

Philippine creole Spanish: assessing the Portuguese element

Philippine Creole Spanish (PCS), known locally as Ternateño, Caviteño, Zamboangueno, etc., and collectively as Chabacano, is the most extensive Spanish-based creole language now in existence, and the only one found in Asia or Oceania¹. Although its contemporary manifestations have been well documented, its origins are shrouded in uncertainty. Available information indicates that the first PCS dialects arose in the Manila area in the middle of the 17th century, when a group of Spanish settlers, known as *Mardikas*, left Ternate in the Moluccas Islands and arrived in Manila, to fortify the Spanish position against the attacks of the Chinese pirate Koxinga (Whinnom 1956: chap. 1). These newcomers (garrison troops plus civilian personnel) were subsequently resettled along the shores of Manila Bay, around the modern towns of Tanza and Ternate, and it is here that the first legitimate PCS dialects are presumed to have taken root. The dialect of San Roque and Cavite City was evidently formed somewhat later, by creole-speaking Ternateños and, presumably, troops speaking some Spanish and a variety of Philippine languages; this dialect produced an offshoot in Manila, in the Ermita and San Nicolas areas. Finally, the Zamboanga Chabacano dialect is presumed to have been formed following the Spanish reoccupation of this city in 1719 and the arrival of mercenary troops from various regions of the Philippines; this dialect later spread to Basilan, Jolo, Cotabato and Davao, and in Zamboanga City itself, it was partially decreolized in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, through contact with metropolitan Spanish (Whinnom 1956: 14–17; Lipski b; Molony 1973; Riego de Dios 1978).

Comparative linguistic studies situate Ternateño as the earliest surviving PCS variant (Riego de Dios 1978, Molony 1973, Whinnom 1956:

¹ An essential minimal bibliography would include the following: Whinnom (1954, 1956, 1965), Frake (1971), Forman (1972), Riego de Dios (1976a, 1976b, 1978), Molony (1973, 1977a, b, 1978), Miranda (1956), Evangelista (1972), Germán (1932), Llamado (1969, 1972), McKaughan (1954), Nigoza (1985), Batalha (1960), Quilis (1970, 1980, 1984), Santos y Gomez (1924), Tirona (1924), Batausa (1969), Domingo (1967), Macasantos (1971), Maño (1963). For historical background, cf. Schurz (1985), Phelan. For the constant interaction between Spanish and the indigeneous Philippine languages, cf. Bowen (1971), Sibayan (1971), Morales Goulet (1971), C. Lopez (1965a).

16–17, Lipski b), which is consistent with known data on immigration and settlement of the *Mardikas*; the Caviteño dialect is a slightly later development. In addition, the dialects of Cavite and Ermita suffered significant decreolization in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, much as the case of Zamboangueno. The latter dialect contains elements from later periods of Hispano-Philippine contact, but it is extremely unlikely that Zamboanga Chabacano is a spontaneous development unrelated to the presence of Manila Bay PCS speakers among the military contingents sent to reoccupy Zamboanga (Lipski b, c).

An area of greater concern and controversy is the relation between the earliest stages of PCS and the creole Portuguese dialects spoken in various parts of Oceania and Asia, and as a maritime lingua franca from the 15th century onward. Following the pioneering work of Whinnom (1956), it has generally been assumed that the *Mardikas* brought to the Philippines an already formed creole dialect, a mixture of Spanish and Portuguese, which in turn resulted from a creole Portuguese presumed to have been spoken in the Moluccas in the 16th century. In other words, it is claimed that the original Ternateño dialect was a Portuguese-based creole, which became relexified with Spanish elements and which was subsequently extended by the introduction of Philippine lexical items and structures, following the Spanish exodus from the Moluccas to Manila. Much of the evidence adduced in favor of this claim is circumstantial, in that it is demonstrated that Portuguese-based creoles were spoken prior to the formation of the PCS dialects, in the region whence came the *Mardikas*; there is also linguistic evidence stemming from a comparison of the PCS dialects and other Hispanic creoles, but this is often subordinated to the historical arguments.

The present study is devoted to a reassessment of the Portuguese component of Philippine Creole Spanish, from the standpoint of comparative dialectology². It will be assumed from the outset that the historical arguments adequately demonstrate the feasibility for the transfer of a Portuguese creole, or of individual creolized Portuguese elements, to the Spanish colony in Manila in the 17th century. Attention will be concentrated on the nature of the PCS dialects themselves, their similarity with known Portuguese-based creoles of the past and present, and the possibility for ramifications of or alternatives to the Portuguese creole hypothesis for PCS.

For the purposes of comparison, the following recognized and currently spoken Portuguese-based creoles may be identified. In Africa: the

² Work in the Philippines was carried out in 1985 thanks to a Fulbright advanced research fellowship, administered by the Philippine-American Educational Foundation. I gratefully express my thanks to the personnel of PAEF, as well as to the many scholars and private citizens of the Philippines who so generously gave of their time to make the investigation a success.

kriol of Guiné-Bissau and the Casamance region of Senegal (Scantamburlo 1981, Wilson 1962, Chataigner 1963, Perl 1982b, 1984, Schuchardt 1888b); Cape Verdean creole (Da Silva 1957, Coelho 1963, Schuchardt 1888d); the creole dialects of São Tomé and Príncipe (Valkhoff 1966; Ferraz 1975, 1978, 1983; Negreiros 1895, Günther 1973; Schuchardt 1882, 1889b); the *fa d'ambó* dialect of Annobon Island (Barrena 1957; Granda 1976a, b; Ferraz 1976; Vila 1891; Schuchardt 1888c). In Latin America: Papiamentu of the Netherlands Antilles (Goilo 1953, Lenz 1928, Hesseling 1933, Van Wijk 1958, Birmingham 1970); the *palenquero* dialect of Palenque de San Basilio, Colombia (Friedemann and Patiño Rosselli 1983, Bickerton and Escalante 1970). In Asia: the *papiá kristang* dialect of Malacca (Hancock 1973, 1975; Chaves 1933; Wexler 1983); Macau creole Portuguese (Batalha 1959, 1960, 1974; Ferreira 1978; Thompson 1959; Diez 1981); vestigial creole Portuguese of Sri Lanka and India (Smith 1979, Theban 1973, 1974). To these may be added earlier and more widespread Portuguese creoles in several areas of India and Ceylon, in Indonesia and in Hong Kong (Dalgado 1900, 1900–1901, 1902–1903, 1906, 1917, 1919–1921; Schuchardt 1883a, b, c, 1889a, 1979; Theban 1974). Spanish-based creoles are much fewer in number; the PCS dialects are the primary examples of currently spoken Hispanic creoles, and we may also mention vestigial remnants, such as the speech of the *negros congos* of Panama (Lipski e), and the largely decreolized speech of some regions of Ecuador (Lipski f), Cuba (Perl 1982b, 1985, a; Yacou 1977; Granda 1978: 481–491; López Morales 1981) and the Dominican Republic (González and Benavides 1982, Megenney a). In earlier centuries, a more widely spoken Hispanic creole evidently existed among African speakers in the Spanish Caribbean, and prior to this time, in southern Spain (Alvarez Nazario 1974; Granda 1978; Megenney 1984, 1985; Otheguy 1975; López Morales 1980, 1983).

