Ilokano-Spanish : Borrowing, code-switching or a mixed language?

Sippola, Eeva

Mazzoli , Maria; Sippola, Eeva

2021

http://hdl.handle.net/10138/344536

Sippola, E 2021, Ilokano-Spanish : Borrowing, code-switching or a mixed language? in M Mazzoli & E Sippola (eds), New Perspectives on Mixed Languages : From Core to Fringe . Language Contact and Bilingualism [LCB], vol. 18, De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, pp. 253-276. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501511257-009

This is a final draft of Sippola, E 2021, Ilokano-Spanish: Borrowing, code-switching or a mixed language? in M Mazzoli & E Sippola (eds), New Perspectives on Mixed Languages: From Core to Fringe. Language Contact and Bilingualism [LCB], vol. 18, De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, pp. 253-276. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501511257-009

Ilokano-Spanish: borrowing, code-switching or a mixed language?

Eeva Sippola

1. Introduction

There are several well-known outcomes of language contact in the Philippines, including heavy lexical borrowing from Spanish into Philippine languages, the formation of the Chabacano creoles, and the widespread use of Taglish, a Tagalog-English code-switching variety. Based on a text sample taken from a letter in Schuchardt (1884), it has been suggested that a mixed language variety, Ilokano-Spanish, also existed in the Philippines; it would have been spoken by mestizos in the town of Vigan in the province of Ilocos Sur but died out by the end of the 19th century (Steinkrüger 2008: 226). This claim is echoed by Bakker (2017: 221) who calls it a Philippine Mestizo language (Ilokano-Spanish) in his structural classification of mixed languages. Ilokano (also known as Iloko, ilok1237, Northern-Luzon, Austronesian) is one of the largest languages of the Philippines by the number of speakers, spoken on the Northern parts of Luzon, while Spanish was the colonial language in the Philippines for over 300 years.

In this paper, I examine the Ilokano-Spanish text sample in order to assess the claim that it is an example of a mixed language. As very limited information on the author and the context of the letter is available, we only know that it was written in the late-19th century in the Philippines, the focus will be on a structural analysis of the text in question and a general overview of the sociohistorical context. The results of the structural analysis are compared to other documented Spanish contact varieties in the Philippines of that period, such as the creoles and pidgins (Lipski 2010; Fernández and Sippola 2017), code-switching practices in contemporary varieties such as Taglish (Bautista 2004), and other known mixed language systems (Meakins 2013; Bakker 2017).

Although the literature and data on mixed languages has increased over the past decades, and more of them have been identified (Meakins 2013: 159), their relatively low number is still an issue when it comes to making comprehensive statements about the existence and nature of this group as a class of languages. More information on the grammatical nature of these varieties and how they emerge in different types of social settings is therefore needed to address the central questions in the study of language contact and mixed varieties. Similarly, detailed studies on the history of different language contact situations in the Philippines can shed light on how the processes and outcomes involved might differ from more commonly studied contexts, such as those in the Atlantic and the Americas. So far, in many historical and linguistic works, there seems to be confusion about the characteristics of the Philippine contact varieties and the differences between them. Lipski (2010) explains the confusion to be due to the gradual processes of formation of the Philippine creole varieties, the high number of shared features among them, and that the similar borrowing processes have taken place in other Philippine languages. Also, for ideological reasons, contact languages are not seen as independent varieties. In addition, as shown more generally in historical sociolinguistics and contact linguistics (e.g. Arends 2017; van Rossem 2017; Ayres-

Bennett 2018), a careful examination and critique of sources is crucial when trying to answer questions about the origins of contact varieties, such as the one under scrutiny.

2. Classifications of linguistic mixing

As a background for the study and for the purposes of classifying the text sample, I will offer a selection of definitions about borrowing, code-switching[1], and mixed languages and what differentiates them. The differences between these processes generally depend on the perspective taken toward the language system and its stability. Mixed languages are stable codes, while code-switching is often understood as a situational practice. Borrowing is an outcome of language contact at the level of the language system. Code-switching can be seen on a diachronic continuum with respect to borrowing. Loans into one language often start off as synchronic codeswitches that gradually, through diachronic change, become established as part of the system. A borrowing is usually integrated into the recipient language's system, extending the vocabulary with new items, while code-switching usually takes the form of overt, unintegrated elements from different language varieties.

The first defining feature to distinguish between these classifications is thus that of the stability of a variety (Bakker 2017: 227). Code-switching patterns are common in multilingual settings, but they are generally not understood as stable practices or varieties. Mixed languages, on the other hand, are stable varieties that result from the fusion of two or more identifiable languages and present a split in the sources of their morphemes, which remains visible in their synchronic make-up. Varieties with heavy borrowing are often stable as well, in that despite the borrowing, no general shift or birth of a new language has occurred. In the case of Tagalog, for example, despite heavy borrowing, the grammatical structure has not been significantly affected.

The second area of definitions has to do with the social and historical factors, such as the level and nature of bilingualism. Bi- or multilingualism is common to all the processes, but there are again differences as to how these are understood. For code-switching to happen, the speaker needs to be bilingual, and the switching is often understood as happening at an *individual* level. Mixed languages, on the other hand, are often identified as a phenomenon at the *community* level (Meakins 2013:156). They emerge in situations of community bilingualism, and can sometimes lead to situations where the two languages participating in their formation are no longer present. Bilingualism is also needed for borrowing to happen, but borrowings can spread from bilingual individuals to the community level and then be taken on by monolingual speakers as well. Furthermore, severe social upheaval is often understood as an important factor in the formation of mixed languages (Meakins 2013: 186), whereas this factor has not been identified in communities where code-switching is common.

The third area has to do with identity functions. Mixed languages often develop in relation to the expression of identity, reflecting either a new social category or an ancestral group membership, often as a conscious linguistic operation led by a group of speakers (Meakins 2013: 181). Code-switching or borrowing can also have identity functions, where switches or borrowings index social affiliations (e.g. Auer 2005). Consequently, although identity is central to understanding the formation of a variety or a practice, this factor can be relevant to either stable varieties or more situational or stylistic codes, so it alone cannot be used to distinguish between them.

[1] Codeswitching is here understood as a practice, while the term code-mixing is reserved for the structural mixing in any variety or practice, from mixed languages to codeswitching practices. The terms are not used in opposition here but offer different vantage points to the mixing phenomena.

