

**ENGLISH, SPANISH AND TAGALOG:
A STUDY OF GRAMMATICAL, LEXICAL AND
CULTURAL INTERFERENCE**

by

Rosalina Morales Goulet

A PUBLICATION OF THE LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF THE PHILIPPINES

PREFACE

This study covers a wide range in point of time and place, and represents the results of some years of formal and informal studies in bilingualism and biculturalism. It dates back to the time when I learned my first English poem at my mother's knee and (not much later) when I discovered I could read a weekly Tagalog comic strip without help. My interest in English and languages in general was encouraged and sustained by the Filipino and American teachers I have had since grade school.

Later, my experience as a "foreign student" at the International Summer School in Bennington, Vermont, at the University of Michigan, at the East-West Center in Honolulu, and at New York University all provided me with opportunities to participate actively in a foreign culture.

I have also profited greatly from my work as a teacher and supervisor of English in the Philippine school system, as a teacher of Tagalog to Americans, as an instructor in second language teaching at the University of the Philippines, and at Peace Corps training centers.

The basic work for this study was completed in April 1968 and submitted to the Department of English, New York University, as a doctoral thesis. Since my return to Manila in July 1968 I have presented certain sections of this study at linguistic seminars. It was very gratifying to have my insights confirmed. I have also been able to eliminate a few errors which were pointed out to me in the course of revision and updating.

I have made a few changes, especially in Chapter IV, to bring the material up to date and to account for the changing sociolinguistic atmosphere brought about by the demands of more militant nationalism and a greater awareness of the need for a sound language policy. I have also added more Spanish material.

Clearly there is much more to be done in this area, and I hope that this monograph will inspire students of language and culture to explore different aspects of this broad topic in much greater detail than is possible here. I would also be grateful to receive any comments, suggestions or corrections.

It is impossible to acknowledge all those who in one way or another helped make this study possible. Special thanks, however, are due Pag-asa Barrientos, Felicitas Cabbat, Cristina Cagauan, Rizalina Cancerran, Mrs. Salud Carmona, Salud Datoc, Sister Emma Garcia, Teresita Goseco, Angelo and Louise Larraga, Francisco Morales, Teresita Ramos and Dr. Emy Pascasio for serving as valuable informants and for providing me with additional data from letters they have generously loaned to me.

For help with the Spanish sections, I owe thanks to Prof. Dolores Arboleda of de la Salle College, Manila, Mrs. Carmen Infante, Mrs. Marucha vda. de Lopez, and Henry and Carmina Pinkey. Professor Edgar Knowlton of the University of Hawaii deserves gratitude for his help in suggesting useful Spanish sources.

For helping me secure important material on the Philippine educational system and for making available to me other sources pertinent to this study, I am grateful to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alejandro R. Morales, to Manuel and Amelia Bonifacio, Neonetta Cabrera, Mrs. Balbina Codilla, Ben Kapili and Belen Ongteco.

I am also grateful to Dr. **Edilberto Dagot** with whom I discussed the early drafts of this study. He also acted as a reader for the updated work.

Amparo Prowel deserves thanks for typing the revised manuscript.

To all my students who unwittingly served as living sources of data, I offer my sincere thanks.

I also wish to thank all my American friends, particularly Mr. and Mrs. William Archer, Dr. James Austin, Clayton Carlson, Gloria Constantino, Pat Heenan, Mr. and Mrs. John D. Hickerson, Mrs. Allan Hubbell, Kathy Jones, Chris and Patricia Kahr, Mr. and Mrs. Jorma Kaukonen, Jack and Nancy Kelleher, Linda Katherine Kettell, Mr. and Mrs. John Lersch, Mrs. James Macris, Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Maxfield, Dr. Howard McKaughan, Dr. and Mrs. Carl H. McMillan, Carl McMillan, Jr., Milaine Minami, Gerald Mullins, Pat Okawa, Stephen and Vickie Oleskey, Prof Theodore Plaister, Dr. and Mrs. Lawrence Reid. Mary Jo Rossi, Mrs. Bradford Smith, Joana Taba, Janet Goulet Wilson, Mr. and Mrs. Sterling Wilson, Prof. Yao Shen and Gayle Yoshida. I feel deep gratitude not only for their kind friendship and moral support but also for their having given me greater insight into American culture as well as my own.

Professor James Macris deserves special mention, for it was he who made it possible for me to go to New York.

I would like to thank Father Teodoro A. Llamzon, S.J., president of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines, for inviting me to publish this study as a special monograph issue of the **Philippine Journal of Linguistics**. He and Dr. Cesar Hidalgo of the University of the Philippines helped me obtain financial assistance for publication.

For financial help I am thankful to the Institute of International Education, to New York University, and to the Asia Foundation.

To my thesis advisor, Professor Allan F. Hubbell, I wish to express my deepest appreciation and gratitude for his guidance and personal interest, which went far beyond what duty would have required.

Finally, I wish to thank my husband, Roger Goulet, for valuable suggestions and corrections and especially for the arduous task of typing the original manuscript. I also wish to thank him for making life in two cultures a rewarding personal involvement. To him I dedicate this modest effort.

R.M.G.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE CONTACT SITUATION: GEOGRAPHICAL, HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL FACTORS AFFECTING BILINGUALISM	1
II. THE TAGALOG LANGUAGE: PHONOLOGICAL, MORPHOLOGICAL AND SEMANTIC BORROWINGS	15
Phonological Borrowing and Modification	17
Substitution	18
Simplification and subtraction	21
Addition of phoneme (s)	22
Other changes	22
Morphological Borrowings	24
Borrowing of full words	24
Borrowing of affixes	31
Semantic Borrowing	35
Semantic domains of borrowing	40
Characteristics of Borrowing	45
Comparison of English and Spanish Borrowings	48
III. INTERFERENCE: GRAMMATICAL, LEXICAL AND CULTURAL	55
Grammatical Interference	58
Grammatical relations	58
Obligatory and optional grammatical categories	65
Lexical Interference	69
Interference Due to Cultural Differences	73
IV. THE TAGALOG BILINGUAL AND LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR: FACTORS INFLUENCING BORROWINGS, MIXING AND LANGUAGE CHOICE	79
The Nature of Bilingualism	79
The Psychology of Borrowing	81
Factors influencing language mixing	83
Language choice	86
Individual traits of the bilingual speaker--the nature of his bilingualism	87

Nature of the communication situation	88
Motives of the speaker/writer	90
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	91
PARTIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY	96
APPENDIX A—CHINESE AND SANSKRIT ELEMENTS IN TAGALOGS	102

CHAPTER I

THE CONTACT SITUATION: GEOGRAPHICAL, HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL FACTORS AFFECTING BILINGUALISM

Geographical, historical and cultural factors have contributed to make the educated Tagalog a bilingual (here also meant as a speaker of more than two languages). Islands as well as mountain barriers have promoted linguistic diversity. The Republic of the Philippines comprises over 7000 islands and islets with an area of over 115,000 square miles. On the large islands, rugged mountain ranges such as the Sierra Madre in Luzon, which often exceeds a height of 4,500 feet, raise additional barriers to homogeneity of language. Even in areas such as central Luzon where few geographical obstacles exist, different languages are found side by side, bearing witness to the isolation of population groups from each other in Philippine history.

Although all the Philippine languages can be traced to a common Malayo-Polynesian origin, the Filipinos speak a considerable variety of them – the number is estimated to be between 87 and more than a hundred. On the island of Luzon alone, there are at least six major languages, many minor ones and a host of dialects. The Tagalogs of central Luzon where Manila is located form the largest single ethnic-linguistic group. In addition to the variety of native languages, the picture is further complicated by the fact that the country has been occupied by two foreign powers, each speaking a different language and each leaving its traces not only in material objects but in the native languages themselves.¹

The Tagalog, especially of Manila, perhaps fortified by his feelings of superiority over the other Philippine groups, usually does not feel the need to learn another Philippine tongue (most non-Tagalogs, especially in Luzon but also in the Visayas and in Mindanao learn Tagalog, however). Nonetheless he has been forced into bilingualism. An educated Tagalog is usually at home in at least two languages and able to understand one or two more. Usually he speaks Tagalog at home, English in official transactions and a mixture of English, Tagalog and Spanish when talking with his friends.²

Even a superficial study of both the spoken and written forms of Tagalog of Manila will reveal the effects of linguistic and cultural contacts with Spanish and English on the language. In fact, a naive listener is usually struck by the fact that although Tagalog sounds like a strange language with its peculiar intonation and staccato rhythm, it does not seem altogether foreign. In a stream of speech, he catches Spanish and English words which may be pronounced a little bit differently or may form parts of an elaborate system of affixation, but the Spanish and English words are often still recognizable and can readily be isolated.

A cursory inspection of a Tagalog text might make a foreigner suspect that Tagalog belongs to the same family as Spanish and English. Unless it is a very formal and serious form of writing, he is likely to find a lot of Spanish and English interspersed throughout the material. The frequency of Spanish and English words in Tagalog has made some foreigners wonder whether there is such a thing as a Tagalog language.

Comments like “Tagalog is really Spanish, isn’t it, only a corrupted form?” or “Tagalog does not seem to have its own vocabulary, only some kind of a loose grammar” have been made half-seriously by the uninitiated.

It requires very little linguistic sophistication, however, to hazard the correct guess that the familiar English and Spanish words in Tagalog utterances are actually loan words from the two foreign languages. A little knowledge of Philippine history will make one attribute these loan words or borrowings to the contact with Spanish for almost 400 years and with English for more than 50 years, resulting in significant changes in Tagalog.

Before going on to a discussion of the kinds of language change brought about by contact with Spain and the United States, a word about the Philippine language situation before the coming of the Westerners is in order. Not very much can be said.

Philippine history prior to this event (the death of Magellan in April, 1521) is shrouded in obscurity, as there are no written records either in Philippine or Spanish archives, and few, if any, prehistoric monuments with the exception of a few unpretentious tombs in the Island of Sulu and burial caves occasionally discovered in the Visayan Islands. It is probable that the only documentary information that can shed light on these periods is to be found in the old manuscript records of China, India, Japan and Malaysia.³

Likewise commenting on the paucity of prehistoric Philippine material, Malcolm attributes it to

. . . misplaced missionary zeal (which) has deprived us of the privilege of having knowledge of all but a scanty few of the written documents which had been prepared in the Philippines before the coming of the Spaniards.⁴

In a brief account of the Philippine language situation at the close of the 16th century, Morga observed that a variety of languages was spoken in the islands of Luzon and the Visayas and that literacy was high for men and women alike. He described the orthography as having characters similar to Greek or Arabic and running from right to left.⁵

Fox gives a more detailed account of what the pre-Spanish language situation was like. He writes that by the 16th century there were some 16 different Philippine cultural-linguistic groups using a form of syllabic writing originally developed in southern India. This type of writing made use of syllable signs to record a consonant-vowel or a consonant-vowel-consonant sequence. Unlike those found throughout most of Indonesia, the Philippine syllabaries did not record final consonants. Perishable materials such as bamboo were used for writing, which ran from bottom to top, left to right. Three non-Christian groups, the Tagbanuas of Palawan and the Hanunoo and Bukid of Mindoro, still write in this manner.⁶

Theoretically, the longer the period of contact, the greater would be the linguistic influence of the conquerors’ language on that of the conquered. It would seem there-

fore that the almost 400 years of Spanish rule in the Philippines would have produced a nation of Spanish speakers. Indeed it would not have been totally impossible for Spanish to have completely replaced the native languages. In the 1903 census of the Philippine Islands, however, it was estimated that less than 10 percent of the native population could speak either English or Spanish (no exact figures exist for the number of Spanish speakers among the natives at the turn of the century).⁷ Compare this with the figures for Filipinos fluent in English and in Spanish after only two decades of American rule:

By 1918 in the Philippine Islands, 49.2 percent were literate, 26.4 percent being males and 22.8 percent being females. Of the literate native population ten years of age and over, the census of 1918 found that 33.9 percent of the males and 22.4 percent of the females spoke English, while only 30.4 percent of the males and 16.9 percent of the females spoke Spanish. 32.1 percent of the males and 21.5 percent of the females were able to read and write English while only 27.0 percent of the males and 14.5 percent of the females were able to read and write Spanish. The larger proportion of Filipinos with a knowledge of English shows the progress made since implantation of the American educational system.⁸

It appears from the 1918 figures that the 1903 census-takers had underestimated the number of Spanish speakers. Nevertheless, it seems clear that use of English was more widespread after two decades than Spanish had been after 400 years.

A study of the differences between the Spanish and the American colonial philosophies in general and educational and language policies in particular will help account for the difference in impact of the two languages on Tagalog as well as for the Filipinos' attitude toward the foreign languages and their mastery of them.

The consensus revealed in available histories of the Spanish regime in the Philippines is that the learning of Spanish was not generally encouraged. Forbes states that, with a few rare exceptions, the few schools established outside Manila during the Spanish times were conducted in the native languages and no attempt was made to adopt any one of these as a general language for all the Filipinos. Spanish was taught at a few schools attended mostly by the children of the wealthy. A few of the poor children who displayed exceptional ability were allowed to attend these schools but the great bulk of the people scarcely learned Spanish at all.⁹

Citing James Smith's first annual report as secretary of public instruction under the United States Government, Forbes mentions that the object of the Spanish missionaries "was to make a good, not a learned people and consequently, only so much instruction was imparted as was necessary . . . to accomplish the purpose they had in view."¹⁰ The friars restricted the Filipinos' reading matter to tracts consisting mostly of novenas and lives of saints.

. . . the education thus provided was calculated to extend and perpetuate the power of the friars, to provide them with the means to enforce obedience and

maintain themselves as the directors and censors of the conscience and sentiments of the people.¹¹

It is a fairly common practice to lay the blame for the non-Hispanization of the Filipinos upon the Church and the friars. Secular officials during the 18th century were inclined to accuse the regular clergy of a conscious conspiracy to keep the Filipinos in linguistic isolation on the supposition that non-Spanish speaking Filipinos would be more amenable to Church control.¹² One authority noted the near-complete disregard by the friars of the numerous royal orders to teach Castilian to the young natives. One league from Manila, he wrote, one could scarcely be understood unless he knew the dialect, and in the provinces Spanish was almost entirely unknown. The friars sought to teach the Indians to read and write in their own language, but no attempt was made to transmit a knowledge of Spanish other than an occasional few words. Moreover, the ordinary Indian who knew a little Castilian was forbidden to converse in it.¹³

It seems that monastic opposition to teaching Spanish to the natives had another self-serving end as well. If the people ever became conversant in Spanish, the friar's role as intermediary between the natives and the civil authorities would end, reducing his influence with both parties.¹⁴

An easy and popular treatment of Philippine history is to characterize the Spanish era as "all bad" and the American occupation as "all good." It is easy enough to dismiss the Spanish era in the Philippines as characterized simply by "raising the cross and thrusting with the sword"¹⁵ and to attribute the failure of the Spanish language to become universally known to a backward colonial policy that preserved it as an "aristocratic" language known only to the elite. It was true that the friars were not very much interested in teaching the "Indios" the Castilian language, but this may not have been entirely due to their desire to keep the natives ignorant.

... a maxim of Spanish missionary policy was that converts should be indoctrinated in their own tongues. It was thought that the natives would respond more readily if the faith were not preached in an alien language.¹⁶

Thus, once the friars took the trouble to learn the native languages, it was perhaps natural that they carried on their work among the Indians in those languages rather than taking on the additional burden of teaching them Spanish.

H.F. Fox points out the efforts of religious orders to bring education to the young. In 1580 the Franciscans urged the parish pastors to found schools where the community children might not merely learn to read and write but also acquire some useful vocational skills. An official Dominican parish priest's handbook of 1739 recommended that serious attention be paid to the schools of both boys and girls.¹⁷ Fox further cites several statements by officials of both religious orders and the regular clergy favoring the teaching of Spanish. In 1596, he writes, the Augustinians requested their friars to teach the children Spanish, and in 1771 a Church decree ordered parochial learning centers to hold classes five hours a day and to use Spanish for every subject except religion.¹⁸ There is certainly some support for the proposition that the religious authorities made statements favoring education, although that word may have meant

different things to different people. Nonetheless, Fox's assertion of the friars' interest in teaching their charges Spanish is contrary to the weight of the other evidence. There seems to have been steady resistance on the part of the priests in the field to the teaching of Spanish.

So far we have been considering Spanish policies and attitudes during the early period of Spain's rule, with emphasis on the role played by the friars. The civil authorities, however, particularly during the latter part of the Spanish period, sometimes had policies which conflicted with those of the religious. For instance, they favored instruction in Spanish for the natives, partly on the theory that Indians who knew Spanish would feel loyalty toward Spain because they shared its linguistic and cultural heritage. In the 17th century the Spanish royal policy was encouragement of the Filipinos to become bilingual; in the 18th century it was one of compelling the natives to adopt Spanish. This "gradual shift toward linguistic imperialism" was motivated by the "ethnocentric prejudice of the Spaniards" that the native tongues were not adequate for expressing the subtle mysteries of the Catholic faith. Added to this was the fear that idol worship and superstition would persist if the natives continued to use the language of their pagan past. Every community was therefore ordered to set up a primary school with Spanish as the obligatory language of instruction.¹⁹

In spite of this more enlightened policy, very little progress was made toward educating the Filipinos. For one thing, Spanish-speaking teachers were very rare, and the monthly salary of one peso did not provide any economic incentive for the Filipinos to become teachers. For another, students were often hard to come by. Since they could be of great use in planting and in doing household chores, their parents showed very little interest in sending them to school. In addition, since students had to travel long distances daily to attend classes, very few of the schools ran by the civil authorities which were supposed to replace the parochial schools actually functioned.

Punitive measures in the 18th century produced no appreciable change. A royal cedula that no Filipino could be elected to public office unless he could read, write and speak Spanish was unenforceable since so few Filipinos could have qualified.²⁰

In a recent symposium, "Our Spanish Heritage," conducted in Manila, Spain's contributions to the Philippines were re-examined and re-evaluated. Among the more pertinent claims was one that Spanish colonial policy toward education was more advanced than that of any other colonial power. While other European countries feared universal education in their colonies, Spain consistently pursued a program of popular education, secondary and collegiate as well as elementary. The orientation was admittedly toward doctrinal religious studies, but by 1589 secondary colleges had been started and the University of Santo Tomas was founded in 1611, followed by many other institutions of higher learning.²¹

Despite all good intentions, however, it seems that this policy of creating an educated colonial people was frustrated on the operational level. The friars failed to carry it out, and the civil government did not itself follow up its decrees with the steps necessary to implement them.

In sharp contrast to this lackadaisical policy of the Spaniards which kept the natives from acquiring an education and from developing a common tongue, almost the first thing the Americans turned their attention to in the Philippines was education and the teaching of English on a massive scale. The relevant part of President McKinley's instructions to the members of the Civil Commission leaving for the Philippines is the following:

It will be the duty of the Commission to promote and extend and, as they find occasion, to improve the system of education already inaugurated by the military authorities. In doing this they should regard as of first importance the extension of a system of primary education which shall be free to all, and which shall tend to fit the people for the duties of citizenship and for the ordinary avocations of a civilized community. This instruction should be given, in the first instance, in every part of the Islands in the language of the people. In view of the great number of languages spoken by the different tribes, it is especially important to the prosperity of the Islands that a common medium of communication may be established, and it is obviously desirable that this medium should be the English language. Especial attention should at once be given to affording full opportunity to all the people of the Islands to acquire the use of the English language.²²

It should be noted that these instructions to the Second Philippine Commission were, in effect, the constitution of the Philippines for two years. They were the only check on the Commission's powers, or more properly, since the Commission had what amounted to complete legislative and executive power, the only standard of reference for it in determining the validity of the laws it was considering. Although the instructions did not make the use of English mandatory, the Commission agreed that English ought to be the medium of instruction, and it was so ordered.

On January 21, 1901, the Second Philippine Commission passed the first organic school law, Act No. 74, drafted by Dr. Fred W. Atkinson, the first general superintendent of public instruction. This law provided for the creation of a department of public instruction in the Philippines and for the establishment of a centralized system of free public instruction in English. It also authorized the establishment of a normal school in Manila for the training of Filipino teachers and provided for the importation of trained American teachers. An important provision was one abolishing compulsory religious instruction in the public schools.²³ Thus the first organic act in the Islands' history as an American possession established English as the language of the schools, and this policy was continued and extended throughout the American period.

General Otis started American schools under military rule. He desired his officers to open as many schools as possible and selected and ordered textbooks which were used in American schools at that time.²⁴ The public schools in Manila were reopened as American military occupation extended to other cities and towns. By July 1, 1900, one hundred thousand pupils were attending primary schools established by the army.²⁵

The Americans began giving instruction in English almost from the beginning. Very little instruction was given in the native dialects, and even if it had been desired,

it would have been difficult owing to the non-existence of textbooks or literature. The instructions of President McKinley were so thoroughly carried out that it is probable, as one authority asserts, that more English was spoken in the Islands three years after the American teachers arrived than there was Spanish spoken at the end of three centuries.²⁶ The school system had in effect suppressed the use of Tagalog and forced out Spanish.

Commenting on the Filipinos' reaction to the system of public education instituted by the Americans, Governor-General Frank Murphy in his message to the Philippine Legislature on its final session before the establishment of the Commonwealth government in 1935, stated:

No people ever accepted the blessings of education with more enthusiasm than the Filipinos. Like the Americans, they saw that the road to self-government lies through the schoolhouse. The U.S. Army began the establishment of modern schools in 1898 and within a year, more than 4,500 primary pupils were enrolled in Manila alone.²⁷

The report of the Philippine Commission in 1902 also pointed the people's positive reaction toward English. Children, the report noted, were as eager to learn as their parents were to have them educated. People were delighted at the opportunity to learn their rulers' language, and the American teachers were held in high regard.²⁸

Bernstein adds that the near-universal use of English was instrumental in creating a strong sense of Filipino nationality in that at last a single language was common to the whole country. Not only was English spoken all over the Islands, but it was spoken by people of all classes.²⁹

The Tydings-McDuffie Act, promulgated on March 24, 1934, likewise provided for the establishment and maintenance of an adequate system of public schools, to be primarily conducted in English.³⁰

The Americans quickly recognized the practical necessity of throwing open most of the jobs in the civil service to qualified Filipinos. English was made the *sine qua non* for obtaining these positions. With English as the obligatory language of instruction from the primary grades up to the university level, it is no wonder that this foreign language became the lingua franca within a generation, uniting the people through a common tongue.

Besides the differences in colonial policies and attitudes toward the language of the conquered and the conqueror, another important factor influencing the character of Spanish and American contacts were the agents of contact themselves. Before the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869, there were few Spanish civilians in the Philippines. Those that did live there followed occupations directly connected with Spain's colonial administration — merchants, soldiers, bureaucrats and priests. Filipinos outside Manila rarely came in contact with any Spaniards other than local priests.³¹ This isolation from Spaniards certainly helps explain the fact that after so long a colonial period so few colonials spoke the rulers' language.

The situation was different in the case of metropolitan Manila. The large Filipino population in the capital was thrown into frequent contact with the Spanish community. They became urbanized wage-earners who spoke at least a smattering of Spanish and hence were more Hispanized than those in the provinces. Although a small class of mestizos emerged, intermarriage between the Filipinos and the Chinese was much more frequent than between Filipinos and Spaniards. In fact, there were far more Chinese in Manila than there were Spaniards.³²

In the late 18th and throughout the 19th century, however, with the Philippines' ties to and dependence upon Mexico broken and replaced by direct contact with Spain, Manila acted as the focal point of culture change. The opening of the Suez Canal and the establishment of regular steamship service between Europe and Manila increased the flow of both persons and ideas. More and more Spaniards came to the Philippines, and Filipinos also travelled to Spain. The new export crop economy had provided those families who benefited from it with the kind of wealth that enabled them to send their sons to Europe, particularly to Spain, for their higher education. The students travelling back and forth between Manila and Spain and between Manila and their home provinces transmitted ideas from Spain to the local regions. Nevertheless, extensive contact with Spanish speakers did not take place until very late in the Spanish period. In contrast, the American agents of contact began immediately to affect the Filipinos' language profoundly.

The first American teachers were the soldiers themselves who had come to fight the Filipinos and who undertook almost from the beginning to teach them. Within a short time the people ceased to think of the soldier as an enemy, but admired him for putting down the "civilizing" rifle and "picking up a ragged textbook to expound the ABC's to a group of Filipino children clustering at his knee, athirst for knowledge."³³

Act No. 74 of the Philippine Commission gave the general superintendent of public instruction authority to obtain a thousand teachers from the United States. These teachers were not, however, all brought from America, for a number were appointed from the ranks of discharged soldiers and from wives and relatives of officers and civilians. On August 23, 1901, the army transport *Thomas* docked at Manila bearing a cargo of 600 American teachers. Their mission was both to teach English in the public schools and to train Filipinos to become teachers. Although they were preceded a few months earlier by an advance shipment of 48 teachers, the Thomasites, as they were called by the Filipinos, are considered to have made up the first group of teachers, and the first shipment of Peace Corps volunteers who landed in Manila more than 50 years later were called the Thomasites of the '60's.

The number of Americans physically present in the Philippines at any given time was not significantly larger than the number of Spaniards during their occupation of the country, but certainly the impact of the English language and culture was greater, considering the short time it took to make many Filipinos fluent speakers of English. The Americans had been given instructions to establish English as a living language in the Philippines, and they made immediate and intensive efforts to carry out these orders.

They concentrated especially on teaching the natives the duties of citizenship in the English language. This accounts in part for their success in creating a nation in which English is so widely spoken. On the other hand, the isolation of the Filipinos from most social contacts with the Spaniards and the slow growth of a Spanish-speaking class as well as the absence of any incentive to learn Spanish all contributed to confining fluency in Spanish to Filipinos living in Greater Manila. And even there Tagalog remained the language of the home.³⁴ While during the American period it was advantageous for the Filipino to learn English as well and as fast as he could, since it opened the door to opportunity, during Spain's rule to learn Spanish and to be an intellectual was dangerous. The families of those studying in Europe were watched carefully by the government, which feared that subversive political ideas would be spread through them.³⁵

Another factor affecting the extent of the spread of the foreign languages in the country was the unavailability of instructional materials during the Spanish times. Phelan³⁶ reports that in the whole course of the 17th century the four printing presses in the Philippines published only about 100 books. The bulk of them were bilingual catechisms, dictionaries, grammars, and confessionals. Because of the high cost of printing and the impermanence of the rice paper used, instruction was mostly oral. This oral transmission of the language perhaps accounts in great measure for the "errors" found in the Spanish speech of Filipinos who learned it outside of school or at least rarely saw the language in its written form. The urbanization of Manila and the development of more cosmopolitan tastes and a more sophisticated type of Spanish cultural influence did result in the publication of newspapers and periodicals in Manila after 1850 and the development of other forms of literature, notably novels and poetry in Spanish. Despite this, the large mass of the population in the rural areas were hardly affected. Culture remained essentially a monopoly of the upper classes.³⁷

In contrast to the dearth of written materials in Spanish was the influx of English texts that followed immediately upon the American occupation. Books written for Americans were used in the instruction of Filipinos as if English were their native language. From Aparri to Jolo (the northernmost and southernmost tips of the Philippines, respectively), Filipino children pledged allegiance to the American flag and learned that George Washington never told a lie. Tagalog and all the other Philippine languages were taboo and school children were penalized for speaking "the dialect" within the school premises.

The language situation, however, has changed considerably since the early years of the American occupation. Local teachers have long since taken over the work started by the Americans and there has been constant agitation for a re-examination and re-evaluation of language policies.³⁸ As the chief result of this agitation, Tagalog, formerly only a regional language, has spread all over the archipelago, is employed as one of the official languages (the other two being English and Spanish), is used as an auxiliary medium of instruction and is fast becoming the national language as envisioned in the Philippine Constitution.

In spite of the fact that English no longer occupies the central position in Philippine affairs that it did before independence, it still persists as an important lingua franca as well as an effective link with the outside world. English will continue to maintain an important place in the life of the country. English broadcasts and telecasts.

English newspapers and magazines, as well as contact with native speakers (businessmen, tourists, members of the diplomatic corps and other United States agencies, old residents and Peace Corps volunteers) all help to keep the English language very much alive, at least in the bigger cities like Manila.

On the other hand, although there are radio and television programs in Spanish and Spanish newspapers and magazines are available, the Spanish language has continued to be the language of only a few. Republic Act. No. 1881, which requires students in all colleges and universities to complete at least 12 hours of Spanish, and students in certain courses like law, commerce, liberal arts, the foreign service and education to complete 24 hours, has failed to create a larger number of Spanish speakers. Not very many people share the belief of Nick Joaquin (a leading Filipino writer) that “. . . Spain has given the Philippines its truest identity as a people by bringing the numberless islands, bloods, and cultures into a geographical unit.” Nor do many people besides the Hispanistas feel that

. . . the fountainheads of our cultural anchorage have been swept away by the decline of the Spanish language here in the Philippines. The soul of the people . . . can be fathomed only through a resurgence of the Spanish tongue.⁴¹

It is in light of the above that the language situation in the Manila area will be described. I have devoted considerable attention to the historical, social, and cultural background of the contact situations, not only because it is useful in explaining the differences between the Hispanization and Anglicization of Tagalog but also because it has not been systematically described before. The fundamental differences between the Spanish-Tagalog and English-Tagalog acculturation situations in such matters as periods of contact, agents of contact, conquerors' motivation for colonization, the attitude toward the colonizers and the prestige of the foreigner and his language have affected the language spoken and written by the educated Tagalog bilingual. Legislation, school policy and mass media have likewise contributed to either fostering or hindering language change.

The description of the phonological, morphological and lexical (semantic) borrowings from Spanish and English as well as the resulting types of confusion and mixing of patterns on the word, phrase, and discourse levels will constitute the major part of this study.

I will attempt to explain the extralinguistic factors influencing borrowing, mixing and language choice and give tentative answers as to when and why the Tagalog speaker uses a pure or a mixed language. The influence on the qualitative and quantitative forms of borrowing and mixing of such variables as the speaker/writer's education and control of the foreign languages, his attitude toward them, his age, the nature of the communication situation (e.g., formal/informal) and the identity of his listener/reader will be considered.

Finally, I will offer some tentative conclusions regarding the question of whether the contact with Spanish and English has had any effect on the total structure of Tagalog. In other words, I will attempt to resolve the question of whether borrowing and mixing

have resulted in a language which has retained its basic pattern or whether such borrowings have had the effect of altering Tagalog in a fundamental way.

