The description of Ilokano in the 17th century

Fernández Rodriguez, R.

Publication date
2014
Document Version
Final published version
Published in
Linguistics in Amsterdam

[Link to publication](#)

The description of Ilokano in the 17th century

Rebeca Fernández Rodríguez
Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro

The grammar Arte de la lengua ilocana (1627) was written by the Augustinian Francisco López (?–1627) in order to learn the language and to be able to spread the Christian doctrine in the Philippines. It is the first description of this Austronesian language. It is written in Spanish and based on data from an oral corpus and translated texts, mainly doctrines and gospels. It has almost 200 pages divided in two parts: morphology and verbs. There is also the usual license, a poem written by an Ilokano native, an index and an errata sheet. It follows the lead of Antonio de Nebrija's grammar, because, as the author said, the missionaries had learnt Latin with the help of Nebrija's books, so it was easier for them to learn a new language using the usual methods. However, López includes some innovations, because Ilokano is very different from Latin. To sum up, this grammar was very didactic, and so complete and easy to use that any missionary who wanted to learn Ilokano had to study it and could do it quickly because of its graphics and translations.

1   Introduction

Spanish missionaries did not find any written description of the many languages they encountered in the Philippines. Applying contrastive models, they described these languages for the first time. Missionaries based their ideas on the classic *Introductiones Latinae* (1488) by Antonio de Nebrija (1441–1522) – even though it is impossible to know which edition they used – and on linguistic works of other missionaries to copy strategies. They followed the Latin grammatical categories (Ridruejo 2007: 449-450), but added some important changes, due to the characteristics of the languages they had to describe. Philippine languages are agglutinative, while Latin is not, and thus the Latin model was not the best to explain many of their features. The missionaries recognized there were some structures that did not fit in the Latin model, such as the copulative verb *sum es fui*, so they tried to find a way to express the same meaning in the Philippine languages through textual equivalents, examples and translations. Missionary linguists wanted to give the easiest explanations so that their readers were able to understand the grammatical structures and learn the language in a short time. The best way to accomplish their mission was to

describe and compare the languages and the grammatical rules with the ones they already knew, namely Latin, Hebrew and other Philippine languages. The grammars written by missionaries in nearby regions presented common formal aspects, especially in terminology and organization.

The first grammar written in the Philippines was an anonymous *Arte* of the Zambal or Sambal language (1601) (Ridruejo 2011), while the first printed grammar in the Philippines was *Arte y reglas de la lengua tagala* (1610) by the Dominican Blancas de San José (?–1614). Sueiro (2002:106) states that Blancas took Nebrija's *Introductiones* as the starting point, but did not follow it faithfully. In 1618, the Augustinian Alonso de Méntrida (1559–1637) wrote *Arte de la lengua bisaya hiliguayna de la Isla de Panay*; in 1621 Francisco Coronel (?–1630) wrote *Arte y reglas de la lengua pampanga*. Many grammars on these and other Philippine languages were written in the following years by missionaries of different orders.[1]

The purpose of this paper is to describe the first grammar of Ilokano, *Arte de la lengua iloca*, as contained in the printed copy kept in the British Library. The grammar was printed in the Philippines in 1627 by the Augustinian Francisco López (?–1627) and re-edited in 1792, 1793 and 1895. The complete title is *Arte de la lengua yloca compuesto por el padre fr*[ay] *Francisco Lopez de la orden de S*[an] *Augustin. Con las licencias de los Superiores. En Manila, en el Colegio i Universidad de S*[an]*Thomas de Aquino, por Thomas Pinpin. Año de 1627*. García-Medall published a facsimile edition with an introduction in 2009. However, a thorough study has still to be made. There is also a manuscript copy wrongly dated in 1628, in the Library of the Estudio Teológico Agustiniano in Valladolid (Spain).

2   Biography

Francisco López was born in the Spanish province of Toledo in the late 16th century. He studied in Alcalá de Henares and subsequently enrolled in the Augustinian mission to the Philippines, where he arrived in 1598. The next year he was sent to Caluntian (nowadays, San Nicolás) in the Region of Ilocos. In 1602 he was chosen to preach in Japan, a trip he never made due to technical problems. He was second examiner of Ilokano between 1617 and 1620. He published the first translation into Ilokano of the *Doctrina Christiana* in 1621 (De Castro 1954[1780]:103), and also published the first Ilokano grammar and started a vocabulary, but his death in 1631 prevented him from finishing it.

