PHILIPPINE JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS
Volume 35, Number 2
December 2004

SEMANTIC RECONSTRUCTION IN AUSTRONESIAN LINGUISTICS

R. DAVID ZORC
McNeil Technologies Language Research Center
Hyattsville, Maryland, USA

The process of historical reconstruction involves the search for similarities in four areas: sound, form, function, and meaning. Further, there can be four degrees of resemblance: identical, regular, irregular, or false. The mere fact that two words are formally similar will not do. Yet the principles of semantic reconstruction in Austronesian have generally been unstated or ignored.

I will be discussing some of the reconstructions and the inherent methodology of Dempwolff and earlier work of Dyen, and will touch upon Dyen's later refinements (with Aberle). Blust's exemplary work is also examined. Illustrations and exemplifications also come from several original PAN, PMP, PPH, or lower order reconstructions where the semantic unification is particularly problematic. Relevant sections deal with the following points:

- *The past is relatively silent, but important steps have recently been made (especially by Blust) which should guide us in the art and science of assigning meanings to etyma.*
- *We should strive for a full citation of semantic information for each entry.*
- *We need a careful investigation of the breadth and meaning of cognates within any given set.*
- *We should compare and contrast all information with synchronic values within the semantic system of the languages presented.*
- *Having done 2, 3, and 4, we can only then successfully undertake the extrapolation of a common core, i.e., the assignment of semantic kernels to the etymon. While in many cases the results may be trivial, there are some which are no less than fascinating.*
- *We can evaluate our results by consulting current and past semantic theory. Semantic relationships such as synonymy, antonymy, metonymy, metaphor, synecdoche, taboo, etc. serve as a system of checks and balances for our method.*

- *We should appreciate the importance of semantic innovations. These can play as significant a role in subgrouping languages as do the phonological or lexical ones we have so comely to rely upon.*

1. Introduction

We learn by imitation and by doing on our own. Much of what I say here draws upon my daily research work at the Languages Research Center of MRM Inc. Either I am working on a newspaper reader, in which case I need to find out what a word means in the context of the article being glossed and translated, or on a dictionary, in which case I need to find out the entire range of meanings of a word, extrapolate the common core, and give a comprehensible gloss. In either case, if there are too many meaning candidates (e.g. 'good, fine, well, skilled, talented, wonderful, tasty, delicious'), the need arises to encapsulate those in a brief gloss that will aid the user.

The process of historical reconstruction involves the search for similarities in four areas: sound, form, function, and meaning. Further, there can be four degrees of resemblance: identical, regular (or derived), irregular, or false [see my review of Blust, 1980a (Zorc, 1984/1985)]. The mere fact that two words are formally similar will not do. Yet the principles of semantic reconstruction in Austronesian have either been unstated or ignored. Blust has emphasized "I have long considered semantic reconstruction one of the most important and neglected aspects of historical linguistics. Without careful attention to a principled basis for the reconstruction of meaning many proto-forms remain incompletely reconstructed" (Blust, personal communication, 4 Jun 1997).

2. The Silence of the Past

Until quite recently, Austronesianists have been quite silent on the problems and procedures of semantic reconstruction. This is not to imply that it was not done, only that there was no discussion of how one went about it, or how it should be done. Dempwolff, for example, did assign meanings to etyma, but nowhere did he discuss a methodological basis for his assignments. In some instances, it is clear that he sensed a problem, and tried to deal with an issue such as synonymy, as in ***balay** 'Haus, Hütte, Halle' vs. ***Rumaq** 'Behausung, Haus.'[1] He also demonstrated cultural awareness in cross-referencing PIN ***Bantu** 'help, support' to PIN ***b<in>antu** 'son-in-law,' the relationship of

[1] Here, as elsewhere throughout, I owe much to Bob Blust's guidance and comments in email correspondences on this topic.

which is independently supported by Akl **paŋ-agád** 'help out, work for one's parents-in-law to be' and **<um>ágad** 'son-in-law.' But there were instances where any further specification was abandoned, such as when PMP? ***uRaŋ,** PHN? ***qulun,** PAN ***Cau** [reconstructions updated and revised] were all glossed 'person.' [2]

Dahl (1976) discussed the status (fiction vs. reality) and structure [CVC(N)VC] of Dempwolff's reconstructions and ran through his posited sound system, but gave no details of how one deals with the semantic properties of proposed cognates.

Dyen's Austronesian approach typically listed the meanings of attested forms, but did not assign a meaning to the reconstruction. The following three examples (using Dyen's citations, but my orthographic conventions and language abbreviations) come from Dyen (1965, pp. 295 and 299), but typify his methodology from 1947 onwards:

***baseq**, Tag **basa7**, Mal **basah**, NgD **bias** (M) 'wet,' TB **baso** 'watery,' Sai **bahi**, Ami **mi-vatsa7**, Puy **b<en>ase**, Pai **v<en>ata7** (sic) 'wash (clothes, utensils).'

***basuq**, Mal **basuh** 'wash (hands),' Aty **mahuq** (m/b), Paz **ba-batsu7**, Pai **v<en>atu7** (sic) 'wash (clothes).'

***Sinaw**, Tag **hinaw**, Hil **hinaw** 'wash,' SedK **s<im>inaw**, SedT **s<m>i:naw** 'wash (clothes),' Thao **Sinaw-an** 'wash (other than clothes),' Bun **ma-sinaw**, RukTn **ua-sinaw** 'wash (clothes).'

3. Movements in the Right Direction

However, in conjunction with David Aberle, Dyen did work out principles for LEXICAL RECONSTRUCTION. By this method, one reconstructs an etymon that most closely fits a given meaning. Question: what was the most probable Austronesian word for 'father'? Answer: ***-ama**. When one encounters difficulties, such as competing etyma, Dyen and Aberle outline a series of scientific applications for this procedure, which neither space nor time allows reiteration here. For example, there is ample justification for the reconstruction of PAN ***tama[7]** 'father' on the basis of Sediq **támа7**, Ruk, Kav **ta:má7**, Bun **tama7** [TAG:177], Fj **tama-**, Sam **tamā**. However, there is a widespread occurrence of forms representing a straightforward ***ama** > Tag **amá**, Han **áma**, TB **áma**, Saa **ama**, Puy **ama** [Ref], **amaa** [Adr], Tso **amó**, Thao **7á:ma7**. Furthermore, there is sufficiently widespread evidence of morphological derivation, e.g., Jav **r/ama**, and plenty to assume that a ***t-** was some form of prefix associated with the kin class, e.g., ***t-ina** 'mother,' ***t-u-Saji** 'younger sibling,' ***t-umpu** 'ancestor; lord, master, owner.'

[2] Blust's ***qaRta** 'outsiders, alien people' can be added to this set and also an overlapping meaning and etymon, ***qudip-en** 'slave' (1972c and 1987, p. 80).

While this method may be less used than that discussed immediately below, it was one Blust also applied in the reconstruction of his Austronesian word list for lexicostatistical comparison of language retention rates (1981a). Its methodology can also offer a system of checks-and-balances for comparison and contrast (#4 below).

