

REVIEWS

Filipino o Pilipino?: Mga Bagong Babasahin sa Pambansang Wika at Literatura. Inedit nina ERNESTO CONSTANTINO, ROGELIO SIKAT, at PAMELA D. CRUZ Manila: Rex Book Store, 214 pp.

Reviewed by MA. LOURDES S. BAUTISTA, De La Salle University

The title which the editors have given this volume has been a very happy choice; under its umbrella are covered the different topics, points of view, and undertakings brought together in this collection. The wide scope of the book is indicated by the titles and general contents of its six sections. Section I is entitled 'Pagdebelop as Pambansang Wika at Literatura'; it contains four articles that present what can be called the UP position on, and approach to, developing our national language and literature. The eight articles of Section II, 'Pambansang Wika sa Edukasyong Filipino', in general provide a short history of the use of the national language as a medium of instruction in the University of the Philippines. Section III, 'Pambansang Wika sa Literaturang Filipino', has eight articles dealing with the creation and the teaching of Philippine literature, with some emphasis on the teaching of Philippine literature at UP. Section IV, 'Pagsasalin sa Wikang Pambansa', is made up of two articles discussing the role of translation in the development of the national language and literature. Section V, 'Sayantipikong Wika', presents two instances of the use of the national language in scientific discourse, one example being from botany and the other from analytic geometry. Section VI, 'Mga Apendiks', made up of Appendix A to G, compiles several position papers prepared by members of the Board of the Institute of National Language on the national language problem, translations in the Filipino of UP of sections of the Philippine Constitution and of the Bilingual Education Policy and its implementing guidelines, and a copy of the alphabet and the new rules for orthography prepared by the INL.

Except for one article, Liwag's 'Ang Deribatib', the source for which is not given, all the articles had been presented earlier as short talks or lectures or articles, given either in Pilipino/Filipino originally or in English and then subsequently translated by the editors into Pilipino/Filipino. The fact that the papers were not specifically prepared for this volume does not detract from the worth of the collection; it is contribution enough that the editors have put together in one handy package all of these 'new readings in the national language and literature'.

There is no question that every student of Pilipino/Filipino and every student of sociolinguistics should have a copy of this book. Even apart from the important ideas that it proposes and espouses, the book is valuable because it serves as a superb piece of documentation. As I see it, the documentation assumes the following form:

1. It exemplifies some of the different styles, or formality levels, of Pilipino/Filipino. Consider the following samples:

1.1 Layunin ng papel na ito na ipaliwanag ang ilang misteryo ng paraang ito [the 'universal approach']. Pagkaraan ng mahigit na isang taon mula nang iharap ito sa Konkon, ipinasiya namin na ipaliwanag dito sa komperensiyang ito ang mga

pangunahing karakteristik ng paraang ito. Alam namin na isang malaking obligasyon para sa amin na iharap ang paraang ito sa publiko, lalo na sa komperensiyang ito ng mga eksperto sa wika mula sa iba't ibang bansa sa Asia, mga lingguwist, mga titser sa wika at iba pang iskolar sa wika, dahil sa pangyayaring ang paraang ito ang inindors o sadyang pinili ng Komite ng Wikang Pambansa ng Konkon na gagamitin sa pagdeblop sa bagong wikang pambansa ng Pilipinas. (Ernesto Constantino, 'Ang "Universal Approach" at ang Wikang Pambansa ng Pilipinas', p. 18)

1.2 Ang direksyon ng pananaliksik sa bilinggwalismo at bilinggwal na pagtuturo sa Pilipinas ay napakalinaw. Ito'y tungo sa pagtuklas sa mga kundisyong makatutulong sa higit na mabisang pagkatuto ng mga Pilipino. Halimbawa, maaaring alamin sa pamamagitan ng metodo ng sikolohiyang eksperimental kung aling anyo ng salita ang pinakamainam para sa mabilis o mahusay na pagkatuto, paggunita at pag-unawa. Simula lamang ang paga-aantas ng mga salita sa pagsasalin. Sa pamamagitan ng mga panglaboratoryong lapit sa kalikasan at proseso ng pagsasalin, mapagaalaman hindi lamang kung aling bersyon ng pagsasalin ang gusto ng mga kalahok kundi, mas mahalaga pa rito, aling bersyon ang maiintindihan at epektibong magagamit ng mga estudyante sa Pilipinas. (Virgilio G. Enriquez, 'Ang Alamat ng Bilinggwal na Pilipino', pp. 85-6)

1.3 Ang wika ay di lamang imbentaryo ng mga sagisag. Manapa'y maayos na pagkakaugnay-ugnay ng mga ito sa loob ng mga hulwaran at kayarian. Sa masining na panunulat ay kailangang-kailangan ang pambihirang kakayahan sa manipulasyon ng kawing ng mga sagisag na ito.

