23

AN ETYMOLOGICAL, BILINGUAL DICTIONARY — ESOTERIC OR ESSENTIAL?

R. David Zorc
School of Australian Linguistics
Darwin Community College

1.0. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this paper to outline the basic features of an etymological dictionary for use in a bilingual context. Such a dictionary must contain all the information required of a basic dictionary, and it must further act as a guide to speakers of Language A (Lg-A) concerning the cultural contexts and histories of words in Language B (Lg-B). The development of such a dictionary involves the authors directly in areas of LANGUAGE PLANNING and the hotly debated issues of DESCRIPTIVE versus PRE-SCRIPTIVE linguistics. While the development of such a dictionary is not an early item on the agenda in the establishment of a bilingual/bicultural programme, the wealth of historical information it can provide — and the pride in one's own culture and language it can achieve — moves it from (what some have called) 'an esoteric luxury' to a committed essential. Since the author is currently involved in preparing a core etymological dictionary of Pilipino at the request of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines, examples will be drawn from this project (of necessity involving Indonesian languages as well), and also from Australian Aboriginal languages (particularly of the Yolnu Group, e.g., Gumatj).

1.1. THE BASIC DICTIONARY.[1]

It is the purpose of a basic dictionary to draw together as many words of any given language as possible. It thus differs from *wordlists, vocabularies,* and *lexicons* in the quantity and quality of the entries.[2] It serves as a guide to the sounds, spelling, meaning, and grammar of each entry: each of these four areas must be covered. Where any element is predictable, patterned, or regular, it should be covered in the introduction. For example, if the spelling is totally phonetic/phonemic, each entry automatically gives a guide to the pronunciation and spelling of each word. However, it is important to include in the introduction the IPA[3] symbol that each letter or digraph represents, e.g., Malay e = [ə], ng = [ŋ], Dutch/Indonesian oe = [u]. It is regrettable that a large number of dictionaries do not give any indication of accent: vowel length, pitch accent, or stress. If accent is predictable and always falls on a given syllable, this should be stated in the introduction. Exceptions must be treated in the dictionary, as must *all forms* in languages where accent may fall on different syllables and hence convey different meanings, e.g. Tagalog [ʔáːso] 'dog' / [ʔasó] 'smoke', where the written convention is adequately covered by *aso* vs *asó* (no accent mark means the penult is long and stressed).

---

[2] It is the view of many linguists that a book must have at least 8000 or more entries to qualify as a dictionary. A wordlist contains anywhere from a handful to a 1000 entries. Beyond 1000 entries and up to 8000, one is constructing either a vocabulary or a lexicon. Technically, however, the term lexicon refers to ALL of the content words of a language, i.e. all of the non-grammatical forms.

[3] That is, the International Phonetic Alphabet. One may make recourse to other systems, e.g. that devised by Charles Kenneth Thomas (1947. *An Introduction to the Phonetics of American English),* but should state clearly which system is followed.

Giving the meaning of a form is rarely an easy task, since one must consider both the basic meaning *(denotation)* and the overtones *(connotation)*. For example, in Javanese one must indicate the speech level at which a form may be used (unless it occurs in all); in English, the level of sophistication: scientific or erudite *(intestinal fortitude)*, polite *(courage)*, or rude *(guts)*; in Aboriginal languages, the moiety, age-level, or sacredness/ceremonial-significance; and so´ on. One must also consider the *extensions of meaning (eye — of human, -of needle, -of cyclone)*, and *idioms (see eye to eye, private eye)*. Often, the meaning is best illustrated in context by examples: *hit the man, hit a home run, hit and run, hit the nail on the head, hit him below the belt, hit him hard, hit the road, hit sixty miles an hour, hit the bank, hit it off together, hit parade,* etc. In giving the meanings, it is useful to include *synonyms (large, big, huge, gigantic, great)* or *antonyms (small, tiny, little, petite, miniature)* where they specify or clarify the meaning. Words with more than one related meaning *(polysemes)* are traditionally treated in a single entry *(big = large, older, important)*, while words with totally unrelated meanings *(homonyms)* are given separate entries *(well$_1$ = good, fine, healthy; well$_2$ = water-hole; well$_3$ = to swell-up; well$_4$ =* Exclamation: *well, now! , well, I never)*.

