

Some Notes and Critiques of Selected Lexicographic Texts in Bikol

Louward Allen Zubiri

University of the Philippines Diliman

ABSTRACT

This study revolves around notes and critiques of Bikol lexicography. Based on a selection of six dictionaries, the structure and diachronic development of Bikol lexicography were analyzed. Half of the selected dictionaries were authored in full or part by Malcolm Mintz, a renowned Bikol expert. These enabled a linear analysis of changes in lexicography that have occurred within the span of four decades. The dictionaries studied include the earliest and most influential Bikol dictionary of Lisboa (1865). The study presents a preliminary description of lexicographic work done in Bikol and traces the shift in the paradigm of dictionary making from the Spanish era to the present.

Keywords: Bikol languages, lexicography, diachronic

The recent shift of the Philippine educational system to mother tongue-based multilingual education has highlighted the crucial need to generate and make available materials and resources in various Philippine languages. Without such materials and resources, the inherent theoretical advantage of a mother tongue-based multilingual education will be wasted (Gallego & Zubiri, 2011).

The country's diverse linguistic landscape, having more than 170 languages (Lewis, Simons, & Fennig, 2013), magnifies this concern. Initially, the Department of Education (DepEd), through DepEd Order No. 16 s. 2012, is implementing the mother tongue-based multilingual education (MTBMLE) covering 12 languages only. While more languages are planned to be eventually included in the program, the initial languages chosen reflect the disjunction between a select group of languages in the Philippines and the rest. As material development is one of the steps needed for a strong MTBMLE implementation, this study contributes to the assessment of lexicographic texts in Bikol. *Bikol*¹ is included in the initial implementation of MTBMLE.

The term *Bikol* does not refer to a specific language and should not be taken as one language. There are several Bikol languages and the term *Bikol languages*² is

generally used to refer to the languages located in the Bikol Peninsula. The literature shows no consensus on the number of languages in the Bikol Peninsula, as linguists base their count on a number of different criteria. This count ranges from a minimum of four distinct language areas (Lobel & Tria, 2000) up to a maximum of 11 varieties (McFarland, 1974). Despite this linguistic diversity, it happens that the lingua franca of the region, Bikol Naga, is almost always taken to be synonymous to and the referent of the term *Bikol*. Bikol Naga is the variety spoken in Naga City and nearby towns in Camarines Sur. It belongs to the Central Bikol Group (Lobel & Tria, 2000, p. 114), alongside other varieties such as Bikol Legazpi and Bikol Daet. Bikol Legazpi is the variety spoken in Legazpi City and nearby towns in Albay and Sorsogon, while Bikol Daet is the variety spoken in the eastern half of Camarines Sur. The status of Bikol Naga as the focal variety of the whole Bikol group is illustrated in the subsequent sections.

Bikol languages are spoken between the areas occupied by the Tagalog and Bisayan languages – that is, Central Philippines, and genetically form a group with these two other languages. The Central Philippine languages not only occupy a large chunk of the linguistic landscape of the country but are also the focus of decades of linguistic inquiry and documentation. Works began in the Spanish period, continued to an era of Structuralism until the rise and development of Philippine linguistics. The central role of the Bikol languages and the other Central Philippine languages is reflected in the various subdisciplines of Philippine linguistics. One of these is Bikol lexicography.

Lexicography, in its simplest sense, is the science of dictionary making. Anyone working with language documentation or linguistic archival research knows that in addition to a grammatical sketch, a dictionary or a wordlist is not only fundamental but is also one of the first types of work that can be done. A sketch supplies basic language rules while a dictionary provides the lexicon of a language.

While most Bikol languages have at least a basic sketch, dictionaries are not readily available. This illustrates the point made earlier that while the differences between the various Bikol languages have been investigated (Lobel & Tria, 2000; McFarland, 1974), lexicographic work concentrates on certain varieties (see the next section for a discussion). The general problem in Philippine linguistics is that there is no readily available database or corpus of languages, unlike in the case of foreign languages. Take Google's Ngram Viewer, for example. It has a database of words in American English, British English, French, German, Spanish, Russian, or Chinese. A database of World Englishes also exists in the International Corpus of English. The closest thing that Philippine linguistics has is the Filipino Speech Corpus, which is

for Filipino, one of the official languages of the Philippines. The other 170 languages in the country have no official databases. This is important since one of the basic practices in lexicography is the establishment of lemmas.

The establishment of lemmas begins with lemmatization. Lemmatization, which is the analysis of inflected forms into a single entity, necessitates a lexical database. Lemma selection requires lemmatization. Without a lexical database, there are no frequency counts, there are no lists of word forms. Basically, it means that lemmatization is not possible. Without lemmatization, there is no lemma selection. Given that there is currently no well-made database of most Philippine languages, one can only wonder how dictionaries of these languages, academic or not, are made.

Relatively little research on the diachronic development of Bikol lexicography has been done. This research attempts to fill that gap. It can also serve as a recommendation in the formulation of a new Bikol dictionary.

Due to an apparent lack of monolingual dictionaries of any of the Bikol languages, this study is limited to bilingual and multilingual dictionaries. Bilingual and multilingual dictionaries focus on providing equivalent structures from a source language to a target language.

The six dictionaries considered in the study are Lisboa (1865), Mintz (1971), Silverio (1980), Mintz and Britanico (1985), Diksyunaryong English-Filipino-Bikol (2001), and Mintz (2004). Malcolm Mintz, who authored in full or in part three of these dictionaries is a renowned Bikol expert.

ANALYSES OF SELECTED TEXTS

This study provides notes and critiques on the contents of six Bikol dictionaries. Using structural concepts in lexicography as discussed by Svensen (2009), the composition of these dictionaries was dissected. This study briefly describes the context, purpose, and type of each dictionary, and provides an analysis of its microstructure and macrostructure.

The six dictionaries studied were selected based on two criteria: academic orientation and impact; and time frame. Most of these lexicographic texts are academically and linguistically oriented, particularly those by Mintz. In addition, since this study is diachronic in nature, the selected texts come from different time periods:³ two in the early 2000s, two in the early 1980s, and one in the early

1970s. Despite the great amount of time that has lapsed since its publication, *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol* is included for its sheer importance in the discourse of Bikol lexicography. A review of these dictionaries is provided below.

Lisboa, M. d. (1865). *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol*. Manila: Colegio de Santo Tomás.

