

**THE PHILIPPINE LANGUAGE SCENE —
THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC CONTRIBUTIONS
OF HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS**

R. DAVID ZORC

*School of Australian Linguistics
Darwin Community College*

0. INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

I am pleased to have this opportunity to dedicate an article to Dr. Sibayan and to present some points of sociolinguistic relevance drawn from over fifteen years of work in the historical/comparative area. Many colleagues have commented how tedious and esoteric my work has seemed to be. The former, alas, is true, but the latter is not. Firm statements about the prehistory of the Filipino people and reasonable suggestions about the exact linguistic situation in the Philippines can be put forward as direct fruits of a comparativist's harvest. I trust that these will be of relevance and interest.

1. LANGUAGES, DIALECTS, OR COMMUNILECTS?

One popular view, often implicit in the minds of Filipinos, maintains that a language is a widespread and prestigious vehicle of communication (such as English, Chinese, Russian, or Pilipino), while any other kind of speech variety is 'a dialect'.¹ In contrast, sociolinguists determine a language on the basis of mutual intelligibility, whether total or chained (Hockett's L-simplex vs L-complex, respectively). Under this definition, *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, recognizing the speech of a single individual as an **IDIOLECT**, while that of a reasonably homogenous social group as a **COMMUNILECT**.

In terms of the Philippines, there are probably **50 million idiolects** (based on a 1984 population estimate) broken up into approximately **500 communilects** (based on the number of barrios, sitios, or barangays in non-metropolitan areas), 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, or Mountain Province) can attest to the multiple differences in pronunciation, intonation, vocabulary and/or grammar prevailing. 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 communilect as the base-line definition of a Philippine speech variety. We therefore recognize, as do the speakers, a Kalibonhon vs Libakawnon Aklanon, an

¹This view is compatible in many regards with the concept of communilect discussed below. In practice Filipinos are aware of even the most minute linguistic variations and label them accordingly (even if not always complementarily — statements such as 'They talk like birds' are sometimes heard).

Oas vs Polangui Bikol, an Ilianen vs. Livunganen Manobo, a Marinduque vs Batangas Tagalog, a Tina vs Botolan Sambal, an Amganad vs Kiangnan Ifugao, and so on.

The determination of the precise number of Philippine communilects (as opposed to the estimate of 5000 above) can be made by means of a survey of fifty words with a high probability of replacement.² Table 1 herein is derived from principles discussed a decade ago (Zorc 1974a) and virtually separates the Philippines into several thousand linguistic communities. For the purposes of this comparison, it is essential that forms be identical in sound, form, accent, and grammar — any difference whatsoever is important in establishing a communilect, and hence should be counted as minus. While historical linguists and lexicostatisticians are interested in cognates (forms descended from a single ancestral word or etymon), sociolinguists must concern themselves with differences separating speakers. Thus, Tag *maglaró* differs from Sina *mig-lalú* 'play' both in prefixation and phonology (r vs l), and each differs from Aln *ladó*, even if all three descend from an etymon **ladú*. Tag (*um*)*akyat*, Kpm *mu-kyat*, Abr *apyat*, and Ivt *k(om)ayat* 'climb' again differ from one another even though they are ultimately cognate. Phonological differences (Kin *bedlay* :: Hil *budlay* 'difficult'; Akl *indi* :: Tag *hindi* 'not'; Rom *huyát* :: Akl *hu-lat* 'wait'), accent dissimilarities (Bon *o:tot* :: Png *otót* 'rat'), and semantic mismatches (Tag *do'ón* 'there-far' :: N-S *du'ún* 'there-near') need to be regarded as separators of communilects.

Table 1
DIFFERENTIAL VOCABULARY SEPARATING PHILIPPINE COMMUNILECTS

1. akyat	'to climb (a tree)'	26. isá	'one'
2. alikabók	'dust'	27. itó	'this'
3. anó	'what?'	28. iyón	'that'
4. a:way	'to fight'	29. kailán	'when?'
5. ba:ba?	'chin'	30. kaunti?	'little (bit)'
6. bilís	'fast'	31. kanlu:ran	'west'
7. bu:kas	'tomorrow'	32. kapatíd	'sibling'
8. dagá	'rat'	33. ki:tid	'narrow' (= sikíp)
9. dali:ri'	'finger'	34. kuló	'to boil'
10. da:mi	'many'	35. lalamu:nan	'throat'
11. dibdib	'chest'	36. lamíg	'cold'
12. di:to	'here'	37. la:pit	'near'
13. do'ón	'there'	38. laró	'to play'
14. ga:lit	'anger'	39. líft	'small'
15. ha:gis	'to throw'	40. li:mot	'forget'
16. ha:pon	'afternoon'	41. lu:pa'	'earth/ground'
17. ha:wak	'to hold'	42. luwáng	'wide'
18. hindi?	'not'	43. mabu:ti	'good'
19. hintay	'to wait'	44. magsinunga:ling	'to lie'
20. hi:rap	'difficult'	45. mahi:na'	'weak'
21. hi:wa'	'to cut/slice'	46. masamá'	'bad'
22. hiyá'	'ashamed'	47. ta:pon	'throw away'
23. i:bon	'bird'	48. uma:ga	'morning'
24. ikli'	'short'	49. upó	'to sit'
25. i:log	'river'	50. walá'	'none'

²See Dyen, James and Cole (1967) and Zorc (1974a). Conversely, it should be noted that these words have a very low probability of retention, such that very few of these meanings can be assigned an etymon or reconstruction with any reliability at the PAN or even PPH level.