Blust's (1987) tour de force on the SEMANTIC RECONSTRUCTION of words for 'house' is probably the most thorough treatment to date for the Austronesian language family. In his summary report in the Baldi volume (1990, p. 144f), he cites the work of Capell, Lichtenberk, and Pawley, as well as a few of his earlier publications (e.g. 1972c).

We all owe Blust a great debt for the care he has taken with the semantics of his etymologies[3] and for citing ALL the meanings of each cognate form. I must acknowledge that I had been quite sloppy in my earlier work, but now have vowed to be as comprehensive as possible. The inclusion of all (or at least the most relevant portions) of a gloss does take a great deal of time. However, there are a lot of rewards by being thorough, such as finding widespread secondary (or idiomatic) meanings that would be missed in a cursive single cite.

4. What is Wrong with this Picture? (Examining Breadth of Meaning)

One of the first steps in reconstruction is to locate phonologically-unifiable cognate sets. These then become ETYMOLGICAL CANDIDATES. The importance, however, of matching up FORM, FUNCTION, and MEANING should be apparent from the following:

Tag **pintás** 'fault, defect; fault-finding;' **I-pintás** 'use (x: a fault) in finding faults'

Ilk **na-pintas** 'beautiful, handsome, good-looking, comely, pretty, attractive, lovely, fair, elegant, graceful, charming, exquisite'

Bon **pintas** 'be beautiful, as a woman or clothes'

Akl **píntas** 'treat cruelly, be brutal (with), brutalize, be mean;' **ma-pintas** 'cruel, savage, mean, brutal'

Ceb **pintas** [adj] 'ferocious, cruel and merciless;' [v] become cruel and ferocious;' [n] **ka-** 'ferocity, brutality'

Bik **pintás ma-** 'discourteous, ill-bred;' **mag-** 'to become...;' **–an** 'to be...'

[3] One excellent example is from his yet unpublished paper at 3ICAL (1981a, pp. 23, 24, 32) where he draws a distinction between PMP ***tuqela[n,ng]*** 'condylar bone' vs PMP ***ZuRi*** 'fish bone'.

Han **píntas** {relig} 'any extremely powerful and evil force in the supernatural realm (**padáya7**, q.v.); specifically, either of the two worst types of **labáŋ**, q.v.'

Mar **pintas** 'take away from, disturb as one does the luck of a gambler'

Mal **pintas** 'cutting across; taking a short cut'

I propose that these sets defy unification, especially if we consider only the Tagalog and Ilokano (which were the first two I looked at). Unification must be justified by appeal to independently-established cultural connections that lead to a semantically- and logically-satisfying conclusion. Perhaps the more adventurous would propose some unifying connections as follows: The religious connotation of the Hanunoo and the reference to luck in Maranao may indicate some common thread of {magic}, as does the sense of English 'charming' reflected in one of the Ilokano glosses. One might further contemplate if there is a root *+**tas** 'cut, sever' involved in this comparison, as reflected in the Malay. If, as it would appear to be in this case, all assignments cannot be reconciled and are therefore rejected, then the reconstruction is either invalidated, or reduced to a lower-order proto language, for which cognation of form and meaning can be established.[4] Alternatively, one might consider if we are dealing with a series of homophones (semantic doublets).

The fact that a single etymon can have an enormous amount of polysemy was taken up in detail by Blust (1981b, pp. 73-77) and 1981c) in the case of PAN ***baliw**, which can have any of the following glosses:

1. 'transformation, metamorphosis, variation' = {physical change}
2. 'change, exchange, pay (back); buy, sell" = {business exchange}
3. 'repay, return in kind; retaliate, take revenge; equalize (a loss ~ debt)' = {social exchange}
4. 'substitute' = {temporary physical change}
5. 'oppose, opposite part ~ side; dual division, moiety' = {social structure}
6. 'friend, partner' = {social interaction}
7. 'answer; repeat' = {speech}
8. 'don mourning apparel; mourn for a deceased spouse' = {change by death}
9. 'ritual punishment; punitive storm, hail storm' = {spiritual change}

It is important to note that multiple reflexes of this often survive, such as: Akl **balíw** 'be bewitched, be stricken ill by an evil spirit,' **báliw- báliw** 'bridge of the nose; place between the eyes,' **báyluh** 'change, exchange, trade' or

[4] Thus, perhaps, a PCP ***pintas** {culturally-inappropriate behavior} would somehow unify the Tagalog, Bikol, and Bisayan forms, whereas a PSP ***pintas** {bad magic} the Hanunoo and Maranao.

Tag **báliw** 'demented person' [n], **balíw** 'demented' [adj], **i-bayó** 'opposite side,' **máliw** 'loss of intensity, reduction of fervor; end, ending; disappearance' or SaiT **Si-baLiw** 'sell,' **ba-baliw** 'sale.'

5. Comparison and Contrast: The Case for 'wash'

There are numerous terms in any Austronesian language for {wash}, and lexical differentiation depends on what is being washed. Since I know Aklanon best, let us look at its system:

Akl **bánlaw** 'wash off, rinse out (with water after soaping)'
Akl **basá7** 'wet;' **ma- basá7** 'wet, moist;' **basa7-ún** ~ **bás7-un** 'wet, put water on'
Akl **batíya7** ~ **bátya7** 'wooden wash basin' < Mex Sp (see below) [Syn: dúEaŋ 'large wooden bowl']
Akl **bunák** 'wet, damp', **bunak-ún** 'moisten, wet, dampen'
Akl **Eabáh** 'launder, wash (clothes)' < Sp **lavár** 'wash'
Akl **gú7gu7** *Entada phaseoloides* ~ *Ganophyllum falcatum* (tree – bark used as shampoo); **mag-** 'shampoo, wash (the hair)'
Akl **hilám7us** 'wash one's face (with one's hands ~ by splashing water on it)'
Akl **húgas** 'rinse, wash (off)'
Akl **kilís** ~ **kísl-i** 'rinse ~ wash (rice)'
Akl **labakára** 'wash ~ face cloth' > Sp **lava** 'washing + **cara** 'face'
Akl **lígus** ~ **pa-lígus** 'take a bath, bathe oneself; go swimming' [Contrast: **Eangúy** 'swim (after ~ the length of)']
Akl **páhid** 'wipe;' **pamahirán** 'rag, wash rag ~ cloth'
Akl **palibánaw** 'wash ~ (hands, feet)'
Akl **palimúgmug** 'gargle, wash out the mouth'
Akl **paŋ-labár** 'wash (one's face with washcloth)' < Sp **lavár** 'wash'
Akl **pu7pu7** 'wash (anus and/or private parts by patting water on them)'
Akl **trápuh** 'dush cloth, wiping cloth, cloth for cleanings, rag(s);' **trápuh** 'wipe up ~ off (wet table); sponge bath, wash a sick person (with a washcloth)' < Sp **trapo** 'rag; cloth'

A similar result may be achieved by looking at any reasonably thorough English to language index such as that for Tagalog (English 1977, p. 1173), Bikol (Mintz & Britanico, 1985, p. 207), Bontok (Reid, 1976, p. 494), Ilokano (Vanoverbergh, 1956b, p. 352), or Paiwan (Ferrell, 1982, p. 494f).

