

APOLOGIES, COMPLIMENTS, DIRECTIVES, AND PROBES IN  
PILIPINO RADIO DRAMAS: AN EXPLORATORY ANALYSIS  
OF PILIPINO SPEECH ACTS<sup>1</sup>

Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista  
De La Salle University

1. INTRODUCTION

The work of linguistic philosophers like Austin and Searle and sociolinguists like Hymes and Ervin-Tripp has brought the 'speech act' into focus as the unit par excellence for linguistic analysis. No longer is it sufficient to consider the syntax and semantics of a sentence; it has become necessary to look at the speaker's intention in uttering the sentence. To cite common examples from the literature: 'Do you have a match?' uttered in the usual circumstances is not a yes/no question but a request. The declarative sentences

It's cold today.  
I'm cold.  
That looks like a warm coat you have.  
Brr-r-r.  
I wonder if I brought a coat.

can, depending on the circumstances, be used as alternative indirect ways of making the request 'Please lend me your coat'.

The crucial point is that every time a speaker utters a sentence, he is attempting to accomplish something with the words; specifically, he intends to have some effect on the listener and wants the listener to recognize this intention. This is what is meant by 'speech act' (Clark and Clark 1977:25).

It might appear, then, that there are an innumerable number of speech acts, since speakers can attempt to do an innumerable number of things with their utterances. Searle (1976) has masterfully shown that there are, in fact, only five classes of speech acts or — to use his term for them, without going into philosophical distinctions between the two terms — illocutionary acts.

Using mainly the criterion of point or purpose of the speech act, i.e. illocutionary point, Searle claims that the five are:

(1) Representatives — In uttering a representative, the speaker conveys his belief in the truth of the expressed proposition. Thus, assert, suggest, hypothesize, swear, hint are all representatives.

(2) Directives — In uttering a directive, the speaker attempts to get the hearer to do something. Thus, order, command, beg, plead, pray, invite, permit, advise are all directives. Also included in this class is *ask*, since it is an attempt by the speaker to get the hearer to answer.

(3) Commissives — In uttering a commissive, the speaker commits himself to some future course of action. Thus, promise, vow, pledge, guarantee are all commissives.

<sup>1</sup>This is a slightly revised and shorter version of Chapters 2 and 3 of my manuscript *Patterns of speaking in Pilipino radio dramas: A sociolinguistic analysis*, to be published by the Institute for the Study of the Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University for Foreign Studies. I would like to thank the De La Salle University Research Council and the Japan Foundation for the grants which made this study possible.

(4) Expressives – In uttering an expressive, the speaker expresses his psychological state about something, he expresses how good or bad he feels about some event. Thus, thank, congratulate, apologize, condole, deplore, welcome are all expressives.

(5) Declarations – In uttering a declaration, the speaker brings about a correspondence between the propositional content of his utterance and reality. Thus, if the speaker successfully performs the act of declaring a state of Martial Law, then there is Martial Law; if he successfully performs the act of firing a person, then the person is fired.

Searle therefore makes a clear distinction between illocutionary act, illocutionary verb, and illocutionary force. There are only the five above-mentioned classes of illocutionary acts but there are countless illocutionary verbs which have different illocutionary forces. To repeat his examples: 'I *insist* that we go to the movies' and 'I *suggest* that we go to the movies' are both directives but with different illocutionary forces. So also, 'I *solemnly swear* that Bill stole the money' and 'I *guess* Bill stole the money' have the same illocutionary point – both belong to the class of representatives – but the illocutionary force of the two is different.

Searle provides the best summary of his work:

There are not, as Wittgenstein (on one possible interpretation) and many others have claimed, an infinite or indefinite number of language games or uses of language. Rather, the illusion of limitless uses of language is engendered by an enormous unclarity about what constitute the criteria for delimiting one language game or use of language from another. If we adopt illocutionary point as the basic notion on which to classify uses of language, then there are a rather limited number of basic things we do with language: we tell people how things are, we try to get them to do things, we commit ourselves to doing things, we express our feelings and attitudes, and we bring about changes through our utterances. Often, we do more than one of these at once in the same utterance. (1976: 22-23)

Although Searle's work will not be alluded to in the subsequent discussion, except in passing, the point he has made about the importance of illocutionary point and the fact that an utterance can have more than one illocutionary point has constituted important background knowledge in doing the analysis.

## 2. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The study aims to present an analysis of four speech acts found in a corpus of Pilipino radio dramas – apologies and compliments (which fall under Searle's class of expressives) and directives and probes (both subsumed under Searle's class of directives). The choice of the speech acts for consideration has been largely arbitrary; I decided to study apologies and compliments because they are interesting speech acts in themselves and interesting in their variety, directives because there is ample literature to serve as a point of departure for the present analysis, and probes because the adjacency pair 'response – probe' was very striking to me during my preliminary investigation of the corpus.

The study is primarily descriptive and exploratory in intent, and does not aim at theorizing of any kind. Its aim is to help provide the groundwork for an ethnography of speaking of the Tagalog speech community.

## 3. PROCEDURE

The data have been derived from the scripts of seven top-ranking 30-minute radio drama programs in 1977-78: *Love Story* (henceforth *LS*), *In Unum Deum* 'In One God' (*UD*), *Hukumang Pantahanan* 'Courthouse for the Home' (*HP*), *Ito ang Katotohanan* 'This Is the Truth' (*IK*), *Pinagpala* 'Blessed' (*PP*), *Mga Mata ni Angelita* 'The Eyes of Angelita' (*MA*), and *Bukang Liwayway sa Takipsilim* 'Dawn at Dusk' (*BL*). As the titles

already indicate, these dramas run the gamut of plots – from romances to moral dramas to legal and medical stories to supernatural tales.

*LS*, *UD*, *HP*, and *IK* present a different story every day Monday through Saturday, *PP* (now off-the-air) featured a story complete in one week (Monday through Saturday), while *MA* and *BL* are long-running serials. Using systematic random sampling, 120 radio dramas were obtained to constitute the corpus: 24 scripts from *PP*, 20 each from *LS*, *UD*, and *MA*, and 12 each from *HP*, *IK*, and *BL*.

Instances of the different speech acts under consideration were taken down on note cards and the data on note cards sorted and analyzed for patterns. The description of the speech acts given below has been achieved utilizing a variety of methods – doing frequency counts (usually, settling for approximate rather than exact figures), searching for representative examples or for apt and telling examples (one example can be more illustrative than another, although this illustrative example may not be very representative of the examples in the data), and studying adjacency pairs (one turn of speaking from Speaker A eliciting a turn of speaking in response from Speaker B, e.g. compliment – acceptance/rejection).