The features most generally cited³ in conjunction with hypotheses as to the common origins of PCS and other Iberian creole dialects include: (1) the verbal system, consisting of an uninflected stem together with temporal/aspectual particles; (2) the nature and placement of negative morphemes; (3) the general lack of nominal inflection and the nature of the nominal pluralization process; (4) choice of personal pronouns; (5) possessive constructions; (6) the existence and nature of copulative and existential verbal elements; (7) specific lexical items. These areas will be examined in turn, in an effort to situate the PCS dialects in a wider creole perspective.

(1) **Verbal system.** The Chabacano verbal system consists of an uninflected stem, generally derived from the Spanish infinitive minus final

³ E. g. by Granda (1978), Megenney (1984, 1985), Perl (1982, 1985), Otheguy (1975), Valkhoff (1966), Whinnom (1956, 1965).

/r/, but at times derived from a conjugated 3rd person form (e. g. *quiere* “want”, *puede* “be able to”, *tiene* “have, exist”). The stems are combined with one of three particles: *ta* (present/imperfective), *ya* (past/perfective, with variant *a* in Ternate), and *di* (future/irrealis, with variant *ay* and older variant *el* in Zamboanga). Use of the particles is generally obligatory, except for some uses of the immediate future, and with a small subset of ‘modal’ verbs which include the three mentioned above, plus *sabe* “know”, *debe* “ought to”, *conoce* “be acquainted with”, and a few more. The combination of an uninflected stem and verbal particles is a nearly universal feature of creole languages, and the tripartite division found in the PCS dialects has also been claimed as a universal trait, independent of the source language (Muysken 1981, Bickerton 1981). However, the specific particles found in the PCS dialects are similar or identical to those which occur in the majority of Portuguese-based creoles throughout the world, both current and extinct. The particle *ta* is found, for example, in the following creoles: Macau creole Portuguese; Malaysian *papiá kristang*; the Portuguese creoles of Java, Goa, India and Ceylon (at times with the variant *te*; cf. Dalgado 1917: 48); the Afro-Portuguese creoles of São Tomé, Príncipe, Cape Verde, and with some variation in Guinea-Bissau and Annobon; in Papiamentu, Saramaccan of Surinam, Colombian *palenquero* and the former Caribbean Afro-Hispanic creole. The particle *ya* (or the Portuguese variant *ja*), derived from the word for “already”, occurs in the same set of creoles, with the exception of Saramaccan (*bi*), Papiamentu (*taba*), *palenquero* (*ba*), Príncipe and Annobon (*za*). In the future/irrealis series, considerable variation exists among creole particles. Except in those dialects having no special future/irrealis particle (e. g. Annobon, São Tomé, Príncipe), the most common particle is *lo*, derived from Portuguese *logo* “later, afterward”, being found in the Malaysian and India/Ceylon Portuguese creoles, in Papiamentu and as a variant (together with *al*) in Cape Verde creole. Among the remaining creoles, that of Guinea-Bissau has *na* or *ta*, Saramaccan has *sa*, *palenquero* has *tan*, and only Bombay/Goa creole Portuguese shows *di*.

In view of the above similarities, it is tempting to simply classify the PCS verbal system as a carryover from earlier creolized Portuguese; the Chabacano verbal system constitutes the strongest linguistic argument in favor of a creole/pidgin Portuguese origin. However, we must contemplate several facts which, while not invalidating the claims of Portuguese origins, call into question the necessity of such postulates. Despite the apparent homogeneity of aspectual particles among the various creoles, there is considerable variation in their use, in the existence of alternative forms, and in the actual morphological constitution of the items in question. First, in the future series, none of the PCS dialects shows any reflex of the generalized creole Portuguese particle *lo(go)*; only an older

variant *el* in Zamboanga shows even a slight phonetic similarity with the former particle, and this *el* appears to have been derived from the reduction of a relative clause. The existence of *di* in the Manila Bay dialects and in the creole Portuguese of Goa and formerly of Bombay may be a fortuitous similarity, given the geographical separation of these points, the lack of documented direct influence of the Indian dialects on the putative Moluccan pidgin which in turn gave rise to PCS, and the fact that no reflex of *di* appears in Indonesian or Malaysian creole Portuguese. Comparative reconstruction suggests that *di* may be a later development in the Manila Bay PCS dialects, since this particle is not found in Zamboangueno, which evidently split off from the Manila Bay dialects in the 18th century; on the other hand, the predominant Zamboangueno variant, *ay/ey*, is attested in Cavite (Miranda 1956), and is still recalled by the oldest Chabacano speakers in that area. Both *di* and *ay/ey* appear to derive from the combination *ha/he de* + infinitive (although in St. Lucia French creole, an identical particle occurs: Dalphinis 1985: 117), a periphrastic future construction characteristic of Spanish but scarcer in Portuguese. A similar construction is used in Macau Portuguese creole, in the negative future: *nadi* (perhaps derived from *não hei de*) *vai co vós* ‘I won’t go with you’; cf. Chaves (1933: 175), Batalha (1974: 37). In the Indian creole Portuguese dialects, *had* (< *ha de*) was used as a future/irrealis particle (Schuchardt 1883b: 6; Dalgado 1906: 159–160). Some Cape Verdean dialects use *a* as a future/irrealis particle (Da Silva 1957: 141–142), possibly derived from the Portuguese *ha de* + infinitive combination, and São Tomé creole occasionally uses *-te* or *-di* to express distant future (Valkhoff 1966: 111): *n-te fla amanhã* ‘I will talk tomorrow’.

The use of *ya* or *ja* as a past/perfective particle in a variety of Iberian-based creoles does not militate in favor of a unique origin, since this adverb is a common denominator in references to past/perfective actions, in non-creole varieties of both Spanish and Portuguese; it is also found in some varieties of pidgin/creole French, presumably derived from *déjà* (Stageberg 1956). It is also significant that in the PCS dialects, this particle is frequently eliminated in narrating past-time events, being retained principally when the connotation of ‘already’ is to be conveyed. Similar behavior has also been noted in Cape Verdean creole (Da Silva 1957: 139), in Macau Portuguese (Ferreira 1978: 29), in Guiné-Bissau (Scantamburlo 1981: 45) Annobonese and São Tomé creole (Valkhoff 1966: 109), and in Malaccan *papiá kristang* (Hancock 1973: 26). In Papiamentu and Colombian *palenquero*, and variably in the creoles of São Tomé, Cape Verde and Guiné-Bissau, the past-time particles are derived from the imperfect form *estaba* (Ptg. *estava*) of the auxiliary verb *estar*, whose present tense form *está* presumably accounts for the particles *ta* and *stá*. The postposition of *-taba* or *-ba* may also be derived

from the imperfect suffix *-ba* (Sp.)/*-va* (Ptg.), either as a carryover from the formative stages, or as a partially decreolized reintroduction. Among the PCS dialects, Zamboangueno occasionally exhibits Spanish imperfect forms in *-ba* (e. g. *pensaba yo* "I thought" instead of Chabacano *ya* (*pensá yo*)).

