

The Filipino Monolingual Dictionaries and the Development of Filipino Lexicography

ALDRIN P. LEE

This study tackles the development of writing Filipino dictionaries by presenting critical review analyses of the three of the most current Filipino monolingual dictionaries published by the two most authoritative institutions of Filipino language: the Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino [KWF] (formerly the Institute of National Language, then became the Linangan ng Wika sa Pilipinas [LWP]), and the Sentro ng Wikang Filipino (SWF). The oldest of the three is the first edition of KWF's (then LWP's) Diksiyunaryo ng Wikang Filipino (1989). The second is the centennial edition of the same dictionary (1998), still published by the KWF. And the last is the UP Diksiyonaryong Filipino (2001), published by the SWF. The study primarily aims to provide a preliminary discussion of the development of monolingual lexicography of Filipino. The examination of these dictionaries is done by applying lexicographic principles in writing monolingual dictionaries. This study found several errors in the writing of these dictionaries and concludes that such errors were primarily due to the lack of substantial corpus collection.

Filipino lexicography is one of the most significant forces in the development of Filipino language. Both the standardization¹ and intellectualization² of Filipino as the Philippine national language require much lexicographic work. A representative monolingual dictionary³ will not only add prestige to the language and possible recognition from non-speakers, it will also provide source of reference the moment the national language is taught in schools. This study attempts to decipher the development of writing Filipino dictionaries and analyze the three of the most current Filipino monolingual dictionaries based on existing lexicographic principles.

The study is limited to monolingual dictionaries since they better represent the lexicographic tradition of Filipino as a language. Unlike bilingual dictionaries, monolingual dictionaries are not translation-focused, but instead are more definition-focused.

The three works, which will be the focus of this study, were published by two of the most authoritative institutions of the Filipino language: the *Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino*⁴ [KWF] (formerly the Institute of National Language, then later the *Linangan ng Wika sa Pilipinas* [LWP]), and the *Sentro ng Wikang Filipino*⁵ (SWF). The oldest of the three is the first edition of KWF's (then LWP) *Diksiyunaryo ng Wikang Filipino* (1989). The second one is the centennial edition of the same dictionary (1998), still published by the KWF. And the last one is the UP⁶ *Diksiyonaryong Filipino* (2001), published by the SWF. The UP *Diksiyonaryong Filipino*, being the most recent, is rendered a relatively more comprehensive analysis in this undertaking.

The necessity of this research comes from the fact that no single study has been done explaining the development of monolingual lexicography of Filipino. This study could also serve as a guide to those who have plans to either write or acquire a Filipino dictionary.

The debate of whether it is Pilipino or Filipino will not be a matter of discussion in this research⁷. This issue had already been settled legally

in the 1987 Constitution. The Article XIV section 6 of the 1987 Constitution, states that “the National language of the Philippines is Filipino. As it evolves, it shall be further developed and enriched on the basis of existing Philippine and other languages.”⁸

Previous Research

Although there is no existing critique yet of the three monolingual dictionaries mentioned above, research regarding the development of lexicography in the Philippines has already been undertaken. Cesar Hidalgo (1977) did one, if not the most extensive research on the development of Philippine lexicography. Part of his discussion is on the Philippine lexicographic tradition where he mentions the numerous lexicographic works written as part of the campaign to develop a Philippine national language. His most interesting point however, which is also most relevant to this study, is his pessimistic view about the Institute of National Language’s *Diksyunaryo ng Wikang Filipino*, which at the time was still an on-going project. In page 73 of his work, he boldly stated:

One attempt to define what Filipino is an ongoing project of the Surian ng Wikang Pambansa (Institute of National Language) called “Diksyunaryo ng Wikang Filipino,” *Wikang Filipino!* The entries in this dictionary come from Tagalog, Kapampangan, Cebuano, Bikol, Samar-Leyte (?), Ilokano, Hiligaynon, Pangasinan (the so-called major languages) and Tausog, Maranao, Maguindanao, Ibanag. That the SWP calls this Filipino is ridiculous. Obviously, they know that all they are attempting to do is write a multilingual dictionary. Or do they?

In his above statement, Hidalgo seems to be very doubtful of the feasibility of a national language coming from different languages. He also claims that if and when created, this national language would be a language no Filipino speaks natively. He even makes a remark that those who pushed for Filipino in the Constitutional Convention have done disservice to the Filipino people.

In a paper read in the National Conference on Lexicography (*Pambansang Kumperensiya sa Leksikograpiya*) in November 2003, Virgilio Almario, the editor of the UP Diksiyonaryong Filipino, reveals that one of the motivations behind the writing of this dictionary is the failure of the KWF's (then LWP) 1989 *Diksiyunaryo ng Wikang Filipino* to represent the true Filipino:

Nito lamang 1989 nalathala ang Diksiyunaryong Filipino ng Surian. Nakagugulat na ang kapal nito na may 696 pahina at naglalaman ng 31,244 batayang salita, 12,743 deribatibo, at 1,384 salitang idyomatiko. Sinimulan ito diumano bilang Diksiyunaryong Tagalog sa panahon ni Julian Cruz Balmaseda (1946-48), pinayaman at matagal nang natapos, ngunit hindi agad naipalimbag dahil sa kawalan ng pondo.

Ngunit sadyang tila pinakapal lamang itong diksiyonaryong Tagalog ni Balmaseda. May pamagat man itong Diksiyunaryong Filipino ay imposible itong maging gayon sapagkat ni walang entri na nagsisimula sa "F" o mga entri na ginamitan ng mga panukalang bagong titik ng alpabeto nitong 1987.

(It was only in 1989 when the *Diksiyunaryong Filipino* of the Institute [referring to then LWP] was published. The thickness is quite surprising at 696 pages containing 31,244 main entries, 12,743 derivatives, and 1,384 idiomatic words. It is said that the dictionary started as *Diksiyunaryong Tagalog* during the time of Julian Cruz Balmaseda (1946-48), but was not published right away due to lack of funds.

But this dictionary seems to be no more than a thickened Tagalog dictionary of Balmaseda. Though it has the title *Diksiyunaryong Filipino*, it is still impossible to be one because it does not even contain an entry for "F" or entries using the new letters of the alphabet proposed in 1987.)⁹

Almario's statements entail another challenge to this research, that is, to verify such a failure and to come up with a new set of assessments and evaluation of these three dictionaries that currently represent the most extensive efforts in Filipino lexicography.

Methodology

This study utilizes the various principles of lexicography in scrutinizing the contents of the three dictionaries. In particular, Sidney

Landau's *Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography* (2001) was used to ascertain the different principles of defining and other essential issues that must be taken into account when writing dictionaries. Hidalgo's *Philippine Lexicography: From 1521 to Present* (1977) was also consulted for reference purposes.

This study dissects the three dictionaries' adherence to the basic principles of monolingual lexicography, focusing on the principles that govern "definition styles". An entry-word's definition is the most vital information that a monolingual dictionary provides and the dictionary's efficacy highly depends on whether or not entry-words are vividly rephrased using the same language. To be able to judge the definition styles of the dictionaries examined in this paper, existing principles of defining, particularly those of Ladislav Zgusta¹⁰ (1971)¹¹, as pointed out by Landau, have been applied:

1. All words within a definition must be explained.
2. The lexical definition should not contain words "more difficult to understand" than the word defined.
3. The defined word may not be used in its definition, nor may derivations or combinations of the defined word unless they are separately defined. But one part-of-speech may be used to define another, as "to use a crib" if the noun sense of crib (in the sense of a secret copy of notes, etc.) has been defined.
4. The definition must correspond to the part-of-speech of the word defined (pp. 157-163).

