



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Spanish suffixes in tagalog: the case of common nouns

Baklanova, E.; Bellamy, K.; Klammer, M.; Moro, F.

Citation

Baklanova, E., & Bellamy, K. (2023). Spanish suffixes in tagalog: the case of common nouns. In M. Klammer & F. Moro (Eds.), *Brill Studies in Language Contact and the Dynamics of Language* (pp. 307-347). Leiden: Brill. doi:10.1163/9789004529458_010

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Creative Commons CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3714627>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Spanish Suffixes in Tagalog: The Case of Common Nouns

Ekaterina Baklanova and Kate Bellamy

1 Introduction

The intense contact that took place between Spanish and Tagalog during Spanish colonial rule in the Philippine archipelago from the mid-16th until the turn of the 20th century was not characterized by widespread bilingualism (e.g. Lipski et al., 1996: 272–275; Thompson, 2003: 17). However, it did lead to heavy lexical borrowing,¹ which has resulted in significant changes to Tagalog derivation (see notably López, 1965; Goulet, 1971; Rau, 1992; Alcántara y Antonio, 1999; Steinkrüger, 2008; Potet, 2016). Less attention has been paid to morphological borrowing from Spanish, such as the adoption of several Spanish nominative and adjectival affixes, which constitute mostly suffixes (Wolff, 1973, 2001; Baklanova, 2004, 2017; Quilis and Casado-Fresnillo, 2008). This chapter will address the characteristics and impact of Spanish noun-forming suffixes in Tagalog, using the framework of Seifart (2015) to identify whether these constitute direct or indirect borrowings.

1.1 *On the Traces of Spanish in the Tagalog Lexicon*

Of the several dialects of Spanish present in the Iberian Peninsula in the 16th century, Castilian Spanish dominated in most administrative centers of the American colonies of Spain, including Mexico, “since most officials of the Crown came from this area, in particular from Toledo and Madrid” (Gómez Rendón, 2008, 1: 126). As the Philippine colony was under the jurisdiction of the Vice-royalty of New Spain established in Acapulco in 1535, Mexican Spanish and thus also Castilian might well have been the main variants of Spanish that

1 Following Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 37), we shall use “borrowing” as the traditional cover term for both lexical and structural linguistic items transferred into the recipient language, as well as the process of this transfer. The term “loanword” will be used, as in Haspelmath (2009: 36), only for “a word that at some point in the history of a language entered its lexicon as a result of borrowing (or transfer, or copying)”.

influenced Tagalog.² Philippine contacts with Spain were initially mostly limited to galleon trade via Mexico, since only from the 19th century and the independence of Mexico onwards were the Philippines, as other Spanish Pacific territories, administered directly from Spain (Sippola, 2020: 455; see also Quilis and Casado-Fresnillo, 2008).

Lipski et al. (1996: 272–275) show that there was no significant group of Spanish mestizos in the Philippines at this time, nor a large Tagalog-Spanish bilingual community. By the end of the Spanish rule “the census indicated that less than three percent of the population spoke Spanish” (Thompson, 2003: 16). Sippola (2020: 455) elaborates:

Local laws and customs were largely maintained, although the legal code was codified in Spanish. For most of the Spanish period, the policy was for priests to interact with Filipinos in the local vernaculars rather than teach Spanish, and Spanish education was limited mostly to a small elite.

With the advent of transoceanic steam navigation in the second half of the 19th century, increased trade with the Philippines “created a new wealthy class of Chinese mestizos who controlled commerce throughout the islands. They eagerly learned Spanish and spread it throughout the Philippines along with their business interests” (Thompson, 2003: 16). These bilinguals might, then, have become the main agents of the spread of Spanish language influence to Tagalog speakers from lower social strata.

Overall, the language situation in Manila and other Tagalog-speaking regions appeared to roughly correspond to diglossia (Fishman, 1967), where the High language (in this case Spanish) operated as the written/formal-spoken code and the Low language (Tagalog) as the vernacular, with no interaction between the two. The cases of Spanish-Quechua and Spanish-Otomí contact also indicate that in a diglossic situation where speakers of the Low language are socio-politically subdominant to speakers of the High language, the latter typically becomes a source of active borrowing into the former (Bakker and Hekking, 2012; Gómez Rendón, 2008). This is similar to the Philippine case: Spanish was a marker of high social status (Wolff, 2001: 234; Quilis and Casado-Fresnillo, 2008: 62–66). Hence, more than three centuries of influence by Spanish as a high prestige language of the colonial administration and local elite, even without a significant degree of bilingualism, has resulted in heavy lexical borrowing into

2 Loanwords of both Indo-American and Spanish origin adopted by Tagalog via Spanish are considered hispanisms and marked as Mexican Spanish (Mex Spanish).

Tagalog. According to various estimates, Tagalog vocabulary consists of around 20% Spanish borrowings (Baklanova, 2017: 333–334), or even up to 32% (Rau, 1992: 101), with loanwords appearing in all domains (Wolff, 2001). Spanish influence on Tagalog rates at least as the third stage (“more intense contact”) on Thomason and Kaufman’s (1988) scale, where notably basic vocabulary is borrowed, including function words and discourse markers; new phonemes are added to the Tagalog inventory; and also derivational morphemes from Spanish are borrowed (see also Wolff, 1973, 2001; Baklanova, 2004, 2017; Quilis and Casado-Fresnillo, 2008; Steinkrüger, 2008).

The case of Tagalog is particularly interesting as the Spanish influence overlaps with English influence. Even after the replacement of Spanish rule by that of the USA in 1898, Spanish remained the second official language of the Philippines alongside English, and dominated in the courts and high society until the early 1930s (Lipski et al., 1996: 272; Thompson, 2003: 63). Already around 1920, society had seen an increase in the number of educated Filipinos who could speak English, often, however, with a Spanish-like accent (Fernández, 2013: 369).

We assume that a certain Spanish adstrate influence still persists in Tagalog through the following processes: 1) mildly productive nominal and adjectival derivation with Spanish affixes; 2) the development of a marginal gender system, as discussed in Stolz (2012) and Baklanova (2016); and 3) the “hispanization” of English borrowed lexical items.³ The third phenomenon needs some elaboration because examples of it are sometimes regarded simply as “mistakes” in the everyday speech of Filipinos (see, e.g., Alcántara y Antonio, 1999; Ortograpiyang Pambansa, 2013). It is highly probable that very few, if any, English words were borrowed into Tagalog via Spanish during the Spanish rule. Except for some culturally-specific borrowings, numerous English words began to enter the Spanish lexicon only from the 1950s onwards (Dworkin, 2012: 217–218). Examples of some early borrowings from English that had entered Spanish by the end of the 19th century, whence they were then borrowed into Tagalog are: Spanish *bistec* > Tagalog *bístik* ‘beef steak’, Spanish *cheque* > Tagalog *tséke* ‘check’, Spanish *turista* > Tagalog *turísta* ‘tourist’ (Dworkin, 2012:215). In the present study the immediate donor language of a loanword is taken as the source of the borrowing, thus the above examples are also considered hispanisms in Tagalog.

3 With thanks to Dr. Anthony Grant (p.c. Oct. 2020) for sharing a similar view on the adstrate character of Spanish influence on Tagalog.

Following Haugen (1969), Aikhenvald (2012: 178) observes, that “grammatical and lexical morphemes may not be borrowed directly, and yet come to share their form and meaning with a morpheme in the contact language”. In the case of Tagalog, the tendency to create neologisms through analogy with Spanish loanwords has been attested since the 20th century, along with the reshaping of English loanwords into Spanish-like forms as a means of accommodation (Goulet, 1971; Wolff, 1973, 2001). This pattern is similar to the way in which English loanwords are adopted into Indonesian based on an earlier way of borrowing Dutch words (Tadmor, 2009).⁴ General hispanization patterns of English borrowings in Tagalog are presented in Baklanova (2017: 336–337), two of which are reproduced in (1a–b).

- (1) a. English *-er* > Tagalog *-ero*: English *abus-er* > Tagalog *abus-éro* (cf. Spanish *abusador*)
- b. English *-ist* > Tagalog *-ista*: English *cartoon-ist* > Tagalog *kartun-ísta* (cf. Spanish *caricaturista*)

Perhaps surprisingly, this tendency in Tagalog developed independently of a similar mode of adopting Anglicisms and the creation of English-Spanish hybrid neologisms in Spanish, which has only been attested since the second half of the 20th century, such as English *adherence* > Spanish *adherencia* (Dworkin, 2012: 220–224). This process increases the frequency of Spanish and Spanish-like grammatical items in Tagalog discourse, which may foster the use of Spanish borrowed suffixes in Tagalog word formation.

1.2 Aims and Methodology of the Present Study

The present study investigates the borrowing of the Spanish agentive suffixes *-ero/a*, and *-ista*, the diminutives *-illo/a*, *-ito/a*, and *-ete*, and the adjectival *-eño* into Tagalog nominal derivation. The focus will be their impact on the contemporary derivation of common nouns.

Winford (2003b: 134) observes that “certain structural innovations in an RL [recipient language] appear to be mediated by lexical borrowing”, i.e. adopted through *indirect* borrowing. Cases of *direct* borrowing of structural elements typically involve free morphemes, while bound morphemes “appear to

4 Tadmor (2009: 702) describes the integration pattern of English loanwords as “based on an earlier pattern of borrowing similar Dutch words ending in *-atie* [asi] and *-isatie* [isasi]”: Dutch *proclamatie* ‘proclamation’ > Indonesian *proklamasi*. Hence English *-(iz)ation* is reshaped into *-(is)asi*: English *stagflation* > Indonesian *stagflasi*.

be borrowed only in cases where they substitute for RL morphemes that are semantically and structurally congruent. Moreover, such borrowing requires a high degree of bilingualism among individual speakers” (ibid.). Seifart (2015: 511) defines *indirect affix borrowing* as follows:

This scenario involves two subprocesses. First, a language borrows a number of complex loanwords containing an affix, and second—possibly much later—these complex loanwords come to be analyzed within the recipient language, and eventually the affix becomes productively used on native stems.

The scenario of *direct affix borrowing* (Seifart, 2015: 512) occurs when:

An affix is recognized by speakers of the recipient language in their knowledge of the donor language and used on native stems as soon as it is borrowed, with no intermediate phase of occurring only in complex loanwords.

Thus, Seifart’s (2015) definitions corroborate those of Winford (2003b), including the observation that direct borrowing requires a significant degree of bilingualism among speakers of the RL. However, such borrowing does not necessarily imply “full familiarity with the donor language”, or source language (SL; Seifart, 2015: 512). Moreover, the distribution of borrowed affixes and the ratio of corresponding *complex* (with the borrowed affix) and *simplex* (without the borrowed affix) loanwords in a corpus can be used to assess whether borrowing has been direct or indirect (ibid.). This also supports the observation that complex loanwords of low token frequency relative to corresponding simplex forms tend to be decomposed and analyzed by RL speakers more easily (Hay, 2001; Baayen, 2008). The analogically deducted affix may then be used to produce *hybrid formations* with the RL stems. According to Seifart (2017: 394):

[an affix] is considered effectively borrowed only if it is used with at least some native stems, i.e. it is not considered borrowed if it only combines with equally borrowed stems to form complex loanwords.

However, Tagalog hybrid formations with Spanish affixes may also be derived from borrowed stems, adopted from Spanish or another donor language, such as English (see Appendix, Table 9.13). If a stem has been borrowed into Tagalog from a source language other than Spanish, we consider its hybridization

with an affix of Spanish origin as evidence of the productiveness of this affix in Tagalog.

