TAGALOG RESPECT FORMS:
SOCIOLINGUISTIC USES, ORIGINS, AND PARALLELS

Joseph F. Kess

Tagalog, like the other languages of the Philippines, belongs to the Western Indonesian grouping of the Austronesian family of Pacific languages. Like many other languages, it exhibits forms of respectful address in terms of overtly shown categories. Such sociolinguistic devices express formally and explicitly the social relationship between co-locutors in a given interaction. This paper reviews these devices in Tagalog, giving an outline of their identification and their classification, then moving on to a discussion of the two major research themes entertained in this discussion, namely, the possible origins and the contemporary dimensions of sociolinguistic usage of Tagalog respectful address. The key formal device for showing sociolinguistic differences in Tagalog is found in the respectful use of enclitic particle and pronominal forms. Two enclitic particles, po and ho, correlate with the use of the pronouns ikaw/ka *you* (singular) and kayo *you* (plural) in showing sociolinguistic differences in conversational interaction. The exact dimensions of po (the most respectful) vs. ho vs. zero (absence of respectful address) was assessed by a questionnaire-like inventory listing sample conversational dyads. Approximately thirty subjects graciously filled out a four-page checklist, indicating whether a given dyad required po, ho, either, or neither in their usage. The analysis of contemporary sociolinguistic usage is based on the responses obtained from these subjects.

The possible historical origins of these sociolinguistic devices in Tagalog was assessed by examining the earliest available descriptions of Tagalog, and comparing them with later descriptive treatments. Another aspect of the research deals with the appearance or non-appearance of such respect forms in the syntax of some of the other languages of the Philippines, as well as related languages like Chamorro in Guam. This is to ascertain whether other languages of the group, major or minor, employ either the enclitic particles or the pronominal forms as respect forms in the syntax of that particular language, and if so, whether there is historical attestation of their appearance. It was hoped that information on this point would shed some light on the possible extra-familial origins of the sociolinguistic use of enclitic particles and pronominal forms in Philippine languages.

On the personal exchange level, it is obvious that personal encounters require interactants to observe a variety of linguistic etiquette strategies, the most important of which is the proper exchange of address forms. How to address

the other person is a crucial decision in much social interaction, and several seminal studies have addressed themselves to exactly these considerations in dealing with the pronouns of power and solidarity in European languages (Brown and Gilman 1960) and the forms of titled address in American English (Brown and Ford 1964).

Interest in the analysis of respectful address was quickly stimulated by these early studies by Brown and his colleagues. In a history of sociolinguistics sense, Brown and his colleagues' work represents an important initial contribution to an understanding of the structured dimensions of the social setting. Numerous subsequent studies have inquired into the social psychological implications of such forms of address (Little and Gelles 1975), and for a variety of social or linguistic settings, as for example, Italian (Bates and Benigni 1975), for Swedish (Paulston 1974, 1975a, 1975b), for Canadian French (Lambert 1967, 1969), for Hungarian (Hollos 1975), for Russian (Friedrich 1972; Mayer 1975), for Quaker speech (Shipley and Shipley 1969), for Slovene and Serbo-Croatian (Kess and Juričić 1978a, b; Juričić and Kess 1978), for Turkish (Casson and Ozertug 1976), for Spanish (Fox 1969), for Japanese (Martin 1964), for Yiddish (Slobin 1963), for Tagalog (Kess 1973), and even for business (Slobin et al 1968) and academic settings (McIntire 1972; Blocker 1976).

The Tagalog respect forms are several in number. They have, however, the dual functions of distinguishing individuals as members of the same or different groups (acquainted or unacquainted) as well as designating members of one's own group as equal or unequal socially for various reasons (superior, inferior, or equal). There are two basic ways of indicating respect in Tagalog. One of these is the use of the respect particles po and ho as contrasted with their absence (zero). This zero is paralleled in the language by the presence of three forms of the affirmative (*yes* opo, oho, and oo), corresponding to po, ho and zero, respectively. Thus, respect use in simple affirmatives is replaced by a special pair of affirmatives both meaning *yes*, but with the secondary feature of level of respectful address included. For example, compare opo *yes* (po) and oho *yes* (ho) with oo *yes*. (The negative simply follows the typical enclitic pattern of orderings, with hindi *no*, *not*, acting as the first full sentence word.)

Respect particles fall under the heading of enclitics in Tagalog, usually appearing after the first full word or phrase in the sentence. This initial full phrase may be either a verbal or adjectival predicate or a nominal or prepositional phrase. There are, of course, other enclitics, and where two or more enclitics appear, the enclitics are ordered by a fairly rigorous set of occurrence privileges when other enclitics are also present in the same sentence, such that they occur in a rigidly predetermined order. An example of this ordering with a fuller range of enclitics follows, though it is obviously unlikely that such a constellation of enclitics occurs that frequently in Tagalog sentences.

+ PREDICATE na nga po ba din lamang sana ± Substantive Topic

In other uses, the po particle (but apparently not the ho) is simply frozen in such calcified greeting expressions as Tao po *Anybody home* or *Hello the house* (usually met with Tuloy po kayo *Come on in!*) and in Mano po, *May I have your hand?* (a hand to head ritual greeting with much older respected individuals). It is also interesting to note that of the earlier studies in Tagalog, neither Totanes (1745) nor the much later Blake (1925) and Bloomfield (1917) mention ho (nor, consequently, oho). Of course, neither do some more contemporary studies as, for example, Aspillera (1969), and though this may have been merely oversight on their part, it does not seem as likely. Only more contemporary pedagogical treatments concentrating on the colloquial spoken seem to make clear mention of the two, for example, Bowen et al (1965). Moreover, the apparent variation between po and ho

has only been noted in Bowen et al (1965:5), where the inherent variability of the po/ho continuum is noted by indicating that 'though po is usually considered more formal than ho, some speakers prefer one, some the other, and some use both'.

The other sociolinguistic device used to express respect is the use of a plural pronoun to address an individual person. Commonly, it is the second person plural pronoun kayo which is typically used. Occasionally, and perhaps more rarely now, when the addressee is especially esteemed for his elevated position, Tagalog makes use of the third person plural pronoun sila in direct address. It also makes occasional use of it as respectful reference in the axis of conversational reference to a third person singular third party. Such conventions are not unknown elsewhere (see Martin 1964, for an example of this in Japanese; Hoppe and Kess 1978, for one in English; and Kess and Juričić 1978a, for an example in South Slavic). It does seem to be noticeably lacking in Spanish, classical or contemporary, if we were thinking of the latter as a possible origin for such sociolinguistic practices.

Both kayo and sila contrast with the second person singular pronoun ikaw (or ka, depending upon sentence position). The pronominal system of Tagalog is presented below in an effort to place pronominal contrasts in focus. Incorporating the first person plural inclusive-exclusive distinction, Tagalog pronouns fall into two categories: (1) those which refer to the speaker (S), the hearer (H), the speaker plus hearer (S+H) or some other person (NSH), and (2) those which refer to each of the above plus others (see Stockwell 1959).

