Very few linguistic studies have been made on the Chinese influence on Philippine culture, and these have not treated their subject in depth.¹ The present study is an attempt to take a close look at one area of Philippine culture that unmistakably exhibits Chinese, specifically Hokkien Chinese, influence—the domain of Tagalog cookery.² This influence is evidenced by the sizeable number of Hokkien Chinese loanwords in the domain.³

Hokkien Chinese influence on Tagalog cookery will be analyzed by subjecting the loanwords to a technique of semantic analysis known as taxonomic analysis, after which their lexical content will be determined. Finally, a formal analysis will be proposed. All these techniques will help to shed light on the nature and kind of loanwords found in this domain.

Taxonomic analysis is commonly used in zoology and botany for classifying flora and fauna. It classifies sets of contrasting categories hierarchically into successive levels, or taxa, with categories at one level being included in a category at the next higher level.⁴ More than two taxa can belong to the next higher

¹ Arsenio Manuel’s Chinese Elements in the Tagalog Language (Manila: Filipiniana Publications, 1948) for instance, merely provides a list of Chinese terms in Tagalog, with their Chinese etymologies and Tagalog meanings.


³ The loanwords analyzed in this study were derived from Jose Villa Panganiban’s Talahulugang Pilipino-Ingles (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1972) and Arsenio Manuel’s Chinese Elements in the Tagalog Language, after they were double-checked for authenticity with native speakers of Hokkien. A third check was provided by Carstairs Douglas’s Chinese-English Dictionary of the Vernacular or Spoken Language of Amoy (London: Publishing Office of the Presbyterian Church of England, 1899) and Thomas Barclay’s Supplement (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1923) to Douglas’s dictionary.

Taxonomies are said to have two dimensions -- a horizontal one of discrimination and a vertical one of generalization. Taxonomic analysis can lead to a typology indicating the hierarchical relationship of each of the loanwords, thereby offering an efficient and convenient way of determining which categories contain the highest number of loanwords. This can further help to pinpoint the nature and the kind of loanwords that have been borrowed into the domain of cookery. In this way, taxonomic analysis can be used as a means of refining the statements made about the nature of the loanwords isolated under this domain.

**T A X O N O M Y O F T H E L O A N W O R D S**

The listing below shows the taxonomic structure of the Hokkien loanwords in Tagalog cookery. It contains 19 categories which appear on 5 distinct levels of inclusiveness. The categories

List 1: Cookery

*Instruments:* siyanse, bithay, bilao, *pohiya*, lansong

*Food:*

*Cooked food:* See list 2, below.

*Raw food*

*Flour products:* miswa, miki
*Rice products:* bihon, bilu-bilo
*Soy bean products:* tokwa, tahuri, tawpe, suwatanghon, totso
*Vegetables:* petsay, sitaw, upo, utaw, toge, yansoy, kutsay, kintsay
*Meat*

*Pork cuts:* tito, kasim, paykot, liyempo
*Beef cuts:* goto, kinse, kamto
*Fowls:* ulikba
*Fish & seafood:* tuwabak, swahe, tuwakang, pehe, hibe

List 2: Cooked Food

*Food preparation:* toyo, tawsí, heko, kelwa, angkak, sangke, hibe


6. There are however, according to Leopold Pospisil, "several, more abstract categories which are superordinate to the nineteen categories" ("A Formal Analysis of Substantive Law: Kapauku Papuan Laws of Land Tenure," *American Anthropologist* 64: 195).
Type of Food

**Meat:** tito, kasim, paykot, liyempo, goto, kinse, kamto, tuwabak, swahe, tuwakang, pehe, hibe, ulikba

**Vegetables:** sitaw, upo, utaw, toge, yansoy, kutsay, kintsay, petsay

**Soy bean products:** taho, tahuri, tokwa, suwantanghon, totso, tawpe

**Rice products:** bihon, bilu-bilo

**Flour products:** miswa, miki

Manner of cooking

**Boiled, steamed:** tikoy, biko, siyomay, siyopaw, pesa, batutay, tiim, taho

**Fried:** ukoy, bitso, pansit

**Stewed:** lome, humba, kiyamlo, padpo

**Soupy:** mami, suam, am, batsoy

are presented below in a manner that can best capture the structural relationship that exists between them.

“Meat” is a superordinate level that covers the loanwords on uncooked meat cuts coming from four categories: (1) “pork cuts,” like *tito* ‘pig’s tripe’, (2) “beef cuts,” like *goto* ‘ox tripe’, (3) “fowls,” like *ulikba* ‘white-feathered or light-skinned fowl with dark meat’, and (4) “fish and sea food,” like *tuwabak* ‘big-eyed herring’.