The sociolinguistic situations where certain structural mixing patterns are found can also be used to classify mixing types (see Table 1). For example, insertional code-mixing often happens in situations with asymmetric power relations, typically in postcolonial settings. Here the L1, the original language of the community, especially from a historical perspective, functions as the base language, and speakers often have limited proficiency in the L2, which is the new, introduced language (Muysken 2013a: 720).[2] In insertional code-mixing, one language determines the overall structure into which constituents from another language are inserted. The process is constrained by categorical or semantic congruence, or equivalence between the inserted element and the properties of the slot into which it is inserted (Muysken 2000: 95, 230). Borrowing, code-switching, and mixed languages all show insertional patterns of mixing. Alternational mixing patterns are typical for communities with high levels of bilingual proficiency, where the languages in question are often in political competition. Code-switching typically shows alternational patterns; for example, Taglish alternational code-switching conforms to this situation to some degree (see 3.2). Here languages occur alternately, with the switch point being located at a major syntactic boundary, constrained by both grammatical and interactional factors (Muysken 2000: 96–97). Another relevant type identified in Muysken's (2000, 2013a) classification is back-flagging.[3] Back-flagging happens in situations of language shift in the second or third generation. The community's historical L1 is used to highlight aspects of ethnic or linguistic identities, although the speakers are generally more proficient in the L2 of the community. The structural types and the sociolinguistic processes connected to them make clear that with shift in time, the labels L1 and L2 can change for individuals and also communities, leading to situations where the assignation of these labels is challenging. Beyond the structural patterns of mixing, we can identify another extralinguistic feature for classification: power relations between the languages that affect the selection of the prestige language in the community.

Table 1. Sociolinguistic factors and strategies in code-mixing (adapted from Muysken 2013a: 720)

Code-mixing pattern	**Sociolinguistic factors**	**Proficiency**	**Strategies**
Insertion	Asymmetric power relations, postcolonial settings	Low proficiency in L2	L1 as the base language
Alternation	Political competition	High bilingual proficiency	Universal principles for combinations

2 It should be noted that communities do not always reflect the L1/L2 divide at the individual level. In situations of widespread bilingualism, the assignation of these labels can be challenging and should be done taking several factors into account according to the research question and the point in time when the assignation is being made.

3 In addition, Muysken (2000) has congruent lexicalization as part of his typology. It is characteristic of communities with relaxed language norms and closely-knit networks, where the languages in question have a long history of contact. Speakers have high levels of bilingual proficiency, and the languages in contact share typological and/or lexical properties; this type is common for code-mixing between related languages and for dialect contact.

Back-flagging	Language shift in second or third generation	High proficiency in L2	L2 as the base language

An additional structural factor that is often used to argue for the differences between the types is the degree of mixing. Bakker (2017: 220) points out that there is no consensus about what degree of mixing is needed for a variety to be called a mixed language, although the degree of borrowing in heavy borrowing languages is nevertheless significantly lower than in documented mixed languages. In addition, borrowing does not generally affect words of the basic lexicon to the same degree as in mixed languages.

From the above it becomes clear that many extralinguistic and structural features and processes are shared between borrowing, code-switching, and mixed languages. The differences focus mostly on the perspective we take on a contact phenomenon, structural tendencies, and power relations in the communities where language contact takes place. A careful contextualization of the object in its social history is therefore needed when we want to classify a text sample.

3. Contact varieties in Philippine (post)colonial history

Over 150 languages are spoken in the Philippines. The great majority of these are local Philippine languages, but varieties of Chinese, Malay, and European colonial languages have also historically been spoken there. The centuries-long contacts between local and other languages have resulted in different contact outcomes. Although there has been lexical and grammatical influence from Malay and Chinese varieties, the attention here is given to contact situations starting in the colonial era, with special focus on Spanish and English—the languages that are relevant for the cases of mixing that are discussed in this chapter.

These examples (see Table 2 for an overview) show that Spanish and English have both similarities and differences with regard to contact outcomes. From these examples it is clear that trilingual mixing is common in the Philippines. It may well be that other mixing practices also existed during the Spanish colonial period, but the only samples available are very limited and often confusing (see, e.g., Lipski 2001, 2010).

Table 2. Examples of inter-ethnic contact varieties in Philippine history.

Variety	**Mix**	**Type**	**Speakers**	**Time Period**
Chinese Spanish Pidgin	Spanish, Hokkien[4], Tagalog	Pidgin	Chinese merchants, no native speakers	Until early 20th century
Chabacano	Spanish, Tagalog, Cebuano, Hiligaynon	Creole	Native speakers from diverse social classes	18th century onwards
Taglish	Tagalog, English	Code-switching variety	Upper class, emerging native speakers?	1960s onwards

[4] I.e. Min Nan.

Hokaglish	Hokkien, Tagalog, English	Mixed variety	Filipino-Chinese community, no native speakers	From the American period?

3.1. Spanish contact varieties

The Spanish colonial period in the Philippines lasted for over three centuries, from the early 16th century to the end of the 19th century, but Spanish was never widely adopted as a colonial language by the majority of the native population. The reason has to do with the low numbers of Spanish-speaking migrants, which meant that there was no significant Spanish mestizo group or any possibility for demographic shifts among the general native population to take place (Lipski, Mühlhäusler, and Duthin 1996).

The socioethnic composition of the Philippines during the Spanish colonial period included different groups divided and administered according to their ethnic background and their relation to the Spanish (Garcia de los Arcos 1999: 57): *españoles* 'Spanish' included those born in Europe or in the colonies, *indios* referred to the indigenous population of the Philippines, and *mestizos* could refer to either *mestizos de sangley* or *mestizos de español*. The former were descendants of the local indigenous population and the Chinese, while the latter were born out of unions of Spanish with other groups. These groups were also the basis for taxation, and to some degree, it was possible to change affiliation to a group by marrying into a different group or by other means (Wickberg 1964: 65–66). By the mid-19th century, the influence and size of the Chinese mestizo class had grown significantly: it was the largest non-indigenous group of the islands, which led to the term *mestizo* coming to mean primarily Chinese mestizo (Wickberg 1964: 67, 80).

Spanish was the prestige language in the Philippines during the Spanish colonial era. It was spoken by the colonial administrators, the military and clergy, and the local indigenous and mestizo groups that occupied the highest positions in the colonial hierarchy. For most of the Spanish period, Spanish education was limited to a small elite, that of *españoles* and selected members of the *mestizo* and *indio* groups. The local population naturally spoke Spanish to differing degrees due to the continuing presence of the colonial language throughout the islands and the prestige attached to it, but the historical representations of these have clear traits of learner varieties (Lipski 2001: 133).

