

INTELLECTUALIZATION OF FILIPINO: AN UPDATE¹

Teodoro A. Llamzon
De La Salle University - Manila

In 1978, the Department of Education, Culture and Sports (DECS) enjoined all tertiary institutions in the country to spearhead the intellectualization of Filipino, and to provide the necessary services and funds for this task (Order No. 52 and 54, Series 1978). Moreover, the Congressional Commission on Education in 1991 recommended that DECS start a program for the development of instructional materials in Filipino so that by the year 2000 all subjects except English and other languages shall be taught in Filipino (Bautista, 1996, p. 226).

Since this is the year 2000, it is time for us to take stock of the progress in implementation of this directive. The object of this paper is to find out what work is being done today on the intellectualization of Filipino. However, due to limited resources, we have confined our survey to the leading institutions in the NCR region. In addition to the survey, we also conducted interviews with key personnel.

This report is divided into two parts: (1) the quantitative report, and (2) an in-depth analysis of three representative works on intellectualization. But before I begin the first part, let me explain what is meant by intellectualization, and what this process entails. Briefly, in language planning, there are at least four phases in the development of a language, namely, selection, standardization, diffusion, and finally cultivation (Haugen, 1972). Intellectualization is actually, as Gonzalez says (1985, p. 2), one of the processes in the cultivation phase, and involves the development of registers in the academic and technical domains of language use. The term was first used by Havranek, of the Prague School of Linguistics, as reported by Garvin and Mathiot (1968).

In today's world, there are no longer any so-called "primitive languages". There are, of course, languages which are threatened with extinction, because their speakers are gradually disappearing, and there are also languages which are considered "dead", because no one speaks them anymore in everyday life. But none of the known languages at present are "primitive" in the sense of "embryonic". Only certain cultures are considered "primitive", mainly because their speech communities are not in step with the developments of modern life.

¹Paper read as the Andrew Gonzalez, FSC Distinguished Professorial Chair Lecture in Linguistics and Language Education at De La Salle University on July 15, 2000.

This is why Ferguson (1968) calls the intellectualization process modernization. In other words, it is the speech community and its language use that need to be modernized. What the speakers must do to achieve modernization is to use the language not only in the domains of the home and entertainment as has been the case with Filipino, but also in what Sibayan (1986) calls the “controlling domains” of language, i.e. the domains that dictate the language to be used in a community, such as business, labor, commerce and industry, education (especially higher education), science and technology. On the other hand, there are languages that are modernized (i.e., used for modern needs, such as TV and radio), but are not intellectualized; hence, the term “intellectualization” is preferred (Sibayan, 1999, p. 449).

How is a language intellectualized? Before we answer that question, let us remember that all present-day languages are fully mature. As such, they have the capacity to refer to any object in the outside world or to any concept whatsoever. If they lack the words necessary to do so, they have several built-in mechanisms whereby such words can be produced. For example, there is the mechanism called **borrowing**. The English language is extremely rich in vocabulary principally because of loanwords from Greek, Latin, French, German, Spanish, and many other languages in the world. Second, there is the process called **calquing** or loan-translation. For example, the American English word *skyscraper* is rendered in Spanish by “*rasca cielo*”; in French, by “*gratte ciel*”; and in German, by “*Wolkenkratze*”. The English word *ceasefire* is rendered in Filipino by “*tigil putukan*”. Third, there is the mechanism called **derivation** or the use of affixes. For example, the English word *school* is rendered in Filipino by “*paaralan*” and *government* by “*pamahalaan*”. Fourth, there is the process called **compounding**. For example, the English word *employment* is matched in Filipino by the word “*hanapbuhay*” and *translation* by “*salingwika*”. Fifth, there is the mechanism called **coining**. For example, there are the trade names “*kodak*” and “*xerox*” and in Tagalog, there are the words “*tapsilog*” and “*longsilog*”. Sixth, there is the process called **blending**. For example, the English word *fantabulous* is a combination of “*fantastic*” and “*fabulous*”; and in Philippine English, there is the neologism “*Imeldific*”. Finally, there is **paraphrasing**, e.g. the English term *humus* is given the equivalent “*mayaman at maitim na lupang galing sa mga nabulok na dahon ng halaman*” (Constantino, 1999, p. 180). This process is actually a combination of defining and translating.