---

[1] See Sueiro (2002).

3 Sources and methodology

Since there was no written literature, missionaries had to learn the languages by speaking with the Philippine people and taking notes. They had to listen carefully to what people spoke and how they spoke, and then write down what they had heard. Thereupon they drew their conclusions based on their previous knowledge. Since Ilokano is an agglutinative language, López warned about it being very different from Latin, even though he would still use Nebrija's grammar based on Latin. His explanation was that all the missionaries had learnt Latin thanks to this work, and thus it would be easier for them to learn another language using the same model and terminology they already knew:

> *Aunque el idioma de esta lengua, es muy diferente del de la lengua latina, con todo eso en quanto fuere posible, nos conformaremos con el método de la arte de Antonio de Lebrixa, por ser la por donde los mas de los religiosos que vienen a estas islas, han estudiado el latin: i asi hallarán mas claridad, y facilidad en aprender esta lengua, con solo leer por si esta arte, aunque no tengan maestro, que viva voce se la explique.*
> 'Although the language is very different from Latin, whenever it will be possible, we will conform to the method of Antonio de Lebrixa's grammar, because it is with this grammar that most of the missionaries who arrived to these islands had learnt Latin. In this way, they will find learning this language clear and easy, just by reading this grammar, even without a teacher explaining it orally' (López 1627: prologue).

López based his work not only on Nebrija's, but also used other missionaries' works to copy examples and strategies, such as the translation of Sermons into Ilokano by Antonio Mexia (?–?) and Blancas's Tagalog grammar. López (1627: 240) used some of Blanca's terminology in his explanations: "[…] i esto es lo que el eruditisimo padre fray Francisco de s[an] Joseph, en su arte tagalo llamó *facere facere*[2] [...] 'and this is what the erudite father, friar Francisco de San Joseph, called *facere facere* in his Tagalog *arte*'. He also used some of Nebrija's terminology:

> *Dicense tambien por esta comp[osicion] (um) muchas de las acciones que el Antonio llama inchoativas [...].*

---

[2] According to Ridruejo (2007: 461–462), *facere facere* or *facere fieri* was the term used for causative sentences.

'Many of the actions called inchoative by Antonio are also expressed by this affix (um) (…)' (López 1627: 263).

Another source was Pedro Bukaneg (ca. 1592–1630), who is considered the father of Ilokano literature. López acknowledged Bukaneg's help in the prologue and in the explanations. He reminded his readers that the best way to learn the language was by speaking with Ilokano people:

> *[...] y notese que lo usan muy raras veces por la comp[osicion] en de manera que el dicho d[on] Pedro Bucaneg (oráculo de esta lengua) ha dicho que mejor dicha está la dicha oracion sin la comp[osicion] en asi (cayátco no ammóc ti agcanta etc.) [...].*
> '[...] and note that they use it very rarely with the affix *en*, so the aforementioned don Pedro Bukaneg (the oracle of this language) has said that this sentence is better said without the affix *en*, as *cayátco no ammóc ti agcanta* etc. [...]' (López 1627: 288).

López also added new information and used other sources to explain Ilokano phenomena that were different from Latin and that may not be found in the Philippine language. He was not interested in using the proper terminology because he thought that the information was far more important than the terminology. López had observed the speech of the Ilokano people for the many years he had lived among them. Therefore, he was able to describe the rules and the language structure, as well as to notice the problems the Spaniards encountered when they tried to speak Ilokano. In his opinion, learning how to speak was far more interesting than knowing the names of the grammatical categories:

> *Ante todas cosas digo, que el uso de ella es tan facil como el de la (dagás) i que en eso todos vamos a una, pero quanto a lo que importa bien poco que es el llamarla verbo o adverbio, digo que, considerado despacio el sentido que hace en todas ocasiones, totalmente parece verbo porque significa accion.*
> 'Before everything, I say that the use of it is as easy as the use of (*dagás*) and that here everyone goes for the same, but what is less important is to call it a verb or adverb; I say that, when considering carefully the meaning in all cases, it seems to be a verb, because it expresses action' (López 1627: 296).

Comparison was another key in the description of Ilocano. López contrasted Ilocano with the languages he knew, that is, Spanish, Hebrew and Latin.