Above I cited three forms from Dyen, all containing some sense of {wash}. Can their glosses be more accurately defined? Throughout the literature, one can indeed find over 20 forms in this meaning. Although very few of them can be reconstructed at the PAN level, what is clear is that

historically and synchronically Austronesians are cleanliness-oriented people. Furthermore, many etyma appear to be founded on monosyllabic roots (***+ñaw, *+puq, *+suq;** possibly ***+Ras,** *+**saw, *+seq**) which may help uncover their underlying semantic profiles. Forms that have acquired the meaning {launder} can be assumed to be secondary in that both clothing and soap are relatively recent introductions. That is why so many languages have borrowed words for and relating to this process rather than extended the meaning of extant ones.

PAN ***ba+ñaw+ma-** 'wash, bathe' > Akl **pali-bánaw** (above), Itb **ma-vanaw** 'wash hands,' Ami **fanaw** 'lake, pond; wash articles of any kind (not cloth),' (Pai **ma-vanaw** 'take a bath,' **pa-pa-vanaw** 'bath someone'),[5] Tae **bano** 'wash rinse,' Mok **mañau** 'wash (bottle); baptize (dip in water)' [AE1, p. 041] Dbl: PPH ***bal+naw**

PPH ***bal+naw** 'rinse ~ wash off' > Tag **banláw** (above), Bik **balnáw mag- -on** 'rinse off (as soap, dirt),' **maghiŋ-hiŋ--an** 'rinse for a second time in a change of water,' Ceb **bánlaw** 'rinse, clean with water,' S-L **bánlaw** 'wash, rinse,' Kpm **banló** 'rinse off,' Ilk **balnáw** = **bugnáw** 'rinse' [PFL, p. 0809]

PAN? ***baséq** 'wet; wash with water' > Akl **basá7**(above), Tag, Ceb **basá7**, Sbl **bahá7**, Itg, Ilk **basá**, Itb **vasa** 'wet,' TB **baso** 'watery,' Iban, Mal **basah**, NgD bias (M) 'wet,' Ami **faca7**, Pai **v<n>ateq**, Sai **bæhi7** 'wash clothes' [Dahl, 1976, p. 28; PMJ, p. VL3] See: ***baseq** 'wet;' problematic final laryngeal in Iban.

PHF ***benatu** 'wash (clothes)' > Mal **benatu** 'laundryman, washerman,' Jav **penatu** 'laundryman;' Pai **v<n>ateq** 'wash clothes' [PAA, p. 046] I reject this on the grounds of the discrepancies of initial and final consonants; Pai is from an infixed form of ***baseq**

PMP ***buRiq** 'wash' > KB **burih** 'wash hands,' Ymd **buri** 'rinse (off/out),' Motu **huri-a** 'wash, scrub,' Ngg **vuli** 'pour water' [AE3, p. 057] Note widespread Australian Aboriginal Kriol **bogi** 'wash, bathe' which is probably a loan from some AN language with R > g.

PMP ***bulú** wash up (hands) > Bon **bolo**, Ilt **muu**, Fj **vulu** 'wash one's hands,' Jav **wulu** 'wash oneself,' Tonga, Fut, Sam **fu/fulu** 'wash up' [PA1, p. 123, VL3]

PCP ***búnak** 'wet; wash' > Ceb, Snt **búnak** 'launder,' Hil **búnak** 'wet,' Msk **bonak** 'wash (clothes),' (Ntg **bunak** 'wet') [PFL, p. 1147]

PPH ***da7Rup** 'wash face' > WBM **dapug** (M), Itg **agi-dálup**, Man **daL7op**, Luba **min-dá7up**, Isg **mahi-dárup**, Kla **ma-dE7op**, Inb man-da7 [McF-NP, p. 338, Z-DS]

PPH ***-da7mus** 'wash the face' > Tag **hi-lámos** 'washing of the face,' Akl **hi-lám7us** (above), Bik **ku-rá7mus, mu-rá7mus, pu-rá7mus** 'wash ~

[5] Paiwan /ma-vanaw/ may be a loan, as the palatal nasal normally yields a voiceless lateral.

wipe the face with the hand,' Ceb **hi-lám7us** 'wash someone's face,' S-L **hi-rám7us** 'lave, wash the face,' Msk **pu-**lamus, Bol **mag-**ra7mus, Bot **ulámeh**, Sbl **mi-la7mus**, Png **dilamús**, KnkN **men-dilam7us**, KnKS **dira7mus** 'wash face,' Ilk **di-ram7us** 'wash one's face' [McF-NP, p. 338, PFL, p. 0434]

PHN ***díRus** 'bathe, wash oneself' > Akl **pa-lígus** (above), Bik **ka-rígus**, Ata, Tig **digus**, K-C **pe-digus**, BilS **dyo**, Bilk, Tbl **dyoh**, Ilk, Mlw **dígus**, Ibg **zígu7**, ltb, lvt **ma-riyus**, Jav **dus**; TB **duris** (M) 'sprinkle,' Mal **dirus** 'wetting, watering, irrigating' [VL3]

PMP ***hi+suq** 'clean oneself by scrubbing' > Tag **híso7** 'cleaning of the teeth by rubbing,' Bik **híso7** 'rub dirt off the body with a stone while bathing,' Ceb **hísu7** 'apply oily substance to one's hair,' S-L **hísu7** 'clean one's hair with coconut milk,' (WBM **isu7** 'clean the anus with leaves),' Ifg **íhu**, Ilk **ísu**, OJav **isuh-2**, Num **is** 'scour, scrub,' ral **iu** 'bathe'

PHN? ***hu+ñaw** 'wash the hands ~ face' > Ceb **hunáw,** Klg **unaw**, Msk, Sar **onaw**, Murik **m-uño** [ACD, p. h126]

PHN ***lu+sáw** 'immerse in water' > Tag lusáw melted, liquefied (as ice), **l<ag>usáw** 'sound of splash of disturbed water, as when fish, animals, children play in it,' Akl **Eusáw** 'wade,' TB **luso** 'clean by washing up' [VL3] Dempwolff's gloss of 'rinse' is not quite right; probably has a monosyllabic root, cf: Akl **sawsaw** 'dunk, dip (into liquid)'

PAN ***+ñaw** 'wash, rinse, bathe' [Bey+ART, p. 127+ACD(huñaw, Siñaw), Wolff-PANN] See: ***ba+ñaw, *bal+naw, *hu+naw, *Naw+Naw, *Se+naw, *Si-ñaw**; note that PAN ***danaw** 'lake, pond' may be connected

PHF ***Naw+naw** 'rinse, wash' > Ceb **nawnaw** 'put s.t. in liquid and swish it around,' **hi-nawnaw** 'rinse,' Amis **nanaw** 'wash (hands ~ dishes),' **nawnaw** 'be swamped, surrounded by water, float' [AE3, p. 221] Dbl: PHF ***Saw+saw**