In this study, I have used two major sources of data : printed material produced by educated Tagalog bilinguals and a fairly considerable body of personal correspondence in my possession .¹I have not confined myself to these data, however, but have drawn on my experience as a bilingual from the area under study and as a teacher of English to Filipinos and Tagalog to Americans. I have also checked my observations with native speakers of the languages in contact.

N O T E S

CHAPTER I

¹In addition, Morga notes that among those who traded with Manila were the Chinese, the Japanese, the Borneans, the Portuguese, and on rare occasions the Siamese and Cambodians. Such contacts could not have failed to have an effect on the Philippine language and culture. Antonio de Morga. **The Philippine Islands, Moluccas, Siam, Cambodia, Japan and China at the Close of the Sixteenth Century**, translated from the Spanish by Henry E.J. Stanley (London: Hakluyt Society, 1868), pp. 339, 341-43.

²Comments similar to the following were common among the early American observers in the Philippines: "The Filipinos have a flair for languages and are natural polyglots. . . . every educated Filipino is compelled by circumstances to be a linguist. Commonly he needs and uses three languages-English, Spanish and his dialect. He requires a knowledge of English for business, work and intercourse with Americans, Europeans, Japanese, etc.. He requires Spanish for social functions, legal acts and communications with Spaniards and mestizos. His dialect comes to him from his parents and is used in his home, in conversations with his neighbors and in political campaigns." George A. Malcolm, **The Commonwealth of the Philippines** (New York: Appleton Century Company, 1936), p. 294.

³W. Cameron Forbes, **The Philippine Islands** (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1928), 1, 30.

⁴Malcolm, *op. cit.*, pp. 317-18.

⁵Morga, *op. cit.*, pp. 294-95.

⁶Robert Fox, "The Philippines in Prehistoric Times," Eufronio Alip (ed.), **The Philippines of Yesteryears**, Manila : Alip & Sons, 1964). pp. 316-17.

⁷United States Bureau of the Census, **Census of the Philippine Islands: 1903**. Vol. II (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1905), p. 78. "The number of natives --the Spanish call them 'Indians' --who can read and write is tolerably large, but owing to the total unreliability of all statistics on the subject, nothing accurate can be stated. In 1863 the Government attempted to make an enumeration of the population, and, incidentally, to note the number of those who could read and write. The fact that

the result was never published seems to confirm the opinion that an unsatisfactory condition of things was found." **Ibid**, III, 577.

⁸**Census of the Philippine Islands**, 1918, II, 60-62, quoted by Forbes, **op. cit.**, I, 416, n. 2.

⁹ Forbes, **op. cit.**, I, 410.

¹⁰**Ibid.**, p. 412, quoting James Smith, secretary of public instruction.

¹¹**Census of the Philippine Islands: 1903**, I, 305.

¹²John Leddy Phelan, **The Hispanization of the Philippines** (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1959), p. 132.

¹³Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robertson, **The Philippine Islands 1493-1898** (Cleveland, Ohio: The A.H. Clark Co., 1903-09), XXVIII, 211-12.

¹⁴**Census of the Philippine Islands: 1903**, III, 594.

¹⁵Forbes, **op. cit.**, I, 49, citing a translation of S. Vidal y Soler, **Viajes por Filipinas** de F. Jagor (Madrid: 1875), p. 305.

¹⁶ Phelan, **op. cit.**, p. 51.

¹⁷Henry Frederick Fox, S.J., "The Heritage of Formal Education," **Weekly Women's Magazine**, May 26, 1967, p. 30 [an English language publication circulated in the Philippines].

¹⁸**Ibid.**

¹⁹ Phelan, **op. cit.**, p. 131.

²⁰ **Ibid.**, pp. 131-32.

²¹C. Richard, F.S.C., Introduction to the symposium "Our Spanish Heritage," **Weekly Women's Magazine**, May 5, 1967, p. 19.

²²Forbes, **op. cit.**, II, Appendix VII, These instructions were prepared by Elihu Root, Secretary of War, with the help of William Howard Taft, the chairman of the Commission.

²³Gregorio F. Zaide, **Philippine Political and Cultural History** (Manila: Philippine Education Company, 1957), II, 286.

²⁴John Bancroft Devins, **An Observer in the Philippines** (Boston: American Tract Society, 1905), p. 191.

²⁵Forbes, **op. cit.**, I, 115, citing a report of Col. E.H. Crowder, Secretary to the Military Governor of the Philippine Islands, 1900, House Document No. 2, 56th Congress, 2nd Session, p. 26.

²⁶Devins, **op. cit.**, pp. 188-89.

²⁷Quoted by David Bernstein, **The Philippine Story** (New York: Farrar, Straus & Company, 1947), p. 110.

²⁸Forbes, **op. cit.**, citing **Report of the Philippine Commission** (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1902), pp. 869-70.

²⁹Bernstein, **op. cit.**, pp. 111-12.

³⁰Statutes at Large, 73rd Congress, 2nd Session, p. 6380.

³¹Phelan, **op. cit.**, p..106.

³²**Ibid.**, pp. 106, 131, 134. See also Edgar Wickburg, **The Chinese in Philippine Life, 1850-1898** (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), pp. 129-30.

³³Bernstein, **op. cit.**, p. 109.

³⁴Phelan, **op. cit.**, p. 133.

³⁵Wickberg, **op. cit.**, p. 130, citing **Census of the Philippine Islands: 1903**, I, 380.

³⁶**Op. cit.**, p. 51.

³⁷Wickberg, **op. cit.**, pp. 130, 131-34.

³⁸For instance, as noted in Chapter Two, a new educational policy instituted by the Board of National Education in 1957 made the local native languages the media of instruction in grades I and II with the shift to English as the medium of instruction postponed to grade III.

³⁹Article XIII, Section 3 of the Constitution of the Philippines, promulgated by the Constitutional Convention on February 8, 1935, provides: "The National Assembly shall take steps toward the development and adoption of a common national language

based on one of the existing native languages. Until otherwise provided by law, English and Spanish shall continue as official languages.”

⁴⁰Richard, *loc. cit.*

⁴¹*Ibid.*

CHAPTER II

THE TAGALOG LANGUAGE: PHONOLOGICAL, MORPHOLOGICAL, AND SEMANTIC BORROWINGS

Tagalog is spoken as a native language mostly in Luzon, the most important of the three main geographical divisions of the archipelago, the other two being the Visayas and Mindanao. Luzon is also the largest single island and the most heavily populated. In Manila, the chief port and the most important city, as well as in Quezon City, the new capital of the Philippines, both of which are located on Luzon, the predominant language is Tagalog. The provinces of the Philippines where Tagalog is spoken as the native language are Bulacan (considered the seat of "pure" Tagalog), Cavite, Bataan, Batangas, Laguna, Quezon, Nueva Ecija, Mindoro Oriental, Mindoro Occidental, Marinduque, and parts of Camarines Norte. Tagalog is usually spoken as a second language in the Visayas and in Mindanao by non-Tagalogs.

According to the 1960 Census of the Philippines, 12,019,193 or 44.4 percent of a total population of 27,087,685 spoke Tagalog; 39.5 percent spoke English; and Spanish was spoken by 2.1 percent. Tagalog was officially designated as one of the official languages only in 1946.

In 1936, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of the Philippine Commonwealth,¹ the Institute of National Language was created and given the task of making a study of all the Philippine languages and recommending to the Commonwealth President that one best suited to be the "basis of the national language." On November 9, 1937, President Quezon proclaimed Tagalog as this basis. It was expected that words from other Philippine languages would be added to make up a language representative of all Philippine languages. The teaching of Tagalog in the school systems was made mandatory, but some years passed before this provision of the law could be implemented.

From the early 1900's until 1957, English was the sole medium of instruction in Philippine schools although Tagalog was taught as a subject in the early 1940's. Since 1957 the first two grades in the public schools and most private schools have been conducted in the vernaculars with Pilipino (Tagalog-based national language) as an "auxiliary medium."² In the high schools, Tagalog is a required subject. There are courses leading to a bachelor's degree in Tagalog and more recently a few universities have begun graduate programs devoted to Tagalog, including a doctoral program in Pilipino at the University of the Philippines.

The Second World War and the Japanese occupation of the country from 1941 to 1945 provided an impetus for the development and propagation of Tagalog. The Japanese insisted on the teaching of Nippongo (from Nippon, the Japanese name for Japan) but they did not prevent the increasing use of Tagalog in schools and offices. Filipino writers, inhibited by the fear of censorship, wrote in Tagalog as English was suspect. Tagalog stage shows, which served as almost the sole means of entertainment for the people of Manila and its suburbs, were another means of propagating the language. English was never completely suppressed, however. Although most of the English books were either destroyed or censored, the Japanese allowed certain non-controversial American movies

to be shown. In fact, some of the Japanese propaganda movies were produced in English. The English language was likewise kept alive in the homes. School-age children who did not want to “collaborate” with the enemy stayed home but kept up their studies by reading English books, and students exchanged books from their home libraries.

Before World War II and shortly after it, Tagalog speakers usually had to communicate with their non-Tagalog countrymen in English. Now it is possible to go almost anywhere in the Philippines and be understood in Tagalog. Many factors have contributed to this. Among them, in addition to those mentioned above, are improved Tagalog mass media, increasing nationalism, and greater mobility resulting in increased contact between Tagalogs and non-Tagalogs.

Tagalog has been receptive to foreign loans, and borrowing is a very active and productive phenomenon. It appears that attempts to create or use “pure” Tagalog words are met with resistance, if not ridicule. As a matter of fact, the Institute of National Language is still the butt of occasional jokes because at one point in its history some purist members of the staff coined native words for common vocabulary items for which Spanish loans are generally used.

The borrowed words are readily made to conform to the phonological and morphological systems of Tagalog and become part of it. The educated Tagalog bilingual may sometimes make an effort to use the loans without phonological or morphological modifications, but usually he does not or cannot. This is generally true of loans incorporating any language. As Jespersen puts it:

The more familiar such loan-words are, the more unnatural it would be to pronounce them with foreign sounds or according to foreign rules of quantity and stress; for this means in each case a shunting of the whole speech-apparatus onto a different track for one or two words and then shifting back to the original ‘basis of articulation’ – an effort that many speakers are quite incapable of and one that in any case interferes with the natural and easy flow of speech.³

No attempt will be made to trace Tagalog to its pristine forms. Tagalog was affected from early times by borrowing from Sanskrit, Chinese and other languages, and at this late date it is a matter of uncertainty which Tagalog words are pure and which are early loans.⁴ For the Tagalog purist, “pure” or “deep” Tagalog means Tagalog without any recognizable foreign elements. In reality, however, what he considers pure Tagalog may in fact be made up in part of Chinese, Sanskrit, Malay or other elements. (see Appendix A for Sanskrit and Chinese elements in modern Tagalog). In this study, a term will be defined as Tagalog even though it may be of older Sanskrit, Chinese or Malay descent and a borrowing will be labelled as either of Spanish or English origin.⁵ It is possible in some cases, however, that what is in fact a Spanish loan will be taken to be native Tagalog simply because it has undergone so much phonological and/or morphological modification that it is unrecognizable as Spanish.

In this chapter as well as in succeeding ones, Tagalog (T) words are in italics, and Spanish (S) loans in bold type. The English meanings of non-English words will be enclosed in single quotes.

Except for direct citations from my corpus which fluctuate between respelling the loans and using the foreign spelling (sometimes in italics). I will cite the Tagalog

words and the Spanish and English loans using only Tagalog orthography. This is not the usual practice, but such spellings are necessary to give the reader an indication of the phonological modifications undergone by a borrowing.⁶

The linguistic changes (phonological, morphological, and semantic) undergone by loan words as well as their effects on the structural system of Tagalog will now be considered.

I: PHONOLOGICAL BORROWING AND MODIFICATION

The borrowing of foreign words always entails their phonetic modification. There are sure to be foreign sounds or accentual peculiarities that do not fit the native phonetic habits.

.....
The highly significant thing about such phonetic interinfluencing is the strong tendency of each language to keep its phonetic pattern intact.⁷

This statement by Sapir is true to some extent of Tagalog borrowings, although the kinds of phonological adjustments they undergo cannot always be easily described. Sound substitutions, simplification, addition, subtraction and change in stress do occur but the bilingual speaker often has two sets of pronunciation for the loans he uses: a sophisticated pronunciation (almost no phonological modification) and a folk pronunciation (with phonological modification).⁸ Both types of pronunciation may be used by the educated speaker either consciously or unconsciously, depending on the communication situation. They are not mutually exclusive in the same person. In other words, a Tagalog speaker may have mastered the English and Spanish sound systems, making it relatively easy for him to give the loans their foreign sounds. The same Tagalog speaker may, however, in spite of his proficiency substitute the Tagalog sounds for the foreign when he is speaking a mixed Tagalog utterance or may fluctuate in his use of the foreign sounds or their equivalents in the native language. In a Tagalog stream of speech, he may use Tagalog sounds even for the English and Spanish loans or he may use English or Spanish sounds for them. In an English stream of speech, he may either substitute Tagalog sounds for English or show no phonological substitutions at all. He may also use foreign sounds or their native substitutes randomly.

Since this is not meant to be a contrastive phonological analysis,⁹ no attempt will be made to give a detailed account of the phonological aspects of borrowing in Tagalog. Rather, the types of phonological interference will be treated in a cursory fashion, and only to give the reader an idea of the shapes of borrowed morphemes; i.e., how the borrowings are realized in speech. The examples will also be limited to segmental phonemes although it is obvious that phonological modifications and interference have also occurred on the suprasegmental level. I do, however, note certain changes in placement of stress.

The following are some types of phonological modification:

Substitution

The phonological adaptation of loan words by the Tagalog speaker leads to the substitution of native sounds for those most closely resembling the foreign. The more common and more predictable type of phonological interference is substitution. A comparison of the phonemic systems and patterns of sound distribution of the three languages in contact will reveal the possible sources of conflict.

Consonant Substitutions (including substitutions made for allophones)

/p/ for E, S/f/10 _

telepono – 'telephone'
ponograp 'phonograph'
plor waks – 'floor wax'
bupete -- **bufete** 'lawyer's office and clientele'
gripo – **grifo** 'faucet'

/b/ for E /v/ or S [b]

bikturi - 'victory'
baytamin - 'vitamin'
pabor - **favor** 'favor'
korkobado – **corcovado** 'hunchback'

/t/ for E /θ/

bert kontrol – 'birth control'
tutbras – 'toothbrush'
helt – 'health'

/d/ for E /ð/ or S [ð]

der – 'there'
brader – 'brother'
seda – **seda** 'silk'
todo – **todo** 'all'

/g/ for S [g]

agwa – **agua** 'water'
larga – **largo** 'away!'
pulgada 'leeway' – **pulgada** 'inch'

/s/ for E /z/ and S [z]

son – 'zone'
siper – 'zipper'
mismo – **mismo** 'same', 'similar'
desde – **desde** 'since', 'after', 'from'

/s/ or /sy/ for E [ʃ]

si – 'she'
syolder – 'shoulder'

syampu -- 'shampoo'
syarpsyuter -- 'sharpshooter'

/ty/ or /ts/ for E / č /

tyokoleyt -- 'chocolate'
tsip -- 'chief'

/s/ or /ty/, or /ts/ for S / č /

sile -- **chile** 'pepper'
siste -- **chiste** 'joke'
plantsa -- *plantya* -- **plancha** 'iron'
petsa 'date' -- **fecha** 'date of a letter', 'time'
tsaleko -- **chaleco** 'vest'

/s/ for S /θ/ and S [z]

asikaso -- **hacer caso** 'to pay attention to'
singko -- **cinco** 'five'
kabesa -- **cabeza** 'head'
husgado -- **juzgado** 'judge' (n.)

/h/ or /s/ for S /x/

garahe -- **garaje** 'garage'
maneho -- **manejar** 'manage'
hepe -- **jefe** 'chief'
sugal -- **jugar** 'gamble'
sabon -- **jabon** 'soap' (but: *habonera* -- 'soap dish')

/r/ for S multiple trill r

gitara -- **guitarra** 'guitar'
yero -- **hierro** 'iron'
tore -- **torre** 'tower'
perokaril -- **ferrocarril** 'railroad'
kuryente -- **corriente** 'current'
sigarera -- **cigarrera** 'cigar-maker or seller'

Some substitutions involving /l r d/ in Spanish loans seem rather haphazard:

balbas -- **barba** 'beard'
kumpisal -- **confesar** 'to confess', 'confession'
saklolo -- **socorro** 'help'
kasal -- **casar** 'to marry'
delantar -- **delantal** 'apron'
karsonsilyo -- **calzoncillos** 'pants', 'trunks'
karsada -- **calzada** 'paved highway'
piraso -- **pedazo** 'piece'
ataul -- **ataud** 'coffin'
labaha -- **navaja** 'razor'
tsapad 'flat' -- **chafar** 'become flat'

Vowel Substitutions

/i/ for E /ɪ/

hipi -- 'hippie'
insyurans -- 'insurance'
import -- 'import'

/i/ for S /e/

mantika -- **manteca** 'lard'
didal -- **dedal** 'thimble'
disareglado -- **desarreglado** 'unruly'

/e/ for E /ey/

bekon -- 'bacon'
bebi -- 'baby'
peborit -- 'favorite'
implesyon -- 'inflation'

/o/ for E /ow/

bot -- 'boat'
go -- 'go'
kok -- 'Coke'
sop opera -- 'soap opera'

/a/ for E /æ/

hat -- 'hat'
kap -- 'cap'
katnap -- 'catnap'

/aw/ for E /ɔ/

awtograp -- 'autograph'
awto -- 'auto'
restawran -- 'restaurant'

/o/ for E /ɔ/

lo -- 'law'
bot -- 'bought'
to -- 'thaw'

/u/ for S /o/

bulkan -- **volcan** 'volcano'
hurno -- **horno** 'oven'
sibuyas -- **cebolla** 'onion'

/u/ for E /ʊ/

pul -- 'pull'
syuk -- 'shook'

Sometimes the vowel substitutions seem random and haphazard as shown in the following:

- sarado* – **cerrado** ‘closed’
- paminta* – **pimienta** ‘black pepper’
- paminton* – **pimenton** ‘cayenne pepper’
- umpisa* – **empezar** ‘to begin’

Simplification and Subtraction

These are exemplified by loss of phonemes (initial, medial or final) and simplification of double consonants and diphthongs.

Loss of Initial Phoneme(s)

- masyado* -- **demasiado** ‘excessive’
- manong/manang* (with endearing suffix *-ng*) - **hermano/hermana**
‘elder brother/sister’
- hurnado* ‘baked’ -- **ahornado** ‘dried-up bread’

Loss of Medial Phoneme(s)

- kumare* – **comadre** ‘godmother of one’s child’
- pare* -- **padre** ‘priest’
- kutson* – **colchon** ‘mattress’
- katsa* ‘a coarsely-woven, cheap cloth’ – **calcha** ‘workman’s clothing and bedding’

Loss of Final Phoneme(s) – in general, there is a loss of final [-t, -d, -əd] in past tense of regular English verbs and a loss of -r of the infinitive ending of Spanish verbs.

Loss of Vowel and Vocalizing of (w) in certain Spanish words

- gurnasyon* – **guarniciones** ‘harness’
- kustyon* -- **cuestion** ‘question’
- kurisma* – **cuaresma** ‘Lent’
- pasko* -- **pascua** ‘Christmas’
- saragate* – **saraguate** ‘a kind of monkey’
- pusta* – **puesta** ‘bet’

Simplification of many consonant clusters, both initial and final

- lobo* ‘ball’ – **globo** ‘ball’, ‘sphere’
- momen* – ‘moment’
- grasp* – ‘grasps’

Loss of the *ío* and *ía* hiatus in certain Spanish words

- galerya* -- **galería** ‘gallery’
- kategorya* – **categoría** ‘category’
- garantiya* – **garantía** ‘security’, ‘guarantee’
- baterya* – **batería** ‘battery’
- tyo* – **tío** ‘uncle’

Use of a glide or a glottal stop in Tagalog for two vowel clusters in Spanish pronounced without hiatus but with a glide

poyta *poʔeta* **poeta** 'poet'
lawrel *laʔurel* **laurel** 'laurel'

Addition of Phoneme(s)

Addition of -s after vowels or -es after consonants in many Spanish loans

ohales **ojal** 'buttonhole'
salas **sala** 'living room'
gastos **gasto** 'expense'
perlas **perla** 'pearl'

In certain words, according to no apparent discernible pattern, addition of a final glottal stop to Spanish loans

mutaʔ - **mota** 'mote'
kandilaʔ - **candela** 'candle'
manyikaʔ - **muñeca** 'doll'
panyoʔ 'handkerchief', 'scarf' - **pañó** 'cloth'
paloʔ - **palo** 'stick'

Intrusion of a vowel to avoid certain consonant clusters and to conform to the predominant Tagalog C-V-C syllable pattern

baraso - **braso** 'arm'
suwelo - **suelo** 'floor'
kubiyertos - **cubierto** 'table service'

Addition of a prothetic vowel in English words beginning with sk-, sp- and st-, possibly due to Spanish influence

iskrin tes - 'screen test'
iskul - 'school'
istraples - 'strapless'
ispeling bi - 'spelling bee'
ispeys sip - 'space ship'

Other Changes

Metathesis

pader - **pared** 'wall'
grabansos - **garbanzo** 'chick pea'
nunal - **lunar** 'mole'

Palatalization

hinyebra - **ginebra** 'gin', 'liquor'
gyera - **guerra** 'war'
simyento **cemento** 'cement'

Change in stress

bangkó? ... **ban'co** 'bench'

barkó -- **bar'co** 'boat'

bulsá -- **bol'sa** 'pocket' (but: *bólsa de yelo* - **bol'sa de hielo** 'ice pack')

baldé -- **bal de** 'tin can', 'bucket'

Spelling pronunciation -- pronunciation of "silent letters" and giving unaccented English vowels full value

harina -- **harina** 'flour' (pronounced without h in Castilian Spanish)

sabtel -- 'subtle'

kup de gras -- 'coup de grace'

aprubal -- 'approval'

importan -- 'important'

pensil -- 'pencil'

ereyser -- 'eraser'

Doublets and triplets in Tagalog for a single Spanish model

banyo 'bathroom'

baño 'bath'

banyos 'sponge bath'

barato 'cheap'

barato 'cheap'

barat 'haggler'

balato 'cash given as a gift from gambling winnings'

Compared to either English or Spanish, Tagalog has a smaller number of phonemes. The patterns of distribution of these phonemes also vary among the three. These differences in the phonemic systems of the three languages account for most of the phonological interference shown in the above examples. Phonetic differences such as differences in points and manner of articulation of sounds like [t, d, l, r] cause interference. The failure of the Tagalog speaker to aspirate voiceless stops causes interference on the part of his listener, who often hears /p-, t-, k-/ as /b-, d-, g-/. The non-diphthongal nature of Tagalog and Spanish vowels which makes it difficult for the Tagalog speaker to pronounce English diphthongs is another problem.

As has been indicated, an additional problem is spelling pronunciation, which leads the Tagalog speaker to give English vowels their full-grade values even when they are in unstressed positions. Finally, an ambivalent attitude toward the type of pronunciation to cultivate (a "Stateside" pronunciation or a Filipino-English variety) serves to complicate the problem. Mention has been made of the fact that the bilingual often cultivates both a sophisticated and a folk pronunciation of English: the former he uses when talking to native speakers of English and in formal situations, and the latter when he wants to assure his Filipino friends that he is "one of them."

Among the results of the influx of foreign words into Tagalog is a considerable change in the Tagalog phonological system. For one thing, the number of vowel-phonemes has changed from three to five.¹² For another, the presence of consonant clusters in loan words has changed the basic Tagalog Consonant-Vowel-Consonant pattern

to include Consonant-Consonant-Vowel-Consonant in educated speech. Finally, the bilingual still fluctuates between the use of /f, v, θ, ð, š, z/ and their respective substitutions /p, b, t, d, s, s/ but these foreign sounds are fast becoming part of the language.

II. MORPHOLOGICAL BORROWINGS

Borrowing of Full Words

The question of whether borrowings affect the grammar of a language which has borrowed extensively from another is pertinent at this point. More specifically, the question is whether Tagalog grammar has been seriously influenced by its contact with Spanish and English or whether the borrowed morphological elements are, to quote Sapir, "but superficial additions on the morphological kernel of the language."¹³

Jespersen maintains it is an exaggeration to claim that the grammar of a language cannot be affected by borrowing since "the vocabulary of a language and its 'grammatical apparatus' cannot be nicely separated."¹⁴ Moreover, Haugen adds:

if loanwords are to be incorporated into the utterances of a new language, they must be fitted into its grammatical structure. This means that they must be assigned by the borrower to the various grammatical classes which are distinguished by his own language. Insofar as these are different from those of the model language, an analysis and adjustment will be necessary . . . ¹⁵

In the same way that no easy and simple statement can be made about phonological adaptation of Spanish and English loans, grammatical borrowings also defy easy explanation. As has been indicated earlier, Tagalog borrowings have been from all grammatical classes: nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs as well as function words. English and Spanish nouns are adopted as Tagalog nouns; English and Spanish verbs, adjectives, adverbs as well as function words are borrowed as such. The process, however, is not simply that of substituting a Spanish or an English loan for a Tagalog word. Within the form classes themselves modifications are made.

This is to be expected since "the borrowed form is usually subjected to the system of the borrowing language, both as to syntax. . . and as to the indispensable inflections. . . and the fully current 'living' constructions of composition. . . and word formation. . ." ¹⁶ Besides, as Jespersen asserts, "when a word is borrowed, it is not as a rule taken over with all the elaborate flexion which may belong to it in its original home . . ." ¹⁷

It is the case that in many loans from Spanish and English, grammatical categories of number, gender, person and tense, obligatory in the borrowed languages, are ignored or confused. In the case of Spanish borrowings, the confusion is partly due to the fact that, as a rule, Spanish had been learned and passed on orally. ¹⁸ The confusion in English, however, seems to be partly traceable to overlearning. For instance, a Tagalog learner of English may transfer the -s plural marker even to nouns that form their plurals in different ways.

A Spanish noun may be borrowed in the plural form but used as a singular or vice versa. Examples of Spanish words borrowed in the plural to indicate both the singular and the plural are the following:

Ilang oras ka naghintay? 'How many hours did you wait?'
Isang oras lang. *'One hours only'; i.e., 'Only for an hour.'

Other examples include:

beses 'time' – *vez* 'time' *veces* 'times'
relos 'watch' – *reloj* 'watch' *relojes* 'watches'¹⁹
alahas 'jewelry' *alhaja* 'jewelry' *alhajas* 'pieces of jewelry'
manggas 'sleeve' *manga* 'sleeve' *mangas* 'sleeves'
sopas 'soup' – *sopa* 'soup'
galyetas 'a kind of biscuit' – *galleta* 'a kind of biscuit' *galletas* 'biscuits'
punyos, 'cuff' – *puño* 'cuff' *puños* 'cuffs'
sardinas 'sardine' – *sardina* 'sardine' *sardinas* 'sardines'
pulgas 'flea' – *pulga* 'flea' *pulgas* 'fleas'
patatas 'potato' – *patata* 'potato' *patatas* 'potatoes'
peras 'pear' – *pera* 'pear' *peras* 'pears'
bores 'voice' – *voz* 'voice' *voces* 'voices'

Borrowing of Spanish and English words in the singular for forms that are plural in the borrowed languages include:

pera -- *perras* 'money' (slang)
kumplanyo -- *cumpleaños* 'birthday'
prenda -- *prendas* 'a game of forfeits'
limpyabota -- *limpiabotas* 'bootblack'
sisor -- 'scissors'
trosor -- 'trousers'
player -- 'pliers'
pant -- 'pants'

The use of the English hyperforms *furnitures*, *baggages*, *luggages*, *properties* or *jewelries* for *furniture*, *baggage*, *luggage*, *property* or *jewelry* is also common.

The definite articles *el/la* used to mark Spanish nouns and "the" are sometimes interpreted as part of the nouns. Such nouns are therefore doubly marked by the Tagalog noun marker *ang* and the Spanish *el/la* or the English "the." Some examples are:

ang el toro -- *el toro* 'the the bull'
ang lamesa -- *la mesa* 'the the table'
ang di end -- the end 'the the end'

The Tagalog speaker makes a masculine/feminine distinction in certain borrowed Spanish nouns but *el/la* are replaced by *ang*. Thus:

ang doktor/doktora -- *el doctor/la doctora* 'the male/female doctor'
ang konsehal/konsehala -- *el concejal/la concejala* 'the male/female councillor'

(Note that in colloquial speech, the Spanish usage of the feminine forms to mean 'the doctor's wife' or 'the councillor's wife' is also fairly common among Tagalog speakers. Thus they would refer to a councillor's wife as *ang konsehala* or *Misis Kawnsilor*.)

Other evidence of the confusion pertaining to nouns (and also predicate adjectives) is the use of redundant agentive markers. Some of the examples are as follows:

komikero - **comico** 'comedian', 'comic'
musikero - **musico** 'musician', 'musical'
pakialamero - *pakialam* 'meddler' + **-ero** 'Spanish agentive suffix'

Confusion in the gender of the borrowed nouns is shown in the following:

sinisera for **cenicero** 'ash tray'
klaro for **clara** 'white of an egg'
tira for **tiro** (noun) 'throw', 'shot'
Loreta for **Loreto** 'a girl's name'
mismo for **mismo** and **misma** 'myself'

In the case of adjectives, the Tagalog speaker may adopt both the Spanish stem and its suffix with its gender distinctions; i.e., he may borrow the forms as they are used in Spanish or he may create new forms using the borrowed suffixes. Thus, he may borrow *atrebido/-ida* - **atrebido/-ida** 'daring', 'audacious' or create a new form *awayero,-era* - **away** 'fight' / **-ero/era** 'quarrelsome'. (See the section on affixes for more examples.)

Just as the Tagalog speaker tends to ignore or confuse number distinctions in the usage of borrowed nouns, he also fails to distinguish between Spanish adjective forms in the singular and those in the plural. Thus he would say *Kapritsosa ang babae/Kapritsosa ang (mga) babae* for **La mujer es caprichosa/Las mujeres son caprichosas** 'The woman is capricious/The women are capricious'.

