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1. Introduction

Laurie Reid has devoted much of his career to the study of the languages of Northern Luzon. His various studies of Bontok (1963, 1964, 1970, 1992) including his *Bontok-English dictionary* (1975), his analysis of Kankanay (1973), his researches on Atta (Reid, Lusted, and Whittle 1964), Arta (1989) and Alta (1991) as well as his continuing delimitation of a Cordilleran subgroup (1974, 1979, 1989) all point to an abiding theoretical interest in this critical group of Philippine languages. As a tribute to his fundamental research and to him personally for his contributions to the study of Austronesian languages, I offer this anthropological analysis of the available evidence on the relationship terminologies of the Northern Luzon. This paper examines the structural variation in these northern Philippine relationship terminologies.

The Northern Philippines or Cordilleran language group consists of a large number of diverse languages for which there is considerable, reliable linguistic and ethnographic documentation. Reid (1989:57) includes twenty-four separate languages in his revised classification of this group. Well-documented and reasonably reliable relationship terminologies have been recorded for eighteen of these languages, representing most of its various internal divisions.

An analysis of these terminologies offers exceptional possibilities for comparison, particularly within the wider context of a comparative study of Austronesian relationship terminologies in general. In the expansion of the Austronesian populations southward from Taiwan, the northern Philippines is the initial region in which a distinct group of languages can be defined as Malayo-Polynesian. A study of these relationship terminologies thus looks in two directions: (i) to the terminologies of the Formosan languages, and (ii) to those of other Malayo-Polynesian languages — in particular, the western Malayo-Polynesian languages.

In 1908, A. L. Kroeber wrote a brief paper setting forth eight “principles” that underlie all relationship terminologies. These “principles” are 1) generation (the difference between persons of the same and separate generations), 2) laterality (the difference between a lineal and collateral relationship), 3) relative age (the difference of age within one generation), 4) gender (sex of relative), 5) sex of speaker, 6) affinity (the difference between consanguineal relatives and those relatives related by marriage), 7) the condition of (connecting) relative, and 8) the condition of (connecting) relative.

This paper forms part of a more comprehensive comparative study of contemporary Austronesian relationship terminologies. This larger study is intended as a systematic examination of a representative sample of approximately five hundred complete terminologies drawn, as far as possible, from all of the purported subgroups of the Austronesian language family.
and 8) the sex of connecting relative. All of these principles are relevant to the study of Austronesian relationship terminologies, although principle 8 would be more appropriate if it were modified to include 'status' as well as 'sex' of the connecting relative. All eight principles are also relevant to the terminologies of the Cordilleran languages.

All the Cordilleran relationship terminologies are structured according to generation and distinguish between consanguineal and affinal relationships. These two principles set the parameters within which other principles, such as relative age, gender, sex of speaker and so on, are variably applied. This paper will focus specifically on the consanguineal and affinal dimensions of two generations: the first ascending generation (G+1) and Ego's generation (G+0). The first descending (G–1) generation will also be considered briefly. The analysis is concerned to identify the common features of these terminologies while at the same time noting the variable elements that differentiate them. As a methodological and also as an expository means of proceeding, I will endeavor to examine the basic configurations in these terminologies beginning in each case with the simplest in a formal sense. In providing examples of these configurations, I will try to represent, as far as possible, the range of Cordilleran terminologies.

2. The Cordilleran Languages

Following Reid's (1989) classification of the group of Cordilleran languages, I have grouped these eighteen terminologies in relation to one another as follows:

I. Northern Cordilleran

1. Cagayan Valley [A]

   (a) Atta
   (b) Isnag
   (c) Ga’dang

It is worth noting that in 1919, Kroeber published an analysis entitled “Kinship in the Philippines” in which one can recognize his application of these principles of relationship to Philippine terminologies. The data he had to work with was limited and his reconstruction of an “ancient system” is tentative at best. While his specific observations are often pertinent, it is particularly interesting to observe that he gave little attention to the varied affinal dimensions of Philippine terminological systems (See Fox 1988 for a further discussion of Kroeber’s model.)

It should be emphasized that this is a formal analysis, not a historical linguistic analysis. That this formal analysis is directed to a group of terminologies that share relatively close historical relationships is, however, a critical factor underlying the analysis and therefore historical connections among these terminologies are relevant to an overall discussion. The terminologies that I have relied on for this analysis are drawn from a variety of sources. Chief among these sources is the compendium on Philippine kinship compiled by Elkins and Hendrickson on the basis of data supplied by linguists of the Summer Institute of Linguistics. I have also drawn on information in Handbook of Philippine language groups as well as the analyses of specific terminologies by anthropologists and linguists (Fred Eggan, Ronald Himes, Henry Lewis, and Michelle Rosaldo). All of these sources are cited in the References. I am also grateful for additional information supplied by the editors of this volume and by Ronald Himes who commented on an earlier draft of the paper.

