

INTRODUCING PHILIPPINEASIAN

By E. Arsenio Manuel

It is my intention in this seminal paper to introduce the term Philippineasian not only in all areas of study in this field but also in Oceanic, Austronesian, and Southeast Asian studies. It is high time to do this because of advances in anthropological research in this part of the world especially in linguistics and archaeology. Before such investigations get too far advanced and terminologies get deeply rooted, it is propitious to review these and examine their reference, context, coverage, and propriety of their usage. The terms Malayo-Polynesian, Indonesian, Malay, and Philippine will necessarily be the focus of our attention and scrutiny as these terms have been used and applied in the past until contemporary times in both scholarly and popularly written works.

My approach will be well within the compass of the anthropological in general terms, though it will be leaning more heavily on the linguistic and archaeological. These biases do not of course preclude all other ways known in anthropology such as those used in ethnological studies. The known facts as established in anthropology, linguistics, archaeology, ethnology and history, whether by general practitioners or specialists, will be used in promoting the consideration and acceptance of the new terms Philippineasia and Philippineasian. I shall of course draw data derived from my own researches which will be used in realigning the known facts. By doing so, a fresh interpretation can be achieved.

Some Background Studies

Initially, I wish to present data under this caption to the barest essentials to show a little of the background of the issues touched in this paper, eliminating details that are not necessary to minimal comprehension. After the age of geographical discoveries and piracy in the high seas, the Europeans came to know other civilizations and hundreds of other societies outside the European world. Colonization and imperialism came to be born, and the maritime powers started to divide the world. More and more discoveries of far-flung places and primitive societies were found and described. Magellan was among the adventurers who reached the Far East to scout for opportunities for trade and possible colonization, and during his event-

ful sojourn brought along a Malay from Malacca, the same native upon whom he depended for communicating to the natives in his voyage around the world to discover a new route to the Far East by sailing west. It is therefore the Malay language that Europe came to know first.

Anthropologists appeared late in the scene and the linguists were the scholars who came to think of classifying the language of the world. In 1814 they coined the term Indo-European to designate a huge area of countries and communities from India to farthest Britain which spoke languages that were related to one another and their common origin suspected and theorized.

Other European linguists also thought that there is such a superfamily of languages in other parts of the world. As vocabularies and wordlists compiled by all kinds of people came to their hands, they found firm ground to call a new superfamily of languages in Oceania Malayo-Polynesian, drawing its extent and coverage from the best known to the least known. We have no information at the moment who coined the term and plotted its course and delineated its boundaries. In later times, especially in the 20th century, the term has been used and applied to cover and include vast regional compartments, namely: Indonesia, Micronesia, Melanesia and Polynesia.

In 20th century studies, Philippine language came to be subsumed under the term Indonesian. In fact, in this work *Introduction to Indonesian Linguistics* (1916), Brandstetter discussed and classified Tagalog among the other languages belonging to the Indonesian subfamily. At this time, a pioneering period in the study and classification of languages in this part of the world, not many Philippine dictionaries and vocabularies were available to European linguists including Brandstetter. In fact, due to this lack, he made use of Jose Rizal as informant and one of Rizal's works in writing that magnum opus. That was to be expected, and this fact does not in any way minimize the high esteem the world has for that pioneering scholar.

The influence of Brandstetter's opus was far reaching to say the least. It did not only subsume Philippine languages under the schema Indonesian, but it also affected the thinking of other comparative linguists of the period, culminating in the

decades following in the work of Otto Dempwolff, the *Vergleichende Lautlehre des Austronesischen Wortchatzes* (1934-1938). In this giant of a work, Dempwolff used three languages, one of them being Tagalog, and put them under the subfamily Indonesian, a step forward in the reconstruction of the parent speech of the four subfamilies of languages named previously.

Then came the general linguists who wrote introductory works on linguistics. Among them, Gleason (1955:470) wrote: "The whole Philippine area uses Indonesian languages: Tagalog, Bisayan and Ilocano are the best known."

That is not all. After World War II, the linguists of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, Philippine Branch, in their works prefer to use Malayo-Polynesian rather than Austro-nesian, the less culturally-loaded term, whenever called upon to use an umbrella-cover term. It is not necessary at this point to single out individual works in this paper.

In folklore studies, Ronald B. Dixon of Harvard in discussing Philippine mythology in his *Oceanic (Mythology)*, 1916, being volume IX of *The Mythology of All Races* series, put this under Indonesian, thus drowning in a way the individuality and relevance of Philippine traditions and their probable connection with others of Formosa or Taiwan and mainland Asia. In another instance, another leading authority on Oceanic traditional lore, Kathleen Loumala, of the University of Hawaii, contented herself presenting the Philippine material under Indonesian, so that there is no entry provided in the *Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology and Legends* (1949, 2 vols.) for Philippine mythology separate from Indonesian.

In the above elucidation, scholarship has not become aware that Philippine culture might be older than Indonesian or Polynesian which we will try to demonstrate in a little while. I believe, then, that this usage should not be allowed to continue, for aside from other grounds, Indonesian has come to acquire a political connotation and significance after gaining its independence. Will Philippine languages be a good case then of "a speech community" coinciding "with political boundaries" (Hockett 1958:8) though in a generalized sense?

Complications Arising from the Use of Malayo-Polynesian

The term Malayo-Polynesian and its derivative Malayan have penetrated national thinking and behavior very deeply, in almost all aspects of this country's culture, history, literature, biography, and the arts. These terminologies have generated concepts and ideas that disturb Filipino identity and nationality. The historians and scholars of this country before the 20th century, as everyone in the academe knows, were foreigners, most of them Spaniards. Their works can be examined and all of them from the beginning to the 19th century point to the Malays, with the exception of the Negritos, as the origin of the Filipino people. In other words, Filipinos are descendants of Malays. All subsequent historians, foreigners and Filipinos alike, have accepted this view as proved fact and the truth. This alacrity on the part of foreign and Filipino writers, scholars or not, may be ascribed to the writings of the Spanish chroniclers and historians mainly, which later in the beginning of the 20th century became strengthened by the classification of Philippine languages under the Indonesian subfamily and the Malayo-Polynesian superfamily of languages. This concept of the Malay origin of Filipinos was most likely started by the remembrance of the Malacca boy who was used as guide and interpreter by Magellan, but more assuredly from native traditions and movements of peoples from the south very much in evidence at the time of Spanish arrival and colonization.

