

SECOND FOOTNOTE ON THE TASADAY

Z. A. Salazar

Two new reports issued almost simultaneously by PANAMIN on the Tas., one (Fernandez and Lynch) more scientific in language than the other (Nance), provide an excellent occasion for further comment on our shifting knowledge of this celebrated Filipino group. The Ateneo anthropologists fail to mention, as in a recent pamphlet (: 13), that PANAMIN chief Manda Elizalde "is known to the Tasaday as 'Momo Dakel Diwata Tasaday' or bringer of good fortune",¹ whereas PANAMIN photographer-turned-ethnographer Nance writes that the 35-year old Harvard graduate Tao Bung or "big man" among Mindanao minorities (June 12: 19) is also considered by the troglodytic Tas. as "the man their ancestors had foretold would one day come to them" in order to "just love us and help us" (June 8: 6). However, both reports follow the same outline, beginning with the helicopter penetration of the Tas. forest homeland and ending with the humanist exhortation for change through choice and research by invitation. Both likewise exhibit an unfaltering faith in the B'lit Manobo culture hero named Dafal, whose testimony is of prime importance in the determination of the real Tas.

techno-economic condition before their presumed "effective isolation" was finally broken after centuries by the scientific entry of PANAMIN.

At any rate, the Tas. now appear less hoary from their forcible journey through archeo-glottochronological time, less speculatively removed from their modern countrymen. For instance, they do not seem to appreciate "a loud voice and sharp looks" (Nance June 11: 1), a sentiment quite understandable to most Filipinos and not too readily perceived by Western guests. Their predilection for the betel-nut chew provides the best occasion for dirt (Fernandez and Lynch: 9) and even for human contact (: 26, passim), as in most traditional Phil. and Indon. groups. The jew's harp played by Balayam and not yet attributed to Dafal's advent among the Tas. (Pamphlet: 4, 5) is quite a common instrument in the country, particularly among archaic groups. If not just a typical subordinate's contribution to a personality cult, the reported messianic expectation among the Tas. in relation to the PANAMIN head is known in Filipino as bola, pambibilog ng ulo, panlalangis, etc.; a not exactly rare expression of Filipino raillery. Provided it is not conveniently identified later as another Dafal importation, the term "diwata"

puts the Tas. in the same category as all the other Philippine groups from Mindanao and Sulu up to Pampanga where this Sanskrit loan word is found, unlike those in the rest of Luzon and the entire Austronesian world except West Indonesia which all have instead only anito and its cognates (cf. Salazar 1968: 115-146, 154).

"Diwata" also carries adverse implications for precipitate theories about the Tas. It was earlier thought, for instance, that either the B'lit separated from the Tas. or both separated from a common ancestral group called Pre-BT with, in any case, the Tas. remaining "primitive" in their forest environment and the B'lit gradually changing through civilizational influences from the coast (Lynch and Llamzon 1971:93; Llamzon 1971:8), which include probably even agriculture (Elkins 1971:33). Though they now recognize "minimal contacts" between the Tas. and other "bands of similar size" like the Tasafang and Sanduka from whom their wives come and whose presence "perhaps not more than 10 or 20 kilometers away" becomes more likely at "bedding down for the day" (:9-11, 17-18), Fernandez and Lynch continue to postulate the "effective isolation of the ancestral forest people (Tasaday and others) from the early B'lit and

others like them" (:22). The presence of "diwata" implies, however, that either they already had the term before separating from the B'lit (or with the B'lit from the common indigenous Mindanao stock) and therefore had contact like all the other related groups with cultural influences from the coast, or they had contact with their relations and other advanced or advancing coastal groups after their supposed separation. In either case, the theory of "effective isolation" becomes untenable, because the contact must have been long and intense enough for a culture-heavy concept like "diwata" to penetrate, replace or coexist with other religious ideas. Under such circumstances, how could the other more techno-economic items of culture closely associated in Mindanao and elsewhere with "diwata", like agriculture and metallurgy, not have affected the "originally primitive" Tas.? Analogous changes have precisely been attributed to the five or so intermittent contacts with Dafal between 1966, 1967 or 1968 and 1971 (Fernandez and Lynch: 26; Nance June 8: 6).

The Chronological content of "diwata" is likewise unfavorable. In contrast with "deva", another Sanskrit loan word whose distribution in the Indonesian world is limited to Java and the

