

New Thoughts on the Origins of Zamboangueño (Philippine Creole Spanish)

John M. Lipski

University of New Mexico

ABSTRACT

Zamboangueño is the largest and most stable variety of Philippine Creole Spanish (PCS). The pioneering work of Whinnom (1956) grouped all PCS varieties together as "Spanish contact vernacular-ff-," while the first serious study of Zamboangueño, by Frake (1971), stated that

"Philippine Creole Spanish is not simply a Philippine language with unusually heavy Spanish lexical influence, nor is it Spanish with a large number of Philippine loan words. It is a distinct language, easily distinguishable from both its Romance and its Austronesian progenitors. . . ."

Two prevailing viewpoints exist on the origins of Zamboangueño, which shows both striking similarities and significant differences with respect to Manila Bay PCS dialects. The first holds that Zamboangueño is the direct offshoot of transplanted Manila Bay PCS, used by garrison troops and enriched by central and southern Philippine elements. The second is that Zamboangueño was formed *in situ* by repatriated slaves from all parts of the Philippines, who were recaptured from the Moslems of the Sulu Sea and set ashore at Zamboanga's Fort Pilar. The present study attempts to reconcile the similarities and differences among PCS dialects, thereby situating Zamboangueño in a refined geneological perspective. It is suggested that, although certain features of Zamboangueño almost certainly come from Manila Bay PCS, this did not result from a transplantation of a flourishing Manila Bay PCS variety in Zamboanga. Rather, Zamboangueño was formed gradually in a largely downward fashion from received Spanish, aided by two additional components. The first is the inevitable pidginization that resulted in the Spanish garrison at Zamboanga, reinforced by the concentration of freed slaves from all parts of the Philippines. The second was a continuing trickle of Manila Bay PCS speakers into Zamboanga, as well as a general awareness, by Spanish and Zamboangueño speakers, of linguistic features prevailing in Manila Bay PCS.

INTRODUCTION

Since the pioneering work of Whinnom (1956), the existence of Spanish-based

“contact vernaculars” in the Philippines has come to the attention of linguists.¹ Collectively, all varieties of Philippine Creole Spanish (PCS) are known as Chabacano,² and three distinct dialects still exist, in Ternate, Cavite and Zamboanga. Whinnom postulated that Ternateño (T) was the first to be formed, suggesting that this creole has extraterritorial roots, descending from a largely Portuguese-based creole formed in the 17th century on the Indonesian island of the same name. Comparative work by Molony (1973; 1977a, b) supports the hypothesis that T is the oldest of the Spanish-based creoles in the Philippines while observations by Batalha (1960) suggest more than casual parallels with Asian Portuguese-based creoles.

Caviteño (C) was a later offshoot of T, one of many stable or fleeting Spanish-based contact vernaculars that arose in the fortified areas around Manila Bay, and it too can be traced back at least as far as the 18th century. T and C exhibit several grammatical features that make them contenders for being descendents or relexifications of earlier Portuguese-based creoles and pidgins (but cf. Lipski 1988). Both have been influenced by Tagalog; this is evident not only in the preferred VSO word order (at least with pronominal subjects), but also in the incorporation of Tagalog particles and other syntactic structures.

Varieties of PCS are also spoken on the island of Mindanao. The largest group of speakers is found in and around Zamboanga City. A small group, now largely dispersed, previously existed in Davao, derived from immigrants from Zamboanga who arrived at the turn of the 20th century. Another small group is found in Cotabato City (Riego de Dios 1976a, 1978). Cotabateño (Ct) is virtually identical to Zamboangueno (Z), with the few differences being mostly lexical. Riego de Dios suggests that the two dialects may have partially different roots, although admitting immigration from Zamboanga to Cotabato as the likely source of most of Ct.

Z was only briefly studied by Whinnom (1956), who transcribed some folk poems without registering the fundamental differences between Z and the Manila Bay PCS dialects. McKaughan (1954) also offered brief observations on Z, based on the speech of a single expatriate informant.³ It was not until Frake (1971) that accurate and updated information on Z became available, and although other grammatical descriptions of Z have appeared subsequently,⁴ the postulates established by Whinnom and Frake have remained virtually unchanged.

Frake (1971: 223–4) is unequivocal in his classification of PCS, including Z (the main focus of his article):

“Philippine Creole Spanish is not simply a Philippine language with unusually heavy Spanish lexical influence, nor is it Spanish with a large number of Philippine loan words. It is a distinct language, easily distinguishable from both its Romance and its Austronesian progenitors. . . . Philippine Creole Spanish shares enough in common with the classic creoles of the Caribbean that no one. . . would, I think, challenge its assignment to the category ‘creole language.’”

In the following remarks, some of the arguments that have been used to account for the origin, development, and current status of Z will be re-examined. In particular, the notion that Z has always been “easily distinguishable” from its Philippine language neighbors, will be challenged. At the same time, the typological relatedness of Z to the Manila Bay PCS dialects will be reconsidered. It will be suggested that, although certain features of Z almost certainly come from the Manila Bay dialects, this did not result from a simple transplantation of PCS to Zamboanga. Z was gradually formed *in situ*, in a downward fashion from received Spanish, aided by two additional components. The first is the inevitable pidginization that resulted in the Spanish garrison at Zamboanga, and among the civilian population of freed slaves and former prisoners from all parts of the Philippines. The second was a continuing trickle of Manila Bay PCS speakers into Zamboanga, as well as a general awareness, by Spanish and Z speakers, of linguistic features prevailing in Manila Bay PCS. Constraints of space require limiting the presentation to a schematic account, entailing that examples and suggestions often take the place of detailed arguments. It is hoped that the basic line of reasoning can be followed throughout.

EARLIER ATTESTATIONS OF ZAMBOANGUENO

Early Period

Zamboanga City began as a military outpost built to contain Moslem penetration in the southern Philippines. Fort Pilar, the main defense, was constructed in the 1630s, but was abandoned some 30 years later due to repeated attacks. Spaniards returned to Zamboanga in 1719, and the subsequent Spanish presence in that area was continuous until 1898 (cf. Barrows 1926). Despite the fact that Z is currently spoken by as many as 200,000 individuals, throughout the province of Zamboanga del Sur, no trustworthy pre-20th century documentation on this language has come to light, in contrast to numerous 19th-century observations of Manila Bay PCS. This makes reconstruction of Z a risky and precarious endeavor. A composite of observations of the linguistic situation in Zamboanga, made over a period of more than a century and a half, enables a very rough bracketing, but the margin for error is at least 50–75 years. A brief sample of the hundreds of accounts which permit a reconstruction of the formative period of Z give an idea of the ambiguity of early attestations, and the ambivalence with which Filipinos’ attempts at speaking any form of Spanish were viewed by outsiders.

Early visitors to Zamboanga, in 1772 (Sonnerat 1776: 127) and in 1774–6 (Forrest 1780: 374–5) speak only of ‘Spaniards’ (in reference to the garrison troops) and of escaped slaves from Jolo (largely of Visayan origin), without noting any special contact language that might have been in use. Even the language spoken by the

“Spanish” troops must be suspect; Sonnerat (1776: 128–9) observed that the fort was guarded by “des gens bannis des Etats Espagnols, aussi prêts sans doute à le livrer qu’à le défendre” [men expelled from Spanish colonies, doubtlessly as willing to surrender the fort as to defend it]. Martínez de Zúñiga (1973: 236–7), describing the situation in the Philippines at the turn of the 19th century, noted that few Filipinos spoke Spanish. The exception was in the San Roque barrio of Cavite, where “they speak a kind of Spanish which has been corrupted and whose phraseology is entirely taken from the dialect of the country” (p. 250). This is unquestionably C, so that the author should have recognized PCS had he found it elsewhere. Upon describing Zamboanga, however, Martínez de Zúñiga only mentioned the Spanish garrison, “5162 souls composed of natives, Spaniards, soldiers and prisoners,” with no indication that anything other than (non-creole) Spanish or Philippine languages were spoken there.

Some Spanish was apparently spoken near Zamboanga in the Sulu Sea early in the 19th century. Moor (1837: 37) mentions Moslem Datus on Jolo who spoke Spanish, a fact also noticed by Yvan (1855: 230), and Saleeby (1980: 164–5). However, visitors to Zamboanga during the same period (Keppel 1853: 70f.; St John 1853: 131–2; Marryat 1848; Mallat 1846, etc.) still note only Spanish (spoken by Spanish troops) or “Moro” spoken by Muslims from Jolo. The general lack of knowledge of Spanish was frequently commented on by visitors to the Philippines. Bowring (1859: 28) speaking of the Manila working class, estimated that not one in a hundred spoke or understood Spanish. Lannoy (1849: 33) observed that indigenous political leaders were required to speak Spanish, but that this requirement was not enforced. Lannoy noted that the Zamboanga garrison had roughly 380 men, of which 11 were officers, 6 were sub-officers, and 24 were corporals. Of the linguistic and cultural problems, he stated (pp. 71–2) that

“près de la moitié des officiers subalternes dans les régiments sont des indigènes, parlant la langue du soldat et jaloux les officiers espagnols, que parviennent seuls aux grades supérieurs. C’est là une cause constante de mésintelligence et d’irritation...”

[more than half the sub-officers are natives, speaking the soldiers’ language and resenting the Spanish officers, who exclusively hold the higher ranks. This is a constant source of misunderstanding and irritation...]. MacMicking (1967: 92), writing in the 1850s, commented that most Filipinos could not speak Spanish, although “most of those in the neighborhood of Manilla can speak it after a fashion.” Jagor (1875: 156) stated that most soldiers spoke no Spanish.

