SOME HISTORICAL LINGUISTIC CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOCIOLINGUISTICS

R. David Zorc

0. INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS[1]

Historical linguists can have some pretty strange and varied bedfellows. During the past 16 years of work in the comparative linguistic area, I've needed recourse to such diverse fields as oceanography, botany, entomology, geography, anthropology, and sociology. Forays into distinctly non-Austronesian camps, such as Sanskrit, Chinese, Spanish, and Dutch, have also been necessary, as well as the other 'camps' of theoretical and socio-linguistics. The latter has been particularly helpful and productive, since the way people of different sex, age, and social standing speak profoundly affects the course of language change. Li (1980, 1982a, 1982b), for example, has made Atayalic forms more comparable to Austronesian etyma by unravelling female conservatism from what may be termed 'male speech disguise'.

When it comes to paying long-accumulated debts, most benefactors have to accept simple gratitude. But historical linguists can repay sociolinguists with some insights into determining the exact linguistic situation of multilingual countries and areas like the Philippines, Indonesia, Melanesia, and Oceania. Although I will be discussing the Philippines in particular, what I have to say should apply (certainly *in principle*) to a wide range of language families where the number and the relationships of speech varieties are in dispute. The 100-meaning list presented below is intended to offer a tool for 'fine-tuning' on linguistically discrete communalects*. It is anticipated that a far larger number of such speech varieties will surface than anyone has previously surmised.

1. LANGUAGES, DIALECTS, OR COMMUNALECTS?

In contrast with some popular (non-technical) points of view,[2] a linguist determines a *LANGUAGE* on the basis of mutual intelligibility, whether total (*L-simplex*) or chained (*L-complex*) (see Hockett 1958:327f). Thus, 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, recognising the speech of a single individual as an *IDIOLECT*, and that of a reasonably homogeneous social group as a *COMMUNALECT* (or *ISOLECT* (Hudson 1967)).

In the Philippines alone, there are probably *50 million idiolects* (based on a 1984 population estimate) broken up into approximately *5000 communalects* (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, Ilocos, or Mountain Province) can attest to the multiple differences in pronunciation, intonation, vocabulary, and grammar prevailing. The situation is certainly the same in Sabah, Java, Sumatra, and other Austronesian locales. 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 communalect as the bottom line. We therefore recognise, as do the speakers, a Marinduque vs Batangas Tagalog, an Oas vs Polangui Bikol, a Kalibonhon vs Libakawnon Aklanon, an Ilianen vs Livunganen Manobo, a Tina vs Botolan Sambal, an Amganad vs Kiangan Ifugao, and so on. Language labels such as 'Bisaya', 'Ifugao', 'Manobo' in this context are uninformative and confusing.[3] Some have been downright wrong, such as 'Sinauna Tagalog' (which is a distinct Southern Luzon language) or 'Datagnon Mangyan' (which is a West Bisayan dialect with no special genetic affiliation to any Mangyan language).

2. THE DETERMINATION OF COMMUNALECTS - A TOOL

The precise number of communalects can be determined by a survey of 100 (or even 50) words that in statistical terms have a high probability of replacement, or, conversely, a low probability of retention (see Dyen, James and Cole 1967). Table 1 is derived from principles discussed a decade ago (Zorc 1974) and virtually separates the Philippines into several thousand linguistic communities. For a positive score (+) in this kind of comparison, it is essential that forms be identical in sound, accent, form, and grammar - any difference whatsoever is crucial in establishing a communalect, and hence should be counted as minus. While historical linguists and lexicostatisticians are concerned with cognates (forms descended from a single ancestral word or etymon), sociolinguists take notice of differences separating speakers.

In scoring this list, for example, Tagalog laró? differs from Sinauna lalú? *play* (r vs l), and each differs from Alangan ladó?, even if all three descend from an etymon *ladú?. Tagalog (um)akyát, Kapampangan mukyat, Aborlan-Tagbanwa apyat, and Ivatan k(um)ayat *climb* again differ from one another, even though they are ultimately cognate. Phonological differences (Kinaray-a bádlay :: Hiligaynon búdlay *difficult*; Aklanon ?índi? :: Tagalog hindí? *not*; Romblon huyát :: Aklanon huɫát *wait*), accent dissimilarities (Bontok ?ótot :: Pangasinan ?otót *rat*), and semantic mismatches (Tagalog do?ón *there-far* :: Northern-Samar du?ún *there-near*) need to be regarded as separators of communalects.

