13 Hybridization

Wilkinson Daniel Wong Gonzales

13.1 Introduction

Linguistic hybridization has always been present in society; it undoubtedly plays a role in the development of most natural languages and varieties. While such is the case, the general awareness of such processes and products – the hybrids – in the field of linguistics (particularly in the study of world Englishes) is relatively recent (Onysko, 2016; Schneider, 2016). There is increasing attention given toward them, but much remains to be investigated particularly in English-using societies where multilingualism is not the exception, but the norm. One such example is the Philippines, where historically indigenous and non-indigenous languages coexist and interact with each other, resulting in various linguistic hybrids.

In this chapter, I investigate hybrids related to Philippine English (PhE) using a bottom-up approach. I survey related works and analyze linguistic data with the goal of broadening the traditional PhE field by including studies of language contact, language documentation, and diaspora sociohistory to PhE research. Another goal of this chapter is to propel studies of PhE beyond the homogenizing paradigm, fulfilling the goal of the field of world Englishes, that is, to study the varied uses of English in various contexts around the world (Smith, 1981).

Hybridization in this chapter refers to a process where distinct and disparate systems create a new system or process – the hybrid – that may have features from varying levels (i.e. phonological, morphological, syntactic, etc.) and multiple source languages (Sanchez-Stockhammer, 2012). In this survey, I refer to three notions of language contact that are relevant in the process of linguistic hybridization. The first, borrowing, is characterized by the process of grafting lexicon onto the recipient language with phonological adaptation (Grosjean, 2010). Although scholars have referred to borrowing of non-lexical items (Thomason, 2001; Thomason & Kaufman, 1988), here these are referred to as instances of substrate influence; I distinguish it from borrowing. The second type involves code-switching, defined here as a situation where a speaker completely shifts to another language for a word, phrase, or clause (Grosjean, 2010). While there is phonological adaptation

in borrowing, code-switched words (as defined in this chapter) retain the phonological features of the base. The third process involves "substratum influence" (Thomason, 2001, p. 75) or (system) transfer. Unlike borrowing and code-switching, both of which are analyzed at the lexical level in this chapter, the substratum influence hybridization process referred to here is analyzed at non-lexical levels of language (e.g. syntactic, morphological).

To facilitate the discussion, this chapter surveys three groups of PhE-related varieties based on the three mechanisms above: (1) hybrids with borrowing, (2) hybrids involving code-switching, and (3) substrate-influenced hybridized Englishes. Note that varieties in a certain group need not be mutually exclusive from other groups.

13.2 Hybrid Varieties of English and Other Philippine Languages

13.2.1 Hybrids with Borrowing

The first group of hybrids are *hybrids with borrowing* (hence group-1). One thing hybrids of this group have in common is the salience of lexicon from two or more sources. Lexical items are borrowed from the source(s) into the (original) recipient language.

13.2.1.1 *Conyo English/Englog*

Conyo English (also known as Englog 'English-Tagalog') is an English sociolect that has Tagalog and Filipino (§ 13.2.1.2) borrowings. The variety indexes privilege, 'elite-ness', and has negative connotations due to the claimed contrived nature of mixing in the variety. It is also viewed as "less smooth" switching (Borlongan, 2015) compared to Tagalog-Filipino-English code-switching (§ 13.2.2.1). While this is partially warranted due to the 'playful' nature of the variety, some syntactic aspects of Conyo English suggests that the variety is more conventionalized than previously characterized. The *make* + Tagalog V construction is a salient attribute of Conyo English. In (1), the Tagalog lexical word *sakay* 'ride' was borrowed into the English clause. A preliminary observation for Tagalog verbal borrowings in Conyo English like this is that they tend to be preceded by *make*. This pattern does not seem to hold for English verbs. Reduplication is also another feature (2); it also seems to be restricted to Tagalog/Filipino lexicon. In this case, there is both borrowing (e.g. *kanto* 'sidewalk') and transfer (e.g. reduplication of *tusok* 'skewer') from Tagalog. If the word reduplicated is English, the utterance does not seem to reflect Conyo English anymore.

