# PHILIPPINE ENCYCLOPEDIA
## of the
## SOCIAL SCIENCES

# HISTORY

by

## PHILIPPINE NATIONAL HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Published by

## PHILIPPINE SOCIAL SCIENCE COUNCIL
### Quezon City
### 1993

raphy on Philippine sociolinguistics shows the following to be the most prominently studied: 1) state-of-the-art reports (Gonzalez 1991; Rafael 1978; Sibayan 1985/86); 2) code switching (Bautista 1974, 1975,1990 and 1991; Pascasio 1978; 1984); 3) language use in specified domains (Bautista 1979, 1980 and 1988; Pascasio and Hidalgo 1973; Fabregas 1983 and Volkey 1988). (See also Sociolinguistics, this volume.)

E. S. CASTILLO

## Historical Linguistics in the Philippine Context

Since World War II the area of Philippine comparative and historical linguistics has been an active, promising, and exciting one. In evidence, the draft bibliography put together prior to writing this article itself exceeded the overall length allowed. The onerous task of writing a condensation of so much is made easier by an excellent and definitive article by Blust (1991) to which the reader is referred.

Apart from the score of foreign — mostly American — linguists (only some of whom can be mentioned below), three Philippine scholars deserve special mention for their contributions to this field:

- *Cecilio Lopez* [who studied with Dempwolff, applied his method to Philippine languages (1970, 1971, 1972, 1978), and collated an enormous mass of data that will serve researchers for deca-des to come (1974, 1976)],

- *Teodoro Llamzon* [who produced two subgrouping studies (1969, 1976) and was one of the founders of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines (LSP) and Philippine Journal of Linguistics (PJL)], and

- *Consuelo J. Paz* [who produced the first detailed reconstruction of PPH phonemes and morphemes (1981)].

In this abbreviated survey, three issues will be addressed: data, reconstruction, and subgrouping. The reward for such endeavors is the stimulating area of Austronesian culture history, which, while beyond the scope of this article, is dealt with in Blust (1976, 1984/85), Dyen (1976), or Zorc (in press). Those interested in a more thorough treatment should consult the studies cited in each respective area. For an overview of the archeological record consult Bellwood (1985) and for Austronesian reconstruction see Dahl (1976).

### Lexical Data

A researcher must include a wide range of languages sufficient to give a detailed picture of both the sound system of the parent language and the distribution of the daughter languages.

Philippine comparativists have drawn from two kinds of resources: those strictly limited to synchronic data

painstakingly gathered from informants (Barbian 1977, Zorc 1974, 1977, Paz 1981) or from published dictionaries and wordlists (Charles 1974), Blust 1991, 1992). The ever-growing list of thorough studies make the linguist's work easier and reliable, such as those on Hanunoo (Conklin 1953), Ilokano (Vanoverbergh 1956), Maranao (Mc-Kaughan and Macaraya 1967), Western Bukidnon Manobo (Elkins 1968), Aklanon (Zorc 1969), Tiruray (Schlegel 1971), Cebuano (Wolff 1972), Isneg (Vanoverbergh 1972), Tagalog (Panganiban 1972), Dumagat (Head-land 1974), Bontok (Reid 1976), or Bikol (Mintz and Britanico 1985).

The importance of basic vocabulary in establishing reconstructions and subgroups cannot be underestimated, so references like Reid (1971), McFarland (1977), Yap (1977) must be consulted. Nevertheless, Pallesen (1985) and Blust (1992) have shown how even basic vocabulary cannot be immune to borrowing, so the researcher must be ever cautious in drawing conclusions.

The scholar must also establish the overall or relative quality of language evidence. Zorc's other papers (1982:114 and 1984:84) indicate that a reconstruction is founded upon three different kinds. (1) A test language is one wherein a phoneme directly reflects one — and only one — proto phoneme, e.g., Tagalog $b$ < PAN *B or Ilokano $e$ < *e. (2) A criterion language is one where a phoneme can relate to two or more proto phonemes, but with the evidence of additional languages, the comparativist can "triangulate" on the most probable correspondence set, e.g., Bontok $g$ < *g or *J and Hanunoo $d$ < *d or *j so Bon $g$ + Han $d$ < *j. (3) A witness language is primarily useful in determining the antiquity of an etymon — not its phonemic shape. Thus, with the great number of borrowings from numerous language sources (see Blust 1992), many Tiruray data might best be considered witness evidence.

