

REVIEWS

LLAMZON, TEODORO A. 1978. Handbook of Philippine language groups. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Reviewed by Lawrence A. Reid, University of Hawaii

Dr. Llamzon's long-awaited handbook has at last appeared. It is a very attractive volume consisting of two main parts. The first is a series of three essays on the Philippines and the Filipinos, giving first a historical background, and then general statements on the cultural characteristics of Philippine language groups, and their general linguistic features. The second part provides capsule statements on various aspects of the culture and languages of 25 language groups – presented geographically in a general north-to-south direction. The groups described are Ivatan, Ilokano, Ibanag, Itawes, Kalinga, Ifugaw, Bontok, Kankana-i, Pangasinan, Pampango, Tagalog, Bikol, Hanunoo-Mangyan, Ilonggo, Waray, Sebuano, Aborlan Tagbanwa, Batak, Bukidnon, Mamanwa, Maranaw, Magindanaw, Bilaan, Tausug and Bajau. Each of these sections is followed by a brief (about 5-10 items) suggested reading list, and the volume is completed with two and a half pages of general references.

The Handbook of Philippine Language Groups (HPLG) purports to be a compilation and summary of scientific reports on the 25 ethnic groups included in the book. The stated purpose of the volume is to make this basic information available to as wide an audience as possible. There is no doubt in my mind that this attractive volume, published with the financial assistance of UNESCO, will be widely distributed and will soon form part of libraries throughout the Philippines and perhaps elsewhere. I am not so sure, however, that those who buy this work will get their money's worth. It is unfortunate that a scholar of the stature of Teodoro Llamzon has allowed a work of this sort to be published without taking painstaking care to ensure that the multitudinous errors of fact and interpretation that occur throughout the book were not eliminated.

This is a serious criticism to make, and were it not for the impression that this book will make, because of the stature both of the author and of the funding agencies, I would hesitate to discuss these problems. However, the data are supposedly taken from scientific reports, and we must scrutinize them to ensure that in fact what we are getting is scientific information, even though it is clothed in 'popular' language.

The author claims that HPLG is 'primarily linguistic in nature and aims to acquaint the reader with the basic structures of the most important languages'. It is typical of the inconsistencies in HPLG that although the 25 languages described are here claimed to be the most important (although why is never mentioned), the previous sentence tells us that the languages were chosen primarily because data on them were available and they were accessible to field work, in order 'to fill in the lacunae and to check the accuracy of the data'. It is clear that Dr. Llamzon did in fact do fieldwork, but apparently not for the purpose he cited. All of the illustrative sentences in HPLG are from his fieldwork, and as we shall see, suffer from the problems that all fieldworkers face when too little time is spent ascertaining the accuracy of their data. The analysis of the data likewise is not from published analyses, but is the author's own attempt to fit the linguistic facts that he was able to pick up during the course of his too brief fieldwork into a single framework, a task which he accomplished with varying degrees of success.

As far as the ethnographic information is concerned, the author likewise has not provided us with a summary of the published material. He has, instead, taken one or two works for each language, and copied sentences verbatim from them (often without appropriate source citations), stringing them together out of context into a *Sunday*

Magazine type of popular presentation. What we are given is a potpourri of oddities, frequently reminiscent of the 'curiosity shoppe' approach to ethnography that one would expect from a 19th century traveller, rather than the careful, succinct description of the societies that one would expect.

Having made these criticisms, let me proceed to document them. Because of limitations of space, I shall restrict myself to comments on three of the groups, Ivatan, Ilokano, and Bontok, although similar comments could be drawn for many of the other groups described in HPLG.

The linguistic characterization of the language groups follows the system briefly described in the essay citing 'General Linguistic Features of Philippine Languages', i.e. a statement of the phonemes, charts of the personal and demonstrative pronouns and the case-marking particles, an indication of the form of the Linker, lists of cardinal, ordinal and distributive numerals, a table indicating the system of verb affixation, and finally a list of between 20-25 illustrative sentences.