1 <u>it was their first time to make **sakay** [ride] *sa* jeepney</u>[1]
   "It was their first time to ride the jeepney".

   (Garvida, 2012, p. 28)

2   <u>they are like making</u> ***tusok*** [skewer] <u>some calamares along the</u> ***kanto***
   [sidewalk]
   "They are like skewering some squid along the sidewalk".

   (Garvida, 2012, p. 28)

13.2.1.2 *Filipino*

Designed to be the unifying language of the Philippines, Filipino[2] is a language that is primarily based on Tagalog and enriched by other languages like English, Spanish, Hokkien, among many others. This variety has an expanded phonemic inventory from Tagalog that includes phonemes like [f], which is used by other non-Tagalog languages like English. Another feature of this variety is the conventionalized borrowing of historically non-indigenous lexicon. For instance, in (3), the word *parti* derives from the English word *party*. Other English-derived words include *biskwit* 'biscuit', *bolpen* 'ballpen', and *kompyuter* 'computer'. Filipino also has conventionalized Hokkien borrowings like *siomai* 'Chinese dumpling' (4), *bihon* 'rice vermicelli', *ate* 'sister') (Chan-Yap, 1980).

3   *Gusto   ko   ng   pumunta   sa   **parti**,   pero   siya, ayaw.*
   Want   1SG LNK go   LOC   party   but   3SG no
   "I want to go to the party but he doesn't want to".

   (Schachter & Otanes, 1972)

4   *salamat   sa   **siomai**   haha   <u>mbtc & god bless</u>
   Thanks   for   dumpling   haha   mbtc & god bless
   "Thank you for the shumai. Haha. Mbtc (?) and god bless!"

   (from Twitter, https://twitter.com/reemfatoum/status/1069963797811654656)

13.2.1.3 *Lánnang-uè*

Lánnang-uè[3] 'Our People speech' or Philippine Hybrid Hokkien is an oral code with Hokkien, Tagalog/Filipino, English, and Mandarin elements, which has characteristics consistent with descriptions of mixed languages. It is perceived as a broken variety of Hokkien and is generally used by the Lannangs[4] – a group of Philippine-based individuals who have Southern Chinese (majority Hokkien) heritage, specifically a group that primarily comprises late 19th- to early 20th-century Southern Chinese immigrants to the Philippines and their descendants (Gonzales, 2017b).

   The lexicon of Lánnang-uè is dominated by Hokkien (220-word Swadesh list, 49% of the lexicon is exclusively sourced from Hokkien). Unlike Philippine Hokkien, it incorporates Tagalog and English features beyond the phonetic level. One role of English in Lánnang-uè is that of a lexical contributor

(37% of the basic lexicon can be expressed using the English variant). Preliminary work on Lánnang-uè shows that English is also involved in language transfer processes, such as the transfer of some functional morphemes such as conjunctions (e.g. *so* in 5) and borrowing of noun phrases, such as *manager*, *grade*, and *per semester* (5 and 6) from English to Lánnang-uè.

5 <u>So</u> <u>per semester</u>   *kê*   *khuà*   *o*   *hî*   *ge*   <u>grade</u>?
   So   per semester   all   look   PRT   DEM   CLF   grade
   "So, all of the grades were looked at per semester?"

   (Gonzales's Lánnang-uè data)

6 <u>Actually</u>,   tsî   ge   <u>manager</u>   u   ***diprensiya***   la.
   Actually,   DEM   CLF   manager   have   disorder   PRT
   "Actually this manager has a disorder".