Another type of confusion is seen in the use of double comparative and superlative forms. A few examples are:

mas lalong mabuti (literally, 'more more good'; i.e., better) - **mas** 'more' + **lalo** 'more' + **-ng** 'linker' + **mabuti** 'good'
mor beter 'more better'
pinakamasimportante (literally, 'most importantest') - **pinaka** - 'superlative marker' + **mas** 'more' + **importante** 'important'
 the most beautiful 'the most beautiful'

Verb loans are more complicated. The Spanish verbs are usually borrowed in the third person, singular number. These serve as bases and are subjected to Tagalog verbalization through affixation. The Tagalog verb thus formed is usually not inflected for number but only for aspect. The same verb base selects different affixes depending on

whether it occurs in an active (actor is the subject) or a passive (some other grammatical element is the subject) sentence construction. Moreover, different affixes are used with the same verbal base depending on the type of passive construction.²⁰ Thus *tantya-tantear* 'to calculate', 'to try' takes the following forms, among others:

<i>tumantya</i> 'calculate!'	
<i>tumantya</i> 'calculated'	take actor
<i>tumatantya</i> 'is/are calculating'	as subject
<i>tatantya</i> 'will calculate'	
<i>tantyahin</i> 'calculate!'	take some other grammatical
<i>tinantya</i> 'calculated'	element as the subject
<i>tinatantya</i> 'is/are calculating'	
<i>tatantyahin</i> 'will calculate'	

Thus:

<i>Tumantya ka ng dalawang metro.</i>	'Calculate two meters.'
<i>Tantyahin mo ang dalawang metro.</i>	
<i>Tumantya si Ana ng limang kilo.</i>	'Ana estimated five kilos.'
<i>Tinantya ni and limang kilo.</i>	

intindi – **entender** 'to understand'

<i>intindihin</i> 'understand (it) !'
<i>inintindi</i> 'was/were understood'
<i>iniintindi</i> 'is/are being understood'
<i>iintindihin</i> 'will be understood'

With a different affix, the base acquires a new meaning:

<i>mag-intindi</i> 'to take care of', 'to worry about'
<i>nag-intindi</i> 'took care of', 'worried about'
<i>nag-iintindi</i> 'is/are taking care of', 'is/are worrying about'
<i>mag-iintindi</i> 'will take care of', 'will worry about'

The English verbs, however, are borrowed in their base and gerund forms. Like the borrowed Spanish verbs, they undergo a process of affixation, are inflected not for tense but aspect, and occur in active and passive constructions.

hayk – *hayking* – 'hike', 'hiking'

<i>maghayk</i> – <i>maghayking</i> 'go for a hike'
<i>naghayk</i> – <i>naghayking</i> 'went for a hike'
<i>naghahayk</i> – <i>naghahayking</i> 'is/are hiking'
<i>maghahayk</i> – <i>maghahayking</i> 'will go hiking'

bend – *bending* – 'bend', 'bending'

<i>magbend</i> – <i>magbending</i> 'bend'
<i>nagbend</i> – <i>nagbending</i> 'bent'
<i>nagbebend</i> – <i>nagbebending</i> 'is/are bending'
<i>magbebend</i> – <i>magbebending</i> 'will bend'

The Tagalog speaker often ignores number and tense distinctions in English verbs but he also tends to “overlearn” and use double past signals as in:

nagtaught ‘*taughted’ – *nag-* ‘past marker’ + *taught*
nacontacted ‘*contacteted’ – *na* ‘past marker’ + *contacted*

Related to the use of double past signals is the use of double markers to indicate the third person singular number of English verbs in the present. Thus:

Does she goes every day?

She does not agrees with me.

In the case of adverbs, Spanish and English borrowings usually conform to adverbial usage in native Tagalog and do not undergo morphological changes. In Tagalog there are no adjective/adverb contrasts of the form *rápido/rápidamente* ‘rapid/rapidly’ or pretty/prettily. Instead, Tagalog uses the particle *nang* with an adjective to show adverbial use. For example, one says *Mabagal ang bata*. ‘The child is slow.’ and *Tumakbo siya nang mabagal*. ‘He ran slowly.’ If the Tagalog speaker wants to use a loan word as an adverb he simply uses the borrowing with *nang*. Thus: *Kumain siya nang puerte*. ‘He ate heartily.’ - *fuerte/fuertemente* ‘hearty/heartily’ and *Umalis siya nang engri*. ‘He left angrily.’ Other adverbs are borrowed complete with their –ly or –mente forms, as *precisamente* ‘precisely’ and actually.

The ease and naturalness with which a Tagalog bilingual manipulates a borrowed word or phrase so that it can function as a noun, a verb or an adjective deserves mention. The following examples show how almost any part of speech, can be borrowed and then be nominalized, verbalized or adjectivized.

gwapo – *guapo* ‘handsome’

gumwapo ‘became handsome’

pinagwapo ‘was made handsome’

pampagwapo ‘something that makes one handsome’

pagkagwapo ‘one’s handsomeness’

piknik – ‘picnic’

magpiknik ‘to have a picnic’

piknikan ‘a picnic area’

prug – ‘frug’

nagpuprug ‘doing the frug’

ang kaprug ‘the person one is doing the frug with’

and pagprug ‘the way one does the frug’

bitnik – ‘beatnik’

magbibitnik ‘will become a beatnik’

bitnik-bitnikan ‘a phony beatnik’

kabibitnik ‘as a result of being a beatnik’

lektyur – ‘lecture’

naglektyur ‘gave a lecture’

and lektyuran ‘the place where the lectures are held’

ang pagkalektyur 'the way the lecture was conducted'

take down

Nagtakedown ka ba ng notes? 'Did you take down notes?'

Kahit itakedown mo lahat, mahirap pa rin. 'Even if you take down everything, it is still hard.'

Nag-improve ang pagtakedown mo ng lecture. 'The way you take down the lectures has improved.'

bending exercises

Araw-araw nagbebending exercise kami. 'Every morning we do our bending exercises.'

Anong bending exercises ang alam mo? 'What bending exercises do you know?'

Kabending-exercise kosi Rogelio. 'Roger is my bending exercise partner.'

via Europe

Nag-via Europe sila. 'They went home via Europe.'

Via Europe ba ang uwi ninyo? 'Are you going home via Europe?'

Mahirap and biyahe na via Europe. 'The trip via Europe is difficult.'

look up

Nilook up mo ba ang meaning sa diksyonari? 'Did you look up the meaning in the dictionary?'

Mali ang pag-look-up mo. 'The way you looked it up was wrong.'

Naubos ang time ko sa kalulook up ng words. 'I spent all my time looking up words.'

run for mayor

Akala ko nagrun ka for mayor. 'I thought you ran for mayor.'

Hindi biro ang magrun for mayor. 'Running for mayor is no joke.'

going steady

Going steady na ba sila? 'Are they going steady already?'

Ayoko silang maggoing steady. 'I don't want them to be going steady.'

The Tagalog pronoun system has managed to remain intact and is not markedly influenced by foreign elements. Certain Spanish pronouns have, however, come into restricted use. These are *mio/mia* 'my', 'mine' mostly in exclamations of dismay, surprise, exasperation or any strong feeling, as in *Diyos miyo!* – ¡*Dios mio!* 'My God!,' *Madre miya!* – ¡*Madre mia!* (literally, 'My Mother!') or *iha miya* – *hija mia* (literally, 'my child') and reflexive pronoun *mismo* used with a Tagalog pronoun as in *ako mismo*–*yo mismo* 'I myself' or *siya mismo* – *él mismo/ella misma* 'he/she himself/herself.' The masculine form *mismo* is used in Tagalog even when the referent is feminine. Only the first person pronouns just mentioned have been borrowed, but a further foreign influence may be reflected in the Tagalog use of *kayo*, the plural form of the second person pronoun when addressing one person to show respect or in recognition of a higher status on the part of the person addressed. The plural form is also used to indicate social distance. One wonders if this is innate in Tagalog or is an effect of the *usted/tu* distinction in Spanish. Although *usted* takes a third person singular verb, it functions as a second person form when used in addressing one person politely. That this practice of using the second person plural pronoun may be foreign is suggested by its absence in other related

languages, for example Malay. In polite address, a Malay uses the name or title of the person addressed instead of the second person pronoun. The person spoken to likewise refers to himself in the third person. This avoidance of personal pronouns is characteristic of Malay usage. Thus:

Servant: Tuan Smith ada di-rumah? 'Is Mr. Smith at home?

Mr. Smith: Tuan Smith ada (or Dia ada). 'Mr. Smith is',
(or 'He is')²¹

Kany points out that in addition to being a form of respect, *usted* may be employed with older children to show anger.²² This usage coincides with the ironic use of the Tagalog polite particle *po* and/or *kayo* by parents to censure their children,

In Tagalog, the *ng* pronouns (a class of pronouns that substitutes for nouns used in passive constructions) + a noun or the particle *ni* + the name of a person indicates the "possessor" of the noun. Thus: *tindahan niya* *store his/her, i.e., 'the woman's store'. The Tagalog pattern (*ng/ni* + noun) is similar to the English use of the "of" phrase, as in the leg of the table (*ang paa ng mesa*) or the foot of the mountain (*ang paa ng bundok*).

As a result of the contact with English, the 's possessive case marker is now evident not only in speech but also is seen on store signs. Thus: *Fely's Carinderia* for *Karinderya ni Fely* 'Fely's Restaurant'; *Nena's Sari-Sari Store* for *Tindahang Sari-Sari ni Nena* 'Nena's General Store'; Ana's Farmacia for *Parmasya ni Ana* 'Ana's Pharmacy'. Not only has the 's possessive morpheme been borrowed, but also the English word order to show possession. The Spanish influence is evident in the use of the pattern: possessed + possessor as in *Botica Boie* 'Boie Drug Store' or Club Filipino 'Filipino Club'.

The Tagalog speaker often has trouble with Spanish and English prepositions. One problem is due to the analysis of certain Spanish prepositions as being part of the nouns. This results in the use of two prepositions, as, for example the Spanish *a* and the Tagalog *sa*: *sa abeynte* – *a veinte* 'on on the 20th'; *sa ala una* *at at one o'clock'. A reverse type of confusion is seen in *sa kisame* 'in the loft' for *sa sakisame* from *zaquisame* 'loft'. In this case, *za-* (respelled as *sa* and interpreted as the Tagalog preposition *sa* meaning 'on', 'in', 'at') is wrongly analyzed as being separate from what is part of the word –*quisame*²³ (Cf. English an apron, an adder). A similar type of confusion is seen in children's use of *peryodi* and *lasti* for *periodico* 'newspaper' and *elastico* 'elastic material', respectively. The final –*co* is interpreted as the Tagalog pronoun *ko* used as a possessive marker after the noun possessed, as in *bahay ko* 'my house'.

Although a language does not normally borrow function words from a foreign language, the long period of contact with Spanish has resulted in making certain Spanish function words very much a part of Tagalog. A few examples are the connectors like *pero* 'but', *o* 'or', *ni-ni* 'neither-nor', *o-o* 'either-or', and *pues, entonces* 'then, therefore'.

English and Spanish hesitation and transition words or phrases are often used also. A few of them are *como se llama* as in *Nakita ko si . . . como se llama . . .* 'I saw . . . what's his name . . .'; *Este . . . ano ang napagkayarian ninyo?* 'Uh . . . what have you agreed upon?'

Borrowing of Affixes

Derivative endings certainly belong to the grammatical apparatus of a language; yet many such endings have been taken over into another language as parts of borrowed words and have then been freely combined with native speech-material.²⁴

A number of Spanish affixes have found their way into Tagalog. They may co-exist with the Tagalog affixes or may be used instead of the native forms. The Spanish suffixes *-ero/-era*, *-ador/-adora*, *-ista* and *-ante* co-exist with the Tagalog agentives */mang --man --mam/* (phonologically variant) and *mag*.²⁵ Some examples are:

trabahador – *trabajador* ‘laborer’ – *manggagawa* ‘laborer’
peskador – *pescador* ‘fisherman’ – *mangingisda* ‘fisherman’
nobelista – *novelista* ‘novelist’ – *manunulat ng nobela* ‘novelist’

In other examples, the Spanish has no Tagalog competitor, or at least the Spanish borrowings are more commonly used than their Tagalog counterparts.

retratista – *retratista* ‘photographer’
hardinero – *jardinero* – ‘gardener’
komersyante – *comerciante* – ‘trader’, ‘merchant’
komedyante – *comediante* – ‘comedian’

All the examples above show that the lexical items themselves (stem + suffix) are borrowed. In the following examples, the borrowed Spanish suffixes are attached either to a Tagalog or an English stem, supporting Bloomfield’s contention that “when an affix occurs in enough foreign words, it may be extended to new formations with native material.”²⁶

pakialamero/-ra ‘meddler’ – *pakialam* ‘meddler’ + *-ero/-era*
pasikatero/-ra ‘show-off’ – *pasikat* ‘show-off’ + *-ero/-era*
tenista – tennis + *-ista* ‘tennis player’ (collapsed from *tenisista*)
butangero ‘mugger’ *butang* ‘mug’ ‘beat up’ + *-ero*

In still other examples, it seems that the Spanish stems are borrowed and then the Spanish agentive suffixes are attached to the stems to form nouns usually of a different or extended meaning. Examples are *palikero* ‘playboy’ – *palique* ‘chit chat’ + *-ero* and *pahinante* ‘porter’, ‘stevedore’ – *paje* ‘page’, ‘valet’ + *-ante*.

Two other suffixes that have become a part of the Tagalog language are the diminutive suffixes *-ito/-ita*, *-illo/-illa*, and the augmentative suffix *-on*. For example:

mesa-mesita – *mesa-mesita* ‘table’, ‘small table’
kapiraso-kapirasito – *pedazo-pedacito* ‘piece’, ‘small piece’
istampa-istampita – *estampa-estampita* ‘print’, ‘small print’; ‘portrait’, ‘small portrait’ (The Tagalog meaning is limited to religious pictures given to parochial school students.)
papel-papilito – *papel-papelito* ‘paper’, ‘small paper’
pobre-pobresito – *pobre-pobrecito* ‘poor’, ‘poor little thing’
mongha-monghita – *monja-monjita* ‘nun’, ‘small nun’

eskina-eskinita – **esquina-esquinita** ‘corner’

(The Tagalog meanings are ‘alley’, ‘a small alley’ and Cassell’s ‘does not list **esquinita** as a diminutive form)

kopa-kopita – **copa-copita** ‘cup’, ‘small cup’

kwarto-kwartito – **cuarto-cuartito** ‘room’, ‘small room’

bintana-bintanilya – **ventana-ventanilla** ‘window’, ‘small window’ (as in a railway carriage). The Tagalog meanings are ‘window’, ‘a small window’ (as in a house).

lampara-lamparilya – **lampara-lamparilla** ‘lamp’, ‘small lamp’

kusina-kusirilya – **cocina-cocinilla** ‘kitchen’, ‘stove’

gantso-gantsilyo – **gancho-ganchillo** ‘hook’, ‘little hook’ (In Tagalog, *gantsilyo* refers to a crochet hook.)

In a few cases the whole paradigm for a term is borrowed. Thus:

kutsara-kutsarita-kutsaron **cuchara-cucharita-cucharón**
‘spoon’, ‘small spoon’, ‘large spoon’

kaha-kahita-kahon – **caja-cajita-cajón** ‘box’, ‘little box’, ‘big box’ (In Tagalog, *kahon* usually means ‘box’; *kaha* ‘safe’; and *kahita* often refers to very small jewels boxes.)

tasa-tasita-tason – **taza-tacita-tazón** ‘cup’, ‘small cup’, ‘large bowl’

Sometimes only the diminutive or augmentative forms are borrowed. Thus:

kambing-kabron – **cabra-cabrón** ‘goat’, ‘buck’

pantalon-kalsonsilyo – **calza-calzoncillos** ‘trousers’, ‘men’s undergarments’

trumpo-malaking trumpo – **trompo-trompón** ‘top’, ‘large top’

sigarilyo-tabako – **cigarillo-cigarros-puros** ‘cigarette’, ‘cigar’

In other instances, the Spanish diminutive suffixes have come to have a different meaning. Thus:

tsino-tsinito ‘Chinese’, ‘Chinese-like’ (especially with reference to the eyes)
– **chino** ‘Chinese’

mestiso-mestisilyo ‘hybrid’, ‘having somewhat European features’
mestizo ‘hybrid’

The Tagalog diminutive suffix *-ling* often co-exists with the Spanish forms *-ito/-ita*.

Angela–Angelita–Angela-Angeling – **Angela-Angelita** ‘names of girls’,
‘nicknames for Angela’

The use of English diminutives is common in Filipino nicknames. Robert-Berting (Bertito) is losing out to Robert-Bobby in the same way that Rosaling is considered old-fashioned and has given way to Rosalie, Sally or Rosie. Other common nicknames are Boy, Jun (from Junior) and Baby. They have replaced the Tagalog Totoy and Nene.

The Spanish *-na/-no* and *-ena/-eno* ‘native’ of *_____* alternate with the Tagalog *taga-_____* with the same meaning. Thus:

taga-Maynila ~ *Manilenya* – **Manileña** ‘from Manila’

taga-Amerika ~ *Amerikano* – **Americano** ‘American’

taga-probinsya 'from the province' ~ **probinsyano** – *provincia* 'province'
+ **-ano** (But: *tagasiyudad* 'from the city' – **ciudad** 'city')

In many instances, the Spanish forms are preferred to the Tagalog and often the Spanish spelling is preferred. Examples are:

Zamboangueno 'from Zamboanga'
Batangueño 'from Batangas'
Pampangueno 'from Pampanga'
Bicolano 'from Bicol'
Boholano 'from Bohol'

The English suffix *-less* has found its way into Tagalog as a bound form in such loans as *islibles* 'sleeveless', *bakles* 'backless', and *taples* 'topless'. That *-less* is recognized as a suffix is shown in *pañueloless* from *pañuelo* 'a kind of shawl', 'a neckcloth' + *-less* meaning 'without a pañuelo'.

Although it has not quite made its way into formally accepted speech, the English suffix *-able* is used jokingly with *tanggal* 'to remove', and *tanggalable* 'detachable' is fast supplanting the Spanish loan *kitay pone* from *quita y pone* 'to remove and to put': i.e., 'detachable'. One also hears *lababol* 'can be washed' from *laba* 'to wash' + *-able*. But these examples belong to a different "key" and are used mostly for comic effect.²⁷

The Spanish superlative suffix *-ísimo* is also borrowed as a bound form in words like *santísimo* – **santísimo** 'most holy' (often used in Tagalog as an interjection) and *pyanisimo* – **pianissimo** 'very soft'.

Although the Tagalog agentive markers /*mang-* ~ *mam-* ~ *man-*/mentioned earlier are prefixes, not suffixes as agentive markers are in Spanish, suffixation is used as a device in Tagalog. There is, for example the locational suffix /*-an* ~ *-han*/ (phonologically variant) as in *kain* 'to eat' *kainan* 'an eating place'; *bili* 'to buy' *bilihan* 'a place where things are bought'. This Tagalog locational suffix /*-han* ~ *-an*/, incidentally, often finds competition with the Spanish locational suffixes *-ria* and *-ero*. Thus:

tindahan 'shop', 'stall' – **tienda** 'shop', 'stall' + *-han*
pansiteriya 'a kind of restaurant' *pansit* 'a kind of noodles' + **-ria**
sapaterya **zapateria** 'a shoemaker's shop' ~ *sapatusan*
'a shoemaker's shop' **zapato** 'shoe' + *-an*
kapitera – **cafetero** 'coffee pot' ~ *kapihan* 'coffee pot', 'place where coffee is served' – *kape* – **cafe** 'coffee' + *-han*
salero – **salero** 'salt cellar' ~ *asinan* 'salt cellar', 'place where salt is made' – *asin* 'salt' + *-an*

Sapir would probably deny that the examples given above are
“true evidences of a morphological influence exerted by one language on another. Setting aside the fact that they belong to the sphere of derivational concepts and do not touch the central morphological problem of the expression of relational ideas they have added nothing to the structural peculiarities [of Tagalog]”²⁸

In other words, just as “English was already prepared for the relation of pity to piteous by such a native pair as luck and lucky”²⁹ Tagalog was ready for the relation of *basura-basurero* - *basura-basurero* ‘garbage’, ‘garbage collector’ because of such pairs as *takbo-takbuhan* ‘to run’, ‘a place for running’ or *dukot - mandurukot* ‘to pick pockets’, ‘a pickpocket’.

The introduction of the agentive, diminutive, augmentative and locative suffixes mentioned above in Tagalog probably makes “hardly more of a difference in the essential build of the language than the mere fact that it incorporated a given number of words.”³⁰ Sapir would probably consider these morphological influences as only slightly “different in kind from the mere borrowing of words.” As a matter of fact, it is tempting to agree with Sapir that such morphological borrowings are no different from lexical borrowings. In many cases it is actually difficult to tell if the naive speaker is aware, for instance, that the endings are bound forms functioning in the same way as the Tagalog prefixes. It is possible that he thinks that he is borrowing a word like *trabahador* from *trabajador* ‘worker’ and not a bound and a free form *trabajo* + *-ador* with loss of *-o*. That this is possible seems to find support in borrowings of other kinds. For instance, in *aplaya* ‘seashore’ — a ‘to’ + *playa* ‘seashore’, the preposition is considered part of the word, resulting in a redundant form like *sa aplaya* ‘*to to seashore’ (see the section above on morphological borrowings for more examples of this kind). Notice, however, the words *basketbolero* ‘basketball’ player’ — *basketbol* — ‘basketball’ + *-ero*, *babaero* ‘a Don Juan’ — *babae* ‘woman’ + *-ero*, *sabungero* ‘one who frequents cockfights’ — *sabong* ‘cockfight’ + *-ero*, and *bakasyonista* ‘vacationer’ — *vacación* ‘vacation’ — *-ista*, where the borrowed Spanish suffixes — *-ero* and *-ista* are attached to a native or to a borrowed English or Spanish stem, giving evidence that the Tagalog is aware that he is borrowing Spanish suffixes and that these borrowed suffixes are productive.

It is not easy to dismiss these Spanish borrowings as merely constituting a form of lexical borrowing for one important reason. These borrowed suffixes add a new dimension: the concept of gender embodied in the suffix itself, shown in the contrasts — *-ero/-era*, — *-ador/-adora*, — *-ito/-ita*, — *-illo/-illa* and — *-eno/-ena*. When a gender distinction needs to be made, Tagalog uses a *na ~ -ng* (alternants) + *lalaki/babae* phrase (‘linker + man/woman’). Thus: *manggagawang lalaki* for *trabahador* ‘a male worker’ and *manggagawang babae* for *trabahadora* ‘a female worker.’ In Spanish loans shown in the following, the masculine-feminine distinctions are indicated by the Tagalog speaker without using a *na ~ ng* + *lalaki/babae* phrase.

- kusinero/-era* — *cocinero/-era* ‘cook’
tindero/-era — *tendera/-era* ‘shopkeeper’
senyorito/-ita — *señorito/-ita* ‘master’, ‘mistress’
tsismoso/-sa — *chismoso/-sa* ‘one who gossips’
luhoso/-sa — *lujoso/-sa* ‘showy’, ‘luxurious’
kondinado/-da — *condenado/-da* ‘perverse’, ‘damned’
istupido/-da — *estupido/-da* ‘dull’, ‘stupid’
kastilyano/-na — *castellano/-na* ‘Castilian’

One can argue that such masculine/feminine distinctions based on the sex of animate beings apply only to loan words. There are no contrasts in native Tagalog words like *maganda*/**magando* 'pretty' or *anak*/**anako* 'child' corresponding to Spanish *guapa*/*guapo* 'handsome' and *hija*/*hijo* 'daughter/son'. Instead, the Tagalog speaker says *magandang lalaki*/*magandang babae* 'handsome man/woman' and *anak na lalaki*/*babae* 'son/daughter'.

That these gender distinctions exist only in borrowings does not alter the fact that Spanish did introduce a new grammatical category into Tagalog: that of gender. Borrowings employing these gender distinctions are pervasive and extensive and therefore constitute a true addition to the language.

Other than introducing distinctions in borrowed nouns and adjectives, however, Spanish and English have not greatly affected Tagalog grammar. Obligatory distinctions in the foreign languages such as tense and number have not, in general, been transferred to Tagalog. Rather, the borrowings are made to conform to the morphological system of Tagalog. In general one may say that instead of involving great grammatical changes in Tagalog, the borrowings from Spanish and English often simply present the Tagalog speaker with alternate shapes for certain morphemes. The central core of the Tagalog lexicon has been affected by the borrowings, but one must not equate a language with its vocabulary.

III. SEMANTIC BORROWING

The most obvious and most productive type of borrowing is that on the semantic level. In the examples following, both Spanish and English elements will be given without indicating which words came into the Tagalog language first. But for historical reasons it can be assumed that the Spanish loans represent older borrowings.

Borrowing takes place for a number of reasons. When there is a new cultural item and there is no equivalent term for it, the borrowed word is adopted. The Tagalog seems to borrow words just as readily as he accepts new cultural elements. A few examples of loan words for past and present cultural novelties are as follows:

Spanish Loans ³¹	English Loans
<i>pyesta</i> - <i>fiesta</i> 'festival', 'merriment', 'holiday'	<i>kopi breyk</i> - 'coffee break'
<i>krusipiho</i> - <i>crucifijo</i> 'crucifix'	<i>ismok glas</i> - 'smoked glasses'
<i>kasa de empenyos</i> - <i>casa de empeños</i> , 'pawnshop'	<i>sinemaskop</i> - 'cinemascope'
<i>Syete Palabra</i> - <i>Siete Palabras</i> 'Seven Last Words' (of Christ)	<i>sosyal sekyuriti</i> - 'social security'
	<i>mini iskert</i> - 'miniskirt'

A borrowed word may exist with a native word to indicate a certain aspect or a different context in which the borrowing is used (differential borrowing).

kanin 'rice' but *aros caldo* - *arroz con caldo* for *sopa de arroz* 'a rice dish' and *rays puding* - 'rice pudding'

buwan 'moon' but *luna de myel* - *luna de miel* 'honeymoon' and *hanimun* 'honeymoon'

buwan 'month' but *syete mesinos* – *siete mesinos* 'a seven-month baby';
i.e., premature. Connotes dullness, stupidity

salapi 'money' but *mutso dinero* – *mucho dinero* 'monied'

ginto 'gold' but *boda de oro* – **boda de oro** '50th wedding anniversary' and
gold digger – 'gold digger'

kilay 'eyebrows' but *aybro pensil* – 'eyebrow pencil'

linggo 'week' but *Semana Santa* – **Semana Santa** 'Holy Week'

kamay 'hand' but *bwena mano* – **buena mano** (literally, 'good hand'); a storekeeper's
first customer of the day, who is given a good bargain because he is
supposed to bring the storekeeper good luck for **buena suerte**
and *sekon hen* – 'second hand'

bulaklak 'flower' but *Plores de Mayo* – **Flores de Mayo** 'a semi-religious festival'

tubig 'water' but *agwa de kal* – **agua de cal** 'mineral water' *agwador* – **aguador**
'water carrier' and *agwa bendita* – **agua bendita** 'holy water'

simbahan 'church' but *Iglesya ni Kristo* – **Iglesia de Cristo** 'a religious sect'

mamalengke 'to shop for food at a market' but *magsyaping* 'to go shopping at
a department store'

salita 'word' but *palabra de onor* – **palabra de honor** 'word of honor'

A borrowed word may replace the Tagalog lexeme. In these cases the use of the native word actually sounds pedantic or non-native.

bandera ~ *bandila* – **bandera** 'flag' and *pleg* – 'flag' for T *watawat* 'flag'

silya – *silla* 'chair' for T *upuan* 'chair'

dimpols – 'dimples' for T *biloy* 'dimples'

A borrowed word may exist as an alternate form. Borrowing presents the native speaker with alternate words for the same concept, and the use of the alternates seems random.

paaralan 'school' ~ *eskwelahan* – **escuela** 'school' ~ *iskul* – 'school'

aklat 'book' ~ *libro* – **libro** 'book' ~ *buk* – 'book'

balikan 'round trip' ~ *idebwelta* – *ida y vuelta* (literally, 'and return')

ikadalawa 'two o'clock' ~ *alas dos* – *las dos* 'two o'clock' ~ *tu o klak* – 'two
o'clock'

A word is borrowed when a loan is correlated with status. The following foreign titles indicate respect and formality:

Mister/Mis/Misis – 'Mr./Miss/Mrs.'

Don/Donya – **Don/Doña** 'Mister/Mrs.' (the Spanish titles for gentleman/
lady, used only before the Christian name)

Besides undergoing phonological modifications, borrowings likewise are subject to semantic change. Most loans retain their original meaning, or at least most of the senses in which they are used in the borrowed language.

erport – ‘airport’
galon – **galón** ‘gallon’
trapik – ‘traffic’
grabe – **grave** ‘grave’, ‘momentous’, ‘serious’
swabe – **suave** ‘smooth’, ‘soft’, ‘mellow’

Some words widen or extend their meaning.

seksi – ‘sexy (but also ‘well-dressed’, ‘pretty’)’
propesor – ‘professor’ (but also ‘any teacher in college’)’
gago – **gago** ‘one who mispronounces a word’ (but also ‘dumb’, ‘stupid’)’
bomba – ‘bomb’, ‘pump’ – **bomba** ‘bomb’, ‘pump’. Now *bomba* also means ‘a fiery political speech, an extravagant bet, as in poker.’ The most recent meaning is having to do with nudity or sex,’ as in ‘*bomba* movie’.

Change in scope of meaning (semantic expansion) is likewise illustrated by numerous cases of brand names which gain acceptance as generic names. Usually the trademark of the product first introduced into country becomes the generic term for subsequent products of the same kind but a different brand.

Kat Rayt – Cut Right ‘wax paper’
Kolgeyt – Colgate ‘toothpaste’
Klīneks – Kleenex ‘tissue’
IBM – IBM ‘calculating machine’
Pridyider – Frigidaire ‘refrigerator’
Siroks – Xerox ‘duplicating machine’
Singher – Singer ‘sewing machine’
Neskape – Nescafe ‘instant coffee’
Kodak – Kodak ‘camera’

(Compare these with English Kleenex, Vaseline and Xerox, where the brand names have also acquired generic meaning.)

