

FURTHER NOTES ON PARDO DE TAVERA'S 'EL SANSKRITO EN LA LENGUA TAGALOG'

JUAN R. FRANCISCO

Introductory

WHEN T. H. PARDO DE TAVERA WROTE,

Yo no creo, y fundo mi opinion en las palabras mismas que he reunido en este vocabulario, que los hindus desempeñaron en Filipinas un simple papel de comerciantes, sino que dominaron en diferentes puntos del archipiélago, en aquellos en que hoy día se hablan las lenguas mas cultas, como el tagalog, el bisaya, el pampango y el ilocano, y la mayor cultura de estas lenguas proviene precisamente de la influencia de aquella raza de hindus sobre los filipinos,¹

he did not realize that this would embark many a writer — like H. Otley Beyer,² — to speculate on the *definitive* influence of Indian culture upon the Philippines. He was followed by E. M. Alip³ and G. F. Zaide,⁴ who did not, in any manner, question the assumptions of the former. Beyer's stand on Pardo de Tavera's view was further elaborated by T. A. Agoncillo and O. Alfonso⁵ with some questions raised but no new evidences on such an influence were offered, at least to confirm Pardo de Tavera's earlier assumptions.

However, Beyer, in the course of his further pioneering studies on the relations of the Philippines with the neighbouring areas in pre-hispanic times, on the basis of stray data, argued that the mother culture of the Philippines was India. These seemed to confirm Pardo de Tavera's 19th century studies. But in the course of the work that has been done on the Indian elements of Philippine culture, Pardo de Tavera's view that the Indians "dominaron en diferentes puntos del archipiélago," do not now hold.

Alfred L. Kroeber, who was then the foremost American authority on the Philippines in the early period of American domination, apparently followed the view that Pardo de Tavera held.⁶

¹ T. H. Pardo de Tavera, *El Sanscrito en la Lengua Tagalog*. (Paris: Imprimerie de la Faculte de Medicine, 1887), p. 10.

² H. Otley Beyer, "The Philippines Before Magellan," *Asia*, vol. XXI (January-December 1921), pp. 861-66, 890, 892.

³ E. M. Alip, *Philippine History* (Manila: Alip and Sons, 1958), pp. 66-67; *Political and Cultural History of the Philippines* vol. I (Manila: Alip and Sons, 1954), pp. 47-50.

⁴ G. F. Zaide, *Philippine History* (Manila: Bookman, Inc., 1961), pp. 45-46.

⁵ T. A. Agoncillo and O. Alfonso, *A Short History of the Filipino People* (Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1960), pp. 28-30.

⁶ A. L. Kroeber, *Peoples of the Philippines* (New York: American Museum of Natural History, 1943), pp. 213-217. Kroeber wrote further that "with Sanskrit

The implication that is apparent in the above citations is that "the Indians were present in the Philippines in person." This aggravated the situation, for in so far as material evidences are concerned, they are not extensive enough to allow full acceptance of the view. No substantial evidences of that presence in the Islands have been found. Pardo de Tavera evidently contradicts himself when he wrote,

Con los elementos que ofrece Java, se ha llegado a conocer toda la estencion que tubo en aquella isla la influencia de los hindus, pero en Filipinas no tenemos ni los monumentos, ni las estatuas, ni la literatura que nos digan nada, y la tradicion que quizas en los primeros dias de la conquista hubiera dado valiosas indicaciones, no se conserva ya mas en los Filipinos.⁷

This contradiction indicates the very shaky position of Pardo de Tavera.

But archaeology and ethnology *per se* are not the concern of the present essay. It is concerned with the language — the Tagalog language which has been influenced by Sanskrit. The circumstances of this influence, its history, process of its influx into the language are discussed in broader perspectives in an earlier work of book length,⁸ and a brief essay dealing on the date of the coming of that influence.⁹

Between my earlier works and the present essay, there will be noted certain contradictions in terms of my study of the philological development of Sanskrit in the Philippine languages. However, I must hasten to say that on further study of Pardo de Tavera new insights into the problem have become apparent. And, in this context, therefore, my views in this essay supersede those in the earlier works.