In other words, the Malays are taken as the original peoples who spread out to populate the Malayo-Polynesian world and the Filipinos were one of the end-products of that expansion. That concept gained ground for the reason that in the beginning and even later stage of Indo-European linguistic studies, it was thought that India was the starting point of the Indo-Europeans who spread westward to Europe, when in fact it was somewhere else, perhaps in the Caucasus.

This concept of origin has beclouded concepts of race. Whether it was race or language that decided matters in the early beginnings of studies on Malayo-Polynesian origins, it is not now necessary to go into. It is not essential for the purposes of this paper. The fact remains however that studies in many aspects of Filipino culture and history have been affected by

the linguistic suggestions arising from the terminology Malayo-Polynesian. These early ideas and concepts have produced a mental aberration which has become widespread in the scholarly world and therefore deserve some serious consideration.

In biographical writing, for example, the winning biography on the life and works of Jose Rizal during the Commonwealth Period and authored by Rafael Palma titled *Biografía de Rizal* when it was translated into English became *The Pride of the Malay Race*, the translation having been done by Roman Ozaeta no less, an honored justice of the Supreme Court of the country. This is another way of saying that the concept of language grouping in Malayo-Polynesian has been translated into racial implications. But the translation of the title of Palma's book in Spanish of course is erroneous, grossly misleading for there is no such thing as Malay race in anthropological science. It really becomes fantastic how minds of writers and thinkers become befuddled by terminology they do not fully understand.

Another example is *The Great Malayan* by Carlos Quirino, a respectable biographer and scholar and at one time director of the National Library. This is another biography of Jose Rizal worth reading, but the title is unfortunate for the subject of the book was not a Malayan. In this country, one big name affects another almost instantaneously, without much thinking and understanding, for Filipino scholarship still relies on established names, that is, what position the author had filled before writing the work.

For it is an established fact that Rizal's father and mother were both genetically and dominantly Chinese and hence Rizal could not have been of Malay origin, much more ethnically. His ancestry on the maternal side was rather mixed, but the Chinese genes still predominated, and whatever Malay strains can be traced are certainly minimal if not infinitesimal. Why then entitle a biography on Rizal *The Pride of the Malay Race* or *The Great Malayan*? More accurately and appropriately, Rizal was a great Filipino-Chinese or Chinese-Filipino, or a great Filipino or Philippinean or Austronesian, or a great Mongoloid or Asian. For there is no such a thing as Malay race.

The brilliant student Wenceslao Vinzons was infected by the virus of this fever overriding the concept of race and history.

His oration *Malaya Irredenta* so touched the judges in an oratorical contest under the auspices of the UP College of Law in pre-World War II years that it was awarded the first prize, the Manuel L. Quezon gold medal. The oration was emotionally charged as the subject could only inspire the attainment of national independence, but this was another misplaced understanding of Malaya and its referent, the country that is the Philippines. This statement, let me make it clear, does not in any way lessen the sacrifices and patriotism of Vinzons during the Japanese occupation and our high regard for him as one of our national heroes.

It is perhaps something not beyond comprehension that adherence to ideas repeated in the writings and books of historians and scholars are picked up by both students and educators because they have become sacred beliefs.

The Origin of the Prehistoric Inhabitants of the Philippines: The Essence of Theory

Right from the start we come to grips using the proper terminology. We could have captioned this section "The Origin of the Ancient Filipinos before Prehispanic Times," but the term Filipino became applied only to the peoples of this archipelago in the 19th century, and hence, its use becomes right away an anachronism. But before ever thinking of using the proper term, a coined one, let us recall a theory of origin for Southeast Asian peoples, to which we are inclined to subscribe.

Let us call this theory the East Asian River System Theory, for the rivers of Eastern Asia were the streams used by the aboriginal peoples originating somewhere in Central Asia in following the river courses, to spread in different parts of this vast region, some groups still remaining in interior locations and others reaching the coastal areas. I am not certain now whether the father of this theory was Fr. Wilhelm Schmidt, a venerated SVD and anthropologist, some time in the early years of this century (for I have lost my notes in the fire that gutted our UP Diliman cottage in 1974). This theory was picked up by Fay-Cooper Cole in his *The Peoples of Malaysia* (1945) to explain the origin of the peoples of both mainland and insular Southeast Asia including the Philippines. This eminent Ame-

rican anthropologist, however, did not pursue the theory further, leaving it to be explicated by future workers and scholars, which, however, has never been done.

Let us call this original group Proto-Asian. These people were in the region of Central Asia (which is of course a conjecture), because it was also from there in my opinion, that the North American Indians branched out in glacial times during the last one. There is some consensus that this movement of the Proto-Asians took place more than 10,000 years B.C. Due to some still unexplained happening – environmental, climatic, geological, diminishing food resources, disease, etc. – these people, the Proto-Asians scampered to many other places and in all directions, some crossing the Bering Strait, others finding the Chinese alluvial plains, and still others following the great rivers of the Irrawaddy, Salween, Mekong, the Red and Yellow Rivers until some reached the coastal areas while others got stuck in immediately favorable areas. This river system theory is, I believe, crucial to understanding one of the views on the origin of the Filipino people.

All these peoples referred to above are now classified as belonging to the Mongoloid race. These people spoke a monosyllabic parent speech, theoretically speaking. When these people reached the coastal areas, they stayed there for some time, most likely during the Mesolithic, that is during post-glacial times. Most likely they were food gatherers, hunters, trappers and fishers. It was about 8,000 B.C. that some groups discovered rice and raised it, as evidenced by Gorman's discovery in the highlands of Thailand (as reported by Solheim in 1972). It is likely that other peoples like the Proto-Chinese discovered rice too and cultivated it to become a domesticated plant, though older sites must be discovered.