Also instructive of the awareness of varieties of Philippine “Spanish” by outsiders, are observers’ lists of languages spoken in each area of the Philippines. Jagor (1875: 55–6) assigned Spanish and Tagalog (in that order) to Cavite, Tagalog, Spanish and Chinese to Manila, Spanish and Manobo Cotabato, and “Mandaya” and Spanish to

Zamboanga. Escosura and Cañamaque (1882: xxiii), writing in the 1860s, assign Spanish and Tagalog to Cavite, Tagalog, Spanish and Chinese to Manila, Spanish and ‘Moro’ to Basilan (just off the coast of Zamboanga), and only Spanish to Zamboanga. This could indicate that Zamboanga was the most “Spanish”-speaking area of the Philippines in the mid 19th century. However, the same authors (p. 5) lament that native Filipinos speak only *español de cocina* “kitchen Spanish,” so the designation ‘Spanish’ assigned to Cavite, Manila and Zamboanga could well represent a Spanish pidgin, if not PCS. The information sifted and analyzed by Schuchardt (1883) would also suggest that “Malayo-Spanish” was more typical of Manila and Cavite, and that Zamboanga might actually be Spanish-speaking.

Spanish Presence

Beginning with the reoccupation of Zamboanga, Spanish presence there was significant. Zamboanga continued to be an important military defense against constant raiding by pirates and slavers from Jolo and other Moslem territories, although the commercial importance of the city declined. It is not unreasonable to suppose that some notice would have been taken of a Spanish-based creole which evidently was widespread enough as to have left its vestiges over hundreds of square miles.

Assuming that Spaniards and other observers were not unaware of language usage in Zamboanga, the according of no special mention to Z may mean that they regarded it as a nondescript pidgin or “kitchen Spanish”. This is also unlikely, since what came to be known as *español de cocina* (fragments of which are found in 19th century Philippine Spanish literature, and which is recalled by some of Manila’s oldest residents) was more transparently a rough pidgin, spoken principally by and to Chinese shopkeepers, and containing few creole features. A typical example of (Chinese-influenced) “kitchen Spanish” is (López 1893: 58) “sigulo, señolía... como no tiene ahola talabajo; como no tiene capé, y ha de ganalo la vida, sigulo tiene que hace tabaco” [of course, sir; since {I} do not have a job now, and since {I} don’t have any coffee, and {I} have to earn a living, of course {I} have to make cigars]. Montero y Vidal (1876: 241) offers “Mía quiele platicalo” [I want to speak with you]. Other examples are given by Feced (1888: 77), Moya y Jiménez (1883: 334), Mallat (1846: 352), and others. None of these examples illustrates typical PCS features, while at the same time showing other traits which were never attested for PCS (use of *mi/mia* as subject pronoun, apparent pleonastic clitics as in *platicalo*, etc.). The term *español de cocina* was not applied to the true creoles C and T, except in error (e.g. Montero y Vidal 1876: 97, Escosura 1882: 5). If Spaniards had noticed large segments of the population conversing among themselves in “kitchen Spanish” instead of in a Philippine language, this would surely not have escaped mention.

Second Possibility

A second possibility is that Filipinos in Zamboanga were actually speaking Spanish, or at least an approximation which Spaniards and other visitors considered as unremarkable. In view of the dramatic differences between contemporary Z and Spanish, this seems improbable, but it may be partially correct, as will be suggested below. Many observers of the linguistic situation in the Philippines in the 19th and early 20th centuries offered descriptions of Spanish usage that were ambiguous enough to admit not only pidgins and creoles, but also closer approximations to European Spanish. A typical travel account of Philippine "Spanish" which exhibits this potential confusion is Dauncey (1910: 212-3):

"I daresay you are surprised at my accounts of these and other conversations in Spanish, but the fact is, though I have not tried to learn the patois that obtains in the Philippines, I find it impossible not to pick up a good deal... They speak badly, though, and the accent does not sound a bit like what one heard in Spain, besides which, there are so many native and Chinese words in current use. Instead of saying *andado*, they say *andao*; *pasao* for *pasado*, and so on, with all the past participles, besides other variations on the pure Castilian tongue. I found that the Spanish grammars and books I had brought with me were of so little use for every-day life that I gave up trying to learn out of them..."

Mrs Dauncey was clearly not aware of real "Castilian" usage, where the pronunciation of *-ado* as *-ao* is commonplace. Nonetheless, her description, while not accurate for legitimate Philippine varieties of Spanish (whose characteristics are much closer to Peninsular usage; cf. Lipski 1987c), would provide a reasonable impressionistic account of PCS. There is no evidence that the latter was ever as widely spoken as her remarks would indicate. Perhaps, then, she was referring to the *español de cocina* that, so recently following the Spanish defeat in the Philippines, would be proffered to any foreign visitor, especially one who by all accounts did not speak "proper" Spanish herself. Dauncey's comments, while linguistically ambiguous, illustrate the level of ignorance and indifference that outsiders showed with respect to accurate descriptions of Philippine linguistic usage.

Not all observers of Zamboanga were so equivocal. Worcester (1898: 130) noted that "On account of the multiplicity of native dialects, Spanish became the medium of communication, but they have long since converted it into a Zamboangueño patois which is quite unintelligible to one familiar only with pure 'Castellano.'" This observer had evidently come into contact with Z. Russell (1907: 172), who visited Zamboanga in 1900, and who had considerable knowledge of Spanish, referred to "Zamboanganese" as "a mixture of Castilian, Visayan and Malay." She also refers to Zamboangueños speaking "unintelligible Spanish" in moments of excitement. The fact remains, however, that the majority of 19th century descriptions of Zamboanga

mention only "Spanish," without any suggestion that Peninsular Spanish coexisted with a Spanish-based creole.

Current Situation

In fieldwork connected with the present study, Zamboangueños born in the late 1800s were interviewed, as well as younger residents who accurately recalled the speech of parents and grandparents born even earlier, thus pushing back the date as far as the middle of the 19th century for reasonably trustworthy accounts of Z. In speaking with the oldest residents, the observer is immediately struck by the much higher similarity to Spanish. Many older Zamboangueños are fluent in Spanish, and their at times precarious awareness of the difference between 'Spanish' and 'Chabacano' suggests that the latter term was once applied to Spanish derivatives that were significantly less creolized than modern Z.

THEORIES OF THE FORMATION OF ZAMBOANGUEÑO

Whinnom's Theory

Most descriptions of PCS have not distinguished between Z and the Manila Bay varieties, assuming implicitly or explicitly that Z is simply the offspring of Manila Bay PCS. Whinnom (1956), although speculating that Z was a "semi-independent growth, germinated and perhaps controlled by the use of other contact vernaculars among the garrison soldiers" (p. 14), hypothesized that the formation of the PCS dialects, including Z, was the result of linguistic and cultural *mestizaje* between Spanish-speaking garrison troops (soldiers from the lowest social classes) and Malay speakers: "only the convenience, and indeed intermarriage, of Spaniard and Malay can account for the fact that a creolized language emerged in the brief space of two generations" (p. 1).

The garrison troops, whose presence in Zamboanga was the strongest Spanish influence during the formative period of Z, were drawn from Mexico and from elsewhere in the Philippines, especially from the Manila area and some central islands. The Philippine soldiers learned Spanish from the Mexican troops, and from other Spanish speakers already in the Philippines.⁵

Frake's Theory

Frake (1971) implicitly accepts Whinnom's hypothesis of the garrison-troop origin of Z, but makes the intriguing observation that many of the contemporary Philippine items in Z do not come from the geographically contiguous Visayan languages, but from Hiligaynon (Ilongo), spoken in the Central Philippines. Most of the words in

question are lexical items with no particular semantic restrictions, but a number of core syntactic items are included.

Frake offers no explanation for the presence of Ilongo items in Z, except to suggest that many garrison troops probably came from the Ilongo-speaking area. There may be additional or alternative routes of penetration; for example, Iloilo (the principle city in the Ilongo region) was one of the main stopover ports for ships travelling from Manila to Zamboanga (Warren 1981), and it is likely that Ilongo speakers were picked up along the way. Another potential missing link comes from indirect evidence that when Zamboanga was rebuilt in 1719, many PCS-speaking families from Cavite emigrated to Zamboanga, with some remaining in Iloilo (Germán 1984). Although PCS never took root in Iloilo, if family ties existed between Iloilo and Zamboanga, including the possibility for subsequent migration of settlers originally stopping in Iloilo, Ilongo words could have arrived in Zamboanga by this means. Riego de Dios (personal communication) has also discovered that many laborers were recruited from Panay (the main island where Ilongo is spoken) during the time period when Zamboanga and Cotabato were building up their military defenses, and she suggests that the Ilongo elements in the PCS dialects of both cities is a direct result of this immigration.⁶

Warren's Theory

An alternative account of the formation of Z is suggested by Warren (1981). From the 17th century to well into the 19th century. Moslem pirates and slave raiders from Jolo and other islands in the Sulu Sea attacked many parts of the Philippines and carried off captives, who were pressed into slavery. Many of the slaves held on Jolo managed to escape to Zamboanga. Spanish and English military vessels also rescued slaves, usually depositing them at the nearest port under Spanish control; Zamboanga was a frequent dropoff point. Some freed slaves delivered to Zamboanga were once more forced to labor by the Spanish military authorities, and thus spent more time in the vicinity of Fort Pilar than they had originally intended, long enough, perhaps, for a Spanish-based contact vernacular to form or be extended by speakers of different Philippine languages. Warren (1981: 235–6) speculates thus:

“The fugitives established themselves with impoverished Chinese and vagrants in a community situated some distance from the *presidio*. Originating from different parts of the Philippine archipelago and lacking a common language, these *degradados* developed their own Spanish-Creole dialect—Chavacano—to communicate. A large percentage of the surrounding rural population labelled Zamboangueno at the end of the nineteenth century were descendants of fugitive slaves who had lived on the margins of the *presidio* as social outcasts.”

