

A GUIDE TO THE FILIPINO LINGUIST IN READING AND APPRECIATING ROBERT A. BLUST'S AUSTRONESIAN ETYMOLOGIES (1980)

R. DAVID ZORC
*School of Australian Linguistics
Darwin Institute of Technology*

INTRODUCTION

While it is not generally customary to review an issue of a journal, the appearance of these additional etymologies in a single volume affords us the opportunity to acknowledge the monumental contribution that Blust has made over the last decade and a half and to take stock of the state-of-the-art (or, more accurately, *science*) in Proto Austronesian reconstruction. For the reader who may be unable to appreciate the significance of this book, I will take the liberty of offering an outline introduction to the main tenets of comparative Austronesian linguistics, drawing on illustrations from Blust, but also including material relevant to the Philippine context (Part 1). I will then embark on a general review of the book (Part 2). Since some readers may not wish to be involved in extensive complexities, these will be limited to a more detailed critique (Part 3).

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

(1) **LANGUAGES USED.** A scholar must include a wide range of languages sufficient to give a full enough picture of both the sound system (phonology) of the parent language and the distribution of its daughter languages. In the Philippines, for example, one could theoretically reconstruct Proto Philippine on the basis of a comparison of Ilokano and Tagalog, since they are historically and geographically separated, but this reconstruction would miss numerous important distinctions and give a very limited view of what the parent language had in its lexicon and morphology. In my review of Paz's PPH reconstruction (1981), I commended her treatment of 29 widespread Philippine languages (Zorc 1981). Blust's 'present study draws on approximately 200 of the 700 or more AN languages' (9) representing diverse subgroups of the family, and an increase of at least 142 languages since his initial major contribution (1970).

(2) **CORRESPONDENCE CLASSES.** The process of historical reconstruction involves the search for similarities in four areas: sound, form, function, and meaning, or, in the jargon of the field, the isolation of phonological, morphological, grammatical, and semantic correspondences. These, of necessity, involve a further four degrees of resemblance: (a) identical, (b) regular, (c) irregular, or (d) false correspondences.

(2a) **Identities** yield rather straightforward reconstructions: Tagalog, Ilokano, Malay, and Fijian *mata* 'eye' yield a parent form, **mata* (the asterisk signifies that the form is hypothetical—we have no surviving proof that it was so). Note that *every element* is identical: the sounds m-a-t-a, usage as a noun, and semantics. [Only a few of Blust's discoveries are of this type; some examples are his #22, 29, 33, 48, 59, etc.—but the absolute identities are more limited to form rather than to meaning.]

(2b) By far the most common type of correspondence set is **regular**, wherein a sound in one language regularly corresponds to a different sound in another, which probably descends from a distinct phoneme of the parent (proto) language. For example, Tag *ka*: 'in, Ceb *ka*: 'un 'eat' < **ka*:en [note Tag *i*::Ceb *u* < **e*], Tag *la*:yag, Malay *layar* 'sail' < **la*:yaR [Tag *g*::Malay *r* < **R*].

(2c) **Irregular correspondences** often, but by no means always, involve loans. Thus, while **e* goes to *i* in Tagalog (except when a neighboring syllable has **u*, e.g., **penuq* 'full' > Tag *puno*?), all instances of **e* > *a* should be viewed with suspicion, e.g., Tag *andal* 'jostle' < Malay *endal* 'stuff, push', #120) — numerous loans from Kapampangan and Malay establish this. However, a similar development

in Pangasinan is irregular and unexplained, e.g., *talo* 'three' (< **telu*), *pano* 'full' (< **penuq*), *batik* 'run' (< **betik*), *sali* 'foot' (< **seli*), etc. It is difficult to maintain a hypothesis that these are loans (many of the etyma in question are specific to the South Cordilleran subgroup to which Png belongs), since no donor language with the same words and shifts is identifiable. A similar situation exists with Ilokano reflexes of *R—most scholars would agree that *r* is the expected reflex, yet *g* occurs on more numerous forms, some even as doublets (*ba:go*, *baro* 'new' < **baqRuH*, **bibig*, *bibir* 'lip' < **bibiR*), so that the treatment of forms with *g* as irregular correspondences is more attractive than a loan hypothesis (viz: a split of *R > *r* and *g* might have occurred in the history of the language).

(2d) **False correspondences** involve loans or accidental similarities. In a family, such as Austronesian, where so many influences have been felt (Spanish, Portuguese, Indic/Sanskrit, Arabic, Persian, Chinese, Dutch, English, etc.), a scholar cannot be expected to be a master of all potential sources. Hence, a beginner might be excused for making spurious reconstructions, e.g., **g*gadapun 'water-jar' (< Sp *garrafon* 'large decanter') or **x*mani? 'peanuts' (< Mex-Sp *mani* 'peanut'). [The raised *x* indicates a false correspondence.] But even a veteran scholar might include foreign material in what may be a legitimate etymon (see 2.8 below). Blust in his earlier work, as did Dempwolff before him, included appropriately coded loan material in order to exemplify regular correspondences in the languages treated. However, some readers mis-interpreted this as 'a literal claim that Sanskrit or even Arabic loanwords were found in Proto-Austronesian' (29), which clearly was not the case.