The crucial condition for primarily *indirect* affix borrowing is the presence of complex loanwords with this affix in the RL, while certain proficiency in the SL is necessary for *direct* affix borrowing (Seifart, 2015: 513–515). Based on this methodology and classification, we will identify the primary character of borrowing of the above-mentioned Spanish suffixes into Tagalog. This will also entail an assessment of the distribution and ratio of these suffixes in the research data described in Section 1.3.

Our second goal is to investigate the semantics of the borrowed suffixes. As observed by many scholars, such as Aikhenvald (2007: 23), “a borrowed bound morpheme, reanalysed and reinterpreted, may acquire a quite different meaning in the target language”. Wolff (2001: 248) suggests that Tagalog semantic deviations from the Spanish original be analyzed, for they “reveal the extent to which Spanish concepts were not taken over but reinterpreted into a Filipino understanding of the world”.

Thus, the present study focuses on three major groups of research questions:

1. Are all of the above-mentioned Spanish suffixes attested in derivations of Tagalog native stems, thus producing hybrid formations? What are the characteristics of the Tagalog stems receiving these suffixes?
2. What are the characteristics of the borrowing process for each of these suffixes? First, is it predominantly direct or indirect borrowing, following Seifart (2015)? Second, is the adoption of each of these Spanish suffixes older, pertaining to the colonial period (i.e., when Spanish still persisted in the Philippines); or is it more recent, being dateable to the 20th century (thus without the influence of Spanish)?
3. What new meanings do the borrowed Spanish suffixes introduce into Tagalog nominal derivation, if any? What is the overall impact of the Spanish suffixes on the Tagalog derivation of common nouns?

1.3 Research Data

To address these questions, and also in view of the present-day English influence on Tagalog, two datasets have been employed for the analysis: (a) historical data from the 19th–early 20th century (i.e., before the spread of English-Tagalog bilingualism); and (b) contemporary data of the 20th–early 21st century (when English-Tagalog bilingualism is widespread).

The early data are difficult to obtain, so dataset (a) is rather limited, consisting of the available Spanish-Tagalog dictionaries (Laktaw, 1889; Calderón, 1915), 34 sample Tagalog texts of 20,500 tokens (Bloomfield, 1917: ch. 1), and six liter-

ary texts from 1906–1922 by six Tagalog writers (Project Gutenberg), comprising around 60,000 tokens in total. This dataset is only used to check whether derivatives with each of the above-mentioned Spanish suffixes may already be found in the pre-English Tagalog lexicon. If hybrid formations with one of these Spanish suffixes are found in the early sources, this indicates that the suffix was borrowed into Tagalog during the period of direct Spanish influence on Tagalog. However, the lack of Tagalog hybrids with a Spanish suffix in the early dataset is not sufficient evidence that the suffix was not borrowed in the Spanish period. Since dataset (a) comprises mostly written texts and is rather small, it may not reflect colloquial Tagalog use from that period, and in fact, innovations might already have emerged.

The main source is the contemporary dataset, which comprises two large Tagalog dictionaries (English, 1987; Rachkov, 2012), and the recent Tagalog Leipzig Corpus (Goldhahn et al., 2012), hereafter LC, which consists of around 20 million *tokens* (total number of words), and about 472,000 *types* (each word form counted once). It was compiled in 2012–2016 from more than 500 sources, predominantly from the leading Filipino e-dailies (Abante, Abante Tonite, PhilStar, Journal.com.ph) and Tagalog Wikipedia, but also from some Tagalog blogs, thus it partly reflects colloquial, contemporary Tagalog.

Both datasets were first searched for complex nominal formations containing the suffixes *-ero/a*, *-ista*, *-ito/a*, *-ilyo/a* (*-illo/a*), *-eryo* (*-eño*) and *-ete/a*. The lists of derivatives from datasets (a) and (b) with each suffix were then analyzed in terms of provenance (namely, a Spanish complex loanword or a Tagalog hybrid formation), type of stem, semantics, and distribution in the datasets.

The rest of this chapter is organized as follows. Section 2 gives a description of some relevant aspects of Tagalog nominal derivation. Section 3 presents an overview of the characteristics of the agentive suffixes *-ero/a*, *-ista* and the suffix *-eño* in Spanish, an analysis of their distribution in the Tagalog datasets (a) and (b), as well as their impact on Tagalog nominal derivation. In Section 4 the same analysis is carried out for the Spanish diminutive suffixes *-ito/a*, *-illo/a*, and *-ete/a* in Tagalog lexical derivation. A discussion of the mechanism of borrowing of each suffix, based on the methodology of Seifart (2015) is presented in Section 5, followed by some concluding remarks in Section 6. The Appendix presents the characteristics of all Tagalog hybrid formations with *-ero/a* found in the datasets.

2 Notes on Tagalog Lexical Derivation

Tagalog is a language of the Central Philippine group of the Austronesian family, whose standardized variant—Filipino—is the national language of the Republic of the Philippines. Tagalog is characterized typologically as agglutinative-synthetic, with a relative abundance of affixes and clear morpheme boundaries (Blust, 2013: 41; 355–356). As such, Tagalog possesses a large inventory of derivations. A stem may be derived into different lexical categories (Shkarban, 1995: 38–42; De Guzman, 1996: 312–315). Shkarban (2004: 319–320) claims that the major rules regulating the functioning of Tagalog affixes operate “at the level of semantic relations between root-morphemes and affixes” (see also Wolff, 1993).

Nominal derivation may involve verbal, nominal or adjectival stems, and may include affixation, reduplication, compounding, conversion with prosodic changes, or a combination of the above. Nouns are stem lexemes or derivatives that do not take the verbal inflections of voice and aspect, nor the adjectival affixes of degree. They also do not inflect for case or number.

The class of nouns includes as its most productive:

- i. Names of persons and objects
- ii. Abstract names of quality or situation
- iii. Places

In class (i) common nouns are distinguished from personal names by the particles with which they co-occur: *ang* for common nouns, and *si* for personal names, which become *ng/ni* and *sa/kay* in genitive/ergative and oblique constructions (Schachter and Otnes, 1972: 93–96).⁵ The present paper focuses on common nouns in this first class, that is, names of persons and objects. For this class, the main native derivation strategies are presented in Table 9.1 (following Blake, 1925; Schachter and Otnes, 1972; Rachkov, 1981; Shkarban, 1995; De Guzman, 1996).

With regard to the strategies presented in Table 9.1, a number of observations can be made. Firstly, prefixation clearly prevails over suffixation, as illustrated in examples (3a–3e).

5 As stress is phonemic in Tagalog, in all the Tagalog examples stressed vowels are marked with an accent /'/, and the voiceless glottal stop is represented orthographically as /ʔ/ in word-final position.

TABLE 9.1 Tagalog native derivation of the class ‘names of persons and objects’

Derivation strategy*	Derivation type	Meaning
maŋ-r-V (w/prosodic change)	Prefix	‘a regular/professional doer of V’ ‘a person prone to do V’
mag-r-V (w/prosodic change)	Prefix	‘a regular/professional doer of V’ ‘a person prone to do V’
mag- + N	Prefix	‘a pair of persons (rarely, objects) bearing the relation designated by the stem’
ka- + N/V/Adj	Prefix	‘a person/object reciprocally associated with another’
R+N+ -(h)an	Two-syllable reduplication + suffix	‘a person/object imitating what the stem designates’ ‘diminutive of an object’ (n/prod?)
N + -(h)in	Suffix (n/prod.)	‘a similarity subject’
N + <in>	Infixation (n/prod.)	‘a similarity subject’
pala- + V	Prefix	‘(a person) prone to do V’
taga- + V	Prefix	‘a person charged to V’, ‘a regular doer of V’
taga- + N	Prefix	‘a person born/living/working at the place designated by the stem’
N(-ŋ)+N	Compound	‘a person/object designated by the compounded stems’

* Adj – adjectival stem, LNK – linker (ligature), N – nominal stem, n/prod – not productive, r – one-syllable reduplication, R – two-syllable reduplication of the stem, V – verbal stem

- (3) a. *mam-(b)ángká?* ‘to sail by boat’ > *mámamangká?* ‘boatman’; *mag-la síng* ‘to get drunk’ > *maglalásing* ‘drunkard’
b. *mag-lólo* ‘grandfather with a grandchild’
c. *ka-palít* ‘a substitute’
d. *palá-káin* ‘frequent eater (of)’
e. *taga-báyan* ‘city resident’; *taga-showbiz* ‘person from showbusiness’ (< English)

There is only one productive suffixal strategy, namely *R+N+ -(h)an*, see examples (4a–b).

- (4) a. *báhay-bahay-an* '1. toy house; 2. small house'
 b. *bulág-bulág-an* 'person pretending to be blind'

The presently unproductive suffixal strategy $N + -(h)in$ seems connected to the infixal $N + \langle in \rangle$ of roughly the same meaning, namely 'a similarity subject', as in (5a–d).

- (5) a. *wika-ín* 'dialect, i.e. like-a-language'
 b. *k-in-arayom* 'long thin rice, i.e. like-a-needle'
 c. *ama-ín* 'uncle, i.e. as close as father'
 d. *k-in-ákapatíd* 'person as close as brother'

Tagalog lacks its own affixal inventory to derive agent nouns of the semantic group 'a doer of N/A' from non-verbal stems. For the diachronically polysemantic strategy $R+N+-(h)an$ (i.e. two-syllable reduplication of a nominal stem plus suffix $-(h)an$), the contemporary corpus data attest only word types meaning 'a person/object imitating what the stem designates', with no new diminutive types found. There is no evidence for the present-day productivity of this pattern. Diachronically, Tagalog derived a number of diminutive names of objects, some meaning both 'a small object' and 'an imitation of the object'. These occurred with both native (6a) and borrowed (6b) stems.

- (6) a. *ilog* 'river'—*ilug-ilúgan* 'rivulet, small river'
 b. *báso* (< Spanish *vaso*) 'glass'—*básu-basúhan* 'small glass; toy glass'

In the next section we shall discuss further how the suffixes borrowed from Spanish have contributed to Tagalog nominal derivation.

3 Spanish Suffixes in Tagalog Derivation of Agentive Nouns

Spanish is a fusional language, that is, its morphemes can simultaneously encode several meanings (Payne, 1997: 28). Most words contain more than one morpheme, and morpheme boundaries can be difficult to identify (Gómez-Rendón, 2008, 1: 156; Rainer, 2011). Spanish also has grammatical gender, so many of its nominal and adjectival suffixes are marked with the masculine or feminine exponents *-o/-a*, including *-ero/a*, *-illo/a*, *-ito/a*, *-eño/a* (Gramática: § 2).

Due to heavy borrowing from Spanish, a wide variety of simplex-complex pairs and groups of Spanish loanwords have been adopted into the Tagalog lex-

icon, such *káha* ‘box’, *kah-íta* ‘small box’, *kah-éro* ‘cashier’ (< *caja* ‘box’); and *espírito* ‘spirit’ (identical in Spanish), *espirit-ísta* ‘spiritualist’, *espirítu-ál* ‘spiritual’. Evidently this process has enabled Tagalog speakers to contrastively analyze the semantic and structural differences between simplex and complex loanwords formed with the same stem. As a result, the hypothetical semantics of the suffixes *-ero/a*, *-ista*, *-eño/a*, *-ito/a*, *-illo/a*, *-ete* might have been acquired and eventually transferred to native noun formations.