The present/imperfective particle *ta* is the common denominator linking most Romance-based creoles, and is found in nearly all Spanish and Portuguese creoles. A common origin is naturally suggested (e. g. Taylor 1971, Whinnom 1956, 1965), but other considerations partially undermine the strength of such arguments. If one assumes that *ta* is derived from *está*, two types of source constructions are possible: the progressive *está* + gerund (*está comiendo*, *está falando*), found in both Spanish and Portuguese, and the Portuguese innovation *está* + *a* + infinitive, also a progressive construction (Schuchardt 1979: 69–70 [1888a]). The latter seems more likely to have produced the creole forms, but its existence in peninsular Portuguese is only attested since the second half of the 19th century, although possibly it occurred earlier as a substandard regional variant (Lipski d). In the Portuguese creole dialects of Macau, Malacca, Ceylon, São Tomé, Cape Verde and Guiné-Bissau, *ta* serves more as a progressive marker than a present-tense marker, which to a certain extent also holds for the PCS dialects, thus suggesting that the *ta* + infinitive construction may ultimately be derived from the normal Spanish/Portuguese progressive forms. In popular/rural Spanish and Portuguese, *está* is normally reduced to *ta*, and gerunds may be phonetically reduced to a form resembling or identical to the infinitive. Presumably, the Iberian creoles derive from highly popular and nonstandard received Spanish and Portuguese; this is certainly true in the case of the PCS dialects, where there is a high concentration of elements characteristic of the speech of peasants and sailors, not found in educated urban speech either at present or in past centuries. It is therefore not impossible that phonetically similar combinations involving *ta* arose spontaneously in both Spanish- and Portuguese-derived creoles in geographically separated areas.

Another possible source for *ta* is the rich aspectual systems of West African languages which interacted with both Spanish and Portuguese from the 15th to the 19th centuries, resulting in both long-lasting creoles and short-term contact vernaculars.

Aspectual particles of the form C + /a/, including *ta* itself, are found in many West African languages, and such fortuitous similarity may have caused this particle to be incorporated into certain Afro-Iberian creoles independent of direct transmission from one dialect to another (Lipski d). As for the mechanism for the transfer of such an element to the Philippines, the usually postulated route is via Asian/Oceanic creole Portuguese, which in itself may ultimately derive from 15th and 16th cen-

ture Africanized maritime Portuguese. Another possibility lies in the speech of the Spanish soldiers and sailors, many of whom may have interacted with pidgin or creole-speaking African slaves and freedmen in southern Spain, in the Caribbean region, or in Mexico, including the port of Acapulco, which during the formative period of the PCS dialects contained a considerable quantity of African slaves (Aguirre Beltrán 1958, 1971; Rout 1976). One of the postulates surrounding the formation of pidgins and creoles is deliberate deformation by superstrate speakers; if this occurred in the Philippines, the result would be that Spanish sailors and soldiers employed Afro-Iberian verb forms, together with uninflected infinitives, in an attempt to reach a linguistic middle ground with Philippine natives speaking a variety of languages.

Also of interest is the fact that a subset of verbs in both the PCS dialects and the various Portuguese creoles is based on the inflected third person singular form rather than the infinitive minus final /r/. These verbs, statistically among the most common in both Spanish and Portuguese, are usually employed without the aspectual particles (cf. Schuchardt 1979: 69 [1888a]), and their existence in PCS might suggest a common origin with Portuguese creoles. However, gravitation to the third person singular is a common feature of pidgin Spanish since the earliest recorded examples of Arabized and Africanized Spanish, in the 15th century. Currently, this tendency is observable in the (non-creolized) Spanish of Equatorial Guinea (Lipski 1984, 1985), in largely decreolized Spanish of Panama (Lipski e), the Dominican Republic (González and Benavides 1982, Megenney a) and Ecuador (Lipski f), among partially bilingual Guaraní/Spanish speakers (Gifford 1973), and in the vestigial language of semi-speakers in a number of regions where Spanish is dying out as a viable language, including among *mestizo* Philippine Spanish speakers (Lipski 1984, 1985, a, c, f). The fact that just this set of verbs most frequently combines with infinitives instead of other complements in both Spanish and Portuguese has also been instrumental in shaping their destiny in creole languages.

(2) **Negative structures.** A common feature of most Afro-Portuguese creoles is the postposition of a negative particle or morpheme, and this feature has been used in monogenetic creole theories. In Asian and Oceanic creole Portuguese, as well as in the PCS dialects, there is no such general postposition, and negation usually follows the same general patterns as in the source languages. A derivative of Portuguese *não* or Spanish *no* is normally used (in Zamboangueño, the Tagalog/Hiligaynon *hende* [qendeq] is also found, in complementary distribution with *no*), although certain past and future tense verbal constructions employ other elements. For example, in Zamboangueño, *nuay* (from Spanish *no hay*) is used to negate past-tense verbs: *nuay yo andá* 'I didn't go', while in Macau the use of *nadi* for negation in the future has already been men-

tioned; in the past this dialect uses *nunca* “never” for negation. In general, the PCS dialects closely follow received Spanish patterns, and such divergence as does exist is not paralleled among creole Portuguese dialects of Asia or Africa.

(3) **Nominal inflection.** The PCS dialects, like nearly all Romance-based creoles, have largely eliminated inflection of gender and number in adjectives and nouns; those exceptional, inflected forms are either fossil remnants or recent decreolized reintroductions. This in itself does not suggest a common origin, for the attraction of maximally unmarked forms is a universal trait of creole languages, and most nominal inflection is grammatically and semantically redundant in Spanish and Portuguese. Of greater significance is the method of signalling nominal and adjectival plurality, which in all the PCS dialects is effected through use of the Philippine particle *mga* (variously pronounced [mana], [maga] and [maŋa] in PCS). A determiner (definite article, demonstrative or possessive) normally accompanies plural nouns: *el mga casa* “the houses”, *di mi mga hermano* “my brothers”, etc. Occasionally, decreolized combinations involving Spanish morphological signals of gender or number are found, but the majority of cases involve the Philippine plural structure, which naturally is not found among any other Spanish- or Portuguese-based creoles. Among the latter dialects, reduplication is the most common form of signalling pluralization, when there is any overt morphological signal; in PCS, nominal reduplication is an occasional process, usually having an intensive function, and nearly always occurs in conjunction with *mga* (e.g. *aquel mga cosa-cosa* “all that stuff”). The Manila Bay dialects employ an innovative adjectival reduplication, suffixing the Tagalog connectives *-ng* (after vowels) and *na* (after consonants) to the first adjective: *carong-carong* “very expensive”, *tamad na tamad* “very lazy”. In Zamboangueño, such reduplication does not occur regularly; rather, the Visayan intensifier *gayot* is suffixed to the adjective in question, at times also prefixing *bien*: *(bien) grande gayot* “very large”.

(4) **Personal pronouns.** Given the considerable similarity among the personal pronouns of Spanish and Portuguese, it is difficult to offer definitive conclusions as to the source of the PCS pronouns. The existence of the second person singular *bo(s)* and third person singular *ele* in PCS has been claimed as a carryover from creole Portuguese (Whinnom 1956: 30; Mugler 1983). The former pronoun is of particular interest, since it appears in nearly all Portuguese-based creoles, including Papiamentu and *palenquero*, while it has completely disappeared from metropolitan Portuguese. *Vos* continues to be used in many dialects of Latin American Spanish, including all of Central America, parts of Colombia and Venezuela, the Andean region, and the Southern Cone nations; *vos* was also used in some Caribbean dialects until the end of the 19th century. The PCS dialects were formed during the same time

period as those Latin American dialects which conserve *vos*, since the latter pronoun was still common in popular Spanish, often with a derogatory connotation (which it continues to have in contemporary PCS).

