

SOME HISTORICAL LINGUISTIC CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOCIOLINGUISTICS

R. David Zorc

0. INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS¹

Historical linguists can have some pretty strange and varied bedfellows. During the past 16 years of work in the comparative linguistic area, I've needed recourse to such diverse fields as oceanography, botany, entomology, geography, anthropology, and sociology. Forays into distinctly non-Austronesian camps, such as Sanskrit, Chinese, Spanish, and Dutch, have also been necessary, as well as the other 'camps' of theoretical and socio-linguistics. The latter has been particularly helpful and productive, since the way people of different sex, age, and social standing speak profoundly affects the course of language change. Li (1980, 1982a, 1982b), for example, has made Atayalic forms more comparable to Austronesian etyma by unravelling female conservatism from what may be termed 'male speech disguise'.

When it comes to paying long-accumulated debts, most benefactors have to accept simple gratitude. But historical linguists can repay sociolinguists with some insights into determining the exact linguistic situation of multilingual countries and areas like the Philippines, Indonesia, Melanesia, and Oceania. Although I will be discussing the Philippines in particular, what I have to say should apply (certainly *in principle*) to a wide range of language families where the number and the relationships of speech varieties are in dispute. The 100-meaning list presented below is intended to offer a tool for 'fine-tuning' on linguistically discrete communalects*. It is anticipated that a far larger number of such speech varieties will surface than anyone has previously surmised.

1. LANGUAGES, DIALECTS, OR COMMUNALECTS?

In contrast with some popular (non-technical) points of view,² a linguist determines a *LANGUAGE* on the basis of mutual intelligibility, whether total (*L-simplex*) or chained (*L-complex*) (see Hockett 1958:327f). Thus, every speech variety is a *DIALECT*, and the combination of all dialects that can communicate directly or indirectly with one another makes up a single *LANGUAGE*. Further refinements have been made, recognising the speech of a single individual as an *IDIOLECT*, and that of a reasonably homogeneous social group as a *COMMUNALECT* (or *ISOLECT* (Hudson 1967)).

In the Philippines alone, there are probably 50 million *idiolects* (based on a 1984 population estimate) broken up into approximately 5000 *communalects* (based on the number of barrios, sitios, or barangays in non-metropolitan areas),

Paul Geraghty, Lois Carrington and S.A. Wurm, eds *FOCAL I: papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, 341-355. *Pacific Linguistics*, C-93, 1986.

i.e. where people talk in much the same way. While these numbers are very high (and hence not entirely informative), they are a matter of fact. Anyone who has journeyed from town to town within a purportedly common linguistic area (be it Bikol, Panay, Ilocos, or Mountain Province) can attest to the multiple differences in pronunciation, intonation, vocabulary, and grammar prevailing. The situation is certainly the same in Sabah, Java, Sumatra, and other Austronesian locales. In all fairness to the speakers who so choose to identify themselves on the basis of even minor language variations, linguists and laymen alike should accept the communalect as the bottom line. We therefore recognise, as do the speakers, a Marinduque vs Batangas Tagalog, an Oas vs Polangui Bikol, a Kalibonhon vs Libakawnon Aklanon, an Ilianen vs Livunganen Manobo, a Tina vs Botolan Sambal, an Amganad vs Kiangnan Ifugao, and so on. Language labels such as 'Bisaya', 'Ifugao', 'Manobo' in this context are uninformative and confusing.³ Some have been downright wrong, such as 'Sinauna Tagalog' (which is a distinct Southern Luzon language) or 'Datagnon Mangyan' (which is a West Bisayan dialect with no special genetic affiliation to any Mangyan language).

2. THE DETERMINATION OF COMMUNALECTS - A TOOL

The precise number of communalects can be determined by a survey of 100 (or even 50) words that in statistical terms have a high probability of replacement, or, conversely, a low probability of retention (see Dyen, James and Cole 1967). Table 1 is derived from principles discussed a decade ago (Zorc 1974) and virtually separates the Philippines into several thousand linguistic communities. For a positive score (+) in this kind of comparison, it is essential that forms be identical in sound, accent, form, and grammar - any difference whatsoever is crucial in establishing a communalect, and hence should be counted as minus. While historical linguists and lexicostatisticians are concerned with cognates (forms descended from a single ancestral word or etymon), sociolinguists take notice of differences separating speakers.

In scoring this list, for example, Tagalog *laró?* differs from Sinauna *lalú?* *play* (r vs l), and each differs from Alangan *ladó?*, even if all three descend from an etymon **ladú?*. Tagalog (um) *akyát*, Kapampangan *mukyat*, Aborlan-Tagbanwa *apyat*, and Ivatan *k(um)ayat* *climb* again differ from one another, even though they are ultimately cognate. Phonological differences (Kinaray-a *bédlay* :: Hiligaynon *búdlay* *difficult*; Aklanon *ʔíndi?* :: Tagalog *hindí?* *not*; Romblon *huyát* :: Aklanon *huát* *wait*), accent dissimilarities (Bontok *ʔótot* :: Pangasinan *ʔotót* *rat*), and semantic mismatches (Tagalog *doʔón* *there-far* :: Northern-Samar *duʔún* *there-near*) need to be regarded as separators of communalects.