	TAGALOG	CEBUANO	AKLANON	NAGA BIKOL	ILOKANO	W.BKD MANOBO	ILIANEN MANOBO	CEN.MIND. MANOBO
01.*afternoon	hápon	hápun	hápun	hápun	malém	hapun	məʔapun	
02.*angry	galít	sukúʔ	ʔákig	ʔaŋgút	ʔunét	{paʔuk ʔəpəs	laŋət	{kəpaʔuk kələŋətan
03.*ashamed	hiyáʔ	ʔúlaw	huyáʔ	súpug	baʔín	ʔələd	yəyaʔan	
04.*bad/evil	masamáʔ	dáʔut	maɬáʔin	maraʔút	dákes	daʔat	məraʔat	məraʔat
05. bark (tree)	balát	pánit	pánit	ʔúpak	ʔukís	ləkaŋ	ʔupis	
06. beautiful	magandá	níndut	mayadʔáyad	magayún	napintás	{dagwəy tandaŋ	pəpənuk	tandaŋ
07.*bird	ʔíbon	láŋgam	píspis	gamgám	billít	tagbis	pəpənuk	tagbis
08. blow (at)	híhip	huyúp	huyúp	hayúp	puyút	hiyup	pəriyup	pəriyup
09.*boil (intr.)	kulóʔ	bukál	bukáɬ	kalaʔkágaʔ	burék	diʔdiʔ	diʔdiʔ	
10. bright	maliwánag	lámdag	maháyag	liwánag	naranyág			
11. carry/bring	dalá	dalá	daɬáh	dará	yeg	ʔuwit		baba
12.*chest	dibdíb	dúghan	dúghan	daghán	barúkuŋ	kuməŋ	kuməŋ	kuməŋ
13.*chin	bába	suwáŋ	suɬáŋ	kuʔkú	tímid	bakaʔ	bakaʔ	bakaʔ
14.*climb (up)	ʔakyát	saká	sákaʔ	sakát	ʔumúli	{təkəzəg pəmənahik	ʔambak	{təkərəg ʔambak
15.*cold	{maginów malamíg	túgnaw	maɬamíg	malíput	{lamʔek lamíʔis	gənəw	məʔadsil	məʔadsil
16. collapse	gibáʔ	gubáʔ	gubáʔ	gabáʔ	narbá			
17. command	ʔútos	súguʔ	súguʔ	súguʔ	bílin	{suguʔ təlaʔan		təlaʔan
18. companion	kasáma	ʔubán	kaʔibáhan	kaʔibá	kaduá	duma	duma	duma
19. crawl	gápaŋ	kámaŋ	kámaŋ	kamáŋ	karayám	pənanap		
20. crush-lice	tirís	ʔirúk	turús	tadús	ligʔís			
21. cut-off	pútol	pútul	putúɬ	putúl	púted	raprap		
22. dark	madilím	ŋítŋit	maduɬúm	diklúm	nasipŋét	mərusirəm		mərusirəm
23. different	ʔibá	láʔin	ɬaʔín	{ʔibá láʔin	sabáli	{saŋiʔ səlakəw	laʔin	səŋakuʔən
24.*difficult	mahírap	lisúd	malisúd	dipísil	narígat	mərəgən	mərəhən	mərəhən
25. dirty	marumí	húgaw	hígkuʔ	maʔatíʔ	narugít	rəmərik	mərədsik	mərədsik
26.*dust	ʔalikabók	ʔabúg	taputapúh	ʔalpúg	tápuk	ʔəliyavuk	lipukpuk	ʔalyabuk
27.*earth/soil	lúpaʔ	yútaʔ	ɬúgtaʔ	dagáʔ	dagá	tanaʔ	tanaʔ	tanaʔ
28. fall (down)	húlog	húlug	húɬug	húlug	tinnág	{ʔulug piləy	piləy	ʔulug
29.*fast/swift	mabilís	páspas	páspas	kaskás	nadarás	gaʔan	məsasəw	
30.*few	kauntiʔ	gamáy	saŋkurút	diʔít	bassít	dəʔisəy		
31.*fight/quarrel	ʔáway	ʔáway	ʔáway	ʔíwal	riŋgúr	{ʔəgət təbək		{ʔəhət kəwahaʔən
32.*finger	dalíriʔ	túdluʔ	túdluʔ	murúʔ	rámay	{kəmər təzuʔ	təruʔ	kəmər

Table 1 (cont'd)