#### 4. APOLOGIES

The scripts are replete with instances of apology, ‘an admission to another of a wrong or discourtesy done him accompanied by an expression of regret’ (Webster’s Third International Dictionary). The high frequency is to be expected for, after all, the corpus is made up preponderantly of heavy dramas – so wayward husbands and wives plus wayward parents and children are continually making apologies.

4.1. Analysis of the data indicates two major patterns in making an apology: One is to use the Pilipino expression *Patawarin mo ako* ‘Please forgive me’ or expressions using variants of the word *tawad* ‘forgive’ and the other is to use the English expression *I’m sorry* or just *Sorry*. Of the 55 instances of apology noted, 30 use *tawad* or its variants, 17 use *sorry*, and the remaining eight constitute a miscellaneous group.

Clearly there is a qualitative difference in the seriousness of the offense being apologized for by using *tawad* on the one hand or *sorry* on the other. *Patawarin mo ako* is used in the scripts for grievous offenses, e.g. for being an unfaithful spouse, for being a negligent parent, for having an abortion, for attempting suicide. *I’m sorry* appears in the scripts for relatively minor offenses, e.g. for coming to an appointment late, for being sarcastic or irritable, for bringing up an unpleasant topic, for denying a request.

Let me focus on the *tawad* group. There are three main variants in this group: (1) an imperative form *Patawarin mo ako* ‘Please forgive me’, which has by far the greatest number of occurrences, (2) an interrogative form *Mapapatawad mo ba ako?* ‘Can you forgive me?’, and (3) a declarative form *Naririto ako* (or some such expression) *para humingi ng tawad* ‘I’m here to ask for forgiveness’. In my opinion, if the three forms were to be ranked according to the psychological cost it would entail the speaker to utter them, *Patawarin mo ako* might be the most difficult to say. Here, the solicitation of forgiveness is direct and therefore the acknowledgment of wrongdoing is also correspondingly direct. It also has a tone of earnestness which does not seem to characterize *Mapapatawad mo ba ako?*. The declarative form appears to be the mildest perhaps because the phrase which incorporates the asking for forgiveness is simply part of a larger construction.

The group of apologies using *sorry* can be further subdivided into those using the complete statement *I’m sorry* and those using just the expression *Sorry*. *I’m sorry* sounds, to me, more regretful than just *Sorry*, maybe owing to the fact that *Sorry* has acquired an interjectional use, creating the effect of sounding casual, offhanded, and mechanical. The difference can be sensed in the following exchange between two illicit lovers (*PP* # 3):

- Melissa : Raul, ang akala ko'y hindi ka na darating. Kanina pa ako dito sa tabing-dagat. 'Raul, I was beginning to think you weren't coming anymore. I've been here by the seawall for quite a while'.
- Raul : (fading in) *Sorry*, natagalan ako. Matrapik kasi sa daan eh. 'Sorry, I took long. The traffic was heavy'.
- Melissa : (doubting) Matrapik . . . o si Evelyn ang dahilan? 'Was it the traffic or . . . Evelyn?'
- Raul : Huwag nating pag-usapan ang asawa ko. Wala siyang nalalaman sa ating dalawa. 'Let's not talk about my wife. She knows nothing about the two of us'.
- Melissa : (contrite) *I'm sorry*, Raul.
- Raul : It's all right. Tena. 'It's all right. Let's go'.

In the scripts, *I'm sorry* appears as the common way of turning down a request and, in this usage, is motivated by slightly different reasons than those for the regular apology. Apologies are usually proffered for wrongs that one has committed and the relationship between the wrong done and the apology given is fairly straightforward. In turning down a request, one says *I'm sorry* not because one believes one has done wrong (although the other person might think so) but because one is causing the other person embarrassment or hurt or discomfort. In this context – refusing a request – the Pilipino expression *dinaramdam ko* 'I'm sorry' also appears in the data.

The miscellaneous group consists of two forms of *paumanhin* 'please excuse', two occurrences of *pasensya ka na* 'please put up with . . .', two occurrences of *unawain mo sana* 'please understand', all of which explicitly ask something of the addressee, and two occurrences of *nahihiya ako sa iyo* 'I feel ashamed towards you', which is a more oblique way of making an apology. From my analysis, it appears that this miscellaneous group can be more closely aligned with *sorry* than with *tawad* in terms of seriousness of the offense. Furthermore, it seems to be the case that *I'm sorry* has the communicative effect of *ipagpaumanhin mo*, on the one hand, and *dinaramdam ko*, on the other. Frequently, *I'm sorry* is a translation equivalent of *ipagpaumanhin mo*, when the apology is given for an offense that has been committed and *dinaramdam ko* when the apology is given for denying a request. This is not a hard-and-fast rule, by any means, but it is what is suggested by the limited data available. The reason why *I'm sorry* is used more frequently than *ipagpaumanhin mo* or *dinaramdam ko* may be that the Pilipino expressions have the ring of being literary and stiff.

The gravity of the offense therefore is the primary determinant of what form is to be used, the closeness of the relationship of the interlocutors and their relative statuses vis-à-vis each other appearing to be of little importance. Perhaps the finding on the seriousness of the offense determining the form to be used can be stated in the following way: *Patawarin mo ako* captures the sense of being both apologetic and repentant while *I'm sorry* sounds only apologetic.

4.2. The composite structure of the apology reveals three other components in addition to the admission of the wrong expressed by *Patawarin mo ako/I'm sorry*, not all of which simultaneously appear in a particular instance of an apology: (1) an explicit acknowledgment of the need to apologize, (2) an explanation or justification for the failing, and (3) a promise it will not happen again. Consider the following examples:

In UD#12, Zeny has gone to the city and has had a baby in an unfortunate love affair. She goes home to her mother in the province and tells her:

Patawarin 'nyo ako, Inay. *Alam kong nagkasala ako sa inyo*, at naririto ako para humingi ng tawad. Patawarin 'nyo ako, Inay, patawad. 'Please forgive me, Mother. I know I have sinned against you and I am here to ask for forgiveness. Please forgive me, Mother, please forgive me'.

The above is an instance of the admission of the wrong together with the acknowledgment of the need to apologize.

In *HP#3*, while her husband Joseph was away in Guam, Anabelle found companionship in Philip, a former suitor. Joseph subsequently finds out about her unfaithfulness and Anabelle tries to explain why:

Patawarin mo ako, Joseph. *Nalungkot ako ilang buwang makaalis ka para sa 'yong kontrata. Kaya . . .* 'Please forgive me, Joseph. I became lonely a few months after you left to fulfill your contract. And that is why . . .'