It is the group that reached the coasts of South China that is pointed to by prehistorians as the place of origin of the Proto-Austronesians, who may be contemporaneous with the Proto-Chinese (Bellwood 1985). At this juncture, let me state that I am giving labels to groups of people without known names in the contemporary period in which they were supposed to have lived, and prehistorians often differ in the identification of these peoples. There is no other way, but it is necessary and essential for my own purposes.

At this juncture, I wish to state that I am sticking to my theory that the language of the Proto-Asians was monosyllabic, that is, the seedwords and affixal morphemes, if any, were of one syllable. This feature of monosyllabism was continued by the Proto-Chinese in their language up to and until modern times. The group that reached the southern China coast is identified by prehistorians and linguists as the homeland of the Proto-Austronesians. I subscribe to this terminology because it is not culturebound. At this time, it is not related yet to any of the ethnolinguistic groups in different parts of Austronesia (such as Philippineasia, Indonesia, Polynesia etc.), for there were no people there except in New Guinea, Australia, Borneo, and Palawan these scattered thin groups being referred to as Australoids and other dwarfish peoples and so on. At this juncture, it should be recalled that the Proto-Austronesian language as reconstructed by Dempwolff (1939) is 95 per cent disyllabic, a very small percentage being monosyllabic.

At this stage, we have reached a crucial point. For I have tried to demonstrate in my writings that the Proto-Austronesian forms show unmistakably a later development of the parent speech which we have called Proto-Asian, and this was characteristically monosyllabic. We have used componential analysis to arrive at this conclusion. No one to my knowledge has assailed this analysis of the disyllabic forms as found in Tagalog and in other Philippine languages. We have attempted to demonstrate, and I think successfully, that the disyllabic wordbases of the reconstructed Original Austronesian by Dempwolff and other followers are constructions from the monosyllabic elements by reduplication, word combination of two seedwords which are monosyllabic, or by affixation (Manuel 1966). We have also demonstrated that these monosyllabic seedwords can be used in building the disyllabic wordbases in their first syllabic position or in the second, and vice-versa. In other words, it is clear to us, that the so-called Original Austronesian or Proto-Austronesian disyllabic wordbases came from monosyllabic words and the aboriginal parent speech was monosyllabic.

Since the Chinese language is a monosyllabic language, we posit the common origin of the Proto-Austronesian and Chinese as coming from the same parent speech. This common

parentage must have been in existence thousands and thousands of years ago. By reason of this analysis involving an examination of the elementary constituents of their wordstock, the conclusion is inescapable that the Chinese language and Austronesian languages came from some common parent speech which was monosyllabic. This inference can lead to no other conclusion, in our opinion, but points to Central Asia as the origin of these languages and their carriers. The river system theory therefore is plausible, reasonable, persuasive and inevitable in its final outcome. In other words, it leads to inferences that were natural to occur because of the proximity of the sources of these river streams in Central Asia. The only lacking supporting evidence is the archaeological, which most likely has been overlaid and buried under the loses cover that had crypted the material evidence of stone implements and other artifacts the people used. This is also lacking along the footpaths or stations along the riverways to the coasts.

The Beyer Theory of Movements of Peoples

The Beyer theory of the peopling of Philippineasia is mainly based on the archaeological evidence which is chiefly classificatory and typological. The main criticism that has been leveled at his schema is the fact that he had no sites to show the cultural sequences of Paleolithic, Mesolithic, and Neolithic and their specific layering; a necessary documentation of the past unrecorded history. Younger anthropologists and archaeologists therefore have reasons to assail his reconstructed narration of the development of Philippineasian culture mainly on this circumstance which, however in my opinion, should not be blamed on this pioneer prehistorian. He had to pick up the evidence from the surface for he could not help it. The only site that showed some kind of stratigraphy, or more accurately, from which layering could be reconstructed, was the Novaliches dam site; and perhaps, also, his sites in downtown Manila, and isolated grave sites along lacustrine areas around Laguna de Bai. But even so the archaeologist that was Professor Beyer had no control over them, nor did he have any assistants to uncover the layered stone tools, pottery, and other artifacts in Novaliches, nor in Manila and Laguna de Bai, for these sites were at best

excavated under conditions of salvage archaeology.

Beyer's sites which yielded Paleolithic tools and paleontological fragments are few and far between. This is to be expected. The coastal sites in Anda and Bolinao, for example, have been exposed by water action and those in the interior, like in Cagayan, were covered up by soil erosion and transposition, so they have to be discovered and excavated to yield the evidence.

We need not go into the Paleolithic period which occurred during the land connections Philippineasia had with surrounding island and mainland Asia. This should not detain us because there appears to be no surviving descendants of these people using primitive stone tools, except perhaps the Negritos who had discarded them a long time ago and lost their original language. Nothing can be said also with regard to the language used during the Mesolithic, except venturing into guesses.

What is enlightening, however, is the entire period of the Neolithic which is very well documented in the Beyer collection of stone tools. It appears to me that his classification into Early, Middle, Late Neolithic has some good justification on typological basis and following an evolutionary theory. Here theory again lends a hand to cultural studies, for the theory of natural evolution applies just as well to the study of culture, i.e., speaking in general terms. While societies may show differential development, the trend from crude tools and simple ways to sophisticated tools and behavior of doing things is never questioned except to show in specific cases the exceptions to the principle of gradual development.

The problem presenting itself now is how to relate these Neolithic sequences to language development. It is too hazardous on my part to attempt this, but there is no other way. I would like to present one way of resolving the problem by working on whatever is available of the known facts and analyzing and pushing these up into the unknown. The endeavor therefore is highly theoretical.

First, let me state that I believe in the theory of monogenesis and therefore Philippineasia could not have been the birthplace of the ancestors of man and neither could the Proto-Asians have developed there either. It appears to me therefore that the Proto-Philippineasians were Asians. There is no doubt also that the

Austronesians and the carriers of the Original Austronesian parent speech were the same and they came from somewhere in South China. There are some new ideas detailing this consensus, but contrary views have not found support. The parent speech or OrAus, has been reconstructed by Brandstetter and Dempwolff and others and found to be disyllabic.

