

On the chronology of the formation of the Chabacano varieties: a reply to Parkvall & Jacobs 2018

Mauro Fernández & Eeva Sippola

University of A Coruña – University of Helsinki

This paper is a reply to Parkvall & Jacobs (2018) who claim that the formation of Chabacano took place already in the late 16th century, right after the arrival of the Spanish to the Philippines, earlier than so far understood (Fernández 2015; Fernández & Sippola 2017). We argue against this view showing that the sources cited in Parkvall & Jacobs (2018) do not support their linguistic argument, that the Amerindian languages show traces of the Spanish prepalatal and thus similar layers of contact as in the Philippines, and that a significant social division between the routes over which the Spanish lexicon (and grammar) entered the Creole varieties and other Philippine languages is unlikely. An analysis of Chabacano personal pronouns and selected lexical items provides additional evidence in support of the view that the crystallization of Chabacano did not occur before the second half of the 17th century.

Keywords: Chabacano, formation period, sound change [j] to [x], creole lexicon, Chabacano personal pronouns.

1. Introduction

The formation process and chronology of the Spanish creoles of the Philippines, known collectively as Chabacano, has received attention in the research on these varieties, but so far, no consensus as to their exact formation period(s) has been reached (cf. Whinnom 1956; Fernández 2015; Fernández & Sippola 2017; Lipski 2012). Fernández & Sippola (2017) argue that the crystallization of Chabacano as a community language did not occur before the second half of the 17th century, when the process of changes in the Spanish sibilants was already advanced or had already concluded. Concerning Chabacano, the most important of these changes was the transformation of the prepalatal fricative [j] to the velar fricative [x], documented extensively in the literature on Spanish diachrony (e.g. Lloyd 1987: 342–344, Penny 2002: 100–103, and the references therein).

Recently, Parkvall & Jacobs (2018) presented a new theory about the origins of Chabacano and critique some arguments presented in Fernández

(2015) and Fernández & Sippola (2017). Parkvall & Jacobs (2018: 66–67) claim that the formation of Chabacano took place much earlier than so far acknowledged, i.e. already in the late 16th century, right after the arrival of the Spanish to the Philippines. In addition, they propose a significant social division between the routes over which the Spanish lexicon (and grammar) entered the creole varieties and other Philippine languages, arguing that the Chabacano varieties were formed through contact with soldiers, while loans in other Philippine languages bear traces of contact with missionaries (Parkvall & Jacobs 2018: 59). In this paper, we address the linguistic arguments these claims are based on and the critique of our work by pointing out some errors and shortcomings in Parkvall & Jacobs (2018) and their inaccurate use of the bibliography.¹ We also provide additional evidence and new data for our claim of a later formation period of the Chabacano varieties.

2. The problem: When did the Chabacano varieties emerge?

To open the possibility that a creole variety would have been present since the last decades of the 16th century, right after the establishment of Spanish in Manila in 1571, Parkvall & Jacobs (2018) need to provide evidence contrary to the linguistic argument about the chain of changes that the Spanish fricatives underwent in the 16th and 17th centuries, as explained in Fernández & Sippola (2017: 309). A central sound change here is the transformation of the prepalatal fricative /ʃ/ to a velar /x/. While Tagalog contains old loanwords in which the Spanish [ʃ] is reflected as [s], like Tag. *sabon* ‘soap’ < Old. Sp. *xabon* [ʃaβón],² the prepalatal sound does not occur in similar words in

¹ For reasons of space, this response will not touch upon all the problematic claims laid out in Parkvall & Jacobs (2018), such as seeing common features of Spanish in the core lexicon of Chabacano as “idiosyncrasies” (used to justify their chronology), judging the differences between varieties as “superficial”, the representation of the sociohistorical scene of Manila and Cavite 1571–1640, or the interpretation of Chabacano’s substrate languages (table 5 in Parkvall & Jacobs (2018) includes more than fifty). In general, there are problems in all sections regarding the interpretation of the sources, the extrapolation of data used in them, or the incorrect citation of ideas that were not mentioned in them. For example, the idea that Chabacano was formed among the Chinese mestizos in order to flag a new identity (Parkvall & Jacobs 2018: 61, 62, 69) is repeatedly misattributed to Fernández. Similarly, relevant parts of the sources are omitted, such as the data and comments regarding the places where Chabacano was spoken in Fernández (2011, 2012), or possible routes of entry for the lexicon known to be of Portuguese origin. Instead, we will focus on the sound changes that are central for the chronology question of the formation period of Chabacano.

² For a detailed account of the first Spanish loanwords to Tagalog, cf. García-Medall (2013).

Chabacano. All the loans that were taken to Tagalog as [s] are pronounced with [h] in Chabacano, e.g. [*habón*].³ This means that during the formation period of the Creole, the general pronunciation of the sound was already the velar [x]. For this reason, we have stated that the *terminus post quem* for the emergence of Chabacano must be “around the mid-to-late 17th century” (Fernández & Sippola 2017: 309), when the process of the velarization of prepalatal fricatives was already widespread in the Spanish-speaking world.

Although acknowledging that this reasoning “at first sight looks like a convincing argument regarding the late birth of Chabacano”, Parkvall & Jacobs (2018: 7) “believe that the story is more complicated”. They argue that the complications against the chronology presented in Fernández & Sippola (2017) arise from the following three points:

- Earlier velarization in Spanish: The velarization of the prepalatal fricative [ʃ] started earlier than assumed by Fernández & Sippola (2017). According to Parvall & Jacobs (2018: 59), it would have started at the end of the 15th century and had reached an advanced state in the last part of the 16th century, thus disproving the timeline of formation given in Fernández & Sippola (2017).
- A lack of the prepalatal fricative [ʃ] in Latin America: Parkvall & Jacobs (2018: 59) state that the prepalatal fricative [ʃ] did not leave significant traces in Latin American varieties, be they Spanish dialects or creoles, nor in the Spanish loanwords to Amerindian languages. As the Spanish presence in Latin America predates the arrival to the Philippines, this would make the formation timeline based on the chronology of the fricatives in Fernández & Sippola (2017) “ahistorical”, as traces of the prepalatal fricative would be expected also in Latin American contexts.