This idea is not new, for Worcester (1898: 129–30), in describing the population of Zamboanga, stated:

“... certainly a very considerable portion [of the Zamboangueños] are the offspring of slaves who have contrived to escape from the Moros... the result has been that representatives of most of the Philippine coast-tribes have found their way to Zamboanga, where their intermarriage has given rise to a people of decidedly mixed ancestry. On account of the multiplicity of native dialects, Spanish became the medium of communication, but they have long since converted it into a Zamboangueño patois...”

In a later account, Worcester (1930: 512) noted that “Zamboanga was at the outset populated by escaped Moro slaves who had sought the protection of the Spanish garrison there. Coming originally from widely separated parts of the archipelago, these unfortunates had no common native dialect, hence there arose among them a Spanish patois known as *Zamboangueño*.”

DISCUSSION

The hypothesis that Z arose *in situ* as a contact vernacular among former slaves and transients, while possible as a contributing factor, cannot be accepted as the main stimulus for the formation of this language, despite the presence of several key ingredients for creolization. First, the grammatical similarities between Z and Manila Bay PCS dialects are too striking to overlook. There is nothing to have prevented returned slaves in Zamboanga from adopting an already existent Spanish-based pidgin/creole, assuming such was already in existence in the military camp, and particularly if large numbers of former slaves were forced to labor in the fort. If these ex-slaves remained outside the pale of the fort, however (as observed by Sonnerat 1776: 127), it is more likely that a contact vernacular based primarily on Philippine languages would have arisen. It will be suggested below that such a Philippine-based contact vernacular could indeed have served as the primary input to Z (even inside Fort Pilar), but assuming that Z was derived only from the speech of former slaves would not account for the similarities with Manila Bay PCS. At the same time, a much more heterogeneous mix of lexical items from scattered Philippine languages would be expected for such an extramural developing creole. Z lexical items of Philippine origin come, in descending order, from: (i) regional Visayan, which in the last century has become the predominant language in western Mindanao; (ii) Ilongo; (iii) very occasionally, Tagalog. Finally, known demographic and historical facts about Zamboanga fail to confirm the notion that a ‘large percentage’ of rural Zamboangueños descend from former slaves or prisoners, although the fact that a Spanish-based contact vernacular rather than a local Philippine language is spoken so far from Zamboanga City must be accounted for. Since the non-Moslem population of southwestern Mindanao was quite small prior to the establishment of Zamboanga, the answer may lie in the simple fact that there was no appropriate local language available to the developing rural Christian population. Warren’s hypothesis must be downgraded as

the major source of Z, although there is no doubt that returned slaves and other transients who made their way into Zamboanga were instrumental in increasing the number of speakers of any Spanish-based contact language.

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ZAMBOANGUENO AND MANILA BAY PCS

Any hypothesis based on the notion that Z was imported ready-made from Manila Bay to Zamboanga has to account not only for similarities but also for differences. Both categories provide intriguing puzzles, whose total resolution is an ongoing concern. The realms in which similarities and differences can be assessed are: (i) grammatical/morphological structures; (ii) lexical choices, and (iii) input varieties of Spanish, as reflected by Spanish lexical items.

Grammatical/Morphological Structures

In comparison with C and T, Z words taken from Spanish are almost uniformly representative of more standard, relatively modern items. Phonologically, very few Z items show the neutralization of syllable-final /l/ and /r/ that is so common in C and T (cf. Z *puerco*—C *puelco* 'pig'). Reduction/elision of syllable-final /s/ does occur in Z, as in the Manila Bay PCS dialects, but at a rate which is low enough to suggest initial contact with varieties of Spanish in which the process had only begun (Lipski 1986b, 1987a).

Z contains a few rustic/archaic Spanish lexical items, but they are words which are still found in nonstandard or rural Spanish even at the present time, and are not usable in dating the formation of Z. However, the majority of the Z lexicon is neutral with respect to the chronology of input Spanish dialects, since most of the major indicators of marginal/archaic status within Spanish involve verbal morphology, which is totally absent in PCS. The more modern-sounding nature of Z could conceivably be attributed to the heavy presence of native Spanish speakers in the late 19th century (v. *infra*), but even in remote areas of the province where there was never more than a sprinkling of Spaniards, the speech differs from urban Z more in terms of intonation, and in the retention of Spanish-based words, as opposed to the heavy Visayan incursions in Zamboanga City.

Lexical Choices

Z systematically differs from the Manila Bay PCS dialects with respect to several lexical choices of an originally Spanish vocabulary. This is typified by the selection of the verb 'to speak a language.' The Manila Bay PCS dialects have *platicá*, while

Z has *conversá*. The former word (which has evolved to mean simply 'have a conversation' in Latin American Spanish) originally had a somewhat negative connotation, much like the Portuguese *papiar* 'babble, chatter' that gave rise to the verb for 'speak' in Portuguese-derived creoles from the Caribbean to southeast Asia. *Conversá* is much closer in meaning to its Spanish cognate, and suggests more recent adoption in Z. However in general the lexical differences between Z and Manila Bay PCS are inconclusive in tracing the origins of Z. All the PCS varieties converge on *ablá* (< Sp. *hablar* 'to speak') for 'to say, tell.'

Varieties of Input

The most significant arguments in favor of classifying Z as a creole, and for positing its genetic ties to Manila Bay PCS and even, perhaps, to Ibero-Romance creoles throughout the world, lies in grammatical similarities. Some similarities between Z and Manila Bay PCS are part of the common intersection of Philippine languages and do not necessarily point to direct transfer. This includes general word order, and use of reduplication and Philippine particles. Similarities in the PCS verbal particle systems are harder to explain away as independent developments. All PCS varieties have three aspectual particles, which invariably are preverbal clitics. They share progressive/iterative *ta* and, for C and Z, past/perfective *ya*. T has *a* for past/perfective, which could either be an elision of *ya* (although T has *ya* meaning 'now, already'), or a continuation of Ibero-Romance present perfect (*h*) *a*, as in Papiamento, Palenquero and other Ibero-Romance based creoles. Future/irrealis is *di* in Manila Bay PCS and *ey/ay* in Z (*ey* is earlier, and is presently confined to the speech of older, rural speakers). Both constructions are posited to come from Ibero-Romance (possibly Portuguese) periphrastic future forms based on *ha/hai/hei+de*. Earlier C (including as late as the turn of the century) also had *ey* (Miranda 1956), which also supports transfer of this form from Cavite to Zamboanga.

Z also has an alternative future/irrealis particle *el* with identical meaning, which most residents claim is an older, rustic variant, although it is still used considerably. The etymology of *el* has yet to be determined; the presence of /l/ bears a resemblance to *lo* < Ptg. *logo*/Sp. *luego* found in several Asian Portuguese creoles, and in Papiamento, but it is difficult to imagine a route of evolution that would give *el*. This particle evidently did not come from Manila Bay PCS, none of whose varieties have ever given evidence of such a form.

Particles

The particle *ya*, which also occurs independently as an adverb meaning 'already, now,' as in Sp. *ya*/Ptg. *ja*, appears to have been used already in vernacular Philippine

Spanish as a quasi-redundant addition to verbs conjugated in the preterite. It could have appeared in Z without direct transfer from Manila Bay PCS, either through Philippine Spanish or as a spontaneous creation.

There is no such ready explanation for the presence of the particle *ta* in Z, and the existence of this particle in Ibero-Romance creoles worldwide is a powerful argument that at least some early proto-creole features were spread by Portuguese or Spanish maritime and military contacts (but cf. Lipski 1987b; 1988). There are no combinations in Philippine, Mexican or Peninsular Spanish which could plausibly have resulted in spontaneous formation of *ta+verb* constructions in Zamboanga. Z verbal forms based on *ta* (and possibly *ey/ay*) are undoubtedly related to Manila Bay PCS. This does not require complete transfer of the latter to Zamboanga; *ta* could be an accretion adopted from the amply-attested migration of C speakers to Zamboanga beginning in the middle of the 18th century and continuing until the end of the 19th. Spaniards themselves could have contributed to the propagation of *ta*, for nearly all 19th century accounts of PCS written by Spaniards note use of *ta* as verbal particle, while use of *ya*, *di* or *ay/ey* as verbal markers is never acknowledged. If Spaniards (and indigenous Mexican garrison soldiers who learned Spanish from the latter) regarded *ta* as an integral part of "kitchen Spanish," they could have carried this particle to Zamboanga.

Differences and Similarities

The grammatical differences between Manila Bay PCS and Z are as striking as the similarities, and provide powerful evidence in favor of at least partially independent formation of Z *in situ*. Z has completely taken over Visayan plural pronouns: *kamé* "we (exclusive)," *kitá* "we (inclusive)," *kamó* "you (pl.)," and *silá* "they." These items replace Spanish-derived forms (although a few of the oldest rural residents of Z occasionally use *nosotros* for the first person plural, in their own words, due to more recent Spanish presence in Zamboanga).⁷ The singular pronouns, however, are exclusively of Spanish origin, and Philippine pronouns never crop up. Manila Bay PCS, on the other hand, maintains Spanish-derived pronouns throughout. Differences exist in the plural series: T has *m(ih)otro*, *b(uh)otro* and *l(oh)otro*, as compared to C *nisós*, *busós*, *ilós*. There is no evidence that any of these Manila Bay PCS plural pronouns were ever a part of Z, which stands in stark contrast to the similarities in the verbal particles.

