

Morphological Assimilation of Borrowings in Tagalog

Ekaterina Baklanova
Moscow State University
langit7@yandex.ru

Integration, or assimilation, of foreign words implies their adaptation to the rules of the recipient language. The present paper is an analysis of the Tagalog main strategies in morphological assimilation of its numerous borrowings from Sanskrit, Malay, Chinese, Spanish, English, etc. The following aspects will be examined:

- Use of '*phonological citations*' as the least adopted borrowings: '*phonological citations*' are unassimilated borrowings used in the recipient language in their original form. However, Tagalog tends to partially bring them into accord with its morphological rules;

- Simplification of borrowings and their use as roots: Borrowings are usually simplified in Tagalog, i.e. become morphologically indivisible, and are used as root words, with the following derivation according to the Tagalog rules;

- Annulment of borrowings' grammatical characteristics. Gender and Number: Special Case: Borrowings are adopted as indivisible root words, with all their grammatical characteristics annulled. However, with more and more borrowings adopted, Tagalog speakers began to distinguish such grammatical categories as gender and number in their loanwords;

- *Wrong interpretation* of borrowings' morphemic structure: Due to differences between the donor's and recipient's morphological systems the borrowings may undergo a *hypercorrection* (wrong interpretation) of their morphemic structure: word combinations become merged; some elements are regarded as native and omitted;

- *Hybridization* of borrowings during their assimilation: While adopting a borrowing Tagalog may replace some part of it with the native lexical material, thus making a *hybrid loanword*. Here the problem of *early hybrid loans* will be discussed.

Abbreviations

Ar	Arab
Hok	Hokkien Chinese
Eng	English
Jav	Javanese
Mal	Malay
Mex-Sp	Mexican Spanish
Skt	Sanskrit
Sp	Spanish
Tag	Tagalog

<i>cf.</i>	compare (with)
<i>coll</i>	colloquial (word)
<i>e.g.</i>	for example
<i>fem.</i>	feminine (gender)

<i>Ibid</i>	the same (as above)
<i>i.e.</i>	that is
<i>intern</i>	international
<i>lit.</i>	literally
<i>masc.</i>	masculine (gender)
<i>old</i>	old or outdated word
<i>smb</i>	somebody
<i>smth</i>	something
<i>suf.</i>	suffix:
	<i>act. suf.</i> - actor suffix, <i>diminut. suf</i> - diminutive <i>suf</i> , <i>internat. suf.</i> - international <i>suf</i> , <i>gerund. suf.</i> - gerundial <i>suf</i> .
<i>Vs</i>	versus

As Uriel Weinreich rightly pointed out in his fundamental work ‘Languages in Contact’, an interesting point about a language is the phonetic, grammatical, semantic and stylistic integration of foreign elements into it (Weinreich 1966: 12). Integration, or *assimilation* of foreign elements is their adaptation to the norms and needs of the recipient language. Following the general patterns of this integration, many borrowings from Chinese, Sanskrit, Malay, Arab, Spanish, English and other languages undergo phonetic, semantic and morphological assimilation in the Tagalog language.

In the present paper I shall attempt to analyze the main strategies of the *morphological assimilation* of different borrowings in Tagalog, i.e. their adaptation to the grammar rules and word-building patterns of the recipient.

I. UNASSIMILATED BORROWINGS

1.1. Use of unassimilated borrowings (*‘phonological citations’*).

UNASSIMILATED LOANWORDS, or so-called *‘phonological citations’* (Weinreich’s term) keep intact their original phonetic, semantic and even graphic appearance in the recipient language. In Tagalog this group is mostly represented with recent borrowings from Spanish and English. Nowadays unassimilated loanwords are widespread in Tagalog, due to the domination of Spanish in the past and the mass English-Tagalog bilingualism at present. Noteworthy, the use of a Spanish or English unassimilated borrowing does not necessarily imply the lack of the native equivalent, e.g.:

bigyán ng oportunidad [< Sp *oportunidad* ‘opportunity’] ‘to give smb opportunity’ instead of Tag *pagkakataón* ‘chance; opportunity’,

maglaán ng target [< Eng *target*]] ‘to set as an object’ instead of Tag *layunin* ‘purpose, aim’ or *patamaan* ‘target’.