³ Some Chabacano lexical items might at first sight appear to be counterevidence to the timing of the varieties’ emergence, and a careful diachronic and etymological analysis is needed to determine their origins. One of these is *insuga* ‘to dry (clothes, rice in the sun)’ (Ariston 2002; German 1932; Nigoza 2007; Ocampo 2007; Santos 2010), which could be presented as an example of the Spanish prepalatal in Chabacano, as in < Sp. *enjuagar* (< *enxugar*) ‘to remove the surface moisture from something by absorbing it with a cloth, a sponge, etc., to clean the moisture from the body’ (DRAE 2014). This would be the case, if *insuga* was taken directly from the Spanish *enxugar*. It is more probable, however, that the origin is Sp. *ensugar*. This form has been maintained in several Spanish varieties through centuries (DRAE 1992).

- The sources for the loanwords in Tagalog and Chabacano: The difference between the occurrence of the prepalatal fricative in Tagalog and its absence in Chabacano can be explained due to contact with different groups of Spanish speakers, and not due to a different period of contact (Parkvall & Jacobs 2018: 59). Some speakers, such as the missionaries using educated sociolects, would have preserved the prepalatal [ʃ], while others, such as the soldiers with uneducated sociolects, would not, and would instead have used [x] or [h] from a more advanced state in the chain of sound changes. Consequently, Parkvall & Jacobs (2018) propose that in the Philippines, the missionaries would have been in close contact with the Tagalog speakers who did not take part in the birth of the creole varieties. For their part, the soldiers would have participated in the creolization of the Chabacano varieties along with several other groups.

These three points form the core of the “complications” that lead Parkvall & Jacobs (2018) to suggest a new timeline for the formation history of the Chabacano varieties. In the following, we will assess these three claims and point out some specific problems with them, based on concrete linguistic examples from the Spanish Americas and the Philippines. In addition, we will provide new lexical and grammatical data that show evidence of a later chronology.

Before proceeding with the analysis, a methodological note is in order. There is no doubt that everything in historical linguistics often is much more complicated than what it seems at first sight, and careful investigations are needed in order to account for processes of change in the history of spoken and written varieties. We do not find such a careful study in Parkvall & Jacobs (2018) when it comes to the new proposal of the sound change of /ʃ/ to /x/ (and [h]) and the implications for the chronology of formation for Chabacano. As is the case in much (socio-)historical linguistic research, problems related to the vernacular representativeness of the scarce data and text types have to be carefully examined, as must the results of the analysis of corpora and databases, which are often based on written sources (cf. Ayres-Bennett 2018). Analyzing historical texts requires expertise on writing systems (and the corresponding sounds) in addition to the knowledge of local historical and social contexts and varieties present in them, and should, where possible, be based on concrete examples instead of general speculation. Although there are problems related to the reconstruction of social variables in historical texts, the Royal Spanish Academy’s *Corpus diacrónico del español* (CORDE) is a useful source for examining the diachronic development in Spanish by genre.

In addition, geographical variation can be traced back to regional dictionaries and other linguistic works. These two source types are used here to examine some lexical and grammatical items, among other possible ones, whose presence in Chabacano from the initial moment would imply a *terminus post-quem* not before the second half of the 17th century.

3. Chronology of velarization of the Spanish fricatives

Parkvall & Jacobs (2018: 59) cite Quilis & Rozas (1963: 446–449), Lapesa (1981: 378) Aguilar (2005: 839 [sic.]), and Blanco (2006: 111) to support their claim of the early (15th century) velarization of the fricatives and the advanced state of the process by the end of the 16th century. However, after careful examination, it becomes strikingly clear that the cited sources actually do not address (or discuss) the question in the way Parkvall and Jacobs claim they address (or discuss) it. In reality, these works reach a very different conclusion: that velarization did not start in the 15th century (except in one of the sources), and it was still not very advanced even one century later.

Quilis & Rozas (1963: 445) clearly state the opposite about the starting period of the velarization: *sin duda alguna en el siglo XV no existía el sonido de nuestra actual fricativa [velar] sorda* “without any doubt the sound of our current voiceless [velar] fricative did not exist in the 15th century”. In addition, in all the 16th century grammatical descriptions with notes on pronunciation, the grapheme <x> is noted as corresponding to the prepalatal and not the velar sound. The first author to give a clear mention of the grapheme <x> as corresponding to /x/ was Jiménez Patón in 1614 (Quilis & Rozas 1963: 445–448).

Lapesa (1981: 379) argues that the two pronunciations (velar and palatal) must have been in contention for a long time. He points to the first third of the 17th century as the period in which the velarization process can be taken as generalized. With regard to the starting period, Lapesa (1981: 378) cites Nebrija’s *De litteris graecis* (from ca. 1507) where there is a short reference to the pronunciation of the Greek letter <χ> and of the Spanish <x>. However, this reference is rather difficult to interpret with certainty (cf. Santiago 1994). Lapesa (1981: 378) interprets certain graphemes registered in Lima in the mid-16th century as an indication of a voiceless mediopalatal pronunciation, such as the German <ch> in *ich* ‘1SG’, but not yet as a full velar. In sum, contrary to what Parkvall & Jacobs (2018: 59) state, we have not been able to locate in Lapesa (1981) anything that would support the claim

that the velarization process would have started at the end of the 15th century, but instead, that it was generalized later than they assume, in first third of the 17th century.

