

ARTICLE

Savaxay and the language of kinship in Batanic communities

Maria Kristina S. Gallego

ABSTRACT

Based on kinship terminologies collected for Batanic languages, this study reconstructs the Proto-Batanic kinship system and traces its transformations in present-day daughter communities. Since speakers of Batanic languages have maintained close contact among each other, the groups exhibit significant similarities not only in linguistic structure but also in certain cultural aspects such as kinship. All Batanic communities follow a lineal type of kinship (also known as Eskimo type), which is a retention of the ancestral Batanic kinship system. This is a departure from the generation type (also known as Hawaiian type) reconstructed for Proto-Philippines and Proto-Malayo-Polynesian. This development is analyzed as a reflection of changes in the behavior of the speakers, particularly in terms of rule of residence. Moreover, the physical house is seen as a reproduction of kinship relations in Batanic communities, where it serves as the primary locus of activities, rituals, and traditions that relate to kinship. Despite significant transformations in the kinship system of Batanic communities since their descent from Proto-Philippines, cultural features, particularly the value structure of Filipino communities, persist to this day.

KEYWORDS

kinship, Batanes, ethnolinguistics, historical linguistics, language, culture

Kinship and community, language and culture

Language can be seen as a fabric into which the threads of a community's culture, tradition, and history are woven. Edward Sapir writes that people's perception of the world is to a large extent built by the words they speak (1929, 209).¹ While the dependence of a person's thought and action on his/her language has been challenged since the 1930s onwards, it is recognized that language is an effective tool to examine a particular group's way of life. This is the premise of the words

and things technique (*wörter und sachen*) in comparative historical linguistics, in which a reconstructed form in the protolanguage (i.e., the parent language) of a group of present-day languages is regarded as culturally and environmentally salient in the speakers' community. This means that it is possible to reconstruct the culture and way of life of a group of people beyond the limits of written records.² Such has been done in many studies, as in the case of Proto-Austronesian (PAN), the parent language of all the languages spoken in Taiwan (i.e., the Formosan languages), Island Southeast Asia, the Pacific, and Madagascar.³

In reconstructing a specific cultural feature such as kinship, for instance, one begins by examining kinship terminologies of a group of languages. According to Robert Blust, universal kinship categories, such as *father*, *mother*, *sibling*, *spouse*, and *child*, are combined to form culture-specific categories, such as *cousin* and *in-law* (1993, 26). This paper examines culture-specific kinship categories in the Batanic communities and reconstructs the possible kinship system of the Proto-Batanic-speaking community. Specifically, this study addresses the following questions:

- (1) What is the kinship system of the Proto-Batanic community?
- (2) How does this relate to the kinship system of Proto-Philippines and Proto-Austronesian?
- (3) How did it develop in present-day Batanic-speaking communities?

Conclusions are drawn primarily from linguistic data, with supporting evidence from informant interviews and field observation. Specifically, to elicit native kinship terminologies, I made use of a word list (presented in Filipino and English) which language consultants translated. In-depth interviews and field observation verified the data. The profile of the language consultants, as well as other information on the fieldwork undertaken, is presented in the appendix.

Since this paper primarily intends to explore how a specific cultural feature can be reconstructed by means of linguistic data, this paper, in many respects, is still preliminary. Due to limited fieldwork, the data presented may not generate an accurate description of the Batanic kinship system, which requires an extensive ethnographic research in each Batanic-speaking community. With these limitations, I tried to undertake a reconstruction of the Proto-Batanic kinship system and give a basic ethnolinguistic description of its development in present-day communities.

The Batanic languages: Yami, Itbayat, Ivatan, and Ibatan

The languages spoken on the islands bordering Taiwan and the Philippines constitute a small and discrete subgroup within the Philippine language family.⁴ This subgroup, known as Batanic, Bashiic, or Vasayic, is composed of: (1) Yami,

spoken on Orchid Island, Taiwan; (2) Itbayat, spoken on Itbayat Island, Batanes; (3) Ivatan, with dialects Ivasay (spoken in the northern part of Batan), and Isamorong (spoken in the southern part of Batan as well as on the island of Sabtang); and (4) Ibatan, spoken on the island of Babuyan Claro, Cagayan (Moriguchi 1983; Tsuchida et al. 1987; Tsuchida et al. 1989; Blust 1991). Figure 1 presents the location of the different Batanic languages.



Figure 1: The location of Batanic languages
(Source: CartoGIS, ANU College of Asia and the Pacific, 2017)

All Batanic languages exhibit a high degree of linguistic similarity (Cottle and Cottle 1958; Hidalgo and Hidalgo 1971; Reid 1966; Ross 2005). This indicates that the break-up of the proto-language ancestral to the microgroup (i.e., Proto-Batanic) has been fairly recent, which according to linguistic, ethnographic, and archaeological records occurred approximately 1000 years ago (Li 2001, 277). The close linguistic relationship of the present-day Batanic groups also correlates with apparent commonalities in terms of certain cultural features, as in the domain of kinship. Thus, reconstructing the kinship system of Proto-Batanic is fairly straightforward.

From Proto-Austronesian to Proto-Batanic: Reconstructing the ancestral kinship system

Comparing contemporary kinship terms of Batanic languages, I present a reconstruction of the kinship system of Proto-Batanic, the ancestral language of present-day Batanic languages. Table 1 below shows the reconstructed terms for the Proto-Batanic language.⁵

Table 1: Reconstructed kinship terms for Proto-Batanic⁶

Kinship term	Associated meanings
*apu	Grandparents, grandchildren
*ama	Father, father-in-law
*ina	Mother, aunt, mother-in-law, someone's mother
*anak	Child, niece/nephew, son/daughter-in-law
*(ka)ketex	Sibling
*kaka	Elder sibling
*wadi	Younger sibling
*maraqan	Uncle
*(ka)teysa	Cousin, family on father's side
***	Unreconstructed possibility for the category parent's sister (i.e., aunt)

(1) **Proto-Batanic *apu ‘grandparent, grandchild’, from PAN *apu ‘grandparent/grandchild (reciprocal)’⁷** The term *apu was reciprocally used to refer to both grandparents and grandchildren. Certain derivations in the daughter languages are observable, specifically in the use of affixes or clitics. The use of the term to refer to the older generation (two or more generations older than the Ego) signals respect and deference. In the analysis of the kinship term *apo* in Itbayat, Yukihiro Yamada (1970) claims that this term is the widest compared to other kinship terms with regard to semantic features because it exhibits a number of derivations that cover several generations. The affixes *-en* and *in-* mark lineality and generation, respectively. This means the affix *-en* derives collaterality, which is also applicable to other

kinship terms, such as *ama* ‘father’ and *ina* ‘mother’; and the affix *in-* derives generation younger than the Ego. These derivations may also apply to other Batanic languages and can be reconstructed for Proto-Batanic.

Proto-Batanic *apu ‘grandparent’

- ape-n *Yami*. Shortened form of *apoan ni* (Providence University 2008). This category is also differentiated according to sex by adding *akay* ‘man’ for grandfather and *akes* ‘woman’ for grandmother.
- p-apu *Itbayat, Iwasay, Isamorong*. Possibly originally a vocative term for grandparents. According to Robert Blust and Stephen Trussel regarding their ongoing work on the Austronesian Comparative Dictionary, the term is used in Itbayat as vocative term for a grandparent or any person two generations older than the Ego.
- apu-ng *Ibatan*. Similar to the Itbayat, Iwasay, and Isamorong, this is also used as a vocative term in Ibatan to refer to grandparents or to old people with respect (Maree and Tomas 2012, 53).

Proto-Batanic *apu ‘grandchild’

- apo *Yami, Itbayat*.
- in-apu *Itbayat, Iwasay, Isamorong*. The affix *in-* marks generation, specifically the generation two levels below the Ego.
- apu-ku *Ibatan*. A combination of the morphemes *apu* and *ku*, the 1st person genitive pronoun in Ibatan. The term may have originally meant ‘my grandchild’ and was used in a vocative sense.

(2) **Proto-Batanic *ama ‘father or the father’s generation’, from PAN *amax ‘father’** This term is primarily used to refer to the Ego’s father. Itbayat also shows a reflex of the term used to refer to the Ego’s father-in-law. It is possible that the term originally had a wider scope that generally referred to the father’s generation. Non-cognates (i.e., terms that are assumed to come from a different etymological source because of the difference in form) of the term are used in other Batanic languages to refer to father-in-law, such as *iciaroa* in Yami, *bijenan* in Iwasay and Isamorong (possibly borrowed from Filipino), and *katugangan* in Ibatan (an Ilokano loanword).