Lesser Sunda Islands, "diwata" is associated not only with the Austronesian cognate "hantu" but also with djin, setan and other terms related to Islam (cf. Salazar 1968: 85-154). This suggests an Islam-borne conglomerate of folk-religious ideas which may have started from the original homeland of the Malays, Sumatra, since it is here that the connection "hantu/diwata" appears to be strongest. In this context, the "diwata" concept could not have reached the Tas. earlier than the accelerated expansion of Islam in Indonesia in the 14th century (Villiers 1965: 258 et seq.). In the Philippines, Islamic influences of Sumatran flavor penetrated the Sulu region during the end of the 14th century and did not reach the Cotobato bassin till the 15th century (Majul 1966: 308-9). In that case, how long did it take for the term to reach and then be adopted by the Tas. or the "ancestral group" to which the Tas. may have belonged? It is quite futile to speculate, since the date should be very much later than the 2,000 years advanced by Fox (1971) on the basis of a supposed similarity of Tas. stone tools with C-14 dated prehistoric analogues in the Philippines. The opinion was challenged almost immediately with the

suggestion that Fox support his claim with "a seriously documented comparison", the typology of Philippine prehistoric implements being still quite rudimentary (Salazar 1971: 35). Now his collaborators consider "the making and using of stone tools ... unimportant", adding that the "range of tool forms that we observe" approximate no "known type or series of Philippine stone implements" and that none of the axes "among stone tools recovered from Philippine archaeological sites ... resembles the kind of axe used by the Tasaday" (Fernandez and Lynch 1972: 20, 21).

Fox's line of argument has therefore been apparently abandoned. However, is it a new course to express the opinion that "probably the nearest form" to Tas. "axes" would be "some of those tools that show only edge-grinding and have been labeled 'protoneoliths' on this account" and "called 'Late Hoabinhian' or 'Bacsonian' because of their type provenience" (loc. cit.: 21)? Again, it would only be fair to the Filipinos and to scholarship to support this view with a well documented comparison. Among others, the classic works of Mansuy, Colani, Patte, etc. probably would be of better help than presently available local materials. In any case, it may be

noted at this juncture that the characteristic Bacsonian tool, the "short axe", was obtained through segmentation of a biface and polished on only one side of the cutting edge, whereas the Tas. analogue is ground or "sharpened" in a rudimentary fashion against a rock on both sides of the cutting edge, the material appearing to be any stone or stone fragment (loc. cit.: 21-23, pl. 5). Furthermore, this new conjecture perhaps should not be allowed to carry scientific enthusiasm away to further flights of temporal or anthropological fancy, particularly since the Hoabinhian-Bacsonian complex has been presumed elsewhere to be at once "protoneolithic" and "Australoid or Papuan-Melanesian" (Van Stein-Calenfals 1936: 41-51) and the Fernandez-Lynch report suggestively mentions, again without citing sources, that the supposed Tas. subsistence area of approximately 25 sq. km. or one sq. km. per person is "not unlike estimates that have been made for certain Upper Paleolithic peoples" (: 44). Neither the Tas. physiognomy (the projected mensurational stint by Kelso among the Tas. would probably be an exercise in anthropological futility, in this sense) nor their most likely age would reach that far!

Indeed, the supposed starting date of Tas. separation (with or without companion groups) from the rest of Mindanao ancestral mankind has progressively become more recent. After Fox's archaeological estimate of 2,000 years was made to recede into the speculative penumbra of prehistory, the glottochronological evidence was invoked in turn. From 700-900 glottochronological years ago around April, 1971 (Lynch and Llamzon: 92), the estimate decreased to only 571-755 years ago in December of the same year (Llamzon: 8), increasing again to 1,000 years ago this year (Nance June 11: 13) in line with the reported result of "study period no. 4" (with Fox, Lynch and Llamzon as personnel), establishing Tas. descent "from the same group from which the B'lit came, the split having occurred about 900-1000 years ago" (Pamphlet: 11). In the Fernandez-Lynch report, the start of Tas. isolation (presently conceived as being with "intermittent contacts") has been reduced to "say 600 years or more" (: 1) or, in another context, "for well over 500 years and perhaps for as many as 800" (: 18-19) -- i. e., the old Llamzon estimate of last December, though in a justificative note relegated to the back

pages this is again raised to "perhaps one millenium" (n. 13, p. 52). To restate a point made earlier (Salazar 1971: 35), the glottochronological method can only apply to the onset of a separate linguistic evolution within two or more languages stemming from a common source and not to the separation, much less isolation, of linguistic communities, assuming that it is indeed valid for Austronesian languages where documentary checks on the rate of lexical loss are not available for a long period.

If both Tas. and B'lit were diverging linguistically "well over 500 years ago", their speakers in reality probably still had at the moment quite intimate contact with each other and with other Mindanao coastal groups, as the presence of "diwata" among the Tas. suggests (supra). Indeed, as the only truly historical clue thus far available on Tas. "age", this Sanskrit loan word constitutes not only a terminus ad quem for any supposed original or prehistoric "effective isolation" but, more damagingly, a terminus a quo for their effective contact with other groups and the Indonesian world -- at the very moment they were supposed to have become glottochronologically isolated! In this context, the forms of "seladeng" ("deer"),

which Elkins mistakenly believes "occur only in Manobo languages" and consequently uses as one among the lexical items proving the autonomy of his proposed Manobo sub-group of Philippine languages (: 32), may not be cognates after all of Malay "seladang" ("wild deer") as earlier suggested (Salazar 1971: 36, 37) but loan words ultimately deriving from the same Malay-Sumatran source. At any rate, among the Mindanao groups used by Llamzon (: 30) for his glottochronological determination, three Manobo (Cotabato, Agusan and Binukid) and only one non-Manobo (the Kamato T'boli) possess (have retained?) the common Philippine term for "deer", "usa". Also of some interest is the parallel construction of Tas. "mata agdaw" ("eye of day") and Mal. "mata hari" ("eye of day") for "sun", in the face of just the normal reflexes of Proto-Austronesian *ʔa(n)day in Mindanao and other Phil. languages.

