TOWARDS A MODEL FOR WRITING
PHILIPPINE DICTIONARIES*

CESAR A. HIDALGO

1. *The problem.* The "language question is inseparable from the larger question of nation-building in all its ramifications," President Ferdinand Marcos accurately observes in his 1975 language policy statement.[1] He underscores the New Society's "commitment to national unity through a national language" and specifies that

   (1) Pilipino [be] firmly incorporated in all the college entrance examinations and in all the civil service examinations;

   (2) Important documents of the State...should be published in two languages—both Pilipino and English; and

   (3) Pilipino [be] rapidly established as a medium of instruction together with English in appropriate courses in our institutions of learning.[2]

An important area of response to this triadic language policy is in the production of useful dictionaries of the Philippine national language and other indigenous languages, dictionaries that can bring out the languages' semantic wealth, subtlety and nuances and help preserve the cultural heritage of the Filipino people. This is not possible, however, unless we develop a new theoretical framework that can account for the linguistic features of Philippine languages and that can organize our research and material such that we study carefully domains that will reveal and preserve our culture as a people.

   Like technology and its relation to science, Philippine lexicography or lexicography in general, for that matter, has

---

[1] Ferdinand E. Marcos, "National Language and Unity," *Language Policy on Education and Culture in the New Society* (Manila: Surian ng Wikang Pambansa, 1975), p. 28.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

been slow in catching up with its theoretical counterpart—
lexicology. This retarded response of the lexicographers has
been severely criticized by linguists. Even one of the monu-
mental products of lexicographic research, Webster's *Third
International,* has not escaped criticism. Weinreich, reviewing
it, finds "disconcerting that a mountain of lexicographic prac-
tice such as an an unabridged dictionary of English should
yield no more than a paragraph-sized molehill of lexicographic
theory."[3] To be sure, of course, the lexicographers have not
been without defenders. Zgusta points out, for instance, that
the lexicologists' theoretical formulations have not readily
found application owing to the practical character of lexi-
cography and to the considerable time required in completing
a lexicographic project.[4] Gleason indicates that: "Dictionary
making is tedious in the extreme. It is exacting. It is an incre-
dibly large job."[5]

The lack of theoretical development has impeded the
production of good dictionaries. The inability of Philippine
lexicographers, both Filipinos and foreigners, to comprehend
the semantic structure of the lexicon has resulted in the lack
of criteriality of definitions leading to misinformation, mis-
conception, and misunderstanding that has resulted in the
production of dictionaries that are less than useful. Mary
Haas, discussing languages that have caused great difficulties
in lexicography, classifies Philippine languages as belonging
to the more "intractable type of language(s)... [because of
their] multiplicity of prefixes and infixes."[6]

To find in a dictionary, for instance, the Tagalog root *–dam-
dam* as "v. to feel", or "*feel,* v. *hipuin; maramdaman; dam-
damin; pakiramdaman; waring*"[7] or "*maramdamin,* adj. sensi-
tive; readily affected"[8] is simply inadequate. It clearly shows
failure to comprehend the structure of *–damdam* and to account

[3] Uriel Weinreich, "Webster's Third: A Critique of its Semantics,"
International Journal of American Linguistics, 30 (1964), p. 408.
[4] Ladislav Zgusta, "Die Lexikographie and die Sprachwissenschafft,"
in Kaspar L. Riemschnaider, *Probleme der Lexikographie* (Berlin: Akade-
mie-Verlag, 1970), pp. 7-22.
[5] H.A. Gleason, Jr. "The Relation of Lexicon and Grammer," in
Fred W. Householder and Sol Saporta (eds.), *Problems in Lexicography*
(Bloomington: Indiana University, 1967), p. 88.
[6] Mary R. Haas, "What Belongs in a Bilingual Dictionary," *Ibid.,*
p. 49.
[7] Felix M. Manalili and Reynaldo de Dios, *English-Tagalog Vocabulary*
(Quezon City: Pressman Printers and Publishers, 1964), p. 61.
[8] *Ibid.,* p. 116.

systematically meaning modification through affixation involving inflectional and derivational morphology. Consider the various paradigms below:

Verb forms

magdamdam	'be hurt emotionally'
maramdamin	'be overly sensitive'
madamdamin	'be full of overpowering feeling'
pakiramdaman	'gauge someone's position, attitude, feeling, reaction'
damdamin	'feel, as of joy of hurt'
maramdaman	'feel, as of hardship, earthquake'
iparamdam	'make someone sense one's position'
kadamdamin	'be of one & the same feeling, belief persuasion'

Noun forms

damdamin	'feeling'
karamdaman	'sickness, ailment'
pakiramdam	'state or condition of feeling' as in *Ano ang pakiramdam mo ngayon?* 'How do you feel now?'
pagkamaramdamin	'sensitivity'

and the superlative form when *–damdam* is adjectivalized — *pinakamaramdamin* 'most sensitive.'

A further problem, not linguistic but political, has been the confused governmental linguistic policies indicative of the mind-bending effects of imperialistic rule, e.g., the foreign language syndrome. The first Philippine Republic, in its Malolos Constitution (1899), avoided decision on the national language issue but specified that "the use of the languages spoken in the Philippines is optional. For the purpose of these acts shall be used [sic] at present the Castilian language."[9] It failed to consider that the Filipino masses were literate only in their native tongues.[10]

---

[9] *The Constitution of the First Philippine Republic (The Malolos Constitution*, VRTTQ, in Gregorio F. Zaide (*Philippine Constitutional History and Constitutions of Modern Nations* (Manila: The Modern Book Company, 1970), p. 189.

[10] See *Census of the Philippine Islands*, 1903. Volume II (Washington: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1905, p. 78.

The second Philippine Constitution (1935) opted for the development of a national language based on one of the Philippine languages (with Tagalog later chosen as the basis), in consonance, unwittingly perhaps, with church language policy of the Spanish colonial state (1565-1898) to make Tagalog the lingua franca, in the same way that the missionaries in Mexico tried to spread Nahuatl among the Indians, Tupi in Brazil, Quicha in Peru and Guarani in Argentina. Surely a nationalistic move, except that Article XIII, Section 10, states that the organic law of the land "shall be officially promulgated in English and Spanish but in case of conflict the English text shall prevail."[11] An incredible provision since the majority of the Filipinos could neither read nor speak, much less write English or Spanish. In 1918, 3,138,634 or 59.2% of the Filipinos ten years of age and over were reported to be "able to read some local dialects" while only 885,854 were literate in English and 879,811 in Spanish.[12] The 1973 Philippine Constitution, however, replaced Tagalog and decreed the "development and formal adoption of a common national language to be known as Filipino." "Filipino" is to be the "result of a comingling of the native languages"[13] which number 180 or so distinct languages.