	TAGALOG	CEBUANO	AKLANON	NAGA BIKOL	ILOKANO	W.BKD MANOBO	ILIANEN MANOBO	CEN.MIND MANOBO
33. *fish*	ʔisdáʔ	ʔísdaʔ	ʔísdaʔ	siráʔ	ʔikán	paʔit	səraʔ	{seraʔ / ŋalap
34. *flood*	baháʔ	baháʔ	baháʔ	baháʔ	layús			
35. *forget*	límot	límut	lipát	liŋáw	lípat	lipat	lipat	
36. *good*	mabúti	maʔáyu	mayád	maráy	nasayáʔat	ʔupiya	məʔupiya	
37. *happy*	{masayá / maligáya	lípay	malípay	maʔugmá	naragsák	məlipəy		galəwhaləw
38. *hard* (subst)	matigás	gahíʔ	matígʔa	matagás	nataŋkén	məzəsən	mərəsən	mərəsən
39. *here*	díto	{dirí / dínhi	{ʔiyá / diyá	digdí	dituy	{kayi / dini	kayi	kay
40. *hold*	háwak	kupút	buyút	kapút	ʔiggém	{gawəd / kəmkəm	kəmkəm	{gawəd / kəmkəm
41. *kind*	məbaʔít	buʔután	mabúʔut	mabúʔut	naʔánus	tulaŋəd		tulaŋəd
42. *lake*	{láwaʔ / lánaw	línaw	danáw	dánaw	dánaw	ranəw	ranəw	ranaw
43. *lie/untruth*	sinuŋáliŋ	bakák	puríl	pútik	ʔulbúd	taruʔ	taruʔ	taruʔ
44. *lonely*	mapaŋláw	{mínaw / guʔúl	namíŋaw	mapuʔŋaw	nalidáy	buluŋ	kəliməŋawan	
45. *lose/lost*	waláʔ	waláʔ	dúɫaʔ	waráʔ	púkaw	tazin	tarin	tarin
46. *many*	marámi	dághan	ʔabúʔ	dakúl	ʔadú	məzakəl	mərakəl	mərakəl
47. *morning*	ʔumága	búntag	ʔagáhun	ʔága	bigát	məsələm	məsələm	məsələm
48. *mud*	pútik	lápuk	ɫúnaŋ	labúy	pítak	basak	ɓasak	basak
49. *narrow*	{makítid / masikíp	sígpit	makitíd	kipút	ʔakíkid	məligət	məlihət	məlihət
50. *near*	malápit	duʔúl	maɫapít	haraní	ʔasidég	{ʔuvəy / rani	mərani	ʔubəy
51. *noisy*	maʔíŋay	sábaʔ	masáŋag	maríbuk	naʔariyaŋgá	məzagiŋ		
52. *none/nothing*	waláʔ	waláʔ	ʔuwáʔ	mayúʔ	ʔawán	wazaʔ	waraʔ	wəraʔ
53. *not* (fut.)	hindíʔ	díliʔ	ʔíndiʔ	daʔí	saʔán	kənaʔ	kənaʔ	kənaʔ
54. *one* (as in counting)	ʔisá	ʔusá	ʔisaɫáh	sarúʔ	maysá	{ʔisa / səvəha	səbəka	{ʔisa / səbəka
55. *play*	laróʔ	dúlaʔ	hámpaŋ	káwat	ʔayʔáyam	baləyvaləy	dərəmət	galəw
56. *push*	túlak	tulúd	tuɫúd	ʔúsul	túlak	{tukuʔ / tulud	sinumag	{sumag / tulud
57. *put/place*	lagáy	bután	bután	bugták	kábil	savuk		tahu
58. *question/ask*	tanóŋ	paŋutána	paŋutána	hapút	saludsúd	ʔinsaʔ		ʔinsaʔ
59. *rainbow*	bahagháriʔ	bálaŋaw	baɫaŋáw	{balánaw / bulalanáw	bullaláyaw	{bəludtu / bəlugtu	bəluntu	bəluntu
60. *raincloud*	dagím	dágʔum	gáɫʔum	daʔgúm	libuyúŋ	kivəl	kibəl	kibəl
61. *rat*	dagáʔ	ʔilagáʔ	ɫáŋgam	kinúʔ	baʔú	rumat	rumat	{kiput / rumat

Table 1 (cont'd)

	TAGALOG	CEBUANO	AKLANON	NAGA BIKOL	ILOKANO	W.BKD MANOBO	ILIANEN MANOBO	CEN.MIND. MANOBO
62.*river	ʔílog	subáʔ	subáʔ	sálug	karayán	wahig	wayig	wayig
63. round	mabílog	líŋin	malibúnug	talímun	nabukél	kəlizəŋ		
64. sad	maluŋkót	subúʔ	masubúʔ	mamundúʔ	naladíŋit			
65. say/said	sábi	súlti	hámbaɬ	sábi	saʔú	kagi	kahi	kahi
66. seek	hánap	paŋítaʔ	ʔúsuy	hánap	bíruk			
67.*short (obj)	maʔiklíʔ	mubúʔ	matágʔud	haliʔput	ʔababá	məvavaʔ	məbabaʔ	məbabaʔ
68. short (pers)	pandák	putút	putút	hababáʔ	pandék	{pəndak / məlimpuguʔ	məbabaʔ	məbabaʔ
69.*sibling	kapatíd	ʔigsúʔun	ʔigmáɲhud	túgaŋ	kabsát	suləd		
70.*sit	ʔupóʔ	líŋkud	líŋkud	túkaw	tugáw	pinuʔu	pinuʔu	pinuʔu
71.*slice (meat)	híwaʔ	híwaʔ	kíwaʔ	pidásu	ʔíwa	karad	karad	karad
72. slow	mabágal	hínay	mahínay	malúway	nabuntúg	{məlanat / nanəy		nanay
73.*small (obj)	maliʔít	gamáy	maʔisút	sadáy	bassít	dəʔisək	dəʔisək	dəʔisak
74. smell (n.)	ʔamóy	báhuʔ	húgum	páruŋ	ʔáŋut			
74a.smell (v.)	ʔamuyín	timahúʔ	hugúm	parúŋun	ʔaŋúten	hazək	ʔəbpəŋarək	ʔarək
74b.fragrant	mabaŋó	humút	mahumút	mahamút	nabaŋlú	həmut	məʔəmut	məʔamut
74c.bad-smelling	mabáhoʔ	bahúʔ	mabáhuʔ	mabatáʔ	nabuyúk	məmahuʔ		məmawuʔ
75. soft	malambót	humúk	mahumúk	malumúy	naluknéŋ	ləminəg		{mələmək / məʔuməl
76. space under the house	síloŋ	síluŋ	síluŋ	síruŋ	síruk	sihuŋ	siyuŋ	
77. speak/talk = word	salitáʔ	púluŋ	hámbaɬ	tarám	saʔú	lalag	lalag	
78. spider (gen)	{gagambá / ʔanlaláwaʔ	lawaʔlawáʔ	ɬamáŋ	láwaʔ	lawalawá	kələlawaʔ	kəlawaʔlawaʔ	
79. split = cleft	biʔák	buʔák	bukáʔ	buwáŋ	{bísak / búsak	teviʔ		
80. tear/rip	púnit	gísiʔ	gísiʔ	gísiʔ	pígis	bindas		
81.*that (far)	ʔiyón	kádtu	datú	ʔitú	daydiáy	həʔaza	ʔəyan	ʔayan
82.*there (far)	doʔón	didtu	{ʔídtu / ditú	dumán	didiáy	diyaʔ	kənyan	
83.*this	ʔitó	{kirí / kiní	dáya	ʔiní	daytúy	həʔini	ʔini	ʔini
84.*throat	lalamúnan	tutúnlan	tutúnlan	halanúhan	karabukúb	bəkərəŋ	bəkərəŋan	bəkərəŋan
85.*throw	hágis	lábay	habúy	ʔapún	ibatú	{timbag / ʔantug	ʔantug	timbag