(3) **RECONSTRUCTION OF PARENT LANGUAGE PHONOLOGY.** Blust, as well as most researchers nowadays, uses the PAN phonology reconstructed by Dempwolff as revised by Dyen (1947, 1951, 1953a, 1965). The following table indicates the status of the PAN phonemic inventory to date [excluding the sub-numerals as discussed in Dyen 1953b (*R₁–R₅) or Tsuchida 1976 (*S₁–S₆), see also 2.5 and 3.1 below for further details]:

PAN	AUTHOR	NOTES	ACCEPTABILITY
*a	Demp		yes
*b	Demp		yes
*B	Prentice & Nothofer		no
*c	Dyen	Demp & Dahl *k'	yes-Blust; Wolff rejects
*C	Dyen	Dahl *t ₂	yes, on Formosan evidence
*d	Demp	Dahl d ₁	yes, but Wolff rejects
*D	Dyen	Demp *d̥, Dahl *d ₂	problematic (Tagalic, Javanese, and Paiwan/Formosan evidence need comprehensive re-investigation)
*d ₃	Dahl		maybe; Blust rejects
*e	Demp	Demp *ə	yes
*é	Dyen	(Mid front vowel)	no
*g	Demp		yes, but Wolff rejects
*h	Demp	Revised by Dyen	yes, but = *S in Blust
*H	Dyen	Extended by Zorc	yes, on Formosan evidence
*i	Demp		yes
*j	Dyen	Demp & Dahl *g'	yes
*k	Demp		yes
*l	Demp		yes
*L	Dyen&Ts	Formosan evidence	maybe; Dahl rejects;
		recent paper by Dyen and Tsuchida may re-instate	
*m	Demp		yes
*n	Demp	Dahl *n ₁	yes

*ñ	Demp	Possibly only PMP	problematic next to *i
*N	Dyen&Ts	Dahl *ɳ	yes, on Formosan evidence
*ɲ	Demp	(Orthographic "ng")	yes
*o	Dyen	(Mid back vowel)	no
*p	Demp		yes
*q	Dyen	Demp *h	yes
*r	Dyen	Demp *ɽ	yes, but Wolff rejects
*R	Dyen	Demp & Dahl *ʀ	yes
*s	Dyen	Demp & Dahl *tʰ	yes
*S	Dyen&Ts		yes, on Formosan evidence
*θ	Tsuchida		problematic; Formosan and
		Malagasy evidence need re-investigation	
*t	Demp	Dahl *tɿ	yes
*T	Dyen	Demp & Dahl *t̚	yes-Blust; Wolff and Dahl
		reject based on Indic influence in Javanese	
*u	Demp		yes
*w	Dyen	Demp *v	yes, but Dahl rejects
*W	Dyen	Probably *u marker	no
*X	Dyen	Probably = *S	no
*y	Dyen	Demp *j	yes, but Dahl rejects
*z	Dyen	Demp & Dahl *dʰ	yes-Blust; Wolff rejects
*Z	Dyen	Demp *dʰ	yes, some problems
*?	Dyen & Zorc		yes, some problems
*:	Zorc	Vowel length	Blust rejects
*˘	Zorc	Vowel shortness	Blust rejects

(4) **SUBGROUPING.** Unlike determining correspondence classes, the establishment of subgroups depends on the isolation of **shared differences** (rather than similarities) – these constitute **innovations** which form the backbone of a subgrouping argument. The subgrouping hypothesis of each researcher must be made explicit. Since 1977, Blust has evolved a subgrouping that recognizes the indigenous languages of Formosa as falling into at least one first-order subgroup of Proto Austronesian, and the numerous languages spoken outside of Formosa taken together as the Malayo-Polynesian family. I am not in a position to take issue with the finer details of this hypothesis (but see. 2.3). However, Blust's statement is a marked improvement over his earlier study, where (akin to a procedure used by Dempwolff) certain reconstructions were labelled PAN (Dempwolff's UAN) despite a limited distribution in Indonesian and Philippine languages [which would clearly indicate a label of 'Proto Western-Malayo-Polynesian' (in Blust's terminology) or 'Proto Hesperonesian' (in Dyen's)]. Hence, Blust's indication by a code [1 = Proto Austronesian (spoken around 5000 B.C.), 2 = Proto Malayo-Polynesian (spoken around 4000 B.C.), and 3 = Proto Western Malayo-Polynesian (spoken around 2000 B.C.)] is an honest appraisal of the status and also the approximate time-depth of each etymology. Any scholar who may disagree with these assignments can easily recompute the status based on the scope of the languages represented and his own subgrouping hypothesis.

(5) **DOUBLET vs DISJUNCT.** Blust has made a very useful distinction between reconstructions that are formally and semantically similar (**doublets** = Dempwolff's 'Nebenformen', e.g., *adaduq/*anaduq 'long', *kambing/*kanding 'goat') and reconstructions which have an overlap of cognate sets (**disjuncts**, e.g., Fijian kumi which could come from either *kumis or *gumi 'beard', Tagalog gata? from *Rataq or (irregularly from) *getaq 'coconut milk'). However, Blust recognizes that the term 'doublet' is still used to describe several quite distinct phenomena (27): phonologically similar reconstructions, e.g., *bingag and *bingaR [volute shell],

*baNaw and *baNaR *Smilax* (= true doublets) and etyma containing a monosyllabic root [or 'phonetheme', which he has since treated in more detail in a recent article (Blust, in press b)], e.g., *ket 'sticky, adhesive' or *ngaC, *ngeC, *ngiC, *nguC 'gnash the teeth as in anger'. To this list can be added suspect synonyms, e.g., *beRngi and *Rabi:ʔiH 'night'. I propose that the terms and abbreviations used can be adapted to include: doublets (Dbl), disjuncts (Dsj), monosyllabic roots (Mon), and synonyms (Syn). Where there is still some potential ambiguity as to the mixture of types, a convention can be adopted to mark suspect morpheme boundaries, e.g., *ti+kuʔ 'bend, curve' (Dbl+Mon). At least some of the remaining difficulties would appear to have to do with the quality of specific language evidence rather than problems in labelling reconstructions.