3.1 Spanish Suffix *-ero/a*

As Muysken (2012: 485) observes, Spanish agentive suffixes such as *-ero/a*, *-dor/a* “almost operate in paradigmatic opposition [with] a series of related meanings <...>: profession, typical behavior, personal propensity, remarkable physical characteristic, resemblance, affective negative, pejorative, affective positive, endearment, diminutive”. The suffix *-ero/a* combines mostly with nominal and adjectival stems, and derives both nouns and adjectives (Gramática: 5.1.b). In nominal derivation it forms mostly agentive nouns with the meanings ‘a person of a profession/occupation related to N’, where N is mostly ‘an object of action’ (7a) or ‘a place of action’ (7b).

- (7) a. *reloj* ‘watch/clock’—*relojero* ‘watch/clock-maker’
 b. *taquilla* ‘box-office’—*taquillero* ‘box-office clerk’

It can also refer to ‘a person of a certain propensity related to N’, in diachrony often with a negative (deprecatory) connotation, as in (8a–b).

- (8) a. *aventura* ‘adventure’—*aventurero* ‘adventurer, prone to adventures’
 b. *política* ‘politics’—*politiquero* ‘political manoeuvrer (neg.)’

Moreover, it can also refer to nouns of objects meaning ‘place’, ‘container’, ‘instrument/utensil’, ‘group/set’, ‘tree/plant’ (ibid.: § 6.8i–6.8m, 6.8s).

In the historical dataset used in the present study, 25 types of Spanish complex loanwords (CL) with *-ero/a* and eight hybrid formations (HF), i.e. Tagalog neologisms with *-ero*, are attested (see Table 9.2).⁶

6 As most of the Tagalog stem words cannot be attributed to a concrete class outside of their context, for the purposes of the present analysis we shall take nominal stems as roughly referring to a person/object/place, adjectival stems as referring to a quality/trait, and verbal stems as referring to an action.

TABLE 9.2 Characteristics of nouns with *-ero/a* in the Tagalog dataset of 1900s

Semantic group of derivates	Type of stem	CLS		Simplex related to CLS	HFS		Simplex related to HFS
					Tagalog/ non- Spanish stem	Spanish stem	
Object/place	N	7	2	-	-	-	-
Person of certain pro- fession/occupation	N	18	11	2		1	3
	V	-	-	1		1	2
Person of certain	N	-	-	1 neg.		-	1
	V	-	-	2 neg.		-	2
TOTAL # of types		25	13	6		2	8

Examples (9a–b) contain two of the complex loanwords attested in the historical dataset.

- (9) a. Object/place: Spanish *candeléro* > Tagalog *kandeléro* ‘candelabrum’
b. Person of certain profession/occupation: Spanish *fogonero* > Tagalog *pugonéro* ‘stoker’

Among the examples of the hybrid formations found in the dataset are those presented in (10a–b).

- (10) a. Person of profession/occupation: *sípa?* ‘kick with the boot; game with rattan ball’ > *sipéro* ‘sipa player’; *salamángka* ‘conjuring; magic; sleight of hand’ (< Spanish *salamanca* ‘cave for sorcery’) > *salamangkéro* ‘magician; juggler’
b. Person of certain propensity/trait: *baság-úlo* ‘altercation; scuffle’ > *baság-uléro* ‘squabbler’ (neg.)

Moreover, among the entries of Calderón’s (1915) dictionary, there are around 50 more Spanish complex words along with some simplex-complex pairs, which do not appear in the dictionaries from the 1890–1900s. Yet these forms eventually entered the Tagalog lexicon, presumably not later than the early 20th century, while Spanish still had influence on Tagalog through its bilinguals (recall Thompson, 2003: 17, 63). The vast majority of these later Spanish complex loanwords also pertain to agentive nouns meaning ‘a person of profession/occupation’, but there are also a few meaning ‘a person of certain propensity’, mostly negative (11a), or referring to an object (11b).

- (11) a. Spanish *calle* ‘street’, *callejero* ‘loiterer, gadabout’ > Tagalog *kálye*, *kalye-héro*
 b. Spanish *grano* ‘grain’, *granero* ‘granary’ > Tagalog *gráno*, *granéro*

Based on the above data, several observations may be made regarding derivation with *-ero/a* in Tagalog at the beginning of the 20th century. First, the presence of hybrid formations with a Tagalog stem and the Spanish suffix *-ero* (including the masculine exponent *-o*) indicates that the suffix had been borrowed in that form into Tagalog not later than the turn of the 20th century. The form *-era* with the feminine exponent *-a* is not attested in the same dataset. Second, although in the early Spanish complex loanwords only the meaning ‘person of certain profession/occupation’ occurs, two of the three original meanings of Spanish *-ero* are registered in Tagalog hybrids, see (12a–b).

- (12) a. Person of certain profession/occupation: *bangká?* ‘boat’—*bangkéro* ‘boatman’
 b. Person of certain propensity/trait, with a negative connotation: *satsát* ‘babble, chatter’—*satsatéro* ‘chatterbox’

Third, the agentive *-ero* in Tagalog, unlike its original in Spanish, combines not only with nominal stems, but also with stems referring to an action, as in (12b). Fourth and final, following Seifart’s (2015) methodology, we can observe that the ratio of Spanish complex loanwords (25) to Tagalog hybrid formations (8) with *-ero*, and that to related simplex (stem) words, indicates a primarily indirect character of suffix borrowing from Spanish into Tagalog. This will be discussed further in Section 5.

Let us now turn to the recent Tagalog dataset, from the late 20th–early 21st century, in order to assess the contemporary usage and semantics of the borrowed suffix *-ero/a*. This dataset rendered far more Spanish complex loanwords and Tagalog hybrids: a dictionary search, cross-checked with the corpus data (see Section 1.3), gave 158 Spanish complex loanwords, including 150 items as actor nouns. These 150 nouns pertain to the same two semantic groups as above, namely ‘person of certain profession/occupation’ ($n = 143$) and ‘person of certain propensity/trait’ ($n = 7$), mostly with a negative connotation.

There is also a considerable number of hispanized English loanwords in the contemporary dataset, which are not included in the count. These are English lexemes which have been reshaped in Tagalog by analogy with a Spanish pattern, as in (13a–b), see also Section 1.1.⁷

7 A similar pattern of hispanization of English loanwords is observed in Chamorro, e.g.: English *upholsterer* > Chamorro *apostero/a* ‘upholsterer, m/f’ (Rodríguez-Ponga, 2009: 241–248).

TABLE 9.3 Characteristics of hybrid formations with -ero/a in contemporary Tagalog

Semantic group of HF	Type of stem	Derivates of Tagalog stems	Derivates of Spanish stems	Derivates of English stems
Person of certain profession/occupation	N	7	9	2
	V	1	2	1
Person of certain propensity/trait	N	4, neg.	-	1, neg.
	A	5, neg.	2, neg.	1, neg.
	V	5, neg.	4, neg.	1, neg.
TOTAL # of types		22 types	17 types	6 types

- (13) a. *blogéro* ‘blogger’ (coll.) < English *blogger*⁸
b. *debatéro/a* ‘one who often disputes, m/f’ < English *debater* (cf. Spanish *polemista*)

Tagalog hybrid formations with -ero/a are also significant in number in this dataset, occurring 45 times. The full list of Tagalog hybrids with -ero/a, their stems and source forms, and the information on their token quantities in the corpus is presented in the Appendix (Table 9.13). Table 9.3 summarizes their main characteristics.

There are ten more Tagalog hybrids with -ero/a attested only in the contemporary corpus. These types have the lowest frequency (from 2 to 38 tokens in total), indicating their recent creation. All of them also carry the meaning ‘person of certain propensity/trait’ with a negative connotation, as in (14a–b).

- (14) a. *ingleséro/a* ‘Filipino who prefers English to his mother tongue, m/f’ < Tagalog *Inglés* < Spanish *Inglés* ‘English’
b. *emotéro/a* ‘too emotional person, m/f’ < English *emotion*/(to) *emote*

Sixteen of the 45 hybrid forms listed in the Appendix (Table 9.13) are attested as both -ero, for masculine or generic and -era for feminine, which corroborates Stolz’s (2012) observations on the emergence of “marginal gender” in Tagalog (see also Bowen, 1971; Baklanova, 2016).

The suffix -ero/a demonstrates a growth of productivity over time in Tagalog. Although the size of the historical dataset is much smaller than the con-

8 The same tendency has evolved independently in contemporary Spanish (Gramática: 6.8p).

TABLE 9.4 Semantic distribution of CLs and HFs with -ero/a in contemporary Tagalog

Semantic group of derivates	% of Spanish CLs	% of Tagalog hybrids
Person of certain profession/occupation	c. 95 %	c. 40 %
Person of certain propensity/trait	c. 5 %, mostly negative	c. 60 %, all negative
Total # of types	150	55

temporary one, and thus cannot be directly compared, the scarcity of Tagalog hybrids (8 items) in the early dataset, and their much larger number in the contemporary data (55), including some recent creations, certainly implies a certain growth in productivity. Unlike in Spanish, in Tagalog *-ero/a* can combine with all type of stems: with nominal and verbal stems for the semantic group ‘person of certain profession/occupation’, and with nominal, adjectival and verbal stems for ‘person of certain propensity/trait’. Note also that the ratio between the two semantic groups for Spanish complex loanwords and Tagalog hybrid forms reveals a significant shift in Tagalog towards ‘person of certain propensity/trait’ with a distinct negative connotation, as illustrated in Table 9.4.

3.2 Spanish Suffix *-ista*

The Spanish suffix *-ista* is mostly added to nominal stems, both common and proper (Gramática: 6.9b), with rare cases of verbal and adjectival derivation, (see Rainer, 2011: 490). Its productivity reportedly correlates with that of derivatives with the abstract nominal suffix *-ismo* (Gramática: 6.9c). Diachronically *-ista* appears to be mostly productive in forming agentive nouns with the following semantics: ‘a person of a certain profession/occupation’ (15a), often also used as a corresponding relational adjective (Gramática: 7.7h); ‘a person of certain propensity/trait’ (15b), with weak productivity; and ‘a follower/participant of a tendency/movement/party’ (15c) (see, e.g., Gramática: 6.9b).

- (15)
- a. *técnico electricista* ‘electric technician’—*electricista* ‘electrician’

b. *anécdota* ‘anecdote’—*anecdotista* ‘one who is prone to anecdotes; one who composes anecdotes’

c. *absolutismo* ‘absolutism’—*absolutista* ‘supporter of absolutism’

In the historical dataset, 14 types of Spanish complex loanwords with *-ista* and only one Tagalog hybrid formation are attested. Their characteristics are summarized in Table 9.5.

TABLE 9.5 Characteristics of nouns with *-ista* in the Tagalog historical dataset

Semantic group of derivates	Type of stem	CLS	Simplex related to CLS	HFS		Simplex related to HFS
				Tag. stem	Sp. stem	
Person of certain profes- sion/occupation	N	11	8	-	1?	1
Person of certain propensity/trait	V	1	1	-	-	-
Follower of a trend/ party/movement	N	2	2*	-	-	-
TOTAL # of types		14	11	0	1	1

* The related simplex forms for the attested *anarkista*, *sosyalista* are *anarkíya* ‘anarchy’ and *sosyál* ‘social’ respectively. They are found in the later dictionaries (i.e. English, 1987; Rachkov, 2012), but are absent in the early dataset, presumably due to its small size. Nonetheless, it is possible that they might have been borrowed into Tagalog in the early 20th century, but were infrequent.

From this earlier data it may be noted that Spanish agentive complex loanwords of all the three original meanings are attested in Tagalog, with the items of group (a) prevailing (as in (15a)). Note further that all the stems of the complex loanwords except one are nominal, as in (16a–b).