I have designated each of the subgroups within this classification with a letter [Aâ€”F] as a simple way of representing these subgroups for comparative purposes.
(d) Itawes
(e) Ibanag

2. Northeastern Luzon [B]

(f) Dumagat (Casiguran)
(g) [Dumagat (Umiray)]

II. South Central Cordilleran

3. Central Cordilleran

3.1 Nuclear Cordilleran [C]

(h) Ifugao (Amganad)
(i) Balangao
(j) Bontok
(k) Kankanay (Northern)/Sagada Igorot

3.2 Itneg-Kalinga [D]

(l) Itneg (Binongan)
(m) Kalinga

4. Southern Cordilleran [E]

(n) Ilongot
(o) Kallahan (Keley-i)
(p) Ibaloi [Karao]^{5}
(q) Pangasinan

III. Ilocano [F]

(r) Ilocano

It is important to note that although Reid included Dumagat (Umiray) in his 1989 classification of Cordilleran languages, by 1994, he was able to offer evidence that Umiray Dumagat did not belong within this group of languages. He had earlier communicated this possibility, which was accepted (see Blust 1991). Now further evidence to support this view has been provided by Himes (2002). In this paper, I have purposely retained Umiray Dumagat. It is clearly the most divergent terminology within the group and thus, from a different basis, supports the view that this language

---

^{5} Information on the Karao/Karau terminology from Ronald Himes’ fieldnotes indicates that in terms of reference, Karao is remarkably similar to Ibaloi. For the purposes of this paper, I refer to the published data on the Ibaloi.
does not belong among the Cordilleran subset of languages. The evidence of this divergence is worth presenting.

### 3. First Ascending Generation: Consanguineal Relations

All of the Cordilleran relationship terminologies have a broadly similar cognatic or bilateral structure. Thus, in the first ascending generation, FB is not distinguished from MB nor is FZ distinguished from MZ.

Of the eighteen Cordilleran terminologies, only one, Bontok, makes no distinction between F, FB, MB on the male side and M, FZ and MZ on the female side. In Bontok, only gender is applied to distinguish relatives in this generation.

**Bontok**

- **ama**: F, FB, MB [male, G +1]
- **ina**: M, MZ, FZ [female, G +1]

In formal terms, this configuration can be represented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F/FB/MB</th>
<th>M/MZ/FZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ama</strong></td>
<td>F/FB/MB</td>
<td>M/MZ/FZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ina</strong></td>
<td>F/FB/MB</td>
<td>M/MZ/FZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Cordilleran terminologies have, in addition to terms for F and M, terms for designating FB/MB and FZ/MZ, a configuration that can be represented as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSb m</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>PSb f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of these terminologies are, in fact, not markedly different from the Bontok case in that they use variants of the term for father (**ama**) and mother (**ina**) to designate FB/MB and FZ/MZ. In addition, they continue to use terms for father and mother in addressing FB/MB or FZ/MZ. The Kalinga provide an example of this pattern.

**Kalinga (Southern Tanudan) [E]**

- **ama**: F, FB, MB [Address: amaq/papa]
- **amaqon**: FB, MB
- **ina**: M, MZ, FZ [Address: inaq/mama]
- **inaqon**: FZ, MZ

Similarly, Kallahan, Ibaloi and Pangasinan all use terms derived from **ama** and **ina** to designate FB/MB and FZ/MZ as indicated in this example from Ibaloi.

**Ibaloi [E]**

- **ama**: F [Address: ama, tatang, dadi]
- **ina**: M [Address: ina, nanang, mami]

---

6 In the following discussion, I rely on standard specifications for kin terms: P = Parent, F = Father, M = Mother, B = Brother, D = Daughter, Z = Sister, S = Son, Sb = Sibling, Sp = Spouse, W = Wife, H = Husband, C = Child, e = elder, y = younger, f = female, m = male, m.s. = man-speaking, w.s. = woman-speaking. Thus, for example, FB is father’s brother, MB is mother’s brother, CC is child’s child or grandchild, BW (w.s.) is brother’s wife (woman-speaking).
Other Cordilleran terminologies refer to FB/MB and FZ/MZ by separate terms. Some examples of this pattern are:

**Atta [A]**

- ammonq/yama: F
- innoq/yena: M
- ulitak: FB, MB: Psb (m)
- ikiq: FZ, MZ: Psb (f)

**Balangao [C]**

- ama: F (FB, MB)
- ina: M (MZ, FZ)
- oletéq, oletao: FB, MB [Address: ama]
- iket: MZ, FZ [Address: ina]