Pronominal Forms

Frake (1971) suggested that when a Spanish-Philippine lexical pair is found in Z, the Philippine form is more "marked," and that it is never possible for a Philippine

form to have a higher sociolinguistic status than a Spanish form. To support this assertion, forms like *ustedes/bosotros* (neutral or respectful) as opposed to *kamó* (rude or disrespectful) are adduced. However, even in the pronominal paradigm, such an account would only account for *kamó*; it gives no indication, for example, of why Philippine pronouns were introduced in the first and third person plural. One might argue that a low-marked or disrespectful first person plural would be self-disparaging and therefore unlikely to occur, but such a claim could not be made about the third person plural. At the same time, the use of two or three Spanish terms in the singular (neutral *tu*, disrespectful/familiar (e)*bos*, highly respectful *usté*) rather than alternation with a Philippine form, goes unexplained.

Explanation

The key to explaining the distribution of Spanish and Philippine pronouns in Z lies in the intersection of two factors: (i) a desire to maintain the inclusive-exclusive distinction in the first person plural, and (ii) an originally fortuitous similarity between the developing use of *con* as objective case marker in PCS and some Visayan plural pronominals.

Inclusive/Exclusive Distinction

All Philippine languages maintain the inclusive-exclusive distinction typified by Z *kamé-kitá*; in English based pidgins and creoles of the southwestern Pacific, this distinction has been encoded through calquing into English (e.g. Melanesian Pidgin *yumi* vs. *mipela*), but Spanish provides no ready mechanism to represent this opposition. Manila Bay PCS, in retaining derivatives of the Spanish pronoun *nosotros*, ignores the distinction, but Z has taken the opposite course of simply adopting the Philippine pronouns. This is consistent with the general pattern of Z to maintain Philippine morphological patterns largely intact when no ready Spanish alternative was available.

Pronouns

The Zamboanga garrison troops spoke cognate Philippine languages, and if multilingual contact with Spanish persisted for longer than a brief catalytic period, a distinction like the inclusive-exclusive "we" would be a prime candidate for inclusion in the contact language. The great majority of Philippine languages employ pronouns which are cognate with or identical to *kitá* and *kamé*, and these forms could be incorporated into a contact language with the assurance of wide comprehensibility. The same holds for the second person familiar plural pronoun *kamó* and the third person plural *silá*; paradigmatic integration of the personal pronouns is simplified by taking the entire plural series.

Con as a Marker

The second part of the formula lies in the fact that all varieties of PCS adopted the Spanish preposition *con* "with" as a marker of objective (usually accusative) case, with both animate and inanimate objects.⁸ In Manila Bay PCS, expressions with *con* remain analytical, and other elements, such as modifiers, can intervene between *con* and the object. In many Visayan languages, however, object pronouns are synthetic elements formed of an inseparable prefix plus elements similar or identical to *-amon*, *-aton*, *-ninyo*, *-nila*. The 'prefixes' include *sa-*, *na-* and *ka(n)-*, with the latter, in speech, sounding very similar to unstressed *con*. In contemporary Z, it is not infrequent, especially among younger speakers, to hear the plural object pronouns pronounced as *konamon*, *konaton*, etc., which indicates that analogical processes are at work, and that an originally fortuitous morphological similarity is popularly analyzed as a true morphophonemic alternation. These forms are integrated into the paradigm formed by Spanish analytic pronouns, such as *conmigo* 'with me,' *contigo* 'with you,' etc. In the singular series, pronouns in Visayan and other Philippine languages exhibit greater variation, and do not mimic Spanish preposition+pronoun combinations.

TOWARDS A REVISED VIEW OF ZAMBOANGUEÑO FORMATION

A New View

No single event furnishes a precise date of origin for Z, but the language must have developed well after the re-establishment of Fort Pilar in 1719, the establishment of the Spanish presence in southwestern Mindanao, and the arrival of former slaves recaptured from the Moslems of the Sulu Sea. A period toward the end of the 18th century is not inconsistent with the data. The question remains of whether Z represents an independent development, or whether it is simply Manila Bay PCS with a later overlay of southern Philippine elements. The former hypothesis is supported by the coexistence of the verbal particles *ta* and *ay/ey*, and less strongly by *ya*. On the other hand, the future particle *el* unique to Z, the complete replacement of Spanish plural pronouns by Visayan elements, and the substantial penetration of Visayan particles, conjunctions and basic lexical elements are difficult to explain away as accretions occurring in Zamboanga during a period of perhaps as little as 50 years. The two postulates are not mutually incompatible if Z is analyzed not as a single monolithic creole, but rather as the end product of the convergence of several language contact events, the foremost of which did not involve true creolization.

Historical Perspectives

From the middle of the 19th century onward, Zamboanga enjoyed the reputation of being among the most "Spanish" of all the Philippine cities, not in terms of architecture or churches, but in terms of language and culture. Scheidnagel (1880: 44) observed that "la raza de los zamboangueños es muy española por sus sentimientos y posee facciones más regulares y color más claro que se conoce en Filipinas" [the Zamboangueño race is very Spanish in its sentiments, and has more regular features and a lighter complexion than anywhere else in the Philippines]. Zamboanga's most influential citizens had been educated in Spanish and spoke the language fluently (cf. Schuchardt 1883: 112). English made little headway until after World War II, Tagalog was virtually unknown, and no regional Philippine language had any viable status in official or public settings. Several Spanish-language newspapers flourished, signs and announcements were primarily in Spanish, and Spanish was a language of instruction not only in private schools but not infrequently also in public education (cf. Orendain 1984). Many urban Zamboangueños slipped seamlessly between Spanish and Z in what might in some instances have approached a creole continuum. In rural areas, it is logical that Z would prevail, but study of vestigial rural Z (e.g. interviews of speakers born in the late 1800s, and who remember language usage of their elders), reveals that even rural Z at the turn of the century was much closer to Spanish than any variety surviving today. The large overlay of Visayan lexical items had just begun, and the use of Philippine particles was reduced in comparison to contemporary speech. This more "Spanish-like" Z cannot be attributed solely to the presence of fluent Spanish speakers, for with the exception of a few priests, Spaniards had scant contact with rural residents, and vice versa.⁹

The facts suggest that the divergence between received Spanish (of the Philippine variety, at least) and Z was never as great in the outlying areas as might be supposed by samples of modern usage. This accounts for the fact that earlier accounts of visits to Zamboanga, while implicitly recognizing differences between Spaniards and native Filipinos, did not register anything peculiar about the Spanish spoken there.

Relexification

Relexification in the direction of Visayan has occurred in the past 50–100 years. If intermediate stages of Z were sufficiently close to some variety of Spanish, the premise of prior creolization needs to be revised. To account for the similarities between Z and Manila Bay PCS, it is necessary to assume that at least some version of the latter was at one time available in Zamboanga. The military garrison at Fort Pilar is an obvious candidate for a route of entry, but later arrivals from Cavite are not to be ruled out. Such speakers need not have been in a majority, but would

represent a stabilizing influence on the developing Z, the bearers of a more cohesive and replicable verb system around which might be patterned a new Spanish-based language. Pidgin-like elements were in common use throughout the Philippines, by non-Spanish speakers as well as by speakers of basilectal Philippine Spanish. The use of *cosa*, *qué laya* and *qué modo* as universal interrogatives appears to have been part of the prevailing concept of 'survival' Spanish, and use of *ta* and *ya* might be added to the list.

Original Z

Contemporary Z has been influenced by Visayan syntactic patterns, and has also adopted a heavy English lexical transfer. In extreme cases, the Spanish basis is nearly obscured. It has been proposed that a more Spanish-like Z existed during the 19th century. What, then, was the original Z like? It is not possible to totally accept either the transfer of Manila Bay PCS to Zamboanga, nor the *in situ* creation of a new creole. Z developed in symbiosis with a Philippine-based contact vernacular consisting of a distillate of syntactic and morphological common denominators, to which a largely Spanish lexicon was added.

By all indications, Z arose not under duress, but rather as the natural intersection of Philippine languages which shared cognate grammatical systems, and which had already absorbed a significant quantity of Hispanisms. Although the Spanish language was never firmly implanted in the Philippines, and replaced no native Philippine language, Spanish lexical penetration of Philippine languages was very profound. Spanish influence in, e.g., Tagalog and Visayan goes far beyond the transfer of nouns and occasional verbs or adjectives, to encompass core areas of grammar, including articles, prepositions, conjunctions and adverbs (cf. Bowen 1973; López 1965a; Oficina de Educación Iberoamericana 1972; Panganiban 1961; Quilis 1973; 1976; 1980; Wolff 1973-4). Moreover, it is not the case that Spanish elements always replaced Philippine counterparts in their entirety; in many instances what occurred was a smooth blend of Philippine and Spanish elements within the same construction.¹⁰ In communicating with Spaniards, an intermediate configuration was reached, which combined common Spanish lexical items with common denominators found among major Philippine languages. Spaniards in turn attempted, if not to meet their native interlocutors halfway, at least to make some use of Philippine languages.

A special situation arose in Zamboanga, where speakers of cognate Philippine languages which had also absorbed a large Spanish lexical component were thrust into contact. To this mix can be added the fact that at least some of the Filipinos were already accustomed to handling varieties of Spanish. These speakers provided nuclei around which the cognate Philippine and Spanish items shared by the rest of the Zamboanga population could continue to coalesce into a new language, smoothly

evolving rather than being abruptly truncated. At this point, new arrivals who spoke Manila Bay PCS could contribute to the evolving language, particularly in mediating between the morphologically complex verbal system of Spanish, the inadequately sparse unconjugated verbs of pidgin Spanish, and the largely non-cognate verb morphology of the Philippine languages carried to southwestern Mindanao.

Grammatical Building Blocks

Z required no linguistic catastrophe for its formation. All that was required was the grouping of speakers of grammatically cognate Philippine languages which had already absorbed a great quantity of largely overlapping Spanish lexical items (cf. Constantino 1965; Llamzon 1978; López 1965b). The major grammatical building blocks were already in place:

- (i) a Philippine-based pronominal system, which eventually became a hybrid due to the considerations mentioned above;
- (ii) a host of similar or identical syntactic particles;
- (iii) a common means of signalling nominal pluralization;
- (iv) virtually identical word order for major constituents;
- (v) similar or identical lexical patterns for negation and existential sentences;
- (vi) a set of recognizably cognate vocabulary items relating to daily life (flora and fauna, food, kinship terms, meteorological phenomena, etc.).

