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Integration, or assimilation, of foreign words implies their adaptation to the rules of the recipient language. The present paper is an analysis of the Tagalog main strategies in morphological assimilation of its numerous borrowings from Sanskrit, Malay, Chinese, Spanish, English, etc. The following aspects will be examined:

- Use of ‘phonological citations’ as the least adopted borrowings:
  ‘phonological citations’ are unassimilated borrowings used in the recipient language in their original form. However, Tagalog tends to partially bring them into accord with its morphological rules;

- Simplification of borrowings and their use as roots: Borrowings are usually simplified in Tagalog, i.e. become morphologically indivisible, and are used as root words, with the following derivation according to the Tagalog rules;

- Annulment of borrowings’ grammatical characteristics. Gender and Number: Special Case: Borrowings are adopted as indivisible root words, with all their grammatical characteristics annulled. However, with more and more borrowings adopted, Tagalog speakers began to distinguish such grammatical categories as gender and number in their loanwords;

- Wrong interpretation of borrowings’ morphemic structure:
  Due to differences between the donor’s and recipient’s morphological systems the borrowings may undergo a hypercorrection (wrong interpretation) of their morphemic structure: word combinations become merged; some elements are regarded as native and omitted;

- Hybridization of borrowings during their assimilation:
  While adopting a borrowing Tagalog may replace some part of it with the native lexical material, thus making a hybrid loanword. Here the problem of early hybrid loans will be discussed.

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Arab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hok</td>
<td>Hokkien Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jav</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal</td>
<td>Malay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mex-Sp</td>
<td>Mexican Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skt</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cf.</td>
<td>compare (with)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coll</td>
<td>colloquial (word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g.</td>
<td>for example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem.</td>
<td>feminine (gender)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As Uriel Weinreich rightly pointed out in his fundamental work ‘Languages in Contact’, an interesting point about a language is the phonetic, grammatical, semantic and stylistic integration of foreign elements into it (Weinreich 1966: 12). Integration, or assimilation of foreign elements is their adaptation to the norms and needs of the recipient language. Following the general patterns of this integration, many borrowings from Chinese, Sanskrit, Malay, Arab, Spanish, English and other languages undergo phonetic, semantic and morphological assimilation in the Tagalog language.

In the present paper I shall attempt to analyze the main strategies of the morphological assimilation of different borrowings in Tagalog, i.e. their adaptation to the grammar rules and word-building patterns of the recipient.

I. UNASSIMILATED BORROWINGS

1.1. Use of unassimilated borrowings (‘phonological citations’).

UNASSIMILATED LOANWORDS, or so-called ‘phonological citations’ (Weinreich’s term) keep intact their original phonetic, semantic and even graphic appearance in the recipient language. In Tagalog this group is mostly represented with recent borrowings from Spanish and English. Nowadays unassimilated loanwords are widespread in Tagalog, due to the domination of Spanish in the past and the mass English-Tagalog bilingualism at present. Noteworthy, the use of a Spanish or English unassimilated borrowing does not necessarily imply the lack of the native equivalent, e.g.:

*bigyán ng oportunidad* [< Sp oportunidad ‘opportunity’] ‘to give smb opportunity’ instead of Tag *pagkakataón* ‘chance; opportunity’,
maglaán ng target [<Eng target>] ‘to set as an object’ instead of Tag layunin ‘purpose, aim’ or patamaan ‘target’.

There are quite a number of Spanish borrowings, which have been adopted unassimilated as they belong to onomastical lexica - personal and geographical names, for example:

*Jose Rizal* – personal name, read as /Hose Risa/, according to the rules for the Spanish letters ‘j’ and ‘z’, which do not exist in the Tagalog alphabet,

*Peñafrancia* – geographical name, read as /Penyafransya/, no ‘ñ’, ‘f’ or ‘c’ in Tagalog,

also – Aquino, Lopez, Teofilo; Vigan, Davao, Zamboanga, and many others.

There are also plenty of English unassimilated borrowings in the modern Tagalog. They are abundant in newspapers and printings, where they are often marked with italics (thus corroborating the term ‘phonological citations’), e.g.:

‘Nilusob ang tirahan ng mga illegal workers’ – ‘Illegal workers’ house was raided’,

‘Hinihinalang isa na naman itong anyo ng religious clash…’ – ‘It is supposed to be another form of religious clash…’.

