

SOME SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS IN TAGALOG-ENGLISH LANGUAGE MIXING¹

FRANK A. SOBOLEWSKI
University of Hawaii

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A relatively new area of research in the study of code switching is the question as to whether there are syntactic constraints in code switching – that is, syntactic mixes of the two languages that would be regarded as ungrammatical by members of the code-switching speech community. Bautista (1974: 22) states the basic premise of this research: 'If language behavior is rule-governed behavior, then presumably code switching is also rule governed'. She then goes on to pose two questions for investigation: 'What are the patterns and constraints in code switching? How can these patterns and constraints be stated as rules that can be tested for predictive power?'

Patterns in Tagalog-English code switching and lexical borrowing (both of which are types of language mixing) have been presented in a systematic way by Marfil and Passigna (1970), Bautista (1974), and others. However, the question of syntactic constraints in Tagalog-English mixing has not been dealt with systematically. Bautista does state and discuss some syntactic constraints but she does not draw these findings together, since determining syntactic constraints was not the purpose of her research.

The purpose of this study is to investigate some of the syntactic constraints or apparent constraints in the mixing of Tagalog and English in the Philippines. The constraints that will be examined involve (1) pronouns and (2) the relationship between verbs and other elements in clauses and sentences. My findings as to syntactic constraints will be presented, not as a set of rules for which there is sufficient evidence, but as suggestions which further research might determine to be valid for written and/or spoken Tagalog-English mixing. Reasons and evidence for the findings will be presented, but not proof. Proof would require evaluative feedback on the suggested rules from different social groups of bilingual Tagalog-English speakers who code-switch these two languages. Obtaining this proof is beyond the scope of this study.

The reasons and evidence that will be presented for the suggested constraints include the following: (1) whether a syntactic construction that I am suggesting is ungrammatical occurs in my data, and if so, how many times; (2) whether such a construction is reported in the seven studies of Tagalog-English mixing that I have examined, and if so, how many times; (3) statements made by Bautista (1974) as to the grammaticality or ungrammaticality of particular constructions and the justification she presents for these statements; and (4) my own insights as a student of Tagalog and of Tagalog-English mixing. In addition, the findings in this study will be compared with those of Timm (1975), Gumperz (1977), and Pfaff (1979) on syntactic constraints in Spanish-English mixing by Chicanos.

In the investigation of syntactic constraints, this study will test the hypothesis that the types of syntactic constructions involving pronouns and/or verbs that are described by Timm (1975) as unacceptable in Spanish-English mixing do not occur in Tagalog-

¹This paper is a condensation of my M.A. thesis (Sobolewski 1980). For their contributions to the thesis and, therefore, to this paper, I would like to thank the members of my Thesis Committee: Dr. Richard R. Day, Dr. Ted Plaister, Dr. Michael L. Forman, and Dr. Teresita V. Ramos.

English mixing. This study will also examine other syntactic constructions involving pronouns and/or verbs that seem ungrammatical in Tagalog-English mixing. These constructions involve Tagalog function words – namely, adverbial enclitics and the direct object marker *ng* – that Spanish does not have.

In testing the hypothesis, this study will investigate the following types of syntactic constructions that Timm (1975: 477-79) reports as being ‘unacceptable’ in Spanish-English mixing. (Each construction is followed by hypothetical examples given by Timm.)

1. A subject pronoun in one language and the main verb in the other language.

*Yo went (‘I went’)	*I fui (‘I went’)
*El wants (‘He wants’)	*He quiere (‘He wants’)
*Ellos gave (‘They gave’)	*They daban (‘They gave’)

2. An object pronoun in one language and the main verb in the other language.

*Mira him (‘He/She looks at him’)
*Dijo to them (‘He/She said to them’)
*She sees lo (‘She sees him/it’)

3. An auxiliary verb in one language and the main verb in the other language.

*I must esperar (‘I must wait’)
*He has visto (‘He has seen’)
*I was caminando (‘I was walking’)
*Debo wait (‘I must wait’)
*Ha seen (‘He/She has seen’)
*Estaba walking (‘I/He/She was walking’)

4. A word of negation in one language and an auxiliary verb in the other language.

*I do no want	*I do no quiero (‘I do not want’)
---------------	-----------------------------------

5. A word of negation in one language and the main verb in the other language.

*I do not/don’t quiero (‘I do not want’)		
*I do no want	*I no want	*(I) not quiero

6. A main verb in one language and an infinitive complement in the other language.

*They want a venir	*I’m going a decidir
*Quieren to come	*Voy to decide
*Quieren come	*Voy a decide
(‘They want to come’)	(‘I’m going to decide’)

1.2. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Conflicting definitions of the terms ‘code switching’, ‘code mixing’, ‘language mixing’, and ‘lexical borrowing’ have appeared in the literature. There is definitely a need to standardize the definitions and use of these and other terms in this area of linguistic research.

SOME SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS IN TAGALOG ENGLISH LANGUAGE MIXING

1. Language Mixing. I am using the term 'language mixing' in the way in which it is used by Pfaff. Pfaff (1979:295) uses this term as 'a neutral cover term' that encompasses both code switching and lexical borrowing while avoiding the issue as to how to specify the difference between these two concepts. Ramos (1970) and Goulet (1971) use the terms 'mixed language' and 'language mixing' in describing combinations of Tagalog and English that fall under the categories of code switching and lexical borrowing as defined below (although they themselves do not use the term 'code switching'). Marfil and Pasigna (1970) use the term 'language shifting' in a similar way. They define this concept as the 'concurrent use' of two languages, that is, the use of 'lexical items or idioms and/or grammatical patterns' (2) of two languages.

As used in this study, the term 'language' does not include the possibility that the mixing of Tagalog and English, or of Spanish and English, as done in the speech communities involved, constitutes a separate language.

2. Lexical Borrowing. I am using Gumperz's definition of this term as interpreted by Pascasio. Gumperz (1977) defines 'lexical borrowing' as 'the introduction of single words or short, frozen, idiomatic phrases, from one language into the other', with the borrowed items being 'incorporated into the grammatical system of the borrowing language' (6). Gumperz's concept of lexical borrowing does not require that lexical borrowings conform to the phonological system of the borrowing language (1977: 6-7). Pascasio (1978: 41, 47) uses Gumperz's definition of lexical borrowing, which she paraphrases as 'a process of lexical insertion or branching of the lexicon of one linguistic system'.

Gumperz uses the term 'lexical borrowing', while Bautista and Pascasio use the term 'lexical insertion'. I will use these two terms as being identical in meaning.

3. Code Switching. I am using Gumperz's definition of 'code switching', which he defines as 'the juxtaposition of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems' (1977: 1). By 'different', he means 'distinct' (1977: 2, 6). Gumperz holds the view that lexical borrowing, as he has defined it, is not code switching. This is the view adopted for the present study.

It is important to keep in mind the distinction between code switching and lexical borrowing because, as Pfaff (1979: 295-96) states, these two types of language mixing make 'vastly different claims about the competence of the individual speaker' who engages in one or both of them. According to Pfaff, the difference is that a monolingual person can engage in lexical borrowing, while a person must have 'some degree of competence in two languages' in order to be able to code switch. For example, American and Filipino lawyers can use legal terms of Latin origin as lexical insertions in their speech and writing, but this does not mean that they can speak Latin as a native or non-native language.

4. Word. In this study, with regard to written and transcribed language, unless otherwise specified the term 'word' means 'sequence of letters which occurs between spaces' (Hartmann and Stork 1972: 256). Thus, two or more sequences of letters that are linked to each other by a hyphen or hyphens constitute a single word. An exception is that, where the names of two or more persons are linked to each other by a hyphen or hyphens, each name constitutes a separate word.

For the purpose of defining a 'word', all types of punctuation constitute spaces between words except for (1) a hyphen, (2) an apostrophe used in a possessive suffix, and (3) an apostrophe that represents the omission of a letter or letters in a sequence of letters that could not be written as two separate words in the same context. For example, 'gov't' ('government') is one word, but 'I'm' ('I am') constitutes two words.

5. **Phrase.** The term 'phrase' is used in this study in the sense in which it is used in traditional grammar. Hartmann and Stork (1972: 175) give the traditional meaning of 'phrase' as 'a group of words forming a syntactic unit' which does not have a subject and a predicate, either expressed or understood. According to this definition, one word cannot constitute a phrase. (By contrast, in generative-transformational grammar, there can be, for example, noun phrases and verb phrases that consist of a single word.)

1.3. THE DATA FOR THIS STUDY

The data for this study comes from letters written by persons age 12 to 30 that appear in movie and song magazines published in the metropolitan Manila area in the Philippines during the period October 1978 to December 1979. (Determination of the age range of the writers is based on information that the writers have given in their letters.)