The third source used in Parkvall & Jacobs (2018) to argue against our dating of the velarization process is Aguilar (2005[sic.]: 839) with the title *El español a través de los tiempos* in their bibliography. However, the book with this title, written by Rafael Cano Aguilar, only has 328 pages and was published in 1988 for the first time. We are not aware of any edition from 2005. The book Parkvall & Jacobs (2018) are citing must therefore be another one. It is probable that the reference should lead us to Cano Aguilar (2004) that deals with the phonological changes of Spanish in the 16th and 17th centuries, where there is a page 839. Cano Aguilar (2004: 839, our translation) states: “it is possible that it could have started in the Late Middle Ages, specifically at the end of the 15th century, but the unquestionable data stems from the 16th century, and the definitive triumph of the new sound must not have been earlier than in the 17th century”. This citation thus gives some credit to Parkvall & Jacobs’ (2018) claim about the possibility of an early starting period, but is a rather weak statement and furthermore, it is irrelevant as it relates to the adoption of the velar fricative in Chabacano and thus a later formation period.

To support their theory that groups from different social and geographical backgrounds were involved in the contact situations with Tagalog on the one hand and in the creation of Chabacano on the other, Parkvall & Jacobs (2018: 59) also cite Aguilar (2005) [sic. the assumed reference Cano Aguilar 2004: 839]. However, Cano Aguilar (2004) does not take for granted the diffusion of the sound change from Andalusia towards the north. About the relationship between the change from [ʝ] to [x] and the loss of voicelessness, Cano Aguilar (2004: 841, our translation) says that

everything depends on the date each phenomenon is assumed to have taken place: the earliest probable date of voicelessness, at least in some areas (the north?), would be before velarization; in other areas (Toledo? the south?), the processes of voicelessness and velarization could have taken place simultaneously [...] it has been assured on numerous occasions that velarization began in the south, in Andalusia; but this is not known for sure, because when documenting the palatal to velar change by interpreting the grapheme *h* as proof of velarization this could only happen where *h* represented an actual sound (Andalusia, Extremadura, Toledo), not where it had already ceased to be pronounced (Old Castile).

The last source used by Parkvall & Jacobs (2018) is Blanco (2006: 111). But this book does not analyze the sound changes regarding velarization. Actually,

the only time the topic is touched upon is exactly in the cited page and the previous one. Blanco (2006: 111) summarizes in a very compact manner some of the conclusions by Lapesa and Cano Aguilar discussed above, and adds information from Alarcos (1950) and Kiddle (1975). According to Alarcos (1950), velarization was a late process that must have been completed in the 17th century, while Kiddle (1975) maintains that the modern sound [x] became generalized after 1660. On the other hand, Blanco (2006: 110) uses her data to conclude the following:

Regarding the phenomena of interdentalization and velarization, affecting the old sibilants, the data that our corpus shows confirms the view defended in the Hispanic tradition, which defines both phenomena as late processes, which were not generalized until the second half of the 17th century or even later. According to our data, it seems that these phenomena had to begin towards the end of the 16th century and that their generalization was not completed until well into the 17th century.

In conclusion, in the sources mentioned in Parkvall & Jacobs (2018), there is no support to refute the argument in Fernández & Sippola (2017) about the chronology of velarization in Spanish. Quite to the contrary, all the sources support the same view of a late process that, according to evidence, started in the 16th century and was generalized at some point in the 17th century. It is true that several theories and sometimes rather passionate views about the matter have been presented in the literature, as we are dealing with a topic that has long been of great interest among historical linguists studying Spanish. But if the knowledge about this specific sound change is limited to the sources mentioned in Parkvall & Jacobs (2018), these authors should have arrived at the opposite conclusion from the one they advance. We do agree with Parkvall & Jacobs' statement that many stories are more complicated than what appears at first sight, but after an assessment of their sources and the information presented in them, the complications are shown to arise from mistakes in the interpretation of said material.

4. Traces of the prepalatal [ʃ] in Amerindian languages

According to Parkvall & Jacobs (2018: 59), the traces of the prepalatal /ʃ/ are rare in Amerindian languages, even though American colonization obviously preceded the colonization of the Philippines, thus lending support to their hypothesis of different social groups participating in the contact with Tagalogs and creole speakers.

Before proceeding to examine this question, however, let us discuss some caveats. Naturally, to talk about Amerindian languages as a whole does not make sense due to the diversity of their phonemic systems and the timespan of the contact with Spanish. We must first differentiate between the ones that had the voiceless prepalatal fricative in their phonetic systems and those that did not. The former group of languages would thus have had no problems in adapting the sound into their system, had they adopted Spanish loans with [j] before the change to a velar. This is the case of Nahuatl and Mayan, for example. In fact, in the first Spanish documents, the grapheme <x> in *México*, *Oaxaca* and *Texas*, used to indicate /j/, which is the sound found in the language they were adopted from. In Spanish, which has since undergone the velarization, <x> in these words now represents /x/. Another example can be found in Q'eqchi', a Mayan language of Guatemala, where early loanwords, such as *xaar* < Sp. *jarro* 'jug, pitcher', *akuux* < Sp. *aguja* 'needle', and *xab'on* < Sp. *jabón* 'soap' have spellings with <x> that correspond to /j/ reflecting the colonial Spanish palatal sibilant of the early colonization (Wichmann & Hull 2009: 889). Testing for traces of the prepalatal fricative in Amerindian languages, one should focus on the languages from the latter group that did not have /j/ in their inventories or a more similar sound than /s/, like Tagalog in the Philippines. A case in point from the American context is provided by Aymara and Quechua, which we will discuss below. Second, it is difficult to know which sound was represented by the letter <x> in Spanish colonial texts from the Americas, as happens with the Spanish documents produced in the peninsula. The options are generally the voiceless prepalatal /j/ or the velar /x/. Only examples that show the confusion between <h> and <x> (for example, when someone writes <caha>) expose a velar pronunciation. Some examples like this have been documented, and they prove that the velar realization already existed but not that the velar pronunciation was generalized. Instead, Spanish loanwords to several Amerindian languages show evidence of the fact that the pronunciation in Spanish was prepalatal. In these loanwords, <x> or <j> are reflected as <s>, and thus clearly show that the pronunciation in Spanish was prepalatal at the time of loan adoption.

