FOOTNOTE TO DR. FRANCISCO'S "NOTES" ON TAVERA

Z. A. SALAZAR

THE "NOTES" IN QUESTION (FRANCISCO 1968)[1] TEND TO confirm the author's shift, modestly initiated elsewhere,[2] from the Indiano-centric orientation of his Madras dissertation (1964) to a less zealous view of culture contacts in the Indonesian world.[3] Since Sanskrit is generally considered the "vehicle" of Indian influence in pre-colonial Southeast Asia (COEDES 1948: 34 et seq., 422-3; 1962: 212-13), the study of loan words from this language should rely less on enthusiasm than on measured scepticism. Having realized this, Dr. Francisco takes a more critical view of Tavera's derivation from Sanskrit of certain Tagalog terms. He arrives at an adverse opinion mainly by conducting his own special analysis of the "original" Sanskrit words, while occasionally invoking the more probable Austronesian or local character of the supposedly derived terms and the absence of intermediate forms in the West Indonesian languages which had been exposed earlier and more intensively to Indian culture.[4]

The last argument implies of course that all supposedly Sanskrit-derived Tagalog monemes were filtered through West Indonesia, meaning that they were linguistically no longer Sanskrit upon entry into the

---

[1] Only the scantiest bibliographical data are mentioned in the text and notes, a complete bibliography being available at the end of the paper. Publications by the same author are distinguished from one another through their dates.

[2] FRANCISCO 1967-68. The fact that two heroes of the Indian *Mahabharata* and the Ifugaw *Hud-Hud* go to battle without heeding previous warning betrays itself to be just "fortuitous" parallelism. The Wind's involvement with both heroes of the *Mahabharata* and the Iloko *Lam-ang* is revealed in the article to be mere parallel development. Other "resemblances" of the same type are diligently brought out and then judged irrelevant to Indian literary influence in the Philippines. The one which correlates the moral antitheses "good$\neq$bad" with the lateral opposites "right$\neq$left" is just as pleasant, though Dr. Francisco takes it seriously. Such a classificatory correspondence is just as reversible as the one which obtains between "superior$\neq$inferior" and "head$\neq$feet." In structural clusters of this sort, the search for influence is more meaningful in connection with the reversed correlations (i.e. "good$\neq$bad" = "left$\neq$right" and "superior$\neq$inferior" = "feet$\neq$head"), since they would be less common. As a matter of fact, the left hand is just as "sinister" in Asia as it was in Rome and is in India and Europe. But it takes anthropological "dexterity" to manipulate conceptual tools of this kind.

[3] Essentially linguistic and cultural, the term "Indonesian" is here used to refer to the area now occupied by Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines, including Formosa, Marianas and the Palaw.

[4] FRANCISCO 1968: 227, *passim;* 1964: 5, 8, *passim.* "West Indonesia" includes the Greater Sunda and Malaya. For the Indian impact in this region, cf. COEDES 1948 and ZOETMULLER 1965.

Philippines. It thus leaves open the fundamental question of how to identify a loan word within a given Austronesian language. Indeed, Dr. Francisco appears to have given little attention, particularly in his dissertation,[5] to this basic methodological problem. One purpose of this paper is to give it at least an initial consideration. The more urgent one is to follow Dr. Francisco's cue on the more probable Austronesian or local character of Tavera's loan-words from Sanskrit, their examination through this language necessitating a thoroughly different competence or nature.

———

Of the Tag. "loan words" of Tavera which Dr. Francisco believes to have "no intermediate forms in either Malay or Javanese or both" and "may yet turn out to be Austronesian" (1968:   227), the following deserve further comment and/or study. For convenience, Dr. Francisco's orthography is respected — except for Malay and Indonesian where the conventional Bahasa Indonesia spelling has at least the merit of consistency. The asterisk placed before a given term marks it as a hypothetically constructed form.

ANITO. That this moneme is in form and content Austronesian is shown quite amply in a recent dissertation which traces its cognates throughout the Austronesian cultural domain, including Hawaii, New Zealand (with Chatham Island) and Madagascar (SALAZAR 1968). *Hantu* is of course the West Indonesian form of *Anito*, though its derivation from Sanskrit (mainly by Tavera) has long obscured the point. VAN DER TUUK (1862:   173-4 n.; 1825:   419), WILKEN (1885:   184), H. KERN (1886:   140, 204, *passim*), DUYVENDAK (1935:   154), etc. do not relate it to ANITO and its cognates. Though recognized as Austronesian, it appears to DEMPWOLFF as a "variant" (Nebenform) of the "extended form" *hanitu* of the Common Austronesian (henceforth "CA") prototype *nitu (1926:   48-9), later changed to *anitu (1934: 116; 1937:   122, 140; 1938:   16, 42). GONDA (1952:   322) rejects categorically its Sanskrit origin, maintaining that such a derivation has merely been encouraged by the fact that "*antu*" ("evil spirits, etc.") coexists in modern Javanese with the literary term "*antu*", which means "death" (from the Sanskrit "*hantu*" = "killing" which in Old Javanese takes the sense of "dying"). In a work written in collaboration with KRUIJT, ADRIANI (1951:   73 n. 17) considers the homographs (*h*)*antu* ("death") and (*h*)*antu* ("*spirit*") as one single "Austronesian" word descended from the Old Javanese *hantu*, which he translates as "dead, killed." Since the latter coexists with OJav. *anitu* (which he says denotes a prince who