Beyond these mechanisms for generating lexical items, there are the features of **coherence** and **cohesion** (Halliday & Hassan, 1976), which give a text unity, clarity, force and interest. Examples of these features are: the organization of ideas, the employment of lexical ties (in the form of references, repetitions, and substitutions) as well as the use of conjunctions. Again, beyond all this – there is the **register**, which is all important, i.e. lexical and semantic expectancies that are involved in the discussion of specific topics in various areas of specialization, including the more abstract subjects of higher education, the sciences and technology, trade and industry. Halliday (1968) claims that it is register that sets the **tone**, **mode**, and **field** of a particular text. This is the key to the intellectualization of a language.

How is this process of intellectualization or modernization best achieved with regard to Filipino? Actually, I can see two schools of thought on this question. We might call the first group the dictionary-makers. This group, led by Ernesto A. Constantino of the University of the Philippines, believes that there is need to produce wordlists to match a highly intellectualized language such as English. The aim of this group is to produce terms or equivalent expressions in Filipino equal to the English words. They use the mechanisms of language enumerated above to produce the terms and expressions frequently used in English; since, as Tinio says, in the Philippines the learned and erudite people are those who are educated in English (Tinio, 1975, p. 147).

INTELLECTUALIZATION OF FILIPINO

The second group is made up of the textbook and/or article writers, led by Andrew B. Gonzalez (1988) and Bonifacio P. Sibayan (1988). They argue, if I understand them correctly, that intellectualization consists of developing not just technical terms and vocabulary for use in the various academic and technical disciplines, but most important lexical links or associations and registers. Examples of lexical associations are: bread and butter or pen and ink; of collocations are “strong coffee” (English) or “fond of ice-cream” and not “fond of mistakes”; “commit murder” and not “commit matrimony”. Finally, examples of expectancy chains or scripts are courtship → engagement → wedding → family (Hatch, 1992, p. 85). These lexical associations, collocations, and expectancy chains are referred to nowadays in communication theory as “*schemas or scripts*” (Schanks & Abelson, 1977).

We come now to the main purpose of this paper. At this point, I would like to give you an update on what some institutions in the NCR are doing to implement the injunction of the Department of Education, Culture and Sports (DECS).

The progress of implementation of the 1978 DECS directive is given in Tables 1a and 1b which summarize the work done in 10 categories in the three leading institutions of learning in the National Capital Region from 1987 to 1999.

Table 1a. Number of Books Written in Filipino at the Tertiary Level from 1987 to the Present

School	Science	Math	Philosophy	Economics	Computer Science	Theology	Medicine	Agriculture	Engineering	Social Science	TOTAL
University of the Philippines	28	7	3	1	2	-	2	1	9	9	57
De La Salle University	-	1	4	4	1	-	-	-	1	2	13
Ateneo de Manila University	-	-	4	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	7
TOTAL	28	8	11	5	3	2	2	4	2	12	77

N.B. The Sentro ng Wikang Filipino, which is the official printer and publisher of the University of the Philippines, has listed in its 1998-1999 catalogue 111 books on different subjects. Eleven books were written for the secondary level, while 100 of these are for the tertiary level as shown above. However, 15 from the published catalogue of UP are categorized as references, e.g. dictionary, glossary, and document, while 25 are classified as Communication/Literature/Arts/Humanities, and 3 are classified as Language and Culture to make a total of 100 items. These classifications are not included in the table above. The number of books in this table include Science, which comprises 37% of the total number of 77.

De La Salle University has published 13 books in five categories. Other books printed and published by the school are also categorized as Language and Literature, Political Science, Economics, etc. This is also true of Ateneo de Manila University. This information will be shown in Table 2.

Table 1b. Other Categories of Books Written in Filipino for the Tertiary Level from 1987 to the Present with the Inclusion of Other Schools and Independent Writers

Schools	Language and Culture	Literature/ Communications/ Arts/Humanities/	Political Science	Reference (Dictionary, Glossary, Document)	Teacher Education	Commerce and Technology	Law	World Geography	Social Science	TOTAL
U.P	3	26	-	15	1	-	-	1	-	46
De La Salle University	1	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
Ateneo de Manila University	-	13	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	14
Polytechnic University of the Philippines (PUP)	-	4	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	5
PNU (PNC)	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Far Eastern University	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
University of the East	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
University of Santo Tomas	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Technical Institute of the Philippines	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Lyceum	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3
Jose Rizal College	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Collaborative: PNU/Ateneo	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Collaborative: UST/FEU	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Collaborative: UE/Lyceum	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Collaborative: PNU/UST	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Writing Consortium: PCU, Trinity College, Wesleyan University	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Independent Writers	5	34	2	-	-	2	3	-	3	49
TOTAL	10	102	3	15	2	2	5	1	4	144

Table 1b shows the total number of books written in Filipino from 1987 to the present with an additional eight categories (Social Science is already in Table I). Independent writers top the Literature/Communication/Arts category with a total of 34 written books while UP has 26 (25 in the *Katalogo Filipino* plus one independent writer from UP). The rest of the schools listed have contributed one in the categories listed. Also Literature/Communication/Arts category received the highest total number of books with a total of 102 compared to the rest of the categories. This number comprises 71% of the total number of books written in the additional categories for Table 2.