A look at historical Aymara sources reveals that we find early loanwords from Spanish in Amerindian languages with traces of the prepalatal /j/. This shows that the process of velarization was not yet concluded or very advanced in the 16th century, when Spanish entered the Andean region. Like Tagalog, Aymara and other Amerindian languages have /s/ in these loans, which was interpreted as corresponding to the prepalatal /j/ in Spanish. Cerrón

Palomino (1997: 216) discusses some examples from the Andean area that show that the Castilian phoneme /ʃ/ was assimilated as /s/ by Aymara speakers, who did not have a similar phoneme (or had lost it). He gives the following example from Bertonio (1612): *Nos reymos de los indios nosotros quando les oymos que dizen [...] Carauasara en lugar de Carvajal, [...] Salo por jarro [...] y otros disparates como estos*. ‘We laugh about the Indians when we hear them say [...] *Carausara* instead of *Caravajal*, [...] *Salo* instead of *jarro* [...] and other absurdities like these.’ In this example, the Spanish grapheme <j> in *Carvajal* and *jarro* must indicate the prepalatal fricative, because Aymara would have had other sounds that would better correspond to the velar fricative. Other examples include *sura* < Sp. *jurar* ‘swear’, *lesituma* < Sp. *legítimo* ‘legitimate’, *monsa* < Sp. *monja* ‘nun’, *imasena* < Sp. *imagen* ‘image’, and *lesitora* < Sp. *regidor* ‘governor’. Analyzing these examples, Cerrón Palomino (1997: 216) notes that in these contexts it would be rather absurd to speak of a change from /x/ to /s/. In addition, when considering the probable realizations of the grapheme <x>, Cerrón Palomino (2010: 88) explains that the <x> in toponyms of Quechua origin, such as <Caxamalca>, <Caxatambo> or <Xauxa>, used to represent the prepalatal fricative from the northern dialectal varieties of Quechua. According to him, the Spanish would have pronounced these names, approximately, as [koʃebamba], [koʃitambo], [kaʃamalka], [kaʃatambo] and [ʃawʃa], respectively.

In sum, a close examination of the historical documents and early contacts reveals traces of the prepalatal fricative in Amerindian languages, thus showing that the process of velarization was not advanced at the time of the conquest of the Spanish Americas. On the other hand, it is probable that the process of velarization advanced at different paces according to the area and also depending on social class in both European and American varieties of Spanish. However, the timing and direction of the change(s) would need to be examined with concrete examples in the diverse expansion zones of the Spanish colonial empire before arguing, as done in Parkvall & Jacobs (2018: 59), that this is the solution to explain the differences between the lexical items in Tagalog, which reflect the Spanish prepalatal, and the ones in Chabacano, which show evidence of a Spanish velar pronunciation.

5. From whom did the Tagalogs adopt the first Spanish loanwords?

With the assumptions about the early chronology of the velarization of Spanish fricatives and the geographical and social directions of the diffusion

of the changes, Parkvall & Jacobs (2018: 59) formulate a speculative explanation for the differences in Tagalog and Chabacano pronunciations of the Spanish-derived items, such as Tag. *sabon* < Sp. [ʃaβón] and Cha. *jabon/habon* < Sp. [xaβón]. They speculate that Spanish soldiers (or those from colonies of Spanish America) formed a group which had already adopted the velarized pronunciation [xaβón], while the missionaries who Christianized the Tagalogs would have had the old pronunciation [ʃaβón]. From this would follow that as the Tagalog loans reflect the prepalatal as /s/, they were taken from the mouths of the missionaries, while the absence of the prepalatal in the Chabacano varieties indicates that the source of their Spanish lexicon was the Spanish spoken by the soldiers and sailors. In the following, we will provide some linguistic evidence for assessing if this kind of social division reflecting differences in pronunciation is probable, and make an observation on the timing of the loanwords.

First, it is known that at least some missionaries of the early 17th century pronounced the prepalatal [ʃ], as also stated by Parkvall & Jacobs (2018: 59) but without clear references or examples. San Buenaventura (1613) is a very clear instance:

En la lengua castellana ay vocablos que se escriuen con g. y otros con j. y otros con x. y al oydo suenan con .j. (adlongū) Con .g. se escriuen, generaçion, gestos, gemir. &c. Con .j. juntar, jaula, juego, &c. con .x. xabon, xara, xeme .&c. pues para evitar confusion de si se escribe este o aquel con .x. j. o .g. pondre esta .I. por todas; y ansi con ella se escriuira, Iesto, Iuntas, y Jara. No tiene el Abc. tagalog esta letra .I. que suene como .j. o .x. y quando les es forçoso pronunçiar las vsan de la .S. como, sestos, pro jestos, eserçitarse pro exerçitarse, sente pro lente &c (San Buenaventura 1613: 373).