Proto-Batanic *ama ‘father’

- ama *Yami, Itbayat, Iwasay, Isamorong*.
- ama-ng *Ibatan*. Also used as a vocative term.

Proto-Batanic *ama-en ‘father-in-law’

- ama-wun *Itbayat*. Combination of the morphemes *ama* ‘father’ and *-en*, an affix typically used in kinship terms to indicate collaterality.

(3) Proto-Batanic *ina ‘mother or the mother’s generation’, from PAN *ina ‘mother, mother’s sister’ Proto-Batanic *ina refers primarily to the Ego’s mother. Like Proto-Batanic *ama, evidence also shows that the term possibly refers more widely to the mother’s generation (mother, aunt, and mother-in-law). Similar to Proto-Batanic *ama, however, non-cognates of Proto-Batanic *ina are currently used to refer to mother-in-law in the Batanic languages except Itbayat, namely *iciaroa* in Yami, *biyenan* in Ivasay and Isamorong, and *katugangan* in Ibatan.

Proto-Batanic *ina ‘mother’

ina *Yami, Itbayat, Ivasay, Isamorong.*
 ana-ng *Ibatan.* Also used as a vocative term.

Proto-Batanic *ka-m-ina-en ‘aunt’

ka-m-ina-n *Yami.* A combination of the affix *ka-* ‘fellow, company, of the same X’ and *minan*. *Minan* is further analyzed as a shortened form of *mo ina ni* and is used to refer to someone’s mother (Providence University 2008).

ka-m-na-n *Itbayat, Ivasay, Isamorong, Ibatan.* The derivation of the term is most possibly parallel with Yami.

Proto-Batanic *ina-en ‘mother-in-law’

ina-wun *Itbayat.* A combination of the morphemes *ina* ‘mother’ and the affix *-en*.

(4) Proto-Batanic *anak ‘child or the child’s generation’, from PAN *aNak and PMP *anak ‘child, offspring; son, daughter’ Similar to the wide scope of the terms for ‘mother’ and ‘father’, Proto-Batanic *anak refers to the Ego’s child and the child’s generation (i.e., niece/nephew and son/daughter-in-law). Non-cognates for the category son/daughter-in-law include *vai* or *aci* in Yami (generally used to refer to girl or boy by the parental generation respectively) and *manugang* in Ibatan (an Ilokano loanword).

Proto-Batanic *anak ‘child’

anak *Yami, Itbayat, Ivasay, Isamorong, Ibatan.*

Proto-Batanic *anak-en ‘niece/nephew’

man-kakteh *Yami.* While the form *anak* is not evident in the Yami word for niece/nephew, the term is actually a shortened form of *manganak no kakteh*, which literally means ‘sibling’s child’.

- anak-en *Itbayat*. A combination of the morphemes *anak* ‘child’ and the affix *-en*.
- ka-anak-an *Ibatan*. A combination of the affixes *ka-*, *anak*, and *-en* (with *-en* undergoing vowel harmony to change to the contemporary *-an*).
- pam-angk-en *Iwasay, Isamorong*. Perhaps a loanword from Filipino. However, the term *pamangkin* is also a reflex of PMP **anak*, a result of the combination of the morphemes *pang-*, *anak*, and *-en*.

Proto-Batanic **anak-en* ‘son/daughter-in-law’

- anak-en *Itbayat*. A combination of the morphemes *anak* ‘child’ and the affix *-en*.
- mang-anak-en *Iwasay, Isamorong*. A combination of the morphemes *mang-*, *anak*, and *-en*.

(5) **Proto-Batanic *(ka)ketex ‘sibling’** This term generally refers to the relationship between siblings. The term is analyzed as a combination of the affix *ka-* ‘fellow, company, of the same X’ and *ketex*. The latter morpheme also literally means sibling in Yami (*keteh*), and thus Proto-Batanic **ka-ketex* may mean ‘fellow sibling’. While the reflex of **ketex* means ‘sibling’ in Yami, the bare root does not seem to appear in some Batanic languages, such as Isamorong. It is possible that Proto-Batanic **ketex* carried a different meaning historically, and the association with the meaning of ‘sibling’ may be a more recent innovation. While the etymology of the word is still unclear at present, a particular metaphor used by speakers of Yami may shed some light on this matter. The phrase *kakteh do cinai* ‘siblings of the intestines (literal)’ is used in Yami to describe very close friends, and are also used to refer to speakers of other Batanic languages. Moreover, the word *kakteh* is sometimes analyzed by the speakers as related to the word *kaketeb/kakteh* ‘cut from the same X’ (derived from *keteb* ‘cut’). Thus, *kakteh/kakteh du cinai* may also literally mean ‘cut from the same intestine’. The two forms (*kakteh* and *kakteh*) appear very similar, but historically, there is no correspondence of the fricative (velar [x] for Itbayat and glottal [h] for the rest of Batanic languages) with the bilabial stop [b] in the Batanic languages. This suggests that the relationship between *kakteh* and *kakteh* may be regarded as folk etymology. A parallel case can be seen in Filipino, where *kapatid* ‘sibling’ is often analyzed as a combination of the affix *ka-* and the word *patid* ‘cut’, literally ‘cut from the same (intestine)’. To clearly establish the etymological history of Proto-Batanic **kaktex* ‘sibling’ thus needs further investigation.

Proto-Batanic *(ka)ketex ‘sibling’

- kaktex *Itbayat*.
- kakteh *Iwasay, Isamorong, Ibatan*.
- ka-keteh *Yami*. A combination of the morphemes *ka-* and *keteh*.

- (6) **Proto-Batanic *kaka ‘elder sibling’, from PAN *kaka ‘elder sibling’ and PMP *kaka ‘elder sibling of the same sex’** Relative age plays an important factor in the kinship system of the Proto-Batanic language. The reconstructed Proto-Batanic *kaka refers to the Ego’s elder sibling. Elicited data from Iwasay show loanwords from Chinese, namely *ate* ‘elder sister’ and *kuya* ‘elder brother’ which highlights difference in sex.

Proto-Batanic *kaka ‘elder sibling’

kaka *Yami, Itbayat, Isamorong.*
 aka-ng *Ibatan.* Vocative.

- (7) **Proto-Batanic *wadi ‘younger sibling’, from PAN *Suaji ‘younger sibling’ and PMP *huaji ‘younger sibling of the same sex; younger parallel cousin of the same sex’** Proto-Batanic *wadi is reconstructed for the category younger sibling. Iwasay does not reflect a term for this category.

Proto-Batanic *wadi ‘younger sibling’

wari *Yami, Itbayat, Isamorong.* The voiced, alveolar, stop [d] underwent rhotacism to a voiced, alveolar, trill [r].
 adi *Ibatan.*

- (8) **Proto-Batanic *maraqan ‘uncle’** While Proto-Batanic *ama ‘father’ also refers to male kin of the father’s generation, the term *maran/maraan* is found consistently in Batanic languages to refer to the Ego’s uncle, reconstructed as Proto-Batanic *maraqan. The reconstruction of this term produces an asymmetrical kinship system, as no separate term was found for the category of parent’s sister/aunt other than the reflexes of Proto-Batanic *ina ‘mother’. In addition, the etymology of Proto-Batanic *maraqan is obscure, as a cognate external to the Batanic languages is yet to be found. It is assumed that the term originally meant something different but related to the male generation, which has developed to mean ‘uncle’ in Batanic languages.

Proto-Batanic *maraqan ‘uncle’

maran *Yami, Itbayat, Iwasay, Isamorong.*
 maraan *Ibatan.*

- (9) **Proto-Batanic *(ka)teysa ‘cousin’** Proto-Batanic *(ka)teysa is found in the Batanic languages to refer to the Ego’s cousin. Ibatan exhibits a non-cognate, *kasinsin*, which is a loanword from Ilokano. Moreover, Yami shows evidence of bifurcation for this category, in which the cognate of the word *teysa/*

kateysa is used to refer to cousins from the side of the father, while *posing/kaposing* is used to refer to cousins from the side of the mother. The term *posing* also means ‘mother or hen’, combining with the affix *ka-* to indicate pertinence, fellowship, or companionship, thus having the literal meaning ‘of the same mother’. In a similar fashion, Proto-Batanic **kateysa* is analyzed as a combination of the morphemes *ka-* and *teysa*. The original meaning of *teysa* is yet to be found, but it appears as a combination of the morphemes *tey-* ‘each’ and *asa* ‘one’. How such derivation developed as a kin term remains an open question.

Proto-Batanic *(ka)teysa ‘cousin’

kateysa *Yami*.
kataysa *Itbayat, Iwasay, Isamorong*.

