

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

Counting and Marking Time: From the Precolonial to the Contemporary Tagalog World

Damon L. Woods

Philippine Studies vol. 59 no. 3 (2011): 337–365

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>

Counting and Marking Time From the Precolonial to the Contemporary Tagalog World

The Spanish intrusion resulted in cultural and linguistic changes in Philippine societies, but did not lead to a complete exchange of the indigenous for the foreign. The changes were not imposed but rather chosen by the local population, as demonstrated by changes in counting and marking time in Tagalog society, which this article traces, beginning with Tomas Pinpin's *Librong pagaaralan nang manga Tagalog nang uicang Castila* (1610), to the present. Using the categories of core values (animism) and surface values (Spanish Catholicism), this article explains the resulting hybridity evident today.

KEYWORDS: CATHOLICISM • SPANISH COLONIALISM • ANIMISM • VALUES • HYBRIDITY

Imagine posing two questions to two Tagalog speakers: When counting, what comes after twenty? How do you refer to the day two days previously? Now imagine that one of these persons is from 1610 and the other from 2010. You would most likely get very different answers to these questions. What would account for the differences? And how are the two questions related? In the market, when I was growing up in Baguio, when a vendor stated the price as *singko* (*cinco*), I knew she meant five centavos, but when she said *lima* she meant five pesos. Yet both words meant five. Why the difference?¹ To find the answer, one must begin in the precolonial period as well as the early years of the Spanish intrusion.

In contrast to the ethnic groups surrounding them, the precolonial Tagalog possessed a view of reality with a strong quantitative component and a penchant for numbering. This is seen in various aspects of Tagalog culture. To cite but one example: where those to the north and south of them adapted the Spanish *hermano* (brother) and *hermana* (sister) into *manong* and *manang*, the Tagalog instead borrowed the Chinese system of titles for older siblings: first eldest brother, *kuya*; second eldest brother, *diko*; third eldest brother, *sanko*; fourth eldest brother, *siko*; first eldest sister, *ate*; second eldest sister, *ditse*; third eldest sister, *sanse*; fourth eldest sister, *dete*. After the fourth siblings, the Tagalog used *manong* and *manang* as those around them. Both the adaptation and the borrowing occurred *after* the Spanish intrusion.² And it should be stressed that this approach was found within the cultural context of an animistic worldview.

At the same time, the precolonial Tagalog, like the surrounding peoples not only in the archipelago but throughout Southeast Asia, domesticated foreign cultural practices and made them uniquely their own.³ As John Leddy Phelan (1959, viii–ix) observed in his classic work, *Hispanization of the Philippines*: “the Filipinos were no mere passive recipients of the cultural stimulus created by the Spanish conquest. . . . Their responses varied all the way from acceptance to indifference and rejection.”⁴ However, often the borrowing was done to such an extent that many have failed to differentiate from those aspects that were Tagalog and those that were Spanish. As reflected in J. C. van Leur’s (1967, 95) famous phrase of “the thin, flaking glaze,”⁵ the Spanish aspects provided the forms while the Tagalog aspects the thinking or heart behind the forms borrowed. By looking at counting and marking time, one can more easily track how the Tagalog selected what aspects of Spanish culture they wanted to borrow or adapt to their own.

A number of scholars have examined the matter of counting among the Tagalog of the early Spanish period. Jean-Paul G. Potet’s (1992) highly technical “Numeral Expressions in Tagalog” is extremely helpful in this area. He first explains the modern Tagalog system, which he terms a “calque of the Spanish model” and the “old system.” I am grateful for his work in explaining the intricacies of the old Tagalog numeral system. Ricardo Manapat’s (2001) paper, “Mathematical Ideas in Early Philippine Society,” seeks to bridge the gap between how the Tagalog counted and kept track of time.⁶ His work, like Potet’s, is informative, but both papers focus on different issues from this article.

Both rely heavily on Spanish sources or those who quote such sources. Moreover, the sources used for the most part date from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Potet does use the Dominican Francisco Blancas de San José’s (1610) *Arte y reglas de la lengua Tagala*. Pedro Serrano Laktaw’s (1914) *Diccionario Tagalog-Hispano*, a work that depended heavily on Spanish sources, features prominently in both works. This is not to discount Spanish sources but to point out two things. First, there should be a more discriminating use of such sources. The fact that an account or record was written does not make it a worthwhile source. Unfortunately, Gaspar de San Agustin’s works are still taken seriously, in spite of the fact that his work is eighteenth century, that it is a rehashing of seventeenth-century sources, and is colored by hostility against the Tagalog. Second, there are in fact Tagalog sources from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries that scholars have failed to examine and utilize. This article seeks to correct this latter shortcoming by utilizing Tomas Pinpin’s *Librong pagaaralan nang manga Tagalog nang uicang Castila* (1610).

Manapat’s focus is the presence of a mathematical system at the time of the Spanish intrusion. In doing this, he gives an extensive presentation of the precolonial counting system. Both Potet and Manapat have contributed significantly to our field of knowledge. Manapat makes the connection between counting and marking time. Potet points out the differences between the number system of the early Spanish Tagalog and the modern Tagalog. For example, as he points out, “Today’s Tagalog speakers do not know the multiplicands beyond *libo*. Instead they use *milyón* and *bilyón*.” These are used in the place of *ángaw* and *gatós* (Potet 1992, 169). Potet acknowledges that the present Tagalog way of counting differs from that of the past, stating, “It is extremely difficult to determine the period during

which the Tagalogs switched from the old to the modern system because examples in contemporary documents are few and far between” (ibid. 172). This article will demonstrate that this is not the case.

Vicente Rafael’s (1988) influential *Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Christian Conversion in Tagalog Society under Early Spanish Rule* has an entire chapter dedicated to Tomas Pinpin’s *Librong pagaaralan*. The fact that Pinpin’s first of five *cabanata* (sections or chapters) dealt with numbers makes numbers an important issue. As Rafael notes, “Pinpin’s decision to begin with numbers suggests that the ‘Tagalogs’ conception of the place of counting in language differed from that of the Spaniards” (ibid., 67). However, Rafael does not deal with the details of the counting system, but rather seeks to theorize the place of counting in Tagalog society. He writes: “We may infer, then, that for Tagalogs an important way of indicating the quality of something is to refer to quantity. The absence of arithmetic allows for the ready conversion of quality to quantity” (ibid., 69). As intriguing as this idea is, I see the quantification of reality, including time, as a mark of how the Tagalog viewed their world, the thinking behind which this discussion will show and explain.

To examine the issue of how counting and marking time changed, this article relies on Tagalog sources from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries. Why use documents written in Tagalog by the Tagalog? On the face of it, the answer is obvious.⁷ Such documents allow one to break through the mythical parchment curtain and set to the task of writing or rewriting the history of early Spanish Philippines. Among the information found in these documents are “the categories that the person and his peers used to classify himself and his thoughts and actions, as well as the phenomena surrounding him, thus studying concepts borne in a person’s language” (Lockhart 1992, 8).

The two main types of sources used are a book and a set of notarial documents. The book is Tomas Pinpin’s *Librong pagaaralan nang manga Tagalog nang uicang Castila* (A Book for the Tagalog to Learn the Spanish language), published in 1610. The notarial documents range in date from the late sixteenth century to the early eighteenth century. Pinpin’s work provides the foundation for understanding how the Tagalog counted and marked time, while the notarial documents demonstrate the evolution from the precolonial to a hybrid system. Together these sources make it possible to observe how the precolonial approach to counting and time changed due to the Spanish intrusion.

Pinpin’s *Librong pagaaralan*

Librong pagaaralan nang manga Tagalog nang uicang Castila (hereafter *Librong pagaaralan*) was one in a trio of books published between 1610 and 1613, or a generation after the Spaniards had taken Manila. All three were printed by the Dominican press in the Philippines, the only Spanish press in the islands at the time. In 1610 the press then located at Abucay, Bataan, produced *Arte y reglas de la lengua Tagala* by the Dominican Francisco Blancas de San José⁸ and *Librong pagaaralan* by Tomas Pinpin.⁹ Three years later, having been relocated to Pila, Laguna, the press printed *Vocabulario de la lengua Tagala* by the Franciscan Pedro de San Buenaventura.¹⁰ Each book was meant to serve a different purpose. Blancas’s work was a grammar, Pinpin’s a series of language lessons, and San Buenaventura’s a dictionary. In terms of worldview, the works of Blancas and San Buenaventura began in the Spanish world and sought to make some sense of the Tagalog world, while Pinpin began and stayed in the Tagalog world.

