

SECOND FOOTNOTE ON THE TASADAY

ZEUS A. SALAZAR

TWO NEW REPORTS ISSUED ALMOST SIMULTANEOUSLY BY PANAMIN on the Tasaday, one¹ more scientific in language than the other,² 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 pamphlet³, that PANAMIN chief Manda Elizalde "is known to the Tasaday as 'Momo Dakel Diwata Tasaday' or 'bringer of good fortune,'" ⁴ whereas PANAMIN photographer-turned-ethnographer Nance writes that the 35-year old Harvard-graduate Tao Bung or "big man" among Mindanao minorities⁵ 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."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 unflinching 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 the presumed "effective isolation" was finally broken after presumed 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," ⁷ a sentiment quite understandable to most Filipinos and not too readily perceived by Western guests. Their predilection for the betel-nut chew pro-

¹ Carlos A. Fernandez and Frank Lynch, *The Tasaday: Cave-dwelling Food Gatherers of South Cotabato*, Mindanao Special Release, Panamin Foundation Inc., 1972).

² John Nance, "The Tasadays," *Manila Times*, June 8-12, 1972.

³ "Protecting Man's Right to Choice," *Panamin Foundation Inc.*, 1972, p. 13. (Henceforth cited as *Pamphlet*).

⁴ Kenneth MacLeish, "The Tasaday: Stone Age Cavemen of Mindanao," *National Geographic*, CXL11:2 (August, 1972), pp. 219, 226, 230, *passim.*, also mentions this new title of Elizalde as well as the Tas. messianic expectation in relation to him (*cf. infra*). An article in the German magazine *Stern* ("Mit dem Hubschrauber in die Steinzeit") recently identified *Momo Dakel Diwata* as the God they await from Heaven in their caves (pp. 41, 53).

⁵ Nance, *loc. cit.*, June 12, 1972, p. 19.

⁶ *Ibid.*, June 8, 1972, p. 6.

⁷ *Ibid.*, June 11, 1972, p. 1.

vides the best occasion for dirt⁸ and even for human contact⁹, as in most traditional Philippine and Indonesian groups. The jew's harp played by Balayem and not yet attributed to Dafal's advent among the Tas.¹⁰ 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 Austro-nesian world except West Indonesia which all have instead only *anito* and its cognate.¹¹

"*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 coast¹² which include probably even agriculture.¹³ 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 no more than 10 or 20 kilometers away" becomes more likely at "bedding down for the day,"¹⁴ Fernandez and Lynch continued to postulate the "effective isolation of the ancestral forest people (Tasaday and others) from the early B'lit and others like them."¹⁵ 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

⁸ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 26, *passim*.

¹⁰ Pamphlet, pp. 14, 15.

¹¹ Zeus A. Salazar, *Le Concept AC* 'anitu' dans de monde austronésien: vers l'étude comparative des religions ethniques austronésiennes*. Ms. dissertation. (Sorbonne: Université de Paris, 1968), pp. 115-146; 154. (Henceforth cited as *Le Concept*).

¹² Frank Lynch and Teodoro A. Llamzon, "The B'lit Manobo and the Tasaday," *Philippine Sociological Review*, XIX:1-2 (Jan.-April, 1971), p. 93; Teodoro A. Llamzon, "The Tasaday Language So Far," *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, XI:2 (December, 1971), p. 8 (Henceforth cited as *Tasaday*).

¹³ Richard E. Elkins, "Comments," *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, XI:2 (December, 1971), p. 33.

¹⁴ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, pp. 11,17-18.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

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 1971.¹⁶

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.¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ In the Philippines, Islamic influences of Sumatran flavor penetrated the Sulu region during the end of the 14th century and did not reach the Cotabato basin till the 15th century.¹⁹ 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 Fox²⁰ 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.²¹ 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

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 26; Nance, *loc. cit.*, June 8, 1972, p. 6.