(10) * ‘aunt’ (unreconstructed possibility)**

The reconstructed forms Proto-Batanic **maraqan* ‘uncle’ and Proto-Batanic **kateysa* ‘cousin’ show that collaterality is highlighted in the Proto-Batanic kinship system. No separate word, however, is found to refer to the category of parent’s sister/aunt, other than the reflexes of Proto-Batanic **ina*. While there is currently no evidence to support the existence of this category other than the reconstructed forms for uncle and cousin, it is best to leave this category an unreconstructed possibility instead of reconstructing an asymmetrical kinship system for Proto-Batanic.

(11) Affinal kin (non-cognates)

While the concept of affinity is highlighted in contemporary Batanic kinship terminologies, such may not have been the case for Proto-Batanic, as the categories for affinal kin are reflexes of terms for consanguineal kin, namely: Proto-Batanic **ama* ‘father’s generation, including father-in-law’; Proto-Batanic **ina* ‘mother’s generation, including mother-in-law’; and Proto-Batanic **anak* ‘child’s generation, including son/daughter-in-law’.

Non-cognates are also sometimes used for affinal kin. For instance, the terms for ‘spouse’ vary considerably in Batanic languages, namely: *Yami kaosong*; *Itbayat, Iwasay, Isamorong kakuvut*; and *Ibatan kababay*. These terms, however, share a similar derivational history, in which the affix *ka-* ‘fellow, company, of the same X’ combines with another morpheme, *kuvut* in the case of *Itbayat, Iwasay, and Isamorong*, and *babay* in the case of *Ibatan*, with both words meaning ‘house’. In *Yami*, the affix combines with the word *osong*, which means mortar. More problematic are the terms used to refer to the Ego’s in-laws. The terms vary greatly, but most of these are loanwords from other languages, such as Filipino

and Ilokano. In Ibatan, for example, *katugangan* refers to parents-in-law, and *manugang* refers to son/daughter-in-law. These are borrowed from the Ilokano word *manugang*, a reflex of PMP *tuRaN ‘kinsman, relative (undefined)’.

From the set of reconstructed forms for Proto-Batanic, majority of the kin terms can be traced back to PAN and PMP, and are thus retentions of ancestral forms. Significant changes, however, can also be observed. The reconstructed kinship system for PPH proposed by Alfred Louis Kroeber reflects common terms used for lineal and collateral kin, as well as for consanguineal and affinal kin (1919). This is characterized as a feature of the generation type of kinship (also known as Hawaiian kinship), distinctly different from the lineal type (or Eskimo kinship) seen in Batanic communities, not only at present but also up to the level of Proto-Batanic. The reconstruction proposed by Kroeber is supported by Maria Kristina Gallego, which makes use of linguistic data in reconstructing the kinship system of PPH (2015). Kroeber’s study also served as a basis to argue for a generation type kinship system reconstructed by George Peter Murdock for Proto-Malayo-Polynesian (1949, 229). Blust’s work, which reconstructs descent groups for Proto-Austronesian, contrary to the expected bilateral descent characteristic of generation type kinship, also argues for an ancestral preferential matrilineal cross-cousin marriage, in which the Ego marries the daughter of his mother’s brother (1980, 205–247). Other studies regarding reconstructions of kinship system for Proto-Austronesian and Proto-Malayo-Polynesian include those of Robert Lane (1961) and Ward Goodenough (1955).

If we consider the determinants of kinship terminologies proposed by Murdock, PPH follows the generation type system, which suggests that the ancestral community practiced a matrilocal rule of residence (i.e., the husband moves in with or near the family of his wife) (1949). This rule of residence is also claimed to apply to PAN which dates as far back as 5000 to 4500 BP (Jordan et al. 2009). According to Murdock, matrilocal residence also entails community endogamy (1949, 214). In terms of marriage, however, preferential matrilineal cross-cousin marriage argued for by Blust (1980) on the level of PAN cannot be seen in PPH (Gallego 2015, 493–495).

From PPH, the Proto-Batanic kinship system underwent a shift from generation type to lineal type, in which the concept of collaterality is highlighted, that is, different terms are used for the Ego’s parents and the parents’ siblings (and similarly, the Ego’s siblings and cousins). This has implications on other aspects of kinship, such as rule of residence. Generation type kinship system, as discussed previously, is characterized as matrilocal. Lineal kinship, however, suggests separation from the extended kin, thus giving rise to distinct kinship terms used for lineal and collateral kin. Murdock, moreover, claims that “neolocal residence tends to be associated with the terminology of the lineal type” (1949, 152–253). While the shift to a neolocal rule of residence may be analyzed as a

recent innovation in the Batanic communities brought about by Western influence, it is also possible that this shift happened historically as reflected in the development of lineal terminology in Proto-Batanic.

Kinship terminologies in present-day Batanic languages and their implications

From the reconstructed kinship terminologies for Proto-Batanic, this section presents how the nomenclature developed in Batanic communities of the Philippines, namely Itbayat, Ivatan, and Ibatan, and what the terminologies suggest in terms of the kinship system of Batanic groups.

The gathered kinship terminologies may be divided into two categories: (1) consanguineal kin, or relatives formed by blood; and (2) affinal kin, or relatives formed by marriage. Consanguineal kin are further categorized into: either (1) lineal kin, or kin related to the Ego by means of a direct line, as in grandparents, parents, children, and grandchildren; or (2) collateral kin, or relatives outside the direct line of descent such as siblings and cousins.

Table 2: Consanguineal kin terms in Batanic languages

Consanguineal kin of Batanic groups						
	English	Filipino	Itbayat	Ivasay	Isamorong	Ibatan
Lineal	grandparents	lolo/lola	papu	papu; lolo/lola	papu	apung
	father	tatay/ama	ama	ama	ama	amang
	mother	nanay/ina	ina	ina	ina	anang
	child	anak	anak	anak	anak	anak
	grandchild	apo	apu/inapu	inapu	inapu	apuku
Collateral	sibling; brother/sister	kapatid; kuya/ate	kaktex; kaka/wari; kuya/ati	kakteh; kuya/ati	kakteh; kaka/wari	kakteh; akang/adi
	uncle	tito	maran; uncle	maran; uncle	maran	maraan
	aunt	tita	kamnan; auntie	kamnan; auntie	kamnan	kamnan; ikit
	cousin	pinsan	kataysa; pinsan	kataysa; pinsan	kataysa	kasinsin
	niece/nephew	pamangkin	pamangkin; anaken	pamangkin	pamangkin	kaanakan

Table 3: Terminologies for affinal kin in Batanic languages

Affinal kin of Batanic groups					
English	Filipino	Itbayat	Ivasay	Isamorong	Ibatan
spouse	asawa	kakuvut; maysa	kakuvut	kakuvut	kabahay
parent-in-law	biyenan	amawun/ inawun	byenan; ama/ina	byenan	katugangan
son/daughter-in-law	manugang	anaken	manganaken	manganaken	manugang
brother/sister-in-law	bayaw/ hipag	kumpari/ kumari	katayug	katayug	kayung/ipag

In the case of consanguineal kin terms, bifurcation is ignored, that is, kin from both the sides of the father and the mother share similar terms. For example, grandparents are called *papu* or *apung* for both the sides of the father and the mother. Data, however, shows that the concept of collaterality is highlighted, based on the distinction between one's own parents and the siblings of the parents, that is, *ama/amang* and *ina/anang* for 'father' and 'mother', respectively, and *maran/maraan* and *kamnan* for 'uncle' and 'aunt', respectively. This is clearly indicative of the shift from a generation type of kinship in PPH to a lineal kinship system in Proto-Batanic, which was carried over in the daughter communities.

The concept of affinity is also highlighted in the Batanic kinship system on the basis of the existence of various terms for affinal kin. Some terms, particularly those that refer to parent and son/daughter-in-law, exhibit observable formal similarities with those used for consanguineal kin. As such, *amawun* and *inawun* referring to one's father and mother-in-law, respectively, are derivations of the terms *ama* 'father' and *ina* 'mother'. Similarly, *anaken* 'son/daughter-in-law' is a derivation of *anak* 'child'. These similarities indicate that a single term must have originally been used to refer to certain affinal and consanguineal kin. This means that at the level of Proto-Batanic, the concept of affinity is not distinct in kinship terminologies of the group, particularly in the categories of the parent and child-in-law. At present, some Batanic languages reflect loanwords for affinal kin, such as *byenan* 'parent-in-law' in Ivasay and Isamorong, and *manugang* 'son/daughter-in-law' in Ibatan, which means that affinity has come to be more discrete in the daughter languages.

