

Remixing a mixed language: The emergence of a new pronominal system in Chabacano (Philippine Creole Spanish)

International Journal of Bilingualism
17(4) 448–478

© The Author(s) 2012

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/1367006912438302

ijb.sagepub.com



John M. Lipski

The Pennsylvania State University, USA

Abstract

In bilingual contact environments, personal pronoun systems are relatively impervious to replacement or borrowing. Several Creole languages contain hybrid personal pronoun paradigms, but the language contact environments that resulted in creolization and mixed pronominal systems are no longer in effect, and the mechanisms of pronominal replacement remain unknown. The present analysis is based on data from Zamboangueno Chabacano, a variety of Philippine Creole Spanish that has already undergone at least one set of pronominal replacements in its history, substituting Spanish-derived plural pronouns with pronouns taken from Philippine languages. Due to recent migration, Zamboangueno Chabacano is now in contact with Tagalog, and younger speakers are incorporating the Tagalog second-person singular respect-neutral pronoun *ikaw* into the Chabacano system. The insertion of *ikaw* restores the respectful–respect-neutral pronominal distinction originally present in Spanish and found in Philippine languages but lacking in Chabacano. The ease with which a Tagalog pronoun is entering Chabacano is attributed to long-standing popular views that Zamboangueno Chabacano is already a mixed-up language—often regarded as “broken Spanish”—devoid of its own grammar and therefore readily susceptible to any and all intrusions. The use of *ikaw* as an in-group marker among Zamboangueno youth further aids the addition of the Tagalog pronoun to the Chabacano paradigm.

Keywords

Chabacano, Creole languages, mixed languages, Philippine Creole pronoun systems, Spanish

Introduction: Can pronouns be borrowed? Evidence from Creole languages

Pronouns are often regarded as “off-limits” for borrowing, as they belong to the most fundamental core grammar. Thomason and Everett (2005, p. 301) observe that “Perhaps the most commonly

Corresponding author:

John M. Lipski, Department of Spanish, Italian & Portuguese, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA.

Email: jlipski@psu.edu

mentioned hard-to-borrow lexical feature is the category of personal pronouns [...] speakers' choices may be the most important factor motivating the borrowing of 'hard-to-borrow' features," and Thomason (1999) illustrates the role of speakers' choices in atypical borrowing environments. While a survey of the relevant literature reveals numerous instances where languages have borrowed pronouns (usually from a member of a different linguistic family), most of the cases involve reconstruction of purported contacts occurring long ago and for which little accurate information is available. In order to more closely examine the circumstances in which personal pronouns are borrowed, it is helpful to search for contemporary speech communities or at least contact environments occurring recently enough as to permit a more substantiated analysis. One fruitful domain of inquiry into the borrowing of pronouns is the class of mixed languages, particularly those formed through multiple linguistic contacts. This category is typified by Creole languages, formed through contact between a lexifier language (typically the language of a former colonial power or slave-owning society) and a diverse group of other languages, none of which was dominant in the original population. Creoles present the advantage of being "new" languages, formed in contact environments for which specific information is frequently more feasible to obtain than in the case of proto-languages projected into the distant past; this claim was made vehemently by Bickerton (1981) and represent a viewpoint shared by a large number of Creole language researchers. Mixed-origin pronominal systems are not unknown in Creole languages, although the reasons for the insertion of pronouns from sources other than the lexifier language have yet to be elucidated. Gullah and other Afro-English-derived Creoles have the West African second-person plural pronoun *oonuh/unu*, Papiamentu (an Afro-Iberian Creole) has the (probably African-derived) third-person plural pronoun *nan*, and Afro-Colombian Palenquero has the Kikongo-derived pronouns *enú* (2-pl.) and *ané* (3-pl.) (Schwegler, 2002); similar variants of these pronouns are found in the Afro-Portuguese Creoles of São Tomé, Príncipe, and Annobón, where the remaining pronouns are of Portuguese origin. In the English-derived Creoles, the incorporation of an exogenous second-person plural pronoun may be related to the fact that English has lost the singular-plural distinction among second-person pronouns, with *you* functioning in both cases, whereas the African languages known to have been present in the formative period of the Creoles have distinct singular and plural second-person pronouns. In the case of Spanish- and Portuguese-lexified Creoles, however, this line of reasoning does not hold since Spanish and Portuguese exhibit distinct singular and plural pronouns in the second person.

The present study focuses on a contemporary Creole language environment in which a shift in the pronominal system is in progress, via the introduction of an exogenous pronoun. The Creole language in question, Zamboangueno Chabacano (henceforth ZC), is Spanish lexified, and is spoken in the southern Philippines. ZC has undergone one or more similar shifts in its history, in each case via the incorporation of a pronoun from another language. It will be proposed that the introduction of pronouns from the substrate (Philippine) languages into ZC has not been entirely a haphazard matter but rather has served to move the ZC pronominal system further from its Spanish roots and into closer alignment with Philippine languages as regards semantic and pragmatic distinctions. This diachronic transition is correlated with ambiguous accounts of ZC, ranging from what was reported to be nearly pure Spanish to descriptions of an obviously restructured and mixed language. According to the proposed reconstruction, the insertion of Philippine pronouns into ZC has occurred in tandem with ZC speakers' ever-diminishing contact with speakers of Spanish and with Zamboanguenos' evolving views regarding the nature of their language, from "Spanish," to "broken Spanish," and finally to a de facto Philippine language. It is suggested that the semantic and pragmatic alignment of the ZC pronominal system with pan-Philippine paradigms has been facilitated by long-standing and deeply rooted opinions about the disorderly

nature of ZC itself. ZC was (and for many speakers, still is) implicitly regarded as a jumbled mass of random accretions, lacking any normalized structure that might be disrupted by further introduction of functional elements such as pronouns. The variable insertion of yet another Philippine pronoun into contemporary ZC is proposed as potentially marking the beginning of another stage in an evolutionary pattern spanning more than two centuries.

The remainder of this study is organized as follows. Section “Reconstructing the historical trajectory of Philippine Creole Spanish” reviews available historical documentation on the existence of Philippine Creole Spanish, section “Sources of linguistic data” describes data collection for the present study, section “Chabacano pronominal systems” describes the pronominal systems in the three main varieties of Philippine Creole Spanish, with particular emphasis on the Zamboangueño dialect. In sections “The first Philippine insertions into the ZC pronominal system: exclusive–inclusive ‘we’” and “Other Philippine plural pronouns are (simultaneously?) accreted,” the first hybridization of the ZC pronominal system is discussed. Section “The continued evolution of the ZC pronominal system: recent incursions of Tagalog *ikaw/ka*” describes contemporary ZC usage, in which the Tagalog subject pronoun *ikaw* (and clitic variant *ka*) is entering the Chabacano pronominal system. Section “Possible reasons for the introduction of *ikaw/ka* in ZC” suggests some reasons for the entry of *ikaw/ka* into ZC and section “Why Tagalog *kayo* is not accompanying *ikaw/ka* into ZC” offers an explanation for the failure of the corresponding Tagalog second-person plural pronoun *kayó* to accompany *ikaw* into the ZC pronominal system. Section “Linguistic and cultural hybridity as the essence of ZC” provides additional information on language mixing and sociolinguistic attitudes in Zamboanga. Section “Summary and conclusions” concludes this study.

Reconstructing the historical trajectory of Philippine Creole Spanish

Philippine Creole Spanish, composed of the main local varieties Ternateño (spoken in Ternate, Manila Bay), Caviteño (spoken in Cavite City, Manila Bay), and Zamboangueño (spoken in Zamboanga City, Mindanao) and known collectively as Chabacano, is the most extensive Spanish-based Creole language now in existence, and the only one found outside of the Americas. The only dialect to have maintained and even increased its vitality is the Chabacano of Zamboanga (Zamboangueño), still spoken by several hundred thousand residents of Zamboanga del Sur province (Mindanao) centering on Zamboanga City and also including nearby Basilan Island. A small group of Chabacano speakers, now confined to a few dispersed families, previously existed in the central Mindanao city of Davao, derived from immigrants from Zamboanga who arrived at the turn of the 20th century. Another small, but still viable, group of Chabacano speakers is found in Cotabato City, Mindanao. Cotabateño is virtually identical to Zamboangueño, with the few differences being mostly lexical. Riego de Dios (1976, 1978) suggests that the two dialects may have partially different roots, although admitting immigration from Zamboanga to Cotabato as the likely source of most of Cotabateño. The author’s own fieldwork in Cotabato confirms the nearly complete overlap between the two varieties.

Although the contemporary manifestations of Chabacano have been well documented, the origins are shrouded in uncertainty. According to one widely disseminated theory, first proposed by Whinnom, (1956, chap. 1), the first Chabacano dialects arose in the Manila area in the middle of the 17th century, when a group of Spanish settlers, known as *Mardikas* (De Ocampo, 2007; Nigoza, 2007), left Ternate in the Moluccas Islands and arrived in Manila to fortify the Spanish position against the attacks of the Chinese pirate Koxinga. These newcomers (garrison troops

plus civilian personnel) were subsequently resettled along the shores of Manila Bay, around the modern towns of Tanza and Ternate, and it is here that the first Chabacano dialects are presumed to have taken root. The dialect of San Roque in Cavite City was evidently formed somewhat later, by Creole-speaking Ternateños and, presumably, troops speaking some Spanish and a variety of Philippine languages; this dialect in turn produced a now defunct offshoot in Manila, in the Ermita and San Nicolas areas. Comparative work by Molony (1973, 1977a, 1977b) supports the hypothesis that Ternateño is the oldest of the Spanish-based Creoles in the Philippines, and the comprehensive study of Sippola (2011) is consistent with this proposal (also Steinkrüger, 2006). The origins of ZC are even less clearly known, although all available accounts implicate the mixture of languages spoken by soldiers and laborers at the Spanish military garrison at Zamboanga (e.g. Frake, 1988, p. 43; Lipski, 1992). Although the first major Spanish settlement in Zamboanga dates from 1635 (the first Spanish mission dates from 1593 and a small military base was established in 1598), the fort was subsequently abandoned in 1663 under the ongoing threat of pirate attacks. ZC is presumed to have emerged following the Spanish reoccupation of this city in 1719 and the arrival of garrison troops and laborers from various regions of the Philippines (although Gómez Rivera, 2002, p. 127, has suggested that ZC actually began with the construction of the first fort in 1635). ZC shares many grammatical elements with the Manila Bay Chabacano dialects, including the preverbal particles *ta* (habitual/progressive) and *ya* (perfective), the third-person singular gender-less pronoun *ele*, the use of *cosa* (“thing” in Spanish) as interrogative “what?,” and use of *con* (Spanish “with”) as oblique case marker. Some of these elements may be transferred directly into ZC, for example, from sailors and garrison troops from the Spanish military installations in Cavite (e.g. as suggested by Camins, 1999, pp. 3–4; Grant, 2002; and Maño, 1961, p. 54), while others were already present in the Spanish foreigner-talk used throughout the colonial Philippines (Lipski, 1992, 2000, 2001, 2010). It is quite unlikely that ZC is simply the result of Spanish settlers’ deliberate simplification of their language with laborers brought in to construct the fort, as suggested by Malcampo (2007, pp. 124–126). At the same time, there is evidence that ZC is not just a transplanted version of Caviteño Chabacano, but rather a contact-induced language that regardless of its original provenance coalesced in its present form in the Zamboanga garrison, among soldiers and contract laborers speaking mutually unintelligible but structurally very congruent Philippine languages already heavily impregnated with Spanish lexical items. According to available information, ZC has undergone several fluctuations as regards its similarity to Caviteño, Spanish, and a general cross-section of Philippine languages, respectively (Lipski, 1992). It will ultimately be suggested that these fluctuations are in part responsible for the mutations affecting the ZC pronominal system and, at the same time, reflect the speakers’ often ambiguous notions about the true nature of ZC, as a language inherently related both to Spanish and to Philippine languages but identical to neither.

Although some form of Creole Spanish may have existed in the Philippines as early as the 17th century, any historical reconstruction is complicated by the almost complete lack of any reliable documentation prior to the turn of the 20th century. During the Spanish regime, lasting from Legazpi’s 1565 expedition until 1899, there was no acknowledgment of any stable Spanish-derived pidgin or Creole language in the Philippines. Approximations to Spanish by Filipino natives as well as Chinese merchants were regarded with condescension and given derisive designations such as *español de cocina* “kitchen Spanish,” *español de tienda* “shopkeepers Spanish,” and *español de trapo* “ragged Spanish.” In a few 19th-century literary texts, examples of consistently restructured language similar or identical to the Cavite (Manila Bay) Chabacano varieties appear but are

implicitly considered only as specimens of Filipinos' inability to acquire "proper" Spanish. Literary portrayals of restructured Spanish can be found in Entrala (1881, 1882), Moya y Jiménez (1883), Feced (1888), Rizal (1891), López (1893), Rincón (1897), and Balmori (1917), among others. As an example of Spaniards' attitudes toward Philippine Spanish varieties, Montero y Vidal (1876, p. 97) offered the following account of a conversation between a Spaniard who had spent considerable time in the Philippines and a recently arrived compatriot:

... ¿Y eso de que los criados entienden todas las cosas al revés?