¹⁷ Salazar, *Le Concept*, pp. 85-154.

¹⁸ John Villiers, *Südostasien vor der Kolonialzeit*, Fisher Weltgeschichte, Bd. XVIII (Frankfurt: Fischer Bücherei, 1965), p. 258 *et seq.*

¹⁹ Cesar A. Majul, "The Role of Islam in the History of the Filipino People," *Asian Studies*, IV:2 (August, 1966), pp. 308-9.

²⁰ Robert Fox, "Time Catches Up With the Tasaday," *The Asian*, I:3,7.

²¹ Zeus A. Salazar, "Footnote on the Tasaday," *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, XI:2 (December, 1971), p. 35. (Henceforth cited as *Footnote*).

"among stone tools recovered from the Philippine archaeological sites. . . resembles the kind of axe used by the Tasaday."²²

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"²³? 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.²⁴ 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"²⁵ and since 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."²⁶ 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, 1971,²⁷ the estimate decreased to only 571-755 years ago in December of the same year,²⁸ increasing again to 1,000 years ago

²² Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, pp. 20, 21.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 21-23, pl. 5.

²⁵ P.V. Van Stein-Calenfals, "The Melanesoid Civilisations of Eastern Asia," *Bull. Raffles Museum*, Ser. B:1. 1936, pp. 41-51.

²⁶ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

²⁷ Lynch and Llamzon, *loc. cit.*, p. 92.

²⁸ Llamzon, *Tasaday*, p. 8.

this year²⁹ 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 year ago."³⁰ In the Fernandez-Lynch report, the start of Tas. isolation (presently conceived as being with undeterminable "intermittent contacts") has been reduced to "say 600 years or more"³¹ or, in another context, "for well over 500 years and perhaps for as many as 800"³² — *i.e.*, the old Llamzon estimate of last December (1971), though in a justificative note relegated to the back pages this is again raised to "perhaps one millenium."³³ To restate a point made earlier,³⁴ 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 long periods.

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.³⁵ 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 the autonomy of his proposed Manobo sub-group of Philippine languages³⁶ may not be cognates after all of Malay "*seladang*" ("wild deer") as earlier suggested³⁷ but loan words ultimately deriving from the same Malay-Sumatran source. At any rate, among the Mindanao groups used by Llamzon³⁸ for his glottochronological determination, *three* Manobo (Cotabato, Agusan and Binukid) and *only one* non-Manobo (the Kamato T'boli) possess (have retained?)

²⁹ Nance, *loc. cit.*, June 11, p. 13.

³⁰ *Pamphlet*, p. 11.

³¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 1.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.

³³ *Ibid.*, no. 13, p. 52.

³⁴ Salazar, *Footnote*, p. 35.

³⁵ Cf. *supra*.

³⁶ Elkins, *loc. cit.*, p. 32.

³⁷ Salazar, *Footnote* p. 36, 37.

³⁸ Llamzon, *Tasaday*, p. 30.

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 **a(n)dav* 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 "*seladeng*" 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.³⁹ 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.⁴⁰ 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.⁴¹

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."⁴² 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"⁴³ 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 (and human) one. Agriculture, even of the "shifting" variety exemplified by the *kaingin* method practiced by the Manobo in the late 20's⁴⁶ and even now,⁴⁷ requires a much bigger number than we would suppose the Tas. had at the outset⁴⁸ and implies

³⁹ Salazar, *Footnote*, p. 36.

⁴⁰ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, pl. 2.

⁴¹ Llamzon, *Tasaday*, p. 8; Lynch and Llamzon, *loc. cit.*, pp. 92-93; Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

⁴² Lynch and Llamzon, *loc. cit.*, pp. 92-93; Llamzon, *loc. cit.*, p. 8.