- (16) a. *sálmo* ‘psalm’ (< Spanish *salmo*)—*salmísta* ‘psalmist’ (< Spanish *sal-*
mista)
b. Mex. Spanish *jaranista* ‘prone to revelry; player of a *jarana* (small four-
string guitar)’ > Tagalog *haranísta* ‘person prone to revelry (archaic)’,
with the simplex *harana* ‘revelry’ also attested

There is only one hypothetical hybrid form with *-ista* (marked with ‘?’ in Table 9.5) presumably derived from a Spanish stem (17).

- (17) *dibúho* ‘drawing’ (< Spanish *dibujo*) > *dibuhísta* ‘draftsman’ (cf. Spanish *dibujador/dibujante*)

However, it is also possible that *dibuhísta* is a Mexican Spanish complex loanword, as lexical items display geographical variation in agentive suffixes, such as Peninsular Spanish *jaranero* versus Mexican Spanish *jaranista* ‘prone to revelry’ (see DRAE 2014; Rainer, 2011). Thus the historical data is insufficient to confirm whether *-ista* had been borrowed into Tagalog by the early 20th century.

The lack of hybrids indicates either very weak productivity, or the complete absence of *-ista* in Tagalog lexical derivation in the (early) 1900s. However, the presence of a number of simplex-complex pairs of Spanish loanwords with *-ista* may have provided the basis for a possible reanalysis and subsequent decomposition of stem and *-ista* suffix in complex loanwords by Tagalog speakers.

The recent data displays a considerable increase in the number of complex loanwords in *-ista*, with around 140 counted in the dictionaries of English (1987) and Rachkov (2012). The vast majority of these forms have a corresponding simplex lexeme, thus fostering their reanalysis in Tagalog. There are also 19 hybrid formations, of which 13 are formed with Spanish stems, for example (18a), four with Tagalog stems (18b), and two more with recently borrowed English stems (18c).

- (18) a. *independísta* ‘person of independent character’ < *independénte* ‘independent’ (< Spanish)
 b. *balagtasísta* ‘follower of poet Balagtas’ < *Balagtas*
 c. *raliyísta* ‘demonstration participant’ < *ráli* ‘mass demonstration’ (< English ‘rally’)

The characteristics of these nouns in *-ista* are outlined in Table 9.6.

Both the complex loanwords and the hybrid forms belong to the three original Spanish semantic groups (18a–c). A further 15 Tagalog hybrids with *-ista* are attested in the LC, but with the lowest frequencies (2 to 13 tokens in total), which may indicate their very recent creation. There are items for each of the three meanings presented above among them, mostly derived from Spanish or English nominal and adjectival stems, see (19a–f).

- (19) a. *aghamísta* ‘scientist’ < Tagalog *aghám* ‘science’ (< Skt *āgama* ‘religion; sacred science’)⁹
 b. *iligalísta* ‘one who is involved in an illegal business’ < Spanish *ilegal* ‘illegal’
 c. *parlorísta* ‘one who works in a beauty parlor/salon’ < English [*beauty*] *parlor*
 d. *mujerísta*¹⁰ ‘crossdresser or effeminate gay’ (slang) < Spanish *mujer* ‘woman’

9 See Casparis (1997).

10 There is a recent tendency in Tagalog to retain the original orthography of both Spanish and English donor words. Baklanova (2017: 353, Tab. 3) rates such cases as 0.2 % of the total number of Spanish and English borrowings in her data.

TABLE 9.6 Characteristics of nouns with *-ista* in the contemporary Tagalog dataset

Semantic group of derivates	Stem type	Avg CL	Simplex related to CL	Hybrid formations			Simplex related to HF
				Tag. stem	Spanish stem	Eng. stem	
Person of certain pro- fession/ occupation	N	c. 85	c. 70	1	6	1	8
	V	5	5	2	1	1	4
Person of certain propensity/ trait	N	2	2	-	2	-	2
	A	2	2	-	2	-	2
Follower of a trend/ party/ movement	N	c. 45	c. 40	1	2	-	3
TOTAL types		c. 140	c. 120	4	13	2	19

- e. *wangwangísta* ‘one who uses special car signal to demonstrate authority’ (neg. coll.) < Tagalog *wangwáng* ‘1. completely exposed; 2. special car signal to give a priority pass’
- f. *punkísta* ‘punk’ < English *punk*

Compared with *-ero/a*, *-ista* appears to be a more recently borrowed suffix in Tagalog, with an observable growth in productivity attested in the contemporary sources. It derives agentive nouns of the same semantic groups as *-ero/a*, with the semantics ‘person of a certain profession/occupation’ prevailing (see Table 9.6). However, *-ista* tends to convey the meaning ‘person of certain propensity’ in a neutral manner, whereas *-ero/a* conveys a negative connotation for this semantic group (see Table 9.4). The suffix *-ista* also derives nouns meaning a ‘follower of a tendency/movement/party’, which *-ero* lacks.

In Tagalog *-ista* combines with the same types of stems as the Spanish complex loanwords, with nominal stems most common for all three semantic groups. The contemporary data also comprise many complex loanwords with *-ista* that are not Spanish loanwords, but rather English cognates or false cognates formed with the suffix *-ist*, which have been reshaped in Tagalog by analogy with Spanish (20a–b).

- (20) a. *kolon-ísta* < English *colon-ist* (cf. Spanish *colono*)
- b. *loyal-ísta* < English *loyal-ist* (cf. Spanish *partidario del régimen*)

This reshaping of *-ist* > *-ista* in the context of large-scale assimilation of English lexical items makes the Spanish suffix *-ista* more frequent in Tagalog speech which, in turn, may lead to an increase in its productivity with native stems.

3.3 Spanish Suffix *-eño/a*

The Spanish suffix *-eño/a* is one of the suffixes that can form relational adjectives from proper nouns (place and personal names) and common nouns, usually with the following meanings (Gramática: 7.6ñ–7.6o; Rainer (2011: 475)):

- Born/living in N, e.g. *Madrid*—*madrileño/a* ‘born/living in Madrid’
- Pertaining to N, e.g. *Velazquez*—*velazqueño/a* ‘pertaining to Velazquez (or his painting), m/f’; *águila* ‘eagle’—*aguileño/a* ‘pertaining to an eagle, aquiline, m/f’

It is claimed that *-eño* was borrowed into Tagalog in the form *-enyo* with the meaning ‘person born/residing in some place’ (Rachkov, 1981: 59; Alcántara y Antonio, 1999). However, no clear evidence of Tagalog hybridization with the Spanish suffix *-eño* was found in this study.

No such derivatives can be attested with certainty in the historical dataset; only a small number of personal names were found. Indeed, the search found no evidence of *-enyo* hybridization in Tagalog until the end of the 19th century. During the 20th century there was a growth in number of *-enyo* derivatives in the texts. The dictionaries queried give 10 *enyo*-formations meaning ‘person born/residing in some place’, mostly with names of big cities, provinces and countries as stems. Four overt Spanish loanwords, with names of countries (21a), a city and the word ‘island’ (21b) as stems were attested.

- (21) a. *Brasilénio/a* ‘Brazilian (resident) m/f’ < Spanish *Brasileño*
 b. *islénio* ‘resident of an island’ < Spanish *isleño* ‘pertaining to an island’

Five derivatives with names of Philippine provinces as stems were also attested, as in (22).

- (22) *Batángas*—*Batang(g)énio/a* ‘resident of Batangas province, m/f’

Finally, we also found one derivative with the name of a capital as stem (23).

- (23) *Manila*—*Manilénio/a* ‘resident of Manila, m/f’

The most recent data show that derivatives with *-enyo* are in use in contemporary Tagalog, although with low frequencies (from 2 to 40 total tokens). A number of

formations has been attested, predominantly with names of the old Philippine cities and provinces as stems, in both Spanish and Tagalog orthography, as in (24a–b).

- (24) a. *Davaoéño* ‘1. born/resident of Davao city/province; 2. native dialect of Davao’
 b. *Palawéño* / *Palawénio* ‘born/resident of Paláwan island’

It is still unclear whether the nouns/adjectives related to such important geographical areas are indeed derived in Tagalog, or whether they were simply diffused in the early 20th century as loanwords from Spanish language newspapers, legal documents and other sources. The double orthography of the suffix *-enyo/-eño* at present may reflect present-day Filipinos’ awareness of its Spanish provenance, and their positive attitude to the foreign spelling. This interpretation is supported by the official introduction of some Spanish letters into the Filipino alphabet (Ortograpiyang Pambansa 2013).

All such items co-vary with the derivatives of the native nominative strategy *taga+place*, see (25a–b), where token frequencies from the LC are given in brackets.

- (25) a. *taga-Ma(y)níla(?)* (55)—*Manilényo*, *Maniléño* (41) ‘Manila-born/resident’
 b. *taga-Táguig(u)* (6)—*Taguig(u)éño* (5) ‘Taguig-born/resident’

Since further research is needed to identify cases of *-enyo* derivation with recent stems and thus to verify the productivity or lack of productivity of this Spanish suffix in Tagalog, it is not included in the analysis in the next section.

3.4 *Impact of the Spanish Agentive Suffixes -ero/a and -ista on Tagalog Derivation*

Table 9.7 presents the impact of *-ero/a* and *-ista* on the Tagalog agentive derivation inventory outlined in the preceding sections.

For the semantic groups ‘person of certain profession/occupation’ and ‘person of certain propensity/trait’ Tagalog lacks native affixal inventory to derive an agent noun from a nominal or adjectival stem. The introduction of the Spanish suffixes *-ero/a* and *-ista* into Tagalog morphology partly fills this gap. That said, with the addition of the Spanish strategies to the two existing Tagalog ones (*taga-* and *may/mag+r*), native derivation with verbal stems has become redundant, and a functional differentiation of these four strategies may be expected in the future.

TABLE 9.7 Comparison of native and Spanish strategies of agentive derivation in Tagalog

Semantic group of agentive noun	Stem type	Prefix <i>taga-</i>	Prefixed <i>mag/ mag + r</i>	Prefix <i>pala-</i>	Suffix <i>-ero/a</i>	Suffix <i>-ista</i>
Person of certain profession/occupation	N	-	-	-	+	+
	A	-	-	-	-	-
	V	+	+	-	+	+
Person born, living, or working at place	N	+	-	-	-	-
	A	-	-	-	-	-
	V	-	-	-	-	-
Person of certain propensity/trait	N	-	-	-	+ neg.	+
	A	-	-	-	+ neg.	-
	V	-	+	+	+ neg.	-
Follower of tendency/movement/party	N	-	-	-	-	+
	A	-	-	-	-	-
	V	-	-	-	-	-

The *-ero* derivation adds a negative connotation to the nouns referring to ‘person(s) of a certain propensity/trait’, while *pala-* and *-ista* are neutral. Thus, it appears to be the first item of affective morphological inventory in Tagalog. Moreover, *-ista* has introduced the new meaning ‘follower of tendency/movement/party, etc.’ to the Tagalog derivational inventory. Finally, it should be noted again that *-ero* and *-ista* are similar to the corresponding English suffixal forms *-er* and *-ist* and thus enable the phonetic assimilation of English borrowings which, in turn, appears to foster the adoption of English lexical items into Tagalog.