1.2. Morphological adaptation of the unassimilated borrowings.

The peculiarity of ‘phonological citations’ in Tagalog is that regardless of being UNASSIMILATED they still may be embedded into the Tagalog morphological system, i.e. may act in speech as root words in accordance with the Tagalog syntax rules; or as roots taking over the Tagalog prefixes. It is noteworthy that even in such cases Tagalog speakers usually handle them as FOREIGN WORDS, either italicizing them in the text, or putting a hyphen between the unassimilated root and the Tagalog prefix used with it:

*Nag-withdraw siy kahapon.* - ‘He/she withdrew yesterday’,

*Naka-attach ditto ang litrato ko.* - ‘My photo is attached here’,

*Naki-pose na lang siya sa mga Pinay.* – ‘He was just posing in front of the Philippine girls’;

*Laging rude siya sa akin.* – ‘He is always rude with me’,

*Miss na miss kita.* – ‘I’m missing you much’.

The MORPHOLOGICAL assimilation of the loanwords, which still remain unassimilated graphically, semantically and phonetically, is perfectly represented by such derived borrowings as verbal nouns or conjugated forms of the Tagalog verbs. The Present and Future Tenses of Tagalog verbs, as well as the verbal nouns are formed with help of the reduplication of the root’s first syllable, e.g.: lutuin ‘to be cooked’ > niluluto ‘is being cooked’, lulutuin ‘will be
cooked’; magtanggol ‘to defend’ > pagtanggol ‘defending, defense’. The borrowed unassimilated roots are handled accordingly to this general Tagalog rule. However the REDUPLICATED part of their first syllable becomes assimilated (changing its phonetic and graphic appearance where needed, to fit the Tagalog alphabet and phonological system), while the root itself remains UNASSIMILATED and is often separated from the assimilated part with a hyphen:

Magko-concert siya sa Cyprus – ‘He will give a concert in Cyprus’,

Para kaming nata-transform sa ibang mundo – ‘We are as if transformed to another world’;

Mahirap ang pagdodraw-up ng project – ‘Drawing up a project is difficult’,

Malayò pa ang pagga-graduate niya sa Universidad.– ‘His University graduation is still far’

Such a large-scale incorporation of unassimilated borrowings into Tagalog is maintained and increased by the widespread LANGUAGE MIXING, or CODE-SWITCHING, which has become common in the everyday colloquial language of educated Filipinos with the expansion of the English language in the Archipelago (see e.g. Pascasio 2004: 73-75). There are plenty of unassimilated borrowings and even their abbreviations used in the so-called ‘Mix-Mix language’, which was so well described by David Zorc (Zorc 1990), e.g.:

kilig to the bones – ‘overjoyed’ (lit. ‘tremble to the bones’)  
kadiri to death – ‘gross, coarse’ (lit. ‘loathing to death’);  
b.f. – boy friend,  
d.o.m.- dirty old man,  
o.a. – over-acting, over-reaction.

II. ASSIMILATION

2.1. Simplification of borrowings.

Tagalog pertains to agglutinative languages and is notable for its manifold morphological system, which includes such word-building methods as affixation, reduplication, word compounding, full duplication, and morphophonemics. Being assimilated by Tagalog, borrowed words or word-and-particle combinations usually undergo SIMPLIFICATION, i.e. become INDIVISIBLE monomorphemic words used by the recipient as roots or root words in full accordance with its morphological rules:

Skt dhṛta ‘to bear; to endure’ > Tag dalitā ‘extreme poverty; torment’ > karālitān ‘extreme poverty or misery’,

Mal. darat-an ‘continent; land’ (from darat ‘land; highland’) > Tag dalatan ‘cultivated highland’,
Mal barat laut ‘North-West; North-Western wind’ > Tag balaklaoi ‘North-Western wind or monsoon’,

Ar hikay’at ‘preach, parable, legend’ > Tag hikayat ‘persuasion’ > hikayât ‘persuaded’, hikayatin ‘to persuade’,

Ar sharbat ‘drink’ > Mal sērbat ‘ginger tea’, Tag salabát ‘ginger tea’, magsalabát ‘to prepare or drink ginger tea’,

Sp en paz ‘in peace’ > Tag impás ‘settled’, mag-impás ‘to settle smth’,

Eng (to) stand by > Tag istambáy ‘to stand by, to idle’.