Note: In the process of doing the survey for the books written in Filipino, I discovered that the greatest number of books written is in the subject category of Literature and Communication. The researcher found some literature written as early as 1921; but since this research is limited to the 10 categories as shown in Table 1 and covers the years from 1987 to the present, they were not included.

INTELLECTUALIZATION OF FILIPINO

We see from the two tables that the University of the Philippines (UP) has published more than 100 books and dictionaries whereas Ateneo and De La Salle together do not add up to 50. Thus, we notice that most of the work is being accomplished at UP. From interviews, we have learned that the faculty members there have been given both the motivation and funding to implement the DECS directive. However, some still feel that the "critical mass" has not yet been reached, and much more work needs to be done. In the other institutions, on the other hand, the work of intellectualization lacks both funding and motivation, since their institutions, it seems feel no urgency to implement the policy. Only time will tell if enough leadership will arise to intensify the work on this program. At any rate, it is not just the leaders in academe, but the students and the citizens of the nation who will have to make a decision on this issue.

We come now to the second part of this investigation, namely, the in-depth study of three attempts to implement the intellectualization of Filipino. We would like now to take a look first at the work done by Professor Ernesto A. Constantino, of the University of the Philippines. Last year, Constantino (1999) published his dictionary entitled *The Contemporary English-Filipino Dictionary* (1999), whose two-fold aims are: "(1) to encourage and assist Filipinos, especially those who are English-dominant, in shifting linguistically from English to Filipino in their educational, academic, and professional activities, and (2) to show that Filipino has equivalents for all English words and phrases which Filipinos use; thus giving the lie to the blatantly spurious and egregious claim made by some critics and non-users of Filipino that this language lacks intellectualization. This claim is obviously false and is nothing but a red herring. For, indeed, it is the non-knowledgeable and non-user of the language, not the language, that lacks intellectualization". (1999, p. iv).

Briefly, this dictionary gives the equivalents of 20,000 English lexical items in the National Language. It seems that the guiding principle of the dictionary is what Filipino speakers actually use when they engage in scholarly and technical discourse. With the help of my research assistants, we have tried to quantify the different mechanisms of language that the author employed in order to come up with equivalent words and expressions in Filipino. The following is the result of our investigation:

Table 2. Mechanisms of Language in Constantino

Loanwords	4,475	24.35%
a. English	2,763	15.03%
b. Spanish	1,712	9.31%
Derivations	5,876	31.98%
Calques	358	4.13%
Compounding	749	1.94%
Coining	0	0.0 %

LLAMZON

We notice that borrowing is the mechanism predominantly used in this dictionary. Moreover, it seems to contradict what Otanes (1994) reported in her "Survey of Translation Preferences in Filipino". Her study discovered that Filipinos, as a rule, preferred Spanish to English or any other language as loanwords. On the contrary, Constantino's preference is for English loanwords in this dictionary. This is, perhaps, because Filipinos are better acquainted with English than Spanish words for modern technical terms, having been educated in English; in addition, more such terms are available for this purpose in English. In his frequent employment of phrases, clauses, and sentences as equivalents of English terms, we also see efforts at translation or paraphrase.

Secondly, the basic principle followed in the dictionary is the spoken language used by Filipinos today. Hence, it is not surprising that the derived words found in Lope K. Santos' *balarila* are, with few exceptions, *not found* here. For example, the words *pandiwa*, *pang-uri*, *pang-abay*, *simuno*, *panaguri*, and *pangungusap* are absent in the dictionary. Instead, we find *berbo o verb*, *adhetibo o adjektiv*, *adberbyo o adverb*, *sabjek*, *predikeyt*, and *sentens*. However, the words in *balarila* that have by now become common Filipino words are in the dictionary; for example, *paaralan* and *pamahalaan* and *panitikan*.