———

terrorizes his subjects, hence "tyrant, despot"), ADRIANI derives both terms from a single "Austronesian" root.

The facts admit of a different interpretation. It is true that hanitu[6] exists in OJav., but JUYNBOLL (1923: 653) gives it the meaning "booze geesten" (malevolent spirits) while defining pinaka/hanitu "die als booze geesten zijn" (who are as the malevolent spirits) and hani-/hanitu "verschillende kwelgeesten" (which can be translated "diverse tormentors" or "diverse evil spirits"). As applied to ADRIANI's tyrannical prince, the OJav. term "anitu" (more properly "hanitu") was manifestly being used in a figurative way. As for OJav. hantu ("gestorven zijn" = to be dead), its Sanskrit origin is scarcely doubtful. One encounters it only in texts of a distinctly Indian inspiration. Whereas it appears with "hanitu" in JUYNBOLL's OJav. lexicon (1923: 653), it remains alone in the same author's glossary on the OJav. Rāmāyana (1902: 612). GONDA is therefore right in deriving modern literary Javanese "antu" (death) from the Sanskrit-derived OJav. word "hantu" (dying, dead, killing). Similarly, the modern Jav. ngoko and krama term "antu" in the sense of "malignant spirits" (FAVRE: vi, 6) may be said to come from OJav. "hanitu" (malevolent spirits), the "i" of the latter having probably disappeared through its treatment as a pepet within the framework of the disyllabic drift in Javanese monemes or through its assimilation with the Sanskrit-derived OJav. "hantu". The loss of "i" may also be implied from the palatalized "t" of "hentja", a term which the people of Bima (Sumbawa) use for "spirits, ghosts" (JONKER: 25). At any rate, the geographic distribution of "hantu" is complementary to that of "anito" and its cognates (SALAZAR: cf. map). It covers approximately the area successively under the intermediary "Indian" influence of the various empires founded by the Javanese and the Malays in the Insulinde. The "hantu" of the ethnic groups other than the latter may thus have come about through (a) the regular loss of the "i" in *hanitu; (b) the assimilation of *hanitu with the Sanskrit-derived hantu; (c) its confusion with Malayo-Javanese "hantu"; or (d) the simple diffusion of the latter form.

The form hantu ("spirit") as cognate of Tag. anito cannot therefore be used to derive the latter from Sanskrit. More fanciful than TAVERA's, R. A. KERN's etymological opinion concerning "anitu" (which Dr. Francisco cites to suggest the "probable" Austronesian character of Tag. "anito") may also be examined in this connection. The form "anditu" known to the Bada'-Toradja (Sulawesi) led R. KERN (1956: 5-7) to derive all the cognates of anito from a "preposition" *a-("in, on, at") and the prenasalized "demonstrative pronoun" *ditu, comparing the

---

[6] O Jav. distinguished between "a" and "ha.". In modern Jav., the "h" is mute, except between two vowels of the same phonetic value, if the second syllable is either open or closed by a nasal (VAN DER TUUK 1897: 1, 3; KILIAAN: 26).

resulting compound *anditu with the Sundanese "diditu" (yonder) where
"di-" supposedly corresponds to the *a- of *anditu. Its supposed seman-
tic extension to "ancestors, spirits" is explained by the parallel case of
Jav. "luluhur" ("ancestors)" which literally means "those who are above
(luhur)".

The major weakness of R. KERN's theory is that it presupposes the
diffusion of Austronesian *'anitu' from the area occupied by the Bada'-
Toradja. Furthermore, it has to explain from the Bada'-Toradja anditu
the implicit phonetic change in the cognate forms which range from
anu, nit, through aitu, elus, yaris, galid, to manitra, manitu, kenitu, (cf.
SALAZAR 1968). To begin with, it should elucidate the loss of "d" in
the "anitu" of the fraternal Bare'e-Toradja (ADRIANI 1928: 19) and
the fact that "anito" coexists in Tag. with "(n)anditu" or "naritu" (here,
right here), which corresponds to the hypothetical *anditu of KERN
(cf. Tag. na+ditu = nanditu or naritu, intervocalic —d— becoming —nd—
or —r—; KERN's construction *a—+ditu, with prenasalized —nd—). In
reality, Bada' —nd— is the equivalent in the same position of Bare'e
—n—. As for "diditu" and "luluhur", they are but examples of redu-
plication, a common phenomenon in Austronesian languages(cf., for
example, Malay-Indonesian dua "two", laki "male", dara "virgin, dam-
sel" beside Tag. dalawa, lalaki, dalaga). CA *'anitu' can be derived nei-
ther from an outside source (Sanskrit) nor from constituent elements
in Austronesian languages. It is an indivisible moneme expressive of
a fundamental Austronesian religious concept.