In addition to the basic principles of defining, Landau's list of "good defining practices" is also utilized. These include the following:

1. Avoid circularity.
2. Define every word used in a definition- the lexicographer must presuppose that in a monolingual dictionary, the reader has the right to expect that if they do not know the meaning of a word, they can look that word up and find it defined.

3. Define the entry word- though sometimes it is good to have additional information added in every entry-term, the lexicographer must see to it that he still gives the definition and not anything else (pp. 170-171).

Landau regards the avoidance of circularity as an indispensable defining principle since circularity violates the main purpose of a dictionary which is to inform the reader what a particular word means. The other good defining practices for Landau include the priority of essence, reflection of grammatical function, simplicity, brevity and avoidance of ambiguity. Priority of essence ensures that the core of the definition is effectively rendered. Reflection of grammatical function means that the definition should at least show, if not substitutable with the term, the part-of-speech of the word defined. Simplicity here entails exclusion of the difficult words in definitions of simple ones since doing otherwise would cause the reader waste of time looking for the meanings of the 'mind-boggling' words used in the definition. The definition should not only be 'simple' but should also be brief. The last defining practice pointed out by Landau emphasizes the avoidance of polysemous words to be used in the definition.

Aside from the definition styles, the basic elements of a dictionary including the entry-term, the alphabetization, entry-counting, grammatical information, pronunciation, etymology, synonyms (if included), illustrations, and front and back matters were also scrutinized in the examination of the three dictionaries. Particular attention was also given to the usage of the dictionary. Usage of the dictionary encompasses the currency of the entry-words, and the frequency of their usage. This is especially important in trying to provide a parallel view of the writing of these dictionaries and the development of Filipino lexicography. As contemporary work, these dictionaries are expected to contain an extensive coverage of "current" and "frequently"-used words of the Filipino language. Other aspects of usage are also tackled if they are present in the dictionary, such as slang, taboo words, and colloquial expressions.

THE FILIPINO MONOLINGUAL DICTIONARIES AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF FILIPINO LEXICOGRAPHY

Filipino lexicography supposedly set about during the time when the idea of a national language became a national issue. Lexicography became a tool to proliferate the idea that the national language was being developed after Executive Order no. 134 s. 1937 was passed¹².

The three dictionaries that are examined in this research are the most comprehensive monolingual dictionaries in Filipino¹³. All of them are projects of the two major institutions of national language in the Philippines, the KWF and the SWF.

The development of Filipino as the national language is apparently the main driving force behind the research efforts and the publication of these three dictionaries. Dictionaries are seen to have massive influence in the eventual standardization of a language and the development of these dictionaries is an inevitable concern in language planning and in the formulation of language policies.

Sibayan (1991) points out the salient role of the works of the Institute of National Language in the development of Filipino. He stressed that the written materials produced by the Institute have helped standardize Filipino. Sibayan though did not discuss in detail LWP's *Diksyunaryo* which at the time had already been published. He only pointed out the supposed purist attitude of the institute, prevalent in their 1989 *Diksunaryo*, that according to him had delayed the standardization of Filipino orthography. The institute insisted on a 20-letter *abakada* [alphabet], discarding the letters *c,f,j,q,v,x* and *z* simply because these letters are borrowed from sounds that are not existing in Philippine languages. This is actually the most popular criticism against the LWP's 1989 *Diksyunaryo*. But the Institute was quick in restoring the letters, for these were already included in the centennial edition of the *Diksyunaryo*.

The 1989 *Diksyunaryo*, on the other hand, was a big consideration in the formation of the *UP Diksiyonaryong Filipino* of the *Sentro ng Wikang Filipino* (SWF). Almario, as mentioned in Section 1.2 of this paper, stressed the supposed failure of the 1989 *Diksyunaryo*. He particularly noted the lack of entry for [F] despite of the presence of [F] in the dictionary-title, *Diksyunaryo ng Wikang Filipino*. In spite of various criticisms hurled against the 1989 *Diksyunaryo*, its publication still marks a significant shift in the development of Filipino lexicography since this was the first dictionary which contained comprehensive entry-terms and which definition style digressed from the traditional thesaurus-like 'Pilipino' dictionaries like that of Ignacio (1958), Buenaventura (1982), and Silverio (1980) among others.

Linangan ng mga Wika sa Pilipinas. 1989. *Diksyunaryo ng mga Wika sa Pilipinas*. Mandaluyong, MM: Cacho Hermanos, Inc.¹⁴

As stated in its foreword, the manuscript of this dictionary had been completed for quite a long time, but was not published due to lack of funds. The original number of entry-terms was 26,835, but this was subsequently increased with new terms derived from textbooks, newspapers, magazines, and other print media. Considering synonyms, idioms, colloquial expressions, dialectal variants, and slang also did improvement. Basic terms used in Science and Technology had been included as well. All in all, the dictionary had a total of more or less 31,244 entry terms. If one will include the derivatives and idioms, the total entries would be more or less 627,592 entries.

The front matters include a foreword, a comprehensive guide on how to use the dictionary and dictionary-statistics. The guide in using the dictionary includes an abbreviation list of 12 categories (9 parts-of-speech, 1 idiom, 1 synonym, etc.), symbols used (brackets [] used to separate the root word, angled open and closed parentheses < > for the illustratives, and a slash / for spelling variants). It also includes a detailed explanation about the entry-words, pronunciation, parts-of-

speech, illustratives, derivatives, idioms, synonyms, syllabification, spelling, and morphophonemic changes.

Many of the features of the entry-words are already specified in the guide. They include the following:

- (1) the alphabetical arrangement of the entry-words is by letter, not by word; so,

ka•hél *png.*

ka•he•ro *png.*

- (2) like we see above, entry-words are broken down into syllables;

- (3) homonyms are treated as separate entry-terms; it is possible therefore to find entries like these:

¹ba•kal *png.* 1. Kansang kulay-abuhin. 2. Patos sa paa ng kabayo, baka o kalabaw.

²ba•kal *pr.* Hingi o bigay.

- (4) nouns, particularly those that are loaned from Spanish, are specified in gender;

a•bu•sa•da (-o)

bi•ya•he•ro (-a)

- (5) homographs and homophones are not separated from the main entry;

bi•yas o bi•as *png.*

ka•di•kit o ka•dig•kit *png.*

- (6) spelling variants are separated, but only the standard form is defined;

sa•yo•te *png.* (definition)

tsa•yo•te Tingnan (*see*) *sayote*

- (7) inflected and derived forms are treated as separate entries;

ban•tu•án [banto] *pd.*

du•ma•kò [dako] *pd.*

(8) as seen in (7) above, inflected or derived entries are immediately followed by the root word enclosed in brackets; in case of consecutive derivatives having the same root word, only the first one is provided with a root word in brackets; and

(9) only loanwords which spelling were neutralized are included;

am•ne•sya

aw•to•ma•tik

Of the other guide topics, syllabification and morphophonemic changes have the most detailed explanation. These topics are very basic, nothing new for somebody who has been studying Filipino since Grade I, but helpful for someone who has a hard time understanding the accent and the morphophonemic changes in Filipino. The part on statistics seems to be useful for a dictionary-reviewer, but not much to a dictionary-user. As a matter of fact, the statistics only provide the number of entries per letter, sorted into entry words, derivatives and idioms, and nothing else.