If these criteria are strictly applied, only those speech varieties that score very high (in excess of 45/50) with one another can be regarded as belonging to the same communilect — and if the speakers consider themselves as such. In this way we can have sociological and linguistic confirmation of the Philippine language scene. Because of borrowing, common inheritance, and convergence (e.g., disparate shift of *p > f, *d > r, *r > l, *e > u, etc.), scores will rarely be 0/50. However, the list has been constructed on the basis of abundant data (Reid 1971, Yap 1977, McFarland 1977) such that it can be stated with confidence that scores will be very low, even between reasonably close genetic relatives.³

Although we now have a tool for determining the number of communilects in the Philippines (and adequate data are available in the files of the Summer Institute of Linguistics and many 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.⁴ 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 the doctor may respond, yet all of the rest of the dialog would well be lost on the Filipino. This is not practical intelligibility. The SIL has conducted extensive tests of intelligibility throughout the Philippines, and is therefore best equipped data- (if not time-)wise to assess the number of dialects and languages in the archipelago. Translators need to know the degree to which the Bible can be understood by speakers/readers in other communities. If too many barriers to understanding exist, a different translation is necessary. Hence, each speech variety is accorded its own dignity. Furthermore, linguistic imperialism is avoided — Warays may understand Cebuano, and Aklanon Hiligaynon, but each deserve their own intimate version of the Word.

If linguists could agree on a criterion for determining mutual intelligibility (and the SIL tests and scores are both accurate and sound in this regard), and factors such as bilingualism and sesquilingualism (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

³Preliminary counts made for Tag, Ceb, and Ilk indicate that Ilk has 31 unique forms, Tag 23, and Ceb 11 — the latter is due to Ceb's strong influence in the central and southern Philippines resulting in copious loans. These unique forms dictate that no other communilect could share a score higher than 19 with Ilk, 27 with Tag, or 39 with Ceb, except a communilect that was indeed Ilk, Tag, or Ceb respectively. Note, however, that in fact scores are substantially lower than the highest figures cited: Tagalog scores 8 with Sinauna, 7 with Kapampangan, 4 with Botolan, 3 with Bikol; Cebuano scores 25 with Hiligaynon (clearly inflated by borrowing), 18 with Samar-Leyte, 12 with Surigao; Ilokano scores 11 with Itneg, 8 with Kankanay dialects collectively, and 7 with Luba.

⁴For a more detailed discussion of the problems and issues involved see Zorc (1977:165-70).

decade, depending on research interests of M.A. or Ph.D. scholars and access to SIL files.⁵ In the meantime, genetic linguistics can provide a solution.

2. THE HISTORICAL PICTURE – MAJOR PHILIPPINE SUBGROUPS

The number of languages in the Philippines has long been debated and estimated by linguists and laymen.⁶ The question is, of course, a complex one, and the most reasonable solution that can be put forward is based on the concept of a linguistic subgroup as established in the discipline of historical/comparative linguistics. There are, at most, twenty-seven major linguistic groups (see Table 2) that can be described as 'Philippine' on the basis of geographic or genetic criteria. Note, however, that three are spoken in Celebes (Sulawesi, Indonesia), but can be proven to be immediately related to Southern Philippine languages. Another two families are spoken in Borneo (B1-2) and share features with Philippine and Sabahan languages,⁷ while three (U1-3) are spoken in the Pacific and await definitive classification. One subgroup, Sama (I1), is clearly intrusive to the Philippines within the last millenium, and is genetically of an 'Indonesian type'. Within the political boundaries of the Philippines, then, there are at most eighteen language groups (N1-9+S1-9) which could share an immediate genetic ancestor, which have in all likelihood developed *in situ* over at least three thousand years, and which can not be attributed to multiple migrations as popular history suggests. 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 (18 Philippine + 1 Indonesian intrusive) represents a core of agreement among Philippinologists, amidst otherwise widespread disagreement as to the collapsability of these to ten⁸ or two⁹ or even one.¹⁰

⁵The Summer Institute of Linguistics has always been most generous and open with its data. However, since years of labor and research are involved, it would be most appropriate if an SIL team member drew up a comprehensive Philippine matrix of intelligibility test scores, possibly as part of his/her studies for a degree.

⁶Blumentritt (1901) recognized 194 native groups made available in the literature of his time. But he well knew that many of these were repetitious and/or inaccurate in several ways. Conklin (1952) was concerned with linguistic criteria and outlined 75 main groups broken up into a total of 156 members.

⁷Blust (1974) has proposed that these languages, while 'of the Philippine type', are more intimately related to the North Sarawak subgroup based on the sharing of the innovation involving strengthened reflexes of PAN *b, *d, *f, *g. By including them here, I do not take issue with his subgrouping hypothesis; I merely wish to indicate the counter hypothesis of scholars such as Charles (1974) or Prentice (1970). The innovations shared could be the result of borrowing (see 2.2 below).

⁸Ruhlen (in progress), following Reid for the most part, splits Western Malayo-Polynesian into 11 branches, ten of which concern us here: (1) Chamorro, (2) Palauan, (3) Yapese, (4) Northern Philippines, (5) Southern Philippines, (6) Meso-Philippine, (7) South Mindanao, (8) Celebes, (9) Borneo, (10) Sama-Bajaw.

⁹That is, a Proto Northern Philippine and a Proto Southern Philippine as the ancestors of most Ph languages respectively, excluding Sama.

¹⁰That is, a common Proto Philippine ancestor from which all Ph languages except Sama descended.

Table 2.