Table 1 (cont'd)

	TAGALOG	CEBUANO	AKLANON	NAGA BIKOL	ILOKANO	W.BKD. MANOBO	ILIANEN MANOBO	CEN.MIND. MANOBO
86. *throw-away	tápon	lábug	pilák	tápuk	bellén	timbag	timbag	timbag
87. *tomorrow	búkas	ʔúgmaʔ	hinʔágah	sa ʔága	ʔintun bigát	kəʔsələm	kəʔsələm	kəʔsələm
88. turn (in a direction)	likóʔ	líkuʔ	likúʔ	síkuʔ	sikkú			tiku
89. turn/revolve	ʔíkot	túyuk	tíyug	tarírik	pusípus	biyu	tiləŋ	
90. ugly	pánit	ŋilʔad	maɬáwʔay	makanús	naláʔad			
91. vagina	púki	{bilát / bútuʔ	{bilát / puyás	{budáy / putáy	ʔúki	bətiʔ	bətiʔ	
92. *wait	{hintáy / ʔantáy	hulát	huɬát	halát	ʔúray	tagad	tahad	
93. waterfall	tálon	busáy	busáy	busáy	dissúʔur	ʔəvaga	dəmpilas	sampəw
94. *weak	mahínaʔ	lúya	maɬúya	malúya	kapsút	{məguyaʔ / məluya	məluɓəy	
95. wear/put-on	suʔót	súlʔub	súksuk	suʔlút	ikapét	sunʔud		
96. *west	kanlúran	kasádpan	katuɬúndan	{subsúban / sulnúpan	láʔud	sənləpan	sənləpan	sənləpan
97. *what?	ʔanú	ʔúnsa	{ʔanúh / nánuh	ʔanú	ʔanya	həŋkəy	ʔəŋkəy	ʔəŋkəy
98. *when? (fut.)	kaʔilán	sánʔu	hinʔunúh	nuʔarín	kaʔánu	kəʔənu	kəʔənu	kəʔənu
99. *wide	malápad	lapád	maɬápad	halakbáŋ	ʔakába	məluʔag	məluʔag	
100. wrong	malíʔ	sayúp	saɬáʔ	saláʔ	(dákes)	salaʔ		

When gathering data for a survey of this sort, it is imperative that exact semantic matches be obtained. While the list is designed to exaggerate differences amongst even close dialects, any cause(s) for such separation should be real and not the result of inexact comparison. The following notes are included to guide researchers as to the semantics intended.

00 – All forms elicited should follow the matching of English and Tagalog. I have not been able to double-check the data with informants, but I have noted some errors in the main sources (McFarland 1977 for Tag, Ceb, Naga, Ilk; Reid 1971 for WBM and Iln) when compared to other published data (Elkins 1968 for WBM; Vanoverbergh 1956 for Ilk; Wolff 1972 for Ceb; Mintz 1971 for Naga). Akl is from Zorc 1969, and CMM from Elkins 1954.

02 – The most general term for *anger*; avoid: *peeved, upset, crabby*.

03 – Here and throughout the list, verb affixes have not been included. If affixes are included, a single paradigm should be obtained, e.g. *I was embarrassed* (simple past); affixes could be used to show differences beyond the root word or stem.

04 – The most common term for *bad* often coincides with the word for *evil*. A sense such as Tag masamá? aŋ panahón *the weather is bad* or masamá? aŋ pakiramdám ko *I feel bad* is intended.

05 – Often the same as the form for *skin* (which is omitted from the list). Avoid specialised terms for *second layer of bark* (CMM luwit) or *bark/skin of banana trunk* (Akl ?úpas).

06 – Usually the opposite of *ugly* (#90); *good looking* as applied to a woman, especially if *handsome (male)* is differentiated in the language.

08 – As in *blowing at/on a fire to increase its heat*; avoid: *blowing out (as a match)* or *exhaling*.

09 – The actual boiling of water (intransitive verb); avoid: *to boil (vegetables/ eggs)* (Tag lága?) or *inception of boiling when first bubbles are formed,* etc.

10 – Generic; avoid: *brightness of sun or moon, glare*.