4 Spanish Diminutive Suffixes in Tagalog Lexical Derivation

Spanish possesses many suffixes that produce diminutives of nominal, adjectival and adverbial stems (Gramática: 9.1b). They help to express “a wide range of affective notions (size, affection, disapproval, irony, etc.)”, thus a noun + *ito/ita* “spring[s] more readily to the tongue of a Spanish-speaker than a noun+ *pequeño*” [‘small’], especially in Mexican Spanish (Batchelor and San José, 2010: 450). Jurafsky (1996: 543) shows that the basic meaning of diminutives refers to the concepts of being ‘small’ or ‘a child’, with a metaphorical development into a meaning conveying an attitude of the speaker. It has been claimed

that the Spanish diminutive suffixes *-ito/a*, *-illo/a* and *-ete* have been adopted into Tagalog nominal derivation (Wolff 1973, 2001; Baklanova, 2004; Quilis and Casado-Fresnillo, 2008).

4.1 Suffixes *-ito/a* and *-illo/a*

-Ito/a is considered to be currently the most productive diminutive suffix in Spanish, whereas historically *-illo/a* predominated (Gramática: 9.1j). This preference is manifested in, for example, the prevalence of Spanish diminutive toponyms with *-illo/a* in Spain (Gramática, 9.1m, j). Although *-illo/a* and *-ito/a* alternate with some stems (26a), in Latin America *-illo/a* is regarded as having mostly negative connotations (26b) (Batchelor and San José, 2010: 452).

- (26) a. *cuchara* ‘spoon’—*cucharita/cucharilla* ‘small spoon, teaspoon’
 b. *guerra* ‘war’—*guerrilla* ‘1. insignificant war, skirmish; 2. guerilla’

The search of the historical dataset produced the ratio of Spanish complex loanwords with *-ito/a*, *-ilyo/a* (*-illo/a*) to their related simplex loanwords, and to possible hybrid formations (Table 9.8).

Only four Spanish complex loanwords with the suffix *-ito/a* are attested in the early dataset, all of which are related to ‘an object smaller than that designated by the stem’. Two of them have their simplex pairs, such as in (27).

- (27) *palíto* ‘toothpick; matchstick; small stick’ (< Spanish *palito* ‘small stick’)—
pálo ‘stick’ (< Spanish *palo* ‘idem.’)

At least two types of hybrid formations with *-ito/a* are: one with a Spanish stem (28a), and one with a non-Spanish stem that was borrowed earlier into Tagalog (28b).

- (28) a. *naran(g)híta* ‘tangerine; small orange’ (cf. Spanish *naranjillo* ‘small green citrus’)—*narán(g)ha* ‘orange’ (< Spanish *naranja*); cf. the later loan-blended form *dalanghíta* (< Tagalog *dalandán* ‘orange’)
 b. *sampag(u)íta*—*sampága* ‘Jasminium sambac, Arabian jasmine’ < Skt *campaka* ‘Michelia Champaka’ (M-W, 1899: 388.3),¹¹ probably via Malay *cempaka* ‘Michelia Champaka tree’ (cf. Casparis, 1997: 15)

11 Skt *campaka* ‘Michelia Champaka’ as the etymon for Tagalog *sampága* with a close meaning casts doubts on the supposition of Blust and Trussel (2010) that the base of Ilokano *sampága* “may be native to some Philippine languages, the longer word with diminutive suffix appears to be a Spanish loan in both the Philippines and the Marianas”.

TABLE 9.8 Characteristics of nouns with *-ito/a* and *-ilyo/a* (*-illo/a*) in the historical dataset

Semantic group of derivates	Type of stem	-ITO/-ITA		-ILYO/-ILYA (-illo/illa)	
		Ratio of CLS: simplex	Ratio of HFS: simplex	Ratio of CLS: simplex	Ratio of HFS: simplex
Smaller object	N	4:2	2:2 1 Spanish, 1 non-Spanish	8:4	-
	A	-	-	-	-
	V	-	-	-	-
TOTAL of types		4:2	2:2	8:4	0

Though it is uncertain whether the two hybrid forms were created by Tagalog bilinguals, there is also no evidence for the Spanish provenance of these hybrids in the early dictionaries (Serrano Laktaw, 1889; Lopes and Bensley, 1895; Calderón, 1915). It is therefore possible that they may be early Tagalog hybrid forms.

Slightly more complex loanwords with *-ilyo/a* (*-illo*) are attested in the historical dataset. They are also related to ‘a smaller object’, and three occur with their simplex pairs, as in (29).

- (29) *ganchílyo/gantsílyo* ‘crochet hook’ (< Spanish *ganchillo*)—*gáncho/gántso* ‘hook; staple’ (< Spanish *gancho*)

No hybrid formations with *-ilyo/a* were found, although there are two instances of diminutive Tagalog hybrid formations that may pertain to the lexicon of the early 20th century, despite being unattested in this limited dataset. Both forms are derived from Tagalog stems and have the basic meaning of ‘younger, child’. As will be seen below, both are attested in the contemporary data, where they have a much higher token frequency (c. 500 tokens each) than other hybrid forms from the same period, which may indicate their older provenance. Two examples can be observed in (30a–b).

- (30) a. *binatílyo* ‘preadolescent boy’ < Tagalog *bináta*? ‘young man, bachelor’
b. *dalagíta* ‘preadolescent girl’ < Tagalog *dalága* ‘maiden’

There are 39 complex loanwords with diminutive *-ito/a* attested in the contemporary data, the majority of which have nominal stems. All of them pertain to

one of the two semantic groups ‘object smaller than the stem’ (31a) and ‘child (of human or animal)’ (31b–c). See also Table 9.9.

- (31) a. *labahíta* ‘small razor; small penknife’ (< Spanish *navajita* ‘small clasp-knife’ (archaic))—*labáha* ‘razor; knife’ (< Spanish *navaja* ‘clasp-knife; razor’)
 b. *guwapíto/a* ‘pretty boy/girl’ (< Spanish *guapito/a*)—*guwápo* ‘nice, pretty’ (< Spanish *guapo*)
 c. *kabríto/a* ‘goatling, m/f’ (< Spanish *cabrito*)—*kábra* ‘goat’ (< Spanish *cabra*)

Spanish complex loanwords in *-ilyo/a* outnumber those in *-ito/a*, with a total of 53. They have nominal stems and pertain to ‘an object smaller than the stem’, as in (32).

- (32) *granílyo* ‘small grain’ (< Spanish *granillo*)—*gráno* ‘grain; pimple’ (< Spanish *grano*)

No complex loanwords in *-ito/a* or *-ilyo/a* were found with negative connotations, although three with the suffixal form *-silyo* (< *-cillo*) have a slightly negative or pejorative meaning, referring to ‘someone less significant than the stem’, see (33).

- (33) *gobernador-silyo* (< Spanish *gobernadorcillo*) ‘city authority lower than governor’—*gobernador* (< Spanish *gobernador*) ‘governor’

Regardless of the significant number of simplex-complex pairs of diminutive complex loanwords pertaining to the basic meaning ‘small object’, and some meaning ‘child’, contemporary Tagalog hybrid formations with *-ito/a*, *-ilyo/a* show a shift toward human nouns with affective connotation. More specifically, *-ito/a* appears to have recently developed an ironical connotation to a person denoted by the stem, close to the meaning ‘one who looks like/imitates the stem’, such as in (34a–c), where token frequency in the LC is provided in brackets.

- (34) a. *bagíto* ‘newbie; someone unskilled’ (359)—Tagalog *bágo* ‘new’
 b. *baklíta* ‘effeminate male’ (coll.) (59)—Tagalog *baklá?* ‘gay’
 c. *puríta* ‘one who looks like a poor person’ (ironic) (5) < English *poor* (as an unassimilated borrowing)

The hybrid formation types with *-ito/a* meaning ‘child’ (35a) or ‘small object’ (35b) are scarce and formed with Spanish stems. Again, LC token frequency is provided in brackets.

- (35) a. *Tsinító/a* ‘(one who looks like) a Chinese boy/girl’ (8)—*Tsino* ‘Chinese’ (< Spanish *Chino*)
 b. *platító* ‘small portion; small dish’ (cf. Spanish *platillo* ‘small dish’ (archaic)), (18)—*plátó* ‘dish; portion’ (< Spanish *plato*)

The suffix *-ilyo/a* is attested in only three hybrid forms whose attribution is problematic. They are all derived from Spanish borrowed stems, however, these stems do not appear in the dictionaries consulted (Serrano Laktaw, 1889; Lopes, Bensley, 1895; DRAE). All the formations are agentive human nouns with an ironic/negative connotation, as in (36).

- (36) *maestrílyo* ‘one who likes to sermonize’—*maestro* ‘teacher’ (< Spanish *maestro*)

The characteristics of the attested complex nouns and hybrid forms with *-ito/a* and *-ilyo/a* in Tagalog and their associated ratios are presented in Table 9.9.

As discussed in Section 2, Tagalog lacks a clear native diminutive suffixal strategy, relying instead on the suffix-stem duplication (*R+(h)an*) construction. Rather than conveying the canonical meaning of ‘small object’ for inanimate stems and ‘child’ for animate stems, the *R+(h)an* strategy conveys the mixed meaning ‘small or imitated object’ for inanimate stems, with rare cases of nouns with human-related stems conveying a mildly negative connotation, namely ‘one who imitates/pretends’. Thus, in this case the trigger for transfer cannot have been functional and structural congruency of the affixes between the two languages (Winford, 2003: 92–93; Matras, 2007: 34; Chamoreau, 2012: 85–86). That said, the morphotactic transparency of the Spanish suffix might have facilitated its borrowing into the Tagalog system (see Gardani, 2008). Moreover, as Tagalog lacks native affixal inventory for the semantic group ‘younger, child’, the borrowing of *-ito/a* shows potential, albeit weakly, to fill this gap. The recent hybrids with *-ito/a* are formed purely as agentive nouns, with nominal and adjectival stems of Tagalog, Spanish and English provenance.

The derivation with *-ito/a* thus provides Tagalog with a clear diminutive strategy. Its interaction with the native *R+(h)an* strategy may account for the development of a similar meaning for human noun derivations with *-ito/a*, such as *sántu-santú-han* ‘one who pretends to be holy, a prude’ and *santo-santító* with the same meaning. Thus the new pattern with *-ito/a* seems to undergo

TABLE 9.9 Characteristics of nouns with *-ito/a* and *-ilyo/a* in contemporary Tagalog

Semantic group of derivates	Type of stem	-ITO/-ITA		-ILYO/-ILYA	
		CLS: Simplex	HFS: Simplex	CLS: Simplex	HFS: Simplex
Smaller object/animal	N	32:17	2:2 1 Spanish, 1 non-Spanish	52:21	-
	A	-	-	1:1	-
Child	N	6:6	3:3 2 Spanish, 1 non-Spanish	-	1:1 1 Spanish
One who is sim- ilar to/imitates the stem	N	-	6:6 2 Spanish, 4 non-Spanish	-	2:2 (neg.) 2 Spanish
	A	-	3:2 1 Spanish, 2 non-Spanish	-	-
	V	-	1:1 1 non- Spanish	-	-
TOTAL ratio of types		38:23	15:14	53:22	3:3

a functional differentiation towards an affective connotation, mostly of the meaning ‘one who looks like/imitates the stem’. The current emergence of personal names (nicknames) with *-ito/a* attested in the LC corroborates this view, since they also bear affectiveness. Take, for example, *Milk-ita* as a brand name of milk products, *Dracul-ita* as a movie character, and nicknames such as *Daldal-ita* (< Tagalog *daldál* ‘talkative’).