(6) TEST, CRITERION, AND WITNESS LANGUAGES. In an earlier paper, I indicated that a reconstruction is founded upon three different kinds of language evidence (Zorc 1982:114). (1) A **test language** is one wherein a phoneme directly reflects one—and only one—proto phoneme, e.g., Paiwan ts < *C, Ilokano e < *e. (2) A **criterion language** is one where a phoneme can relate to two or more proto phonemes, but with the evidence of additional languages, the comparativist can 'triangulate' on the most probable correspondence set, e.g., Akl ʔ < *q or *ʔ and Iban ʔ < *ʔ or *h so Akl ʔ + Ib ʔ < *ʔ. (3) A **witness language** is useful primarily in determining the antiquity of an etymon—not its phonemic shape. Thus, with the loss of final consonants and/or numerous mergers in the Oceanic languages, a word might be descended from any of several etyma within a range of formal and semantic similarities. Amongst the languages of the North Cordilleran subgroup (Ibanag, Atta, Agta, Yogad, etc.), only Malaweg differentiates *s from *t, and is thus a test language for both phonemes; whereas Ibanag, which merges the two, as well as all final voiceless stops into glottal stop, is a witness language.

2. BLUST'S BOOK

The organization of Blust's book is as follows: 30 pages are dedicated to textual introduction, 7 to language abbreviations (including the subgroup affiliation of each language) and data sources, 6 to notes, 19 to references, 7 to a very useful index of languages, and a full 121 to the reconstructions themselves. This proportion is very much as it should be in a study of this kind. The brevity of the nine introductory sections belies the depth of time, research and study so obviously involved, and the importance of Blust's insights for future etymological work.

(1) The 'Brief History of Research' is an excellent survey of the field since Reland proposed 23 Malagasy-Malay comparisons in 1708 (representing the earliest Austronesian etymologies known), through Humboldt, Klaproth, van der Tuuk, Brandstetter, to Dempwolff (1938). Although there seems to have been a suspension of innovative etymological work in the two or more decades after Dempwolff, this need not reflect a tacit assumption that 'the work had been done'. (3) I suspect that this slow-down was in part due to the reorganization of academic priorities during and after World War II (when teaching and learning 'foreign' languages was foremost in the visions and finances of politicians and educationists). Also, scholars needed to understand more clearly the correspondences of reflexes in the numerous languages for which data was finally being published and the subgrouping relationships within the entire family. That might best be characterised as a period of **consolidation**, resulting in: the refinement of several correspondences sets (*q, *h, *D, *Z), including the introduction of new phonemes based on Formosan evidence (*S, *C, *N/L, *ʔ, *H), and a productive debate over higher and lower order Austronesian subgroups. These endeavors consumed (certainly not wasted) a good deal of time, and were the necessary prerequisites for further careful etymological work.

Blust's statistical analysis of the contributions to Austronesian lexical reconstruction are fair and accurate, and not at all self-serving. He has, after all, almost single-handedly doubled the 2,215 etymologies made available by Dempwolff

(1938), and improved well over 600 reconstructions with the presentation of criterial evidence, thereby correcting either the phonological or semantic assignments.

(2) In section 2, Blust outlines the scope of his study and other details of a comparativist's work, e.g., cognate decisions. Most of these have been discussed in 1.1-6 above. Blust has taken great pains to establish the regular correspondences for each of the many languages he is dealing with, but admits that errors could crop up (10). Nevertheless, he has applied stricter criteria than in his previous studies and limits irregularities of most kinds of notes rather than the main entries for each new etymology.

(3) Section 3 details Blust's view of the Austronesian family tree (see 1.4 above). My only reservation is the large corpus of etyma that appear to be limited to Formosan, Philippine and/or Indonesian languages, which has led me to classify reconstructions of this type as PHF (Proto Hesperonesian-Formosan). Many of these are probably *not* innovations, such as terms relating to rice agriculture (*be-Ras, *pa-jay, *benSiq, *Semay, *Ri'ek, etc.) which were presumably lost in the Oceanic move. Some may be the result of borrowing or inter-influence going back quite far in time. Many too probably have Oceanic cognates as yet undiscovered—Blust has certainly presented many Eastern Austronesian cognates in his publications. But the residue is still significantly large enough to caution me to conservatism—if even a handful turn out to be innovations, they could substantiate a subgrouping hypothesis different from that proposed by Blust and Dahl. Reconstructions that might be thus affected are: #17, 23, 39, 41, 42, 55, 56, 58, 105, 158, 165, 212, 231, 270, 274, 353, 404, 409, 410b, 413, 431.