**Itneg (Binongan) [D]**

- ama: F [Address: ammang]
- ina: M [Address: innang]
- uliteg: FB, MB [Address: ama]
- ikit: MZ, FZ [Address: ina]

**Ilongot [E]**

- ‘ama: F, FB, MB, MBW, FBW [honorific address]
- ‘ina: M, MZ, FZ, MZH, FZH
- ta’u: FB, MB [optional]
- ‘ikit: MZ, FZ [optional]

**Ilocano [F]**

- ama(ng)/tata(ng): F [Address: ama, tatang, tata]
- ina(ng)/nana(ng): M [Address: ina, mamang, nana]
- uliteg: FB, MB
- ikit: MZ, FZ

The fact that in all of these examples the terms for FB/MB (ulitak, oléteg, uliteg) and FZ/MZ (ikiq, iket, ikit, ‘ikit) are cognates gives a sense of seeming similarity to these terminologies. More significantly, the optional use of separate terms for FB/MB and FZ/MZ, as in the case of Ilongot, and the continued use of ama/ina in address for FB/MB and FZ/MZ in the case of the Balangao and Itneg are indications that these

---

It is worth noting that whereas the Ilongot term, ‘ikit is cognate with the other FZ/MZ terms, the FB/MB term, ta’u is not. It derives from a Proto-South Central Cordilleran form *qulita:qu ‘uncle’, whereas the other terms derive from Proto-Cordilleran *quliteg ‘uncle’. I am grateful to Ronald Himes for this information.
terminologies are not greatly dissimilar to the structurally simple Bontok configuration. In its simplified form, Ilongot is exactly like Bontok in this regard.

A number of other Cordilleran terminologies are, as it were, in some kind of ‘transitional state’ between these two configurations. Thus Dumagat (Casiguran), for example, has a variant of the term ‘ama’ for FB/MB but a separate term for FZ/MZ.

**Dumagat (Casiguran) [B]**

- ‘ama’ F [Address: améng, ‘maméng’]
- amay FB, MB
- ‘ina’ M [Address: inéng, ‘nanéng’]
- ‘dada’ MZ, FZ

Kankanay has two terms for FB/MB, one of which is a variant of *ama*.

**Kankanay (Northern) [C]**

- ama F
- ina M
- pangamaqen, alitaqo FB, MB [Address: ama]
- ikit MZ, FZ

Ifugao, by contrast, uses a variant of *ama* for FB/MB and a variant of *ina* for FZ/MZ but in addition has another separate term for FB/MB.

**Ifugao (Amganad) [C]**

- ama F
- ina M
- amaon, ulitaon FB, MB
- inaon FZ, MZ

Rather than posing a contrast between two possible configurations, it would seem more appropriate to recognize the possible gradations between these two patterns. It is possible to trace these gradations from (1) the Bontok case to that of (2) the Ilongot, where separate terms are optional, to the cases of (3) the Kalinga, Kallahan, Ibaloi and Pangasinan where terms for parents’ siblings are variants of the terms for father and mother, to (4) the Ifugao and Dumagat (Casiguran) cases where a separate term for FB/MB exists along with a variant term for F, to (5) Kankanay where there are two separate terms plus an additional variant (of the term for father), to cases such as those of (6) the Balangao and Itneg that have separate terms for FB/MB and FZ/MZ but maintain variants of F and M as address terms to the (7) Ga’dang and Ilocano where separate terms for FB/MB and FZ/MZ are used for both reference and address. One could see this as a possible historical transformation but given all the gradation in this schema, one could imagine ‘transformations’ in both directions. In other words, over

---

8 In this generation, Ifugao also displays another not-uncommon feature of Austronesian relationship terminologies. Terms of reference to relatives in this senior generation are changed when the relative dies. Thus *ama* becomes *amandi* ‘late or deceased father’, *ina* becomes *inandi*, *amaon* becomes *amaondi*, *ulitaon* becomes *ultaon*, and *inaon* becomes *inaondi*.
time one could envisage the possibilities of the loss of options and the simplification of
systems as well as their further development.⁹

In all of this the Dumagat (Umiray) stand out as exceptional by their
thorough-going differentiation according to relative age. Thus parents’ siblings (male
and female) are distinguished by separate terms according to age.

**Dumagat (Umiray)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ama</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ina</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wawa</td>
<td>e (FB, MB) [Sbm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mama</td>
<td>y (FB, MB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teti</td>
<td>e (MZ, FZ) [Sbf]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nangnang</td>
<td>y (MZ, FZ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among Malayo-Polynesian terminologies in general, this is a relatively rare
configuration.¹⁰

### 4. Ego’s Generation: Sibling Terms

There are evident similarities in the patterning of terms used in ego’s generation
among all the Cordilleran terminologies with various gradations in this patterning. The
simplest of these patterns is reported among the Ga’dang and Kalinga who have a single
term for sibling and among the Ifugao who have two alternative terms for
sibling/cousin.