There are quite a number of Spanish borrowings, which have been adopted unassimilated as they belong to onomastical lexica - personal and geographical names, for example:

Jose Rizal – personal name, read as /Hose Risal/, according to the rules for the Spanish letters ‘j’ and ‘z’, which do not exist in the Tagalog alphabet,

Peñafrancia – geographical name, read as /Penyafransya/, no ‘ñ’, ‘f’ or ‘c’ in Tagalog,

also – *Aquino, Lopez, Teofilo; Vigan, Davao, Zamboanga*, and many others.

There are also plenty of English unassimilated borrowings in the modern Tagalog. They are abundant in newspapers and printings, where they are often marked with italics (thus corroborating the term ‘phonological citations’), e.g.:

‘Nilusob ang tirahan ng mga *illegal workers*’ - ‘Illegal workers’ house was raided’,

‘Hinihinalang isa na naman itong anyo ng *religious clash...*’ – ‘It is supposed to be another form of religious clash...’.

1.2. Morphological adaptation of the unassimilated borrowings.

The peculiarity of ‘phonological citations’ in Tagalog is that regardless of being UNASSIMILATED they still may be embedded into the Tagalog morphological system, i.e. may act in speech as *root words* in accordance with the Tagalog syntax rules; or as *roots* taking over the Tagalog prefixes. It is noteworthy that even in such cases Tagalog speakers usually handle them as FOREIGN WORDS, either italicizing them in the text, or putting a hyphen between the unassimilated root and the Tagalog prefix used with it:

Nag-withdraw siy kahapon. - ‘He/she withdrew yesterday’,

Naka-attach dito ang litrato ko. - ‘My photo is attached here’,

Naki-pose na lang siya sa mga *Pinay*. – ‘He was just posing in front of the Philippine girls’;

Laging rude siya sa akin. – ‘He is always rude with me’,

Miss na *miss* kita. – ‘I’m missing you much’.

The MORPHOLOGICAL assimilation of the loanwords, which still remain unassimilated graphically, semantically and phonetically, is perfectly represented by such derived borrowings as verbal nouns or conjugated forms of the Tagalog verbs. The Present and Future Tenses of Tagalog verbs, as well as the verbal nouns are formed with help of the reduplication of the root’s first syllable, e.g.: *lutuin* ‘to be cooked’ > *niluluto* ‘is being cooked’, *lulutuin* ‘will be

cooked’; *magtanggol* ‘to defend’ > *pagtatanggol* ‘defending, defense’. The borrowed *unassimilated* roots are handled accordingly to this general Tagalog rule. However the REDUPLICATED part of their first syllable becomes assimilated (changing its phonetic and graphic appearance where needed, to fit the Tagalog alphabet and phonological system), while the *root* itself remains UNASSIMILATED and is often separated from the assimilated part with a hyphen:

Magko-concert *siya sa Cyprus* – ‘He will give a concert in Cyprus’,

Para kaming nata-transform *sa ibang mundo* – ‘We are as if transformed to another world’;

*Mahirap ang pagdod*draw-up *ng project* – ‘Drawing up a project is difficult’,

Malayo pa ang pagga-graduate *niya sa Unibersidad*.- ‘His University graduation is still far’

Such a large-scale incorporation of unassimilated borrowings into Tagalog is maintained and increased by the widespread LANGUAGE MIXING, or CODE-SWITCHING, which has become common in the everyday colloquial language of educated Filipinos with the expansion of the English language in the Archipelago (*see e.g. Pascasio 2004: 73-75*). There are plenty of unassimilated borrowings and even their abbreviations used in the so-called ‘Mix-Mix language’, which was so well described by David Zorc (*Zorc 1990*), e.g.:

kilig to the bones – ‘overjoyed’ (lit. ‘tremble to the bones’)

kadiri to death – ‘gross, coarse’ (lit. ‘loathing to death’);

b.f. – boy friend,

d.o.m.- dirty old man,

o.a. – over-acting, over-reaction.