Table 1: Differential vocabulary separating Philippine communal dialects

	TAGALOG	CEBUANO	AKLANON	NAGA BIKOL	ILOKANO	W. BKD MANOBO	ILLANEN MANOBO	CEN. MIND. MANOBO
01. *afternoon	hápon	hápon	hápon	hápon	malém	hápon	məʔapun	{kəpaʔuk kələŋətan
02. *angry	galít	sukúʔ	ʔákig	ʔangút	ʔunét	{paʔuk ʔəpəs	ləŋət	məraʔat
03. *ashamed	hiyáʔ	ʔúlaw	huyáʔ	súpug	baʔín	ʔələd	yəyaʔan	
04. *bad/evil	masamáʔ	dáʔut	matáʔin	maraʔút	dákəs	daʔat	məraʔat	
05. *bark (tree)	balát	pánit	pánit	ʔúpak	ʔukís	ləkaŋ	ʔupís	
06. *beautiful	magandá	níndut	mayadʔayad	magayún	napintás	{dagwey təndan	təndaŋ	
07. *bird	ʔíbon	lángam	píspis	gamgám	billít	tagbis	tagbis	
08. *blow (at)	híhip	huyúp	huyúp	hayúp	puyút	hiyup	periyup	
09. *boil (intr.)	kulóʔ	bukál	bukát	kalaʔkágaʔ	burék	diʔdiʔ	diʔdiʔ	
10. *bright	maliwénag	lámday	maháyag	liwánag	naranyág			
11. *carry/bring	dailá	dailá	datán	dará	yeg	ʔuwit	baba	
12. *chest	dibdíb	dúghan	dúghan	daghán	barúkuŋ	kuməŋ	kuməŋ	
13. *chin	bábaʔ	suwán	sután	kuʔkúʔ	tímid	bakaʔ	bakaʔ	
14. *climb (up)	ʔakyát	saká	sákaʔ	sakát	ʔumúli	{tekezəg pəmenahik	ʔambak	
15. *cold	{magináw malamíg	túgnaw	matamíg	malíput	{lamʔək lamíʔis	genəw	məʔadsiil	
16. *collapse	gibáʔ	gubáʔ	gubáʔ	gabáʔ	narbá			
17. *command	ʔútos	súguʔ	súguʔ	súguʔ	bílin	{suguʔ təlaʔan	təlaʔan	
18. *companion	kasáma	ʔubán	kaʔibáhan	kaʔibá	kaduá	duma	duma	
19. *crawl	gapaŋ	káməŋ	káməŋ	káməŋ	karayám	penanap		
20. *crush-lice	tiris	ʔirúk	turús	tadús	ligʔis			
21. *cut-off	putol	putul	putút	putúl	púted	raprap		
22. *dark	madilím	ʔitqit	madutúm	dikiúm	nasipqət	mərusi rəm	mərusi rəm	
23. *different	ʔibá	láʔin	ʔaʔín	{ibá láʔin	sabáli	{saŋiʔ sələkəw	laʔin	seŋəkəʔən
24. *difficult	mahirap	lisúd	malisúd	dipísil	narígat	mərəŋ	mərəŋ	
25. *dirty	marumi	húgaw	hígkuʔ	maʔatíʔ	narugít	mərədik	mərədik	
26. *dust	ʔalikabók	ʔabúg	taputapúh	ʔaipúg	tápuk	ʔaliyavuk	ʔaliyabuk	
27. *earth/soil	lúpaʔ	yútaʔ	ʔúgtaʔ	dagáʔ	dagá	tanaʔ	tanaʔ	
28. *fall (down)	húlog	húlug	húlug	húlug	tinnág	{ʔulug píley	ʔulug	
29. *fast/swift	mabilís	páspas	páspas	kaskás	nadarás	gaʔan	mesəsəw	
30. *few	kauntiʔ	gamáy	saŋkurút	diʔít	bassít	deʔisey		
31. *fight/quarrel	ʔáway	ʔáway	ʔáway	ʔíwal	ringúr	{əgət tebək	ʔəhət	{kəwahaʔən kəmə
32. *finger	dalíriʔ	túdluʔ	túdluʔ	murúʔ	rámay	{kəmə tezuʔ	teruʔ	

Table 1 (cont'd)