The idea of giving the root word immediately after the inflected or derived entry word is a good decision, but restricting it to only the first derived/inflected entry in case of consecutive entries with the same root word, is not a good idea. Take a look at the following entries:

a•bu•han [abó] *png.*(definition)

a•bu•hín *png.* (definition)

a•bu•kay *png.* (definition)

In the case of the entries above, only **a•bu•han** is provided with a root word because among the inflected forms, it comes ahead in the alphabetical arrangement. But scenarios like the one above create confusion because an underived or uninflected entry form following an inflected/derived-entry word might be reanalyzed to have undergone the same affixation process. A particular example is **a•bu•kay** above, which might be reanalyzed as an affixed form of [abó]. Even worse is the case when the following uninflected or

underived form bears a final syllable that sounds like a regularly occurring affix.

The following are sample entry-terms from this dictionary:

a•bó *png.* **1.** Gabok na labi ng anumang bagay na nasunog. **2.** Isdang-alat na nakakahawig ng mga isdang alakaak at kabang ang hugis, kulay at laki kaya kung minsan ay tinatawag ng gayon. Isa ito sa mga isdang karaniwang kinakain. —**a•bu•hin** *pd., pr., png.*—**ma•a•bo** *pr.*—**a•bu•han** *png.*—**abo ang utak** *idy.* Salat sa talino; walang nalalaman; mahina ang ulo; kulang sa nalalaman. <Paano siya makalalampas sa pagsusulit ay abo ang kanyang utak.>

kal•mu•tin [kalmot] *pd.* **1.** Saktan ang isang tao sa pamamagitan ng kuko. **2.** Kamutin (kung sa pusa), <Huwag mong harutin ang pusa at baka ka kalmutin.>

di•li•di•li [dili] *png.* Pag-iisip na mabuti; nilay-nilay; muni-muni, gunamgunam, wari.—**di•li•di•li•hin**, **mag•di•li•di•li** *pd.* —**pag•di•di•li•di•li** *png.*

As shown in the entry-terms above, the entry –word is normally preceded by the abbreviated part-of-speech, except in the case of inflected or derived forms like **kalmutin** which is immediately followed by the root word. Illustratives are added to almost all entry-terms.

“Run-on” entries (also called *run-on derivatives*) are also found in the entry-terms in this dictionary. “Run-on” entries are so-called because they are usually run-on at the end of entries in order to save space, especially in large dictionaries like this one (Landau, 2001). They are therefore included as such because there is no more space to separately define them. But the fact that they are just ‘run-on entries’, it is presumed that their meanings are predictable based on the entry-word containing them, and the affix, which is defined in its own as a main entry. In the sample entries above, run-on entries are found in **abó** and **dilidili**. In the case of **abó** however, two of its run-on entries, **abuhin** and **abuhan**, are given separate definitions.

á•bu•han [abo] *png.* 1. Lalagyan ng upos ng sigarilyo o tabako. 2. Lata o metal na lalagyan ng abo. 3. Mesa o anumang bagay na pinagpapatungan ng kalan. **sk:** 1. *astrey, sinisera, titisan.* 3. *kalanan, dapog,*

¹**a•bu•hín** *png.* 1. Kulay na nasa pagitan ng puti at itim sa ispekto. 2. Tandang o tatyaw na kulay-abo.

²**a•bu•hín** *pd.* 1. Gawing kulay-abo. 2. Linisin sa pamamagitan ng abo.

³**a•bu•hín** *pr.* May kulay na nasa pagitan ng puti at itim sa ispekto; kulay- abo; senisado.

It is apparent that the dictionary does not differentiate run-on entries from the derivatives that necessitate separate definition. Another problem is the very selective inclusion of illustrative sentences and phrases. Illustrative sentences are visible but it is not specified even in the guide when or when not illustrative sentences are used. The dictionary should have therefore informed the reader when they should expect illustrative sentences to appear. Synonyms are also included, as seen in **abuhan** above. The idea of putting the synonyms in numbers corresponding to their equivalent definition is a good idea.

The definition style employed in this dictionary is generally fine except a few cases of circular definitions and the use of words that are far less common than the entry-term being defined. Below are examples of circularly defined entry-terms in the dictionary:

a•byer•to o **a•byerta** *pr.* 1. Hindi nakapinid (gaya ng pinto, tarangkahan, atb.). 2. Hindi nakasara o walang takip, tabing, atb. (gaya ng bahay, kahon, atb.). 3. Hindi nakakulong o napaliligiran ng bakod.—**a•byer•ta•hin**, **mag-a•byer•ta**, **i•a•byer•ta** *pd.* **sk:** *bukas, lantad.*

sa•ra•do *pr.* 1. nakapinid, nakasusi, may takip. 2. *tapat, tunay.* <sarado katoliko> **sk:** 1. nakasara.

The problem of using words that are even more difficult than the entry-term is exemplified in the definition of **abó** above. The terms

isdang alakaak and **kabang** are without question more difficult to understand than **abó**. Another instance is the definition of ¹**a•bu•hín** above which contains the word **tatyaw**, a word which is far less familiar than ¹**a•bu•hín**. Words like these should instead be deleted, or substituted with a more simple term. Another option is to just mark them as synonyms.

As mentioned earlier in this section, the most popular criticism about this dictionary is the fact that its authors have discarded many letters already considered as part of the Filipino alphabet during that time. Using *Filipino* (with an **F**) in the title of the dictionary despite the lack of an entry in this letter utterly ruins this dictionary's consistency and credibility. It may lead the reader to generalize that the Filipino referred to in this dictionary is still Tagalog-based, and is not the true representative of Filipino as mandated by the 1973 and the 1987 Constitutions. The necessity of the inclusion of the eight letters in the new alphabet need not be established here. It is clear that they are needed to accommodate sounds from native languages in the Philippines, or from foreign languages from which words are borrowed into Filipino.

In this dictionary's foreword, it is stated that the data in the manuscript have long been completed, but the exact date is not specified. The currency of the usage of the dictionary's entry terms might therefore be questioned, because they might already be non-existent at the time the dictionary was published. The dictionary should therefore have clear mechanisms in identifying non-existent or "obsolete" terms. A good corpus in lexicography should set a particular frequency level for a term to be considered an entry in a dictionary. Otherwise, these terms might be included but they should be marked to indicate that they are non-existent, or that they are words used in an older stage of the language.

This dictionary has a huge back matter, almost 50 pages devoted to various notes about the Philippines. It includes a linguistic map of

the Philippines, the country's physical features, list and classification of the country's provinces, cities, municipalities, and many others. Though interesting to read, the totality of the back matter just seems to be too much to be included in a monolingual dictionary like this.

Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino. 1998. *Diksiyunaryo ng Wikang Filipino, Sentinyal Edisyon*. Quezon City: Merylvn Publishing House.

KWF is an evolution of the *Linangan ng mga Wika sa Pilipinas*. It is no wonder then why the same people who compiled the 1989 *Diksiyunaryo* are also the same people who worked on the centennial edition of the dictionary in 1998. Although KWF's *Diksiyunaryo ng Wikang Filipino* is just a revised edition of the LWP's *Diksiyunaryo*, the two still differ in quite a number of dictionary features. The KWF finally recognized the necessity of including the eight additional letters in the new Filipino alphabet.

