

TALAHULUGANANG PILIPINO-INGLES. By Jose Villa Panganiban
Maynila: Kagawaran ng Palimbagan, 1966.

Reviewed by TEODORO A. LLAMZON, S.J. and JOHN P. THORPE, C.S.C.,
Ateneo de Manila University

This dictionary is one of several extremely helpful and significant contributions of the late Dr. J. V. Panganiban, former director of the Institute of National Language (1940–1970), to the development and acceptance of Pilipino as the country's national language. It was preceded by his other publications: *Fundamental Tagalog* (1939), *English-Tagalog Vocabulary* (1946), *English-Tagalog Dictionary* (1960), two courses on learning Tagalog (1948, 1965), *English-Tagalog Thesaurus* (mimeographed, 1967), *English-Tagalog Dictionary* (1969), and *Pilipino-Ingles Tesauro* (1972). These works, together with some 37 other scholarly articles on Pilipino served not only as attempts at clarification of issues on the nature of the language and its role in the important task of nation-building, but as undying monuments to his great zeal, energy and dedication to this task. Without doubt, one can say that Dr. J. V. Panganiban is the country's dean of lexicographers, at least, as far as Tagalog is concerned.

The *Talahuluganang Pilipino-Ingles* (henceforth, TPI) appears to be an abridged edition of the larger work, *Pilipino-Ingles Tesauro*, just as the English-Tagalog Dictionary of 1946 was an abridged form of the *English-Tagalog Dictionary* of 1960 as well as of the *English-Pilipino Thesaurus*. The author himself tells us that he began work on it in 1944, during the Japanese occupation, and, after a number of revisions, finally found a publisher for it in 1966, the 26th anniversary of the teaching of Pilipino as a compulsory subject in Philippine schools.

In the preface, the author makes a statement to the effect that of the approximately 30,000 Pilipino word roots, 5,000 are of Spanish origin, 3,200 are borrowed from Malay, 1,500 each from Chinese and English, and hundreds from Sanskrit, Arabic, Persian, Latin, Greek, Japanese, German, Russian, etc. Hence, it would be false to say that the development of Pilipino was "puristic" in character.

The statement is interesting, because the author was, in effect, was saying that since about 30% of the total number of Pilipino word roots were loanwords, Pilipino could not be accused of "puristic" tendencies. This statement looks reasonable at first blush, until we find out that one of the reasons why English has such an enormous vocabulary at present (ca. 650,000) compared with its Old English stock of vocabulary (ca. 5,000) is that about 75% of its lexicon is of foreign origin!

At any rate, it is worthwhile to investigate Panganiban's TPI, not only with regard to its lexical entries, but also its worth from the lexicographic point of view. The former will give us a chance to verify the figures on loanwords given above, as well as enable us to make some inferences with regard to the cross-cultural influences which have shaped the modern Filipino view of the universe (*Weltanschauung*) and his culture. The latter will give us some guidelines for future lexicographic endeavors.

LEXICAL CONTENT

The purpose of the investigation should be to determine the total number of

entries in the TPI; and then to make a distinction between the "morphemes" (i.e. function words — e.g. affixes, prepositions, conjunctions, particles, pronouns, adverbs, prepositives, and enclitics — which belong to closed inventories) and the "lexemes" (i.e. — content words — e.g. nouns, verbs, and adjectives — which belong to open inventories). The lexemes can tell us not only about the native Filipino world view, but also about the various foreign cultural influences on the present Filipino world view. We can also check on Panganiban's statements in his preface to the TPI on these matters.

Obviously, an investigation of this scope will require a great deal of work — much of it, quantitative in nature. Fortunately, we have all this done for us. Fr. Frank Lynch's graduate class "Culture in Language" at the Ateneo-PNC Consortium for Ph.D. in linguistics made a study of the TPI for just this purpose, and we can report the results of their study.

TABLE 1

WORDS ROOTS OF TAGALOG AND FOREIGN ORIGIN

Borrowed roots		Tagalog roots		TOTAL	
N	%	N	%	N	%
3846	42	5283	58	9129	100

Of the borrowed roots 33 percent were Spanish in origin. Chinese and Malay were the only other languages making any sizeable contribution to the world list, as can be seen in Table 2.