II. ASSIMILATION

2.1. Simplification of borrowings.

Tagalog pertains to agglutinative languages and is notable for its manifold morphological system, which includes such word-building methods as affixation, reduplication, word compounding, full duplication, and morphophonemics. Being assimilated by Tagalog, borrowed words or word-and-particle combinations usually undergo SIMPLIFICATION, i.e. become INDIVISIBLE monomorphemic words used by the recipient as roots or root words in full accordance with its morphological rules:

Skt *dhr̥ta* ‘to bear; to endure’ > Tag *dalitâ* ‘extreme poverty; torment’ > *karálitaán* ‘extreme poverty or misery’,

Mal. *darat-an* ‘continent; land’ (from *darat* ‘land; highland’) > Tag *dalatan* ‘cultivated highland’,

Mal *barat laut* ‘North-West; North-Western wind’ > Tag *balaklaot* ‘North-Western wind or monsoon’,

Ar *hikay’at* ‘preach, parable, legend’ > Tag *hikayat* ‘persuasion’ > *hikayát* ‘persuaded’, *hikayatin* ‘to persuade’,

Ar *sharbat* ‘drink’ > Mal *sěrbat* ‘ginger tea’, Tag *salabát* ‘ginger tea’, *magsalabát* ‘to prepare or drink ginger tea’,

Sp *en paz* ‘in peace’ > Tag *impás* ‘settled’, *mag-impás* ‘to settle smth’,

Eng (*to*) *stand by* > Tag *istambáy* ‘to stand by, to idle’.

Noteworthy, a considerable number of the loanwords, mostly early borrowed, which then underwent derivation, are preserved by the modern Tagalog only in their ‘FROZEN’ DERIVED forms. The following words are examples of the simplification of borrowings derived in various ways:

- REDUPLICATION (of the first syllable of a stem)

Skt *yūpa* ‘sacrificial column / pole’ > Tag *yupapà* ‘submission, resignation; to prostrate oneself’,

Mal *alěh* ‘to move, to replace; to change’ > Tag *halili* (with metathesis of the final *-h*?) ‘substitute; alternative’,

Mal *jari* ‘finger on hand / foot’ > Tag *da-li-rì* (with interchange of *l/r*) ‘finger on hand / foot’;

- DUPLICATION (full stem / word reduplication)

Ch *giet* (scorpion) - á *thâng* (insect), scorpion > Tag *atang-atang* ‘scorpion’,

Ch *kut* ‘to dig, excavate’ > Tag *kutkót* ‘to dig; to scrape’,

Skt *gala-* ‘resin; pitch’ > Mal *gala, galagala* ‘to pitch, calk’, Tag *galagalá* ‘resin, pitch; calker’,

Skt *guna* ‘quality’ > Mal *guna* ‘advantage, benefit’ > Tag *gunágunahín* ‘to take advantage, opportunity’,

Skt *muni* ‘sage, ascetic’ > Tag *magmunimuni* ‘to contemplate, meditate’;

- AFFIXATION

Ch *ui* (on the account of) *-li* ‘for smb’s sake / benefit; stimulated by interest / profit’ > Tag archaic *wili* ‘appreciation, fondness, enjoyment’ > *kawilihán, pagkávili* ‘pleasant interest in smth; enjoyment’; *kawili-wili* ‘pleasant, amusing’,

Skt *aga* ‘sun’ > Tag *maaga* ‘early’, *umaga* ‘morning’, *agahan* ‘breakfast’,

Skt *rahasya* ‘secret’ > Tag archaic *rahuyò* ‘charm, attraction; persuasion’ > *marahuyò* ‘to be attracted; to be persuaded / induced’,

Mex-Sp *ciruelas* ‘plums’ > Tag *sinigwelas* ‘plum’ (with *r>g* shift).

Among such ‘frozen’ derivations we may find simplified loanwords with the now NON-PRODUCTIVE affixes:

Ch *châi* (money) –*pi* (any monetary unit) ‘money’ > Tag *salapî* ‘money’,

Skt *samūha* ‘collection; community’ > Tag **salamuhà* > *makisalamuhà* ‘to mingle / mix with people’;

Ch *iô* (to move, shake, balance) –*pái* (to limp; to stagger) ‘to shake, balance’ > Tag *bayubay* ‘hanging, dangling’,

Jav *angut* ‘ravings, nightmare’ ?> Tag *bangutngót* (with elision of the initial ‘a’ and duplication?) ‘nightmare’,

Mal *lisah* ‘restless; anxious’ > Tag *balisa* ‘anxiety; restlessness’;

Ch *pai* ‘to decay, weaken; destroy’ > Tag *lupaypáy* (with duplication) ‘prostrate; weak; languid’.