Notes on the Vocabulary

(1) Pardo de Tavera wrote that he used a Sanskrit-French dictionary by Burnouf. In an earlier draft of this essay, I wrote that it is

handicapped by the absence of this dictionary in the libraries in U.P. because the item referred to by Pardo de Tavera in his work can not be checked. However, it may be inferred from his reference from Burnouf that (a) the orthography of Sanskrit works in the dictionary are still not standard transliterations of Sanskrit phonemes as represented by the *devanagari* script in which Sanskrit is written; (b) Pardo de Tavera appeared to have a passing knowledge of the *devanagari* script for him to have been able to transliterate correctly the script into Roman letters. During his time, it appears that there had been no standard transliteration of *devanagari*. At the same time, it may be speculated that he had only a lexical knowledge of Sanskrit.

words came a form of writing based on the Sanskrit alphabet." Basic re-orientation of this reference had been made in J. R. Francisco, *Philippine Palaeography*. U.P. Social Sciences Research Council, 1966.

⁷ Pardo de Tavera, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9.

⁸ Juan R. Francisco, *Indian Influences in the Philippines*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines, 1964.

⁹ Juan R. Francisco, "On the Date of the Coming of Indian Influences in the Philippines," *Philippine Historical Review*, vol. I, no. 1 (November 1965), pp. 136-152.

All the above speculations were confirmed when I obtained a xerox copy of the preface of Burnouf's dictionary in 1967.¹⁰

Burnouf, according to Pardo de Tavera, transliterated the aspirates by using the single quotation mark after the consonant, thus थ' $th > t'$, क् $ch > c'$, ध' $dh > d'$, etc.^{11*} He rendered these aspirates in transliteration thus th for थ', ch for क्, dh for ध', etc. The compound consonant ks क्ष, or क्ष् has been transliterated by Burnouf as "x," but which Pardo de Tavera rendered ksh . He was in fact using unknowingly the standard transliteration of these phonemes that is now used officially by Sanskrit scholars the world over.

In many cases, however, his transliterations of *devanagari* are not standard, and no distinctions in the transliteration of the dentals, cerebrals and palatals are made. For the purpose of the present essay, I will cite only a few illustrations.

Devanagari क् (k) is rendered c , and there is one example of rendering the phoneme to q , which is, indeed, understandable in terms of Pardo de Tavera's orientation to the Spanish language.

While he makes distinction between *Devanagari* च् (c) and क् (ch), the transliteration of the latter is indeed not standard. Take for instance आलोकित (aalocita), which he renders *alochita*, which ch is actually the standard rendering of the phoneme क् (ch). Then his rendering of the क् shows a sibilant form — thus, Sanskrit छाया (chaaya) $>$ *schaya* and क् (ceda) $>$ *scheda*. Sometimes, to distinguish च् from क् in the transliteration, they are respectively rendered as ch and chh . This seems to be the more acceptable transliteration among the Indian as well as other scholars in the script.

The transliteration of the palatal media ज् (j) to dj is somehow understood in terms of the phoneme's nature in the Spanish, for if

¹⁰ Emile Burnouf, *Dictionnaire Classique Sanscrit-Francais*. Paris: Maisonneuve, Libraire-Editeur, 1866.

I obtained this material when I visited the University of Chicago in 1967, after having participated in the XXVII International Congress of Orientalist, which was held in the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, U.S.A. I must acknowledge the Asian Foundation for financing my trip to this Congress, which enabled me to visit my alma mater.

^{11*} Further examination of the Table of Transcription in the Burnouf dictionary show that the transliteration of the devanagari script are not standard. This indeed was a devise to represent the sounds in the roman script because of the absence of standard romanization at the time.

For the present essay, I devised a way of indicating the various Sanskrit sounds as they are used (here), since there are no types among the printers in the Philippines to indicate the standard roman transliterations of *devanagari*.

The long vowel sounds are indicated as aa , ii , uu ; the cerebrals as t , $t.t.h$, d , $d.d.h$, n ; the palatal sibilant as s' ; the seventh vowel of the Sanskrit sound system is indicated as r . (which resembles the sound of ri in *merrily*). The guttural n is symbolized as ng . All other sounds are represented and articulated like those in the Roman alphabet.

