

GONZALEZ, ANDREW, FSC and MA. LOURDES S. BAUTISTA, eds.
1981. Aspects of language planning and development in the Philippines.
Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Reviewed by Gloria Chan

Ateneo de Manila University

From June to September, 1977, the Linguistic Society of the Philippines, assisted by the Philippine Social Science Council, initiated and sponsored a series of round-table conferences on language planning and development. Later that same year, from October 20-23, a national conference of linguists and language education specialists was held, again spearheaded by the LSP and co-sponsored by the Surian ng Wikang Pambansa, the Philippine Social Science Council and the Fund for Assistance to Private Education. The papers read and the proceedings of these two 'linguistic events' have been painstakingly compiled by Gonzalez and Bautista.

The papers read at the round-table conferences are presented in Part I, and the papers read during the national conference are found in Part II. What results is a seemingly voluminous and, therefore, impressive volume, but it is in fact neither voluminous nor impressive. It is not voluminous because one can easily breeze through the papers and digest what is being said without difficulty. With the exception of a handful, the papers and the proceedings read like a broken record — the same issues and problems in language planning and development occur and recur. One, however, tenaciously reads on with the hope that something new and revolutionary (or earthshaking, to borrow Gonzalez's favorite term) will appear, only to be disappointed, though not totally so. This is what I mean by my negation of the impressiveness of the book.

Lest I be taken to task for making a general statement without citing specific instances, I would like to enumerate the issues and problems that crop up in this volume and in every single conference on language which has made each succeeding conference increasingly boring because monotonous:

1. the national language vis-à-vis the 1973 Constitution
2. the particular variety of Pilipino — colloquial or formal — to be used in the classroom
3. the necessity/non-necessity of having a national language as a unifying force for the Philippines
4. the viability of switching to Pilipino as medium of instruction in terms of teacher preparation and materials construction
5. the raging battle between and among the Purists, the Filipino proponents and the Manguayin proponents
6. the most effective and sure-proof way of propagating Pilipino

It is evident that a considerable amount of thinking went into the planning of the round-table conferences. The editors came up with a neat analytical framework (taken from Haugen for language planning) in which papers read at each round-table conference were supposed to conform to each of the four stages of the framework: 1) selection of norm 2) codification of form 3) elaboration of function and 4) acceptance by population.

Perhaps the most enlightening papers in Part I of the book are those that focus on the codification of form. This includes the following articles: Otones's 'On the Intellectualization and Elaboration of Pilipino — the PNC Experience', Enriquez's 'Ang Intelektwalisasyon ng Wikang Filipino sa Disiplina ng Sikolohiya', and del Rosario's 'Ang Manguayin Talasalitaan sa Agham at Aghimuan' and 'Ang Pamamaraang Manguayin sa Saunlad ng Pilipino'. However, what I found confusing and disconcerting in this section was the use of the word 'intellectualization'. It is not clear which particular

concept the word is referring to – does it refer to the process of expanding the lexicon of Pilipino or to the mental exercise of perceiving, understanding, forming, abstracting, and/or formulating certain ideas through the use of Pilipino? Otones's and del Rosario's articles dwell on intellectualization in the first sense whereas Enriquez's focuses on the second.

It is not until one gets to the Discussion that comes at the end of the section that one realizes that Gonzalez and Bautista view intellectualization as the elaboration of the lexicon. I think it is rather presumptuous of them to make the claim that 'only linguists understand that the term refers to expanding the resources of a language so that it can be used for scholarly purposes' (105), for I am a linguist and my initial understanding of the term certainly does not conform to theirs! Perhaps to avoid initial confusion, Gonzalez and Bautista should have settled for the simple label 'elaboration of lexicon'.

In actuality, Enriquez, by expounding on indigenous concepts in the field of psychology, is not concerned with the codification of form. To be sure, the forms already exist and are very much a part of the Filipino's active vocabulary: *tampo*, *salingpusa*, *hinanakit*, etc. Enriquez succinctly sees the problem as one of 'translating Pilipino terms into English because we can hardly express these in English' and gives the example of *sama ng loob*, *hinanakit* and *tampo*, all translated as English 'resentment' although each differs from the other in meaning. In his opinion, Pilipino 'from the point of view of psychology is rich enough' and 'does not need any intellectualization', an opinion with which I wholeheartedly agree.