PHN ***púnas** 'wipe (off ~ out)' > Tag **púnas** 'wiping off ~ clean; sponge bath,' Bik **púnas mag-** 'take a sponge bath,' **mag- -an** 'wipe with a cloth ~ sponge (as a table),' WBM **punas** 'wipe s.t.,' Bon **pónas** 'to wipe; anything used for wiping,' Isg **púnas** 'wipe, clean ~ dry by rubbing (dishes, etc.),' Chm **funas** 'eradicate, erase, wipe out, put an end to,' Iban **punas** 'barren, childless, with no direct heirs; died out, having no survivors; wipe out, destroy' [AE4, p. 464] (Interesting semantic variation in Chamorro and Iban compared to Philippine languages)

PHN? ***puq+puq** 'pat ~ slap water on (e.g., private parts, dirty item)' > Akl **pu7pu7** (above), Bik **pu7pu7** 'wash the anus,' Mar **popo7** 'wash the private parts,' Kel **pupu7** 'wash clothes' [PAA, p. 310]

PHF ***Se+ñaw** 'wash (up), rinse; cool off' > Tag **hináw**, Bik **hanáw**, Ceb **hunáw** 'wash one's hands,' NgD **eñaw,** Paz **me-senaw** [ACD:S27, Tsuchida-PTP:246(S136enaw), Wolff-PANN] Dbl:***sinaw**

PHF ***Si+naw** 'wash (up)' > Ceb, Hil **hináw**, Ilk **innáw**, Kan **m-ari-**sináu, Thao **S<m>inaw** 'wash (other than clothes),' Bun ma-sinav 'wash

(clothes)' [ACD, p. S44; Dahl, 1976, p. 32; Dyen-65 Ev, p. 12.2; Tsuchida-PTP, p. 246]

PHF ***Si+naw** 'place where one washes' [ACD, p. S44a]

PMP *****+suq 'wash, scrub' [ACD, p. h102] See; ***ba+suq**, ***hi+suq**; also: ***suq+suq**

PHF ***Saw+saw** 'wash, rinse; water down' > Amis **sawsaw, sasaw** [ACD, p. S20] Dbl: PHF *Naw+Naw, *raw+raw

PAN? *****SúRas 'wash, scrub, rinse (body parts ~utensils, but not clothes)' > Akl (above), Bik, Ceb, Hil, Tag **húgas**, Han **úgas**, Tir **urah**, Ilk **úgas**, TB **uras**, Mal **huras**, Hov **uza**, Buli **uas**, Puy **-**** [ACD, p. S61, VL3]

PHN *****huRas-an 'wash something' [ACD, p. S61d]

PHN *huRas-en 'be washed off' [ACD, p. S61e]

PHN *****huRas-I 'BE WASHED OFF' [ACD, p. S61f]

PHN *maR-húRas 'wash, cleanses' [ACD, p. S61b]

PHN *maμ-húRas 'wash, cleanse' [ACD, p. S61a]

PHN *paμ- húRas 'instrument for washing' [ACD, p. A61c]

Sp ***labáh-** 'wash (clothes), launder' > Akl **Eabáh** (above), Bik, Ceb **labáh-** [McF-NP335, Z-DS] Sp **lavar** 'to launder'

Sp ***batya[7]** > Bik **batyá7**, Akl (above), Ceb, Hil **batíya7**, S-L **bátya7**, Dbw **batya7**, Kpm, Png **batyá**, Ilk **batiá** [Z-DS} < Mex Sp **batea** 'wash basin' < Sp **batea** 'tray, trough; flat-bottomed boat'

6. Assignment of Semantic Kernels

Semantic assignments can be clear and straightforward or highly problematic. In some cases, knowledge of the culture can establish a tenuous connection as valid. Thus, when Blust (1986, AE3#327) questions my inclusion of Paiwan **s<m>aliL** 'to isolate, put s.t. off by itself, **ki-saliL** 'isolate oneself' and Malay **alin** 'massage by magic art so as to extract a toxic foreign body from the human frame' within a PAN ***SaliN** 'move (away ~ over), transfer, leave; isolate' otherwise justified by Ceb **halín** 'move away from a place permanently,' Akl, Hil, Han **hálin** 'transfer, move to another place,' WBM **halin** 'transfer, move from one place to another; change, as one's appearance,' Mgg **aliŋ** 'move (a horse), transfer to another place; change; go out from inside,' then the reconstruction would have to be revised to PMP ***halin** 'move, transfer.' However, I see the semantic kernel of this reconstruction as {movement away}. If one has observed a medicine man perform the curing rite by removing stones and other matter from an ailing body implicit in the Malay form, there is no leap of logic in saying he is moving the affliction away from the patient.[6] Similarly,

[6] Aklanon **butbut** 'treat for a disease (done by a herbolario, during which process stones and/or small pieces of wood are extracted from the infected area)' is similarly related to PMP ***but+but** 'pluck (feathers), tear ~ pull out (entrails); extract.'

the grammar of Austronesian languages can seriously affect the meaning, such as Tag **alís** 'removal; departure,' **<um>alis** 'go away' [intransitive], **alis-in** 'remove something' [transitive]. Thus, in my view of the Paiwan cognates, there is a transitivizing and specialization of the meaning, {moving something away} + {alone}. Pai **ki-** is a self-reflexive or autobenefactive with the effect of 'do willing to/for oneself,' and its result fits within the semantic kernels I suggest, i.e. {movement away} + {of oneself}.

In one of Dempwolff's classic reconstructions, one can see that there have been extended semantic developments from PAN ***búŋaH*** {plant outgrowth}:

TB, Mal **buŋa**, Iban **buŋay**, OJav **wuŋa**, Sam **fuŋa**, Kan **buŋabuŋa** 'flower'
Mlg **vuni** 'blossom'
Akl, Bik, Ceb, Tag, Tsg **búŋah**-, Blw, Ifg, Ilk, Kpm, Sbl **búŋa**, Bkd, Btk, Klg, K-C, Msk, Sub **buŋa**, Tbl **buŋuh** 'fruit'

There has been semantic specialization in:

Akl, Bik, Ceb, Tag **búŋah**-, Sbl, Itg **búŋa**, Sub **buŋa**, Kal **buŋa7** *Areca catechu,* 'betel nut,'
NgD **buŋeh** 'rice blossom'
Fj **vuŋa** *Metrosideros polymorpha*
AmiF **vuŋa**, Aty, Sed **buŋa7**, Puy **buŋa** 'sweet potato'[7]

and even extension of meaning outside of its botanical denotation:

Akl, CEb, Tag **búŋah**- 'result,'
NgD **buŋah** 'tax'

Blust's ongoing work on the ACD has uncovered an exciting case of how one can pin-point the semantics of an etymology with his PAN ***Sáwak*** 'waist, back of waist.' Only some of his many citations need be reiterated here:

Kav **sawaq** 'the vulnerable area between the rib cage and the pelvic bone, specifically and emphatically excluding the front area which is protected by the abdominal muscles'
Akl, Ceb **háwak**, Itw **áwak** 'waist'

[7] These Formosan words for 'sweet potato,' like the plant, are introductions, but with a semantic shift of an Austronesian root. There is no known source for this form in this meaning, certainly not the Northern Philippines where Sp **²kamuti** is the most common form (see McFarland, 1977, p. 106).