Marriage facilitates sexual privilege and economic cooperation, and it is through marriage that family units are formed (Murdock 1949, 8). Spouses are called *kakuvut* in Itbayat, Ivasay, and Isamorong, or *kababay* in Ibatan, both meaning 'house companion' (Valientes 2006). This implies that affinity starts on the basis of cohabitation, and that the physical house is central in forming social units. This is further illustrated by how Batanic languages encode the concept of 'family', namely Itbayat *savaxay*, Ivasay and Isamorong *savabay*, and Ibatan *kababay*, which Edwin Valientes analyzes as derivations of the expression *asa ka vaxay/vabay/babay*, literally 'one house' (2006). Similarly, Yami encodes *asa ka vabay* to mean 'family' (Kao 2012, 40).

Such nomenclature is suggestive of the centrality of the physical house in the kinship system of Batanic communities. Janet Carsten and Stephen Hugh-Jones write that the house is linked to the body both physically and conceptually, and that both are "the loci for dense webs of signification and affect and serve as basic cognitive models used to structure, think and experience the world" (1995, 3). This statement derives from the conceptualization of Claude Lévi-Strauss of the house as a form of social organization, for which he coins the term *house societies* to describe certain kinship systems (1983, 184). In this

framework, Lévi-Strauss formulates the house as a union of incompatible principles, such as: patrilineal–matrilineal descent, filiation–residence, hypergamy–hypogamy, close–distant marriage, and hereditary–election. For instance, the kinship system and social organization of many Southeast Asian societies are not fully compatible with traditional frameworks of analyzing kinship. Thus, it is through Lévi-Strauss’s model of *house societies* that such types of social groups can be analyzed in a new light (Carsten & Hugh-Jones 1995, 22). If we consider the case of Batanic communities, the terms used for ‘family’ and ‘spouse’, which are derived from the word for ‘house’, suggest the possibility of framing the Batanic social organization via Lévi-Strauss’s *house societies*. Clearly, the use of ‘house’ to refer to the family unit in Batanic languages is by no means coincidental, as the house is the objectification of this relationship (Lévi-Strauss 1984, 195). It is the main locus not only for the ritualistic aspects of kinship but also for what is everyday and commonplace in the family. Going beyond nomenclature, Batanic communities as *house societies* can be seen in the habits and interaction of the kin group centered on the house, as well as the social and ritualistic aspects concerning the house as a physical structure.

If we consider rituals associated with marriage in Batanic communities, for example, the physical house serves as the central locus of these activities. Marriage starts with the practice of *paychakavabey*, which literally means ‘to talk/discuss’ in Ivatan. In Itbayat, this practice of pre-marriage arrangement is called *kayon*, which is typically carried out in proverbs (Yamada 1995, xxxi). This tradition begins with the man and his family asking permission to enter the house of the woman (Yamada 1995, 443). Once permitted, the discussion between the two families begins. In the case of the Ivatans, this tradition is led by the *kayun*⁸, usually an older male member of the community known for his eloquence. Both the man and the woman select their respective *kayun*, and it is during the *paychakavabey* that the good and bad traits of the couple are laid down. It is then up to the *kayun* to defend the one he represents. Thus, the *kayun* plays a central role in the *paychakavabey*, and the couple must choose their *kayun* well. However, this tradition has seen many changes since then, especially in the role of the *kayun*. *Paychakavabey* without the *kayun* has become the norm at present, in which the discussion has moved from arguing for the good qualities of the couple, to the parents giving advice to their children regarding marriage as well as family life.

According to Florentino Hornedo, pre-Hispanic Ivatans used to impose the bride price in marriage, often with the man paying gold to the woman’s family (2000, 15). Half of this goes to the wife, and half would go to her parents (Llorente 1983, 39). In the case of Itbayat, the man would give all his possessions to the family of his bride (Hornedo 2000, 19). At present, bride price and dowry are rarely practiced, but the concept of bride service is retained to a certain

degree. While the man is not obligated to work for his bride's family, there is an expectation that he would help in the household work.

The wedding is an important affair in the Batanic communities. Weddings used to take place outside the community (Llorente 1983, 39; Hornedo 2000, 19). Later on, this practice changed to wedding feasts being held in the houses of the bride and groom. In pre-colonial Batanic communities, the wedding, similar to the *paychakavabey/kayon*, began with the groom asking permission to visit the house of the bride (Yamada 1995, 441). The celebration usually lasted for five to six days, with the groom visiting the parents of the bride on the fifth day, and the bride's parents visiting the groom's parents on the last day (Llorente 1983, 40).

Communal eating has been an essential part of the wedding ceremony, from pre-colonial times up to the present. The slaughtering of animals such as pigs, cows, or goats at the house of the couple getting married is an essential part of the tradition (Yamada 1995, 441). This is also practiced during house building, where it is the responsibility of the owner to serve food as well as *palek* 'sugarcane wine' (Hidalgo 1996, 98). The parallelisms in rituals practiced at both the wedding and house building suggest that both events are considered major occasions for the couple. This supports the idea of Batanic communities as *house societies*, where the physical house reflects the relationship of the married couple, and eventually, of the family unit.

Various accounts and ethnographies note that Batanic communities, including the Yami of Orchid Island, have been monogamous, even before Spanish colonization (Gonzalez 1966; Llorente 1983; Hidalgo 1996; Benedek 1991; Kao 2012). Polygamy was punished; however, divorce was practiced. In addition, parents may arrange the marriage of their children. There are cases wherein an arranged marriage was only to last a certain period of time, allowing the man to marry someone else after.

Murdock proposes that communities that follow a lineal kinship system, such as Batanic groups, are typically characterized by a neolocal rule of residence (1949, 152). In this set-up, the nuclear family (i.e., parents and children) lives separately from the other consanguineal kin. At the start of the marriage, it is typical for the couple to live with the husband's family; but they are expected to move out and live in their own house especially once they have children of their own. This rule of residence is also seen in Yami (Kao 2012, 40).⁹ It is evident from this behavior that the concept of collaterality is highlighted from the separation of the Ego from his/her parents' siblings (aunts and uncles). Similarly, with this separation, we see the development of distinct terms for the Ego's parents (*ama* and *ina*) and the parents' siblings (*maran* and *kamnan*).

In the case of the Itbayat, newly married couples live with the *wife's mother* if the wife is an only child; otherwise they live with the *husband's mother* (Yamada

1995, xxxi). Yamada emphasizes the peculiar use of the term *mother* to refer to such rule of residence (xxxii). This points to the connection of the physical house with the mother. Such a relationship is not surprising, as the women in Batanic communities are mostly in charge of the sustenance of the household; and thus, the physical house is generally considered their domain (Hidalgo 1996, 102).

It is the norm in Batanic communities for each family to own a piece of land to cultivate. Cesar Hidalgo writes that this is to ensure that the nuclear family can stand as an independent unit capable of sustaining itself (1996, 97–98). Owning a piece of land is also a way of continuing the practice of passing down traditional knowledge from parent to child.

The division of labor within the household and the community is at times gendered. As an example, weaving the traditional Ivatan headgear *vakul* is by and large restricted to women, while fishing and boat making is exclusively done by men (Alamon et al. 1998, 70). Moreover, according to Hidalgo, warfare and maintaining the structure of the house especially during typhoons are exclusively done by men, while sustaining the household, which includes cultivating rootcrops such as yam and potatoes, are done by women (1996, 102–107). In addition, within the family, boys go with their fathers to fish while girls stay at home with their mothers (Hidalgo 1996, 96; Llorente 1983, 36). Hsin-chieh Kao outlines similar gender roles for Yami:

... male jobs include fishing, goat pasturing, farmland preparation, water channel maintenance, logging, boat and house building, etc., which are traditionally done with simple hand-tools, exhausting but mostly occasional. Fishing and supplying *yakan* (side dishes) are husbands' routine work, and the ocean is an exclusive male workplace. Besides fatigue, male jobs are often performed in distant or risky areas away from villages, so it is said that men monopolise these jobs for the sake of women's safety. Less laborious and dangerous (though by no means easy) jobs are assigned to women, these include livestock feeding, cultivating and harvesting with digging sticks, which are mostly done inside or near villages within 10–20 minutes walking distance. Corresponding to husbands' role as *yakan* suppliers, wives' routine work is taking care of sweet potato and wet taro farmland and supplying *kanen* (staple). (2012, 41)

He adds that this division of labor is to a large extent gender exclusive, and a wife doing a male job would bring humiliation to her spouse (41). There are also jobs, however, that are considered neutral, such as fruit and betel nut planting on the hillside, shell and crab collecting on the tidal flat, as well as newly introduced jobs such as business and corporate work (42).