During the Spanish era, a number of contact varieties arose in different parts of the Philippines. The most well-known are Chinese Spanish Pidgin and the Philippine Spanish Creole varieties, collectively known as Chabacano. Chinese Spanish Pidgin served specific social functions in trade between different ethnic groups. The Chinese had an important economic position in the colonial Philippines. Their monopoly over food provision, retail trading, and artisanal works made them a crucial part of the everyday functions of the colony. In addition, they traded between coastal China and Manila as well as distributed the imports from Manila to other parts of Luzon (Wickberg 1964: 67). The Chinese Spanish Pidgin was a rather stable code, with some defining features such as unmarked verbs, the personal pronouns *mia* '1SG' and *suya* '2SG', the substitution of /r/ for [l], and clitics without referents in verbs (Reinecke 1937: 823; Lipski 2010: 9). It was used by Chinese merchants in commerce with the local population, or between these groups and the Spanish. It was not a native language

nor was it used as a lingua franca between local population groups who shared a common native language (Lipski 2001: 132).[5]

The Chabacano varieties are today spoken in Zamboanga, Cavite City, and the town of Ternate, but similar varieties elsewhere in the archipelago have also historically been documented, although not in Vigan (Fernández 2011; Fernández and Sippola 2017: 305–307). Other names, such as *español de cocina* 'kitchen Spanish', *español de tienda* 'shop Spanish', and *lengua de Parian* 'language of the Parian'[6] were used to refer to Chabacano. This denomination sometimes also included other types of contact varieties to different degrees, which were often poorly described by Spanish narrators (Fernández 2011: 200). Of interest here is to state that all the Chabacano varieties show clear creole traits in that their lexicon is for the most part of Spanish origin while the structure differs from it: the TAM system consists of preverbal aspectual particles and an invariant stem, gender is generally not marked in adjectives or nouns, the plural is marked with the Philippine plural particle *mga*, etc.

Although there is no agreement as to the exact origin and development of the creole varieties, we know that Chabacano was used by different socioeconomic groups in the time period that interests us, the 19th century, at least in Manila and Cavite. It was used in interactions between the Spanish and the local population as well as serving as an in-group language, such as in the restricted enclave of Ternate (Schuchardt 1884; Fernández 2011). Chabacano samples showing its variety of uses can be found in 19th century sources (Schuchardt 1884; Fernández and Sippola 2017). According to Fernández (2011, 2012), the crystallization of Chabacano was linked to the emergence of a new socioeconomic class, that of the Chinese mestizos. This socioeconomic group's position was a favorable one in that they paid less taxes than the Chinese, were more hispanized than the indigenous population, and overlapped with the leading indigenous class in the colonial hierarchy. The mestizos used local varieties of Spanish that at a point in time would have led to the consolidation of Chabacano as an in-group language for some and as a code of social promotion for others.

3.2. English contact varieties

After the Spanish period, when the United States took control of the Philippines, English quickly took over as the prestige language, and today it is used widely in the government, education, business, the media, and especially in urban areas of the Philippines (Thompson 2003: ch. 2). Today it is the official language of the Philippines, alongside the Tagalog-based Filipino. English has penetrated the personal and private lives of Filipinos, and some even learn it as a first language. Proficiency in English is often connected to socioeconomic status as those more proficient in the language tend to be in a higher socioeconomic situation (Borlongan and Hyuk Lim 2013).

The English contact has given rise to varying degrees of bilingualism and mixed codes. A lectal division of Philippine Englishes (Llamzon 1997) can be made with regard to their proximity or distance to Standard American English, but this is also influenced by social and cultural factors. As put by Gonzales (2017: 88): "The English used by a Filipina *tindera* or stall vendor would most likely be different from the English spoken by a middle-class Filipina businesswoman. At the same time, the Philippine English spoken by Filipino-Chinese could be distinct from the English spoken by Filipino-Koreans or 'pure' Filipinos".

---

[5] Lipski (2001, 2010) calls the Chinese Spanish Pidgin "Kitchen Spanish", a denomination generally used for Chabacano.

[6] *Parian* refers to the Chinese district in Manila or other towns, which were also centers for commercial activity.

The most well-studied code-switching variety is Taglish, involving Tagalog and English (Bautista 1980).[7] It was first attested in the late 1960s as a creation of educated Filipinos and spread from the classroom to the general population via mass media, especially radio and TV (Thompson 2003: 41). Two types of Taglish code-switching are identified by Bautista (2004): the most common type is used by speakers with high levels of competence in both Tagalog and English, but deficiency-driven switching also exists. In general, Taglish is the code for informal communication, while the languages are kept apart in formal situations (Thompson 2003: 41).

Taglish is often characterized as an alternational type of code-switching, but when the base language is Tagalog, insertional mixing predominates. Here, English insertions into the Tagalog base tend to be limited to noun and noun phrase insertion, rejoinders, tags, and conjunctions (Bautista 1980; Thompson 2003: 153). When Tagalog insertions occur in the English frame, they tend to be limited to discourse items such as conjunctions, enclitics, linkers, the plural marker *mga*, the affirmative marker *oo*, and formulaic expressions (Bautista 1986). The latter type is occasionally called Engalog or Coño English. This variety tends to be used by a small group of elite English speakers who use Tagalog insertions as a way of indexing, or back-flagging, their Filipino identity (Smedley 2006: 40).

In addition, a mixed variety called Hokaglish or Salamstam-oe 'mixed language' has been documented (Zulueta 2007; Gonzales 2016, 2018). It is the use of Philippine Hokkien, Tagalog, and English in conversation where Philippine Hokkien dominates. Gonzales (2016: 112) proposes that the Filipino-Chinese communities would have been using this mixed variety for a long time, excluding the contemporary immigration from China. The variety is used for marking insider group identity among young Chinese-Filipinos and to signal a good socioeconomic position (Zulueta 2007).

4. A letter in Ilokano-Spanish

The text sample is a letter sent to the Spanish-language newspaper *La Oceanía Española* in 1884 and quoted in Schuchardt (1884: 125–126). We do not have much information about it beyond what is explained by Schuchardt (1884). Schuchardt collected most of his material from correspondence with people located in creole-speaking areas, often colonial administrators or clergymen making use of diverse sources, including newspapers. *La Oceanía Española* was one of the channels Schuchardt used to collect material from the Philippines. The newspaper was one of the main publications in Manila at the time, with a daily edition between 1877 and 1899. In response to Schuchardt's inquiries, people from different parts of the Philippines wrote to the newspaper with opinions and samples of contact varieties of Spanish. One of the letters included the Ilokano-Spanish text, and Schuchardt (1884: 125, footnote 1) used it to show that "in certain places, the Malayization of Spanish words has no limits" when discussing the nature of the structural blending in the Spanish-Tagalog contact.