Hil **háwak**, Tir **owok** 'waistline'
Ifg **áwak** 'loins, waist'
Han **(h)áwak** 'back of the waist' [Note: no general term for waist]
Bik **háwak** 'body, torso; physique; fuselage of an airplane; hull of a boat; stalk of plants; shaft of an arrow; mani- 'to take the form of something'
Mal **awak** 'body, trunk of body; oneself (I, we)'
Iban **awak** 'space, gap, vacancy'
TB **ak** 'hips, loins'
Mgg **awak** 'hips, waist'

This is accompanied by a note which reads in part "The precise semantic agreement in the glosses of KAV /sawaq/ and HAN / háwak/ 'back of the waist', and the somewhat wavering English gloss 'waist, hips' in several languages suggest that the referent of *Sawak did not correspond exactly to any semantic category of English. Rather, the available information suggests that PAN *Sawak and PMP *hawak referred to the unprotected space between the rib cage and the pelvic bone which is not covered by the muscles of the abdominal diaphragm, hence a part of the body corresponding roughly to the English concept 'waist', but applying only to the sides and back." I would add that given the feature of {vulnerability}, it is easier to see how senses such as {self} and {body} developed.

One of my favorite "discoveries" is the following set of cognates:

Akl **únuŋ** 'stand by, be loyal to, stand up for; allege, pledge'
Blk **únuŋ** 'cause,' **únuŋ kan** 'because of, owing to,' **ma- -an** 'be the cause of,' **-an** 'cause, reason'
WBM **unuŋ** 'a person's possessions which are buried with him; die along with someone'
Tir **unuŋ** 'guard something'
Bon **ónoŋ** 'fight, struggle with, as to move a heavy object or open a jammed door'
Ilk **úŋuŋ** 'avenge, revenge, e.g., killing someone in retaliation for the death of a headman (in bygone times); taking vengeance at the first opportunity for an injury that had been inflicted with impunity some time before'

which I feel has the semantic kernel of {loyalty} and reconstruct as PPH ***únuŋ** 'watch over; be loyal to.' The semantic shifts and specializations to WBM {die with}, Ilk {retaliate}, Bik {cause}, Tir {guard} are reasonably straightforward; perhaps less so the generalization to Bon {struggle}, but derived from {fight with}.

Another interesting compilation of cognate sets of a "no identity" variety is:

Tag **laŋgám** 'ant'
Akl **Eaŋgam** 'rat'
Ceb **láŋgam**, Kuy **lamgam**, Ntg **lamlam** 'bird'
Han **laŋgám** 'millepede'
WBM **laŋgam** 'any non-human creature' (generic)

which I reconstruct as PSP ***lam+Ram** 'vermin' {any creature taking man's food supply} [PFL, p. 2105] Dbl: ***Ram+Ram** (Bik **gamgám** 'bird') This may contain a root *+**Ram**, itself a doublet of *+**kam** 'seize, take, grab.'

The extension or splitting of meaning to such a degree that cognates may appear to be no more than homophones may be evidenced by:

Tag **hilík** 'snore'
Ntg **elek**, Bol **ma-7lek**, Sbl **ka-7luk**, Ifg **olók**, Knk **ek** 'sleep'
Knk **elék** 'sleep with s.o.' [ACD, p. H060]
Btk **elek** 'sleepy'
Bik(Leg) **úluk**, Png **elék** 'laugh'

which I construe to be: PPH ***hê+lék** 'snore' {sound of sleeping} with the following semantic developments: from {snore} to {sleep} to {sleepy} as opposed to {sleep with} and from {sound of snoring} to {laugh} – certainly some forms of laughter resemble the snorting sound of snoring.

7. A System of Checks and Balances

In undertaking this task, we have a tremendous advantage in verifying our results by recourse to the insights and developments of current (and past) semantic theory. Ironically, while Austronesianists had been relatively silent on the issue (§1 above), some of the greatest advances in semantics came from the historical study of Indo-European languages (Palmer, 1976, p. 11). Remember that in the development of the early American linguistic schools, semantics was, for the most part, considered outside the domain of most formal linguistic analysis. Even so, one can find a superb treatment in Bloomfield (1933, pp. 425-443) relevant to our field.

In setting up cognate sets, having satisfied the phonological requirements, we should draw upon any of the following SEMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS (see Bierwisch, 1970, pp. 166-184; Palmer, op. cit.; etc.).

SYNONYMY (nearness in meaning) represents a (near) identical correspondence and therefore presents no problem in establishing a reconstruction. Thus, Akl **matá** = Pai **matsa** 'eye' < PAN ***maCá** 'eye.' The vast majority of AN etymologies represent synonymy across languages, which (if

not the product of borrowing) renders them solid. However, when reconstructions are synonymous, there may be cause for some concern. At 7ICAL (Zorc, 1997, p. 615f) I evaluated a number of them. In brief, when an innovation in form has replaced the semantic space occupied by a previous word, there is a justifiable case of synonymy (e.g. PMP ***há(ŋ)saŋ** => PNP ***hadaŋ** 'gills'). But when two etymologies appear to be nearly identical in meaning, one might well wonder if the proto-community distinguished them in some way (e.g. PAN ***Rabí7iH** vs. **beRŋi** 'night').

ANTONYMY (oppositeness in meaning) plays a significant role in Iban [see Blust, 1980b] and may be the result of some form of speech disguise or social fad. Thus, PAN ***qaŋSit** [AE4, p. 030] > Akl **aŋhit** 'having a strong body odor,' Amis **7aŋsit** 'stink of a skunk' universally refers to some form of bad smell,' but Iban **aŋit** has come to mean 'fragrance, sweet scent.' I have seen this process operative in Tagalog slang (Zorc, 1991) and in Aklanon cynicism, where, for example, **kúEaŋ sa inúm** 'lacking drink' refers to a 'drunkard.'

METONOMY (nearness in space or time) is exemplified by the shift in meaning of Tag **bibíg** 'mouth' from PMP **bi+bíR** 'lip.' It may also apply in a case such as PHF ***buqél** [HLC, p. 51] {protruding bone} > Akl **bu7úE** 'heel,' WBM b**u7el** 'knee,' Ceb **bu7ul-2** 'ankle,' Sai **bö7öl** 'bone.'

POLYSEMY (multiple meanings) as in the case of PAN ***baliw** discussed in §4 above or GCP ***húsay** 'organize, settle, pacify; smooth, orderly; smoothen (out)' > Ceb, S-L **húsay** 'orderly,' Tsg **husay** 'disadvantage,' Han **húsay** 'caress, pet, stroke,' WBM **husey** 'settle (a case).'

NARROWING or GENERALIZATION, as when PAN ***Si-ká7en** 'used for eating' is applied very broadly to 'fish' in Kal**ian**, Chm **guihan**, Iban, Mal **ikan**, Fj, Tonga **ika**, Bun **iska:n**, or PHF ***qáyam** 'domestic animal' > WBM **ayam** 'domestic livestock' has come to mean Akl **áyam** 'dog,' Mal **ayam** 'fowl,' Amis **7ayam** 'chicken,' Sai **7æyam** 'pork.'

WIDENING, a form of HYPONYMY, as with Pai **tsiqaw** 'fish' (generic) < PAN **Ciqaw** 'goatfish' [AE1, p. 425; PTP, p. 165].