All this suggests that the present Tas. must have become isolated not originally, in their "primitive" state, but rather after the probably long and intensive contacts implicit in the penetration of "diwata" and possibly other borrowed terms like "seladang" which ultimately originate from Sumatran Mal. On the basis of earlier reports that the Tas. numbered

150 persons, an estimate of 150 years ago was proposed for this event (Salazar 1971: 36). Fernandez and Lynch now report that, beginning with the first couple, five generations can be counted, of which three constitute the present band of some 25 members (:pl. 2). This should reduce our estimate to something like 80 years ago or much less. But even if 200 years were given to this point of separation, it would still mean that the actual Tas. constitute the "wreckage" of a formerly more advanced (possibly already a kaingin-based) culture, an idea quite repugnant to Lynch and his collaborators (Llamzon 1971: 8; Lynch and Llamzon 1971: 92-93; Fernandez and Lynch 1972: 22).

The idea of "culture loss" in relation to the Tas. does not appeal to Lynch because agriculture and hunting "would immensely increase their chances for survival" and "the opportunities for planting and the materials for bow-and-arrow construction were at hand" (Lynch and Llamzon: 92-93; Llamzon: 8). As it now turns out, the "chances for survival" do not have to depend on such techniques. The Tas. environment is such that, even without them, subsistence "is not precarious"

(Fernandez and Lynch: 42) for the Tas., who "live in plenty and will continue to do so for years to come" (:44) by following "a strategy that has led to successful survival with a minimum of harassment or anxiety" (: 45). As for "opportunities", the physical environment constitutes less of a problem than the cultural (and human) one. Agriculture, even of the "shifting" variety exemplified by the kaingin method practiced by the Manobo in the late 20's (Garvan: 74 et seq.) and even now (Lopez), requires a much bigger number than we would suppose the Tas. had at the outset (cf. their genealogy in Fernandez and Lynch: pl. 2) and implies the application of specialized techniques, like the felling of trees and the control of fire, and ritual-propitiatory practices known only to a specialist like the baylan.

Though less complex, hunting presents similar problems for a small group without a specialist in ritual or at least a knowledgeable person in the technique. As the Fernandez-Lynch report points out, hunting is not just the use of the bow and arrow or the spear; it involves "equally, if not more important, ... the knowledge of animal behavior" (l: 29) -- i. e., it is already a kind of specialization. The "trapper" Dafal is

himself already a specialist in his group, within which a great many do not possess the knowledge of Dafal! As for iron and particularly steel whose loss Fernandez and Lynch consider "less likely in the circumstances" (: 22), the aleatory nature of the former as a trade product from the coast has already been underlined (Salazar 1971: 35) whereas the latter should not even be considered "in the circumstances" of coastal trade in Mindanao until perhaps very recently! At any rate, even ethnic metallurgy is an art of the specialist.

Culture loss, it would seem, explains quite a number of things in Tas. life. For example, the Tas. stone-tool "technology", which cannot be attached to any tradition, is probably that "pragmatic" (Fernandez and Lynch: 22) because it is in fact not a product of tradition but that of just simple circumstance and necessity. The actual stone implements are fashioned not by working them with a stone or wooden "hammer" as in most prehistoric traditions but rather by "sharpening" them against a rock as one would a metal tool (loc. cit.: pl. 5); whereas an "heirloom" stone tool is not only shaped like a knife (: pl. 6 fig. 9; Lynch and Llamzon: 94) but is used like one and in the Filipino way --i. e., held between the thumb and

the forefinger for "scraping" in an outward direction from the body, as when one prepares rattan or bamboo (cf. ibid.; Fernandez and Lynch: pl. 7). Is this the "knife" called igot in the Llamzon list (: 2)? In that case, the word is probably a cognate of Sebuano igut "scrape s. t. by rubbing a knife which has been fixed into s. t. immovable up and down against it" (Wolff: 366), whose root is identifiable at once in Tag. hagot. Seb. hag-ut and Bik. ha-got "strip the outer part of abaca to get the fibers" (a technique where the blade is fixed and the abaca mobile) and in Bis. and Bik. gutgut "cut with a slicing motion" and Tag. gutgot "torn or rent into pieces" (ibid.: 280, 288; Panganiban: 457, 465). At the very least, such an etymology does not contradict an earlier Tas. use of metal. The same is true with the "special role" of the bamboo knife bilis (cognate to Tag. bulos "harpoon, dart, spear"?) "in the severing of the newly-born's umbilical cord" (Fernandez and Lynch: 24), since it indicates precisely a taboo on metal tools which, in this case, would expose the infant to some mysterious malady or death (in the modern view, from tetanus and other infestions). Similarly, the "wooden pounders" used to "loosen the yellow-orange pith" in the preparation of the

beneficent staple natak (: pls. 8, 9, 13) recall in shape and handling the familiar metal hoe -- unless, of course, this peculiarity is again attributed to the already pervasive influence of Dafal's five or more visits with the Tas.