> *El siguiente pron[ombre] es dual (que llama la lengua hebrea y las*
> *mas de estas islas le tienen, y a la lengua latina, y española les falta)*
> *incluye primera y segunda persona, de suerte que quiere decir (los*
> *dos, tu y yo) y pondremosle el romance (los dos) en que se entienda*
> *(tu y yo).*
> 'The following dual pronoun (as Hebrew names it, and which most of
> the languages of these islands have, but Latin and Spanish do not)
> includes the first and second person, so it means (both, you and me)
> and we will write in Spanish (los dos 'both of us') meaning (you and
> me)' (López 1627: 2).

López used all the resources at hand to write the first grammar of Ilocano. He did not confine himself to following the Latin tradition; he added innovations in the description of the language. His descriptions of the language were based on his own experiences and knowledge. Examples and use of the language were basic in the learning process. In this way, the readers had to extract the grammatical structure. His method was quite pedagogic and new, due to the inclusion of diagrams and translations in all the examples. His teachings can be summarized in: speak with Ilokano people and read the *Doctrina Christiana*.

4   Description of the grammar

The Ilocano grammar has a beautiful cover illustrating the Augustinian heart in the middle. It was printed by Thomas Pinpin (1580–?) in the University of Santo Thomas de Aquino in Manila. It measures 18 x 13 cm and has 343 pages divided into two books, plus 14 unnumbered pages at the beginning, containing the corresponding printing licenses – by the prelate, the prior of monastery San Pablo in Manila, general Juan Niño de Tavora (?–1632) and general vicar of the archbishopric in Manila, Pedro de Lassarte (ca. 1560–?) – followed by a poem in Spanish with its translation in Latin written by Bukaneg and dedicated to López.

Then there are some words to the readers, followed by the prologue "Prólogo y advertencias de algunas particularidades, que es bien llevar notadas desde el principio…" and an index for the first book. In the words to the reader, López stated he had avoided previous *topoi* used by other missionaries. He explained that he started the grammar because he needed to learn the language, and this is the reason why he dedicated it to present and future missionaries. He ended this section asking the future missionaries to pray both for him and Bukaneg, who was the proofreader of the grammar. He also quoted ancient philosophers, mainly Aristotle, in Latin:

> *Pues es tan experimentada la verdad del axioma del Philosopho: facile est ad inventis addere.*
> 'The truth of the Philosopher's axiom has been proved: it is easy to improve inventions' (López 1627: dedicatory).

López ended the prologue explaining the characteristics of the grammar. He stated that he had numbered and titled the topics of the paragraphs in the margins of the book. In this way, readers could quickly find what they were looking for. This grammar offers a corpus of sentences in Ilokano, as well as their translation. López strongly recommended learning the rules by listening to Ilokano native speakers.

The first book has 134 pages about what can be called morphology: explanations about pronouns, proper names, vocatives, plurals, demonstratives, numerals, relatives, partitives, adjectives, ordinals and distributives, noun concordances, comparatives, superlatives, uses of different affixes, the verb *sum es fui*, subjunctive and conditional, imperative, affirmative, infinitive, etc.:

> *El libro primero contendra todos las partes de la oracion (fuera del verbo digo de todo genero de verbo que significa accion) porque el verbo (sum es fui) que no significa accion, irá entre los nombres por estar encerrado en ellos (como diremos en su lugar).*
> 'The first book will contain all the parts of the sentence (except for the verb, I say, of all types of verbs that express action) because the verb (*sum es fui*) does not mean action and it will be among the nouns because it is included in them (as we will see later)' (López 1627: prologue)

The second book has 185 pages on verbs, starting with a three page prologue. It contains verbal affixes and their meanings, actions, roots, uses of verbal particles*,* passive particles, past particles, defectives, (in)transitives, multipliers, counting gold and earnings, counting times, expressions of warning and possible answers in the confession:

> *El libro segundo se empleará todo en la silleria y piedras grandes del edificio que son todos los generos de verbos, con quien tendremos bien que hacer; no por la multitud de preteritos y supinos (que esto es estudio de un dia) si no por la diversidad de significaciones, que una misma palabra o raiz hace, según la diversidad de composiciones que se le arriman, ya por una parte ya*

> *por otra, ya por ambas partes, ya sencillas ya dobladas, como en su*
> *lugar veremos*
> 'The second book will be all about the masonry and big stones of the
> building, which are the verbal genres, with which we will have a lot
> to do; not because of the many past tenses (this is a task for a day)
> but because of the different meanings that the same word or root has,
> considering the different affixes, in one place or another or in both
> places, simple or double as we will study later' (López 1627:
> prologue).