	(1) Simple	(2) Plus Others
S	ako	kami
H	ikaw/ka	kayo
S+H	kata	tayo
NSH	siya	sila

In fact, there are three parallel pronominal paradigms in Tagalog: the ako paradigm (presented above), the ko paradigm, and the akin paradigm. These correspond to the particles ang, nang, and sa, which mark the case functions of noun phrases in sentences. Thus, personal pronouns in Tagalog fall into sets corresponding to the three sets of nominal expressions marked by the particles ang, nang, and sa. The ako, ko, and akin pronoun classes are as follows.

	ang/si	nang/ni	sa/kay
Person:			
I	ako	ko	akin
thou	ikaw, ka	mo	iyo
I and thou	kata	nata, ta	kanita
he, she	siya	niya	kaniya
we (exclusive)	kami	namin	amin
we (inclusive)	tayo	natin	atin
you	kayo	ninyo	inyo
they	sila	nila	kanila

The rules affecting the respectful use of the second person singular and plural touch identically upon its manifestations in all three paradigms.

This paper takes the position that the respect particles co-occur in principle, though not necessarily in each instance, with the plural pronoun kayo (sila is exempted from further treatment in this discussion because of its special status and relative rarity). While it is true that either the particles or the pronoun may occur alone it seems that where only one of them occurs, the absent form is alleged to be implied by the form which does appear. It is always possible to insert the absent respect form without any noticeable grammatical or lexical change in the content of the sentence, as for example,

Pumunta na (po) ba kayo?; Pumunta na (ho) ba kayo?
Did you go?

On the other hand, solidarity and absence of status differences is expressed by the reciprocal use of the second person singular pronoun ikaw/ka and the non-use of the respect particles.

The occasions when the singular pronoun ikaw occurs with po, for example, are rare and are usually sociolinguistically marked. For example, in prayer addressing God or the saints one notes ikaw and po (see Schachter and Otanes 1972); this is not entirely unlike the use of *thou, thy, thine* in the Early Modern English version of the *Our Father* in the King James 1611 bible *('Hallowed be thy name')* or the Spanish version of the *Padre Nuestro ('Santificado sea tu nombre')*. The Tagalog use of both ikaw, the familiar pronoun, and the respectful po represents the best possible compromise between the respectful awe and filial piety that Christians were to have shown in respect to the deity. The only other instances in Tagalog where such a paired presence (ikaw-po) occurs is in sarcas- tically marked speech, as for example, in ikaw po .... *you think you're so important, but ....* Here one is in disagreement with another's pretended great- ness and issues a mocking form of address; the two are in direct contrast, a sociolinguistic contradiction in terms. Other forms have been occasionally designated as used in respectful fashions, but their uses in this sense are not entirely frequent and are highly restricted. This is said of tayo *we* (inclusive), and is used in situations characterised by gaiety or playfulness or in situations where the speaker wishes to denote his identification with a familiar hearer who may find himself in the same situation as the speaker. It is not used with individuals who are either non-solidary or superior to oneself (see Bowen 1965:175).

Kin terms typically have respectful address overtones, since they are non-reciprocal and are embedded in the hierarchically structured familial system. Terms like ama *father*, ina *mother*, amain *uncle*, ale *aunt*, impo *grandmother*, and ingkong *grandfather*, may be said to have such dimensions. It is not generally customary for younger siblings to use respectful particles with older siblings, but distinctive terms for the children of a family unit distinguished by order of birth and sex do reflect non-reciprocity. For example, one notes terms like kuya and ate for the oldest brother and sister, diko and ditse for the second oldest, and sangko and sanse for the third oldest. One even has inso for spouse of the eldest son and siyaho for spouse of the eldest daughter.

Given the roots in sangko and sanse, one suspects that they may be derived from some southern Chinese dialect like Hokkien. Certainly the care in the differential naming of oldest to youngest child in the family unit is a Chinese sociolinguistic practice of long standing. Comparing the roots in Mandarin, one notes some remarkable similarities, more than could be possibly due to chance. Thus, compare

di 第 *second in a counting series* with diko and ditse; also

ge 哥 *elder brother* and

jiě 姐 *elder sister*. (See also

zǐ 姊 *elder sister*.) One also has

san 三 *three* and the previous roots in sangko and sanse. This borrowing seems to have been extended to inso and siyaho; compare

saǒ 嫂 *elder brother's wife* and jiě *elder sister* coupled with

fū 夫 *husband* (this latter would have heard the bilabial fricative qualities of fū and transferred it as an /h/). One also has

pó 婆 *paternal grandmother* for impo and

gōng 公 *paternal grandfather* for ingkong. It is easy to see parts of the highly respect-marked kin-address system as being borrowed from some Chinese language.

The similarities are even more striking with Hokkien, a more southerly coastal language, and one which is probably the most widespread Chinese language throughout South-east Asia. It is obvious that the terms and the highly respect-marked kin-address system has been borrowed from some Chinese language.

The use of titled forms of address also exhibit sociolinguistic dimensions of respectful address, either adding to or bestowing a sociolinguistic status on the individual. For example, terms like Aling before a female name or Mang before a male name function in this fashion. So also does pare, where even anonymous social exchanges can be superimposed on the respectful address system. For example, a buyer may address a street-vendor by using pare, *buddy*, *pal*, *Mac*, a term of non-solidary but seemingly familiar address. Though the vendor may be obviously lower in status in general, he becomes for this particular conversational exchange a banter partner in the buying-selling circumstance and the ensuing ritualised give-and-take (see Lynch 1962). None of this is particularly surprising, for according to Fox (1956), interpersonal relationships in the Philippines, especially those between non-kinsmen, are characterised by a marked self-awareness of personal position. It is not expected that one will find social devices for reducing possible friction and preventing the loss of self-esteem between non-kin types.

Lastly, one may also see the persistent use of the respect particles by one of the co-locutors after the other drops it from the conversation as a way of

keeping one's distance from one with whom one does not wish the social distance to close (see Lynch 1962). This is not unlike the strong-minded individual in English who insists on being addressed by title-plus-last-name (Mr Smith) after an aggressive salesman has tried to change the conversational tenor by switching to first names.

Use of the respect particles is not a pan-Philippine usage, however, and it is interesting to speculate on its possible origins. On the other hand, it is clearly not a general Philippine language characteristic, as the following discussion demonstrates. One possibility is that it is derived from Spanish sociolinguistic practices, though this is not easily demonstrated. Spanish, like all the languages of Europe, was party to the courtly spread of the pronouns of power and solidarity, and by the time of its colonial ministrations in South-east Asia this would have been a permanent sociolinguistic fixture in Spanish speech.

There is little question that the Spanish colonial regime had a tremendous impact on Philippine culture, and, as Wolff (1973) exemplifies, there is a good deal that can be told about the nature of Spanish-Filipino contact by the types of Spanish linguistic elements which find themselves in Philippine languages. Though the use of Spanish has practically disappeared from the Philippine scene, the amount and extent of bilingualism at one time must have been extremely widespread. One sees this both in the number of Spanish contact vernaculars as well as in the large extent to which Spanish borrowings penetrated the vocabulary core of Philippine languages. Wolff (1973:73) cites approximately 25 per cent of the total lexical entries in a Cebuano dictionary as being Spanish in origin. He notes further that 'in this way Cebuano is probably representative of languages spoken by Christian Filipinos'. The sociolinguistic status of Spanish must have always been that of the prestige language and Filipinos who did not master it would very likely have been wont to emulate it. Bilingualism must have been high in those speech communities which lived directly under strong Spanish influence and this influence must have permeated in some small fashion even the more remote peripheral areas by ripple effect.