Understanding the development of Bikol lexicography demands an analysis of Lisboa's work, which is one of the most prominent studies on Bikol languages. The contribution of this work, not only in the field of lexicography but also in language documentation, was unparalleled in its time.

The extensive use of the Bikol languages in the southeast peninsula of Luzon did not go unnoticed by early Spanish scholars. Bikol Naga, as the representative of the various Bikol languages, has been fortunate to have a documentation (Lobel, 2004) of its former state of affairs. Not every Philippine language had been documented during the Spanish era. Other central Philippine languages like Tagalog and Cebuano have documentations also in the Spanish era.

Bikol Naga had a grammar book by 1739, *Arte de la lengua bicol para la enseñanza de este idioma* by Andres de San Agustin, and a dictionary by 1754, *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol*. This dictionary was reprinted in 1865.

Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol is a bilingual dictionary: Bikol and Spanish. The dictionary entries are in Bikol and the corresponding definitions in Spanish. Understandably, it applied orthographic rules of Spanish orientation, as evident in the representation of vowels by their semivowel counterparts (e.g., I↔Y and U↔W).

The dictionary has a very simple framing structure. It has a preface, an introduction, and a single entry list. It has no section on the grammatical information of Bikol. Regarding the macrostructural level of the entry list, the ordering principle is based on orthographic properties. It follows an alphabetical order. However, the order reflects I↔Y and U↔W, since entries beginning in Y come before entries beginning in L, for example:

YDO. pc. Cachorrillo de perro, no es para otro animal. Prim. act. caret. *Naggydo*, parir la perra. *Pinaggydoan*, el lugar. *Ypinaggydo*, nacer perrillos, o cachorrillos (p. 197).

LIPAY. pc. Vide *Tipay* (p. 226).

This dictionary also employs nesting, which interferes with the alphabetical order, as seen below:

YDO. pc. Cachorrillo de perro, no es para otro animal. Prim. act. caret. *Naggydo*, parir la perra. *Pinaggydoan*, el lugar. *Ypinaggydo*, nacer perrillos, o cachorrillos (p. 197).

Here, the entry word YDO is followed by other nesting entries: *Naggydo*, *Pinaggydoan*, and *Ypinaggydo*. Two of these nesting entries do not begin with Y. It is important to notice the distinction between nesting entries and entry words. The format of a nesting entry differs: it is not capitalized but is italicized. Further information can be found in the microstructure.

On the microstructural level, this dictionary uses a rather simplistic marking and labeling format. As seen in the example below, the lemma entry (i.e., YDO), usually marked bold in most modern dictionaries, is simply written in capital letters. Considering the temporal context of this work, it is understandable since manuscripts during this period did not have the luxury of the typeface that later printing and modern typing offer.

YDO. pc. Cachorrillo de perro, no es para otro animal. Prim. act. caret. *Naggydo*, parir la perra. *Pinaggydoan*, el lugar. *Ypinaggydo*, nacer perrillos, o cachorrillos (p. 197).

The field format of its microstructure is relatively simple. It does not provide a phonological representation of an entry. Each entry is followed only by a meaning description and then several morphological derivatives with their own meaning definitions. There is likewise no label for any syntactic category, word formation process, or construction. Etymological information and examples are also lacking.

The limitations of this work are logical given its temporal context. It is reflective of its purpose, which is instruction. One can surmise that this bilingual dictionary written in Bikol and Spanish was not for general use but for academic purposes. During that era, the Spanish language was only accessible to a select fraction of the population.

A major strength of *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol*, as the pioneering work in Bikol lexicography, is that provided the preliminary investigation of the Bikol lexicon and a springboard from which other Bikol dictionaries would build their work. It focused on what was essential. While it may lack several features found in modern

dictionaries, such as information on the language and grammatical information, it established Bikol lexicography. It began to address the challenge of documenting Philippine languages and initiated the discourse on Bikol languages.

Mintz, M.W. (Ed.). (1971). *Bikol dictionary*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

For several decades, *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol* remained the paramount reference of Bikol lexicography. Scholarship in the Spanish period concentrated more in the production of grammar books such as Andres de San Agustin's *Arte de la Idioma Bicol* (The Art of the Bicol Language) and Roman de Vera's *Gramatica Hispano-Bicol Segun El Metodo de Ollendorff*.

Using Asuncion-Landé's (1970) periodization, it was only during the Philippine period⁴ that the next academic Bikol dictionary came into the picture. This was due to the efforts of Malcolm Mintz, a renowned linguist and Bikol scholar. Mintz authored three editions of Bikol dictionaries. His 1971 work, published by the University of Hawaii Press, is the first of the series.

Mintz' Bikol dictionary is a bilingual dictionary: Bikol and English. This dictionary has a very simple framing structure. It has a preface, an introduction, grammatical information of Bikol, and a two-part entry list. Part I is a Bikol-English dictionary, where the entries are in Bikol and the corresponding definitions are in English. Part II is an English-Bikol dictionary, where the entries are in English and the corresponding definitions are in Bikol.

On the macrostructural level of the entry list, the ordering principle is by orthographic properties. It follows an alphabetical order, as seen below:

NÁRA tree (all sp; pterocarpus) (p. 297).

NARÁNSAS a small orange (p. 297).

NARANGHÍTA variant of ARANGHÍTA (p. 297).

The examples above also illustrate the use of cross-referencing, instead of using a particular label to address lexical variations. Another feature found in the macrostructure is the use of homonym number. Homonymy is addressed in the macrostructure by distinguishing homonyms as separate entries. These are indicated by numbered superscripts as seen below:

¹BAGSÍK MA- swift (p. 80).

²BAGSÍK MAG- to become strong, to become powerful, to become mighty; KA- + -AN strength, power, might (p. 80).

The apparent inclusion of English words is another feature of this dictionary. These entries are specially marked by the label (E) to indicate that they are loans from English. Nonetheless, some of these entries reflect native word formation processes, as seen in the examples below:

BAKE (E) MAG-, -ON to bake (as a cake) (p. 81).
BAKERY (E) bakery (p. 81).

This dictionary also employs nesting, which interferes with the alphabetical order, as seen below:

NASIONALÍSTA nationalist; PARTIDO NASIONALÍSTA the Nationalist Party; MAG- to join the Nationalist Party (p. 297).
NÁTAD front yard (p. 297).