	TAGALOG	CEBUANO	AKLANON	NAGA BIKOL	ILOKANO	W. BKD MANOBO	ILIANEN MANOBO	CEN. MIND MANOBO
33. fish	ʔisdaʔ	ʔisdaʔ	ʔisdaʔ	siráʔ	ʔikán	paʔit	seraʔ	{seraʔ ʔalap
34. flood	baháʔ	baháʔ	baháʔ	baháʔ	layús	lipat	lipat	galwahalew
35. *forget	límot	límut	lípát	língaw	língaw	ʔupiya	məʔupiya	məresən
36. *good	mabúti	maʔáyu	mayád	maráy	nasayáʔat	malipay	kayi	kay
37. happy	{maseyá maligáya	lípay	malípay	maʔugmá	naragsák	mezəsen	mezəsen	{gawed kəmkəm
38. hard (subst)	matigás	gahíʔ	matíʔa	matagás	nataŋkén	{kayi dini	kayi	ranaw
39. *here	díto	{dirí díŋhi	{ʔiyá diyá	digdí	ditúy	ranaw	ranaw	taruʔ
40. *hold	háwak	kupút	buyút	kapút	ʔiggém	buluŋ	kəmkəm	{gawed kəmkəm
41. kind	mabaʔít	buʔután	mabúʔut	mabúʔut	naʔánus	tulaŋəd	tulaŋəd	taruʔ
42. lake	{láwaʔ láŋaw	líŋaw	danáw	dánaw	dánaw	ranaw	ranaw	kaliməŋawan
43. *lie/truth	sinugáliŋ	bakák	puríl	pútik	ʔulbúdd	taruʔ	taruʔ	tarin
44. lonely	mapaŋláv	{míŋaw guʔúl	namíŋaw	mapuʔŋaw	nailidáy	buluŋ	kaliməŋawan	merakel
45. lose/lost	waláʔ	waláʔ	dútaʔ	waráʔ	púkaw	tazin	tarin	məsələm
46. *marry	marámi	dághan	ʔabúʔ	dakúl	ʔadú	mezakəl	merakəl	basak
47. *morning	ʔumága	búntag	ʔágaŋun	ʔága	bigát	basak	məsələm	basak
48. mud	pútik	lápuk	ʔunaŋ	labúy	pítak	maligət	malihət	ʔubey
49. *narrow	{makítid masikítip	sígpit	makitíd	kipút	ʔakíkid	{ʔuvey rani	malihət	ʔubey
50. *near	malápít	duʔúl	matapít	haraní	ʔasidég	merani	merani	wəraʔ
51. none/nothing	maʔíŋay	sábaʔ	masánag	maríbuk	naʔariyangá	mezagiŋ	wəraʔ	kənaʔ
52. *not (fut.)	waláʔ	waláʔ	ʔuwáʔ	mayúʔ	ʔawán	wəzaʔ	kənaʔ	{ʔisa səbəkə
53. *one (as in counting)	hindíʔ	díliʔ	ʔíndiʔ	daʔí	saʔán	{ʔisa səvəha	ʔisa	galəw
54. *play	laróʔ	ʔusá	ʔisarát	sarúʔ	maysá	baləyvaləy	səbəkə	{sumag tulud
55. push	túlak	dúlaʔ	hámpaŋ	kawat	ʔayʔáyam	{tukuʔ tulud	derəmet	tahu
56. put/place	lagáy	tulúd	tuʔúd	ʔusul	túlak	savuk	sinumag	ʔinsaʔ
57. question/ask	tanón	bután	bután	bugták	kábil	ʔinsaʔ	tahu	baluntu
58. rain/rainbow	bahagháriʔ	paŋutána	paŋutána	hapút	saludsúd	{baləwtu beləwtu	ʔinsaʔ	kibəl
59. raincloud	dagim	baláŋaw	bataŋáw	{baláŋaw daʔgum	bulaláŋaw	kivəl	baluntu	kibəl
60. *rat	degáʔ	dəgʔum	gátʔum	daʔgum	libuyún	rumat	kibəl	{kiput rumat
61. *rat	degáʔ	ʔilagáʔ	ʔaggam	kinúʔ	baʔú	rumat	rumat	

Table 1 (cont'd)

	TAGALOG	CEBUANO	AKLANON	NAGA BIKOL	ILOKANO	W. BKD MANOBO	ILIANEN MANOBO	CEN. MIND. MANOBO
62. *river	ʔilog	subá?	subá?	sálug	karayán	wahig	wayig	wayig
63. *round	mabílog	líjin	malibúnug	talímun	nabukél	kelizen	wayig	
64. *sad	malungkót	subú?	masubú?	mamundú?	naladíngit			
65. *say/said	sábi	súlti	hámbat	sábi	saʔú	kagi	kahi	kahi
66. *seek	hánap	paŋíta?	ʔusuy	hánap	bíruk			
67. *short (obj)	maʔiklí?	mubú?	matágʔud	halíʔput	ʔababá	mevava?	mebaba?	mebaba?
68. *short (pers)	pandák	putút	putút	hababá?	pandék	{pendak malimpugu?	mebaba?	mebaba?
69. *stibling	kapatíd	ʔigsúʔun	ʔigmánhud	túgan	kabsát	suléd		
70. *sit	ʔupo?	líŋkud	líŋkud	túkaw	tugaw	pinuʔu	pinuʔu	pinuʔu
71. *slice (meat)	híwa?	híwa?	kíwa?	pidásu	ʔíwa	karad	karad	karad
72. *slow	mabágal	hínay	mahínay	malúway	nabuntúg	{malanat naney	nanay	nanay
73. *small (obj)	maliʔít	gamáy	maʔisút	sadáy	bassít	dəʔisek	dəʔisek	dəʔisek
74. *smell (n.)	ʔamóy	báhu?	húgum	páruŋ	ʔáŋut			
74a. *smell (v.)	ʔamuyín	timahú?	hugúm	parúgun	ʔagúten	ʔebbeŋarek	ʔebbeŋarek	ʔarek
74b. *fragrant	mabagó	humút	mahumút	mahamút	nabaŋlú	hemut	meʔemut	meʔamut
74c. *bad-smelling	mabáho?	bahú?	mabáhu?	mabatá?	nabuyúk	memahu?	memawu?	memawu?
75. *soft	malambót	humúk	mahumúk	malumúy	naluknéŋ	lémíneg		{malamæk meʔumel
76. *space under the house	sílon	sílung	sílung	síruŋ	síruk	síhuŋ	siyuŋ	
77. *speak/talk = word	salitá?	púlung	hámbat	tarám	saʔú	lalag	lalag	
78. *spider (gen)	{gagambá ʔanlaláwa?	lawaʔlawá?	ʔamán	láwa?	lawalawá	kələlawá?	kələlawá?	
79. *split = cleft	biʔák	buʔák	buká?	buwán	{bfsak búsak	tevi?		
80. *tear/rip	púnit	gfsi?	gfsi?	gfsi?	pígis	bindas	ʔayan	ʔayan
81. *that (far)	ʔiyón	kádtu	datú	ʔitú	daydíáy	heʔaza?		
82. *there (far)	doʔón	ditu	{ditu ditú	dumán	didiáy	diya?	kənyan	
83. *this	ʔitó	{kirí kiní	dáya	ʔiní	daytúy	heʔini	ʔini	ʔini
84. *throat	lalamúnan	tutúnlan	tutúnlan	halanúhan	karabukúb	bekərəŋ	bekərəŋ	bekərəŋ
85. *throw	hágis	lábay	habúy	ʔapún	ibatú	{timbag ʔantug	ʔantug	timbag