Grammatical information of all kinds is also necessary: the basic part of speech, inflections, and irregularities *(tooth/teeth; go/went/gone)*. It is not necessary to list inflected forms or derivatives if they are predictable, as in Indonesian *perlu* 'necessity' / *ke-perlu-an* 'be in need of', *sakit* 'ill' / *ke-sakit-an* 'be sick'; but it is necessary if there is a significant change in meaning *(tua* 'old' / *ke-tua-an* 'too old' / *mer-tua* 'parents-in-law') or in form (Aklanon [bakʌ́l] 'buy' / [bʌ́kl -a] 'buy (it)'); it would be necessary to list Akl *bakáe / báke-* 'buy', and other such irregularities.

1.2. THE BILINGUAL DICTIONARY

The bilingual dictionary is both a basic dictionary and a guide for speakers of Lg-A and Lg-B. Thus, besides information on sounds, spelling, meaning, and grammar, references to the culture *(ethnolinguistics)* of the words is crucial, and many more example phrases and sentences are called for.

It is useful to give a guide to sounds in Lg-B that are the same in Lg-A, and a warning for those that are not, e.g. Tagalog *"a"* = [a] as in English f*a*ther (not as in f*a*t), *"e"* = [ɛ] as in f*ea*ther (not as in f*ee*t). A clear, non-technical description of hard to produce 'new' sounds in Lg-A, with examples, is crucial for speakers of Lg-B, such as [ŋ] in word initial position for speakers of English, or the interdental, palatal, and retroflex sounds of Australian Aboriginal languages.

In the area of meaning, besides giving the denotations, connotations, extensions of meaning, idioms, polysemes, and homonyms of forms from Lg-A to Lg-B, it is useful to indicate or refer to *semantic sets*. For example, in his Batad Ifugao Vocabulary, Newell (1968:129) under *hēpeŋ* 'one centavo' lists:

1	centavo	—	behhen/ŋēpeŋ
5	centavos	—	kūlaŋ
10	centavos	—	haqis
20	centavos	—	pihīta
25	centavos	—	bintin
50	centavos	—	halapi
1	peso	—	pīhu
10	pesos	—	himpuluy pīhu
15	pesos	—	kinhi

In the same way, under 'money' one could well cross-reference the American English: *penny, nickel, dime, quarter, two bits, dollar, buck, c-note, fin, grand,* etc., although the definitions and translations would occur under each entry in alphabetical order. The semantic sets chosen depend on their importance to the culture(s) involved, but might include kinship terms, directions (compass or wind), related utensils or artifacts, and

synonyms. Antonyms are especially useful if they help specify the meaning: *fine₁* = *good, well, not sick; fine₂* = *penalty* (Opp: *reward); fine₃* = *smooth, not rough*. This teaches the user a good deal about the language.

In the bilingual dictionary, grammatical information is crucial as a means of learning to speak and understand the other language. While many languages such as English and those of the Philippines and Indonesia use a form *(root word)* as a noun, verb, or adjective (depending on inflection or derivation), other languages such as Australian Aboriginal languages use entirely different forms. Compare Aklanon [? ȋ:hi?] 'urine' (n) / urinate (v) with Gumatj [bálkay] 'urine' / [wár-yun] 'urinate' or Aklanon [? úlán] 'rain' (n + v) with Gumatj [walt^yan] 'rain' (n) / [daʳ-yun] (v).