‘In the Castilian languages there are words written with g. and others with j. and others with x. and to the ear they sound as .j. (adlongū) With .g. are written, generaçion, gestos, gemir. &c. With .j. juntar, jaula, juego, &c. with -x- xabon, xara, xeme .&c. so to avoid confusion about whether this word or another is written with .x.j. or .g. I will put this .I. for all; and this way it is written, Iesto, Iuntas, and Jara. The Tagalog Alphabet does not have this letter .I. which would sound like .j. or .x. and when it is difficult for them to pronounce they use .S. like, sestos, for jestos, eserçitarse for exerçitarse, sente for lente &c’

San Buenaventura’s note on how the Tagalogs pronounced words with the prepalatal in Spanish would be meaningless if the missionary pronounced them with /x/. In such a case, the Tagalogs would have pronounced them with the Tagalog velar /h/, practically identical to several realizations of the Spanish /x/. However, it is not certain whether all the missionaries of that time

preserved the prepalatal pronunciation, and even less so, whether the soldiers or sailors would have lost it. Of course, some loans were clearly taken through the missionary activities, as they deal with religion or religious objects. Some loans of this kind include *birsin* < Sp. *virgen* ‘virgin’, *indunsinçias* < Sp. *indulgencias* ‘indulgences’, or *benditahan* < Sp. *pila de agua bendita* ‘holy water font’. But others that were already documented by San Buenaventura (1613) seem to have entered via less religious paths: *paminta* < Sp. *pimienta* ‘pepper’ (possibly through the Portuguese *pementa*), *polomase* < Sp. *plumaje* ‘plumage’ (accompanied by a slightly critical note about the decoration of hats), or even *somblelo* < Sp. *sombrero* ‘hat’, an accessory not known to be used by the friars. Why should *nabasa* (currently *labasa* ‘razor’) or *tisa* < Sp. *teja* ‘tile’ have entered via the missionaries? Advancing this argument by saying that it is proved by the fact that they have <s> instead of <j> or <h> as in Chabacano would be completely circular, and of no scientific value. Furthermore, to state that the Tagalog loans of the first contact period were taken only through the missionaries’ activities even contradicts the scenario later presented by Parkvall & Jacobs (2018: 67, 70), in which Filipinos are mixed with the Spaniards working in the Cavite shipyards, etc.

Unfortunately, the verbal hygiene of the authors of the *vocabularios* does not permit us to know in which period individual words, such as *lamiyerda* ‘to hang out with friends’ < Sp. *la mierda* ‘the shit’ or *kesehoda* ‘who cares’ < Sp. *que se joda* ‘fuck him/her/it’, entered Tagalog. These particular words do not appear in the modern dictionaries either, although their meanings have clearly undergone semantic bleaching. There is no reason to assume that they would not have entered Tagalog early in the contact history with Spanish, although it is rather unlikely that they were taken from the missionaries. Other documented items from the early contact period are *tinra* < Sp. *tienda* ‘shop’, *sobla* < Sp. *sobra* ‘a lot’, and *calatas* < Sp. *cartas* ‘paper’ (corrected, among others, by the Augustinians until the Tagalog would replace it with *papel*), *ponyal* < Sp. *puñal* ‘dagger’. There is no reason to assume that they could not have entered Chabacano because of their use by people other than the missionaries (see also García-Medall 2013).

6. New data for a later formation period of Chabacano

6.1. The pronoun *usted*

It is clear that new lexical items are incorporated to the creole lexicon also after the formation period. Many of these contain information about the date of incorporation into Chabacano, in the sense that they cannot be prior to the invention of a certain artifact or the emergence and dissemination of a concept, and can therefore not tell us anything about the formative period of a creole (although they can tell us something about the history of its lexicon). For example, *nacionalista* ‘nationalist’ could not enter Chabacano before the mid-19th century, nor *autobus* ‘bus’ before the 20th century. But others, like the Chabacano personal pronouns, coinciding with the Spanish ones, should have been in the creole since its early moments.

Parkvall & Jacobs (2018) adhere, of course, to this principle of common sense and apply it in various parts of their contribution. In fact, they (2018: 65) use the similarity of the singular personal pronouns (*yo*, *bo(s)/tu* and *ele*) in all the Chabacano varieties as an argument that would prove a common origin that happened early and abruptly in the Manila area, in the two decades following the Spanish settlement. But their list omits the second-person forms derived from *usted*, which also exist in all the varieties: *usté* in Zamboangueno and Cavite Chabacano, and *(us)tedi* in Ternate Chabacano, the latter identical in singular and plural (Sippola 2011: 128–129). Instead, Parkvall & Jacobs (2018: 65) present a table of the plural equivalents derived from *ustedes* with the intention of not showing the similarity, but the evident difference between the varieties, which they discard as “superficial”.⁴

In contrast to the rest of the pronominal forms corresponding to the Spanish pronouns, which are compatible with any chronological account placed after the arrival of the Spanish, *usted* marks a *terminus post quem* around the mid-17th century or later. In Table 1, frequencies of *usted(es)* and *vues(tr)a(s) merced(es)* in the Diachronic Corpus of Spanish (CORDE) are compared, in the period that starts with the arrival of the Spanish in the Philippines.

Adding up the numbers in the two columns, there is a noticeable difference in the totals of the third and fourth subsets, with a total of a few hundred, and the other groups, which are in the thousands. This could be due to a different composition of the corpus in each period, including a variable number of texts in suitable genres, such as reproductions of letters, documents addressed to a recipient, or narrative texts that involve the use of forms of

⁴ Their argument of such a superficiality is limited to the following phrase: “changes in the plural pronominal domain appear to be quite common cross-linguistically” (2018: 65), with which they consider themselves exempt from any explanation on the genesis of such differences and their chronological implications.

address. But these differences do not weaken our case: the frequencies of *usted* and the preceding form *vuestra merced* are only balanced from 1650, and the predominance of *usted* in the written texts becomes clearly dominant in the texts written after 1750.⁵ Obviously, in speech, *usted* existed earlier: there are testimonies from grammarians of the late 17th century that confirm the extension of its use. For example, in Caribbean Spanish *usted(es)* probably reached a general use in oral language in the last decades of the 17th century, as concluded by Gutiérrez Maté (2012 [2009], 2013: 262) from a corpus of documents from the second half of the 17th century.