Still others restrict or narrow in meaning.

leydi – lady > ‘unmarried woman’
hitsura – **hechura** ‘figure’, ‘form’, ‘build’ > ‘facial features’
anomali – anomaly > ‘graft and corruption’
despedida – **fiesta de despedida** ‘farewell’, ‘leave-taking’ > ‘farewell party’

A word used to designate a general concept in English or Spanish acquires a specific meaning in Tagalog. Tagalog drops the noun qualifier and uses only the noun to denote a specific item in the general category which would in English or Spanish require qualification.

maquina de coser ‘sewing machine’ > *makina* ‘sewing machine’

maquina de escribir ‘typewriter’ > *makinilya* ‘typewriter’

roller skating *mag-iskeyting*

A borrowed word may represent only one aspect of the whole semantic domain.

estrellya – ‘star’ but **estrella** ‘star’, ‘lot’, ‘fate’ ‘destiny’

lote ‘lot’ but **lote** ‘lot’, ‘chance’, ‘fortune’, ‘a group’

abaniko ‘fan’ but **abanico** ‘fan’, ‘sword’, ‘crane’

madrina ‘godmother’, ‘sponsor at a wedding’ but **madrina** ‘godmother’, ‘bridesmaid’, ‘protectress’, ‘straps’, ‘prop’

partido ‘political party’ but **partido** ‘party’, ‘profit’, ‘interest’, ‘protection’

On the other hand, the different senses of a word may be borrowed and a borrowing may represent more than one aspect of the semantic domain.

libro – **libro** ‘book’, ‘third stomach of a ruminant’

tyempo – **tiempo** ‘time’, ‘tempo’, ‘season’

kwarto – **cuarto** ‘room’, ‘fourth’

Occasionally, the borrowing may also include derivative words and phrases. Thus related to **cabeza** ‘head’ are:

kabesa de barangay – **cabeza de barangay** ‘head of a settlement in pre-Spanish times’, ‘early Spanish local official’

Kabesang Alejandro – **cabeza** + linker (used as a title with the Christian name) (cf. *kabesi* – **cabeza** ‘boss’)

kabisera – **cabecera** ‘head of the table’, ‘capital of a province’

kabisote ‘one who learns by rote’ (This seems to be a coined word from **cabeza**; **cabezota** and **cabezudo** mean obstinate.)

Besides **cara** ‘face’, ‘mien’, Tagalog has borrowed:

karay krus – **cara y cruz** ‘game of pitch and toss’

doble kara – **hombre de dos caras**; **cara con dos haces** ‘deceitful’

mukhang Biyernes Santo – **cara de viernes** or **cara de viernes santo** ‘sad’, ‘lean face’ (In this example, the Tagalog word for face, *mukha*, is substituted for **cara**.)

Related to **decision** ‘decision’ are:

disisyon – **decisión**

disidido – **decidido** ‘decided’, ‘determined’

In addition to *bista* – **vista** ‘view’, ‘vision’, ‘intent’, ‘purpose’, ‘trial’, the following are used:

largabista – **largomira** ‘telescope’

primera bista – **a primera vista** ‘at first sight’

Asta la bista – **Hasta la vista** ‘Goodbye’

may bista – **tener vista** (literally, ‘to have a view’) ‘to look well’ In this case, the Tagalog word for have, *may* is substituted for Spanish **tener** ‘to have’.)

Some words lose their regular meanings altogether.

mutsatso – ‘servant’ – **muchacho** ‘boy’

siguro ‘perhaps’ – **seguro** ‘sure’, ‘certain’ (but *sigurado* ‘sure’ – **asegurado** ‘fixed’, ‘assured’ ‘guaranteed’)

postura ‘well-dressed’ – **postura** ‘posture’, ‘position’, ‘attitude’, for **bien vestido**

sagala ‘a participant in Santa Cruz de Mayo (a kind of semi-religious procession)’ – **zagala** ‘girl’, ‘lass’

osyoso ‘curious’, ‘inquisitive’, – **ocioso** ‘idle’, ‘lazy’, ‘fruitless’

etso diretso ‘custom-built’, – **hecho y derecho** ‘perfect’, ‘absolute’, ‘completo’

istambay ‘bum’, ‘corner loafer’, ‘unemployed’ – standby

tiheras ‘cot’ – **tijeras** ‘scissors’, ‘any X-shaped tool’

A few words have acquired a special connotation, sometimes pejorative.

baylarina ‘a B-girl’ – **bailarina** ‘a professional dancer’

otel – ‘hotel’ (Hotels are often associated with prostitutes and clandestine meetings between men and women. Unless absolutely necessary, one does not stay in a hotel but puts up for the night with a friend or relative).

ninya bonita ‘one trying to look younger than she is’ – **niña bonita** ‘a pretty girl’

hostes – ‘a B-girl’ – hostess

pis taym ‘period before World War II’ – peacetime

dyenwayn ‘goods (clothes, equipment) acquired before WWII’ - genuine

liberesyon ‘the entry of American forces into Manila in 1945’ – liberation

rilip ‘clothes given to war victims’ – relief

Miki Maws ‘paper money issued by the Japanese during the Second World War’ – Mickey Mouse

Blu Sil ‘American’ – blue seal (from the tax stamp on American cigarettes, usually smuggled)

Borrowed words may “weaken” and lose their pejorative meanings.

pilyo ‘naughty’ – **pillo** ‘vagabond’, ‘rascal’, ‘loafer’, ‘blackguard’

salbahe mean– **salvaje** ‘savage’, ‘ferocious’, ‘rough’

A borrowed word may serve as a euphemism for what is taboo in Tagalog or may express directly what must be expressed euphemistically in Tagalog:

Wayt Haws – White House

twylayt – twilight

Misis Marpi – Mrs. Murphy toilet

Mang Elyas from *kasilyas* –*casilla* (Ecuadorian Spanish for *retrete* ‘toilet’)

berd – bird ‘male reproductive organ’

plawer – flower ‘female reproductive organ’

Native terms of endearment *irog*, *giliw*, *mahal* are used mostly in literature and in the movies. People who are self-conscious about addressing their loved ones by the native words of endearment do not hesitate to call them “Honey” or “Sweetheart”.

Semantic Domains of Borrowing

All areas of experience seem to have been affected by linguistic borrowings in Tagalog. Haugen, in his study of the Norwegian language in America, found it quite impossible to predict with any confidence that a given word cannot be borrowed.

One can only say that it is highly probable that words of high frequency in the native language are less likely to be displaced than those of low frequency. . . . But individually and sporadically any word can be borrowed; . . . even the conjunctions **and** and **but** . . . 32

In the Tagalog bilingual situation, even native words of high frequency--in fact, any Tagalog word--can usually be displaced. Borrowing of necessary words does not account for all the loans. One is inclined to think that the Tagalog speaker, aware of the diverse linguistic choices open to him, indulges in luxurious borrowing. The following lists of loan words are by no means exhaustive, but they do show the range and extent of borrowings from Spanish and English. Note that they include all grammatical categories; nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs.

Household articles and appliances

plato – **plato** ‘plate’

kama – **cama** ‘bed’

mikser – ‘mixer’

hawla – **jaula** ‘cage’

pala – **pala** ‘wooden shovel’

wasing masyin – ‘washing machine’

lamp syed – ‘lampshade’

telebisyon – ‘television’

garapinyera – **garapiñera** ‘ice cream freezer’

Articles of clothing and adornment

hat pants – ‘hot pants’

naylons – nylons ‘stockings’

gwantes – **guante** ‘glove’

manton – **mantón** ‘a kind of shawl’

Amerikina – **Americana** ‘a sport coat’

bandana – ‘bandanna’
kot en tay – ‘coat and tie’ (for formal wear)
ibning dres – ‘evening dress’

Flora and Fauna

rosas **rosa** ‘rose’
rusal ‘gardenia’ – **rosal** ‘rose-bush’
orkid – ‘orchid’
baka – **vaca** ‘cow’
kabayo – **caballo** ‘horse’
sibra – ‘zebra’

Church and Religion

nobena – **novena** ‘novena’
santo – **santo** ‘saint’
altar – **altar** ‘altar’
sermon – **sermon** ‘sermon’
belo – **velo** ‘veil’
abstinens – ‘abstinence’
pinitensya – **penitencia** ‘penitence’
Birhen – **virgen** ‘The Blessed Virgin’

Life, Birth, Death

bertday – ‘birthday’ ~ *kumpleanyo* ~ **cumpleaños** ‘birthday’
partido bawtismo – **partido bautismo** ‘baptismal certificate’
sesaryan – Caesarian ‘Caesarian birth’
sementeryo – **cementerio** ‘cemetery’
punerarya – **funeraria** ‘funeral parlor’

Travel and Transportation

eroplano – **aeroplano** ~ *erpleyn* ‘airplane’
purtero – **portero** ‘porter’
trabel naw pey leyter plan – ‘travel now, pay later plan’
wan wey – ‘one way’
loding en unloding son – ‘loading and unloading zone’
parking tiket – ‘parking ticket’
ispeys sip – ‘space ship’
biyahe – **viaje** – ‘travel’
trapik – ‘traffic’
dyet – ‘jet’
dyey wok – ‘jay walk’
pyer – ‘pier’
sigsag rod – ‘zigzag road’

Entertainment (Theatre, Art, Radio, Television)

kolor TB – ‘color TV’
drama – **drama** ‘drama’

personal apirans – ‘personal appearance’
isnik pribyu – ‘sneak preview’
konsyerto – **concierto** ‘concert’
isteyd syo – ‘stage show’
mayk – mike ‘microphone’
art eksibit – ‘art exhibit’
rak en rol – ‘rock and roll’
gloryeta – **glorieta** ‘circle or square at intersection of streets where
band concerts are often held’

Economics, Business, Occupations

bisnes – ‘business’ ~ *negosyo* – **negocio** ‘occupation’, ‘business’
kaswal – casual ‘temporary employee’
import en eksport – ‘import and export’
mina – **mina** – ‘mine’
barbero – **barbero** ‘barber’
materniti lib – ‘maternity leave’
ploting reyt – ‘floating rate’
amo – **amo** ‘boss’ ~ *bos* – boss ‘chief’
dolar ekstyens – ‘dollar exchange’
mekaniko – **mecanico** ‘mechanic’
saydwok bendor – ‘sidewalk vendor’

Law and Government

presidente – **presidente** ‘president’
gobyerno – **gobierno** ‘government’
baryo – **barrio** ‘city district’, ‘village’
eleksyon – ‘election’
danyos i perwisyos – **daños y perjuicios** ‘damages’
magkampeyn – ‘to campaign’
miting de abanse – meeting + **de avance** ‘an election’ – ‘an election rally’
asunto – **asunto** ‘case’, ‘law suit’ ~ *keys* – ‘case’
diputado – **diputado** ‘representative’, ‘delegate’

Health, Medicine, Sickness

medisina – **medicina** ‘medicine’
klinika – **clínica** ‘clinic’
operasyon – **operación** ‘operation’
mikrobyo – **microbio** ‘microbe’
ospital – **hospital** ‘hospital’
wil tser – ‘wheel chair’
awt pesyent – ‘out-patient’
plastik sardyeri – ‘plastic surgery’
hay blad – ‘high blood (pressure)’
hart transplant – ‘heart transplant’
konsulta – **consulta** ‘consultation’
kolesterol – ‘cholesterol’

Education

edukasyon – **educación** ‘education’, ‘breeding’
edyukeysyon – **educación** ‘education (profession)’
pablik – public; i.e., ‘public school’
kolehiyo – **colegio** ‘school or college run by religious orders’
titser – ‘teacher’ ~ *mestra* – **maestra** ‘teacher’
enrolmen – ‘enrollment’
unibersidad – **universidad** ‘university’ ~ *yunibersiti* – ‘university’
simester – ‘semester’

Marriage and Family Life

kasamyento – **casamiento** ‘marriage’, ‘marriage certificate’
kasal sa huwes – **casar** + *sa* ‘relation marker’ + **juez** ‘judge’ ‘civil marriage’
mereyds laysens – ‘marriage license’
primo/a – **primo/a** ‘cousin (male and female)’
paryente – **pariente** ‘relative’, ‘kinsman’
madrina – **madrina** ‘marriage sponsor’

Architectural Structures

bunggalo – ‘bungalow’
bilding – ‘building’
kongkreto – **concreto** ‘made of concrete’
ap en dawn – up and down ‘a two-story house’
tsalet – ‘chalet’
iskay iskreyper – ‘skyscraper’
dupleks – ‘duplex’
mesanin – ‘mezzanine’
aparmen – ‘apartment’

Social Stratification

proletaryat – ‘proletariat’
klase – **clase** ‘class’, ‘category’
senyorito – **señorito** ‘lord’, ‘master’
sosayati ‘one who moves in high circles’ – society
klasmeyt – ‘classmate’
midel klas – ‘middle class’
oligark – ‘oligarch’
implyado – **empleado** ‘employee’
elit – ‘elite’
komrad – ‘comrade’
amigo – **amigo** ‘friend’

Weights, Measures, Monetary and Number Systems

kilo – **kilo** ‘kilogram’
pawn – ‘pound’
milya – **milla** ‘mile’
sentimiter – ‘centimeter’
put – ‘foot’

dos singkwenta – **dos cincuenta** ‘two pesos and fifty centavos’ *tu pipti* –
two fifty ‘two pesos and fifty centavos’
tatlo singko – *tatlo* ‘three’ + *cinco* ‘five’
‘three (items) for five centavos’

Notice that both the American and metric systems are used for weights and measurements. Food is usually weighed by the kilo and people by the pound. All three number systems – Tagalog, English and Spanish – are used.

Leather, Textiles, Fabrics

seda – **seda** ‘silk’
dakron – ‘dacron’
was en wer – ‘wash and wear’
brokeyd – ‘brocade’
tapeta – ‘taffeta’
bwal – ‘voile’
Korpam – ‘Corfam’

Parts of the Body

braso – **brazo** ‘arm’
labi – **labio** ‘lip’
kwelyo – **cuello** ‘neck’ (used only with reference to size and shape of the neck of a garment; *leeg*, the Tagalog word, is used to refer to the part of the body)
torso – **torso** ‘trunk,’ ‘body’
tete – **teta** ‘nipple’ (The Tagalog meaning is ‘baby talk for ‘milk from the breast or from a bottle’).
corason – **corazón** ‘heart’
pulmon – **pulmón** ‘lung’

Social Formulas of Politeness, Stock Phrases

kumusta – **¿Como esta?** ‘How are you?’
asta manyana – **¡Hasta mañana!** ‘Till tomorrow’; i.e.,
‘I’ll see you later’. (The Tagalog *Hanggang bukas!* must be a direct translation from the Spanish.)
pwede ba – **puede ser** ‘Is it possible?’; i.e., ‘Please?’
plis – ‘please’
Adyos – **Adios** ‘Good-bye’
Okey – ‘Okay’
sige na – **sigá Ud.** (means many things depending on the context and the intonation used; ‘Go ahead’, ‘Please’, ‘May I?’, among others)
Pronto! – **Pronto** ‘Quickly!’
may gudnes! – ‘My goodness!’
ke oror – **¡Qué horror!** ‘Horrors!’
Gudbay – ‘Good-bye’
ke barbaridad – **¡Qué barbaridad!** ‘How strange!’
por ehemplo – **por ejemplo** ‘for example’

poko más o menos – *poco mas o menos* ‘more or less’
por lo tanto – *por lo tanto* ‘for that reason’
insidentalí – ‘incidentally’

Loan Translations and Creations

Sometimes, instead of a direct borrowing, Tagalog makes use of loan translations. While borrowing the ideas indicated by the borrowed word or phrase, the Tagalog speaker substitutes native words for the foreign. Sometimes there is a slight modification in or an extension of the meaning.

awa ng Diyos – *grasya ng Diyos* ‘food’ – *la gracia de Dios* ‘bread’, ‘sunshine’
may gatas pa sa labi – *estar con la leche en los labios* (literally, ‘has milk on his lips’; i.e., ‘to lack experience’. Cf. the Tagalog idiom *marami pang bigas: na kakainin* – literally, ‘still has a lot of rice to eat’; i.e., ‘to lack experience’)
bukas ang palad – *es de mano abierta* ‘open the hands’; i.e., ‘to give liberally’, ‘to be generous’ (the Tagalog expression means ‘the palms are open’)
mukhang Byernes Santo – *cara de viernes* – *cara de viernes Santo* (literally, ‘face of Friday or Good Friday’; i.e., ‘sad, lean face’)
doble kara – *hombre de dos caras* ‘deceitful’ (the Tagalog expression is simply ‘double-faced’; Spanish says ‘a man of two faces’)
magbilang ng sentimo ‘to count pennies’ (cf. Tagalog *maghatak ng kumot* – literally, ‘to pull a blanket’, the idea being to make do with a small blanket)
pinilakang tabing – a loan translation of ‘silver screen’ *pinilakan* ‘silver +linker’
 + *tabing* ‘screen’

Creations

Hispanization of English borrowings:

seryoso ‘for ‘serious’ (The Spanish word is *serio*)
tyansa for ‘chance’ (The Spanish word is *chamba*)
responsibilidad for responsibility (The Spanish word is *responsabilidad*).

Anglicization of Spanish borrowings:

demand for *demanda* ‘file a suit in court’
kabinete for *gabinete* ‘cabinet’ (political)
resit for *receta* ‘prescription’

IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF BORROWING

It is clear that both English and Spanish have permeated all areas of experience. Loan words are not just specialized or technical terms, as was indicated in the examples in the preceding section. Perhaps a further indication of how much the borrowings have become part of Tagalog is the fact that a Tagalog, when constrained to use strong language, swears either in Spanish or in English. It seems that the borrowed swear words function as euphemisms.

One wonders if there are any cultural areas where borrowing is not possible or at least kept to a minimum. The fact is that even “basic native vocabulary” such as terms

for parts of the body, kinship terms, number systems and terms for basic human functions are often replaced by or used with loan words. Of Swadesh's basic vocabulary list of 200 words, 18 words are easily recognized as having been borrowed and are used instead of or with the native Tagalog.

In the case of parts of the body, loans are often used only in certain contexts and not as replacements of the Tagalog words. Thus:

kamay 'hand' but *bwena mano* – *buena mano* 'lucky first customer'

buhok 'hair' but *piluka* – *peluca* 'wig'

katawan 'body' but *medya kwerpo* – *medio cuerpo* – literally, 'half-body' (used to indicate a picture of a person showing only the upper portion of the body) for *busto*.

bibig 'mouth' but *boka byeha* – *boca vieja* – literally, 'old mouth' (Tagalog meaning is 'pointed chin')

kilay 'eyebrows' but *aybro pensil* – 'eyebrow pencil'

paa 'foot' but *kold pit* – 'cold feet'

mukha 'face' but *labakara* – *lavacara* for *tohalla de cara* 'face cloth'

A few of the terms for parts of the body applied to animals are used with human beings in a humorous or derisive manner.

pata – *pata* 'foot and leg of animals' for *hita* 'human foot' (cf. English "paw")

pitso – *pechuga* 'breast of a fowl' for *dibdib* '(human) breast', 'chest'

In the same manner, words for parts of inanimate objects are used for human anatomy.

kaha – *caja* 'body', 'frame' for *katawan* 'body'

tsasis – 'chassis' for *katawan* (cf. the outdated American slang use "look at the chassis on that girl!")

As has been indicated, all three numeral systems – English, Spanish and Tagalog – are employed by the Tagalog speaker. In the speech of many Filipinos, the three languages are used interchangeably for counting or for telling time, English being resorted to more frequently than the other two. For doing arithmetic problems, English is likewise more commonly used than Spanish and Tagalog. A mixed system involving Spanish and Tagalog is usually employed to indicate quantity and cost as in *dalawa, beynte singko* – *dalawa* + *veinte y cinco* 'two for twenty-five centavos'. But English is also used. Thus, *tu por twenti payb* 'two for twenty-five centavos' may be employed.

Borrowed terms for kinship and family relations have been mentioned earlier. Although borrowed kinship terms are often used instead of the Tagalog, the loan words seem to be associated with status, with education, with "high birth" and, negatively, with pretentiousness. Resistance to borrowed words when they affect certain aspects of the culture is best exemplified in the negative reaction to someone's calling his parents *Mama* and *Papa* or *Mommy* and *Daddy* instead of *Nanay* and *Tatay* or *Inay* and *Itay* unless he comes from an educated and well-to-do family. The implication is that the foreign terms should be used only by the fair-skinned and the "high-nosed." Comments like "The price of bread will go up" (with the implication that the adoption of the

foreign terms suggests a desire to be a bread - rather than a rice-eater) or "He's very dark but he calls his mother Mama (or Mommy)" are often heard. The ambivalent attitude toward the use of the foreign languages is illustrated by the fact that children who do not call their parents Mama and Papa often feel they are not "with it" and are ashamed because they use the Tagalog words.

The same ambivalent attitude toward the foreigners and their languages which has sometimes made resistance to borrowing an active force and at other times a non-existent one is shown in other ways. In formal situations, one makes a conscious effort not to use mixed forms and to resist borrowed words. On the other hand, in informal, everyday conversations one who prefers "pure" Tagalog words to loan words commonly used by the Tagalog speaker usually gives himself away as a non-native speaker of Tagalog and his bookish "school Tagalog" is made fun of.

It is clear that the Tagalog speaker is not averse to extensive borrowing, even of terms for objects or concepts that could be expressed as easily in his native language. Indeed, in spite of almost universal resistance to the Japanese during World War II, a few Japanese words have managed to become part of the Tagalog language. For example, *tomadachi* 'friend', *taksan* 'a lot', *derobo* 'thief' and *sabes* 'Please give'.

Sapir's statement that

the general cultural influence of English has so far been all but negligible. . . there is nothing to show that it is anywhere entering into the lexical heart of other languages as French has colored the English complexion. . . There are now psychological resistances to borrowing . . . 33

does not seem to hold true insofar as borrowing of English in Tagalog is concerned. For that matter, the non-resistance to English (as well as to the use of old Spanish borrowings) has reached such proportions that the educated bilingual has developed an utterly new "mixed" language made up of either a Tagalog core with English and Spanish borrowings or an English core with Tagalog and Spanish borrowings. In any given informal situation, a Tagalog may start talking or writing in English and without any hesitation put in a Tagalog word or phrase as the "clincher." He may likewise start in Tagalog and end with an English word or phrase. This he does unconsciously, so unconsciously in fact that he is not aware of the difficulty it makes for monolinguals. My American friends have told me how frustrated it has made them to listen to a Filipino regaling his audience in English, only to switch to Tagalog at the crucial point. The same type of frustration must have been felt by the Filipino who had not learned English.

Rather than merely replacing native words, the borrowings have provided the Tagalog speaker with greater resources. In other words, borrowings have not been used merely to fill a lexical gap but to fulfill certain functions. Borrowing provides the speaker with the most appropriate word for a particular context and this seems to be the most important reason for its extensive occurrence.

Finally, the process seems to be consistently and generally a one-sided borrowing from the foreign-imposed culture by the native, although a few Tagalog words have

become part of the Spanish and English lexicons. Note for example the following Tagalog words listed in Cassell's as being of Philippine provenience:³⁴

Tagalog → Spanish

paypay or *pamaypay* → **paipai** 'large fan made of palm'

bungbong → **bombon** 'vessel made of cane'

tabo → **tabo** 'cup made from coconut shell' (Tagalog modern *tabo* may be a tin can or a plastic container)

tinapa → **tinapa** 'smoke-dried fish'

tindalo → **tindalo** 'hardwood tree'

tamaraw → **tamarao** 'a kind of small buffalo'

salakot → **salacot** 'a kind of native headwear'

pingga → **pinga** 'yoke', 'bamboo for carrying loads'

tapis → **tapis** 'a sash used by women'

nito → **nito** 'a fibrous fern'³⁵

Tagalog → English

bangka → 'banca' (a native boat)

bolo → 'bolo' (a large knife)

kalabaw → 'carabao'

bundok 'mountain' → 'boondocks' (remote, isolated area) as in "from the boondocks" (rustic)

V. COMPARISON OF ENGLISH AND SPANISH BORROWINGS

Borrowing from English is still a very active, continuous and productive process, but borrowing from Spanish seems to have stopped. New English words for new things which are the products of modern technology are still constantly being borrowed. A few of these terms that easily come to mind are "nylon," "sputnik," "plastic," "transistor," and "computerized." New borrowings also represent new concepts or the result of technology, social change, of war and of new social problems. Some examples are "pollution," "phoneme," "integration," "hippie," "alienation," "escalation," "megapolis" and "anomie."

As has been indicated, the greater receptivity to the American and his language and the hostility to the Spaniard and his probably lie in the differences between the colonial policies of Spain and the United States. Almost from the start of the American occupation, the learning of English was made available to everyone, while during Spain's rule, Spanish was reserved for the elite. There is almost no resistance to English borrowings but a great deal of self-consciousness and a negative reaction toward Spanish. It is widely felt, at least among my generation, that one who speaks Spanish is pretentious if not unpatriotic. This attitude was partly engendered by the public schools

created by the American administration which laid emphasis on the constructive achievements during the American occupation and the abuses of the Spaniards when they ruled the country.

An awareness that English is a linguistic bridge to the outside world is another factor responsible for the continuing enthusiasm for English borrowings. Almost any English word may be borrowed if the speaker knows it and has a reason (conscious or unconscious) for using an English instead of a Tagalog or Spanish word. Moreover, there is a continuous first-hand contact between English and Tagalog through mass media and increasing personal contact with English speakers.

It is tempting to suggest that for most Tagalog speakers, Spanish loans have become for all intents and purpose, actually part of their native linguistic and cultural heritage. It seems that a Tagalog speaker who does not know Spanish is not even aware that he is using Spanish loans.³⁶ In other words, Spanish words have been more thoroughly assimilated into Tagalog than English borrowings, and even the uneducated speaker is heir to the linguistic bequest from Spain.

The educated speaker who uses English loans extensively likewise does not show any indication that he is consciously putting an English word into a Tagalog utterance. It is not as if he were using mental quotes whenever he says an English word. He does not pause or hesitate before a word to indicate a conscious borrowing. Neither does he use parenthetical expressions like "As we'd say in English" or "To use an English expression." He would probably do so and pause before saying the foreign word if it were a French or a German borrowing, for example.

If orthography is an indication of the extent of assimilation of borrowed words into a native tongue, it is noteworthy that English borrowings in contemporary Tagalog written works are usually written in italics, while Spanish loans are not. The time factor – a longer period of contact with Spanish and the length of time since it ceased to exercise direct influence – must be responsible for the Spanish loans being considered as "native." We may conclude, therefore, that while borrowing of English is fast becoming an automatic process for the Tagalog bilingual, it has not yet reached the point where borrowings are not recognized as being English.³⁷

While it is difficult to state in statistical terms which aspects of culture and consequently of language have been affected most by Spanish and English, it seems reasonable to assume that English borrowings have more pertinence to technology, business, industry and material culture in general, while those from Spanish have relevance to religion, social organization, law and government. That this may not be an accurate guess is possible because English borrowing is an ongoing process. More and more, English loans are competing with Spanish. It is not unlikely that English borrowings will affect even the areas of experience where Spanish loans predominated before.

A more detailed study of the Spanish borrowings will perhaps reveal that a number of these loans represent either regional or archaic forms no longer used by the modern Castilian speaker.³⁸ In any case, new Spanish words are not borrowed by the

modern Tagalog speaker, while new English words are borrowed almost as fast as they are created. Nevertheless, he tends to use expressions which strike the modern native English speaker as being clichés, outdated slang, and excessively bookish. Use of words and phrases like “saw the light of day,” “broad daylight,” “tears streaming down her cheeks,” “hope and pray,” “but to no avail,” “scampering in all directions,” “hubby,” “oomph,” “gang” (meaning a group of friends); and “accompanied,” “arrived,” “respond,” “submit,” “gave birth to” where the native English speaker would say “went with,” “came,” “answer,” “give in,” and “had,” respectively, are some examples.

One reason for this is that, in spite of the presence of live agents of contact in Manila and the larger cities, the Tagalog speaker’s chief contact with English still has been through textbooks and other reading material of a much earlier era. For reasons mostly economic, modern English books and magazines have not reached the Philippines in quantity and modern printed sources of information are not as common there as they are in the U.S. Thus the prose style of the 18th and 19th century English writers continues to serve as a model for both the written and oral language of the Tagalog bilingual. Commenting on this, Dagot writes:

The learner of a second language is not always aware of the changes that happen to the language over a span of years. Filipino students are fond of jotting down their favorite expressions and figures of speech culled from their reading; they derive great satisfaction in being able to use these expressions in sentences. But often the sources of these expressions are essays written in the early and mid-19th century. What one discovers as a fresh metaphor has actually been dead for quite a while. Victorian novels are popular with Filipino students but meanings and speech patterns have changed since Heathcliff and Catherine roamed the moors. The frozen language persists and creeps into the speaking vocabulary of the students who fail to distinguish between literary and current spoken forms of the language.³⁹

NOTES

¹See Chapter I, note 39.

²The feasibility of having classes conducted in the vernacular with Pilipino as an auxiliary medium through Grade Four is being considered by educators.

³Otto Jespersen, *Language: Its Nature, Development and Origin* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1922), p. 208.

⁴Pigafetta’s account of Magellan’s voyage, *The First Voyage Around the World*, trans. James A. Robertson (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Co., 1906), p. 183, includes a list of basic vocabulary items used by the “heathen peoples.” Unfortunately for this study, he recorded two non-Tagalog languages (what he calls Suba and Moslem). But his lists show a large number of cognates between Tagalog and these languages, suggesting that these might be “pure” Tagalog words. Among the words recognizable as similar or identical to Tagalog are names of parts of the body: *buhok* ‘hair’, *kilay* ‘eyebrows’; *mata* ‘eyes’, *ilong* ‘nose’, *baba* ‘chin’, *ngipin* ‘teeth’, *dila* ‘tongue’, *likod* ‘back’, *siko* ‘elbow’, *palad* ‘palm’, *kuko* ‘nails’, *pusod* ‘navel’, *utin* ‘penis’, *tuhod* ‘knees’; names of plants and animals: *baboy* ‘pig’, *kambing* ‘goat’, *manok* ‘hen’, *aso* ‘dog’, *isda* ‘fish’, *Kawayan* ‘bamboo’, *saging* ‘banana’, *luya* ‘ginger’; and *tinapay* ‘bread’, *tubig* ‘water’, *pilak* ‘silver’, *bahay* ‘house’, *timbang* ‘weight’, and the numbers one through nine.