Listed below by date and issue number are the issues of the magazines that contain the letters from which the data has been obtained. The issue number is given in parentheses after each date. Listed under each magazine are the titles of the sections of letters in that magazine. All of the sections of letters in these magazines are included in the corpus. All dates are 1979 unless otherwise indicated.

A. MOVIE MAGAZINES

1. *Teen World*: June 12 (96), June 26 (98), October 30 (114), November 6 (115), November 20 (117), November 27 (118), December 4 (119), December 18 (121).
 - a. 'Letters to the Editor'
 - b. 'Advice to Guys and Dolls', by Aunt Elizabeth
 - c. 'Cupid's Corner'
 - d. Letters from fans of Arnold Gamboa and Maribel Aunor -- pages 8 and 9 of the December 4 issue only.
2. *Kislap Magasin*: November 9, 1978 (530), November 23, 1978 (532), May 3 (555), June 14 (561), July 5 (564), July 12 (565), September 27 (576), October 11 (578), November 1 (581), November 15 (583), November 22 (584), November 29 (585), December 6 (586), December 13 (587), December 29 (590).
 - a. 'Dear Ninang -- Ang Pitak na May Puso'
3. *Weekly Movie Specials*: November 11 (481), November 18 (482), December 2 (484), December 23 (487), December 30 (488)
 - a. 'Dear Vi'
 - b. 'Dear Guy'
 - c. 'A Love Song Story' (song dedications)
4. *Love Story*: November 22 (426), November 29 (427), December 6 (428), December 31 (432)
 - a. 'May Kasintahan na ba Kayo?'

B. SONG MAGAZINES

1. *Continental Atbp Music Magazine*: April (49) and May (50)
 - a. 'Tell-a-Gram'
 - b. 'Atbpen Pals'

SOME SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS IN TAGALOG ENGLISH LANGUAGE MIXING

2. *The New Romantic Song-Movie Magazine*: June (Vol. VIII, No. 2)
 - a. 'Dear Someone' (song dedications)
3. *Jingle Songhits Magazine*: Numbers 70, 72, 73, 74, all issued in 1979.
 - a. 'Dear Friends at JINGLE'
 - b. 'Dedications' (song dedications)
4. *Song Cavalcade and Top Melodies*: October 6, 1978 (Vol. X, No. 20); October 19, 1979 (Vol. XI, No. 21); November 30, 1979 (Vol. XI, No. 24)
 - a. 'Message For You'
 - b. 'Dedicated To You' (song dedications)

The selection of issues of these magazines does not constitute a random sample. These particular issues were used because they were the only ones available to me for analysis that were published during the period covered by this study.

The possibility exists that the letters may have been edited, but this does not seem likely, except in the matter of stating the name of the magazine (*Teen World* is always abbreviated TW) and in the printing of the names of movie and singing stars in all capitals in the 'Letters to the Editor' section in *Teen World*.

I have not used the few letters (less than ten) in the magazines in which the writer gives his or her age as being over 30. No types of language mixing appear in these letters that do not appear in the letters that I have used.

1.4. PROCEDURES IN ANALYZING AND PRESENTING THE DATA

In analyzing the Tagalog syntax in the data, I have utilized the *Tagalog Reference Grammar* by Schachter and Otnes (1972). In analyzing English syntax, I have consulted *Patterns of English*, Teacher's Edition, by Roberts (1956); *The Structure of American English* by Francis (1958); and the *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics* by Hartmann and Stork (1972).

The source for each example from my data is indicated after it by a code. The code contains four elements: first, two letters that indicate the magazine; second, the issue number of the magazine as printed on the cover; third, the page number where the example is located; and fourth, the number of the letters on that page. For example, KS 555-28-4 means the example cited is found in the fourth letter on page 28 of issue number 555 of *Kislap* magazine. An exception to this method of identification is that codes for examples from 'A Love Song Story' (song dedications) in *Weekly Movies Specials* do not contain a number identifying the letter on the page because the letters in this section are not arranged in columns.

The alphabetic codes that indicate the magazine are as follows.

<i>Abbreviation</i>	<i>Magazine</i>
CN	Continental Atbp Music Magazine
JS	Jingle Songhits Magazine
KS	Kislap Magasin
LS	Love Story
MS	Weekly Movie Specials
NR	The New Romantic Song-Movie Magazine
SC	Song Cavalcade and Top Melodies
TW	Teen World

After the code, my translation of each example or the pertinent part thereof is given. The translation is enclosed in parentheses and single quotation marks.

2. SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS IN TAGALOG-ENGLISH MIXING THAT INVOLVE PRONOUNS

2.1. INTRODUCTION

In this section and in section 3, I will present and discuss syntactic combinations of Tagalog and English that contain pronouns and/or verbs and that seem to be ungrammatical, that is, appear to violate the rules governing the mixing of Tagalog and English. Each such syntactic combination is followed by one or more hypothetical examples which I composed and which are preceded by an asterisk. Underlined in each example are the element or elements whose presence or combination causes the example to seem ungrammatical.

For each syntactic combination that I am suggesting is ungrammatical, I will present examples, if any, that are in my data or in the data reported in the following studies of Tagalog-English mixing: Marfil and Pasiona (1970), Ramos (1970), Goulet (1971), Forman (1973), Bautista (1974), Pascasio (1978), and Dimatera (date unknown). For each syntactic combination, unless an example from one of the aforementioned sources is presented, there were no such examples.

The syntactic constraints discussed in this study apply to *written* discourse. They may or may not apply to spoken discourse. These syntactic constraints are presented, not as a set of rules for which there is sufficient evidence, but as suggestions which further research might determine to be valid for written and/or spoken Tagalog-English mixing.

In the phrasing of the syntactic constraints, elements labeled as 'English' do not include English words that have undergone spelling changes so as to conform to Tagalog phonology and orthography. Examples of such words in the data of Marfil and Pasiona (1970) from the newspaper *Taliba* include *isyu* ('issue'), *reperi* ('referee'), *boksing* ('boxing'), *pimpong* ('pingpong'), *apidabit* ('affidavit'), and *kontrobersiyal* ('controversial'). Presumably, the spelling changes in these words are an indication the words have been fully incorporated into Tagalog, and in this study such words are considered to be Tagalog words.

The syntactic elements labeled as English in this study also do not include English words to which Tagalog affixes have been attached. For the purposes of this study, words that contain a Tagalog affix or affixes are considered to be Tagalog words. Examples in the data of Bautista (1974: 56-58, 104) include the following. (The words are written here in the same way in which they appear in Bautista's study.)

1. *Verbs*. The following words contain Tagalog verb affixes: *nag-distribute* ('distributed'), *nagga-graduate* ('is/are graduating'), *adapt-in* ('to be adapted'), *di-discourage-in* ('will be discouraged')
2. *Gerunds*. The following words contain Tagalog gerund prefixes, i.e. the prefix *pag-* with or without reduplication of the first syllable of the base. *pag-register* ('registering'), *pag-a-approve* ('approving', 'approval'), *pagse-celebrate* ('celebrating', 'celebration')

2.2. ENGLISH PRONOUNS AND THE PLACEMENT OF TAGALOG ADVERBIAL ENCLITICS

Schachter and Otones (1972: 411) define enclitics in Tagalog as 'words that, with certain storable exceptions, obligatorily follow the first word of the construction of which they constitute an immediate part'. The enclitics 'occur only in certain fixed word-order relations to other sentence elements' (411).

SOME SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS IN TAGALOG
ENGLISH LANGUAGE MIXING

The term 'Adverbial Enclitic' as used here refers to the eighteen Tagalog adverbial enclitics that are listed by Schachter and Otones (1972: 411). The Tagalog adverbial enclitic or enclitics in each example below are underlined. Underlined after each example is the English translation of each adverbial enclitic as used in that example.

The most common syntactic location of Tagalog adverbial enclitics that are used in English clauses and sentences in my data is at the end of an English clause or sentence. The following are examples.

- 1) I'm a fan of Marilou Uson. She's so sweet kasi. TW 98-4-5 ('The reason is that she is so sweet')
- 2) Do get in touch naman. TW 119-38-5 ('Please do get in touch')
- 3) Am I old enough to go steady na? TW 117-47-2 ('now')

A. English Personal, Possessive, or Demonstrative Pronoun
Subject + Tagalog Adverbial Enclitic + English Verb

Syntactic combination A above seems ungrammatical. The following is a hypothetical example.

- 4) *I rin will go to the fiesta tomorrow. ('too')

In example (4), even if the Tagalog pronoun *Ako* were used instead of 'I', the sentence would still seem ungrammatical because it would violate restriction A in 2.4 below, which requires that pronoun subjects and auxiliary verbs be in the same language.