[and about the servants getting everything backwards]

... Aprenda a hablarles en el idioma *sui generis*, que llamamos aquí *español de cocina*, repitiéndoles tres veces la misma cosa. Verá V. cómo lo entienden.

[learn to speak to them in their *sui generis* speech that we call *kitchen Spanish*, saying everything three times, and you'll see how well they understand]

Escosura and Cañamaque (1882, p. 5) lamented that:

los indios mismos que se tienen por instruídos en castellano, lo están tan poco, que es preciso para que comprendan hablarles una especie de algarabía que vulgarmente se llama *español de cocina*; y para entenderlos a ellos, estar habituados al mismo bárbaro lenguaje

[the very Indians, who are supposedly trained in Spanish really are not, so that to make them understand one must speak a kind of mumbo-jumbo popularly known as *kitchen Spanish* and in order to understand them one must become familiar with this same barbaric speech]

Although Chabacano varieties were firmly established in the Manila Bay communities of Cavite, Ternate, and the Ermita zone of Manila in the 19th century, most accounts from the time period mention only "Spanish" and Tagalog, as shown in Table 1. Even when some sort of mixed or corrupted language was mentioned, however, there were no specific details of grammatical structures or lexical choices. Although Cavite/Ternate Chabacano was the subject of early 20th-century research by Tirona (1923), Germán (1932), Miranda (1956), and Whinnom (1956), these authors did not probe into earlier stages of the language such as might have been accessible in the speech of their oldest informants.

The documentation for Zamboanga is more extensive but no clearer, as shown in Table 2. Although some type of creolized Spanish may have arrived with the permanent establishment of a Spanish garrison in 1719 (since contacts with the Spanish naval installations in Cavite were extensive), only Spanish is mentioned as the language of the Zamboanga fort and neighboring community until the latter part of the 19th century. No details of the sort of mixed language spoken in Zamboanga appeared in print until the brief mention by Broad (1929), and not again until the article by McKaughan (1954) and a brief account by Whinnom (1956), who had not been able to personally visit Zamboanga. It was not until Forman (1972) that ZC was thoroughly described, but with an eye toward synchronic analysis rather than sociohistorical reconstruction.

It can be seen from Tables 1 and 2 that outsiders' accounts of the linguistic situation in Zamboanga differed widely even during the same time period. It will be shown below that Zamboanguenos' own views toward the coexistence of Spanish and ZC are equally beset by ambiguity and

Table 1. Mention of languages spoken in Cavite.

Source	Language(s) mentioned for Cavite
Santayana (1862, p. 111)	"[...] todo el pueblo habla castellano como idioma nativo" [everyone speaks Spanish as a native language]
Jagor (1875, pp. 55–56)	Spanish and Tagalog
González Fernández and Moreno Jerez (1877, pp. 37–38)	Spanish and Tagalog
Escosura and Cañamaque (1882, p. xxiii)	Spanish and Tagalog
Caro y Mora (1897, p. 181)	"Los de Cavite (el puerto) y San Roque [...] hablan castellano, porque desde fundación han mantenido asidua comunicación con soldados y marinos peninsulares" [the people of the port of Cavite and San Roque speak Spanish because since the founding they have maintained assiduous communication with Peninsular soldiers and sailors]
United States Philippine Commission (1900, p. 425)	Spanish, Tagalog
United States Philippine Commission (1909, pp. 293, 817)	"Spanish is the language of the common people in [...] Cavite and its suburb, San Roque."
Martínez de Zúñiga (1973, p. 250) [ca. 1800]	Inhabitants of San Roque, Cavite "speak a kind of Spanish which has been corrupted and whose phraseology is entirely taken from the dialect of the country."
Editor of <i>De los Reyes y Florentino</i> (1888, p. 137)	"kitchen" Spanish/"Chavacano"
Guerrero (1896, p. 122)	Chabacano
Francia y Ponce de León and González Parrado (1898, p. 177)	"kitchen Spanish" and Tagalog

ambivalence. In the following sections, a number of developmental stages of ZC will be postulated, en route to a comprehensive account of the contemporary ZC pronominal system. Since there are no known documents purporting to represent ZC prior to the first decades of the 20th century, all proposed reconstructions are based on two admittedly tenuous methods. The first involves tapping personal recollections, collective memories, and community-wide received wisdom. Given the ambiguity surrounding the mix of Spanish and ZC in Zamboanga prior to the early 20th century, as well as the long-standing ambivalence accruing to a language that many consider incomplete and undesirable, this source of data is at best imperfect. The margin of error can be minimized by the following combination of factors: obtaining responses from the broadest possible cross-section of community members, separating out common denominators, and in combination with known historical-demographic data triangulating the conclusions with that offer the highest degree of probability.

The second scaffolding used to bolster proposed historical construction of ZC is the application of comparative linguistic analysis to the cluster of Philippine Creole Spanish dialects, to other Ibero-Romance lexified Creoles in Asia with structural and historical similarities (e.g. Macau Creole Portuguese; Batalha, 1960; Lipski, 1988), and to Peninsular and Latin American Spanish dialects known to have been present during the formation of Chabacano varieties. The combined results will be used to build a circumstantial case based on means, motive, and opportunity.

Table 2. Mention of languages spoken in Zamboanga.

Source	Language(s) mentioned for Zamboanga
Sonnerat (1776, p. 127)	Spanish
Forrest (1780, pp. 374–375)	Spanish
Moor (1837, p. 37)	Spanish
Mallat (1848)	Spanish
Marryat (1848)	Spanish
Lannoy (1849, pp. 71–72)	Spanish
Keppel (1853, p. 70f.)	Spanish
St. John (1853, pp. 131–132)	Spanish
Yvan (1855, p. 230)	Spanish
Saleeby (1908, pp. 164–165) [ca. 1860]	Spanish
Escosura and Cañamaque (1882, p. xxiii)	Spanish
Santayana (1862, p. 111)	Spanish
Barrantes (1869, pp. 55, 64)	Spanish
Álvarez Guerra (1872)	Spanish
Heras (1878, p. 2)	Spanish
Jagor (1875, pp. 55–56)	Spanish
Cavada y Méndez de Vigo (1876)	Spanish
González Fernández and Moreno Jerez (1877, pp. 37–38)	Spanish
De la Corte y Ruano (1877)	Spanish
Gonzalez Serrano (1880, p. 181)	Spanish
Baranera (1880, p. 71)	Spanish
Cañamaque (1880, p. 44)	Spanish
Montano (1886, p. 132)	Spanish
Élisée Reclus (1892, p. 268)	Spanish
Guillemard (1908, p. 88; original date 1894)	Spanish
Caro y Mora (1897, p. 181)	Spanish
Whitmarsh (1901, p. 639)	Spanish
Philippine Information Society (1901, p. 16)	Spanish
MacKinlay (1901, p. 214)	Spanish
Peet (1904, p. 37)	Spanish
Lay (1839, pp. 113–114)	Some residents of Zamboanga informed him that “[they] have forgotten their native tongue and have learned to speak the Spanish in all their communications with each other as well as with their masters [...] their dialect was a mixture, and that they did not understand the Spanish language when spoken to them in its purity.”
Waitz (1863, p. 250)	that “Among the inhabitants of Zamboanga [...] a corrupt Spanish has established itself, consisting of Spanish and native words mixed up in various combinations by different individuals.”
Bastian (1870, p. 51)	“verdorbenes Spanisch” [corrupted Spanish]

Table 2. (Continued)

Source	Language(s) mentioned for Zamboanga
Banqué (1884, p. 28)	“una jerigonza de visaya, tagalo, moro y castellano de taberna y germanía” [a slang of Visayan, Tagalog, Moro and tavern and underworld Spanish]
Blumentritt (1885, p. 64)	“pidgin Spanish”
Doyle (1888, p. 125)	“[...] no conocen otro idioma que el español, aunque mezclado con frases y giros extraños [...]” [they know no language other than Spanish, although mixed with strange phrases and expressions]
Sancho (1888, p. 104)	“[...] la lengua de Castilla, única que se habla en esta provincia, aunque con los modismos que tanto nos divierten á los que no los usamos” [the language of Castile, the only one spoken in this province, but with the expressions that so amuse those of us who don’t use them]
Pi (1894, p. 62)	“[...] lenguaje que todas estas gentes usan, que si bien llaman castellano, y entre los más instruidos tiene parte de tal, es un verdadero chavacano, como ya se llama entre los españoles, que menos que ninguna de las lenguas indias tiene ó admite gramática y que en boca de los más rudos es un galimatías de tagalo, moro, también chino, palabras castellanas, medio comidas más allá de lo andaluz, y no sé que más con unos modismos y unas construcciones tan raras que cuando ellos hablan entre sí no los entendemos [...]” [the language they all use, that although they call it Spanish and the more educated ones come close to it, is a real Chavacano as the Spaniards call it, that has less grammar than any of the Indian languages and in the mouth of the worst speakers is a jumble of Tagalog, Moro, Chinese, Spanish words chopped up worse than in Andalusia, and who knows what else with sayings and expressions so strange that when they speak among themselves we can’t understand them]
Francia y Ponce de León and González Parrado (1898, p. 177)	“kitchen Spanish”
Worcester (1898, p. 130)	“On account of the multiplicity of native dialects, Spanish became the medium of communication, but they have long since converted it into a Zamboangueno patois which is quite unintelligible to one familiar only with pure <i>Castellano</i> .”
United States Philippine Commission (1901, p. 541)	“[...] these children do not speak Spanish in their homes, but a hybrid patois called ‘Chabacano’. Chabacano is a mixture of Spanish, Tagalog, Visayan, and Moro. The principal being perhaps Spanish. Their speech is, however, unintelligible to the Spaniard.”
Townsend (1902, p. 485)	Christians in Mindanao “nearly all speak the Visayan language, except those of Zamboanga, who were so much mixed that, having no language in common, they adopted Spanish, which they mixed with other words, and adapted to their own uses.”
Governor William H. Taft Horton (1903, p. 87)	“In Zamboanga they speak the Zamboangan language. I think that is a mixture of several dialects.”
United States Bureau of the Census (1905, p. 452)	“they do not [...] speak Visayan, but a corrupt Spanish, which is known by the term <i>Chabacano</i> .”

(Continued)

Table 2. (Continued)

Source	Language(s) mentioned for Zamboanga
Blake (1905, p. 121)	In Zamboanga "is spoken a jargon which is a mixture of Spanish, Tagalog, Visaya and Moro"
Foreman (1906, p. 535)	"Dialect called <i>Chabacano</i> —a mixture of very corrupt Spanish and native tongues"
Ruiz (1907, p. 193)	a corrupted Spanish known as Chabacano
Commissioner of Education (1907, p. 355)	"The Christian population of southern Mindanao, and especially Zamboanga, speak a corrupt Spanish, the native dialects having disappeared"
Russell (1907, p. 172)	Described "Zamboanganese" as "a mixture of Castilian, Visayan and Malay" and stated that when they became excited, natives of Zamboanga spoke "unintelligible Spanish."
United States Philippine Commission (1909, pp. 293, 817)	"Spanish is the language of the common people in [...] the Christian colonies of Zamboanga and Cotabato, where a corrupt Spanish dialect called 'chabacano' is spoken."
Barrows (1914, p. 266)	"A corrupt Spanish dialect, known as the 'Chabacano' [<i>sic.</i>] has become the common speech, the only instance in the Philippines where the native dialect has been supplanted."

Sources of linguistic data

Data on Zamboanga (including offshoots in Cotabato and Davao), Cavite, and Ternate varieties of Chabacano were first collected by the author during an extended stay in 1985, most of which was spent in Zamboanga. Several hundred hours of free conversation as well as responses to questions about language and community history were recorded during this visit. In Zamboanga, there were significant differences in language usage between residents of Zamboanga City proper (with a high proportion of Visayan and English elements) and unschooled rural residents, whose speech showed few traces of 20th-century linguistic and demographic trends affecting southwestern Mindanao. The oldest respondents were born in the final years of the 19th century and claimed to recall the speech patterns of the generation of their parents and even their grandparents. In view of the consistency of responses from several dozen elderly Zamboanguenos interviewed in 1985, reasonably plausible extrapolation can be made for the status of ZC from the second half of the 19th century onward.