Note that Aklanon $h$ provides test evidence for PPH *h (but at a higher level only criterion evidence for PAN *S of *H). Similarly, Kalamian $k$ could be construed to provide test evidence for PPH or PAN *q, although [k] < *k is found in reduplicated monosyllables reducing such instances to criterion evidence; additionally [k] is found in so many loannwords that one might consider as witness evidence much on an overall list from this language (kindly supplied by Ed Ruch of SIL).

*Reconstruction*

The process of historical reconstruction involves the search for similarities in four areas: sound, form, function, and meaning, and leads to the isolation of phonological, morphological, grammatical, and semantic correspondences. These, of necessity, involve a further four degrees of resemblance: (a) identical, (b) regular, (c) irregular, or (d) false correspondences.

Identities yield straightforward reconstructions: Tagalog, Bikol, Cebuano, Ilokano, Kalinga, and Ibanag

*pitu* 'seven' yield a parent form, PPH (and PAN) *\*pitu* — the asterisk signifies that the form is hypothetical, we have no surviving proof that it was so, even though the likelihood is very great. Note that every element is identical: the sounds *p-i-t-u*, the accent, usage as a numeral, and semantics.

The most common type of correspondence set is regular, wherein a sound in one language regularly corresponds to a different sound in another, both of which probably descend from a distinct phoneme of the protolanguage. For example, Tagalog *bigas*, Aklanon *bugas*, Pangasinan *belas*, Kapampangan *abyas* 'milled rice' < *\*beRas* [note Tag *i* :: Ceb *u* :: Kpm *a* :: Png *e* < *\*e* ; Tag, Ceb *g* :: Kpm *y* :: Png *l* < *\*R*].

Irregular correspondences often, but by no means always, involve loans. Thus, while *\*e* goes to *i* in Tagalog (except when a neighboring syllable has *\*u*, e.g., *\*besuR* 'sated' > Tag *busog*), all instances of *\*e* > *a* should be viewed with suspicion — numerous loans from Kapampangan and Malay establish this (see Wolff 1976). However, a similar development in Pangasinan is irregular and unexplained, e.g., *talo* 'three' (< *\*telu*), *pano* 'full' (< *\*penuq*), etc. Since no donor language with the same words and shifts is identifiable, it is difficult to suggest that these are loans (many of the etyma in question are specific to the South Cordilleran subgroup to which Png belongs). Most scholars would agree that *r* is the expected Ilokano reflex of *\*R*, yet *g* occurs on more numerous forms, some even as doublets (*bago, baro* 'new' < *\*baqRuH*, *\*bibig, bibir* 'lip' < *\*bibiR*), so that the treatment of forms with *g* as irregular correspondences is more attractive than a loan hypothesis (viz: a split of *\*R* > *r* and *g* might have occurred in the history of this language).

False correspondences involve loans or accidental similarities. In the Philippines, influences from Spanish, Malay, Indic/Sanskrit, Arabic, Persian, Chinese, and English are widely in evidence. Since a scholar cannot be expected to be a master of all potential sources, there is a danger of making spurious reconstructions like [x]*gadapun* 'water-jar' < Sp *garrafon* 'large decanter' or [x]*mani7* 'peanuts' < Mex-Sp *mani* 'peanut'. [The raised x indicates a false correspondence.] Blust in his earlier work, as did Dempwolff before him, included appropriately coded loan material in order to exemplify regular correspondences in the languages treated. Some researchers misinterpreted this to imply that Sanskrit or even Arabic loanwords were found in Proto-Autronesian, which clearly was not the case.

There is also the danger of relying on a formulaic approach to the unification or reconciliation of conflicting data sets. For example, Paz (1981) reconstructs PPH *supsep 'suck' or *dagu7 'blood' to reconcile in a single formula data which might more appropriately be assigned to two (*sepsep vs *supsup, *daRaq vs *duRuq). There is a need for scholars to proceed with more restraint and discipline. Even though such caution may appear to be overly conservative, evidence external to the Philippines justifies the reconstructions cited.