(4) Section 4 deals with orthographic conventions for both data and etymologies. It is essential to have a uniform orthography, which sometimes differs from the original sources, so that data can be compared without requiring the reader to be a master of numerous and varying conventions. I applaud this procedure and commend it to other scholars. Note that *only* the following have been retained from the original sources: Paiwan *tj* vs *ts* and Palauan *ch*, and that Casiguran Dumagat *e* = schwa, while *e'* = mid front vowel (which is an inverse of the convention in the Headland dictionary). The Philippine convention of not writing intervocalic glottal stop is followed, and this alone I find unfortunate—it would have been clearer to indicate *-ʔ-* in forms and languages where it does occur since the reconstruction of **-ʔ-* vs **-∅-* can be at issue (see #4, 5, 71, 197, 228, 263, 275, 287).

Blust's suppression of the complex convention of indicating ambiguities in reconstructions (such as *[qS∅]a(ŋ)bek 'mat', in favor of a more straightforward PHN *a(m)bek) is welcome, given the evidence of the data and the level of a reconstruction. The indication of homorganic nasals (rather than *ŋC) is also appreciated. Granting that it can be justified in a more abstract phonological interpretation, the evidence of some languages would appear to indicate non-homorganic clusters (e.g., PPH *hamtik 'wasp'; PHN *halintang 'cross-piece', possibly also PHN *kamding 'goat', and PHN *limtaq < PHF *qalimeCaq 'leech') which would be lost by the previous convention.

The list of test and criterion languages for various PAN phonemes is useful, but does not indicate the *degree of reliability* of some languages, e.g., Malay, Samal, and Gorontalo are not particularly good witnesses for initial *S. Paiwan may turn out to be a far more critical test language than many of the others listed in evidence for *d, *D, *j distinctions, yet it is omitted (perhaps rejected?).

(5) In section 5, Blust rejects various proposals for the revision of PAN phonology: Prentice (1974, for *B), Wolff (1974, against *r and *d), Dahl (1976, against *w and *y, for *d₃), Dyen (1978, for *e' and *o, although the latter is possible at #28, 235, 354), and Zorc (1978, for contrastive accent). He tentatively accepts my proposals for the laryngeals *H and *ʔ (Zorc 1982), noting the counter-evidence of some Iban and Sasak forms. He outlines two pro-

blematic correspondence sets: Iban -ʔ :: Malay -h (where I suspect the Iban form is secondary and therefore would reconstruct *q, giving priority to the Malay evidence), and Iban -h :: Malay -∅ (where I cannot explain the Iban form, but would reconstruct *h or *s giving priority to the current reflexes in Philippine or Formosan languages).

He reiterates his position (Blust 1974) that certain languages of north Sarawak require the retention of *S as a sibilant in their immediate proto language, thereby necessitating *S for PMP (in all but final position) rather than just for PAN. Dahl (1976) and I (Zorc 1982) have maintained that only Formosan evidence can warrant the reconstruction of *S, and I have since argued (Zorc 1983:13-20) that (a) the north Sarawak reflexes were the result of accent phenomena yielding strengthened reflexes of *b, *d, *D, *j and (b) those languages appear to have lost *S and *H > *h in all positions. Since Blust and I are apparently at an impasse over this issue, scholars will have to determine if certain *S reconstructions are warranted—my hypothesis suggests that # 66, 83, 408, 409, 410 are, but # 47, 194, 405, 406, 407 are not (due to lack of substantiating evidence from Formosa). However, this difference is, after all, minor because, as Blust points out (15), ‘information. . . is extractible from the cognate sets themselves once these witnesses are known’ and the indication of *S can be interpreted as a shorthand for ambiguities, e.g., *kaSiR = *ka[hHS]iR.

(6) Section 6 briefly summarises his criteria for the reconstruction of morpheme boundaries. Blust’s identification of rather standard affixes, e.g., *ma- [adjective], *-en [stative], *[S]a- [attributive] (with my suggestion for the addition of *S) is straightforward. I question the morpheme division at # 23 (*qati-mela ‘flea’)—whereas a series of frozen affixes, including PAN *qaLi-, can be identified, neither *qati- nor a base *mela is warranted, as Paiwan qatjim+tjim appears to testify. If anything, a *qa- prefix and *-a suffix *may* be involved as indicated by Ilokano ti:mel, Ifugao ti:mol ‘flea’. It is also possible that an *aR infix is present in # 95 (i.e., *d<aR>aya?), both -g- and -ag- have a pluralising function in Bisan (see Zorc 1977:115f).

(7) The useful distinction between doublets and disjuncts is covered in section 7. I have commented on this above (1.5), but would note again that some problems involve not only the evaluation of reconstructions, but also of the languages used (see 1.6).

(8) Section 8 acknowledges the problems involved in identifying intimate borrowings and the fact that Malay has had a strong influence in insular Southeast Asia. While it is most difficult when reflexes are regular (especially in the case of identity correspondences, see 1.2a), I would suggest a rule of thumb that excludes new etyma where Malay and only one Philippine language are witnesses. This would then affect reconstructions # 70, 120, 128, 131, 135, 155, 177, 195, 275, 302, 382, 417, 440, 441. The problem of Hispanic influence has affected two reconstructions. The inclusion of Chamorro maña ‘custom, habit, tradition’ [< Sp ‘skill, knack; habit’ (in the phrase malas mañas ‘bad habits’)] at #297, leads to a reconstruction fraught with difficulties [*maña, *manaq, or *maña ‘inherit(ance)’] which could be the result of widespread Hispanic/Portuguese influence. A similar problem is encountered at # 133 (*gana, *ganas ‘raw energy, animal appetite’ < Sp gana ‘desire, appetite’, -s ‘plural’) for *at least* the Philippine evidence — it is hard to see how Old Javanese could contain anything but inherited material, but difficult to determine which forms are legitimately cognate.