Nearly a decade after the framing of the new Philippine Constitution, Filipino is still nonexistent. This might be the case for some time, for nobody speaks Filipino. Nobody knows its phonological, morphological, grammatical and semantic structures.

In this context, we can see the significance and the wisdom of the 1975 language policy statements which specifies Pilipino as the language of the land, even as a bilingual policy with English as the other language is adopted.

2. *Philippine dictionaries.* The problems just described are of a linguistic and political nature. If lexicography is an important area of response to the triadic language policy of the country, what has been the Philippine lexicographic tradition? What kind of dictionaries have been written and what has been

---

[11] *Constitution of the Commonwealth of the Philippines (1935),* in Zaide, *op. cit.,* p. 341.

[12] *Census of the Philippine Islands, 1918. Volume II* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1921), pp. 53, 62.

[13] Jose M. Aruego and Gloria A. Torres, *The New Philippine Constitution Explained* (Manila: University Book Supply, Inc. 1975), p. 218.

the theoretical basis of these works? What languages have been studied?

Philippine dictionaries[14] have been mainly bilingual, with a few multilingual ones, indicative of imperialistic rule and its effects: during the Spanish regime (1565-1898), under American rule (1898-1946), and Japanese military occupation during Word War II. The foreign languages figuring in these dictionaries have been mainly Spanish, English, Japanese and Russian. There is no monolingual lexicographic tradition.

Theoretically, the dictionaries have either been prescriptive or descriptive. Semantically, the dictionaries are of two types: those that assumed that lexical entries and their "equivalents" in the foreign language(s) are mutually exclusive semantically and those that adopted the meaning multiplicity hypothesis, i.e., these dictionaries attempted to respond to polysemy and to certain aspects of meaning modification through affixation. Of the first type, Antonio Pigafetta, "Cebuano-Spanish word list" (1521), is an example; of the second type, excellent examples are the works of the Jesuits Juan de Noceda and Pedro de San Lucar, *Vocabulario de la Lengua Tagala* (1860); Filipino lexicographer Pedro Serrano Laktaw, *Diccionario Tagalog-Hispano* (1914); Redemptorist Father Leo James English, *English-Tagalog Dictionary* (1965), and Jose Villa Panganiban, *Diksyunaryo-Tesauro Pilipino-English* (1972).

Organizationally, the dictionaries are either topical or alphabetical. Those organized topically, i.e., according to semantic fields, adopted the one-to-one meaning correspondence assumption and are indeed thin in content both in the range of the entries and in the definitions. They deal with common phrases, body parts and the like. A couple of examples of this type are Eligio Fernandez, *Vocabulario Tagalog-Castellano* (1885) and Jaime D. Escobar y Lozano, "Vocabulario Español-Tagalog" in his *El Indicador del Viajero en los Islas Filipinas* (1885). Those organized alphabetically by stem or root entries adopted either one of the two theoretical hypotheses discussed above. Those that adopted the second, while some have been quite exhaustive, suffer in the lack of general guiding principles and a systematized criteria for the study of specific dictionary entries.

---

14 For details, see Hidalgo, *Philippine Lexicography* (forthcoming, U.P. Press).

Of the seven hundred lexicographical works, with date of publication or completion of the manuscript beginning with Pigafetta's 1521 "Cebuano-Spanish word list," the language that emerges with the most dictionaries is Tagalog (close to one-third of the works). The most studied major languages, other than Tagalog, are, expectedly, Cebuano, Ilocano, Hiligaynon, Kapampangan, Pangasinan. The minor languages are: Ibanag, Isinay, Gaddang, Tausog, Ivatan, and various languages of the ethnic minorities of the Mountain Province.

Surely serious lexicographical work has been undertaken. The volume of work alone (see Table below) points to the tremendous interest in the field which continues today, basically from the Summer Institute of Linguistics, the Department of Linguistics of the University of Hawaii and the East-West Center, the Philippine Institute of National Language, some Filipino linguists and various local and foreign lexicographers.

3. *The proposed model.* But even with this volume of work there has been little theoretical advance. Towards this advance, this proposal is made.

Languages, while universally sharing in semantic structures, have also language specific semantic structures. We are not, however, concerned here with universal semantic structures, but with the following: language specific structures, semantic postulates in understanding the semantic structure of specific dictionary entries, the systematization and specification of the criteria for analyzing specific lexical entries in a dictionary, dictionary organization and research strategy.

3.1. *Semantic postulates.* In writing bilingual/multilingual dictionaries, it is assumed that lexical items across languages have shared and unshared features.

3.1.1. The possibility that an entry from language 1 could be more inclusive than a roughly corresponding equivalent in language 2 must be recognized. Boas gives a famous example of this. *Snow* in English is broken up by the Eskimo into four specific lexical items: snow on the ground, falling snow, drifting snow and snowdrift. Or take the French *mouton*. The English speaker specifies it as *mutton*, the meat, and *sheep*, the animal. Or take *rice*. To the Filipino, it could be *palay*, 'unshelled rice,' *bigas*, 'shelled rice,' *kanin*, 'cooked rice.'

LEXICOGRAPHIC RESEARCH
1521-1978
(Estimate)

	Lg., with most no. of dictionaries	Lgs. with most no. of dictionaries other than Tagalog	Some minor lgs. with dictionaries	No. of lgs. with dictionaries for the period	Total no. of dictionaries for the period
1521-1662	Tagalog (14)	Bisayan Panayano Pampango Ilocano Cebuano	Ibanag Igoleta	11	28
1662-1764	Aagalog (8)	Bicol Bisaya Isinay Cebuano Ilocano	Isinay Aetas	8	27
1765-1814	Tagalog (9)	Ilocano Maguin- danao Pampango Panayano Pangasinan	Gaddang Tausog	10	25
1815-1871	Tagalog (13)	Bisaya Ilocano Pampango Bicol Pangasinan	Ivatan Gaddang	13	43
1872-1897	Tagalog (16)	Bisaya Tiruray Pampango Bagobo Sulu (Tausug) Maguin- danao	Ibanag Igorot Manobo Tagbanwa Bontoc Ata Bilaan Samal	26	96
1898-1946	Tagalog (16)	Ilocano Bisaya Ivatan Pangasinan Sulu	Igorot Tagbanwa Mangyan Ibanag Itawa Isinay Hanunuo Subanon	32	164
1947-1971	Tagalog (62)	Ilocano Visayan Maranao Ifugao Cebuano	Yakan Tagbanwa Subanon Dibabaon Agta Tausog Aklanon	38	195
1972-1978	Tagalog (8)	Cebuano Waray Tausug Hiligaynon Bikol	Ivatan Ivatan Manobo Isneg Yakan Bontok	17	25

These lexical items are cultural words that would remain unanalyzed if the lexicographer assumed semantic isomorphism across languages.