The text is a letter to a friend, and in it, two main topics of information are given: the author of the letter has been appointed chief of the *barrio* 'neighborhood', and the recipient's *comadre* 'godmother' or 'close friend' is pregnant and has also had an accident. Schuchardt (1884: 125, footnote 1) considers it a sample of the language used among the Mestizos in Vigan. The example lines are ordered as follows: first, the original text in Schuchardt (1884: 125–126) where the Tagalog lexical items are indicated with underlining; second, the same line in with Ilokano words in modern

[7] Other mixed varieties involving English and other Philippine languages also exist, but since Taglish is the most well studied one, it will be the example studied here.

Ilokano orthography and morpheme division (when applicable); third, the gloss in English; fourth, the English translation; and fifth, the original Spanish translation from Schuchardt (1884).

(1) *Mi estimado amigo*:
Mi estimado amigo:
my dear friend
'My dear friend:'
Mi estimado amigo:

(2) *iparticiparco qca á nanombraranac á*
i-participar-ko kenka a na-nombrar-an-ak a
TH-inform-1SG 2SG.OBL LK PFV-nominate-V-1SG LK
'I inform you that I was appointed'
te participo que me han nombreado

(3) *cabo del barrio qt sentirec unay ti caasanmo*[8]
kabo del barrio ket sintir-e-k unay ti ka-asan-mo
chief of the barrio and feel-V-1SG very the NOM-absence-2SG
'chief of the barrio and I regret much your absence'
cabo del barrio y siento mucho tu ausencia

(4) *ditoy porque convidarenca met comá á*
ditoy porque kumbida(r)-en-ka met komá a
here because invite-V-2SG also OPT LK
'here because I would invite you also to'
aquí porque te convidaría también para

(5) *maquipagdespachar itoy bassit á napreparar*
makipag-despatsar itoy bassit a na-preparar
JNT-serve this little LK PFV-prepare
ditoy balay.
ditoy balay
here house
'the little party here at home.'
despachar la preparación que tengo en casa.

(6) *Unica á noticia á maiproporcionarca qca:*
unica a noticia a mai-proporcionar-ka kenka
only LK news LK POT-deliver-2SG 2SG.OBL
'The only news I am able to deliver to you'
Unica noticia que te puedo proporcionar

(7) *ni comadrem buntis manen qt idi*
ni komadre-m buntis manen ket idi
ART godmother-2SG pregnant again and before
'your close friend is pregnant again and when'
tu comadre está otra vez en cinta y un dia, cuando

[8] Probably *caawanmo* (Steinkrüger 2008: 225, footnote 5).

(8) *inda* *cobraren* *ti* *buisna,* *timmacbu* *qt*
in-da cobrar-en ti buis-na timmacbu ket
go-3PL charge-V ART tax-3SG ran and
'they went to collect the tax of hers, she ran and'
fueron á cobrarla el tributo, echó á correr y

(9) *natnag* *idiay* *batalan* *qt* *nabiac* *diay* *quiliquilina.*
natnag idiay batalan ket na-biac diay quiliquili-na
fell over.there porch and PFV-break that armpit-3SG
'fell on the proch/roof and broke that armpit of hers.'
se cayó en la azotea: consecuencia de este accidente fué la hendidura de su sobaco.

(10) *Na* *castigar* *ngarud,* *pues* *naarimuhanan* *la* *unay.*
na castigar ngarud pues naarimuhanan la(eng) unay
PFV punish then so thrifty only very
'Then punished for being so stingy.'
digno castigo de su avaricia.

(11) *Toy* *amigo* *qt* *servidormo* *Z*
toy amigo ket servidor-mo Z
this friend and servant-2SG NAME
'This friend and servant of yours Z.'
Tu amigo y servidor Z.

5. Mixing practices

5.1. Structures and types of mixing

The letter contains 65 words of Spanish, Ilokano, and Tagalog origin. The Spanish component includes verbs in infinitive form, nouns, conjunctions, and a possessive pronoun. The Spanish nouns *amigo* 'friend', *cabo del barrio* 'chief of the barrio', *comadre* 'godmother', and *servidor* 'servant' are related to social roles. Some of these, such as *comadre* and *amigo* have also been borrowed to Philippine languages. The Spanish verbs do not pertain to basic lexical verbs, but also indicate a variety of social meanings and many of them have been borrowed to modern Ilokano, sometimes with semantic changes (*sintir* 'to resent', *kumbida(r)* 'invitation', *agkumbida* 'to invite', *despatsar* 'to sell, to dismiss, to dispatch', *agkobra* 'to collect a payment', *kastigar* 'to punish', cf. Rubino 2000).

Table 3. Mixed verbs in the Ilokano-Spanish letter

Verb	**Spanish root**	**Ilokano affix**
iparticiparco	*participar* 'share'	*i-* 'TH', -co '1SG'
nanombraranac	*nombrar* 'name'	*na-* 'PFV', *-an-* 'V', *-ac* '1SG'
sentirec	*sentir* 'feel'	*-ec* '1SG'
convidarenca	*convidar* 'invite'	*-en* 'V', *-ca* '2SG'
maquipagdespachar	*despachar* 'take care of'	*maquipag-* 'JNT'
napreparar	*preparar* 'prepare'	*na-* 'PFV'
maiproporcionarca	*proporcionar* 'provide'	*mai-*'POT' *-ca* '2SG'
cobraren	*cobrar* 'charge'	*-en* 'V'

na castigar *castigar* ‘punish’ *na(-)* ‘PFV’

The grammatical affixes and clitics are from Ilokano and indicate thematic roles, person, verbalizers[9], and TAM meanings. The word order of the main clauses is verb-initial, as in the Philippine languages in general and Ilokano in particular (Rubino 2005: 331). Ilokano and Spanish do not differ in typological terms as to how subjects are marked: in both languages subjects are (generally) marked as suffixes (Dryer 2011). However, there are no full noun or independent pronominal subjects in the text that would be expressed. In Ilokano, clauses with predicative adjectives do not have a copula and show a predicate-initial pattern (Rubino 2008: 519). Similarly, there is no copula in (7) *ni comadre-m buntis manen* [ART-friend-2SG pregnant again] ‘your friend is pregnant again’, but the sentence is not predicate-initial. In (10), *naarimuhanan la unay* [thrifty only very] ‘being very stingy’, the subject is not expressed.