TABLE 2

WORD ROOT DISTRIBUTION BY LANGUAGE OF ORIGIN

Arabic		Chinese		English		Malay		Sanskrit		Spanish		Tagalog		TOTAL	
N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
7	.07	320	4	111	1	357	4	57	.62	2994	33	5283	58	9129	100

The next step was to classify the lexemes according to a set of mutually exclusive cultural categories, covering all aspects of Filipino culture. Four studies, similar to this but incomplete for our purposes here, preceded this one, namely: Manuel's study of Chinese Elements (1948), Francisco's work on Sanskrit words (1963), Lopez's investigation of Spanish loanwords (1941) and Malay words in Tagalog (1939).

Several problems had to be solved before actual counting could be started. The first problem was whether to count variously related roots as either one root, or as many roots.

Where Panganiban indicated a word root for a dictionary item, only that word root was counted, if it was included in the dictionary. If the word root was not in the dictionary, the derived term was counted instead.¹ Pairs of words that represent examples of petrified infixes² were also considered as only one word root. *Alakbáy* and *akbáy* were counted as one. Pairs of words showing nazalization were also considered as being only one root. *Alimpuyó* and *alipuyó* were considered equivalent. Further, dictionary entries that were morphologically related were considered one word root. *Sultán* and *sultána* were counted only once. Some word roots account for numerous dictionary entries. *Radyo*, for example, is considered the root for *radyopon*, *radyograma*, *radyograpa*, *radyoterapyá*. As such, it is counted only once. When the word root and its variants were semantically related, no questions arose. However, in certain cases, although dictionary entries were morphologically related, they were not semantically related. *Pakpák* means "wing", and, though *pakpák-langaw*, *pakpák-lawin*, and *pakpák-tutubí* have an analogous reference to a bird's wing, they actually refer to separate entities. These four items, and other cases of analogous usage were each counted as separate word roots. Occasionally, two word roots had been combined to form a new root with specific cultural content. *Antandá* (the Sign of the Cross) from *ang* plus *tandá* was considered a word root separate from *tandá*. Finally, each member of the word sets that represent the Malayo-Polynesian equivalent of umlauting was considered a separate root, e.g. *siksík*, *suksúk*, *saksák* were considered three word roots.

The cross classification of these roots by cultural field yielded the results as seen in table 3.

Forty-eight percent of the word roots shown in Table 3 deal with the visible and invisible aspects of man. The categories of animals, plants, food, and nature cover what can be considered man's subsistence activities. These categories cover his activities to secure his livelihood, since hunting is included in the category *animal* and farming in the category *plant*. These four categories make up 22 percent of the total word root count. The only subsistence type activity that is not contained in these four categories is housing, and that is covered in the next most important grouping of categories. Crafts and occupations and the category of material objects account for 13 percent of the word root count. These categories cover the production and use of things that promote the physical improvement of man's way of life. The word roots considered here reach from simple shelter (*sibi*) to telecommunications (*teleponó*). Governmental, military, and commercial activities, the fine arts, and games account for 10 percent of the total, each of these categories contributing 2 percent. Religious terminology represents 3 percent of the count. Terms for kinship and age relations, titles and honorifics, numerals, measurements, and sounds together account for the final 5 percent.

In Table 4 the distribution of the word roots in each cultural field is considered. The borrowed roots along with the Tagalog roots are compared for each cultural field. In

¹Panganiban records his derivations in two ways. Some derivations are given as *katotohan* (rw. totoó). Whenever a derivation was given in this "rw." form it was accepted and recorded in the manner just mentioned. Panganiban also identifies some of his derivations as *paturay* (fr. *pa-* plus *tunay*). He does not indicate the difference between these two ways of marking his entries.

For the purposes of this study, however, the "fr." entries were treated in the same way as Panganiban's word root derivations.

²For a treatment of these infixes see Felixberto B. Viray. The infixes *la*, *li*, *lo*, and *al* in Philippine languages. Manila, Publications of the Institute of National Language. Bulletin No. 3, 1939.