⁵Some of the items labelled Spanish may represent borrowings that came to the Philippines via Central and South America, particularly Mexico, or may have been of Philippine provenience.

⁶The old Tagalog syllabary has long been superseded by the Roman alphabet from Spain. Except for a few extant specimens of the old Tagalog syllabary, Tagalog writings are in the borrowed alphabet.

Tagalog, as a rule, is a very well-spelled language and there is almost a perfect one-to-one correspondence between Tagalog sound and spelling. The only exceptions are particles like *mga* /*mana*/ 'plural marker' and *ng/nan*/ 'object and possessive marker' and proper names like Pangasinan /*pangasinan*/, Davao /*dabaw*/, and Zamboanga /*sambwanga*/. At least two types of orthography exist in contemporary Tagalog writings. The more commonly used employs certain letters standing for sounds not native to Tagalog. This is true mostly of place names like Forbes Park, San Lorenzo Village, Quiapo, Cebu City, and of people's names like Francisco Vergara, Juan Perez, Alejandro Nuñez. The other type is an almost self-conscious nativistic respelling of all words so that no foreign letters are used. In this case too, an intervening vowel is used between consonants to indicate the predominant Consonant-Vowel-Consonant syllable pattern of Tagalog. It is as if the writer, jealous of new sounds encroaching on the pure Tagalog tongue, wants to stop the corrupting influence of foreign sounds by using an orthography employing only the symbols for native sounds. This second type uses only 19 letters (a, b, k, d, e, g, h, i, l, m, n, o, p, r, s, t, u, w and y) and substitutes k for c and q, h for j, ny for ñ, p for f, b for v, and s for z, among others.

The following are two different ways of spelling the same sets of sentences:

Hindi pumunta si Edwardo Gomez na kasama si Fernando sa cementerio noong Jueves ng hapon. 'Eduardo Gomez did not go to the cemetery with Fernando on Thursday afternoon.'

Hindi pumunta si Eduardo Gomes na kasama si Fernando sa sementeryo noong Huwebes ng hapon.

Nadelay ang promotion niya dahil sa red tape. 'His/her promotion was delayed because of red tape.'

Nadeley ang promosyon niya dahil sa red teyp.

The second type is usually considered an "illiterate" type of spelling, especially by those who do not feel the need to prove their nationalism by discarding all foreign influences. In actual practice, the use of English and Spanish letters does not necessarily indicate that the words are pronounced with the foreign sounds. The Tagalog writer/speaker actually may use the foreign spelling and yet use the native pronunciation. He may also show inconsistencies in employing either type.

⁷Edward Sapir, *Language* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1921), pp. 210, 215.

⁸Cecilio Lopez, "The Spanish Overlay in Tagalog," *Lingua*, XIV (1965), 503, defines sophisticated pronunciation as "a fairly faithful reproduction of the Spanish model" and folk pronunciation as 'deviant' pronunciation.

⁹For contrastive analyses of the languages discussed here, see Robert P. Stockwell and J. Donald Bowen, *The Sounds of English and Spanish* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965); Robert L. Politzer and Charles N. Staubach, *Teaching of Spanish* (New York: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1961); Adelaida Paterno, "Tagalog Consonant Phonemes Compared with English Consonant Phonemes," *The MST English Quarterly*, VII (1957), 11-17 [Manila]; Robert P. Stockwell, "A Contrastive Analysis of English and Tagalog: Part I" (unpublished manuscript, The University of California, Los Angeles, 1957).

¹⁰E, S, and T will stand for English, Spanish, and Tagalog respectively. No examples will be given of those English and Spanish sounds which are produced almost exactly like the Tagalog sounds and therefore do not constitute interference. Examples of loans assimilated with practically no phonological modifications are Spanish *pobre* 'poor', *mesa* 'table'; English 'set', 'box'. Notice that often more than one phonological modification occurs in a morpheme; e.g., *tarip* 'tariff', *labanos* - *rabano* 'radish.'

¹¹The change in stress in many Spanish loans has become accepted pronunciation. Unless one knows Spanish, he will not know that the Spanish loans are being mispronounced. A person who puts the emphasis on the wrong syllable of an English loan, however, is liable to be corrected either mentally or orally.

¹²Historically, Tagalog had a three-vowel set (i, a, u/ with the lower allophones of /i/ and /u/ distributed so that they "occurred in any syllable immediately preceding a juncture, and with the lowering extending back to the next last syllable if it was separated from the last one only by a/? / . . ." (Stockwell, *op. cit.*, pp. B-1-2). Thus:

/tubo/ 'pipe for water' but */tubuj mahaba/* 'long tube'
/babae/ 'girl' but */babaij maganda/* 'pretty girl'

Bloomfield considers /i/ and /e/ and /o/ and /u/ as occurring in free variation, with the higher variants commoner than the lower (Leonard Bloomfield, *Tagalog Texts With Grammatical Analysis*, Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, III, No. 3, 1917, pp. 134-136). Stockwell, however, posits a five-vowel system and prefers to consider the alternation between /i/ and /e/ and between /u/ and /o/ as morphophonemic rather than allophonic.

The educated speaker of Tagalog makes a distinction between /u/ and /o/ and between /i/ and /e/. Immediately preceding a juncture he may say */bato ~ batu/* 'stone' or */babae ~ babai/* 'girl'. But he would not say */mura/* 'cheap' for */mora/* 'Muslim girl' or */misa/* 'Mass' for */mesa/* 'table' and vice versa. The free fluctuation in certain environments is between full phonemes and not between sub-members of the same phonemes. Also, under strong stress, many words do not have this /e, i/ and /u, o/ alternation.

While allophonic variations did historically exist in Tagalog and in fact do occur in some modern dialects (including those of uneducated speech), and words with /o/ and /e/ are mostly loans from Spanish and English, it is still best to posit a five vowel system. Both Lopez and Constantino analyze Tagalog as consisting of such a five-vowel system:

In native T. words, i and e are allophones of i; u and o of u. With the importation of S. loan-words, it has become necessary to set up the oppositions

i:e and u:o in order to distinguish pairs, not necessarily minimal, either of loan-words or of a loan-word and a native T word (Cecilio Lopez *op. cit.*, p. 469).

Constantino states: "The vowels /i, a, u/ occur in each of the twenty-six languages. In addition to these vowels, /e, o/ occur in Tagalog . . ." (Ernesto Constantino, "The Sentence Patterns of Twenty-Six Philippine Languages," *Lingua*, XV (1965), 72).

¹³ Sapir, *op. cit.*, p.220.

¹⁴ Jespersen, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

¹⁵ Einar Haugen, "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing," *Language*, XXVI (1950), 217.

¹⁶ Leonard Bloomfield, *Language* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933), p. 453.

¹⁷ Jespersen, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

¹⁸ I am referring here to the inherited Spanish loan words. Modern students of Spanish are of course taught both the oral and written forms.

¹⁹ Actually the form *relos* may have come about in another way. Professor Edgar Knowlton, in a personal communication to the writer, pointed out that "*reloj* is a borrowing from Catalan or Provençal and is an irregular word in many ways. But nowadays in standard Spanish its singular is pronounced *relo* but spelled *reloj* or *relo*, and the plural is *relojes* in which the *i* would be pronounced as an aspiration or with the *jota* value. So that Tagalog *relos* would seem to reflect an older pronunciation of the singular, with a replacement of the *š* by *s*, perhaps."

²⁰ For a fuller treatment of the subject, see Constantino, *op. cit.*, and Antonia Silverio, "The Passive Verbal Sentence Construction in Tagalog," (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of the Philippines, Manila, 1962).

²¹ Vernon E. Hendershot, *The First Year of Standard Malay* (Mountain View California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1943), pp. 45,62.

²² Charles E. Kany, *American-Spanish Syntax* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945), p. 93.

²³ My Spanish informants differ in their use of *zaquisame*. One accepts it as an older form of the word; the other thinks only *quizame* is "right".

²⁴ Jespersen, *op. cit.*, p. 214.

²⁵ *Mag-* is used with partial reduplication of certain noun bases to indicate 'a

seller of', 'a dealer in'. Thus: *mag-aasin* 'a seller of salt' and *mag-aasukal* 'a dealer in sugar. (Cf. *azucarero* 'foreman in a sugar factory').

²⁶Bloomfield, *op. cit.*, p. 454.

²⁷See John S. Kenyon, "Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties of English," *Readings in Applied English Linguistics*, (Harold B. Allen, ed., Appleton - Century - Crofts, New York, 1938).

²⁸Sapir, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

²⁹*Ibid.*

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 216.

³¹As in the phonological borrowings, the Tagalog respellings of English and anish loans represent folk pronunciation.

³²Einar Haugen, *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953), p. 97.

³³Sapir, *op. cit.*, p. 207.

³⁴For additional examples of borrowings, see Fe Aldave Yap, *Pilipino Loan Words in English (Mga Salitang Pilipino sa Ingles)*, (Maynila, Surian ng Wikang Pambansa, Nobyembre 1970).

³⁵Lopez, *op. cit.*, 501, mentions a few more Spanish words identified by Cuyas' (Arturo Cuyas' *Appleton's New English-Spanish and Spanish-English Dictionary*, New York, 1940) as being of Philippine origin. They include *chongo* 'monkey', *juramentado* 'one who runs amuck' and *vinta* 'Muslim boat with multicolored sails.'

³⁶Some expressions and ejaculations, however, are unmistakably Spanish and are recognized as such. They are standard and stereotyped, and are used in speech and writing to depict Spanish speakers. For example.:

¡Hola, amiga! 'Hi, friend.'

¡Sin verguenza! 'Shameless!'

¡Que adelantado! 'How forward!'

Si, señor. 'Yes, sir.'

³⁷Obvious exceptions are those English words which are cognates with Spanish. Some examples are : auto *auto*, suave *suave*, naval *naval* and tropical *tropical*.

³⁸See note 19, *supra*.

³⁹Edilberto P. Dagot, "The Cultural and Linguistic Features Involved in Cross-Cultural Communication Between Filipino Students and Americans and the Use of Short Stories to Teach These Features" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York, 1967, pp. 28-29).

CHAPTER III

INTERFERENCE: GRAMMATICAL, LEXICAL AND CULTURAL

The acquisition of foreign linguistic elements usually leads to a confusion of patterns, especially when the bilingual has not thoroughly mastered the foreign language. Indeed, one of the inevitable results of bilingualism is interference. In its broadest sense, we might define interference as the intrusion of elements of one language into another. Language A may interfere with Language B so that an A feature gains currency in B or even replaces a lexical, phonological or morphological feature of B.

In the preceding chapter, the word “borrowing” was used to describe this type of interference on the word and phrase levels. Such a type simply meant the transfer of morphemes from one language to another. Thus *silya* – *silla* ‘chair’ and *meylman* – ‘mailman’ are borrowings from Spanish and English respectively. In many cases this transfer involves phonological and morphological changes to conform with the system of Tagalog, the borrowing language. Thus *perokaril* – ferrocarril ‘railroad’ and *elektrik pan* – ‘electric fan’ are borrowings too, as are *oras* – *hora* ‘time’, ‘hour’ and *prapertis* – ‘property’. A borrowing may likewise undergo semantic change – see Chapter II, section III.

Besides referring to the direct adoption of the foreign morphemes, borrowing as used in this study also includes creations of the following types:

- TS¹ *maabla* ‘talkative’ – *ma-* ‘having the quality of’ + *habla* ‘talk’
 TS *pinakapaborito* ‘the most favorite’ – *pinaka* ‘superlative marker’ + *favorito* ‘favorite’
 TE *bakya* crowd ‘the masses’ – *bakya* ‘wooden shoes’ + crowd
 TE *nakamini* ‘in a mini dress’ – *naka-* ‘to be in’ + *mini*
 ET common *tao* ‘the common man’ – common + *tao* ‘person’, ‘man’
 TE *hanggang pyer* ‘abandoned woman’ – *hanggang* ‘until’ + *pyer*
 TE *sisid* rice ‘rice from sunken ships (during World War II)’ – *sisid* ‘to dive’ + rice
 SE *mañana habit* ‘procrastination’ – *mañana* ‘tomorrow’ + *habit*

In other words, I include in “borrowing” what Haugen calls the results of “importation” and “substitution.”² Moreover, I have also used “borrowing” to designate the process involved in adopting or adapting words from another language. Such uses of the term to indicate both the process and the result coincide with practical everyday linguistic usage. The instances of borrowing have also been called “loans” or “loan words.”

In this chapter, “interference” will be used in two senses: first, to denote borrowings placed in a grammatical framework larger than the word or the phrase; i.e., on the clause, sentence and discourse levels. Thus, the following by themselves are labelled borrowings (loans/loan words):

martsa marcha march

kartero – *cartero* ‘mailman’

TS *hele hele bago kyere* ‘pretending not to care’, ‘saying no the first time in the hope that one will be asked again’ – (perhaps from) *helar* ‘to dissuade’, ‘to discourage’ + *bago* ‘but’ + *quiere* ‘like’

TS *santo santito bago maldito* ‘wolf in sheep’s clothing’ – *santo* ‘saint’ + *santito* ‘little saint’ + *bago* but + *maldito* ‘evil’

TE *natenesi waltz* ‘jilted’ – *na* ‘past marker’ + ‘Tennessee Waltz’ ‘a song telling a story about a man who was jilted by his lover’

TE *nagwi-wi parti* ‘a small intimate party’ – *nag* – ‘past tense morpheme’ + reduplication of “we” + party

TE *nag* – *Oonassis* – ‘reading/talking about the Aristotle Onassis’ – *nag* – ‘past morpheme’ + reduplication of *Oonassis* ‘a Greek shipping magnate’

TE *ander de saya* ‘henpecked’ – under the + *saya* ‘woman’s long skirt’

These loans, however, will be considered as a form of interference when they are used in the contexts of sentences, clauses and discourse.³ Thus:

Nakinig ako sa martsa. ‘I listened to a march.’

Na indisper si Kulas. ‘Kulas was jilted.’

In these examples, *martsa* and *na indisper* interfere in a Tagalog sentence. In the next two examples, the borrowings interfere in an English sentence:

We went to a *lamayan* (‘wake’)

He bought me a basket of *lansones*. (‘a kind of fruit’)

The following are examples of interference on the discourse level. Notice that the Spanish and English loans occur anywhere in the utterance.

“Very timely” *ang pagdating ng* “birthday gift” *mo sa akin*. *Iyong* “cheque” *ay tinanggap noong Biyernes ng tanghali*. ‘The arrival of your birthday gift was very timely. I received the check on Friday at noon.’ (This example is from an informant who is very self-conscious about his use of English. Notice that he uses quotation marks to set off English loans.)

. . . de luxe *daw* . . . *umiiyak ang bursa namin pero* you can’t take it with you *daw* so we’re spending it to live well. ‘They say it’s a de luxe (model) . . . our pockets are crying but they say you can’t take it with you so we’re spending it to live well.’

I enjoyed my stay . . . *patiklop-tiklop ng tela atsaka ayos-ayos ng mga* gift items. *Pero* after a week (we stayed two weeks), I was homesick *kay Al*. I enjoyed my stay . . . (I would) arrange the dress material and put the gift items in order. But after a week (we stayed two weeks), I was homesick for Al.’

Na-force labor si Rogelio na magtype ng paper mo. *Seguradong pagod na pagod siya, ano?* ‘Roger was commandeered to type your paper. He certainly must be terribly exhausted.’

How about spending the Thanksgiving recess with the —'s? Really we would like to have you come for a visit here, *parang familia* reunion, ano? We promise to take you around, entertain you and feed (*importante sa lahat ito!*) you and make you feel at home. *E, ano pa ba naman ang gusto mo?* it would be just like a family reunion, wouldn't it? . . . and feed (this is the most important!) you . . . what more could you want?

As you can see, *nag peaceCorps na naman ako*. 'As you can see, I am working for the Peace Corps again.'

Alam mo, may green revolution na sa aming backyard. 'You know there's already a 'green revolution' in our backyard'. i.e. 'We've started to plant tomatoes and eggplants.'

The second use of interference also equates with the ordinary sense of the word. While borrowing will be used to connote something neutral as to its correctness/incorrectness, interference will connote something undesirable; e.g., erroneous usage on the part of a foreign learner attempting to speak or write a language not his own. Such "errors" may involve either grammatical (having reference to tense, gender, case) or lexical interference (may include wrong choice of lexical items, misuse of idioms, use of false cognates or literal translations). The patterns and habits of the native language interfere when the bilingual attempts to understand or produce utterances in the foreign language. Sometimes it works the other way also and the linguistic patterns of the foreign language interfere when the speaker is using his own language. It seems that some interference problems cannot be traced to the differing structures of the languages in contact but are due to other factors, often extralinguistic. Nonetheless, the patterns of the foreign language and the ways in which they correspond with or differ from the borrowing language are important factors in interference and deserve careful attention.

In such a bilingual community as Manila, one finds what Martinet calls individuals who are "a battlefield for conflicting linguistic types and habits, and, at the same time, a permanent source of linguistic interference."⁴ In this portion of the study, informal letters from such individuals, educated bilingual speakers of English and Tagalog from the Manila area, will be used as the main source of data for the ways in which interference results from bilingualism. These letters are all written in English or in Tagalog. There are no examples written in Spanish simply because none of them are fluent in it and it is usually not a common practice to write in Spanish. There are Spanish loans in the letters, it is true, but they are minimal, taking the form of old borrowings often hardly recognizable as such. I will also use data I have collected over the years from teaching English to Filipinos and Tagalog to Americans. It will be useful from now on not to consider the Spanish loans as constituting a case of borrowing in the same way English loans do. In this connection, Weinreich differentiates between interference in speech and in language:

In speech, it occurs anew in the utterances of the bilingual speaker as a result of his personal knowledge of the other tongue. In language, we find interference phenomena, which, having frequently occurred in the speech of bilinguals, have become habitualized and established. Their use is no longer dependent on bilingualism.

When a speaker of Language X uses a form of foreign origin not as an on-the-spot borrowing from Language Y, but because he had heard it used by others in X-utterances; then this borrowed element can be considered, from the description viewpoint, to have become a part of Language X . . . This theoretical distinction is necessary if we wish to understand what language contact means to an individual who experiences it, for what

the historical linguist finds to be an effect of interference from another language . . . may not be one to the user of the language . . .⁵

Mackey maintains that “analysis of interference rests on a good knowledge of the local standard” which can be found in the speech of native monolinguals.

If such persons have only one way of expressing something, even though this may belong to another language, it may be considered as belonging to the local code. This also applies to items existing in free variation in the speech of local monolinguals.⁶

Given the nature of the Philippine educational system, educated Manila speakers are bilingual if not multilingual. Nevertheless, the Tagalog they speak is similar to that used by the uneducated speaker who does not know English. The speech of such an uneducated person which can be considered the “local standard” may in itself be called bilingual in that it contains native words and Spanish borrowings.

But as has been pointed out, most Spanish words have obtained sufficiently general usage to become fixed in the language and have remained stable. Spanish loans now belong to the local unilingual code of the dialect the Tagalog speaker is using. The presence of *pila* – *fila* ‘line’, ‘rank’ or *kwento* – *cuento* ‘story’ in a person’s Tagalog speech or writing no longer indicates an interference from Spanish any more than “garage” or “chef” would indicate an interference from French in English, since such words are now a part of the language. In other words, the Spanish borrowings are inherited loan words which the Tagalog may or may not recognize as such.⁷

In citing the examples consisting of Tagalog, English and Spanish, the Spanish elements will be in bold type (as before) to distinguish them from Tagalog (in italics), but the Spanish portion will henceforth be considered as part of the monolingual dialect. The types of interference problems dealt with here will therefore consist mostly of those between Tagalog and English. Moreover, in this chapter the concentration will be upon certain types of grammatical interference, although examples of lexical interference will also be given. Finally, interference caused by some cultural differences between the Tagalog, the American and the Spaniard will be discussed.

I. GRAMMATICAL INTERFERENCE

The grammatical interference between English and Tagalog to be dealt with here will in part take the forms suggested by Weinreich. Grammatical relations, “including (1) order, (2) agreement, dependence and similar relations between grammatical units; and (3) modulations of stress and pitch” will be considered in this chapter. They will be distinguished from morphemes, that is, “segments of utterances, including prosodic features which differentiate single morphemes.”⁸ This distinction between grammatical relations and morphemes must be made “because grammatical functions which are performed in one language by morphemes may be identified by bilinguals with relations of another language.”⁹

Grammatical Relations

The different ways English and Tagalog show opposition between subject (S) and object (O) is a good example of how one language performs by the use of morphemes certain grammatical functions which are performed by relations in another. Thus:

T *Kinain ni Pedro ang isda.* E Peter ate the fish.

T *Kinain si Pedro ng isda.* E The fish ate Peter.

In English, the opposition between subject and object is indicated by a shift in the order of the morphemes ("Peter" and "the fish" in the above examples), the regular English statement pattern being Subject-Verb-Object. In Tagalog it is also possible to shift the order of the morpheme "Peter" and "the fish":

T *Kinain ni Pedro ang isda.* E Peter ate the fish.

T *Kinain ng isda si Pedro.* E The fish ate Peter.

It would seem that Tagalog could show the opposition between subject and object through word order in the same way English does. In fact, however, what signals the "doer" and the "receiver" in Tagalog are the particles *ni* (for personal nouns) and *ng* (for common nouns), and *si* (for personal nouns) and *ang* (for common nouns), respectively. It does not matter whether the "doer" appears before the "receiver" and vice versa as long as the Tagalog nouns are marked. In English, word order is for the most part an obligatory signal; in Tagalog, the same function is performed by contrasting morphemes.

Another example is the manner in which the English sentences I saw him and I saw him are rendered in Tagalog:

T *Nakita ko siya.* E I saw him.

T *Ako ang nakakita sa kanya.* E I saw him.

English simply shifts the stress to "I" to indicate that I and not someone else saw him. Tagalog uses a subject pronoun *ako* for the object pronoun *ko* at the beginning of the sentence. Instead of the verb *nakita*, a noun phrase made up of a noun marker *ang* + the past participle *nakakita* contrasts with the verb *nakita*. *Siya* 'him/her' is replaced by the prepositional phrase made up of *sa* (preposition) + *kanya* 'him/her'. The Tagalog speaker, instead of using the English shift in stress, says TE I was the one who saw him for AE I saw him. Again in the following example, a shift in stress in the English sentence suffices to indicate the differences between I bought the bread and I bought the bread. In Tagalog, these English sentences are rendered thus: *Binili ko ang tinapay.* 'I bought the bread.' and *Ang tinapay ang binili ko.* 'I bought the bread.' In Tagalog, the whole noun phrase *ang tinapay* 'the bread' shifts its position at the beginning of the sentence and the verb *binili* 'bought' becomes a noun phrase *ang binili* 'that which is bought', thus changing a Verb-Subject-Object Tagalog pattern into an equational sentence-- *Binili ko ang tinapay* → *Ang tinapay ang binili ko.*

Where English uses only a prepositional or an adverbial phrase to show a particular grammatical relation, Tagalog may either do likewise or use a different form of the verb indicating the same type of relation. The following sets of sentences illustrate this:

E We bought a book from the store.

T *Bumili kami ng libro sa tindahan.*

T *Binilhan namin ng libro ang tindahan.*

E We bought a book for her.

T *Bumili kami ng libro para sa kanya.*

T *Ibinili namin siya ng libro.*

- E We bought a book because of her. T *Bumili kami ng libro dahil sa kanya.*
 T *Ikinabili namin siya ng libro.*

The first Tagalog sentence in each set has a similar construction to its English counterpart, i.e., it has a prepositional or an adverbial phrase co-occurring with an active verb. In the second Tagalog sentence in each set, however, the passive verb form is used and the prepositional phrase becomes an *ang*-phrase, indicating a change in focus.¹⁰

Certain types of grammatical relations, expressed in Tagalog by changes in the verb form, are indicated in English by use of prepositions. As a result, the Tagalog speaker of English often has difficulty with English prepositions, which seem to be the greatest stumbling block to correct usage. The following examples represent only a few of the errors of this type found in the corpus:

- He'll be going home on December.
 Blame it to the poor means of communication.
 I heard of him also. He wrote yesterday.
 Then we went out to drink to the nearest restaurant.
 I plan to transfer in another school.
 He is now attending in a nursery school.
 We shop our groceries on weekends.
 We waited it for such a long time.
 The students could not cope up with the requirements.
 I was a consultant to the guides they were preparing.
 She always shares us your letters to her.

Every type of relation, be it order, modulation or dependence and agreement can be affected by interference.

Interference affecting order is seen in the Tagalog use of English noun modifiers. In Tagalog, a noun modifier occurs either before or after the noun it modifies. For example, Tagalog *kaibigang doktor ~ doktor na kaibigan* = Engli ' doctor friend. In speaking TE, the Tagalog speaker tends to confuse the noun modifier with the noun modified, producing TE friend doctor for AE doctor friend.

That correct word order, particularly the correct placement of modifiers and complements, is a problem for the Tagalog speaker of English is also shown in the following examples:

- TE We sent through her a package. = AE We sent a package through her.
 TE I like very much my job but I have to leave it on January or February.
 = AE I like my job very much but I have to leave it in January or February.

Other word order problems are evident in the following examples:

- TE I'm eager to know how are you doing. = AE I'm eager to know how you are doing.
 TE He wants to know if are you coming. = AE He wants to know if you are coming.

TE We wonder whether will the phone ring. = AE We wonder whether the phone will ring.

Examples of interference affecting modulation; for instance, the application of native pitch, stress and intonation contour patterns to other languages, are shown in the following: Tagalog signals what questions by means of Question word *±ba* 'Tagalog question marker' + Verb + Subject + / ↑ / . This intonation pattern is carried over into TE What are you doing ↑, Where are you going ↑. Tagalog can also signal questions by simply using a statement pattern *±ba* + / ↑ / . This results in TE You are coming ↑ for AE Are you coming ↑. You are coming ↑ is possible in English but it means 'Did you say you were coming?' This is an example of a possible but less common question pattern in English which is usual in Tagalog. Common too is the use of a statement pattern + some kind of tag question, resulting in TE *Yóu áre coming ↑ no ↑* = AE You are coming, aren't you? and TE *Yóu're not coming ↑ no ↑* = AE You're not coming, are you? The need to make all the negative-positive person, tense, and number agreements puzzles the TE speaker and makes him commit errors like TE He's happy, isn't it, They came, isn't it, She's not coming, isn't it, and You were starting to learn the game, wasn't it?

Examples of interference pertaining to agreement abound in the material studied. One of them is the failure to select the right gender of a pronoun to agree with its antecedent. Tagalog does not indicate gender in its third person, singular number of pronouns. English he/she are rendered by the same Tagalog form *siya*, English him/her also by Tagalog *siya*, and English his/ her, hers by Tagalog *kanya*. One hears TE My mother showed me his new dress, Mr. Cruz is my history teacher; she is very hard, I met Jose on her way to school, I told my brother that she should join me here.

Another problem pertaining to agreement is the failure to select the right number of a pronoun to agree with its antecedent, resulting in TE sentences like the following:

The pictures and the cards you sent are still with me. I would like to give it to him when he comes.

They seem to have some problems and it remains to be seen how it will be solved.

We took pictures of the snow and sent it home.

The books are all lying on the floor and it is getting dusty.

Some of the types of interference of relations suggested by Weinreich are observable in the Tagalog speaker's use of English.

The replica of the relation of another language conveys an unintended meaning.¹ For example, TE negative sentences of the sort Don't you have a pen? patterned after Tagalog questions convey an unintended meaning to the AE hearer, who interprets it as 'What's the matter with you, that you don't have a pen?' In Tagalog, it is normal to ask all questions in the negative. Thus:

TE Don't you have a pen? — T *Wala ka bang pen?* = AE Do you have a pen?

Another example which is a cause of confusion for the AE hearer is the Tagalog speaker's use of "used to" + the infinitive to indicate a present habitual action. Thus:

TE I used to go to work at 7:00 A.M. = AE I go to work at 7.00 A.M.

Likewise, the Tagalog speaker often uses "have to" + the infinitive to indicate simple future actions. Thus:

- TE –’s sister has to follow her husband there in N.Y. = AE –’s sister will join her husband in N.Y.
- TE They did not leave us immediately but have to relate many stories about you.
= AE They did not leave us immediately but stayed and told us many stories about you.

In the examples just given, there seems to be no interfering Tagalog patterns. The problem comes from a lack of understanding of the meanings and the use of “used to” and “have to.”

Sometimes “the replica of the relation of another language violates an existing relation pattern creating a nonsensical sentence or one that can be understood only by implication.”¹² This second type of interference of relations is shown in the following:

- TE Sir, do you know if the American Embassy is where? = AE Do you know where the American Embassy is?
- TE –is asking me, to ask you where in Hawaii is the best place to see. = AE – asked me what the best place to see in Hawaii is.
- TE You were asking me what particular book do I like to possess = AE You were asking me what particular book I would like to have.

Another type of interference is “the application of a grammatical relation of Language A to B-morphemes in B speech or the neglect of a relation of B which has no prototype in A.”¹³ This is exemplified in the application of Tagalog reduplication patterns to English and Spanish taking the following forms:

Reduplication with Tagalog - *ng* or *na* linker to indicate intensity. Thus:

- Bising-bisi si Terry.* ‘Terry is very busy.’
Haping-hapi ako. ‘I’m very happy.’
Lionize na lionize siya. ‘He’s lionized everywhere.’

- TE He’s getting better but there is great, great room for improvement. ‘He’s getting better but there is a great deal of room for improvement.’

Reduplication joined by Tagalog *nang* to indicate intermittent and repeated actions. Thus:

- Nagsermon nang nagsermon si Inay.* ‘Mother sermonized interminably.’ – **sermon** ‘sermon’
Nagtur nang nagtur ang mga turista. ‘The tourists went on tour after tour.’ – ‘tour’

Reduplication to indicate desultory, aimless or disorganized activity. Thus:

- Kailangang magplano-plano na para sa summer.* ‘It’s necessary, perhaps to get started on planning for the summer.’ – **plano** ‘plan’
I don’t have to be easy-easy with my work. ‘I can’t take my work lightly.’

Reduplication + Tagalog - *-han* or -*an* to indicate something diminutive or imaginary usually pertaining to children’s activities.

- Pinaglaruan niya ang plantsa-plantsahan* ‘She played with the toy iron.’ – **plancha** ‘iron’

Gusto mong magtitser-titseran? 'Do you want to play teacher?' – 'teacher'

Reduplication for a pejorative effect. Thus:

Hayaan mo na. Medyo medyo iyan e. 'Don't mind him. He's a half-wit.'
– *medio* 'half'

Nanood ako ng beauty-beauty contest. 'I went to a mock beauty contest.' – 'beauty contest.'