The charts of pronouns and particles are organized by case. In each language, the author identifies the cases by citing one of the case-marking particles of the singular common noun phrase, as in Tagalog *ang*, *ng* and *sa*. They are not otherwise labeled. In the general description of Philippine syntax, however, he indicates that the three cases in the paradigm are 'nominative, possessive and goal/locative' (30). Although this description may be appropriate for some Philippine languages, it certainly is not appropriate for Ivatan. The cases of the pronominal sets are given for Ivatan as *o*, *so* and *do*. Whereas, *o* is nominative, and *do* can perhaps be characterized as goal/locative, *so* can never be used as possessive, or genitive. The possessive case in Ivatan is *no* (Hidalgo 1971:230-231, Reid 1966:85), and *so* is accusative, marking indefinite object noun phrases. An NP marked by *so* cannot have a pronoun substituting for it, since pronouns always have definite reference. The *so* pronouns that are cited in HPLG have a variety of functions. Seven of them are actually *do* or goal/locative pronouns. They are: *diaken* 1s., *dimoq* 2s., *diraq* 3s., (should be *diyaaq*), *diaten* li.p., *diamen* le.p., *dinyoq* 2p., and *diraq* 3p. *Koq* 1s., *moq* 2s., *taq* li.p., *namen* le.p., *nियोq* 2p., and *daq* 3p., are *no* or possessive pronouns. *Niyaaq* which is cited as a *so* case, enclitic 3s. pronoun, is actually part of a pronominal set otherwise not appearing in the data. This set (*niaken*, *nimoq*, *niyaaq*, *niaten*, *niamen*, *ninyoq* and *niraq* – following the author's spelling conventions), substitute for what has been described for Ivatan as the *no* or associative NP, carrying, among others, the case relations of instrument and object of comparison. One other form cited in HPLG as belonging to the *so* personal pronouns ('*naw* enclitic 3 s.') is actually a demonstrative pronoun.

Similar problems also are found in the listing of the *do* pronouns. The 3s. form is cited as either *yaq* or *diq*. The first of these two forms is a nominative demonstrative meaning 'this', the second is neither a personal pronoun nor a demonstrative but the personal singular noun marker, corresponding to *do*. The correct form is *diyaaq*.

The chart of case-marking particles lists both *so* and *no* as meaning possessive case. As indicated above, *so* is accusative, not possessive. The list of non-personal plural forms cited in HPLG is identical to the singular. However, in Ivatan a plural morpheme *sa* is used to indicate plurality, e.g. *o chito na sa* 'his dogs'. Singular personal nouns in the *do* case are shown as being marked by either *di*, *sa* or *da*. Only *di* may be so used. *Sa* marks a nominative plural personal noun, e.g. *minodi sa Juan* 'Juan (plural) went home'. *Da* marks either genitive, associative or locative plural personal nouns, e.g. *Minodi kami da Juan* 'We went home to Juan's family's place'.

The Linker, or Ligature, is one of the most important features of Philippine syntax, yet it is not mentioned in the description of general features of Philippine languages. HPLG cites the Ivatan Linker as '*aka* (with numerals only)'. The implication being that only between a numeral and a noun does a linker occur. In fact, a linker occurs in all Head-Attribute constructions, its form being *a*, e.g. *anak a mahakay* 'male child, son'.

Although accent is listed as a phoneme for Ivatan in HPLG, it is not consistently marked on Ivatan words. Among the numerals, for example, *asaq*, *apat* and *anem* all have initial long vowels and should either be marked with accent (as in Reid 1966:100), or with a geminate vowel to correspond to the reduplication found in the other pronouns, e.g., *dadowa*, *tatdo*, *dadima*, etc. Representation of glottal stop is also inconsistent, with *tatdoq* showing a final glottal stop, but *dadima* showing none. Although in HPLG it is never represented word initially, reflecting the author's interpretation of Tagalog phonology (Llamzon 1968:34), he frequently indicates its occurrence at the end of a word, where it is phonemic in Tagalog, but it is not in Ivatan. In Basco, all phonological words which would otherwise end in a vowel have an excrescent glottal stop optionally attached. It is not contrastive in this position.

The chart by which HPLG attempts to display verbal affixation, marks actor, goal, location and instrument foci in its vertical parameters, with non-finite, finite and gerund 'moods' in its horizontal parameters. Four 'finite moods' are given – imperfect, perfect, future, and recent past – reflecting once again the author's analysis of Tagalog. This system does not adequately represent the majority of Philippine languages (a fact noted by the author (HPLG p. 30)), which rather make a single distinction between actions presently completed (i.e. past), or presently non-completed (i.e. present or future). To each of these sets of affixes (not just the nonpast as indicated by the author), reduplication, or some equivalent device, can be attached to mark continuing action, i.e. past imperfect, present continuous, etc.