If we examine kinship terminologies of the four Batanic groups, sex is distinguished in the terms for parents of the Ego: *ama/amang* 'father' and *ina/anang* 'mother'. Sex, however, is ignored in the category of the grandparents, as

only one term is used to refer to both the grandfather and the grandmother, *papu/apung* ‘grandparent’. Thus, it can be said that while the role of the grandfather and grandmother in the family is generally the same regardless of sex, the same cannot be said of the role of the parents, as sex is not only a central factor in facilitating the Ego’s behavior towards his/her parents, but more important, it has direct correlations in the specific roles and obligations of the parents themselves, as discussed above.

For the category of the child, sex is not an important factor in kinship terminologies, as only a single term, *anak*, is used to refer to one’s son and daughter. With regard to the category of siblings, encoded in Batanic languages as *kaktex/kakteh* ‘sibling’, a distinction applies in terms of relative age, in which *kaka/akang* is used to refer to the Ego’s elder sibling, while *wari/adi* is used to refer to the Ego’s younger sibling. These terminologies suggest that relative age is the more crucial factor in this category, compared to sex. The elder sibling, with his/her relative seniority, for instance, is expected to look after his/her younger siblings.

It is important to note that while Batanic (and most Philippine) languages exhibit generally gender-free terminologies, gendered role behavior still applies, as outlined previously. Gender division is particularly salient in certain aspects of the kinship system of these communities. Aside from the division of labor, inheritance is also gendered. In Yami, sons inherit male properties (e.g., gold pieces and silver helmets) while daughters inherit female properties (e.g., agate necklaces) (Kao 2012, 39–40). Facilitating land inheritance, however, typically depends on each family. In Batanic communities of the Philippines, there are cases where land would be divided among the siblings; and there are instances in which the youngest child inherits the property as he/she is expected to look after his/her parents. There are also others who believe that the drawing of lots is the most justifiable means of deciding inheritance (Alamon et al. 1998, 65).

Gender distinction is also important in terms of how an individual regards other members of the family. In cases where an individual would consult a particular member of the family for advice, there is a preference for consulting family members of the same sex, as the person would typically feel more comfortable sharing sensitive information with them. Nestor Castro et al. write that a man would typically consult his brother or father, while a woman would ask advice from her sister or mother (1998, 47).

On the one hand, physiological differences dictate traditional gender roles; but on the other hand, it can also be said that all the members of the family work together to support the household, regardless of sex. During fieldwork, I met some women who are running businesses and are at the same time employed, while also occasionally working in the field. Similarly, the father is expected to share some of the household work. The husband and wife take turns in working

and caring for their children at home. The elder sibling, once old enough to take care of his/her siblings, takes over the responsibilities in the household, while the parents continue their work. Arnold Alamon et al. write that while certain activities are kept gender-exclusive in Batanic communities, it can be said that both men and women are expected to work for the benefit of the family, both in the private and the public spheres (1998, 70).

Within the family, seniority and authority depend on one's age and generation. The *papo* 'grandparent/s' are treated as people of highest authority in the family; and in the case of kin from the same generation, according to Castro, it is the *kaka/akang* 'elder sibling' who holds authority over the *wari/adi* 'younger sibling' (1996, 30).

The importance placed on one's generation is linguistically evident in Itbayat and Yami through the system of teknonymy, which involves parents taking the name of their firstborn child (Yamada 1995, xxx–xxx; Kao 2012, 57). This means, for example, that a couple named Rufina and Francisco will take the name of their firstborn child, Maria. In Itbayat, the father will take the name *Amanmaria* (from *ama ni Maria* 'father of Maria'), and the mother will take the name *Inanmaria* (from *ina ni Maria* 'mother of Maria'). In Yami, the father will be named *Syamanmaria* (from *si ama ni Maria* 'father of Maria'), and the mother will be named *Sinanmaria* (from *si ina ni Maria* 'mother of Maria'). The grandparents' name may also change if *Syamanmaria* and *Sinanmaria* are firstborn children, becoming *Syapenmaria* (from *si apo ni Maria* 'grandparent of Maria') in Yami.¹⁰ According to Kao, it is an insult for the Yami to be called by their former names after they acquire their new names because name changes are considered significant in the life of a person, especially the elderly (2012, 57). It also signals promotion to the next generation, thereby acquiring more seniority within the family and the community. It appears that this practice of teknonymy was also applied in Ivatan in the past, as seen in the name of *Amandangat* (from *ama ni Dangat* 'father of Dangat'), a historical figure who led a revolt against the Spaniards in Sabtang Island in the eighteenth century.

Teknonymy also serves a functional purpose in a kinship system. Hildred Geertz and Clifford Geertz write that such practice leads to genealogical amnesia, which makes inclusion or exclusion to a kin group flexible (1964). While the term genealogical amnesia may have negative connotations, teknonymy may also be regarded as a reflection of the values held by the group. In Batanic communities, such practice is indicative of the value placed on one's generation, more than on one's inclusion to a particular kin group. That is, the generation grade (i.e., if one is unmarried, a parent, or a grandparent) is more significant, in contrast to the family one belongs to. This is also connected with what Geertz and Geertz claim about the flexibility, elasticity, and adaptability of such kinship system (1964). According to Alamon et al., residents in many Batanic communities form kinship relations with each other (1998, 69). Moreover, kinship terminologies

are also used to refer to non-kins as a sign of respect (Kao 2012, 56). This means that members of the community are treated practically as members of a kin group; thus, Batanic communities, particularly in the past, are more flexible about one's genealogical history, in contrast to one's generation grade.

Seniority marked by generation, while particularly salient in Batanic communities, is also seen in many Philippine communities. This seniority is not only seen within one's own kin group, but is also recognized by everyone in the community. The elders are always treated with respect and deference; and in public affairs, their words hold authority. In Yami, for instance, the *syapenkwa*, or elders who reach the name *Syapen*, have the right to speak in public, while the younger generations are only expected to listen. They are also the ones who hold highly technical and specialized jobs (Kao 2012, 57). With regard to how an individual resolves personal issues or problems, seniority also plays a role. Personal problems are usually discussed with one's own generation first, for instance with one's siblings or cousins, with more senior members of the family such as one's parents or grandparents consulted in times of more difficult and sensitive problems (Castro et al. 1998, 47).

Power, authority, and stratification may also be observed in these communities. Various ethnographies describe the *mangpus* as the ruler of the territory (Gonzalez 1966; Llorente 1983; Hidalgo 1996; Hornedo 2000). Next to the *mangpus* are the *mapolon* who hold responsibility over the other members of the community. Under the *mapolon* are the *cailianes* who are warriors and workers, and on the lowest level are the slaves. The *manyukuyukud* (which includes the *mangpus* and the *mapolon*) are the nobles, and it was believed that their souls go to heaven and become stars after they die (Hidalgo 1996, 93). On the contrary, the souls of the commoners become *anyitu* or spirits that wander the earth (Llorente 1983, 30–31). It is evident in Batanic languages that political and social stratification overlap, but one is not restricted in terms of social mobility (Hidalgo 1996, 93). To be specific, leadership can be given to a person of distinguished skill, wisdom, and intellect.

Stratification is not only seen within the community but also outside it, as there are communities considered more prominent than others. Smaller communities, for instance, typically go to these more powerful communities in times of conflict and war (Hornedo 2000, 49). Thus, it can be said that the concepts of hierarchy and nobility in Batanic groups precede the coming of the Spanish colonizers in the sixteenth century.

In relation to this system of stratification, Hidalgo mentions marriage across sub-tribes and other territories, which implies exogamy (1996, 97). Communities, however, are still generally endogamous, which means that the individual marries within his/her own community. Community endogamy in Batanic communities is seen as a result not only of difficulty in accessing neighboring communities in precolonial times, but also because of the expected responsibility of the individual

towards his/her community. While families are largely independent units, cooperation among the members of the community is also an important norm in the ethnolinguistic groups. Ana Maria Madrigal Llorente writes that “much of the difficult work in the farms or fields was done by the community. The spirit of solidarity among them was well-developed” (1983, 18). Endogamy thus helps to maintain stable livelihood within the community. Based on Hidalgo’s account discussed earlier, however, endogamy is not strictly imposed, and cases of marrying outside the community are increasing (or perhaps even preferred in certain cases). This is particularly salient among those in centers such as Basco. There is an increasing number of intermarriage between Ivatans and *Ipulas* ‘non-Ivatans’, especially with the rise in tourism and migration. A significant portion of the communities, however, still follow this system. Because of the small size of some communities, there are also a few instances in which incest taboos are violated, meaning that while groups still recognize marriage between cousins as incest, such cases are still seen in smaller communities.