Because of the large amount of grammatical information necessary in a bilingual dictionary, there should be a concise grammatical sketch of Lg-A in the introduction, with cross-references to such information at each relevant entry. Thus, if there are several verb classes (certain verbs take a given group of affixes), some abbreviation (e.g., RV-1= *Regular Verb of Type 1)* is sufficient. This avoids the repetition of predictable forms and meanings, but introduces the necessity of isolating root words or their alternate forms, e.g., Tagalog [ká:? in] root / [ká:n-] 'to eat', [kú:ha] root / [ku:n-] 'to take, get'. An example of such an entry for Aklanon is:

> *inôm / imn-* 'to drink' [RV-1] ; *ilímnon* 'drink, beverage' (n);
>
> *ilimnan* 'bar, pub, place for drinking, drinking-party' (n);
>
> *pa-inôm* 'to give to drink; to make take (medicine/tablet)'

The root word [? inúm] and its alternate [? imn-] are specified as members of the Regular Verb Class 1, which then excludes the need to list some 60 forms [ga-? inúm, ma-? inúm, naga-? inúm, nag-? inúm, na-? inúm, gina-? inúm, pag-? inúm, ? ímn-un, ? ímn-a, ? ímn-an, pag-? ímn-a, paga-? ímn-un, (etc.)] that are predictable for any verb of that class; [? ilímnun] and [? ilímnan] are not predictable because they take a limited infix (<il>) and need to be cited; [pa-? inúm] , while a normal causative verb, has a secondary meaning of 'giving someone a medication (tablet, powder)' that might not be predicted by speakers of Lg-B.

The amount of ethnolinguistic information needs to be limited, unless one is embarking on the publication of an encyclopedia, but some indication of the importance and relevance of an item to the culture must be given. It is not sufficient to know that Cebuano [? apí:tuŋ] is 'a tree'; it is useful to know that it is 'used for timber and for *balaw* resin, which is used to caulk and waterproof a boat'; it is also useful to know that it is *Dipterocarpus grandiflorus*. Cebuano [balá:nak] is not just 'a fish', but 'a general name for large mullets *(Mugilidae)';* and [baʃús] is 'milkfish *(Chanos chanos),* caught locally, used in trade and commerce, and cooked in a large variety of ways'.

1.3. THE ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY

The etymological dictionary builds upon the basic and the bilingual dictionary. In the case of languages without a body of written literature extending back into prehistory, care must be taken that the etymologies are ACCURATE and not the product of guesswork or happenstance agreements. It is better to have an entry without an etymon rather than a blatant error. In the Philippines, for example, it is not sufficient that a word SOUNDS Chinese or Spanish, one must illustrate the word(s) from which it comes, show a reasonable parallel in meaning (or likely shift), and examine available etymologies to see if there is not a history for the form within the language family. Tag [tá:kaw] 'greed(y)' is more likely to be from Proto Austronesian (PAN) *ta:kaw 'steal' than from Hokkien [tuā-kaú] 'greedy', despite its similarity in meaning (but not in sound) to the Chinese form [Yap (1973:52)] . Similarly, Tag [sipsíp] is from PAN *səpsəp 'suck', not from Chinese just because it is a doubled monosyllable [Manuel (1948:71-72); Panganiban (1969:909)] ; and Tag [supsóp] is from a PAN doublet *supsup 'suck', not from Spanish *chupar* [Panganiban (1969:926)] .

An etymological dictionary is of necessity a co-operative effort, based on the amount of research that must be done, and on the number of languages that need to be searched for likely *cognates* (words that come from an earlier form and have a common ancestor; see examples below). A scholar who has a full knowledge of Chinese, Sanskrit, Tamil, Arabic, Persian, Spanish, English, Malay, Buginese, Javanese, and several Philippine languages would be a boon to Philippinologists, but is probably non-existent. Yet words from all these languages have found their way into Tagalog, and hence Pilipino; although some came through an intermediate route through Indonesian languages. Tracing the history of such loanwords is itself a fascinating study, and shows the impact of other societies (in adopted artifacts, values, and concepts).