What is the implication of Enriquez's article on language planning? Most certainly, language planning in the Philippines has to include an exploration into other fields where indigenous concepts abound, and this brings to light a major oversight of the book. It should, but does not, include representative papers on religion, philosophy, sociology, political science and history. Authorities in these fields have been experimenting with Pilipino as medium of instruction and have in the process unearthed insights as revolutionary as Enriquez's in psychology.

Enriquez proposes several ways of categorizing concepts in Filipino psychology. Where foreign influences definitely have no native counterpart both linguistically and conceptually, he takes the pragmatic stance of borrowing the concept lock, stock and barrel, e.g. 'home for the aged', 'prejudice'. His main concern, however, is to explore indigenous concepts and in the process, he is able to arrive at insights heretofore neglected.

Enriquez contends that 'prejudice' and what it implies is too potent a word to be used in the Philippine context. He claims that prejudice does not exist here, for an Ilocano, a Maranao and a Cebuano would not mind living together in the same room in a school dorm; thus, he proposes that the word 'preference' be used. I think prejudice does exist in the Philippines; it may not be, however, too evident among Ilocanos, Cebuanos, Maranaos, etc. but it is certainly evident where the Chinese are concerned. To what else can one ascribe the government's policy of nationalizing the rice and corn industry in 1969 and of prohibiting the Chinese from the retail trade in 1954 if not to prejudice (Chan Yap 1977:93)?

Otones and del Rosario each talk about the approaches and methodologies their respective institutions use in the codification of form. Del Rosario's methodology can be described as more systematic, and therefore, more rigid and scientific than Otones's. For example, the prefix *mik* coming from Pilipino *mikmik* 'very small' is regularly affixed to certain roots to indicate diminution.

miksipat	'microscope'
miktinig	'microphone'
miksalikop	'miniaturized circuit'
miksurian	'microanalysis'

miktataghay

'micro organism'

Del Rosario makes the claim that such a method enhances school-children's learning of scientific concepts since it uses terms that are familiar to the children; to indicate smallness, students will only have to remember the prefix. Such an argument is sound and I would tend to agree with Del Rosario.

The systematicity of the methodology del Rosario talks about is based on perfectly acceptable ways of linguistic codification; however there is a tendency to over-do things so that what results may not be pedagogically sound. One such process of codification, for example, is blending; del Rosario gives the following as examples of this process:

puhoy from *puno* and *kahoy* 'arbor'

taburaw from *taon*, *buwan*, and *araw* 'date'

sagitan ng from *sa pamamagitan ng* 'by means of'

ligbay from *ligtas* and *buhay* 'survival'

siksin from *siksik* and *sinsin* 'solid'

The question I would like to ask is this: why should new forms have to be manufactured when there are already existing equivalents, for example, *petsa* or *pecha* for date? The answer of course is that the Maignayin Approach would like to utilize indigenous forms for codification purposes, i.e., *pecha* is from Spanish *fecha*. But, is this really the case? Del Rosario says on page 295:

However, if the scientific terms to be translated are only simple names and not abstract concepts, these can be directly borrowed from foreign languages, like

bapor	dollar	gestalt
antena	ton	karate
tsek	pisos	sukiyaki
ampin	gramo	tsunami
bolt	om	Martes
metro	eng	Hupiter

Clearly then, there is some sort of inconsistency in the approach. In addition, one wonders what the bases are for determining which foreign scientific terms should be borrowed and which ones should have new creations in Pilipino? Del Rosario, for instance, mentions *init sukat*, rather than *termometro* for thermometer. If *metro* has been suggested as a form to be borrowed, why not *termometro*?

On the whole, the Maignayin Approach is a laudable one; even more laudable are the people who believe in the approach and are working very hard to propagate it. It is a pity, though, that the fruits of their success are mainly confined within the walls of Araneta University.

The approach to the codification of form that Otanes describes is a pragmatic, rather than a scientific, one. This does not mean though that it is totally unscientific; it is scientific without the rigidity of the Maignayin Approach and because it follows a systematic procedure.