The front matters of the dictionary have a foreword written by the project director, Ponciano Pineda. In the foreword, he states the basic difference of this dictionary from the first edition. Pineda also humbly admits that the dictionary may still have so many weak points, and that this is expected because Filipino as a language is still in the process of rapid development. Aside from the foreword, the front matters also include a guide on how to use the dictionary, Article XIV of the 1987 Constitution stating provisions about the national language, and the dictionary's statistics. The guide is basically the same as that of the first edition, except that the list of abbreviations now contains abbreviations of dialects and languages from which new entries in this dictionary were derived. This list seems to exemplify the lack of linguistic knowledge of the people who compiled this list, and possibly of the same people who have worked on the same dictionary. In the list of abbreviations for dialects and languages, they include items like *Igorot (Ig.)*, *Islam (Is.)*, *Palawan Agta*, *Samar-Leyte*, *Sulu*, *Tawi-Tawi*, and

Visaya(*Vis.*). *Igorot* refers to the people and not the language, same as the case of *Visaya*. *Islam* is the faith of the Muslims but not a language. A Muslim can be a Tausug, Maranao, Molbog and many others. *Samar-Leyte*, *Sulu*, and *Tawi-Tawi* are names of places but are neither the languages spoken in these places, nor the people living there. They should have instead used *Waray* instead of *Samar-Leyte*, and they should have specified the languages in Sulu and Tawi-Tawi where they have gotten new entries. A good lexicographer should be somebody who has an in-depth knowledge of dialectology considering the fact that dialectal variation is a huge factor needed to be considered in a lexicographic work.

But while the dictionary recognizes the dialects/languages of the Philippines where a term originates, borrowings from foreign languages like English were not recognized. In the examples below, while the entry-term **aburoy** was marked as a loan from Ilokano (Ilk), **abolish** was not recognized as a loanword from English.

abolish *pd.* Alisin; tapusin; pawalang-bisa; pawiin; puksain.

a•bu•roy (Ilk.) *png.* Tao o hayop na nanganak ng kambal, triplet, apatan o limahan na pare-pareho ang kasarian o seks.

The dictionary has a total of more or less 49,066 entry terms excluding derivatives and idioms. Almost 18,000 entry-terms were added to the first edition. Additional entries come from the inclusion of the eight new letters. An erroneous inclusion though is [ñ], which was recognized as a letter, but has a zero-entry count in this dictionary. No explanation was given why [ñ] has no entry at all.

The entry-terms in the first edition still have the same definitions in this dictionary. The same flaws in the definition style are therefore expected. The newly added terms are also defined employing the same style (see **abolish** above). They should have decided to include illustrative phrases/sentences in the loanwords, because it is in this case that they are needed most. Loanwords often undertake semantic

shift, and synonyms are not usually apt to state its definition. **Abolish** above for example, is defined using synonyms like *alisin* and *tapusin*. Without an illustrative sentence to show the proper contextual use of the term, pragmatically anomalous sentences like *<abolish ang basahan sa mesa>* may be generated, the fact that **alisin** is used to define **abolish**. The point here is that a mechanism that would restrict the usage of the term to the proper context, like giving appropriate illustrative sentences such as *<i-abolish ang batas>* should have been created by the lexicographers.

The quantity of this edition's back matter is much more overwhelming than the first edition. In fact, more than a hundred pages are devoted to the back matter. None of the back matter included in the first edition is discarded in this edition. Additional back matter includes a list of slang and colloquial expressions, and borrowings from French and Latin which should have been included instead in the dictionary as entry-terms. Most of the additional back matters seem to be irrelevant, like the "Executive Order No. 343, Adopting the 'Panunumpa ng Katapatan sa Watawat' as the Official Pledge of Allegiance for all Filipinos", lyrics of the song "Sampagita" and many others. These back matters have informative nature, but the dictionary is definitely not the proper venue for them.

Almario, Virgilio (Ed.). 2001. *UP Diksiyonaryong Filipino*. Quezon City: UP-SWF.

One of the major considerations in the *UP Diksiyonaryong Filipino* project, as pointed out by Almario (2003), is the alleged failure of the 1989 LWP's *Diksyunaryo ng Wikang Filipino* to represent the true Filipino in the said dictionary.

The *UP Diksiyonaryong Filipino* project was started in 1995 with two major conceptual objectives: (1) nationalization and (2) modernization of Filipino. The first objective is fulfilled by incorporating concepts from various native languages in the Philippines (as seen in

the entry-word **kalimusta** from *Tagbanwa* below), and the second one by incorporating technical and educational vocabularies from English and other modern languages in the world (as exemplified by the entry-word *carcinogen* from English below).

ka•li•mus•ta *png Mus [Tbw]* : solong awit.

carcinogen (kar•sín•o•dyén) *png [Ing]* : anumang substance na nagdudulot ng kanser.

The front matters of the dictionary¹⁵ include three introductory notes, a comprehensive guide on how to use the *UP Diksiyonaryong Filipino*, and a long list of abbreviations on how to use the dictionary. Like the previous two dictionaries, this one still does not have grammar notes in front.

The introductory notes are from former UP President Emil Q. Javier, the concurrent (with the time the dictionary was published) UP President Francisco Nemenzo, and former UP-SWF Director Mario Miclat. Both UP Presidents highly commend the feat of the UP-SWF, stating the importance of this monolingual dictionary to the nationalization and modernization of Filipino. Miclat, on the other hand, briefly states the development of Philippine lexicography.

The guide includes a user's guide on entries, a pronunciation guide, parts-of-speech, categorization of (technical and scientific) words, origin of the entry-word, definition style, order of the definitions, and run-on entries. The guide on entries basically gives information on where to locate the entry. It also gives specific information about the entry-word, like the font used¹⁶.

Entry-words which are considered native in origin are syllabified using periods in-between syllables, but not loanwords. The syllabification using periods and the use of three accents, as seen in the sample entries below, help the reader pronounce the word correctly.

ka•bag•ha•nán

sa•pa•tíl•ya

Exclamatory entries are always followed by an exclamatory mark [!].

Geym! *Png*

Pa•á•lam! *pdd*

And reduplicated words are only considered as separate entry terms when they have a special meaning, like *haluhalo* below, which is treated as a separate entry from the root *halo*.

ha•lò *png* [*Seb Tag*] **1:** pagsasama o paglalahok ng isang bagay sa ibang nasa loob ng isang sisidlan : *GATBANG, SUBÁK* **2:** paghalukay sa laman ng sisidlan : *HUKAG* **3:** paglapit o pakikisama sa karamihan **4:** *Idy* gaya sa “maghalo ang balát sa tinalupan” – magtungo sa masama ang pinag uusapan o maging magulo ang pag uusap – *pnd* **mag•ha•lò, ha•lú•in, i•ha•lò.**

ha•lú•ha•lò *png* **1:** pagkaing pampa-lamig na karaniwang binubuo ng kinuskos na yelo, mga minatamis na bungangkahoy, gatas, at asukal **2:** lutong Tsino na binubuo ng ginayat na baboy at hilaw na papaya **3:** anu-mang binubuo ng iba’t ibang bagay na pinagsama-sama.

A popular variant is considered a separate entry-term but is not defined.

dá•ing *png* [*Kap Hil Ilk Tag War*] : varyant ng **daeng**.

ná•han *pnh* : varyant ng **nahaan**.

A loanword which pronunciation is different from the spelling is provided with a transcription enclosed in parentheses. This transcription helps the dictionary-user pronounce the entry-term properly. It is important to note however that the transcription used is not phonetic.

rendezvous (ran-de-vú) *png* [*Ing Fre*] **1:** kasunduan ng dalawa o higit pang tao na magtagpo sa isang tiyak na oras o panahon **2:** pook na pinagta-tagpuan o pinagtitipunan **3:** itinakdang pagtatagpo sa kalawakan ng mga sasakyang pangkalawakan.

If a loan word has a pronunciation variant, two transcriptions are given inside parentheses, like in the case of **matriarch** below:

matriarch (mát•ri•yárk, méy•tri•yárk) *png* [*Ing*] : pinunong babae.