In this connection, it seems odd that Dafal's name has not been perpetuated in at least one of his cultural importations into Tas. -- like the bolo, for instance. Instead, this most useful of the reported "gifts" of Dafal was called fais, the old name for the Tas. stone axe which, as a result, purportedly came to be known as batu fais or "stone fais" (ibid.: 20-21). If true, the phenomenon is linguistically a most quaint instance of a new object taking the generic name of an old one instead of just being classified as just one specified type. In this sense, our pan americano would be called simply pan, while the earlier known ones would be specified as pan filipino or pan español; the potato would be identified simply as "appel" in Dutch and "pomme" in French instead of "aardappel" and "pomme de terre" (earth apple) respectively, while the original apple would be qualified as "hemelappel" and "pomme de ciel" (apple of heaven)! The point must be driven home, because the designation of the bolo as fais, instead of "fais Dafal".

(in honor of this culture-bearer and on the model of bulbul siko and bulbul laso in the Llamzon list: 2) or simply whatever Dafal calls the bolo (if the term natak was presumably accepted by the Tas. with the entire process and product from Dafal, why should his term for bolo not be?), may in fact be normal in the light of an earlier knowledge of metal or even of the bolo itself.

That the bolo may even have been known before Dafal is implicit in the speculation by Fernandez and Lynch that the use of rattan for hafting "may have followed the introduction of the bolo; cutting this plant would be a difficult task for the stone axe" (: 23), because the stone tool "heirlooms" which the Tas. "say they have had for generations" (i. e., certainly before the reported advent of Dafal) are also hafted through the use of rattan (: pl. 6 fig. 7 and 9, pl. 7; Lynch and Llamzon: 94). As a matter of fact, they are not only better worked but also better hafted with much more cleanly shaved rattan than the ones made for the curious visitors of the Tas. forest (cf. Pamphlet: 6; Fernandez and Lynch: pl. 5, pl. 6 fig. 8). In that case, there seems to be no need to suspect that the Tas. did not use bamboo internodes or nafnaf for cooking before Dafal's arrival (: 24) or to suppose that it was Dafal's bolo which

was responsible for the popularization of nafnaf (: 34), also used as containers to fetch water (: 15) in the manner of our barrio folk not so long ago. The rub, however, lies in the fact that extensive Tas. use of nafnaf before Dafal would point to previous knowledge of the bolo or some other metal tool. Such a circumstance would be most unprepossessing, since even for the metal (brass) earrings that a young Tas. wears there can be no other explanation but some insignificant "recent contact with neighboring Manobo peoples" (Lynch and Llamzon: 94; cf. Fernandez and Lynch: 28, pl. 7) who, of course, collectively could not produce the same massive effects as the solitary Dafal on his five or more short excursions into Tas. land. The assumption must be maintained firmly that the Tas. constitute an originally primitive people untouched by the world until Dafal came to bring them to a higher level of culture. Thus communicated to anthropological science as "one of the most significant finds of the last half century", the discovery could afford the PANAMIN and other interested sectors "a rare, and perhaps our last, chance to study man living at the extreme end of the spectrum of cultural development" (Fernandez and Lynch: 52 n. 13).

That end of the spectrum, however, appears to be considerably less extreme than the sweep of this self-consciously momentous view -- even and particularly on the crucial point of food production. The early appearance of terms for "grain" and "grind" (a reflex of Proto-Austronesian *gilin cf. Dempwolff 1937: 55) in our still very limited Tas. vocabulary (Llamzon List: 2), tattoo (a practice closely associated with ritual headhunting within the context of agriculture among Mindanao and even Austronesian groups) and the "incipient horticulture" observed by Fox have already been pointed out as indicating the probable previous knowledge of agriculture (Salazar 1971: 37). Describing Tas. "incipient horticulture" as a "system of monitoring and fussing over the wild yam's growth, marking it for future harvest, and removing tubers in such a way as not to kill the plant", Fernandez and Lynch (: 36) limit it to only one yam species "referred to as biking", all the other species having been "pointed out by Dafal, who even taught them how to leach one species known to be poisonous" (ibid.). This means that Dafal, "trapper of wild pig and a collector of coconut pith, for both delicacies he had a good market in his own settlement" (Lynch and Llamzon: 91), is

also an expert on wild yams and on the preparation of at least one poisonous species. He must have also introduced their names (kalut, bugsu, lafad, malafakid, banag, fugwa, cf. Llamzon List: 4) into the Tas. vocabulary, after having found them in the forest Zone II (Fernandez and Lynch: 35) and taught their use to the Tas. who are presumed to have lived in that same environment for a thousand years or even two without discovering other yam sorts than their very own biking before Dafal! Indeed, it would be most unusual if the Tas. had known these other species (particularly the poisonous kalut), because that would make them real and not just "incipient" wild yam horticulturists, unpleasantly removing them from the more interesting "extreme end of the spectrum".

