

BAUTISTA, MA. LOURDES S. 1979. Patterns of speaking in Pilipino radio dramas: a sociolinguistic analysis. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (Monograph Series No. 13).

Reviewed by Richard A. Benton, New Zealand Council for Educational Research

The Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa is to be congratulated for making available yet another monograph concerned with Philippine languages. Much valuable work in Philippine linguistics which has been completed over the last few decades still remains almost inaccessible in graduate theses and unpublished manuscripts, and it is encouraging to see the Institute helping to remedy this situation by making significant research reports like the one under review available to an international audience.

This is a compact, attractively presented volume. The work is divided into four chapters, followed by a bibliography and two appendices. Chapter 1 (pp. 1-13) includes a brief discussion of the Philippine language situation (pointing out that the National Language controversy has served as a stimulus to sociolinguistic research in the Philippines, particularly in the area of language planning), and presents the reasons for conducting the study and why radio dramas were used as basic data sources. A number of related studies are also briefly reviewed—some of them are referred to again at greater length in the theoretical discussions incorporated in subsequent chapters. Chapters 2 (pp. 14-74) and 3 (pp. 75-129) are the substantive ones, where the data are presented, discussed, and analyzed. Chapter 4 (pp. 130-145) ties together themes developed in the preceding chapters, and includes suggestions for research. The appendices provide summarized plots of the non-serialized dramas in the corpus, and the complete script of one such drama.

The author explains that the study has been conducted 'to lay the groundwork for an ethnography of speaking of the Pilipino speech community'—it is 'an attempt to describe the patterns of speaking prevalent in social interaction in [this] community' (p.5). The 'patterns of speaking' in which she is interested are grouped into six categories: address forms, and five specific speech acts—greetings, apologies, compliments, directives, and probes. One chapter (Ch. 2) is devoted entirely to the address forms, and another (Ch. 3) to the specific speech acts.

Radio dramas have been chosen as the raw materials for the study because they provide an easily available corpus of conversational data which, there is good reason to believe, are authentic. Audience surveys have shown that these dramas are very popular, particularly with the lowest socio-economic groups (who make up the bulk of the population). Certainly, the plots summarized in Appendix I are strikingly similar to ethnographic life histories in anthropological literature (see e.g. those in Decaesstecker 1978). This authentication of the dramas as representative of natural speech implies that Bautista equates Pilipino with Manila Tagalog, and thus the 'speech community' to which she refers is Tagalog-speaking Metro-Manila. The referent of the term 'Pilipino' is never identified explicitly in the study, however, which could be very confusing to foreign readers, especially as *Pilipino* (the 'Tagalog-based' official language) and *Filipino* (the yet-to-emerge new National Language, whose creation is enjoined by the 1973 Constitution) are equated with each other in the introductory chapter (pp. 3-4).

Similarly, a theoretical discussion of the classification of speech acts and their components is included in a section headed 'Some Observations' near the end of Chapter 3 (pp. 116-125), but it is not at all obvious how the classification of speech acts proposed by John R. Searle which is sympathetically outlined here relates to the classification used by the author in organizing her data earlier in the chapter. The reasons for selecting certain kinds of speech acts for discussion while perhaps ignoring others are likewise unexplained. Despite those oversights, Bautista's analysis of her data within the framework she has chosen is interesting and perceptive.

The variety of scripts used is sufficient to ensure that the study is not one of the style of one or two individuals (and thus literary criticism rather than sociolinguistic in nature). Furthermore, although discussion is centered on the material in the corpus, evidence has also been drawn from the author's or others' observations of real-life situations. The constraints on scriptwriters and the extent to which the dramas can be regarded as linguistically representative of natural speech are explored in some depth in the final chapter.