It seems that a Tagalog adverbial enclitic can come between an English subject that is an *indefinite* pronoun and an English verb, although there are no examples of this type of construction in my data. Pascasio presents the following example in which two Tagalog adverbial enclitics follow an English indefinite pronoun.

- 5) ' Something na lang received ('only') (Pascasio 1978:47)

However, in this example it is unclear whether the subject of the verb 'received' is the pronoun 'something' or a relative pronoun that is understood.

A Tagalog adverbial enclitic can come between an English subject that is *not* a pronoun and an English verb, as shown below.

- 6) Sabi niya, each mark daw means na may secret admirer ako. TW 115-44-3 ('... it is said that each mark means that I have a secret admirer')
- 7) beer daw is considered as a beverage ... (Bautista 1974: 76) ('... it is said that ...')
- 8) Wildlife: ho is very sensitive doon sa pamamaril. (Bautista 1974: 76) ('Wildlife, sir, is very sensitive there to hunting')
- 9) Pat nga gave me this income tax form. (Goulet 1971: 65) ('indeed')

B. English Verb + Tagalog Adverbial Enclitic + English Object Pronoun

Syntactic combination B above seems ungrammatical. The following is a hypothetical example.

- 10) *Write naman me a letter. ('Please do write me a letter')

Tagalog adverbial enclitics can *follow* English object pronouns, in some syntactic situations at least, as shown below. (In the three examples below, the enclitics *naman*, *na*, and *pa* are redundant because their meaning is also expressed in English.)

- 11) Do write me naman, please. TW 118-46-10 ('Please do')
- 12) . . . he has kissed me na already . . . TW 121-47-3 ('already')
- 13) . . . I still love you pa rin. TW 115-46-4 ('. . . I still love you too')

Tagalog adverbial enclitics can come between English verbs and English direct objects that are not pronouns, as shown in the following examples.

- 14) Sorry kung hindi ako makasulat, I lost kasi your address. TW 118-46-10 ('Sorry that I have not been able to write you; the reason is that I lost your address')
- 15) O wipe muna your hands (Goulet 1971: 86) ('Oh, wipe your hands first')
- 16) I will donate na lang paper plates. (Ramos 1970: 42) ('I will just donate paper plates')

It is not clear if a Tagalog adverbial enclitic can occur *between* an English indirect object pronoun and an English direct object, as, for example, in the hypothetical sentence 'Write me naman a letter'.

Tagalog adverbial enclitics can precede an English prepositional phrase that functions as an indirect object, as in the following example.

- 17) Make pansin naman to me. TW 119-38-9 ('Please do take notice of me'/Please do pay attention to me')

Thus, while *'Write naman me a letter' seems ungrammatical, 'Write a letter naman to me' and 'Write naman to me' are grammatical. In summary, English verbs and subject and object pronouns apparently cannot be separated by Tagalog adverbial enclitics, except for indefinite pronouns that are subjects and for indirect objects that are preceded by the preposition 'to'.

2.3. MIXING SUBJECT PRONOUNS AND NEGATORS

It seems that a subject pronoun and a negator must be in the same language.

- A. English Subject Pronoun + English Auxiliary Verb + Tagalog Negator *hindi* ('not')

Syntactic combination A above seems ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

- 18) *I will *hindi* return to the Philippines this year.
- 19) *I will *hindi* bumalik sa Pilipinas sa taong ito. ('I will not return to the Philippines this year.')

SOME SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS IN TAGALOG ENGLISH LANGUAGE MIXING

20) **I will hindi* babalik sa Pilipinas sa taong ito.

B. English Subject Pronoun + Tagalog Inversion Marker *ay* + Tagalog Negator *hindi*

Syntactic combination B above seems ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

21) **I ay hindi* babalik sa Pilipinas sa taong ito.

(‘I will not return to the Philippines this year’)

22) **They ay hindi* nagtatrabaho sa pabrika.

(‘They are not working at the factory’)

C. Tagalog Subject Pronoun + Tagalog Inversion Marker *ay* + English Auxiliary Verb + English Negator *not*

Syntactic combination C above seems ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

23) **Ako’y not* babalik sa Pilipinas sa taong ito. (‘I will not return to the Philippines this year’)

24) **Ako’y not* return to the Philippines this year.

25) **Ako will not* return to the Philippines this year.

26) **Ako’y will not* bumalik/babalik sa Pilipinas sa taong ito.

Restrictions A, B, and C above are derived from the following rules discussed elsewhere in section 2 or section 3.

1. A negator and the main verb must be in the same language. (See section 3.2.) Examples (18), (23), and (26) violate this rule.
2. In clauses and sentences with Subject – Predicate word order, a subject pronoun and the main verb must be in the same language. (See restrictions D and E in section 2.4.) Examples (19), (20), (21), (22), (24), and (25) violate this rule.
3. A subject pronoun and an auxiliary verb must be in the same language. (See restrictions A, B, and C in section 2.4.) Examples (25) and (26) violate this rule.

Thus, the rule that a subject pronoun and a negator must be in the same language applies regardless of what language the main verb and the auxiliary verb(s), if any, are in. This rule also applies to Timm’s analysis, because Timm (1975: 477-79) cites rules 1 and 2 above for Spanish-English mixing.

2.4. MIXING SUBJECT PRONOUNS AND VERBS

A. Tagalog Subject Pronoun + Tagalog Inversion Marker *ay* + English Auxiliary Verb

Syntactic combination A above seems ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

27) **Ako* (‘I’) have visited the Philippines.

- 28) **Ako* 'y have visited the Philippines.
 29) **Ako* will go to the airport tomorrow.

This restriction and restrictions B and C below are derived from the following two rules discussed elsewhere in section 2 or section 3.

1. In clauses and sentences with Subject – Predicate word order, a subject pronoun and the main verb must be in the same language. (See restrictions D and E below.)
2. An auxiliary verb and the main verb must be in the same language. (See section 3.1.)

Both of these rules are cited by Timm (1975: 477-78) for Spanish-English mixing.

- B. English Subject Pronoun that is a single word + Tagalog Inversion Marker *ay* + Tagalog Pseudo-Verb

Syntactic combination B above seems ungrammatical. The following is a hypothetical example.

- 30) **I ay dapat mag-aral ng Hapones.* ('I should/must study Japanese')

Schachter and Otnes (1972: 261) label the modal verbs in Tagalog as 'pseudo-verbs' because they 'have verb-like meanings, but . . . unlike genuine verbs, are incapable of inflection to show variation in aspect'. The term 'pseudo-verb' as used in this study refers to the eight pseudo-verbs that are listed by Schachter and Otnes (1972: 261). The pseudo-verb in example (30) is *dapat* ('should', 'must').

Restriction B above applies only to single-word English subject pronouns because an English pronoun phrase can occur as the subject preceding a Tagalog verb. Examples of this will be presented in the discussion of restriction E below.

- C. Tagalog Pseudo-Verb + English Subject Pronoun + Tagalog Main Verb

Syntactic combination C above seems ungrammatical. The following is a hypothetical example.

- 31) **Dapat I mag-aral ng Hapones.* ('I should/must study Japanese')

This type of construction seems to be ungrammatical regardless of the length of the English subject pronoun element because the two Tagalog verbs form a syntactic unit that cannot be broken by an English word or phrase.

- D. Tagalog Subject Pronoun + Tagalog Inversion Marker *ay* + English Main Verb

Syntactic combination D above seems ungrammatical. The following is a hypothetical example.

- 32) **Ako* ('I') went to the store yesterday.

Timm (1975: 478) cites the same type of restriction for Spanish-English mixing. Hypothetical examples that he gives are *'Yo went', *'El wants', and *'Ellos gave'.

Pascasio presents the following example of this type of construction that was uttered by a hotel clerk in Manila.

SOME SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS IN TAGALOG
ENGLISH LANGUAGE MIXING

- 33) *Ah, hindi kayo check-out? (Pascasio 1978: 42) ('Ah, you are not checking out?')

This example would be grammatical, according to the rules of Tagalog grammar, if the verb 'check-out' contained Tagalog verb prefixes that indicated focus and aspect, resulting in, for example, *nagche-check-out* ('is/are checking out') or *magche-check-out* ('will check out').

However, constructions of the form 'English Main Verb + Complement of the Verb + Tagalog Subject Pronoun' do occur in clauses and sentences with Tagalog Predicate – Subject word order. The following are examples. (In each example, the English verb and the Tagalog subject pronoun are underlined.)

- 34) . . . believe naman ako sa iyo ah. TW 98-43-19 ('. . . I do believe in you')
- 35) Enjoy ako sa TW dahil narito ang mga paborito kong teenstars. TW 118-5-6 ('I enjoy *Teen World* because my favorite teenstars are here [in it]')
- 36) Alam mo, love kita. Sana, love mo rin ako. TW 98-42-3 ('You know that you are loved by me. Hopefully, I am loved by you too')
- 37) Miss na ba ninyo ako? TW 119-38-3 ('Am I missed by you already?')