However, for languages without a written history (and this is the case for Australia and most of insular Southeast Asia) an etymological dictionary is a means of achieving some knowledge of prehistory. It must be recognized that in societies where history is only recently recorded, prehistory can be known from only three sources: archaeology, language reconstruction, and oral literature. Linguists have developed a means of reconstructing a parent language by comparing forms that are similar in shape and meaning among different members of the same (proven) language family. Most Western Austronesian peoples have a form [mãtá] meaning 'eye'; in Philippine languages where accent may be on either syllable, the form is pronounced [mãtá]. We may safely conclude that some 4000 years ago, the ancestors of Indonesians, Malays, and Filipinos (PHN) called the visual organ something like PHN *mata* (the *star* or asterisk indicates it is a *reconstruction* since we have no recorded proof that it WAS so), and if the Philippines preserve an original accent distinction, it may have been PHN *mãtá.[4] In such comparison or reconstruction, we discover correspondences, sounds that agree from language to language, and re-occur in different words. Thus, Iban [manuk] and Cebuano [manúk] correspond sound-for-sound (Ib m : Ceb m, Ib a : Ceb a, etc.), for meaning ('chicken, domestic fowl'), but not for accent; based on almost identical forms in other Philippine and Indonesian languages, one can reconstruct a PHN *mãnúk* 'chicken, fowl'. Sometimes different sounds correspond, like the final sounds in Malay [kawat] and Tagalog [ka:wad] 'wire', as opposed to Malay [bayar], Tag [ba:yad] ' to pay'; Tagalog shows -d in both instances, while Malay has -t in one, -r in the other. One must therefore set up different *correspondence sets* for the *proto* (parent) *language* on the assumption that they reflect a distinction which was originally made. One way of doing this is with small and capital letters, yielding PHN *ka:wad* 'wire' and PHN *ba:yaD* 'pay'. These are then confirmed as more words having the same correspondences are discovered: Ml *tawar*, Tag *ta:wad* 'bargain (v); discount (n)' < PHN *ta:waD;* Ml *akar* 'root', Akl *?a:kad* 'to uproot' < PHN *?a:kaD* 'root'; Ml *hañut*, Tag *?a:nod* 'drift' < PHN *qa:ñud;* Ml *busut*, Akl *buŋsud* 'anthill' < PHN *bu(ŋ)sud.*

Space does not permit an explication of the method of reconstruction here, but it has been a respected science since 1786 when Sir William Jones discovered and stated that languages spring from a common source which no longer exists, i.e. that languages do not come from one another, because *all languages are subject to change, and together evolve from a parent language.[5]* In the 1800's, scholars like Franz Bopp, August Wilhelm von

---

[4]Zorc (1978) has presented evidence from Philippine languages and from Toba-Batak in Indonesia, that accent was a feature of Proto Hesperonesian. Based on the complexity of accent, it is also probable that Proto Austronesian had it too, but that it was lost in most daughter languages. The reconstructions in this paper take account of accent (penult vowel length or shortness) where sufficient Philippine evidence exists.

[5]Comparative reconstruction has a limited power, estimated at about 10,000 years before the present. Hence, no statements can be made that all the languages of the world have come from a common parent language. Linguists deal with established language families, and Proto Austronesian is just one. Attempts, mostly unconvincing and unsuccessful, have been made to link Austronesian languages with Chinese, Thai, Japanese, Indo-European, or Australian Aboriginal languages, but clearly all languages have changed so drastically in time that only a handful of evidence for such linkage (to any *ONE* of the above-mentioned groups) is presented. Such evidence can be the product of accident, early-borrowing, or genetic inheritance, but is so scarce that it is doubtful that we will ever know what was the language family closest to Proto Austronesian.

Schlegel, Christian Lassen, William Dwight Whitney, and Jacob Grimm refined the method in reconstructing Proto-Indo-European (the parent language of most Indian and European languages), and Wilhelm von Humboldt, H. C. von der Gabelentz, and Johan Hendrik Caspar Kern applied it to Proto Austronesian (the parent language of Malaysian, Indonesian, Philippine, Micronesian, and Polynesian languages). In the century, Otto Dempwolff, Isidore Dyen, Otto Christian Dahl, and Shigeru Tsuchida have made enormous advances in Austronesian studies. An excellent summary of the method and its application can be found in Dyen (1971) and in Dahl (1976).