SYNECHDOCHE (whole/part relationship) is exemplified by the development of meanings from PMP ***banua** 'inhabited territory (human ecosystem)' > Akl, Ceb **bánwa** 'town,' Mal **benua** 'continent,' etc. treated so thoroughly in Blust (1987, p. 93f, 99f).

HYPERBOLE (stronger to weaker meaning), as with PAN ***bunúq** 'kill, butcher' > Tag **bunó7** 'struggle' or Akl **bunú7** 'stab.'

LITOTES (weaker or stronger meaning), as may be the case with Tir **sila7** 'lightning' < PMP ***silaq** 'split.'

DEGENERATION (lower or more negative meaning), as with PMP ***tulíh** 'earwax' > Mal **tuli** 'deaf' or PHN ***lalaw** 'exceed, surpass, go beyond' > WBM **lalew** 'grieve over s.t. to the extent that one does not eat.'

ELEVATION (higher or more positive meaning), as may be the case with PMP ***dátu7** 'chief, head of a clan' > Jav **ratu** 'prince,' **ke-ratO-n** 'court' or Tir **datu7** 'Moslem nobleman.'

SPECIALIZATION (limitation to a specific field or sense) as in the scientific application of English 'mass' or 'energy,' whereby PHN ***gemi** 'sucking fish, sucker fish,' *Echeneis* ~ *Remora* sp. is derived from PMP ***gemi** 'hold on by biting' > Iban **gemi-an**, Mal **ikan gemi**. Mkr **gammi**, Wol **gomi** [AE3, p. 108; AE4, p. 206].

TABOO (avoidance of a word by using more culturally-acceptable or politically-correct words) as in the case of English 'toilet' which has developed numerous circumlocutions such as 'bathroom,' 'W.C.,' 'lavatory,' etc. This may have been the case in the semantic development of PMP ***ZuRúq** 'sap' to PSP 'blood' discussed below (§8).

IDIOMATICITY (the assignment of special semantic features to pre-existing forms such that the true meaning of the word or phrase cannot be derived outside of the language community in which it is used). Thus Akl **ánwaŋ** 'water buffalo, carabao' also refers to a 'hard-working person' (similar to English 'he works like a horse').

A final consideration may be that of the CARRYOVER of meaning from a form's containing a MONOSYLLABIC ROOT. While I had not thought of this when I originally conceived of this paper, it has already come up (as in several of the forms for {wash} discussed in §5 above). My only "addition" to Blust (1987) is that PMP ***b<al>áy** may contain a monosyllabic root ***+bay** {together} and simply meant 'construction, building.' I consider Dempwolff's ***abay** to contain this root, whether it has come to mean 'move together (as arms when walking),' 'be together' (as Bisayan ***ab(a)y-an** 'friend, companion' or Iban **ambai** 'sweetheart, lover,' and 'be beside or next to' in many SPh languages), or 'put together.' I interpret PPH ***bay+bay** as {place of togetherness}, i.e. where sea and land meet, therefore 'shore, beach, bank' – but this has then gone through all kinds of semantic specialization where in NPh lgs it almost universally means 'sea,' but in Bikol and Central Bisayan dialects it has come to mean 'sand.' I propose that ***b<al>ay** reflects this root and infix ***<al>** with the semantic kernel of {put together, construct} (or the object thereof). In further support, there is the Akl accent pair **báEay** [v] 'construct, build' and another derivation **baEáybay** 'compose verses and poetry' {put words together} alongside Ceb **bálay** 'compose' as in **gibálay ko aŋ ákuŋ húna7húna7** 'I composed my thoughts.' The infix ***<al>** is reasonably productive and found on such reconstructions as ***b<al>aŋa7** 'open mouth jar,' and is the result of the back-formation of NPh **7íma** 'hand' as if PAN ***qa-límaH** 'hand' {thing of five} were ****q<al>ímaH**. Going one step back, in my reconstructional method, when I enter any etymology in my database, I look to see if it can plausibly contain ANY evidence for a root. Thus, a form like *balay

bal- ay
might be **bla-ay, **ba-lay, or **b<al>ay. When I called up potentials like *bal, *lay, and *bay, I opted for the latter when I saw the kernel of {togetherness} in reconstructions like ***a+bay** (actually two ***á+bay** and ***a+báy**), PCP ***ag+bay** 'go together with hands around the shoulders', the synchronic forms from Aklanon cited above, and Tag **sabáy** 'together, in unison, simultaneous,' etc.

8. Importance of Semantic Innovations

Comparativists have traditionally drawn upon phonological innovations in the establishment of subgroups. More recently, in conjunction with lexicostatistical or functor results, they have used proposed lexical innovations (e.g. Zorc (1976) vis-à-vis Pallesen (1978) in the establishment of Bisayan, or McFarland (1974) for Bikol). However, a genuine but limited semantic shift can also offer qualitative evidence. If we can posit with reasonable certitude an early etymon (including its meaning), then a shift in meaning may have been the result of a particular subgroup's playing with that word, yielding to a taboo, or the like. Two such shifts have been discussed in Zorc (1974) and Blust (1991):

PAN ***danúm** 'water;' PHN ***túbiR** 'deep water' > GCP ***túbig** 'water' (generic)

PAN ***daRaq** 'blood;' PMP ***ZuRúq** 'sap, fluid' > PSP ***duRúq** 'blood'

There has been a semantic shift limited to a number of Southern Philippine languages of the following: PAN ***Rumaq** 'house' > SPh 'sheath, scabbard' > Sin **gume7-an**, Soc **guma7-an**, Bkd, K-C, WBM **guma7**, (Klg **luma7**, Sar **loma** < Bilic), Tir **ruma7**, BilK **lumo7**, BilS **luma7**, Tbl **lumak**, Snl **róma**, San **homa**; note also Mar **goma7-an** 'weapon' {that which is sheated}. It is found as far as north as Bot, Sbl **gúma7**, the reflexes of which I take to indicate a loan from early contact with Tagalog (Tag has since replaced it with **kalúban**, a Southern Luzon innovation found in Kpm, Png, and Bol). The disappearance of the well-attested etymon ***Rumaq** in the vast majority of Philippine languages as well as the almost universal appearance of ***baláy** in the meaning 'house' to be held in memory long enough for its meaning to switch. What appears to be important about this semantic innovation is the fact that the Bilic and Sangiric languages as well as some of the southernmost members of GCP have this word in its regular reflexes. Unless we are dealing with a loan translation (e.g., Tag **bágo** 'before' < Mal **baru**) on the part of Bilic, perhaps the Bilic subgroup is not as distant from Philippine languages as some have proposed. I still consider them to be part of Proto Southern Philippine, the next node up from GCP.

* would appear to indicate some form of taboo factor upon *Rumaq, although the word had

9. Postscript

Many years ago, Brother Andrew Gonzalez of De La Salle University and the Linguistics Society of the Philippines asked me to consider writing a textbook on Austronesian Historical Linguistics that would make the field accessible to Filipino students. While I have not been in a position (academically, financially, and temporarily) to do this, I have strived in my papers for the ICAL series and other all too rare opportunities to present "chapters" of such a text. Thus, Zorc (1984/1985) via a review of Blust's AE1 presents an overview of the basic premises and methodology of the comparative method. Zorc (1990) was a review of the status of research on the monosyllabic root, with some suggestions that there may be suffixes operative so that search need not be limited to the final CVC. Zorc (1994) was a comprehensive application of the Wörte und Sache technique, which was perhaps too ambitious in its uncritical acceptance of just about every AN reconstruction made. And Zorc (1997) (at the 7ICAL in 1994) presented a schema for evaluation of evidence and errors in Austronesian reconstruction.