(9) The last section of the introduction contains a brief forward look into Austronesian etymological studies. There is great promise in the forthcoming work of Blust and Anceaux, and in that of other scholars’ endeavors to reconstruct lower-order proto languages. As more and more descriptions and dictionaries of AN languages become available, so shall ‘opportunities for uncovering more of the early Austronesian lexicon’ (30), and ‘the culture-historical inferences that sometimes

follow from them' (31). I would only add to this by expressing the hope that the Philippines, in the fullness of time, will develop an economic and academic climate that would support students and scholars in researching the immensely intriguing linguistic 'Garden of Eden' available in the archipelago.

(10) The list of language abbreviations and sources of material is excellent. Blust uses upper-case (capital) letters for languages, which facilitates the ready recognition of each new entry. Blust's abbreviations make a great deal of sense, but not all languages have been assigned a code, which prompts me to encourage a 'meeting of Austronesian minds' in standardizing these, see Zorc (1984) for suggested Philippine language abbreviations. Various considerations involve clarity, impact, economy (one, two, or three letters), and format (small or upper case). We may never achieve total conformity, but attempts could be made to find some common core of agreement, if possible.

3. THE RECONSTRUCTIONS – DETAILS AND SUGGESTIONS

(1) DUBIOUS PHONEMES?

Blust has waved the wand of the 'independent evidence requirement' at many scholars, yet accepts *T on the basis of Javanese evidence alone. He even assumes its validity in cognate sets for which no Javanese forms are available (on the assumption that monosyllabic roots form a part of the etymon, e.g., # 154, 234, 337, 352, 434) – the assumption is legitimate on logical grounds, but the distinctness of *T must be held highly suspect.

I have been sceptical of Central Philippine evidence supporting a *d/*D distinction (see Zorc 1977:211-16), because *d/*D/*j have fallen together, yet complex morphophonemics, loans, and re-analysis have resulted in irregular reflexes that have led different scholars (Dempwolff, Dyen, Dahl, Wolff, etc.) to widely-varying solutions.

As Blust indicates, reflexes of *r are difficult to determine, but given Wolff's objections (1974), every possibility of identifying false cognates or an alternate etymon with *D or *R should be exhausted, as with # 101 (revised as *deRung by Blust (in press a)), 169 (revised to *qingaR), 194 (Dsj *kahir could be dropped), 232 (*kuDis, with r forms as secondary or irregular developments), 302 (*naRa, with *r evidence interpreted as loans), etc. I find several of the reconstructions with *r quite solid (#4, 144, 145, 335, 365, 366, 368, 390) but some are questionable on semantic or formal grounds (70, 147, 158, 210, 223, 363, 373, 416).

Following on from Wolff (1982) and my additional comments on the role that accent may have played in the development of irregular reflexes (Zorc 1983), reservations might now be expressed over at least some of the following reconstructions with *c: # 86, 87, 88, 89-90, 91, 265, 347, 350, 354, 367.

Similarly, several reconstructions with *g will need further evaluation: #21, 71, 115, 116, 128-162, 250, 251, 356, 369, 388, 417. Some of these (e.g., 7, 132, 138, 139, 144, 146, 153, 355, 418, 427) may well serve to substantiate the validity of *g, despite Wolff's objections (1982).

(2) REFINEMENT OF CORRESPONDENCES INVOLVING LARYNGEALS

I agree with the reconstruction of *ʔ at # 27, 44, 95, 130, 168, 268, 417, but feel the evidence cited would also warrant its reconstruction at # 37, 108 (add Kal duduʔ), 283 (add Btk, Kyp liʔnget, Ilk, Knk lingʔet < *lingʔet), 358 (*puʔngaw), 393 (*sasaʔ, Dbl: *sasah), 438 (*u(ng)kuʔ, given the possible Paiwan cognate).

Similarly, I agree with the reconstruction of *h at # 19 and 393, but feel that evidence supports its reconstruction as well at # 85 (Ceb butuh- : Iban buntuʔ < *bu(n)tuh), 110 (Ceb dulah-, with Iban durah-2 unexplained), 112 (Akl dapadapah, Ceb lapalalah-. Takituduh ʔalajah 'sole', Iban tapaʔ 'palm' < PHF(Z)

*DapaH), 269 (dismiss Ceb lu:ku? on the basis of length, and add Akl l-ukuh < *lekuh), and 396 (Akl pu/sngah < *sengah).

Some of the discrepancies in the reconstruction of *ʔ and *H have to do with inconsistencies or omissions in a table of reflexes of these phonemes (Zorc 1982:115). For the record, it should be noted that if an Iban form ends in -ʔ, PHN/PMP *h or PAN*H may be reconstructable on the basis of morphophonemic evidence from Cebuano (and other Bisayan dialects), Bikol, and Western Bukidnon Manobo. Unfortunately, dictionaries of these languages do not give such information, so that forms that appear to end in zero may actually be indicative of either *-ϕ or *-h. the correspondence Iban -ʔ : Bisayan, Bikol, WBM -ϕ (as entered in the dictionaries, even without further morphophonemic information) should be indicative of a reconstruction with *h.