2.2. Annulment of grammatical characteristics. Gender and Number: special case.

As shown above, even late borrowings (Spanish and English) are mostly assimilated as simplified root-words grammatically close to nouns or adjectives, irrespective of their original grammatical characteristics and forms. For example, the Spanish *atado* ‘tied into a bundle’ is clearly derived from the verb *atar* ‘to tie’, but Tagalog adopts *atado* as a *noun* meaning ‘bundle (of things to be sold)’ and then forms the verb *ataduhin* ‘tie into a bundle’ on the basis of this borrowed form.

Sp *casar* ‘to marry’ > Tag *kasál* ‘marriage’ (cf. Sp *boda* ‘marriage’), *ikasál* ‘to marry’,

Sp *jugar* ‘to play’ > Tag *sugál* ‘gamble’ > *manunugál* ‘gambler’,

Sp *Vale!* ‘That’ll do!; All right!’ (verb in the 3rd person singular, from *valer* ‘to cost, value; to fit’) > Tag *bale* ‘worth; promissory note, credit’, *bumale* ‘to buy smth on credit’, *Hindí bale!* ‘It doesn’t matter; Never mind!’ (lit. ‘not worthy’);

Eng *to hold-up* > Tag *holdapin* ‘to hold-up, to rob’;

Eng *recording* (gerund) > Tag *rekording* ‘smth. recorded’ > *pagrerekording* ‘recording’.

There is no grammatical category of Gender or Number in Tagalog. Consequently, distinguishing these categories in borrowed words was difficult even for those Filipinos who were acquainted with the donor language. Due to this fact borrowings were usually adopted in the forms, which were most frequently used by the donor language speakers in the Philippines. Thus, some of the Spanish loanwords may be first assimilated in the feminine gender: e.g. *guapa* ‘beautiful; well-dressed (fem)’, *nerbyosa* ‘nervous (fem)’. According to Keith Whinnom Spaniards used such kind of

adjectives more frequently in relation to ladies (e.g. Sp *esta mujer nerviosa* ‘this nervous woman’), which resulted in the preservation of the feminine forms in Tagalog [Whinnom 1956: 30]. The Tagalog tendency to assimilate borrowings in any grammatical forms (e.g. *gasta* ‘expense’ < Sp *gastar* ‘to spend’ and *gastos* ‘expense’ < Sp *gastos* ‘expenses’) is well presented in the Tagalog-Spanish creolized languages. For instance, the definite article in these dialects has only one universal form – e.g., in the so-called Ermitaño

the Spanish masculine form *el* was used instead of all the others (*la, los, las*), while the possessive pronoun *su* meant both ‘his/her’ and ‘their or your’ (instead of the original Spanish plural form *sus*) [*Ibid*: 28-29].

Plural in Tagalog is usually denoted through lexical means, i.e. through the addition of particle *mga*: *tao* ‘a person’ - *mga tao* ‘people’. Due to the lack of Number grammatical category Tagalog could assimilate borrowings either in singular or in plural form, with their following use as *singular*. In many cases the choice of the plural form of a loanword was caused by its frequent use in this form by the native speakers of the donor language (e.g., names of PAIRED objects):

Sp *bolsicos* ‘small bags / purses hanged on the dress’ > Tag *bolsikos/bolsikot* archaic ‘a small sack on the dress; a deep pocket of woman’s skirt’,

Sp *botones* ‘buttons’ > Tag *bitones* ‘a button’,

Sp *pliegues* ‘folds, pleats, bends’ > Tag *pileges / pleges* ‘a fold, bend’,

Sp *vozes* ‘voices’ > Tag *bozes* ‘a voice’,

Sp *zapatos* ‘shoes’ > Tag *sapatos* ‘a shoe / shoes’,

Eng *buys* > Tag *bays* ‘a buy’,

Eng *fight*s > Tag *pait*s ‘a fight’.