Here, the entry word NASIONALÍSTA is followed by a nesting entry: PARTIDO NASIONALÍSTA. The nesting entry does not begin with the same letter as the entry word; it should not appear before NÁTAD if a strict alphabetical order is followed. It is also important to notice the distinction between nesting entries and entry words. Nesting entries are subsumed in the microstructure of an entry word. However, the formats of both a nesting entry and an entry word are the same – both are capitalized.

On the microstructural level, this dictionary uses a rather simplistic marking and labeling format. As seen in the example below, the lemma entry (i.e., ÁYAM), which is usually marked bold in most modern dictionaries, is simply written in capital letters. This is similar to how *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol* represents a lemma entry. While it has been mentioned that this dictionary has nesting entries, most of the time, morphological information is not in terms of derivations but rather of word formation processes.

DÁKING MAG- to digress (p. 121).

There is no phonological representation as well as lexical category information. Immediately after the lemma entry, the meaning definition follows, unless the field of word formation process is filled by affix frames.

ÁYAM dog (p. 16).
EGG sugok (p. 646).

Mintz' initial foray into Bikol lexicography is commendable since it provided access in English to lexical information in Bikol. However, it could be improved such as by including English loans and by providing phonological representation and lexical category information. Subsequent editions of the dictionary addressed these concerns.

Silverio, J.F. (Ed.). (1980). *New Bicolano-Pilipino-English dictionary*. Metro Manila: National Book Store.

New Bicolano-Pilipino-English Dictionary is a trilingual dictionary: Bikol, Tagalog, and English. The dictionary entries are in Bikol and the corresponding definitions are in Tagalog and English. A unique feature of this dictionary is the presentation of orthographic variants as entry words rather than as labeled part of the microstructure. This can be observed in the example below:

HARAM, HADAM, adj. – hiram, hiniram – *borrowed* (p. 55).

Another unique feature is the inclusion of information on lexical category of each lemma. Other dictionaries lack this information. As seen in the examples below, Silverio based his categorization on the concept of parts-of-speech in Western linguistics.

DAI, adv. – hindi, dili, di – *not, no* (p. 39).

DALAG, n. – lihim na tagpuan – *illicit rendezvous* (p. 39).

SIYO, n. – sisiw, inakay – *chick, young fowl* (p. 100).

While the two entries are nonproblematic, the use of adverb as a category in Bikol is a bit shaky. As mentioned in works such as Mattes (2006), lexical categorization is innately complex in Bikol and in other Philippine languages due to the sheer linguistic productivity of lexical roots. Take for example this construction:

Dai ko aram kung nag-iyo o nag-**dai** kamo sa...

'I don't know if you agreed or rejected..'

A weakness of this dictionary is that it is more of a comparative word-list than a dictionary. There is an apparent lack of construction in its microstructure. While it made up in the format of the microstructure by including lexical categories, it failed on several points, such as the lack of phonological representation and construction.

While *New Bicolano-Pilipino-English Dictionary* is a good attempt at constructing a Bicol dictionary, it is obvious from the onset that there had been little lexicographic background in the creation process of this work. As noted earlier, it is more of a comparative word list than a dictionary.

Mintz, M.W. & Britanico, J. (Eds.). (1985). Bicol-English dictionary. Quezon City: New Day Publication.

The second edition of Mintz' lexicographic work, a collaboration with Jose Del Rosario Britanico, was published in 1985. Like Mintz' previous work, *Bicol-English Dictionary* is a bilingual dictionary. It has a simple framing structure. It has a preface, an introduction, grammatical information of Bikol, a map, and two entry lists. It is a Bicol and English dictionary with a two-section continuous entry list. The first section is an English-Bikol dictionary: the entries are in English and the corresponding definitions are in Bikol. The second section is a Bikol-English dictionary: the entries are in Bikol and the corresponding definitions are in English.

On the macrostructural level of the entry list, the ordering principle is by orthographic properties. It follows an alphabetical order, as seen below:

EUCHARIST **Eukaristía** (p. 103).
EULOGY **tarám** (p. 103).
EUROPE **Európa**; EUROPEAN **Européo** (p. 103).

Another feature addressed in the macrostructure is homonymy. Unlike the previous edition, this dictionary does not make use of numbered superscript. Homonyms are treated as multiple instances of the same form without any other label, as seen in the example below:

retokár MAG-, -ON to touch on or bring up a subject; to revive an issue [Sp-retocar] (p. 452).
retokár MAG-, -ON to remind someone; MAG-, I- to remind someone about (p. 452).

The second example above illustrates the use of dead examples. Dead examples are invented examples containing only those elements that are indispensable for conveying the grammatical information. In the example, the use of an indefinite pronoun (someone) indicates a dead example.

Another feature of this dictionary is the inclusion of direct loans. These entries are marked by an etymological field. In this field, the language of origin is indicated (in

this case it is English). Some of these entries also reflect native word formation processes, as seen in the examples below:

revise MAG-, I- to revise [E- from Greek] (p. 452).
rey king [Sp-] (p. 452).

This dictionary also employs nesting, which interferes with the alphabetical order, as seen below:

bakli' MAG-, -ON to reform o/s; to mend one's ways; **magbakli' kan paginom** to go on the wagon (p. 237).

Here, the entry word **bakli'** is followed by a nesting entry **magbakli' kan paginom**. The nesting entry does not begin in the same letter as the entry word and is not limited to a single word lemma. It is also important to note the distinction between nesting entries and entry words. The nesting entries are subsumed in the microstructure of an entry word. However, in this case, the formats of a nesting entry and an entry word are the same – both are in bold typeface.

On the microstructural level, this dictionary uses a complex marking and labeling format. As seen in the examples below, the lemma entry is marked bold, the English entry words are simply capitalized, and the Bikol definition is marked bold also. In addition, as previously mentioned, this dictionary has nesting entries and the morphological information is not in terms of derivations but rather of word formation processes.

ido' dog; canine; historically this meant 'puppy' (p. 315).
 GNARLED **biribid** (p. 115).
siwó' chick; MAG- to walk together (a hen and her chicks); -AN a hen and her chicks [D- Partido]; var- **siyó'** (p. 489).

Several observations can be made from the examples above: phonological representation and lexical category information are lacking, etymological information is provided, and diatopic marking is used.

The second edition of Mintz' dictionary remedies some of the issues found in the first edition. For instance, it provides more information by indicating the etymological fields and by providing diatopic marking. However, the lack of phonological representation and lexical category remains as a problem.

Diksyunaryong English-Filipino-Bikol. (2001). San Miguel, Maynila: Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino.