PCS *ele* is identical to the Portuguese 3rd person singular masculine pronoun, which many Portuguese creoles have reduced to *i* or *e*. Use of *ele* in PCS could also stem from a paragogic /e/ added to Spanish *él*, a process attested elsewhere in Spanish, or from the old Spanish variants *ele/ela* (modern *él/ella*).

In the plural series, there is more variation in PCS; Zamboangueno has replaced the entire series with Visayan pronouns, Ternateño has *mihotro*, *buhotro* and *lohotro*; Caviteño shows *nisos*, *busos* and *ilos*. The Ternateño forms are clearly derived from the vulgar pronunciation, heard even today, of Spanish *nosotros*, *vosotros* and *los otros*, while in Cavite the occasional alternation between *nisos/vusos* and *nisotros/busotros* suggests Spanish rather than Portuguese (which has *nos/vos*) as the source. Schuchardt (1884: 145) cited *nosos/bosos* as additional variants in Cavite and Ermita, but these are not currently observable. *Ilos* may be a reduction of *ellos/ellas* (as supposed by Whinnom 1956: 36), or a derivative of the clitic pronoun *los*. A superficially similar form, *ellot/illot* was found in Indian creole Portuguese (Dalgado 1906: 151), but this was probably derived from *el otro/eles otros*, since *ellotros* is found in Ceylon creole Portuguese (Dalgado 1900: 43).

(5) **Possessive constructions.** A typical creole configuration is the use of (usually postposed) subject pronouns as possessive adjectives. This practice is followed in one form or another in the Gulf of Guinea creoles, in Papiamentu and *palenquero*, and in the oldest versions of Asian and Oceanic Portuguese creoles. In Macau creole Portuguese, *sua* (derived from the possessive adjective) is placed after the corresponding subject pronoun (*iou-sua*, *ele-sua*, etc.), while in Malacca *papiá kristang*, the corresponding particle is *sa*, alternating with postposition of the subject pronoun (e.g. *yo-sa chapeu/chapeu yo* "my hat"). In the PCS dialects, on the other hand, the possessive is normally formed via the preposition *di* + Spanish object/possessive pronoun: *di mi/di mio*, *di tu/di tuyo*, *di su/di suyo*, *di nisos*, etc. In the plural series, Zamboangueno has created analogous *di-* forms based on the Visayan pronouns: *diamon*, *diaton*, *diño*, *diila*. The short Spanish possessive forms (*mi*, *su*, etc.) may be due to recent decreolization, but the PCS dialects do not ordinarily use unmodified subject pronouns as possessives (and when this occurs, it is probably the result of deletion of *di*, rather than an originally creolized use of the subject pronoun), and subject pronouns are never postposed to serve as possessives. In this dimension, PCS does not participate in either Portuguese or general creole possessive formation.

(6) **Copulative and existential verbs.** The PCS dialects are nearly unique among Spanish/Portuguese creoles in having no copulative

verb, preferring simple juxtaposition to achieve comparable structures: *Zamboangueno yo* "I am a Zamboangueno". In this respect, the Chabacano dialects follow the syntactic patterns of the surrounding Philippine languages, which similarly lack a copula. Most Afro-Portuguese creoles have a variant of *sa* (derived from *sar*, a 15th century blend of *ser* and *estar*), which is also found in Macau and Malacca creole Portuguese. Other creole variants include *i*, *sentá* (also from a blend of *ser* and *estar*, mixed with *sentar*) and *ta*. Whereas other creoles also make occasional use of juxtaposition instead of copulative verbs, the total lack of a copula in PCS has no parallel among creole Portuguese dialects.

For existential expressions, the PCS dialects employ *tiene* "have", while in the negative *nuay* (< SP. *no hay* "there is not") is used. The use of some form of *tener* (Ptg. *ter*) instead of the Spanish/Portuguese existential verb *haber/haver* is common in Iberian-based creoles, and has been claimed as an argument in favor of monogenesis. Such arguments are weakened by noting the considerable overlap between the two verbs in old Spanish and Portuguese, during the time periods in which the various creole dialects were formed. Not only does modern Brazilian Portuguese use *ter* with existential force, but many marginal and vestigial Spanish dialects do so as well, under circumstances in which mutual influence is impossible to postulate (Lipski a). In the PCS dialects, particularly in Zamboangueno, an interesting alternation occurs with respect to the existential verbs, which shows no parallel among creole Portuguese dialects. In addition to the use of *nuay* to negate past tense verbs, this form is used to negate the locative verbs *taquí* "be here" and *tallá* "be there", used primarily with human subjects. Thus *nuay si Ramón* means "Ramón is not here/there", corresponding to the statements *iaquí/tallá si Ramón*. This may result from Philippine syntactic patterns, e.g. *wala si Ramón* "Ramón is not here", where *wala* roughly corresponds to Chabacano *nuay* in other functions.

(7) **Lexical similarities.** Given the considerable lexical similarity among Spanish and Portuguese dialects, which increases significantly among dialects of past centuries, tracing Portuguese elements in PCS is a difficult task which often yields nonconclusive results. Moreover, partial or total relexification is an ongoing process among creole languages, and the PCS dialects have absorbed a large quantity of more recent Spanish elements, in addition to hundreds of Philippine lexical items. Many putative Portuguese words found in one or more PCS dialects also occur in Spanish of earlier centuries, spanning the formative periods of both the Manila Bay and Zamboanga PCS dialects. These include *agora* (Sp. *ahora*) "now", *canto* (Sp. *esquina*), "[street] corner", *onde* (Sp. *donde*) "where". Other words represent nonstandard/dialectal variants often found even in contemporary Spanish; examples include *empelmo* (Sp.

enfermo) “sick”, *endenantes* (Sp. *antes*) “before”, *boneca* (Sp. *muñeca*) “doll”, *rempuá* (Sp. *empujar*) “to push”, etc.

Turning to less easily classifiable examples, we consider the preposition *na*, used in the PCS dialects in the sense of “in, on”. This form is identical to the Portuguese *na*, a contraction of the preposition *em* and the feminine definite article *a*, which is also found in the majority of Portuguese-based creoles. *Na* and similar prepositions are common among non-Iberian contact vernaculars, which may point to the use of maritime Portuguese as a lingua franca in earlier centuries (Whinnom 1956: 28; Naro 1978). It is also possible that like the verbal particle *ta*, *na* has multiple loci of evolution, via analogy with similar particles in local languages. In the case of the Philippine languages, we may cite the multifunctional Tagalog preposition *sa*, which covers all the use of PCS *na* plus many other cases (Whinnom 1956: 36), and also the preposition *nasa*, with locative function; in the Manila Bay PCS dialects, *sa* is at times used in alternation with *na*. While the formal similarity with standard and creole Portuguese may be fortuitous, *na* has no ready parallels in other creole or non-creole Spanish dialects.