Pinpin is worth noting for several reasons. First, he was involved in all three works. He was not only the author of *Librong pagaaralan*, but also the listed printer for the *Arte* and the *Vocabulario*. (He was not listed as the printer of *Librong pagaaralan*; instead, Diego Talaghay is credited as the printer.) Second, Pinpin most likely served as an informant for Blancas’s work. His first chapter was similar to Blancas’s nineteenth chapter, with Pinpin’s being the basis for both. Third, he was not a friar or priest.¹¹ Lastly, he was a Tagalog, not a Spaniard like Blancas and San Buenaventura.

Pinpin was a Tagalog writing to his fellow Tagalog, a point he makes throughout his work. Unlike Blancas and San Buenaventura, he was not examining the Tagalog system; rather he was attempting to harmonize the indigenous and Spanish constructs to help transition his fellow Tagalog from their basic perceptions to those of the Spanish, perceptions which were similar to their own, yet with differences. What is more, unlike the various Tagalog documents of the period, his work is the only one that encapsulates the Tagalog vision of the world, its cultural matrix. *Librong pagaaralan* as a block of work provides a framework and a multifaceted insight into Tagalog society, including the Tagalog system of counting and marking time, among many other things.

Counting

Pinpin's *Librong pagaaralan* provides a full presentation of how the Tagalog of the early Spanish Philippines counted and marked time. His book is divided into five cabanata, with each section containing *aral* or lessons. The first section is foundational and important to this study; it consists of eight lessons, five dealing with numbers and one each dealing with currency, measurements, and time. The four lessons on numbers deal with cardinal, ordinal, and distributive numbers. The final lesson of the chapter deals with the transcribing of numerals, an essential skill because the Tagalog at the time wrote out the words for each of their numbers. Lesson five focuses on the rate of exchange between Tagalog and Spanish currencies. Lesson six covers land measurement and dry measure, and lesson seven deals with time. The material presented in these lessons focus primarily on economic transactions that required an understanding of the Tagalog equivalents for Spanish numbers, currency, measurements, and time.

The Tagalog culture at the beginning of the seventeenth century included an "intricate numeral system," one that is different from the modern Tagalog (Potet 1994, 1).¹² The old Tagalog system included: hundred (*daan*), thousand (*libo*), ten thousand (*laksa*), hundred thousand (*yuta*), million (*angaw*), ten million (*kati*), hundred million (*bahala*), and billion (*gatos*).¹³

Although base ten in nature, the Tagalog system of counting had no zero and only numbers one through nine, which were foundational and basic to all other numbers in Tagalog. Ten was literally *one ten*—*isa ng pouo*, stated as *sangpouo*, *sampu* in modern Tagalog. However, from eleven to nineteen, the word for ten was not used and the designations for the numbers were constructed by adding the prefix *labin* (*labing*) from *labi*, which meant surplus, excess, or remainder.¹⁴ Twenty was *dalauang pouo*—two tens—differing somewhat from the Spanish system in which *veinte* is a unique designation; while representing the value of two tens, it does not translate as two tens, but rather as twenty. Thirty was *tatlong pouo*—three tens, and so on.

While twenty was expressed as *dalauang pouo* (two tens), twenty-one was expressed as *maycatlon isa*, that is, one (*isa*) of the third (*maycatlo* from *tatlo*). This pattern continued throughout. Thirty-one was *maycapat-isa*, one of the fourth group; forty-one was *maycaliman-isa*; fifty-one, *mayca-anim-isa*, and so on.¹⁵ As Karl Menninger (1969, 27) noted of Old Norse, "the age of 48 is expressed as follows: 'he had 8 winters in the fifth decade.'"

The numbers ninety-one through ninety-nine were expressed as "of (one) hundred [the tenth set of ten] one, etc." (*maycaraan isa*, etc.). With *d* and *r* often interchangeable in Tagalog, *maycaraan isa* followed the pattern *mayca-daan*.

This pattern in Tagalog counting continued when expressing numbers over 100. While 100 was expressed as *sandaan* (*isa ng daan*, one hundred, as in Spanish), 101 was *labisandaan isa*, following the pattern of the numbers between ten and twenty. In turn, 200 was *dalauang daan*, but 201 was *maycatlon (daan) isa*, that is, one of the third group of hundred.

While the pattern might appear confusing, there was simplicity to this system. One had only to know the first nine numerals and then add the appropriate prefixes in order to create cardinal numbers, ordinals, distributives, fractions, and so on.

It should be noted that for all the intricacies of their system the Tagalog did not have digits. All numeric values had to be written out. Pinpin's eighth and final lesson in the first chapter deals with digits, which he refers to as the marks of counting (*manga tandá nang bilang*) and letters (*letra*, a borrowed word from Spanish), as Tagalog had no word for numerical digits. This, along with other factors, would indicate that the Tagalog prior to the Spanish presence had no equivalents for Spanish numerals, in spite of the Islamic influence from Brunei. Not until the eighteenth century, in the work of Juan Francisco de San Antonio, is any mention made of the pre-Spanish Tagalog method of computation. All mathematical calculations were worked out using pebbles and the results written in *baybayin*, the preconquest script (Blair and Robertson 1906, 40:364).¹⁶

Marking Time

As stated above, lesson seven of the first section (*Ycapitong aral*) of Pinpin's book deals with time. In marking time/duration, one must have "formalized reference points" (Hallowell 1937, 647). For Pinpin and his fellow Tagalog, as with most Southeast Asians, there was one such reference point: the present (Wolters 1999, 21). This present is not a "timeless present" or a "present orientation" with "the total absence of the past as a subject matter in their discourse" (Bloch 1977, 288) nor a motionless present (Geertz 1966, 66).¹⁷

Pinpin (1610/1910, 157) begins the seventh lesson in the first chapter with his "formalized reference point": Ngayon: *agora*: (now) *ngayong arao na yto*, *Oy este dia* (today). Beyond daily events, the Tagalog marked time

by numbering, based on the formalized reference point of the present. From that point, the day before today—yesterday (*cahapon*)—was preceded by *camacalaua* (the second day previous), *camacatlo* (the third day previous), and so on. Tomorrow (*bucas*) was followed by *macalaua* (two days from now), *macatlo* (three days from now), and so on. Weeks, months, and years were also numbered using the same referential system. As Pinpin notes, “This month, the coming month, the second month, the third month, and this way for the rest up to one year” (Ngayong bouang yto: *este mes*. sa ysang bouang darating, *el mes que viene*. Sa ycalauang bouan: *de aqui á dos meses*. Sa ycatlong bouan: *de aqui á tres meses*; at gayon ang lahat, hangan di macadating sa taong ysa) (ibid., 158). The present was always the formalized reference point. Rather than saying next month and the month after that, the Tagalog numbered or counted time.

In seventeenth-century Tagalog as in modern Tagalog, the word for day was *arao*, from the word for sun, the word for night was *gabi*, month was *bouan* from the word for moon, and year was *taon*, which meant “the assembling of many” (Blair and Robertson 1906, 40:359–60). *Linggo*, which was used to designate a week, was a relatively recent addition.¹⁸ These time segments were counted, whereas the day was divided into increments based on events in the day—the exceptions being *hating gabi* (half the night; midnight) and *saycatlo na ang gabi* (the third part of the night). Pinpin began his section on the twenty-four-hour day at midnight and moved chronologically through the day until he again reached midnight.

In the chart below, the Tagalog and the Spanish come from Pinpin’s lesson, while the English is not a translation, but the equivalent (Pinpin 1610/1910, 159). For example, *mahahating gab,y na* means it is the middle of the night now. Hector Santos’s (1996) article, “Ancient names for hours of the day,” has been especially helpful with the English equivalents.