Additional field data were collected during a brief visit to the Philippines in 2000 and during a longer visit to Zamboanga in 2009, where data from the youngest generation of Zamboanguenos were obtained. In the aggregate, data obtained by the author span roughly 100 years from the birth-dates of the oldest to the youngest respondents (1890s to 1990s), with plausible backward extrapolation to at least one previous generation.

Chabacano pronominal systems

The subject pronouns of the three main Chabacano dialects are given in Table 3, together with their Spanish and Tagalog counterparts.

Unlike the Manila Bay Chabacano varieties, the personal pronoun system in ZC is hybrid Spanish–Philippine. In the singular, the pronouns are all Spanish derived, the same as in Cavite and Ternate. Whinnom (1956, p. 88), who had never visited Zamboanga but only spoke with a ZC speaker in Manila, reported the use of the singular pronoun *siyá* in Zamboangueno, in alternation with *ele* (and Mugler, 1983, p. 54, repeats this assertion, apparently without independent

Table 3. Spanish, Chabacano, and Tagalog pronominal systems.

Subject	Spanish (Spain)	Cavite	Ternate	Zamboanga	Tagalog
1-sg.	yo	yo	yo	yo	akó
2-sg. familiar	tú	(e)bos/tu	(e)bos/tu	(e)bos/tu	ikaw
2-sg. formal	usted	tu	tu	tu (usté)	kayó
3-sg.	él (m.), ella (f.)	ele	ele	ele	siyá
1-pl.	nosotros	nisós	mijotro	kamé (excl.) kitá (incl.)	kamí (excl.) tayo (incl.)
2-pl. familiar	vosotros	busós	bujotro	kamó (ustedes)	kayó
2-pl. formal	ustedes	busós/ustedes	bujotro/ustedes	ustedes	kayó
3-pl.	ellos (m.), ellas (f.)	ilós	lojotro	silá	silá
Possessive	Spanish (Spain)	Cavite	Ternate	Zamboanga	Tagalog
1-sg.	mío (mi)	di mio (mi)	di mio (mi)	di mio (mi)	ko
2-sg. familiar	tuyo (tu)	di bos (bo)	di bos (bo)	di bos (bo)	mo
2-sg. formal	usted	di tuyo (tu)	di tuyo (tu)	di tuyo (tu)	ninyó
3-sg.	suyo (su)	di suyo (su)	di suyo (su)	di suyo (su)	niya
1-pl.	nuestro	di nisós (nisós)	di mijotro	diamon (excl.) diaton (incl.)	namin (excl.) natin (incl.)
2-pl. familiar	vuestro	di busós (busós)	di bujotro	diinyo (di ustedes)	ninyó
2-pl. formal	suyo (su)	di busós/di ustedes	di bujotro/di ustedes	di ustedes	ninyó
3-pl.	suyo (su)	di ilós (ilós)	di lojotro	diila	nilá
Object	Spanish (Spain)	Cavite	Ternate	Zamboanga	Tagalog (sa +...)
1-sg.	me	conmigo	conmigo	conmigo	Akin
2-sg. familiar	te	con bos	con bos	con bos	iyó
2-sg. formal	le	contigo	contigo	contigo/con usté	inyó
3-sg.	le/llo/lla	con ele	con ele	con ele	kaniya
1-pl.	nos	con nisós	con mijotro	kanamon (excl.) kanaton (incl.)	amin (excl.) atin (incl.)
2-pl. familiar	os	con busós	con bujotro	kaninyo (con ustedes)	inyó
2-pl. formal	les/los/las	con busó/con ustedes	con bujotro/con ustedes	con ustedes	inyó
3-pl.	los/las	con ilós	con lojotro	kanila	kanilá

pl.: plural; sg.: singular; m.: masculine; f.: feminine; incl.: inclusive; excl.: exclusive.

verification), but the present investigation uncovered no examples of this usage, despite the study of hundreds of hours of recorded conversation and after having spent several months living with Zamboanguenos. No other description of ZC mentions *siyá*. There is use of *usté* < Spanish *usted* “you” as a more formal second-person singular address form, but despite the claims of some purists, this pronoun is not well integrated by all ZC speakers. The plural subject pronouns in ZC are all of Philippine origin, coming from central Philippine Visayan languages (some are identical to the corresponding Tagalog pronouns).

To date, there has been no widely accepted explanation for the historical evolution leading to the ZC pronominal paradigm, which is unlike Spanish and like all Philippine languages in exhibiting the lack of grammatical gender and the inclusive–exclusive first-person plural distinction, but has a more complex second-person system as regards the dimension of respect. The following observations will be offered as a proposed trajectory of ZC across the typological space from Spanish to the Philippine languages. It will be suggested that the evolution of the ZC pronoun system mirrors the transition (within the structure of ZC itself, and in the minds of its speakers) from an exogenous language to a Philippine language with a largely non-Philippine lexical base, a transition aided by the deep-seated notion that Chabacano was not a “real” language in its own right but rather a nearly empty receptacle cobbled together during chaotic linguistic encounters, and into which bits and pieces from any language could be freely tossed.

The first Philippine insertions into the ZC pronominal system: Exclusive–inclusive “we”

The bilateral nature of the ZC pronominal system—half Spanish and half native Philippine—appears to be the most recent in a series of modifications that successively shifted the ZC pronoun system away from both Spanish and the Manila Bay Chabacano dialects. As late as the early 20th century, speakers in Zamboanga, particularly in rural areas, were still using the Spanish first-person plural pronoun *nosotros* “we” as well as the Philippine dyad *kamé-kitá* now used almost exclusively in ZC. Although Forman (1972, p. 107), who collected data in Zamboanga in the mid-1960s, stated that he only heard *nosotros* once (in 1963), a few older residents interviewed by the present author in 1985 and representing the early years of the 20th century and, by extrapolation, the last decades of the 19th, still used this pronoun spontaneously, as well as the possessive *di nosotros* (Spanish *de nosotros* “of ours”); the Spanish possessive determiner *nuestro* “our(s)” was not used except in formulaic expressions such as the beginning of the Lord’s Prayer: *Padre Nuestro* “Our Father.” In the earliest known description of ZC, Broad (1929, p. 142) mentions only *kame* and *kita* for the first-person plural, as do the serialized newspaper columns by Apostol (1964–1967). In a recent compilation of ZC grammar, Camins (1999, p. 10) claims that Spanish plural pronouns used in ZC are more formal, and Philippine pronouns are more informal. Quilis and Casado-Fresnillo (2008, p. 450) assert that in ZC, *kitá* alternates with *nosotros* but with no supporting examples or clarification. Frake (1971, p. 227), in the most thorough analysis of the ZC pronominal system, had observed that ZC pronouns of Spanish origin were used to show greater respect than Philippine-origin pronouns, but he did not include *nosotros* in the inventory. Head (1978, p. 160) offered a similar commentary, based on comparative data from several languages, including Chabacano. He also asserts that Spanish *nosotros* “we” is the more formal first-person plural pronoun, but in reality, this pronoun is now rarely used and was already confined to the speech of older and/or rural speakers by the late 1970s. In a recent update, including the youngest generations of ZC speakers, Edding (2003, p. 94) surveyed 400 ZC speakers of all ages and found that as many as 9% claimed to still use *nosotros* or at least recognize the form. There is no independent verification of the actual vitality of *nosotros* in Zamboanga since individual breakdowns were not included, but in 2009, the author taught a seminar at Western Mindanao State University in Zamboanga City, and the adolescent Chabacano-speaking students all recognized *nosotros* as an old word used by the generation of their grandparents. No current Zamboangueno speakers of any age claimed to still use *nosotros* in 2009 (and only a handful of elderly rural speakers used this form in 1985), nor were any speakers overheard using *nosotros*. Camins (1999) also asserts that the Spanish singular pronoun *el* “he” (and presumably also “she”) from Spanish *él* “he” is part of the ZC lexicon, pertaining to the more

formal register, but there is no independent attestation of these forms by any researcher. In particular, all Zamboanguenños queried by the author from 1985 until 2009 rejected this item as ZC rather than Spanish. Camins includes the Spanish third-person plural pronoun *ellos* “they” among the “formal” Chabacano pronouns, although no living speaker known to the author uses this form (some elderly speakers interviewed in 1985 recalled this item, but none spontaneously used *ellos*). Broad (1929, p. 160) only mentions *silá* for the third-person plural in ZC, although he erroneously attributes this word to a corruption of Spanish *ellas* “they (f.)” Apostol (1962–1967) and Forman (1972, p. 107) only registered *silá* for Zamboanga in the 1960s. Nieva (1984, p. 213) also claimed that *ellos* is “accepted” in ZC, although his examples all use *silá* “they.” The term *diglossia* was first introduced into linguistics by Ferguson (1959) in reference to speech communities in which two varieties of a language (or two different languages) are employed in complementary distribution. The “H(igh)” language is used in formal settings, such as literature, education, legal proceedings, religious services, and in general any situation in which a standardized or prestigious language is required. The “L(ow)” language is the basis for ordinary vernacular conversations. Camins’ assertion appears to be a nostalgic and anachronistic notion that (“real”) Spanish is the “H language” of Zamboanga (i.e. in a configuration of diglossia) and Chabacano of any sort is the “L language.” However, there is no evidence that Zamboanga has ever been truly diglossic, although in the past, many Zamboanguenños spoke both Spanish and Chabacano; as will be suggested below, this partial bilingualism lies at the heart of the ambiguity surrounding the existence and nature of ZC in the past.

If ZC has followed the pattern exhibited by all other Spanish- and Portuguese-lexified Creoles, then from the outset, the Chabacano pronominal systems differed from Spanish in exhibiting no manifestation of grammatical gender. In this respect, the gender-less Chabacano third-person pronouns are homologous to their counterparts in all Philippine languages. Modern ZC *ele* “he/she” is identical to Cavite/Ternate Chabacano as well as to the homologous pronoun in most Portuguese-lexified Creoles and most plausibly was transferred to ZC from the Manila Bay Chabacano dialects, but the lack of grammatical gender distinction itself is directly predictable from the substrate. During the 2009 research trip, the author interviewed a number of (non-Chabacano-speaking) students of Spanish of varying levels of ability at the Instituto Cervantes in Manila. All but the most proficient learners of Spanish committed at least some errors of grammatical gender concord, invariably in favor of the Spanish masculine forms (including *él* “he” instead of *ella* “she”).

The aforementioned data suggest that Spanish *nosotros* was the sole ZC first-person plural pronoun at least until the beginning of the 20th century; older speakers interviewed by the author in 1985 rejected *kamé* “we (excl.)” and *kitá* “we (incl.)” as ZC and insisted that these pronouns belonged to Visayan rather than ZC, although today these pronouns have replaced *nosotros* “we.” Consequently, the establishment of the exclusive–inclusive “we” distinction in ZC represents the second stage in the approximation to pan-Philippine pronominal systems. Among the Philippine languages, the exclusive–inclusive distinction is fundamental and provides a defining element in nearly all discourse (Barrios, 2006, gives more details). Given that the Zamboanguenño dialect apparently arose (as suggested by Fernández, 2006; Frake, 1971, p. 225; Lipski, 1992; Malcampo, 2007, p. 124) or expanded (e.g. McWhorter, 1995, pp. 228–229, 2000, p. 18; Whinnom, 1956) in a military garrison staffed by Spanish colonial officers and indigenous Philippine and Mexican subordinates, the expression of inclusiveness and exclusivity is a natural concomitant of the strongly hierarchical military structure, coupled with colonial attitudes toward indigenous people as reflected in earlier quotes. In describing the emergence of innovative inclusive–exclusive “we” pronouns in Pacific Pidgin Englishes, Baker and Huber (2000, p. 855) observe that “For speakers of more standard varieties [of English], however, *us* implies the existence of an established close

relationship between or among the people to whom it is applied, that is, that they live or work together or, in some sense, form part of a team.”