11 – The most general form for carrying or bringing something from one place to another regardless of means of transport or carriage. Avoid: *carry on back* (Tag babá), *carry in the hand* (Tag bitbít), *carry on shoulder* (Tag pasán), *carry on head* (Tag súnoŋ), etc.

12 – The upper torso, not just *breast* or *ribs*.

13 – Distinguish from *jaw* (Tag síhaŋ, paŋá).

15 – As in *cold weather* (Tag magináw, Ilk lam?ék); distinguish from *cold (to touch)* (Tag malamíg, Ilk lamí?is); either could be used in the comparison, so long as the sense is the same.

16 – As a house from age or a ship from a storm.

17 – As from a person in authority; not just *send on an errand*, nor *deathbed command = final will and testament* (Tag bílin).

19 – As a baby on all fours; distinguish from *crawl on one's belly* or *crawl as a snake* (WBM dula).

20 – Crush between the fingernails.

21 – As in amputating a limb.

23 - Several languages distinguish between *another - of the same type* (Akl ʔibáh) vs *another - of a different kind* (Akl ɬaʔín); the latter sense is intended here.

25 - Avoid special senses such as *dirty laundry* (Akl ʔumúg), *muddy*, etc.

27 - Not: *earth/world* (Tag daʔigdíg) or special kinds of soil, e.g. *clay*.

30 - A little bit, in small amount.

31 - Not: *hit, box, come to blows*; more in the sense *to fall out*.

32 - Generic for *digit* (often the same as for *toe*); avoid: *thumb, index finger, middle finger*, etc.

36 - Generic; avoid senses such as *good at* (Tag magalíŋ) or *clever* (Tag marúnoŋ).

40 - As in: *hold this for me*; avoid specifics such as *hold in the palm of one's hand* or *hold under the arm* (see note #11).

41 - As a good or giving person; avoid *loving, generous*.

43 - As in telling a deliberate untruth; avoid senses such as Tag magbuláʔan *fib, exaggerate, 'bullshit'*.

44 - Different from *sad* (#64); sense of isolation or melancholy felt.

45 - Note that only verb affixes differentiate this from *none* (#52) in Tag and some other CPh languages; differentiate from *lose one's way* (Akl táɬaŋ).

49 - As a narrow entrance or road; Tag masikíp *tight, crowded* is perhaps too specialised.

52 - *There is none.*

53 - The future negative, as in *I will not go*. Note the various negators in McFarland 1977:20; only one of five possibilities is sought here.

54 - In the sequence: *one - two - three* .... Note that numerous forms with classifiers occur (e.g. Akl saŋka-, sambáto, sambílog).

56 - Generic; not specialised meanings (e.g. WBM dəgupi *be pushed along or aside by a strong force*, dəkuzas *push something back and forth over a surface*, pəsəl *push something with the thumb or finger*, etc.).

60 - As distinguished from other types of cloud.

65 - Avoid quotative particles (e.g. Tag daw, Akl kunúh).

66 - To look for something that has been *lost* (#45).

69 - Generic; avoid terms for *older* and *younger* sibling.

70 - Generic; avoid terms for *squat, sit on the ground*, etc.

71 - Not just *cut*; avoid specifics like *to slice thin* or *to slice into big chunks*.

72 - Generic adjective; avoid verbs like *to cook slowly* (WBM nanəy *to proceed slowly* may be too specific here and is wrongly included).

73 - Distinguish from *small amount = few* (#30); note that Ilokano (and perhaps other communalects) do not draw such a distinction.

74 - 74a-c are included here to illustrate the various senses that can exist within a given meaning and the dangers of semantic mismatch. The most

neutral *noun* for *smell* is intended (with no implications as to the pleasant-ness, or otherwise, of the aroma), not verbs (74a) or adjectives (74b,c).

75 - The opposite of *hard* (#38); not that of *loud, coarse*, etc.

77 - May not be differentiated in some communalects from *say* (#65) (e.g. Aklanon).

79 - As a stone or wood may split open; distinguish from senses such as Tag bisák *to split wood*, Tag háti? *to split in half* (= Akl píhak).

80 - As cloth or paper.

85 - Keep separate from senses such as *throw stone(s), throw overhand, throw underhand, throw-away* (#86); generic *to throw [x] at, cast*.

88 - Generic; avoid verbs like *turn right, turn left, turn one's head*.

89 - Intransitive verb, like a coin or top turns around.

95 - As in *"What will you wear?"*, avoiding specific garment terms.

96 - Sometimes not distinguished from *sunset-place* or *west-wind*.

98 - As in *"When will he arrive?"*; some languages have *when* (past)?.

99 - Opposite of *narrow* (#49).

100 - *In error, incorrect*; not intended as a negator (Akl bukún *not so*).

 This list may be used in toto, or those 50 items marked with an asterisk may form an abbreviated survey. If the criteria outlined above are strictly applied, only those speech varieties that score 90% (in excess of 45/50 or 90/100) with one another can be regarded as belonging to the same communalect - and if the speakers consider themselves as such. In this way, there is a sociological and linguistic confirmation of a given (Philippine or Austronesian) language scene. Because of borrowing, common inheritance, and convergence (e.g. dispar-ate shift of *p > f, *d > r, *r > l, *ə > u, etc.), scores will rarely be 0. Ilokano, for example, scores 4% with Akl and Ceb, up to 8% with Tag. However, the list has been constructed on the basis of abundant data (Reid 1971, Yap 1977, McFarland 1977), so that it can be stated with confidence that scores will be very low, even between reasonably close genetic relatives.