In *LS#12*, Ramon goes back to his wife Loreta after several infidelities and asks to be taken back on the basis of a promise; he also hints at an explanation for his behavior:

Wala na akong kaugnayan kay Donna o kahit na sino pa man, Loreta. Patawarin mo lamang ako *nakahanda na akong magbago*. Napakabaliw ko nga, kung sinu-sinong babae ang pinatulan ko samantalang mas nakahihigit ka sa kanila. 'I have nothing to do with Donna or any other woman now, Loreta. If you forgive me I am going to change. I must have been crazy going after those women when you are so far better than they are'.

In general, only half of the apologies consist of more than just the statement asking for forgiveness. In the *tawad* group, out of the 30 occurrences, six include an explicit acknowledgment of the need to apologize, six provide a justification for the wrong committed, and three include a promise that it will not happen again. In the *sorry* group, out of the 17 occurrences, one includes an explicit acknowledgment and 10 provide a justification – the high number of justifications here is due to the fact that when one is sorry for not being able to grant a request, one typically gives the reason for the refusal. In the miscellaneous group, out of eight occurrences, three provide an acknowledgment and two provide a justification.

4.3. In the data, the responses to the apologies are so varied in form and content that it is difficult to attempt to categorize them. My sense is that in a few cases, the reaction is something like 'there is no need to apologize'; in others, it is something like 'I don't accept your explanation'; in a few others, it is something like 'should I believe your promise this time?'. In these instances, the response attaches to one of the components of an apology. In the majority of cases, however, the response implies reaction to the entire macro-apology: a sob, an embrace, a statement to the effect that 'it's all right' or 'let's forget it' or 'it's too late for apologies'. But it is clear that an outright statement of *pinapatawad kita* 'I forgive you' or *hindi kita mapapatawad* 'I cannot forgive you' is a very rare occurrence; acceptance or rejection of an apology is usually not as explicit as that.

## 5. COMPLIMENTS

Whereas the gravity of the offense can lead to a categorization of apologies into the *tawad* and *sorry* groups, as shown in the previous section, in the case of compliments it is not possible to sort them out into 'high' compliments and 'not-so-high' compliments or some such continuum. A woman may be complimented on her good looks, her kindness, her cooking, her handling of a situation – and who is to say that one compliment is more highly valued than another? In going over the compliments in my data, I became interested less in the compliment itself than in the reaction to the compliment. Stated another way, in the adjacency pair 'compliment – response', it is response that is more susceptible to analysis.

Setting aside those instances where the compliment was not responded to because an intervening speech act took place, 35 compliments and their responses were noted in the scripts.

5.1. There are many ways to react to a compliment, but the responses in the data seem to fall into two general groups, each group subdivided more finely:

(1) The addressee downplays the compliment. As I see it, this can be done in the following ways:

One way is for the addressee to call the compliment *bola* 'flattery, some sense of the idiom "you're pulling my leg"' or *biro* 'joke', as in the examples given below. (Note that in all the examples below, the compliment and the response to the compliment being focused on are underscored.)

*HP#9* Lorna has asked her elder sister Celina permission to live with her for a while. Celina gives in.

Lorna : *Hayan, pumayag na ang ate ko. Talagang ang bait-bait mo.* 'There, my sister has agreed. You're really very very kind'.

Celina : *Tama na ang bolahan.* Pero kapag nanganak na ako at kaya ko na ang trabaho dito, puede ka nang magbalik kina Inay. 'Enough of the flattery. But once I've given birth and I can already do the work here, then you should go back to our parents'.

*LS#16* Rex is visiting Lorena at her home.

Rex : *Kahapon ay naka-uniporme ka bilang flight stewardess at naakit na ako.* 'Yesterday you were in your uniform as a flight stewardess and I was already attracted'.

Lorena : (smiles) Eh ngayon? 'And now?'

Rex : *Ngayong iba ang ayos mo, nakalugay ang buhok, nakabestidong bulaklakin, lalo ka palang kaibig-ibig.* 'Now that you're fixed differently, with your hair down, in a printed dress, you're even more alluring'.

Lorena : *Teka nga, ikaw ba'y nagbibiro o nagtatapat ng pag-ibig?* 'Hold it a minute, are you teasing me or proposing to me?'

Calling the compliment *bola* or *biro* is the most frequent reaction, occurring 10 times out of the 35 instances of compliment.

A second way of downplaying the compliment is to imply that the complimenter is too easily moved, too sentimental, too soft:

*UD#4* Luisa, a stranger to the city, meets Louela at the train station. Louela takes her in for the night and then tells her that they will look for an apartment for both of them and then look for a job for Luisa.

Luisa : (bursts into tears)

Louela : O, bakit ka napaiyak? 'Why have you started to cry?'

Luisa : *Hindi ko kasi akalaing makakakita ako ng kasingbait mo dito sa lungsod.* 'Because I never thought I'd find someone as kind as you in the city'.

Louela : *Naku . . . huwag ka nang magdrama diyan.* Ituring mo akong kapatid mula ngayon. 'Oh . . . don't be so melodramatic about it. Just consider me your sister from now on'.

There are three such instances in the data, all occurring between young women who are friends.

As a variant of this second way, the addressee downplays the compliment by implying that the complimenter is too easily pleased; here there is a measure of disdain for the complimenter. There are two instances of this in the data, for example:

*UD#15* between a married woman and her admirer

## APOLOGIES, COMPLIMENTS, PROBES IN FILIPINO RADIO DRAMA

Andro : Hindi alam ni Tony ang tungkol dito, ang pagsunod-sunod ko sa mga kasayahang dinadaluhan mo. (pause) *Ang nalalaman ko, parang mamamatay ako kapag hindi kita nakita, kapag hindi ko narinig ang iyong tinig.* 'Tony does not know about this, my following you around to these different parties. (pause) What I know is, it seems as if I'd die if I didn't see you, didn't hear your voice'.

Lerma : (chuckles) *Isa ka sa baliw, Andro.* Baliw, tulad ng asawa kong si Tony. 'You're a fool, Andro. A fool like my husband Tony'.

A third way of downplaying the compliment is to deny the substance of the compliment; there are three occurrences of this sort in the data and here is one of them:

LS#5 between the mistress of the house and the adopted member of the family

Rosanna : *Alam mo, simula nang ikaw ang siyang nagluluto, naging magana ang pagkain ko. Mahusay kang magluto, hija.* 'You know, ever since you took over the cooking, I have developed an appetite. You're a good cook, child'.

Carmen : (smiles) *Hindi naman ho, misis.* Si doctor ho? 'Not really, ma'am. Where is the doctor [i.e. Rosanna's son]?'