MAJOR PHILIPPINE SUBGROUPS	EXTRA-PHILIPPINE SUBGROUPS
N1 Ibatanic = Bashiic	C1 Minahasan
N2 North Cordilleran	C2 Mongondowic
1 South (Gaddang-Yogad)	C3 Gorontalic
2 North (Ibanag-Atta)	B1 Kadazan-Dusunic
3 Central	B2 Murutic
4 Agta	I1 Sama
N3 Dumagat = East Cordilleran	U1 Chamorro
1 Negrito	U2 Palau
2 Paranan	U3 Yapese
3 Central/Casiguran	
4 South/Umirey	
N4 Ilokano	
N5 Central Cordilleran	
1 South (Isinai)	
2 North (Itneg)	
3 East (Kalinga)	
4 Nuclear (Balangaw)	
5 Ifugaø	
6 Bontok-Kankanay	
N6 Ilongot	
N7 South Cordilleran	
N8 Southern Luzon	
1 Sambalic	
2 Sinauna	
3 Kapampangan	
N9 North Mangyan	
S1 South Mangyan	
S2 Palawanic	
1 North	
2 South	
S3 Kalamianic	
S4 Central Philippine	
1 Tagalog	
2 Bikol	
3 Bisayan	
4 Mansakan	
S5 Subanon	
S6 Manobo	
1 North	
2 Inland	
3 South	
S7 Danao	
S8 Bilic	
S9 Sangiric	

R. DAVID ZORC

2.1. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PHILIPPINE SUBGROUPS

The major subgroups presented in Table 2 are the product of intensive research, most of which has taken place in the last decade:

- Bashiic = Ivatanic (Yamada 1965, 1966, 1973, and personal communications)
- North Cordilleran (Tharp 1974)
- Dumagat (Headland, personal communication)
- Central Cordilleran (Reid 1974)
- South Cordilleran (Reid and Zorc, personal communications)
- Mangyan (Zorc 1974b; Barbian 1977;¹¹ Pennoyer 1979)
- Palawanic (Thiessen 1981)
- Central Philippine (Zorc 1977, especially Bisayan; Bikol – MacFarland 1974; Mansakan/Northeast Mindanao – Gallman 1979)
- Manobo (Elkins 1974)
- Danao (Allison 1979; Fleischman 1981)
- Sangiric (Sneddon 1978)
- Mongondow (Charles, personal communications)
- Gorontalo (Little, personal communications)
- Sama (Pallesen 1977)
- Dusunic and Murutic (Prentice 1970; contrasted with Blust 1974)

An overview of Philippine linguistic reconstruction is contained in the work of Charles (1974) and Paz (1981), and the establishment of a single Philippine subgroup has been taken up by Chrétien (1962), Thomas and Healey (1962), Llamzon and Martin (1974), and Walton (1977). However, Reid (1981) has challenged these conclusions and the long-standing assumption that all Philippine languages form a single Austronesian node. Indeed, the rift between Northern and Southern Philippine languages is a big one, and some groups such as Bashiic and Bilic do not easily lend themselves to inclusion within NPh or SPh. A reasonably thorough coverage of both the facts and the disagreements linguists confront can be found in McFarland (1980) and in Ruhlen (in progress).

But these disputes should not be mis-construed. They indicate a vigorous interest on the part of many scholars in Philippine linguistics, and reflect a commitment to diverse theories drawn from an ever-growing corpus of data. Intuitive judgments have been put aside in favor of lexicostatistical, genetic, and grammatical criteria, and an overview of the relationships of most speech varieties has become possible, particularly in language blocs.

Hence, the groups presented in Table 2 represent the agreements of most scholars as to the maximum number of subgroups. It is in organizing these into higher-order subgroups (macro-subgrouping) that Philippinologists are in disagreement. For example, Tharp proposes that N2-4 form a single

¹¹Barbian's study contains much valuable lexical data, but is unfortunately unsound from the genetic viewpoint. He defends a single Mangyan family (that includes Datagnon, which is demonstrably a West Bisayan dialect – Zorc 1972 and 1977) and therefore proves little more in his lexical counts than that Mangyan languages are genetically Philippine. Were Ilokano and Tagalog included in his study, by his own criteria and scoring, they would also be 'Mangyan'.

group, while I feel that Ilokano (N4) belongs in a subgroup with N5,¹² and personal communications from Headland on the unique character of Dumagat languages (N3) prompt me (and also McFarland 1980) to treat them independently pending further analysis. It is also likely that S5-7 constitute a single higher-order group, but which languages are then coordinate with that group (e.g., S4 or S2 or S8) remains unclear. Because of a great deal of lexical innovation and replacement, Ilongot (N6) is kept separate (as in McFarland 1980), although grammatically it almost certainly belongs with N7. Perhaps the weakest links are manifest in the establishment of N8,¹³ linked by the merger of PAN, PPH *R and *y (suggesting further a grouping of N1 and N9 with them). However, despite geographic proximity historically,¹⁴ shared innovations are few, and if not the product of borrowing, indicate an immense time separation (viz: in excess of 3000 years).

While we can be sure that there are no more than 19 major linguistic groups (N1-9, S1-9, I1) within the Philippines, speakers would take little consolation in such broad criteria. Cebuanos will identify themselves as Bisaya', not as Central Philippine; Bikolanos as Bikol, not CPh; the same holds true for Ibanags, Pampangueños, Tausugs, Tagalogs, etc. Hence, some of the major subgroups have been delineated, but the fragmentation into languages (based on the bounds of mutual intelligibility) and into communilects (recognizing dialectal idiosyncracies) must await further study. (See section 3 below, where approximately 250 communilects have been identified in Table 3.)

2.2. GENETIC CRITERIA: INNOVATIONS VS BORROWINGS

The biggest hurdle in the genetic classification of Philippine languages is the problem of sorting out borrowings from genuine innovations. If a group moves to a new area, borrowing will take place between neighbors, regardless of genetic linguistic boundaries. The incoming group might incorporate an innovation already made by their new neighbors (e.g., Tag *pa:wis* 'sweat' and *kapatid* 'sibling' from early-Kapampangan *pa:wes* and *kapatéd* respectively). Or new neighbors might borrow a form previously innovated in the incoming group's home area (e.g., Dbw *ka:yu* 'fire' from Bisayan **kala:yu*). Furthermore, the new social alignments might innovate

¹²I base this on the deictic system containing essentially Central Cordilleran stems: **tu* 'this', **ta* 'that-near', **di* 'that-far' yielding Ilk *daytuy* (**da-i+tu-y*), *dayta* (**da-i+ta*), *daydiay* (**da-i+di-ay*), *dituy* (**di-tu-y*), *dita* (**di-ta*), *didiay* (**di-di-ay*). Even the final *-y* and *-ay* elements are reminiscent of cognates in Knk, Ifugao, Isi.