E.G. Ilokano

agsarita	agsarsarita
speaks, will speak	is speaking, will be speaking
nagsarita	nagsarsarita
spoke	was speaking

Recent past although marked distinctively in most Philippine languages is syntactically and morphologically at variance with the rest of the tense-aspect system and does not form a part of it.

Ivatan has one of the most complex verbal systems of all Philippine languages, and its representation in HPLG does not begin to adequately characterize it. Imperfect, future and recent past columns are all marked with zero. Ivatan, however, marks continuing action with either length on the final vowel of the verb stem or by partial reduplication of the verb stem (Hidalgo 1971:74-75). Even the forms of the affixes given in the Ivatan verb chart in HPLG are in several cases wrong. A contrast between *om* 'non-finite', and *um* 'finite perfect' is given. However, there are no back vowel contrasts in Ivatan as indicated in the vowel chart (HPLG p. 34). The correct forms should be either *-om-* and *-omin-* respectively, or *-um-* and *-umin-*, depending on one's representation of the back vowel. HPLG does not list *may-* (from PAN **maR-*) or *mang-* anywhere on the chart, even though they are as important to Ivatan verb formation as *mag-* and *mang-* are to Tagalog. The sequence *pa-* + *en*, is characterized as nonfinite, instrument focus. In fact, it is a causative goal focus form. I am completely unable to interpret the meaning of *s* + *vv* given as the form of the Ivatan gerund and the author provides no key to these symbols.

The illustrative sentences for Ivatan are good examples of over translation. All indefinite nouns have been translated with the numeral 'one', e.g. a 'window' is translated: *asa ka vahay* 'one window', even though, as in most Philippine languages, accusative NP's in active focus sentences require an indefinite interpretation without specification of a numeral one. Attempts to make explicit the future tense of a verb like Tagalog *magbú-bukas* have resulted in the insertion of *anti* into the Ivatan sentence even though without

it, the sentence is interpretable as future. Attempts to elicit instrument focus verbs with sentences like 'Use the pail to get water', have resulted in sentences with *serbien* 'to use' rather than instrument focus verb forms which occur in Ivatan probably as frequently as in they do Tagalog. Finally, in order to translate the Tagalog imperfect sentences, the informant has resorted to paraphrases using the existential verb *tayto*.

Many of the problems indicated for the HPLG treatment of Ivatan can also be found in its treatment of Ilokano; beginning from the completely ungrammatical Ilokano sentence given on p. 30, where *Agsarita iloko si Pedro* supposedly means 'Pedro speaks Iloko'. The appropriate Ilokano should be *Agsarita ni Pedro ti iloko*.

The forms used to characterize the Ilokano cases in HPLG are *iti* nominative, ϕ genitive and *idiay* locative. *Iti* is a determiner (but rarely used nominatively) whereas *idiay* is a demonstrative: There is no dialect of Ilokano to my knowledge which does not mark the genitive case. The facts are that nominative and genitive cases are both marked by the same set of forms, *ti* 'singular common', *ni* 'singular personal', *dagiti* 'plural common', and *da* 'plural personal'. Word order, agent before patient, eliminates ambiguity. *Ti* also marks indefinite accusative NPs. *Iti* primarily marks singular common locative NPs. Its plural form is *kadagiti*.

The pronominal forms in the chart are also confusing. There are no second or third person plural forms given. *Isina* and *isu* are given as non-enclitic and enclitic forms respectively, of the 3s. nominative pronoun. In fact, neither is enclitic, they are simply free variants. The search for non-enclitic genitive pronouns in the northern Philippine languages to correspond to the *atin*, *amin*, *inyo*, etc. series in Tagalog apparently still continues. In fact there are none. Forms such as Ilokano *kukuwak* and *bagik* which are cited as non-enclitic genitive pronouns in HPLG are genitively possessed nouns, *kukua* 'goods, possessions, property, commodities; things' and *bagi* 'share, portion, part, lot' (Vanoverbergh 1956). The enclitic genitives *ku* and *k*, and *mu* and *m* are phonologically conditioned variants of one another.