It appears that the borrowing of *-ito*, *-illo/-ilyo* into Tagalog might have begun in the early 20th century, or perhaps even earlier, but has not yet reached its completion. There is clear evidence of only a small number hybrids adopted by the masses, such as *sampagita* as a Philippine national symbol; *dalagita* and *binatilyo* as the terms filling the lexical gap ‘teenager’ with relatively high frequencies (c. 500 tokens each in the LC). The suffix *-ito/a* still shows weak productivity, mostly with a mildly negative or ironical meaning. Low token frequency and the absence of some of the hybrid forms with *-ito/a* in the dictionaries consulted indicate their most recent creation. Such items still appear to be

cases of individual usage by (educated) Tagalog speakers. The scarcity of hybrid forms with *-ilyo/a* in the dictionaries and their absence in from the corpora indicates that this derivation strategy is unproductive in contemporary Tagalog.

4.2 Spanish Suffix *-ete*

The suffix *-ete/a* is among the less frequent diminutive suffixes in Spanish, being used both neutrally and affectionally or pejoratively (Batchelor and San José, 2010: 452). It is also productive to a certain extent as a nominal suffix denoting an instrument or utensil, such as *color* ‘color’—*colorete* ‘blusher, rouge’ (Rainer, 2011: 217–218).

Ten complex loanwords with *-ete* are attested in the historical Tagalog dataset, all of which refer to an instrument or utensil, such as *bilyéte* ‘bill; ticket’ (< Spanish *billete*). No simplex pairs or diminutives were registered. Only one hybrid form with *-ete* occurs (37), which might have been created by Tagalog-Spanish bilinguals rather than by analogy, since there are no simplex-complex pairs attested in the data. This form is still in use at present (70 tokens in the LC).

(37) *kaliwéte* ‘left-handed; leftist’—*kaliwá?* ‘left’

The contemporary Tagalog dataset includes 39 complex loanwords with *-ete*, which relate to the semantic groups of ‘instrument/utensil’ (38a), ‘smaller object/animal’ (38b) and ‘person of certain occupation’ (38c); note that almost half of these forms also have a related simplex loanword.

- (38) a. *asuléte* ‘bluing (for linen)’ (< Spanish *azulete*)—*asúl* ‘blue’ (< Spanish *azul*)
 b. *toréte* ‘a small bull’ (< Spanish *torete* ‘small bull; difficult point’)¹²—*tóro* ‘bull’ (< Spanish *toro*)
 c. *gruméte* ‘younger, ship’s boy’ (< Spanish *grumete*)—(no simplex)

There are only two more hybrid formations in the recent data, one with a Spanish borrowed stem (39a) registered only in Rachkov (2012), the other with a Tagalog stem (39b) that is an analogical creation based on (37).

- (39) a. *negosyéte* ‘huckster, haggler’ (neg.)—*negósyo* ‘commerce, business’ (< Spanish *negocio*)
 b. *kananéte* ‘right-handed’—*kánan* ‘right (side)’

¹² See Lopes and Bensley (1895: 599).

TABLE 9.10 Characteristics of nouns with *-ete* in contemporary Tagalog

Semantic group of derivates	Type of stem	Ratio	
		CL:Simplex	HF:Simplex
Instrument/utensil	N	25:7	-
	A	1:1	-
Smaller object/animal	N	10:7	-
Person of certain occupation	N	3:0	1:1 (neg.) Spanish stem
Person of certain trait	N	-	2:2 Tagalog stems
TOTAL ratio of types	39:15	3:3	

Table 9.10 outlines the characteristics of nouns with *-ete* in contemporary Tagalog.

Thus, although the complex loanwords with *-ete* in Tagalog mostly refer to an ‘instrument/utensil’ or a ‘smaller object’, no hybrid forms exist with such meanings. The three attested hybrids do not show consistency in semantics, with one Spanish-derived item referring to ‘a person of certain occupation’, and another denoting a ‘person of certain trait’. Indeed, except for (39) as a clear analogical creation, there is no other evidence for the productivity of *-ete* in the recent corpus.

5 Discussion of the Results

Contact-induced change requires a certain degree of bilingualism in the recipient community for linguistic innovations to spread (Winford, 2003a). However, until the 19th century there had been only a very small stratum of bilingual Spanish-Tagalog mestizos in the Philippines (Lipski et al., 1999). Only in the late 19th century did the bilingual community grow significantly due to a “new wealthy class of Chinese mestizos” who readily learned and used Spanish for their commercial interests (Thompson 2003: 16). Additionally, “individuals who have large numbers of weak ties outside the community tend to be innovators, and to serve as instigators of language change” (Bright, 1998: 90–91; see also Milroy and Milroy, 1992). In the case of the Philippines, individuals with higher socioeconomic status and stronger inter-community ties, namely

TABLE 9.11 Scale of directness of affix borrowing

Directness of borrowing	Direct borrowing					Indirect borrowing
Complex loanwords:	None	Few	Few	Many	Many	
Frequent simplex loanwords:	None	None	Many	Many	Many	
Knowledge of donor language:	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	

SEIFART, 2015: 527, FIG. 3

Spanish-Tagalog mestizos (in local administration) and active Chinese-Tagalog mestizos (as leaders in trade) might have been the only agents of Spanish borrowing and innovations in Tagalog up to the early 20th century.

The Tagalog-Spanish contact situation corroborates Winford’s (2003b: 134) observation that *direct borrowing* of bound morphemes “requires a high degree of bilingualism among individual speakers”, while “certain structural innovations in an RL appear to be mediated by lexical borrowing”, i.e. adopted through *indirect borrowing*. As shown in Sections 3 and 4, the majority of hybrid creations with Spanish suffixes have a number of simplex-complex pairs of Spanish loanwords as the foreground for the indirect borrowing process. However, there are some Tagalog-Spanish hybrids which do not have such corresponding pairs of simplex-complex loanwords.

This situation correlates with Seifart’s (2015) assumption, that both *direct* and *indirect* scenarios of affix borrowing may apply in the majority of cases, making it possible to define only the *primary* character of the borrowing in a given RL. As such, Seifart (2015: 527) proposes a scale of directness of affix borrowing, which is reproduced in Table 9.11.

Three major criteria indicate that *indirect* borrowing (i.e. the borrowing of an affix from the loanwords adopted in the RL) was “the only or primary process involved” in the transfer of an affix to the RL (Seifart, 2015: 514):

- 1) The number of complex loanword types is larger than the number of hybrid formations;
- 2) The existence of pairs of loanwords with and without a certain affix; and
- 3) Low token frequencies of complex loanwords, in comparison to the frequencies of their corresponding simplex forms.

These three conditions provide a strong basis for reanalyzing the structure of a complex loanword in the RL, and for extracting its affix for subsequent use in analogical creation. As observed by Bybee (1995: 434), “the more forms that bear an affix, the stronger the representation of that affix, the greater likelihood

TABLE 9.12 Summary of distribution of agentive *-ero/a* in Tagalog historical data

CRITERION	VALUE	RATIO
Ratio of CL to HF	25:8	3:1
Ratio of total CL to the simplex-complex pairs	25:13	2:1
Ratio of total simplex-complex pairs to infrequent CL*	13:3	4:1

* The limited dataset appears insufficient to check criterion 3.

that that affix will be productive”. Consequently, “if no complex loanwords that would include the borrowed affix are attested, this is a strong indicator of direct borrowing” (Seifart, 2015: 528). In this case, there is no lexical basis in the RL for extracting the affix, so a speaker may only receive it directly from their knowledge of the donor language.

Regarding the simplex-complex pairs of Spanish loanwords attested in Tagalog, *indirect* borrowing appears to be the primary mode of adopting most of the suffixes discussed in the previous sections. To verify this assumption, Seifart’s methodology is applied to analyze the ratio of complex loanwords to hybrid formations with each Spanish agentive and diminutive suffix discussed. Table 9.12 illustrates this analysis using the case of *-ero*.

Table 9.12 indicates that Seifart’s criteria 1 and 2 are well met in our data: the number of compound loanword types with *-ero/a* is three times larger than that of hybrid formations; and half of the compound loanwords have their simplex pairs in Tagalog. Criterion 3 is only partially met, partly due to the rather limited early text dataset, which extends to only about 82,500 tokens, making it difficult to correctly assess token frequencies. Thus, the above distribution ratio should be regarded as a preliminary estimate, which requires a follow-up study using a larger corpus, preferably including texts from early newspapers as a vehicle for lexical innovations. Nonetheless, on the basis of criteria 1 and 2, it seems fair to propose that the primary process involved in the transfer of the Spanish suffix *-ero/a* to Tagalog was *indirect borrowing* from a number of complex loanwords.

The second adopted Spanish agentive suffix *-ista* is less productive and appears to have been borrowed into Tagalog more recently than *-ero*, since the early dataset does not include any *-ista* hybrids with a Tagalog stem (see Table 9.5). The ratio of complex loanwords to hybrid formations (with a Spanish stem) is 14:1, while the ratio of total complex loanwords to their simplex-complex pairs is 1:0.8. These distributions served as a sound basis for the decomposition of the suffix from the complex loanwords by speakers. A sig-

nificant growth in the number of complex loanwords with *-ista* and the corresponding recent simplex loanwords (c. 140:120) also correlates with a growth in hybrid formations (19, including items with Tagalog stems; recall Table 9.6). This again indicates the *indirect* character of borrowing of the suffix *-ista* into Tagalog.

As shown in Tables 9.8 and 9.9, several compound loanwords and hybrid formations with *-ito/a* are already attested in the early dataset, and both increase in frequency in the contemporary data, with the same ratio of 2:1 during the two periods. Many of the compound loanwords are less frequent, however, than their simplex pairs. Thus *-ito/a* also meets Seifart's criteria for the primarily *indirect* character of borrowing.

As only one possible hybrid with *-ilyo/a* and one with *-ete* are attested in the early dataset, both with Spanish stems, we assume that these Spanish suffixes might not have been adopted into Tagalog until the 1900s. The simplex-complex pairs with and without *-ilyo/a* in Tagalog, the lower frequency of many compound loanwords compared with their related simplex types, as well as the lack of hybrid formations with Tagalog stems strongly suggest that this possible *indirect* suffixal borrowing is not yet complete, and that the suffix *-ilyo* is not productive in Tagalog.

As for *-ete*, Seifart's criteria 2 and 3 are not met, due to the lack or absence of the simplex corresponding forms for the complex loanwords. Thus it is possible that the only hybrid formation attested in the early data (37) could be an individual creation by Spanish-Tagalog bilinguals who might have directly transferred the Spanish suffix onto the Tagalog stem. In other words, they may have extracted the suffix using knowledge of Spanish (the source language) "with its subsequent use on native stems" (Seifart, 2015: 529). Except for (39) as a clear analogical creation, there is no other evidence for the productivity of *-ete* in the recent corpus, thus it appears to not yet have become a part of Tagalog lexical derivation. However, a more detailed investigation with a larger dataset would be instructive for clarifying the status of *-ilyo/a* and *-ete* in Tagalog.

6 Concluding Remarks

The Tagalog data presented in this study corroborate the observation that "in adstrate situations, borrowing affects the lexicon first, before it extends to other domains of language structure" (Haspelmath, 2009: 50). The majority of the Spanish suffixes discussed here appear to have been adopted through a primarily *indirect* borrowing process, that is, from Spanish complex loanwords (Seifart, 2015).

It has been demonstrated that structural items from a source language are borrowed more easily if the function they express already exists in the recipient language, but in a less analytic form (Gómez Rendón, 2008: 102). This is also true for the Tagalog case: the Spanish suffix *-ero/a* displays clear morpheme boundaries, and has thus provided a comprehensive strategy for deriving agentive nouns from any type of stem.