That Spanish had a large sociolinguistic influence on the general social mores of large urban centres in the Philippines is supported by lexical borrowings in many languages in just these areas. For example, sexual mores, master-servant relationships, superior to inferior exchanges, the reception and treatment of guests, many kin terms, and so forth, are often of Spanish provenience in languages like Tagalog and Cebuano. It would not be surprising to expect that many other Spanish sociolinguistic conventions may have also found their way directly into the Filipino monolingual and bilingual communities.

Mention of Tagalog forms of respectful address is seen in the earliest Spanish treatments of Tagalog. Totanes (1745:17), for example, notes po, but indicates that there is no need to add kayo (cayo in Totanes' text, following Spanish orthographic practices). It may be that the respectful particles were already in use as a Tagalog device and that only the use of pronominal forms was derived from Spanish. The exact extent of the usage is puzzling, and Totanes presents a very incomplete picture, such that we are not sure of whether he is in fact recording contemporary sociolinguistic usage or simply seeing Tagalog through Spanish eyes. He does list (p.60) a verb magpaico (magpa-ikaw?), citing its gloss as *llamar de tu,* presumably the Tagalog equivalent of the Spanish *tutear.* He also (p.17, paragraph 59) records use of the second person plural for singular addressees in Tagalog. For example, he makes reference to asking questions of an inferior using ca or mo, depending upon the sequence in question. He also notes the use of cayo (kayo), comparing it to Spanish usage — the use of maano cayo? for *¿Como está VMd.? [Vuestra Merced].* It is interesting to note that the older form maano is used (cf. paano, *how*) instead of the contemporary borrowing

from Spanish, kumusta (from *¿Como esta?*).   Thus, the greeting borrowed into
Tagalog wholesale has not yet taken place.   While it is difficult to give a time-
scale for such events, the argument for Spanish origins would have been more
persuasive had the greeting been Kumusta kayo, reflecting the intrusion from
Spanish a little more convincingly.   Totanes' paragraph (p.17, paragraph 59) is
included below for its insights into that earlier stage.

> *59. Con este* anó *se pregunta el parenteseo, ó dependencia,*
> *que uno tiene con otro, poniendo (para hablar con politica)*
> *al que fuere, ó parceiere mayor en nominativo, y al otro en*
> *genitivo. Vg.: (preguntando al superior)* Anóca nitong
> babáye, l. báta? *qué eres tú de esta muger, ó de este*
> *muchacho? Y responde* Amà, *soy padre.* Asàua, *soy su marido,*
> Panĝinoon, *soy su señor, etc.* Anómo itong tàuo? *(preguntando*
> *al inferior)* Amà, *es mi padre.* Asàua, *es mi marido, etc.,*
> *aunque tambien ponen en nominativo á aquel á quien preguntan,*
> *sin atencion á mayor ó menor.* Anóca nitong babáye?
> *(preguntando á un chiquillo)* Anàc, *soy su hijo. Hablando*
> *asimismo el inferior á su superior como amo, ó P. Ministro,*
> *etc., y como usando nosotros nombres de Usted, ó de V.*
> *merced, lo practican del modo siguiente; en lugar de las*
> *partículas de* icáo, l. ca, *usan de la partícula* cayó.
> *Vg.:* maano cayó? *como está Vmd.?* Cun cayo, i, hindi napa
> sa Maynila? *si Vmd. no hubiera ido á Manila? y ási del*
> *mismo modo en todas las locaciones de esta clase: con la*
> *advertencia, de que al* cayo *no se le ha de añadir la*
> *partícula* pó: *con lo que se particulariza este comun modo*
> *de hablar, bastante usado en los mas advertidos.*

By the time turn-of-the-century English descriptions like Blake's (1925)
appear, this sociolinguistic practice was already well established, and is of
course a fact of current Tagalog usage.   (Note that although Blake's comprehen-
sive work, *A grammar of the Tagalog language,* appeared in 1925, his research was
easily begun just after the turn of the century, as attested to by his many
earlier publications.)

Languages in contact situations often produce different results, and when
looking at the other languages of the Philippines, this sociolinguistic device
appears rather limited.   Rather than all the languages which had intimate and
continuing contact with Spanish having borrowed this practice, the following
picture emerges.   Tagalog is paralleled in its particle or pronominal usage by
those languages which more or less surround it, suggesting a sociolinguistic
drift of the practice.   Other languages of the group further north (except
Ilokano which, as a large and important language, may have had more contact with
either Spanish or Tagalog or both) and further south, are conspicuously lacking
in this device.   The same is also largely true for the languages of the Bisayas
surveyed here; this feature has in fact been cited by some (Lynch 1962) as at
least one characteristic differentiating Tagalog from the Bisayan languages.
Since only a limited representative sample of languages was surveyed, it is
always possible that another sample would provide a different picture, though
this is not likely.

To give the specific languages surveyed for this paper, we may note that in
the Bisayas Cebuano (Wolff 1966:40; Bunye 1971:10) uses titled forms of address.
Motus (1971:86) notes similar respectful titles of address in Hiligaynon, but
neither po-like forms nor pronominal deployment.

On Luzon, Bikol (Mintz 1971:409) has both respect marker po and a second person plural pronoun (kamó) usage for a singular addressee. Most interestingly, Mintz (1971:116) notes that po is generally used in the Naga dialect of Bikol and dialects north towards Manila, but is rarely heard in the south. It may be that this reflects the earlier spread of this sociolinguistic device either from Spanish or through Tagalog from Spanish making a case for the contact limitations of such sociolinguistic practices derived from Spanish. If this is in fact the explanation for this situation, one speculates that such geographic constraints would have been that much more restrictive in an age without mass media.

Mirikitani (1972) notes the Kapampangan respect form pu as "a term marking deference and formality of speech (p.12)", and the distinction between ka *you* (singular) and kayu *you* (plural) as being one with politeness overtones (p.21). M. Forman (personal communication) has also confirmed this fact for Kapampangan. Benton (1971:14, 84) also notes the use of the second person plural pronoun (kayó) as having respectful address overtones in Pangasinan and a respect marker pa (p.178).

Further north, Bernabe (1971:9) notes the plural pronoun used in Ilokano as a sign of respect. L. Reid (personal communication) also notes no use of respect particles in Ilocano, but notes that there are respectful pronouns for address. Reid (personal communication) further notes no use of particles or pronouns for Bontoc nor for Ivatan on the Batanes islands north of Luzon.

An early study by Scheerer (1905) notes that the Nabaloi dialect of Igorot has only respectful overtones to the use of the first person pronouns inclusive and exclusive (sikatayo and sikame). Scheerer (1905:113) notes that

> sikame will be heard, for instance, in a respectful report
> to a superior; sikatayo, on the contrary, in familiar talk
> among equals. The same propriety in speaking is found in
> Ilocano, Tagalog, etc., but is especially noteworthy among
> Igorot who otherwise address everybody, high or low, with
> sikam (thou), after the fashion of the Tyrolese mountaineers.

Scheerer, of course, would have been extremely conscious of this distinction, given the status of *Du/Sie* exchanges in German, and so we can take his testimony as to its non-appearance in Igorot. This is in keeping with the sociolinguistic practices of the other northern languages surveyed here.

T. Headland (personal communication) also notes that Dumagat, a Negrito language of north-eastern Luzon, has neither pronouns nor particles as respectful address devices.

In Mindanao, H. McKaughan (personal communication) notes neither particles nor pronouns used in respectful address devices for Maranao. Recalling that Maranao is in Muslim territory, with Marawi City a predominantly Muslim city, this absence would be entirely expected if the provenience of such forms of respectful address is ultimately Spanish.