TAGALOG	SPANISH	ENGLISH
Mahahating gab,y, na:	ya es cerca de media noche:	almost midnight
hating gab,y,	ya es de media noche:	midnight
mababao sa hating gab,y,	ya es más de media noche:	past midnight
Nagtalaoc na ang manoc,	ya han cantando los gallos el primer canto:	crowling of the rooster; around 4 A.M.
magmamarali nang arao,	ya es cerca el dia x ya poco falta para ser de dia:	just before daybreak

TAGALOG	SPANISH	ENGLISH
Magbubucan liuanag na,	ya quiere abrir el dia x ya quiere reir el alba x ya quiere amanecer:	the break of dawn
Omaga na,	ya esclarece x ya está claro x ya hay claridad:	it is morning
arao na,	ya es de dia:	the day is here
sisilang na ang arao,	ya quiere salir el sol x ya comienza á somar el sol:	the sun is about to rise
songmilang na ang arao,	ya ha salido el sol:	the sun has broken through the horizon
mataas na ang arao,	ya está algo alto el sol x ya está un poco alto el sol.	the sun is above the horizon; around 7 A.M.
Masasaolo na ang arao;	ya es cerca de medio dia:	the sun is almost overhead; around 11 A.M.
tanghali na,	ya es media dia:	noon
natatanghatanghali;	medio dia es en punto:	exactly noon
bagong naquiling ang arao;	ya comienz á declinar el sol:	just after noon; the sun has started to move toward the horizon
longmalo na sa tanghali;	ya es, mas de medio dia	past noon
Lolobog na ang arao,	ya se quiere poner el sol:	the sun is setting
longmobog na ang arao,	ya está puesto el sol.	the sun has set
Sisilim na;	ya comienza á oscurecer:	it is now getting dark
malaeta,	oscuro que ya no se conoce la gente	it is now dark (one cannot recognize other persons)
gab,y, na,	ya es la noche:	it is nighttime
icatotolog bata;	recien anochesido:	time for children to sleep
ihahapon dalam;	ya es hora de dormir las gentes:	time for all to sleep
saycatlo na ang gab,y,	ya es pasada la tercera parte de la noche:	the third part of the night; from 10 P.M. to midnight
caboong gab,y;	media noche	Here there is a difference between Pinpin’s Tagalog and Spanish equivalent

In Tagalog the phrase *caboong gabi* means the whole night, whereas *media noche* means the middle of the night. Santos (1996, 4) correctly points out that Blancas’s *Arte* included eleven terms to cover the period from 4:00 A.M. to 8:00 AM, nine having to do with sunrise. In addition, nine terms

covered the period from 4:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M., five having to do with sunset. Pinpin, on the other hand, does not give the same detailed information, giving those aspects which have Spanish translations. Blancas gives the hour for some of the Tagalog time periods.

The Tagalog and Time

With reference to time, the Tagalog system was relational rather than absolute. Juan Francisco de San Antonio wrote in his *Cronicas* (1738): “They [the Tagalog] had a word to signify seasons and climates, namely *panahòn*. But they never knew the word ‘time’ [*tiempo*], in its general sense, and there is no proper Tagalog word for it; but they use the Spanish word only, corrupted after their manner, for they make it *tiyempo*” (Blair and Robertson 1906, 40:359–60).

Over a century earlier, San Buenaventura provided information regarding the word *tiempo* in his *vocabulario*. In the first half, in which Tagalog equivalents were given for Spanish words, one finds the following: *bayan*, *panahon*, *camasahan*, *casagsagan*, *sucat*, *agbay*. In the second half, much abbreviated as single words are usually given, the equivalents for *panahon* are *cosecha*, *temporal*, and *tiempo*.

It is *panahon* that has come to essentially become the word for time. In *Vicassan's Pilipino-English Dictionary* (1986), *panahon* is defined as: time; period of time; era; epoch; season. Listed after *panahon* are: *panahong kasalukuyan*, present time; *panahong darating*, time to come; *panahong haharapin*, future time; *panahong lumipas*, past time; *panahong nagdaan*, past time. That is, the past, present, and future are spoken of in terms of season: *panahon*.¹⁹

As Leopold E. A. Howes (1981, 223) notes about another Southeast Asian people:

Balinese do not, in fact, have a concept of ‘time’ as such; no word in their language designates a concept which overlaps perfectly with ours. What they have is a set of concepts, the structure and content of which is not the same as ours but which nonetheless bears comparison. It is the presence of some similarities which makes a discussion of the differences possible.

Although it has been argued that Southeast Asians, and therefore the Tagalog, lacked a linear sense of time,²⁰ Nancy Farriss (1995, 112–13) makes

the point that all conceptions of time incorporate both linear and cyclical features. Rather than expressing a perception of time, counting time should be seen as marking duration.

In the West, “psychological significance of time-consciousness” is seen in part in temporal disorientation as a sign of some mental disorder (Hallowell 1937, 650). If an individual has suffered some injury, such as a concussion, he or she is asked: “Do you know what day it is?” In a linear system, any failure to correctly identify the day is seen as an indication of a significant problem. But with the present as the formalized reference point and temporal distance marked by counting, any Tagalog contemporary with Pinpin would only be able to answer such a question with, “Of course, it is today.”

While the Tagalog did recognize the year as a time measurement, they did not count or number their years. This convention they borrowed from the Spaniards. But as Hallowell (*ibid.*, 665) pointed out, “recognition of a yearly interval by no means implies that the year [is taken] as a temporal unit . . .”

Animism

What was the driving force behind such a sense of time? Animism or “the immanence of life” as James J. Fox refers to it, was the governing principle of the religion of the Tagalog (Reid 1993, 138). Benedict Anderson’s (1990, 22) essay on “The Idea of Power in Javanese Culture” is a primer on animism; he states: “Power is that intangible, mysterious, and divine energy which animates the universe. It is manifested in every aspect of the natural world, in stones, trees, clouds, and fire . . . there is no sharp division between organic and inorganic matter, for everything is sustained by the same invisible power.” Anthony Reid (1992, 137–38), in writing on animism, notes:

The whole material world was animated by spirits that needed sustenance and propitiation. Modern theorists have interpreted this multiplicity as forming part of a cosmic unity, a single animating principle . . . Ritual and shamanistic activity was usually designed, therefore, for immediate practical ends. Spiritual forces had to be manipulated to cure illness, ensure fertility, increase power, safeguard the living, particularly at dangerous life crises . . .

Farriss (1995, 114) notes that “concepts of time are intimately bound up with concepts of the sacred to form part of a particular understanding of the way the cosmos works and the way that man relates to it.” As O. W. Wolters

has noted, Southeast Asia was “a world where people were religious, where this world was ephemeral” (Reid 1979, 7).

The Tagalog marking of time was a reflection or by-product of the animism that governed their view of reality. Existential in nature, the reference point was the present. The past, while it was acknowledged, was not tracked or reckoned but referenced with events as markers. Beyond that: “Southeast Asian cultures are well-known for their indifference to the past for its own sake” (Wolters 1999, 187).

The focus of much of the writing of Spanish religious and civil authorities was on the various aspects of local religion involved with propitiating the powers or spirits believed to be controlling different aspects of the material world, and not the overall system of thought behind these practices. The principle governing these practices was an existential view, a rootedness in the present. All practices were tied to present or “immediate practical ends,” to use Reid’s (1993, 137) phrase. Propitiation, possession of amulets and other objects, and other “religious” activities were tied to the present, rarely the future, as in a good harvest, and never the past.

Pinpin’s purpose is allegedly religious as seen in the introduction to his lessons, which begins with a doxology of sorts thanking the Lord our God (*P. N. Dios*) for the fact that they (i.e., Pinpin and his readers) had become Christians (Pinpin 1610/1910, 141). Yet, for all of his stated intentions for his book as a means to make Tagalog better Christians, Pinpin writes as an animist. Thus Pinpin begins where one would expect: *ngayon*, now. While Pinpin’s presentation certainly gives one insight into how the Tagalog reckoned time, it raises more questions than it answers. The Spanish presence brought three significant innovations: names for days, names for months, and numbers for years. Yet Pinpin failed to mention them in the section on marking time or anywhere else in his book.

It would have seemed reasonable that, for religious purposes, at least the concept of *Domingo* (Sunday) would have found its way into his lessons, but it did not. Even though a *confesionario* (guide for the ritual of confession) was included at the end of his lessons,²¹ it was not intended to be a means of teaching the Tagalog new concepts of time. The only instance in which the *confesionario* even referred to these Spanish constructs of time is found in the section on the commandment regarding the Sabbath. Here and only here are the days Sunday and Friday mentioned by name,²² and the reader is assumed to know what they mean.

In the area of marking time within the twenty-four hour context, after attempting briefly to explain the Western concept of hours,²³ Pinpin soon reverts back to the position of the sun as his means of marking day time. His approach suggests several possibilities: that he himself did not fully understand the Spanish method of tracking time; that clocks were not common even among the Spaniards in the islands and thus not significant to everyday events; that the Spaniards with whom Pinpin’s readers would come into contact would have had to make the adjustment to the Tagalog method of tracking time, one based on events.

It seems strange that Pinpin does not mention what one would assume to be important material: the names of the days of the week, the names of the months, and the concept of numbering years. After all, as he tells his readers, Pinpin was seeking to create a *ladino* (bilingual [Tagalog and Spanish]) class who would be able to function in both worlds.²⁴ Knowing such information would be critical, particularly in the writing of documents that would need to be dated, following the Spanish system. Could it be that his readers already possessed this knowledge? Even if they did, one would reasonably expect to find at least a passing mention of the information. One senses reticence, almost resistance, to include this information, material that had significant Christian overtones. His failure to convey materials to his readers—from the numbering of the hours of the day (something that would have appealed to the Tagalog sensibility and important for knowing when particular religious activities took place), to giving the names of the days of the week (Sunday is of obvious importance, but there is Ash Wednesday, Good Friday, and so on), to the names of the months, and the numbering of years (as in the year of our Lord)—points to Pinpin’s remaining within the Tagalog system of marking time. He was writing as an animist.