“Vegetables,” which covers all loanwords on uncooked vegetables, is a category on the same level as “meat”; no further distinction is made within this category. Examples under this category are *petsay* ‘Chinese cabbage’ and *kintsay* ‘celery’.

“Soy bean products,” like “vegetables,” is a category by itself. It covers all loanwords on uncooked bean products such as *tokwa* ‘soybean curd’ and *tahuri* ‘fermented salted soybean curd’.

“Flour products” covers all loanwords on uncooked flour products; it likewise constitutes a category by itself. Examples under the category are *miki* ‘thick flour noodles’ and *miswa* ‘thin flour noodles’.

“Rice” constitutes a category by itself. It covers all loanwords on uncooked rice products such as *bihon* ‘rice noodles’.

The eight categories above are subsumed under the level of “raw.” The categories discussed below fall under the level that includes four categories: (1) “fried,” like *ukoy* ‘fried flour cake of grated squash and carrots or of *toge* (mongo sprouts) with shrimps’, (2) “boiled and steamed,” like *siyopaw* ‘steamed rice cake filled with meat and condiments’, (3) “stewed,” like *humba* ‘highly
spiced dish of pork or chicken' cooked at low temperature, and
(4) "soupy," like mami 'noodles cooked in soup'.

"Type of food" includes all the categories subsumed under raw:
"meat," "vegetables," "soy bean products," "fish and sea food,"
"rice products," and "flour products." While these five are con-
trasting categories directly superordinated by the level "raw," they
are interposed by the level "type of food," which is the category
directly superordinated by the level "cooked." One may find
confusing this appearance of the same linguistic
forms
at different
levels of contrast, but it is common in certain linguistic systems,
such as the Subanuns.' The categories included in "type of food,"
however, can be distinguished further by the presence of certain
modifiers - for instance, toge gisado or kintsay gisado. The same
cannot be said of these categories appearing under "raw."

"Preparation of food" is a whole category by itself. It includes
all the loanwords whose referents are used in the preparation of
food, such as spices, seasoning, and food preservatives. Examples
are angkak 'red-colored grains of rice used as coloring for food'
and kelwa 'powdered mustard'.

The categories "manner of cooking," "type of food," and
"preparation of food" are not contrasting but complementary
categories, since a lexical item may belong to two of these cate-
gories (for example, biko 'rice cake cooked by steaming') or two
lexical items from two categories may be combined (such as
upo gisado). 8

"Instruments" contrasts with "food" on level two and consti-
tutes the sole category on the vertical dimension. It includes all
the loanwords that refer to cooking utensils and other devices.
Only five loanwords belong to this category: (1) siyanse 'kitchen
turner for frying', (2) lansong 'apparatus for steaming made of
bamboo splits fixed in a tin ring', (3) bithay 'bamboo sieve',
(4) pohiya 'ladle', and (5) bilao 'bamboo winnowing basket'.

7. Charles Frake observed this in the people's diagnosis of diseases, as well as in their
botanical and kinship terminologies ('Diagnosis of Disease,' p. 197).
8. An alternative analysis would be to treat "meat," "vegetables," "fish and other
sea food," "soy bean products," "rice products," and "flour products" as belonging to
the level of "raw" only, and to treat a combination like upo gisado as coming from a
"raw" category and combined with a cooked category. My intuition, however, tells me
that when the form upo gisado is used, one does not think of upo as being raw and
becoming cooked through the addition of gisado. "Gisado" is used to indicate the
manner in which the upo was cooked as against some other manner of cooking such as
"fried" or "sinam."
LEXICAL CONTENT OF THE HOOKIEN LOANWORDS

The taxonomic analysis of the loanwords in the previous section was made with the view of setting up the categories necessary for an in-depth analysis of these words. Nineteen categories were thus identified, and the loanwords were classified and inserted in their proper slots. What remains to be done is to indicate lexical content of these loanwords and to determine the number of loanwords in each taxonomic category. For this process, I have replicated the technique used by John Thorp in his study of Panganiban’s *Talahulugang Pilipino-Ingles.* In classifying the loanwords, the decision was made to mention the five categories appearing under the higher categories of both “raw” and “cooked” only once, which meant cutting down the total number of 14.