Totaled together, downplaying the compliment accounts for roughly half of the data on responses to compliments.

(2) The addressee accepts the compliment, either directly or indirectly, in the following ways:

Acceptance of the compliment can be straightforward with a *salamat* 'thank you' or *thank you*. There are only two cases in the data:

IK#10 between a police rookie and a sergeant

Rookie : *Ako nama'y kahit na bago pa lamang sa serbisyo, Sarge, eh maaasahan mo naman na nasa panig ninyo ako.* 'Even if I'm new in the service, Sarge, you can count on my being on your side'.

Sergeant: *Kaya nga pinili kita na siyang makakasama ko sa patrol car na ito . . . maaasahan kita.* 'That's why I chose you to be in this patrol car with me . . . I can count on you'.

Rookie : *Salamat, Sarge.* 'Thanks, Sarge'.

But whether the rookie is thanking the sergeant for choosing him to accompany the sergeant in the patrol car or for the trust the latter has in him or for the sergeant's compliment that he is trustworthy is not clear.

A clearer *thank you* appears in the following:

UD#2 between a director and a movie star

Vanessa : (sighs to fade in) *Nahirapan ako sa eksenang iyon ah.* 'I really had difficulty with that scene'.

Director : *Nahirapan? Talagang you're still humble in spite of the fact na —.* 'You had difficulty? You're really still humble in spite of the fact that —'.

Vanessa : (cuts in, smiling) *Direk, bobolahin mo na naman ako.* 'Direk, you'll flatter me again'.

Director : (cuts in) *Ano bang bola ang sinasabi mo? Vanessa, isa ka nang star pero hanggang ngayon napakaganda pa rin ng image mo. You're really great and fantastic.* 'What flattery are you talking about? Vanessa, you are now a star and yet your image is still very good. You're really great and fantastic'.

Vanessa : (smiles) *Thanks for the compliment.*

Notice that when Vanessa does thank the director for the compliment, it is after she had dismissed his first compliment as flattery and he had remonstrated with her over it.

Acceptance of the compliment can be in the form of some boasting, typically good-natured. There is good-natured boasting in the following two cases:

UD#16 After Redentor has introduced his wife to Paulo, there is an awkward silence and Redentor asks if the two had met before.

Paulo : (startled) Ha? Hindi, Redentor. Nagulat lang ako sa misis mo. *Ubod pala ng ganda.* 'What? No, Redentor. I was just surprised at your wife. She's extremely pretty'.

Redentor: (proudly) *Siempre. Pipili ba naman ako ng hindi maganda? Este, Margie, siya si Paulo, ang best friend kong playboy.* 'Of course. Would I choose someone who's not pretty? By the way, Margie, this is Paulo, my best friend who's a playboy'.

UD#3 between illicit lovers

Augusto : (fades in) Hello, Cel. *Lalo ka yatang gumaganda ngayon.* 'Hello, Cel. It seems you're getting prettier'.

Celia : (smiles) *Of course. May nagpapaganda yata.* 'Of course. There's someone who's making me become prettier'.

Augusto : (quickly) Hep, hep, hold that. (softly) I'm sure ako 'yon. 'Hep, hep, hold that. I'm sure I'm the one'.

In these two instances, the addressee can answer *siempre* or *of course* without appearing what Tagalogs call *mayabang* 'boastful' because the compliment is really meant for somebody else or is passed on to somebody else.

In the third case (given below), however, the boasting seems to be done in earnest — and this seems to be the scriptwriter's way of delineating the character of Hilario, a despicable character in one of the dramas.

HP#11 Between friends who are at the same time officemates

Fidel : *Pambihira ka pa rin sa lahat ng naging kaibigan ko, Hilario. Talagang pinabilib mo ako ng husto.* Biruin mo, makuha mo ang Doris na iyon. Aba'y matagal na rin akong pabalik-balik sa club na iyon, pero nahirapan ako ng hustong mapasagot siya. 'You're really special among my friends, Hilario. You really impressed me. Imagine, you succeeded with Doris. Why, I've been going to that night-club for a long time but I've had a hard time making her say yes'.

Hilario : *Ibahin mo ako, Fidel, Basta sa chicks, iba ang kalibre nitong kaibigan mo.* 'Consider me different from the others, Fidel. When it comes to women, the caliber of your friend is different from that of the rest'.

Another way of accepting a compliment is to accept it as a matter of course, without taking credit for the substance of the compliment. If the addressee has the quality she is being complimented for, it is because that is the way things are, not because of any special merit of her own. Consider the following

PP#4 Belen has waited up for Carissa and when she arrives Belen ministers to her.

Carissa : (sniffing) Oh, Ate, *hindi ako nababagay sa iyong kabaitan sa akin.* 'Oh, Ate, I am unworthy of your kindness to me'.

Belen : (gently) Ano bang pinagsasabi mo? *Sino pa bang taong babaitan ko kungdi ikaw? Dadalawa na lamang tayong magkapatid.* 'What are you saying? Who else should I be kind to if not you? There are only the two of us left'.

## APOLOGIES, COMPLIMENTS, PROBES IN PILIPINO RADIO DRAMA

LS#15 between kidnapper and kidnap victim

- Rino : *Huh, kanina mo pa ako pinahahanga, babae. Matapang ka. Hindi ka marunong masindak.* 'Huh, you're making me respect you, woman. You're brave. You don't scare easy'.
- Angela : *Hindi ako maaaring matakot dahil wala akong pagkakasala at hindi ako maaaring mapoot sa iyo dahil hindi kita kaaway.* 'There is no reason for me to be afraid because I'm not guilty of any wrongdoing and there is no reason for me to be angry with you because you're not my enemy'.

There are seven such matter-of-fact reactions to compliments in the data.

One more way of accepting a compliment consists in promising to live up to the substance of the compliment. There are three cases in the data, and the following is best for purposes of exemplification:

UD# 3 between illicit lovers

- Augusto : *Alam ko, malaking pagkakasala ang nagagawa ko kay Adora. Pero kasalanan ba kung mawala ang pagmamahal ko sa kanya? Iba ka sa kanya. Marunong ka. We can discuss things.* Samantalang siya, lagi na lang "hindi ko alam", "wala akong . . .". (sighs) *Nabo-bore ako kapag si Adora ang kasama ko. 'I know, I'm doing Adora a great injustice. But is it a sin for me to have lost my love for her? You are different. You're intelligent. We can discuss things. While with her, it is always "I don't know", "there's nothing I . . .". (sighs) I get bored when it's Adora who's with me'.*
- Celia : *Gagawin kong maligaya ang mga sandali mo sa piling ko, Augusto. Sabihin na nilang makasalanan ako. I don't care. Basta ang nalalaman ko'y mahal kita. 'I will make your moments with me happy, Augusto. Let them say I'm wicked. I don't care. All I know is that I love you'.*

Still another way of accepting a compliment is to return the compliment, as in this one instance:

UD#17 Bernard and Anabelle talk about their friend Cheryl's aversion to getting married.