AWA "pity, compassion, mercy". Sanskrit avah "to defend, protect,
conserve" (Tavera) or "favour, help, comfort" (Francisco), presumed to
have given Tag. awa', may have an intervening form in Mal.-Indon.
awas "pay attention, be careful" (SUHADIONO-TESELKIN: 66; KA-
ROW-HILGERS-HESSE: 24; POERWADARMINTA-TEEUW: 22), but
the latter does not appear to be of Sanskrit origin. Neither does Tag.
awa', for that matter. It may be cognate to Mal.-Indon. hiba or iba
"touched, moved, sorrowful," iba kasihan signifying "pity, compassion"
(SUHADIONO: 288; KAROW: 130; POERWADARMINTA: 116).
In this regard, Mal.-Indon. heban "throw" (away) may be connected
with Tag. iwan "leave", Bikol giboh "work, do" with Tag. gawa' "work,
do". Common Indonesian *v is realized either as w or as b in the va-
rious languages (DEMPWOLFF 1934: 39). Aside from Tag. gawa'/
Bik. giboh, we may mention another set of Philippine examples of this
w/b alternance in Tag. puwet, Iloko ubet, Pangasinan obet, Pangasinan
obet and Bik. lubot, all indicating the human hind part. While Malay
normally reacts to CA *v with w, it can also respond with—b— (DEMP-
WOLFF 1937: 19, 27).

BAHAG-HARI "rainbow". It is without doubt a native compound particularly in the face of Tag. *bahag* "loincloth". The second element may well refer to the local term for "king", though the sense of its Mal.-Indon. homonyme ("sun, day") may also be involved. If Tag. *araw*, Bik. *aldaw* correspond linguistically to the latter (as Tavera suggests), then the *"hari"* in Tag. *bahag-hari* is Tag. *hari'*, Bik. *hadi'* (with glottal stop), both meaning "king". These may be related to Polynesian *hariki*, *ariki* ("king"), a fact which runs counter to Dr. Francisco's supposition (FRANCISCO 1964: 19) that *hari* comes from the Sanskrit *hari* "king, name of Indra, king of the celestials". The idea would indeed depart from his principle of intermediate forms. This is probably the reason why he translates Mal. *mata hari* "lit. eye of the king; fig. the sun" (*ibid.*). *Hari* means of course "day", the sun being figuratively the "eye of day." It is considered of Sanskrit origin by KAROW-HILGERS-HESSE (: 122).

DALUBHASA "interpreter" (Tavera), "expert" (Francisco). The word is of course not composed by *dala* ("carry") and *basa* ("read) as Tavera thinks. He is however right in relating it to Mal. *djurubhasa* (sic) and Pampanga *dulubhasa*, both meaning "interpreter". It is manifestly derived from Mal. *djuru bahasa*, lit. "expert in language" = "interpreter" (KAROW: 88; SUHADIONO: 202), the second term being Mal.-Indon. for "language, good manners" (KAROW: 26; POERWADARMINTA: 22). Tag. response to Mal.-Indon. *"dj—"* is generally *"d—"* (cf. Mal.-Indon. *djalan* "road", *djari* "finger", *djemput* "what one can take with the fingers", *djengkal* "measure from thumb tip to tip of second or middle finger" = Tag. *daan, daliri', damput, dangkal*), a phenomenon perceptible even in supposed loan words (cf. Sanskrit-derived Mal.-Indon. *djiwa* "soul, psyche, spirit" = Tag. *diwa'*). For DEMPWOLFF (1934: 43, 56), Tag. *d—* and *—r—* may come from either CA **d* or **dj*, the latter being palatalized "d". It is interesting that Tag. reacts to Mal.-Indon. *djarum* "needle" with *ka/rayum*, Bikol having simply *dagum*. Mal.-Indon. *—r—* provokes an *—l—* in Tag. (cf. Mal.-Indon. *berita* "news", *perak* "silver, *kurang* "less, need" = Tag. *balita', pilak, kulang*). DEMPWOLFF would say that Common Indonesian retroflex *l* produces *r* in Mal.-Indon. and *l* in Tag. (1934: 52; 1937: 28, 29). While *djuru* is native Mal.-Indon., *bahasa* comes from Sanskrit according to WILKENSON (I, 65). SUHADIONO (: 72) and KAROW (: 26-7) do not however ever mention its Sanskrit origin. Tag. *basa*, term through which Tavera derives *djurubhasa* from Sanskrit, comes from Mal.-Indon. *batja* "recitation, reading" which WILKINSON (I, 61) derives from Sanskrit.