Evolving Hybrids

Although Pinpin did not include the information regarding names of months and the numbering of years, the Tagalog adapted quickly. At the time of the Spanish intrusion, the Tagalog recognized the year as a temporal unit, but did not reckon time by means of counting or numbering years; they made the adjustment. Actually, two adjustments were made; the first was the matter of numbering years; the second involved their counting system.

The adjustments are seen during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Tagalog documents, that is, documents written in Tagalog by the

Tagalog involving legal matters under the Spanish presence. They provide evidence of a dual adaptation and transition from the Tagalog system of counting time to a new hybrid system made up of both Spanish and Tagalog indicators. This change is demonstrated most clearly in the dating of the documents.

Although they exist, Tagalog documents are relatively few in number (compared with the number from the colonial period found in Mexico, for example) and are scattered both chronologically and geographically. As a result, the historian is limited when dealing with early Spanish Philippines. As is the case with early Latin American history:

There is a cycle of sources, from more to less synthetic . . . the main elements of the series are 1) contemporary books and other formal accounts, which we call 'chronicles'; 2) official correspondence; 3) the internal records of institutions; 4) litigation; 5) notarial records. With the chronicles, a sort of narrative history is practically ready made; the scope of reference is then gradually reduced as one proceeds through the series until in the notarial records the historian is confronted with an individual item about one ordinary person on one day of his life. The sources also get less and less accessible as one proceeds down the list, both in the physical sense and in the sense of requiring more special skills for use. They become more primary, minute, local, fresh, and of more direct interest to social history. (Lockhart 1992, 3)

Indigenous language documents usually fall in the last two categories: litigation and notarial records. Yet for all the limitations the documents might put on the historian, they are invaluable as “language itself turns out to be an *irreplaceable vehicle for determining the nature and rate of general cultural evolution*” (ibid., 89, italics added).

Several points should be taken into consideration before examining the documents that clearly illustrate these changes. First, while these documents were written in Tagalog, the Tagalog region was quite diverse at the time and one cannot expect to find a uniformity of usage throughout the region.²⁵ Second, these documents were written by different *escribanos* (notaries), each with his own style. The trio of documents from Maybonga, mentioned below, for example, while coming from the same town in Pasig and generated within a seventeen-month period of each other, was written

by three different notaries each with his own orthography. Nevertheless, one still finds a pattern emerging that indicates there was a steady transition from the Tagalog system of counting to that of the Spanish.

One is able to track the changes because the documents followed the formula found in Spanish legal writing. First, the place or location of the writing of the document is stated. In Tagalog documents, this would be *Sa bayan nang* and then the name of the place. Second, the date of the writing of the said document is given, first stating the day, then the month, followed by the year. Third, the person recording the document is identified. The listing of the date makes the task of following the evolution much easier.

There are, in fact, three identifiable stages found in the dating of seventeenth and eighteenth century documents. The first stage was thoroughly Tagalog, as found in Pinpin's *Librong pagaaralan*. One of the oldest existing Tagalog documents is dated 1583 and was written on behalf of a group of *datus*. The date is written as *ycalimang arao nang buang Mayo nang taong sang libot limang daan at maycasiyam tatlong taon* (the fifth day of the month of May of the year one thousand five hundred and three of the ninth group of tens). One of the famous baybayin (Tagalog script) documents housed at the University of Santo Tomas archives is dated in the text as: *libo anim na raan taon may ikatlong limang taon*. This represented: one thousand, six hundred years and five of the third set of tens (25) years (Villamor 1922, 92–97).²⁶ Two documents from the Augustinian archive in Valladolid also illustrate the system employed by Pinpin. One was dated 4 June 1634—*sa apat na arao nang Junio at sa labi sa libon anim na daan at micapat apat na taon*—and the other 6 September 1638—*anim na arao nang bouang Sept[iembre] sa taong sang libot anim na raan maycapat ualo*.²⁷ Thus we see that documents from the first half of the seventeenth century, to express the Spanish numbering of years, followed the old Tagalog method of counting and expressing numbers.

The second stage ran from about 1650 to 1685. In this stage, the Spanish system of counting was used to express the number of the years. There is, however, the appearance of the Tagalog word *labi* (as in the second document of the earlier stage). Several examples illustrate this trend. The first was dated 1665—*labi sa libot anim na raan anim na pouo at limang taon*, more than (one) thousand six hundreds six tens and five years.²⁸ The second was dated 1681—*nang labi sa libon anim na daan ualong pouo at ysang taon*, more than (one) thousand six hundreds eight tens and one

year.²⁹ The last read, 1685—*sa labi sa libo anim na daan ualong pouo at limang taon*.³⁰ This practice of using labi was found well into the middle of the eighteenth century.

By the end of the seventeenth century, the Tagalog had more thoroughly adopted the Spanish method of expressing numbers, at least to designate the years. This usage was still not uniform, however. Three petitions from Maybonga, located in Pasig outside of Manila, followed the Spanish pattern—*san libot anim na daan siam na pouo at anim na taon*, one thousand six hundreds nine tens and one year.³¹ This pattern is found in the majority of Tagalog documents well into the eighteenth century. Yet this stage also found the Tagalog employing other methods as well. In a document dated 1698 (in which there were fifteen signatures, seven of them being in baybayin) the number of the year was written in numerals.³² A document from 1714 used Tagalog to express the day of the month and Spanish for the year—*ysang arao nang bouang jullo de mille sete cientos y catorce años*, first day of the month of July, (one) thousand seven hundreds and fourteen years.³³

Sebastian Totanes in his *Arte de la lengua tagala* (1745) stated that the Tagalog used the Spanish system when addressing Spaniards and the Tagalog system when addressing fellow Tagalog: “Though today, when communicating with Spaniards, many are those who count as we do. Thus they will say *dalawang puo at isa*, twenty-one; *san daan at lima*, one hundred and five; *limang daang dalawang puo at lima*, five hundred and twenty-five, and so on with the other numbers” (cited in Potet 1994, 17). But this claim is not borne out by the evidence available. For example, a document from 1722 has: *may catlong dalauang arao nang bouang Febrero sang libo at pitong daan at dalauang pouong taon* (the second of the third set [of ten] day of the month of February one thousand and seven hundred and twenty [two tens]).³⁴ While the Tagalog changed to the Spanish system for expressing the year of a given date, well into the eighteenth century they retained the Tagalog system for expressing the day of the month. While there are exceptions, the pattern generally accepted was to use the Spanish system for the number of the years and the Tagalog system for the number of the days.³⁵

As the Spanish influence became more pervasive, a hybrid numerical system, one that combined and expressed both Tagalog and Spanish numerical values, inevitably resulted. The indigenous population used, for example, Tagalog for the day of the month and Spanish to mark hours. Such

a blending of cultures is still evident in modern Tagalog. Spanish is used for specifying hours and minutes (for example, *a las dos na* [it’s two o’clock already] is used, not *dalawa na*), but times of the day, such as morning and afternoon, are expressed in Tagalog: *umaga at hapon* (morning and afternoon). *Tanghali* is used to signify noon.³⁶

By the beginning of the nineteenth century, what one found was a hybrid of expressions, both linguistic and numerical. Affected as well was one’s sense of time. While the Spanish system provided a basis and means for regarding the past, the Tagalog system took into account and reflected the existential moment, the now. One could therefore argue that the Tagalog adopted the Spanish terminology required to function in a Spanish world, while retaining their own perspectives on the nature of reality. The past took on another dimension. It became important for its use, and yet was not always marked or counted in the Spanish way.

This is illustrated by Tagalog documents written during the 1745 “revolt” in the Tagalog provinces. In making their case that the Dominicans had wrongly taken their land, the people of the town of Silang wrote to Pedro Calderón Henríquez, an *oidor* (a judge or magistrate with additional authority, in this case, to investigate the uprising) of the Audiencia of Manila, who had been sent to deal with the uprising. Although there can be no question, based on the Tagalog documents mentioned above, that the people of Silang knew how to mark time in the Spanish way, they used events as reference points for the past. They reported that “the reason for the misery which engulfs us is because the fathers of St. Dominic have taken the land which was ours before we became Christians” (Cushner 1973, 51). Rather than give a date using the Spanish system they referenced the past in terms of events. And the event had religious overtones: “before we became Christians.”

Animists or Christians?

Did the shift to the Spanish way of marking time indicate the conversion of the Tagalog to Catholicism? No. To use J. C. van Leur’s phrase, Catholicism was a “thin and flaking glaze” in both Tagalog society and in Pinpin’s work. That is, Catholicism remained a surface system of values, while not significantly affecting Tagalog core values.