We found that *-ero/a* is the most productive Spanish nominal suffix in Tagalog. As it may combine with any type of stem in Tagalog, including unassimilated borrowings, this may also foster its hybridization with English borrowings by Tagalog-English bilinguals, such as *stiréro* ‘teaser; cheater; prankster’ < English (*to*) *stir*. Moreover, the suffixes *-ero* and *-ista*, which correspond to English *-er* and *-ist*, promote the phonetic assimilation of English borrowings, thus increasing the adoption of more English lexical items into Tagalog. Indeed, the growing adaptation of English lexemes through such a hispanization process may increase the amount of *-ero* and *-ista*-derivatives in Tagalog which, in turn, may lead to the hybridization of the suffixes with a wider range of stems (see Wolff, 2001).

Spanish suffixes in Tagalog provide a good example of the widely attested tendency for polysemantic morphemes from a source language to be borrowed into a recipient language with their most concrete meanings and functions (Winford, 2003a: 91–92). However, “the erstwhile patterns come to coexist with new ones, and new rules develop governing the functional differentiation of new and old patterns” (Aikhenvald 2007: 46). Indeed the derivation with *-ito/a* in Tagalog seems to interact with the native diminutive strategy *R+(h)an* possessing the mixed semantics of ‘smallness’ and ‘imitation’. This interaction may account for the development of a similar meaning for the human noun derivation with *-ito/a*, namely ‘one who looks like/imitates the stem’.

To conclude, it should be noted that the use of these Spanish suffixes as nominalizers only enlarges the purely nominal morphological base of Tagalog, and in the future may lead to a more distinct functional distribution of the Tagalog derivational inventory, with clearer boundaries between the lexical classes.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank John Wolff, Marian Klammer, Francesca R. Moro, Maria Kristina Gallego and the anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this chapter. Any remaining shortcomings are the authors’ responsibility.

Appendix

TABLE 9.13 Hybrids with *-ero/a* in contemporary Tagalog

No	Tagalog hybrid formation	# of tokens in LC	Tagalog simplex word	# of tokens in LC	SL		
1.	ansikutero	'loiterer, truant'	o	ansikót	'loitering; truancy'	o	Tag
2.	babaero	'philanderer'	143	babae	'woman'	12027	Tag
3.	balitero	'reporter'	o	balítaq	'news'	4573	Tag
4.	bangkero	'boatman'	19	bangkáq	'boat'	537	Tag
5.	baság-ulero/-a	'trouble-maker, m/f'	7	baság-ulo	'altercation; scuffle'	3	Tag
6.	boksingero	'boxer'	543	bóksing	'box, boxing'	348	Eng
7.	bulsero	'pickpocket' (cf. Spanish, Mex Spanish <i>bolseador</i> , <i>carterista</i>)	o	bulsá [<i>< Mex Spanish bolsa</i> 'pocket; pouch']	'pocket'	387	MexSp
8.	bombéra	'porno actress' (cf. Spanish <i>bombero</i> 'fireman; worker on petrol pump')	o	bómba [<i>< Spanish bomba</i> 'pump, fire engine; bomb']	'pump; bomb; porno scene'	435 as 'bomb; pump' 2 as 'porno scene'	Sp
9.	boratséro/-a	'drunkard, m/f' (cf. Spanish <i>borrachera</i> 'drunkenness')	o	borátso [<i>< Spanish borracho</i> 'drunk; drunkard']	'drunk'	o	Sp
10.	bosero	'peeper, voyeur'	6	boso [<i><? Mex buzo</i> 'Look out! Watch it!']	'peeping'	1	MexSp?
11.	bulakbulero/-a	'truant; vagabond m/f'	1	bulakból [<i>< English black ball</i>]	'idle, truant; black ball (in ballot)'	12	Eng
12.	bungangéro/-a	'chatterbox, m/f'	5	bunganga	'gullet of animals/fish; mouth'	151	Tag
13.	butangéro	'bandit, gangster'	5	butáng	'beating up; thrashing'	o	Tag
14.	kaing(in)éro	'one who clears land for farming'	1	kaingín	'burning off in field for cultivation; cleared land in a forest'	12	Tag
15.	kartomanséro	'fortune-teller by cartomancy' (cf. Spanish <i>cartomante</i>)	o	kartomans(i)ya [<i>< Spanish cartomancia</i>]	'fortune-telling by cartomancy'	o	Sp
16.	kaskaséro/a	'speed maniac, m/f'	27	kaskás	'sudden effort; spurt; rush'	1	Tag

TABLE 9.13 Hybrids with *-ero/a* in contemporary Tagalog (*cont.*)

No	Tagalog hybrid formation	# of tokens in LC	Tagalog simplex word	# of tokens in LC	SL		
17.	Katipunéro/a	'revolutionary of Katipunan society'	36	Katipúnán	'revolutionary society'	234	Tag
18.	komikéro	'comic, clown' (cf Spanish payaso 'clown', cómico 'comic')	8	komiko [< Spanish cómico]	'clown, comedian; comic (adj.)'	4	Sp
19.	daldalero/-a	'gabbler; gossip; chatterbox, m/f'	37	daldál	'gossiping; jabber; talkative'	1	Tag
20.	dupléro	'participant of duplo poetry competition'	1	dúplo [< Spanish duplo 'double; a group of two']	'poetic duel as competition'	4	Sp
21.	hambugéro	'boaster, braggart'	0	hambóg	'boastful, arrogant'	25	Tag
22.	isnabéro/-a	'snob, m/f'	18	isnáb [< English snob]	'snob'	1	Eng
23.	lakwatséro/-a	'truant; loiterer'	6	lakwátsa [? < Mex (el)acuache 'buddy, mate']	'truancy; staying away from school or work'	12	Mex Sp?
24.	langiséro/-a	'smoothie, flatterer'	0	langís	'oil'	1383	Tag
25.	lasing(g)éro	'drunkard'	7	lasíng	'drunk; inebriated'	520	Tag
26.	madyongéro	'player of mah-jong'	0	madyóng / majóng [< ? Ch/Mal]	'game of mah-jong'	4	? Ch/Mal
27.	musikéro/-a	'musician, m/f' (cf. Spanish músico)	182	músika [< Spanish música]	'music'	1099	Sp
28.	osyoséro/-a usyoséro/-a	'unduly curious person, m/f'	8	osyóso/usyóso * [< Spanish ocioso 'idle']	'curious; idle'	2	Sp
29.	pakialaméro/-a	'meddler; busybody'	31	pakialám	'interfering, meddling'	561	Tag
30.	palikéro	'man who is too free and insincere with women, philanderer'	10	? palíki?, mamalíki? 'to philander'	** 'philandering'	0	Tag
31.	pangging(g)éro/-a	'player of panggingge, m/f'	0	panggingge / panggingue	'card game of unknown origin, resembling rummy' (popular in the Philippines at least in late 19th-early 20th century)	0	?

TABLE 9.13 Hybrids with *-ero/a* in contemporary Tagalog (*cont.*)

No	Tagalog hybrid formation	# of tokens in LC	Tagalog simplex word	# of tokens in LC	SL		
32.	parakaidéro	‘paratrooper’ (cf. Tagalog parakaidista < Spanish paracaidista)	o	parakaída/ parakáyda [< Spanish paracaídas]	‘parachute’	2	Sp
33.	pasyaléro	‘gadabout, wanderer, flaneur’	o	pasyál [< Spanish pasear ‘to take a walk; to go for a ride’]	‘stroll; taking a walk; a walk for pleasure’	5	Sp
34.	panitikéro	‘bookman; member of Panitikan society’	o	pánitik(án)	‘literature; Panitikan literary society’	44o	Tag
35.	sabungéro	‘fan/frequent participant of cockfight’	47	sábong	‘cockfight’	91	Tag
36.	salamangkéro	‘conjurer; wizard’	42	salamángka [< Spanish salamanca ‘cave for sorcery’]	‘conjuring; magic; sleight of hand’	46	Sp
37.	satsatéro/a	‘chatterbox; scandalmonger, m/f’	o	satsát	‘idle talk; gossip’	15	Tag
38.	sorbetéro	‘ice cream vendor’ (cf. Spanish vendedor de hielo)	3	sorbétes [< Spanish sorbete ‘sherbet; iced drink’]	‘ice cream’	22	Sp
39.	stiréro	‘teaser; cheater; prankster’ (slang)	o	N/A	English (to) stir	o	Eng
40.	tinahéro	‘producer/seller of tinaha jars’	o	tináha	‘earthen jar for water; 12,5 gallon liquid measure’	o	Tag
41.	tsineléro	‘1. producer/seller of slippers; 2. home-body’	o	tsinélas [< Spanish chinelas, pl]	‘slipper(s)’	142	Sp
42.	tubéro	‘plumber, pipe fitter’ (cf. Tagalog plomero < Spanish)	13	túbo [< Spanish tubo]	‘tube, pipe’	ab. 56**	Sp
43.	umbagéro	‘pugnacious; prone to beat up; ‘brave man’ (Rachkov 2012)	8	umbág	‘a punch’	o	Tag
44.	usiséro/-a	‘very inquisitive person, m/f’	41	usísa? [< Spanish ocioso ‘idle; pointless’] *	‘inquiry; examination’	23	Sp

TABLE 9.13 Hybrids with *-ero/a* in contemporary Tagalog (cont.)

No	Tagalog hybrid formation	# of tokens in LC	Tagalog simplex word	# of tokens in LC	SL
45.	utangéro/-a 'one who often makes debts, m/f' (neg.); 'debtor, m/f?' (Rachkov 2012)	2	utang 'debt'	1441	Tag

PATTERN ADOPTED FROM BAKKER AND HEKKING (2012: TABLE 7)

Abbreviations: Ch – Chinese (incl. dialect), Eng – English, f – feminine, LC – Leipzig Corpus, Mal – Malay, m – masculine, Sp – Spanish, Mex Sp – Mexican Spanish, SL – source language, ? – origin uncertain.
* The simplex forms *usisa?* and *osyóso* are both from Spanish *ocioso* 'idle'. The difference in meaning, phonetics, number of derivates, and frequency (22 vs. 2 tokens in LC) allow us to assume that the Spanish lexeme has been borrowed twice, with *usisa?* adopted at an earlier stage of Spanish colonization than *osyóso*.
** Due to the ambiguity of the type *tubo* in the LC, comprising the homonyms 'pipe, tube', 'born', 'profit, income' and 'sugarcane', the quantity of tokens for 'pipe, tube' in the first 250 entries has been counted manually (38 tokens), and an average of such tokens for the total 376 entries with *tubo* has been estimated (56.4).

Bibliography

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2007). Grammars in contact: a cross-linguistic perspective. In: Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y., and Dixon, R.M.W. (eds.), *Grammars in contact: A cross-linguistic typology*. Explorations in Linguistic Typology, 4. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1–66.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2012). 'Invisible' loans: how to borrow a bound form. In: Johanson, Lars, and Robbeets, Martine (eds.), *Copies versus cognates in bound morphology*. Brill's Studies in Language, Cognition and Culture, 2. Leiden: Brill, pp. 167–185.

Alcántara y Antonio T. (1999). *Mga Hispanismo sa Filipino (Batay sa Komunikasyong Pangmadla ng Filipinas: Pagaaral Lingguwistiko)*. Quezon City: UP Diliman.

Baayen, R. Harald. (2008). Corpus linguistics in morphology: morphological productivity. In: Lüdeling, Anke, and Kytö, Merja (eds.), *Corpus Linguistics. An international handbook*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter, pp. 900–919.

Bakker, Dik, and Hekking, Ewald. (2012). Constraints on morphological borrowing: Evidence from Latin America. In: Johanson, Lars, and Martine Robbeets (eds.), *Copies versus cognates in bound morphology*. Brill's Studies in Language, Cognition and Culture, 2. Leiden: Brill, pp. 187–220.

