'nose' is found throughout the archipelago (Isneg, Ibanag qigung; Ata, Binukid, Tigwa qidung; Maranao ngrirung; Waray, Kuyo, Kamayo, Mamanwa qirung; Tiruray qirung.) It would seem that a change in shape of such a form would be significant by contrast

in identifying language groups that participated in such a change. The following forms give such evidence that the languages of Mindoro are not to be grouped with Central Philippine (Tagalog, Bisayan), but may be grouped with Pampango and/or Palawanian.

- V-1 'nose' Kal, Agy, Ntg, Abr, Btk, Aln, Iry urung. Buh uyung, Tdy ngulung. Pal edung and Pam arong may indicate the etymon *(q)eDung, with all of the other languages showing assimilation of the *e to *u.
- V-2 'nit' Kal, Agy liket, Ntg likes, Pal lies, Han liqus, Buh liyus, Tdy liis, Aln leyus, Iry liques, Pam liyas. All indicate *liques, which is to be set apart from CPH *lesaq (as found in Tag, Bik, Bis, Abr, Btk); however, both etyma probably derive from PPH *lisehaq (see Wbm lisehaq, Itb lisaha, Ivt disaa, Ilk lisqa, Mar lisaq). For *liques see Ilk, Png lies.
- V-3 'water' Abr, Btk, Pal, Han, Buh, Pam danum, Sbl lanum. Agy wiq, Kal, Ntg waiq. Wbm wahig, Dbw wehig. Mar ig. Tag, Bik, Bis, Tsg, Msk-Klg, Sub, Mongondow tubig.
- V-4 'blood' Aln, Iry, Sbl, Pam dayaq. Han, Tag, Bis, Bik, Abr, Pal, Tsg, Msk-Klg, Mam, Sub Mongondow duguq.

Although the forms *Danum 'water' and *DaRaQ 'blood' are spread throughout the Philippines and are inherited from Proto Austronesian, both forms have undergone replacement in the central and southern Philippine area (going as far south as Mongondow on Celebes). At some period in the mutual history of these languages, there must have been competition when *wahiR and *tubiR began to replace *Danum, and when *Duruq began to replace *Daraq. In this regard there may be a kind of relative chronology. That is, before the innovative forms began to take hold, Pampango and Sambal separated from the others, retaining both *Danum and *DaRaQ. The NM languages clearly reflect *DaRaQ, but have the innovations sapaq (Aln, Iry) and lebeng (Tdy) for 'water'. The SM languages on the other hand, clearly reflect *Danum, but Hanunoo has a cognate of *DuRuq (while Buhid has an innovation, fulut). In this regard Hanunoo matches the languages of Palawan, which also retain *Danum, but have *DuRuq.¹⁶

4. CONCLUSIONS.

This paper has been a preliminary attempt at subgrouping the languages of Mindoro. Evidence has clearly indicated that the two languages of the south (Hanunoo and Buhid) can be subgrouped together as opposed to the three languages of the north (Iraya, Alangan, and Tadyawan).

Evidence that all of these five languages share the same mesolanguages is not forceful, see J-1 to J-12 for functors and F-1 through G-11 for contentives. The fact that there is not much evidence for considering NM and SM as immediate subgroups of the same mesolanguage is partially attributable to the time depth with which we are dealing. The individual history of each of these languages, including the number of innovations in Iraya and Buhid, or the number of borrowings of Hanunoo (from Bisayan), and of Tadyawan and Alangan (from Tagalog), could potentially cover up evidence of a mutually shared ancestor.

For an alternate hypothesis evidence from some outside languages has been considered. There is some indication of an alignment of Iraya with Pampango, based primarily on the pronominal forms *tamu* and *iya*, the shape of the forms 'to see' (T-2), 'needle' (T-5), and the words for 'cold' (T-1) and 'to wait' (T-4). The Iraya deictics *tiyaq* 'this' and *nataq* 'that' may be related to the Pampango-Sambal base *-ti* 'this' and Pampango *ita* 'that'. The falling together of *R and *y may also serve as a criterion.