**Ga’dang [A]**

- **kolak** Sb (B, Z)

**Ifugao (Amganad) [C]**

- **iba, agi** Sb (B, Z), PSbCx [Syn]

**Kalinga [D]**

- **sunud** Sb (B, Z) [agi: ‘relative’]

Cognates of the term agi used to refer to siblings, occur in many of the
terminologies. This term is commonly used along with relative age terms as is the case
in the following examples:

**Atta [A]**

- **wagi** Sb (B, Z)
- **kaka** e (B, Z, PSbC)
- **urian** y (B, Z, PSbC)

---

⁹ A crude model for this might be the following: Bontok <> Ilongot <> [Kalinga, Kallahan, Ibaloí, Pangasinan] <> [Ifugao, Dumagat (Casiguran)] <> Kankanay <> [Balangao, Itneg] <> [Ga’dang, Ilocano].

¹⁰ It is perhaps worth noting that Himes in his paper argues that many of the features Dumagat (Umiray) have are the result of very early contact between a non-Austronesian speaking population and speakers of a language that would now be classified among Central Philippine languages (2002).
### Ibanag [A]
- wagi: Sb
- kaka: e (B, Z)
- urrian: y (B, Z)

### Balangao [B]
- agi, sonod, iba: Sb (B, Z), PSbC
- pangolowan: e (Sb, PSbC)
- enawdi: y (Sb, PSbC)

### Bontok [C]
- agi: Sb
- iyonaq: e (Sb, PSbC)
- inaqodi: y (Sb, PSbC)

### Ilongot [E]
- katan'agi: Sb (B, Z, PSbC)
- 'eka: e (B, Z, PSbC)
- 'agi: y (B, Z, PSbC)

### Kallahan (Keley-i) [E]
- agi: Sb, PSbC
- peppenggulwan: e (Sb, PSbC) [Address: agi]
- udiday: y (SB, PSbC) [Address: agi]

### Ibaloi [E]
- agi: Sb
- pangadowan: e (Sb) [Address: manong: eB; manang: eZ]
- orishiy: y (Sb) [Address: ading]

### Pangasinan [E]
- agi: Sb, PSbC
- panguluwan: e (Sb, PSbC) [Address: kuya: eB; aqsi: eZ]
- yugtan: y (Sb, PSbC) [Address: name]

Similar patterning is observable among the Kankanay (among whom agi is the general term for 'cousin' or 'relative') and among the Ilocano. Thus most Cordilleran terminologies have the following configuration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>elder</th>
<th>younger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For both Dumagat groups, however, only relative age terms are reported in use to refer to siblings and cousins.
4.1 *Manong/manang* transformations

The use of the terms *manong* for elder male and *manang* for elder female siblings, cousins (and, in some instances, affines) is an interesting feature of a number of Cordilleran terminologies. The Ilocano, for example, use *manong* and *manang* as terms of reference as well as address. They thereby add a further discrimination by gender to the elder sibling and cousin categories. Some Kankanay-speaking groups (but not the Sagada Igorot) are reported to have borrowed these terms from the Ilocano and use them, as do the Ilocano, as terms of address for elder male and female siblings and cousins. The Ibaloi have done the same but have also adopted the term *ading* as a designation of address for the younger sibling who is still referred to as *orishiyan*. The Itneg appear to have developed further along these same lines. They have no separate term for elder sibling but instead use *manong/manang* for elder male and female siblings and have two synonymous terms (*inaqodi, ading*) for younger sibling (compare: Ilocano: *inaqodi/adi(ng)*: y (Sb)). The Itneg usage is as follows:

**Itneg [D]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sibling Term</th>
<th>Reference Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>sonod</em></td>
<td>Sb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>manong</em></td>
<td>e (B, PSbS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>manang</em></td>
<td>e (Z, PSbD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>inaqodi, ading</em></td>
<td>y (Sb, PSbC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This patterning of sibling terms among the Itneg produces another distinctive configuration, which has the following format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e male</th>
<th>e female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y sibling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This configuration occurs almost as commonly among Austronesian-speaking populations as does the configuration that differentiates siblings by relative age only. It is interesting therefore to see how among a group where differentiation by relative age is the predominant configuration, this alternative configuration can develop.

The Dumagat (Umiray) are also distinctive in their use of address terms for siblings. Although they are similar to the Dumagat (Casiguran) in using only relative age categories among siblings, they resemble the Ilocano and other Cordilleran groups in addressing elder siblings by terms that distinguish gender. These address terms, *yaya* for elder (B, PSbS) and *ati* for elder (Z, PSbD) derive from the Chinese, possibly by way of Tagalog terms *kuya/ate*. They are unrelated to *manong/manang*.