Another unusual PCS element is *maskin* “although, even if”, which currently is more frequent in Zamboangueno than in the Manila Bay dialects. In the former dialect, *maskin* combines with *cosa*, *donde*, etc. with the meaning of “any whatsoever”, as in *maskin cosa hora* “any time at all”, *maskin donde* “wherever”, etc. Variants of *maskin* occasionally appear in Tagalog and Visayan, and Whinnom (1956: 38) speculated that the word may have been Hispanized to *masque*. The latter configuration, with the meaning of “even if, although”, is not attested for any Spanish dialect, although similar combinations do occur. Variants of *maski(n)* are common in Asian and Oceanic creole Portuguese dialects, including Ceylon (Dalgado 1900: 162), Macau (Ferreira 1978: 31), and Malacca (Hancock 1973: 30), but are not attested for African or Latin American Portuguese creoles. The form *maskee* was used in 19th century Chinese Pidgin English (Leland 1876: 12), which leads to the conclusion that it formed part of the Portuguese-based lingua franca in circulation in Asia during earlier centuries, regardless of whether similar or identical forms were used in Spanish at the same period.

PCS dialects use *cosa* as the interrogative word corresponding to “what, which”, although *que* may be used in conjunction with nouns or when asking for repetition of something which has not been understood or accepted; use of *que* may be the result of more recent contacts with peninsular Spanish. Among the Romance languages, only Italian makes frequent use of *cosa* as an interrogative pronoun. Many dialects of Spanish, however, employ *qué cosa* (as a variant of standard *qué*), while derivatives of Portuguese *que coisa* are found in Cape Verdean creole (Da Silva 1957: 165–166), in Malacca *papiá kristang* (Hancock 1973: 29),

in Indian Portuguese creole (Dalgado 1906: 155), and in Macau creole Portuguese (Ferreira 1978: 26). *Cosa* was also prominent in the (Italian-derived) lingua franca or Sabir of earlier centuries (Whinnom 1977, Hadel 1969, Schuchardt 1909, Collier 1977), which may have influenced 16th and 17th century maritime Portuguese in the Pacific. Thus while the use of *cosa* in PCS is not an unequivocal sign of Portuguese provenance, it must be considered as a potential candidate for such a classification.

Use of the preposition *con* to signal direct objects (instead of Spanish *a* for animate objects and \emptyset for inanimate objects) has been claimed as a result of Portuguese influence (Whinnom 1965: 512), given the existence of similar constructions in some Portuguese creoles (e. g. Theban 1974: 108). Use of *con* instead of *a* does occur in popular Spanish throughout the world (e. g. *fui con ellal doctor* "I went to the doctor") while in some PCS examples, *con* straddles the boundary between an accusative marker and a preposition indicating accompaniment (Whinnom 1956: 54). In the case of Zamboangueno, and possibly also the Manila Bay PCS dialects, I have suggested (Lipski b) that the use of *con* + subject pronoun may have been caused or reinforced by fortuitous similarity of Philippine accusative pronouns such as *kanaton*, *kanamon*, which in popular Chabacano are often pronounced as *konaton*, *konamon*, etc., and are apparently analyzed morphologically as /kan+aton/, /kan+amon/, and so forth.

Batalha (1960b: 303) has suggested that the use of *dale* "to give" instead of *da* stems from creole Portuguese, although she offers no evidence in support of this claim. Use of this combination of Spanish verb stem + accusative or dative pronoun is unique among the PCS dialects, and the existence of *dale* in all PCS dialects is one of the arguments in favor of a common origin (Lipski b). In popular Mexican Spanish, which formed the received input for most of the formative period of the PCS dialects, the expression *dale* is used with extraordinary frequency, as an interjection roughly meaning "let's go", "okay", "do it now", and so forth, and Mexican Spanish is noted for its exceptional and non-etymological use of the clitic *le* in a variety of other circumstances. Given the widespread lack of forms similar to *dale* in Portuguese-based creoles, it is safer to assume that this element arose spontaneously in the first PCS dialect, through imitation and extension of received popular Mexican Spanish.

The final lexical item to be considered is *quilaya*, roughly meaning "how, in what fashion", which alternates with the clearly Spanish *quimodo* and occasional *como*. Whinnom (1956: 46) appears mystified by this item, but it evidently derives from an older popular Portuguese form (Batalha 1960b: 302), and is attested for Macau creole Portuguese, Indian Portuguese (Schuchardt 1889a: 516; Schuchardt 1883c: 801),

Malaccan *papiá kristang* (Hancock 1973: 29) and Ceylon creole Portuguese (Dalgado 1900: 53); a variant form *qui lei* was attested for the Indo-Portuguese dialect of Negapatão (Dalgado 1917: 46). Since no similar form has been attested for any Spanish dialect, this item must be tentatively regarded as a creole Portuguese incursion in the PCS lexicon.

The results of the preceding survey yield a very mixed verdict on the putative creole Portuguese origins of Philippine Creole Spanish. The lexical arguments are the weakest, since with the possible exception of *quilaya*, all the other claimed Portuguese elements in PCS exhibit alternative etymological potentials, and many are popular/archaic/dialectal forms occurring in other Spanish-speaking areas. Even the existence of the totality of these lexical items in PCS does not unduly stretch the boundaries of coincidence, given their small number and the considerable overlap between popular Spanish and Portuguese variants. It is more probable, however that some maritime Portuguese elements would have filtered into any variety of Spanish spoken in the Philippines in the vicinity of military garrisons, naval yards, trading centers and commercial areas. Given available information on the widespread use of pidgin Portuguese lexical elements throughout Asia, the Pacific and Africa from the 15th to the 19th centuries, even the presence of verifiable Asian creole Portuguese items in PCS does not in itself militate in favor of a creole Portuguese origin for PCS.

The general syntactic structures of PCS share very little similarity with Asian or African creole Portuguese, except inasmuch as they manifest such quasi-universal tendencies as elimination of gender and number inflection, general lack of verb conjugation, frequent elimination of prepositions, categorical use of subject pronouns, etc. Such key structures as possessives, copulative equations, negative and interrogative structures show more differences than parallels between the PCS dialects on the one hand and creole Portuguese variants on the other. At the same time, the PCS dialects fit in neatly among indigeneous Philippine languages in terms of basic syntactic patterns (C. Lopez 1965b, Constantino 1965), and it is possible that even some putative Portuguese elements (such as the use of a single undifferentiated subject pronoun *ele*) reflect the behavior of corresponding elements (in this case, *siya*) among the Philippine languages. The lack of parallels between PCS dialects and Afro-Portuguese creoles is even more striking, both in the lexical and in the syntactic dimension, thus suggesting that any influence the latter creoles may have had on the formation of an Asian Portuguese lingua franca had little or no repercussion in the Philippines, or was neutralized by the heavy grammatical and lexical nativization of PCS.