At the first stages of borrowing from Spanish a form of a loanword denoting a creature, once chosen, was used to nominate both masculine and feminine. However, with adoption of more and more Spanish loanwords of the type, the patterns of use have gradually changed. At present we may assert that within the system of the modern Tagalog a certain GRAMMATICAL SUB-SYSTEM OF BORROWINGS exists, which includes the grammatical categories of gender and number. Thus some of the borrowings, which might be originally adopted in either feminine or masculine, are now given their ‘pairs’, even if there is no such form in the donor language:

alumno / alumna ‘graduated from a college (masc/fem)’ [< Sp *alumno* ‘pupil’],

burdadór / burdadera ‘embroiderer (masc/fem)’ [< Sp *bordar* ‘to embroider’],

listó / listá ‘alert; astute, nimble (masc/fem)’ [< Sp *listo* ‘smart, astute, sharp-witted; alert’] (cf. Sp *lista* ‘stripe, line; list, roll-call’),
maestro/maestra ‘teacher in school (masc/fem)’ [< Sp *maestro/-a*],

Manilenyo/Manilenya ‘Manila inhabitant (masc/fem)’ [< Sp *Manileño/-a*],

Manong/Manang ‘elder brother/sister’ [< Sp *hermano/-a* ‘brother/sister’],

peskadór/peskadora «fisherman/fisherwoman» [< Sp *pesgador*],
Pilipino/Pilipina ‘Filipino (masc/fem)’ (also *Pinóy / Pinay*) [< Sp *Filipino/-a*],

seryoso/seryosa ‘serious (masc/fem)’ [< Sp *serio*].

Such REVERSE influence of the assimilated borrowings upon the recipient language refers to the phenomenon of INTERFERENCE,¹ i.e. to the post-assimilation processes. Another result of the interference is that many Filipinos can often distinguish singular and plural forms of borrowings. For instance, there already exist in Tagalog such pairs of loanwords as *plor – plores* ‘a flower - flowers’ [< Sp *flor, flores*]. Moreover, some borrowings get *re-analyzed* as containing ‘s’ denoting plural form, so their *quazy-singular* forms are created by omitting the final –s, e.g.:

Eng *age* > Tag *eids* > *eid* ‘age’; Eng *overalls* > Tag *oberól* ‘loose trousers worn over clothes to keep them clean’.

2.3. Wrong interpretation.

Due to the difference between the grammatical systems of Tagalog and its donor languages, the assimilation of loanwords may involve WRONG INTERPRETATION (HYPERCORRECTION) of a borrowing’s morphemic structure by the Tagalog speakers.

As a result of the above-mentioned simplification an original word combination is often taken as a single word:

Mal *juru bahasa* ‘language specialist, interpreter’ > Tag *dalubhasà* ‘specialist, expert’,

Mal *lěpas tangan* ‘free hand’ > Tag *lapastangan* ‘irreverent, disrespectful; sacrilegious’,

Mal *tengah hari* ‘midday, noon’ > Tag *tanghalì* ‘midday, noon’,

Sp *¿Cómo está?* ‘How are you’ > Tag *Kumustá?* ‘Hello!’, ‘How are you?’,

Eng *(to) cut short*, a *short cut* > Tag *syor(t)kat* ‘short cut (of a way), *magsyorkat* ‘to cut (way) short’.

Part of a loanword may be mistaken as A NATIVE Tagalog morpheme (on the account of their sound similarity). Thus, while

¹ About interference in Tagalog see e.g. my paper [Baklanova 2004].

assimilating Skt *nirgundī* ‘plant *Vitex negundo*’ Tagalog omitted the initial **ni-** and adopted the word as *lagundi* ‘plant *растение Vitex trifoliata/Vitex repens*’. In my opinion, it may be accounted for the wrong interpretation by the Tagalog speakers of **ni-** as their native affix *-in-*, which changes into the prefix **ni-** before the initial *l* or *y* (*lipatín* – *nilipát*, *yari* – *niyari*). Thus: Skt *nirgundī* > Tag **nilagundi* > *lagundi*. Other possible examples of the wrong interpretation (hypercorrection) of borrowings in Tagalog are:

Skt *parīkṣā* ‘to examine, to investigate, to check’ > **ligsá*² ‘test, quiz’, *paligsahan* ‘competition; concurrence’ (**pa-** misinterpreted as the Tagalog causative prefix),

Mal *pontianak* ‘spirit of a dead pregnant woman’ > Tag *patianák* / *tianák* ‘evil spirit’;