Harley and Ritter (2002, p. 490) analyze first-person plural inclusive pronouns as conjoining the roles of the speaker and addressee, and assert that “inclusives are more marked than other persons, crosslinguistically, and yet allow for languages that make reference to both Speaker and Addressee features in their morphophonological forms for inclusives.” They also note that “The learner can deduce that Speaker is not underspecified [...] from the presence of this inclusive/exclusive contrast.” They represent this distinction as follows:

(1)



This geometric structure represents exclusive first-person plural pronouns as containing fewer features than the corresponding inclusive plural pronouns and by implication as being less marked. The authors propose (Harley and Ritter (2002, p. 499) that this geometric structure in turn implies a specific order of acquisition: “Acquisition proceeds from the top down; a given node must be acquired before its dependents. In this way, the geometry captures the global uniformity apparent in acquisition.” In particular, they propose (Harley and Ritter (2002, p. 500) that under the participant node, “speaker” is the default specification supplied by Universal Grammar and that “addressee” should be acquired later. In practical terms, this analysis would predict that first-person plural exclusive pronouns would be acquired—or would develop in an emergent Creole language—before first-person plural inclusive pronouns. Dalrymple and Kaplan (2000, pp. 780–783) represent exclusive first-person plural pronouns as containing fewer features (e.g. only {speaker}) than the corresponding first-person plural inclusive pronouns (containing {speaker} and {hearer}). Cysouw (2003, p. 96) proposes the implicational relationship that “there can only be a specialized exclusive when there is already a specialized inclusive.” In practice, this means that although there are languages that only mark inclusive “we” by a specialized morpheme, there are no languages that only mark exclusive “we” with a distinct morpheme without also possessing a special morpheme for inclusive “we.” On the other hand, Mühlhäusler and Harré (1990, pp. 171–172) suggest that in languages that embody the inclusive–exclusive “we” distinction, the inclusive form is the less-marked member of the dyad. They also note that the dual “you and I” inclusive is typically the first to appear in the acquisitional sequence. Comparative data from several related Malay languages also confirms the unmarked status of inclusive rather than exclusive “we” (Donohue & Smith, 1998; see also Wallace, 1983).

Although the presence of an exclusive–inclusive distinction in Philippine languages provided the scaffolding for the borrowing of this distinction—and the respective pronouns themselves—into ZC, this shift to a hybrid system did not occur from the outset but rather around the turn of the 20th century. The possible reasons for this chronology will be presented shortly.

Other Philippine plural pronouns are (simultaneously?) accreted

Left unexplained—and possibly unexplainable—is the addition of the Philippine pronouns *kamó* (second-person plural) and *silá* (third-person plural), evidently at the same time that the first-person plural pronouns *kamé* and *kitá* entered ZC (according to the testimony of elderly speakers

interviewed in 1985, this would be from late 19th century to early 20th century). This may have occurred simply done through paradigmatic expansion, but while *silá* has completely replaced the earlier Spanish-derived form *ellos* “they (masc.),” *kamó* never quite fit in and was not used as a respect-neutral pronoun as in Visayan but rather entered ZC as a nonrespectful pronoun, the plural homologue to *(e)bos* “you (s.),” and ultimately developed the connotation of vulgarity and the lack of respect. Adult ZC speakers interviewed by the author in 1985 considered *kamó* to be *bastos* “crude,” and during the 2009 research sojourn, younger speakers interviewed by the author asserted that they did not use this pronoun, preferring instead *ustedes*; one aristocratic older speaker (a prominent politician) was heard to use *kamó* with servants, but this behavior is increasingly rare in Zamboanga. Frake (1971, p. 232) observed that Philippine items in ZC can also connote “worse evaluation,” a classification that certainly fits the behavior of *kamó* in ZC. Philippine languages do not mark the respectful/respect-neutral distinction in the second-person plural, so the simultaneous existence of *ustedes* and *kamó* (and occasionally even Spanish-derived *vosotros* “you-pl., familiar”) in ZC is a non-Philippine configuration that for a large number—perhaps a majority—of Zamboanguēños was resolved by the effective removal of *kamó* from the paradigm as ZC became increasingly aligned with other Philippine languages. These considerations may partially account for the ease with which the Philippine third-person plural pronoun *silá* “came along for the ride” when the first-person plural pronouns *kitá* and *kamé* entered ZC.

The continued evolution of the ZC pronominal system: Recent incursions of Tagalog *ikaw/ka*

It is possible that Tagalog (the principal language of Manila and environs) has exerted some influence on ZC since its formation, but following the formation of autonomous Philippine governments after World War II, Tagalog—in its now official designation as Pilipino—was largely shunned by Zamboanguēños, as an expression of resistance against the imposition of the language of the capital on citizens of a remote province. Although Tagalog/Pilipino has been obligatory in Zamboanga schools, it was seldom used in daily life, except when interacting with visiting or resident Tagalog speakers. Such was the sociolinguistic situation at the time of the author’s first research trip to Zamboanga in 1985, but in the intervening years, the real linguistic presence of Tagalog in Zamboanga has increased considerably. This is due to the continued immigration of Tagalog speakers from Luzon, first in the form of military troops during the martial law period (roughly 1972–1986) and later in the form of civilians drawn by the relative prosperity of Zamboanga City. Frake (1988, p. 45) commented on the usefulness of proficiency in Tagalog at Zamboanga military checkpoints during the height of the martial law period. Many Zamboanguēños have also emigrated to Manila and upon returning to Zamboanga to visit or to reside, naturally employ Tagalog. Perhaps for these reasons, the spontaneous use of Tagalog among young people in Zamboanga is increasing; it is not uncommon to hear Zamboanga-born students speaking in Tagalog, and even young native speakers of Chabacano freely code-switch into Tagalog and insert Tagalog lexical items into Chabacano, much as has been done with English since the turn of the 20th century. The mixture is also present in electronic communications, most notably in the Zamboanguēño chat-room “Zamboanga Hermosa” (www.pinoyexchange.com) in which participants freely mix English, Tagalog, Visayan, and Chabacano in their friendly and informal exchanges. One consequence of the increased Tagalog usage is the introduction of the Tagalog second-person singular, nonformal subject pronoun *ikaw* and its clitic variant *ka* into Zamboanga Chabacano. Grant (2009) surveys some recent changes in ZC, and Forman (2001, pp. 106–107) gives examples such as the following, taken from unpublished work by Lojean Valles-Akil:

(2)

Ya mira yo CON IKAW
 PERF see I WITH YOU

“I saw you”

(Normal Zamboangueno: Ya mira yo **contigo** alla.)

(3)

Que tal IKAW?
 how YOU

“How are you?”

(Normal Zamboangueno: *Que tal* tu?)

(4)

Quiere KA mira sine?
 want YOU watch movie

“Do you want to watch a movie?”

(Normal Zamboangueno: Quiere **tu** mira sine?)

While accepting the putative validity of examples with the enclitic form *ka*, Forman expresses skepticism as to the veracity of the examples with *ikaw*:

[...] I was also offered very similar (if not identical) examples by others (who presented them as shocking things to be horrified by) [...] The examples with *ikaw* strike me as “crashingly ungrammatical” and rather unlikely—as though someone made them up to use as cautionary examples.

Forman’s observations are undoubtedly correct for the purported example (3), where ZC would use the pronoun *tu* and Tagalog would use the clitic form *ka*: *kumusta ka* (from Spanish *¿cómo está?* “how are you?”). In Tagalog, the disjunctive form *ikaw* is normally limited to fronted or topicalized position, while in the normal postverbal contexts of this fundamentally verb–subject–object (VSO) language only *ka* is used. On the other hand, the purported ZC sentence (2) does fit overall Chabacano syntactic patterns, since full disjunctive pronouns are used following the accusative marker *con* (< Spanish *con* “with”). It is true that some older Zamboanguenos with prescriptivist views on language frequently criticize the purported use of *ka/ikaw* with stereotypical examples similar to those offered by Forman. Malcampo (2009) offered the following examples in a position article presented to the Zamboanga City Council (and echoing identical comments made by Dr Malcampo to the author in various personal conversations):

(5)

Ya acabá ya KA?
 PERF finish already YOU

“Have you finished already?”

(6) Andá ya KA?
 go PERF YOU

“Did you go?”

Table 4. Second-person singular pronominal choices in Zamboangueño Chabacano; N = 400.

Pronoun	% First choice
<i>tu</i>	70.5
<i>bos</i>	9
<i>usté</i>	7.75
<i>ka</i>	6.75
<i>bo</i>	3
<i>ikaw</i>	3

Source: From Edding (2003, p. 90).

(7)

Preguntá pa KA?
ask yet YOU
“Did you ask yet?”

(8)

Di IKAW gale
of YOU INTENS
“It’s yours”

(9)

Bueno pa sana con IKAW lang
good for cure with YOU LIM
“[this is] good for curing you”

The use of *ikaw* following possessive *di* (< Spanish *de* “of, from”) and accusative marker *con* is consistent with Chabacano syntax, whether or not the cited examples are exact replicas of overheard speech. Although Forman (2001, p. 107) did not hear Tagalog pronouns in the conversations he participated in, Rubino (2008, p. 283) gives personally observed examples such as

(10)

Onde KA puede encontra maestra ansina?
where you able find teacher thus
“Where can you find a teacher like that?”

In the only formal study available to date, Edding (2003) surveyed 400 speakers of Zamboanga Chabacano, 200 native speakers, and 200 “nonnative” speakers. Included in the second category are persons born in Zamboanga City of parents who are not native speakers of ZC, but the Zamboanga-born participants presumably acquired ZC natively. Edding probed for numerous lexical and morphosyntactic patterns that might point to the influence of Tagalog and other Philippine languages in contemporary ZC, and among the survey items was the choice of second-person singular pronouns. The choices were *tu*, *bos*, *bo* (a colloquial variant of *bos*), *usté*, *ka*, and *ikaw*, each embedded in the frame *Donde ___ anda?* “Where are {you} going?” Respondents were asked to rank the corresponding items according to their preference in usage. The preliminary results (Edding, 2003, p. 90) are given in Table 4; although respondents were given the opportunity

to choose more than a single response, ranking the possibilities in decreasing order of preference, only the top choices were tabulated.

According to Edding's chi-square calculations, the results showed no significant differences in overall choice of pronouns between native and nonnative speakers, between rural and urban speakers (200 of each), between male and female speakers (200 of each), by socioeconomic status (five groups), or by age (four groups, from 16 to 60+). However, nonnative speakers use *ka/ikaw* 13% of the time, and natives use them only 6.5% of the time. Running a chi-square collapsing *ka/ikaw*, *bo/bos* yields significant results at the $p < .01$ level. The choice *ka/ikaw* is also four times more frequent among teens (16%) than among seniors over 60 years of age (4%); moreover (Edding, 2003, p. 389), nonnative speaker seniors and few middle-aged native speakers use *ka/ikaw*. Running chi-square tests by age groups (combining native and nonnative) and collapsing *ka/ikaw* versus everything else, the results are significant at the $p < .02$ level.

Edding (2003) documents that the apparent entry of *ikaw/ka* is into ZC in the speech of the community's youth and is not merely an exaggerated shibboleth brandished by indignant community elders resentful of any Tagalog presence in Zamboanga. In 2009, the author interviewed (in Chabacano) 25 young (18- to 21-year-old) native speakers of ZC in Zamboanga City. Small-group conversations were also conducted in which the young speakers did most of the talking among themselves. Of the 25 interviewees, all but two claimed to use *ka/ikaw* in their own speech and actually did so with one another in spontaneous conversation, producing examples similar to (2)–(10). Some of these combinations were repeated frequently and may signal the incipient grammaticalization of fixed phrases. If *ikaw/ka* is making headway in quasi-fixed expressions, this could be a first step toward the restructuring of the ZC pronominal system via the permanent addition of *ikaw/ka*.

Possible reasons for the introduction of *ikaw/ka* in ZC

Since the introduction of Tagalog *ikaw/ka* into ZC discourse is evidently an ongoing process, the eventual outcome can only be extrapolated at this point. The use of these Tagalog pronouns and the choice of *ikaw/ka* from among the entire Tagalog pronoun repertoire require a multifaceted inquiry, based on means, motive, and opportunity available to ZC speakers. The fact that native speakers of Tagalog have emigrated to Zamboanga in recent years places spoken Tagalog in a position of greater prominence than in the past, when Tagalog was primarily a school subject and used only sparingly in spontaneous conversation among Zamboanguenos. The presence of Tagalog speakers in Zamboanga, while providing a necessary condition for the adoption of *ikaw/ka*, is not in itself sufficient to account for the use of Tagalog pronouns in ZC. The principal Philippine language other than Chabacano present in Zamboanga continues to be Visayan (Cebuano and related dialects), whose plural subject pronouns are already nearly identical to those of ZC (*kami*, *kita*, *kamo*, *sila*) and whose singular pronouns are identical to those of Tagalog. In particular, the second-person singular pronoun in Visayan is *ikaw*, with clitic form *ka*, just as in Tagalog, but prior to the recent upsurge in Tagalog usage in Zamboanga, and despite the continued prominence of Visayan, these pronouns made no appearance in ZC. Why, then, has a Tagalog pronoun succeeded in penetrating the Chabacano paradigm when the homophonous Visayan pronouns remained outside the pale of ZC until now? And more to the point, why is any exogenous pronoun entering ZC at all? The following partially interlocking reasons will be proposed, each of which appears to have contributed to the incursions of Tagalog pronouns into contemporary ZC:

- (a) Creation of a more definitive respect/nonrespect distinction in the second-person singular
- (b) Bringing the ZC pronominal system into closer alignment with other systems that embody the exclusive–inclusive distinction

- (c) A further drift from community-wide knowledge of Spanish and increasing identification of ZC as an inherently Philippine language
- (d) The long-standing tradition of massive borrowing into Chabacano, coupled with persistent notions that the language possessed no internal cohesiveness that would impede such borrowings
- (e) *ikaw/ka* comes to implicitly serve as in-group markers among Zamboanga youth and distinguish their speech from registers used by older residents. These points will be discussed in turn. Jake (1994) has claimed that subject pronouns may sometimes serve as discourse markers rather than functional categories and that language shifts between pronominal subjects and verbs can be acceptable. The use of *ikaw/ka* in ZC may have its origins in a sort of emblematic code-switch using a quintessential high-frequency Tagalog item, although among contemporary ZC speakers, a strong case cannot be made for synchronic code-switching involving this Tagalog pronoun.