The important factor here is that with a careful, systematic, and scientific comparison of genetically-related languages, one can reconstruct the parent language or various stages of daughter languages *(meso-languages)*. From the reconstructions obtained, one can learn something of the prehistory of the people, especially from the names of actions and artifacts (for what they did and made), and of plants, insects, animals, and meteorological terms (for where they came from). It is precisely in this area that a people can be justly proud of their heritage. For example, words reconstructed for the Philippine/Indonesian parent language, called Proto Hesperonesian (PHN), of approximately 4000 years ago, or for Proto Austronesian (PAN) of up to 8000 years ago, reveal a wealth of expertise in the following areas:[6]

RICE AGRICULTURE

'seed(ling)'	PHN *bənhiq
'rice-plant'	PHN *pa:jəy
'milled-rice'	PHN *bəRas
'cooked-rice'	PHN *hə̆may
'husk, chaff'	PHN *qə̆pa
'rice-straw'	PHN *ZaRa:mi
'to thresh'	PHN *Rĭək
'to grind'	PHN *gi:liŋ
'millstone'	PHN *gĭlĭŋ-án
'to plant'	PHN *mu:la

HORTICULTURE AND PLANT USE

'earth'	PHN *ta:nəq
'plant' (n/v)	PHN *tă̆nəm
'to grow'	PHN *tu:buq
'to dig'	PHN *ka:lih
'to lever-up'	PAN *sŭwal

---

[6]A few of the forms cited are posited for PPH (Proto-Philippine approximately 3000 years ago). Articles by Dyen (1971 and 1976) and Blust (1977) also discuss most of these forms, and I acknowledge my gratitude to both scholars for their many insights.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED

Akl	Aklanon (Phil. Bisayan)		Ml	Malay (Bahasa)
Bik	Bikol (central Phil.)		Mr	Merina (Malagasy)
Bon	Bontok (north Phil.)		Ng	Ngadju-Dayak
Br	Bornean lgs. (Ray. 1911.)		PAN	Proto-Austronesian
Ceb	Cebuano (Phil. Bisayan)		PHN	Proto-Hesperonesian
Fj	Fijian (Micronesian)		PPH	Proto-Philippine
Ft	Futuna (Polynesian)		Sa	Sa'a (Polynesian)
Ib	Iban (Sea Dayak)		Sm	Samoan (Polynesian)
Ilk	Ilokano (north Phil.)		Tag	Tagalog (Phil. Nat. Lg.)
Jv	Javanese		Tb	Toba-Batak
Kal	Kalamian (Palawan, Phil.)		To	Tongan (Polynesian)

'hoe'	PAN *suwan
'taro' *Colocasia*	PAN *taləs
'taro' *Alocasia*	PAN *bi:Raq
'yam'	PAN *qu:bi
'sugarcane'	PHN *tŏbuh
[bamboo]	PHN *bu:luq
[bamboo]	PHN *qauR
[bamboo-large]	PHN *bŏtuŋ
'jackfruit' *Artocarpus*	PHN *naŋka?
[tree] *Erythrina*	PAN *DapDap
[tree] *Barringtonia*	PAN *butun
[tree] *Casuarina*	PAN *?aRu:hu?
[tree] *Pandanus*	PAN *paŋDan
[tree] *Terminalia*	PAN *tali:say
[tree-mangrove] *Ceriops*	PHN *tŏŋəR
[tree-hibiscus] *Gnetum*	PAN *ba:Ru
coconut	PAN *nĭuR
[banana]	PAN *punti
[banana]	PHN *sab?a
ginger	PAN *laquya
tree, wood	PHN *ka:yuh,
fruit	PHN *bŭaq
blossom fruit	PAN *bu:ŋa

BOATING AND SEAFARING

boat	PHN *parau
canoe	PPH *baŋka?
outrigger	PHN *ka:tiR
sail	PAN *la:yaR
paddle	PAN *bəRsay
punt-pole	PAN *təkən
bail(er)	PAN *lĭmas
rope	PHN *tăli[h]
land	PAN *banŭa
prow	PHN *zu:luŋ
mast	PAN *tiaŋ
sea	PHN *lăwəd
salt-water	PHN *tăsik
water	PHN *wa:hiR
fresh-water	PAN *Dănum
lake	PHN *Danaw
wave	PHN *qa:lun
swell	PHN *humbak
tidal-wave	PPH *dălu:yun
current	PHN *qa:Rus
channel	PHN *?a:luR
to drift	PHN *qa:ñud
rain	PHN *qŭZan
wind	PHN *ha:ŋin
[wind-N/W]	PHN *haba:Rat
[wind-S/E]	PHN *ti:muR
[wind-S]	PHN *sala:tan