The above is rather cumbersome, but this is the only way by which the closest transliteration to the standard system can be done in terms of the printing facilities in the Islands.

were romanized to *j* as is standardly done, it would be the spirant *h*, hence Pardo de Távèra had to devise a way by which he could distinguish the Spanish from the *Devanagari j*, since he was transliterating into Roman script as understood in the Spanish. Thus, Sanskrit गज (gaja) as transliterated is *gadja*, वाणिजिक (vaan.ijika) as *vaan.idjika*, राज (raaja) as *raadja*.

Pardo de Tavera transliterates the cerebral त् (t.) in *paripr.sht.a* and *kot.i* to dental *t*, which, indeed, is not distinguished from the latter. This is also seen in अष्टन [ashtan (T)]. He transliterates धूप (dhuupa) with the deaspirated *dh*, thus *d.upa*, the dental (d) having become a cerebral ङ (d.). He shows quite a few forms of the nasals in transliteration. The dental न् (n) does not suffer any change in transliteration, like in Sanskrit श्रान्त (S'raanta) > *cranta*. The cerebral ए (n.) and the guttural ङ (ng) are transliterated without distinction — शृण्वन् (s'r.n.khala > *crngkhala* and शङ्ख (S'angkha) > *cangka*. Then he transliterates the labial like a palatal — न् (ñ), e.g. हम्सा (hamsa) > *hañsa*. The anusvara becomes a labial — ताम्रक (taamraka) > *taamraka*.

There is a case where the फ् in फल (phala) has been de-aspirated in the transliteration, viz., *pala*.

Devanagari व् (v) shows two forms in Pardo de Tavera's transliteration — Sanskrit वाह (vaaha) > *waha*; वान्त (vaartta) > *wartta*, while Sanskrit वाणिजिक (vaan.ijika) becomes *banidjika*.

The sibilants have quite a few forms also as they are transliterated by Pardo de Tavera. Cerebral ष (s.) is rendered *sh* — Sanskrit अष्टन (asht.an) > *ashtan*, परिपृष्ट (paripr.sht.a) > *paripr.shta*. Palatal श् (s') in श्रान्त (s'raanta) becomes *cranta*, while संसार (sams'ara) becomes *sansara*. The ç in *cranta* may have been intended to be the French cedilla *c*, the transcription of which is seen in *cangka* and *crngkala*. The cedilla has been used by French Sanskrit scholars as the romanized form of the Sanskrit palatal sibilant. Dental स (s) is transcribed correctly as *s*.

On the whole, it may be observed that all errors in transliteration may be due to the exigencies of printing. But I think these could not have been the case for Pardo de Tavera himself in later years made marginal corrections and notations on this particular work, and there are no indications that he made any corrections.¹²

One significant, though perhaps unimportant, observation that may be made is that one, who is not familiar with *devanagari*, if he relied

¹² I had the fortune of having had the acquaintance of the former Miss Josine Pardo de Távèra Loinaz (now Mrs. Freddie Elizalde), who was then studying anthropology in the University. She lent me the personal copy of her great grandfather, which bear further notations of the work in his own handwriting.

My profound gratitude to Mrs. Elizalde for the privilege and fortune of using the personal copy of her ancestor.

only on the transliteration in the dictionaries and lexicons, while attempting to check on Pardo de Tavera, would certainly encounter difficulties in his search for the correct reference.¹³

2. For these brief notes, I have selected a few of the vocabulary listed in Pardo de Tavera's work to further illustrate my thesis that some of the items are doubtful and therefore, may be taken with caution or rejected. This may have been due to what he calls towards the end of his introduction to the list as "muchas palabras, a primera vista, me parecian tener origen Sanscrita y ya me complacia en descubrirlas . . ." I had fallen into the same state when I wrote my book.

The enthusiasm I had was understandable; but upon rethinking the problems involved in the further study of the work, I find it now uncomfortable to think of the impact upon those who are not familiar with the language as well as with the proto-history of the Philippines.

The following words are some of the most important in the list of Pardo de Tavera in terms of their having Sanskrit origins, because they seem to have no intermediate forms in either Malay or Javanese or both. I use them thus to dramatize the caution in accepting these as foreign elements in the Tagalog language. They may yet turn out to be Austronesian (Malayo-Polynesian).

Anito,¹⁴ a name that the Tagalogs give to the images representing the dead whom they adore because they believe in the cult or worship of their ancestors. The Tagalog dictionaries translate *anito* as "Idol". Sanskrit *hantu*, "death". The Malay *hantu* means "spirit, spectre, evil spirit." Pampango *anito*, "soul of the dead." Of the disappearance of the initial *h*, I suspect that the word is not directly taken from Sanskrit. It must have come from the Javanese *antu*. The *i* was introduced upon passing into Tagalog and Pampango to soften the pronunciation.