ZC contains two second-person singular pronouns, *tu* and (*e*)*bos*. Although both are derived from Spanish second-person singular familiar forms, these pronouns have taken a different course in Chabacano, with *tu* becoming in effect a respect-neutral pronoun and (*e*)*bos* increasingly relegated to the sociolinguistic margins of discourse. ZC speakers consistently identify (*e*)*bos* (usually realized simply as *bo*) with being *rabiao* “angry,” and this pronoun is typically observed only in angry interchanges and ritualized insults. During the time period in which many Zamboangueños were still aware of the basic structures of Spanish (i.e. though the first half of the 20th century), the second-person singular pronoun *usté* < Spanish *usted* “you (s.)” was sometimes used as a pronoun of respect; this usage is still found in Zamboanga, as verified by Edding (2003, p. 90) but is increasingly confined to formulaic situations, such as the speech of hotel employees to guests and in addressing some elderly people who insist on being called *usté*. Many young Zamboangueños interviewed by the author in 2009 are no longer aware of the Spanish origins of Chabacano pronouns and believe that *usté* is simply a fast-speech variant of the second-person plural pronoun *ustedes* (also of Spanish origin). The banishment of (*e*)*bos* from most speech events and the rapidly fading awareness of the *tu-usted* distinction in Spanish have effectively left *tu* as sole exponent for both respectful and respect-neutral usage in contemporary ZC. This creates a mismatch between ZC and all other Philippine languages, in which pronominal usage consistently reflects respectful versus respect-neutral address, usually via the use of the second-person plural pronoun for singular respectful usage (e.g. *kayo* in Tagalog). The use of plural pronouns for singular respectful usage is not an option in ZC, since the second-person plural Philippine pronoun *kamó* has also been relegated to substandard status and is therefore inappropriate for respectful usage, while *ustedes* is recognized as a plural-only element, due to its Spanish-derived plural ending in /-s/, a feature found in partially fossilized form throughout the ZC lexicon, with high enough frequency to be still perceived as a plural marker. Individual Zamboangueños observed by this author between 1985 and 2009 attempted (perhaps unconsciously) to mitigate this un-Philippine collapsing of respectful and nonrespectful address in various fashions; some haughtily employ *bo(s)* with social inferiors, while others continue to insert *usté* to mitigate ambiguous social exchanges, against the general trend to abandon this pronoun. Most speakers, however, simply use *tu* but express respect by the grammaticized English-derived *sir* and *mam* [mam] (< English *ma'am*) as well as by nonverbal gestures such as bowing and lowering of the eyes. The incorporation of Tagalog *ikaw/ka* as a respect-neutral pronoun in ZC is consistent with the overall dichotomy in ZC between deferential forms derived from Spanish and nondeferential forms derived from Philippine languages, first demonstrated by Frake (1971). This apparent consistency with respect to the recent presence of *ikaw/ka* in

Zamboanga may be accidental, however, since among young ZC speakers who employ *ikaw/ka* there is little awareness of Spanish and no consideration of Spanish as more prestigious than either Chabacano or other Philippine languages. In fact, given the increasing presence of Tagalog as a viable and visible language in Zamboanga, as well as the ambivalent attitudes with respect to Chabacano, some Zamboangueños may regard Tagalog as more prestigious than ZC. If this is the case, ZC would be an apparent exception to the observation of Head (1978, p. 161) that “The most respectful form of address in a Creole language is typically the most recent one adopted from a more prestigious language, regardless of its social meaning (which is often non-deferential) in the language of origin.” Head’s statement refers to Creole languages undergoing decreolization in contact with the original lexifier, which is not applicable to ZC. In the latter language, the borrowed pronoun *ikaw/ka* from an arguably more prestigious language is not used to express greater respect than the corresponding Chabacano (Spanish-derived) pronoun but rather retains the same nondeferential status it exhibits in Tagalog. Given the widespread knowledge of Tagalog and Visayan as a first or second language in Zamboanga, it is inconceivable that the quintessentially nondeferential pronoun *ikaw/ka* could embody an expression of respect when incorporated into Chabacano. The fact that Tagalog appears to be gaining prestige in contemporary Zamboanga City as compared to Visayan, which is regarded simply as a pedestrian linguistic neighbor, may also account for the fact that the identical Visayan pronouns *ikaw/ka* did not enter ZC until the upsurge of the vitality and social acceptability of Tagalog.

The stranding of ZC *tu* for the expression of both respectful and respect-neutral address not only potentially strains pan-Philippine verbal honorific structures but is typologically inconsistent with the exclusive–inclusive “we” distinction incorporated into ZC since the turn of the 20th century. Cysouw (2002, pp. 51–52), after surveying 265 pronoun systems in 234 languages, presents evidence of an extremely strong correlation between the presence of an inclusive/exclusive (first-person plural) opposition and the absence of singular homophony: none of the languages surveyed employed the same pronoun for more than one person in the singular series if the plural series explicitly embodied an inclusive/exclusive distinction. On the other hand, horizontal homophony—the use of the same pronoun in the singular and plural—shows no correlation with the presence or absence of the inclusive/exclusive distinction. Put more precisely, “The person distinctions within the singular and within the non-singular have to be clearly separated before an inclusive/exclusive distinction is possible” (p. 52) and again: “[...] in a paradigm with an inclusive/exclusive distinction, the person reference is of such central importance that it is not possible to fuse person reference elsewhere in the paradigm” (p. 53). Although Cysouw stops short of attributing any causal force to this implication, the robustness of the absolute inverse correlation between an inclusive/exclusive distinction and singular homophony suggests that any deviations from this strong correlation could represent favorable loci for linguistic innovation. All Philippine languages, for which Tagalog serves as an exemplar, have distinct pronouns for first-person plural inclusive and exclusive. Tagalog also exhibits horizontal homophony in the use of *kayo* to express (neutral) second-person plural (the original meaning) as well as second-person singular respectful. In the singular series, the respect-neutral second-person pronoun is *ikaw/ka*. Given the strong emphasis on linguistic expression of respect in Tagalog (e.g. via the use of honorific particles such as *po*), second-person respectful and second-person respect-neutral effectively represent different personal referents.

Tagalog complies with the aforementioned correlation between an inclusive–exclusive distinction and no singular homophony. Spanish, on the other hand, has only a single first-person plural pronoun *nosotros* (with feminine variant *nosotras*). Although Spanish distinguishes between the respectful second-person singular pronoun *usted* and the respect-neutral *tú*, only the latter pronoun (and its archaic alternate, *vos*) entered ZC, possibly due to the practice by Spanish colonists and military officers of referring to all indigenous subjects (implicitly regarded as inferior) with

familiar pronouns. There is no independent evidence to date the entrance of *usté* (2-sg.)/*ustedes* (2-pl.) in ZC; elderly speakers interviewed in 1985 knew and used these pronouns alongside *tu* (2-sg.) and *bo(s)* (2-sg.), and an anonymous newspaper dialog in ZC from 1933 reprinted in Nieva (1984, p. 215) also uses *usté* “you (s.),” as does the brief sketch by Broad (1929, p. 160). However, given the absence of these items in Cavite and Ternate Chabacano, *usté/ustedes* may be a later accretion in ZC, possibly occurring during the period of closest approximation to Spanish in the late 19th century. Extrapolating once more from the speech of the oldest rural Zamboanguenos, ZC apparently first used only the Spanish first-person plural pronoun *nosotros* and employed *tu* and (*e*) *bos* in the singular, a pronominal system congruent to that of Spanish itself.

By the turn of the 20th century, ZC began moving away from its Spanish sources, as the number of fluent Spanish speakers diminished quickly following the loss of Spanish sovereignty after the Spanish–American War (1899) and as speakers of central Philippine Visayan languages flooded into Zamboanga City. It was during these years that Spanish *nosotros* was replaced by the Philippine dyad *kamé* (exclusive)-*kitá* (inclusive), effectively marking a key stage in the linguistic transition of ZC from a Spanish contact vernacular still regarded by speakers and outside observers alike as some sort of “strange Spanish” to a bona fide Philippine language. At the same time, (*e*)*bos* “you (s.)” was fading from the singular series, considered too rude to be used except for insults and in moments of emotional distress, and the use of *usté* < *usted* as a more respectful alternative to *tu* also faded along with general awareness of Spanish grammar. This effectively stranded *tu* as the sole exponent of second-person singular in a neo-Philippine language (now effectively behaving as such), all of which sustains a distinction between respectful and respect-neutral second-person singular address forms. *Tu* in effect embodied singular homophony in a pronominal system containing an inclusive/exclusive distinction, a typological anomaly according to Cysouw’s (2002) survey results. The use of *ka/ikaw* by young Zamboanguenos in effect eliminates singular homophony by reintroducing a respect-neutral pronoun and consequently restricting *tu* for respectful usage. Regardless of whether singular homophony is a potential sore spot and more to the point, if *ka/ikaw* does become fully integrated into the ZC pronominal system, then this language will cease to stand out among Philippine languages in not exhibiting a neutral-respectful distinction in the singular pronominal system.

Why Tagalog *kayo* is not accompanying *ikaw/ka* into ZC

Of the 23 young ZC speakers interviewed in 2009 who admitted to using *ka/ikaw*, 3 indicated that they occasionally use the Tagalog second-person plural pronoun *kayo* but only in its basic sense as a second-person plural pronoun; in Tagalog, *kayo* is also used in the singular as a respectful form of address. Although in Tagalog, *kayo* as a plural pronoun is neutral with respect to the familiar-respectful dichotomy, in the few instances when young speakers in Zamboanga use *kayo* in Chabacano, it not only has second-person plural reference, but because it is only used with other young interlocutors, it can be construed as an in-group pronoun. For young Zamboanguenos who use *kayo* with one another, ZC *ustedes* “you (pl.)” narrows its scope to that of a pronoun of respect used with older interlocutors. Philippine languages, however, do not distinguish levels of respect or deference in second-person plural pronouns; just as the *kamó-ustedes* distinction was not consistent with Philippine patterns, so a potential *kayo-ustedes* dichotomy is not consistent with the postulated tendency of ZC to move into closer congruity with other Philippine languages.

In Tagalog, *kayo* is also used as a second-person singular pronoun of respect, and its usage is absolutely de rigueur when speaking to any adult not known to the speaker or who occupies a higher social status than the speaker. The use of *kayo* as singular second-person pronoun is not found in the innovative Chabacano of young Zamboanguenos; only one interviewee claimed to have heard *kayo*

occasionally used as a formal second-person singular, but only when speakers seemed to have confused Tagalog and Chabacano when speaking to an older interlocutor. In Tagalog, with its inexorable honorific markers and ironclad familiar–respectful pronominal distinction, for a young person to address an older adult as *ikaw* is unthinkable. Thus, the very occasional use of singular *kayo* by young Zamboanguenos might only occur at moments when the speaker becomes flustered upon suddenly being faced with the need to use a respectful address form with an older adult. If the young speaker has been using *ikaw/ka* as a neutral second-person singular form of address, but is aware of the impropriety of using this pronoun with an older adult when speaking Tagalog, then the ameliorative use of *kayo* can be construed as a momentary code-switch to Tagalog as a matrix language in order to avoid the potential sociolinguistic ambiguity represented by *ikaw/ka*: presumably neutral in innovative ZC but familiar and inappropriate as a respectful form in Tagalog.