The last pages of the grammar are dedicated to notes about some missing
information in different chapters of both books, some words about the
translation of the *Doctrina Christiana*, and the index of the second book. The
grammar ends with two pages of errata, including the corresponding page and
line where the mistakes are.

The structure is similar to Nebrija's grammar, but some of the
grammatical categories are different, as well as the importance given to
terminology. Missionaries in the Philippines not always followed the terms used
by their colleagues in America – the Amerindian word *saltillo* to name the
glottal stop was the same as the Philippine *cortadillo*. According to Ridruejo
(2001: 540), the Spanish term *preposiciones* 'prepositions' to indicate affixes
was used by the Augustinian Francisco Coronel for Pampango (1621), and by
Alonso de Méntrida and Martín Claver (?–1646) for Bisaya (1618 and 1637
respectively), while López (1627) used *partículas* 'particles' or *composiciones*
'compositions' for affixes.

5   Phonology and orthography

López does not explain prosody, because he considered it to be very difficult. In
his twenty-eight years in the Region of Ilocos, he had not been able to come up
with a rule about prosody. Thus, prosody was to be learnt by listening carefully
and by reading both the *Doctrina Christiana* and the grammar, while noticing
the different accents in the words. His learning method was inductive. He
recommended listening to Ilokano people and asking them questions, but he
explained a basic rule: the accent of the root followed by *–en* or *–an* goes on the
previous syllable, with some exceptions. However, he wrote some paragraphs on
the orthography and the pronunciation of certain letters such as <g> and <c>, as
well as that of diphthongs and of the digraph <ng>[3], which he called *gangosa*
'nasal'.

---

[3] In Philippine grammars, the velar nasal is represented by <ḡ> (Ridruejo 2007: 461).

Tiene esta lengua (como todas las de estas islas) una pronunciación, que en su sonido no se parece a ninguna de nuestras letras: y el que hace al oido, se llama ya comúnmente gangoso; y señalase con estas dos letras juntas (nḡ) teniendo la (ḡ) la tilde como se vée a diferencia de la (g) q[uan]do le antecede (n) que estando la (ḡ) la dicha tilde, se ha de entender que entonces ella con la (n) antecedente, hacen una letra consonante compuesta de dos por no tener en nuestros caracteres españoles ninguno que, a solas corresponda al comun de estas islas, que este (ꜿ). Y assi se lleve advertido, que ay algunos vocablos que no se diferencia[n] mas que en apartar la (n) de la (g) o en pronunciarlas ambas juntas como queda dicho.

'This language (like all the languages of these islands) has a pronunciation of which the sound is very different to any of our letters, and this sound is commonly called *gangoso* 'nasal'; and it is marked with these two letters together: *nḡ*, having *ḡ* a tilde to distinguish it from *g* when it is preceded by *n*, because *ḡ* with the aforementioned tilde and the preceding *n* are understood to form one consonant character composed of two letters, because there is no Spanish character that alone corresponds to the one of these islands, that is ꜿ. And therefore, be warned that there are words that are only distinguished from each other by either separating the *n* from the *g* or by pronouncing them together' (López 1627: prologue).

There is no dialectal information as in other Philippine grammars, such as in the Dominican Andrés López's (?–1683) *Arte de la lengua pangasinán* (1690), and in Blancas's Tagalog grammar. López explained the use of the Ilokano vowels by comparing them with Latin. He also wrote about some consonants that might have caused problems to Spaniards, like the consonants <c> and <k>:

Acerca de la (c) tambien se advierte que en esta lengua proprisimamente tiene la pronunciación de la (k) dura igualmente con todas las vocales, y assi en los vocablos que comienzan con pronunciación de (k) si fuere con una de las tres vocales (a, o, u) usaremos la (e). Y si fuere una de las dos (e, i) usaremos la (q) y por consiguiente en los preteritos de los dichos vocablos que comenzaren con (ca, co, cu). [...]

'As for the *c*, notice that in this language it has the pronunciation of a strong *k* with all the vowels, and so, in all the words that start with this *k* pronunciation, we will use *e* as if it were one of these vowels *a, o, u*. And if it is with one of these two, *e, i,* we will use *q* and thus in

all the past tenses of the words starting with *ca, co, cu…*' (López 1627: prologue).