Scholars should be aware of four areas of potential overlap: doublets, disjuncts, monosyllabic roots, and synonyms. It was Blust who first made a very useful distinction between reconstructions that are phonologically and semantically similar (doublets = Dempwolff's 'Nebenformen', e.g., *kambing ~ *kanding 'goat') and reconstructions which have an overlap of cognate sets (disjuncts, e.g., Tagalog gata7 from *Rataq or (irregularly from) *getaq 'coconut milk'). There are also etyma that contain a monosyllabic root, which Blust has treated in great detail (1988), e.g., *ket 'sticky, adhesive' or *ngaC, *ngeC, *ngi *NguC 'gnash the teeth as in anger'. There are also probable synonyms, e.g., *beRngi and *Rabi7iH 'night'. Any remaining difficulties would appear to have to do with the quality of specific language evidence rather than problems in labelling reconstructions.

A list of currently-accepted Proto-Philippine phonemes can be found in Table 1; for reconstructions the reader is referred to Paz (1981) or Zorc (1971, 1979-).

### Table 1: Proto Philippine Phonology

| PPH | Charles | Paz | Blust | Zorc | Special Evidence |
|-----|---------|-----|-------|------|------------------|
| *p | p | p | p | p | |
| *b | b | b | b | b | |
| *m | m | m | m | m | |
| *w | w | w | w | w | |
| *t | t | t | t | t | |
| *d | d | d | d | d | |
| *n | n | n | n | n | |
| *l | l | l | l | l | |
| *r | (r)? | # | r | r | |
| *s | s | s | s | s | |
| *z | # | # | Z | ? | ← Inati |
| *D | # | d | # | # | |

| PPH | Charles | Paz | Blust | Zorc | Special Evidence |
|------|---------|-----|-------|------|------------------|
| *ñ | ñ | # | ñ | ñ | Kapampangan |
| *L | # | l | # | # | |
| *y | y | y | y | y | |
| *j | j | r | j | j | |
| *k | k | k | k | k | |
| *g | (g)? | g | g | g | |
| *ng | ng | ng | ng | ng | |
| *R | R | g | R | R | |
| *q | q | 7 | q | q | Kalamian and Tboli |
| *7 | # | # | # | 7 | |
| *h | h | h | h | h | |
| *a | a | a | a | a | |
| *e | e | e | e | e | |
| *i | i | i | i | i | |
| *u | u | u | u | u | |

*V: Charles  -  word accent on the penult or ultima

Paz  -  stress ['] based on statistical frequency

Zorc  -  vowel length based on the consistent agreement
of data from accent-preserving languages or
irregular sound changes involving strengthening
of a given reflex

Diphthongs: *aw, *ay, *ey, *uy, *iw

## Subgrouping

Unlike determining correspondence classes, the establishment of subgroups depends on the isolation of shared differences (rather than similarities) — these constitute innovations which form the backbone of any subgrouping argument. Zorc (1982) summarizes the methods that may be useful in establishing subgroups: judgment by inspection, lexicostatistical classification, discovery of exclusively-shared innovations, functor analysis, and diagnostic lists. Zorc (1986a) established the languages of the Philippines (with the exception of the Sama group) as belonging to a single genetic group of Austronesian on the basis of lexical innovations. Blust (1991) has presented a subgrouping of greater Central Philippine languages on a similar basis.

However achieved, the subgrouping hypothesis of each researcher must be made explicit. Lexicostatical classifications (Dyen 1965, Thomas and Healey 1962, Walton 1979), while useful in conjunction with other methods, when used alone fail to account for heavy borrowing (convergence) or unusually low retention rates (Dyen, James & Cole 1967). Blust has show "that Ilongot has the lowest basic vocabulary retention rate of any of the 25 Philippine languages tested to date" (1991:79); whereas it can be established that Ilongot shares innovations with the Pangasinic group (Zorc 1979:243 + footnote 7).

While there is no agreement at present on the overall subgrouping of the languages of the archipelago, there is a growing consensus on Philippine microgroups, as listed in Table 2. The higher or macrogroup relationships of each are a task remaining for scholars. Over the past fifty years, historical linguistics in and on the Philippines has come a long way and the outlook is decidedly encouraging. (See "Subgrouping of Philippine Languages" in this volume for a more extended treatment.)