But Dafal is also credited with having introduced the ubod, "tasty terminal bud of the wild palm and other plants" (:25, 36, passim), and the natak or wild palm pith (:25, 27). The names must consequently be assumed to have come from Dafal, since the Tas. could not have had them without knowing what they stood for. Having taught the Tas. to appreciate ubod as food (it is taking them some time to accept other food products brought by PANAMIN, cf. Nance June 12: 19; Fernandez

and Lynch: 29, passim), he must have found time enough to show that it can be collected from "three species of palm (possibly more), from rattan (ubod balagan), and from bamboo shoots" (: 36-37), before being cooked over hot coals, steamed in a bamboo tube or simply eaten raw (: 37)! The WB Manobo of course know urud, "the edible heart of bud of a palm tree or banana plant" (Elkins 1968: 216). It is the Bik. ubud or "coconut palm core", the Bis. ubud or "tender heart of the trunk of palms, bananas, bamboos, rattans" (Wolff: 1075), the Ibanag ubud or "kind of palm" and Tag. ubod or "core, gist, substance, essence of" (Panganiban: 1003). It is thus a pan-Philippine and even pan-Austronesian (cf. *u(m)bu[dg'] in Dempwolff: 159) phenomenon which the Tas. never experienced till Dafal!

The same is suggested with natak, known to the WB Manobo as "sago, a starchy food prepared from the juice of the trunk of certain palms" (Elkins 1968: 127). Bik. natuk refers to "coconut milk or any extract", whereas Bis. natuk is the "powdery starch of any sort that has been obtained by soaking the source in water and letting it settle" (Wolff: 699). The word could not have been known to the Tas. before Dafal

who brought the food it refers to. With it, the B'lit culture hero also introduced "a complex of knowledge, equipment, and behavior" -- i. e., the tools (like the bolo, a press made of split bamboo and ferns, a trough made of bark, bark trays to heat the starch, bark scoop, pith pounder, etc.) and their utilization (Fernandez and Lynch: 25, 28). Dafal appears thus as an expert in another field, as versatile as a trained Peace Corps volunteer! In this sense, is it also safe to assume that he also taught the Tas. to "test-cut the trunk and determine from the consistency of the pith if it is ready" to be tapped for the stored-up starch through natək extraction? Some Tas. claim they can tell "by knocking the trunk with one knuckle, or by tapping it with a piece of wood" (: 39). Such method and talent would require quite a long apprenticeship which Dafal must have also provided during the "about five trips" he made to the Tas.! Did he also initiate them in the technique of taking less than half of the basag trunk for natək extraction in order to leave the remaining portion to rot as potential source of beetle grubs (ibid.) to be collected some time after for food (: 17)? Apparently associated with fallen and rotting palm trees (: 20), the "grub" industry must have been connected

(or flourished only) with the introduction of the natak process.

Little would then really remain as "originally" Tas., since Dafal supposedly introduced also trapping and hunting, together with all the necessary instruments and their utilization (: 35, passim). All the Tas. terms relative to these activities, therefore, must be considered as loan words from the B'lit through the omnipresent Dafal. However, the words "usada makatalunan" or "pig (wild)" (Llamzon List: 3) and "faen" or "bait" (Fernandez and Lynch: 32) seem to be Tas. and therefore quite interesting. Literally, the first should mean "forest usada", since "katalunan" (: 2) or "talonan" (Fernandez and Lynch: 38) means "forest". Does this point to another animal of the same category as the pig but also called usada or to the previous existence of domesticated pig among the Tas.? As for "faen", the Tas. seem to use the wild banana which, of course, should relate the term to Bis. Bik. "paon", Ilok. "appan" and Tag. "pain". The WB Manobo do not have a cognate term, "bait" being for them either "segkad" "to set a captive bird as bait" or "kati" "to catch a wild animal or bird by using another to attract him" (Elkins 1968: 38, 162, 229),

the Tag. "kati" and Bik. "kate" "decoy for birds, fowls, animals, etc." (Panganiban: 272). Could this be interpreted generously to give the Tas. at least the techniques of animal food acquisition implicit in the word "faen" -- i. e., including perhaps fishing? At any rate, Dafal seems to have been the least effective in precisely the area where he is supposedly most qualified and to which he also must have devoted most of the instructional time consumed during the "about five times" he was with the Tas. between 1966 and 1971 (Fernandez and Lynch: 26, passim).