---

11 Information on this derivation comes from Ronald Himes (pers. comm.).
5. Ego’s Generation: Cousin Terms

Two groups — Bontok and Ilongot — have a single term for all cousins. The Ilongot term encompasses both siblings and cousins, whereas Bontok have a separate term for cousins.

**Bontok [C]**
- kayong
  - PSbC [Address: e or y]

**Ilongot [E]**
- katan’agi
  - Sb, PSbC

All of the other Cordilleran terminologies share a similar patterning for cousin terms, a configuration that can be described as one of ‘numeric laterality’. Cousins are reckoned to extend laterally by degrees from a sibling set, with each degree given a numeric designation. This is a characteristic pattern of many cognatic systems of kin reckoning, including that of English, which designates ‘first’, ‘second’ and even ‘third’ cousins. Examples of this among the Cordilleran terminologies are as follows:

**Isneg [A]**
- kapinsan 1st cousin [Address: pinsan]
- kapidduwa 2nd cousin [Address: pinsan]
- kapiqlu 3rd cousin [Address: pinsan]

**Dumagat (Casiguran) [B]**
- ‘pensan-’buu 1st cousin
- ‘pensan ikaduwa 2nd cousin
- ‘pensan ikatelo 3rd cousin
- partidu “distant cousin”

**Balangao [C]**
- apenghan 1st cousin [Address: name or e/y]
- kapegwa 2nd cousin [Address: name or e/y]
- kapetlo 3rd cousin [Address: name or e/y]

**Itneg (Binongan) [D]**
- kasinsin 1st cousin
- kapidowa 2nd cousin
- kapitlo 3rd cousin

**Pangasinan [E]**
- kapinsán 1st cousin
- kapidua 2nd cousin
- kapitlu 3rd cousin

**Ilocano**
- kasinsin PSbC [Address: manong: e male; manang: e female]
- kapidua 2nd cousin
This system of ‘numeric laterality’ for designating cousins occurs in virtually all Cordilleran terminologies. Most groups extend this laterality by three degrees to the third cousin. The Sagada Igorot, however, like the Ilocano, are reported to extend this laterality by five degrees to the fifth cousin.

6. First Descending Generation (G-1): Consanguineal Terms

Virtually all Cordilleran terminologies make a fundamental distinction in the first descending generation, that between child and sibling’s child. The term for sibling’s child may also be extended to spouse’s sibling’s children. Thus all these terminologies distinguish the children within the nuclear family from those of other families. In a majority of cases, the term for sibling’s child is a ‘variant’ of the term for child. Several examples of this across all Cordilleran groups are:

**Atta [A]**

- anaq/abbing\(^{12}\) C
- kanakan SbC, SpSbC

**Dumagat (Casiguran) [B]**

- anak C [Address: ‘duduy’]
- anéng SbC

**Balangao [C]**

- anaq C [Address: name or anaqo]
- amonaén SbC, SpSbC [Address: name or anaqo]

**Kalinga [D]**

- anak C
- amunakon SbC

**Ibaloi [E]**

- anak C
- kaqanakan SbC

**Ilocano [F]**

- anak\(^{13}\) C
- kaqanakan SbC, SpSbC

This is a common and consistent configuration not just in Cordilleran languages but in a majority of Malayo-Polynesian terminologies.

\(^{12}\) Anaq is reported as the term for offspring, but abbing is the more usual term for child (Claudia White, pers. comm.)

\(^{13}\) Anak is the unmarked term for child in Ilocano; men can use another term, putot, for a child they have fathered (Carl Rubino, pers. comm.).
7. First Ascending and First Descending Cross-Generational Affinal Terms

Most of the Cordilleran relationship terminologies have a single term for spouse’s parent and another term for child’s spouse. This mutual familiar relationship crosses generations. In the relationship, the spouse’s parents are generally addressed by terms for father and mother and the child’s spouse by the term for child. The term used for spouse’s parent may be extended to spouse’s parents’ siblings who are often addressed by consanguineal terms.

Examples of these paired terms are:

**Ga’dang [A]**
- katuwang: SpP, SpPSb [Address: ama/ina/utitag/titti]^{14}
- manuwang: CSP

**Ibanag [B]**
- katugangan: SpP
- mammanugang: CSP

**Balangao [C]**
- atoganga: SpP, SpPSb [Address: ama/ina]
- mangugang: CSP [Address: name or anaqo]

**Bontok [C]**
- katogangan: SpP [Address: ama/ina]
- innapo: CSP

**Itneg [D]**
- katogangan: SpP
- manogang: CSP

**Pangasinan [E]**
- katulangan: SpP [Address: ama/ina]
- manugan: CSP [Address: name]

**Ilocano [F]**
- katugangan: SpP [Address: tata(ng), nana(ng)]
- manugang: CSP [Address: anakko]

Although this affinal pattern is the most common configuration that occurs among Cordilleran groups, there are variations on this pattern.