⁴³ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

⁴⁶ John M. Garvan, *The Manobos of Mindanao* (Washington: Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences, 1931), p. 74, *et seq.*

⁴⁷ Rogelio M. Lopez, *Agricultural Practices of the Manobo in the Interior of Southwestern Cotabato (Mindanao)*. Cebu: University of San Carlos, 1968.

⁴⁸ Cf. their genealogy in Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, pl. 20.

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"⁴⁹ — *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 his knowledge! As for iron and particularly steel whose loss Fernandez and Lynch consider "less likely in the circumstances,"⁵⁰ the aleatory nature of the former as a trade product from the coast has already been underlined,⁵¹ 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"⁵² 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;⁵³ whereas an "heirloom" stone tool is not only shaped like a knife⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵ Is this the "knife" called *igot* in the Llamzon list?⁵⁶ 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,"⁵⁷ 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.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

⁵¹ Salazar, *Footnote*, p. 35.

⁵² Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pl. 5.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pl. 6 fig. 9; Lynch and Llamzon, *loc. cit.*, p. 1.7.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 94; Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, pl. 7.

⁵⁶ Teodoro A. Llamzon, "A Tasaday Manobo Word List" (compiled on July 16-17, 1971) Mimeo. p. 2. (Henceforth cited as *List*).

⁵⁷ John U. Wolff, *A Dictionary of Cebuano Visayan*, Philippine Journal of Linguistics. (Special Monograph No. 4, 1972), p. 366.

gutgut "cut with a slicing motion" and Tag. *gutgut* "torn or rent into pieces."⁵⁸ 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,"⁵⁹ 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 infections). Similarly, the "wooden pounders" used to "loosen the yellow-orange pith" in the preparation of the beneficent staple *natek*⁶⁰ 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 supposed 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*."⁶¹ If true, the phenomenon is linguistically a most quaint instance of a new object taking the generic name of an old one instead of 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 list⁶²) or simply whatever Dafal calls the bolo (if the term *natek* 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,"⁶³ be-

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 280, 288; Jose V. Panganiban, *Diksiyunaryo-Tesouro Pilipino-Ingles* (Lungsod ng Quezon: Manlapaz Publishing Co., 1972), pp. 457, 465.

⁵⁹ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pls. 8, 9, 13.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 20-21.

⁶² Llamzon, *List*, p. 2.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

ause 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*.⁶⁴ 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.⁶⁵ 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 arrival⁶⁶ or to suppose that it was Dafal's bolo which was responsible for the popularization of *nafnaf*,⁶⁷ also used as containers to fetch water⁶⁸ 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"⁶⁹ 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."⁷⁰

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 **giliŋ*⁷¹ in our still very limited Tas. vocabulary,⁷² *tatoo* (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

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, pl. 6 fig. 7 and 9, pl. 7; Lynch and Llamzon, *loc. cit.* p. 94.

⁶⁵ Cf. *Pamphlet*, p. 6; Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, pl. 5, pl. 6 fig. 8.

⁶⁶ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁶⁹ Lynch and Llamzon, *loc. cit.*, p. 94; Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 28, p. 17.

⁷⁰ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 52 n. 13.

⁷¹ Otto Dempwolff, *Vergleichende Lautlehre des Austronesischen Wortschatzes. I. Induktiver Aufbau einer Indonesischen Ursprache* (Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1934), p. 55 (Henceforth cited as *Induktiver Aufbau*).

⁷² Llamzon, *List*, p. 2.

agriculture.⁷³ 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 Lynch⁷⁴ 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."⁷⁵ 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,"⁷⁶ 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*)⁷⁷ into the Tas. vocabulary, after having found them in the forest Zone II⁷⁸ 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,"⁷⁹ and the *natek* or wild palm pith.⁸⁰ 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 PANAMIN⁸¹), 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,"⁸² before being cooked over hot coals, steamed in a bamboo tube or simply eaten raw! The WB Manobo of course know *wvud*, "the edible heart or bud of a palm tree or banana plant."⁸³ It is the Bik. *ubud* or "coconut palm core," the Bis. *ubud* or "tender heart of the trunk of palms, bananas, bamboos, rattans,"⁸⁴ the Ibanag *ubud* or "kind of palm" and Tag. *ubod* or

⁷³ Salazar, *Footnote*, p. 37.