DALAMPASIG "shore or bank of the sea or river". Tavera may be right in dividing the word into *dala* and *pasig*, with the intervening euphonic *m*. One can only approve his equation of *pasig* with Malay *pasir*, though this means "sand, **sandbank**" hence "sandy shore" (KA-

ROW: 279; SUHADIONO: 618). The correspondence $r=g$ follows the classic first Van der Tuuk law (DEMPWOLFF 1934: 54). *"Pasig"* does not seem to be a current Tag. word, though DYEN (: 8) mentions it with the meaning "beach", which would make it synonymous with *dalampasig*. However, it is apparently identical with the name of the famous Manila river. One may ask if it has not come to mean in Tag. simply "river". In this sense, the term *"dalampasig"* becomes self-explanatory: "that which is carried (*dala*) by the river" = "shore or bank." If *pasig* means "sand", *dalampasig* can be rendered "carried sand" (i.e., in contradistinction to "normal" sand). Dr. Francisco's doubts should be encouraged concerning *paamsu* "crumbling soil, dust, sand" and *paara* "shore, bank" as possible Sanskrit sources for Mal.-Indon. *pasir*, hence Tag. *pas'g*. Dubitative grace is normally destructive of faith in miracles, even of the linguistic variety.

MANA "heritage". Polynesian *manas* "spiritual power'", which Dr. Francisco gives in this connection, is more properly *mana*, a Pol. term found even in Melanesia. It was here that CODRINGTON (1891) picked it up to feed ethnological speculations on the earliest manifestations of religion for several decades (LEVI-STRAUSS 1960: xli-li). Analyzing its uses in the various Pol. dialects, HOCART concluded long ago that its "fundamental' meaning appears to be 'to come true' . . . 'response of spirits to prayer' ", *mana* being "almost invariably manifested in answer to a prayer or curse" (: 100). To HOGBIN, it is the help of the spirits for the obtention of "success". Its meanings in Fidji, Samoan, Maori turning around the idea of "power" or "the marvellous", H. KERN (1886, V, 53-4) relates Pol. *mana* to OJav. *wenang* "power", Mod. Jav. "powerful"; *menang* "conquer", Sumbanese *manang* "gain, win", Dayak *manang* "win". No linguistic objection can be made against H. KERN, since Common Indonesian *—ng* regularly becomes in Pol. and Mel. what DEMPWOLFF calls a "loose glottal stop" (1937: 129, 149, 171; 1934: 15), which is tantamount to its practical disappearance. It corresponds in effect to DYEN's CA "laryngeal"* —*h* (: 47-8). CAPELL mentions Tag. *mana* with Bare'e (Sulawesi) *mana* "inherited position or rank, quality of spirit or body that one has from one's forebears", but does not connect it either specifically to Pol. *mana* and its supposed cognates Jav. *menang* "power, might", Toba-Batak *monang* "power to gain or win, luck" and Sea-Dyak *manang* "medicine man or woman". Nevertheless, the concepts of "heritage", "win, gain" and "power, luck, success" appear to be sufficiently close. What one acquires from the spirits (cf. HOGBIN and HOCART) could be "heritage", "gain" and "luck" all at once. Magical power is generally "passed on" from generation to generation. In this sense, Tag. *mana* cannot be related to Sanksrit *mana* "to think, to believe", as Tavera supposed. As for Dr. Francisco's at-

maan (also Sanskrit) "inner soul, esssence", it would have to expand semantically (its phonetic reduction being left aside) to encompass Pol. *mana* — even in the sense that he takes it ("spiritual power, influence of the good").

PATIANAK "Evil spirit who delights in killing infants". The problem of its derivation is unnecessarily complicated by the reference of *pati* to Sanskrit *punth* "to strike, kill" (Tavera) or *puth* "to crush, kill, destroy" (Francisco). Its second element being easily identified as Common Indonesian for "child" (*anak*), the compound may be analyzed, through a more "indigenous" approach, as *patay-anak* ("killer of children") which becomes *patya-anak = patyanak =patianak* through metathesis. *Patay/matay* is CI and CA for "death, to die, to kill" (DEMP-WOLLF 1937: 23, 133, 153, *passim*), initial *m*— being "nasaler Ersatz" for *p*— (1934: 71-2, 88). Mal.-Indon. *punti-anak* and Roti *bunti-anak* are forms with prenasalized "t", both being probably loan words. As for Tag. and Bisaya *sang-putana-n* "gloom", the imaginative may extract it with Dr. Francisco from the Sanksrit *puutanaa* "a female demon which kills children or infants". The linguist would simply analyze it into *sang-putan-an* or *sangputan-an*, the post-fixed particle being quite an ordinary occurrence in Philippine and Indonesian languages. Moreover, the semantic gap between "gloom" and "female demon" would take some extra-linguistic goodwill to bridge.