Table 1 (cont'd)

	TAGALOG	CEBUANO	AKLANON	NAGA BIKOL	ILOKANO	W. BKD. MANOBO	ILIANEN MANOBO	CEN. MIND. MANOBO
86. *throw-away	tápon	lábug	piilák	tápuk	belléñ	timbag	timbag	timbag
87. *tomorrow	búkas	gúgma?	hin?ágah	sa ?ága	?intun bigát	kə?əsələm	kə?əsələm	kə?əsələm
88. turn (in a direction)	likó?	líku?	likú?	síku?	sikkú			tiku
89. turn/revolve	?íkot	túyuk	tíyug	tarírik	pusípus	biyu	tiləñ	
90. ugly	páñit	ñil?ad	ma?áw?ay	makanús	nala?ad			
91. vagina	púki	{bilát bútu?	{bilát puyás	{budáy putáy	?úki	beti?	beti?	
92. *wait	{hintáy ?antáy	hulát	huhát	halát	?úray	tagad	tahad	
93. waterfall	tálon	busáy	busáy	busáy	dissú?ur	?əvaga?	dempilas	sampəw
94. *weak	mahína?	lúya	ma?úya	malúya	kapsút	{meguya? meluya	melubəy	
95. wear/put-on	su?ót	súl?ub	súksuk	su?lút	ikapét	sun?ud		
96. *west	kanlúran	kasáddpan	katutúndan	{subsuban sulnúpan	lá?ud	senləpan	senləpan	senləpan
97. *what?	?anú	?únsa	{?anúh nánuh	?anú	?anya	həjkey	?əñkey	?əñkey
98. *when? (fut.)	ka?ilán	sán?u	hin?undúh	nu?arín	ka?ánu	kə?ənu	kə?ənu	kə?ənu
99. *wide	malápud	lapád	ma?ápud	halakbán	?akába	melu?ag	melu?ag	
100. wrong	malí?	sayúp	sa?á?	salá?	(dákas)	sala?		

When gathering data for a survey of this sort, it is imperative that exact semantic matches be obtained. While the list is designed to exaggerate differences amongst even close dialects, any cause(s) for such separation should be real and not the result of inexact comparison. The following notes are included to guide researchers as to the semantics intended.

- 00 - All forms elicited should follow the matching of English and Tagalog. I have not been able to double-check the data with informants, but I have noted some errors in the main sources (McFarland 1977 for Tag, Ceb, Naga, Ilk; Reid 1971 for WBM and Iln) when compared to other published data (Elkins 1968 for WBM; Vanoverbergh 1956 for Ilk; Wolff 1972 for Ceb; Mintz 1971 for Naga). Ak1 is from Zorc 1969, and CMM from Elkins 1954.
- 02 - The most general term for *anger*; avoid: *peevied, upset, crabby*.
- 03 - Here and throughout the list, verb affixes have not been included. If affixes are included, a single paradigm should be obtained, e.g. *I was embarrassed* (simple past); affixes could be used to show differences beyond the root word or stem.
- 04 - The most common term for *bad* often coincides with the word for *evil*. A sense such as Tag *masamá? an panahón the weather is bad* or *masamá? an pakiramdám ko I feel bad* is intended.
- 05 - Often the same as the form for *skin* (which is omitted from the list). Avoid specialised terms for *second layer of bark* (CMM *luwit*) or *bark/skin of banana trunk* (Ak1 *úpas*).
- 06 - Usually the opposite of *ugly* (#90); *good looking* as applied to a woman, especially if *handsome (male)* is differentiated in the language.
- 08 - As in *blowing at/on a fire to increase its heat*; avoid: *blowing out (as a match)* or *exhaling*.
- 09 - The actual boiling of water (intransitive verb); avoid: *to boil (vegetables/eggs)* (Tag *lága?*) or *inception of boiling when first bubbles are formed*, etc.
- 10 - Generic; avoid: *brightness of sun or moon, glare*.
- 11 - The most general form for carrying or bringing something from one place to another regardless of means of transport or carriage. Avoid: *carry on back* (Tag *babá*), *carry in the hand* (Tag *bitbít*), *carry on shoulder* (Tag *pasán*), *carry on head* (Tag *súnoŋ*), etc.
- 12 - The upper torso, not just *breast* or *ribs*.
- 13 - Distinguish from *jaw* (Tag *síhaŋ, paŋá*).
- 15 - As in *cold weather* (Tag *magináw*, Ilk *lam?ék*); distinguish from *cold (to touch)* (Tag *malamíg*, Ilk *lam?is*); either could be used in the comparison, so long as the sense is the same.
- 16 - As a house from age or a ship from a storm.
- 17 - As from a person in authority; not just *send on an errand*, nor *deathbed command = final will and testament* (Tag *bílin*).
- 19 - As a baby on all fours; distinguish from *crawl on one's belly* or *crawl as a snake* (WBM *dula*).
- 20 - Crush between the fingernails.
- 21 - As in amputating a limb.