A thorough account of the lexical and grammatical cognates just mentioned would be voluminous, but a few schematic remarks will give the flavor of a comprehensive demonstration.

Background

There is no accurate linguistic breakdown of the inhabitants of Zamboanga during the time period in which Z developed. For recaptured former slaves, there is no reason to suppose that the breakdown was significantly different than that which characterizes modern Philippine society, in which the principal language families are still concentrated in coastal regions surrounding port cities where slaves were captured. Forrest (1780: 374-5) observed that most slaves held by the Moros were "Visayan and Spanish," while Warren's (1981) demographic reconstructions suggest a predominance of central and southern Philippine coastal regions. Currently, the proportion of Filipinos who can speak Tagalog is very large, due to the use of a standardized form of the language (Pilipino) as an official national language. In the 18th and 19th centuries, however, most who knew Tagalog spoke it as their first language; only a small percentage of the inhabitants of Zamboanga would fluently speak more than one Philippine language. For rough purposes of typological comparison, we may use the

distribution of native-language usage in the first half of the 20th century as representative of the mix of languages that could be found in 18th century Zamboanga. A comparative cross-section of grammatical patterns from these languages will illustrate the feasibility of using certain common denominators in the emerging contact vernacular, while pointing to other areas where extra-Philippine (i.e. Spanish) sources would be required.

Major Languages

Although somewhere between 100 and 150 languages are found in the Philippines (depending upon the precise definition of 'language'), eight major languages or dialect clusters account for more than 90% of first-language usage (Lamzon 1978). They are, in descending order: Cebuano (Visayan), Tagalog, Hiligaynon (Ilongo), Ilokano, Bikolano, Samar-Leyte (Waray-Waray), Pampango, and Pangasinan. The first two groups alone constitute more than 40% of first-language speakers and the first four together represent more than three fourths of first-language speakers. All derive from a common precursor, but significant grammatical differences exist among them. Ilokano and Pangasinan diverge the furthest from the remaining groups; perhaps for this reason, it is more common for speakers of Ilokano and Pangasinan to learn other Philippine languages rather than vice versa.

The Pronominal System

In the pronominal system, there is much greater correspondence of forms in the plural series than in the singular, in particular the free-standing (non-clitic) forms which in a language-contact situation would likely be preferred. The major convergent singular pronoun is the first person, which derives from the proto-Philippine *akú*, and is found in all major Philippine languages except for Ilokano and Pangasinan. The other singular pronouns show greater diversity among language families, which increases when clitics and case-marked forms are considered. Z adopted Spanish forms to replace what would in any event have been a heterogeneous and possibly nonviable set of common intersections.

In the plural series, the convergence among nearly all Philippine languages is much higher. All Philippine languages share the inclusive/exclusive {1 pl.}. Nearly all have *kamí/kamé* as the exclusive form; the inclusive form is often adopted from the dual, but is usually *kitá* or a close variant. These forms have been adopted wholly by Z. The {2 pl.} series varies more widely, including *kayó/kayú* and *kamú/kamó*. The latter variants are found in all central and southern Philippine languages, including Ilongo and Cebuano. Z has taken *kamó*.

The {3 pl.} forms also show some diversity among Philippine languages, but *silá* is found in Tagalog, Cebuano and other central and southern Philippine languages. Although the diversity here is greater than in the remainder of the plural series, *silá*

differs from Spanish *ellos/ellas* in being unmarked for gender, reflecting the totality of Philippine languages. Z has adopted *silá*.

The Definite Article

Another feature of Z taken over from Spanish was the definite article, universally *el* (with plural *el mga*, using the nearly universal Philippine pluralizer. In Philippine languages, what is translated as an article is better seen as a case-marker, which varies significantly depending upon the case. Common denominators are scarce; although nominative *ang* might win through force of numbers, the neutral Spanish *el*, which does not vary among cases, emerges as a good choice.

Deixis

Both Spanish and Philippine languages distinguish three degrees of deixis: close to the speaker, close to the listener, and distant from both. However, the Philippine demonstratives vary widely. To cite a single example, the singular equivalent of 'this' (nominative case): *daytoy* (Ilokano), *iyá* (Pangasinan), *ití* (Pampango), *ito* (Tagalog), *iní* (Bikol, Ilongo, Waray-Waray), *kini* (Cebuano). Spanish *este*, an item with a high text frequency, is a logical compromise. The other Spanish deictics, *ese* 'that near the listener' and *aquel* 'that over there' have also been adopted by Z.

The Plural Marker

Z has adopted the Philippine plural marker *mga*, both to signal numerical plurality and to express approximate amount or time: *mga a las ocho* "at about 8:00." This reflects the use of *mga* as a pluralizer in a wide variety of Philippine languages, and the existence of typologically dissimilar pluralization systems in others. *Mga* is found in central and southern languages, including Tagalog, Bikol, Ilongo, Waray-Waray and Cebuano. Ilokano and Pangasinan use a complex set of reduplicative processes and Pampango has *reng*. By adopting a plural marker widely known in the vast majority of coastal Philippine languages, Z offers a simple and efficient system which requires no internal phonological analysis.

The System of Negation

One of the most interesting features of Z is the hybrid Spanish-Philippine system of negation, using Spanish *no* and Philippine *hende?* The facts are very complex, and can only be briefly mentioned here. Z uses *hende?* as the free-standing negator (e.g. in response to a question), and to negate most verbs in the present tense. "Modal" verbs in Z (those not combining with particles) negate with *no*. In the past, *nuay* (< Sp. *no hay* "there is not") is used; this is also the negative form of the verb *tiene* "to have": *Tiene yo sen/nuay yo sen* "I have money/I do not have money." The word *hende?* corresponds to negative particles in Tagalog (*hindi*) and Ilongo (*indi*).

Cebuano uses *dili*, but apparently a derivative of *hindi* was used previously. The remaining Philippine languages use widely varying negative forms. Reconstruction of the speech of the oldest residents of Zamboanga suggests that generalized use of *hende?* may be relatively recent, occurring towards the end of the 19th century. Nearly all Philippine language families use similar or identical words both to indicate non-existence "there is no(t)" and to negate copulative verbs. Use of the same expression to negate a past-tense verb is also found. The precise mechanism by which the Z negation system was formed remains to be clarified and a detailed perusal would go far beyond the bounds of the present discussion. Suffice it to say that in terms of the distinctions made, negation in Z parallels large cross-sections of Philippine languages, while departing sharply from Spanish. Equally as important, negation in Z does not follow the simple patterns found in most pidgins and creoles; not only are three different elements used (*hende?*, *no*, *nuay*) but the interaction with syntactic and semantic structure is significantly different from negation as found in other creoles.

Other Syntactic Elements

A few other syntactic elements of Z which find broad cognates among major Philippine languages include: *si* to mark personal nouns (e.g. *si Juan*), the particle *pa* "still, already," and use of *nuay pa* for "not yet," in answer to a question with a past tense verb; the interrogative particle *ba*, the emphatic particle *man* (e.g. *cosa man bo quiere?* "just what do you want?"). Spanish items in Z which replace Philippine items which show a low degree of cognate vocabulary include: use of *taqui* (< Sp. *está aquí* "is here") as an affirmative locative (e.g. *taqui si Maria* "Maria is here"), negated by *nuay*, and the basic interrogative words.

The Verb System

By far the most complex aspect of Philippine syntax is the verb system, and only the briefest of remarks can be made here. In all Philippine languages, verbs are marked for aspect rather than tense, while containing no person or number marking. Three aspectual differences are usual; perfective, imperfective and contemplated/irrealis. All Philippine verbs may be analyzed as affix+base, but the base itself may change to reflect aspectual distinctions; reduplication of the first syllable of the base commonly accompanies imperfective and irrealis forms. The infinitive/imperative form is usually the minimally marked variant, sometimes being identical to the perfective.

A noteworthy feature of Philippine languages is the possibility for nearly any NP to occupy the "focus" position, thus creating, e.g., passive, instrumental, locative, etc. constructions as alternatives to simple transitive/intransitive patterns. For example, it is more frequent for transitive verbs to have the NP bearing the thematic role of direct object occupy the "subject" position, with the thematic subject occupying an agentive position. This is accomplished by case-marking particles accompanying

the respective nouns, and by an appropriate choice of verbal affixes. The latter vary widely among Philippine languages, while the word order of the alternative constructions remains substantially the same, for example from Tagalog:

Kumain ang bata ng tinapay {transitive}

"The child ate the bread"

Kinain ng bata ang tinapay {passive}

"The bread was eaten by the child"

In searching for common denominators around which a Philippine-based contact vernacular could be formed, verbal affixes could be replaced by simple aspect markers, and nominal case markers could be replaced by the invariable Spanish article, which was already incorporated into many lexical items borrowed from Spanish. Word order would remain, and the loss of options as to the grammatical signalling of focus would be offset by the increased inter-language communication effectiveness achieved by the elimination of verbal inflection.