### TABLE 2.  Philippine Microgroups [after Zorc 1986b, Blust 1991]
### Geographically proceeding from north to south

**BASHIIC or BATANIC:**
  Itbayaten, Ivatan (+Yaml)                                   [Tsuchida et al. 1987]
**CORDILLERAN**
  NORTH:     Agta, Atta, Gaddang, Ibanag,
             Isneg, Itawis, Malawg, Yogad                     [Tharp 1974]
  EAST:      Casiguran Dumagat, Paranan, Umirey(?)
  MESO:      Baler, Alta
  ILOKAN:    Ilokano
  CENTRAL:   Balangaw, Bontok, Ifugaw (Amganad
             and other dialects), Isinay, Itneg,
             Kalinga, Kankanay                                [Reid 1974]
  SOUTH:     Ilongot, Inibaloi, Kallahan, Karaw, Pangasinan
**CENTRAL or SOUTHERN LUZON**
  SAMBALIC:       Bolinaw, Botolan, Tina
  PAMPANGAN:      Kapampangan
  TANAYAN:        Sinauna
**NORTH MANGYAN:**  Iraya, Alangan, Tadyawan               [Zorc 1977]
**INATI:**          Inati (of Panay)                       [Pennoyer 1986/87]
**SOUTH MANGYAN:**  Hanunoo, Buhid, Taubuid                [Zorc 1974, 1982,
                                                            Pennoyer 1979]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| PALAWANIC: | Aborlan, Tagbanwa, | |
| | Batak, Molbog, Palawano | [Thiessen 1981] |
| KALAMIANIC: | Agutaynon, Kalamian, Northern Tagbanwa | |

CENTRAL PHILIPPINE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| TAGALOG: | Batangas, Lubang, Manila, Marinduque, Quezon | |
| BIKOL: COASTAL: | Naga, Legazpi, Virac | [McFarland 1974] |
| BIKOL: | Pandan | |
| BIKOL: INLAND: | Buhi, Oas, Libon | |
| BISAYAN: WEST: | Aklanon, Kinaray-a, Kuyonon | [Zorc 1972, 1977] |
| BISAYAN: | Banton, Odionganon, Sibale | |
| BISAYAN: CENTRAL: | Camotes, Hiligaynon, Masbateño, | |
| | Samar-Leyte, Waray | |
| BISAYAN: | Cebuano, Leyteño | |
| BISAYAN: SOUTH: | Butuanon, Jaun, Surigaonon, Tausug | |
| MANSAKAN or SOUTH-EAST MINDANAO: | Kalagan, Mamanwa, | |
| | Mandaya, Mansaka | [Gallman 1979] |
| SUBANON: | Kalibugan-Siocon, Lapuyan-Salug-Sindangan | |
| MANOBO | | [Elkins 1974, 1982, 1984] |
| NORTH: | Kagayanen, Kinamigin | [Harmon 1977] |
| INLAND: | Ata, Dibabawon, Western Bukidnon | |
| SOUTH: | Kalamansig-Cotabato, Tasaday | |
| DANAW: | Iranon, Magindanaw, Maranaw [Allison 1979, Fleischman 1981] | |
| BILIC: | Blaan, Giangan, Tboli (= Tagabili), | |
| | Tiruray | [Blust 1991, Savage 1986] |
| SANGIRIC: | Sangil, Sangir | [Sneddon 1984] |
| MINAHASAN: | Tonsea, Tombulu, Tondano, | |
| | Tontemboan, Tonsawang | [Sneddon 1978] |
| CELEBES EXTENSION: | Gorontalo, Mongondow | [Sneddon 1989] |

**Note:** The SAMAL or SINAMA group [including Abaknon, Samal, Sibutu, Yakan] is intrusive to the Philippines and has no special genetic connection to any of the languages listed above; its closest ties may be with Makassarese of south Sulawesi.

R. D. ZORC

## Intellectualization

In treating the development of a language, most sociolinguists use the now classic classification of activities advanced by Haugen (1972), those of selection, standardization, dissemination, and cultivation.