The listing of three sets of demonstratives for Ilokano is also misleading. There are five sets. The *daytay* 'recent' and *daydi* 'remote' sets are missing.

The Ilokano verb formation chart, although more complete than the Ivatan, is still far from complete. The listing of *i-* + *-an* as instrument focus is inaccurate. This combination marks benefactive focus. In Ilokano, as in other Cordilleran languages, instrument and benefactive foci are formally distinguished, unlike Tagalog where they are marked in the same way. The appropriate Ilokano form for instrument is *i-*. The locative focus form is *-an*, with *pag-* + *-an* being its nominalized counterpart. The chart should also have shown the time focus form *panang-*. This form is also missing from the gerund column, as are the other gerundives *pannaka-* and *pannaki-*.

The illustrative sentences given for Ilokano are generally accurate. The following corrections, however, should have been made. Sentence 2 should have *idiay kusina* for 'in the kitchen' not *diay kusina* which is a nominative phrase. Sentence 6 should have a glottal stop after the reduplication, i.e. *umin-inum*, not *umininum*. Sentence 11 should have *parpartiyən*, not *parpartiyən*. Sentence 26 should show a glottal stop in the verb 'waiting', *ur-urtyən* rather than *ururtyen*.

Although a considerable amount of material has been published on the Bontok language, e.g. Reid 1963, 1964, 1971a, b, 1976 (none of which were cited in the bibliographical references), it is apparent that the author did not refer to it during the preparation of HPLG. The phonological statement inaccurately represents Bontok as having both *l* and *r* phonemes. These sounds are in complementary distribution in Bontok. The distribution is cited in several places in the published literature. *r* is also listed as a phoneme in Ifugao and Kankana-i. In neither of these languages is it contrastive. However, in Kalinga, palatal [lʲ] which appears in approximately the same environment as [r] does in Bontok and Ifugao is listed as an allophone of /l/ (see Reid 1973).

Bontok pronouns are correctly represented apart from the following: 1s. *nominative* non-enclitic *sakqan* should be *sakqən*, and the oblique plural forms have been incorrectly aligned in the chart. There are no oblique enclitic forms as the chart implies, *kən dakayu* is 2p. nonenclitic, and *kən daidd* is 3p. non-enclitic. Since the other forms have been listed phonemically, using *q* for glottal stop, all 3p. and dual forms which are listed with a vowel sequence (*daida*, *daita*), should have a medial glottal stop (*daqida*, *daqita*). (Bontok does not have a canonical form V, all syllables start with a consonant.)

A variety of errors are found in the demonstrative chart. The syllable initial variant of /d/, which is [ts], has been improperly heard as [s] in the following forms: *satunqa*, *satunsa* (the second *s* in the latter form is correct, but there is no *n* in the form), *tusi*, and *tadtusi*. The phonemically correct forms are respectively *datunga*, *datusa*, *tudi*, and *datudi*. The chart also combines forms from at least four different paradigmatic sets. The alternation of *datuna* and *datunqa*, and *datusa* and *datusqa* given as genitive forms, illustrates one of the differences between two of these sets. The presence of a glottal stop following the final consonant, however, not only occurs optionally in these plural forms, it may occur in all *tu*- initial demonstratives, both singular and plural. These forms, moreover, both with and without *q*, are restricted to personal reference, i.e. this person, that person, etc. The form listed as *nandida* (*nandayda*), apparently represents *nan dəqəyda* 'those (common, far)', and is from a different paradigm from the personal forms with which it is placed.

The complete list of Bontok demonstratives as they occur in a nominative NP is found in Chart 1. It will be noted that the [+pers] and [-pers] forms are preceded by the appropriate nominal marker, *nan*, *si* or *da*. The forms marked [+pers] only occur as nominatives and are not preceded by the nominal markers. The [+pers] and [-pers] forms also occur as demonstratives in genitive and oblique NP's with the appropriate case marking particles preceding them. The forms listed in HPLG as oblique demonstratives *siná*, *sisá*, and *sidí* are actually locative demonstratives. They also have variant forms with an excrescent glottal stop, *sinqa*, *sisqa* and *sidqi*. Each of these locative demonstratives, beginning as they do with *s*, are post-consonantal variants. Post-vocalic variants also occur. The form *isna* (correctly *qisná*) is a variant which along with the unlisted *qissá* and *qisdí* occurs in isolation or in deliberate, or slow speech; *qis* is one of the Bontok locative markers.

