

**BAUTISTA, MA. LOURDES S. 1980. The Filipino bilingual's competence: A model based on an analysis of Tagalog-English code switching. Pacific Linguistics Series C-No. 59. Canberra: The Australian National University**

Reviewed by Emy M. Pascasio  
*Ateneo de Manila University*

In a multilingual society such as the Philippines, the alternate use of two or more languages such as English and any one of the Philippine languages is not a matter of random choice. Rather the selection of a certain language to be used in a particular situation is patterned and governed by a set of linguistic rules as well as psychosocio-cultural rules. That is to say, the choice of the language code to be used in one situation depends upon who speaks what to whom, when and where, why and how.

This book is primarily concerned with constructing a model representing the Filipino bilingual's linguistic competence on the basis of an analysis of Tagalog-English code switching. The study draws up a conceptual input-output model that shows the relationship among the different components of a grammar. The study focuses only on the syntax of Tagalog-English code switching and its theoretical orientation is transformational grammar.

There are six chapters followed by a bibliography and two appendices. Chapter 1 (1-20) presents an overview which includes the aims of the study, its significance, the methods used in gathering and analyzing the data. Related studies have been reviewed here where points of similarities and differences of this study under review are discussed (Goulet 1971, Gumperz and Wilson 1971, Labov 1971, Azores 1967, Marfil and Pasiona 1970, Pimentel 1972). Chapters 2 (21-114) and 3 (115-176) present a complete typology of the different kinds of code switches found in the corpus, with Chapter 2 discussing code switches at the word and phrase level and Chapter 3 discussing code switches at the clause and sentence level. On the basis of insights from this typology, Chapter 4 formulates the patterns and constraints in code switching as phrase structure rules. Chapter 5 proposes a model representing the Filipino bilingual's linguistic competence. Finally, Chapter 6 summarizes the conclusions of the study and indicates directions for further research.

The data used in this study consist of a sequence of ten taped recordings of a 30-minute radio broadcast program, *Pulong Pulong sa Kaunlaran* 'Meetings for Progress', produced by the National Media Production Center. The program includes panel discussions and interviews. For a wider sampling of interviewees in the corpus, subsequent broadcasts featuring the same guests were excluded. The transcripts consist of a total of 1,508 utterances, distributed among 564 turns of speaking and 22 speakers. 66.31% contain some kind of Tagalog-English code switching. The corpus used here is more extensive than Marfil and Pasiona's (1970) and Pimentel's (1972) and carries a wider range of code switching. The number of utterances with code switches considered in this study under review is larger than the number of utterances of the three related Philippine studies, which is only a total of 599 sentences; hence more patterns and constraints in code switching emerge. The corpus contains switching from Tagalog to English and from English to Tagalog, and the analysis considers both kinds of code switching. A unified set of rules is presented that accounts for the code switching in the corpus; on the basis of the analysis, a restatement of the analysis as rules in a grammar is presented and a model of the Filipino bilingual's linguistic competence hypothesized.

If code switching is defined as any shift between Tagalog and English within an utterance or between utterances, would loanwords be treated here as also code switches?

Although *language mixing* is mentioned several times in this study, it has not been clearly distinguished from *code switching*.

Chapter 2 discusses code switches involving English and Tagalog open-set items, closed-set items, special combinations of closed-set and open-set items, collocations, prepositional phrases, participial phrases, infinitive phrases, and relative phrases. The discussion here is relatively informal and makes minimal use of tree diagrams.

An open set has an unlimited number of members and readily accepts new items, while the closed-set has a restricted and fixed number of members. Nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs constitute open-set categories; pronouns, prepositions, determiners, etc. constitute closed-set categories. Bautista states that some nouns undergo a change in category as a result of being subjected to the rich derivational processes of Tagalog. In the process they lose their character as English words and become Tagalog words. For example: *nagfa-family planning*, *ma-contempt of court* (32). In her discussion on Tagalog adverbs, Bautista classifies adverbs under the open-set category, but then there are specific adverbs which can be included under the closed-set. Perhaps more data is needed here and subjected to further analysis in order to tighten the classification of the adverbs.

In her observation there is an asymmetry between the number of English open-set items appearing in Tagalog S's and the small number of Tagalog open-set items appearing in English S's. I agree with her that this imbalance could be partially explained by sociolinguistic factors. But would it be due to the process of intellectualization or is it more due to that of elaboration in the vocabulary development of Tagalog?

The majority of items belonging to the English closed-set are conjunctions which may be subordinating or coordinating. A similar case is the presence of Tagalog conjunctions in English sentences. However, there is nothing among the closed-set items in English to match the Tagalog enclitics or the *ay* linker because English simply does not operate with such items. *Daw* and *naman* are enclitics that have no one-to-one correspondence with English lexical items. Tagalog inversion *ay* provides Tagalog constituents greater freedom to move about. *Ano* has nothing equivalent in the English closed-set that approximates the frequency of the use of *ano* as a catch-all tag question.

I found the special combinations of closed-set and open-set items interesting: combinations of Det + N in one language appearing as NP subject, NP complement or NP appositive in an S in the other language. In surface structure, the typical NP node has a branch for a Tagalog determiner, another branch (optional) for an English adjective, and branch for an English noun.