   (Gonzales's Lánnang-uè data)

At the suprasegmental level, English-sourced Lánnang-uè words have tone. For instance, in the Lánnang-uè word /ε^{51}ɹej^{51}sɛɹs^{55}/ 'erasers' (pronounced [ε^{33}.ˈɹej^{33}. sɛɹs^{55}]), all syllables in the word have either falling or high tone. Tone is conditioned by syllable structure (consonant-vowel-consonant [CVC] syllables, high tone; non-CVC syllables, falling tone). This feature is also observed in all other English-sourced words in Lánnang-uè. Along with the borrowings and transfers, the tonal system seems to be conventionalized in the Lánnang-uè-speaking community.

13.2.2 Hybrids Involving Code-Switching

Hybrids involving code-switching are the second group (hence, group-2) of linguistic hybrids. These are similar to group-1 hybrids in that both have lexicon that have multiple sources. What distinguishes this group is that its users shift from one language to another through code-switching, which does not involve processes of phonological adaptation unlike borrowing.

13.2.2.1 Tagalog-Filipino-English Code-Switching

Tagalog-Filipino-English 'Taglish' code-switching in this chapter primarily refers to code-switching among Tagalog, Filipino, and English in the clausal (7) and phrasal level (8). Since word-level 'code-switching' in Tagalog is typically phonologically adapted, word-level 'code-switching' is not treated as code-switching but as a borrowing. This borrowing is part of Filipino (§ 13.2.1.2).

   Tagalog-Filipino-English code-switching is primarily used by Filipinos in the metropolitan Manila area, although its use is also salient in other Philippine regions. Apart from its prevalence in Philippine society,

Tagalog-Filipino-English code-switching has often been highlighted in (socio)linguistic literature for its functions in Philippine society, as well as its structure (Bautista, 2004; Lesada, 2017; Sobolewski, 1980). Example (7) starts with the English clause *I hope* followed by Filipino relative clause. Example (8), on the other hand, begins with Filipino, followed by Tagalog, and ends with the English phrase *one of his baskets*. The words *teen star* and *bike* in (7) and (8) are phonologically adapted and may be interpreted as borrowings from English.

7 **I hope** *na*   *magkaroon* *sana*   *ng*   *pelikula*   *ang*
  I hope   that   have   hopefully of   move   NOM

  <u>fave</u>   <u>teen star</u>   *ko*   *-ng*   *si*   *Arnold Gamboa.*
  favorite   teen star   2SG   that   NOM   Arnold Gamboa

"I hope that my favorite teenage star Arnold Gamboa will have a film".

(Sobolewksi, 1980)

8 *may*   *d<um>aan*   *na*   *bata*   *na*   *may*   <u>*bike,*</u>
  have   <PFV>cross   LNK   kid   that   have   bike,

  na-   *nakaw*   *yung*   **one of his baskets.**
  PFV   steal   DEM   one of his baskets.

"There was a boy with a bike who crossed; one of his baskets was stolen".

(Lesada, 2017, p. 81)

13.2.2.2 *Hokkien-Lánnang-uè-Tagalog-Filipino-English Code-Switching*

Hokkien-Lánnang-uè-Tagalog-Filipino-English 'Hokaglish' code-switching is a phenomenon that involves the inter-phrasal or inter-clausal switching among Hokkien, Lánnang-uè, Tagalog, Filipino, and English. Exclusively used by the Lannang community, particularly those residing in the metropolitan Manila area, this phenomenon has predominantly Hokkien and Lánnang-uè clauses (Gonzales, 2016). Like Taglish, it also has an established community of users. The only difference between this and Tagalog-English-Filipino code-switching is the addition of (Philippine) Hokkien and Lánnang-uè in the switching phenomenon. Example (9) begins with a Tagalog clause, followed by Lánnang-uè, then (Philippine) Hokkien. This is succeeded by English and Filipino.

9 *hindi*   *niya*   *b<in>ayad,*
  NEG   3SG   <PFV>pay

  î   tsiageh   diapdì   u   siá   *cheke*   hó
  3SG   January   twenty two have   write   cheque   PRT

î	laktsap kuí	tshieng	huan	ì	kô	ó
3SG	sixty around	thousand	return	3SG	PRT	PRT

It's	because
It's	because

nag-	*bigay*	*siya*	*ng*	<u>clearance</u>.
PFV	give	3SG	PRT	clearance

"She/he didn't pay. he wrote a check on January returning him/her 60,000. It is because she/he gave him/her clearance".