Archaeological evidence in Polynesia shows that the stone tools collected in the Bishop Museum in Honolulu belong to the Neolithic. The peopling of Polynesia therefore can be dated as having occurred during that period. The linguistic evidence confirms this because Polynesian languages are disyllabic in structure like Philippine languages. Aside from this fact, Austronesian linguists have reconstructed an estimated total of about 2,000 OrAus. WBs that are common to all the four subfamilies of the superfamily (in scattered readings the specific citations of which could not be supplied at the moment). In view of the fact that Polynesian Neolithic implements in many typological forms duplicate Philippine specimens (Beyer 1948:35-37), it can be stated that the Polynesians came and stayed in the Philippines on their way later to the Pacific basin. The Polynesian adze in particular has been identified as without doubt an offshoot of the Luzon adze which is Middle Neolithic in age; hence, the peopling of Polynesia must have started during that period. Here is what H. Otley Beyer wrote (1948:35):

Final views as to the migration routes of the Middle Neolithic culture in Eastern Asia and the Pacific: The Pacific Island cultures are basically of Middle Neolithic origin, with their distribution into Polynesia extending over into the early phase of the Late Neolithic. The full Late Neolithic, and especially its later phases with sawing, hole-boring, etc., did not reach the Eastern Pacific — although some elements of the later culture passed from Melanesia to New Zealand. That the original cultures developed in Eastern Asia there can be no doubt; and their subsequent history appears to have been somewhat as follows:

.... (see Beyer 1948:35-37 for the continuation).

Now let us go into the different stages of development in the Neolithic and relate these to the linguistic evidence, however skimpy. Beyer divided it into the Early, Middle, and Late in general terms. There is no doubt that there is some linguistic evidence in support, for the movements of peoples into Philippineasia did not happen all at once, but possibly in what critics

object to as waves, unevenly in all stages of the Neolithic. The known linguistic fact is that the Proto Austronesian language developed somewhere in South China and this was disyllabic in structure. When Dempwolff made his reconstructions of OrAus. based on some existing languages of Indonesia (which included Philippineasia), Micronesia, Melanesia, and Polynesia, he found that 95 percent were disyllabic and 1 percent monosyllabic.

The evidence in Philippinean tends to confirm this finding and perhaps more. We have found that some languages like the ones being spoken in Cagayan Valley have more monosyllabic words than any in the Philippines today, which means in our interpretation that the carriers of those languages must have moved out of the mainland home at an earlier date than say, the Ilokans and the latter earlier than the Tagalogs, for the Tagalogs do not have in their vocabulary any monosyllabic wordform (WF) referring to things. Whereas the monosyllabic seedwords (SWs) in Iloko can be isolated after the activating affixes have been identified and removed, it need not be done in Ibanag, for these are plainly monosyllabic in that language. For examples, the following, with corresponding Tagalog forms:

<i>Ibanag</i>	<i>Tagalog</i>
bag 'g—string, loin cloth'	bahag 'id.'
dan 'old thing'	da.'an 'pass, time past'
don 'leaf'	da.hon <i>id.</i>
<i>dung</i> 'disembark'	du.ung 'anchor'
fun 'origin, beginning, trunk of tree'	pu.nu' <i>id.</i>
lig 'neck'	li.ig <i>id.</i>
yu'(t) 'carnal intercourse'	hin.dut <i>id.</i>

The evidence of Iloko monosyllabism may be deduced and abstracted from the following verbal forms:

- mang.ted* 'to give', *i.ted* (to give something', fr. *ted* 'give')
- ma.ngan* 'to eat', fr. *mang* + *kan*, fr. *kan* 'eat'
- iy-yut* 'carnal intercourse', fr. *yut* 'sexual intercourse'

i.num 'to drink', *da.num* 'water', fr. *num*, 'water'
ma.yat 'agree', *ka.yat* 'like, want', fr. *yat* 'conformity'

To be noted in the above illustrations is the monosyllable *kan* 'eat'. In Iloko *kaan* 'eat' is also used, but *kan* no longer. This is a good example of the development of monosyllabic wordform to a disyllabic one. For in Philippine languages *kaan* is *kain* in TI and *kaun* in Vs. So the original form *kaen* can be reconstructed as the OrPhil. form the *e* representing the puppet; it is also the OrAus. form. So the inference is inescapable that the disyllabic form came from a monosyllabic form. The former is a later development. We think that the *kan* is from an older parent speech which we call Pre-Proto-Philippineasian. We also think that if OrAus. was formed in mainland Asia somewhere in Southern China, the older parent speech was formed from an interior location, following the East Asian River System theory. The date is Early Neolithic (my interpretation from Beyer 1948: 35 ff.).

Though much of the relationships are inferential, which to many students of prehistory might be termed guesswork, the inferences are justifiable.

For example, we believe that when the Proto-Austronesian left the mainland they were already building houses called *ba.hay* in TI, *ba.lay* in II, *ba.li* in Zb. *ba.le* in Kp, *ba.oy* in Mv, and so on, to demonstrate the fact that the house was a common cultural possession of our proto-ancestors. This is disyllabic in form, and since the Proto-Austronesians were using that kind of language disyllabic in structure, their language was that far removed from the Proto-Asian parent speech. It seems to us that the monosyllabic SW can be abstracted as *bay* from the given examples meaning 'house', for in Tagalog "town" is *ba.yan*, a place where there are many houses — *an* being a morpheme in Philippine Languages indicating among other referents 'place'. In other words, even the Proto-Asians who may be called Pre-Proto-Austronesians had already discarded rock shelters and caves for a dwelling and had knowledge of houses, though the type is none to clear.

Let us go into names of things in nature other than cultural objects which are manmade. Names of the parts of the body are primal and less subject to change and therefore reliable in-

dices as to age or linguistic development. One of the ways we found in identifying the monosyllabic WFs in Tl and other Philippine languages is the reduplicated WB. To us the origin of the WF from the reduplicated WB is unmistakable. In Tl alone there are a little more than 300 examples and in Il a little bit more. Let us take *ti.ti* 'penis', *ki.ki* 'vagina' in Tl, since they illustrate the general statement just immediately preceding. These are easily traceable to the monosyllabic forms *ti'* and *ki'* respectively, because it follows an evolutionary development, from the simple to the more complex.