However, in dealing with the matter of marking time, perhaps it might be better to think, as Melba P. Maggay puts it, in terms of “survival

values.” These were “developed as coping strategies in the face of colonial oppression and marginalization” (cited in Mendoza 2006, 71).³⁷ Thus, while Pinpin wrote his book to help the Tagalog survive in the Spanish dominated marketplace, his fellow Tagalog learned rather quickly to make the necessary adjustments—as in counting time as the Spaniards did—as well as unnecessary adjustments—as in following the Spanish pattern. In time, maycatlong-isa became *dalawampu’t isa*. The second change was the result of choice, not necessity.

The Tagalog borrowed the forms but not necessarily the thinking behind them. The core value remained animism and its attendant worldview, while the surface/survival values included a hybrid of Tagalog and Spanish forms. This synthesis is what is found in Filipino society.

Virgilio G. Enriquez (1994) has argued that this has continued to the present, referring to modern Filipinos as Christianized animists or *anitists* (from the word *anito*, meaning spirit or ancestral god). Quoting Teodoro Agoncillo in this regard he maintained, “while statistics show that Catholics comprise 83 percent of the total population, actually the genuine Catholics do not probably comprise 0.5 percent of the whole population” (ibid., 4). Maggay (1987, 3) notes:

It is widely conceded that Christianity, as it was brought to these shores, has yet to grip the indigenous imagination . . . The Filipino’s mythology—his way of looking at the world, his beliefs about his origins and the realm of the supernatural—remained largely untouched and unaltered. What transpired was a transformation in form rather than meaning, hence the continuing animistic element in religious beliefs and practices.

As mentioned at the beginning of the article, Filipinos have chosen certain aspects of Spanish forms while retaining some of their own. There is a symbiotic relationship between the core values and survival values. But the relationship is not always a smooth one. *Ang Dambuhalang Pagkakahating Kultural* (The Great Cultural Divide) is a reflection of this. Maggay argues that

Perhaps the greatest single source of anomie in this country, there exists in the Philippines an invisible yet impermeable dividing line

between those who are able to function within the borrowed ethos of power structures transplanted from without and those who have remained with the functional meaning system of the indigenous culture . . . this sharp disjunction in sensibility has on top a thin layer of culture brokers known as the “ladino” class . . . The vast bottom half consists of that supposedly silent and inert mass whose universe of discourse is limited to the indigenous languages and whose subterranean consciousness has remained impervious to colonial influence. (cited in Mendoza 2006, 96)

This also explains in part the evolution of various aspects of Tagalog thinking and society. There is, for example, the concept of *utang na loob*, something not mentioned by Pinpin but included in San Buenaventura’s *Vocabulario: otangloob, obligacion*, obligation. By the time of the Philippine Revolution (almost three centuries after Pinpin’s work), *utang na loob* came to have an unstated but implicit temporal aspect to its meaning. Although there are other aspects to the concept of *utang na loob*, such as the hierarchical and unequal nature of the relationship between the parties involved (Rafael 1988, 128–131), the temporal aspect becomes more important. Reynaldo Ileto (1998, 1) illustrates this when he writes of the war against Spain: “For the people to have arrived at a state of mind in which such a break or separation was possible, if not inevitable, their conceptions of the past—after all *utang na loob* is based on remembrance of the past—must have changed.”³⁸ Yet as stated above, Tagalog society at the coming of the Spaniards did not have a sense of chronology in terms of history. They adopted this from Spanish culture and adapted it for their own purposes.

Conclusion

Pinpin wrote his book, in part, to help the Tagalog learn the Spanish system, a system that existed within a much different context. Why learn a new system? Why make any changes at all? The Tagalog had not learned the Chinese system, as best we can tell, even though the Chinese had been trading in the area near Manila since at least the thirteenth century. There was much to be gained from adopting the Chinese system; yet the Tagalog did not do so. The significant difference became plain: Spaniards, like the other Westerners who would come to Southeast Asia, did not come to participate in trade, they came to control trade. They would be in control of

the marketplace, establishing the rules under which commerce would take place. Thus Pinpin goes to great lengths to explain the Spanish system, with its Tagalog equivalents, in great detail.

Pinpin's primary purpose for writing *Librong pagaaralan* seems apparent when one reviews the material he presented and the manner in which it was organized. His goal, although unstated, was survival and to enable his fellow Tagalog to survive. In a world in which the Spanish had reconstructed the reality in which the Tagalog were to live and do business, the Tagalog might be lost. Farriss (1984, 256–85) writes of Mayan survival as a “corporate enterprise” and indeed, as in Latin America, the Tagalog adapted and used *compadrazgo* (ritual kinship) as one means of survival. *Librong pagaaralan*, however, was one man's contribution to the goal of survival.

In a real sense, his goal was not the dissemination of knowledge or information per se, but to provide tools for survival. In practical terms, survival had to begin in the marketplace, which was now controlled by the Spaniards. This covert purpose must have escaped the notice of the Spanish censors who then controlled the content of all published materials. Approval was given by a censor named Fr. Roque de Barrionuevo,³⁹ probably for at least two reasons: Pinpin's professed religious intentions and the addition of a confessional guide near the end of his work.

Yet, in fact, his fellow Tagalog, *mga kapwa* or as he would write it *manga capoua Tagalog*, went beyond what he had to teach. They learned about the names of days and months, as well as the numbering of years. One might argue that they had to do so. The reality is that they chose to do so. In the process, they adapted an existing system of counting to one patterned after Spanish. Maycatlong isa became dalawam pu't isa.

Other changes happened as well. The Tagalog, and other Filipinos as well, learned to survive within a system of hybrids: Spanish for centavos and Tagalog for pesos; Spanish for hours of the day and Tagalog for times of the day; survival values and core values.

Notes

I am grateful to Prof. Nenita Pambid Domingo for her help with the English translation of various Tagalog portions included in this essay.

- 1 I would like to thank a former student, Francis “Ted” Mempo, who pointed this out to me many years ago. It is one of those things that, when mentioned to others, generally generates the response, “Ay, oo nga” (Oh, yes, indeed). And then, “Bakit kaya?” (Why so?). That is what this article seeks to answer.

- 2 As William Henry Scott (1994, 281 n. 33) points out, these designations did not appear in the early dictionaries.
- 3 This reflected a pattern found throughout Southeast Asia, as Craig Reynolds (1995, 431) has noted. “Domestication,” “vernacularization,” “indigenization,” and “localization” are names historians give to the processes by which Southeast Asian agency may be traced, the consequences of Southeast Asian will. They are evidence of the capacity of Southeast Asian societies to shape change. The stress on localizing agency shifts the focus onto Southeast Asians and their future, away from their suspect origin as mere borrowers and culture brokers.
- 4 The full title of Phelan's book is *The Hispanization of the Philippines: Spanish Aims and Filipino Responses, 1565–1700*. It represented a new direction in Philippine historiography. Written by someone who neither visited the Philippines nor learned any Filipino language, this work represented the beginning or attempted beginning of a social history, for it sought, as the subtitle indicates, not only to examine the aims of the Spanish intruders but the responses of the Filipinos.
- 5 In writing about the nature of Indian and Islamic influence in Indonesia, van Leur (1967, 95) affirmed: “They did not bring about any fundamental changes in any part of Indonesian social and political order. The sheen of the world religions and foreign cultural forms is a thin and flaking glaze; underneath it, the whole of the old indigenous forms has continued to exist—with many sorts of gradations appearing, of course, according to the cultural level” (cited in Reynolds 1995, 431). This issue will be dealt with later in this article.
- 6 I am grateful to the editor for bringing this work to my attention.
- 7 As James Lockhart (1992, 7) has noted: “I need not belabor the advantage of using records produced in the mother tongue by the subjects of a given historical study. Wherever native-language materials have been available, they have been used as the primary source for writing a people's history.”
- 8 The Dominican Francisco Blancas de San José arrived in the Philippines in 1595 and was assigned to the province of Bataan. He learned Tagalog so quickly that “he began to preach in it within three months, and could teach it to others in six” (Wolf 1947, 10). In the early years of the seventeenth century, Blancas authored a series of books in Tagalog for the Tagalog. In his listing of the first books printed in Tagalog, with the exception of the first—the *Doctrina Christiana*—P. Van der Loon (1966, 43) lists Blancas as the author of the first five books in Tagalog: *Libro de nuestra Señora del Rosario* (1602); *Libro de los Sacramentos* (1603); *Libro de quatro postrimerias* (1604); *Memorial de la vida christiana* (1605); and *Tratado del sacramento de la confesión* (c. 1607). These books were not for Spanish friars but for the *indio* converts. In the dedication to his work *Memorial de la vida christiana*, Blancas informed his readers that his next work, which was to be on confession, “would be his last book for laymen; thereafter he intended to write for the missionaries who had to learn the language.” However, on his transfer back to Abucay, Bataan, he was instructed to continue printing the books that he had written in Tagalog (ibid., 38–39). The *Arte y reglas de la lengua Tagala* marked a significant shift in Blancas's work. It was a book for Spaniards to enable them to learn Tagalog. Four years after its publication, Blancas died.
- 9 Not much is known of Tomas Pinpin. Believed to be from the town of Abucay in the province of Bataan, where the Dominican press was located in 1610, he is remembered for his work as a printer and the significant works on which he was listed as printer. What Pinpin did before becoming a printer is not known, but there are hints in several sections of his book. It appears