Baklanova, Ekaterina. (2004). Interference in Tagalog as a Result of Borrowing. *Pilipinas. A Journal of Philippine Studies*, 42: 95–116.

- Baklanova, Ekaterina. (2016). On marginal gender in Tagalog: A case study. *Proceedings on XIII LESEWA*: 25–33. Moscow: Yazyki Narodov Mira.
- Baklanova Ekaterina. (2017). On contact-induced changes in modern Tagalog: A case study. In: Ogloblin Alexander, Yanson Rudolf, Dmitrenko Sergey (eds.), *Intercivilizational Contacts In South-East Asia: Historical Perspectives and Globalization*. Saint Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriya, pp. 329–359.
- Batchelor, R.E., and San José, Miguel Ángel. (2010) *A Reference Grammar of Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blake, Frank R. (1925). *A grammar of the Tagalog language, the chief native idiom of the Philippine Islands*. New Haven, Conn.: American oriental society. URL: <https://archive.org/details/agy9509.0001.001.umich.edu/page/80/mode/2up>. Accessed on December 12, 2020.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. (1917). *Tagalog Texts with Grammatical Analysis*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Blust, Robert and Trussel, Stephen. (2010). *Austronesian Comparative Dictionary*, web edition. 2010 (rev. 2016). URL: www.trussel2.com/ACD. Accessed on July 2, 2020.
- Blust, Robert. (2013). *The Austronesian Languages*, revised edition/SEAMLES Series. Canberra: Australian National University. URL: <https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/10191/6/Blust-2013-AustronesianLanguages.pdf> Accessed on 14 March 2021.
- Bowen, J. Donald (1971). Hispanic languages and influence on Oceania. In: Sebeok, Thomas A. (ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics 8, pt. 2*. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 938–952.
- Bright, William. (1998). Social Factors in Language Change. In: Coulmas, Florian (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics 4). Oxford & Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, pp. 81–91.
- Bybee, Joan. 1995. Regular morphology and the lexicon. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 10(5): 425–455.
- Calderón, Sofronio G. (1915). *Diccionario Ingles-Español-Tagalog (Con partes de la oracion y pronunciacion figurada)*. Primera edición. Manila: Libreria y papeleria de J. Martinez.
- Casparis, J.G. de (1997). *Sanskrit loan-words in Indonesian: An annotated check-list of words from Sanskrit in Indonesian and Traditional Malay*. Jakarta: Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya.
- Chamoreau, Claudine. (2012). Spanish diminutive markers -ito/-ita in Mesoamerican languages. A challenge for acceptance of gender distinction. In: Vanhove, Martine, Stolz, Thomas, and Urdze, Aina (eds.), *Morphologies in Contact* (Studia Typologica 10). Berlin & Boston: Akademie Verlag, pp. 71–92.
- De Guzman, V.P. (1996). Lexical categories in Tagalog. *Pan-Asiatic Linguistics: Proceed-*

- ings of the Fourth International Symposium on Languages and Linguistics*, vol. 1. Salaya: Mahidol University, pp. 307–396.
- DRAE. (2014). *Diccionario de la Lengua Española*. 23rd ed. Madrid: Real Academia Española. URL: <https://dle.RAE.es/>. Accessed Jan-Feb 2020.
- Dworkin, Steven N. (2012). *A History of the Spanish Lexicon: a Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press on Demand.
- English, Leo James. (1987). *Tagalog-English Dictionary*. Manila: National Book Store.
- Fernández, Mauro (2013). The Representation of Spanish in the Philippine Islands. In: Del Valle, José (ed.), *A Political History of Spanish: The Making of a Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 364–379.
- Fishman, J.A. (1967). Bilingualism with and without diglossia; Diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23(2): 29–38.
- Gardani, Francesco. (2008). *Borrowing of inflectional morphemes in language contact*. Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang.
- Gómez Rendón Jorge A. (2008). *Typological and social constraints on language contact: Amerindian languages in contact with Spanish*, vols. 1 & 2. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Goulet, Rosalina Morales. (1971). English, Spanish and Tagalog: A study of grammatical, lexical and cultural interference. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, Special Monograph Issue, no. 1.
- Gramática. (2011). *Nueva gramática de la lengua española. Morfología. Sintaxis. Fonética y fonología*, ed. by Ignacio Bosque. Madrid: Real Academia Española/Asociación de Academias de la Lengua Española.
- Haspelmath, Martin. (2009). Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues. In: Haspelmath, Martin, and Tadmor, Uri, *Loanwords in the world's languages*. Berlin & New York: Mouton De Gruyter, pp. 35–54.
- Hay, Jennifer. (2001). Lexical frequency in morphology: Is everything relative? *Linguistics*, 39: 1041–1070.
- Haugen, Einar. (1969). *The Norwegian language in America. A study in bilingual behavior*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. (2009). Notes on Tagalog nominalism. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 35(1): 115–123.
- Jurafsky, Daniel. (1996). Universal tendencies in the semantics of the diminutive. *Language*, 72(3): 533–578.
- Lipski, John M., with Mühlhäusler, P., and Duthin, F. (1996). Spanish in the Pacific. In: Wurm, Stephen A., Mühlhäusler, Peter, and Tryon, Darrell T. (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 271–298.
- Lopes, José M., and Bensley, Edward R. (1895). *Nuevo diccionario inglés-español y español-inglés*. Paris: Garnier. URL: <https://archive.org/details/nuevodiccionario00lopeoft>. Accessed on 2–10 November 2020

- López, Cecilio. (1965). The Spanish overlay in Tagalog. *Lingua*, 14: 467–504.
- Matras, Yaron. (2007). The borrowability of structural categories. In: Matras, Yaron, and Sakel, Jeanette (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 31–73.
- Milroy, Lesley, and Milroy, James. (1992). Social network and social class: Toward an integrated sociolinguistic model. *Language in Society*, 21(1): 1–26.
- M-W – Monier-Williams, Monier. (1899). *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, new edition*. Delhi, Varanasi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Muysken, Pieter. (2012). Spanish affixes in the Quechua languages: A multidimensional perspective. *Lingua*, 122(5): 481–493.
- Ortograpiyang Pambansa. (2013). *Unang Edisiyon*. Manila: Komisyon sa Wikang Pambansa.
- Payne, Thomas E. (1997). *Describing morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Potet, Jean-Paul G. (2016). *Tagalog Borrowings and Cognates*. Raleigh: Lulu Press.
- Quilis, Antonio, and Casado-Fresnillo, Celia. (2008). *La lengua Espanola en Filipinas: Historia, situacion actual. El Chabacano. Antología de textos*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Rachkov, Gennadij E. (1981). *Введение в Морфологию Современного Тагальского Языка* [Introduction to the morphology of Modern Tagalog]. Leningrad: Leningrad State University.
- Rachkov, Gennadij E. (2012). *Новый тагальско-русский словарь* [New Tagalog-Russian Dictionary], vols. 1 & 2. Saint Petersburg: Saint Petersburg State University.
- Rainer, Franz. (2011). *Spanische Wortbildungslehre*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Rau, Der-Hwa V. (1992). Language contact in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 23(1–2): 91–109.
- Rodríguez-Ponga, Rafael. (2009). *Del español al Chamorro. Lenguas en contacto en el Pacífico*. Madrid: Ediciones Gondo.
- Schachter, Paul, and Otones, Fe T. (1972). *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Seifart, Frank. (2015). Direct and indirect affix borrowing. *Language*, 91(3): 511–532.
- Seifart, Frank. (2017). Patterns of affix borrowing in a sample of 100 languages. *Journal of Historical Linguistics*, 7(3): 389–343.
- Seifart, Frank. (2020). *AfBo: A world-wide survey of affix borrowing*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- Serrano Laktaw, P. (1889). *Diccionario Hispano-Tagalog*. Manila: Estab. Tipografico La Opinion.
- Shkarban, Lina I. (1995). *Грамматический Строй Тагальского Языка* [Tagalog grammatical structure]. Moscow: Vostochnaya literatura.
- Shkarban, Lina. (2004). On Tagalog morphology in the context of parts-of-speech typo-

- logy. In: Alieva, Natalia (ed.), *Malay and Indonesian Studies*, Issue XVI, pp. 314–324.
- Sippola, Eeva. (2020). Contact and Spanish in the Pacific. In: Hickey, Raymond (ed.), *The handbook of language contact*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 453–469.
- Steinkrüger, Patrick O. (2008). Hispanisation processes in the Philippines. In: Stolz, Thomas, Bakker, Dik, and Salas Palomo, Rosa (eds.), *Aspects of language contact. New theoretical, methodological and empirical findings with special focus on Romanisation processes*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 203–236.
- Stolz, Thomas, Bakker, Dik, and Salas Palomo, Rosa (eds.). (2008). *Aspects of language contact. New theoretical, methodological and empirical findings with special focus on Romancisation processes*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Stolz, Thomas. (2012). Survival in a niche. On gender-copy in Chamorro (and sundry languages), in: Vanhove, M., Stolz, T., Urdze, A. (eds.), *Morphologies in Contact. Studia Typologica Series (Book 10)*. Berlin, Boston: Akademie Verlag, pp. 93–140.
- Tadmor, Uri. (2009). Loanwords in Indonesian. In: Haspelmath, Martin, and Tadmor, Uri (eds.), *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 686–716.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey, and Kaufman, Terrence. (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley & LA: University of California Press.
- Thompson, Roger M. (2003). *Filipino English and Taglish. Language switching from multiple perspectives*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Winford, Donald. (2003a). *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Winford, Donald. (2003b). Contact-induced changes: Classification and processes. *OSUWPL* 57: 129–150.
- Wolff, John U. (1973). The character of borrowings from Spanish and English in the languages of the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 4(1): 72–82.
- Wolff, John U. (1993). Why roots add the affixes with which they occur: A study of Tagalog and Indonesian adjective formations. In: Reesink, Ger P. (ed.), *Topics in descriptive Austronesian linguistics*. Leiden: Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden, pp. 217–244.
- Wolff, John U. (2001). The influence of Spanish on Tagalog. In: Zimmermann, Klaus, and Stolz, Thomas (eds.), *Lo propio y lo ajeno en las lenguas austronésicas y amerindias*. Frankfurt a.M./Madrid: Vervuert/Iberoamericana, pp. 233–253.

Data Sources

- Almarío R. 1910. *Ang Mánanayaw* [short story], in: *Project Gutenberg E-books*, URL: <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/>. Accessed in Jan-Feb 2020.
- Calderón S.G. 1907. Dating Pilipinas, in: *Project Gutenberg E-books*, URL: <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/>. Accessed in Jan-Feb 2020.

- Cruz H. 1922. Kartilyang Makabayan ... [essay], in: *Project Gutenberg E-books*, URL: <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/>. Accessed in Jan-Feb 2020.
- Francia J.R. 1919. *Hindi biro!* ... [short story], in: *Project Gutenberg E-books*, URL: <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/>. Accessed in Jan-Feb 2020.
- LC—Goldhahn D., Eckart T. & Quasthoff U. (2012). *Building Large Monolingual Dictionaries at the Leipzig Corpora Collection: From 100 to 200 Languages*. In: Proceedings of the 8th International Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12), 2012. Available at: https://corpora.uni-leipzig.de/en?corpusId=ttl_community_2017. Accessed in Feb 2020.
- Mariano P. 1906. *Juan Masili* ... [short story], in: *Project Gutenberg E-books*, URL: <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/>. Accessed in Jan-Feb 2020.
- Rivera J.M. 1910. *Sa Tabing Bangin* ... [play], in: *Project Gutenberg E-books*, URL: <https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/>. Accessed in Jan-Feb 2020.