The greeting formula in line (1) is in Spanish, while the closing (11) shows a mixed structure. In the closing, only the nouns are in Spanish, while the demonstrative pronoun *toy* ‘this’, the conjunction *qt* [ket] ‘and’, and the possessive suffix *-mo* are expressed with Ilokano items.

The Tagalog elements mentioned in Schuchardt (1884: 125–126) are five in number and are mostly lexical elements (*buntis* ‘pregnant’, *buis(na)* ‘(her) tax’ < Tag. *buwis* ‘tax’, *timmacbu* ‘ran’ < Tag. *tumakbo*, *batalan* ‘porch’, *nabiac* ‘broke’ < Tag. *nabiyak*, and *naarimuhanan* ‘thrifty). A note accompanying the text mentions that these words are from Tagalog, and according to some Ilokanos, only used in Vigan (Schuchardt 1884: 126 footnote).

The types of mixing patterns observed are generally insertional, with Spanish lexical items inserted into an Ilokano frame. An alternational pattern is found in the opening paragraph in Spanish, which alternates with the mixed code with an Ilokano frame in the main body of the letter. No creole or pidgin traits are attested, beyond general borrowing patterns that can also be found in these types of languages.

5.2. Sociohistorical characteristics

Sociohistorical context might give us some clues as to the nature of the text and its author. The level and nature of bilingualism and access to Spanish in the community where the letter was written is central. No information on the author of the letter is available, but it was probably sent from Vigan, a city in Ilocos Sur, in the northern part of the island of Luzon. Vigan is known for its Spanish heritage as well as for the fact that it was an important trading center between northern Luzon and Chinese traders from the Fujian province in China. The city had an important Chinese mestizo population and a *pariancillo* ‘Chinese district’ (Doeppers 1972). As the frame of the letter is for the most part in Ilokano, it is probable that the author was a fluent speaker of that language. We also know that the person who sent the letter to the newspaper, and probably held a close relationship with the author and/or recipient of the letter, if not actually one of them, was a reader of a Spanish-language newspaper, and thus fluent in this language, and belonged to a class that participated in the cultural activities of colonial society. There are no cues as to the ethnicity of the author in the letter itself, but due to his participation in Spanish-speaking cultural activities and his knowledge of Ilokano, he might have belonged to the Chinese or Spanish mestizo groups, or been

[9] The common suffixes that are here glossed as verbalizers are used, among other things, to transitivize nouns in Ilokano.

an upper class *indio*. These groups had access to education in Spanish, and members of these groups would have occupied minor administrative positions such as *cabo del barrio*.

Did the mixed variety have identity functions? The mixed code was used in a letter of personal intimacy, which gives us some clues based on the use of other contact varieties of the time. Several examples from the Filipino elites of that time, both from mestizo and *indio* groups, and elsewhere show that the creole varieties were used in personal communication as an in-group language. These members of the elite had (full) access to Spanish as well, which they used in educational and official institutions (Fernández 2013). However, another correspondent to *La Oceanía Española* wrote in Chabacano that the letter sent from Ilocos is merely the language used by the people in the food stalls and selling vegetables[10], not the elevated, beautiful kitchen Spanish, i.e. the creole Chabacano, that Schuchardt was looking for (Schuchardt 1884: 123). This note tells us more about the creole variety than the Ilokano-Spanish text, showing that it was already consolidated and associated positively with a certain identity. Yet, it is unlikely that a market seller of the lower social classes, with more limited access to Spanish, would have corresponded with a friend by writing letters. Due to the text type, a personal letter, it is thus probable that both the writer and the recipient had access to Spanish. Also, using a mixed code could have served identity functions, as in the creole varieties.

The power relations affecting the selection of the prestige language are well documented from the colonial period in question. It is clear that Spanish had the highest level of prestige. Although the Philippine independence movement had already started to develop, the Filipino revolutionaries used Spanish as their home language and in cultural and social life (Fernández 2013: 371).

5.3. Degrees of mixing

As to the degree of mixing found in the text, a simple calculation of the written words separated by a space shows the following patterns: the majority of the words (37) are from Ilokano, and we can attest a lower number of Spanish (12) and Tagalog (6) words, while there are in total nine mixed words with a Spanish root/stem and Ilokano affixes.[11] The total number of words is too low to give any valid calculations about the degree of mixing, but the Spanish component occupies less than 30%, even if the mixed words with Ilokano affixes are included.

A look into the degrees and types of borrowings in other Philippine languages gives us some context. Spanish has had extensive lexical influence on Tagalog and other Philippine languages, and Bowen (1971: 948) connects the degree of borrowing with the amount and type of contact between Spanish and the Philippine languages. The more extensive the contact, the more the cultural penetration of Spanish can be observed. The most studied language with a borrowed component is Tagalog, which has been estimated to have borrowed between 10 and 30 percent of its lexicon from Spanish (Bowen 1971; Wolff 2001). No studies of Spanish or English borrowings in Ilokano are available, but Panganiban (1961: iii) estimates that the Tagalog case is similar to other major languages of the Philippines, including Ilokano. A look into Ilokano dictionary (Rubino 2000) reveals that many of the Spanish lexical items in the sample letter have actually been incorporated into modern Ilokano (see 5.1). This means that the degree of mixing of elements from different languages in the analyzed text is

[10] *el lengua del mangá saluyot, propio de carindería, donde ta ende el mangá gulay* in the original.
[11] The letter Z symbolizing the author of the letter is left out of this calculation.

quite similar to general observations on the extent of borrowing into Philippine languages. It should be kept in mind, however, that the realization of these percentages in individual texts might naturally be very different.