The Commission on the Filipino Language is a government institution charged with the mission to develop Filipino as a language of literature and as an academic language as well as to preserve and develop the other languages in the country (Gonzalez, 1998). As such, it has a lexicography unit.

Diksyunaryong English-Filipino-Bikol is a trilingual dictionary: English, Bikol, and Tagalog. It is unique in the sense that the entry words are in English. The other dictionaries have entry lists in Bikol. Correspondence in Tagalog and in Bikol is given as the meaning definition, as seen below.

dog *n.* aso **Bk.L.** ayam, ido (p. 238).

On the macrostructural level of the entry list, the ordering principle is by orthographic properties. It follows an alphabetical order, as seen below:

chick *n.* a young chicken: sisiw **Bk.L.** siwo. The chicken stepped on the chick. Naapakan ng manok ang sisiw. Nabatoyan kan manok an siwo (p. 121).

chicken *n.* fowl: manok **Bk.L.** manok. Fried chicken. Prinitong manok. Prinitos na manok (p. 121).

This dictionary has a rich microstructure, which includes the use of polysemy. Polysemes are treated as different senses of the same instance. These are indicated by the numbered senses, as seen in the example below:

hostile *adj.* 1. unfriendly ; unfavorable: masama

Bk.L. maraot; maisog. A hostile attitude. Masungit na pakikitungo. Maraot na pakikiiba.

2. angry: galit **Bk.N.** anggot; **Bk.L.**ungis; dagit (p. 340).

Interestingly, this dictionary also has information on lexical categories. Apparently, when a nonlinguist creates a dictionary, he/she does not find it problematic to attach particular lexical categories to lemmas. The previous point raised in Silverio (1980) is applicable to this dictionary. The example below exemplifies this problem:

no *adv.* 2. *adj.* not any; not a : wala **Bk.L.** wara; **Bk.N.** mayo. (p. 439).

The same example illustrates one of the strengths of this dictionary: the use of diatopic marking. In the example, labels for Bikol Legazpi (**Bk.L.**) and Bikol Naga (**Bk.N.**) were used to mark lexical differences.

Being a trilingual dictionary is reflected in its microstructure, which has a more sophisticated format. After the entry word, which is in English, the formal section includes information on lexical category but not phonological representation. The semantic-pragmatic section provides the equivalents in Tagalog and in the different varieties available (e.g., Bikol Legazpi and Bikol Naga). Constructions are given as live examples; they are also provided in the three languages used by the dictionary. These can be seen below:

chick *n.* a young chicken: sisiw **Bk.L.** siwo. The chicken stepped on the chick. Naapakan ng manok ang sisiw. Nabatoyan kan manok an siwo (p. 121).

chicken *n.* fowl: manok **Bk.L.** manok. Fried chicken. Prinitong manok. Prinitos na manok (p. 121).

Some of this dictionary's weaknesses include the following: lack of phonological representation, use of English entry words, and use of lexical categories. On the other hand, its strengths are in the use of diatopic marking, three languages, and live examples in construction. Despite these, it is not the best Bikol dictionary. That position is held by the dictionary discussed in the next section.

Mintz, M.W. (Ed.). (2004). Bikol dictionary. Perth, Australia: Indonesian/Malay Texts and Resources.

Bikol Dictionary is the third edition and latest dictionary from Malcolm Mintz. Produced based on decades of research in Bikol lexicography, this two-volume work encompasses previous editions (Mintz, 1979, 1981) and includes updates (e.g., translations of Lisboa), as seen below:

ÍDO dog (Mintz, 1971, p. 190).

ido' dog; canine; historically this meant 'puppy' (Mintz & Britanico, 1985, p. 315).

YDO. pc. Cachorrillo de perro, no es para otro animal. Prim. act. caret. *Nagyydo*, parir la perra. *Pinagyydoan*, el lugar. *Ypinagyydo*, nacer perrillos, o cachorrillos (Lisboa, 1865, p. 197).

ido' dog, canine [MDL: puppy; MAG-, IPAG- to give birth to a litter of puppies] (Mintz, 2004, p. 620).

Bikol Dictionary is a bilingual dictionary, presented in two lists: English-Bikol and Bikol-English. The two volumes have several differences. First, the entries are presented using different formats. The first volume is an English-Bikol dictionary,

with the entries given in English and the corresponding definitions in Bikol, as seen below:

ACCOMMODATION (residence), **istár** (Mintz, 2004, p. 74).

It is noted that the entry in English is in capital letters and mimics the format in *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol*, and the Bikol entry is marked bold. Usually, the bold typeface is used to indicate a lemma entry.

The second volume is a Bikol-English dictionary, with the entries given in Bikol and the corresponding definitions in English. It follows the modern standard where the lemma entry is marked bold, as seen below:

ido' dog, canine [MDL: puppy; MAG-, IPAG- to give birth to a litter of puppies] (Mintz, 2004, p. 620).

This dictionary has a complex framing structure. It has a table of contents, maps, list of references illustrations, list of abbreviations, a section on the use of the dictionary, grammar of Bikol, translation, and then integration of *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol*. The dictionary uses continuous pagination across volumes.

On the macrostructural level of the entry list of both volumes, the ordering principle is by orthographic properties. It follows an alphabetical order. It also follows a letter-by-letter principle, which disregards spaces between words and treats multi-word lemmas as solid ones, as seen below:

ACCENT (mode of pronunciation), **púnto**; to ..., **aksentuár**
ACCENT MARK **áccent**; to place an ... on, **áccent, aksentuár**
ACCENTUATE: to ..., **aksentuár**
ACCENTUATED **aksentuádo**

This dictionary has a strict alphabetical macrostructure with grouping. This is illustrated in the degree of textual condensation on the microstructural level. The dictionary does not employ nesting. The reason behind this is that unlike other dictionaries that include derivatives as nesting entries, this dictionary provides information on word formation in the form of productive affixes. The example below illustrates this feature.

áyam dog, canine; **babáying áyam** bitch [+MDL: M- or MAG- to hunt with dogs; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG-ON to hunt a particular type of game with dogs; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to take particular dogs on a hunt; PARA- a hunter who hunts with dogs; -ON referring to s/o with dog-like habits] (Mintz, 2004, p. 444).

As seen above, productive affixes are included in the microstructure. Here, several affixes such as MAG- and PARA- follow the dictionary meaning. After each affix, the resultant meaning is provided. This shows that the dictionary's microstructure uses more marking and a more complex labeling format.