Not dealt with explicitly, although discussed in different parts of the study in relation to various specific categories of speech acts or forms of address, is the significance of English intrusions into basically Tagalog discourse. Terms of endearment used particularly by partners in illicit relationships, for example, are mostly English in origin (pp. 22-23). This may simply be a case of lexical borrowing, but in some contexts the use of English phrases or sentences seems to result from deliberate code-switching, to emphasize the status of one of the participants or the formality of a situation (e.g. the exchange in Love Story No. 14, p. 102, where the use of English seems clearly to be an indicator of social distance); likewise, a switch from English to Tagalog may transform a formal situation into one of intimacy (cf. p. 42). However English is obviously not always associated with formality and increasing social distance—the discussion of apologies (pp. 89-93) shows that the English word *sorry* is used in connection with minor offenses, but the Tagalog root *tawad*, or an equivalent Tagalog form, occurs almost invariably in apologies for serious misdemeanors.

There is an excellent discussion of the pronouns and particles of respect on pp. 30-58. One point of interest which is not discussed here or elsewhere, however (perhaps because none of the dramas contained relevant exchanges), is the problem which certain groups of non-Tagalogs, especially speakers of certain Visayan languages, have in handling these respect markers when they learn Tagalog. These problems are frequently observed in real life, but they may not yet have been used for dramatic purposes (e.g. to indicate that a character is not from Manila, is a recent arrival, etc.).

The author notes on p. 58 that one tendency which may have been realistic—to show more use of overt respect markers between adults and their parents than between (contemporary) children and the same adults—resulted in protests about the corrupting influence of certain programs. The Kapisanan ng mga Brodkaster ng Pilipinas – Broadcast Media Council—accordingly directed scriptwriters to reflect 'traditional Filipino values' in their work by portraying children as generally properly respectful to their elders. In this respect therefore the scripts may reflect social norms rather than actual practice.

There is a succinct discussion of the use of the word *kuwan* (a multipurpose substitute morpheme which has parallels in many Austronesian languages – e.g. *mea* in Maori) in evasive replies (pp. 114-115). It would be interesting to know if the particle *daw* ('so it is said') has similar functions in this regard. This particle has parallels in most

Philippine languages (*kano* in Ilocano, *kono* in Pangasinan and Tausog, etc.), and absolves the speaker from direct responsibility for the authenticity of the information conveyed. It is so common in Tagalog and Philippine English speech that it would be very odd indeed if it were absent from the scripts (such absence in itself would be worthy of remark), but its functions are not alluded to in this study.

After summarizing some of the major themes and discussing in some depth the constraints on script writers and the degree to which the dialogues can be regarded as natural speech, the author concludes her final chapter with suggestions for further research. Among the most important of these is that attention be given to content analysis of the dramas—are they, for example, conveying a ‘philosophy of poverty’ so that in their apparent realism they have truly become an opiate for the masses?

The format of the book is very helpful to the reader. Each chapter is preceded by a table of contents showing its major divisions. There are a number of charts and diagrams summarizing key points made in some of the more complex discussions, including an ingenious flow-chart on p. 65 summarizing the principles underlying selection of terms of address in the dramas (which can be contrasted with the much less complex American system illustrated in a similar style on p. 73). Typographical errors are few and mostly minor (e.g. ‘homw’ for ‘home’, line 10 p. 116). There is occasional confusion in references to other works. ‘Pascasio 1977’ is listed in the bibliography as a book edited by that author, for example, yet the reference ‘Pascasio 1977’ on page 3 appears to refer to a particular paper; whether this is by Pascasio or by a contributor to the volume is not clear. A reference to ‘Searle 1965’ on p. 127 has no counterpart in the bibliography, where the references to this author’s works are dated 1969 and 1976.

This monograph is an important contribution both to socio-linguistics and ethnography. It will be of interest to students of philosophy and literary criticism, as well as to anyone interested in the dynamics of contemporary Philippine society as these are reflected both in natural speech and in the dramas from which the speech has been drawn. The author has certainly more than fulfilled the expectations aroused by her modest aims, and it is to be hoped that this study will be the first of many such explorations in depth of the social dimensions of language use in Philippine settings.

REFERENCE

- DECAESSTECKER, DONALD DENISE. 1978. *Impoverished urban Filipino families*. Manila: University of Santo Tomas Press.