By far the strongest argument in favor of the relexification hypothesis

for PCS is the verbal/aspectual system, particularly the use of the particles *ta*, *ya* and *di/ay*. Although use of a three-particle system has been claimed as a universal creole structure, the existence of similar or identical particles in PCS and creole Portuguese is more difficult to explain by recourse to universal traits, as demonstrated above. The possibility that a completely developed creole tense/aspect system may have been transferred from the Moluccas to Manila by the original *Mardikas* is the prevailing hypothesis, which, however, does admit of ramifications and even opposing postulates. Since the existence of *ya* can be attributed to normal Spanish adverbial usage, and *ay/di* may also be derived from normal Spanish patterns, only *ta* needs to be accounted for in PCS. This particle also appears in Caribbean Spanish creoles, beginning around the turn of the 19th century, where it may have been transferred by Papiamentu-speaking slaves brought from Curaçao to Cuba and Puerto Rico just before the end of the Caribbean slave trade (Lipski d). Its use in Colombian *palenquero* is a component of the Afro-Portuguese creole theory, and similar arguments apply to Papiamentu (Megenney 1984, 1985). This type of creole verb structure was evidently known to non-creole Spanish speakers of the time periods in question, as evidenced by literary imitations of Afro-Hispanic *bozales* (slaves born in Africa and speaking pidgin/creole Spanish; cf. Lipski d), and the testimony of historians and religious figures (e. g. Estrada 1797). If one is to believe the theories of the spread of pidgin Portuguese as a maritime and commercial lingua franca, then such constructions must also have been known to and used by sailors and merchants of many nations, beginning in the early 16th century. Such general knowledge may have enabled sailors and soldiers frequenting the Spanish garrisons and naval yards at Cavite and Corregidor, as well as the residential and commercial areas of Intramuros and Ermita and later the fortifications of Zamboanga, to reinforce incipient pidgin Spanish or 'kitchen Spanish' (as PCS was known in Manila) tendencies among the local populace, resulting in the eventual fixation of a creolized verbal system with aspectual particles. Evidence exists that as late as the mid 18th century, Asian Portuguese creole did not use the particle *ta* or used it only sporadically (Lopes 1969: 76–77), with *ja* and *lo* being used for past and future, respectively, at times in conjunction with partially conjugated verbs. In 19th century Asian Portuguese, use of a third-person singular verb form instead of the infinitive, with or without an aspectual particle, is a common recourse, and while this has often been attributed to decreolization, it may just as well reflect another quasi-universal tendency among Iberian-based creoles, the use of the 3rd singular verb as the basic form (Lipski a; Perl 1982, 1985, a; Schuchardt 1979: 79). Several literary attestations of what appears to be PCS (e. g. V. López 1893, Montero y Vidal 1876, Retana 1921) also contain partially conjugated verbs, rather than a fully

developed system of aspectual particles, and current speakers of Caviteño and particularly Zamboangueno mix non-conjugated and partially conjugated verbs with creole combinations of particle + stem, in fashions more suggestive of traditional usage than of recent decreolization.

While it is probable that some form of pidgin Portuguese was spoken in the Moluccas at the time of the Spanish takeover of that territory, it is not equally certain that the *Mardikas* evacuated from Ternate to Manila spoke a fully-developed Portuguese or Spanish creole, nor that their relatively small number (some 200 families) immersed in the Spanish colony of Manila was sufficient to transmit intact whatever creolized language they may have brought with them. Those 'Mardika' words surviving until the 20th century have no recognizable Spanish or Portuguese roots (Tirona 1923) and recent contacts between residents of Ternate, Cavite and Ternate, Moluccas have produced great consternation on both sides, as absolutely no recognizable lexical or grammatical items are mutually shared (Tirona 1923, Nigoza 1985, personal communication). It is conceivable that a small group of *Mardikas* transferred from Manila to Tanza and Ternate and who later migrated to Cavite, brought with them some creolized Spanish or Portuguese constructions, which when added to the multilingual flux characterizing Cavite and Intramuros/Ermita catalyzed and channeled pidgin Spanish usage in those regions. This, however, is significantly different from the hypothesis of complete relexification of Moluccan creole Portuguese as the source for the original Manila Bay PCS dialects.

In summary, the chapter on the origins of the PCS dialects is far from closed, given major gaps in historical documentation. Most of the dialects which could have shed light on the issues have disappeared or are rapidly disappearing, and only collective efforts at comparative reconstruction and additional searches of historical records may permit refining currently available theories. The present remarks suggest caution in attributing Philippine Creole Spanish to a relexification of a completely established creole Portuguese, without adequate exploration of alternative routes of evolution.

Houston

JOHN M. LIPSKI

References

- Gonzalo Aguirre Beltrán (1958). *Cuijla, esbozo etnográfico de un pueblo negro*, Mexico (Fondo de Cultura Económica)
 – (1971). *La población negra de México*, 2nd ed., Mexico (Fondo de Cultura Económica)
 Manuel Alvarez Nazario (1974). *El elemento afronegroide en el español de Puerto Rico*, San Juan (Instituto de Cultura Puertorriqueña)

- Feliciana Apostol (1962–1967). *The Chabacano dialect*, series of articles appearing in the Southern Tribune, Zamboanga City, from 5 December, 1962 to 15 February, 1967
- (1967). *Cartilla Zamboanguêna*, Zamboanga City (“El Maestro”)
- Nicolás Barrena (1957). *Gramática annobonesa*, Madrid (Instituto de Estudios Africanos)
- Graciete Nogueira Batalha (1958–1959). *Estado actual do dialecto macaense*, Revista Portuguesa de Filologia 9, 177–213
- (1960). *Coincidências com o dialecto de Macau em dialectos espanhóis das Ilhas Filipinas*, Boletim de Filologia 19, 295–303
- (1974). *Língua de Macau*, Macau (Imprensa Nacional)
- Corazón Batausa (1969). *A descriptive-contrastive analysis of Chabacano and Tagalog noun reduplication patterns*, M. A. thesis, Univ. of the Philippines
- Derek Bickerton (1981). *Roots of Language*, Ann Arbor (Karoma)
- Derek Bickerton and Aquiles Escalante (1970). *PALENQUERO: a Spanish-based creole in northern Colombia*, Lingua 32, 254–267
- John Birmingham (1970). *The Papiamentu Language of Curaçao*, Ph. D. dissertation, University of Virginia
- J. Donald Bowen (1971). *Hispanic languages and influence in Oceania*, in T. Sebeok (ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics*, v. 8, 938–952, The Hague (Mouton)
- Abel Chataigner (1963). *Le créole portugais du Sénégal: observations et textes*, Journal of African Languages 2, 44–71
- Luis Chaves (1933). *O ‘cristão’, papiá cristão, o ‘secani’*, A Língua Portuguesa 3, 169–178
- F. Adolfo Coelho (1963). *Os dialectos românicos ou neo-latinos na Africa, Asia e América*, in J. Morais-Barbosa (ed.), *Estudos linguísticos crioulos*, 1–233, Lisbon (Academia Internacional de Cultura Portuguesa)
- Barbara Collier (1977). *On the origins of Língua Franca*, Journal of Creole Studies 1, 281–298
- Ernesto Constantino (1965). *The sentence patterns of twenty six Philippine languages*, Lingua 15, 71–124
- Sebastião Dalgado (1900). *O dialecto indo-português de Ceylão*, Lisbon (Imprensa Nacional)
- (1900–1901). *Dialecto indo-português de Goa*, Revista Lusitana 6, 63–84
- (1902–1903). *Dialecto indo-português de Damão*, Ta-ssi-yang-kuo 3, 359–367; 5, 515–523, 684–694, 746–750
- (1906). *Dialecto indo-português do norte*, Revista Lusitana 9, 142–166, 193–228
- (1917). *Dialecto indo-português de Negapatão*, Revista Lusitana 20, 40–53
- (1919–1921). *Glossário luso-asiático*, Coimbra (Imprensa Nacional)
- Morgan Dalphinis (1985). *Caribbean and African Languages*, London (Karia Pres)
- Baltasar Lopes Da Silva (1957). *O dialecto crioulo de Cabo Verde*, Lisbon (Imprensa Nacional)
- Blanca Diez (1981). *Language change in progress in the Portuguese of Macau*, Ph. D. dissertation, Georgetown University
- Pilar Domingo (1967). *Aspect and tense in Spanish and Zamboanga verbs*, M. A. thesis, University of the Philippines
- Nicolás Estrada (1797). *Explicación de la doctrina cristiana acomodada a la capacidad de los negros bozales*, Havana (Imprenta de Boloña)
- José Evangelista (1972). *An analytical study of the Chabacano verb*, M. A. thesis, Central Philippine University, Iloilo City
- Luis Ferraz (1975). *African influences on Principense creole*, in M. Valkhoff