The three examples below follow the pattern in examples (34) to (37), except that the English word at the beginning of the predicate phrase contains a participial ending.

- 38) Going steady na ba sila? (Goulet 1971: 29) ('Are they going steady now/already?')
- 39) Kapag sinusundo niya ako, holding hands kami. TW 98-46-6 ('. . . we were holding hands')
- 40) Forgiven na ba ako? TW 119-38-14 ('Am I forgiven now/already?')

E. English Subject Pronoun that is a single word + Tagalog Inversion Marker *ay* + Tagalog Main Verb; or, Tagalog Main Verb + English Subject Pronoun that is a single word

The two syntactic combinations stated above seem ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

- 41) *He ay pumunta sa Maynila. ('He went to Manila')
- 42) *Pumunta he sa Maynila. ('He went to Manila')
- 43) *Nakita ko na that. ('I saw that already' literally, 'That was seen by me already')
- 44) *Mine ay ibinigay sa akin ng mga magulang ko. ('Mine was given to me by my parents')
- 45) *All ay uminom ng serbesa. ('All drank beer')

Examples (41) to (45) contain an English personal pronoun, demonstrative pronoun, possessive pronoun, and indefinite pronoun.

Timm (1975: 478) states that constructions of the form 'English Subject Pronoun + Spanish Verb' are unacceptable. However, all of the hypothetical examples that he gives have a *personal* pronoun as the subject.

Gumperz (1977: 24) cites for Spanish-English, Hindi-English, and Slovenian-German code switching a modified version of Timm's complete prohibition on subject pronoun-verb mixing. Gumperz states that, for these pairs of languages, having a personal pronoun subject in one language and the verb in the other is unacceptable. However, he states that having the subject pronoun phrase 'that one' (or its translation equivalent) is 'marginally acceptable' when the verb is in the other language. According to Gumperz, the difference in acceptability between a personal pronoun and 'that one' is that a personal pronoun is one word but the phrase 'that one' is two words. Gumperz (1977) states that 'on the whole the longer the . . . [subject phrase] the more natural the switch [from one language to another]' (24).

There are instances in my data of constructions of the form 'English Subject that is an Indefinite Pronoun Phrase + the Inversion Marker *ay* + a Tagalog Predicate'. The pronoun phrases in such constructions contain at least three words. The following are examples.

- 46) Ang panganay namin ay nag-asawa na at may dalawang anak while the other two ay nahinto sa pag-aaral . . . TW 121-46-1 ('The eldest child in our family is married already and has two children, while the other two [my other two brothers] have stopped going to school')
- 47) Ang hindi ko maintindihan ay kung bakit one of my uncles na kapatid ng may-ari ng bahay ay laging galit sa akin. TW 96-48-5 ('What I don't understand is why one of my uncles who is a brother of the owner of the house is always angry at me')

The two pronoun phrases underlined in (46) and (47) above are illustrations of Gumperz's rule concerning the length of code-switched subject phrases. These examples provide justification for my limiting to single-word pronoun elements all but one of the restrictions in section 2 that deal with English pronouns and Tagalog verbs or Tagalog prepositions.

2.5. MIXING VERBS AND OBJECT PRONOUNS

It seems that verbs and single-word object pronoun elements must be in the same language.

A. Tagalog Verb + English Object Pronoun that is a single word

Syntactic combination A above seems ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

- 48) *Kumain *it* ako. ('I ate it')
- 49) *Kumain ako ng *it*. ('I ate it')
- 50) *Kumain ng *it* ako. ('I ate it')
- 51) *Nagbisita *him* ako. ('I visited him')
- 52) *Nagbisita ako sa *him*. ('I visited him')
- 53) *Ako'y nagbisita sa *him*. ('I visited him')

SOME SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS IN TAGALOG ENGLISH LANGUAGE MIXING

- 54) *Nagmakinilya siya ng *his*. ('He typed his')
- 55) *Sumulat siya ng *this*. ('He wrote this')
- 56) *Humiram siya ng *some*. ('He borrowed some')
- 57) *Nagturo siya sa *himself*. ('He taught himself')

Examples (48) to (57) above contain English personal, possessive, demonstrative, indefinite, and reflexive pronouns.

Timm (1975: 478) formulated a general rule that prohibits all mixes of Spanish and English in which the verb is in one language and an object pronoun is in the other. Again, his examples contain only personal pronouns.

Pfaff (1979: 303) cites and agrees with Timm's rule. Pfaff and Timm give a reason for the prohibition on Spanish-English object pronoun switching that does not exist for Tagalog-English, namely that, in Spanish, enclitic object personal pronouns – *me, te, le, la, lo, nos, os, les, las, los* – must immediately precede the main verb, or the first auxiliary verb if there is one. (An exception is that, in affirmative imperative constructions, these pronouns immediately follow the main verb.) In other words, there is a conflict between Spanish and English in the position of such pronouns that does not exist with respect to Tagalog and English. Thus, Pfaff (1979) states that, in addition to the requirement that verbs and object pronouns be in the same language, they must also be 'in the position required by the syntactic rules of that language' (303).

B. English Verb + Tagalog Object Pronoun

Syntactic combination B above seems ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

- 58) *I gave *kanya* a book. ('him'/'her')
- 59) *I carried *kanya* ('him') to a place where he could rest.
- 60) *I wrote *siya* a letter. ('him'/'her')
- 61) *I carried *nito* ('this') to the market.
- 62) *I carried *nito* sa palengke. ('I carried this to the market')

The examples above cover the three case forms of Tagalog pronouns.

The following is an example in my data in which a Tagalog object pronoun occurs in a predicate phrase that begins with an English element. In this example, it is not clear what part or parts of speech the English element *T. Y.* ('Thank You') constitutes.

- 63) *Kung tayo pasa, T.Y. tayo "KANYA". TW 119-38-18 ('If we pass, we [will say] Thank You to Him')

The example above is ungrammatical, according to the rules of Tagalog grammar, because the object pronoun *KANYA* ('Him') is not preceded by the preposition *sa*.

One reason that examples (58), (59), (60), and (63) are ungrammatical is that, in Tagalog, the preposition/case marker *sa* must precede an indirect object that is not the name of a person, and all personal pronoun objects, whether direct or indirect (Schachter

and Otones: 75, 383-84). Whether a construction of the form 'English verb + *sa* + a Tagalog personal pronoun' is grammatical is not clear. There is one example in my data in which the Tagalog phrase '*sa* + indirect object pronoun' follows an English direct object, as shown below.

- 64) Happy love-day sa inyong lahat. TW 98-43-16 ('. . . to you all.') (The direct object phrase is 'Happy love-day'. A subject and verb such as 'I wish' are understood.)

There are no examples in my data, or in the studies in the literature that I have consulted, of constructions of the form 'English verb + *sa* + Tagalog personal pronoun' or 'Tagalog verb + the preposition "to" + an English personal pronoun'. Timm (1975: 478) considers these types of constructions to be ungrammatical in Spanish-English mixing. I consider these constructions to be unusual from the point of view of frequency of occurrence, but I am unable to take a position as to whether such constructions are grammatical, since there are many instances in my data of code-switched prepositional phrases. For example, there are many instances in my data of the occurrence of prepositional phrases with *sa* in English clauses and sentences.

Examples (61) and (62) involve the use of the object form (*nito*) of the demonstrative pronoun *ito* ('this'). The pronoun *nito* is marked as being non-nominative in case by the presence of the initial consonant 'n', whereas the English demonstratives — 'this', 'that', 'these', 'those' — do not differ in form according to case. This difference between English and Tagalog demonstratives makes the use of *nito* in examples (61) and (62) ungrammatical because an English verb cannot be followed by a Tagalog direct object marker, since there are no such markers in English (Bautista 1974: 332-38). This matter is discussed further in section 3.4.

Bautista (1974: 95-102) presents examples in which the Tagalog demonstrative pronouns/determiners *ito* ('this') and *iyon* ('that'), which are *nominative* case forms, are the first word in Tagalog direct object phrases that follow English verbs. All of these phrases contain at least two Tagalog words besides *ito* or *iyon*. Thus, these examples do not cover the situation in which a Tagalog demonstrative pronoun is the only word in a direct or indirect object construction.

The following is an example of a code-switched Tagalog direct object phrase that begins with the demonstrative pronoun *iyon*.

- 65) . . . this concerns those who are in the Civil Service at iyon pong hindi pa nakasasali at covered ng Civil Service . . . (Bautista 1974: 97) ('. . . and those, sir, who are not yet included as participants and covered by the Civil Service')

The fact that Tagalog direct object phrases with *ito* or *iyon* and other Tagalog words do occur after English verbs, but that *ito* and *iyon* by themselves do not, is an indication of Gumperz's rule that 'on the whole the longer the . . . [syntactic structure] the more natural the switch [from one language to another]' (Gumperz 1977: 24).