Moreover, the microstructure has labels for etymological information and semantic relations, as seen below:

kapatas foreman, overseer [SP- *capataz*].

kapaw syn- **pawpaw** [MDL].

The format of the etymological information of the lemma indicates two additional fields: the language of origin and the etymon. In the example above, the language of origin of **kapatas** is Spanish and the etymon is *capataz*.

Further, semantic relations are indicated by the labels. In the above example, the synonym of **kapaw** is introduced by the label SP- and is then followed by the synonymous lemma, which in this case is **kapaw**.

Since this dictionary incorporates lexical information from *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol*, an entry previously described in *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol* is indicated by the label MDL in the microstructure. All relevant information from *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol* is translated and adjusted to current standards. For examples:

kapaw syn- **pawpaw** [MDL].

áyam dog, canine; **babáying áyam** bitch [+MDL: M- or MAG- to hunt with dogs; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG-ON to hunt a particular type of game with dogs; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to take particular dogs on a hunt; PARA- a hunter who hunts with dogs; -ON referring to s/o with dog-like habits] (Mintz, 2004, p. 444).

Mintz's (2004) *Bikol Dictionary* represents the pinnacle of his lexicographic work. It provides a discussion of Bikol grammar and has other pertinent parts not found in other dictionaries. It has both Bikol-English and English Bikol entry lists. Nonetheless, this dictionary is not without flaw. It lacks labeling regarding lexical categories. This may be due to the linguistic difficulty of determining word class not only in Bikol but in other Philippine languages. This dictionary also magnifies the focus on Bikol Naga among the Bikol varieties. Again, this does not belittle the immense contribution of this dictionary. By combining features not only from Mintz's two previous dictionaries but also from the well-known *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol*, this dictionary is definitely the best.

TRENDS AND PROSPECTS OF BIKOL LEXICOGRAPHY

Bikol lexicography began in the Spanish period with *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol*. Alongside grammar books in Bikol, *Vocabulario* formed the early documentation of the language. Eventually, other linguists studied the language and published dictionaries. Since they mostly function as didactic and academic references, these dictionaries are bilingual and multilingual dictionaries.

There have been several changes on how these dictionaries are portrayed. First, the glossing language shifted from Spanish to English. This is to be expected with the movement of the field of linguistics in the Philippines from the Spanish period to the American period; English has remained the dominant glossing language since the American period. Second, the megastructure and microstructures of the dictionaries have changed. Lastly, by tracing a particular lemma across the various lexicographic texts, pertinent issues and insights have been discovered.

Megastructure

Several changes have been observed in the megastructure of the different lexicographic texts analyzed in this study. Table 1 presents a comparison of the various structures found within each dictionary.

Table 1. Comparison of Dictionary Structures

	Lisboa, 1865	Mintz, 1971	Silverio, 1980	Mintz, 1985	DEFB ⁵ , 2001	Mintz, 2004
Table of contents	Absent	Present	Absent	Present	Absent	Present
Preface	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
Instructional use	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Present
Information on the language	Absent	Present	Absent	Present	Present	Present
Grammatical information	Absent	Present	Absent	Present	Absent	Present
Entry list	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
Appendices	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Present
Illustrations and maps	Absent	Absent	Absent	Present	Absent	Present
List of abbreviations	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Present

Two structures are consistently found in all lexicographic texts: preface and entry list. It is noted that Mintz' 2004 dictionary has the most number of dictionary structures.

Microstructure

Likewise, several changes have been observed in the microstructure of the different lexicographic texts analyzed in this study. A comparison of the set of fields found in the microstructures of each dictionary is presented in Table 2.

Three entry fields are consistently found in most lexicographic texts: meaning definition, semantic relation, and construction. Some trends were also observed in the microstructure with regard to the lemma indicator, diatopic marking, and morphological structure. It is evident that in the early works in Bikol lexicography, such as Lisboa (1895) and Mintz (1971), the preferred lemma indicator is capitalization of the entry form. This preference shifted later: Silverio (1980), for instance, made use of both capitalization and bold typeface. Succeeding dictionaries

Table 2. Comparison of Entry Fields

	Lisboa, 1865	Mintz, 1971	Silverio, 1980	Mintz, 1985	DEFB⁶, 2001	Mintz, 2004
Lemma indicator	Capital letters	Capital letters	Capital letters and bold typeface	Bold typeface	Bold typeface	Bold typeface
Phonological representation	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Lexical category	Absent	Absent	Present	Absent	Present	Absent
Meaning definition	In Spanish	In English and Bikol	In English, Tagalog, and Bikol	In English and Bikol	In English, Tagalog, and Bikol	In English and Bikol
Morphological structure	Derivatives	Word formation	Absent	Word formation	Absent	Word formation
Diatopic marking	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent	Present	Present
Semantic relation	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present
Construction	Present	Present	Absent	Present	Present	Present
Language of origin	Absent	Present	Absent	Present	Absent	Present
Etymon	Absent	Absent	Absent	Present	Absent	Present

like Mintz (1985; 2004) and *Diksyunaryong English-Filipino-Bikol* (2001) shifted to the sole use of bold typeface.

In early works, diatopic marking is often subsumed under orthographic variation. However, in recent works such as Mintz (2004) and *Diksyunaryong English-Filipino-Bikol* (2001), diatopic labels that indicate lexical differences from other varieties are employed. This may indicate a gradual awareness of the various Bikol languages and a movement toward a comparative dictionary of Bikol.

Vocabulario de la lengua Bikol includes derivations in its microstructure. However, succeeding dictionaries from Malcolm Mintz shifted to the use of word formation processes such as affix frames. Two of the dictionaries (Silverio, 1980 and DEFB, 2001) do not have a field on morphological information. The use of word formation processes rather than derivations seems to be preferred by linguists and a means to condense the dictionary.

Table 2 also shows that among the dictionaries, Mintz's 2004 dictionary is the most complete in terms of entry fields.

Diachronic Trajectories

The development of Bikol lexicographic was analyzed by comparing the changes in the description of various lemmas. The following lemmas were considered: CHICK, EGG, DOG, HOUSE, NO, WHY, and GO. However, some of these lemmas are not available in all of the dictionaries under consideration. As such, only the diachronic trajectories of two lemmas found in all six dictionaries were investigated further. These lemmas are DOG and CHICK. The dialectal variations of these terms across the different Bikol varieties provide clear indicators for diatopic marking. Interestingly, the lemma for DOG is characteristic of Austronesian forms (Blust, 2002).