There is also evidence of an alignment of Hanunoo with the Palawan languages based on the shared locatives *asan* 'there' (near you)' and the **ti* remote base. The falling together of *R and *g and the **pag--en* passive progressive formation may also serve as additional evidence. Lexicostatistical evidence also points to a closer and more coordinate relationship of Hanunoo with the languages of Palawan.

While some of the evidence discussed herein is suggestive, none of it is ineluctable. Most of the features discussed are spread in one way or another throughout the Palawan-Mindoro-Pampango area. Continued research far beyond the kind and quality of data

treated in this paper is necessary. I have presented in this paper in the hope of stimulating both discussion and interest in the relatively neglected Mindoro linguistic area.¹⁷

NEW HAVEN

NOTES

This article is a partial result obtained in the Austronesian Genetic Classification Project directed by Isodore Dyen at Yale University, and supported by the National Science Foundation (Grant No. GS-38073X). Fieldwork was supported by a grant from the Foreign Area Fellowship Program (August 1971-July 1972). I would like to thank professors I. Dyen, Lawrence Reid, and Harold Conklin, and my colleagues, Mathew Charles, Shigeru Tsuchida, and Curt McFarland, and Bob Blust for their help, advice, and criticisms. All errors, of course, are mine.

In this paper, I adopt a convention that an asterisk (*) following a form indicates that something is wrong with the correspondence, such as Buh balukas* (expected *baluhas) or Aln busug* (expected *busuy).

The abbreviations used are as follows:

Abr Aborlan Tagbanwa (Palawan)	Ivt Ivatan (Batanes Islands)
Agy Agutaynen (Kalamian)	Kal Kalamian
Akl Aklanon (West Bisayan)	Lub Lubang [Tagalog dialect]
Aln Alangan (North Mindoro)	Ntg Northern Tagbanwa (Kalamian)
Bik Bikol [Naga dialect]	Pal Palawano
Btk Batak (North Palawan)	Pam Kapampangan
Buh Buhid (South Mindoro)	Png Pangasinan
Han Hanunoo (South Mindoro)	Sbl Sambal [Botolan dialect]
Ilk Ilokano (Northern Mindoro)	Sin Sina-una [Tagalog dialect]
Iry Iraya (North Mindoro)	Tag Tagalog [Manila dialect]
Itb Itbayaten (Batanes Islands)	Tdy Tadyawan (North Mangyan)

¹The locations at which I found informants in the language survey were:

-Hanunoo (2 dialects)--one at barrio Nalwak, Magsaysay, Occidental Mindoro; the other at barrio Pinamalayan, Mansalay, Oriental Mindoro, a settlement organized by Rev. Antoon

Postma, S.V.D., who was also most helpful in many ways. In addition, for Han, I consulted with Conklin (1953) and with Conklin himself.

- Buhid (2 dialects)--A group of informants were interviewed in the town of San Jose itself, they claimed they were from [fún tán# balíkyas], nearly three days walking distance from San Jose. This area is probably the hinterlands of Roxas. I also went to sitio Batangan between Roxas and Bongabon for a second Buhid dialect. (This Batangan is not to be confused with the Batangan language that is spoken further to the north.)
- Tadyawan (2 dialects)--My first interview was in barrio Tagbakín, Pola; another informant from barrio Putingkakáw, Pola was also present and agreed with the answers of the first informant. However, I met a group of Tadyawans outside of the town of Victoria, who claimed they were from far upstream in the Magasawangtubig area.
- Alangan (1 dialect)--barrio Paitan, on the Nauhan side of Mount Halcon.
- Iraya (2 dialects)--barrio Talipanan, Peurto Gallera; another at sitio Baras, barrio Binaybay, Baco.

²See Zorc (1973, to appear in *Oceanic Linguistics*) for a discussion of Datagnon, also known as Ratagnon and Latagnon, as a member of the Western Subgroup of Bis. I exclude Bisayan, Tagalog, and Bikol from this present survey because they all share a large number of features among functors (such as the deictics and the case marking particles) which are not found in any of the Mangyan or the Palawan languages. The more immediate genetic relationships of Bisayan are to be found to the south on Mindanao where a large number of shared features (such as the *aN case marking system, the *didtu locative, and so on) can be found in the Mansakan languages, in Subanon, and perhaps in others as well.

³See Dyen (1965:30).