Table 1 gives a breakdown of the total percentage of loanwords within each culinary category. In the order of their rank, the categories are:

1. Vegetables; boiled and steamed
2. Food preparation
3. Soy bean products; stewed
4. Instruments
5. Pork cuts, beef cuts; fish and other sea food
6. Fried; soupy
7. Flour products; rice products
8. Fowls

What conclusions can be drawn from this ranking? First, it seems that, of all the raw materials to which the Tagalog speakers were introduced, the greatest variety came from the category “vegetables.” This means that these vegetables must have been brought into the country by the Hookiens or that they were found locally but the natives were ignorant of their culinary potentialities. “Boiled and steamed” describes a method of cooking common among Hokkien speakers, but previously uncommon among Tagalogs. It is therefore not unexpected that the Tagalogs borrowed heavily in this category. Second, the Hokkien speakers introduced varied ways of preparing food to the Tagalogs whose own ways of

9. In his study of *Talahulugang Pilipino-Ingles* (Manila: Bureau of Printing, 1966), John Thorp (“Lexical Content of Tagalog and the Culture of the Philippines” [Paper, Department of Linguistics, Ateneo de Manila, 1972]) found that the lexical content of 58 percent of the entries was Tagalog in origin, and the remaining 42 percent, of foreign origin – 33 percent, Spanish; 3 percent, Chinese; 4 percent, Malay; and the remaining percentage spread out among English, Sanskrit, and Arabic.
Table 1. Hokkien Loanwords in each Culinary Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culinary Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No. of loanwords</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pork cuts</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Beef cuts</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fowls</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fish and sea food</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vegetables</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Flour Products</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Soy bean products</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rice products</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fried</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Boiled and steamed</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Stewed</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Soupy</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Food preparation</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Instruments</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

preparing food were probably less varied. This conclusion concurs with Thorp's that "it is more likely for a group to accept new ways of preparing raw materials, rather than accept new raw materials or new names for things that have already been identified."\(^{10}\) Third, the use of soy bean for food is commonly identified with the Chinese, and by extension, with the Hokkien people. Next to "boiled and steamed" as a manner of cooking, "stewed" is also popular among the Hokkiens. Loanwords falling under the categories "rice products" and "fowls" are the fewest. This can be viewed as conforming to the cultural facts that rice is the staple crop of the Tagalogs and that fowls had long provided a source of food among them. The Tagalogs therefore already had in their possession the culinary words appropriate for describing referents in the above-named categories.

If the loanwords were viewed from a different perspective, that is, if they are distributed among higher-level categories, different conclusions can be drawn, as shown in Table 2. The superordinate level of "meat" contains a higher number of loanwords than the category "vegetables." This fact does not invalidate the conclusion in the previous paragraph, but it does indicate that the loanwords under the category "meat" constitute a rather sizable and significant number — a generalization missed when the category was broken down into four-level categories. However, this could mean that the Tagalogs acquired from the Hokkien speakers the habit of eating a great many pork and beef cuts as well as certain kinds of fish and sea food, which they were not eating heretofore. With this habit, of course, came the loanwords. To be sure, pigs and chickens had been domesticated even before the coming of the Chinese, as witnessed by the presence of such native Tagalog terms as pata ‘pig’s knuckles’, ulo ng baboy ‘head of pig’, kalamnan ‘jowl of pig’ and other varieties of meat as balun-balunan ‘gizzard’, puso ‘heart’, atay ‘liver’, and baga ‘lungs’. For beef cuts, most of the terms used are Spanish — punta y pecho ‘brisket’, cadera ‘ribs’, tapadera ‘rump’, solomillo ‘tenderloin’ — which might possibly point to the fact that the eating of beef became common among the Tagalogs as a result of the coming of the Spaniards. It can still be said that of the loanwords that fall under the major category of "raw," a great number belong to the categories of "meat" and

Table 2. Hokkien Loanwords Distributed Among the Higher-Level Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culinary Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No. of loanwords</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Meat</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Legumes</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Soy bean products</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Flour and rice products</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Manner of cooking</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Food preparation</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Instruments</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“vegetables.” Although “flour” and “rice products” are lumped together under one category, the combined percentages are so small as to be insignificant. The category “manner of cooking,” which constitutes the highest percentage, will not be discussed, since the fairer comparison is between categories covering one to four and categories subsumed under “manner of cooking,” as contained in Table 1. Table 2 is the result of an analysis made on the basis of categories on the same level.