⁷⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 36.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ Lynch and Llamzon, *loc. cit.*, p. 91.

⁷⁷ Llamzon, *Tasaday*, p. 4.

⁷⁸ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 25, 36, *passim*.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 25, 27.

⁸¹ Nance, *loc. cit.*, June 12, p. 19; Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, pp. 29, *passim*.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 36-37.

⁸³ Richard E. Elkins, *Manobo-English Dictionary* (Hawaii: University Press, 1968), p. 216. (Henceforth cited as *Dictionary*.)

⁸⁴ Wolff, *op. cit.*, p. 1075.

“core, gist, substance, essence of.”⁸⁵ It is thus a pan-Philippine and even pan-Austronesian phenomenon which the Tas. never experienced till Dafal!

The same is suggested with *natek*, known to the WB Manobo as “sago, a starchy food prepared from the juice of the trunk of certain palms.”⁸⁶ *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.”⁸⁷ 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.⁸⁸ Dafal appears thus as an expert in another field, as versatile as a trained Peace Corps volunteer! In this sense, is it 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 *natek* extraction? Some Tas. claim they can tell “by knocking the trunk with one knuckle, or by tapping it with a piece of wood.”⁸⁹ Such method and talent would require quite a long apprenticeship which Dafal must have 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 *natek* extraction in order to leave the remaining portion to rot as potential source of beetle grubs⁹⁰ to be collected some time after for food?⁹¹ Apparently associated with fallen and rotting palm trees,⁹² the “grub” industry must have been connected (or flourished only) with the introduction of the *natek* 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.⁹³ 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)”⁹⁴ and “*faen*” or “bait”⁹⁵ seem to be Tas. and therefore quite interesting. Literally, the first

⁸⁵ Panganiban, *op. cit.*, p. 1003.

⁸⁶ Elkins, *Dictionary*, p. 127.

⁸⁷ Wolff, *op. cit.*, p. 699.

⁸⁸ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, pp. 25, 28.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 25, *passim*.

⁹⁴ Llamzon, *List*, p. 3.

⁹⁵ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

should mean "forest *usada*," since "*katalunan*"⁹⁶ or "*talonan*"⁹⁷ 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,"⁹⁸ the Tag. "*kati*" and Bik. "*kate*" "decoy for birds, fowls, animals, etc."⁹⁹ 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 1971.¹⁰⁰

In fact, he apparently was more effective with the "bamboo broom" he was supposed to have given the Tas.¹⁰¹ since Cave III was constantly kept "quite clean by reason of regular attention from a split-bamboo broom,"¹⁰² a habit quite unusual and archaeologically regrettable in a troglodytic people¹⁰³ 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"¹⁰⁴ and the fact that they lived in caves became clear only in March of this year.¹⁰⁵ 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"¹⁰⁶ called "*lawi*"¹⁰⁷ which, quite distinct from the "roof" or "*tifang*" (cf. Bik. *atop*, Tag. *atip*, Ivt. *atep*) a simple "lean-to" would not possess,¹⁰⁸ should be related to Tag. *bahay*, Mal. Bik. Bis. Ilk. *balay* and Ivt. *vahay*

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

⁹⁸ Elkins, *Dictionary*, pp. 38, 162, 229.

⁹⁹ Panganiban, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

¹⁰⁰ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, pp. 26, *passim*.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

¹⁰⁵ Nance, *loc. cit.*, June 8, p. 6.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 34-35.

¹⁰⁷ Liamzon, *List*, p. 2.