Another proof of such statement is the existence in some parts of Polynesia of a mythological creator called Tiki, which can be dissected componentially as referring to the male and female principle of creation, for this is revealed by the components' meanings in Philippine languages. The loss of the glottal catch in *ti'* and *ki'* may be accounted for because there was a stage in the development of Chinese language (Karlgren 1949) that perhaps parallel the Proto-Austronesian and that is in the dropping of the final consonant. This is also substantiated partially in the presence of correlates in Tl *pu.ki* 'vagina' and Il *u.ki* 'id.', where there is loss of the glottal stop. In Polynesian languages, there is such evidence and this is a good proof of the relationship perhaps that the Proto-Austronesians had with the Chinese language and Philippineasian. Such occurrence dates the movement of Proto-Austronesians into Polynesia.

I will give one example of a term referring to a natural behavior of human beings as much as in other animals of the primate order, although the latter may not have such term. The act of sexual intercourse in Tl is *hin.dut*. This disyllabic term must have been coined quite early in the history of Tagalog culture and language which goes to its Austronesian, Proto-Austronesian and Proto-Asian beginnings. Why? For the reason that it can be analyzed componentially into *hin* and *dut*, with their individual respective meanings. In the methodology that we have developed in analyzing etymologies of Philippineasian WFs, we start first with discovering whether the WF has a duplicated form. The component *hin* has, and that is *hin.hin* 'modest, modesty, gracefulness; and the element *dut* has the reduplicated WF *dut.dut* 'finger, insert something, e.g., the finger' (more accurately expressed in *dut.du.tin* "insert the finger into something"). When put together, the resulting disyll-

labic WB has no other meaning but to indicate the "act of sexual intercourse". This example is given because sexual intercourse is a primal act and goes deep in the beginnings of human behavior, nay primate behavior, and, also, to show once again the development of Philippinean languages from its monosyllabic stage.

From a natural act let us proceed to a cultural act, in fact an invention. Since the outriggered banca played an important role in the peopling of Philippinean and Oceania and other places, I wish to devote some space to its reconstructed history from linguistics. From the methodology devised, we venture the guess that the banca is probably an invention of the Proto-Austronesians, and so this must have happened in the mainland. In the first place, the native term *bang.ka* (present in many Philippine languages, see Yap 1977:47) is disyllabic in form and that is also the form of the so-called OrAus. that is being reconstructed by Austronesian linguists and specialist.

Whoever translated *bang.ka* into English as 'dug-out' must have been a linguist of no mean ability and hindsight because the English equivalent was fortuitously and fittingly rendered from the constituent elements of *bang.ka*. The first component *bang* is present in the reduplicated form *bang.bang* meaning 'canal, ditch for running water', e.g. under the eaves of a house; and *bang.ba.ngan*, its verbal form, means "to make a canal, ditch or groove" in the earth or piece of wood. The second element *ka* is present in such WBs as *u.ka* 'dented', *tu.ka* 'bill' or 'peck'; *lu.ka* 'bamboo tube' used for keeping articles; *bu.ka.ka* 'legs apart', all of which being drawn from TI, a member of the Austronesian super-family of languages. When the two SWs are joined or combined, the WB *bang.ka* is formed, an exact picture of the English 'dug-out'. You may call this a linguistic coincidence; but that is how the Proto-Austronesians built their WBs. The *bang.ka* therefore is an OrAus. invention; it is also a Proto-Philippinean because our analysis is based on Philippine languages.

The outrigger, however, is of Chinese invention as I have shown in a previous work (1948). The Chinese device of attaching bamboo poles to the rim of their vessels still continues in Chinese coastal areas, and so too in the Philippines. The *ka.tiek* of Chinese origin is however different from the Proto-Austro-

nesian improvement of the device, for the boom is attached to two crosspieces across the banca to stabilize it. This is so attached that the boom partly buoys up the banca on one side or on both sides and the tail part of the boom touches the water, thus stabilizing it. The WB *ka.tiek* is *ka.tig* in many Philippine languages and is reconstructed as *ka.tig* in OrAus., but the meaning bamboo attachment in Chinese remains in Proto-Austronesian.

With the dugout provided with outriggers, the Proto-Austronesians converted the banca into a sea-worthy vessel, for the outriggered banca then becomes unsinkable. Nooteboom (1932) has shown the distribution of the outriggered banca throughout Indonesia and Austronesia and there is very little doubt that it is of Proto-Austronesian invention, though the original outrigger model was Chinese. This vessel with outriggers enabled the Proto-Austronesians to reach the farthest islands of the Pacific Ocean and Indian Ocean, the voyagers becoming not only the "Vikings of the Pacific" but also of the Indian Ocean as well, the most extensive expanse known ever peopled by primitive man.

Bellwood's contribution to the Elucidation of the Problem Arising from Terminology

One of the recent works that has perked up this paper is Peter Bellwood's *Prehistory of the Indo-Malaysian Archipelago* (1985). I have not read any review of this work in anthropological journals, but its author from Australian National University provided us enlightening points in developing this paper. Bellwood agrees with the general notion that the homeland of the Proto-Austronesians is South China; however, he makes them reach Formosa or Taiwan first and from there they voyaged southward through Philippineasia (he actually used Philippines), peopled it, and from there spread still southward into Indonesia, and then spread eastward and westward into Sumatra and Malaya.

My opinion is rather that the Proto-Austronesians, having their homeland in South China and being master of the outriggered canoe, could move and sail in several directions, one of which was a northeasterly one, thus enabling them to settle

Taiwan. They need not, however, do that first, for they could also in some other direction, e.g., sail directly southeastward into Philippineasia and populate it. Still other groups must have gailed southward into the coast of northern Indo-China and nearby places. When they reached Taiwan, some settled there permanently while others proceeded eastward to populate Oceania and the same thing happened to those who reached Philippineasia, some of whom stayed or got stuck or moved into inland areas, while others moved on southward and eastward. Such movements were possible because of the outriggered banca which was improved further by rigging two bancas together side by side enabling the voyages to carry heavier load and transport more human and animal cargo as they pleased across the seas and the vast Pacific. Since they have also invented a device for indicating latitude (Beals & Hoijer 1969), they could go back and forth to places of origin or launching stations as they wanted.