Noteworthy, a considerable number of the loanwords, mostly early borrowed, which then underwent derivation, are preserved by the modern Tagalog only in their ‘FROZEN’ DERIVED forms. The following words are examples of the simplification of borrowings derived in various ways:

- REduplication (of the first syllable of a stem)
  Skt yūpa ‘sacrificial column / pole’ > Tag yupapà ‘submission, resignation; to prostrate oneself’,
  Mal alĕh ‘to move, to replace; to change’ > Tag halili (with methasesis of the final -h?) ‘substitute; alternative’,
  Mal jari ‘finger on hand / foot’ > Tag da-li-rì (with interchange of l/r) ‘finger on hand / foot’;

- Duplication (full stem / word reduplication)
  Ch giet (scorpion) - à thâng (insect), scorpion > Tag atang-atang ‘scorpion’,
  Ch kut ‘to dig, excavate’ > Tag kutkót ‘to dig; to scrape’,
  Skt gala ‘resin; pitch’ > Mal gala, galagala ‘to pitch, calk’, Tag galagalà ‘resin, pitch; calker’,
  Skt guna ‘quality’ > Mal guna ‘advantage, benefit’ > Tag gunigunahin ‘to take advantage, opportunity’,
  Skt muni ‘sage, ascetic’ > Tag magmunimuni ‘to contemplate, meditate’;

- Affixation
  Ch ul (on the account of) –li ‘for smb’s sake / benefit; stimulated by interest / profit’ > Tag archaic wili ‘appreciation, fondness, enjoyment’ > kawilihán, pagkáwili ‘pleasant interest in smth; enjoyment’; kawili-wili ‘pleasant, amusing’,
  Skt aga ‘sun’ > Tag maaga ‘early’, umaga ‘morning’, agahan ‘breakfast’,
  Skt rahasya ‘secret’ > Tag archaic rahuyò ‘charm, attraction; persuasion’ > marahuyò ‘to be attracted; to be persuaded / induced’,
  Mex-Sp ciruelas ‘plums’ > Tag sinigwelas ‘plum’ (with r>g shift).
Among such ‘frozen’ derivations we may find simplified loanwords with the now NON-PRODUCTIVE affixes:

- Ch čhái (money) –pi (any monetary unit) ‘money’ > Tag salápí ‘money’;
- Skt samúha ‘collection; community’ > Tag *salamuhà > makisalamuhà ‘to mingle / mix with people’;
- Ch ió (to move, shake, balance) -pái (to limp; to stagger) ‘to shake, balance’ > Tag bayubay ‘hanging, dangling’;
- Jav angut ‘ravings, nightmare’ > Tag banguítngót (with elision of the initial ‘a’ and duplication?) ‘nightmare’;
- Mal lisah ‘restless; anxious’ > Tag balisa ‘anxiety; restlessness’;
- Ch pai ‘to decay, weaken; destroy’ > Tag lupaypáy (with duplication) ‘prostrate; weak; languid’.

2.2. Annulment of grammatical characteristics. Gender and Number: special case.

As shown above, even late borrowings (Spanish and English) are mostly assimilated as simplified root-words grammatically close to nouns or adjectives, irrespective of their original grammatical characteristics and forms. For example, the Spanish atado ‘tied into a bundle’ is clearly derived from the verb atar ‘to tie’, but Tagalog adopts atado as a noun meaning ‘bundle (of things to be sold)’ and then forms the verb ataduhin ‘tie into a bundle’ on the basis of this borrowed form.