- 23 - Several languages distinguish between *another* - of the same type (Akl ?ibáh) vs *another* - of a different kind (Akl ta?ín); the latter sense is intended here.
- 25 - Avoid special senses such as *dirty laundry* (Akl ?umúg), *muddy*, etc.
- 27 - Not: *earth/world* (Tag da?igdíg) or special kinds of soil, e.g. *clay*.
- 30 - A little bit, in small amount.
- 31 - Not: *hit, box, come to blows*; more in the sense to *fall out*.
- 32 - Generic for *digit* (often the same as for *toe*); avoid: *thumb, index finger, middle finger*, etc.
- 36 - Generic; avoid senses such as *good at* (Tag magalín) or *clever* (Tag marúnoq).
- 40 - As in: *hold this for me*; avoid specifics such as *hold in the palm of one's hand* or *hold under the arm* (see note #11).
- 41 - As a good or giving person; avoid *loving, generous*.
- 43 - As in telling a deliberate untruth; avoid senses such as Tag magbulá'an *fib, exaggerate, 'bullshit'*.
- 44 - Different from *sad* (#64); sense of isolation or melancholy felt.
- 45 - Note that only verb affixes differentiate this from *none* (#52) in Tag and some other CPh languages; differentiate from *lose one's way* (Akl tálan).
- 49 - As a narrow entrance or road; Tag masakíp *tight, crowded* is perhaps too specialised.
- 52 - *There is none*.
- 53 - The future negative, as in *I will not go*. Note the various negators in McFarland 1977:20; only one of five possibilities is sought here.
- 54 - In the sequence: *one - two - three ...*. Note that numerous forms with classifiers occur (e.g. Akl saŋka-, sambáto, sambílog).
- 56 - Generic; not specialised meanings (e.g. WBM dægupi *be pushed along or aside by a strong force, dəkuzas push something back and forth over a surface, pəsəl push something with the thumb or finger*, etc.).
- 60 - As distinguished from other types of cloud.
- 65 - Avoid quotative particles (e.g. Tag daw, Akl kunúh).
- 66 - To look for something that has been *lost* (#45).
- 69 - Generic; avoid terms for *older* and *younger* sibling.
- 70 - Generic; avoid terms for *squat, sit on the ground*, etc.
- 71 - Not just *cut*; avoid specifics like *to slice thin* or *to slice into big chunks*.
- 72 - Generic adjective; avoid verbs like *to cook slowly* (WBM naney *to proceed slowly* may be too specific here and is wrongly included).
- 73 - Distinguish from *small amount = few* (#30); note that Ilokano (and perhaps other communalects) do not draw such a distinction.
- 74 - 74a-c are included here to illustrate the various senses that can exist within a given meaning and the dangers of semantic mismatch. The most

- neutral noun for *smell* is intended (with no implications as to the pleasantness, or otherwise, of the aroma), not verbs (74a) or adjectives (74b,c).
- 75 - The opposite of *hard* (#38); not that of *loud*, *coarse*, etc.
 - 77 - May not be differentiated in some communalects from *say* (#65) (e.g. Aklanon).
 - 79 - As a stone or wood may split open; distinguish from senses such as Tag *bisák to split wood*, Tag *hátì? to split in half* (= Akl *píhak*).
 - 80 - As cloth or paper.
 - 85 - Keep separate from senses such as *throw stone(s)*, *throw overhand*, *throw underhand*, *throw-away* (#86); generic *to throw [x] at*, *cast*.
 - 88 - Generic; avoid verbs like *turn right*, *turn left*, *turn one's head*.
 - 89 - Intransitive verb, like a coin or top turns around.
 - 95 - As in "*What will you wear?*", avoiding specific garment terms.
 - 96 - Sometimes not distinguished from *sunset-place* or *west-wind*.
 - 98 - As in "*When will he arrive?*"; some languages have *when* (past)?.
 - 99 - Opposite of *narrow* (#49).
 - 100 - *In error*, *incorrect*; not intended as a negator (Akl *bukún not so*).

