

A *Dumagat (Casiguran) – English Dictionary*. By THOMAS N. and JANET D. HEADLAND. The Australian National University. 1974.

Reviewed by CURTIS D. McFARLAND, De La Salle University

I suppose the first question that arises is why one would want to buy a dictionary of Casiguran Dumagat. The speakers of these language number at most a few thousand and live in remote areas in eastern Luzon. Few of us, including linguists, are likely ever to meet and converse with a Dumagat. Nor are we likely to have occasion to read anything written in this language. Thus this dictionary does not serve the most usual purpose of a dictionary, as does a dictionary of Tagalog, Ilocano, or for that matter, a dictionary of Bontoc or Tausog.

If on the other hand, you are interested in comparative Philippine linguistics, either for the purpose of reconstructing the historical development of Philippine languages or for the purpose of broadening your insights about Philippine languages in general, you will find this dictionary a very interesting and valuable contribution to your library.

Data on Casiguran Dumagat will contribute to the investigation of a number of historical questions. The first of these has to do with the subgrouping of the language itself. As pointed out on page *ix*, Casiguran Dumagat, along with its close relatives, constitutes one of the more remote divisions of Philippine grouping. These languages appear to be as different from the main body of Philippine languages as Ilongot, Ivatan, Tiruray, and T'boli. Their exact position has still to be resolved.

Another question has to do with the mid-level sub-grouping of the Austronesian languages in the Philippines. We have made considerable progress in recent years with regard to lower level sub-grouping, e.g. the determination of such groups as Northern Cordilleran, Central Cordilleran, Tagalic or Meso-Philippine, etc. We haven't really begun to attack the question of mid-level sub-grouping. For example, is there a clearly defined Proto-Philippine, the ancestor of a Philippine subgrouping; that is, a sub-group including nearly all of the languages of the Philippines and few languages outside the Philippines? Do the languages of the central and southern Philippines constitute a single sub-group? Data from a language such as Casiguran Dumagat will make a big contribution in investigating such questions.

A third very intriguing question has to do with (1) the history of the Negritos and (2) the question of how they came to adopt Austronesian languages and of what happened to their original idioms. It is widely held that the Negritos are descended from the earliest or earlier inhabitants of the Philippines. And yet they all seem to speak languages which are clearly Austronesian, and, furthermore, usually closely related to nearby Philippine languages. For example, the Negritos of Botolan, Zambales, speak the same dialect of Sambal as the "Pilipino" residents of Botolan. The Agta of Pamplona, Cagayan, speak a dialect which is very similar to the Northern dialect of Ibanag. Similarly, as Headland points out, Casiguran Dumagat is quite similar to Casiguranin 'the language of the indigenous non-Negrito population of Casiguran' (page *vii*). Clearly, at some point, the Negritos abandoned their original languages and adopted Austronesian languages. We will not here speculate on the circumstances which motivated such a development. What we would like to know is whether these original languages have disappeared totally and without a trace, or whether it is possible to discover an earlier sub-stratum which has survived up to the pre-

sent. Investigation of this question will not only contribute to our understanding of the development of the Negrito languages in the Philippines but also to the investigation of languages in other areas, such as Melanesia, where the presence of sub-strata has been offered as one of the reasons for the great diversity in that area.

This dictionary satisfies both purposes discussed above. It presents a solid synchronic lexicon. It also contains a number of features of distinctly comparative-historical interest.

The occurrence of an eight-vowel system in Casiguran Dumagat is very interesting. And Headland has presented a very thorough and reasonable explanation for the development of eight vowels out of the original four vowels of Proto-Austronesian. The question that comes to my mind is whether the eight-way distinction is maintained in all environments or whether neutralization occurs in some environments as happens in a number of Philippine languages. For example, for most speakers of Tagalog, a long *o* is phonemically distinct from a long *u* (e.g. *oso* 'bear', *uso* 'current style'). The corresponding short vowels are not distinct. In Ibanag and other Northern Cordilleran languages, *a* and *ə* are distinct in some environments but not in all. I observe that many of the minimal pairs listed on pages *xiv-xviii* illustrated distinctions which occur in final syllables or in doubled monosyllables. Can minimal pairs be found to support eight-vowel distinctions in other environments, in particular in the penultimate syllable of a non-doubled word? I leave this as a question, but I suspect that the answer is 'no'.

By the way, this vowel system illustrates one of the orthographic problems which is still to be solved. There are simply not enough symbols to represent more than five or six vowels. Headland has solved the problem by using diacritics for three vowels. This is not a particularly satisfactory solution, but I don't know any better way.

As mentioned above, Headland's discussion of the historic development of Casiguran vowels is thorough and interesting. I wish he had also shown us the development of Casiguran consonants, which would seem to be equally interesting.

The discussion of grammar is brief, but I think quite clear, at least to anyone familiar with another Philippine language. This approach is also a more satisfactory approach to defining or demonstrating the meanings of the various pronominal forms, noun markers, verbal affixes, rather than trying to deal with them in the body of the dictionary.

Looking now at the body of the dictionary, I find a number of attractive features which are frequently not contained in dictionaries.

Headland has marked the 400 most frequent words in the language on the basis of 25,000 words of text, and has indicated the number of occurrences of these words in the texts. This is very useful on a number of grounds. If you are doing lexicostatistics and find a number of words listed with the same meaning, this marking enables you to determine which is the more frequent or preferred of the various synonyms. Also if you are scanning the dictionary looking for cognates, it is possible to look first at the most frequent items, since this is where most of the interesting cognates are to be found. This feature is an excellent illustration of the uses that can be made of concordance programs in preparing a dictionary. I assume that Headland also found these concordance data very useful in selecting the less frequent items to be included in his dictionary.

In the entries themselves Headland deserves high marks on a number of scores. His definitions seem to be quite complete and precise. They are supplemented by ample examples. His cross-referencing is excellent. He identifies numerous synonyms and makes

frequent reference to words with related though not synonymous meanings. In certain areas of 'semantic clustering' he includes extensive lists of related items, such as types and stages of development of rice. A related point is that the English index seems to be quite complete, and well prepared.

In principle the practice of identifying borrowings is very useful in comparative work. Unfortunately, Headland has confined himself to the identification of Spanish, English, Chinese, and a very few Tagalog borrowings, that is, to words whose source is probably obvious to any scholar in the field. In view of the extensive borrowing into Dumagat from Tagalog, Ilocano, and other Philippine languages, and in view of our interest in distinguishing these borrowings from what is genuinely Dumagat, it would have been much more useful if Headland had been able to identify those borrowings for us. With his knowledge of the historical phonology of Dumagat, and the great distance separating Dumagat from these languages, it should have been relatively easy to identify these borrowings.

Just a couple of additional negative points about an otherwise excellent piece of work: In most cases, Headland has identified various stems as verbs. From his discussion of verbs in the introduction, we can see that the choice of affixes is unpredictable, or at best based on a complicated set of rules. It is to be desired that he adopt some method of identifying the primary affixes with which the stem combines, either by listing the full forms or through some symbolic representation. The same is true for sub-entries for verbs derived from nouns or adjectives.

Headland tells us (page *vii*) that accent is shown only on the stems at the head of entries but not on sub-entries or examples. It would have been better either to mark the accent on the sub-entries or to explain at some point the rules governing the shifting of accent. If accent does not shift, he should tell us this.

On the whole it is an outstanding job with many strong points and only a few weaknesses.