 The languages chosen in Table 1 demonstrate this last point. Tag, Ceb, Akl, and Naga are genetically related Central Philippine languages. Akl and Ceb, which are Bisayan, score no higher than 42%; Tag-Bik, no higher than 21% with each other. Central Mindanao Manobo stands in a dialect relationship with Ilianen and Western Bukidnon, yet the CMM-Iln score is 88% and CMM-WBM is 76%, while Iln-WBM is 63%. Even if cognates, rather than identities, are counted, the Manobo scores are: CMM-Iln 91%, CMM-WBM 88%, and Iln-WBM 76% *based on the data available* (numerous lacunae for CMM and Iln make these rough computations). Thus, Central Mindanao Manobo (or Kiriyenteken Manobo; Elkins, personal com-munication 9 August 1983) is a communalect in its own right.

 Of just the 50 items marked with an asterisk, Ilokano has 31 unique forms, Tagalog 23, and Cebuano 11 (the latter is due to Ceb's strong influence in the central and southern Philippines resulting in numerous loans into or from Ceb). These uniques dictate that no other communalect could share a score higher than 19/50 with Ilk, 27/50 with Tag, or 39/50 with Ceb, except a communalect that was indeed Ilk, Tag, or Ceb respectively. In fact, Tagalog scores 8/50 with Sinauna, 7 with Kapampangan, 4 with Botolan, and 3 with Bikol. Cebuano scores 25/50 with Hiligaynon (due to loans), 18 with Samar-Leyte, 12 with Surigao, and 10 with

Aklanon.   Ilokano scores 11/50 with Itneg, 8 with Kankanay, and 7 with Luba.
The overall effects of convergence are thus negligible in this kind of survey,
which is *sociolinguistic* and *not historical* in intent.

3.   THE DETERMINATION OF LANGUAGES

Although we may eventually know how many communalects exist in the
Philippines or other Austronesian areas (since adequate data are available in
the files of the Summer Institute of Linguistics and several 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 (see Zorc
1977:165-170).   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 virtually all of the rest of the speech act could
well be lost on the Filipino.   This is not *practical intelligibility* - the Malay
is not likely to get much joy from a Filipino doctor if each sticks to his own
language.   The Summer Institute of Linguistics needs to know the degree to which
a translation of the Bible can be understood by speakers/readers in other areas.
They have conducted extensive tests of intelligibility throughout the Philippines;
if too many barriers to understanding exist, a different translation is necessary.
Each speech variety is accorded its own dignity; linguistic imperialism is
avoided - Warays may understand Cebuano or Aklanons Hiligaynon, but each deserves
their own intimate version.

If linguists could agree on a criterion for determining mutual intelligi-
bility (the SIL tests and scores are accurate and sound in this regard), and
factors such as bilingualism and sesquilingualism[4] (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 decade, depending on research inter-
ests of M.A. or Ph.D. scholars and access to SIL files.   While SIL has always
been most generous and open with its data, it would be most appropriate (given
the years of labour and research involved) if an SIL member drew up a compre-
hensive Philippine matrix of intelligibility test scores, possibly as part of
his/her studies for a degree.   Kroeger's paper on "Intelligibility patterns in
Sabah" in this volume is a welcome step in this direction.

In the meantime, genetic linguistics can provide a working solution.   The
number of languages in the Philippines alone has been debated and estimated by
linguists and laymen.   Blumentritt (1901) recognised 194 native groups mentioned
in the literature of his time.   But he well knew that many of these were repeti-
tious or inaccurate in several ways.   Conklin (1952), being more concerned with
linguistic criteria, outlined 75 main groups broken up into a total of 156 mem-
bers.   Historical/comparative linguists are generally in agreement that there
are, at most, 28 major linguistic groups that can be described as 'Philippine'
on the basis of geographic or genetic criteria (see Table 2).   One subgroup,
Sama (Il), is clearly intrusive to the Philippines within the last millenium,
and is genetically of an 'Indonesian type', possibly related to the South
Sulawesi group (including Makassarese and Buginese (Roger F. Mills, personal
communication, 4 October 1983)).

Table 2: Probable and possible Philippine subgroups

N1 North Cordilleran
  1 South (Gaddang-Yogad)
  2 North (Atta-Ibanag)
  3 Central (Malaweg, Isneg)
  4 Agta

N2 Dumagat = East Cordilleran
  1 Negrito
  2 Paranan
  3 Central (Casiguran)
  4 South (Umirey)

N3 Ilokano

N4 Central Cordilleran
  1 South (Isinai)
  2 North (Itneg)
  3 East (Kalinga)
  4 Nuclear (Balangaw)
  5 Ifugao
  6 Bontok-Kankanay