This list may be used in toto, or those 50 items marked with an asterisk may form an abbreviated survey. If the criteria outlined above are strictly applied, only those speech varieties that score 90% (in excess of 45/50 or 90/100) with one another can be regarded as belonging to the same communalect - and if the speakers consider themselves as such. In this way, there is a sociological and linguistic confirmation of a given (Philippine or Austronesian) language scene. Because of borrowing, common inheritance, and convergence (e.g. disparate shift of *p > f, *d > r, *r > l, *ə > u, etc.), scores will rarely be 0. Ilokano, for example, scores 4% with Akl and Ceb, up to 8% with Tag. However, the list has been constructed on the basis of abundant data (Reid 1971, Yap 1977, McFarland 1977), so that it can be stated with confidence that scores will be very low, even between reasonably close genetic relatives.

The languages chosen in Table 1 demonstrate this last point. Tag, Ceb, Akl, and Naga are genetically related Central Philippine languages. Akl and Ceb, which are Bisayan, score no higher than 42%; Tag-Bik, no higher than 21% with each other. Central Mindanao Manobo stands in a dialect relationship with Ilianen and Western Bukidnon, yet the CMM-Iln score is 88% and CMM-WBM is 76%, while Iln-WBM is 63%. Even if cognates, rather than identities, are counted, the Manobo scores are: CMM-Iln 91%, CMM-WBM 88%, and Iln-WBM 76% based on the data available (numerous lacunae for CMM and Iln make these rough computations). Thus, Central Mindanao Manobo (or Kiri-yenteken Manobo; Elkins, personal communication 9 August 1983) is a communalect in its own right.

Of just the 50 items marked with an asterisk, Ilokano has 31 unique forms, Tagalog 23, and Cebuano 11 (the latter is due to Ceb's strong influence in the central and southern Philippines resulting in numerous loans into or from Ceb). These uniques dictate that no other communalect could share a score higher than 19/50 with Ilk, 27/50 with Tag, or 39/50 with Ceb, except a communalect that was indeed Ilk, Tag, or Ceb respectively. In fact, Tagalog scores 8/50 with Sinauna, 7 with Kapampangan, 4 with Botolan, and 3 with Bikol. Cebuano scores 25/50 with Hiligaynon (due to loans), 18 with Samar-Leyte, 12 with Surigao, and 10 with

Aklanon. Ilokano scores 11/50 with Itneg, 8 with Kankanay, and 7 with Luba. The overall effects of convergence are thus negligible in this kind of survey, which is *sociolinguistic* and *not historical* in intent.

3. THE DETERMINATION OF LANGUAGES

Although we may eventually know how many communalects exist in the Philippines or other Austronesian areas (since adequate data are available in the files of the Summer Institute of Linguistics and several researchers), if we address the question of how many languages there are, numerous problems beset us. Since a language is defined in terms of mutual intelligibility, both the degree and the kind of intelligibility would need to be determined (see Zorc 1977:165-170). Some linguists would accept *genetic intelligibility*: if a Malay says "Mata ku sakit" (*my eye hurts*), and if a Filipino understands him (as most would be likely to), then obviously some communication is taking place. But the Malay may rattle on and virtually all of the rest of the speech act could well be lost on the Filipino. This is not *practical intelligibility* - the Malay is not likely to get much joy from a Filipino doctor if each sticks to his own language. The Summer Institute of Linguistics needs to know the degree to which a translation of the Bible can be understood by speakers/readers in other areas. They have conducted extensive tests of intelligibility throughout the Philippines; if too many barriers to understanding exist, a different translation is necessary. Each speech variety is accorded its own dignity; linguistic imperialism is avoided - Warays may understand Cebuano or Aklanon's Hiligaynon, but each deserves their own intimate version.

If linguists could agree on a criterion for determining mutual intelligibility (the SIL tests and scores are accurate and sound in this regard), and factors such as bilingualism and sesquilingualism⁴ (when someone understands but cannot speak another language) could be controlled, then we would be well on our way to knowing how many dialects and languages there are in the Philippines. The exact answer could be known within this decade, depending on research interests of M.A. or Ph.D. scholars and access to SIL files. While SIL has always been most generous and open with its data, it would be most appropriate (given the years of labour and research involved) if an SIL member drew up a comprehensive Philippine matrix of intelligibility test scores, possibly as part of his/her studies for a degree. Kroeger's paper on "Intelligibility patterns in Sabah" in this volume is a welcome step in this direction.

In the meantime, genetic linguistics can provide a working solution. The number of languages in the Philippines alone has been debated and estimated by linguists and laymen. Blumentritt (1901) recognised 194 native groups mentioned in the literature of his time. But he well knew that many of these were repetitious or inaccurate in several ways. Conklin (1952), being more concerned with linguistic criteria, outlined 75 main groups broken up into a total of 156 members. Historical/comparative linguists are generally in agreement that there are, at most, 28 major linguistic groups that can be described as 'Philippine' on the basis of geographic or genetic criteria (see Table 2). One subgroup, Sama (Il), is clearly intrusive to the Philippines within the last millenium, and is genetically of an 'Indonesian type', possibly related to the South Sulawesi group (including Makassar and Buginese (Roger F. Mills, personal communication, 4 October 1983)).