- Bernard : *Kawawang Joseph. Walang suerte sa kanyang nobya. Mabuti na lang, hindi ako natulad sa kanya. Masuerte ako dahil mabait at ideal wife ang misis ko. At hindi natatakot na magmukhang kung ano sa pag-aasikaso sa akin at sa bahay.* 'Poor Joseph. Unlucky in his girl friend. Fortunately for me, I am not like him. I'm lucky because my wife is kind and is an ideal wife. And she's not afraid of what she will look like from taking care of me and of our house'.
- Anabelle : (smiles) *Mas masuerte ako, dahil mabait, mapagmahal, at maalalahanin ang mister ko. At pogi pa ha?* 'I'm even luckier, because my husband is kind, loving, and thoughtful. And he's also handsome, right?'

5.2. It may be that the two categories of downplaying the compliment and accepting the compliment are too gross, while the subdivisions given under either category are too fine. Further refinements of the typology will need to be made. But what appears from this superficial analysis is that expected behavior for the recipient of a compliment is not to believe the compliment too quickly (or where are his defenses?) and most particularly, not to agree to the substance of the compliment too readily (or where is his

humility? ). In support of this observation, note that in the data, there are only two instances of 'thank you' in response to a compliment; in one it is not clear if the 'thank you' is for the confidence shown by the speaker in the addressee or for the compliment on the addressee's trustworthiness; in the other, the 'thank you' comes after the recipient has called the first compliment 'flattery' and the giver has objected to its being considered such.

Ranged against this paucity of straightforward acceptance is the high frequency of dismissing the compliment as *bola* or *biro*, that is, as a form of flattery or teasing; the most common reaction to a compliment seems to be along the line of 'you're pulling my leg, you're teasing me'. The second most commonly occurring reaction is to take the substance of the compliment as a matter of fact; although the compliment is in a way accepted, the acceptance is indirect: The compliment is almost bypassed as the recipient goes on to say it is his duty or it is what circumstances dictate.

## 6. DIRECTIVES

In her comprehensive study of the structure of American English directives, Ervin-Tripp (1976) has found co-variation between the linguistic forms of directives and such social factors as 'familiarity, rank, territorial location, difficulty of task, whether or not a duty is normally expected, whether or not non-compliance is likely' (25). Her corpus, made up of directives some of which had been elicited, some tape-recorded, and some noted down after they had been observed to occur, yielded the following types of directives 'ordered approximately according to the relative power of speaker and addressee in conventional usage and the obviousness of the directive' (29):

Need statements: 'I need a match'.

Imperatives: 'Gimme a match' or the elliptical 'a match'.

Imbedded imperatives: 'Could you gimme a match?', where the agent, action, object, and often beneficiary are as explicit as in direct imperatives, though they are embedded in a frame with other syntactic and semantic properties.

Permission directives: 'May I have a match?', where bringing about the condition stated requires an action by the hearer other than merely granting permission.

Question directives: 'Gotta match?', where the desired act is not specified.

Hints: 'The matches are all gone'.

Ervin-Tripp's study has inspired the informal analysis of directives presented here. Although it has not been possible to do a detailed study in the sense of specifically looking at the way different variables shape the linguistic form of the directive employed, the following observations can be made:

6.1. The six types of directives that Ervin-Tripp obtained from her American English data seem to be general in scope, and it is not surprising that they have correspondences in the Pilipino data. Here are the best examples that can be picked out from the corpus; the utterance exemplifying the directive in focus is underscored:

(1) Need statements. There are very few occurrences of need statements in the data. The best example occurs in a transactional setting between an account executive and a fashion designer.

LS#14 Rafael: *Gusto kong makilala ang mga modelo mo tomorrow morning, okay?* 'I'd like to meet your models tomorrow morning, okay?'

Gerry: Sure, sure, Rafael.

Here, Rafael is the superior by virtue of his having power to make the arrangements for the fashion show and so his statement of need becomes an obligation on the part of the

## APOLOGIES, COMPLIMENTS, PROBES IN PILIPINO RADIO DRAMA

subordinate, Gerry, to bring the models for his inspection. (Note how *okay* and the rising intonation temper Rafael's need statement.)

(2) Imperatives. By far the greatest number of directives are of the imperative type. The imperative may be in the full form, in the elliptical form, or may appear with some variants.

Full form:

LS#13 common-law husband and wife

Gardo : *Bumili ka nga ng maiinum namin sa tindahan, Antonia.* O hetong pera. 'Buy us something to drink at the store, Antonia. Here's the money'.

(Note that the enclitic *nga* somehow modifies the imperative so that it does not sound too much like a command.)

And a turn of speaking later:

Gardo : *Sige, lakad na doon at bumili ka tuloy ng mapupulutan.* 'Go ahead, go there and buy us also something to munch'.

Elliptical form (where the verb has been dropped):

LS#2 father to son

Mang Pablo: *Uy, oo nga pala, Bebot, soft drink. Yung malamig na malamig ha.* 'Oh, by the way, Bebot, a soft drink. A very cold one'.

In addition to names and preposed attention-getters like *Uy, oo nga pala* and *sige*, the word *please* appears often in imperatives:

*Please* + imperative:

LS#15 When Yoly answers the doorbell, she is confronted by a man with a gun. Then the doorbell rings again. This time it is her pediatrician. Wanting to follow the orders of the criminal and also to protect the doctor, she asks the doctor to leave.

Yoly : (uneasy) *Sige na, Doctora. Puede ka nang umalis.* 'Go ahead, Doctora. You may leave now'.

Doctora : *Aba, naninibago ako sa iyo.* 'Why, I'm not used to you being like this'.

Yoly : *Please, umalis ka na.* 'Please, go now.'

Going by impressions alone, the *please* appearing in the data seems to give directives more urgency, and this is very clear in HP#7, where Joan begs her father to deny the accusation that he is a homosexual:

Joan : (begs, sobs) *Please, Pa, sabihin mo hindi totoo. Sabihin mo, Pa.* 'Please, Pa, say it's not true. Say it, Pa'.