Table 1: Frequencies of *usted(es)* and *vues(tr)a(s) merced(es)* in CORDE 1565–1799

	Vues(tr)a(s) merced(es)	Usted(es)
1565-1599	3348	5 ⁶
1600-1649	4623	42
1650-1699	210	261
1700-1749	323	174
1750-1799	390	3231

Based on the above, it seems that the formation period for Chabacano is after *usted(es)* had replaced the other variants derived from *vuestra merced*.⁷ These

⁵ See also Calderón Campos (2019) for the progressive generalization of the plural *ustedes* in Latin American Spanish in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with the subsequent loss of the distinction *ustedes/vosotros*.

⁶ It would be necessary to consult the original documents to verify the real existence of these forms, since all the transcriptions of the documents are from the 20th century, so the transcriptionist could have expanded an abbreviation like Vd or Vmd. At least in one of the cases, i.e. “usted vuestra merced”, it seems to be the expansion of an abbreviation, with a hesitation in the transcription that was not amended before sending the work to the printing press.

⁷ Also Palenquero has *uté/te* and *utere*. Although the exact foundation date of the maroon community in San Basilio del Palenque is uncertain, the Colombian maroon communities were formed in the 17th century. Therefore, it is more probable to think that that pronominal form has been there since the formation period and not that it would have been incorporated later (cf. Gutiérrez Maté in press). In addition, there are no derived forms of *você* in the Portuguese creoles, whose formation dates are well known, such as Cape Verdean (Lang 2012, 2018), Principense (Maurer 2009), or those of the Gulf of Guinea in general. Nor are such forms found in Papia Kristang (Baxter 1988) or Makista. The case of the Indian creoles is more complex: Dalgado (1900: 36) states that in the Portuguese creole of Sri Lanka *vussé* only appears in *Novo Testamento* from 1826; the form of highest respect was *vossas*. Instead, in the creole of Daman, *ussê* and *voscê* are documented (Dalgado 1903: passim; Clements 2014), as are the Northern varieties’ *ucê*, *oscê*, and sometimes *cê* (Dalgado 1906: 155). Forms derived from *você* also exist in the Indo-Portuguese varieties of Diu (Cardoso 2009), Korlai (Clements 1996; Clements & Koontz-Garboden 2002), Batavia and Tugu (Schuchardt 1890;

forms exist in Chabacano because they were in the input. Certainly, one could argue that these forms were taken into Chabacano later, assuming that speakers were in close contact with Spanish and that the creole underwent partial decreolization. In such a case, however, it would be necessary to explain, first, why the creoles of Macao and Malacca do not have forms derived from Pt. *você*, nor does Cape Verdean, not even the variety of Santiago, with an intense and prolonged contact with Portuguese. Second, it would be necessary to explicate the circumstances and details of such a decreolization process and the social changes in a creole-speaking community where the introduction of a new form of treatment was considered necessary or useful. In addition, one should also explain why these circumstances and changes occurred in all places where people speak Chabacano, or how the innovation spread from one Chabacano variety to another.

6.2. A lexical argument

In a field contrary to that of respect, we are now going to deal with a clearly derogatory lexical item: the colloquial term *pendejo*. We find this term in all the varieties of Chabacano with the meaning of ‘fool’ that is well known in Mexico and other parts of the Spanish-speaking Americas. The first dating with a derogatory meaning applied to people is from 1662 (Gutiérrez Maté 2013: 17–18), while in CORDE we find this use from 1705 in the Memories of Raymond de Lantery, who resided in Cádiz: “y fueron tan pendejos, que los volvieron a dejar entrar” ‘and they were so foolish/cowardly, that they let them in again’ (RAE – CORDE), while the second appearance is much later in 1871, in a book by José María Pereda.

Obviously, derogatory colloquial terms are not frequent in written texts, and that is why their history is challenging to study. As Malkiel (1953: 67) writes: “*pendejo* has, from the start, been a word often uttered and seldom written”. But the case here is that it appears in all the dictionaries starting from the one by Nebrija in 1495, with the meaning referring to the pubic hair. Malkiel (1953: 67) presents quotes with *pendejo* from various works of the 16th and 17th centuries, including burlesque lyrics, plays composed in rustic vein, novels containing coarse dialogue, and medical treatises: all with the meaning ‘pubic hair’. Malkiel also explores how different meanings could have developed, including those of scurrilous ‘bobo’ and ‘coward’ (1953: 67–

Maurer 2011). According to Cintra (1972), the first written documentation of *você* is from ca. 1666. As far as we know, nobody has until now explored the possible chronological and/or social implications of these differences in the Portuguese creoles.

72). But instead of how, we are here interested in when these derived meanings can be found. A mocking meaning applied to individuals appears much later: only in the Spanish-French bilingual dictionary from 1705 do we find the meaning ‘coward’: “es un pendejo, *C’est un lâche*” (Sobrino 1705). This meaning of ‘coward’ is also the one that can be found in the first edition of the Dictionary of the RAE (1737) and in successive ones until 1970. Some semantic differences are documented, for example, in the dictionary of Terreros y Pando (1788 [1767]): “effeminate, cowardly, poltroon.” And only in Alemany y Bolufer (1917) do we find for the first time the meaning ‘stupid’: “In Mexico, Colombia and Chile, stupid or stupid man”. Another meaning, the most insulting of them all, is that of ‘cuckold’, which is common in Mexican Spanish and in Chabacano. We have not found it in the revised dictionaries, but there is enough textual evidence to prove its existence.