Thirdly, the strictly one-to-one correspondence between phoneme and grapheme is not always easy to implement, even though it is the most efficient system. The reason for this is that when certain words have been in use in the community for a certain length of time, it acquires a visual identity of its own, and it seems to be a different word when it is spelled in a different way. It is much like meeting an old friend who now has dyed his hair blond and wears sunglasses to boot. He does not seem to be the same person anymore. In fact, this seems to be the reason why the former Wikang Pilipino (WP) way of spelling has been changed to the new Wikang Filipino (WF) way with 28 letters. For example, proper names like *Zialcita*, *Ceballos*, or *Cañizares* seem to be different names spelled as *Sialsita*, *Sebaliyos*, or *Kanyisares*.

Along the same vein, it seems there are difficulties with regard to certain spelling sequences, especially in loanwords. Thus, the WP sequence *diy/dy/ds* has been replaced in WF and CEFD, following the WF way, with <j> (Constantino, 1996). However, the word *Diyos* or *Dios* is difficult to recognize when spelled <Jos>. The WP letter /c/ has been replaced by /s/ but <c> must be retained, when it has the sound /k/, for example, in words like *condom* and *cosmos* and in loanwords with <ch> like *chemistry* and *branch*. The letter <x> has been replaced by the WF and CEFD sequence /k+s/; but <x> should be retained in loanwords like *sex*, *taxi*, and *x-ray*. Similarly, the sequence /s + h/ or /s + y/ has been replaced by <sy> or <siy> but again in loanwords, the original <sh> should be retained, e.g., *workshop* and *shampoo*. I have taken these points from the handbook published by the Filipino Department of De La Salle University (1993) and would like to refer the reader to that publication for more details. Finally, the English term "ego" should have its spelling retained, because some Filipinos will pronounce this word, as Virgilio Enriquez (1996, p. 271) pointed out, with [e] and not [i] and will thus unwittingly refer to a favorite trademark of mayonnaise in the Philippines!

The earliest work on intellectualization of Filipino (then called Tagalog or Pilipino) was probably the 1593 book entitled *Doctrina Christiana*. This was really a collaborative work by Spanish missionaries headed by the Franciscan friars Juan de Plasencia, Miguel de Talavera, and Juan de Oliver and jointly edited and published by the Dominicans, Augustinians, and Jesuits. The work was analyzed in-depth by Gonzalez (1985), and we shall use his framework of analysis for the study of the two books we intend to investigate for the purpose of this paper.

INTELLECTUALIZATION OF FILIPINO

As Gonzalez correctly pointed out, it was amazing that this work was done only 16 years after the first serious attempt at colonization by the Spaniards in the person of Miguel de Legaspi in 1565. The work is available now in only a few libraries, e.g., Chicago University Library; but a Tagalog grammar (*Arte*) "with religious citations" was written by friar Juan de Quiñones in 1581. In the following quote, Gonzalez explains the enormous task before the missionaries (p. 9):

What the friar-missionaries did was to use a developed and intellectualized code (with its Latin roots, a language which had been highly intellectualized) to speak of an indigenous world with its richness of Austronesian references in highly developed theological tradition (admittedly based on an assumption of faith) and to attempt to give the equivalence of this structure of reference in an altogether different code (with its own structure and vocabulary) to speak of totally strange referents to the Indio.

The task was herculean, for it meant not only translation (carrying across of meanings and referents from one world to a totally different world which had no experience of the referents of the first original world) but simultaneously intellectualization, for the subject matter of reference had to do not with common everyday realities but with abstract realities pertaining to mystery (and its response, faith) and beliefs as well as practices (commandments and prohibitions). For the Filipino, these were indeed strange things. But for the friar missionary, the feat was even more difficult, to speak of abstract though familiar things in one's world to a person having little experience with abstraction and to speak to him of things totally unfamiliar, strange, perhaps, even ridiculous at first blush. What the friar-missionary offered was admittedly a popularized though nonetheless intellectualized structure of reference of beliefs and values.

Next, Gonzalez examined the different mechanisms used for producing equivalents in Tagalog for the Spanish terms. There were, first of all, *direct loanwords* from Spanish to Filipino like *Dios*. The Tagalogs had the word from Sanskrit "Bathala", but it had certain connotations that were not consonant with the teachings of the new religion. Hence, the best way was to borrow the Spanish term "Dios" directly. However, they made use of the Tagalog words "Poong Maykapal" for "God the Creator", and "Panginoon" for "Lord or Master". Similarly, the following words were also directly borrowed from the language of the missionaries: *Sanctissima Trinidad*, *Spiritu Santo*, *impyerno*, *birhen*, *gracia*, *santo*, *sacramento*, *baptismo*, *pagkasal*, *padre*. The missionaries also used the loanwords from Sanskrit that were already used by the people from previous contacts with Malay traders who originally had borrowed them from Indian merchants. For example, *hukom*, *ligaya*, *parusa*, *pintakasi* 'advocate, patron', *saksi*, *sala*, *samba*, and *sampalataya*.