In addition to the potentially non-Philippine nature of an emergent *kayo-ustedes* distinction in the second-person plural, the allomorphy of Tagalog pronouns may also be a factor inhibiting the entrance of the second-person plural pronoun *kayó* into ZC. In ZC, personal pronouns present three paradigms, as shown in Table 3: subject, possessive, and object. Tagalog pronouns are similarly divided into case-marked paradigms, which in addition to often unrecognizable allomorphy present distributional characteristics different from those in Chabacano. Such differences may be reflected in the borrowing of *ikaw/ka* but not the remaining Tagalog allomorphs and may also contribute to the exclusion of *kayo* from entry into ZC.

The Tagalog second-person singular subject pronoun *ikaw* and enclitic variant *ka* alternate with the enclitic possessive *-mo*, as in:

(11)

ano ang pangalan mo
 what DET name you-POSS
 “What is your name?”

Not only is the phonotactic shape of *mo* completely different from *ikaw* but also the enclitic placement of *mo* is at odds with the prenominal placement of possessives in ZC:

(12)

cosa el dituyo nombre
 what DET you-POSS name

If *mo* were placed preminally in ZC, it would not only depart from its obligatorily enclitic status in Tagalog but could also be potentially confused with the equative *amo* “just like, correct” as in

(13)

Zamboanga amo el mas bonito ciudad
 Zamboanga COP DET most beautiful city
 “Zamboanga is (truly) the most beautiful city.”

In Tagalog, the object pronoun (also used with the long possessive constructions with *sa* ___) corresponding to *ikaw* is *iyó*, which has a very different phonotactic shape and is potentially confused with *yo* “I” (e.g. as observed by Forman, 2001, p. 107). Zamboanguenos who introduce *ikaw/ka* into Chabacano

have borrowed only the Tagalog word but not the complete pronoun, which in reality is a set of case-marked forms and distribution frames. In the currently observable speech of young Zamboanguenos, *ikaw/ka* continues to behave as any other Chabacano pronoun, despite its exogamous origin.

The situation is analogous for the Tagalog second-person plural pronoun *kayo*. The short possessive enclitic corresponding to *kayo* is *ninyó*, and the oblique form is *inyó*, both of which are cognate with the shunned ZC second-person plural possessive forms *diinyo* (possessive) and *kaninyo* (oblique), corresponding to the subject pronoun *kamó*. By introducing *ikaw/ka* into Chabacano, the familiar–formal distinction in the 2-sg. is resolved. As indicated by the result of the author’s interviews with young Zamboanguenos, *kayó* does not appear to be making any headway in Chabacano, except for occasional moments of confusion or deliberate code-switching. Nor have any of the other Tagalog pronouns been observed or reported in contemporary ZC; only *ikaw/ka* has emerged as a strong contender for the rehybridization of the ZC pronominal system.

Linguistic and cultural hybridity as the essence of ZC

Although ZC probably differed significantly from Spanish right from the outset, explicit awareness by outside observers (and also by Zamboanguenos) of the existence of a restructured language different from Spanish was apparently slow in arising. And when such awareness did emerge, it was manifested in such a fashion as to suggest that what is now known as ZC was considered by its own speakers as well as by Spanish-speaking observers from elsewhere as nothing but a hopeless jumble of bits and pieces of many languages. Fernández (2006) and Lipski (2010) describe in detail the ambiguous and often ambivalent comments on the language(s) used in Zamboanga, from the mid-18th century until well into the 20th. These attitudes are reflected in many of the comments presented in Table 2; in fact Fernández (2006) interprets the lack of mention of anything other than “Spanish” for Zamboanga prior to the 1880s as evidence that ZC arose spontaneously in Zamboanga not following the reestablishment of the Spanish fort after 1719 but at some point in the second half of the 19th century, when demographic shifts resulted in native Spanish speakers being outnumbered by speakers of Philippine languages. However, the earliest mention of “mixed” language cited by Fernández dates from 1883, while Table 2 shows that acknowledgement of contact-induced varieties of Spanish in Zamboanga are found in the early decades of the 19th century. Leaving aside grammatical similarities between ZC and Manila Bay Chabacano varieties, which suggest at least some influence of the latter dialects on ZC, there is independent evidence (e.g. by extrapolating from the oldest recorded speakers, born in the final decades of the 19th century) that a restructured variety that came to be known as Chabacano had emerged in Zamboanga at least by the beginning of the 19th century and quite possibly several decades earlier.

The ambiguous descriptions of the language(s) spoken in Zamboanga prior to the 20th century contain the seeds of an explanation as to the confusion between the two objectively different languages, European Spanish and Chabacano, especially the Zamboangueno variety. The incorporation of the Tagalog pronoun *ikaw/ka* into Zamboanga Chabacano has been aided and abetted by the long-standing view, held by Zamboanguenos and outsiders alike, that Chabacano is a hopelessly mixed-up language, a degenerate form of Spanish, an illegitimate language, and a language without grammar and therefore without any metalinguistic infrastructure that would keep exogamous intrusions at bay. During an extended stay in Zamboanga in 1985, the author was repeatedly queried by city residents who expressed surprise at any scholarly interest in Chabacano, since according to them *nuay kamé* “grammar” “we don’t have any grammar” or *Chabacano amo* “broken Spanish” “Chabacano is really broken Spanish.” The late mayor of Zamboanga, Maria Clara Llobregat (cited by Forman, 2001, p. 100), stated that “To be frank about it, until recently Chabacano had been taken

as a joke, even by some of those for whom it was the language of the cradle. One reason is that Chabacano is considered just a bastardized form of Spanish.” Although this viewpoint is held by no serious scholars and appears to be on the decline among the general citizenry of Zamboanga, it continues to exhibit great tenacity even among young students who have been exposed to courses in linguistics. Valles-Akil (2002) offers a recent study of attitudes toward and maintenance of ZC. One reason for the persistent belief that Chabacano is not a “real” language is that it is not taught in schools, and the only available written materials are occasional pamphlets for tourists and the grammar and phrase book of Camins (1999) given to visitors at the Zamboanga City Hall but not widely known to the remainder of the population. Chabacano is used in many church services and both Catholic and Protestant translations of the New Testament are available, but many residents continue to recite the traditional prayers in (memorized) Spanish and harbor the deep-seated opinion that praying in Chabacano borders on sacrilege. Unlike with English and Tagalog, both of which are taught in schools and for which teachers, grammar books, and dictionaries can be readily consulted, there are no acknowledged authorities on Chabacano usage. Chabacano speakers freely incorporate English, Visayan, and more recently Tagalog lexical items in tacit recognition of the fact that there are no other Chabacano-speaking communities from which new words can be drawn (the earlier practice, common among some influential radio personalities, of introducing Spanish words as effective Chabacano neologisms, described in Lipski, 1986, is no longer viable). From its outset, Zamboanga Chabacano was the product of contacts between many languages and subcultures, none of which—not even Spanish—were completely dominant. Camins (1999, p. 4) offers an unusually positive interpretation of this development: Chabacano de Zamboanga “is a living dialect which had been enriched by foreign and local cultures of the past as it is being continually enriched with the injection of more words from other foreign and local sub-cultures of today.” Not all Zamboangueños share this up-beat assessment, and comments on the “mongrel” nature of ZC continue to sprinkle many conversations about the Chabacano language.

Although many older Zamboangueños express displeasure at the use of Tagalog *ikaw/ka* by younger speakers (since in their minds a complete Chabacano pronoun system already exists), those who use the Tagalog pronouns simply accept this behavior as part of the “anything goes” ethos ascribed to all things Chabacano. An official brochure of the City of Zamboanga (2008) describes Chabacano as “a delightful potpourri of 60% *Español* and 40% *nativo* words”; the ambivalence surrounding Chabacano is continued in a tourist brochure and map distributed by the Zamboanga Mayor’s Office, which in addition to repeating the aforementioned “potpourri” commentary, describes Zamboanga as “The only city in the Philippines and in Asia speaking the Spanish-derivative *Chavacano*.” The “laissez faire” attitude taken by many Zamboangueños with respect to Chabacano contrasts sharply with usage in Tagalog, Visayan, and English, all of which are implicitly and explicitly treated as “real” languages subject to the usual types of lexical borrowing, as well as the pan-Philippine practice of freely code-switching, but whose grammatical integrity is not to be tampered with.

Summary and conclusions

The ZC pronominal system has evolved in at least three stages and is apparently entering a fourth, each of which can be correlated with the relative proportion of contacts with Spanish and Philippine languages, and, according to available testimony, with the shift in (self-) identification of ZC as, successively, a pidginized soldiers’ vernacular, a dialectal form of Spanish, and finally a Philippine language.

The FIRST STAGE, being the most speculative but apparently lasting at least until the early 19th century, was characterized by relatively little sustained contact with non-Creole Spanish, probably

by the greatest amount of intraspeaker variability and by a Spanish-derived pronominal system that embodied a fundamentally Spanish set of semantic oppositions, except for the absence of grammatical gender. The latter trait is common to all Philippine languages but could have already been present in Spanish colonists' awareness of pidginized Spanish and Portuguese as used throughout southern and southeastern Asia.

The proposed SECOND STAGE of ZC spans most of the 19th century and the first years of the 20th century. During this period, the use of the Spanish language reached its peak in Zamboanga, as did Chabacano–Spanish bilingualism. During this period, Zamboanga developed the reputation it continues to tout (a bit unrealistically today) as the Philippine City in which the most Spanish was spoken. Interviews conducted in 1985 with elderly Zamboanguenos, especially from rural areas, confirmed some knowledge of noncreolized Spanish by these speakers, and their assertions that previous generations also spoke noncreolized Spanish alongside ZC cannot be dismissed. It was during this time period that the Spanish pronouns *nosotros* “we” and *vosotros* “you-pl.” (and, possibly also *el* “he, she” and *ellos* “they”) were still viable in ZC, and the conceptual boundaries between Spanish and Chabacano became most permeable. During this stage, the pronoun *usté* < Spanish *usted* “you (s.)” became frequently used as a formal second-person singular address form, with ZC *tu* reverting to its etymological Spanish sense of a familiar or respect-neutral pronoun, and ZC (*e*)*bos* being relegated to the most colloquial registers. In this proposed second stage, not only the ZC pronominal system but also, in large measure, the entire Chabacano language was functionally homologous to a dialect of Spanish, whose principal non-Spanish trait was the absence of grammatical gender distinctions.

The postulated THIRD STAGE in the evolution of the ZC pronoun system occurred around the turn of the 20th century, coterminous with the increasing presence of English following the United States' occupation (lasting from 1899 until the Japanese invasion of 1941 and again from 1944 until 1946) and the rapid decline of Spanish, together with the influx of Visayan speakers. During this time period, Zamboanga City and its environs experienced a large growth spurt, entirely composed of speakers of languages other than Chabacano. From a population of less than 2000 at the beginning of the 20th century (including an undetermined but evidently significant number of Spanish speakers), the population of Zamboanga grew to more than 350,000 by the early 1980s and has nearly tripled since that time period (Barrios-Fabian, 2004, p. 7; also Tigno, 2006). The 1900–1980 growth includes mostly speakers of central Philippine languages such as Visayan, while the data from the 1980s to the present include a majority of Tagalog speakers. The proposed third stage is marked by the incorporation of the inclusive–exclusive “we” distinction into ZC through the borrowing of the pronouns *kitá/kamé*, together with the respective second- and third-person pronouns *kamó* and *silá*. Whinnom (1956, p. 77) was of the opinion that “[...] Zamboangueno is disintegrating in two directions, into two dialects, one which is little more than incorrect Spanish with some features of the contact vernacular, and the other which makes extensive use of native words and constructions.” Although Forman (1972, p. 11) is critical of Whinnom's attitude as well as his reliance on a handful of verses for his analysis of an entire language, Whinnom's description is consistent with the succession of developmental stages proposed here. During this stage of ZC development, there was no further influence of the Spanish language (except for erudite borrowings by some radio announcers and Bible translators; Lipski, 1986); Visayan provided the principal source of new accretions, a status that was eventually overtaken (but not completely effaced) by English. As ZC increasingly behaved lexically, morphosyntactically, and semantically like a Philippine language, the ZC pronominal system for the first time in its history was functionally equivalent to those found in patrimonial Philippine languages. Only the tendency to avoid the second-person plural pronoun *kamó* and to prefer *ustedes*, as well as the decline of singular *usté*

(sometimes incorrectly analyzed as a variant of *ustedes*), resulted in an incompletely Philippine pronominal paradigm in which the dichotomy respectful/respect-neutral was not firmly in place in the second-person singular.