Sanskrit *hantu*, "killing or slaying," is the nominal form of /*han* (infinitive: *hantum*). However, compare this word with *anitu* (in R.A. Kern, "Anitu", *Journal of Austronesian Studies*, I, 1, 1956) which is believed to be a native Indonesian. Kern takes the view that the word is demonstrative pronoun (general indefinite) meaning, "yonder." ". . . *anitu* . . . , meaning 'those there, far away.' It is a veiled expression, perhaps for magic reasons, not without parallels in other regions . . ."

Aua (awa), pity, compassion, mercy. Sanskrit *ava* [avah], to defend, to protect, to conserve.

Sanskrit *avah*. is found only in RgVeda I, 128, 5, meaning "favour, help, comfort, satisfy." But there are no forms in the intervening languages. Moreover, its being primarily Vedic in usage would necessi-

¹³ In the forthcoming text and translation with critical notes, which I plan to publish, I will have occasion to use the standard transliterations now in force among Sanskrit scholars.

¹⁴ Citations from Pardo de Tavera shall be in eight points, and shall be followed immediately by the critical notes in ten points to avoid confusion.

tate against its having been borrowed by the languages with which Sanskrit was in contact in the past.

Bahag-hari, the rainbow. Sanskrit *waha* [vaha], cart, path, route; and *hari*, sun, ray of light. The *g* added to *baha* is a euphonic letter. It is the only word in Tagalog in which *hari* Sanskrit appears to mean "sun" like Malay. In the Malay dictionary of Abbott Favre,* *hari* is compared with Tagalog *arao* and is considered both to have come from one origin. I consider *arao* to be a Polynesian origin for which reason it does not appear in this vocabulary. The Malays accept *hari* to be from Sanskrit which by coincidence the word has a very close phonetic resemblance with *arao*.

Compare Sanskrit *bhaga hara* (?), "carrier of fortune." In Tagalog mythological literature, the *bahaghari*, "rainbow", has been regarded as a sign of good fortune, as in the Indian folk literature and beliefs.

But the Tagalog *bahaghari*, literally, means the "loincloth of the king," which figuratively is the "rainbow." It could not therefore be considered to have been derived from a Sanskrit origin. It is more Malayo-Polynesian than any other language. If the Tagalog, in its mythologico-figurative meaning, were compared with Sanskrit *bhagahara*, in its very literal meaning "carrier of good fortune," a relationship may be found, which is, indeed, significant. But the laws of language borrowing would not allow such a "phenomenon" to occur because no phonetic and semantic laws can explain such a situation.

Balatong, phaseolus mungo. Sanskrit *balata*, "Id." Pampanga *Balatung*. The final *ta* has been changed to *tong*, which is a suffix very agreeable to the Tagalog hearing.

Iloko *balatong*, "id." if it were to be derived also from Sanskrit *balata*, according to Pardo de Tavera, is not verifiable in the dictionaries. Compare Sanskrit *hari*, "phaseolus mungo," which does not show any phonetic affinity with the word that is believed to be Sanskrit in origin.

Basahan, rag, torn dirty clothes, old apparel. According to Kern¹⁵ it comes from Sanskrit *waasa*, vestment.

Compare Sanskrit *vasana*, "clothing, vestment." However, it seems that the root of the word *basa*, "wet" and with the suffix *han*, it would give a figurative meaning "that which is wet." Extending this meaning further, it is "a piece of cloth used in wiping, cleaning," usually wet because it is used in cleaning and wiping wet surfaces. It is, therefore, the view of this essay that the word is not foreign to the Tagalog language.

Bighani, the real meaning of this word is "illtempered, easy to anger, irritable," but the Tagalog dictionaries give a different meaning "to tame the heart." Kern notes the opposing meanings, and says that *bighani* means "pacific heart", possessing a meaning contrary to the derivation. This does

* Abbe Favre, *Dictionnaire Malaise-Francaise*, Wien, 1875.