Then there were *calques* (or loan-translations) like *unang mula* for "primera causa", *walang pinagmulan* at *walang hanggan* for "no source and no end". *Ang kaunaunahan ng lahat* "el principio de todas las cosas", *Kasamahan ng mga santos* for "communion of saints", and *nakaluklok sa kanan ng Dios Ama* "seated at the right hand of God the Father", and *nagkatawan-tao* "became incarnate" and *mabuhay muli* "resurrection". Finally, there were *paraphrases* of Christian terms when there were no equivalents in Filipino. This mechanism, by the way, was used frequently by Constantino in translating English terms. For example, his translation of the English word "curfew" was *oras sa gabi na hangganan ng pinapayagang oras ng paglabas sa mga daanan*, and his definition of the English loanword "cul-de-sac" is

kalsada o daanan na bukas sa isang dulo lamang. There is thus the use of phrases and sentences to explain the meaning of the term with no one-to-one equivalent in Filipino. In the *Doctrina Christiana*, the term “tithe” is rendered in Tagalog as *ang isang kapulo ihain sa Dios*, and terms “gluttony” and “drunkenness” are rendered by *kayamuan sa pagkain* and *kayamuan sa pag-inom*, respectively.

The development of a register (in this case the religious teaching and Christian doctrine) is the product of not only the selection of specific vocabulary for a discipline, but, as Gonzalez points out (1985, p. 2) “the use of collocations and structures at the paragraph and discourse level”. Actually, Gonzalez does not go into examples of this register from the *Doctrina Christiana* mainly because to do so would require longer texts than were available to him at the time, but it is easy to see that such registers were effected in the prayers Our Father, Hail Mary, the Creed, and Hail Holy Queen.

We come now to the second text in our study of the intellectualization of Filipino, namely the book *Pambungad sa Metapisika* by Roque J. Ferriols, S.J. This book is a pioneering work on the intellectualization of Filipino, because at that time, many were of the opinion that it was impossible to discuss Metaphysics in Filipino, since the language did not even have the verb TO BE. In this book, the author tried to re-conceptualize the basic objects of the science of Metaphysics, and express them in Filipino. He employed the Filipino word *meron* for ‘being’, and provided texts and register for its proper usage. The book was published in 1991, before the 28 letters of the alphabet were introduced, hence the title of the book should now read *Pambungad sa Metafisika*.

The book contains many examples of word associations, collocations, as well as expectancy chains — all of which establish the register of a philosophical discourse. Because of the excellent work the book had accomplished, it was awarded the gold medal by the National Critics Association of the Philippines in 1998.

I would like now to present a section of this textbook and analyze it to demonstrate how it achieves the philosophical register in metaphysics: Here is the text we want to analyze:

ANG PAGBUO NG KONSEPTO

Ang hindi ako (dalawa, langgam, puno atbp.) ay siyang paksa ng mga isip na may nilalaman at may mga hangganan; at ako, bilang palaisip, ay siyang tumatanggap at lumilikha sa pag-uunawa ukol sa mga hindi-akong ito... Ngunit... Sino iyong nag-iisip sa ako bilang may-hangganang-nilalaman-ng-isip? ... na isang uring hindi ako? Sino ang nag-iisip sa ako bilang kaisipang nasa harap ko na maari ko pang bali-baliktarin? Ako pa rin!

Ano ang itatawag natin sa mga isip na may-nilalamang-may-hangganang? May isang katagang Latin na madalas gamiting pagtukoy sa ganitong uring kaisipan: CONCEPTUS: na maari nating gawin KONSEPTO. Ang conceptus ay isang inilihi at binuo sa sinapupunan ng ina. Tinutukoy ng conceptus ang isang buhay na bunga ng bisa ng ina at hindi ina. Ang taong nag-iisip, babae man siya o lalaki, maihahambing sa inang nagbubuo ng sanggol sa kanyang sinapupunan. Ang binubuo ng taong nag-iisip, ang kanyang pinakaanak ay ang mga nilalaman ng kanyang isip: mga bunga ng bisa ng siya at hindi-siya. Ang ako at hindi-ako. Iyan ang pinagmumulan ng konsepto.