FISHING AND THE SEA

fish	PAN *ʔikan
	PHN *isədaq
net	PAN *pukət
fishnet	PHN *Rambat
large-net	PHN *salambaw
fishtrap	PAN *bu:bu
weir	PAN *əmpaŋ
fish-hook	PHN *kăwil
fish-poison	PAN *tŭba
giant-clam	PAN *kima
crocodile	PAN *buqa:ya
eel	PAN *tuna
octopus	PAN *kuRi:ta
oyster	PAN *tiRəm
mackerel	PHN *taŋi:Ri
stingray	PAN *pa:Ri
shark	PAN *qi:hu
shrimp	PAN *qŭDaŋ
Triton-shell	PAN *tambu:ri
tortoise	PAN *pŏñu

HUNTING AND ANIMALS

bow	PAN *bu:suR
arrow	PAN *pănaq
spear	PHN *baŋkaw
bamboo-trap	PHN *băwəR
booby-trap	PHN *bala:tik
kill/stab	PHN *bŭnuq
pig	PHN *ba:buy
fowl	PAN *mănuk
egg	PHN *(qi)tə̆luR

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION

house	PAN *Rumaq
building	PAN *bălay
thatch-roof	PAN *qătəp
rafter	PAN *ka:saw
plank	PAN *pàpan
ridge-beam	PAN *bŭbuŋ
hearth	PHN *dăpuR
nail	PAN *pa:kuʔ
wedge	PHN *ka:laŋ
housepost	PAN *turus
	PPH *haDi:Ri
wall/screen	PHN *DiŋDiŋ
flooring	PHN *lantay
floor-slats	PHN *săləR
storage-shelf	PHN *pa:Ra
to plane	PHN *tăRaq
to rasp	PAN *parud
adze	PPH *wa:say

COMMERCE AND TRADE

count	PAN *hituŋ
	PHN *bi:laŋ
buy	PAN *bəlih
pay	PHN *ba:yaD
debt	PHN *qu:taŋ
discount	PHN *ta:waD
one	PHN *?ə̆sa
two	PHN *dŭha
three	PHN *tə̆lu
four	PHN *?ə̆(m)pat
five	PAN *lĭma
six	PHN *?ə̆nəm
seven	PAN *pĭtu
eight	PAN *wă̆lu
nine	PAN *pu:luq
hundred	PAN *Ră̆tus

WEAVING AND BRAIDING

weave	PAN *añam
braid	
weave	PPH *hă̆bəl
shuttle	PHN *bali:ja
weft	PHN *pakan
mat	PHN *hikam
[basket]	PHN *ba:kul
[basket-large]	PHN *baŋkat
[winnowing-basket]	PHN *bija:u
cloth	PHN *ka:yu
blanket	PPH *ha:bəl

SEWING

to sew	PAN *za:quit
	PPH *tă̆hiq
thread	PHN *bə̆naŋ
needle	PAN *Za:Rum

UTENSILS

cooking-pot	PAN *ku:Dən
cup/bowl	PAN *maŋkuk
jar/pot	PHN *b<al>aŋa?
broom	PAN *sapu
hook	PHN *ka?wit
torch	PAN *sŭluq
pouch	PAN *kantuŋ
whet(stone)	PHN *ha:saq

How can the knowledge of such a prehistory fail to fill Malaysians, Indonesians, and Filipinos with pride? The preservation of a language, and realisation of its value, depends to some extent on the pride its speakers have — especially as a communicative tool of and within the culture. Many wish to speak English as an international language to further

their careers and enhance their prestige. Surely the knowledge that their ancestors had a highly-developed, complex society (when many branches of Indo-European society were still highly primitive by comparison) should make them proud to be bi-lingual and bi-cultural individuals! The labours that have gone into an etymological, bilingual dictionary are proportionately rewarded.