Chamorro, like Palauan, belongs to the Philippine subgrouping by reason of their verb morphology and other characteristics. According to D. Topping (personal communication), Chamorro has neither respect particles nor the respect-ful deployment of pronouns like Tagalog. The Marianas were also discovered for Spain by Magellan (chronologically just before the Philippines) on his westward journey home while circumnavigating the globe for the first time. There was also a mission there since the 1600s, and an early and lasting influence on Chamorro from Spanish was the case until 1898 when Guam went to the United States.

The presence and importance of Spanish influence linguistically is amply testified to by the Spanish contact vernaculars in the Philippines, languages like Caviteño, Ermiteño, Davaueño, and Zamboangueño (see Whinnom 1956; also McKaughan 1958, Frake 1971). In general, much of the vocabulary of these Spanish contact creoles is Spanish in origin (though the grammar is markedly Filipino in structure), giving some idea of the penetration of Spanish in areas where it impinged closely and continuously on Filipino linguistic communities. Not surprisingly, these contact vernaculars often show the residue of Spanish socio-linguistic practices, since they were the result of creolisation with Spanish, from whence much of the original pidgin was derived.

Thus, M. Forman (personal communication) notes that while there are no particles in Zamboangueño, the second person pronoun set does have respectful uses like the Spanish and Tagalog. In discussing the Zamboangueño second person pronouns singular ʔuste, tu, ʔebos and plural ʔustedes, bosotros, and kamo, Frake (1971:226) also notes the differences in respect usage between the two sets. It is difficult to tell from Molony's (1977:156-161) description whether the same thing is happening in Ternateño, though one guesses it likely to be similar.

In those Philippine languages which make use of this sociolinguistic device, the practice seems to run fairly parallel to that of other languages. In fact, claims about sociolinguistic universals in terms of which pronominal respect forms of address have been used have been made by Slobin, Miller, and Porter (1968). They suggest (1968:289) that

> It is apparently a sociolinguistic universal that the address term exchanged between intimates ("familiar pronoun," first name, etc.) is the same term used in addressing social inferiors, and that the term exchanged between nonintimates ("polite pronoun," title and last name, etc.) is also used to address social superiors.

The universality of such observations is certainly open to question, though those Philippine languages which do use it seem to follow the general pattern. There is little quarrel with other such suggestions that the greater the status between individuals the greater is the probability of non-reciprocal address in those languages which do have such sociolinguistic mechanisms. However, it is certainly not a pan-Philippine characteristic, and many languages do not use it or use other means.

As for Spanish origins, the case is attractive, but inconclusive. Either the sociolinguistic device of pronominal deployment was borrowed and assimilated quickly enough from Spanish to have appeared in Totanes (1745) or it was already present. One would have expected other major languages of the grouping to have also done the same; Ilokano seems to have vestiges of it, but Cebuano and other Bisayan languages do not. The case would have been more convincing, had all the major contacted languages had the feature. Those languages surrounding Tagalog probably have it as a result of a ripple effect, but the question is whether this has ultimately a Spanish origin again or is a typological feature spread from Tagalog itself. A plausible guess is that the pronominal deployment feature was borrowed from Spanish and very early; there is, however, no immediate way of supplying incontrovertible proof for this speculation. The respectful enclitic particles po and ho may have had their own native history, and the remainder of this paper deals with their contemporary sociolinguistic usage pattern.

Turning to the analysis of the respect particles, an earlier preliminary analysis (see Kess 1973) was made on the basis of dialogues found in either the popular literature or in teaching materials. At first blush, the first division

seemed to be between addressees who are solidary (+S) and those who are not (-S). Solidarity is a continuum between acquaintance and familiarity. The next division involves the factors of relative status (S) or relative age (A). The +SA category requires only one plus. If the addressee is plus status or plus relative age (or both), he is considered +SA. If the addressee is about the same status and the same age, he is ±SA; if both factors are absent, he is -SA.

In sum, the function of Tagalog respect forms may be represented generally as below. The first distinction involves the presence (R) or absence (NR) of respect forms. Thus, if the addressee is +S but -SA or ±SA, respect forms normally do not occur, while the remainder of the categories do require them.

+SA	R	R	+SA
±SA	NR	R	±SA
-SA	NR	R	-SA
	+S	-S	

This earlier analysis posited a possible third division to account for two distinct though complementary groupings. Addressees who are +SA and +S, may also stand in a particularly solidary relationship with the speaker (though others may not). This relationship may be considered a secondary degree of solidarity, or, for lack of a better term, familiarity (F). The former (+SA, +S, +F) may option- ally receive ho, but the latter (+SA, -F, +S) seemed to obligatorily receive po — for example, an employer or professor one is on good terms with, as opposed to one with whom the speaker is not. The second distinction between the variation of po and ho seemed to be a matter of style and the variation dependent on external factors. For -S and -SA or ±SA addressees the speaker seemed permitted a stylistic choice between po and ho. For -SA and -S addressees the speaker seemed permitted two choices. The first is between R and NR; the second a stylistic choice between po and ho, if R is chosen. Such a situation might arise with addressees who are in a temporary 'service' relationship like waiters and store clerks. Some speakers appeared to punctuate the initial stages of the exchange with respect forms, and them omit them altogether, as if there were a subtle balance between the -SA and -S factors, one momentarily outweighing the other.

Thirdly, on the +S side, +SA addressees who were +F seemed to optionally receive a ho and those who were not a po. There was a distinction between those -S addressees who exhibited some kind of plus absolute status (+AS), like a bishop, and those who did not (-AS). The former appeared to obligatorily receive po, the latter according to the speaker's style, either po or ho, as summarised below.

	+S	-S	
+SA	+F po ---------- -F ho	po +AS ---------- {po -AS {ho	+SA
±SA	∅	{po {ho	±SA
-SA	∅	{po {ho ∅	-SA

Despite typical claims to the contrary, it seemed that po and ho were not just in a more to less respectful continuum of usage. The relationship between the two seems to be also characterised by an inherent variability, and contemporary sociolinguistic usage patterns were checked by means of a detailed questionnaire. A four-page 115-dyad questionnaire (derived from an earlier twenty-page 460-dyad questionnaire) was graciously filled out by twenty-eight native Tagalog speakers. The dyad exchanges included highly restricted situations like kin exchanges at the one end of the continuum and less restricted exchanges like service relationship exchanges at the other. The questionnaire included situational exchange categories like the following:

(a) kin terms (kin terms were also varied to obtain the interplay of additional factors like age and degree of acquaintance):
    e.g. son (child) to father vs. son (adult) to father; considerably older male cousin to female cousin (close ties) vs. considerably older male cousin to female cousin (first acquaintance);

(b) similar work situation:
    e.g. male salesclerk to older female salesclerk (first acquaintance) vs. male salesclerk to older female salesclerk (long acquaintance);

(c) employer-employee situation:
    e.g. male salesclerk to same age male boss (first acquaintance) vs. male salesclerk to same age male boss (long acquaintance);

(d) employer-employee situation + status as a relative:
    e.g. male boss to young male employee who is also a relative, while at work vs. while at family gatherings;

(e) equal status:
    e.g. male doctor to male doctor: first acquaintance vs. colleague status;
    e.g. nun to nun; first acquaintance vs. long-standing acquaintance vs. long-standing friendship;

(f) service relationships:
    e.g. young female shopkeeper to young male customer: first acquaintance vs. intermittent customer vs. steady customer;
    e.g. young male teacher to young mother visiting the school;

(g) formalised settings:
    e.g. middle-aged host to guest who is less socially prominent than host.