(3) AUSTRONESIAN ROOT THEORY: CLUSTER POSSIBILITIES

It is generally accepted that Austronesian clusters could involve nasals (*NC) or the velar fricative (*RC, see # 58), as well as any potential cluster which was the result of *C₁VC₂ (Mon) reduplication [e.g., *kes+kes (# 212), *sud+sud (# 401), *sung+sung (403)]. Zorc (1982:129f) demonstrated that there was probably a *ʔC cluster in the etymon *beRʔ at 'heavy' and several other etyma. However, since reduplicated monosyllables involved such a wide range of consonant clusters, they could (even if only by widespread drift) increase the range of potential clusters in the phonotactic system of a language. My hypothesis puts non-homorganic clusters not only into PPH, but also into Proto Western Austronesian—I do not see such clusters as only the result of *e loss (e.g., PAN *qaSelu > PHN *qahlu 'pestle').

Hence, there are a few reconstructions where Blust inserts *e without any evidence supporting that additional vowel beyond the hypothesis that such clusters might not have been allowed. I would suggest the following revisions (including some revised morpheme boundaries):

- (10) PHN(B) : *qali-peqip < PHN(Z) *q<al> ip+qip 'scapula'
- (118) PHN(B) *Di(m)peqit < PHN(Z) *Diʔ+pit 'join, fasten together (along the length)'
- (118) PMP(B) *kangeqa/kaqenga > PMP(Z) *kaʔ+ngah 'fissured, slightly cracked'
- (247) PMP(B) *labak/labeqak/laqebak > PMP(Z) *laʔbak 'wide open'
- (288) PHN(B) *lukat/lukeqat > +HN(Z) *luʔkat 'exercise, purify ritually' [Ceb lukat is from a different etymon, note WBM lekat < PSP *lekat 'redeem'.]
- (358) PHN(B) *pungaw/pungeqaw/puqengaw > PHN(Z) *puʔngaw 'lonely, forlorn'

(4) NASAL CLUSTERS IN THE NORTHERN PHILIPPINE LANGUAGES?

Reid (1982) demonstrated that genuine Ilokano and Bontok cognates of etyma reconstructed with *NC clusters have a simple consonant (viz: without a nasal). I have taken issue with the ensuing *subgrouping hypothesis* that NPh languages are closer to Formosan and CPh languages to PMP (Zorc 1984), but suggested that the development of nasal clusters in NPh languages (viz, the *reconstructional implications of the hypothesis*) needed further investigation. Many of Blust's new etyma have NPh witnesses without a nasal reflex (# 1, 93, 118, 172, 209, 242, 246, 258, 277, 337, 352, 436), which I interpret as supporting Reid's observations. It is therefore noteworthy that the following NPh etyma do have *NC clusters:

- (116) Ilk indang 'overseer', if there are no other Ph cognates, perhaps < Javanese?
- (173) Png kanding, but note Bon gelding 'goat'
- (311) Knk nangket 'glutinous', but Cas nicket 'honey'
- (334) Ilk pantar 'treeless plain; shore' (?)

- (355) Note: Knk pongdaw, pongdol 'to pollard, cut the top off', Bon
 pongdol 'prune a tree'
 (388) Ilk sangga 'collar/flange at base of blade' (?)
 (411) Ilk tamban [sardine]
 (411) Cas dangkal, pos < Tag via Malay jengkal 'handspan'

Few of these are of unimpeachable quality, such that they clearly support the continuation of *NC clusters into NPh languages. It might therefore be necessary to accept their inclusion within the respective cognate sets with some reservation.

(5) SOME OTHER DETAILS

p4 – Milke 1968 does not appear in the bibliography.

p22 – A number (3) is inserted into the text, but has no previous reference (i.e., it continues the Iban -h : : Malay -Ø of (2)).

#17 – Mongondow agi? 'come here' should correspond with a PAN *aRi (although the final glottal is problematic). Perhaps the reconstruction as *ari involves a typographical error, as suggested in the note about *R > Paiwan r, but much of the data points to a disjunct: *maRi vs *mari.

#67 note – Ceb bitan?ag (not bintan?ag).

#74 – The semantic connection between a PNP *bukel 'seed' and Malay bongkal 'lump; a measure of weight' is tenuous.

#126 – None of the languages cited gives direct evidence for an initial *q-; note the morphophonemics of Sub m-osom 'sour'. The initial consonant can not be determined simply by realting it to the doublet *qal(e)sem.

#165 – Tbl kilu(h) can be removed from the note and added to the main entry, since it reflects each element of the reconstruction quite faithfully. Note that Tbl has morphophonemic final -h on all vowel final stems (contrast the dictionary and Reid 1971).

#170 – Could Balinese hiso 'entrails' justify a *qisaw?

#192 – Evidence suggests only *kakaq, although a doublet *kaqkaq might be *independently* supported, see Akl, Ceb bika?ka? 'open the legs wide apart, do a split'.

#235 – Despite the semantic connections, I would suggest the reconstruction of synonyms: *ku(ng)kung 'make a deep resonant sound' and *kungkung [bird with a deep resonant cry].

#249 – K-C ma-label 'wide' cannot be directly cognate (since *R > K-C g); it could be retained in the note as a possible loan from a Bilic language.

#253 – The addition of Abr, Kyp la?lu leads to a revision of the reconstruction as PHN *laqlu (Dbl: *qaSelu) [contrast with my note to #126 above; see also 3.3 concerning clusters in PHN].

#274 – Paiwan ledep 'dive' < PHF *lejep (Isg laggap, Png legep, Tsg lurup, Bik ladup), yet another doublet in the series.