An English verb that does *not* have any object pronouns can be immediately followed by a Tagalog word, phrase, or clause, as shown in the examples below.

- 66) I can't concentrate sa ['at'] mass every Sunday . . . TW 98-43-22
- 67) When will Ching Riego appear sa, ['on'] Big Ike's? TW 98-5-17 ('Big Ike's' refers to a TV program, the full name of which is 'Big Ike's Happening, Young Ones, Young Once')
- 68) Watch out sa figure mo . . . SC 21-64-5 ('Watch out for your figure')

SOME SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS IN TAGALOG ENGLISH LANGUAGE MIXING

- 69) I hope na magkakaroon sana ng pelikula ang fave teenstar kong si Arnold Gamboa . . . TW 121-4-4 ('I hope that my favorite teenage star Arnold Gamboa will have a film')

In examples (66), (68), and (69), the subject of the English verb is an English pronoun, either expressed or understood. This indicates that the occurrence of a pronoun subject does not affect the language that is used after the main verb in that clause.

2.6. MIXING PREPOSITIONS AND PRONOUNS THAT ARE OBJECTS OF PREPOSITIONS

It seems that a prepositional phrase that consists of a preposition and a single-word pronoun must be entirely in one language.

A. Tagalog Preposition + English Pronoun that is a single word

Syntactic combination A above seems ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

- 70) *Bumoto ako para sa him. ('I voted for him')
- 71) *I gave some candy sa him. ('I gave some candy to him')

Pascasio presents the following example in which a two-word English indefinite pronoun phrase is used as the object of the Tagalog preposition *ng* ('of').

- 72) . . . nagkaroon ng immediate changes talagang beyond control ng anybody else. (Pascasio 1978: 47) ('. . . there were immediate changes [that were] certainly beyond the control of anybody else')

B. English Preposition + Tagalog Pronoun

Syntactic combination B above seems ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

- 73) *I voted for siya. ('him'/'her')
- 74) *I voted for niya. ('him'/'her')
- 75) *I voted for kanya. ('him'/'her')
- 76) *I gave some money to kanya. ('him'/'her')

The examples above cover the three case forms of Tagalog pronouns.

While it seems that a switch cannot occur within a prepositional phrase from a preposition in one language to a pronoun in another language, an entire prepositional phrase that contains these two elements can be code-switched. The following are examples.

- 77) Do you conduct seminars and meetings tungkol po rito? (Bautista 1974: 141) ('. . . concerning, sir, this')
- 78) . . . some schools are conducting review classes para sa kanila. (Bautista 1974: 142) ('. . . for them')

- 79) Kasiraan ba for me na masabing homo ang erpat ko? TW 114-42-2 ('Will the fact that it is said that my father is a homosexual cause damage/destruction [to/of my reputation] for me?')
- 80) Sana'y laging may pictorial at article dito sa TW about him. TW 121-4-2 ('Hopefully, there will always be a pictorial [display] and article here in Teen World about him')
- 81) . . . karaniwan sa mga kaedad namin ang magsalita like the others at magkaroon ng idols. TW 114-43-4 ('. . . talking like the others and having [show-business] idols are ordinary/common among our peers')
- 82) . . . magpa-kiss sa kanya because of this. TW 121-47-2 ('. . . to kiss him because of this')

The fact that prepositional phrases containing pronouns can be code-switched but that single-word pronoun elements by themselves cannot, is additional justification for Gumperz's rule that 'on the whole the longer the . . . [syntactic structure] the more natural the switch [from one language to another]' (Gumperz: 1977: 24).

The following are the only two examples in my data in which a Tagalog pronoun is used as the only Tagalog word in an English clause.

- 83) Ako, I miss you a lot! TW 98-43-8
- 84) Ako, I just wear old dresses . . . TW 115-44-2

In these two examples, *Ako* has the same meaning as, and adds emphasis to, the English subject pronoun 'I'. *Ako* occurs in a stressed position in these sentences. In neither case does *Ako* have any syntactic relationship with the verb.

3. SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS INVOLVING MAIN VERBS AND AUXILIARY VERBS, NEGATORS, AND DIRECT OBJECT COMPLEMENTS

The constraints discussed under this section apply regardless of what part of speech the subject is or the length of the subject component.

3.1. MIXING AUXILIARY VERBS AND MAIN VERBS

It seems that, in a predicate phrase, auxiliary verbs and the main verb must be in the same language.

A. English Auxiliary Verb + Tagalog Main Verb

Syntactic combination A above seems ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

- 85) *I can magsalita ng Tagalog. ('I can speak Tagalog')
- 86) *Ako'y can magsalita ng Tagalog. ('I can speak Tagalog')
- 87) *I have pumunta sa Maynila. ('I have gone to Manila')
- 88) *Ako'y have pumunta sa Maynila. ('I have gone to Manila')

B. Tagalog Pseudo-Verb + English Main Verb

SOME SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS IN TAGALOG ENGLISH LANGUAGE MIXING

Syntactic combination B above seems ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

- 89) *Gusto kong play softball. ('I like to play softball')
- 90) *Dapat akong learn how to speak Japanese. ('I should/must learn how to speak Japanese')

Timm (1975: 478) states that, for Chicano Spanish-English mixing, sequences consisting of one or more auxiliary verbs and a main verb must be entirely in one language. One type of construction that would violate this rule is of the form 'Spanish Auxiliary Verb + English Participle'. Hypothetical examples of this construction that Timm gives are **Ha seen* ('He/She has seen') and **Estaba walking* ('I/He/She was walking').

Sequences of the form 'Tagalog Auxiliary Verb + English Participle' corresponding to the Spanish-English examples above cannot occur because Tagalog has no auxiliary verbs that correspond to the Spanish auxiliaries *haber* ('to have'), *estar* ('to be'), and *ser* ('to be').

3.2. MIXING NEGATORS AND VERBS

It seems that negators and auxiliary verbs, and negators and main verbs, must be in the same language.

A. Tagalog Negator *di* or *hindi* + English Main Verb

Syntactic combination A above seems ungrammatical. The following is a hypothetical example.

- 91) *The refugees do hindi ('not') have enough food to eat.

The following is the only example of this type of construction in my data.

- 92) *Gusto sana kitang sulatan pero di ko know ang address mo. TW 119-38-15 ('I want to write to you but I don't know your address', literally, '. . . your address is not known by me')

Pascasio presents the following example of this type of construction.

- 93) *Ah, hindi kayo check-out? (Pascasio 1978: 42) ('Ah, you are not checking out?')

As explained under restriction D in section 2.4, example (93) would be grammatical, according to the rules of Tagalog grammar, if the verb 'check-out' contained Tagalog verb prefixes that indicated focus and aspect, resulting in, for example, *nagche-check-out* ('is/are checking out') or *magche-check-out* ('will check out').

B. English Auxiliary Verb + Tagalog Negator *di* or *hindi*

Syntactic combination B above seems ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

- 94) *Former President Ford will hindi be a candidate for President or Vice-President this year.

95) *Example (7) above.

C. English Negator *not* + Tagalog Main Verb

Syntactic combination C above seems ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

96) *Ang mga estudyante ay not gumawa ng kanilang homework. ('The students did not do their homework')

97) *Not pumunta si Juan sa Maynila. ('Juan did not go to Manila')

D. English Negator *not* + Tagalog Pseudo-Verb

Syntactic combination D above seems ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

98) *Si Juan ay not puwedeng bumili ng mga sigarilyo. ('Juan cannot buy cigarettes')

99) *Not puwedeng bumili ng mga sigarilyo si Juan. ('Juan cannot buy cigarettes')

The types of syntactic constraints stated in A, B, C, and D above were also cited by Timm (1975: 479) for Spanish-English mixing.

3.3. MIXING MAIN VERBS AND INFINITIVE COMPLEMENTS THAT ARE DIRECT OBJECTS

A. English Main Verb + Tagalog Infinitive Complement that is a Direct Object

An infinitive in Tagalog consists of the basic or uninflected form of a verb. There is no infinitive marker in Tagalog (that corresponds to the infinitive marker 'to' in English).

Syntactic combination A above seems ungrammatical. The following is a hypothetical example.

100) *I have decided mag-aral sa Unibersidad ng Hawaii. ('I have decided to study at the University of Hawaii')

Timm (1975: 478) states that this type of construction is unacceptable in Spanish-English mixing. The following is the only example of this type of construction in my data.

101) *I am avoiding na mag-steady dahil alam ko . . . TW 115-45-1 ('I am avoiding going steady/to go steady because I know . . .')