The ZC speech community—or at least many of the youngest speakers—is evidently entering a FOURTH STAGE, with the incorporation of Tagalog *ka/ikaw* representing the effective restoration of the distinction between respectful and respect-neutral second-person singular pronouns. The increasing vigor of Tagalog as a spoken language in Zamboanga (aided by the aforementioned doubts as to the legitimacy of Chabacano) tipped the balance in favor of a purely Philippine pronominal system as regards semantic and pragmatic distinctions, embedded in a language that no longer behaves like an offshoot of Spanish but rather like any other Philippine language. Although taken from Tagalog, *ka* and *ikaw* behave morphosyntactically as ZC items. By increasing the number of Chabacano pronominal options, this borrowing brings the ZC system more closely into alignment with Tagalog/Visayan.

Despite scholarship and increasing official recognition, many ZC speakers and their neighbors still think of Chabacano as not a “real” language; they continue to use terms like “bastard Spanish” and “halo-halo” (a Japanese-derived term meaning “mixed together”), while modern Tagalog–Chabacano hybrid combinations are referred to disapprovingly as “Chabacano *pul-pul*” (from the Tagalog *pulpul* “ignorant, useless person”; Forman, 2001, p.106). The fact that the ZC pronoun system is already a Spanish–Filipino hybrid as well as the lingering notion that ZC is nothing but a crazy mixed-up language attenuate whatever inhibitions as might arise against borrowing such a putatively untouchable item as a single pronoun. From *halo-halo* to *Chabacano pulpul* is a sociolinguistically small step; many young Zamboanguenos have already taken this step.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Dr Grace Rebollos, president of Western Mindanao State University, and her staff, for facilitating my research during my visit to WMSU in 2009. This is my second debt of gratitude to Dr Rebollos; the first was incurred in 1985 during my Fulbright research fellowship at WMSU, at which time Dr Rebollos was director of the WMSU Research Center. My thanks also go to Dr Nimfa Rebollos Edding, Dr Hermenegildo Malcampo, Mrs Melanie Enriquez (artist name “Titang Jaldon”), Congresswoman Maria Isabel “Beng” Climaco, Zamboanga City Mayor Celso Lobregat, former Zamboanga City Mayor José Atilano, and all the WMSU students and colleagues who attended my seminars and who responded to my inquiries into the Chabacano language. In Cavite City, Dr Enrique “Ike” Escalante provided valuable corroborative information on Caviteño Chabacano. Additional information in Cavite was provided by Mrs Jocelyn “Joy” de la Rosa, head librarian of the Cavite City Library, and by the late Mrs Purificacion “Puring” Ballesteros, my first and longest standing Chabacano friend. Dr Evangelino “Enjoe” Nigoza provided helpful data on Ternateño Chabacano in 1985 and continues to be the major Philippine expert on this language. Posthumous thanks are also due to Mrs Natividad “Nati” Nazareno and Mr Dominador “Doming” Nazareno of Cavite for their extensive help during my 1985 research, to Zamboanga radio personality Romy Enriquez of the “Tienda na Gulud” program (who frightened me out of my wits by interviewing me over the air in Chabacano during my first days in Zamboanga), and to Mrs Hilda Araneta and Mr Rodolfo “Po” Araneta of Zamboanga, my host family and source of invaluable linguistic information and warm friendship. Finally, I thank the dozens of Chabacano speakers in Manila, Cavite, Ternate, Zamboanga, Basilan, Jolo, Davao, and Cotabato who generously shared their lives and their language with me. *Hendeq ay ulbida yo con ustedes.*

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

- Álvarez Guerra, J. (1872). *Un viaje por Oriente: De Manila á Marianas* [A trip to the Orient: from Manila to the Marianas]. Madrid, Spain: Imp. de C. Molino y Cía.
- Apostol, F. (1962–1967). The Chabacano dialect. Series of articles appearing in the Southern Tribune, Zamboanga City (from December 5, 1962, to February 15, 1967).
- Baker, P., & Huber, M. (2000). Constructing new pronominal systems from the Atlantic to the Pacific. *Linguistics*, 38, 833–866.
- Balmori, J. (1917). Na maldito arena. *Philippine Review*, 2, 71–73.
- Banqué, P. S. J. (1884). Carta del Hermano Pablo Banqué al P. Hermenegildo Jacas, fechada en Zamboanga en 10 de abril de 1884. In *Cartas de los PP. de la Compañía de Jesús de la Misión de Filipinas* [Letter from Brother Pablo Banqué to Father Hermenegildo Jacas, dated Zamboanga April 10, 1884. In Letters to the Fathers of the Company of Jesus, Philippine Mission] (Cuaderno 6, pp. 25–35). Manila, Philippines: Establecimiento Tipo-Litográfico de M. Pérez hijo, 1887.
- Baranera, F. (1880). *Compendio de geografía de las Islas Filipinas, Marianas y Joló* [Geographical compendium of the Philippine Islands, the Marianas and Jolo]. Manila, Philippines: Establecimiento Tipográfico de Ramírez y Giraudier.
- Barrantes, V. (1869). *La instrucción primaria en Filipinas de 1596 hasta 1868* [Primary education in the Philippines from 1596 to 1868]. Madrid, Spain: Imprenta de la Iberia y Manila: Imprenta y Librería de Ramírez y Giraudier.
- Barrios, A. (2006, January). *Austronesian elements in Philippine Creole Spanish*. Paper presented at Tenth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Puerto Princesa City, Palawan, Philippines. Retrieved from <http://www.sil.org/asia/philippines/ical/papers.html>
- Barrios-Fabian, M. L. (2004). *Case study of Zamboanga City (forced migration area)* (Discussion Paper Series No. 2004-50). Makati City, Manila: Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
- Barrows, D. (1914). *A history of the Philippines*. Yonkers-on-Hudson, NY: World Book Company.
- Bastian, A. (1870). *Sprachvergleichende Studien mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Indochinesischen Sprachen* [General linguistic studies with special emphasis on Indo-Chinese languages]. Leipzig, Germany: F.A. Brockhaus.
- Batalha, G. N. (1960). Coincidências com o dialecto de Macau em dialectos espanhóis das Ilhas Filipinas [Coincidences between the dialect of Macao and the Spanish dialects of the Philippines]. *Boletim de Filologia* [General linguistic studies with special emphasis on Indo-Chinese languages], 19, 295–303.
- Bickerton, D. (1981). *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma.
- Blake, F. (1905). The Bisayan dialects. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 26, 120–136.
- Blumentritt, F. (1885). Vocabular einzelner Ausdrücke und Redensarten, welche dem Spanischen der philippinischen Inseln eigenthümlich sind, II. In *Jahres-Bericht der Communal-Ober-Realschule in Leitmeritz* (Vol. XIX, pp. 1–64). Leitmeritz, Germany: Verlag der Communal-Ober-Realschule.
- Broad, H. P. (1929). Chabacano. *Philippine Magazine*, 26, 142, 160.
- Camins, B. (1999). *Chabacano de Zamboanga handbook and dictionary*. Zamboanga City, Philippines: Office of the Mayor.
- Cañamaque, F. (1880). *Las Islas Filipinas (de todo un poco)* [The Philippine Islands: a little bit of everything]. Madrid, Spain: Librería de Fernando Fé, Librería de Simón y Osler.
- Caro y Mora, J. (1897). *La situación del país* [The situation of the country]. Manila, Philippines: Impr. de “Amigos del País.”
- Cavada y Méndez de Vigo, A. (1876). *Historia geográfica, geológica y estadística de Filipinas* [Geographical, geological, and statistical history of the Philippines]. Manila, Philippines: Ramírez y Giraudier.
- City of Zamboanga. (2008, December). *Adelante Zamboanga*: Official publication, City of Zamboanga, Asia’s Latin City. No. 1, Maiden issue.

- Commissioner of Education. (1907). *Report of the commissioner of education for the year ending June 30, 1905* (Vol. 1). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Cysouw, M. (2002). “We” rules: The impact of an inclusive/exclusive opposition on the paradigmatic structure of person marking. In H. Simon & H. Wiese (Eds.), *Pronouns—Grammar and representation* (pp. 41–62). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Cysouw, M. (2003). *The paradigmatic structure of person marking*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dalrymple, M., & Kaplan, R. (2000). Feature indeterminacy and feature resolution. *Language*, 76, 759–798.
- De la Corte y Ruano, F. (1877). *La isla de Mindanao, su suelo y sus habitantes* [The island of Mindanao, its land and its inhabitants]. Madrid, Spain: Imprenta del Memorial de Ingenieros.
- De los Reyes y Florentino, I. (1888). *Artículos varios sobre etnografía, historia y costumbres de Filipinas* [Assorted articles on the ethnography, history, and customs of the Philippines]. Manila, Philippines: J.A. Ramos-Editor.
- De Ocampo, E. (2007). *The Ternateños: Their history, languages, customs and traditions*. Manila, Philippines: National Historical Institute.
- Donohue, M., & Smith, J. C. (1998). What’s happened to us? Some developments in the Malay pronoun system. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 37, 65–84.
- Doyle, J. S. J. (1888). Carta del P. Juan Doyle al Rector de Ateneo de Manila, fechada en Cotabato el 27 de mayo de 1888. In *Cartas de los PP. de la Compañía de Jesús de la Misión de Filipinas* (Cuaderno 8, pp. 124–129). Manila, Philippines: Establecimiento Tipo-Litografía de Chofré y Comp^a, 1889.
- Edding, N. R. (2003). *Language maintenance and shift among native and non-native speakers of Zamboanga Chabacano* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Western Mindanao State University, Philippines.
- Élisée Reclus. (1892). *The earth and its inhabitants: Oceania* (Vol. 14, A. H. Keane, Ed.). New York, NY: D. Appleton and Company.
- Entrala, F. de P. (1881). *Sin título, novela de costumbres* [No title, a novel of customs]. Manila, Philippines: Establecimiento Tipográfico de Ramírez y Giraudier.
- Entrala, F. de P. (1882). *Cuadros filipinos* [Philippine portraits]. Manila, Philippines: Imprenta de “La Oceanía Española.”
- Escosura, P. de la, & Cañamaque, F. (1882). *Memoria sobre Filipinas y Joló* [A memoir on the Philippines and Jolo] (2nd ed.). Madrid, Spain: Librería de los señores Simón y Osler.
- Feced, P. [Quioquiap]. (1888). *Filipinas, esbozos y pinceladas* [The Philippines: sketches and drawings]. Manila, Philippines: Estab. Tipog. de Ramírez y Compañía.
- Ferguson, C. (1959). Diglossia. *Word*, 15, 325–340.
- Fernández, M. (2006). Las lenguas de Zamboanga según los padres jesuitas y otros observadores occidentales [The languages of Zamboanga according to the Jesuit fathers and other observers]. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana*, 7, 9–26.
- Foreman, J. (1906). *The Philippine islands*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner’s Sons.
- Forman, M. (1972). *Zamboangueno texts with grammatical analysis* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Cornell University, Ithaca, NY.
- Forman, M. (2001). Confidence in Chabacano: Counterbalance to a western ideology of language. *Estudios de Sociolingüística* [Studies in Sociolinguistics], 2, 95–117.
- Forrest, T. (1780). *Voyage aux Moluques et à la Nouvelle Guinée* [A trip to the Moluccas and New Guinea]. Paris, France: Hôtel de Thou.
- Frake, C. (1971). Lexical origins and semantic structure in Philippine Creole Spanish. In D. Hymes (Ed.), *Pidginization and creolization of languages* (pp. 223–242). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Frake, C. (1988). Abu Sayyaf: Displays of violence and the proliferation of contested identities among Philippine Muslims. *American Anthropologist*, 100, 41–54.