#307 – The appearance of ñ next to i is not surprising, and may obviate the need for a doublet *ñikfik 'gnat, sandfly'.

#336 – I have also cited Makassarese pattung [large bamboo] in connection with this etymon as evidence for a short penult vowel (Zorc 1983:7). However, the appearance of Balinese petung now substantiates a doublet, *petung.

#370 – Other evidence leads to the reconstruction of doublets *Diken (Ilk, WBM diken, Tag, Ceb, Hil dīkin, alongside Hil likin) and *Reken (Bik, S-L gūkun), with which some of the supporting evidence may belong (e.g., Puyuma Reken).

#379 – Kal ma-lakan 'light(weight)' confirms every element of the first reconstruction.

#392 – None of the South Cordilleran evidence (Ilongot, Kayapa, or Pangasinan) supports the reconstruction of *R (and I take the forms to be a SCR innovation). Png ga:tas must be a loan because of *R > g and the vowel length, and would not indicate even an irregular shift of *R > g as the note implies.

#399 – Additional evidence suggests a doublet with *D: Akl, Hil, Han sidla:ng-an 'east' < PHN *si(l)Dang.

#400 – None of the evidence supports a doublet *sisiq, except by analogy with the final of *sisuq and *susuq (see comment to #126 above).

#404 – The glottal stop in Tbl suʔal is in conflict with Puyuma suHaR.

#422 – All evidence points to PAN *timid.

#439 – Kal kumang 'hermit crab' confirms this reconstruction.

Oceanic Linguistics has suffered from a backlog in publications that can result in an article being dated prior to its conception. This happened with an article I wrote on West Bisayan in 1973, presented for publication in 1974, but appeared as Zorc 1972! Blust has worked on the present etymologies for at least half a decade prior to 1980, so the year of publication is quite appropriate in this instance. [The volume's distribution in 1983 means this review is not as delayed as it would appear to be.] However, if scholars are interested in claiming temporal priority for the publication of 'new discoveries', the dating of this journal should be taken into consideration (favorably or unfavorably, as the case may be). Since it is difficult to keep up with the ever-growing list of publications, research, new etyma, etc. of all scholars, the time may come when correct chronology makes a difference. For example, commencing with the second fascicle of the *Core Etymological Dictionary of Filipino* (Zorc, in progress), I have used that study as a vehicle for publishing a number of my own discoveries (provided that a Tagalog/Filipino cognate is available).

Blust has very kindly supplied me a pre-publication draft of his *Austronesian Etymologies II*, which contains another 443 etymologies. Certain errors in the book under review have been corrected. I have not intentionally included any critique of elements in the newer work here since it has not yet appeared in print. However, I can say that any new study by Blust is most welcome. He is to be congratulated for both the quantity and the quality of the etyma he has presented. If the period 1965-1985 is examined with 'Austronesian spectacles', it will be notable for the many new reference books, the subgroup specific studies, and the tremendous surge in etymological work. While many scholars have participated in the former areas, there is no doubt that Blust stands prominent and tall as a master of the latter.

REFERENCES¹

- BLUST, ROBERT A. 1970. Proto-Austronesian addenda. *Oceanic Linguistics* 9.104-62.
- _____. 1972a. Proto-Oceanic addenda with cognates in non-Oceanic Austronesian languages. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 4.1.1-43. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- _____. 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. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- _____. 1973. Additions to 'Proto-Austronesian addenda' and 'Proto-Oceanic addenda with cognates in non-Oceanic Austronesian languages'. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 4.8.1-17. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- _____. 1974. The Proto North Sarawak vowel deletion hypothesis. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Hawaii, Honolulu.
- _____. 1977. The Proto-Austronesian pronouns and Austronesian subgroupings: a preliminary report. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 9.2.1-15. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- _____. 1980. Austronesian etymologies. *Oceanic Linguistics* 19.1&2.
- _____. In press a. Austronesian etymologies II. *Oceanic Linguistics*.
- _____. In press b. Beyond the morpheme: Austronesian root theory re-examined.
- DAHL, OTTO CHR. 1976. Proto-Austronesian 2nd revised edition. Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series, Number 15. London: Curzon Press.
- _____. 1982. Early phonetic and phonemic changes in Austronesian. The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, Series B. 63. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- DEMPWOLFF, OTTO. 1938. Vergleichende Lautlehre des austronesischen Wortschatzes Band 3: Austronesisches Wortverzeichnis. *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen Beiheft* 19. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- DYEN, ISIDORE. 1947. The Tagalog reflexes of Malayo-Polynesian *D. *Language* 23.227-38.
- _____. 1951. Proto-Malayo-Polynesian *Z. *Language* 27.534-40.
- _____. 1953a. The Proto-Malayo-Polynesian laryngeals. Baltimore; Linguistic Society of America.
- _____. 1953 b. Dempwolff's *R. *Language* 27.534-40.
- _____. 1965. Formosan evidence for some new Proto-Austronesian phonemes. *Lingua* 14.285-305.
- _____. 1971. The Austronesian languages and Proto-Austronesian. In *Current trends in linguistics Volume 8*, ed. by Thomas A. Sebeok, 5-54. The Hague: Mouton.
- _____. 1978. Proto-Ambonic evidence for additional Proto-Austronesian vowels. In *Spectrum: Essays presented to Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana on his seventieth birthday*, ed. by S. Udin, 390-9. Jakarta: Dian Rakyat.
- _____. and SHIGERU TSUCHIDA. 1984. Proto-Austronesian laterals and nasals. Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Suva, Fiji.