¹⁵ H. Kern, "Sanskritische Woorden in het Tagala," *Bijdragen tot de Taal- Land- en Volkenkunde*, vol. IV, 1880.

not follow its real meaning "irritable". But if *di*, a negative particle is prefixed, it would mean otherwise. Sanskrit *wihari* (-n), to move, to create, to delight (Kern). [*vihari*].

Sanskrit *vihaari* (°n), "to move, etc." becoming Tagalog *bighani*, "ill-tempered", is rather farfetched. Unless the transformation of the Sanskrit through the intervening languages, e.g., Malay, Javanese, etc., in a process of change from one stage to another is shown, the borrowing as shown by Pardo de Tavera or even Kern is unacceptable. This word is perhaps a native Tagalog.

Bisti. Kern translates this word as "to help to dress," which he saw in P. de los Santos' dictionary¹⁶ but doubted the exactness of this meaning and with much reason. In fact, *bisti* is not Tagalog; it is the corrupted Spanish *vestir*, to dress. It does not appear in any Tagalog dictionary, for it is a *vocabulary of the kitchen*... This should, therefore, be taken out of the list of words of Sanskrit origin.

Obviously the word is Spanish, but its etymology goes back to Latin *vestis*, "garment," which becomes Italian *veste*, "*id.*". It is also Greek *esthes*, "dress" and Gothic *vasjan*, "*id.*". Compare Sanskrit 4. /*vas*, causative, *vaasayati*, °*te* (passive), "to cause or to allow to put on or wear (clothes), clothe (A. ones self) with (inst.). The nominative form *vastra* "cloth, clothes, garment, raiment, dress, cover, etc. (Rgveda)" is instructive. Compare this also with Tamil *vesti*, which means "the *dhoti*," which is a piece of cloth used by man around the waist down.

Cosa (*kusa*), "appetite, desire; free of charge, gratis." Sanskrit *kos'a*, an interior of anything, the contents of a glass. Pampanga *cusa* means, criterion, will. In P. de los Santos dictionary, it means, judgement. *Loob* (literally, *inside*) means, the heart, intestines, etc. These are all applied to Tagalog *kusa*. (Kern)

Compare Sanskrit *kosht.ha*, "entrails, stomach, abdomen," with current Tagalog *kusa*, "involuntary, free will." The Tagalog in compound — *kusang-loob*, "involuntary inside; free will, on one's own accord" — has a wider meaning. It is, however, difficult to accept Pardo de Tavera's view that the word is Sanskrit.

Dalabasa, interpreter. This word is composed of *dala* (to carry) and *basa* (to read). Malay *djurubhasa*, Pampanga *dulubhasa*, "*id.*"

Current Tagalog *dalubhasa*, is "specialist in any field of study, e.g., *dalubhasa sa pangagamot*, "specialist in the medical science," *dalubhasa sa wikang ingles*, "specialist in the English language." It is difficult to accept Pardo de Tavera's derivation of the word, because it seems doubtful.

Dalampasig, the shore or bank of the sea or river, beach, shore. The word is composed of *dala* and *pasig*, with the intervening euphonic *m*. *Dala* comes from Sanskrit *jaala*, "water" plus Malay *pasig*, "shore" or

¹⁶ Fray Domingo de los Santos, *Vocabulario de la Lengua Tagala*. Manila: La Imprenta Nueva, 1835.

"border of the water." It corresponds to the older Malay form, *pasir*, "sand"; Batak *pasir*, "border of the water, beach"; Dayak *pasir*, "sand". Pampanga *dalam pasig*, "a bank of sand."

Compare Sanskrit *paamsu*(?), "crumbling soil, dust, sand." Could Malay *pasir*, derive from this word? Compare also Sanskrit *paara*, "shore, bank." It is highly doubtful. It may be postulated with some certainty that the word is native Tagalog or Malayo-Polynesian.

Dayau, victory, song (while bringing prisoners or spoils of war). Sanskrit *djaya*, victory, war song. Malay *djaya*, victory.

Apparently, the Tagalog *dayau* means "song" in its principal meaning, but compared to Sanskrit *jaya*, as "victory" its principal meaning, it is never "song." While it is true that one of its meaning is "name of particular verses causing victory [(personified as deities), *Vayu Purana* ii, 6, 4ff], it can not be said that Tagalog *dayau* is Sanskrit *jaya*. In Malay and Javanese *djaya* means "victory." Compare Tagalog *dayau* with Iloko *dayau*, "honour, esteem, etc." This may further explain why the word can not be accepted as originating from Sanskrit. It is more likely that it is Austronesian.