(Gonzales's Hokaglish code-switching data)

13.2.2.3 A Taishanese Variety Spoken in the Philippines

Taishanese is a dialect of Cantonese historically used in Taishan, located in southern Guangdong. Preliminary observations show that the lexicon of the variety of Taishanese used in the Philippines has been influenced by English, through code-switching with English. For instance, (10) and (11) show that Taishanese Lannang speakers can switch from Taishanese to English. The consultant noted that Cantonese Lannangs mix however they want with whatever language, suggesting that the variety has non-conventionalized code-switching.

10	*Nieng*	*goi*	***fanyekyon***	*hui*	***ngitpun.***
	DEM	CLF	translator	go	Japan

"The translator is going to Japan".

(Gonzales's Taishanese elicitation data)

11	*Nieng*	*goi*	<u>***translator***</u>	*hui*	<u>***Japan***</u>.
	DEM	CLF	translator	go	Japan

"The translator is going to Japan".

(Gonzales's Taishanese elicitation data)

13.2.2.4 Cebuano-English Code-Switching

Cebuano is a language used in the central and southern Philippine regions. Like many other Philippine languages, it came into contact with English around the American occupation period in the 1900s. One outcome of Cebuano-English contact is Cebuano-English code-switching, a phenomenon that has been associated with the upper class and the well-educated (Abastillas, 2015). In (12), the utterance starts with an English utterance, followed by a Cebuano phrase, then another Cebuano phrase headed by English conditional *if*. The English utterance at the beginning of the sentence can be translated to Cebuano freely (13), based on a native speaker consultant.

12 ***yeah***   ***sure***   *mas*   *nindot*   *if*   *di*   *sabutan*
   yeah   sure   more   nice   if   NEG   understand
   "Yeah, sure. It'd be nicer if you didn't know".

   (Abastillas, 2015, Twitter data)

13 ***O***   ***sige***   *mas*   *nindot*   *kung*   *di*   *sabutan*
   yeah   sure   more   nice   if   NEG   understand
   "Yeah, sure. It'd be nicer if you didn't know".

   (Cebuano, translation by native speaker, 2018)

13.2.2.5 Contemporary Chabacano Varieties

Commonly identified as one of the few Spanish-lexified creoles in the world, Chabacano is a creole language group (e.g. Zamboanga Chabacano, Cavite Chabacano, and Ternate Chabacano) that is primarily spoken and used in the Philippines. The Chabacano group, like all other Philippine languages and varieties, has also been influenced by peripheral linguistic varieties such as Tagalog, Filipino, and English (Lesho, 2013). In the case of English, this influence primarily manifests in Chabacano in the lexical level through code-switching.[5] Cavite Chabacano data (Lesho, 2013), for example, show that the code-switched words are used interchangeably. So, while Cavite Chabacano speakers use English *accent* to refer to 'accent', they also frequently use Chabacano/Spanish *intonacion* and Filipino/Spanish *tono* to refer to the same thing (14) (Lesho, 2013). From this, Lesho notes from her ethnographic observations that English code-switching in Cavite Chabacano has most likely not conventionalized (Lesho, personal communication). She notes that pinpointing the default language of expression is difficult due to this lack of convention.

14 Tiene   medio   **class**   el   **accent.**
   Have   APPX   class   DEF   accent
   "Their accent sort of has class".

   (Lesho, 2013, Cavite Chabacano)

13.2.3 Substrate-Influenced Hybridized Englishes

The last group of hybrids – *substrate-influenced hybridized Englishes* (group-3) – is distinct from the previous two groups. Hybrids in the third group have mixing in non-lexical levels (e.g. phonological, morphological, and syntactic) that is primarily motivated by the interaction between English and other languages in the language ecology of hybrid user, particularly the substrate influence of these other languages on English. Hybrids from this group in general have a lexicon that is dominantly English, resembling

standardized English varieties such as standard American English or standard British English. For this reason, hybridized Englishes may not be immediately recognized as products of linguistic hybridization.