⁴See Tadyawan kama from *kami for a similar change of the final vowel.

⁵It is old in that an alternation between the personal dative markers *kaN, *ki, and *kay is widespread among Meso-Philippine and Sulic languages. Tagalog preserves all three of these markers: ki-na 'dative plural name marker', kan-ya 'his/her' and kan-ila 'their', and kay 'dative singular name marker'. Other evidence includes: ki in Kuyonon, in Bikol, in Aborlan, and in Maranao; kay in Palawan Batak, in West Bisayan, in Surigaonon, and in Tagalog; kan in Masbateño, Waray, Butuanon, and Tausug, and kang in Cebuano, Kamayo, and Mansaka.

⁶Both in my data and those of Dyen (obtained independently), for the different Tadyawan dialects researched, there appears to be no distinction between a locative and a pronominal deictic set. All forms elicited were interchangeable in either a pronominal or a locative paradigm.

⁷Mongondow tuwa 'there-yonder' and Cebuano tuqa, qatuqa 'there-far away' may be related if we posit a kind of semantic reversal, or possibly by a change from an original intermediate distance to very close (in Iry) and very far (in Ceb and Mong). Another possible etymology for the Iraya form is considered in 3.3.3.

⁸Note the *-in- > -iy- in Aln and Tdy, so that *pinag- > piyag- in Aln is a normal development. The loss of *n in the *-in- past passive infix is a phenomenon found limited (so far) to Sulic or Southern Philippine languages. It occurs in Tausug, Mansaka, Maranao, and Batak of Palawan, besides Alangan and Tadyawan. Related to this may be the alternation between *pag- and *pig- in Bikol, *paga- and *piga- in Butuanon, and mag- and mig- in Kalagan. This may prove to be the most qualitative evidence available for subgrouping these Mangyan languages in the Southern Philippine family (Dyen's Sulic Hesion), pending further investigation of other Philippine and Austronesian languages.

⁹Aphesis is the loss of a short unaccented initial syllable; the process is related to apheresis (loss of a short initial vowel).

¹⁰For example, in Buhid I could not elicit the passive of certain sentences, such as hu na-lag wa hiamu haraw 'I saw you earlier (today)' or idu na-hagat angku 'The dog bit me.' I am not sure why this was so, because some verbs clearly had active and passive imperative forms. I believe, for example, that my informants understood the difference between the Tagalog: kinagat ako nang asu and ang asu ang kumagat sa akin.

¹¹These subgroups can be justified by criteria which cannot be discussed here without going far afield. The closeness of Tag and Bis is discussed to some extent in my dissertation. (In progress)

¹²Note also da:gum in WBs; but ra:dom (< *dayum) in Odionganon on Tablas.

¹³This merger has occurred in Datagnon, Bulalakawnon, Santa Teresa, Dispoholnon, Looknon, Romblomanon, Odionganon, and Aklanon--to list those languages of the Bis family surrounding Mindoro. It has also occurred in many other Bis dialects: Hiligaynon, Cebuano, Masbateno, Samar-Leyte, Surigaonon,

Butuanon, and Jaun-Jaun, but not necessarily in all dialects of these speech types. There are still dialects of Ceb and War which retain the original four vowel system. Although this merger is probably the product of replacement in many Bis dialects (where an [e] is less prestigious than an [u]), the question can be raised if such replacement can occur across a language boundary as exists between Bis and Han/Buh.

¹⁴The base *ta is used to show intermediate distance (i.e., close to addressee but not to speaker) in Ilk dayta 'that (near you)', and perhaps in other languages of the Cordillera.

¹⁵Dyren (1973) discussed the shift *l → ∅ in Tag, and notes that it appears in final position only after *e, e.g., bingí < *bengél 'deaf', katí < *katel 'itch', ha:bi < *ha:bel 'weave', si:si < *selsel 'regret', laki < *Dakel 'big'. Tag but(q)ó, rather than being an exception, probably indicates borrowing from a Sambalan language, where this loss is regular. It is clear that *butqul is an innovation, replacing PPH *tuqlan 'bone'. Further, its widespread distribution in Sbl, Pam, Aln, Buh, Han, suggests that it was an innovation in Proto-Mangyan-Pampanganic, subsequently borrowed from one of its *-l → -∅ dialects by the then immigrating early speakers of Tag.