that, previous to printing, he had been a teacher of Spanish to other Tagalog. Whether or not he was paid for this service is not known, but he indicated that he was successful in his teaching. As he tells his readers: "Is it not that other fellow Tagalog were the same ones whom I taught with these writings of mine so that in barely a year they were able to learn so much? This is why, upon seeing their learning, which came from this work of mine, I was delighted and attempted to publish these collected lessons: so that like them, you can also benefit, all of you who have wanted to obtain this valuable language" (Ay ano, baquin ang ibang manga tauo capoua natin tagalog ay silang maralan co niton manga catha cong ito ay di na taonan ay magsialam na ang dami nang naalaman nila. Caya nga sa natanto co yaong canilang caronongan, na dito rin sa manga gaua cong ito napaquinabang nila ay aco,y, matoua ngani at mangbanta na acong isalimbagan itong madlang aral: nang paraparang magsipaquinabang nito cayong lahat na magaalang magsicap nanag camahalan at dili aco nacabata) (Pinpin 1610/1910, 147–48 cited in Rafael 1988, 59–60). Based on Retana (1911, 29–128), the following books list Pinpin as the printer, with the books' authors in parentheses:

- 1610 *Arte y Reglas de la Lengua Tagala* (Fr. Francisco Blancas de San José)
- 1613 *Vocabulario de la lengua Tagala* (Fr. Pedro de San Buenaventura)
- 1623 *Relacion Verdadera del Insigne y excelente Martyrio* (Fr. Melchor de Manzano); *Virgen S. Mariano tattoq I Rosarion iardin fanazoni tatoyuru qio* (Fr. Juan de los Angeles)
- 1625 *Relacion de Martirio* (anonymous); *Relacion Verdadera y Breve de la Persecucion y martyrios* (Fr. Diego de San Francisco)
- 1626 *Triunfo del Santo Rosario y Orden de S. Domingo en los Reynos del Japon* (Fr. Francisco Carrero)
- 1627 *Arte de la Lengua Iloca* (Fr. Francisco Lopez)
- 1630 *Vocabulario de Iapón declarado primero en Portugues* (anonymous); *Ritual para Adminstrar los Sanctos Sacramentos* (Fr. Alonso de Mentrída)
- 1636 *Confesionario en lengua tagala* (Fr. Pedro de Herrera)
- 1637 *Sucesos Felices* (anonymous)
- 1639 *Relacion de lo que asta agora se a sabido de la Vida y Martirio del Jesuita P. Mastrilli* (Fr. Geronimo Perez)

10 Pedro de San Buenaventura, a Franciscan, arrived in the Philippines one year before Blancas and was assigned to a variety of postings, all in Tagalog-speaking areas. He became part of a strong Franciscan tradition of producing works in Tagalog, the vast majority of which were never printed due to the absence of a printing press owned or controlled by the Franciscans. A partial list of the Franciscan linguists of note includes: Juan de Oliver, Juan de Plasencia, Miguel de Talavera, Diego de la Asunción, and Gerónimo Monte. The reason given for the fact that most of their work was never published is given in the Franciscan historical report: "since their writings are so common and so well received by all the orders. They have not been printed because they are voluminous, and there are no arrangements in this kingdom for printing so much. Those things that have been printed, as being urgently needed for the instruction of the native, are the following . . ." (Blair and Robertson 1906, 35:312–13). The first book listed is San Buenaventura's *Vocabulario*. Plasencia had written an *arte* and *vocabulario* earlier, but it was not printed. San Buenaventura stated near the end of his *vocabulario* that he had begun on 20 May 1606 and completed the work on 27 May

1613. But as P. Sanchez points out in the introduction to the recent reprint of San Buenaventura's *Vocabulario*, more than the work of an individual, it represented the culmination of the collective efforts of various Franciscans over thirty years beginning in 1580 (*El Vocabulario de fray Pedro, más que la obra de un individuo, significa la culminación del proyecto iniciado en el Capítulo custodial celebrado en Manila en 1580 y gestado a lo largo de cerca de treinta años de esfuerzo misionero de una colectividad: la Orden Franciscana de Filipinas*). It also represented Spanish efforts to enter the Tagalog world.

- 11 This would not have been possible based on the racial barrier, which prevented Filipinos from joining any of the mendicant orders; see Woods 1991.
- 12 Potet's (1992) *Numeral Expressions in Tagalog* is extremely helpful in this area. He first explains the modern Tagalog system, which he terms a "calque of the Spanish model" and then the "old system." His historical research in deciphering the old system is primarily based on dictionaries and grammars. I am grateful for his work in explaining the intricacies of the old Tagalog numeral system.
- 13 Potet (1994, 7) mentions Blancas's failure to go beyond *yuta* and was confused about *bahala*: "*Millares de yuta, no se conoce: sino dizen sang bahala, que es dixer un que se yo, ycao na ang bahala, echa por es sos trigos de Dios que ya no se puede pensar* (The expression for thousand *yuta* is unknown, instead they will say *sang bahala*, which somehow means *Ikaw na ang bahala* [You take care of everything], but they must be mistaken because it does not even begin to make sense)." Potet poses several possibilities for Blancas's error: he failed to distinguish between *bahala* as hundred million and *bahala* as responsibility, the difference being in pronunciation; his informants may not have known the system to its full extent; those Tagalog who did understand the system were unwilling to explain it to Blancas. The last two reasons seem unlikely as Pinpin was one of his informants. It has been suggested that the error Blancas made was in mistaking *bathala* for *bahala*, *bathala* being the Tagalog word for the Supreme Being. Thus, the expression was *bathala na*, a Tagalog equivalent of *Inshallah*. It may be that by the seventeenth century the pronunciation of *bathala na* had deteriorated to *bahala na*.
- 14 *Labin ysa, onze* (eleven); *labin dalaua, doze* (twelve); *labin tatlo, treze* (thirteen); *labin apat, catorze* (fourteen); *labin lima, quinze* (fifteen); *labin anim, diez y seis* (sixteen); *labin pito, diez y siete* (seventeen); *labin ualo, diez y ocho* (eighteen); *labin siyam, diez y nueve* (nineteen). Potet (1994, 20) argues that the word for "the first power of ten" is understood but erased. Thus, eleven, although rendered as *labin ysa*, the full understanding is *labin sa puo isa*, or more than ten one.
- 15 Pinpin's first lesson begins: "Ysa, *uno* (one); *dalaua, dos* (two); *tatlo, tres* (three); *apat, quatro* (four); *lima, cinco* (five); *anim, seis* (six); *pito, siete* (seven); *ualo, ocho* (eight); *siyam, nueve* (nine); *sangpouo, diez* (ten). *Labin ysa, onze* (eleven); *labin dalaua, doze* (twelve); *labin tatlo, treze* (thirteen); *labin apat, catorze* (fourteen); *labin lima, quinze* (fifteen); *labin anim, diez y seis* (sixteen); *labin pito, diez y siete* (seventeen); *labin ualo, diez y ocho* (eighteen); *labin siyam, diez y nueve* (nineteen); *dalauang pouo, veinte* (twenty). *Maycatlon isa, veinte y uno* (twenty-one); *maycatlon dalaua, veinte y dos* (twenty-two); *maycatlon tatlo, veinte y tres* (twenty-three); *maycatlon apat, veinte y quatro* (twenty-four); *maycatlon lima, veinte y cinco* (twenty-five); *maycatlon anim, veinte y seis* (twenty-six), *maycatlon pito, veinte y siete* (twenty-seven); *maycatlon ualo, veinte y ocho* (twenty-eight); *maycatlon siyam, veinte y nueve* (twenty-nine); *tatlong pouo, treinta* (thirty). *Maycapat isa, treinta y uno* (thirty-one); *maycapat dalaua, treinta y dos* (thirty-two); *maycapat tatlo, treinta y tres* (thirty-three); *maycapat apat, treinta y quatro*