As to the types, the Spanish borrowings in Tagalog are most visible in nouns, the counting system, the calendar, the expression of time, and greetings. Even for some core semantics that are seen as the least borrowable in language contact, Tagalog has borrowings that have fully or partly replaced the original forms, e.g. *braso* 'arm' and *kantá* 'song' from Sp. *brazo* and *cantar* 'to sing' (Baklanova 2017). The lexical borrowings also include function words, such as the modal verb *puwede* 'can, be able to' (< Sp. *puede* 'can-3SG.PRS'), other modal particles, such as *siguro* 'probably' and *sigurado* 'certain' (< Sp. *seguro* 'certain' and *asegurado* 'guaranteed'), and elements in comparative constructions, where the Spanish-origin comparative *más* 'more' is used. It is difficult to estimate the penetration of the Spanish words into the basic lexicon of the mixed code in the letter but looking at the semantics of the Spanish items present, they are rather far removed from the items generally included in basic word listings. In addition, it is probable that a local fully immersed in the Ilokano-speaking surroundings of Vigan would have known the Ilokano words that the Spanish words in the text replaced. The Spanish items are greeting and farewell formulas, occasional nouns or noun phrases (*cabo del barrio*, *única á noticia*, and *comadre*), two conjunctions, and—differently from Tagalog—verbs that function as the stem for Ilokano affixes. To explain the selection of these specific Spanish words, we have to look elsewhere. For the Spanish borrowings in Tagalog, Stolz (1996) and Wolff (2001) have suggested that the use of the colonial language was a means of acquiring power in colonial Philippine society. Social lexical items in the Ilokano-Spanish text, such as the opening formula and verbs with social meanings, as well as elements of discourse organization (e.g., conjunctions), would therefore be easily borrowed.

Similar examples of codes with heavy borrowing are, for example, the hyperformal English of Indian officers in colonial India (Babu English, Kachru 2006: 266–267) and the formal register of Tetum in East Timor (Williams-van Klinken 2002), with an exceptionally high number of items of the colonial languages.[12] The mixing in these codes appear to be especially associated with formal, written, and administrative language and not with domains more prevalent in informal daily communication, due to the fact that they were acquired to the communicative repertoires of language users who acquired and used the colonial language formally for official administrative tasks. Similarly, in other Philippine contact varieties, the degree and type of mixedness has been said to correlate with the social position of the speaker and the domain of use (see section 3).

5.4. From borrowing to code-switching

Some of the mixing patterns observed in the text show similar patterns to recent borrowings from English into Tagalog or Filipino. They are abundant in everyday speech and connected to the code-switching practices of urban bilinguals (Baklanova 2017: 40). Baklanova explains that the code-switching variety, Taglish, functions as a model for borrowings into the speech of monolinguals. The most frequent intrasentential switches in Taglish are also borrowed by Tagalog/Filipino monolinguals and incorporated into the Tagalog vocabulary used in a variety of contexts, from everyday speech to more specific domains.

[12] I thank the anonymous reviewer for pointing out these similarities.

The degree of the integration of a borrowing into Tagalog can be assessed by different means. For example, in written text, Tagalog speakers often handle nonce borrowings as foreign words with italics or by putting a hyphen between the Tagalog prefix and the English root, as in (12a, b). In the Ilokano-Spanish text, the Spanish items are fully integrated in the writing, except for the marker *na* in (10), which is written separately before *castigar* 'punish', although all other verbs present affixation.

(12) Tagalog with English borrowings (Baklanova 2017: 40)

a. *Nagtungo sila sa Iloilo City at doon sila na-stranded*
headed 3PL to NAME and there 3PL V-stranded
'They headed to Iloilo City and there they got stranded.'

b. *kina-shock ko talaga*
CAUS.PFV-shock 1SG really
'I was really shocked.'

Assimilated borrowings are integrated either phonetically, morphologically, or semantically (Baklanova 2017: 42). Based on a written text, not much can be said about phonetic assimilation in the Ilokano-Spanish code, nor are there clear examples of semantic assimilation. Morphologically assimilated words are simplified into indivisible root words and used for further derivation, as in Tagalog *istambáyan* 'a place where idlers gather' and *istambayán* 'to loiter'. The Ilokano items in the mixed text do not show derivational modifications to Spanish borrowings, as the base is always a Spanish verb, and thus the affixes do not serve derivational functions such as changing word class (see Table 3). Verbal affixation similar to the Ilokano-Spanish text is found in (12a, b) with *na-stranded* 'got stranded' and *kina-shock* 'was shocked'. The latter example is from a famous Philippine media figure and is also found quoted as *kina-shocked* in other news sources[13], showing that the borrowing of the English verb has not yet been fully integrated into Tagalog.

In the code-switching variety Taglish, beyond noun insertion, switches happen at equivalence points (Bautista 1980: 200). These equivalence points are, e.g., the English prepositional phrase and the Tagalog *ng*-genitive phrase or the *sa*-oblique phrase and prepositional phrases in general. Bautista (1980: 178) used word order and major vs. minor constituents to establish the base language for the switch to happen. In the Ilokano-Spanish text, the types of mixing that are found include noun and conjunction insertion, verb stem insertion (Table 3), and alternational switches pertaining to the greeting and closing formulas (1–2, 10–11). The main difference is that Taglish is generally described as alternational switching, while it is clear that the Ilokano-Spanish text mostly favors insertional patterns within clauses and phrases.

5.5. A mixed language?

Was the Ilokano-Spanish text a sample of a mixed language spoken by the mestizos of Vigan? In the previous pages, we have explored the sociohistorical conditions typical of that time and of other contact varieties in the Philippines, as well as the sample's structural characteristics. In order to assess the nature of the Ilokano-Spanish letter, its sociohistorical framing can be discussed in the light of a general overview of the structural types of mixed languages and typical sociolinguistic factors

[13] E.g. https://news.abs-cbn.com/entertainment/04/19/14/when-did-bistek-kris-start-dating (accessed 11 November 2019).

is presented in Table 4 (based on Muysken 2000, 2013a) as well as mixing patterns (see Table 1).

Table 4. Sociolinguistic factors and strategies in mixed languages (adapted from Muysken 2013a: 720)

Type of mixed language	**Sociolinguistic factors**	**Strategies**
L1-oriented mixed languages, e.g. Media Lengua	Lexifier language with a very limited presence in the community	L1 base language
Compromise mixed languages, e.g. Michif	Bilingual settings with a clear division between the two languages	L1/L2 base language
L2-oriented mixed languages, e.g. Gurindji Kriol	'New' language provides essential components through language shift	L2 base language

When a lexifier language has a very limited presence in the community, it is often the L1 that takes the role of the base language. This kind of situation is typical of Media Lengua in the Quechua-speaking communities, for example, where Spanish has only a limited presence. In the case of Spanish in the Philippines, the lexifier language had a relatively limited presence in the everyday life of the masses, although Spanish was used by colonial elites of different ethnic backgrounds. It is also true that the Ilokano-Spanish situation reflects bilingual settings with a clear division between the two languages: Ilokano for the everyday domains of native Filipinos and Spanish for the colonial administration, which was made up of both colonial mestizo/indio elites and native Spanish speakers. Muysken (2013a: 720) sees these bilingual situations as typical of compromise mixed languages, such as Michif, where the base language can either be the L1 or the L2 of the community. The third type in Muysken's (2013a) typology requires a situation of community language shift. We know that the general native population in Luzon never shifted to Spanish, so this would only be possible had the mestizo group shifted to Spanish and then resorted to Ilokano elements for identity purposes, which does not seem probable based on the mixing patterns of the text and the Ilokano frame.