Aspectual Particles

Speakers of diverse Philippine languages, grouped in Zamboanga, would bring to the task of creating a new verbal system awareness of the basic structure and usage of Philippine verbs. However, the strategies of reduplication and prefixation differ significantly among Philippine languages, as do the morphemes involved. At the pidgin stage, speakers might simply use a bare Spanish verb or a Philippine verb with high cognate recognizability. In searching for aspectual markers to supplement this system, which evidently contained mostly Spanish roots with few Philippine elements, Spanish items already found in the immediate environment could be pressed into service. Many Philippine languages had already adopted Spanish *puede* "is able to" as a modal verb, and this survives in all PCS dialects. Spanish adverbial *ya* had penetrated some Philippine languages, and would also be known to those who spoke even the most rudimentary Spanish. The full system of aspectual particles, including *ta*, *ay/ey* (and possibly *el*) could only have come from already existent PCS models, such as Zamboanga garrison troops from Cavite. Once more, no complete transfer of Manila Bay PCS is called for; the common intersection of Philippine verbal structures had set the stage for a three-way aspectual system based on monosyllabic prefixes to a largely invariable verbal stem. Even distant awareness of the availability of such particles in PCS would suffice to steer the proto-Z into adopting this simple alternative to a rather chaotic pan-Philippine pool of verb forms.

EVIDENCE OF PROTO-CREOLE STRUCTURES IN NON-CREOLE PHILIPPINE SPANISH

The Development of Z

The preceding discussion has demonstrated that by taking the syntactic and morphological common denominators of the major Philippine languages, in the rough proportions assumed to have existed in Zamboanga during the late 18th and early 19th centuries, many of the structural patterns of Z can be directly accounted for. Philippine items present in Z reflect a high percentage of cognates, while adoption of Spanish lexical items reflects greater diversity among Philippine languages. Another key factor in tracing the development of Z is the determination of the features already present in non-creole varieties of Spanish used by Philippine natives. Although little direct documentation is available on earlier stages of Philippine Spanish, data from the last decades of the 19th century suggest that the features of Z that cannot be directly traced either to European Spanish or to a cross-section of Philippine languages were to be found in the "Philippinized" Spanish or "Malay-Spanish" used by and to Filipinos for several centuries. Chinese merchants may have introduced some key items into "kitchen Spanish"; if some of the Chinese had previously learned a Portuguese-based pidgin or creole in Macau or Hong Kong, they might use the same words when attempting to speak Spanish, a language which they would identify with Portuguese. For example, the use of what appears to be a first-person subject pronoun derived from *mi*, which is never found in any variety of PCS, may have been transferred either from Portuguese pidgin or from Chinese Pidgin English (e.g. Montero y Vidal 1876: 241; Feced 1888: 77). Other items may have been introduced by Spaniards, based on stereotypes of pidgin speech which had already been solidified for Afro-Hispanic speech, including literary stereotypes dating from the beginning of the 16th century. However, most of the creoloid forms appear to be simply the natural amalgam of Spanish words and Philippine morphosyntactic patterns, calques into Spanish that would be immediately recognized by any Philippine speakers, and which at the same time could be deciphered by native Spanish speakers. A good example is the use of *cuidado* in expressions like *tú cuidado* "it's up to you, it's your problem, you take care of it," in translation of Tagalog *bahala*+subject pronoun. This construction occurs in all varieties of Philippine Spanish and is still used by the remaining Spanish speakers in the Philippines; it is also found in all PCS dialects. Since identical or similar expressions are found in nearly all Philippine languages, Philippine listeners immediately understand the expression the first time they hear it, and Spanish-speaking arrivals in the Philippines picked up this expression as one of the first accretions to their "colonial" lexicon. Irrespective of ultimate origins, non-creole Philippine Spanish supplies many pieces in the reconstruction of proto-Z.

The Use of *cosa*

The use of *cosa* as a generic interrogative is attested in Philippine Spanish, ranging from reasonably fluent to "kitchen Spanish" varieties. A typical example is (Feced 1888: 91): "Quiero decir que tendrás muchos galanes. — ¿Cosa galanes?" [I mean that you must have many beaux. What are beaux?]. Other examples are given in Feced (1888: 68–9), Montero y Vidal (1876: 239), López (1893: 34), (Entrala 1882: 12, 22). *Tiene* as existential is used frequently, for example (Entrala 1882: 22): "Cosa Goyo? . . . cosa tiene?" [What is it, Goyo? . . . what is there?].

The Use of the Third Person Verb Forms

The use of the third person singular for all verb forms, including as first person singular in answer to questions (without the accompanying subject pronoun) is also attested for non-creole Philippine Spanish; for example Feced (1888: 90): "¿Capaz serás todavía de enamorar a algún capitán y casarte otra vez? — No sabe, señor." [Could you still get some captain to fall in love with you and marry again? {I} don't know, sir.] Feced (1888: 103): "Oye, piloto, ven acá: ¿tú conoces esto? — Conoce, señor. . . ." [Hey, pilot, come here. Do you know about this? {I} know, sir.].

The Use of *no hay*

Speakers of Philippine Spanish at times used *no hay* to indicate that a person or thing inquired after was not present (e.g. Feced 1888: 15): "Que venga el médico, — dijẽ al muchacho indio que me servía de ayuda de cámara. — No hay más, señor. — ¿Cómo no hay más? — Se ha marchado á recoger un muerto á dos días de caballo." [Have the doctor come, I told the Indian cabin boy. He's gone sir. What do you mean he's gone? He went to pick up a dead person; it's two days on horseback]. Use of *no hay* as "not to have," is attested in Philippine Spanish: (Entrala 1882: 12): "que no hay cualtas" [{he says} that {he} has no money].

The Use of *con*

The use of *con* as accusative case marker is widely found in non-creole Spanish in the Philippines. An example is (Montero y Vidal 1876: 240): "Pues suya cuidado, pero esa tiene novio castila y seguro no ha de querer con suya: [Well, that's his problem, but she has a Spanish fiancée and she probably doesn't love him]. In Moya y Jiménez (1883: 293) we have "señor, V. sin duda no recordar *conmigo*" [Sir, of course you don't remember me], and many examples of *con* as indirect object marker, such as (p. 285) "Señor, más mejor que de usted *conmigo* seis pesos de sueldo. . ."

[Sir, it would be better for you to give me six pesos' salary. . .] (cf. also Feced 1888: 42, López 1893: 58).

Verbless Adj+Noun Combinations

Use of verbless Adj+Noun combinations to replace copulative sentences, as found in Z, are also found elsewhere in Philippine Spanish (Feced 1888: 21): "Señor, malo este bache. . . malo este puente grande" [Sir, this pot hole {is} bad. . . this big bridge {is} bad]. Entrala (1882: 22): "Seguro tú grande el robo" [You {can be} sure {it was a} big robbery] (see also Entrala 1992: 23; López 1893: 34).

Cross-section of Usage

None of the preceding examples comes from PCS-speaking communities, but rather provide a cross-section of usage which, extrapolating backwards only a few decades, could have been found in the rudimentary knowledge of Spanish shared by Spaniards, Philippine garrison troops, and former slaves in Zamboanga. These features alone do not suffice to explain all the creoloid traits in Z. However, in combination with the Philippine common denominators surveyed in the preceding section, nearly all the major structures of Z can be accounted for without postulating a transplantation of a functioning PCS speech community to Zamboanga.

SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF ZAMBOANGUEÑO

Concluding Remarks

Zamboangueño is a language with an especially rich history of partial relexifications, in a region characterized by multilingual contacts and a very fluid series of demographic movements. Z began not as a true creole, but as a natural common intersection of grammatically cognate Philippine languages which had already incorporated a lexical core of Spanish borrowings. The pool of speakers who provided the original input for Z did not constitute a single group, but included garrison troops, transients and later, former slaves recaptured from Moslem territories to the south. Over the period of a century and a half, Z partially relexified in a number of directions, with each stage of relexification responding to particular demographic or social events. The tentative stages are:

STAGE I: (mid 1700s). Z arises in the Zamboanga garrison, as the common intersection of Spanish-laden Philippine languages.

STAGE II: (mid-late 1700s). Z absorbs grammatical and lexical structures from Manila Bay PCS, as the Spanish military presence in Zamboanga is consolidated. Additional migrations of civilians from Cavite have a trickle-down effect on Z.

STAGE III: (1800s ?). Ilongo lexical elements are introduced into Z, possibly as the result of the use of Iloilo as a stopover for ships bound from Manila to Zamboanga. Ilongo grammatical forms could have been introduced at this time.

STAGE IV: (most of 1800s). Increasing presence of (civilian) native Spanish speakers in Zamboanga City results in incorporation of additional Spanish items, with structural differences between Z and (Philippine) Spanish reaching their alltime low point.

STAGE V: (Turn of 20th century onward). Large-scale immigration from the central Visayan region to southwestern Mindanao makes Cebuano Visayan the de facto number two language in Zamboanga City. Spanish lexical items are increasingly replaced by Visayan items. Word order begins to shift towards Visayan.

STAGE VI: (1930s onward). Increasing use of English in Zamboanga, not only in schools but even in casual conversations, results in growing incorporation of Anglicisms into Z. In the last two generations, this is leading the way to an eventual relexification of Zamboangueño away from its Hispanic lexical basis.

The most remarkable aspect of Z, from the perspective of theoretical reconstruction, is its chameleon-like character, which provides substantially different profiles depending upon the point in history that a sample is taken. This can be seen most clearly by sampling contemporary, urban Z, then progressively moving backwards in time, taking verifiable or reconstructed samples at successively greater time-depths.

Current Situation

Currently, English and Visayan are contending for lexical replacement of the Z lexicon, but English is gaining, at least in the news media and in intellectual circles. University students, journalists, politicians, educators and other professionals routinely switch into English even when sharing Z as a common native language, and particularly when technical terms are employed, Z elements are frequently confined to syntactic connectors (articles, possessives, prepositions, and the like), surrounded by a largely English lexicon. Since a not inconsiderable portion of Z function words

are themselves of Philippine origin (most verbal and adverbial particles, the plural marker and the intensifier), the results are barely distinguishable from *halo-halo* (mixed) English as spoken by natives of Philippine languages with only partial control of English structures. Philippine languages have also incorporated many Spanish function words (numbers, some prepositions and demonstratives, and fossilized articles), and the casual listener might easily mistake Anglicized Z for a Visayanized version of 'Taglish,' the English-Tagalog hybrid used by bilingual speakers in the Manila area. Consider the following combinations, chosen at random from a corpus of more than 200 hours of recorded speech of younger Zamboanguenos:

Di mi *daddy dentist*

"My father {is a} dentist"

Este amó el *plan* del diaton *city mayor*

"This {is} the plan of our city mayor"

Ta man-*type*, cabar ta man-*file* el mga *report*

"{We} type, then we file the reports"

Este el mga *report* del diaton *police station*

"These {are} the reports from our police station"

Cosa *question* quiere tu man-*answer?*

"What question do you want to answer?"