Carlo : (breathes hard) *Joan . . .*

Joan : (ardently/sobs) *Please, Pa, please.* Sabihin mong hindi totoo. Huwag kang Joan nang Joan. Sabihin mo hindi totoo. Sabihin mo. 'Please, Pa, please. Say it's not true. Don't just keep saying Joan. Say it's not true. Say it'.

Pilipino has the request affix *paki-*, which converts what are conventionally called commands into what are conventionally called requests:

*Paki-* + imperative:

LS#1 customer to manicurist

Pete : *Pakilagyan mo na lang pagkatapos ng colorless nail polish ha?* 'Please add colorless nail polish afterwards'.

The *ha* with its rising intonation appears often in the data for directives and it seems to soften the command-quality of a directive.

Filipino has the word *pakiusap*, which means 'request', and in the data, imperatives are sometimes prefaced by an introductory phrase containing the word *pakiusap*:

*Pakiusap* + imperative:

IK #11 Aling Osang has heard that her son Eddie's best friend, Bart, is angry with him. She turns to Eddie's good friends, the couple Noli and Deling, for help.

Osang : *Pakiusap ko na rin sa inyo ni Noli, payuhan naman sana ninyong mag-asawa si Eddie. Sabihin ninyo na umiwas na lang muna habang nasa kainitan pa si Bart. 'My request to you and Noli, please give Eddie some advice. Tell him to avoid Bart while Bart is still very angry with him'.*

The impression I get from the *pakiusap* in the data is that it is more forceful than other directives and makes the request seem more important.

As stated earlier, the imperative is the directive type that appears most frequently in the data – its tokens number more than the tokens of all the other directive types put together. Among the imperatives, the most common is the full form.

(3) Embedded imperatives. I have adopted Ervin-Tripp's definition of embedded imperative to refer to instances in which the agent, action, and object are explicit, so that the forms preceding them are a kind of formal addition, for example: *Why don't you open the window?*, *Can you open the window?*, *Would you care to open the window?* (33). Thus, in Filipino, the typical imperative would be, e.g. *Umalis ka na* 'Go away now', but an imbedded imperative would have some other forms before *Umalis ka na*, resulting in *Puede ba umalis ka na?* 'Could you please go now?' or, after some rules of flip-flopping the pronoun and the verb, *Maaari ka nang umalis* 'You may go now'.

In the data, the most common 'modal' that goes with the imperative is *puede*, as in the following:

LS#12 Ramon has just asked his wife Loreta to forgive him for his failings as a husband. Her answer:

Loreta : *Puede bang iwan mo muna ako rito sandali? Susunod na lamang ako sa iyo sa kuwarta natin. Sandali lang. Gusto ko lang makapag-isip. 'Could you leave me alone for a while? I'll just follow you to the room. Just a while. I just would like to think'.*

Appearing less often is *maaari*:

PP#4 Belen has learned from her fiance, Cesar, that he is being forced to marry another woman because of an indiscretion.

Belen : Please, narinig mo ang sinabi ko? (short pause as Cesar hesitates) *Maaari ka nang umalis.* (low but hard) Please, leave me alone. *Umalis ka naaa!* 'Please, did you hear what I said? (short pause as Cesar hesitates) You may go now. (Low but hard) Please, leave me alone. Go away now!'

The over-all effect of embedding the imperative, it seems, is to modify the directive by removing the bluntness of a command to give it the ring of a request or a hint.

(4) Permission directives. *Puede* can also be used in what Ervin-Tripp calls permission directives. The difference between an embedded imperative and a permission directive is that in the permission directive, there is a

shift of focus to the beneficiary or recipient's activity, rather than the donor-addressee's. The overt form, therefore, looks like a permission request, but the two can be discriminated in that the activity required includes activity

of the addressee, e.g. :brother to sister: 'Can I have my records back?' [where the sister will have to get the records] and salesman to clerk: 'May I have change for a dollar?' [where the clerk will have to count change for a dollar]. (37)

The best example from the data is the following:

LS#16 airline passenger to stewardess

Rex : *Teka, puede ko bang malaman ang pangalan mo?*  
'Just a minute, may I know your name?'

Lorena : *Ako si Lorena, Lorena Gomez.* 'I am Lorena, Lorena Gomez.'

Notice that here it seems the speaker is asking permission to do something, but actually it is the addressee who will have to do it, in this case, give her name.

(5) Question directives. The obviousness of the directive decreases greatly in the case of question directives. As Ervin-Tripp points out, 'they give the listener who does not want to comply an escape route, in treating the question directive as if it were an information question' (38). Consider the following examples:

MA#3 Mang Teryo has asked his daughter Lita to keep the child Angelita company in the big house. After a while:

Lita : (humming a song)

Teryo : *Oy, Lita. Hindi ka pa ba tapos sa kakaarte mo diyay?* 'Hey, Lita. Haven't you finished prettying yourself up yet?'

Lita : *Ang itay naman. Nariyan na ho. Lalabas na ako.* 'This father of mine. I'm coming. I'm leaving now'.

Here, Lita correctly interprets her father's question not as an information question but as a directive to get going.

LS#14 Gonzalo has just given Dyhann a car as a gift

Dyhann : Thank you very much, Gonzalo.

Gonzalo : *Wala bang kiss?* 'Is there no kiss?'

Dyhann : (busses him) Ummmm.

Like Lita, Dyhann knows how to interpret the question.

LS#14 after Rafael has offered to give Dyhann a lift home

Dyhann : *Maaga pa naman, di ba?* 'It's still early, isn't it?'

Rafael : It's six-thirty.

Dyhann : *Baka gusto mong mamasyal muna tayo.* 'You might want us to go out for a drive first'.

Rafael : *Ihahatid na kita sa inyo, Dyhann.* 'I'm taking you home, Dyhann'.

Dyhann's first utterance is probably meant to be a directive, i.e. 'don't take me home yet, it's still early', but Rafael chooses to interpret it as an information question. So Dyhann tries an invitation-suggestion.

(6) Hints. There are several comments made in the scripts which appear to me to be hints, that is, general statements which can be interpreted as comments although they have been intended as directives. Consider the following:

LS#15 between kidnapper and kidnap victim, after the victim has started inquiring into the kidnapper's past life

Rino : *Babae, masyado kang masatsat.* 'Woman, you talk too much'.

Doctora : *Ako si Doctora Mendez, Angela Mendez.* 'I am Doctor Mendez, Angela Mendez'.

Rino : Huwag ka nang maraming salita. Yang pagmamaneho ang asikasuhin mo. 'Don't talk anymore. Concentrate on your driving'.

Rino's first statement above looks like a hint to the doctor to stop talking. But she attends to his address term for her, *babae*, and reacts to that, or perhaps she has perceived the hint but has decided to ignore it. In Rino's second remark, he uses an imperative.