2. THE ROLE OF AN ETYMOLOGICAL, BILINGUAL DICTIONARY IN LANGUAGE PLANNING

A dictionary has three functions: DESCRIPTIVE (giving forms and uses actually recorded), PEDAGOGICAL (teaching facts about the spelling, pronunciation, words, meanings, uses, and idioms of the language), and PRESCRIPTIVE (stating what the language must be). Linguists waged war on prescriptive linguistics as long ago as four decades with the maxim 'if it is used, it *is* the language'. But more recently people have worried 'Why Johnny can't read? ' and 'Why Johnny can't write? '. Inability to express oneself in an appropriate speech style (High German, the Queen's English, Bahasa, Pilipino, etc.) can cost a person prestige, social standing, and a livelihood. Linguistic discrimination is a fact.

Since a dictionary serves all three roles, great care must go into its production. If a form is rude or archaic or dialectal, it must be labelled so; otherwise a phrase like 'But it's in the dictionary! ' evolves into a nagging clang. Since a dictionary can settle an argument *or* start a feud, it is an important instrument in language-planning.

Recording actual usage or knowledge by the public is an important factor. As an accident of history, the Spanish/Portuguese word *banco* 'seat' has found its way into Indonesian and Philippine languages (M1, Ib *baŋku,* Tag *baŋkô?,* Bis *báŋku?*). Feeling a need for a 'native' word, Tag *(salûmpu̯wît)* 'seat' was coined, but never gained prestige or popularity. Officials have generally avoided such coinages, and have instead sent out questionnaires on the terms actually in use for non-native items, concepts, or activities. Thus, Tag [sorbe:tes] (from Spanish) and [? ayskrim] (from English) enjoy a peaceful co-existence, as do [bir] and [serbé:sa]. Most Filipinos count in native numbers (at least to ten), tell time in Spanish, and buy or sell in English. Since they do so, they should be left to do so. It may seem wasteful to outsiders, but it is quite efficient within the culture; witness Akl [? alâs du:si] vs [na-pu:tu-g dáywa-ŋ tákna?] '12 o'clock'. Thus far the dictionary resulting is both descriptive and pedagogical.

The need for a prescriptive dictionary, at least at the national language level, is most felt where there is either (1) a commonly used term in languages other than that on which the national language is based, or (2) no known term that needs coining. Tagalog was chosen as the basis for the national language, yet there are a number of words used in most major languages (and certainly by more than 50% of the Philippine population) that are pronounced differently in Tagalog. Thus, Tag [ba:hay] 'house' differs from [balay] spoken in Ilokano, Atta, Bisayan (most dialects), Aborlan, Isneg, Kalagan, Kalamian, etc. The same is true for Tag [da? án] 'trail, road' spoken [da:lan] elsewhere; Tag [buwán] 'moon, month' vs [bu:lan]; Tag [bá:? on] 'provisions' vs [bá:lun]; Tag [bú:ho?] 'bamboo' vs [bú:lu?]; Tag [pu̯wiŋ] 'blinded by something in eye' vs [pú:liŋ]; etc. The Institute of National Language has wisely allowed some of these alternate forms to become part of the Pilipino lexicon. On the etymological side, it is clear that Tag underwent some unusual changes of PPH *1, and that the other languages reflect both the original accent and the PPH *1: PPH *baláy 'house', *dá:lan 'trail', *bú:lan 'moon', *bá:lun 'provisions', *bú:lu? 'bamboo', *pú:liŋ 'blinded'. Other forms include: PPH *tali:ŋa > Tag te:ŋa/ta? iŋa 'ear'; PPH *bá:lu > Tag bá:? o 'widow'; PPH *? uliq > Tag ? uwi? 'go home'; PPH *bú:liR > Tag buwig 'bunch (bananas)'. The fact that most non-Tagalog speakers already use such words justifies their inclusion as AT LEAST ALTER-NATES in the national language, and does not prejudice it as a truly NATIONAL LANGUAGE.