Of course, it is difficult to provide historical accounts based on lexicon, given that in this situation there are large gaps between lexicographical works, and for centuries, relatively little attention has been paid to the Spanish lexicon of the Americas. But the lexicon can provide some clues that in this case allow us to speculate about the diffusion of the meaning ‘coward’ throughout the 18th century, while the meanings ‘stupid’ and ‘cuckold’ probably appeared later. In Zamboanga Chabacano, the accepted meanings are ‘coward’, ‘fool’, ‘stupid’ and ‘cuckold’ (Ariston 2002; Santos 2010; ZdA⁸), without any trace of the meaning ‘pubic hair’ which it had in the 16th century. It is not irrelevant for the problem that we are dealing with that Chabacano lacks insulting terms, such as *bellaco* ‘wicked’, *villano* ‘villain’ or *malandrín* ‘scoundrel’, which were of habitual usage in the Spanish of the 16th century, and that fell into decline in the territory of New Spain from the 17th century onwards. And even less so is the fact that it has, instead, others, such as *cabrón* or *pendejo*, that only acquire an insulting meaning late in the 17th century and which become common during the 18th century.

The presence of words such as *pendejo* in Chabacano can only be explained in two ways. Either Chabacano crystallized when the meanings of ‘fool’, ‘coward’, and ‘cuckold’ already existed in Spanish, or many of the Chabacano speakers were in close contact with Spanish for such a long time that they could incorporate the meaning after its appearance in Spanish varieties. Accounting for the late incorporation of the meaning would require presenting the facts of such a process, in order to avoid the circularity that

⁸ Zamboanga de Antes (ZdA) is a facebook group that aims to preserve the Zamboanga culture and the Chabacano language.

assumes that they are late incorporations only because it supports the hypothesis presented.

7. Concluding remarks

In this paper, we have shown several shortcomings in Parkvall & Jacobs' (2018) linguistic argumentation that should account for an early formation of the Chabacano varieties. The generalization of the velar pronunciation of the Spanish prepalatal fricative was not an earlier process than so far understood, and an account of different social origins for different pronunciations would need to be supported by linguistic evidence reflecting the mentioned differences. In addition, we have presented additional evidence of a later formation period from an examination of the pronouns and the lexicon. A chronological study about the formation of Chabacano or the different varieties known under this denomination could benefit from this kind of approach, which examines known and relatively well-documented processes of change (be they semantic or grammatical). A focus on supposed archaisms that only are seen as such if compared with today's Peninsular Standard Spanish leaves aside the fact that many forms have been in use until recently, or even continue to be used, in diverse varieties of Spanish that are more probable to have participated in the contact situation that led to the formation of Chabacano.

References

- Aleman y Bolufer, José. 1917. *Diccionario de la lengua española*. Barcelona: Ramón Sopena.
- Alarcos Llorach, Emilio. 1950. *Fonología española*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Ariston, Emerson. 2002. *Chabacano-English dictionary*. ms. [Sponsored by the Program "Towards a Common Future" for Cultural Cooperation between the Ministry of Education Culture and Sports of Spain and Universities in the Philippines].
- Ayres-Bennett, Wendy. 2018. Historical sociolinguistics and tracking language change. In Wendy Ayres-Bennett & Janice Carruthers (eds.), *Manual of Romance Sociolinguistics*, 253–279. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Bertonio, Ludovico (1612 [1984]). *Vocabulario de la lengua aymara*. Cochabamba: Ediciones Ceres.
- Blanco Domínguez, Marta. 2006. *Aproximación a la cronología de las transformaciones funcionales de labiales y fricativas del español*. Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.

- Baxter, Alan N. 1988. *A grammar of Kristang (Malacca Creole Portuguese)*. (Pacific Linguistics B-95.) Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, Australian National University.
- Calderón Campos, Miguel. 2019. Pérdida del pronombre vosotros y su paradigma. In Juan Pedro Sánchez Méndez, Antonio Corredor Aveledo & Elena Padrón Castilla (eds.), *Estudios de morfosintaxis hispanoamericana. Vol I: El pronombre*, 125–162. Valencia: Tirant Humanidades.
- Cano Aguilar, Rafael. 1988. *El español a través de los tiempos*. Madrid: Arco.
- Cano Aguilar, Rafael. 2004. Cambios en la fonología del español durante los siglos XVI y XVII. In Rafael Cano Aguilar (ed.), *Historia de la lengua española*, 825–858. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Cardoso, Hugo C. 2009. *The Indo-Portuguese language of Diu*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Cerrón Palomino, Rodolfo. 1997. La primera codificación del aimara. In Klaus Zimmermann (ed.), *La descripción de las lenguas amerindias en la época colonial*, 195–257. Frankfurt / Madrid: Vervuert / Iberoamericana.
- Cerrón Palomino, Rodolfo. 2010. La grafía <x> en la toponimia andina (siglos XVI-XVII). Ejemplos representativos. *Revista Andina* 50. 83–113.
- Clements, Clancy. 2014. Lectal differences in Daman Indo-Portuguese. *Revista de Crioulos de Base Lexical Portuguesa e Espanhola* 5. 115–156.
- Clements, Clancy & Andrew Koontz-Garboden. 2002. Two Indo-Portuguese creoles in contrast. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 17(2). 191–236.
- Cintra, Luis F. Lindley. 1972. *Sobre formas de tratamento na língua portuguesa*. Lisbon: Livros Horizonte.
- Dalgado, Sebastião Rodolfo. 1900. *Dialecto indo-português de Ceilão*. Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional
- Dalgado, Sebastião Rodolfo. 1903. Dialecto indo-português de Damão. (Separata da revista *Ta-ssi-yang-kuo* 3. 35-67, 4. 515–422).
- Dalgado, Sebastião Rodolfo. 1906. Dialecto indo-português do Norte. *Revista Lusitana* 9. 142-166; 193–228.
- Fernández, Mauro. 2011. Chabacano en Tayabas: implicaciones para la historia de los criollos hispano-filipinos. *Revista internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana* 17. 189–218.
- Fernández, Mauro. 2012. Leyenda e historia del chabacano de Ermita (Manila). *UniverSOS* 9. 9–46; 65–70.
- Fernández, Mauro. 2015. La emergencia del chabacano en Filipinas: pruebas, indicios, conjeturas. In José María Rovira Santos (ed.), *Armonía y contrastes: estudios sobre variación dialectal, histórica y sociolingüística del español*, 175–196. Lugo: Axac.
- Fernández, Mauro & Eeva Sippola. 2017. A new window into the history of Chabacano: two unknown mid-19th century texts. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 32(2). 304–338.
- García-Medall, Joaquín. 2013. En torno a los primeros préstamos hispánicos en tagalo. *Cuaderno Internacional de Estudios Humanísticos* 19. 51–66.
- Gutiérrez Maté, Miguel. 2012 [2009]. El pronombre *usted* en el español de Cartagena de Indias del siglo xvii y su “divergencia” de *vuestra merced*. In Emilio Montero Cartelle (ed.), *Actas del VIII Congreso Internacional de la Lengua Española, 1890–1904*. Santiago de Compostela: Meubook.
- Gutiérrez Maté, Miguel. 2013. *Pronombres personales sujeto en el español del caribe. Variación e historia*. Doctoral Diss., University of Valladolid.
- Gutiérrez Maté, Miguel. In press. Palenquero Creole: The syntax of second person pronouns and the pragmatics of address switching. In Bettina Kluge, María Irene Moyna & Horst