13.2.3.1 *Philippine Korean Learner English*

Philippine Korean Learner English (PKLE) is a hybridized English that has recently emerged in the Philippines – a popular English as a Second Language (ESL) learning destination for young Koreans beginning in the 1990s (Gonzales, 2017a; Imperial, 2016; Kim, 2015; Miralao, 2007). Its use is salient in Korean students particularly in the cities of Manila, Baguio, Cebu, Iloilo who have interacted frequently with Filipino peers and were more involved in their formal English learning.

PKLE distinguishes itself from other (Korean Learner) Englishes by having substrate influences from PhE (most likely Manila English) and Korean. It has phonetic features of the PhE stop system "across segmental and subsegmental levels" as well as stops that assimilate toward Korean production norms (Imperial, 2016, p. 145). Beyond Imperial's (2016) analyses, a closer investigation of PKLE data also shows potential syntactic substrate influence from Korean and PhE as well. Copula deletion, illustrated with a $\varnothing$ in (15), appears to be a salient feature of PKLE. A potential account for this might be related to the Korean word order. In Korean, the verbs and copulas are mostly found at the end of the clause since Korean is SOV (16). As they produce the English clause like in (15), Korean learners in the Philippines might be subconsciously delaying the verb/copula until the end of the clause, like in Korean, but upon reaching the end of the clause realize that the delay is not typical of English. By the time they realize this, they are unable to return and correct the 'error' without repeating the clause. This is also a common 'error'/feature in other non-Philippine Korean learners of English (Ji-seung Kim, personal communication) and might explain why Korean learners in the Philippines drop their copula in English, demonstrating Korean substrate influence on English.

On the other hand, in the same utterance, the use of intensifier *really* at the beginning of the clause cannot be traced back to Korean but to PhE (17) and, perhaps, Tagalog (i.e. clause-initial *talaga* 'really'), where similar clause-initial 'really' intensifier constructions are permitted. Although this warrants more investigation, what are demonstrated here collectively show that PKLE is a substrate-influenced hybridized English.

15 Because if somebody $\varnothing$ very good at speaking English, **really** I can understand.
"Because if somebody is very good at speaking English, I can really understand".

(Imperial, 2016)

16 만약   누군가   영어를   매우   잘   한다   면…
    manyag   nugunga yeongeoleul maeu jal- handa -myeon…
    if   somebody English   very well- do   -if
    "Because if somebody is very good at speaking English…"

    (Korean, native speaker translation of the first clause of 15)

17 **Really** I mean they they wear this they wore this very short skirt

    (Manila English, ICE-PHI:S1A-080#240:1:A)

13.2.3.2 Manila Lannang English

Manila Lannang English (MLE) (known in previous work as Manila Chinese English) is an English variety of the Manila Lannangs. It is a hybridized English that has Hokkien and Tagalog influence on its English (morpho) syntax (Gonzales, 2017a; Gonzales & Hiramoto 2020). Used specifically in, but not limited to, academia, computer-mediated, and formal settings (e.g. meetings, religious), MLE is characterized by its non-lexical Hokkien and Tagalog/Filipino-sourced features.

For instance, 'standard' English typically places the adverb *only* at the pre-verbal position. In MLE, however, *only* has the tendency to be in the clause-final position (18), similar to *ni* 'only' in Hokkien and *lang* 'only' in Tagalog/Filipino, which both have clause finality. Similarly, MLE also has the plain *than*-comparative marker (19), which can be argued to be due to influence from Hokkien *pi* (comparative) (Gonzales & Hiramoto, 2020). The *pi* comparative does not need to be in proximity with another comparative marker like *kha* (comparative) for the sentence to be grammatical, but such is not the case in Tagalog/Filipino, where you need both comparative markings (i.e. *mas...kaysa* '*more…than*'). This suggests that, among the primary source languages, Hokkien is the sole substrate influence on the MLE plain *than*-comparative feature (Gonzales & Hiramoto, 2020). As a Hokkien and Tagalog-influenced English, MLE can belong to the third group of hybrids.