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF WORD ROOTS IN EACH CULTURAL FIELD FOR THE BORROWED ROOTS AND TAGALOG ROOTS

Cultural Fields	Borrowed roots		Tagalog roots		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1a. Man – visible	563	6	1157	13	1720	19
1b. Man – invisible	963	11	1600	18	2521	29
2. Animal	133	1	396	4	529	5
3. Plant	137	1	355	4	492	5
4. Food	323	4	373	4	696	8
5. Kinship and age relations	46	1	40	.43	86	1
6a. Titles, honorifics	37	1	8	.08	45	.49
6b. Social power, class, government	143	4	32	.35	175	2
6c. Military	90	1	54	1	144	2
7. Crafts and occupations	310	3	234	3	544	6
8. Trade, commerce	140	2	51	1	191	2
9. Fine arts	131	1	37	.4	168	2
10. Games and gambling	109	1	31	.33	140	2
11. Religion	242	3	56	1	298	3
12. Natural phenomena	124	1	249	3	373	4
13. Material objects	242	3	371	4	613	7
14. Numerals	32	.35	7	.07	39	.42
15. Measurements	81	1	40	.43	121	1
16. Sounds	–	–	192	2	192	2
TOTAL	3809	42	5278	58	9087	100

the categories of man-visible, animals, plants, and natural phenomena the Tagalog contribution to the root list is significantly above 50% of the Tagalog contribution to the total list as shown in Table 1. The Tagalog word roots in the categories man-invisible and material objects account for percentages that are also higher than the 58–42 percent division of Table 2, though they are only slightly higher. These categories basically cover all the activities necessary to guarantee the subsistence of a group of people. Only the Tagalog contribution to the category of food does not surpass the 58–42 percent mark of Table 1. Tagalog accounts for only 54 percent of the roots in this category. The category of food deals with the preparation of food stuffs. The categories animals and plants deal with the provision or production of these food stuffs. That people have the food stuffs is more important than how they prepare them. It is more likely for a group to accept new ways of preparing familiar raw materials, rather than accept new raw materials or new names for things that have already been identified.

The category crafts and occupations and the category material objects present an interesting contrast. In the category crafts and occupations 57 percent of the items are of

TABLE 4
 PERCENTAGE OF TAGALOG AND BORROWED WORD ROOTS
 IN EACH CULTURAL FIELD

Cultural Fields	Borrowed roots		Tagalog roots		TOTAL	
	N.	%	N	%	N	%
1a. Man – visible	563	33	1157	67	1720	100
1b. Man – invisible	963	38	1600	62	2563	100
2. Animal	133	25	369	75	529	100
3. Plant	137	28	355	72	492	100
4. Food	323	46	373	54	696	100
5. Kinship and age relations	46	53	40	47	86	100
6a. Titles, honorifics	37	82	8	18	45	100
6b. Social power, class, government	143	82	32	18	175	100
6c. Military	90	63	54	37	144	100
7. Crafts and occupations	310	57	234	43	544	100
8. Trade, commerce	140	73	51	27	191	100
9. Fine arts	131	78	37	22	168	100
10. Games and gambling	109	78	31	22	140	100
11. Religion	242	81	56	19	298	100
12. Natural phenomena	124	33	249	67	373	100
13. Material objects	242	39	371	61	613	100
14. Numerals	32	82	7	18	39	100
15. Measurements	81	67	40	33	121	100
16. Sounds	–	–	192	100	192	100
TOTAL	3846	42	5283	58	9129	100

foreign origin, and 43 percent are Tagalog. This is the reverse of the division in Table 1, and is an indication that the technical improvements in ship building, housing, communication, and other such fields came into the Philippines from the outside. However, this is not to say that there is, nor was, no indigeneous technology. In the category material objects Tagalog accounts for 61 percent of the items. There is a Tagalog technological assemblage. It deals with more simple techniques and objects than modern technology. Various general structural items are included here: *taban* and *suhay* (supports). Simple objects like *tabing* (screen); and *sumpal* and *sabát* (plug) are also included. There are references to bamboo working *salá-salá* and *sanginshin*.

In the remaining categories of kinship and age relations, titles and honorifics, government, military, commerce, fine arts, gambling and games, religion, numerals, and measurements, the borrowed roots account for the majority of items in the word list. The percentages for the borrowed roots are far beyond the overall 42 percent of Table 1. However, in terms of Table 3 each of these categories makes only a minor contribution to the total

root list. The largest contribution of any of these categories to the overall root list is made in the category religion, but then it is only 3 percent of the overall total.