Contemporary usage patterns derived from the questionnaire provide the following picture of primary dimensions in the deployment of respect particles (and by extension, probably for pronominal forms as well). In the kin setting, absolute age merits the greatest degree of respect usage in upward exchanges. The greatest usage of po is seen from grandson to grandfather; from this exchange it is a descending scale of po to ho usage according to relationship. For example, note the following table (P=po; H=ho; E=either; and N=neither).

grandson (child) to grandfather	P 67%	H 4%	E 30%
son to father	P 46%	H 7%	E 43%	N 4%
niece (child) to uncle	P 14%	H 29%	E 54%	N 4%

It seems that all kin elders receive respectful forms, but the greater the age for such individuals within the mainstream family line, the greater the percentage of P. This is affirmed by grandfather addressees who receive the highest percentage of P in the entire questionnaire; the child to old man exchange, for example, only receives 54% P.

There seems to be little change in upward exchanges as the child becomes an adult; an adult son or daughter uses almost the same degree of respect as when a child. The same also appears to be true for other upward exchanges like aunts or uncles. There is some movement towards H, but it is not overly significant. For example, note the following table.

daughter (adult) to father	P 43%	H 14%	E 39%	N 4%
son (child) to father	P 46%	H 7%	E 43%	N 4%
niece (child) to uncle	P 14%	H 29%	E 54%	N 4%
nephew (adult) to uncle	P 14%	H 29%	E 50%	N 4%

This is in contrast with the intuitive expectations of at least one subject, who noted that "in general, an adult child (male or female) switches to ho or 'neither' when talking to his/her parents. It is as if the child has acquired a more equal status with the parents". One explanation may be that some subjects simply recorded the sociolinguistic practices within their own familial setting, and some chose to view the matter of these exchanges in the abstract. Nevertheless, the data point in the direction of a minimal degree of movement toward H in this setting. Moreover, familial kin relationships are not relationships that can be renegotiated, as for example, the English shift from title — last-name to first-name; rather, they are fixed and stable, unchanging over time, as is the intimacy of the kin relationship. It is not unexpected that the sociolinguistic expression of these relationships are also fixed over time, not as subject to change as are other types of social relationships which may be both renegotiated and see a movement toward greater intimacy.

In the downward direction P and H rarely appear at any age for the addressee. The only time the enclitics might appear, apparently, is sarcastically, when a child is being rude, to remind him to use the forms. For example, note the following table.

grandfather to grandson (child)	96% N
father to son (child)	93% N
uncle to niece (child)	96% N
uncle to nephew (adult)	96% N
father to daughter (adult)	96% N

As expected, P/H play a minor role in sibling relationships. Still, recalling the earlier discussion of sibling terms embedded within a ordered hierarchy-by-birth-order system, it is not surprising to see some use of H in an upward relationship (especially when the age is unstated, and one is possibly dealing with a wide range of age separation). Note, for example, the following table. Thus, a boy addressing an older sister gives 25% H, 21% E, and 54% N, while receiving 96% N in return.

As one moves further from mainstream familial ties, one finds that other dimensions like age take precedence, mirroring other social exchanges. For ·example, note the following table where the ratio of N responses is tied directly to age difference.

male cousin to female cousin of same age (close ties)	96% N
male cousin to considerably older female cousin (close ties)	37% N
considerably older male cousin to female cousin (close ties)	85% N

The fact of an inherent kinship relationship does make for an inherent acquaintanceship tie. Consequently, one sees less of its effects, and there is only a slightly greater tendency to use respect forms when unacquainted, as seen in the following table.

	P	H	E	N
considerably older cousin to cousin				
- (close ties)		H 14%	E 4%	N 82%
- (on first acquaintance)		H 14%	E 7%	N 79%
cousin to cousin of same age				
- (close ties)			E 4%	N 96%
- (on first acquaintance)		H 4%	E 7%	N 89%
younger cousin to considerably older cousin				
- (close ties)	P 4%	H 30%	E 30%	N 37%
- (on first acquaintance)	P 4%	H 29%	E 36%	N 32%

In meeting individuals for the first time, where no social parameters are mentioned, the overtly discernible variable of age emerges as a powerful determinant in P/H usage. Very simply, the older the addressee is in respect to the speaker, the greater the respect usage; the younger, the less its use. For example, young man to child elicits 96% N while the reverse only 7% N, a large gap for a minimal age distance. Similarly, old woman to child elicits 96% N, old man to young man 89% N, old man to middle-aged woman 74% N, and old man to old woman 59% N. Even children are expected, at least in the abstract, to pay some heed to the sociolinguistic dimensions of such exchanges, as seen in the following.

child to young man	P 14%	H 32%	E 29%	N 25%
child to middle-aged woman	P 14%	H 39%	E 39%	N 7%
child to old man	P 54%	H 14%	E 29%	N 4%

Sex does not seem to be as important a variable, although one does record some respect usage for same age (young) male-female co-locutors, possibly, as one subject noted, perhaps as much so as "not to appear fresh or ill-mannered", as for the lack of solidarity variable. For example, a young man to young woman elicits 3% P, 10% H, 14% E, and 69% N.

In similar work settings, age and acquaintance emerge as the primary dimensions. Thus, the older the addressee, the higher the percentage and type of respect usage, as evidenced in the following table.

salesclerk to salesclerk of same age (first acquaintance)	89% N
salesclerk to older salesclerk (first acquaintance)	0% N
salesclerk to salesclerk of same age (long acquaintance)	89% N
salesclerk to older salesclerk (long acquaintance)	15% N

On first acquaintance, it is simply age that matters in P/H assignment; for example, compare 0% N for younger to older salesclerk exchanges and 64% N for old to young exchanges. But speakers of the same age are more familiar in address (89% N) than even older speakers addressing younger salesclerk colleagues (64% N). In the case of long acquaintance, both exchange dyads show an equal degree of familiarity (86% N). There also seems to be a tendency towards less use of the respect forms when there is a relationship of long acquaintance between co-locutors of disparate ages. Note, for example, the following.

younger to older salesclerk (first acquaintance)	P 7%	H 61%	E 32%	N 0%
younger to older salesclerk (long acquaintance)	P 4%	H 52%	E 30%	N 15%

On the other hand, for same-age dyads in the similar work scenario, acquaintance does not seem to be as significant a variable as it is elsewhere. Same-age salesclerks on first acquaintance elicit 4% P, 0% H, 7% E, and 89% N, while the same dyad under the long acquaintance condition elicits exactly the same responses.