Since almost all residents of the *idi/ili* ‘community’ are considered family and close friends, groups such as the Itbayat *pivaxvaxsan*, comprised of family and friends, are formed to provide support for various activities in the community, such as farming (Alamon et al. 1998, 66). This is also seen in the Ivatan *kayvayvaynan* or literally ‘friendship’, a larger community assistance unit for house building, road repairs, and other difficult tasks. There are also smaller groups identified by Llorente (1983, 36), Hidalgo (1996, 97–98), and Alamon et al. (1998, 45), such as *payubvan* comprised of about five members, and *mayubu* or *kapayubwan* comprised of two to three members, working together in less difficult tasks, such as in preparing the land for cultivation. A group of around 10 to 15 teenagers comprise another cooperative group called *payoboan*, which literally means ‘helping one another’. Maria Mangahas also writes about the *vannua*, with the literal meaning of ‘port’, as a seasonal cooperative group active during the fishing season (2008).

These organized cooperative work groups carry out various types of work, such as construction, agricultural work, fishing, and even ceremonial practices. House building is a particularly significant work carried out by such organized groups. This particular activity is treated as an important affair, comparable to weddings, and thus bring us back to our idea of Batanic communities as *house societies*. A number of features of the Batanic kinship system and social organization which center on the physical house fit with Lévi-Strauss’s idea of house-based societies; and while only a few are mentioned here, this model serves as a good framework for analyzing the Batanic community.¹¹

Foreign influence on kinship terminologies

From kinship terminologies presented in the previous section, it can be observed that foreign influence has also played a role in the development of the Batanic

kinship system. This foreign influence is not only restricted to Chinese, Spanish, and American contact, but also in the way communities are situated vis-à-vis other Philippine ethnolinguistic groups. Terms of foreign origin, such as *ate* ‘elder sister’ and *kuya* ‘elder brother’ (from Chinese), *kumare* ‘ritual sister’ and *kumpari* ‘ritual brother’ (from Spanish), and *auntie* and *uncle* (from English) are commonly used in the four groups examined. Similarly, borrowed terms from Philippine languages, particularly Filipino and Ilokano, can be seen in the lexicon of Batanic languages. Ilokano, in particular, exhibits great influence in Ibatan, not only in terms of kinship but also in other domains, since it is the main language spoken on the neighboring Babuyan Islands (Maree and Tomas 2012). Foreign influence certainly brought significant changes in kinship terminologies of the ethnolinguistic groups. For instance, we have seen how relative age plays an important factor in sibling terminology, but with the influence brought by the Chinese, the terms *ate* and *kuya* have also given rise to highlighting the distinction of sex in sibling terms. Thus, gender roles in the house and the community are magnified. Similarly, the concept of kinship is no longer restricted to those formed by blood and marriage, but it has expanded to include those formed through certain rituals, such as baptism, which was brought by the Spanish colonizers. In this regard, the addition of ritual kin, such as *kumpari* and *kumare* serving as godparents to one’s own child, has brought an expansion to the kinship system of Batanic communities.

Retentions and innovations

The previous sections presented how kinship terminologies developed from Proto-Batanic to present-day Batanic languages. Kinship terminologies, according to Murdock, are determined by behavior, and thus a limited reconstruction of the features of the ancestral kinship system was proposed on the basis of reconstructed terminologies (1949). Significant aspects of the Proto-Batanic kinship system are retained, such as distinctions in terms of collaterality and relative age, as well as endogamy (to a certain degree) and rule of residence. The system of naming via teknonymy may also be reconstructed for Proto-Batanic, which is retained in Yami and Itbayat. Innovations, however, can also be seen in daughter languages, mainly brought about by contact with other groups. For instance, in sibling terminologies, sex has come to play an important factor, aside from relative age, with the use of gendered terms, namely *kuya* ‘elder brother’ and *ate* ‘elder sister’. Also, affinity has become more pronounced by the use of *byenan* ‘parent-in-law’ and *manugang* ‘son/daughter-in-law’, distinct from the terms used for one’s own parents and children. Ritual kin are also added to the kinship system of Batanic groups with the introduction of *kumpari* ‘ritual brother’ and *kumare* ‘ritual sister’.

Retentions of ancestral Filipino values can also be observed in Batanic communities. Felipe Landa Jocano presents several features that characterize Filipino kin groups, particularly concerning the expected behavior of the individual towards his/her family and community (1989). Respect, obligation, and *utang na loob* or ‘debt of gratitude’ are central in kinship relations, and in Batanic communities, it is evident that such concepts still apply. Despite changes brought by foreign cultures in the Philippines, fundamental concepts underlying kinship and community are still deeply entrenched in the consciousness of the Filipinos. For instance, while kinship relations commonly refer to one’s relatives by blood and marriage, this relationship also accommodates friends and members of the community as well (Gallego 2015, 499). In addition, while the concepts of ritual kin such as *kumpari* and *kumare* are clear Spanish influences, it can be argued that a similar kind of relationship existed even before the Spanish colonizers came to the Philippines. If we observe how a person behaves in relation to the people around him/her, we can clearly say that he/she forms kinship-like relations with people outside his/her kin group. In Batanic communities, for instance, one calls his/her elders, regardless of kinship relations, *auntie* and *uncle* as a sign of respect and friendship. While these are evidently borrowed terms from English, this can be analyzed as foreign concepts which are modified and adapted to fit indigenous values and principles. The core Filipino values of *hiya* or ‘embarrassment’ and *utang na loob* or ‘debt of gratitude’ are central to how an individual is expected to behave not only to his/her own kin group but also to all members of the community (Jocano 1989; Kikuchi 1989).

Hiya can also be translated as ‘shame’, which, on the one hand, can be seen in a negative light, such as in how Filipinos overspend to the point of going into debt just to please visitors during parties or feasts (Andres 1994, 64). On the other hand, it can also be analyzed as ‘sense of propriety’ which influences how a Filipino is supposed to act in a given situation. This interpretation is discussed in detail by Zeus Salazar (1981; 1985). *Utang na loob* or ‘debt of gratitude’ or ‘principle of reciprocity’ (Andres 1994, 190–191), according to Virgilio Enriquez, is best analyzed as ‘gratitude/solidarity’ in the context of traditional Filipino values (1977). It is free from the negative connotation of ‘debt’, as returning a favor is always a part of the interpersonal relations of Filipinos. These two terms, aside from other traditional concepts, namely *pakikisama* or ‘companionship/esteem’, *bahala na* or ‘determination’, *sama/lakas ng loob* or ‘resentment/guts’, *pakikibaka* or ‘resistance’, *kapwa* or ‘shared identity’, *pakikiramdam* or ‘shared inner perception’, *kagandahang-loob* or ‘shared humanity’, *karangalan* or ‘dignity’, *katarungan* or ‘justice’, and *kalayaan* or ‘freedom’, comprise core Filipino values and behavior patterns, reconceptualized by Enriquez following the framework of *Sikolohiyang Pilipino* ‘Filipino Psychology’ (1992).⁵

Conclusion

Based on the arguments of Murdock, there exists an intimate relationship between kinship nomenclature and features that characterize the kinship system of a particular group (1949). Similarly, such system is directly reflected in how an individual is expected to behave towards his/her kin. For example, the distinction seen in the terminology used to refer to one's father and uncle would point to a difference not only in the behavior of the Ego towards the aforementioned kin, but also to the role these members play in the family. In a similar way, the use of a single term to refer to two distinct kin, such as aunts from both the sides of the mother and the father for instance, shows that such kin are treated similarly in the family. Along with changes in the kinship system, it is expected that changes would be reflected in kinship nomenclature as well. Thus, major transformations can be observed since the descent of Proto-Batanic from the ancestral Proto-Austronesian and Proto-Philippine communities, specifically with regard to the change from a generation to a lineal type of kinship. As for the daughter Batanic communities of Batanes and Orchid Island, they still share a high degree of similarity in their kinship systems at present. This indicates that the close relationship of the four communities is not only restricted to linguistic structure, but it is also evident in certain cultural aspects such as kinship. Value structure and social organization are indigenous concepts and principles that persist until now, such as those concerning power, authority, and leadership in the community, as do core values of Filipino communities.