¹³Although I originally proposed this group (including Bashiic and North Mangyan) in 1974b, and labelled it 'North Extension of SPh' in 1977:34 (erroneously considering them SPh), both Reid (in Ruhlen, but labelled 'Central Luzon') and McFarland (1980, labelled 'Sambalic') have come to accept this as a macro-subgroup.

¹⁴This has led to intimate borrowing that has long skewed lexicostatistical scores. Thomas and Healey (1962) considered Kpm Tagalog-related, while Walton (1977) puts Kpm and the Sambalic languages with Tagalog in his 'Central Philippine' node. Grammatical analysis does not support this, nor does a more careful inspection of the provenance of each language's lexicon; borrowing in every direction has occurred (viz: Tag from Sbl, Tag from Kpm, Kpm from Sbl, Sbl from Kpm, etc.).

new forms together, giving a false picture of an intimate genetic connection (e.g., many forms shared between Tag and Kpm and/or Sbl after the Tag settlement of Southern Luzon, see form labelled SLz in the *Core Etymological Dictionary of Filipino*).¹⁵

The clearest indication that Ph languages are genetically related (i.e., in a single Austronesian subfamily) comes from innovations that skip over genetic and geographic boundaries. One such example is PPH **da'gun* 'year' (replacing PAN **taqun*) found in WBs (Akl, Alk *dag'un*), Danao (Mar *ragon*), NCr (Ibg, Isg *dagun*), and NMg (Iry *dag'un*, Aln *da.gun*). While Han *dag'un* could be a borrowing from WBs (as might even the NMg forms), there is no reason to suspect the NCr and WBs forms of being anything other than cognate, i.e. stemming back to a period of Philippine history when these now divergent languages were dialects sharing a common innovation. A similar kind of innovation (PPH **i:pus* 'tail') unites most NPh languages with those of Celebes, while SCr and most SPh languages retain PAN **i:kuR*.

At least two innovations appear to unite Ph languages with northern Celebes and northern Borneo (PPH **bulbul* 'feather, body-hair', PPH *seda* 'fish; viand'), another one (PPH **siam* 'nine' is shared by Mongondow and several languages (including Kadazan and Timugon-Murut) of Sabah. A stronger case exists for the connection of Ph and N. Celebes with four innovations (PPH **pasua* 'hot', **dakel* 'many; large', **tulud* 'push', and **kuRun Imperata cylindrica*'), particularly between SPh and N. Celebes with five innovations (PSP **bata* 'child', **Ru:maq* 'sheath', **ka-Rabi:iH* 'yesterday', **kasi:li* 'eel', **pawi:kan* 'turtle').¹⁶ Mongondow, Ponosakan, and Gorontalo reveal an intimate connection with SPh languages since they share PSP **duRúq* 'blood' (replacing PAN **Da:Raq*), and Mongondow and Ponosakan share PSP **tu:biR* 'water' (replacing PAN **DaNum* or PMP* *wahiR*).

Innovations have been identified by various scholars that establish each of the major Ph subgroups. I hope to publish shortly a list that defends the nodes PPH, PSP, and PNP.

Even if it can be proven that most (if not all) Philippine languages descend from a common ancestor (PPH), the label is prejudicial geographically and politically, since more languages of Celebes clearly share the same parent, as well may Chamorro of Guam, Palau and Yap in the Carolinas, and possibly some of Borneo. Thus, at least the name, 'Proto Philippine' (if not the subgroup) has seen its demise, and 'Eastern Hesperonesian' (or 'Eastern West Malayo-Polynesian') will be the object of controversy in the years to come.

2.3. MIGRATION THEORIES

Contrary to the popular belief in multiple migrations being responsible for the linguistic diversity of the Filipino peoples, it can be proven from the

¹⁵ Another interesting transfer appears to be the following. Bot, Sbl *guma* 'sheath' cannot be inherited due to the irregular reflexes of **R* (**yuma* would be expected); they probably borrowed this form from early Tag, who then replaced their word with *kahu:ban* (a SLz innovation probably borrowed from Kpm).

¹⁶ These innovations are reported in Blust (1982), where he makes the point that the Minahasan languages are quite probably Ph or SPh; the case for Borneo is clearly very tenuous.

data that most divergence has developed *in situ* over at least three thousand years. It is doubtful that oral history could accurately retain the facts of origin and route over such a time span, so that the legends of various groups are motivated by more recent intrusions, such as the advent of Malay traders within the last millenium. Under this hypothesis, if a trader settled and established himself, he would have gained the power of wealth and prestige, and could have become a *datu* 'chief'. Through social (especially marital) and ritual contracts, he would have developed an extended family (as is still the case in the country), and more and more people would identify with him and his heirs. As time progressed, he would be recognized by his grandchildren and grand-cousins as the progenitor of the social unit, although he was basically a New Adam in an already populated Garden. It is in this way that there is or may be an element of truth in the Acehnese origins of the Kapampangans or the Bornean tree of the Ilonggos, Aklanons, and Haray'a of Panay.¹⁷

All the linguistic evidence indicates that most sociological and linguistic divisions developed within the Philippine archipelago. Thus, the origin of Filipino groups is within the Philippines itself.¹⁸ When a socio-linguistic unit (tribe or clan) became too big to support itself in a given area (or if climatic or medical catastrophies so dictated), at least part of the group fragmented by emigration to another location. If contacts were still maintained, dialects developed as the new settlers innovated new forms or borrowed from new neighbors; if contacts were broken, different languages emerged as centuries passed.

Languages reveal their prehistory through layers of lexical and grammatical analysis, but the process of sorting out inherited forms, innovations, and borrowings is long and tedious. While scholars now agree that the Austronesian homeland was in continental southeast Asia, and that the first migration was probably to Formosa, it cannot yet be determined from where the Filipino peoples originally came.¹⁹ First, the nature and number of highest-order subgroups will need to be determined; then connections to other language families will have to be established; lastly evidence from socio-semantic domains (agriculture, trade, building construction, etc.) and areas with the highest order of diversity (language differentiation) will need to be weighed and compared with archeological

¹⁷See Zorc (1977:45f). While we can speak with certainty about the languages, not necessarily of the people who speak them, people rarely give up a language totally – there should surely be some lexical and/or grammatical substrata revealing a non-Ph origin.