¹ Publications appearing in Blust's references have not generally been reported here unless they are germane to this review.

- FERRELL, RALEIGH. 1969. Taiwan aboriginal groups: Problems in cultural and linguistic classification. Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, Monograph Number 17. Taipei.
- _____. 1982. Paiwan dictionary. Pacific Linguistics C.73. Canberra: Australian National University.
- HEADLAND, THOMAS N. and JANET D. 1974. A Dumagat (Casiguran)-English dictionary. Pacific Linguistics C.28. Canberra: Australian National University.
- NOTHOFFER, BERND. 1975. The reconstruction of Proto-Malayo-Javanic. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- PAZ, CONSUELO J. 1981. A reconstruction of Proto-Philippine phonemes and morphemes. Publication 3 of the Cecilio Lopez Archives of Philippine Languages and the Philippine Linguistics Circle. Diliman: University of the Philippines.
- PRENTICE, D. J. 1974. Yet another PAN phoneme? Papers of the First International Conference on Comparative Austronesian Linguistics. Oceanic Linguistics 13.33-75.
- REID, LAWRENCE A., ed. 1971. Philippine minor languages: Word lists and phonologies. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication Number 8. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- _____. 1982. The demise of Proto-Philippines. Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics Volume 2. Pacific Linguistics C.75.201-16.
- TSUCHIDA, SHIGERU. 1976. Reconstruction of Proto-Tsouic phonology. Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa Monograph Series Number 5. Tokyo.
- WOLFF, JOHN U. 1974. Proto-Austronesian *r and *d. Papers from the First International Conference on Comparative Austronesian Linguistics. Oceanic Linguistics 13.77-121.
- _____. 1976. Malay borrowings in Tagalog. Southeast Asian history and historiography essays presented to D. G. E. Hall, 345-67. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- _____. 1982. Proto-Austronesian *c, *z, *g, and *T. Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Volume 2. Pacific Linguistics C.75.1-30.
- ZORC, R. DAVID. 1972. The Western subgroups of Bisayan. Oceanic Linguistics 11.2.110-39.
- _____. 1977. The Bisayan dialects of the Philippines: Subgrouping and reconstruction. Pacific Linguistics C.44.
- _____. 1978. Proto-Philippine word accent: innovation or Proto-Hesperonesian retention? Papers from the Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Fascicle 1. Pacific Linguistics C.61.67-119.
- _____. 1981. Review of Consuelo J. Paz, A Reconstruction of Proto-Philippine phonemes and morphemes (1981). Philippine Journal of Linguistics 12.2.44-50.
- _____. 1982. Where, oh where, have the laryngeals gone? Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Volume 2. Pacific Linguistics C.75.111-44.
- _____. 1983. Proto Austronesian accent revisited. Philippine Journal of Linguistics 14.1.1-24.
- _____. 1984. The genetic relationships of Philippine languages. Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Suva, Fiji.
- _____. In progress. Core etymological dictionary of Filipino. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines. (Fascicles 1-4 [A-L] have appeared as LSP

Publication Numbers 12 (August 1979, reprinted March 1983), 13 (December 1981), 14 (September 1982), and 25 (January 1985).

APPENDIX LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

–	Morpheme boundary
+	Suspect monosyllabic root boundary
*	A reconstructed (hypothetical) parent form/etymology
>	Went to, became
<	Came from, descended from
: :	Is cognate with, is directly related to
Abr	Aborlan Tagbanwa (Southern Palawan)
Akl	Aklanon (West Bisayan)
(B)	Reconstructed by Blust
Bik	Bikol (usually Naga dialect is implied)
Bon	Bontok (Central Cordilleran)
Bot	Botolan (Sambal)
Btk	Batak (Southern Palawan)
Cas	Casiguran (Dumagat)
Ceb	Cebuano (Bisayan)
CPh	Central Philippine
Dbl	Doublet
Dsj	Disjunct
Han	Hanunoo (South Mangyan)
Hil	Hiligaynon (Central Bisayan)
Ilk	Ilokano (Cordilleran)
Isg	Isneg (Central Cordilleran)
Kal	Kalamian (especially, Kalamian/Northern Tagbanwa)
K-C	Kalamansig-Cotabato (Southern Manobo)
Knk	Kankanay (Central Cordilleran)
Kyp	Kayapa-Kallahan (South Cordilleran)
Mex	Mexican
Mon	Monosyllabic root
NPh	Northern Philippine
PAN	Proto Austronesian
PHF	Proto Hesperonesian and Formosan (= Blust's PAN)
PHN	Proto Hesperonesian (Western Malayo-Polynesian)
PMP	Proto Malayo-Polynesian
Png	Pangasinan (South Cordilleran)
PNP	Proto Northern Philippine
PPH	Proto Philippine
PSP	Proto Southern Philippine
SCr	South Cordilleran
S-L	Samar-Leyte (Central Bisayan)
Sp	Spanish
Sub	Subanon
Syn	Synonym(s)
Tag	Tagalog (usually Manila dialect is implied)
Tbl	Tboli = Tagabili (Bilic)
Tir	Tiruray (Bilic)
Tsg	Tausug (South Bisayan)
WBM	Western Bukidnon Manobo (Western Inland Manobo)
x	A widespread loan, not proposed as a reconstruction
(Z)	Reconstructed by Zorc