This paper represents a continuation of that "series" and looks broadly at the assignment of semantic glosses to etymologies. Alas, in "practicing what I preach," I have been overtaken by time. The process of presenting a full citation (rather than an abbreviated gloss) from each dictionary entry is enormously time-consuming, but as indicated above, very rewarding. Nevertheless, I hope to have given a glimpse into my methodology, as it has evolved (thanks to the guidance of colleagues such as Blust and Wolff,) and hopefully some insights into this fascinating area of reconstruction.

ABBREVIATIONS USED AND LANGUAGES CITED

x	a loan or maverick reconstruction
*	a reconstruction
**	form not known to occur
<X>	an infix
-	morpheme break
/	suspect morpheme break ("benign slash")
+	monosyllabic root
?	or a level lower than that posited
ACD	Blust (in progress)
Adr	Address [kinship term]
AE1	Blust (1980)
AE2	Blust (1983/84)
AE3	Blust (1986)
AE4	Blust (1989)
Akl	Aklanon
Amis	Amis
AN	Austronesian
Ata	Ata Manobo
Aty	Atayal
Bey	Blust (1988)
Bik	Bikol (Naga-Legaspi)
BilK	Koronadal Bilaan
BilS	Sarangani Bilaan
Bkd	Binukid Manobo
Blw	Balangaw
Bol	Bolinaw Sambal
Bon	Bontok (Guinaang)
Bot	Botolan Sambal
Bs	Bisayan subgroup
Btk	Batak (of Palawan)
Bun	Bunun
CDF	Zorc (1979-85)
Ceb	Cebuano (Bs)
Chm	Chamorro
Dbl	doublet
Dbw	Dibabawon Manobo
DS	Zorc data system (ms)
Dsj	disjunct
Fj	
GCP	
Han	
Hil	
HLC	
Hov	
Iban	
Ibg	
Ifg	
Ilk	
Ilt	
Isg	
Itb	
Itg	
Ivt	
Jav	
K-C	
Kal	
Kan	
Kav	
KB	
Kdz	
Kel	
Kla	
Klg	
Knk	
KnkN	
KnkS	
Kpm	
Kuy	
Lar	
Luba	
Mal	
Man	
Mar	
McF	
Mex	
Mgg	
Mkb	
Mlg	
Mlw	
Mok	
Msk	
NgD	
Ngg	
Ntg	
OJav	
PA1	
PA2	
PA3	
PA4	

ij	Fijian
GCP	Greater-Central-Philippines (Blust 1991)
Han	Hanunoo (S. Mangyan)
Hil	Hiligaynon (Bs)
HLC	Dyen (1990)
Hov	Malagasy (data from VL3)
Iban	Iban (Sea Dayak)
Ibg	Ibanag
Ifg	Ifugaw
Ilk	Ilokano
Ilt	Ilongot
Isg	Isneg
Itb	Itbayaten
Itg	Itneg
Ivt	Ivatan
Jav	Javanese
K-C	Kalamansig Cotobato Manobo
Kal	Kalamian(en)
Kan	Kanakanabu
Kav	Kavalan
KB	Karo Batak
Kdz	Kadazan
Kel	Kelabit
Kla	Kalinga (Guinaang)
Klg	Kalagan
Knk	Kankanay
KnkN	nortern Kankanay
KnkS	Southern Kankanay
Kpm	Kapampangan
Kuy	Kuyonon (Bs)
Lar	Dyen (1953a)
Luba	Luba
Mal	Malay
Man	Manobo
Mar	Maranao
McF	McFarland (1977)
Mex	Mexican Spanish
Mgg	Manggarai
Mkb	Minangkabau (Malay)
Mlg	Malagasy
Mlw	Malaweg
Mok	Moken
Msk	Mansaka
NgD	Ngaju Dayak
Ngg	Nggela
Ntg	northern Tagbanwa (Kalamianic)
OJav	Old Javanese (Kawi)
PA1	Blust (1972a)
PA2	Blust (1972b)
PA3	Blust (1973)
PA4	Blust (1970)

Pai	Paiwan
PAN	Proto-Austronesian
PANN	Wolff (1993)
Paz	Pazeh
PCP	Proto Central Philippine
PFL	Zorc (1971)
PHF	Proto Hesperonesian and Formosan
PHN	Proto-Hesperonesian (West Austronesian)
PIN	Proto-Indonesian (followed by first letter of Demp's abr: T(oba), M(alay), J(av), N(gadju), H(ova)
PMJ	Proto Malayo-Javanic (Nothofer)
PML	Proto Malayic (usually Adelaar)
PMP	Proto-Malayo-Polynesian
Png	Pangasinan
PPH	Proto-Philippine
PSP	Proto-Southern-Philippine
Puy	Puyuma
Rd	Reid (1971)
Ref	Reference [kinship term]
Ruk	Rukai
RukTn	Tona dialect of Rukai
S-L	Samar-Leyte (Bs)
Sai	Saisiyat (Taai)
SaiT	Saisiyat (Tungho)
Sam	Samoan
San	Sangir
Sar	Sarangani Manobo
Sbl	Sambal
Sed	Sediq
Sin	Sindingan Subanon
Snl	Sangil
Soc	Siocon Subanon]
Sp	Spanish loanword
SPh	southern Philippine
Sub	Subanon
Syn	Synonym
Tag	Tagalog
TAG	Ferrell (1969)
TB	Toba Batak
Tbl	Tagabili/Tboli
Thao	Thao
Tig	Tigwa Manobo
Tir	Tiruray
Tonga	Tongan
Tsg	Tausug
Tso	Tsou
VL3	Dempwolff (1938)
VRR	Blust (1981)
WBM	Western Bukidnon Manobo
Ymd	Yamdena

REFERENCES

Adelaar, K.A. (1985). *Proto-Malayic the reconstruction of its phonology and parts of its lexicon and morphology.* Alblasserdam: Offsetdrukkerji Kanters B.V.

Bierwisch, M. (1970). Semantics. In J. Lyons (Ed.), *New horizons in linguistics* (Chapter 8) (pp. 166-184). Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.

Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Blust, R. (1970). Proto-Austronesian addenda. *Oceanic Linguistics, 9*, 104-162.

Blust, R. (1972a). Proto-Oceanic addenda with cognates in non-Oceanic Austronesian languages. *Working Papers in Linguistics, 4*(1), 1-43.

Blust, R. (1972b). Additions to 'Proto-Austronesian addenda' and 'Proto-Oceanic addenda' with cognates in non-Oceanic Austronesian languages. *Working Papers in Linguistics, 4*(8), 1-17.

Blust, R. (1972c). Note on PAN *qa(R)(CtT)a 'outsiders, alien people'. *Oceanic Linguistics, 11*, 166-171.