Right after the entry word is written the part-of-speech, which is put in *italic*. If the entry-word is a verb, three derivatives follow the entry words. The derivatives/inflected forms of the verb usually include a past/infinitive agent-focus, an infinitive object-focus, and an infinitive locative-focus verb-form.

ta•bág *png* [*ST*]: paggutom sa hayop bago katayin – *pnđ* **mag•ta•bág**,
ta•ba•gín, **i•ta•bág**.

si•bóg *png* **1**: pagkakagulo at pagtakas **2**: pagliliparan ng mga ibon dahil sa pagkatakot : BULABOG – *pnđ* **ma•si•bóg**, **su•mi•bóg**,
si•bu•gán, **si•bu•gín**.

The above entry-guide on derivatives found to be applied to native words does not apply to borrowed verbs included in the dictionary, most of them coming from the English language. For example, **fill-up**, though classified as a verb, does not contain any derivative.

fill up (fil ap) *pnđ* [*Ing*] **1**: punuin **2**: sulatan.

In case an entry-word qualifies for more than one lexical category, then both categories are indicated. The first category is defined first though, before another category is identified. But this is not applied to homonyms.

ká•bag *png* *Med*: hangin sa loob ng tiyan sanhi ng mahinang panlusaw na nagiging dahilan ng hindi pagka-tunaw ng kinain, at malimit na pag-labas ng hangin sa pamamagitan ng pagdighay o pag utot: ÁGBU, BUTÓD3, LÁGDOS, LEBÁG, PAMÁWO, SÚ DOL, TAM-NÓK–*pnđ*
ka•bá•gan, **mag•ka•ká•bag**.

After the lexical categorization, the word is then categorized if it is used in any academic or professional discipline, or if it belongs to the language's *flora* and *fauna*. In the examples below, **pagwawangis** is categorized under Literature (Lit.) and Linguistics (Lgw.). **Sigay**, an animal, is categorized under Zoology (Zoo) while **nami**, a kind of plant, is categorized under Botany (Bot).

pág•wa•wá•ngis *png* [*pag+wa+wangis*] **1**: *Lit* tayutay na gumagawa

ng pag-hahawig sa mga katangian ng dalawang bagay na pinaghahambing **2:** *Lgw* proseso ng pagkakalikha o pagbabago ng mga salita sang ayon sa padron ng wika *Cf* PÁGHAHAMBÍNG, PAGTUTÚLAD, PÁGWAWANGKÍ: ANALOGY¹, ANALOHÍYA.

si•gáy *png Zoo [Seb]:* kalígay.

na•mî *png Bot:* halamang baging (*Dioscorea hispiada*) na may laman na maaaring kainin ngunit nakalalason kapag hindi mabuti ang pagkakaluto *var lamî:* KÁLOT, MAMÓ.

The entry-word is also categorized if it is colloquial, pejorative, or idiomatic. The symbol [*Kol*] is used when the entry is a colloquial word/expression, [*Alp*]¹⁷ for pejorative and discriminating words, and [*Idy*] for idiomatic word/expression.

le•dyit *pnr Kol [Ing]:* pinaikling legitimate

ba•lim•bíng *pnr Alp:* doble kara.

ka•sang•gá *png [ka+sangga] 1:* kasama sa isang koponan **2:** *Idy* kaibigan.

The origin of the word, which includes the source language and the original form if it has been respelled, or changed in any way (phonological or morphological) is also recognized in this dictionary. It is put inside brackets [], right after the category of the word. In the example below, the Filipino word **masyado** is indicated as a loanword from Spanish *demasiado*.

mas•yá•do *png [Esp demasiado]:* labís

Information is also given when an entry-word supposedly underwent complex derivation, like in the case of **ngalandakan** below:

nga•lan•dá•kan *png [nga+landak+an] 1:* pagkakalat ng balita **2:** paghahambog; pagyayabang; pagpaparangalan *Cf* PARALI – *pnd*
i•pa•nga•lan•dá•kan, ma•nga•lan•dá•kan.

The definition comes after the origin of the word. This might be in the form of a simple definition like **oakum** below:

oakum (ó•kum) *png* [*Ing*] : mga himaymay mula sa lumang lubid na ginagamit sa pagtatali ng hugpungan ng mga sasakyang dagat.

Or by giving taxonomic sisters as in the case of **bahay**:

bá•hay *png* **1**: kubo, gusali, o katulad na ginagamit na tirahan ng isa o ilang mag anak : ABÓNG, BALÁY¹, BALÉ, BAY, KÁSA, TAHÁNAN, VAHÁY, WALAY **2**: kanlungan ng ilahas na hayop **3**: na-tural na pambalot, gaya ng talukab ng mollusk, upang magdulot ng pro-teksiyon sa hayop **4**: gusaling inilaan para sa isang gawaing pangmadla **5**: angkan kasama ang mga ninuno at kamag anak.

In some cases additional explanation is given to justify the meaning of an entry-word. It is introduced by a semi-colon [;].

ka•ba•bá•ang lo•ób *png* [*ka+baba+ an+ng loob*] : ugaling hindi mapagmataas o mayabang; mabuting paki-kitungo sa kapuwa *Cf* PAKUMBABÁ : HUMILITY, UMILDÁD.

The semi-colon though has been used in other cases in the dictionary proper. Take a look on the following entry-terms:

ka•á•gaw *png* [*ka+agaw*] : kapuwa na naghahangad ding makamit ang isang bagay; kalaban *Cf* KAÁWAY, RIBÁL : KARIBÁL, SALIPÉW.

yá•o *pnd* **yu•má•o, ma•pa•yá•o** **1**: umalis; lumisan **2**: mamatay *var* yaon.

As shown in **kaagaw** above, a semi-colon introduces a synonym and not an additional explanation. It is also the case in **yaon**. This erroneous use of a semi-colon is most probably typological, and is a minor mistake.

For plants and animals, scientific names are provided for specific identification of the referent plant or animal.

tá•ma•ráw *png* *Zoo* : katutubong hayop (*Aroa Mindorensis*) na matatagpuan sa Mindoro, kahawig ng kalabaw, maliit ang binti at sungay ngunit ma-bangis at mapanganib.

sam•pá•lok *png* *Bot* [*Bik Hil Kap Seb Tag War*] : punongkahoy (*Tamarindus indica*) na nakakain ang bunga at murang dahon : SÁMBAG, SAMBALAGI, SALAMÁGI, SALOMAGI.

In the absence of the scientific name, the family, genus, order, phylum, or species (taxonomic classification) is instead given.

sabertooth tiger (séy•ber•tút táy•ger) *png Zoo [Ing]*: anumang kabilang sa extinct na uri ng mga pusa (genus *Felidae*) na mula sa panahong Oligocene at Pleistocene, na may mahaba at tila sableng mga pangil : SABER-TOOTH.

Surprisingly, there are some cases of entry-terms which are either animal or plant but do not bear their scientific names:

ta•lí•ba *png Zoo* : uri ng isdang alat.

dá•at *png Bot [ST]* : damo na maligasang dahon.

Aside from the scientific names, chemical formulas and atomic symbols are also provided for substances and elements.

oxygen (óx•i•dyén) *png Kem [Ing]*: gaseous element na walang kulay at walang amoy (atomic number 8, symbol **O**): OKSÍHENÓ.

sodium chloride (sód•yum kló•rayd) *png Kem [Ing]* : compound na walang kulay, kristalina, at nasa tubig alat (NaCl) : ASIN.

But upon examining the other entry terms in the dictionary, there are some isolated words, like the chemical compound **calcium carbonate**, that do not have any formula accompanying it.

calcium carbonate (kál•syum kár•bo•néyt) *png Kem [Ing]* : puti, di natutunaw na solido at karaniwang nasa anyong tsok, apog, marmol, at mga katulad.