Ginoo, principal lady, lady of rank. This word is composed of the Sanskrit root \sqrt{go} , which means in the Vedas, "all that is good, the earth, cloud, the sacrifice, the mother," and Tagalog infix *-in-*. We have already said that Kawi adopted Sanskrit words according to the linguistic laws of the Malayo-Polynesian languages. Therefore, the development attributed to *ginoo* (would show) that it has no singular form.

Sanskrit *go* is not a verb. It is a noun form which means "several good things, e.g., ray of light, speech, etc." But its primary meaning is *cow*, which to the Indian is sacred and the source of food and the objects of sacrifice. Compare Sanskrit *ganya*, "respectable, worthy (in popular Indian languages)." Is *ginoo* used in things other than deities or persons, as Pardo de Tavera suggests? But compare furthermore, Sanskrit *gnaa*, "wife (Rgveda IV, 9, 4), divine lady, a species of goddess; speech."

With the feminine form of Tagalog which is *ginang*, it appears that it may be derived from Sanskrit *gnaa*, "wife, woman, divine female," with all the possible phonetic formations, e.g., svarabhakti *i* and epenthetic *ng*. But this assumption may be dismissed for an ancient form like this Vedic word is unlikely to have travelled to the Philippines, considering the very late period of the coming of Indian influences to the Islands. Moreover, there is no form in either Malay or Javanese.

Hari, king, queen. Sanskrit *hari*, among other things it means sun. Perhaps, this was given by the Tagalogs as an appellation of their kings as other nations gave "son of the sun, son of heaven or of the moon" to their kings. Pampanga *ari*, "id." In the Malayo-Polynesian languages where *hari* means the "sun" it is always preceded by *mata*, eye. In the Polynesian languages, *ao* which means the "sun" and which gave origin to *arao*, like the word *bahag-hari*, it is also preceded by *mata*. In *mata*.

hari, the Malays substituted Polynesian *arao* with Sanskrit *hari* due to phonetic similarity. [In Pardo de Tavera's handwriting: Later I saw that *hari* is Polynesian in origin.]

Among the gods of the Hindu pantheon known as *hari* are Vishnu, and Indra; *hara* is S'iva. The Sanskrit words are nominal forms of the root /*hri*, "to take away or remove evil or sin". E.g., S'rii S'iva as *hara*, meaning god or king; *hari* as Indra, king of heaven, can also have the meaning "king." Pardo de Tavera's manu-script notation assumes a significant position for the word is indeed recognized to be Austronesian rather than Indo-Aryan, in the context of the Tagalog meaning and form.

Laca, *Lacan* (*laka*, *lakan*), title of the landlords in the Philippines before and on the arrival of the Spaniards: *Lacan-dola*, *Lacan-solan*, *Lakan-Hiatan*, etc. *Lakan* comes from Sanskrit *raksha*, protector, guardian. The introduction of the final *n* is euphonic as in *ganan*.

The term as it is generally used means *headman*, thus, *Lakandula*, meaning the "headman" name *Dula*, as in Sanskrit *gramapati*, "village lord." Nevertheless, *lakan* devolving from Sanskrit *raksha* is rather doubtful. The Sanskrit does not have a form in Malay or Javanese.

Lakan appears to be a native Malayo-Polynesian. It is found in an inscription in Kalasan, Central, Java dated S'aka 700 (A.D. 778 or 22 March 779) in the Javanese form *raka*. The word is a title meaning "lord." In this inscription, it appears in its sanskritized form *rakarayan*, *rakr.yan*. In a Malay form it appears in an old Malay inscription as *karayan*.¹⁷

Together with this word, *Lakan*, are the others which Pardo de Tavera believes to be derived from Sanskrit — they are *Lakambini*, *Lakanpati*, and *Lakhanbakor*. In terms of the facts presented above, it is fair inference that the word does not have Sanskrit for its origin. Its being found in compound words explains the versatility of the Tagalog language, except perhaps the word *pati*, which if Sanskrit would mean "lord", or its more common meaning "owner, master, householder."