The procedure calls for a collective decision of the translation group, followed by feedback from the try-out teachers. Translated materials are tried out for two successive years: the first year at the PNC Laboratory School and the second year at selected schools in both Tagalog and non-Tagalog areas.

Otanes points out two things in relation to codification of form which very likely will not meet the approval of the Maignayin proponents but yet are sensible. She reports that the 'intuition of translators, who were native Tagalog speakers, still played a great part in the decision-making' and that the vocabulary, especially in the teachers' guides, is

drawn from colloquial usage. The vocabulary developed in this manner will have greater mass appeal, and therefore, will be easier to disseminate.

However, the issue that logically follows is: what is the variety of Pilipino that should be used in the classroom, colloquial or formal? This is a question that can be discussed till one is 'blue in the face' and that will remain unanswered; this is apparent in the proceedings, Part II of the book.

I might add, too that in the approach Otones describes, there is a great number of borrowings: *kumandidato*, *bumoto*, *eleksyon*, *internasyonal*, *turismo*, *turista*, *pagbibiyah*, *planetaryum*, *pribadong kompanya*, *eksibit*, *makopya*; twelve out of sixteen words on a list used are borrowed.

In the review of these two approaches, I am fully conscious that their goals and objectives differ. The approach that Otones describes assumes that Pilipino is the selected norm and that it is based on colloquial Tagalog, whereas the Maignayin Approach sees Filipino as the language that has been selected as the norm and therefore the language that has to be developed.

A dimension of language that Otones mentions in passing has to do with the thought processes identified with Pilipino as contrasted with English. In Pilipino *Pakuluin ang tubig* 'boil the water' and *Patuyuin ang kamay* 'dry your hands', the Pilipino speaker is indicating that he can merely cause certain processes to take place whereas the English speaker thinks that he is capable of acting directly upon an object. This dimension is worthy of a longer treatment, not in a volume on language planning, but perhaps in a volume on the psycho-semantic aspects of language. Such a volume would be a more worthwhile, because challenging, pursuit for Gonzalez and Bautista.

A few brief remarks on the other articles or papers in Part I should be made. Pineda's paper merely outlines what the INL is planning to do, is doing and has done. It is a factual report that has to be accepted for what it is. Sibayan's paper, as usual, is anecdotal. What I always find irritating about Sibayan, as a speaker and a writer, are the unfathomable questions he raises every time. As a matter of fact, the editors of the book make the same comment — about the questions, not the resulting attitude. I find Sibayan's questions ego-deflating because a linguist like me cannot answer them. Constantino gives a 'blow-by-blow' historical account of the development of a national language for the Philippines and concludes that the Constitutional Convention of 1973 favors the use of the 'universal approach' in the development of a national language. Other than referring to the approach as a fusion of various Philippine languages, he has not given a detailed picture of the approach. This can be frustrating to a language researcher interested in language planning.

The two papers on the role of media, written by Cesar Mercado and Clodualdo del Mundo, Jr., bear out my impression and I suspect, that of a lot of other people, concerning the importance of media, especially movies, as a disseminator of Pilipino. Del Mundo's paper contains a wealth of data that are of value when one gets to stage 4 of language planning: acceptance by intended population. Lumbera's paper on the contribution of the literary artist to national language development takes a practical stance by suggesting that comics, because of their popularity, be used as a means of expanding the writers' influence.

The papers in Part II, in the main, re-echo what is said in Part I. I would suggest that anyone who has plowed through Part I need only skim through Part II. After each of the five sections, there is a summary of the discussions; I find the summary a most effective means of getting a consolidated picture.

Whatever negative impressions of the book I may have given at the beginning of the review must not mar its documentary value. The book is an excellent source for the problems and prospects, and the considerations and directions, of the entire process of language planning and development. While the issues and problems discussed in the book may appear trite and hackneyed to me because of my long (suffering?!) exposure to them,

Don't think
my mind
for give
—
What
is this?
So what
you
one
not
good fact

the books provides a wealth of materials to the researcher in language planning, Philippine style.

I don't think
Gloria can jump is
qualified to review
this book - nor any
for that matter.
She must still be writing for
the youths in class.