This shift is taking place in the complete absence of conditions which are considered propitious for creole relexification, since there is absolutely no real need to include most Anglicisms, but the intersection of prestige, instructional media and an intangible but nevertheless real attraction felt toward adopting English words is resulting in something rather like what has been proposed as the precursor to Modern Z.

A listener unaware of the full range of contemporary Z speakers, including those who incorporate little or no English elements, and also those who retain a higher than normal proportion of Spanish items, might fail to identify Z as a Spanish-based language. Extreme cases do not constitute the norm in Zamboanga City, and even less in the outlying *barangays*, where little English or Visayan is used, and where Spanish items dominate the lexicon. Nonetheless, the massive Anglicizing just reported has occurred in the last generation, and the speakers who use highly Anglicized Z are among the most influential, socially and politically mobile members of the community. A linguistic dipstick inserted into modern Zamboanga might come into contact with authentic native Z speakers, whose speech nonetheless is not readily analyzable as a Spanish-based creole, and which in fact could conceivably be an English-influenced contact vernacular.

Mixing of English

In the Zamboanga area, it is unusual to find speakers who mix contemporary Visayan into Z to the extent that English elements are being incorporated. This is largely because while Visayan/Cebuano is the most common immigrant language in Zamboanga City, and is spoken in the homes of many native-born Zamboanguenos, it is not a common language in the intellectual, political, social and educational circles in which English has its largest impact. Among Visayans who speak Z as a recessive second language, more language mixing is observed, and among the remaining PCS speakers in Davao, where Visayan is the prevailing home language, wholesale mixing comparable to English-Z mixing in Zamboanga occurs. Considerable intellectual flexibility is required to accept the resulting speech as PCS. Once more, a linguistic probe which touched such speakers (who by any classificatory criterion are still native PCS speakers) would identify the language as a relative of the Visayan group.

The Missing Link

In the period immediately following World War II (and still characterizing the speech of many of Zamboanga's older residents), Z had already begun shedding Spanish elements, had absorbed enough Visayan elements to be distinct from Manila Bay PCS, while maintaining clear signs of being a Spanish-based creole. This is the Z "discovered" by Whinnom, an intriguing candidate as a missing link in Spanish/Portuguese creolization in Asia and the Pacific. It is, however, yet another link in a larger chain of partial relexifications, whose immediate predecessor and at times cohort is still observable among the oldest, rural Zamboanguenos: a highly Hispanized language which, while retaining all the unmistakable creole features, including verbal particles, negative and interrogative structures, etc., represented a much closer approximation to received Spanish. This earlier stage, which for all intents and purposes came to an end in the first decades of the present century, probably dates as far as the beginning of the 19th century. Partial restoration of nominal and adjectival concord is found, and use of Philippine particles is correspondingly less frequent. A probe landing among speakers of this variety of Z might lead one to question its status as a creole, rather than a noncreolized variety of Spanish produced under conditions of bilingualism, much as Spanish spoken by recessive bilinguals in the United States.

The Earliest Steps

There are no records of the earliest stages of Z, which must be inferred by

reconstruction. Extrapolation backward from Hispanized Z, whose creole features trickled down from Manila Bay PCS via different routes, yields an amalgam of central and southern Philippine languages, all of which had liberally borrowed from Spanish. Such a contact vernacular would be difficult if not impossible to distinguish from genetically regular regional varieties of Philippine languages. It is possible, even likely, that other Philippine-based contact vernaculars have arisen in the past, in regions where several languages converge. Nonetheless, the circumstances which existed in the Spanish garrison at Fort Pilar, and the later arrival of slaves and settlers speaking widely varying although cognate Philippine languages, were sufficiently unique as to result in the formation of a more deeply interwoven language.

Summary

The preceding discussion has sustained the claim that Z was formed *in situ*, and later underwent several overlays, importations and exportations. It is not feasible to link Z directly with earlier stages of creolization in Asia, to a putative Portuguese-based pidgin, or to the speech of the Merdikas who travelled from Ternate to Manila Bay. Most similarities between Z and Manila Bay PCS can be just as feasibly attributed to Philippine areal characteristics and to the Mexicanized Spanish of military personnel found in both populations. Only a subset of the verbal particle system is a likely candidate for direct transfer, and several routes of entry have been suggested which fall short of presupposing that a full Spanish-based creole was transferred from Manila Bay to Zamboanga.

To return to the queries posed at the outset, although Frake's comment that Z is not simply a Philippine language with an unusually high proportion of Spanish words is strictly correct, Z did not develop directly from a rudimentary pidgin, foreigner talk, trade vernacular or similar reduced code. Z represents an extreme point on a continuum of Philippine linguistic patterns, in which partial relexification is the rule rather than the exception, and has been so for centuries. Z is hybrid in the extreme, containing elements of more homogeneous creoles as well as the effects of direct relexification, and even within the typologically unique domain of creole languages, Z cannot be fitted directly into genealogical reconstructions. In retrospect, the title which Whinnom (1956) gave to the various PCS dialects, namely 'Spanish contact vernaculars' is a more accurate designation than 'creole,' since the latter term has become associated with a specific route of evolution, the nativization of a pidgin, whether abruptly or gradually. Z is more accurately described as a gradual remaking of common denominators in an ever-changing population, which never represented the sort of discrete break with native languages as found in other creoles. The proposals offered in the present study are tentative and preliminary, and their main purpose has been to reopen discussion on a significant piece of the creole mosaic, which has all too frequently been taken for granted.

NOTES

1. Previously, Schuchardt (1883) had described one type of "Malay Spanish" in the Philippines, and Wagner (1949: 161-7) briefly took up the matter, adding little that would help situate this variety of Tagalog-influenced speech.
2. The term *chabacano* (sometimes spelled *chavacano*) comes from a Spanish word meaning "clumsy, rude," and reflects the Spaniards' attitudes towards less than perfect approximations to their language by their erstwhile Philippine subjects. This term currently carries no negative connotation, although at the individual level there are PCS speakers who do not like the word. The term *chabacano* is used in translations of the Bible and in prayer books, in newspapers and books, and in radio and television broadcasting, and is the official designation given to the group of PCS varieties in government publications and in scholarly work written by Filipino researchers.
3. Whinnom (1956) criticizes McKaughan for this methodological shortcoming, suggesting that the linguistic value of such an informant is negligible. Ironically, based on my own extensive field work in Zamboanga and Cotabato, McKaughan's data are far more accurate than those cited by Whinnom, who included no personally collected speech samples, but stereotyped songs.
4. These include Forman (1972), Quilis (1970), Frake (1980), and in the Philippines such studies as Apostol (1962-1967), Batausa (1969), Domingo (1967), Evangelista (1972), Macansantos (1971), Maño (1963).
5. The presence of soldiers from Mexico is a consequence of the Manila Galleon route between Acapulco and Manila (Schurz 1939); many aspects of vernacular Philippine Spanish, as well as all PCS dialects, show lexical and syntactic Mexicanisms. In Z alone, we find *tyange* "market" (Mex. Sp. *tianguis*), *Sayote* "type of soft green squash" (Mex. Sp. *chayote*), *zacate* "grass, lawn" (Mex. Sp. *zacate*), asking for repetition of something not completely understood by *mande?*, and cursing using the omnipresent Mexicanism *chinga(r)*. All these items are found in the Spanish and PCS of other areas of the Philippines, however, and have penetrated the major Philippine languages; they do not necessarily implicate Mexican troops directly in the formation of Z, except as a contributing source.
6. Implicit in this line of reasoning is the claim that Ct may have been formed *in situ*, rather than as a transplanted variety of Z. However, given the nearly total correspondence of Ilongo lexical items in the two PCS dialects, as well as the lack of major distinguishing features, the possibility of independent parallel developments in Zamboanga and Cotabato is rather remote.
7. The exception is in the second person plural, where *kamó* (like its singular equivalent *(e)bos* is felt to be excessively vulgar and disrespectful. More frequent is *ustedes*, with *bosotros* a less common alternative.

8. Actually, the PCS use of *con* is better regarded as a replacement for Spanish object clitics, none of which were retained in PCS, because in the absence of a Case marker, the invariable PCS pronouns in object position could be confused with subject pronouns.
9. Older Z items which are closer to Spanish than their contemporary counterparts include:
 - (1) use of *chiquito/pequeño* instead of *dyutay* "small";
 - (2) use of *hijo/hija* "son/daughter" instead of *anak*;
 - (3) categorical use of postposed possessives, as opposed to the increasing tendency to place possessives between the article and the noun: *el casa diaton* 'our house' as opposed to *el diaton casa*;
 - (4) greater use of vestigial Spanish inflected forms, including past tense verbs such as *tenía, sabía*, etc.
 - (5) use of *papá/mamá* "father, mother" instead of *tata/nana*.
10. This is typified by the greeting *komusta ka?* "how are you?", derived from Spanish *¿cómo está?* plus the Tagalog pronoun *ka*. The original Spanish interrogative adjective+verb combination has become lexicalized into a synthetic element, which significantly does not take the canonical form that would be expected of a purely Tagalog question. The use of Spanish lexical items for concepts such as "meat," "sing," "knife," "friend," etc. into a culture which already possessed the concepts in question, and the words to express them, bespeaks of far more than a casual contact situation. The penetration of the Spanish number system, e.g. in telling time is also revealing. Many non-Western cultures have calqued European expressions for telling time, upon introduction of mechanical clocks and the associated semantic and lexical concepts, but the incorporation of a system of numerals derived from a foreign language is quite unusual.
11. Address correspondence to: Dr. John M. Lipski, Spanish and Portuguese, 235 Ortega Hall, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, 87131, U.S.A.