¹⁰⁸ Salazar, *Footnote*, p. 37.

through Maranaw *oalai* and Magindanaw *walay*¹⁰⁹ by metathesis. Even the other term gathered by Fox — *dungdung*¹¹⁰ recalls Tag. Kap. *dalungdung* “forest grass cabin, hut or cottage”¹¹¹ as well as Bik. Bis. *dungdung* “head covering of cloth or any flexible material.”¹¹² 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.¹¹³

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 has had as one main hindrance “the refusal of the Tasaday themselves to be interviewed or observed unless Elizalde were present or somewhere nearby.”¹¹⁴ 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,¹¹⁵ 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 Lynch¹¹⁶ 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 even beyond this, *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.¹¹⁷ He must have taught the Tas. by sign language, the Tas. learning thereby more proficiently Dafal’s B’lit than he their Tas.!

¹⁰⁹ Llamzon, *Tasaday*, p. 22.

¹¹⁰ Llamzon, *List*, p. 2.

¹¹¹ Panganiban, *op. cit.*, p. 345.

¹¹² Wolff, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

¹¹³ Lopez, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

¹¹⁴ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.* p. 4.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 26-27, *passim*.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

¹¹⁷ Llamzon, *Tasaday*, p. 1; Fox, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

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,"¹¹⁸ 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?¹¹⁹ 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"¹²⁰ or with Tag. "*sapang*" "red tint from wood; brazilwood tree which gives off a red dye," with cognates in Kap., Ibg., Ilk., Ivt. and Png.¹²¹ 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."¹²² Among the Samal and the Sangir in the Mindanao area, "*ápeng*" refers to "shore," the meaning of "*pangpang*" in Manobo-Dibabawon. All reflect Proto-Austronesia **paŋpaŋ* "to separate, part, divide" (auseinander Stehen), the Ngadju-Dajak having *pampang* "peak, spike; antler point" and the Hova *fampana* "abyss, gulf, pit; chasm, gap, rift."¹²³ 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'"¹²⁴ or that its people met with the Tas. "at a stream where they fished together,"¹²⁵ the streams and their banks being the focal point of economic and other activities.¹²⁶

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,"¹²⁷ Tas. "*katalunan*" or "*ta-*

¹¹⁸ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

¹¹⁹ Salazar, *Footnote*, pp. 34-35.

¹²⁰ Wolff, *op. cit.*, pp. 854, 875.

¹²¹ Panganiban, *op. cit.*, pp. 885-886.

¹²² *Ibid.*, p. 764; Wolff, *op. cit.*, p. 732.

¹²³ Otto Dempwolf, *Vergleichende Lautlehre des Austronesischen Wortschatzes. III. Austronesisches Wörterverzeichnis*. (Berlin: Deitrich Reimer, 1937), p. 144. (Henceforth cited as *Wörterverzeichnis*).

¹²⁴ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 34, *passim*.

¹²⁷ Salazar, *Footnote*, p. 37.

lonan "forest" has other cognates in Ilocano *talon* "field, farm" and Ibanag (sa) *talon* "field," (sa) *aroyu talon* "forest." The sense of "field, farm; fields" of *talon* in Ilk. and Ibg.¹²⁸ should perhaps be emphasized in the context of an upland *kaingin*-type of agriculture for the original Tas. Furthermore, 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. 'uta' and Fu. Sm. *uta* "(forested) interior."¹²⁹ In this sense, **qu-(t)an* would have to be withdrawn from Dyen's examples¹³⁰ of PMP Initial q, the Van der Tuuk-ish Tag.-Mal. correspondence -l/*-h- consisting perhaps a clue to Dempwolff's erstarrten Infix at least in the instance of Tag. *kala-baw*, Jav. *kebaw* and Tob. *horbo* "water buffalo."¹³¹ As for *natek*, its sense among the Tas. and elsewhere¹³² should make it a reflex of Proto-Austronesian **ña[t]uh* "name of a tree," as reconstructed by Dempwolff from Tag. *nato* "*Sterculiaciae* (i.e., family comprising the cacao and kola nut trees)," Mal. NgD. *ñatuh*, *ñato* "guttapercha tree" and Hov. *natu* "imbricate plant (i.e., like the coniferae),"¹³³ all having a "starchy" or substantial nature. Tas. "*ma/bula*" or "white"¹³⁴ corresponds to WB Manobo "*evul*" or "whitish; of a diseased eye or of water, to become cloudy or whitish in color,"¹³⁵ a cognate of Tag. *laboq* "turbidity (of liquids); obscurity of meaning; dimness (of light), developing blindness."¹³⁶ All reflect Dempwolff's reconstruction **labu* "to be dirty."¹³⁷ Together with Tag. Bkl. Ilk. Png. *tipon*, "gathering together, collecting, accumulating,"¹³⁸ Tas. *tifun* "local group; band"¹³⁹ also reflects Proto-Austronesian *[t]i(m)pun "to gather, collect, accumulate."¹⁴⁰ Tas. *foso* "flower"¹⁴¹ 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.¹⁴²