In the development of any culture, subsistence problems must be solved. The preponderance of Tagalog word roots in the subsistence categories indicates an indigeneous solution to these problems. With subsistence secured, new ways of social organization, religious belief, commercial activity, and recreation were freely borrowed, and became important parts of the Tagalog way of life.

When each language of origin is considered separately striking differences occur. In all categories Spanish makes the greatest contribution. In the category of kinship and age relations, however, another language comes close to equalling the Spanish contribution: Spanish contributes 20 percent and Chinese contributes 19 percent. Chinese also makes a substantial contribution in the category of food – 12 percent. Malay makes sizeable contributions in the categories of numerals, 23 percent; kinship and age relations, 13 percent; measurements, 12 percent; and titles and honorifics, 11 percent. Arabic, English and Sanskrit contribute only very small percentages in each field. The largest contribution made by any of these three languages is made by English in the category of gambling and games – 9 percent.

Within each cultural field there are various sub-groupings of items. For example, in the category of man-visible many types of clothing and jewelry are grouped together. Although percentages were not done for these sub-groupings, certain emphases deserve to be pointed out. They can possibly serve as guides to further sophistication of the methods used here. Only Spanish and Tagalog will be treated because they are the two major contributors to the word root list. In the field man-visible Spanish provides a variety of terms dealing with dress and adornment. Tagalog provides a number of anatomical terms, as well as a variety of terms for intestinal disorders. Tagalog also provides a number of terms for specific types of physical movements, for example, *hibay* meaning the swaying of the body due to weakness, and *kumkom* meaning to hold something against the chest. In the category animals Tagalog provides many terms for fish. There are also a number of terms for smaller animals of the bug-insect type. In the category of crafts and occupations there are a number of subdivisions: ships and ship building, housing, land transportation, printing, photography. For an island country it is interesting that Spanish provides a large number of its naval terms. Most of the terms for masonry dwellings are also Spanish. For land transportation, Spanish provides the terms dealing with automobiles and modern roads. Tagalog is concerned with transportation by foot. The religious terminology is provided for the most part by Spanish. Except for *antandâ* meaning the "Christian Sign of the Cross," little of the Christian terminology has found Tagalog equivalents. In the category of natural phenomena, Tagalog provides many terms dealing with geography: types of hills, sources of water, and the like. The category of sounds is special to Tagalog. Each of a great variety of sounds has a special distinctive term.

Further analysis might well lead to the establishment of qualitative differences between the contributions of the various foreign languages and the properly Tagalog contribution. For example, it is a common notion that there are few properly Tagalog words for abstract concepts. If the data in Table 6 for the category 1b., man-visible is examined, it is obvious that Tagalog contributes abstract items to the root list. Sixty-three percent of the items are properly Tagalog. A comparison of these items with the Spanish contribution would show, however, a qualitative difference between these two contributions.

With regard to the "morphemes" in the language, table 6 gives us the figures.

TABLE 5
 PERCENTAGES BY CULTURAL FIELD FOR THE WORD
 ROOTS IN EACH LANGUAGE OF ORIGIN

Cultural field	Arabic		Chinese		English		Malay		Sanskrit		Spanish		Tagalog		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1a.	1	.05	72	4	21	1	72	4	9	1	388	23	1157	67	1720	100
1b.	5	.019	54	2	15	1	62	2	20	1	807	31	1600	62	2563	99
2.			15	3	0	0	27	5	3	1	88	17	396	75	529	101
3.			14	3	3	1	26	5	1	.2	93	19	355	72	492	100
4.			84	12	5	1	24	3	3	.43	207	30	373	54	696	100
5.			16	19	0	0	11	13	2	.2	17	20	40	47	86	101
6a.			0	0	0	0	5	11	1	2	31	69	8	18	45	100
6b.			1	1	4	2	2	1	2	1	134	77	32	18	175	100
6c.			3	2	2	1	8	6	1	1	76	53	54	36	144	99
7.			6	1	27	5	22	4	1	.18	254	47	234	43	544	100
8.			12	6	3	2	8	4	1	1	116	61	51	27	191	100
9.			2	1	1	1	3	2	2	1	123	73	37	22	168	100
10.			6	4	13	9	1	1	0	0	89	64	31	22	140	100
11.	1	.33	2	1	0	0	8	3	3	1	228	77	56	19	298	101
12.			3	1	5	1	27	7	4	1	85	23	249	67	373	100
13.			25	4	10	2	28	5	2	.32	177	29	371	61	613	101
14.			1	3	1	3	9	23	2	5	19	49	7	18	39	101
15.			4	3	1	1	14	12	0	0	62	51	40	33	121	100
16.			—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	192	100	192	100
Total	7	.07	320	4	111	1	357	4	57	.62	2994	33	5283	58	9129	100