Non-cultural entries also pose problems. To find in an English-Tagalog dictionary, for instance, "bachelor n. *binata*," is to miss a lot. The English entry is polysemous while the Tagalog "equivalent" is not. Where the latter means "man who has never married," the English item, to Katz and Fodor,[15] also includes among its meanings: a young knight serving under the standard of another knight, a person who has the first or lowest academic degree, and a young male fur seal when without a mate during breeding time.

3.1.2. It is also possible that entries from both languages have a shared feature but have different referents with different attributes. Insensitivity to this principle in many of the Philippine dictionaries has caused problems. For instance, P.D. Neilson, *Tagalog-English Dictionary* (1903) simply enters *"Bathala —God"* as if the concept of god of the westerners were the same as that of the early Tagalogs' conception of their deity. Religion for the latter was animistic in character and *Bathala* for them was the supreme head of the spirits dwelling in the land. If Neilson had problems with this, so did some of the best lexicorgraphers of the Spanish period. So, to Noceda and Sanlucar (1860), in their Spanish-Tagalog section, *Dios* is simply *Bathala*, but in their Tagalog-Spanish section this misleading information is corrected: *"Bathala—Dios el mayor de sus anitos."* To preclude problems of this nature (during the Spanish times), the 1584 decree of Philip II ordered that key concepts of the Christian faith be presented to the Filipinos in Spanish and to avoid providing a native word equivalent. Some of these concepts were: God, trinity, Holy Ghost, grace, church, sin, cross, hell, holy.

---

[15] Jerrold J. Katz and Jerry A. Fodor, "The Structure of a Semantic Theory," *Language*, Vol. 39 (April-June, 1963), pp. 170-210. Note that the Katz and Fodor semantic theory has since been revised, but represents the first linguistic semantic theory proposal within the framework of transformational grammar. This was followed by the standard theory in Noam Chomsky *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* (1965); extended standard theory in the more recent works of Chomsky and R. Jackendoff; and significant breaks from standard theory as proposed by J.S. Gruber and Charles Fillmore and generative semantics as developed by J. MoCawley G. Lakoff, J.R. Ross and others. See Janet D. Fodor, *Semantics: Theories of Meaning in Generative Grammar* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1977) for study of these theories.

The insensitivity to specific differences in the early dictionaries is still manifest in the contemporary ones. In Richard E. Elkin's *Manobo-English Dictionary* (1968) we find the following: "*diwata*—god, deity; specifically the supreme being" and the cross-reference "god—*diwata.*" The English word *god* is generic while *diwata* is not.

3.1.3. Entries from both languages may differ in marked features. *Siya* in Tagalog and 'he' or 'she' in English are both anaphoric and deictic pronouns but *siya* may be used to refer to either animate or inanimate objects while he or she is used only for animate ones. Moreover, sex difference is lexicalized in English while this distinction is not a property of the Tagalog pronoun.

3.1.4. A lexical entry from language 1 may be subject to meaning modification through affixation which could be syntactically significant, a characteristic absent in the "corresponding" item in language 2.

The morphology of Philippine languages is extremely complex and rich and the semantics of these languages can be better understood by a careful study of the morphology of these languages.

This can be seen in the case of the Tagalog—*damdam* where we found at least eight verb forms, four noun forms and one adjective form. Noceda and Sanlucar, in their attempt to respond to this feature of Philippine languages, presented six entries for the Tagalog stem *abut* "to reach, to seize, to catch" plus two additional entries which account for idiomatic use, while Jose Villa Panganiban, *Diksyunario-Tesauro Pilipino-English* (1972) has seventeen realizations of his two *abot* entries. Pedro Serrano Laktaw, *Diccionario Tagalog-Hispano* (1941) devotes pages 145 to 147 for just his *buhay* "life" entry.

Meaning modification through affixation has continued to baffle Philippine lexicographers. Some simply ignore this complexity, others attempt inadequately to look into it. The result is too general an information or superficial treatment. E. Constantino, *Ilokano Dictionary* (1971), has the following information for one of his entries: "*ababaw*, adj./ (NA-) /shallow, not deep; superficial, not profound. *Ababaw dayta waig.* That brook is shallow. v/-UM-/-art. *ADALEM.*" To begin with, our informants say that -UM- cannot be infixed in *ababaw*.

How about *iyababaw, iyabababaw, imbabaw, naabababaw* and
the set of four degrees of comparison from *naababaw* 'very
shallow,' *naabababaw* 'very, very shallow,' *nakaababaw* 'very,
very, very shallow,' and finally *kaababawan* 'shallowest,' to
name some forms? Degrees of comparison in Ilocano differ
from English.

3.1.5. The basic research strategy, dictionary organization
and entry system for Philippine dictionaries affect substantially
the sorts of information that a lexical entry may have, including
its pedagogical and reference utility, orderly and exhaustive
presentation, and cultural information and preservation.

To adopt a research strategy on the basis of conventional
lexicography, i.e., to look for printed citations, is inadequate
and impossible in most cases in Philippine lexicography. Most
of the languages do not have a written literary tradition; one
must depend on oral material. To merely pick up an English
dictionary or any dictionary, whether attempting to write a
monolingual or bilingual/multilingual dictionary and use this
as a basis for translating or source is to fall into the trap
that has ensnared many a lexicographer, i.e., assuming one-to-
one meaning correspondence across languages which has re-
sulted in misinformation, inadequate research and abdication
of responsible authorship.

The entry strategy and organization cannot adopt the
established lexicographic practice for Indo-European languages,
i.e., word entry and strict alphabetical organization. To do so
would result in a cumbersome and disorganized entry system
and inadequate study of specific entries, particularly cultural
items as seen in 3.1.1. All of these affect the usefulness of the
dictionary and its role as an agent for the study and preserva-
tion of Philippine culture.

3.2. *The framework of the model.*

3.2.1. The postulates presented in 3.1.1, 3.1.2, and 3.1.3
require the lexicographer to undertake careful analytical study
of Philippine languages and/or the foreign language(s) in-
volved, before he can attempt to write a dictionary, monolingual
or otherwise.