Skt *paribhoga* ‘application, use, consumption’ > Tag *alibughá* old ‘irresponsible; wasteful, prodigal’ (the initial **pari-** might be mistaken as the Tagalog old prefix **ali-**, as in Tag *ali-walas* ‘spacious’, *ali-taptáp* ‘moth’),

Skt *pariprṣṭa* ‘investigation, interrogation, examination’ > Tag *alipustá* ‘despised and maltreated; taunt, insult; low’ [Verstraelen 1962: 828]. The same pattern of hypercorrection may also account for the changes in some Sanskrit borrowings to Malay: Skt *pārāpatī* ‘dove’ ?> Mal **perpati* or *merpati* (could the Sanskrit **par-** be misinterpreted as the Malay prefixes **per-** or **me-**?) ‘tame pigeon’ - cf. Tag *kalapati*; Skt *drohaka* ‘injustice; harm; treachery’ > Mal *děrhaka* (was the change caused by the sound analogy with the Malay prefixes **ter-**, **ber-**, **per-**?) ‘treacherous; treason’ - cf. Tag *dulúhaká* old ‘to misinterpret; treacherous’.

Ch *kà* (watery) –*lok-lok* (very watery; softened; doughy) > Tag *luglóg* ‘kind of *pansit* – the noodles are cooked by plunging into water; to rinse with clear water’ (**ka-** might be mistaken as the Tagalog prefix);

Sp *limosna* ‘alms, charity’ > Tag *limós* ‘alms, charity; allowances; grant’ (**na** might be misinterpreted as the Tagalog ligature *na/ng*);

Mex-Sp *zaquisamé* ‘loft, upper floor’ > Tag * *sakisame* > *kisamé* ‘ceiling’ (**sa** might be taken as the Tagalog preposition *sa* ‘in, on’).

Two similar morphemes of a loanword may be misinterpreted by Tagalog as REDUPLICATION, and one of the similar elements may be omitted:

Skt *lalāsa* ‘wish’ > Tag **lasa* > *nasa* ‘wish, desire’;

Mal *agar-agar* ‘edible seaweeds; jelly’ > Tag *agár* / *agar-agár* ‘jelly substance got from seaweeds’,

² The right form is *paligsa*, but the authors of some Dictionaries misinterpreted the word as derivation from the ‘root *ligsá*’ [see: English 1986-2002; Rubino 2000].

Mal *ěmběl-ěmběl* ‘little additions’ > Tag *ambíl* ‘nickname, pet name; different interpretation of word from that intended; repetition of a word / expression liked by the speaker».

3.3. Hybridization.

While adopting a borrowing the recipient language may replace some part of the borrowing (mostly the root or its part) with the native lexical material, thus making a HYBRID LOANWORD. In the case of Tagalog borrowed morphemes may be substituted with those of PREVIOUSLY ASSIMILATED loanwords, thus some of the Tagalog hybrid loans consist only of borrowed material:

Sp *carnero marino* ‘seal’ (lit. ‘ram-sea’) + Tag *dagat* ‘sea’ > *karnerong-dagat* ‘seal’,

Mex-Sp (*naran*)*jita* ‘small tangerine or grapefruit’ + Tag *dalan(dán)* ‘orange’ > *dalanghita* «tangerine»;

Sp *largo(mira)* ‘binoculars, telescope’ + Tag *bista* ‘sight; view, landscape’ [< Sp *vista*] > *largabista* (cf. Sp *vista larga* ‘long-sight’),

Sp (*porta*)*monedas* ‘purse’ + Tag *kwarta* ‘money’ [< Sp *cuarto* ‘old copper coin; money’] > *kwartamoneda* ‘purse’.