REFERENCES

- Apostol, F.
1962–1967 "The Chabacano Dialect," Series of articles appearing in the *Southern Tribune*, Zamboanga City, 5 December 1962–15 February 1967.
1967 *Cartilla Zamboangueña*, Zamboanga City: "El Maestro."
- Barrows, D.
1926 *History of the Philippines*, Yonkers-on-Hudson: World Book Company.
- Batalha, G. N.
1960 "Coincidências com o dialecto de Macau em dialectos espanhóis das Ilhas Filipinas," *Boletim de Filologia* 19. 295–303.
- Batausa, C.
1969 *A Descriptive-Contrastive Analysis of Chabacano and Tagalog Noun Reduplication Patterns*, Unpublished M. A. Thesis, University of the Philippines.
- Bowen, J. D.
1973 "Spanish and English Loanwords in Maranao," Parangal kay Cecilio López, Andrew Gonzalez (ed.) 95–107, Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Bowring, J.
1859 *A Visit to the Philippine Islands*, London: Smith, Elder and Co.
- Constantino, E.
1965 The sentence patterns of twenty-six Philippine languages, *Lingua* 15: 71–124.
- Dauncey, Campbell.
1910 *The Philippines: an Account of Their People, Progress and Condition*, Boston: J. B. Millet Company.
- Domingo, P.
1967 *Aspect and Tense in Spanish and Zamboanga Verbs*. M.A. Thesis, University of the Philippines.
- Entrala, F. de P.
1882 *Cuadros filipinos*, Manila: Imprenta de "La Oceanía Española."
- Escosura, P. de la, and F. Cañamaque
1882 *Memoria sobre Filipinas y Joló* Madrid: Librería de los señores Simón y Osler.
- Evangelista, José
1972 *An Analytical Study of the Chabacano Verb*, M. A. Thesis, Central Philippine University, Iloilo City.
- Feced, Pablo [Quioquiap]
1888 *Filipinas, esbozos y pinceladas*, Manila: Estab. Tipog. de Remírez y Compañía.
- Forman, M.
1972 *Zamboangueño Texts with Grammatical Analysis*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University.
- Forrest, Capt
1780 *Voyage aux Moluques et à la Nouvelle Guinée*, Paris: Hôtel de Thou.
- Frake, C.
1971 "Lexical Origins and Semantic Structure in Philippine Creole Spanish," *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, pp. 223–42. Dell Hymes, (ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- 1980 "Zamboangueño Verb Expressions," *Language and Cultural Description, Essays by Charles O. Frake* pp. 277-310. Anwar S. Dil (ed.), Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Germán, A.
1984 "Chabacano: A Funny Thing Happened to Cervantes on the Way to Cavite," *Filipino Heritage, the Making of a Nation*, vol. 8, pp. 1986-8. Alfredo Roces, (ed.), Manila: Felta Book Sales.
- Jagor, F.
1875 *Travels in the Philippines*, London: Chapman and Hall.
- Keppel, H.
1853 *A Visit to the Indian Archipelago*, Vol. I, London: Richard Bentley.
- Lannoy, M. J.
1849 *Iles Philippines, de leur situation ancienne et actuelle*, Brussels: Imprimerie de Delevigne et Callewaert.
- Lipski, J.
1986a "Modern Spanish Once-removed in Philippine Creole Spanish: The Case of Zamboanga," *Language in Society* 16. 91-108.
1986b "The Reduction of /s/ in Philippine Creole Spanish and its Implications for Historical Hispanic Dialectology," *Diachronica* 3. 43-66.
1987a "Phonological Reduction in Philippine Creole Spanish: Implications for Hispanic Dialectology," in *Language and Language Use: Studies in Spanish*, pp. 79-96, by T. Morgan, J. Lee and B. VanPatten (eds), Washington: University Press Of America.
1987b "On the Construction *ta*+Infinitive in Caribbean Bozal Spanish," *Romance Philology* 40. 431-50.
1987c "Contemporary Philippine Spanish: Comments on Vestigial Usage," *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 18. 37-48.
1988 "Philippine Creole Spanish: Reassessing the Portuguese Element," *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 104. 25-45.
- Llamado, Librada.
1972 "The Phrase-structure Rules of Cavite Chabacano," *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 3. 67-96.
- Llamzon, T.
1978 *Handbook of Philippine Language Groups*, Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila Press.
- López, C.
1965a *The Spanish Overlay in Tagalog. Indo-Pacific Linguistic Studies*, Part I, pp. 462-504. G. B. Milner and E. Henderson (eds), Amsterdam: North Holland.
1965b "Contributions to a Comparative Philippine Syntax," *Lingua* 15. 3-16.
- López, V.
1893 *El filibustero*, Madrid: Imprenta de la Viuda de M. Minuesa de los Ríos.
- Macansantos, A.
1971 *A Contrastive Analysis of Spanish and Chabacano Concordance of Forms and Structures of Noun-head Modifications*. M. A. Thesis, University of the Philippines.
- MacMicking, R.
1967 *Recollections of Manilla and the Philippines during 1848, 1849, and 1850*, Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild.
- Mallat, J.
1848 *Les Philippines, histoire, géographie, moeurs*, Paris: Arthus Bertrand.
- Martinez de Zúñiga, J.
1973 *Status of the Philippines in 1800*, tr. of El estadismo de las Islas Filipinas, by Vicente del Carmen, Manila: Filipiniana Book Guild.
- Maño, T.
1963 "The Zamboanga Chabacano Grammar," *Far Eastern University Journal* 7. 672-82.
- Marryat, F.
1848 *Borneo and the Indian Archipelago*, London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans.
- McKaughan, H.
1954 "Notes on Chabacano Grammar," *University of Manila Journal of East Asiatic Studies* 3. 205-26.
- Miranda, G.
1956 *El Dialecto Chabacano de Cavite*, Dumaguete City.
- Molony, C.
1973 *Sound Changes in Chabacano*, Parangal kay López, pp. 38-50, Andrew Gonzalez (ed.), Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
1977a "Semantic Changes in Chabacano," *Langues en contact-pidgins-creoles- languages in Contact*, pp. 153-66, J. Meisel (ed.) Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
1977b "Recent Relexification Processes in Philippine Creole Spanish," *Socio-cultural Dimensions of Language Change*, pp. 131-60, Ben Blount and Mary Sanches (eds) New York: Academic Press.
- Montero y Vidal, José
1876 *Cuentos filipinos*, Madrid: Imprenta, Estereotipia y Galvanoplastia de Aribau y Compañía.
- Moor, J. H.
n.d. *Noices of the Indian Archipelago and Adjacent Countries*, Singapore.

- Moya y Jiménez, F. J. de.
1883 *Las Islas Filipinas en 1882*, Madrid: Est. Tipográfico de El Correo.
Oficina de Educación Iberoamericana.
1972 *Hispanismos en el tagalo*, Madrid: Oficina de Educación Iberoamericana.
- Orendain, Antonio (ed.)
1984 *Zamboanga Hermosa: Memories of the Old Town*, Manila: Filipinas Foundation.
- Panganiban, José Villa
1961 *Spanish Loanwords in the Tagalog Language*, Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- Phelan, J.
1959 *The Hispanization of the Philippines*, Madison: University of Wisconsin.
- Quilis, A.
1970 "Notas de Morfología Verbal Sobre el Español Hablado en Cavite y Zamboanga (Filipinas)," in *Homenaje universitario a Dámaso Alonso* pp. 59–63, Madrid: Gredos.
1973 "Hispanismos en Tagalo," *Canadian Journal of Romance Linguistics* 1. 68–92.
1976 *Hispanismos en cebuano*, Madrid: Alcalá.
1980 "Le sort de l'espagnol aux Philippines: un problème de langues en contact," *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 44. 82–107.
- Riego de Dios, M. I.
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. 77–81.
- Russell, F. K.
1907 *A Woman's Journey Through the Philippines*, Boston: Page & Co.
- St. John, H.
1853 *The Indian Archipelago: its History and Present State*, London: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans.
- Saleeby, N.
1908 *The History of Sulu*, Reprinted in 1963 by the Filipiniana Book Guild, Manila.
- Scheidnagel, M.
1880 *Las colonias españolas en Asia—Islas Filipinas*, Madrid.
- Schuchardt, H.
1883 "Kreolische Studien III: ueber das Malaiospanische der Philippinen," *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien* 105. 111–50.
- Schurz, W.
1939 *The Manila Galleon*, New York: Dutton.
- Sonnerat, M.
1776 *Voyage a la Nouvelle Guinée*, Paris; Chez Ruault.
- Wagner, M. L.
1949 *Lingua e dialetti dell'America spagnola*, Florence: Edizioni "Le Lingue Estere."
- Warren, J.
1981 *The Sulu Zone 1768–1898*, Singapore: Singapore University Press.
- Whinnom, K.
1956 *Spanish Contact Vernaculars in the Philippines*, Hong Kong: Hong Kong University.
- Wolff, J.
1973-74 "The Character of Borrowings from Spanish and English in Language of the Philippines," *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 45. 72–81.
- Worcester, D.
1898 *The Philippine Islands and Their People*, New York: Macmillan.
1930 *The Philippines Past and Present*, New York: Macmillan.
- Yvan, M.
1855 *Six Months Among the Malays and a Year in China*, London.