Let us touch, though briefly, the field of folklore. The oral traditions studied by Norbeck (1950) of the Atayal and those of Northern Luzon may of course be interpreted either way to support Bellwood's view as well as mine, the assemblage of motifs are just too many not to negate either view. It appears to me that this is evidence of common origin in their homeland, for many of these motifs are also found among the Chinese of Fukien province (discussion and exchange of views with Dr. Wang Tehming in many occasions), which indicates the passageway of the Proto-Austronesians or perhaps their amalgamation.

Let us now look at the linguistic evidence. That there was a southern movement from the homeland of the Proto-Austronesians from Southern China is indicated by recent findings by a member of the Summer Institute of Linguistics who had done field work both in the Philippines and in the Laos-Vietnam area, for Jarai, for example, is related genetically to Tagalog (Pittman 1959). In *The Ethnic Minorities in Vietnam* (1984) by Dang et al, five ethnic groups are identified as belonging to the Austronesian language family.

From the archaeological evidence and the invention of the outriggered banca, there is no other probability that Taiwan and Philippineasia were peopled at the same time from the home-

land of the Proto-Austronesians in South China, though Taiwan is closer to the mainland than Philippineasia. Perhaps it will be well to remember that some critical condition existed in the homeland for these people to seek other places for settlement, and though these are beyond human guesswork to be certain about specifically, the voyagers could go back and forth once they reached the neighboring islands. They must have tried doing this search for more hospitable places and favorable environment than the homeland, so they had to sail in all directions and back and forth. Since Taiwan has a more semi-temperate climate than tropical Philippineasia, the explorers had to make choices and Philippineasia proved better to many. This view is somewhat strengthened by the presence of more Neolithic tools from the Early to the Late stage in Philippineasian soil and sites than in Taiwan, judging from the skimpy reports from the *Bulletin* of the Academia Sinica.

The calculation of Bellwood in Figure 4.4. of his work dating the settlement of Taiwan in 4,000 B.C. appears to me to apply equally well to Philippineasia where one has an abundance of stone artifacts from all stages of the Neolithic than Taiwan. In fact Beyer thinks the settlement of Philippineasia very much older (1947). This is of course an impression, for no actual comparative counts between the Taiwanese and Philippineasian collections have been attempted, quantitatively or qualitatively.

It will also be noted that Bellwood dates the settlement of Malaya, Sumatra, Java and southern Borneo as having taken place between 2,000 and 500 B.C., a couple of thousand years after the settlement of Philippineasia by the exploring and venturesome Proto-Austronesians. The point to consider here is, coming from the same origin, Philippineasia as a recipient of these settlers were peopled very much earlier than Malaya and so on. Why then name the linguistic family Malayo-Polynesian? This is not only a linguistic misnomer but also a historical anachronism. This is the reason for our favoring the unbiased or culturally-unloaded term Austronesian in place of Malayo-Polynesian, and for introducing the term Philippineasian in Austronesian linguistic terminology and cultural studies.

In view of these facts and circumstance, I support the opi-

nion of Thomas and Healey (1962) of subgrouping Philippine languages into a linguistic stock which includes Chamic and Malay independent or apart from Indonesian. I propose to name this group Philippineasian for the simple reason that Philippine languages are older than Chamic and Malay. If this proposal were accepted, then the term Philippineasian will have a more stable and appropriate place in the subgrouping of the Austronesian super-family of languages. For in the first place, Philippineasia lies in the main path of moving Proto-Austronesians coming from South China after they invented the banca and outriggered it. It is rather unfortunate that this invention has never been appropriately used and recognized by prehistorians in the reconstruction not only of the prehistory of Austronesia, but also in tracing the branching of the Austronesian superfamily of languages. When movements of peoples are correlated with archaeological evidence of dated sites for instance, the prehistory of the linguistic family can be achieved more solidly than glottochronology or lexicostatistics. This is proven in the instance of the dating of the Ifugao rice terraces by C-14 and the glotto-chronological dating of Northern Luzon languages including the Ifugao language which is well a thousand years off the C-14 date (see Maher 1973; cf. Fox et al 1965). Bellwood cites many authorities on lexicostatistics and glottochronology which need not be gone into at the moment because these subdisciplines afford us unreliable dates of separation of branching languages. To my knowledge, glottochronology has not also been used for dating monosyllabic languages, especially of languages belonging to the Sinitic and Tibeto-Burmese families.

In other words, the early beginnings of the parent speech of Austronesian, the Sinitic, and Tibeto-Burmese family of languages cannot be reached by glottochronology and hence lexicostatistics cannot be utilized either, for the formulaic devices so far used have only been made applicable to Austronesian languages with disyllabic WBs. For it is clear to me that the older stage of Austronesian is a monosyllabic language like Chinese, Tibetan and Burmese, although members of these languages can build WFs into disyllabic and polysyllabic forms without difficulty using monosyllabic elements as building blocks and units. There is no evidence as claimed by Bellwood

that the monosyllabic forms originated from polysyllabic forms (1985:113), for I have demonstrated the contrary to be true and more accurate by using some Philippineasian languages (Manuel 1966). More important, lexicostatisticians and glottochronologists themselves prepare their own basic worldlists of 100 or 200 with no uniformity and there may be other shortcomings. Bellwood himself admits that these methods are applicable in societies with well established written records which go back deep in history (1985:117).

Our statements made above, however, should not be taken to mean that another formula cannot be devised for Pre-Proto-Philippineasian and members of the Sinitic and Tibeto-Burmese families of languages.

The recent terminology in naming various regroupings in Austronesian languages is an awareness among linguists of the problems besetting the discipline and perhaps would require new or modified methods and approaches. A number of well-known linguists now focus their attention on related problems of classification and subgrouping and tracing the tracks of the carriers of the different languages to the present places and locations of their speakers of the Austronesian family. There is need for tolerance for the differing views, approaches, and findings. However bright the picture is in this vital field of reconstructing the history of the Austronesian peoples, there should be more workers seeing the problems through in varying ways, but always on the move to correlating the findings not only in linguistics, but also in archaeology, ethnology, folklore and other cognate disciplines. However, it is well to remember Bellwood's conclusion (1985:124):

. . . The old idea, so often repeated in popular works today, that the Austronesians migrated from the Asian mianland through the Malay Peninsula or Vietnam, is absolutely wrong.