Such recent hybrid borrowings seem to be relatively scarce. There are much more HYBRID NEOLOGISMS (CREATIONS) in the modern Tagalog, i.e. new words invented by Filipinos with use of some native and already assimilated borrowed material. However, far greater number of EARLY hybrid loans may be eventually found within the Tagalog vocabulary itself. Thus, the following hypothesis of William Maxwell may be referred to the problem of EARLY HYBRID LOANS (Maxwell 1920). This linguist picked up some considerable amount of Malay words with *bu-/bung* for the first syllable, which he considered to be an ancient monosyllabic prefix conveying ‘an idea of roundness’ (*Ibid*: 4) (I would also add here ‘the idea of fullness’): *bu-lan* ‘moon’ (cf. Tag *bu-wán*), *bun-tut* ‘buttocks; tail’ (Tag *bun-tót* ‘tail’), *bung-kus* ‘bundle; bunch’ (Tag *bung-kós* ‘bundle; bunch’), etc. One can easily find this element in some Tagalog words as well, especially in those created by syllable duplication: e.g. *bu-lak* ‘cotton’ > *bu-lak-lák* ‘cotton flower; flower; blossom’, *bu-nga-ngà* ‘gullet; mouth’ (cf. *nga-ngà* ‘to chew betel’), *bu-ngis-ngís* ‘giggle’ (cf. *ngis-ngís* ‘grinning, showing the teeth’). Another probable ‘prefix’ Maxwell found in Malay is *ta-/tang-* ‘a hand/an arm’: *tang-an* ‘hand’, *tang-kap* ‘to seize’, *tang-kei* ‘a stalk’. It’s also possible to distinguish this element in such Tagalog words as: *tang-án* ‘held (in hand)’, *tang-gáp* ‘to get; accepted’, *tang-káy* ‘stalk, stem’, *tang-kál* ‘coop’ > *tang-ka-kál* ‘support; protection’, *tang-kô* ‘light touch, as with the

tip of fingers' (cf. *ku-kò* 'nail'), *ta-guyod* 'united support' (cf. *guyod* 'bundle of sticks; herd; thick rope').

Developing this idea, may we suppose that such prefixes / lexical elements, being productive in the early periods of the Tagalog language development, could participate in the word creation with use of the early borrowings (Chinese, Malay, Sanskrit)? Such creations should then be regarded as *early hybrid loans*. May we, for instance, trace Tag *tadhanà* 'fate, destiny' to *ta-* + *dhanà* [< Skrt *dhāna* 'fortune, property etc.']?

Arsenio Manuel, studying Chinese borrowings in Tagalog, claimed that the element *-pak-* in Tagalog was borrowed from the Chinese *pak* 'stripping off skin of trees' (Manuel 1949: 36). If this probable lexical morpheme is of Chinese origin, the following words might be examples of the early hybridization: *bakbák* 'strip off the skin, bark', *gapak* 'tear, strip', *paknít* 'to flay, skin', *paknós* 'scald, excoriate', *paknót* ' (cf. Tag *nutnót* 'worn away; unraveled'). If this element in Tagalog is of Chinese origin, the above words might be examples of the early hybridization.

REFERENCES

1. Baklanova, Ekaterina 2004. Interference in Tagalog as a Result of Borrowing. *Pilipinas* 42 (March): 95-116.
2. English, Leo James 1977. *Tagalog-English Dictionary*. Manila: National Book Store Publ.
3. Manuel, E. Arsenio 1949. Origins of the Tagalog Language and Chinese Contribution to its Growth. – *Fookien Times Yearbook* 1949: 33-36.
4. Maxwell, William E. 1920. *A Manual of the Malay Language*, 11th ed. London.
5. Pascasio, emy M. 2004. The Filipino Bilingual From A Sociolinguistic Perspective. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 34 (2) and 35 (1): 69-79.
6. Rubino, Carl R. G. 2000. *Tagalog-English, English-Tagalog Dictionary*. N.-Y.: Hippocrene Books.
7. Verstraelen, M.E.J.G. 1962. Soundshifts in some dialects of the Philippines. *Anthropos* (Fribourg) 57 (fasc. 3/6): 826-856.
8. Weinreich, Uriel 1966. *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems*, 4th print. London-the Hague-Paris: Mouton &Co..
9. Whinnom, Keith 1956. *Spanish Contact Vernaculars in the Philippine Islands*. Hong Kong.
10. Zorc, R. David 1990. Tagalog Slang. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 21 (1): 77-82.

The preceding document was presented at the Tenth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (10-ICAL). To properly reference this work, please use the following format:

<LastName>, <FirstName>. 2006. <PaperTitle>. Paper presented at Tenth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics. 17-20 January 2006. Puerto Princesa City, Palawan, Philippines.
<http://www.sil.org/asia/philippines/ical/papers.html>

For other papers that were presented at 10-ICAL, please visit <http://www.sil.org/asia/philippines/ical/papers.html>.