It is important to stress that the relationship between language and behavior is not absolute. For instance, Batanic kinship terminologies are relatively gender-free (such as sibling terms), but some aspects of the kinship systems remain gendered, as in those regarding inheritance and division of labor. If we go back to the arguments for and against the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis, it is true that behavior is not entirely dependent on language (and the inverse as well), but language is also an effective tool through which we can understand a speaker's behavior. Reconstructing prehistory, for instance, is made possible not only through "digging up the past" as in archaeology, or examining genetic mutations through biological anthropology, but also, of equal importance, through the reconstruction of languages following the principles of historical linguistics.

I am aware that my study is largely limited to linguistic data. As such, only basic ethnolinguistic descriptions were made for Batanic communities. Since the main goal of this study is to reconstruct the ancestral kinship system of Proto-Batanic and trace its development in present-day communities, the data is mainly from linguistics. In this regard, extensive ethnographic studies are still needed to further illuminate the subject.

Endnotes

- ¹ Sapir's ideas on language and thought, along with those of Benjamin Lee Whorf, is known as the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis. The interpretation of the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis has sparked a huge debate in ethno- and psycholinguistics. See the following for a discussion of this issue: Kay and Kempton (1984), Lakoff (1987), Gumperz and Levinson (1996), Lee (1996), and Pinker (2007a and 2007b) among many other works.
- ² Cultural reconstruction begins with a reconstruction of the protolanguage ancestral to a group. This follows the comparative method of historical linguistics, which compares lexical data from different languages hypothesized to be closely related. By undoing the changes (from sound to meaning) these languages underwent; an earlier form can be reconstructed. This method, however, is limited in terms of: (1) temporality in the sense that it can only work as far back as 10,000 years, since the rate of change may obscure reconstructions beyond this period; (2) linguistic objects since the method relies heavily on the lexicophonological domain, which is arbitrary and symbolic and is more indicative of genetic relationships, as compared to grammatical objects which largely operate on universal tendencies, thus similarities may arise simply by chance; and (3) items which are contact-induced or those that get transferred through borrowing or diffusion and are often unaccounted for and thus treated as residue (Harrison 2003). In addition, the method is unable to date the divergence of languages and instead relies on extra-linguistic evidence, such as those from archaeology and genetics, for a clearer picture of a speech community's prehistory. For a thorough discussion of the Comparative Method, see Fox (1995), Crowley (1997), and Harrison (2003).
- ³ See Blust 1980, 1995 and Bellwood 1996, among other works.
- ⁴ Linguists such as Reid (1978, 1982) and Ross (2005) working on the history of Philippine languages contest the validity of a single protolanguage that serves as the ancestor of all Philippine languages. Reid and Ross argue against PPH based on the lack of innovations attributed to the protolanguage. On the contrary, Zorc (1986) and Blust (1991, 2005) posit several lexical innovations to support the subgroup. For a detailed discussion of this debate, see Reid (2017).
- ⁵ The data for Yami comes from the Yami Dictionary Project (Providence University 2008).
- ⁶ Starred forms [*] are used to indicate reconstructed terms. Below are approximated phonetic descriptions of some symbols used in the reconstruction of Proto-Batanic forms:
 - *e Mid to high central vowel
 - *q Voiceless, glottal, stop
 - *x Voiceless, velar, fricative (retained in Itbayat while innovated to /h/elsewhere)
- ⁷ Reconstructed forms for PAN and Proto-Malayo-Polynesian (PMP) are derived from Blust & Trussel (ongoing).
- ⁸ The term kayon/kayun, which originally referred to the process of pre-marriage arrangement, exhibits a semantic shift in Ivatan to refer to the person carrying out the tradition.
- ⁹ Jordan et al., however, tag Yami as a patrilocal society in their phylogenetic study (2009, 1962).

- ¹⁰ In Itbayat, the names of the grandparents change following the process of habitonymy, i.e., naming after one's peculiar habit or characteristic (Yamada 1995, xxx–xxx). For example, a person is renamed Apkombwar, from apo and kombwar 'to boil', referring to his temper.
- ¹¹ For a more detailed discussion of the Ivatan as a house society, see Mangahas (2008) and Valientes (2016).
- ¹² For a discussion of this framework, see Enriquez (1975) and Pe-Pua and Protacio-Marcelino (2000) among other works.

References

- Alamon, Arnold, Nestor Castro, Janella Cacdac, and Yvonne Malupa. 1998. "Itbayat: Pamumuhay sa mga takey [Itbayat: Life in the field]." *IPEG* 4–5: 59–87.
- Andres, Tomas Quentin. 1994. *Dictionary of Filipino culture and values*. Quezon City: Giraffe Books.
- Bellwood, Peter. 1996. "Hierarchy, founder ideology and the Austronesian expansion." In *Origin, ancestry and alliance: Explorations in Austronesian ethnography*, edited by James J. Fox and Clifford Sather, 19–41. Canberra: Department of Anthropology, the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.
- Benedek, Dezso. 1991. *The songs of the ancestors: A comparative study of Bashiic folklore*. Taipei: Southern Materials Center.
- Blust, Robert. 1980. "Early Austronesian social organization: The evidence of language." *Current Anthropology* 21, no. 2: 205–47.
- _____. 1991. "The Greater Central Philippines hypothesis." *Oceanic Linguistics* 30, no. 2: 73–129.
- _____. 1993. "Austronesian sibling terms and culture history." *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 149, no. 1: 22–76.
- _____. 1995. "The prehistory of the Austronesian-speaking peoples: A view from language." *Journal of World Prehistory* 9, no. 4: 453–510.
- _____. 2005. "The linguistic macrohistory of the Philippines: Some speculations." In *Current topics in Philippine linguistics and anthropology, Parangal kay Lawrence A. Reid*, edited by Hsiu-Chuan Liao and Carl Rubino, 31–68. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Blust, Robert, and Stephen Trussel. ongoing. "The Austronesian comparative dictionary." Online, <http://www.trussel2.com/acd/>, accessed 19 March 2017.
- Carsten, Janet, and Stephen Hugh-Jones, eds. 1995. *About the house: Levi-Strauss and beyond*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- CartoGIS, ANU College of Asia and the Pacific. 2017. "Batanes and Babuyan Islands." Online map, <http://asiapacific.anu.edu.au/maponline/base-maps/batanes-babuyan-islands>, accessed 2 Oct. 2017.
- Castro, Nestor. 1996. "Kapangyarihan, awtoridad at moralidad sa Imnajbu [Power, authority, and morality in Imnajbu]." *IPEG* 2: 27–37.

- Castro, Nestor, Arnold Alamon, Yvonne Malupa, and Janella Cacdac. 1998. "Ivatan: Pakikipamuhay sa mga takda ng panahon [Ivatan: Living according to seasons]." *IPEG* 4-5: 33-58.
- Cottle, Morris, and Shirley Cottle. 1958. *The significant sounds of Ivatan*. Oceania Linguistic Monographs, 3. Sydney: University of Sydney.
- Crowley, Terry. 1997. *An introduction to historical linguistics*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Enriquez, Virgilio. 1975. "Mga batayan ng Sikolohiyang Pilipino sa kultura at kasaysayan [The foundations of Filipino psychology in culture and history]." *General Education Journal* 29: 61-88.
- _____. 1977. "Pakikisama o pakikibaka: Understanding the psychology of the Filipino." Paper presented at the "Conference on Philippine Culture", held at the Bay Area Bilingual Education League, Berkeley, California, n.d.
- _____. 1992. *From colonial to liberation psychology*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press.
- Fox, Anthony. 1995. *Linguistic reconstruction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gallego, Maria Kristina. 2014. Tracing ancestry and descent: A reconstruction of the Proto-Batanic language. MA thesis, University of the Philippines Diliman.
- _____. 2015. "Philippine kinship and social organization from the perspective of historical linguistics." *Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints* 63, no. 4: 477-506.
- Geertz, Hildred, and Clifford Geertz. 1964. "Teknonymy in Bali: Parenthood, age-grading, and genealogical amnesia." *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 94, no. 2: 94-108.
- Gonzalez, Julio. 1966. *The Batanes Islands*. Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press.
- Goodenough, Ward. 1955. "A problem in Malayo-Polynesian social organization." *American Anthropologist* 57, no. 1: 71-83.
- Gumperz, John, and Stephen Levinson, eds. 1996. *Rethinking linguistic relativity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Harrison, S. P. 2003. "On the limits of the comparative method." In *The handbook of historical linguistics*, edited by Brian Joseph and Richard Janda, 213-43. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hidalgo, Cesar. 1996. *The making of the Ivatans: The cultural history of Batanes*. Pasig City: Cognita TRC.
- Hidalgo, Cesar, and Araceli Hidalgo. 1971. *A tagmemic grammar of Ivatan*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Hornedo, Florentino. 2000. *Taming the wind: Ethno-cultural history on the Ivatan of the Batanes Isles*. Manila: University of Santo Tomas Publishing House.
- Jocano, Felipe Landa. 1989. Elements of Filipino social organization. In *Philippine kinship and society*, edited by Yasushi Kikuchi, 1-26. Quezon City: New Day, 1989.