- (ed.), *Miscelânea Luso-Africana*, 153–164, Lisbon (Junta de Investigações de Ultramar)
- (1976). *The substratum of Annobonese creole*, *Linguistics* 173, 37–47
 - (1978). *The creole of São Tomé*, *African Studies* 7, 3–68, 235–288
 - (1983). *The origin and development of four creoles in the Gulf of Guinea*, in Ellen Woolford, William Washabaugh (eds.), *The Social Context of Creolization*, 120–125, Ann Arbor (Karoma)
- José dos Santos Ferreira (1978). *Papiá cristán de Macau*, Macau (Tipografia da Missão do Padroado)
- Michael Forman (1972). *Zamboangueno texts with grammatical analysis*, Ph. D. dissertation, Cornell University
- Charles Frake (1971). *Lexical origins and semantic structure in Philippine creole Spanish*, in D. Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, 223–242, Cambridge (Cambridge University)
- Nina de Friedemann and Carlos Patiño Rosselli (1983). *Lengua y sociedad en el Palenque de San Basilio*, Bogotá (Instituto Caro y Cuervo)
- Alfredo Germán (1932). *The Spanish dialect of Cavite*, M. A. thesis, University of the Philippines
- Douglas Gifford (1973). *Field notes on the morpho-syntax of Chaco Spanish*, in K.-H. Körner, K. Rühl (eds.), *Studia Iberica*, Festschrift für Hans Flasche, 166–174, Bern (Francke)
- E. W. Goilo (1953). *Gramatica papiamentu*, Curaçao (Hollandsche Boekhandel)
- Carlisle González and Celso Benavides (1982). *¿Existen rasgos criollos en el habla de Samaná?* in Orlando Alba (ed.), *El español del Caribe*, 105–132, Santiago de los Caballeros (Universidad Católica Madre y Maestra)
- Germán de Granda (1976a). *Un plantamiento sociohistórico del problema de la formación del criollo portugués de Africa Occidental*, *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 40, 299–310
- (1976b). *A socio-historical approach to the problem of Portuguese creole in West Africa*, *Linguistics* 173, 11–22
 - (1978). *Estudios lingüísticos hispánicos, afrohispanicos y criollos*, Madrid (Gredos)
- Wilfried Günther (1973). *Das portugiesische Kreolisch der Ilha do Príncipe*, Marburg (Universität Marburg/Lahn)
- Richard Hadel (1969). *Modern creoles and Sabir*, *Folklore Annual of the University Folklore Association* 1, 35–43
- Ian Hancock (1973). *Malacca creole Portuguese: a brief transformational outline*, *Te Reo* 16, 23–44
- (1975). *Malacca creole Portuguese: Asian, African or European?* *Anthropological Linguistics* 17, 211–236
- D. Hesseling (1933). *Papiamento en Negerhollands*, *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde* 52, 265–288
- Charles Leland (1876). *Pidgin English Sing-Song or Songs and Stories in the China-English Dialect*, Philadelphia (Lippincott)
- Rodolfo Lenz (1928). *El papiamentu, la lengua criolla de Curazao*, Santiago (Universidad de Chile).
- John Lipski (1984). *Observations on the Spanish of Malabo, Equatorial Guinea*, *Hispanic Linguistics* 1, 69–96
- (1985). *The Spanish of Equatorial Guinea*, Tübingen (Max Niemeyer)
 - (a). *Vestigial Spanish and creole Spanish: evolutionary parallels*, forthcoming in *Linguistics*
 - (b). *Philippine Creole Spanish dialects: problems and proposals*, forthcoming in *Oceania*

- (c). *El español de Filipinas: breves apuntes*, forthcoming in *Anuario de Letras* (Mexico)
 - (d). *On the construction TA + infinitive in Caribbean BOZAL Spanish*, forthcoming in *Romance Philology*
 - (e). *The speech of the NEGROS CONGOS of Panama: vestigial creole Spanish*, forthcoming in *Hispanic Linguistics*
 - (f). *El Valle del Chota: enclave lingüístico afroecuatoriano*, forthcoming in the *Boletín de la Academia Puertorriqueña de la Lengua Española*
- Librada Llamado (1969). *An analysis of the basic structure of Cavite Chabacano*, M. A. thesis, Philippine Normal College, Manila
- (1972). *Phrase-structure rules of Cavite Chabacano*, *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 3, 67–96
- David Lopes (1969). *A expansão da língua portuguesa no oriente durante os séculos XVI, XVII e XVIII*, 2nd ed., Porto (Editora Portucalense)
- Cecilio Lopez (1965a). *The Spanish overlay in Tagalog*, *Lingua* 15, 467–504
- (1965b). *Contributions to a comparative Philippine syntax*, *Lingua* 15, 3–16
- Ventura López (1893). *El filibustero*, Madrid (Viuda de M. Minues de los Ríos)
- Humberto López Morales (1980). *Sobre la pretendida existencia y pervivencia del 'criollo' cubano*, *Anuario de Letras* 18, 85–116
- (1983). *Estratificación sociolectal frente a diglosia en el Caribe hispánico*, *Lingüística Española Actual* 5, 205–222
- Armando Macansantos (1971). *A contrastive analysis of Spanish and Chabacano concordance of forms and structures of noun-head modifications*, M. A. thesis, University of the Philippines
- Toribia Maño (1963). *The Zamboanga Chabacano grammar*, *Far Eastern University Journal* (Manila) April 1963, 672–682
- Howard McKaughan (1954). *Notes on Chabacano grammar*, *Journal of East Asiatic Studies* 3, 205–226
- William Megenney (1984). *Traces of Portuguese in three Caribbean creoles: evidence in support of the monogenetic theory*, *Hispanic Linguistics* 1, 177–190
- (1985). *La influencia criolla-portuguesa en el español caribeño*, *Anuario de Lingüística Hispánica* (Valladolid) 1, 157–180
 - (a). *África en Santo Domingo: su herencia lingüística*, to be published by the Museo del Hombre Dominicano
- Gervasio Miranda (1956). *El dialecto chabacano de Cavite*, Dumaguete City (n. p.)
- Carol Molony (1973). *Sound changes in Chabacano*, in Andrew Gonzalez (ed.), *Parangal Kay López: Essays in Honor of Cecilio López on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, 38–50, Quezon City (Linguistic Society of the Philippines)
- (1977a). *Semantic changes in Chabacano*, in J. Meisel (ed.), *Langues en contact-pidgins-creoles-Languages in Contact*, 153–166, Tübingen (Gunter Narr)
 - (1977b). *Recent relexification processes in Philippine Creole Spanish*, in B. Blount, M. Sanches (eds.), *Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Change*, 131–160, New York (Academic Press)
 - (1978). *Lexical changes in Philippine creole Spanish*, in W. McCormack, S. Wurm (eds.), *Approaches to Language: Anthropological Issues*, 401–416, The Hague (Mouton)
- José Montero y Vidal (1876). *Cuentos filipinos*, Madrid (Aribau y Compañía)
- Rosalinda Morales Goulet (1971). *English, Spanish and Tagalog: a Study of Grammatical, Lexical and Cultural Interference*, Manila (Linguistic Society of the Philippines)