¹⁶See my paper "Towards a definite Philippine wordlist--the qualitative use of vocabulary in identifying and classifying languages," Table 7 and section 5.2.

¹⁷For example, further research may bring to light a relationship between Ivatan and the Mangyan-Pampangan languages. Charles (in a personal communication) has noted a large number of agreements between Kapampangan and members of the Ivatan group in having a similar prothetic vowel, *a-. Normally, initial a in Pam has been taken to be the result of metathesis of *e and an initial consonant, e.g., Pam atlu < *telu 'three', Pam abyas < *beRas 'milled rice'. However, this same phenomenon is noted on forms in Itb and Ivt, where the normal reflex of *e is e, not a (as in Pam); and it is found in forms in Pam and Itb which have no *e at all.

- *telu 'three' Pam a-tlú, Itb atluq.
 - *øenem 'six' Pam anám, Itb aqnem.
 - *øepat 'four' Pam ápat, Itb aqpat.
 - *Depa 'fathom' Pam a-bpáq, Ivt adpaq.
 - *keDut 'to pinch' Pam a-kdút, Itb akdut-en.
 - *besuR 'full, satisfied' Pam -absíq, Itb -absuy.
-

- *quhaw 'thirst' Pam áwaw/áwo, Itb ahwaw.
*puluq 'ten' Pam apúluq, Itb sa-apuguq.
*quway 'rattan' Pam áway, Itb ahway.
*paøen 'bait' Pam apán, Itb aqpan.

REFERENCES

- Conant, Carlos E. 1911. The RGH law in Philippine languages. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 31:70-85.
- Conklin, Harold C. 1953. *Hanunoo-English vocabulary*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press.
- Dyen, Isidore. 1965. A lexicostatistical classification of the Austronesian languages. *Memoir 19-- Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, Linguistics*. Baltimore, Waverly Press Inc.
- _____. 1973. Tagalog reflexes of Proto-Austronesian 1. In: Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez, pp. 3-7. Manila, Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Forman, Michael L. 1971. *Kapampangan dictionary*. Pali Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press.
- Schneider, E. E. 1912. Notes on the Mangyan language. *Philippine Journal of Science* 7(3):157-178.
- Tweddel, Colin. 1958. *The Iraya (Mangyan) language of Mindoro: phonology and morphology thesis*. Seattle, University of Washington.
- _____. 1970. The identity and distribution of the Mangyan tribes of Mindoro. *Anthropological Linguistics* 12(6):189-207.

Ward, Jack H. 1971. A bibliography of Philippine linguistics and minor languages. SEA Program, Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University Linguistic Series V, Data Paper #83.

Zorc, R. David. 1972. The western subgroup of Bisayan. *Oceanic Linguistics* 11:110-139.

_____. 1974. Towards a definitive Philippine wordlist--the qualitative use of vocabulary in identifying and classifying languages. Paper presented at the First International Conference on Comparative Austronesian Linguistics. January 2-7. Honolulu, Hawaii.

LINKED CITATIONS

- Page 1 of 1 -



You have printed the following article:

Internal and External Relationships of the Mangyan Languages

R. David Zorc

Oceanic Linguistics, Vol. 13, No. 1/2, Papers of the First International Conference on Comparative Austronesian Linguistics, 1974: Proto-Austronesian and Western Austronesian. (Summer - Winter, 1974), pp. 561-600.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0029-8115%28197422%2F24%2913%3A1%2F2%3C561%3AIAEROT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-H>

This article references the following linked citations. If you are trying to access articles from an off-campus location, you may be required to first logon via your library web site to access JSTOR. Please visit your library's website or contact a librarian to learn about options for remote access to JSTOR.

References

The RGH Law in Philippine Languages

Carlos Everett Conant

Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 31, No. 1. (1911), pp. 70-85.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-0279%281911%2931%3A1%3C70%3ATRLIPL%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Z>

The Western Subgroup of Bisayan

R. David Zorc

Oceanic Linguistics, Vol. 11, No. 2. (Winter, 1972), pp. 110-139.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0029-8115%28197224%2911%3A2%3C110%3ATWSOB%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Y>