Ang mga salita ay may indibidwal na katangian — at pang-akit. Ang karamihan sa mga manunulat nang lumipas ay binalani ng mga salita. At sa pagkakabalaning iyon ay nawala sila ng pagpipigil hanggang sa kaladkarin ang kanilang idea ng mga waywayan, masalimuot at mabuway na kayarian. (Ponciano B.P. Pineda, 'Ang Wika ng Panitikan', p. 121)

Going impressionistically, I think there are three styles here. I shall borrow Joos' terms (1968) and call the style of the first sample consultative, the style of the second formal, and the style of the third frozen. If, indeed, there are three styles here, what appears from these samples is that 'style' in Pilipino/Filipino depends less on syntax than on lexicon. Pineda's syntax is no more complex than Constantino's and Enriquez's and yet his style seems the most formal of the three; this may be due to Pineda's lexical choices. Between the sample from Constantino and that from Enriquez, the first seems less formal than the second, perhaps because of the greater number of patently English-derived words in the first. As I said earlier, I am going by impressions and the analysis I am giving here is very superficial. But the discussion brings out an intriguing question in the analysis of styles in Pilipino/Filipino: How much has 'purism' got to do with style and how can this 'purism' be measured?

2. The book records our difficulties in finding a way to standardize our orthography. The principle followed by the editors is to be as liberal as the new rules of orthography will allow and, in effect, to allow alternative spellings to compete in the market. Just as the new rules allow *buwaya* or *buaya* or *bwaya*, *indibiduwal* or *indibidwal* or *indibidwal*, *kuwento* or *kuento* or *kwento* (Apendiks B, 174), so throughout this collection, *bilinggwal* and *bilinggwal*, *lingguwistika* and *linggwistika*, *medium* and *midyum* alternate. It is obvious that the problem lies mainly in the spelling of borrowed English words. If English *propose* is given affixes and then spelled as *iprinopos*, the question becomes, do we really pronounce it as /i pri no pos/ or, as seems to be the case, /i pri no pows/? And if we give it a different affix, do we then spell it as *nagpropopos* or, what seems to be more accurate, *nag-propopose* (as rule 8.iv of the new orthography would dictate)? If the purpose is to

represent graphemically the pronunciation of such words, then the better way to spell them seems to be *iprinopose*, *ipabliish*, and *iskolarship*. If the purpose, however, is to make borrowed words look native, then *iprinopos*, *ipablis* and *iskolarsip* serve the purpose better. What is one's purpose then? Why should *mass media* be spelled *mas media* (21)? Why not *mass media* or *mas midya*? Isn't it possible for all words ending in English /ʃan/ to be spelled in one way? The spelling of the underlined words in the phrase *ang mga tradisyon at kombensiyong makikita sa mga unang nobelang Tagalog* (40) and of *introduksiyon* and *edukasyon* on the same page (149) seems highly inconsistent and raises the question of whether a writer, at least, should not aim at consistency within his article, even if the principle is *laissez faire* at the moment.

3. It documents efforts to intellectualize Pilipino/Filipino. The intellectualization of the national language is intimately tied to its use in tertiary institutions as a medium of instruction; the book provides a case history of Pilipino/Filipino in the University of the Philippines from the time a few professors experimentally used it as a medium of instruction in 1966 to the present time when English in effect has become optional because it can be replaced by Pilipino/Filipino in the General Education Program (61-2).

The volume also presents different ways of developing the national language for use in scholarly discourse. In 'Pagpaparami ng Lubi-Lubi (*Ficus pseudopalma*)', Lugod uses Pilipino/Filipino sentences and simply inserts English words, thus:

Isinaksak ang bawat cutting sa anggulong 30 degrees sa isang seed plot at diniligan ang mga ito araw-araw. (158)

Liwag, on the other hand, transforms English terms into Pilipino/Filipino-sounding words in her article 'Ang Deribatib':

Kung ekwesyon (2) ang gagamitin natin, hindi naman natin alam ang koordiney ng (x_1, y_1); isa lamang ang alam nating poynt, ang (x, y). Kung gayon, humanap tayo ng ibang paraan ng pagkuha ng islop ng nakadikit na linyang L (na siya ring islop ng kurba). (165)

Although Enriquez's article does not appear in the section on scientific language, his discussion of bilingualism in 'Ang Alamat ng Bilinggwal na Pilipino' is a good example of how Pilipino/Filipino can be used for scholarly purposes. As can be seen in the following passage, his approach uses translation; he looks for the most accurate equivalent in Pilipino/Filipino of the English term:

Isa pang pag-uuri ng bilinggwalismo ang iminungkahi ni Weinreich (1953). Ito ay ang pagkakaiba ng *bilinggwalismong tambalan* sa *bilinggwalismong magkaagapay* . . . Ayon kay Weinreich (1953), ang mga sagisag ay tambalan para sa isang bilinggwal kapag ang iisang bagay na tinutukoy ay may tig-isang sagisag sa dalawang wika. Magkaagapay ang mga sagisag para sa isang bilinggwal kapag iisa lamang ang tinutukoy ng bawat sagisag kahit mapapansing ito ay may katumbas na sabi sa ikalawang wika. (77-8)

The alternatives available to us in elaborating the lexicon of the national language are vividly illustrated in different articles by Constantino: In one article, he uses *dayalek* and *gramar*, in another, *diyalekto* and *gramatika*.

Efforts to intellectualize Pilipino/Filipino are also evident in the articles in the collection which are translations of documents, lectures, or speeches originally prepared in English and here presented in the Filipino of UP. These include Constantino's speech on the 'universal approach', sections of S.P. Lopez's speech to the UP Writers Club, Behn

Cervantes' talk on Philippine theater, the resolution of the National Board of Education on bilingual education, the policy guidelines proposed by the INL on media of instruction, the Department of Education and Culture's implementing guidelines for the Bilingual Education Policy, and sections of the Philippine Constitution (the Preamble, Articles I, II, and XV).

4. The book, specifically the lead article by Constantino, provides a historical account of the events in the Constitutional Convention that led to the repudiation of Tagalog-based Pilipino and the acceptance of 'a common national language to be called Filipino'.

Constantino graphically reconstructs the sociolinguistic atmosphere of those days; the extreme hostility of the majority of the ConCon delegates to Tagalog and therefore to Tagalog-based Pilipino and the imminent possibility that, as a result, English might be selected as the national language of the Philippines. His narrative shows us that against this possibility, the linguists of UP had to act and so they proposed the 'universal approach' to developing a new national language.

On the four points above, the book is an important document and is already assured of its place in the literature on the sociology of language.

The book is also important for two ideas that recur over and over like leit-motifs. Both ideas sound eminently reasonable now and appear to be non-controversial, but they must have been controversial when they were first broached.

One idea concerns our national literature—why is it, Constantino and Sikat ask, that what is commonly called Philippine literature is none other than Tagalog literature written by Tagalogs (37)? They claim that Philippine literature, to deserve the name, should encompass not only the literature written in Tagalog and the literature written by Filipinos in Spanish and English but also the literature in the different vernaculars; not only the *balagtasan* of the Tagalogs therefore, but also the *balaks* of the Cebuanos, the *tenes-tenes* of the Badjaos, the *pembayoka* of the Magindanaos, and so on. There is a need, they say, to compile the regional literatures and then to translate them into the national language in order to form our national literature. In doing this, we will come closer to shaping our national consciousness.

The other idea concerns our national language. Constantino and his colleagues maintain, not in these words but in words to this effect, that our national language should be a language different from the specific formal register of Tagalog enshrined in the 1939 *Balarila* of the INL. I think most Filipinos will agree with this position; we certainly do not want puristic Tagalog to be our national language.

The controversy begins when we start asking what the basis of our national language should be. The Constitutional Convention delegates accepted the 'universal approach' proposed by Cecilio Lopez and Constantino as the way to develop our national language; through the 'universal approach' we hope to be able to form 'a common national language to be called Filipino'. Constantino claims that the 'universal approach' has been much misunderstood; it is necessary therefore that the principles underlying the approach and the methods that can be used in this approach be presented here.

Constantino mentions the following three principles (22-3):

1. The first principle states that the national language of the Philippines should be based not on one language alone but on several languages of the Philippines, but this does not preclude the possibility that one of these languages will serve as the nucleus or

starting point of the national language.

2. The second principle states that in choosing the elements or forms to be included in the national language (for example, the sounds, words, affixes, constructions, etc.), we should prefer the elements or forms that are used by the great majority of languages.

3. The third principle states that the national language will be allowed to have, especially at the start, several groups of words having similar meanings (synonyms), but as much as possible, not to have more than four members to a group.