In the similar work setting where status differences do exist, employee to employer address also pays heed to the age variable. Thus, if the boss is older, the employee uses more respectful forms of address, depending on the age discrepancy. If the boss is the same age, there is less of a tendency to use a respect particle. Similarly, if the boss is younger, there is also less tendency to use a respect particle. The factor of long acquaintance seems not to make too much difference here either, and the percentages are almost the same for first or long acquaintanceship relationships. Note, for example, the following table.

employee to older boss (first acquaintance)	P 4%	H 61%	E 36%	N 0%
employee to boss of same age (first acquaintance)	P 11%	H 32%	E 36%	N 21%
employee to younger boss (first acquaintance)	P 11%	H 29%	E 32%	N 29%
employee to boss of same age (long acquaintance)	P 4%	H 44%	E 15%	N 37%
employee to younger boss (long acquaintance)	P 7%	H 44%	E 11%	N 37%

In the case of an older boss, the age difference remains fixed and there is still the likelihood of respectful address being given. Compare, for example 37% N to a boss of the same age with 0% N to an older boss, both in the long acquaintance condition. It would appear that acquaintance is a relevant variable for an employee addressing a younger or same-age boss. At first acquaintance there is a greater tendency to use P or E, while with long acquaintance there is a greater tendency to use H or N. However, when addressing an older boss the degree of acquaintance seems almost irrelevant, for the age difference is fixed. One may conclude that age is ultimately a more important variable than acquaintance, though acquaintance is the dimension that defines other relationships which are not already predetermined by a substantial age gap. For example, note the following table.

employee to boss of same age (first acquaintance)	P 11%	H 32%	E 36%	N 21%
employee to boss of same age (long acquaintance)	P 4%	H 44%	E 15%	N 37%
employee to younger boss (first acquaintance)	P 11%	H 29%	E 32%	N 29%
employee to younger boss (long acquaintance)	P 7%	H 44%	E 11%	N 37%
employee to older boss (first acquaintance)	P 4%	H 61%	E 36%	N 0%
employee to older boss (long acquaintance)	P 7%	H 59%	E 33%	N 0%

Despite the added dimension of the employee being a kin relative, age remains the prime factor. Thus, an older relative is less likely to use a respect form to his boss than is a related employee who is younger than the boss. For example, the data show that an older related employee elicits 79% N to an older boss at a

family gathering while a younger employee elicits only 18% N. Moreover, a boss is more likely to use a respect form at work with an older related employee (36% N) than with a younger related one (23% N). This is matched by the boss to older related employee dyad in the family gathering setting with 25% N, as opposed to the boss to younger related employee there with 89% N.

The setting itself may exert some pressure on the formality of the exchange, such that one sees slightly less exchange of respect forms at family gatherings than in the formal settings of the workplace. In general, it seems that a kin relationship between co-locutors assumes a long acquaintance, and subjects were wont to treat it as such. It also seems to confer a special dimension to the relationship entirely congruent with this observation, and one sees somewhat less use of P (and consequently more use of H, E, or N) in the questionnaires than one sees for other dyadic relationships.

Service relationships again revert to the age variable as the primary feature. A teacher to parent exchange, for example, is primarily concerned with this feature, such that the older the addressee the more likely the respect forms. The progression of increasing use of respect forms is easily seen in the following trio of exchanges:

young teacher to young father visiting school	P 4%	N 46%
young teacher to middle-aged mother visiting school	P 11%	N 7%
young teacher to old father visiting school	P 14%	N 0%

Though there is less likelihood of respect forms in addressing someone younger, the very role setting itself seems to exert functional-stylistic pressure to observe the formality of the exchange setting, and one notes a higher percentage of respect forms than one might otherwise. This has also been observed elsewhere (see Kess and Juričić on South Slavic, 1978a) to a much more dramatic effect. Note, for example, the following table for some indication of how Tagalog seems to handle this setting for teachers to parents visiting the school.

middle-aged male teacher to old father	P 14%	H 57%	E 29%	N 0%
middle-aged female teacher to middle-aged mother	P 8%	H 31%	E 31%	N 31%
old male teacher to young mother	P 4%	H 29%	E 14%	N 54%
old female teacher to middle-aged father	P 4%	H 37%	E 19%	N 41%

For other service exchanges like shopkeeper to customer, both age and acquaintance are relevant variables. The greater the degree of acquaintance in a service relationship, the greater the likelihood of the one serving to use N. For example, for same-age young shopkeeper to young customer, the percentage of N use goes from 57% for first acquaintance to 79% as an intermittent customer and 93% N for a steady customer. The greatest jump is obviously between the first acquaintance and intermittent customer conditions, a feature that emerges from other shopkeeper to customer triads of this type. As expected, age also emerges as a

criterial feature, such that old and middle-aged shopkeepers are more likely to use N (82% and 64%, respectively) to a young customer on first acquaintance, and so on. However, this difference is much smaller when the customer is an inter-mittent or a steady one. The young shopkeeper is somewhat less likely to use a respect form than his older counterparts in the steady customer condition. For example, young shopkeepers to intermittent young customers elicit 81% N, middle-aged shopkeepers to intermittent middle-aged customers 82% M, and old shopkeepers to intermittent old customers 86% N while the same dyads in the steady customer condition elicit 93% N, 86% N, and 86% N, respectively.

The acquaintance variable is superseded by the age variable when present. Thus, in the case of older customers, younger shopkeepers use almost the same degree of respect in addressing customers in any of the three conditions. However, for same-age dyads at the older end of the continuum, acquaintance once again emerges as an important characteristic. Thus, for example, a steady middle-aged customer will receive 71% N from the same-age middle-aged shopkeeper, while one who is visiting the store for the first time will receive 25% N (compare with 29% for a younger intermittent customer). And at the lower end of the age continuum, younger shopkeepers are more likely to use N when addressing same-age steady customers (93%) than are middle-aged or old shopkeepers addressing same-age steady customers (74% and 59% respectively). This seems to be true in general at the younger end of the age continuum, even for intermittent customers. For example, younger shopkeepers to same-age intermittent customers proffer 57% N, while middle-aged and old shopkeepers only proffer 29% and 39% N to same-aged intermittent customers. This is also true of the first acquaintance conditions as well, so that a same-aged customer visiting the store for the first time will more likely receive N if the shopkeeper is young. Compare, for example, the percentage of N responses for same-age shopkeeper to customer exchanges for young (93%), middle-aged (25%), and old (33%) under this condition.

When the situation is reversed to customers addressing shopkeepers, the age factor again emerges as primary. The degree of respectful address increases as the age difference increases between speaker and addressee. This holds true regardless of degree of frequency of patronage and acquaintance, as seen in the following table.

young steady customer to young shopkeeper	P 4%	H 0%	E 4%	N93%
young steady customer to middle-aged shopkeeper	P 4%	H48%	E41%	N 7%
young steady customer to old shopkeeper	P14%	H50%	E36%	N 0%
young intermittent customer to young shopkeeper	P 3%	H 7%	E17%	N72%
young intermittent customer to mid-aged shopkeeper	P 7%	H57%	E29%	N 7%
young intermittent customer to old shopkeeper	P21%	H43%	E36%	N 0%
young customer to young shopkeeper (first acquaintance)	P 4%	H21%	E18%	N57%
young customer to middle-aged shopkeeper (first acquaintance)	P 7%	H52%	E41%	N 0%
Young customer to old shopkeeper (first acquaintance)	P25%	H43%	E32%	N 0%

In the downward direction, the degree of familiarity does have an effect, so that moving from first-time to intermittent to steady customer status is reflected in the degree of N given to younger shopkeepers. Note, for example, the following table.

```
middle-aged customer to younger shopkeeper
        first acquaintance      63% N
        intermittent            86% N
        steady                  89% N

old customer to younger shopkeeper
        first acquaintance      79% N
        intermittent            89% N
        steady                  96% N
```

This even extends to the upward relationship, but ever so slightly. There is just a slight shading toward less P and more H or E, when the degree of familiarity is increased, as can be seen in the following trio.

```
young customer to old shopkeeper (first acquaintance)           P25% H43% E32%
intermittent young customer to old shopkeeper (first acquaintance) P21% H43% E36%
steady young customer to old shopkeeper                         P14% H50% E36%
```

Not surprisingly, there seems to be a slightly greater tendency for shopkeepers to use a respect form to customers than vice versa. No doubt buyers are aware of both the caveat emptor dictum and the heightened sociolinguistic persuasiveness of the marketplace, and this is not too surprising a finding.