The structures of mixing in the sample resemble lexical borrowing in modern Tagalog, and to some extent the insertional types of mixing found in the code-switching varieties of Taglish and Hokaglish. However, no clear alternational patterns more typical of contemporary code-switching are found in the text.

In the letter, the pattern of mixing is clearly Spanish and Tagalog lexical insertions into an Ilokano base. The insertional pattern is also typical of certain mixed languages, such as Media Lengua, as pointed out by Steinkrüger (2008: 227). Media Lengua (which has Quechua grammar and Spanish lexicon) is one of the mixed languages that display primarily lexical mixing, together with Ma'á/Mbugu (Bantu grammar and Cushitic lexicon) and Angloromani (English grammar and English and Romani lexicon), although in it, Romani lexicon is rather sporadic and always optional (Matras 2010). For all these cases, the creation of a separate identity after language shift is crucial. In the Ma'á/Mbugu case, the expression of a non-Bantu identity led to the creation of the mixed language (Mous 2013), while Angloromani is used to express group cohesion and solidarity (Matras et al. 2007: 173, 177). In the case of Media Lengua, young migrant workers' contact with Hispanic urban society set them apart

from the peasant community in the areas where Media Lengua is spoken, and it is now an intragroup language not understood by outsiders (Muysken 2013b).

Like the speakers of Media Lengua, the writer of the letter, likely a mestizo from Vigan, was not necessarily that different from other Filipinos, but identification with the colonial Spanish and hispanized elites could have been an incentive to set them apart. There are other parallels as well. As in the Tagalog case, many dialects of Quechua contain Spanish words due to the centuries of contact. In the case of Media Lengua, however, it is relatively easy to set the mixed language apart from these dialects due to the degree of mixing. In Media Lengua, 90% of Quechua roots, including basic vocabulary, have been replaced by Spanish roots (Muysken 2013b). As we saw in 5.3, the degree of mixing cannot be reliably estimated based on mere 65 words of the Ilokano-Spanish letter, although the borrowings and the pattern of incorporation into Ilokano point towards heavy borrowing. In addition, for a variety to be categorized as a mixed language, it should be seen as a stable code. Both code-switching varieties and borrowing permit more fluctuation. However, the issue of stability is impossible to answer based on a single letter and without more contextual information than what is available. Although there are some overlaps between the functions, strategies, and patterns of mixing in the text and the known mixed languages, the overall balance does not permit us to rule out a one-off performative function of the text or its use as a stylistic resource in the written communication.

6. Conclusions

This paper offers detailed information about an Ilokano-Spanish text previously claimed to be an example of a mixed language, showing that it presents mixing that is characteristic of Ilokano with heavy borrowing from Spanish. Motivation for this type of mixing could have included social positioning within the colonial hierarchy and participation in Spanish cultural life, as well as possibly serving identity functions for a mestizo group. Comparison to other mixed codes from the Philippines, including both creoles and code-switching varieties, shows that based on this isolated sample, it is difficult to state conclusively if we are dealing with a case of a mixed language, code-switching, or borrowing. All of these varieties can be used to express identity, but the lack of information about the author and other domains of use for this code allows room for little more than speculation. Despite the challenges presented by this limited sample, however, detailed case studies such as the one presented here can contribute to the debate on processes of language mixing and the boundaries between different language types where grammatical analysis of the mixing practices is complemented with social factors.

List of abbreviations

ART = article, JNT = joint action, L1 = first language, L2 = second language, LK = linker, NOM = nominalizer, OBL = oblique, OPT = optative, PFV = perfective, POT = potentive, SG = singular, TH = theme, V = verbalizer

References

Arends, Jacques. 2017. *Language and Slavery. A social and linguistic history of the Suriname creoles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ayres-Bennett, Wendy. 2018. Historical sociolinguistics and tracking language change. In Wendy Ayres-Bennett & Janice Carruthers (eds.), *Manual of Romance Sociolinguistics*, 253–279. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Auer, Peter. 2005. A postscript: code-switching and social identity. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37. 403–410.
Bakker, Peter. 2017. Typology of mixed languages. In Alexandra Aikhenvald & R.M.W. Dixon (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology*, 217–253. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Baklanova, Ekaterina. 2017. Types of borrowings in Tagalog/Filipino. *Kritika Kultura* 28. 35–54.
Bautista, Maria Lourdes S. 1980. *The Filipino bilingual's linguistic competence: A model based on an analysis of Tagalog-English codeswitching*, Pacific Linguistics Series C-59. Canberra: Australian National University.
Bautista, Maria Lourdes S. 1986. English-Pilipino contact: A case study of reciprocal borrowing. In Wolf-Dietrich Bald & Wolfgang Viereck (eds.), *English in Contact With Other Languages: Studies in Honour of Broder Carstensen On the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, 491–510. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
Bautista, Maria Lourdes S. 2004. Tagalog-English codeswitching as a mode of discourse. *Asia Pacific Education Review* 5(2). 226–233. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03024960.
Kachru, Braj B. 2006. English in South Asia. In Kinglsey Bolton & Braj B. Kachru (eds.), *World Englishes: Critical Concepts in Linguistics*, Vol. 2, 255–310. London & New York: Taylor & Francis.
Borlongan, Ariane Macalinga & Joo Hyuk Lim. 2013. Philippine English. In Bernd Kortmann & Kerstin Lunkenheimer (eds.), *The Electronic World Atlas of Varieties of English*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. http://ewave-atlas.org/languages/75 (accessed 31 July 2019).
Bowen, Donald. 1971. Hispanic Languages and influences in Oceania. In Thomas Sebeok (ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics 8: Linguistics in Oceania*, 938–953. The Hague: Mouton.
Doeppers, Daniel. 1972. The Development of Philippine Cities Before 1900. *The Journal of Asian Studies* 31(4). 769–792. doi:10.2307/2052101.
Dryer, Matthew S. 2011. Expression of Pronominal Subjects. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, Chapter 101. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library. wals.info/chapter/101 (accessed 22 July 2019).
Fernández, Mauro. 2011. Chabacano en Tayabas. Implicaciones para la historia de los criollos hispano-filipinos. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana* 9,1(17). 189–218.
Fernández, Mauro. 2012. Leyenda e historia del Chabacano de Ermita. *UniverSOS: Revista de Lenguas Indígenas y Universos Culturales* 9. 9–46 & 65–70. http://www.uv.es/~calvo/amerindias/numeros/n9.pdf (accessed 23 July 2019).
Fernández, Mauro. 2013. The representation of Spanish in the Philippine Islands. In José Del Valle (ed.), *A Political History of Spanish: The Making of a Language,* 364–379. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fernández, Mauro & Eeva Sippola. 2017. A new window into the history of Chabacano. Two unknown mid-19th century texts. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 32(2). 304–338.
García de los Arcos, María Fernanda. 1999. Grupos éthnicos y clases sociales en las Filipinas de finales del siglo XVIII. *Archipel* 57. 55–71.
Gonzales, Wilkinson Daniel Wong. 2016. Trilingual Code-switching Using Quantitative Lenses: An Exploratory Study on Hokaglish. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 47. 106–128.