N5 Ilongot

N6 South Cordilleran
  1 Pangasinan
  2 Inibaloi-Karaw
  3 Kallahan

N7 Bashiic = Ivatanic
  1 Yami
  2 Itbayaten
  3 Ivatanen-Babuyan

N8 Southern Luzon
  1 Sambalic
  2 Sinauna
  3 Kapampangan

N9 North Mangyan
  1 Iraya
  2 Alangan
  3 Tadyawan

N10 Inati of Panay

S1 South Mangyan
  1 Buhid-Taubuid
  2 Hanunoo

S2 Palawanic
  1 North (Aborlan-Batak)
  2 South (Molbog-Brookes)

S3 Kalamianic

S4 Central Philippine
  1 Tagalog
  2 Bikol
   -Inland
   -Coastal
   -Pandan
  3 Bisayan
   -West
   -Banton
   -Central
   -Cebuan
   -South
  4 Mansakan
   -Mamanwa
   -North
   -East
   -West

S5 Subanon
  1 Siocon-Kalibugan
  2 Sindangan-Salug-Lapuyan

S6 Manobo
  1 North
  2 Inland
  3 South

S7 Danao

S8 Bilic
  1 Giangan/Bagobo
  2 Tiruray
  3 Tboli
  4 Inner Blaan

S9 Sangiric
  1 North (Sangil-
    Sangir-Talaud)
  2 South (Bantik-Ratahan)

C1 Minahasan
  1 South (Tonsawang)
  2 North (Tontemboan)
  3 North-east (Tondano-
    Tonsea-Tombulu)

C2 Mongondow-Ponosakan

C3 Gorontalic
  1 Dila (Buol-Suwawa)
  2 East (Bulanga)
  3 West (Gorontalo)

I1 Sama-Bajaw
  1 Indonesian Bajaw
  2 North Borneo/
    Sabah Land Bajaw
  3 Jama-Mapun
  4 Southern Sulu
  5 Central Sulu
  6 Western Sulu
  7 Northern Sulu
  8 Yakan
  9 Zamboanga Sama
 10 Abaknun

U1 Chamorro

U2 Palau

U3 Yapese

B1 Kadazan-Dusunic

B2 Murutic

Code: B = Borneo
     C = Celebes
     N = Northern Philippines
     S = Southern Philippines
     U = Ungrouped

Maps showing the locales of these languages can be found in McFarland 1980.

Within the geopolitical boundaries of the Philippines, there are at most 19 language groups (Nl-10 + Sl-9) which could share an immediate genetic ancestor, which have in all likelihood developed in situ over at least 3,000 years, and which can not be attributed to multiple migrations from overseas as popular history suggests. Note, however, that three groups are represented in northern Celebes (Sulawesi, Cl-3) which can be proven to be immediately related to Southern Philippine languages. There are two families in Borneo (Bl-2) which share features of Philippine and the distinct Sabahan languages. Blust (1974) has proposed that these are more intimately related to the North Sarawak subgroup, based on the sharing of the innovation involving strengthened reflexes of PAN *b, *d, *j, *g. Their similarities to the Ph-type may be due to loans or convergence, and require further study. Another three (Ul-3) are spoken in the Pacific and await definitive classification. 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 (19 Philippine + 1 Indonesian intrusive) represents a core of agreement amongst Philippinologists, amidst otherwise widespread disagreement as to the collapsibility of these to ten (Ruhlen (in progress)), or two, or even one. (See my paper on "The genetic relationships of Philippine languages", where I argue for the latter alternative, i.e. a common Proto-Philippine ancestor from which all Ph languages except Sama descend.)

While we can be sure that there are no more than *20 major linguistic groups* (Nl-10, Sl-9, Il) within the Philippines, speakers would take little consolation in such broad criteria. Cebuanos identify themselves as Bisaya (not Central Philippine); the same holds true for Bikolanos or Tagalogs; and, more widely, for Ibanags, Pampangeños, etc. Hence, Table 2 delineates *50 Northern and Southern Philippine subgroups* with which speakers may more readily identify.

The verification of these as languages (based on the bounds of mutual intelligibility) and their fragmentation into communalects (recognising dialectal idiosyncrasies) must await further study.

What was it that I was saying earlier about gratitude? I have just outlined a massive task - for Philippinologists and for Austronesianists! I have presented a 'fine-tuning tool' for isolating communalects and given some suggestions from the genetic evidence for what ultimate language groups we may arrive at. The hard work ahead may not be appreciated, but hopefully the hints will be helpful.

NOTES

1. Some of the ideas discussed in this paper, including the original 50 items from Table 1, have appeared in Zorc 1984. The present paper and its FOCAL companion (Zorc 1986) split the topics covered therein, and treat them in much greater detail. I am grateful to Otto Dahl for a list of five Malagasy dialects which confirms the value of Table 1 in differentiating communalects, and to Paul Black for many helpful comments on the original draft.

2. Many Filipinos regard a *language* as a widespread and prestigious vehicle of communication (such as English, Chinese, Russian, or Pilipino), while any other kind of speech is 'a *dialect*'. This view is compatible in many regards with the concept of communalect discussed below. In practice, Filipinos are aware of even the most minute linguistic variations and label them accordingly (even if not always complimentarily, e.g. "They talk like birds").

3. Because they refer to genetic subgroups (if a linguist is talking), or
    geopolitical isolates (if a layman is talking).