According to Constantino (23), two methods are possible in forming the national language: Method A begins with several languages at the same time while Method B begins with only one language. (Constantino later adds a third method, Method C, which takes from two to eight languages as the basis of the national language (25).) In whatever method is chosen, several steps are necessary; Constantino lists them as follows (23-4):

1. To adopt a universal alphabet, like the alphabet approved by the INL (and given in Appendix B of this book).

2. To write a universal grammar of the languages of the Philippines; this means providing an analysis of the deep and surface structures of the different Philippine languages and dialects.

3. To prepare a universal dictionary or thesaurus for the languages and dialects of the Philippines. If Method A is followed, the dictionary will be composed of all the words collected in the different Philippine languages and dialects, with synonyms being grouped under one entry. If Method B is used, words from the language chosen to be the nucleus of the national language will comprise the initial dictionary of the national language. In the following years, this dictionary will be enriched by words coming from other local languages and from foreign languages.

4. To standardize the dictionary, the following steps should be taken: (1) Remove from the dictionary all synonyms used by fewer than one-half or one-third of the languages represented in the dictionary, except those synonyms coming from a large regional language, like Tagalog, Cebuano, Ilokano, or Tausug. (b) Whenever possible, there should be no more than four members in every group of synonyms. (c) There should be no synonyms for words that are frequently used, like articles and other markers for grammatical relations.

There can be no quarrel with Constantino if Method B is indeed properly subsumed under the 'universal approach'. In Method B, one language is used as the basis of the national language, i.e. the grammar of one language serves as the basis of the grammar for the national language; to the lexicon of this language are added lexical items coming from different existing Philippine and foreign languages. Constantino of course uses the term 'starting point'; it is not clear whether 'starting point' should be taken to refer to 'initial grammar and initial lexicon' to which grammatical features and lexical items from other languages will be added. If such is the case, there will be quibbling over whether it is possible, once a language is codified, to fit in syntactic and morphological structures from other languages within the existing system.

However, the 'universal approach' has become associated not with Method B but with Methods A and C. That is, judging from the spirit of the discussions at the ConCon and among students of sociolinguistics, the 'universal approach' is tied to the concept of creating an amalgam language from existing Philippine languages and dialects. Constantino must be granted the point that nowhere does he mention 'amalgamating' languages,

but perhaps 'amalgamating' has been taken as the shorthand term for 'forming a national language out of several languages'.

Elsewhere, Gonzalez (1974) admits that it is theoretically possible to construct a language using the 'universal approach' but he questions the practicality and the feasibility of such an enterprise. Assuming that Constantino has already analyzed the deep structures of twenty-six Philippine languages (1965), the problem remains one of comparing the transformational rules of existing Philippine languages and of abstracting a common set of transformations that will produce the surface structures of Filipino.

It is difficult, therefore to accept at face value the following remark from Constantino:

As of now, we have collected at UP a great bulk of data from more than 400 [sic] languages and dialects of the Philippines. If we are given the necessary funding, personnel and equipment, the universal grammar will be finished within two years. (Translation mine, 23.)

Taking another view of the matter, a grammar is prepared on the basis of surface structure; from the surface structure one infers the deep structure and the transformations the deep structure has undergone to become surface structure. In his 1965 article, Constantino lists the surface structure for sentences of the twenty-six languages and then he posits the deep structure and transformations for these sentences. One question is therefore begging to be asked: What is the surface structure of Filipino, taken as incorporating common elements of Philippine languages? A corollary to this is: How can deep structures and transformations be posited for it when there is no surface structure, because there is no living language, to begin with?

Constantino claims that forming a language out of different languages is not impossible and that this is being done now in Norway (Haugen 1968) and was done in Southern Rhodesia and Macedonia (Lunt 1959). He does not give the source for the Southern Rhodesia example and I will not be able to discuss it here. But the Norwegian case does not prove his point; in fact, it highlights the difficulties involved in fusing languages. The problem in Norway is to form Samnorsk from a fusion of Bokmal and Nynorsk, which, according to Haugen (684) 'are not really distinct languages, but might be called stylistic norms'. Haugen says further:

None of the planning for fusion . . . would be conceivable if the two written norms with all their subvarieties were genuinely distinct languages. Bm. and Nn., particularly in their government-administered forms, have a very large common core: (1) They have identical phonemic systems, though the phonemes are of course differently distributed in many obviously cognate words . . . (2) They have virtually identical syntax: Word order is so similar that in nearly every case translation requires no change whatever . . . (3) They have most of their vocabulary in common . . . (4) The chief difference today is in morphology, and it is at this point that interpenetration of the two languages is most difficult . . . (683)

In spite of the fact that there are only two languages involved and there are obvious similarities between them, in spite of the fact that the government is actively involved in language engineering, after more than half a century, Norway still has not completely succeeded in forming and standardizing its written norm.