18 Because only limited persons per day **only**.
    "Because they only allow limited persons per day".

    (Gonzales' MLE data)

19 I like Dr. Uayan's suggestion of a laptop or Terabyte as the ultimate chiong guan[6] **than** a TV.
    "I like Dr. Uayan's suggestion of a laptop or a Terabyte hard drive as the first prize rather than (instead of) a TV".

    (Gonzales' MLE data)

13.2.3.3 *Other Non-Manila Ethno-Geographic Englishes*

Apart from Manila English, other ethno-geographic Englishes have also been observed in regions where Cebuano and Hiligaynon are used (Villanueva, 2016). For simplicity, this chapter refers to them as Cebuano English and Hiligaynon English. In these Englishes, the regional language(s) can influence the English used by the speakers. For instance, the formulaic phrase *a lot of* to refer to 'many' in 'standard' English is reduced to *a lot* in Cebuano English (20), potentially because Cebuano does not have this formulaic phrase and realizes this phrase as one phonological word *daghan(g)* 'many' (21). The reduction of three phonological words to two could be attributed to Cebuano influence. Also, 'standardized English' has a more comprehensive prepositional system (e.g. the use of *in*, *on*, etc.), but in Hiligaynon and Tagalog, for example, there is usually only one preposition/locative marker, *sa*. In Hiligaynon English (22), 'incorrect' uses of prepositions such as *in* instead of *with* in English can be observed. This can be due to the lack of a similar system in Hiligaynon.

20   There are **a lot** reasons.
     "There are many reasons".

     (Cebuano English, EWCSE-2, Villanueva, 2016)

21   daghang   mga   rason
     many   PLU   reason
     "many reasons"

     (Cebuano, Philippine Star – Banat, https://www.philstar.com/banat/balita, November 22, 2014)

22   Similarly, it is claimed that if teachers are happy **in** their job they become productive and effective. (Hiligaynon English)

     (Hiligaynon English, TDWHSE-1, Villanueva, 2016)

13.3 Summary and Conclusion

After briefly defining hybridization and situating it in the Philippine (English) context, this chapter surveyed 11 linguistic varieties and code-switching phenomena in the Philippines that can belong to one of the three hybrid groups – (1) hybrids with borrowing, (2) hybrids involving code-switching, and (3) substrate-influenced hybridized Englishes (Table 13.1). This preliminary grouping of hybrids should not be considered a rigid classification because the groups are not meant to be exclusive and the varieties in these groups can change over time. For instance, MLE can be part of group-2 and group-3 if its users code-switch to Hokkien or another language in a specific

Table 13.1 Summary of Hybrids Involving Philippine English

#	Group	Varieties and/or Phenomena
1	Hybrids with borrowing	• Conyo English/Englog • Filipino • Lánnang-uè (Philippine Hybrid Hokkien)
2	Hybrids involving code-switching	• Tagalog-Filipino-English code-switching/Taglish • Hokkien-Lánnang-uè-Tagalog-Filipino-English code-switching/Hokaglish • Taishanese variety spoken in the Philippines • Cebuano-English code-switching • Contemporary Chabacano varieties
3	Substrate-influenced hybridized Englishes	• PKLE • MLE • Non-Manila ethno-geographic Englishes (Cebuano English, Hiligaynon English, etc.)

context, like in example (19). Also, the Taishanese variety (§ 13.2.2.3) in the second group might become a group-1 hybrid if its speakers phonologically adapt the code-switched words over time or if sociohistorical factors favor the variety in the future.