TABLE 6

Affixes and close-listed items	Tagalog N	Spanish N	Malay N	Chinese N	Sanskrit N	TOTAL N
Affixes	87	2				89
Adverbs	104	12	4	3	1	124
Pronouns	41	1	8			50
Conjunctions	18	2				20
Prepositions	15	2		1		18
Articles	2					2
Idioms	7	1				8
TOTAL	274	20	12	4	1	311

This table summarizes the items that were not considered in the word root count summarized in Table 1. Hence, the total number of entries in TPI is 9,398.

LEXICOGRAPHY

The object is to evaluate the methodology that is employed in TPI. One of the interesting features of this bilingual dictionary is that the author provides information on the origins of his entries. These are of two types: (a) the donor languages are identified (with or without the original words in those languages) in cases of loanwords; and (b) the morphological composition of the words is given, when the entries are not loanwords.

With regard to the first type, Panganiban cites in parenthesis the donor language and the original form of the word in that language, if there is a difference in their shapes, at least orthographically, e.g. *multó* 'ghost' (Sp. *muerto*). However, if the Pilipino words are identical to their original forms in the donor languages, the original words were not cited, e.g. *martés* (Sp.)

The question, however, arises: what criteria were used in deciding whether a word is a loanword or not? Apparently, one of these criteria was similarity or identity of forms (at least, orthographically). If this is correct, then many of the entries which were labelled as loanwords from Malay had to be re-classified — which was what had to be done e.g. in the case of *matá* 'eye'. Both the Tagalog-based Pilipino and Malay inherited the word from their common parent language (Proto-Malayopolynesian/Proto-Austronesian); and neither one borrowed from the other.

Moreover, there are cases where it is known that the word was first borrowed by Malay from Sanskrit, before it became a loanword from Malay in Pilipino, e.g. *kutà* 'fort'. In this case, the author labels the item (Sk.) only, i.e. from Sanskrit. Moreover, a loanword may have been a loanword in Malay from Persian first, before Pilipino borrowed it from Malay, e.g. *barò* 'dress'. In this last example, its origin either from Persian or Malay has been left out in the TPI. It is simply an entry without origin.

Some entries have two donor languages given, e.g. *baboy* (Mal. *babi*; Ch.). In these cases, the author uses two types of symbols: (a) the slant line, e.g. *balang* 'locust' (Ind/Mal.); and (b) the comma, e.g. *kuko* 'fingernail' (Mal., Ch.). Presumably, the slant line indicates

that the word could have been borrowed from either language. This is certainly true, for example, of *oktupus* (Sp/Eng.). On the other hand, the notation (L_1, L_2) seems to indicate that L_2 borrowed from L_1 , while Pilipino borrowed from L_1 . Just what was the actual sequence of events is not easy. For example, *diabetes* 'diabetes' is labeled (Sp., Lat.), whereas *baryo* 'barium (Chem.)' is labeled (Lat. barium, Sp. bario); yet in this latter case, the Pilipino form resembles the Spanish form more closely, and this may be an indication that the donor language was more immediately Spanish.

Moreover, Panganiban labels words which are known to be from Proto-Austronesian as loanwords from Chinese and Malay, e.g. *baboy* 'pig' (Mal. babi, Ch.), *kuko* 'fingernail' (Mal., Ch.), and *panà* 'arrow' (Sk./Mal.).

With regard to the second type of words, i.e. non-loanwords, the author gives their origin by giving their morphological constituents, e.g. *patalastás* 'information' (fr. pa- + talastás). However, there are inconsistencies in his notation as well as analyses. For words like *saláwikaín* 'epigram', the notation given is (rw.: *wiká*); but for *patakaran* 'by-laws', the notation is (fr. pa- + takad + -an). One may well ask whether rw.: differs from fr.