- Sp casar ‘to merry’ > Tag kasál ‘marriage’ (cf. Sp boda ‘marriage’), ikasál ‘to merry’;
- Sp jugar ‘to play’ > Tag sugál ‘gamble’ > manunugál ‘gamblers’;
- Sp Vale! ‘That’ll do!; All right!’ (verb in the 3rd person singular, from valer ‘to cost, value; to fit’) > Tag bale ‘worth; promissory note, credit’, bumale ‘to buy smth on credit’, Hindî bale! ‘It doesn’t matter; Never mind!’ (lit. ‘not worthy’);
- Eng to hold-up > Tag holdapín ‘to hold-up, to rob’;
- Eng recording (gerund) > Tag rekording ‘smth. recorded’ > pagrekording ‘recording’.

There is no grammatical category of Gender or Number in Tagalog. Consequently, distinguishing these categories in borrowed words was difficult even for those Filipinos who were acquainted with the donor language. Due to this fact borrowings were usually adopted in the forms, which were most frequently used by the donor language speakers in the Philippines. Thus, some of the Spanish loanwords may be first assimilated in the feminine gender: e.g. guapa ‘beautiful; well-dressed (fem)’, nerbyosa ‘nervous (fem)’. According to Keith Whinnom Spaniards used such kind of
adjectives more frequently in relation to ladies (e.g. Sp *esta mujer nerviosa* ‘this nervous woman’), which resulted in the preservation of the feminine forms in Tagalog [Whinnom 1956: 30]. The Tagalog tendency to assimilate borrowings in any grammatical forms (e.g. *gasta* ‘expense’ < Sp *gastar* ‘to spend’ and *gastos* ‘expense’ < Sp *gastos* ‘expenses’) is well presented in the Tagalog-Spanish creolized languages. For instance, the definite article in these dialects has only one universal form – e.g., in the so-called Ermitaño
the Spanish masculine form *el* was used instead of all the others (*la, los, las*), while the possessive pronoun *su* meant both ‘his/her’ and ‘their or your’ (instead of the original Spanish plural form *sus*) [*Ibid*: 28-29].

Plural in Tagalog is usually denoted through lexical means, i.e. through the addition of particle *mga*: *tao* ‘a person’ - *mga tao* ‘people’. Due to the lack of Number grammatical category Tagalog could assimilate borrowings either in singular or in plural form, with their following use as *singular*. In many cases the choice of the plural form of a loanword was caused by its frequent use in this form by the native speakers of the donor language (e.g., names of PAIRED objects):

Sp *bolsicos* ‘small bags / purses hanged on the dress’ > Tag *bolsikos/bolsikot* archaic ‘a small sack on the dress; a deep pocket of woman’s skirt’,
Sp *botones* ‘buttons’ > Tag *bitones* ‘a button’,
Sp *pliegues* ‘folds, pleats, bends’ > Tag *pileges / pleges* ‘a fold, bend’,
Sp *vozes* ‘voices’ >Tag *boses* ‘a voice’,
Sp *zapatos* ‘shoes’ >Tag *sapatos* ‘a shoe / shoes’,
Eng *buys* > Tag *bays* ‘a buy’,
Eng *fights* > Tag *paits* ‘a fight’.

At the first stages of borrowing from Spanish a form of a loanword denoting a creature, once chosen, was used to nominate both masculine and feminine. However, with adoption of more and more Spanish loanwords of the type, the patterns of use have gradually changed. At present we may assert that within the system of the modern Tagalog a certain GRAMMATICAL SUB-SYSTEM OF BORROWINGS exists, which includes the grammatical categories of gender and number. Thus some of the borrowings, which might be originally adopted in either feminine or masculine, are now given their ‘pairs’, even if there is no such form in the donor language:

*alumno / alumna* ‘graduated from a college (masc/fem)’ [ < Sp *alumno* ‘pupil’],

*burdador / burdadera* ‘embroiderer (masc/fem)’ [ < Sp *bordar* ‘to embroider’],
Such reverse influence of the assimilated borrowings upon the recipient language refers to the phenomenon of interference, i.e. to the post-assimilation processes. Another result of the interference is that many Filipinos can often distinguish singular and plural forms of borrowings. For instance, there already exist in Tagalog such pairs of loanwords as plor – plores ‘a flower – flowers’ [<Sp flor, flores]. Moreover, some borrowings get re-analyzed as containing ‘s’ denoting plural form, so their quazy-singular forms are created by omitting the final –s, e.g.:

Eng age > Tag eids > eid ‘age’; Eng overall > Tag oberól ‘loose trousers worn over clothes to keep them clean’.