4. I once met some Tadyawan-Mangyans who claimed they could understand Ilokano!
    The genetic gap (by *any* measure) between Ilokano and Tadyawan is so great
    that the only cause for such a statement was their frequent dealings with
    an Ilokano merchant (who bought bundles of rattan from them). Intelligi-
    bility must be tested by rather precise (rather than impressionistic)
    measures, if it is going to be validly established. It is for this reason
    that I expressed reservations (Zorc 1977:170 and footnote 59) about links
    between Sorsogon :: Bikol and Naturalis :: Kamayo. The lexical and gram-
    matical differences between these speech varieties must create a consider-
    able amount of *code noise* (Hockett 1958:331f) and render intelligibility
    far from perfect and mutual. I rather suspect sesquilingualism (or passive
    language ability) has led to such statements. If, however, *all* members of
    both communities are sesquilingual, then a link genuinely exists. But in
    a certain area of Davao City, all the people on a block understand Tagalog,
    Hiligaynon, and Ilokano. An Iloko will speak Ilokano to an Ilonggo, who
    will respond in Ilonggo. Would this mean that Ilokano is now part of the
    Bisayan complex? One would (hopefully) not seriously propose this!

    *EDITORIAL NOTE: Zorc (1984 and elsewhere) uses the spelling communilect,
    and not the more usual communalect, as used by *Pacific Linguistics* here.

REFERENCES

BLUMENTRITT, Ferdinand

1901   Philippine tribes and languages. *Annual Report of the Board of
         Regents of the Smithsonian Institution*, 527-547. Washington.

BLUST, Robert A

1974   The Proto-North Sarawak vowel deletion hypothesis. Ph.D. disser-
         tation, University of Hawaii.

CONKLIN, Harold C.

1952   Outline gazeteer of native Philippine ethnic and linguistic groups.
         Reprinted in Andrew B. Gonzalez, Teodoro Llamzon and Fe Otanes, eds
         Readings in Philippine linguistics. Manila: Linguistic Society of
         the Philippines, 1973.

DYEN, Isidore, A.T. JAMES and J.W.L. COLE

1967   Language divergence and estimated word retention rate. *Language*
         43:150-171.

ELKINS, Richard

1968   *Manobo-English dictionary*. *Oceanic Linguistics* Special Publication
         No.3. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

ELKINS, Richard and Betty ELKINS

1954   *A vocabulary of Central Mindanao Manobo*. Manila: Summer Institute
         of Linguistics, Bureau of Public Schools, Institute of National
         Language.

HOCKETT, Charles F.

1958   *A course in modern linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.

HUDSON, Alfred B.

1967   *The Barito isolects of Borneo*. Data Paper Number 68. Ithaca: Southeast Asia Program, Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University.

KROEGER, Paul

1986   Intelligibility patterns in Sabah. In this volume, 309-339.

LI, Paul Jen-kuei

1980   Men's and women's speech in Mayrinax. In *Papers in honor of Prof. Lin Yü-k'eng on her seventieth birthday*, 9-17. Taipei: Academia Sinica and National Taiwan University; Wen Shin.

1982a   Male and female forms of speech in Atayal. *The Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 53/2:265-304. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

1982b   Linguistic variations of different age groups in the Atayalic dialects. In *Studies in linguistics presented to Dr. Fang-kuei Li on his eightieth birthday*, 167-191. *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, New Series 14. Taipei.

McFARLAND, Curtis D.

1977   *Northern Philippine linguistic geography*. Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa Monograph Series No.9. Tokyo.

1980   *A linguistic atlas of the Philippines*. Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa Monograph Series No.15. Tokyo.

MINTZ, Malcolm W.

1971   *Bikol dictionary*. PALI Language Texts: Philippines. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

PALLESEN, A. Kemp

1977   Culture contact and language convergence. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.

PENNOYER, F. Douglas

n.d.   Unpublished field notes on the Inati dialects of Panay (Inete, Sugodnin 1, Sugodnin 2).

REID, Lawrence A.

1971   *Philippine minor languages: word lists and phonologies*. *Oceanic Linguistics* Special Publication No.8. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

RUHLEN, Merritt

in pro- *A guide to the world's languages*.
gress

VANOVERBERGH, Morice, C.I.C.M.

1956   *Iloko-English dictionary*. Baguio City: Catholic School Press.

WOLFF, John U.

  1972   *A dictionary of Cebuano Visayan. Philippine Journal of Linguistics,*
            Special Monograph No.4. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

YAP, Fe Aldave

  1977   *A comparative study of Philippine lexicons*. Manila: Institute of
            National Language, Department of Education and Culture.

ZORC, R. David

  1969   *A study of the Aklanon dialect*, vol.2: *Aklanon to English dictionary.*
            Kalibo: Aklan Printing Center.

  1974   Towards a definitive Philippine wordlist - the qualitative use of
            vocabulary in identifying and classifying languages. FICAL paper.
            Oceanic Linguistics 13/1&2:409-455.

  1977   *The Bisayan dialects of the Philippines: subgrouping and reconstruc-
            tion. PL*, C-44.

  1984   The Philippine language scene - the sociolinguistic contribution of
            historical linguistics. In Andrew Gonzalez, FSC, ed. *Panagani
            essays in honor of Bonifacio P. Sibayan on his sixty-eighth
            birthday*, 135-148. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

  1986   The genetic relationships of Philippine languages. In *FOCAL II*,
            147-173.