Reduplication to give the meanings "somewhat" or "rather", "by the . . .", and "every". Thus:

Presku-presko dito. 'It's rather cool here.' – *fresco* 'cool'

Saku-sako kung bumili siya ng bigas. 'He buys rice by the sack.' – *saco* 'sack'

Oras-oras kung tumawag sila. 'They call every hour.' – *hora* 'hour'

Another example of interlingual identification,¹⁴ this time applying the grammatical relation of B. to A, is illustrated by an inaccurate analysis of the Tagalog statement pattern. The normal Tagalog statement pattern is Predicate-Subject as in, *Maganda si Ana.* 'Pretty personal noun marker Ana.' 'Ana is pretty,' but a Subject-linker-Predicate pattern likewise exists—*Si Ana ay maganda.* 'Ana is pretty.' School grammarians of Tagalog, influenced by English grammar, insist that *ay* is equivalent to the English verb "to be" and that Subject-Verb is the "natural order" of Tagalog statement patterns. Learners of Tagalog are usually made to work out conversion exercises from "natural" to "inverted" order of the kind *Ang titser ay mabait. Mabait and titser.* 'The teacher is kind.'

Still another type of interference is due to "a change (extension, reduction) in the functions of the B-morphemes on the model of the grammar of language A brought about by "the identification of a specific B-morpheme with a specific A-morpheme."¹⁵ This form of interference is illustrated by the Tagalog use of already and just/only, translations of *na* and *lang/lamang* respectively. Although *na* and *lang/lamang* can be used to mean "already" and "just/only," the former cover wider areas of usage than the latter. *Na* refers to contemplated as well as completed action; already, on the other hand, only refers to completed action or action before the expected time. Here are a few examples of the ways in which the two languages differ in their use of *na* and already.

TE	T	AE
Go already.	<i>Pumunta ka na.</i>	Go!
I'll go already.	<i>Pupunta na ako.</i>	I'm going now.
I'm going already.		
I go there already every day.	<i>Pumupunta na ako doon araw-araw.</i>	I go there every day.
She's already our principal.	<i>Siya na ang prinsipal namin.</i>	She's our present principal.

Oftentimes, *na* appears in the guise of "longer," "more", and "any more" in negative sentences. Thus:

I won't go anymore.	<i>Hindi na ako pupunta.</i>	I won't go now.
<i>TE</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>AE</i>
We can no more postpone our trip.	<i>Hindi na natin maipag-papaliban ang ating lakad.</i>	We can't postpone our trip any longer.
Do you like Coke? No more.	<i>Gusto mo ba ng kok? Huwag na.</i>	Would you like a Coke? No thanks.

The use of “just/only” by the Tagalog speaker often connotes an apology for something or a “minimizing” of something. This use of language is closely tied to interpersonal relations. The following illustrates the Tagalog use of “just/only” showing the influence of Tagalog *lang/lamang*.

Where does he live? Near only our house.	<i>Saan siya nakatira? Malapit lang sa amin.</i>	Where does he live? Near our house.
What's your father? He's just an employee.	<i>Ano ang tatay mo? Kawani lamang.</i>	What's your father? He's an employee.

English “we” is equated with its Tagalog counterparts, but there is another dimension present in the Tagalog pronoun system not found in English. Tagalog distinguishes between we exclusive *kami* (excludes the hearer) and we inclusive *tayo* (includes the hearer). Thus:

T (excl.)	<i>kami</i>	E	we
T (incl.)	<i>tayo</i>		
T (excl.)	<i>namin</i>	E	our
T (incl.)	<i>natin</i>		
T (excl.)	<i>amin</i>	E	our, ours
T (incl.)	<i>atin</i>		

A Tagalog bilingual, influenced by his native language, tends to break down English “we” into *tayo/kami* when he hears or reads a statement like “We are leaving early tomorrow,” and he asks himself, “Does that include me?”

Sometimes, although both the languages in contact have similar sentence patterns, the constituent parts of the sentence are interpreted differently in one language and cause interference when using the other. English has a Subject-Verb-Object sentence pattern, as in “I enjoyed the party;” Tagalog has a similar construction, as in *Ako ay kumain ng ubas.* ‘I ate grapes.’ English “enjoy” is a transitive verb and takes a direct object. Tagalog speakers of English, however, often use “enjoy” intransitively, resulting in TE sentences like the following:

I enjoyed very much. Did you enjoy?
We are enjoying, although we are working.

I guess you're enjoying so much that you don't like to come back anymore.

Another set of verbs that suffers the same fate is "like" and "want." One hears TE Do you want? Yes, I like, from Tagalog *Gusto mo ba?* 'Want/like you question marker' for AE Do you want/like it? Thus:

Gusto ko ng prutas.
Ibig

'I like fruit.'

Gusto ko ng prutas. *Pahingi nga.*
Ibig

'I want some fruit.
May I have some?'

Gusto kong manood ng sine.
Ibig

'I want/like to go to the movies.'

The Tagalog speaker tends to use "like" in situations where an English speaker would use "want." Thus

TE I am forcing her to enroll but she does not like.

TE If she likes she can stay.

Often the interfering morphemes are simply Tagalog or assimilated Spanish particles and function words. They usually have no easy English equivalents. They are used to emphasize a statement made, to indicate a mood or a shift in thought, or to show surprise. These sentences are usually spoken with a pronounced Tagalog accent, as if they were in fact Tagalog sentences. Thus:

Pat *nga* gave me this income tax form.

O, see what you've done!

E, the problem is I don't see him at all.

I couldn't write you earlier, *e. Kasi* I have been busy.

Di go ahead with your plans.

Today *naman* we received a memorandum.

Sige, I'll write a longer letter next time.

You may not believe it *porke* you did not see it.

And of course *pala*. Congratulations!

He left for Thailand *na*.

Should I send it to you or keep here *muna?*

He misses you a lot. How could he forget *daw?*

Aba! They should be thankful *pa nga*.

Never mind. *Kwan lang*.

Obligatory and Optional Grammatical Categories

There are usually two kinds of grammatical choices available to a speaker of any language: an optional choice and an obligatory one. Indeed, speaking a language consists of making these choices and the grammar of a language "may be regarded as the set of rules which specify what the optional choices are, what their obligatory conse-

quences are, and what the restrictions are that each choice imposes on all the subsequent choices.”¹⁶

The abandonment of obligatory grammatical distinctions in the borrowed language seems to be the most common kind of native language interference where the corresponding grammatical categories are either non-obligatory or simply do not exist at all in the borrowing language.

In English, for instance, an action expressed by a finite verb must show its time in relation to the speech event by a tense. In other words, tense is an obligatory category in that language. Tagalog verb inflections, however, do not refer to time. Rather, Tagalog has a verb system based on aspect distinctions and the inflections are better considered aspect forms.¹⁷ They indicate whether an action has begun or not begun; and if begun, whether an action has been completed or not completed.

Although it is often true that an act completed is an act in the past, and an act not yet begun is an act of future time, time is not a necessary correlate of these forms. One may refer to an act in progress at the present moment, at a past time, or in the future. In all these cases, the begun-but-not-completed form (imperfective) is used. In other words, the whole system can be placed in the past, the present, or future time since tense in itself is not expressed by the verb forms. For example, the base form *takbo* ‘to run’ may take the following forms:

<i>tumatakbo</i>	an act in progress
<i>tumakbo</i>	an act completed
<i>tatakbo</i>	an act not yet begun

Tagalog has three aspects: imperfective (begun but not completed), perfective (completed) and future (to be completed). Again taking *takbo* as an example:

Imperfective

- Tumatakbo ako ngayon.* ‘I am running now.’
- Tumatakbo ako nang dumating ka.* ‘I was running when you came.’
- Tumatakbo pa ako pagdating mo.* ‘I will still be running when you come.’

Perfective

- Tumakbo ako kahapon.* ‘I ran yesterday.’
- Tumakbo ako ngayon mismo.* ‘I ran right now.’
- Sigurado na akong tumakbo mamaya.* ‘I am sure to have run later today.’

Future

- Tatakbo ako bukas.* ‘I will run tomorrow.’
- Sabi niya tatakbo daw siya bukas at tumatakbo na siya ngayon.* ‘He/she said he/she would run tomorrow and he/she is running now.’
- Sabi niya noong Linggo tatakbo siya kahapon.* ‘He/she said last Sunday he/she would run yesterday.’

Where time is not implied by context, it is made so by the use of time expressions like *kahapon* ‘yesterday’, *ngayon* ‘now’, ‘today’, *noong Linggo* ‘last Sunday’, or *bukas* ‘tomorrow’.

Some examples illustrating interference due to the Tagalog speaker's failure to indicate the correct verb form and tense in English are as follows:

Right now I'd been very busy.
 It was a tedious job but I love every minute of it.
 This afternoon I have read your letter.
 Meanwhile he has gone home last Saturday.
 Have you find someone there?
 As usual, I was the old unreliable when it comes to writing.
 I didn't personally met her.
 For a long time you haven't hear from me.
 I heard him commented yesterday that we must tell you to write him.
 Whenever I heard your husband's name, it remind me of my yesterday.

In Chapter II, examples were given indicating the Tagalog learner's difficulty with another obligatory category in English, that of number. In Tagalog, the function word *mga* is used when it is necessary to indicate plurality. It is not unusual for a TE speaker to omit the English plural marker or to create hyperforms like sheeps or sceneries. Possibly the lack of final consonant clusters in Tagalog helps to make the TE speaker omit -s. Note the following examples showing the Tagalog speaker's difficulties with number, including the inability to distinguish between mass and count nouns.

Please give me some informations so that I can tell my sister what to do.
 There are many newses here that would frighten you.
 I'm looking forward for the helps you will be extending.
 You know, I'm banking on your inspirational advices.
 Regards to all your friend.
 He got a gray hair.
 We hope also that they will like this cards.
 —— and —— are close friend.
 I have contacted one of the travel agency here.

Related to the problem of number of nouns is the omission of or the failure to use the correct English articles. In Tagalog equational sentences of the sort exemplified in the following, there are no articles, definite or indefinite. Moreover, because English articles are usually unstressed, the Tagalog speaker cannot hear them in English sentences and tends to omit them.

Abogado siya. Lawyer he. 'He's a lawyer.'
(Mga) abogado sila. (Plural marker) lawyer they. 'They're lawyers.'
Palengke ito. Market this. 'This is a market.'
(Mga) palengke ito. (Plural marker) market this.
Palengke ang mga ito. Market (noun marker) (plural marker) this.
 'These are markets.'

Citations illustrating the Tagalog speaker's problem with articles include the following:

I attend dance clinic regularly.
 What do you want for birthday gift?

I know you will have interest (in it).
 Here students lack sense of responsibility.
 It is a good news.
 We have to report for faculty session.
 Men and women exercise equal right to vote.
 An offense against family members is viewed as insult and threat to the whole family.
 Bluntness is regarded as sign of ill-breeding.
 He enjoys game.

In English the contrast between definite and indefinite articles can be shown thus: the definite article “the” (pronounced /ðə/ before a consonant and /ði/ before a vowel) is used with singular and plural nouns. The indefinite articles are “a” before a consonant and “an” before a vowel. Under a stronger stress, “a” is pronounced either /ə/ or /ey/; “an” is /æn/. Under weak stress, “a” is /ə/ and “an” is /ən/. “Some,” when it functions as the indefinite plural article is pronounced /səm/.

In Tagalog the contrast between definiteness and indefiniteness cannot be as simply stated, as the following shows:

Definite

<i>E</i>	<i>T</i>
I bought the book.	<i>Binili ko ang libro.</i>
I bought the books.	
I bought the books.	<i>Binili ko ang mga libro.</i>
I read the interesting story.	<i>Binasa ko ang nakawiwiling kwento.</i>
I read the interesting stories.	<i>Binasa ko ang nakawiwiling kwento.</i>
I read the interesting stories.	<i>Binasa ko ang mga nakawiwiling kwento.</i>
	(The optional plural marker <i>mga</i> can be placed before the noun <i>kwento</i> ‘story’ or before the adjective <i>nakawiwili</i> ‘interesting’.)

Indefinite

I bought a book.	<i>Bumili ako ng libro.</i>
I bought books.	
I bought books.	<i>Bumili ako ng mga libro.</i>
I read an interesting story.	<i>Bumasa ako ng nakawiwiling kwento.</i>
I read some interesting stories.	

I read some interesting stories.

*Bumasa ako ng nakawiwiling mga
kwento.,
Bumasa ako ng mga nakawiwiling
kwento.*

Failure to distinguish number in verbs when speaking or writing English is another serious problem for the Tagalog speaker. In Tagalog, the verb is usually not inflected for number and the same verb form co-occurs with nouns indicating a singular or a plural idea. Thus:

Pumupunta siya. 'He/she goes.'

Pumupunta sila. 'They go.'

The Tagalog speaker often fails to indicate the -s ending of third person singular verbs or tends to use an -s ending when it is not required. He also experiences difficulty with the verb "to be." Thus:

He go to school early.

Does he goes early?

Mother always advise me to "take it easy."

There has been much improvements in the University.

How's your studies?

Firecrackers was banned to prevent accidents.

How about in February when your school work are not too heavy?

I thought —— or —— or —— have been writing to you.

It is something that do not happen to many.

Her eyes is regular in size.

She also obey what I advise to her.

II. LEXICAL INTERFERENCE

The large-scale borrowings of Spanish and English into Tagalog could not but have resulted in lexical interference of various kinds. The most common type simply involves a direct transfer of the morphemes of English and Spanish into Tagalog. Examples of this kind are plentiful in the material studied.

Another type of lexical interference is evident in the use of false cognates. A number of Spanish loans have English cognates and both the English and Spanish forms are usually borrowed by the Tagalog speaker. Usually, these cognates have the same range of meanings and can fit into similar frames, but often enough their patterns of distribution are not exactly alike. The Tagalog who has only an incomplete knowledge of the range of meanings and patterns of distribution of these cognates often constructs sentences that are either amusing or incomprehensible to the native speaker of English. For instance, *destinar* which in Spanish means to destine, to appoint, to designate, or to assign is equated with the English "destine" which has the meanings to predetermine (as by divine will) or to appoint.. Thus:

My father was destined in the province for a year. –
Nadestino ang tatay ko sa probinsya ng isang taon. =
 ‘My father was assigned to the province for a year.’

Another example is Spanish *molestar* ‘to worry’, ‘to vex’, ‘to disturb’, ‘to annoy’, ‘to tease’ interpreted in the same way as English “molest” to interfere with so as to injure or disturb’. Thus:

My students often molest me even when I’m busy. – *Lagi akong minumulestya ng mgaestudyanteko kahit marami akong trabaho* = ‘My students often disturb me even when I’m busy.’

Sometimes the problem stems from the fact that the English loans sound like some Spanish words and the Tagalog uses the English loans and gives them their Spanish meanings (or at least one aspect of a wide range of meanings). Thus *kompromiso* – **compromiso**:

‘This is a compromise already.’ For ‘We have committed ourselves.’

Another example is *delikeyt* – *delicado*. ‘He is very delicate. He won’t eat anything.’ for ‘He is very finicky.’

A similar kind of identification by the Tagalog learner of a native word or concept with the foreign on a one-to-one basis has led to literal translations like the following (the English words in bold type are translations of the underlying Tagalog constructions responsible for the interference:)

Before I close I would like to change the **color of my story**. (*Kulay ng usapan* – literally, ‘the color of my conversation’)

She was **all big eyes** to find me in lace. (*lumaki ang mata* – literally, ‘the eyes became big’)

In how many **days** did you get the package? (*sa loob ng ilang araw* – literally, ‘inside how many days’)

Regards me to your mother. (a translation of “regards” as a verb similar to *ikumusta* ‘say hello’)

With regards to my papers in going there, I’m **nearing to finish** it within this month. (*malapit nang matapos* – literally, ‘near to be finished’)

I usually go with our **3-house** neighbor here. (*ikatlong bahay* – literally, ‘third house’; i.e., neighbor living three houses away)

How is our beloved teacher? Is she **increasing upwards or sideways?** (*lumalaking pataas o palapad* – literally, ‘growing upward or sideward’)

You can **throw her anywhere** and she’ll always find a reason to enjoy. (*kahit saan mo itapon* – literally, ‘wherever you throw her’)

She is **sunk in work**. (*nakalubog sa trabaho* – literally, ‘sunk in work’)

Is your **hair natural?** (*natural ang buhok* – literally, ‘the hair is natural’, i.e., naturally curly)

I don’t know how to **carry** an evening dress. (*magdala* – literally, ‘carry’; i.e., I don’t look well in an evening dress)

Sometimes the “strangeness” of TE or SE stems from the fact that the Tagalog or Spanish is translating an idiom into English word for word (idiom is used here to mean “a conventional phrase or expression having a meaning different from the literal”). Some examples are:

- TE He looked ready for his funeral. – T *nakapamburo!* ‘dressed for his funeral’= AE He was dressed to kill.
- TE He got a raise because he often oils his employer. T *linalangisan* =AE He got a raise because he often butters up his employer.
- TE When are you going to have your long table? – T *magamamahabang dulang* When are you getting married?
- TE He is taller than a carabao. from the T saying *Ang langaw nang matuntong sa kalabaw, mataas pa sa kalabaw.* ‘The fly, alighting on the carabao, is taller than the carabao.’= AE He is too big for his breeches.
- TE Even a long procession winds up in church. from the T saying *Pagkahaba-haba man ng prusisyon, sa simbahan din ang tuloy.* ‘Even a long procession winds up in church’.= AE It will all come out in the wash.
- TE He often lifts his own bench. – T *nagbubuhat ng sariling bangko* ‘lifts his own bench,’= AE He blows his own horn.
- TE They went from the mat to the floor. – T *umalis sa banig, napunta sa sahig,* ‘left the mat went to the floor’= Out of the frying pan, into the fire.
- TE He still has a lot of rice to eat. – T *marami pang bigas na kakainin* ‘more rice to eat’ =AE He is still wet behind the ears.
- TE She is onion-skinned. – T *balat-sibuyas* ‘onion-skinned’ = AE She is very sensitive.
- TE You are very another now. – T *Ibang-iba ka na.* ‘You are very another.’ =AE You’ve changed a lot.
- TE We can’t move the amount. – T *Hindi namin magagalaw ang kuarta.*= AE We can’t spend the money.
- TE I don’t like him. He has no one talk. – T *Ayoko nga sa kanya. Wala siyang isang salita.* = AE I don’t like him. He goes back on his word.
- TE What do you want, a painful body? – T *Anong hinahanap mo, sakit ng katawan?* =AE Are you looking for trouble?
- SE He does not have a grandmother – S *No tiene abuela* = AE ‘He is a braggart.’
- SE Call it “h”. – S *Llamalo h.* = AE ‘It’s the same thing’.
- SE How many years do you have? –S *¿Cuantos años tiene Ud?* = AE ‘How old are you?’
- SE He talks in silver. – S *Habla en plata.* = AE He speaks clearly.
- SE It’s from a box. – S *Es de cajon;* = AE It’s absolutely sure’.

Often physical reality is seen in different ways by the speakers of English and Tagalog, leading them to use different idioms or figures of speech.

In English and Spanish one talks of the leg of a chair (*la pata de una silla*), the eye of a needle (*el ojo de la aguja*), and the neck of a bottle (*el cuello de una botella*). In Tagalog, one refers to the same things as the foot (*pa*) of a chair, the hole (*butas*) of a

needle, and the mouth (*bibig*) of a bottle. An ear of corn is referred to as a heart (*puso*) in Tagalog; in Spanish it is called *una mazorca*. Both English and Tagalog use the expression "arm of the law" (*bisig ng batas*). In Spanish, one talks of the strength or force of the law (*la fuerza de la ley*).

In the three cultures, animals are frequently used in comparisons. One hears such expressions as "hungry as a bear", "busy as a bee", "fierce as a lion", "wise as an owl", and "happy as a clam". A Tagalog makes comparisons such as *kasing tuso ng matsing* (crafty as a monkey), *bores ipis* (has the voice of a cockroach, i.e., very soft-spoken), *matakaw pa sa alamid* (greedier than a wildcat), *buhay alamang* (a tiny shrimp's life, i.e., a difficult existence), *hingal kabayo* (the panting of a horse, i.e., breathless). In Spanish, one becomes hungry as a wolf (*hambriento como un lobo*, assiduous as an ant (*hacendosa como una hormiga*), fierce as a lion (*fiero como un leon*).

The Tagalog does not kill time the way English and Spanish speakers do (*matando el tiempo*); he just lets hours go by (*nagpapalipas ng oras*). For that matter, time does not fly; it runs fast (*mabilis ang takbo*.)

A miserable-looking person is *basang sisiw* (a wet chicken); an old bachelor is a *matandang tinala* (an old rooster); an old experienced person is *matandang kalabaw* (an old carabao). In Spanish, an old bachelor is *un hombre que tiene ya espolones*, 'a man who already has spurs', an old experienced person *tiene mas conchas que un galapago* 'has more shell than a turtle'.

In English, one stews in his own juice; in Tagalog, he is sautéed in his own lard (*ginigisa sa sariling mantika*). One burns the midnight oil in English, in Tagalog, he burns his eyebrows (*nagsusunog ng kilay*).

An English and an American speaker shed crocodile tears (*lagrimas de cocodrilo*) cries like a cat—without tears (*iyak pusa, walang luha*).

An impossibility will take place *pagputi ng uwak* (when the crow turns white) or *paglipad ng kalabaw* (when the carabao flies). Compare these with English when the rivers run dry or when hell freezes over. In Spanish, one waits for the Judgement Day (*espera el día del juicio*).

A haughty American has his nose up in the air. the Tagalog has a stiff neck (*matigas ang leeg*). A Spaniard *mira por encima del hombro* 'looks above his shoulders'.

A final type of lexical interference is reflected in the misuse of English idioms or the poor choice of lexical items. Some examples are:

Some took it with a tongue in cheek.

My sick mother's the only reason why I can't look for a greener pasture.

We think about these people who are really trying hard and hitching their shoulders to the grindstone.

We're still as happy as a bee.

She said she wrote you to get from the horse's mouth—this means you—whether the story is true.

I'm afraid I'm keeping up most of your precious time so I'll just close up here.

I feel sorry for my defunct father.

We went to mass before depositing ourselves in the house.

I really couldn't delete the image of my advisor.

Our new house will be inaugurated next month.

I will probably be immersed in concern over the center being proposed by the Foundation.

III. INTERFERENCE DUE TO CULTURAL DIFFERENCES

Mention has been made of the types of interference which come from the differences between the structures and idioms of English, Spanish and Tagalog. A greater source of interference, however, are certain patterns of Tagalog behavior and attitude which are closely tied up with his speech. A large number of educated Tagalogs have an almost perfect mastery of English, but it is rare to find one who is bicultural as well. In fact, the differences in the patterns of cultural behavior between the Tagalog, the Spaniard and the American have been the cause of misunderstanding or a lack of understanding among them. Very often neither the Tagalog, the American nor the Spaniard is aware that these differences in cultures exist. Nor are they aware that they may speak the same language in different ways. Because they communicate in English and occasionally in Spanish, they take for granted that their words and gestures always convey the meanings they want to express. We can assume that a Tagalog observing a certain behavior of an American or Spaniard will interpret it according to his own culture. The American or Spaniard in turn observes the Filipino's behavior in a certain situation and interprets it in terms of his own culture. This is to be expected because

individuals tend to transfer the terms and meanings and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture—both productively when attempting to speak the language and to act in the culture, and receptively when attempting to grasp and understand the language and the culture as practiced by natives¹⁸

A Tagalog failed to appear for a certain appointment after he told an American friend that he would "try to come." He had really no intention of doing so but he thought it would save his American friend's feelings if he did not tell him outright that he could not make it. The American was annoyed not only because his Tagalog friend had made him waste time waiting for him but also because he was not true to his word. When the Tagalog says, "I'll try," he usually means one of three things:

1. I cannot do it but I do not want to hurt your feelings by saying "no".
2. I would like to, but I am not sure you really want me to come. Please insist that I do.
3. I will probably meet you around a certain time, but I will not say "yes". Something may prevent me from coming.

The Spaniard is like the Tagalog in this respect. Except with a close friend, a **confianza**, i.e., one with whom one does not have to observe the social amenities, the Spaniard tends to say, **Trataré de ir** or more formally, **Procurare ir** 'I'll try' or **Voy a ver si puedo** 'I'll see if I can', even if he knows he cannot come.

Neither the Tagalog nor the Spaniard is a slave to time. They do not want to be pushed or hurried. The Tagalog is often "walking in the moonlight" (*naglalakad sa liwanang ng buwan*). If you ask him what time it is, he usually says, "It's still early; it isn't

twelve yet” or, jokingly, “Same as yesterday’s time”. If pressed to give a definite answer, he says “Around—A.M./P.M..” If you ask an American the same question, he will generally give you the precise time to the minute. The Spaniard tends to give the exact time but is not fanatic about it.

A social engagement scheduled at 7:00 P.M. may mean anything between 7:00 and 9:00 to the Tagalog, and the more “important” a person is, the later he is likely to arrive. However, when two Tagalogs agree to meet at 10:00 “American time,” they mean 10:00 sharp. Similarly, the Spaniard tends to be casual about social appointments. He may turn up hours late without making any excuses. As a matter of fact, invitations tend to make allowances for this lack of concern about time. One is invited for *entre siete y siete media*, between seven to seven thirty’ or a *eso de las dos* ‘around two o’clock. One may come at eight and not feel embarrassed about being late. An American may be late for a social function by ten to fifteen minutes without having to apologize for it but longer than fifteen minutes is cause for apology.

Unless the American realizes that the greeting *Saan ka pupunta?* (literally, ‘Where are you going?’) simply means ‘Hi!’ or ‘Hello’, he may think that the Tagalog is excessively inquisitive. The fact that the person who asks another where he is going does not wait for a definite answer and is content with the vague *Diyan lang* ‘There, only’ or *Wala* ‘Nowhere’ proves that *Saan ka pupunta* in this context is simply a form of greeting. Again the Spaniard is like the Tagalog in this respect and asks as a form of greeting where someone is going, where he came from or what he is doing at a certain place. ¿*Qué haces por aquí?* ‘What are you doing around here?’ All these are simply signs of friendliness and not officiousness.

The Tagalog propensity for asking personal questions even of persons he barely knows can be disconcerting to an American. But such questions as *Wala ka pa bang asawa?* ‘Aren’t you married yet?’ or *Ilan na ang anak mo?* ‘How many children have you got?’ (and if the answer is “none yet” or “only one”, *Nagkokontrol ba kayo?* ‘Are you practicing birth control?’) are used simply as conversation openers and are meant to show the Tagalog’s desire to be friendly. They serve a similar function to the English “How are you?” and comments about the weather. The Tagalog who is unaware of this may in turn think that Americans are very casual about their relationships. “Americans ask you how you are but they do not really want to know” is a common complaint. Among the Spaniards in the Philippines, the common conversation opener is how long one has been in the Philippines. One may talk about the weather but it is considered offensive to ask a casual acquaintance what one does for a living. Neither is it considered polite to ask how many children one has and why he does not have more.

The Tagalog’s answer to a Yes-No question in English is often confusing to an American. In Tagalog, it is normal to answer *Oo, hindi ako pupunta*. ‘Yes, I’m not going.’ in answer to the question *Hindi ka ba pupunta?* ‘Aren’t you going?’. The Tagalog usually bases his answer on the question—whether it is given affirmatively or negatively. In English, the answer pattern is either “Yes”, I am” or “No, I’m not”. It does not matter whether the question is “Are you going?” or “Aren’t you going?” In Spanish, the answer to the question ¿*Vas a ir?* ‘Are you going?’ is either *Sí, voy a ir* ‘Yes’, I’m going’ or *No, no voy a ir*, ‘No, I’m not going.’

The Tagalog often sounds apologetic because his sentences often have an "only" or a "just" (a translation of *lang* or *lamang*) and *sana* (a particle expressing the wish or hope that something particular might come to pass). 'I would only like to talk to you if possible' is a translation of *Gusto ko lamang sana kayong makausap kung maaari*. He often refers to himself as one who is "supposed to be the mayor of X town" when he is actually the mayor of the town. Likewise he even more than Southern Americans punctuates his sentences with "Sir" or "Ma'am," thus giving the impression of extreme humility. In reality, "Sir" or "Ma'am" are simply translations of the Tagalog polite particle *po*, which does not have the connotation of servility. In Tagalog the second person plural *kayo* 'you' and the third person plural *silá* 'they' are used when addressing one person to indicate respect or distance. (See the section on pronouns under Morphological Borrowings, Chapter II).

In Spanish the formal form Ud. 'you' is usually used to show respect (not distance) for one's parents (usually the mother is addressed informally, i.e. with *tu*), old aunts and uncles and grandparents. Outside the family circle, everyone except friends is addressed formally. "Extra" respect is conveyed by the use of an additional, non-obligatory Ud. Thus *¿Quiere salir?* 'Do you want to go?' is normal; *¿Quiere Ud. salir?* is extra-polite. A superior may tell an inferior *Venga aquí* 'Come here' but the usual form for an inferior to a superior is *Venga Ud. aquí, por favor* 'Could you come here, please?'

Unless a Tagalog has become "Stateside," he is happy to be told that he has gained weight and does not generally interpret it as a cue to go on a diet. He takes it as a compliment meaning "You look much better now because you have put on some weight." Stoutness is generally considered a sign of prosperity and well-being. Compare this attitude with the reaction of a modern American to such "compliments." On the other hand, to be told that one is thin or has lost weight means "You are undernourished and should eat more" or "The world must be treating you badly." In Spanish a usual compliment is *¡Qué hermosa!* 'How prosperous/good looking/solid/healthy' for babies and young girls. Men are complimented *¡Qué hermosura/tipaso de hombre!* 'What a hunk of man!'

A Tagalog's reaction to a compliment may be puzzling to an American. When a girl is told that her dress is pretty, she says something like "It's an old dress, really, I've had it for years" or sometimes she may say, "Is it only the dress that is pretty?" a direct translation of *Ang damit lang ba ang maganda?* This calls for an answer like "The wearer is even lovelier" from *lalong maganda ang nagsusuot*. An American's response to a compliment on something is usually 'Thank you'. In Spanish 'Thank you' is not enough. One says something like *Muchas gracias. Está a su disposición*. 'Thank you very much. It's at your disposal.' The Spaniard does not feel he has to downgrade the article admired.

