



Figure 18: Subgrouping of the Batanic languages

*Gallego 2014*

Such hypothesis is similar to that of Yang (2002), in which a statistical analysis of phonological divergence and phonemic correspondences was utilized. This proposed subgrouping differs with those of Zorc (1977) and Li (2001), in which Itbayat is regarded as closer to Ivatan (i.e. Ivasay, Isamorong, and Ibatan). Moreover, this subgrouping assumption also differs with the proposal of Moriguchi (2005), in which he places Yami together with Isamorong and Ibatan, based on evidence in the fisherman's register among others (discussed in §2.1.1.2).

From the proposed reconstructions in Proto-Batanic, Itbayat seems to retain most of the features of the proto-language, such as the number and form of the phonemes as well as the system of nominal marking in which grade contrast in terms of proximity is preserved. Thus, it can be assumed that the descent of Proto-Batanic is characterized by three separate branches. One main branch is composed of Itbayat, in which a direct line can be traced from Proto-Batanic based on the several