Overall, a brief analysis of these Philippine hybrid varieties collectively demonstrates three things. First, it shows that linguistic hybridization is very much present in multicultural and multilingual Philippines. As shown in the survey, hybrids exist in profusion. I have also demonstrated that hybridization in these varieties is realized in different forms and levels ranging from the phonological to the syntactic. Second, my analysis highlights the significant and dynamic role (Philippine) English plays in Philippine hybrid varieties. The preceding sections demonstrate how PhE can contribute to other Philippine languages, varieties, and phenomena through borrowing or code-switching of certain (Philippine) English lexicon. The section on hybridized Englishes (§ 13.2.3) also shows that PhE can also play the role of a malleable language susceptible to substratum influence. Third, this preliminary survey supports the idea that PhE is not a homogenous variety of English (Gonzales, 2017a). The existence of multiple ethno-regional variants of PhE (group-3 hybrids) is not surprising given that English was initially brought to "every province" (p. 179) in the Philippines by the Thomasites during the American occupation period (Bolton & Butler, 2008) and interacted with the languages used in each of those provinces.

As demonstrated, a bottom-up exploration of hybrids can give us a clearer and more accurate picture of the status and development of PhE; it is also crucial for its growth as a field. It would be interesting to look at more varieties and phenomena where PhE assumes different roles in language change and creation: either it was the one being influenced or it was the one contributing the feature. This chapter, however, should be taken

as what it is – a simple overview. For reasons of space, we are unable to expound on the individual varieties that for obvious reasons need further elaboration. What one can glean from this chapter, hopefully, is that it is simply inadequate to confine research on PhE *within* the bounds of PhE. While research on and within the general PhE framework is important, there is need to conduct more research *beyond* this 'monolithic' framework by focusing on other languages, varieties, and code-switching phenomena – hybrids – where (Philippine) English does not assume a static role. It is hoped that this chapter would raise an awareness of the gap and current issues hounding PhE, motivating scholars to redress these in previous work and contemplate on how research in PhE should be conducted in the years to come.

Notes

1 In this and the following examples, words sourced from Tagalog, Filipino (in some examples), and Cebuano are italicized while the English ones are under-lined. In plain text are words and morphemes of Sinitic origin, i.e. Hokkien, Taishanese, or Mandarin. Other non-Sinitic words (e.g. Korean, Spanish) are also in plain text. Emphasis is expressed in bold face.
2 While a linguistic distinction between Filipino and Tagalog is made, Filipinos use the terms Filipino and Tagalog interchangeably.
3 The term Lánnang-uè is also used to refer to the 'pure' and 'unmixed' variety of Hokkien in the Philippines. For this chapter, I use Lánnang-uè to refer to the mixed code.
4 A lot of Lannangs also refer to themselves as Philippine Chinese, Filipino-Chinese, Chinese Filipinos. For more discussion, read Gonzales (2021).
5 I say code-switching and not borrowing from English because it could be the case that these are Chabacano switches to Filipino English-borrowed words. At the same time, I am not discounting the possibility that the English words could be borrowings from English itself. At this point, there is more evidence of it being code-switching because borrowings are usually more conven-tionalized but in the case of contemporary Chabacano, the switches are not conventionalized.
6 Since this is from a written source, it is hard to determine whether it has phono-logically adapted. This may or may not be a borrowing from Hokkien.

References

Abastillas, Glenn. (2015). *Divergence in Cebuano and English code-switching prac-tices in Cebuano speech communities in the Central Philippines* (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Georgetown University.

Bautista, Maria Lourdes S. (2004). Tagalog-English code switching as a mode of discourse. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 5*(2), 226–233.

Bolton, Kingsley & Susan Butler. (2008). Lexicography and the description of Phil-ippine English vocabulary. In Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista & Kingsley Bolton (eds.), *Philippine English: Linguistics and literary perspectives*, 175–200. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Borlongan, Ariane Macalinga. (2015). Conyo English: Explorations of Philippine English sociolects. In D. Salazar (Chair), *Contemporary studies of Philippine English.* Symposium convened at the 21st Conference of the International Association for World Englishes, Istanbul, Turkey.