Table 2: Probable and possible Philippine subgroups

N1 North Cordilleran	S1 South Mangyan	S9 Sangiric
1 South (Gaddang-Yogad)	1 Buhid-Taubuid	1 North (Sangil-Sangir-Talau)
2 North (Atta-Ibanag)	2 Hanunoo	2 South (Bantik-Ratahan)
3 Central (Malaweg, Isneg)	S2 Palawanic	C1 Minahasan
4 Agta	1 North (Aborlan-Batak)	1 South (Tonsawang)
N2 Dumagat = East Cordilleran	2 South (Molbog-Brookes)	2 North (Tontemboan)
1 Negrito	S3 Kalamianic	3 North-east (Tondano-Tonseal-Tombulu)
2 Paranan	S4 Central Philippine	C2 Mongondow-Ponosakan
3 Central (Casiguran)	1 Tagalog	C3 Gorontalic
4 South (Umirey)	2 Bikol	1 Dila (Buol-Suwawa)
N3 Ilokano	-Inland	2 East (Bulanga)
N4 Central Cordilleran	-Coastal	3 West (Gorontalo)
1 South (Isinai)	-Pandani	I1 Sama-Bajaw
2 North (Itneg)	3 Bisayan	1 Indonesian Bajaw
3 East (Kalinga)	-West	2 North Borneo/Sabah Land Bajaw
4 Nuclear (Balangaw)	-Banton	3 Jama-Mapun
5 Ifugao	-Central	4 Southern Sulu
6 Bontok-Kankayan	-Cebuan	5 Central Sulu
N5 Ilongot	-South	6 Western Sulu
N6 South Cordilleran	4 Mansakan	7 Northern Sulu
1 Pangasinan	-Mamanwa	8 Yakan
2 Inibaloi-Karaw	-North	9 Zamboanga Sama
3 Kallahan	-East	10 Abaknun
N7 Bashiic = Ivatanic	-West	U1 Chamorro
1 Yami	S5 Subanon	U2 Palau
2 Itbayaten	1 Siocon-Kalibugan	U3 Yapese
3 Ivatanen-Babuyan	2 Sindangan-Salug-Lapuyan	B1 Kadazan-Dusunic
N8 Southern Luzon	S6 Manobo	B2 Murutic
1 Sambalic	1 North	
2 Sinauna	2 Inland	
3 Kapampangan	3 South	
N9 North Mangyan	S7 Danao	
1 Iraya	S8 Bilic	
2 Alangan	1 Giangan/Bagobo	
3 Tadyawan	2 Tiruray	
N10 Inati of Panay	3 Tboli	
	4 Inner Blaan	

Code: B = Borneo
 C = Celebes
 N = Northern Philippines
 S = Southern Philippines
 U = Ungrouped

Maps showing the locales of these languages can be found in McFarland 1980.

Within the geopolitical boundaries of the Philippines, there are at most 19 language groups (N1-10 + S1-9) which could share an immediate genetic ancestor, which have in all likelihood developed in situ over at least 3,000 years, and which can not be attributed to multiple migrations from overseas as popular history suggests. Note, however, that three groups are represented in northern Celebes (Sulawesi, C1-3) which can be proven to be immediately related to Southern Philippine languages. There are two families in Borneo (B1-2) which share features of Philippine and the distinct Sabahan languages. Blust (1974) has proposed that these are more intimately related to the North Sarawak subgroup, based on the sharing of the innovation involving strengthened reflexes of PAN *b, *d, *j, *g. Their similarities to the Ph-type may be due to loans or convergence, and require further study. Another three (U1-3) are spoken in the Pacific and await definitive classification. As linguistic research progresses, these groups will probably be collapsed, but the current state of knowledge and debate dictates some prudence, so that the maximum number (19 Philippine + 1 Indonesian intrusive) represents a core of agreement amongst Philippinologists, amidst otherwise widespread disagreement as to the collapsibility of these to ten (Ruhlen (in progress)), or two, or even one. (See my paper on "The genetic relationships of Philippine languages", where I argue for the latter alternative, i.e. a common Proto-Philippine ancestor from which all Ph languages except Sama descend.)

While we can be sure that there are no more than 20 major linguistic groups (N1-10, S1-9, I1) within the Philippines, speakers would take little consolation in such broad criteria. Cebuanos identify themselves as Bisaya (not Central Philippine); the same holds true for Bikolanos or Tagalogs; and, more widely, for Ibanags, Pampangeños, etc. Hence, Table 2 delineates 50 Northern and Southern Philippine subgroups with which speakers may more readily identify.

The verification of these as languages (based on the bounds of mutual intelligibility) and their fragmentation into communalects (recognising dialectal idiosyncrasies) must await further study.

What was it that I was saying earlier about gratitude? I have just outlined a massive task - for Philippinologists and for Austronesianists! I have presented a 'fine-tuning tool' for isolating communalects and given some suggestions from the genetic evidence for what ultimate language groups we may arrive at. The hard work ahead may not be appreciated, but hopefully the hints will be helpful.

NOTES

1. Some of the ideas discussed in this paper, including the original 50 items from Table 1, have appeared in Zorc 1984. The present paper and its FOCAL companion (Zorc 1986) split the topics covered therein, and treat them in much greater detail. I am grateful to Otto Dahl for a list of five Malagasy dialects which confirms the value of Table 1 in differentiating communalects, and to Paul Black for many helpful comments on the original draft.
2. Many Filipinos regard a language as a widespread and prestigious vehicle of communication (such as English, Chinese, Russian, or Pilipino), while any other kind of speech is 'a dialect'. This view is compatible in many regards with the concept of communalect discussed below. In practice, Filipinos are aware of even the most minute linguistic variations and label them accordingly (even if not always complimentarily, e.g. "They talk like birds").