2.3. Wrong interpretation.

Due to the difference between the grammatical systems of Tagalog and its donor languages, the assimilation of loanwords may involve wrong interpretation (hypercorrection) of a borrowing’s morphemic structure by the Tagalog speakers.

As a result of the above-mentioned simplification an original word combination is often taken as a single word:

Mal juru bahasa ‘language specialist, interpreter’ > Tag dalubhasà ‘specialist, expert’,
Mal lépas tangan ‘free hand’ > Tag lapastangan ‘irreverent, disrespectful; sacrilegious’,
Mal tengah hari ‘midday, noon’ > Tag tanghali ‘midday, noon’,
Sp ¿Cómo está? ‘How are you’ > Tag Kumustà? ‘Hello!’, ‘How are you?’,
Eng (to) cut short, a short cut > Tag syor(t)kat ‘short cut (of a way), magsyorkat ‘to cut (way) short’.

Part of a loanword may be mistaken as a native Tagalog morpheme (on the account of their sound similarity). Thus, while

1 About interference in Tagalog see e.g. my paper [Baklanova 2004].
assimilating Skt nirgundī ‘plant Vitex negundo’ Tagalog omitted the initial ni- and adopted the word as lagundi ‘plant Vitex trifoliata/Vitex repens’. In my opinion, it may be accounted for the wrong interpretation by the Tagalog speakers of ni- as their native affix -in-, which changes into the prefix ni- before the initial l or y (lipatin – nilipat, yari - niyari). Thus: Skt nirgundī > Tag *nilagundi > lagundi. Other possible examples of the wrong interpretation (hypercorrection) of borrowings in Tagalog are:

Skt parīśṣā ‘to examine, to investigate, to check’ > *līgsā ² ‘test, quiz’, palīgsahan ‘competition; concurrence’ (pa- misinterpreted as the Tagalog causative prefix),

Mal pontianak ‘spirit of a dead pregnant woman’ > Tag patianak / tianák ‘evil spirit’;

Skt parībhoga ‘application, use, consumption’ > Tag alibughā old ‘irresponsible; wasteful, prodigal’ (the initial pari- might be mistaken as the Tagalog old prefix ali-, as in Tag ali-walas ‘spacious’, ali-taptáp ‘moth’),

Skt parīṛṣṭa ‘investigation, interrogation, examination’ > Tag alipustā ‘despised and maltreated; taunt, insult; low’ [Verstraelen 1962: 828]. The same pattern of hypercorrection may also account for the changes in some Sanskrit borrowings to Malay: Skt pārīpati ‘dove’ ?> Mal *perpati or merpati (could the Sanskrit par- be misinterpreted as the Malay prefixes per- or me-?) ‘tame pigeon’ - cf. Tag kalapati; Skt drohaka ‘injustice; harm; treachery’ > Mal dērha (was the change caused by the sound analogy with the Malay prefixes ter-, ber-, per-?) ‘treacherous; treason’ - cf. Tag dulūhakā old ‘to misinterpret; treacherous’.

Ch kā (watery) –lok-lok (very watery; softened; doughy) > Tag luglóg ‘kind of pansit – the noodles are cooked by plunging into water; to rinse with clear water’ (ka- might be mistaken as the Tagalog prefix);

Sp limosna ‘alms, charity’ > Tag limōs ‘alms, charity; allowances; grant’ (na might be misinterpreted as the Tagalog ligature na/ŋ);

Mex-Sp zaquisamé ‘loft, upper floor’ > Tag * sakisame > kisamé ‘ceiling’ (sa might be taken as the Tagalog preposition sa ‘in, on’).

Two similar morphemes of a loanword may be misinterpreted by Tagalog as REDUPLICATION, and one of the similar elements may be omitted:

Skt lalāśa ‘wish’ > Tag *lasa > nasa ‘wish, desire’;

Mal agar-agar ‘edible seaweeds; jelly’ > Tag agár / agar-agár ‘jelly substance got from seaweeds’,
Mal ēmbēl-ēmbēl ‘little additions’ > Tag ambil ‘nickname, pet name; different interpretation of word from that intended; repetition of a word / expression liked by the speaker».