The case of Macedonian has even fewer parallels with our own case. The problem there involved adopting a standard language that would symbolize the cultural and linguistic solidarity of all Macedonians within the Yugoslav federal state and their inde-

pendence from their Serbian and Bulgarian neighbors, who for certain periods in history had dominated them. Eventually, a 'generalized Macedonian language' was evolved, based principally on the dialects of the central west. Lunt (22) gives the reason for this choice:

These dialects have several advantages: They are the most distinct from both Serbian and Bulgarian, they are relatively homogeneous, and they are spoken by the largest portion of the total population. Moreover the neighboring dialects share a good many of their features, so that it is not difficult for any Macedonian to adapt his speech to the central western type.

Notice how different the sociolinguistic facts are in the two cases. There was no attempt there to develop a standard language from several languages, only an attempt to develop a standard language from relatively homogeneous dialects. Furthermore, there was a 'lack of dissent about important details' (23); this may partly have been because 'on points where the western dialects differ, there is usually a clear majority usage on which "everybody agreed"' (23). Another important factor is this: The Macedonians number less than a million people, at least as of 1959, when Lunt wrote his article.

Apart from the difficulty of constructing a language from several languages, there is another problem. Will this constructed language become a living language? Gonzalez believes that a confected Filipino has little chance of survival because there is no community to support it, to propagate it. Nakpil (1972), quoted by Constantino (28), says that 'an artificial language with no native speakers . . . just won't take'.

To this, Constantino has an evasive reply. He says that depending on the method used, the result may be a natural language with native speakers (Method B) or an artificial language with no native speakers at the beginning (Methods A and C). He then quotes Pei (1968) as saying that artificiality is irrelevant to the discussion; the 'artificial' automobile is superior to the 'natural' horse for purposes of travel today. Still, it is a fact that no artificial language (Esperanto, Parle, Orbis, Frate, Universalia — as mentioned by Nakpil) has yet become widespread and acquired a community of speakers.

Rather than go by what Constantino believes will be the way the national language could be formed, let us go by how it is actually being formed—for example, at UP. There, as Constantino himself says, the national language is being developed by using Method B, by basing Filipino on the Pilipino of UP. This Pilipino, according to Constantino (26-7), is definitely not Tagalog but is the kind of Pilipino being used in the whole country, not only in the Tagalog regions but even in the non-Tagalog regions. As I see it, the Pilipino of UP is Tagalog-based Pilipino, with the important proviso that this Tagalog base is not puristic Tagalog but rather the Tagalog spoken in Manila, the Manila lingua franca with its great number of borrowed words. At this stage, the loanwords are mainly of Spanish and English origin and it may still take some time before words from the vernacular languages are taken in.

Judging then from the sample of the Pilipino/Filipino of UP given in this book, and assuming that this is taken to be the exemplar of the 'universalist approach', there is no longer any controversy. Anyway, with or without the controversy, the language which in reality is Pilipino but is legally called Filipino will continue to grow, develop, and spread.

In conclusion, I recommend this book highly. The choice of articles is commendable, although I have reservations about the inclusion of several short pieces that simply echo Constantino. The organization of the papers is logical. The editing and proofreading and printing are almost flawless. Most important of all, the ideas and the documentation are invaluable. In short, this is the kind of book that the Institute of National Language should be publishing and that all students of the national language should be discussing.

REFERENCES

- CONSTANTINO, ERNESTO. 1965. The sentence patterns of twenty-six Philippine languages. *Lingua* 15.71-124.
- GONZALEZ, ANDREW. 1974. The 1973 Constitution and the Bilingual Education Policy of the Department of Education and Culture. *Philippine Studies* 22.325-37.
- HAUGEN, EINAR. 1968. Language planning in modern Norway. Readings in the sociology of language, ed. by Joshua A. Fishman, 673-87. The Hague: Mouton.
- JOOS, MARTIN. 1968. The isolation of styles. Readings in the sociology of language, ed. by Joshua A. Fishman, 185-91. The Hague: Mouton.
- LUNT, HORACE G. 1959. The creation of standard Macedonian: Some facts and attitudes. *Anthropological Linguistics* 1(5). 19-26.
- NAKPIL, CARMEN GUERRERO. 1972. Happy but mute. *The Manila Chronicle*, April 7, 1972, p. 4.
- PEI, MARIO. 1968. Foreword. *Esperanto: A complete grammar*, by Ivy Kellerman Reed, vii-x. Metuchen, N.J.: The Scarecrow Press.
- SURIAN NG WIKANG PAMBANSA. 1939. *Balarila ng Wikang Pambansa*. Maynila: Kawanihan ng Palimbagan.