Chart 1. Bontok Nominative Demonstratives

	Near speaker		Near hearer		Far	
	[+sg]	[-sg]	[+sg]	[-sg]	[+sg.]	[-sg]
[±pers]	ná	daná	sá	dasá	dí	dadí
[+pers]	si tuná	da tuná	si tusá	da tusá	si tudí	da tudí
	si tunqá	da tunqá	si tusqá	da tusqá	si tudqí	da tudqí
[-pers]	nan náqay	nan náqayda	nan sána	nan sánada	nan dóqəy	nan dóqəyda

The Bontok case-marking particles that are listed are both incomplete and in some cases inaccurate. The nominative *nən* should be *nan*. The explicit plural form, which is listed as *nan*, should be *nan da*. The phonetics of the personal plural *da* given as [tsa] in the nominative and [ča] in the genitive is misleading. The forms are of course identical. The one major difference between the nominative and the genitive forms which the author apparently completely missed is that the genitive requires an enclitic *-n* on vowel final stems preceding a genitive NP, e.g. *qábun nan laláki* 'the man's house', but *qásu-n nan*

lalŕki 'the man's dog'. This is also true when the genitive is a personal noun, e.g. *qābun Juan* 'John's house' but *qāsun-n Juan* 'John's dog'. HPLG fails to include the marker *san* which appears throughout the Bontok case-marking system as a recent past, anaphoric or strongly referential marker. The cluster of forms given as oblique non-personal singular have the following explanation. *qis* (also -s) and *si* are the postvocalic and post-consonantal variants marking, respectively, accusative (non-specific) and close locative place names in Central Bontok (as well as in Kankanay). The corresponding marker of far locative place names for Central Bontok is not listed in HPLG; it is *qid*, or -d postvocally. The latter does appear, however, in the form *isdid* which is listed, but which is actually a locative demonstrative, *qisdi* (see above) plus -d as would mark the phrase *qisdid Manila* 'there, in Manila'. A form *ad* is also listed. This is the equivalent of *qid* found in a number of dialects of Bontok, such as Guinaang, Malegcong and Mainit. *qad* has a corresponding *qas* 'near locative' in these dialects which is not listed. The form listed as *asnanka* is not a plural form, it probably represents either *qisnan* or *qasnan* 'oblique, singular, specific' noun markers, plus *ka-* a prefix attaching to locative nouns of foreign origin, e.g. *ka-market*, *ka-garahe*, etc. The function of *sid* which is also listed as an oblique form is unknown to me.

The problem of fitting the verb forms of a northern Philippine language into a grid set up for a language such as Tagalog has already been discussed above.

The problem noted above for Ilokano in which the benefactive focus affixation is cited as instrument focus is also present in the Bontok verb formation chart. *I-* + *-an* is not instrument focus, it is benefactive. The presence of *pang-* at various points on the chart is also an error. Bontok has lost all reflexes of **pan-*, **paR-*, **paki-* and **paka-* affixes. Such forms are present only as fossilized prefixes on a few lexical items such as *pangegnanan* 'handle (i.e., place for holding)'. The forms listed as location focus are in fact all nominalizations which may or may not signify location, depending upon context. These forms also are used as gerunds.

Although future has been explicitly marked in the appropriate illustrative sentences with *tu* or *-ntu* (No. 5, 12, 19), these future adverbs are certainly not Bontok forms. They are Ilokano, and reveal an informant whose Bontok is heavily influenced by that language. Other problems with the data indicate that the informant was probably out of touch with his mother tongue. These include: No. 1 incorrect stress on the word for child. It should be *qungqungá*. No. 2 use of Tagalog *sa* as a locative marker rather than *qasnan*, or *qisnan*. No. 3 the missing genitive *-n* in the phrase *bintána-n nan qabung* 'window of the house'. No. 9 (b) *nənpartiyen*, should have an *-an* suffix, not *-en* (or *-ən*). No. 10, which is supposedly benefactive focus, should have the benefactive phrase 'for the child' in the nominative: *nan qungqungá*, not *páras nan unqúnga*. No. 18 is clumsy and probably ungrammatical. It should be *Layden nan qina ay mangipaltis manuk paras nan qungqunga* 'The mother wants to kill a chicken for the child'. No. 19 and No. 20 and other sentences which have their subjects in final position are unnatural. The subjects of Bontok non-actor focus sentences properly come immediately after the agent NP. The word order as it is given in HPLG is apparently the result of literal translation from the Tagalog equivalents. Thus, a sentence such as No. 20 *Iparpartiyen nan inas manuk nan unqungunga* has as its first (if not its only) interpretation, 'The mother killed the child's chicken for someone (unspecified)', in which child is interpreted as genitive, not nominative.