¹²⁸ The name of a controversial estate in Quezon City, *tatalon*, should have its etymology sought in the same direction, particularly in view of the formerly "forested" nature of the area. "Forest" is also *talon* among the Dumagat of Casiguran, *talun* among the Agta (Bkl.) and Gaddang, *tolunan* among the Subanun.

¹²⁹ Dempwolff, *Wörterverzeichnis*, p. 66

¹³⁰ Isidore Dyen, *The Proto-Malayo-Polynesian Laryngeals* (Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1953), p. 32.

¹³¹ Dempwolff, *Induktiver Aufbau*, pp. 59, 73.

¹³² Cf. *supra*.

¹³³ Dempwolff, *Wörterverzeichnis*, p. 108.

¹³⁴ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

¹³⁵ Elkins, *Dictionary*, pp. 69, 352.

¹³⁶ Panganiban, *op. cit.*, p. 579.

¹³⁷ Dempwolff, *Wörterverzeichnis*, p. 100.

¹³⁸ Panganiban, *op. cit.*, p. 981.

¹³⁹ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

¹⁴⁰ Dempwolff, *Wörterverzeichnis*, p. 139.

¹⁴¹ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

¹⁴² Dempwolff, *Wörterverzeichnis*, p. 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.¹⁴³ Tas. *igkan* "fruit,"¹⁴⁴ as distinguished from *bunga* "fruit" in the Llamzon list,¹⁴⁵ appears to be connected with Bis. *gikan* "from such and such a place or time; originate from" which forms *kagikan* "ancestral origin" and *ginikanaan* "parents; origin, primary source,"¹⁴⁶ 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 a particular word, like for instance the Tas. one for "boat," is not known¹⁴⁷ 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,¹⁴⁸ when a little research reveals at least six of them with probable cognates in major Philippine languages. These are: Man. *getek* "belly"¹⁴⁹—Bik, *tulák* "stomach," Bis. *gutuk* "filled to the point that it is tight. *Gutuk na ang ákung tiyan*, my stomach is filled to bursting";¹⁵⁰ Man. *langesa* "blood"—Bik. Bis. *langsa* "having a fishy smell or the taste of blood,"¹⁵¹ Tag. *lansa* "odor or taste of fish or of shed blood," Ilk. *lang-es* "odor of fish (and blood)";¹⁵² Man. *qumaw* "call"—Bik. *qumaw* "praise"; Man. *seladeng* "deer"—Mal. *seladang* "wild deer";¹⁵³ Man. *belad* "hand"—Tag. Bik. Bis. *palad* "palm of hand"; and Man. *lasuq* "penis"—Bis. *lúsù* "penis (coarse)" or *lasù* "masturbate"¹⁵⁴ Bik. *lusiq* "exposed head of penis" or *lasog* "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

¹⁴³ Lopez, *op. cit.*, p. 21 n. 5.