Where coinages become necessary in the mathematical, scientific, legal, medical, and other spheres, it would seem best to tap the best-known trade or international language of the area. This would mitigate the choice of English terms in the Philippines or Malaysia, or of Dutch in Indonesia, unless, of course, there were a perfectly good local term that could survive an extension of meaning. For example, Akl [dá:paw] originally referred to a 'tiny louse', but is now commonly used for 'germs'. But it was Aklanons who made the semantic shift, not a governing body or dictionary. Gone are the days (if ever they were) of a strict datu imposing his speech impediments upon his subjects (the legend told about the origin of Aklanon fricative [ɬ]). One cannot doubt the ingenuity of people in coining terms, making metaphors, extending meanings, creating idioms, and otherwise using language to communicate effectively. This Mankind has clearly done since the Dawn of Man. Thus, it is people who make and use language, and scholars who make (and use?) a dictionary.

REFERENCES

BLUST, ROBERT. 1977. Austronesian culture history: some linguistic inferences and their relations to the archaeological record. NUSA, Linguistic Studies in Indonesian and Languages in Indonesia. 4:25-37.

DAHL, OTTO CHRISTIAN. 1976. Proto Austronesian. Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph. London: Curzon Press Ltd.

DEMPWOLFF, OTTO. 1934-38. Vergleichende Lautlehre des Austronesischen Wortschatzes. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift fur Eingeborenen-Sprachen 15, 17, 19. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1934, 1937, 1938.

DYEN, ISIDORE. 1971. The Austronesian languages and Proto-Austronesian. Current Trends in Linguistics: 8 ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok: Linguistics in Oceania, 5-54. The Hague: Mouton.

_____. 1976. Some cultural characteristics of the Proto-Austronesians. Actes du 29e Congrès International des Orientalistes. Indonésie 2:70-77.

ECHOLS, JOHN M., and HASSAN SHADILY. 1968. An Indonesian-English dictionary. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

GLEASON, HENRY A. 1961. An introduction to descriptive linguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

HOCKETT, CHARLES F. 1958. A course in modern linguistics. New York: The MacMillan Company.

INSTITUTE OF NATIONAL LANGUAGE. 1953. A composite vocabulary of Philippine languages. Manila: Bureau of Printing.

MANUEL, E. ARSENIO. 1948. Chinese elements in the Tagalog language. Manila: Filipiniana Publications.

NEWELL, LEONARD E. 1968. A Batad Ifugao vocabulary. New Haven: Human Relations Area Files, Inc.

PANGANIBAN, JOSE VILLA. 1972. Disyunaryo tesauro Pilipino-Ingles. Quezon City: Manlapaz Publishing Company.

RAY, SIDNEY. 1911. The languages of Borneo. The Sarawak Museum Journal 1.1.

REID, LAWRENCE A. 1971. Philippine minor languages: word lists and phonologies. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 8. Hawaii: University Press.

_____. 1976. Bontok-English dictionary. Pacific Linguistics, C, 36. Canberra: The Australian National University.

SCOTT, N.C. 1956. A dictionary of Sea Dayak. University of London: School of Oriental and African Studies.

SCOTT, WILLIAM HENRY. 1968. A critical study of the prehispanic source materials for the study of Philippine history. Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press.

TSUCHIDA, SHIGERU. 1976. Reconstruction of Proto-Tsouic phonology. Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Monograph Series No. 5 Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

VANOVERBERGH, MORICE. 1956. Iloko-English dictionary. Baguio: Catholic School Press.

WILKINSON, R.J. 1959. A Malay-English dictionary (romanised). London: MacMillan and Company, Ltd.

WOLFF, JOHN U. 1972. A dictionary of Cebuano Visayan. Philippine Journal of Linguistics, Special Monograph No. 4. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

YAP, GLORIA CHAN. 1973. Sound changes in Tagalog words of Chinese origin. Philippine Journal of Linguistics 4/5.48-54.

ZORC, R. DAVID. 1969. A study of the Aklanon dialect, Volume 2: Aklanon to English Dictionary. Kalibo: Aklan Printing Center.

_____. 1977. The Bisayan dialects of the Philippines: subgrouping and reconstruction. Pacific Linguistics, C, 44. Canberra: The Australian National University.

_____. 1978. Proto-Philippine word accent: innovation or Proto-Hespero-nesian retention? Paper presented at Second International Conference on Austro-nesian Linguistics, Canberra. (To appear in Pacific Linguistics.)