The inaccurate representation of Bontok sounds mentioned above when discussing the demonstratives, is, unfortunately, found also in the illustrative sentences, as well as in the numerals, and in the list of kinship terms. A recurring problem is the inability to distinguish between aspirated [k^h], a variant of /g/ in syllable initial position, and unaspirated [k], which contrasts with it. Sentence No. 6 has *táku* for *tágu* 'person', No. 7 has *ákas* for *qágas* 'medicine'. In the numerals, *gasut* 'hundred' is consistently misrepresented as *kasut*; likewise, among the kinship terms, *aki* should be *agi*, and *kattugangan* should be *kattugangan*.

Other errors in the representation of Bontok numerals include the following:

Cited in HPLG	Correct Form
4. upát	qəpát
6. inám	qənám
10. simúqu	sinpúqu
11. simpúyu ya isá	sinpúqu ya qəsá
12. sinpuyu ya čuwa	sinpúqu ya duwá
20. duwampúu ya isá	duwan púqu ya qəsá
30. talumpúu	tulun púqu
40. upát púu	qəpat púqu
101. sənkasút ya sá	sin-gasút ya qəsá
102. duwáy kasút	duwán gasút
400. upát ay kasút	qupát gasút
1000. sinlifu	sinlǐbu

Several of the above errors can be shown to be the result of Ilokano influence in the speech of the informant, e.g. the initial vowels of the numerals '4' and '6' both follow Ilokano (*uppat*, *innem*); furthermore, Bontok does not assimilate the nasal of *sin-*, nor the numeral linker *-n*, to the point of articulation of the following consonant. Nasal assimilation of *n* + non-alveolar consonant is required in Ilokano.

The volume of errors both in fact and interpretation which exist in the descriptions of the languages is so great that one can only warn readers to accept nothing as fact without first verifying it against descriptions of the languages prepared by reputable scholars.

But is it possible to find some redeeming feature in the book, perhaps in the three introductory essays? Unfortunately no. The first essay which attempts to trace the historical development of Philippine languages would be rejected by most if not all comparativists as giving an incorrect picture of linguistic development in the Philippines. Llamzon, for example, attempts to date the original dispersal of the Proto-Austronesian speaking peoples by combining an archaeological date for the presence of iron in South China (ca. 1500 to 1000 BC), with a glotto-chronological figure provided by Thomas and Healey for the separation of the Philippine languages from the Chamic languages of Southeast Asia. 'This means', Llamzon says, 'that the early Austronesian speaking Filipinos left their original homeland, together with some other groups who went on to other places, about 1,300 B.C.' (2). The knowledge of iron in PAN is controversial, being rejected by Dyen (1971) who doubts that Fijian *vesi* 'name of spear' implies the presence of iron in Proto-Oceanic times, but is supported by Blust (1977), with reconstructions such as **bari*['iron'], **malat* 'parang, machete', **(cs)al(cs)al* 'blacksmithing', **lanDas-an* 'anvil', and **kara(Ct)* 'rust'. But whether or not the knowledge of iron was part of PAN culture, the dispersal of the Austronesian languages must be dated at considerably earlier than 1,300 B.C., even earlier than 3000 B.C., Dyen's lexicostatistical figure which was rejected by Llamzon as too early. Archaeological evidence, including C-14 dating from the Oceanic area, as reported by Pawley and Green (1973), indicate that the dispersal of Proto-Oceanic could not have been later than 3000 B.C.; and consequently, the dissolution of Proto-Austronesian must have been earlier still.

Llamzon's slavish adherence to glottochronological dates goes counter to all the evidence that such dates must be treated with great scepticism. Furthermore, he perpetuates the myth of sequences of migrations, each responsible for a subgroup of Philippine languages. The first migration he says resulted in the Northern languages of the Philippines with northward migration continuing into Formosa. As evidence he cites 'the presence on the island of Formosa of the Itneg tribe, who are apparently identical to the Itnegs of Abra' (3). A search through the literature supports my own field-work experience that the Formosan Itneg is a myth. There is no group so named in Formosa. One wonders where this piece of 'scientific' information came from.