In fact, he apparently was more effective with the "bamboo broom" he was supposed to have given the Tas. (: 28), since Cave III was constantly kept "quite clean by reason of regular attention from a split-bamboo broom" (: 8), a habit quite unusual and regrettable in a troglodytic people (: 8-9) but really very reminiscent of house-dwelling groups. As with the other benevolences of Dafal, the broom is mysterious, since on "none of (his) visits did he reach the caves where (the Tas.) lived" (: 26) and the fact that they lived in caves became clear only in March of this year (Nance June 8: 6). Furthermore, even if the gift were simply another proof of

Dafal's uncanny perception of Tas. needs, the Tas. urge to sweep the cave floor would have to be explained with its none too prehistoric constancy (and result). Would it be too simple to admit that, after all, the Tas. probably knew and had houses? They now still have sheds or temporary shelters "fashioned out of wood and palm leaves" (: 34-35) called "lawi" (Llamzon List: 2) which, quite distinct from the "roof" or "tifang" (cf. Bik. atop, Tag. atip, Ivt. atep) a simple "lean-to" would not possess (Salazar 1971: 37), should be related to Tag. bahay, Mal. Bik. Bis. Iik. balay and Ivt. vahay through Maranaw oalai and Magindanaw walay (cf. Llamzon: 22) by metathesis. Even the other term gathered by Fox -- dungdung (Llamzon List: 2) -- recalls Tag. Kap. dalungdung "forest grass cabin, hut or cottage" (Panganiban: 345) as well as Bik. Bis. dungdung "head covering of cloth or any flexible material" (Wolff: 238). It may be mentioned that, among the related Manobo of the interior of Southwestern Cotabato the houses are "temporary in nature" and made of bamboo, cogon leaves, tree trunks and tree barks (Lopez: 59).

At any rate, there seem to be strong indications not only for "culture loss" among the Tas. in the areas of housing, food production and metallurgy, but more so for serious doubt

with regard to Dafal's testimony -- particularly because research up to now had as one main hindrance "the refusal of the Tasaday themselves to be interviewed or observed unless Elizalde were present or somewhere nearby" (Fernandez and Lynch: 4). No real reason for Dafal's benevolence toward the Tas. has been established except that the Tas. were giving him bui, a vine chewed with betel nut (: 26-27, passim), which he could have procured for himself anyway. His "about five trips" or even ten to the Tas. -- the number is in fact important, contrary to what Fernandez and Lynch (: 26) believe -- do not appear sufficient in frequency or intensity to produce the kind of techno-economic and linguistic changes his supposed importations imply, even assuming he was capable and willing to carry them out. In this sense, a great number of the presently known Tas. vocabulary would have to be dismissed as loan words from the B'lit through Dafal, a phenomenon comparable in dimension to the Indianization of Indonesia or, why not, to the Americanization of the Philippines (with Dafal playing the role at once of the soldier, the banker, the businessman, the missionary and the Peace Corps Volunteer). This should be emphasized in the face of the fact that, up to the time of Tas.

contact with PANAMIN and perhaps even now; Dafal did not seem to know much of the Tas. language since, according to Secretary Elizalde and Dr. Fox, no one could be found, "either T'boli, Ubo or B'lit, who could understand (it) to obtain detailed information" except Igna who said at the outset that "less than half" of what the Tas. said was intelligible (Llamzon: 1; Fox: 7). He must have taught the Tas. by sign language, the Tas. learning thereby more proficiently Dafal's B'lit than he their Tas.!

To close this footnote, a few etymological points may be added to the ones already made above. When Fernandez and Lynch state that the Tas. "take their name from the forested peak in which the western slope of the valley terminates, about 300-350 feet above the floor of the main cave" (: 6), are they transmitting original information from the Tas. or are they interpreting an etymology we proposed long before it was known that the Tas. lived in caves (Salazar 1971: 34-35)? In the former case, the derivation of Tasaday from "ta/sa/aday" or, by metathesis, "ta/sa/daya" (i. e., "people of the upstream, from the direction toward the mountain") is confirmed. In the latter case, the source of the information should have been

cited in good faith. In this regard, the etymology of Tasafang may be related to that of Tasaday, in the same manner the two groups seem to be related in marriage. Tasafang can be analyzed into "ta/sa/fang" or "ta/safang", meaning "people of or from fang" or "safang people". Less likely, the latter etymology would have to connect a Tas. term "safang" either with Bis. "sapang" or "salapang" "spear that is thrown or a harpoon" (Wolff: 854, 875) or with Tag. "sapang" red tint from wood (brazilwood); brazilwood tree which gives off a red dye", with cognates in Kap., Ibg., Ilk., Ivt. and Png. (Panganiban: 885-886). In the former etymology, "fang" must be related to Tag. pampang, Bik. Bis. pangpang "river bank", Ilk. pangpang "furrow" and Seb. Sam-Leyt. pangpang "rock; cliff" (: 764; Wolff: 732). All reflect Proto-Austronesian *panpan "to separate, part, divide" (aus einander Stehen), the Ngadju-Dajak having pampang "peak, spike; antler point" and the Hova fampanā "abyss, gulf, pit; chasm, gap; rift" (Dempwolff 1937: 114). These meanings do not seem to contradict the fact that Tasafang is remembered "indistinctly as far away, high up in a cave where nearby the water boils"

(Fernandez and Lynch: 18) or that its people met with the Tas. "at a stream where they fished together" (: 10), the streams and their banks being the focal point of economic and other activities (: 34, passim).