Although the Tagalog is embarrassed when paid a compliment, he loves to pay compliments himself. When a woman greets another with *Magandang umaga* 'Good morning' (literally, 'a beautiful morning'), she usually gets the answer *Maganda pa kayo sa umaga* 'You are more beautiful than the day.' Not to be outdone, she answers back *Lalo na ang bumabati* 'The person greeting me is lovelier'.

The Spaniard is likewise lavish with compliments. When introduced to someone, his usual response is *Tanto gusto de conocer a Ud.* 'It's a great pleasure to know you. He is then told *El gusto es mío* 'The pleasure is mine.

All these examples prove that the extent of interference can hardly be accounted for by strictly linguistic data. Weinreich notes that

the manifestation of the accent [is] controlled by powerful social and psychological, i.e., non-structural, factors.

For practically every form of interference, there is an interplay of factors external to the structures of the languages which favor or inhibit the development of interference of that type.¹⁹

Haugen asserts that language acquisition is not primarily a matter of learning single words:

Languages differ not only in the specific terms they use for specific objects and actions; they differ even more in the kind of linguistic and social contexts in which these terms can be used. Even after one has mastered perfectly the grammatical situations, there are rigid limitations on the use of terms to describe classes of objects.²⁰

Bilingualism is possible without biculturation. It is possible to acquire a well-nigh perfect mastery of a foreign language; i.e., to employ its phonological, grammatical and lexical systems about as well as the native speaker. Somehow it is harder to master the different patterns of cultural behavior of the foreigner. This makes true biculturalism almost impossible. Nonetheless,

if one wishes really to master a foreign language so that he may understand with some completeness the native speakers of the language, he must find some substitute for the kind of background experience he has in his own language . . . He can . . . set himself the task of attaining as complete a realization as possible of the common situations in which the language operates for the native speakers.²¹

NOTES

¹TS, TE and SE refer to Tagalog-Spanish, Tagalog-English and Spanish-English mixtures respectively. Later TE will be used to refer to Tagalog-English (with its interference problems) in contrast to AE (American English) used as the standard for judging correct usage in speaking English.

²"If the loan is similar enough to the model so that a native speaker would accept it as his own, the borrowing speaker may be said to have **imported** the model into his language, provided it is an innovation in that language. But insofar as he has reproduced the model inadequately, he has normally **Substituted** a similar pattern from his own language. This distinction between **Importation** and **Substitution** applies not only to a given loan as a whole but to its constituent parts as well, since different parts of the pattern may be treated differently." Haugen, "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing," *op. cit.*, 212.

³In a discussion with Dr. Edilberto Dagot, he suggested that it might be necessary to posit the notion of "points of accommodation" rather than interference in this context. An English utterance would "allow" a Tagalog construction to appear at certain places where it could be accommodated, but not at others. Similarly, a Tagalog utterance would accommodate an English construction at certain points but not others.

⁴Andre Martinet, in his preface to Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact* (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1967), p. vii (Originally published as Number 1 in the series "Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York", New York, 1953).

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁶ William F. Mackey, "Bilingualism Interference: Its Analysis and Measurement," *The Journal of Communication*, XV (December, 1965), 240.

⁷ A.R. Diebold, in "Incipient Bilingualism," *Language*, XXXVII (1961), 100-101, finds it useful to adopt Haugen's distinction between interference, "the overlapping of two languages" and integration, "'the regular use of materials from one language to another so that there is no longer either switching or overlapping, except in a historical sense' . . . Elements of a language which are genetically replicas of models found in another language S [secondary language] , but which the linguist would describe as a part of the *langue* of P [primary language] , will be termed *integration*. They are those nonnative elements which the monolingual speaker of P, as well as the bilingual, learns in the childhood acquisition of his language. They are the products of completed linguistic diffusion. Interference will subsume, on the other hand, those elements in P which are replicas of models in another language S and which the speaker acquires, not through childhood learning of his P native language, but rather through subsequent contact with the S-language, i.e., through bilingualism. This material is part of the *P parole*, occurring in the speech of some but not all of the P-speakers. It is the manifestation of on-going linguistic diffusion."

⁸ Weinreich, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ See Silverio, "The Passive Verbal Sentence Construction in Tagalog," *op. cit.*, and Lydia Fer. Gonzales, "The Active Verbs and Active Affixes in Tagalog" (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of the Philippines, Manila 1963), for a discussion of Tagalog active and passive verbs.

¹¹ Weinreich, *op. cit.*, p. 37. *Replica* refers to nonnative elements, the models which are found in the other language.

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 37-38.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

¹⁴ "Interlingual identification occurs when speakers equate items in one language with items in another because of their similarities in shape, distribution, or both." Einar Haugen, *Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide* (Publication No. 26 of the American Dialect Society, University of Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1956), p. 67.

¹⁵ Weinreich, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

¹⁶ Stockwell and Bowen, *The Sounds of English and Spanish*, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

¹⁷ *Beginning Tagalog: A Course For Speakers of English*, J. Donald Bowen, ed. (University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1965).

¹⁸ Robert Lado, *Linguistics Across Cultures* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1957), p. 2.

¹⁹ Weinreich, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

²⁰ Haugen, *The Norwegian Language in America*, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-10.

²¹ Charles C. Fries, *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1945), p. 58.

CHAPTER IV

THE TAGALOG BILINGUAL AND LANGUAGE BEHAVIOR:
FACTORS INFLUENCING BORROWING, MIXING AND LANGUAGE CHOICE

I. THE NATURE OF BILINGUALISM

Bilingualism has been a subject of interest to students of many disciplines. Psychological studies have included analyses of the effects of bilingualism on intelligence and emotional adjustment. Speech development of bilingual children has also been investigated.¹ Educators have concentrated on the problems connected with teaching in a bilingual situation, including the effects of bilingualism on the learning of mathematics, reading and language itself.² For the sociologists the study of bilingualism has taken the forms, among others, of research into matters of language loyalty and relationships between language status.³ A number of studies by anthropologists have considered bilingualism as a factor in acculturation and culture change.⁴

Linguists have explored many facets of the subject, including degrees and types of bilingualism and manner of language acquisition, and have made studies of languages in contact similar to this one.⁵ For the linguist, bilingualism may mean a number of things. Bloomfield, for instance, uses the term to mean "native-like control of two languages"; a "perfect foreign-language learning. . . not accompanied by loss of the native language."⁶ Haugen considers bilingualism "to begin at the point where the speaker of one language can produce *complete meaningful utterances* in the other language."⁷ Weinreich calls the "practice of alternately using two languages" bilingualism and refers to "those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language (as) *Interference* phenomena."⁸ Diebold prefers to "leave open the question of minimal proficiency, reserving for the initial learning stage the term incipient bilingualism."⁹

Fishman defines bilingualism as a " 'demonstrated ability to engage in communication via more than one language' " and does not "restrict bilingualism to any particular level of 'demonstrated ability' or to any particular kind of 'communication.' " Neither does bilingualism necessarily mean " 'equal (balanced) and *advanced* mastery of two languages' " because to require it to be so is

no more justifiable than to require that intelligence be defined restrictively to genius or that health be defined restrictively as equivalent to the complete absence of any dysfunction.¹⁰

Fishman's definition will be used in this study because it aptly describes the levels of proficiency of my informants, whose command of English varies all the way from virtually perfect to decidedly inadequate.

With a few exceptions, my informants went through approximately the same process leading to bilingualism. There was a separation in time and place in acquiring Tagalog and English. From birth till the early years before school (around six or seven years) they learned Tagalog in the home. They probably learned a few English words and

English rhymes but as a rule, they spoke only Tagalog. When they started school, they got their first formal instruction in English. Informants whose parents were educated and who had access to reading material in English also learned the foreign language passively. Radio and much later television also exposed some of the bilinguals to English. Actual personal contact with native speakers of English was limited or almost nil during the early periods, since the schoolteachers in the public schools they attended were Filipinos.

In later years – in college, at work and in society opportunities for meeting native speakers of English became greater, but not enough to cause a great impact. Thus as a rule the English learned by my informants was mostly via the written language and from non-native speakers. This affected the type of interference problems they had with the language. These were reflected mostly in the use of bookish English, e.g., polysyllables where native speakers would use two-word verbs. They also tended to have problems with pronunciation. Contact with Spanish as a rule came rather late, when my informants were in college and were required to take elementary courses in Spanish. Most of their Spanish professors used the grammar translation method and there was very little opportunity to use Spanish in actual live situations outside the classroom. Even in the classroom the Spanish spoken was confined mostly to a recitation of grammatical rules and conjugation of verbs. A few professors had my informants memorize bits of poetry, but there was very little attempt to teach modern conversational Spanish other than a few social formulas like *¿Como esta Ud.?* 'How are you?' *Bien, gracias.* 'Fine, thanks.'

Ten of my informants had the benefit of living in the United States either as exchange visitors or as regular students. They have an almost perfect command of English and the kinds of interference problems they have are more subtle. They rarely have difficulty with grammar but they occasionally use the wrong preposition or mix levels of style. With the exception of one informant who became an American citizen and has no intention of returning to the Philippines, all of my informants use a mixed language in certain situations to be discussed later. One informant had an opportunity to practice her stilted Spanish with Puerto Rican cleaning ladies and Cuban plumbers in New York City, but these few encounters did not improve her aural-oral control of the language.

The parents of these bilinguals generally welcomed their children's growing command of English and took pride in the youngsters' ability to learn it. There was no alienation of the kind reported by Haugen in "The Bilingual Individual" where an Italian-American, Mangione, comments on his mother's attitude toward the English the children brought into the house:

'My mother took no notice of such childish snobbery. As long as I remained under her jurisdiction she continued to cling to her policy of restricting the family language to Italian. "I might as well not have my children if I can't talk to them," she argued.'¹¹

With Spanish the attitude is different. Many parents ridicule their children's attempts to speak Spanish and make fun of their inability to speak a grammatical sentence in spite of their "units" in Spanish. As a matter of fact, even my informants themselves admit to using Spanish only in jest or to mock someone. They are typical of many Filipinos who never use Spanish. Only those who have ties of some sort with the small Spanish-speaking community use Spanish unself-consciously.

II. THE PSYCHOLOGY OF BORROWING

It has been mentioned earlier that the cosmopolitan society of Manila and its suburbs has been in part responsible for the non-hostile attitude toward borrowing on the part of the Tagalog speaker. Another factor which might have contributed to a favorable attitude toward languages in general is the Tagalog's love for words. This is manifested in many ways. For instance, traditional courtship is conducted in high-flown literary language. At wakes, singing and composing of verses provide entertainment and comfort to the bereaved family and their sympathizers. The traditional literary forms, the *balagtasán* (a poetical verbal joust), the *bugtong* (riddles) and the *tula* (poems) as well as the modern declamation and oratorical contests are favorite ways of displaying one's mastery of words.

In school, spelling contests and annual oratorical tourneys are held with much fanfare. Students love to collect and memorize favorite quotations and stock phrases from English works. A regular practice among Filipino teachers of English is to require their students to make vocabulary notebooks for difficult words and their meanings. The students study these words assiduously and use them at the slightest provocation, often in un-English constructions. As a matter of fact, English teachers find it hard to convince their students that language learning is not simply a matter of memorizing vocabulary items. For that matter, many unenlightened teachers still confuse language-learning with vocabulary-building.

The Tagalogs also enjoy punning, usually in more than one language. Indeed, the more languages they know, the better they are equipped to manipulate words and the wider their range of choices for their word games. No wonder then that they are receptive to language and language-learning.

The Tagalog bilingual is not self-conscious about his bilingualism as many Americans are wont to be about their immigrant-based bilingualism.¹² For him, bilingualism generally is a good thing no matter how or where he acquired it. Far from being shy about his proficiency in a foreign language, he seeks to exhibit it at every opportunity. Neither does the bilingual child have any emotional maladjustment brought about by his parents' ignorance of English. He may feel some embarrassment about their not having gone to school and learned English, but this does not cause real humiliation. Young people are aware that education was not as widely available during their parents' youth as it is now. Indeed, few girls of that time were permitted anything but rudimentary schooling. As a result, mothers who grew up before World War II are often functionally illiterate. Recognizing this, school officials encourage parents' participation by conducting school activities in Tagalog.

The phenomenon of persons changing their language and discarding the tongue which they have grown up with as a result of economic and social pressures observed by McLoughlin in the Republic of the Sudan¹³ does not seem to exist among the Tagalogs, who retain their language even when they move to non-Tagalog regions. This is usually true also of non-Tagalogs who move to a Tagalog region. Rather than discarding their own tongues, they retain them even after they learn the new language. Since Tagalog is a more

prestigious language than the other native languages, however, it is more likely that a non-Tagalog would discard his native language than that a Tagalog would his. As a matter of fact, non-Tagalogs who move to Manila inevitably learn Tagalog, but I have met a number of Tagalogs living in non-Tagalog areas who have not learned the local language. Because Tagalog is the national language and is widely taught in schools and disseminated through the mass media, the Tagalog speaker can usually get along in a non-Tagalog area without learning the local language. Some of the Philippine languages, however, are close enough to Tagalog so that a Tagalog speaker can learn them relatively quickly, and the more usual practice is for him to acquire one or more.

What has been said so far refers to the predominant attitude toward languages in general and does not account for some of the groups who for one reason or another are not enthusiastic about acquiring foreign languages. Among them are those who insist on "pure" forms and resent the use of foreign elements in Tagalog, not realizing that what they consider native Tagalog has in fact been "contaminated" by earlier borrowings. Rather than use borrowed words, they make up new words based on Tagalog stems.

In addition, some nationalists believe strongly that the Filipino soul cannot find expression in a foreign language. They forget that during both the Spanish and American regimes the conquerors' languages were used to voice the Filipino people's aspirations for independence. Rizal himself, the foremost Filipino patriot, wrote his novels *Noli Me Tangere* and *El Filibusterismo* in Spanish.

There are varying reactions toward the specific languages themselves. As a result of the emphasis in the public schools on the benevolence of the Americans in contrast to the inhumanity of the Spaniards, both Spain and Spanish have become anathema to many Filipinos. The Spanish mestizos are often given derogatory epithets like *Kastilaloy* 'phony Spaniards' or *mestisong bangos* 'a hybrid milkfish', and the learning of Spanish is often not taken seriously by many students. This attitude is in sharp contrast to that of some people educated in Catholic parochial schools who consider Spanish the language of culture and good breeding and look upon Mother Spain as the source of a great cultural heritage.

As we have seen, English is generally accepted, and people are impressed by one's mastery of it; there is prestige attached to a good command of English generally denied Spanish. The difference in attitude is partly traceable to the different colonial histories. This is a good example of non-linguistic factors affecting the attitude toward language. Still, there is an ambivalent attitude toward the degree of proficiency one should have in English. This makes a Tagalog who has acquired an excellent command of English wary of using American English when talking to his Filipino friends. He is afraid of being accused of trying to be an American, of speaking "slang" or of "talking through his nose" (the layman's concepts of American English). He is called "high society," "Stikside" and "a spokener of England" (the last two are deliberate mispronunciations of "Stateside" and "an English speaker"). He will, however, use American English when talking to Americans. This almost subconscious adjustment, creating, as it were, two dialects of English within a speaker (Filipino English and American English) is I believe, motivated by an awareness of other people's ambivalent feelings toward the use of English and an unconscious desire to be one of the group. This negative attitude, curiously enough, is limited to spoken English and does not apply to the written form.

My informants who have been to the United States complained that upon returning from abroad they were put into an extremely difficult situation when they spoke English. People expected them to have acquired a "Stateside" pronunciation and were disappointed when they did not show any "improvement" and still talked "carabao English." On the other hand, they were criticized for trying to be "Stateside" when they did talk like Americans. I have heard arguments like, "Australian English is good enough for the Australians, British English is spoken in England, so why not Filipino English for the Filipinos?"

It seems that what is interpreted as hostility to American pronunciation is in fact directed toward the persons who speak it and not toward English itself. Here the problem is two-fold. If the person who has acquired an American accent behaves differently from the group and considers himself apart from them, and if he also tends to display what people consider American mannerisms, he may be criticized. Among such "Americanisms" are women smoking, drinking, and using heavy make-up. In speech, this takes the form of exaggerated aspiration of stops and exaggerated rise and fall of tone. But if the person with an acquired American pronunciation shows in other ways that his experience abroad has not spoiled him, that he still considers himself one of the group, then he gets credit for having made good use of his time abroad.

Here is another instance of extralinguistic factors being confused with linguistic considerations.¹⁴ The present muddled state of government language policies in the Philippines is partly traceable to this factor. The authorities have confused linguistic nativism with patriotism, while at the same time recognizing the usefulness of English as a bridge to the rest of the world. As a result language policies have often been at cross-purposes.

Factors Influencing Language Mixing

In this section I will deal with the attitudes toward the mixed language that results from the use of borrowings, as well as the motivations for its use and the functions it serves.

Among educated Tagalogs, mixing is considered the normal acceptable conversational style of speaking and writing. The bilingual uses borrowings generously, shifts from one language to another easily and does not resist the adoption of loans. The linguistically sophisticated person, secure in his knowledge, uses only English or only Tagalog in strictly formal speaking and writing situations, but he will not hesitate to mix the languages in informal settings or when there seems to be a good reason for it. As a matter of fact, pure Tagalog spoken in an informal situation is not considered natural. One is easily identified as a non-native speaker of Tagalog if he uses pure Tagalog where a native speaker would not hesitate to use loans.

The purist, however, characterizes Tagalog spoken with borrowings as poor style, uncultured even if the mixing takes place in informal situations. The same attitude obtains toward the use of pure English; the purist would object to mixing regardless of which language is the borrowing one.

In the data studied, borrowing and mixing seem to have been motivated by the following factors:¹⁵

For precision. Sometimes English or Spanish words give the exact meaning the speaker/writer wants to convey, and it is more economical and efficient to use an English or Spanish loan. Thus:

Nag-Freudian slip ka. ‘You Freudian-slipped.’

Para bang Dresden China ‘Like Dresden China (frail and very feminine)’

Magtitrip muna ako around the world *bago ako pakasal.* ‘I’ll make a trip around the world before I get married.’

Masyado ang kanyang inferiority complex. ‘He has a marked inferiority complex.’

Nualienate mo siya dahil sa ginawa mo. ‘You’ve alienated him by your actions.’

Wala yatang labor-saving devices dito. ‘There are no labor-saving devices here.’

Mayroon silang mutual admiration club. ‘They have a mutual admiration club.’

Wala silang kaimaimagination sa pagtuturo. Ang gusto e step by step *sasabihin mo.*

Kailangan naman ang kaunting creativity. ‘Their teaching is utterly unimaginative. They want everything demonstrated step by step. What is needed is a little creativity.’

Nasaan ka noong nagblackout? ‘Where were you during the blackout?’

Sabi nga nila amor con amor se paga. ‘As they say, love begets love.’

Wala siyang palabra de honor. ‘He goes back on his word.’

Ang hirap e wala silang delicadeza. ‘The problem is they don’t have any sense of propriety.’

Wala ba kayong sentido comun? ‘Don’t you have any common sense?’

For transition. A shift in language may mark a transition in thought. Thus:

... *nakita ko sila.* Another news. *Bumili na kami ng auto – Pontiac Tempest 1964.* ‘... I saw them. Another news. We bought a car – Pontiac Tempest 1964.’

We really had a nice time. *Siya nga pala Inang* has given us the gray Taunus at half the price. ‘... Incidentally, Mom has given us the gray Taunus at half the price.’

Binisita ko sila. By the way, *alam mo bang nag-asawa na si Cristina?* ‘We visited them. By the way, did you know that Cristina had gotten married?’

For comic effect. Mixing is very effective in creating humor. Often the Tagalog creates a word composed of elements from Tagalog and English or Spanish and the effect is strikingly funny to his Tagalog hearer/reader. Thus:

Sumakay kami sa Kadilakad. ‘We rode in a Kadilakad.’ – Cadillac + *lakad* ‘to walk’; i.e., ‘We walked.’

Nag-attend ako ng kainference. ‘I attended a *kainference*.’ *Kain* ‘to eat’ + conference – ‘I attended a meeting where nothing much except eating was accomplished.’

Mukha siyang bandido dahil bigoted siya. ‘He looks like a bandit because he is *bigoted* – *bigote* ‘moustache’ + -d ‘past participle marker’ – ‘He looks like a crook because he has a moustache.’

Nagbisita ng klase kahapon ang mga superbasura. ‘Yesterday the *superbasuras* visited classes.’ – supervisor + *basura* ‘garbage’ – a statement showing a healthy disrespect for supervisors.

In-between being *atsays*, they have fun, going to cultural events. – *muchacha* ‘maid’ – a snide reference to the fact that these girls have to do their housework without the help of maids.

We live in **Pobres** Park and my husband drives a *Paakard*. – Forbes Park, a plush community in the suburbs of Manila and Packard, a brand of automobile. **Pobres**, however, means ‘poor folks’ and *Paakard* is made up of *paa* ‘foot’ and -kard of Packard.

Gusto niyang maging professional ang mga anak niya, pero ang kinalabasan e siraniko, hinangyero, abugago at sayangtist. ‘She wanted her children to enter the professions but they became a *siraniko* (from *sira* ‘destroyed’, ‘cracked up’ + *-nico* of *mecanico* ‘a mechanic’), a *hinangyero* (from *hinang* ‘to weld’ + *-iero* of *ingeniero* ‘engineer’), an *abugago* (from *abo-* of *abogado* ‘lawyer’ + *-gago* ‘stammerer’, ‘a stupid person’), and a *sayangtist* (from *sayang* ‘what a waste!’ + *-tist* of scientist).’

Nakakatakuyut ang kanilang torpesor. ‘Their stupid professor is frightening.’ – *nakakata-* of *nakakatakot* ‘frightening’ + *kyut* – ‘cute’ and *torpe* ‘dull’, ‘slow’, ‘stupid’ and *-sor* of **professor**.

He’s a *bwisiting* professor from California. ‘He’s a visiting professor (who has caused a lot of trouble) from California.’ – *bwisit* ‘bad luck’, ‘a nuisance’ + *-ing*.

Masarap ang tyanporado. ‘The *champurrado* tastes good.’ – *tyan* ‘stomach’ + *-purrado* of **champurrado** ‘a rice-based breakfast dish’.

In your reading, have you come across Lin Yutang *na loob*? – Lin Yutang, a Chinese author, + *utang na loob* ‘debt of obligation’.

Did you say he studied at Harvard? No, I said Harvard *diyan*. ‘No, I said Harvardian – Harvardian, a second-rate Philippine college, + *diyan* ‘there’.

Another way of creating humor using loans and mixing is by translating the members of a compound literally and putting them together so that the result does not give the original meaning and is often nonsensical. Thus:

kickback ‘bribe’ is translated as *tadyak sa likod* literally ‘a kick on the back’

bungang araw ‘heat rash’ is translated as *fruit of the sun

kapitbahay ‘neighbor’ is translated as *holdhouse – *kapit* ‘hold’ + *bahay* ‘house’

postman is translated as **posteng mama* – *poste* ‘post’ + *-ng* ‘linker’ + *mama* ‘man’.

bulakbol ‘loafer’ is translated as *cottonball – *bulak* ‘cotton’ + *-bol*.

For atmosphere. Often a mixed dialect heavily laced with English expressions is used to convey a “Stateside” atmosphere in stereotyped plays, movies or novels. This is often the dialect used by the bad city girl and the mustachioed villain. The former is usually portrayed as being immodestly dressed, heavily made-up and prone to vices like smoking and drinking. In contrast, the good girl, simple, unassuming and long-suffering, wears modest clothes, has no make-up at all and speaks literary Tagalog.

Villain: Hi, sweetheart, how about a drink?

City Girl: Of course, *basta ikaw* (if it’s you). Hmmm . . . this is good.

Villain: **Siyempre** (‘Of course’). Nothing is too good for the toast of Manila’s Four Hundred. Hey, say – *dadayo tayo sa Bulacan* (We’ll go to Bulacan) *ng* good time. *Ako ang taya at* (It’s all on me, and . . .) the sky is the limit!

To bridge or create social distance. To indicate the speaker/writer's desire to be friendly and to make the situation informal, a mixed language is used. Usually the "superior" sets the tone when he wants to use mixed speech. By the same token, he can show that he does not want the relationship to be any closer by consistently using pure English or pure Tagalog, the latter interspersed with polite particles and other polite signals used to indicate that intimacy would not be welcome. Related to this last function of mixing is the use of a mixed language by a Tagalog bilingual although she is aware that her hearer does not know Tagalog or Spanish. In the particular instance I have in mind, the Tagalog speaker is married to a native speaker of English. As if to make up for the fact that she has to use a foreign language even in an intimate situation, where one's emotional involvement makes the native language the logical one to use, the informant has developed a special kind of mixed language – English spoken with a Tagalog accent.

For snob appeal. To set off their children from those of their neighbors, some parents teach them English as a first language.¹⁶ Most of the time such parents simply succeed in being ridiculous because their English is rarely without flaws. Usually it is spoken with a strong Tagalog accent, translated Tagalog idioms, and English mixed with Tagalog particles. Thus:

Bebi, you want kendi ba? O, here is some. Don't make your dress dirty, ha? . . .
O wipe muna your hands. It is very sticky. 'Baby, do you want candy? Here is some. Please don't make your dress dirty. . . Wipe your hands, they are very sticky.'

The use of English or Spanish pretentiously is not limited to the above situation. I know a number of people who pretend that they do not understand "deep" Tagalog and stumble over every other word when reading a Tagalog text. They prefer to use English consistently although they cannot handle it well.

For secrecy. Parents who do not want their children to understand the conversation at a particular moment when it is impossible to prevent the children's overhearing usually resort to either Spanish or English. In the latter case, this is possible only when their children are of preschool age or have not yet learned English.¹⁷

Language Choice

The problem of language choice where two or more languages co-exist in a single speech community has been the subject of study among anthropologists and sociologists. Usually the functions performed by one language are divided between the two or more languages. Barker, for instance, notes that among the Mexicans in Tucson, Arizona, "individuals brought up in the language of their ancestral culture seem to find it easier to talk to each other in that language and to talk to outsiders in the language of the outsider's culture." Thus the "ethnic language comes to symbolize the group and its cultural background, or in terms of its social function, to identify the group as a group." Moreover, "the individual's skill in using the language of a second or adopted culture comes to symbolize his status in the new society."¹⁸

Concerning the Tagalogs of Manila, it is extremely difficult to make a simple statement about the functions of English, Spanish and Tagalog. while it is true that the

Tagalog speaker considers his native language as the language of intimacy and of familial relations, and English and Spanish as official languages and languages of business and diplomacy, certain other factors influence his choice of language at a particular time. Tagalog bilinguals often display variations in their language behavior, showing a relation between linguistic usage and the non-linguistic situation. Usage varies considerably from person to person and from situation to situation, and depending on the different variants to be discussed here, the Tagalog shifts from English to Tagalog, from Tagalog to English, or uses only English or only Tagalog.

When both the native and borrowed word exist and are equally common in use, what determines the choice of lexical items? Is the selection of one of a pair of alternate forms merely a matter of individual preference and lexical command of the language? If options were possible, what would be the preferred form – Tagalog, English or Spanish ?

In *Efficiency in Linguistic Change*, Jespersen points out that although a speaker or a writer is not clearly aware that he is often “obliged to make a choice from among a variety of expressions that his own language. . . places at his disposal and which he retains in his memory” it is nevertheless a fact that

he has to decide for the moment if he is to use the most familiar, natural, everyday expression, or if he is to use a more literary, solemn, stilted or even poetical style.¹⁹

The Tagalog bilingual makes a similar unconscious choice, except that he has at his disposal two complete sets of vocabularies – Tagalog with its assimilated Spanish loans and English – which enables him to insure variety in both speech and writing. Thus, depending on the effect he wants to produce, he can use a native Tagalog word, a Spanish loan or an English borrowing.

In Leo Pap’s study of Portuguese-American speech, he claims that many English words frequently heard impose themselves by sheer force of repetition upon the vocabularies of the Portuguese speakers. In other words, what influences the choice of a lexical item is not just the absence of a native term, but the more forceful presence of the foreign one. Aron states:

It is a psychological fact that when a person speaks two languages, a word from either language may bob up as he speaks. The ordinary person will use the first word that comes to mind uncritically and unconsciously. The more English is spoken, the oftener will English words present themselves.²⁰

This seems also to be the case with frequently-heard or read loans among Tagalog speakers of English. But factors other than simple chance affect lexical as well as language choice.

Variations in linguistic behavior seem to be a function of the following factors:²¹

Individual traits of the bilingual speaker – the nature of his bilingualism.

Lehmann maintains that:

To understand borrowings of various types, we must know the degree of command which speakers have of the language in question. For the extent of

reproduction is often determined by the extent of control which speakers have acquired of a second language, especially before conventions of borrowing have been established.²²

The Tagalog bilingual's choice of language in a specific linguistic context seems to be influenced by his education, his age, his emotional involvement, his language loyalty, and of course his facility with the languages and his feelings of security or insecurity about them. A bilingual with a college education is presumably more proficient in the borrowed languages than one with only an elementary or high school education. Theoretically, he would be more prone to use English or a mixed language than one who does not have as good a command of the foreign languages. He would probably not have very marked feelings of loyalty toward any particular language but would use the one which satisfied the needs of the particular situation. One who is not very secure about his control of the foreign language may nonetheless use it to prove that he is "educated" and "cultured." Bilinguals in their 60's and 70's, the greater part of whose education was conducted in Spanish, use more Spanish than bilinguals in their 30's and 40's. The latter are mostly the products of the public school system initiated by the Americans. They have a better command of English and have a greater affinity for it than their Spanish-trained parents or grandparents. Today's school children, however, are being trained under a new educational policy which stresses Tagalog as much as English and which postpones the use of English as a medium of instruction until the third grade. The use of Tagalog is never prohibited in the school and its premises as it was in the pre-independence era. The recent upsurge in nationalism with its emphasis on the native languages cannot fail to have its effect on the younger generation's linguistic attitudes, as the near-pure Tagalog speeches during the recent student-worker rallies illustrate.