B. English Main Verb + English Infinitive Marker 'to' + Tagalog Infinitive Complement that is a Direct Object

Syntactic combination B above seems ungrammatical. The following is a hypothetical example.

102) *I have decided to mag-aral sa Unibersidad ng Hawaii. ('I have decided to study at the University of Hawaii')

SOME SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS IN TAGALOG ENGLISH LANGUAGE MIXING

Timm (1975: 478) states that this type of construction is considered 'possible, thought not tasteful'. Hypothetical examples he gives are 'They want to venir ['come']' and 'I'm going to decidir ['decide']'.

C. Tagalog Verb + English Infinitive Complement that is a Direct Object

Syntactic combination C above seems ungrammatical. The following is a hypothetical example.

103) *Nagpasiya akong to study at the University of Hawaii. ('I have decided to study. . .')

Timm (1975: 478) considers this type of construction to be unacceptable in Spanish-English mixing.

While it seems that it is ungrammatical to have a code-switched infinitive phrase that is a direct object, infinitive phrases that are used as Adverbial Phrases of Purpose can be code-switched. The following is an example in my data of a code-switched Tagalog infinitive phrase that is an Adverbial Phrase of Purpose.

104) I want to work para makatulong sa kanila . . . Tw 98-44-6 ('I want to work in order to be able to help them [my parents]')

Furthermore, there are a number of instances in my data and in the data of Bautista (1974: 161-64) in which a Tagalog verb is followed by an English infinitive phrase that is used as an Adverbial Phrase of Purpose, where the infinitive marker 'to' carries the meaning of 'in order to'. The following are examples from my data. In each one, the English infinitive has an English direct object.

105) Sabik na akong umuwi sa B. City, eh, just to see you. CN 50-59-1 ('I was eager to return home to B. City . . .')

106) Minsan naman, kapag di siya nakakaluwas ng bayan to see me, ako ang gumagawa ng paraan para makapunta doon . . . TW 117-46-3 ('One time also, when he was unable to leave town to see me, I was the one who succeeded in finding a way in order to be able to go there')

107) Ano ang dapat kong gawin to cure this pimples? TW 118-45-4 ('What must I do in order to cure my pimples?')

108) Ano ho ang dapat kong gawin to win their love? TW 118-45-2 ('What must I do in order to win their love?')

There is an instance in my data of an English verb that has a compound direct object that is composed of two conjoined infinitive phrases, the second of which is in Tagalog. The example is as follows.

109) Please don't advise me to look for another or maki-join sa barkada . . . TW 119-40-3 ('. . . or join a barkada' ('gang'))

What examples (20) to (25) have in common is that each code-switched infinitive is followed by a direct object complement in the same language. There is no instance in my data, or in the studies of Tagalog-English mixing that I have examined, of code-switching only an infinitive.

Except for examples (17) and (25), there are no instances in my data of code-switched *infinitive phrases* that are direct objects. There are also no instances in my data of code-switched English *clauses* that are direct objects. However, there are a number of examples in my data and in the data of Bautista (1974: 224-27, 232) of code-switched *Tagalog clauses* that are direct objects of English verbs. The following are examples from my data.

1. Where no Subordinating Conjunction introduces the Tagalog Direct Object Clause
 - 110) Remember, ako ang sumulat sa iyo noon. TW 96-45-13 ('Remember, I was the one who wrote to you then')
 - 111) I hope mamahalin mo si V.C.I. nang siya lang. CN 49-54-1 ('I hope that you will love V.C.I. only')
2. Where the Subordinating Conjunction *kung* ('if') introduces the Tagalog Direct Object Clause
 - 112) I wouldn't mind kung pangit siya as long as he has a stable job. LS 432-32-8 ('I wouldn't mind if he is ugly as long as . . .')
3. Where the Linker *na* ('that') is used as a Subordinating Conjunction that introduces the Tagalog Direct Object Clause
 - 113) . . . I believe na pwede ring tambalan sina Boyet O. at Ching Riego. TW 114-4-14 ('. . . I believe that Boyet Orca and Ching Riego can also be paired together')
 - 114) We are praying na sana ay back to each other's arms ang dalawa soonest. TW 119-8-3 ('We are praying that, hopefully, the two of them will be back in each other's arms as soon as possible')
 - 115) I wish na malagay sa cover ng TW na magkakasama ang tatlo kong fave teenstars: Lala Aunor, Boyet Orca & Adrian P. TW 121-4-6 ('I wish that my three favorite teenage stars-Lala Aunor, Boyet Orca and Adrian Panganiban – will be put on the cover of *Teen World* together')

3.4. VERBS AND DIRECT OBJECT CASE MARKERS

- A. Tagalog Verb + English Direct Object (without the Tagalog Direct Object Marker *ng*)

Syntactic combination A above seems ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

- 116) *Ako'y bumili many books in Manila. ('I bought . . .')
- 117) *Ako'y sumulat letters to my friends. ('I wrote . . .')

Bautista (1974: 91-95) presents examples of English noun phrases that are direct objects of Tagalog verbs, but all of them are preceded by *ng*. The following are examples from my data.

SOME SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS IN TAGALOG ENGLISH LANGUAGE MIXING

- 118) I just hope na sa 1980 ay muli siyang magkaroon ng more movie offers. TW 121-4-7 ('I just hope that in 1980 he will again have more movie offers')
- 119) First year high school lang ako nang magkaroon ng first love. KS 576-28-4 ('I was only a first year high school student when I had my first love')

B. English Verb + Direct Object Marker *ng*

Syntactic combination B above seems ungrammatical. The following are hypothetical examples.

- 120) *I bought ng many books in the Philippines.
- 121) *I bought ng maraming aklat sa Pilipinas. ('I bought many books in the Philippines')

An English verb can be followed by a Tagalog direct object that is *not* preceded by *ng*. The following is an example presented by Pascasio.

- 122) . . . and then we will need dalawa ['two'] with the same text. (Pascasio 1978: 46)

Bautista (1974: 95-101) also presents examples of Tagalog direct object phrases that follow English verbs, but all of them begin with the *nominative* form of a demonstrative pronoun/determiner, instead of the objective form. The same situation occurs in my data in a compound direct object phrase in which the first coordinate element is in English and the second is in Tagalog. The example is as follows.

- 123) Ako, I just wear old dress or iyong mga pinaglumaan ng aking elder sister. TW 115-44-2 ('I just wear old dresses or those second-hand [dresses] of my elder sister')

In this example, the writer used the nominative demonstrative *iyon* ('that', 'those') instead of the objective forms *niyon* or *noon*.

Thus, Tagalog direct object noun phrases can follow English verbs, but the noun phrases cannot have any objective case marker since there are no such markers in English. In example (39) and in the examples presented by Bautista, the nominative forms of the demonstrative pronouns were used after English verbs because the English demonstratives – 'this', 'that', 'these', 'those' – do not differ in form according to case (Bautista 1974: 332). On the other hand, English direct object phrases can follow Tagalog verbs only if the English phrases are preceded by a direct object marker (except for the Tagalog verbs that are never followed by direct object markers). What these two rules mean, according to Bautista (1974: 335-38), is that the presence or absence of a direct object marker is determined by the syntactic rules of the language to which the verb belongs, not the language of the direct object.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has examined some of the syntactic constraints or apparent constraints in the mixing of Tagalog and English in the Philippines. Findings as to syntactic constraints involving pronouns and/or verbs were presented, not as a set of rules for which there is sufficient evidence, but as suggestions which further research might determine to be valid for written and/or spoken Tagalog-English mixing.

One of the purposes of this study was to test the hypothesis that the types of syntactic constructions involving pronouns and/or verbs that are described by Timm (1975) as 'unacceptable' in Spanish-English mixing do not occur in Tagalog-English mixing. This hypothesis was tested using my data and the data reported in seven studies of Tagalog-English mixing. The following is a summary of my findings with respect to the six types of syntactic constructions that were tested.

1. A subject pronoun in one language and the main verb in the other language.

With regard to single-word subject pronoun elements in clauses and sentences with Subject – Predicate word order, there were no examples of this construction in my data and only one in the literature (example (33) in section 2.4). However, with regard to Predicate – Subject word order, there was one example in the literature and a number of examples in my data of constructions of the form 'English Main Verb + Complement of the Verb + Tagalog Subject Pronoun' (examples (34) to (40) in section 2.4.). All of these examples contain single-word Tagalog personal pronouns as subjects. (Timm's hypothetical examples in this category involved only personal pronoun subjects in constructions with Subject – Predicate word order.)

Timm's hypothetical examples involved only single-word subject pronoun elements. There was one example in my data (example (46) in section 2.4) in which a three-word English indefinite pronoun phrase was used as the subject preceding a Tagalog predicate verb. The fact that subject pronoun-verb switches can occur where the subject is an indefinite pronoun phrase of two or more words has been reported by Gumperz (1977: 24).