Conclusion

While the term Malayo-Polynesian continues to be used, Bellwood seems to apply it, on reading his work (1985), in a more limited sense than what it formerly connoted. It is no longer used as the equivalent of Austronesian. Just the same, Bellwood uses the limited application unaware perhaps that it is a biased term even from his point of view. For it is always

suggestive of the origin of the subgroup he has designated as Indo-Malaysian, which connotation cannot be avoided. His terminology remains anachronistic, though he states "that Proto-Austronesian and Proto-Malayo-Polynesian may be separated by half a millenium in time" (1985:12).

There is some optimism that the view of Thomas and Healey (1962) will find supporters for a Philippineasian stock of languages. We call this stock Philippineasian, for this term is not only descriptive of the history of this group of languages but is more fitting because it is more accurate historically as we have attempted to demonstrate in this paper. The first component *Philippi* — is derived from King Philip II of Spain (the Sp. name is spelled Felipe) after whom Villalobos named the archipelago or a part of it in 1543, contained in — *nes* — or the Spanish term ending in — *nas* which means "islands"; and the third element — *asian* which is the name of the mainland from where the ancient peoples came from, the — *nes* — and — *asian* coalescing in — *neasian*. By using this term, it is hoped to avoid the narrow term Filipino which is a creation of historic times in origin and development, for this term applied only to natives of the country in the 19th century, formerly referring only to children of Spaniards both in the country and Spaniards themselves. The pejorative reference which the term carried at one time or another (at one time our distinguished citizen and author Carlos P. Romulo said that the Igorots of the former Mountain Province were not Filipinos) is done away with; and the prior settlement of Philippineasia by our proto-ancestors is upheld. Lastly, the use of the term Malay or Proto-Malay is relegated to the background or rejected because the Malays were the end-products of the Proto-Austronesians or Proto-Philippineasians. The Malays were not our ancestors, it was rather the Proto-Austronesians or Proto-Philippineasians who were the descendants of a still more ancient stock of Proto-Asians who were Mongoloids.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1905 "History of the Population," in *Gensus of the Philip-*
Barrows, David P.
1905 "History of the Population," in *Gensus of the Philip-*
pine Islands, 1903 (U.S. Bur. of the Census, Washing-
ton, 1905), I, 411 ff.
- Beals, Ralph L. & Hoijer, Harry
Introduction to Anthropology. 3rd ed. New York:
Macmillan, 1969. 788 pp.
- Bellwood, Peter
1985 Prehistory of the Indo-Malayan Archipelago. Academic Press, 1985. 370 pp.
- Beyer, H. Otley
1948 Philippine and East Asian Archaeology, and Its
Relation to the Origin of the Pacific Islands Popu-
lation. Quezon City: Nat. Res. Council of the
Philippines, Dec. 1948. 130 pp.
- 1947 Philippines Saga; a pictorial history of the Archi-
pelago since time began. Manila: Evening News,
1947. 155 pp. With J.C. de Veyra as joint author.
- Bloomfield, Leonard
1933 Language New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1933, 564
pp.
- Blumentritt, Ferdinand
1882 An Attempt at Writing a Philippine Ethnography.
1980 Trans. from the original German text by Marce-
lino N. Maceda. Publ. by the Univ. Res. Center,
Mindanao State University, Marawi City, 1980.
238 pp.
- Brandstetter, Renward
1916 An Introduction to Indonesian Linguistics Trans. by
G.G. Blagden. London: Royal Asiatic Society,
1916.

44 AGHAMTAO

Chretien, Douglas

- 1962 "Classification of Twenty-one Philippine Languages,"
Phil. Jour. of Science, v. 19 (1962), 485-506.

Cole, Fay-Cooper

- 1945 The Peoples of Malaysia. New York: D. Van Nostrand
Co., 1945. 354 pp.

Craig, Austin

- 1928 "Rizal's Parentage Typically Filipino," Phil. Educ.
Mag., v. 25, no. 1 (June 1928), 11, 67-68.

Dang, Nghiem Van, Chu Thai Son and Lau Hung

- 1984 The Ethnic Minorities in Vietnam. Foreign Languages
Publ. House, Hanoi, 1984. 305 pp.

Dempwolff, Otto

- 1939 Studies on Dempwolff's Vergleichende Lautlehre
des Austronesischen Wortchatzes. An abstract by
Cecilio Lopez. Manila: Bur. of Printing, 1939. 63
pp.

Dixon, Roland B.

- 1916 Oceanic (Mythology). Boston: Marshall Jones Co.,
1916. 364 pp. Being vol. IX of The Mythology of
All Races.

- 1930 "Recent Archaeological Discoveries in the Philippines
and Their Bearing on the Prehistory of Asia," *Pro-
ceedings of the Am. Philos. Soc.*, v. 69 (1930),
225-229.

Elkins, Richard E.

- 1973 A Prelim. Proto-Manabo World List," Phil. Journal of
74 Linguistics, v. 4-5 (1973-74), 23-40.

Evangelista, Alfredo E.

- 1966 "The Incipient and Emergent Periods in Philippine
Culture History," in F. L. Jocano (ed.); Filipino
Cultural Heritage, Lecture Series No. 1, "Prehis-
toric Cultures," (Publ. by Phil. Women's Univ.),
15-35.

Fox, Robert B.

1967 Prehistory of the Philippines. Manila: Nat. Museum, 1967. 200 pp.

1970 The Tabon Caves. Manila: Nat. Museum, 1970. 197 pp.

Rox, Robert B., Willis E. Sibley and Fred Eggan

1965 "A Prelim. Glottochronology for Northern Luzon," Asian Studies, v. 3, no. 1 (April 1965), 103-113.

Francisco, Juan R.

1971 The Philippines and India: Essays in Ancient cultural relations. Manila: National Book Store, 1971. 181 pp.

Galang, Ricardo E.