Nature of the communication situation. Depending on the formality or informality of the situation, the domains of interaction (whether the topics dealt with have something to do with the home, for instance, or with subjects like the arts, philosophy or government), the identity of the listener/reader (his age and educational background), and the relation between the speaker/writer and hearer/reader (whether between peers, from a superior to an inferior or an inferior to a superior), a bilingual will choose to communicate in the language he thinks most appropriate.²³

In extremely formal speaking or writing situations, only English or only Tagalog is used and no mixing takes place. In informal speech or writing, mixing is commonplace. Formal communication situations include speaking at conferences, giving lectures, writing business letters and writing for scientific and other learned journals. Informal situations, on the other hand, include talking and writing to friends, family and acquaintances and conducting everyday commercial transactions.

Fishman held that the domains of interaction affect the degrees of bilingualism. "Certain socio-cultural foci and certain relationships between individuals call for one language rather than another in bilingual settings throughout the world."²⁴

Certain topics are better discussed in English than in Tagalog. For instance, it seems that discussions about linguistics, philosophy, physiology or political science cannot be sustained in Tagalog. One of my informants tried to give a lecture on sex education in

Tagalog but failed. The problem was not a lack of native vocabulary items; rather, the native terms had inevitably obscene connotations even though they were as precise as the English clinical terms. He found it embarrassing to employ them and was left the choice of using Tagalog euphemisms or English terms.

Since the work for this study was completed, there has been an effort among a few college professors to use Tagalog in situations traditionally conducted in English, e.g., philosophy, literature and linguistics classes at the University of the Philippines and Ateneo de Manila. It seems that the problem, particularly at the beginning, was mostly the lack of fluency of both the professors and the students in the use of Tagalog in a situation where they were trained and accustomed to using English. Students not quite at home in Tagalog either refused to take part in the discussions or asked permission to use English or a mixed language. Where native technical vocabulary was lacking, the professors borrowed the English term, used coined words, or employed a mixed language.

Everyday conversation carried on in one's home is ordinarily in Tagalog. In informal situations, both kinds of topics, the homely and the abstract, are discussed in a mixed language. Persons of my parents' generation pray in Latin or Spanish, but their children pray in a mixed language – Latin, English and Tagalog.

The age, educational background, and type of work of the bilingual often determine his linguistic proficiency. The speaker/writer takes these into account when addressing his listener/reader. If the speaker/writer knows that his interlocutor has only a smattering of English, he will not embarrass him by talking to him in the foreign language. Professional people and those with white-collar jobs are often addressed in English in a formal situation. With laborers, however, the conversation is nearly always in Tagalog. In schools, colleges and offices, people communicate orally in Tagalog or a mixed language but use English in written communication. Conferences between a parent and a teacher are normally conducted in Tagalog unless the parent indicates that he wants to carry it on in English. Even the formal PTA meetings are usually carried on in Tagalog. Young parents (in their 20's through 40's) are more likely to know English than older ones (in their 50's and 60's). The latter might have some knowledge of Spanish but as a rule are more at home in Tagalog. The very old are usually addressed in Tagalog.

Tagalog is also the language of the market and the department store; it is used in general in conducting ordinary business affairs. I can imagine few situations where a Tagalog would use English in such places, except perhaps price quotations and certain English words used in isolation, often for humorous effect. Examples of the latter are "always" for *galunggong*, a kind of fish which always finds its way onto poor people's tables because it is cheap, and "bargain *dahil sa* Apollo landing" 'sale because of the Apollo landing'. English used more extensively in the marketplace would indicate pretentiousness of the highest order. Moreover, it would probably make the prices go up in the same way that the presence of an American (or any Caucasian) would. In downtown shops and department stores, however, English is sometimes useful for catching the attention of haughty salesclerks who tend to ignore plain-looking, Tagalog-speaking customers.

As a rule, a subordinate uses English to start a formal conversation in a school or office situation when he is talking to his superior. The superior usually answers in English and the whole conversation is conducted in English, maintaining its formal nature.

On the other hand, the superior may answer in Tagalog, signalling the fact that his subordinate can relax and be informal. The inferior may on occasion switch to Tagalog even though his superior does not, to indicate that he is asking his superior to be less formal. I also found that teachers or clerks, for instance, who want to impress their superiors with their command of English will continue to use English even when the superior has shifted to Tagalog. Tagalog is used at the beginning of a conversation to established rapport between superiors and inferiors. It is also used by a superior as a prelude to dressing down an inferior. When the unpleasant business (conducted in English) is finished, the superior reassures the inferior that he wants to re-establish friendly relations by shifting back to Tagalog.

Peers do not seem to worry about the language to conduct their affairs in at the office or other work settings, but use the language most appropriate for the occasion based on the considerations mentioned earlier.

The native language is used to show affinity for the group. For example, when a Tagalog bilingual meets a countryman abroad, they nearly always converse in Tagalog, at least in the beginning. Tagalog to them is a symbol of national solidarity. By the same token, a Tagalog who does not, for some reason, want to be identified with his countrymen, professes ignorance of Tagalog and when greeted in Tagalog will answer in English.

Somehow, even for the bilingual, it is a great strain to have to use a foreign language when he is tired and wants to relax. At such a time Tagalog is the language normally used. Similarly, at informal gatherings where Americans are present, Filipino guests may "delegate" one or more of their number to look after the American guests (i.e., speak English) so that they can speak Tagalog and enjoy themselves.

Motives of the speaker/writer. Language choice is also influenced by the motives, conscious or unconscious, of the speaker/writer. The motives for borrowing and mixing discussed earlier apply equally to language choice. For social and economic advancement, a knowledge of English is of extreme importance, and people learn to speak it well for these reasons. A person with a good command of English generally has a better chance of getting a high-paying job than one who does not. He is also more able to move in social circles where people have a high educational attainment.²⁵ Nonetheless, no stigma is attached to one's inability to communicate in English.²⁶ In spite of the use of English and Spanish for snob appeal and to bridge (or create) social distance, language does not function to separate social classes as such among Tagalogs. Not all who speak good English are from the upper classes, but all from the upper classes (according to other criteria such as money, length of time money has been in the family, and general acceptance by other people of their upper-class status) speak good English and/or good Spanish. In other words, ability to speak English is not an infallible indicator of social class, but inability to do so is. Since education is not limited to the wealthy few and there is a reasonable amount of social mobility, it is possible for one from a lower class to get an education and be bilingual. In short, bilingualism is not confined to any specific social group.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Tagalog has borrowed extensively from Spanish and English, and loans have been from all grammatical and cultural categories. The differences in contact situations as well as in attitudes toward the two foreign colonizing powers explain in part why borrowing from English is still a living process while borrowing from Spanish has stopped.

The borrowings have undergone phonological, morphological and at times even semantic changes to conform with Tagalog. In many cases loan words co-exist with native words or replace them in certain contexts. Although the Tagalog lexicon has not by any means been supplanted by the borrowings, English and Spanish have had a profound influence on Tagalog vocabulary, enriching it and providing the Tagalog speaker with a great variety of words to choose from.

The impact upon the phonological system has not been as great. This conforms with what is generally true about language contact.

Contact between languages is a powerful influence in language change but . . . there is little or no evidence that phonemic systems undergo rapid and drastic changes as an immediate result of such contact The effects of contact on the sound system of a language have generally been shown to take the form of gap-filling, some redistribution of contrasts and restructuring without, however, any profound reorganization or extension system.¹

It has been shown that as a result of the influx of Spanish loans, Tagalog has changed from a three-to a five-vowel system and that the presence of consonant clusters in both Spanish and English has led to the adoption of a few of them. But the Tagalog phonemic system has remained virtually intact.

The influence on morphology has also been slight. Tagalog has maintained its morphological system and has imposed its patterns on the borrowed languages. Grammatical categories which are obligatory in the foreign languages have not been borrowed. Again this conforms with what is generally true of borrowing on the morphological level.

Opinions differ as to the importance of the purely morphological influence exerted by one language on another in contrast with the more external type of phonetic and lexical influence. Undoubtedly such influences must be taken into account, but so far they have not been shown to operate on any great scale.²

The differences in the phonological, morphological and lexical systems of the languages in contact often result in interference problems of varying kinds. The patterns of the native language interfere when the Tagalog attempts to speak or write in the foreign languages.. Another type of interference can be traced to the differences in the patterns of behavior and attitudes between the Americans and the Tagalogs.

In general it can be said that while the contacts with Spanish and English have led to profound cultural changes, the impact on the basic framework of Tagalog has not been as great. This is to be expected since

culture change and linguistic change do not move along parallel lines and hence do not tend to stand in a close causal relation the conservative tendency makes itself felt more profoundly in the formal groundwork of language than in that of culture.³

One may conclude that the language described in this study, for all its borrowings and mixings, is still Tagalog and will never suffer the fate of the many European immigrant languages in America. Because it is spoken in the home country

and because speaking pure English is not needed for day-to-day survival, the pressures that were brought to bear on the European immigrants to America do not exist in the Philippines.

At present there are still no pressures upon the Tagalog speaker to confine himself to his native language and to give up the use of English. It is conceivable, however, that within the next few decades the growing demands of nationalism will lead to a substantial change in the Philippine language situation, resulting in English being relegated to a less exalted position than it holds at present. Already there are indications that Tagalog and the other native languages will play a more important role than they have in the past. Instruction will probably be conducted wholly in Tagalog and/or the other vernaculars in the elementary grades, and English will be taught only in high schools and universities.

Such a development would be useful in a practical but limited sense. For reasons largely economic, many Filipino school children never reach the stage of functional literacy in any language because of the large percentage of drop-outs during the first four years of school. It seems that the time spent learning a foreign language might better be spent on content courses.

But many important factors militate against the eventual repudiation of English. There are not enough books written in Tagalog and the other native languages to replace those in English and it will require a major financial commitment to translate and print English works in the native languages.

More important, the Tagalogs live in a cosmopolitan milieu and generally have a very positive attitude toward Western culture in all its forms. From pre-Spanish times they have been favorably disposed to foreign language acquisition and it is unlikely that they will change their attitude toward borrowing and begin creating new words for new cultural items at this late date. Moreover, confining the use of English to the higher levels of learning would make it the exclusive property of the elite, a situation which the Filipino who prides himself in being democratic could hardly countenance.

The Philippines has many highly educated people and those who are now at the helm of state are the products of an American inspired system of education. They will continue to be agents of cultural change and will go on using English. The strong cultural and historical ties between America and the Philippines will likewise help prevent the total rejection of English. Unlike some other colonial masters of Asia, the Americans left no legacy of hate, and there are continuing personal contacts between the two peoples. More recently, student activists have adopted Tagalog as an expression of nationalism. To some extent it appears that this is done for a practical as well as an ideological reason. The students hope that use of Tagalog at worker-student rallies will speed politicization of the masses. The more radical students associate English with imperialism and accuse their professors who speak only English of being puppets. The majority of Filipinos, however, do not associate English with imperialism.

Unless narrow nationalism triumphs and English is totally discarded in the Philippines, the Tagalog speaker will continue to borrow freely from English and will remain a bilingual. He will eventually be less self-conscious about his colonial past and will perhaps be proud of the fact that as a consequence of fate and history he belongs to a nation of mixed tongues and mixed cultures. As such he will continue to be an integral link between East and West.

¹See, for example, Natalie T. Darcy, "The Effect of Bilingualism Upon the Measurement of the Intelligence of Children of Preschool Age," **Journal of Educational Psychology**, XXXVII (1946), 21-44; Dorothy T. Spoerl, "Bilinguality and Emotional Adjustment", **Journal of Abnormal Psychology**, XXXVIII (January, 1943), 37-57; Werner Leopold, **Speech Development of a Bilingual Child** (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University, 1939).

²See, e.g., Ernest G. Malherbe, **The Bilingual School: A Study of Bilingualism in South Africa** (Johannesburg, 1934); Madorah E. Smith, "Some Light on the Problem of Bilingualism as Found From a Study of the Progress in Mastery of English Among Pre-School Children of Non-American Ancestry in Hawaii," **Genetic Psychology Monographs**, XXI (1939), 119-284; Susan M. Erwin and Charles E. Osgood, "Second Language Learning and Bilingualism," **Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology** (Supp. 1954), 139-46.

³See, for example, Joshua A. Fishman, et al., **Language Loyalty in the United States** (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1965); James A. Bossard, "The Bilingual Individual as a Person: Linguistic Identification With Status," **American Sociological Review**, X (1945), 699-709.

⁴See, e.g., Edward H. Spicer, "Linguistic Aspects of Yaqui Acculturation," **American Anthropologist**, n.s. XLV (1943), 410-26; George C. Barker, "Social Functions of Language in a Mexican-American Community," **Acta Americana**, V, no.3 (1947), 185 – 202.

⁵See, for example, Leo Pap, **Portuguese-American Speech** (New York: 1949); A. F. Spencer, "Japanese-American Language Behavior," **American Speech**, XXV (December, 1950), 241-52.

⁶Bloomfield, **Language**, *op. cit.*, pp. 55-56.

⁷Haugen, **The Norwegian Language**, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.

⁸Weinreich, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

⁹Diebold, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

¹⁰Joshua A. Fishman, "The Implications of Bilingualism for Language Teaching and Language Learning," **Trends in Language Teaching**, Albert Valdman, editor (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. 122.

¹¹Einar Haugen, "The Bilingual Individual," **Psycholinguistics**, Sol Saporta, editor (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), p. 397.

¹²Fishman, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

¹³Peter F.M. McLoughlin, **Language-Switching as an Index of Socialization in the Republic of the Sudan** (University of California Publications in Sociology, Vol. I, University of California Press, Berkeley. 1964).

¹⁴A similar type of confusion has led to tracing problems of emotional adjustment of bilinguality. Dorothy T. Spoerl's "Bilinguality and Emotional Adjustment," *op. cit.*, reveals that most of the emotional and social mal-adjustments peculiar to second-generation American college students were environmentally determined. They were not the result of mental conflicts brought about by speaking and thinking in two languages; rather, the inevitable disharmony between foreign-born parents and their Americanized children and the rejection of the parents' cultural background by the children were the causes. Social and cultural rather than linguistic factors may cause problems of which linguistic phenomena are only a manifestation.

¹⁵See Alice H. Marfil and Aida L. Pasigna, "An Analysis of Shifts From Tagalog to English in Printed Materials" (unpublished master's thesis, Philippine Normal College, Manila August 1970), for rules for shifting from Tagalog to English. It seems that "... the more closed categories (i.e., function words) tend to be Tagalog while the more open categories (i.e., content words) tend to be English." (p. 92.)

¹⁶Not all parents who teach their children to speak English as a first language are motivated by such reasons, of course. The reasons most frequently given by respondents in the **Language Policy Survey of the Philippines, Initial Report**, by Fe T. Otones and Bonifacio P. Sibayan (prepublication edition, Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College, December 1969), p. 136, are "to learn more rapidly, to communicate better, show they are educated, get a good job, to be able to travel and to maintain dignity and self-respect." On the other hand, the reasons given for parents' wanting their children to learn Pilipino (Tagalog) are: "to be patriotic and to understand their heritage."

¹⁷Normally, Tagalog speakers do not distinguish between the language they use in public and that used in private. It seems that they are free to choose the language in terms of their personal needs without regard to whether they are inside or outside the home. Simon Herman in "Explorations in the Social Psychology of Language Choice," **Human Relations**, XIV (1961), 149-64, reports the use by immigrants to Israel of their native tongue at home and a switch to Hebrew on buses, at concerts, and in other public places. The tendency is more pronounced where the foreign language is subject to public derogation.

¹⁸Barker, *op. cit.*, 186-87.

¹⁹København: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1941, p. 12.

²⁰Albert W. Aron, "The Gender of English Loan-Words in Colloquial American-German," **Language Monograph No. 7, Curme Volume of Linguistic Studies**, James Hatfield, Werner Leopold, and A.J. Friedrich Zieglschmid, editors (Waverly Press, Inc., Baltimore, 1931).

²¹It seems that to give empirically tested answers to the question of what language a particular type of interlocutor will use, given a particular context, one needs specific data from bilingual informants, perhaps in response to questionnaires. But no such study will be attempted here. Instead I will simply offer suggestions based on my practical experience with Tagalog bilingual behavior. Throughout this study, I have verified my observations and tentative conclusions with other Tagalog bilinguals.

After the basic work for this study was completed, the **Language Policy Survey of the Philippines, Initial Report**, *op. cit.*, was published. Its conclusions tend to confirm those of this study.

²²Winfred P. Lehmann, **Historical Linguistics: An Introduction** (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1962), p. 213.

²³These questions are dealt with at length in the **Language Policy Survey**, *op. cit.*; see especially pp. 55-56.

²⁴Fishman, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-26.

²⁵In the Philippines where the utilitarian value of knowing English is great, it is noteworthy that the "integrative motive", i.e., "the desire to associate with or be like valued members of the cultural - linguistic community whose language is being learned" is an important factor in second-language acquisition. See Emma H. Santos, "A Study of the Roles of Aptitude and Motivation in Second Language Acquisition" (unpublished thesis, Philippine Normal College, Manila, July, 1969) and Robert C. Gardner, "Motivational Variables in Second Language Learning," *International Journal of American Linguistics*, XXXII (January 1966), pp. 24-44. The **Language Policy Survey**, *op. cit.*, indicates that "achieving success in an occupation of high prestige is associated with multilingualism at least in English and Pilipino, but most desirably in English, Pilipino and the local Philippine language . . . English is still the language primarily associated with certain personal goals directly or indirectly contributing to the economic and social advancement." See also Priscilla V. Dizon, H.J. Feenstra and E.P. Dagot, "Language Preference Among Filipino Grade 2 Children" (Occasional Paper No. 9, Series of 1971, Philippine Normal College, Manila).

²⁶Cf. Ruth Tuck, **Not With the Fist: A Study of Mexican-Americans in a Southwest City** (New York: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1946). Here Tuck suggests that the general tendency of Mexican laborers not to use English in public together with their faulty use of it when they are forced to, constitutes the principal reason for the feeling on the part of many Anglo-Americans that the Mexican cannot be assimilated, or, in short, that he should have no status at all in the community.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

¹L.W. Lanham, "The Proliferation and Extension of Bantu Phonemic Systems Influenced by Bushman and Hottentot," **Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists**, Cambridge, Mass., August 27-31, 1962, Horace G. Lunt, editor (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1964).

²Edward Sapir, "Language," **Culture, Language and Personality**, David G. Mandelbaum, editor (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), p. 33.

³Edward Sapir, "Dialect," **Selected Writings of Sapir in Language, Culture and Personality**, David G. Mandelbaum, editor (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963), pp. 100, 102.

Partial Bibliography

An English-Tagalog Dictionary, Manila: Institute of National Language, 1960.

Aron, Albert. "The Gender of English Loan-Words in Colloquial American-German," **Language Monograph No. 7, Curme Volume of Linguistic Studies**, James Hatfield, Werner Leopold, and A.J. Friedrich Zieglschmid, editors. Baltimore: Waverly Press, Inc. pp. 11-28

Barker, George C. "Social Functions of Language in a Mexican-American Community," **Acta Americana**, V, No. 3 (1947), 185-202.

Beginning Tagalog: A Course for Speakers of English. J. Donald Bowen, ed. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1965.

Bernstein, David. **The Philippine Story**. New York: Farrar, Straus & Company, 1947.

Blair, Emma Helen and James Alexander Robertson. **The Philippine Islands 1493-1898**. 55 vols. Cleveland, Ohio: The A.H. Clark Co., 1903-09.

Bloomfield, Leonard. **Language**. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1933.

———. **Tagalog Texts With Grammatical Analysis**. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, III, No. 3, 1917.

Bossard, James A. "The Bilingual Individual as a Person: Linguistic Identification With Status," **American Sociological Review**, X (1945), 699-709.

Bull, William E. **Time, Tense, and the Verb**. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960.

Cassell's Spanish Dictionary. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1960.

Constantino, Ernesto. "The Sentence Patterns of Twenty-six Philippine Languages," *Lingua*, XV (1965), 71-124.

Dagot, Edilberto P. "The Cultural and Linguistic Features Involved in Cross-Cultural Communication Between Filipino Students and Americans and the Use of Short Stories to Teach These Features." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, New York, 1967.

Darcy, Natalie T. "The Effect of Bilingualism Upon the Measurement of the Intelligence of Children of Preschool Age." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXXVII (1946), 21-44.

Devins, John Bancroft. *An Observer in the Philippines.* Boston: American Tract Society, 1905.

Diebold, A.R. "Incipient Bilingualism," *Language*, XXXVII (1961), 97-112.

Dizon, Priscilla V., H.J. Feenstra and E.P. Dagot. "Language Preference Among Filipino Grade 2 Children." Occasional Paper No. 9, Series of 1971, Philippine Normal College, Manila.

Erwin, Susan M. and Charles E. Osgood. "Second Language Learning and Bilingualism," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* (Supp. 1954), 139-46.

Feenstra Henry J. "The Filipino Bilingual Child." Occasional Paper No. 8, Series of 1970, Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College, Manila.

———, and Emma H. Santos – Castillo. "Aptitude, Attitude and Motivation in Second-Language Acquisition: a Look at Two Cultures." Occasional Paper No. 5, Series of 1970, Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College, Manila.

Fishman, Joshua A. "The Implications of Bilingualism for Language Teaching and Language Learning," *Trends in Language Teaching*, Albert Valdman, editor. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966. Pp. 121-32.

———, et al. *Language Loyalty in the United States.* The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1965.

Forbes, W. Cameron. *The Philippine Islands.* 2 vols. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1928.

Fox, Henry Frederick. "The Heritage of Formal Education," *Weekly Women's Magazine*, May 26, 1967, 30-31, 42 [an English language publication circulated in the Philippines].

Fox, Robert. "The Philippines in Prehistoric Times," *The Philippines of Yesteryears*,

- Eufronio Alip, editor. **Philippines [Manila]** : Alip & Sons, 1964 .
- Fries, Charles C. **Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language**. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1945.
- Galinsky, Hans. "Stylistic Aspects of Borrowing," **Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists**. Cambridge, Mass., August 27-31, 1962. Horace G. Lunt, editor. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1964, 365-73.
- Gonzales, Lydia Fer. "The Active Verbs and Active Affixes in Tagalog." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of the Philippines, Manila, 1963.
- Haugen, Einar. **Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide**. Publication No. 26 of the American Dialect Society, University of Alabama, University of Alabama Press, 1956.
- . "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing," **Language**, XXVI (1950), 210-31.
- . "The Bilingual Individual," **Psycholinguistics**, Sol Saporta, editor. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, Pp. 395-407.
- . **The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior**. 2 vols. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953.
- Herdan, Gustav. **The Advanced Theory of Language as Choice and Chance**. New York: Springer - Verlag, 1966.
- Hendershot, Vernon E. **The First Year of Standard Malay**. Mountain View, California: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1943.
- Herman, Simon. "Explorations in the Social Psychology of Language Choice," **Human Relations**, XIV (1961), 149-64.
- Jespersen, Otto. **Efficiency in Linguistic Change**. København: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1941.
- . **Language: Its Nature, Development and Origin**. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd. 1922.
- Kany, Charles, E. **American-Spanish Syntax**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.
- Kenyon, John S. "Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties of English," **Readings in Applied English Linguistics**. Harold B. Allen, ed. New York: Appleton - Century-Crofts, 1938.
- Lado, Robert. **Linguistics Across Cultures**. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1957.

- Lanham, L.W. "The Proliferation and Extension of Bantu Phonemic Systems Influenced by Bushman and Hottentot," **Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists**. Cambridge, Mass., August 27-31, 1962. Horace G. Lunt, editor. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1964, 382-91.
- Lapesa, Rafael. **Historia de la Lingua Española**. Madrid: Escelicer, S.L., 1955.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. **Historical Linguistics: An Introduction**. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.
- Leopold, Werner F. **Speech Development of a Bilingual Child**. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University, 1939.
- Llamzon, Teodoro, S.J. **Standard Filipino English**, Manila : Ateneo University Press, 1969.
- Lopez, Cecilio, "The Spanish Overlay in Tagalog," **Lingua**, XIV (1965), 467-504.
- Mackey, William F. "Bilingualism Interference: Its Analysis and Measurement," **The Journal of Communication**, XV (December, 1965), 239-249.
- Malcolm, George A. **The Commonwealth of the Philippines**. New York: Appleton Century Company, 1936.
- Malherbe, Ernest. G. **The Bilingual School: A Study of Bilingualism in South Africa**. Johannesburg, 1934.
- Manuel, Arsenio. **Chinese Elements in the Tagalog Language**. Manila: Filipiniana Publication, 1948.
- Marfil, Alice H. and Aida L. Pasigna. "An Analysis of Shifts from Tagalog to English in Printed Materials." Unpublished master's thesis, Philippine Normal College, Manila, August 1970.
- McLoughlin, Peter F.M. **Language-Switching as an Index of Socialization in the Republic of the Sudan**. University of California Publications in Sociology, Vol. I. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964.
- Morales, Rosalina A. "Language and Culture," **The MST English Quarterly** (1960).
- . "No Literal Translation, Please!" **Exchange News** (first quarter, 1961), 10-11.
- . "Signals and Cross-Signals," **English Teaching Newsletter**. Washington: USIA Publication (1961).
- . "Ugaling Pilipino: An Introduction to Filipino Thought and Culture," **The NAFSA Newsletter** (February 15, 1963).

- Morga, Antonio de. **The Philippine Islands, Moluccas, Siam, Cambodia, Japan and China at the Close of the Sixteenth Century.** Trans. Henry E.J. Stanley. London: Hakluyt Society, 1868.
- Otanes, Fe and Bonifacio P. Sibayan. **Language Policy Survey of the Philippines, Initial Report** (prepublication edition). Language Study Center, Philippine Normal College, Manila, December, 1969.
- Pap, Leo. **Portuguese-American Speech.** New York, 1949.
- Paterno, Adelaida. "Tagalog Consonant Phonemes Compared With English Consonant Phonemes," **The MST English Quarterly**, VII (1957), 11-17.
- Phelan, John Leddy. **The Hispanization of the Philippines.** Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1959.
- Pigafetta, Antonio. **The First Voyage Around the World.** Trans. James A. Robertson. Cleveland, Ohio: The Arthur H. Clark Co., 1906.
- Politzer, Robert L. and Charles N. Staubach. **Teaching of Spanish.** New York: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1961.
- Ramos, Maximo. **Language Policy in Certain Newly Independent States.** Roderick J. Hemphill, ed. PCLS Monograph Series No. 2, Philippine Center for Language Study, Pasay City, Philippines, 1961.
- Report of the Philippine Commission.** 3 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900.
- Richard, C. "Introduction to the Symposium 'Our Spanish Heritage,'" **Weekly Women's Magazine**, May 5, 1967, 18-20.
- Santos, Emma H. "A Study of the Roles of Aptitude, Attitude, and Motivation in Second Language Acquisition." Unpublished Master's thesis, Philippine Normal College, Manila, July 1969.
- Sapir, Edward. "Dialect," **Selected Writings of Sapir on Language, Culture and Personality**, David G. Mandelbaum, editor. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963, Pp. 83-103.
- "Language," **Culture, Language and Personality**, David G. Mandelbaum, editor. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966. Pp. 1-44.
- Language.** New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1921.
- Silverio, Antonia. "The Passive Verbal Sentence Construction in Tagalog." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of the Philippines, Manila, 1962.

- Smith, Madorah E. "Some Light on the Problem of Bilingualism as Found From a Study of the Progress in Mastery of English Among Pre-School Children of Non-American Ancestry in Hawaii," **Genetic Psychology Monographs**, XXI (1939), 119-284.
- Spencer, A.F. "Japanese-American Language Behavior," **American Speech**, XXV (December, 1950), 241-52.
- Spicer, Edward H. "Linguistic Aspects of Yaqui Acculturation," **American Anthropologist**, n.s. XLV (1943), 410-26.
- Spoerl, Dorothy T. "Bilinguality and Emotional Adjustment," **Journal of Abnormal Psychology**, XXXVIII (January, 1949), 37-57.
- Statutes at Large, 73rd Congress, 2nd Session, p. 6380.
- Stockwell, Robert P. "A Contrastive Analysis of English and Tagalog: Part I." Unpublished manuscript, The University of California, Los Angeles, 1957.
- , and J. Donald Bowen. **The Sounds of English and Spanish**. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- , J. Donald Bowen, and John W. Martin. **The Grammatical Structures of English and Spanish**. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Tavera, Pardo de. **El Sanscrito en la Lengua Tagalog**. Paris: Imprimeria de la Faculté de Médecine, 1887.
- Tuck, Ruth. **Not With the Fist: A Study of Mexican-Americans in a Southwest City**. New York: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1946.
- United States Bureau of the Census. **Census of the Philippine Islands: 1903**. 4 vols. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1905.
- Weinreich, Uriel. **Languages in Contact**. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1967 [Originally published as Number 1 in the Series "Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York," New York, 1953.]
- Wickberg, Edgar. **The Chinese in Philippine Life, 1850-1898**. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.
- Yap, Fe Aldave. **Pilipino Loan Words in English (Mga Salitang Pilipino sa Ingles)**. Maynila: Surian ng Wikang Panbansa, Nobyembre 1970.
- Zaide, Gregorio F. **Philippine Political and Cultural History**. 2 vols. Manila: Philippine Education Company, 1957.

APPENDIX A

CHINESE AND SANSKRIT ELEMENTS IN TAGALOG *

The following loans from Chinese and Sanskrit do not represent all the categories of borrowing from these two languages. They have been chosen particularly because they constitute what are now considered literary or pure Tagalog.

Chinese Loans

lakambini 'maiden'
binibini 'maiden'
hinhin 'modesty'
tangi 'unique'
himlay 'slumber'
tanglaw 'light', 'lamp'
lupaypay 'weakened'
liham 'letter'
kutya 'to mock', 'to ridicule'

Sanskrit Borrowings

tala 'star'
tadhana 'destiny'
sutla 'silk'
awa 'compassion'
bahagi 'portion', 'part'
kudyapi 'guitar'
dusa 'suffering', 'affliction'
saksi 'witness'
mutya 'pearl', 'loved one'
samantala 'while'
palibhasa 'because'
sampalataya 'belief'
Bathala 'God'
samba 'to worship'
sinta 'loved one'
aksaya 'destroy', 'waste'
dalaga 'an unmarried woman'

*From Arsenio Manuel, *Chinese Elements in the Tagalog Language* (Manila: Filipiniana Publication, 1948), and Pardo de Tavera, *El Sanscrito en la Lengua Tagalog* (Paris: Imprimerie de la Faculté de Médecine, 1887).