¹⁸Thus, Tausug has its origins in the Butuan area, Tagalog from the greater Leyte-N.E. Mindanao region, West Bisayan from the East, etc. Ifugaos, Manobos, and Mangyans were possibly pushed inland by immigrating coastal groups that ultimately asserted and established themselves – but any of these could as easily have chosen upland country as preferable for one reason or another. Caution must be applied in drawing conclusions.

¹⁹It is highly unlikely that the proto-Filipinos came directly from continental Asia. Depending on our ultimate subgrouping hypothesis, Formosa, Celebes, Borneo, or Indonesia may have been the secondary homeland; but several waves of migrations are unlikely – I suspect a maximum of three, with subsequent language differentiation on Philippine soil.

and anthropological evidence. The answers can be known, but the re-writing of Philippine prehistory still needs an immense amount of work.

One note of caution is in order. Filipinos too eagerly seek progenitors overseas. Tabon Cave taught us that Man has been in the Philippine area (viz: Palawan) for some 25,000 years. Genetic linguistics suggests developments internal to the Philippines in excess of three millenia. The fact that groups on Celebes are closely related to SPh languages does not prove that SPh groups came from Celebes – while there were obviously migrations to or from Celebes, we cannot say at present which direction was taken. The order of diversity of groups S1-9 (if a single genetic reality) would suggest a Mindanao origin for C1-3, but more evidence than this is ultimately needed.

3. PHILIPPINE COMMUNILECTS AND CONVENTIONS FOR ABBREVIATIONS

The need to recognize Filipino communilects was discussed in section 1. A subtle indication of the acceptance of this principle is manifested in the abbreviations of languages that linguists employ. Healey (1962) proposed many useful and well thought out conventions which have been adopted or adapted through the years (Reid 1971, Yap 1977, amongst many others). I have preferred to indicate a communilect with an abbreviated form of its name, rather than its subgroup, and recommend this practice to others. Hence, Dbw is suggested for Dibabawon Manobo (rather than MbAD), K-C for Kalamansig Cotabato Manobo (rather than MbKC), Sin for Sindangan Subanun (rather than SubS), etc. Granting that information on subgroup membership is helpful, this can be given in the explanation of abbreviations – a small cost compared to the value of the recognition of individual speech varieties. Where confusion might result due to similarity or identity of names, such as Pandan-Bikol vs Pandan-Kinaray'a Bisaya, additional information can be added, e.g. *PanBk vs PanBs.

Obviously, scholars have different needs and preferences, so that space-saving techniques (e.g. one- or two-letter abbreviations in studies involving only a few languages) or heuristic considerations (use of capital letters instead of small) will carry the day. For those who may find them useful, I offer the following guidelines:

(1) Major language names, such as Bisayan, Bikol, Ifugao, Manobo, are confusing and uninformative; each has so many dialects that a scholar can rarely know which speech variety is intended.

(2) Reasonably homogenous linguistic groups could be identified by an addition to the abbreviation (see TagM, TagQ, TagS; KnkC, KnkN, KnkS), although community-specific names could equally be devised and used (e.g. Mdq = TagM, conversely Lub could be TagL).

(3) As more and more communilects are identified, overlap in abbreviations will need to be avoided by choice of different letters (contrast Ira and Iry, Ban and Bnt, N-S and NS1, etc.).

(4) Where three or four-letter names occur, they should be used in full (e.g. Ata, Atta, Bahi, Blit, Boso, Buhi, etc.).

(5) Consideration should be given to the people's name for their own language (e.g. Jaun, Nat, Tau, etc.). If they do not have a particular name, geographical locations should be used to distinguish communilects (e.g. Snt, Boh, Dar, Pol, etc.).

(6) Pejorative terms should be avoided (e.g. Btn is included here because it occurs frequently in the literature; however, Tau should be used instead).

Table 3 consists of a comprehensive list of all genetically or geographically determined Philippine communilects. It is far short of the approximately 5000 yet to be isolated, but represents the wealth of information gathered thus far by linguists. As time permits, researchers armed with the list in Table 1 can update our knowledge and correct any errors that may occur.