HP#4 Manolo starts calling up Teresa, wanting to see her, although she is now married and has children.

Manolo : (filtered) *Teresa, hiwalay na kaming dalawa ni Elsa.* Matagal na. 'Teresa, Elsa and I have separated. For sometime now'.

Teresa : Dinaramdam ko, Manolo. Iwasan mo ako. Bye. 'I'm sorry, Manolo. Don't try to see me. Bye'.

Manolo's statement is not only a statement of fact but also a hint that Teresa can start seeing him again since he is now free to see her, and in fact Teresa interprets it in that way.

6.2. In addition to these six types of directives, there appears one other type quite common in the Pilipino radio drama data, which can be called suggestion directives. To me these lie intermediate between embedded imperatives and question directives — although less explicit than imperatives, they are not as ambiguous as question directives, since they in fact mention what action the speaker desires the addressee to do at the same time giving the addressee a graceful way out. This is done by using *baka* 'perhaps', as in the following:

IK #7 Aling Lucia is presenting her husband's case to the judge.

Lucia : Judge, mahirap po lamang kami. *Baka naman po may magagawa kayo para huwag nang makulong ang asawa ko.* 'Judge, we're only poor people. Perhaps you can do something so that my husband won't have to go to jail'.

Another example is:

HP#11 Hilario has embezzled a huge amount of money and now needs help to cover the deficit. He approaches a friend.

Hilario : Litong-lito ako ngayon, Fidel. Lumapit na ako sa iba kong mga kakilala, pero hindi ako pinautang. *Ikaw, baka naman matulungan mo ako.* 'I'm terribly lost now, Fidel. I've approached several friends, but they have not lent me money. Perhaps you might be able to help me'.

Another way to make the suggestion is to use *kung maaari* 'if possible', as in:

HP#11 a wife approaching her husband's best friend for help

Marlene : *Kung maaari'y tulungan mo sana kaming patigilin na si Hilario sa kanyang madalas na pagnanightclub at pagkahumaling sa hostess.* 'If possible help us get Hilario to stop frequenting nightclubs and falling for hostesses'.

In these three cases, help is being sought, but it is not just a matter of saying *Tulungan mo ako* 'Help me', a plain imperative. Perhaps because in instances like these, the nature of the requests causes the speaker some embarrassment to make them in addition to the fact that there may be some social distance in the relationship, then they have to be phrased very carefully and obliquely.

Another instance of suggestion is the following, using *mabuti* 'it will be good':

LS#2 wife to husband after their young son has shown signs of being terrified of his father

Anita : *Mabuting kausapin mo uli ang bata.* 'It will be good if you talk to the boy again'.

Perhaps Anita uses a suggestion directive rather than a direct imperative to keep from sounding like a domineering wife.

6.3. What appears from the superficial analysis that has been done is that 'difficulty of task' and 'whether or not non-compliance is likely' are primary considerations in the phrasing of directives, over and above the expected influence of the power and solidarity dimensions. It is also clear that rising intonation, words like *okay, sig, ha, nga, baka*, and address terms work to blunt or in some way modify the impact of the directive.

## 7. PROBES

A phrase that struck me because it kept recurring throughout the scripts was the phrase *Walang anumang ito* 'This is nothing' or just the word *Wala* 'Nothing'. It soon was obvious that, in radio dramas, this was the usual response to inquiries as to whether something was bothering the addressee. Further analysis of the structure of this adjacency pair showed the probe to be as interesting as the response to it.

I have noted the occurrence of some 30 probing exchanges. The structure of the exchange appears to be the following: It usually begins with an initial probing question, stated in very general terms — *Bakit ba?* 'What is it?' or *Ano bang nangyayari sa iyo?* 'What's happening to you?' = 'What's the matter?' or words to that effect. To this, there is a high probability that the addressee will answer *Wala* 'Nothing'. Out of the 30 occurrences of probe, in only five was there a rather immediate revelation of the problem, meaning there was no denial of some kind, although — among these five — the revelation may be preceded by some expression of reluctance or of need for moral support, e.g. silence or a vocative like *Inay* 'Mother'.

The first speaker therefore probes some more. In this second probe, the speaker usually makes specific mention of what occasioned his probing in the first place, e.g. *Iiyak ka ba ng walang dahilan?* 'Will you be crying for no reason at all?'. The addressee may respond with another denial *Walang anumang ito* 'This is nothing' or with a refusal to discuss the matter *Ikinalulungkot ko hindi ko masasabi* 'I'm sorry I cannot tell you' or with an evasion-fabrication *Inisip ko lang na . . .* 'I was just thinking that . . .' giving some other (false) reason for his/her distress. In some rare instances, the addressee may reveal the actual problem at this time. What is noticeable is that the most common response to the second probe is a denial 'This is nothing' instead of a refusal 'I cannot tell you' or an unburdening of the problem.

When no revelation is forthcoming, the probing persists, and this later probe includes some probable reason, e.g. *Alam kong umiiyak ka dahil sa kuya* 'I know you're crying because of my older brother'. The persistence with which the probing has been conducted, plus mention of a probable reason acting as a triggering device, usually brings about a revelation at this point.

The following excerpt from LS#3 presents the different stages in a probing exchange through annotations on the margin. In this story, Ellen has come to Manila from Bacolod City and has asked her friend Grace to help her look for a job. Grace knows there must have been a reason for Ellen's sudden decision to leave Bacolod, but Ellen has been very secretive.

Sound : Opening of door

Ellen : (sadly) Grace? Gising ka pa?  
'Grace? You're still awake?'

	Grace	: (fading in) Ikaw din, hindi ba? 'You too, no?'
	Ellen	: (sighs) Hindi ako makatulog kaya andito ako sa may labas. 'I can't get to sleep, that's why I'm here outside'.
Probe 1	Grace	: Mula nang dumating ka dito sa ciudad, yan ang napapansin ko sa iyo. Malungkutin ka at laging nag-iisip. 'Ever since you came to the city, that's what I've noticed about you. You're always sad and pensive'.
Denial	Ellen	: Walang anuman ito. 'This is nothing'.
Probe 2	Grace	: Lumuwas ka ba ng Maynila para makaiwas? 'Did you come to Manila to get away?'
Evasion-Fabrication	Ellen	: Ha? Ahm, makikipagsapalaran ako dito sa Maynila. 'What? Ahm, I just want to try my fortune here in Manila'.
Probe 3	Grace	: Huwag ka nang magkaila. Nararamdaman kong may problema ka. 'Don't deny it anymore. I can sense you have a problem'.
Denial	Ellen	: P-Problema? W-Wala. 'A problem? No'.
Probe 4	Grace	: Meron, Ellen. 'You have a problem, Ellen'.
Vocative	Ellen	: Grace . . .
Probe 5	Grace	: May kinalaman kaya sa pinagpunit-punit na tseke? 'Does it have something to do with a check torn- into pieces?'
	Music	: Bridge
	Biz	: Crickets at background
Revelation	Ellen	: (in tears) Yan ang nangyari. Kontra ang kanyang Mama sa akin dahil sa agwat sa aming kabuhayan. 'That's what happened. His mother was against me because of the gap in our backgrounds'.