Aside from the Mal. *puntianak*, the Tag. *patianak* has of course sisters all over Indonesia. In the island of Roti, the *buntianak* is a *nitu nisalalak* or spirit of one who has not been able to enjoy to the full his share of happiness in life. Soul of a woman who died in childbirth, the *buntianak* is beautiful but for her feet which resemble those of a horse and for a hole in her back (VAN DER KAM: 263, 269-72). She emasculates men and destroys the foetus in the mother's womb (RIEDEL 1889: 647). In Eastern Flores, she is called *kurung sanak* ("who confines children"). From a cave in the forest, she persecutes mothers and their children. She has a hollow back and often changes herself into a night bird (ARNDT 1951: 32). In Timor, the spirits of women who die in childbirth are classified by RIEDEL (1887: 279, 283) with those who fall in war as *nitu kanlekov*, "evil *nitu*". Also called "divine birds", they attack 1) men, because these are collectively responsible for their death and 2) parturient women, because these make good companions of misfortune. It is quite apparent that the *patianak* belongs to an Austronesian conception correlating one's behavior in afterlife to the relative "normality" of his death — i.e., whether or not this has shortened his allotted life or "happiness".

SI "particle placed before proper names of persons". Tavera furnishes himself the elements to an elementary proof that it is not linguistically

possible to derive Tag. *si* from Sanksrit *s'rii*. The latter, in the form of the "honorific" *seri*, coexists in Mal. with the "demonstrative prefix" *si* (WILKINSON, II, 1100), cognate of Tag. *si*. As cited by Dr. Francisco, Blake's supposition that Tag. response to Sanskrit *s'rii* would be *sal* is only partly true. In the first place, Tag. would not react here to Sanskrit *s'rii* itself, but to the derived Mal. form *seri*. In this case, Tag. would more properly emit *sali* — as Dr. Francisco rightly supposes but unwittingly rejects. The correspondence between Mal. —*r*— and Tag. —*l*— has already been explained in connection with Tag. *dalubhasa* (cf. *supra*). Whether Tag. has in effect the term "sali" remains to be seen. But Blake's equation of Sanskrit *s'raanta* to Tag. *salanta* must be abandoned in the face of the linguistic necessity to explain the latter from **sali-anta*, the form **sal* from Sanskrit *s'rii* being improbable in Tag. As for Tag. *si*, its indigenous character is more than evident in the fact that it enters into the oppositional classification of Tag. substantives into: 1) those that take only "*si*" and 2) those determined by "*ang*". This "nominative" dichotomy is carried into the "genetive-factitive" case opposing "*ni*" ($= n + i <$ (s)i) and "*ng*" (i.e. "*nang*" $= n + ang < ang$). In simpler terms, there is a correlation between the oppositions "*si* Juan $\neq$ *ang* bata'" and "(isip, inisip) *ni* Juan $\neq$ (laruan, nilaruan) *ng* bata'", "thought *of*, was thought *by* Juan $\neq$ plaything *of*, was played *by* the child". If Tag. morphology itself does not suffice to free Tag. *si* from conscription into Sanskrit, the fact may be invoked that it is simply the Tag. response to Common Indonesian *t'i*, determinants for nomina propia as reconstructed by DEMPWOLFF (1934: 118; 1937: 26).

ULABISA "venomous snake". Tavera's division of the term into Mal. *ular* + *bisa* is acceptable. Meaning "poison" in Mal.-Indon., the latter term appears to be Sanskrit to neither WILKINSON (I, 145) nor KAROW (: 50). The Mal.-Indon. term for "snake" is not *ulara'* as Dr. Francisco writes, but *ular* as Tavera rightly knew. No scholar other than the latter seems to have bestowed upon it the honor of Sanskrit-hood. In this connection, Iloko *udang* "shrimp" is not, as Dr. Francisco supposes, related to Mal. *ular*, since Mal-Indon. has, beside *ular* "snake", the term *udang* "shrimp" (SUHADIONO: 1028, 1031; KAROW: 467, 469).

Our discussion shows that the derivation from Sanskrit of Tag. words may be adequately refuted through the latter's identification as CI or CA cognates. As yet not quite at home in Austronesian linguistics, Dr. Francisco engages sparingly in this endeavour. As a matter of fact, he frequently cites as evidence of a Tag. (FRANCISCO 1968: 227, *passim*) or Phil (1964: 5, 10, *passim*) term's non-Sanskrit origin the absence of a corresponding West Indonesian "intermediate form." While the former point of view is at least a negative criterion in the problem of borrow-

ing, the latter does not constitute one at all. In either way, however, the basic problem of how to identify a Sanskrit loan word is left untouched. This, of course, could only be examined within the larger context of linguistic borrowing.