The chemical formula of calcium carbonate, which is CaCO_3 , is not present in the entry term. This is instead found in the entry-term **calcite**, which is just the crystalline form of calcium carbonate.

calcite (kál•sayt) *png Kem [Ing]* : isa sa mga karaniwang mineral, calcium carbonate, CaCO_3 , matatagpuan sa napakaraming uri ng anyong kristalina; isang pangunahing sangkap ng limestone, marmol, at tisa.

The dictionary uses the initial *Cf* (confer) if it wants to suggest the reader to look up another entry-term in the dictionary in relation to the one defined.

da•án *png* **1:** pook na nauukol sa paglakad o pagtakbo ng tao, hayop, o sasakyan patungo sa isang pook *Cf* BAGNÓS, HÁYWEY, KÁLYE, LANDÁS, LANSÁNGAN : AGIHÁN, CAMINO, DÁLAN¹, ESTRADA, GATÓS³, JÁLAN, LÁWANG, WAY¹, YAGBÁN **2:** bakás o palatandaang na naiwan sa pagdaraan **3:** dahilan; sanhi **4:** paraan o sistema **6:** *Mat* pamilang na katumbas ng sampung sampu *var* raán : HUNDRED, SIYÉNTO.¹⁸

The superscript on the co-referred entry terms above limits the relation of the suggested term to the meanings of **daan**. For example, DÁLAN¹ above is only related to the first meaning of **daan** and not to the other five meanings.

If the entry word has two or more meanings, either homonyms or polysemes, numbers are used to mark them. According to the number 7 (entitled *Mga Pakahulugan*) of the guide on how to use the dictionary, the more popular meaning usually is given priority.

ma•yor•yá *png* [*Esp* *mayoria*] **1:** ang nakararami; ang higit na marami **2:** **a** ang bilang o dami ng ibinigay na boto para sa isang partido o kandidato na nagpapakita ng kalamangan sa kalaban **b** partido na nakatanggap ng higit na maraming boto.

This preference seems to conflict with the explanation presented in the number 8 of the guide, wherein historical aspect of the entry-word is considered in choosing which meaning should come first. According to this section, the older meaning of the word should be prioritized.

Ginagamitan ng tuntuning historikal ang pagsasaayos ng mga pakahulugan. Nakalistang una ang pakahulugan na kinikilalang unang pumasok sa wikang Filipino. Mahalaga ito sa mga salitang hiram sa Espanyol sapagkat naipapakita sa salansan ng pakahulugan kung ano ang orihinal na gamit nito noong panahon ng kolonyalismo at ang naging pagbabago ng kahulugan nitong kasalukuyang siglo.

‘We are using historical guideline in ordering the meanings [of the entry-Words]. The meaning of the word when it became a part of the Filipino vocabulary is listed first. This is particularly important as to loanwords from Spanish because the order of meanings shows what the original usage of the word was during the period of colonization and the changes that have occurred in its meaning in this century’.¹⁹

Below this paragraph is an entry-word (**alkalde**) given as an example of an entry following the above guideline.

al•kál•de *png Pol [Esp alcalde]* **1:** noong panahon ng Espanyol, tawag sa pinuno ng alcaldia o lalawigan **2:** tawag sa pinuno ng isang lalawigan o lungsod : MAYOR, MEYOR, PUNONG BAYAN, PUNONG LUNGSOD.

However, this guideline (that the older meaning should come first) is not even followed in the dictionary proper. As a matter of fact, different entry information for **alkalde** could be found in its actual entry in the dictionary:

al•kál•de *png [Esp alcalde]* **1:** pinunong bayan, **al•kal•dé•sa** kung babae : MEYOR **2:** noong panahon ng Espanyol, pinuno ng isang alkaldiya *Cf* ALKALDE MAYOR.

The guide also explains that the same chronological guideline is applied to the ordering of meanings of native words. They give the entry-term of **kabyaw** as an example:

kab•yáw *png 1: [Ilk Tag]* pag ilo o pagkatas ng tubó: DÁPIL – *pnđ* **mag•kab•yáw, kab•ya•wín, i•kab•yáw 2: [Hil Seb]** uri ng lambat.

But after checking the entry in the dictionary proper, the meanings of **kabyaw** are not ordered as they are shown in the example given in the guide part. The following is the actual entry-term of **kabyaw** in the dictionary proper.

kab•yáw *png 1: [Hil Seb]* uri ng lambat **2: [Ilk Tag]** pag ilo o pagkatas ng tubó: DÁPIL – *pnđ* **mag•kab•yáw, kab•ya•wín, i•kab•yáw.**

These inconsistencies may confuse the reader and may lead them to think that this dictionary violates its own rules and guidelines.

Perhaps another significant flaw of this dictionary would be the fact that certain basic principles of lexicography have been violated. The first one is with regard to circular definition. There are entry-terms, like **stenography** and **takigrapiya** below, which have been circularly defined.

stenography (is·te·nóg·ra·fí) *png* [*Ing*]: takigrapiya.

ta·kí·gra·pí·ya *png* [*Esp taquigrafía*]: stenography : TACHIGRAPHY.

Aside from circular definition, there are also some entries wherein words used in the definition are not even defined. The following entry-terms prove this:

du·lá·ro *png Zoo* [*Kay Tag Tbw*]: durado.

sabertooth tiger (séy·ber·tút táy·ger) *png Zoo* [*Ing*]: anumang kabilang sa extinct na uri ng mga pusa (genus *Felidae*) na mula sa panahong Oligocene at Pleistocene, na may mahaba at tila sablang mga pangil : SABER-TOOTH.

In **dularo** above, the word used to define the meaning is **durado** alone, but there is no such entry-term in the dictionary like **durado**. This means that the reader would not be able to countercheck in case he/she does not understand **durado**. In the case of **sabertooth tiger**, there is an available entry for **Pleistocene**, but none for **Oligocene**.

This dictionary has more or less 100,000 entry-terms in it. Most of the items though are questionably Filipino.

First, there are a lot of terms not comprehensible to a Filipino speaker now. The dictionary marks them as *s.t.* (*sinaunang tagalog*), or Old Tagalog. Below are some of these entry-terms:

pa·gá·way *png* [*ST*]: kasangkapan; kagamitan.

sa·át *png* **1:** kalawit **2:** talim ng palaso at anumang katulad : HAYAP, SIMÀ **3:** [*ST*] pagbabawal Cf SAWÁY, PÍGIL.

ta·bág *png* [*ST*]: paggutom sa hayop bago katayin – *pnd* **mag·ta·bág, ta·ba·gín, i·ta·bág.**

The intention for including these entry-terms may be good as pointed out by former UP Pres. Javier in his introductory note in this dictionary, that is, to be able to make us aware that such terms did exist. But these entry-terms are clearly Old Tagalog and not Old Filipino. If you are writing a monolingual dictionary in Tagalog, these entry-terms might matter. The lexicographers might argue that Tagalog is the basis of the national language, that is why Old Tagalog terms are still considered, and this is true. But the Tagalog that has been the basis of the national language is not the Old Tagalog. The Old Tagalog therefore cannot even pass as a good representative of the core of the Filipino language.