3. Because they refer to genetic subgroups (if a linguist is talking), or geopolitical isolates (if a layman is talking).
4. I once met some Tadyawan-Mangyans who claimed they could understand Ilokano! The genetic gap (by *any* measure) between Ilokano and Tadyawan is so great that the only cause for such a statement was their frequent dealings with an Ilokano merchant (who bought bundles of rattan from them). Intelligibility must be tested by rather precise (rather than impressionistic) measures, if it is going to be validly established. It is for this reason that I expressed reservations (Zorc 1977:170 and footnote 59) about links between Sorsogon :: Bikol and Naturalis :: Kamayo. The lexical and grammatical differences between these speech varieties must create a considerable amount of *code noise* (Hockett 1958:331f) and render intelligibility far from perfect and mutual. I rather suspect sesquilingualism (or passive language ability) has led to such statements. If, however, *all* members of *both* communities are sesquilingual, then a link genuinely exists. But in a certain area of Davao City, all the people on a block understand Tagalog, Hiligaynon, and Ilokano. An Iloko will speak Ilokano to an Ilonggo, who will respond in Ilonggo. Would this mean that Ilokano is now part of the Bisayan complex? One would (hopefully) not seriously propose this!

*EDITORIAL NOTE: Zorc (1984 and elsewhere) uses the spelling *communilect*, and not the more usual *communalect*, as used by *Pacific Linguistics* here.

REFERENCES

- BLUMENTRITT, Ferdinand
- 1901 Philippine tribes and languages. *Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution*, 527-547. Washington.
- BLUST, Robert A
- 1974 The Proto-North Sarawak vowel deletion hypothesis. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii.
- CONKLIN, Harold C.
- 1952 Outline gazeteer of native Philippine ethnic and linguistic groups. Reprinted in Andrew B. Gonzalez, Teodoro Llamzon and Fe Otones, eds *Readings in Philippine linguistics*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines, 1973.
- DYEN, Isidore, A.T. JAMES and J.W.L. COLE
- 1967 Language divergence and estimated word retention rate. *Language* 43:150-171.
- ELKINS, Richard
- 1968 *Manobo-English dictionary*. *Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No.3*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- ELKINS, Richard and Betty ELKINS
- 1954 *A vocabulary of Central Mindanao Manobo*. Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics, Bureau of Public Schools, Institute of National Language.

HOCKETT, Charles F.

1958 *A course in modern linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.

HUDSON, Alfred B.

1967 *The Barito isolects of Borneo*. Data Paper Number 68. Ithaca: Southeast Asia Program, Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University.

KROEGER, Paul

1986 Intelligibility patterns in Sabah. In this volume, 309-339.

LI, Paul Jen-kuei

1980 Men's and women's speech in Mayrinax. In *Papers in honor of Prof. Lin Yü-k'eng on her seventieth birthday*, 9-17. Taipei: Academia Sinica and National Taiwan University; Wen Shin.

1982a Male and female forms of speech in Atayal. *The Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 53/2:265-304. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

1982b Linguistic variations of different age groups in the Atayalic dialects. In *Studies in linguistics presented to Dr. Fang-kuei Li on his eightieth birthday*, 167-191. *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, New Series 14. Taipei.

McFARLAND, Curtis D.

1977 *Northern Philippine linguistic geography*. Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa Monograph Series No.9. Tokyo.

1980 *A linguistic atlas of the Philippines*. Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa Monograph Series No.15. Tokyo.

MINTZ, Malcolm W.

1971 *Bikol dictionary*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

PALLESEN, A. Kemp

1977 Culture contact and language convergence. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.

PENNOYER, F. Douglas

n.d. Unpublished field notes on the Inati dialects of Panay (Inete, Sugodnin 1, Sugodnin 2).

REID, Lawrence A.

1971 *Philippine minor languages: word lists and phonologies*. *Oceanic Linguistics* Special Publication No.8. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

RUHLEN, Merritt

in progress *A guide to the world's languages*.

VANOVERBERGH, Morice, C.I.C.M.

1956 *Iloko-English dictionary*. Baguio City: Catholic School Press.

WOLFF, John U.

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

YAP, Fe Aldave

- 1977 *A comparative study of Philippine lexicons.* Manila: Institute of National Language, Department of Education and Culture.

ZORC, R. David

- 1969 *A study of the Aklanon dialect, vol.2: Aklanon to English dictionary.* Kalibo: Aklan Printing Center.
- 1974 Towards a definitive Philippine wordlist - the qualitative use of vocabulary in identifying and classifying languages. FICAL paper. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13/1&2:409-455.
- 1977 *The Bisayan dialects of the Philippines: subgrouping and reconstruction.* PL, C-44.
- 1984 The Philippine language scene - the sociolinguistic contribution of historical linguistics. In Andrew Gonzalez, FSC, ed. *Panagani essays in honor of Bonifacio P. Sibayan on his sixty-eighth birthday*, 135-148. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- 1986 The genetic relationships of Philippine languages. In *FOCAL II*, 147-173.