3.3. Hybridization.

While adopting a borrowing the recipient language may replace some part of the borrowing (mostly the root or its part) with the native lexical material, thus making a HYBRID LOANWORD. In the case of Tagalog borrowed morphemes may be substituted with those of PREVIOUSLY ASSIMILATED loanwords, thus some of the Tagalog hybrid loans consist only of borrowed material:

Sp carnero marino ‘seal’ (lit. ‘ram-sea’) + Tag dagat ‘sea’ > karnerong-dagat ‘seal’;
Mex-Sp (naran)jita ‘small tangerine or grapefruit’ + Tag dalan(dān) ‘orange’ > dalanghita «tangerine»;
Sp largo(mira) ‘binoculars, telescope’ + Tag bista ‘sight; view, landscape’ [< Sp vista] > largabista (cf. Sp vista larga ‘long-sight’),
Sp (porta)monedas ‘purse’ + Tag kwarta ‘money’ [< Sp cuarto ‘old copper coin; money’] > kwartamoneda ‘purse’.

Such recent hybrid borrowings seem to be relatively scarce. There are much more HYBRID NEOLOGISMS (CREATIONS) in the modern Tagalog, i.e. new words invented by Filipinos with use of some native and already assimilated borrowed material. However, far greater number of EARLY hybrid loans may be eventually found within the Tagalog vocabulary itself. Thus, the following hypothesis of William Maxwell may be referred to the problem of EARLY HYBRID LOANS (Maxwell 1920). This linguist picked up some considerable amount of Malay words with bu-/bung for the first syllable, which he considered to be an ancient monosyllabic prefix conveying ‘an idea of roundness’ (Ibid: 4) (I would also add here ‘the idea of fullness’): bu-lan ‘moon’ (cf. Tag bu-wān), bun-tut ‘buttocks; tail’ (Tag bun-tōt ‘tail’), bung-kus ‘bundle; bunch’ (Tag bung-kós ‘bundle; bunch’), etc. One can easily find this element in some Tagalog words as well, especially in those created by syllable duplication: e.g. bu-lak ‘cotton’ > bu-lak-lāk ‘cotton flower; flower; blossom’, bu-nga-ngā ‘gullet; mouth’ (cf. nga-ngā ‘to chew betel’), bu-ngis-ngis ‘giggle’ (cf. ngis-ngis ‘grinning, showing the teeth’). Another probable ‘prefix’ Maxwell found in Malay is ta-/tang- ‘a hand/an arm’: tang-an ‘hand’, tang-kap ‘to seize’, tang-kei ‘a stalk’. It’s also possible to distinguish this element in such Tagalog words as: tang-ān ‘held (in hand)’, tang-gāp ‘to get; accepted’, tang-kāy ‘stalk, stem’, tang-kāl ‘coop’ > tang-ka-kāl ‘support; protection’, tang-kō ‘light touch, as with the
tip of fingers’ (cf. ku-kò ‘nail’), ta-guyod ‘united support’ (cf. guyod ‘bundle of sticks; herd; thick rope’).

Developing this idea, may we suppose that such prefixes / lexical elements, being productive in the early periods of the Tagalog language development, could participate in the word creation with use of the early borrowings (Chinese, Malay, Sanskrit)? Such creations should then be regarded as early hybrid loans. May we, for instance, trace Tag tadhanà ‘fate, destiny’ to ta- + dhanà [< Skrt dhāna ‘fortune, property etc.’]?

Arsenio Manuel, studying Chinese borrowings in Tagalog, claimed that the element –pak- in Tagalog was borrowed from the Chinese pak ‘stripping off skin of trees’ (Manuel 1949: 36). If this probable lexical morpheme is of Chinese origin, the following words might be examples of the early hybridization: bakbák ‘strip off the skin, bark’, gapak ‘tear, strip’, paknit ‘to flay, skin’, paknós ‘scald, excoriate’, paknót ‘(cf. Tag nutnót ‘worn away; unraveled’). If this element in Tagalog is of Chinese origin, the above words might be examples of the early hybridization.
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