3.1. Situation one: Limiting data to qualitative vocabulary.

In evaluating scores that I obtained from a hand-count of the Swadesh 100 list over many dialect and language pairs, I was impressed by several alignments which seemed in error. One of those was that of Kagayanen, the language spoken on Cagayan Island, between Negros and Palawan. Although it shows no significantly high score with any Philip­pine language, it has scores in the neighborhood of 60 percent with Kuyonon, Kinaray-a, and Aklanon (which are members of the western branch of the Bisayan family) and with Binukid and other members of the Manobo family (such as Ilianen). High scores with the Bisayan cluster, particularly with Kuyonon, led Dyen to classify Kagayanen in the Tagalic Hesion, coordinate with Bisayan, Mamanwa, and Tagalog. [1965:29; Dyen has since grouped Kag and other languages of the Manobo groups together into a single family (personal communication).] Since Manobo and Bisayan are two separate language families within the Sulic (Southern Philippine) Hesion, it is unlikely that we have a linking member in Kag. Further­more, the scores of Kagayanen do not parallel the Bisayan groupings. Thus, even from the alignment of lexicostatistical percentages there is reason to suspect the scores of Kag with the other languages.

If one looks more critically at the content of the 100 word list for Kag (see Table 1) there are 17 forms that are more readily traced to the Manobo family, and 13 forms that appear to be Bisayan. Of these, only four are found throughout the Bisayan group; five are more typically West Bisayan, and four are more typically South Bisayan. We get no informa­tion from 58 of the forms because they are found scattered throughout the Philippines, while 12 are problematic in that they represent innovations in form or meaning within Kag itself. It is important to note that of the 100 forms then, only 30 are of significance in giving information about the genetic relationship of Kag to a Philippine language group. If we look at those 30 forms, evidence for membership within either Bis or Man should become apparent. The 17 Kag forms that can generally be traced to Manobo, or, more specifically, that cannot be related to any Bis dialect are found in Table 2. On the other hand, the 13 Kag forms that do not appear in Manobo languages or dialects, and which appear to be Bisayan are found in Table 3.

TABLE 1. Kagayanen 100 Word List

all tanán PBs man/male ma:ma Mb

ashes Ɂabú PPH many ta:maɁ --

belly gəttək PMB meat sapúɁ --

big bakə́d SPh moon bu:Lan PH

bird yu:pan PH mountain bu:kid PH

bite kagát PPH mouth baɁbaɁ PH

black mi:tem PPH name nga:ran PH

blood langəssa PMB neck liɁəg PH

body la:wa PMB new bagɁu PH

bone bəkkəg GCP night kiləm Mb

breast su:su PPH nose Ɂirung PH

burn su:nug PPH not di:liɁ SBs

cloud(rain) Ɂitəm -- one Ɂisya --

cold tignaw SBs person Ɂittaw Mb

come/arrive Ɂabút PBs rain Ɂuran PH

die -patay PPH red min:ug --

dog Ɂa:yam PPH road/trail da:Lan PH

drink Ɂinum PPH root gamút PH

dry -ma:ra PPH round bilúg PH

ear tali:nga PPH sand pantad Mb

earth basak PMB+Sb say/said ɁambaL WBs

eat ka:Ɂan EMn see ki:taɁ PH

egg tallug PPH seed-rice bi:niɁ PH

eye mata PPH sit pungkuɁ WBs

fat tambek PBs skin langgit Mb

feather buLbuL PPH sleep tunu:ga Mb

fingernail su:Lu PMb small siset

fire Ɂapuy PPH smoke Ɂasu PH

fish [n] siddaɁ PH stand tindeg PH

fly (v) layug PH star bituɁ{m PH

foot bati:Ɂis PH stone batu PH

full pennuɁ PH sun Ɂadlaw PH

give Ɂa:tag SBs swim luuy

good at miyad WBs tail Ɂi:kug PH

green/unripe Ɂilaw PH this tini PH

hair buuk PH that sanyaɁ Mb

hand li:ma PH thou ka:un Mb

head Ɂu:bu PH tongue di:laɁ PH

hear ka-ma:tiɁ Bs tooth ngi:pen PH

heart tagipusu:Ɂun WBs tree/wood ka:uy PH

horn sungay PH two darwa PH

I yaken ~ Ɂa Mb walk panaw PH

kill patay PH warm/hot Ɂi:nit PH

knee bu:Ɂul Mb water wa:ig Mb

know-fact na:man WBs we [excl] kami PH

leaf da:un PH what? Ɂaran --

lie down neggaɁ -- white putiɁ PH

liver Ɂatay PH who? kinu --

long langkaw woman ba:y PH

louse kutú ~ -tuma PH yellow duLaw PH

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Bs =General Bisayan form; SBs =South Bisayan; WBs =West Bisayan; Mb = a Manobo form; PH = a Philippine form of wider occurrence than just Manobo or Bisayan.