- France Mugler (1983). *A comparative study of the pronominal systems of Romance-based creoles*, Ph. D. dissertation, University of Michigan
- Pieter Muysken (1981). *Creole tense/mood/aspect systems: the unmarked case?* in Pieter Muysken (ed.), *Generative Studies in Creole Languages*, 181–200, Dordrecht (FORIS)
- Anthony Naro (1978). *A study on the origins of pidginization*, *Language* 54, 314–347
- Almada Negreiros (1895). *História ethnográfica da Ilha de S. Thomé*, Lisboa (José Bastos)
- Evangelino Nigoza (1985). *Notes on Ternateño vocabulary*, unpublished MS, Ternate City
- Ricardo Otheguy (1975). *The Spanish Caribbean: a creole perspective*, In C. Bailey, R. Shuy (eds.), *New Ways of Analyzing Variation in English*, 323–339, Washington (Georgetown University).
- Matthias Perl (1982a). *Creole morphosyntax in the Cuban 'habla bozal'*, *Studii și Cercetări Lingvistice* 5, 424–433
- (1982b). *Acerca de alguns aspectos históricos do português crioulo em Africa*, *Biblos* 58, 1–12
- (1984). *Some sociolinguistic aspects of the crioulo variants in West Africa*, *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 37, 606–610
- (1985). *El fenómeno de descriollización del 'habla bozal' y el lenguaje coloquial de la variante cubana del español*, *Anuario de Lingüística Hispánica* (Valladolid) 1, 191–202
- (a). *Rasgos poscriollos léxicos en el lenguaje coloquial cubano*, forthcoming in *Thesaurus*
- John Phelan (1959). *The Hispanization of the Philippines*, Madison (University of Wisconsin)
- Antonio Quilis (1970). *Notas de morfología verbal sobre el español hablado en Cavite y Zamboanga (Filipinas)*, in *Homenaje universitario a Dámaso Alonso*, 59–63, Madrid (Gredos)
- (1980). *Le sort de l'espagnol aux Philippines: un problème de langues en contact*, *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 44, 82–107
- (1984). *La lengua española en las Islas Filipinas*, *Cuadernos del Centro Cultural de la Embajada de España (Manila)* 11, 1–22
- W. Retana (1921). *Diccionario de filipinismos*, *Revue Hispanique* 51, 1–174
- Maria Isabelita Riego de Dios (1976a). *The Cotabato Chabacano verb*, *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 7, 48–59
- (1976b). *A composite dictionary of Philippine Creole Spanish*, Ph. D. dissertation, Ateneo de Manila University
- (1978). *A pilot study on the dialects of Philippine Creole Spanish*, *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 2 (1), 77–81
- Leslie Rout (1976). *The African Experience in Spanish America*, Cambridge (Cambridge University)
- Antonio Santos y Gomez (1924). *The Caviteño dialect*, Tagalog Paper 448 of the Beyer Collection, Philippine National Library, Manila
- Luigi Scantamburlo (1981). *Gramática da língua crioula da Guiné-Bissau*, Bologna (Editrice Missionaria Italiana)
- Hugo Schuchardt (1882). *Kreolische Studien I, über das Negerportugiesische von S. Thomé*, *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien* 101, 889–917
- (1883a). *Kreolische Studien III, über das Indoportugiesische von Diu*, *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien* 103, 3–18

- (1883b). *Kreolische Studien VI, über das Indoportugiesische von Mangalore*, Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien 105, 881–904
- (1883c). *Kreolische Studien II, über das Indoportugiesische von Cochim*, Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien 102, 799–816
- (1884). *Über das Malaiospanische der Philippinen*, Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien 105, 111–150
- (1888a). *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des kreolischen Romanisch I, Allgemeines über das Negerportugiesische*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 12, 242–254
- (1888b). *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des kreolischen Romanisch II, zum Negerportugiesischen Senegambiens*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 12, 301–312
- (1888c). *Kreolische Studien VII, über das Negerportugiesische von Annobom*, Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien 116, 193–226
- (1888d). *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des kreolischen Romanisch III, zum Negerportugiesischen der Kapverden*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 12, 312–322
- (1889a). *Allgemeines über das Indoportugiesische*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 13, 476–524
- (1889b). *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des kreolischen Romanisch IV, zum Negerportugiesischen der Ilha do Principe*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 13, 463–475
- (1909). *Die Lingua Franca*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 33, 441–461
- (1979). *The Ethnography of Variation: Selected Writings on Pidgins and Creoles*, tr. T. Markey, Ann Arbor (Karoma)
- William Lytle Schurz (1985). *The Manila Galleon*, 2nd ed., Manila (Historical Conservation Society)
- Bonifacio Sibayan (1971). *The Philippines*, in T. Sebeok (ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics*, v. 8, 1038–1062, The Hague (Mouton)
- Ian Smith (1979). *Convergence in South Asia: a creole example*, *Lingua* 48, 193–222
- Norman Stageberg (1956). *Pidgin French grammar: a sketch*, *Modern Language Journal* 40, 167–169
- Douglas Taylor (1971). *Grammatical and lexical affinities of creoles*, in D. Hymes (ed.), *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, 293–296, Cambridge (Cambridge University)
- Maria Theban (1973). *Structura propoziț în portugheză și indo-portugheză*, *Studii și Cercetări Lingvistice* 24, 639–645
- (1974). *A evolução sintáctica dos dialectos indo-portugueses*, *Studii și Cercetări Lingvistice* 25, 107–110
- Robert Thompson (1959). *Two synchronic cross-sections in the Portuguese dialect of Macau*, *Orbis* 8, 29–53
- Tomas Tirona (1923). *An account of the Ternate dialect of Cavite*, Tagalog Paper 487 of the Beyer Collection, Philippine National Library, Manila
- Marius Valkhoff (1966). *Studies in Portuguese and Creole*, Johannesburg (Witwatersrand University)
- H. Van Wijk (1958). *Orígenes y evolución del papiamentu*, *Neophilologus* 42, 169–182
- Isidro Vila (1891). *Elementos de gramática annobonesa*, Madrid (A. Pérez Du-brull)

- Paul Wexler (1983). *Kristang as a tool for recovering the mid-15th century Portuguese reconnaissance language*, *Romance Philology* 37, 139–150
- Keith Whinnom (1954). *Spanish in the Philippines*, *Journal of Oriental Studies* 1, 129–194
- (1956). *Spanish Contact Vernaculars in the Philippines*, Hong Kong (Hong Kong University)
 - (1965). *Origin of European-based creoles and pidgins*, *Orbis* 14, 510–527
 - (1977). *The context and origins of Lingua Franca*, in J. Meisel (ed.), *Langues en contact-pidgins-creoles-Languages in Contact*, 3–18, Tübingen (Gunter Narr)
- W. Wilson (1962). *The Crioulo of Guiné*, Johannesburg (Witwatersrand University)
- John Wolff (1973–1974). *The character of borrowings from Spanish and English in the languages of the Philippines*, *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 4–5 (1–2), 72–82
- Alain Yacou (1977). *A propos du parler bossal, langue créole de Cuba*, *Espace Créole* 2, 73–92