SECOND FOOTNOTE ON THE TASADAY

ZEUS A. SALAZAR

TWO NEW REPORTS ISSUED ALMOST SIMULTANEOUSLY BY PANAMIN on the Tasaday, one more scientific in language than the other, provide an excellent occasion for further comment on our shifting knowledge of this celebrated Filipino group. The Ateneo anthropologists fail to mention, as in a recent pamphlet, that PANAMIN chief Manda Elizalde “is known to the Tasaday as 'Momo Dakel Diwata Tasaday' or 'bringer of good fortune,'” whereas PANAMIN photographer-turned-ethnographer Nance writes that the 35-year old Harvard-graduate Tao Bung or “big man” among Mindanao minorities 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.” However, both reports follow the same outline, beginning with the helicopter penetration of the Tas. forest homeland and ending with the humanist exhortation for change through choice and research by invitation. Both likewise exhibit an unfaltering faith in the B’lit Manobo culture hero named Dakel, 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,” a sentiment quite understandable to most Filipinos and not too readily perceived by Western guests. Their predilection for the betel-nut chew pro-

4 Kenneth MacLeish, “The Tasaday: Stone Age Cavemen of Mindanao,” National Geographic, CXLII: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 Mono Dakel Diwata as the God they await from Heaven in their caves (pp. 41, 53).
6 Ibid., June 8, 1972, p. 6.
7 Ibid., June 11, 1972, p. 1.
vides the best occasion for dirt\textsuperscript{8} and even for human contact\textsuperscript{9}, 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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{bola}, \textit{pambibilog ng ulo}, \textit{panlalangis}, etc., a not exactly rare expression of Filipino railery. Provided it is not conveniently identified later as another Dafal importation, the term "\textit{diwata}" puts the Tas. in the same category as all the other Philippine groups from Mindanao and Sulu up to Pampanga where this Sanskrit loan word is found, unlike those in the rest of Luzon and the entire Austronesian world except West Indonesia which all have instead only \textit{anito} and its cognate.\textsuperscript{11}

"\textit{Diwata}" also carries adverse implications for precipitate theories about the Tas. It was earlier thought, for instance, that either the B'lit separated from the Tas. or both separated from a common ancestral group called Pre-BT with, in any case, the Tas. remaining "primitive" in their forest environment and the B'lit gradually changing through civilizational influences from the coast\textsuperscript{13} which include probably even agriculture.\textsuperscript{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,"\textsuperscript{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."\textsuperscript{15} The presence of "\textit{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
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\textsuperscript{8} Fernandez and Lynch, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{9} ibid., p. 26, passim.
\textsuperscript{10} Pamphlet, pp. 14, 15.
\textsuperscript{11} "Zeus A. Salazar, \textit{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 \textit{Le Concept}).
\textsuperscript{14} Fernandez and Lynch, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 11,17-18.
\textsuperscript{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 Sundas 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
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16 Ibid., p. 26; Nance, loc. cit., June 8, 1972, p. 6.
“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

²³ Ibid., p. 21.
²⁴ Ibid., pp. 21-23, pl. 5.
²⁶ Fernandez and Lynch, op. cit., p. 44.
²⁷ Lynch and Llamzon, loc. cit., p. 92.
²⁸ Llamzon, Tasaday, p. 8.
this year\(^{29}\) 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 “divata” 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 languages\(^{36}\) may not be cognates after all of Malay “seladang” (“wild deer”) as earlier suggested\(^{37}\) but loan words ultimately deriving from the same Malay-Sumatran source. At any rate, among the Mindanao groups used by Llamzon\(^{38}\) 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.
\(^{32}\) 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 harr” (“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
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39 Salazar, Footnote, p. 36.
40 Fernandez and Lynch, op. cit., pl. 2.
43 Fernandez and Lynch, op. cit., p. 42.
44 Ibid., p. 44.
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" — 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," the aleatory nature of the former as a trade product from the coast has already been underlined, 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" 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, whereas an "heirloom" stone tool is not only shaped like a knife 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. Is this the "knife" called igt in the Llamzon list? In that case, the word is probably a cognate of Sebuan igt "scrape s.t. by rubbing a knife which has been fixed into s.t. immovable up and down against it," 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. 6.
54 Ibid., pl. 6 fig. 9; Lynch and Llamzon, loc. cit., p. 17.
55 Ibid., p. 94; Fernandez and Lynch, op. cit., pl. 7.
"gutgut "cut with a slicing motion" and Tag. *gutgut "torn or rent into pieces." 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," 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 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." 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 *bulul *siko and *bulul *laso in the Llamzon list) 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," be-

60 Ibid., p. 20-21.
61 Ibid., pp. 8, 9, 13.
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. 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. In that case, there seems to be no need to suspect that the Tas. did not use bamboo internodes or nafnaf for cooking before Dafal’s arrival or to suppose that it was Dafal’s bolo which was responsible for the popularization of nafnaf, also used as containers to fetch water 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" 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."