The Ifugao use the terms for father and mother in conjunction with the 1st person plural (‘our’) to refer to father-in-law and mother-in-law. For child’s spouse, they use the term, inapu.

^{14} Among the Ga’dang, when a spouse dies, the change in this affinal relationship is marked by a change in terms: the term, kafalwan replaces katuwang.
Ifugao [C]

ama F, WF, HF [1st per. pl. in reference to SpF]
ina M, HM, WM [1st per. pl. in reference to SpM]
inapu CSp ['all relatives related to ego by marriage']

The Ilongot have a single reciprocal term for this relationship SpP/CSp. This is reported to be the same term as that for ‘grandparent’: ‘apu. However, this may only be a resemblance, since the two appear to have separate derivations. Ilongot ‘apu (SpP/CSp) may be related to Bontok innapo, Kalinga inapu, and Ibaloi ineo, all of which are used to refer to CSp.

Ilongot [E]

‘apu PP, SpP, CSp (DH, SW)

Like the Ilongot, the Dumagat (Casiguran) also have a single term for this mutual relationship.

Dumagat (Casiguran) [B]

manugen SpP, CSp

8. Ego’s Generation: Affinal Terms

8.1 The category of spouse

The category of ‘spouse’ is a linking affinal term. In all the Cordilleran terminologies, this category is denoted by a single term, which is cognate among many groups. Thus all of the populations of the Cagayan Valley (Atta, Isnag, Ga’dang, Itawes, and Ibanag) have atawa; Dumagat (Casiguran) has asawa, and Balangao, ahawa, whereas Bontok, Kankanay, Isnag and Kalinga also have asawa as do Pangasinan and Ilocano; Kallahan has ahwa and Ibaloi asewa. As Kroeber (1919:80) observed in his early paper, asawa is the most common term for spouse, not just in Cordilleran languages but throughout the Philippines. Among many of these populations, husband and wife are personally addressed by the use of terms for ‘male’ and ‘female’ as for example among the Ga’dang.

Ga’dang [A]

atawa Sp [Address: lakay (H), bakat (W)]

This usage is also reported for the Dumagat (Casiguran), Kankanay, Itneg and Ilocano.

Although possessing a single term for spouse, three Cordilleran terminologies have a term unrelated to asawa. The Ifugao use inayan, the Ilongot be’yek, and the Dumagat (Umiray) bebi.

As in other features of its terminology, the Dumagat (Umiray) appear different from other Cordilleran groups in the elaboration of address terms depending upon the ‘condition’ of the spouse. The Dumagat (Umiray) thus address both spouses by different terms, if the wife is pregnant, if a child dies, or after the birth of the first child and after child-bearing. This pattern of address is remarkable both for its elaboration and its distinctiveness in comparative terms.

Dumagat (Umiray) [B]

bebi Sp
8.2 Affines and the affines of affines

In the anthropological literature, there are few established conventions for comparing different configurations of affinal terms. As a minimal convention, one can proceed by differentiating between terminologies that have one, two, three or more terms for categorizing affines.

Only three Cordilleran groups are reported to have a single term for all affines. They are the Ifugao, Kallahan and Kalinga.

**Ifugao [C]**

- **aydu** SpSb, SbSp, SpSbSp

**Kallahan [E]**

- **aydu** SpSb, SbSp [Address: agi]

**Kalinga [D]**

- **sinunud** SpSb, SbSp [sinud: Sb]

The remaining terminologies make a fundamental distinction between immediate affines who consist of spouse’s siblings and siblings’ spouses (SpSb, SbSp) on the one hand and the affines of affines, namely spouse’s sibling’s spouses (SpSbSp).

The Dumagat (Casiguran), Ilongot and Ibaloi, for example, make only this distinction and thus have just two terms for affines.

**Dumagat (Casiguran) [B]**

- **’kayong** SpSb, SbSp
- **idas** SpSbSp

**Ilongot [E]**

- **’aum** SpSb, SbSp
- **bidet** SpSbSp

**Ibaloi [E]**

- **bayaw** SpSb, (SbSp)
- **abidat** SpSbSp

Among all the Cordilleran groups that possess a term for the affines of an affine, the same cognate form is apparent. Thus in addition to Dumagat (Casiguran) idas and Ilongot bidet, and Ibaloi abidat, the following terms for SpSbSp are: Atta: kabiraq, Isnag: kabirat, Ga’dang: kabirat [Address: birat], Itawes: abirat, Ibanag: abarag, Dumagat (Umiray): bilas, Ifugao: abilat, Kankanay: abilat, Itneg: bilas, Ilocano: abirat.