Secondly, in the analysis of the morphological composition of words, what criteria were used to decide what the root word (i.e. rw.) of an entry was? An example is *pangakò* 'promise', which has the label (rw.: *akò*), presumably because there is a word *akò* 'guarantee'; on the other hand, *kaibuturan* 'dead center' is analyzed as (rw.: *butod*), but there is no word *butod* in Pilipino.

Finally, some of the statements on the morphological constituents range from the probable (e.g. *kapangyarihan* 'power' rw.: *yari*), to the possible (e.g. *munakala* 'project' fr. *muna* + *akalà*), to the fanciful (e.g. *munukala* 'project' fr. *punò* *akalà*), to something that approaches "folk-etymology" (e.g. *himuyat* 'present' fr. *puyat* — given by prospective bridegroom to future mother-in-law for the latter's vigils over the bride when she was an infant).

Occasionally, the author gives the dialectal origin of a word, e.g. *bagol* (in Batangas) 'five-centavo coin.' However, he does not do this consistently, for some of the entries are given in various forms with the label var., without specifying the dialect of origin, e.g. *babae* var. *babai*, *babayi*.

Similarly, the author could have been helpful if he had indicated the style of use for certain lexical items. Thus, the word *bastós* 'indecent' is not only colloquial; it approaches the vulgar; yet, the reader is not warned about this fact. Similarly, *barat* 'haggler' is at least colloquial, if not vulgar; but nothing is mentioned to this effect.

In a bilingual dictionary of this type, it is at least advisable, if not absolutely necessary, to illustrate each meaning assigned to the lexical entry in a phrase, because of the danger that the reader might equate the meaning (given — in his English language — through translation) given to the various usages of a Pilipino word with its equivalent meanings in his native language. Thus, the author gives the following meaning for *punta* v.i. 'to go'; but the English word *go* can mean not only 'to proceed' but also (among many others) 'move along', as when someone who moves sluggishly is urged by somebody else to move faster and is asked to "go!". In this particular context, one cannot use the Tagalog word *puntá*.

Similarly, the author should indicate the syntactic restrictions of his lexical entries, in order to warn his readers about their proper use. Thus, for example, the word *hinhin* 'modesty' should be marked (said only of women), and *kisig* 'elegance', should be marked

(said only of men). This is not to say that Panganiban fails to do this in all cases. Sometimes, he does it; as for example, in the entry *dahop* 'in want' the author adds the syntactic specification (specially of money or necessities of life); and the entry *dalahirà* 'gossipy' he adds "(applied only to women)". The point is that this is not done consistently for the lexical entries concerned.

Another question that arises, on reading this dictionary, is the criterion used for the inclusion or exclusion of words. There had to be a cut-off point, to be sure; but it is not clear just what that point was. Some of the items included were obsolete words (e.g. *ayamín* 'toy' (O. Tag.); today the word used is *laruán*); on the other hand, such everyday common words as *adiós* 'goodbye', *alay* 'offering', *alon* 'waves (sea)', etc. are not included in the dictionary.

In summary, one can say that the TPI of J. V. Panganiban is a contribution to the development and propagation of the national language, but its worth, lexicographically speaking, is rather unsatisfactory. We still need a reliable etymological, as well as a good dialectal, dictionary of Pilipino. It goes without saying that we also need a descriptive type of dictionary of "scientific terms" in Pilipino for the various disciplines to provide an alternative to the prescriptive and (to many) objectionable scientific word list prescribed by the Lupon sa Agham.

REFERENCES

- FRANCISCO, JUAN R. 1963. Indian Influences in the Philippines With Special Reference to Language and Literature. *Philippine Social Sciences and Humanities Review*. XXVIII (January-September, 1963).
- LOPEZ, CECILIO. 1939. A Comparison of Tagalog and Malay Lexicographies (On Phonetic-Semantic Basis). Institute of National Language Bulletin No. 2. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- _____. 1941. Studies on Tagalog Lexicography No. 1 Institute of National Language. Bulletin No. 6. Manila: Bureau of Printing.
- MANUEL, ARSENIO E. 1948. Chinese Elements in the Tagalog Language. Manila: Filipiniana Publications.
- VIRAY, FELIXBERTO B. 1939. The Infixes *la*, *li*, *lo*, and *al* in Philippine Languages. Manila: Publications of the Institute of National Language. Bulletin No. 3.