Borrowing is essentially a relation between *two and only two languages,* the donor and the recipient. Plurilateral or even circular borrowing among several languages is conceivable, but it can only obtain linguistic pertinence if its analysis is restricted to bilateral relations. If English *sugar* may be traced ultimately to an Indian dialectal cognate of Sansk. *çakarra* and Pers. *shakar* through the "intermediate forms" Arab *zukker,* Ital. zucchero and finally Old French *suchre* (= Mod. *sucre*), its relation to the latter is the only linguistically relevant — precisely as relevant as that which obtains between Old French *zuchre* and Ital. *zucchero* and between this and Arab *zukker.* Each form is a linguistic response to a stimulus through close contact with another language. In the same way English i/n/t/e/l/i/ɟ/e/n/s, German i/n/t/e/l/i/g/e/n/ts (Intelligenz) and Russian i/n/t/e/l/i/gy/e/n/ts/i/ya, as individual reactions of different languages to French E͡/t/e/l/i/Ƶ/a/s (intelligence), can only be related *singly* to the latter, their "source", and not to one another as "loan words". They thus differ fundamentally from "cognates" which, through their interrelation, point collectively to a common diachronic "source". While "cognates" theoretically result from phonetic change in a common parent language (proto-language), "loan words" are the phonemic and/or morphological reactions of any language to one or several usually contemporary languages.

The relation between the donor and the recipient languages is *unidirectional* — i.e., the latter is the active pole, in the sense that it is the one affected by the borrowing process. As a closely knit system, it reacts and adjusts to the entry of extraneous but needed elements. If it returns loan words to a donor language, this simply acquires the function of a recipient tongue and becomes in turn the focus of the unidirectional relation. When English *flirt* and *budget,* derived from French *fleurette* and *bougette* ("small bag"), re-entered French, both were received just like any other English word and did not recover their ancient phonetic shapes in French. Borrowing is a bilateral, uni-directional, *irreversible* relation starting and terminating in a recipient linguistic system.

The problem of borrowing must therefore be studied within the context of one language in so far as this has bilateral loan relations with other languages. We know that a language borrows from another either directly or indirectly. In the latter way, it reacts through a calque which, by extracting the semantic content of a foreign term, avoids importing its phonetic form (cf. French *coup d'etat* = Germ.*Staatsstreich,*

Dutch *staatsgreep;* Span. *sin verguenza* = Tag. *walang hiya'*, Bik. *daing supog;* humoristically, Eng. *kickback* = Tag. *tadyak sa likod*).   In directly borrowing foreign words, a language may react by deforming them morphologically through popular etymology (cf. Eng. *country dance,* (game of) *Aunt Sally* = Fr. *contre-danse* and (jeu de) *l'âne salé*), by recasting them to its phonemic-morphological structure (cf. Eng. *blackball* = Tag. *bulakbol;* Span. *sombrero* = dialectal Tag. *sambalilo;* Span. *jugar, casar* = Tag. *sugal, kasal*) or by accepting certain phonemic-morphological modifications itself (Span. *crimen, sombrero* = Tag. *krimen, sombrero*).

These rapid remarks on linguistic borrowing should make clear two points which may be raised against recurrent attempts to discover Sanskrit terms in Tag. and other Phil. languages. The first one is that the study of loan words cannot be meaningfully undertaken within the framework of a supposed donor language, for the simple reason that borrowing is a linguistic event engendered in each individual recipient language, unrelated to similar ones in other individual recipient languages. The donor language is always passive and can have no influence on the forms it parts with. Phonemic and/or morphological responses to borrowing can be expected and their configuration predicted *solely* in the context of the recipient language and not in that of the donor. The study of *known* Sanskrit loan words in Phil. languages cannot therefore yield anything meaningful in linguistics, except in so far as they relate individually to the recipient languages. Moreover, the *known* Sansk. loan words are taken to be so because they are West Indon. forms previously considered to have derived from Sansk. It is quite evident that the recipient Phil. languages may individually or collectively have as donor or donors any of the West Indon. languages — if, indeed, not one or several of themselves. The recipient languages would therefore be reacting to these West Indon. or local languages. In this sense, Sanskrit is quite irrelevant to the problem of linguistic borrowing in Phil. languages. A similar inference may be made concerning its importance in culture contacts, since the Sanskrit-derived West Indon. forms may be said to have undergone a parallel semantic acclimation previous to their entry into the Phil. cultural milieu.