The Pangasinan present an exception. In addition to the term, irat for SpSbSp, the Pangasinan are reported to use the term balay (abalayan), which is also applied to child’s spouse’s parents (CSpP), for SbSpSb.
Most of the Cordilleran terminologies that distinguish between affines and the affines of affines rely on two terms to distinguish among direct affines. Among these terminologies, however, there are significant differences in just how these two affinal terms are applied.

The most common pattern is to distinguish immediate affines simply by gender. Thus among the Cagayan Valley groups, the Atta, Itawes and Ibanag distinguish between male and female affines as do the Kankanay or Sagada Igorot, the Isnag, and Ilocano.

Atta [A]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kayung} & : \text{WB, ZH, HB} \\
\text{asipak} & : \text{HZ, BW, WZ}
\end{align*}
\]

Kankanay [C]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kasod} & : \text{WB, ZH, HB} \\
\text{aydo} & : \text{HZ, BW, WZ}
\end{align*}
\]

Itneg [D]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kayong} & : \text{WB, ZH, HB} \\
\text{ipag} & : \text{HZ, BW, WZ}
\end{align*}
\]

Ilocano [F]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kayong} & : \text{WB, ZH [Address: manong, if elder]} \\
\text{ipag} & : \text{WZ, BW [Address: manang, if elder]}
\end{align*}
\]

Another pattern is found among the Isnag. Instead of applying the principle of gender to distinguish male and female affines, the terminology uses the principle of sex of speaker as a means of differentiation.

Isnag [A]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{katayug} & : \text{WB, ZH (m.s.), HZ, BW (w.s.)} \\
\text{ipag} & : \text{WZ, BW (m.s.), HB, ZH (w.s.)}
\end{align*}
\]

The Ga’dang introduce another twist to affinal relationships by combining gender and sex of speaker in applying the term, katayug, thus creating a special relationship between male affines. (Female affines and male affines when referred to by women are categorized as ipag.)

Ga’dang [A]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{katayug, kayung} & : \text{WB, ZH (m.s.)} \\
\text{ipag} & : \text{HZ, BW (w.s.), HB, ZH (w.s.); WZ, BW (m.s.)}
\end{align*}
\]

The Bontok and the Balangao offer another variant to these affinal relationships. Instead of marking a special relationship between male affines, both the Bontok and the Balangao terminologies mark a special relationship between female affines by a different use of a combination of gender and sex of speaker.
Bontok [C]

inged  HZ, BW (w.s.)
kasud  HB, ZH (w.s.), WB, ZH, BW, ZH (m.s.)

These different patterns are significant and represent, as it were, the exploitation of possibilities inherent in such terminologies.

Another affinal feature of most Cordilleran terminologies is the existence of a separate term for ‘child’s spouse’s parents’ (CSpP). This defines a reciprocal relationship between parents whose children have married. Among most of these languages, the term is a reflex of some form of *balay. Thus Atta has kabbalay, Isnag abalay, Ga’dang kafalay, Dumagat (Casiguran) balaqi, Dumagat (Umiray) belaqi, Balangao abalayan, Itneg abalay, Kalinga aboryan, Pangasinan abalayan, and Ilocano abalayan. Bontok, by contrast, has aliwid, and Kankanay and Ibaloi have kaqising and Kallahan kaqthing. No such category, however, is reported for Ifugao and Ilongot.

The variable distribution — even among closely related populations — of the CSpC category makes it of special significance (see Fox 2002). Rather than defining any positive rule of marriage, CSpP designates a post-facto relationship between members of the same generation. Although CSpP occurs frequently in cognatic relationship terminologies, it is not a distinguishing feature of such systems because it does not occur in all cognatic terminologies. It thus represents an interesting optionally occurring relationship. The Cordilleran terminologies are a good illustration of this pattern.

9. Comparative Considerations

This analysis of Cordilleran terminologies is part of a wider analysis of Austronesian relationship terminologies. For a study of Malayo-Polynesian relationship terminologies, in particular, Northern Luzon offers a strategic vantage point to advance this comparative endeavor. Northern Luzon represents a large area into which early Austronesians began to migrate and radiate out. It is an area of long settlement and complex interaction among related populations who have both diverged and intermingled.15

What this analysis highlights is the remarkable variety among these Cordilleran terminologies. Table 1 is a matrix of equations and distinctions for the Cordilleran terminologies considered in this paper. As Table 1 indicates, a minimum of twenty-four relational distinctions are required to encompass the variety of possibilities among Cordilleran groups. No two relational terminologies make the same set of distinctions.16 Interestingly in those cases where the consanguineal distinctions are similar, affinal distinctions are quite distinct. Thus even the appearance of similarity masks remarkable diversity.