Blust, R. (1980a). Austronesian etymologies. *Oceanic Linguistics, 19*(1), 1-181.

Blust, R. (1980b). Iban antonymy: A case from diachrony? In D.J. van Alkemade, et al. (Eds.), *Linguistics studies offered to Berthe Siertsema* (pp. 35-47). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Blust, R. (1981a). Variation in retention rate among Austronesian languages. Paper presented to the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics. Denpasar, Bali.

Blust, R. (1981b). Dual divisions in Oceania: Innovation or retention? *Oceania, 52*(1), 66-80.

Blust, R. (1981c). Linguistic evidence for some early Austronesian taboos. *American Anthropologist, 83*(2), 285-319.

Blust, R. (1983/1984). Reconstruction and semantic reconstruction: The case of Austronesian 'house' words. *Diachronica IV*, 1/2, 79-106.

Blust, R. (1989). Austronesian etymologies IV. *Oceanic Linguistics, 28*(2), 111-180.

Blust, R. (1990). Summary report: Linguistic change and reconstruction methodology in the Austronesian language family. In P. Baldi (Ed.), *Linguistic change and reconstruction methodology* (pp. 133-153). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Blust, R. (1991). The Greater Central Philippines hypothesis. *Oceanic Linguistics, 30*(2), 73-129.

Blust, R. (1994). Austronesian sibling terms and culture history. In A.K. Pawley & M.D. Ross (Eds.), *Austronesian terminologies: Continuity and change.* Pacific Linguistics C.127 (pp. 31-72). Canberra: Australian National University.

Blust, R. (In progress). *Austronesian comparative dictionary* (computer files). University of Hawaii.

Dahl, O. C. (1976). *Proto-Austronesian* (2nd revised edition). Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series, No. 15. London: Curzon Press.

Dempwolff, O. (1924-25). Die l-, r- und d-Laute in austronesischen Sprachen. *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen, 15*(19-50), 116-138, 223-238, 273-319.

Dempwolff, O. (1934-38). *Vergleichende Lautlehre des Austronesischen Wortschatzes. Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 15, 17, 19. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.

Dyen, I. (1947). The Tagalog reflexes of Malayo-Polynesian *D. *Language, 23*, 227-38.

Dyen, I. (1951). Proto-Malayo-Polynesian *Z. *Language, 27*, 534-40.

Dyen, I. (1953). Dempwolff's *R. *Language, 29*, 577-590.

Dyen, I. (1953). *The Proto-Malayo-Polynesian laryngeals.* William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series No. 9. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America.

Dyen, I. (1965). Formosan evidence for some new Proto-Austronesian phonemes. *Lingua, 14*, 285-305.

Dyen, I. (1971). The Austronesian languages and Proto-Austronesian. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Current trends in linguistics* Vol. 8: Linguistics in Oceania (pp. 5-54). The Hague: Mouton.

Dyen, I. & Aberle, D. F. (1974). *Lexical reconstruction: The case of the Proto-Athapaskan kinship system.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elkins, R. E. (1968). *Manobo-English dictionary.* Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 3. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

English, L. J., C.Ss.R. (1977). *English-Tagalog dictionary.* Manila: National Bookstore.

Ferrell, R. (1969). *Taiwan aboriginal groups: Problems in cultural and linguistic classification.* Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, Monograph No. 17. Taipei, Taiwan.

Ferrell, R. (1982). *Paiwan dictionary.* Pacific Linguistics C.73. Canberra: Australian National University.

McFarland, C. D. (1974). *The dialects of the Bikol area.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University.

McFarland, C. D. (1977). *Northern Philippine linguistic geography.* Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa Monograph Series, No. 9. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

Mintz, M. W. & Britanico, J. R. (1985). *Bikol-English dictionary.* Quezon City: New Day Publishers.

Pallesen, A. K. (1978). Review of Zorc's The Bisayan Dialects of the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics,* 9, 90-95.

Palmer, F. R. (1976). *Semantics: A new outline.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Panganiban, J. V. (1972). *Diksyunaryo-tesauro Pilipino-Ingles.* Quezon City: Manlapaz Publishing Company.

Reid, L. A. (Ed.) (1971). *Philippine minor languages: Word lists and phonologies.* Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 8. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.

Reid, L. A. (1976). *Bontok-English dictionary.* Pacific Linguistics C.36. Canberra: The Australian National University.

Reid, L. A. (1982). The demise of Proto-Philippines. In A. Halim, L. Carrington & S.A. Wurm (Eds.), *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics,* Vol. 2, Pacific Linguistics C.75 (pp. 201-216). Canberra: The Australian National University.

Schlegel, S. A. (1971). *Tiruray-English lexicon.* University of California Publications in Linguistics.

Tramp, G. D. Jr. (1995). *Waray-English dictionary.* Kensington: Dunwoody Press.

Vanoverbergh, M. (1956a). *Iloko-English dictionary.* Baguio City: Catholic School Press.

Vanoverbergh, M. (1956b). *English-Iloko thesaurus.* Baguio City: Catholic School Press.

Wilkinson, R. J. (1959). *A Malay-English dictionary (Romanised).* London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd.

Wolff, J. U. (1972). *A dictionary of Cebuano Visayan.* Special Monograph No. 4. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Wolff, J. U. (1991). The Proto-Austronesian phoneme *t and the grouping of the Austronesian Languages. In R. Blust (Ed.), *Currents in Pacific linguistics: Papers on Austronesian languages and ethnoliguistics in honour of George W. Grace.* Pacific Linguistics C.117 (pp. 535-549). Canberra: Australian National University.

Wolff, J. U. (1993). The PAN phonemes *ñ and *N. *Oceanic Linguistics, 32*(1), 45-61.

Zorc, R. D. (1974). Towards a definitive Philippine wordlist: The qualitative use of vocabulary in identifying and classifying languages. *Oceanic Linguistics, 13,* 409-455.

Zorc, R. D. (1977). *The Bisayan dialects of the Philppines: Subgrouping and reconstruction.* Pacific Linguistics C.44. Canberra: The Australian National University.

Zorc, R. D. (1978). Functor analysis: A method of quantifying function words for comparing and classifying languages. *Oceanic Linguistics, 13,* 409-455.

Zorc, R. D. (1979-1983). *Core etymological dictionary of Filipino.* Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines. Fascicles 1-4 ("A" – "L").

Zorc, R. D. (1984/85). A guide to the Filipino linguist in reading and appreciating Robert A. Blust's 'Austronesian Etymologies' (1980). Review article. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics, 15*(2) and *16*(1), 81-93.

Zorc, R. D. (1990). The Austronesian monosyllabic root, radical or phonestheme. In P. Baldi (Ed.), *Linguistic change and reconstruction methodology* (pp. 175-194). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Zorc, R. D. (1991). *Tagalog slang dictionary.* Kensington, MD: Dunwoody Press.

Zorc, R. D. (1994). Austronesian culture history through reconstructed vocabulary: An overview. In A. K. Pawley & M. D. Ross (Eds.), *Austronesian terminologies: Continuity and change.* Pacific Linguistics C.127 (pp. 541-594). Canberra: Australian National University.

Zorc, R. D. (Ms.) Philippine and Austronesian data system. Computer database and data sheets.