On an even higher level of categorization, the distribution of percentages yielded the following order of ranking as seen in Table 3: (1) raw, (2) cooked, (3) instruments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No. of loanwords</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Raw</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cooked</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instruments</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This indicates that the bulk of Hokkien contribution to Tagalog cookery belongs to the “raw,” rather than to the “cooked” category. The implication here is that the Tagalogs had a lot of raw materials of which they were unaware, until their contact with the Hokkien speakers, whose eating habits and ways of preparing food were decidedly more highly developed. The category “cooked,” although second in rank, is not significantly lower than the category “raw” as the category “instruments” is to “cooked.” The high percentage of loanwords in the category “cooked” implies the Tagalogs’ simple ways of cooking and preparing food, which must have led them to freely adopt newer modes of cooking and preparing food. This fact is independently attested to by the presence in Tagalog cookery of numerous Spanish dishes and ways of preparing food. The low percentage of loanwords under the category “instruments” can only be conjectured: either the Tagalogs’ interest lay in newer ways of preparing raw materials rather than in the instruments used for preparation, or they already had utensils adequate for preparing the new dishes.
EXTENDED USE OF THE LOANWORDS

So far the discussion on the Hokkien loanwords in the domain of cookery has concentrated only on those forms whose original meanings have been kept more or less intact. There have been only a few minor cases of semantic shifts. The loanwords in this domain can be used either in isolation or in combination with other native Tagalog words or with other foreign borrowings to refer to concoctions different from those designated by the original. The results of the latter are invariably classified under the category “cooked,” never under that of “raw.”

In this section, I shall present a formal analysis of the loanwords used in isolation and in combination with other forms. The analysis will be preceded by the clarification of certain terms. “Nuclear forms” are those that occupy a central position and can be equated with the notion of noun head. They can either stand alone or can stand in a relation of attribution, where the first element is the nuclear form and the second the modifier, following the Tagalog “noun head + modifier” construction, like, dalagang maganda; such a construction is called a “composite form.” The nuclear forms in these contexts are Hokkien loanwords. Such loanwords as petsay, goto, and humba can occur in isolation; in the Tagalog culinary terms such as kintsay gisado or lumpiya ubod, the first element, the nuclear form, is a Hokkien loanword, and the second element, the modifier, is a non-Hokkien word.

A Hokkien loanword can also be used as a secondary form in a composite form where the nuclear form is of Tagalog or other foreign origin, and where the modifier is a Hokkien loanword, like arroz caldo con goto, Baguio onion with tokwa, and eggs with miswa. Although the loanwords do not, strictly speaking, modify the nuclear terms, the label “modifier” is used for terminological simplicity.

PROPOSED FORMAL ANALYSIS

The following formal analysis is proposed for composite culinary labels within the domain of Tagalog cookery utilizing Hokkien loanwords either as nuclear or secondary forms. In composite

forms where the Hokkien loanword is a secondary form, the conjunction symbol (.) is used to indicate that the terms conjoined by . is the product; where the loanwords is a nuclear form, no conjunction symbol is used, except to connect two categories enclosed in parentheses ( ). X symbolizes a nuclear form of Hokkien origin; Y, a nuclear form of other origin. X and Y are further specified for the following categories whenever applicable:

- p = pork
- be = beef
- f = fish and other sea food
- fo = fowls
- r = rice products
- fl = flour products
- b = soy bean products
- fr = fresh
- fd = fried
- s = soupy
- st = stewed
- bs = boiled and steamed

Categories are enclosed in parentheses ( ) and follow X; subcategories are enclosed in parentheses within parentheses ( ( ) ). M stands for modifier and is further specified as X or Y. Thus, the following culinary terms will have the following corresponding formulas:

1. *petsay*: X(L)
   Read: X is the nuclear form of Hokkien origin and belongs to the category “vegetables.”

2. *toge gisado*: X(L) M(Y(fr))
   Read: X is a nuclear form of Hokkien origin belonging to the category of “vegetables,” modified by a non-Hokkien modifier.

3. *milkfish en tocho (totso)*: Y.M(X(b))
   Read: Y is a nuclear form of non-Hokkien origin modified by a secondary form of Hokkien origin belonging to the category of “soy bean products.”

4. *pesang dalag*: X(bd.f) M(Y)
   Read: X is a nuclear form of Hokkien origin belonging to the categories “boiled” and “fish” and M is a modifier of non-Hokkien origin.