Much of the variety in western Malayo-Polynesian terminologies can already be seen in these Cordilleran terminologies. All of the ‘principles’ that Kroeber defined for terminologies in general can be identified in the Cordilleran terminologies. These terminologies are structured in terms of generations and there is a clear development of

15 Although the Bashiic languages (Yami and Ivatan) constitute a separate subgroup, Bashiic relationship terminologies have many of the features of Cordilleran terminologies: partial laterality in the 1st ascending generation, relative age for siblings, numeric laterality (Yami) in ego’s generation, and a differentiation between child and sibling’s child in the 1st descending generation. By contrast, there is virtually no elaboration of the affinal dimension of these terminologies. Ivatan is reported to have a single term for all affines of ego’s generation. For Yami, there is even less evidence of affinal recognition.

16 Information is insufficient for Itawes and Ibanag to make an adequate comparison.
both the consanguineal and the affinal dimensions of these terminologies. Gender, laterality, and relative age are utilized in ways that are recognizable among numerous other Malayo-Polynesian languages. Condition of (connecting) relative is also utilized to a limited extent in the case of deceased relatives. On the other hand, sex of speaker and sex of connecting relative are barely utilized and only in a specific affinal context. In other Malayo-Polynesian terminologies, these principles are given far greater elaboration and indeed become critical in the overall structuring of some terminologies.

Most significantly, from a comparative point of view, there is no development of lineality in any of these terminologies, neither in the first ascending generation nor in ego’s generation. Since lineality is indeed a critical feature of various terminologies in different parts of the Malayo-Polynesian speaking world, this feature may have been developed more than once. This development, however, is not evident in any terminology from the Philippines, Borneo or Sulawesi. Interestingly, where lineality exists and has been elaborated to a greater or lesser extent, as in Sumatra, Madagascar, eastern Indonesia and Oceania, terminologies that rely on laterality can also be found. The development of lineality thus appears as one possibility in a repertoire of possibilities. The same may be said of various other structural principles, such as relative age or sex of speaker, which have also been elaborated by particular Malayo-Polynesian populations. As a group, the Cordilleran languages have particularly developed laterality, gender, relative age and a variety of affinal possibilities. The analysis of these terminologies provides an essential building block for a general understanding of Austronesian kinship.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Atta</th>
<th>Ismag</th>
<th>Gadiang</th>
<th>Itawes</th>
<th>Ibanag</th>
<th>Dum (Gas)</th>
<th>Dum (Un)</th>
<th>Ifugao</th>
<th>Balinguo</th>
<th>Bomdok</th>
<th>Kankanay</th>
<th>Itneg</th>
<th>Kalinga</th>
<th>Hongot</th>
<th>Kallahan</th>
<th>Isalo</th>
<th>Pangasinan</th>
<th>Ilocano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>x</td>
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<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
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<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
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<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
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<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
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<td>x</td>
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<td>x</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
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<td>x</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
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<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
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<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>x</td>
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<tr>
<td>14</td>
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<td>x</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
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<td>x</td>
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<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>x</td>
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<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
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<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
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<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Matrix of equations and distinctions among Cordilleran relationship terminologies.
Kin Coda

1. $F = FB = MB$
2. $F < PSb (m)$                $M < PSb (f)$  [< related: thus ama < amaon; ina < inaon]
3. $F \neq PSb (m)$            $M < PSb (f)$
4. $F < PSb (m)$                $M \neq PSb (f)$
5. $F \neq PSb (m)$            $M \neq PSb (f)$
6. $F \neq e/y PSb (m)$        $M \neq e/yPSb (f)$
7. $Sb$ [Sibling only]
8. $eSb + ySb$
9. $Sb + eSb/ySb$
10. $Sb + eSb(m)/eSb(f) + y$
11. $PSbC$
12. $PSbC: 1, 2, 3...$
13. $C \neq SbC$
14. $SpP (F/M) = P (F/M)$
15. $SpP = CSp$ (Reciprocal)
16. $SpP \neq CSp$
17. $SpSbSp$ [Separate term for SpSbSp]
18. $SpSbSp \neq SbSpSb$ [2 terms for affines of affines]
19. $SpSb = SbSp$ [1 term for all same generation affines]
20. $SpSb(m) = SbSp (m) \neq SpSb(f) = SbSp(f)$ [2 terms by gender only]
21. $WB/ZH/HZ/BW \neq WZ/BW/HB/ZH$ [2 terms by gender and sex of speaker]
22. $WB/ZH (m.s.) \neq HZ/BW/WZ/BW/HB/ZH$ [Special term between male affines]
23. $HZ/BW (w.s.) \neq HB/ZH/WZ/BW/WB/ZH$ [Special term between female affines]
24. $CSpP$
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