Mana, heritage. Sanskrit *mana*, to estimate, to esteem, to appreciate. Malay *manah*, to esteem, to appreciate; relic, heritage. Pampanga *mana*, heritage; *menan*, gift, present. Tagalog, Pampanga and Malay *mana* is evidently related to Sanskrit *mana* because gift is a proof of appreciation and esteem of a person he has for another.

Sanskrit *mana* is a derivative from the root /*man*, "to think, to believe, to suppose; to set the heart or mind on, honour, esteem, etc." The shift of meaning is rather polar. But compare Polynesian *manas*, "spiritual power, influence of the good exerted through men or inanimate objects;" also Sanskrit *aatman*, "inner soul, essence."

A gift is not always a sign of esteem and honour for a person, so that further investigation on the word through the intervening languages would prove or disprove the shift.

¹⁷ Louis-Charles Damais, "Etude d'Epigraphie Indonesienne," *Bulletin de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extreme Orient*, vol. XLVI, no. 1 (1952), p. 23.

Look at Sanskrit *manas*, n. (/man, to think, to believe, imagine, suppose, etc.), "mind, intellect, intelligence, understanding, perception, sense, conscience, will." Compare the meaning that Pardo de Tavera gives to the Tagalog word as being derived from Sanskrit *daana*, n. (/daa, to give), "the act of giving, donation, gift." Malay *dana*, "alms". This does not have any form in Tagalog. In the context of the above, it is apparent that Pardo de Tavera's assumption is doubtful.

Ogac (ogak), noise of the tempestuous sea, in torrents, in spurts. *Ogac-ogac ang dugo*, the blood flows in spurts (San Lucar).¹⁸ Sanskrit *ogha*, a mass of water, torrent, wave.

Sanskrit *oghas*, m. (/vah), means "flood, stream, rapid flow of water; heap or quantity, flock, multitude, abundance." There are no forms in the Malay and Javanese languages, and hence, it is rather difficult to follow Pardo de Tavera.

Olabisa (ulabisa), a venomous snake; Malay *ola*, *ula*: a corruption of *ular*, serpent + Sanskrit *visha*, venom, poison. Malay *ular* appears in Tagalog *olapihan*, which is rarely used having suffered transformation — the initial and antepenultimate vowels have been interchanged, thus *alopihan*, centipede. Tagalog *alupihan*, formerly *ulapihan* is formed from Malay *ular* + Tagalog *hipun*, shrimp, because the form of the centipede, ringed and shining, is similar to that of the shrimp. *Ular* originates from Sanskrit *uraga*, breast-goer, that which moves on its belly, hence, serpent...

Compare Cham *ula*, Malay *ulara'*, Old Javanese *ula*, Toba *uluk*. Iloko and Pangasinan *uleg*, Tiruray *urrar*, "snake or serpent." Compare, furthermore, Iloko, *udang*, "shrimp." In spite of the forms in the intervening languages, like Old Javanese, Malay, etc., it is difficult to say that the Tagalog is derived from the Sanskrit. May be there is a possibility that this is Sanskrit because of the tendency of these languages to dissyllabism.¹⁹ But this seems farfetched.

Patianac (Patianak), evil spirit which is believed to cause miscarriage and abortion. When a woman gives birth, the *patianak* climbs a nearby tree and executes its evil designs. It is the enemy of the new-born; and an evil spirit which delights in killing infants. This term belongs to Tagalog mythology. Sanskrit *punth*, to strike, to kill + Malay *anac*, *anak*, child. Malay *puntianak*, *puntianak*, pernicious spirit, which attacks children or pregnant women, is much closer to Sanskrit in phonetics. Tagalog *pati* is far from being closely related to Sanskrit *punth*. Nevertheless, the Malay *punti* explains the origin of the Tagalog. Sanskrit *punth*, Malay *punti*, > Tagalog *pati*. Pampanga *patianak*.

Punth is not verifiable in the Sanskrit lexicons, e.g. *Amarakos'a*, or *S'abdakalpadruma*. Compare, however, Sanskrit /*puth*, "to crush, kill, destroy." Compare, furthermore, Tagalog with the Bisayan *sang-putana-n*, "gloom" which may be Sanskrit *puutanaa*, "a female demon which kills

¹⁸ P. Juan de Noceda y P. Pedro de Sanlucar, *Vocabulario de La Lengua Tagala*. Manila: Imprenta de la Ramirez y Giraudier, 1860.