Tables 4 and 5 give the formal analyses of some Tagalog culinary
labels taken from *Philippine Cookery and Household Hints* and *Recipes of the Philippines*. Pansit mami, in Table 4, is an anomalous combination, since pansit, which always connotes something fried in Hokkien, combines with mami, a soupy dish. Other anomalous uses of the loanwords are evident in pansit molo (number 1), pesang manok (number 16) and humbang manok (number 21). A formal semantic analysis of these terms yields anomalous combinations which have been normalized by the borrowing language through the process of semantic shifts. This means that the meanings

**Table 4. Formal Semantic Analysis of some Tagalog Cookery Terms with Hokkien Loanwords as Nuclear Forms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culinary Labels</th>
<th>Semantic Formulas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pansit molo*</td>
<td>X(fr) M(Y(s))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pansit gisado*</td>
<td>X(fr) M(Y(f))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pansit luglug</td>
<td>X(fr) M(Y(bd))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pansit mami*</td>
<td>X(fr) M(X(s))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pansit langlang</td>
<td>X(fr) M(X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pansit bihon</td>
<td>X(fr) M(X(r))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pansit Malabon</td>
<td>X(fr) M(Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pansit Marilao</td>
<td>X(fr) M(Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Kintsay gisado</td>
<td>X(1) M(Y(fr))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Toge gisado</td>
<td>X(1) M(Y(fr))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Upo gisado</td>
<td>X(1) M(Y(fr))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lumpiya ubod</td>
<td>X(st) M(Y(fr(1)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lumpiya labong</td>
<td>X(st) M(Y(fr(1)))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lumpiya Shanghai</td>
<td>X(bl.f) M(Y(f))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Pesang dalag*</td>
<td>X(bl.f) M(Y(f))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Pesang manok*</td>
<td>X(bd.f) M(Y(fo))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Sugpo sinuam</td>
<td>Y(f) M(X(s))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Halaan sinuam</td>
<td>Y(f) M(X(s))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Hipon sinuam</td>
<td>Y(f) M(X(s))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Humba estofado*</td>
<td>X(st.p) M(Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Humbang manok*</td>
<td>X(st.p) M(Y(fo))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*anomalous label
+redundant label

Table 5. Formal Semantic Analysis of some Tagalog Cookery Terms with Hokkien Loanwords as Secondary Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culinary Labels</th>
<th>Semantic Formulas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arroz caldo con goto</td>
<td>Y.M(X(be))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Baguio onions with tokwa</td>
<td>Y.M(X(b))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chicken with suwantanghon</td>
<td>Y.M(X(b))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fish balls with petsay</td>
<td>Y.M(X(1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Meat balls with suwatanghon</td>
<td>Y.M(X(b))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Eggs with miswa</td>
<td>Y.M(X(f1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kilawin pork with tokwa</td>
<td>Y.M(X(b))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Milkfish en tocho (totso)</td>
<td>Y.M(X(b))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Patola miswa soup</td>
<td>Y.M(X(f1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Steamed fish with tawsi</td>
<td>Y.M(X(b))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identified with the original Hokkien words have undergone semantic changes: for instance, pesa which means ‘boiled fish’ (from the Hokkien pe+sá ‘boiled fish’) now simply means ‘boiled’ in the combination pesang.manok.

**Semantic Shifts of the Loanwords**

"Semantic shift" or "semantic change" refers to the process by which the meaning of a loanword is shifted from its original meaning to something similar or closely related to the original.13 It occurs randomly and no systematic pattern can be evolved from it. Attempts have been made to classify semantic shifts based on the "logical relations of successive meanings" such as (1) narrowing, e.g., Old English mete 'food' becoming meat 'edible flesh'; (2) widening, e.g., Middle English bridde 'young birdling' becoming

bird; (3) metaphor, e.g., Primitive Germanic bitraz ‘biting’ becoming bitter ‘harsh of taste’; (4) metonymy, e.g., Old French ceace ‘jaw’ becoming cheek; (5) synecdoche, e.g., Primitive Germanic tunaz ‘fence’ becoming town; (6) hyperbole, e.g., pre-French kwälljan ‘to torment’ becoming Old English cwellan ‘to kill’; (7) degeneration, e.g., Old English cnafa ‘boy, servant’ becoming knave; and (8) elevation, e.g., Old English cnight ‘boy, servant’ becoming knight.14

Not many Hokkien loanwords in cookery have undergone semantic shift. Those that have undergone this process can all be classified under “widening.” These are listed below.