Llamzon's proposed second migration supposedly also came by way of Borneo (around 100 B.C.), because Tausug, supposedly related to the Central Philippine languages, is located in Sulu. However, Pallesen (1977) has shown that Tausug was a relatively recent intrusion into the area from North East Mindanao about 1300 A.D. This 'second migration' is said to be responsible for the Central Philippine languages. A third migration, which Llamzon says arrived in 'trickles', was supposedly responsible for the Manobo languages (among which he includes Bagobo, which has not been shown to be a Manobo language), and the 'Moro' languages, a disparate group of languages relatable only by the fact that they have embraced Islam. Other 'trickles' are said to have resulted in the languages of Eastern Mindanao (Mandaya-Mansaka) as well as surprisingly Bilaan, T'boli, Tagbanwa of Palawan, Tiruray and Subanon. He also includes Maranaw and Magindanao in the later trickle, although they are also cited as part of the 'Moro' trickle.

The problem with all this is that absolutely no linguistic evidence has ever been presented to prove, or even to give support to, migration theories of this sort. Moreover, it betrays a lack of understanding of the nature of language change. If such a theory were correct, we would be able to link the languages associated with at least the latest migration with the languages at their point of origin. The time of separation of the migrating languages from their homeland would be less than their time of separation from the languages which formed the earlier migration. Each of the Philippine subgroups would be more closely related genetically to some language groups outside the Philippines than they would be to each other. But such has never been shown to be the case. Philippine languages, even those which seem to be most aberrant, such as Ivatan, Ilongot, Bilaan and the like, apparently form part of a single language family. This is not to deny that multiple migrations have taken place. Obviously, they have. The influence of migrations from the north (Formosa) as well as from the south can be seen throughout the Philippines. However, these have only served to add 'strata' to languages which already existed and whose development apparently took place in situ; they were not themselves the congeners of the languages in question. Whether the Austronesian speaking people who originally settled in the Philippines came from the south or the north is a question which is still to be answered.

Although the second essay is a valiant attempt to make generalizations about the cultural characteristics of Philippine groups, it fails most noticeably in believing that homogeneity actually exists and is easily describable. Even among lowland groups great diversity exists now and probably also did during the Spanish and pre-Spanish periods. The author provides us with an idealized view of lowland society, taken from the reports of early *conquistadores*, taking note of their cleanliness, and that they were 'basically monogamous', and that although they drank heavily, 'they never lost complete control of themselves'. On the other hand, he feels it is necessary to discuss the distinctive characteristics of 'pagan' Filipinos, particularly those of the mountain provinces, whom he calls 'Cordillerans', a name he ascribes to Scott (1969). However, Scott never used the name in his book and would probably reject it as implying a Cordilleran vs. Lowlander distinction, a position, that Scott has rejected for many years. Apparently, the author missed the diversity made explicit in the subtitle of Scott's book, 'A look at the peoples and cultures of the Mountain Province'. Scott would also, I believe, reject the implication that his description of the Madukayan of Kalinga is in any way representative of the cultures of the other mountain peoples, nor would his Sagadan be an 'average Cordilleran', nor is it possible to describe a characteristic Cordilleran house, or typical Cordilleran architecture.

What the author fails to note is that the people he describes as 'until recently a headhunting and fierce people' reflect many of 'the cultural features of his own lowland ancestors, including headhunting and an animistic religion which still permeates the belief system of many 'Christianized' and educated lowlanders, and that the distinction between lowlanders and 'Cordillerans' is not an ethnic one but an imposed political and geographic one.

Although the author characterizes the highlanders as 'people who withdrew to the hinterlands upon the encroachment of modern ways of living introduced by the Spaniards and the Americans', a position espoused by Keesing (1962), he ignores the considerable evidence which points to a far longer period of habitation in the mountains, particularly in the Bontok and Ifugao areas.

Apart from these general criticisms, the essay has its share of errors such as incorrect translations: *basi* said to be wine made from nipa palm, and *lambanug*, said to be wine from sugar cane, and the copying of a misprint in Scott (1969), where *olag* is used instead of Bontok *olog* for 'girls' dormitory'.