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 *gilip" in our still very limited Tas. vocabulary," 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.
67 Ibid., p. 34.
68 Ibid., p. 15.
69 Lynch and Llamzon, loc. cit., p. 94; Fernandez and Lynch, op. cit., p. 28, p. 1.7.
70 Fernandez and Lynch, op. cit., p. 52 n. 13.
72 Llamzon, List, p. 2.
agriculture. Describing Tas. “incipient horticulture” as a “system of monitoring and fussing over the wild yam’s growth, marking it for future harvest, and removing tubers in such a way as not to kill the plant,” Fernandez and Lynch 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.” 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,” 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) into the Tas. vocabulary, after having found them in the forest Zone II 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,” and the natek or wild palm pith. The names must consequently be assumed to have come from Dafal, since the Tas. could not have had them without knowing what they stood for. Having taught the Tas. to appreciate ubod as food (it is taking them some time to accept other food products brought by PANAMIN), 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,” before being cooked over hot coals, steamed in a bamboo tube or simply eaten raw! The WB Manobo of course know uvud, “the edible heart or bud of a palm tree or banana plant,” It is the Bik. ubud or “coconut palm core,” the Bis. ubud or “tender heart of the trunk of palms, bananas, bamboo, rattans,” the Ibanag ubud or “kind of palm” and Tag. ubod or
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73 Salazar, Footnote, p. 37.
74 Ibid.
75 Lynch and Llamzon, loc. cit., p. 91.
76 Llamzon, Tasaday, p. 4.
77 Ibid.
78 Ibid., pp. 25, 36, passim.
79 Ibid., pp. 35, 27.
81 Ibid., 36-37.
83 Wolff, op. cit., p. 1075.
“core, gist, substance, essence of.” 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.” 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.” 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. 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.” 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 grubs to be collected some time after for food? Apparently associated with fallen and rotting palm trees, 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. 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)” and “faen” or “bait” seem to be Tas. and therefore quite interesting. Literally, the first

85 Panganiban, op. cit., p. 1003.
87 Wolff, op. cit., p. 699.
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 "katî" "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 people\(^103\) 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" 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. Isk. balay and Ivt. vahay

\(^{96}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 2.
\(^{97}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 38.
\(^{99}\) Panganiban, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 272.
\(^{100}\) Fernandez and Lynch, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 26, passim.
\(^{101}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 28.
\(^{102}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 8.
\(^{103}\) \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 8-9.
\(^{105}\) Nance, \textit{loc. cit.}, June 8, p. 6.
\(^{106}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 34-35.
\(^{107}\) Lamzon, \textit{List}, p. 2.
\(^{108}\) \textit{Schäfer, Footnote}, p. 37.
through Maranaw oalai and Magindanaw walay\textsuperscript{109} by metathesis. Even the other term gathered by Fox — dungdung\textsuperscript{112} recalls Tag. Kap. dalungdung “forest grass cabin, hut or cottage”\textsuperscript{114} as well as Bik. Bis. dungdung “head covering of cloth or any flexible material.”\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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 Lynch\textsuperscript{116} 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.\textsuperscript{117} He must have taught the Tas. by sign language, the Tas. learning thereby more proficiently Dafal’s B’lit than he their Tas.!

\textsuperscript{109}Llamzon, Tasaday, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{110}Llamzon, List, p. 2.
\textsuperscript{111}Panganiban, op. cit., p. 345.
\textsuperscript{112}Wolff, op. cit., p. 238.
\textsuperscript{113}Lopez, op. cit., p. 59.
\textsuperscript{114}Fernandez and Lynch, op. cit. p. 4.
\textsuperscript{115}Ibid., pp. 26-27, passim.
\textsuperscript{116}Ibid., p. 26.
\textsuperscript{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/sa/afang,” meaning “people of or from fang” or “sa-fang people.” Less likely, the latter etymology would have to connect a Tas. term “sa-fang” 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/tal-
on/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-

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 Wort-
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 *ku[t]an “wood, forest” may have to be recast, since it is reflected in Proto-Polynesian only by To. ’uta’ and Fu. Sm. uto’ “(forested) interior.” 129 In this sense, *kuw-(t)an would have to be withdrawn from Dyen’s examples 130 of PMP Initial q, the Van der Tuuk-ish Tag.-Mal. correspondence -t/-*h- consisting perhaps a clue to Dempwolff’s erstarrten Infix at least in the instance of Tag. kalabaw, Jay. kebau and Tob. horbo “water buffalo.” 131 As for natek, its sense among the Tas. and elsewhere 132 should make it a reflex of Proto-Austronesian *ná[t]uh “name of a tree,” as reconstructed by Dempwolff from Tag. nato “Sterculiaceae (i.e., family comprising the cacao and kola nut trees),” Mal. NgD. nátu, nato’ “guttapercha tree” and Hov. nato’ “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. labuq “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. pusu’ 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
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.
137 Dempwolff, Wörterverzeichnis, p. 100.
138 Panganiban, op. cit., p. 981.
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 "napanap" 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 napanap in Ilok.143 Tas. igkan "fruit," 144 as distinguished from bungo "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 ginikan "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 known 147 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. tudik "stomach," Bis. gutuk "filled to the point that it is tight. Gutuk na ang dikang tiyoo, my stomach is filled to bursting";160 Man. langesa "blood"—Bik. Bis. langsaa "having a fishy smell or the taste of blood,"151 Tag. lanso "odor or taste of fish or of shed blood," Ilok. 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. lusì "penis (coarse)" or lasì "masturbate"154 Bik. lusìq "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.
150 Wolff, op. cit., p. 280.
151 lb.d., p. 577.
152 Panzalanban, op. cit., pp. 606, 610, sub "langis."
153 Cf. supra.
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