The second point is corollary to the first. Any study of borrowing should be based on the recipient language, should be nourished by a less desultory knowledge of its phonemic and morphemic mechanisms. A special acquaintance with the donor language is also necessary but not of decisive import, since borrowing is a multiplicity of bilateral relations converging on the recipient language. All this should of course discourage precipitate attempts to encompass all Phil. languages in any

study of borrowing — more particularly, if this takes as a frame of reference a supposed omni-donor language such as Sansk.

The recipient language is central to the study of linguistic borrowing because it is there and not through a supposed donor language that loan words can be identified. In fact, the existence of loan words is basic to any language, the rest of the vocabulary being either "cognates" or linguistic "inventions". This implies that whatever cannot be attached to forms in parent languages or identified as elaborated elements of the language concerned can be considered as virtual "loan words". Theoretically, "cognate" and "developed" forms fit into the phonemic and morphological patterns of the language, whereas "loan words" would tend to be less integrated — i.e., would constitute irregularities in the system. In practice, "invented" forms and "loan words" may be difficult to distinguish. In this case, two expedients, however unreliable, are available to decide the issue — namely, documentary evidence of borrowing if any and the speakers' sentiment concerning the "extraneousness" of the forms. The virtual "loan words" (including doubtful cases) can subsequently be matched with possible "sources" from probable donor languages which are determined through their historical contact, geographic proximity, etc. with the recipient language. There must be regular phonetic correspondence and semantic similarity between the "loan words" and their "sources" from one particular donor language. Irregular forms may be due to the different periods in which they were borrowed.

Such a method to identify loan words, though ideally conceived, could be used to discover if some Tag. and (by the same token) other Phil. terms derive in effect from Sanskrit and not just from Sansk.-borrowed West Indon. forms. The endeavour is of course enough to cool the ardour of many an enthusiast.

―――――――

Tavera's derivation of certain Tag. terms from Sansk. loses linguistic sense in the face of their identification as CI or CA cognates. In his "Notes" and in his doctoral dissertation, Dr. Francisco prefers to this method those of (1) rebuttal through his own special analysis of the presumed Sanskrit "sources" and (2) appeal to "intermediate forms" in West Indonesia. The last implies that the Tag. and Phil. "loan words" treated by Tavera and Dr. Francisco a priori do not derive directly from Sansk. Which would mean that the latter language is irrelevant to the problem of linguistic borrowing in the Philippines. This was left aside by Dr. Francisco, despite its methodological importance as a basis to his dissertation. A preliminary approach to the problem has therefore been sketched. Borrowing is seen to be analyzable only within the context of the recipient language, the donor being the passive element.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

ADRIANI, N.
>   1928   *Bare'e-Nederlandsch woordenboek. Met Nederlandsch-Bare'e register.*
>   Leiden: E. J. Brill, xv, 1074 pp.

ADRIANI, N. and Alb. KRUIJT.
>   1951   *De Bare'e-sprekende Toradjas van Midden-Celebes (Oost Toradjas).*
>   Amsterdam: Noordhollandsch Uitgeversmij., II, viii, 557 pp.

ARNDT, P.
>   1951   *Religion auf Ostflores, Adonare und Solor. Wien-Moedling:* Mis-
>   sionsdruckerei St. Gabriel, xxvii, 248 pp. map.

CAPELL, A.
>   1938   "The word 'mana': a linguistic study," *Oceania,* IX (1938), 89-96.

CODRINGTON, R. H.
>   1891   *The Melanesians. Studies in their Anthropology and Folklore.* Oxford:
>   University Press, xv, 419 pp.

COEDES, Georges.
>   1948   *Les états hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie.* Paris: E. Broc-
>   card, xii, 466 pp. maps, tabls.
>   1962   *Les peuples de la Péninsule Indochinoise.* Paris: Dunod, iii, 228
>   pp. plates.

DEMPWOLFF, Otto.
>   1926   "Worte für 'Seele' u. dgl. in einigen Südsee-Sprachen," *Folia Ethno-
>   Glossica,* II, iii-iv, 42-53.
>   1934   *Induktiver Aufbau einer Indonesischen Ursprache.* Berlin: Dietrich
>   Reimer, 124 pp.
>   1937   *Deduktive Anwendung des Urindonesischen auf Austronesischen Ein-
>   zelsprachen.* Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 194 pp.
>   1938   *Austronesisches Woerterverzeichnis.* Berlin: Dietrich Reimer, 192 pp.

DUYVENDAK, J. P.
>   1935   *Inleiding tot de ethnologie van de Indische Archipel.* Groningen:
>   J. B. Wolters, 201 pp.

DYEN, Isidore.
>   1953   *The Proto-Malayo-Polynesian Laryngeals.* Baltimore: Linguistic So-
>   ciety of America, viii, 65 pp.

FAVRE l'Abbe P.
>   1870   *Dictionnaire javanais-français.* Vienne: Imprimerie impériale et royale,
>   viii, 546 pp.