Turning to urban versus rural settings, one finds in general neighbours in a rural environment are seen as showing more respect forms than their urban counterparts. Moreover, the tendency is more marked for rural speakers in first-acquaintance situations. Thus, one finds the following comparisons between barrio and urban settings.

	Rural	Urban
male neighbour to male neighbour (first acquaintance)	32% N	61% N
male neighbour to male neighbour (long acquaintance)	71% N	89% N
male neighbour to male neighbour (long friendship)	82% N	82% N
female neighbour to female neighbour (first acquaintance)	29% N	57% N
female neighbour to female neighbour (long acquaintance)	71% N	86% N
female neighbour to female neighbour (long friendship)	79% N	86% N

This also seems to match with observations by at least one subject, who noted that in Laguna she (in her thirties) is addressed as po by the old people, presumably because she is matandang dugo *old blood*, possibly because at some time in the past her great-grandfather might have been a teniente del barrio. Not only is this Jungian consciousness of traditions past more typical of a fixed stable community, so also are the social positions less privy to change here. Urbanisation makes for anonymity and less risk in social exchanges as well and consequently more likelihood of change. Still, as noted in the preceding table, even in the rural setting, there is less use of P/H as the degree of acquaintance increases. This is mirrored in the urban exchanges, where the degree of acquaintance is also translated into differences in the percentage of N responses. Thus, an urban male neighbour to a male neighbour elicits 61% N under the first acquaintance condition and 89% N under the long acquaintance condition; his female neighbour to female neighbour counterpart similarly elicits 57% N under the first condition, and 82% N under the second.

In assessing exchanges at an informal party or gathering, the more socially prominent the addressee the higher the likelihood of respect forms from host to guest. This may be compounded with age differences in the downward relationship in the absence of this factor, but can be clearly seen in its presence, as seen in the following.

younger host to more socially prominent guest	P 15%	H 44%	E 26%	N 15%
younger host to less socially prominent guest	P 7%	H 19%	E 22%	N 52%
older host to more socially prominent guest	P 11%	H 37%	E 19%	N 33%
older host to less socially prominent guest	P 4%	H 4%	E 7%	N 85%

For guest to host exchanges, the feature of relative age is the critical feature once again. The younger the guest in relation to the host, the higher the incidence of respect forms. This seems to run across the feature of social prominence, and likely takes some precedence over it as the primary variable when the two are in conflict, as seen in the following table.

younger more prominent guest to host	P 0%	H 19%	E 30%	N 52%
older more prominent guest to host	P 7%	H 7%	E 0%	N 85%
younger less prominent guest to host	P 11%	H 15%	E 22%	N 52%
older less prominent guest to host	P 7%	H 7%	E 11%	N 74%

Social prominence does not seem to be an overly important variable for guests addressing hosts. It would appear that age is the defining feature, and that further, the functional stylistic role of the host is one which automatically draws a certain status from its realisation. Note, for example, the following table, in which there is only a subtle shift in the responses.

more prominent older guest to host	P 7%	H 7%	E 0%	N 85%
less prominent older guest to host	P 7%	H 7%	E 11%	N 74%
younger more prominent guest to host	P 0%	H 19%	E 30%	N 52%
younger less prominent guest to host	P 11%	H 15%	E 22%	N 52%

Secondly, hosts are more likely to use respect forms to more prominent guests than guests are to hosts. In general, social prominence is a feature more relevant to the sociolinguistic choices made by hosts to guests than it is for guests to hosts (whose duties are already well defined by the role). Age differences, as always, seem to be extremely important; for the guest addressee social prominence may also be an extremely highly profiled feature. Note, for example, the following.

younger host to more prominent guest	P 15%	H 44%	E 26%	N 15%
younger guest to more prominent host	P 11%	H 15%	E 22%	N 52%
older host to more prominent guest	P 11%	H 37%	E 19%	N 33%
older guest to more prominent host	P 7%	H 7%	E 11%	N 74%

In general summation, one concludes that age is the most important variable in determining respectful address and the forms thereof. The older the addressee in relation to the speaker, the higher the incidence of respect forms, while the inverse sees their absence. A second variable is degree of acquaintance, such that the greater the degree of acquaintance, the less the degree of respect. It does not, however, usually supersede the factor of age. Other factors like occupational status, social prominence, and service relationships all play a part in determining the roles of the co-locutors, and this is reflected in the degree of respectful address used. Lastly, rural speech is perceived as being more conservative than urban speech in respect to respectful address considerations.

In general, the results also show females as somewhat more formal than males in their usage practices. There is not a wholesale shift in sociolinguistic styles, but rather a gradient with women tending to be slightly more polite and more formal. This is in keeping with sociolinguistic patterns generally reported elsewhere.

My attention has also been called to the possibility of differential patterns even among age groups separated by a mere decade or so (personal communication, Teresita V. Ramos). For example, at least one questionnaire from a respondent in his thirties seemed to have different patterns of response, using ho and po only rarely, to two others from the same subject subset in their forties. Ho seems to be more commonly used by younger speakers, and to the degree that age differences were noted in our survey, ho seems to be on the increase especially among young speakers (see also Schachter and Otanes 1972:324).

Lastly, the data indicate that ho is more frequent than po, which seems to occur primarily in situations of extreme respect (for example, young teacher to old father, grandson to grandfather, or young customer to old shopkeeper on first

acquaintance). It is clear that ho is on the rise in general, while po seems to be in the process of being set aside for special circumstances to show absolute respect. It also seems that po is used with really old people regardless of status. As one subject suggested, "for instance, a young senator will use po to an old garbage collector. The old garbage collector will show respect for the young senator by addressing him as 'Senator' but may not use po." In general, ho is both more common and is used when po is inappropriate, but there is nevertheless a need to show respect or social distance. When in doubt, one can and often does use ho. It may be that this is a change in the sociolinguistic strategies underlying the po/ho usage. Although several subjects noted that "the use of po/ho is dying in Manila", one suspects that it is rather a change in the relative weight and importance attached to the respect particles that may have accounted for this impression. Indeed, on the contrary, the data here reported suggest that the forms of respectful address are alive and well in Tagalog speech.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ASPILLERA, P.

   1969   *Basic Tagalog*. Rutland, Vt: Charles E. Tuttle Co.

BATES, Elizabeth and Laura BENIGNI

   1975   Rules of address in Italy: a sociolinguistic survey. *Language in Society* 4:271-288.

BENTON, Richard A.

   1971   *Spoken Pangasinan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

BERNABE, Emma et al

   1971   *Ilokano lessons*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

BLAKE, F.R.

   1925   *A grammar of the Tagalog language*. American Oriental Series 1. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society.

BLOCKER, Dianne

   1976   *And how shall I address you? A study of address systems at Indiana University*. Working Papers in Sociolinguistics 33. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

BLOOMFIELD, L.

   1917   *Tagalog texts with grammatical analysis*. *University of Illinois Studies in Languages and Literature* 3.

BOWEN, J. Donald et al

   1965   *A beginning course in Tagalog*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

BROWN, Roger W.

   1965   *Social psychology*. New York: The Free Press.