Second, the incorporation of vocabularies coming from native languages in the Philippines is a good idea. But this move entails a set of problems that could have been settled by this dictionary in the first place. For instance, there is no clear mechanism on how and why they have chosen these entry-terms to be part of the Filipino vocabulary. The lack of proper mechanism in the incorporation of these vocabularies becomes apparent when the type of entry-terms coming from these native languages is carefully examined. An interesting observation comes from the vocabularies which are supposedly borrowed from Cuyonon and Tagbanwa. Out of the three entry-terms coming from Cuyonon, two of them are terms on the music tradition of this ethnolinguistic group. All of the three are supposed to be musical terminologies, but the other one is erroneously defined. These entry terms are provided below:

lan•tóy *png Mus* 1: [Btk Cuy Han] kallaleng 2: [Ata] suling 3: [Mnb Cot] bulungudyung 4: [Seb] klarineteng kawayan.

tí•pa•nú *png Mus* [Cuy Tbw]: plauta na yari sa kawayan, may anim na butas, at tinutugtog nang pahalang; plutang yari sa buho at hinihipan sa gilid.

tug•dá *png Mus* [Cuy]: dayday o

Lantoy and **tipanu** above are both musical terms. **Tugda** is defined using the Kalamianen term **dayday-o**. **Dayday-o** is a musical term. But **tugda** in Cuyonon only means two things, a noun referring to an instrument used in rice-planting, and a verb meaning to suddenly add up to a conversation. In Tagbanwa, on the other hand, out of almost twenty-entries, six of them are musical terms and the rest are either kinds of fish or something related to a tribal ceremony. The Tagbanwa terms are presented below:

ba•ban•díl *png Mus 1: [Mag Tbw] agung 2: [Sub] agung para sa beklog.*
[musical instrument]

ba•ri•tos *png Zoo [Kay Tbw] : bugíng.* [a kind of fish]

dá•tag *png [Tbw] : higaan.*[sleeping mat]

du•lá•ro *png Zoo [Kay Tag Tbw] : durado.* [no entry for durado; violation]

es•pá•da *png 1: Mil sandatang pansaksak at pantaga Cf SALDE 2: isa sa mga set ng baraha na may ganitong ilustrasyon 3: Zoo [Kap Kay Tag Tbw] isdang alat (*Trichiurus lepturus*) [a kind of fish], karniboro at mahaba, may malaking bunganga, at kahugis nito : BALILA, BOLUNGNAS, LANGKOY, LAYING, LIWIT, PINGKA, SIKWAN, SAMBUKOT 4: Bot halamang tubig na maugat.*

ka•li•mus•ta *png Mus [Tbw] : solong awit.* [a solo song]

ka•li•pen•dan *png Mus [Tbw] : piyesa ng musika na tinutugtog sa pangkat ng gong.* [a musical piece]

kan•tó•ris *png Zoo [Kay Tbw] : ba-bansi.* [a kind of fish]

ka•wát•si *png Zoo [Kay Tbw] : hito.* [milkfish]

ki•táy *png Zoo [Kyn Tbw] : isdang bu-wayá; karniborong isda.*
[carnivorous fish]

run•sáy *png Mit [Tbw] : ritwal ng pag aalay ng balsang may liyutyut, kakanin, at iba pa upang pigilan ang mga espiritung may dalang salot.* [a tribal ritual/ceremony]

sa•ba•gán *png Mus [Btk Tbw] : luntang.* [musical instrument]

san•daw san•daw *png Lit [Tbw]* : awit ng pag ibig ng lalaki para sa babae. [love song]

sa•ri•kan *png [Tbw]* : balagbagan. [a kind of shark]

sa•rim•ba•lay *png [Tbw]* : upuang yari sa kawayan. [a bamboo chair]

sa•ba•gán *png Mus [Btk Tbw]* : luntang. [a musical instrument]

tá•bad *png 1:* tubig na idinadagdag upang pahinain ang bisà ng alak o anumang likido *Cf TABAG 2: [Tbw]* alak mula sa bigas at ginagamit sa ritwal na pagdiwata. [wine used in a tribal ceremony]

tu•ga•tek *png Mus [Tbw]* : musika mula sa pangkat ng gong. [music]

This seemingly restrictive sense of the dictionary when it comes to the entries from the native languages may be due to the manner of corpus collection done for this dictionary. The corpus collection seems to have relied so much on secondary sources, instead of coming up with its own data bank. Almario (2003) mentions that one of the big problems they have encountered is the inavailability of written sources for the native languages. Former UP Pres. Javier, in his introductory note in this dictionary, states that the various research efforts on the native languages of the Philippines, from missionary works up to Jose Maceda's book about the native musical instruments, are the main reasons behind the realization of this dictionary. This somehow explains why this dictionary is teeming with terminologies of native music. Furthermore, Pres. Javier also specifically mentions a list of animals, plants, and fish from all over the country, as one of those research efforts. It is not surprising therefore that this dictionary is also abounding with zoological, botanical, and aquatic terminologies.

One of the strengths of this dictionary is its being the first Filipino monolingual dictionary to have entries in all the 28 letters of the Filipino alphabet. The technical aspect is satisfactory as well. However, the swarming of musical terminologies and other cultural entry-terms from different native languages cannot justify the "Filipino" in this dictionary. This is notwithstanding the fact that these cultural entry-

terms are taken from a limited number of fields such as music, botany, and zoology. The corpus should have been collected from the proper media, from media that truly represent “Filipino” in every sense.

CONCLUSION

Apart from being the most comprehensive, the three Filipino monolingual dictionaries are the only works which satisfy the basic standards of “monolingual lexicography”. The development of Filipino lexicography, therefore, largely depended on the formation of these three dictionaries.

Upon examining the contents of these dictionaries however, this study found that the three seemingly share a common mistake; all of them relied so much on secondary sources and/or previous works for their corpuses. The process of collecting lexicographic corpus through secondary sources is already obsolescent, especially during these times when native speakers are easily accessible and the language is being actively used in various forms of media.

Among the three, the UP-SWF’s UP *Diksiyonaryong Filipino* deserves a commendation for taking a big leap. However, the enormous number of entries and the relatively longer definitions are not enough to cover its blindspots. Many of the entries in this dictionary are either obsolete (Old Tagalog), or native terms of limited use. It has been mentioned earlier that one of the objectives of the UP-SWF’s UP *Diksiyonaryong Filipino* is the standardization of Filipino, but how can one standardize Filipino that is obsolete, or of a very limited use?

All of the three dictionaries somehow employed the same dictionary-writing undertaken by Juan Jose de Noceda and Pedro San Lucar, the Jesuits who authored *Vocabulario de la lengua Tagala* (Vocabulary of the Tagalog Language) which was printed and published in 1754. *Vocabulario* was compiled by taking words from existing Tagalog sources (Postma, 2001). Interestingly, the obsolete

words found in the three dictionaries examined in this paper are present in Noceda and San Lucar's *Vocabulario*. The KWF and UP-SWF should have considered collecting data from spoken Filipino than culling words from existing Filipino or Tagalog sources. A monolingual dictionary, especially one which main purpose is to provide an excellent scholarly reference rather than a bestselling commercial dictionary, should contain entries that are carefully gathered through an extensive corpus collection. While the corpus of a commercial dictionary is normally based on "preexisting works", a scholarly dictionary especially if it is a pioneering project is supposed to rely on "primary sources" for its corpus (Landau, 2001). Collecting corpus from primary sources will need a considerable amount of time. But this is somehow expected for pioneering dictionaries. As Zgusta observes "I certainly do not know all lexicographic projects past and present; but those I know not a single one was finished in the time and for the money originally planned" (as quoted by Landau, 2001, p. 86).

The inclusion of obsolete Tagalog words in these dictionaries also compromises the Filipino language, which is supposed to be the focus of these works. It has to be reiterated that Old Tagalog words, especially those taken from 18th Century sources, are in no way considerable as "Old Filipino".