(thirty-four); maycapat lima, *treinta y cinco* (thirty-five); maycapat anim, *treinta y seis* (thirty-six); maycapat pito, *treinta y siete* (thirty-seven); maycapat ualo, *treinta y ocho* (thirty-eight); maycapat siyam, *treinta y nueve* (thirty-nine); apat na pouo, *quarenta* (forty). Maycaliman isa, *quarenta y uno* (forty-one). Ang ybang ysusunod dito, ay uala nang liuag: yayamang manga camocha din nitong sinabi ngayong pagbubuhay nang pagtuturing nang bilang hangang sa limang pouo, *cinquenta* (fifty); anim na pouo, *sesenta* (sixty); pitong pouo, *setenta* (seventy); ualong pouo, *ochenta* (eighty); siyam na pouo, *noventa* (ninety); sangdaan, *ciento* (one hundred).” [What follows here is no longer difficult; since the origin of the terms for the numbers up to fifty (five tens) are similar: sixty (six tens), seventy (seven tens), eighty (eight tens), ninety (nine tens); one hundred.] Ay ang manga pagipagitan nitong manga bilang ay para din naman niyong na onang pagitan, nang dalawang pouo, nang tatlong pouo. [The intervals of these numbers are similar to those intervals of twenty (two tens), of thirty (three tens).] (Pinpin 1610/1910, 149)

- 16 According to San Antonio’s *Cronicas* (1738–1744): “So was their usage in their business. Although there are no arithmetical [sic] numbers among their characters, such as we use, they counted with little stones, making small heaps of them, and made use of the natural words of their own speech, which are very expressive in Tagalog; and they did not feel their ignorance of the numbers written in their own characters; for they could express the highest number very clearly by word of mouth” (Blair and Robertson 1906, 40:493).
- 17 The essays by Bloch (1977), Howe (1981), and Geertz (1966) all deal with the Balinese and their notions of time. While there are some similarities between the Balinese world and that of the Tagalog, there are also significant differences.
- 18 John Wolff (1976, 351) has argued that *linggo* in Tagalog (Sunday, week) is from the Malay *minggu* (Sunday, week) which is from the Portuguese *Domingo* (Sunday). The Portuguese conquest of Malacca occurred in 1511 and marked the beginning of Portuguese influence. Malay language and culture were influenced and that influence also affected the Tagalog.
- 19 A 1998 calendar produced by Tahanan Books in Manila was based on the *mata-on*, seasons, of the Kankana-ey people, an ethnic minority found in the Cordilleras of Northern Luzon. The text, written by Wasing D. Sacla, divides the year into “12 short seasonal periods” that correspond to the months of the modern calendar. The Kankana-ey equivalent for August is “Tiwtiuidan,” which is described as follows: “A bird called the ‘tiwtiuidan’ or ‘jajaran’ appears. Easily distinguished by its yellow belly and light blue feathers, it is spotted in yards, roads, rooftops, farms, and riverbanks. The appearance of this bird is believed to signal the coming of a strong typhoon.”
- 20 “[I]n the absence of linear history in earlier Southeast Asia, the conviction could not be sustained that the inhabitants of the region were moving through time into closer and therefore “Southeast Asian” relationships. Only the Vietnamese élite developed a linear sense of time, based on a sequence of recorded dynasties” (Wolters 1999, 39).
- 21 The format in the *confesionario* written by a friar was to give the question first in Tagalog and then in Spanish. Whereas the 1910 edition used running lines of text, the original version (1610) began each sentence, Tagalog and Spanish, each on a new line. As shown below, I have numbered these questions to set them apart from each other. The reader should keep in mind that these questions were not the creation of Pinpin, but that of a Spanish friar. However, one would think that Pinpin’s work would assist that of the friar—but it does not. Of personal interest is question 15, which deals with the matter of being late for mass. Again, Pinpin’s lesson on marking time is of no help to his reader here.

- (1.) Nangilin ca caya con lingo, at con fiestang pinangingilinan ninyo? Has guardado los Domingos y fiestas que son de guardar para vosotros? [Do you observe the Sabbath, and the feast days that you observe and honor?] (Pinpin 1610/1910, 211)
 - (2.) Opan gongmaua ca con lingo at con fiesta nang anomang di mangyaring gaoin? Por ventura has hecho en Domingo, ó fiesta lo que no es licito hazer en tales días? [Do you work on anything that should not be done on Sunday, or during a fiesta?] (ibid.)
 - (3.) Ylang lingo, at ylang fiesta yaong di mo pinangilinan? Quantos Domingos y fiestas son las que no has guardado? [How many Sundays, and how many fiestas did you not observe?] (ibid.)
 - (15.) Opan di caman songmala, ay naholi ca sa paquiquinyig nang Missa? Dado que no ayas faltado de Missa, por ventura has llegado tarde? [In order that you not miss mass, did you come late?] (ibid., 211–12)
 - (20.) Pinapaquinyig mo caya nang Missa ang manga casang bahay mo, touing Lingo at touing fiesta? Has mandado á los de tu casa oyir Missa todos los Domingos, y fiesta? [Do you allow your housemates, every Sunday and every fiesta to hear mass?] (ibid., 212)
- 22 In the *confesionario*, while *lingo* usually indicates week, both *lingo* and *Domingo* are used for Sunday. The mention of Friday is found in the 23rd question of the third section: Nagsila ca caya nang lamang cati, con Viernes at con vigilia at sa cuaresma caya? *Has comido carne en Viernes ó en vigilia cuaresma?* [Have you eaten meat on Friday or during Lent?] (Pinpin 1610/1910, 212).
 - 23 Diyata, pagaralan na ninyo ang mga horas. Pito na ang horas, *ya son las siete*: cahati na nang pito, nang ualo, *ya son cerca de las ocho*: lomalo na sa ualo, *ya son mas de las ocho*; colang colang sa siyam, *poco menos de las nueve*: songmiya sa sang pouo, *las diez son justas y cabales*. At ang mga horas ay para nang sa omaga. Isa na ang horas. *ya es la una* etc. (You should now study the time. The hour is seven. [It is seven]: it is half of seven, [half past seven], of eight, it is almost eight: it is past eight, not quite nine: it is exactly ten. And the hours are similar to the morning. It is already one [o’clock] etc.) (Pinpin 1610/1910, 159)
 - 24 “What I will teach you now (my) beloved ones who wish to become *ladinos* will all the more correct your speaking Spanish and each thing that you do not learn will take away from you your ability to ever learn Spanish” (Caponoponoan din namang macatotoud nang pangongosap ninyo nang uicang castila, itong iaaral co ngayon sa inyong manga mahal na naibig maguing ladinos at bauat di ninyo maalaman ito ay uala ding capangyarihan cayong matoto moliman sa uicang castila) (Pinpin 1610/1910, 167).
 - 25 Blancas (1610/1752, xxvi) notes at the beginning of his *Arte*: “Es materia muy varia la de la lengua; y esta no lo es menos que otras, pues dentro de limites de Tagala tiene Comentan, Laguna y Tagalos; y yo no lo he podido andar todo; en estos rincones donde suelo estar a bueltas de otras ocupaciones, se ha hecho en 14 años de estudio esto poquillo.”
 - 26 This document was written in *baybayin*, the ancient Tagalog script that was being used at the time of the Spanish intrusion. The transliteration is Villamor’s. Elsewhere I have argued for universal Tagalog literacy. Here I would simply point out the convergence of two systems: the Tagalog writing system (baybayin) and the Spanish system of marking time. The Tagalog expression of numbers is retained in this mixture.
 - 27 *Legajo* (box file, henceforth leg.) 371, 1c; and leg. 369, 1b, Archivo de la Provincia del Santísimo Nombre de Jesús de Filipinas, Valladolid (henceforth, APSNJF). The dating for the first document

is the fourth day of June and more than (*labi*) thousand six hundred and four of the fourth set of tens. The second is the sixth of the month September of the year one thousand six hundred eight of the fourth set of tens. I would point out the use of *labi* in the first document. This is an addition seen in the second stage.

28 Leg. 408, 2a, APSNJF.

29 Leg. 94, 18, Archivo Franciscano Ibero-Oriental, Madrid (henceforth AFIO).

30 Leg. 68, 29, AFIO.

31 Nicholas Cushner (1976) has included a transcription of the first of these three documents as Appendix E. The documents are found in "Títulos y recaudos de la Estancia de Mandaloya" (mss. 1585–1721), folios 114–18, in the Lilly Library, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

32 Leg. 357, 2b, 176, APSNJF.

33 Leg. 375, 2b, 175, APSNJF.

34 "Títulos y recaudos de la Estancia de Mandaloya," mss. 1585–1721, fol. 110, Lilly Library, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

35 It should be noted that when dealing with the use of the old system of counting in recording dates, one's study is necessarily limited by the fact that only nine or ten days of the month would use the old Tagalog system, that is, days twenty-one through twenty-nine and thirty-one is present.