Table 3
PHILIPPINE COMMUNILECTS THUS FAR ISOLATED

Abk	II	Abaknon-Sama	Btk	S21	Batak-Palawanic (North)
Adr	S21	Borlan Tagbanwa-Palawanic (North)	Btn	S1	Batangan = Taubid-South Mangyan (pejorative, see Tau)
Ads	N23	Adasen-North Cordilleran	Bty	S43	Bantayan-Central Bisayan
Aeta	N81	Aeta-Sambalic	Buh	S1	Buhid-South Mangyan
Ags	S62	Agusan-Inland Manobo (East)	Buhi	S42	Buhi-Inland Bikol
Agta	N24	Agta-North Cordilleran	Buol	C3	Buol-Gorontalic
Agy	S3	Agutaynen-Kalamianic	But	S43	Butuanon-South Bisayan
Akl	S43	Aklanon-West Bisayan ²⁰	Byn	N55	Bayninan Ifugao-Central Cordilleran
Alc	S43	Alcantaranon-West Bisayan (North-Central)	Cam	S43	Camotes-Central Bisayan
Aln	N9	Alangan-North Mangyan	Can	S22	Canipaan-Palawanic (South)
Amg	N55	Amganad Ifugao-Central Cordilleran	Cap	S43	Capiznon-Central Bisayan
Apy	N23	Apayao-North Cordilleran (dialect of Isnag)	Car	S44	Caraga-Mansakan
Ata	S62	Ata-Inland Manobo (South)	Cas	N3	Casiguran-Dumagat
Atta	N22	Atta-North Cordilleran (grouped with Ibanag)	Ceb	S43	Cebuano-Bisayan
Bab	N1	Babuyan-Ivatanic	Chm	U1	Chamorro
Bahi	I1	Bahi-Sama	CMM	S62	Central Mindanao Manobo-Inland Manobo (West)
Baj	I1	Bajaw (Sama macro-group)	CS1	I1	Central Sama
Bal	N3	Baler-Negrito-Dumagat	CS8		(eight dialects distinguished)
Ban	S43	Banton-Bisayan	Dar	S42	Daraga-Inland Bikol
Bgb	S63	Bagobo-Southern Manobo (East)	Dav	S44	Davaweño-Mansakan
Bkd	S61	Binukid-Northern Manobo	Dbw	S62	Dibabawon-Inland Manobo (East)
Blit	S63	Blit-Southern Manobo (West)	Dgt	N3	Dumagat
Blk	S43	Bulalakawnon-West Bisayan (North-Central)	Dila	C3	Dila-Gorontalic
Blw	N54	Balangaw-Central Cordilleran (Nuclear)	Dsp	S43	Dispoholnon-West Bisayan (North-Central)
Bnd	C3	Bunda-Gorontalic	Dtg	S43	Datagnon-West Bisayan (Kuyan)
Bng	I2	Banggi	Fil	S41	Filipino (based on Tagalog)
Bnt	S9	Bantik-Sangiric	GadN	N21	Gaddang or Ga'dang-North Cordilleran
Boh	S43	Bohol-Sambalic	GadS	N21	South Gaddang-North Cordilleran
BonC	N56	Central Bontok-Central Cordilleran	Gia	S8	Giangan (also called Bagobo)-Bilic
BonE	N56	East Bontok-Central Cordilleran	Gim	S43	Gimeras-West Bisayan (Kinarayan)
BonS	N56	South Bontok-Central Cordilleran	Gor	C3	Gorontalo
Boso	S44	Boso-Mansakan	Gub	S43	Gubat-Central Bisayan (Warayan)
Bot	N81	Botolan-Sambalic	Guh	N55	Guhang Ifugao-Central Cordilleran
Btd	N55	Batad Ifugao-Central Cordilleran	Ham	S43	Hamtiknon-West Bisayan (Kinarayan)
			Han	S1	Hanunoo-South Mangyan
			Hig	S61	Higao-North Manobo

²⁰ At present, Kalibo-Aklanon is the only communilect represented in the literature. Eventually, AKIK = Kalibonhon, AKIL = Libakawnon, AKII = Ibayaynon, etc. will be necessary.

R. DAVID ZORC

Hil	S43	Hiligaynon-Central Bisayan	Lub	S41	Lubang-Tagalog
Hin	S43	Hinaray'a-West Bisayan (Kinarayan)	Luba	N56	Luba-Central Cordilleran
Iba	N81	Iba-Sambalic	Mam	S44	Mamanwa-Macro Mansakan
IbgN	N22	North Ibanag-North Cordilleran	Man	N52	Manabo-Central Cordilleran
IbgS	N22	South Ibanag-North Cordilleran	Mar	S7	Maranao-Danao
Ibl	N7	Inibaloi = Ibaloi-South Cordilleran	Mas	S43	Masbateño-Central Bisayan
Ilk	N4	Ilokano	Mdy	S44	Mandaya-Mansakan
Iln	S62	Ilianen-Inland Manobo (West)	Mgd	S7	Magindanao-Danao
Ilt	N6	Ilongot	Mlw	N23	Malaweg-North Cordilleran
Ira	N2	Iraya-North Cordilleran	Mol	S22	Molbog-Palawanic (South)
Iri	S42	Iriga-Inland Bikol	Mong	C2	Mongondow
Irn	S7	Iranon-Danao	M-S	S62	Matig-Salug-Inland Manobo
Iry	N9	Iraya-North Mangyan	Msk	S44	Mansaka-Mansakan
Isg	N23	Isnag = Isneg-North Cordilleran	Nab	S43	Nabasnon Aklanon-West Bisayan (North Central)
Isi	N51	Central Cordilleran	Naga	S42	Naga-Coastal Bikol
Ism	S44	Isamal Mansakan	Nat	S43	Naturalis-South Bisayan
Itb	N1	Itbayaten-Ivatanic	Neg	N3	East Cagayan Negrito-Dumagat
Itg	N52	Itneg-Central Cordilleran	N-S	S43	Northern Samar-Central Bisayan (Warayan)
Itw	N23	Itawis = Itawit-North Cordilleran	NS1	II	Northern Sama
Ivt	N1	Ivatan	NS10		(ten dialects distinguished)
Iwk	N7	Iwak-South Cordilleran	Ntg	S3	Northern/Kalamian Tagbanwa-Kalamianic
Jaun	S61	Kagayanen-North Manobo	Oas	S42	Oas-Inland Bikol
Jaun	S43	Jaun-Jaun South Bisayan	Obo	S62	Obo-Inland Manobo
J M	II	Jama-Mapura-Sama	Odg	S43	Odianganon-Banton Bisayan
Kag	Sbl	Kagayanen-North Manobo	Pal	S22	Palawano/Palaweano-Palawanic (South)
Kal	S3	Kalamian	PanBk	S42	Pandan-Bikol
Kam	S44	Kamayo-Mansakan	PanBs	S43	Pandan-West Bisayan (Kinarayan)
Kan	S43	Kantilan-South Cordilleran	Par	N3	Paranan-Dumagat
Kar	N7	Karaw-South Cordilleran	Pil	S41	Pilipino (based on Tagalog)
Kas	N3	Kasiguranin-Dumagat	PI	U2	Palau
Kaw	S43	Kawayan-Central Bisayan	P-M	I1	Pullon-Mapun-Sama
Kbs	S44	Kabasagan-Mansakan	Png	N7	Pangasinan-South Cordilleran
K-C	S63	Kalamansig Cotabato-South Manobo (West)	Pon	C2	Ponosakan-Mongondowic
Kdz	B1	Kadazan-Dusunic	Pol	S42	Polangi-Inland Bikol
Kia	N55	Kiangan Ifugao-Central Cordilleran	Qzn	S22	Quezon-Palawanic (South)
Kin	S43	Kinaray'a-West Bisayan	Riz	N23	Rizal Malaweg-North Cordilleran
KlaG	N53	Guinaang Kalinga-Central Cordilleran	R-K	S62	Rajah Kabungsuwan-Inland Manobo
Klal	N53	Itneg Kalinga-Central Cordilleran	Rom	S43	Romblomanon-Central Bisayan
KlaN	N53	North Kalinga-Central Cordilleran	Rth	S9	Ratahan-Sangiric
KlaS	N53	South Kalinga-Central Cordilleran	SalMb	S62	Salug-Inland Manobo
Klb	S5	Kalibugan-Subanon	SalSb	S5	Salub-Subanon
Klg	S44	Kalagan-Mansakan	San	S9	Sangir
Kly	N7	Keley'i' Kallahan-South Cordilleran	SarBl	S8	Sarangani-Bilic
Kmg	S61	Kinamigin-North Manobo	SarMb	S63	Sarangani-South Manobo (East)
Kml	S42	Kamalig-Inland Bikol	Sbg	I1	Sibuguey-Sama
KnkC	N56	Central Kankanay-Central Cordilleran	Sbl	N81	Sambal
KnkN	N56	North Kankanay-Central Cordilleran	Sbt	I1	Sibutu'-Sama
KnkS	N56	South Kankanay-Central Cordilleran	Sem	S43	Semirara-West Bisayan (Kuyan)
Kor	S8	Koronadal-Bilic	Sgd	N56	Sagada Igorot (= Sadanga?)-Central Cordilleran
Kpm	N83	Kapampangan-Southern Luzon	Sia	I1	Siasi-Sama
Kul	S62	Kulamanan-Inland Manobo	Sib	S43	Sibalenhon-Banton Bisayan
Kuy	S43	Kuyonon-West Bisayan (Kuyan)	Sim	I1	Simunul-Sama
Kyp	N7	Kayapa Kallahan-South Cordilleran	Sin	S5	Sindangan-Subanon
Lan	S7	Lanao-Danao	Sina	N82	Sinauna-Southern Luzon
Lap	S5	Lapuyan Subanon	S-L	S43	Samar-Leyte-Central Bisayan (Warayan)
Leg	S42	Legaspi-Coastal Bikol	Std	S/U	Sulod-Ati of Panay (recent data)
Ley	S43	Leyteño-Cebuan Bisayan			
Lib	S43	Libon-Inland Bikol			
Liv	S62	Livunganen-Inland Manobo (West)			
Lok	S43	Looknon-West Bisayan (North-Central)			