¹⁴⁴ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

¹⁴⁵ Llamzon, *List*, p. 2.

¹⁴⁶ Wolff, *Dictionary*, p. 264.

¹⁴⁷ Fernandez and Lynch, *op. cit.*, p. 20, *passim*.

¹⁴⁸ Elkins, "Comments", p. 32.

¹⁴⁹ The term may even be a Proto-Austronesian reflex, since it has probable cognates in Polynesian Fiji, Tongan, Uneven *kete* "belly" and Rotuman *efe* "belly." Cf. George W. Grace, *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., 1959), pp. 58-59.

¹⁵⁰ Wolff, *op. cit.*, p. 280.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 577.

¹⁵² Panganiban, *op. cit.*, pp. 606, 610, *sub* "langis."

¹⁵³ Cf. *supra*.

¹⁵⁴ Wolff, *op. cit.*, pp. 650, 588.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Dyen, Isidore. *The Proto-Malayo-Polynesian Laryngeals*. Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1953.
- Dempwolff, Otto. *Vergleichende Lautlehre des Austronesischen Wortschatzes. I. Induktiver Aufbau einer Indonesischen Ursprache*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1934.
- . *Vergleichende Lautlehre des Austronesischen Wortschatzes. III. Austronesisches Wörterverzeichnis*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 1937.
- Elkins, Richard E. *Manobo-English Dictionary*. Hawaii: University Press, 1968.
- . "Comments," *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. XI:2, December, 1971.
- Fernandez, Carlos A. and Frank Lynch. *The Tasaday: Cave-dwelling Food Gatherers of South Cotabato, Mindanao*. Special Release. Panamin Foundation, 1972.
- Fox, Robert. "Time Catches Up with the Tasaday," *The Asian*. I:3, 7.
- Garvan, John. *The Manobos of Mindanao*. XXIII:1. Washington: Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences, 1931.
- Grace, George W. *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, 1959.
- Llamzon, Teodoro A. *A Tasaday Manobo Word List*. Compiled on July, 6-17, 1971. Mimeo.
- . "The Tasaday Language So Far," *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. XI:2, December, 1971.
- Lopez, Rogelio M. *The Agricultural Practices of the Manobo in the Interior of Southwestern Cotabato (Mindanao)*. Cebu: University of San Carlos, 1968.
- Lynch, Frank and Teodoro A. Llamzon. "The B'lit Manobo and the Tasaday," *Philippine Sociological Review*. XIX:1-2 (Jan.-April), 1971.
- MacLeish, Kenneth. "The Tasadays. Stone Age Cavemen of Mindanao," *National Geographic*. CXLII:2 (August), 1972.
- Majul, Cesar. "The Role of Islam in the History of the Filipino People," *Asian Studies*. IV:2 (August), 1966.
- Nance, John. "The Tasadays," *Manila Times*. June 8-12, 1972.
- Pamphlet. "Protecting Man's Right to Choice." Panamin Foundation, Inc. 1972.
- Panganiban, Jose V. *Diksiyunaryo-Tesauro Pilipino-Ingles*. Lungsod ng Quezon: Manlapaz Publishing Co., 1972.
- Salazar, Zeus A. *Le Concept AC* 'anitu' dans de monde austronésien: vers l'étude comparative des religions ethniques austronésiennes*. Ms. dissertation. Sorbonne: Université de Paris, 1968.
- . "Footnote on the Tasaday," *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. XI:2 (December), 1971.
- Van Stein-Calenfals, P.V. "The Melanesoid Civilisations of Eastern Asia," *Bull. Raffles Museum*. Ser. B:1, 1936.
- Villiers, John. *Südostasien vor der Kolonialzeit*. Fisher Weltgeschichte. Bd. XVIII. Frankfurt: Fischer Bücherei, 1965.
- Wolff, John U. "A Dictionary of Cebuano Visayan," *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. Special Monograph No. 4, 1972.