INTELLECTUALIZATION OF FILIPINO

Let us now go over this text and identify, first, the mechanisms which were used to generate the terms necessary for this discussion or exposition:

1. **Loanword** – *conceptus/konsepto* (Latin).
2. **Calques** – *paksa ng isip* (topic of thought), *inang nagbubuo ng sanggol sa kanyang sinapupunan* (mother forming her baby in her womb), *hindi ako/siya* (not-I/he).
3. **Paraphrases** – *paksa na may nilalaman at may hangganan* (content and definition of idea), *bunga ng bisa ng ina* (result of woman power).
4. **Compounding** – *may-hangganan nilalaman-ng-isip/ may-nilalaman-na-may-hangganan* (defined concept).

We now would like to identify the mechanisms that establish the “register” of this section of the book, by identifying the lexical associations, collocations, and expectancy chains (or scripts) in the text:

1. **Associations** – *paksa ng isip*: A. *ako palaisip/hindi ako*: B. *Dalawa/langgam/puno atbp., konsepto: may-hangganan-nilalaman-ng-isip, ako*: C. *Hindi ako/siya, konsepto*: D. *Inilihi at binuo, inilihi*: E. *Sa sinapupunan, sinapupunan*: F. *Ina, tao*: G. *Babae/lalake, tao*: H. *Nag-iisip, ako*: I. *Hindi ako*.
2. **Collocations** – *ang hindi ako*: A. *paksa ng mga isip, paksa ng isip*: B. *may nilalaman at may mga hangganan, palaisip*: C. *tumatanggap at lumilikha sa pag-uunawa, konsepto*: D. *may-hangganan-nilalaman-ng-isip, konsepto*: E. *isang buhay na bunga ng bisa ng ina at hindi ina*.
3. **Expectancy Chain (Script)** – *ako* → *palaisip* → *paksa ng isip* → *hindi ako* → *may nilalaman at may mga hangganan* → *tumatanggap at lumilikha sa pag-uunawa* → *isang uring hindi ako* → *konsepto* → *inilihi at binuo sa sinapupunan ng ina* → *ang kanyang pinanganak ay ang mga nilalaman ng kanyang isip* → *bunga ng bisa ng siya at hindi siya*.

I would like now to analyze a third text, a selection from a recent publication of De La Salle University Press, namely the book written by Forentino T. Timbreza entitled *Intelektwalisasyon ng Pilosopiyang Filipino*. In the same manner as above, we can study a section from this book and analyze the mechanisms and register that the text displays:

HUMANISMO (p. 24)

Itinuturo ng humanismo ang pansadaigdigan, pagkakapatiran, pakikipagkapwa-tao, kaisahan ng sangkatauhan, at pandaigdigang kapayapaan (Fromm 1964:98 108, et passim). Samakatwid, pagmamahal ng buhay ang diwang tunay na nangingilalim sa ibat ibang bersyon ng humanistikong pilosopiya. Sa lahat ng anyo nito’y ipinapahayag ang tanging prinsipyo na mahal ng tao ang buhay kung kayat ang kanyang namumukod-tanging layunin ay iwasan ang anumang karahasan at mga pangyayaring makapipinsala sa katiwasayan at kapayapaan ng buhay sa buong sandaigdigan.

Maraming humanistang nagtaguyod nito. Isa na rito si Nikolas ng Cusa na siyang nagturo diumano tungkol sa panrelihiyong PAGPAPARAYA (toleransya) para sa lahat ng tao. Si Fecino naman ang nangaral na ang pagmamahal ay siyang pangunahing pwersa ng sangkalikhaan. Si Thomas More din ay nagtaguyod at namatay alang-alang sa mga prinsipyo ng

LLAMZON

unibersalismo at pantaong kabukluran. Pandaigdigang kapayapaan at sanlibutang pagkakaisa naman ang ipinagdiinan ni Postel, samantalang si Siculo ang nagtaguyod tungkol sa dignidad ng tao (Fromm 19964:98-108). At si Hesukristo naman ay inihandog ang sariling buhay para sa “pagmamahal niya sa kanyang kapwa tulad ng pagmamahal sa sarili.” Higit sa lahat, kung wawariin, ang katangi-tanging doktrina ng kawalang-karahasan ni Mahatma Gandhi ay halos walang iniwan sa pangangaral ni Lao Tzu, kung kayat palasak ang palapalagay na nagkaroon ng malaking impluwensya ang dakilang Tsino sa pagkakahubog ng pag-iisip ng dakilang Hindu.