3.2.2. For 3.1.4, response to meaning modification through
affixation principle requires a thorough study of the morphology
of Philippine languages figuring in the dictionary. To systema-

tize the criteria for analyzing specific lexical entries, it is proposed that case, voice and aspect be studied as they are manifested by affixes and these affixes modify the basic meaning(s) of most lexical entries; and in some instances present new definitions of the entries. The same is true of derivations as in *ka–* + *stem/root* in Ivatan,[16] e.g.,

vahay 'house' ——————→*kavahay* 'one who shares a house, concubine'

–kuvot 'something carried in the womb, fetus' ——————→*kakuvot* 'one with whom one fights, opponent'

diman 'kill' ——————→   *Kadiman* one with whom one fights, opponent'

ivan 'accompany' ——————→*kayvan* 'one who shares one's company, friend'

3.2.1.1. *Case*. How does a case affix effect changes in the basic meaning of a dictionary entry? A case affix in Philippine languages is not limited to indicating the case role of a particular noun phrase. It may also change the syntactico-semantic category of a lexical item resulting in meaning modification or a complete change in the meaning of the entry.

Thus, if a bilingual dictionary on Philippine languages ignored the Ivatan case prefix *om–*,[17] for instance, and entered only *"apoy n.* fire," *omapoy* 'to blaze' would be left out. Similarly, if only *"dasal-*n-prayer" were entered with the locative case affix *–an* ignored, *paydasalan* 'place where prayers are said, church' would be left out. The same happens with *among* 'fish' and the agentive/actor case affix *ma–/N. Mangamong* 'to fish, fisherman' is lost. In these examples, part of the meaning of the root is still carried by the derived word. In other cases, a more dramatic change results. For example, to prefix the case affix *om–* to *avid* 'beauty' results in a verb 'to

---

[16] Ivatan, one of the Philippine languages, is used as the test language in this section. See Araceli C. Hidalgo, "Focus in Philippine Languages," *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 1, no. 1 (1970), 25-32; Cesar A. Hidalgo and Araceli C. Hidalgo, "Ivatan Morphology: The Predicatives," *Philippine Journal of Linguitics*, 1, no. 2 (1970), 10-54; and their *A. Tagmemic Grammar of Ivatan* (Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines, 1971).

[17] The prefix *om-* is a case affix focusing the logical subject of an intransitive sentence, thereby making it the surface subject or the topic as well. In other words, the verbal case affix identifies the case role of the noun phrases that function as topic of the sentence.

flirt.' To prefix the case affix *ma–* to the same root word results in an adjective—*mavid* 'beautiful.'

In *omapoy*, the *om–* prefix identifies the case role *state* (S), i.e., the condition or state of affairs of the potential noun phrase; in *paydasalan*, *–an* indicates the referent (R), i.e., the location of an act, also called site; while in *mangamong*, *ma–* identifies the agentive (A) case, i.e., the agent which is a typically animate doer of an action. Would there be other cases in Ivatan and what would be their affixational manifestations? What would be the constraints in their occurrence?

Consider, then, sentences (1) and (2):

(1) *Rotongan ni Maria o manok.*
    'The chicken is what Maria cooks.'

(2) *Kayatan ni Mario o nyoy.*
    'The coconut tree is what Mario climbs.'

Manifesting the object (0) case role, where object is the entity towards which an action is directed, are *–an2* and *–an2*. The affix *–an* may occur with no other affix or only with the abilitive affix *ka–* (e.g. *karotongan* 'can be cooked') and with verb stem 1 (an inherently transitive verb stem which may take the transitive voice affix –(N–)– without having to be affixed with a derivational affix that allows prefixation of –(N)–),[18] or noun stem 3 (a concrete noun pertaining specifically to meteorological conditions like *chimoy* 'rain,' *chidat* 'lightning').[19] It may also convey the locative as in *Oyogan no ranom o kawayan aya,* 'It is the bamboo where water flows.' When *–an* occurs alone with a stem, it signals the potential occurence of an object in syntactic construction.

In sentences (3) and (4),

(3) *Ipanotong/panotong mo o kayo aya do gagan.*
    'The wood outside is what you use for cooking.'

(4) *Iamomo mo so manakaw o voday aya.*
    'The snake is what you use to scare the robber.'

the forms (*i*)*pa–* and *i–* indicate the instrument role, where instrument is ∓ animate object involved in the performance of an act, detracting from the proposed universal definition

---

[18] Hidalgo and Hidalgo (1971), *op. cit.*, p. 57.
[19] *Ibid.*

"typically inanimate."[20] The prefix *(i)pa–*, which, semantically, is also benefactive and causal, occurs outermost in the morphological construction and either the affix *–n–*or*–v–* may occur after it. It occurs with stems other than verb stem 2 (i.e., an inherently intransitive verb stem).[21] The prefix *i–* signals, along with instrument, the comitative and causal, if it occurs with verb stem 2, noun stem 1 (a concrete noun such as *among* 'fish') or derived noun stem 2.[22]

In (5) *Ipanotong ni Maria si apo so manok,* 'For grandmother Maria cooks chicken,' *(i)pa–*, like the instrument affix, conveys the benefactive (B) role, where the benefactive is a typically animate beneficiary of an act. The identifying features for the instrument affix are identical with the beneficiary affix and can only be disambiguated by examining the features of the noun phrase.

The comitative (C) role, where the comitative is a typically inanimate object with an agent in the performance of an act, in (6) and (7),

    (6) *Ikayat ni Mario o lokoy aya do nyoy.*
       'Mario climbs the coconut tree with the bolo.'
    (7) *Itwaw ni Maria o vayo aya laylay na.*
       'Maria appears with her new dress.'

is conveyed by the prefix *i–*1. It has identical constraints with the instrument affix but can be disambiguated by looking into the features of the verb, where the comitative will have for its verb the feature "movement."

In (8), (9), (10) and (11),

    (8) *Iparotong ni ina o manok aya ni Maria.*
       'Mother is having Maria cook the chicken.'
    (9) *Panotongen mo si Maria so manok.*
       'Have Maria cook the chicken.'
    (10) *Ipakayat mo nyoy ta aya mo Mario.*
       'Have someone, Mario, climb our coconut tree.'
    (11) *Ichavid na o laylay na aya.*
       'Her dress makes her pretty.'

---

[20] See Charles J. Fillmore, "The Case for Case," in Emmon Bach and Robert T. Karms (eds.), *Universals in Linguistics Theory* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968), p. 24, for problems related to this.

[21] Hidalgo and Hidalgo (1971), *cp. cit.*, p. 57.