1941 "Types of Watercraft in the Philippines," Phil. Jour. of Science, v. 75, no. 3 (Jl. 1941), 291-306.

Gamboa, Virginia L.

1933 Malay Loan-Words in English, a Critical Study. M.A. thesis, U.P., 1933.

Garvan, John M.

1964 The Negritos of the Philippines. Wien: F. Berger, 1964. 288 pp.

Gleason, H.A., Jr.

1955 An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics. Revised. New York: Holt, 1955. 503 pp.

Grace, George W.

1961 "Austronesian Linguistics and Culture History," American Anthropologist, v. 63 (1961), 359-368.

1964 "Movement' of the Malayo-Polynesians: 1500 B.C. to A.D. 500: The Linguistic Evidence," Current Anthorology, v. 5 no. 5 (Dec. 1964), 361-368.

Hatt, Gudmund

1949 Asiatic Influences in American Folklore. Kobenhaven: 1949. 122 pp.

Heine-Geldern, Robert

1945 Prehistoric Research in the Netherlands Indies. In Science and Scientists in the Netherlands Indies (1945), 129-167.

Hutterer, Karl L.

- 1976 "An Evolutionary Approach to the Southeast Asian Cultural Sequence," *Current Anthropology*, v. 17, no. 2 June 1976), 221-242.

Jocano, F.L.

- 1975 *Philippine Prehistory*. Quezon City: PCAS, 1975. 280 pp.

Karlgren, Bernard

- 1949 *The Chinese Language; an Essay on Its Nature and History*. Ronald Press, New York 1949. 122 pp.

Kroeber, A.L.

- 1943 *People of the Philippines*. American Mus. of Nat. History New York, 1943. 244 pp.

Lopez, Cecilio

- 1939 *A Comparison of Tagalog and Malay Lexicographies (on phenoticosemantic basis)*. Inst. of Nat. Language Bull., No. 5. Bur. of Printing, 1939. 92 pp.
- 1967 "Origins of the Philippine Languages," *Phil. Studies*, v. 15 no. 1 (Jan. 1967), 130-166.
- 1974 *A Comparative Philippine Word-list*. The ARchive, Special Monograph Issue No. 1, 1974.
- 1976 *A Comparative Philippine Word-list. Sequels I & II*. a Publ. of the Archives of Phil. Langs. and Dialects and the Phil. Linguistics Circle. Quezon City: U.P., 1976. 131 + 77 pp.

Laumala, Kathleen

- 1949 Article on Indonesian Folklore, in Maria Leach (ed.), *Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology and Legends*. N.Y.: Funk and Wagnalls, 1949. 2 vols.

Maher, Robert F.

- 1973 "Archaeological Investigation in Central Ifugao," *Asian Perspectives*, v. 16 (1973), 39-70.

Manuel, E. Arsenio

- 1948 *Chinese Elements in the Tagalog Language with Some Indication of Chinese influence on other Philippine Languages and Cultures and an Excursion into Austronesian Linguistics*. With a historical

introduction, by H. Otley Beyer. Manila: Filipiniana Publications, 1948. xxv, 139 pp.

- 1966 "Pre-Proto-Philippinian," in F. L. Jocano (ed.): Filipino Cultural Heritage, Lecture Series No. 1, "Prehistoric Cultures." (Publ. by Phil. Women's Univ.), 35-60.

Molina, Antonio M.

- 1960 The Philippines Through the Centuries. U.S.T. Coop., 1960. 2 vols.

Norbeck, Edward

- 1950 Folklore of the Atayal of Formosa and the Mountain Tribes of Luzon. Univ. of Michigan, Mus. of Anthropology, Anthropology Papers, No. 5, 1950. 44 pp.

Palma, Rafael

- 1949 Biografia de Rizal. Manila: Bur. of Printing, 1949. 398 pp.
1949 The Pride of the Malay Race. Trans. by Roman Ozaeta. N.Y.: Prentice Hall, 1949. 385 pp.

Pittman, Richard S.

- 1959 "Jarai as a Member of the Malayo-Polynesian Family of Languages," Asian Culture, v. 2, no. 4 (Summer 1959).

Quirino, Carlos

- 1958 The Great Malayan; the Biography of Rizal. Manila: Phil. Educ., 1958. 340 pp.

Rodriguez, Eulogio B.

- 1928 "Names Under which the Philippines Has Been Known at Different Times in History," Phil. Educ. Mag., v. 25, no. 4 (Sept. 1928), 206-207, 232-234.

Scott, William Henry

- 1984 Prehispanic Source Materials for the Study of Philippine Prehistory. New Day Publishers, Quezon City, 1984. 196 pp.

Solheim, Wilhelm II

1964 The Archaeology of Central Philippines. Nat. Inst. of Science and Technology, Monog. 10, Manila: 1964. 235 pp.

1967 "The Sa-Huynh-Kalanay Pottery Tradition: Past and Future Research," in M. Zamara (ed.): Studies in Philippine Anthropology (1967), 151-174.

1975 "Reflections on the New Data of Southeastern Asian Prehistory," Asian Perspectives, v. 18 (1975), 146-160.

1972 "An Earlier Agricultural Revolution," Scientific American, 1972, 34-41. My copy of reprint has not have the volume number and specific date.

Tangco, Marcelo

1938 "A Sketch of the Racial and Cultural History of the Filipinos," Phil. Social Sciences Rev., v. 10, no. 2 (May 1938), 110-126.

Thomas, David and Alan Healey

1962 Some Philippine Language Subgroupings: a Lexicostatistical Study, Anthropological Linguistics, v. 4, no. 1 (1962), 21-23.

Tung, Fei Hsiao

1981 Toward a People's Anthropology. New World Press, 1981.

Yap, Fe Aldave

1977 A Comparative Study of Philippine Lexicons. Inst. of Nat. Language, 1977. 429 pp.

Zaide, Gregorio F.

1957 Philippine Political and Cultural History. Manila 1957. 2 vols.



This cross-section of a trading vessel bares its hold that cramps together various trade items including the products of haciendas and plantations strictly managed to produce crops for overseas trade — to the sacrifice of local demands and staples. McAndrew's study analyzes how Cavite was merely used as a terminal for the Galleon Trade.