The development of Filipino lexicography is largely dependent upon the publication of dictionaries like the ones examined here. And as the Filipino language develops, scholars should be more critical about the lexicographic works coming out. Otherwise, if this trend continues, Noceda and San Lucar's vocabularies will never lose their place in future monolingual Filipino dictionaries.

Notes

1. Language standardization refers to the way in which a language variety has been intended to officially become a preferred variety, thus requiring certain development measures such as grammar books and dictionaries (Wardhaugh 2006).
2. Intellectualization refers to the process by which language becomes a tool in "giving and obtaining education in any field" (Sibayan, 1991).
3. Landau (2001) defines a monolingual dictionary as a dictionary that provides periphrastic definition in the same language. It is written generally to provide reference for "the native speakers of that language, for people learning it as a second language in a country where the language is widely spoken, either as a native language or a lingua franca, or for people learning it as a foreign language" (p. 8).
4. The Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino (KWF, aka Commission on the Filipino Language) was established by virtue of Republic Act 7104, on August 14, 1991, and was tasked to undertake, coordinate and promote researches for the development, propagation and preservation of Filipino and other Philippine languages (Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino).
5. The UP Sentro ng Wikang Filipino is part of the implementation of the 1989 UP Language Policy (UPLP). As an academic body in the University of the Philippines, the UP Sentro ng Wikang Filipino serves as a consultative, coordinating and research center on matters relating to Filipino. One of the main objectives of the UP-SWF is to prepare and publish grammars and dictionaries of Filipino and other Philippine languages.
6. University of the Philippines
7. Two articles which comprehensively discuss the development of Filipino as a language, and how should it be differentiated from Tagalog and Pilipino are the ones by Belvez ("Development of Filipino, the National Language of the Philippines") and Rubrico ("The Metamorphosis of Filipino as a National Language").
8. The study however recognizes the fact that there are published 'Pilipino dictionaries', i.e., monolingual dictionaries, which bear Pilipino in its title, and is written in the national language before 1987. The first lexicographic work which may be considered as a 'Pilipino dictionary' was published in 1958, a year before Pilipino was proclaimed as the national language. This is Rosendo Ignacio's *Diksiyunaryo ng Wikang Pilipino*, published by Samar publishing. This dictionary however looked more like a thesaurus than a monolingual dictionary, as it lacks sufficient definition of its entry-terms. Several monolingual Pilipino dictionaries of such kind have been published since then, including Del Valle et al's (1969), Silverio's *Bagong Diksiyunaryong Pilipino-Pilipino* and Buenaventura's *Diksiyunaryong Pilipino-Pilipino* (1982).
9. Translation mine.

10. The Czech-American Ladislav Zgusta, who authored “Manual of Lexicography” (1972) is considered as one of the pillars of modern lexicography and also earned honors in comparative-historical linguistics and onomastics (Hartmann, 2003) .
11. Zgusta, Ladislav. 1971. *Manual of Lexicography*. Prague: Academia and the Hague: Mouton.
12. For more information regarding the development of Filipino, you may refer to Belvez’ *Development of Filipino*, the National Language of the Philippines (n.d.) <http://www.ncca.gov.ph/about-culture-and-arts/articles-on-c-n-a/article.php?igm=3&i=207>
13. Although this paper focuses on three of the most comprehensive Filipino Dictionaries, I feel that it is also important to note that there is another current dictionary, which also looks comprehensive, published almost in the period as that of the three. This is the *Diksiyunaryo Filipino-Filipino* (2000), published by the City Schools Division of Manila.
14. In 1985 the LWP and the Instructional Materials Corporation (IMC) signed a memorandum stating that the IMC would publish the dictionary (LWP, 1989). The LWP turned over the manuscript to the IMC on December 12, 1986. They then decided to have the National Bookstore (NBS) as a co-publisher. The NBS eventually published the book, but only the LWP and the IMC own the copyright of this dictionary.
15. The dictionary does not have any back matter.
16. The dictionary utilizes sans serif bold for all the entry-words, and sans serif bold italic for some proper nouns included as entry-words.
17. From the word *alipusta* which means ‘discrimination’.
18. This entry lacks no. 5 in its roster of definitions.
19. Translation mine.

References

- Almario, V. (Ed.). (2001). *UP Diksiyonaryong Filipino*. Quezon City: UP-SWF.
- Almario, V. A. (2003). *Bakit Kailangan ang U.P. Diksiyonaryong Filipino?* Paper presented at the “Pambansang Kumperensiya sa Leksikoghraphiya” (National Conference on Lexicography), 26-27 November 2003, U.P. Diliman
- Belvez, P. M. (n.d.) *Development of Filipino, the National Language of the Philippines*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncca.gov.ph/about-culture-and-arts/articles-on-c-n-a/article.php?igm=3&i=207>
- Buenaventura, L. C. (1982). *Diksiyonaryong Pilipino-Pilipino*. Manila: Goodwill Trading Co., Inc.
- Constantino, P. C. (2000, August 29). *Tagalog/Pilipino/Filipino: Do they differ?* Retrieved from http://www.emanila.com/pilipino/various/ntu_tagalog.htm

- Del Valle, B. & Del Valle, M. J. (1969). *Talatinigang Pilipino-Pilipino*. Manila: Bereda Publishers.
- Hartmann, R.R.K. (2003). *Lexicography: Dictionaries, Compilers, Critics and Users*. London: Routledge.
- Hidalgo, C. A. (1977). *Philippine lexicography from 1521 to present*. Quezon City: National Research Council of the Philippines.
- Ignacio, R. (1958). *Diksiyonaryo ng wikang Pilipino*. Quezon City: Samar Publishing Co.
- Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino. (1998). *Diksiyunaryo ng wikang Filipino, sentinyal edisyon*. Quezon City: Merylvyn Publishing House.
- Komisyon sa Wikang Filipino. Homepage (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.komfil.gov.ph/mandate.htm>
- Landau, S. I. (2001). *Dictionaries: The art and craft of lexicography*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Linangan ng mga Wika sa Pilipinas. (1989). *Diksiyunaryo ng mga wika sa Pilipinas*. Mandaluyong, M.M: Cacho Hermanos, Inc.
- Mga Tagamasid at Mga Puno ng Kagawaran, Sangay ng mga Paaralang Lungsod ng Maynila. (2000). *Diksiyunaryo Filipino-Filipino 2000*. Manila: Sangay ng mga Paaralang Lungsod ng Maynila.
- de Noceda, P. J. & de Sanlucar, P. P. (1754). *Vocabulario de la lengua Tagala*. Manila: Imprenta de Ramirez y Giraudier.
- Perdon, R.(n.d.). *The Making of a National Language*. Retrieved from http://www.emanila.com/pilipino/making_fil.htm
- Postma, A. (2001). *Tagalog Vocabularios*. PDF manuscript published online by Pila Historical Society Foundation Inc. <http://pinagpala.googlepages.com/Vocabularios.pdf>
- Rubrico, J. G. (n.d.). *The Metamorphosis of Filipino as National Language*. Retrieved from http://www.languagelinks.org/onlinepapers/fil_met.html
- Sibayan, B. (1991). The intellectualization of Filipino. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 88, 69-82.
- Sibayan, B. (n.d.). *The Intellectualization of Filipino*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncca.gov.ph/about-culture-and-arts/articles-on-c-n-a/article.php?igm=3&i=210>
- Silverio, J. F. (1980). *Bagong diksiyunaryong Pilipino-Pilipino*. Manila: National Bookstore Inc.
- UP Sentro ng Wikang Filipino. (2001). *Historikal na Rebyu ng Implementasyon ng UP Palisi sa Wika*. Unpublished paper
- Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.