Gonzales, Wilkinson Daniel Wong. 2017. Philippine Englishes. *Asian Englishes* 19(1). 79–95.
Gonzales, Wilkinson Daniel Wong. 2018. *Philippine Hybrid Hokkien as a postcolonial mixed language: Evidence from nominal derivational affixation mixing.* National University of Singapore MA thesis. http://scholarbank.nus.edu.sg/handle/10635/151219 (accessed 1 August 2019).
Lipski, John. 2001. The place of Chabacano in the Philippine linguistic profile. *Estudios de Sociolingüística* / *Sociolinguistic Studies* 2(2). 119–163.
Lipski, John. 2010. Chabacano y español: resolviendo las ambigüedades. *Lengua y migración* 2(1). 5–41.
Lipski, John, Peter Mühlhäusler & F. Duthin. 1996. Spanish in the Pacific. In Stephen Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler & Darrel Tryon (eds.), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia and the Americas, II.1.*, 271–298. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Llamzon, Teodoro. 1997. The phonology of Philippine English. In Maria Lourdes S. Bautista (ed.), *English is an Asian language: The Philippine context*, *Proceedings of the Conference held in Manila on August 2-3, 1996*, 41–48. Australia: Macquarie Library.
Matras, Yaron. 2010. *Romani in Britain: The Afterlife of a Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Matras, Yaron, Hazel Gardner, Charlotte Jones & Veronica Schulman. 2007. Angloromani: A Different Kind of Language? *Anthropological Linguistics* 49(2). 142–184.
Meakins, Felicity. 2013. Mixed Languages. In Yaron Matras & Peter Bakker (eds.), *Contact Languages: A Comprehensive Guide*, 159–228. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Mous, Maarten. 2013. Mixed Ma'a/Mbugu. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.), *The survey of pidgin and creole languages. Volume 3: Contact Languages Based on Languages from Africa, Asia, Australia, and the Americas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual Speech. A typology of code-mixing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Muysken, Pieter. 2013a. Language contact outcomes as the result of bilingual optimization strategies. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 16(4). 709–730.
Muysken, Pieter. 2013b. Media Lengua. In Susanne Maria Michaelis, Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.), *The survey of pidgin and creole languages. Volume 3: Contact Languages Based on Languages from Africa, Asia, Australia, and the Americas*, 143–148. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Panganiban, José Villa. 1961. *Spanish loan-words in the Tagalog language*. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
Reinecke, John E. 1937. *Marginal Languages. A sociological survey of the creole languages and trade jargons*. New Haven: Yale University dissertation.
Rubino, Carl R. Galvez. 2000. *Ilocano dictionary and grammar. Ilocano-English, English-Ilocano*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
Rubino, Carl. 2005. Iloko. In Alexander Adelaar & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann (eds.), *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 326–349. London; New York: Routledge.

Rubino, Carl. 2008. Ilocano. In Keith Brown & Sarah Ogilvie (eds.), *Concise Encyclopedia of Languages of the World,* 518–521. New York: Elsevier.
Schuchardt, Hugo. 1884. Kreolische Studien IV. Ueber das Malaiospanische der Philippinen. In *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien 105*, 111–150.
Smedley, Frank. 2006. *Code-switching and Identity on the Blogs: An Analysis of Taglish in Computer Mediated Communication*. Auckland: Auckland University of Technology MA thesis.
Steinkrüger, Patrick O. 2008. Hispanization processes in the Philippines. In Thomas Stolz, Dik Bakker & Rosa Salas-Palomino (eds.), *Hispanisation: The Impact of Spanish on the Lexicon and Grammar of the Indigenous Languages of Austronesia and the Americas*, 203–236. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
Stolz, Thomas 1996. Grammatical hispanisms in Amerindian and Austronesian languages. *Amerindia* 21. 137–160.
Thompson, Roger M. 2003. *Filipino English and Taglish: Language switching from multiple perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
van Rossem, Cefas. 2017. *The Virgin Islands Dutch Creole Textual Heritage: Philological Perspectives on Authenticity and Audience Design*. Utrecht: LOT.
Wickberg, Edgar. 1964. The Chinese Mestizo in Philippine History. *The Journal of Southeast Asian History* 5(1). 62–100.
Williams-van Klinken, Catharina. 2002. High registers of Tetun Dili: Portuguese press and purist priests. In Cynthia Allen (ed.), *Proceedings of the 2001 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*. http://www.als.asn.au (accessed 3 January 2020).
Wolff, John. 2001. The influence of Spanish on Tagalog. In Klaus Zimmermann & Thomas Stolz (eds.), *Lo propio y lo ajeno en las lenguas austronésicas y amerindias: procesos interculturales en el contacto de lenguas indígenas con el español en el Pacífico e Hispanoamérica*, 233–253. Madrid: Iberoamericana.
Zulueta, Johanna. 2007. "I speak Chinese but…" Codeswitching and identity construction among Chinese-Filipino youth. *Caligrama (São Paulo. Online)* 3(2). http://www.revistas.usp.br/caligrama/article/view/65395/68006 (accessed 16 July 2019).