He also explained the use and pronunciation of diphthongs. He included three diphthongs; *ae, áy, ué*, but explained that the first two were basically the first syllables of the demonstrative pronouns *daétoy* and *dáydi* and that they were pronounced as /e/, and that was why he wrote *détoy* and *dédi* instead. He affirmed in the prologue that his plan was to write the words as Ilokano people pronounced them – and as he heard them. He was far more interested in teaching how to speak properly than in the correctness of the language. He used Spanish sounds to explain some Ilokano phenomena in order to ease the missionaries' comprehension.

López did not use any term to identify the glottal stop /ʔ/, contrary to what other missionaries used to do. However, he distinguished it orthographically using a hyphen, even though in the grammar he said he was going to write a dot (·). He affirmed that there were many Ilokano words that required a break in the middle in order to pronounce them correctly. To explain this, he took the Spanish words *mal* 'bad' and *lino* 'linen' which, when pronounced quickly after each other, can sound as *mali[g]no* 'devil', but when pronounced separately, simply mean 'bad linen'. When the last consonant of a word was followed by a vowel and these had a natural tendency to be pronounced together but should not, he wrote a hyphen to mark the glottal stop clearly, e.g. *nalag–án* 'light thing'. Once again, practice meant learning.

6   Morphosyntax

This grammar can sometimes be considered a bit messy and not well organized, because whenever López thought he had missed some information or an explanation he added it in the text, no matter what was the topic of the paragraph. There are also some unnecessary repetitions, especially when explaining the future tense – he dedicated a whole chapter to the future tense, but then he wrote about it again in the last paragraphs of the second book without adding anything new, merely repeating what he had already said earlier. He also wrote that making mistakes was normal, but even with those, learning Ilokano in a short time was possible, because his grammar was clear and very graphic.

In the second book, he started with the affixes in order to draw all the conclusions about the verbs, even though he had already explained the substantive, subjunctive, conditional and imperative verb. Many times, he introduced the topic followed by examples so that the reader had to learn the languages by drawing their own conclusions. He was very innovative, since

learning by deducing the rules and making mistakes was not very usual at that time. He included graphic tables to explain the verbal tenses, and, taking the verb *agsurat* 'to write' as an example, he wrote that adding the affix *na–* at the beginning of the verb expressed the past tense, while adding the affix *–to* at the end indicated the future tense.

Table 1: Present, past and future of the verb *agsurat* ('to write')

Present	*agsurat*	'he writes'
Past	*nagsurat*	'he wrote'
Future	*agsuratto*	'he will write'

López told his readers that they could take any verb and simply add one of these affixes in order to put a verb in the past or future tense. Table 1 is followed by a new one showing the singular and plural forms of the verbs. Studying the verb *obedecer* 'obey', missionaries learnt the rules for conjugating the tenses.

Table 2: Forms of the verb *anugutec* ('to obey')

Ilokano	**Spanish**	**English**
anugutenca	*obedezcote*	I obey you (2nd person sing.)
anugutencayo	*obedezcoos*	I obey you (2nd person plural)
anugutec ida	*obedezcoles*	I obey them
anugutennac	*obedecesme* or *obedeceme*	you obey me
anugutendac	*obedeceysme* or *obedecenme*	(all of) you obey me
anugutennacami	*obedecesnos* or *obedecenos*	you obey us
anugutendacami	*obedeceysnos* or *obedecennos*	they obey us
anuguten naca	*obedécete*	you obey yourself
anuguten nacayó	*obedeceos*	you obey yourselves
anugutennaida	*obedecelos*	you obey them

Once personal pronouns as well as the corresponding past and future affixes had been explained, López went on to explain how to form the passive, using again a table. All these examples are clearly organized and easy to learn. He studied the meaning of what he called *composiciones*, but which are affixes – *mang–*, *pag–*, *pinag–*, etc. – which can have different meanings, depending on whether they stand alone or are combined with other affixes. Therefore, the descriptions of these compositions were very exhaustive and clearly explained by examples. He made a list of affixes and their meanings, which could be transitive, intransitive

and neutral. López explained that affixes had both semantic and syntactic consequences and that they were similar to Latin verbal prefixes. He added long lists of lexical units to specific morphemes, all followed by examples where the reader could learn how to use them. He included fourteen main passive combinations and eleven main active combinations, such as:

Table 3: Affixes and their meanings

pag– 'instrument'	verb–*an* 'for someone'	–*an*– 'place'
ag– 'action'	–*um*– 'continuity'	*mang*– 'movement'
–*en* 'passive'	–*ka* 'who is taking the action'	*pa*– 'causative'

He dedicated one chapter and several other paragraphs to the Latin verb *sum es fui*, although it does not exist in Ilokano. It has to be said in a roundabout way, using some affixes and adding time adverbs:

> *El verbo substantivo (sum es fui) (regulandole por la lengua latina) tiene tres significaciones diversas, que son (seer, haver o tener, estar) la principal significacion dejemos para la postre, que es el (seer)* […]
> 'The substantive verb (*sum es fui*) (explaining it by Latin) has three different meanings that are ('to be' and 'to have') and the main meaning is 'to be' […] (López 1627: 62).

López stated that Ilokano nouns had no number or gender, notwithstanding the fact that he included a whole chapter on *modo de dar plural a los nombres* ('how to form plural nouns'). There he explained the plural, the dual pronoun (you and me), inclusive and exclusive, comparing them with Hebrew. Plurals were marked in the personal pronoun. This was done by doubling the first syllable and taking the first consonant of the second syllable: *ubing* 'boy' > *ubbing* 'boys'; *balay* 'house' > *balbalay* 'houses'.[4] This rule had its exceptions (mainly phonetic), because it could not take the consonant of the second syllable: *cabsat* 'brother' > *cacabsat* 'brothers'. Many words starting with a vowel could form their plural by adding *na* or by doubling the first syllable only: e.g. *ama* 'father' > *ammá* 'fathers', *ana* 'child' > *annác* 'children'. Exceptions

---

[4] Since he writes *ubbing* (plural of *ubing*) with a geminate *b* and not with a geminate *u*, it is possible that in a case such as *ubing* > *ubbing*, where the first syllable is a vowel, the doubling of the first syllable probably did not happen, since *u*– + *u*– did not became *uu*–, or that it did not imply vowel lengthening. In the latter case, both vowels evidently merged into one.

were the adjectives starting with *ma*; their plural was made by adding *agca–* and suppressing *ma*: e.g. *mainḡel* 'brave' > *dagiti agcainḡel* 'brave people'.

López dedicated a chapter to the plurals of metals. He says that, like in Spanish and Latin, the names of the metals cannot be put in the plural, e.g. **los oros* 'the golds' was wrong. However, when there were many metal items, especially if they belonged to different people, they were put in the plural:

> *[…] han hurtado algunas preseas de oro de don Juan i de don Pedro, dicen (tinácao da ámin ti balbalitoc da don Juan qen don Pedro, hurtado han todos los oros) quiere decir, todas las pieças de oro (de don Juan y de don Pedro).*
> '[…] they have stolen some pieces of Mr Juan and Mr Pedro's gold, so they say *tinácao da ámin ti balbalitoc da don Juan qen don Pedro*, all the golds were stolen, meaning all the pieces of (Mr Juan and Mr Pedro's gold)' (López 1627: 16–17).

López explained six cases, the same as the ones in Nebrija's *Introductiones Latinae*: singular and plural nominative, genitive, vocative, dative, accusative and ablative, although he used the same term for the last three cases:

Table 4: Ilokano cases according to López

SINGULAR	Nominative	*sica, ca*	you
	Genitive	*mo, m*	yours
	Dative, accusative, ablative	*quenca*	for you
	Vocative	*o N!* or *nay sica* [a]	hello you!
PLURAL	Nominative	*dacayo, cayo*	you(PL)
	Genitive	*yo*	yours(PL)
	Dative, accusative, ablative	*cadacayo*	for you(PL)
	Vocative	*o N!* or *nay dacayo* [a]	hello you(PL)!

[a] 'N' is a stand-in for 'Name', for instance "O Pedro!"

López explained that there were two types of nominative affixes: the ones that had meaning and the ones that needed a root to mean an action. As for the genitive, he said it expressed possession and was used to make passive agents and was used with derivatives. All these cases were explained by dozens of examples with their translations into Spanish.