DOG. Reconstruction of the faunal terms for DOG includes *qáyam and *asu (Zorc, 1995). The form *qáyam is interesting since an analysis of semantic domains for faunal terms indicates that this particular term has some association with the general term used for animals (Blust, 2002, p. 91). In the case of Bikol languages, two distinct forms can be seen: <ayam> and <ido>. These two forms vary in their distribution, with <ayam> more frequently found in most varieties. Three varieties – Masbateño, Bikol Daet, and Bikol Naga – have an additional term: <ido>. Since all the dictionaries studied employ Bikol Naga in one way or another, they have entries for both terms.

The subsequent section deals with the chronological order of the entries for DOG, AYAM, and IDO.

Entries for DOG. Most of the studied dictionaries are bilingual and have entry lists where the lemmas are in English, as follows:

DOG *áyam, ido'* (Mintz, 1971, p. 636).

DOG **áyam, ido'**; ... (said in anger), **dayó, damayó**; in the... house, **kulambó'** (Mintz & Britanico, 1985, p. 97).

dog *n. aso* **Bk.L.** *ayam, ido* (Diksyunaryong English-Filipino-Bikol, 2001, p. 238).

Previous analyses of the microstructures show that the lemma indicator is the bold typeface. However, in the case of the second example, Mintz and Britanico (1985), the words in bold are the meaning definition and not the citation form. This indicates that this dictionary gives more importance to the Bikol forms in the overall structure.

It is also noted that the terms **dayó, damayó** with the label "(said in anger)" are included. It is known that Bikol has an angry register (Lobel, 2005).

Entries for AYAM. The dictionary entries of AYAM across the various dictionaries are as follows:

AYAM *pp. Perro. Naayam, yel nag aayam, cazar con perros. Ynaayam, l, pinag, la caza, que es corrida de los perros. Ynaayaman, l, ypinag, los perros con que se caza, tiempo, y causa. Paraayam, pp. cazador con perros. Ayamon, el que es como perro en las costumbres* (Lisboa, 1865, p. 16).

ÁYAM *dog* (Mintz, 1971, p. 16).

AYAM, *n. -aso -dog* (Silverio, 1980, p. 9).

áyam *dog; canine; babáying áyam* *bitch* (Mintz & Britanico, 1985, p. 233).

áyam *dog, canine; babáying áyam* *bitch* [+MDL: M- or MAG- to hunt with dogs; MA-, -ON or MAG-, PAG-ON to hunt a particular type of game with dogs; MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to take particular dogs on a hunt; PARA- a hunter who hunts with dogs; -ON referring to s/o with dog-like habits] (Mintz, 2004, p. 444).

Here, two points can be raised. First, there is a verbal sense of **áyam** as evident in the word formation processes included in its entry. Second, the inclusion of a

nested entry **babáying ayam** indicates that the term is more entrenched as opposed to **ido**. There is no record, at least in these dictionaries, that **babáying ido** can be interpreted to mean ‘bitch’.

Entries for IDO. The dictionary entries of IDO across the various dictionaries are as follows:

YDO. pc. Cachorrillo de perro, no es para otro animal. Prim. act. caret. *Naggydo*, parir la perra. *Pinaggydoan*, el lugar. *Ypinaggydo*, nacer perrillos, o cachorrillos (Lisboa, 1865, p. 197).

ÍDO dog (Mintz, 1971, p. 190).

ido' dog; canine; historically this meant ‘puppy’ (Mintz & Britanico, 1985, p. 315).

ido' dog, canine [MDL: puppy; MAG-, IPAG- to give birth to a litter of puppies] (Mintz, 2004, p. 620).

Similarly, two points can be raised here. As in **ayam**, there is a verbal sense of **ido** as evident in the word formation processes included in its entry. Moreover, there is an etymological note that the original meaning of this word is ‘puppy’ and that, eventually, the term was expanded to mean ‘dog’. This is interesting since there is already a term for dog, which is **ayam**. The question then is what motivated the expansion of the meaning of **ido**.

CHICK. There is a Proto-Malayo Polynesian faunal term for chicken: *manuk, which is also related to the term for bird (Blust, 2002, p. 91). The Proto-Malayo Polynesian term for chick is *anak i manuk, which is literally ‘child of a chicken.’

In the case of Bikol languages, four distinct forms can be seen: <siwo>, <siyo>, <siwsiw>, and <isiw>. Two of these forms are attested in the lexicographic texts under consideration, but vary in their distribution. The more frequently observed form, <siwo>, can be found in Bikol Naga, Bikol Legazpi, Central Sorsoganon, and Southern Sorsoganon. Several of the dictionaries indicate that Bikol Naga also uses <siyo>, which is also used in Bikol Daet.

The subsequent section deals with the chronological order of the entries for CHICK and SIWO.

Entries for CHICK. Most of the studied dictionaries are bilingual dictionaries and have an entry list where the lemmas are in English, as follows:

CHICK *siyó* (Mintz, 1971, p. 574).

CHICK *siyó'* (Mintz & Britanico, 1985, p. 79).

chick *n.* a young chicken: *sisiw* **Bk.L.** *siwo*. The chicken steppen on the chick. Naapakan ng manok ang *sisiw*. Nabatoyan kan manok an *siwo* (*Diksyunaryong English-Filipino-Bikol*, 2001, p. 121).

Entries for SIWO~SIYO. Two forms of entry can be found in the dictionary: SIWO and SIYO. The entries across the dictionaries considered are as follows:

SIUO. *pc.* Pollo de la gallina. *Nasiuo*, vel *nag*, sacar la gallina los pollos, o andar con ellos. *Sinisiuoan*, *l*, *pinag*, el lugar. *Ysinisiuo*, *l*, *ypinag*, los pollos, tiempo y causa. *Siuoan*, gallina con pollos (Lisboa, 1865, p. 550).

SIYÓ a chick (Mintz, 1971, p. 406).

SIYO, *n.* –*sisiw*, *inakay* – *chick*, *young fowl* (Silverio, 1980, p. 100).

siwó' chick; MAG- to walk together (a hen and her chicks); -AN a hen and her chicks [D- Partido]; var- **siyó'** (Mintz & Britanico, 1985, p. 489).

siwó' chick [D- Partido][+MDL: MA- or MAG- to walk together (a hen and her chicks); MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to help its chicks hatch (a hen); -AN a hen and her chicks] also see var- **siyó'** (Mintz, 2004, p. 888).