FRANCISCO, Juan.
>   1964   *Indian Influence in the Philippines with Special Reference to Lang-
>   uage and Literature.* Diliman: University of the Philippines, xxviii,
>   310 pp.
>   1967-8 "Foreign elements in the Philippine Folk Literature". Reprint from
>   *Brahmavidya:* The Adyan Library Bulletin, XXXI-XXXII, 450-71.
>   1968   "Further Notes on Pardo de Tavera's 'El Sanscrito en la lengua
>   Tagalog'," *Asian Studies,* VI, ii (Aug. 1968), 223-34.

GONDA, J.
>   1952   *Sanskrit in Indonesia.* Nagpur: W. P. Djha, xxix, 456 pp.

HOCART, A. M.
>   1914   "Mana," *Man,* VI, 97-101.

HOGBIN, H. Ian.
    1936   "Mana," *Oceania,* VI, 241-74.
JONKER, J.
    1896   *Bimaneesch-Hollandsch Woordenboek.* Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 134
            pp.
JUYNBOLL, H. H.
    1902   *Kawi-Balineesch-Nederlandsch Glossarium op het oudjavaansch Râmâ-*
            yana. 's-Gravenhaag: Martinus Nijhoff, vi, 644 pp.
    1923   *Oudjavaansch-Nederlandsch Woordenlijst.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, xi, 685
            pp.
KAM, E. E. van der.
    1935   "De heidensche godsdienst der Rotineezen," *Koloniaal Tijdschrift,*
            XXIV, 248-76.
KAROW, Otto and Irene HILGERS-HESSE.
    1962   *Indonesisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch. Kamus Bahasa Indonesia-Djer-*
            man. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, xix, 483 pp.
KERN, H.
    1886   *De Fidji-taal vergeleken met hare verwanten in Indonesië en Poly-*
            nesië. Amsterdam: Johannes Muller, ii, 242 pp. Also *in: Verspreide*
            Geschriften, IV, 243-343; V, 1-141.
KERN, Rudolf A.
    1956   "Anitu," *Journal of Austronesian Studies,* I, 2, pp. 5-7.
KILIAAN, H. N.
    1919   *Javaansche Spraakkunst.* 's-Gravenhaag: Martinus Nijhoff, xxxi, 368
            pp.
LEVI-STRAUSS, Claude.
    1960   "Introduction à l'oeuvre de Marcel Mauss," *in* Marcel Mauss, *Socio-*
            logie et Anthropologie. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, pp.
            ix-lii.
POERWADARMINTA, W. J. S. and A. TEEUW.
    1952   *Indonesisch-Nederlands Woordenboek.* Djakarta: J. B. Wolters, xiv,
            383 pp.
RIEDEL, J. G. F.
    1887   "Die Landschaft Dawan oder West-Timor," *Deutsche Geographische*
            Blätter (Bremen), X, iii, 228-36; iv, 278-87.
    1889   "Note sur l'île Rote," *Compte-rendu du IVè Congres des Sciences*
            Geographiques tenu a Paris en 1889, t. I, Annexe 1, pp. 646 *et seq.*
SALAZAR, Z. A.
    1968   *Le concept AC * *anitu* dans le monde austronésien: vers l'étude*
            comparative des religions ethniques austronésiennes. Ms. dissertation
            defended on May 20, 1968 at the Sorbonne (Université de Paris),
            310 pp. maps, tabl.
SUHADIONO and A. S. TESELKIN.
    1961   *Kamus Bahasa Indonesia-Rusia.* Moskow: Badan Negara Penerbit
            Kamus-kamus Bahasa Asing dan Nasional, 1172 pp.
TUUK, H. N. van der.
    1862   *Taalkundige aanteekeningen en Bladwijzer, vertaalde stukken en In-*
            houdsopgave tot de drie stukken van het "Bataksche Leesboek".
            Amsterdam: F. Muller, 222 pp.
    1865   "Outlines of a Grammar of the Malagasy Language," *Journal of the*
            Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, I (n. s.), 419-46.

1897 . *Kawi-Balineesch-Nederlandsch woordenboek,* vol. I. Batavia: Lands-
drukkerij, iv, 831 pp.

WILKEN, G. A.
1885 *Het animisme bij de volken van den Indischen Archipel, in: De Vers-
preide Geschriften,* III, 1-289. Originally published in *De Indische
Gids* (Amsterdam), V, i, 925-1000; ii, 19-100; VII, i, 13-58, 191-242.

WILKINSON, R. J.
1957 *A Malay-English Dictionary* (Romanized). London: MacMillan Co.,
Part I (A-K), Part II (L-Z).

ZOETMULLER, Piet.
1965 "Die Hochreligionen Indonesiens," *in* Stöhr, Waldemar and Piet
Zoetmuller, *Die Religionen Indonesiens.* Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer,
pp. 223-354.