PHILIPPINE LANGUAGE SCENE

gathered by Pennoyer suggests that this may be a completely different language, unrelated to Bs or CPh speech varieties; it is the language of the Atis/Agtas of inland Panay who were presumed to speak a dialect of Kinaráy'a)		Tgk	S44	Tagakaolo-Mansakan
		Tic	S43	Ticao-Central Bisayan
		Tig	S62	Tigwa-Inland Manobo (South)
		Tina	N81	Tina-Sambalic
		Ting	N2/5	'Tinggian' (name for minority groups in Abra; the term is linguistically inaccurate since it cuts across sub-groups)
Smg	S44			San Miguel-Mansakan
Sml	I1			Samal-Sama
Snl	S9			Sangil-Sangiric
Snt	S43			Santa Teresa-West Bisayan (Kuyan)
Soc	S5			Siocon-Subanon
Sor	S43			Sorsogon-Central Bisayan
SSI	I1			Southern Sama
SSS				(five dialects distinguished)
Sub	S5			Subanon
Sur	S43			Surigao-South Bisayan
Suw	C3			Suwawa-Gorontalic
TagM	S41			Marinduque-Tagalog
TagQ	S41			Quezon-Tagalog
TagS	S41			Southern Tagalog
Tal	S9			Talaut-Sangiric
Tas	S63			Tasaday-South Manobo (West)
Tau	S1			Taubuid-South Mangyan
T-B	S22			Tau't Batu-South Manobo (South)
Tba	S63			Tagabawa-South Manobo (East)
Tbl	S8			Tboli = Tagabili - Bilic
Tbt	C1			Tombatu-Minahasan
Tdn	C1			Tondano-Minahasan
Tdy	N9			Tadyawan-North Mangyan
		Tir	S8	Tiruray/Tiduray-Bilic
		Tmb	C1	Tombulu-Minahasan
		Tmg	B2	Timugon-Murut
		Tse	C1	Tonsea-Minahasan
		Tsg	S43	Tausug (South Bisayan)
		Tsw	C1	Tonsawang-Minahasan
		Ttb	C1	Tontemboan-Minahasan
		Ubo	S8	Ubo-Bilic
		Umr	N3	Umirey-Dumagat
		Vir	S42	Virac-Coastal Bikol
		War	S43	Waray-Central Bisayan
		WBM	S62	Western Bukidnon-Inland Manobo (West)
		WSI	I1	Western Sama
		WS2		(two dialects distinguished)
		Yak	I1	Yakan-Sama
		Yami	N1	Yami-Ivatanic
		Yap	U3	Yapese
		Yog	N21	Yogad-North Cordilleran
		ZB1	I1	Zamboanga-Sama
		ZB3		(three dialects distinguished)