36 Pinpin (1610/1910, 159) writes the following in his lesson on measuring time (*Ycapitong Aral*): Masasaolo na ang arao: ya es cerca de medio dia. Tanghali na: ya es media dia. Natatanghatanghali: medio dia es en punto. (The sun will be overhead: it is almost noon already [literally midday]. It is now noon: it is exactly midday).

37 Mendoza's (2006, 71, italics added) statement bears repeating here: "Though still premised on the presumed existence of 'inherent' cultural characteristics (for example, in terms of world view, time orientation and other cultural dimensions suggested by traditional cultural anthropology), Maggay's framework provided a way of looking at the seeming contradictions, fissures, and fractures in Filipino culture and personality (found to be most evident in the urban communities more heavily exposed to the Western influence of modern industrial culture) without naturalizing them."

38 Virgilio Enriquez (1994, 64) defines *utang na loob* as: "appreciation of *kapwa* solidarity" (ibid., 167) and *kapwa* as: "shared identity" (ibid., 161). He argues that *utang na loob* is a surface value, as opposed to a core value. It is a surface value of the core value of *pakiramdan* (shared inner perception)—"the pivotal aspect of *kapwa*." Enriquez writes: "Without *pakiramdam*, there is no sense of time and *kalooban*" (ibid., 64).

39 Fray Roque de Barrionuevo was the examiner of Pinpin's book before it was published. "Por mandado del Señor Gobernador Capitan General y Presidente de estas Islas, yo Fr. Roque de Barrionuevo, Prior del Convento del santísimo nombre de Jesús de Tondo, de la orden de N.P.S. Agustin, ví y examiné con advertencia este libro intitulado, *Librong pagaaralan nang manga Tagalog nang uicang Castila*, que en nuestro castellano, quiere decir; libro en que aprendan los tagalos la lengua Española, compuesto por Thomas Pinpin Tagalog . . ."

References

- Anderson, Benedict. 1990. The idea of power in Javanese culture. In *Language and power: Exploring political cultures in Indonesia*, 17–77. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Blair, Emma Helen and James Robertson, eds. 1906. *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898*, vol. 35. Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark.
- . 1906. *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898*, vol. 40. Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark.
- Blancas de San José, Francisco. 1610/1752. *Arte, y reglas de la lengua tagala por el P. F. Francisco de S. Joseph de la Orden de S. Domingo Predicador General en la Provincia de N. Señora del Rosario de las Islas Filipinas*. Reprint, Manila: Colegio y Universidad de S. Thomas.
- Bloch, Maurice. 1977. The past and the present in the present. *Man*, new ser., 12:278–92.
- Cruz, Jose M., S.J., ed. 1995. *Declaración de la doctrina Christiana en idioma Tagalog: Juan de Oliver, O.F.M.* Quezon City: Pulong.
- Cushner, Nicholas. 1976. *Landed estates in the colonial Philippines*. Southeast Asia Series Monograph 20. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Enriquez, Virgilio. 1994. *Pagbabangong-Dangal: Indigenous psychology and cultural empowerment*. Quezon City: Akademya ng Kultura at Sikolohiyang Pilipino.
- Farriss, Nancy. 1984. *Maya society under colonial rule: The collective enterprise of survival*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1966. *Person, time, and conduct in Bali: An essay in cultural analysis*. New Haven: Southeast Asia Studies, Yale University.
- Hallowell, A. Irving. 1937. Temporal orientation in Western civilization and a pre-literate society. *American Anthropologist* 39:647–70.
- Howe, Leopold E. A. 1981. The social determination of knowledge: Maurice Bloch and Balinese time. *Man*, new ser., 16(1): 220–34.
- Ileto, Reynaldo. 1998. *Filipinos and their revolution: Event, discourse, and historiography*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Lockhart, James. 1972. The social history of colonial Latin America: Evolution and potential. *Latin American Historical Review* 7:4–41.
- . 1992. *The Nahuas after the conquest: A social and cultural history of the Indians of Central Mexico, sixteenth through eighteenth centuries*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- . ed. and trans. 1993. *We people here: Nahuatl accounts of the conquest of Mexico*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Lumbera, Bienvenido L. 1986. *Tagalog poetry 1570–1898: Tradition and influences in its development*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Maggay, Melba. 1987. *The gospel in Filipino context*. Quezon City: Institute for Studies in Asian Church and Culture.
- Manapat, Ricardo. 2001. Mathematical ideas in early Philippine society. Paper submitted for the graduate course on History of Mathematics, Department of Mathematics, Ateneo de Manila University.

Mendoza, Susanah Lily L. 2006. *Between the home and the diaspora: The politics of theorizing Filipino and Filipino American identities*. Manila: UST Publishing House.

Menninger, Karl. 1969. *Number words and number symbols: A cultural history of numbers*, trans. Paul Broneer. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Phelan, John Leddy. 1959. *The hispanization of the Philippines: Spanish aims and Filipino responses, 1565–1700*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Pinpin, Tomas. 1610/1910. Librong pagaaralan nang manga Tagalog nang uicang Castila. In *La primera imprenta en Filipinas*, Manuel Artigas y Cuerva, 135–259. Manila: [Tipo-Litografia Germania].

Potet, Jean-Paul. 1987. La pétition tagale Caming manga alipin (1665). *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale* 16(1): 109–57.

———. 1992. Numeral expressions in Tagalog. *Archipel* 44:167–81.

———. 2005. *Seventeenth-century events at Liliw, Laguna, Philippines*, [trans.] Jean-Paul G. Potet. Clichy: J. P. G. Potet.

Rafael, Vicente L. 1988. *Contracting colonialism: Translation and Christian conversion in Tagalog society under early Spanish rule*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Reid, Anthony. 1993. *Southeast Asia in the age of commerce 1450–1680*, vol. 2: *Expansion and crisis*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Retana, Wenceslao E. 1911. *Origenes de la imprenta Filipina: Investigaciones históricas, Bibliografiías y Tipográficas*. Madrid: Librería General de Victoriano Suarez.

Reynolds, Craig. 1995. A new look at old Southeast Asia. *Journal of Asian Studies* 54(2): 419–46.

San Antonio, Juan Francisco de. 1906. Crónicas de la Provincia de San Gregorio Magno, chap. 45. In *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1989*, vol. 40, ed. Emma Blair and James Robertson, 296–373. Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark.

San Buenaventura, Pedro de. 1613/1994. *Vocabulario de lengua Tagala*. Reprint, Valencia: Librerías Paris-Valencia.

Santos, Hector. 1996a. Ancient names for hours of the day. *Sulat sa Tanso* 3 (May): 3.

———. 1996b. More on Pinpin's 'Paralang sulat . . .' *Sulat sa Tanso* 2 (Sept.): 1.

Santos, Vito C. 1986. *Vicassan's Pilipino-English dictionary*. Caloocan City: Philippine Graphic Arts, Inc.

Scott, William Henry. 1982. *Cracks in the parchment curtain and other essays in Philippine history*. Quezon City: New Day.

———. 1989. *Prehispanic source materials for the study of Philippine history*. Rev. ed. Quezon City: New Day.

———. 1992. *Looking for the prehispanic Filipino*. Quezon City: New Day.

———. 1994. *Barangay: Sixteenth-Century Philippine culture and society*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Villamor, Ignacio. 1922. *La antigua escritura: Filipina del Belarmino y otros antiguos documentos*. Manila: [Tip. Pontificia del Colegio de Sto. Tomas].

Wolff, John U. 1976. Malay borrowings in Tagalog. In *Southeast Asian history and historiography: Essays presented to D. G. E. Hall*, ed. C. D. Cowan and O. W. Wolters, 345–67. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Wolters, O. W. 1999. *History, culture, and region in Southeast Asian perspectives*. Rev. ed. Ithaca, NY: Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, in cooperation with the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore.

Woods, Damon L. 1991. Racial exclusion in the mendicant orders from Spain to the Philippines. *UCLA Historical Journal* 11:69–92.

Damon L. Woods is visiting lecturer, History Department, 6265 Bunche Hall, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA. He received his PhD degree in Southeast Asian History from the same university. He has also been a lecturer at the University of California, Irvine, and California State University, Long Beach. He grew up in Baguio City, the son of missionaries. His research has focused on documents written in Tagalog by the Tagalog people in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. Among his recent publications are *Tomas Pinpin and Tagalog Survival in Early Spanish Philippines* (UST Publishing, 2011); *Librong pagaaralan nang manga Tagalog nang uicang Castila* (transcribed and edited, UST Publishing, 2011); and *From Wilderness to Nation: Interrogating Bayan* (editor and contributor, University of the Philippines Press, 2011). <dlwoods@ucla.edu>