Chan-Yap, Gloria. (1980). *Hokkien Chinese borrowings in Tagalog.* Canberra: Australian National University.

Garvida, Mignette Marcos. (2012). "Conyo Talk": The affirmation of hybrid identity and power in contemporary Philippine discourse. *Lingue e Linguaggi, 8*, 23–34.

Gonzales, Wilkinson Daniel Wong. (2016). Trilingual code-switching using quantitative lenses: An exploratory study on Hokaglish. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics, 47*, 109–131.

Gonzales, Wilkinson Daniel Wong. (2017a). Philippine Englishes. *Asian Englishes, 19*(1), 79–95.

Gonzales, Wilkinson Daniel Wong. (2017b). Language contact in the Philippines: The history and ecology from a Chinese Filipino perspective. *Language Ecology, 1*(2), 185–212.

Gonzales, Wilkinson Daniel Wong. (2021). Filipino, Chinese, neither, or both? The Lannang identity and its relationship with language. *Language & Communication, 77*, 5–16.

Gonzales, Wilkinson Daniel Wong & Mie Hiramoto. (2020). Two Englishes diverged in the Philippines? A substratist account of Manila Chinese English. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages, 35*(1), 125–159.

Grosjean, François. (2010). *Bilingual.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Imperial, Rowland Anthony. (2016). *Speech production and sociolinguistic perception in a 'non-native' second language context: A sociophonetic study of Korean learners of English in the Philippines* (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). National University of Singapore.

Kim, Dong-Yeon. (2015). Korea-Philippine relations: From blood-tied alliance to strategic partnership. In Lee Choong Lyol, Hong Seok-Joon, & Youn Dae-yeong (eds.), *ASEAN-Korean relations: Twenty-five years of partnership and friendship*, 674–723. Nulmin: Seoul.

Lesada, Joseph D. (2017). *Taglish in Metro Manila: An analysis of Tagalog-English code-switching* (Unpublished Honors Thesis). University of Michigan.

Lesho, Marivic. (2013). *The sociophonetics and phonology of the Cavite Chabacano vowel system* (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation). The Ohio State University.

Miralao, Virginia A. (ed.). (2007). Understanding the Korean diaspora in the Philippines. In Virginia A. Miralao and Lorna P. Makil (eds.), *Exploring transnational communities in the Philippines*, 24–39. Quezon City: Philippine Migration Research Network and Philippine Social Science Council.

Onysko, Alexander. (2016). Modeling world Englishes from the perspective of language contact. *World Englishes, 35*(2), 196–220.

Sanchez-Stockhammer, Christina. (2012). Hybridization in language. In Philipp Wolfgang Stockhammer (eds.), *Conceptualizing cultural hybridization: A transdisciplinary approach*, 133–157. Berlin: Springer.

Schachter, Paul & Fe T. Otanes. (1972). *Tagalog reference grammar.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schneider, Edgar. (2016). Hybrid Englishes: An exploratory survey. *World Englishes, 35*(3), 339–354.

Smith, Larry E. (1981). *English for cross-cultural communication.* London: Macmillan.

Sobolewski, Frank Andrew. (1980). *Some syntactic constraints in Tagalog-English language mixing* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). University of Hawaii.

Thomason, Sarah Grey. (2001). *Language contact: An introduction*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufman. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Villanueva, Rey John Castro. (2016). *The features of Philippine English across regions* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). De La Salle University, Manila, the Philippines.

Appendix. Glosses

1   First person
2   Second person
3   Third person

APPX   Approximator
CLF   Classifier
DEF   Definite
DEM   Demonstrative
LNK   Linker
LOC   Location marker/locative
NEG   Negation marker
NOM   Nominative marker
PLU   Plural marker/pluralizer
PFV   Perfective marker
PRT   Particle
SG   Singular