[22] A derived stem is a non-simple stem which consists of either a noun root and a derivational affix or a ns1 root in the plural form.

the prefixes *i–2*, *ipa–1*, and *icha–1* convey the causative role, where the causative (K) is a ∓ animate cause.

In *iparotong*, the causative affix *–pa–* occurs and the prefix *i–* is an object focus affix in this environment. The causative *i–* has features identical with that of the instrument affix but can be disambiguated (e.g. *itanis* 'cry because of—causal'). The causative affix *pa–* indicates the action of causation (but not the cause of a state or an activity in specified environments).[23] With verb stem 1 as predictive stem, the causative indicates the potential occurrence of the indirect object in syntax, making the construction potentially ditransitive. With stems other than verb stem 1, it transitivizes, i.e. it signals the potential occurrence of an object. For instance, the object does not occur with the predicative *omoyog* 'flow' in syntax, but it may occur with the predicative in *mapawyog* 'cause to flow.'

The prefix *ipa–*, as in *ipakayat* 'cause to climb' and *mapaypavid* 'cause to become more beautiful' is causal. In the latter example, it occurs with noun stem 2 (abstract nouns pertaining to the emotion such as *adaw* 'love'), 3 and 4 (abstract nouns pertaining to a quality such as *avid* 'beauty') and participates in the morphological construction along with the idea of increase in the intensity or volume of a state or activity.·

For *icha–*, the prefix occurs with no other affixes, so that it is outermost in the morphological construction, e.g., *ichavid* 'cause beauty,' *ichadaw* 'cause to be in love,' *icharakoh* 'cause to be big.'

In (12), (13) and (14),

(12) *Mamana sa so among do Valogan.*
    'They spear fish in Valogan.'
    '*Mangamomo sa so kametdehan do kanayan.*
    'They scare children on the beach.'
    Manita sa so baka do payaman.
    'They search for cattle in the pastureland.'
    Manweswes sa so falowa do idaod.
    'They are turning the big boat at sea.'
(13) *Mayarek sa o dadwa aya aka kametdehan.*
    'The two children kiss each other.'
(14) *Tayto mayramon o tao aya.*
    'The person is washing his face.'

---

[23] For the constraints, see Hidalgo and Hidalgo (1971), *op. cit.*, pp. 68-69.

various realizations of the directional role (D), (i.e. ⫛ animate object to which the act of an agent is directed which could be undirectional, reciprocal and reflexive) are presented. (*N*), undirectional, is signaled in various environments as /ñ-ng-m-n/. Syntactically, the occurrence of (*y*) signals the non-occurrence of the object.

In (15) *Manganit sa o mangalkem aya*: 'The old people are sick,' *ma–* plus certain features of the verb indicate the experiencer role. The transitivizer (N) does not occur. (E) indicates this role and is the entity affected by a condition or activity.

The cases identified are as follows:

Agent (A)	Directional (D)
Object (O)	Unidirectional: *un*
Instrument (I)	Reciprocal: *rec*
Benefactive (B)	Reflexive: *ref*
Causative (K)	Experiencer (E)
Comitative (C)	State (S)
Locative (L)	

3.2.2.2. *Voice.* Another cause of meaning modification through affixation is voice. Meaning modification of the basic meaning of a lexical entry takes place when voice affixes modify case roles, e.g. the agent role in *manotong* 'to cook' where the syntactic structure is V–NP (Agent) –NP (Object) is affected when *–chi–*, a participative affix, occurs as in *machipanotong* 'to participate in the activity of cooking' where the syntactic structure is V–NP (those that participate) –NP (those with whom one participates). Participation (Pa) is the sharing of an activity or something.

In sentences (16) and (17),

(16) *Makavid ka.*
     'Be beautiful (try to possess beauty).'
(17) *Makadadwa ka so hapen a laylay.*
     'Bring two shirts with you.'

makavid 'to enhance, possess beauty' and *makadadwa* 'to have two,' *–ka–* conveys the notion of possession, i.e., possession (Po) conveys acquiring or owning a feature. It occurs with noun stem 4 or with a numeral stem and is affixed immediately before the root. Its occurrence signals that an object can potentially occur in syntax, e.g., *Makavid ka* can be transformed to *Makavid ka so laylay* 'You wear a pretty dress.'

In (18) *Mayaaamong o tataya aya* 'The rowboat smells like
a fish,' *–ya–* manifests the notion of similitude (Si), i.e., indi-
cates a likeness or resemblance. It occurs next to an outermost
affix and is limited to a derived 1a noun stem 1, e.g., *–aamong*,
–kakadin as in *mayakakadin* 'smells like a goat.' It indicates
that something is similar to the olfactory feature possessed
by the referent of the predicative stem.

The notion of impression (Im), i.e., thinking or feeling
that an entity has a certain quality, in (19) *Machimavid sa ji
Maria* 'They think Maria to be beautiful,' is conveyed by *–chi–*1.
The infix occurs with adjective stems or with noun stem 4.
The infix is homophonous with the participative affix, although
the participative affix occurs with stems other than the ad-
jective stem.

In (20) and (21).

(20) *Mavyavid o lyak na ao.*
     'Her voice is better.'

(21) *Machimochimoy sichawan kano kaminsawan.*
     'It is more rainy this year than last year.'

partial reduplication indicates comparison (Co) while in (22)
No mavvid ao so lyak o rákkoh ao so kapakapamarim 'The one
with the sweetest voice is the most powerful,' it is a stress
suprafix accompanied by consonant gemination that conveys
the superlative (Su).

In (23) *Maypavid do kapayapakarang na aya* 'She is be-
coming prettier as she grows taller,' it is *ipa–*2 that gives the
idea of augmentative (Au), i.e., increasing in intensity of a
quality or state, while in (24) *Tya sa maychatatada o kamet-
dehan aya* 'The children are dancing (the children are dancing
but with the action of each considered separately)' it is *icha–*2
that conveys the action of distribution (Di), i.e., the act per-
formed by several or act done to several objects is performed
individually. Constraints involving *icha–* (it is homophonous
with the causative affix) are discussed elsewhere.[24]

Sentences (25) and (26),

(25) *Chinarotongan na ava o among ao ta arava o rikado.*
     'He was unable to prepare the fish dish because there
     are no fish condiments.'

---

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 65-66.