REFERENCES

- ALLISON, E. JOE. 1979. Proto-Danaw: a comparative study of Maranaw, Magindanaw, and Iranun. In *Studies in Philippine linguistics* No. 10, Pacific Linguistics A.55:53-112.
- BARBIAN, KARL-JOSEF. 1977. The Mangyan languages of Mindoro. Unpublished MA thesis, University of San Carlos, Cebu.
- BLUMENTRITT, FERDINAND. 1901. Philippine tribes and languages, 527-47. Washington: Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.
- BLUST, ROBERT A. 1974. The Proto North Sarawak vowel deletion hypothesis. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii.
- _____. 1982. Review of Sneddon's Proto-Minahasan. *Language* 58.4:921-6.
- CHARLES, MATTHEW. 1974. Problems in the reconstruction of Proto-Philippine phonology and the subgrouping of Philippine languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13:457-509.
- CHRÉTIEN, C. DOUGLAS. 1962. A classification of twenty-one Philippine languages. *Philippine Journal of Science* 91.4:485-506.
- CONKLIN, HAROLD. 1952. Outline gazeteer of native Philippine ethnic and linguistic groups. In *Readings in Philippine Linguistics*, ed. by Andrew B. Gonzalez, Teodoro Llamzon, and Fe Otones, 1973. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- DYEN, ISIDORE, A.T. JAMES and J.W.L. COLE. 1967. Language divergence and estimated word retention rate. *Language* 43:150-71.
- ELKINS, RICHARD E. 1974. A Proto-Manobo word list. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13.
- FLEISCHMAN, ERIC. 1981. The Danao languages: Magindanaon, Iranun, Maranao, and Illanun. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 12.1:57-77.
- GALLMAN, ANDREW FRANKLIN, II. 1979. Proto-South-East Mindanao and its internal relationships. *Papers in Philippine Linguistics* No. 10, Pacific Linguistics A.55:1-52.
- HEALEY, ALAN. 1962. Three letter abbreviations of Malayo-Polynesian (Austronesian) language names. *Tc Reo* 5:36-40.
- HOCKETT, CHARLES F. 1958. *A course in modern linguistics*. New York: The MacMillan Company.
- LLAMZON, TEODORO A. and MA. TERESITA MARTIN. 1974. A subgrouping of 100 Philippine languages. Paper presented at the First International Conference on Comparative Austronesian Linguistics, Honolulu.

R. DAVID ZORC

- McFARLAND, CURTIS D. 1974. The dialects of the Bikol area. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Yale University.
- _____ 1977. Northern Philippine linguistic geography. Studies of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa Monograph Series No. 9. Tokyo.
- _____ 1980. A linguistic atlas of the Philippines. Studies of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa Monograph Series No. 15. Tokyo.
- PALLESEN, A. KEMP. 1977. Culture contact and language convergence. Unpublished Ph D dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.
- PAZ, CONSUELO J. 1981. A reconstruction of Proto-Philippine phonemes and morphemes. Publication 3, Cecilio Lopez Archives of the Philippine Languages and the Philippine Linguistic Circle. Diliman: University of the Philippines.
- PENNOYER, F. DOUGLAS. 1979. Buhid and Taubuid: a new subgroup in Mindoro, Philippines. In Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia No. 15, ed. by Paz B. Naylor, 265-72. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- PRENTICE, D. JACK. 1970. The linguistic situation in northern Borneo. In Pacific Linguistic Studies in Honour of Arthur Capell, ed. by S. A. Wurm and D. C. Laycock, 369-408. Pacific Linguistics C.13.
- REID, LAWRENCE ANDREW. 1971. Philippine minor languages: Word lists and phonologies. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 8. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- _____ 1974. The Central Cordilleran subgroup of Philippine languages. Oceanic Linguistics 13:511-60.
- _____ 1981. The demise of Proto-Philippines. Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics C.75, 1982.
- RUHLEN, MERRITT. In progress. A guide to the world's languages.
- SNEDDON, JAMES N. 1978. Proto-Minahasan: Phonology, morphology and wordlist. Pacific Linguistics B.54.
- _____ In press. Proto-Sangiric and the Sangiric languages. Pacific Linguistics.
- THARP, JAMES A. 1974. The Northern Cordilleran subgroup of Philippine languages. Working Papers in Linguistics, University of Hawaii 6.6.53-114.
- THIESSEN, HENRY ARNOLD. 1981. Phonological reconstruction of Proto-Palawan. Anthropological Papers No. 10. Manila: National Museum.
- THOMAS, DAVID and ALAN HEALEY. 1962. Some Philippine language subgroupings: a lexicostatistical study. Anthropological Linguistics 4.9.21-33.
- WALTON, CHARLES. 1977. A Philippine language tree. Austronesian Symposium, University of Hawaii, August 18-20, 1977. Manila: SIL. (mimeographed)
- YAMADA, YUKIHIRO. 1965. Phonology of Itbayaten. Philippine Journal of Science 94:373-93.
- _____ 1966. A preliminary Itbayaten vocabulary. Quezon City: Institute of Asian Studies, University of the Philippines. (mimeographed)
- _____ 1973. Itbayat swidden agriculture with special reference to its vocabulary. Kochi: Kochi University. (mimeographed)
- YAP, FE ALDAVE. 1977. A comparative study of Philippine lexicons. Manila: Institute of National Language, Department of Education and Culture.
- ZORC, R. DAVID. 1972. The western subgroup of Bisayan. Oceanic Linguistics 11.2.110-39.
- _____ 1974a. Towards a definitive Philippine wordlist -- the qualitative use of vocabulary in identifying and classifying languages. Oceanic Linguistics 13:409-55.
- _____ 1974b. Internal and external relationships of the Mangyan languages. Oceanic Linguistics 13.561-600.
- _____ 1977. The Bisayan dialects of the Philippines: Subgrouping and reconstruction. Pacific Linguistics C.44.
- _____ 1981. Micro- and macro-subgrouping: criteria, problems, and procedures. In Gava' Studies in Austronesian Languages and Cultures dedicated to Hans Kähler Band 17, ed. by Rainer Carle et al. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.
- _____ In progress. Core etymological dictionary of Filipino. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines Publications 12, 13, 14 (Fascicles 1-3, A-H, have been printed.)