The third essay, 'General Linguistic Features of Philippine Languages', has a section on the sociolinguistic situation in the Philippines, a section on subgrouping relationships, and a section on phonological, morphological and syntactic features of Philippine languages. The first section provides a good capsule statement on the development of Pilipino as a national language and its position under the new constitution. The second section reports the subgrouping theories from a number of reputable studies. The third section attempts to make statements about the development of Philippine linguistic features from Proto-Austronesian. The description of the development of Philippine personal pronouns is particularly amateurish, containing a series of apparently spot analyses without careful research to support his statements. The following is typical, 'The Northern Philippine Languages introduced two forms [of the third person plural nominative pronoun]; *sikada* which is the Manobo form [*sikanda*] without the nasal and *dida*, which is a combination of *di* [an old locative marker] and the Proto-Austronesian third person plural number nominative *da*'. There is no evidence from Cordilleran languages to support an earlier nasal in this pronoun as the author suggests. Comparative evidence suggests that the Proto-Cordilleran pronoun from which Pangasinan *sikara* (the language most closely resembling the cited *sikada*) and Kalinga, Bontok, etc. *dida* derive was **siqida*. The various analogical processes which resulted in the development of these forms is fully explained in Reid 1974(a) and (b). No old locative marker is responsible, nor is there any evidence that the Manobo form has a parallel history with the Pangasinan form (see also Harmon 1974).

From this section also it would be possible to add a long list of errors both in the data, their translation and their interpretation, but I think enough has been said.

As a Handbook of Philippine Language Groups this work is a failure. We can only hope that its place on the bookshelves will soon be replaced by a work that laymen, as well as linguists and anthropologists; will be able to refer to and be confident that the material contained in it is an accurate representation of the extensive literature now available on this great family of languages.

REFERENCES

- BLUST, ROBERT. 1977. Austronesian culture history: some linguistic inferences and their relationship to the archaeological record. *World Archaeology* 8.19-43.
- HARMON, CAROL W. 1974. Reconstructions of Proto-Manobo pronouns and case-marking particles. University of Hawaii Department of Linguistics Working Papers in Linguistics 6.6.13-46.
- HIDALGO, CESAR A. and ARACELI C. 1971. A tagmemic grammar of Ivatan. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph No. 2*. Manila: University of the Philippines Press.
- KEESING, FELIX M. 1962. *The ethnohistory of Northern Luzon*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

PHILIPPINE JOURNAL OF LINGUISTICS

- LLAMZON, TEODORO A. 1968. Modern Tagalog, a functional-structural approach. Manila: Ateneo Language Center.
- PAWLEY, ANDREW and ROGER GREEN. 1973. Dating the dispersal of the Oceanic languages. Papers of the First International Conference on Comparative Austronesian Linguistics, 1974 – Oceanic. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13.1-68.
- REID, LAWRENCE A. 1963. Phonology of Central Bontoc. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 72.21-26.
- _____. 1964. A matrix analysis of Bontoc case-marking particles. *Oceanic Linguistics* 3.116-137.
- _____. 1966. An Ivatan syntax. *Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 2*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- _____. 1971a. Philippine minor languages: word lists and phonologies. *Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 8*, Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- _____. 1971b. Central Bontoc: discourse, paragraph and sentence structures. *Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields No. 27*, University of Oklahoma Press.
- _____. 1973. Kankanay and the problem *R and *1 reflexes. In Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez, 51-63, *Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph No. 4*, Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- _____. 1974a. The pronominal systems of Proto-Cordilleran, Philippines. *University of Hawaii Department of Linguistics Working Papers in Linguistics* 6.6.1-11.
- _____. 1974b. The Central Cordilleran subgroup of Philippine languages. *Papers of the First International Conference on Comparative Austronesian Linguistics, 1974-Proto-Austronesian and Western Austronesian. Oceanic Linguistics* 13.511-560.
- _____. 1976. Bontok-English dictionary, with English-Bontok finder list. *Pacific Linguistics, Series c, No. 36*. Canberra: Australian National University.
- SCOTT, WILLIAM HENRY. 1966. On the Cordillera. Manila: MCS Enterprises.
- VANOVERBERGH, MORICE. 1956. Iloko-English dictionary. Manila: CICM Press.