1. Pansit, which comes from Hokkien pián+e+sit, does not mean a noodle dish: literally, it means ‘something that is conveniently cooked’; and since noodles require very little preparation, the dish pansit has somehow acquired this name. Chinese pansit requires frying; but in Tagalog, the term can refer to fried noodles as well as to noodles cooked in soup, like pansit mami or a nonnoodle but soupy dish as pansit molo.

2. Humba in Hokkien cookery refers to a pork dish, but in Tagalog cookery, the term has been extended to cover a chicken dish.

3. Pesa in Hokkien simply means ‘plain boiled’ and it is used only in reference to the cooking of fish, the complete term in Hokkien being pèq+sà+hí, the last morpheme meaning ‘fish’. Tagalog, however, adopted only the first two morphemes. If the term is used in isolation, it retains the meaning of the original, but “pesa” in Tagalog is extended to cover chicken, as in pesang manok ‘chicken boiled in water’. In this case the term has been widened to mean ‘cooking by boiling’.

4. Lumpiña in Hokkien refers to a dish cooked by mixing and stewing thinly sliced tokwa and vegetables like carrot, cabbage, and string bean, and subsequently wrapping the concoction in thin flour wrappers. In Tagalog cookery, the term is not restricted to the ingredients mentioned above. since other ingredients like ubod ‘pith of coconut trunk’ and labong ‘bamboo shoots’ may be used as substitutes. The term has been widened to mean anything wrapped in flour wrappers or wrappers made from egg, e.g., lumpiña ubod and lumpiña labong.

5. Ukoj’ comes from Hokkien ō+kuē ‘cake made from gabi’. In

Tagalog cookery, flour is used as a substitute for gabi, with the main ingredient being a species of small shrimps; shrimps are not an ingredient in the original Hokkien dish. Tagalog ukoy is made by deep-frying the mixture of flour and shrimps, while the Hokkien ô+ kuê is made by steaming the gabi and minced pork, which can then be eaten as is or after it has been deep-fried.

6. *Batsoy* in Hokkien refers to a dish with loin of pork as its main ingredient; in Tagalog cookery, the ingredients range from kidney, to pancreas, to liver, and to loin of pork.

7. *Suam* in Hokkien has the literal meaning ‘cook the broth from rice porridge (*lugaw)*’. The term has been extended in Tagalog cookery to describe a dish of either *sugpo* ‘prawns’ as in sugpo sinuam, or *hipon* ‘shrimps’ as in hipon sinuam cooked in soup with rice. In Hokkien cookery, the term *âm* is used strictly to describe the broth from rice porridge; the term is also borrowed into Tagalog with the same meaning.

8. *Taho* in both Hokkien Tagalog cookery means ‘soy bean curd’; however, while the Hokkiens use the term *taū+hî* to refer to uncooked soy bean curd, the Tagalogs use the term *taho* to refer to cooked soy bean curd taken with brown syrup. When cooked, the Hokkien *taū+hî* is always a salty, never a sweet, dish. The Hokkien term for the Tagalog *taho* is *taū+hûê*.

**SUMMARY**

Applying taxonomic analysis to the analysis of the Hokkien loanwords in cookery yielded superordinate and subordinate levels which could show the hierarchical relationship of the lowest-level categories to the highest-level ones. On the horizontal level, the analysis resulted in the categories under which the loanwords in cookery could be classified. Certain generalizations on the nature of the loanwords were then made, based on the percentages of loanwords under each category on three different levels. These generalizations bear out the popular impression that Chinese (Hokkien) has influenced Tagalog cookery.

The findings reveal that, on the highest superordinate level, the greatest bulk of Hokkien loanwords come from the category “raw,” closely followed by “cooked”; the category “instruments” had the lowest percentage. Under the level of “raw,” the category “meat”
had the highest percentage, followed closely by "vegetables," and then by "soybean products"; the percentage of "flour and rice products" is significantly lower than those of the first three categories. Under the level "manner of cooking," the category "boiled and steamed" had the highest percentage, which bore out the fact that this way of cooking commonly identified with the Hokkiens was readily accepted by the Tagalogs.

Finally, under the domain of cookery, Hokkien loanwords occurring in isolation or combined with other non-Hokkien words were subjected to a formal analysis. This analysis was based on the use of Hokkien loanwords either as nuclear forms or as secondary forms and has proven to be viable in the analysis of actual Tagalog cookery. Perhaps, the greatest value of such analysis lies in its ability to distinguish what is anomalous and what is redundant in Tagalog culinary labels. The use of analysis can also be extended to other foreign loanwords in Tagalog cooking, particularly those of Spanish origin.