- Simon (eds.), *It's not all about you – New perspectives on address research*. Amsterdam Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Jiménez Patón, Bartolomé. 1611. *Epítome de la ortografía latina y castellana*. Baeza: Pedro de la Cuesta.
- Kiddle, Lawrence B. 1975. The Chronology of the Spanish Sound Change: $\xi > x$. In *Studies in honor of Lloyd A. Kasten*, 73–100. Madison: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies.
- Lang, Jürgen. 2012. A filiação dos pronomes pessoais do crioulo da ilha de Santiago (Cabo Verde). *Revista de Crioulos de Base Lexical Portuguesa e Espanhola* 3. 20–35
- Lang, Jürgen. 2018. *Gramática do Crioulo da ilha de Santiago (Cabo Verde) (obra em curso)*. Author's edition. <<https://opus4.kobv.de/opus4-fau/frontdoor/index/index/start/1/rows/10/sortfield/score/sortorder/desc/searchtype/simple/query/Gram%C3%A1tica+do+crioulo/docId/9898>>
- Lantery, Raimundo de. 1949 [1705]. *Memorias*. Madrid: Escelicer.
- Lapesa, Rafael. 1981. *Historia de la lengua española*. Novena edición corregida y aumentada. Madrid: Gredos.
- Lipski, John. 2012. Remixing a mixed language: The emergence of a new pronominal system in Chabacano (Philippine Creole Spanish). *International Journal of Bilingualism* 17(4). 448–478.
- Lloyd, Paul. 1987. *From Latin to Spanish*. Vol 1: Historical phonology and morphology of the Spanish language. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Malkiel, Yakov. 1953. The Luso-Hispanic triad *pen(m)*, *pendeljo*, (*em*)*peine*. The comb as a focus of linguistic imagery. *Boletim de Filologia* 14. 27–79.
- Maurer, Philippe. 2009. *Principense – Grammar, texts, and vocabulary of the Afro-Portuguese creole of the island of Príncipe, Gulf of Guinea*. London: Battlebridge.
- Maurer, Philippe. 2011. *The former Portuguese Creole of Batavia and Tugu (Indonesia)*. London: Battlebridge Publications.
- Nebrija, Antonio. 1507. *De litteris graecis*. Logroño: Arnao Guillén de Brocar.
- Parkvall, Mikael & Bart Jacobs. 2018. The genesis of Chavacano revisited and solved. *Lingua* 215. 53–77.
- Penny, Ralph. 2002. *A History of the Spanish Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Quilis, Antonio & Juan M. Rozas. 1963. Para la cronología de la fricativa, velar, sorda, /x/, en castellano. *Revista de Filología Española* 66(3–4). 445–449.
- RAE – CORDE. REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de datos (CORDE) [online]. Corpus diacrónico del español. <<http://www.rae.es>>
- Real Academia Española. 1737. *Diccionario de la lengua castellana [Diccionario de autoridades]*. Tomo V. Madrid: Imprenta de la Real Academia Española por los herederos de Francisco del Hierro.
- San Buenaventura, Pedro de. 1613. *Vocabulario de Lengua Tagala*. Pila: Thomas Pinpin Dominco Loag.
- Santiago, Ramón. 1994. De la correspondencia entre x castellana y šim árabe o χ griega. In Carmen Codoñer & Juan Antonio González Iglesias (eds.), *Antonio de Nebrija: Edad Media y Renacimiento*, 321–328. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.
- Santos, Rolando Arquiza. 2010. *Chavacano de Zamboanga. Compendio y diccionario. Chavacano – English / English – Chavacano*. Ateneo de Zamboanga University Press.
- Schuchardt, Hugo, 1884. Kreolische Studien IX. Ueber das Malaioportugiesische von Batavia und Tugu. *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Wien* 122. 1–256.

- Sippola, Eeva. 2011. *Una gramática descriptiva del chabacano de Ternate*. Helsinki: Unigrafia.
- Sobrino, Francisco. 1705. *Diccionario nuevo de las lenguas española y francesa*. Bruselas: Francisco Poppens.
- Terreros y Pando, Esteban de. 1788 [1767]. *Diccionario castellano con las voces de ciencias y artes y sus correspondientes en las tres lenguas francesa, italiana y latina*. Tomo tercero. Madrid: Viuda de Ibarra
- Wichmann, Søren & Kerry Hull. 2009. Loanwords in Q'eqchi', a Mayan language of Guatemala. In Martin Haspelmath & Uri Tadmor (eds.), *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*, 873–896. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Whinnom, Keith. 1956. *Spanish Contact Vernaculars in the Philippine Islands*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.