TABLE 2. Kagayanen Forms Relatable to Manobo

 KAGAYANEN EXPECTED, IF BISAYAN

'belly' gettek \*tiyan

'blood' langessa \*duguɁ

'body' la:wa \*la:was

'earth' basak \*lugtaɁ, \*lu:paɁ

'eat' ka:Ɂan \*ka:Ɂen

'fingernail su:Lu \*kuku, \*kulu

'I' Ɂa \*Ɂaku

'knee' bu:Ɂul \*tu: (h)ud

'man' ma:ma \*lala:ki

'night' ki:lem \*gab(i)Ɂi, \*delem

'person' Ɂittaw \*ta:wu

'sand' pantad \*baras, \*bu(h)a:ngin

'skin' langgit \*pa:nit

'sleep' tunu:ga \*tu:rug

'that (near)’ sanyaɁ \*ɁinaɁ, \*dan, \*Ɂiyan, \*yaɁu.n

'thou' ka:un \*Ɂikaw

'water' wa:ig \*tu:big

On the basis of the 30 forms gleaned from just the 100 word list. we can conclude that Kag is a Manobo. rather than a Bisayan language. The following are some of the reasons:

1. The quality of the Manobo innovations which are found in Kag is rather convincing: \*langesa 'blood'. \*getek 'belly'. \*Ɂa 'I' (enclitic form), \*buɁel 'knee', \*-kilem 'night', \*langgit 'skin', \*ku:na 'thou', \*yaɁ [second person deictic].

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

TABLE 3. Kagayanen Forms Relatable to Bisayan

 GENERAL BISAYAN EXPECTED MANOBO FORM

'all tanán \*langun, \*tibəɁ, \* Ɂəlin

'arrive' Ɂabút \*Ɂuma, \*dungguk

'hear' ka-ma:tiɁ \*dineg, \*paliman

'fat' tambək \*lambuɁ

 SOUTH BISAYAN

'bone' bəkkə́g \*tulɁan | Note:

 \*bəkə́g 'fishbone'

'cold' tignaw \*gənnaw | Cf:

 Kag ginnaw 'chilled'

'give qa:tag \*bəggay

'not (so)' di:liɁ \*kənnaɁ

 WEST BISAYAN

'good at' miyád \*(qu)piya

'heart' tagipusu: Ɂun \*pusung

'know (facts)' na:man \*sabut, \*taɁu, (+?)

'say' ɁambaL \*ka:gi

'sit' pungkuɁ \*pinuɁu, (+?)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. The contrastive evidence that, while forms like \*sulu 'fingernail', \*wahiR 'water', \*la:wa 'body', \*ma-Ɂa:ma 'man', \*Ɂetau 'person' are more widespread than just the Manobo subgroup, they are found throughout the Manobo subgroup, but are not found in any Bis dialect, nor even in the wider circle of Tagalic languages, to which Bis belongs.

3. The uneven distribution of forms from two different Bis subgroups suggests two different periods of contact, rather than the continua­tion of a single genetic descendant. No Bis dialect shows such a distribution, since each dialect of a Bis subgroup agrees in reflecting a form common to its own subgroup in the meanings cited. That is to say, all WBs dialects (Akl, Kin, Kuy, etc.) reflect \*tulɁan 'bone', \*ma-ramíg 'cold', \*taɁú 'to give', and \*ɁindiɁ 'will not' vs \*bəkə́n 'not so', while all SBs dialects (Sur, Jaun, But) reflect \*ma-dayáw 'good', \*kasingka:sing 'heart', \*hibarú/\*Ɂingát 'to know', \*laɁúng 'to say', and \*lingkud ~ \*Ɂingkud 'to sit' (compare these forms with those given in Table 3).

Confirming these conclusions are the following points from outside the domain of the 100 word list.

4. We know that the Manobos as a whole are not seafarers, nor have they been for some time now. On the other hand, we know that the Bisayans are and have been seafarers, traders, fishermen. It is a simpler solution to explain the Manobo elements on Cagayan Island as the retentions of an original Manobo immigrant population and the Bisayan elements as of secondary introduction.

5. Further study of other forms, particularly the pronouns \*din 'his/her', \*nay 'ours', \*dan 'theirs', \*kiyu 'ye', \*kay 'we' (excl.-enclitic), \*kaw 'ye' (enclitic) illustrate the Manobo substratum of Kagayanen. So it is with other lexical innovations that so far appear only in other Manobo languages: Kag Ɂindis, Man \*Ɂindes 'to defecate', Kag ma-dyuɁ, Man \*ma-dyuɁ 'far', Kag la:suɁ, Man \*lasuɁ 'penis', Kag n-La: Ɂu, Man \*laɁu 'thirsty', Kag Ɂindi, Man hendeɁi 'where?', Kag ɁansaɁ, Wbm ɁinsaɁ 'to ask', Kag Ɂumaw, Man \*Ɂumaw 'to call', Kag, Bkd, Dbw lamɁed 'to swallow', Kag bLengngan, Ata, Tig \*Ɂabelengan 'throat'.

Thus, our attention is drawn to the possibilities and problems of ranking lexical evidence such that more information is obtained, and of excluding other evidence as inappropriate for our purposes. The consideration of select lexical elements to the exclusion of others proves helpful, if not significant, in the subgrouping or classification of a speech type. In the case of Kag, we have other information supporting the conclusions arrived at through the use of lexical evidence. Wherever possible, one must make use of geographic, ethnographic, archaeological, or other information. (See Sapir (1916), "Time Perspective in Aboriginal American Culture: A Study in Method.")