2. An object pronoun in one language and the main verb in the other language.
3. An auxiliary verb in one language and the main verb in the other language.
4. A word of negation in one language and an auxiliary verb in the other language.

There were no examples of constructions 2, 3, and 4 above in my data or in the literature.

5. A word of negation in one language and the main verb in the other language.

There was one example of this construction in my data and one example in the literature (examples (8) and (9) in section 3.2).

6. A main verb in one language and an infinitive complement in the other language.

There were no examples in the literature and two examples in my data of such constructions that involve infinitive complements that are direct objects (examples (17) and (25) in section 3.3). However, there are a number of instances in my data (examples (20) to (24) in section 3.3) and in the data of Bautista of code-switched infinitive phrases that are Adverbial Phrases of Purpose.

Of the counter-examples to Timm's rules that appeared in my data or in the literature on Tagalog-English mixing, the following types of constructions seem to be grammatical and therefore constitute modifications to Timm's rules when applied to Tagalog-English mixing.

SOME SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS IN TAGALOG ENGLISH LANGUAGE MIXING

1. English Main Verb + Tagalog Subject Pronoun

This construction seems acceptable, at least for Tagalog *Personal* Pronoun Subjects. The following is an example (example (35) in section 2.4).

Enjoy ako sa TW dahil narito ang mga paborito kong teenstars. TW 118-5-6 ('I enjoy *Teen World* because my favorite teenstarts are here [in it]')

2. English Subject that is a Pronoun Phrase containing two or more words + the Tagalog Inversion Marker *ay* + a Tagalog Verb

This construction seems acceptable, at least for English subjects that are *Indefinite* Pronoun phrases. The following is an example (example (46) in section 2.4).

Ang panganay namin ay nag-asawa na at may dalawang anak while the other two ay nahinto sa pag-aaral . . . TW 121-46-1 ('The eldest child in our family is married already and has two children, while the other two [my other two brothers] have stopped going to school')

3. Main Verb in Language A + Indirect Object in Language A + Direct Object Infinitive Phrase in Language A + Coordinating Conjunction + Direct Object Infinitive Phrase in Language B

This construction seems acceptable, at least where the infinitive in language B itself has a complement in language B. The following is an example (example (25) in section 3.3).

Please don't advise me to look for another or maki-join sa barkada . . . TW 119-40-3 ('. . . or join a barkada' ('gang'))

4. Verb or Infinitive in Language A + Infinitive Phrase in Language B that is an Adverbial Phrase of Purpose

This construction seems acceptable, at least where the infinitive in language B itself has a complement in language B. The following is an example (example (24) in section 3.3).

Ano ho ang dapat kong gawin to win their love? TW 118-45-2 ('What must I do in order to win their love?')

None of these four modifications contradicts any of Timm's hypothetical examples of unacceptable constructions. These modifications involve syntactic situations that Timm's hypothetical examples did not cover.

In one area there was insufficient data for me to pass judgment on the applicability of Timm's rules to Tagalog-English mixing. This area concerns the grammaticality of prepositional phrases (with 'to' or *sa*) that contain an indirect object pronoun and that are in a language that is different from that of the main verb. (Such a construction definitely seems ungrammatical if the preposition and the indirect object pronoun are in different languages, but I am not referring to that situation here.) This matter was discussed under restriction B in section 2.5.

The similarities between my findings and those of Timm raise the possibility that these syntactic types of language mixing involving English and another language are considered ungrammatical in a number of different speech communities that engage in code switching between English and another language. Perhaps there are language universals in syntactic constraints in code switching. In this regard, the findings in this study support Gumperz's (1977) conclusion that

the process of [code] switching at a more abstract level is also governed by perhaps universal underlying constraints, which bear some similarity to the grammatical phenomena discussed in the recent work on pragmatics. [Code] Switching in other words is a pragmatic or perhaps stylistic phenomenon in which verbal sequences are chunked into contrastable units. Any feature of the context or of the message itself, such as, for example, the presence of a conjunction or an adverbial . . . phrase, that sets off one sequence from preceding or following segments, favours the process [of code-switching] or makes the [code] alternation sound more plausible. (26-27)

Given that there are syntactic constraints in code switching, the next question is why these constraints exist. In some cases the constraints are based on the grammatical rules of the languages involved. For example, in the Tagalog-English speech community, the presence or absence of a direct object marker is determined by the syntactic rules of the language (English or Tagalog) to which the verb belongs. (This was discussed in section 3.4.)

However, most of the constraints discussed in this study deal with situations in which the grammatical requirements of neither language are violated. Such constraints seem to be based on the following two rules that are presented by Gumperz (1977: 24, 27): 'On the whole the longer the . . . [syntactic structure] the more natural the switch [from one language to another]'; and '[Code] Switching is blocked where it violates the speaker's feeling for what on syntactic or semantic grounds must be regarded as a single unit'. I will now summarize the findings in this study with respect to these two rules.

4.1. GUMPERZ'S RULE ON SYNTACTIC LENGTH

The following findings in this study concerning Tagalog-English mixing support Gumperz's rule on syntactic length.

1. A subject pronoun phrase of two or more words can be code-switched with respect to the verb, but a single-word subject pronoun apparently cannot. (See restriction E in section 2.4.)
2. An object pronoun phrase of two or more words can be code-switched with respect to the verb, but a single-word object pronoun apparently cannot. (See section 2.5.)
3. A pronoun phrase of two or more words that is the object of a preposition can be code-switched with respect to the preposition, but a single-word object that is a pronoun apparently cannot. (See section 2.6.)
4. A prepositional phrase consisting of a preposition and a single-word pronoun can be code-switched, but the pronoun by itself apparently cannot. (See examples (78), (79), (80), and (82) in section 2.6.)

SOME SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS IN TAGALOG ENGLISH LANGUAGE MIXING

5. While there are instances of code-switched infinitive phrases in my data and in the data of Bautista (1974), there were no instances in which only an infinitive was switched. (See section 3.3.)

4.2. GUMPERZ'S RULE ON SINGLE SYNTACTIC UNITS

On the basis of the findings in this study and in the studies of Timm (1975), Gumperz (1977), and Pfaff (1979), it seems that, according to the rules of language mixing in both the Tagalog-English and the Chicano Spanish-English code switching speech communities, each of the following sequences constitutes a syntactic unit that must be expressed entirely in one language. (Disagreement over sequence 4 is cited below. The term 'pronoun' as used below refers to single-word pronoun elements. The citations in parentheses refer to the section where the sequence is discussed.)

1. Subject Pronoun + Negator (section 2.3)
2. Subject Pronoun + Auxiliary Verb (section 2.4)
3. Subject Pronoun + Main Verb (section 2.4)
4. Auxiliary Verb + Main Verb (section 3.1). Pfaff (1979: 299-300) and Timm (1975: 478) express some modifications to this rule that involve the use of the auxiliary verb 'to be' or its Spanish equivalents *estar* and *ser*.
5. Negator + Main Verb (section 3.2)
6. Negator + Auxiliary Verb (section 3.2)
7. Auxiliary Verb + Negator (section 3.2)
- 8) Direct or Indirect Object Pronoun + Auxiliary Verb (Spanish syntax)
9. Direct or Indirect Object Pronoun + Main Verb (Spanish syntax)
10. Main Verb + Direct Object Pronoun (section 2.5)
11. Main Verb + Indirect Object Pronoun that is not preceded by a Preposition (section 2.5)
12. Preposition + Pronoun (section 2.6)

In addition, the following sequence seems to form a single unit that must be expressed in one language in the Tagalog-English speech community.

13. Main Verb + Direct Object that is an Infinitive (section 3.3)

However, Pfaff (1979: 299-300) and Timm (1975: 478) disagree over whether this sequence must be expressed in one language in the Chicano Spanish-English speech community.

Sequences 1 to 7 above include all possible combinations of Subject Pronouns, Negators, Auxiliary Verbs, and Main Verbs in clauses with Subject – Predicate word order. Combining sequences 1 to 7 results in the following sequence that, it seems, must be expressed entirely in one language in the Tagalog-English and the Chicano Spanish-English speech communities. (Exceptions that have been noted by Pfaff and Timm have been referred to above.)

14. Subject Pronoun + Auxiliary Verb + Negator + Auxiliary Verb + Main Verb

(An auxiliary verb cannot precede a negator in Spanish.)

Combining sequences 1 to 7, 10, 11, and 13 results in the following sequence that, it seems, must be expressed entirely in English in the Tagalog-English speech community if *any one* element in it is expressed in English.