- Jordan, Fiona M., Russell D. Gray, Simon J. Greenhill, and Ruth Mace. 2009. Matrilineal residence is ancestral in Austronesian societies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 276 (1664): 1957–64.
- Kao, Hsin-chieh. 2012. "Labour, life, and language: Personhood and relations among the Yami of Lanyu." Doctoral dissertation, University of St. Andrew.
- Kay, Paul, and Willett Kempton. 1984. "What is the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis?" *American Anthropologist* 86, no. 1: 65–79.
- Kikuchi, Yasushi. 1989. "The concept of corporate group in cognatic forms: Dynamic aspect in the Philippines." In *Philippine kinship and society*, edited by Yasushi Kikuchi, 27–47. Quezon City: New Day.
- Kroeber, Alfred Louis. 1919. "Kinship in the Philippines." *Anthropological papers of the American Museum of Natural History* 19: 69–84.
- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lane, Robert B. 1961. "A reconsideration of Malayo-Polynesian social organization." *American Anthropologist* 63, no. 4: 711–20.
- Lee, Penny. 1996. *The Whorf Theory Complex: A critical reconstruction*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. 1983. *The way of the masks*. Translated by Sylvia Modelski. London: Jonathan Cape.
- _____. 1984. *Paroles données*. Paris: Plon.
- Li, Paul Jen-Kuen. 2001. "The Dispersal of the Formosan Aborigines in Taiwan." *Languages and Linguistics* 2, no. 1: 271–78.
- Llorente, Ana Maria Madrigal. 1983. *A blending of cultures: The Batanes 1686–1898*. Manila: Historical Conservation Society.
- Mangahas, Maria. 2008. "Making the vanua: Collective fishing technology in Batanes and an Austronesian archetype of society." *Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints* 56, no. 4: 379–412.
- Maree, Judith, and Orland Tomas. 2012. *Ibatan to English dictionary, with English, Filipino, Ilokano, and Ivatan indices*. Manila: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Moriguchi, Tsunekazu. 1983. "A preliminary report on the Ivatan dialects." In *Batan Island and Northern Luzon: Archaeological, ethnographical and linguistic survey*, edited by Kasumi Sharikahara, 205–53. Kumamoto: University of Kumamoto.
- Murdock, George Peter. 1949. *Social structure*. New York: Macmillan.
- Pe-Pua, Rogelia, and Elizabeth Protacio-Marcelino. 2000. "Sikolohiyang Pilipino (Filipino Psychology): A legacy of Virgilio Enriquez." *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* 3: 49–71.
- Pinker, Steven. 2007a. *The language instinct*. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
- _____. 2007b. *The stuff of thought: Language as a window into human nature*. New York: Viking.

- Providence University. 2008. "Yami (Tao) Dictionary Project." Online, http://yamibow.cs.pu.edu.tw/index_en.htm, retrieved 19 March 2017.
- Reid, Lawrence. 1966. *An Ivatan syntax*. Honolulu: Univesity of Hawaii.
- _____. 1978. "Problems in the reconstruction of Proto-Philippine construction markers." In *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings*, Vol. 1, edited by Stephen Wurm and Lois Carrington, 33–66. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.
- _____. 1982. "The demise of Proto-Philippines." In *Papers from the 3rd International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*. Vol. 2 of *Tracking the travelers*, edited by Amran Halim, Lois Carrington, and Stephen A. Wurm, 201–16. Canberra: Australian National University.
- _____. 2017. "Revisiting the position of Philippine languages in the Austronesian family." Presented at the Br. Andrew Gonzalez (FSC) Distinguished Professorial Chair Lecture, De La Salle University, Manila, February 18.
- Ross, Malcolm. 2005. "The Batanic languages in relation to the early history of the Malayo-Polynesian subgroup of Austronesian." *Journal of Austronesian studies* 1, no. 2: 1–24.
- Salazar, Zeus. 1981. "Wika at *diwa*: Isang panglinggwistikang analisis sa halimbawa ng konsepto ng "hiya" [Language and consciousness: An illustrative psycholinguistic analysis of the concept of "hiya"]." In *Ulat ng ilkalabindalawang seminar sa sikolohiya ng wika [Proceedings of the 12th Seminar on the psychology of language]*, edited by Susan Cipres-Ortega, 38–43. Quezon City: University of the Philippines, Diliman.
- _____. 1985. "Hiya: Panlapi at salita [Hiya: Affixations and word]." In *Sikolohiyang Pilipino: Isyu, pananaw at kaalaman [New directions in Indigenous psychology]*, edited by Allen Aganon and Ma. Assumpta David, 288–96. Manila: National Book Store.
- Sapir, Edward. 1929. "The status of linguistics as a science." *Language* 5: 207–14.
- Tsuchida, Shigeru, Ernesto Constantino, Yukihiro Yamada, and Tsunekazu Moriguchi. 1989. *Batanic languages: Lists of sentences for grammatical features*. Tokyo: Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo.
- Tsuchida, Shigeru, Yukihiro Yamada, and Tsunekazu Moriguchi. 1987. *List of selected words of Batanic languages*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo.
- Valientes, Edwin A. 2006. "Vahay, savahay, kavahayan: The "house" among the Ivatans of Batanes." Presented at the 12th Philippine Linguistics Congress, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, November 26-28.
- _____. 2016. "Vahay, Tawu, Anito an ethnoarchaeological study of the symbolic dimension of the Ivatan houses." MA thesis, University of the Philippines, Diliman.
- Yamada, Yukihiro. 1970. "A semantic analysis of the Itbayaten kinship term apo." *Journal of the Linguistic Society of Japan* 56: 63–78.
- _____. 1995. *Ichbayat folkways (No kaonoonongan a Ichbayaten): Itbayat texts with English translation*. Quezon City: Giraffe Books.
- Zorc, David. 1986. "The genetic relationships of Philippine languages." In *FOCAL II: Papers from the 4th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, edited by Paul Geraghty, Lois Carrington, and Stephen A. Wurm, 147–73. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank the Office of the Chancellor of the University of the Philippines Diliman, through the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Development, for funding support through the Thesis and Dissertation Grants. I also wish to extend my gratitude to the two anonymous reviewers and the editors of *Social Science Diliman* for their comments on how to improve my paper, speakers of Batanic languages I consulted for this study, and Edwin Valientes for his ideas and insights into the Ivatan culture, not only as an anthropologist but more important, as an Ivatan himself.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Maria Kristina S. Gallego is assistant professor, Department of Linguistics, University of the Philippines Diliman, where she teaches courses in Linguistics and the Japanese language. Her current research is on the contact situation between Ibatan and Ilokano spoken on the island of Babuyan Claro, Cagayan.

Appendix: Profile of the language consultants

Fieldwork was done in Basco, Batanes on 19–29 April 2012, and 1–17 May 2013 in conjunction with data gathering for the reconstruction of some features of the Proto-Batanic language in Gallego (2014). Consultants were asked to translate kinship terminologies presented in both English and Filipino. After the initial data elicitation and recording, subsequent interviews were done to validate the data gathered. Consultants were selected on the basis of convenience sampling due to limited time in the field.

Age	Sex	Hometown	Current address	Other languages spoken
<i>Itbayat</i>				
30	M	Itbayat, Batanes	Basco, Batanes	Ivatan, Filipino, English
28	M	Itbayat, Batanes	Basco, Batanes	Ivatan, Filipino, English
27	F	Itbayat, Batanes	Basco, Batanes	Ivatan, Filipino, English
62	F	Itbayat, Batanes	Basco, Batanes	Ivatan, Filipino, English
<i>Inasay</i>				
33	M	Basco, Batanes	Basco, Batanes	Filipino, English
27	F	Basco, Batanes	Basco, Batanes	Filipino, English
59	F	Basco, Batanes	Basco, Batanes	Filipino, English
<i>Isamorong</i>				
45	F	Mahatao, Batanes	Basco, Batanes	Filipino, English
30	M	Ivana, Batanes	Quezon City	Filipino, English
<i>Ibatan</i>				
21	M	Calayan, Cagayan	Basco, Batanes	Ilokano, Filipino, English
19	F	Calayan, Cagayan	Basco, Batanes	Ilokano, Filipino, English