Here, several points can be raised. First, there is a verbal sense of **siwo** as evident in the word formation processes included in its entry. Second, **siwo** is the first to be documented. *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol* lists chick as **siwo** and not **siyo**. **Siyo** is not mentioned in *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol*. However, the two subsequent dictionaries (Mintz, 1971 and Silverio, 1980) use **siyo**. While **siyo** can also be found in Bikol Daet, it is a less investigated variety and never mentioned unlike Partido. The last two dictionaries (Mintz & Britanico, 1985 and Mintz, 2004) still reflect some verbal sense in the use of the lemma and maintain **siwo**. Nonetheless, they include **siyo** as a variant. It is important to take note of this backpedalling. In Mintz (1971), the entry is **siyo** but in the latter editions (1985; 2004), the entry suggests lexical gradience between **siwo** and **siyo**.

PROSPECTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

With regard to its state of documentation, Bikol still lacks lexicographic work. While Bikol Naga, the most prominent variety, has a number of dictionaries, the same cannot be said of the other Bikol languages. Studies of the dialectological nature of Bikol languages are aplenty (e.g., Hernandez, 1998; Eco, 1969; Dolores, 1972; Ella, 1973; Lamberto, 1961; McFarland, 1974). However, these do not translate to dialectal lexicographic work, and as seen in dictionaries considered in this study, lexicographic work so far has been primarily based on Bikol Naga, although some terms used by other varieties have been included. It is also important to note that some dictionaries employed diatopic marking.

Recommendations

The analyses of the six dictionaries in Bikol showed that most of the important lexicographic information has been incorporated in Mintz (2004). This study offers recommendations in three areas: lexical category, pronunciation and phonological representation, and diatopic marking and dialectal variation.

Lexical category. Resolving the problem of lexical categories in Bikol and in other Philippine languages presents an inherent difficulty, which stems from the complexity and flexibility of lexicon (Mattes, 2006). Meaning, lexical roots are highly productive. They can take several affix frames, undergo numerous derivations, and have a polyfunctional role.

Take for example the role of predication. In Bikol and in most Philippine languages, the role of predication can be taken by nonverbal elements. Some linguistic processes like V_1 -reduplication and some forms of affixation provide some insight as to which group these elements belong. While these processes can delineate these classes and group lexical roots into some natural classes, the delineation is not as clear-cut as is traditionally known in Western linguistics.

It is not a wonder then that most of the dictionaries under consideration in this study do not provide information on the lexical category of a lemma, except Silverio (1980). This may be partly because the authors wanted to avoid addressing the dilemmas in classifying lexical roots. It is noted that Silverio's inclusion of lexical category is not without flaw, as exemplified below:

DAI, adv. – hindi, dili, di – *not, no* (p. 39).

In this example, the lemma **DAI** is identified as an adverb. Two main insights can be obtained from this. First, Silverio utilizes the traditional parts of speech from Western linguistics. Second, he adheres to the notion that Bikol has these parts of speech. This is somewhat problematic since some traditional ‘parts of speech’ – adverbs, for example – are not clearly defined in the context of Philippine languages.

Pronunciation and phonological representation. Usually, the pronunciation of the lemma follows immediately after the citation form, using the International Phonetic Alphabet. However, none of the dictionaries reviewed include a pronunciation field. In practice, filling in this field may be limited to such cases where the phonological representation is not derivable by rule from the orthographic representation. However, since Bikol and most Philippine languages have a near one-to-one correspondence of its phonological and orthographical representation, phonological representation may be omitted.

The only consistent markings used were the primary stress symbol (ˈ) and diacritics like acute accent (´). Both markings are indicators of a suprasegmental: stress. The traditional notion of stress has been re-analyzed in Philippine languages as acoustic correlates (Brichoux, 1972). One of the acoustic correlates of stress is vocalic length. Vowel length is distinctive, hence phonemic, in Bikol (McFarland, 1974, p. 31). This is why the placement of the stress marker has implications on the particular meaning of an entry.

Take for example the minimal pairs: **ˈsalog** and **saˈlog**. *Salog* with a penultima stress means ‘riverbank’ while *salog* with an ultima stress means ‘floor’. Here, one can see the significance of a marking stress.

It is also important to note that in the later editions (1985 & 2004) of Mintz’s dictionary, the symbol (ˈ) represents the glottal stop, and primary stress is indicated by the acute accent. These same dictionaries employ both symbols.

Diatopic marking and dialectal variation. Diatopic marking is a labeling system used to identify variation according to place or geographical area. It is often associated with dialectal variation. Oftentimes, it is simply indicated by the name of the dialect from where the entry is obtained, as shown below:

no *adv.* 2. *adj.* not any; not a : wala **Bk.L.** wara; **Bk.N.** mayo (*Diksyunaryong English-Filipino-Bikol*, 2001, p. 439)

siwó' chick [D- Partido][+MDL: MA- or MAG- to walk together (a hen and her chicks); MA-, I- or MAG-, IPAG- to help its chicks hatch (a hen); -AN a hen and her chicks] also see var- **siyó'** (Mintz, 2004, p. 888).

The examples above demonstrate that the labeling system differs. In *Diksyunaryong English-Filipino-Bikol*, the diatopic label is indicated by bold italicized names of a particular variety, e.g., **Bk. L.** (Bikol Legazpi) and **Bk. N.** (Bikol Naga). In the third edition of Mintz' series of Bikol dictionaries, the diatopic label is enclosed in a subsection, e.g., [D- Partido]. This indicates that this particular entry is based from the Bikol variety spoken in the Partido area. It is interesting to find this particular label since the word **siwó'** does exist in Bikol Naga and there is no explicit reason to include a diatopic marker since the form in Bikol Partido is exactly the same as that in Bikol Naga.

Mintz (2004) also made use of the label var- to indicate lexical variance. However, there seems to be confusion on whether this variance is language-intrinsic or language-extrinsic. If it is language-extrinsic, it should have followed the format of diatopic marking. Looking at the diachronic development of the term, it is odd to find *siuo~siwo* in *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol* and then *siyo* in Mintz (1971) and Silverio (1980).

Outlook

Work in Bikol lexicography can go in the direction of a multilingual dictionary, focusing on the lexical variation among the different Bikol languages. Not only will such dictionary serve as a definitive reference to the distinctiveness of each Bikol language, it will also facilitate the translation of texts from one Bikol variety to another. In light of the implementation of the MTBMLE program in the region, having a multilingual Bikol dictionary will be of immense help.