- Francia y Ponce de León, B., & González Parrado, J. (1898). *Las Islas Filipinas: Mindanao, tomo I*. Havana, Cuba: Imp. de la Subinspección de Infantería.
- Germán, A. (1932). *The Spanish dialect of Cavite* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of the Philippines, Philippines.
- Gómez Rivera, G. (2002). El idioma criollo de Filipinas [The creole language of the Philippines]. *Papia*, 12, 125–137.
- González Fernández, R., & Moreno Jerez, F. (1877). *Anuario filipino para 1877* [Philippine yearbook for 1877]. Manila, Philippines: Establecimiento Tipográfico de Plana y Ca.
- Gonzalez Serrano, V. (1880). *Ecoss de Manila*. Manila, Philippines: Imprenta y Librería de El Oriente.
- Grant, A. (2002). El chabacano zamboangueno: Una lengua mezclada [Zamboangueno Chabacano: a mixed language]. *Papia*, 12, 7–40.
- Grant, A. (2009). Contact, complexification and change in Mindanao Chabacano structure. In E. Aboh & N. Smith (Eds.), *Complex processes in new languages* (pp. 223–241). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Guerrero, R. (1896). *Crónica de la guerra de Cuba y de la rebelión de Filipinas, tomo cuarto* [Chronicle of the Cuban war and the Philippine rebellion]. Barcelona, Spain: Casa Editorial Maucci.
- Guillemard, F. H. H. (1908). *Australasia, volume II: Malaysia and the Pacific Archipelagoes* (2nd ed., Revised by A. H. Keane). London, UK: Edward Stanford.
- Harley, H., & Ritter, E. (2002). Person and number in pronouns: A feature-geometric analysis. *Language*, 78, 482–526.
- Head, B. (1978). Respect degrees in pronominal reference. In J. Greenberg (Ed.), *Universals of human language: Word structure* (Vol. 3, pp. 151–211). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Heras, J. S. J. (1878). Carta del Padre Juan Heras al Provincial, fechada en Manila en 10 de diciembre de 1878. In *Cartas de los PP. de la Compañía de Jesús de la Misión de Filipinas* (Cuaderno, pp. 2–45). Manila, Philippines: Establecimiento Tipo-Litográfico de Ramirez y Giraudier, 1879.
- Horton, A. B. (Compiler). (1903). *Committee on insular affairs, house of representatives, fifty-seventh Congress, first and second sessions, 1901-1903*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Jagor, F. (1875). *Travels in the Philippines*. London, UK: Chapman and Hall.
- Jake, J. (1994). Intrasentential code-switching and pronouns: On the categorical status of functional elements. *Linguistics*, 32, 271–298.
- Keppel, H. (1853). *A visit to the Indian archipelago* (Vol. I). London, UK: Richard Bentley.
- Lannoy, M. J. (1849). *Iles Philippines, de leur situation ancienne et actuelle* [The Philippine Islands : their former and current situation]. Brussels, Belgium: Imprimerie de Delevigne et Callewaert.
- Lay, G. T. (1839). *The claims of Japan and Malaysia upon Christendom exhibited in notes of voyages made in 1837*. New York, NY: E. French.
- Lipski, J. (1986). Modern Spanish once—Removed in Philippine Creole Spanish: The case of Zamboanga. *Language in Society*, 16, 91–108.
- Lipski, J. (1988). Philippine Creole Spanish: Reassessing the Portuguese element. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 104, 25–45.
- Lipski, J. (1992). New thoughts on the origins of Zamboangueno (Philippine Creole Spanish). *Language Sciences*, 14, 197–231.
- Lipski, J. (2000). El español criollo de Filipinas: El caso de Zamboanga [Philippine creole Spanish: the case of Zamboanga]. In Y. Lastra (Ed.), *Estudios de sociolingüística* (pp. 339–366). México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Instituto de Investigaciones Antropológicas.
- Lipski, J. (2001). The place of Chabacano in the Philippine linguistic identity. *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 2, 119–163.

- Lipski, J. (2010). Chabacano y español: Resolviendo las ambigüedades [Chabacano and Spanish: resolving the ambiguities]. *Lengua y Migración/Language and Migration*, 2, 5–41.
- López, V. (1893). *El filibustero* [The Philibusterer]. Madrid, Spain: Imprenta de la Viuda de M. Minuesa de los Ríos.
- MacKinlay, W. (1901). Memorandum on the languages of the Philippines. *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, 31, 214–218.
- Malcampo, H. (2007). *Historia de Zamboanga (en Chabacano) antes y durante el período español 1400-1900* [History of Zamboanga (in Chabacano) before and during the Spanish period 1400-1900]. Zamboanga, Philippines: Western Mindanao State University Press.
- Malcampo, H. (2009, July). *A position paper on the present status of Chabacano in the city of Zamboanga*. Presented to the Zamboanga City Council, Zamboanga City, Philippines.
- Mallat, J. (1848). *Les Philippines, histoire, géographie, moeurs* [The Philippines, history, geography, customs]. Paris, France: Arthus Bertrand.
- Maño, T. (1961). Zamboangueno Chabacano. *Far Eastern University Faculty Journal*, 6, 52–57.
- Martínez de Zúñiga, J. (1973). *Status of the Philippines in 1800* (Vicente del Carmen, Trans.). Manila, Philippines: Filipiniana Book Guild.
- Marryat, F. (1848). *Borneo and the Indian archipelago*. London, UK: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans.
- McKaughan, H. (1954). Notes on Chabacano grammar. *University of Manila Journal of East Asiatic Studies*, 3, 205–226.
- McWhorter, J. (1995). The scarcity of Spanish-based creoles explained. *Language in Society*, 24, 213–244.
- McWhorter, J. (2000). *The missing Spanish creoles: Recovering the birth of plantation contact languages*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Miranda, G. (1956). *El dialecto chabacano de Cavite* [The Chabacano dialect of Cavite]. Dumaguete City, Philippines: n. p.
- Molony, C. (1973). Sound changes in Chabacano. In A. Gonzalez (Ed.), *Parangal kay López* (pp. 38–50). Quezon City, Philippines: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Molony, C. (1977a). Semantic changes in Chabacano. In J. Meisel (Ed.), *Langues en contact-pidgins-creoles-languages in contact* (pp. 153–166). Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr.
- Molony, C. (1977b). Recent relexification processes in Philippine Creole Spanish. In B. Blount & M. Sanches (Eds.), *Sociocultural dimensions of language change* (pp. 131–160). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Montano, J. (1886). *Voyage aux Philippines et en Malaisie* [A trip to the Philippines and Malaysia]. Paris, France: Librairie Hachette et Cie.
- Montero y Vidal, J. (1876). *Cuentos filipinos* [Philippine tales]. Madrid, Spain: Imprenta, Estereotipia y Galvanoplastia de Aribau y Compañía.
- Moor, J. H. (1837). *Notices of the Indian archipelago and adjacent countries*. Singapore: n. p.
- Moya y Jiménez, F. J. de. (1883). *Las Islas Filipinas en 1882* [The Philippine Islands in 1882]. Madrid, Spain: Est. Tipográfico de El Correo.
- Mugler, F. (1983). *A comparative study of the pronominal system of Romance-based creoles* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Mühlhäusler, P., & Harré, R. (1990). *Pronouns and people: The linguistic construction of social and personal identity*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Nieva, A. (1984). Chabacano: Bien facil lang gayot [Chabacano: it's really easy]. In A. Orendain II (Ed.), *Zamboanga hermosa: Memories of the Old Town* (pp. 213–217). Makati, Manila: Filipinas Foundation.
- Nigoza, E. (2007). *Bahra: The history, legends, customs and traditions of Ternate, Cavite*. Cavite City, Philippines: Cavite Historical Society.
- Peet, S. D. (1904). Native tribes of the Philippines. *The American Antiquarian and Oriental Journal*, 26, 46–48.

- Philippine Information Society. (1901). *Facts about the Filipinos* (Vol. 1, part no. 1). Boston, MA: Philippine Information Society.
- Pi, P. S. J. (1894). Carta del P. Pío Pi al Hermano Francisco de A. Alós, fechada en Zamboanga a 8 de agosto de 1894. In *Cartas de los PP. de la Compañía de Jesús de la Misión de Filipinas* (Cuaderno 10, pp. 57–67). Manila, Philippines: Establecimiento Tipo-Litográfico de M. Pérez, hijo, 1895.
- Quilis, A., & Casado-Fresnillo, C. (2008). *La lengua española en Filipinas* [The Spanish language in the Philippines]. Madrid, Spain: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Riego de Dios, M. I. (1976). The Cotabato Chabacano verb. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 7, 48–59.
- Riego de Dios, M. I. (1978). A pilot study on the dialects of Philippine Creole Spanish. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics*, 2, 77–81.
- Rincón, M. (1897). *Cháchara: Páginas de la vida manileña* [Idle chatter: pages from Manila life]. Manila, Philippines: Tipo-Litografía de Chofré y Comp.
- Rizal, J. (1891). *El filibusterismo* [Philibusterism]. Ghent, Belgium: Boekdrukkerij F. Meyer-Van Loo.
- Rubino, C. (2008). Zamboangueno Chavacano and the potentive mode. In S. Michaelis (Ed.), *Roots of creole structures: Weighing the contribution of substrates and superstrates* (pp. 279–299). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Ruiz, S. (1907). Cuestiones filipinas: La instrucción española y la Americana [Philippine issues: Spanish and American education]. *Nuestro tiempo*, Año 7, 93, 181–193.
- Russell, F. K. (1907). *A woman's journey through the Philippines*. Boston, MA: Page & Co.
- St. John, H. (1853). *The Indian archipelago: Its history and present state*. London, UK: Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans.
- Saleeby, N. (1908). *The history of Sulu* (Reprinted in 1963 by the Filipiniana Book Guild). Manila, Philippines: Bureau of Printing.
- Sancho, J. S. J. (1888). Carta del P. Joaquín Sancho al Superior de la Misión, fechada en Zamboanga el 30 de octubre de 1888. In *Cartas de los PP. de la Compañía de Jesús de la Misión de Filipinas* (Cuaderno 8, pp. 99–104). Manila, Philippines: Establecimiento Tipo-Litografía de Chofré y Comp^a.
- Santayana, A. (1862). *La isla de Mindanao: Su historia y su estado presente, con algunas reflexiones sobre su porvenir* [The island of Mindanao, its history and current situation, with some reflections on its future]. Madrid, Spain: Imprenta de Alhambra y Comp.
- Schwegler, A. (2002). On the (African) origins of Palenquero subject pronouns. *Diachronica*, 19, 273–332.
- Sippola, E. (2011). *Una gramática descriptiva del chabacano de Ternate* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Helsinki, Finland.
- Sonnerat, M. (1776). *Voyage a la Nouvelle Guinée* [A trip to New Guinea]. Paris, France: Chez Ruault.
- Steinkrüger, P. (2006, January). *The puzzling case of Chabacano: Creolization, substrate, mixing and secondary contact*. Presented at tenth international conference on Austronesian linguistics, Puerto Princesa City, Palawan, Philippines. Retrieved from <http://www.sil.org/asia/philippines/ical/papers.html>
- Thomason, S. (1999). Speakers' choices in language change. *Studies in the Language Sciences*, 29, 19–43.
- Thomason, S., & Everett, D. (2005). Pronoun borrowing. In C. Chang, M. Houser, Y. Kim, D. Mortensen, M. Park-Doob, & M. Toosarvandani (Eds.), *Berkeley Linguistics Society* (Vol. 27, pp. 301–315). Berkeley, CA: UC Linguistics Dept.
- Tigno, J. (2006). Migration and violent conflict in Mindanao. *Population Review*, 45, 23–47.
- Tirona, T. (1923). *An account of the Ternate dialect of Cavite* (Tagalog Paper 487 of the Beyer Collection). Manila, Philippines: Philippine National Library.
- Townsend, H. (1902). Notes on Philippine geography. *The School Journal*, 65, 484–486.
- United States Bureau of the Census. (1905). *Census of the Philippine Islands taken under the direction of the Philippine Commission in the year 1903*, Volume 1. Washington: United States Bureau of the Census.

- United States Philippine Commission. (1900). *The report of the Philippine Commission to the President* (Vol. 2). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- United States Philippine Commission. (1901). *Report of the United States Philippine commission: To the secretary of war for the period from December 1, 1900 to October 15, 1901, part 2*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- United States Philippine Commission. (1909). *Report of the United States Philippine commission to the secretary of war 1908, part 2*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Valles-Akil, L. (2002). Mantenimiento de lengua criolla en un contexto multilingüe: El caso del chabacano en la ciudad de Zamboanga [Maintenance of a creole language in a multi-lingual context: the case of Chabacano in Zamboanga City]. *Papia*, 12, 41–66.
- Waitz, T. (1863). *Introduction to anthropology*. London, UK: Longman Green, Longman & Roberts.
- Wallace, S. (1983). Pronouns in contact. In F. Agard, G. Kelley, A. Makkai, & V. B. Makkai (Eds.), *Essays in honor of Charles F. Hockett* (pp. 573–589). Leiden, South Holland: E.J. Brill.
- Whinnom, K. (1956). *Spanish contact vernaculars in the Philippines*. Hong Kong, China: Hong Kong University.
- Whitmarsh, P. (1901). Around Mindanao. *The Outlook*, 67, 637–643.
- Worcester, D. (1898). *The Philippine islands and their people*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Yvan, M. (1855). *Six months among the Malays and a year in China* (p. 230). London.

Author biography

John M. Lipski is Edwin Erle Sparks Professor of Spanish and Linguistics at the Pennsylvania State University. His research involves language contact and bilingualism, with special emphasis on creole languages and the contributions of the African diaspora to Spanish and Portuguese. He has conducted field-based research in Spain, Latin America, Africa, the United States, and the Philippines.