Already linked with Tag. katalonan "priestess" (i. e., ka/talon/an "that which or he who is connected with the talon") and Mal. metathesized hutan "forest" from *tahun which may have conflicted with a homonym meaning "year" (Salazar 1971: 37), Tas. "katalunan" or "talonan" "forest" has other cognates in Ilk. talon "field, farm" and Ibg. (sa) talon "fields", (sa) aroyu talon "forest". If the correlation talon = *tahun is correct, then Dempwolff's reconstruction of Proto-Austronesian *hu[t]an "wood, forest" may have to be recast, since it is reflected in Proto-Polynesian only by To. 'uta⁶ and Fu. Sm. uta⁶ "(forested) interior" (1937: 66). In this sense *qu(tT)an would have to be withdrawn from Dyen's examples (: 32) of PMP Initial q, the Van der Tuuk-ish Tag.-Mal. correspondence -l-/*-h-constituting perhaps a clue to Dempwolff's erstarren Infix at least in the instance of Tag. kalabaw, Jav. kebaw and Tob. horbo "water buffalo" (1934: 59, 73). As for natak, its sense among the Tas. and elsewhere (supra) should make

it a reflex of Proto-Austronesian *na[t]uh "name of a tree", as reconstructed by Dempwolff from Tag. nato "Sterculiaceae (i. e., family comprising the cacao and kola nut trees)", Mal. NgD. *natuh, natu "guttapercha tree" and Hov. natu "imbricate plants (i. e., like the Coniferae)" (1937: 108), all having a "starchy" or substantial nature. Tas. ma/bula or "white" (Fernandez and Lynch: 11) corresponds to WB. Manobo evul or "whitish; of a diseased eye or of water, to become cloudy or whitish in color" (Elkins 1968: 69, 352), a cognate of Tag. laboq "turbidity (of liquids); obscurity of meaning; dimness (of light); developing blindness" (Panganiban: 579). All reflect Dempwolff's reconstruction *labu "to be dirty" (1937: 100). Together with Tag. Bik. Ilk. Png. tipon, "gathering together, collecting, accumulating" (Panganiban: 981), Tas. tifun "local group; band" (Fernandez and Lynch: 13) also reflects Proto-Austronesian *[t]i(m)pun "to gather, collect, accumulate" (Dempwolff 1937: 139); Tas. foso "flower" (Fernandez and Lynch: 20) joins Bik. Bis. Tag. puso, Ibg. futu, Mar. Png poso "heart; center, middle" as reflexes of P-A *put'uh "heart; heart leaf", constructed from Tg. puso TB. pusu "heart" and NgD. puso "bud" among others (Dempwolff 1937: 124).

Finally, some "local" etymologies may be of some interest. The controversial "nafnaf" or "bamboo internodes" is found among the Manobo in Southwestern Cotabato as nafnaf "a kind of small bamboo" probably related to Schizostachyum lumampao (Blanco) Merr, otherwise known as napnap in Ilok (Lopez: 21 n. 5). Tas. igkan "fruit" (Fernandez and Lynch: 20), as distinguished from bunga "fruit" in the Llamzon List (:2), appears to be connected with Bis. gikan "from such and such a place or time; originate from" which forms kagikan "ancestral origin" and ginikanan "parents; origin, primary source" (Wolff: 264), all of which forms and meanings are also found in Bik. A word can thus always crop up in any given language and, having done so, find cognates elsewhere in sister languages. In this sense, prudence becomes another name for intellectual honesty. Consequently, it might not be too judicious to state that such and such a word, like for instance the Tas. one for "boat", is not known (Fernandez and Lynch: 20, passim) or that, to one's knowledge, it is known only in a certain linguistic subgroup. An instance of the latter is Elkins' listing of eleven lexical items as specifically Manobo (1971: 32), when a little research reveals at least six of them with probable cognates

in major Phil. languages. These are: Man. getek "belly"² - Bik. tulák "stomach", Bis. gutuk "filled to the point that it is tight. Gutuk na ang ákung tiyan, My stomach is filled to bursting" (Wolff: 280); Man. langesa "blood" - Bik. Bis. langsa "having a fishy smell or the taste of blood" (: 577), Tag. lansa "odor or taste of fish or of shed blood", Ilk. lang-es "odor of fish (and blood)" (Panganiban: 606, 610 sub "langis"); Man. qumaw "call" - Bik. qumaw "praise"; Man. seladeng "deer" - Mal. seladang "wild deer" (cf. supra); Man. belad "hand" - Tag. Bik. Bis. palad "palm of hand"; and Man. lasuq "penis" - Bis. lúsù "penis (coarse)" or lasù "masturbate" (Wolff: 650, 588) Bik. lusiq "exposed head of penis" or la-sog "penis".