CONCLUSION

Bikol lexicography gains from the fact that Bikol is considered by most as a major language. Most Spanish-era work on Philippine languages was on the 'major' languages. In the case of Bikol, documentation of the language began early in the Spanish times and has continued up to the present. However, Bikol lexicography mainly revolves around one particular variety – Bikol Naga. While linguistic awareness of the various Bikol languages is evident in linguistic research in the region, Bikol lexicography is susceptible to the problem of the *center* versus the *periphery*. Here, the periphery refers to the other Bikol languages. Improvement in

this aspect is promising, however, as seen in the trend in diatopic marking. It is one of the objectives of this paper to highlight this point and to provide a discourse in addressing this problem.

Bikol lexicography is fortunate to have the scholarship of a renowned linguist in the person of Malcolm Mintz. His work has been immense; the contribution of his three dictionaries in the overall development of the field is unparalleled. The latest edition of Mintz' dictionary is the pinnacle of Bikol lexicography, even if some issues still need to be addressed and some areas improved such as phonological representation and lexical categorization. Given the above, the prospect of Bikol lexicography is, indeed, promising.

ENDNOTES

- ¹ Bikol is used as a holistic term to denote the languages in the Bikol region. The use of Bikol instead of Bicol is a personal preference brought about by the desire to use the indigenized spelling of the names of Philippine languages. However, as seen in the literature, it generally refers to the same ethnolinguistic area.
- ² This paper will not delve into the relationship of the different Bikol languages and follows the consensus and acceptability of various classification schemes of these languages in linguistic works such as Lobel and Tria (2000) and McFarland (1974).
- ³ This decade-long time period was adopted for convenience and for the diachronic approach. This is not to be taken as a proposal of distinctive time periods in Bikol lexicography.
- ⁴ The history of linguistic research in the Philippine is divided into three periods: Spanish, American, and Philippine (Asuncion-Landé, 1970). The Spanish period made use of a more traditional and didactic framework. The American period involved the introduction of structuralism to the study of Philippine languages. The Philippine period revolves around the rise of local scholars such as Cecilio Lopez, the father of Philippine linguistics.
- ⁵ Diksyunaryong English-Filipino-Bikol
- ⁶ Diksyunaryong English-Filipino-Bikol

REFERENCES

- Asuncion-Landé, N. (1970). Theoretical and methodological trends in Philippine linguistics research, 1560-1970. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 12(6), 208-225.
- Blust, R. (2002). The history of faunal terms in Austronesian languages. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 41(1), 89-139.
- Brichoux, R. (1972). *Acoustic correlates of stress in Tagalog: Spectrographic studies of relative amplitude, relative frequency, and length*. Pullerton: California State College.

- Diksiyunaryong English-Filipino-Bikol*. (2001). San Miguel, Maynila: Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino.
- Dolores, R.L. (1972). A survey of the dialect geography in the five towns and one barrio of Catanduanes (Caramoran, Viga, San Miguel, Virac, San Andres and Cabugao). Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- Eco, C. (1969). A survey of the dialect geography in the six towns of Sorsogon : Donsol, Sorsogon, Bacon, Gubat, Casiguran and Sta. Magdalena. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City.
- Ella, L. O. (1973). *A survey of the dialect geography in the six towns of Camarines Norte: Capalonga, Jose Panganiban, Vinzons, Talisay, Daet and Basud*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of the Philippines Diliman, Quezon City.
- Gallego, M.K. & Zubiri, L.A. (2011). MTBMLE in the Philippines: Perceptions, attitudes and outlook. *Frontiers of Language and Teaching*, 2, 405-414.
- Gonzalez, A. (1998). The language planning situation in the Philippines. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 19(5-6), 487-488.
- Hernandez, J.F. (1998). Wikang Rinconada sa Bikol. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines.
- Lamberto, M. (1961). *Notes on the dialect geography of the Bicol Region*. Manila: Institute of the National Library.
- Lewis, M.P., Simons, G.F., & Fennig, C.D. (Eds.). (2013). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world* (17th ed.). Dallas, Texas: SIL International.
- Lisboa, M.d. (1865). *Vocabulario de la lengua Bicol*. Manila: Colegio de Santo Tomás.
- Lobel, J.W. (2004). Old Bikol -um- vs. mag- and the loss of a morphological paradigm. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 43(2), 469-497.
- Lobel, J.W. (2005). The angry register of the Bikol languages of the Philippines. In H.-c. Liao & C.R.G. Rubino (Eds.), *Current issues in Philippine linguistics and anthropology: Parangal kay Lawrence A. Reid* (pp. 149-166). Manila: LSP and SIL.
- Lobel, J.W. & Tria, W.J. (2000). *An satuyang tataramon: A study of the Bikol language*. Naga City, Philippines: Lobel & Tria Partnership.
- Mattes, V. (2006). Looking for parts of speech in a Philippine language. Does Bikol have nouns and verbs? Paper presented at the Universality and Particularity in Parts-of-Speech Systems Conference, June 8-10, 2006, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- McFarland, C.D. (1974). The dialects of the Bikol area. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, USA.
- Mintz, M.W. (Ed.). (1971). *Bikol dictionary*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

- Mintz, M.W. (Ed.). (2004). *Bikol dictionary* (Vols. 2: Bikol-English Dictionary). Perth, Australia: Indonesian/Malay Texts and Resources.
- Mintz, M.W. & Britanico, J. (Eds.). (1985). *Bikol-English dictionary*. Quezon City: New Day Publication.
- Silverio, J.F. (Ed.). (1980). *New Bicolano-Pilipino-English dictionary*. Metro Manila: National Book Store.
- Svensen, B. (2009). *A handbook of lexicography: The theory and practice of dictionary-making*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zorc, R.D. (1995). A glossary of Austronesian reconstructions. In D. T. Tryon (Ed.), *Comparative Austronesian dictionary: An Introduction to Austronesian studies, Part 1: Fascicle 2* (pp. 1106-1197). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Louward Allen Zubiri <louward.zubiri@gmail.com> is a faculty member at the Department of Linguistics, University of the Philippines Diliman. He is finishing his MA in Linguistics at the same institution. His primary research interests are language contact, change, and variation in Philippine languages. He is a member of the Linguistic Society of the Philippines, Southeast Asian Linguistic Society, and Linguistic Society of America.