7   Conclusions

Even though López was aware of the differences between Ilokano, Spanish and Latin, he followed Nebrija's Latin model, because it was what all missionaries were familiar with, and he thought that this might simplify both his task and the learning process. Nevertheless, his descriptions were very innovative and pedagogically correct. He tried to draw general rules, but always included exceptions. His goal was that missionaries would be able to learn the language in a short time in order to start evangelization. There are hundreds of examples translated into Spanish, so that the missionaries would be able to learn new words while reading and studying the grammar. Whenever he could not find a proper rule or he could not find a strategy in other missionaries' grammars, he decided to write down as many examples as he could, so that readers could draw their own conclusions while studying the grammar and speaking and practicing the language. For this purpose, he compared Ilokano language with Spanish, Latin and Hebrew.

López's work was the source to study Ilokano for more than two centuries due to his clear and systematic explanations as well as his innovative exposition – although sometimes it can be considered untidy and repetitive. Topics are numbered in the margins, so that readers could find easily what they needed. He highlighted the equivalents in mood and tense with combinations of roots and affixes, which he included in graphical explanations. Therefore, his 'students' had to make some effort to learn the language, because they had to deduce the rules from those graphics. López thought that it was more important to know how to speak than to use the correct terminology. He encouraged learners to speak with Ilokano people in order to learn the intonation of the language and its structures. López tried to make his work as clear and easy as possible, but at the same time he acknowledged that it had to contain basic rules to start learning the language. In doing so, he based his work both on Nebrija's grammar and on other contemporary vocabularies of Philippine languages, but added innovations.

8   References

Anon. 1601. Arte de la lengua sambala y española compuesto por un religioso de la orden de Nuestro P. S. Agustín Ministro que ha sido por muchos años en ella; para ayuda de los Nuevos Operarios que vinieran a la Administración. Dedicado al gran Apostol de España Santiago. Año de 1601. (ms)

Blancas de San José, F. 1610. *Arte y Reglas de la lengua tagala por el Padre fray Francisco de San Ioseph de Orden de S*[anto] *Domingo Predicador General en la Provincia de N*[uestra] *Señora del Rosario de las Islas Filipinas*. Bataan: Thomas Pinpin.

Castro (de), A.M. 1954[1780]. *Osario Venerable. Misioneros Agustinos en el Extremo Oriente 1565–1780*. Madrid: Instituto Santo Toribio de Mogrovejo & Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Coronel, F. 1621. Arte y reglas de la lengua pampanga, compuesto por el Padre Predicador del Orden de N. P. S. Agustín y Prior Ministro del Convento de Macabele. (ms)

López, F. 2010[1627]. *Arte de la lengua yloca*. Madrid: Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional. [Facsimile by Joaquín García–Medall]

Méntrida, A. de. 1818[1618]. *Arte de la lengua bisaya hiliguayna de la isla de Panay*. Manila: Oficina de los Jesuítas. Segunda edición, Manila: Imprenta de don Manuel Memije, por don Anastasio Gonzaga, 1818.

Nebrija, E.A. de. 1996[1488]. *Introductiones latinas contrapuesto el romance al latín*. Edición e introducción de Miguel Ángel Esparza y Vicente Calvo. Münster: Nodus.

Ridruejo, E. 2001. Las primeras descripciones gramaticales de las lenguas filipinas (s. XVII). In J. Calvo Pérez (ed.), *V Jornadas Internacionales de Lengua y Culturas Amerindias. Contacto interlingüístico e intercultural en el mundo hispánico*. Valencia: Instituto Valenciano de Lengua y Cultura Amerindias, 529–553.

Ridruejo, E. 2007. Lingüística misionera. In J. Dorta, C. Corrales & Dolores Corbella (eds.), *Historiografía de la lingüística en el ámbito hispánico: fundamentos epistemológicos y metodológicos*. Madrid: Arco & Libros, 435–477.

Ridruejo, E. 2011. The first grammar of a Philippine language? The anonymous Arte de la Lengua Sambala y Española [Grammar of the Sambal and Spanish languages] (1601). In L. Reid, E. Ridruejo & Thomas Stolz (eds.), *Philippine and Chamorro Linguistics before the Advent of Structuralism*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 11–32.

Sueiro, J. 2002. *La enseñanza de idiomas en Filipinas (siglos XVI–XIX)*. La Coruña: Toxosoutos.

Rebeca Fernández Rodríguez

rebecafr@utad.pt and rebecafr@gmail.com