Restraint would seem to be, in the light of what has been discussed, still quite a commendable virtue -- even with regard to the now rejuvenated (hopefully) Tas.

Diliman, September 12, 1972

FOOTNOTES

1. MacLeish (: 219, 226, 230, passim) also mentions this new title of Elizalde as well as the Tas. mesianic expectation in relation to him (cf. infra).

2. The term may even be a Proto-Austronesian reflex, since it has probable cognates in Polynesian Fiji, Tongan, Urean kete "belly" and Rotuman éfe "belly" (Grace: 58-59).

R E F E R E N C E S

- DYEN, Isidore.
1953 The Proto-Malayo-Polynesian Laryngeals. Baltimore: Waverley Press, viii, 65 pp.
- DEMPWOLFF, Otto.
1934 Vergleichende Lautlehre des Austronesischen Wortschatzes. I. Induktiver Aufbau einer Indonesischen Ursprache. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 124 pp.
1937 Vergleichende Lautlehre des Austronesischen Wortschatzes. III. Austronesisches Wörterverzeichnis. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 192 pp.
- ELKINS, Richard E.
1968 Manobo-English Dictionary. Hawaii: University Press, XX, 356 pp.
1971 Comments. Philippine Journal of Linguistics, II:2 (December), 31-33.
- FERNANDEZ, Carlos A. and Frank Lynch
1972 The Tasaday: Cave-dwelling Food Gatherers of South Cotabato, Mindanao. Special Release. Panamin Foundation, Inc., 53 pp., 1 app., 16 pls.

FOX, Robert.

- 1971 Time Catches up with the Tasaday. *The Asian*, I, 3:7.

GARVAN, John.

- 1931 The Manobos of Mindanao. *Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences*. XXIII: 1 (Washington), xvi, 251 pp., pls.

GRACE, George W.

- 1959 The Position of the Polynesian Languages within the Austronesian (Malayo-Polynesian) Language Family. *Indiana University Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics*, Memoir 16 of the *International Journal of American Linguistics*. Baltimore: Waverly Press, Inc., v, 77 pp.

LLAMZON, Teodoro, A.

- 1971 A Tasaday Manobo Word List Compiled on July 16-17. Mimeo., 4 pp.
- 1971 The Tasaday Language So Far. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. II: 2 (December), 1-30.

LOPEZ, Rogelio M.

- 1968 Agricultural Practices of the Manobo in the Interior of Southwestern Cotabato (Mindanao). Cebu: University of San Carlos, vii, 94 pp.

LYNCH, Frank and Teodoro A. Llamzon.

- 1971 The B'lit Manobo and the Tasaday. *Philippine Sociological Review*. XIX: 1-2 (Jan.-April), 90-93, 94.

MacLeish, Kenneth.

- The Tasaday. *Stone Age Cavemen of Mindanao*. *National Geographic*. CXLII: 2 (August 1972), 218-249. With Photographs by John Lannois.

MAJUL, Cesar A.

- 1966 The Role of Islam in the History of the Filipino People. *Asian Studies*. IV: 2 (August), 303-315.

NANCE, John.

- 1972 The Tasadays. *Manila Times*. June 8: 1, 6; June 9: 1, 6; June 10: 1, 25; June 11: 1, 13; June 12: 1, 19.

PAMPHLET (Panamin).

- 1972 Protecting Man's Right to Choice. Panamin Foundation, Inc., 36 pp.

PANGANIBAN, Jose V.

- 1972 Diksyunaryo-Tesauro Pilipino-Ingles. Lungsod ng Quezon: Manlapaz Publishing Co., xx, 1027 pp.

SALAZAR, Z. A.

- 1968 Le concept AC* 'anitu' dans le monde austronésien vers l'étude comparative des religions ethniques austronésiennes. Ms. dissertation. Sorbonne (Université de Paris). 310 pp., maps, tabl.

- 1971 Footnote on the Tasaday. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. II:2 (December), 34-38.

VAN STEIN-CALENFALS, P. V.

- 1936 The Melanesoid Civilisations of Eastern Asia. *Bull. Raffles Museum*. Ser. B: I.

VILLIERS, John.

- 1965 Südostasien vor der Kolonialzeit. *Fischer Weltgeschichte*. Bd. XVIII. Frankfurt: Fischer Bucherei, 348 pp.

WOLFF, John U.

- 1972 A Dictionary of Cebuano Visayan. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. Special Monograph No. 4. xx, 1164 pp.