In this exchange, none of the probing questions is responded to with a refusal like *Wala kang pakialam* 'It's none of your business' or *Huwag mo na lang alamin* 'Don't try to find out'. In fact the refusal as a response to a probing question occurs very rarely in the data. It is denial that definitely predominates. But whether the response is denial, refusal, or evasion, it is clear that initial probes are followed by more probing.

A rough estimate of the number of probing questions asked and the responses to these questions is as follows:

Number of probing questions (including general questions, questions alluding to addressee's demeanor, questions giving possible reasons for addressee's agitated appearance)	73
Denial, e.g. <i>Wala</i> 'Nothing'	30
Refusal, e.g. <i>Huwag mo na lang alamin</i> 'Don't try to find out'	8
Evasion-fabrication, e.g. giving some other (false) reason or changing the topic	6
Sob, sigh, or vocative, e.g. <i>Inay</i> 'Mother'	15
Revelation	14

Looking at the ratio of number of probing questions to number of revelations, it can be said that an average of five probing questions is needed to elicit a revelation. Typically, the revelation is preceded by a probe – vocative exchange.

Of course the relationship between probing and willingness to respond depends upon what the problem is and who the person is: The problem may be very serious or the person may be secretive by nature. In addition, the relationship of the two interlocutors will also determine the single-mindedness with which the probing is conducted. It is to be expected that the relationship of the interlocutors involved in a probing exchange is a close one, especially if the probing is persistent. The data show the probing to occur among the following pairs:

mother – daughter	6 occurrences
mother – son	1 occurrence
husband – wife	4 occurrences
sisters	2 occurrences
sweethearts	1 occurrence
close friends (females)	3 occurrences
(males)	2 occurrences
(male – female)	3 occurrences

Only two pairs do not show such intimacy; the two pairs are made up each of a female trying to kill herself and the male saving her (*LS#5* and *LS#12*). The male asks a probing question to get at the reason behind the suicide attempt and the female refuses saying *Huwag mo na lang alamin ang dahilan* ‘Don’t try to find out the reason’ and *Wala kang pakialam* ‘It’s none of your business’. In one case the male suggests a reason and the female unburdens at this point. In the other case, the male offers to help the female with her problem – whatever it is – and she responds by revealing the problem. In these two cases, the probing cannot be considered persistent.

But even taking these situational variables into account, what is clear is that, in radio dramas at least, the persistence of systematic probing and the initial, almost automatic *Wala* of denial are expected behavior. A line from one probing exchange hints as much:

*HP#5* between husband and wife

Pete : Kanina ko pa napapansin na parang may gumugulo sa iyong isipan. Bakit ba, Lina? ‘I’ve been observing that something seems to be bothering you. What is it, Lina?’

Lina : (sighs) *Bakit pa nga ba ako maglilihim sa iyo, Pete? Kanina, nagkita kami ng iyong kapatid, si Kuya Amador. ‘Why should I try to conceal things from you, Pete? Earlier, I met your brother, Kuya Amador’.*

Lina sees no reason to keep things from her husband – almost as if the norm is for characters in radio dramas to be private and to reveal only when prodded, after much persistent probing.

## 8. CONCLUSION

I have presented a description of four speech acts – apologies, compliments, directives, and probes – found in a corpus of 120 scripts from seven popular Pilipino radio drama programs. The study has shown that there are patterns characteristic of apologies, compliments, directives, and probes in radio dramas and has indicated certain situational variables that determine the form of the speech act.

Some of the most obvious patterns are the following: Seriousness of offense leads to the use of *Patawarin mo ako* ‘Please forgive me’ rather than *I’m sorry* in apologies. The usual response to a compliment is to downplay it by calling it *bola* ‘flattery’ or *biro*

'joke'. 'Difficulty of the task' and 'whether or not non-compliance is likely' are important in shaping the linguistic form of the directive. A probing question usually meets with a denial of the existence of a problem, and persistent probing seems almost to be expected.

The scripts are full of other speech acts – insults, banter, breaking of unpleasant news, greetings, leavetakings, etc. – just as interesting and as worthy of study. Ideally, of course, the data should be spontaneous natural conversations. Until we have such a data bank, however, the products of mass media, especially movies and television dramas, can serve as the corpora. Even if the analyses are done on constructed data, the results can bring us closer to an ethnography of speaking of the Filipino speech community.

Doing an ethnography of speaking is a worthwhile and exciting enterprise. Identifying patterns of speaking is an important exercise, since these patterns reveal the linguistic and social rules that underlie the communicative competence of speakers in a speech community. But patterns of speaking are interesting also as a means to identifying the patterns of behavior, the patterns for living – i.e. 'culture' in a broad sense – of that community. In other words, what can we learn about Filipino culture from the fact that the pattern for reacting to a compliment seems to be to dismiss it as *bola* or *biro*? What can we learn from the fact that the pattern for answering initial probes is to say that nothing is the matter and from the fact that the pattern for probing is to persist in probing: even after the addressee has stated that there is no problem or that he/she refuses to discuss the problem?

In the same way that Enriquez (1978) is trying to approach Filipino psychology from Filipino terms like *tampo*, *hinanakit*, *sama ng loob*, and *galit* (all related to 'resentment' in English but with different antecedents and nuances) or the dichotomy between *loob* 'inside' and *labas* 'outside', it will be rewarding to use speech acts as an entry point in the study of Filipino culture. In sum, why not use an ethnography of speaking as an entry point to an ethnography?

#### REFERENCES

- CLARK, HERBERT K. and EVE V. CLARK. 1977. Psychology and language: An introduction to psycholinguistics. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- ENRIQUEZ, VIRGILIO G. 1978. Filipino psychology in the Third World. Quezon City: Philippine Psychology Research House, University of the Philippines.
- ERVIN-TRIPP, SUSAN. 1976. Is Sybil there? : The structure of some American English directives. *Language in Society* 5.25-66.
- SEARLE, JOHN R. 1976. A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society* 5.1-23.