(26) *Karotongan mo inolokan ta aya?*
'Can you cook the beef we purchased?'

ch–a and *ka–2* indicate abilitive (Ab), i.e., capability of an entity while in (27) *Naypidwa da mavoya o rakoh ao a among* 'They saw the big fish twice,' *–pi–* gives the frequentative idea, i.e, number of occurrences of an event. This is limited to numeral stems. The idea of repetitiveness (Re) is conveyed by reduplication as in (28) *Tayto so monotonotong* 'They are cooking (involving repetitious acts related to cooking).'

Voice, a feature of the predicative manifested by affixes conveying verbal notions as process or action, does modify the basic meaning of a lexical entry. We have identified the following:

Possession (Po)	Augmentative (Au)
Similitude (Si)	Distributive (Di)
Impression (Im)	Abilitive (Ab)
Participative (Pa)	Frequentative (Fr)
Comparison (Co)	Repetitive (Re)
Superlative (Su)	

3.2.3.3. *Aspect.* Still another source of meaning modification is aspect. Time aspect is considered here (elsewhere, action aspect was discussed under this section).[25] Both time and action aspects, however, modify the sense of a verb in the way that an adverb does. Time aspect is descriptive of an act or state in terms of time: inceptive, habitual, punctiliar, continuative and durative.

In (29) *mangaviren* 'generally beautiful,' *machachimoyen* 'generally rainy,' (31) *matatanisen* 'usually cries,' *–en3* conveys the act or state as habitual, i.e., repetitive occurrence of an event under specified environments.[26] In (32) *maychaviren* 'at its prettiest' and (33) *maychakarángen* 'at its tallest,' primary stress on the penultimate syllable and *–en4* indicate punctiliar aspect, a state or quality at its crest or ebb.

In (34) *maychamavekhasan* 'all morning' and (35) *maychamahpan* 'all night,' *–an3* indicates duration.

For sentences (36) and (37),

(36) *Kapanótong da pa.*
'They just started cooking.'

---

[25] *Ibid.,* pp. 55 ff.
[26] *Ibid.,* p. 63.

(37) *Kapanotóng da.*
     'They kept on cooking.'

the stress suprafix on the penultimate syllable conveys incep-
tive, i.e., the beginning of an event or state, while the length
suprafix on the final syllable indicates continuative, i.e., a state
or event goes on and on.

Case, voice and aspect clearly modify the meaning of a
stem or root. Constraints on the participation of a specific
affix in word formation abound. The analysis automatically
leads to stem classification. This provides information on the
affixational potential of a stem, the affixation possible for the
stem as far as case, voice and aspect are concerned, and gram-
matical information such as transformation potential and
complement expansion. To indicate, then, what types of case,
voice and aspect affixes can occur with a stem or root will help
greatly in any attempt to define what a lexical entry is and
is not.

3.2.3 To respond to 3.1.6, it is proposed that the research
strategy be based on semantic domains. Broad semantic domains
are to be identified and subcategorized, e.g., politics (ethnic
political systems, imposed political systems, organization, lead-
ership), religion (millenial movements, imposed religions,
organization, leadership) commerce and trade, education, farm-
ing, fishing and medicine.

Some major semantic groupings suggested by Swanson[27]
are: food and drink, food preparations, tools and weapons,
natural phenomena, topography and geography, body parts,
kinship, social status and occupation, metals and natural subs-
tances, excretions, time (and its parts), furnishings and fur-
niture, folklore and folk literature, manufacturers and products,
political and administrative terms, ailments, cures and physical
conditions, military and naval terms, fishing and the sea,
farm and farming. Semantic categories proposed by Worth[28]
include motion, space (three, two-or one-dimensional space),
time, degree (various kinds of intensity markers and qualifiers),
sensory perception (taste, touch, hearing, etc.).

---

[27] Donald C. Swanson, "The Selection of Entries for a Bilingual Dic-
tionary," in Householder and Saporta, *op. cit.*, p. 76.
[28] Dean Stoddard Worth, "Comments," in Householder and Saporta,
ibid., pp. 81-82.

A careful study of semantic category listings like this should result in a refined listing and subcategorization and arrangement through associative clusters. The various sets of semantic domains become the basis of exhaustive research for indigenous material for the dictionary. A study like this reveals, among other things, the *weltanschauung* of a people. Other disciplines have something to contribute here.[29]

It is further proposed that the dictionary be organized along general and specified semantic domains. This aids the user in seeing organization, in considering sets as not just an imposed alphabetical ordering.

Within each specified topic, however, the dictionary entries are arranged alphabetically. To aid further the user of the dictionary, a cross-reference section arranged alphabetically must be included where all dictionary entries are indicated with their corresponding page location. Because of the morphological complexity of the Philippine languages, it is not practical to enter the complete inflected forms of each lexicon. This has to be systematized as proposed in 3.2.2. Necessarily, then, stem entry has to be used. To aid the user, a simple discussion of the various features of the dictionary with illustrations must be included in the introduction of the dictionary. To enrich further cultural research and preservation, collocations, besides the study of cultural items, must also reveal the cultural thinking or practices of the people.

---

[29] Anthropology and its ethnographic categories and research, e.g., F. Landa Jocano's *Ethnographic Handbook* (forthcoming) presents seven broad areas: setting, material culture, economic life, social organization, life cycle, belief system and value orientation.

3.2.4. *The model summarized.*

PROPOSED MODEL

I. Theoretical Basis

  A. Generative grammar

  B. Dictionary as part of a grammar (lexical rules within grammar) [36]

II. Semantic Postulates

  A. A lexical entry from L1 could be more inclusive than a roughly corresponding equivalent in L2. An entry from L1 could be polysemous while in L2 it is not.

  B. Entries from L1 and L2 have a shared feature but have different referents with different attributes.

  C. Entries from L1 and L2 may differ in marked features.

  D. A lexical entry from L1 may be subject to meaning modification through affixation.

  E. The basic research strategy, dictionary organization, entry system for Philippine dictionaries affect substantially the sorts of information that a lexical entry may have.

III. Research Strategy

  A. Semantic fields identified

  B. Semantic domains subcategorized to determine lexical sets

  C. Lexical items in a lexical set analyzed:

    1. Orthographically

    2. Phonemically

    3. Morphologically

    4. Semantically

    5. Culturally

    6. Conventionally (e.g., etymology, dialect, stylistics)

---

[30] See John Lyons, *Semantics* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1977), Chapter 13, "Lexical entries," for the discussion of the relation of grammar and dictionary.