¹⁹ J. Gonda, *Sanskrit in Indonesia*, (Nagpur: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1952) pp. 253-257.

children or infants." *Puutanaa*, in Indian literature, becomes a definite personage related to the story of Krishna: In search for infants for children, the demonness came upon the birth place of Krishna, who was still in his infant years. In the act of nursing the infant Krishna, she took him on her lap . . . "She offered her terrible breast containing indigestible poison. The Lord (Krishna) crushed it with his hands, and with anger, sucked it together with her life . . ." ²⁰

Si, a particle placed before proper names of persons; sometimes before names of personified animals in fables; before names of relationships. Sanskrit *cri*, placed before names of persons or things as a sign of respect. Malay *sri*, "id.", variant *seri*, . . . The Tagalogs may have used this term as title, . . . Everyone used it without distinction. . . . It is also used in

* Ibanag, Pampango and a large number of languages in Luzon.

Compare Sanskrit *s'riimaan*, "blessed, affluent."; Prakrit forms and even South Indian languages, e.g., Tamil *siimaan*. Incidentally, F. R. Blake²¹ attempted to reconstruct Pardo de Tavera's derivation of the Tagalog *si* from Sanskrit *s'rii*. In this, he used the Sanskrit *s'raanta* becoming Tagalog *salanta* for an analogy, saying that the consonantal conjunct *s'r* is represented in *sal*. Indeed, the *s'r* in *s'raanta* does not follow the rule in svarabhakti, but to say that *sal* represents the *s'r* in *s'rii* becomes *si*, then it is far from acceptable. For even if there were a form *sali*, should his analogy be followed, it would still violate the rule.

Compare, however, the forms of *s'rii* in Sulu, e.g., *siri(pada)*, which follows the rule of anaptyxis — the *svrabhakti* vowel being influenced by the nearest vowel, thus *s'rii* becoming *siri* or in Malay *seri*, the pepet being one of the glosses of the *i*.

Tadhana, to convene, to agree. Sanskrit *sandhanaa*, convention, contract, to listen to. . . . *s* becomes *t*, and *m* disappears when the word is introduced in Tagalog, because of the exigencies of pronunciation.

The meaning of Sanskrit *samdhana* in the meaning that Pardo de Tavera gives can not be verified in the dictionaries. The Tagalog *tadhana*, as far as classical literary and current popular usages are concerned, does not mean "to convene, to agree"; it means, "fate; may be danger." Compare Tagalog *sakuna*, "accident, etc." Sanskrit *s'akuna*, "omen, good or bad." The word *tadhana* in its meaning that Pardo de Tavera gives is not verifiable in the lexicons.

Remarks and Observations

Some of the words discussed above were included in my large work as part of the broad study of Sanskrit in the Philippine languages. Some

²⁰ *Srimad Bhagavata*. Condensed Text and Translation by V. Raghavan. Madras: G.A. Natesan and Company, 1936.

²¹ F. R. Blake, "Sanskrit Loanwords in Tagalog," *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, XXII, 163 (June 1903), p. 65.

were not included because they appeared to me doubtful at the time; and I did not bother to explain why.

In this brief essay, I attempted to point out that those words included in the large work do not show any relation with the assumed origin, considering the fact that there are no forms in the intervening areas. It should be always borne in mind that the influx of Indian influences into the Philippines must be explained in terms of the development in the intervening regions. Or, that they had been assigned Sanskrit origins, because these were sanskritized by the early Javanese (e.g. *lakan* from *raka* becoming *rakarayaan*, *rakr.yan*) to infuse an Indian spirit into the words.

After a further rethinking of the words which were not included in the large work, and which were considered doubtful then, they now tend to appear indigenous to the language. The rather minute examination of the words would point out why they were not touched upon in that work mentioned above.

No conclusions are inferred in this brief essay as I reserve these for the longer essay fully explaining the work under criticism. This shall be an attempt to put the work in proper perspective, since it has been cited very extensively by writers attempting to show relationships of Philippine languages with neighbouring languages, without raising questions concerning many problems relevant to language borrowing. Hence, it may be said at this juncture that while Pardo de Tavera may have committed some very interesting errors owing to his enthusiasm, we are thankful to him for blazing a trail towards a better understanding of pre-hispanic Philippine cultural orientations.