In this text, the mechanisms of language used to produce the terms in the discussion of the philosophical principles involved are:

1. **Loanwords** – humanismo, bersyon, humanistikong pilosopiya, prinsipyo, humanista, panrelihiyon, toleransya, unibersalismo, dignidad, doktrina, impluwensya.
2. **Calques** – pansandaigdigang (universal), pagkakapatiran (fraternity), kaisahan ng sangkatauhan (unity of mankind), panrelihiyong pagpaparaya (religious tolerance), pangunahing pwersa ng sangkalikhaan (primary force/principle of nature), pataong kabukluran (unity of mankind), pandaigdigang kapayapaan (world peace), sanlibutang pagkakaisa (universal unity), dignidad ng tao (human dignity), doktrina ng kawalang-karahasan (doctrine of non-violence).
3. **Derivations** – pansandaigdigang, pagkakapatiran, kaisahan, sangkatauhan, panrelihiyon, pagpaparaya, sangkalikhaan, pantao, kabukluran, kapayapaan, pagkakaisa.
4. **Paraphrases** – iwasan ang anumang karahasan (non-violence), nagtataguyod tungkol sa dignidad ng tao (espoused human dignity), ang katangi-tanging doktrina ng kawalang-karahasan (the special doctrine of non-violence).
5. **Compounding** – pakikipagkapwa-tao (neighborly love), kawalang karahasan (non-violence).

The register established in the above mentioned text is established by the following:

1. **Associations** – humanismo: pakikipagkapwa-tao, humanismo: kaisahan ng sangkatauhan, humanismo: pandaigdigang kapayapaan, humanismo: pagmamahal ng buhay, mahal ang buhay: iwasan ang anumang karahasan.
2. **Collocations** – humanistikong pilosopiya: pagmamahal ng buhay, dignidad ng tao, pagmamahal, kawalang-karahasan, sandaigdigang kapayapaan, pagpaparaya/ toleransya, mga humanista: Nikolas Cusa, Fecino, Thomas More, Hesukristo, Mahatma Gandhi, Lao Tzu.
3. **Expectancy Chains (Scripts)** – humanismo → humanistikang pilosopiya → pagkakapatiran → pakikipagkapwa-tao → kaisahan ng sangkatauhan → kawalang-karahasan → pandaigdigang kapayapaan.

Mga humanismo → Nikolas ng Cusa, Fecino, Thomas More, Hesukristo, Mahatma Gandhi, Lao Tzu.

Pagmamahal → pangunahing pwersa ng sangkalikhaan → prinsipyo ng unibersalismo → pantaong kabuluran.

INTELLECTUALIZATION OF FILIPINO

I have more texts from both books to show that they both establish the register of philosophical discourse, but we are limited by time. These specimens, however, suffice to realize the objective of this study. I would like now to make an evaluation of the contributions made by the three works that we have discussed above.

First, consider the dictionary of Ernesto Constantino. It is, undoubtedly, a huge contribution to the task of Filipino intellectualization. After all, providing Filipino equivalents for 20,000 English terms is an immense undertaking. However, one cannot expect his work to develop registers in the different academic disciplines it tries to serve. In fact, Constantino's dictionary specifies as many as seven or eight contexts, but without appropriate texts to support such specifications, the registers were simply not developed.

Moreover, Sibayan points out that the work of intellectualization needs the help of the English-educated professionals, since in this country, those who have expertise in the various disciplines are, for the most part, educated and trained in English (Sibayan, 1988, pp. 9-10). Moreover, Gonzalez and Sibayan claim that the direction of intellectualization should be from the top down rather than from the bottom up (Gonzalez, 1988, p. 5; Sibayan, 1988, p. 9). This is because the content of the subject matter which is abstract and abstruse is easier to break down and calibrate for the different grades down the ladder of academe (Sibayan, 1988).

Finally, although the viewpoint has been expressed that it will take Filipino one hundred years to become intellectualized (Sibayan, 1999, pp. 229 ff.), this does not have to be considered a foregone conclusion. It really depends on the motivation and enthusiasm of the country's intellectuals, as the case of Ben Yehuda of Israel and the experience of Indonesia have abundantly demonstrated. They did it in much less than a hundred years, and the Filipinos can do likewise.

The pioneering work of Fr. Roque Ferriols is actually a *tour de force* in the effort to intellectualize Filipino. It confirms the belief that a language will always come up with the necessary terms the users need for their goals.

The work done by Timbreza is in large part the result of paraphrasing and translation. Thus, there are many instances of the preferred use of the actor-focus of the verb and the use of the abstract noun affixes (*ka-an*), e.g. kapatiran 'brotherhood.' The three works analyzed show conclusively that the Filipino language can be intellectualized and in the words of Constantino, it is not the National Language, but "the non-knowledgeable and non-user of the language that lacks intellectualization".