In her discussion on combinations in subject position as in the English NP as subject (49) as shown in her example: (241.3, page 50) '*Ito po bang sinasabi nyong hindi pwede e. sa . . . kung pag-uusapan po ito pong the whole building itself . . .*' she mentions that the effect of the emphatic form *itself* on the use of the English determiner is not clear. I think that the use of *ito* and *itself* are used to denote emphasis on *building* because in Tagalog, emphasis is marked by syntactic devices instead of stress. The English determiner *the* does not mark emphasis but the code switch to English.

Regarding collocations, I think *hindi* in the collocation *hindi ba* may be considered more as a negative marker with *ba* as an interrogative marker rather than considering the combination of these two forms as a collocation (72). With her claim of *hindi ba* as a collocation, would *ano ba* then be also a collocation? *Nga* may also be treated as a marker instead of a collocation since its presence seems to denote specificity and emphasis as well as confirmation. With these questions raised, perhaps collocations should be clearly distinguished from markers. How should euphemisms be classified? Can they be considered as collocations?

I agree that the facility with which prepositional phrases in one language are inserted into sentences in the other language apparently stems from the inter-translatability of prepositional phrases in English and Tagalog. With the question posed regarding

the presence of intertranslatability, why switch at all? Such questions can be answered in a study on the communicative functions of code-switches, something however beyond the scope of this study under review.

Chapter 3 discusses code switches involving relative clauses, noun clauses, adverbial clauses, independent clauses, and whole sentences. Bautista's arguments supporting her distinction of a Tagalog relative clause from a Tagalog relative phrase depending on whether the identical NP in the embedded S is subject or not are well taken. She further claims that in English, the embedded S can become a clause which may then be reduced to a phrase if it satisfies the requirements of having a relative pronoun and a form of the copula 'be' as predicate.

Bautista is able to show the difference between a non-restrictive relative clause from a restrictive clause through the deep structure. A non-restrictive clause is generated from a conjoined S; a restrictive relative clause is generated from an S embedded in an NP containing another NP.

In the noun clauses, however, the distance between the deep structure and the surface structure is relatively narrow; hence, it is not necessary to indicate the deep structure of the noun clauses. Code switching here takes place with the lower S and this code switching may or may not include the linker. The code switch affecting the lower S may be anticipated in the linker.

In the adverbial clauses code switching takes place with the lower S although it may be anticipated in the subordinating conjunction before that S. Bautista's analysis of the adverbials as closer to independent clauses rather than to relative and noun clauses is tentative although she provides some insights for its further treatment; she also offers some proposals.

She is able to point out gaps such as: there are no equivalent Tagalog participial and infinitive phrases to correspond with such English constructions; there are no English relative phrases — only relative clauses, which may or may not be reduced — while there are both Tagalog relative clauses and phrases. Similarities between English and Tagalog constructions involved in code switching have been highlighted: e.g. English and Tagalog noun clauses as well as English and Tagalog adverbial clauses manifest striking similarities. Differences are also pointed out: the Tagalog enclitics, especially the respect markers, can be glossed in English only by indirect means; relative constructions in English and Tagalog do not fall together the way English and Tagalog noun and adverbial clauses do.

Bautista's adoption of a two-step procedure seems to have worked out relatively well: first, to analyze a sentence into its component S's so that such S's can serve as the matrix for code switches at the word and phrase level, and second, to put the S's together again into the complete sentence so that switches involving clauses might be studied. This simplifies the task of typologizing by limiting the linguistic context of each particular code switch.

Although debate on alternative models is a continuing activity in linguistics, this study has stayed clear of the controversy by limiting itself to a consideration of Chomsky's standard theory as applied to the representation of the bilingual's linguistic competence. Chapter 5 presents an attempt to construct a model of the Filipino bilingual's linguistic competence. The model is preliminary, schematic, and needs to be tested. It is offered as a starting point, a first approximation, an evocative description that invites refinements. It is not a model of performance but a representation of the linguistic competence of the Filipino bilingual. The important considerations in this model are: 1) the primitive S is the starting point for the derivation of a bilingual sentence, 2) an S that is generated by PS Component<sub>L1</sub> can be shunted to PS Component<sub>L2</sub> and can be developed by the PS rules of that language. The result, after drawing from the two lexicons, is a single deep structure tree like the one on page 214.

Even if the 'variable competence' of the Filipino bilingual has not been captured

**in the model, I think the model has adequately handled all the code switches in the corpus. Of course, a model encompassing a complete grammar needs to be constructed. If the Tagalog-English contact situation continues for a much longer time, which may eventually result in creolization, then a different model will be needed. However, even at this point other models should be constructed using other frameworks so that comparison can be made and empirical consequences of adopting one model over the others can be weighed. Alternative models will then allow for the cross checking of the assumptions of the model that has been presented in this study under review.**

The format of the book is very helpful to the reader. The first chapter, which is an overview, provides the reader with the plan of the study, its aims, significance, scope and limitations, methodology, and review of related studies. Each chapter has an introduction and a summary. The arguments are well supported by data. The inclusion of some observations in each chapter is very helpful to the reader for further explanation and clarification of what has been discussed in each section. Typographical errors are few and mostly minor (e.g. 'aeverbial' for 'adverbial', line 36, page 157).

Although this study is not a complete grammar of code switching, it is an important contribution to model-building. It is hoped that this study will serve as a springboard for alternative models in code switching to be constructed.

This book is a significant contribution to linguistics, sociolinguistics, and bilingualism.