D. Lexical entries selected based on
   1. Objective(s) of the dictionary
   2. Cultural information
   3. Frequency count
   4. Usefulness in the educative process
E. Lexical entry strategy—stem/root entry

IV. Dictionary Organization
   A. Preliminaries
      1. Scope and objectives
      2. Grammatical survey
      3. Guide to the use of the dictionary
   B. Dictionary proper
      1. Semantic field headings, alphabetically arranged, e.g., education, farming, fishing, medicine, politics, religion
      2. Subcategorized semantic domains, alphabetically arranged, e.g.,
         Religion
            Indigenous religions
            Millenial movements (e.g., Rizalistas)
            Imposed religious sects (e.g., Protestant, Baptist, Catholic, Roman Catholic)
            Revised religious sects (Iglesia ni Cristo, Aglipayan)
      3. Specific lexical items within a lexical set, alphabetically arranged, e.g., from Ivatan
            Kapayhakahakao—Farming
            Paysirbyen do kapayhahahakao—Farm implement
            Abdiit n. brace of basket[31]
            Alat ni. basket, generic term
      4. Lexical entry information strategy
         a. Lexical entry—stem or root orthographically closed to the language's phonemic system
         b. Form class

---

[31] Note that the English glosses for *abdiit* and *alat* are not the equivalents as proposed in a dictionary using this model. See Section 4 for *abdiit*.

c. Basic, general logical sense with collocational illustration providing cultural information plus secondary senses

Conventional implicature, if any

d. Additional senses derived from meaning modification through affixation—inflectional and morphology[32]

1. Case ...... [(A) (O) (B) (C) (K) (R) (D-un, rec, ref) (P) (S)]

2. Voice ...... [(Po) (Si) (Im) (Pa) (Co) (Su) (Au) (Di) (Ab) (Fr) (Re)]

3. Aspect ..... [(Ha) (Pu) (Du) (In) (Co)]

4. Other word formation devices, e.g., partial root gemination of *tao* 'person' as in *tatao* 'paper cutting of persons, scarecrow,' *vahay* 'house' as in *vavahay* 'playhouse, toyhouse', *ka–* Noun stem *–an* where *ka– –an* is 'location', e.g., *kavahayan* 'where houses are, barrio, town, any cluster of houses,' *kamongan* 'where fish abound, the abode of fish'

e. Syntactic constraints

f. Dialect and usage level

g. Synonyms, antonyms

h. Etymology

C. Cross reference

1. Entire lexical entries arranged alphabetically, Philippine language entries first plus page location

2. Entire entries arranged alphabetically, L2 first plus page location

---

[32] The distinction between inflection and derivation has always been controversial. Lyons (1977: 521-522) offers the following distinction: "inflection produces from the stem (or stems) of a given lexeme all the word forms of that lexeme which occurs in syntactically determined environments: derivation, on the other hand, results in the formation of what is traditionally considered to be a different lexeme."

V. Lexical Entry Information
    A. Phological information
        1. Segmentals
            a. Vowel system
            b. Consonant system
        2. Suprasegmentals
            a. Stress and length
            b. Terminal contours
        3. Phonotactics
        4. Syllable system

    B. Morphological information
        1. Stem or root
        2. Word formation devices—affixation (inflection and derivation)—causing meaning modification[33]
            a. Case
            b. Voice
            c. Aspect
            d. Other word formation devices

    C. Syntactic information
        1. Form
        2. Syntactic constraints, e.g., word order, transformation

    D. Semantic information
        1. Logical meaning basic and secondary senses plus collocational illustration[34]
        2. Conversational implicature[35]
        3. Synonyms (and antonyms)

    E. Cultural information
        1. Cultural items studied in semantic fields, e.g., kinship
        2. Use of cultural information for collocational illustrations

---

[33] Cf. above for details.

[34] Voltaire, writing to Charles Duclos in 1760, says that 'a dictionary without quotations is a skeleton,' (see Francis Noel Chaney, *Fundamental Reference Sources* (Chicago: American Library Associations, 1971), p. 107.

[35] Recent theoretical developments include, for instance, proposals for the consideration of implications (see James D. McCawley, "Logic and the Lexicon," in *Parasession on the Lexicon, Chicago Linguistic Society Conference,* Chicago, 1978).

F. Orthographic information
 1. Writing system consistent with the Philippine
    language's phonemic system
 2. Revisions for Philippine languages with writing
    system established during the Spanish period

G. Other information
 1. Etymology
 2. Dialect (local, regional) and stylistic informa-
    mation (formal, colloquial, slang, technical, reli-
    gious, archaic)

Taken collectively, VA-G defines a lexical entry.

In defining the lexical entry, a couple of interesting pro-
posals must be summed up here. Bendix (1966) proposes his
"minimal definition" principle,[36] i.e., the requirement that the
semantic description of each vocabulary item in a language
should consist of exactly those features which will distinguish
it from every other vocabulary item in the language and no
more.[37] Weinreich suggests that the meaning of a term is "the
set of conditions which must be fulfilled if the term is to de-
note"[38] formalized as follows:

$$x \text{ denotes if } c_1 \text{ and } c_2 \text{ and} \ldots c_n;$$
$$\text{for example, } d_1 \text{ or } d_2 \text{ or } \ldots d_n.$$
$$x^1 \text{ denotes if } c'_1 \text{ and } c'_2 \text{ or} \ldots c'_n.$$
$$\text{for example, } d'_1 \text{ or } d'_2 \text{ or} \ldots d'_n.$$

term	description part	ostensive part

[39]

definition

---

[36] Edward E. Bendix, Componential Analysis of General Vocabulary:
The Semantic Structure of a Set of Verbs in English, Hindi and Japanese
(Indiana University Press, 1966).

[37] See Charles J. Fillmore, "On the Organization of Semantic In-
formation in the Lexicon," *Parasession o nthe Lexicon, Chicago Linguis-
tic Society Conference*, Chicago, 1978.

[38] Uriel Weinreich, "Lexifographic Definition in Descriptive Seman-
tics", in Fred W. Householder and Sol Saporta (eds.), *Problems in Lexi-
cography* (The Hague—Mouton and Co., 1967), pp. 29, 31.

[39] The Weinreich definition has been criticized for being "imprecise"
and "might well have been explained in more detail or perhhaps illus-
trated by more actual words and fewer algebraic symbols" (see Dean
Stoddard Worth, "Comments," *ibid.*, p. 82).

4. *Sample entry.* If the proposed framework were used, how would a dictionary entry look like? Below is an entry from the first dictionary[40] using this model.

Kapayhakahakao—Farming
> *Paysirbyen do kapayhakahakao*—Farm Implement
> > *Alat*—Basket

Alat
abdiit n. 1. brace, as that of a basket. *Pakahyin mo o abdiit no alat aya no baka.* Repair the brace of the basket for cows (i.e., baskets used for carrying farm produce hung on saddles).