The work of intellectualization of Filipino has a long way to go, but as the Chinese proverb states it, "the journey of a thousand miles begins with the first step". And we have taken a big first step. Let us continue to work on the intellectualization of Filipino, encouraging all types of contributions to this process, whether they be in the form of wordlists, translations or original textbooks and articles. MABUHAY ANG FILIPINO.

References

- BAUTISTA, M. L. S. (1996). *Readings in Philippine sociolinguistics*. Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- BAUTISTA, M. L. S. 1996. An outline: The National Language and the language of instruction. In M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *Readings in Philippine sociolinguistics* (pp. 223-227). Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- CONSTANTINO, E. A. (1996). *Ortografi ng Wikang Filipino*. Diliman, Q. C.: CSSP Publications at Departamento ng Linggwistiks, Kolehyo ng Sosyal-Sayans at Pilosopiya. Unibersidad ng Pilipinas.
- CONSTANTINO, E. A. (1996). *The contemporary English-Filipino dictionary*. Diliman, Q.C. : EAC Center for Philippine Languages, i-xii and 1-382.
- DEPARTAMENTO NG FILIPINO AT MGA WIKA NG PILIPINAS. (1993). *Filipino ispelng sa DLSU*. Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- ENRIQUEZ, V. C. (1985). Pagbuo ng terminolohiya sa sikolohiyang Pilipino. In A. O. Santiago (Ed.), *Linggwistika at panitikan. Mga piling sanaysay na handog-parangal kay Al Q. Perez* (pp. 261-283). Manila: Rex Bookstore at Pambansang Samahan sa Linggwistikang Pilipino, Ink. (Reprinted in M. L. S. Bautista (Ed.), *Readings in Philippine sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-286). Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- FERGUSON, C. A. (1968). Language development. In J. A. Fishman, C. A. Ferguson & J. das Gupta (Eds.), *Language problems in developing nations* (pp. 27-35). New York: Wiley.
- FERRIOLS, R. J., S.J. (1991). *Pambungad sa metapisika*. Loyola Heights, Q.C.: Ateneo de Manila University Office of Research and Publication.
- GARVIN, P. L. AND MATHIOT, M. (1968). The urbanization of the Guarani language: A problem in language and culture. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the sociology of language* (pp. 365-374). The Hague: Mouton.
- GONZALEZ, A. B. (1985). The sixteenth century Tagalog of the *Doctrina Christiana* (1593): A first step towards intellectualization. *Likha* 2, 1-36.
- GONZALEZ, A. B. (1988). The intellectualization of Filipino: Agenda for the twenty-first century. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 19(2), 3-6.
- HALLIDAY, M. A. K. (1968). The users and uses of language. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the sociology of language* (pp. 139-169). The Hague: Mouton.
- HALLIDAY, M. A. K. & HASSAN, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- HATCH, E. (1992). *Discourse and language education*. N.Y. : Cambridge University Press.
- HAUGEN, E. (1972). *Dialect, language, nation: Essays by Einar Haugen*. Selected and Introduced by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- OTANES, F. T. (1994). *Survey of translation preferences in Filipino*. Manila: Philippine Normal University (Language Study Center).
- SCHANKS, R. AND ABELSON, R. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals and understanding*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Earlbaum.

INTELLECTUALIZATION OF FILIPINO

- SIBAYAN, B. P. (1986). Comment on the *Question of an official language: Language rights and the English language* by David F. Marshall. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 60, 163-168. Reprinted in *The Intellectualization of Filipino and other essays on education and sociolinguistics*. (1999). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines, pp. 195-199.
- SIBAYAN, B. P. 1988. Terms and points of reference with particular reference to Filipino. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics*, 19(2), 7-12.
- SIBAYAN, B. P. (1991). The intellectualization of Filipino. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 88, 69-82. Reprinted in *The intellectualization of Filipino and other essays on education and sociolinguistics*. (1999). Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines, pp. 447-459.
- SIBAYAN, B. P. (1998). A suggested one-hundred-year timetable for the intellectualization of Filipino. Paper presented at the International Conference on Language and Education. Manila, April 3-4, 1998. Revised and Reprinted in *The intellectualization of Filipino and other essays on education and sociolinguistics*. (1999). Manila. The Linguistic Society of the Philippines, pp. 229-240.
- TIMBREZA, F. T. (1999). *Intelektwalisasyon ng pilosopiyang Filipino*. Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- TINIO, R. S. 1975. *Pilipino para sa mga intelektuwal*. *Likha* 6, 147-149.