BROWN, Roger W. and Marguerite FORD

   1964   Address in American English. In: Dell Hymes, ed. *Language in culture and society: a reader in linguistics and anthropology,* 234-244. New York: Harper and Row.

BROWN, Roger W. and Albert GILMAN

   1960   The pronouns of power and solidarity. In: Thomas A. Sebeok, ed. *Style and language,* 253-276. New York: MIT Press.

BUNYE, Maria and Elsa P. YAP

   1971   *Cebuano grammar notes.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

CASSON, Ronald W. and Banu OZERTUG

   1976   Respect and address in a Turkish village: a quantitative sociolinguistic account. *American Ethnologist* 3:587-602.

CONSTANTINO, Ernesto

   1971   Tagalog and other major languages of the Philippines. In: Thomas A. Sebeok, ed. *Current trends in linguistics* 8:112-154. The Hague: Mouton.

FORMAN, Michael L.

   1971   *Kapampangan grammar notes.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

FOX, J.

   1969   The pronouns of address in Spanish. *Actes du Xe Congress Internationale des Linguistique,* 685-693. Bucarest: Academie.

FOX, Robert B.

   1956   The Filipino concept of self-esteem. *Area handbook on the Philippines,* vol.1:430-436. Chicago: Human Relations Area Files.

FRAKE, Charles O.

   1971   Lexical origins and semantic structure in Philippine Creole Spanish. In: Dell Hymes, ed. *Pidginization and creolization of languages,* 223-242. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

FRIEDRICH, Paul.

   1972   Social context and semantic feature: the Russian pronominal usage. In: John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes, eds *Directions in sociolinguistics,* 270-300. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

GEERTZ, Clifford

   1961   *The religion of Java.* New York: The Free Press.

GONZALEZ, Mary A.

   1965   The Ilongo kinship system and terminology. *Philippine Sociological Review* 13/1:23-31.

HOLLOS, Marida

   1975   *Comprehension and use of social rules in pronoun selection by Hungarian children.* Working Papers in Sociolinguistics 24. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

HOPPE, Ronald A. and Joseph F. KESS

> 1978   Sociolinguistic dimensions of referent choice. In: W. Meid, ed. *Proceedings of the XIIth International Congress of Linguistics,* 297-300. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.

JURIČIĆ, Želimir B. and Joseph F. KESS

> 1978   Sociolinguistic dimensions of respectful address: a comparative study of native and immigrant Croatian. In: Zbigniew Folejewski et al, eds *Canadian contributions to the VIII International Congress of Slavists (Zagreb-Ljubljana 1978),* 103-116. Ottawa: Carleton University.

KESS, Joseph F.

> 1973   Respectful address in Tagalog: a preliminary study. *Cahiers Linguistique d'Ottawa,* 3:17-24.

KESS, Joseph F. and Želimir B. JURIČIĆ

> 1978a   Solidarity, socialism and the South Slavic second person singular. *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 20/3:307-313.

> 1978b   Slovene pronominal address forms: rural vs. urban sociolinguistic strategies. *Anthropoligical Linguistics* 20:297-311.

LAMBERT, Wallace E.

> 1967   The use of *tu* and *vous* as forms of address in French Canada: a pilot study. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior,* 6/4:614-617.

> 1969   Some current psycholinguistic research: the *tu-vous* and *le-la* studies. In: Jan Puhvel, ed. *Substance and structure of language,* 83-98. Berkeley: University of California Press.

LITTLE, Craig B. and Richard J. GELLES

> 1975   The social psychological implications of form address. *Sociometry* 38:573-586.

LYNCH, Frank, S.J., et al

> 1962   *Understanding the Philippines and America: a study of cultural themes.* Manila: Institute of Philippine Culture.

> 1962   Lowland Philippine values: social acceptance. In: *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Baguio Religious Acculturation Conference,* 100-120. Manila: BRAC. Also in: *Four Readings on Philippine Values* (Ateneo de Manila Institute of Philippine Culture).

MANUUD, G., ed.

> 1967   *Essays on Philippine cultural tradition and literature.* Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila Press.

MARTIN, Samuel E.

> 1964   Speech levels in Japan and Korea. In: Dell Hymes, ed. *Language in culture and society,* 407-415. New York: Harper and Row.

MAYER, Gerald L.

> 1975   The use of *ty* and *vy* in Modern Standard Russian. *Slavic and East European Journal* 19:435-442.

McINTIRE, Marina L.

   1972   Terms of address in an academic setting. *Anthropoligical Linguistics* 14:286-291.

McKAUGHAN, Howard P.

   1958   Review of Keith Whinnom *Spanish contact vernaculars in the Philippine Islands. Hispanic Review* 26:255-257.

   1971   Minor languages of the Philippines. In: Thomas A. Sebeok, ed. *Current trends in linguistics* vol.8:155-167. The Hague: Mouton.

MINTZ, Malcolm W.

   1971a   *Bikol grammar notes*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

   1971b   *Bikol texts*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

MIRIKITANI, Leatrice T.

   1972   *Kampampangan syntax*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

MOLONY, Carol H.

   1977   Semantic changes in Chabacano. In: Jürgen M. Meisel, ed. *Langues en contact: pidgins, créoles / Languages in contact,* 153-166. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

MOTUS, Cecile L.

   1971   *Hiligaynon lessons*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

PAL, Agaton P.

   1956   The people's conception of the world. *A Philippino barrio: a study of social organizations in relation to planned cultural change,* Chapter 7 (pp.339-355). Published in the *Journal of East Asiatic Studies* 5:333-486.

PAULSTON, Christina Bratt

   1974   Language and social class: pronouns of address in Swedish. Paper presented at the Linguistic Society of America 49th Annual Meeting, New York, December 1974. See 1975b.

   1975a   Language universals and sociocultural implications in deviant usage: personal questions in Swedish. *Studia Linguistica* 29:1-15.

   1975b   *Language and social class: pronouns of address in Swedish.* Working Papers in Sociolinguistics 29. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

SCHACHTER, Paul and Fe T. OTANES

   1972   *Tagalog reference grammar*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

SCHEERER, Otto

   1905   *The Nabaloi dialect*. Manila: Bureau of Public Printing.

SHIPLEY, Elizabeth F. and Thomas E. SHIPLEY, Jr

   1969   Quaker children's use of thee: a relational analysis. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 8:112-117.

SLOBIN, D.I.

   1963   Some aspects of the use of pronouns of address in Yiddish. *Word* 19:193-202.

SLOBIN, D.I., S.A. MILLER and L.W. PORTER

   1968   Forms of address and social relations in a business organization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 8/3:289-293.

STEEDLEY, Bartlett

   1957   Some aspects of Tagalog family structure. *American Anthropologist* 59/2:236-249.

STOCKWELL, Robert F.

   1959   A contrastive analysis of English and Tagalog, Part 2: Grammar. University of California, Los Angeles. Unpublished monograph.

TOTANES, S. de

   1745   *Arte de la lengua tagala*. Sampaloc.

TUCKER, Richard G.

   1968   Psycholinguistic research in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal for Language Teaching,* vol.5.

WHINNOM, Keith

   1956   *Spanish contact vernaculars in the Philippine Islands*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

WOLFF, John U.

   1966   *Beginning Cebuano (part one)*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

   1967   *Beginning Cebuano (part two)*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

   1973-74 The character of borrowings from Spanish and English in languages of the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 4-5/1-2:72-83.