15. Subject Pronoun + Auxiliary Verb + Negator + Auxiliary Verb + Main Verb + Indirect Object Pronoun + Direct Object that is a Pronoun or an Infinitive

In relation to sequence 15 above, there were no examples in my data, or in the seven studies in the literature, in which a Tagalog adverbial enclitic occurred within this sequence or within any part of it. This fact provides further evidence for my claim that sequences 1 to 7, 10, 11, and 13 (which, when combined, form sequence 15) constitute single syntactic units with respect to language mixing, since it seems that none of these sequences can be interrupted by a Tagalog adverbial enclitic.

4.3. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH IN TAGALOG-ENGLISH MIXING

1. Verifying that sequences 1 to 7 and 10 to 15 listed above are expressed either entirely in English or entirely in Tagalog.

2. Determining whether prepositional phrases that contain the preposition 'to' or *sa* and an indirect object pronoun can be code-switched. If they can be code-switched, in what positions can they occur in relation to the main verb?

3. Investigating the use of Tagalog adverbial enclitics in English clauses and sentences in order to determine more fully where they occur syntactically, why they are used in English constructions, why they occur where they do occur, and whether the rules governing their placement in Tagalog sentences influence their positions in English clauses and sentences.

4. Finding out if there are restrictions on Tagalog-English mixing within noun phrases and prepositional phrases. For example, although there are a number of instances in my data of the use of the preposition *sa* as the only Tagalog word in an English clause or sentence, there are no instances in which *sa* is followed by an English article.

5. Finding out if there are Filipinos who speak a mixture of Tagalog and English as their *first language*. In this regard, Gibbons (1979) has reported that, in Hong Kong, where 98 per cent of the people are Chinese and the native language of most of the Chinese people there is Cantonese (Gibbons 1979: 113), there is a new generation of children (of English language educated parents) who are growing up speaking a mixture of English and Cantonese; that is, these children have a mixture as their native language' (Gibbons 1979: 119). This phenomenon has occurred primarily as a result of the widespread use of English as a medium of instruction in secondary schools and colleges in Hong Kong since World War II (Gibbons 1979: 120), a situation that has occurred on a much wider scale in the Philippines.

6. Analyzing the effects on teaching English as a second language and Tagalog as a first or second language if students in these language arts classes mix these two languages in everyday informal conversation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AGUIRRE, ADALBERTO, JR. 1976. Acceptability judgements of code-switching phrases by Chicanos: some preliminary findings. ERIC Document ED 129 122.
- AZORES, FORTUNATA M. 1967. A preliminary investigation of the phenomenon of language change in the Philippines. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Ateneo de Manila University.

SOME SYNTACTIC CONSTRAINTS IN TAGALOG
ENGLISH LANGUAGE MIXING

- BAUTISTA, MARIA LOURDES S. 1974. The Filipino bilingual's linguistic competence: a model based on an analysis of Tagalog-English code switching. Ph.D. dissertation, Ateneo de Manila University – Philippine Normal College Linguistics Consortium. A condensed version of this dissertation is found in *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. 1975. 6. 1. 51-89. Published in Pacific Linguistics Series C-No. 59. 1980. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- BLOM, JAN-PETTER and JOHN J. GUMPERZ. 1971. Social meaning in linguistic structures: code switching in Norway. In *Language in social groups: essays by John J. Gumperz*. Selected and introduced by Anwar S. Dil, 274-310. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- CHAN-YAP, GLORIA and TERESITA M. PALO. 1978. The pseudo-verbal predicate in Tagalog. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*. 9. 1 and 2. 51-59.
- CREWE, WILLIAM J. 1977. Singapore English and Standard English: Exercises in awareness. Singapore: Eastern Universities Press.
- DIMATERA, NINFA. n.d. English-Tagalog mixture in oral communication among Tagalog-speaking students at the Philippine Normal College. (Graduate course paper)
- FERNANDO, CHITRA. 1977. English and Sinhala bilingualism in Sri Lanka. *Language in Society* 6. 3. 341-60.
- FORMAN, MICHAEL L. 1973. Philippine languages in contact: Honolulu radio station K.I.S.A. Working Papers in Linguistics. 5. 10. 137-51. Honolulu: Department of Linguistics, University of Hawaii.
- FRANCIS, W. NELSON. 1958. The structure of American English. New York: The Ronald Press Company.
- GIBBONS, JOHN. 1979. Code-mixing and koineising in the speech of students at the University of Hong Kong. *Anthropological Linguistics* 21. 3. 113-23.
- GOULET, ROSALINA MORALES. 1971. English, Spanish and Tagalog: a study of grammatical, lexical and cultural interference. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics, Special Monograph Issue No. 1*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- GUMPERZ, JOHN J. 1977. The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching. *RELJ Journal* 8. 2. 1-34.
- GUMPERZ, JOHN J. and EDUARDO HERNANDEZ-CHAVEZ. 1972. Bilingualism, bidialectalism, and classroom interaction. In *Functions of language in the classroom*, ed. by Courtney B. Cazden, Vera P. John, and Dell Hymes, 84-108. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University. 84-108.
- HARMANN, R. R. K. and F. C. STORK. 1972. *Dictionary of language and linguistics*. New York and Toronto: John Wiley and Sons.
- INSTITUTE OF NATIONAL LANGUAGE. 1974. *An English-Pilipino dictionary*. Manila: Government Printing Office.
- KACHRU, BRAJ B. 1978. Code-mixing as a communicative strategy in India. In *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1978*, ed. by James E. Alatis, 107-24. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- KWAN-TERRY, A. 1978. The meaning and the source of the 'la' and the 'what' particles in Singapore English. *RELJ Journal* 9. 2. 22-34.
- LLAMZON, FR. TEODORO A., 1969. *Standard Filipino English*, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- _____. 1978. *Handbook of Philippine language groups*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- MARFIL, ALICE E. and AIDA L. PASIGNA. 1970. An analysis of shifts from Tagalog to English in printed materials. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Philippine Normal College.

- MATUTE, GENOVEVA E. 1975. Isang palatuntunan sa Pilipino ukol sa edukasyong bilingguwal. (A program in Pilipino for bilingual education). *Philippine Journal for Language Teaching* 8. 1-8.
- McALLISTER, J. F. 1978. Language problem: The country's 'Tower of Babel'. *Philippine News (San Francisco)* January 28-February 3. 10.
- McCLURE, ERICA. 1977. Aspects of code-switching in the discourse of bilingual Mexican-American children. In *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1977*, ed. by James E. Alatis, 93-115. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- OTANES, FE T., ALFONSO O. SANTIAGO, and GLORIA V. BAYLON. 1974. Translation preferences of educators. *Philippine Journal for Language Teaching*. 7. 31-59.
- PANGANIBAN, JOSE V. 1970. *Diksiyunaryong Pilipino-Ingles, Ikalawang Paglilimbag (Second Edition)*. Manila: Bede's Publishing House.
- PASCASIO, EMY M. 1978. Dynamics of code-switching in the business domain. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 9. 1 and 2. 40-50.
- PFAFF, CAROL W. 1979. Constraints on language mixing: intrasentential code-switching and borrowing in Spanish/English. *Language* 55. 2. 291-318.
- PLATT, JOHN T. 1975. The Singapore English speech continuum and its basilect 'Singlish' as a creoloid. *Anthropological Linguistics* 17. 7. 363-74.
- RAMOS, TERESITA V. 1970. Bilingualism: suggested directions for its study. *Philippine Education Quarterly* 2. 4. 37-56.
- _____. 1971. *Tagalog structures*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- RICHARDS, JACK C. 1979. Rhetorical and communicative styles in the new varieties of English. *Language Learning* 29. 1. 1-25.
- ROBERTS, PAUL. 1956. *Patterns of English, Teacher's Edition*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- SCHACHTER, PAUL and FE OTANES. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- SIBAYAN, BONIFACIO P. 1971. Language-planning processes and the language-policy survey in the Philippines. In *Can language be planned? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations*, ed. by Joan Rubin and Bjorn H. Jernudd, 123-40. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- _____. 1978. Bilingual education in the Philippines: strategy and structure. In *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1978*, ed. by James E. Alatis, 302-29. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- SOBOLEWSKI, FRANK A. 1980. Some syntactic constraints in Tagalog-English language mixing. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Hawaii.
- TIMM, L. A. 1975. Spanish-English code-switching: el porque y how-not-to. *Romance Philology* 28. 4. 473-82.
- VALDES-FALLIS, GUADALUPE. 1979. Code switching and the classroom teacher. In *Language in education: theory and practice*, No. 4 Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- VARELA, ILUMINADO, JR. 1979. They now speak 'Piglish' in the Philippines. *Philippine News (San Francisco)*. July 7-13.
- WENTWORTH, HAROLD and STUART BERG FLEXNER. 1968. *The pocket dictionary of American slang*. Pocket Book edition. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- WOLFF, JOHN U. 1974. The character of borrowings from Spanish and English in languages in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 4 and 5. 1 and 2. 71-81.