> v.   (OR—A:*ma*-1   O:*an*-1   I:*ipa*-1
> > B:*ipa*-2   K:*ipa*-3   D:-*m*_   S:*ma*-3)

> 2. To cause to have something braced or strengthened.
> *To ipabdiit ni ina o alat aya tapian maparin a sedseren no wakay.* Mother is having the basket braced so that it can be loaded fully with sweet potato.

> (VO—Pa:*chi*-2   Ab:-*ka*-2)

> 3. to be included in what is braced.
> *Nachiabdiit o viao ao do alat aya.*
> The reed was included when the basket was braced.

> (AS—*In*:'   ko:-)

> 4. to keep on putting the braces of something.
> *Kapamdit da so alatsee aran mahep dana.*
> They keep on bracing the baskets even when it is already dark.

What would this entry reveal? First, the entry belongs to the broad semantic domain *farming*, specified and clustered with *farm implement* and *basket*. Second, the entry is a free form presented phonemically; third, since there is no indication of etymology, it is a native word; fourth, number 1 meaning is the basic meaning of the entry and a collocation illustration is presented; fifth, this noun entry can be verbalized; sixth, it allows case roles, namely, *agent, object, instru-*

---

[40] Cesar A. Hidalgo, *Ivatan-English Dictionary.* Research project with the Summer Institute of Linguistics.

ment, benefactive, causative, direction and *state;* seventh, the causative meaning is arbitrarily picked up as meaning number 2 and a collocational example is given; eighth, the entry allows voice features, namely *participation* and *abilitive;* ninth, the participative meaning is arbitrarily picked up as number 3 meaning and a collocational example is presented; tenth, it participates in aspectual features *inceptive* and *continuative;* eleventh, the continuative meaning is arbitrarily picked up as number 4 meaning and a collocational example is given; twelfth, since no idiomatic expression is presented, it is not available; thirteenth, since no synonym is given, it is not available; and fourteenth, since no dialect information is presented, the word is the only word used for this concept in the entire Ivatan-speaking community.

Furthermore, the information that we derive from case, voice and aspect (CVA) features present further criterial definition for the entry. The claims made at the end of section 3.2.3.3 are verified, i.e., stem classification, information on the affixation potential of the stem, and grammatical information on transformational potential and complement expansion.

We suggest that given this model for writing Philippine dictionaries, we will be able to produce dictionaries of the type defined in this paper and to respond to the triad language goals of the nation.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Aruego, Jose M. and Gloria A. Torres. *The New Philippine Constitution Explained.* Manila: University Book Supply, Inc., 1975.

Bendix, Edward H. *Componential Analysis of General Vocabulary: The Semantic Structure of a Set of Verbs in English, Hindi and Japanese.* Indiana University Press, 1966.

Blair, Emma Helen and James Alexander Robertson. *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898.* Cleveland, Ohio: A. H. Clark Co., 1903-09.

Census of the Philippine Islands, 1903. Volume II. Washington, U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1905.

Census of the Philippine Islands, 1918. Volume II. Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1921.

Chaney, Francis Noel. *Fundamental Reference Sources.* Chicago: American Library Associations, 1971.

Fillmore, Charles J. "The Case for Case," in Emmon Bach and Robert T. Harns (eds.), *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.
——————. "On the Organization of Semantic Information in the Lexicon," *Parasession on the Lexicon*. Chicago Linguistic Society Conference, Chicago, 1978.

Fodor, Janet. *Semantics: Theories of Meaning in Generative Grammar*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1977.

Francisco, Juan. *Indian Influences in Philippine Languages and Literature*.

Frei, Ernest J. *The Historical Development of the Philippine National Language*. Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1959.

Gleason, Jr. H. A. "The Relation of Lexicon and Grammar," in Fred W. Householder and Sol Saporta (eds.), *Problems in Lexicography*. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1967.

Haas, Mary R. "What Belongs in a Bilingual Dictionary," in Fred W. Householder and Sol Saporta (eds.), *Problems in Lexicography*. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1967.

Hidalgo, Araceli C. "Focus in Philippine Languages," *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 1, no. 1 (1970), 25-32.
——————. "The Connection Between Antecedent and Consequent in Tagalog Conditionals," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1978.

Hidalgo, Cesar A. *Philippine Lexicography*. Quezon City: University of the Philippines Press, 1979.
——————. *Ivatan-English Dictionary*. Forthcoming.

Hidalgo, Cesar A. and Araceli C. Hidalgo. "Ivatan Morphology: The Predicatives," *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 1, no. 2, 1970. 10-54.
——————. *A Tagmemic Grammar of Ivatan*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines, 1975.

Jocano, F. Landa. *Ethnographic Handbook*. Manuscript.

Katz, Jerrold J. and Jerry A. Fodor. "The Structure of a Semantic Theory," *Language*. Volume 39. April-June, 1963. 170-210.

Lyons, John. *Semantics*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Manalili, Felix M. and Reynaldo de Dios. *English-Tagalog Vocabulary*. Quezon City: Pressman Printers and Publishers, 1964.

Marcos, Ferdinand E. "National Language and Unity." *Language Policy on Education and Culture in the New Society*. Manila: Surian ng Wikang Pambansa, 1975.

——————————. *Tadhana: The History of the Filipino People.* Manila, 1976.

McCawley, James D. "Logic and the Lexicon," *Parasession on the Lexicon.* Chicago Linguistic Society Conference, Chicago, 1978.

Swanson, Donald C. "The Selection of Entries for a Bilingual Dictionary," in Householder and Saporta (eds.), *Problems in Lexicography,* 1967.

Weinreich, Uriel. "Webster's Third: A Critique of its Semantics," *Lnternational Journal of American Linguistics.* Volume 30. 1964.

——————————. "Lexicographic Definition in Descriptive Semantics," in Fred W. Householder and Sol Saporta (eds.), *Problems in Lexicography,* 1967.

Worth, Dean Stoddard. "Comments," in Householder and Saporta (eds.), *Problems in Lexicography,* 1967.

Yabes, Leopoldo Y. "Let's Study the New Constitution: Language Provision," *Philippine Social Sciences and Humanities Review,* XXXVIII. March-June, 1973.

Zgusta, Ladislav. "Die Lexikographie and die Sprachwissenschafft," in Kaspar L. Riemschnaider, *Probleme der Lexikographie.* Berlin: Akawemie-Verlag, 1970, 7-22.

——————————. *Manual of Lexicography.* The Hague: Mouton, 1971.